

# ALGORITHMS FOR PARABOLIC INDUCTIONS AND JACQUET MODULES IN $GL_n$

KEI YUEN CHAN AND BASUDEV PATTANAYAK

**ABSTRACT.** In this article, we present algorithms for computing parabolic inductions and Jacquet modules for the general linear group  $G$  over a non-Archimedean local field. Given the Zelevinsky data or Langlands data of an irreducible smooth representation  $\pi$  of  $G$  and an essentially square-integrable representation  $\sigma$ , we explicitly determine the Jacquet module of  $\pi$  with respect to  $\sigma$  and the socle of the normalized parabolic induction  $\pi \times \sigma$ . Our result builds on and extends some previous work of Mœglin-Waldspurger, Jantzen, Mínguez, and Lapid-Mínguez, and also uses other methods such as sequences of derivatives and an exotic duality. As an application, we give a simple algorithm for computing the highest derivative multisegment.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $GL_n(F)$  be the general linear group over a non-archimedean local field  $F$ . The smooth representation theory of  $GL_n(F)$  is primarily shaped by two essential tools: parabolic inductions and Jacquet modules. These two functors have been studied long in the literature and have given resolutions to several classical problems, including classification of irreducible representations [Zel80], unitary dual problem [Tad86, LM16], Zelevinsky dual [MW86, Jan07], theta correspondence [Min08], and branching laws [Cha22]. Even investigation on their own properties, such as irreducibility of parabolic inductions [BLM13, LM16, LM18, LM20, LM22], composition factors of parabolic inductions [Tad15, Gur21] and homological properties of the functors [Cha24e], is also interesting and has connections to other subjects.

Our primary goal is to establish some effective computational tools for problems on branching laws and Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives (see Section 1.6 for more discussions). This relies on two essential notions: derivatives from Jacquet functors and integrals from parabolic inductions. We shall now introduce more notations to explain our results.

**1.1. Notion of some representations.** In his work [Zel80], Zelevinsky classifies all irreducible smooth complex representations of  $GL_n(F)$  in terms of combinatorial objects known as multisegments. These multisegments consist of a finite number of segments attached to some irreducible supercuspidal representation, along with a pair of integers. Each segment  $\Delta$  can be associated with a segment representation  $\langle \Delta \rangle$  and a generalized Steinberg representation  $\text{St}(\Delta)$  through parabolic induction. For any irreducible smooth complex representation  $\pi$  of  $GL_n(F)$ , there exists a multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}$  such that  $\pi$  takes the form  $Z(\mathfrak{m})$  (or  $L(\mathfrak{m})$ ), which is the unique irreducible

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 22E50.

*Key words and phrases.* Parabolic inductions, Jacquet modules, Jantzen-Mínguez algorithm, Mœglin-Waldspurger algorithm, highest derivative multisegments.

submodule of the parabolic induction of tensor product of  $\langle \Delta \rangle$  (resp.  $\text{St}(\Delta)$ ) for  $\Delta \in \mathfrak{m}$  in a certain order. Refer to Sections 2.1 and 2.2 for more details of the notations.

**1.2. Notion of derivatives.** Let  $\pi$  be an irreducible smooth representation of  $\text{GL}_n(F)$  and  $\sigma$  be an essentially square integrable representation of  $\text{GL}_\ell(F)$  for  $\ell < n$ . Then  $\sigma = \text{St}(\Delta)$  for some segment  $\Delta$ . Let  $N_\ell \subset \text{GL}_n(F)$  be the unipotent radical of the standard parabolic subgroup corresponding to the partition  $(n - \ell, \ell)$  i.e.  $N_\ell$  is the unipotent subgroup containing matrices of the form  $\begin{pmatrix} I_{n-\ell} & u \\ & I_\ell \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $u$  is a  $(n - \ell) \times \ell$  matrix over  $F$ . There exists at most one irreducible smooth representation  $\tau$  of  $\text{GL}_{n-\ell}(F)$  such that

$$\tau \boxtimes \sigma \hookrightarrow \text{Jac}_{N_\ell}(\pi),$$

where  $\text{Jac}_{N_\ell}(\pi)$  is the normalized Jacquet module of  $\pi$  associated to  $N_\ell$ . If such  $\tau$  exists, that  $\tau$  is called the derivative of  $\pi$  under  $\text{St}(\Delta)$  and is denoted by  $D_\Delta^R(\pi)$ . If no such  $\tau$  exist, we set  $D_\Delta^R(\pi) = 0$ . Similarly, there exists at most one irreducible smooth representation  $\tau'$  of  $\text{GL}_{n-\ell}(F)$  such that  $\sigma \boxtimes \tau' \hookrightarrow \text{Jac}_{N_{n-\ell}}(\pi)$ . The left derivative  $D_\Delta^L(\pi)$  is defined as  $\tau'$  if such  $\tau'$  exists; otherwise, we set  $D_\Delta^L(\pi) = 0$ . The derivatives under irreducible supercuspidal representations  $\rho$  are called  $\rho$ -derivatives, and under essentially square integrable representations  $\text{St}(\Delta)$  are called St-derivatives.

We remark that in some contexts e.g. [Jan07] (also see [Jan14, Xu17, Jan18, Ato20, Tad22] for other classical groups), the notion of derivatives is (roughly) defined to be a collection of the composition factors of the form  $\tau \boxtimes \sigma$  appearing in the semisimplification of  $\text{Jac}_{N_\ell}(\pi)$ , which is related but different notion from the one used in this article. However, when one considers the so-called highest  $\rho$ -derivatives, those notions coincide by certain multiplicity one results [Jan07, Min09]. The notion we use here, fits our needs better in the applications discussed below. We also remark that in general, those factors  $\tau \boxtimes \sigma$  may not appear in a submodule or quotient of  $\text{Jac}_{N_\ell}(\pi)$ , and some of such higher structure issue is studied in [Cha24e].

**1.3. Notion of integrals.** Let  $\pi$  be an irreducible smooth representation of  $\text{GL}_n(F)$  and let  $\sigma = \text{St}(\Delta)$  be an essentially square integrable representation of  $\text{GL}_\ell(F)$  for some segment  $\Delta$ . Then, there exists a unique simple submodule

$$I_\Delta^R(\pi) \hookrightarrow \pi \times \text{St}(\Delta) \quad (\text{resp. } I_\Delta^L(\pi) \hookrightarrow \text{St}(\Delta) \times \pi)$$

of the normalized parabolic induction  $\pi \times \text{St}(\Delta)$  (resp.  $\text{St}(\Delta) \times \pi$ ). We call  $I_\Delta^R(\pi)$  (resp.  $I_\Delta^L(\pi)$ ) the right (resp. left) integral of  $\pi$  under  $\text{St}(\Delta)$ . According to [LM18, Corollary 2.4] and the second adjointness of parabolic induction, we have:

$$D_\Delta^R \circ I_\Delta^R(\pi) \cong \pi \text{ and if } D_\Delta^R(\pi) \neq 0, I_\Delta^R \circ D_\Delta^R(\pi) \cong \pi.$$

A similar result holds for left derivatives and left integrals. When  $\sigma = \text{St}(\Delta)$  is a supercuspidal representation  $\rho$ , the integrals  $I_\Delta^{R/L}(\pi)$  under  $\sigma$  are called  $\rho$ -integral.

The problem of determining when  $I_\Delta^R(\pi) \cong I_\Delta^L(\pi)$  is explored in [LM16], and also in a series of work of [LM18, LM20, LM22] for more general situation of  $\square$ -irreducible representations.

**1.4. Main results.** Let  $\pi$  be an irreducible smooth representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(F)$  and let  $\sigma = \mathrm{St}(\Delta)$ , which is a generalized Steinberg representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_\ell(F)$  for some segment  $\Delta$ . Then, there exist multisegments  $\mathfrak{m}$ , and  $\mathfrak{n}$  such that  $\pi = L(\mathfrak{m})$  (in Langlands classification) and  $\pi = Z(\mathfrak{n})$  (in Zelevinsky classification). By Algorithm 3.3 and Algorithm 5.3 (resp. Algorithm 4.2 and Algorithm 6.1), we can attach multisegments  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  (resp.  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Zel}}(\mathfrak{n})$  and  $\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Zel}}(\mathfrak{n})$ ) respectively to the multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{n}$ ). We then show the following main results of this paper:

(1) For derivatives in Langlands classification:

$$D_\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \begin{cases} L\left(\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})\right) & \text{if } \mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and for derivatives in Zelevinsky classification:

$$D_\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{n})) \cong \begin{cases} Z\left(\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Zel}}(\mathfrak{n})\right) & \text{if } \mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Zel}}(\mathfrak{n}) \neq \infty \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2) For integrals in Langlands classification:  $I_\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})\right)$ , and for integrals in Zelevinsky classification:  $I_\Delta^{\mathrm{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{n})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Zel}}(\mathfrak{n})\right)$ .

Here, we denote  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  or  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Zel}}(\mathfrak{n})$  as  $\infty$  if some steps of the respective algorithms fail to construct the multisegment  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  or  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\mathrm{Zel}}(\mathfrak{n})$ . A similar result holds for left derivatives and left integrals in both classifications.

The algorithms are mainly formulated in terms of linked relations of segments, which is probably not so surprising as already seen in the work of [MW86, Jan07, Min09, LM16]. Our results can be viewed as extensions of theirs, and for more comparison of results/methods in [MW86, Jan07, Min09, LM16], see Remarks 3 and 4. We shall explain some of our key inputs in the following section.

**1.5. Methods of proofs.** We shall use rather different perspectives to deal with each case of the main results in Section 1.4. We now highlight some key ingredients of our proofs:

- (1) (Derivative algorithm for Langlands classification, Section 3) We exploit the commutativity of derivatives and sequences of derivatives to reduce to  $\rho$ -derivatives. The representation-theoretic counterpart of such idea is studied in [Cha24a].
- (2) (Derivative algorithm for Zelevinsky classification, Section 4) We use the Mœglin-Waldspurger (MW) algorithm as a basic case, and introduce the notion of minimally linked multisegments to systematically study the combinatorics arising from multiple MW algorithms.
- (3) (Integral algorithm for Langlands classification, Section 5) We establish an exotic duality between the right integral algorithm and the left derivative algorithm. This duality allows one to transfer properties between two algorithms, and then use those properties to reduce to the case of  $\rho$ -integrals. Here we refer the duality to be exotic because it comes from the left derivative and right integral, which have no obvious relation from representation-theoretic viewpoint.

- (4) (Integral algorithm for Zelevinsky classification, Section 6) The proof uses an idea of gluing minimally linked multisegments explained in Appendix A, in addition to the MW algorithm.

### 1.6. Applications/motivations.

- (1) Let  $\pi$  be an irreducible smooth representation of  $\mathrm{GL}_n(F)$  and  $\Delta$  be a segment. Define  $\varepsilon_{\Delta}^{\mathrm{R}}(\pi)$  to be the largest non-negative integer  $k$  such that  $(D_{\Delta}^{\mathrm{R}})^k(\pi) \neq 0$ . For a segment  $[a, b]_{\rho}$ , define the (right)  $\eta$ -invariant by

$$\eta_{[a,b]_{\rho}}^{\mathrm{R}}(\pi) = \left( \varepsilon_{[a,b]_{\rho}}^{\mathrm{R}}(\pi), \varepsilon_{[a+1,b]_{\rho}}^{\mathrm{R}}(\pi), \dots, \varepsilon_{[b,b]_{\rho}}^{\mathrm{R}}(\pi) \right)$$

Let  $\Delta, \Delta'$  be two segments. A triple  $(\Delta, \Delta', \pi)$  is called combinatorially RdLi-commutative if  $D_{\Delta}^{\mathrm{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$  and  $\eta_{\Delta}^{\mathrm{R}}(\mathbb{I}_{\Delta'}^{\mathrm{L}}(\pi)) = \eta_{\Delta}^{\mathrm{R}}(\pi)$ . The notion of generalized GGP relevant pair in [Cha24d] is an extension of this notion to a multisegment version. Results in this article allow one to check the GGP relevance condition, and, for example, are practical to recover some classical known branching laws such as generic representations. While the algorithms in this article are sufficient to determine quotient branching law in finite processes, one can still improve the efficiency of determining quotient branching laws by incorporating the ideas in [Cha23]. We hope to address this elsewhere.

- (2) It is shown in [Cha23] and [Cha24a] that a sequence of derivatives of essentially square-integrable representations can be used to compute simple quotients of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives of irreducible representations. It is also shown in [Cha24a] that those simple quotients can be classified in terms of the highest derivative multisegment and removal process (see Section 2.3). As a consequence of our study, we also explain a simple algorithm to compute the highest derivative multisegment of an irreducible representation in Section 7, and hence provide an effective solution to that classification problem.
- (3) Using [CW25], one can also compute explicitly simple quotients and submodules of certain parabolically induced modules, and simple quotients of some translation functors for  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ . Those algebraic structures also have applications to branching laws. One may expect to obtain similar applications for  $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{R})$  via the Schur-Weyl duality constructed in [CT12].

*Acknowledgements.* Some of the results are announced in Tianyuan Conference on Real Reductive Groups and Theta Correspondence in August 2024. The authors would like to thank the organizers Zhang Lei, Ning Li, Jiajun Ma and Binyong Sun for their kind invitations. This project is supported in part by the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No: 17305223, 17308324 ) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Project No. 12322120).

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

Let  $F$  be a non-archimedean local field with normalized absolute value  $|\cdot|_F$ . For every integer  $n \geq 0$ , let  $G_n = \mathrm{GL}_n(F)$  be the general linear group over  $F$ , where  $G_0$  is considered as the trivial group. The character  $\nu_n : G_n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\times}$  is defined by  $\nu_n(g) = |\det(g)|_F$  for  $g \in G_n$ . For any integer  $n \geq 0$ , let  $\mathrm{Rep}(G_n)$  be the category of smooth complex representations of  $G_n$  of finite length and let  $\mathrm{Irr}(G_n)$  be the set of

irreducible objects of  $\text{Rep}(G_n)$  up to equivalence. For every integer  $n \geq 1$ , let  $\text{Irr}^c(G_n)$  be the set of irreducible supercuspidal representations of  $G_n$ . We set

$$\text{Irr} = \bigsqcup_{n \geq 0} \text{Irr}(G_n), \text{ and } \text{Irr}^c = \bigsqcup_{n \geq 1} \text{Irr}^c(G_n).$$

Let  $P = LN$  be a standard parabolic subgroup of  $G_n$ , where the Levi subgroup  $L$  is isomorphic to  $G_{n_1} \times \cdots \times G_{n_r}$  for some composition  $n = n_1 + \cdots + n_r$ . Let  $\pi_i$  be a smooth representation of  $G_{n_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq r$  and let  $\pi$  denote a smooth representation of  $G_n$ . The normalized parabolic-induced representation is denoted by

$$\pi_1 \times \cdots \times \pi_r = \text{Ind}_P^{G_n}(\pi_1 \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \pi_r),$$

and the normalized Jacquet module of  $\pi$  with respect to  $P$  is denoted by

$$\text{Jac}_N(\pi) = \frac{\delta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \pi}{\text{span}\{n \cdot v - v \mid n \in N, v \in \pi\}}.$$

For  $\pi \in \text{Rep}(G_n)$ , the socle of  $\pi$ , denoted by  $\text{soc}(\pi)$ , is the maximal semisimple subrepresentation of  $\pi$  and the cosocle of  $\pi$ , denoted by  $\text{cosoc}(\pi)$ , is the maximal semisimple quotient of  $\pi$ .

**2.1. Segments and multisegments.** We recall the notion of segments and multisegments introduced in [Zel80]. Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $b - a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and let  $\rho \in \text{Irr}^c(G_k)$ . A segment in the cuspidal line  $\rho$  is denoted either by a void set or by  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$ , which is essentially the set  $\{v^a \rho, v^{a+1} \rho, \dots, v^b \rho\}$  with the character  $v = v_k$ . The segment  $[a, a]_\rho$  is written as  $[a]_\rho$ . We denote  $\text{Seg}$  for the set of all segments and  $\text{Seg}_\rho$  for the set of segments in the cuspidal line  $\rho$ . We set  $[a, a - 1]_\rho = \emptyset$  for  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For a segment  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$ , the starting (or beginning) element  $v^a \rho$  is denoted by  $s(\Delta)$ , and the ending element  $v^b \rho$  is denoted by  $e(\Delta)$ . The relative length of  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$  is denoted by  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\Delta) = b - a + 1$ . By convention, the length of the void segment is 0. Two non-void segments  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta'$  are said to be linked if  $\Delta \not\subseteq \Delta'$ ,  $\Delta' \not\subseteq \Delta$  and  $\Delta \cup \Delta'$  remains a segment. If not, they are considered unlinked or not linked. For two linked segments  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$  and  $\Delta' = [a', b']_\rho$ ,  $\Delta$  is said to precede  $\Delta'$  if  $a < a'$ ,  $b < b'$  and  $a' \leq b + 1$ . If  $\Delta$  precedes  $\Delta'$ , we denote  $\Delta \prec \Delta'$ . If  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$  is a non-void segment, we define

$$\Delta^+ = [a, b + 1]_\rho, \Delta^- = [a, b - 1]_\rho, {}^+\Delta = [a - 1, b]_\rho, \text{ and } {}^-\Delta = [a + 1, b]_\rho$$

with the convention that  $\Delta^-$  and  ${}^-\Delta$  are void if  $a = b$ .

A multisegment, denoted as  $\mathfrak{m} = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r\}$ , a multiset of non-void segments and is represented as  $\mathfrak{m} = \Delta_1 + \cdots + \Delta_r$ . Let  $\text{Mult}$  be the set of all multisegments and  $\text{Mult}_\rho$  be the set of those multisegments consisting of segments in the cuspidal line  $\rho$ . The relative length of a multisegment  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  is defined by  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \sum_{\Delta \in \mathfrak{m}} \ell_{\text{rel}}(\Delta)$  and is 0 if  $\mathfrak{m}$  is void. For a multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}$ , the number of non-void segments in  $\mathfrak{m}$  is denoted by  $|\mathfrak{m}|$ . The support of a multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}$  is the multiset of integers obtained by taking the union (with multiplicities) of the segments in  $\mathfrak{m}$ . For two multisegments  $\mathfrak{m}, \mathfrak{m}' \in \text{Mult}$ , we write  $\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{m}'$  for the union  $\mathfrak{m}$  and  $\mathfrak{m}'$  counting multiplicities. For a segment  $\Delta$ , we set  $\mathfrak{m} + \Delta = \mathfrak{m} + \{\Delta\}$  if  $\Delta \neq \emptyset$ , and  $\mathfrak{m} + \Delta = \mathfrak{m}$  if  $\Delta = \emptyset$ . Similarly, we define  $\mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}'$  and  $\mathfrak{m} - \Delta$ .

For  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define,  $\mathfrak{m}[i] = \{[a, b]_\rho \in \mathfrak{m} \mid a = i\}$  and  $\mathfrak{m}\langle i \rangle = \{[a, b]_\rho \in \mathfrak{m} \mid b = i\}$ . For a multisegment  $\mathfrak{m} = \Delta_1 + \cdots + \Delta_r \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  (with all  $\Delta_i \neq \emptyset$ ), we define

$$\mathfrak{m}^+ = \Delta_1^+ + \cdots + \Delta_r^+ \text{ and } \mathfrak{m}^- = \Delta_1^- + \cdots + \Delta_r^-.$$

**2.2. Zelevinsky and Langlands classification.** Let  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$  be a segment for some  $\rho \in \text{Irr}^c$ . The normalized parabolic-induced representation  $v^a \rho \times v^{a+1} \rho \times \cdots \times v^b \rho$  has a unique irreducible submodule denoted by  $\langle \Delta \rangle = \text{soc}(v^a \rho \times v^{a+1} \rho \times \cdots \times v^b \rho)$ , and a unique irreducible quotient denoted by the generalized Steinberg representation

$$\text{St}(\Delta) = \text{cosoc}(v^a \rho \times v^{a+1} \rho \times \cdots \times v^b \rho).$$

**2.2.1. Zelevinsky classification.** Consider an ordered multisegment  $\mathfrak{m} = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \cdots + \Delta_r$  with  $\Delta_i \not\prec \Delta_j$  for  $i < j$ . Then, the normalized parabolic-induced representation  $\zeta(\mathfrak{m}) = \langle \Delta_1 \rangle \times \langle \Delta_2 \rangle \times \cdots \times \langle \Delta_r \rangle$  has a unique irreducible submodule, denoted by

$$Z(\mathfrak{m}) = \text{soc}(\zeta(\mathfrak{m})).$$

If  $\pi$  is any irreducible smooth representation of  $G_n$ , there exists a unique multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}$  such that  $\pi$  is isomorphic to  $Z(\mathfrak{m})$ .

**2.2.2. Langlands classification.** Consider an ordered multisegment  $\mathfrak{m} = \Delta_1 + \Delta_2 + \cdots + \Delta_r$  with  $\Delta_i \not\prec \Delta_j$  for  $i > j$ . We denote the unique irreducible subrepresentation of the normalized parabolic-induced representation  $\lambda(\mathfrak{m}) = \text{St}(\Delta_1) \times \text{St}(\Delta_2) \times \cdots \times \text{St}(\Delta_r)$  by

$$L(\mathfrak{m}) = \text{soc}(\lambda(\mathfrak{m})).$$

Again, for any irreducible smooth representation  $\pi$  of  $G_n$ , there exists a unique multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}$  such that  $\pi$  is isomorphic to  $L(\mathfrak{m})$ .

