

ON THE NON-VANISHING CONDITION FOR $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ OF $U(p, q)$ IN THE MEDIOCRE RANGE

DU CHENGYU

ABSTRACT. The modules $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ of $U(p, q)$ can be parameterized by their annihilators and asymptotic supports, both of which can be identified using Young tableaux. Trapa developed an algorithm for determining the tableaux of the modules $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ in the mediocre range, along with an equivalent condition to determine non-vanishing. The condition involves a combinatorial concept called the overlap, which is not straightforward to compute. In this paper, we establish a formula for the overlap and simplify the condition for ease of use. We then apply it to K -types and the Dirac index of $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let G be a real reductive group. It is well known that the cohomologically induced modules $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ exhaust the unitary representations of G when the infinitesimal character is real, integral and strongly regular. At singular infinitesimal characters the situation is much less understood. In the weakly fair range, the $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ modules still provide a long list of unitary modules. For the group $G = U(p, q)$, Vogan conjectured that the modules $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ include all the unitary modules with integral infinitesimal characters:

Conjecture (Vogan). The cohomologically induced modules $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ in the weakly fair range exhaust the unitary Harish-Chandra modules for $U(p, q)$ whose infinitesimal character is a weight-translate of ρ .

Recently, this conjecture is proved in the case of $U(p, 2)$ in [8], but one needs $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ in the mediocre range, which is slightly wider than the weakly fair range. In the case of $U(p, q)$, the modules $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ in the mediocre range is either irreducible or zero. Therefore, the primary problem is to establish a non-vanishing criterion for $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$. Trapa established such a criterion in [7] when studying the algorithm of the annihilators of $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$. Roughly speaking, to obtain a nonzero $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$, the singularity of the infinitesimal character should be smaller than the overlap. Both of the notions, the singularity and the overlap, are defined by combinatorial ways. The definition of the overlap involves heavy operations on Young tableaux. Due to the complicated definition of the overlap, the criterion is not easy to use.

In this paper, we prove a formula for the overlap. The formula simply adds up some integers which are given by the θ -stable parabolic subalgebra \mathfrak{q} . This formula renders the criterion in [7] operable for practical application. In particular, this criterion becomes pretty simple for $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ in the nice range, see Theorem 4.1. We will apply this criterion to the study of K -types and the Dirac index of $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$. Hopefully, this criterion can help prove the conjecture mentioned above in the future.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 will provide some preliminaries. In section 3, we will prove the formula for the overlap. In section 4, we update the non-vanishing criterion for $A_q(\lambda)$ and apply it to the K -types. We prove that K -types of a particular highest weight must exist in $A_q(\lambda)$. Section 5 applies the criterion to the Dirac index. We give a non-vanishing criterion for the Dirac index of $A_q(\lambda)$ in the nice range.

2. PRELIMINARIES

From now on, let G be $U(p, q)$, and let $K \cong U(p) \times U(q)$ be the fixed points of the Cartan involution of inverse conjugate transpose. On the Lie algebra level, let θ be the differentiated Cartan involution and let $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{k}_0 + \mathfrak{s}_0$ be the corresponding decomposition. We drop the subscript for complexification.

2.1. K -conjugacy classes of θ -stable parabolic subalgebras of \mathfrak{g} . We will need a very explicit description of (K -conjugacy classes of) θ -stable parabolic subalgebras $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$ of \mathfrak{g} . Let $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$ be an ordered sequence of pairs of non-negative integers (not both zero for each pair). Set $p = \sum_i p_i$, $q = \sum_i q_i$. Define $U(p, q)$ with respect to the Hermitian form H_q defined by a diagonal matrix $I_{p, q}$ consisting of p_1 pluses, then q_1 minuses, then p_2 pluses, and so on. Let E_{ij} be the matrix where the (i, j) -th entry is 1 and the rest entries are zero. Based on the Hermitian form H_q defining $U(p, q)$, E_{ij} is in \mathfrak{k} if and only if the i -th and the j -th entry of $I_{p, q}$ are either both + or both -.

Fix the diagonal torus $T \subset K$ with Lie algebra \mathfrak{t}_0 , and set $\mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}} = \sqrt{-1}\mathfrak{t}_0$. Write $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$ for the roots of \mathfrak{t} in \mathfrak{g} and make standard choice of positive roots, $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t}) = \{e_i - e_j | i < j\}$. Let ρ denote the half-sum of all positive roots. Further, let $\alpha_i := e_i - e_{i+1}$ represent the i -th simple root. With all these choices, a weight $\nu = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$ is \mathfrak{g} -dominant if and only if $v_1 \geq v_2 \geq \dots \geq v_n$. A root $e_i - e_j$ is a root of K if and only if the i -th and the j -th entry of H_q are either both + or both -. Denote $\Delta(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$ as the root system of \mathfrak{k} , and choose $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t}) = \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t}) \cap \Delta(\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{t})$. It is a bit complicated to describe the \mathfrak{k} -dominant chamber. So, we introduce another way to write the coordinates of a weight ν to fit in the shape of \mathfrak{k} . Similar to the matrix $I_{p, q}$, we denote the first p_1 entries as $\nu_1^+, \nu_2^+, \dots, \nu_{p_1}^+$, then the next q_1 entries as $\nu_1^-, \nu_2^-, \dots, \nu_{q_1}^-$, and then the next p_2 entries $\nu_{p_1+1}^+, \dots, \nu_{p_1+p_2}^+$, and so on. In the end, we have

$$(2.1) \quad \nu = (\nu_1^+, \nu_2^+, \dots, \nu_{p_1}^+; \nu_1^-, \nu_2^-, \dots, \nu_{q_1}^- | \dots | \dots, \nu_p^+; \dots, \nu_q^-).$$

Denote $n_i = p_i + q_i$. We intentionally divide the $(p + q)$ -tuple into blocks of length n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r , to remind us the structure of \mathfrak{k} . And in each block, we use a semicolon to separate the positive part and the negative part. With the new notations, a weight ν is \mathfrak{k} -dominant if and only if

$$(2.2) \quad \nu_j^+ \geq \nu_{j+1}^+; \quad \nu_j^- \geq \nu_{j+1}^-, \quad \forall j.$$

Let \mathfrak{l} denote the block diagonal subalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}(n_1, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{gl}(n_r, \mathbb{C})$, and let \mathfrak{u} denote the strict block upper-triangular subalgebra, and write $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$. Then \mathfrak{q} is a θ -stable parabolic subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . As the ordered sequences of pairs of non-negative integers range over all

$$\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}, \quad p = \sum_i p_i, q = \sum_i q_i,$$

the \mathfrak{q} constructed in this way exhaust the K -conjugacy classes of θ -stable parabolic subalgebras of \mathfrak{g} . A θ -stable parabolic $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$ attached to a sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$ means the one described above. Let L be the Levi subgroup of \mathfrak{q} . In the coordinates given above, any unitary 1-dimensional $(\mathfrak{l}, L \cap K)$ -module, restricted to T , has differential

$$(2.3) \quad \lambda = (\overbrace{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1}^{n_1} | \dots | \overbrace{\lambda_r, \dots, \lambda_r}^{n_r}) \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^*,$$

with each $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. The module $A_q(\lambda)$ is the cohomologically induced module $\mathcal{L}_{\dim \mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{k}}(\mathbb{C}_\lambda)$, where \mathbb{C}_λ is a 1-dimensional unitary $(\mathfrak{l}, L \cap K)$ -module. See more detail of cohomological induction in [5].

Definition 2.1. The character λ is said to be in the **mediocre** range for $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$ if $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbb{C}_{\lambda+t\rho(\mathfrak{u})} \otimes \bigwedge^{\text{top}} \mathfrak{u})$ is irreducible for all $t \geq 0$. The λ is said to be in the **weakly good** range if $\lambda + \rho$ is \mathfrak{g} -dominant. The λ is said to be in the **weakly fair** range if $\lambda + \rho(\mathfrak{u})$ is \mathfrak{g} -dominant.

Lemma 2.2. Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$ be attached to $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$, and let \mathbb{C}_λ be a one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{l}, L \cap K)$ -module. Write

$$(2.4) \quad \nu = (\nu_1^{(1)}, \dots, \nu_{n_1}^{(1)}; \dots; \nu_1^{(r)}, \dots, \nu_{n_r}^{(r)}) = \lambda + \rho,$$

where $n_i = p_i + q_i$. Then the definition of mediocre, weakly good, and weakly fair can be equivalently rephrased in the following way.

- (1) The λ is in mediocre range if, for each pair $i < j$, either $\nu_1^{(i)} \geq \nu_1^{(j)}$ or $\nu_{n_i}^{(i)} \geq \nu_{n_j}^{(j)}$;
- (2) The λ is in weakly good range if, for each pair $i < j$, $\nu_{n_i}^{(i)} \geq \nu_1^{(j)}$;
- (3) The λ is in weakly fair range if, for each pair $i < j$, $\nu_1^{(i)} + \nu_{n_i}^{(i)} \geq \nu_1^{(j)} + \nu_{n_j}^{(j)}$.

In the discussion of $A_q(\lambda)$ modules of $U(p, q)$, we need one more kind of range of positivity, which is called **nice**. It is introduced in [7].

Definition 2.3. Let \mathfrak{q} , λ and ν be the same as in Lemma 2.2. We say λ is **nice** for \mathfrak{q} if, for each pair $i < j$, we have both $\nu_1^{(i)} \geq \nu_1^{(j)}$ and $\nu_{n_i}^{(i)} \geq \nu_{n_j}^{(j)}$.

It is not hard to see that

$$\text{weakly good} \Rightarrow \text{nice} \Rightarrow \text{weakly fair} \Rightarrow \text{mediocre}.$$

When λ is in the mediocre range, $A_q(\lambda)$ is either irreducible unitary or zero. This fact is correct for $U(p, q)$ but not for general reductive groups. Chapter 8 of [5] provides sufficient conditions from which to conclude this fact.

2.2. Young Tableaux and $A_q(\lambda)$ modules of $U(p, q)$. Irreducible $A_q(\lambda)$ modules can be parameterized by pairs consisting of an $(\lambda + \rho)$ -antitableau and a (p, q) -signed tableau of the same shape. This is due to Barbasch, Vogan [1] and Trapa [7]. We first state the main results for the parameterization and then explain the terminologies involved.

Theorem 2.4. [1] Suppose that $\nu \in \rho + \mathbb{Z}^n$ is a weight lattice translate of the infinitesimal character of the trivial representation. The map assigning an irreducible Harish-Chandra module for $U(p, q)$ with infinitesimal character ν to the pair consisting of its annihilator

and its asymptotic support is an injection. On the level of tableaux, the map assigns a ν -antitableau and a signature (p, q) -signed tableau of the same shape to each irreducible module of infinitesimal character ν , and any such pair arises in this way.

