

Lecture 6: Integrality of slopes of ghost series at classical weights

Goal Compute $NP(G^{(k)}(w_k, -))$ for $k \equiv k \pmod{p-1}$.

Notation Suppose we have a list of pts $P_i = (i, A_i)$, $A_i \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$i = m, m+1, \dots, n.$$

We shift them down relative to a linear function $y = ax + b$ ($a, b \in \mathbb{R}$)
by transforming them into $Q_i = (i, A_i - ai - b)$, $i = m, m+1, \dots, n$.

Facts (1) $\forall i \neq j$ slope of $\overline{Q_i Q_j} = \text{slope of } \overline{P_i P_j} - a$.

(2) if the convex hull of P_i 's is a straight line
then the same is true for Q_i 's.

(3) Fix i_0 . If P_{i_0} is a vertex of the convex hull of P_i 's,
then Q_{i_0} is a vertex of the convex hull of Q_i 's.

$$\Delta'_{k,l} = v_p \left(g_{\frac{1}{2}d_k + l, k}^{\text{inv}}(w_k) \right) - \frac{k-2}{2} \cdot l$$

$$\Delta_k = \text{convex hull of } (l, \Delta'_{k,l}) \text{ with } |l| \leq \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{new}} \longleftrightarrow \text{convex hull of } (n, v_p(g_n(w_k)))$$

$$n \in \overline{nS_{w_k, k}} = \left[\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{inv}} - \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{new}}, \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{inv}} + \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{new}} \right].$$

$$\text{Here } nS_{w_k, k} = \left(\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{inv}} - L_{w_k, k}, \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{inv}} + L_{w_k, k} \right).$$

$L_{w_k, k}$ is the largest integer in $\{1, \dots, \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{new}}\}$

$$\text{s.t. } v_p(w_k - w_k) \geq \Delta_{k, L_{w_k, k}} - \Delta_{k, L_{w_k, k} - 1}.$$

Goal Show that the convex hull of the pts $(n, v_p(g_n(w_k)))$ for $n \in \overline{nS_{w_k, k}}$
is a straight line and we compute its slope.

$$\text{Note } v_p(g_n(w_k)) = v_p(g_n(w_k)) + m_n(k) \cdot v_p(w_k - w_k), \quad g_n(w) = \prod (w - w_k)^{m_n(k)}.$$

Lemma The convex hull of the pts

$$(n, v_p(g_{n,k}(w_k))) + m_n(k) \cdot v_p(w_{\star} - w_k), \quad n \in \overline{n_{\text{Sw},k}}$$

is a straight line of slope $\frac{k-2}{2}$.

Proof Write $n = \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} + l \Rightarrow m_n(k) = \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{new}} - |l|$

\hookrightarrow the above pts can be written as

$$P_l = \left(\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} + l, \Delta'_{k,l} + \frac{k-2}{2} l + \left(\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{new}} - |l| \right) \cdot v_p(w_{\star} - w_k) \right)$$

for $l \in [-L, L]$, $L = L_{w_{\star}, k}$ for simplicity.

We shift P_l 's relative to the linear function

$$y = \frac{k-2}{2} \left(x - \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} \right) + \Delta_{k,L} - \left(\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} - L \right) v_p(w_{\star} - w_k)$$

and we get

$$Q_l = \left(\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} + l, \Delta'_{k,l} - \Delta_{k,L} + (L - |l|) \cdot v_p(w_{\star} - w_k) \right).$$

By def'n $n_{\text{Sw},k} \Rightarrow v_p(w_{\star} - w_k) \geq \Delta_{k,L} - \Delta_{k,L-1}$

$$\geq \Delta_{k,L-1} - \Delta_{k,L-2} \geq \dots \geq \Delta_{k,|l|+1} - \Delta_{k,|l|}.$$

$$(L - |l|) v_p(w_{\star} - w_k) \geq \Delta_{k,L} - \Delta_{k,|l|} \geq \Delta_{k,L} - \Delta'_{k,l}.$$

\Rightarrow y coordinate of $Q_l \geq 0$,

"=" holds when $l = \pm L$.

