Forum of Mathematics, Sigma (2026), **Vol. 14**:e40 1–48
doi:10.1017/fms.2026.10190

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Strongly tempered hyperspherical Hamiltonian spaces

Zhengyu Mao[1], Chen Wan[2] and Lei Zhang[3]

[1]Rutgers University-Newark, USA; E-mail: zmao@rutgers.edu.
[2]Rutgers University-Newark, USA; E-mail: chen.wan@rutgers.edu (Corresponding author).
[3]National University of Singapore, Singapore; E-mail: matzhlei@nus.edu.sg.

Received: 12 April 2025; **Revised:** 12 December 2025; **Accepted:** 12 December 2025

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: *Primary* – 11F67; *Secondary* – 11F72

Abstract

In this paper, we give a complete list of strongly tempered anomaly-free hyperspherical Hamiltonian spaces-those that are dual to symplectic vector spaces under the relative Langlands duality. We show that the period integrals attached to the list contain many previously studied Rankin-Selberg integrals and period integrals, thus giving a new conceptual understanding of these integrals. The list also proposes many new interesting period integrals to study.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 BZSV duality . . . 2
1.2 The period integral conjecture . . . 4
1.3 Statement of main results . . . 7
1.4 Rankin-Selberg integrals and special values of period integrals . . . 9
1.5 Organization of the paper . . . 11
2 Our strategy **11**
2.1 Notation and convention . . . 11
2.2 Theta correspondence for classical groups . . . 12
2.3 Anomaly-free symplectic representations . . . 14
2.4 A conjecture of the duality under induction . . . 14
2.5 General strategy . . . 15
3 Models in Table 1 of [30] **16**
3.1 The reductive case . . . 17
3.2 The nonreductive case . . . 17
4 Models in Table 2 of [30] **20**
4.1 The reductive case . . . 20
4.2 The nonreductive case . . . 22
5 Models in Table 11 of [30] **25**
5.1 The reductive case . . . 26
5.2 The nonreductive case . . . 27
6 Models in Table 12 of [30] **29**
6.1 The reductive case . . . 30
6.2 The nonreductive case . . . 33

© The Author(s), 2026. Published by Cambridge University Press. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

7 Models in Table 22 of [30] **35**
7.1 The reductive case 36
7.2 The nonreductive case 37
8 Summary **39**
9 Table S of [30] **42**
References **47**

1. Introduction

1.1. BZSV duality

In [1], Ben-Zvi, Sakellaridis, and Venkatesh introduced a striking relative Langlands duality for the so-called anomaly-free hyperspherical Hamiltonian spaces, which we will refer to as the BZSV duality. We begin by briefly recalling the key data involved.

Throughout this paper, k is a global field, $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}_k$, F is a local field, and ψ is a nontrivial additive character of $\mathbb{A}/k$ (resp. F) if we are in the global (resp. local) setting. Let G be a split connected reductive group defined over k. In Section 3.5.1 of [1], Ben-Zvi, Sakellaridis, and Venkatesh defined a special category of G-Hamiltonian spaces called the hyperspherical G-Hamiltonian spaces. The most important condition for hyperspherical is the coisotropic condition (Condition (2) in Section 3.5.1 of [1]), which states that the field of G-invariant rational functions on the Hamiltonian space is commutative with respect to the Poisson bracket. In Theorem 3.6.1 of [1], Ben-Zvi, Sakellaridis, and Venkatesh proved a structure theorem stating that each hyperspherical G-Hamiltonian space is associated with a quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ where H is a split reductive subgroup of G; ρ_H is a symplectic representation of H; and ι is a homomorphism from SL_2 into G whose image commutes with H. We will call such a quadruple the BZSV quadruple in this paper.

Let us briefly recall how to associate a G-Hamiltonian space $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ to a BZSV quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$. Set $\hbar(t) := \iota(\begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} \end{pmatrix})$ in G and denote by L the centralizer of $\hbar(t)$ and by $U = \exp(\mathfrak{u})$ (resp. $\bar{U} = \exp(\bar{\mathfrak{u}})$) the corresponding unipotent subgroups of G associated with ι, where $\mathfrak{u} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ (resp. $\bar{\mathfrak{u}} \subset \mathfrak{g}$) is the positive weight space (resp. negative weight space) of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G under the adjoint action of $\hbar(t)$. Then $P = LU$ and $\bar{P} = L\bar{U}$ are parabolic subgroups of G that are opposite to each other. It is clear that $H \subset L$.

Let $\mathfrak{u}^+$ be the ≥ 2 weight space under the adjoint action of $\hbar(t)$. It is well known that the vector space $\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+$ has a symplectic structure and realizes a symplectic representation of H (and of L) under the adjoint action. If we use $V = V_{\rho_H}$ to denote the underlying vector space of the symplectic representation ρ_H, then the Hamiltonian variety $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ is defined to be ((3.17) of [1])

$$\mathcal{M}_\Delta = ((V \times \mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+) \times_{(\mathfrak{h}+\mathfrak{u})^*} \mathfrak{g}^*) \times^{HU} G \tag{1}$$

where

- the maps $\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+ \to \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $V \to \mathfrak{h}^*$ are the moment maps;
- the map $V \to \mathfrak{u}^*$ is the zero map;
- the map $\mu : \mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+ \to \mathfrak{u}^*$ is given by

$$\mu(u) = \kappa_1(u) + \kappa_f$$

where $\kappa_1 : \mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+ \to (\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+)^*$ is the isomorphism via the symplectic form on $\mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+$ and

$$\kappa_f(X) = (f, X),\ X \in \mathfrak{u},\ f = \iota\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theorem 3.6.1 of [1] states that any hyperspherical G-Hamiltonian space is of the form $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ for some BZSV quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$.

Remark 1.1. When $\Delta = (G, H, 0, 1)$ (here 1 means the SL_2-homomorphism is the trivial map and 0 means that the symplectic representation is zero dimensional), the Hamiltonian space $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ is just the cotangent bundle $T^*(G/H)$ for the variety G/H. This is called the spherical variety case. When $\Delta = (G, G, \rho, 1)$ (which is the case we consider in this paper), the Hamiltonian space $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ is just the underlying vector space of the symplectic representation ρ. This is called the symplectic vector space case.

Definition 1.2. We say that a quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ is hyperspherical if the associated Hamiltonian variety $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ is.

Remark 1.3. As we explained above, the most important condition in the definition of hyperspherical is the coisotropic condition. By Proposition 3.6.3 of [1], the Hamiltonian space $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ associated to a BZSV quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ is coisotropic if HU is a spherical subgroup in G (i.e. it acts with an open orbit in the flag variety of G) and the vector space $V \times \mathfrak{u}/\mathfrak{u}^+$ is a coisotropic/multiplicity free symplectic representation of the generic stabilizer of G on the cotangent bundle $T^*(G/HU)$ or equivalently, the generic stabilizer of H on the cotangent bundle $T^*(L/H)$ (we say a symplectic representation is coisotropic, or multiplicity free if the field of invariant rational functions on the vector space is commutative with respect to the Poisson bracket). All multiplicity-free symplectic representations are completely classified by Knop [30] and Losev [35].

Next we explain the anomaly-free condition for a Hamiltonian space. Let $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ be a hyperspherical BZSV quadruple, and let $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ be the associated hyperspherical Hamiltonian space. The map ι induces an adjoint action of $H \times \mathrm{SL}_2$ on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G and we can decompose it as

$$\oplus_{k \in I} \rho_k \otimes Sym^k$$

where ρ_k is some representation of H and I is a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We let I_{odd} be the subset of I containing all the odd numbers and we define

$$\rho_{H,\iota} = \rho_H \oplus (\oplus_{i \in I_{odd}} \rho_i). \tag{2}$$

This is a symplectic representation of H.

Definition 1.4 (Proposition 5.1.2 of [1]). We say that the Hamiltonian space $\mathcal{M}_\Delta$ is anomaly-free (or equivalently, the quadruple Δ is anomaly-free) if the representation $\rho_{H,\iota}$ is a symplectic anomaly-free representation (see Definition 2.7) of H.

Let $\hat{G}$ be the dual group of G. The BZSV duality is a conjectural duality between the set of anomaly-free hyperspherical G-Hamiltonian spaces and the set of anomaly-free hyperspherical $\hat{G}$-Hamiltonian spaces, or equivalently, a conjectural duality between the set of anomaly-free hyperspherical BZSV quadruples of G and the set of anomaly-free hyperspherical BZSV quadruples of $\hat{G}$. This proposed duality not only extends the classical Langlands program to a broader geometric setting but also provides a new perspective on the interaction between Hamiltonian symmetries and representation theory.

In [1], Ben-Zvi, Sakellaridis, and Venkatesh formulated a series of elegant and far-reaching conjectures that should hold within this framework. An important aspect of their work concerns period integrals, which we will recall in the next subsection.

Despite its conceptual beauty, a major challenge in BZSV duality is the lack of a general algorithm to explicitly compute the dual of a given anomaly-free hyperspherical Hamiltonian space. In other words, for a given anomaly-free hyperspherical BZSV quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$, there is currently no known systematic procedure to determine its dual $\hat{\Delta}$. This remains a fundamental open problem.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In Section 4 of [1], the authors devised an algorithm to compute the dual in a special case known as the polarized case, which is when the symplectic representation $\rho_{H,\iota}$ of H is of the form $\rho_{H,\iota} = \tau \oplus \tau^\vee$ for some representation τ of H. In particular this includes the cases when $\Delta = (G, H, 0, 1)$ (i.e. the spherical variety case).

In this paper, we focus on another fundamental case: when the Hamiltonian variety is a vector space, that is, the case when $\Delta = (G, G, \rho, 1)$. We will give an algorithm to compute the dual in this case and we will provide several pieces of evidence of the period integral conjecture in this case. Understanding this setting is an important step toward unraveling the full structure of the duality. We refer the reader to Section 2.4 and 2.5 for more details.

In our previous paper [36], we proposed a relative trace formula comparison that connects the periods $\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi)$ associated with any BZSV quadruple (G, H, ρ_H, ι) to the periods of a quadruple dual to a symplectic vector space. In principle, this approach—assuming the conjectural relative trace formula comparison holds—would reduce the period integral conjecture to the symplectic vector space case. This motivates our study of the duality and period integral conjecture in the symplectic vector space setting. Moreover, by examining the period integral conjecture in this setting, we recovered many previously studied Rankin-Selberg integrals and period integrals, thus giving a new conceptual understanding of these integrals. Our work also introduces several new and interesting period integrals for further study. For more details, see Section 1.4.

1.2. The period integral conjecture

In this subsection we will recall the period integral conjecture for the relative Langlands duality. Let $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ and $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{H}', \rho_{\hat{H}'}, \hat{\iota}')$ be two anomaly-free hyperspherical BZSV quadruples that are dual to each other. As we explained in the previous subsection, the maps ι and $\hat{\iota}'$ induce adjoint actions of $H \times \mathrm{SL}_2$ (resp. $\hat{H}' \times \mathrm{SL}_2$) on $\mathfrak{g}$ (resp. $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$) and they can be decomposed as

$$\mathfrak{g} = \oplus_{k \in I} \rho_k \otimes Sym^k, \ \hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \oplus_{k \in \hat{I}} \hat{\rho}_k \otimes Sym^k$$

where ρ_k (resp. $\hat{\rho}_k$) are representations of H (resp. $\hat{H}'$). It is clear that the adjoint representation of H (resp. $\hat{H}'$) is a subrepresentation of ρ_0 (resp. $\hat{\rho}_0$).

For an automorphic form ϕ of $G(\mathbb{A})$ (resp. $\hat{G}(\mathbb{A})$), we can define the period integral $\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi)$ (resp. $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{H}',\hat{\iota}',\rho_{\hat{H}'}}(\phi)$) associated with the quadruple. Let us briefly recall the definition. We have a symplectic representation $\rho_{H,\iota} : H \to \mathrm{Sp}(V)$. Let Y be a maximal isotropic subspace of V and Ω_ψ be the Weil representation of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(V)$ on the Schwartz space $\mathcal{S}(Y(\mathbb{A}))$. The anomaly-free condition on $\rho_{H,\iota}$ ensures $\widetilde{\mathrm{Sp}}(V)$ splits over $Im(\rho_{H,\iota})$ and Ω_ψ restricts to a representation of $H(\mathbb{A})$ on $\mathcal{S}(Y(\mathbb{A}))$. We define the theta series

$$\Theta^\varphi_\psi(h) = \sum_{X \in Y(k)} \Omega_\psi(h)\varphi(X), \ h \in H(\mathbb{A}), \varphi \in \mathcal{S}(Y(\mathbb{A})),$$

and we can define the period integral to be

$$\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi, \varphi) = \int_{H(k)\backslash H(\mathbb{A})} \mathcal{P}_\iota(\phi)(h)\Theta^\varphi_\psi(h)dh.$$

Here $\mathcal{P}_\iota$ is the degenerate Whittaker period associated with ι (we refer the reader to Section 1.2 of [36] for its definition). To simplify the notation, we will omit the Schwartz function in the notation of the period and simply write it as $\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi)$[1]. Similarly we can also define the period integral $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{H}',\hat{\iota}',\rho_{\hat{H}'}}(\phi)$. The following conjecture is the main conjecture regarding global periods in BZSV duality.