In the case of A_q of $U(p, q)$, the ν -antitableau corresponds to the annihilator due to Joseph's parameterization of primitive ideals of $\mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$; and the signed tableau corresponds to the asymptotic support due to [2], 9.3.3.

Given a partition $k = k_1 + k_2 + \cdots + k_s$ with k_i decreasing, we can associate a left-justified arrangement of k boxes, where the i -th row contains k_i boxes. Such an arrangement is called a Young diagram of size k . Roughly speaking, a ν -antitableau is a Young diagram filled with coordinates of ν satisfying some decreasing condition; and a (p, q) -signed tableau is a Young diagram filled with p "+" and q "-". Below are the precise definitions of these concepts.

Definition 2.5. If $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k)$ is a k -tuple of real numbers, a ν -quasitableau is defined to be any arrangement of ν_1, \dots, ν_k in a Young diagram of size k . If a ν -quasitableau satisfies the condition that the entries weakly increase across rows and strictly increase down columns, it is called a ν -tableau. Replacing "increase" by "decrease" in the definition of ν -tableau defines a ν -antitableau. The underlying Young diagram of a quasitableau/antitableau is called its shape.

Definition 2.6. A signed Young tableau of signature (p, q) is an equivalence class of Young diagrams whose boxes are filled with p pluses and q minuses so that the signs alternate across rows; two signed Young diagrams are equivalent if they can be made to coincide by interchanging rows of equal length.

There is a detailed description of how to construct such a pair of tableaux for $A_q(\lambda)$ of $U(p, q)$ in Theorem 2.9. Briefly speaking, the process involves two steps: first, one constructs the (p, q) -signed tableau to determine the shape, and then duplicates that shape and fills it with the coordinates of ν to obtain the ν -antitableau. The following algorithm refers to Lemma 5.6 of [7].


Definition 2.7. Suppose \mathfrak{q} is attached to the ordered pairs of integers $\{(p_i, q_i)\}$ and let $p = \sum p_i$, $q = \sum q_i$. The (p, q) -signed tableau of $A_q(\lambda)$ is constructed by induction. In the i -th step, we obtain a signed tableau S_{\pm}^i by adding p_i pluses and q_i minuses to S_{\pm}^{i-1} constructed in the previous step. The first column has length $n_1 = p_1 + q_1$, which means each row has one entry and in total there are p_1 pluses and q_1 minuses. The order of the signs does not matter for now. They could be adjusted in the arrangement of later columns. Now, suppose we already have S_{\pm}^{i-1} and planning to construct S_{\pm}^i . We should follow these rules:

- (1) At most one sign is added to each row-end; add signs from the top to bottom, until the new signs run out.
- (2) If a row is ended by "+", add a "-" to it; if a row is ended by "-", add a "+" to it. Equivalently, in each row the signs are arranged alternatively.
- (3) In total there are p_i "+" and q_i "-".
- (4) If "+" or "-" runs out when doing (2), skip the row.
- (5) If all rows of S_{\pm}^i have new signs added and there are still more signs remaining, start a new row for each sign left over.

- (6) After all $n_i = p_i + q_i$ signs are arranged, the resulting diagram may not necessarily have rows of decreasing length, but one can choose a tableau equivalent to S_{\pm}^{i-1} and redo the process so that the result does have rows of decreasing length.

Eventually, we obtain a representative of the equivalent class of signed tableau S . We say that this S is **attached to \mathfrak{q}** .

Example 2.8. Let \mathfrak{q} be a θ -stable parabolic subalgebra attached to $\{(2, 1), (3, 1), (0, 2)\}$. The signed tableau attached to \mathfrak{q} is constructed based on Definition 2.7 as follows



After the signed tableau of $A_q(\lambda)$ is obtained, one can then easily construct the $(\lambda + \rho)$ -antitableau as stated in the following theorem, which works for $A_q(\lambda)$ in the good range. Later in section 4, we will prove that the following theorem can be extended to the nice range.

Theorem 2.9. [7, Theorem 6.4] *Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{u}$ be attached to $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$, and let \mathbb{C}_λ be a one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{l}, L \cap K)$ -module in the good range for \mathfrak{q} , and let*

$$(2.5) \quad \nu = (\nu_1^{(1)}, \dots, \nu_{p_1+q_1}^{(1)}; \dots; \nu_1^{(r)}, \dots, \nu_{p_r+q_r}^{(r)}) = \lambda + \rho \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^*.$$

The tableau parameters (Theorem 2.4) of $A_q(\lambda)$ are obtained inductively as follows. Start with the empty pair of tableaux and assume that the $(s-1)$ step has been completed giving a pair (S^{s-1}, S_{\pm}^{s-1}) . S_{\pm}^s is obtained by adding p_s pluses and q_s minuses to S_{\pm}^{s-1} according to the algorithm just describe above; S^s is the tableau of the same shape of S_{\pm}^s obtained by adding the coordinates $\nu_1^{(s)}, \dots, \nu_{p_s+q_s}^{(s)}$ sequentially from top to bottom in the remaining unspecified boxes.

Definition 2.10. [7] A skew diagram is any diagram obtained by removing a smaller Young diagram from a larger one that contains it. A **skew column** is a skew tableau whose shape consists of at most one box per row and whose entries strictly increase when moving down in the diagram. A skew column is called **difference-one** if its consecutive entries (when moving down the column) decrease by exactly one when moving down the column.

Theorem 2.9 also attach the ν -antitableau a partition into difference-one skew columns, $S = \coprod S_i$, and each skew column S_i is described in the theorem. But this theorem only works for λ in good range for \mathfrak{q} . For λ in the mediocre range, the tableau obtained in this way is not necessarily a ν -antitableau. Extra work on the tableaux level is needed. Trapa fixed this issue in [7] by developing an algorithm on the ν -antitableau. Here we will briefly state his result in Theorem 2.13, but skip the algorithm.

In [7, section 6], the ranges of positivity of Lemma 2.2 is translated to the level of tableaux. Let λ and \mathfrak{q} be associated to some partition $S = \coprod S_k$, and $i < j$,

- (1) S_i and S_j are said to be in **mediocre** position if either of the following conditions is satisfied: the smallest entry in S_i is greater than or equal to the smallest entry in S_j ; or the largest entry in S_i is greater than or equal to the largest entry of S_j .
- (2) S_i and S_j are said to be in **(weakly) fair** position if the average of the entries in S_i is (weakly) greater than the average of the entries in S_j .
- (3) S_i and S_j are said to be in **(weakly) good** position if the smallest entry in S_i (weakly) greater than the largest entry in S_j .
- (4) S_i and S_j are said to be in **nice** position if both the smallest entry in S_i is greater than or equal to the smallest entry of S_j , and the largest entry in S_i is greater than or equal to the largest entry in S_j .
- (5) The entire partition is called mediocre, fair, good, or nice if all pairs of its skew columns are in the specified position.

Definition 2.11. [7] Given two adjacent columns $C = S_j$ and $D = S_{j+1}$ of a partition of S into skew columns, we first define an integer depending only on the shape of C and D in the following way. Label the entries of C and D (moving sequentially down each skew column) as c_1, \dots, c_k , and d_1, \dots, d_l . For $1 \leq m \leq \min\{k, l\}$, define a condition

condition m : c_{k-m+i} is strictly left of d_i in S , for $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Define the **overlap** of C and D , denoted by $\text{overlap}(C, D)$, to be the largest $m \leq \min\{k, l\}$ so that condition m holds. In particular, if condition m never holds, define $\text{overlap}(C, D) = 0$.

Definition 2.12. [7] The singularity of C and D , denoted $\text{sing}(C, D)$, is defined to be the number of pairs of identical entries among the c_i and d_j .

Theorem 2.13. Let \mathfrak{q} be a θ -stable parabolic and \mathbb{C}_λ be a one-dimensional $(\mathfrak{l}, L \cap K)$ -module in the mediocre range for \mathfrak{q} . Let $\nu = \lambda + \rho = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n)$, and construct a ν -quasitableau S , together with a partition into difference-one skew columns $S = \coprod S_i$, as in Theorem 2.9. Then there is an algorithm (described in [7]) to locate a distinguished $S' = \coprod S'_i$ equivalent (in the sense of [7, Definition 7.4]) to $S = \coprod S_i$ such that either $S' = 0$; or S' is actually a ν -antitableau and $\coprod S'_i$ is in the nice position with

$$(2.6) \quad \text{overlap}(S'_i, S'_{i+1}) \geq \text{sing}(S'_i, S'_{i+1}), \quad \forall i.$$

The module $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ is nonzero if and only if the latter case holds and in this case, $\text{Ann}(A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)) = S'$.

Remark of Theorem 2.13. In the intermediate steps of the algorithm mentioned above, one will obtain a sequence of tableaux, each of which should pass the requirement (2.6). The consequence of failing 2.6 is that the tableau vanishes. In this note, we do not need the detail of the algorithm and the definition of the equivalence of two partitions of a tableau. So, we omit the detail here. For readers that are interested, please check sections 6 and 7 of [7]. What we will study further is the non-zero criterion (2.6).

2.3. Dirac cohomology and Dirac index. We fix a non-degenerate invariant symmetric bilinear form B on \mathfrak{g} . Then \mathfrak{k} and \mathfrak{s} are orthogonal to each other under B . Fix an orthonormal basis $\{Z_1, \dots, Z_{\dim \mathfrak{s}_0}\}$ of \mathfrak{s}_0 with respect to the inner product on \mathfrak{s}_0 induced by B . Let $U(\mathfrak{g})$ be the universal enveloping algebra, and let $C(\mathfrak{s})$ be the Clifford algebra. As introduced by

Parthasarathy in [6], the **Dirac operator** is defined as

$$D := \sum_{i=1}^{\dim \mathfrak{s}_0} Z_i \otimes Z_i \in U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes C(\mathfrak{s}).$$

It is easy to check that D does not depend on the choice of the orthonormal basis $\{Z_i\}$. Let spin_G be a spin module for the Clifford algebra $C(\mathfrak{s})$. For any (\mathfrak{g}, K) -module X , the Dirac operator D acts on $X \otimes \text{spin}_G$, and the **Dirac cohomology** defined by Vogan is the following \tilde{K} -module:

$$H_D(X) := \ker D / (\ker D \cap \text{im } D).$$

Here \tilde{K} is the spin double cover of K . That is

$$\tilde{K} := \{(k, s) \in K \times \text{spin}(\mathfrak{s}_0) \mid \text{Ad}(k) = p(s)\},$$

where $\text{Ad} : K \rightarrow SO(\mathfrak{s}_0)$ is the adjoint map, and $p : \text{spin}(\mathfrak{s}_0) \rightarrow SO(\mathfrak{s}_0)$ is the universal covering map.

