

# SEMI-LIE ARITHMETIC FUNDAMENTAL LEMMA FOR THE FULL SPHERICAL HECKE ALGEBRA

EVAN CHEN

*Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

ABSTRACT. As an analog to the Jacquet-Rallis fundamental lemma that appears in the relative trace formula approach to the Gan-Gross-Prasad conjectures, the arithmetic fundamental lemma was proposed by Wei Zhang and used in an approach to the arithmetic Gan-Gross-Prasad conjectures. The Jacquet-Rallis fundamental lemma was recently generalized by Spencer Leslie to a statement holding for the full spherical Hecke algebra. In the same spirit, Li, Rapoport, and Zhang have recently formulated a conjectural generalization of the arithmetic fundamental lemma to the full spherical Hecke algebra. This paper formulates another analogous conjecture for the semi-Lie version of the arithmetic fundamental lemma proposed by Yifeng Liu. Then this paper produces explicit formulas for particular cases of the weighted orbital integrals in the two conjectures mentioned above, and proves the first non-trivial case of the conjecture.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	4
1.1. Brief history and motivation for the arithmetic fundamental lemma	4
1.2. Formulation of AFL conjectures to the full spherical Hecke algebra	7
1.3. Results	11
1.4. Roadmap	15
2. Acknowledgments	16
3. General background	16
3.1. Notation	16
3.2. Intersection of disks in an ultrametric space	17
3.3. The spaces $S_n(F)$ and $S_n(F) \times V'_n(F)$	19
3.4. Definition of Hecke algebra	20

---

*E-mail address:* [evanchen@alum.mit.edu](mailto:evanchen@alum.mit.edu).

*Date:* February 11, 2025.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11G18, 11F70.

*Key words and phrases.* arithmetic fundamental lemma.

3.5.	The specific Hecke algebras $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$ and $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$ and the module $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$	20
4.	Regular semi-simplicity and matching	21
4.1.	Regular semi-simple elements	21
4.2.	Matching in the group version of the inhomogeneous AFL	23
4.3.	Matching in the semi-Lie version of the AFL	24
5.	Base change	24
5.1.	Background on the Satake transformation in transformation	25
5.2.	The Satake transformation for the particular Hecke algebras $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$ and $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$	25
5.3.	Relation of Satake transformation to base change	27
5.4.	The map $\mathrm{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}}$	27
5.5.	Example: Calculation of $\mathrm{BC}_{S_n}$ when $n = 3$	28
6.	Definition of the weighted orbital integral for $S_n(F)$	36
7.	Synopsis of the weighted orbital integral $\mathrm{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s)$ for $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\mathrm{rs}}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$	37
7.1.	Definition	37
7.2.	Basis for the indicator functions in $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$	38
7.3.	Parametrization of $\gamma$	39
7.4.	Parameters used in the calculation of the weighted orbital integral	40
8.	Support of the weighted orbital integral for $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$	41
8.1.	Iwasawa decomposition	41
8.2.	Action of upper triangular matrices on $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$	41
8.3.	Description of support	41
8.4.	Cases based on $\theta$	43
9.	Evaluation of the weighted orbital integral for $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$	46
9.1.	The contribution for Case 1	47
9.2.	The contribution for Case $2^+$ and Case $2^-$	48
9.3.	Proof of Theorem 1.5	52
9.4.	Proof of Corollary 1.6	58
9.5.	Proof of Corollary 1.7	60
10.	Large kernel and large image	62
10.1.	In the semi-Lie case, the kernel is trivial if we allow $v(e)$ to vary, for every fixed choice of $\gamma$	63
10.2.	In the semi-Lie case, the kernel has finite codimension for fixed $v(e)$	68
10.3.	A sequence of test functions almost lying in the kernel in the semi-Lie case	70
11.	Transfer factors	71
11.1.	Transfer factor for the inhomogeneous group AFL	71
11.2.	Transfer factor for the semi-Lie AFL	72
12.	The geometric side	73

12.1.	Rapoport-Zink spaces	73
12.2.	A realization of the non-split Hermitian space $\mathbb{V}_n^-$ of dimension $n$	74
12.3.	Intersection numbers for the group version of AFL for the full spherical Hecke algebra	74
12.4.	Intersection numbers for the semi-Lie version of AFL for the full spherical Hecke algebra	76
12.5.	An analogy between the geometric and analytic sides	78
13.	Intersection numbers for $\text{Int}((g, u), f)$ for $n = 2$	79
13.1.	Background on quaternion division algebra	79
13.2.	The invariants for the orbit of $(g, u)$	81
13.3.	A basis for $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+))$	83
13.4.	Background on special divisors for $n = 2$	84
13.5.	Comparison of the unitary and orthogonal special divisors	86
13.6.	The intersection number as a triple product	86
13.7.	The formula of Gross-Keating	87
14.	Proof of Theorem 1.12	89
14.1.	Matching $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ and $(g, u)$ , and the invariants for the matching	89
14.2.	Translation of the Gross-Keating data to the orbital side	90
14.3.	Base change	92
14.4.	Transfer factor	92
14.5.	Comparison to orbital formula	92
14.6.	Conclusion (proof of Theorem 1.12)	95
14.7.	A particularly clean formula for a certain intersection number	96
	References	99

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this whole paper,  $p > 2$  is a prime,  $F$  is a finite extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ , and  $E/F$  is an unramified quadratic field extension.

**1.1. Brief history and motivation for the arithmetic fundamental lemma.** The primary motivation for this paper arises from the study of conjectured variants of the arithmetic fundamental lemma for spherical Hecke algebras proposed in [LRZ24]. This section briefly provides an overview of the historical context that led to the formulation of these conjectures. This history is also summarized in Figure 1.

Because this subsection is meant for motivation only, in this survey we do not give complete definitions or statements, being content to outline a brief gist. A more detailed account can be found in [Zha24a].




FIGURE 1. The history behind the fundamental lemma and its arithmetic counterpart. Unlabeled arrows denote generalizations.

1.1.1. *The GGP conjectures, and the fundamental lemma of Jacquet-Rallis.*

In modern arithmetic geometry, a common theme is that there are deep connections between geometric data with the values of related  $L$ -functions.

This story begins with a result of Waldspurger [Wal85] which showed a formula relating the nonvanishing of an automorphic period integral to the central value of the same  $L$ -functions. Later, a conjecture that generalizes Waldspurger's formula was proposed by Gross-Prasad in [GP92; GP94]. This was further generalized to a series of conjectures now known as the Gan-Gross-Prasad (GGP) conjectures, which were proposed in 2012 in [GGP12]; they generalize the Gross-Prasad conjecture to different classical groups.

Specifically, the GGP conjecture predict the nonvanishing of a period integral based on the values of the  $L$ -function of a certain cuspidal automorphic representation.

In 2011, Jacquet-Rallis [JR11] proposed an approach to the Gross-Prasad conjectures for unitary groups via a relative trace formula (RTF). The idea is to compare an RTF for the general linear group to one for a unitary group. This approach relies on a so-called *fundamental lemma*, which links values of certain orbital integrals over two reductive groups over a non-Archimedean local field.

Let's be a bit more precise about what this fundamental lemma says. Let  $\mathbb{V}_n^+$  denote the split  $E/F$ -Hermitian space of dimension  $n$  (unique up to isomorphism), fix a unit vector  $w_0$  in it, and let  $(\mathbb{V}_n^+)^{\flat}$  be the orthogonal complement of the span of  $w_0$ . Let  $(G')^{\flat} := \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(E)$ ,  $G' := \mathrm{GL}_n(E)$ ,  $G^{\flat} := \mathrm{U}((\mathbb{V}_n^+)^{\flat})(F)$  and  $G := \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)(F)$ . For certain

$$\gamma \in (G')^{\flat} \times G', \quad g \in G^{\flat} \times G$$

the Jacquet-Rallis fundamental lemma proposes a relation between two orbital integrals. Specifically, it supplies a relation between

- the orbital integral of  $\gamma$  with respect to the indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_{(K')^{\flat} \times K'}$  of the natural hyperspecial compact subgroup

$$(K')^{\flat} \times K' \subset (G')^{\flat} \times G' = \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(E) \times \mathrm{GL}_n(E);$$

and

- the orbital integral of  $g$  with respect to the indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_{K^{\flat} \times K}$  of the natural hyperspecial compact subgroup

$$K^{\flat} \times K \subset G^{\flat} \times G = \mathrm{U}((\mathbb{V}_n^+)^{\flat})(F) \times \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)(F).$$

In other words, it states that

$$(1) \quad \mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \mathbf{1}_{(K')^{\flat} \times K'}) = \omega(\gamma) \mathrm{Orb}(g, \mathbf{1}_{K^{\flat} \times K})$$

where  $\omega(\gamma)$  is a suitable *transfer factor*. The fundamental lemma has since been proved completely; a local proof was given by Beuzart-Plessis [Beu21] while a global proof was given for large characteristic by W. Zhang [Zha21b].

1.1.2. *The arithmetic GGP conjectures, and the arithmetic fundamental lemma.* At around the same time Waldspurger's formula was published, Gross-Zagier [GZ86] proved a formula relating the height of Heegner points on certain modular curves to the derivative at  $s = 1$  of certain  $L$ -functions. The Gross-Zagier formula was then generalized over several decades, culminating in [YZZ13] where the formula is established for Shimura curves over arbitrary totally real fields.

An arithmetic analogue of the original Gan-Gross-Prasad conjectures, which we henceforth refer to as *arithmetic GGP* [GGP12], can then be formulated, further generalizing Gross-Zagier's formula. Here the modular curves in Gross-Zagier are replaced with higher dimensional Shimura varieties. Rather than the period integrals considered previously, one instead takes

intersection numbers of cycles on some Shimura varieties. Specifically, if one considers the Shimura variety associated to a classical group, the arithmetic GGP conjecture predicts a relation between intersection numbers on this Shimura variety with the central derivative of automorphic  $L$ -functions.

By analogy to the work Jacquet-Rallis [JR11], the arithmetic GGP conjectures should have a corresponding *arithmetic fundamental lemma* (henceforth AFL), which was proposed by W. Zhang [Zha12, Conjecture 2.9]. The arithmetic fundamental lemma then relates the derivative of the weighted orbital integral with respect to the indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_{(K')^b \times K'} \in \mathcal{H}((G')^b \times G, (K')^b \times K')$ , that is

$$\left. \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} \text{Orb}(\gamma, \mathbf{1}_{(K')^b \times K'}, s)$$

for  $\gamma \in (G')^b \times G'$ , to arithmetic intersection numbers on a certain Rapoport-Zink formal moduli space. The AFL in [Zha12] has since been proven over  $p$ -adic fields for any large prime  $p$  in Mihatsch-Zhang [MZ24], W. Zhang [Zha21b], and then for any odd prime  $p$  by Z. Zhang [Zha23].

1.1.3. *The semi-Lie version of the AFL proposed by Liu.* There is another different version of the AFL, proposed by Yifeng Liu in [Liu21, Conjecture 1.12], which is often referred to as the *semi-Lie version* of the AFL. Its statement has been shown to be equivalent to AFL, see [Liu21, Remark 1.13] and is thus now proven. In contrast, the original AFL proposed by Zhang in [Zha12, Conjecture 2.9] is sometimes referred to as the *group version*.

A more detailed account of this equivalence is described in [Liu21, §1.4].

1.1.4. *Generalizations of FL and AFL to the full spherical Hecke algebra.* Recently it was shown by Leslie [Les23] that in fact (1) holds in greater generality where the indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_{K^b \times K}$  can be replaced by any element in the spherical Hecke algebra  $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}((G')^b \times G', (K')^b \times K')$ . In that case,  $\mathbf{1}_{(K')^b \times K}$  needs to be replaced by the corresponding element  $\varphi'$  under a certain base change homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}((G')^b \times G', (K')^b \times K') &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(G^b \times G, K^b \times K) \\ \varphi' &\mapsto \varphi \end{aligned}$$

In that case, the identity (1) still hold as

$$(2) \quad \text{Orb}(\gamma, \varphi') = \omega(\gamma) \text{Orb}(g, \varphi).$$

To complete the analogy illustrated in Figure 1, there should thus be a generalization of the AFL in which  $\mathbf{1}_{(K')^b \times K}$  is replaced by any element of the Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{H}((G')^b \times G, (K')^b \times K)$ . This conjectural generalization (for the group version of the AFL) is [LRZ24] and we discuss it momentarily; while the analogous conjectural generalization for the semi-Lie version of the AFL is our Conjecture 1.2 also discussed in the next section.

## 1.2. Formulation of AFL conjectures to the full spherical Hecke algebra.

1.2.1. *The inhomogeneous version of the arithmetic fundamental lemma for spherical Hecke algebras proposed by Li-Rapoport-Zhang.* In contrast to the vague motivational cheerleading in the previous section, starting in this section we will give more precise statements, even though we will necessarily need to reference definitions appearing in later sections.

Retain the notation  $G' := \mathrm{GL}_n(E)$ , and  $G := \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)(F)$ , with  $K' \subset G'$  and  $K \subset G$  the natural hyperspecial compact subgroups. Also, let  $q$  denote the residue characteristic of  $F$ . Moreover, define the symmetric space

$$S_n(F) := \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(E) \mid g\bar{g} = \mathrm{id}_n\}.$$

Finally, let  $\mathbb{V}_n^-$  be the non-split Hermitian space of dimension  $n$  (unique up to isomorphism), while  $\mathbb{V}_n^+$  continues to denote the split one (again unique up to isomorphism).

For concreteness, we focus on the inhomogeneous version of the arithmetic fundamental lemma, which is [LRZ24, Conjecture 6.2.1]. This allows us to deal with just  $G'$  instead of  $(G')^b \times G'$ , etc., so that the Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{H}((G')^b \times G', (K')^b \times K')$  can be replaced by the simpler one  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E)) := \mathcal{H}(G', K')$ . Similarly,  $\mathcal{H}(G^b \times G, K^b \times K)$  can be replaced by the simpler  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)) := \mathcal{H}(G, K)$ .

The AFL conjecture provides a bridge between a geometric left-hand side (given by an intersection number) and an analytic right-hand side (given by a weighted orbital integral). Stating it requires several pieces of data. We only mention these pieces by name here, with definitions given later:

- On the geometric side, we have an intersection number. It uses the following ingredients.
  - We choose a regular semisimple element  $g \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ . (The notation  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  denotes the regular semisimple elements of  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$ , etc. The notion of regular semisimple is defined in [Definition 4.4](#).)
  - We choose a function  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  from the spherical Hecke algebra, defined in [Section 3](#).
  - We define a certain *intersection number*  $\mathrm{Int}(g, f)$  in [Definition 12.7](#). These intersection numbers take place in a Rapoport-Zink space described in [Section 12](#).
- On the analytic side, we have a weighted orbital integral. It uses the following ingredients.
  - We choose a regular semisimple element  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ .
  - We choose a test function  $\phi$  which comes from a certain  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$ -module that we will denote  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$ . This module  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  is defined in [Section 3](#).
  - The weighted orbital integral  $\mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi, s)$  is itself defined in [Definition 6.1](#). (It is connected to an unweighted orbital integral

on the unitary group according to [Theorem 6.3](#).) We abbreviate

$$\partial \text{Orb}(\gamma, \phi) := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} \text{Orb}(\gamma, \phi, s).$$

- There is also an extra transfer factor  $\omega \in \{\pm 1\}$  which we define in [Section 11](#).
- We need a way to connect the inputs between the two parts of our conjecture. Specifically,  $f$  and  $\phi$  need to be linked, and  $g$  and  $\gamma$  need to be linked. This is done as follows.
  - Once the regular semisimple element  $g \in \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}}$  is chosen, we require  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}$  to be a *matching* element. This matching is defined in [Definition 4.5](#). (Alternatively, one could imagine picking  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}$  first and finding corresponding  $g$ . It turns out  $\gamma$  will match an element of  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm)_{\text{rs}}$  in general, and the conjecture is only formulated in the case where  $g \in \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$ .)
  - Once  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  is chosen, we select

$$\phi = (\text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}})^{-1}(f)$$

to be the image of  $f$  under a *base change*. This base change is defined and then calculated explicitly for  $n = 3$  in [Section 5](#).

With all our protagonists now having names and references, we can now state the conjecture proposed in [\[LRZ24\]](#).

**Conjecture 1.1** (Inhomogeneous version of the AFL for the full spherical Hecke algebra, [\[LRZ24, Conjecture 6.2.1\]](#)). *Let  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  be any element of the Hecke algebra, and let*

$$\phi = (\text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}})^{-1}(f) \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$$

*be its image under base change as defined in [Section 5](#). Then for matching (as defined in [Definition 4.5](#)) regular semisimple elements*

$$g \in \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}} \longleftrightarrow \gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}$$

*we have*

$$(3) \quad \text{Int}((1, g), \mathbf{1}_{K^\flat} \otimes f) = -\frac{\omega(\gamma)}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}(\gamma, \phi)$$

*where the weighted orbital integral  $\text{Orb}(\dots)$  is defined in [Definition 6.1](#), the transfer factor  $\omega$  is defined in [Section 11](#), and the intersection number  $\text{Int}(\dots)$  is defined in [Section 12](#).*

At present, the (inhomogeneous) AFL is the case where  $f = \mathbf{1}_K$ , and is thus proven. Note that in the case of interest where  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}$  matches an element of  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}}$  (rather than  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)_{\text{rs}}$ ), the actual value of  $\text{Orb}(\gamma, \phi, s)$  at  $s = 0$  is always zero by [Theorem 6.3](#); so the conjecture instead looks at the first derivative at  $s = 0$ .

The generalized conjecture is also proved in full for  $n = 2$  in [LRZ24, Theorem 1.0.1] (in that reference, our  $n$  denotes the  $n + 1$  in *loc. cit.*). The part of the calculation involving the weighted orbital integral has two parts:

- The calculation makes  $\mathrm{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}}$  completely explicit in a natural basis for  $n = 2$ . The result is [LRZ24, Lemma 7.1.1].
- The calculation makes explicit the value of the weighted orbital integral

$$\mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi, s)$$

for any  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  and  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$ , in terms of invariants of  $\gamma$  and a decomposition of  $\phi$  in a natural basis. The result is [LRZ24, Proposition 7.3.2].

Combining these two (hence obtaining the right-hand side of (3)) with a calculation of intersection numbers in [LRZ24, Corollary 7.4.3] (which is the left-hand side of (3)) shows that **Conjecture 1.1** holds for  $n = 2$ , cf. [LRZ24, Theorem 7.5.1].

1.2.2. *A proposed arithmetic fundamental lemma for spherical Hecke algebras in the semi-Lie case.* The primary focus of this paper is an analogous conjecture to **Conjecture 1.1** for the semi-Lie version (also called the Fourier-Jacobi case). It serves to complete the analogy given in **Table 1**.

Version	AFL for <b>1</b> (now proven)	Full spherical Hecke
Group	[Zha12, Conjecture 2.9]	[LRZ24, Conjecture 6.2.1]
Semi-Lie	[Liu21, Conjecture 1.12]	<b>Conjecture 1.2</b>

TABLE 1. Table showing the analogy between the proposed **Conjecture 1.2** and the existing conjectures.

In this variation, as in [Liu21], rather than matching  $g \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  to  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ , we consider an augmented space larger than  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$  and  $S_n(F)$ . Specifically, one considers a matching between tuples of regular semisimple elements

$$(g, u) \in (\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}} \longleftrightarrow (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V_n'(F))_{\mathrm{rs}}$$

where  $V_n'(F) = F^n \times (F^n)^\vee$  (defined in **Definition 4.8**) consists of pairs of column vectors and row vectors of length  $n$ , and the space  $\mathbb{V}_n^-$  is defined in **Definition 12.4**. The notion of *matching* is defined in **Definition 4.8** as well.

Meanwhile, we still use the same test functions  $f$  and  $\phi$ , as we did for [LRZ24, Conjecture 6.2.1]. The derivative of interest will be denoted

$$\partial \mathrm{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi) := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} \mathrm{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s).$$

Finally, we also update the definition of intersection number to accommodate the new term  $u$  in **Definition 12.11**.

**Conjecture 1.2** (Semi-Lie version of the AFL for the full spherical Hecke algebra). *Let  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  be any element of the Hecke algebra, and let*

$$\phi = (\mathrm{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}})^{-1}(f) \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$$

*be its image under base change defined in Section 5. Then for matching (as defined in Definition 4.8) regular semisimple elements*

$$(g, u) \in (\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}} \longleftrightarrow (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\mathrm{rs}}$$

*we have*

$$(4) \quad \mathrm{Int}((g, u), f) = -\frac{\omega(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}{\log q} \partial \mathrm{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee})$$

*where the orbital integral  $\mathrm{Orb}(\dots)$  is defined in Definition 7.1, the transfer factor is defined in Section 11, and the intersection number  $\mathrm{Int}(\dots)$  is defined in Section 12.*

Note that in this version the new orbital integral  $\mathrm{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s)$  is defined similarly. However, as far as we know, no analog of Theorem 6.3 (linking it to an unweighted orbital integral on the unitary side) appears in the literature. Thus we record the corresponding statement as Conjecture 7.3. Like before, Conjecture 7.3 predicts that  $\mathrm{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, 0) = 0$  in the case of interest, which in this case can be checked independently.

**Remark 1.3.** For  $n = 1$ , the Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  is trivial and therefore Conjecture 1.2 becomes a special case of the known result [Liu21]. Therefore  $n = 2$  is the first case of Conjecture 1.2 worth examining.

1.2.3. *A proposed large image conjecture.* We let  $S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^-$  (resp.  $(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\mathrm{rs}}^-$ ) denote the subsets of  $S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  (resp.  $(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\mathrm{rs}}$ ) consisting of regular semisimple elements that also match with an element of  $\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  (resp.  $(\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ ), i.e. those for which Conjecture 1.1 and Conjecture 1.2 apply.

In [LRZ24], it was observed that for  $n = 2$  there was a rather large space of  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  such that

$$\partial \mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi) = 0$$

held identically across all  $\gamma \in S_2(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^-$ . If we consider the map

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \mathrm{Orb}: \mathcal{H}(S_2(F)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty(S_2(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^-) \\ \phi &\mapsto (\gamma \mapsto \partial \mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi)) \end{aligned}$$

then [LRZ24, Theorem 8.2.3] in fact shows this map has a kernel of codimension 2 (equivalently, the image of the map was only two-dimensional). They thus stated [LRZ24, Conjecture 1.0.2] which asserts that for  $n \geq 2$ , a similarly defined map (albeit for more than one Hecke algebra) has a large kernel.

It is therefore natural to ask whether a similar large kernel result could hold for the analogous orbital integral in the semi-Lie case. We instead propose the following *large image* conjecture, which we have proved for  $n = 2$ .

**Conjecture 1.4** (Large image conjecture for  $(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ ). *Let  $n \geq 2$ . The map*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \text{Orb}: \mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty((S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))^-) \\ \phi &\mapsto \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \mapsto \partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

*is injective.*

In fact for  $n = 2$  we have a more precise result showing that the injectivity essentially comes from  $v(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top)$  alone in this case. See [Theorem 1.9](#) and [Theorem 1.10](#) momentarily.

### 1.3. Results.

1.3.1. *Formulas for the orbital side of the semi-Lie AFL conjecture for  $n = 2$ .* The main case of interest in this thesis is the new conjectured AFL for the spherical Hecke algebra in the semi-Lie situation in the specific case  $n = 2$  where one can provide evidence for the conjecture. On the orbital side, the various ingredients can be described concretely in the following way:

- The Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  has a natural basis of indicator functions  $\mathbf{1}_{K', \leq r}$  for each  $r \geq 0$ ; see [Section 7](#) for a definition.
- Suppose  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V'_2(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ . Then under the action  $\text{GL}_2(F)$  we may assume  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  is of the form

$$(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, (0 \ e) \right) \in (S_2(F) \times V'_2(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$$

(that is, we can find a  $\text{GL}_2(F)$ -orbit representative of this form). The parameters  $a, b, c, d$  need to satisfy certain dependencies for the matching to hold; these requirements are documented in [Lemma 7.8](#).

Then we were able to derive the following fully explicit formula in terms of the representative detailed in [Lemma 7.8](#). See [Section 9.3](#) for some concrete examples and illustrations of [Theorem 1.5](#).

**Theorem 1.5** (Explicit orbital integral on  $S_2(F) \times V'_2(F)$ ). *Let*

$$(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, (0 \ e) \right) \in (S_2(F) \times V'_2(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$$

*satisfy the requirements in [Lemma 7.8](#). Let  $r \geq 0$ .*

*If  $v(e) < 0$  or  $v(b) + v(c) < -2r$ , then*

$$\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K', \leq r} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) = 0$$

*holds identically for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ .*

Otherwise define

$$\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) := \min \left( \left\lfloor \frac{k+v(b)+r}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{(2v(e)+v(c)+r)-k}{2} \right\rfloor, N \right)$$

where

$$N := \min \left( v(e), \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r, v(d-a) + r \right).$$

Also, if  $v(d-a) < v(e) - r$  and  $v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a)$ , then additionally define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) = \min & \left( k - (2v(d-a) - v(b) + r), \right. \\ & \left. (2v(e) + v(c) - 2v(d-a) - r) - k, v(e) - v(d-a) - r \right). \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise define  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) = 0$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}}, s) &= \sum_{k=-(v(b)+r)}^{2v(e)+v(c)+r} (-1)^k \left( 1 + q + q^2 + \dots + q^{\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k)} \right) (q^s)^k \\ &+ \sum_{k=2v(d-a)-v(b)+r}^{2v(e)+v(c)-2v(d-a)-r} (-1)^k \mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) q^{v(d-a)+r} (q^s)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Differentiating this yields the following result:

**Corollary 1.6** (Derivative at  $s = 0$  for  $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$ ). *Retain the setting of [Theorem 1.5](#). Also define  $\varkappa := v(e) - (v(d-a) + r)$ . If both  $\varkappa \geq 0$  and  $v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a)$ , then we have the formula*

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^N \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j \\ &- q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) - \frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise we instead have the formula

$$\frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}}) = \sum_{j=0}^N \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j.$$

The formula simplifies even further if one considers instead  $\mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}}$ ; and indeed we will see that this particular combination comes up naturally in [Section 14](#) with a special role as the base change mentioned in [\[LRZ24, Lemma 7.1.1\]](#).

**Corollary 1.7** (The special case  $\partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}})$ ). Retain the setting of [Theorem 1.5](#). Also define  $\varkappa := v(e) - (v(d-a) + r)$ . For  $r \geq 1$  define

$$C := \begin{cases} \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa > 0 \text{ is odd and } v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a) \\ \frac{\varkappa+v(b)+v(c)-2v(d-a)-1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \geq 0 \text{ is even and } v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a) \\ v(e) - N & \text{if } v(e) \geq \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r \text{ and } 2v(d-a) > v(b) + v(c) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$C' := \begin{cases} C + 1 & \text{if } \varkappa \geq 0 \text{ and } v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}}) \\ & = (q^N + q^{N-1} + \cdots + 1) + Cq^N + C'q^{N-1} \end{aligned}$$

**Example 1.8** (Examples of [Corollary 1.7](#)). We show some examples of [Corollary 1.7](#):

- When  $r = 5$ ,  $v(b) = -20$ ,  $v(c) = 37$ ,  $v(e) = 35$  and  $v(d-a) > \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} = 8.5$  the derivative in [Corollary 1.7](#) equals
 
$$\log q \cdot (23q^{13} + q^{12} + q^{11} + q^{10} + q^9 + \cdots + q + 1).$$
- When  $r = 6$ ,  $v(b) = 10$ ,  $v(c) = 5$ ,  $v(e) = 7$ ,  $v(d-a) > v(e) - r = 1$ , the derivative in [Corollary 1.7](#) equals
 
$$-\log q \cdot (q^7 + q^6 + q^5 + \cdots + q + 1).$$
- When  $r = 8$ ,  $v(b) = -101$ ,  $v(c) = 1000$ ,  $v(e) = 29$ ,  $v(d-a) = 11$ , the derivative in [Corollary 1.7](#) equals
 
$$\log q \cdot (444q^{19} + 445q^{18} + q^{17} + q^{16} + q^{15} + \cdots + q + 1).$$

1.3.2. *Kernel and image results for the semi-Lie orbital integral when  $n = 2$ .* As we mentioned our earlier conjecture [Conjecture 1.4](#) is true for  $n = 2$ . More precisely, we have the following two theorems.

**Theorem 1.9** ( $\partial \text{Orb}$  is injective even for fixed  $\gamma \in S_2(F)$ ). Fix any  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ . Then there doesn't exist any nonzero function  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  such that

$$\partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \varpi^i \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi, \right) = 0$$

holds for every integer  $i$ . Thus [Conjecture 1.4](#) holds for  $n = 2$ .

In particular, for  $n = 2$  the map

$$\begin{aligned} \partial \text{Orb}: \mathcal{H}(S_2(F)) & \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^\infty((S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))^-) \\ \phi & \mapsto \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \mapsto \partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

is indeed injective.

**Theorem 1.10** (The kernel of  $\partial \text{Orb}$  is large for fixed  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in V_2'(F)$ ). *Let  $N \geq 0$  be an integer. Consider all  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$  for which  $v(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top) \leq N$ . Then the space of  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  for which*

$$\partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \right) = 0$$

*holds for all such  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector subspace of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  whose codimension is at most  $N + 2$ .*

*Moreover, this subspace of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  is not contained in any maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  when  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  is viewed as a ring under the isomorphism of [Section 5](#).*

**Remark 1.11** (On formalizing large kernels). In each case the Hecke algebra is isomorphic as a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra to  $\mathbb{Q}[T]$  for a single variable  $T = Y + Y^{-1}$ . So actually it's mildly surprising that we get a result on finite codimension. In general, a finite codimension vector subspace of  $\mathbb{Q}[T]$  could be contained in a maximal ideal, such as the codimension one subspace  $T\mathbb{Q}[T] \subset \mathbb{Q}[T]$ . Conversely, a *finite* dimension vector subspace might still not be contained in any maximal ideal, such as the one-dimensional space  $\mathbb{Q} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}[T]$ .

Thus neither finite codimension nor generating all of  $\mathbb{Q}[T]$  as an ideal imply each other. It might be interesting to consider other different ways of formalizing the notion of “large kernel”.

1.3.3. *The geometric side of the semi-Lie AFL conjecture for  $n = 2$ .* To provide evidence for [Conjecture 1.2](#), we prove that:

**Theorem 1.12** (Semi-Lie AFL for the full Hecke algebra for  $n = 2$ ). *Our generalized AFL conjecture, [Conjecture 1.2](#), holds for  $n = 2$ .*

The proof of [Theorem 1.12](#) is built up gradually throughout the paper, culminating in [Section 14](#).

We comment briefly on the strategy of the proof. The proof is made possible because the intersection numbers for  $n = 2$  are easier to work with for a few reasons.