[1]when the nilpotent orbit associated to ι is not even, the degenerate Whittaker period $\mathcal{P}_\iota$ is a Fourier-Jacobi coefficient and one also needs to include an extra Schwartz function in its definition

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Conjecture 1.5 (Ben-Zvi–Sakellaridis–Venkatesh, Conjecture 14.3.5 and (14.6.4) of [1]).

1. *Let π be an irreducible discrete automorphic representation of $G(\mathbb{A})$ and let $\nu : \pi \to L^2(G(k)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))_\pi$ be an embedding. Then the period integral*

$$\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi),\ \phi \in Im(\nu)$$

is nonzero only if the Arthur parameter of π factors through $\hat{\iota}' : \hat{H}'(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \to \hat{G}(\mathbb{C})$. If this is the case, π is a lifting of a global tempered Arthur packet Π of $H'(\mathbb{A})$ (the Langlands dual group of $\hat{H}'$). Then we can choose the embedding ν so that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi)|^2}{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle}\text{“}=\text{„}\frac{L(1/2,\Pi,\rho_{\hat{H}'})\cdot\Pi_{k\in\hat{I}}L(k/2+1,\Pi,\hat{\rho}_k)}{L(1,\Pi,Ad)^2},\ \phi\in Im(\nu).$$

Here $\langle,\rangle$ is the L^2-norm.

2. *Let π be an irreducible discrete automorphic representation of $\hat{G}(\mathbb{A})$ and let $\nu : \pi \to L^2(\hat{G}(k)\backslash\hat{G}(\mathbb{A}))_\pi$ be an embedding. Then the period integral*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\hat{H}',\hat{\iota}',\rho_{\hat{H}'}}(\phi),\ \phi \in Im(\nu)$$

is nonzero only if the Arthur parameter of π factors through $\iota : H(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \to G(\mathbb{C})$. If this is the case, π is a lifting of a global tempered Arthur packet Π of $\hat{H}(\mathbb{A})$ (the Langlands dual of H). Then we can choose the embedding ν so that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{P}_{\hat{H}',\hat{\iota}',\rho_{\hat{H}'}}(\phi)|^2}{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle}\text{“}=\text{„}\frac{L(1/2,\Pi,\rho_H)\cdot\Pi_{k\in I}L(k/2+1,\Pi,\rho_k)}{L(1,\Pi,Ad)^2},\ \phi\in Im(\nu).$$

Remark 1.6. The above conjecture is usually called the Ichino-Ikeda type conjecture. To state an explicit identity instead of using the notation "=", one must choose suitable Haar measures on G and H, and make some adjustments to the right-hand side. We refer the reader to Remark 1.3 of [36] for details. In particular, at ramified places the local $L-$value is replaced by the *local relative character*.

Remark 1.7. In [1], they also formulated many other conjectures for the duality (i.e., local/global geometric conjecture, local conjecture for Plancherel decomposition). The expectation is that those conjectures would uniquely determine the duality. In this paper we will only focus on their conjecture for period integrals.

Definition 1.8. We say the quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ is strongly tempered if $\hat{G} = \hat{H}'Z_{\hat{G}}$, i.e. the "dual group" of Δ is equal to the dual group of G up to center (this is equivalent to saying that the dual Hamiltonian space is essentially a symplectic vector space). We say the quadruple is reductive if ι is trivial.

If the quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ is strongly tempered, then Conjecture 1.1(1) states that for all global tempered L-packet Π of $G(\mathbb{A})$[2], there exists $\pi \in \Pi$ and $\nu : \pi \to L^2(G(k)\backslash G(\mathbb{A}))_\pi$ such that

$$\frac{|\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi)|^2}{\langle\phi,\phi\rangle}\text{“}=\text{„}\frac{L(1/2,\Pi,\rho_{\hat{H}'})}{L(1,\Pi,Ad)},\ \phi\in Im(\nu).\tag{3}$$

In other words, it means that the norm square of the period integral $\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi)$ is essentially equal to the central value of an automorphic L-function on every tempered global L-packet.

[2]when $\hat{G} \neq \hat{H}'$, we need to make some assumptions on the central character of Π so that its Langlands parameter factors through $\hat{H}'$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The most well-known example of strongly tempered quadruple is the Gross-Prasad model $(G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = (\mathrm{SO}_{2n+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, 0, 1)$. In this case the dual quadruple is given by

$$(\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1) = (\mathrm{Sp}_{2n} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{Sp}_{2n} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}, 1).$$

In this case, Conjecture 1.5(1) is just the Ichino-Ikeda conjecture in [27] and Conjecture 1.5(2) is just the Rallis inner product formula for the theta correspondence between Sp_{2n} and SO_{2n}.

Remark 1.9. Conjecturally the quadruple is strongly tempered if and only if the integral

$$\int_{H(F)} \mathcal{P}_\iota(\phi)(h)\varphi(h)dh \tag{4}$$

is absolutely convergent for all tempered matrix coefficient ϕ of $G(F)$. Here $F = k_v$ is a local field for some $v \in |k|$, $\mathcal{P}_\iota$ is the local analogue of the global degenerate Whittaker period, and $\varphi(h)$ is a matrix coefficient of the local Weil representation of $H(F)$ associated to the symplectic representation ρ_H (although the unipotent integral $\mathcal{P}_\iota$ is not necessarily convergent and it needs to be regularized, see examples in [2, 33, 44, 45, 46]). In this case, the local relative character in Remark 1.6 is given by the integral (4) where ϕ is a matrix coefficient of π_v; and π_v is the local component of π at v which is a tempered representation of $G(F)$.

The local relative character for unramified datum is defined in (4) with ϕ and φ being unramified matrix coefficients normalized to be 1 at identity, and with suitably chosen Haar measures. For Conjecture 1.5 to hold, we need the local relative character for unramified datum to be

$$\frac{L_v(1/2, \Pi, \rho_{\hat{H}'})}{L_v(1, \Pi, Ad)}.$$

In the following, we will encounter several strongly tempered quadruples Δ whose associated period comes with an Euler product factorization

$$\mathcal{P}_{H,\rho_H,\iota}(\phi) = L_{RS}^S\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \cdot \Pi_{v \in S} I_v(W_\phi)$$

that arises from Rankin-Selberg theory. Here L_{RS} is an $L-$function, W_ϕ is the Whittaker coefficient of ϕ and I_v is a local Rankin-Selberg integral.

Consider the unramified datum $I_v(W_v)$ where W_v is unramified vector in the local Whittaker model whose value at identity is 1. Then $I_v(W_v) = L_{RS,v}(\frac{1}{2})$.

Definition 1.10. In the above setting we will call $I_v(W_v) = L_{RS,v}(\frac{1}{2})$ the local unramified Rankin-Selberg factor of the quadruple Δ.

Assume $\hat{\rho} = T(\hat{\tau}) := \hat{\tau} \oplus (\hat{\tau})^\vee$ for some representation $\hat{\tau}$ of $\hat{G}$. If the local unramified Rankin-Selberg factor of the quadruple Δ is $L(1/2, \Pi_v, \hat{\tau})$, then the equation in part (1) of Conjecture 1.5 holds[3].

Remark 1.11. In the above discussion ϕ is assumed to be a cusp form. There are cases when the period integral of a noncuspidal representation (i.e. an Eisenstein series) has a Rankin-Selberg integral. We can use the same procedure to define the local unramified Rankin-Selberg factor for the quadruple, as the local integral $I_v(W_v)$ depends only on the local component of the representation.

[3]note that the Whittaker coefficient contributes the missing adjoint L-function according to Lapid-Mao's conjecture [33]

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

1.3. Statement of main results

In this paper, we consider the case when the Hamiltonian space is a symplectic vector space, that is, it is associated with a quadruple of the form

$$\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1).$$

In this case, the hyperspherical and anomaly-free conditions are equivalent to the following three conditions for the symplectic representation $\hat{\rho}$ of $\hat{G}$.

1. The symplectic representation $\hat{\rho}$ is anomaly-free (see Definition 2.7).
2. The symplectic representation $\hat{\rho}$ is multiplicity free (i.e. the field of invariant rational functions on the vector space is commutative with respect to the Poisson bracket).
3. The generic stabilizer of the representation $\hat{\rho}$ of $\hat{G}$ is connected.

The set of multiplicity-free symplectic representations were classified by Knop [30] and Losev [35] independently. In this paper we will use the list in [30]. By [30, Theorem 2.3], the classification is reduced to that of symplectic representations that are *saturated* and multiplicity free, which are listed in Tables 1, 2, 11, 12, 22, S of [30].

For each multiplicity-free symplectic representation in Knop's list that is anomaly-free and has a connected generic stabilizer (which is equivalent to the symplectic vector space being anomaly-free and hyperspherical), we will write down the quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ that is dual to $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$. In other words, we provide an algorithm to compute the dual Hamiltonian space in the symplectic vector space case. To determine the dual quadruple, we will provide a systematic way to write down H and ι (see Property 2.11). On the other hand, the choice of ρ_H has been made in an ad hoc way at this stage.

Remark 1.12. Condition (1) is the anomaly-free condition and Condition (2) is the coisotropic condition (in the definition of hyperspherical Hamiltonian spaces). Condition (3) above is related to the Type N spherical root. Whenever this condition fails, we should expect some covering group to appear in the dual quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$. This is not covered in BZSV's framework at this moment. Nonetheless, for some of the cases in [30] that do not satisfy (3), we are still able to write down a candidate for the dual quadruple Δ from some existing automorphic integrals in previous literature[4].

We first consider representations not in Table S of [30] (because Table S of [30] is an infinite table). For each representation $\hat{\rho}$ in the table, we will write down a quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ that is dual to $(\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ where $Z_\Delta = Z_G \cap ker(\rho_H)$ and Z_G is the center of G (i.e. it is dual to the symplectic vector space up to some central isogeny). To support the duality, we provide evidence through the three main theorems below. Our results are summarized in the six tables at the end of this paper (Table 21, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26, the first two tables are for reductive cases while the last four tables are for nonreductive cases). In particular, we give a complete list of strongly tempered anomaly-free hyperspherical Hamiltonian spaces (up to isogeny).

Theorem 1.13.

1. *For all the reductive cases (Table 21 and 22) except Model 3-5 of Table 22, and for all quadruples in Table 23 and 24 except Model 2 of Table 24, either the local relative character with unramified datum equals* $\frac{L_v(1/2,\Pi_v,\rho_{\hat{H}'})}{L_v(1,\Pi_v,Ad)}$*, or we have* $\hat{\rho} = T(\hat{\tau})$ *for some representation* $\hat{\tau}$ *of* $\hat{G}$*,* $\mathcal{P}_\Delta$ *is a Rankin-Selberg integral, and the local unramified Rankin-Selberg factor of* Δ *equals* $L_v(1/2, \Pi, \hat{\tau})$*.*
2. *For Model 3, 5 of Table 22 and Model 2 of Table 24, there exists a Levi subgroup* M *of* G *such that* $\hat{\rho}|_{\hat{M}} = T(\hat{\tau})$ *for some representation* $\hat{\tau}$ *of* $\hat{M}$*. Moreover, when we consider the period integral* $\mathcal{P}_\Delta$ *for Eisenstein series on* $G(\mathbb{A})$ *induced from* $M(\mathbb{A})$ *(in particular* Π *is the parabolic induction of an automorphic representation* Π_M *of* $M(\mathbb{A})$*), we recover the Rankin-Selberg integral studied in [7, 18, 38] whose local unramified Rankin-Selberg factor equals* $L_v(1/2, \Pi_M, \hat{\tau})$*.*

[4]In this paper, we will not check the connectedness condition for representations in [30], we will leave it as an exercise for the reader.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark 1.14.

1. It is easy to check for all cases in Table 21 – 26, the integral (4) is absolutely convergent. In [27] and [46], many cases of the local relative characters are computed with unramified datum. We expect that the methods there can be used to compute the unramified factor for all the cases in these tables.
2. In the case of Model 4 of Table 22, an anonymous referee provided a beautiful argument connecting it to the exterior cube L-function during the peer review process. We refer the reader to Section 6.1 for details and are grateful to the referee for this contribution.
3. As the local relative character (resp. local Rankin-Selberg factor) is defined via certain integral of the matrix coefficient (resp. the Whittaker model), it is nontrivial to prove a relation between them.

Theorem 1.15. *For the quadruples in Table 21, 23 and 25, the nonvanishing part of Conjecture 1.5(2) holds, if we assume (when applicable) the global period integral conjectures in [13, 14, 27] for Gan-Gross-Prasad models. Moreover, the local relative character of the period $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{H}',\hat{\iota}',\rho_{\hat{H}'}}$ is equal to the L-value in Conjecture 1.5(2) at unramified places (i.e. $\frac{L(1/2,\Pi,\rho_H)\cdot\Pi_{k\in I}L(k/2+1,\Pi,\rho_k)}{L(1,\Pi,Ad)^2}$).*

Remark 1.16. In most cases for Theorem 1.15 and some cases for Theorem 1.13 we utilize the theta correspondence. We summarize the results needed for theta correspondence in Section 2.2.

Remark 1.17. In [14], the authors formulated only a global conjecture concerning the nonvanishing of period integrals for the Gan-Gross-Prasad models associated with nontempered Arthur L-packets (Conjecture 9.11 of [14]). An Ichino-Ikeda-type conjecture for these periods is not provided in [14] due to the challenges in defining local relative characters at ramified places in the nontempered case (see the last paragraph of Section 9 in [14]). Consequently, in Theorem 1.15, we can only establish the nonvanishing part of Conjecture 1.5(2).