Let $\Delta(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$ be the set of roots of \mathfrak{s} , and put

$$\Delta^+(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) = \Delta(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \cap \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t}), \quad \Delta^-(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) = \Delta(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \cap \Delta^-(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{t})$$

Denote ρ_n to be the half sum of roots in $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$. We have the corresponding isotropic decomposition

$$\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}^+ \oplus \mathfrak{s}^-, \text{ where } \mathfrak{s}^+ = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \text{ and } \mathfrak{s}^- = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^-(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$

Then

$$\text{spin}_G = \bigwedge \mathfrak{s}^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_{-\rho_n}.$$

The spin module decomposes into two parts as

$$\text{spin}_G^+ := \bigwedge^{\text{even}} \mathfrak{s}^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_{-\rho_n}; \quad \text{spin}_G^- := \bigwedge^{\text{odd}} \mathfrak{s}^+ \otimes \mathbb{C}_{-\rho_n}.$$

Let X be any (\mathfrak{g}, K) -module, the Dirac operator D interchanges $X \otimes \text{spin}_G^+$ and $X \otimes \text{spin}_G^-$. Thus the Dirac cohomology $H_D(X)$ decomposes into the even part and the odd part, which will be denoted by $H_D^+(X)$ and $H_D^-(X)$ respectively. The Dirac index is defined as

$$\text{DI}(X) := H_D^+(X) - H_D^-(X),$$

which is a virtual \tilde{K} -module. It is obvious that if $\text{DI}(X)$ is non-zero, then $H_D(X)$ is non-zero. However, the converse is not true.

3. A FORMULA FOR THE OVERLAP

3.1. New notations for tableaux. In this section, we have to frequently describe the relative positions of the entries of signed tableaux. To avoid redundant descriptions, we introduce some new notations.

In general, we use square brackets $[b]$ to represent an entry in a tableau. Let $S = \coprod S_i$ be a partition, and let $S^k = \coprod_{i \leq k} S_i$ be the union of its first k skew columns. For a specific skew column S_j , we denote the t -th entry, counting from top to bottom, as $[t]^{(j)}$. Note that this entry may not be located in the t -th row of S^j due to possible skip in the arrangement of S_j . Let \hat{S}_\pm be a representative of an equivalent class of signed tableaux, and let $\hat{S} = \coprod \hat{S}_{\pm, i}$

be a partition. If the sign of $[t]^{(j)}$ is known, we append the sign to the notation, such as $[t]_-^{(j)}$ for a negative entry and $[t]_+^{(j)}$ for a positive one. When only the sign information is needed, we may simplify the notation to $[+]^{(j)}$ and $[-]^{(j)}$, or even just $[+]$ or $[-]$ when the specific skew column is not relevant.

If an entry $[t_1]^{(j_1)}$ is below (or in the same row of) another entry $[t_2]^{(j_2)}$, we say $[t_1]^{(j_1)} >\downarrow [t_2]^{(j_2)}$ (or $[t_1]^{(j_1)} \geq\downarrow [t_2]^{(j_2)}$). If an entry $[t_1]^{(j_1)}$ is right to (or in the same vertical column of) another entry $[t_2]^{(j_2)}$, we say $[t_1]^{(j_1)} >\leftrightarrow [t_2]^{(j_2)}$ (or $[t_1]^{(j_1)} \geq\leftrightarrow [t_2]^{(j_2)}$). We may reverse the direction of these "inequalities" to indicate the contrary situations. In fact, if we regard S as a set of entries, then $(S, \geq\downarrow)$ is an ordered set with respect to the vertical position, and $(\hat{S}_\pm, \geq\leftrightarrow)$ is an ordered set with respect to the horizontal position.

In the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,j}$ in \hat{S}_\pm , we say $[t]^{(j)}$ is **paired up** with $[s]^{(i)}$, denoted as $[t]^{(j)} \sim [s]^{(i)}$, if they are adjacent and in the same row. Definitely, they are of different signs. We define some finite sets of (pairs of) entries as follows:

$[\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}$	the set of pairs of entries from $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$ and $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$ that are paired up.
$[\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}$	the set of entries from $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$ that are not paired up with entries from $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$.
$[\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]$	the set of entries from $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$ that are not paired up in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$.
$[\bullet]^{(l)} <\downarrow [x]$	the set of entries from $\hat{S}_{\pm,l}$ that are strictly above $[x]$.
$[\bullet]_+^{(i)}$	the set of all $[+]$ in $\hat{S}^{(i)}$
$[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$	the set of all $[-]$ in $\hat{S}^{(i)}$

In practice, we may combine or slightly adjust these notations to describe sets. But one can quickly understand the meaning based on the table above. For example, $[\bullet]_+^{(l)} \leq\downarrow [x]$ means the set of positive entries from $\hat{S}_{\pm,l}$ that are above or in the same row as $[x]$. We will use $\#$ to denote the cardinality of a finite set. These newly defined notations can greatly reduce wordy description of the tableaux. As the first application, we shall restate the condition- m for adjacent skew columns S_j and S_{j+1} in Definition 2.11 using the new notations:

$$\text{condition-}m: [k - m + i]^{(j)} <\leftrightarrow [i]^{(j+1)} \text{ in } S, \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq m,$$

where k is the length of S_j .

3.2. A partition consistent with the equivalent classes of signed tableaux. Given an equivalent class of signed tableau S_\pm with signature (p, q) and a θ -stable parabolic subalgebra attached to the ordered sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$, a nature question is that whether S_\pm is attached to \mathfrak{q} .

Definition 3.1. Let $\{S_1, \dots, S_r\}$ be a set of disjoint skew columns of a ν -quasitableau S , and suppose $S = \coprod S_i$. Then we say that the set $\{S_i\}$ **forms a partition of S** into skew columns if $S^j := \coprod_{i \leq j} S_i$ is a quasitableau for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, r$.

Proposition 3.2. Let \mathfrak{q} be a θ -stable parabolic subalgebra attached to the ordered sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_j, q_j)\}$. Let S_\pm be an equivalent class of signed tableau. Then S_\pm is attached to \mathfrak{q} if and only if there exists a representative \hat{S}_\pm having a partition $\hat{S}_\pm = \coprod \hat{S}_{\pm,j}$ with the following property for all j : (1) each skew column $\hat{S}_{\pm,j}$ has p_j $[+]$ and q_j $[-]$; (2) if a row is

skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, j}$ in \hat{S}_{\pm} , then the rows of \hat{S}_{\pm}^j including and in between the first skipped row and the last row of \hat{S}_{\pm}^j end in the same sign.

Example 2.8 fits in this proposition very well. In the second step, row 3 is skipped; and we see until row 5 all rows end by $[+]$. In the last step, row 2 is skipped; and we see both the second row and the third row end by $[-]$.

Proof of 3.2. Suppose \hat{S}_{\pm} is attached to $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_j, q_j)\}$, which means \hat{S}_{\pm} is obtained by the rules in Definition 2.7. The process in Definition 2.7 naturally makes a partition satisfying part (1) of the property. The rule (4) of Definition 2.7 causes skips, and this rule is applied when one of the signs are run out. Suppose $[-]$ is run out. Then starting from the row skipped, all entries arranged later are all $[+]$. This phenomenon is exactly part (2) of the property we want.

Suppose such a partition $\hat{S}_{\pm} = \coprod \hat{S}_{\pm, j}$ satisfying the property exists. We shall prove that each skew column in this partition can be constructed following the rules of Definition 2.7. There is no problem for the first column. For any $j > 1$, suppose $\coprod_{i < j} \hat{S}_{\pm, i}$ is done. For the j -th skew column, one follows the rule (2) and (5) of Definition 2.7 until hitting a skip. We shall prove this is the place exactly when rule (4) is triggered. We may assume that a $[-]$ is skipped. By part (2) of the property, all entries of $\hat{S}_{\pm, j}$ to be arranged after this point are negative. So, all positive entries of $\hat{S}_{\pm, j}$ have been arranged already. Hence positive entries run out and one should make a skip. Repeat the process then we complete the arrangement of the j -th skew column. One last thing is rule (6). In fact, the situation described in rule (6) will not happen because we construct the tableau following a given partition, and a partition naturally preserve decreasing lengths of rows. \square

Definition 3.3. (see the prose following [7, def. 6.10]) Suppose \hat{S}_{\pm} is a representative of a signed tableau S_{\pm} of the same shape of S , and the partition of $S = \coprod S_i$ into skew columns induces a partition $\hat{S}_{\pm} = \coprod \hat{S}_{\pm, i}$ of \hat{S}_{\pm} . Define $\hat{S}_{\pm}^j = \coprod_{i \leq j} \hat{S}_{\pm, i}$. Let (p_i, q_i) denote the number of $[+]$ and $[-]$ in $\hat{S}_{\pm, i}$, and let \mathbf{q}^j be the θ -stable parabolic attached to the ordered sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_j, q_j)\}$ of the appropriate $\mathfrak{g}^j = gl(n_j, \mathbb{C})$. We say that the partition $S = \coprod S_i$ is **consistent** with (the representative) \hat{S}_{\pm} if the following explicit condition hold for all j : if a row is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, j}$ in \hat{S}_{\pm} , then the rows of \hat{S}_{\pm}^j including and in between the first skipped row and the last row of \hat{S}_{\pm}^j end in the same sign.

3.3. Proof of the overlap formula. In the following lemma, we collect some observations that will be frequently used later.

Lemma 3.4. Let $S = \coprod S_i$ be a partition consistent with a signed tableau representative \hat{S}_{\pm} and let $\hat{S}_{\pm} = \coprod \hat{S}_{\pm, i}$ be the induced partition. Here are some observations:

- (1) In the same skew column, say the i -th column, $t_1 > t_2$ implies $[t_1]^{(i)} >^{\uparrow} [t_2]^{(i)}$.
- (2) Suppose $[t]^i$ is paired up with some entry $[s]$ which is not in $\hat{S}_{\pm, i-1}$. If there exists at least one entry of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i-1}$ below $[s]$, then there is a skip at the place of $[s]$ in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i-1}$.