- First, one can identify  $\mathbb{V}_2^-$  with an  $E/F$ -quaternion division algebra, equipped with a compatible Hermitian form defined via quaternion multiplication. This makes it possible to describe  $U(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$  concretely as transformations obtained via left multiplication by an element of  $E$  and right multiplication by a quaternion.
- Secondly, it becomes possible to replace the so-called Rapoport-Zink spaces  $\mathcal{N}_2$  used in the definition of the intersection number with a Lubin-Tate space  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . Thus the problem of computing the intersection number  $\text{Int}((g, u), f) \log q$  can be reduced to calculating the intersection of certain special Kudla-Rapoport divisors on the space  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .

However, on the Lubin-Tate space  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , there is a result known as the Gross-Keating formula [GK93] which allows one to make this intersection number fully explicit. One can then match the resulting equation to the formulas described in [Corollary 1.6](#) and verify that, under the base change [Section 5](#) and the matching condition described in [Section 4](#), the two obtained formulas are identical.

**1.4. Roadmap.** The rest of the paper is organized as follows.

**1.4.1. Background information.** The paper begins with some general background information.

- In [Section 3](#) we provide some preliminary background on the spaces appearing in the overall paper and the Hecke algebras  $\mathcal{H}(U(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  and  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$ .
- Further background is stated in [Section 4](#), where we describe the matching of regular semisimple elements so that we may speak of  $S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}^-$  and  $(S_n(F) \times V_n'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ .
- In [Section 5](#) we provide reminders on the Satake transform.

**1.4.2. Introduction and calculation of the orbital integrals.** In [Section 6](#) we introduce the weighted orbital integral for the group version of the AFL for full spherical Hecke algebra briefly. This is only for comparison with the definition in later sections and will not be used again afterwards.

In [Section 7](#) we introduce the weighted orbital integral for the semi-Lie version of the AFL for full spherical Hecke algebra, and state the parameters to be used in [Lemma 7.8](#). The main calculation is carried out in [Sections 8](#) and [9](#), which is used to prove [Theorem 1.5](#) and its corollaries.

**1.4.3. Large kernel and image.** Having completely computed the orbital integrals in these cases, we take a side trip in [Section 10](#) to prove the large image results asserted. We establish [Conjecture 1.4](#) for  $n = 2$  by proving the asserted [Theorem 1.9](#) and [Theorem 1.10](#) for the orbital integral on  $(S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ .

**1.4.4. Geometric side.** We then turn our attention to the other parts of the two versions of the AFL. In addition to stating the relevant definitions, the subsequent chapters aim to prove [Theorem 1.12](#).

- In [Section 11](#) we briefly define the transfer factors  $\omega \in \{\pm 1\}$ .
- In [Section 12](#), we describe the Rapoport-Zink spaces  $\mathcal{N}_n$  that the geometric side is based on, and define the intersection numbers  $\text{Int}((1, g), \mathbf{1}_{K^\flat} \otimes f)$  and  $\text{Int}((g, u), f)$  that appear in the two version of the generalized AFL. The main ingredients are the Hecke operator introduced in [LRZ24] and the KR-divisor  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$  introduced in [KR11].
- In [Section 13](#), we specialize to the situation  $n = 2$  for the intersection numbers in the semi-Lie AFL only. The Rapoport-Zink space  $\mathcal{N}_2$  become replaced with Lubin-Tate space  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , and we introduce

the Gross-Keating formula that will be our primary tool for the calculation.

Finally, in [Section 14](#) we tie everything together and establish [Theorem 1.12](#).

## 2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is a subset of the author's PhD thesis [[Che25](#)] which was completed under the supervision of Wei Zhang. (The thesis [[Che25](#)] contains some additional calculations related to the  $n = 3$  case of [Conjecture 1.1](#) which were not included in this paper, but can be found in the published thesis. Some Sage source files are also provided in the published thesis.) I thank my advisor Wei Zhang for suggesting this project, for his infinite patience and kindness throughout my entire time during graduate school, and his seemingly instantaneous response times at all hours of the day to the many, many stupid questions I asked.

I thank Ryan C. Chen for his interest in this project, reading a draft of the thesis, and for suggesting [[CLZ](#)] which helped to remove the hypotheses from the main result of this paper. I also thank Mark Sellke for proofreading a draft of my PhD thesis and finding several corrections.

I thank the organizers and attendees of the fall 2024 learning seminar on arithmetic inner product formula for inviting me to speak about my work-in-progress, and their helpful comments on it leading directly to improvements to this paper.

This work was partially supported by NSF GRFP under grant numbers 1745302 and 2141064.

## 3. GENERAL BACKGROUND

**3.1. Notation.** We provide a glossary of notation that will be used in this paper. As mentioned in the introduction,  $p > 2$  is a prime,  $F$  is a finite extension of  $\mathbb{Q}_p$ , and  $E/F$  is an unramified quadratic field extension.

- For any  $a \in E$ , we let  $\bar{a}$  denote the image of  $a$  under the nontrivial automorphism of  $\text{Gal}(E/F)$ . (Hence  $a = \bar{a}$  exactly when  $a \in F$ .)
- Fix  $\varepsilon \in O_F^\times$  such that  $E = F[\sqrt{\varepsilon}]$ .
- Denote by  $\varpi$  a uniformizer of  $O_F$ , such that  $\bar{\varpi} = \varpi$ .
- Let  $q := |O_F/\varpi|$  be the residue characteristic. (Hence  $|O_E/\varpi| = q^2$ .)
- Let  $v$  be the associated valuation for  $\varpi$ .
- Let  $\eta$  be the quadratic character attached to  $E/F$  by class field theory, so that  $\eta(x) = -1^{v(x)}$ .
- $\mathbb{V}_n^+$  denotes a split  $E/F$ -Hermitian space of dimension  $n$  (unique up to isomorphism).
- Let  $\beta$  denote the  $n \times n$  antidiagonal matrix

$$\beta := \begin{pmatrix} & & & 1 \\ & & & \\ & & \ddots & \\ & & & \\ 1 & & & \end{pmatrix}$$

and pick the basis of  $\mathbb{V}_n^+$  such that the Hermitian form on  $\mathbb{V}_n^+$  is given by

$$\mathbb{V}_n^+ \times \mathbb{V}_n^+ \rightarrow E \quad (x, y) \mapsto x^* \beta y.$$

- Set

$$U(\mathbb{V}_n^+) = \{g \in GL_n(O_E) \mid g^* \beta g = \beta\}$$

the unitary group over  $\mathbb{V}_n^+$ . Note that  $\beta$  is *antidiagonal*, in contrast to the convention  $\beta = \text{id}_n$  that is often used for unitary matrices with entries in  $\mathbb{C}$ . The natural hyperspecial maximal compact subgroup is

$$U(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \cap GL_n(O_E).$$

In some parts of the paper we abbreviate  $G = U(\mathbb{V}_n^+)$  and  $K = U(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \cap GL_n(O_E)$  following the convention in [LRZ24].

- Let  $K' := GL_n(O_E)$  denote the hyperspecial maximal compact subgroup of  $G' := GL_n(E)$ .
- Let  $\mathbb{V}_n^-$  denote the non-split  $E/F$ -Hermitian space of dimension  $n$  (unique up to isomorphism), and  $U(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$  the corresponding unitary group. This space will be realized in [Section 12](#).

**3.2. Intersection of disks in an ultrametric space.** The following two lemmas will be useful for both versions of the orbital integral. It is a slight rephrasing of [Zha12, Lemma 4.4].

**Lemma 3.1** (One-disk volume lemma). *Let  $\xi \in O_E^\times$ ,  $\rho \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $n \geq \max(\rho, 1)$  an integer. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Vol}(\{x \in E \mid v(1 - x\bar{x}) = n, v(x - \xi) \geq \rho\}) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } v(1 - \xi\bar{\xi}) < \rho \\ q^{-n}(1 - q^{-2}) & \text{if } \rho \leq 0 \\ q^{-(n+\rho)}(1 - q^{-1}) & \text{if } v(1 - \xi\bar{\xi}) \geq \rho \geq 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* When  $\rho \leq 0$ , the condition  $v(x - \xi) \geq \rho$  is vacuously true, so we just are computing

$$\text{Vol}(\{x \in E \mid v(1 - x\bar{x}) = n\}).$$

However, in general for any Schwartz function  $\psi$  on  $E$  we have an identity

$$(5) \quad \int_E \psi(x) dx = \frac{1}{1 - q^{-1}} \int_{y \in F} \int_{t \in O_E^\times} \psi\left(x_t \cdot \frac{y}{\bar{y}}\right) dy dt$$

where  $x_t$  is any choice of element  $x_t \in E$  such that  $t = x_t \bar{x}_t$  (see the proof of [Zha12, Lemma 4.4]). Note the measures here are additive despite  $t \in O_E^\times$ . So if one selects

$$\psi(x) = \mathbf{1}_{v(1 - N(x)) = n}$$

then we get

$$\text{Vol}(\{x \in E \mid v(1 - x\bar{x}) = n\}) = \frac{1}{1 - q^{-1}} \int_{t \in F} \int_{y \in O_E^\times} \mathbf{1}_{v(1 - N(x_t \cdot \frac{y}{\bar{y}})) = n} dy dt$$




FIGURE 2. Figure corresponding to [Lemma 3.2](#).

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{1 - q^{-1}} \int_{t \in F} \int_{y \in O_E^\times} \mathbf{1}_{v(1-t)=n} dy dt \\
&= \frac{\text{Vol}_E(O_E^\times)}{1 - q^{-1}} \cdot \text{Vol}_F(1 + \varpi^{-n} O_F^\times) \\
&= \frac{1 - \frac{1}{q^2}}{1 - q^{-1}} \cdot \left( q^{-n} \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{1}{q} \right) \right) \\
&= q^{-n} (1 - q^{-2}).
\end{aligned}$$

The case  $\rho > 0$  is proved in [[Zha12](#), Lemma 4.4] using the same method of using (5).  $\square$

We also comment on the well-known fact that in an ultrametric space, any two disks are either disjoint or one is contained in the other. See [Figure 2](#).

**Lemma 3.2** (No ultrametric MasterCard logo). *Choose  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in E$  and  $\rho_1 \geq \rho_2$ . Consider the two disks:*

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 &= \{x \in E \mid v(x - \xi_1) \geq \rho_1\} \\
D_2 &= \{x \in E \mid v(x - \xi_2) \geq \rho_2\}.
\end{aligned}$$

*Then, if  $v(\xi_1 - \xi_2) \geq \rho_2$ , we have  $D_1 \subseteq D_2$ . If not, instead  $D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset$ .*

*Proof.* Because  $E$  is an ultrametric space and  $\text{Vol}(D_1) \leq \text{Vol}(D_2)$ , we either have  $D_1 \subseteq D_2$  or  $D_1 \cap D_2 = \emptyset$ . The latter condition checks which case we are in by testing if  $\xi_1 \in D_2$ , since  $\xi_1 \in D_1$ .  $\square$

We package both of these results together in this lemma that will be used repeatedly.

**Lemma 3.3** (Two-disk volume lemma). *Let  $\xi_1, \xi_2 \in O_E^\times$  and let  $\rho_1 \geq \rho_2$  be integers. Also let  $n \geq \max(\rho_1, 1)$  be an integer. Then the set of points  $x \in E$  satisfying all of the equations*

$$\begin{aligned} v(x - \xi_1) &\geq \rho_1 \\ v(x - \xi_2) &\geq \rho_2 \\ v(1 - x\bar{x}) &= n \end{aligned}$$

*has positive volume if and only if*

$$v(1 - \xi_1\bar{\xi}_1) \geq \rho_1, \quad \rho_2 \leq v(\xi_1 - \xi_2).$$

*In that case, the volume is equal to*

$$\begin{cases} q^{-(n+\rho_1)}(1 - q^{-1}) & \text{if } \rho_1 \geq 1 \\ q^{-n}(1 - q^{-2}) & \text{if } \rho_1 \leq 0. \end{cases}$$

In the situation where  $\xi_i \notin O_E^\times$ , the quantity  $v(x - \xi_i) = \min(0, v(\xi_i))$  becomes independent of the value of  $x$ , and so **Lemma 3.3** becomes unnecessary (**Lemma 3.1** will suffice). We will deal with this situation when it arises; it turns out this will only occur when  $v(b) \neq 0$ .

**3.3. The spaces  $S_n(F)$  and  $S_n(F) \times V'_n(F)$ .** For the analytic side of the two AFL conjectures we investigate, the following two spaces will be used as inputs to our weighted orbital integrals.

**Definition 3.4** ( $S_n(F)$ ; [Zha24b, (4.10)]). We define the symmetric space

$$S_n(F) := \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(E) \mid g\bar{g} = \mathrm{id}_n\}.$$

It has a natural left action of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(E)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{GL}_n(E) \times S_n(F) &\rightarrow S_n(F) \\ g \cdot \gamma &:= g\gamma\bar{g}^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 3.5** ( $V'_n(F)$ ; [Zha24b, (4.11)]). We set

$$V'_n(F) := F^n \times (F^n)^\vee$$

where  $-\vee$  denotes the  $F$ -dual space, i.e.,  $(F^n)^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}_F(F^n, F)$ . Then we may also consider the augmented space

$$S_n(F) \times V'_n(F).$$

If we identify  $F^n$  with column vectors of length  $n - 1$  and  $(F^n)^\vee$  with row vectors of length  $n$  then we have a left action of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(F)$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{GL}_n(F) \times (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F)) &\rightarrow S_n(F) \times V'_n(F) \\ h \cdot (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) &:= (h\gamma h^{-1}, h\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top h^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that according to the embedding

$$S_n(F) \times V'_n(F) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Mat}_{n+1}(E)$$

$$(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v}^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

we can consider elements of  $S_n(F) \times V'_n(F)$  as elements of  $\text{Mat}_{n+1}(E)$  too. In that case the action of  $h \in \text{GL}_{n+1}(F)$  coincides with  $h \cdot g \mapsto hgh^{-1}$  as well.

**Definition 3.6** ( $K'_S$ ). For brevity, let

$$K'_S := S_n(F) \cap \text{GL}_n(O_F).$$

**3.4. Definition of Hecke algebra.** We remind the reader the definition of a Hecke algebra. For this subsection,  $G$  will denote *any* unimodular locally compact topological group, and  $K$  any closed subgroup of  $G$ .

**Definition 3.7** ( $\mathcal{H}(G, K)$ ). The *Hecke algebra*

$$\mathcal{H}(G, K) := \mathbb{Q}[K \backslash G / K]$$

is defined as the space of compactly supported  $K$ -bi-invariant locally constant functions on  $G$ . (The adjective *spherical* Hecke algebra refers to the special case where  $K$  is a maximal compact subgroup of  $G$ , which is the main case of interest for us.)

Given two such functions  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  in  $\mathcal{H}(G, K)$ , one can consider define the convolution

$$(f_1 * f_2)(g) := \int_G f_1(g^{-1}x)f_2(x) \, dx$$

which makes  $\mathcal{H}(G, K)$  into a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra, whose identity element is  $\mathbf{1}_K$ .

In other sources, this may be denoted  $\mathcal{H}_K(G)$  or even just  $\mathcal{H}_K$ . (So what is written in  $\mathcal{H}_{K'^b \otimes K'}$  in other places will be written as  $\mathcal{H}(G'^b \otimes G', K'^b \otimes K')$  here).

In the case where  $G$  is a reductive Lie group and  $K$  is the maximal compact subgroup (or more generally whenever  $(G, K)$  is a Gelfand pair), this Hecke algebra is actually commutative.

**3.5. The specific Hecke algebras  $\mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E))$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  and the module  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$ .** For our purposes, we define shorthands for two specific Hecke algebras that will come up consistently:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) &:= \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E), \text{GL}_n(O_E)) \\ \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)) &:= \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+), \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \cap \text{GL}_n(O_E)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\text{GL}_n(O_E)$  and  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \cap \text{GL}_n(O_E)$  are the natural hyperspecial maximal compact subgroups of  $\text{GL}_n(E)$  and  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)$ , respectively.

Now the symmetric space  $S_n(F)$  is not a group, so it does not make sense to define the same thing here. Nevertheless, we introduce

$$\mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) := \mathcal{C}_c^\infty(S_n(F))^{K'}$$

as the set of smooth compactly supported functions on  $S_n(F)$  which are invariant under the action of  $K' \subseteq G'$ ; this is an  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$ -module, where the action of  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$  on  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  is given by

$$(f \cdot \phi)(\gamma) := \int_G f(g)\phi(g \cdot \gamma) dg$$

for  $\gamma \in S_n(F)$ . This does **not** have a multiplication structure at the moment, *a priori*. However, we will later (in [Section 5](#)) give an isomorphism from  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  to  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  as  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector spaces; since the latter is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra, this induces a multiplication structure on  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  and consequently we may speak of  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  as a ring under this isomorphism.

Throughout this paper, to be consistent with the notation, we denote

- elements of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  using  $f$  or  $f_i$  or similar (i.e. lowercase Roman letters);
- elements of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$  by  $f'$  or  $f'_i$  or similar (i.e. lowercase Roman letters with apostrophes);
- elements of  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  by  $\phi$  or  $\phi_i$  (i.e. lowercase Greek letters).

#### 4. REGULAR SEMI-SIMPLICITY AND MATCHING

**4.1. Regular semi-simple elements.** We first recall the notion of regularity that first appeared in [\[RS07, §6\]](#).

**Definition 4.1** (Regular semisimple in  $\mathrm{Mat}_n(E)$ ). Consider a  $n \times n$  matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v}^\top & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_n(E)$$

where  $A$  is an  $(n-1) \times (n-1)$  matrix. Then we say this matrix is *regular semi-simple* if

$$\langle \mathbf{u}, A\mathbf{u}, \dots, A^{n-2}\mathbf{u} \rangle$$

and

$$\langle \mathbf{v}^\top, \mathbf{v}^\top A, \dots, \mathbf{v}^\top A^{n-2} \rangle$$

are each a basis of  $E^{n-1}$ . Equivalently, the matrix

$$\left[ \mathbf{v}^\top A^{i+j-2} \mathbf{u} \right]_{i,j=1}^{n-1}$$

should be nonsingular.

**Remark 4.2** (Equivalent definition of regular semisimple). In [\[RS07, Theorem 6.1\]](#), this definition is shown to be equivalent to requiring that, under the action of conjugation by  $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(E)$ :

- the matrix has trivial stabilizer; and
- the  $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(\overline{E})$ -orbit is a Zariski-closed subset of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\overline{E})$ .

Here  $\overline{E}$  is as usual an algebraic closure of  $E$ .

**Remark 4.3** (Invariants under  $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(E)$  conjugation; [RS07, Proposition 6.2]). It turns out we can detect whether two regular semisimple elements

$$\begin{pmatrix} A_1 & \mathbf{u}_1 \\ \mathbf{v}_1^\top & d_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} A_2 & \mathbf{u}_2 \\ \mathbf{v}_2^\top & d_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_n(E)$$

are conjugate by an element of  $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(E)$ . This happens if and only if the following conditions all hold:

- The matrices  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  have the same characteristic polynomial;
- We have

$$\mathbf{v}_1^\top A_1^i \mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{v}_2^\top A_2^i \mathbf{u}_2$$

for every  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-2$ ; and

- We have  $d_1 = d_2$ .

Thus, this gives a set of invariants that completely classify the orbits under the action of  $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(E)$ .

Put another way, the invariants of

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v}^\top & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_n(E)$$

are the (monic) characteristic polynomial of  $A$  (which has  $n-1$  coefficients besides the leading coefficient), the values of  $\mathbf{v}^\top A^i \mathbf{u}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n-2$  and the number  $d$ , for a total of  $2n-1$  numbers.

We can now speak of regular-simplicity in each of the four particular cases relevant to this paper.

**Definition 4.4** (Regular semisimple). In the group version of the AFL:

- We say  $\gamma \in S_n(F)$  is regular semisimple if its image under the inclusion  $S_n(F) \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}_n(E)$  is regular semisimple. We write  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ .
- For  $g \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm)$ , we say  $g$  is regular semisimple if its image under the inclusion  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm) \subseteq \mathrm{Mat}_n(E)$  is regular semisimple. We write  $g \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ .

In the semi-Lie version of the AFL:

- We say  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in S_n(F) \times V'_n(F)$  is regular semisimple if its image under the embedding

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} S_n(F) \times V'_n(F) &\hookrightarrow \mathrm{Mat}_{n+1}(E) \\ (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \gamma & \mathbf{u} \\ \mathbf{v}^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

is regular semisimple. In other words, we require that both of the sets  $(\mathbf{u}, \gamma \mathbf{u}, \dots, \gamma^{n-1} \mathbf{u})$  and  $(\mathbf{v}^\top, \mathbf{v}^\top \gamma, \dots, \mathbf{v}^\top \gamma^{n-1})$  are bases of  $E^n$ . In this case we write  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\mathrm{rs}}$ .

- For  $(g, u) \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm) \times \mathbb{V}_n^\pm$  we say  $(g, u)$  is regular semisimple if its image under the embedding

$$(7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm) \times \mathbb{V}_n^\pm &\hookrightarrow \mathrm{Mat}_{n+1}(E) \\ (g, u) &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} g & u \\ u^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

is regular semisimple. Here  $u^*$  is the conjugate transpose.

This is equivalent to the set  $(u, gu, \dots, g^{n-1}u)$  being linearly independent (i.e. form a basis of  $\mathbb{V}_n^\pm$ ); in this case the independence of  $(u^*, u^*g, \dots, u^*g^{n-1})$  is redundant, so it's enough to verify one condition. We write  $(g, u) \in (\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm) \times \mathbb{V}_n^\pm)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ .

**4.2. Matching in the group version of the inhomogeneous AFL.** We now describe the matching condition used in the group version of AFL.

**Definition 4.5** (Matching  $S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}} \longleftrightarrow \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ ; [Zha12, p. 202]). We say  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  matches the element  $g \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  if  $g$  is conjugate to  $\gamma$  by an element of  $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(E)$ . By Remark 4.3, this is an assertion that the invariants for  $\gamma$  and  $g$  coincide.

In that case, we have the following result.

**Proposition 4.6** ([Zha12, Lemma 2.3]; see also [LRZ24, (3.3.2)]). *This definition of matching gives a bijection of regular semisimple orbits*

$$[S_n(F)]_{\mathrm{rs}} \xrightarrow{\sim} [\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)]_{\mathrm{rs}} \amalg [\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)]_{\mathrm{rs}}.$$

Moreover, we can detect whether  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  matches an orbit of  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  or  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  as follows. Suppose we write  $\gamma$  in the format of Definition 4.1 and consider

$$\Delta := \det \left[ \mathbf{v}^\top A^{i+j-2} \mathbf{u} \right]_{i,j=1}^{n-1} \neq 0.$$

Then

- $\gamma$  matches an orbit in  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  if  $v(\Delta)$  is even;
- $\gamma$  matches an orbit in  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  if  $v(\Delta)$  is odd.

In this paper, Conjecture 1.1 requires that  $\gamma$  should match an element of  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  and consequently we will usually only be interested in the latter case. We write the following abbreviation:

**Definition 4.7** ( $S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^\pm$ ). We let

$$S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^- \subset S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$$

denote the subset of elements in  $S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}$  that match with an element in  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ . Define  $S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^+$  similarly. Hence  $S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}} = S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^- \amalg S_n(F)_{\mathrm{rs}}^+$ .

**4.3. Matching in the semi-Lie version of the AFL.** For the semi-Lie version matching is defined analogously:

**Definition 4.8** (Matching  $(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}} \longleftrightarrow (U(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm) \times \mathbb{V}_n^\pm)_{\text{rs}}$ ; [Liu21, §1.3]). We say  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}$  matches the element  $(g, u) \in (U(\mathbb{V}_n^\pm) \times \mathbb{V}_n^\pm)_{\text{rs}}$  if their images under the embeddings (6) and (7) are conjugate by an element of  $\text{GL}_n(E)$ .

Unwrapping this with Remark 4.3, an equivalent definition is to require both of the following conditions:

- As elements of  $\text{GL}_n(E)$ , both  $g$  and  $\gamma$  have the same characteristic polynomial.
- We have  $\mathbf{v}^\top \gamma^i \mathbf{u} = \langle g^i u, u \rangle$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ , where  $\langle -, - \rangle$  is the Hermitian form on  $\mathbb{V}_n^\pm$ .

We have the following analogous criteria for matching.

**Proposition 4.9** ([Liu21]). *This definition of matching gives a bijection of regular semisimple orbits*

$$[S_n(F) \times V'_n(F)]_{\text{rs}} \xrightarrow{\sim} [U(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \times \mathbb{V}_n^+]_{\text{rs}} \amalg [U(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-]_{\text{rs}}.$$

Moreover, we can detect whether  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}$  matches an orbit of  $(U(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \times \mathbb{V}_n^+)_{\text{rs}}$  or  $(U(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}}$  as follows: consider the determinant

$$\Delta := \det \left[ \mathbf{v}^\top \gamma^{i+j-2} \mathbf{u} \right]_{i,j=1}^n \neq 0.$$

Then

- $\gamma$  matches an orbit in  $(U(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \times \mathbb{V}_n^+)_{\text{rs}}$  if  $v(\Delta)$  is even;
- $\gamma$  matches an orbit in  $(U(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}}$  if  $v(\Delta)$  is odd.

In this paper, Conjecture 1.2 requires that  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  should match an element of  $(U(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}}$  and consequently we will usually only be interested in the latter case. Accordingly we write the following shorthand:

**Definition 4.10**  $((S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^\pm)$ . We let

$$(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^- \subset (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}$$

denote the subset of those elements in  $(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}$  that match with an element of  $(U(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}}$ . Define  $(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^+$  analogously. Hence  $(S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}} = (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^- \amalg (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^+$ .

## 5. BASE CHANGE

This section introduces necessary background material on the base change

$$\text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}} : \mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(U(\mathbb{V}_n^+)).$$

Throughout this section we let  $\text{Sym}(n)$  denote the symmetric group in  $n$  variables with order  $n!$  (since  $S_n(F) \subseteq \text{GL}_n(E)$  is already reserved for the symmetric space).

### 5.1. Background on the Satake transformation in transformation.

We recall a general form of the Satake transformation, which will be used later.

For this subsection,  $G$  will denote an arbitrary connected reductive group over some non-Archimedean local field  $F$ . We will not distinguish between  $G$  and  $G(F)$  when there is no confusion.

To simplify things, we will assume  $G$  is unramified; but we do *not* assume  $G$  is split. Introduce the following notation:

- Let  $K$  be a hyperspecial maximal compact subgroup of  $G$  (it exists because  $G$  is unramified).
- Let  $A$  denote a maximal  $F$ -split torus in  $G$ . All the maximal  $F$ -split tori in  $G$  are conjugate; let  $A$  denote one of them.
- Let  $M$  be the centralizer of  $A$ ; this is itself a maximal torus in  $G$ .
- Let  ${}^\circ M := M(F) \cap K$  be the maximal compact subgroup of  $M$ .
- Let  $P$  denote a minimal  $F$ -parabolic containing  $A$ .
- Let  $\delta$  denotes the modulus character of  $P$ . It can be describes as follows. Let  $\varpi$  denote a uniformizer for  $F$  and  $q$  the residue characteristic. Then if  $\rho$  is the Weyl vector and  $\mu$  is a positive cocharacter, then

$$\delta(\mu(\varpi)) = q^{-\langle \mu, \rho \rangle}.$$

- Let  $N$  denote the unipotent radical of  $P$ .
- Let  $W$  be the relative Weyl group for the pair  $(G, A)$ , which acts on  $\mathcal{H}(M, {}^\circ M)$ .

We can now state the Satake isomorphism.

**Definition 5.1** (Satake transform). The *Satake transform* is a canonical isomorphism of Hecke algebras

$$\text{Sat}: \mathcal{H}(G, K) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(M, {}^\circ M)^W$$

which is given by defining

$$(\text{Sat}(f))(t) := \delta(t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_N f(nt) \, dn$$

for each  $t \in M$ .

We are going to apply this momentarily in two situations: once when  $G$  is the general linear group (which is split), and once when  $G$  is a unitary group.

**5.2. The Satake transformation for the particular Hecke algebras  $\mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E))$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$ .** To take the Satake transform of  $\mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$ , we define the following abbreviations.

- Let  $T$  denote the split diagonal torus of  $\text{GL}_n$ .

- Let

$$N' := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & * & \dots & * \\ & 1 & \dots & * \\ & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right\} \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_n(E)$$

denote the unipotent upper-triangular matrices.

Similarly for  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$ :

- Set  $m := \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  for brevity.
- Let

$$A := \{ \mathrm{diag}(x_1, \dots, x_m, 1_{n-2m}, x_m^{-1}, \dots, x_1^{-1}) \}$$

so that  $A(F)$  is a maximal  $F$ -split torus of  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)$ .

- Let  $N := N' \cap G$  denote the unipotent upper triangular matrices which are also unitary.
- For brevity, let  $W_m := (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^m \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(m)$  be the relative Weyl group of  $(G, A)$ .

We can now introduce the Satake transform for our two *bona fide* Hecke algebras, using the data in Table 2.

Group	$G' = \mathrm{GL}_n(E)$	$G = \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)$
Local field	$E$	$F$
Hyperspecial compact	$K' = \mathrm{GL}_n(O_E)$	$K = G \cap \mathrm{GL}_n(O_E)$
Max'l split torus	$T(E)$	$A(F)$
Centralizer of split torus	$T(O_E)$	$A(O_F)$
Parabolic (Borel)	Upper tri in $G'$	Upper tri in $G$
Unipotent rad. of parabolic	$N'$ (unipot. upper tri)	$N$ (unipot. upper tri)
Relative Weyl group	$\mathrm{Sym}(n)$	$W_m = (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^m \rtimes \mathrm{Sym}(m)$

TABLE 2. Data needed to run the Satake transformation.

Hence, the Satake transformations obtained can be viewed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Sat}: \mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E)) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Q}[T(E)/T(O_E)]^{\mathrm{Sym}(n)} \\ \mathrm{Sat}: \mathcal{H}(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Q}[A(F)/A(O_F)]^{W_m} \end{aligned}$$

(In both cases, the modular character  $\delta^{1/2}$  gives rational values, so it is okay to work over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .)

To make this further concrete, we remark that the cocharacter groups involved are free abelian groups with known bases. This identification lets us rewrite the right-hand sides above as concrete polynomials. Specifically, we identify

$$\mathbb{Q}[T(E)/T(O_E)]^{\mathrm{Sym}(n)} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Q}[X_1^\pm, \dots, X_n^\pm]^{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}$$

by identifying  $X_i$  with the cocharacter corresponding to injection into the  $i^{\text{th}}$  factor. Similarly, we identify

$$\mathbb{Q}[A(F)/A(O_F)]^{W_m} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Q}[Y_1^\pm, \dots, Y_m^\pm]^{W_m}$$

by identifying  $Y_i + Y_i^{-1}$  with the cocharacter corresponding to

$$x \mapsto \text{diag}(1, \dots, x, \dots, x^{-1}, \dots, 1)$$

where  $x$  is in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  position and  $x^{-1}$  is in the  $(n-i)^{\text{th}}$  position, and all other positions are 1. Here  $\mathbb{Q}[Y_1^\pm, \dots, Y_m^\pm]^{W_m}$  denotes the ring of symmetric polynomials in  $Y_i + Y_i^{-1}$ .