For these cases, assuming (when applicable) the Ichino-Ikeda conjecture for the Gan-Gross-Prasad models, we could, in principle, fully prove Conjecture 1.5(2), subject to verifying two additional conditions beyond checking the L-factors at unramified places:

- At ramified places, one must establish a local identity between the local relative character of the period $\mathcal{P}_{\hat{H}',\hat{\iota}',\rho_{\hat{H}'}}$ and the local relative characters arising from the Gan-Gross-Prasad model and theta correspondence.
- It is necessary to verify that the global constant defined in (14.26) of [1] for the period conjecture matches the global constant derived from the Gan-Gross-Prasad model and theta correspondence.

In this paper, we do not pursue this direction further. Instead, we focus solely on verifying the L-factors at unramified places.

Besides the above two theorems, we provide one further piece of evidence for the duality for all the nonreductive quadruples. To state the evidence, we need to introduce one more notation. Let $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ be a BZSV quadruple, and let L be the centralizer of $\{\iota(diag(t, t^{-1}))|\ t \in \mathrm{GL}_1\}$ in G as before. We define

$$\Delta_{red} = (L, H, \rho_{H,\iota}, 1)$$

where the representation $\rho_{H,\iota}$ has been defined in (2). As we explained before, the Hamiltonian G-space associated to Δ is defined by certain induction of the Hamiltonian L-space associated to Δ_{red}. In Section 4.2.2 of [1], Ben-Zvi–Sakellaridis–Venkatesh proposed a conjecture about the relation between the dual quadruples of Δ and Δ_{red}. We will recall this conjecture in Conjecture 2.10. Now we are ready to state the third evidence.

Theorem 1.18. *For any quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ in Table 23, 24, 25 and 26, the corresponding quadruple $\Delta_{red} = (L, H, \rho_{H,\iota}, 1)$ is a quadruple in Table 21 and 22. Moreover, the duality for the quadruples Δ and Δ_{red}[5] is compatible with Conjecture 2.10.*

[5]here by saying the duality for Δ (resp. Δ_{red}) we mean the duality between Δ (resp. Δ_{red}) and the quadruple $(\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ (resp. $(\hat{L}, \hat{L}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$) where $\hat{\rho}$ is the corresponding symplectic representation in Table 21-26

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark 1.19. Most of the quadruples in Table 21 and 22 come from Tables 1, 11, 2, 12, 22 of [30]. There are some exceptions; the quadruples given in (24), (31), (32), (39) and (40) are strongly tempered and dual to $\hat{\rho}$ from Table S in [30].

Remark 1.20. For quadruples in Table 23, 24 and 25, Theorem 1.13 and 1.15 already provide strong evidence for the duality of (G, H, ρ_H, ι). Combining with Theorem 1.18, we get strong evidence of Conjecture 2.10 for quadruples in these three tables.

Lastly we consider Table S of [30]. The representations coming out of this table are glued together from various representations of this table that already appeared in Tables 1, 2, 11, 12, 22 of [30]. Since the length can be arbitrary (i.e. we can glue any number of certain representations together), this table produces infinitely many representations. In Section 9, for all the representations $\hat{\rho}$ coming from Table S that are anomaly-free and with connected generic stabilizer, we will describe a way to glue the dual quadruples which gives the dual of the quadruple $(\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$.

More precisely, given representations $(\hat{G}_i, \hat{\rho}_i)$ in Table S of [30], let $(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$ be the gluing of those representations. Assume that $\hat{\rho}$ is anomaly-free and its generic stabilizer is connected. We will describe the dual quadruple Δ of $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ in terms of the dual quadruples Δ_i of $(\hat{G}_i, \hat{G}_i, \hat{\rho}_i, 1)$. Roughly speaking, Δ is glued from Δ_i, where the gluing process will be described in Section 9. To justify our construction, we will prove the following theorem (we refer to Section 9 and Remark 9.1 for further details and clarification).

Theorem 1.21. *With the above notation, Conjecture 1.5 for* $(\Delta, \hat{\Delta})$ *follows from Conjecture 1.5 for* $(\Delta_i, \hat{\Delta}_i)$.

In this paper, we provide evidence of duality mainly through the period integral aspect, namely, Conjecture 1.5. As we mentioned in Remark 1.7, there are other ways to justify the duality, for example from the geometric conjectures and local Plancherel conjectures (e.g. [10, 12, 3, 4, 43, 11]). We will not consider those conjectures in this paper. We just want to remark that Theorem 1.13 provides numerical evidence for the local Plancherel conjecture in Proposition 9.2.1 of [1], but we will not digress in these directions here.

1.4. Rankin-Selberg integrals and special values of period integrals

To end this introduction, we would like to point out that the list of strongly tempered quadruples we found in this paper recovers many existing integrals such as the Rankin-Selberg integrals in [5], [6], [7], [8], [15], [16], [17], [18], [28], [29], [37], [38] and the period integrals in [13], [22], [46]. It also produces many new interesting period integrals for studying.

A simple example that leads to a Rankin-Selberg integral is the quadruple (13):

$$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}), 1)$$

which is dual to

$$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}), 1).$$

The attached period integral is

$$\int_{\mathrm{GL}_n(k)\backslash \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})} \phi_1(g)\phi_2(g)\Theta^{\Phi}(g)\, dg$$

where $\phi_1 \in \pi_1, \phi_2 \in \pi_2$ are cusp forms in irreducible unitary cuspidal automorphic representations π_1 and π_2 on GL_n and $\Theta^{\Phi}(g)$ is a theta series on GL_n explicitly given by

$$\Theta^{\Phi}(g) = |\det g|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\xi \in k^n} \Phi(\xi g).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Let $\xi_0 = (0, 0, \ldots, 0, 1)$, then we can identify $\Theta^{\Phi}(g)$ with the sum of $|\det g|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi(0)$ and a mirabolic Eisenstein series[6]

$$E^{\Phi}(g) = |\det g|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\gamma \in P_0(k)\backslash \mathrm{GL}_n(k)} \Phi(\xi_0 \gamma g)$$

where P_0 is the mirabolic subgroup that fixes ξ_0. This period integral is just the specialization of the well-known Rankin-Selberg integral for tensor product $L-$function [28] evaluated at a specified value (note that either the contribution from $|\det g|^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi(0)$ to the period integral is 0 or the $L-$value is infinity).

Remark 1.22. In this case, Conjecture 1.5 predicts that the square of the period integral equals the square of the central value of the standard L-function. It is therefore reasonable to expect that the period integral itself equals the central value of the standard L-function, which is precisely what has been proved via the Rankin-Selberg integral for the tensor product L-function [28]. More generally, when $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, T(\hat{\rho}), 1)$, Conjecture 1.5 predicts that the square of the period integral $\mathcal{P}_{\Delta}$ equals $L(1/2, \Pi, \hat{\rho})^2$. It is then reasonable to expect the period integral $\mathcal{P}_{\Delta}$ to equal $L(1/2, \Pi, \hat{\rho})$, and there is a Rankin-Selberg integral that represents $L(s, \Pi, \hat{\rho})$.

The theory of Rankin-Selberg integrals is a very successful theory, producing many integral representations to study L-functions. A noted drawback of this theory is that the integrals are mostly developed in an ad hoc way. The list provided in this paper can actually fit many of the Rankin-Selberg integrals into the framework of BZSV duality. To be precise, those Rankin-Selberg integrals (evaluated at certain value) are simply the period integrals attached to some strongly tempered BZSV quadruples whose dual is closely related to the L-functions associated to the Rankin-Selberg integrals. The following is a list of such Rankin-Selberg integrals.

- Integrals for exterior square $L-$functions by Bump-Friedberg [5].
- Integrals for Spin $L-$function by Bump-Ginzburg [6], [7] and [17].
- Integrals for standard $L-$functions of exceptional groups E_6 by Ginzburg [15].
- Multivariable Rankin-Selberg integrals by Ginzburg-Hundley [18] and Pollack-Shah [38].
- Rankin-Selberg convolution by Jacquet-Piatetski-Shapiro-Shalika [28].
- Integrals for exterior square $L-$functions by Jacquet-Shalika [29].

The above list exhausts all currently known Rankin-Selberg integrals utilizing the mirabolic Eisenstein series. There are also examples above that use the Eisenstein series of other types (e.g., the ones in [18] and [38]).

Our list provides more candidates for Rankin-Selberg integrals. For example, Model 12 of Table 26 suggests considering the following Rankin-Selberg integral of $G = \mathrm{GSO}_8$, which should produce the standard L-function and the Half-Spin L-function. Let π be a generic cuspidal automorphic representation of $\mathrm{GSO}_8(\mathbb{A})$, $\phi \in \pi$ and $P = MN$ be a maximal parabolic subgroup GSO_8 with its Levi subgroup $M = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$. Let $H = S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4)$ be a subgroup of M and let $E(h, s_1, s_2)$ be an automorphic function on H induced from the trivial function on GL_2 and the Borel Eisenstein series of GSO_4 (s_1, s_2 are the parameter of the Eisenstein series). It is easy to see that one can take a Fourier-Jacobi coefficient of ϕ along the unipotent subgroup N that produces an automorphic function on H. We will denote it by $\mathcal{P}_N(\phi)$. Then, the integral associated to Model 12 of Table 26 is just

$$\int_{H(k)\backslash H(\mathbb{A})/Z_G(\mathbb{A})} \mathcal{P}_N(\phi)(h) E(h, s_1, s_2) dh.$$

In the spirit of Conjecture 1.5, we expect this to be the integral representation of the L-function $L(s_1, \pi, \rho_1)L(s_2, \pi, \rho_2)$ where ρ_1 (resp. ρ_2) is the standard representation (resp. Half-Spin representation) of $\mathrm{Spin}_8(\mathbb{C})$.

[6]more precisely, after we integrate the theta series E^{Φ} over the center of GL_n we get the mirabolic Eisenstein series

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Meanwhile the majority of the quadruples in our list have period integrals that cannot be considered as specializations of Rankin-Selberg integrals. In some cases, the identities between the periods and the $L-$values in Conjecture 1.5 are consequences of Gan-Gross-Prasad conjectures [13, 14, 27] and the conjectures in [46]. There is also one case where the integral is predicted by the work of Ginzburg-Jiang-Rallis [22] on the central value of symmetric cube $L-$functions. Of more interest are the many cases where the conjectured identity in Conjecture 1.5 is new and unrelated to the conjectures mentioned above. For example, each of the quadruples in Tables 25 and 26 gives such a new conjecture.

We now list one example from Table 22 that not only provides a new Ichino-Ikeda type conjecture for a strongly tempered quadruple but also can be used to explain the Rankin-Selberg in [18]. The example is Model 3 of Table 22. This quadruple is self-dual and is given by

$$\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)),$$
$$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}).$$

Let π be a cuspidal generic automorphic representation of $G(\mathbb{A})$, $\phi \in \pi$ and Θ_{ρ_H} be the theta series associated to the symplectic representation ρ_H. Then the period integral is given by

$$\mathcal{P}_\Delta(\phi) = \int_{H(k)\backslash H(\mathbb{A})/Z_\Delta(\mathbb{A})} \phi(h)\Theta_{\rho_H}(h)dh.$$

In the spirit of Conjecture 1.5, we expect the square of this period integral to be equal to

$$\frac{L(1/2, \Pi, \hat{\rho})}{L(1, \Pi, Ad)}$$

where $\hat{\rho}$ is the representation $std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$ of $\widehat{G/Z_\Delta}(\mathbb{C})$. This is a new period integral that has not been considered before. However if we replace the cusp form on GSp_4 and GL_2 by Borel Eisenstein series, then the period integral $\mathcal{P}_\Delta$ becomes the Rankin-Selberg integral in [18].

Remark 1.23. In this paper we will also encounter some representations $\hat{\rho}$ whose generic stabilizer is not connected. While these representations do not fit in the current framework of BZSV quadruple, one can still consider the associated period integrals and they are related to the previously studied integrals on covering groups, in [8, 16, 22, 24, 37, 42].

1.5. Organization of the paper

In Section 2, we will explain our strategy for writing down the dual quadruple. In Sections 3–7, we will consider Tables 1, 2, 11, 12 and 22 of [30]. In Section 8 we summarize our findings in six tables. In Section 9 we will discuss Table S of [30].

2. Our strategy

2.1. Notation and convention

In this paper, for a group G of Type A_n (resp. B_n, C_n, D_n, G_2, E_6, E_7), we use std_G to denote the n-dimensional (resp. $2n+1$-dimensional, $2n$-dimensional, $2n$-dimensional, 7-dimensional, 27-dimensional, 56-dimensional) standard representation of G. We use Spin_{2n} (resp. Spin_{2n+1}) to denote the Spin representation of the reductive group of Type D_n (resp. B_n) and we use HSpin_{2n} to denote the Half-Spin representation of reductive group with Type D_n. We use Sym^n (resp. $\wedge^n$) to denote the n-th symmetric power (resp. exterior power) of a reductive group of Type A. We use $\wedge^3_0$ to denote the third fundamental representation of a reductive group of Type C_3. Lastly, for a representation ρ of G, we use $\rho^\vee$ to denote the dual representation and $T(\rho)$ to denote $\rho \oplus \rho^\vee$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In this paper, we always use l to denote the similitude character of a similitude group. If we have two similitude group GH_1 and GH_2, we let

$$G(H_1 \times H_2) = \{(h_1, h_2) \in GH_1 \times GH_2 |\ l(h_1) = l(h_2)\},$$

$$S(GH_1 \times GH_2) = \{(h_1, h_2) \in GH_1 \times GH_2 |\ l(h_1)l(h_2) = 1\}.$$

Similarly we can also define $G(H_1 \times \cdots \times H_n)$ and $S(GH_1 \times \cdots \times GH_n)$. For example,

$$S(\mathrm{GL}_2^3) = S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2) = \{(h_1, h_2, h_3) \in \mathrm{GL}_2^3 |\ \det(h_1h_2h_3) = 1\}.$$

All the nilpotent orbits considered in this paper are principal in a Levi subgroup (this is also the case in [1]). As a result, we will use the Levi subgroup or just the root type of the Levi subgroup to denote the nilpotent orbit, i.e. we will use a Levi subgroup L of G to denote the nilpotent orbit of $\mathfrak{g}$ that is principal in L (the zero nilpotent orbit is still denoted by 1). For a split reductive group G, we will use T_G to denote a maximal split torus of G (a minimal Levi subgroup).