- (3) Suppose $[t]^{(i-1)}$ is not paired up with any entry from $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$. If there exists at least one entry of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$ below $[t]^{(i-1)}$, then there is a skip at the place of $[t]^{(i-1)}$ in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$.
- (4) Suppose two entries $[t_1]$ and $[t_2]$ are the last entries of two different rows of S^j for certain j . Then $[t_1] >^\uparrow [t_2]$ implies $[t_1] \leq^\leftrightarrow [t_2]$.
- (5) In adjacent columns, say the i -th and $(i+1)$ -th columns, $[s]^{(i)} \geq^\uparrow [t]^{(i+1)}$ implies $[s]^{(i)} <^\leftrightarrow [t]^{(i+1)}$.
- (6) If a row of \hat{S}_{\pm}^{j-1} ending by $[+]$ is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,j}$ in \hat{S}_{\pm} , then all $[-]^{(j)}$ must be strictly above this $[+]$. If a row of \hat{S}_{\pm}^{j-1} ending by $[-]$ is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,j}$ in \hat{S}_{\pm} , then all $[+]^{(j)}$ must be strictly above this $[-]$.
- (7) If multiple entries $[x_k]$ are skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,j}$ in \hat{S}_{\pm} , then all $[x_k]$ have the same sign.

Proof. (1), (2) and (3) is trivial.

(4) This is because the rows of a tableau have decreasing lengths. The equal happens when the two rows have equal length.

(5) Suppose $[t]^{(i+1)}$ is paired up with $[x]$, then $[x] \geq^\uparrow [s]^{(i)}$, and $[x] <^\leftrightarrow [t]^{(i+1)}$. Notice both $[x]$ and $[s]^{(i)}$ are the row end of \hat{S}^i . By (3), $[x] \geq^\leftrightarrow [s]^{(i)}$. Hence, $[s]^{(i)} \leq^\leftrightarrow [x] <^\leftrightarrow [t]^{(i+1)}$.

(6) and (7) are due to the last sentence of Definition 3.3. \square

Lemma 3.5. Let $S = \coprod S_k$ be a partition consistent with a signed tableau representative \hat{S}_{\pm} and let $\hat{S}_{\pm} = \coprod \hat{S}_{\pm,k}$ be the induced partition. Suppose $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$ has p_i $[+]$ and q_i $[-]$ for all i . Denote $m_i = \min\{p_i, q_{i+1}\} + \min\{p_{i+1}, q_i\}$ and $n_i = p_i + q_i$. Then

$$(3.1) \quad [n_i - m_i + j] \geq^\uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}, \quad \forall j \leq m_i.$$

Proof. Part I: The case of $p_i \geq q_{i+1}$ and $q_i \geq p_{i+1}$.

Define a number $s = \#([\bullet]^{(i)} <^\uparrow [j]^{(i+1)})$. Then $[n_i - m_i + j] \geq^\uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}$ is equivalent to $n_i - m_j + j - s > 0$. We compute the difference $n_i - m_i$ and $j - s$ separately.

$$n_i - m_i = (p_i + q_i) - (p_{i+1} + q_{i+1}) = \#([\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]) - \#([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}).$$

And,

$$\begin{aligned} j - s - 1 = & \#([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i+1)} <^\uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}) \\ & - \#([\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i)} \leq^\uparrow [s]^{(i)}). \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the first equation actually counts the entries not paired up by the other column. Similar explanation applies to the second equation but only for the entries above $[j]^{(i+1)}$ and $[s]^{(i)}$. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} (*) \quad n_i - m_i + j - s = & 1 + \#([\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i)} >^\uparrow [s]^{(i)}) \\ & - \#([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i+1)} \geq^\uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}) \\ = & (\text{denoted by}) \ 1 + z_1 - z_2. \end{aligned}$$

If $z_2 = 0$, then the proof is done. Assume the contrary and let

$$[d]^{(i+1)} \in ([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i+1)} \geqslant^\uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}).$$

Notice that $[d]^{(i+1)}$ cannot be the first entry of a row due to the assumption that $p_i + q_i \geqslant p_{i+1} + q_{i+1}$. In other words, $\hat{S}_{\pm, i+1}$ is too short to start a new row. Thus $[d]^{(i+1)}$ must be paired up with an entry.

Without loss of generality, we may assume $[d]^{(i+1)}$ is paired up with a positive entry $[x]_+$ and hence $[d]^{(i+1)} \in [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$. We now prove by hypothesis that

$$(*) \quad ([\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \cap ([\bullet]_+^{(i)} <^\uparrow [d]_-^{(i+1)}) = \emptyset.$$

Assume the contrary, and let $[c]_+^{(i)}$ be then by Lemma 3.4 (3), there is a skip happened at $[c]_+^{(i)}$ in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i+1}$. By Definition 3.3, all entries of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i+1}$ below $[c]_+^{(i)}$ should be positive. This is contrary to the fact that $[d]^{(i+1)} \in [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$. Thus $(*)$ is correct.

This $(*)$ implies

$$(*) \quad \# \left(([\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i)} >^\uparrow [d]_-^{(i+1)}) \right) \geqslant \# ([\bullet]_+^{(i)} \sim [\times]).$$

Because $[d]^{(i+1)} \geqslant^\uparrow [j]^{(i+1)} \geqslant^\uparrow [s]^{(i)}$, we have that z_1 is greater than the left side of $(*)$. Hence

$$(*)' \quad z_1 \geqslant \# ([\bullet]_+^{(i)} \sim [\times]).$$

Now we compute the right side of $(*)'$,

$$\# ([\bullet]_+^{(i)} \sim [\times]) = p_i - q_{i+1} + \# ([\times] \sim [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}).$$

By Lemma 3.4 (2) and the fact that the length of \hat{S}_{\pm}^{i+1} is less than \hat{S}_{\pm}^i , we know all entries in $([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)})$ cause skips. By Lemma 3.4 (7), they should all have the same sign. Our early assumption indicates that one of these entries, which is $[d]^{(i+1)}$, has negative sign. Thus

$$([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}) \subset [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$$

Continue on $(*)'$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_1 &\geqslant \# ([\bullet]_+^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \\ &= p_1 - q_{i+1} + \# ([\times] \sim [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}) \\ &= p_i - q_{i+1} + \# ([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}) \\ &\geqslant p_i - q_{i+1} + z_2 \geqslant z_2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last line, the first inequality is due to the definition of z_2 , and the second inequality is due to the assumption $p_i \geqslant q_{i+1}$ at the beginning of Part I. Finally, we have proved $n_i - m_i + j - s = 1 + z_1 - z_2 > 0$.

Part II: The case of $p_i \leqslant q_{i+1}$ and $q_i \leqslant p_{i+1}$.

Suppose $[j]^{(i)}$ is paired up with an entry $[s]^{(i+1)}$ from $\hat{S}_{\pm, i+1}$. We claim that no entry above $[j]^{(i)}$ is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i+1}$.

Assume the claim fails, and we may assume an $[x_1]_+^{(i)}$ is skipped above $[j]^{(i)}$ without loss of generality. By Lemma 3.4 (6), all $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ must be above this $[x_1]_+^{(i)}$. Notice that $q_{i+1} \geq p_i$, which means $[\bullet]_+^{(i)}$ is not enough to get all $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ paired up. Thus at least one of $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ is paired up with an entry from \hat{S}_{\pm}^{i-1} . By Lemma 3.4 (2), an $[x_2]_+$ in \hat{S}_{\pm}^{i-1} is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$. Then by Definition 3.3, all entries of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i}$ below $[x]_+$ are positive, which implies $[j]^{(i)} \in [\bullet]_+^{(i)}$. Now we have a contradiction: $[s]^{(i+1)} \in [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ but meanwhile all $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ should be above $[x_1]_+^{(i)}$ which is even above $[j]^{(i)}$. Thus the claim holds.

The claim is equivalent to say that all entries above (and including) $[j]^{(i)}$ are paired up with entries from $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$. A direct corollary is that $s \geq j$. Thus

$$[n_i - m_i + j]^{(i)} = [j]^{(i)} = \uparrow [s]^{(i+1)} \geq \uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}.$$

Suppose $[j]^{(i)}$ is not paired up with any entry from $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$. A trivial situation is that $[j]^{(i)}$ is not skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$. This means all $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$ are above $[j]^{(i)}$. Then $[j]^{(i)} < \uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}$ is naturally true.

We may assume $[j]^{(i)}$ is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$. Without loss of generality, we may also assume $[j]^{(i)} \in [\bullet]_+^{(i)}$. We put $j = x_1$ as in the proof of the claim in (iii). The proof shows that all $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ are above $[j]^{(i)}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.4 (6), all $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$ are above $[x_2]_+$ which is above $[j]^{(i)}$. As a conclusion, all $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$ and $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ are above $[j]_+^{(i)}$. By Lemma 3.4 (7), those $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$ cannot be skipped. Then those positive entries paired up with $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$ are again above $[j]_+^{(i)}$. In total,

$$\#([\bullet]_-^{(i+1)} < \uparrow [j]_+^{(i)}) \geq q_i + q_{i+1} \geq q_i + p_i \geq j.$$

Therefore,

$$[n_i - m_i + j]^{(i)} = [j]^{(i)} > \uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}.$$

Part III: The case of $p_i < q_{i+1}$ and $q_i > p_{i+1}$.

We first prove a fact that at least one entry of $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$ is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$. Because $q_i > p_{i+1}$, at least one entry $[y_1]_-^{(i)} \in ([\bullet]_-^{(i)} \sim [\times])$. For the same reason, at least one entry $[y_2]_-^{(i+1)} \in ([\times] \sim [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)})$. Either the entry $[y_2]_-^{(i+1)}$ is the first entry of a row or it is paired up (on their left side) with an entry of \hat{S}_{\pm}^{i-1} . In the former case, $[y_2]_-^{(i+1)} > \uparrow [y_1]_-^{(i)}$ because all $[y_2]_-^{(i+1)}$ is arranged after all $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$. In the latter case, if $[y_2]_-^{(i+1)} < \uparrow [y_1]_-^{(i)}$, then by Lemma 3.4 (3), there is a skip over $[+]$ which is the entry paired up with $[y_2]_-^{(i+1)}$. As a consequence, $[y_1]_-^{(i)}$ cannot have negative sign by Definition 3.3. Therefore, we have a contradiction. As a conclusion, $[y_2]_-^{(i+1)} > \uparrow [y_1]_-^{(i)}$. By Lemma 3.4 (3), there is a skip over $[y_1]_-^{(i)}$.

Now we go back to (3.1). A trivial case is that no skip happens in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm,i+1}$ above $[j]^{(i+1)}$. Thus $[j]^{(i+1)}$ is actually in the j -th row. Meanwhile, $n_i - m_i + j = q_i - p_{i+1} + j > j$, which means $[k - m + j]^{(i)}$ must be below the j -th row. Hence $[k - m + j]^{(i)} > \uparrow [j]^{(i+1)}$.