**2.2.3. Zelevinsky involution.** Let  $\mathcal{R}(G_n)$  be the Grothendieck group of  $\text{Rep}(G_n)$  and put  $\mathcal{R} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{R}(G_n)$ . The normalized parabolic induction gives a product map

$$\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{R} \longrightarrow \mathcal{R} \text{ defined by } ([\pi], [\pi']) \mapsto [\pi \times \pi'],$$

which transforms  $\mathcal{R}$  into a ring of polynomials in the indeterminates  $\langle \Delta \rangle$  (as well as  $\text{St}(\Delta)$ ) for  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . The map  $\iota : \text{Irr} \longrightarrow \text{Irr}$  defined by the involution  $\iota : \text{St}(\Delta) \mapsto \langle \Delta \rangle$  can be extended uniquely to a ring endomorphism  $\iota : \mathcal{R} \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}$ , such that  $\iota$  is an involution and for any multisegment  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$ , we have

$$\iota(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong L(\mathfrak{m}) \text{ and } \iota(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z(\mathfrak{m}).$$

In [MW86], Mœglin and Waldspurger provide an algorithm to compute a multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}^\#$  associate to each multisegment  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}$  such that

$$Z(\mathfrak{m}) \cong \iota(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong L(\mathfrak{m}^\#) \text{ and } L(\mathfrak{m}) \cong \iota(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z(\mathfrak{m}^\#).$$

2.2.4. *Gelfand-Kazhdan involution.* Let  $\theta : G_n \rightarrow G_n$  given by  $\theta(g) = g^{-T}$ , the inverse transpose of  $g$ . This induces a covariant auto-equivalence, still denoted by  $\theta$ , on  $\text{Rep}(G_n)$ . On the combinatorial side, we define  $\theta : \text{Seg}_\rho \rightarrow \text{Seg}_{\rho^\vee}$  given by  $\theta([a, b]_\rho) = [-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}$ . Define

$$\Theta : \text{Mult}_\rho \rightarrow \text{Mult}_{\rho^\vee}, \quad \Theta(\{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k\}) = \{\theta(\Delta_1), \dots, \theta(\Delta_k)\}.$$

Gelfand-Kazhdan showed that for  $\pi \in \text{Irr}$ ,  $\theta(\pi)$  is isomorphic to its smooth dual of  $\pi$ . In particular, we have:

$$\theta(L(\mathfrak{m})) = L(\Theta(\mathfrak{m})), \quad \theta(Z(\mathfrak{m})) = Z(\Theta(\mathfrak{m})).$$

Using the relation: for any  $\pi_1 \in \text{Rep}(G_{n_1})$  and  $\pi_2 \in \text{Rep}(G_{n_2})$ ,  $\theta(\pi_1 \times \pi_2) \cong \theta(\pi_2) \times \theta(\pi_1)$ , one can relate left and right integrals/derivatives as follows:

$$I_{[a, b]_\rho}^L(\theta(\pi)) \cong \theta\left(I_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^R(\pi)\right), \quad D_{[a, b]_\rho}^L(\theta(\pi)) \cong \theta\left(D_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^R(\pi)\right).$$

The above isomorphisms can be reformulated as: for  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ ,

$$(1) \quad I_{[a, b]_\rho}^L(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \theta(I_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^R(L(\Theta(\mathfrak{m})))), \quad D_{[a, b]_\rho}^L(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \theta(D_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^R(L(\Theta(\mathfrak{m}))))$$

$$(2) \quad I_{[a, b]_\rho}^L(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \theta(I_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^R(Z(\Theta(\mathfrak{m}))))), \quad D_{[a, b]_\rho}^L(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong \theta(D_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^R(Z(\Theta(\mathfrak{m}))))).$$

We shall use these later to deduce the algorithms from right derivatives/integrals to those for left derivatives/integrals.

2.2.5. *Representations along a fixed cuspidal line.* We fix a cuspidal representation  $\rho \in \text{Irr}^c$ . Define the set of irreducible representations along the  $\rho$ -line by

$$\text{Irr}_\rho = \{\pi \in \text{Irr} \mid \pi = L(\mathfrak{m}) \text{ for some } \mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho\}.$$

In other words,  $\text{Irr}_\rho$  consists of the elements of  $\text{Irr}$  which are an irreducible quotient of  $v^{a_1}\rho \times v^{a_2}\rho \times \dots \times v^{a_r}\rho$ , for some integers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_r$ . According to Zelevinsky [Zel80], it is most interesting to study the parabolic inductions and Jacquet modules for representations in  $\text{Irr}_\rho$  for a fixed supercuspidal representation  $\rho$ . The general case of our results can be deduced from this.

**2.3. Highest derivative multisegment and removal process.** Fix an integer  $c$ . Let  $\Delta = [c, d]_\rho$ , and  $\Delta' = [c, d']_\rho$  be non-void segments. We define the ordering  $\Delta \leq_c^a \Delta'$  if  $d \leq d'$ . A multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}$  is said to be at the point  $v^c\rho$  if every non-empty segment of  $\mathfrak{m}$  is of the form  $[c, d]_\rho$  for some  $d \geq c$ . For  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$ , there exists a unique  $\leq_c^a$ -maximal multisegment  $\mathfrak{h}_c$  at the point  $v^c\rho$  such that  $D_{\mathfrak{h}_c}^R(\pi) \neq 0$  (see [Cha24a] for the notion  $D_{\mathfrak{h}_c}^R$ ). The highest derivative multisegment of  $\pi$  is defined by  $\mathfrak{h}\partial(\pi) = \sum_{c \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{h}_c$ . In [Cha24a, Cha24c], the first-named author shows that  $D_{\mathfrak{h}\partial(\pi)}^R(\pi) = \pi^-$  the highest Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivative of  $\pi$ , and for any  $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ , there exists  $\sigma \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  such that  $\mathfrak{h}\partial(\sigma) = \mathfrak{n}$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** [Cha24a, Corollary 9.5] *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  and let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then  $D_{[a, b]_\rho}^R(\pi) \neq 0$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{h}\partial(\pi)$  contains a segment of the form  $[a, c]_\rho$  for some  $c \geq b$ .*

To provide a proof of Lemmas 3.5, 3.7 and 3.9 later, we have utilized a combinatorial removal process, denoted as  $\tau(\Delta, \pi)$ , and the first segment of the process, denoted as  $Y(\Delta, \pi)$  for a segment  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  satisfying  $\varepsilon_\Delta^R(\pi) \neq 0$ . We also utilized the derivative resultant multisegment, denoted as  $\tau(\mathfrak{n}, \pi)$ , for a multisegment  $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  that is admissible to  $\pi$ . For further details, we refer to Section 8 in [Cha24a], and we only mention few properties we frequently need:

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then the following holds:*

- (i)  $Y([a]_\rho, \pi) \in \mathfrak{hd}(\pi)[a]$ ; and
- (ii)  $\tau([a]_\rho, \pi) = \mathfrak{hd}(\pi) - Y([a]_\rho, \pi) + {}^-Y([a]_\rho, \pi)$ .

*Proof.* This follows directly from the definition of the removal process in [Cha24a, Definition 8.2].  $\square$

The relation to derivatives is the following:

**Lemma 2.3.** [Cha24a, Theorem 9.3] *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then, for any  $c \geq a$ ,*

$$\mathfrak{hd}(\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(\pi))[c] = \tau([a, b]_\rho, \pi)[c].$$

### 3. DERIVATIVES IN LANGLANDS CLASSIFICATION

In this section, we introduce an algorithm to calculate the derivatives of the irreducible representations of  $\text{GL}_n(F)$ , wherein the representations are expressed in terms of Langlands data. The algorithm of Jantzen and Mínguez serves as the initial step in an inductive argument to validate the Algorithm 3.3.

**3.1. Algorithm for  $\rho$ -derivatives.** We first state an algorithm for computing the right  $\rho$ -derivative of an irreducible representation in Langlands classification, which is already obtained in [Jan07, Min09, LM16] in different words/terminology.

*t $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{s}$ -process:* To illustrate an algorithm for the  $\rho$ -derivative, we initially propose a removal process (abbreviated as the *t $\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{s}$ -process*) for two linked segments in  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  for a fixed integer  $c$ . This process is executed through the following steps:

- (i) Select the longest segment  $\Delta''$  from  $\mathfrak{m}[c+1]$ .
- (ii) Choose the longest segment  $\Delta'$  from  $\mathfrak{m}[c]$  such that  $\Delta'$  precedes  $\Delta''$ .
- (iii) If both  $\Delta'$  and  $\Delta''$  exist, remove them to define a new multisegment as  $\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}, c) = \mathfrak{m} - \Delta' - \Delta''$ .

We say that the segment  $\Delta'$  (resp.  $\Delta''$ ) participates in the  $\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{s}(-, c)$  process on  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

**Algorithm 3.1** (Right  $v^a\rho$ -derivative). *Suppose  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Define a new multisegment  $\mathcal{D}_{v^a\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{m})$  by the following steps:*

*Step 1.* Set  $\mathfrak{m}_0 = \mathfrak{m}$  and recursively define  $\mathfrak{m}_i = \mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}_{i-1}, a)$  until the process terminates. Suppose this  $\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{d}\mathfrak{s}(-, a)$  process terminates after  $k$  times and the final multisegment is  $\mathfrak{m}_k$ .

*Step 2.* Choose the shortest segment  $\Delta_* \in \mathfrak{m}_k[a]$  and define the multisegment

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{D}_{v^a\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{m}) := \mathfrak{m} - \Delta_* + {}^- \Delta_*.$$

*If such segment  $\Delta_*$  does not exist, we write  $\mathcal{D}_{v^a\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{m}) := \infty$ .*



**Example 1.** Let  $\mathbf{m} = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [1, 5]_\rho, [1, 4]_\rho, [1, 3]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$  and  $a = 1$ . Then  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \text{t}\partial\mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{m}, 1) = \mathbf{m} - [1, 4]_\rho - [2, 5]_\rho$ , and  $\mathbf{m}_2 = \text{t}\partial\mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{m}_1, 1) = \mathbf{m}_1 - [1, 2]_\rho - [2, 3]_\rho$ . The  $\text{t}\partial\mathfrak{s}(-, 1)$  process terminates on  $\mathbf{m}_2$ , and  $[1, 3]_\rho$  is the shortest segment in  $\mathbf{m}_2[1] = \{[1, 5]_\rho, [1, 3]_\rho\}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\mathcal{D}_{[1]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} - [1, 3]_\rho + [2, 3]_\rho = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [1, 5]_\rho, [1, 4]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}.$$

**Theorem 3.2.** (cf. [Jan07, Theorem 2.2.1], [Min09, Théorème 7.5]) Suppose  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then, the right  $\nu^a \rho$ -derivative of  $L(\mathbf{m})$ :

$$D_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) \cong \begin{cases} L\left(\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{m})\right) & \text{if } \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**3.2. Algorithm for St-derivatives.** To establish an algorithm for derivatives, we need to define the following upward sequence of maximally linked segments to arrange the segments of the multisegment corresponding to the given irreducible representation.

*Upward sequence  $\underline{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{s}$ :* We define the upward sequence of maximally linked segments with the smallest starting in a multisegment  $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  as follows: identify the smallest number  $a_1$  for which  $\mathbf{n}[a_1] \neq \emptyset$  and choose the longest segment  $\Delta_1 \in \mathbf{n}[a_1]$ . Recursively for  $j \geq 2$ , find the smallest number  $a_j$  (if it exists) such that  $a_{j-1} \lesssim a_j$  and there exists a segment  $\Delta'_j \in \mathbf{n}[a_j]$  with  $\Delta_{j-1} \prec \Delta'_j$ . Then, we pick a longest segment  $\Delta_j \in \mathbf{n}[a_j]$  such that  $\Delta_{j-1} \prec \Delta_j$ . This process terminates after a finite number of steps, say  $r$ , and  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_r$  are obtained in this process. We then define

$$\underline{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{n}) = \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_r\}.$$

**Algorithm 3.3.** Given  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ , we consider the multisegment

$$\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m}_{[a, b]} = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathbf{m} \mid a \leq a' \leq b + 1 \leq b' + 1\}.$$

*Step 1. (Arrange upward sequences):* Let  $\underline{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{m}_1) = \{\Delta_{1,1}, \Delta_{1,2}, \dots, \Delta_{1,r_1}\}$  be the upward sequence of maximally linked segments on  $\mathbf{m}_1$  with  $\Delta_{1,j} \prec \Delta_{1,j+1}$ . Recursively for  $2 \leq i \leq k$ , we define  $\mathbf{m}_i = \mathbf{m}_{i-1} - \underline{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{m}_{i-1})$  and the corresponding upward sequence by

$$\underline{\mathfrak{L}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{m}_i) = \{\Delta_{i,1}, \Delta_{i,2}, \dots, \Delta_{i,r_i}\} \text{ with } \Delta_{i,j} \prec \Delta_{i,j+1},$$

such that  $k$  is the smallest integer for which  $\mathbf{m}_{k+1} = \emptyset$ .

*Step 2. (Removable free points):* Denote  $\Delta_{i,j} = [a_{i,j}, b_{i,j}]_\rho$ . We define the ‘removable free’ section for the segment  $\Delta_{i,j}$  for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$  as:

$$(4) \quad \text{rf}(\Delta_{i,j}) = \begin{cases} [a_{i,j}, a_{i,j+1} - 2]_\rho & \text{if } 1 \leq j < r_i \\ \Delta_{i,r_i} & \text{if } j = r_i. \end{cases}$$

Here,  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{i,j}) = \emptyset$  if  $a_{i,j} > a_{i,j+1} - 2$ . For  $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we call  $[y]_\rho$  a ‘removable free point’ of  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{i,j}) = [x, z]_\rho$  if  $x \leq y \leq z$ .

*Step 3. (Selection):* We then select some segments  $\Delta_{i,j}$  (if they exist), whose removable free points cover  $[a, b]_\rho$  in the following way.

- (i) Choose a segment  $\Delta_{i_1, j_1} \in \mathbf{m}_1$  (if it exists) where  $i_1$  is the largest integer in  $\{1, \dots, k\}$  for some  $j_1 \in \{1, \dots, r_{i_1}\}$  such that  $[a_{i_1, j_1}, b]_\rho \subseteq \text{rf}(\Delta_{i_1, j_1})$ .

(ii) Recursively for  $t \geq 2$ , Choose a segment  $\Delta_{i_t, j_t} \in \mathfrak{m}_1$  (if it exists), where  $i_t$  is the largest integer in  $\{1, \dots, i_{t-1}\}$  such that

$$(5) \quad [a_{i_t, j_t}, a_{i_{t-1}, j_{t-1}} - 1]_\rho \subseteq \mathfrak{rf}(\Delta_{i_t, j_t}).$$

(iii) This process terminates (when no further such segment can be found) after a finite number of steps and suppose  $\Delta_{i_\ell, j_\ell}$  is the last segment of the process.

Step 4. (Truncation): If  $a_{i_\ell, j_\ell} = a$ , we define new left truncated segments as follows:

$$\Delta_{i_1, j_1}^{\text{trc}} = [b + 1, b_{i_1, j_1}]_\rho, \text{ and } \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} = [a_{i_{t-1}, j_{t-1}}, b_{i_t, j_t}]_\rho \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq \ell.$$

As convention,  $[c, c - 1]_\rho = \emptyset$ . Then, the right derivative multisegment in Langlands classification is defined by

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}}.$$

We shall call those segments  $\Delta_{i_1, j_1}, \dots, \Delta_{i_\ell, j_\ell}$  participate in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ .



Step 4'. If  $a_{i_\ell, j_\ell} \neq a$ , we write

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty.$$


Remark 1. Note that  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{m})$  for any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . We use the algorithm of  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{m})$  to get  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  without mentioning it further.

**Example 2.** Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \{[0, 5]_\rho, [0, 4]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$ . Then, we have the following  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  for various  $\Delta$ :



(i) Suppose  $\Delta = [0, 2]_\rho$ . Then,  $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_{[0, 2]} = \mathfrak{m}$  with  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_1) = \{[0, 5]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho\}$ :



$\mathfrak{m}_2 = \mathfrak{m}_1 - \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_1) = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$  with  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_2) = \{[0, 4]_\rho\}$ :





and  $\mathfrak{m}_3 = \mathfrak{m}_2 - \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_2) = \{[1, 2]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$  with  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_3) = \{[1, 2]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$ :




The blue and red points in the graphs represent the removable free points of the segments and the red points in the graphs represent the free points to be removed to get the derivative  $\mathcal{D}_{[0, 2]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \{[0, 5]_\rho, [2, 4]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho, [3]_\rho\}$ .


(ii) Suppose  $\Delta = [0, 3]_\rho$ . Then  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m}_{[0,3]} = \{[0, 5]_\rho, [0, 4]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$  with  $\underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_1) = \{[0, 5]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho\}$ :



$\mathbf{m}_2 = \mathbf{m}_1 - \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_1) = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$  with  $\underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_2) = \{[0, 4]_\rho\}$ :



and  $\mathbf{m}_3 = \mathbf{m}_2 - \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_2) = \{[2, 3]_\rho\}$  with  $\underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_3) = \{[2, 3]_\rho\}$ :



The blue and red points in the graphs represent the removable free points of the segments and the red points in the graphs represent the free points to be removed to get the derivative  $\mathcal{D}_{[0,3]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \{[0, 5]_\rho, [2, 4]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho\}$ .

(iii) Let  $\Delta = [0, 5]_\rho$ . Then,  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m}_{[0,5]} = \{[0, 5]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho\} = \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_1)$ . Here,  $[1]_\rho$  is not a removable free point of any segment in  $\underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_1)$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{D}_{[0,5]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$ .

### 3.3. Composition of $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ .

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  with  $b > a$ . Suppose  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) = 1$ .*

- (i) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\varepsilon_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}).$$

*Proof.* Let's assume all the notations as mentioned in Algorithm 3.3 applied for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ . We fix an integer  $k_0$  with  $1 \leq k_0 \leq k$  such that  $a_{i,1} = a$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k_0$  and  $a_{i,1} \neq a$  for  $i \geq k_0 + 1$ .

- (i) As  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$  with  $[a]_\rho \subset \text{rf}(\Delta_{i_\ell,1})$  and  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) = 1$ , we have

$$\mathbf{n} = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} - \Delta_{i_\ell,1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}.$$

We denote  $\mathbf{n}_1 = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathbf{n} \mid a + 1 \leq a' \leq b + 1 \leq b' + 1\} = \mathbf{m}_1 - \mathbf{m}_1[a] + {}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$ . For  $i > 1$ , define  $\mathbf{n}_i = \mathbf{n}_{i-1} - \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{n}_{i-1})$ . Then, for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , it can be observed that

$$(7) \quad \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{n}_i) = \begin{cases} \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_i) - \Delta_{i,1} & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq k_0 \text{ and } i \neq i_\ell \\ \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_i) - \Delta_{i,1} + {}^-\Delta_{i,1} & \text{if } i = i_\ell \\ \underline{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{m}_i) & \text{if } k_0 + 1 \leq i \leq k. \end{cases}$$

as  $a_{i,2} = a + 1$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k_0$  except  $i = i_\ell$ .

By (4) and (7), one sees that the segments participating in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})$  and for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$  agree except that

- (a)  $\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$  participates in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ ;
- (b)  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$  participates in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})$  if and only if any segment participating in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$  does not start with  $\nu^{a+1}\rho$ . For the only if direction, if a segment starting with  $\nu^{a+1}\rho$ , participates in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ , that segment is  $\Delta_{i_{\ell-1}}$ , and then, the fact  $i_\ell < i_{\ell-1}$  and (7) ensure that  $\Delta_{i_{\ell-1}}$  also participates in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})$ . For the if direction, as

$$\text{rf}({}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}) \cup \{\nu^a\rho\} = \text{rf}(\Delta_{i_\ell,1}),$$

where the first  $\text{rf}$  is considered for  $\mathbf{n}$  and the second  $\text{rf}$  is considered for  $\mathbf{m}$ . Since  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{i_\ell,1})$  (considered for  $\mathbf{m}$ ) satisfies the condition (5),  $\text{rf}({}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1})$  (considered for  $\mathbf{n}$ ) also satisfies the condition (5) i.e.  $[a+1, a_{i_{\ell-1}j_{\ell-1}} - 1]_\rho \subset \text{rf}({}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1})$ . Now, if  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$  does not participate in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})$ , then one can choose an index greater than  $i_\ell$  for the last segment in the algorithm for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})$ . One sees that segment will then also participate in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ .

We divide it into two cases.

- Case 1:  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$  participates in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})$ . If we shorten the segment  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$  by removing  $[a+1, a_{i_{\ell-1}j_{\ell-1}} - 1]_\rho$  from the left, the remaining part is  $({}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1})^{\text{trc}} = \Delta_{i_\ell,1}^{\text{trc}}$ . In this case, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) &= \mathbf{n} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} - {}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} + ({}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1})^{\text{trc}} \\ &= \mathbf{m} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}). \end{aligned}$$

- Case 2:  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$  does not participate in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})$ . Then  $\Delta_{i_\ell,1}^{\text{trc}} = {}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1}$ . In this case, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) &= \mathbf{n} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} \\ &= \mathbf{m} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + {}^-\Delta_{i_\ell,1} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) We denote  $\mathbf{n} = \mathcal{D}_{[a]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} - \Delta_* + {}^-\Delta_*$ , for some  $\Delta_* \in \mathbf{m}[a]$ . As  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\Delta_* \in \mathbf{m}_1$ , say  $\Delta_* = \Delta_{i_*,1}$  for some  $1 \leq i_* \leq k_0$  with  $a_{i_*,2} \geq a+2$  and hence  $\nu^a\rho \in \text{rf}(\Delta_*)$  (considered for  $\mathbf{m}$ ).