For a BZSV quadruple $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$, there are many other quadruples that is essentially equal to $\hat{\Delta}$ up to some central isogeny. To be specific, one can take any group $\hat{H}$ of the same root Type as $\hat{G}$ such that the representation $\hat{\rho}$ can also be defined on $\hat{H}$. Then one can choose any group $\hat{G}'$ containing $\hat{H}$ such that $\hat{G}' = \hat{H}Z_{\hat{G}'}$. The quadruple $(\hat{G}', \hat{H}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ is essentially equal to $\hat{\Delta}$ up to some central isogeny. For example, both $(\mathrm{PGL}_2^3, \mathrm{PGL}_2, 0, 1)$ and $(\mathrm{GL}_2^3, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, 1)$ can be viewed as trilinear GL_2-model. The dual quadruple of them are $(\mathrm{SL}_2^3, \mathrm{SL}_2^3, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ and $(\mathrm{GL}_2^3, S(\mathrm{GL}_2^3), \hat{\rho}, 1)$ where $\hat{\rho}$ is the tensor product of the standard representations of $\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2$ and $S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2)$ respectively, and they are equal to each other up to some central isogeny. While there are various choices of dual quadruples pairs $(\Delta, \hat{\Delta})$ associated to $\hat{\rho}$ due to the isogeny issue, in this paper, for each representation $\hat{\rho}$ in [30], we will only write down one quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ whose dual quadruple $\hat{\Delta}$ is $(\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ where $Z_\Delta = Z_G \cap ker(\rho_H)$.

Remark 2.1. In our proof of Theorem 1.13, we frequently quote the unramified computation in [27] and [46]. The settings in [27] and [46] may actually differ from ours through finite isogeny or central isogeny. It is clear that the computation can be adapted and the results there still apply. For example, in [27], they computed the local relative character for the Gross-Prasad model $(\mathrm{SO}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_n, \mathrm{SO}_n)$ at unramified places. Their results can be also applied to models like $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ (which is essentially the Gross-Prasad model $(\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5, \mathrm{SO}_5)$ up to some central isogeny).

2.2. Theta correspondence for classical groups

In this paper we will frequently use theta correspondence for classical groups. We will briefly review it in this subsection. We start with the theta correspondence for the general linear group. Let $n \geq m \geq 1$ and $G = H_1 \times H_2 = \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_m$. We use V to denote the underlying vector space of the representation $\rho = std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_m}$ of G. For $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}(V(\mathbb{A}))$, we define the theta function

$$\Theta_\psi^\varphi(g) = \sum_{X \in V(k)} \rho(g)\varphi(X),\ g \in G(\mathbb{A})$$

which is an automorphic function on $G(\mathbb{A}) = H_1(\mathbb{A}) \times H_2(\mathbb{A})$. Let π be a cuspidal automorphic representation of $H_2(\mathbb{A})$. For $\phi \in L^2(H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A}))_\pi$, the integral

$$\int_{H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A})} \Theta_\psi^\varphi(h_1, h_2)\phi(h_2)dh_2$$

gives an automorphic function on $H_1(\mathbb{A})$ which will be denoted by $\Theta(\phi)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Theorem 2.2 [34]. *We have*

$$\{\Theta(\phi)|\ \phi \in L^2(H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A}))_\pi\} = \{E(\phi',1)|\ \phi' \in L^2(H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A}))_\pi\}$$

where $E(\phi',1)$ is the Eisenstein series on $H_1(\mathbb{A}) = \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{A})$ induced from ϕ' and the identity function on $\mathrm{GL}_{n-m}(\mathbb{A})$ that belongs to the induced representation $Ind_P^{H_1}((\pi\otimes 1)\delta_P^{1/2})$ (here P is a parabolic subgroup of $H_1 = \mathrm{GL}_n$ of type $(m, n-m)$). Moreover, for $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in L^2(H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A}))_\pi$, we have the Rallis inner product formula

$$\int_{H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A})/Z_{H_2}(\mathbb{A})}\int_{H_1(k)\backslash H_1(\mathbb{A})}\int_{H_1(k)\backslash H_1(\mathbb{A})}\Theta_\psi^\varphi(h_1,h_2)E(\phi_1,1)(h_1)\overline{\Theta_\psi^\varphi(h_1',h_2)E(\phi_2,1)(h_1')}dh_1dh_1'dh_2$$

$$\text{“}=\text{”}L(\frac{n-m+1}{2},\pi)\cdot\int_{H_1(k)\backslash H_1(\mathbb{A})/Z_{H_1}(\mathbb{A})}E(\phi_1,1)(h_1)\overline{E(\phi_2,1)(h_1)}dh_2.$$

Here the integrals on both sides require regularization.

Remark 2.3. When $m = 1$, the above theorem implies that if we integrate the theta series on GL_n associated to the symplectic representation $T(std_n)$ over the center of GL_n we will get the mirabolic Eisenstein series of GL_n. We will frequently use this fact in later discussions.

For the unramified computation, we also need the local theta correspondence for unramified representation. Let F be a p-adic local field that is a local place of k. We use $\phi_\rho(h_1,h_2)$ to denote the local spherical matrix coefficient of the Weil representation with $\phi_\rho(1,1) = 1$. Let π be a tempered unramified representation of $H_2(F)$, ϕ_π (resp. $\phi_{\pi,1}$) be the unramified matrix coefficient of π (resp. $Ind_{\mathrm{GL}_m\times\mathrm{GL}_{n-m}}^{\mathrm{GL}_n}(\pi\otimes 1)$) with $\phi_\pi(1) = \phi_{\pi,1}(1) = 1$.

Theorem 2.4 [34]. *With the notation above, we have*

$$\int_{H_2(F)}\phi_\rho(h_1,h_2)\phi_\pi(h_2)dh_2 = L\left(\frac{n-m+1}{2},\pi\right)\cdot\phi_{\pi,1}(h_1).$$

Next we study the theta correspondence between SO_{2n} and Sp_{2m} with $n > m \geq 1$. Let $G = H_1\times H_2 = \mathrm{SO}_{2n}\times\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$ and we use V to denote the underlying vector space of the representation $\rho = std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}$ of G. Let Y be a maximal isotropic subspace of V, we can define $\Theta_\psi^\varphi(g)$ an automorphic function on $G(\mathbb{A})$ as in the introduction, for any Schwartz function φ on Y.

Let Π be a cuspidal tempered global Arthur packet of $H_2(\mathbb{A}) = \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(\mathbb{A})$ and let Π' be its lifting to $H_1(\mathbb{A}) = \mathrm{SO}_{2n}(\mathbb{A})$ under the map $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}(\mathbb{C})\times\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})\to\mathrm{SO}_{2n}(\mathbb{A})$ whose restriction to SL_2 is the principal embedding from SL_2 to $\mathrm{SO}_{2n-2m-1}$ (if $n > m+1$ then Π' is a nontempered Arthur L-packet)[7]. For $\phi \in L^2(H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A}))_\pi$, the integral

$$\int_{H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A})}\Theta_\psi^\varphi(h_1,h_2)\phi(h_2)dh_2$$

gives an automorphic function on $H_1(\mathbb{A}) = \mathrm{SO}_{2n}(\mathbb{A})$ which will be denoted by $\Theta(\phi)$. Then the following theorem holds.

Theorem 2.5 [32, 49, 20]. *With the notation above, the representation*

$$\{\Theta(\phi)|\ \phi \in L^2(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(k)\backslash\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}(\mathbb{A}))_\Pi\}$$

[7]in fact here Π' should be an Arthur packet of $O_{2n}(\mathbb{A})$ which is the union of two Arthur packets of $\mathrm{SO}_{2n}(\mathbb{A})$ differed by the outer automorphism

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

of $\mathrm{SO}_{2n}(\mathbb{A})$ *is a direct sum of some distinct irreducible representations belonging to the Arthur L-packet* Π' *of* $H_1(\mathbb{A}) = \mathrm{SO}_{2n}(\mathbb{A})$. *Moreover, for* $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \Pi'$, *we have the Rallis inner product formula*

$$\int_{H_2(k)\backslash H_2(\mathbb{A})} \int_{H_1(k)\backslash H_1(\mathbb{A})} \int_{H_1(k)\backslash H_1(\mathbb{A})} \Theta_\psi^\varphi(h_1, h_2)\phi_1(h_1)\overline{\Theta_\psi^\varphi(h_1', h_2)\phi_2(h_1')} dh_1 dh_1' dh_2$$
$$\text{“} = \text{”} L(n-m, \Pi) \cdot \int_{H_1(k)\backslash H_1(\mathbb{A})} \phi_1(h_1)\phi_2(h_1) dh_1.$$

For the unramified computation, we also need the local theta correspondence for unramified representation. Let F be a p-adic local field that is a local place of k. We use $\phi_\rho(h_1, h_2)$ to denote the local spherical matrix coefficient of the Weil representation with $\phi_\rho(1, 1) = 1$. Let π be a tempered unramified representation of $H_2(F)$ and π' be its lifting to $H_1(F)$ (which is also unramified). Let ϕ_π (resp. $\phi_{\pi'}$) be the unramified matrix coefficient of π (resp. π') with $\phi_\pi(1) = \phi_{\pi'}(1) = 1$.

Theorem 2.6 [34]. *With the notation above, we have*

$$\int_{H_2(F)} \phi_\rho(h_1, h_2)\phi_\pi(h_2) dh_2 = L(n-m, \pi) \cdot \phi_{\pi'}(h_1).$$

The theta correspondence between SO_{2m} and Sp_{2n} (resp. GSO_{2n} and GSp_{2m}, GSO_{2m} and GSp_{2n}) is similar and we will skip it here.

2.3. Anomaly-free symplectic representations

In this subsection we will recall the definition of anomaly-free symplectic representations. Let G be a split reductive group, $T \subset G$ be a maximal split torus and $\rho : G \to \mathrm{Sp}(V)$ is a symplectic representation of G. Since T is split, the restriction of the representation (ρ, V) to T can be decomposed into a direct sum of two representations that are dual to each other, i.e.

$$(\rho|_T, V) \simeq (\rho_0, W) \oplus (\rho_0^\vee, W).$$

Definition 2.7 (Definition 5.1.2 and Proposition 5.1.5 of [1], Definition 2.2 of [47]). With the notation above, we say the symplectic representation ρ is anomaly free if there exists a character χ of $T \to \mathrm{GL}_1$ and a character η of $G \to \mathrm{GL}_1$ such that $\det(\rho_0) = \chi^2 \cdot \eta|_T$.

Remark 2.8.

1. Roughly speaking, anomaly-free means that the sum of half of the weights of ρ is a square in the weight lattice of T (up to some character of G).
2. It is clear that the definition is independent of the choice of the decomposition $(\rho|_T, V) \simeq (\rho_0, W) \oplus (\rho_0^\vee, W)$.
3. If $\rho = T(\tau)$ then it is anomaly free.
4. If $\rho_{=}\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2$ such that ρ_i is an anomaly free symplectic representation for $i = 1, 2$, then ρ is also anomaly free.

2.4. A conjecture of the duality under induction

We recall the notion from the introduction. Let $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ be a BZSV quadruple. Let L be the centralizer of $\{\iota(diag(t, t^{-1}))|\ t \in \mathrm{GL}_1\}$ in G. Then L is a Levi subgroup of G with $H \subset L$. We have defined

$$\Delta_{red} = (L, H, \rho_{H,\iota}, 1)$$

where the representation $\rho_{H,\iota}$ was defined in (2). It is clear that Δ is reductive if and only if $\Delta = \Delta_{red}$.

In Section 4.2.2 of [1], Ben-Zvi–Sakellaridis–Venkatesh made a conjecture about the relation between the dual of Δ and Δ_{red}. To state their conjecture, we first need a definition.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Definition 2.9. Let L be a Levi subgroup of G and ρ be an irreducible representation of L with the highest weight ϖ_L. There exists a Weyl element w of G such that $w\varpi_L$ is a dominant weight of G[8]. We define $(\rho)_L^G$ to be the irreducible representation of G whose highest weight is $w\varpi_L$. In general, if $\rho = \oplus_i \rho_i$ is a finite-dimensional representation of L with ρ_i irreducible, we define

$$(\rho)_L^G = \oplus_i (\rho_i)_L^G.$$

Now we are ready to state the conjecture.

