

# CHROMATIC ABERRATIONS OF GEOMETRIC SATAKE OVER THE REGULAR LOCUS

S. K. DEVALAPURKAR

It is an established practice to take  
old theorems about ordinary  
homology, and generalise them so  
as to obtain theorems about  
generalised homology theories.

---

J. F. Adams, [Ada69]

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. The regular locus	11
3. Equivariant cohomology and the case of tori	15
4. Degenerations	22
5. Loop rotation equivariance	28
6. Review of the classical case	32
7. The K-theoretic story	46
8. The elliptic story	54
9. Comparison to Brylinski-Zhang	61
Appendix A. Comparison to Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel	66
Appendix B. Coulomb branches of pure supersymmetric gauge theories	72
References	78

---

Part of this work was done when the author was supported by the PD Soros Fellowship and NSF DGE-2140743. The present article is a preliminary version, so any comments and suggestions for improving it are greatly appreciated! I'll post major updates to the arXiv, but I'll upload minor edits to my website at <https://sanathdevalapurkar.github.io/files/grG-regular.pdf>; so please see there for the most up-to-date version.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. The derived geometric Satake equivalence.** Let  $G$  be a semisimple algebraic group over  $\mathbf{C}$ , and let  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  denote the affine Grassmannian, defined as  $G((t))/G[[t]]$ . The geometric Satake equivalence of Mirkovic-Vilonen states:

**Theorem 1.1** (Mirkovic-Vilonen, [MV07]). *Let  $\check{G}_{\mathbf{Z}}$  denote the smooth split reductive group scheme over  $\mathbf{Z}$  whose root datum is dual to that of  $G$ . Then there is an equivalence of symmetric monoidal abelian categories*

$$\mathrm{Perv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Z}) \simeq \mathrm{Rep}(\check{G}_{\mathbf{Z}}).$$

The abelian category  $\mathrm{Perv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Z})$  arises as the heart of a  $t$ -structure on the stable  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Z})$  of  $G[[t]]$ -equivariant constructible sheaves on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ . However, Theorem 1.1 does not lift to an equivalence of stable  $\infty$ -categories between  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Z})$  and the derived  $\infty$ -category of  $\mathrm{Rep}(\check{G}_{\mathbf{Z}})$ . Nevertheless, one has:

**Theorem 1.2** (Bezrukavnikov-Finkelberg, [BF08]). *Let  $\check{G} = \check{G}_{\mathbf{C}}$ . There is a  $\mathbf{C}$ -linear equivalence of monoidal stable  $\infty$ -categories*

$$\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathrm{Perf}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]/\check{G}).$$

Here,  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]$  denotes the derived scheme given by  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  placed in (homological) degree 2. Using Koszul duality, the right-hand side can be rewritten as

$$\mathrm{Perf}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]/\check{G}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}((\{0\} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}} \{0\})/\check{G}).$$

In [CR23, Theorem 6.6.1], it was shown that the above equivalence can be refined to an equivalence of monoidal factorization stable  $\infty$ -categories. (We will not need this refinement here, and only mention it for the sake of completeness.) There are several variants of Theorem 1.2 which have been proved in the literature; of relevance to us is a theorem from [ABG04] concerning the Iwahori subgroup  $I$  of  $G[[t]]$ . Namely, fix a Borel subgroup  $B \subseteq G$  with unipotent radical  $N$ , and let  $I = G[[t]] \times_G B$ . Then:

**Theorem 1.3** (Arkhipov-Bezrukavnikov-Ginzburg, [ABG04]). *There is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Shv}_I^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathrm{Coh}((\tilde{N} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}} \{0\})/\check{G}),$$

where  $\tilde{N} = T^*(\check{G}/\check{B})$  is the Springer resolution. Using Koszul duality, the right-hand side can be rewritten as

$$\mathrm{Coh}((\tilde{N} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}} \{0\})/\check{G}) \simeq \mathrm{Perf}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{C}}[2]/\check{G}_{\mathbf{C}}),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{\mathbf{C}}[2] = \check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{\mathfrak{n}}^{\perp}[2]$  is a shifted analogue of the Grothendieck-Springer resolution.

The equivalences of Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3 admit simpler analogues, where one considers the full subcategories of the ind-completions of  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  and  $\mathrm{Shv}_I^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  generated by the constant sheaf. Let us denote these  $\infty$ -categories by  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  and  $\mathrm{Loc}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$ . In this case, as we will discuss in the body of the article, the above results restrict to equivalences

$$(1) \quad \mathrm{Loc}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*, \mathrm{reg}}[2]/\check{G}),$$

$$(2) \quad \mathrm{Loc}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}[2]/\check{G}).$$

Here,  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\text{reg}}$  denotes the open subscheme of *regular* elements in  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ , i.e., those elements whose stabilizer under the coadjoint action of  $\check{G}$  has dimension given by the rank of  $\check{G}$ ; and similarly for  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{reg}}$ . We will refer to these equivalences as the derived geometric Satake equivalence (resp. the ABG equivalence) over the regular locus. In fact, one can give a proof of Theorem 1.2 using (1) combined with the fact that  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\text{reg}}$  has complement of large codimension in  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ .

Our goal in this article is to study an analogue of the derived geometric Satake equivalence over the regular locus where  $\mathbf{C}$  is replaced by other ring (spectra) of coefficients. The observation allowing us to do this is that the  $\infty$ -categories  $\text{Loc}_{G[[t]]}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  and  $\text{Loc}_I(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  are homotopy-theoretic in nature. Indeed, they depend only on the  $G[[t]]$ -equivariant (resp.  $I$ -equivariant) homotopy type of  $\text{Gr}_G$ . This, in turn can be understood using a result of Quillen and Garland-Raghunathan (see [GR75, Mit88]), which gives a homeomorphism  $\text{Gr}_G \simeq \Omega G_c$ ; so all computations reduce to homotopy-theoretic statements about  $\Omega G_c$ . Here,  $G_c \subseteq G(\mathbf{C})$  is a maximal compact subgroup. Since  $G[[t]]$  is homotopy equivalent to  $G_c$  (and  $I$  is homotopy equivalent to a maximal torus  $T_c \subseteq G_c$ ), the equivalences (1) and (2) can be restated as a pair of equivalences

$$(3) \quad \text{Loc}_{G_c}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C}) \simeq \text{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\text{reg}}[2]/\check{G}),$$

$$(4) \quad \text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C}) \simeq \text{QCoh}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{reg}}[2]/\check{G}).$$

**1.2. A K-theoretic and elliptic variant.** As mentioned above, our goal in this article is to generalize the equivalence (2) to the case of K-theoretic and elliptic cohomology coefficients. In order to motivate the discussion, we need to review some of the setup of equivariant generalized cohomology.

If  $G_c$  is a compact Lie group, Atiyah and Segal defined  $G_c$ -equivariant complex K-theory  $\text{KU}_{G_c}$  in [Seg68, AS69]: this is a generalized cohomology theory, viewed as a spectrum in the sense of homotopy theory, which classifies  $G_c$ -equivariant vector bundles on finite  $G_c$ -spaces. Direct sum and tensor products of  $G$ -equivariant vector bundles equips  $\text{KU}_{G_c}$  with the structure of a *ring* spectrum; in fact, it is an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring, meaning (for instance) that the multiplication on cohomology can be refined by Adams operations. Despite its definition, the geometric interpretation of cocycles for equivariant K-theory as equivariant vector bundles will play *no* role below.

Two important examples are the following. When  $G_c$  is the trivial group,  $\text{KU}_{G_c}$  is simply periodic complex K-theory  $\text{KU}$ , and Bott periodicity gives a graded isomorphism  $\pi_* \text{KU} \cong \mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}]$  with the Bott class  $\beta$  in weight 2. On the other hand, when  $G_c$  is a connected compact Lie group with complex representation ring  $\text{RU}(G_c)$ , the coefficient ring  $\pi_* \text{KU}_{G_c}$  is the tensor product  $\text{RU}(G_c) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}]$ . In particular, if  $G_c$  is a compact torus  $T_c$ , then  $\text{Spec } \pi_* \text{KU}_{T_c}$  is the corresponding algebraic torus  $T_{\mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}]}$  over  $\mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}]$ .

In Section 3, we define a  $\text{KU}$ -linear  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KU})$  of  $T_c$ -equivariant local systems of  $\text{KU}$ -modules on  $\text{Gr}_G$ ; this should be viewed as a K-theoretic analogue of the  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Loc}_I(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KU})$ . The ideal analogue of (2) would identify  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KU})$  with the  $\infty$ -category of perfect complexes on some stack over  $\text{KU}$  defined in terms of the Langlands dual group. Unfortunately, we do not know how to define this putative stack over  $\text{KU}$ ; instead, we will study a particular *degeneration* of this  $\infty$ -category, denoted  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KU})$ . The reason for studying this degeneration is explained in the introduction to Section 4; we will also discuss its “philosophical” meaning momentarily. For the moment, let us just note

the utility of this degeneration: while  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU})$  is a  $\mathrm{KU}$ -linear  $\infty$ -category,  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU})$  is instead an ordinary ( $\mathbf{Z}$ -linear)  $\infty$ -category; so we do not have to be concerned with questions such as the definition of the dual group over  $\mathrm{KU}$ .

Exactly the same setup works if  $k$  is a complex oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring which is an elliptic cohomology theory (in the sense of [Lur09, GM20, GM23]) with associated elliptic curve  $E$  over  $\pi_0(k)$ . Namely, we construct a  $k$ -linear  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$ , as well as a degeneration  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  which is instead an ordinary ( $\pi_0(k)$ -linear)  $\infty$ -category. In both this case and the case of  $\mathrm{KU}$ , an object  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  define a corresponding object  $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$ , and there is a spectral sequence

$$(5) \quad \pi_*(k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \pi_* \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)}(\underline{k}^{\mathrm{gr}}, \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}}) \Rightarrow \pi_* \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)}(\underline{k}, \mathcal{F}) = \pi_* \Gamma_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathcal{F}).$$

Here,  $\underline{k}$  denotes the constant sheaf.

To state our main result, we need a small observation. Suppose  $G$  is a connected, almost simple, and *simply-laced* algebraic group over  $\mathbf{C}$ , and let  $\check{G}_{\mathbf{C}}$  denote the Langlands dual over  $\mathbf{C}$ . Then  $\check{G}_{\mathbf{C}}$  is centrally isogeneous to  $G$ . For instance, if  $G$  is simply-connected,  $\check{G}_{\mathbf{C}}$  is the quotient of  $G$  by its center. In general (under the simply-laced hypothesis), the action of  $G$  on itself by conjugation descends/ascends to an action of  $\check{G}_{\mathbf{C}}$ . In particular, the action of  $T_{\mathbf{C}}$  on  $G$  by conjugation descends/ascends to an action of  $\check{T}_{\mathbf{C}}$  on  $G$ . Therefore, if  $T_c$  denote the maximal compact subgroup of  $T_{\mathbf{C}}$  (and similarly for  $\check{T}_c$ ), then the conjugation action of  $T_c$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  descends/ascends to an action of  $\check{T}_c$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ .

The main result of this article is the following.

**Theorem 1.4** (Corollary 6.8, Corollary 7.8, Corollary 8.11). *Suppose  $G$  is a connected, almost simple, and simply-laced algebraic group over  $\mathbf{C}$ . Let  $T \subseteq G$  be a maximal torus, and let  $\check{T}_c$  denote a maximal compact subgroup of the Langlands dual torus over  $\mathbf{C}$ . Let  $k$  denote either 2-periodified rational cohomology  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ , complex  $K$ -theory  $\mathrm{KU}$ , or elliptic cohomology with associated elliptic curve  $E$ , and let  $F$  be an algebraically closed field containing  $\pi_0(k)$ . Then there are equivalences*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} F &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}} / \check{G}), \\ \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\tilde{G}^{\mathrm{reg}} / \check{G}), \\ \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the dual groups on the right-hand side are defined over  $F$ ; the final equivalence is assuming that  $k$  is an elliptic cohomology theory;  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  denotes  $\check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{\mathfrak{b}}$ ;  $\tilde{G}$  denotes  $\check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{B}$  for the conjugation action of  $\check{B}$  on itself<sup>1</sup>; and  $\mathrm{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)$  denotes the moduli stack of degree zero  $\check{B}$ -bundles on  $E$ .

Since  $T_c$  and  $\check{T}_c$  are isogeneous by a finite group, there is no difference between  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}])$  and  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\check{T}_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}])$ . Therefore, the first part of Theorem 1.4 is, of course, just (4) (once one identifies  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \cong \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ ). However, we warn the reader that if  $k$  is not a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra, the categories  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  and  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\check{T}_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  are genuinely different, and do not agree even upon base-change along  $\pi_0(k) \rightarrow F$ .

<sup>1</sup>We warn the reader that the symbol  $\tilde{G}$  will mean  $\check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{B}$  *only* in the introduction; it has a slightly different meaning in the body of the article, described in Definition 7.1.

**Remark 1.5.** The same argument used to prove Theorem 1.4 shows that if  $G$  is a connected, almost simple, and *simply-laced* algebraic group over  $\mathbf{C}$  with torsion-free fundamental group, and  $k$  denotes either 2-periodified rational cohomology  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ , complex K-theory  $\mathrm{KU}$ , or elliptic cohomology with associated elliptic curve  $E$ , then there are equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} F &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}), \\ \mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}), \\ \mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Bun}_{\check{G}}^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathrm{Bun}_{\check{G}}^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}} \subseteq \mathrm{Bun}_{\check{G}}^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)$  is an open substack of the moduli stack of semistable degree zero  $\check{G}$ -bundles on  $E$ .

The proofs of the equivalences with  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ -coefficients follow from work of Bezrukavnikov-Finkelberg-Mirkovic [BFM05] and Yun-Zhu [YZ11]; and the proofs of the equivalences involving  $\mathrm{KU}$  follow from the aforementioned work of Bezrukavnikov-Finkelberg-Mirkovic [BFM05]. However, we reprove these results in the present article so as to provide a *uniform* approach to all the equivalences of Theorem 1.4 and the preceding remark. In particular, the work of [BFM05] relies on knowing a geometric interpretation of classes in equivariant homology/K-theory; since such a geometric interpretation is unknown in the case of elliptic cohomology, the approach taken there is not amenable to generalization.

**Remark 1.6.** Let us mention some previous work towards analogues of the geometric Satake equivalence with other coefficients. For instance, a conjecture regarding the case of complex K-theory was proposed in [CK18]; in a similar vein, a discussion of the K-theoretic case is the content of the talk [Lon21]. In [YZ21], Yang and Zhao study a higher chromatic analogue of quantum groups, and it would be interesting to study the relationship between the present article and their work. After the first version of this paper was written, the preprint [Zho23] was posted on the arXiv; it is concerned with ideas similar to the ones studied here.

**Remark 1.7.** In Section 9, we also study a degeneration  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)$  of the category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(G_c; k)$  of *conjugation-equivariant* locally constant sheaves on  $G_c$ . Namely, we show that (at least if  $G_c$  has torsion-free fundamental group)  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)$  is equivalent to the category of quasicoherent sheaves on the additive (resp. multiplicative; resp. elliptic) regular centralizer group scheme for  $\check{G}$  if  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  (resp.  $k = \mathrm{KU}$ ; resp.  $k$  is an elliptic cohomology theory). Motivated by [NZ09] and [GPS18, Theorem 1.1], one can heuristically interpret our discussion as describing a version of mirror symmetry for the wrapped Fukaya category of the symplectic stack  $T^*(G_c/G_c)$ , albeit with coefficients in the complex-oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -ring  $k$ . Namely, the “ $k$ -theoretic” mirror to  $T^*(G_c/G_c)$  is the appropriate variant of the regular centralizer group scheme for the Langlands dual group.

Let us now discuss further the degeneration of the  $\mathrm{KU}$ -linear  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  to  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$ . This can be explained in “two” ways<sup>2</sup>:

<sup>2</sup>The quotes are to indicate that these two approaches are really the same; since it would be too digressive to do so here, we will explain the meaning of this (admittedly cryptic) statement in a sequel to this article.

- (a) One important lesson from chromatic homotopy theory is that the stable homotopy groups of spheres are closely connected to the coherent cohomology of the moduli stack  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$  of 1-dimensional formal groups. For instance, the Adams-Novikov spectral sequence can be restated as a spectral sequence

$$E_2^{*,*} \cong H^*(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}; \omega^{\otimes *}) \Rightarrow \pi_*(S^0),$$

where  $S^0$  is the sphere spectrum and  $\omega$  is the line bundle of invariant differentials on the universal 1-dimensional formal group over  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$ . This picture can in fact be categorified: the  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Sp}$  of spectra behaves like the  $\infty$ -category  $\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$  in a very precise sense<sup>3</sup>. Namely, the Adams-Novikov spectral sequence is categorified by a 1-parameter degeneration of  $\text{Sp}$  into  $\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$ ; see [Pst23b, GWX21]. Moreover, this degeneration can be constructed using the stable motivic category over  $\mathbf{C}$ . This gives a precise sense in which “topology is approximated by algebra”. The degeneration of  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  into  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  is of exactly the same type. In fact, both degenerations ( $\text{Sp} \rightsquigarrow \text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$  and  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \rightsquigarrow \text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$ ) can be constructed simultaneously using the even filtration of [HRW22, Pst23a], and we will address this point in a future article. (That is to say, the Adams-Novikov spectral sequence and (5) should both be regarded as special cases of a more general construction.)

- (b) In geometric representation theory, one often considers “graded lifts” of categories of ( $\mathbf{C}$ -valued, say) sheaves on a scheme/stack  $X$ : this is generally defined as the category  $\text{Shv}^{\text{mixed}}(X; \mathbf{C})$  of *mixed* sheaves on  $X$ . See [BBD82] and the more recent [HL22]. It is generally expected, for instance, that there is a mixed variant of Theorem 1.2, stating that there is an equivalence  $\text{Shv}_{G[t]}^{\text{mixed}}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C}) \simeq \text{Perf}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*(2)/\check{G})$ , where  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*(2)/\check{G}$  is now a classical (not derived!) stack, except with a grading which places  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*(2)$  in weight 2. This grading can be ignored if we replace  $\mathbf{C}$  by its 2-periodification. One can view  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  as a category of “mixed”  $k$ -valued local systems. The reason that no grading is visible on the right-hand sides of the equivalences in Theorem 1.4 is that the  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -ring  $k$  is assumed to be 2-periodic. A natural question, of course, is to define a full  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Shv}_I^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  which specializes to the usual category of mixed sheaves when  $k = \mathbf{C}[u^{\pm 1}]$ ; we hope to address this in the future article referred to in the preceding bullet point.

The perspective of the degeneration  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \rightsquigarrow \text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  being analogous to the degeneration  $\text{Sp} \rightsquigarrow \text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$  – and furthermore that both are related to the even filtration of [HRW22, Pst23a] – is very helpful, because it gives us an indication of how to define  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  when  $k$  is not necessarily complex-oriented and 2-periodic. In particular, we also study the example of  $k$  being *real* K-theory  $\text{KO}$ . This is an  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -ring with somewhat complicated homotopy groups. Despite this, the  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -ring  $\text{KO}$  is itself easy to describe using  $\text{KU}$ : namely, there is

<sup>3</sup>This is not quite correct: namely, one has to instead replace  $\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$  by the ind-completion of the thick subcategory of  $\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$  generated by tensor powers of  $\omega$ . For brevity, we will simply denote this variant category by  $\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$ . In the homotopy theory literature, e.g., [Gre21] or [BHS20, Definition 5.14], this variant subcategory is often instead denoted by  $\text{IndCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$ . However, the use of the symbol  $\text{IndCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}})$  does not agree with more established notion of ind-coherent sheaves from [GR17].

an action of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  on  $KU$  by complex conjugation, and  $KO = KU^{h\mathbf{Z}/2}$ . Moreover, just like the standard Adams-Novikov spectral sequence for the homotopy of the sphere spectrum, there is a spectral sequence

$$E_2^{*,*} \cong H^*(B\mathbf{Z}/2; \omega^*) \Rightarrow \pi_*(KO),$$

where  $\omega$  is the line bundle over  $B\mathbf{Z}/2$  given by the sign action of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  on  $\mathbf{Z}$ . That is, the sphere spectrum is to  $\mathcal{M}_{\text{fg}}$  as  $KO$  is to  $B\mathbf{Z}/2$ . There is also a good notion of equivariant real K-theory.

Instead of constructing a degeneration of the  $KO$ -linear  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; KO)$  into a graded  $\pi_*(KO)$ -linear  $\infty$ -category, one can instead construct a degeneration of  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; KO)$  into a  $\text{QCoh}(B\mathbf{Z}/2)$ -module  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; KO)$ . The construction of  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; KO)$  is straightforward: the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action via complex conjugation on  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; KU)$  defines a  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; KU)$ , and this defines the  $\text{QCoh}(B\mathbf{Z}/2)$ -module category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; KO)$ .

**Proposition 1.8** (Proposition 7.20). *Let  $\theta$  denote the involution on  $\tilde{G}/\check{G}$  given on  $\tilde{G} = \check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{B}$  by  $(g, x) \mapsto (g, x^{-1})$ , so that the quotient  $(\tilde{G}/\check{G})/\langle \theta \rangle$  defines a stack over  $B\mathbf{Z}/2$ . Then there is a  $\text{QCoh}(B\mathbf{Z}/2)$ -linear equivalence*

$$\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; KO) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F \simeq \text{QCoh}((\tilde{G}^{\text{reg}}/\check{G})/\langle \theta \rangle).$$

For instance, if  $G = \text{PGL}_2$ , so that  $\tilde{G}$  is the moduli of pairs  $(g, \ell)$  with  $g \in \text{SL}_2$  and  $\ell = [x : y] \in \mathbf{P}^1$  is a line preserved by  $g$ , the involution  $\theta$  simply inverts  $g$ .

**1.3. Outline and other results.** We now give an overview of the content of this article. In Section 2, we briefly review the derived geometric Satake and the Arkhipov-Bezrukavnikov-Ginzburg equivalences, and show how to deduce the corresponding statements (1) and (2) over the regular loci.

Motivated by the issue of *decompleting* Borel-equivariant cohomology (which appears naturally in studying the derived geometric Satake and the Arkhipov-Bezrukavnikov-Ginzburg equivalences), we recall in Section 3 the setup of (genuine) equivariant generalized cohomology following [Lur09, GM20, GM23]. For a compact abelian group  $T_c$  and a finite  $T_c$ -space  $X$ , we also introduce the category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  of equivariant local systems of  $k$ -modules on  $X$  for an  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -ring  $k$  equipped with an “oriented” 1-dimensional commutative group scheme  $\mathbf{G}$ . This section also reviews/generalizes the all-important Atiyah-Bott localization theorem, and the corresponding results of Goresky-Kottwitz-MacPherson [GKM98].

In Section 4, we introduce the degeneration  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  of the  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  that we discussed in the preceding subsection, and also discuss the definition of this  $\infty$ -category for the non-complex-oriented  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -ring  $KO$ . The definition of  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  depends only on the equivariant homology  $k_*^{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G)$  (denoted by  $\pi_* \mathcal{F}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G)^{\vee}$  in the body of this article) as a comodule over the equivariant cohomology  $\pi_* k_{T_c}$  of a point.

The next Section 5 is essentially purely combinatorial: it studies the case when  $G$  is a torus  $T$ , and imposes the additional data of loop-rotation equivariance. In terms of the homeomorphism  $\text{Gr}_G \cong \Omega G_c$ , this comes from the  $S^1$ -action on  $\Omega G_c$  obtained by viewing it as  $\Omega^2(BG_c) = \text{Map}_*(S^2, BG_c)$  and using the  $S^1$ -action by rotation on  $S^2$ . Namely, we show that if  $k$  is an  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -ring equipped with an “oriented” 1-dimensional commutative group scheme  $\mathbf{G}$ , then  $k_*^{T_c \times S^1_{\text{rot}}}(\text{Gr}_T)$  (or

really, its sheafification over  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), \mathbf{G})$  can be identified with a  $\mathbf{G}$ -analogue of the Weyl algebra of the Langlands dual torus  $\check{T}$ . For instance, if  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  and  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_a$ , then  $k_*^{T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)$  is the rescaled Weyl algebra of  $\check{T}$ ; similarly, if  $k = \mathrm{KU}$  and  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_m$ , then  $k_*^{T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)$  is the  $q$ -Weyl algebra of the dual torus  $\check{T}$ . We also explain the relationship between this  $\mathbf{G}$ -analogue of the Weyl algebra of  $\check{T}$  and the “ $F$ -de Rham complex” of [DM23].

In Section 6, we review the classical story concerning  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  when  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ . The purpose of this section is to reprove the results of [BFM05, YZ11] using only techniques amenable to generalization to other equivariant cohomology theories. In particular, in Corollary 6.8, we reprove the equivalence between  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  and  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G})$ . The remainder of Section 6 is concerned with the question of loop-rotation equivariance. Using results of [GKV97] and [Gin18], we prove that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  can be identified with a certain localization of the Harish-Chandra category  $\mathrm{HC}_G^{\hbar} = U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})\text{-mod}^{(\check{G}, \mathrm{weak})}$ . This line of argument is, in some sense, precisely the opposite of that of [Lon18].

We finally turn to the K-theoretic story in Section 7. Corollary 7.8 therein states that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  is equivalent to  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\tilde{G}}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G})$  when  $G$  is connected, almost simple, and simply-laced; in this section, unlike in Theorem 1.4, the multiplicative Grothendieck-Springer resolution  $\check{\tilde{G}}$  is defined to be  $\check{G} \times^{\check{B}} B$  (instead of  $\check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{B}$ ). This is to be understood as analogous to the usual Grothendieck-Springer resolution  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}$ , which is defined to be  $\check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{\mathfrak{n}}^{\perp}$  (as opposed to  $\check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{\mathfrak{b}}$ ). We also briefly study the question of loop-rotation equivariance in Theorem 7.14 using degenerate affine nil-Hecke algebras, and phrase some precise expectations about the relationship to the representation theory of quantum groups; but we do not yet know how to prove these statements. In Proposition 7.20, we also study the effect under Langlands duality of complex conjugation on equivariant K-theory.

The elliptic story is studied in Section 8, where we use the important results of [Dav19] to show in Corollary 8.11 that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  is equivalent to  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E))$  when  $G$  is connected, almost simple, and simply-laced. We also briefly study the question of loop-rotation equivariance in Theorem 8.14, but do not even know how to describe the expected Langlands dual story (we expect it is related to the representation theory of elliptic quantum groups [Fel95]).

The remainder of this article is concerned with comparisons to (by now) classical results in equivariant algebraic topology. In Section 9, we explain how the degeneration of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  to  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  should be viewed as analogous to the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg degeneration of Hochschild homology to differential forms. (See [Rak20] for a modern take on this degeneration.) Using this perspective, we show how (when  $G$  has torsion-free fundamental group) Theorem 1.4 recovers results of [BZ00] identifying the conjugation-equivariant cohomologies  $H_{G_c}^*(G_c; \mathbf{Q})$  (resp.  $\mathrm{KU}_{G_c}^*(G_c)$ ) with the algebra of Kähler differentials on  $\mathfrak{t} // W$  (resp.  $T // W$ ); the same argument also describes the equivariant elliptic cohomology of  $G_c$  in terms of the algebra of Kähler differentials on the moduli *space* of semistable degree zero  $G$ -bundles on the elliptic curve.

The results of this article were motivated by the work of Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel [HKR00] describing the generalized equivariant cohomology of *finite* groups. In Appendix A, we briefly review their results (and the corresponding categorifications,



due to Lurie [Lur19]). Despite the case of finite groups being the diametric opposite to the case of connected compact Lie groups studied in this article, we give a heuristic argument showing that Theorem 1.4 can be viewed as an analogue of (some of) the results of [HKR00, Lur19].

Another motivation for the results of this article came from physics. Namely, the equivariant homology of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  describes the Coulomb branch of 3d  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  pure gauge theory [BFN18], and one expects that the generalized equivariant KU-homology (resp. elliptic homology) of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  is related to the Coulomb branch of 4d  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  (resp. 5d  $\mathcal{N} = 1$ ) pure gauge theory. We briefly review this story in Appendix B, and give explicit generators and relations for the Coulomb branches of 3d  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  and 4d  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  pure gauge theories with gauge groups  $\mathrm{SL}_2$  and  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . The 4-dimensional case is a  $q$ -analogue of the quantization of the Atiyah-Hitchin manifold [AH88] from [BDG17, Equation 5.51].

**1.4. Notation and terminology.** In most of this article,  $G$  will denote a connected, almost simple, and *simply-laced* algebraic group over  $\mathbf{C}$ , and  $B$  will denote a Borel subgroup therein. If  $H$  is a reductive algebraic group over  $\mathbf{C}$ , we will write  $H_c$  to denote the maximal compact subgroup of the complex Lie group  $H(\mathbf{C})$ , so  $H_c$  is a compact Lie group. We will use the terminology “finite  $H_c$ -space” to mean a finite  $H_c$ -CW complex. I have tried to be careful to add the subscript  $c$  where necessary, but some omissions have certainly inevitably crept in.

The symbol  $k$  will denote an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring which will generally be fixed at the beginning of each section/theorem statement. The symbol  $F$  will denote an algebraically closed field containing  $\pi_0(k)$ . The Langlands dual group  $\tilde{G}$  will generally be defined over  $F$ ; if we wish to view it as defined over a commutative ring  $R$ , we will denote it by  $\tilde{G}_R$ . If  $T$  is a torus, we will write  $\mathbb{X}^*(T)$  and  $\mathbb{X}_*(T)$  to denote its lattice of characters and cocharacters. We will also write  $\tilde{\Lambda}$  to denote the root lattice of  $G$  and  $\Lambda$  to denote the coroot lattice of  $G$ . The symbol  $\tilde{T}$  will denote the extended torus  $T \times \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}$ . If  $\tilde{N} \subseteq \tilde{G}$  is the unipotent radical of a Borel subgroup of  $\tilde{G}$ , we will write  $\psi : \tilde{\mathfrak{n}} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_a$  to denote a nondegenerate character of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{n}}$ , i.e., an additive character which is nonzero on each simple root space. If  $X$  is an  $\tilde{G}$ -scheme, we will write  $T^*(X/\psi\tilde{N})$  to denote the Hamiltonian reduction of  $T^*X$  (that is, if  $\mu : T^*(X) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{n}}^*$  is the moment map, then  $T^*(X/\psi\tilde{N}) \cong \mu^{-1}(\psi)/\tilde{N}$ ).

Finally, some category-theoretic notation. We will write  $\mathcal{S}$  to denote the  $\infty$ -category of spaces (also known as “anima”, but we will not use this terminology here). If  $A$  is an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring,  $\mathcal{C}$  is an  $A$ -linear  $\infty$ -category (that is, a  $\mathrm{Mod}_A$ -module in the  $\infty$ -category of presentable stable  $\infty$ -categories) and  $A \rightarrow B$  is a map of  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -rings, then  $\mathcal{C} \otimes_A B$  will denote the  $B$ -linear  $\infty$ -category  $\mathcal{C} \otimes_{\mathrm{Mod}_A} \mathrm{Mod}_B$ .

**1.5. Acknowledgements.** I am grateful to David Ben-Zvi, Lin Chen, Charles Fu, Tom Gannon, and Kevin Lin for helpful conversations and for entertaining my numerous silly questions. I am also grateful to Victor Ginzburg, Yiannis Sakellaridis, and David Treumann for very enlightening discussions, and Pavel Safronov for a useful email. Thanks to Ben Gammage for discussions which helped shape my understanding of some of the topics in Appendix B, and to Hiraku Nakajima for a very informative email exchange on the same topic. My interest in this area started after I took a class taught by Roman Bezrukavnikov when I was an undergraduate; I am very grateful to him for suggesting that I read [CG10], and also for introducing me to [BFM05], which led me down the beautiful road to geometric representation

theory. Since the first version of this article, my understanding of the subject has also been influenced by [BZSV23]. I would also like to thank anonymous referees for helpful suggestions on improving this article. Last, but certainly far from least, the influence, support, advice, and encouragement of my advisors Dennis Gaitsgory and Mike Hopkins is evident throughout this project; I cannot thank them enough.

## 2. THE REGULAR LOCUS

In this section, we will quickly review the derived geometric Satake equivalence following [BF08] and [AG15]. Let  $k$  denote a commutative  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra; all Langlands dual objects will be assumed to live over  $k$ , and are base-changes of their “split forms” over  $\mathbf{Q}$ .

**Setup 2.1.** Let  $G$  be a connected reductive group (over  $\mathbf{C}$ , always), and let  $\mathrm{Gr}_G = G((t))/G[[t]]$  denote the affine Grassmannian. There is a canonical left action of  $G((t))$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ , and hence an action of  $G[[t]] \subseteq G((t))$ . The affine Grassmannian is a union of  $G[[t]]$ -invariant closed subschemes  $X_\alpha$  of finite type, and one defines  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) = \mathrm{colim}_\alpha \mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(X_\alpha; k)$ . Inside  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  are two full subcategories:

- $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^{\mathrm{lcc}}$  is the full subcategory of objects whose image under the forgetful functor  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \rightarrow \mathrm{Shv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  is compact. Such objects are called “locally compact”.
- $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^\omega$  of compact objects in  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$ .

The  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  admits a monoidal structure, which in fact restricts to a monoidal structure on each of the full subcategories above.

**Setup 2.2.** Let  $(e, f, h)$  denote a principal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple in the Langlands dual Lie algebra  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}$ . The element  $f$  defines a nondegenerate character  $\psi : \check{\mathfrak{n}} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^1$ . Let  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e}$  denote the orthogonal complement to the subspace  $[e, \check{\mathfrak{g}}] \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{g}}$ . This defines the *Kostant slice*  $\psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e} \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ ; we will denote this inclusion by  $\kappa$ . Composing the invariant-theoretic quotient map  $\chi : \check{\mathfrak{g}}^* \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^* // \check{G}$  with the Kostant slice defines an isomorphism. In other words, the following composite is an isomorphism:

$$\psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e} \xrightarrow{\kappa} \check{\mathfrak{g}}^* \xrightarrow{\chi} \check{\mathfrak{g}}^* // \check{G}.$$

It will be convenient to identify  $\psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e}$  with  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^* // \check{G}$  under this isomorphism. If the vector space  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  is placed in weight 2, the map  $\kappa$  can be checked to give a *graded* map

$$\kappa : \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*(2) // \check{G} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*(2).$$

Shearing this graded map (in the sense of [Dev24, Section 2.1]) defines a map  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2] // \check{G} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]$ , which we will also denote by  $\kappa$ .

**Lemma 2.3** (Chevalley restriction). *There is an isomorphism  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^* // \check{G} \cong \mathfrak{t} // W$ , which refines to an isomorphism of graded schemes*

$$\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*(2) // \check{G} \cong \mathfrak{t}(2) // W \cong \mathrm{Spec} H_G^*(*; \mathbf{C}).$$

The first part of the following result is [BF08, Theorem 5], and the second part is [AG15, Theorem 12.5.3].

**Theorem 2.4** (Bezrukavnikov-Finkelberg, Arinkin-Gaitsgory). *There is a monoidal equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^{\mathrm{lcc}} \simeq \mathrm{Perf}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2] / \check{G}),$$

*which restricts to a monoidal equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^\omega \simeq \mathrm{Perf}_{\check{N}/\check{G}}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2] / \check{G}),$$

*where the right-hand side is the full subcategory of those perfect complexes which are set-theoretically supported on the nilpotent cone of  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ . Furthermore, there is a*

commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ind}(\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^{\mathrm{lcc}}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]/\check{G}) \\ p_! \downarrow & & \downarrow \kappa^* \\ \mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(*; k) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]//\check{G}), \end{array}$$

where  $p : \mathrm{Gr}_G \rightarrow *$  is the canonical map to a point and  $\kappa^*$  is pullback along the (shifted) Kostant slice.

We will refer to the first equivalence of Theorem 2.4 as the *derived geometric Satake equivalence*, or more colloquially as “derived Satake”.

**Definition 2.5.** A point  $x \in \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  is called *regular* if its centralizer  $Z_{\check{G}}(x) \subseteq \check{G}$  has dimension given by the rank of  $\check{G}$ . Let  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\mathrm{reg}}$  denote the locus of regular elements; this is an open subscheme whose complement is of codimension 3.

**Theorem 2.6** (Kostant, [Kos63]). *The  $\check{G}$ -orbit of the Kostant slice  $\kappa : \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*//\check{G} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  identifies with the regular locus  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\mathrm{reg}}$ .*

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let  $\underline{k}_{\mathrm{Gr}_G} \in \mathrm{Ind}(\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^{\mathrm{lcc}})$  denote the constant sheaf, and let  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  denote the full subcategory generated by  $\underline{k}_{\mathrm{Gr}_G}$ . Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\mathrm{reg}}[2]/\check{G}).$$

*Proof.* Observe that  $\underline{k}_{\mathrm{Gr}_G}$  is the pullback  $p^*\underline{k}$  of the (necessarily constant) sheaf  $\underline{k} \in \mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(*; k)$ . Since  $p^*$  is the right adjoint to  $p_!$  (and  $\kappa_*$  is the right adjoint to  $\kappa^*$ ), the commutative diagram of Theorem 2.4 says that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  is equivalent to the full subcategory of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]/\check{G})$  generated by  $\kappa_*\mathcal{O}_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*[2]//\check{G}}$ . However, Theorem 2.6 implies that this full subcategory is equivalent to  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,*}[2]/\check{G})$ , as desired.  $\square$

A parallel story holds for the Arkhipov-Bezrukavnikov-Ginzburg (called “ABG” in this article) equivalence from [ABG04].

**Recollection 2.8.** Let  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  denote the Grothendieck-Springer resolution, so that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = T^*(\check{G}/\check{N})/\check{T}$ . The action of  $\check{G}$  on  $T^*(\check{G}/\check{N})$  defines the moment map  $\mu : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}$  denote the preimage of the regular locus  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\mathrm{reg}} \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  under the moment map  $\mu$ .

**Proposition 2.9.** *There is an isomorphism  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \cong \check{G} \times^{\check{B}} \check{\mathfrak{b}}^*$ , as well as a map  $\kappa : \psi + \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{b}}^* \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  which fits into a Cartesian square*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \psi + \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* & \longrightarrow & \check{\mathfrak{b}}^* & \longrightarrow & \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \mu \\ \psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e} & \longrightarrow & & & \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*. \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Let  $\check{M}$  be a Hamiltonian  $\check{G}$ -scheme with moment map  $\mu : \check{M} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ . Then the pullback  $\check{M} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*} (\psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e})$  can be identified with the Whittaker reduction  $\check{M}/_{\psi} \check{N}$ .

Indeed, a theorem of Kostant's from [Kos78] identifies  $\psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e}$  with  $(\psi + \check{\mathfrak{n}}^{-,\perp})/\check{N}^-$ , so that there are isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \check{M} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*} (\psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e}) &\cong \check{M}/\check{G} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*/\check{G}} (\psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,e}) \\ &\cong \check{M}/\check{G} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*/\check{G}} (\psi + \check{\mathfrak{n}}^{-,\perp})/\check{N}^- \\ &\cong (\check{M} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{n}}^{-,*}} \{\psi\})/\check{N}^- = \check{M}/_{\psi} \check{N}^-. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the fiber product in the statement of the proposition identifies with the Whittaker reduction  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}/_{\psi} \check{N}^-$ . Since  $\check{\mathfrak{g}} \cong T^*(\check{G}/\check{N})/\check{T}$ , we may identify  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}/_{\psi} \check{N}^-$  with the quotient by  $\check{T}$  of  $T^*(\check{N}^- \setminus_{\psi} \check{G}/\check{N})$ . Since Whittaker functions are supported on the big cell, this twisted cotangent bundle is in turn isomorphic to  $T^*(\check{N}^- \setminus_{\psi} (\check{N}^- \times \check{T} \times \check{N})/\check{N}) \cong \check{T} \times (\psi + \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*)$ . The desired Cartesian square follows.  $\square$

Again,  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}$  admits a  $\mathbf{G}_m$ -action obtained by placing  $\check{\mathfrak{b}}^*$  in weight 2, and the map  $\kappa : \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{b}}^*$  is equivariant if  $\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  is also placed in weight 2. Therefore, shearing (as in [Dev24, Section 2.1]) defines a map

$$\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*[2] \xrightarrow{\kappa} \check{\mathfrak{b}}^*[2] \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}[2].$$

We will sometimes denote this composite also by  $\kappa$ .