So, henceforth, we will consider

$$\text{Sat}: \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Q}[X_1^\pm, \dots, X_n^\pm]^{\text{Sym}(n)}$$

$$\text{Sat}: \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{Q}[Y_1^\pm, \dots, Y_m^\pm]^{W_m}.$$

### 5.3. Relation of Satake transformation to base change. Let

$$\text{BC}: \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$$

denote the stable base change morphism from  $\text{GL}_n(E)$  to the unitary group  $\text{U}$ . The relevance of the Satake transformation is that (see e.g. [Les23, Proposition 3.4]) it gives a way to make this BC completely explicit: we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{Sat}} & \mathbb{Q}[X_1^\pm, \dots, X_n^\pm]^{\text{Sym}(n)} \\ \downarrow \text{BC} & & \downarrow \text{BC} \\ \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{Sat}} & \mathbb{Q}[Y_1^\pm, \dots, Y_m^\pm]^{W_m} \end{array}$$

Here the right arrow is also denoted BC following [LRZ24] (although it is denoted  $\nu$  in [Les23]). This gives a way in which we can concretely calculate the map BC in some situations.

**5.4. The map  $\text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}}$ .** Before we can define the map  $\text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}}$  we need one more piece of notation. Consider the following map.

**Definition 5.2** (proj). Denote by  $\text{proj}: \text{GL}_n(E) \rightarrow S_n(F)$  the projection defined by

$$\text{proj}(g) := g\bar{g}^{-1}.$$

Then  $\text{proj}$  induces a map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{proj}_* : \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) \\ \text{proj}_*(f')(g\bar{g}^{-1}) &= \int_{\text{GL}_n(F)} f'(gh) dh \end{aligned}$$

by integration on the fibers. A similar twisted version by  $\eta$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{proj}_*^\eta : \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) \\ \text{proj}_*^\eta(f')(g\bar{g}^{-1}) &= \int_{\text{GL}_n(F)} f'(gh)\eta(gh) dh \end{aligned}$$

is defined analogously, where as before  $\eta(g) = (-1)^{v(\det g)}$  in a slight abuse of notation.

Then Leslie [Les23] shows the following result.

**Theorem 5.3** ([Les23, Theorem 3.2 and Proposition 3.4]). *Both maps  $\text{proj}_*$  and  $\text{proj}_*^\eta$  induce isomorphisms*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BC}_{S_n} : \mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) \\ \text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}} : \mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) \end{aligned}$$

such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{BC} &= \text{BC}_{S_n} \circ \text{proj}_* \\ \text{BC} &= \text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}} \circ \text{proj}_*^{\eta^{n-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

We take these isomorphisms promised by this theorem as the definition of  $\text{BC}_{S_n}$  and  $\text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}}$  in our conjectures (noting when  $n$  is odd they coincide, as  $\eta^{n-1} = 1$ ).

When combined with the Satake information we have, we get the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_n(E)) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{Sat}} & \mathbb{Q}[X_1^\pm, \dots, X_n^\pm]^{\text{Sym}(n)} \\ \downarrow \text{BC} & & \downarrow \text{BC} \\ \text{proj}_*^{\eta^{n-1}} \left( \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)) & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\text{Sat}} & \mathbb{Q}[Y_1^\pm, \dots, Y_m^\pm]^{W_m} \\ \uparrow \sim \text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}} & & \end{array} \right) \\ \mathcal{H}(S_n(F)) & & \end{array}$$

**5.5. Example: Calculation of  $\text{BC}_{S_n}$  when  $n = 3$ .** As an example, we make the base change completely explicit in the special case  $n = 3$ , where  $m = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor = 1$ . (In this case  $\text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}} = \text{BC}_{S_n}$  as  $\eta^2 = 1$ .) The completed result is [Proposition 5.7](#). This can be considered a digression and this section will not be needed later.

This calculation parallels the  $n = 2$  case that was done in [LRZ24, Lemma 7.1.1]. When it is not more difficult, some of the results will be stated for all  $n$ , rather than  $n = 3$  specifically.

**5.5.1. Overview.** Throughout this subsection, we use the shorthand

$$\varpi^{(n_1, n_2, n_3)} := \text{diag}(\varpi^{n_1}, \varpi^{n_2}, \varpi^{n_3}).$$

As a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -module, the spaces  $\mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  and  $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  have a canonical basis of indicator functions indexed by  $\mathbb{Z}$ :

- $\mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  has  $\mathbb{Q}$ -module basis  $\mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}}$  for  $j \geq 0$ .
- $\mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  has a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -module basis given by the indicator functions

$$\mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)}$$

for  $r \geq 0$ .

On the other hand, the natural  $\mathbb{Q}$ -module basis for  $\mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$ , namely

$$\mathbf{1}_{K'\varpi^{(n_1, n_2, n_3)}K'}$$

is given by triples of integers  $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq n_3 \geq 0$ , and is much larger. So explicit calculations for the  $\mathrm{proj}_*$  or the Satake transforms viewed in  $\mathbb{C}[X_1, X_2, X_3]^{\mathrm{Sym}(n)}$  are nontrivial if one works with the entire basis.

Hence the overall strategy, to reduce the amount of work we have to do, is to focus on only the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -indexed elements

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Mat}_3(O_E), v \circ \det = r} = \sum_{\substack{n_1 \geq n_2 \geq n_3 \\ n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = r}} \mathbf{1}_{K'\varpi^{(n_1, n_2, n_3)}K'} \in \mathcal{H}(\mathrm{GL}_n(E))$$

for  $r \geq 0$ . This aggregated indicator function is easier to compute, because given an explicit matrix it is somewhat easier to evaluate

$$\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Mat}_3(O_E), v \circ \det = r}$$

at it (one only needs to check it has  $O_E$  entries and that the determinant has valuation  $r$ , rather than determining the exact coset  $K'\varpi^{(n_1, n_2, n_3)}K'$ ).

5.5.2. *Satake transform of the determinant characteristic function on the top arrow.* This is the easiest calculation, and we do it for all  $n$  rather than just  $n = 3$ .

**Proposition 5.4** (Satake transform for  $v \circ \det = r$ ). *For every integer  $r \geq 0$ , we have*

$$\mathrm{Sat}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Mat}_n(O_E), v \circ \det = r}) = q^{(n-1)r} \sum_{e_1 + \dots + e_n = r} X_1^{e_1} \dots X_n^{e_n}.$$

*Proof.* We evaluate the coefficient  $X_1^{e_1} \dots X_n^{e_n}$ . Choose a cocharacter  $\mu$ , and suppose  $\mu(\varpi) = \varpi^{(e_1, \dots, e_n)}$  with  $n_1 \geq n_2 \geq n_3$ . Let  $q_E = q^2$  be the residue characteristic of  $E$ . Take the upper triangular matrices as our Borel subgroup as usual, so the unipotent radical of this Borel subgroup are the unipotent upper triangulars  $N'$  which we describe as

$$N' := \left\{ \left( \begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & y_{12} & y_{13} & \dots & y_{1n} \\ & 1 & y_{23} & \dots & y_{2n} \\ & & 1 & \dots & y_{3n} \\ & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & 1 \end{array} \right) \mid y_{12}, \dots, y_{(n-1)n} \in E \right\}$$

and with additive Haar measure is  $dy_{12} dy_{23} \dots dy_{(n-1)n}$ . Recall also the Weyl vector for  $\mathrm{GL}_n(E)$  is just

$$\rho_{\mathrm{GL}_n(E)} = \left\langle \frac{n-1}{2}, \frac{n-3}{2}, \dots, -\frac{n-1}{2} \right\rangle.$$

Compute

$$\mathrm{Sat}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Mat}_n(O_E), v \circ \det = r})(\mu(\varpi))$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \delta(\mu(\varpi))^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{n' \in N'} \mathbf{1}_{\text{Mat}_n(O_E, v \text{det} = r)}(\mu(\varpi)n') \, dn' \\
&= q_E^{-\langle \mu, \rho \rangle} \underbrace{\int_{y_{12} \in E} \int_{y_{13} \in E} \cdots \int_{y_{(n-1)n} \in E}}_{\binom{n}{2} \text{ integrals}} \\
&\quad \mathbf{1}_{\text{Mat}_3(O_E), v \text{det} = r} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \varpi^{e_1} & \varpi^{e_1} y_{12} & \varpi^{e_1} y_{13} & \cdots & \varpi^{e_1} y_{1n} \\ & \varpi^{e_2} & \varpi^{e_2} y_{23} & \cdots & \varpi^{e_2} y_{2n} \\ & & \varpi^{e_3} & \cdots & \varpi^{e_3} y_{3n} \\ & & & \ddots & \vdots \\ & & & & \varpi^{e_n} \end{pmatrix} \right) \\
&\quad dy_{12} dy_{23} \cdots dy_{(n-1)n} \\
&= q_E^{-\left(\frac{n-1}{2}e_1 + \frac{n-3}{2}e_2 + \cdots + \frac{n-1}{2}e_n\right)} \mathbf{1}_{e_1 + \cdots + e_n = r} \underbrace{\int_{y_{12} \in E} \int_{y_{13} \in E} \cdots \int_{y_{(n-1)n} \in E}}_{\binom{n}{2} \text{ integrals}} \\
&\quad \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbf{1}_{O_E}(\varpi^{e_i} y_{ij}) \, dy_{ij} \\
&= q_E^{-\left(\frac{n-1}{2}e_1 + \frac{n-3}{2}e_2 + \cdots + \frac{n-1}{2}e_n\right)} \mathbf{1}_{e_1 + \cdots + e_n = r} \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} q_E^{e_i} \\
&= q_E^{-\left(\frac{n-1}{2}e_1 + \frac{n-3}{2}e_2 + \cdots + \frac{n-1}{2}e_n\right)} \mathbf{1}_{e_1 + \cdots + e_n = r} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} q_E^{(n-i)e_i} \\
&= \mathbf{1}_{e_1 + \cdots + e_n = r} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n} q_E^{\frac{n-1}{2}e_i} \\
&= q_E^{\frac{n-1}{2}r} \mathbf{1}_{e_1 + \cdots + e_n = r} \\
&= \begin{cases} q^{\frac{n-1}{2}r} & \text{if } e_1 + \cdots + e_n = r \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

This gives the sum claimed earlier.  $\square$

### 5.5.3. Satake transform of the indicator on the bottom arrow.

**Proposition 5.5** (Satake transform for  $\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)$ ). *For each  $r \geq 0$  we have*

$$\text{Sat} \left( \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} \right) = \sum_{i=0}^r q^{2r-1_{r \equiv i \pmod{2}}} Y_1^{\pm i}$$

where we adopt the shorthand

$$Y_1^{\pm i} := \begin{cases} Y_1^i + Y_1^{-i} & i > 0 \\ 1 & i = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We first need to describe

$$N = N' \cap \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)$$

a little more carefully. For  $n \in N'$  we have

$$n^* \beta n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ \bar{y}_1 & 1 & \\ \bar{y}_2 & \bar{y}_3 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \beta \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y_1 & y_2 \\ & 1 & y_3 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} & & 1 \\ & 1 & y_3 + \bar{y}_1 \\ 1 & y_1 + \bar{y}_3 & y_2 + \bar{y}_2 + y_3 \bar{y}_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

So  $n \in N$  if and only if the above matrix equals  $\beta$ , which means

$$0 = y_3 + \bar{y}_1 = y_2 + \bar{y}_2 + y_3 \bar{y}_3.$$

Then we can re-parametrize by  $z_1, z_2, z_3 \in F$  according to

$$\begin{aligned} y_3 &= z_1 + z_2 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ y_2 &= -\frac{z_1^2 + z_2^2 \varepsilon}{2} + z_3 \sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ y_1 &= -z_1 + z_2 \sqrt{\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Back to the original task. For each  $i \geq 0$  we can evaluate the Satake transform at the element  $\nu(\varpi) = \mathrm{diag}(\varpi^i, 1, \varpi^{-i})$ , for the cocharacter  $\nu$  corresponding to  $Y_1^i + Y_1^{-i}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Sat} \left( \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} \right) (\nu(\varpi)) \\ &= \delta(\nu(\varpi))^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{n \in N} \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} (\nu(\varpi) n') \, dn \\ &= \delta(\nu(\varpi))^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_{n \in N} \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \mathrm{Mat}_3(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} \left( \begin{pmatrix} \varpi^i & \varpi^i y_1 & \varpi^i y_2 \\ & 1 & y_3 \\ & & \varpi^{-i} \end{pmatrix} \right) \, dn \end{aligned}$$

The matrix itself is always in  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)$ , because it's the product of two unitary matrices. So the indicator needs to check whether all the entries have valuation at least  $-r$ . If we switch characterization to the coordinates  $z_1, z_2, z_3$  we described earlier, we see that the conditions are

$$\begin{aligned} i &\leq r, \\ v(z_1) &\geq -r, \\ v(z_2) &\geq -r, \\ v(z_3) &\geq -(r+i), \\ v(z_1^2 + z_2^2 \varepsilon) &\geq -(r+i). \end{aligned}$$

Assume  $i \leq r$  henceforth. The condition for  $z_1$  and  $z_2$  then really says

$$\min(v(z_1), v(z_2)) \geq -\left\lfloor \frac{r+i}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

So the integral factors as a triple integral

$$\int_{z_1 \in F} \int_{z_2 \in F} \int_{z_3 \in F} \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-\lfloor \frac{r+i}{2} \rfloor} O_F}(z_1) \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-\lfloor \frac{r+i}{2} \rfloor} O_F}(z_2) \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-(r+i)} O_F}(z_3) dz_1 dz_2 dz_3$$

which is equal to

$$q^{2\lfloor \frac{r+i}{2} \rfloor + r+i}.$$

Meanwhile,  $\delta(\nu(\varpi))^{\frac{1}{2}} = q^{-2i}$ . In summary,

$$\text{Sat} \left( \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} \right) (\nu(\varpi)) = \begin{cases} q^{2\lfloor \frac{r+i}{2} \rfloor - i + r} & i \leq r \\ 0 & i > r \end{cases}$$

Finally, since

$$2 \left\lfloor \frac{r+i}{2} \right\rfloor - i + r = \begin{cases} 2r & r+i \text{ is even} \\ 2r-1 & r+i \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

we get the formula claimed.  $\square$

#### 5.5.4. Integration over fiber.

**Proposition 5.6** (Integration over fiber). *For every integer  $r \geq 0$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{proj}_*(\mathbf{1}_{\text{Mat}_3(O_E), \nu \text{det}=r}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^r \left( \sum_{i=0}^{2(r-j)} \min \left( 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \right\rfloor, 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{2(r-j)-i}{2} \right\rfloor \right) q^i \right) \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}}. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The coefficient of  $\mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}}$  will be equal to the evaluation of the integral at any  $g$  such that  $g\bar{g} \in K'_{S,j}$ . Fixing  $j \geq 0$ , we are going to take the choice

$$g = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \varpi^{-j} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ & 1 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We need to check this choice of  $g$  indeed satisfies  $g\bar{g}^{-1} \in K'_{S,j}$ . This follows as

$$\bar{g} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\varpi^{-j} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ & 1 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \implies \bar{g}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \varpi^{-j} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ & 1 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and therefore

$$g\bar{g}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2\varpi^{-j} \sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ & 1 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in K'_{S,j}$$

as needed.

Having chosen the representative  $g$ , we aim to calculate the right-hand side of

$$\text{proj}_*(\mathbf{1}_{\text{Mat}_3(O_E), \nu \text{det}=r})(g\bar{g}) = \int_{h \in \text{GL}_3(F)} \mathbf{1}_{\text{Mat}_3(O_E), \nu \text{det}=r}(gh) dh.$$

We take (non-Archimedean) Iwasawa decomposition of  $h \in \mathrm{GL}_3(F)$  to rewrite it as

$$h = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & & \\ & x_2 & \\ & & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y_1 & y_2 \\ & 1 & y_3 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} k$$

for  $k \in \mathrm{GL}_3(O_F) \subseteq K'$ , which does not affect the indicator function. Here  $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in F^\times$  and  $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in F$ . In that case, note that

$$\begin{aligned} gh &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \varpi^{-j}\sqrt{\varepsilon} & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & & \\ & x_2 & \\ & & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y_1 & y_2 \\ & 1 & y_3 \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} k \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \varpi^{-j}\sqrt{\varepsilon} & \\ & 1 & \\ & & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_1y_1 & x_1y_2 \\ & x_2 & x_2y_3 \\ & & x_3 \end{pmatrix} k \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_1y_1 & x_1y_2 + x_3\varpi^{-j}\sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ & x_2 & x_2y_3 \\ & & x_3 \end{pmatrix} k. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can rewrite the  $\mathrm{proj}_*(\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Mat}_3(O_E), v\mathrm{det}=r})$  as a six-fold integral

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{proj}_*(\mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Mat}_3(O_E), v\mathrm{det}=r}) \\ &= \int_{x_1 \in F^\times} \int_{x_2 \in F^\times} \int_{x_3 \in F^\times} \int_{y_1 \in F} \int_{y_2 \in F} \int_{y_3 \in F} \\ &\quad \mathbf{1}_{\mathrm{Mat}_3(O_E), v\mathrm{det}=r} \left( \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_1y_1 & x_1y_2 + x_3\varpi^{-j}\sqrt{\varepsilon} \\ & x_2 & x_2y_3 \\ & & x_3 \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &\quad d^\times x_1 d^\times x_2 d^\times x_3 dy_1 dy_2 dy_3. \end{aligned}$$

Apparently the indicator function only depends on the valuations, so accordingly we rewrite the six-fold integral as a discrete sum over the valuations  $\alpha_i := v(x_i)$ . Then the conditions are that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &\geq 0, & \alpha_2 &\geq 0, & \alpha_3 &\geq j \\ v(y_1) &\geq -\alpha_1, & v(y_2) &\geq -\alpha_1, & v(y_3) &\geq -\alpha_2. \end{aligned}$$

We have  $\mathrm{Vol}(\varpi^{\alpha_i} O_F^\times) = 1$  and  $\mathrm{Vol}(\varpi^{-\alpha_i} O_F) = q^{\alpha_i}$ . Hence the integral can be rewritten as the discrete sum

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 = r \\ \alpha_1 \geq 0 \\ \alpha_2 \geq 0 \\ \alpha_3 \geq j}} q^{\alpha_1} \cdot q^{\alpha_1} \cdot q^{\alpha_2} &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq r - j \\ \alpha_1 \geq 0 \\ \alpha_2 \geq 0}} q^{2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{2(r-j)} \min \left( 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \right\rfloor, 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{2(r-j) - i}{2} \right\rfloor \right) q^i \end{aligned}$$

as desired.  $\square$

5.5.5. *Base change from  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+))$  to  $\mathcal{H}(S_3(F))$ .* We first need to determine an element of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  which is in the pre-image of

$$\mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)}$$

under BC:  $\mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_3(E)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+))$ .

For convenience, we define the shorthand

$$\mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_3(E)) \ni f'_r := \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}_{\text{Mat}_3(\mathcal{O}_E), v \text{odet}=r} & r \geq 0 \\ 0 & r < 0 \end{cases}$$

for every integer  $r$ . We start with the following intermediate calculation.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{BC}(\text{Sat}(f'_r - q^2 f'_{r-1})) \\ &= \text{BC} \left( q^{2r} \sum_{n_1+n_2+n_3=r} X_1^{n_1} X_2^{n_2} X_3^{n_3} - q^2 \cdot q^{2(r-1)} \sum_{n_1+n_2+n_3=(r-1)} X_1^{n_1} X_2^{n_2} X_3^{n_3} \right) \\ &= q^{2r} \left( \sum_{n_1+n_2+n_3=r} Y_1^{n_1-n_3} - \sum_{n_1+n_2+n_3=(r-1)} Y_1^{n_1-n_3} \right) \\ &= q^{2r} \left( \sum_{n_1+n_3=r} Y_1^{n_1-n_3} \right) \\ &= q^{2r} (Y_1^r + Y_1^{r-2} + \cdots + Y_1^{-r}). \end{aligned}$$

Replacing  $r$  with  $r-1$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{BC}(\text{Sat}(f'_{r-1} - q^2 f'_{r-2})) \\ &= q^{2r-2} (Y_1^{r-1} + Y_1^{r-3} + \cdots + Y_1^{-(r-1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Adding the former equation to  $q$  times the latter gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{BC}(\text{Sat}(f'_r + (q - q^2)f'_{r-1} - q^3 f'_{r-2})) \\ &= q^{2r} (Y_1^r + Y_1^{r-2} + \cdots + Y_1^{-r}) + q^{2r-1} (Y_1^{r-1} + Y_1^{r-3} + \cdots + Y_1^{-(r-1)}) \\ &= \text{Sat}(\mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)}). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\text{BC}(f'_r + (q - q^2)f'_{r-1} - q^3 f'_{r-2}) = \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)}$$

so indeed  $f'_r + (q - q^2)f'_{r-1} - q^3 f'_{r-2}$  lies in the desired pre-image of the map BC:  $\mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_3(E)) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+))$ .

On the other hand, it is easy to check that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{proj}_*(f'_r - q^2 f'_{r-1}) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^r \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{2(r-j)} \min \left( 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \right\rfloor, 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{2(r-j)-i}{2} \right\rfloor \right) \right] q^i \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \sum_{i=0}^{2(r-1-j)} \min \left( 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \right\rfloor, 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{2((r-1)-j)-i}{2} \right\rfloor \right) q^{i+2} \Big] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^r [1 + q + q^2 + \cdots + q^{r-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}}
\end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{proj}_*(f'_r - q^2 f'_{r-1} + q(f'_{r-1} - q^2 f'_{r-3})) \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^r [(1 + q + q^2 + \cdots + q^{r-j}) + (q + q^2 + \cdots + q^{r-j})] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^r [1 + 2q + 2q^2 + \cdots + 2q^{r-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}}.
\end{aligned}$$

To summarize, the completed commutative diagram can be written in full as

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\begin{array}{l} f'_r + (q - q^2)f'_{r-1} \\ -q^3 f'_{r-2} \in \mathcal{H}(\text{GL}_3(E)) \end{array} & \xrightarrow{\text{Sat}} & \cdots \in \mathbb{Q}[X_1^\pm, X_2^\pm, X_3^\pm]^{\text{Sym}(3)} \\
\downarrow \text{BC} & & \downarrow \text{BC} \\
\text{proj}_* \left( \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} \\ \in \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)) \end{array} \right) & \xrightarrow{\text{Sat}} & \begin{array}{l} q^{2r} (Y_1^{\pm r} + \cdots + Y_1^{\mp r}) \\ + q^{2r-1} (Y_1^{\pm(r-1)} + \cdots + Y_1^{\mp(r-1)}) \\ \in \mathbb{Q}[Y_1^\pm]^{W_1} \end{array} \\
\uparrow \sim \text{BC}_{S_3} & & \\
\begin{array}{l} \sum_{j=0}^r [1 + 2q + 2q^2 \\ + \cdots + 2q^{r-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \\ \in \mathcal{H}(S_3(F)) \end{array} & & 
\end{array}$$

Thus, we arrive at the following:

**Proposition 5.7** (Base change  $\text{BC}_{S_3}$ ). *For  $n = 3$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{BC}_{S_3} \left( \sum_{j=0}^r [1 + 2q + 2q^2 + \cdots + 2q^{r-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \right) & = \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} \\
\text{BC}_{S_3} \left( \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,r}} + \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} 2q^{r-j} \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \right) & = \mathbf{1}_{K^{\varpi(r,0,-r)}K}
\end{aligned}$$

for every integer  $r \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* The first equation is the one we just proved. The second one follows by noting that

$$\mathbf{1}_{K^{\varpi(r,0,-r)}K} = \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_3(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)} - \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-(r-1)} \text{Mat}_3(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_3^+)}$$

so one merely subtracts the left-hand sides evaluated at  $r$  and  $r - 1$  for  $r \geq 1$  to get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^r [1 + 2q + 2q^2 + \cdots + 2q^{r-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \\
& \quad - \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} [1 + 2q + 2q^2 + \cdots + 2q^{(r-1)-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \\
& = \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,r}} + \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} [1 + 2q + 2q^2 + \cdots + 2q^{r-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \\
& \quad - \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} [1 + 2q + 2q^2 + \cdots + 2q^{(r-1)-j}] \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}} \\
& = \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,r}} + \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} [2q^{r-j} \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S,j}}].
\end{aligned}$$

as claimed.  $\square$

## 6. DEFINITION OF THE WEIGHTED ORBITAL INTEGRAL FOR $S_n(F)$

We briefly mention the definition of the weighted orbital integral that appears in [Conjecture 1.1](#). However, we will not reuse this definition later on. This definition is only used for comparison with later definitions and to provide context for [Conjecture 1.1](#).

Let  $H = \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}(F)$ . Then  $H$  has a natural embedding into  $\mathrm{GL}_n(E)$  by

$$h \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} h & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

which endows it with an action  $S_n(F)$ . Then our weighted orbital integral is defined as follows.

**Definition 6.1** ([\[LRZ24, Equation \(3.2.3\)\]](#)). For brevity let  $\eta(h) := \eta(\det h)$  for  $h \in H$ . For  $\gamma \in S_n(F)$ ,  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$ , and  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ , we define the *weighted orbital integral* by

$$\mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi, s) := \int_{h \in H} \phi(h^{-1}\gamma h) \eta(h) |\det(h)|_F^{-s} dh.$$

**Definition 6.2** (The abbreviation  $\partial \mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi)$ ). From now on we will abbreviate

$$\partial \mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi) := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} \mathrm{Orb}(\gamma, \phi, s).$$

We remark that this weighted orbital integral is related to an (unweighted) orbital integral on the unitary side by the so-called relative fundamental

lemma. Specifically, for  $g \in \mathbf{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)$  and  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$ , we define the (unweighted) orbital integral by

$$\text{Orb}^{\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)}(g, f) := \int_{\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)} f(x^{-1}gx) dx.$$

Then the following result is true.

**Theorem 6.3** (Relative fundamental lemma; [Les23, Theorem 1.1]). *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  and  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}$ .*

$$\omega(\gamma) \text{Orb}(\phi, \gamma, 0) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}^- \\ \text{Orb}^{\mathbf{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)}(g, \text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}}(\phi)) & \text{if } \gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}^+ \end{cases}$$

where the transfer factor  $\omega$  is defined in [Section 12](#).

### 7. SYNOPSIS OF THE WEIGHTED ORBITAL INTEGRAL

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) \text{ FOR } (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}} \\ &\text{AND } \phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F)) \end{aligned}$$

Throughout this section,  $H = \text{GL}_n(F)$  (rather than  $H = \text{GL}_{n-1}(F)$ ) and  $K' = \text{GL}_n(O_F)$ . For the concrete calculation, we are mostly interested in the case  $n = 2$ . The goal of this chapter is to define the orbital integral in [Theorem 1.5](#) and give a precise statement of the parameters used to state the formula, as well as the dependencies between the parameters that needs to hold in order for the matching to work.

**7.1. Definition.** For our conjecture, it will be enough to define the weighted orbital integral in the case where our function is of the form

$$\phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}$$

where  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  is the left component, and the right component is the indicator function defined in the obvious way:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee} : V_n'(F) \rightarrow \{0, 1\} \\ &(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \mapsto \begin{cases} 1 & \mathbf{u} \text{ and } \mathbf{v}^\top \text{ have } O_F\text{-entries} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Then, unsurprisingly from the definition of our action as

$$h \cdot (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = (h\gamma h^{-1}, h\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top h^{-1})$$

we analogously define the weighted orbital integral as follows.

**Definition 7.1** ([Liu21, §1.3]). For brevity let  $\eta(h) := \eta(\det h)$  for  $h \in H$ . For  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in S_n(F) \times V_n'(F)$ ,  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$ , and  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ , we define the weighted orbital integral by

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) \\ &:= \int_{h \in H} \phi(h^{-1}\gamma h) \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}(h\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top h^{-1}) \eta(h) |\det(h)|_F^{-s} dh. \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 7.2** (The abbreviation  $\partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi)$ ). Moving forward we abbreviate

$$\partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi) := \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \right|_{s=0} \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s).$$

As before it seems this weighted orbital integral should be related to an ordinary one. To define it, fix a self-dual lattice  $\Lambda_n$  in  $\mathbb{V}_n^+$  of full rank. First, if  $(g, u) \in \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \times \mathbb{V}_n^+$  and  $f \in \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$ , then we define an orbital integral for  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \times \mathbb{V}_n^+$  by

$$(8) \quad \text{Orb}^{\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \times \mathbb{V}_n^+}((g, u), f \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\Lambda_n}) := \int_{\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)} f(x^{-1}gx) \mathbf{1}_{\Lambda_n}(x^{-1}u) dx.$$

Then in the spirit of [Liu21, Conjecture 1.9] and Theorem 6.3, we propose the following.

**Conjecture 7.3** (Relative fundamental lemma in the semi-Lie case). *Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_n(F))$  and  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \omega(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \text{Orb}(\phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), 0) \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^- \\ \text{Orb}^{\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+) \times \mathbb{V}_n^+}((g, u), \text{BC}_{S_n}^{\eta^{n-1}}(\phi) \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\Lambda_n}) & \text{if } (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}^+ \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where the transfer factor  $\omega$  is defined in Section 12.

Wei Zhang suggests that this conjecture can be proven by similar means to Theorem 6.3, but since it is not necessary for this paper we do not pursue this proof here.

**7.2. Basis for the indicator functions in  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$ .** From now on assume  $n = 2$ . Set

$$S_2(F) := \{g \in \text{GL}_2(E) \mid g\bar{g} = \text{id}_2\}.$$

We again have a Cartan decomposition indexed by a single integer  $r \geq 0$ :

**Lemma 7.4** (Cartan decomposition of  $S_2(F)$ ). *For each integer  $r \geq 0$  let*

$$K'_{S,r} := \text{GL}_2(O_E) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varpi^r \\ \varpi^{-r} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

denote the orbit of  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varpi^r \\ \varpi^{-r} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  under the left action of  $\text{GL}_2(O_E)$ . Then we have a decomposition

$$S_2(F) = \coprod_{r \geq 0} K'_{S,r}.$$

*Proof.* This is [LRZ24, Equation (7.1.7) and (7.1.8)].  $\square$

Like last time,  $K'_{S,r}$  is the part of  $S_2(F)$  for which the most negative valuation among the nine entries is  $-r$ . And as before we abbreviate the  $r = 0$  term specifically:

$$K'_S := K'_{S,0}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathrm{GL}_2(O_E) \cdot \begin{pmatrix} & 1 \\ 1 & \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \mathrm{GL}_2(O_E) \cdot \mathrm{id}_2 = S_2(F) \cap \mathrm{GL}_2(O_E).
\end{aligned}$$

Repeating the definition

$$K'_{S, \leq r} := S_2(F) \cap \varpi^{-r} \mathrm{GL}_2(O_E) = K'_{S,0} \sqcup K'_{S,1} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup K'_{S,r}$$

we get a basis of indicator functions for the Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$ :

**Corollary 7.5** (Basis of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$ ). *For  $r \geq 0$ , the indicator functions  $\mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}}$  form a basis of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$ .*

**7.3. Parametrization of  $\gamma$ .** From now on assume  $n = 2$ , and that  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2')_{\mathrm{rs}}$  is regular.