Conjecture 2.10 (Ben-Zvi–Sakellaridis–Venkatesh, [1]). *With the notation above, if the dual of Δ_{red} is given by $\hat{\Delta}_{red} = (\hat{L}, \hat{H}'_L, \rho', \hat{\iota}')$, then the dual of Δ is given by*

$$(\hat{G}, \hat{H}', (\rho')_{\hat{H}'_L}^{\hat{H}'}, \hat{\iota}')$$

where $\hat{H}'$ is generated by $\hat{H}'_L$ and $\{Im(\iota_\alpha) |\ \alpha \in \Delta_{\hat{G}} - \Delta_{\hat{L}}\}$[9]*. Here $\Delta_{\hat{G}}$ (resp. $\Delta_{\hat{L}}$) is the set of simple roots of $\hat{G}$ (resp. $\hat{L}$) and $\iota_\alpha : \mathrm{SL}_2 \to \hat{G}$ is the embedding associated to α.*

Assuming the above conjecture, it would suffice to develop an algorithm for the duality in the reductive case, i.e. when $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, 1)$ (where $\iota = 1$). Within this setting, two particularly important special cases arise:

- the case when $\rho_H = 0$ (i.e. the spherical variety case);
- the case when $H = G$ (i.e. the symplectic vector space case).

As mentioned in the introduction, Ben-Zvi, Sakellaridis, and Venkatesh provided an algorithm in Section 4 of [1] for computing the dual Hamiltonian space in the spherical variety case. In this paper, we develop an algorithm for the symplectic vector space case (our approach will be explained in the next subsection).

Ultimately, our goal is to integrate these two algorithms to establish a general procedure for all reductive cases. If successful, this could be combined with Conjecture 2.10 to produce a general algorithm for computing the duality of any anomaly-free hyperspherical Hamiltonian space.

2.5. General strategy

Let $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ be a quadruple such that $\hat{\rho}$ is an anomaly-free symplectic representation of $\hat{G}$, and it appears in Tables 1, 2, 11, 12, 22 of [30]. Our goal is to write down a dual quadruple (up to isogeny) $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$.

The data in Knop's tables of [30], besides $(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$, also contains the following two items: a Levi subgroup $\hat{L}$ of $\hat{G}$ and a Weyl group $\hat{W}_V$ written in the form of $W_{\hat{H}}$ where $\hat{H}$ is the root type (e.g. A_n, B_n, C_n, etc). (In [30] the notations are L, G, W_V in place of $\hat{L}, \hat{G}, \hat{W}_V$ respectively.) Our key observation is that two data (H, ι) of the dual quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ are given by the following properties.

Property 2.11.

1. The root type of H is dual to the root type of $\hat{W}_V$ in the tables of [30].
2. The nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}_\iota$ associated to ι is the principal nilpotent orbit of L where L is the dual Levi of $\hat{L}$.

Remark 2.12. Basically, the Weyl group $\hat{W}_V$ can be viewed as the "little Weyl group" of the quadruple $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$, and $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ in Tables of [30] is an analogue of $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}_X$ in Table 3 of [31]. Here $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ is defined to be the generic isotropy algebra of the symplectic vector space (i.e. the stabilizer of a generic point of the vector space) and the little Weyl group is defined to be a subquotient of the Weyl group that satisfy equation (1.8) of [30].

[8] the choice of w is not unique but $w\varpi_L$ is uniquely determined by ϖ_L

[9] In particular, $\hat{H}'$ is conjectured to commute with $\mathrm{Im}(\hat{\iota}')$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Property 2.11 provides an algorithm to compute H and ι in the dual quadruple $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$. It remains to determine the symplectic representation ρ_H. At this moment we do not have a systematic way to construct ρ_H. Instead, we propose a ρ_H in an ad hoc way and then provide evidence for the duality between $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ and $(\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$.

We provide two strong pieces of evidence for the duality. The first one is evidence for the period integral conjecture (Conjecture 1.5), i.e., Theorem 1.13 and 1.15. The second evidence is for nonreductive models. For those models, we will show that the duality is compatible with Conjecture 2.10, i.e. Theorem 1.18.

In the sections that follow, we will go through Knop's list of representations $\hat{\rho}$ (i.e. Tables 1, 2, 11, 12, and 22 in [30]). For each $\hat{\rho}$ we write down a quadruple (G, H, ρ_H, ι). When the quadruple is not reductive, we will also write down Δ_{red} which is dual to another representation $(\hat{L}, \hat{\rho}_L)$ in Knop's list and verify that Theorem 1.18 holds.

For cases in Table 21, 22, 23 and 24, we give references where either the local relative character is calculated in the unramified places, or a Rankin-Selberg integral provides the local unramified Rankin-Selberg factor, thus verifying Theorem 1.13. We will also verify Theorem 1.15 for the global periods associated to the dual side $\hat{\Delta}$ for cases in Table 21, 23 and 25. In Section 8, we summarize our findings in Table 21-26.

Lastly, in Section 9 we will deal with Table S of [30]. We will describe an algorithm to glue to dual Hamiltonian spaces for representations in Table S of [30] and then we will prove Theorem 1.21.

3. Models in Table 1 of [30]

In this section we will consider Table of [30], this is for the case when $\hat{\rho}$ is an irreducible representation of $\hat{G}$. It is easy to check that the representations in (1.2), (1.8), (1.9) and (1.10) of [30] are not anomaly free and the representation in (1.1) of [30] is only anomaly free when $p = 2n$ is even. Hence it remains to consider the following cases. Note that we only write the root type of $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ and we write 0 if it is abelian. Also we separate the cases when $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ is abelian and when $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ is not abelian. These are precisely the cases where the dual quadruple is reductive/nonreductive (see Property 2.11).

Table 1. *Reductive models in Table 1 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(1.1), p=2m	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m}})$	D_m	0
(1.1), p=2m+2	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m+2}, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2}})$	C_m	0
(1.3), m=2	$(\mathrm{Spin}_5 \times \mathrm{Spin}_7, \mathrm{Spin}_5 \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7)$	$C_2 \times A_1$	0
(1.3), m=3	$(\mathrm{Sp}_6 \times \mathrm{Spin}_7, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7)$	$C_3 \times B_3$	0
(1.3), m=4	$(\mathrm{Sp}_8 \times \mathrm{Spin}_7, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_8} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7)$	$D_4 \times B_3$	0
(1.6)	(SL_2, Sym^3)	A_1	0

Table 2. *Nonreductive models in Table 1 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(1.1), $p = 2n < 2m$	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}})$	D_n	C_{m-n}
(1.1), $p = 2n > 2m + 2$	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}})$	C_m	D_{n-m}
(1.3), m=1	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{Spin}_7, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7)$	A_1	A_2
(1.3), $m > 4$	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{Spin}_7, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7)$	$D_4 \times B_3$	C_{m-4}
(1.4)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{Spin}_9, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_9)$	$A_1 \times A_1$	A_2
(1.5), n=11	$(\mathrm{Spin}_{11}, \mathrm{Spin}_{11})$	A_1	A_4
(1.5), n=12	$(\mathrm{Spin}_{12}, \mathrm{HSpin}_{12})$	A_1	A_5
(1.5), n=13	$(\mathrm{Spin}_{13}, \mathrm{Spin}_{13})$	B_2	$A_2 \times A_2$
(1.7)	$(SL_6, \wedge^3)$	A_1	$A_2 \times A_2$
(1.11)	(E_7, std_{E_7})	A_1	E_6

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

3.1. The reductive case

In this subsection we consider the reductive cases, i.e., the ones in Table 1. The nilpotent orbit ι is trivial for all these cases so we will ignore it.

For (1.1) with $p = 2m$ (resp. $p = 2m + 2$), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m}, 0) \tag{5}$$

$$(\text{resp.}(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m+2}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, 0)) \tag{6}$$

which is just the reductive Gross-Prasad model. The unramified computations in [27] prove Theorem 1.13 in these two cases. For the dual side, Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence between $\mathrm{SO}_{2m} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$ (resp. $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$) implies Conjecture 1.5(2) and this proves Theorem 1.15.

For (1.3) with $m = 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{Sp}_2), 0)$$

which is the model $(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{Sp}_2))$ studied in [46]. The unramified computations in [46] prove Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (1.3) with $m = 3$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_7, S(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_7), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7).$$

For (1.3) with $m = 4$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_9, S(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_8), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_8). \tag{7}$$

Theorem 1.13 and 1.15 for two cases can be established by the same argument as Model (11.11) of [30] (see (23) and (22) of Section 5.1) together with the triality of D_4.

For (1.6), it is clear that the generic stabilizer of $\hat{\rho}$ in $\hat{G}$ is not connected, hence it does not belong to the current framework of BZSV duality. However, for this specific case, by the work of [22], we expect there is an associated quadruple of the form $(\mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2, \rho_H, 1)$ where ρ_H is no longer an anomaly free symplectic representation, but rather we understand that ρ_H corresponds to the theta series on $H = \mathrm{GL}_2$ defined via the cubic covering of GL_2 as in [22]. There is a covering group involved in the integral since the generic stabilizer is not connected. In [22] it is established that the nonvanishing of $\mathcal{P}_{H,\iota,\rho_H}(\phi)$ is equivalent to the nonvanishing of $L(1/2, \Pi, \hat{\rho})$. We expect further that Conjecture 1.5(1) holds in this case.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 1 (without the row corresponding to (1.6)) is given as follows. Note that ι is trivial for all these cases.

Table 3. *Dual quadruples of Table 1.*

$(\mathrm{G}, \mathrm{H}, \rho_H)$	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m}, 0)$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m}}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, 0)$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2}}$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{Sp}_2), 0)$	$\mathrm{Spin}_5 \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_7, S(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_7), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7)$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_9, S(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_8), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_8)$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_8} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7$

3.2. The nonreductive case

In this subsection we consider the nonreductive cases, i.e., the ones in Table 2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For (1.1) with $p = 2n < 2m$, the associated quadruple Δ is[10]

$$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, 0, (\mathrm{GL}_1)^n \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m-2n+1} \times T_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}) \tag{8}$$

and it is the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}$. For (1.1) with $p = 2n > 2m + 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, 0, T_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}} \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^m \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n-2m})$$

and it is still the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}$. In these two cases Δ_{red} are given by (5), (6). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in these two cases. The unramified computation in [27] proves Theorem 1.13 for these two cases. Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence between $\mathrm{SO}_{2n} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$ implies Conjecture 1.5(2) and proves Theorem 1.15 for these two cases.

For (1.3) when $m = 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, (\mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_1) \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_2}) \tag{9}$$

and it is the model $(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2 \ltimes U)$ studied in [46]. In this case $\Delta_{red} = ((\mathrm{GL}_2)^3, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, 1)$ (which a special case of (6) with $m = 1$). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case and the unramified computation in [46] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (1.3) when $m > 4$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSp}_6, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times \mathrm{GSp}_6), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_8, L)$$

where L is the Levi subgroup whose projection to GSpin_{2m+1} (resp. GSp_6) is of the form $(\mathrm{GL}_1)^4 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{2m-7}$ (resp. the maximal torus). The nilpotent orbit induces a Bessel period for the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = (\mathrm{GL}_1)^{m-4} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_9 \times \mathrm{GSp}_6$ whose stabilizer is $\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times \mathrm{GSp}_6$ and we can naturally embed H into the stabilizer. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (7) and it is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds. Theorem 1.13 and 1.15 for this model can be established by the same argument as (27) in Section 5.2 together with the triality of D_4.

For (1.4), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), 0, \mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_1 \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_2}). \tag{10}$$

The nilpotent orbit induces a Bessel period for the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ whose stabilizer is $G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2) \times \mathrm{GL}_2$. We embeds H into the stabilizer so that the induced embedding from H into M is given by the natural embeddings of H into GSp_4 and into $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$. In this case $\Delta_{red} = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), 0, 1)$ which is essentially the Gross-Prasad model for $\mathrm{SO}_5 \times \mathrm{SO}_4$. If we replace the cusp form on GL_2 by an Eisenstein series, we recover the Rankin-Selberg integrals in [7]. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case and the result in [7] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (1.5) when $n = 11$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_{10}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, \mathrm{GL}_5 \times \mathrm{GL}_1) \tag{11}$$

and it is the model $(\mathrm{GSp}_{10}, \mathrm{GL}_2 \ltimes U)$ studied in [46]. In this case $\Delta_{red} = ((\mathrm{GL}_2)^3, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, 1)$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case and the unramified computation in [46] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

[10]here we recall from Section 2.1 that for nonzero nilpotent orbits appear in this paper, we will use a Levi subgroup to represent it: we will use a Levi subgroup L of G to denote the nilpotent orbit of $\mathfrak{g}$ that is principal in the Levi subgroup L. This notation applies to all the nonreductive cases in this paper. For example, in the quadruple 8, $(\mathrm{GL}_1)^n \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m-2n+1} \times T_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}$ stands for the product of the nilpotent orbit of SO_{2m+1} that is principal on the Levi subgroup $(\mathrm{GL}_1)^n \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m-2n+1}$ with the nilpotent orbit of SO_{2n} that is principal on the Levi subgroup $T_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}$ (which of course is the zero nilpotent orbit of SO_{2n}).