As  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) = 1$ , we have

$$(8) \quad a_{i,2} = a + 1 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k_0 \text{ except } i = i_*,$$

and as  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ , we have

$$(9) \quad a_{i,3} = a + 2 \text{ for all } i < i_*,$$

and so  $\nu^{a+1}\rho \notin \text{rf}(\Delta_{i,2})$  for all  $i < i_*$ . The rest of the arguments are similar to the proof of assertion (i) if we replace  $i_\ell$  by  $i_*$  and replace the fact  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$  by  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{n}) \neq \infty$  and (9).  $\square$

**Lemma 3.5.** *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  with  $a < b$ . Suppose  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) = 1$ . Then,*

- (i) *If  $\varepsilon_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \cong \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi)$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\varepsilon_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \cong \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi).$$

*Proof.* (i) As  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) = 1$ , there is exactly one segment in  $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi)[a]$ . Moreover, by Lemma 2.1, there exists at least one segment  $[a, c]_\rho \in \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi)[a]$  such that  $c \geq b$  because  $\varepsilon_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ . Therefore,  $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi)[a] = \{[a, c]_\rho\}$ . Then,  $[a, b]_\rho$  (as well as  $[a]_\rho$ ) is a nonempty segment admissible to  $\pi$ , and the first segment (in this situation, the only segment) in the removal sequence is  $Y([a, b]_\rho, \pi) = Y([a]_\rho, \pi) = [a, c]_\rho$ . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{r}([a]_\rho, \pi) &= \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi) - [a, c]_\rho + [a + 1, c]_\rho \\ &= \mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi) - \{Y([a, b]_\rho, \pi)\} + \{-Y([a, b]_\rho, \pi)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using [Cha24a, Lemma 8.7 and Definition 8.13] we get,

$$\mathfrak{r}([a, b]_\rho, \pi) = \mathfrak{r}([a + 1, b]_\rho, \mathfrak{r}([a]_\rho, \pi)) = \mathfrak{r}(\{[a + 1, b]_\rho, [a]_\rho\}, \pi).$$

By [Cha24a, Theorem 10.2], we conclude that  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \cong \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi)$ .

(ii) As  $\varepsilon_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) = 0$ , Lemma 2.1 implies that  $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi)[a + 1] = \emptyset$ . On the other hand,  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$  and so Lemma 2.1 implies that  $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi))$  has a segment of the form  $[a + 1, d]_\rho$  for some  $d \geq b$ . Now, by Lemma 2.3 and  $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi)[a + 1] = \emptyset$ , we have  $\mathfrak{r}([a]_\rho, \pi)[a + 1] = \{[a + 1, d]_\rho\}$ . Then, since  $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi)[a + 1] = \emptyset$ ,  $\mathfrak{h}\mathfrak{d}(\pi)$  must contain the segment  $[a, d]_\rho$ , in order to produce the segment  $[a + 1, d]_\rho$  in  $\mathfrak{r}([a]_\rho, \pi)$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$  by Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

### 3.4. Commutativity of $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ .

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Suppose  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \geq 2$ .*

- (i) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Let's assume all the notations as mentioned in Algorithm 3.3. We fix an integer  $k_0$  with  $1 \leq k_0 \leq k$  such that

$$a_{i,1} = a \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq k_0 \text{ and } a_{i,1} \neq a \text{ for } i \geq k_0 + 1.$$

There exists  $\Delta_a \in \mathfrak{m}[a]$  such that  $\mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \Delta_a + {}^-\Delta_a$ . Consider the multi-segment  $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{n} \mid a \leq a' \leq b + 1 \leq b' + 1\}$ . Recursively for  $i > 1$ , we set  $\mathfrak{n}_i = \mathfrak{n}_{i-1} - \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_{i-1})$ . If  $\Delta_a \notin \mathfrak{m}_1$ , we have  $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_1$  and when  $a_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}} = a + 1$ , the segment  ${}^-\Delta_{i_{\ell}, 1}$  replaces  $\Delta_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}}$  to participate in the removal steps of the  $\text{tds}(-, a)$  process on  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ , whereas  $\Delta_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}}$  participates in the removal steps of the  $\text{tds}(-, a)$  process on  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Therefore, if  $\Delta_a \notin \mathfrak{m}_1$ , both the assertions (i) and (ii) hold. Hence, for the remainder of this proof, we assume that  $\Delta_a \in \mathfrak{m}_1$ . Then,  $\Delta_a = \Delta_{i_*, 1}$  for some  $1 \leq i_* \leq k_0$ . It can be easily observed that

$$(10) \quad \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_i) = \begin{cases} \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) & \text{if } 1 \leq i < i_* \text{ or } k_0 + 1 \leq i \leq k \\ \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) - \Delta_{i,1} + {}^-\Delta_{i,1} + \Delta_{i+1,1} & \text{if } i = i_* \text{ and } i + 1 \leq k_0 \\ \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) - \Delta_{i,1} + {}^-\Delta_{i,1} & \text{if } i = i_* = k_0 \\ \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) - \Delta_{i,1} + \Delta_{i+1,1} & \text{if } i_* < i < k_0 \\ \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) - \Delta_{i,1} & \text{if } i_* < i = k_0, \end{cases}$$

as well as, if  $\text{rf}({}^-\Delta_{i,1})$  (resp.  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{i+1,1})$ ) represents the removable free part of the segment  ${}^-\Delta_{i,1}$  (resp.  $\Delta_{i+1,1}$ ) considered in  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_i)$ , we have

$$(11) \quad \text{rf}({}^-\Delta_{i,1}) \cup v^a \rho = \text{rf}(\Delta_{i,1}) \text{ and } \text{rf}(\Delta_{i+1,1}) \subseteq \text{rf}(\Delta_{i,1}),$$

where  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{i,1})$  represents the removable free part of  $\Delta_{i,1}$  considered in  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i)$ .

(i) Suppose  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} \neq \infty$  as in Algorithm 3.3. As  $[a]_\rho \subset \text{rf}(\Delta_{i_\ell, 1})$ , we have  $i_* \geq i_\ell$ . Further, as  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \geq 2$ , there exists largest integer  $1 \leq i_{**} < i_\ell$  such that

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{i_{**}, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} \text{ if } i_* = i_\ell.$$

Therefore, if  $i_* = i_\ell$ , we have  $v^a \rho \in \text{rf}(\Delta_{i_{**}, 1})$  where  $\text{rf}$  is considered both in  $\mathfrak{m}$  and  $\mathfrak{n}$ .

If we shorten the segment  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1}$  by removing  $[a + 1, a_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}} - 1]_\rho$  from left, the remaining part is  $({}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1})^{\text{trc}} = \Delta_{i_\ell, 1}^{\text{trc}}$ . Therefore, using (10),  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} + \begin{cases} -{}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1} + ({}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1})^{\text{trc}} - \Delta_{i_{**}, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} & \text{if } i_* = i_\ell, \\ -\Delta_{i_\ell, 1} + \Delta_{i_\ell, 1}^{\text{trc}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} + \begin{cases} -\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} & \text{if } i_* = i_\ell, \\ -\Delta_{i_*, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_*, 1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) + \begin{cases} -\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} & \text{if } i_* = i_\ell, \\ -\Delta_{i_*, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_*, 1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

If  $i_* > i_\ell$  and  $a_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}} = a + 1$ , we have  $i_* > i_{\ell-1}$  and the segment  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1}$  replaces  $\Delta_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}}$  to participate in the removal step of the  $\text{tds}(-, a)$  process on  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ ,

whereas  $\Delta_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}}$  participate in the removal step of the  $\text{tds}(-, a)$  process on  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Otherwise the  $\text{tds}(-, a)$  process on both  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $\mathfrak{m}$  removes same set of segments starting with  $\nu^a \rho$  and  $\nu^{a+1} \rho$ . Hence, using (10),

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) + \begin{cases} -\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_{**}, 1} & \text{if } i_* = i_\ell, \\ -\Delta_{i_*, 1} + {}^-\Delta_{i_*, 1} & \text{if } i_* > i_\ell. \end{cases}$$

(ii) Suppose  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ . Then, by (10) and (11), we can conclude that  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Suppose  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \geq 2$ . Then,*

- (i) *If  $\varepsilon_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \cong \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ , we have  $\varepsilon_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* (i) The commutativity part follows from [Cha24a, Lemma 4.4], and the non-zero part follows from [Cha24a, Proposition 5.5].

(ii) As  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a, a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ , it follows from Lemma 2.1 that  $\text{hd}(\mathcal{D}_{[a, a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi))$  contains a segment of the form  $[a, c]_\rho$  for some  $c \geq b$ . Now Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3 imply  $\text{hd}(\pi)$  has the segment  $[a, c]_\rho$ , and so  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$  by Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

### 3.5. Commutativity of $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ .

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  with  $a < b$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ . Then,*

- (i) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Assume all the notations as mentioned in Algorithm 3.3. We fix integers  $k', k''$  with  $1 \leq k' < k'' \leq k$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{i,1} &= \begin{cases} a & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq k' \\ a+1 & \text{if } k'+1 \leq i \leq k'' \end{cases}, \text{ where } a_{i,1} \neq a+1 \text{ for } i \geq k''+1, \\ a_{i,2} &= a+1 & \text{if } i \in \{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_s\} \text{ with } 1 \leq \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots < \lambda_s \leq k' \\ a_{i,2} &\neq a+1 & \text{if } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k'\} \setminus \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s\}. \end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , there exists a segment  $\Delta_{a+1} \in \mathfrak{m}[a+1]$  such that

$$\mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \Delta_{a+1} + {}^-\Delta_{a+1}.$$

We denote  $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{n} \mid a \leq a' \leq b+1 \leq b'+1\}$ . Recursively for  $i > 1$ , we set  $\mathfrak{n}_i = \mathfrak{n}_{i-1} - \underline{\text{Us}}(\mathfrak{n}_{i-1})$ . If  $\Delta_{a+1} \notin \mathfrak{m}_1$ , we have  $e(\Delta_{a+1}) < b$  and  $\mathfrak{n}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_1$ . Consequently, it can be easily observed that both statements (i) and (ii) are valid. For the remainder of this proof, we assume that  $\Delta_{a+1} \in \mathfrak{m}_1$ . Then, we have  $\Delta_{a+1} = \Delta_{i_*, j_*}$ , where either  $k'+1 \leq i_* \leq k''$  and  $j_* = 1$ , or  $i_* \in \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_s\}$  and  $j_* = 2$ . Observe that

$$(12) \quad \underline{\text{Us}}(\mathfrak{n}_i) = \underline{\text{Us}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq i_* - 1.$$

Let's denote  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i)[a+1] = \{\Delta'_i\}$  and  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i)[a+2] = \{\Delta''_i\}$ . Then, we can observe

$$(13) \quad \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_{i_*}) = \begin{cases} \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_{i_*}) - \Delta_{i_*,j_*} + {}^-\Delta_{i_*,j_*} + \Delta'_{i_*+1} & \text{if } j_* = 1 \text{ \& } \Delta'_{i_*+1} \neq \emptyset \\ \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_{i_*}) - \Delta_{i_*,j_*} + {}^-\Delta_{i_*,j_*} + \Delta'_{i_*+1} & \text{if } j_* = 2 \text{ \& } \Delta_{i_*,1} \prec \Delta'_{i_*+1} \neq \emptyset \\ \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_{i_*}) - \Delta_{i_*,j_*} + {}^-\Delta_{i_*,j_*} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Recursively for  $i_* + 1 \leq i \leq k$ , there exists  $k'_0$  with  $i_* + 1 \leq k'_0 \leq k'' + 1$  such that

$$(14) \quad \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_i) = \begin{cases} \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) - \Delta'_i + \Delta'_{i+1} & \text{if } i < k'_0 \\ \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i) & \text{if } i \geq k'_0, \end{cases}$$

and  $[a+1]_\rho$  is not an element of  $\text{rf}(\Delta'_{i+1})$  considered in  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_i)$ . In particular, when  $j_* = 1$ , we find that  $k'_0 = k'' + 1$ .

(i) We recall Algorithm 3.3 where  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}}$ . Let's assume the  $i_* = i_{\ell-1}$ . Then,  $\Delta_{i_*, j_*} = \Delta_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}} = [a+1, b_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}}]_\rho$ . As  $a_{i_\ell, 2} \geq a+2$  and  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i)[a+1] \neq \emptyset$  for  $i_\ell + 1 \leq i \leq i_{\ell-1}$ , we have two scenarios. In the first one, there exists a non-void segment  $\Delta'_i$  for some  $i_\ell + 1 \leq i < i_{\ell-1}$  such that  $[a+1]_\rho \subseteq \text{rf}(\Delta'_i)$  considered in  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_i)$ . In this case, we set  $i_{**}$  for the largest possible  $i$  where such  $\Delta'_i$  exists. In the second scenario, we have  $a_{i_\ell, 2} \geq a+3$  and we set  $i_{**} = i_\ell$ . Then, using (13), (14), and Algorithm 3.3, we can deduce  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathfrak{n} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-2} \Delta_{i_t, j_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell-1} \Delta_{i_t, j_t}^{\text{trc}} - \Delta_{i_{\ell-1}, j_{\ell-1}} + \begin{cases} -\Delta'_{i_{**}} - \Delta'_{i_{**}} - \Delta_{i_\ell, j_\ell} + {}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, j_\ell} & \text{if } i_{**} > i_\ell \\ -\Delta_{i_\ell, j_\ell} + [a+2, b_{i_\ell, j_\ell}]_\rho & \text{if } i_{**} = i_\ell, \end{cases} \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) + \begin{cases} -\Delta'_{i_{**}} - \Delta'_{i_{**}} & \text{if } i_{**} > i_\ell \\ -\Delta_{i_\ell, j_\ell}^{\text{trc}} + [a+2, b_{i_\ell, j_\ell}]_\rho & \text{if } i_{**} = i_\ell. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Now  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  cannot take the form of  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta'_i + {}^-\Delta'_i$  for any  $i \geq i_{\ell-1}$ , since  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \Delta'_{i_{\ell-1}} + {}^-\Delta'_{i_{\ell-1}}$ , and  $\Delta'_{i_{\ell-1}} \notin \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ . Therefore, for  $i \geq i_{\ell-1}$ , the segment  $\Delta'_i$  participates in certain removable steps of the  $\text{tds}(-, a+1)$  process, which is applied repeatedly on  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  until it terminates. If  $i_{**} > i_\ell$ , the segment  $\Delta'_{i_{**}}$  does not participate in the removable step of the  $\text{tds}(-, a+1)$  process applied several times (until it terminates) on  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$  because  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1} \in \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})[a+1]$  and for  $i_\ell < i < i_{**}$ , the pair  $(\Delta'_i, \Delta''_i)$  participates in the same removable step of the  $\text{tds}(-, a+1)$  process applied several times (until it terminates) on  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta'_{i_{**}} + {}^-\Delta'_{i_{**}} = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}).$$

If  $i_{**} = i_\ell$ , we have  ${}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1} \in \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})[a+1]$  with  $a_{i_\ell, 2} \geq a+3$  and hence

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) - {}^-\Delta_{i_\ell, 1} + {}^-(\Delta_{i_\ell, 1}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}).$$



Similarly, for  $i_* \neq i_{\ell-1}$ , it is easier to show that (i) holds as the operators  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$  affect on two disjoint subsets of segments in  $\mathfrak{m}$ . We omit the proof.

(ii) Put  $\mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ . We denote  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_p) = \left\{ \hat{\Delta}_{p,q} = [A_{p,q}, B_{p,q}]_\rho \mid 1 \leq q \leq s_q \right\}$  with  $\hat{\Delta}_{p,q} \prec \hat{\Delta}_{p,q+1}$ . As  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{n}) \neq \infty$ , there must exist a segment  $\hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t} \in \underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_{p_t})$  for  $1 \leq t \leq v$  such that

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{n}) = \mathfrak{n} - \sum_{t=1}^v \hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t} + \sum_{t=1}^v \hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t}^{\text{trc}}$$

where  $1 \leq p_v < p_{v-1} < \dots < p_1 \leq k$ . Let  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{p,q})$  (resp.  $\text{rf}(\hat{\Delta}_{p,q})$ ) be the removable free part of  $\Delta_{p,q}$  (resp.  $\hat{\Delta}_{p,q}$ ) considered in the sequence  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{m}_p)$  (resp.  $\underline{\mathfrak{Ls}}(\mathfrak{n}_p)$ ). From equations (12), (13), and (14), if  $1 \leq t \leq v-3$ , we have  $\hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t} = \Delta_{p_t, q_t}$  with  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{p_t, q_t}) = \text{rf}(\hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t})$  and for  $t = v-1, v-2$ , the segment  $\hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t}$  is either  $\Delta_{p_t, q_t}$  or  $-\Delta_{i_*}$  with  $\text{rf}(\hat{\Delta}_{p_{v-1}, q_{v-1}}) \subseteq \text{rf}(\Delta_{p_{v-1}, q_{v-1}})$ . As  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \Delta'_{i_*} + -\Delta'_{i_*}$ , we get  $p_v \neq i_*, k'_0 - 1$  and from (14), we deduce  $p_v \notin \{i_* + 1, \dots, k'_0 - 2\}$ . Further, when  $p_v < i_*$ , or  $p_v \geq k'_0$ , using (12) we get  $\hat{\Delta}_{p_v, q_v} = \Delta_{p_v, q_v}$  with  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{p_v, q_v}) = \text{rf}(\hat{\Delta}_{p_v, q_v})$ . Therefore,  $\text{rf}(\hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t}) \subseteq \text{rf}(\Delta_{p_t, q_t})$  for all  $1 \leq t \leq v$ . As the segment  $[a, b]_\rho$  is covered by the free parts  $\{\text{rf}(\hat{\Delta}_{p_t, q_t}) \mid 1 \leq t \leq v\}$ , so it is also covered by the free parts  $\{\text{rf}(\Delta_{p_t, q_t}) \mid 1 \leq t \leq v\}$ . Hence, we conclude  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  with  $a < b$  and  $\varepsilon_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ .*

- (i) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \cong \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0$ .*

*Proof.* (i) The commutativity part follows from [Cha24a, Lemma 4.4]. The non-zerosness part follows from the third bullet of [Cha24a, Theorem 9.3].

(ii) One can argue similarly as in the proof of Lemma 3.5(ii) by using properties of removal process in Section 2.3. We omit the details.  $\square$

### 3.6. Main results.

**Theorem 3.10.** *Let  $\pi = L(\mathfrak{m})$  for some  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then,*

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty \text{ if and only if } \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \neq 0.$$

*Proof.* We prove the result by induction on  $\ell_{\text{rel}}([a, b]_\rho)$  and  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\mathfrak{m})$ . If  $a = b$ , the statement follows from Theorem 3.2. Assume  $a < b$ . We divide the proof into the following cases:

Case 1:  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \geq 2$ . In such case, we conclude by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.6}) \\ &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0 \quad (\text{by induction assumption}) \\ &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0 \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.7}) \end{aligned}$$

Case 2:  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) = 1$  and  $\varepsilon_{[a+1]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) = 0$ . In such case, we conclude by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.4}) \\ &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^R \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0 \quad (\text{by induction assumption}) \\ &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0 \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.5}) \end{aligned}$$

Case 3:  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) = 1$  and  $\varepsilon_{[a+1]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$ . In such case, we conclude by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.8}) \\ &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a+1]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0 \quad (\text{by induction assumption}) \\ &\iff \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0 \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.9}) \end{aligned}$$

Case 4:  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) = 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) = 0$ . The first equality and Theorem 3.2 imply that  $v^a \rho$  is not in  $\text{rf}(\Delta_{i,j})$  for any segment  $\Delta_{i,j}$  involved in the upward sequences of Algorithm 3.3 applied to  $\mathbf{m}$  and so  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$ , while the second equality implies  $\text{hd}(\pi)[a] = \emptyset$  and so  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(\pi) = 0$  by Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.11.** *Let  $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in \text{Irr}$ . Let  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}$  such that  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^R(\tau_1) \cong \mathcal{D}_\Delta^R(\tau_2) \neq 0$ . Then,  $\tau_1 \cong \tau_2$ .*

*Proof.* Apply the integral  $\mathcal{I}_\Delta^R$  on both sides of  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^R(\tau_1) \cong \mathcal{D}_\Delta^R(\tau_2)$  to get the result.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.12.** *Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . If  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_\Delta^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right).$$

*Proof.* We use induction argument on the relative length  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\Delta)$ , and  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\mathbf{m})$  of  $\mathbf{m}$  to prove this result. By Theorem 3.2, for  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\Delta) = 1$  and for any  $\mathbf{m}' \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ , we have

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m}')) \cong L\left(\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}')\right).$$

As  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\varepsilon_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$ ,  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , and so,  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$ .

Case 1.  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \geq 2$ . As an inductive step, we assume that

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{n})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})\right).$$

for any  $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  with  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\mathbf{n}) < \ell_{\text{rel}}(\mathbf{m})$ . Put  $\mathbf{n} = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ . As  $\ell_{\text{rel}}(\mathbf{n}) < \ell_{\text{rel}}(\mathbf{m})$ , we have

$$(16) \quad \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R\left(L\left(\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right)\right) \cong L\left(\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right).$$

Then, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{[a]_\rho}^R \left( L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right) \right) &\cong L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right) \quad (\text{by (15)}) \\
&\cong L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.6}) \\
&\cong D_{[a,b]_\rho}^R \left( L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right) \right) \quad (\text{by (16)}) \\
&\cong D_{[a,b]_\rho}^R \circ D_{[a]_\rho}^R (L(\mathfrak{m})) \quad (\text{by (15)}) \\
&\cong D_{[a]_\rho}^R \circ D_{[a,b]_\rho}^R (L(\mathfrak{m})) \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.7}).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.11, we conclude that  $D_{[a,b]_\rho}^R (L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right)$ .