**7.3.1. Identifying an orbit representative.** The weighted orbital integral depends only on the  $H$ -orbit of  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ . Consequently, we may assume without loss of generality (via multiplication by a suitable change-of-basis  $h \in H = \mathrm{GL}_2(F)$ ) that

$$\mathbf{u} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{v}^\top = (0 \ e) \quad e \in F.$$

(We know  $\mathbf{u}$  is not the zero vector from the regular condition applied on  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ .)

Meanwhile, we will let  $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{GL}_2(F)$  for  $a, b, c, d \in F$ . Then, viewed as an element of  $\mathrm{GL}_3(F)$  via the embedding we described earlier, we have

$$(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ c & d & 1 \\ 0 & e & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{Mat}_3(F).$$

Thus, our definition of regular requires that  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$  is linearly independent

from  $\begin{pmatrix} b \\ d \end{pmatrix}$  and  $(0 \ e)$  is linearly independent from  $(c \ d)$ . This is just saying that  $b, c, e$  are all nonzero. We also know that  $\gamma \in S_2(F)$ , which gives us relations on  $a, b, c, d$  (the same as [LRZ24, Equation (7.3.2)]); we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{a} & \bar{b} \\ \bar{c} & \bar{d} \end{pmatrix} \implies \begin{aligned} \bar{b}c &= b\bar{c} = 1 - a\bar{a} = 1 - d\bar{d}, \\ d &= -\bar{a}c/\bar{c} = -\bar{a}b/\bar{b}. \end{aligned}$$

**7.3.2. Simplification due to the matching of non-split unitary group.** Like before, we focus on the case where regular  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  matches an element in the non-split unitary group. As we described in [Proposition 4.9](#), this is controlled by the parity of  $v(\Delta)$ , where

$$\Delta = \det \left( \left( \mathbf{v}^\top \gamma^{i+j} \mathbf{u} \right)_{0 \leq i, j \leq n-1} \right).$$

When  $n = 2$ , for the representatives we described before, we have

$$\left( \mathbf{v}^\top \gamma^{i+j} \mathbf{u} \right)_{0 \leq i, j \leq n-1} = \begin{pmatrix} e & de \\ de & bce + d^2e \end{pmatrix}$$

so

$$\Delta = bce^2 = \frac{b}{\bar{b}}(1 - a\bar{a})e^2.$$

Hence,  $v(\Delta)$  is odd if and only if  $v(1 - a\bar{a})$  is odd. Thus, we restrict attention to the following situation:

**Assumption 7.6.** *We will assume that*

$$v(1 - a\bar{a}) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}.$$

In particular,  $a$  must be a unit. And since  $d = -\bar{a}c/\bar{c}$ , it follows  $d$  is a unit. In other words, [Assumption 7.6](#) gives the direct corollary

$$v(a) = v(d) = 0.$$

**7.4. Parameters used in the calculation of the weighted orbital integral.** We will state our derivative in terms of the five integers  $r$ ,  $v(b)$ ,  $v(c)$ ,  $v(e)$  and  $v(d - a)$ . From [Assumption 7.6](#), we actually get that

**Assumption 7.7.** *We have that*

- $v(b) + v(c)$  is an odd positive integer;
- $v(d - a) \geq 0$ .

These are the only constraints between these five numbers we will consider (together with  $r \geq 0$ ). However, we mention that we will only be interested in the case when  $v(e) \geq 0$  since in the case  $v(e) < 0$  we will shortly see that  $\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{O}_F^n \times (\mathcal{O}_F^n)^\vee}, s) = 0$  identically in  $s$  in that situation.

For convenience, we summarize all the assumptions on the shape of  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  in the following single lemma.

**Lemma 7.8** (Parameters for  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}$ ). *Suppose  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}$ . Then one can choose a representative of the  $\text{GL}_2(F)$ -orbit of  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  of the form*

$$\left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, (0 \ e) \right)$$

where  $a, b, c, d, e \in F$  satisfy  $bce \neq 0$ ,

$$\bar{b}c = b\bar{c} = 1 - a\bar{a} = 1 - d\bar{d},$$

$$d = -\bar{a}c/\bar{c} = -\bar{a}b/\bar{b}.$$

Moreover, we always assume  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  matches an element of  $(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^-) \times \mathbb{V}_2^-)_{\text{rs}}$  rather than  $(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+) \times \mathbb{V}_2^+)_{\text{rs}}$ ; this is equivalent to [Assumption 7.6](#) which states that

$$v(1 - a\bar{a}) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}.$$

In particular, we may assume  $v(a) = v(d) = 0$  and  $v(b) + v(c) \geq 1$  is odd ([Assumption 7.7](#)).

## 8. SUPPORT OF THE WEIGHTED ORBITAL INTEGRAL FOR $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$

We assume  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  is as in [Lemma 7.8](#) throughout this chapter.

**8.1. Iwasawa decomposition.** The overall method is to take the Iwasawa decomposition in  $KAN$  form:

**Lemma 8.1** (Iwasawa decomposition). *Every element in  $h \in \mathrm{GL}_2(F)$  may be parametrized as*

$$h = k \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $k \in K' = \mathrm{GL}_2(O_F)$ ,  $x_1, x_2 \in O_F^\times$  and  $y \in O_F$ .

Because the orbits are invariant under conjugation by  $K'$ , the parameter  $k$  can be discarded. The Haar measure in these coordinates

$$\left| \frac{x_1}{x_2} \right| d^\times x_1 d^\times x_2 dy$$

where we take multiplicative Haar measure on  $F^\times$  (normalized so that  $O_F^\times$  has volume 1) and additive Haar measure on  $F$  (so  $O_F$  has volume 1).

**8.2. Action of upper triangular matrices on  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ .** We now compute the action of an arbitrary

$$h = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

on  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ . The main term is given by

$$\begin{aligned} h\gamma h^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & x_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} cy + a & -cy^2 + (d - a)y + b \\ c & -cy + d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & x_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} cy + a & \frac{x_1}{x_2} \cdot (-cy^2 + (d - a)y + b) \\ \frac{x_2}{x_1} \cdot c & -cy + d \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h\mathbf{u} &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 y \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{v}^\top h^{-1} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & e \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_1^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & x_2^{-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{e}{x_2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

**8.3. Description of support.** From now on we fix the notation

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &:= v(x_1) \\ n_2 &:= v(x_2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that although  $n_2 \geq 0$ , the value of  $n_1$  will often be non-positive. In fact  $n_1$  is not particularly simple to work with and we will prefer to introduce the notation

$$(9) \quad m := n_2 + v(c) + r - n_1$$

instead to use as a summation variable. This is chosen so that  $\frac{x_2}{x_1} \cdot c \in \varpi^{-r}O_F \iff m \geq 0$ . Note that it follows we have

$$(10) \quad n_1 + n_2 = 2n_2 - m + v(c) + r$$

8.3.1. *Collating the linear constraints.* For a given  $r \geq 0$ , we find that  $h$  contributes to the integral exactly if  $h\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}^\top h^{-1}$  have  $O_F$ -entries, and all the entries of  $h\gamma h^{-1}$  are in  $\varpi^{-r}O_F$ . The former condition is just saying that

$$\begin{aligned} v(y) &\geq -n_1, \\ 0 &\leq n_2 \leq v(e). \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the entries of  $h\gamma h^{-1}$ . First, because  $a$  and  $d$  are units by [Assumption 7.6](#), and  $r \geq 0$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} cy + a, -cy + d \in \varpi^{-r}O_F &\iff cy \in \varpi^{-r}O_F \\ &\iff v(y) \geq -v(c) - r. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{x_2}{x_1} \cdot c \in \varpi^{-r}O_F \iff n_2 + v(c) - n_1 \geq -r \iff m \geq 0.$$

In summary, up until now we have the following requirements imposed:

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &\leq n_2 \leq v(e) \\ 0 &\leq m \\ v(y) &\geq \max(-n_1, -v(c) - r) \\ &= \max(m - n_2, 0) - v(c) - r. \end{aligned}$$

8.3.2. *The quadratic constraint.* As for the quadratic constraint, we seek  $y$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{x_1}{x_2} \cdot (-cy^2 + (d-a)y + b) &\in \varpi^{-r}O_F \\ \iff v\left(-y^2 + \frac{d-a}{c}y + \frac{b}{c}\right) &\geq n_2 - n_1 - v(c) - r \\ &= m - 2v(c) - 2r. \end{aligned}$$

As before, we complete the square:

$$-y^2 + \frac{d-a}{c}y + \frac{b}{c} = -\left(y - \frac{d-a}{2c}\right)^2 + \frac{b}{c} + \frac{(d-a)^2}{4c^2}.$$

Because  $b\bar{c} = 1 - a\bar{a}$  has odd valuation, it follows that  $\frac{b}{c} = \frac{1-a\bar{a}}{c\bar{c}}$  has odd valuation to. On the other hand,  $\frac{(d-a)^2}{4c^2}$  has even valuation.

This motivates us to introduce the following parameter:

**Definition 8.2** ( $\theta$ ). We define

$$\theta := \min(v(b) + v(c), 2v(d - a)) \geq 0.$$

Note that  $v(b) + v(c)$  is odd, so  $\theta$  takes the odd value if  $v(b) + v(c) < 2v(d - a)$  and the even value otherwise. This definition ensures that

$$v\left(\frac{b}{c} + \frac{(d - a)^2}{4c^2}\right) = \theta - 2v(c).$$

8.4. **Cases based on  $\theta$ .** Henceforth we consider two cases based on  $\theta$ .

**Case 1:** Let's assume first that

$$\theta - 2v(c) \geq m - 2v(c) - 2r \iff m \leq \theta + 2r.$$

Then the only additional condition on  $y$  is that

$$v\left(y - \frac{d - a}{2c}\right) \geq \left\lceil \frac{m}{2} \right\rceil - v(c) - r.$$

We refer to this as **Case 1**.

**Case 2<sup>+</sup> / Case 2<sup>-</sup>:** Otherwise assume that

$$\theta - 2v(c) < m - 2v(c) - 2r \iff m > \theta + 2r.$$

Then in order for  $y$  to satisfy the constraint, we would need to be in a situation where  $2v(y - \frac{d-a}{2c}) = \theta - 2v(c)$ . So this case could only arise at all when  $\theta$  is even, that is

$$0 \leq 2v(d - a) = \theta < v(b) + v(c)$$

(note that  $v(d - a) \geq 0$  because  $a$  and  $d$  are units). As the quantity  $\frac{b}{c} + \frac{(d-a)^2}{4c^2}$  must be a perfect square, we denote it by  $\tau^2$ , with

$$v(\tau) = \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c).$$

This gives us the factorization

$$\frac{b}{c} = \tau^2 - \frac{(d - a)^2}{4c^2} = \left(\tau - \frac{d - a}{2c}\right) \left(\tau + \frac{d - a}{2c}\right).$$

The left-hand side has odd valuation  $v(b) - v(c)$ , so the two factors on the right have unequal valuations and hence exactly one of them has valuation the same as  $v(\frac{d-a}{2c}) = v(\tau)$ . Hence, we agree to fix the choice of the square root  $\tau$  so that

$$\begin{aligned} v\left(\tau + \frac{d - a}{2c}\right) &= v(b) - v(c) - v(\tau) = v(b) - \frac{\theta}{2} \\ v\left(\tau - \frac{d - a}{2c}\right) &= v(\tau) = \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c) \end{aligned}$$

and in particular  $v\left(\tau + \frac{d-a}{2c}\right) > v\left(\tau - \frac{d-a}{2c}\right)$ .

In any case, the constraint on  $y$  is that

$$\begin{aligned}
v\left(y - \left(\frac{d-a}{2c} \pm \tau\right)\right) &\geq (m - 2v(c) - 2r) - v(\tau) \\
&= (m - 2v(c) - 2r) - \left(\frac{\theta}{2} - v(c)\right) \\
&= m - \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c) - 2r \\
v\left(y - \left(\frac{d-a}{2c} \mp \tau\right)\right) &= v(\tau) = \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c).
\end{aligned}$$

By assumption, the second equation is true whenever the first inequality is and we may disregard it. **Case 2<sup>+</sup>** refers to the situation where the  $\pm$  sign is  $+$  and **Case 2<sup>-</sup>** refers to the situation where the  $\mp$  sign is  $-$ . And these cases must be disjoint because the right-hand sides above are unequal.

8.4.1. *Analysis of Case 1.* The triple  $(x_1, x_2, y) \in O_F^\times \times O_F^\times \times O_F$  contributes to the weighted orbital integral in Case 1 exactly if the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq n_2 \leq v(e) \\
0 &\leq m \leq \theta + 2r \\
v(y) &\geq \max(m - n_2, 0) - v(c) - r \\
v\left(y - \frac{d-a}{2c}\right) &\geq \left\lceil \frac{m}{2} \right\rceil - v(c) - r.
\end{aligned}$$

However, from the definitions we already know that

$$v\left(\frac{d-a}{2c} - 0\right) \geq \frac{\theta - 2v(c)}{2} \geq \frac{m}{2} - v(c) - r$$

so the disks in the last two conditions have nonempty intersection. Hence the earlier [Lemma 3.2](#) applies to tell us that the locus of valid  $y$  is a single disk whose volume in  $O_F$  is given by

$$q^{-\max(m-n_2, \lceil m/2 \rceil, 0) + v(c) + r} = q^{-\max(m-n_2, \lceil m/2 \rceil) + v(c) + r}.$$

The volume contribution for and  $x_1 \in O_F^\times$  and  $x_2 \in O_F^\times$  is also 1, because  $v(x_1)$  and  $v(x_2)$  are fixed. Hence the overall volume of the support in  $H$  for this pair  $(m, n_2)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{x_1}{x_2} \right| q^{n_2 - n_1} \text{Vol}(\{y \mid \dots\}) &= q^{n_2 - n_1 - \max(m-n_2, \lceil m/2 \rceil) + v(c) + r} \\
&= q^{m - \max(m-n_2, \lceil m/2 \rceil)}.
\end{aligned}$$

And again, this case is summed over

$$0 \leq n_2 \leq v(e), \quad 0 \leq m \leq \theta + 2r.$$

8.4.2. *Analysis of Case 2<sup>+</sup> and Case 2<sup>-</sup>.* Again, this case could only occur if  $\theta$  is even. The triple  $(x_1, x_2, y) \in O_F^\times \times O_F^\times \times O_F$  contributes to the weighted orbital integral in Case 2<sup>+</sup> and Case 2<sup>-</sup> exactly if the following identities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq n_2 \leq v(e) \\ \theta + 2r &< m \\ v(y) &\geq \max(m - n_2, 0) - v(c) - r \\ v\left(y - \left(\frac{d-a}{2c} \pm \tau\right)\right) &\geq m - \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c) - 2r. \end{aligned}$$

The last two inequalities specify disks. So in each case, via [Lemma 3.2](#) we get a nonzero contribution if and only if the distance between the centers 0 and  $\frac{d-a}{2c} \pm \tau$  has valuation at least that of the smaller of the two right-hand sides, that is

$$\begin{aligned} v\left(\frac{d-a}{2c} \pm \tau\right) &\geq \min\left(\max(m - n_2, 0) - v(c) - r, m - \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c) - 2r\right) \\ &= \min\left(\max(m - n_2, 0), m - \frac{\theta}{2} - r\right) - v(c) - r. \end{aligned}$$

Hence the upper bound on  $m$  is given by two different requirements, depending on which of the two values of  $v\left(\frac{d-a}{2c} \pm \tau\right) + v(c) + r$  is given by the case:

- In Case 2<sup>+</sup>, we need at least one of the inequalities

$$\begin{cases} \max(m - n_2, 0) \leq v(b) - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(c) + r, \\ m \leq v(b) + v(c) + 2r \end{cases}$$

to hold. Now the inequality  $0 \leq v(b) - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(c) + r$  is always true, as  $\theta < v(b) + v(c)$ , so we can disregard it. Therefore this can be rewritten as just

$$m \leq \max\left(r, n_2 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) + v(b) + v(c) + r.$$

- In Case 2<sup>-</sup>, we need at least one of the inequalities

$$\begin{cases} \max(m - n_2, 0) \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r \\ m \leq \theta + 2r \end{cases}$$

to hold. But  $m \leq \theta + 2r$  is always false and  $0 \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r$  is always true, so this simplifies to

$$m \leq n_2 + \frac{\theta}{2} + r.$$

Assuming  $m$  lies in the valid range so that the locus of valid  $y$  is nonempty, it follows that the volume is given exactly by

$$q^{-\max(m-n_2, m-\frac{\theta}{2}-r, 0)-v(c)-r} = q^{-\max(m-n_2, m-\frac{\theta}{2}-r)-v(c)-r}.$$

Hence the overall volume of the support in  $H$  for this pair  $(m, n_2)$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{x_1}{x_2} \right| q^{n_2 - n_1} \text{Vol}(\{y \mid \dots\}) &= q^{n_2 - n_1 - \max(m - n_2, m - \frac{\theta}{2} - r) + v(c) + r} \\ &= q^{m - \max(m - n_2, m - \frac{\theta}{2} - r)} \\ &= q^{\min(n_2, \frac{\theta}{2} + r)}. \end{aligned}$$

And this sum is over two ranges of  $m$  (although the ranges obviously overlap, they set of  $y$  they cover is disjoint):

$$\begin{aligned} \theta + 2r < m &\leq \max\left(r, n_2 - \frac{\theta}{2}\right) + v(b) + v(c) + r \\ \theta + 2r < m &\leq n_2 + \frac{\theta}{2} + r. \end{aligned}$$

Note the second range could be empty if  $n_2$  is small enough, but the first range is always nonempty.

## 9. EVALUATION OF THE WEIGHTED ORBITAL INTEGRAL FOR $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$

We continue to assume  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  is as in [Lemma 7.8](#) throughout this chapter.

We now aggregate the supports we found in the previous section together with the definition of the weighted orbital integral to extract the desired formulas.

Recall that the weighted orbital integral was defined as

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) \\ &:= \int_{h \in H} \phi(h^{-1}\gamma h) \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}(h\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top h^{-1}) \eta(h) |\det(h)|_F^{-s} dh \end{aligned}$$

and that after taking Iwasawa decomposition as

$$h = k \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & y \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

we broke the sum based on  $n_1 = v(x_1)$  and  $n_2 = v(x_2)$ . For  $h$  as above, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(h) &= (-1)^{n_1 + n_2} \\ |\det(h)|_F^{-s} &= (q^s)^{n_1 + n_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying [\(10\)](#) we find that

$$\eta(h) |\det(h)|_F^{-s} = (q^s)^{2n_2 - m + v(c) + r}.$$

**9.1. The contribution for Case 1.** We assume  $\theta + 2r \geq 0$ , because otherwise the entire sum is empty. Hence, the total contribution for **Case 1** is

$$\begin{aligned} I^5 &:= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=0}^{\theta+2r} q^{m-\max(m-n_2, \lceil m/2 \rceil)} (-q^s)^{2n_2-m+v(c)+r} \\ &:= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=0}^{\theta+2r} q^{\min(n_2, \lceil m/2 \rceil)} (-q^s)^{2n_2-m+v(c)+r}. \end{aligned}$$

We'll change the summation variable to

$$k := 2n_2 - m + v(c) + r \iff m = 2n_2 - k + v(c) + r.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} I^5 &:= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{k=2n_2-\theta+v(c)-r}^{2n_2+v(c)+r} q^{\min(n_2, n_2 + \lfloor \frac{v(c)+r-k}{2} \rfloor)} (-q^s)^k \\ &= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{k=2n_2-\theta+v(c)-r}^{2n_2+v(c)+r} q^{n_2-\max(0, \lfloor \frac{k-(v(c)+r)}{2} \rfloor)} (-q^s)^k. \end{aligned}$$

We then interchange the order of summation so that  $k$  is outside. Then  $k$  runs from the lowest value of  $k = -\theta + v(c) - r$  to the largest value  $k = 2v(e) + v(c) + r$  over all choices of  $n_2$ . Since

$$2n_2 - \theta + v(c) - r \leq k \leq 2n_2 + v(c) + r$$

then in addition to  $0 \leq n_2 \leq v(e)$  we also need

$$\frac{k - v(c) - r}{2} \leq n_2 \leq \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2}.$$

In other words, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I^5 &= \sum_{k=-\theta+v(c)-r}^{2v(e)+v(c)+r} (-1)^k (q^s)^k \sum_{n_2=\max(0, \lfloor \frac{k-v(c)-r}{2} \rfloor)}^{\min(v(e), \lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r}{2} \rfloor)} q^{n_2-\max(0, \lfloor \frac{k-(v(c)+r)}{2} \rfloor)} \\ &= \sum_{k=-\theta+v(c)-r}^{2v(e)+v(c)+r} (-1)^k (q^s)^k \left( q^{\min(v(e), \lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r}{2} \rfloor) - \max(0, \lfloor \frac{k-v(c)-r}{2} \rfloor)} + \dots + q^0 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, we adopt the convention that ellipses of the form

$$q^i + \dots + q^{i'}$$

denote the expression  $q^i + q^{i-1} + \dots + q^{i'}$  (i.e. within any ellipses, the exponents are understood to decrease by 1, and the sums are always nonempty, meaning  $i \geq i'$ ).

To simplify the exponent, write

$$\begin{aligned}
(12) \quad & \min \left( v(e), \left\lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r}{2} \right\rfloor \right) - \max \left( 0, \left\lceil \frac{k-v(c)-r}{2} \right\rceil \right) \\
&= \min \left( v(e), \left\lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r}{2} \right\rfloor \right) + \min \left( 0, \left\lfloor \frac{v(c)+r-k}{2} \right\rfloor \right) \\
&= \min \left( \left\lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r}{2} \right\rfloor, v(e) + \left\lfloor \frac{v(c)+r-k}{2} \right\rfloor, v(e), \left\lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{v(c)+r-k}{2} \right\rfloor \right).
\end{aligned}$$

This already completes **Theorem 1.5** in the situation when  $\theta$  is odd since **Case 2<sup>+</sup>** and **Case 2<sup>-</sup>** do not appear at all. However, let's turn to the remaining cases first.

**9.2. The contribution for Case 2<sup>+</sup> and Case 2<sup>-</sup>.** Herein we assume  $\theta = 2v(d-a) > v(b) + v(c)$  is even, and in particular  $\theta \geq 0$ . We get a contribution of

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{6+} &:= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{\max(r, n_2 - \frac{\theta}{2}) + v(b) + v(c) + r} q^{\min(n_2, \frac{\theta}{2} + r)} (-q^s)^{2n_2 - m + v(c) + r} \\
I^{6-} &:= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{n_2 + \frac{\theta}{2} + r} q^{\min(n_2, \frac{\theta}{2} + r)} (-q^s)^{2n_2 - m + v(c) + r}.
\end{aligned}$$

We will split  $I^{6+}$  into two parts:

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{6+} &= \sum_{n_2=0}^{\frac{\theta}{2} + r} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{v(b) + v(c) + 2r} q^{n_2} (-q^s)^{2n_2 - m + v(c) + r} \\
&+ q^{\frac{\theta}{2} + r} \sum_{n_2=\frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{n_2 - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b) + v(c) + r} (-q^s)^{2n_2 - m + v(c) + r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the second sum is nonempty only when  $v(e) > \frac{\theta}{2} + r$ . So we consider cases on this in what follows.

**9.2.1. Sub-case where  $v(e) \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r$ .** First, suppose  $v(e) \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r$ . Then the contribution of **Case 2<sup>-</sup>** is void, since the inner sum of  $I^{6-}$  contributes only when  $n_2 > \frac{\theta}{2} + r$ . We only need to consider

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{6+} &= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{v(b) + v(c) + 2r} q^{n_2} (-q^s)^{2n_2 - m + v(c) + r} \\
&= \sum_{n_2=0}^{v(e)} \sum_{k=2n_2 - v(b) - r}^{2n_2 - \theta + v(c) - r - 1} q^{n_2} (-q^s)^k.
\end{aligned}$$

Swapping the summation order so that  $k$  is outside, the sum runs from the lowest value  $k = -v(b) - r$  up to the highest value  $k = 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1$ ,

subject to  $0 \leq n_2 \leq v(e)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & 2n_2 - v(b) - r \leq k \leq 2n_2 - \theta + v(c) - r - 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rfloor \leq n_2 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{k + v(b) + r}{2} \right\rfloor. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$I^{6+} = \sum_{k=-v(b)-r}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \sum_{n_2=\max(0, \left\lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r+1}{2} \right\rfloor)}^{\min(v(e), \left\lfloor \frac{k+v(b)+r}{2} \right\rfloor)} q^{n_2} (-q^s)^k.$$

9.2.2. *Sub-case where  $v(e) > \frac{\theta}{2} + r$ .* We start on  $I^{6-}$ ; note if  $n_2 \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r$  then the inner sum of  $I^{6-}$  has empty range anyway. Consequently, we can simply write

$$I^{6-} = q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{n_2=\frac{\theta}{2}+r+1}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{n_2+\frac{\theta}{2}+r} (-q^s)^{2n_2-m+v(c)+r}$$

which in particular is nonempty. In that case, simplifying the inner sum gives

$$I^{6-} = q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{n_2=\frac{\theta}{2}+r+1}^{v(e)} \left( (-q^s)^{2n_2-\theta+v(c)-r-1} + \dots + (-q^s)^{n_2-\frac{\theta}{2}+v(c)} \right).$$

We collect the coefficient of  $(-q^s)^k$  for each  $k$ . The lowest value of  $k$  which appears is  $k = v(c) + r + 1$ ; the highest one is  $k = 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1$ . For these  $k$ , the coefficient is the number of integers  $n_2$  such that

$$\frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1 \leq n_2 \leq v(e)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & n_2 - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(c) \leq k \leq 2n_2 - \theta - r - 1 + v(c) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \leq n_2 \leq k + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c). \end{aligned}$$

Note we already have  $\frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r+1}{2} \geq \frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1$  for  $k$  in the desired range. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} I^{6-} = q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} & \sum_{k=v(c)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \left( 1 + \min \left( v(e), k + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c) \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \max \left( \frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1, \left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rfloor \right) \right) (-q^s)^k \end{aligned}$$

$$= q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=v(c)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \left( 1 + \min \left( v(e), k + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c) \right) - \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil \right) (-q^s)^k.$$

The second double sum of  $I^{6+}$  is again nonempty since  $v(e) > \frac{\theta}{2} + r$ . So we compute it in a similar way to  $I^{6-}$  by putting

$$\begin{aligned} & q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{n_2=\frac{\theta}{2}+r+1}^{v(e)} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{n_2-\frac{\theta}{2}+v(b)+v(c)+r} (-q^s)^{2n_2-m+v(c)+r} \\ &= q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{n_2=\frac{\theta}{2}+r+1}^{v(e)} \left( (-q^s)^{2n_2-\theta+v(c)-r-1} + \dots + (-q^s)^{n_2+\frac{\theta}{2}-v(b)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again we calculate the coefficient of  $(-q^s)^k$ . The values of  $k$  run from the lowest value  $k = \theta - v(b) + r + 1$  and end at the highest value  $k = 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1$ . In this range we need  $\frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1 \leq n_2 \leq v(e)$  and

$$\begin{aligned} & n_2 + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(b) \leq k \leq 2n_2 - \theta + v(c) - r - 1 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \leq n_2 \leq k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b). \end{aligned}$$

The double sum therefore becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=\theta-v(b)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \left( 1 + \min \left( v(e), k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \max \left( \frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1, \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil \right) \right) (-q^s)^k. \end{aligned}$$

It is natural to split this sum into  $k \leq v(c) + r$  and  $k > v(c) + r$ . In the former case, we have both  $k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b) \leq v(e)$  and  $\frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1 \geq \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil$ ; in the latter case we have just  $\frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1 \leq \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil$  instead. Hence, the double sum simplifies further to

$$\begin{aligned} & q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=\theta-v(b)+r+1}^{v(c)+r} \left( 1 + \left( k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b) \right) - \left( \frac{\theta}{2} + r + 1 \right) \right) (-q^s)^k \\ & + q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=v(c)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \left( 1 + \min \left( v(e), k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b) \right) - \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil \right) (-q^s)^k \\ & = q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=\theta-v(b)+r+1}^{v(c)+r} (k - \theta + v(b) - r) (-q^s)^k \end{aligned}$$

$$+ q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=v(c)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \left( 1 + \min \left( v(e), k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b) \right) - \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil \right) (-q^s)^k.$$

Meanwhile, the first sum within  $I^{6+}$  can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n_2=0}^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{v(b)+v(c)+2r} q^{n_2} (-q^s)^{2n_2-m+v(c)+r} &= \sum_{n_2=0}^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} q^{n_2} \sum_{m=\theta+2r+1}^{v(b)+v(c)+2r} (-q^s)^{2n_2-m+v(c)+r} \\ &= \sum_{n_2=0}^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} q^{n_2} \sum_{k=2n_2-v(b)-r}^{2n_2-\theta+v(c)-r-1} (-q^s)^k. \end{aligned}$$

We now interchange the summation so that  $k$  is outside, running from the lowest value  $k = -v(b) - r$  to the highest value  $k = v(c) + r - 1$ . From

$$2n_2 - v(b) - r \leq k \leq 2n_2 - \theta + v(c) - r - 1$$

we require that  $0 \leq n_2 \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r$  and

$$\frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \leq n_2 \leq \frac{k + r + v(b)}{2}.$$

In other words, we get

$$\sum_{k=-v(b)-r}^{v(c)+r-1} (-q^s)^k \sum_{n_2=\max\left(0, \left\lceil \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r+1}{2} \right\rceil\right)}^{\min\left(\frac{\theta}{2}+r, \left\lfloor \frac{v(b)+r+k}{2} \right\rfloor\right)} q^{n_2}.$$

Hence the total contribution from **Case 2** can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} I^{6+} + I^{6-} &= \sum_{k=-v(b)-r}^{v(c)+r-1} (-q^s)^k \left( q^{\min\left(\frac{\theta}{2}+r, \left\lfloor \frac{v(b)+r+k}{2} \right\rfloor\right)} + \dots + q^{\max\left(0, \left\lceil \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r+1}{2} \right\rceil\right)} \right) \\ &\quad + q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=\theta-v(b)+r+1}^{v(c)+r} (k - \theta + v(b) - r) (-q^s)^k \\ &\quad + q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=v(c)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \left( 2 + \min \left( v(e), k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \min \left( v(e), k + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c) \right) - 2 \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil \right) (-q^s)^k. \end{aligned}$$