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For (1.5) when $n = 12$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, \mathrm{GL}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_1)$$

and it is the model $(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, \mathrm{GL}_2 \ltimes U)$ studied in [46]. In this case $\Delta_{red} = ((\mathrm{GL}_2)^3, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, 1)$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case and the unramified computation in [46] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (1.5) when $n = 13$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_{12}, \mathrm{GSp}_4, 0, \mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_1).$$

The nilpotent orbit induces a Bessel period for the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4$ whose stabilizer is $H = \mathrm{GSp}_4$. In this case $\Delta_{red} = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4, 0, 1)$ which is essentially the Gross-Prasad model for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. In this case the unramified computation can be done in a similar way as [46], which will give Theorem 1.13. Specifically, following the approach outlined in Sections 2.4–2.5 of [46], one need only verify equations (2.21) and (2.23), as well as Lemma 2.32 of loc. cit., for the present model. Equations (2.21) and (2.23) can be established via straightforward matrix computation, while Lemma 2.32 can be verified by direct calculation. The argument is similar to the models studied in [46].

For (1.7), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, \mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_3) \tag{12}$$

and it is the Ginzburg-Rallis model $(\mathrm{GL}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2 \ltimes U)$ studied in [46]. In this case $\Delta_{red} = ((\mathrm{GL}_2)^3, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, 1)$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case and the unramified computation in [46] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (1.11), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(E_7, \mathrm{PGL}_2, 0, GE_6)$$

and it is the model $(E_7, \mathrm{PGL}_2 \ltimes U)$ studied in [46]. In this case $\Delta_{red} = ((\mathrm{PGL}_2)^3, \mathrm{PGL}_2, 0, 1)$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case and the unramified computation in [46] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 2 is given as follows. Here for ι, we only list the root type of the Levi subgroup L of G such that ι is principal in L.

Table 4. *Dual quadruples of Table 2.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, 0)$	B_{m-n}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, 0)$	D_{n-m}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_2	$std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSp}_6, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times \mathrm{GSp}_6), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_8)$	B_{m-4}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), 0)$	A_2	$std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_9$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_{10}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_4	Spin_{11}
$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_5	HSpin_{12}
$(\mathrm{GSp}_{12}, \mathrm{GSp}_4, 0)$	$A_2 \times A_2$	Spin_{13}
$(\mathrm{GL}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	$A_2 \times A_2$	$\wedge^3$
$(E_7, \mathrm{PGL}_2, 0)$	E_6	std_{E_7}

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

4. Models in Table 2 of [30]

In this section we will consider Table 2 of [30], this is for the case when $\hat{\rho} = T(\hat{\tau})$ is the direct sum of two irreducible representations of $\hat{G}$ that are dual to each other. All the representations in Table 2 of [30] are anomaly free (see Remark 2.8(3)), so we need to consider all of them. We still separate the cases based on whether $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ is abelian or not.

Table 5. *Reductive models in Table 2 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(2.1), m=n	$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	A_{n-1}	0
(2.1), m=n+1 and (2.4), n=2	$(\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	A_{n-1}	0
(2.3)	$(\mathrm{GL}_n, T(Sym^2))$	A_{n-1}	0
(2.6), m=n=2	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	$A_1 \times A_1$	0
(2.6), m=2, n=3	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	$C_2 \times A_2$	0
(2.6), m=2, n=4	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4, T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_4}))$	$C_2 \times A_3$	0
(2.6), m=2, n=5	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_5, T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_5}))$	$C_2 \times A_3$	0
(2.6), m=n=3	$(\mathrm{Sp}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_3), T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	$A_3 \times A_2$	0

Table 6. *Nonreductive models in Table 2 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(2.1), $m > n+1$, and (2.4), $n > 2$	$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	A_{n-1}	A_{m-n-1}
(2.2), n=2m	$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m}, T(\wedge^2))$	A_{m-1}	$(A_1)^m$
(2.2),n=2m+1	$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m+1}, T(\wedge^2))$	A_{m-1}	$(A_1)^m$
(2.5)	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}, T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}})$	0	C_{m-1}
(2.6), $m > 2$, n=2	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SL}_2, T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}))$	$A_1 \times A_1$	C_{m-2}
(2.6), m=2, $n > 5$	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_m, T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_m}))$	$C_2 \times A_3$	A_{m-5}
(2.6), $m > 3$, n=3	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SL}_3, T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_3}))$	$A_3 \times A_2$	C_{m-3}
(2.7), m=2k	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2k}, T(std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}}))$	A_1	D_{k-1}
(2.7), m=2k+1	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2k+1}, T(std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k+1}}))$	A_1	B_{k-1}
(2.8), n=7	$(\mathrm{Spin}_7, T(\mathrm{Spin}_7))$	A_1	A_2
(2.8), n=9	$(\mathrm{Spin}_9, T(\mathrm{Spin}_9))$	$A_1 \times A_1$	A_2
(2.8), n=10	$(\mathrm{Spin}_{10}, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_{10}))$	A_1	A_3
(2.9)	$(G_2, T(std_{G_2}))$	A_1	A_1
(2.10)	$(E_6, T(std_{E_6}))$	A_2	D_4

4.1. The reductive case

In this subsection we consider the reductive cases, i.e., the ones in Table 5. The nilpotent orbit ι is trivial for all these cases so we will ignore it.

For (2.1) with $m = n$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})). \tag{13}$$

For (2.1) with $m = n+1$ and (2.4) with $n = 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, 0). \tag{14}$$

The period integrals in these two cases are exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ and $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ in [28]. The result in loc. cit. proves Conjecture 1.5(1). The unramified computation in [26] and [48] imply Theorem 1.13. For the dual side, Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n+1}$ and $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ imply Conjecture 1.5(2) and this proves Theorem 1.15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Remark 4.1. With the work of [26] and [48], we know the local relative character with unramified datum for the Rankin-Selberg periods on $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ and $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$. While we obviously also know the local unramified Rankin-Selberg factor in these cases by the work of [28], in the following, we rely on the relative character computation of [26] and [48] in the proof of Theorem 1.13 that uses these Rankin-Selberg periods.

For (2.3), the generic stabilizer of $\hat{\rho}$ in $\hat{G}$ is not connected, hence it does not belong to the current framework of the BZSV duality. However, for this specific case, by the Rankin-Selberg integral in [8, 37, 42], we know that the dual integral should be the one in [8, 37, 42]. As the generic stabilizer is not connected, there are covering groups involved in the integral.

For (2.6) with $m = n = 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2})) \tag{15}$$

where the embedding of H into G is given by the canonical embedding from $\mathrm{GSpin}_4 = G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)$ into $\mathrm{GSpin}_5 = \mathrm{GSp}_4$ and the projection of $G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)$ into GL_2 via the first GL_2-copy. The representation ρ_H is the standard representation of the second GL_2-copy of H. This integral is essentially the Gross-Prasad model for $\mathrm{SO}_5 \times \mathrm{SO}_4$ except we replace the cusp form on one GL_2-copy by the theta series. The unramified computation in [27] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ and Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture (Conjecture 9.11 of [14]) for nontempered Arthur packet for the pair $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ which is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (2.6) with $m = 2, n = 3$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, T(std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3})).$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ (note that the theta function constructed from $T(std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3})$ is the restriction of the theta function from $T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3})$), the integral over GL_3 of a cusp form on GL_3 with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an Eisenstein series of GL_4 induced from the cusp form on GL_3 and the trivial character of GL_1. Then the integral over GSp_4 is just the period integral for the pair $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ which is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.4 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$ and the global period integral conjecture for the pair $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ (which is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$) in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (2.6) with $m = 2, n = 4$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4})). \tag{16}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$, the integral over Sp_4 of a cusp form on GSp_4 with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an automorphic form of GL_4. Then the integral over GL_4 is just the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ as in [28][11]. The Rankin-Selberg integral in [28], the unramified computation in [48], and Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$ proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ and the global period integral conjecture for the pair $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ (which is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$) in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15. This is a very interesting case because both Δ and $\hat{\Delta}$ are strongly tempered and they are not equal to each other.

[11] In this paper we will frequently use the fact that the theta series associated to $\rho \oplus \rho'$ is the product of the theta series associated to ρ and ρ'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For (2.6) with $m = 2, n = 5$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_5, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2). \tag{17}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$, the integral over Sp_4 of a cusp form on GSp_4 with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an automorphic form of GL_4. Then the integral over GL_4 is just the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_5 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$. The Rankin-Selberg integral in [28], the unramified computation in [26], and Theorems 2.5 and 2.6 applied to theta correspondence $\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$ proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_5$ and the global period integral conjecture for the pair $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ (which is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$) in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (2.6) with $m = n = 3$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(G, H, \rho_H) = (\mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3})). \tag{18}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ (note that GSpin_6 is essentially GL_4 up to some central isogeny which won't affect the unramified computation) the integral over GL_3 of a cusp form on GL_3 with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an Eisenstein series of GSpin_6 induced from the cusp form on GL_3 and the trivial character of GL_1. Then the integral over GSpin_6 is just the period integral for the Gross-Prasad model of $\mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6$. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.4 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$ and the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 5 is given as follows. Note that ι is trivial for all these cases.

Table 7. *Dual quadruples of Table 5.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, 0)$	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}))$	$T(Std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, H = G, T(std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	$T(Std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_3})$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4}))$	$T(Std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_4})$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_5, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2)$	$T(Std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_5})$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	$T(Std_{\mathrm{GSp}_6} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_3})$

4.2. The nonreductive case

For (2.1) with $m > n + 1$ and (2.4) with $n > 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = (\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, 0, (\mathrm{GL}_1)^n \times \mathrm{GL}_{m-n} \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_n}).$$

When $m - n$ is odd (resp. even), the nilpotent orbit induces a Bessel period (resp. Fourier-Jacobi period) for the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = (\mathrm{GL}_1)^{m-n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ (resp. $M = (\mathrm{GL}_1)^{m-n} \times \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$) whose stabilizer in M is $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$. We can diagonally embed H into the stabilizer. This is the Gan-Gross-Prasad model for the general linear group defined in Section 13 of [13]. In this case Δ_{red} is given by the quadruple (14) (resp. (13)). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The period integral in this case is closely related to the Rankin-Selberg integral in [28]. However the difference is not negligible and we do not claim Theorem 1.13 for this case. For the dual

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_m$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (2.2) with $n = 2m$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m}, \mathrm{GL}_m, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m}), (\mathrm{GL}_2)^m).$$

The nilpotent orbit induces a Bessel period for the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_m$ whose stabilizer in M is $H = \mathrm{GL}_m$. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (13). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The period integral in this case is exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral in [29]. The result in loc. cit. proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13.

For (2.2) with $n = 2m + 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{GL}_m, 0, (\mathrm{GL}_2)^m \times \mathrm{GL}_1).$$

The nilpotent orbit induces a Fourier-Jacobi period for the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_m$ whose stabilizer in M is $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_1$. We can naturally embed H into the stabilizer. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (13). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The period integral in this case is exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral in [29]. The result in loc. cit. proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13.

For (2.5), the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{SO}_2, 0, \mathrm{SO}_{2m-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_1).$$

It is the Gross-Prasad model of $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_2$ and Δ_{red} is given by (5) when $m = 1$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The unramified computation in [27] proves Theorem 1.13. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SO}_2$ and this proves Theorem 1.15.

For (2.6) with $m > 2, n = 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = (\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), (\mathrm{GL}_1)^2 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{2m-3} \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GSpin}_5 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^{m-2} \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ whose stabilizer in M is $\mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$. We then embeds $H = G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)$ into $\mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ via the identity map on GSpin_4 and the projection of $G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)$ into GL_2 via the first GL_2-copy. The representation ρ_H is the standard representation of the second GL_2-copy of H. This integral is essentially the Gross-Prasad model for $\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_4$ except we replace the cusp form on one GL_2-copy by theta series. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (15). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The unramified computation in [27] proves Theorem 1.13. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_{2n} \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$ and the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_1$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (2.6) with $m = 2, n > 5$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_n, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2, T_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^4 \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-4}).$$

When n is odd (resp. even), the nilpotent orbit induces a Bessel period (resp. Fourier-Jacobi period) for the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_5 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^5$ (resp. $M = \mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^4$) whose stabilizer in M is $\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$. We can naturally embed H into the stabilizer. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (17) (resp. (16)). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ and the global period integral conjecture for the pair $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ (which is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$) in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For (2.6) with $m > 3, n = 3$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}), (\mathrm{GL}_1)^3 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{2m-5} \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_3}).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^{m-3} \times \mathrm{GL}_3$ whose stabilizer in M is $H = \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (18). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.4 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$ proves Theorem 1.13. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GSp}_{2n} \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$ and the Rankin-Selberg period for $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_3$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (2.7) with $m = 2k$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2k}, \mathrm{GSpin}_3, T(\mathrm{Spin}_3), \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{2k-2}).$$

This is essentially the Gross-Prasad model for $\mathrm{GSpin}_{2k} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_3$ except we replace the cusp form on GSpin_3 by a theta series. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (13) when $n = 2$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The unramified computation in [27] proves Theorem 1.13.

For (2.7) with $m = 2k + 1$, the generic stabilizer of $\hat{\rho}$ in $\hat{G}$ is not connected, hence it does not belong to the current framework of the BZSV duality. However, for this specific case, by the Rankin-Selberg integral in [24], we know that the dual integral should be the one in [24]. As the generic stabilizer is not connected, there are covering groups involved in the integral.

For (2.8) with $n = 7$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), \mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_1).$$

This is essentially the same as the quadruple (9) except we replace the cusp form on GL_2 by theta series. The period integral in this case is exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral in [6] and Δ_{red} is given by (13) when $m = 2$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The unramified computation in [46] proves Theorem 1.13.