The first part of the below equivalence was proved by Arkhipov-Bezrukavnikov-Ginzburg in [ABG04]; the commutative diagram below follows from Proposition 2.9 and Theorem 2.4.

**Theorem 2.10.** *Let  $B \subseteq G$  be a Borel subgroup, and let  $I = G[[t]] \times_G B$  denote the associated Iwahori subgroup. Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Shv}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^{\mathrm{lcc}} \simeq \mathrm{Perf}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}[2]/\check{G}),$$

which restricts to a monoidal equivalence

$$\mathrm{Shv}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^{\omega} \simeq \mathrm{Perf}_{\check{N}/\check{G}}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}[2]/\check{G}).$$

Furthermore, there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ind}(\mathrm{Shv}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)^{\mathrm{lcc}}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}[2]/\check{G}) \\ p_! \downarrow & & \downarrow \kappa^* \\ \mathrm{Shv}_I(*; k) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*[2]), \end{array}$$

where  $p : \mathrm{Gr}_G \rightarrow *$  is the canonical map to a point and  $\kappa^*$  is pullback along the (shifted) Kostant slice.

As in Corollary 2.7, we find:

**Corollary 2.11.** *Let  $\underline{k}_{\mathrm{Gr}_G} \in \mathrm{Shv}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  denote the constant sheaf, and let  $\mathrm{Loc}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  denote the full subcategory generated by  $\underline{k}_{\mathrm{Gr}_G}$ . Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}[2]/\check{G}).$$

The constant sheaf has singular support given by the zero section. In fact, the  $\infty$ -categories  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  and  $\mathrm{Loc}_I(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  are the subcategories of *locally constant* (equivariant) sheaves on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ . As such, they depend only on the underlying homotopy types of  $G[[t]]$ ,  $I$ , and  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ .

**Notation 2.12.** Let  $G_c$  be the maximal compact subgroup of  $G(\mathbf{C})$ , and let  $T_c$  be the maximal torus of  $G_c$  corresponding to the Borel  $B$ . It is not difficult to see that there are homotopy equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} G[[t]] &\simeq G(\mathbf{C}) \simeq G_c \\ I &\simeq B(\mathbf{C}) \simeq T_c. \end{aligned}$$

The homotopy type of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  follows from the next result, due to Quillen and Garland-Raghunathan:

**Theorem 2.13** (Quillen, Garland-Raghunathan, [GR75, Mit88]). *There is a homeomorphism  $\mathrm{Gr}_G \simeq \Omega G_c$  which is equivariant for the left-action of  $G_c \subseteq G(\mathbf{C}) \subseteq G(\mathbf{C}[[t]])$  on the left-hand side and the action of  $G_c$  on the right-hand side given by conjugation.*

In our discussion below, we will mostly be concerned with the homology of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ , in which case we may replace  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  by  $\Omega G_c$ . To this extent, we will implicitly use Theorem 2.13 without further mention. We will describe analogues of the equivalences of Corollary 2.7 and Corollary 2.11 for equivariant K-theory and equivariant elliptic cohomology.

## 3. EQUIVARIANT COHOMOLOGY AND THE CASE OF TORI

In order to study and prove analogues of the equivalences of Corollary 2.7 and Corollary 2.11 for other cohomology theories, we need to review some foundational aspects of the theory of equivariant cohomology. I have reviewed some of the basics of equivariant K-theory in [Dev24, Section 2.2]. The theory of equivariant elliptic cohomology is developed similarly, and we will now describe this story (in a somewhat leisurely fashion) following [Lur09, GM23, GM20]. At the end of this section, we describe the geometric Satake equivalence for tori.

The basic question we will address is giving a definition of the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  for a  $T_c$ -space  $X$  for a sufficiently general  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring  $k$ . When  $k$  is an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra, Theorem 2.10 requires that there is an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(*; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*[2]).$$

One often defines the  $\infty$ -category of  $k$ -modules on a space  $X$  as the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Fun}(X, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$ . However, when  $X = BT_c$ , the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Fun}(BT_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  does *not* agree with  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*[2])$ ; instead, it only agrees with a certain completion of this  $\infty$ -category, as we will now explain.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $k$  be an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -algebra. Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Fun}(BT_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k) \simeq \mathrm{IndCoh}(\{1\} \times_{\check{T}} \{1\}).$$

*If, moreover,  $k$  is an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra, this can be rewritten as an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Fun}(BT_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\check{\mathfrak{t}}}^*[2]),$$

*where  $\widehat{\check{\mathfrak{t}}}^*$  denotes the completion of  $\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  at the origin.*

*Proof.* If  $X$  is a finite space, there is an equivalence  $\mathrm{Fun}(X, \mathrm{Mod}_k) \simeq \mathrm{IndCoh}_{C_*(\Omega X; k)}$ , where  $C_*(\Omega X; k)$  is the  $\mathbf{E}_1$ - $k$ -algebra of  $k$ -chains on the based loop space  $\Omega X$ . When  $X = BT_c$ , we may identify  $\Omega X = T_c$ . Recall that  $T_c$  is the classifying space of the lattice  $\mathbb{X}_*(T)$ , so that there is an equivalence

$$C_*(T_c; k) \cong k \otimes_{C_*(\mathbb{X}_*(T); k)} k.$$

Of course, we may identify  $C_*(\mathbb{X}_*(T); k) \cong k[\mathbb{X}_*(T)]$  with the ring of functions on  $\check{T}$ . Therefore,  $\mathrm{Spec} C_*(T_c; k) \cong \{1\} \times_{\check{T}} \{1\}$ , as desired.

Koszul duality gives an equivalence  $\mathrm{IndCoh}(C_*(T_c; k)) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(C^*(BT_c; k))$  given by  $M \mapsto \mathrm{Hom}_{C_*(T_c; k)}(k, M)$ . If  $k$  is an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra, then  $C^*(BT_c; k)$  is formal, and so it can be identified with the shearing of  $H^*(BT_c; k)$ . But

$$\mathrm{Spf} H^*(BT_c; k) \cong \widehat{\mathfrak{t}}(2) \cong \widehat{\mathfrak{t}}^*(2),$$

so  $\mathrm{IndCoh}(C_*(T_c; k))$  is equivalent to  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\check{\mathfrak{t}}}^*[2])$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Example 3.2.** Suppose  $T_c = S^1$ . Then Lemma 3.1 tells us that  $\mathrm{Fun}(BS^1, \mathrm{Mod}_k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^1[2])$ ; the equivalence sends a functor  $BS^1 \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_k$ , regarded as a  $k$ -module  $M$  with  $S^1$ -action, to its homotopy invariants  $M^{hS^1}$ . Let  $t \in \pi_{-2}(k^{hS^1})$  denote a generator. Observe that if  $a_\lambda : k \rightarrow k[2]$  denotes the boundary map in the cofiber sequence  $k[1] \rightarrow C_*(S^1; k) \rightarrow k$ , the homotopy invariants of  $k[a_\lambda^{-1}]$  are simply  $k^{hS^1}[t^{-1}]$  (i.e., the Tate construction). In particular,  $\pi_*(k[a_\lambda^{-1}])^{hS^1} \cong k((t))$ . However, there is no (ind-)object in  $\mathrm{Fun}(BS^1, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  whose image in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^1[2])$

has homotopy given by  $k[t^{\pm 1}]$ : any object of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\mathbf{A}^1}[2])$  must have  $t$  as a topologically nilpotent element in its homotopy.

We therefore need an alternative definition of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(*; k)$ , so that it is equivalent to  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathbf{t}}^*[2])$  when  $k$  is an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra. Motivated by methods from equivariant homotopy theory, as well as [Lur09, Lur18a, Lur18b, Lur19], we will simply *define*  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(*; k)$  to be the category of quasicoherent sheaves on a (spectral) stack  $\mathcal{M}_T$ . That this category has any relation to topology will come from the requirement that the category of quasicoherent sheaves on the *completion* of  $\mathcal{M}_T$  at a certain basepoint is equivalent to the ind-completion of  $\mathrm{Fun}(BT_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$ .

For this, we review some constructions from [Lur09] in a form suitable for our applications. This review will necessarily be brief, since a detailed exposition may be found in *loc. cit.*; there is also some discussion in the early sections of [GKV95] in the setting of ordinary (as opposed to spectral) algebraic geometry.

**Setup 3.3.** Fix an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring  $k$  and a commutative  $k$ -group  $\mathbf{G}$ , so  $\mathbf{G}$  defines a functor  $\mathrm{CAlg}_A \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbf{Z}, \geq 0}$  which is representable by a *flat*  $k$ -algebra; here,  $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbf{Z}, \geq 0}$  denotes the category of connective  $\mathbf{Z}$ -module spectra. We will write  $\mathbf{G}_0$  to denote the resulting commutative group scheme over  $\pi_0 k$ . Note that taking zeroth spaces defines an equivalence between  $\mathrm{Mod}_{\mathbf{Z}, \geq 0}$  and topological abelian groups.

**Definition 3.4.** A *preorientation* of  $\mathbf{G}$  is a pointed map  $S^2 \rightarrow \Omega^\infty \mathbf{G}(k)$  of spaces, i.e., a map  $\Sigma^2 \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}(k)$  of  $\mathbf{Z}$ -modules (by adjunction). This induces a map  $\mathbf{C}P^\infty = \Omega^\infty \Sigma^2 \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \Omega^\infty \mathbf{G}(k)$  of topological abelian groups, and hence a map  $\mathrm{Spf} A^{\mathbf{C}P^\infty} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$  of  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $k$ -group schemes. (Note that  $\mathrm{Spf} A^{\mathbf{C}P^\infty}$  need not admit the structure of a commutative  $k$ -group scheme: for instance,  $A^{\mathbf{C}P^\infty}$  need not be flat over  $k$ .)

**Definition 3.5.** Given a preorientation  $S^2 \rightarrow \Omega^\infty \mathbf{G}(k)$ , we obtain a map  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}} \rightarrow C^*(S^2; k)$  of  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $k$ -algebras. On  $\pi_0$ , this induces a map  $\pi_0 \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0} \rightarrow \pi_0 C^*(S^2; k)$ . However, the target can be identified with the trivial square-zero extension  $\pi_0 k \oplus \pi_{-2} k$ , so that the preorientation defines a derivation  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0} \rightarrow \pi_{-2} k$ . This defines a map  $\beta : \omega = \Omega_{\mathbf{G}_0/\pi_0 k}^1 \rightarrow \pi_{-2} k$ . The preorientation is called an *orientation* if  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is smooth of relative dimension 1 over  $\pi_0 k$ , and the composite

$$\pi_n k \otimes_{\pi_0 k} \omega \rightarrow \pi_n k \otimes_{\pi_0 k} \pi_{-2} k \xrightarrow{\beta} \pi_{n-2} k$$

is an isomorphism for each  $n \in \mathbf{Z}$ . This forces  $k$  to be 2-periodic (but does not force its homotopy to be concentrated in even degrees).

**Warning 3.6.** As discussed in [Lur09, Section 3.2], the universal  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Z}$ -algebra over which the additive group scheme  $\mathbf{G}_a$  admits an orientation is given by  $\mathbf{Z}[\mathbf{C}P^\infty][\frac{1}{\beta}] = \mathbf{Q}[\beta^{\pm 1}]$ . Therefore, we are allowed to let  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_a$  in the story below only when  $k$  is a 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra. (If  $k$  is not an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Z}$ -algebra, one cannot in general define  $\mathbf{G}_a = \mathrm{Spec} k[t]$  as a commutative  $k$ -group: the coproduct  $k[t] \rightarrow k[x, y]$  will in general not be a map of  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $k$ -algebras.)

We can now review the definition of  $T_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -cohomology when  $T_c$  is a compact torus. We will write  $T$  to denote the corresponding split torus over  $\mathbf{Z}$ .

**Construction 3.7.** Fix an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring  $k$  as above and a commutative  $k$ -group  $\mathbf{G}$ . Given a compact abelian Lie group  $T_c$ , define a  $k$ -scheme  $\mathcal{M}_T$  by the mapping stack  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), \mathbf{G})$ . The underlying  $\pi_0(k)$ -schemes will be denoted by  $\mathbf{G}_0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ . If we wish to emphasize the dependence on  $k$ , we will add a superscript (e.g.,  $\mathcal{M}_T^k$ ).



We will be particularly interested in the case when  $T_c$  is a torus. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{S}$  spanned by those spaces which are homotopy equivalent to  $BT_c$  with  $T_c$  being a compact abelian Lie group. By arguing as in [Lur19, Theorem 3.5.5], a preorientation of  $\mathbf{G}$  is equivalent to the data of a functor  $\mathcal{M} : \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{Aff}_k$  along with compatible equivalences  $\mathcal{M}(BT_c) \simeq \mathcal{M}_T$ . The  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $k$ -algebra  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$  is the  $T_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -cochains of a point, and will occasionally be denoted by  $k_T$ .

We can now sketch the construction of the  $T_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -cochains of more general  $T_c$ -spaces; see [Lur09, Theorem 3.2]. Let  $T_c$  be a torus over  $\mathbf{C}$  for the remainder of this discussion, and let  $\mathbf{G}$  be an *oriented* commutative  $k$ -group. Let  $\mathcal{S}(T_c)$  denote the  $\infty$ -category of finite  $T_c$ -spaces, i.e., the smallest subcategory of  $\text{Fun}(BT_c, \mathcal{S})$  which contains the quotients  $T_c/T'_c$  for closed subgroups  $T'_c \subseteq T_c$ , and which is closed under finite colimits. There is a functor  $\mathcal{F}_T : \mathcal{S}(T_c)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$  which is uniquely characterized by the requirement that it preserve finite limits and sends  $T_c/T'_c \mapsto q_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T'_c}}$ . Here,  $q : \mathcal{M}_{T'_c} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$  is the canonical map induced by the inclusion  $T'_c \subseteq T_c$ . If  $X \in \mathcal{S}(T_c)$ , then the  $T_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -cochains of  $X$  is the global sections  $\Gamma(\mathcal{M}_T; \mathcal{F}_T(X))$ ; we will denote it by  $C_{T_c}^*(X; k)$ . This can be extended to define  $T_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -cochains of filtered colimits of finite  $T_c$ -spaces. If we wish to emphasize the dependence on  $k$ , we will denote  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)$  by  $\mathcal{F}_T(X; k)$ .

**Remark 3.8.** If  $k$  is 2-periodic and  $\mathbf{G}$  is a commutative  $k$ -group, then [Lur18b, Proposition 4.3.23] shows that the data of an orientation on  $k$  (in the sense of Definition 3.5) is equivalent to the formal completion of  $\mathbf{G}$  at the origin being isomorphic to  $\text{Spf } C^*(BS^1; k)$ . That is, when  $\mathbf{G}$  is oriented, the formal completion of  $\mathcal{M}_T$  at its basepoint is isomorphic to  $\text{Spf } C^*(BT_c; k)$ .

We will denote the functor  $\Gamma(\mathcal{M}_T; \mathcal{F}_T(-)) : \mathcal{S}(T_c)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\Gamma(\mathcal{M}_T; \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}))$  by  $C_{T_c}^*(-; k) : \mathcal{S}(T_c)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(k_T)$ .

**Definition 3.9.** If  $X \in \mathcal{S}(T_c)$ , then the  $T_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -chains of  $X$  is the quasicoherent sheaf on  $\mathcal{M}_T$  given by the  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ -linear dual  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$ . We will denote its global sections by  $C_*^{T_c}(X; k)$ . Note that if  $X$  admits an  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra structure (compatible with the  $T_c$ -action), then  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  admits the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra<sup>4</sup> in  $\text{coCAlg}(\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ . Note that  $C_*^{T_c}(*; k) \simeq k_T$ , which completes to the  $k$ -cochains (not  $k$ -chains) of  $BT_c$ .

If  $X$  is a filtered colimit  $\text{colim}_\alpha X_\alpha$  of finite  $T_c$ -spaces, we will write  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  to denote  $\text{colim}_\alpha (\mathcal{F}_T(X_\alpha)^\vee)$ . Note that if we equip the presentation of  $X$  as a filtered colimit  $\text{colim}_\alpha X_\alpha$  with the structure of a filtered  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra, then  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  acquires the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra in  $\text{coCAlg}(\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ .

**Notation 3.10.** Let  $\lambda : T \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_m$  be a character, and let  $T_\lambda = \ker(\lambda)$ . Then the map  $q : \mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$  is a closed immersion, and we will denote the ideal in  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$  defined by this closed immersion by  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$ . Equivalently, let  $V_\lambda$  denote the  $T_c$ -representation obtained by the projection  $T \rightarrow T_\lambda$ . Then  $\mathcal{I}_\lambda$  is given by the line bundle  $\mathcal{F}_T(S^{V_\lambda})$ .

It is trickier to extend the definition of equivariant cochains to nonabelian groups, but a construction is sketched in [Lur09, Section 3.5], and a detailed construction is given in [GM23]. However, we will not recall this here, because we will only be concerned with torus-equivariance in the present article.

<sup>4</sup>If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -category, [Lur18a, Corollary 3.3.4] can be used to show that there is an equivalence  $\text{coCAlg}(\text{Alg}_{\mathbf{E}_n}(\mathcal{C})) \simeq \text{Alg}_{\mathbf{E}_n}(\text{coCAlg}(\mathcal{C}))$ .

We now take a moment to prove some foundational aspects of the theory of generalized equivariant cohomology.

**Lemma 3.11** (Atiyah-Bott localization). *Let  $X$  be a finite  $T_c$ -space, and let  $\mathcal{U}_X \subseteq \mathcal{M}_T$  denote the complement of the union of the closed substacks  $\mathcal{M}_{T'}$  over all stabilizers  $T'_c \subseteq T_c$  of points in  $X$ . Then the map  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$  is an isomorphism after pulling back to  $\mathcal{U}_X$ .*

*Proof.* This follows from induction on the cell structure of  $X$ . Namely, the statement is true when the  $T$ -action on  $X$  is trivial, which gives the base case. For the inductive step, note that if  $X$  is the cofiber of a map  $T/T' \rightarrow Y$ , then there is a cofiber sequence  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(T/T')$ ; but  $\mathcal{F}_T(T/T')$  is isomorphic to the pushforward of the structure sheaf along the map  $\mathcal{M}_{T'} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$ , and so it vanishes upon pulling back to  $\mathcal{U}_X$ . This implies that the map  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(Y)$  is an isomorphism upon pulling back to  $\mathcal{U}_X$ , as desired.  $\square$

One consequence of Lemma 3.11 which is worth restating is the following. Let  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T$  denote the complement of the union of the closed subschemes  $\mathcal{M}_{T'}$  ranging over all closed *proper* subgroups  $T' \subsetneq T$ . Then the map  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T}$ , and hence the map  $\mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})^\vee \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$ , is an equivalence upon restriction to  $\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T$ .

We will also need a version of the Goresky-Kottwitz-MacPherson approach [GKM98] to equivariant cohomology; in the setting of generalized equivariant cohomology, it has also been studied in [HHH05, GM23]. As such, we will only give a sketch of the relevant argument.

**Definition 3.12.** Let  $X$  be a finite  $T_c$ -space equipped with a chosen presentation in terms of  $T_c$ -cells. Say that  $X$  is a *GKM space* if the following conditions are satisfied:

- (a)  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)$  is a vector bundle over  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ ;
- (b) if  $X^{(1)}$  denotes the equivariant 1-skeleton of  $X$ , then  $X^{(1)}$  consists of a finite number of spheres  $S^\lambda$  meeting only at the fixed points, where  $\lambda$  ranges over characters of  $T$ .

In this setup, let  $V$  denote the set  $X^{T_c}$  of fixed points, and let  $E$  denote the set of characters  $\lambda$  such that  $S^\lambda \subseteq X^{(1)}$ . There are two maps  $E \rightrightarrows V$  sending  $\lambda$  to the points  $0, \infty \in S^\lambda \subseteq X^{(1)}$ . The resulting graph with set of vertices  $V$  and set of edges  $E$  will be referred to as the *GKM graph* of  $X$ .

The utility of the first condition in the above definition is due to the following.

**Lemma 3.13.** *Let  $X$  be a finite  $T_c$ -space. If  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)$  is a vector bundle over  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ , the map  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$  is an injection.*

*Proof.* Since the map  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c}) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T}$  factors as  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X)|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T}$ , and the map  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T}$  is an equivalence by Lemma 3.11, it suffices to show that the map  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_T(X)|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T}$  induces an injection on  $\pi_0$ . But  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)$  was assumed to be a vector bundle over  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ , so one is reduced to the case  $X = *$ , i.e., to showing that the map  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}|_{\mathring{\mathcal{M}}_T}$  induces an injection on  $\pi_0$ . This, however, is clear, since the closed subscheme  $\mathcal{M}_{T',0} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$  defined by each closed subgroup  $T' \subseteq T$  is cut out by a regular sequence.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.14** (Goresky-Kottwitz-MacPherson). *Let  $X$  be a finite GKM  $T_c$ -space, and choose a presentation in terms of  $T_c$ -cells. For each character  $\lambda : T \rightarrow S^1$ , let  $T_\lambda$  denote the kernel of  $T$ , let  $q_\lambda : \mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$  denote the induced map, and let  $S(\lambda)$  denote the unit representation sphere. Then there is an equalizer diagram*

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X) \hookrightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c}) \cong \text{Map}(V, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}) \rightrightarrows \prod_{\lambda \in E} q_{\lambda,*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda,0}},$$

where the two maps in the equalizer are defined in the evident manner.

*Proof sketch.* First, we show that the maps  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$  and  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{(1)}) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$  have the same image. There is an evident map from the image of  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$  to the image of  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{(1)}) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$ , which we will denote by  $f$ . The map  $f$  is an injection by Lemma 3.13. Let  $T'$  denote a proper closed subgroup of  $T$  of codimension 1, and let  $U' \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{T',0}$  denote the complement of the union of the closed varieties  $\mathcal{M}_{T'',0}$  ranging over the proper closed subgroups  $T'' \subseteq T'$ . By Lemma 3.11, the map  $f$  is an isomorphism upon restriction to  $U' \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{T',0} \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$  for each proper closed subgroup  $T' \subseteq T$  of codimension 1. Therefore, the locus  $Z \subseteq \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$  over which  $f$  fails to be an isomorphism is contained in the union of closed subvarieties  $\mathcal{M}_{T',0}$  for finitely many  $T' \subseteq T$  of codimension at least 2. However, the map  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)|_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}-Z}$  is an isomorphism (by Hartogs). Since the same is true of the map  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c}) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})|_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}-Z}$ , and the map  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$  factors through the map  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{(1)}) \rightarrow \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})$ , the desired result follows.

For the equalizer diagram, an easy induction on the cell structure of  $X$  reduces us to the case  $X = S^\lambda$  for a character  $\lambda : T \rightarrow S^1$ . In this case, the isomorphism  $T/T_\lambda \cong S^\lambda$  defines an isomorphism between  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(S(\lambda))$  and the pushforward of the structure sheaf along the map  $\mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda,0} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ . Since  $S^\lambda \cong \Sigma S(\lambda)$ , we obtain an equalizer diagram

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(S^\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}} \cong \text{Map}(\{0, \infty\}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}) \rightrightarrows q_{\lambda,*} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda,0}}.$$

This proves the desired claim.  $\square$

The same argument proves the following dual to Proposition 3.14 (see also [Bri00]).

**Proposition 3.15.** *Let  $X$  be a finite GKM  $T_c$ -space, and choose a presentation in terms of  $T_c$ -cells. Then  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  is isomorphic to the subset of  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X^{T_c})^\vee \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}[X^{T_c}]$  of those  $\sum_{x \in X^{T_c}} f_x[x] \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}[X^{T_c}]$  such that:*

- *For each fixed point  $x \in X^{T_c}$ , the poles of  $f_x$  all have order  $\leq 1$ , and these are contained in the ideal sheaf of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda,0}}$  for each character  $\lambda : T_c \rightarrow S^1$  such that the  $T_c$ -orbit  $S^\lambda$  meets  $x$ .*
- *For each character  $\lambda : T_c \rightarrow S^1$  such that the  $T_c$ -orbit  $S^\lambda$  meets  $x_0, x_\infty \in X^{T_c}$ , we have*

$$\text{Res}_{\mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda,0}}(f_{x_0}) + \text{Res}_{\mathcal{M}_{T_\lambda,0}}(f_{x_\infty}) = 0.$$

These results can be extended without much trouble to ind- $T_c$ -spaces  $X$  with isolated fixed points satisfying the conditions of Definition 3.12. (The first condition therein should be replaced by the condition that  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)$  is an ind-vector bundle over  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ .)

The preceding discussion can be categorified, as we now explain. The following categorifies the  $T_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -cochains  $C_{T_c}^*(X; k)$ .

**Construction 3.16.** Let  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(*; k)$  denote the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ . Let  $T'_c \subseteq T_c$  be a closed subgroup, so that there is an associated morphism  $q : \mathcal{M}_{T'} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$ . This defines a symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T'})$ , which equips  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T'})$  with the structure of a  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ -module.

Let  $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{oc}_{T_c}(-; k) : \mathcal{S}(T_c)^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathrm{ShvCat}(\mathcal{M}_T))$  be the functor uniquely characterized by the requirement that it preserve finite limits and send  $T/T' \mapsto \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T'})$ . If  $X \in \mathcal{S}(T_c)$ , then the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  of  $T_c$ -equivariant local systems of  $k$ -modules on  $X$  is defined to be the global sections of the quasicoherent stack  $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{oc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  on  $\mathcal{M}_T$ . If  $X$  is a  $T_c$ -space which is presented as a filtered colimit of finite  $T_c$ -spaces  $X_\alpha$ , we will write  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  to denote  $\mathrm{colim} \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X_\alpha; k)$ .

If  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  is a map in  $\mathcal{S}(T_c)$ , the associated symmetric monoidal functor  $f^* : \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(Y; k) \rightarrow \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  (induced by taking global sections of the morphism  $f^* : \mathcal{L}\mathrm{oc}_{T_c}(Y; k) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}\mathrm{oc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  of  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -algebras in quasicoherent stacks over  $\mathcal{M}_T$ ) will be called the *pullback*. One can show that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  is a presentable stable  $\infty$ -category, and that  $f^*$  preserves small colimits (so it has a right adjoint  $f_*$ , which will be called *pushforward*).

For instance, if  $T_c = \{1\}$ , then  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  is equivalent to the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}(X; k) := \mathrm{Fun}(X, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  of local systems on  $X$ .

**Remark 3.17.** Let  $X$  be a finite  $T_c$ -space. The *constant local system*  $\underline{k}_T$  is defined to be the image of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$  under the symmetric monoidal functor  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(*; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T) \rightarrow \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  induced by pullback along  $f : X \rightarrow *$ . Observe that if  $\underline{k}_T$  denotes the constant local system, then  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)}(\underline{k}_T) \simeq C_{T_c}^*(X; k)$ . Indeed,  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)}(\underline{k}_T) \simeq \Gamma(\mathcal{M}_T; f_* f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T})$ , but it is easy to see that  $f_* f^* \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T} = \mathcal{F}_T(X) \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ . The desired claim then follows from Construction 3.7.

**Remark 3.18.** If the complexification of  $T_c$  were a *finite* diagonalizable group scheme (such as  $\mu_n$ ), the desired category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  is closely related to the  $\infty$ -category of  $\mathbf{G}$ -tempered local systems on the orbispace  $X//T$ , as described in [Lur19]. Our understanding is that Lurie is planning to describe an extension of the work in [Lur19] and its connections to equivariant homotopy theory in a future article. We warn the reader that Construction 3.16 is somewhat *ad hoc*; so the resulting category of equivariant local systems may or may not agree with the output of forthcoming work of Lurie.

**Remark 3.19.** If  $X$  is a finite  $T_c$ -space, a more straightforward definition of the category of  $T_c$ -equivariant local systems on  $X$  is simply the category  $\mathrm{Fun}(X/T_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$ . Equivalently, it can be described as the functor  $\mathcal{S}(T_c)^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathrm{L}})$  which is uniquely characterized by the requirement that it preserve finite limits and send  $T_c/T'_c \mapsto \mathrm{Fun}(BT'_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$ . It follows from Lemma 3.1 that  $\mathrm{Fun}(BT'_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  is equivalent to  $\mathrm{Mod}(C^*(BT'_c; k))$ . As discussed in Remark 3.8, if the group scheme  $\mathbf{G}$  is oriented, then this is in turn equivalent to  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}_T})$ , where  $\widehat{\mathcal{M}_T}$  is the completion of  $\mathcal{M}_T$  at its basepoint. That is,  $\mathrm{Fun}(BT'_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  can be viewed as a completion of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T'})$ . This implies that  $\mathrm{Fun}(X/T_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  can be viewed as a completion of the subcategory of compact objects of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$ . Motivated by this, we will write  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^\wedge(X; k)$  to denote  $\mathrm{Fun}(X/T_c, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$ ; we will use the same notation to denote the extension of the assignment  $X \mapsto \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^\wedge(X; k)$  to filtered colimits of finite  $T_c$ -spaces.

Using this discussion, let us now discuss geometric Satake with  $k$ -coefficients in the case of a torus.

**Theorem 3.20.** *Fix a complex-oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring  $k$  and an oriented commutative  $k$ -group scheme  $\mathbf{G}$ . Let  $\check{T} = \mathrm{Spec} k[\mathbb{X}^*(\check{T})]$  denote the dual torus over  $k$ . In the following statements, all actions of  $\check{T}$  are trivial. Then there are equivalences*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^\wedge(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k) &\simeq \mathrm{IndCoh}(\{1\} \times_{\check{T}} \{1\} / \check{T}), \\ \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k) &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T / \check{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there is an isomorphism of spectral group  $k$ -schemes

$$\mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee \cong \mathcal{M}_T \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(k)} \check{T} \cong \mathcal{M}_T \times_{\mathcal{M}_T / \check{T}} \mathcal{M}_T.$$

*Proof.* Since the underlying topological space of  $\mathrm{Gr}_T$  is simply the lattice  $\mathbb{X}_*(T)$ , it follows from Lemma 3.1 that

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^\wedge(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k) \simeq \bigoplus_{\mathbb{X}_*(T)} \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^\wedge(*; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(B\check{T}) \otimes_{\mathrm{Mod}_k} \mathrm{IndCoh}(\{1\} \times_{\check{T}} \{1\}).$$

For the trivial action of  $\check{T}$  on  $\{1\} \times_{\check{T}} \{1\}$ , this is precisely  $\mathrm{IndCoh}(\{1\} \times_{\check{T}} \{1\} / \check{T})$ . Exactly the same discussion proves the second equivalence:

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k) \simeq \bigoplus_{\mathbb{X}_*(T)} \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(*; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(B\check{T}) \otimes_{\mathrm{Mod}_k} \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T).$$

The claim about  $\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee$  can be proved similarly.  $\square$

**Remark 3.21.** Note that in Theorem 3.20, the “spectral”/algebraic-geometric description of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^\wedge(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k)$  does not seem to depend on the choice of coefficient  $k$  (in particular, not on  $\mathbf{G}$ ). This dependence, however, can be made more explicit by noting that  $\mathrm{IndCoh}(\{1\} \times_{\check{T}} \{1\})$  is equivalent to  $\mathrm{Mod}(k^{hT_c}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}_T})$ . That is, there is an equivalence  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^\wedge(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\widehat{\mathcal{M}_T} / \check{T})$ .

Our basic goal is to find a replacement of Theorem 3.20 where  $\mathrm{Gr}_T$  is replaced by  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  for a general connected reductive group  $G$ .

## 4. DEGENERATIONS

We begin this section by immediately amending the goal referred to at the end of the preceding section. Namely, instead of studying the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  for a connected reductive group  $G$  and a maximal torus  $T \subseteq G$ , we will study a particular *degeneration* of this  $\infty$ -category. Before discussing the construction of this degeneration, let us motivate *why* it is useful (see also the introduction for some “philosophy” regarding this degeneration).

Suppose that there was an equivalence of the form  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{X}_k)$  for some spectral  $k$ -stack  $\mathfrak{X}_k$ . In order for such an equivalence to be considered related to Langlands duality, the stack  $\mathfrak{X}_k$  must have some relationship to the dual group  $\check{G}$ ; for instance, one can wonder whether the underlying classical  $\pi_0(k)$ -stack of  $\mathfrak{X}_k$  lives over the classifying stack  $B\check{G}_{\pi_0(k)}$ . Here,  $\check{G}_{\pi_0(k)}$  is the base-change of the Chevalley split form of  $\check{G}$  along the map  $\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \pi_0(k)$ . (When  $k$  is an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra, the stack  $\mathfrak{X}_k$  is  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}[2]/\check{G}$ , which does indeed live over  $B\check{G}$ .) It follows that the most satisfying description of  $\mathfrak{X}_k$  would involve a lift of the dual group  $\check{G}$  to a (flat) spectral group scheme over  $k$ . Unfortunately, this is far from clear: even giving a flat lift of  $\mathrm{SL}_2$  to complex K-theory KU seems difficult.

Instead, let us return to the general situation of a finite  $T_c$ -space  $X$ . One can then view  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  as a categorification of the cochains  $\mathcal{F}_T(X) \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ ; so for the moment, let us just describe a degeneration of  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)$  and  $\mathcal{M}_T$ . There is a natural filtered lift of  $\mathcal{M}_T = \mathrm{Spec} k_T$  to a filtered  $\tau_{\geq *}(k)$ -scheme, given by  $\mathrm{Spec} \tau_{\geq *}(k_T)$ . (This construction is, of course, closely related to the even filtration constructed in [HRW22, Pst23a].) In particular, one obtains a corresponding graded  $\pi_*(k)$ -scheme  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_*(k_T)$ . Note that this is now a *classical* scheme, with no spectral algebro-geometric nature. If  $k$  is even-periodic, i.e., is equipped with an isomorphism  $\pi_*(k) \cong k[u^{\pm 1}]$  with  $u \in \pi_2(k)$ , then this is equivalent to the data of the classical  $\pi_0(k)$ -scheme  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0(k_T)$ . (Recall that this is the affinization of the scheme  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ ; to get to the definition described below, one needs to replace  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0(k_T)$  in the below discussion by  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ .)

If the finite  $T_c$ -space  $X$  has even cells, then one can construct a well-behaved filtered lift of  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)$  to a filtered quasicoherent sheaf over  $\mathrm{Spec} \tau_{\geq *}(k_T)$ , given by  $\tau_{\geq *} \mathcal{F}_T(X)$ . This defines a corresponding graded variant of  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)$ , given simply by the quasicoherent sheaf  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)$  over  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0(k_T)$ . Again, this is an object in the realm of *classical* algebraic geometry; so when applied to the affine Grassmannian  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ , it is something that could, in theory, be described in terms of the usual dual group  $\check{G}$  base-changed to  $\pi_0(k)$ .

The idea for constructing the desired degeneration of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  is very similar; we now turn to its mechanics. Let us begin with a simple observation. If  $Y$  is a connected space, the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}(Y; k) = \mathrm{Fun}(Y, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  of local systems on  $Y$  is equivalent, by Koszul duality, to  $\mathrm{LMod}_{C_*(\Omega Y; k)}$ . This is very useful, since it allows one to reduce the study of local systems to the study of a particular (derived) algebra. A similar property is true for  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$ :

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $X$  be a connected finite  $T_c$ -space. Then there is an equivalence  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k) \simeq \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathcal{F}_T(\Omega X)^\vee}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $s : * \rightarrow X$  denote the inclusion of a point. We claim that  $s^* : \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$  admits a left adjoint  $s_!$ . Indeed, the statement for

general  $X$  follows formally from the case of  $X = T/T'$  for some closed subgroup  $T' \subseteq T$  (so  $s$  is the inclusion of the trivial coset). In this case,  $s^*$  is the functor  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T'}) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$  given by pushforward along the associated morphism  $q : \mathcal{M}_{T'} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$ , so it has a left adjoint  $s_!$  given by  $q^*$ . Note that  $s^*$  also has a right adjoint; in particular, it preserves small limits and colimits. Observe now that  $s_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$  is a compact generator of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$ : indeed, suppose  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  such that  $\mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)}(s_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}, \mathcal{F}) \simeq 0$  as an object of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ . Because  $s^* \mathcal{F} \simeq \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)}(s_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}, \mathcal{F})$  in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ , we see that  $s^* \mathcal{F} \simeq 0$ . Using the connectivity of  $X$ , we see that  $\mathcal{F}$  itself must be zero, which implies that  $s_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$  is a compact generator of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$ . It follows from the Barr-Beck-Lurie theorem [Lur16, Theorem 4.7.3.5] that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  is equivalent to the  $\infty$ -category of left  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; A)}(s_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T})$ -modules in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$ . But  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; A)}(s_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}) \simeq s^* s_! \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ , which identifies with  $\mathcal{F}_T(\Omega X)^\vee$ .  $\square$

**Remark 4.2.** Modifying the preceding argument shows that if  $X$  is a connected finite  $T_c$ -space, there is an equivalence

$$(6) \quad \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k) \simeq \mathrm{coLMod}_{\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)).$$

In particular, if  $X$  admits an  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra structure (compatible with the  $T_c$ -action), then  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  admits the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra<sup>5</sup> in  $\mathrm{coCAlg}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ , and the equivalence (6) is  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -monoidal for the convolution tensor product on both sides.

Proposition 4.1 and Remark 4.2 continue to hold even when  $X$  is a filtered colimit of finite  $T_c$ -spaces. In order for the claim in Remark 4.2 about  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra structures to hold, we need the filtered diagram  $\{X_\lambda\}$  presenting  $X$  to admit the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_n$ -algebra in filtered  $T_c$ -spaces. We will need to apply this in the case when  $X$  is the affine Grassmannian, in which case we can apply the following observation.

**Lemma 4.3.** *The  $\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+$ -indexed Schubert filtration  $\{\mathrm{Gr}_G^{\leq \lambda}(\mathbf{C})\}$  naturally admits the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_2$ -algebra in  $\mathrm{Fun}(\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+, \mathcal{S}(T_c))$ .*

*Proof.* This can be proved in essentially the same way as [HY19, Theorem 3.10]; let us sketch the argument. We will utilize [Lur16, Proposition 5.4.5.15], which states that if  $\mathcal{C}$  is a symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -category, then a nonunital  $\mathbf{E}_2$ -algebra object in  $\mathcal{C}$  is equivalent to the datum of a locally constant  $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{Disk}(\mathbf{C}))_{\mathrm{nu}}$ -algebra object in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Concretely, this amounts to specifying an object  $A(D) \in \mathcal{C}$  for every disk  $D \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  and coherent maps  $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n A(D_i) \rightarrow A(D)$  for every inclusion  $\coprod_{i=1}^n D_i \rightarrow D$  of disks, such that for every embedding  $D \subseteq D'$  of disks, the induced map  $A(D) \rightarrow A(D')$  is an equivalence.