We'd like to further simplify the coefficient of  $q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r}$  as follows. First, we may as well write

$$2 - 2 \left\lceil \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \right\rceil = 2 - ((k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1) + \mathbf{1}_{k+\theta+v(c)+r \equiv 1 \pmod{2}})$$

$$= \mathbf{1}_{k+\theta+v(c)+r \equiv 0 \pmod{2}} + v(c) - \theta - k - r.$$

Set aside the indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_{k+\theta+v(c)+r \equiv 0 \pmod{2}}$  momentarily; we will merge it in a moment. To consolidate the minimum's in the third double sum, note that we have

$$v(c) + r + 1 \leq v(e) + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(b) < v(e) + v(c) - \frac{\theta}{2} \leq 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1.$$

Hence, based on the value of  $k$ , we get the following coefficients:

- If  $v(c) + r + 1 \leq k \leq v(e) + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(b)$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (v(c) - \theta - k - r) + \left(k - \frac{\theta}{2} + v(b)\right) + \left(k + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c)\right) \\ = k - \theta + v(b) - r. \end{aligned}$$

- If  $v(e) + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(b) \leq k \leq v(e) + v(c) - \frac{\theta}{2}$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (v(c) - \theta - k - r) + v(e) + \left(k + \frac{\theta}{2} - v(c)\right) \\ = v(e) - \frac{\theta}{2} - r. \end{aligned}$$

- If  $v(e) + v(c) - \frac{\theta}{2} \leq k \leq 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} (v(c) - \theta - k - r) + v(e) + v(e) \\ = 2v(e) + v(c) - \theta - r. \end{aligned}$$

Noting the expression in the first bullet also matches the coefficient of  $(-q^s)^k$  for  $\theta - v(b) + r + 1 \leq k \leq v(c) + r$ , we can now write

$$\begin{aligned} I^{6+} + I^{6-} &= \sum_{k=-v(b)-r}^{v(c)+r-1} (-q^s)^k \left( q^{\min\left(\frac{\theta}{2}+r, \lfloor \frac{v(b)+r+k}{2} \rfloor\right)} + \dots + q^{\max\left(0, \lfloor \frac{k+\theta-v(c)+r+1}{2} \rfloor\right)} \right) \\ &+ q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=\theta-v(b)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) (-q^s)^k \\ &+ q^{\frac{\theta}{2}+r} \sum_{k=v(c)+r+1}^{2v(e)-\theta+v(c)-r-1} \mathbf{1}_{k+\theta+v(c)+r \equiv 0 \pmod{2}} (-q^s)^k \end{aligned}$$

as the overall contribution from **Case 2**, where

$$\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) := \min \left( k - \theta + v(b) - r, v(e) - \frac{\theta}{2} - r, 2v(e) + v(c) - \theta - r \right).$$

**9.3. Proof of Theorem 1.5.** We now prove **Theorem 1.5**, which we restate here.

**Theorem 1.5** (Explicit orbital integral on  $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$ ). *Let*

$$(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, (0 \quad e) \right) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$$

*satisfy the requirements in Lemma 7.8. Let  $r \geq 0$ .*

*If  $v(e) < 0$  or  $v(b) + v(c) < -2r$ , then*

$$\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) = 0$$

*holds identically for all  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ .*

*Otherwise define*

$$\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) := \min \left( \left\lfloor \frac{k + v(b) + r}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{(2v(e) + v(c) + r) - k}{2} \right\rfloor, N \right)$$

*where*

$$N := \min \left( v(e), \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} + r, v(d - a) + r \right).$$

*Also, if  $v(d - a) < v(e) - r$  and  $v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d - a)$ , then additionally define*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) &= \min \left( k - (2v(d - a) - v(b) + r), \right. \\ &\quad \left. (2v(e) + v(c) - 2v(d - a) - r) - k, v(e) - v(d - a) - r \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Otherwise define  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) = 0$ . Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}}, s) &= \sum_{k=-(v(b)+r)}^{2v(e)+v(c)+r} (-1)^k \left( 1 + q + q^2 + \dots + q^{\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k)} \right) (q^s)^k \\ &\quad + \sum_{k=2v(d-a)-v(b)+r}^{2v(e)+v(c)-2v(d-a)-r} (-1)^k \mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) q^{v(d-a)+r} (q^s)^k. \end{aligned}$$

For reference, we provide [Figure 3](#) sketching the shapes of  $\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  and  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$ , which may be easier to think about.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* First, suppose  $\theta = v(b) + v(c) < 2v(d - a)$  is odd. Then

$$\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) := \min \left( \left\lfloor \frac{k + v(b) + r}{2} \right\rfloor, \left\lfloor \frac{(2v(e) + v(c) + r) - k}{2} \right\rfloor, v(e), \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} + r \right)$$

and  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  terms do not appear. Now, in that case, the exponent (12) can be simplified, because

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} \right\rfloor &= \left\lfloor \frac{k + v(b) + r}{2} \right\rfloor \\ v(e) + \left\lfloor \frac{v(c) + r - k}{2} \right\rfloor &= \left\lfloor \frac{(2v(e) + v(c) + r) - k}{2} \right\rfloor \\ \left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{v(c) + r - k}{2} \right\rfloor &= \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} + \frac{v(c) + r - k}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \frac{\theta - 1}{2} + r \end{aligned}$$




FIGURE 3. Sketch of the functions in [Theorem 1.5](#). The boxed numbers indicate values of  $k$ .

$$= \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} + r < v(d-a) + r.$$

Hence,  $\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  coincides with the exponent in [\(12\)](#). So the result is true in this case.

Now assume instead  $\theta = 2v(d-a) < v(b) + v(c)$  is even. Notice that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{v(c) + r - k}{2} \right\rfloor = \frac{\theta}{2} + r - \mathbf{1}_{k+v(c)+r \equiv 0 \pmod{2}}.$$

First assume that  $v(e) \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r$  and consider [\(12\)](#). For the range of values of  $k$  in  $I^{6+}$ , that is

$$-v(b) - r \leq k \leq 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1$$

we have the first term of (12) is smallest, as

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} \right\rfloor &< v(e) \\ &\leq v(e) + \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} \leq v(e) + \left\lfloor \frac{v(c) + r - k}{2} \right\rfloor \\ \left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} \right\rfloor &\leq v(e) - 1 \leq \frac{\theta}{2} + r - 1. \end{aligned}$$

So the contributions from **Case 1** and **Case 2** fit together to give

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} \right\rfloor} q^j + \left( q^{\min(v(e), \lfloor \frac{v(b) + r + k}{2} \rfloor)} + \dots + q^{\max(0, \lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \rfloor)} \right) \\ = q^{\min(v(e), \lfloor \frac{v(b) + r + k}{2} \rfloor)} + \dots + q^0 \end{aligned}$$

which thus matches the formula for  $\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k)$ .

Now suppose instead  $v(e) > \frac{\theta}{2} + r$ . First, a similar analysis gives that the first part of  $I^{6+}$  fits together with  $I^5$  again. Indeed if

$$-v(b) - r \leq k \leq v(c) + r - 1$$

then in (12) we get the first exponent again, and hence we again get the fit

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{\left\lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r}{2} \right\rfloor} q^j + \left( q^{\min(\frac{\theta}{2} + r, \lfloor \frac{v(b) + r + k}{2} \rfloor)} + \dots + q^{\max(0, \lfloor \frac{k + \theta - v(c) + r + 1}{2} \rfloor)} \right) \\ = q^{\min(\frac{\theta}{2} + r, \lfloor \frac{v(b) + r + k}{2} \rfloor)} + \dots + q^0 \end{aligned}$$

which matches the claimed formula for  $\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  in this range.

The remaining contribution from **Case 2<sup>+</sup>** and **Case 2<sup>-</sup>** is

$$\begin{aligned} q^{\frac{\theta}{2} + r} \sum_{k=\theta - v(b) + r + 1}^{2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1} \mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) (-q^s)^k \\ + q^{\frac{\theta}{2} + r} \sum_{k=v(c) + r + 1}^{2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1} \mathbf{1}_{k + \theta + v(c) + r \equiv 0 \pmod{2}} (-q^s)^k. \end{aligned}$$

The first sum matches the claimed coefficient  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  (except the summation in the theorem statement includes endpoints at  $k = \theta - v(b) + r$  and  $k = 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r$ , but  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) = 0$  at these two endpoints, so there is no change).

Meanwhile the second sum accounts for the discrepancy between the final term of (12) and the formula for  $\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$ . That is, the range of  $k$  for which (12) achieves the last minimum is exactly

$$v(c) + r + 1 \leq k \leq 2v(e) - \theta + v(c) - r - 1$$

and only in those cases does (12) differs from  $\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  by exactly  $\mathbf{1}_{k+\theta+v(c)+r \equiv 0 \pmod{2}}$ . This final step shows the claimed formulas coincide.  $\square$

**Example 9.1** (The special case  $v(e) = 0$ ). When  $v(e) = 0$  the expression is particularly simple. The assumption  $v(d - a) \geq v(e) - r$  is automatically true, and  $\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  is identically zero, so

$$\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) = \sum_{k=-(v(b)+r)}^{v(c)+r} (-q^s)^k.$$

**Example 9.2.** Suppose  $r = 14$ ,  $v(b) = -5$ ,  $v(c) = 100$ ,  $v(e) = 3$ . We have  $v(d - a) \geq 0 > -11 = v(e) - r$ . Hence the above formula reads

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq 14}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) = & -q^{-9s} \\ & + q^{-8s} \\ & - (q + 1) \cdot q^{-7s} \\ & + (q + 1) \cdot q^{-6s} \\ & - (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{-5s} \\ & + (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{-4s} \\ & - (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{-3s} \\ & + (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{-2s} \\ & - (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{-s} \\ & + (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^0 \\ & - (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^s \\ & + (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{2s} \\ & \vdots \\ & - (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{111s} \\ & + (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{112s} \\ & - (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{113s} \\ & + (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{114s} \\ & - (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{115s} \\ & + (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{116s} \\ & - (q + 1) \cdot q^{117s} \\ & + (q + 1) \cdot q^{118s} \\ & - q^{119s} \\ & + q^{120s}. \end{aligned}$$

**Example 9.3.** Suppose  $r = 2$ ,  $v(b) = -5$ ,  $v(c) = 100$ ,  $v(e) = 20$ ,  $v(d-a) = 1$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq 2}} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^n \times (O_F^n)^\vee}, s) &= -q^{3s} \\
&+ q^{4s} \\
&- (q+1) \cdot q^{5s} \\
&+ (q+1) \cdot q^{6s} \\
&- (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{7s} \\
&+ (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{8s} \\
&- (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{9s} \\
&+ (2q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{10s} \\
&- (3q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{9s} \\
&+ (4q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{10s} \\
&- (5q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{9s} \\
&+ (6q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{10s} \\
&\vdots \\
&- (17q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{25s} \\
&+ (18q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{26s} \\
&- (18q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{27s} \\
&+ (18q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{28s} \\
&\vdots \\
&- (18q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{117s} \\
&+ (18q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{118s} \\
&- (18q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{119s} \\
&+ (17q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{120s} \\
&- (16q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{121s} \\
&+ (15q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{122s} \\
&\vdots \\
&+ (3q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{134s} \\
&- (2q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{135s} \\
&+ (q^3 + q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{136s} \\
&- (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{137s}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + (q^2 + q + 1) \cdot q^{138s} \\
& - (q + 1) \cdot q^{139s} \\
& + (q + 1) \cdot q^{140s} \\
& - q^{141s} \\
& + q^{142s}.
\end{aligned}$$

9.4. **Proof of Corollary 1.6.** With **Theorem 1.5** established, we aim to calculate the derivative of

$$\text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K', S, \leq r} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{O_F^\times \times (O_F^\times)^\vee}, s)$$

now at  $s = 0$ . Our goal is to prove **Corollary 1.6**:

**Corollary 1.6** (Derivative at  $s = 0$  for  $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$ ). *Retain the setting of **Theorem 1.5**. Also define  $\varkappa := v(e) - (v(d - a) + r)$ . If both  $\varkappa \geq 0$  and  $v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d - a)$ , then we have the formula*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K', S, \leq r}) \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^N \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j \\
& \quad - q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) - \frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Otherwise we instead have the formula

$$\frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K', S, \leq r}) = \sum_{j=0}^N \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j.$$

*Proof of Corollary 1.6.* For this calculation it will be more convenient to reformat **Theorem 1.5** as a sum over  $q^j$  rather than  $(-1)^k (q^s)^k$ . To that, continuing to write

$$N := \min \left( v(e), \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} + r, v(d - a) + r \right)$$

consider any index  $0 \leq j \leq N$ . Then

$$\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) \geq j \iff 2j - v(b) - r \leq k \leq 2v(e) + v(c) + r - 2j.$$

In other words, the first part of **Corollary 1.7** can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{k=-(v(b)+r)}^{2v(e)+v(c)+r} (-1)^k \left( 1 + \dots + q^{\mathbf{n}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k)} \right) (q^s)^k = q^j \sum_{j=0}^N \left( \sum_{k=2j-v(b)-r}^{2v(e)+v(c)+r-2j} (-q^s)^k \right).$$

If we take the derivative at  $s = 0$  with respect to  $k$ , we get

$$\log q \sum_{j=0}^N \left( q^j \sum_{k=2j-v(b)-r}^{2v(e)+v(c)+r-2j} (-1)^k k \right).$$

The number of terms inside the summation is  $2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j + 1$ , an even number. Each consecutive pair differs by  $(-1)^{v(c)+r}$ . Hence we get

$$(-1)^{v(c)+r} \log q \sum_{j=0}^N \left( q^j \cdot \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \right).$$

Now in the case that  $v(e) > v(d-a) + r$  and  $2v(d-a) < v(b) + v(c)$ , we have to handle the additional contribution obtained when we differentiate

$$(13) \quad q^{v(d-a)+r} \sum_{k=2v(d-a)-v(b)+r}^{2v(e)+v(c)-2v(d-a)-r} (-1)^k \mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) (-q^s)^k$$

at  $s = 0$ . For brevity, we will define

$$\varkappa := v(e) - v(d-a) - r \geq 0.$$

(We allow the degenerate case  $\varkappa = 0$  for convenience, in which case  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}$  is still identically zero.)

We return to differentiating (13). We will use the following extremely easy lemma:

**Lemma 9.4** (Extremely easy). *If  $a_0 \leq a_1$  are integers then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=a_0}^{a_1} (k - a_0) \cdot k \cdot (-1)^k &= (-1)^{a_1} \cdot \frac{a_1(a_1 - a_0 + 1)}{2} - \frac{(-1)^{a_0} + (-1)^{a_1}}{4} \cdot a_0 \\ \sum_{k=a_0}^{a_1} (a_1 - k) \cdot k \cdot (-1)^k &= (-1)^{a_0} \cdot \frac{a_0(a_1 - a_0 + 1)}{2} - \frac{(-1)^{a_0} + (-1)^{a_1}}{4} \cdot a_1. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This follows trivially by induction on  $a_1$ . (Alternatively, use a symbolic engine like WolframAlpha; see [here](#) for the first sum and [here](#) for the second sum.)  $\square$

For the range of  $k$  given, we split it into three parts.

- For  $-v(b) + r + 2v(d-a) \leq k < -v(b) + v(e) + v(d-a)$ , apply the first part of the lemma to conclude that the contribution to the derivative is

$$\begin{aligned} \log q \cdot \left( (-1)^{v(b)+v(e)+v(d-a)-1} \cdot \frac{(-v(b) + v(e) + v(d-a) - 1) \cdot \varkappa}{2} \right. \\ \left. - \frac{(-1)^{v(b)+v(e)+v(d-a)+1} + (-1)^{v(b)+r}}{4} \cdot (-v(b) + r + 2v(d-a)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

- For  $v(c) + v(e) - v(d-a) < k \leq 2v(e) + v(c) - 2v(d-a) - r$  apply the second part of the lemma to conclude that the contribution to the derivative is

$$\log q \cdot \left( (-1)^{v(c)+v(e)+v(d-a)+1} \cdot \frac{(v(c) + v(e) - v(d-a) + 1) \cdot \varkappa}{2} - \frac{(-1)^{v(c)+v(e)+v(d-a)+1} + (-1)^{v(c)+r}}{4} \cdot (2v(e) + v(c) - r - 2v(d-a)) \right).$$

- For the region  $-v(b) + v(e) + v(d-a) \leq k \leq v(c) + v(e) - v(d-a)$ , we have  $\mathbf{c}_{(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}(k) = \varkappa$  and the values of  $k$  form  $\left\lceil \frac{v(c)+v(b)-2v(d-a)}{2} \right\rceil$  consecutive pairs. So the contribution to the derivative here is exactly

$$\log q \cdot (-1)^{v(c)+v(e)+v(d-a)} \varkappa \cdot \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d-a) + 1}{2}.$$

If we sum all three, we get a contribution of  $\varkappa \log q \cdot (-1)^{v(c)+v(e)+v(d-a)}$  times

$$\frac{v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d-a) + 1}{2} - \frac{v(c) + v(e) - v(d-a) + 1}{2} + \frac{-v(b) + v(e) + v(d-a) - 1}{2} = -\frac{1}{2}$$

If  $\varkappa$  is even, then that's all she wrote; we simply get

$$(-1)^{v(c)+r+1} \cdot \frac{\varkappa}{2} \cdot q^{v(d-a)+r} \log q.$$

On the other hand, if  $\varkappa$  is odd we get instead

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{v(c)+r} \frac{\varkappa}{2} q^{v(d-a)+r} \log q \\ & - \frac{1}{2} q^{v(d-a)+r} \log q \cdot (-1)^{v(c)+v(e)+v(d-a)} \cdot \left( (2v(e) + v(c) - r - 2v(d-a)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (-v(b) + r + 2v(d-a)) \right) \\ & = (-1)^{v(c)+r} q^{v(d-a)+r} \log q \cdot \left[ - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b) + v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) + \frac{\varkappa}{2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

These formulas match [Corollary 1.6](#), proving it. (Note that we changed  $\varkappa > 0$  to  $\varkappa \geq 0$ , which makes no change since then the contribution is zero anyway.)  $\square$

**9.5. Proof of [Corollary 1.7](#).** From [Corollary 1.6](#) we can now prove [Corollary 1.7](#)

**Corollary 1.7** (The special case  $\partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}}))$ ). *Retain the setting of [Theorem 1.5](#). Also define  $\varkappa := v(e) - (v(d-a) + r)$ . For*

$r \geq 1$  define

$$C := \begin{cases} \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa > 0 \text{ is odd and } v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a) \\ \frac{\varkappa+v(b)+v(c)-2v(d-a)-1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \geq 0 \text{ is even and } v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a) \\ v(e) - N & \text{if } v(e) \geq \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r \text{ and } 2v(d-a) > v(b) + v(c) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$C' := \begin{cases} C + 1 & \text{if } \varkappa \geq 0 \text{ and } v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d-a) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}}) \\ & = (q^N + q^{N-1} + \dots + 1) + Cq^N + C'q^{N-1} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof of Corollary 1.7.* Observe that when we add the right-hand side of Corollary 1.6 to the same right-hand side with  $r$  replaced by  $r-1$ , almost all the terms cancel. Indeed, the main sum for  $0 \leq j \leq N-1$  line up:

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^{r+v(c)} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} q^j \cdot \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \\ & (-1)^{(r-1)+v(c)} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} q^j \cdot \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + (r-1) - 2j \right) \\ & = q^{N-1} + \dots + q^0. \end{aligned}$$

So we consider three cases:

- In the case where  $v(d-a) + r > v(e)$  and  $\frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r > v(e)$  then the value of  $N = v(e)$  does not change when we decrease  $r$  by one. Hence the term for  $j = N$  cancels in both sums and we get exactly we get

$$(-1)^{r+v(c)} \log q (1 + q + \dots + q^N).$$

- Next suppose  $v(e) \geq \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r$  and also  $2v(d-a) > v(b) + v(c)$  (so the extra terms involving  $\varkappa$  are absent). In that case  $N = \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r$ . Then we are left with  $(-1)^{r+v(c)} \log q$  times

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (q^j) + \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - (v(b) + v(c) - 1 + 2r) \right) q^N \\ & = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (q^j) + \left( \frac{2v(e) - v(b) - v(c) - 1}{2} - r \right) q^N \\ & = \sum_{j=0}^N (q^j) + \left( v(e) - r - \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} \right) q^N. \end{aligned}$$

This matches [Theorem 1.5](#).

- Finally, suppose  $\varkappa \geq 0$  and  $v(b) + v(c) > 2v(d - a)$  so that  $N = v(d - a) + r$ . Then we are left with  $(-1)^{r+v(c)} \log q$  times

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (q^j) + \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2(v(d - a) + r) \right) q^N \\
& + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} -\frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{\varkappa}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d - a) - r \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& + q^{N-1} \cdot \begin{cases} -\frac{\varkappa+1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{\varkappa+1}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d - a) - (r - 1) \right) & \text{if } \varkappa + 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (q^j) + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} \left( \frac{2v(e)+v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - 2(v(d - a) + r) \right) - \frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& - q^{N-1} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d - a) - (r - 1) \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ -\frac{\varkappa+1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^N (q^j) + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} \left( \frac{2v(e)+v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r - 2(v(d - a) + r) \right) - \frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& - q^{N-1} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d - a) - (r - 1) \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ -\frac{\varkappa+1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^N (q^j) + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} \left( \frac{v(e)+v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}v(d - a) - \frac{1}{2}r \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{\varkappa+1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& - q^{N-1} \cdot \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} - \left( \frac{1}{2}v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - \frac{3}{2}v(d - a) - \frac{1}{2}r \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ -\frac{\varkappa+1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& = \sum_{j=0}^N (q^j) + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} \left( \frac{\varkappa+v(b)+v(c)-1-2v(d-a)}{2} \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\
& + q^{N-1} \cdot \begin{cases} \frac{\varkappa+v(b)+v(c)+1-2v(d-a)}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ -\frac{\varkappa+1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2}. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

This matches [Theorem 1.5](#), and the proof is complete.  $\square$

## 10. LARGE KERNEL AND LARGE IMAGE

In this chapter we use [Corollary 1.7](#) to prove both [Theorem 1.9](#) and [Theorem 1.10](#) for the orbital integral on  $S_2(F) \times V_2'(F)$ , We also comment on an analogous result for  $S_3(F)$ , although we do not provide all the details.

We assume  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  is as in [Lemma 7.8](#) throughout this chapter.

10.1. **In the semi-Lie case, the kernel is trivial if we allow  $v(e)$  to vary, for every fixed choice of  $\gamma$ .** We prove [Theorem 1.9](#) in this section. We treat  $\gamma$  as fixed, satisfying the requirements of [Lemma 7.8](#), and we let

$$\theta := \min(v(b) + v(c), 2v(d - a)) \geq 0$$

as we did in [Section 8](#).

**Lemma 10.1** (The matrix of  $\partial \text{Orb}$ 's has full rank). *Fix  $\gamma$ . Let  $N \geq 0$  be a nonnegative integer. We define an  $(N + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 2) \times (N + 1)$  matrix  $M$  as follows: for  $0 \leq i \leq N + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 1$  and  $0 \leq r \leq N$ , the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row and  $r^{\text{th}}$  column takes the value*

$$M_{i,r} := \frac{(-1)^r}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb} \left( \left( \gamma, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, (0 \ \varpi^i) \right), \mathbf{1}_{K', \leq r} \right).$$

Then  $M$  has full rank.

The basic strategy of the proof will be to perform some sequences of row operations. Specifically, we introduce the following definition.

- For each  $i = N + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor, \dots, 0$  in that order, subtract the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row of  $M$  from the  $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$  row of  $M$ . Denote the new matrix as  $M'$ .
- For each  $i = N + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, 0$  in that order, subtract the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row of  $M'$  from the  $(i + 2)^{\text{nd}}$  row of  $M'$ . Denote the new matrix as  $M''$ .

Then the basic premise is to show that  $M''$  has an upper triangular submatrix. This is easier to see with some illustrations, which we give below.

**Example 10.2.** For example, for  $N = 4$  and  $v(b) + v(c) = 1$ ,  $v(d - a) = 0$  (hence  $\theta = 0$ ), we have

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 1 & q+3 & 2q+4 & 3q+5 & 4q+6 \\ 2 & q+4 & q^2+3q+5 & 2q^2+4q+6 & 3q^2+5q+7 \\ 2 & 2q+5 & q^2+4q+6 & q^3+3q^2+5q+7 & 2q^3+4q^2+6q+8 \\ 3 & 2q+6 & 2q^2+5q+7 & q^3+4q^2+6q+8 & q^4+3q^3+5q^2+7q+9 \\ 3 & 3q+7 & 2q^2+6q+8 & 2q^3+5q^2+7q+9 & q^4+4q^3+6q^2+8q+10 \end{pmatrix}$$

hence

$$M' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 0 & q+1 & 2q+1 & 3q+1 & 4q+1 \\ 1 & 1 & q^2+q+1 & 2q^2+q+1 & 3q^2+q+1 \\ 0 & q+1 & q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 & 2q^3+q^2+q+1 \\ 1 & 1 & q^2+q+1 & q^2+q+1 & q^4+q^3+q^2+q+1 \\ 0 & q+1 & q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and finally

$$M'' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\ 0 & q+1 & 2q+1 & 3q+1 & 4q+1 \\ 0 & -1 & q^2+q-2 & 2q^2+q-3 & 3q^2+q-4 \\ 0 & 0 & -q & q^3+q^2-2q & 2q^3+q^2-3q \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -q^2 & q^4+q^3-2q^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -q^3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Example 10.3.** For example, for  $N = 4$ ,  $v(b) + v(c) = 17$ ,  $v(d - a) = 2$  (hence  $\theta = 4$ ), we have

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 10 & 11 & \dots \\ 8q+10 & 9q+11 & 10q+12 & \dots \\ 7q^2+9q+11 & 8q^2+10q+12 & 9q^2+11q+13 & \dots \\ q^2+10q+12 & 7q^3+9q^2+11q+13 & 8q^3+10q^2+12q+14 & \dots \\ 8q^2+11q+13 & q^3+10q^2+12q+14 & 7q^4+9q^3+11q^2+13q+15 & \dots \\ 2q^2+12q+14 & 8q^3+11q^2+13q+15 & q^4+10q^3+12q^2+14q+16 & \dots \\ 9q^2+13q+15 & 2q^3+12q^2+14q+16 & 8q^4+11q^3+13q^2+15q+17 & \dots \\ 3q^2+14q+16 & 9q^3+13q^2+15q+17 & 2q^4+12q^3+14q^2+16q+18 & \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

hence

$$M' = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & \dots \\ 8q+1 & 9q+1 & 10q+1 & 11q+1 & \dots \\ 7q^2+q+1 & 8q^2+q+1 & 9q^2+q+1 & 10q^2+q+1 & \dots \\ -6q^2+q+1 & 7q^3+q^2+q+1 & 8q^3+q^2+q+1 & 9q^3+q^2+q+1 & \dots \\ 7q^2+q+1 & -6q^3+q^2+q+1 & 7q^4+q^3+q^2+q+1 & 8q^4+\dots+1 & \dots \\ -6q^2+q+1 & 7q^3+q^2+q+1 & -6q^4+q^3+q^2+q+1 & 7q^5+\dots+1 & \dots \\ 7q^2+q+1 & -6q^3+q^2+q+1 & 7q^4+q^3+q^2+q+1 & -6q^5+\dots+1 & \dots \\ -6q^2+q+1 & 7q^3+q^2+q+1 & -6q^4+q^3+q^2+q+1 & 7q^5+\dots+1 & \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

and finally

$$M'' = \begin{pmatrix} 9 & 10 & 11 & 12 & 13 \\ 8q+1 & 9q+1 & 10q+1 & 11q+1 & 12q+1 \\ 7q^2+q-8 & 8q^2+q-9 & 9q^2+q-10 & 10q^2+q-11 & 11q^2+q-12 \\ -6q^2-7q & 7q^3+q^2-8q & 8q^3+q^2-9q & 9q^3+q^2-10q & 10q^3+q^2-11q \\ 0 & -6q^3-7q^2 & 7q^4+q^3-8q^2 & 8q^4+q^3-9q^2 & 9q^4+q^3-10q^2 \\ 0 & 0 & -6q^4-7q^3 & 7q^5+q^4-8q^3 & 8q^5+q^4-9q^3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -6q^5-7q^4 & 7q^6+q^5-8q^4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -6q^6-7q^5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Example 10.4.** For example, for  $N = 4$ ,  $v(b) + v(c) = 5$ ,  $v(d - a) = 8$  (hence  $\theta = 5$ ), we have

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 & 5 & \dots \\ 2q+4 & 3q+5 & 4q+6 & \dots \\ q^2+3q+5 & 2q^2+4q+6 & 3q^2+5q+7 & \dots \\ 2q^2+4q+6 & q^3+3q^2+5q+7 & 2q^3+4q^2+6q+8 & \dots \\ 3q^2+5q+7 & 2q^3+4q^2+6q+8 & q^4+3q^3+5q^2+7q+9 & \dots \\ 4q^2+6q+8 & 3q^3+5q^2+7q+9 & 2q^4+4q^3+6q^2+8q+10 & \dots \\ 5q^2+7q+9 & 4q^3+6q^2+8q+10 & 3q^4+5q^3+7q^2+9q+11 & \dots \\ 6q^2+8q+10 & 5q^3+7q^2+9q+11 & 4q^4+6q^3+8q^2+10q+12 & \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

hence

$$M' = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\ 2q+1 & 3q+1 & 4q+1 & 5q+1 & 6q+1 \\ q^2+q+1 & 2q^2+q+1 & 3q^2+q+1 & 4q^2+q+1 & 5q^2+q+1 \\ q^2+q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 & 2q^3+q^2+q+1 & 3q^3+q^2+q+1 & 4q^3+q^2+q+1 \\ q^2+q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 & q^4+\dots+1 & 2q^4+\dots+1 & 3q^4+\dots+1 \\ q^2+q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 & q^4+\dots+1 & q^5+\dots+1 & 2q^5+\dots+1 \\ q^2+q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 & q^4+\dots+1 & q^5+\dots+1 & q^6+\dots+1 \\ q^2+q+1 & q^3+q^2+q+1 & q^4+\dots+1 & q^5+\dots+1 & q^6+\dots+1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and finally

$$M'' = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 \\ 2q+1 & 3q+1 & 4q+1 & 5q+1 & 6q+1 \\ q^2+q-2 & 2q^2+q-3 & 3q^2+q-4 & 4q^2+q-5 & 5q^2+q-6 \\ q^2-q & q^3+q^2-2q & 2q^3+q^2-3q & 3q^3+q^2-4q & 4q^3+q^2-5q \\ 0 & q^3-q^2 & q^4+q^3-2q^2 & 2q^4+q^3-3q^2 & 3q^4+q^3-4q^2 \\ 0 & 0 & q^4-q^3 & q^5+q^4-2q^3 & 2q^5+q^4-3q^3 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & q^5-q^4 & q^6+q^5-2q^4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & q^6-q^5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 10.1.* In order to prove  $M$  has full rank, it suffices to prove  $M''$  has full rank. We now confirm the patterns shown by the example above.