Case 2.  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^R (L(\mathfrak{m})) = 1$ . In such case, we conclude by

$$\begin{aligned}
(17) \quad L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right) &= L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right) \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.4}) \\
&\cong D_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^R \left( L \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right) \right) \\
&\cong D_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^R \circ D_{[a]_\rho}^R (L(\mathfrak{m})) \quad (\text{by (15)}) \\
&\cong D_{[a,b]_\rho}^R (L(\mathfrak{m})) \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.5}).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the isomorphism (17) follows from induction as  $\ell_{\text{rel}}([a+1, b]_\rho) < \ell_{\text{rel}}([a, b]_\rho)$ .  $\square$

**3.7. Left derivative algorithm.** For  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_{\rho'}$ , we define

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang},L}(\mathfrak{m}) = \Theta(\mathcal{D}_{[-b,-a]_{\rho^\vee}}^{\text{Lang}}(\Theta(\mathfrak{m}))).$$

Now, with Theorems 3.10 and 3.12 and discussions in Section 2.2.4, we have:

**Theorem 3.13.** *Suppose  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then, the following holds:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Lang},L}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$  if and only if  $D_\Delta^L(L(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0$ ; and
- (2) if  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Lang},L}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $D_\Delta^L(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong L \left( \mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Lang},L}(\mathfrak{m}) \right)$ .

#### 4. DERIVATIVES IN ZELEVINSKY CLASSIFICATION

In this section, we present an algorithm (refer to Algorithm 4.2) for computing the St-derivatives of irreducible representations of  $\text{GL}_n(F)$  in the Zelevinsky classification. Similar to the proof of the St-derivative in the Langlands classification, we could have offered an inductive proof, where the  $\rho$ -derivative in the Zelevinsky classification and several results akin to Lemmas 3.4, 3.6 and 3.8 would be required. Here, we avoid that approach and use the Mœglin-Waldspurger (MW) algorithm for computing derivatives. By applying this algorithm, we can derive Corollary 4.12, and then combine with a reduction in Section 4.5 to prove our main algorithm (refer to Theorem 4.14).

**4.1. MW algorithm for derivatives.** For  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ , define the multisegment  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})$  associated to  $\mathfrak{m}$  in the following way: let  $b$  be the largest integer such that  $\mathfrak{m}\langle b \rangle \neq \emptyset$  that means  $\nu^b \rho$  is the maximal cuspidal support of  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Then, we choose the shortest segment  $\Delta_0$  in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle b \rangle$ . Recursively for  $1 \leq s \leq k$ , we choose the shortest segment  $\Delta_s$  in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle b-s \rangle$  such that  $\Delta_s \prec \Delta_{s-1}$  and  $k$  is the largest possible integer for which such  $\Delta_k$  exists. Define the first segment in  $\mathfrak{m}^\#$  (produced by MW algorithm applied to  $\mathfrak{m}$ ) as:

$$\Delta(\mathfrak{m}) = \{\nu^{b-k} \rho, \nu^{b-k+1} \rho, \dots, \nu^b \rho\} = [b-k, b]_\rho,$$

and the reduced multisegment by

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{i=0}^k \Delta_i + \sum_{i=0}^k \Delta_i^-.$$

By the MW algorithm in [MW86], we get

$$(18) \quad \mathfrak{m}^\# = \Delta(\mathfrak{m}) + \left( \mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right)^\#.$$

We say that  $\Delta_0, \Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_k$  are the ordered segments participating (to find the first segment) in the MW algorithm for  $\mathfrak{m}$ . For any  $a \leq c$ , define  $\varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})$  to be the multiplicity of the segment  $[a, c]_\rho$  in  $\mathfrak{m}^\#$ . It can be shown that  $\varepsilon_{[a',c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \varepsilon_{[a',c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}))$ , which explains the notion of  $\varepsilon_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** [MW86] *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta(\mathfrak{m})$  be the first segment produced in the MW algorithm for  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Then, we have*

$$D_{\Delta(\mathfrak{m})}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z\left(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})\right).$$

*Proof.* By Langlands classification and discussions in Section 2.2.3,

$$Z(\mathfrak{m}) \cong L(\mathfrak{m}^\#) \hookrightarrow \lambda(\mathfrak{m}^\#) = \lambda(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})^\#) \times \text{St}(\Delta(\mathfrak{m})).$$

As the submodule of  $\lambda(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})^\#) \times \text{St}(\Delta)$  is unique and the submodule of  $\lambda(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^\#))$  is isomorphic to  $L(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})^\#) \cong Z(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}))$ , the above map factors through the map

$$(19) \quad Z(\mathfrak{m}) \hookrightarrow Z(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})) \times \text{St}(\Delta(\mathfrak{m})).$$

Now (19) gives that  $I_{\Delta(\mathfrak{m})}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}))) \cong Z(\mathfrak{m})$  and so applying  $D_{\Delta(\mathfrak{m})}^{\text{R}}$  on both sides, we obtain the proposition.  $\square$

**Example 3.** Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \{[0, 2]_\rho, [2, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 5]_\rho, [4, 6]_\rho\}$ . Then,  $\Delta(\mathfrak{m}) = [4, 6]_\rho$  and the multisegment  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \{[0, 2]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 4]_\rho, [4, 5]_\rho\}$ . Therefore, we have  $D_{[4,6]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) = Z(\{[0, 2]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 4]_\rho, [4, 5]_\rho\})$ .  $\square$

## 4.2. Algorithm for derivatives.

**Algorithm 4.2.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Set  $\mathfrak{m}_0 = \mathfrak{m}$  and perform the following steps:*

*Step 1. (Upward sequence of maximal linked segments): Define the removable upward sequence of maximal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathfrak{m}_0$  ranging from  $a-1$  to  $b$  as follows: start with the longest segment  $\Delta_1^{a-1}$  (if exists) in  $\mathfrak{m}_0 \langle a-1 \rangle$ . Recursively for  $a \leq i \leq b$ , we choose the longest segment  $\Delta_1^i$  (if exists) in  $\mathfrak{m}_0 \langle i \rangle$  such that  $\Delta_1^{i-1} \prec \Delta_1^i$ . Then the sequence*

$\Delta_1^{a-1} \prec \Delta_1^a \prec \dots \prec \Delta_1^b$  defines an upward sequence of maximal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathfrak{m}_0$  ranging from  $a - 1$  to  $b$ .

Step 2. (Remove) Replace  $\mathfrak{m}_0$  by  $\mathfrak{m}_1$  defined by

$$\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{i=a-1}^b \Delta_1^i.$$

Step 3. (Repeat Steps 1 and 2): Again find (if it exists, say  $\Delta_2^{a-1} \prec \Delta_2^a \prec \dots \prec \Delta_2^b$ ) the upward sequence of maximal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathfrak{m}_1$  ranging from  $a - 1$  to  $b$ , and remove it to get the multisegment  $\mathfrak{m}_2 = \mathfrak{m}_1 - \sum_{i=a-1}^b \Delta_2^i$ . Repeat this removal process until it terminates after a finite number of times, say  $k$  times.

Step 4. (Final selection): If  $\mathfrak{m}_k \langle b \rangle \neq \emptyset$ , choose the shortest length segment say  $\tilde{\Delta}_b \in \mathfrak{m}_k \langle b \rangle$ . Otherwise, we set  $\tilde{\Delta}_b = \emptyset$  the void segment. Recursively for  $b - 1 \geq i \geq a$ , we choose the shortest segment  $\tilde{\Delta}_i \in \mathfrak{m}_k \langle i \rangle$  (if exists) such that  $\tilde{\Delta}_i \prec \tilde{\Delta}_{i+1}$ . Otherwise, we set  $\tilde{\Delta}_i = \emptyset$ .

Step 5. (Truncation): If  $\tilde{\Delta}_i \neq \emptyset$  for all  $a \leq i \leq b$ , we say that a downward sequence of minimal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathfrak{m}_k$  ranging from  $b$  to  $a$  exists and we define the right derivative multisegment by

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) := \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{i=a}^b \tilde{\Delta}_i + \sum_{i=a}^b (\tilde{\Delta}_i)^-.$$

Step 5'. If  $\tilde{\Delta}_i = \emptyset$  for some  $a \leq i \leq b$ , we set  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ .

**Example 4.** (i) Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [2, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 5]_\rho, [4, 5]_\rho\}$  and  $\Delta = [5, 5]_\rho$ . Then,  $[0, 4]_\rho \prec [2, 5]_\rho$  (resp.  $[2, 4]_\rho \prec [3, 5]_\rho$ ) is the removable upward sequence of maximal linked segments on  $\mathfrak{m}$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{m}_1$ ) ranging from 4 to 5, where  $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m} - [0, 4]_\rho - [2, 5]_\rho$ ,  $\mathfrak{m}_2 = \mathfrak{m}_1 - [2, 4]_\rho - [3, 5]_\rho$  and there is no such sequence on  $\mathfrak{m}_2$  as  $\mathfrak{m}_2 \langle 4 \rangle = \emptyset$ . Since  $[4, 5]_\rho$  is the shortest segment in  $\mathfrak{m}_2 \langle 5 \rangle = \{[2, 5]_\rho, [4, 5]_\rho\}$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[5]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - [4, 5]_\rho + [4]_\rho = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [2, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 5]_\rho, [4]_\rho\}$ .

(ii) Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [3, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 5]_\rho, [4, 6]_\rho\}$  and  $\Delta = [4, 6]_\rho$ . There is no segment ending with  $\nu^3 \rho$  to produce a removable upward sequence of maximal linked segments ranging from 3 to 6. Here,  $\{[4, 6]_\rho, [3, 5]_\rho, [0, 4]_\rho\}$  is the downward sequence of minimal linked segments in the neighbors of  $\mathfrak{m}$  ranging from 6 to 4. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{[4,6]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) &= \mathfrak{m} - [4, 6]_\rho - [3, 5]_\rho - [0, 4]_\rho + [4, 5]_\rho + [3, 4]_\rho + [0, 3]_\rho \\ &= \{[0, 3]_\rho, [3, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 4]_\rho, [4, 5]_\rho\}. \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 5]_\rho, [4, 6]_\rho\}$  and  $\Delta = [5, 6]_\rho$ . Here, the sequence  $\{[0, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [4, 6]_\rho\}$  is the only upward sequence of maximal linked segments in  $\mathfrak{m}$  ranging from 4 to 6. But  $\mathfrak{m} - \{[0, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [4, 6]_\rho\}$  does not have any segment ending with  $\nu^6 \rho$  to get a complete downward sequence of minimal linked segments ranging from 6 to 5. Therefore, we have  $\mathcal{D}_{[5,6]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ .  $\square$

**4.3. Combinatorial structure from multiple MW algorithms.** For convenience, let  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  be segments such that  $e(\Delta_1) = \dots = e(\Delta_r)$ . We say that  $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r$  are in increasing order if  $\Delta_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq \Delta_r$ , equivalently  $s(\Delta_1) \geq \dots \geq s(\Delta_r)$ .

**Definition 1.** (i) Let  $n_1, n_2 \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . The multisegments  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are said to be linked by mapping if there exists an injective map  $f : n_1 \rightarrow n_2$  such that  $\Delta \prec f(\Delta)$  for all  $\Delta \in n_1$ .

(ii) Fix a multisegment  $m \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and an integer  $k$ . Let  $n_1$  be a submultisegment of  $m\langle k-1 \rangle$  and let  $n_2$  be a submultisegment of  $m\langle k \rangle$ . We say that  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are minimally linked (in  $m$ ) if

(a)  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are linked by mapping; and

(b) there does not exist  $n'_1 \subseteq m\langle k-1 \rangle$  such that  $|n'_1| > |n_1|$  and  $n'_1$  and  $n_2$  are linked by mapping;

(c) there does not exist  $n'_1 \subseteq m\langle k-1 \rangle$  such that  $|n'_1| = |n_1|$ ,  $n'_1 < n_1$ , and  $n'_1$  and  $n_2$  are linked by mapping. Here write both the segments  $n_1 = \{\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_r\}$  and  $n'_1 = \{\Delta'_1, \dots, \Delta'_r\}$  in the increasing order, and  $n'_1 < n_1$  means  $s(\Delta_i) \leq s(\Delta'_i)$  for all  $i$  and at least one inequality is strict.

It is straightforward to observe that in Definition 1(ii), for a fixed  $n_2 \subseteq m\langle k \rangle$ , there is at most one submultisegment  $n_1 \subseteq m\langle k-1 \rangle$  minimally linked to  $n_2$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** Let  $v^c\rho$  be the maximal cuspidal support of  $m$ . Let  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  such that  $v^c\rho$  is still the maximal cuspidal support of  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{r-1}(m)$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , let  $\Delta_{c,i}, \Delta_{c-1,i}, \dots, \Delta_{a_i,i}$  be all the ordered segments participating in the MW-algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{i-1}(m)$  with  $e(\Delta_{k,i}) = k$ . Set  $m_0 = m$  and define, recursively,

$$m_i = m_{i-1} - \Delta_{c,i} - \dots - \Delta_{a_i,i}.$$

Then

(i) The ordered segments participating in the MW algorithm for  $m_i$  are precisely the segments  $\Delta_{c,i+1}, \dots, \Delta_{a_{i+1},i+1}$ . In particular,

$$\{\Delta_{c,1}, \dots, \Delta_{a_1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{c,r}, \dots, \Delta_{a_r,r}\}$$

is a submultisegment of  $m$ .

(ii) Let  $[a, c]_\rho$  be the first segment produced in the MW algorithm for  $m$ . Let  $\text{MW}_k(m) = \{\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,x_k}\}$ , where  $x_k$  is the largest integer such that  $\Delta_{k,x_k}$  is defined. Then

(a)  $x_c \geq \dots \geq x_a$ ;

(b)  $\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,x_k}$  are in the increasing order;

(c) for  $a \leq k \leq c-1$ ,  $\text{MW}_k(m)$  and  $\text{MW}_{k+1}(m)$  are minimally linked in  $m$ .

*Proof.* When  $i = 1$ , it follows from the definition of MW algorithm. We consider  $i \geq 2$ . Then inductively, we have:

$$(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{i-1}(m) = m - \sum_{p=1}^{i-1} \sum_{k=a_p}^c \Delta_{k,p} + \sum_{p=1}^{i-1} \sum_{k=a_p}^c \Delta_{k,p}^-.$$

Suppose there exists  $k$  such that  $\Delta_{k,i} = \Delta_{k+1,s}^-$  for some  $1 \leq s \leq i-1$ , which we shall derive a contradiction. Let  $k^*$  be the largest integer ( $\leq c$ ) for which such equality could happen, and let  $s^*$  be the corresponding integer such that  $\Delta_{k^*,i} = \Delta_{k^*+1,s^*}^-$ .

Case 1:  $k^* = c$ . This case indeed cannot happen since the maximality of  $\nu^c \rho$  forces that  $\Delta^-$  does not contain  $\nu^c \rho$  for any segment  $\Delta$  in  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

Case 2:  $k^* < c$ . We first have

$$(20) \quad s(\Delta_{k^*+1,1}) \geq \dots \geq s(\Delta_{k^*+1,x_{k^*+1}}),$$

where the first  $x_{k^*+1} - 2$  inequalities follow from the induction assumption and the last inequality follows from the shortest choice of the MW algorithm.

As  $\Delta_{k^*,i} = \Delta_{k^*+1,s^*}^- \prec \Delta_{k^*+1,i}$ , we have  $s(\Delta_{k^*+1,i}) > s(\Delta_{k^*+1,s^*})$  with  $s^* < i$ . This contradicts the inequality (20). Hence, this case cannot happen.

As both cases cannot happen, we have proved the assertion (i). To see (ii), (a), (b), and (c) again follow from the choices of shortest segments in the MW algorithm.  $\square$

Lemma 4.3 with the uniqueness of the minimal linkedness gives a characterization of segments participating in the MW algorithms. Below, we shall use this characterization to show the compatibility with the segments produced in Algorithm 4.2 (see Proposition 4.10 in the next section).

#### 4.4. MW algorithm and removal maximal upward sequences.

##### 4.4.1. Compare $\varepsilon^{\text{MW}}$ and the number of removal maximal upward sequences.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and let  $\Delta(\mathfrak{m}) = [a, c]_\rho$  be the first segment produced in the MW algorithm. Then, for  $a \leq b \leq c$ , the number of removal upward sequences of maximally linked segments in neighbors in  $\mathfrak{m}$  ranging from  $b - 1$  to  $c$  is equal to*

$$\varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) + \dots + \varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}).$$

(If  $b = a$ , then the number is equal to zero.)

*Proof.* Let  $r'$  be the first number in the lemma and let  $r = \varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) + \dots + \varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})$ .

We first show  $r \leq r'$ . We shall use the notion  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m})$  in Lemma 4.3. By Lemma 4.3,  $|MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m})| = \dots = |MW_c(\mathfrak{m})| = r$ . We first replace  $MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m})$  by the submultisegment of first  $r$  longest segments in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle b-1 \rangle$ , denoted by  $\mathfrak{n}_{b-1}$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{n}_{b-1}$  and  $MW_b(\mathfrak{m})$  are linked by mapping. Now, one replaces  $MW_b(\mathfrak{m})$  by the submultisegment of the  $r$  longest segments in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle b \rangle$  such that  $\mathfrak{n}_b$  and  $\mathfrak{n}_{b-1}$  are maximally linked. (Here maximally linked is defined in the obvious manner in analogous to Definition 1.) One now proceeds the similar process to obtain submultisegments  $\mathfrak{n}_x \subset \mathfrak{m}\langle x \rangle$  such that  $\mathfrak{n}_x$  and  $\mathfrak{n}_{x-1}$  are maximally linked for  $x = b+1, \dots, c$ . From this, one obtains  $r$  many upward sequences of maximally linked segments in neighbors ranging from  $b-1$  to  $c$ . Hence,  $r \leq r'$ .

We next show  $r' \leq r$ . This reverses the construction above. We use the index

$$\Delta_1^{b-1} \prec \dots \prec \Delta_1^c, \dots, \Delta_{r'}^{b-1} \prec \dots \prec \Delta_{r'}^c$$

to represent the upward sequences (of maximally linked segments in neighbors ranging from  $b-1$  to  $c$ ) in Algorithm 4.2. Now one replaces  $\{\Delta_1^c, \dots, \Delta_{r'}^c\}$  by the submultisegment  $\mathfrak{n}'_c$  of first  $r'$ -shortest segments in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle c \rangle$ . Note that  $\{\Delta_1^{c-1}, \dots, \Delta_{r'}^{c-1}\}$  and  $\mathfrak{n}'_c$  are linked by mapping. Now, one recursively find submultisegments  $\mathfrak{n}'_x \subset \mathfrak{m}\langle x \rangle$  for  $x = c-1, \dots, b-1$  such that  $\mathfrak{n}'_x$  and  $\mathfrak{n}'_{x+1}$  are minimally linked, and  $|\mathfrak{n}'_x| = r'$ .

Now, for  $x = b - 2, \dots, a$ , one recursively find submultisegments  $n'_x$  minimally linked to  $n'_{x+1}$ . By Lemma 4.3, all  $n'_x$  determines the mutlisegments participating in the MW algorithms for  $\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathbf{m}), \dots, (\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{r'-1}(\mathbf{m})$ . Then, the condition  $|n'_x| = r'$  for  $x = c, \dots, b - 1$  forces that  $r' \leq r$ .  $\square$

4.4.2. *Overlap between segments from MW algorithms and segments from removal upward sequences.*

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Let  $[a, c]_\rho$  be the first segment produced in the MW algorithm. Suppose, furthermore, the first segment produced in the MW-algorithm  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathbf{m})$  is  $[b, c]_\rho$ . Set*

$$r = \varepsilon_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathbf{m}) + \dots + \varepsilon_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathbf{m}).$$

For  $i = 1, \dots, r + 1$ , let  $\Delta_{c,i}, \dots, \Delta_{a,i}$  be all the ordered segments participating in the MW algorithms for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{i-1}(\mathbf{m})$ . For  $b \leq k \leq c$ , let  $\text{MW}_k(\mathbf{m}) = \{\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,r+1}\}$ . Let  $\tau$  be the set of all segments in the removal upward sequences of maximally linked segments on  $\mathbf{m}$  in neighbor ranging from  $b - 1$  to  $c$ .

Define  $p_k^*$  to be the least integer such that  $\Delta_{k,p_k^*} \notin \tau\langle k \rangle$ . (The existence of such integer is guaranteed by  $|\tau\langle k \rangle| < |\text{MW}_k(\mathbf{m})|$ , see Lemma 4.4.) The following conditions hold:

- (a)  $p_c^* \leq \dots \leq p_b^*$ ;
- (b) For  $b \leq k \leq c$ ,  $\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,p_k^*-1}$  are in  $\tau$ , and moreover they are the first  $p_k^* - 1$  segments in the increasing order of  $\tau\langle k \rangle$ ;
- (c) For  $b \leq k \leq c - 1$ ,  $\text{MW}_k(\mathbf{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  and  $\text{MW}_{k+1}(\mathbf{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  are minimally linked in  $\mathbf{m} - \Delta_{c,p_c^*} - \dots - \Delta_{b,p_b^*}$ ;
- (d)  $\Delta_{c,p_c^*}$  is the shortest segment in  $\mathbf{m}\langle c \rangle - \tau\langle c \rangle$ , and for  $b \leq k \leq c - 1$ ,  $\Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  is the shortest segment in  $\mathbf{m}\langle k \rangle - \tau\langle k \rangle$  that is linked to  $\Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$ .