Suppose there exists an entry $[n_0]^{(i)} <^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}$ such that $[n_0]^{(i)}$ is skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i+1}$. We already have an entry $[y_1]_-^{(i)}$ skipped. By Lemma 3.4 (7), we have $[n_0]^{(i)} \in [\bullet]_-^{(i)}$. We claim that

$$(*3) \quad ([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]_+^{(i+1)} <^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}) = \emptyset.$$

We prove the claim by hypothesis. Assume the contrary, and let $[w_1]_-$ be the entry paired up with $[w_2]_+^{(i+1)}$ which is above $[j]^{(i+1)}$. By Lemma 3.4 (6) and the assumption on $[n_0]_-^{(i)}$, $[w_2]_+^{(i+1)} <^\dagger [n_0]_-^{(i)} <^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}$. Thus by Lemma 3.4 (2), there is a skip over $[w_1]_-$ in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i}$. Then by Lemma 3.4 (6), $[\bullet]_+^{(i)} \subset ([\bullet]^{(i)} <^\dagger [w_1]_-)$. At this point, we have proved that all $[\bullet]_+^{(i)}$ and $[\bullet]_+^{(i+1)}$ are above $[j]^{(i+1)}$. Therefore, $j > p_i + p_{i+1}$ which is contradict to the range $j \leq m_i = p_i + p_{i+1}$. The claim is proved.

Define a number $s = \#([\bullet]^{(i)} <^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)})$. Then $[n_i - m_i + j] \geq^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}$ is equivalent to $n_i - m_j + j - s > 0$. We compute the difference $n_i - m_i$ and $j - s$ separately.

$$\begin{aligned} j - s - 1 &= \# \left(([\times] \sim [\bullet]^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i+1)} <^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}) \right) \\ &\quad - \# \left(([\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i)} <^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}) \right) \\ &= (\text{denoted by}) \ z'_1 - z'_2. \end{aligned}$$

And because $q_i > p_{i+1}$, we have

$$q_i - p_{i+1} = \#([\bullet]_-^{(i)} \sim [\times]) - \#([\times] \sim [\bullet]_+^{(i+1)}).$$

Notice there is a skip over $[n_0]_-^{(i)}$. By Lemma 3.4 (6), $[\bullet]_+^{(i+1)}$ are all above $[n_0]_-^{(i)}$ and hence above $[j]^{(i+1)}$. Combining this fact and (*3), we obtain that $\#([\times] \sim [\bullet]_+^{(i+1)}) = 0$. By Lemma 3.4 (7), we have

$$\left(([\bullet]^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \cap ([\bullet]^{(i)} <^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}) \right) \subset ([\bullet]_-^{(i)} \sim [\times]).$$

Therefore,

$$q_i - p_{i+1} \geq z'_2.$$

Now we compute

$$n_i - m_i + j - s = q_i - p_{i+1} + z'_1 - z'_2 + 1 > 0.$$

As a result, $[n_i - m_i + j]^{(i)} \geq^\dagger [j]^{(i+1)}$.

Part IV: The case of $p_i > q_{i+1}$ and $q_i < p_{i+1}$. It is exactly the same as part III. \square

Theorem 3.6. *Let $S = \coprod S_k$ be a partition consistent with a signed tableau representative \hat{S}_\pm and let $\hat{S}_\pm = \coprod \hat{S}_{\pm, k}$ be the induced partition. Suppose $\hat{S}_{\pm, i}$ has p_i $[+]$ and q_i $[-]$ for all i . Then the overlap of two adjacent skew columns S_i and S_{i+1} is*

$$(3.2) \quad \text{overlap}(S_i, S_{i+1}) = \min\{p_i, q_{i+1}\} + \min\{p_{i+1}, q_i\}.$$

Proof. Denote $m_i = \min\{p_i, q_{i+1}\} + \min\{p_{i+1}, q_i\}$ and $n_i = p_i + q_i$ as in Lemma 3.5. We should prove two facts. One is that condition- m_i holds, and the other one is that condition- $(m_i + 1)$ fails. We have proved (3.1), which is

$$[n_i - m_i + j] \geq^{\uparrow} [j]^{(i+1)}, \quad \forall j \leq m_i.$$

By Lemma 3.4 (5), we have

$$[n_i - m_i + j] <^{\leftrightarrow} [j]^{(i+1)}, \quad \forall j \leq m_i.$$

Hence condition- m_i holds.

In the case when $p_i \geq q_{i+1}$ and $q_i \geq p_{i+1}$, and the case when $p_i \leq q_{i+1}$ and $q_i \leq p_{i+1}$, the proof is done because m_i equals the length of one of the skew columns. In the case when $q_i > p_{i+1}$ and $q_{i+1} > p_i$, we should continue to prove that condition- $(m_i + 1)$ fails. Same for the case when $q_i < p_{i+1}$ and $q_{i+1} < p_i$, and the proof will be the same. Hence we will omit it.

Now, suppose $q_i > p_{i+1}$ and $q_{i+1} > p_i$. We first prove a claim:

(*) At least one entry of $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ is below all of $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$.

Assume the contrary, then there exists one entry $[w]_-^{(i)}$ below all $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$. By Definition 3.3, no positive entry above $[w]_-^{(i)}$ should be skipped in the arrangement of $\hat{S}_{\pm, i}$. As a result, all $[\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}$ have to be paired up with $[\bullet]_+^{(i)}$. This fact implies that $p_i \geq q_{i+1}$, which is contradict to the assumption $q_{i+1} > p_i$.

Here we prove condition- $(p_i + p_{i+1} + 1)$ fails. Because of claim we just proved, we let $[k_*]_-^{(i)}$ be the last entry of $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$, and let $[j_*]_-^{(i+1)}$ be the first negative entry below $[k_*]_-^{(i)}$. Define

$$\begin{aligned} x_1 &:= ([\bullet]_-^{(i)} \sim [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]_+^{(i+1)} <^{\uparrow} [j_*]_-^{(i+1)}); \\ x_2 &:= ([\bullet]_-^{(i)} \sim [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]_-^{(i)} <^{\uparrow} [j_*]_-^{(i+1)}); \\ z_1 &:= \#([\times] \sim [\bullet]_-^{(i+1)}) \cap ([\bullet]_+^{(i+1)} <^{\uparrow} [j_*]_-^{(i+1)}); \\ z_2 &:= \#([\bullet]_-^{(i)} \sim [\times]) \cap ([\bullet]_-^{(i)} <^{\uparrow} [j_*]_-^{(i+1)}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} j_* &= x'_1 + x'_2 + z''_1 + 1; \\ k_* &= x'_1 + x'_2 + z''_2. \end{aligned}$$

In this case, $n_i = p_i + q_i$, and $m_i = p_i + p_{i+1}$. We compute

$$n_i - (m_i + 1) + j_* = q_i - p_{i+1} + x'_1 + x'_2 + z''_1.$$

By claim (*) and Lemma 3.4 (6), all $[\bullet]_-^{(i)}$ and $[\bullet]_+^{(i+1)}$ are above $[j_*]_-^{(i+1)}$. Thus

$$q_i - p_i + 1 = z''_1 - z''_2.$$

Eventually, we have $n_i - (m_i + 1) + j_* = k_*$ and $[k - m + j_*]^{(i)} = [k_*]_-^{(i)}$. By the definition of $[k_*]_-^{(i)}$, we know that $[j_*]_-^{(i+1)} >^{\uparrow} [k - m + j_*]_-^{(i)}$. By Lemma 3.4 (4), $[j_*]_-^{(i+1)} \leq^{\uparrow} [k - m + j_*]_-^{(i)}$. Hence condition- $(p_i + p_{i+1} + 1)$ fails. \square

4. NON-VANISHING CRITERION FOR $A_q(\lambda)$ IN THE NICE RANGE

Once we have the formula for the overlap, we can do a one-step application in Theorem 2.13 by simply writing (2.6) as

$$\min\{p_i, q_{i+1}\} + \min\{p_{i+1}, q_i\} \geq \text{sing}(S'_i, S'_{i+1}),$$

where S'_i has p_i $[+]$ and q_i $[-]$ for all i . What more interesting happens when λ is in the nice range, see Theorem 4.1. Using the notation in (2.3), λ being in the nice range is equivalent to

$$(4.1) \quad \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i \leq \min\{n_i, n_{i+1}\}, \quad \forall i.$$

In this section, we will discuss the ν -quasitableau constructed in Theorem 2.9. We need to update some notations. Write $\nu = \lambda + \rho$ as in (2.4). Define

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{R}_{ij} := \{\nu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\} \cap \{\nu_1^{(j)}, \dots, \nu_{n_j}^{(j)}\}.$$

and let $R_{ij} := \#\mathcal{R}_{ij}$, the cardinality of \mathcal{R}_{ij} . We write \mathcal{R}_{ij} as $\mathcal{R}_{ij}^{(i)}$ when consider it as a subset of $\{\nu_i^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$. Recall the way we construct S from $A_q(\lambda)$, the entry $[j]^{(i)}$ is filled with $\nu_j^{(i)}$. We call $\nu_j^{(i)}$ the **value** of $[j]^{(i)}$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $A_q(\lambda)$ be in the nice range, where \mathbf{q} is attached to $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$. Let (S, S_\pm) be a pair of ν -quasitableau and signed tableau constructed in Theorem 2.9. Then $A_q(\lambda)$ is nonzero if and only if*

$$(4.3) \quad \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i \leq \min\{p_i, q_{i+1}\} + \min\{q_i, p_{i+1}\}, \quad \forall i$$

And when (4.3) holds, S is a ν -antitableau.

Proof. Because λ is in the nice range, it is easy to see that the singularity of two adjacent skew columns is

$$\text{sing}(S_i, S_{i+1}) = R_{i,i+1} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i, & \text{if } \lambda_{i+1} > \lambda_i; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Suppose $A_q(\lambda)$ is nonzero, then by Theorem 2.13 and 3.6, we directly have (4.3).

Now we prove (4.3) implies that S is a ν -antitableau. Let $[j]^{(i_0)}$ be an entry in the ν -quasitableau. We shall prove $\nu_j^{(i_0)}$ is greater or equal to the value of the entry right and adjacent to it, and strictly greater than the value of the entry below and adjacent it. Because λ is in the nice range for \mathbf{q} , $\nu_j^{(i_0)}$ either contributes to the singularity R_{i_0, i_0+1} or is strictly greater than all $\{\nu_{\bullet}^{(i_0+1)}\}$. In the latter case, $\nu_j^{(i_0)}$ is strictly greater than all $\{\nu_{\bullet}^{(i')}\}$ as long as $i' > i_0$. Meanwhile, $\nu_j^{(i_0)} > \nu_{j'}^{(i_0)}$ for all $j' > j$. Consider the entries below and adjacent to $[j]^{(i_0)}$, and the one right and adjacent to $[j]^{(i_0)}$. Their values are either in $\{\nu_{\bullet}^{(i')}\mid i' > i_0\}$ or $\{\nu_{j'}^{(i_0)}\mid j' > j\}$. Thus the value of $[j]^{(i_0+1)}$ is strictly greater than them.