\Rightarrow convex hull of Q_l 's is a straight line of slope 0. \square

Lemma Let $k = k_{\varepsilon} + (p-1)k_0$, $l = 1, \dots, \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{new}}$.

Let $k' = k_{\varepsilon} + (p-1)k'_0$ be another wt

s.t. one of the following conditions hold:

(1) either d_k^{ur} or $d_k^{\text{In}} - d_k^{\text{ur}} \in \left(\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} - l, \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} + l \right)$

(2) $\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} \in \left[\frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} - l, \frac{1}{2} d_k^{\text{In}} + l \right]$.

Then $\Delta_{k,l} - \Delta_{k,l-1} - v_p(w_k - w_{k'}) \geq \frac{1}{2}(2l-1)$

$$(\Delta'_{k,l} - \Delta'_{k,l-1} \geq \frac{3}{2} + \frac{p-1}{2}(l-1).)$$

Prop Let $nS_{w,k} = (\frac{1}{2}d_k^{Iw} - L_{w,k}, \frac{1}{2}d_k^{Iw} + L_{w,k})$ be a near-Steinberg range.

(1) $\forall k' = k\epsilon + (p-1)k_0$. $v_p(w_{k'} - w_k) \geq \Delta_{k, L_{w,k}} - \Delta_{k, L_{w,k-1}}$

then $\frac{1}{2}d_k^{Iw} \notin nS_{w,k}$. $d_{k'}^{ur}, d_k^{Iw} - d_{k'}^{ur} \notin nS_{w,k}$.

(2) For k' in (1), $m_n(k')$ is linear in n when $n \in nS_{w,k}$.

(3) The following two lists of pts

$$P_n = (n, v_p(g_{n,k}(w_k))), \quad Q_n = (n, v_p(g_{n,k}(w_{k'}))), \quad n \in nS_{w,k}$$

are shifts of each other relative to a linear function
with slope in $\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\alpha$, $\alpha = \max\{v_p(w_{k'} - w_k) : w_{k'} \text{ is a zero of } g_n(w), n \in nS_{w,k}\}$.

(4) More generally, let $k = \{k_1, \dots, k_r\}$, $k_i \equiv k_\epsilon \pmod{p-1}$.

Suppose \exists an interval $[n_-, n_+]$ s.t. $\forall k' \in k$

with $v_p(w_{k'} - w_k) \geq v_p(w_{k'} - w_{k'})$

then the ghost multiplicity $m_n(k')$ is linear in n for $n \in [n_-, n_+]$.

Then the lists of pts $P_n = (n, A_n, v_p(g_{n,k}(w_k)))$

$$Q_n = (n, A_n, v_p(g_{n,k}(w_{k'}))) \quad (A_n \in \mathbb{R})$$

are shifts of each other by a linear function w/ slope

in $\mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\beta$, $\beta = \max\{v_p(w_{k'} - w_k) \mid w_{k'} \text{ is a zero of } g_{n,k}(w), n \in [n_-, n_+]\}$.

Proof (1) is an immediate consequence of the previous lemma.

(2) follows from the def of $\{m_n(k')\}_{n \geq 1}$:

$$\underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{\frac{ur}{d_{k'}}} \left| \leftarrow \text{linear} \rightarrow \right. \underbrace{0, 1, 2, \dots, \frac{new}{2}d_{k'}}_{\frac{new}{2}d_{k'}} \left| \leftarrow \text{linear} \rightarrow \right. \underbrace{\frac{new}{2}d_{k'} - 1, \dots, 2, 1, 0}_{\frac{new}{2}d_{k'}} \left| \leftarrow \text{linear} \rightarrow \right. \underbrace{0, \dots}_{\frac{ur}{d_{k'}}}$$

$$(3) \quad U_p(g_{n,k}(w_{k'})) - U_p(g_{n,k}(w_k)) \\ = \sum_{\substack{k' \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\} \\ k' \neq k}} m_n(k') (U_p(w_{k'} - w_k) - U_p(w_k - w_{k'})) \\ \in \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\alpha$$