Before proving the lemma, we shall prove a useful simple counting lemma:

**Lemma 4.6.** *We shall use all the notations in Lemma 4.5. Let  $b \leq k \leq c - 1$  and  $\mathbf{n}$  be a submultisegment of  $\tau\langle k \rangle$ . Then  $\mathbf{n}$  and  $\{\Delta_{k+1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k+1,|\mathbf{n}|}\}$  are linked by mapping.*

*Proof.* As  $\mathbf{n}$  is in  $\tau\langle k \rangle$ , this guarantees that there exist submultisegments  $\mathbf{n}_x \subset \mathbf{m}\langle x \rangle$  ( $x = k + 1, \dots, c$ ) such that for all  $x = k + 1, \dots, c$

- (1)  $|\mathbf{n}_x| = |\mathbf{n}|$ ;
- (2)  $\mathbf{n}_{x-1}$  and  $\mathbf{n}_x$  are linked by mapping. (Here,  $\mathbf{n}_k = \mathbf{n}$ .)

We can replace  $\mathbf{n}_c$  by  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_c := \{\Delta_{c,1}, \dots, \Delta_{c,|\mathbf{n}|}\}$  so that  $\mathbf{n}_{c-1}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_c$  are linked by mapping. Now, by using  $\text{MW}_x(\mathbf{m})$  and  $\text{MW}_{x+1}(\mathbf{m})$  are minimally linked, we inductively replace  $\mathbf{n}_x$  (where  $k + 1 \leq x \leq c - 1$ ) by  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_x := \{\Delta_{x,1}, \dots, \Delta_{x,|\mathbf{n}|}\}$  such that  $\mathbf{n}_{x-1}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_x$  are still linked by mapping. So eventually we also have  $\mathbf{n}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{k+1}$  is also linked by mapping, as desired.  $\square$

*Proof of Lemma 4.5:* For  $b \leq k \leq c$ , let  $\tau\langle k \rangle = \{\Delta'_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta'_{k,r}\}$  written in the increasing order, where the number of segments follows from Lemma 4.4. When  $k = c$ , it is clear that  $\Delta_{c,1}, \dots, \Delta_{c,p_c^*-1}$  are in  $\tau$ . This gives (b) and (d), and there is nothing to prove for (c).



We now assume  $b \leq k < c$  and separately consider each condition:

*Prove condition (a):* We first show that  $\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,p_{k+1}^*-1}$  are in  $\tau\langle k \rangle$ . Suppose not, that means  $\Delta_{k,j}$  is not in  $\tau\langle k \rangle$  for some  $1 \leq j \leq p_{k+1}^* - 1$ . Then Lemma 4.6 and the minimally linked condition implies that we must have  $s(\Delta'_{k,p_{k+1}^*-1}) \leq s(\Delta_{k,p_{k+1}^*})$ . On the other hand, since  $\Delta_{k,p_{k+1}^*} \prec \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$ ,  $s(\Delta_{k,p_{k+1}^*}) < s(\Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*})$ . Combining two inequalities, we have  $s(\Delta'_{k,p_{k+1}^*-1}) < s(\Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*})$ . This implies

$$(21) \quad \Delta'_{k,p_{k+1}^*-1} \prec \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}.$$

On the other hand, since  $\tau\langle k \rangle$  and  $\tau\langle k+1 \rangle$  are linked by mapping, we can define a map  $f : \tau\langle k \rangle \rightarrow \tau\langle k+1 \rangle$  satisfying the following properties: for all  $1 \leq j \leq r+1$

- (i)  $f(\Delta'_{k,j}) = \Delta'_{k+1,j}$
- (ii)  $\Delta'_{k,j} \prec f(\Delta'_{k,j})$ .

Then, using the induction case of condition (b), we must have that

$$\Delta'_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*-1} = \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*-1}$$

Now, combining above discussions, we can define another map  $\tilde{f} : \tau\langle k \rangle \rightarrow \tau\langle k+1 \rangle - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*-1} + \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  such that  $\tilde{f}(\Delta'_{k,j}) = f(\Delta'_{k+1,j})$  if  $j \neq p_k^* - 1$  and  $\tilde{f}(\Delta'_{k,p_{k+1}^*-1}) = \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$ . Hence,  $f$  and (21) show that  $\tau\langle k \rangle$  and  $\tau\langle k+1 \rangle - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*-1} + \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  are linked by mapping. This contradicts the longest choices in  $\tau\langle k \rangle$ . This shows (a).

*Prove condition (b):* The first part follows from how to define  $\Delta_{k,p_k^*}$ . For the second assertion, by Lemma 4.6,  $\{\Delta'_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta'_{k,p_k^*-1}\}$  and  $\{\Delta_{k+1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k+1,p_k^*-1}\}$  are linked by mapping. Now the first assertion of (b) forces that  $\{\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,p_k^*-1}\}$  is minimally linked to  $\{\Delta_{k+1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k+1,p_k^*-1}\}$ . This implies the second assertion.

*Prove condition (c):* The proof is slightly long and so we separate it into the next section. We only need (a) and (b) (but not (d)) to prove (c).

*Prove condition (d):*  $\Delta_{c,p_c^*}$  is the shortest segment in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle c \rangle - \tau\langle c \rangle$  follows from assertion (b). By (a) and (c), we then have that  $\{\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,p_k^*-1}\} \cap (MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*})$ , and  $\{\Delta_{k+1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k+1,p_k^*}\} \cap (MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*})$ , are also minimally linked, where the former (resp. latter) set is simply the first  $p_k^* - 1$  shortest segments of  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  (resp.  $MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$ ). Similarly, we have

$$\{\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,p_k^*}\} \cap MW_k(\mathfrak{m}), \text{ and } \{\Delta_{k+1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k+1,p_k^*}\} \cap MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m})$$

is minimally linked. The uniqueness of minimal linkedness then implies (d).  $\square$

4.4.3. *Proof of Condition (c) in Lemma 4.5.* Recall that we are assuming  $b \leq k < c$ . Let

$$\mathfrak{m}' = \mathfrak{m} - \Delta_{c,p_c^*} - \dots - \Delta_{b,p_b^*}.$$

*Step 1: Show  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  and  $MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  are linked by mapping. Define an injective map*

$$f : MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*} \longrightarrow MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$$

as follows:

- for  $1 \leq j \leq p_{k+1}^* - 1$  and  $p_k^* + 1 \leq j \leq r + 1$ , define  $f(\Delta_{k,j}) = \Delta_{k+1,j}$ . It follows from the minimal linkedness between  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m})$ , we also have  $\Delta_{k,j} \prec f(\Delta_{k,j})$ .
- for  $p_{k+1}^* \leq j \leq p_k^* - 1$ , define  $f(\Delta_{k,j}) = \Delta_{k+1,j+1}$ . By condition (b) in Lemma 4.5,  $\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,p_k^*-1}$  are in  $\mathfrak{r}$ . As  $\mathfrak{r} \subset \mathfrak{m}'$  and the induction assumption give that  $MW_x(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{x,p_x^*}$  and  $MW_{x+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{x+1,p_{x+1}^*}$  are minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m}'$  ( $x = k + 1, \dots, c - 1$ ), one applies similar argument to the proof of Lemma 4.6 to show that

$$\left\{ \Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,p_k^*-1} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \Delta_{k+1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k+1,p_k^*} \right\} - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$$

are linked by mapping. This verifies that  $\Delta_{k,j} \prec f(\Delta_{k,j})$ .

Therefore, the map  $f$  shows that  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  and  $MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  are linked by mapping.

*Step 2: Check minimal linkedness.* Suppose  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  and  $MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  are not minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m}'$ . By assertion (a) in Lemma 4.5, we have  $\Delta_{k,p_k^*} \prec \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  again, and hence,  $(MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}) + \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  and  $(MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}) + \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  are linked by mapping but not minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m}$ . This contradicts that  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m})$  are minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m}$ .

#### 4.4.4. Minimal linkedness between $MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m})$ and $MW_b(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{b,p_b^*}$ .

**Lemma 4.7.** *We use the notations in Lemma 4.5, and similarly, we define*

$$MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m}) = \{ \Delta_{b-1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{b-1,r} \}.$$

*Then  $MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $MW_b(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{b,p_b^*}$  are minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m} - \Delta_{c,p_c^*} - \dots - \Delta_{b,p_b^*}$ .*

*Proof.* One can define an injective map from  $MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m})$  to  $MW_b(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{b,p_b^*}$  by similar arguments as in Section 4.4.3. We first argue that  $\Delta_{b-1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{b-1,p_b^*-1}$  are in  $\mathfrak{r}\langle b-1 \rangle$  by using a similar argument in proving condition (a) of Lemma 4.5 in Section 4.4. By the fact that  $\Delta_{b,p_b^*}$  is not in  $\mathfrak{r}\langle b \rangle$ , one can observe

$$\Delta_{b-1,p_b^*} \prec \Delta_{b,p_b^*+1}, \dots, \quad \Delta_{b-1,r} \prec \Delta_{b,r+1}.$$

Now the minimal linkedness between  $MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $MW_b(\mathfrak{m}) - \Delta_{b,p_b^*}$  follows from the minimal linkedness between  $MW_{b-1}(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $MW_b(\mathfrak{m})$  in  $\mathfrak{m}$ .  $\square$

#### 4.4.5. Segments participating in the MW algorithms for $\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})$ .

**Lemma 4.8.** *We use the notations in Lemma 4.5. Then, we have*

$$\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{k=b}^c \Delta_{k,p_k^*} + \sum_{k=b}^c \Delta_{k,p_k^*}^-.$$

*In particular,  $\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from Condition (d) of Lemma 4.5.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.9.** *We use the notations in Lemma 4.5. For  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , the segments participating in the MW algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{i-1}(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}))$  lie in either  $MW_k(\mathbf{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  for some  $b \leq k \leq c$  or  $MW_k(\mathbf{m})$  for some  $a \leq k \leq b-1$ .*

*Proof.* Note that  $\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})$  is described in Lemma 4.8. We pick the segments participating in  $\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})$  as follows. The first segment is the shortest segment in  $MW_c(\mathbf{m}) - \Delta_{c,p_c^*}$ , that is  $\Delta_{c,1}$  if  $p_c^* \neq 1$  and  $\Delta_{c,2}$  if  $p_c^* = 1$ .

Let  $k^*$  be the smallest integer such that  $p_{k^*}^* \neq 1$ . If such an integer does not exist, set  $k^* = b-1$ . In general, the segments participating in the MW algorithm are:

$$\Delta_{c,2}, \dots, \Delta_{k^*+1,2}, \Delta_{k^*,1}, \dots, \Delta_{a,1}.$$

By condition (a), the above choices are well-defined. We now justify the above choices are the shortest ones:

- (1) Case 1.  $k^* + 1 \leq k \leq c$ : Note that  $\Delta_{k+1,1}^-$  is not linked to  $\Delta_{k+1,2}$ . Hence, we can only find the shortest one in  $\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})\langle k \rangle - \Delta_{k+1,1}^-$ . By Lemma 4.5 Condition (c) and Lemma 4.3(ii)(c),  $\Delta_{k,2}$  is the shortest choice.
- (2) Case 2.  $k = k^*$ : Similar reasoning as above,  $\Delta_{k^*+1,1}^-$  cannot be a choice, and  $\Delta_{k^*,1}$  is the shortest choice.
- (3) Case 3.  $k \leq k^* - 1$ : If  $\Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}^-$  is a choice, then  $s(\Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}) > s(\Delta_{k,1})$  and so  $\Delta_{k,1} \prec \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$ .

Now, one considers  $\mathbf{r}' = \mathbf{r} - \Delta_{k+1,1} + \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$ . By Lemma 4.5(b),  $\Delta_{k,1}$  are in  $\mathbf{r}$ . Now, by using Condition (b) in 4.5, we have that  $\Delta_{k+1,1}$  (resp.  $\Delta_{k,1}$ ) is the first segment in the increasing order of  $\mathbf{r}\langle k+1 \rangle$  (resp.  $\mathbf{r}\langle k \rangle$ ). Now one can define an injective map  $f$  from  $\mathbf{r}\langle k \rangle$  to  $\mathbf{r}\langle k+1 \rangle$  satisfying  $f(\Delta_{k,1}) = \Delta_{k+1,1}$  and  $\Delta \prec f(\Delta)$  for all  $\Delta \in \mathbf{r}\langle k \rangle$ .

Now one defines  $\tilde{f} : \mathbf{r}'\langle k \rangle \rightarrow \mathbf{r}'\langle k+1 \rangle$  by  $\tilde{f}(\Delta_{k,1}) = \Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}$  and  $\tilde{f}(\Delta) = f(\Delta)$  for  $\Delta \neq \Delta_{k,1}$ , which also determines that  $\mathbf{r}'\langle k \rangle$  and  $\mathbf{r}'\langle k+1 \rangle$  are linked by mapping. This contradicts the maximal choice of the removal upward sequences of maximally linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathbf{m}$  ranging from  $b-1$  to  $c$ . Hence, one cannot choose  $\Delta_{k+1,p_{k+1}^*}^-$  and so  $\Delta_{k^*,1}$  is the shortest choice again by Lemma 4.5(c).

One can now proceed to find segments participating in the MW algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^i(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}))$  in a similar manner for  $i \geq 1$ , and see they lie in  $MW_k(\mathbf{m}) - \Delta_{k,p_k^*}$  ( $b \leq k \leq c$ ) or  $MW_k(\mathbf{m})$  ( $a \leq k \leq b-1$ ). We omit the details.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.10.** *We use the notations in Lemma 4.5. Recall that  $r = \varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathbf{m}) + \dots + \varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathbf{m})$ . Suppose  $[b,c]_\rho$  is the first segment produced in the MW algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathbf{m})$ . Then*

$$\left(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}\right)^{r+1}(\mathbf{m}) = \left(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}\right)^r\left(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})\right).$$

*Proof.* It follows from Lemmas 4.3, 4.8 and 4.9.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.11.** *We use the notations in Lemma 4.5. If  $\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , then  $[b,c]_\rho$  is the first segment produced in the MW algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathfrak{m})$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.4, one obtains  $r$  removal upward sequences of segments in neighbors on  $\mathfrak{m}$  ranging from  $b-1$  to  $c$ , and then one downward sequence of minimal linked segments in neighbors from  $c$  to  $b$ . From here, one can do a similar construction in the proof of Lemma 4.4 to obtain segments participating in the MW algorithm. Since the construction and details are elementary and are similar to the proof of Lemma 4.4, we omit further details.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.12.** *Let  $\Delta_0 \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  and  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  such that  $e(\Delta_0)$  is the maximal cuspidal support in  $\mathfrak{m}$ . If  $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta_0}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , then  $D_{\Delta_0}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z(\mathcal{D}_{\Delta_0}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $e(\Delta_0) = v^c \rho$  for some  $c$ . Let  $\Delta_0 = [b,c]_\rho$ . Let  $\Delta(\mathfrak{m}) = [a,c]_\rho$  be the first segment produced in the MW algorithm for  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Let

$$r = \varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) + \dots + \varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}).$$

As  $\mathcal{D}_{\Delta_0}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , one observes the proof of Lemma 4.4 also gives  $a \leq b$ . By Lemma 4.9,

$$(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{r+1}(\mathfrak{m}) = (\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})).$$

By Lemma 4.11, the first segment produced in the MW algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathfrak{m})$  is  $[b,c]_\rho$ . Then, by applying Proposition 4.1 multiple times on above equation, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & D_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ (D_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})} \circ \dots \circ (D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \\ & \cong (D_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})} \circ \dots \circ (D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})} \circ D_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}))). \end{aligned}$$

By the commutativity of derivatives for unlinked segments (see e.g. [Cha24a, Lemma 4.4]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (D_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})} \circ \dots \circ (D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})} \circ D_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \\ & \cong (D_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})} \circ \dots \circ (D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})}(Z(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}))). \end{aligned}$$

Now applying suitable integrals multiple  $r$ -times, we can cancel the first  $r$  derivatives on both sides, we then have  $D_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}))$ .  $\square$

**4.5. Reduction to maximal cuspidal support case.** For  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we denote  $\mathfrak{m}^{\leq x} = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{m} \mid b' \leq x\}$  and  $\mathfrak{m}^{> x} = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{m} \mid b' > x\}$ .

**Proposition 4.13.** *Let  $[a,c]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  and  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Then,*

- (i) *For any  $c' \geq c$ ,  $D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'})) = 0$  if and only if  $D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) = 0$ .*
- (ii) *Suppose  $D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  such that  $Z(\mathfrak{p}) \cong D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c}))$ . Then,*

$$D_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z(\mathfrak{m}^{> c} + \mathfrak{p}).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta = [a, c]_\rho$ . Suppose  $D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'})) \neq 0$ . Then  $Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'}) \hookrightarrow D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'})) \times \text{St}([a, c']_\rho)$ , and so

$$Z(\mathfrak{m}) \hookrightarrow Z(\mathfrak{m}^{> c'}) \times Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'}) \hookrightarrow Z(\mathfrak{m}^{> c'}) \times D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'})) \times \text{St}([a, c]_\rho).$$

Thus,  $Z(\mathfrak{m}) \hookrightarrow \tau' \times \text{St}([a, c']_\rho)$  for some irreducible composition factor  $\tau'$  in  $Z(\mathfrak{m}^{> c'}) \times D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'}))$ . By Frobenius reciprocity, we have  $D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0$ .

Suppose  $D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0$  and we shall show that  $D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'})) \neq 0$ . Let  $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  such that  $Z(\mathfrak{n}) = D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}))$ . Then we have embeddings:

$$Z(\mathfrak{m}) \hookrightarrow Z(\mathfrak{n}) \times \text{St}(\Delta) \hookrightarrow Z(\mathfrak{n}^{> c'}) \times Z(\mathfrak{n}^{\leq c'}) \times \text{St}(\Delta),$$

where the first one follows from Frobenius reciprocity and the second one follows from e.g. [LM16, Proposition 3.6]. Now, by standard arguments, see e.g. [LM16, Lemma 4.13], one has that  $\mathfrak{m}^{> c'} = \mathfrak{n}^{> c'}$  and

$$Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'}) \hookrightarrow Z(\mathfrak{n}^{\leq c'}) \times \text{St}(\Delta).$$

Now, applying Frobenius reciprocity, one has

$$D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'})) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Z(\mathfrak{n}^{\leq c'}) \cong D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c'})).$$

This gives (ii) and the only if direction of (i).  $\square$

#### 4.6. Main result.

**Theorem 4.14.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and let  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then*

- (i)  $D_\Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ .
- (ii) If  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $D_\Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z(\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}))$ .

*Proof.* Suppose  $D_\Delta^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0$ . Write  $\Delta = [b, c]_\rho$ . By Proposition 4.13, we have

$$(22) \quad D_{[b, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})) \neq 0.$$

Let  $[a, c]_\rho$  be the first segment product in the MW algorithm for  $\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})$ .

Let  $r = \varepsilon_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c}) + \dots + \varepsilon_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})$ . Then, by Proposition 4.1,

$$(D_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})} \circ \dots \circ (D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})) \neq 0$$

By the third bullet of [Cha24a, Proposition 9.3(2)] and (22), one has:

$$(23) \quad \varepsilon_{[b, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}((D_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})} \circ \dots \circ (D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c}))) = \varepsilon_{[b, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})) \neq 0$$

and, for  $a' \leq b-1$ ,

$$(24) \quad \varepsilon_{[a', c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}}(D_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a', c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})} \circ \dots \circ (D_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\mathbb{R}})^{\varepsilon_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})) = 0.$$

Hence, by Proposition 4.1 and (23) and (24), the first segment produced the MW algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})$  is  $[b, c]_\rho$ . Now Proposition 4.10 implies  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c}) \neq \infty$ .

It is clear from Algorithm 4.2 that we then have  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ . This proves the only if direction of (i).

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ . Write  $\Delta = [b, c]_\rho$ . Then,  $v^c \rho \in \text{supp}(\mathfrak{m})$  and so  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c}) \neq \infty$ . By Proposition 4.10,

$$(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{r+1}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c}) \neq \infty,$$

where  $r$  is defined as above. By Lemma 4.11, the first segment produced for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathfrak{m})$  is  $[b, c]_\rho$ . Thus, now by Lemma 4.3(i), we have

$$\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{R}} \circ \left( \mathcal{D}_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \right)^{\varepsilon_{[b-1, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})} \circ \dots \circ \left( \mathcal{D}_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \right)^{\varepsilon_{[a, c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})} (Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})) \neq 0.$$

By the commutativity of derivatives for unlinked segments, we then have:

$$\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathfrak{m}^{\leq c})) \neq 0.$$

Now, Proposition 4.13(i) implies the if direction of (i) of this theorem. The assertion (ii) now follows from Proposition 4.13 and Corollary 4.12.  $\square$

**4.7. Left derivative algorithm.** For  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ , define

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel, L}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \Theta \left( \mathcal{D}_{[-b, -a]_\rho^\vee}^{\text{Zel}}(\Theta(\mathfrak{m})) \right).$$

Now, with Theorem 4.14 and discussions in Section 2.2.4, we have:

**Theorem 4.15.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then, the following holds:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel, L}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{L}}(Z(\mathfrak{m})) \neq 0$ ; and
- (2) if  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel, L}}(\mathfrak{m}) \neq \infty$ , we have  $\mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{L}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong Z \left( \mathcal{D}_\Delta^{\text{Zel, L}}(\mathfrak{m}) \right)$ .