Now we may assume $\nu_j^{(i_0)}$ contributes to the singularity R_{i_0, i_0+1} . In other words, $\nu_j^{(i_0)} \in \mathcal{R}_{i_0, i_0+1}^{(i_0)}$. Let $[j_0]^{(i_0+1)}$ be the entry in S_{i_0+1} which has the same value as $[j]^{(i_0)}$. Because λ is in the nice range for \mathbf{q} , $R_{i_0, i_0+1}^{(i_0)}$ are the values of the bottom entries of the skew column S_{i_0} .

Let k be the length of S_{i_0} and write $R = R_{i_0, i_0+1}$. Then $j = k - R + j_0$. Let m be the overlap of S_{i_0} and S_{i_0+1} . Then by Lemma 3.5, $[k - m + j_0]^{(i_0)} \geq^\uparrow [j_0]^{(i_0+1)}$. Meanwhile, (4.3) implies $m \geq R$. Hence $[k - R + j_0]^{(i_0)} \geq^\uparrow [k - m + j_0]^{(i_0)}$. Therefore, $[k - R + j_0]^{(i_0)} \geq^\uparrow [j_0]^{(i_0+1)}$. And as a corollary, we have $[k - R + j_0]^{(i_0)} < \leftrightarrow [j]^{(i_0+1)}$. As a conclusion, $[j]^{(i_0)} = [k - R + j_0]^{(i_0)}$ is lower than and strictly left to the entry with same value in the next skew column S_{i_0+1} .

Let $[x]^{i_x}$ be the entry right and adjacent to $[j]^{(i_0)}$. If $i_x = i_0 + 1$, then by the conclusion in the previous paragraph, it is at least below the entry which has equal value as $[j]^{(i_0)}$. As a result, the value of $[x]^{i_x}$ is no more than that of $[j]^{i_0}$. If $i_x > i_0 + 1$, there are two situations. The trivial one is that $\nu_j^{(i_0)}$ is strictly greater than all of $\{\nu_{\bullet}^{(i_x)}\}$. In the other situation, we can consecutively apply the conclusion of the previous paragraph. Eventually, we conclude that, in S_{i_x} , the entry with the same value as $[j]^{(i_0)}$ is on the right side of and at least above $[j]^{(i_0)}$. Hence, the value of $[x]^{i_x}$ is no more than that of $[j]^{(i_0)}$.

Let $[y]^{(i_y)}$ be the entry below and adjacent to $[j]^{(i_0)}$. All the proof in the paragraph can be copied here. But in this case, the value of $[y]^{(i_y)}$ is strictly less than that of $[j]^{(i_0)}$ because it is below $[j]^{(i_0)}$. Now we have proved S is a ν -antitableau.

Suppose (4.3) holds. Then S is a ν -antitableau. Theorem 2.13 implies that this $A_q(\lambda)$ is nonzero. \square

Corollary 4.2. *Theorem 2.9 is correct for $A_q(\lambda)$ in the nice range.*

We end this section with an application of Theorem 4.1 to K -types.

Proposition 4.3. *Let a nonzero $A_q(\lambda)$ be in the nice range. Then $\lambda + 2\rho(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s})$ must be a K -type of $A_q(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Let

$$\lambda = (\overbrace{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1}^{n_1} | \dots | \overbrace{\lambda_r, \dots, \lambda_r}^{n_r}) \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mathbb{R}}^*,$$

where $n_i = p_i + q_i$. For the convenience of writing, we write it as

$$\lambda = ({}^{(n_1)}\lambda_1 | {}^{(n_2)}\lambda_2 | \dots | {}^{(n_r)}\lambda_r).$$

Here ${}^{(n)}\bullet$ means an n -tuple whose entries have the same value. The formula of $2\rho(\mu \cap \mathfrak{s})$ is

$$2\rho(\mu \cap \mathfrak{s}) = \left({}^{(p_1)}\eta_{1,+}; {}^{(q_2)}\eta_{1,-} | {}^{(p_2)}\eta_{2,+}; {}^{(q_2)}\eta_{2,-} | \dots | {}^{(p_r)}\eta_{r,+}; {}^{(q_r)}\eta_{r,-} \right).$$

Their coordinates are

$$\eta_{j,+} = - \sum_{l < j} q_l + \sum_{t > j} q_t; \quad \eta_{j,-} = - \sum_{l < j} p_l + \sum_{t > j} p_t.$$

By (2.2), $\lambda + 2\rho(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s})$ is \mathfrak{k} -dominant if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_j - \sum_{l < j} q_l + \sum_{t > j} q_t &\geq \lambda_{j+1} - \sum_{l < j+1} q_l + \sum_{t > j+1} q_t; \\ \lambda_j - \sum_{l < j} p_l + \sum_{t > j} p_t &\geq \lambda_{j+1} - \sum_{l < j+1} p_l + \sum_{t > j+1} p_t. \end{aligned}$$

After simplification, we have

$$\lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j \leq p_{j+1} + p_j; \quad \lambda_{j+1} - \lambda_j \leq q_{j+1} + q_j.$$

Theorem 4.1 directly implies the equations above. Thus $\lambda + 2\rho(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s})$ is \mathfrak{k} -dominant. Using the results of bottom layers from Corollary 5.85 of [5] and its following remark, we know that $\lambda + 2\rho(\mathfrak{u} \cap \mathfrak{s})$ is the highest weight of a K -type. \square

5. APPLICATION TO DIRAC INDEX

Recently, Dong and Wong provide an equivalent condition when a weakly fair $A_q(\lambda)$ in the Dirac series has nonzero Dirac index in [3]. On the one hand the advantage of this condition is that it later provides a formula for the Dirac index for $A_q(\lambda)$, but on the other hand it is not easy to quickly check this equivalent condition which is based on a system of inequalities of non-negative integers. In this section, we reduce the range to the nice range, and then develop an easier-to-check non-vanishing criterion for the Dirac index of $A_q(\lambda)$.

5.1. The strengthened H.P.-condition. The Dirac index of $A_q(\lambda)$ is naturally trivial when either $A_q(\lambda)$ or $H_D(A_q(\lambda))$ is zero. Thus we assume $A_q(\lambda)$ is nonzero and lives in the Dirac series. Vogan once gave a conjecture on the Dirac cohomology, and Huang and Pandžić proved it in [4]. Its application, by Dong and Wong, in the case of $A_q(\lambda)$ of $U(p, q)$ gives the following necessary conditions for nonzero Dirac cohomology. And we call it the H.P.-condition, where H.P. stands for the authors of [4].

Lemma 5.1. [3] *Assume that $H_D(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$ and write $\lambda + \rho = \nu$ as*

$$(5.1) \quad \nu = (\nu_1^{(1)}, \dots, \nu_{n_1}^{(1)} | \dots | \nu_1^{(r)}, \dots, \nu_{n_r}^{(r)}).$$

Then

- (1) *No entry can appear more than twice;*
- (2) *There are at most $\min\{p, q\}$ distinct entries appearing twice.*

They also gave a non-vanishing criterion for $\text{DI}(A_q(\lambda))$ in the same paper.

Lemma 5.2. [3] *Using the notations \mathcal{R}_{ij} and R_{ij} in section 4, consider the inequalities for non-negative integers (a_{ij}, b_{ij}) , $1 \leq i < j \leq k$:*

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{cases} a_{ij} + b_{ij} = R_{ij}, \\ (\sum_{x>i} a_{ix} + \sum_{y<i} b_{yi}) \leq p_i, \\ (\sum_{x<i} a_{xi} + \sum_{y>i} b_{iy}) \leq q_i. \end{cases}$$

There is a solution to (5.2) if and only if $\text{DI}(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$.

Remark. There are five equations in [3]. But two of them are redundant.

Remark 5.8 in [3] conjectured that if a weakly fair $A_q(\lambda)$ which satisfies the conditions in Lemma 5.1 but (5.2) has no non-negative integer solution, then this $A_q(\lambda)$ must be the zero module. In fact, this conjecture is not correct. We find out that the problem happens at part (2) of the H.P.-condition in Lemma 5.1. Later in this section, we will modify the H.P.-condition and give a non-vanishing criterion for $\text{DI}(A_q(\lambda))$ different from Lemma 5.2, but only for λ in the nice range.

For a nonzero $A_q(\lambda)$ in the nice range, the first part of the H.P.-condition has the following effects on the R_{ij} 's defined in Lemma 5.2.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose λ only satisfies part (1) of the H.P.-condition and that λ is in the nice range for \mathbf{q} , where \mathbf{q} is attached to a sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$. Let $\nu = \lambda + \rho$ and use the coordinate as (5.1). Then*

- (1) $R_{ij} \neq 0$ if and only if $j = i + 1$.
- (2) $R_{i-1,i} + R_{i,i+1} \leq n_i$.

Proof. Assume the contrary of (1). Then there exist $s + 1 < t$ and two indices a and b such that $\nu_a^{(s)} = \nu_b^{(t)}$. We can pick an integer k such that $s < k < t$. By the assumption of λ being in the nice range for \mathbf{q} , we have

$$\nu_{n_k}^{(k)} \leq \nu_{n_s}^{(s)} \leq \nu_a^{(s)} = \nu_b^{(t)} \leq \nu_1^{(t)} \leq \nu_1^{(k)}.$$

The inequality above shows that there must exists one entry $\nu_x^{(k)}$ equal to $\nu_a^{(s)}$ and $\nu_b^{(t)}$, which means in the coordinates of ν , at least three entries are the equal. This fact is contradict to part (1) of the H.P.-condition. The proof of (1) is done.