By quoting [Corollary 1.6](#) we will write

$$M_{i,r} = \sum_{j=0}^{\min(i,r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor)} \left( i + \frac{v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) q^j \\ - \mathbf{1}_{\theta \equiv 0 \pmod{2}} \cdot q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{i-r}{2} + t_i \right)$$

where

$$t_i = \begin{cases} -\frac{v(d-a)}{2} & \text{if } i+r \equiv v(d-a) \pmod{2} \\ \frac{v(b)+v(c)-3v(d-a)}{2} & \text{if } i+r \not\equiv v(d-a) \pmod{2} \end{cases}$$

depends only on the parity of  $i$ . Hence for  $i \geq 1$  we always have

$$M'_{i,r} = M_{i,r} - M_{i-1,r}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\mathbf{1}_{\substack{\theta \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ i \geq r + \theta/2}} \cdot q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{i-r}{2} + t_i \right) \\
&+ \mathbf{1}_{\substack{\theta \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ i-1 \geq r + \theta/2}} \cdot q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{i-1-r}{2} + t_{i-1} \right) \\
&+ \mathbf{1}_{i \leq r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} \cdot \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - i \right) q^i \\
&+ \sum_{j=0}^{\min(i-1, r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor)} q^j.
\end{aligned}$$

From this we can make the following deductions on

$$M''_{i,r} = M'_{i,r} - M'_{i-2,r}$$

by cancelling most of the terms.

- If  $i \geq r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 3$  then  $M''_{i,r} = 0$  is clear.
- If  $i = r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 2$  we contend that  $M''_{i,r} = 0$  too.
  - When  $\theta = v(b) + v(c)$  is odd, the surviving terms are

$$- \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - (i-2) \right) q^{i-2} + q^{r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor}$$

Substituting in  $i = r + \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + 2$  gives zero, as needed.

- When  $\theta = 2v(d-a)$  is even, the surviving terms are

$$\begin{aligned}
&- q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{i-r}{2} + t_i \right) + q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{(i-2)-r}{2} + t_{i-2} \right) \\
&+ q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{i-1-r}{2} + t_{i-1} \right) \\
&- \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - (i-2) \right) q^{i-2} \\
&+ q^{r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} \\
&= q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( -1 + \frac{i-1-r}{2} + t_{i-1} - \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} - r + i - 2 + 1 \right) \\
&= q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( -\frac{3}{2}r + t_{i-1} - \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} + \frac{3}{2}i \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting in  $i = r + v(d-a) + 2$  (and since  $t_i = t_{i-2}$ ), we also get exactly 0, since  $t_{i-1} = \frac{v(b)+v(c)-3v(d-a)}{2}$ .

- If  $i = r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 1$ , we consider again cases on the parity of  $\theta$ .
  - When  $\theta = v(b) + v(c)$  is odd, the surviving terms are

$$- \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - (i-2) \right) q^{i-2} + q^{r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} + q^{r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1} = q^{r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} - q^{r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1}.$$

– When  $\theta = 2v(d - a)$  is even, the surviving terms are

$$\begin{aligned}
& - q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{i-r}{2} + t_i \right) \\
& + q^{v(d-a)+r} \cdot \left( \frac{i-1-r}{2} + t_{i-1} \right) \\
& - \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - (i-2) \right) q^{i-2} \\
& + q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} + q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1} \\
& = \left( t_{i-1} - t_i + \frac{1}{2} \right) q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} \\
& - \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - (i-2) - 1 \right) q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1} \\
& = \left( -\frac{v(d-a)}{2} - \frac{v(b)+v(c)-3v(d-a)}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \right) q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} \\
& - \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} + r - ((r+v(d-a)+1) - 2) - 1 \right) q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1} \\
& = -\frac{v(b)+v(c)-1-2v(d-a)}{2} q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} \\
& - \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1-2v(d-a)}{2} q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the edge case where  $r = 0$  and  $\theta \leq 1$ , it can be checked the same formula still holds with the last term omitted.

Hence we have found a diagonal of  $M''$  below with all entries are zero, and on which all entries are nonzero except possibly  $M''_{1,0} = 0$  in the case where  $r = 0$  and  $\theta \leq 1$ .

Assuming  $r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor \geq 2$ , suppose we take the rows from  $i = r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 1$  up to  $i = r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + N + 1$ . Then the resulting matrix is upper triangular. The determinant is the product of the diagonal entries; up to multiplication by sign and a power of  $q$ , it equals and the determinant is equal to

$$\begin{cases} (q-1)^{N+1} & \text{if } \theta \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ \left( \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1-2v(d-a)}{2} q + \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1-2v(d-a)}{2} \right)^{N+1} & \text{if } \theta \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \end{cases}$$

which is manifestly nonzero for any odd prime power  $q$ .

In the situation where  $r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor = 1$ , we use the same rows except that we replace the row for  $i = 1$  with the row for  $i = 0$ , which has leftmost entry  $M_{0,0} = \frac{v(b)+v(c)+1}{2} > 0$ . Hence the same proof still shows that the determinant is nonzero.  $\square$

10.1.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.9.* We can now deduce:

**Theorem 1.9** ( $\partial \text{Orb}$  is injective even for fixed  $\gamma \in S_2(F)$ ). *Fix any  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ . Then there doesn't exist any nonzero function  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  such that*

$$\partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \varpi^i \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi, \right) = 0$$

holds for every integer  $i$ . Thus [Conjecture 1.4](#) holds for  $n = 2$ .

*Proof of Theorem 1.9.* Suppose we are given some function

$$\phi = \sum_{r=0}^N (-1)^r c_r \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F)).$$

Letting  $M$  be the matrix given in [Lemma 10.1](#), we are supposed to have

$$M \begin{pmatrix} c_0 \\ c_1 \\ \vdots \\ c_N \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Since  $M$  has full rank, it follows that  $c_0 = \dots = c_N = 0$ .  $\square$

**10.2. In the semi-Lie case, the kernel has finite codimension for fixed  $v(e)$ .** We prove [Theorem 1.10](#) in this section. We start with the following lemma.

**Lemma 10.5** (A combination vanishing for large  $r$ ). *Let  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ . If  $r \geq v(e) + 2$ , we have*

$$\partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + 2\mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-2)}} \right) = 0.$$

*Proof.* This follows directly from [Corollary 1.7](#) which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=0}^{v(e)} q^j &= \frac{(-1)^r}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \left( \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}} \right) \right) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{r-1}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \left( \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-2)}} \right) \right). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

We need one more lemma:

**Lemma 10.6.** *There is no  $Y \in \mathbb{C}^\times$  such that*

$$q^3(Y^r + Y^{-r}) - 3q^2(Y^{r-1} + Y^{-(r-1)}) + 3q(Y^{r-2} + Y^{-(r-2)}) - (Y^{r-3} + Y^{-(r-3)}) = 0$$

holds for all sufficiently large integers  $r$ .

*Proof.* Assume for contradiction such a  $Y \in \mathbb{C}^\times$  existed. Let  $Y^{\pm k} := Y^k + Y^{-k}$  for brevity for every integer  $k \geq 1$ . By writing the recursion relations

$$\begin{aligned} Y^{\pm(r-1)} &= Y^{\pm 1} \cdot Y^{\pm(r-2)} - Y^{\pm(r-3)} \\ Y^{\pm r} &= Y^{\pm 1} \cdot Y^{\pm(r-1)} - Y^{\pm(r-2)} \end{aligned}$$

$$= ((Y^{\pm 1})^2 - 1) \cdot Y^{\pm(r-2)} - Y^{\pm 1} \cdot Y^{\pm(r-3)}$$

we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= q^3 \cdot Y^{\pm r} - 3q^2 \cdot Y^{\pm(r-1)} + 3q \cdot Y^{\pm(r-2)} - Y^{\pm(r-3)} \\ &= [q^3 \cdot ((Y^{\pm 1})^2 - 1) - 3q^2 \cdot Y^{\pm 1} + 3q] \cdot Y^{\pm(r-2)} - [q^3 \cdot Y^{\pm 1} - 3q^2 + 1] \cdot Y^{\pm(r-3)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, in general there is no complex number  $Y \in \mathbb{C}^\times$  such that  $Y^r + Y^{-r} = 0$  for two consecutive values of  $r$ . Hence, if either bracketed coefficient is zero, then so must be the other one. However, in that case, we would conclude that  $Y^{\pm 1} = \frac{3q^2 - 1}{q^3}$  from the second bracketed coefficient, meaning

$$0 = q^3 \cdot \left( \left( \frac{3q^2 - 1}{q^3} \right)^2 - 1 \right) - 3q^2 \cdot \frac{3q^2 - 1}{q^3} + 3q = \frac{(q^2 - 1)^3}{q^3}$$

which is a contradiction, because  $q > 1$ .

Hence neither bracketed coefficient can be zero, from which we conclude that there is some nonzero constant  $c$  such that

$$Y^{\pm(r-2)} = c \cdot Y^{\pm(r-3)} \neq 0$$

holds for all large  $r$ . But then

$$c \cdot Y^{\pm(r-3)} = Y^{\pm 1} \cdot Y^{\pm(r-3)} - Y^{\pm(r-4)} = Y^{\pm 1} \cdot Y^{\pm(r-3)} - \frac{Y^{\pm(r-3)}}{c}$$

and hence  $c = Y^{\pm 1} - \frac{1}{c}$ . So either  $c = Y$  or  $c = \frac{1}{Y}$ . Then from  $Y^{\pm(r-2)} = c \cdot Y^{\pm(r-3)}$  we derive that  $Y = \pm 1$ .

But substituting  $Y = 1$  in the original equation would imply  $(q - 1)^3 = 0$  while  $Y = -1$  would imply  $(q + 1)^3 = 0$  neither of which is possible. This contradiction completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

10.2.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.10.* We now prove:

**Theorem 1.10** (The kernel of  $\partial \text{Orb}$  is large for fixed  $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in V_2'(F)$ ). *Let  $N \geq 0$  be an integer. Consider all  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}$  for which  $v(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top) \leq N$ . Then the space of  $\phi \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  for which*

$$\partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi \right) = 0$$

*holds for all such  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector subspace of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  whose codimension is at most  $N + 2$ .*

*Moreover, this subspace of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  is not contained in any maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  when  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  is viewed as a ring under the isomorphism of Section 5.*

*Proof of Theorem 1.10.* The first part of Theorem 1.10 follows directly from Lemma 10.5.

It remains to show the kernel is not contained in any maximal ideal. Consider the composed isomorphism from Section 5 given by

$$\mathcal{H}(S_2(F)) \xrightarrow{\text{BC}_S^\eta} \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+)) \xrightarrow{\text{Sat}} \mathbb{Q}[Y + Y^{-1}].$$

By combining [LRZ24, Equation (7.1.9)] (which is also [Lemma 14.3](#) later) and [LRZ24, Equation (7.1.4)] we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Sat}(\text{BC}_S^\eta(\mathbf{1}_{K', \leq r} + \mathbf{1}_{K', \leq (r-1)})) &= (-1)^r \text{Sat}(\mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \mathbb{V}_n^+}) \\ &= (-1)^r \left( q^r \sum_{j=-r}^r Y^j - q^{r-1} \sum_{j=-(r-1)}^{r-1} Y^j \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if we define the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} P_r(Y) &:= (-1)^r \text{Sat}(\text{BC}_S^\eta(\mathbf{1}_{K', \leq r} + 2\mathbf{1}_{K', \leq (r-1)} + \mathbf{1}_{K', \leq (r-2)})) \\ &= \left( q^r \sum_{j=-r}^r Y^j - q^{r-1} \sum_{j=-(r-1)}^{r-1} Y^j \right) - \left( q^{r-1} \sum_{j=-(r-1)}^{r-1} Y^j - q^{r-2} \sum_{j=-(r-2)}^{r-2} Y^j \right) \\ &= q^r \sum_{j=-r}^r Y^j - 2q^{r-1} \sum_{j=-(r-1)}^{r-1} Y^j + q^{r-2} \sum_{j=-(r-2)}^{r-2} Y^j \end{aligned}$$

then for any  $r \geq N + 2$ , all the polynomials  $P_r(Y) - P_{N+2}(Y)$  lie in the kernel.

We now prove there is no choice of a single  $Y \in \mathbb{C}^\times$  for which  $P_r(Y)$  is eventually constant, which would complete the proof. Indeed, if we write

$$\begin{aligned} P_r(Y) - qP_{r-1}(Y) &= q^r(Y^r + Y^{-r}) - 2q^{r-1}(Y^{r-1} + Y^{-(r-1)}) + q^{r-2}(Y^{r-2} + Y^{-(r-2)}) \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} (P_r(Y) - qP_{r-1}(Y)) - (P_{r-1}(Y) - qP_{r-2}(Y)) &= q^3(Y^r + Y^{-r}) - 3q^2(Y^{r-1} + Y^{-(r-1)}) \\ &\quad + 3q(Y^{r-2} + Y^{-(r-2)}) - (Y^{r-3} + Y^{-(r-3)}). \end{aligned}$$

So we are done by [Lemma 10.6](#).  $\square$

**10.3. A sequence of test functions almost lying in the kernel in the semi-Lie case.** We make one additional remark on the kernel that unifies both of the preceding two sections. For this section, we define the following indicator function for  $r \geq 3$ :

$$\phi_r := \mathbf{1}_{K', \leq r} + \mathbf{1}_{K', \leq (r-1)} - q^2(\mathbf{1}_{K', \leq (r-2)} + \mathbf{1}_{K', \leq (r-3)}).$$

We give the following theorem which can be thought of as a simultaneously refined version of both [Lemma 10.1](#) and [Lemma 10.5](#). Roughly, it says that we can define a sequence of test functions

$$\phi_r + (q+1)\phi_{r-1} + q\phi_{r-2} \quad r \geq 5$$

such that for any fixed  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ , there are at most three values of  $r$  for which the orbital integral does not vanish.

**Theorem 10.7** (A sequence in  $\mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$ ). *Suppose  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$  is as in [Lemma 7.8](#). Then*

$$\partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi_r + (q+1)\phi_{r-1} + q\phi_{r-2} \right) = 0$$

holds for all  $r \geq 5$  with at most three exceptions, namely those  $r$  with

$$\begin{aligned} & v(e) - \min \left( \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2}, v(d-a) \right) + 2 \\ & \leq r \leq v(e) - \min \left( \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2}, v(d-a) \right) + 4. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* As always  $\theta := \min(v(b) + v(c), 2v(d-a))$  as in [Section 8](#). Consider [Corollary 1.7](#), and let  $N, C, C'$  be as in the statement. Let  $N^{bb}, C^{bb}, (C')^{bb}$  be the changes to those constants when one replaces  $r$  by  $r-2$ . Then one can record the changes to these parameters explicitly, see [Table 3](#).

Note in particular except for the single exceptional value  $r = v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 2$  we should always have  $(N^{bb} + 2) - N \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ ,  $C - C^{bb} \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ ,  $(C') - (C')^{bb} \in \{0, 1\}$ . More explicitly, we have the following result from [Table 3](#) for every  $r \geq 3$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi_r \right) \\ & = \begin{cases} -q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} - q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor - 1} + q + 1 & \text{if } r \leq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 1 \text{ and } \theta = v(b) + v(c) \\ -2q^{r+\lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor} + q + 1 & \text{if } r \leq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 1 \text{ and } \theta = 2v(d-a) \\ -q^{v(e)+2} - q^{v(e)+1} + q + 1 & \text{if } r \geq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 3. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

It follows that for  $r \geq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 4$  we have

$$(14) \quad \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi_r + \phi_{r-1} \right) = 0$$

while when  $r \leq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 1$  we have

$$(15) \quad \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb} \left( (\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \phi_r + q\phi_{r-1} \right) = 1 - q^2.$$

Then [Theorem 10.7](#) follows directly from (14) and (15).  $\square$

## 11. TRANSFER FACTORS

In this short chapter we document the definitions of the transfer factors appearing in [Conjecture 1.1](#) and [Conjecture 1.2](#).

**11.1. Transfer factor for the inhomogeneous group AFL.** The definition of the transfer factor in [Conjecture 1.1](#) is given below:

Assumptions	Parameters for $r$	Parameters for $r - 2$
$r \geq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 3$	$N = v(e)$ $C = C' = 0$	$N^{bb} = v(e)$ $C^{bb} = (C')^{bb} = 0$
$r = v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 2$ $\theta = 2v(d - a)$ (exceptional)	$N = v(e)$ $C = C' = 0$	$N^{bb} = (r - 2) + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor = v(e)$ $C^{bb} = \frac{-1 + (v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a))}{2}$ $(C')^{bb} = C^{bb} + 1$
$r = v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 1$ $\theta = 2v(d - a)$	$N = v(e)$ $C = C' = 0$	$N^{bb} = (r - 2) + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor = v(e) - 1$ $C^{bb} = 0$ $(C')^{bb} = 1$
$r \leq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $\theta = 2v(d - a)$ $\varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$	$N = r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $C = \frac{\varkappa - 1 + (v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a))}{2}$ $C' = C + 1$	$N^{bb} = (r - 2) + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $C^{bb} = \frac{(\varkappa - 2) - 1 + (v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a))}{2}$ $(C')^{bb} = C^{bb} + 1$
$r \leq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $\theta = 2v(d - a)$ $\varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$	$N = r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $C = \frac{\varkappa - 1}{2}$ $C' = C + 1$	$N^{bb} = (r - 2) + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $C^{bb} = \frac{(\varkappa - 2) - 1}{2}$ $(C')^{bb} = C^{bb} + 1$
$r \leq v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $\theta = v(b) + v(c)$	$N = r + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $C = v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + r$ $C' = 0$	$N^{bb} = (r - 2) + \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor$ $C^{bb} = v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + (r - 2)$ $(C')^{bb} = 0$

TABLE 3. Comparison of  $N$  to  $N^{bb}$ , etc., needed to carry out the proof of [Theorem 10.7](#). Note the exceptional case  $r = v(e) - \lfloor \frac{\theta}{2} \rfloor + 2$  differs from all the others because  $C - C^{bb}$  can be large.

**Definition 11.1** ([\[Zha24c, Equation 2.7\]](#)). Choose any  $\gamma \in S_n(F)_{\text{rs}}$ . Let  $\mathbf{e} = (0 \ \dots \ 0 \ 1)^\top \in F^n$  be a column vector. Then the transfer factor  $\omega(\gamma)$  is defined by

$$\omega(\gamma) := \eta \left( \det \left( (\gamma^i \mathbf{e})_{i=0}^{n-1} \right) \right).$$

### 11.2. Transfer factor for the semi-Lie AFL.

**Definition 11.2** ([\[Zha24c, Equation 2.2\]](#)). Choose any  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) \in (S_n(F) \times V'_n(F))_{\text{rs}}$ . Then the transfer factor  $\omega(\gamma)$  is defined by

$$\omega(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) := \eta \left( \det \left( (\gamma^i \mathbf{u})_{i=0}^{n-1} \right) \right).$$

For the purposes of our  $n = 2$  calculation, we compute the transfer factor when

$$(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, (0 \ e) \right) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-.$$

is as described in [Lemma 7.8](#). Applying the definition above, we find that

$$(16) \quad \omega(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = \eta(\det(\gamma^0 \mathbf{u}, \gamma^1 \mathbf{u})) = \eta\left(\det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ 1 & d \end{pmatrix}\right) = (-1)^{v(b)} = (-1)^{v(c)+1}.$$

## 12. THE GEOMETRIC SIDE

**12.1. Rapoport-Zink spaces.** We briefly recall the theory of Rapoport-Zink spaces. This follows the exposition in [[Zha24a](#), §4.1].

Let  $\check{F}$  denote the completion of a maximal unramified extension of  $F$ , and let  $\mathbb{F}$  denote the residue field of  $O_{\check{F}}$ . Suppose  $S$  is a Spf  $O_{\check{F}}$ -scheme. Then we can consider triples  $(X, \iota, \lambda)$  consisting of the following data.

- $X$  is a formal  $\varpi$ -divisible  $n$ -dimensional  $O_F$ -module over  $S$  whose relative height is  $2n$ .
- $\iota: O_E \rightarrow \text{End}(X)$  is an action of  $O_E$  such that the induced action of  $O_F$  on  $\text{Lie } X$  is via the structure morphism  $O_F \rightarrow O_S$ .

We require that  $\iota$  satisfies the Kottwitz condition of signature  $(n-1, 1)$ , meaning that for all  $a \in O_E$ , the characteristic polynomial of  $\iota(a)$  on  $\text{Lie } X$  is exactly

$$(T - a)^{n-1}(T - \bar{a}) \in \mathcal{O}_S[T].$$

- $\lambda: X \rightarrow X^\vee$  is a principal  $O_F$ -relative polarization.

We require that the Rosati involution of  $\lambda$  induces the map  $a \mapsto \bar{a}$  on  $O_F$  (i.e. the nontrivial automorphism of  $\text{Gal}(E/F)$ ).

The triple is called supersingular if  $X$  is a supersingular strict  $O_F$ -module.

For each  $n \geq 1$ , over  $\mathbb{F}$  we choose a supersingular triple  $(\mathbb{X}_n, \iota_{\mathbb{X}_n}, \lambda_{\mathbb{X}_n})$ ; it's unique up to  $O_E$ -linear quasi-isogeny compatible with the polarization, and refer to it as the *framing object*. We can now define the Rapoport-Zink space:

**Definition 12.1** (Rapoport-Zink space; [[LRZ24](#), §5.1]). For each  $n \geq 1$ , we let  $\mathcal{N}_n$  denote the functor over  $\text{Spf } O_{\check{F}}$  defined as follows. Let  $S$  be an Spf  $O_{\check{F}}$  scheme, and let  $\bar{S} := S \times_{\text{Spf } O_{\check{F}}} \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}$ . For every Spf  $O_{\check{F}}$  scheme, we let  $\mathcal{N}_n(S)$  be the set of isomorphism classes of quadruples

$$(X, \iota, \lambda, \rho)$$

where  $(X, \iota, \lambda)$  is one of the triples as we described, and

$$\rho: X \times_S \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_n \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}$$

is a *framing*, meaning it is a height zero  $O_F$ -linear quasi-isogeny and satisfies

$$\rho^*((\lambda_{\mathbb{X}_n})_{\bar{S}}) = \lambda_{\bar{S}}.$$

Then  $\mathcal{N}_n$  is formally smooth over  $O_{\tilde{F}}$  of relative dimension  $n - 1$ . Henceforth, we also make the following abbreviation.

**Definition 12.2** ( $\mathcal{N}_{m,n}$ ). For integers  $m$  and  $n$ ,

$$\mathcal{N}_{m,n} := \mathcal{N}_m \times_{\mathrm{Spf} O_{\tilde{F}}} \mathcal{N}_n.$$

**12.2. A realization of the non-split Hermitian space  $\mathbb{V}_n^-$  of dimension  $n$ .** For the following definition (and later on), we need a variation of  $\mathcal{N}_1$ :

**Definition 12.3** ( $\mathbb{E}$ ). Let  $(\mathbb{E}, \iota_{\mathbb{E}}, \lambda_{\mathbb{E}})$  be the unique triple over  $\mathbb{F}$  whose Rosati involution has signature  $(1, 0)$  (note this is different from  $\mathcal{N}_1$  where the signature is  $(0, 1)$  instead).

At the same time, we can define the following Hermitian space.

**Definition 12.4** ([LRZ24, §5.2]). For each  $n \geq 1$ , let

$$\mathbb{V}_n^- := \mathrm{Hom}_{O_E}^{\circ}(\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{X}_n)$$

which we call the space of special homomorphisms. When endowed with the form

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \lambda_{\mathbb{E}}^{-1} \circ y^{\vee} \circ \lambda_{\mathbb{X}_n} \circ x \in \mathrm{End}_{O_E}^{\circ}(\mathbb{E}) \simeq E$$

it becomes an  $n$ -dimensional  $E/F$ -Hermitian space.

**Proposition 12.5** (Realization of  $\mathbb{V}_n^-$ ). *Up to isomorphism,  $\mathbb{V}_n^-$  is the unique  $n$ -dimensional nondegenerate non-split  $E/F$ -Hermitian space.*

*Proof.* See the comment in [LRZ24, §5.2] or the comment after [Zha24a, Equation (4.2)].  $\square$

As described in [Zha24a, Equation (4.3)], there is an action of  $U(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$  on  $(\mathbb{X}_n, \iota_{\mathbb{X}_n}, \lambda_{\mathbb{X}_n})$  and hence each  $g \in U(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$  acts on  $\mathcal{N}_n$  by

$$g \cdot (X, i, \lambda, \rho) := (X, i, \lambda, g \circ \rho).$$

**12.3. Intersection numbers for the group version of AFL for the full spherical Hecke algebra.** Here we reproduce the definition of the intersection number used in [Conjecture 1.1](#).

Compared to the formulation of the group version and semi-Lie version of the AFL, the intersection number requires the introduction of a *Hecke operator*  $\mathbb{T}_{\varphi}$  for an element

$$\varphi \in \mathcal{H}(G^{\flat} \times G, K^{\flat} \times K)$$

as introduced in [LRZ24]. This definition is too involved to reproduce here in its entirety, we give a summary for this special cases in which we need.

First consider the given  $f \in \mathcal{H}(U(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$ . The main work of the construction is to define another derived formal scheme  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^{\flat}} \otimes f}$  (see [LRZ24, §6.1]) together with two projection maps

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f} & \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n} & & \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}. \end{array}$$

This definition is carried out in [LRZ24, §5], by defining it first for so-called *atomic elements* of the spherical Hecke algebra, which form basis elements of a certain presentation of this Hecke algebra as the unitary group for a polynomial algebra; we refer the reader to *loc. cit.* for the full details.

Now, take the natural closed embedding

$$\mathcal{N}_{n-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_n$$

and let

$$\Delta: \mathcal{N}_{n-1} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}$$

be the associated graph morphism; let  $\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}}$  denote the image, with an inclusion  $\iota: \Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}$ . Once this is done, consider then the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \pi_1^*(\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f} & \\ & \swarrow & & \searrow & \\ \Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n} & \xrightarrow{(\pi_2)_*(\pi_1^*(\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}}))} & \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}. \end{array}$$

That is, one takes the pullback of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}} \xrightarrow{\iota} \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}$  along the projection

$$\mathcal{N}_{n-1,n} \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f}$$

and then takes the pushforward along the other projection

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f} \xrightarrow{\pi_2} \mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}.$$

**Definition 12.6** (Hecke operator). Set

$$\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f}(\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}}) := (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1^*(\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}})).$$

This is the part of the intersection number depending on  $f$  (or rather  $\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f}$ ). As for our  $g \in U(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\text{rs}}$ , consider the translation  $(1, g) \cdot \Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}}$ . The intersection number is then defined as by taking the intersection of these two objects using the derived tensor product  $\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}$  of the structure sheaves.

**Definition 12.7** ( $\text{Int}((1, g), \mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f)$ ; [LRZ24, Equation (6.1.1)] or [Zha24a, Equation (4.4)]). We define the intersection number in **Conjecture 1.1** by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Int}((1, g), \mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f) &:= \left\langle \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f} \Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}}, (1, g) \cdot \Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}} \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}} \\ &:= \chi_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}} \left( \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K^b} \otimes f}(\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}})} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}}}^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{O}_{(1,g) \cdot \Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n-1}}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\chi$  denotes the Euler-Poincaré characteristic, meaning that if  $X$  is a formal scheme over  $\mathrm{Spf} O_{\mathbb{F}}^{\vee}$  then given a finite complex  $\mathcal{F}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules we set

$$\chi_X(\mathcal{F}) = \sum_i \sum_j (-1)^{i+j} \mathrm{len}_{O_{\mathbb{F}}^{\vee}} H^j(X, H_i(\mathcal{F}))$$

provided all the lengths are finite.

**Remark 12.8.** In general we could adapt this definition so  $(1, g)$  is replaced by an element of  $(\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_{n-1}^-) \times \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-))_{rs}$  if we wish to work with the full group version of the AFL rather than just the inhomogeneous version. However, this simpler definition will be sufficient for our purposes.

**12.4. Intersection numbers for the semi-Lie version of AFL for the full spherical Hecke algebra.** Now we continue to define an intersection number needed for the proposed [Conjecture 1.2](#) from earlier. The definition mirrors the one given in the last section. Here we reproduce the definition of the intersection number used in [Conjecture 1.1](#).

We work here with  $\mathcal{N}_{n,n}$  rather than  $\mathcal{N}_{n-1,n}$ . The change is that we need to incorporate the new  $u \in \mathbb{V}_n^-$  that was not present before. In order to do this one considers a certain relative Cartier divisor  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$  on  $\mathcal{N}_n$  for each nonzero  $u \in \mathbb{V}_n^-$ . This divisor was defined by Kudala and Rappart in [\[KR11\]](#) and accordingly we call it a *KR-divisor* following [\[Zha24a, §4.3\]](#). The definition is given as follows.

**Definition 12.9** ( $\mathcal{Z}(u)$ ; [\[KR11, Definition 3.2\]](#)). Recall that  $(\mathbb{E}, \iota_{\mathbb{E}}, \lambda_{\mathbb{E}})$  is the unique triple over  $\mathbb{F}$  whose Rosati involution has signature  $(1, 0)$ . Hence the formal  $O_F$ -module has a unique lifting called its *canonical lifting*, which we denote by the triple  $(\mathcal{E}, \iota_{\mathcal{E}}, \lambda_{\mathcal{E}})$ .

Then the KR-divisor  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$  is the locus where the quasi-homomorphism

$$u: \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_n$$

lifts to a homomorphism from  $\mathcal{E}$  to the universal object over  $\mathcal{N}_n$ . More explicitly, it consists of those  $X \in \mathcal{N}_n$  such that there exists a map  $\varphi: \mathcal{E} \rightarrow X$  with the following property. Let  $S$  be an  $\mathrm{Spf} O_{\mathbb{F}}^{\vee}$  scheme and consider the map on special fiber

$$\mathcal{E} = \mathbb{E} \times_S \bar{S} \xrightarrow{\varphi \times_S \bar{S}} X' \times_S \bar{S}.$$

Since  $X \in \mathcal{N}_n$  we also have  $\rho: X \times_S \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}_n \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}$ . Moreover,  $u$  gives a map

$$\mathbb{E} \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S} \xrightarrow{u \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}} \mathbb{X}_n \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}.$$

Then we require the following diagram to commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{E} \times_S \bar{S} & \xrightarrow{\varphi \times_S \bar{S}} & X \times_S \bar{S} \\ \downarrow \rho_{\mathcal{E}} & & \downarrow \rho \\ \mathbb{E} \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S} & \xrightarrow{u \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}} & \mathbb{X}_n \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}. \end{array}$$

That is,  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$  is the locus where  $u$  lifts to a homomorphism  $\mathcal{E} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_n$ . Note also by the definition that  $g\mathcal{Z}(u) = \mathcal{Z}(gu)$ . See [KR11] for a full definition.