## 5. INTEGRALS IN LANGLANDS CLASSIFICATION

In this section, for  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ , we give an algorithm to compute the integral  $\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m}))$ . The basic strategy is to reduce to  $\rho$ -integrals, but we shall compare with Algorithm 3.3 and transfer some properties in Lemma 5.10.

**5.1. Algorithm for  $\rho$ -integral.** We are now going to present an algorithm for calculating the  $\rho$ -integrals of irreducible representations in the Langlands classification.

*tus-process:* This process involves the removal of two linked segments from a multi-segment  $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  for a fixed integer  $c$ . The steps are as follows:

- (i) First, pick the shortest segment  $\Delta' \in \mathfrak{n}[c]$ .
- (ii) Choose the shortest segment  $\Delta'' \in \mathfrak{n}[c+1]$  such that  $\Delta' \prec \Delta''$ .
- (iii) If both  $\Delta'$  and  $\Delta''$  exist, remove them to define a new multisegment as

$$\text{tus}(\mathfrak{n}, c) = \mathfrak{n} - \Delta' - \Delta''.$$

**Algorithm 5.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We now define a new multisegment  $\mathcal{I}_{v^c \rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathfrak{n})$  by the following algorithm:*

*Step 1.* Set  $\mathfrak{n}_0 = \mathfrak{n}$ , and recursively for an integer  $i > 0$ , define  $\mathfrak{n}_i = \text{tus}(\mathfrak{n}_{i-1}, c)$  until the process terminate. Suppose the  $\text{tus}(-, c)$  process on  $\mathfrak{n}$  terminates after  $\ell$  times and the final remaining multisegment is  $\mathfrak{n}_\ell$ .

Step 2. Choose the longest segment (if it exists)  $\Delta_* \in \mathbf{n}_\ell[c+1]$  and define the multisegment

$$\mathcal{I}_{v^c \rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathcal{I}_{[c] \rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{n}) := \mathbf{n} - \Delta_* + {}^+ \Delta_*.$$

If such segment  $\Delta_*$  does not exist, we write  $\mathcal{I}_{v^c \rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathcal{I}_{[c] \rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{n}) := \mathbf{n} + [c]_\rho$ .

**Example 5.** (i) Let  $\mathbf{m} = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [0, 2]_\rho, [1, 5]_\rho, [1, 4]_\rho, [1, 3]_\rho, [1]_\rho\}$  and  $c = 0$ . Then,  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \text{tus}(\mathbf{m}, c) = \mathbf{m} - [0, 2]_\rho - [1, 3]_\rho$  and  $\mathbf{m}_2 = \text{tus}(\mathbf{m}_1, c) = \mathbf{m}_1 - [0, 4]_\rho - [1, 5]_\rho$ . The  $\text{tus}(-, c)$ -process terminates on  $\mathbf{m}_2 = \{[1, 4]_\rho, [1]_\rho\}$  since  $\mathbf{m}_2[0] = \emptyset$ . As  $[1, 4]_\rho$  is the longest in  $\mathbf{m}_2[1]$ , we have

$$\mathcal{I}_\rho^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} - [1, 4]_\rho + {}^+ [1, 4]_\rho = \{[0, 4]_\rho, [0, 2]_\rho, [1, 5]_\rho, [0, 4]_\rho, [1, 3]_\rho, [1]_\rho\}.$$

(ii) Let  $\mathbf{m} = \{[0, 2]_\rho, [1, 3]_\rho, [1]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$  and  $c = 1$ . Then,  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \text{tus}(\mathbf{m}, 1) = \mathbf{m} - [1]_\rho - [2, 3]_\rho$  and the  $\text{tus}(-, 1)$  process terminates on  $\mathbf{m}_1$  as  $\mathbf{m}_1[2] = \emptyset$ . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{I}_{[1] \rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} + [1]_\rho = \{[0, 2]_\rho, [1, 3]_\rho, [1]_\rho, [1]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}.$$

Like  $\rho$ -derivative, the  $\rho$ -integral seems to be better understood in the literature, for example, see [LM16, Proposition 5.1 and 5.11] and references therein.

**Proposition 5.2** (Jantzen, Mínguez, and Lapid-Mínguez). (see [LM16, Theorem 5.11]) For  $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{I}_{[a] \rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{n})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a] \rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{n})\right).$$

**5.2. Algorithm for St-integral.** Let  $\mathbf{m}$  be a multisegment and  $\Delta$  be a segment. We want to define a new multisegment  $\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$  by the following algorithm so that the right integral of  $L(\mathbf{m})$  under  $\Delta$  is given by  $L\left(\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right)$ .

*Downward sequence  $\underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}$ :* Let  $\mathbf{n}$  be a non-void multisegment in  $\text{Mult}_\rho$ . We define the downward sequence of minimal linked segments with the largest starting as follows: find the largest number  $a_1$  such that  $\mathbf{n}[a_1] \neq \emptyset$ . Pick a shortest segment  $\Delta_1 = [a_1, b_1]_\rho$  in  $\mathbf{n}[a_1]$ . For  $q \geq 2$ , one recursively find largest number  $a_q$  (if it exists) such that  $a_q < a_{q-1}$  and there exists a segment in  $\mathbf{m}[a_q]$  which precedes  $[a_{q-1}, b_{q-1}]_\rho$ . Then, we pick a shortest segment  $\Delta_q = [a_q, b_q]_\rho$  in  $\mathbf{n}[a_q]$ . This process terminates after some finite steps, say  $r$ , and let  $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_r$  be all the segments found in this process. We define

$$\underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathbf{n}) = \{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_r\}.$$

**Algorithm 5.3.** Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Define the following multisegment

$$\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m}_{[a, b]} = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathbf{m} \mid a \leq a' \leq b+1 \leq b'+1\}.$$

Step 1. (Arrange downward sequences): Let  $\underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathbf{m}_1) = \{\Delta_{1,1}, \Delta_{1,2}, \dots, \Delta_{1,r_1}\}$  with  $\Delta_{1,q} \prec \Delta_{1,q-1}$ . Recursively for  $2 \leq p \leq k$ , we define,  $\mathbf{m}_p = \mathbf{m}_{p-1} - \underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathbf{m}_{p-1})$  and the corresponding downward sequence

$$\underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathbf{m}_p) = \left\{ \Delta_{p,1}, \Delta_{p,2}, \dots, \Delta_{p,r_p} \right\}, \text{ where } \Delta_{p,r_p} \prec \dots \prec \Delta_{p,2} \prec \Delta_{p,1},$$

such that  $k$  is the smallest integer for which  $\mathbf{m}_{k+1} = \emptyset$ .

*Step 2. (Addable free points):* Set  $\Delta_{p,q} = [a_{p,q}, b_{p,q}]_\rho$ . We define the ‘addable free’ points’ set for the segment  $\Delta_{p,q}$  for each  $1 \leq p \leq k$  by:

$$\mathbf{af}(\Delta_{p,q}) = \begin{cases} \left\{ [a_{p,q+1} + 1]_\rho, \dots, [a_{p,q} - 1]_\rho \right\} & \text{if } q < r_p \text{ and } a_{p,q+1} \leq a_{p,q} - 2, \\ \left\{ [a]_\rho, [a + 1]_\rho, \dots, [a_{p,q} - 1]_\rho \right\} & \text{if } q = r_p \text{ and } a < a_{p,q}, \end{cases}$$

otherwise, we write  $\mathbf{af}(\Delta_{p,q}) = \emptyset$ .

*Step 3. (Selection):* We now perform the following algorithm by picking the addable free points: find the largest index  $p_1$  such that  $[a]_\rho \in \mathbf{af}(\Delta_{p_1,q_1})$  for some  $1 \leq q_1 \leq r_{p_1}$ . Recursively for  $t \geq 2$ , we find the largest index  $p_t < p_{t-1}$  such that  $[a_{p_{t-1},q_{t-1}}]_\rho \in \mathbf{af}(\Delta_{p_t,q_t})$  for some  $1 \leq q_t \leq r_{p_t}$ . This process terminates after finite times, say  $\ell$  times.

*Step 4. (Expand and replace):* We define new extended segments as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{p_1,q_1}^{\text{ex}} &= [a, b_{p_1,q_1}]_\rho; \\ \Delta_{p_t,q_t}^{\text{ex}} &= [a_{p_{t-1},q_{t-1}}, b_{p_t,q_t}]_\rho \text{ for } 2 \leq t \leq \ell; \\ \Delta_{p_{\ell+1},q_{\ell+1}}^{\text{ex}} &= [a_{p_\ell,q_\ell}, b]_\rho \end{aligned}$$

As convention,  $[c, c - 1]_\rho = \emptyset$ . Finally, we define the right integral multisegment by

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) := \mathbf{m} - \sum_{t=1}^{\ell} \Delta_{p_t,q_t} + \sum_{t=1}^{\ell+1} \Delta_{p_t,q_t}^{\text{ex}}.$$

We shall say that  $\Delta_{p_1,q_1}, \dots, \Delta_{p_\ell,q_\ell}$  participate in the extension process for  $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ .

*Remark 2.* It can be easily observed that  $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lan}}(\mathbf{m})$  when  $b = a$ . For the rest of the article, we use this fact without mentioning it further.

*Remark 3.* One may view that finding downward sequences of maximally linked segments in Algorithm 5.3 above is to look for the matching in the sense of Lapid-Mínguez [LM16, Secton 5.13] i.e. for given  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ , look for an injective function

$$f : \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathbf{m} : a < a' \leq b + 1 \leq b' + 1\} \rightarrow \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathbf{m} : a \leq a' < b + 1 < b' + 1\}$$

such that  $\Delta \prec f(\Delta)$ .

A new input of our algorithm is the notion of addable free points to tell precisely which segments have to be expanded in (25) for the general case in computing  $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\mathbf{m})$ . If  $\nu^a \rho$  is not an addable free point for any segment  $\Delta_{p,q}$  (notations in Algorithm 5.3), then such matching function exists.

**Example 6.** Let  $\mathbf{m} = \{[1]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [2, 4]_\rho, [4, 6]_\rho\}$ . We have the following  $\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})$ :

- (i) Let  $\Delta = [1, 2]_\rho$ . Then,  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \{[1, 2]_\rho, [2, 4]_\rho\}$  and there is no segment in  $\mathbf{m}_1$  contributing the free point  $[1]_\rho$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{I}_{[1,2]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} + [1, 2]_\rho$ .
- (ii) Let  $\Delta = [1, 3]_\rho$ . Then,  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \{[2, 4]_\rho, [4, 6]_\rho\}$ . In  $\mathbf{m}_1$ , the segment contributing the free point  $[1]_\rho$  is  $[2, 4]_\rho$ , and there is no segment in  $\mathbf{m}_1$  contributing the free point  $[2]_\rho$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{I}_{[1,3]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} - [2, 4]_\rho + [1, 4]_\rho + [2, 3]_\rho$ .  $\square$



**5.3. Reduction to  $\mathfrak{m}_{[a,b]}$ .** For  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ , and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ , we recall

$$\mathfrak{m}_{[a,b]} = \{[a', b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{m} \mid a \leq a' \leq b+1 \leq b'+1\}.$$

**Lemma 5.4.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Suppose  $L(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}_{[a,b]})) = \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m}_{[a,b]}))$ . Then*

$$L(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})) = \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})).$$

*Proof.* Set  $\mathfrak{m}_1 = \mathfrak{m}_{[a,b]}$ . By Theorem 3.12, it suffices to show that  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m}$ . On the other hand, the assumption  $L(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}_1)) = \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m}_1))$  implies that  $\mathbb{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}_1))) = L(\mathfrak{m}_1)$ , and so by Theorem 3.12,  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}_1) = \mathfrak{m}_1$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{m}' = \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}_1$ . It follows from Algorithm 5.3 that  $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}_1) + \mathfrak{m}'$ . But it follows from Algorithm 3.3,  $\mathfrak{m}'$  also plays no role in that algorithm. Thus,

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}_1) + \mathfrak{m}') = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}_1) + \mathfrak{m}' = \mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}'.$$

Now the lemma follows from the above discussions.  $\square$

**5.4. Transfer beteen integral and derivative by exotic duality.** Let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . A multisegment  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  is said to be in good range for  $[a, b]_\rho$  if  $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_{[a,b]}$  that means for any  $\Delta \in \mathfrak{m}$ ,

$$a \leq s(\Delta) \leq b+1 \leq e(\Delta) + 1.$$

For any  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  in good range for  $[a, b]_\rho$  and  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ , we define

$$\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m}) = \{[-r + b' + 1, a' - 1]_\rho \mid [a', b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{m}\}, \quad \mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m}) + [b - r + 1, b]_\rho.$$

**Example 7.** (1) Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \{[2, 4]_\rho, [1, 7]_\rho\}$ . Then,  $\mathbb{D}_{10}(\mathfrak{m}) = \{[-5, 1]_\rho, [-2, 0]_\rho\}$  and

$$\mathbb{D}_{10}^{[0,1]_\rho}(\mathfrak{m}) = \{[-5, 1]_\rho, [-2, 0]_\rho\} + [-8, 1]_\rho.$$

(2) Let  $\mathfrak{m} = \{[2, 6]_\rho, [1, 5]_\rho\}$ . Then,  $\mathbb{D}_{15}(\mathfrak{m}) = \{[-8, 1]_\rho, [-9, 0]_\rho\}$  and

$$\mathbb{D}_{15}^{[1,4]_\rho}(\mathfrak{m}) = \{[-8, 1]_\rho, [-9, 0]_\rho, [-10, 4]_\rho\}.$$

**Proposition 5.5.** *Let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  be in good range for  $[a, b]_\rho$ . Then, for sufficiently large  $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ ,*

- (i) if  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})| = |\mathfrak{m}|$ , then  $\infty \neq \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m})) = \mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}))$ .
- (ii) if  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})| > |\mathfrak{m}|$ , then  $\infty \neq \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathfrak{m})) = \mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}))$ .
- (iii)  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})| = |\mathfrak{m}|$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m})) \neq \infty$ .

*Proof.* The proof is quite straightforward. To facilitate discussions, we define a natural bijective map:  $\Psi : \mathfrak{m} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m})$  determined by  $\Psi([a', b']_\rho) = [-r + b' + 1, a' - 1]_\rho$ . We first make the following two simple observations:

- (a) Two segments  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta'$  in  $\mathfrak{m}$  are linked if and only if  $\Psi(\Delta)$  and  $\Psi(\Delta')$  in  $\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m})$  are linked.

(b) The map

$$\Delta \in \mathfrak{m} \mapsto \ell_{rel}(\Delta) + \ell_{rel}(\Psi(\Delta))$$

is a constant map equal to  $r$ .

We also have the following facts, whose proofs are elementary. Let  $\Delta \in \mathfrak{m}$ .

- By using the map  $\Psi$ , one sees that  $a_1$  is the largest integer such that  $a_1 \leq s(\Delta)$  and  $\Delta' \prec \Delta$  for some  $\Delta' \in \mathfrak{m}[a_1]$  if and only if  $a_1$  is also the largest integer  $a_1 - 1 \leq e(\Psi(\Delta))$  and  $\Delta'' \prec \Psi(\Delta)$  for some  $\Delta'' \in \mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m})\langle a_1 - 1 \rangle$ .
- Moreover, for such  $a_1$ , by the second observation above,  $\Delta'$  is the shortest choice in  $\mathfrak{m}[a_1]$  such that  $\Delta' \prec \Delta$  if and only if  $\Psi(\Delta')$  is the longest choice in  $\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m})\langle a_1 - 1 \rangle$  such that  $\Psi(\Delta') \prec \Psi(\Delta)$ .

We now apply the map  $\Theta$  on  $\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m})$  (resp.  $\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]\rho}(\mathfrak{m})$ ) to apply Algorithm 3.3. Let  $\mathfrak{n} = \Theta(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m}))$  (resp.  $\Theta(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]\rho}(\mathfrak{m}))$ ). Now, it follows from the above two bullets: for  $k \geq 1$  (resp.  $k \geq 2$ ), the  $k$ -th upward sequence  $\underline{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{n}_k)$  (here  $\mathfrak{n}_k$  is defined in an obvious way as in Algorithm 3.3) maps naturally, under  $(\Theta \circ \Psi)^{-1}$ , to the downward sequence  $\underline{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}_k)$  (resp.  $\underline{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}_{k-1})$ ), where  $\mathfrak{m}_k$  and  $\mathfrak{m}_{k-1}$  are defined as in Algorithm 5.3. Moreover, for any  $\Delta \in \underline{\mathfrak{D}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}_{k-1})$ ,

$$\Theta \circ \Psi(\text{af}(\Delta)) = \text{rf}(\Theta \circ \Psi(\Delta)).$$

If we consider  $\mathfrak{n} = \Theta(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]\rho}(\mathfrak{m})) = \Theta(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m}) + [-r + b + 1, b]_\rho)$ , the first upward sequence  $\underline{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{n}_1)$  in Algorithm 3.3 contains only the segment  $\Theta([b - r + 1, b]_\rho)$ . The remaining upward sequences are exactly those from that for  $\mathcal{D}_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^{\text{Lang}}(\Theta \circ \mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m}))$ .

Thus, running the two algorithms, if  $\Delta_{p_1, q_1}, \dots, \Delta_{p_\ell, q_\ell}$  are all segments participating in the extension process for  $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ , then

- if  $s(\Delta_{p_\ell, q_\ell}) < b + 1$  (equivalently  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})| > |\mathfrak{m}|$ ), then  $\Theta \circ \Psi(\Delta_{p_1, q_1}), \dots, \Theta \circ \Psi(\Delta_{p_\ell, q_\ell})$  together with  $[-b, r - b - 1]_{\rho^\vee}$  participate in the truncation process for  $\mathcal{D}_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^{\text{Lang}}(\Theta \circ \mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]\rho}(\mathfrak{m}))$ .
- if  $s(\Delta_{p_\ell, q_\ell}) = b + 1$  (equivalently  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})| = |\mathfrak{m}|$ ), then  $\Theta \circ \Psi(\Delta_{p_1, q_1}), \dots, \Theta \circ \Psi(\Delta_{p_\ell, q_\ell})$  are all segments participating in the truncation process for the derivative  $\mathcal{D}_{[-b, -a]_{\rho^\vee}}^{\text{Lang}}(\Theta \circ \mathbb{D}_r(\mathfrak{m}))$ .

Now, using notations in Algorithm 5.3, one can verify, for  $k = 1, \dots, \ell$

$$\Theta \circ \Psi(\Delta_{p_k, q_k}^{\text{ex}}) = \Psi(\Delta_{p_k, q_k})^{\text{trc}};$$

and if  $s(\Delta_{p_\ell, q_\ell}) < b + 1$  (equivalently  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})| > |\mathfrak{m}|$ ), then we also have:

$$\Theta \circ \Psi([s(\Delta_\ell), b]_\rho) = [-s(\Delta_\ell) + 1, r - b - 1]_{\rho^\vee} = ([-b, r - b - 1]_{\rho^\vee})^{\text{trc}}$$

Now, one verifies the formulas (i) and (ii) in the proposition by using the above equations, (6) and (25).

For (iii), it is similar to the above discussion of (a) and (b) on the segments participating in the truncation process.  $\square$

When we later write  $\mathbb{D}_r$ , we shall assume  $r$  is any sufficiently large integer.

**Lemma 5.6.** *Let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  with  $b > a$  and let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  be in good range for  $[a, b]_\rho$ . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i)  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathbf{m}|$ ;
- (ii)  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m})) \neq \infty$ ;
- (iii)  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathbf{m})) \neq \infty$ .

*Proof.* Note that (i) $\Leftrightarrow$ (ii) follows from a similar argument in Proposition 5.5(iii) and is simpler. (ii) $\Leftrightarrow$ (iii) since  $-a > -b$  and  $[-b, r - b - 1]_{\rho^\vee}$  can not participate in the  $\text{tds}(-, -a)$  process on  $\Theta(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m}) + [b - r + 1, b]_\rho)$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 5.7.** *Let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  with  $b > a$  and let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  be in good range. If  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathbf{m}|$  or  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m})) \neq \infty$ , then*

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m})) = \mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})), \quad \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathbf{m})) = \mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})).$$

*Proof.* The argument is again exploiting the map  $\Psi$  defined in the above proofs. The proof is similar to Proposition 5.5, and is much simpler. We omit the details.  $\square$

### 5.5. More on commutation relation of derivatives.

**Lemma 5.8.** *Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Let  $a < c \leq b$ . Then*

- (i) *Suppose  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty.$$

- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ .*

*Proof.* For (i), by Theorem 3.10,  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$ . This follows from Lemma 2.3 that  $\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq 0$  and so we have the commutativity (see e.g [Cha24a, Lemma 4.4]). Now one applies Theorem 3.10 to obtain (i).