Claim (2) is obtained by direct computation. We may assume both of $R_{i-1,i}$ and $R_{i,i+1}$ are nonzero. By the definition of R_{ij} 's,

$$R_{i-1,i} = \nu_1^{(i)} - \nu_{n_{i-1}}^{(i-1)} + 1, \text{ and } R_{i,i+1} = \nu_1^{(i+1)} - \nu_{n_i}^{(i)} + 1.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} R_{i-1,i} + R_{i,i+1} &= (\nu_1^{(i)} - \nu_{n_{i-1}}^{(i-1)} + 1) + (\nu_1^{(i+1)} - \nu_{n_i}^{(i)} + 1) \\ &= (\nu_1^{(i)} - \nu_{n_i}^{(i)} + 1) + (\nu_1^{(i+1)} - \nu_{n_{i-1}}^{(i-1)} + 1) \\ &= n_i + (\nu_1^{(i+1)} - \nu_{n_{i-1}}^{(i-1)} + 1) \leq n_i. \end{aligned}$$

The inequality in the last line is due to (1). In detail, because $R_{i-1,i+1} = 0$, we must have $\nu_1^{(i+1)} < \nu_{n_{i-1}}^{(i-1)}$. \square

Definition 5.4. Let $A_{\mathbf{q}}(\lambda)$ be in the nice range, and ν , R_{ij} be defined as Lemma 5.1. Suppose \mathbf{q} is attached to the $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$. We call the followings the **strengthened H.P.-condition**,

- (1) No entry of coordinates of ν can appear more than twice;
- (2) Let $I = \{k, k+1, \dots, l\}$ be a subset of the index $\{1, 2, \dots, r\}$. Let $p_I = \sum_{i \in I} p_i$ and $q_I = \sum_{i \in I} q_i$. There are at most $\min\{p_I, q_I\}$ distinct entries among $\bigcup_{i \in I} \{\nu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$ appearing twice. Equivalently, all $R_{i,i+1}$ should satisfy

$$(5.3) \quad \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} R_{i,i+1} \leq \min \left\{ \sum_{i=k}^l p_i, \sum_{i=k}^l q_i \right\}, \forall 1 \leq k < l \leq r.$$

Obviously, the second condition heavily depends on the structure of \mathbf{q} . We say that λ satisfies the strengthened H.P.-condition for \mathbf{q} if both two conditions above hold.

5.2. Non-vanishing criterion for $DI(A_q(\lambda))$. In the coordinates of $\nu = \lambda + \rho$, the exact value of each $\nu_s^{(t)}$ is not important. What we care are the sets $\mathcal{R}_{i,i+1}$'s. We will use $\nu_s^{(t)}$ as coordinate functions. When we say $\nu_{s_1}^{(t_1)} = \nu_{s_2}^{(t_2)}$, it means the particular coordinates are equal for the $\nu = \lambda + \rho$ in discussion.

Set $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1 | \dots | \lambda_t, \dots, \lambda_t)$. When λ is in the nice range for \mathfrak{q} , one could easily obtain the following formula for $R_{i,i+1}$:

$$(5.4) \quad R_{i,i+1} = \begin{cases} \lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i, & \text{if } \lambda_{i+1} > \lambda_i; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

From now on, we use (5.4) as the definition of $R_{i,i+1}$. The reason we use this new definition is that we want to get rid of ρ . Later in this section, we are about to use induction on the structure of \mathfrak{q} to prove some facts. But ρ changes when $p + q$ changes, and it will make the proof lengthy. Under this new definition of $R_{i,i+1}$, Lemma 5.3 is still correct. And Theorem 4.1 can be written as

$$(5.5) \quad R_{i,i+1} \leq \min\{p_i, q_{i+1}\} + \min\{q_i, p_{i+1}\}.$$

Definition 5.5. Let $A_q(\lambda)$ be a nonzero module in the nice range, where \mathfrak{q} is attached to the sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$. And suppose λ satisfies part (1) of the H.P.-condition. Assign either a $+$ or $-$ to each entry of the coordinate of $\nu = \lambda + \rho$ as (2.4) following two requirements:

- (1) with a fixed s , all $\nu_s^{(t)}$ should be assigned exactly p_s pluses and q_s minuses;
- (2) if $\nu_a^{(i)} = \nu_b^{(i+1)}$, then these two entries should be assigned opposite signs.

If such an assignment exists, then we call this λ **can be \mathfrak{q} -signed**. And we call a λ with such assignment a **\mathfrak{q} -signed λ** .

Example 5.6. Suppose \mathfrak{q} is attached to $\{(3, 2), (1, 2), (2, 1)\}$ and $\lambda = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0 | 3, 3, 3 | 3, 3, 3)$. Notice $\rho = (5, 4, 3, 2, 1, 0, -1, -2, -3, -4, -5)$. Then $\lambda + \rho = (5, 4, 3, 2, 1 | 3, 2, 1 | 0, -1, -2)$. It can be \mathfrak{q} -signed in the following way:

$$(\lambda + \rho)_\pm = (5_+, 4_-, 3_+, 2_+, 1_- | 3_-, 2_-, 1_+ | 0_+, -1_+, -2_-).$$

Lemma 5.7. Suppose λ is in the nice range for \mathfrak{q} and satisfies part (1) of the H.P.-condition. Then $DI(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$ if and only if λ can be \mathfrak{q} -signed.

Proof. Lemma 5.2 proves that $DI(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$ if and only if (5.2) has non-negative integer solutions. By (1) of Lemma 5.3 and $a_{ij} + b_{ij} = R_{ij}$, a_{ij} and b_{ij} in (5.2) are nonzero only if $j = i + 1$. As a result, (5.2) can be reduced to

$$(5.6) \quad \begin{cases} a_{i,i+1} + b_{i,i+1} = R_{i,i+1}, \\ a_{i,i+1} + b_{i-1,i} \leq p_i, \\ a_{i-1,i} + b_{i,i+1} \leq q_i, \end{cases}$$

where $a_{i,i+1}$ and $b_{i,i+1}$ are 0 when $i = 0$ or $i = r$. Therefore, it suffices to prove that λ can be \mathfrak{q} -signed if and only if (5.6) has non-negative integer solutions.

Let λ be \mathfrak{q} -signed and $(\lambda + \rho)_\pm$ be the corresponding assignment as in Example 5.6. For this $(\lambda + \rho)_\pm$, we construct a solution to (5.6) in the following way. Let $a_{i,i+1}$ be the

number of pluses attached to $\mathcal{R}_{i,i+1}^{(i)}$, and $b_{i,i+1}$ be the number of minuses attached to $\mathcal{R}_{i,i+1}^{(i)}$. Then $a_{i,i+1} + b_{i,i+1} = R_{i,i+1}$ is ensured by definition. Equivalently, $a_{i,i+1}$ is the number of minuses attached to $\mathcal{R}_{i,i+1}^{(i+1)}$, and $b_{i,i+1}$ be the number of pluses attached to $\mathcal{R}_{i,i+1}^{(i+1)}$. Notice $\mathcal{R}_{i-1,i} \cap \mathcal{R}_{i,i+1} = \mathcal{R}_{i-1,i+1} = 0$, and $\mathcal{R}_{i-1,i}^{(i)} \cup \mathcal{R}_{i,i+1}^{(i)} \subseteq \{\nu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$. Consider the pluses assigned to $\{\nu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$, we have $b_{i-1,i} + a_{i,i+1} \leq p_i$; Consider the minuses assigned to $\{\nu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$, we have $a_{i-1,i} + b_{i,i+1} \leq q_i$. As a conclusion, the set $\{a_{i,i+1}, b_{i,i+1}\}$ is a non-negative integer solution to (5.6).

Suppose (5.6) has a non-negative integer solution $\{a_{i,i+1}, b_{i,i+1}\}$. We construct a \mathfrak{q} -assignment to λ in the following way. Step one: for each $\{\nu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$, assign $a_{i-1,i}$ minuses and $b_{i-1,i}$ pluses to $\mathcal{R}_{i-1,i}^{(i)}$; and assign $a_{i,i+1}$ pluses and $b_{i,i+1}$ minuses to $\mathcal{R}_{i,i+1}^{(i)}$. One should adjust the signs so that requirement (2) of Definition 5.5 is satisfied. Step one is feasible because of $a_{i,i+1} + b_{i,i+1} = R_{i,i+1}$ in (5.6). Step two: assign what left over in $\{\nu_1^{(i)}, \dots, \nu_{n_i}^{(i)}\}$ following requirement (1) of Definition 5.5. Because of the inequalities in (5.6), neither pluses nor minuses run out in step one. Therefore, step two is also feasible. The construction of the assignment is completed. \square

Theorem 5.8. *Let $A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)$ be a nonzero module in the nice range for \mathfrak{q} , where \mathfrak{q} is attached to a sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$. Then $\text{DI}(A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)) \neq 0$ if and only if λ satisfies the strengthened H.P.-condition for \mathfrak{q} (see Definition 5.4).*

Proof. Assume $\text{DI}(A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)) \neq 0$. A direct corollary is that $H_D(A_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)) \neq 0$, which implies that part (1) of the strengthened H.P.-condition holds. By Lemma 5.7, (5.6) has solutions. Let $\{a_{i,i+1}, b_{i,i+1}\}$ be a non-negative integer solution, where $a_{i,i+1}$ are $b_{i,i+1}$ is 0 when $i = 0$ or $i = r$. Sum up the inequalities $b_{i-1,i} + a_{i,i+1} \leq p_i$ where i runs from k to l ($k < l$). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=k}^l p_i &\geq \sum_{i=k}^l (a_{i,i+1} + b_{i-1,i}) = a_{l,l+1} + b_{k-1,k} + \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} (a_{i,i+1} + b_{i,i+1}) \\ &= a_{l,l+1} + b_{k-1,k} + \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} R_{i,i+1} \geq \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} R_{i,i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

For the same reason, we also have

$$\sum_{i=k}^l q_i \geq \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} R_{i,i+1}.$$

Thus part (2) of the strengthened H.P.-condition holds.

Assume λ satisfies the strengthened H.P.-condition. We claim the following two inequalities hold:

$$(5.7) \quad \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} R_{i,i+1} \leq \min\{p_k, q_{k+1}\} + \sum_{i=k+1}^{l-1} p_i + \min\{p_l, q_{l-1}\};$$

$$(5.7') \quad \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} R_{i,i+1} \leq \min\{q_k, p_{k+1}\} + \sum_{i=k+1}^{l-1} q_i + \min\{q_l, p_{l-1}\}.$$

It suffices to prove the first line. When $l - k = 1$, (5.7) is exactly (5.5).

When $l - k = 2$, there are two summands $R_{k,k+1} + R_{k+1,k+2}$. Suppose q_{k+1} is greater than or equal to both p_k and p_{k+2} . Then (5.7) becomes $R_{k,k+1} + R_{k+1,k+2} \leq p_k + p_{k+1} + p_{k+2}$, which is covered by (5.3). Suppose q_{k+1} is less than any one of p_k and p_{k+2} , say $q_{k+1} < p_k$. Then by (2) of Lemma 5.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k,k+1} + R_{k+1,k+2} &\leq n_{k+1} = p_{k+1} + q_{k+1} = \min\{p_k, q_{k+1}\} + p_{k+1} \\ &\leq \min\{p_k, q_{k+1}\} + p_{k+1} + \min\{p_{k+2}, q_{k+1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

When $l - k > 3$, we first prove a weaker version, which is

$$(5.7'') \quad \sum_{i=k}^{l-1} R_{i,i+1} \leq \min\{p_k, q_{k+1}\} + \sum_{i=k+1}^l p_i.$$

Suppose $p_k \leq q_{k+1}$, then (5.7'') reduces to (5.3). Suppose $p_k > q_{k+1}$. We add up the following two inequalities from (2) of Lemma 5.3 and (5.3),

$$\begin{aligned} R_{k,k+1} + R_{k+1,k+2} &\leq n_{k+1} = p_{k+1} + q_{k+1}; \\ R_{k+2,k+3} + \cdots + R_{l-l,l} &\leq p_{k+3} + \cdots + p_l. \end{aligned}$$

Then (5.7'') is proved. Repeat this process on (5.7''), one can replace p_l by $\min\{p_l, q_{l-1}\}$ and (5.7) is then obtained.