In this case,  $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Fun}(\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+, \mathcal{S}(T_c))$ , and the object  $A(D) \in \mathrm{Fun}(\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+, \mathcal{S}(T_c))$  assigned to a disk  $D \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  may be defined via the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian  $\mathrm{Gr}_{G, \mathrm{Ran}}$ . Namely, the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian admits (by construction) a morphism  $\mathrm{Gr}_{G, \mathrm{Ran}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ran}_{\mathbf{A}^1}$ ; upon taking complex points, we obtain a map  $\mathrm{Gr}_{G, \mathrm{Ran}}(\mathbf{C}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ran}(\mathbf{C})$ . If  $S \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  is a subset, then the preimage of  $\mathrm{Ran}(S) \subseteq \mathrm{Ran}(\mathbf{C})$  defines a subspace  $\mathrm{Gr}_{G, \mathrm{Ran}}(S \subseteq \mathbf{C}) \subseteq \mathrm{Gr}_{G, \mathrm{Ran}}(\mathbf{C})$ . The filtration of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  via the Bruhat decomposition extends to a filtration  $\mathrm{Gr}_{G, \mathrm{Ran}, \leq \mu}$  of  $\mathrm{Gr}_{G, \mathrm{Ran}}$  by dominant coweights  $\mu \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)^+$ ; see [Zhu17, 3.1.11]. Finally, the

<sup>5</sup>If  $\mathcal{C}$  is a symmetric monoidal  $\infty$ -category, [Lur18a, Corollary 3.3.4] can be used to show that there is an equivalence  $\mathrm{coCAlg}(\mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbf{E}_n}(\mathcal{C})) \simeq \mathrm{Alg}_{\mathbf{E}_n}(\mathrm{coCAlg}(\mathcal{C}))$ .

object  $A(D) \in \text{Fun}(\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+, \mathcal{S}(T_c))$  associated to a disk  $D \subseteq \mathbf{C}$  is the functor  $\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(T_c)$  sending  $\mu \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)^+$  to  $\text{Gr}_{G, \text{Ran}, \leq \mu}(D \subseteq \mathbf{C})$ .

Suppose  $\coprod_{i=1}^n D_i \rightarrow D$  is an inclusion of disks. The induced map  $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n A(D_i) \rightarrow A(D)$  is defined as follows. Let  $\mu \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)^+$ ; for every  $n$ -tuple  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$  with  $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \leq \mu$ , we need to exhibit maps  $\bigotimes_{i=1}^n A(D_i)(\mu_i) \rightarrow A(D)(\mu)$  satisfying the obvious coherences. But

$$\bigotimes_{i=1}^n A(D_i)(\mu_i) = \prod_{i=1}^n \text{Gr}_{G, \text{Ran}, \leq \mu_i}(D_i \subseteq \mathbf{C}),$$

so it suffices to show that if  $\mu_1 + \mu_2 \leq \mu$ , then there are maps  $\text{Gr}_{G, \text{Ran}, \leq \mu_1}(D_1 \subseteq \mathbf{C}) \times \text{Gr}_{G, \text{Ran}, \leq \mu_2}(D_2 \subseteq \mathbf{C}) \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{G, \text{Ran}, \leq \mu}(D \subseteq \mathbf{C})$ . The argument for this is exactly as in [HY19, Construction 3.15].

We next need to show that the  $N(\text{Disk}(\mathbf{C}))_{\text{nu}}$ -algebra  $A$  defined above is locally constant, i.e., that if  $D \subseteq D'$  is an embedding of disks, then  $A(D) \rightarrow A(D')$  is an equivalence of functors  $\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(T_c)$ . This follows from [HY19, Proposition 3.17]. To conclude, it suffices (by [Lur16, Theorem 5.4.4.5]) to establish the existence of a quasi-unit for the functor  $A : \mathbb{X}_*(T)^+ \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(T_c)$ , i.e., a map  $1_{\text{Fun}(\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+, \mathcal{S}(T_c))} \rightarrow A$  which is both a left and right unit up to homotopy. Since the unit in  $\text{Fun}(\mathbb{X}_*(T)^+, \mathcal{S}(T_c))$  is the functor sending  $\mu \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)^+$  to the point  $*$ , a quasi-unit is the datum of a map  $* \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{G, \leq \mu}(\mathbf{C})$  for each  $\mu \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)^+$ . As in the proof of [HY19, Theorem 3.10], this can be taken to be the inclusion of the point corresponding to the trivial  $G$ -bundle over  $\mathbf{A}^1$  with the canonical trivialization away from the origin.  $\square$

Using the preceding discussion, we can now define our desired degeneration.

**Definition 4.4.** Suppose that  $X$  is a (ind-)finite  $T_c$ -space with even cells (such as  $\text{Gr}_G$ ). The  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(X; k)$  is defined as

$$\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(X; k) = \text{coLMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee)}(\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0})).$$

The “constant sheaf”  $k^{\text{gr}}$  in this category is the comodule  $\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee)$  itself. Similarly, suppose  $Y$  is a finite  $T_c$ -space such that  $\Omega Y$  has even cells (such as  $G_c$ ). The  $\infty$ -category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(Y; k)$  is defined as

$$\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(Y; k) = \text{LMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\Omega Y)^\vee)}(\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0})).$$

The “constant sheaf”  $k^{\text{gr}}$  in this category is the structure sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}$  viewed as a  $\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\Omega Y)^\vee)$ -module via the augmentation.

These should be viewed as “mixed” (in the sense of [BBD82]) variants of the full  $\infty$ -categories  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  and  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(Y; k)$ .

**Remark 4.5.** There is an apparent asymmetry in Definition 4.4: why could we not have defined  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(Y; k)$  to be  $\text{coLMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(Y)^\vee)}(\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0}))$ ? The issue is that since  $Y$  contains odd-dimensional cells, taking  $\pi_0$  of  $\mathcal{F}_T(Y)^\vee$  is a very destructive process. More generally, as in the discussion at the beginning of this section,  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  for a finite  $T_c$ -space  $X$  should only be regarded as a well-behaved reflection of  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  itself when  $X$  has even cells.

**Remark 4.6.** If  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  with  $u$  in degree 2, then (using the results of [ABG04])  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  is equivalent to the shearing of the 2-periodification of the category  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$ . This can be understood as a statement about formality. If  $k$  is



a more general  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring (like complex K-theory  $KU$ ), then formality is generally impossible: for instance, a  $KU$ -module  $M$  is generally not equivalent (even as a spectrum!) to the shearing of  $\pi_*(M)$ , unless  $M$  is also a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -module.

**Remark 4.7.** We will not discuss  $G_c$ -equivariant cohomology much in this article, except for the end of Section 6. There, we will only consider the case  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  with  $u$  in degree 2. In this case, the equivariant cohomology  $H_{G_c}^*(\ast; \mathbf{Q})$  is concentrated in even weights; in fact, we may identify  $\mathrm{Spec} H_{G_c}^0(\ast; k) \cong \mathfrak{t} // W$ . It is still reasonable to define  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  to be

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) = \mathrm{coLMod}_{H_{G_c}^0(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t} // W)).$$

Similarly, the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)$  can be defined as

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k) = \mathrm{LMod}_{H_{G_c}^0(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t} // W)).$$

**Example 4.8.** If  $G = T$  is a maximal torus, it follows from Theorem 3.20 that there are equivalences of  $\pi_0(k)$ -linear  $\infty$ -categories

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k) &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0}/\tilde{T}), \\ \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(T_c; k) &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0} \times_{\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0(k)} \tilde{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose  $X$  is a (ind-)finite  $T_c$ -space with even cells. Since  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(X; k)$  is a degeneration of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$ , one should expect a spectral sequence computing the cohomology  $\Gamma_{T_c}(X; \mathcal{F})$  for  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)$  from corresponding objects  $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(X; k)$ . Similarly, if  $Y$  is a finite  $T_c$ -space such that  $\Omega Y$  has even cells, one should expect a spectral sequence computing the cohomology  $\Gamma_{T_c}(Y; \mathcal{F})$  for  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(Y; k)$  from corresponding objects  $\mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(Y; k)$ . This is a special case of the following general setup.

**Construction 4.9.** Recall that if  $\mathfrak{X}$  is a spectral stack and  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{X})$ , the truncation  $\tau_{\geq n}(\mathcal{F})$  is the quasicoherent  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}}$ -module given on an affine open  $U$  by  $\tau_{\geq n}(\mathcal{F}(U))$ ; similarly for  $\tau_{\leq n}$  and  $\tau_{[n,m]}$  with  $m \geq n$ . There is a functor  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0})$  given by sending a quasicoherent sheaf  $\mathcal{F}$  on  $\mathcal{M}_T$  to the quasicoherent sheaf  $\tau_{[0,1]}(\mathcal{F})$  over  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ . This functor can be expressed as the composite of two functors: the first sends the  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ -module  $\mathcal{F}$  to the filtered  $\tau_{\geq 2\star} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ -module  $\tau_{\geq 2\star}(\mathcal{F})$ ; and the second is given by taking associated graded. Note that since the structure sheaf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$  is 2-periodic, the data of the graded  $\pi_{2\star} \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ -module  $\mathrm{gr}(\tau_{\geq 2\star}(\mathcal{F}))$  is equivalent to the data of the (ungraded)  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}$ -module  $\tau_{[0,1]}(\mathcal{F})$ .

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -coalgebra in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$  whose homotopy sheaves are concentrated in even degrees (such as  $\mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$ ). If  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{coMod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ , the comodule map  $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}} \mathcal{A}$  induces a comodule map

$$\tau_{\leq 2\star} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \tau_{\leq 2\star}(\mathcal{F} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}} \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \tau_{\leq 2\star}(\mathcal{F}) \otimes_{\tau_{\leq 2\star}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T})} \tau_{\leq 2\star}(\mathcal{A})$$

due to the oplax symmetric monoidality of the truncation functor. Taking associated graded and using the 2-periodicity of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ , we obtain a  $\pi_0(\mathcal{A})$ -comodule structure on the  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}$ -module  $\tau_{[0,1]}(\mathcal{F})$ . This defines a functor  $\mathrm{coMod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)) \rightarrow \mathrm{coMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{A})}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0}))$ , which we will denote by  $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}}$ . For instance, if  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{F}_T(X)^\vee$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k) = \mathrm{coMod}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ , then there is a spectral sequence

$$\pi_*(k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \pi_* \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(X; k)}(\underline{k}^{\mathrm{gr}}, \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}}) \Rightarrow \pi_* \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; k)}(\underline{k}, \mathcal{F}) = \pi_* \Gamma_{T_c}(X; \mathcal{F}).$$

Similarly, let  $\mathcal{B}$  be an  $\mathbf{E}_1$ -algebra in  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)$  whose homotopy sheaves are concentrated in even degrees (such as  $\mathcal{F}_T(\Omega Y)^\vee$ ). If  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ , the module map  $\mathcal{B} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}} \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  induces a comodule map

$$\tau_{\geq 2*}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\tau_{\geq 2*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T})} \tau_{\geq 2*}(\mathcal{F}) \simeq \tau_{\geq 2*}(\mathcal{B} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}} \mathcal{F}) \rightarrow \tau_{\geq 2*}(\mathcal{F})$$

due to the lax symmetric monoidality of the cotruncation functor. Taking associated graded and using the 2-periodicity of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_T}$ , we obtain a left  $\pi_0(\mathcal{B})$ -module structure on the  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}$ -module  $\underline{\tau}_{[0,1]}(\mathcal{F})$ . This defines a functor  $\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T)) \rightarrow \mathrm{LMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{B})}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0}))$ , which we will denote by  $\mathcal{F} \mapsto \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}}$ . For instance, if  $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{F}_T(\Omega Y)^\vee$  and  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(Y; k) = \mathrm{LMod}_{\mathcal{B}}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T))$ , then there is a spectral sequence

$$\pi_*(k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \pi_* \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(Y; k)}(\underline{k}^{\mathrm{gr}}, \mathcal{F}^{\mathrm{gr}}) \Rightarrow \pi_* \mathrm{Map}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(Y; k)}(k, \mathcal{F}) = \pi_* \Gamma_{T_c}(Y; \mathcal{F}).$$

Let us now discuss how one might define analogous degenerations if  $k$  is not necessarily an even and 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring. Although this discussion can be generalized to some other  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -rings (such as  $\mathrm{TMF}$ ), we will focus only on the case when  $k$  is the  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring  $\mathrm{KO}$  of *real K-theory*. Here is a brief summary of its relevant properties:  $\mathrm{KO}$  can be defined from  $\mathrm{KU}$  using the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on  $\mathrm{KU}$  via complex conjugation. Namely,  $\mathrm{KO} = \mathrm{KU}^{h\mathbf{Z}/2}$ ; in fact, as proved in [Rog08], the map  $\mathrm{KO} \rightarrow \mathrm{KU}$  is a  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -Galois extension, meaning that the base-change of any  $\mathrm{KO}$ -module to  $\mathrm{KU}$  acquires the structure of a  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -equivariant  $\mathrm{KU}$ -module. In the discussion below, we will not need to know much about  $\mathrm{KO}$ , other than the following facts: the generator of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  sends  $u \in \pi_2(\mathrm{KU})$  to  $-u$ ; and the homotopy groups of  $\mathrm{KO}$  are *not* even, nor are they 2-periodic<sup>6</sup>. Therefore,  $\mathrm{KO}$  does not quite fit into the setup of Section 3 and Section 4. Nevertheless, the fact that  $\mathrm{KO}$  is the homotopy fixed points  $\mathrm{KU}^{h\mathbf{Z}/2}$  does admit a spectral algebro-geometric description: the global sections of the spectral stack  $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathrm{KU})/(\mathbf{Z}/2)$  can be identified with  $\mathrm{KO}$ . Moreover, any  $\mathrm{KO}$ -module  $N$  defines a quasicoherent sheaf over this spectral stack given by the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on  $\mathrm{KU} \otimes_{\mathrm{KO}} N$ .

Therefore, a more reasonable analogue of the degeneration from a  $\mathrm{KU}$ -module  $M$  to  $\pi_*(M)$  for a  $\mathrm{KO}$ -module  $N$  is given by considering the graded  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -equivariant  $\pi_*(\mathrm{KU})$ -module  $\pi_*(\mathrm{KU} \otimes_{\mathrm{KO}} N)$ . If  $\mathrm{KU} \otimes_{\mathrm{KO}} N$  is even, then (since  $\pi_*(\mathrm{KU})$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbf{Z}[u^{\pm 1}]$  with  $u$  in weight 2), we may simply view this as the data of the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -equivariant abelian group  $\pi_0(\mathrm{KU} \otimes_{\mathrm{KO}} N)$ . That is, studying (spectral) algebraic geometry over  $\mathrm{KO}$  amounts simply to keeping track of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -equivariance for (spectral) algebraic geometry over  $\mathrm{KU}$ . Moreover, the analogue of the degeneration of the spectral scheme  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{KU}$  to  $\mathrm{Spec}(\pi_*(\mathrm{KU}))/\mathbf{G}_m \cong \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{Z})$  should be understood as a degeneration of the spectral scheme  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{KO}$  to the  $\mathbf{G}_m$ -quotient of  $\mathrm{Spec}(\pi_*(\mathrm{KU}))/(\mathbf{Z}/2)$ , i.e., to the classifying stack  $B\mathbf{Z}/2$ .

Motivated by this discussion, we may define  $\mathrm{KO}_{T_c}$  for a compact torus  $T_c$  as the homotopy  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -fixed points of  $\mathrm{KU}_{T_c}$  for a particular  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action extending the action of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  on  $\mathrm{KU}^{hT_c}$  by complex conjugation. To do so, we need the following simple observation.

<sup>6</sup>In fact, there is an isomorphism

$$\pi_*(\mathrm{KO}) \cong \mathbf{Z}[\eta, x, y^{\pm 1}]/(2\eta, \eta^3, \eta x, x^2 - 4y),$$

where  $\eta$  is in degree 1,  $x$  is in degree 4, and  $y$  is in degree 8. The map  $\pi_*(\mathrm{KO}) \rightarrow \pi_*(\mathrm{KU}) \cong \mathbf{Z}[u^{\pm 1}]$  kills  $\eta$ , sends  $x$  to  $2u^2$ , and sends  $y$  to  $u^4$ .

**Lemma 4.10.** *Under the isomorphism  $\pi_0(\mathrm{KU}^{hS^1}) \cong \mathbf{Z}[[x-1]]$ , the action of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  by complex conjugation sends  $x \mapsto x^{-1}$ .*

Motivated by Lemma 4.10, we make the following:

**Construction 4.11.** There is an action of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  on the multiplicative group  $(\mathbf{G}_m)_{\mathrm{KU}}$  over  $\mathrm{KU}$  given by inversion. If  $T_c$  is a compact torus, this extends to an action of  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  on  $\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KU}} = T_{\mathrm{KU}}$ . Define  $\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KO}}$  to be the spectral stack over  $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathrm{KU})/(\mathbf{Z}/2)$  given by  $\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KU}}/(\mathbf{Z}/2)$ . Observe that the underlying stack of  $\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KO}}$  is given by  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}/(\mathbf{Z}/2)$  over  $B\mathbf{Z}/2$  (again,  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  acts on  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0} \cong T$  by inversion).

It is clear from Construction 3.7 that the functor  $\mathcal{F}_T(-; \mathrm{KU}) : \mathcal{S}(T_c)^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KU}})$  factors through a functor  $\mathcal{S}(T_c)^{\mathrm{op}} \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KO}})$ . We will denote this new functor by  $\mathcal{F}_T(-; \mathrm{KO})$ . In exactly the same way as in Construction 3.16, one can define a  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KO}})$ -linear  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; \mathrm{KO})$  for a finite  $T_c$ -space  $X$ . As in Remark 4.2, there will be an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}(X; \mathrm{KO}) \simeq \mathrm{coMod}_{\mathcal{F}_T(X; \mathrm{KO})^\vee}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KO}}));$$

furthermore, the latter category is equivalent to  $\mathrm{coMod}_{\mathcal{F}_T(X; \mathrm{KU})^\vee}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_T^{\mathrm{KU}}/(\mathbf{Z}/2)))$ .

Thus, following Definition 4.4, we are led to the following.

**Definition 4.12.** Suppose that  $X$  is a (ind-)finite  $T_c$ -space with even cells (such as  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ ). The  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(X; \mathrm{KO})$  is defined as

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(X; \mathrm{KO}) = \mathrm{coLMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(X; \mathrm{KU})^\vee)}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0}/(\mathbf{Z}/2))).$$

Similarly, suppose  $Y$  is a finite  $T_c$ -space such that  $\Omega Y$  has even cells (such as  $G_c$ ). The  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(Y; \mathrm{KO})$  is defined as

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(Y; \mathrm{KO}) = \mathrm{LMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\Omega Y; \mathrm{KO})^\vee)}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0}/(\mathbf{Z}/2))).$$

**Example 4.13.** It follows from Example 4.8 that there are equivalences of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(B\mathbf{Z}/2)$ -linear  $\infty$ -categories

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; \mathrm{KO}) &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(T/(\mathbf{Z}/2) \times B\tilde{T}), \\ \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(T_c; \mathrm{KO}) &\simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(T/(\mathbf{Z}/2) \times \tilde{T}). \end{aligned}$$

## 5. LOOP ROTATION EQUIVARIANCE

In this section, we describe an extension of Theorem 3.20 (or rather, of Example 4.8) which includes loop-rotation equivariance. Recall that Theorem 3.20 gives an isomorphism  $\mathcal{F}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee \cong \mathcal{O}(\tilde{T}_k \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(k)} \mathcal{M}_T)$ . The action of  $T$  on  $\mathrm{Gr}_T$  refines to an action of  $\tilde{T} = T \times \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}$ , where  $\mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}$  acts by loop rotation; we may therefore consider the *loop-rotation equivariant* homology  $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee$ . There is an equivalence  $\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{T}} \simeq \mathcal{M}_T \times \mathbf{G}$ , where the second factor is identified as  $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}}$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee$  is a quasicoherent sheaf over  $\mathcal{M}_T \times \mathbf{G}$  whose fiber over the zero section of  $\mathbf{G}$  recovers  $\mathcal{F}_{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee$ .

**Definition 5.1.** Let  $\mathbf{H}$  be a smooth 1-dimensional group scheme over a base commutative ring  $A$ , let  $T_c$  be a compact torus, and let  $\mathbf{H}_T = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), \mathbf{H})$ . (When  $\mathbf{G}$  is an oriented commutative  $k$ -group scheme, and  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}_0$  is its underlying group scheme over  $A = \pi_0(k)$ , then  $\mathbf{H}_T$  is precisely  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ .) Let  $\lambda$  be a cocharacter of  $T_c$ , so that  $\lambda$  defines a homomorphism  $\mathbb{X}^*(T) \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}$ , and hence a homomorphism  $\lambda^* : \mathbf{H} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_T$ . In turn, this defines a map

$$f^\lambda : \mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}} \simeq \mathbf{H}_T \times \mathbf{H} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr} \times \lambda^*} \mathbf{H}_T.$$

If  $y$  is a local section of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}$ , we will write  $\lambda^*(y)$  to denote the resulting local section of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}}$ .

Let  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}$  denote the quotient of the associative  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}}$ -algebra  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}} \langle x_\lambda | \lambda \in \mathbb{X}_*(T) \rangle$  by the relations given locally by

$$x_\lambda \cdot x_\mu = x_{\lambda+\mu}, \quad y \cdot x_\lambda = x_\lambda \cdot \lambda^*(y).$$

Here,  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)$ , and  $y$  is a local section of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}$ . We will call  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}$  the *algebra of  $\mathbf{H}$ -differential operators* on  $\tilde{T}$ .

**Remark 5.2.** The algebra  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}$  satisfies a Mellin transform: namely, it follows from unwinding the definition that there is an equivalence

$$\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}\text{-mod} \simeq \mathrm{IndCoh}(\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}/\mathbb{X}^*(\tilde{T})),$$

where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}^*(\tilde{T}) \cong \mathbb{X}_*(T)$  acts on  $\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}$  via  $y \mapsto \lambda^*y$ .

**Notation 5.3.** If  $k$  is a complex-oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring and  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is the  $\pi_0(k)$ -group underlying a oriented commutative  $A$ -group  $\mathbf{G}$ , we will write  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{G}}$  to denote  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{G}_0}$ , and refer to it as the *algebra of  $\mathbf{G}$ -differential operators* on  $\tilde{T}$ . We hope this does not cause any confusion.

**Proposition 5.4.** *There is an isomorphism*

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee \cong \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{G}}$$

of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0}$ -algebras. In particular, there is an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{\tilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; k) \simeq \mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{G}}\text{-mod}^{(\tilde{T} \times \tilde{T}, \mathrm{weak})},$$

where the right-hand side denotes the category of left  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{G}}$ -modules whose underlying quasicoherent sheaf over  $\tilde{T}$  is equivariant for  $\tilde{T} \times \tilde{T}$ -action on  $\tilde{T}$  given by left and right multiplication.

*Proof.* Since  $\mathrm{Gr}_T \cong \mathbb{X}_*(T)$ , it is easy to see that  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)} \pi_0 \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{T}}}$ ; let  $x_\lambda$  be a generator of the summand indexed by  $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_*(T)$ . If  $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_*(T) = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), \mathbf{Z})$ , the map  $\Omega T_c \rightarrow \Omega T_c$  given by multiplication-by- $\lambda$  is  $T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1$ -equivariant for the homomorphism  $T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1 \rightarrow T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1$  given by

$$(t, \theta) \mapsto (t\lambda(\theta), \theta),$$

where  $\lambda$  is viewed as a homomorphism  $S^1 \rightarrow T$ . On weight lattices, this homomorphism induces the map  $\mathbb{X}^*(T) \times \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}^*(T) \times \mathbf{Z}$  which sends  $(\mu, n) \mapsto (\mu, n + \mathbb{X}_*(T)(\mu))$ . In particular, the composite

$$\mathbb{X}^*(T) \rightarrow \mathbb{X}^*(T) \times \mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}^*(T) \times \mathbf{Z}$$

sends  $\mu \mapsto (\mu, \mathbb{X}_*(T)(\mu))$ . Applying  $\mathrm{Hom}(-, \mathbf{G})$  to this composite precisely produces the map  $f^\lambda : \mathcal{M}_{\tilde{T}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_T$  from Definition 5.1. This implies the desired identification of  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)^\vee$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.5.** Let  $T \cong S^1$  be a torus of rank 1 (for simplicity). Suppose  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  with  $u$  in degree 2, so  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_a$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0} \cong \mathbf{Q}[\hbar]$ . Then the algebra of Definition 5.1 is the quotient of the  $\mathbf{Q}[\hbar]$ -algebra  $\mathbf{Q}[\hbar]\langle y, x^{\pm 1} \rangle$  by the relation  $yx = x(y + \hbar)$ . In other words,  $y$  acts as the operator  $\hbar x \partial_x$ , so we simply have that

$$\mathrm{H}_0^{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]) \cong \mathrm{H}_*^{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{Q}[\hbar]\langle \hbar x \partial_x, x^{\pm 1} \rangle.$$

This has been stated previously as [BFN18, Proposition 5.19(2)]. In particular, the localization  $\mathrm{H}_0^{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}])[\hbar^{-1}]$  is isomorphic to the rescaled Weyl algebra  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\hbar}$ ; this is the motivation behind the terminology in Definition 5.1. Note that for a general torus, Remark 5.2 simply reduces to the standard Mellin transform, which gives an equivalence between  $\mathrm{DMod}_h(\tilde{T})$  and  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathbf{t}_{\mathbf{Q}[\hbar]}/\mathbb{X}^*(\tilde{T}))$ .

**Example 5.6.** Again, let  $T \cong S^1$  be a torus of rank 1 (for simplicity). Suppose  $k = \mathrm{KU}$ , so  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_m$  and  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0} \cong \mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ . Then the algebra of Definition 5.1 is the quotient of the  $\mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ -algebra  $\mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]\langle y^{\pm 1}, x^{\pm 1} \rangle$  by the relation  $yx = qxy$ . (This is also known as the “quantum torus”.) In other words,  $y$  acts as the operator  $q^x \partial_x$  sending  $f(x) \mapsto f(qx)$ , so we simply have that

$$\mathrm{KU}_0^{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T) \cong \mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]\langle q^x \partial_x, x^{\pm 1} \rangle.$$

This is closely related to the  $q$ -Weyl algebra  $\mathcal{D}_q = \mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]\langle \Theta, x^{\pm 1} \rangle / (\Theta x = x(q\Theta + 1))$  for  $\tilde{T} = \mathbf{G}_m$ : indeed, since the logarithmic  $q$ -derivative  $\Theta = x \nabla_q$  is given by the fraction  $\frac{q^{x \partial_x} - 1}{q - 1}$ , the pullback of  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{G}}$  along  $\mathbf{G}_m - \{1\} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{G}_m$  is isomorphic to the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_q[\frac{1}{q-1}]$ . Note that Remark 5.2 gives a “ $q$ -Mellin transform”, i.e., an equivalence between  $\mathrm{LMod}_{\mathrm{KU}_0^{\tilde{T}}(\mathrm{Gr}_T)}$  and  $\mathrm{QCoh}((\mathbf{G}_m)_{\mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]} / \mathbf{Z})$ , where  $\mathbf{Z}$  acts on  $(\mathbf{G}_m)_{\mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]}$  by sending  $y \mapsto qy$ .

Let us briefly outline the relationship between the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}$  of Definition 5.1 and the  $F$ -de Rham complex of [DM23].

**Notation 5.7.** For the purpose of this discussion, we will assume that  $T \cong S^1$  is a torus of rank 1, so that  $\tilde{T} \cong \mathbf{G}_m$ . We will also fix an invariant differential form on the formal completion  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$  of  $\mathbf{H}$  at the zero section, so that there is an isomorphism

$\hat{\mathbf{H}} \cong \mathrm{Spf} A[[t]]$  of formal  $A$ -schemes. Let  $F(x, y)$  denote the resulting formal group law over  $A$ , and define the  $n$ -series of  $F$  by

$$[n]_F := \overbrace{F(t, F(t, F(t, \dots F(t, t) \dots)))}^n.$$

We will often write  $x +_F y = x +_{\mathbf{G}} y$  to denote  $F(x, y)$ . Let  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}}$  denote the completion of  $\mathcal{D}_T^{\mathbf{H}}$  at the zero section of  $\mathcal{M}_{0, \tilde{T}} \cong \mathbf{H}_T \times \mathbf{H}$ .

**Lemma 5.8** (Cartier duality). *Let  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$  be a 1-dimensional formal group over a commutative ring  $A$ , and let  $\mathrm{Cart}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$  denote its Cartier dual (see [Dri21, Section 3.3] for more on Cartier duals of formal groups). Then there is an equivalence of categories  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(B\mathrm{Cart}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}))$  sending the convolution tensor product on the left-hand side to the usual tensor product on the right-hand side. Under this equivalence, the functor  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_A$  given by restriction to the zero section is identified with the functor  $\mathrm{QCoh}(B\mathrm{Cart}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})) \rightarrow \mathrm{Mod}_A$  given by pullback along the map  $\mathrm{Spec}(A) \rightarrow B\mathrm{Cart}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ .*

**Proposition 5.9.** *There is a canonical action of  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}}$  on  $(\mathbf{G}_m)_{A[[t]]} = \mathrm{Spf} A[[t]][x^{\pm 1}]$  such that  $A[[t]][x^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}}} A[[t]][x^{\pm 1}]$  is isomorphic to the two-term complex*

$$C^\bullet = (A[[t]][x^{\pm 1}] \rightarrow A[[t]][x^{\pm 1}]dx), \quad x^n \mapsto [n]_F x^n dx$$

from [DM23, Remark 4.3.8].

*Proof sketch.* Since  $T$  is of rank 1, there is an isomorphism  $\mathbf{H}_T \cong \mathbf{H}$ , and hence an isomorphism  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_T \cong \hat{\mathbf{A}}^1$  of formal  $A$ -schemes, where  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_T$  denotes the completion of  $\mathbf{H}_T$  at the zero section. Let  $y$  be a local coordinate on  $\mathbf{H}_T$ . Then,  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}}$  is isomorphic to the quotient of the associative  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{H}}$ -algebra  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{H} \times \mathbf{H}_T} \langle x^{\pm 1} \rangle$  subject to the relation  $yx = x(y +_{\mathbf{G}} t)$ . The  $t$ -adic filtration on  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}}$  therefore has associated graded  $\mathrm{gr}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}}) \cong \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{H}_T} [x^{\pm 1}][\bar{t}]$ , where  $\bar{t}$  lives in weight 1. View  $A$  as a  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}$ -algebra via the zero section, i.e., the augmentation  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T} \rightarrow A$ . Then, the action of  $\mathrm{gr}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}})$  on  $A[x^{\pm 1}][\bar{t}]$  is induced by the augmentation  $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathbf{H}_T} \rightarrow A$ . The isomorphism  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_T \cong \hat{\mathbf{A}}^1$  of formal  $A$ -schemes then implies an isomorphism  $A \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}} A \cong A[\epsilon]/\epsilon^2$  with  $\epsilon$  in homological degree 1. It follows that

$$A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathrm{gr}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}})} A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] \simeq A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] [\epsilon]/\epsilon^2,$$

where  $\bar{t}$  is in weight 1 and degree 0, and  $\epsilon$  is in weight 0 and degree 1.

By Lemma 5.8, the  $t$ -adic filtration on  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}}$  is equivalent to the data of a  $\mathrm{Cart}(\hat{\mathbf{H}})$ -action on  $A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] \otimes_{\mathrm{gr}(\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{H}})} A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] \simeq A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] [\epsilon]/\epsilon^2$ . This in turn is equivalent to the data of a differential

$$\nabla : A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] \rightarrow A[[\bar{t}]] [x^{\pm 1}] \cdot \epsilon$$

satisfying an  $\hat{\mathbf{H}}$ -analogue of the Leibniz rule: if  $\nabla(x^n) = f(n)x^n\epsilon$  for some  $f(n) \in A[[\bar{t}]]$ , then  $f(n+m) = f(n) +_{\mathbf{G}} f(m)$ . It therefore suffices to determine  $\nabla(x)$ ; but the relation  $yx = x(y +_{\mathbf{G}} t)$  forces  $\nabla(x) = tx\epsilon$ . This implies that

$$\nabla(x^n) = \overbrace{(t +_{\mathbf{G}} \dots +_{\mathbf{G}} t)}^n x^n \epsilon = [n]_F x^n \epsilon,$$

<sup>7</sup>Note that  $\nabla$  has to be homogeneous in the degree of the monomial in  $x$ , as can be seen by keeping track of the  $x$ -weight.

as desired.  $\square$

**Example 5.10.** When  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}_a$  over<sup>8</sup>  $\mathbf{Q}$ , the complex  $C^\bullet$  is

$$C^\bullet = (\mathbf{Q}[[\hbar]][x^{\pm 1}] \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}[[\hbar]][x^{\pm 1}]dx), \quad x^n \mapsto n\hbar x^n dx.$$

Indeed, since  $yx = x(y + \hbar)$ , we have  $yx^n = x^n(y + n\hbar)$ ; since  $t = \hbar$  in this case, we have  $x^n \mapsto n\hbar x^n \epsilon$ . This is evidently a  $\hbar$ -rescaling of the classical de Rham complex of  $\mathbf{G}_m$ .

When  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}_m$  over  $\mathbf{Z}$ , the complex  $C^\bullet$  is

$$C^\bullet = (\mathbf{Z}[[q-1]][x^{\pm 1}] \rightarrow \mathbf{Z}[[q-1]][x^{\pm 1}]dx), \quad x^n \mapsto (q^n - 1)x^n dx.$$

Indeed, since  $yx = x(qy)$ , we have  $yx^n = x^n(q^n y)$ , and hence

$$(y-1)x^n = x^n(q^n y - 1) = x^n((y-1) +_F (q^n - 1)),$$

where  $F(z, w) = z + w + zw$  is the multiplicative formal group law; since  $t = q - 1$  in this case, we have  $x^n \mapsto (q^n - 1)x^n \epsilon$ . The complex  $C^\bullet$  is a  $(q - 1)$ -rescaling of the  $q$ -de Rham complex of  $\mathbf{G}_m$  from [Sch17].

**Remark 5.11.** The complex of Proposition 5.9 is not quite the  $F$ -de Rham complex of [DM23, Definition 4.3.6]; rather, if  $\eta_t$  denotes the décalage functor of [BO78] with respect to the ideal  $(t) \subseteq A[[t]]$ , the  $F$ -de Rham complex is given by the décalage  $\eta_t C^\bullet$ . In particular, the complex of Proposition 5.9 is isomorphic to the  $F$ -de Rham complex after inverting  $t$ . One can modify the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_T^{\mathbf{H}}$  of Definition 5.1 (by performing a noncommutative analogue of an affine blowup/deformation to the normal cone<sup>9</sup>) such that the relative tensor product as in Proposition 5.9 is the  $F$ -de Rham complex itself. Since it is not needed for this article, we will not describe this modification here.

**Remark 5.12.** Suppose  $k$  is a complex-oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring equipped with an oriented commutative  $k$ -group scheme  $\mathbf{G}$ . Proposition 5.9 says that  $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{\mathbf{G}_0}$  is Koszul dual to the complex  $C^\bullet$ . Forthcoming work of Arpon Raksit shows that the décalage  $\eta_t C^\bullet$  can be recovered from the “even filtration” (in the sense of [HRW22]) on the periodic cyclic homology  $\mathrm{HP}(\tau_{\geq 0} k[x^{\pm 1}]/\tau_{\geq 0} k)$ . See also the discussion in [Dev23, Section 3.3]. Using similar techniques, one can show that  $C^\bullet$  can be recovered from the even filtration on the negative cyclic homology  $\mathrm{HC}^-(k[x^{\pm 1}]/k) = \mathrm{HH}(k[x^{\pm 1}]/k)^{hS^1}$ .

Recalling that  $T = S^1$ , this  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $k$ -algebra is simply  $\mathrm{HC}^-(k[\Omega T]/k)$ . The Hochschild homology  $\mathrm{HH}(k[\Omega T]/k) \simeq k \otimes \mathrm{THH}(S[\Omega T])$  is  $S^1$ -equivariantly equivalent to the  $k$ -chains  $C_*(\mathcal{L}T; k)$  on the free loop space of  $T$ . (For a reference, see [NS18, Corollary IV.3.3].) The  $k$ -chains  $k[\mathcal{L}T]$  is  $S^1$ -equivariantly Koszul dual<sup>10</sup> to  $k[\Omega T]^{hT}$ ; this can be identified as a completion of  $\mathcal{F}_T(\Omega T)^\vee$  at the zero section of  $\mathcal{M}_T$ . In other words,  $\mathrm{HC}^-(k[\Omega T]/k)$  is Koszul dual to the completion of  $\mathcal{F}_{T \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}(\Omega T)^\vee$  at the zero section of  $\mathcal{M}_T \times \mathbf{G}$ . This is the topological source of the Koszul duality of Proposition 5.9.

<sup>8</sup>Of course, one can work over  $\mathbf{Z}$  too; we just chose  $\mathbf{Q}$  to continue with Example 5.5.

<sup>9</sup>For instance, in the case of Example 5.5, this procedure simply adjoins the fraction  $\frac{y}{\hbar}$ ; in the case of Example 5.6, this procedure simply adjoins the fraction  $\frac{y-1}{q-1}$ .

<sup>10</sup>This Koszul duality essentially stems from the (non- $S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1$ -equivariant) decomposition  $\mathcal{L}T \simeq T \times \Omega T$ .

## 6. REVIEW OF THE CLASSICAL CASE

To prepare ourselves for the calculations of  $\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)$  for  $k$  being complex K-theory or elliptic cohomology, we begin with the simpler case of  $k$  being  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  with  $u$  in degree 2; recall that  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0}$  is then isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{t}$ . In this case, the discussion in the present section follows from the work of Bezrukavnikov, Finkelberg, and Mirkovic in [BFM05], as well as the work of Yun and Zhu in [YZ11]. We will nevertheless go through this calculation (and discuss several applications) since it will be useful for us. Our goal is specifically to *not* appeal to the derived geometric Satake equivalence of [BF08], but rather do the calculation in such a way that proof technique generalizes to the K-theoretic or elliptic setting, so as to apply it to prove an analogue of [BF08].

*In the remainder of this article, we will assume the group  $G$  is connected, almost simple, and simply-laced.* The assumption that  $G$  is simply-laced provides many simplifications; in particular, it implies that the Chevalley split forms of the groups  $G$  and  $\check{G}$  are centrally isogenous (so that the adjoint action of  $G$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$  descends to an action of  $\check{G}$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$ ), and that there is a  $\check{G}$ -equivariant isomorphism  $\mathfrak{g} \cong \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  (even over  $\mathbf{Z}$ ). However, we will *never* use an  $\check{G}$ -equivariant isomorphism  $\check{\mathfrak{g}} \cong \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  (this generally fails over  $\mathbf{Z}$ )! In the following discussion, all dual groups are to be understood as defined over  $\mathbf{Q}$  (although some of our discussion will work even over  $\mathbf{Z}$ , perhaps with some small primes inverted).

**Definition 6.1** ((Additive) Kostant slice). Fix a nondegenerate character  $\psi \in \check{\mathfrak{n}}^*$ ; under the isomorphism  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^* \cong \mathfrak{g}$ , there is an isomorphism  $\check{\mathfrak{n}}^* \cong \mathfrak{n}$ , and  $\psi$  corresponds to a principal nilpotent element  $f \in \mathfrak{n}$ . Let  $(e, f, h)$  be the associated  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple in  $\mathfrak{g}$ , and let  $\psi_- : \check{\mathfrak{n}}_- \rightarrow \mathbf{A}^1$  denote the element corresponding to  $e$ . Let  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\psi_-} \cong \mathfrak{g}^e$  denote the centralizer (so  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^e \oplus [e, \mathfrak{g}]$ ), and let  $\mathcal{S} := f + \mathfrak{g}^e \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$  be the Kostant slice. Note that  $\mathcal{S} \cong \psi + \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\psi_-} \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\mathrm{reg}}$ . The composite  $f + \mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} // G \cong \mathfrak{t} // W$  is an isomorphism, by [Kos63].