For (ii), Theorem 3.10 implies  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$ . Hence,  $\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$ , and by [Cha24a, Proposition 9.3(2)],  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(L(\mathbf{m})) \neq 0$ . Now, one applies Theorem 3.10 to obtain statements for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}$ .  $\square$

We shall need the following left version of Lemma 5.8:

**Corollary 5.9.** *Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Let  $a \leq c < b$ . Then*

- (i) *Suppose  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ . Then*

$$\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty.$$

- (ii) *If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , then  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[c]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ .*

### 5.6. Commutation of $\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ .

**Lemma 5.10.** *Let  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  with  $b > a$  and  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  be in good range for  $[a, b]_\rho$ . Then, we have:*

$$\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}).$$

*Proof.* By Algorithm 5.3, we must have  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| \geq |\mathbf{m}|$ . We shall divide it into two cases:

- (1) Case 1:  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathbf{m}|$ . We only show the steps for  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| > |\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})|$ , and the other case is similar.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})) &= \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}))) \quad (\text{by Proposition 5.5}) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathbf{m})) \quad (\text{by Lemma 5.7}) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathbf{m})) \quad (\text{by Corollary 5.9(ii) and (i)}) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}))) \quad (\text{by Proposition 5.5(ii)}) \\ &= \mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})) \quad (\text{by Lemma 5.7}) \end{aligned}$$

For the fourth equality, we can show the condition  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| > |\mathbf{m}|$  as follows: One sees from the previous expressions that the segment  $[-r + b + 1, b]_\rho$  has to be truncated for  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r^{[a,b]_\rho}(\mathbf{m}))$ , and this implies  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m})) = \infty$ , which implies  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| > |\mathbf{m}|$  by Proposition 5.5(iii).

- (2) Case 2:  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| > |\mathbf{m}|$ . We consider  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathbf{m}|$  and the other case only needs some notation changes. Then,  $\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} + [a]_\rho$ . Note that  $[a]_\rho$  has no role in running Algorithm 5.3 for  $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}))$ . Hence,

$$\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) + [a]_\rho.$$

Now, it suffices to show  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| > |\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})|$ . Otherwise,  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})|$  and so by Lemma 5.7,

$$\mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})) = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}\left(\mathbb{D}_r\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right)\right) \neq \infty.$$

Therefore, by Proposition 5.5 and the equality  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathbf{m}|$ , we have:

$$\infty \neq \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}\left(\mathbb{D}_r\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right)\right) = \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m})).$$

So  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m})) \neq \infty$  by Corollary 5.9(ii). However, the given condition is  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})| > |\mathbf{m}|$  and so it contradicts to Lemma 5.6.

□

**Lemma 5.11.** *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then,  $\mathbb{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R(\pi) \cong \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^R(\pi)$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows from  $\text{St}([a]_\rho) \times \text{St}([a, b]_\rho) \cong \text{St}([a, b]_\rho) \times \text{St}([a]_\rho)$  and also [LM16, Corollary 6.11]. □

**5.7. Composition of integrals  $\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$  and  $\mathcal{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}$ .** Note that one may also want to use the exotic duality to prove the following Lemma 5.12. However, in order to do so, one still needs to translate the condition  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$  under the duality  $\mathbb{D}_r$ . The proof does not make much simpler via the duality and so we shall simply give a more direct proof for the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.12.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . If  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ , we then have*

$$\mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$$

*Proof.* Assume all the notation in Algorithm 5.3. To find  $\mathcal{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ , we first set  $\mathfrak{m}'_1 = \mathfrak{m}_{[a+1, b]}$ . We divide into the following two cases:

Case 1.  $\ell \geq 1$ : As  $p_1$  is the highest integer such that  $[a]_\rho$  is an addable free element of  $\Delta_{p_1, q_1}$ , we have  $a_{p, r_p} = a$  for all  $p_1 < p \leq k$  and  $a_{p_1, r_{p_1}} \geq a + 1$ . If  $a_{p_1, r_{p_1}} = a + 1$ ,  $[a + 1]_\rho$  is an addable free element of  $\Delta_{p_2, q_2}$  with  $\Delta_{p_2, q_2}^{\text{ex}} = [a + 1, b_{p_2, q_2}]_\rho$ . As  $\Delta_{p, r_p} \not\prec \Delta_{p_1, q_1}$  for  $p_1 < p \leq k$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ , we have

$$(26) \quad a_{p, r_p} = a \text{ and } a_{p, r_{p-1}} = a + 1 \quad \text{for } p_1 < p \leq k.$$

Then, the downward sequences of minimal linked segments with the largest starting in  $\mathfrak{m}'_1$  are given by

$$(27) \quad \underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{m}'_p) = \begin{cases} \underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{m}_p) & \text{if } a_{p, r_p} \neq a \\ \underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{m}_p) - \Delta_{p, r_p} & \text{if } a_{p, r_p} = a, \end{cases}$$

for  $1 \leq p \leq k$  with  $\mathfrak{m}'_{p+1} = \mathfrak{m}'_p - \underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{m}'_p)$ . Therefore, by (26), (27) and (25), we get

$$(28) \quad \mathcal{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{t=2}^{\ell} \Delta_{p_t, q_t} + \sum_{t=2}^{\ell+1} \Delta_{p_t, q_t}^{\text{ex}} + \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } a_{p_1, q_1} = a + 1 \\ [a + 1, b_{p_1, q_1}]_\rho - \Delta_{p_1, q_1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We now find  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{n})$ , where  $\mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ . Set  $\mathfrak{w} = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{p_1 < p \leq k} \underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{m}_p)$ . Then,

$$(29) \quad \mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{w}) + \sum_{p_1 < p \leq k} \underline{\mathcal{Q}\mathfrak{s}}(\mathfrak{m}_p)$$

By (26) and (29), for  $p_1 < p \leq k$ , the segments  $\Delta_{p, r_p}$  and  $\Delta_{p, r_{p-1}}$  participate in the same removal step of the  $\text{tds}(-, a)$  process applied to  $\mathfrak{m}$  and so, applied to  $\mathfrak{n}$ . Therefore, as  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ , there exists an injective map  $f : \mathfrak{w}[a] \rightarrow \mathfrak{w}[a + 1]$  such that  $\Delta'$  and  $f(\Delta')$  participate in the same removal step of the  $\text{tds}(-, a)$  process applied to  $\mathfrak{m}$ . If  $a_{p_1, q_1} = a + 1$  (resp.  $a_{p_1, q_1} \neq a + 1$ ), we have  ${}^+ \Delta_{p_1, q_1} \not\prec \Delta''$  for any  $\Delta'' \in \mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{w})[a +$

$1] = \mathfrak{w}[a+1] - \Delta_{p_1, q_1} + \Delta_{p_2, q_2}^{\text{ex}}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{w})[a+1] = \mathfrak{w}[a+1]$ ) since  $b_{p_1, q_1} \geq e(\Delta'')$ . Therefore, in both situations,  $\Delta_{p_1, q_1}^{\text{ex}}$  does not participate in the removal steps of the  $\text{tus}(-, a)$  process applied to  $\mathfrak{n}$ , and if  $a_{p_1, q_1} \neq a+1$ ,  $\Delta_{p_1, q_1}^{\text{ex}}$  is the shortest such segments. If  $a_{p_1, q_1} = a+1$ , we have  $(a_{p, r_p}, a_{p, r_{p-1}}) = (a, a+1)$  for  $p_2 < p < p_1$ . Therefore,  $f$  induces an injective map  $\tilde{f} : \mathfrak{w}[a] \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{w})[a+1]$  such that  $\Delta' \prec \tilde{f}(\Delta')$  for any  $\Delta' \in \mathfrak{w}[a] = \mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{w})[a] - \Delta_{p_1, q_1}^{\text{ex}}$ , and so,  $\Delta_{p_1, q_1}^{\text{ex}}$  is the only segment in  $\mathfrak{n}[a]$ , which does not participate in any removal step of the  $\text{tus}(-, a)$  process on  $\mathfrak{n}$ . Therefore,

$$\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{n}) = \mathfrak{n} - \Delta_{p_1, q_1}^{\text{ex}} + {}^-\Delta_{p_1, q_1}^{\text{ex}} = \mathcal{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}).$$

Hence, we conclude that  $\mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})$ .

Case 2.  $\ell = 0$ : Then,  $a_{p, r_p} = a$  and as  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ ,  $a_{p, r_{p-1}} = a+1$  for all  $1 \leq p \leq k$ . Therefore, the downward sequences of minimal linked segments with the largest starting in  $\mathfrak{m}'_1$  are given by  $\underline{\mathcal{Q}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}'_p) = \underline{\mathcal{Q}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}_p) - \Delta_{p, r_p}$  for  $1 \leq p \leq k$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}'_{p+1} = \mathfrak{m}'_p - \underline{\mathcal{Q}}\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{m}'_p)$ . Hence, we get

$$\mathfrak{n} = \mathcal{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} + [a+1, b]_\rho.$$

Let  $X_a = \{[a, b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{m} \mid b' < b\}$  and  $X_{a+1} = \{[a+1, b']_\rho \in \mathfrak{m} \mid b' < b\}$ . As  $(a_{p, r_p}, a_{p, r_{p-1}}) = (a, a+1)$  for  $1 \leq p \leq k$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \infty$ , there exists an injective map  $h : X_a \rightarrow X_{a+1}$  such that  $\Delta' \prec h(\Delta')$  for  $\Delta' \in X_a$ . Then, in some removal step of the  $\text{tus}(-, a)$  process applied to  $\mathfrak{n}$ , each  $\Delta' \in \mathfrak{n}[a] = X_a$  participates along with a segment  $\Delta'' \in X_{a+1} \subset \mathfrak{n}[a+1]$ . Again, for  $1 \leq p \leq k$ ,  $\Delta_{p, r_p} = [a, b_{p, r_p}] \not\prec [a+1, b]_\rho$ , since  $b_{p, r_p} \geq b$  and the pair  $(\Delta_{p, r_p}, \Delta_{p, r_{p-1}})$  participates in the same removal step of the  $\text{tus}(-, a)$  process applied to  $\mathfrak{n}$  as  $(a_{p, r_p}, a_{p, r_{p-1}}) = (a, a+1)$ . Therefore,  $[a+1, b]_\rho$  is the only segment in  $\mathfrak{n}[a+1] - X_{a+1}$ , which does not participate in the removal steps of the  $\text{tus}(-, a)$  process applied to  $\mathfrak{n}$ . Hence, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{n}) = \mathfrak{n} - [a+1, b]_\rho + {}^+[a+1, b]_\rho = \mathfrak{m} + [a, b]_\rho = \mathcal{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m}).$$

□

**Lemma 5.13.** *Let  $\pi \in \text{Irr}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . If  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) = 0$ , we then have*

$$\text{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) \cong \text{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \text{I}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi).$$

*Proof.* Take  $\tau = \text{I}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi)$ . Then,  $\text{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\tau) \cong \pi \neq 0$ . As  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\pi) = 0$ , we have  $\varepsilon_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\tau) = 1$ . By Lemma 3.5, we get  $\text{D}_{[a+1, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}} \circ \text{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\tau) \cong \text{D}_{[a, b]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(\tau)$ . Hence the result follows. □

## 5.8. Main result.

**Theorem 5.14.** *Let  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  and  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Then,  $\text{I}_\Delta^{\text{R}}(L(\mathfrak{m})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{Lang}}(\mathfrak{m})\right)$ .*

*Proof.* We use induction argument on the length  $\ell_{rel}(\Delta)$  of  $\Delta = [a, b]_\rho$ , and the length  $\ell_{rel}(\mathbf{m})$  of  $\mathbf{m}$  to give a proof of the theorem. By Lemma 5.4, we may assume  $\mathbf{m}$  is in good range for  $\Delta$ . By Proposition 5.2, for  $\ell_{rel}(\Delta) = 1$  and for any  $\mathbf{m}' \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ , we have

$$(30) \quad \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m}')) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}')\right).$$

This also serves as a basic case.

Case 1. Let  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ . As an inductive step, we assume that

$$(31) \quad \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{n})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{n})\right).$$

for any  $\mathbf{n} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  with  $\ell_{rel}(\mathbf{n}) < \ell_{rel}(\mathbf{m})$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) &= \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \\ &= \mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) \quad (\text{by Lemma 5.10}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right) &= L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R\left(L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right)\right) \quad (\text{by (30)}) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R\left(L\left(\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right)\right) \quad (\text{by (31)}) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{D}_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \quad (\text{by } \rho\text{-derivative}) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{D}_{[a]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \quad (\text{by Lemma 5.11}) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})). \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. Let  $\mathcal{D}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$ . As an inductive step, we assume that

$$(32) \quad \mathbb{I}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right).$$

Therefore, using Lemma 5.12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right) &\cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R\left(L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang}}(\mathbf{m})\right)\right) \quad (\text{by (30)}) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a]_\rho}^R \circ \mathbb{I}_{[a+1,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \quad (\text{by (32)}) \\ &\cong \mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^R(L(\mathbf{m})) \quad (\text{by Lemma 5.13}). \end{aligned}$$

□

**5.9. Left Integral Algorithm.** The following theorem follows from Theorem 5.14 and Section 2.2.4:

**Theorem 5.15.** For  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ , we define

$$\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang},L}(\mathbf{m}) = \Theta\left(\mathcal{I}_{[-b,-a]_\rho^\vee}^{\text{Lang}}(\Theta(\mathbf{m}))\right).$$

Then,

$$\mathbb{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^L(L(\mathbf{m})) \cong L\left(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang},L}(\mathbf{m})\right).$$

## 6. INTEGRAL IN ZELEVINSKY CLASSIFICATION

In this section, we present an algorithm for computing  $\mathbb{I}_\Delta^R(Z(\mathbf{m}))$ . We shall continue the approach of using MW algorithm from Section 4. An alternate approach is to use reduction similar to Section 3 while the details require some lengthy routine checkings and so we shall not provide details.

### 6.1. Algorithm for integrals.

**Algorithm 6.1.** Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Set  $\mathbf{m}_0 = \mathbf{m}$  to apply the following steps:

*Step 1. (Choose a downward sequence of minimal linked segments):* Define the removable downward sequence of minimal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathbf{m}_0$  ranging from  $b$  to  $a - 1$  as follows: start with the shortest segment  $\Delta_1^b$  (if it exists) in  $\mathbf{m}_0 \langle b \rangle$ . Recursively for  $b - 1 \geq i \geq a - 1$ , we choose the shortest segment  $\Delta_1^i$  (if it exists) in  $\mathbf{m}_0 \langle i \rangle$  such that  $\Delta_1^i \prec \Delta_1^{i+1}$ , and set  $\Delta_1^i = \emptyset$  if it does not exist. Then the sequence  $\Delta_1^{a-1} \prec \dots \prec \Delta_1^b$  defines a downward sequence of minimal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathbf{m}_0$  ranging from  $b$  to  $a - 1$ .

*Step 2. (Remove and replace):* We replace  $\mathbf{m}_0$  by  $\mathbf{m}_1$  defined by

$$\mathbf{m}_1 := \mathbf{m}_0 - \sum_{i=a-1}^b \Delta_1^i.$$

*Step 3. (Repeat Step 1 and 2):* Again find (if it exists say  $\Delta_2^{a-1} \prec \dots \prec \Delta_2^b$ ) the downward sequence of minimal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathbf{m}_1$  ranging from  $b$  to  $a - 1$  and replace  $\mathbf{m}_1$  by

$$\mathbf{m}_2 := \mathbf{m}_1 - \sum_{i=a-1}^b \Delta_2^i.$$

Repeat this removal process until it terminates after a finite number of times, say  $k$  times and there does not exist any downward sequence of minimal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathbf{m}_k$  ranging from  $b$  to  $a - 1$ .

*Step 4. (Upward sequence of maximal linked segments):* If  $\mathbf{m}_k \langle a - 1 \rangle \neq \emptyset$ , we choose the maximal length segment  $\tilde{\Delta}_{a-1} \in \mathbf{m}_k \langle a - 1 \rangle$ . Otherwise, we set  $\tilde{\Delta}_{a-1} = \emptyset$ , the void segment. Recursively for  $a \leq i \leq b - 1$ , we choose the maximal segment  $\tilde{\Delta}_i \in \mathbf{m}_k \langle i \rangle$  (if it exists) such that  $\tilde{\Delta}_{i-1} \prec \tilde{\Delta}_i$ . Otherwise, we set  $\tilde{\Delta}_i = \emptyset$ .

*Step 5. (Extension):* Finally, we define the right integral multisegment by

$$(33) \quad \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}) := \mathbf{m} - \sum_{i=a-1}^{b-1} \tilde{\Delta}_i + \sum_{i=a-1}^{b-1} (\tilde{\Delta}_i)^+,$$

where, we set  $(\tilde{\Delta}_i)^+ = [i + 1, i + 1]_\rho = \{v^{i+1}\rho\}$  if  $\tilde{\Delta}_i = \emptyset$ .

**Example 8.** Let  $\mathbf{m} = \{[0, 2]_\rho, [0, 1]_\rho, [0, 1]_\rho, [1, 2]_\rho, [1, 1]_\rho, [2, 3]_\rho\}$  and  $\Delta = [2, 3]_\rho$ . Then,  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m} - [2, 3]_\rho - [1, 2]_\rho - [0, 1]_\rho$ . Since  $\mathbf{m}_1 \langle 3 \rangle = \emptyset$ , there is no removable downward sequence of minimal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathbf{m}_1$  ranging from 3 to 1. We have  $\tilde{\Delta}_1 = [0, 1]_\rho$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}_2 = \emptyset$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} - [0, 1]_\rho + [0, 2]_\rho + [3, 3]_\rho$ .



*Remark 4.* One may consider the algorithm here is an effective version of [LM16, Proposition 5.1], which does not involve the direct use of Mœglin-Waldspurger algorithm.

## 6.2. MW algorithm and Integral algorithm.

**Lemma 6.2.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Let  $\nu^c \rho$  be the maximal cuspidal support for  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Fix an integer  $b \leq c$ . Suppose that there is no downward sequence of minimally linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathfrak{m}$  ranging from  $c$  to  $b-1$ . Let  $\tilde{\Delta}_{b-1}, \dots, \tilde{\Delta}_{c-1}$  be the (possibly void) segments participating in the extension process for  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})$  i.e.,  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m} - \sum_{i=b-1}^{c-1} \tilde{\Delta}_i + \sum_{i=b-1}^{c-1} \tilde{\Delta}_i^+$ . Then the segments participating in the MW algorithm for  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})$  are  $\tilde{\Delta}_{b-1}^+, \dots, \tilde{\Delta}_{c-1}^+$ .*

*Proof.* Note that the condition on downward sequences guarantee that  $\tilde{\Delta}_{b-1}$  is the longest segment in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle b-1 \rangle$ , and for each  $k = b, \dots, c-1$ ,  $\tilde{\Delta}_k$  is the longest segment in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle k \rangle$  linked to  $\tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}$ . If a segment  $\Delta_c \in \mathfrak{m}\langle c \rangle$  is shorter than  $\tilde{\Delta}_{c-1}^+$ , the sequence  $\Delta_c, \tilde{\Delta}_{c-1}, \dots, \tilde{\Delta}_{b-1}$  produces a downward sequence of linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathfrak{m}$  ranging from  $c$  to  $b-1$ , that contradicts the given condition. Also, for  $c-1 \geq k \geq b$ , we cannot find a segment  $\Delta$  in  $\mathfrak{m}\langle k \rangle$  such that  $\Delta \subset \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}^+$ , and  $\Delta \prec \tilde{\Delta}_k^+$ . Then one can use this to show the lemma.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.3.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Let  $\Delta(\mathfrak{m}) = [a, c]_\rho$  be the first segment produced by MW algorithm on  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Let  $r = \varepsilon_{[a,c]\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m}) + \dots + \varepsilon_{[b-1,c]\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})$  for some  $a \leq b \leq c$ , where  $r = 0$  if  $a = b$ . Then,*

$$\left(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}\right)^{r+1} \left(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})\right) = \left(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}\right)^r(\mathfrak{m}).$$

Moreover, if  $a' \leq b-1$ ,  $\varepsilon_{[a',c]\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})) = \varepsilon_{[a',c]\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathfrak{m})$ ; and the first segment produced by the MW-algorithm for  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r \circ \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})$  is  $[b, c]_\rho$ .

*Proof.* We use the notations in Algorithm 6.1 applied to  $\mathfrak{m}$ . Comparing with the MW algorithm, we obtain  $r$  downward sequences of minimally linked segments:

$$\Delta_1^c, \dots, \Delta_1^{b-1}, \dots; \Delta_r^c, \dots, \Delta_r^{b-1}.$$

Using the notation in Algorithm 6.1, we also have the segments  $\tilde{\Delta}_{c-1}, \dots, \tilde{\Delta}_{b-1}$  (possibly empty) in  $\mathfrak{m} - \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{k=b-1}^c \Delta_i^k$  participating in the extension process for  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m})$ .

Now, for  $b-1 \leq k \leq c$ , let  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m}) = \Delta_1^k + \dots + \Delta_r^k$ . For  $k = b-1, \dots, c-1$ , Lemma 4.3 implies that  $MW_k(\mathfrak{m})$  and  $MW_{k+1}(\mathfrak{m})$  are minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m}$ , and so, they are also minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m} - \sum_{k=b-1}^{c-1} \tilde{\Delta}_k$ . On the other hand, by Lemma 6.2, for  $k = b, \dots, c-1$ ,  $\tilde{\Delta}_k^+$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}_{k+1}^+$  are minimally linked in  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) - \sum_{k=b-1}^c MW_k(\mathfrak{m})$  and no segment in  $(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathfrak{m}) - \sum_{k=b-1}^c MW_k(\mathfrak{m}))\langle b-1 \rangle$  is linked to  $\tilde{\Delta}_{b-1}^+$ . Now by Lemma

A.1, for  $b \leq k \leq c-1$ ,  $MW_k(\mathbf{m}) + \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}^+$  and  $MW_{k+1}(\mathbf{m}) + \tilde{\Delta}_k^+$  are minimally linked in

$$\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}) = \left( \mathbf{m} - \sum_{k=b-1}^{c-1} \tilde{\Delta}_k - \sum_{k=b-1}^c WM_k(\mathbf{m}) \right) + \sum_{k=b-1}^c WM_k(\mathbf{m}) + \sum_k \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}^+,$$

and  $MW_{b-1}(\mathbf{m})$  and  $MW_b(\mathbf{m}) + \tilde{\Delta}_{b-1}^+$  are also minimally linked in  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})$ .