Recall that \mathfrak{q} is attached to pairs of integers $\{(p_1, q_1), (p_2, q_2), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$. We prove that λ can be \mathfrak{q} -signed by induction on r beginning at $r = 2$.

In this case, (5.7) is

$$(5.8) \quad \min\{p_1, q_2\} + \min\{p_2, q_1\} \geq R_{12}.$$

If $R_{12} \leq \min\{p_1, q_2\}$, we could put R_{12} pluses on $\mathcal{R}_{12}^{(1)}$ and the same amount of minuses on $\mathcal{R}_{12}^{(2)}$. Then fill up the rest coordinates of λ following (1) of Definition 5.5. If $R_{12} > \min\{p_1, q_2\}$, we could put $\min\{p_1, q_2\}$ pluses and $R_{12} - \min\{p_1, q_2\}$ minuses on $\mathcal{R}_{12}^{(1)}$ and put same amount opposite signs on $\mathcal{R}_{12}^{(2)}$ following (2) of Definition 5.5. Then fill up the rest coordinates of λ following (1) of Definition 5.5.

For general cases when $r \geq 3$, we define $p'_r := \min\{p_r, q_{r-1}\}$, $q'_r := \min\{q_r, p_{r-1}\}$, and also define a sequence $\{(\lambda_{(t)}, \mathfrak{q}_{(t)}), t < r\}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{q}_{(t)} &\text{ is attached to } \{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_t, q_t)\}; \\ \lambda_{(t)} &:= (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1 | \cdots \cdots | \lambda_t, \dots, \lambda_t). \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, all $\lambda_{(t)}$ satisfy the strengthened H.P.-condition for $\mathbf{q}_{(t)}$ and $A_{\mathbf{q}_{(t)}}(\lambda_{(t)})$ are nonzero.

Subcase I: we assume $R_{r-1,r} \leq \min\{p'_r, q'_r\}$. By induction, we may assume $\lambda_{(r-1)}$ can be $\mathbf{q}_{(r-1)}$ -signed. Make such an assignment and insert it to $\lambda + \rho$. Then we have an incomplete assignment where $\{\nu_1^{(r)}, \dots, \nu_{n_r}^{(r)}\}$ are left over. Suppose there are a pluses and b minuses assigned to $\mathcal{R}_{r-1,r}^{(r-1)}$. By (2) of Definition 5.5, there should be a minuses and b pluses assigned to $\mathcal{R}_{r-1,r}^{(r)}$. Meanwhile, there are p_r pluses and q_r minuses to be assigned. Thus, we should prove $a \leq q_r$ and $b \leq p_r$. The assumption of this subcase is $R_{r-1,r} \leq \min\{p'_r, q'_r\}$. Thus

$$a + b = R_{12} \leq \min\{p'_r, q'_r\} = \min\{p_r, q_r, p_{r-1, q_{r-1}}\}.$$

Since both a and b are non-negative, we must have $a \leq q_r$ and $b \leq p_r$. After assigning a minuses and b pluses to $\mathcal{R}_{r-1,r}^{(r)}$, we just need to assign whatever signs left over to $\{\nu_1^{(r)}, \dots, \nu_{n_r}^{(r)}\} - \mathcal{R}_{r-1,r}^{(r)}$ and the order does not matter.

Subcase II: we assume $R_{r-1,r} > \min\{p'_r, q'_r\}$. Define $d_r := R_{r-1,r} - \min\{p'_r, q'_r\}$. Without loss of generality, we may assume $p'_r \leq q'_r$. Then $R_{r-1,r} = d_r + p'_r$. Consider the following pair (λ', \mathbf{q}') defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}' &\text{ is attached to } \{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_{r-1} - d_r, q_{r-1}), (p_r, q_r - d_r)\}; \\ \lambda' &:= (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1 | \dots | \overbrace{\lambda_{r-1}, \dots, \lambda_{r-1}}^{n_{r-1}-d_r} | \overbrace{\lambda_r - d_r, \dots, \lambda_r - d_r}^{n_r-d_r}). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$R'_{r-1,r} = R_{r-1,r} - d_r.$$

It is not hard to see that λ' is still in the nice range for \mathbf{q}' by checking (4.1). We shall prove $A_{\mathbf{q}'}(\lambda')$ is nonzero and λ' satisfies the strengthened H.P.-condition for \mathbf{q}' . Once the proof is done, it is easy to see $A_{\mathbf{q}'}(\lambda')$ falls in subcase I.

In order to prove that $A_{\mathbf{q}'}(\lambda')$ is nonzero, it suffices to prove the following two inequalities by Theorem 4.1 and (5.5):

$$(5.9) \quad R'_{r-1,r} \leq \min\{p_{r-1} - d_r, q_r - d_r\} + \min\{q_{r-1}, p_r\},$$

$$(5.10) \quad R_{r-2,r-1} \leq \min\{p_{r-2}, q_{r-1}\} + \min\{q_{r-2}, p_{r-1} - d_r\}.$$

For (5.9),

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{p_{r-1} - d_r, q_r - d_r\} + \min\{q_{r-1}, p_r\} &= \min\{p_{r-1}, q_r\} + \min\{q_{r-1}, p_r\} - d_r \\ &\leq R_{r-1,r} - d_r = R'_{r-1,r}. \end{aligned}$$

For (5.10), it reduces to (5.5) when $q_{r-1} \leq p_{r-1} - d_r$. Thus we may assume $q_{r-1} > p_{r-1} - d_r$. By (5.7),

$$R_{r-2,r-1} + R_{r-1,r} \leq \min\{p_r, q_{r-1}\} + p_{r-1} + \min\{p_{r-2}, q_{r-1}\}.$$

Noticing that $R_{r-1,r} = d_r + p'_r = d_r + \min\{p_r, q_{r-1}\}$, we have

$$R_{r-2,r-1} \leq (p_{r-1} - d_r) + \min\{p_{r-2}, q_{r-1}\} = \min\{q_{r-2}, p_{r-1} - d_r\} + \min\{p_{r-2}, q_{r-1}\}.$$

In order to prove that λ' satisfies the strengthened H.P.-condition for \mathfrak{q}' , it suffices to prove the following two inequalities:

$$(5.11) \quad R_{r-2, r-1} + R'_{r-1, r} \leq n_{r-1} - d_r,$$

$$(5.12) \quad R_{k, k+1} + \cdots + R_{r-2, r-1} + R'_{r-1, r} \leq \min \left\{ \sum_{i=k}^r p_i, \sum_{i=k}^r q_i \right\} - d_r.$$

For (5.11),

$$R_{r-2, r-1} + R'_{r-1, r} = R_{r-2, r-1} + R_{r-1, r} - d_r \leq n_{r-1} - d_r.$$

For (5.12), it suffices to prove


$$R_{k, k+1} + \cdots + R_{r-2, r-1} + R'_{r-1, r} \leq p_k + \cdots + p_r - d_n.$$

By (5.7), we have

$$R_{k, k+1} + \cdots + R_{r-2, r-1} + R_{r-1, r} \leq p_k + \cdots + p_{r-1} + \min\{p_r, q_{r-1}\}.$$

Then (5.12) is implied by the inequality above and the fact $R_{r-1, r} - \min\{p_r, q_{r-1}\} = d_r$.

At this point, we see $A_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda')$ is nonzero and falls in subcase I. Write $\nu' = \lambda' + \rho$, and $\nu = \lambda + \rho$. Embed this assignment of ν' to ν as follows. Firstly, remains the assignment for $\{\nu_j^{(i)} | i < r-1\}$; Secondly, complete the rest assignment as shown in the picture.



Now we have proved that λ can be \mathfrak{q} -signed. By Lemma 5.7, we know $\text{DI}(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$. \square

Corollary 5.9. *Let a nonzero $A_q(\lambda)$ be in the nice range, and \mathfrak{q} is attached to the sequence $\{(p_1, q_1), \dots, (p_r, q_r)\}$. When $r \leq 3$, $H_D(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$ if and only if the H.P.-condition stated in Lemma 5.1 holds.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that the H.P.-condition is a sufficient condition for $H_D(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$. When $r \leq 3$, the strengthened H.P.-condition is covered by the H.P.-condition and the nonzero criterion for $A_q(\lambda)$. By Theorem 5.8, $\text{DI}(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$. Hence, $H_D(A_q(\lambda)) \neq 0$. \square

Remark. Due to the definition of the Dirac index, it is possible that the positive and negative parts of the Dirac cohomology get completely canceled in the Dirac index. The corollary above indicates that there is no such cancellation in the case of $A_q(\lambda)$ of $U(p, q)$ when the structure of \mathfrak{q} is relatively simple. In the general case when $r > 3$, we still believe that the Dirac index will not be completely canceled out.

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Barbasch and D. Vogan, *Weyl group representations and nilpotent orbits*, Proceedings of Park City Conference on Harmonic Analysis, Progress in Math, Birkhäuser, Boston, (1982), 21-33.
- [2] D.H. Collingwood and W.M. McGovern, *Nilpotent Orbits in Semisimple Lie Algebras: An Introduction*, Routledge, 1993.
- [3] C.-P. Dong, K.D. Wong, *On the Dirac series of $U(p, q)$* , Math. Zeit. **298**, (2021) 839–859.
- [4] J.-S. Huang, P. Pandžić, *Dirac cohomology, unitary representations and a proof of a conjecture of Vogan*, J. Am. Math. Soc. **15**(1) (2002) 185-202.
- [5] A. W. Knap and D. A. Jr. Vogan, *Cohomological Induction and Unitary Representations*, Princeton Math. Ser. 45, Princeton University Press, 1995.
- [6] R. Parthasarathy, *Dirac operators and the discrete series* Ann. Math. **96** (1972), 1-30.
- [7] P. Trapa, *Annihilators and associated varieties of $A_q(\lambda)$ modules for $U(p, q)$* . Compos. Math. **129** (2001), 1–45.
- [8] K.D.Wong and H.-F. Zhang, *The unitary dual of $U(n, 2)$* , arxiv.org/pdf/2401.15660.

(Du) SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, SOOCHOW UNIVERSITY, SUZHOU 215006, P. R. CHINA
 Email address: cydu0973@suda.edu.cn