Recall that the Grothendieck-Springer resolution is defined as

$$\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp \times^{\check{B}} \check{G} \cong \mathfrak{b} \times^{\check{B}} \check{G},$$

so that  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}/\check{G} \simeq \mathfrak{b}/\check{B}$ . A point of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  can be regarded as a pair  $(\check{\mathfrak{b}}', x \in (\check{\mathfrak{n}}')^\perp)$ ; here,  $\check{\mathfrak{b}}'$  denotes a Borel subalgebra of  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , and  $\check{\mathfrak{n}}'$  denotes its nilpotent radical. There is a map  $\tilde{\chi} : \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}$  which sends a pair  $(\check{\mathfrak{b}}', x)$  to the image of  $x$  modulo  $(\check{\mathfrak{b}}')^\perp$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  denote the fiber product  $\mathcal{S} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ , so that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}} = \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{*,\mathrm{reg}} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*} \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Then, Kostant's result on the Kostant slice implies formally that the composite

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \xrightarrow{\tilde{\chi}} \mathfrak{t}$$

is an isomorphism. We will often abusively write the inclusion of  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$  as a map  $\kappa : \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ .

In fact, we will only care about the composite  $\mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}/\check{G}$  below, so we will also denote it by  $\kappa$ . If we identify  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}/\check{G} \cong \mathfrak{b}/\check{B}$ , then the map  $\kappa$  admits a simple description: it is the composite  $f + \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}/\check{B}$ . (See Proposition 2.9.) In our discussion below, we will often identify  $f + \mathfrak{t}$  with  $\psi + \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$ .

**Definition 6.2.** The stabilizer (inside  $\check{G}$ ) of the Kostant slice  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^{\mathrm{reg}}$  is a closed subgroup scheme of the constant group scheme  $\check{G} \times \mathcal{S}$ , and will be denoted by



$\check{J}$ . It will be called the *regular centralizer group scheme*; if we wish to emphasize the dependence on  $G$ , we will denote it by  $\check{J}(G)$ . Note that since the composite  $\check{S} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}^{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g} // \check{G}$  is an isomorphism, we may identify

$$\check{J} \cong \check{S} \times_{\mathfrak{g} // \check{G}} \check{S}.$$

Similarly, the stabilizer (inside  $\check{G}$ ) of the Kostant slice  $\check{S} \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{g}}^{\text{reg}}$  is a closed subgroup scheme of the constant group scheme  $\check{G} \times \check{S}$ , and will be denoted by  $\check{\tilde{J}}$ . Since  $\check{S} \cong \check{S} \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*} \check{\mathfrak{g}}$ , we may identify

$$\check{\tilde{J}} \cong \check{J} \times_{\check{S}} \check{S} \cong (f + \mathfrak{t}) \times_{\mathfrak{b}/\check{B}} (f + \mathfrak{t}).$$

**Theorem 6.3.** *There is an isomorphism of group schemes over  $f + \mathfrak{t} \cong \mathfrak{t} \cong \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ :*

$$\text{Spec } \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\text{Gr}_G)^\vee \cong (f + \mathfrak{t}) \times_{\mathfrak{b}/\check{B}} (f + \mathfrak{t}).$$

Theorem 6.3 can be proved directly using Proposition 3.15, but I find the discussion below more enlightening (of course, it is essentially an elaboration of the application of Proposition 3.15). We first need a few lemmas.

**Lemma 6.4.** *The projection map  $\check{\tilde{J}} \rightarrow \psi + \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  (onto either factor) is flat.*

*Proof.* For this, we will follow [YZ11, Step II]. Consider the morphism  $\check{B} \times \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp$  sending  $(g, x) \mapsto \text{Ad}_g(\psi + x) - \psi$ . Unwinding definitions shows that there is a Cartesian square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \check{\tilde{J}} & \longrightarrow & \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \check{B} \times \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* & \longrightarrow & \check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp, \end{array}$$

so  $\check{\tilde{J}}$  is a closed subscheme of  $\check{B} \times \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  of codimension  $\dim(\check{\mathfrak{b}}^\perp) = \dim(\check{N})$ . This means that the fibers of the map  $\check{\tilde{J}} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  have dimension at least  $\dim(\check{B}) - \dim(\check{N}) = \text{rank}(\check{G})$ . If all fibers had dimension *exactly*  $\text{rank}(\check{G})$ , then miracle flatness would imply that the map  $\check{\tilde{J}} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  is flat. To show that all fibers have dimension  $\text{rank}(\check{G})$ , observe that there is a contracting  $\mathbf{G}_m$ -action on the vector space  $\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  which pushes everything down to the origin; so it suffices to show that the fiber over  $0 \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  is of the correct dimension.

That is, we need to see that the scheme

$$Y := \{(g, x) \in \check{B} \times \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \mid \text{Ad}_g(\psi) = \psi + x\}$$

is  $\text{rank}(\check{G})$ -dimensional. First, observe that if  $\text{Ad}_g(\psi) = \psi + x \in \check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp$  with  $x \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$ , then actually  $x = 0$ . This is because the image of  $x$  under the map

$$\check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp \rightarrow (\check{\mathfrak{n}} \oplus \check{\mathfrak{n}}^-)^\perp \cong \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$$

is the same as the image of  $\psi + x$ , which is the same as the image of  $\text{Ad}_g(\psi)$ . But the above map  $\check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  is  $\text{Ad}$ -invariant, and so the image of  $\text{Ad}_g(\psi)$  is equal to the image of  $\psi$ , which is zero. This means that the image of  $x$  is also zero. But the inclusion  $\check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp$  splits the map  $\check{\mathfrak{n}}^\perp \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$ , and so we see that  $x = 0$ . Therefore,

$$Y \cong \{g \in \check{B} \mid \text{Ad}_g(\psi) = \psi\} = Z_{\check{B}}(\psi).$$

The centralizer of  $\psi$  is contained entirely in  $\check{B}$ , so  $Z_{\check{B}}(\psi) \cong Z_{\check{G}}(\psi)$ . This, in turn, has dimension given by  $\text{rank}(\check{G})$  since  $\psi$  (corresponding to  $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ ) is a regular nilpotent.  $\square$

Note that

$$\tilde{J} \cong \{(x, y, g) \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \times \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \times \check{B} \mid \text{Ad}_g(\psi + x) = \psi + y\}.$$

The argument at the end of Lemma 6.4 allows us to identify  $x = y \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$ , and so

$$\tilde{J} \cong \{(x, g) \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \times \check{B} \mid \text{Ad}_g(\psi + x) = \psi + x\}.$$

**Notation 6.5.** If  $\alpha$  is a root of  $\check{G}$ , let  $\{e_\alpha, h_\alpha\}$  denote a pinning of  $\check{G}$ . Say that a point  $x \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  is  $\alpha$ -generic if  $x(h_\beta) \neq 0$  for all roots  $\beta \neq \alpha$ . This implies that the centralizer  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)$  has semisimple rank at most 1. Let  $\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*$  denote the  $\alpha$ -regular locus. Observe that  $\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\text{reg}}^* = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Phi} \check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^* \subseteq \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$  is open, with complement of codimension 2.

**Lemma 6.6.** *There is an isomorphism*

$$(7) \quad \tilde{J}(\check{G})|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*} \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{J}(Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ)|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*},$$

where  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)$  is the centralizer of some  $x \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*$  which lies on the  $\alpha$ -hyperplane, and  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ$  denotes the connected component of the identity.

*Proof sketch.* Let us, for simplicity, write  $\check{H}$  to denote  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ$ . There is a map from the left-hand side to the right-hand side, which sends

$$\check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \times \check{B} \ni (x, g) \mapsto (x, g) \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \times (\check{B} \cap \check{H}).$$

Note that  $\check{B} \cap \check{H}$  is a Borel subgroup of  $\check{H}$ . To see that the above map gives an isomorphism, observe that if  $y \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}^*$ , we may identify the centralizer in  $\check{G}$  of  $\psi + y$  with the centralizer in  $Z_{\check{G}}(y)^\circ$  of  $\psi$ . That (7) is an isomorphism is now a consequence of the observation that if  $y \in \check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*$ , then this centralizer  $Z_{\check{G}}(y)^\circ$  is contained in  $\check{H}$ . That is, if  $(x, g) \in \tilde{J}(\check{G})|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*}$ , then  $g$  is already contained in  $\check{H}$ , and so  $(x, g) \in \tilde{J}(\check{H})|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 6.3.* We begin by noting that  $\text{Gr}_G$  only has even cells; so  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\text{Gr}_G)^\vee = \pi_0 C_*^T(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}])$  can be identified with  $H_*^T(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$ , regarded now as an ungraded  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra. Similarly,  $\pi_0(k_T) \cong H_T^*(*; \mathbf{Q})$ , again regarded as an ungraded  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra. The equivariant formality of  $\text{Gr}_G$  implies that  $H_*^T(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is flat over  $H_T^*(*; \mathbf{Q})$ . To prove Theorem 6.3, it therefore suffices to prove an isomorphism

$$\tilde{J}|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*} \cong \text{Spec } H_*^{Tc}(\Omega G; \mathbf{Q})|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*}$$

for each root  $\alpha$ . By Atiyah-Bott localization, the right-hand side can be identified with

$$(8) \quad \text{Spec } H_*^{Tc}(\Omega G; \mathbf{Q})|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*} \cong \text{Spec } H_*^{Tc}(\Omega Z_G(x); \mathbf{Q})|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*},$$

where  $Z_G(x)$  is the centralizer of some  $x \in \mathfrak{t}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}$  which lies on the  $\alpha$ -hyperplane. Note that the right-hand side depends only on the connected component  $Z_G(x)^\circ$  of the identity in  $Z_G(x)$ ; so we might as well replace  $Z_G(x)$  by  $Z_G(x)^\circ$ . Using Lemma 6.6, we are therefore reduced to showing that there is an isomorphism

$$H_*^{Tc}(\Omega Z_G(x)^\circ; \mathbf{Q})|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*} \cong \tilde{J}(Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ)|_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}_{\alpha\text{-reg}}^*}.$$

Since  $Z_G(x)^\circ$  has semisimple rank 1, we are reduced to checking that Theorem 6.3 holds in this case.

That is, we may assume  $G$  is the product of a torus with  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ ,  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ , or  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . It is easy to match up the contribution from the toral factors, so we will assume that  $G$  is  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ ,  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ , or  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ .

- For  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ , we may identify  $\mathfrak{gl}_2^* \cong \mathfrak{gl}_2$ . Then,  $\tilde{J}$  is the centralizer (in  $\check{B}$ ) of  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 1 & y \end{pmatrix}$ . It is not hard to compute directly that  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  stabilizes  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 1 & y \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $c = \frac{a-d}{x-y}$ , meaning that

$$\tilde{J} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Q}[x, y, a^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-d}{x-y}].$$

The coproduct sends  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$  and  $d \mapsto d \otimes d$ .

Let us now calculate  $H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})$  as an algebra over  $H_{T^2}^*(*; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, y]$ . There is a simple  $T^2$ -equivariant cell decomposition of  $\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2$  with  $\mathbb{X}_*(T^2) = \mathbf{Z}^2$  many 0-cells, and where there is a  $T^2$ -equivariant 1-cell connecting  $\mu_1$  to  $\mu_2$  if and only if  $\mu_1 - \mu_2$  is a multiple of a root of  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ . (There are higher equivariant cells, but they will not matter.) This implies, by Atiyah-Bott localization, that the fixed points of the  $T^2$ -action on  $\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2$  are simply  $\Omega T^2 = \mathbf{Z}^2$ , and so

$$H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{x-y}] \cong H_*^{T^2}(\Omega T^2; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{x-y}] \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, y, \frac{1}{x-y}, a^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}].$$

On the other hand, the *completion*  $H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(x-y)}^\wedge$  can be determined directly. After completing at  $(x-y, y) = (x, y)$ , the equivariant homology  $H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})$  simply becomes the *Borel-equivariant* homology, and this can be computed directly via a spectral sequence

$$E_2 = H^*(BT^2; \mathbf{Q}) \otimes_k H_*(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \Rightarrow H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(x,y)}^\wedge.$$

Since  $H_*(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) = \mathbf{Q}[A^{\pm 1}, b]$  with  $A$  in weight 0 and  $b$  in weight 2, the  $E_2$ -page of this spectral sequence is concentrated entirely in even degrees, and hence collapses. This means that

$$H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(x,y)}^\wedge \cong k[[x, y]][A^{\pm 1}, b].$$

This in fact comes from an isomorphism

$$H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(x-y)}^\wedge \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, y, A^{\pm 1}, b]_{(x-y)}^\wedge.$$

We may therefore recover  $H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})$  via the gluing square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) & \longrightarrow & H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{x-y}] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(x-y)}^\wedge & \longrightarrow & H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(x-y)}^\wedge[\frac{1}{x-y}]. \end{array}$$

Explicitly:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Q}[x, y, \frac{1}{x-y}, a^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{Q}[x, y, A^{\pm 1}, b]_{(x-y)}^\wedge & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Q}[x, y, A^{\pm 1}, b]_{(x-y)}^\wedge[\frac{1}{x-y}]. \end{array}$$

The right vertical map sends  $a - d \mapsto b(x - y)$ ; and  $d \mapsto A$ . Note that  $b(x - y)$  is topologically nilpotent, so  $A + b(x - y)$  is a unit, and this is what  $a$  maps to. This discussion implies that the fiber product above identifies with

$$H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, y, a^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-d}{x-y}].$$

We need to determine the coproduct. Since this ring is flat over  $\mathbf{Q}[x, y]$ , it suffices to determine the coproduct after inverting  $x - y$ . As we have seen,  $H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{x-y}] \cong H_*^{T^2}(\Omega T^2; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{x-y}]$ , and  $\Omega T^2 = \mathbf{Z}^2$ . The coproduct here simply comes from the *diagonal* on  $\mathbf{Z}^2$ , which obviously sends  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$  and  $d \mapsto d \otimes d$ . It follows that

$$\mathrm{Spec} H_*^{T^2}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \tilde{J}$$

as (graded) group schemes over  $\mathbf{Q}[x, y]$ , as desired.

- For  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$ , one can similarly calculate that

$$H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, b]/(a = 1 + 2xb) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-1}{2x}].$$

The coproduct is determined by the formula  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$ , so that

$$b \mapsto b \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b + 2xb \otimes b.$$

For completeness, let us quickly summarize the argument. The fixed points of  $S^1$  acting on  $\Omega\mathrm{SU}(2)$  is  $\Omega S^1 = \mathbf{Z}$ , and the action of  $S^1$  on  $\mathrm{SU}(2) \cong S^3$  exhibits it as the one-point compactification of  $\mathbf{R} \oplus \mathbf{C}$ , where  $\mathbf{R}$  is the trivial representation and  $\mathbf{C}$  is the *weight 2* representation. Therefore, inverting the Chern class  $2x$  of the weight 2 representation lets us identify

$$H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{2x}] \cong H_*^{S^1}(\Omega S^1; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{2x}] \cong \mathbf{Q}[x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}].$$

On the other hand, the completion of  $H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q})$  at the class  $2x$  is, via the same spectral sequence argument as in the preceding bullet point, given by

$$H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(2x)}^\wedge \cong \mathbf{Q}[[x]][b],$$

with  $b$  in weight 2. The ring  $H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q})$  can be recovered via the gluing square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) & \longrightarrow & H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q})[\frac{1}{2x}] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(2x)}^\wedge & \longrightarrow & H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q})_{(2x)}^\wedge[\frac{1}{2x}]. \end{array}$$

The right vertical map sends  $a - 1 \mapsto b \cdot 2x$ , and so the above Cartesian square gives an isomorphism

$$H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, b]/(a = 1 + 2xb),$$

as desired.

On the other hand,  $\tilde{J}$  is the centralizer in  $\check{B} \subseteq \mathrm{PGL}_2$  of  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 1 & -x \end{pmatrix} \in \mathfrak{sl}_2 \cong \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ . It is easy to compute directly that  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \check{B}$  (where we only care about this as an element of  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ !) stabilizes  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 1 & -x \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $2xc = a - 1$ . Therefore,

$$\tilde{J} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, c]/(a = 1 + 2xc),$$

and again the group law is determined by the formulae

$$a \mapsto a \otimes a, \quad c \mapsto c \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes c + 2xc \otimes c.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Spec} H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \tilde{J}$$

as (graded) group schemes over  $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ , as desired.

- In exactly the same way, for  $G = \mathrm{PGL}_2$ , one can similarly calculate that

$$H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{PGL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, b]/(a^2 = 1 + xb) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a^2-1}{x}].$$

This is because the fixed points of  $S^1$  acting on  $\Omega\mathrm{PGL}_2 \simeq \mathbf{Z}/2 \times \Omega S^3$  is  $\mathbf{Z}$ , and the action of  $S^1$  on  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ , which is homotopy equivalent to  $\mathbf{R}P^3$ , exhibits it as the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -quotient of the one-point compactification of  $\mathbf{R} \oplus \mathbf{C}$ , where  $\mathbf{R}$  is the trivial representation and  $\mathbf{C}$  is the *weight* 1 representation. The coproduct is determined by the formula  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$ , so that

$$b \mapsto b \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b + xb \otimes b.$$

On the other hand,  $\tilde{J}$  is the centralizer in  $\check{B} \subseteq \mathrm{SL}_2$  of the equivalence class of  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  in  $\mathfrak{pgl}_2 \cong \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ . It is easy to compute directly that  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & a^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in \check{B}$  stabilizes  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $xc = a - a^{-1}$ . Therefore,

$$\tilde{J} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, c]/(a = a^{-1} + xc) \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Q}[x, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x}].$$

Replacing  $c$  by  $b := ca^{-1}$ , we see that the group law is determined by the formulae

$$a \mapsto a \otimes a, \quad b \mapsto b \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b + xb \otimes b.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Spec} H_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{PGL}_2; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \tilde{J}$$

as (graded) group schemes over  $\mathbf{Q}[x]$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 6.7.** Just for posterity, let us record a more canonical variant of the calculation above for  $\check{G} = \mathrm{SL}_2$ , which does not require picking a Borel subgroup (i.e., which does not involve identifying  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}/\check{G} \cong \mathfrak{b}/\check{B}$ ). For simplicity, we will use the fact that 2 is invertible in  $\mathbf{Q}$  to identify  $\mathfrak{sl}_2 \cong \mathfrak{pgl}_2$ . In this case, the Grothendieck-Springer resolution  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = T^*(\mathbf{A}^2 - \{0\})/\mathbf{G}_m$  is the total space of  $\mathcal{O}(-1) \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)$  over  $\mathbf{P}^1$ ; we will think of a point in  $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  as a pair  $(x \in \mathfrak{sl}_2, \ell \subseteq \mathbf{C}^2)$  such that  $x$  preserves  $\ell$ . The Kostant slice  $\kappa : \mathfrak{t} \cong \mathbf{A}^1 \rightarrow \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  is the map sending  $\lambda \in \mathbf{A}^1$  to the pair  $(x, \ell)$

with  $x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda^2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\ell = [\lambda : 1]$ . Indeed, this is essentially immediate from the requirement that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A}^1 \cong \mathfrak{t} & \xrightarrow{\kappa} & \widetilde{\mathfrak{sl}}_2 \\ \lambda \mapsto \lambda^2 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{A}^1 \cong \mathfrak{t} // W & \xrightarrow[\lambda \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}]{\kappa} & \mathfrak{sl}_2. \end{array}$$

Moreover, the  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ -action on  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$  sends  $g \in \mathrm{SL}_2$  and  $(x, \ell)$  to  $(\mathrm{Ad}_g(x), g\ell)$ . If  $g = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ , we compute that

$$\mathrm{Ad}_g \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda^2 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} bd - ac\lambda^2 & (a\lambda)^2 - b^2 \\ d^2 - (c\lambda)^2 & ac\lambda^2 - bd \end{pmatrix}, \quad g \cdot [\lambda : 1] = [a\lambda + b : c\lambda + d].$$

From this, we see that  $\mathrm{Ad}_g(x) = x$  if and only if  $a = d$  and  $b = c\lambda^2$ , in which case  $g$  also fixes  $[\lambda : 1]$ . In other words,  $g = \begin{pmatrix} a & c\lambda^2 \\ c & a \end{pmatrix}$  with  $a, c \in k$ ; in order for  $\det(g) = 1$ , we need  $a^2 - c^2\lambda^2 = 1$ . When  $\lambda \neq 0$ , both  $x$  and  $g$  are diagonalized by the matrix  $\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -\lambda^{-1} & -\lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathrm{SL}_2$ : the diagonalization of  $x$  is  $\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$ , and the diagonalization of  $g$  is  $\begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & w \end{pmatrix}$  where  $2a = t + w$  and  $2\lambda c = t - w$ . Since we have  $\det(g) = a^2 - (c\lambda)^2 = 1$ , we have  $w = t^{-1}$ . This shows that if  $k$  is not of characteristic 2, then  $\mathfrak{t} \times_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{sl}}_2/\mathrm{SL}_2} \mathfrak{t} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Q}[\lambda, t^{\pm 1}, \frac{t-t^{-1}}{\lambda}]$ .

**Corollary 6.8.** *There is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}).$$

Furthermore, the pushforward functor  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \rightarrow \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(*; k)$  identifies with the pullback functor  $\kappa^* : \mathrm{QCoh}(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t})$ .

*Proof.* By definition,  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  is equivalent to the category of comodules over  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee = H_*^T(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  in the category of  $\pi_0 k_T \cong H_T^*(*; \mathbf{Q})$ -modules. By Theorem 6.3, it can be identified the category of quasicoherent sheaves on the quotient stack  $(f + \mathfrak{t})/\check{J}$ . As discussed after Lemma 6.4, we may view  $\check{J}$  as a closed subgroup scheme of the constant group scheme  $\check{B} \times (f + \mathfrak{t})$ . This gives an isomorphism

$$(f + \mathfrak{t})/\check{J} \cong \check{B} \backslash (\check{B} \times (f + \mathfrak{t}))/\check{J}.$$

It follows from Kostant's work in [Kos63] that the  $\check{B}$ -orbit of  $f + \mathfrak{t}$  inside  $\mathfrak{b}$  is precisely the regular locus  $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ . Since  $\check{J}$  is definitionally the stabilizer of  $f + \mathfrak{t} \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$ , the quotient  $(\check{B} \times (f + \mathfrak{t}))/\check{J}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{reg}}$ ; so there is an isomorphism  $(f + \mathfrak{t})/\check{J} \cong \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{B}$ . To finish, note that  $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G} \cong \mathfrak{b}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{B}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.9.** Note that the definition of the Kostant slice  $f + \mathfrak{t} \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$  involved the choice of a regular nilpotent element  $f \in \mathfrak{g}$ . However, this choice does not materialize in Corollary 6.8. This is because two such slices obtained by choosing two different regular nilpotent elements in  $\mathfrak{g}$  are *conjugate* to each other (by  $\check{B}$ ). That is, while the specific inclusion  $f + \mathfrak{t} \subseteq \mathfrak{b}$  depends on the choice of  $f$ , the composite  $f + \mathfrak{t} \subseteq \mathfrak{b} \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}/\check{B}$  is independent of said choice.

Before doing so, let us make a few remarks regarding Theorem 6.3.

**Example 6.10.** Suppose  $G = \mathrm{SL}_n$ . In this case,  $H_*(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  is simply isomorphic to a polynomial algebra  $\mathbf{Q}[b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}]$  on  $n-1$  generators. The coproduct is given by  $b_j \mapsto \sum_i b_i \otimes b_{j-i}$ , where  $b_0$  is understood to be 1. This result is classical, and can be found, for instance, in [Bot58]. The proof there amounts to the following observation. Consider the map  $\mathbf{CP}^{n-1} \rightarrow \Omega\mathrm{SL}_n$  given by sending  $\ell \in \mathbf{CP}^{n-1}$  to (an appropriate rescaling of) the loop sending  $\theta \in S^1$  to rotation by angle  $\theta$  about the line  $\ell$ . Then the image of the induced map  $H_*(\mathbf{CP}^{n-1}; \mathbf{Q}) \rightarrow H_*(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  generates  $H_*(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$ ; that is,  $\mathbf{CP}^{n-1}$  is a generating complex for  $\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n$ . The formula for the coproduct comes from the coproduct on  $H_*(\mathbf{CP}^{n-1}; \mathbf{Q})$ , which is determined easily by the cup product on  $H^*(\mathbf{CP}^{n-1}; \mathbf{Q})$ . The above description of  $H_*(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  implies that  $\mathrm{Spec} H_*(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  is isomorphic to the group scheme  $\mathbf{W}_{n-1}$  of big Witt vectors of length  $n-1$ .

On the other hand, Theorem 6.3 implies that  $\mathrm{Spec} H_*(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  is isomorphic to the centralizer inside  $\mathrm{PGL}_n$  of the regular nilpotent  $f \in \mathfrak{sl}_n$ . Indeed, if  $R$  is a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra, then an element  $g \in \mathrm{GL}_n(R)$  commutes with  $f$  if and only if  $g$  is an invertible polynomial in  $e$ . By the Cayley-Hamilton theorem, such a polynomial is divisible by the minimal polynomial  $t^n$  of  $e$ ; that is,  $g \in (R[t]/t^n)^\times$ . For this to live in  $\mathrm{PGL}_n(R)$ , we need to quotient out by the scalars  $R^\times$ . The assignment  $R \mapsto (1 + tR[t]/t^n)^\times$  is precisely the functor of points of  $\mathbf{W}_{n-1}$ . One can therefore understand the isomorphism between  $\mathrm{Spec} H_*(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  and  $Z_{\mathrm{PGL}_n}(e)$  as being a way to identify the two descriptions of the Witt vector group scheme (either via its functor of points, or via the explicit Witt addition law).

**Example 6.11.** Continuing the preceding example (so  $G = \mathrm{SL}_n$ ), it is not hard to add in torus-equivariance (so  $T_c = (S^1)^{n-1}$ ). In this case, we will identify  $H_{T_c}^*(\ast; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . One can write down an explicit  $T_c$ -equivariant cell structure on  $\Omega\mathrm{SU}(n)$  to find that  $\mathrm{Spec} H_*^{T_c}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  is isomorphic to the deformation of  $\mathbf{W}_{n-1}$  over  $\mathrm{Spec} H_{T_c}^*(\ast; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathbf{A}^n$  which sends a  $\mathbf{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -algebra  $R$  to the group of units  $(1 + tR[t]/(t-x_1) \cdots (t-x_n))^\times$ . On the other hand, by the same argument using Cayley-Hamilton, the centralizer inside  $\mathrm{GL}_n(R)$  of  $f + x \in \mathfrak{sl}_n$  is isomorphic to the group  $(R[t]/(t-x_1) \cdots (t-x_n))^\times$ , since the characteristic polynomial of  $f + x$  is precisely  $(t-x_1) \cdots (t-x_n)$ . Quotienting by the scalars  $R^\times$ , we obtain an isomorphism between  $\mathrm{Spec} H_*^{T_c}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_n; \mathbf{Q})$  and  $Z_{\mathrm{PGL}_n}(f+x)$ .

**Remark 6.12.** For a general reductive group  $G$ , Kostant proved (in [Kos78]) an isomorphism  $(f + \mathfrak{b})/\check{N} \cong \mathfrak{t}/W$ . In fact, the natural map  $(f + \mathfrak{b})/\check{N} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}/\check{G}$  identifies with the map  $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}/\check{G}$  given by the Kostant slice. Since  $(f + \mathfrak{b})/\check{N}$  is isomorphic to the quotient  $\check{G} \backslash T^*(\check{G}/_\psi \check{N})$  of the Whittaker reduction of  $T^*(\check{G})$ , it follows that there are isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \check{J} &\cong (f + \mathfrak{b})/\check{N} \times_{\mathfrak{g}/\check{G}} (f + \mathfrak{b})/\check{N} \\ &\cong \check{G} \backslash T^*(\check{G}/_\psi \check{N}) \times_{\mathfrak{g}^*/\check{G}} T^*(\check{N}_\psi \backslash \check{G})/\check{G} \\ &\cong T^*(\check{N}_\psi \backslash \check{G}/_\psi \check{N}). \end{aligned}$$

That is,  $\check{J}$  can be identified with the *bi-Whittaker reduction* of the cotangent bundle  $T^*(\check{G})$ . In particular, Theorem 6.3 gives an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Spec} H_*^{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \times_{\check{\mathfrak{t}}^*/W} T^*(\check{N}_\psi \backslash \check{G}/_\psi \check{N}).$$

In fact, this isomorphism can be checked to be  $W$ -equivariant (for the action of  $W$  on  $H_*^{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  via the action on  $T$ , and for the action on the right-hand side

coming from the cover  $\check{\mathfrak{t}}^* \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{t}}^* // W$ ). This implies that there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Spec} H_*^G(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}) \cong T^*(\check{N}_\psi \backslash \check{G} / {}_\psi \check{N}).$$

This isomorphism has been exploited heavily in [Tel14], among others.

We will now discuss a *deformation quantization* of Corollary 6.8 by adding loop-rotation equivariance. Write  $\tilde{T} = T \times \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}$  to denote the corresponding affine torus. In the case when  $G$  is a torus, we have already discussed this in Section 5. For more general  $G$ , this turns out to be a bit tricky: while  $H_*^{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is a bicommutative Hopf algebra<sup>11</sup>, the loop-rotation equivariant homology  $H_*^{\tilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is only a cocommutative coalgebroid over  $H_{\tilde{T}_c}^*(*; \mathbf{Q})$ . That is, it does not admit an algebra structure. While this is not a mathematical issue, it does make the task of explicitly understanding  $H_*^{\tilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  in a satisfactory way more complicated. Instead, it turns out to be easier to describe  $H_*^{\tilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$ , where  $\mathrm{Fl}_G$  is the *affine flag variety*, defined as the quotient  $G((t))/I$  for the Iwahori subgroup  $I \subseteq G[[t]]$  associated to a Borel subgroup  $B \subseteq G$ . To state the result, we need a definition from [GKV97].

**Definition 6.13.** Let  $(\Lambda, \Phi, \check{\Lambda}, \check{\Phi})$  be a root datum with associated Weyl group  $W$  and torus  $T = \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, \mathbf{G}_m)$ . Let  $\Delta$  be a base of simple roots, let  $\Phi^+$  denote the corresponding set of positive roots, and let  $\Phi'$  denote the subset  $W \cdot \Delta \subseteq \Phi$ . Let  $\mathbf{H}$  be a 1-dimensional group scheme (over a commutative ring  $R$ ). As in Definition 5.1, let  $\mathbf{H}_T = \mathrm{Hom}(\Lambda, T)$ , and for each character  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , let  $\mathbf{H}_{T_\lambda} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{H}_T$  denote the subgroup corresponding to the subtorus  $T_\lambda = \ker(\lambda) \subseteq T$ . Let  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})$  denote the sheaf of functions on the generic point of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}$ . The twisted group algebra  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})[W]$  is the algebra which is additively given by the tensor product  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}) \otimes_F F[W]$ , and whose multiplication law is given by

$$(f_1 \otimes w_1) \cdot (f_2 \otimes w_2) = (f \cdot w_1 g) \otimes (w_1 w_2).$$

The algebra  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, T, W)$  is defined to be the subset of  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})[W]$  of those elements  $\sum_{w \in W} f_w[w]$  such that:

- The poles of  $f_x$  all have order  $\leq 1$ , and these are contained in the divisors  $\mathbf{H}_{T_\alpha}$  for each  $\alpha \in \Phi'$ .
- For each  $w \in W$  and  $\alpha \in \Phi^+ \cap \Phi'$ , we have

$$\mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{H}_{T_\alpha}}(f_w) + \mathrm{Res}_{\mathbf{H}_{T_\alpha}}(f_{s_\alpha w}) = 0.$$

In [GKV97], this algebra is denoted  $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ . It is proved in [GKV97, Theorem 1.4] that  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, T, W)$  is a *subalgebra* of  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})[W]$ .

**Remark 6.14.** The pair  $(Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}), Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})[W])$  admits the structure of a (co-)commutative Hopf algebroid; we will abusively say that  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})[W]$  admits the structure of a Hopf  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})$ -algebroid. The coproduct comes from the diagonal on  $W$ ; the left unit comes from the inclusion  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}) \subseteq Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})[W]$ ; and the right unit comes from the action of  $W$  on  $\mathbf{H}_T$  (which defines a coaction of  $W$  on  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}$  that extends to a coaction on  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})$ ). The resulting Hopf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}$ -algebroid structure on  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T})[W]$  restricts to  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, T, \mathcal{R})$ , so that  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, T, \mathcal{R})$  admits the structure of a (cocommutative) Hopf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}$ -algebroid.

<sup>11</sup>To be more precise, the  $\mathbf{E}_2$ -space structure on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  equips  $C_*^{T_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  with the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_2$ -algebra in  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -coalgebras over  $C_{T_c}^*(*; \mathbf{Q})$ .



If  $\Lambda$  denotes the coroot lattice of  $G$ , let  $W^{\text{aff}} = \Lambda \rtimes W$  denote the corresponding affine Weyl group, and let  $\widetilde{W} = \mathbb{X}_*(T) \rtimes W$  denote the extended affine Weyl group.<sup>12</sup> For clarity, note that the action of  $\widetilde{W}$  on  $\mathbb{X}^*(T)$  (and hence on  $\mathbf{H}_T$ ) is given as follows: if  $\alpha$  is a coweight of  $T$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the generator  $s_{\alpha, n}$  of  $W^{\text{aff}}$  acts on  $\mathbb{X}^*(T)$  by reflection along the affine hyperplane  $\{x \in \mathbb{X}^*(T) \mid \langle x, \alpha \rangle = n\}$ . The *degenerate nil-Hecke algebra*  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W})$  is defined to be  $\mathbb{X}_*(T) \rtimes_{\Lambda} \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, \widetilde{T}, W^{\text{aff}})$ . In the following discussion, we will simply write  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}]$  to denote  $\mathbb{X}_*(T) \rtimes_{\Lambda} Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}})[W^{\text{aff}}]$ , so that  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W})$  is contained in  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}]$ .

There is a natural inclusion  $\mathcal{D}_{\widetilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}[W] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W})$  of (sheaves of) algebras. The following result can be proved exactly as in [Gin18, Proposition 7.2.4]; one only has to use [GKV97, Proposition 2.3] in place of [Gin18, Lemma 7.1.5], and also observe that the arguments of [Lon17] generalize to the setting of descent along the map  $\mathbf{H}_T/W \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_T//W$ .

**Proposition 6.15.** *Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be  $\mathcal{D}_{\widetilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}[W]$ -module<sup>13</sup>. Then the action of  $\mathcal{D}_{\widetilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}[W]$  extends (necessarily uniquely) along the inclusion  $\mathcal{D}_{\widetilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}[W] \hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W})$  if and only if the natural map  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_T}} \mathcal{F}^W \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$  is an isomorphism.*

**Remark 6.16.** Let us remark on a relationship to [Gan22b]. Following *loc. cit.*, let  $\Gamma_{W^{\text{aff}}}$  denote the ind-scheme given by the union of graphs of the affine Weyl group  $W^{\text{aff}}$  acting on  $\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}$ , and let  $\Gamma_{\widetilde{W}}$  denote  $\widetilde{W} \times^{W^{\text{aff}}} \mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}$ . Then there are two projections  $\Gamma_{\widetilde{W}} \rightrightarrows \mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}$ . This can be extended to a simplicial diagram  $\Gamma_{\bullet}$  of ind-schemes. Define the stack  $\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}//\widetilde{W}$  to be the geometric realization of  $\Gamma_{\bullet}$ . (For instance, if  $W$  is trivial, this is the quotient  $\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}/\mathbb{X}_*(T)$ . Similarly, if  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}_a$ , so that  $\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}} \cong \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathbf{A}_h^1$ , then the specialization of the quotient  $\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}//\widetilde{W}$  to  $\hbar = 1$  agrees with the quotient  $\mathfrak{t}//\widetilde{W}$  from [Gan22b].) In general, there is a map of stacks  $\phi : \mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}//\widetilde{W} \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}//\widetilde{W}$ . By arguing exactly as in [Gan22b, Theorem 4.23], one can show that the pullback functor  $\phi^!$  is fully faithful; and furthermore, an object of  $\text{IndCoh}(\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}//\widetilde{W})$  descends<sup>14</sup> along  $\phi$  if and only if the corresponding object of  $\text{IndCoh}(\mathbf{H}_T/W)$  descends to  $\mathbf{H}_T//W$ . Since Remark 5.2 gives an equivalence between  $\text{IndCoh}(\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}//\widetilde{W})$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{\widetilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}[W]\text{-mod}$ , Proposition 6.15 can be used to obtain an equivalence between  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W})\text{-mod}$  and  $\text{IndCoh}(\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}//\widetilde{W})$ .

Proposition 3.15 yields the following result due to Kostant and Kumar [KK90, KK86, Kum02], which (as we will explain momentarily) could also be seen as a consequence of results from [Gin18, Lon18, BF08]. In the discussion below,  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}_a$ . Note that  $\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}_c}^*(*)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{T}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}}$ .

**Theorem 6.17.** *There is an isomorphism of associative  $\mathbf{Q}[\hbar]$ -algebras*

$$(9) \quad \mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}_c}^*(\text{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W}).$$

<sup>12</sup>The affine Weyl group  $W^{\text{aff}}$  introduced above is very slightly different from the affine Weyl group studied in [Gin18, Section 7.2] or [Gan22b]; the affine Weyl group there is the semidirect product  $W^{\text{aff}} = \check{\Lambda} \rtimes W$ , where  $\check{\Lambda}$  is the root lattice of  $G$ . When  $G$  is simply-laced, these are, of course, isomorphic; but they differ otherwise.

<sup>13</sup>Here, we mean a module in the usual, underived, sense of the word; but it is easy to generalize the statement to the setting of perfect  $\mathcal{D}_{\widetilde{T}}^{\mathbf{H}}[W]$ -modules by induction on the length of the bounded complex.

<sup>14</sup>That is, it lies in the essential image of the left adjoint  $\phi^!$  to  $\phi_*^{\text{IndCoh}}$ .

Here,  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is equipped with the associative algebra structure coming from convolution. Moreover, the above isomorphism is also one of (cocommutative) Hopf  $H_{\tilde{T}^c}^*(*; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}}$ -algebroids.

*Proof.* The affine flag variety  $\mathrm{Fl}_G$  is an ind-finite GKM space in the sense of Definition 3.12, and so we may use Proposition 3.15 to describe  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$ . The GKM graph of  $\mathrm{Fl}_G$  has set of vertices given by  $\mathrm{Fl}_G^{\tilde{T}^c} = \mathbb{X}_*(T) \rtimes W \cong \widetilde{W}$ , and an edge  $w \rightarrow s_{\alpha,n}w$  for each affine reflection  $s_{\alpha,n} \in \widetilde{W}$ . In particular, if  $\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}$  denotes the complement of the union of affine hyperplanes in  $\widetilde{W}$ , then  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is a subalgebra of  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G^{\tilde{T}^c}; \mathbf{Q})|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}}$ . The latter is isomorphic to  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\widetilde{W}; \mathbf{Q})|_{\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}}$ , which in turn can be identified (using Proposition 5.4, for instance) with a localization of  $\mathcal{D}_T^h[W]$ . This localization of  $\mathcal{D}_T^h[W]$  is isomorphic to  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}]$ , so  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is a subalgebra of  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}]$ .

Proposition 3.15 now gives an isomorphism between the two subsets

$$H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q}) \subseteq Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}] \supseteq \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \widetilde{W}).$$

To see that this is an isomorphism of subalgebras, simply observe that both  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \widetilde{W})$  inherit their multiplicative structure from  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}]$ . That this is an isomorphism of Hopf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}}$ -algebroids is also elementary: for instance, the coproduct on both  $H_*^{\tilde{T}^c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  and  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \widetilde{W})$  are inherited from the  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}}$ -linear coproduct on  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}]$  coming from the diagonal on  $\mathrm{Fl}_G^{\tilde{T}^c} = \widetilde{W}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.18.** The left-hand side of Theorem 6.17 admits an obvious grading; on the right-hand side, the resulting grading on  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \widetilde{W})$  can be identified with that inherited from  $Q(\mathcal{O}_{(\mathbf{G}_a)_{\tilde{T}}})[\widetilde{W}]$ , where the coordinates of  $(\mathbf{G}_a)_{\tilde{T}}$  are placed in weight 2.