$$\text{If } U_p(w_{k'} - w_k) < \Delta_{k,L} - \Delta_{k',L-1} (\leq U_p(w_{k'} - w_k)).$$

$$\Rightarrow U_p(w_{k'} - w_k) = U_p(w_k - w_{k'}).$$

$$\text{If } U_p(w_{k'} - w_k) \geq \Delta_{k,L} - \Delta_{k',L-1} \quad \text{by (2).}$$

$$m_n(k') \text{ is linear for } n \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\}. \quad (L = L_{w_{k'}, k}) \quad \square$$

Prop The previous lemma gives

$$\Delta_{k,L} - \Delta_{k',L-1} - U_p(w_{k'} - w_k) \geq \frac{1}{2}(2L-1)$$

if we have $w_{k'}$ very close to w_k ,
then the exclusions in (1) must hold.

Cor Fix $n \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\}$ as before. $w_{k'} \neq w_k$.

(1) Assume that $w_{k'}$ is not a zero of $g_n(w)$ for any (or some) $n \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\}$.

Then the lower convex hull of pts $(n, U_p(g_{n,k}(w_{k'})))$ for $n \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\}$
is a straight line.

Moreover, the slope of this straight line belongs to $\frac{a}{2} + \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\alpha$. (*)

(2) Assume that $w_{k'} = w_k$ is a zero of $g_n(w)$ for any (or some) $n \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\}$.

Then the lower hull of pts $(n, U_p(g_{n,k}(w_{k'})))$, $n \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\}$ \uparrow
is a straight line w/ slope $\in \frac{a}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$. \uparrow b/c $m_n(k)$ linear in n .

Proof (1) For $n \in \overline{n} \setminus \{k\}$, shift rel to a lin func
with slope $\in \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\alpha$

$$(n, U_p(g_{n,k}(w_{k'}))) \xleftarrow{\text{with slope } \in \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z}\alpha} (n, U_p(g_{n,k}(w_k) + m_n(k)U_p(w_{k'} - w_k))).$$

$(n, U_p(g_{n,k}(w_k) + m_n(k)U_p(w_{k'} - w_k)))$ \uparrow lower convex hull = straight line
of slope $\frac{R-2}{2}$.

note $k \equiv k_E \pmod{p-1} \equiv 2 + \{a + 2\delta_E\} \equiv 2 + a + 2\delta_E \pmod{p-1}$.

$$\frac{k-2}{2} \in \frac{a}{2} + \mathbb{Z}.$$

Cor For any $k \equiv k_E \pmod{p-1}$,

- (1) The slopes of $NP(G^{(E)}(w_k, -))$ with multi 1 are all integers
- (2) Other slopes of $NP(G^{(E)}(w_k, -))$ always have even multiplicities and belong to $\frac{a}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$.

For (1): $v_p(g_n(w_k)) \in \mathbb{Z}$.

For (2): we need to compute the slope of lower convex hull of $NP(G^{(E)}(w_k, -))$ on a max $n \in \mathcal{S}_{w_k, k}$.

This follows from the previous corollary (1).

Prop Fix $k_0 \equiv k_E \pmod{p-1}$. $l \in \{1, \dots, \frac{1}{2}d_{k_0}^{\text{new}} - 1\}$. TFAE:

- (1) $(l, \Delta_{k_0, l})$ is not a vertex of Δ_{k_0} .
- (2) $(w_{k_0}, \frac{1}{2}d_{k_0}^{\text{inv}} + l, k_1)$ is near-Steinberg for some $k_1 > k_0$
i.e. $\frac{1}{2}d_{k_0}^{\text{inv}} + l \in n \mathcal{S}_{w_{k_0}, k_1}$.
- (3) $(w_{k_0}, \frac{1}{2}d_{k_0}^{\text{inv}} - l, k_2)$ is near-Steinberg for some $k_2 < k_0$.