The main change is then that we can consider  $\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)}$  as the image of

$$\mathcal{Z}(u) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{N}_n \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{N}_{n,n}$$

where  $\Delta: \mathcal{N}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{n,n}$  now denotes the diagonal map. If one defines an appropriate space  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes f}$  for  $f \in \mathcal{H}(U(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  again following [LRZ24], together with

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes f} & \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ \mathcal{N}_{n,n} & & \mathcal{N}_{n,n} \end{array}$$

then one can then repeat the diagram from before:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \pi_1^*(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes f} & \\ & \swarrow & & \searrow & \\ \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{N}_{n,n} & \xleftarrow{\pi_1} & (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1^*(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)})) & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & \mathcal{N}_{n,n} \end{array}$$

In other words, we again take a pullback followed by a pushforward but this time of  $\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{N}_{n,n}$ . This lets us write an analogous definition:

**Definition 12.10** (Hecke operator). Set

$$\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes f}(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)}) := (\pi_2)_*(\pi_1^*(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)})).$$

Meanwhile to replace  $(1, g)\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_{n,n-1}}$ , we let

$$\Gamma_g \subseteq \mathcal{N}_{n,n}$$

denote the graph of the automorphism of  $\mathcal{N}_n$  induced by  $g$ . This finally allows us to write a definition of the intersection number in the semi-Lie case:

**Definition 12.11** ( $\text{Int}((g, u), f)$ ). In analog to [Definition 12.7](#) for the group version of the AFL, we now define the intersection number in [Conjecture 1.2](#) as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Int}((g, u), f) &:= \langle \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes f}(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)}), \Gamma_g \rangle_{\mathcal{N}_{n,n}} \\ &:= \chi_{\mathcal{N}_{n,n}} \left( \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes f}(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)})} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{N}_{n,n}}}^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_g} \right). \end{aligned}$$

In the situation where  $f = \mathbf{1}_K$ , this coincides with the existing definition in [Zha24a, Equation (4.9)] and [Zha21a, Remark 3.1].

**12.5. An analogy between the geometric and analytic sides.** With the intersection number now defined for [Conjecture 1.2](#), we provide some intuitive discussion about the connection. All of this is for philosophical cheerleading only, and is not meant to formally assert any definitions or results. But it may help in motivating the formulation of the conjecture.

For this section write  $G := \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)$  and  $K := G \cap \mathrm{GL}_n(O_E)$  the hyperspecial maximal compact subgroup of  $G$ . For simplicity we only focus on the semi-Lie AFL originally proposed by Liu to start; which is the special case of [Conjecture 1.2](#) when  $f = \mathbf{1}_K$  and  $\phi = \mathbf{1}_{K'}$ .

The geometric side. On the geometric side,  $\mathcal{N}_n$  is the RZ-space acted on by  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$ , and hence  $\mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-) \times \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$  acts on  $\mathcal{N}_{n,n}$ . Roughly speaking, we are considering the two morphisms

$$\mathcal{N}_n \xrightarrow{\Delta} \mathcal{N}_{n,n} \xleftarrow{\Gamma_g} \mathcal{N}_n$$

with  $\Delta$  being thought of as the diagonal morphism and  $\Gamma_g$  as the graph under multiplication by  $g \in \mathrm{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)_{\mathrm{rs}}$ .

Hence loosely speaking, the intersection  $\mathrm{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_K)$  can be thought of as the intersection of three images in  $\mathcal{N}_{n,n}$ :

- A “diagonal” object  $\Delta$ ;
- A “graph” object  $\Gamma$ ;
- A third object  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$ , the KR-divisor, parametrized by diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{E} & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{X}_n \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{E} & \xrightarrow{u} & \mathbb{X}_n. \end{array}$$

The derived tensor product  $\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}$  is used together with some formalism to make this intersection idea precise. The intersection of the “diagonal” and “graph” is the *fixed point locus*, and in fact could be formally defined as the intersection

$$\Gamma_g \cap \Delta_{\mathcal{N}_n}$$

viewed as a closed formal subscheme of  $\mathcal{N}_n$  (or  $\mathcal{N}_{n,n}$ ); see [[Zha24a](#), Equation (4.6)].

The analytic side. On the other hand, consider the analytic side. We will try to explain how the weighted orbital integral in [Definition 7.1](#) can be thought of as some weighted intersection of analogous objects.

Note the quotient  $G/K$  can be identified as

$$G/K \simeq \{\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{V}_n^+ \mid \Lambda^\vee = \Lambda\}$$

that is, the set of self-dual lattices  $\Lambda$  of full rank, which thus has a natural action of  $G$ . Henceforth we denote elements of  $G/K$  by  $h$ , and fix one particular such lattice  $\Lambda_0$ , acted on by  $O_E$ . Hence  $G/K$  can be thought of as

$$G/K \simeq \{h\Lambda_0 \mid h \in G/K\}.$$

Recall from (8) that we have an orbital integral on the unitary side of the shape

$$\int_{h \in G/K} \mathbf{1}_K(h^{-1}gh) \mathbf{1}_{\Lambda_0}(h \cdot u) dh$$

where  $u \in \mathbb{V}_n^+$ , and  $\Lambda_0$  is a fixed particular lattice in  $G/K$ . See for example the “relative fundamental lemma” stated as [Liu21, Conjecture 1.9].

Like before, we can consider two maps

$$G/K \xrightarrow{\Delta} G/K \times G/K \xleftarrow{\Gamma_g} G/K$$

which are the diagonal morphism and the graph of the action of  $g$ . Hence the intersection are those cosets  $hK$  for which

$$hK = ghK \iff h^{-1}gh \in K.$$

Hence the indicator function  $\mathbf{1}_K(h^{-1}gh)$  plays the analog of the fixed point locus in the geometric side.

Meanwhile, the term  $h \cdot u$  plays a role analogous to the KR-divisor on the geometric side, giving the third intersection object. We have

$$h \cdot u \in \Lambda_0 \iff u \in h^{-1}\Lambda_0$$

and so the object corresponding to the KR-divisor  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$  is the subset in  $G/K$  of those lattices containing  $u$ , that is

$$\{\Lambda' \mid \Lambda' \ni u\}.$$

The analog to the earlier diagram that we described for  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$  is then

$$\begin{array}{c} O_E \rightarrow \Lambda' \\ 1 \mapsto u. \end{array}$$

Up until now this whole section is written for  $f = \mathbf{1}_K$  and  $\phi = \mathbf{1}_{K'}$ . In the general situation, if one replaces  $\mathbf{1}_K$  in the above integral by a general  $f$ , then this corresponds to changing the analog of the fixed point locus; the idea of [LRZ24] is that this should correspond to replacing  $\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)}$  with  $\mathbb{T}_f(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)})$  on the geometric side.

### 13. INTERSECTION NUMBERS FOR $\text{Int}((g, u), f)$ FOR $n = 2$

This chapter is dedicated to computing intersection numbers for the semi-Lie version of AFL in the special case  $n = 2$ .

**13.1. Background on quaternion division algebra.** Through this section we let  $\mathcal{D}$  be a quaternion division algebra over  $F$ , with a fixed maximal order  $O_{\mathcal{D}}$ . We will make  $\mathcal{D}$  explicit in the following way for our calculations to follow.

13.1.1. *Structure as a noncommutative algebra.* As  $F$ -vector spaces we will write

$$\mathcal{D} = E \oplus E\Pi$$

where  $\Pi$  is selected so that  $\Pi^2 = \varpi$ . We endow  $\mathcal{D}$  with a noncommutative multiplication according to

$$\Pi t = \bar{t}\Pi \quad \text{for all } t \in E$$

where  $\bar{t}$  is the image of  $t \in E$  under the nontrivial element of  $\text{Gal}(E/F)$ .

13.1.2. *Conjugation of elements of  $\mathcal{D}$ .* In general, suppose  $x \in \mathcal{D}$  is any element decomposed as  $x = a + b\Pi$  for  $a, b \in E$ . Then we denote by  $\bar{x} \in \mathcal{D}$  the conjugate in  $\mathcal{D}$  defined by

$$\bar{x} := \bar{a} - b\Pi$$

where, again,  $\bar{a}$  is the image of  $a \in E$  under the nontrivial element of  $\text{Gal}(E/F)$ . It is an anti-involution, meaning that  $\bar{\bar{x}} = x$  and  $\overline{xy} = \bar{y}\bar{x}$ .

(Notice that we have a slight abuse of notation here in that we have used the same notation to denote both conjugation under the Galois action of  $\text{Gal}(E/F)$  as well as the conjugation in  $\mathcal{D}$ . However, there is no ambiguity resulting because when  $E$  is viewed as a subset of  $\mathcal{D}$ , the two symbols denote the same element of  $E$ : that is we have

$$\overline{a + 0\Pi} = \bar{a} + 0\Pi$$

in any event. In other words, the restriction of the quaternion conjugation to  $E$  coincides with the nontrivial element of  $\text{Gal}(E/F)$ , so we do not need to introduce a separate notation for it.)

This allows us to define the reduced norm and trace in  $\mathcal{D}$ . The reduced trace is given by

$$\text{tr } x := x + \bar{x} = \text{Tr } E/F(a) = 2x_0 \in F.$$

We may thus define

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}=0} := \{u \in \mathcal{D} \mid \text{tr } u = 0\}$$

which has codimension 1 inside  $\mathcal{D}$  (i.e. is three-dimensional as an  $F$ -vector space). Since  $\text{tr}(a + b\Pi) = \text{Tr}_{E/F}(a)$ , we could also write

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}=0} = \{a + b\Pi \mid a, b \in E \text{ and } \text{Tr}_{E/F}(a) = 0\}.$$

The reduced norm is similarly defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nm } x &= x\bar{x} = (a + b\Pi)(\bar{a} - b\Pi) \\ &= a\bar{a} + b\Pi\bar{a} - ab\Pi - b\Pi b\Pi \\ &= a\bar{a} - b\bar{b}\varpi \\ &= N_{E/F}(a) - N_{E/F}(b)\varpi \in F. \end{aligned}$$

As an  $F$ -vector space,  $\mathcal{D}$  has a basis given by  $\{1, \sqrt{\varepsilon}, \Pi, \sqrt{\varepsilon}\Pi\}$ , that is

$$\mathcal{D} = F \oplus F\sqrt{\varepsilon} \oplus F\Pi \oplus F\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Pi.$$

It will be convenient to introduce the following notation:

**Definition 13.1** ( $x_0$  and  $x_-$ ). For  $x \in \mathcal{D}$ , we introduce the notation  $x_0$  and  $x_-$  to mean

- $x_0$  is the projection into the first component  $F$ ; and
- $x_- = x - x_0$  is the projection into  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}=0} = F\sqrt{\varepsilon} \oplus F\Pi \oplus F\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Pi$ .

In particular, the formula for conjugation then reads as the simpler

$$\bar{x} = x_0 - x_-.$$

13.1.3. *Hermitian structure.* We view  $\mathcal{D}$  as an  $E/F$ -Hermitian space under left multiplication by  $E$ ; that is, for  $a, b, t \in E$  we consider

$$t \cdot (a + b\Pi) = at + bt\Pi.$$

as the action of  $E$  on  $\mathcal{D}$ . Then we equip  $\mathcal{D}$  with a  $E/F$ -Hermitian form  $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle : \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{D} \rightarrow E$  defined by

$$\langle x, y \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{D}/E}(x\bar{y})$$

i.e. the projection of  $x\bar{y} \in \mathcal{D} = E \oplus E\Pi$  onto the first component. In particular, note that

$$\langle x, x \rangle = x\bar{x} = \text{Nm } x$$

or equivalently

$$\langle a + b\Pi, a + b\Pi \rangle = a\bar{a} - b\bar{b}\varpi.$$

13.1.4. *Identification of  $\mathbb{V}_n^-$  with  $\mathcal{D}$ .* We continue using the notation  $(\mathbb{E}, \iota_{\mathbb{E}}, \lambda_{\mathbb{E}})$  as the triple over  $\mathbb{F}$  whose Rosati involution has signature  $(1, 0)$ . Moreover, we will take the identification

$$\text{End}(\mathbb{E}) \simeq O_{\mathcal{D}}$$

see [KR11, Remark 2.5], and hence the corresponding identification

$$\mathbb{V}_n^- \simeq \mathcal{D}.$$

13.2. **The invariants for the orbit of  $(g, u)$ .** We specialize to the situation where  $u \in O_{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $g \in \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^-)$ .

13.2.1. *Coordinates for  $g$ .* To impose coordinates on  $g$ , we appeal to the following fact.

**Lemma 13.2** (Description of  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$ ). *Every unitary map in  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$  can be described in the form*

$$x \mapsto \lambda^{-1}x(\alpha + \beta\Pi)$$

for some quaternion  $\alpha + \beta\Pi \in \mathcal{D}^\times$  and an element  $\lambda \in E^\times$  such that

$$\text{Nm}(\alpha + \beta\Pi) = \text{N}_{E/F}(\lambda).$$

Moreover, such a description is unique up to multiplication by elements of  $F$ . In other words,

$$\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^-) \simeq (E^\times \times \mathcal{D}^\times)^\circ / \Delta(F^\times)$$

where  $(\mathcal{D}^\times \times E^\times)^\circ$  denotes those pairs  $(\lambda, \alpha + \beta\Pi)$  with  $N_{E/F}(\lambda) = \text{Nm}(\alpha + \beta\Pi)$ , and  $\Delta(F^\times)$  is the diagonal embedding of  $F^\times$ .

**Remark 13.3.** In this paper we will not have a need to compose multiple such unitary maps. However, if we did, then our notation above swaps the multiplication order. That is, if we have  $g_1, g_2 \in \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$  represented by pairs  $g_1 \leftrightarrow (\lambda_1, \alpha_1 + \beta\Pi_1)$  and  $g_2 \leftrightarrow (\lambda_2, \alpha_2 + \beta\Pi_2)$  under the isomorphism above, then

$$g_1 \circ g_2 \leftrightarrow (\lambda_2\lambda_1, (\alpha_2 + \beta_2\Pi)(\alpha_1 + \beta\Pi)).$$

Note that in the definition for  $g$ , if  $v(\lambda) \neq 0$  then we can factor out powers of  $\varpi = \bar{\varpi}$  from  $\lambda$  and put them into  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  instead. Hence, by relabeling  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we may assume without loss of generality that:

**Assumption 13.4.** We assume WLOG that  $v(\lambda) = 0$  (and hence  $v(\alpha) = 0$ ,  $v(\beta) \geq 0$ ).

This frees us from having to deal with  $v(\lambda)$  offsets in subsequent calculation.

We encode  $g$  as a matrix on  $\mathcal{D}$  now (with the obvious  $E$ -basis  $1, \Pi$ , again viewing  $\mathcal{D}$  as a left- $E$  module) so we can compute its determinant and trace. We have

$$\begin{aligned} g(1) &= \lambda^{-1} \cdot 1 \cdot (\alpha + \beta\Pi) = \lambda^{-1}\alpha + \lambda^{-1}\beta\Pi \\ g(\Pi) &= \lambda^{-1} \cdot \Pi(\alpha + \beta\Pi) = \lambda^{-1}\bar{\beta}\varpi + \lambda^{-1}\bar{\alpha}\Pi. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, written as a matrix with respect to the obvious basis  $\{1, \Pi\}$  we have

$$g = \lambda^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \bar{\beta}\varpi \\ \beta & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix}.$$

13.2.2. *Coordinates for  $u$ .* We also impose coordinates for  $u$  according to

$$u = s + t\Pi \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}} \quad s, t \in E.$$

To make the calculation that follows less complicated, we are going to make the following assumption on  $u$ .

**Assumption 13.5.** We assume WLOG that either  $u \in E$  or  $u \in E\Pi$ . That is, either  $s = 0$  or  $t = 0$ .

This assumption can be made without loss of generality because the invariants and the intersection only depend on the  $\text{SU}(2)$ -orbit of the pair  $(g, u)$ , and any element  $u \in \mathcal{D}^\times$  can be mapped under an element of  $\text{SU}(2)$  into a pair for which  $u \in E$  or  $u \in E\Pi$ .

In order for  $(g, u)$  to be regular semisimple we require that

$$\begin{aligned} u &= s + t\Pi \\ g(u) &= \lambda^{-1}(s + t\Pi)(\alpha + \beta\Pi) \\ &= \lambda^{-1}((s\alpha + t\bar{\beta}\varpi) + (s\beta + t\bar{\alpha})\Pi) \end{aligned}$$

are linearly independent, meaning

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \neq \det \begin{pmatrix} s & s\alpha + t\bar{\beta}\varpi \\ t & s\beta + t\bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} &= st(\bar{\alpha} - \alpha) + \beta s^2 - \bar{\beta}t^2\varpi \\ &= \beta s^2 - \bar{\beta}t^2\varpi \\ &= \begin{cases} -\bar{\beta}t^2\varpi & \text{if } s = 0 \\ \beta s^2 & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have a requirement that  $\beta \neq 0$  and  $s$  and  $t$  are not both zero (we require  $st = 0$  from [Assumption 13.5](#)).

**Remark 13.6** ( $\alpha \neq 0$ ). Note that necessarily  $\alpha$  is nonzero as well. This follows from the requirement that  $\alpha\bar{\alpha} - \beta\bar{\beta}\varpi = \lambda\bar{\lambda}$ ; if  $\alpha = 0$  we would get a left-hand side with odd valuation but a right-hand side with even valuation.

13.2.3. *The invariants of the matching.* At this point we can state:

**Lemma 13.7.** *Under the coordinates we just described, the four corresponding invariants of [Definition 4.8](#) are:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr } g &= \lambda^{-1}(\alpha + \bar{\alpha}) \\ \det g &= \lambda^{-2}(\alpha\bar{\alpha} - \beta\bar{\beta}\varpi) \\ \langle u, u \rangle &= s\bar{s} - t\bar{t}\varpi \\ \langle g(u), u \rangle &= \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}\bar{\alpha} \text{Nm } u & \text{if } s = 0 \\ \lambda^{-1}\alpha \text{Nm } u & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The first three are immediate. The last one follows by computing

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g(u), u \rangle &= \langle \lambda^{-1}(s + t\Pi)(\alpha + \beta\Pi), s + t\Pi \rangle \\ &= \lambda^{-1} \langle (s\alpha + t\bar{\beta}\varpi) + (t\bar{\alpha} + s\beta)\Pi, s + t\Pi \rangle \\ &= \lambda^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr}_{\mathcal{D}/E} [((s\alpha + t\bar{\beta}\varpi) + (t\bar{\alpha} + s\beta)\Pi)(\bar{s} - t\Pi)] \\ &= \lambda^{-1} (s\bar{s}\alpha - t\bar{t}\bar{\alpha}\varpi) \end{aligned}$$

and recalling that  $st = 0$ .  $\square$

13.3. **A basis for  $\mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+))$ .** As before  $K = \text{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+)$  denotes the maximal hyperspecial compact subgroup of  $\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+)$ . For each  $r \geq 0$ , we define

$$\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} := \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_2(\mathcal{O}_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+)} \in \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_2^+)).$$

For convenience  $\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} = 0$  for  $r < 0$ . We also set

$$\mathbf{1}_{K, r} := \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq (r-1)}$$

which is the indicator function for the coset

$$K \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varpi^r \\ \varpi^{-r} & 0 \end{pmatrix} K.$$

Note when  $r = 0$ ,  $\mathbf{1}_{K,0} = \mathbf{1}_K = \mathbf{1}_{K,\leq 0}$ .

Analogous to [Section 7.2](#) we then have the following result.

**Proposition 13.8** ( $\mathbf{1}_{K,\leq r}$  basis). *The functions  $\mathbf{1}_{K,\leq r}$  (for  $r \geq 0$ ) form a basis of  $\mathcal{H}(U(\mathbb{V}_2^+))$ . (Similarly, so do  $\mathbf{1}_{K,r}$  for  $r \geq 0$ .)*

*Proof.* This follows from the fact that

$$U(\mathbb{V}_2^+) = \prod_{r \geq 0} K \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \varpi^r \\ \varpi^{-r} & 0 \end{pmatrix} K.$$

See the comment in [[LRZ24](#), Equation (7.1.5)]. □

The base change for this basis is given later in [Lemma 14.3](#).

### 13.4. Background on special divisors for $n = 2$ .

13.4.1. *The Rapoport-Zink space  $\mathcal{N}_2$  and  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K,\leq r}}$ .* Recall  $\mathcal{N}_2$  from [Section 12](#). With the Hecke operator  $\mathbb{T}$  from [[LRZ24](#)] (see [Section 12](#) for discussion) we introduce  $\mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K,\leq r}} = \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_{K,\leq r}}(\Delta_{\mathcal{N}_n})$  so that we have the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{T}_{\mathbf{1}_{K,\leq r}} & \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ \mathcal{N}_2 & & \mathcal{N}_2 \end{array}$$

13.4.2. *The Lubin-Tate space  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .* We introduce the notation  $\mathcal{M}_2$  for the Lubin-Tate space for  $n = 2$ . It is defined almost in the same way as  $\mathcal{N}_2$  except that we replace  $\mathbb{X}_2$  with  $\mathbb{E}$  now.

**Definition 13.9** (Lubin-Tate space). We let  $\mathcal{M}_2$  denote the functor over  $\mathrm{Spf} O_{\check{F}}$  defined as follows. Let  $S$  be an  $\mathrm{Spf} O_{\check{F}}$  scheme, and let  $\bar{S} := S \times_{\mathrm{Spf} O_{\check{F}}} \mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}$ . For every  $\mathrm{Spf} O_{\check{F}}$  scheme, we let  $\mathcal{N}_n(S)$  be the set of isomorphism classes of quadruples

$$(Y, \iota, \lambda, \rho)$$

where  $(Y, \iota, \lambda)$  is one of the triples as we described, and

$$\rho: Y \times_S \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}$$

is a *framing*, meaning it is a height zero  $O_F$ -linear quasi-isogeny and satisfies

$$\rho^*((\lambda_{\mathbb{E}})_{\bar{S}}) = \lambda_{\bar{S}}.$$

**Proposition 13.10** ([[LRZ24](#), Example 5.5.6]). *The Serre tensor construction produces an identification*

$$\mathrm{ST}: \mathcal{N}_2 \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_2.$$

*By abuse of notation we will also use the same symbol for the map*

$$\mathrm{ST}: \mathcal{N}_{2,2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2.$$

Recall we have an action of  $U(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$  (actually  $PU(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$ ) on  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . We describe now the corresponding action on  $\mathcal{M}_2$ . We have an isomorphism of short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \longrightarrow & O_E^\times/O_F & \longrightarrow & (O_D^\times \times O_E^\times)^\circ/\Delta(O_F^\times) & \longrightarrow & O_D^\times/O_F^\times \longrightarrow 1 \\ & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & U(1) & \longrightarrow & U(\mathbb{V}_2^-) & \longrightarrow & PU(\mathbb{V}_2^-) \longrightarrow 1. \end{array}$$

The image of  $\alpha + \beta\Pi \in O_D^\times/O_F^\times$  is then  $(\lambda, \alpha + \beta\Pi) \in PU(2)$  for any choice of  $\lambda$  with  $\lambda\bar{\lambda} = \text{Nm}(\alpha + \beta\Pi)$ .

13.4.3. *The divisor  $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger$  on  $\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ .* Now we define the special orthogonal divisor  $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(u)$  on  $\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2$  as follows.

**Definition 13.11** ( $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(u)$ ). Let  $u \in O_D$ . Then we define the divisor  $\mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(u)$  to be the pairs  $(Y, Y') \in \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2$  such that there exists  $\varphi: Y \rightarrow Y'$  with the following property. Let  $S$  be an  $\text{Spf } O_{\bar{F}}$  scheme and consider the map on special fiber

$$Y \times_S \bar{S} \xrightarrow{\varphi \times_S \bar{S}} Y' \times_S \bar{S}.$$

Also, from  $Y \in \mathcal{M}_2$  and  $Y' \in \mathcal{M}_2$  we have the data of framings  $\rho: Y \times_S \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}$  and  $\rho': Y' \times_S \bar{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{E} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}$ . Moreover,  $u$  gives a map

$$\mathbb{E} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S} \xrightarrow{u \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}} \mathbb{E} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}.$$

Then we require the following diagram to commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y \times_S \bar{S} & \xrightarrow{\varphi \times_S \bar{S}} & Y' \times_S \bar{S} \\ \downarrow \rho & & \downarrow \rho' \\ \mathbb{E} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S} & \xrightarrow{u \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}} & \mathbb{E} \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}} \bar{S}. \end{array}$$

We need the following additional hypothesis:

**Hypothesis 13.12** ( $\mathcal{T}_{1_{K, \leq r}} \simeq \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\varpi^r)$ ). *The Serre tensor construction gives an isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{T}_{1_{K, \leq r}} \simeq \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\varpi^r)$$

such that we get an analogous diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\varpi^r) & \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ \mathcal{M}_2 & & \mathcal{M}_2. \end{array}$$

This hypothesis is shown in the in-preparation [CLZ] by Ryan C. Chen, Weixiao Lu, and Wei Zhang. Even without this hypothesis, for  $n = 2$  we could even go as far as to take this as a definition of  $\mathcal{T}_{1_{K, \leq r}}$ , but then the

generalization [Conjecture 1.2](#) would be less obvious, since a definition like this would not easily extend to  $n > 2$ .

13.4.4. *The divisor  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger$  on  $\mathcal{M}_2$ .* Turning to  $\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ , we will henceforth always identify  $\mathcal{M}_2$  with its image under the diagonal map

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_2 \xrightarrow{\Delta_{\mathcal{M}_2}} \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2.$$

**Definition 13.13** ( $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger(u)$ ). Suppose now  $u \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{tr}=0}$ . Then we define the divisor  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger(u)$  to be those  $X \in \mathcal{M}_2$  for which we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\varphi} & X \\ | & & | \\ \mathbb{E} & \xrightarrow{u} & \mathbb{E}. \end{array}$$

Note that basically by definition, for  $u \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{D}}$  and  $\mathrm{tr} u = 0$  we have

$$\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger(u) \simeq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(4)}^\dagger(u) \cap \mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1)$$

when we identify  $\mathcal{M}_2$  with its image in  $\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ .

13.5. **Comparison of the unitary and orthogonal special divisors.** We now relate  $\mathcal{Z}(u)$  to  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger(u)$  through our isomorphism  $\mathcal{N}_{2,2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2$ . Recall that we have the notation

$$\mathcal{Z}(u)^\circ := \mathcal{Z}(u) - \mathcal{Z}\left(\frac{u}{\varpi}\right).$$

Define  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(4)}^\dagger(u)^\circ$  and  $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger(u)^\circ$  similarly.

**Lemma 13.14** ( $\mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u)^\circ$ , [CLZ]). *Let  $u \in \mathbb{V}_n^-$ , and consider it as an element  $u \in \mathcal{D}$ . Then pullback along the Serre tensor construction identifies*

$$\mathrm{ST}^* \mathcal{Z}(u)^\circ \simeq \mathcal{Z}_{\mathrm{SO}(3)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u)^\circ.$$

*Proof.* This is shown in the in-preparation [CLZ] by Ryan C. Chen, Weixiao Lu, and Wei Zhang. (Although [CLZ] is technically written for  $F = \mathbb{Q}_p$ , that restriction is for other parts of the paper that don't affect this lemma.)  $\square$

13.6. **The intersection number as a triple product.** We return to the intersection number

$$\mathrm{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) = \chi_{\mathcal{N}_{n,n}} \left( \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}}(\Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)})} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{N}_{n,n}}}^{\mathbf{L}} \mathcal{O}_{\Gamma_g} \right)$$

which we will rewrite more succinctly using angle brackets as

$$\mathrm{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) = \left\langle \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}} \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)}, \Gamma_g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}_{2,2}}$$

in analogy to [LRZ24, §6.1]. (Note that  $\Delta$  here is the diagonal map  $\mathcal{N}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{N}_{2,2}$ .) For this calculation, it would be sufficient to split

$$\mathcal{Z}(u) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{Z}(u/\varpi^i)^\circ.$$

Accordingly, let us introduce the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) &:= \text{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) - \text{Int}\left(\left(g, \frac{u}{\varpi}\right), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}\right) \\ &= \left\langle \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}} \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)^\circ}, \Gamma_g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}_{2,2}}. \end{aligned}$$

From [Lemma 13.14](#) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) &= \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(g \cdot \varpi^r), \Delta(\text{ST}^*(\mathcal{Z}(u))^\circ) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2} \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(g \cdot \varpi^r), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(3)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u)^\circ \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2} \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(g \cdot \varpi^r), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1)^\circ, \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u)^\circ \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2} \\ &= \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(g \cdot \varpi^r), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2} \\ &\quad - \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(g \cdot \varpi^r), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger\left(\frac{\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u}{\varpi}\right) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

In that case we have

$$(17) \quad \text{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) = \sum_{i \geq 0} \text{Int}^\circ\left(\left(g, \frac{u}{\varpi^i}\right), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}\right).$$

**13.7. The formula of Gross-Keating.** In what follows, we let

$$\langle x, y \rangle_0 = \frac{\langle x, y \rangle + \overline{\langle x, y \rangle}}{2}$$

denote half the  $E/F$ -trace of  $\langle x, y \rangle \in E$ . Let  $O_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tr}=0} := O_{\mathcal{D}} \cap \mathcal{D}^{\text{tr}=0}$ .