Moreover, Theorem 6.17 holds even if  $\mathbf{Q}$  is replaced by  $\mathbf{Z}$  (as long as, on the right-hand side,  $\mathbf{G}_a$  is viewed as defined over  $\mathbf{Z}$ ).

**Remark 6.19.** Suppose  $W$  is finite. Then [GKV97, Proposition 2.3] states that the action of  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, T, W)$  on  $\mathcal{O}_{(\mathbf{G}_a)_T} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}}$  gives an isomorphism between  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, T, W)$  and  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}}^W}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}})$ . Its  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -linear dual is therefore  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}}^W} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t} \times_{\mathfrak{t}} // W}$ . Note that this naturally admits the structure a cocommutative Hopf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -algebroid. The analogue of Theorem 6.17 states that there is an isomorphism  $H_*^{T^c}(G_c/T_c; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, T, W)$  of (cocommutative) Hopf  $H_{T_c}^*(*; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t}}$ -algebroids.

Let  $\mathbf{e} = \frac{1}{|W|} \sum_{w \in W} [w]$  denote the symmetrizer, viewed as an element of  $\mathbf{Q}[W]$ . The spherical subalgebra  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \widetilde{W})^{\mathrm{sph}}$  is defined to be  $\mathbf{e}\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \widetilde{W})\mathbf{e}$ . The following result is now an easy consequence of Theorem 6.17.

**Corollary 6.20.** *There is an isomorphism of associative  $\mathbf{Q}[\hbar]$ -algebras*

$$H_*^{G_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \widetilde{W})^{\mathrm{sph}}.$$

Here,  $H_*^{G_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is equipped with the associative algebra structure coming from convolution. Moreover, the above isomorphism is also one of (cocommutative) Hopf  $H_{G_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}^*(*; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t} // W \times \mathbf{A}_h^1}$ -algebroids.

Let  $\mathcal{D}_G^{\hbar}$  denote the algebra of (rescaled) differential operators on  $\check{G}$ , and let  $\check{N}_\psi \backslash \mathcal{D}_G^{\hbar} /_\psi \check{N}$  denote its bi-Whittaker reduction (that is, its two-sided Hamiltonian reduction by the left and right actions of  $\check{N}$  with respect to a nondegenerate character  $\psi : \check{\mathfrak{n}} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_a$ ). Corollary 6.20 and [Gin18, Theorem 1.2.1] yield:

**Corollary 6.21** ([BF08, Theorem 3]). *There is an isomorphism of associative  $\mathbf{Q}[\hbar]$ -algebras*

$$H_*^{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \check{N}_\psi \backslash \mathcal{D}_G^{\hbar} /_\psi \check{N}.$$

Note that via the diagonal on  $\check{G}$ , the bi-Whittaker reduction  $\check{N}_\psi \backslash \mathcal{D}_G^{\hbar} /_\psi \check{N}$  admits the structure of a (cocommutative) Hopf algebroid over  $U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})/_\psi \check{N}$ ; by [Kos78], the latter is isomorphic to  $Z(U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})) \cong \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{t}^*)^W[\hbar]$ . Again, one can verify that the isomorphism of Corollary 6.21 is one of commutative Hopf coalgebroids over  $H_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^*(\mathfrak{t}^*; \mathbf{Q}) \cong \text{Sym}(\mathfrak{t}^*)^W[\hbar]$ .

**Remark 6.22.** Since  $H_*^{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is Morita equivalent to  $H_*^{T_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})$ , Remark 6.16, Theorem 6.17, Corollary 6.20, and Corollary 6.21 together tell us that there are equivalences of categories

$$\begin{aligned} H_*^{T_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q})\text{-mod} &\simeq H_*^{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})\text{-mod} \\ &\simeq \check{N}_\psi \backslash \mathcal{D}_G^{\hbar} /_\psi \check{N}\text{-mod} \simeq \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \tilde{T}, \tilde{W})\text{-mod} \simeq \text{IndCoh}(\tilde{\mathfrak{t}}/\tilde{W}). \end{aligned}$$

**Definition 6.23.** Denote by  $\text{HC}_G^{\hbar}$  the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathcal{D}_G^{\hbar}\text{-mod}^{\check{G} \times \check{G}, \text{weak}} \simeq U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})\text{-mod}^{\check{G}, \text{weak}}$  of Harish-Chandra bimodules. Let  $\kappa_{\hbar} : \text{HC}_G^{\hbar} \rightarrow U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})\text{-mod}^{(\check{N}, \psi)}$  denote the Kostant functor of [BF08, Section 2.3], so that it is given by the composite

$$\text{HC}_G^{\hbar} \xrightarrow{\text{forget}} U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})\text{-mod} \xrightarrow{\text{Av}_{\check{N}, \psi}} U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})\text{-mod}^{(\check{N}, \psi)}.$$

Note that by Skryabin’s theorem (see the appendix of [Pre02]), there is an equivalence  $U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{g}})\text{-mod}^{(\check{N}, \psi)} \simeq \text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t}/\!/W \times \mathbf{A}_{\hbar}^1)$ . Define  $(\text{HC}_G^{\hbar})_{\text{reg}}$  to denote the localizing subcategory of  $\text{HC}_G^{\hbar}$  on which  $\kappa_{\hbar}$  is conservative.

One can check that upon “setting  $\hbar = 1$ ”, the category  $(\text{HC}_G^{\hbar})_{\text{reg}}$  identifies with the category  $\mathcal{HC}_{\text{nondeg}}$  from [Gan22a, Remark 4.22].<sup>15</sup> Before proceeding, we need a category-theoretic result, which follows from [Lur16, Corollary 4.7.5.3].

**Proposition 6.24.** *Let  $\mathcal{C}^\bullet$  be an augmented cosimplicial presentable stable  $\infty$ -category. Suppose that:*

- (a) *For every  $[n] \in \Delta^+$ , the face map  $d^0 : \mathcal{C}^i \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^{i+1}$  admits a left adjoint  $(d^0)^L$ .*

<sup>15</sup>Let me note here my strong opposition to “setting  $\hbar = 1$ ”. As we have seen above,  $\hbar$  arises naturally as a generator of  $H_{S_{\text{rot}}^1}^2(\mathfrak{t}^*; \mathbf{Q})$ , and as such, it lives in *nonzero grading*. It is therefore not sensible to set  $\hbar$  to be equal to a nonzero number. A better – and in some sense equivalent – way to “set  $\hbar = 1$ ” in a graded  $\mathbf{Q}[\hbar]$ -module/category  $M_{\hbar}$  is to extract the weight zero piece of the localization  $M_{\hbar}[\hbar^{-1}]$ . Doing this procedure to  $(\text{HC}_G^{\hbar})_{\text{reg}}$  will product  $\mathcal{HC}_{\text{nondeg}}$ .

- (b) The “Beck-Chevalley conditions” hold. That is, for every morphism  $\alpha : [m] \rightarrow [n]$  in  $\Delta^+$ , the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{C}^{m+1} & \xrightarrow{([0] \star \alpha)^*} & \mathcal{C}^{n+1} \\ (d^0)^L \downarrow & & \downarrow (d^0)^L \\ \mathcal{C}^m & \xrightarrow{\alpha^*} & \mathcal{C}^n. \end{array}$$

Then the functor  $\mathcal{C}^{-1} \rightarrow \text{Tot}(\mathcal{C}^\bullet|_{N(\Delta)})$  admits a fully faithful right adjoint; moreover, the essential image of this functor identifies with the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{C}^{-1}$  on which the functor  $\mathcal{C}^{-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  is conservative.

**Corollary 6.25.** Recall the category  $\text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  from Remark 4.7. There is an equivalence

$$\text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \simeq (\text{HC}_G^h)_{\text{reg}}.$$

Furthermore, the pushforward functor  $\text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \rightarrow \text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(*; k)$  identifies with the functor  $\kappa_h : (\text{HC}_G^h)_{\text{reg}} \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t}/W \times \mathbf{A}_h^1)$ .

*Proof.* By definition,  $\text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  is the  $\infty$ -category of left comodules over  $H_*^{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  in  $\text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(*; k)$ . The latter category can be identified with

$$\text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(*; k) \simeq \text{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t}/W \times \mathbf{A}_h^1) \simeq U_h(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod}^{(\tilde{N}, \psi)}.$$

Let us denote this category by  $\mathcal{C}^0$ . Corollary 6.21 gives an isomorphism  $H_*^{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \cong \tilde{N}_\psi \backslash \mathcal{D}_G^h /_\psi \tilde{N}$ . Just as in Skryabin’s theorem, there is an equivalence

$$\tilde{N}_\psi \backslash \mathcal{D}_G^h /_\psi \tilde{N}\text{-mod} \simeq \mathcal{D}_G^h\text{-mod}^{(\tilde{N} \times \tilde{N}, \psi \times \psi)}.$$

The Hopf algebroid structure on the pair  $(U_h(\mathfrak{g})/_\psi \tilde{N}, \tilde{N}_\psi \backslash \mathcal{D}_G^h /_\psi \tilde{N})$  defines a cosimplicial diagram

$$\mathcal{C}^0 \rightrightarrows \mathcal{C}^1 \rightrightarrows \mathcal{C}^1 \otimes_{\mathcal{C}^0} \mathcal{C}^1 \rightrightarrows \dots$$

The preceding discussion implies that its totalization is equivalent to  $\text{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$ .

There are equivalences

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^0 &= U_h(\mathfrak{g})\text{-mod}^{(\tilde{N}, \psi)} \simeq \mathcal{D}_G^h\text{-mod}^{(\tilde{G}, \text{weak}), (\tilde{N}, \psi)}, \\ \mathcal{C}^1 &= \mathcal{D}_G^h\text{-mod}^{(\tilde{N} \times \tilde{N}, \psi \times \psi)} \simeq \mathcal{C}^0 \otimes_{\text{HC}_G^h} \mathcal{C}^0 \simeq \text{End}_{\text{HC}_G^h}(\mathcal{C}^0), \end{aligned}$$

which refine to give an equivalence of cosimplicial  $\infty$ -categories

$$\mathcal{C}^\bullet \simeq (\mathcal{C}^0)^{\otimes_{\text{HC}_G^h} \bullet + 1}.$$

Observe that  $\mathcal{C}^\bullet$  extends to an augmented cosimplicial  $\infty$ -category  $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}^\bullet}$  by setting  $\mathcal{C}^{-1} = \text{HC}_G^h$ , where the functor  $\mathcal{C}^{-1} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^0$  induced by the unique morphism  $[-1] \rightarrow [0]$  in  $\Delta^+$  is given by the Kostant functor  $\kappa_h$ . It is straightforward to check that both conditions in Proposition 6.24 hold for  $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}^\bullet}$ , so we find that  $\text{Tot}(\mathcal{C}^\bullet)$  is equivalent to the localizing subcategory  $(\text{HC}_G^h)_{\text{reg}}$  of  $\mathcal{C}^{-1} = \text{HC}_G^h$  spanned those objects on which the Kostant functor is conservative.  $\square$

**Remark 6.26.** One can also deduce Corollary 6.25 from [BF08], as discussed in [Lon18]. This, combined with [Gin18, Theorem 1.2.1], gives an alternative proof of Theorem 6.17 assuming the results of [BF08]. However, as mentioned in the introduction to this section, we specifically do *not* want to appeal to [BF08], since it does not have analogues in the K-theoretic or elliptic settings.

**Remark 6.27.** There is a Kostant functor

$$\kappa_{\hbar} : \mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})^{(\check{G} \times \check{T}, \text{weak})} \rightarrow U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{t}})\text{-mod} \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t} \times \mathbf{A}_{\hbar}^1)$$

given by the composite

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})^{(\check{G} \times \check{T}, \text{weak})} &\xrightarrow{\text{forget}} \mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})^{(\check{T}, \text{weak})} \\ &\xrightarrow{\mathrm{Av}_{\check{N}, \psi}} \mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})^{(\check{T}, \text{weak}), (\check{N}, \psi)} \\ &\simeq \mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{T})^{(\check{T}, \text{weak})} \simeq U_{\hbar}(\check{\mathfrak{t}})\text{-mod}. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\kappa_{\hbar}$ , one can define an  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})_{\mathrm{reg}}^{(\check{G} \times \check{T}, \text{weak})}$ . Just as in Corollary 6.25, there is an equivalence

$$(10) \quad \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})_{\mathrm{reg}}^{(\check{G} \times \check{T}, \text{weak})}.$$

Furthermore, the pushforward functor  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \rightarrow \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}^{\mathrm{gr}}(*; k)$  identifies with the Kostant functor  $\mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})_{\mathrm{reg}}^{(\check{G} \times \check{T}, \text{weak})} \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathfrak{t} \times \mathbf{A}_{\hbar}^1)$ . The arguments in this case are slightly more subtle, though: the equivariant homology  $H_*^{\check{T}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  no longer admits an algebra structure, but it still does admit the structure of a cocommutative coalgebra over  $H_{\check{T}_c}^*(\mathfrak{t}; \mathbf{Q})$ . In fact,  $H_*^{\check{T}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q})$  is isomorphic as a  $(H_*^{G_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{Q}), H_*^{\check{T}_c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G; \mathbf{Q}))$ -bimodule to the  $(\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \check{T}, \check{W}), \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \check{T}, \check{W}))$ -bimodule  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_a, \check{T}, \check{W})\mathbf{e}$ . (This bimodule is denoted  $\mathbb{M}_{\hbar}$  in [Gin18, Theorem 8.1.2].)

**Remark 6.28.** Just as Corollary 2.11 can be viewed as a “generic” version of the Arkhipov-Bezrukavnikov-Ginzburg [ABG04] equivalence

$$\mathrm{Shv}_I^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}/\check{G}),$$

the equivalence Corollary 6.25 can be viewed as a “generic” version of the Bezrukavnikov-Finkelberg [BF08] equivalence

$$\mathrm{Shv}_{G(\mathfrak{o}) \rtimes \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}}^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{HC}_{\check{G}}^{\hbar}.$$

Similarly, the equivalence of (10) can be viewed as a “generic” version of the quantized Arkhipov-Bezrukavnikov-Ginzburg equivalence

$$\mathrm{Shv}_{I \rtimes \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}}^c(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \simeq \mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})^{(\check{G} \times \check{T}, \text{weak})}.$$

Unfortunately, I am not aware of a reference for this final statement, but it can be deduced easily from the work of Ginzburg-Riche in [GR15].

## 7. THE K-THEORETIC STORY

Our goal in this section is to prove an analogue of Corollary 6.8, albeit with coefficients in  $k = \text{KU}$ . Note that in this case,  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0} \cong T$ . To do so, we need an analogue of Definition 6.1 and constructions surrounding it. Recall that the group  $G$  (over  $\mathbf{C}$ ) is connected, almost simple, and simply-laced. We will also fix an algebraically closed field  $F$  of characteristic zero, over which the Langlands dual group  $\check{G}$  will live. When dealing with the algebraic geometry (as opposed to the topology) of  $G$ , we will also view it as living over  $F$ ; since  $G$  is simply-laced, it is isogenous to  $\check{G}$ .

**Definition 7.1.** Let  $G^{\text{sc}}$  denote the simply-connected cover of  $G$ , and let  $f \in G^{\text{sc}}$  be a principal nilpotent element as defined in [Ste65, Theorem 4.6]. We will denote its image under the map  $G^{\text{sc}} \rightarrow G$  also by  $f$ . Then the map  $\mathbf{G}_a \rightarrow G$  corresponding to  $e$  factors through the map  $\mathbf{G}_a = B \rightarrow \text{SL}_2$ ; we will denote the image of the standard generator  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  under the map  $\text{SL}_2 \rightarrow G$  by  $e \in G$ . Let  $Z_G(e)^\circ$  be the connected component of the identity in the centralizer of  $e$  in  $G$ . Define the *multiplicative Kostant slice*  $\mathcal{S}_\mu$  by  $f \cdot Z_G(e)^\circ \subseteq G$ . Since  $G$  is assumed to be simply-connected, the composite

$$\mathcal{S}_\mu \rightarrow G \rightarrow G//G \cong G//\check{G} \cong T//W$$

is an isomorphism. We will often denote the inclusion of the Kostant slice by  $\kappa : T//W \rightarrow G$ .

The *multiplicative Grothendieck-Springer resolution*  $\tilde{\check{G}}$  is defined as

$$\tilde{\check{G}} = B \times^{\check{B}} \check{G},$$

where  $\check{B}$  acts on  $B$  by conjugation. (This makes sense thanks to the assumption that  $G$  is simply-laced.) There is a natural map  $\tilde{\check{G}} \rightarrow G$ , given by the conjugation action of  $\check{G}$  on  $B$ . Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu$  denote the fiber product  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu \times_G \tilde{\check{G}}$ , so that the composite

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu \rightarrow \tilde{\check{G}} \rightarrow T$$

is an isomorphism; we will denote the inclusion of  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu$  as a map  $\kappa : \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu \cong T \rightarrow \tilde{\check{G}}$ .

As with the additive Kostant slice, we will only care about the composite  $T \rightarrow \tilde{\check{G}} \rightarrow \tilde{\check{G}}/\check{G}$  below, so we will also denote it by  $\kappa$ . If we identify  $\tilde{\check{G}}/\check{G} \cong B/\check{B}$ , then the map  $\kappa$  admits a simple description: it is the composite  $f \cdot T \rightarrow B \rightarrow B/\check{B}$ .

**Definition 7.2.** The stabilizer (inside  $\check{G}$ ) of the multiplicative Kostant slice  $\mathcal{S}_\mu \subseteq G^{\text{reg}}$  is a closed subgroup scheme of the constant group scheme  $\check{G} \times \mathcal{S}_\mu$ , and will be denoted by  $\check{J}_\mu$ . It will be called the *multiplicative regular centralizer group scheme*; if we wish to emphasize the dependence on  $G$ , we will denote it by  $\check{J}_\mu(G)$ . Note that since the composite  $\mathcal{S}_\mu \rightarrow G^{\text{reg}} \rightarrow G//\check{G}$  is an isomorphism, we may identify

$$\check{J}_\mu \cong \mathcal{S}_\mu \times_{G/\check{G}} \mathcal{S}_\mu.$$

Similarly, the stabilizer (inside  $\check{G}$ ) of the multiplicative Kostant slice  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu \subseteq \tilde{\check{G}}^{\text{reg}}$  is a closed subgroup scheme of the constant group scheme  $\check{G} \times \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu$ , and will be denoted by  $\tilde{\check{J}}_\mu$ . Since  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu \cong \mathcal{S}_\mu \times_G \tilde{\check{G}}$ , we may identify

$$\tilde{\check{J}}_\mu \cong \check{J}_\mu \times_{\mathcal{S}_\mu} \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\mu \cong (f \cdot T) \times_{B/\check{B}} (f \cdot T).$$

**Theorem 7.3.** *There is an isomorphism of group schemes over  $f \cdot T \cong T \cong \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ :*

$$\mathrm{Spec}(\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F) \cong (f \cdot T) \times_{B/\tilde{B}} (f \cdot T).$$

Just as in Theorem 6.3, the proof of Theorem 7.3 will rely on two lemmas.

**Lemma 7.4.** *The projection map  $\tilde{J}_\mu \rightarrow f \cdot T$  (onto either factor) is flat.*

*Proof.* Like in the proof of Lemma 6.4, it suffices, by miracle flatness, to show that the fibers of the map  $\tilde{J}_\mu \rightarrow f \cdot T$  have dimension exactly  $\mathrm{rank}(\check{G})$ . The fiber of this map over  $f \cdot x \in f \cdot T$  is the scheme

$$Y = \{(g, y) \in \tilde{B} \times T \mid \mathrm{Ad}_g(fy) = fx\}.$$

Observe that the image of  $\mathrm{Ad}_g(fy)$  and  $fx$  (viewed as elements of  $B$ ) under the map  $B \rightarrow T$  are  $y$  and  $x$ ; so  $y = x$  in  $T$ , which means that  $Y$  is isomorphic to the centralizer  $Z_{\tilde{B}}(fx)$ . The dimension estimate is equivalent to the claim that  $fx$  is a regular element of  $G$ , since this means that its centralizer has minimal dimension (namely, the rank of  $G$ , which is also the rank of  $\check{G}$ ). The desired regularity of  $fx$  follows from the discussion in [Ste65, Remark 4.7]. (Note that, as mentioned in *loc. cit.*, the specific choice of the regular unipotent  $f$  is crucial for the regularity of  $fx$ .)  $\square$

**Notation 7.5.** Let  $\alpha$  be a root of  $\check{G}$ . Say that a point  $x \in T$  is  $\alpha$ -generic if  $x(h_\beta) \neq 1$  for all roots  $\beta \neq \alpha$ . This implies that the centralizer  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)$  has semisimple rank at most 1. Let  $T_{\alpha\text{-reg}}$  denote the  $\alpha$ -regular locus. Observe that  $T_{\mathrm{reg}} = \bigcup_{\alpha \in \Phi} T_{\alpha\text{-reg}} \subseteq T$  is open, with complement of codimension 2.

The proof of the next result is exactly as in Lemma 6.6.

**Lemma 7.6.** *There is an isomorphism*

$$(11) \quad \tilde{J}_\mu(\check{G})|_{T_{\alpha\text{-reg}}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{J}_\mu(Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ)|_{T_{\alpha\text{-reg}}},$$

where  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)$  is the centralizer of some  $x \in T_{\alpha\text{-reg}}$  which lies on the  $\alpha$ -hyperplane, and  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ$  denotes the connected component of the identity.

*Proof of Theorem 7.3.* The argument of Theorem 6.3 reduces us to checking that the isomorphism of Theorem 7.3 holds if  $G$  has semisimple rank 1, i.e., is the product of a torus with one of  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ ,  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ , or  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . Again, it is easy to match up the contributions from the toral factors, so we will assume that  $G$  is either  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ ,  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ , or  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . In this case, we can even replace  $F$  by  $\mathbf{Z}$ .

- When  $G = \mathrm{GL}_2$ , we may identify  $\tilde{J}_\mu$  with the centralizer (in  $\tilde{B}$ ) of  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ x & y \end{pmatrix}$ . It is easy to compute that  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  stabilizes  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ x & y \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $c = \frac{a-d}{x-y} \cdot x$ , meaning that

$$\tilde{J}_\mu \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Z}[x^{\pm 1}, y^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-d}{x-y}].$$

The coproduct sends  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$  and  $d \mapsto d \otimes d$ . The same argument as in Theorem 6.3 implies that

$$\mathrm{KU}_*^{T^c}(\Omega \mathrm{GL}_2) \cong \mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}, x^{\pm 1}, y^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-d}{x-y}].$$

The map induced on  $T$ -equivariant KU-homology by the inclusion  $T^2 \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2$  is simply given by the inclusion of the subalgebra  $\mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}, x^{\pm 1}, y^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, d^{\pm 1}]$ .

The coproduct on this subalgebra (and hence, on  $\mathrm{KU}_*^{T_c}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2)$ ) is determined by the formulas  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$  and  $d \mapsto d \otimes d$ . It follows that  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{KU}_0^{T_c}(\Omega\mathrm{GL}_2)$  is isomorphic to  $\tilde{J}_\mu$  as group schemes over  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0 \mathrm{KU}_{T_c} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Z}[x^{\pm 1}, y^{\pm 1}]$ , as desired.

- When  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$ , we may identify  $\tilde{J}_\mu$  with the centralizer (in  $\check{B} \subseteq \mathrm{PGL}_2$ ) of  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ x & x^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$ . An element  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & 1 \end{pmatrix} \in \check{B} \subseteq \mathrm{PGL}_2$  stabilizes  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ x & x^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $c = \frac{a-1}{x-x^{-1}} \cdot x$ . Therefore,

$$\tilde{J}_\mu \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Z}[x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-1}{x-x^{-1}}];$$

the coproduct sends  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$ .

Next, there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{KU}_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2) \cong \mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}, x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-1}{x^2-1}].$$

This is proved exactly as in Theorem 6.3; the role of the class  $2x$  is now played by the Chern class  $x^2 - 1 \in \pi_0 \mathrm{KU}_{S^1}$  of the weight 2 representation of  $S^1$ . (Recall that the action of  $S^1$  on  $G_c \cong \mathrm{SU}(2) \cong S^3$  exhibits it as the one-point compactification of the trivial 1-dimensional representation summed with the weight 2 representation of  $S^1$  on  $\mathbf{C}$ .) The map induced on  $T$ -equivariant  $\mathrm{KU}$ -homology by the inclusion  $S^1 \rightarrow \mathrm{SU}(2)$  of the maximal torus is simply given by the inclusion of the subalgebra  $\mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}, x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}]$ . The coproduct on this subalgebra (and hence, on  $\mathrm{KU}_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2)$ ) is determined by the formula  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$ . It follows that  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{KU}_0^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{SL}_2)$  is isomorphic to  $\tilde{J}_\mu$  as group schemes over  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0 \mathrm{KU}_{S^1} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Z}[x^{\pm 1}]$ , as desired.

- When  $G = \mathrm{PGL}_2$ , we may identify  $\tilde{J}_\mu$  with the centralizer (in  $\check{B} \subseteq \mathrm{SL}_2$ ) of  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ x & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . An element  $\begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ c & a^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in \check{B} \subseteq \mathrm{SL}_2$  stabilizes  $\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 \\ x & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $c = \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-1} \cdot x$ . Therefore,

$$\tilde{J}_\mu \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Z}[x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-1}];$$

the coproduct sends  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$ . Again, as in the preceding cases, there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{KU}_*^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{PGL}_2) \cong \mathbf{Z}[\beta^{\pm 1}, x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-1}],$$

where the coproduct sends  $a \mapsto a \otimes a$ . It follows that  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{KU}_0^{S^1}(\Omega\mathrm{PGL}_2)$  is isomorphic to  $\tilde{J}_\mu$  as group schemes over  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0 \mathrm{KU}_{S^1} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Z}[x^{\pm 1}]$ , as desired.  $\square$

**Remark 7.7.** Just for posterity, let us record a more canonical variant of the calculation above for  $\check{G} = \mathrm{SL}_2$ , which does not require picking a Borel subgroup (i.e., which does not involve identifying  $\check{G}/\check{B} \cong B/\check{B}$ ). If  $\lambda \in \mathbf{G}_m$ , we denote  $\lambda + \lambda^{-1} \in \mathbf{A}^1$  by  $f(\lambda)$ . The Kostant slice  $\kappa : \check{T} \cong \mathbf{G}_m \rightarrow \check{\mathrm{SL}}_2$  is the map sending  $\lambda \in \mathbf{G}_m$  to the pair  $(x, \ell)$  with

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} f(\lambda) - 1 & f(\lambda) - 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \ell = [\lambda - 1 : 1].$$



Note that this indeed a well-defined point in  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2$ , since one can check that  $x$  preserves  $\ell$ : the key point is the conic relation

$$2\lambda = f(\lambda) - \sqrt{f(\lambda)^2 - 4}.$$

Indeed, this calculation of  $\kappa(\lambda)$  is essentially immediate from the requirement that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{G}_m \cong \check{T} & \xrightarrow{\kappa} & \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2 \\ \lambda \mapsto f(\lambda) \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{A}^1 \cong \check{T} // W & \xrightarrow[\lambda \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^{-1} & \lambda^{-2} \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}]{\kappa} & \mathrm{SL}_2. \end{array}$$

Moreover, the  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ -action on  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2$  sends  $g \in \mathrm{SL}_2$  and  $(x, \ell)$  to  $(\mathrm{Ad}_g(x), g\ell)$ . If  $g = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ , we directly compute that  $\mathrm{Ad}_g(x) = x$  if and only if  $b = c(f(\lambda) - 2)$  and  $a - d = (f(\lambda) - 2)c$ , in which case  $g$  also preserves  $\ell$ . Therefore,  $g = \begin{pmatrix} (f(\lambda) - 2)c + d & (f(\lambda) - 2)c \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  for  $c, d \in k$ . In order for  $\det(g) = 1$ , we need

$$d^2 + c(f(\lambda) - 2)(d - c) = 1.$$

Both  $x$  and  $g$  can be simultaneously diagonalized (if  $f(\lambda) \neq \pm 2$ ); note that  $\lambda + \lambda^{-1}$  is an eigenvalue of  $x$ . If  $t$  is an eigenvalue of  $g$ , then we have  $c = \frac{t - t^{-1}}{\lambda - \lambda^{-1}}$  and  $d = \frac{t^2\lambda + 1}{t(\lambda + 1)}$ . When  $k$  is not of characteristic 2, this shows that

$$\mathbf{G}_m \times_{\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2/\mathrm{SL}_2} \mathbf{G}_m \cong k[\lambda^{\pm 1}, t^{\pm 1}, \frac{t - t^{-1}}{\lambda - \lambda^{-1}}].$$

This in turn implies that

$$\mathbf{G}_m \times_{\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2/\mathrm{PGL}_2} \mathbf{G}_m \cong k[\lambda^{\pm 1}, t^{\pm 2}, \frac{t^2 - 1}{\lambda - \lambda^{-1}}],$$

as desired.

**Corollary 7.8.** *There is an  $F$ -linear equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}).$$

Furthermore, the pushforward functor  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(*; \mathrm{KU})$  identifies with the pullback functor  $\kappa^* : \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(T)$ .

*Proof.* By definition,  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU})$  is equivalent to the category of comodules over  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee = \mathrm{KU}_0^T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$  in the category of  $\pi_0 \mathrm{KU}_{T_c}$ -modules. By Theorem 7.3, it can be identified the category of quasicoherent sheaves on the quotient stack  $(f \cdot T)/\check{J}_\mu$ . We may view  $\check{J}_\mu$  as a closed subgroup scheme of the constant group scheme  $\check{B} \times (f \cdot T)$ . This gives an isomorphism

$$(f \cdot T)/\check{J}_\mu \cong \check{B} \backslash (\check{B} \times (f \cdot T))/\check{J}_\mu.$$

It follows from Steinberg's work in [Ste65] that the  $\check{B}$ -orbit of  $f \cdot T$  inside  $B$  is precisely the regular locus  $B^{\mathrm{reg}}$ . Since  $\check{J}_\mu$  is definitionally the stabilizer of  $f \cdot T \subseteq B$ , the quotient  $(\check{B} \times (f \cdot T))/\check{J}_\mu$  is isomorphic to  $B^{\mathrm{reg}}$ ; so there is an isomorphism  $(f \cdot T)/\check{J}_\mu \cong B^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{B}$ . To finish, note that  $\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G} \cong B^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{B}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 7.9.** It can be shown that if  $G$  has torsion-free fundamental group, there is an  $F$ -linear equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(G^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}).$$

Here, the left-hand side is defined (just as in Section 4) to be the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{coLMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_G(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)}(\mathrm{QCoh}(T//W))$ . Note that this is a sensible definition since  $\pi_*\mathcal{F}_G(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee$  is concentrated in even degrees. Furthermore, the pushforward functor  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU}) \rightarrow \mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(*; \mathrm{KU})$  identifies with the pullback functor  $\kappa^* : \mathrm{QCoh}(G^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}) \rightarrow \mathrm{QCoh}(T//W)$ . The proof of the displayed equivalence is quite similar to that of Corollary 7.8, and in fact can be deduced from it using the observation that  $\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_G(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee) = \pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)^W$  and that the natural map  $\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}} \rightarrow G^{\mathrm{reg}}$  is a (ramified)  $W$ -cover. The first statement uses that  $G$  has torsion-free fundamental group, and the second is a multiplicative version of Grothendieck-Springer theory.

**Remark 7.10.** In [Dev24, Section 3.7], we study a variant of Corollary 7.8, where  $\mathrm{KU}$  is replaced by *connective* complex K-theory  $\mathrm{ku}$ ; that is,  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU})$  is replaced by  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{ku})$ . On the Langlands dual side, this has the effect of replacing  $\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}$  by the 1-parameter family over  $\mathrm{Spec}(\pi_*(\mathrm{ku}))/\mathbf{G}_m \cong \mathbf{A}^1/\mathbf{G}_m$  whose generic fiber is  $\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}$ , and whose special fiber is  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}$ .

**Remark 7.11.** There is a variant of Corollary 7.8 if  $G$  is not simply-laced, but it is more complicated to state. Let us just give the analogue of Theorem 7.3. Suppose  $G$  is not simply-laced, and let  $T$  be a maximal torus of  $G$ ; then  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}$  is the fixed point subalgebra  $\check{\mathfrak{h}}^\tau$  of an finite-order outer automorphism  $\tau$  of a simply-laced Lie algebra  $\check{\mathfrak{h}}$ . Let  $H$  denote the simply-connected simply-laced group corresponding to the Langlands dual  $\check{\mathfrak{h}}$ , and let  $T_H$  denote its maximal torus. Then we may identify the fixed subset  $\mathbb{X}^*(T')^\tau$  with  $\mathbb{X}^*(T)$ . If  $n$  denotes the order of  $\tau$ , there is an action of  $\mathbf{Z}/n$  on  $T[[t]]$ ,  $G[[t]]$ , and  $G((t))$ , given by  $\tau$  on  $T$  and  $G$ , and  $t \mapsto \zeta_n \tau$  for a primitive  $n$ th root of unity  $\zeta_n$ . The appropriate replacement of  $\pi_0\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee$  in this case is  $\pi_0\mathcal{F}_{T[[t]]\mathbf{Z}/n}(G_{\mathrm{ad}}((t))^{\mathbf{Z}/n}/G_{\mathrm{ad}}[[t]]^{\mathbf{Z}/n})^\vee$ . The analogue of Theorem 7.3 (see [FT19, Theorem 3.9]) states that this algebra is isomorphic to the stabilizer  $\mathcal{S}_\mu \times_{\check{G}/\check{G}} \mathcal{S}_\mu$ .

There is *another* choice of slice when  $G$  is simply-connected; the calculation of Theorem 7.3 continues to hold for it, too, as we now show.

**Definition 7.12** (Steinberg slice). Let  $G$  be a simply-connected semisimple algebraic group. Given  $w \in W$ , let  $N_w = N \cap w^{-1}N^-w$ , so that  $N_w = \prod_{\alpha \in \Phi_w} U_\alpha$ , where  $\Phi_w$  is the set of roots made negative by  $w$ . Let  $w = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta} s_\alpha \in W$  be a Coxeter element, and let  $\check{w}$  be a lift of  $w$  to  $N_G(T)$ . Define the Steinberg slice  $\Sigma = \check{w}N_w \subseteq G$ . Then [Ste65] proved/stated that the composite  $\Sigma \rightarrow G \rightarrow G//G \cong T//W$  is an isomorphism. Let  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  denote the fiber product  $\Sigma \times_G \check{G}$ , so that the composite  $\tilde{\Sigma} \rightarrow \check{G} \rightarrow T$  is an isomorphism. We will denote the inclusion of  $\tilde{\Sigma}$  by  $\sigma : T \rightarrow \check{G}$ .

**Observation 7.13.** We will illustrate the calculation of  $T \times_{\check{G}/\check{G}} T$  (with  $T$  mapping to  $\check{G}$  by  $\sigma$ ) when  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$ . View a point in  $\check{G}$  as a pair  $(x \in \mathrm{SL}_2, \ell \subseteq \mathbf{C}^2)$  such that  $x$  preserves  $\ell$ . The Steinberg slice  $\sigma : \mathbf{G}_m \rightarrow \tilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2$  is the map sending  $\lambda \in \mathbf{G}_m$

to the pair  $(x, \ell)$  with

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda + \lambda^{-1} & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \ell = [\lambda : 1].$$

Note that this indeed a well-defined point in  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2$ , since one can check that  $x$  preserves  $\ell$ . This calculation of  $\sigma(\lambda)$  is essentially immediate from the requirement that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{G}_m \cong \check{T} & \xrightarrow{\sigma} & \widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2 \\ \lambda \mapsto \lambda + \lambda^{-1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{A}^1 \cong \check{T} // W & \xrightarrow[\lambda \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}]{\sigma} & \mathrm{SL}_2. \end{array}$$

Moreover, the  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ -action on  $\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2$  sends  $g \in \mathrm{SL}_2$  and  $(x, \ell)$  to  $(\mathrm{Ad}_g(x), g\ell)$ . If  $g = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ , one can directly compute that  $g$  commutes with  $\begin{pmatrix} \lambda + \lambda^{-1} & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  if and only if  $a = c(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) + d$  and  $b = -c$ . Therefore,  $g = \begin{pmatrix} c(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) + d & -c \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$  for  $c, d \in k$ . In order for  $\det(g) = 1$ , we need

$$c^2 + d^2 + cd(\lambda + \lambda^{-1}) = 1.$$

As long as  $\lambda \neq \pm 1$ , both  $x$  and  $g$  can be simultaneously diagonalized by  $\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & \lambda^{-1} \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ : the diagonalization of  $x$  is  $\begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$ , and the diagonalization of  $g$  is  $\begin{pmatrix} c\lambda + d & 0 \\ 0 & c\lambda^{-1} + d \end{pmatrix}$ . If  $t = c\lambda + d$ , then  $c\lambda^{-1} + d = t^{-1}$  by the above determinant relation. We also have that  $a = t - \frac{\lambda(t-t^{-1})}{\lambda-\lambda^{-1}}$  and  $c = \frac{t-t^{-1}}{\lambda-\lambda^{-1}}$ . This shows that

$$\mathbf{G}_m \times_{\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2/\mathrm{SL}_2} \mathbf{G}_m \cong \mathrm{Spec} k[\lambda^{\pm 1}, t^{\pm 1}, \frac{t-t^{-1}}{\lambda-\lambda^{-1}}],$$

and hence that

$$\mathbf{G}_m \times_{\widetilde{\mathrm{SL}}_2/\mathrm{PGL}_2} \mathbf{G}_m \cong \mathrm{Spec} k[\lambda^{\pm 1}, t^{\pm 1}, \frac{t^2-1}{\lambda-\lambda^{-1}}],$$

as desired.

We will now discuss the question of loop-rotation equivariance. Recall from Definition 6.13 the algebra  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, T, W)$  associated to a 1-dimensional group scheme  $\mathbf{H}$  over a field  $F$  and a root system with torus  $T$  and Weyl group  $W$ . In the following discussion, we will set  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{G}_m$ , so that  $\mathbf{H}_T = T$ ; we will also write  $q$  to denote the standard character of  $S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1$ , so that  $\pi_0 \mathrm{KU}_{S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1} \cong \mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ . Exactly the same argument as in Theorem 6.17 shows the following result; here,  $G$  does not need to be simply-laced.

**Theorem 7.14.** *There is an isomorphism of associative  $\mathbf{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ -algebras*

$$(12) \quad \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G)^\vee \cong \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_m, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W}).$$

Here,  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G)^\vee$  is equipped with the associative algebra structure coming from convolution. Moreover, the above isomorphism is also one of (cocommutative) Hopf  $\pi_0 \mathrm{KU}_{\widetilde{T}_c} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\widetilde{T}}}$ -algebroids.