For (2.8) with $n = 9$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_8, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}), \mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_1). \tag{19}$$

where $std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}$ is the standard representation of the second GL_2-copy. This is essentially the same as the quadruple (10) except we replace the cusp form on GL_2 by theta series and the period integral in this case is exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral in [7]. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (15). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The result in [7] proves Theorem 1.13.

For (2.8) with $n = 10$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{PGSO}_{10}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, \mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_1).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{SO}_2$ whose stabilizer in M is $H = \mathrm{GL}_2$ (here the embedding is given by $h \mapsto (h, h, diag(\det(h), 1))$). In this case Δ_{red} is given by (13) when $n = 2$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. This integral is very close to the Rankin-Selberg integral in [17], though we again do not claim Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (2.9), the generic stabilizer of $\hat{\rho}$ in $\hat{G}$ is not connected, hence it does not belong to the current framework of the BZSV duality. However, for this specific case, by the Rankin-Selberg integral in [16], we know that the dual integral should be the one in [16]. As the generic stabilizer is not connected, there are covering groups involved in the integral.

For (2.10), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(GE_6, \mathrm{GL}_3, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}), D_4).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In this case Δ_{red} is given by (13) when $n = 3$. The period integral associated to it is exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral in [15]. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The result in [15] proves Theorem 1.13.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 6 is given as follows. Here for ι, we only list the root type of the Levi subgroup L of G such that ι is principal in L.

Table 8. *Dual quadruples of Table 6.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, 0)$	A_{m-n-1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m}, \mathrm{GL}_m, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m}))$	$(A_1)^m$	$T(\wedge^2)$
$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{GL}_m, 0)$	$(A_1)^m$	$T(\wedge^2)$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{SO}_2, 0)$	B_{m-1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}})$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	B_{m-2}	$T(Std_{\mathrm{GSp}_{2m}} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_n, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2)$	A_{n-5}	$T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	B_{m-3}	$T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_3})$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2k}, \mathrm{GSpin}_3, T(\mathrm{Spin}_3))$	D_{k-1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}})$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_2	$T(\mathrm{Spin}_7)$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_8, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_2	$T(\mathrm{Spin}_9)$
$(\mathrm{PGSO}_{10}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_3	$T(\mathrm{HSpin}_{10})$
$(GE_6, \mathrm{GL}_3, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	D_4	$T(std_{E_6})$

5. Models in Table 11 of [30]

In this section we will consider Table 11 of [30], this is for the case when $\hat{\rho}$ is the direct sum of two distinct irreducible symplectic representations of $\hat{G}$. It is easy to check that the representations in (11.5), (11.8), (11.13), (11.14), (11.15) of [30] are not anomaly free and the representation in (11.1) (resp. (11.11)) of [30] is only anomaly free when n is even (resp. p odd). Hence it remains to consider the following cases. We still separate the cases based on whether $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ is abelian or not.

Table 9. *Reductive models in Table 11 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(11.7)	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{Spin}_8 \times \mathrm{SL}_2, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$	$C_2 \times D_4 \times A_1$	0
(11.9)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{Spin}_7 \times SL_2, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7 \oplus \mathrm{Spin}_7 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$	$(A_1)^3 \times B_2$	0
(11.10)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SL}_2, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_6} \oplus std_{\mathrm{SO}_6} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$	$A_1 \times A_1 \times B_2$	0
(11.11), p=2m+1	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$	$B_m \times C_m$	0
(11.11), p=2m-1	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m-1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m-1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$	$B_{m-1} \times D_m$	0

Table 10. *Nonreductive models in Table 11 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(11.1), n=2k	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SO}_{2k} \times \mathrm{SL}_2, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$	$A_1 \times A_1 \times B_2$	D_{k-2}
(11.2)	$(\mathrm{Spin}_{12}, \mathrm{HSpin}^+_{12} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}^-_{12})$	$(A_1)^2 \times B_2$	$A_1 \times A_1$
(11.3)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{Spin}_{12}, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_{12})$	$(A_1)^3$	A_3
(11.4)	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{Spin}_{12}, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_{12})$	$C_2 \times A_1 \times D_4$	A_1
(11.6)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{Spin}_8 \times SL_2, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$	$(A_1)^3$	A_1
(11.11), $p = 2k+1 > 2m+1$	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2k+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$	$B_m \times C_m$	B_{k-m}
(11.11), $p = 2n-1 < 2m-1$	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2n-1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n-1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$	$B_{n-1} \times D_n$	C_{m-n}
(11.12)	$(\mathrm{Sp}_6, \wedge^3_0 \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6})$	$A_1 \times A_1$	A_1

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

5.1. The reductive case

In this subsection we consider the reductive cases, i.e., the ones in Table 9. The nilpotent orbit ι is trivial for all these cases so we will ignore it.

For (11.7), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}). \quad (20)$$

Note that when we take Borel Eisenstein series on GSp_4 and GL_2, this period integral recovers the Rankin-Selberg integral in [18]. This is because the theta lifting of a Borel Eisenstein series on GSp_4 to GSO_8 is the two-variable Eisenstein series on GSO_8 appeared in the Rankin-Selberg integral of [18] and the theta lifting of a Borel Eisenstein series on GL_2 to GSO_8 is the one-variable Eisenstein series on GSO_8 appeared in the Rankin-Selberg integral of [18] up to a triality automorphism on GSO_8 (we need the triality automorphism here becuase we are using the half Spin representation instead of the standard representation in ρ_H). The result in loc. cit. proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. This quadruple is self-dual.

For (11.9), the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4, S(G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2) \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \times std_{\mathrm{SO}_4}).$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4$, the integral over SO_4 of a cusp form on GSO_4 with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an automorphic form on GSp_4. Then the integral over $G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)$ is just the period integral for the pair $(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{Sp}_2))$ in [46]. The unramified computation in [46] and Theorem 2.6 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (11.10), the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), std_{\mathrm{SO}_4} \times std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}). \quad (21)$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4$, the integral over SO_4 of a cusp form on GSO_4 with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an automorphic form on GSp_4. Then the integral over GSp_4 is just the period integral for the pair $(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GSp}_4)$ which is essentially the Gross-Prasad model for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{SO}_5$. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.6 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_6 \times \mathrm{Sp}_4$ (here we view $\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2$ as a subgroup of Sp_4) and the global period integral conjecture for the Gross-Prasad model $\mathrm{SO}_5 \times \mathrm{SO}_4$ in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (11.11) when $p = 2m + 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}). \quad (22)$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$, the integral over Sp_{2m} of a cusp form on Sp_{2m} with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an automorphic form on SO_{2m+2}. Then the integral over SO_{2m+1} is just the period integral for the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}$. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.6 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. This quadruple is self-dual and it is clear that Conjecture 1.5 would follow from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}$ and the global period integral conjecture for the Gross-Prasad model of $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+2} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}$ in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (11.11) when $p = 2m - 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is given by

$$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}}). \quad (23)$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m}\times\mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}$, the integral over Sp_{2m-2} of a cusp form on Sp_{2m} with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an automorphic form on SO_{2m}. Then the integral over SO_{2m} is just the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}\times\mathrm{SO}_{2m}$. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.6 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m}\times\mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m}\times\mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}$ and the global period integral conjecture for the Gross-Prasad model $\mathrm{SO}_{2m}\times\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}$ in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 9 is given as follows (note that ι is trivial for all these cases) where

$$*=(\mathrm{GSp}_4\times\mathrm{GSpin}_8\times\mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8\times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4\times\mathrm{SL}_2)), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}\oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8\otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$$

Table 11. *Dual quadruples of Table 9.*

(G,H,ρ_H)	$\hat{\rho}$
$*$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}\oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8\otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
$(\mathrm{GSp}_6\times\mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GSO}_4\times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4\times\mathrm{SL}_2)), std_{\mathrm{SO}_4}\times std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4})$	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}\otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7\oplus \mathrm{Spin}_7\otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
$(\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4\times\mathrm{GSO}_4), std_{\mathrm{SO}_4}\times std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4})$	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_6}\oplus std_{\mathrm{SO}_6}\otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}\times\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, H=G, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}\oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$	$std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}\oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}\times\mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m}\times\mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m}}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m-2}})$	$std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m-1}}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}\oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}$

5.2. The nonreductive case

For (11.1) when $n=2k$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2k}\times\mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4\times\mathrm{GSO}_4), std_{\mathrm{SO}_4}\times std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}, \mathrm{GSpin}_{2k-4}\times(\mathrm{GL}_1)^2\times T_{\mathrm{GSO}_4}).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P=MU$ with $M=\mathrm{GSpin}_6\times(\mathrm{GL}_1)^{k-3}\times\mathrm{GSO}_4$ whose stabilizer in M is $\mathrm{GSpin}_5\times\mathrm{GSO}_4$. We can embed H into the stabilizer as in (21) and Δ_{red} is given by (21). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.6 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSO}_4\times\mathrm{GSp}_4$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2k}\times\mathrm{Sp}_4$ (here we view $\mathrm{SL}_2\times\mathrm{SL}_2$ as a subgroup of Sp_4) and the global period integral conjecture for the Gross-Prasad model $\mathrm{SO}_5\times\mathrm{SO}_4$ in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (11.2), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4\times\mathrm{GSO}_4), 0, \mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_2\times(\mathrm{GL}_1)^3).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P=MU$ with $M=\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GSO}_4$ whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (21). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (11.3), we first introduce a reductive quadruple which belongs to Table S of [30]. Let $G=(\mathrm{GL}_2)^5$ and $H=S(\mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_2)$ where the embedding $H\to G$ is given by mapping the first GL_2-copy into the first GL_2-copy, and mapping the second (resp. third) GL_2-copy diagonally into the second and third (resp. fourth and fifth) GL_2-copy. Let $\rho_H=std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}$ be the triple product representation and ι be trivial. The quadruple

$$\Delta_0=(G,H,\rho_H,\iota)=((\mathrm{GL}_2)^5, S(\mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_2), std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}, 1) \tag{24}$$

will be used to explain several models in this paper. This quadruple comes from Table S of [30], it is obtained by combining two copies of Model (S.3) with $n=4$. We claim the dual quadruple is given by

$$\hat{\Delta}_0=(\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1),\ \ \hat{\rho}=std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,3}\oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,4}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,5}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,i}$ represents the standard representation of the i-th GL_2-copy. To justify the duality, we will prove Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15 for this case.

We start with Theorem 1.13. By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$, the integral of a cusp form on the first GL_2-copy with the theta series produces cusp forms on the other two GL_2-copies of H. Then the period integral over the remaining two copies of GL_2 are just the period for two trilinear GL_2-models (i.e., the first, second, third GL_2-copies and the first, fourth, fifth GL_2-copies). Then Theorem 1.13 follows from the unramified computation in [27]. In fact, in this case, Conjecture 1.5(1) follows from the result in [25] (for the trilinear GL_2-model) and Theorem 2.6 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) in this case is also a direct consequence of the result in [25] (for the trilinear GL_2-model) and Theorem 2.5 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$. This proves Theorem 1.15. Later in Section 9, we will use a similar argument to prove Theorem 1.21 for most of the cases.

For (11.3) the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12} \times \mathrm{PGL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0, \mathrm{GL}_4 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^3 \times T_{\mathrm{PGL}_2}). \tag{25}$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{PGL}_2$ whose stabilizer in M is $S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4) \times \mathrm{GL}_2$. We can embed H into the stabilizer by mapping the GL_2-copy of H into the GL_2-copy of the stabilizer and by mapping $\mathrm{GSO}_4 = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2/\mathrm{GL}_1^{diag}$ into $\mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{PGL}_2$ via the idenity map on GSO_4 and the projection map $\mathrm{GSO}_4 = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2/\mathrm{GL}_1^{diag} \to \mathrm{PGL}_2$ via the firts GL_2-copy of GSO_4. It is clear that the induced embedding from H into M is the same as (24). In this case Δ_{red} is given by (24). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (11.4), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}, T_{\mathrm{GSp}_4} \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^5).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_8$ whose stabilizer in M is $\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_8)$ and we can naturally embed H into the stabilizer. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (20). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (11.6), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSO}_8 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^3 \times T_{\mathrm{GSO}_4}). \tag{26}$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$ whose stabilizer in M is $S(\mathrm{GSO}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2) \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$. We can embed H into the stabilizer by making the GL_2-copy of H into the GL_2-copy of the stabilizer and by mapping the GSO_4-copy of H diagonally into the two GSO_4-copies of the stabilizer. It is clear that the induced embedding from H into M is the same as (24). In this case Δ_{red} is given by (24). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (11.11) when $p = 2k + 1 > 2m + 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2k}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}, T_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2k-2m} \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^m).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^{k-m} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}$ whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (22). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2k+2}$ and the Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture (Conjecture 9.11 of [14]) for nontempered Arthur packet of the Gross-Prasad model of $\mathrm{SO}_{2k+2} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2k+1}$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For (11.11) when $p = 2n - 1 < 2m - 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}, \mathrm{SO}_{2n} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m-2n+1} \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^n \times T_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}}). \tag{27}$$

In this case Δ_{red} is given by (23). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2n} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}$, the integral over Sp_{2n-2} of a cusp form on Sp_{2n} with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an automorphic form on SO_{2n}. Then the integral over SO_{2n} is just the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}$. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.6 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_{2n} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}$ and the global period integral conjecture for the Gross-Prasad period of $\mathrm{SO}_{2n} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n-1}$ in [13]. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (11.12), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_7, \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2), std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^2).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GSpin}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ whose stabilizer in M is H. The representation ρ_H is the standard representation on the first GL_2-copy. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (22) when $m = 1$. It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 10 is given as follows. Here for ι, we only list the root type of the Levi subgroup L of G such that ι is principal in L and $* = (\mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8})$.