**Proposition 13.15** (Gross-Keating). *Let  $x, y \in O_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tr}=0}$  and let*

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= \min(v(\langle x, x \rangle_0), v(\langle x, y \rangle_0), v(\langle y, y \rangle_0)) \\ n_2 &= v\left(\langle x, x \rangle_0 \langle y, y \rangle_0 - \langle x, y \rangle_0^2\right) - n_1 \end{aligned}$$

so that  $0 \leq n_1 \leq n_2$ . Then if  $n_1$  is odd, we have

$$\left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(x), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(y) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2} = \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{n_1-1}{2}} (n_1 + n_2 - 4j)q^j$$

while if  $n_1$  is even we instead have

$$\left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(x), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(y) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2} = \frac{n_2 - n_1 + 1}{2} q^{n_1/2} + \sum_{j=0}^{n_1/2-1} (n_1 + n_2 - 4j)q^j.$$

*Proof.* This is a rewriting of [Kud97, Proposition 14.6] which is itself a special case of [GK93, Proposition 5.4].  $\square$

We now compute all the quantities needed to invoke the Gross-Keating formula. We start by writing

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u &= (\bar{s} - t\Pi)\sqrt{\varepsilon}(s + t\Pi) \\ &= (\bar{s} - t\Pi)(s\sqrt{\varepsilon} + t\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Pi) \\ &= s\bar{s}\sqrt{\varepsilon} - ts\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Pi + \bar{s}t\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Pi - tt\sqrt{\varepsilon}\varpi \\ &= (s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)\sqrt{\varepsilon} + 2\bar{s}t\sqrt{\varepsilon}\Pi.\end{aligned}$$

We now invoke [Assumption 13.5](#) to simplify this to just

$$\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u = (s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)\sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

This assumption will also let us write

$$(s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)^2 = (s\bar{s} - t\bar{t}\varpi)^2 = (\text{Nm } u)^2.$$

Next we consider

$$g \cdot \varpi^r = \varpi^r(\alpha + \beta\Pi).$$

(Here the action of  $g$  is the one on  $\mathcal{M}_2$ , which is why we write  $g \cdot \varpi^r$  rather than  $g(\varpi^r)$ .) From now on, let's write

$$\alpha = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1\sqrt{\varepsilon}$$

for  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \in F$ . Then we use the notation

$$\begin{aligned}x &:= \bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u = (s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)\sqrt{\varepsilon} \in O_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tr}=0} \\ y &:= (g \cdot \varpi^r)_- = \varpi^r(\alpha_1\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \beta\Pi) \in O_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tr}=0}.\end{aligned}$$

Then we can compute

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x, x \rangle_0 &= \text{Nm } x \\ &= N_{E/F}((s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)\sqrt{\varepsilon}) \\ &= -\varepsilon(s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)^2 = -\varepsilon(\text{Nm } u)^2 \\ \langle y, y \rangle_0 &= \text{Nm } (\varpi^r(\alpha_1\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \beta\Pi)) \\ &= \varpi^{2r}(-\alpha_1^2\varepsilon - \beta\bar{\beta}\varpi) \\ \langle x, y \rangle_0 &= (\bar{x}y)_0 \\ &= [-(s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)\sqrt{\varepsilon} \cdot \varpi^r(\alpha_1\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \beta\Pi)]_0 \\ &= -\varpi^r\alpha_1\varepsilon(s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi).\end{aligned}$$

This lets us compute the determinant

$$\begin{aligned}\langle x, x \rangle_0 \langle y, y \rangle_0 - \langle x, y \rangle_0^2 &= -\varepsilon(\text{Nm } u)^2 \cdot \varpi^{2r}(-\alpha_1^2\varepsilon - \beta\bar{\beta}\varpi) - (\varpi^r\alpha_1\varepsilon(s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi))^2 \\ &= \varepsilon(\text{Nm } u)^2 \cdot \varpi^{2r} \cdot (\varpi\beta\bar{\beta}).\end{aligned}$$

Hence we arrive at an exact formula for

$$\left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(x), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(y) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2}$$

in terms of the valuations of the above formulas, which we will explicate in the next section after matching  $(g, u)$  to the corresponding element in  $(S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}$ .

#### 14. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.12

We now put together all the results from the previous chapters to prove [Theorem 1.12](#).

On the orbital side, we assume  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$  is as in [Lemma 7.8](#) throughout this chapter. On the geometric side, we assume  $(g, u)$  are as described in [Section 13.2](#).

##### 14.1. Matching $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ and $(g, u)$ , and the invariants for the matching.

14.1.1. *The invariants for the orbit of  $(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ .* Recall the relations in [Lemma 7.8](#). The invariants in this case as described in [Definition 4.8](#) are:

- $\text{Tr } \gamma = a + d$
- $\det \gamma = ad - bc$
- $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{u} = e$
- $\mathbf{v}^\top \gamma \mathbf{u} = (0 \ e) \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = de.$

Note that the parameters  $b$  and  $c$  are absent; but we have

$$v(b) + v(c) = v(\det \gamma - ad).$$

14.1.2. *Matching.* We now take these results and line them up with [Lemma 13.7](#) to deduce the following lemma.

**Lemma 14.1** (Explicit matching of invariants of  $U(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$  and  $(S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}^-$ ).

Let

$$g = \lambda^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \bar{\beta}\bar{\varpi} \\ \beta & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \in U(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$$

and  $u = s + t\Pi$  with  $st = 0$  and  $v(\lambda) = 0$ . Suppose  $(g, u)$  matches with

$$(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, (0 \ e) \right) \in (S_2(F) \times V_2'(F))_{\text{rs}}.$$

Then we have

$$a = \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}\bar{\alpha} & \text{if } s = 0 \\ \lambda^{-1}\alpha & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$d = \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}\alpha & \text{if } s = 0 \\ \lambda^{-1}\bar{\alpha} & \text{if } t = 0 \end{cases}$$

$$bc = \lambda^{-2}\beta\bar{\beta}\bar{\varpi}$$

$$e = \text{Nm } u.$$

Thus we also have the identity

$$v(d - a) = v(\alpha_1).$$

*Proof.* Setting the invariants from the previous subsection equal to the ones determined in [Lemma 13.7](#) gives

$$\begin{aligned} a + d &= \lambda^{-1}(\alpha + \bar{\alpha}) \\ \det \gamma = ad - bc &= \det g = \lambda^{-2}(\alpha\bar{\alpha} - \beta\bar{\beta}\varpi) \\ e &= \text{Nm } u \\ de &= \begin{cases} \lambda^{-1}\bar{\alpha} \text{Nm } u & \text{if } s = 0 \\ \lambda^{-1}\alpha \text{Nm } u & \text{if } t = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

So the equations for  $e$ ,  $d$  and  $a$  are immediate. In both cases we get  $ad = \lambda^{-2}\alpha\bar{\alpha}$  and hence

$$\lambda^{-2}\beta\bar{\beta}\varpi = -(\det g - \lambda^{-2}\alpha\bar{\alpha}) = -(\det \gamma - ad) = bc. \quad \square$$

**Remark 14.2** (Deriving [Lemma 7.8](#) from [Lemma 14.1](#)). Note that many of the assumptions in [Lemma 7.8](#) can also be extracted from [Lemma 14.1](#). For example, taking the valuation of

$$\lambda\bar{\lambda} = \alpha\bar{\alpha} - \beta\bar{\beta}\varpi$$

implies that (since the left-hand side is a unit)

$$v(a) = v(\alpha) = 0 < 2v(\beta) + 1 = v(b) + v(c).$$

So indeed  $v(1 - a\bar{a}) = v(\bar{b}c)$  must be odd.

**14.2. Translation of the Gross-Keating data to the orbital side.** We combine the results of [Section 13.7](#) with [Lemma 14.1](#). Retaining the notation

$$\begin{aligned} x &:= \bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u = (s\bar{s} + t\bar{t}\varpi)\sqrt{\varepsilon} \in O_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tr}=0} \\ y &:= (g \cdot \varpi^r)_- = (\alpha_1\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \beta\Pi) \in O_{\mathcal{D}}^{\text{tr}=0} \end{aligned}$$

from [Section 13.7](#), we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} v(\langle x, x \rangle_0) &= 2v(\text{Nm } u) \\ &= 2v(e) \\ v(\langle x, y \rangle_0) &= r + v(\alpha_1) + v(\text{Nm } u) \\ &= r + v(d - a) + v(e) \\ v(\langle x, x \rangle_0 \langle y, y \rangle_0 - \langle x, y \rangle_0^2) &= 2r + 2v(\text{Nm } u) + v(\beta\bar{\beta}\varpi) \\ &= 2r + 2v(e) + v(b) + v(c). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the last valuation is odd. Therefore we can always extract  $v(\langle y, y \rangle_0)$  by writing

$$\begin{aligned} v(\langle x, x \rangle_0) + v(\langle y, y \rangle_0) &= \min\left(v(\langle x, x \rangle_0 \langle y, y \rangle_0 - \langle x, y \rangle_0^2), v(\langle x, y \rangle_0^2)\right) \\ \implies v(\langle y, y \rangle_0) &= \min(2r + 2v(e) + v(b) + v(c), 2r + 2v(d - a) + 2v(e)) - 2v(e) \\ &= 2r + \min(v(b) + v(c), 2v(d - a)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \min(v(\langle x, x \rangle_0), v(\langle x, y \rangle_0), v(\langle y, y \rangle_0),) \\
&= \min(2v(e), r + v(d - a) + v(e), 2r + \min(v(b) + v(c), 2v(\zeta))) \\
&= \min(2v(e), r + v(d - a) + v(e), 2r + v(b) + v(c), 2r + 2v(\zeta)) \\
&= \min(2v(e), v(b) + v(c) + 2r, 2v(d - a) + 2r)
\end{aligned}$$

where we can drop  $r + v(d - a) + v(e)$  from the minimum because it equals  $\frac{2v(e) + (2v(d - a) + 2r)}{2}$ .

Now recall the right-hand side of [Proposition 13.15](#), that is

$$\begin{cases} \sum_{j=0}^{\frac{n_1-1}{2}} (n_1 + n_2 - 4j) \cdot q^j & \text{if } n_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{n_2 - n_1 + 1}{2} q^{n_1/2} + \sum_{j=0}^{n_1/2-1} (n_1 + n_2 - 4j) \cdot q^j & \text{if } n_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}. \end{cases}$$

for  $0 \leq n_1 \leq n_2$ . Then apply [Proposition 13.15](#) to obtain that

$$\left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger((g \cdot \varpi^r)_-) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2}$$

is equal to the above formula applied at

$$\begin{aligned}
n_1 &:= \min(2v(e), v(b) + v(c) + 2r, 2v(d - a) + 2r) \\
n_2 &:= 2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - n_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$n_1 + n_2 = 2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r.$$

For brevity, we henceforth introduce the symbol GK for the sum above; hence we have

$$(18) \quad \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d - a)) = \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger((g \cdot \varpi^r)_-) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2}.$$

In that case we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d - a)) \\
&= \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger\left(\frac{\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u}{\varpi}\right), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger((g \cdot \varpi^r)_-) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Subtracting the two gives

$$\begin{aligned}
(19) \quad \text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) &= \left\langle \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(1), \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger(\bar{u}\sqrt{\varepsilon}u)^\circ, \mathcal{Z}_{\text{SO}(4)}^\dagger((g \cdot \varpi^r)_-) \right\rangle_{\mathcal{M}_2 \times \mathcal{M}_2} \\
&= \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d - a)) \\
&\quad - \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d - a)).
\end{aligned}$$

**14.3. Base change.** The base change for  $n = 2$  was already calculated in [LRZ24] and we simply recall the result here.

As in Section 13, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} &:= \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_2(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)} \in \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)) \\ \mathbf{1}_{K, r} &:= \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq (r-1)} \\ &= \mathbf{1}_{\varpi^{-r} \text{Mat}_2(O_E) \cap \text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+)} \in \mathcal{H}(\text{U}(\mathbb{V}_n^+))\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 14.3** ([LRZ24, Lemma 7.1.1]). *For  $n = 2$  and  $r \geq 1$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\text{BC}_S^\eta(\mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}}) &= (-1)^r \mathbf{1}_{K, r} \\ &= (-1)^r (\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq (r-1)}).\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* This follows directly from [LRZ24, Equation (7.1.9)].  $\square$

**14.4. Transfer factor.** As stated in (16), the transfer factor is

$$\omega(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top) = (-1)^{v(c)+1}.$$

**14.5. Comparison to orbital formula.** In what follows, we introduce the shorthand

$$\partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) := \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}}).$$

The main claim is that the following formula holds:

**Theorem 14.4** (GK is a difference of two orbitals). *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} &\left( \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d-a)) \right) \\ &= \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)).\end{aligned}$$

We continue to use the notation  $N$  and  $\varkappa$  from Section 9 defined by

$$\begin{aligned}N &:= \min \left( v(e), \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r, v(d-a) + r \right) \\ \varkappa &:= v(e) - v(d-a) - r \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

and prove Theorem 14.4 by exhausting the cases based on which value of  $N$  is smallest.

**14.5.1. Proof of Theorem 14.4 when  $v(e) \leq \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r$  and  $v(e) \leq v(d-a) + r$ .** In the Gross-Keating formula we have simply

$$\begin{aligned}n_1 &= 2v(e) \\ n_2 &= v(b) + v(c) + 2r.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) = \frac{-2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r + 1}{2} q^{v(e)}$$

$$+ \sum_{j=0}^{v(e)-1} (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j.$$

On the orbital side, we refer to [Corollary 1.6](#) and compare it to the single instance of Gross-Keating above. The exponent of  $j$  runs up to  $v(e)$  in one case and  $v(e) - 1$  in the second; that is we need

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^{v(e)} \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^{v(e)-1} \left( \frac{2(v(e) - 1) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j \\ & = \frac{-2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r + 1}{2} q^{v(e)} + \sum_{j=0}^{v(e)-1} (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j \end{aligned}$$

which is obvious.

14.5.2. *Proof of [Theorem 14.4](#) when  $\frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r < v(e)$  and  $v(b) + v(c) < 2v(d - a)$ .* Set  $N = \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r$ . In the Gross-Keating formula we have simply

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= 2N + 1 \\ n_2 &= 2v(e). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d - a)) = \sum_{j=0}^N (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j.$$

We compare this to [Corollary 1.6](#); we check

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=0}^N \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j \\ & + \sum_{j=0}^N \left( \frac{2(v(e) - 1) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \cdot q^j \\ & = \sum_{j=0}^N (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j \end{aligned}$$

which is clear.

14.5.3. *Proof of Theorem 14.4 when  $v(d-a) + r < v(e)$  and  $2v(d-a) < v(b) + v(c)$ .* Hence  $N = v(d-a) + r$  and  $\varkappa := v(e) - (v(d-a) + r) > 0$ . In the Gross-Keating side formula, we now have

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &:= 2v(d-a) + 2r = 2N \\ n_2 &= 2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d-a). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) &= \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) - 4v(d-a) - 2r + 1}{2} q^N \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j. \end{aligned}$$

This time, the relevant combination of Corollary 1.6 is

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=0}^N q^j \cdot \left( \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \\ &\quad + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} -\frac{\varkappa}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{\varkappa}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=0}^N q^j \cdot \left( \frac{2(v(e)-1) + v(b) + v(c) + 1}{2} + r - 2j \right) \\ &\quad + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} -\frac{\varkappa-1}{2} & \text{if } \varkappa-1 \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} - \left( (v(e)-1) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) & \text{if } \varkappa-1 \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^N q^j \cdot (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j \\ &\quad + q^N \cdot \begin{cases} -\frac{\varkappa}{2} + \frac{\varkappa-1}{2} - \left( (v(e)-1) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \\ -\frac{\varkappa-1}{2} + \frac{\varkappa}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b)+v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) & \text{if } \varkappa \equiv 1 \pmod{2} \end{cases} \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^N q^j \cdot (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j \\ &\quad + q^N \cdot \left( \frac{1}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b) + v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} q^j \cdot (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4j) \cdot q^j \\ &\quad + q^N \cdot \left( (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4N) + \frac{1}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b) + v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient of  $q^N$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & (2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) + 2r - 4(v(d-a) - r)) + \frac{1}{2} - \left( v(e) + \frac{v(b) + v(c)}{2} - 2v(d-a) - r \right) \\ &= \frac{2v(e) + v(b) + v(c) - 4v(d-a) - 2r + 1}{2} \end{aligned}$$

which matches the one from Gross-Keating. Hence [Theorem 14.4](#) is completely proved.

**14.6. Conclusion (proof of [Theorem 1.12](#)).** From [Theorem 14.4](#) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) &= \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \left( \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d-a)) \right) \\ \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d-a)) &= \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \left( \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d-a)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 2, v(d-a)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

so subtraction (and recalling [\(19\)](#)) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) &= \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \\ &\quad - \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d-a)) \\ (20) \quad &= \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \left( \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 2, v(d-a)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We now show that [\(20\)](#) implies [Theorem 1.12](#). Because  $r = 0$  is known already, it suffices to verify for  $r > 0$ .

Suppose we sum [\(20\)](#) with  $u$  replaced by  $u/\varpi^i$  for  $i = 0, 1, \dots$ . The left-hand side equals  $\text{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r})$  by [\(17\)](#). On the right-hand side this has the effect of decreasing  $v(e)$  by 2 since  $e = \text{Nm } u$ . Hence the sum of the right-hand sides telescopes and gives us the identity

$$(21) \quad \text{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}) = \frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}}).$$

Subtracting the same equation from itself with  $r$  replaced by  $r - 1$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Int}((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq (r-1)}) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{v(c)+r}}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}}). \end{aligned}$$

which, since  $(-1)^{v(c)} = -\omega(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)$ , becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Int}((g, u), (-1)^r (\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq (r-1)})) \\ (22) \quad &= \frac{-\omega(\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top)}{\log q} \partial \text{Orb}((\gamma, \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}^\top), \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq r}} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_{S, \leq (r-1)}}). \end{aligned}$$

But **Lemma 14.3** says that  $(-1)^r(\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r} - \mathbf{1}_{K, \leq (r-1)}) \in \mathcal{H}(U(\mathbb{V}_n^+))$  matches  $\mathbf{1}_{K'_S, \leq r} + \mathbf{1}_{K'_S, \leq (r-1)} \in \mathcal{H}(S_2(F))$  for any  $r \geq 0$ . And hence from the  $r = 0$  case we can inductively conclude **Theorem 1.12** for  $r > 0$ , completing the proof.

**14.7. A particularly clean formula for a certain intersection number.** We mention in particular that the value of

$$\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, r}) = \left\langle \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_{K, r}} \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)^\circ}, \Gamma_g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}_{2,2}}$$

(note the change from  $\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}$  to  $\mathbf{1}_{K, \leq r}$  here) has a particularly clean formula that seems worth mentioning. We phrase this entirely based on the quantities in the geometric side to keep in self-contained.

**Theorem 14.5** ( $\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K, r})$ ). *Let  $r \geq 1$  and  $v(\text{Nm } u) > 0$  for  $u \in \mathbb{V}_2^-$ , and let*

$$g = \lambda^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \bar{\beta}\varpi \\ \beta & \bar{\alpha} \end{pmatrix} \in U(\mathbb{V}_2^-)$$

where  $v(\lambda) = 0$ . Then

$$\left\langle \mathbb{T}_{\mathbf{1}_K \otimes \mathbf{1}_{K, r}} \Delta_{\mathcal{Z}(u)^\circ}, \Gamma_g \right\rangle_{\mathcal{N}_{2,2}}$$

is equal to

$$\begin{cases} (C+1)q^N + (C+2)q^{N-1} & \text{if } v(\text{Nm } u) - r = v(\alpha - \bar{\alpha}) \leq v(\beta) \\ 2q^N & \text{if } v(\beta) + r < \min(v(\text{Nm } u), v(\alpha - \bar{\alpha}) + r) \\ q^N + q^{N-1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where

$$N = \min(v(\text{Nm } u), v(\beta) + r, v(\alpha - \bar{\alpha}) + r)$$

and we write

$$C = v(\beta) - v(\alpha - \bar{\alpha}) \geq 0$$

in the first case.

*Proof.* Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{GK}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \left( \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d-a)) \right) \\ & \text{GK}(r-1, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{r-1+v(c)}}{\log q} \left( \partial \text{Orb}(r-1, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \partial \text{Orb}(r-1, v(b), v(c), v(e) - 1, v(d-a)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

when we subtract we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) &= \frac{(-1)^{r+v(c)}}{\log q} \left( \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \right. \\ &\quad + \partial \text{Orb}(r-1, v(b), v(c), v(e), v(d-a)) \\ &\quad - \partial \text{Orb}(r, v(b), v(c), v(e)-2, v(d-a)) \\ &\quad \left. + \partial \text{Orb}(r-1, v(b), v(c), v(e)-2, v(d-a)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Gathering the first two terms lets us apply the simpler formula [Corollary 1.7](#) twice; doing so gives

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) &= ((q^N + q^{N-1} + \cdots + 1) + Cq^N + C'q^{N-1}) \\ &\quad - \left( (q^{N^b} + q^{N^b-1} + \cdots + 1) + C^b q^{N^b} + (C')^b q^{N^b-1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $N, C, C'$  are as in [Corollary 1.7](#), and  $N^b, C^b, (C')^b$  are the same quantities with  $v(e)$  replaced by  $v(e) - 2$ . Let  $\varkappa$  and  $\varkappa^b = \varkappa - 2$  be also as in [Corollary 1.7](#).

We consider cases now.

- Suppose first  $v(e) \leq \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r$  and  $v(e) < v(d-a) + r$ . Then  $N = v(e)$  and  $N^b = v(e) - 2$  and  $C = C' = (C^b) = (C')^b = 0$ , Hence in this case we have

$$\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) = q^N + q^{N-1}.$$

- Next suppose  $2v(d-a) > v(b) + v(c)$  and consider cases on  $v(e)$ . We only need to consider  $v(e) > \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r$ .
  - If  $v(e) = \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r + 1$  then we have

$$N = \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} + r, \quad N^b = \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} + r - 1$$

and  $C = 1, C^b = 0$ , and  $C' = (C')^b = 0$ . Consequently we get

$$\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) = 2q^N.$$

- Once  $v(e) \geq \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r + 2$  we always have  $N = N^b = \frac{v(b)+v(c)-1}{2} + r$ ,

$$C - C^b = (v(e) - N) - ((v(e) - 2) - N) = 2$$

and  $C' = (C')^b = 0$ . Hence in this case we have

$$\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) = 2q^N$$

as well.

- Finally suppose  $2v(d-a) < v(b) + v(c)$  and consider cases on  $v(e)$ . We only need to consider  $v(e) \geq v(d-a) + r$ .

– If  $v(e) = v(d - a) + r$ , then

$$N = v(d - a) + r, \quad N^b = v(d - a) + r - 2.$$

In this case  $\varkappa = 0$  (and  $\varkappa^b = -2$ ). So  $C^b = (C')^b = 0$  but we have larger terms

$$C = \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a) - 1}{2}$$

$$C' = \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a) + 1}{2}.$$

Hence, we get an exceptional case

$$\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) = \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a) + 1}{2} q^N$$

$$+ \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a) + 3}{2} q^{N-1}$$

– If  $v(e) = v(d - a) + r + 1$ , then we have

$$N = v(d - a) + r, \quad N^b = v(d - a) + r - 1.$$

In this case  $\varkappa = 1$  (and  $\varkappa^b = -1$ ) so we have  $C = 0$ ,  $C' = 1$ ,  $C^b = 0 = (C')^b = 0$ . Consequently we get

$$\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) = q^N + q^{N-1}.$$

– Once  $v(e) \geq v(d - a) + r + 2$ , we always have  $N = N^b = v(d - a) + r$  and

$$C - C^b = (C') - (C')^b = 1$$

regardless of the parity of  $\varkappa$ . Hence in this case we also get

$$\text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r}) = q^N + q^{N-1}.$$

Hence, in summary we get that

$$(23) \quad \text{Int}^\circ((g, u), \mathbf{1}_{K,r})$$

$$= \begin{cases} (C + 1)q^N + (C + 2)q^{N-1} & \text{if } v(e) - r = v(d - a) \leq \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} \\ 2q^N & \text{if } \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 1}{2} + r < \min(v(e), v(d - a) + r) \\ q^N + q^{N-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where

$$C = \frac{v(b) + v(c) - 2v(d - a) - 1}{2} \geq 0$$

in the first case. Then (23) translates via [Lemma 14.1](#) into the desired claim.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [Beu21] Raphaël Beuzart-Plessis. “A new proof of the Jacquet-Rallis fundamental lemma”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 170.12 (2021), pp. 2805–2814. ISSN: 0012-7094,1547-7398. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1215/00127094-2020-0090> (cit. on p. 5).
- [Che25] Evan Chen. *Explicit formulas for weighted orbital integrals for the inhomogeneous and semi-Lie arithmetic fundamental lemmas conjectured for the full spherical Hecke algebra*. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Massachusetts Institute of Technology. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2025, (no paging). URL: <https://web.evanchen.cc/publications.html#thesis> (cit. on p. 16).
- [CLZ] Ryan Chen, Weixiao Lu, and Wei Zhang. “Faltings heights and the subleading terms of adjoint  $L$ -functions”. In preparation (cit. on pp. 16, 85, 86).
- [GGP12] Wee Teck Gan, Benedict H. Gross, and Dipendra Prasad. “Symplectic local root numbers, central critical  $L$  values, and restriction problems in the representation theory of classical groups”. In: 346. Sur les conjectures de Gross et Prasad. I. 2012, pp. 1–109 (cit. on pp. 4, 5).
- [GK93] Benedict H. Gross and Kevin Keating. “On the intersection of modular correspondences”. In: *Invent. Math.* 112.2 (1993), pp. 225–245. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: [10.1007/BF01232433](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01232433). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01232433> (cit. on pp. 15, 88).
- [GP92] Benedict H. Gross and Dipendra Prasad. “On the decomposition of a representation of  $SO_n$  when restricted to  $SO_{n-1}$ ”. In: *Canad. J. Math.* 44.5 (1992), pp. 974–1002. ISSN: 0008-414X,1496-4279. DOI: [10.4153/CJM-1992-060-8](https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1992-060-8). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1992-060-8> (cit. on p. 4).
- [GP94] Benedict H. Gross and Dipendra Prasad. “On irreducible representations of  $SO_{2n+1} \times SO_{2m}$ ”. In: *Canad. J. Math.* 46.5 (1994), pp. 930–950. ISSN: 0008-414X,1496-4279. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4153/CJM-1994-053-4> (cit. on p. 4).
- [GZ86] Benedict H. Gross and Don B. Zagier. “Heegner points and derivatives of  $L$ -series”. In: *Invent. Math.* 84.2 (1986), pp. 225–320. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01388809> (cit. on pp. 4, 5).
- [JR11] Hervé Jacquet and Stephen Rallis. “On the Gross-Prasad conjecture for unitary groups”. In: *On certain  $L$ -functions*. Vol. 13. Clay Math. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011, pp. 205–264 (cit. on pp. 4–6).
- [KR11] Stephen Kudla and Michael Rapoport. “Special cycles on unitary Shimura varieties I. Unramified local theory”. In: *Invent. Math.* 184.3 (2011), pp. 629–682. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: [10.1007/s00209-011-0700-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00209-011-0700-0)

- 1007/s00222-010-0298-z. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-010-0298-z> (cit. on pp. 15, 76, 77, 81).
- [Kud97] Stephen S. Kudla. “Central derivatives of Eisenstein series and height pairings”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 146.3 (1997), pp. 545–646. ISSN: 0003-486X,1939-8980. DOI: [10.2307/2952456](https://doi.org/10.2307/2952456). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2952456> (cit. on p. 88).
- [Les23] Spencer Leslie. “A fundamental lemma for the Hecke algebra: the Jacquet-Rallis case”. In: *J. Number Theory* 243 (2023), pp. 475–494. ISSN: 0022-314X,1096-1658. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2022.06.003> (cit. on pp. 4, 6, 27, 28, 37).
- [Liu21] Yifeng Liu. “Fourier-Jacobi cycles and arithmetic relative trace formula (with an appendix by Chao Li and Yihang Zhu)”. In: *Camb. J. Math.* 9.1 (2021). Appendix by Chao Li and Yihang Zhu, pp. 1–147. ISSN: 2168-0930,2168-0949. DOI: [10.4310/CJM.2021.v9.n1.a1](https://doi.org/10.4310/CJM.2021.v9.n1.a1). URL: <https://doi.org/10.4310/CJM.2021.v9.n1.a1> (cit. on pp. 6, 9, 10, 24, 37, 38, 79).
- [LRZ24] Chao Li, Michael Rapoport, and Wei Zhang. “Arithmetic fundamental lemma for the spherical Hecke algebra”. In: *Manuscripta Math.* 175.1-2 (2024), pp. 1–51. ISSN: 0025-2611,1432-1785. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00229-024-01572-0> (cit. on pp. 4, 6–10, 12, 15, 17, 23, 27, 28, 36, 38, 39, 70, 73–75, 77, 79, 84, 87, 92).
- [MZ24] A. Mihatsch and W. Zhang. “On the Arithmetic Fundamental Lemma conjecture over a general  $p$ -adic field”. In: *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* 26.12 (2024), pp. 4831–4901. ISSN: 1435-9855,1435-9863. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4171/jems/1375> (cit. on p. 6).
- [RS07] Steve Rallis and Gérard Schiffmann. *Multiplicity one Conjectures*. 2007. arXiv: [0705.2168 \[math.RT\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0705.2168). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/0705.2168> (cit. on pp. 21, 22).
- [Wal85] J.-L. Waldspurger. “Quelques propriétés arithmétiques de certaines formes automorphes sur  $GL(2)$ ”. In: *Compositio Math.* 54.2 (1985), pp. 121–171. ISSN: 0010-437X. URL: [http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM\\_1985\\_\\_54\\_2\\_121\\_0](http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1985__54_2_121_0) (cit. on p. 4).
- [YZZ13] Xinyi Yuan, Shou-Wu Zhang, and Wei Zhang. *The Gross-Zagier formula on Shimura curves*. Vol. 184. Annals of Mathematics Studies. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2013, pp. x+256. ISBN: 978-069-115-5-9-2-0 (cit. on pp. 4, 5).
- [Zha12] Wei Zhang. “On arithmetic fundamental lemmas”. In: *Invent. Math.* 188.1 (2012), pp. 197–252. ISSN: 0020-9910,1432-1297. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-011-0348-1> (cit. on pp. 4, 6, 9, 17, 18, 23).
- [Zha21a] W. Zhang. “Weil representation and arithmetic fundamental lemma”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 193.3 (2021), pp. 863–978. ISSN: 0003-486X,1939-8980. DOI: [10.4007/annals.2021.193.3.5](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2021.193.3.5)

- URL: <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2021.193.3.5> (cit. on p. 77).
- [Zha21b] Wei Zhang. “Weil representation and arithmetic fundamental lemma”. In: *Ann. of Math. (2)* 193.3 (2021), pp. 863–978. ISSN: 0003-486X,1939-8980. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2021.193.3.5> (cit. on pp. 5, 6).
- [Zha23] Zhiyu Zhang. *Arithmetic Transfers, Modularity of Arithmetic Theta Series and Geometry of Local-Global Shimura Varieties at Parahoric Levels*. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Massachusetts Institute of Technology. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2023, (no paging). URL: [http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url\\_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft\\_val\\_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res\\_dat=xri:pqm&rft\\_dat=xri:pqdiss:30451257](http://gateway.proquest.com/openurl?url_ver=Z39.88-2004&rft_val_fmt=info:ofi/fmt:kev:mtx:dissertation&res_dat=xri:pqm&rft_dat=xri:pqdiss:30451257) (cit. on p. 6).
- [Zha24a] Wei Zhang. *High dimensional Gross–Zagier formula: a survey*. 2024. arXiv: [2402.17656](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17656) [math.NT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17656> (cit. on pp. 4, 73–78).
- [Zha24b] Wei Zhang. *High dimensional Gross–Zagier formula: a survey*. 2024. arXiv: [2402.17656](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17656) [math.NT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.17656> (cit. on p. 19).
- [Zha24c] Zhiyu Zhang. “Maximal parahoric arithmetic transfers, resolutions and modularity”. In: (2024). arXiv: [2112.11994](https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.11994) [math.NT]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.11994> (cit. on p. 72).