**Remark 7.15.** Recall the quotient  $\widetilde{T} // \widetilde{W}$  from Remark 6.16. The discussion therein combined with Theorem 7.14 gives an equivalence of categories

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\widetilde{T}_c}(\mathrm{Fl}_G)^\vee\text{-mod} \simeq \mathcal{H}(\mathbf{G}_m, \widetilde{T}, \widetilde{W})\text{-mod} \simeq \mathrm{IndCoh}(\widetilde{T} // \widetilde{W}).$$

Assume, again, that  $G$  is simply-laced. Just as in Section 6, one would like to use Theorem 7.14 to prove analogues of Corollary 6.25 and (10). Namely, we expect that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU})$  can be identified with a certain localization of the *quantum* version  $\mathcal{O}_{\check{G}}^{\mathrm{univ}, q}$  of  $\mathrm{DMod}_{\hbar}(\check{G}/\check{N})^{(\check{G} \times T, \mathrm{weak})}$ ; the category  $\mathcal{O}_{\check{G}}^{\mathrm{univ}, q}$  itself is described in [KS20, Definition 4.24]. Similarly, we expect that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c \times S_{\mathrm{rot}}^1}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KU})$  can be identified with a certain localization of the *quantum* version  $\mathrm{HC}_{\check{G}}^q$  of  $\mathrm{HC}_{\check{G}}^{\hbar}$ ; the category  $\mathrm{HC}_{\check{G}}^q$  is described in [KS20, Definition 2.24]. The main sticking point to proving these results is that we do not have a  $q$ -analogue of [Gin18, Theorem 1.2.1] (which would give a  $q$ -analogue of Corollary 6.21); I am currently exploring this direction of research. This is related to [FT19, Conjecture 3.17].

We now turn to the question of the analogue of Corollary 7.8 if KU is replaced by *real* K-theory KO. (Recall the definition of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KO})$  from Definition 4.12.) We begin by constructing a  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on  $\check{G}/\check{G} \cong B/\check{B}$ .

**Lemma 7.16.** *There is a map  $\gamma : T \rightarrow \check{B}$  such that if  $x \in T$ , then  $\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(x)}$  sends  $(fx)^{-1}$  to  $fx^{-1}$ ; moreover,  $\gamma(x)$  squares to the identity.*

*Proof.* This follows from the fact that  $(fx)^{-1}$  and  $fx^{-1}$  in  $B$  both have image  $x^{-1}$  under the map  $B \rightarrow B//\check{B} \cong T$ .  $\square$

**Definition 7.17.** Denote by  $\chi$  the map  $B \rightarrow B//\check{B} \cong T$ . There is an involution  $\theta$  of  $B$  sending  $x \mapsto \mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(\chi(x))}(x^{-1})$ , and similarly an involution  $\theta$  of the constant group scheme  $\check{B} \times T$  over  $T$  sending  $(g, y) \mapsto (\mathrm{Ad}_{\gamma(y)}(g), y^{-1})$ . This defines an involution  $\theta$  of  $B/\check{B}$ , and hence a  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on it.

**Example 7.18.** Suppose  $G = \mathrm{GL}_2$  or  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ . Then one can take for  $\gamma$  the constant map  $T \cong \mathbf{G}_m^2 \rightarrow \check{B}$  sending  $(x, y) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ x & y \end{pmatrix}$ . If  $G = \mathrm{PGL}_2$ , one can simply multiply  $\gamma$  by a primitive fourth root of unity to get an element of  $\check{G} = \mathrm{SL}_2$ . If  $G = \mathrm{GL}_3$ , then one can take for  $\gamma$  the map  $T \cong \mathbf{G}_m^3 \rightarrow \check{B}$  sending  $(x, y, z) \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ x & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & zy^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$ .

It is easy to show:

**Lemma 7.19.** *The involution  $\theta : B/\check{B} \rightarrow B/\check{B}$  is isomorphic to the map induced by inversion on  $B$ .*

**Proposition 7.20.** *The  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action by  $\theta$  on  $\check{G}/\check{G} \cong B/\check{B}$  restricts to an action on  $\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G}$ , and under the equivalence of Corollary 7.8, it identifies with the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action via complex conjugation on equivariant KU. In particular, there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathrm{KO}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}((\check{G}^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{G})/\langle \theta \rangle).$$

*Proof.* It follows from Definition 7.17 that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} T & \xrightarrow{x \mapsto x^{-1}} & T \\ \kappa \downarrow & & \downarrow \kappa \\ B & \xrightarrow{\theta} & B. \end{array}$$

Therefore,  $\theta$  induces an automorphism of  $T \times_{B^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{B}} T$ , and it suffices (by the proof of Corollary 7.8) to show that under the isomorphism

$$(13) \quad \mathrm{Spec} \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^{\vee} \cong T \times_{B^{\mathrm{reg}}/\check{B}} T$$

of Theorem 7.3, the action of  $\theta$  corresponds to the action of complex conjugation on equivariant K-theory. Let  $T^{\text{gen}} \subseteq T$  denote the complement of the union of all hypertori cut out by the coroots of  $G$ . Since both sides of (13) are flat and affine over  $T$ , their rings of functions inject into the corresponding localizations along the map  $T^{\text{gen}} \rightarrow T$ . Furthermore, these localizations are  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -equivariant (for complex conjugation and  $\theta$ , respectively), and so it suffices to show that these localizations are  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -equivariantly isomorphic.

By Lemma 3.11, there is an isomorphism

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\text{Gr}_G)^\vee|_{T^{\text{gen}}} \cong \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\text{Gr}_T)^\vee|_{T^{\text{gen}}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{T^{\text{gen}}}[\mathbb{X}_*(T)].$$

Under this isomorphism, the action via complex conjugation on KU is given simply by inversion on  $T^{\text{gen}}$ , and acts trivially on  $\mathbb{X}_*(T)$ . Similarly, since  $fx \in B$  is regular *semisimple* if  $x \in T^{\text{gen}}$ , and the centralizers of regular semisimple elements are tori, there is an isomorphism

$$(T \times_{B^{\text{reg}}/\check{B}} T) \times_T T^{\text{gen}} \cong T^{\text{gen}} \times \check{T}.$$

Under this isomorphism, the action of  $\theta$  is given simply by inversion on  $T^{\text{gen}}$ , and acts trivially on  $\check{T}$ . This clearly matches with the action on  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\text{Gr}_G)^\vee|_{T^{\text{gen}}}$  via complex conjugation on KU, as desired.  $\square$

Proposition 7.20 says that, up to replacing  $B/\check{B}$  by  $\check{B}/\check{B}$  (that is, replacing  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KU})$  by  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KU})$ ), the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action via complex conjugation on equivariant KU identifies under Corollary 7.8 with the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on  $\check{B}/\check{B} = \text{Map}(B\mathbf{Z}, B\check{B})$  coming from inversion on  $\mathbf{Z}$ .

**Remark 7.21.** Assume  $G$  has torsion-free fundamental group. One can similarly compute the effect of complex conjugation for  $G_c$ -equivariant local systems. Namely, as in Lemma 7.16, there is a map  $\delta : T//W \rightarrow \check{B}$  such that if  $x \in T//W$ , then  $\text{Ad}_{\delta(x)}$  sends  $(fx)^{-1}$  to  $fx$ . Just as in Definition 7.17, we obtain an involution  $\Theta$  on  $G/\check{G}$  which can be identified with the effect of inversion on  $G$ , and the resulting  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on  $\text{QCoh}(G^{\text{reg}}/\check{G})$  identifies, under the equivalence of Remark 7.9, with the  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action on  $\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KU})$  coming from complex conjugation on equivariant KU. This gives an equivalence

$$\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; \text{KO}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F \simeq \text{QCoh}((G^{\text{reg}}/\check{G})/\langle \Theta \rangle).$$

In future work, we will study the effect of both power operations and cohomology operations (like other Adams operations on equivariant complex K-theory) on  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\text{Gr}_G)^\vee$  and  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_G(\text{Gr}_G)^\vee$ .

## 8. THE ELLIPTIC STORY

In this section, we will work over a given algebraically closed field  $F$ . For the moment,  $G$  will be a (split) almost-simple and simply-connected group over  $F$ ; when we talk about the topology of  $G$  later, we will assume that  $G$  lives over  $\mathbf{C}$ . Let  $E$  be a (smooth) elliptic curve over  $k$ , let  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  denote the moduli stack of  $B$ -bundles on  $E$  of degree 0, and let  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  denote the scheme of  $T$ -bundles on  $E$  of degree 0. We will also make use of the stack  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)$  of semistable  $G$ -bundles on  $E$ .

**Definition 8.1.** Say that a  $B$ -bundle  $\mathcal{P}_B$  on  $E$  is *regular* if  $\dim \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P}_B) = \mathrm{rank}(G)$ . Let  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}$  denote the open substack of  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  defined by the regular  $B$ -bundles. Similarly, if  $\mathcal{P} \in \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)$  is a semistable  $G$ -bundle on  $E$ , we say that  $\mathcal{P}$  is *regular* if  $\dim \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P}) = \mathrm{rank}(G)$ . Let  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}} \subseteq \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)$  denote the open substack of regular semistable  $G$ -bundles.

**Proposition 8.2.** *The map  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  admits a canonical unique section  $\kappa : \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  landing in  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be a semistable  $G$ -bundle on  $E$ . By [Dav19, Proposition 4.4.5], the regularity of  $\mathcal{P}$  is equivalent to the condition that for any (or some)  $B$ -reduction  $\mathcal{P}_B$  of  $\mathcal{P}$  of degree 0, the associated  $N$ -bundle  $\mathcal{P}_B/T$  is induced from an  $N_{\mathcal{P}}$ -bundle with nontrivial associated  $N_{\alpha}$ -bundle for each  $\alpha \in \Delta_{\mathcal{P}}$ . Moreover, every geometric fiber of the map  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), E) // W$  to the coarse moduli space of  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)$  contains a unique regular semistable  $G$ -bundle. Also see [FMW98, Proposition 3.9], where a similar result is stated.

Following [Dav19, Definition 3.1.7], set

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}} \cong \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}} \times_{\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), E) // W} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), E).$$

Let  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}$  denote the moduli stack of  $B$ -bundles on  $E$  of degree 0. It then follows from the isomorphism  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E) \cong \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  of [Dav19, Proposition 2.1.11] and the equality  $\dim \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P}) = \dim \mathrm{Aut}(\mathcal{P}_B)$  that there is an isomorphism  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}} \cong \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}$ . In particular, every geometric fiber of the map  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), E) = \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  contains a unique regular  $B$ -bundle of degree 0.

The existence of  $\kappa$  is a consequence of [Dav19, Theorem 4.3.2], which is a refinement of [FM00, Theorem 5.1.1]. Since we will not need the full strength of [Dav19, Theorem 4.3.2] outside of this proof, we will only briefly recall the necessary notation and statements. In *loc. cit.*, the scheme  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  is denoted by  $Y$ . Let  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G(E)$  denote the Kontsevich-Mori compactification of  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E) \cong \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$ ; see [Dav19, Definition 2.1.2]. Let  $\Theta$  denote the theta-line bundle over  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  of [Dav19, Corollary 3.2.10], and let  $\tilde{\chi} : \widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G(E) \rightarrow \Theta^{-1}/\mathbf{G}_m$  denote the map constructed in [Dav19, Corollary 3.3.2]. Then, [Dav19, Theorem 4.3.2] shows that there is a map  $\Theta^{-1} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)$  landing in  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}$  such that the composite

$$\Theta^{-1} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E) \xrightarrow{\tilde{\chi}} \Theta^{-1}/\mathbf{G}_m$$

is the canonical map. Composing with the zero section of  $\Theta^{-1}$ , we obtain a map

$$\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \cong 0_{\Theta^{-1}} \rightarrow \Theta^{-1} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}} \cong \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E).$$

This is the desired map  $\kappa$ . □

**Definition 8.3.** The map  $\kappa : \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  from Proposition 8.2 will be called the *elliptic Kostant slice*.

If  $E$  is replaced by the constant stack  $S^1$  or by  $B\mathbf{G}_a$ , the stack  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  is to be interpreted as  $B/B$  and  $\mathfrak{b}/B$ , respectively. The analogue of the elliptic Kostant section is given by the maps  $f \cdot T \rightarrow B/B$  and  $f + \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \mathfrak{b}/B$ , respectively. Note that one does *not* see the stacks  $B/\check{B}$  and  $\mathfrak{b}/\check{B}$  (after all, no mention of  $\check{G}$  has been made so far!). The following is [Dav19, Lemma 3.1.11].

**Lemma 8.4.** *Let  $I \subseteq \Phi^-$  be a subset, and let  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_I$  denote the subscheme of  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  defined by those bundles  $\mathcal{P}_T$  whose  $\alpha$ -component is trivial precisely for  $\alpha \in I$ . Let  $N_I \subseteq N$  be the smallest unipotent subgroup which is invariant under  $T$ -conjugation and which contains  $N_\alpha$  for every  $\alpha \in I$ . Then the natural map*

$$\mathrm{Bun}_{TN_I}^0(E) \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)} \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_I \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E) \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)} \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_I$$

*is an isomorphism.*

**Example 8.5.** Suppose that  $I = \emptyset$ , so that  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_\emptyset$  denotes the open subscheme of  $T$ -bundles of degree zero whose  $\alpha$ -component is nontrivial for every negative root  $\alpha$ . The isomorphism  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E) \cong \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  implies that the map  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Bun}}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  is an isomorphism over  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_\emptyset$ . In particular, every point of  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_\emptyset$  has a canonical associated (regular) semistable  $G$ -bundle.

The above results continue to hold if  $E$  is replaced by the constant stack  $S^1$  or by  $B\mathbf{G}_a$  (in which case  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  is to be interpreted as  $B/B$  and  $\mathfrak{b}/B$ , respectively). In the case of  $S^1$ , for instance, the semistable  $G$ -bundles obtained in this way from  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_\emptyset$  are precisely those which lie in the regular *semisimple* locus  $G^{\mathrm{rss}}/G$ ; similarly for the case of  $B\mathbf{G}_a$ .

We now turn to the topology of  $G$ , so it is connected, almost simple, and simply-laced over  $\mathbf{C}$ . In this setting,  $k$  will be an even 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring equipped with an oriented group scheme  $\mathbf{G}$  whose underlying classical scheme  $\mathbf{G}_0$  over  $\pi_0(k)$  is an elliptic curve  $E$ . We will continue to fix an algebraically closed field  $F$  containing  $\pi_0(k)$ , over which the Langlands dual group  $\check{G}$  will live. As usual, when dealing with the algebraic geometry (as opposed to the topology) of  $G$ , we will also view it as living over  $F$ ; since  $G$  is simply-laced, it is isogenous to  $\check{G}$ .

**Definition 8.6.** The *elliptic regular centralizer group scheme*  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{\mathrm{ell}}$  is defined to be the group scheme over  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  given by the fiber product

$$\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{\mathrm{ell}} \cong \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)} \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E).$$

Note that this is very slightly (but importantly) different from the definition of  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_\mu$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$ ; the analogues of the fiber product above would instead be  $(f \cdot \tilde{T}) \times_{\tilde{B}/\tilde{B}} (f \cdot \tilde{T})$  and  $(f + \mathfrak{t}) \times_{\mathfrak{b}/\tilde{B}} (f + \mathfrak{t})$ .

In the following discussion, we will consider the  $\tilde{T}$ -equivariant elliptic homology of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  (instead of the  $T$ -equivariant elliptic homology); this will capture the minor difference between the definitions of  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}_{\mathrm{ell}}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{J}}$  mentioned above.

**Theorem 8.7.** *There is an isomorphism of group schemes over  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \cong \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ :*

$$\mathrm{Spec}_{\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)}(\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F \cong \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)} \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E).$$

Here,  $\mathrm{Spec}_{\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)}(\pi_0\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)$  denotes the relative Spec of  $\pi_0\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee$  over  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$ .

As with Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 7.3, the proof of Theorem 8.7 relies on two lemmas.

**Lemma 8.8.** *The projection map  $\tilde{J}_{\mathrm{ell}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  (onto either factor) is flat.*

*Proof.* Like in the proof of Lemma 6.4, it suffices, by miracle flatness, to show that the fibers of the map  $\tilde{J}_{\mathrm{ell}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  have dimension exactly  $\mathrm{rank}(\check{G})$ . But this follows from the fact that the map  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  lands in  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}$  (see Proposition 8.2).  $\square$

For a root  $\alpha$ , let  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_{\alpha\text{-reg}} \subseteq \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)$  denote the union of the substacks  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_{\{\alpha\}}$  and  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_\emptyset$ . The next result follows exactly as in Lemma 6.6 (using Lemma 8.4).

**Lemma 8.9.** *There is an isomorphism*

$$(14) \quad \tilde{J}_{\mathrm{ell}}(\check{G})|_{\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_{\alpha\text{-reg}}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \tilde{J}_{\mathrm{ell}}(Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ)|_{\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_{\alpha\text{-reg}}},$$

where  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)$  is the centralizer of some  $x \in \mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_{\alpha\text{-reg}}$  which lies in  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)_{\{\alpha\}}$ , and  $Z_{\check{G}}(x)^\circ$  denotes the connected component of the identity.

Recall that if  $X$  is a scheme with subschemes  $V = V(\mathcal{J}) \subseteq D = V(\mathcal{J})$  (so that  $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \mathcal{J}$ ) where  $D$  is locally principal, the affine blowup  $\mathrm{Bl}_V^D(X)$  is defined to be the complement of  $V_+(\mathcal{J})$  in the blowup  $\mathrm{Bl}_V(X)$ . That is, it is the relative Spec of the algebra  $\mathcal{O}_X[\frac{\mathcal{J}}{\mathcal{J}}]$  of weight zero elements in  $\mathrm{Bl}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)[\frac{1}{\mathcal{J}}]$ , where  $\mathrm{Bl}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X) = \mathcal{O}_X \oplus \mathcal{J} \oplus \mathcal{J}^2 \oplus \cdots$  is the Rees algebra.

*Proof of Theorem 8.7.* The argument of Theorem 6.3 reduces us to checking that the isomorphism of Theorem 8.7 holds if  $G$  has semisimple rank 1, i.e., is the product of a torus with one of  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ ,  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ , or  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . Again, it is easy to match up the contributions from the toral factors, so we will assume that  $G$  is either  $\mathrm{GL}_2$ ,  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ , or  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . In this case, we can even replace  $F$  by  $\pi_0(k)$ . The proofs are all rather uniform (as we have seen in Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 7.3), so we will simply illustrate the argument when  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$  and  $G = \mathrm{PGL}_2$ .

We begin with the case  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$ . Since  $\check{T} = \mathbf{G}_m$ , we may identify  $\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E) \cong E$ ; to emphasize that it plays the role of the base of  $S^1$ -equivariant elliptic cohomology, we will denote it by  $\mathcal{M}$ . Let  $\infty \in \mathcal{M} = E$  denote the identity section. Consider the closed subschemes

$$V = \{(\infty, 1)\} \subseteq D = \{\infty\} \times \mathbf{G}_m \subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathbf{G}_m.$$

Then, as in Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 7.3,  $\mathrm{Spec}_{\mathrm{Bun}_T^0(E)}(\pi_0\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)$  identifies with the affine blowup  $\mathrm{Bl}_V^D(\mathcal{M} \times \mathbf{G}_m)$ .

Since  $\check{G} = \mathrm{PGL}_2$ , an  $S$ -point of the stack  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  is the data of a degree zero rank 2 vector bundle  $\mathcal{V}$  over  $S \times E$  along with a line subbundle  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$  and an isomorphism  $\mathcal{V}/\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{O}_{S \times E}$ . In this language, the elliptic Kostant section  $\mathcal{M} = E \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$  classifies the unique indecomposable extension  $\mathcal{V}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M} \times E}$  by the Poincaré line bundle  $\mathcal{P}$ . (Recall that  $\mathcal{P}$  can be identified, for instance, with the line bundle corresponding to the divisor  $\Delta - E \times \{\infty\} - \{\infty\} \times E$ .) This extension is classified by a nonzero section of  $\underline{\mathrm{Ext}}_{\mathcal{M} \times E}^1(\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M} \times E}, \mathcal{P})$ .



Let us now compute  $\tilde{J}_{\text{ell}}$ . The fiber product  $\mathcal{M} \times_{\text{Bun}_{\tilde{B}}^0(E)} \mathcal{M}$  is isomorphic (as a group scheme over  $\mathcal{M}$ ) to the subgroup of the constant group scheme  $\tilde{B} := \mathcal{M} \times \tilde{B}$  of those  $b \in \tilde{B}$  such that  $b \cdot \mathcal{V} = \mathcal{V}$ . First, let  $U = (\mathcal{M} - \{\infty\}) \times E$ ; then  $\mathcal{V}|_U$  splits as  $\mathcal{O}_U \oplus \mathcal{P}|_U$ . Indeed, the restriction  $\mathcal{P}|_U$  is a nontrivial line bundle on  $U$ , so its pushforward to  $\mathcal{M} - \{\infty\}$  has no cohomology (and hence the extension class is trivial). It follows that  $\text{Aut}_{\tilde{B}}(\mathcal{V})|_U = \mathcal{M} \times_{\text{Bun}_{\tilde{B}}^0(E)} U$  can be identified with  $U \times \mathbf{G}_m$ .

On the other hand, let  $Z = \{\infty\} \times E$  denote the complement of  $U$ , so that the formal neighborhood  $\hat{Z}$  of  $Z$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{M}_{\infty}^{\wedge} \times E = \hat{\mathbf{A}}^1 \times E$ . Let  $t$  denote a coordinate on  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}^1$ . Then, the restriction of  $\mathcal{P}$  to  $\hat{Z}$  is given by the 1-parameter family of line bundles  $\mathcal{O}_{\hat{Z}}(t - \infty)$  over  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}^1 \times E$ . The restriction of  $\mathcal{V}$  to  $\hat{Z}$  is classified by a map  $\mathcal{O}_{\hat{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\hat{Z}}(t - \infty)[1]$  which vanishes except at the origin of  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}^1$ , where it is given by the unique (up to nonzero scalar) nontrivial map  $\mathcal{O}_E \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_E[1]$ .

For instance,  $\mathcal{V}|_Z$  is isomorphic to the Atiyah bundle over  $E$  from [Ati57] (i.e., the unique indecomposable rank 2 extension of the structure sheaf by itself), so that it can be realized away from  $\infty \in E$  by pairs  $(f_1, f_2)$  of regular functions on  $E$ ; and near  $\infty$  by pairs  $(f_1, f_2)$  such that  $f_1$  and  $f_1 - zf_2$  are regular, where  $z$  is a local coordinate of  $E$ . Under this description,  $\text{End}(\mathcal{V}|_Z) = \text{End}(\mathcal{V})|_Z$  is spanned by the identity and the map  $(f_1, f_2) \mapsto (0, f_1)$ . That is,  $\text{End}(\mathcal{V})|_Z$  is isomorphic to the group of matrices  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & a \end{pmatrix}$ , and so  $\text{Aut}_{\tilde{B}}(\mathcal{V})|_Z$  is isomorphic to  $Z \times \mathbf{G}_a$ . It is easy to extend this description to the formal neighborhood of  $Z$ , and thereby find that  $\text{Aut}_{\tilde{B}}(\mathcal{V})|_{\hat{Z}}$  is isomorphic to the canonical degeneration of  $\mathbf{G}_m$  into  $\mathbf{G}_a$ . In other words, there is an isomorphism

$$\text{Aut}_{\tilde{B}}(\mathcal{V})|_{\hat{Z}} \cong \text{Spec } \pi_0(k)[[t]][a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-1}{t}].$$

Gluing this with the description of  $\text{Aut}_{\tilde{B}}(\mathcal{V})|_U$  from the preceding paragraph, we find that  $\text{Aut}_{\tilde{B}}(\mathcal{V}) \cong \mathcal{M} \times_{\text{Bun}_{\tilde{B}}^0(E)} \mathcal{M}$  is isomorphic to the affine blowup  $\text{Bl}_V^D(\mathcal{M} \times \mathbf{G}_m)$ . We will leave it to the reader to verify that the resulting sequence of isomorphisms

$$\text{Aut}_{\tilde{B}}(\mathcal{V}) \cong \mathcal{M} \times_{\text{Bun}_{\tilde{B}}^0(E)} \mathcal{M} \cong \text{Bl}_V^D(\mathcal{M} \times \mathbf{G}_m) \cong \text{Spec}_{\text{Bun}_{\tilde{T}}^0(E)}(\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}}(\text{Gr}_G)^{\vee})$$

is one of group schemes over  $\mathcal{M}$ .

The case when  $G = \text{PGL}_2$  is very similar; we only indicate the necessary changes. Let  $E[2] \subseteq E$  denote the 2-torsion subgroup, and consider the closed subschemes

$$V = E[2] \times \mu_2 \subseteq D = E[2] \times \mathbf{G}_m \subseteq \mathcal{M} \times \mathbf{G}_m.$$

By arguing as in Theorem 6.3 and Theorem 7.3, we find that  $\text{Spec}_{\text{Bun}_{\tilde{T}}^0(E)}(\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}}(\text{Gr}_G)^{\vee})$  identifies with the affine blowup  $\text{Bl}_V^D(\mathcal{M} \times \mathbf{G}_m)$ . In this case,  $\tilde{G} = \text{SL}_2$ , and the elliptic Kostant section  $\mathcal{M} = E \rightarrow \text{Bun}_{\tilde{B}}^0(E)$  sends a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$  to the trivially filtered  $\text{SL}_2$ -bundle  $\mathcal{O}_E \subseteq \mathcal{O}_E \oplus \mathcal{L}$  if  $\mathcal{L}^2 \neq \mathcal{O}_E$ ; and to the Atiyah extension of  $\mathcal{L}$  by itself if  $\mathcal{L}^2 \cong \mathcal{O}_E$ . This extension is defined by a nontrivial element of  $\text{Ext}_E^1(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{L}^{-1}) \cong H^1(E; \mathcal{L}^{-2})$ . The calculation of  $\mathcal{M} \times_{\text{Bun}_{\tilde{B}}^0(E)} \mathcal{M}$  follows exactly the same path as in the case  $G = \text{SL}_2$  studied above.  $\square$

**Remark 8.10.** The most classical instantiation of the Atiyah bundle  $\mathcal{A}$  is via the Weierstrass functions. The  $\mathbf{G}_a$ -torsor over  $E$  associated to  $\mathcal{A}$  is the complement of the section at  $\infty$  of the projective line  $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{A})$ . If we work complex-analytically,  $E^{\text{an}}$  can be identified as the quotient  $\mathbf{C}/\Lambda$  for some rank 2 lattice  $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbf{C}$ . Associated

to  $\Lambda$  are two Weierstrass functions defined on  $\mathbf{C}$ :

$$\wp(z; \Lambda) = \frac{1}{z^2} + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda - \{0\}} \left( \frac{1}{(z - \lambda)^2} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \right),$$

$$\zeta(z; \Lambda) = \frac{1}{z} + \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda - \{0\}} \left( \frac{1}{z - \lambda} + \frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{z}{\lambda^2} \right).$$

Note that  $\wp(z; \Lambda)$  is doubly-periodic, i.e.,  $\wp(z + \lambda; \Lambda) = \wp(z; \Lambda)$  for any  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ . Alternatively,  $\wp$  defines a map  $\mathbf{C} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$  which factors through a map  $\mathbf{C}/\Lambda = E^{\text{an}} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ .

Although  $\zeta(z; \Lambda)$  is not doubly-periodic, an easy calculation shows that  $\wp(z; \Lambda) = -\partial_z \zeta(z; \Lambda)$ ; so if  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ , then  $\zeta(z + \lambda; \Lambda) - \zeta(z; \Lambda) = c(\lambda)$  for some constant  $c(\lambda)$ . The function  $\lambda \mapsto c(\lambda)$  is evidently additive, and defines a homomorphism  $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$ , which defines a  $\mathbf{C}$ -bundle over  $E^{\text{an}} = \mathbf{C}/\Lambda$ . This  $\mathbf{C}$ -bundle is precisely the analytification of the  $\mathbf{G}_a$ -torsor associated to the Atiyah bundle. It follows that although  $\zeta$  is not defined on  $E^{\text{an}}$ , this analytification is the universal space over  $E^{\text{an}}$  on which  $\zeta$  is well-defined.

This discussion also describes the total space of the rank 2-bundle  $\mathcal{A}^{\text{an}}$  purely analytically. For instance, if  $q \in \mathbf{C}^\times$  is a unit complex number of modulus  $< 1$ , we can identify  $\text{Tot}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{an}})$  over the Tate curve  $\mathbf{C}^\times/q^{\mathbf{Z}}$  with the quotient

$$\text{Tot}(\mathcal{A}^{\text{an}}) = (\mathbf{C}^\times \times \mathbf{C}^2) / ((z, x) \sim (qz, (\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix})x)).$$

The appearance of the Jordan block  $(\begin{smallmatrix} 1 & \\ 0 & 1 \end{smallmatrix})$  is the basic reason why the Atiyah bundle plays the role of the principal nilpotent element  $f$  in the proof of Theorem 8.7.

**Corollary 8.11.** *There is an  $F$ -linear equivalence*

$$\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F \simeq \text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)^{\text{reg}}).$$

Furthermore, the pushforward functor  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \rightarrow \text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(*; k)$  identifies with the pullback functor  $\kappa^* : \text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)) \rightarrow \text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E))$ .

*Proof.* By definition,  $\text{Loc}_{T_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  is equivalent to the category of comodules over  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\check{T}}(\text{Gr}_G)^\vee$  in  $\text{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0}) = \text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E))$ . By Theorem 8.7, it can be identified the category of quasicoherent sheaves on the quotient stack  $\text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E)/\tilde{J}_{\text{ell}}$ . We may view  $\tilde{J}_{\text{ell}}$  as a closed subgroup scheme of the constant group scheme  $\check{B} \times \text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E)$ . This gives an isomorphism

$$\text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E)/\tilde{J}_{\text{ell}} \cong \check{B} \backslash (\check{B} \times \text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E))/\tilde{J}_{\text{ell}}.$$

Let  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)_{\text{triv}}$  denote the scheme whose  $S$ -points are of  $\check{B}$ -bundles over  $S \times E$  of degree 0 equipped with a trivialization at  $S \times \{\infty\}$ , so that there is a natural map  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)_{\text{triv}} \rightarrow \text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)$ . Let  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)_{\text{triv}}^{\text{reg}}$  denote the restriction of  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)_{\text{triv}}$  to the regular locus  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)^{\text{reg}} \subseteq \text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)$ . It follows from Davis' work in [Dav19] that the  $\check{B}$ -orbit of  $\text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E)$  inside  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)_{\text{triv}}$  is precisely the regular locus  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)_{\text{triv}}^{\text{reg}}$ . Since  $\tilde{J}_{\text{ell}}$  is by definition the stabilizer of  $\kappa : \text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E) \rightarrow \text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)$ , the quotient  $\check{B} \backslash (\check{B} \times \text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E))/\tilde{J}_{\text{ell}}$  is isomorphic to  $\text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)^{\text{reg}}$ ; so there is an isomorphism  $\text{Bun}_{\check{T}}^0(E)/\tilde{J}_{\mu} \cong \text{Bun}_{\check{B}}^0(E)^{\text{reg}}$ .  $\square$

**Remark 8.12.** The work of Gepner and Meier in [GM23, GM20] sets up the theory of  $G_c$ -equivariant elliptic cohomology for compact Lie groups  $G_c$ . In particular, they describe a scheme  $\mathcal{M}_G$  over  $k$  with underlying scheme  $\mathcal{M}_{G,0}$  over  $\pi_0(k)$ , such that the global sections of the structure sheaf of  $\mathcal{M}_G$  computes  $G_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -cohomology. Using this setup (and assuming a slight extension of the results of [Dav19] replacing the simply-connectedness assumption with the condition of having torsion-free fundamental group), it can be shown that if  $G$  is almost simple and simply-laced, and has torsion-free fundamental group, there is an  $F$ -linear equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}).$$

Here, the left-hand side is defined (just as in Section 4) to be the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{coLMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_G(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{G,0}))$ . The proof of the displayed equivalence is quite similar to that of Corollary 8.11, and in fact can be deduced from it using the observation that  $\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_G(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee) = \pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)^W$  and that the natural map  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)^{\mathrm{reg}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(E)^{\mathrm{reg}}$  is a (ramified)  $W$ -cover. The first statement uses that  $G$  is simply-connected, and the second is the elliptic version of Grothendieck-Springer theory studied in [Dav19, Proposition 3.1.14].

**Remark 8.13.** The statements of Corollary 6.8, Corollary 7.8, and Corollary 8.11 can be packaged into a single statement as follows. Suppose  $k$  is a complex-oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring, and let  $\mathbf{G}$  be an oriented commutative  $k$ -group scheme. Let  $\mathbf{G}_0$  denote the underlying commutative group scheme over  $\pi_0(k)$ , and let  $\mathbf{G}_0^\vee = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{G}_0, B\mathbf{G}_m)$  denote its 1-shifted Cartier dual. Let  $F$  be an algebraically closed field containing  $\pi_0(k)$ ; then there is an  $F$ -linear equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}).$$

Similarly, there is an  $F$ -linear equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}).$$

In fact, the arguments of Corollary 6.8, Corollary 7.8, and Corollary 8.11 show that these equivalences are monoidal for the convolution tensor products on  $\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  and  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  coming from the  $\mathbf{E}_2$ -structure on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ , and the ordinary tensor product of quasicoherent sheaves. Moreover, a simple adaptation of the discussion at the end of Section 7 shows that the above equivalences are canonical: they respect natural symmetries of  $k$ .

To see that these equivalences do indeed package Corollary 6.8, Corollary 7.8, and Corollary 8.11, note that if  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  and  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_a$ , then the 1-shifted Cartier dual of  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is  $B\hat{\mathbf{G}}_a$ , and  $\mathrm{Map}(B\hat{\mathbf{G}}_a, B\check{B}) \cong \check{\mathfrak{b}}/\check{B}$ . Similarly, if  $k = \mathrm{KU}$  and  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_m$ , then the 1-shifted Cartier dual of  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is  $B\mathbf{Z}$ , and  $\mathrm{Map}(B\mathbf{Z}, B\check{B}) \cong \check{B}/\check{B}$ . Finally, if  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is an elliptic curve  $E$ , then its 1-shifted Cartier dual is  $\mathrm{Pic}^0(E) = E$ , so  $\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee) = \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(E)$ . In fact, in this language, the calculations of [Dev24] show that the stated equivalence continues to hold if  $k = \mathrm{ku}$  (now one must replace  $\pi_0(k)$  by  $\mathbf{Z}[\beta]$ , and  $F$  by  $F[\beta]$ ) and  $\mathbf{G}$  is the group scheme  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{Z}[\beta, x, \frac{1}{1+\beta x}]$  with group law  $x + y + \beta xy$ .

Observe that if  $\mathcal{L}$  is a degree zero line bundle on  $\mathbf{G}_0^\vee$ , then  $H^*(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee; \mathcal{L})$  vanishes unless  $\mathcal{L}$  is trivial, in which case it is isomorphic to an exterior algebra over  $k$  on a class in degree 1. Using this, the Kostant slice is straightforward to describe in the semisimple rank 1 cases. For instance, if  $\check{G} = \mathrm{PGL}_2$ , the map  $\kappa : \mathbf{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$

can be understood as follows. Since  $\mathbf{G}_0 = \text{Hom}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee, B\mathbf{G}_m)$ , a point of  $\mathbf{G}_0$  can be viewed as a degree zero line bundle on  $\mathbf{G}_0^\vee$ . Given such a line bundle  $\mathcal{L}$ , the map  $\kappa$  sends it to the trivial  $\check{B}$ -bundle  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \mathcal{L} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0^\vee} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0^\vee}$  if  $\mathcal{L}$  is nontrivial, and to the unique nontrivial extension  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0^\vee} \subseteq \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{G}_0^\vee}$  if  $\mathcal{L}$  is trivial. This nontrivial extension comes from a nonzero section of  $H^1(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee; \mathcal{O})$ .

Recall from Definition 6.13 the algebra  $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{H}, T, W)$  associated to a 1-dimensional group scheme  $\mathbf{H}$  over a field  $F$  and a root system with torus  $T$  and Weyl group  $W$ . In the following discussion, we will set  $\mathbf{H} = E$ , so that  $\mathbf{H}_T = \text{Bun}_T^0(E) = \mathcal{M}_T$ . Exactly the same argument as in Theorem 6.17 shows the following result; here,  $G$  does not need to be simply-laced.

**Theorem 8.14.** *There is an isomorphism of sheaves of associative algebras over  $\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{G}_m^{\text{rot}}} = E$ :*

$$(15) \quad \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}_c}(\text{Fl}_G)^\vee \cong \mathcal{H}(E, \tilde{T}, \tilde{W}).$$

Here,  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}_c}(\text{Fl}_G)^\vee$  is equipped with the associative algebra structure coming from convolution. Moreover, the above isomorphism is also one of (cocommutative) Hopf  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_{\tilde{T},0}} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{H}_{\tilde{T}}}$ -algebroids.

**Remark 8.15.** Recall the quotient  $\text{Bun}_T^0(E) // \tilde{W}$  from Remark 6.16. The discussion therein combined with Theorem 8.14 gives an equivalence of categories

$$\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{\tilde{T}_c}(\text{Fl}_G)^\vee\text{-mod} \simeq \mathcal{H}(E, \tilde{T}, \tilde{W})\text{-mod} \simeq \text{IndCoh}(\text{Bun}_{\tilde{T}}^0(E) // \tilde{W}).$$

Assume, again, that  $G$  is simply-laced. Just as in Section 6, one would like to use Theorem 8.14 to prove analogues of Corollary 6.25 and (10). However, unlike with Theorem 7.14, we do not even have a putative description for the Langlands dual side. By analogy with the K-theoretic case, it is natural to expect that the dual side will be related to elliptic quantum groups à la [Fel95]; I am currently exploring this direction of research.

## 9. COMPARISON TO BRYLINSKI-ZHANG

In [BZ00], Brylinski-Zhang compute the  $G_c$ -equivariant complex K-theory of  $G_c$  for a connected compact Lie group  $G_c$  with torsion-free fundamental group as the ring  $\Omega_{\mathrm{RU}(G)/\mathbf{Z}}^* = \Omega_{T//W/\mathbf{Z}}^*$  of Kähler differentials on the complex representation ring of  $G$ . Our goal in this section is to describe the relationship between this calculation and (the proof of) Theorem 1.4.

We begin by stating an obvious corollary of Theorem 1.4. Recall that if  $\mathbf{G}_0$  be either  $\mathbf{G}_a$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_m$ , or an elliptic curve  $E$ , and  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0} = \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{X}^*(T), \mathbf{G}_0)$ , there is a Kostant section  $\kappa : \mathcal{M}_{T,0} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_B^0(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$  as described in Definition 6.1, Definition 7.1, and Proposition 8.2. Recall that  $F$  is an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero containing  $\pi_0(k)$ .

**Theorem 9.1.** *Let  $G$  be a connected almost simple simply-laced group. Let  $k$  denote either  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ , KU, or elliptic cohomology, and let  $\mathbf{G}_0$  be either  $\mathbf{G}_a$ ,  $\mathbf{G}_m$ , or an elliptic curve  $E$  over  $\pi_0(k)$ , respectively. Then there is an equivalence*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\check{T},0} \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)} \mathcal{M}_{\check{T},0}),$$

where the right-hand side denotes the self-intersection of the Kostant slice.

*Proof.* Recall from Definition 4.4 that

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{T_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k) = \mathrm{LMod}_{\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee)}(\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{T,0})).$$

In Theorem 6.3, Theorem 7.3, and Theorem 8.7, we showed that  $\mathrm{Spec}_{\mathcal{M}_{T,0}}(\pi_0(\mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee))$  is isomorphic to the self-intersection  $\mathcal{M}_{T,0} \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_B^0(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)} \mathcal{M}_{T,0}$ , so the desired equivalence follows.  $\square$

In the same way, if  $G$  is further assumed to have torsion-free fundamental group, and  $\mathcal{M}_{G,0}$  denotes the moduli space of semistable  $G$ -bundles on  $\mathbf{G}_0^\vee$ , there is a Kostant section  $\kappa : \mathcal{M}_{G,0} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$ . In the additive and multiplicative cases, this follows from Definition 6.1, Definition 7.1, and in the elliptic case, it can be deduced from [Dav19] as in Proposition 8.2. Just as in Theorem 9.1, there is an equivalence

$$(16) \quad \mathrm{Loc}_{\check{G}_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\mathcal{M}_{\check{G},0} \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)} \mathcal{M}_{\check{G},0})$$

where the right-hand side denotes the self-intersection of the Kostant slice. Under this equivalence, the “constant sheaf” in  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\check{G}_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)$  is sent to the pushforward of the structure sheaf under the relative diagonal

$$\delta : \mathcal{M}_{\check{G},0} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\check{G},0} \times_{\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)} \mathcal{M}_{\check{G},0}.$$

In the remainder of this section, we will explain how (16) implies the calculation of [BZ00], as well as the relationship to the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg theorem. (This, of course, is a triple of authors distinct from Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel with initials “HKR”!) For simplicity, we will only focus on the case when  $k$  is  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  or KU (so  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is either  $\mathbf{G}_a$  or  $\mathbf{G}_m$ , and  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$  is either  $\check{\mathfrak{g}}/\check{G}$  or  $\check{G}/\check{G}$ ). With a little bit of elbow grease, one can show that most of the results below continue to work for elliptic cohomology, too.