In order to find all the segments participating in the MW algorithm for

$$\mathbf{m}, \mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}}(\mathbf{m}), \dots, (\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathbf{m}),$$

we, for  $k = b-2, \dots, a$ , recursively find the submultisegments  $WM_k(\mathbf{m}) \subseteq \mathbf{m}\langle k \rangle$  such that  $WM_k(\mathbf{m})$  and  $WM_{k+1}(\mathbf{m})$  are minimally linked in  $\mathbf{m}$ . For  $k = b-2, \dots, a$ , as  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})\langle k \rangle = \mathbf{m}\langle k \rangle$ , we have  $WM_k(\mathbf{m})$  and  $WM_{k+1}(\mathbf{m})$  are also minimally linked in  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})$ .

Now, by using Lemma 4.3(i) and above discussions, one has:  $(\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{r+1}(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})) =$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}) - \sum_{k=a}^{b-1} MW_k(\mathbf{m}) - \sum_{k=b}^c (MW_k(\mathbf{m}) + \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}^+) + \sum_{k=a}^{b-1} MW_k(\mathbf{m})^- + \sum_{k=b}^c (MW_k(\mathbf{m}) + \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}^+)^- \\ &= \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}) - \sum_{k=a}^c MW_k(\mathbf{m}) - \sum_{k=b}^c \tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}^+ + \sum_{k=a}^c MW_k(\mathbf{m})^- + \sum_{k=b}^c (\tilde{\Delta}_{k-1}^+)^- \\ &= \mathbf{m} - \sum_{k=a}^c MW_k(\mathbf{m}) + \sum_{k=a}^c MW_k(\mathbf{m})^- = (\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathbf{m}). \end{aligned}$$

The assertion for  $\varepsilon_{[a',c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}$  follows from its definition, the segments participating in the MW-algorithms above, and Lemma 4.3(i).  $\square$

### 6.3. Main result.

**Theorem 6.4.** *Let  $\Delta \in \text{Seg}_\rho$  and  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Then,  $\mathbb{I}_\Delta^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathbf{m})) \cong Z(\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\Delta = [b, c]_\rho$ . Let  $\mathbf{n} = \mathbf{m}^{\leq c}$ . Let  $\Delta(\mathbf{n}) = [a, c]_\rho$  be the first segment produced by the MW-algorithm for  $\mathbf{n}$ . Let  $k_x = \varepsilon_{[x,c]_\rho}^{\text{MW}}(\mathbf{n})$  for  $a \leq x \leq b-1$ , and set  $r = k_a + \dots + k_{b-1}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{D}_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{k_{b-1}} \circ \dots \circ (\mathbb{D}_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{k_a}(Z(\mathbf{n})) &= Z((\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^r(\mathbf{n})) \\ &= Z((\mathcal{D}^{\text{MW}})^{r+1} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n})) \\ &= \mathbb{D}_\Delta^{\text{R}} \circ (\mathbb{D}_{[b-1,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{k_{b-1}} \circ \dots \circ (\mathbb{D}_{[a,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}})^{k_a}(Z(\mathcal{I}_\Delta^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n}))) \end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Proposition 4.1, the second equality follows from the first assertion of Lemma 6.3, and the third one follows from the second assertion of Lemma 6.3.

Now, applying integrals on both sides and using commutativity of derivatives, we can cancel to obtain:

$$\mathbb{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n}))) = Z(\mathbf{n}).$$

With Theorem 4.14, we have  $Z(\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n})) = Z(\mathbf{n})$  and so  $\mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n}) = \mathbf{n}$ . Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m}) &= \mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}} \circ \mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n} + \mathbf{m}^{>c}) = \mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n}) + \mathbf{m}^{>c}) \\ &= \mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{n})) + \mathbf{m}^{>c} = \mathbf{n} + \mathbf{m}^{>c} = \mathbf{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Theorem 4.14 again,  $Z(\mathbf{m}) = \mathcal{D}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbf{m})))$ . Now, the theorem follows by applying  $\mathcal{I}_{[b,c]_\rho}^{\text{R}}$  on both sides.  $\square$

**6.4. Algorithm for left integral.** We again have the left version:

**Theorem 6.5.** For  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ , define  $\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel,L}}(\mathbf{m}) = \Theta \left( \mathcal{I}_{[-b,-a]_{\rho^\vee}}^{\text{Zel}}(\Theta(\mathbf{m})) \right)$ .

Then,

$$\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{L}}(Z(\mathbf{m})) \cong Z \left( \mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Lang,L}}(\mathbf{m}) \right).$$

**6.5. Exotic duality.** For completeness, we shall also establish an exotic duality analogous to Proposition 5.5. We use  $\mathbb{D}_r$  defined in Section 5.4.

**Proposition 6.6.** Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $[a, b]_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Then, for sufficiently large  $r$ ,

- (i) if  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel,L}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathbf{m}|$ ,  $\mathbb{D}_r(\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel,L}}) = \mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m}))$ .
- (ii)  $|\mathcal{I}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel,L}}(\mathbf{m})| = |\mathbf{m}|$  if and only if  $\mathcal{D}_{[a,b]_\rho}^{\text{Zel}}(\mathbb{D}_r(\mathbf{m})) \neq \infty$ .

A proof is similar to Proposition 5.5, and we omit the details.

## 7. APPLICATION ON HIGHEST DERIVATIVE MULTISEGEMENTS

**Algorithm 7.1.** Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ . Set  $\mathbf{m}_1 = \mathbf{m}$  and apply the following step:

*Step 1. (Choose upward sequences)* Let  $a_1$  be the smallest integer such that  $\mathbf{m}_1 \langle a_1 \rangle \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\Delta_{1,a_1}$  be the longest segment in  $\mathbf{m}_1 \langle a_1 \rangle$ . For  $j \geq a_1 + 1$ , we recursively find the longest segment  $\Delta_{1,j}$  in  $\mathbf{m}_1 \langle j \rangle$  such that  $\Delta_{1,j}$  is linked to  $\Delta_{1,j-1}$ . This process of choosing segments terminates when no further such segment  $\Delta_{1,j}$  can be found. Set the last such segment to be  $\Delta_{1,b_1}$  and define

$$\mathbf{m}_2 = \mathbf{m}_1 - \Delta_{1,a_1} - \dots - \Delta_{1,b_1}.$$

*Step 2. (Repeat Step 1)* For  $i \geq 2$ , we repeat Step 1 for  $\mathbf{m}_i$ , and obtain segments  $\Delta_{i,a_i}, \dots, \Delta_{i,b_i}$ . We recursively define:

$$\mathbf{m}_{i+1} = \mathbf{m}_i - \Delta_{i,a_i} - \dots - \Delta_{i,b_i}.$$

This removal process terminates after say  $\ell$  times when  $\mathbf{m}_{\ell+1} = \emptyset$ .

*Step 3. Finally, we define*

$$\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{m}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} [a_i, b_i]_\rho.$$

**Theorem 7.2.** For  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$ , we have  $\mathfrak{hd}(Z(\mathbf{m})) = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{m})$ .

*Proof.* Most of the combinatorial arguments have been discussed before, and so we only sketch the main steps in this proof. We use the notations in Algorithm 7.1. Let  $[a', b']_\rho \in \text{Seg}_\rho$ . Let  $i^*$  be the largest integer such that  $a_{i^*} \leq a' - 1$ . For each  $i \leq i^*$ , if  $b_i \geq b'$ , we pick all the segments

$$\mathbf{n}_i = \Delta_{i, a' - 1} + \dots + \Delta_{i, b'}$$

and otherwise, set  $\mathbf{n}_i = \emptyset$ .

Now, one shows that the multisegment  $\mathbf{n}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{n}_{i^*}$  coincides with the sum of all the removal upward sequences of maximal linked segments in neighbors on  $\mathbf{m}$  ranging from  $a' - 1$  to  $b'$ . This can be proved by a version of gluing suitable maximally linked segments of Lemma A.1.

Let

$$r = r_{[a', b']_\rho} := \left| \left\{ [a', \tilde{b}]_\rho \in \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{m})[a'] : \tilde{b} \geq b' \right\} \right|.$$

Then, one can use the linked relation of the segments

$$\Delta_{i^*+1, a'}, \dots, \Delta_{i^*+1, b'}, \dots, \Delta_{i^*+r, a'}, \dots, \Delta_{i^*+r, b'}$$

in  $\mathbf{m}_{i^*+1}$  to find a collection of minimally linked segments  $MW_{b'}, \dots, MW_{a'}$  such that

- (1) for all  $j = b', \dots, a'$ ,  $MW_j$  is a submultisegment of  $\mathbf{m}_{i^*+1}\langle j \rangle$ , and  $|MW_j| = r$ ;
- (2)  $MW_{b'}$  consists of the first  $r$  shortest segments in  $\mathbf{m}_{i^*+1}\langle b' \rangle$ , and for  $a' \leq j \leq b' - 1$ ,  $MW_j$  is minimally linked to  $MW_{j+1}$  in  $\mathbf{m}_{i^*+1}$ .

Showing above is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.4.

Now, this shows that  $(\mathcal{D}_{[a', b']_\rho}^{\text{Zel}})^r(\mathbf{m}) \neq \infty$ , and  $(\mathcal{D}_{[a', b']_\rho}^{\text{Zel}})^{r+1}(\mathbf{m}) = \infty$  can be proved by similar arguments. By Theorem 4.14, we have

$$\varepsilon_{[a', b']_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathbf{m})) = r_{[a', b']_\rho}.$$

By [Cha24a, Propostion 5.2], the multiplicity of the segment  $[a', b']_\rho$  in  $\mathfrak{hd}(Z(\mathbf{m}))$  is precisely

$$\varepsilon_{[a', b']_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathbf{m})) - \varepsilon_{[a', b'+1]_\rho}^{\text{R}}(Z(\mathbf{m}))$$

and so is equal to  $r_{[a', b']_\rho} - r_{[a', b'+1]_\rho}$ , that is the number of segments  $[a', b']_\rho$  in  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{m})$ . Thus, one now sees that  $\mathfrak{hd}(Z(\mathbf{m})) = \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{m})$ .  $\square$

**Example 9.** (1) Let  $\mathbf{m} = \{[1, 4]_\rho, [2, 5]_\rho, [3, 4]_\rho, [2, 6]_\rho\}$ . Then, we get

$$\mathfrak{hd}(Z(\mathbf{m})) = \{[4, 5]_\rho, [4]_\rho, [6]_\rho\}.$$

(2) If all the segments in  $\mathbf{m}$  are mutually unlinked, then

$$\mathfrak{hd}(Z(\mathbf{m})) = \{[e(\Delta)]_\rho : \Delta \in \mathbf{m}\}.$$

#### APPENDIX A. GLUING MINIMALLY LINKED MULTISEGMENTS

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{m} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  and  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{p}_k, \mathfrak{p}'_k \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  such that all segments  $\Delta$  in  $\mathfrak{p}_k, \mathfrak{p}'_k$  satisfy  $e(\Delta) = k$ , and let  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}, \mathfrak{p}'_{k+1} \in \text{Mult}_\rho$  such that all segments  $\Delta$  in  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}, \mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}$  satisfy  $e(\Delta) = k + 1$ . Suppose  $|\mathfrak{p}_k| \leq |\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}|$ ,  $|\mathfrak{p}'_k| \leq |\mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}|$ , and furthermore  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{p}'_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}$ ) are minimally linked in  $\mathbf{m} + \mathfrak{p}_k + \mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{m} + \mathfrak{p}'_k + \mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}$ ), then  $\mathfrak{p}_k + \mathfrak{p}'_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1} + \mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}$  are minimally linked in  $\mathbf{m} + \mathfrak{p}_k + \mathfrak{p}_{k+1} + \mathfrak{p}'_k + \mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}$ .*

*Proof.* We shall first consider the case that  $|\mathfrak{p}'_k| = |\mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}| = 1$ , and so let  $\tilde{\Delta}_k \in \mathfrak{p}'_k$  and let  $\tilde{\Delta}_{k+1} \in \mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}$ . Let  $r = |\mathfrak{p}_k|$ , and let  $s = |\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}|$ . We write the segments in  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  (resp.  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$ ) in the increasing order:

$$\Delta_{k,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k,r}, \quad (\text{resp. } \Delta_{k+1,1}, \dots, \Delta_{k+1,s}).$$

Let  $j_i^*$  ( $i = k, k+1$ ) be the smallest integer such that  $s(\Delta_{i,j_i^*-1}) > s(\tilde{\Delta}_i) \geq s(\Delta_{i,j_i^*})$ . For  $1 \leq x \leq s$ , let

$$\bar{\Delta}_{k,x} = \begin{cases} \Delta_{k,x} & 1 \leq x \leq j_k^* - 1 \\ \tilde{\Delta}_k & x = j_k^* \\ \Delta_{k,x+1} & j_k^* + 1 \leq x \leq s \end{cases}$$

Let  $\{\underline{\Delta}_{k,1}, \dots, \underline{\Delta}_{k,s'}\}$  be the submultisegment minimally linked to  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1} + \tilde{\Delta}_{k+1}$  in  $\mathfrak{m} + \mathfrak{p}_k + \mathfrak{p}_{k+1} + \tilde{\Delta}_k + \tilde{\Delta}_{k+1}$ , written in the increasing order

(1) Case 1:  $j_k^* < j_{k+1}^*$ .

- For  $1 \leq x \leq j_{k+1}^* - 1$ , if  $\underline{\Delta}_{k,j_k^*}$  is in  $\mathfrak{n}$ , then it contradicts that  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$  are minimally linked. But then,  $\underline{\Delta}_{k,j_k^*} = \bar{\Delta}_{k,j_k^*}$ .
- For  $x = j_{k+1}^*$ , if  $\underline{\Delta}_{k,j_{k+1}^*}$  is in  $\mathfrak{n}$ , then that segment is linked to  $\bar{\Delta}_{k+1,j_{k+1}^*-1} = \Delta_{k+1,j_{k+1}^*-1}$ . This then contradicts the minimal linkedness of  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$ .
- For  $j_{k+1}^* + 1 \leq x \leq s$ , the case is similar to above two case.
- It remains to show  $s = s'$ . However, if it not the case, one can show it contradicts the minimally linkedness of  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$ .

(2) Case 2:  $j_k^* \geq j_{k+1}^*$ .

- For  $1 \leq x \leq j_{k+1}^* - 1$ ,  $\underline{\Delta}_{k,x} = \bar{\Delta}_{k,x}$  again comes from the minimal linkedness of  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$ .
- We consider  $j_{k+1}^* \leq x \leq j_k^*$ . Suppose  $\underline{\Delta}_{k,x}$  is in  $\mathfrak{n}$ . Then  $\underline{\Delta}_{k,x}$  must have to be shorter than  $\tilde{\Delta}_k$ . This contradicts that  $\tilde{\Delta}_k$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}_{k+1}$  are minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m} + \tilde{\Delta}_k + \tilde{\Delta}_{k+1}$ .
- For  $j_i^* < x \leq s$  and showing  $s = s'$ , one again uses the minimal linkedness between  $\mathfrak{p}_k$  and  $\mathfrak{p}_{k+1}$ .

The case that  $|\mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}| = 1$  and  $|\mathfrak{p}'_k| = 0$  is similar to the consideration of Case 2 above, and we omit the details.

For the general case, we find the first segment  $\Delta_1$  in the increasing order of  $\mathfrak{p}'_{k+1}$  and the first segment in the increasing order  $\Delta'_1$  of  $\mathfrak{p}'_k$ . Then, one uses the given minimal linkedness to deduce that  $\Delta_1$  and  $\Delta'_1$  are minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m} + \Delta_1 + \Delta'_1$ ; and  $\mathfrak{p} - \Delta_1$  and  $\mathfrak{p}' - \Delta'_1$  are minimally linked in  $\mathfrak{m} + (\mathfrak{p} - \Delta_1) + (\mathfrak{p}' - \Delta'_1)$ . Then, one proceeds inductively by using the above two basic cases.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [Ato20] Hiraku Atobe, *On an algorithm to compute derivatives*. Manuscripta Math. 167 (2022), no. 3-4, 721-763. MR 4385389
- [BLM13] Alexandru Ioan Badulescu, Erez Lapid, Alberto Mínguez: *Une condition suffisante pour l'irréductibilité d'une induite parabolique de  $GL(m, D)$* . Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 63(6), 2239-2266 (2013)
- [Cha22] Kei Yuen Chan, *Restriction for general linear groups: The local non-tempered Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture (non-Archimedean case)*. Crelles Journal, vol. 2022, no. 783, 2022, pp. 49-94.

- [Cha23] ———, *Quotient branching law for  $p$ -adic  $(GL_{n+1}, GL_n)$  I: generalized GGP relevant pair*. arXiv:2212.05919 (v2, 2023).
- [Cha24a] ———, *Construction of simple quotients of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives and highest derivative multisegments I: reduction to combinatorics*. preprint (2024), arXiv:2111.13286 (v5).
- [Cha24b] ———, *Construction of simple quotients of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives and highest derivative multisegments II: minimal sequences*. preprint (2024).
- [Cha24c] ———, *Construction of simple quotients of Bernstein-Zelevinsky derivatives and highest derivative multisegments III: properties of minimal sequences*. preprint (2024).
- [Cha24d] ———, *Duality for generalized Gan-Gross-Prasad relevant pairs for  $p$ -adic  $GL_n$* , preprint, arXiv:2210.17249
- [Cha24e] ———, *On the Product Functor on Inner forms of the General Linear Group Over A Non-Archimedean Local Field*. Transformation Groups (2024).
- [CW25] Kei Yuen Chan and Daniel Kayue Wong, *On the Lefschetz principle for  $GL(n, \mathbb{C})$  and  $GL(m, \mathbb{Q}_p)$* . to appear in Israel Journal of Mathematics.
- [CT12] Dan Ciubotaru and Peter Trapa, *Duality for  $GL(n, \mathbb{R})$ ,  $GL(n, \mathbb{Q}_p)$ , and the degenerate affine Hecke algebra for  $gl(n)$* . Amer. J. Math. **134** (2012), 1-30.
- [Gur21] Maxim Gurevich, *Quantum invariants for decomposition problems in type A rings of representations*. Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A, **180** (2021).
- [Jan07] Chris Jantzen, *Jacquet modules of  $p$ -adic general linear groups*. Representation Theory: an electronic journal of the American Mathematical Society **11** (2007), 45-83. MR 2306606
- [Jan14] ———, *Tempered representations for classical  $p$ -adic groups*. Manuscripta. Math. 145(3-4), 319-387 (2014) MR 3268853
- [Jan18] ———, *Jacquet modules and irreducibility of induced representations for classical  $p$ -adic groups*. Manuscripta Math. 156(1-2), 23-55 (2018) MR 3783564
- [LM16] ———, *On parabolic induction on inner forms of the general linear group over a non-archimedean local field*, Select. Math., 22 No. 4 163-183 (2016), 2347-2400. MR 3573961
- [LM18] ———, *Geometric conditions for  $\square$ -irreducibility of certain representations of the general linear group over a non-archimedean local field*, Advances in Mathematics 339(2018), 113-190.
- [LM20] ———, *Conjectures and results about parabolic induction of representations of  $GL_n(F)$* , Invent. Math. 222 (2020), no. 3, 695-747. MR 4169050
- [LM22] ———, *A binary operation on irreducible components of Lusztig's nilpotent varieties II: applications and conjectures for representations of  $GL_n$  over a non-archimedean local field*, (2022) to appear in Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly.
- [Min08] Alberto Mínguez, *Correspondance de Howe explicite : paires duales de type II*, Annales scientifiques de l'École Normale Supérieure, Série 4, Tome 41 (2008) no. 5, pp. 717-741, doi.org/10.24033/asens.2080
- [Min09] ———, *Sur l'irréductibilité d'une induite parabolique*. (French) J. Reine Angew. Math. 629 (2009), 107-131. MR 2527415
- [MW86] Colette Mœglin and Jean-Loup Waldspurger, *Sur l'involution de Zelevinski*. (French) [The Zelevinskiï involution] J. Reine Angew. Math. 372 (1986), 136-177. MR 0863522
- [Tad86] Marko Tadić, *On the classification of irreducible unitary representations of  $GL(n)$  and the conjectures of Bernstein and Zelevinsky*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup., **19** (1986), 335-382.
- [Tad15] ———, *On the reducibility points beyond the ends of complementary series of  $p$ -adic general linear groups*. J. Lie Theory 25(1), 147-183 (2015)
- [Tad22] ———, *On unitarizability and Arthur packets*. manuscripta math. 169, 327-367 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00229-021-01330-6>
- [Xu17] Bin Xu, *On Mœglin's parametrization of Arthur packets for  $p$ -adic quasisplit  $Sp(N)$  and  $SO(N)$* . Canad. J. Math. 69 (2017), no. 4, 890-960.
- [Zel80] A.V. Zelevinsky, *Induced representations of reductive  $p$ -adic groups. II. On irreducible representations of  $GL(n)$* , Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) 13(2)(1980) 165-210. MR 584084

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HONG KONG, HONG KONG

Email address: kychan1@hku.hk and basudev@hku.hk