Recall that  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\check{G}_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)$  is intended to be an approximation to a  $k$ -linear  $\infty$ -category of  $G_c$ -equivariant local systems on  $G_c$ . The algebra of endomorphisms of the constant sheaf in this  $\infty$ -category is given by the equivariant cochains  $\mathcal{F}_G(G_c)$ . This is a quasicoherent sheaf over the spectral  $k$ -scheme  $\mathcal{M}_G$ , and it can be described

explicitly as follows. If  $\mathfrak{X}_k$  is a spectral prestack over  $k$ , let  $\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{X}_k$  denote the free loop space of  $\mathfrak{X}_k$ , i.e., the mapping prestack  $\text{Map}(B\mathbf{Z}, \mathfrak{X}_k)$ . Here,  $\mathbf{Z}$  is viewed as a constant stack over  $k$ . The global sections of the structure sheaf of  $\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{X}_k$  computes the Hochschild homology  $\text{HH}(\mathfrak{X}_k/k)$ .

**Proposition 9.2.** *Assume (for simplicity) that  $k$  is either  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  or  $\text{KU}$ . If  $G$  is connected, then there is an isomorphism of spectral  $k$ -schemes*

$$\text{Spec}_{\mathcal{M}_G}(\mathcal{F}_G(G_c)) \cong \mathcal{LM}_G.$$

*In particular, there is an isomorphism of  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $k_{G_c}$ -algebras*

$$\mathcal{F}_G(G_c) \cong \text{HH}(\mathcal{M}_G/k).$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $B\mathbf{Z}$  is isomorphic to the constant  $k$ -stack  $S^1$ , which can be written as the pushout  $* \amalg_{*\amalg} *$ . Therefore, since  $\mathcal{M}_G = \text{Spec } k_{G_c}$  is affine (because  $k$  is either  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  or  $\text{KU}$ ), we may write  $\mathcal{LM}_G = \text{Spec}(k_{G_c} \otimes_{k_{G_c} \otimes_k k_{G_c}} k_{G_c})$ . Since the functor  $\mathcal{F}_G : \mathcal{S}(G_c)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}_{k_{G_c}}$  sends finite products of connected finite  $G$ -spaces to tensor products, we find that

$$k_{G_c} \otimes_{k_{G_c} \otimes_k k_{G_c}} k_{G_c} \cong \mathcal{F}_G(*) \otimes_{\mathcal{F}_G \times G(*)} \mathcal{F}_G(*) \cong \mathcal{F}_G(G_c),$$

since there is an isomorphism of orbispaces

$$*/G_c \times_{*/(G_c \times G_c)} */G_c \cong G_c/G_c. \quad \square$$

**Remark 9.3.** The approach of Proposition 9.2 can be used to compute the equivariant cohomology  $\mathcal{F}_G(\Omega G_c)$ , too. Namely, observe that there is an isomorphism of orbispaces

$$*/G_c \times_{*/G_c \times_{*/(G_c \times G_c)} */G_c} */G_c \cong (\Omega G_c)/G_c,$$

so that there is an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{F}_G(\Omega G_c) = k_{G_c} \otimes_{k_{G_c} \otimes_k k_{G_c}} k_{G_c} k_{G_c}.$$

The right-hand side can be expressed more succinctly as the factorization homology  $\int_{S^2}(k_{G_c}/k)$ .

More generally, observe that if  $K_c \subseteq G_c$  is a closed subgroup such that  $G_c/K_c$  is a finite  $K_c$ -space (where  $K_c$  acts on the left by multiplication), and  $L(G_c/K_c)$  denotes the (topological) free loop space of  $G_c/K_c$ , then

$$G_c \backslash L(G_c/K_c) \simeq K_c \backslash \Omega(G_c/K_c) \simeq (* \times_{*/G_c \times_{*/(G_c \times G_c)} */G_c} *)/K_c \simeq */K_c \times_{*/K_c \times_{*/G_c \times_{*/(G_c \times G_c)} */K_c} */K_c}.$$

It follows that there is an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{F}_G(\mathcal{L}(G_c/K_c)) = k_{K_c} \otimes_{k_{K_c} \otimes_k k_{G_c}} k_{K_c} k_{K_c}.$$

The right-hand side can be expressed more succinctly as the relative Hochschild homology  $\text{HH}(\mathcal{M}_K/\mathcal{M}_G)$ . The discussion above computing  $\mathcal{F}_K(\Omega K_c)$  is the special case of the above calculation when  $G_c = K_c \times K_c$ , with  $K_c$  embedded diagonally.

**Example 9.4.** Let  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ . Then the preceding discussion shows that  $C_{G_c}^*(\Omega G_c; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}])$  is isomorphic to  $\int_{S^2}(k_{G_c}/k) = \text{HH}(k_{G_c}/k_{G_c} \otimes_k k_{G_c})$ . The latter has a Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg filtration whose associated graded is given by the 2-periodification  $L\Omega_{\mathfrak{t} // W / (\mathfrak{t} // W \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbf{Q}} \mathfrak{t} // W)}[u^{\pm 1}]$  of the derived Hodge complex of  $\mathfrak{t} // W$  embedded diagonally into  $\mathfrak{t} // W \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbf{Q}} \mathfrak{t} // W$ . Since we are working rationally, the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg filtration splits, and so there is an isomorphism

$$\int_{S^2}(k_{G_c}/k) \cong L\Omega_{\mathfrak{t} // W / (\mathfrak{t} // W \times_{\text{Spec } \mathbf{Q}} \mathfrak{t} // W)}[u^{\pm 1}].$$

Note that if  $X$  (like  $\mathfrak{t} // W$ ) is an affine space over a commutative ring  $R$ , then  $L\Omega_{X/(X \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(R)} X)}^* \cong \Gamma^*(\Omega_{X/R}^1)$ ; so the above isomorphism could instead be stated as

$$\int_{S^2} (k_{G_c}/k) \cong \mathrm{Sym}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t} // W}}(\Omega_{\mathfrak{t} // W}^1)[u^{\pm 1}] = \mathcal{O}_{T(\mathfrak{t} // W)}[u^{\pm 1}],$$

where  $T(\mathfrak{t} // W)$  is the tangent bundle of  $\mathfrak{t} // W$ . It follows that there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Spec} C_{G_c}^*(\Omega_{G_c}; \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]) \cong T(\mathfrak{t} // W) \times_{\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{Q})} \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]).$$

This recovers the  $\hbar = 0$  case of [BF08, Theorem 1]. By keeping track of loop-rotation equivariance (namely,  $S^1$  acting on  $S^2$  by rotation about a fixed axis), the general result can also be established by similar arguments.

Let us now discuss the relationship between Proposition 9.2 and (16). Although the cases  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  and  $k = \mathrm{KU}$  can be treated simultaneously, we will present the discussion separately for both for the sake of clarity. The upshot of this discussion that the approximation to  $\mathcal{F}_G(G_c)$  afforded by the degeneration of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(G_c; k)$  to  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)$  identifies, under Proposition 9.2 and (16), with the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg spectral approximation of  $\pi_* \mathrm{HH}(\mathcal{M}_G/k)$  by  $\Omega_{\mathcal{M}_{G,0}/\pi_0(k)}^*$ .

**Lemma 9.5.** *Let  $H$  be a smooth affine group scheme over an affine scheme  $S = \mathrm{Spec}(R)$ , let  $\delta : S \rightarrow H$  denote the zero section, and let  $\mathfrak{h}$  denote its Lie algebra (viewed as a vector bundle over  $S$ ). Then  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{QCoh}(H)}(\delta_* \mathcal{O}_S)$  has a filtration whose associated graded is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{h}^*[1]}$ . If  $R$  is a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra, this filtration splits.*

*Proof.* The endomorphism algebra  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{QCoh}(H)}(\delta_* \mathcal{O}_S)$  is isomorphic to the  $R$ -linear dual of  $\mathcal{O}_{S \times_H S}$ . The derived scheme  $S \times_H S$  depends only on the formal completion  $\hat{H}$ . Note that  $\hat{H}$  admits a filtration (coming from powers of the ideal sheaf of the zero section of  $\hat{H}$ ) whose associated graded is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{h}$ ; furthermore, the exponential map defines a splitting of this filtration when  $R$  is a  $\mathbf{Q}$ -algebra. This defines a filtration on  $S \times_H S$  whose associated graded is isomorphic to  $S \times_{\mathfrak{h}} S = \mathfrak{h}[-1]$ . Therefore, the  $R$ -linear dual of  $\mathcal{O}_{S \times_H S}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{h}^*[1]}$ .  $\square$

**Example 9.6.** Suppose  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ , and let  $\check{J} = \mathfrak{t} // W \times_{\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*/\check{G}} \mathfrak{t} // W$ . Then (16) states that there is an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} F \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{J}),$$

and the “constant sheaf”  $\underline{k}^{\mathrm{gr}}$  in  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)$  is sent to the pushforward of the structure sheaf under the identity section  $\delta : \mathfrak{t} // W \rightarrow \check{J}$ . Taking endomorphisms, we find that

$$\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)}(\underline{k}^{\mathrm{gr}}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} F \cong \mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{J})}(\delta_* \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{t} // W}).$$

By Lemma 9.5, the right-hand side admits a (split) filtration whose associated graded is isomorphic to the algebra of functions on  $\mathrm{Lie}_{\mathfrak{t} // W}(\check{J})^*[1]$ . By [Ric17, Theorem 3.4.2], one finds that the Lie algebra  $\mathrm{Lie}_{\mathfrak{t} // W}(\check{J})$  is isomorphic to the cotangent bundle  $T^*(\mathfrak{t} // W)$ , so that  $\mathrm{Lie}_{\mathfrak{t} // W}(\check{J})^*[1]$  is isomorphic to  $T[1](\mathfrak{t} // W)$ . Its ring of functions is precisely the Hodge cohomology  $\Omega_{\mathfrak{t} // W/F}^* = \bigoplus (\Omega_{\mathfrak{t} // W/F}^i)[-i]$  of  $\mathfrak{t} // W$ . Summarizing, we have found that there is an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{End}_{\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}^{\mathrm{gr}}(G_c; k)}(\underline{k}^{\mathrm{gr}}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} F \cong \Omega_{\mathfrak{t} // W/F}^*.$$

On the other hand, it follows from the constructions in Section 4 that there is a filtration on  $\mathcal{F}_G(G_c) = \text{End}_{\text{Loc}_{G_c}(G_c; k)}(\underline{k})$  whose associated graded is  $\text{End}_{\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(G_c; k)}(\underline{k}^{\text{gr}})[u^{\pm 1}]$ . By the above discussion, the latter is  $\Omega_{t//W/F}^*$ . Proposition 9.2 shows that  $\mathcal{F}_G(G_c) \otimes_k F[u^{\pm 1}]$  is isomorphic to the Hochschild homology  $\text{HH}(t//W/F)[u^{\pm 1}]$ . There is therefore a filtration on  $\text{HH}(t//W/F)[u^{\pm 1}]$  whose associated graded is  $\Omega_{t//W/F}^*[u^{\pm 1}]$ . This filtration is precisely the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg filtration on Hochschild homology (see, e.g., [Ant18, Rak20]).

**Example 9.7.** Suppose  $k = \text{KU}$ , and assume  $G$  is simply-laced and has torsion-free fundamental group. Let  $\check{J}_\mu = T//W \times_{G/\check{G}} T//W$ . Then (16) states that there is an equivalence

$$\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(G_c; \text{KU}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F \simeq \text{QCoh}(\check{J}_\mu),$$

and the “constant sheaf”  $\underline{\text{KU}}^{\text{gr}}$  in  $\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(G_c; \text{KU})$  is sent to the pushforward of the structure sheaf under the identity section  $\delta : T//W \rightarrow \check{J}_\mu$ . Taking endomorphisms, we find that

$$\text{End}_{\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(G_c; \text{KU})}(\underline{\text{KU}}^{\text{gr}}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F \cong \text{End}_{\text{QCoh}(\check{J}_\mu)}(\delta_* \mathcal{O}_{T//W}).$$

By Lemma 9.5, the right-hand side admits a (split) filtration whose associated graded is isomorphic to the algebra of functions on  $\text{Lie}_{T//W}(\check{J}_\mu)^*[1]$ . There is a multiplicative analogue of [Ric17, Theorem 3.4.2] which states the Lie algebra  $\text{Lie}_{T//W}(\check{J}_\mu)$  is isomorphic to the cotangent bundle  $T^*(T//W)$ . In particular,  $\text{Lie}_{T//W}(\check{J}_\mu)^*[1]$  is isomorphic to  $T[1](T//W)$ . Its ring of functions is precisely the Hodge cohomology  $\Omega_{T//W/F}^* = \bigoplus (\Omega_{T//W/F}^i)[-i]$  of  $T//W$ . Summarizing, we have found that there is an isomorphism

$$\text{End}_{\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(G_c; k)}(\underline{k}^{\text{gr}}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Q}} F \cong \Omega_{T//W/F}^*.$$

On the other hand, it follows from the constructions in Section 4 that there is a filtration on  $\mathcal{F}_G(G_c) = \text{End}_{\text{Loc}_{G_c}(G_c; \text{KU})}(\text{KU})$  whose associated graded is  $\text{End}_{\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(G_c; \text{KU})}(\underline{\text{KU}}^{\text{gr}})[u^{\pm 1}]$ . By the above discussion, the latter is  $\Omega_{T//W/F}^*$ . Proposition 9.2 shows that  $\mathcal{F}_G(G_c) \otimes_{\text{KU}} F[u^{\pm 1}]$  is isomorphic to the Hochschild homology  $\text{HH}(T//W/F)[u^{\pm 1}]$ . There is therefore a filtration on  $\text{HH}(T//W/F)[u^{\pm 1}]$  whose associated graded is  $\Omega_{T//W/F}^*[u^{\pm 1}]$ . Again, this filtration is precisely the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg filtration on Hochschild homology.

In fact, the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg filtrations on  $\text{HH}(t//W/F)$  and  $\text{HH}(T//W/F)$  from Example 9.6 and Example 9.7 both split, since  $F$  is of characteristic zero and  $t//W$  and  $T//W$  are smooth schemes. We therefore conclude that there are isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} H_{G_c}^*(G_c; F[u^{\pm 1}]) &\cong \Omega_{t//W/F}^*[u^{\pm 1}], \\ \text{KU}_{G_c}^*(G_c) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} F &\cong \Omega_{T//W/F}^*[u^{\pm 1}], \end{aligned}$$

the latter for  $G_c$  being simply-laced. (This assumption can be removed with further work.) The final isomorphism above recovers (the base-change to  $F$  of) the isomorphism of Brylinski-Zhang. Arguing as above, one also finds that if  $k$  is an elliptic cohomology theory,  $G_c$  is simply-laced and has torsion-free fundamental group, and  $i : \text{Spec}(F[u^{\pm 1}]) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_G$  is a map with  $F$  being an algebraically closed



field of characteristic zero, there is an isomorphism of quasicoherent sheaves over  $\mathrm{Spec}(F[u^{\pm 1}])$ :

$$\pi_* i^* \mathcal{F}_G(G_c) \cong \Omega_{\mathcal{M}_{G,0}/F}^*[u^{\pm 1}].$$

## APPENDIX A. COMPARISON TO HOPKINS-KUHN-RAVENEL

The calculations of this article (more precisely, the perspective of Remark 8.13) were motivated by the work of Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel [HKR00], who study the case of finite groups. In this section, we will describe a relationship to their work. Our discussion will be rather heuristic, and we will sweep a few details under the rug to keep the exposition readable.

Before proceeding, the first thing to note is that while the present article only discusses *connected* compact Lie groups, Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel only study *discrete* compact Lie groups (that is, finite groups). Next, the work of [HKR00] only deals with Borel-equivariant cohomology. This means that one does *not* need to assume that the complex-oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring  $k$  is equipped with an oriented commutative  $k$ -group  $\mathbf{G}$ ; recall from Section 3 that the purpose of  $\mathbf{G}$  is to provide a decompletion of Borel-equivariant cohomology for compact abelian Lie groups. All that is needed is the formal completion  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$  of  $\mathbf{G}$  at the identity section. Note that this is not extra data associated to  $k$ , since  $\hat{\mathbf{G}} = \mathrm{Spf} k^{\mathbf{C}P^\infty}_+$ . Let  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$  denote the underlying 1-dimensional formal group over  $\pi_0(k)$ .

In fact, an even more stringent condition is required of  $k$  in [HKR00]: not only is it required to be complex-oriented and 2-periodic, but  $\pi_0(k)$  is required to be a complete local Noetherian domain with maximal ideal  $\mathfrak{m}$  whose residue field  $\pi_0(k)/\mathfrak{m}$  is of characteristic  $p > 0$ , such that  $p$  is not nilpotent in  $\pi_0(k)$ . Let  $n$  denote the height of the formal group  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$  base-changed along  $\pi_0(k) \rightarrow \pi_0(k)/\mathfrak{m}$ . In the following discussion, we will simply write  $k^0(X)$  to denote  $\pi_0$  of the the  $k$ -cochains on  $X$  (instead of the more cumbersome notation  $\pi_0\mathcal{F}(X)$ ).

Let  $\mathbf{C}_p$  denote the completion of the algebraic closure of  $\mathbf{Q}_p$ , and choose a continuous embedding  $\pi_0(k) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}_p}$ . The base-change of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$  to  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}_p}$  defines a formal group law on the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}_p}$ ; assume that the base-change of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$  along the map  $\pi_0(k) \rightarrow \pi_0(k)/\mathfrak{m}$  has finite height. Then, there exists an exponential isomorphism

$$(17) \quad e : (\mathbf{Q}_p/\mathbf{Z}_p)^n \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{C}_p}}, +_{\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0}),$$

where  $n$  is the height of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$ . The basic calculation driving the results of [HKR00] is the following.

**Proposition A.1.** *There is an isomorphism*

$$k^0(B\mathbf{Z}/p^j) \cong \pi_0(k)[[t]]/[p^j](t),$$

where  $[p^j](t) \in \pi_0(k)[[t]]$  is the  $p^j$ -series of the formal group law  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$ , and  $t$  is the first Chern class of the standard character  $\mathbf{Z}/p^j \cong \mu_{p^j} \subseteq S^1$ . That is, there is an isomorphism  $\mathrm{Spf} k^0(B\mathbf{Z}/p^j) \cong \hat{\mathbf{G}}_0[p^j]$ .

**Construction A.2.** Proposition A.1 and the discussion preceding it gives an isomorphism

$$\mathrm{Spf}(k^0(B\mathbf{Z}/p^j)) \otimes_{\mathrm{Spf} \pi_0(k)} \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{C}_p \cong \frac{1}{p^j} \mathbf{Z}/\mathbf{Z},$$

where the right-hand side denotes the constant group scheme over  $\mathbf{C}_p$ . A choice of generator (e.g.,  $\frac{1}{p^j}$ ) of this group therefore gives a map  $k^0(B\mathbf{Z}/p^j) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_p$ . Now let  $F$  be a finite group, and let  $f : \mathbf{Z}_p^n \rightarrow F$  be a homomorphism. Then  $f$  factors as a map  $\mathbf{Z}_p^n \rightarrow (\mathbf{Z}/p^j)^n \rightarrow F$  for some  $j$ , so there is a map  $k^0(BF) \rightarrow k^0(B(\mathbf{Z}/p^j)^n)$ .

Taking the product of the maps  $k^0(B\mathbf{Z}/p^j) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_p$  described above gives a map  $k^0(B(\mathbf{Z}/p^j)^n) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_p$ , which finally defines a composite map

$$k^0(BF) \rightarrow k^0(B(\mathbf{Z}/p^j)^n) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_p.$$

This composite depends only on the conjugacy class of  $f$ , and so this construction defines a map  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F) // F \rightarrow \mathrm{Map}(k^0(BF), \mathbf{C}_p)$ , whose adjoint is a map  $k^0(BF) \rightarrow \mathrm{Map}(\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F) // F, \mathbf{C}_p)$ . Here,  $F$  acts on  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)$  by conjugation.

In the discussion below,  $F$  will be a finite group. For simplicity, we will further assume that  $k^*(BF)$  is concentrated in even degrees (so, by the 2-periodicity of  $k$ , it is completely determined by  $k^0(BF)$ ). If  $X$  is an  $F$ -space, the homotopy orbits of  $X$  will be denoted  $X_{hF}$ , while the ordinary quotient of  $X$  by the  $F$ -action will be denoted  $X // F$ .

**Theorem A.3** (Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel). *The map from Construction A.2 defines an isomorphism*

$$k^0(BF) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Map}(\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F) // F, \mathbf{C}_p).$$

*The quotient  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F) // F$  can be replaced by the homotopy orbits  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)_{hF}$ , since  $F$  is a finite group and its order is invertible in  $\mathbf{C}_p$ .*

Note that the homotopy orbits  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)_{hF}$  can be identified with  $\mathrm{Map}(BT_p^n, BF)$ , where  $T_p^n = (\mathbf{Q}_p/\mathbf{Z}_p)^n$  is the  $p$ -adic  $n$ -torus. One can use a ring smaller than  $\mathbf{C}_p$  in Theorem A.3; essentially, one only needs to extend scalars to the rationalization of the smallest ring containing  $\pi_0(k)$  over which the exponential isomorphism (17) holds.

In [Lur19], Lurie observes that the isomorphism of Theorem A.3 can be categorified, at least if one assumes the data of a decompletion  $\mathbf{G}$  of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ . (We refer the reader to [Lur19] for further details, since the specific setup will not concern us much below.) Namely, if  $F$  is a finite group, Lurie defines an  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$  (denoted by  $\mathrm{LocSys}_{\mathbf{G}}(BF)$  in *loc. cit.*), and proves the following as (a consequence of) [Lur19, Theorem 6.4.1]:

**Theorem A.4** (Lurie). *Fix an embedding  $\pi_0(k) \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_p$ , so it defines an  $\mathbf{E}_{\infty}$ -map  $k \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}]$ . There is a symmetric monoidal fully faithful embedding*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k) \otimes_k \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}] \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Map}(BT_p^n, BF); \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}]).$$

The essential image of the above embedding is described in [Lur19, Theorem 6.5.13].

Let us examine the isomorphism Theorem A.3 and the embedding Theorem A.4 further; we will rephrase the right-hand sides of both results as algebro-geometric objects. To do this, note that the exponential isomorphism between  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0 \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p$  and  $(\mathbf{Q}_p/\mathbf{Z}_p)^n$  defines an isomorphism between  $\mathbf{D}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p$  and  $\mathbf{Z}_p^n$ . Here,  $\mathbf{D}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0) = \mathrm{Hom}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0, \mathbf{G}_m)$  is the Cartier dual of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$ . Note that the 1-shifted Cartier dual  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^{\vee}$  can be identified with the classifying stack of  $\mathbf{D}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0)$ .

View the finite group  $F$  as defining a constant group scheme  $\underline{F}$  over  $\mathbf{C}_p$ . Since  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^{\vee} \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C} \cong \mathbf{Z}_p^n$ , the mapping stack  $\mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^{\vee}, B\underline{F})$  is the quotient of the discrete scheme  $\underline{\mathrm{Hom}}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)$  by the constant group scheme  $\underline{F}$  acting by conjugation.

It follows that the  $\mathbf{C}_p$ -algebra  $\text{Map}(\text{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F) // F, \mathbf{C}_p)$  is the algebra of functions on the mapping stack  $\text{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\underline{F})$ . (Not that since the order of  $F$  is invertible in  $\mathbf{C}_p$ , the derived and classical algebras of functions agree.) Similarly,  $\text{Loc}(\text{Map}(BT_p^n, BF); \mathbf{C}_p)$  can be viewed as the category of quasicoherent sheaves on the mapping stack  $\text{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\underline{F})$ . Therefore, Theorem A.3 and Theorem A.4 can be restated as:

$$(18) \quad \pi_0 k_F \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p \xrightarrow{\cong} \Gamma(\text{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\underline{F}); \mathcal{O}),$$

$$(19) \quad \text{Loc}_F(*; k) \otimes_k \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}] \hookrightarrow \text{QCoh}(\text{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\underline{F})) \otimes_{\text{Mod}_{\mathbf{C}_p}} \text{Mod}_{\mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}]}.$$

One can even replace  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$  in the above by  $\mathbf{G}_0$ . Observe, now, that  $\text{Map}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee, B\underline{F})$  is simply the stack  $\text{Bun}_{\underline{F}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$ .

We can now compare (18) and (19) to the discussion in the body of this article. Assume now that  $k$  is either  $\mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ , KU, or elliptic cohomology. If  $G_c$  was instead a connected compact Lie group, the analogue of (18) states that  $\pi_0 k_{G_c} \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}$  is the ring of (classical, not derived!) global sections on  $\text{Bun}_G^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$ , where  $G$  is the complex reductive group corresponding to  $G_c$ . This is clear when  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is  $\mathbf{G}_a$  (and  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$ ) or  $\mathbf{G}_m$  (and  $k = \text{KU}$ ). In the case when  $\mathbf{G}_0$  is an elliptic curve, this is essentially part of the definition of equivariant elliptic cohomology as sketched in [Lur09] and constructed in [GM23, GM20].

Let us continue to assume that  $G_c$  is a connected compact Lie group, and further impose that it is simply-laced and almost simple. We will now give a heuristic argument suggesting that Theorem 1.4 – or rather, its variant from Remark 8.12 describing  $\text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k)$  – can be viewed as an analogue of (19).

Indeed, the rephrasing of Remark 8.12 from Remark 8.13 states that there is an equivalence

$$(20) \quad \text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C} \simeq \text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_G^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\text{reg}}).$$

The regular locus  $\text{Bun}_G^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\text{reg}}$  is an open substack of  $\text{Bun}_G^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$  (whose complement has codimension  $\geq 2$ , as proved in [Dav19, Proposition 3.1.16]), and so there is a fully faithful embedding  $\text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_G^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\text{reg}}) \hookrightarrow \text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_G^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee))$ . That is, there is a fully faithful embedding

$$(21) \quad \text{Loc}_{G_c}^{\text{gr}}(\text{Gr}_G; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C} \hookrightarrow \text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_G^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)).$$

Assume for the moment that (21) holds if  $\tilde{G}$  is a finite group  $\tilde{F}$  (and replace  $\mathbf{C}$  above by  $\mathbf{C}_p$ ). Of course, it is not clear what the Langlands dual  $F$  of  $\tilde{F}$  should mean; but it is reasonable to believe that, whatever it is,  $F$  should be a finite group (or perhaps a finite group scheme). In any case,  $\text{Gr}_F$  will just be a point, so the left-hand side of (21) is simply  $\text{Loc}_{\tilde{F}}^{\text{gr}}(*; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}$ . It is reasonable to expect that, thanks to a formality-type statement, the 2-periodification of the category  $\text{Loc}_{\tilde{F}}^{\text{gr}}(*; k) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}$  is equivalent to  $\text{Loc}_{\tilde{F}}(*; k) \otimes_k \mathbf{C}[u^{\pm 1}]$ .

Turning to the right-hand side of (21), note that because  $\tilde{F}$  is a finite group, there is no meaningful notion of semistability, and so  $\text{Bun}_{\tilde{F}}^{\text{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee) = \text{Bun}_{\tilde{F}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$ . With these translations made (so the left-hand side of (21) is replaced by  $\text{Loc}_{\tilde{F}}(*; k) \otimes_k \mathbf{C}[u^{\pm 1}]$ , and the right-hand side by the 2-periodification of  $\text{QCoh}(\text{Bun}_{\tilde{F}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee))$ ), (21) is precisely of the form (19), as claimed.

**Remark A.5.** The above comparison between the quotient  $\text{Gr}_G/G[[t]]$  for a connected compact Lie group  $G_c$  and the classifying space  $BF$  for a finite group  $F$

can be made more precise by noting that  $\mathrm{Gr}_G/G[[t]]$  is homotopy equivalent to the mapping space  $\mathrm{Map}(S^2, BG_c) = \mathrm{Bun}_{G_c}(S^2)$ , and that if  $F$  is a finite group, then  $\mathrm{Bun}_F(S^2) = BF$ .

The work of Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel in fact proves a statement which is much more general than Theorem A.3 (and similarly, Lurie's work in [Lur19] yields a much stronger statement than Theorem A.4). Namely, they prove the following.

**Theorem A.6** (Hopkins-Kuhn-Ravenel). *Let  $F$  be a finite group, and let  $X$  be a finite  $F$ -space. For each homomorphism  $\alpha : \mathbf{Z}_p^n \rightarrow F$ , let  $X^\alpha$  denote the fixed locus of  $\mathrm{im}(\alpha)$ . Then there is an isomorphism*

$$k^*(X_{hF}) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p \xrightarrow{\cong} H^* \left( \left( \coprod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)} X^\alpha \right) // F; \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}] \right).$$

The isomorphism of Theorem A.3 is the special case when  $X$  is a point. In [Lur19], Lurie shows that Theorem A.6 is a consequence of a more general statement. If  $X$  is a finite  $F$ -space, Lurie defines an  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(X; k)$  (denoted by  $\mathrm{LocSys}_{\mathbf{G}}(X//F)$  in *loc. cit.*), and proves the following as [Lur19, Theorem 6.4.1]:

**Theorem A.7** (Lurie). *There is a symmetric monoidal fully faithful embedding*

$$\mathrm{Loc}_F(X; k) \otimes_k \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}] \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Map}(BT_p^n, X_{hF}); \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}]).$$

The essential image of the above embedding is described in [Lur19, Theorem 6.5.13]. For the reader interested in chasing down references: specifically, Theorem A.7 generalizes [Lur19, Theorem 4.3.2]; the latter implies Theorem A.6 by [Lur19, Corollary 4.3.4]. The basic observation is that the mapping space  $\mathrm{Map}(BT_p^n, X_{hF})$  is equivalent to  $\left( \coprod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)} X^\alpha \right)_{hF}$ . Note that the homotopy quotient  $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)_{hF}$  can be written as a disjoint union  $\coprod_{[\alpha]} BZ(\alpha)$  ranging over conjugacy classes of homomorphisms  $\alpha : \mathbf{Z}_p^n \rightarrow F$ ; here  $Z(\alpha)$  denotes the centralizer of the image of  $\alpha$ . Similarly, the homotopy orbits  $\left( \coprod_{\alpha \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{Z}_p^n, F)} X^\alpha \right)_{hF}$  can be rewritten as the disjoint union  $\coprod_{[\alpha]} X_{hZ(\alpha)}^\alpha$ .

**Remark A.8.** One could contemplate a variant of Theorem A.6 and Theorem A.7 which replaces  $\mathbf{C}_p$  by other  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ - $k$ -algebras (e.g., over which the base-change of  $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0$  is not necessarily isomorphic to  $(\mathbf{Q}_p/\mathbf{Z}_p)^n$ , but over which it has  $(\mathbf{Q}_p/\mathbf{Z}_p)^j$  as a summand for some  $j < n$ ). The analogues of Theorem A.6 and Theorem A.7 in this generality were proved in [Sta13, Sta15] and [Lur19].

Given the analogy between Theorem A.4 and Theorem 1.4, it is natural to ask for an analogue of Theorem A.7 for connected compact Lie groups. In the following discussion, we suggest an analogy: namely, one could view the  $k$ -theoretic variant (described for  $k = \mathrm{ku}$  in [Dev24]) of the local unramified relative Langlands conjecture of [BZSV23] as an analogue of the aforementioned results.

To understand this, let us again massage Theorem A.6 and Theorem A.7 to a form more suited to algebro-geometric considerations. We will continue to assume for simplicity that  $k^*(BF)$  is concentrated in even degrees. Theorem A.6 describes how, under the isomorphism of Theorem A.3, the  $k^0(BF) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p$ -module  $k^*(X_{hF}) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p$  decomposes as a module over  $\Gamma(\mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\mathbf{F}); \mathcal{O})$ . Similarly, Theorem A.7 says that there is an explicit  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\mathbf{F}))$ -module category  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_X$  and a fully faithful  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k) \otimes_k \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}]$ -linear embedding

$$\mathrm{Loc}_F(X; k) \otimes_k \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}] \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_X \otimes_{\mathbf{C}_p} \mathbf{C}_p[u^{\pm 1}].$$

Note that one source of  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\mathcal{F}))$ -module categories are maps  $\tilde{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\mathcal{F})$ : namely,  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\tilde{L})$  is a  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\mathcal{F}))$ -module category. That is, one could imagine that  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_X$  is of the form  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\tilde{L})$  for some such  $\tilde{L}$  as above which is associated to  $X$ . (While one can give a somewhat *ad hoc* definition of  $\tilde{L}$  in terms of the fixed point spaces  $X^\alpha$  and their (co)homology<sup>16</sup>, it should be rather interesting to intrinsically understand the algebro-geometric properties of  $\tilde{L}$  directly.)

More generally, recall that the data of a  $k$ -linear  $\infty$ -category with  $F$ -action is just a  $\mathrm{Fun}(B\mathcal{F}, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$ -module category. Since  $\mathrm{Fun}(B\mathcal{F}, \mathrm{Mod}_k)$  is a completion of the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$ , one might view the data of a  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$ -module category  $\mathcal{C}$  as a decompletion of the notion of a  $k$ -linear  $\infty$ -category with  $F$ -action. One example of such a category is  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(X; k)$  for a finite  $F$ -space  $X$ . If  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is a distinguished object of  $\mathcal{C}$ , then  $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{C}}(\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p$  is a  $k^0(B\mathcal{F}) \otimes_{\pi_0(k)} \mathbf{C}_p$ -module, and hence a  $\Gamma(\mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\mathcal{F}); \mathcal{O})$ -module. One could now ask for a description of this module structure; when  $\mathcal{C} = \mathrm{Loc}_F(X; k)$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is the constant sheaf therein, this is precisely answered by Theorem A.6. Similarly, one could ask for an analogue of Theorem A.7 in this generalized context. Summarizing, both Theorem A.6 and Theorem A.7 can be understood as describing how a  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$ -module category decomposes over the mapping stack  $\mathrm{Map}(\hat{\mathbf{G}}_0^\vee, B\mathcal{F})$ .

Let  $G_c$  be a connected, almost simple, simply-laced compact Lie group. Then, as discussed above, the analogue of  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$  is the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\tilde{G}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$ . Moreover, the analogue of the tensor product on  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$  is the *convolution* tensor product on  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\tilde{G}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  coming, for instance, from the  $\tilde{G}_c$ -equivariant  $\mathbf{E}_2$ -space structure on  $\mathrm{Gr}_G \cong \Omega G_c$ . As mentioned in Remark 8.13, the equivalence of (20) is monoidal for the convolution tensor product on  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\tilde{G}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  and the ordinary tensor product of quasicoherent sheaves on  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}$ .

Based on the discussion above, one can interpret the following question as an analogue of Theorem A.6 and Theorem A.7: how does a  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$ -module category decompose over  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}$ ? More precisely, any finite  $G_c$ -space  $X$  should:

- (a) define a  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\tilde{G}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$ -module category  $\mathcal{C}_X$ ; this is the analogue of the  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(*; k)$ -module category  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(X; k)$ .
- (b) define a fully faithful embedding  $\mathcal{C}_X \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_X$  into an explicit  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee))$ -module category  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_X$ ; this is the analogue of the fully faithful embedding  $\mathrm{Loc}_F(X; k) \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{[\alpha]} \mathrm{Loc}(X_{hZ(\alpha)}^\alpha; \mathbf{C}_p)$  from Theorem A.7.

In the following discussion, we will quietly replace  $\mathrm{Loc}_{\tilde{G}_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  by  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  for conceptual simplicity; this, of course, changes the quasicoherent side, but to avoid getting into more detail than is necessary, we will pretend that the dual side remains unchanged<sup>17</sup>. To describe a candidate for  $\mathcal{C}_X$ , recall that the quotient  $\mathrm{Gr}_G/G[[t]]$  is homotopy equivalent to the mapping space  $\mathrm{Map}(S^2, BG_c) = \mathrm{Bun}_{G_c}(S^2)$ . This, in turn, can be described as the double coset stack  $G_c \backslash (LG_c)/G_c$ , where  $LG_c$  denotes the (topological) free loop space of  $G_c$ . Any  $G_c$ -space  $X$  defines an  $LG_c$ -space  $LX$ , and the stack  $G_c \backslash (LG_c)/G_c$  acts on  $(LX)/G_c$  by convolution. That is, the  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; k)$  with its convolution tensor product acts on

<sup>16</sup>For instance, take  $\tilde{L}$  to be the stack  $\coprod_{[\alpha]} \mathrm{Spec}(H^*(X^\alpha; \mathbf{C}_p))/Z(\alpha)$ .

<sup>17</sup>If  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  and  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_a$ , the object  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee) = \mathfrak{g}/\tilde{G}$  must be replaced by  $\mathfrak{g}^*/\tilde{G} = \mathfrak{g}/\tilde{G}$ ; and similarly, if  $k = \mathbf{K}U$  and  $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}_m$ , the object  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee) = \tilde{G}/\tilde{G}$  must be replaced by  $G/\tilde{G}$ .

$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(LX; k)$ . One could therefore regard the latter category as a candidate for  $\mathcal{C}_X$ , and further ask for the following strengthening of (a) and (b) above:

- there should be a stack  $\check{L}^{\mathrm{reg}}$  equipped with a map  $\check{L}^{\mathrm{reg}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}$  such that there is an equivalence

$$\mathcal{C}_X = \mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(LX; k) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{L}^{\mathrm{reg}}).$$

- the stack  $\check{L}^{\mathrm{reg}}$  should be an open substack of a larger stack  $\check{L}$ , and the map  $\check{L}^{\mathrm{reg}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)^{\mathrm{reg}}$  extends to a map  $\check{L} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$ . This gives a fully faithful embedding

$$\mathcal{C}_X \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_X := \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{L}).$$

Note that  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)$  is the quotient of  $\mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)_{\mathrm{triv}}$  by  $\check{G}$ , so one could equivalently view  $\check{L}$  as the data of a  $\check{G}$ -stack  $\check{M}$  equipped with a  $\check{G}$ -equivariant map

$$\mu : \check{M} \rightarrow \mathrm{Bun}_G^{\mathrm{ss}}(\mathbf{G}_0^\vee)_{\mathrm{triv}}.$$

The relation between  $\check{L}$  and  $\check{M}$  is that  $\check{L} = \check{M}/\check{G}$ .

**Example A.9.** If  $k = \mathbf{Q}[u^{\pm 1}]$  and  $\mathbf{G}_0 = \mathbf{G}_a$ , then  $\check{M}$  is simply a  $\check{G}$ -stack equipped with a  $\check{G}$ -equivariant map  $\mu : \check{M} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$ . Similarly, if  $k = \mathrm{KU}$  and  $\mathbf{G}_0 = \mathbf{G}_m$ , then  $\check{M}$  is simply a  $\check{G}$ -stack equipped with a  $\check{G}$ -equivariant map  $\mu : \check{M} \rightarrow G$ .

Suppose  $X$  is the analytification of an affine  $G$ -variety  $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ . In [BZSV23], Ben-Zvi–Sakellaridis–Venkatesh study (under certain additional conditions on  $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ ) the full  $\infty$ -category  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(X_{\mathbf{C}}((t)); \mathbf{C})$  as a module over  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$ . The local unramified geometric conjecture of [BZSV23] (see [BZSV23, Conjecture 7.5.1]) says – up to the issue of shearing, which we will ignore here – that associated to  $X_{\mathbf{C}}$  is a Hamiltonian  $\check{G}$ -stack  $\check{M}$  such that there is an equivalence of categories  $\mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(X_{\mathbf{C}}((t)); \mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{M}/\check{G})$ . The data of a Hamiltonian  $\check{G}$ -structure on  $\check{M}$  gives, in particular, an  $\check{G}$ -equivariant moment map  $\check{M} \rightarrow \check{\mathfrak{g}}^*$  which makes  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{M}/\check{G})$  into a  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*/\check{G})$ -module category. Moreover, under certain assumptions on  $X_{\mathbf{C}}$ , there is a fully faithful embedding  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(LX; \mathbf{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(X_{\mathbf{C}}((t)); \mathbf{C})$ . Putting this together, we find a picture exactly like the one described in the preceding paragraph: namely, assuming [BZSV23, Conjecture 7.5.1], there is a fully faithful embedding

$$\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(LX; \mathbf{C}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Shv}_{G[[t]]}(X_{\mathbf{C}}((t)); \mathbf{C}) \simeq \mathrm{QCoh}(\check{M}/\check{G})$$

of  $\mathrm{Loc}_{G_c}(LX; \mathbf{C})$  into an explicit  $\mathrm{QCoh}(\check{\mathfrak{g}}^*/\check{G})$ -module category. Therefore, one could view (the 2-periodification of) [BZSV23, Conjecture 7.5.1] as a conjectural analogue for connected compact Lie groups and  $k = \mathbf{C}[u^{\pm 1}]$  of Theorem A.6 and Theorem A.7.<sup>18</sup> Motivated by this discussion, we propose in [Dev24] that there should be a variant of [BZSV23, Conjecture 7.5.1] for sheaves with coefficients in other  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -rings (like connective complex K-theory  $\mathrm{ku}$  or elliptic cohomology).

<sup>18</sup>Of course, since  $F$  is a finite group, Theorem A.6 and Theorem A.7 are contentless if  $k = \mathbf{C}[u^{\pm 1}]$ ; so what we mean by the analogy between [BZSV23, Conjecture 7.5.1] and Theorem A.7 is that the latter admits a conjectural generalization to connected compact Lie groups, and that the resulting statement specialized to  $k = \mathbf{C}[u^{\pm 1}]$  is still interesting.

## APPENDIX B. COULOMB BRANCHES OF PURE SUPERSYMMETRIC GAUGE THEORIES

In this brief appendix, we explain some motivation for the results of this article from the perspective of Coulomb branches of 4d  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  and 5d  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  gauge theories with a generic choice of complex structure. The goal here is not to be precise, but instead explain some motivation for the ideas in this article. While reading this appendix, the reader should keep in mind that I know very little physics!

**Recollection B.1.** In [BFN18, Nak16] (see also [Nak17]), it is argued that the Coulomb branch of 3d  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  pure gauge theory on  $\mathbf{R}^3$  can be modeled by the algebraic symplectic variety  $\mathcal{M}_C := \text{Spec } H_*^{G_c}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  over  $\mathbf{C}$ . This is in turn isomorphic by [BF08, Theorem 3] (reproved here as Corollary 6.21) to the phase space of the Toda lattice for  $\check{G}$ , as well as (by [BFN18, Theorem A.1]) to the moduli space of solutions of Nahm’s equations on  $[-1, 1]$  for a compact form of  $\check{G}$  with an appropriate boundary condition. The *quantized* Coulomb branch of 3d  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  pure gauge theory on  $\mathbf{R}^3$  is then modeled by  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon := H_*^{G_c \times S^1_{\text{rot}}}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$ . Note that  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$  is isomorphic to the algebra of operators of the quantized Toda lattice for  $\check{G}$ .

**Remark B.2.** The physical reason for the definition of  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$  is the “ $\Omega$ -background” (introduced in [NS09]); we refer the reader to [BBB<sup>+</sup>20, Tel14] for helpful expositions on this topic. The essential idea is as follows: the equivariant homology  $C_*^G(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  admits the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_3^{\text{tr}}$ -algebra. In particular, the  $\mathbf{E}_3$ -algebra structure on  $C_*^G(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  is equivariant for the action of  $S^1$  on  $C_*^G(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  via loop rotation, and the action of  $S^1$  on  $\mathbf{E}_3$  via rotation about a line  $\ell \subseteq \mathbf{R}^3$ . Using the fact that the fixed points of the  $S^1$ -action on  $\mathbf{R}^3$  are given by the line  $\ell$ , it is argued in [BBB<sup>+</sup>20] that the homotopy fixed points of  $C_*^G(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  admits the structure of an  $\mathbf{E}_1\text{-}C_{S^1}^*(\mathbf{C})$ -algebra. Furthermore, the associative multiplication on  $C_*^{G_c \times S^1_{\text{rot}}}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  degenerates to the 2-shifted Poisson bracket on  $H_*^{G_c}(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  obtained from the  $\mathbf{E}_3$ -algebra structure. The “ $\Omega$ -background” is supposed to refer to the compatibility of the  $S^1$ -action on  $C_*^G(\text{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  with the  $S^1$ -action on the  $\mathbf{E}_3$ -operad.

From the mathematical perspective, the idea that  $S^1$ -actions can be viewed as deformation quantizations has been made precise by [Pre15, Toe14], and more recently in [But20a, But20b], at least in characteristic zero. Although often not said explicitly, the idea has been a cornerstone of the development of Hochschild homology and its relatives. (The reader can skip the following discussion, since it will not be necessary in the remainder of this section; we only include it for completeness.)

Consider a smooth  $\mathbf{C}$ -scheme  $X$ , so that the Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg theorem gives an isomorphism  $\text{HH}(X/\mathbf{C}) \simeq \text{Sym}(\Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^1[1])$ . There is an isomorphism  $\text{Sym}(\Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^1[1]) \simeq \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} (\wedge^n \Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^1)[n]$ , so  $\text{Sym}(\Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^1[1])$  can be understood as a shearing of the algebra  $\Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^* = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} (\wedge^n \Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^1)[-n]$  of differential forms. The Hochschild-Kostant-Rosenberg theorem further states that the  $S^1$ -action on  $\text{HH}(X/\mathbf{C})$  is a shearing of the de Rham differential on  $\Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^*$ .

The Koszul dual of the algebra  $\text{HH}(X/\mathbf{C}) \simeq \text{Sym}(\Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^1[1])$  is  $\text{Sym}(T_{X/\mathbf{C}}[-2]) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{T^*[2]X}$ ; in the same way, the sheaf of differential operators on  $X$  is Koszul dual to



the de Rham complex of  $X$ . This can be drawn pictorially as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathrm{Sym}(T_{X/\mathbf{C}}[-2]) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{T^*[2]X} & \xrightarrow{\text{def. quant}} & \mathcal{D}_{X/\mathbf{C}}^{\hbar} \\
 \downarrow \text{Koszul dual} & & \downarrow \text{Koszul dual} \\
 \mathrm{Sym}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\Omega_{X/\mathbf{C}}^1[1]) \simeq \mathrm{HH}(X/\mathbf{C}) & \xrightarrow[S^1\text{-action}]{} & \text{shearing of } (\Omega_{X/k}^*, d_{\mathrm{dR}}).
 \end{array}$$

Since the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_X^{\hbar}$  of differential operators is a quantization of  $T^*[2]X$ , this diagram illustrates the idea that the  $S^1$ -action on Hochschild homology plays the role of a Koszul dual to deformation quantization.

**Example B.3.** We will keep  $G = \mathrm{PGL}_2$  as a running example in discussing Coulomb branches (see also [SW97, Section 2]), so that  $\tilde{G} = \mathrm{SL}_2$ . In this case,

$$\mathcal{M}_C \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{C}[x, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x}]^{\mathbf{Z}/2} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{C}[x^2, a + a^{-1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x}]$$

by Theorem 6.3, where  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  acts on  $\mathbf{C}[x, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x}]$  by  $x \mapsto -x$  and  $a \mapsto a^{-1}$ . This is the regular centralizer group scheme of  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ . Let us denote by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Phi &= x^2, \\
 U &= a + a^{-1}, \\
 V &= \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$U^2 - \Phi V^2 = (a + a^{-1})^2 - (a - a^{-1})^2 = 4,$$

so  $\mathcal{M}_C$  is isomorphic to the subvariety of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{C}}^3$  cut out by the above equation. This is known as the *Atiyah-Hitchin manifold*, and was studied in great detail in [AH88] (see [AH88, Page 20] for the definition). In [BFN18, Theorem A.1], it was shown that the Atiyah-Hitchin manifold is isomorphic to the moduli space of solutions of Nahm's equations on  $[-1, 1]$  for  $\mathrm{SU}(2)$  with an appropriate boundary condition.

Since a normal vector to the defining equation of  $\mathcal{M}_C$  is  $2U\partial_U - V^2\partial_{\Phi} - 2V\Phi\partial_V$ , the standard holomorphic 3-form  $dU \wedge d\Phi \wedge dV$  on  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{C}}^3$  induces a holomorphic symplectic form  $\frac{d\Phi \wedge dV}{2U}$  on  $\mathcal{M}_C$ . (This can also be written as  $\frac{dU \wedge dV}{V^2}$  or as  $\frac{d\Phi \wedge dU}{2\Phi V}$ .) The associated Poisson bracket on  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_C} \cong H_*^{G^c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$  agrees with the 2-shifted Poisson bracket arising from the  $\mathbf{E}_3$ -structure on  $C_*^{G^c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G; \mathbf{C})$ .

The quantized algebra  $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}$  can be described explicitly as follows. Let us write  $\theta = \frac{1}{x}(s-1)$ , where  $s$  is the simple reflection generating the Weyl group of  $\mathrm{SL}_2$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}$  is generated as an algebra over  $\mathbf{C}[[\hbar]]$  by  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -invariant polynomials in  $x$ ,  $a^{\pm 1}$ , and  $\theta$ , where  $x$  is to be viewed as  $a\partial_a$ . Moreover, under the isomorphism  $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}/\hbar \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{M}_C}$ , the class  $x$  is sent to  $x$ , and  $\theta$  is sent to  $\frac{a-1}{x}$ . We then have the commutation relation  $[x, a^{\pm 1}] = \pm \hbar a^{-1}$ , induced by  $[\partial_a, a] = \hbar$ ; see Example 5.5. This implies that

$$[x^2, a^{\pm 1}] = \hbar^2 a^{\pm 1} \pm 2\hbar a^{\pm 1} x,$$

which in turn implies that  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$  is the quotient of the free associative  $\mathbf{C}[[\hbar]]$ -algebra on  $\Phi$ ,  $U$ , and  $V = \frac{1}{x}(a - a^{-1})$  subject to the relations

$$\begin{aligned} [\Phi, V] &= 2\hbar U - \hbar^2 V, \\ [\Phi, U] &= 2\hbar \Phi V - \hbar^2 U, \\ [U, V] &= \hbar V^2, \\ U^2 - 4 &= \Phi V^2 - \hbar UV. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the commutation relations for  $[\Phi, U]$  and  $[U, V]$  in [DG19, Equation B.3] have typos, but it is stated correctly in [BDG17, Equation 5.51].

**Example B.4.** When  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$ , we can identify  $\mathcal{M}_C$  with the quotient of the scheme of Example B.3 by the free  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action sending  $U \mapsto -U$  and  $V \mapsto -V$ ; so

$$\mathcal{M}_C \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{C}[x^2, (a + a^{-1})^2, \left(\frac{a - a^{-1}}{2x}\right)^2, \frac{(a + a^{-1})(a - a^{-1})}{2x}].$$

This is the regular centralizer group scheme for  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . Note that if we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi &= x^2, \\ A &= (a + a^{-1})^2, \\ B &= 4 \left(\frac{a - a^{-1}}{2x}\right)^2 = \frac{(a - a^{-1})^2}{x^2}, \\ C &= 2 \frac{(a + a^{-1})(a - a^{-1})}{2x} = \frac{(a + a^{-1})(a - a^{-1})}{x}, \end{aligned}$$

then we have relations

$$\begin{aligned} AB &= C^2, \\ A - \Phi B &= 4. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\mathcal{M}_C$  is cut out in  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{C}}^3$  (with coordinates  $\Phi$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$ ) via the equation

$$C^2 - \Phi B^2 = 4B.$$

Note the similarity to the manifold from Example B.3: in fact, it is the quotient of the aforementioned manifold by the free  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action sending  $U \mapsto -U$  and  $V \mapsto -V$ . In terms of these coordinates,  $B = V^2$  and  $C = UV$ . (Sometimes, this quotient is also referred to as the Atiyah-Hitchin manifold.) It is also possible to describe  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ ; we leave this to the reader, since it is rather tedious.

**Heuristic B.5.** An unpublished conjecture of Gaiotto (which I learned about from Nakajima) says that the Coulomb branch of 4d  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  pure gauge theory over  $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$  with a generic choice of complex structure can be modeled by  $\mathcal{M}_C^{\mathrm{4d}} := \mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{KU}_0^{G_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{C}$ . Although I do not know Gaiotto's motivation for this conjecture (it is probably inspired by [SW97]), my attempt at heuristically justifying it goes as follows. (In [Dev24, Appendix C(b)], I suggest that it might be slightly better to consider  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{ku}_*^{G_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{C}$  instead, where  $\mathrm{ku}$  denotes *connective* complex K-theory. The Bott class generating  $\pi_2(\mathrm{ku})$  plays the role of the radius of the circle  $S^1$ .)

Recall that  $\mathrm{Gr}_G/G[[t]]$  can be viewed as  $\mathrm{Bun}_G(S^2)$ . It is reasonable to view  $\mathrm{KU}_0(\mathrm{Bun}_G(S^2)) \otimes \mathbf{C}$  as closely related to  $H_*(\mathrm{LBun}_G(S^2); \mathbf{C})$ , where  $\mathrm{LBun}_G(S^2)$  denotes the topological free loop space of  $\mathrm{Bun}_G(S^2)$ . Since  $\mathrm{LBG} \simeq \mathrm{BLG}$ , we have  $\mathrm{LBun}_G(S^2) \simeq \mathrm{Bun}_{LG}(S^2)$ , so one might view  $H_*(\mathrm{LBun}_G(S^2); \mathbf{C})$  as the ring of

functions on the “Coulomb branch of 3d  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  pure gauge theory on  $\mathbf{R}^3$  with gauge group  $LG$ ”.

Making precise sense of this phrase seems difficult, but one possible workaround could be the following. It is often useful to view gauge theory with gauge group  $LG$  as “finite temperature” gauge theory with gauge group  $G$ . Recall that Wick rotation relates  $(3+1)$ -dimensional quantum field theory at a finite temperature  $T$  to statistical mechanics over  $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$  where the circle has radius  $\frac{1}{2\pi T}$ . This suggests that  $H_*(LBun_G(S^2); \mathbf{C})$  (which is more precisely to be replaced by  $KU_0^{G_c}(\text{Gr}_G) \otimes \mathbf{C}$ ) can be viewed as the ring of functions on the “Coulomb branch of 4d  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  pure gauge theory on  $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$  with gauge group  $G$ ”. See [BFN18, Remark 3.14]. In [BFM05],  $\text{Spec } KU_0^{G_c}(\text{Gr}_G) \otimes \mathbf{C}$  was identified with the phase space of the relativistic Toda lattice for  $\check{G}$ .

One can also define a quantization of  $\mathcal{M}_C^{4d}$  via  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{4d} := KU_0^{G_c \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Gr}_G) \otimes \mathbf{C}$ ; this can be viewed as a model for the quantized Coulomb branch of 4d  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  pure gauge theory on  $\mathbf{R}^3 \times S^1$ . The algebra  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{4d}$  can be identified with the algebra of operators of the quantized relativistic Toda lattice for  $\check{G}$ .

**Example B.6.** When  $G = \text{PGL}_2$ , Theorem 7.3 tells us that

$$\mathcal{M}_C^{4d} \cong \text{Spec } \mathbf{C}[x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-1}]^{\mathbf{Z}/2} \cong \text{Spec } \mathbf{C}[x + x^{-1}, a + a^{-1}, \frac{(a-a^{-1})(x+1)}{x-1}],$$

where  $\mathbf{Z}/2$  acts by  $x \mapsto x^{-1}$  and  $a \mapsto a^{-1}$ . For simplicity, let us consider instead a slight variant of  $\mathcal{M}_C^{4d} = \text{Spec } KU_0^{\text{PSU}(2)}(\text{Gr}_{\text{PGL}_2}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{C}$ , given by  $\mathcal{M}'_C^{4d} = \text{Spec } KU_0^{\text{SU}(2)}(\text{Gr}_{\text{PGL}_2}) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{C}$ . Then

$$\mathcal{M}'_C^{4d} \cong \text{Spec } \mathbf{C}[x^{\pm 1}, a^{\pm 1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-x^{-1}}]^{\mathbf{Z}/2} \cong \text{Spec } \mathbf{C}[x + x^{-1}, a + a^{-1}, \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-x^{-1}}].$$

Let us write  $\Psi = x + x^{-1}$ ,  $W = a + a^{-1}$ , and  $Z = \frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-x^{-1}}$ . Then, one easily verifies that  $\mathcal{M}'_C^{4d}$  is the subvariety of  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{C}}^3$  cut out by the equation

$$W^2 - (\Psi^2 - 4)Z^2 = 4.$$

This may be regarded as a multiplicative analogue of the Atiyah-Hitchin manifold. It would be very interesting to understand a relationship between this manifold and the moduli space of solutions to some analogue of Nahm’s equations for  $\text{PSU}(2)$  with an appropriate boundary condition. The complex manifold  $\mathcal{M}'_C^{4d}$  has a holomorphic symplectic form given by  $\frac{d\Psi \wedge dZ}{W}$ , which can also be written as  $\frac{d\Psi \wedge dW}{(\Psi^2 - 4)Z}$  or as  $\frac{dZ \wedge dW}{\Psi Z^2}$ .

It is also possible to explicitly describe the quantized algebra  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{4d}$ . The resulting description is not very enlightening, so we will only indicate how one reaches the answer. In this case, instead of the relation  $[\partial_a, a] = \hbar$  which appeared in Example B.3, we have the relation  $xa = qax$  (i.e.,  $xa x^{-1} a^{-1} = q$ ); see Example 5.6. In particular,  $xa^{-1} = q^{-1} a^{-1} x$ ,  $x^{-1} a = q^{-1} a x^{-1}$ , and  $x^{-1} a^{-1} = q a^{-1} x^{-1}$ . It follows after some tedious calculation that  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{4d}$  is the quotient of the free associative  $\mathbf{C}[q^{\pm 1}]$ -algebra on  $\Psi$ ,  $W$ , and  $\frac{x+1}{x-1}(a - a^{-1})$  subject to four relations.

Suppose we consider instead the variant of  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{4d}$  defined by  $\mathcal{A}'_\epsilon^{4d} = KU_0^{\text{SU}(2) \times S_{\text{rot}}^1}(\text{Gr}_{\text{PGL}_2}) \otimes \mathbf{C}$ . Then  $\mathcal{A}'_\epsilon^{4d}$  is the quotient of the free associative  $\mathbf{C}[q^{\pm 1}]$ -algebra on  $\Psi$ ,  $W$ , and

$Z = \frac{1}{x-x^{-1}}(a - a^{-1})$  subject to the relations

$$\begin{aligned} [\Psi, W] &= (q-1)(\Psi^2 - 4)Z - \frac{(q-1)^2}{2q}((\Psi^2 - 4)Z + \Psi W), \\ [\Psi, Z] &= (q-1)W - \frac{(q-1)^2}{2q}(\Psi Z + W), \\ [Z, W] &= (q-1)\Psi Z^2 - \frac{(q-1)^2}{2q}(\Psi Z + W)Z, \\ W^2 - 4 &= (\Psi^2 - 4)Z^2 - \frac{(q-1)^2}{2q}(\Psi^2 - 4)Z^2 + \frac{q^2-1}{2q}\Psi WZ. \end{aligned}$$

**Example B.7.** When  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$ , one can view  $\mathcal{M}_C^{4d}$  with the quotient of the scheme  $\mathcal{M}_C^{4d}$  of Example B.6 by the free  $\mathbf{Z}/2$ -action sending  $W \mapsto -W$  and  $Z \mapsto -Z$ ; so

$$\mathcal{M}_C^{4d} \cong \mathrm{Spec} \mathbf{C}[x + x^{-1}, (a + a^{-1})^2, \left(\frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-x^{-1}}\right)^2, \frac{(a-a^{-1})(a+a^{-1})}{x-x^{-1}}].$$

This is the regular centralizer group scheme for  $\mathrm{PGL}_2$ . Note that if we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= x + x^{-1}, \\ A &= (a + a^{-1})^2 = a^2 + a^{-2} + 2, \\ B &= \left(\frac{a-a^{-1}}{x-x^{-1}}\right)^2 = \frac{a^2+a^{-2}-2}{x^2+x^{-2}-2}, \\ C &= \frac{(a+a^{-1})(a-a^{-1})}{x-x^{-1}} = \frac{a^2-a^{-2}}{x-x^{-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

then we have relations

$$\begin{aligned} AB &= C^2, \\ A - (\Psi^2 - 4)B &= 4. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,  $\mathcal{M}_C^{4d}$  is cut out in  $\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{C}}^3$  (with coordinates  $\Psi$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$ ) via the equation

$$C^2 - (\Psi^2 - 4)B^2 = 4B.$$

Note the similarity to Example B.6. It is also possible to describe  $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{4d}$ ; again, we leave this to the reader, since it is rather tedious.

Consider an elliptic curve  $E(\mathbf{C})$  over  $\mathbf{C}$ . Motivated by Heuristic B.5 and [NY05], one might expect that (in some specific complex structure) the Coulomb branch of 5d  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  pure gauge theory over  $\mathbf{R}^3 \times E(\mathbf{C})$  can be modeled by the complexification of the  $G_c$ -equivariant  $k$ -homology of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ , where  $k$  is an elliptic cohomology theory associated to a putative integral lift of  $E$ . Unfortunately, a classical result of Tate says that there are no smooth elliptic curves over  $\mathbf{Z}$ , so  $E(\mathbf{C})$  cannot literally lift to  $\mathbf{Z}$  (i.e.,  $\pi_0(k)$  cannot be  $\mathbf{Z}$ ).

As a fix, one can more generally simultaneously consider all possible ‘‘Coulomb branches’’  $\mathcal{M}_C^{5d} := \mathrm{Spec} \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_G(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee \otimes \mathbf{C}$  associated to every complex-oriented 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -ring  $k$  equipped with an oriented elliptic curve (this is almost equivalent to considering the universal example  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{tmf}_0^{G_c}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \otimes \mathbf{C}$ ). We have described  $\mathrm{Spec} \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_T(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee \otimes \mathbf{C}$  in Theorem 8.7, from which one can calculate  $\mathcal{M}_C^{5d}$ . Similarly, one can even use Theorem 8.14 to calculate  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{T \times \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee \otimes \mathbf{C}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}^{5d} := \pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{G \times \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee \otimes \mathbf{C}$ , but this is already incredibly complicated for  $G = \mathrm{SL}_2$ .

It would be very interesting to give a physical interpretation to  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_G(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee \otimes \mathbf{C}$  and  $\pi_0 \mathcal{F}_{G \times \mathbf{G}_m^{\mathrm{rot}}}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)^\vee \otimes \mathbf{C}$  for other 2-periodic  $\mathbf{E}_\infty$ -rings  $k$ , although we expect this

to be very difficult (since most other chromatically interesting generalized cohomology theories only exist after profinite or  $p$ -adic completion, and do not admit transcendental analogues). It would also be very interesting to describe the analogue of our calculations for the ind-schemes  $\mathcal{R}_{G,\mathbf{N}}$  introduced in [BFN18]. By adapting the methods of [BFN18, Section 4], this is approachable when  $G$  is a torus. We expect it to lead to interesting geometry for nonabelian  $G$ . In [Dev24], we extend the discussion of this paper (at least, the parts concerning ordinary cohomology and K-theory) to connective K-theory, and suggest an analogue of the relative Langlands program of [BZSV23] in this setting; as mentioned in the introduction of [Dev24], the story therein also admits an elliptic variant.

## REFERENCES

- [ABG04] S. Arkhipov, R. Bezrukavnikov, and V. Ginzburg. Quantum groups, the loop Grassmannian, and the Springer resolution. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 17(3):595–678, 2004.
- [Ada69] J. F. Adams. Lectures on generalised cohomology. In *Category Theory, Homology Theory and their Applications, III (Battelle Institute Conference, Seattle, Wash., 1968, Vol. Three)*, pages 1–138. Springer, Berlin, 1969.
- [AG15] D. Arinkin and D. Gaitsgory. Singular support of coherent sheaves and the geometric Langlands conjecture. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 21(1):1–199, 2015.
- [AH88] M. Atiyah and N. Hitchin. *The geometry and dynamics of magnetic monopoles*. M. B. Porter Lectures. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1988.
- [Ant18] B. Antieau. Periodic cyclic homology and derived de Rham cohomology. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.05246>, 2018.
- [AS69] M. Atiyah and G. Segal. Equivariant  $K$ -theory and completion. *J. Differential Geometry*, 3:1–18, 1969.
- [Ati57] M. Atiyah. Vector bundles over an elliptic curve. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 7:414–452, 1957.
- [BBB<sup>+</sup>20] C. Beem, D. Ben-Zvi, M. Bullimore, T. Dimofte, and A. Neitzke. Secondary products in supersymmetric field theory. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 21(4):1235–1310, 2020.
- [BBD82] A. Beilinson, J. Bernstein, and P. Deligne. Faisceaux pervers. In *Analysis and topology on singular spaces, I (Luminy, 1981)*, volume 100 of *Astérisque*, pages 5–171. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1982.
- [BDG17] M. Bullimore, T. Dimofte, and D. Gaiotto. The Coulomb branch of 3d  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theories. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 354(2):671–751, 2017.
- [BF08] R. Bezrukavnikov and M. Finkelberg. Equivariant Satake category and Kostant-Whittaker reduction. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 8(1):39–72, 183, 2008.
- [BFM05] R. Bezrukavnikov, M. Finkelberg, and I. Mirković. Equivariant homology and  $K$ -theory of affine Grassmannians and Toda lattices. *Compos. Math.*, 141(3):746–768, 2005.
- [BFN18] A. Braverman, M. Finkelberg, and H. Nakajima. Towards a mathematical definition of Coulomb branches of 3-dimensional  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  gauge theories, II. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 22:1071–1147, 2018.
- [BHS20] R. Burklund, J. Hahn, and A. Senger. Galois reconstruction of Artin-Tate  $\mathbb{R}$ -motivic spectra. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.10325>, 2020.
- [BO78] P. Berthelot and A. Ogus. *Notes on crystalline cohomology*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1978.
- [Bot58] R. Bott. The space of loops on a Lie group. *Michigan Math. J.*, 5:35–61, 1958.
- [Bri00] M. Brion. Poincaré duality and equivariant (co)homology. *Michigan Math. J.*, 48:77–92, 2000. Dedicated to William Fulton on the occasion of his 60th birthday.
- [But20a] D. Butson. Equivariant localization in factorization homology and applications in mathematical physics I: Foundations. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.14988>, 2020.
- [But20b] D. Butson. Equivariant localization in factorization homology and applications in mathematical physics I: Gauge theory applications. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.14978>, 2020.
- [BZ00] J.-L. Brylinski and B. Zhang. Equivariant  $K$ -theory of compact connected Lie groups. *K-Theory*, 20(1):23–36, 2000. Special issues dedicated to Daniel Quillen on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, Part I.
- [BZSV23] D. Ben Zvi, Y. Sakellaridis, and A. Venkatesh. Relative Langlands duality. <https://www.math.ias.edu/~akshay/research/BZSVpaperV1.pdf>, 2023.
- [CG10] N. Chriss and V. Ginzburg. *Representation theory and complex geometry*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston, Ltd., Boston, MA, 2010. Reprint of the 1997 edition.
- [CK18] S. Cautis and J. Kamnitzer. Quantum  $K$ -theoretic geometric Satake: the  $SL_n$  case. *Compos. Math.*, 154(2):275–327, 2018.
- [CR23] J. Campbell and S. Raskin. Langlands duality on the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian. Available at <https://gauss.math.yale.edu/~sr2532/>, 2023.
- [Dav19] D. Davis. The elliptic Grothendieck-Springer resolution as a simultaneous log resolution of algebraic stacks. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1908.04140>, 2019.

- [Dev23] S. Devalapurkar. Topological Hochschild homology, truncated Brown-Peterson spectra, and a topological Sen operator. <https://sanathdevalapurkar.github.io/files/thh-Xn.pdf>, 2023.
- [Dev24] S. Devalapurkar. ku-theoretic spectral decompositions for spheres and projective spaces. [https://sanathdevalapurkar.github.io/files/hyperboloid\\_spectral\\_decomp.pdf](https://sanathdevalapurkar.github.io/files/hyperboloid_spectral_decomp.pdf), 2024.
- [DG19] T. Dimofte and N. Garner. Coulomb branches of star-shaped quivers. *J. High Energy Phys.*, (2):004, front matter+87, 2019.
- [DM23] S. Devalapurkar and M. Misterka. Generalized  $n$ -series and de Rham complexes. <https://sanathdevalapurkar.github.io/files/fglS-and-dR-complexes.pdf>, 2023.
- [Dri21] V. Drinfeld. A 1-dimensional formal group over the prismatization of  $\mathrm{Spf} \mathbf{Z}_p$ . <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.11466>, 2021.
- [Fel95] G. Felder. Elliptic quantum groups. In *XIth International Congress of Mathematical Physics (Paris, 1994)*, pages 211–218. Int. Press, Cambridge, MA, 1995.
- [FM00] R. Friedman and J. Morgan. Holomorphic principal bundles over elliptic curves. II. The parabolic construction. *J. Differential Geom.*, 56(2):301–379, 2000.
- [FMW98] R. Friedman, J. Morgan, and E. Witten. Principal  $G$ -bundles over elliptic curves. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 5(1-2):97–118, 1998.
- [FT19] M. Finkelberg and A. Tsymbaliuk. Multiplicative slices, relativistic Toda and shifted quantum affine algebras. In *Representations and nilpotent orbits of Lie algebraic systems*, volume 330 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 133–304. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2019.
- [Gan22a] T. Gannon. Classification of nondegenerate  $G$ -categories. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11247>, 2022.
- [Gan22b] T. Gannon. The coarse quotient for affine Weyl groups and pseudo-reflection groups. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.00175>, 2022.
- [Gin18] V. Ginzburg. Nil-Hecke algebras and Whittaker  $\mathcal{D}$ -modules. In *Lie groups, geometry, and representation theory*, volume 326 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 137–184. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2018.
- [GKM98] M. Goresky, R. Kottwitz, and R. MacPherson. Equivariant cohomology, Koszul duality, and the localization theorem. *Invent. Math.*, 131(1):25–83, 1998.
- [GKV95] V. Ginzburg, M. Kapranov, and E. Vasserot. Elliptic algebras and equivariant elliptic cohomology. <https://arxiv.org/abs/q-alg/9505012>, 1995.
- [GKV97] V. Ginzburg, M. Kapranov, and E. Vasserot. Residue construction of Hecke algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 128(1):1–19, 1997.
- [GM20] D. Gepner and L. Meier. On equivariant topological modular forms. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.10254>, 2020.
- [GM23] D. Gepner and L. Meier. Equivariant elliptic cohomology with integral coefficients. Forthcoming, 2023.
- [GPS18] S. Ganatra, J. Pardon, and V. Shende. Microlocal Morse theory of wrapped Fukaya categories. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.08807>, 2018.
- [GR75] H. Garland and M. S. Raghunathan. A Bruhat decomposition for the loop space of a compact group: a new approach to results of Bott. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 72(12):4716–4717, 1975.
- [GR15] V. Ginzburg and S. Riche. Differential operators on  $G/U$  and the affine Grassmannian. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 14(3):493–575, 2015.
- [GR17] D. Gaitsgory and N. Rozenblyum. *A study in derived algebraic geometry. Vol. I. Correspondences and duality*, volume 221 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2017.
- [Gre21] R. Gregoric. Moduli stack of oriented formal groups and cellular motivic spectra over  $\mathbf{C}$ . <https://arxiv.org/abs/2111.15212>, 2021.
- [GWX21] B. Gheorghe, G. Wang, and Z. Xu. The special fiber of the motivic deformation of the stable homotopy category is algebraic. *Acta Math.*, 226(2):319–407, 2021.
- [HHH05] M. Harada, A. Henriques, and T. Holm. Computation of generalized equivariant cohomologies of Kac-Moody flag varieties. *Adv. Math.*, 197(1):198–221, 2005.
- [HKR00] M. Hopkins, N. Kuhn, and D. Ravenel. Generalized group characters and complex oriented cohomology theories. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 13(3):553–594, 2000.
- [HL22] Q. Ho and P. Li. Revisiting mixed geometry. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.04833>, 2022.

- [HRW22] J. Hahn, A. Raksit, and D. Wilson. A motivic filtration on the topological cyclic homology of commutative ring spectra. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2206.11208>, 2022.
- [HY19] J. Hahn and A. Yuan. Multiplicative structure in the stable splitting of  $\Omega SL_n(\mathbb{C})$ . *Adv. Math.*, 348:412–455, 2019.
- [KK86] B. Kostant and S. Kumar. The nil Hecke ring and cohomology of  $G/P$  for a Kac-Moody group  $G$ . *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, 83(6):1543–1545, 1986.
- [KK90] B. Kostant and S. Kumar.  $T$ -equivariant  $K$ -theory of generalized flag varieties. *J. Differential Geom.*, 32(2):549–603, 1990.
- [Kos63] B. Kostant. Lie group representations on polynomial rings. *Amer. J. Math.*, 85:327–404, 1963.
- [Kos78] B. Kostant. On Whittaker vectors and representation theory. *Invent. Math.*, 48(2):101–184, 1978.
- [KS20] A. Kalmykov and P. Safronov. A categorical approach to dynamical quantum groups. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.09081>, 2020.
- [Kum02] S. Kumar. *Kac-Moody groups, their flag varieties and representation theory*, volume 204 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2002.
- [Lon17] G. Loneragan. A remark on descent for Coxeter groups. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.01156v2>, 2017.
- [Lon18] G. Loneragan. A Fourier transform for the quantum Toda lattice. *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, 24(5):4577–4615, 2018.
- [Lon21] G. Loneragan. Geometric Satake over  $KU$ . Online talk, available at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Aazmxfb2i\\_A](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Aazmxfb2i_A), 2021.
- [Lur09] J. Lurie. A survey of elliptic cohomology. In *Algebraic Topology*, volume 4 of *Abel Symp.*, pages 219–277. Springer, 2009.
- [Lur16] J. Lurie. Higher Algebra. <http://www.math.harvard.edu/~lurie/papers/HA.pdf>, 2016.
- [Lur18a] J. Lurie. Elliptic Cohomology I: Spectral Abelian Varieties. <http://www.math.harvard.edu/~lurie/papers/Elliptic-I.pdf>, 2018.
- [Lur18b] J. Lurie. Elliptic Cohomology II: Orientations. <http://www.math.harvard.edu/~lurie/papers/Elliptic-II.pdf>, 2018.
- [Lur19] J. Lurie. Elliptic Cohomology III: Tempered Cohomology. <https://www.math.ias.edu/~lurie/papers/Elliptic-III-Tempered.pdf>, 2019.
- [Mit88] S. Mitchell. Quillen’s theorem on buildings and the loops on a symmetric space. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 34(1-2):123–166, 1988.
- [MV07] I. Mirkovic and K. Vilonen. Geometric Langlands duality and representations of algebraic groups over commutative rings. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 166(1):95–143, 2007.
- [Nak16] H. Nakajima. Towards a mathematical definition of Coulomb branches of 3-dimensional  $N = 4$  gauge theories, I. *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.*, 20(3):595–669, 2016.
- [Nak17] H. Nakajima. Introduction to a provisional mathematical definition of Coulomb branches of 3-dimensional  $N = 4$  gauge theories. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.05154>, 2017.
- [NS09] N. Nekrasov and S. Shatashvili. Quantization of Integrable Systems and Four Dimensional Gauge Theories. In *16th International Congress on Mathematical Physics*, pages 265–289, 8 2009.
- [NS18] T. Nikolaus and P. Scholze. On topological cyclic homology. *Acta Math.*, 221(2):203–409, 2018.
- [NY05] H. Nakajima and K. Yoshioka. Instanton counting on blowup. II.  $K$ -theoretic partition function. *Transform. Groups*, 10(3-4):489–519, 2005.
- [NZ09] D. Nadler and E. Zaslow. Constructible sheaves and the Fukaya category. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 22(1):233–286, 2009.
- [Pre02] A. Premet. Special transverse slices and their enveloping algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 170(1):1–55, 2002. With an appendix by Serge Skryabin.
- [Pre15] A. Preygel. Ind-coherent complexes on loop spaces and connections. In *Stacks and categories in geometry, topology, and algebra*, volume 643 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 289–323. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2015.
- [Pst23a] P. Pstragowski. Perfect even modules and the even filtration. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.04685>, 2023.
- [Pst23b] P. Pstragowski. Synthetic spectra and the cellular motivic category. *Invent. Math.*, 232(2):553–681, 2023.



- [Rak20] A. Raksit. Hochschild homology and the derived de Rham complex revisited. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2007.02576>, 2020.
- [Ric17] S. Riche. Kostant section, universal centralizer, and a modular derived Satake equivalence. *Math. Z.*, 286(1):223–261, 2017.
- [Rog08] J. Rognes. *Galois Extensions of Structured Ring Spectra/Stably Dualizable Groups*, volume 192 of *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* American Mathematical Society, 2008.
- [Sch17] P. Scholze. Canonical  $q$ -deformations in arithmetic geometry. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 26(5):1163–1192, 2017.
- [Seg68] G. Segal. Equivariant  $K$ -theory. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (34):129–151, 1968.
- [Sta13] N. Stapleton. Transchromatic generalized character maps. *Algebr. Geom. Topol.*, 13(1):171–203, 2013.
- [Sta15] N. Stapleton. Transchromatic twisted character maps. *J. Homotopy Relat. Struct.*, 10(1):29–61, 2015.
- [Ste65] R. Steinberg. Regular elements of semisimple algebraic groups. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (25):49–80, 1965.
- [SW97] N. Seiberg and E. Witten. Gauge dynamics and compactification to three dimensions. In *The mathematical beauty of physics (Saclay, 1996)*, volume 24 of *Adv. Ser. Math. Phys.*, pages 333–366. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1997.
- [Tel14] C. Teleman. Gauge theory and mirror symmetry. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Seoul 2014. Vol. II*, pages 1309–1332. Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014.
- [Toe14] B. Toen. Derived algebraic geometry and deformation quantization. In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Seoul 2014. Vol. II*, pages 769–792. Kyung Moon Sa, Seoul, 2014.
- [YZ11] Z. Yun and X. Zhu. Integral homology of loop groups via Langlands dual groups. *Represent. Theory*, 15:347–369, 2011.
- [YZ21] Y. Yang and G. Zhao. Frobenii on Morava  $E$ -theoretical quantum groups. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14681>, 2021.
- [Zho23] C. Zhong. Equivariant oriented homology of the affine Grassmannian. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.13056>, 2023.
- [Zhu17] X. Zhu. An introduction to affine Grassmannians and the geometric Satake equivalence. In *Geometry of moduli spaces and representation theory*, volume 24 of *IAS/Park City Math. Ser.*, pages 59–154. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2017.

1 OXFORD ST, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139

Email address: [sdevalapurkar@math.harvard.edu](mailto:sdevalapurkar@math.harvard.edu), July 18, 2024