Table 12. *Dual quadruples of Table 10.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2k} \times \mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), std_{\mathrm{SO}_4} \times std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4})$	D_{k-2}	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0)$	$A_1 \times A_1$	$\mathrm{HSpin}^+_{12} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}^-_{12}$
$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12} \times \mathrm{PGL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0)$	A_3	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_{12}$
$*$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_{12}$
$(\mathrm{GSO}_8 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0)$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2k}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$	C_{k-m}	$std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}$
$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}, \mathrm{SO}_{2n} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}})$	B_{m-n}	$std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n-1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_7, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2), std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$	A_1	$\wedge^3 \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6}$

6. Models in Table 12 of [30]

In this section we will consider Table 12 of [30], this is for the case when $\hat{\rho}$ is the direct sum of three irreducible representations of $\hat{G}$ with two of them dual to each other (i.e. $\hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho}_0 \oplus T(\hat{\tau})$). It is easy to check that the representations in (12.4), (12.9), (12.10), (12.11), (12.12) of [30] are not anomaly free. Hence it remains to consider the following cases. We still separate the cases based on whether $\hat{\mathrm{I}}$ is abelian or not.

Table 13. *Reductive models in Table 12 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathrm{I}}$
(12.5)	$(\mathrm{SL}_6 \times \mathrm{SL}_2, \wedge^3 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_6} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}))$	$A_1 \times A_1 \times A_3$	0
(12.7), m=1	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_4, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_4}))$	$A_1 \times A_1$	0
(12.7), m=2	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_4, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_4}))$	$C_2 \times A_3$	0
(12.7), m=3	$(\mathrm{Sp}_6 \times \mathrm{Spin}_6, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_6} \oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6))$	$A_3 \times A_3$	0
(12.8)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}))$	$A_1 \times A_1 \times A_3$	0

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 14. *Nonreductive models in Table 12 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G},\hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathrm{I}}$
(12.1)	$(\mathrm{Spin}_{12}, \mathrm{HSpin}_{12} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}}))$	$A_1\times A_1\times A_1$	A_3
(12.2)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2\times\mathrm{Spin}_{10}, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{10}}\oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{10}}))$	$A_1\times A_1\times A_3$	A_1
(12.3)	$(\mathrm{SL}_2\times\mathrm{Spin}_8, std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}\otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}\oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}))$	$A_1\times A_1\times A_1$	A_1
(12.6)	$(\mathrm{SL}_6, \wedge^3\oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_6}))$	$A_1\times A_1$	$A_1\times A_1$
(12.7), $m>3$	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}\times\mathrm{SO}_6, std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}\otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_6}\oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6))$	$A_3\times A_3$	C_{m-3}

6.1. The reductive case

In this subsection we consider the reductive cases, i.e., the ones in Table 13. The nilpotent orbit ι is trivial for all these cases so we will ignore it.

For (12.5), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_6\times\mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2\times S(\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GL}_2), \wedge^2\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}). \tag{28}$$

Here the first GL_2-copy maps into the GL_6 part of G, while the second GL_2-copy maps into the GL_2 part of G, the representation $\wedge^2\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}$ stands for the tensor product of the exterior square representation of GL_4 with the standard representation of the second GL_2-copy. An unramified computation similar to [27] and [46] can confirm the duality in this case.

During the peer review process, an anonymous referee provided a beautiful argument connecting the period of this quadruple to the exterior cube L-function. To be specific, let $\Pi=\pi\otimes\tau$ be a cuspidal representation on $\mathrm{GL}_6\times\mathrm{GL}_2$. After integrating τ against the theta series associated to the representation $\wedge^2\otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}$, we get the Speh representation $Speh(\tau,2)$ on GL_4 (this is the theta correspondence between Sp_2 and SO_6 up to isogeny). Then the global period integral becomes

$$\int_{[\mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_4]/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})}\varphi(diag(g_1,g_2))E_\tau(g_2)dg_1dg_2,\ \varphi\in\pi,\ E_\tau\in Speh(\tau,2).$$

We add a s-variable in the integral and define

$$I(\varphi,E_\tau,s)=\int_{[\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GL}_2]/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})}|\det(g_1)/\det(g_2)^2|^s\varphi(diag(g_1,g_2))E_\tau(g_1)dg_1dg_2,$$
$$\varphi\in\pi,\ E_\tau\in Speh(\tau,2)$$

Lemma 6.1.

$$I(\varphi,E_\tau,s)=\int_{H''(\mathbb{A})\backslash(\mathrm{GL}_4(\mathbb{A})\times\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}))}|\det(g_1)/\det(g_2)^2|^s\varphi_{GR}(g)E_{\tau,\psi}(g_1)d(g_1,g_2)$$

where

$$\varphi_{GR}(g)=\int_{[\mathrm{GL}_2]/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})}\int_{[Mat_{2\times2}]^3}\varphi\left(\begin{pmatrix}I_2 & Z & X\\ 0 & I_2 & Y\\ 0 & 0 & I_2\end{pmatrix}diag(h,h,h)g\right)\psi(tr(Z+Y))\,dXdYdZdh$$

is the period integral of φ with respect to the Ginzburg-Rallis model (12) and

$$E_{\tau,\psi}(g_1)=\int_{[Mat_{2\times2}]}E_\tau\left(\begin{pmatrix}I_2 & U\\ 0 & I_2\end{pmatrix}g_1\right)\psi(-U)\,dU;$$
$$H''=\left\{\begin{pmatrix}h & X\\ 0 & h\end{pmatrix}\times(h)\,|\ h\in\mathrm{GL}_2, X\in Mat_{2\times2}\right\}\subset\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GL}_2.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Proof. We expand the function $\varphi(diag(g_1, g_2))$ along the unipotent subgroup $\begin{pmatrix} I_4 & X \\ 0 & I_2 \end{pmatrix}$:

$$\varphi(\begin{pmatrix} g_1 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix}) = \sum_{\xi} \int_{[Mat_{4\times 2}]} \varphi(\begin{pmatrix} I_4 & X \\ 0 & I_2 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} g_1 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix})\xi(X)dX$$

where ξ runs over characters of $[Mat_{4\times 2}]$. Under the adjoint action of $\mathrm{GL}_4(k) \times \mathrm{GL}_2(k)$, the set of characters ξ have three orbits, which correspond to elements in $Mat_{2\times 4}(k)$ of rank $0, 1, 2$ respectively. Using the cuspidal condition of Π it is easy to see that the contribution of rank 0 and rank 1 terms to $I(\varphi, E_\tau, s)$ is zero. So we only need to consider the rank 2 terms, which can be written as

$$\varphi(\begin{pmatrix} g_1 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix}) = \sum_{g\in H'(k)\backslash(\mathrm{GL}_4(k)\times \mathrm{GL}_2(k))} \int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]^2} \varphi(g^{-1}\begin{pmatrix} I_2 & 0 & X \\ 0 & I_2 & Y \\ 0 & 0 & I_2 \end{pmatrix} g \begin{pmatrix} g_1 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2 \end{pmatrix})\psi(tr(Y))dXdY$$

with

$$H' = \{\begin{pmatrix} h_1 & X \\ 0 & h_2 \end{pmatrix} \times (h_2) |\ h_i \in \mathrm{GL}_2, X \in Mat_{2\times 2}\} \subset \mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2,$$

and we embed H' into GL_6 with $(a, b) \mapsto diag(a, b)$. Unwinding, we have

$$I(\varphi, E_\tau, s) = \int_{H'(\mathbb{A})\backslash(\mathrm{GL}_4(\mathbb{A})\times \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}))} J(g_1, g_2)|\det(g_1)/\det(g_2)^2|^s\ d(g_1, g_2);$$

with

$$J(g_1, g_2) = \int_{[H']/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})} \int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]^2} \varphi(\begin{pmatrix} I_2 & 0 & X \\ 0 & I_2 & Y \\ 0 & 0 & I_2 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} g_1'g_1 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2'g_2 \end{pmatrix})$$
$$\times E_\tau(g_1'g_1)|\det(g_1')/\det(g_2')^2|^s\psi(tr(Y))dXdYd(g_1', g_2').$$

Further expanding with η running through all characters of $[Mat_{2\times 2}]$:

$$J(g_1, g_2) = \sum_{\eta} \int_{[H']/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})} \int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]^3} \varphi(\begin{pmatrix} I_2 & Z & X \\ 0 & I_2 & Y \\ 0 & 0 & I_2 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} g_1'g_1 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2'g_2 \end{pmatrix})$$
$$\times E_\tau(g_1'g_1)|\det(g_1')/\det(g_2')^2|^s\eta(Z)\psi(tr(Y))\ dZdXdYd(g_1', g_2').$$

Under the adjoint action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(k)\times \mathrm{GL}_2(k)$, the set of characters η have three orbits, which correspond to elements in $Mat_{2\times 2}(k)$ of rank $0, 1, 2$ respectively. Using the cuspidal condition of Π it is easy to see that the contribution of rank 0 and rank 1 terms to $J(g_1, g_2)$ is zero. The rank 2 characters η are the orbit of H'/H'' acting on the character $Z \mapsto \psi(tr(Z))$. Thus

$$J(g_1, g_2) = \sum_{H'(k)/H''(k)} \int_{[H']/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})} \int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]^3} \varphi(h\begin{pmatrix} I_2 & Z & X \\ 0 & I_2 & Y \\ 0 & 0 & I_2 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} g_1'g_1 & 0 \\ 0 & g_2'g_2 \end{pmatrix})$$
$$\times E_\tau(hg_1'g_1)|\det(g_1')/\det(g_2')^2|^s\psi(tr(Y+Z))\ dZdXdYd(g_1', g_2'),$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

which unwinds to

$$\int_{H''(\mathbb{A})\backslash H'(\mathbb{A})}\int_{[H'']/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})}\int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]^3}\varphi(h\begin{pmatrix}I_2 & Z & X\\ 0 & I_2 & Y\\ 0 & 0 & I_2\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}g_1'g_1 & 0\\ 0 & g_2'g_2\end{pmatrix})$$
$$\times E_\tau(hg_1'g_1)|\det(g_1')/\det(g_2')^2|^s\psi(tr(Y+Z))\,dZdXdYdhd(g_1',g_2').$$

Write an element in H'' as $(\begin{pmatrix}h & U\\ 0 & h\end{pmatrix},h)$ and change variable $Z\mapsto Z-U$, the above becomes:

$$\int_{H''(\mathbb{A})\backslash H'(\mathbb{A})}\int_{[\mathrm{GL}_2]/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})}\int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]^4}\varphi(\mathrm{diag}(h,h,h)\begin{pmatrix}I_2 & Z & X\\ 0 & I_2 & Y\\ 0 & 0 & I_2\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}g_1'g_1 & 0\\ 0 & g_2'g_2\end{pmatrix})\times$$
$$\times E_\tau(\begin{pmatrix}h & U\\ 0 & h\end{pmatrix}g_1'g_1)|\det(g_1')/\det(g_2')^2|^s\psi(tr(Y+Z-U))\,dU\,dZdXdY\,dhd(g_1',g_2').$$

Now

$$\int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]}E_\tau(\begin{pmatrix}h & U\\ 0 & h\end{pmatrix}\cdot)\psi(tr(-U))\,dU=E_{\tau,\psi}(\mathrm{diag}(h,h)\cdot)$$

By Theorem 13 and Claim 8 of [9], $E_{\tau,\psi}$ is a Shalika model of $Speh(\tau,2)$, namely $E_{\tau,\psi}(\mathrm{diag}(h,h)\cdot)=E_{\tau,\psi}(\cdot)$. Therefore

$$J(g_1,g_2)=\int_{H''(\mathbb{A})\backslash H'(\mathbb{A})}\int_{[\mathrm{GL}_2]/\mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{A})}\int_{[Mat_{2\times 2}]^4}\varphi(\mathrm{diag}(h,h,h)\begin{pmatrix}I_2 & Z & X\\ 0 & I_2 & Y\\ 0 & 0 & I_2\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}g_1'g_1 & 0\\ 0 & g_2'g_2\end{pmatrix})$$
$$\times E_{\tau,\psi}(g_1'g_1)|\det(g_1')/\det(g_2')^2|^s\psi(tr(Y+Z))\,dZdXdY\,dhd(g_1',g_2'),$$

or simply

$$J(g_1,g_2)=\int_{H''(\mathbb{A})\backslash H'(\mathbb{A})}\varphi_{GR}(\begin{pmatrix}g_1'g_1 & 0\\ 0 & g_2'g_2\end{pmatrix})E_{\tau,\psi}(g_1'g_1)|\det(g_1')/\det(g_2')^2|^s\,d(g_1',g_2').$$

The lemma follows from further combine the integration over $H''(\mathbb{A})\backslash H'(\mathbb{A})'$ and $H'(\mathbb{A})\backslash(\mathrm{GL}_4(\mathbb{A})\times\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{A}))$. □

Since the Ginzburg-Rallis model yields the exterior cube L-function, we expect the Eulerian integral above to coincide with the L-function of the tensor product of the standard representations of GL_6 and GL_2 which would explain the duality for the quadruple (28). We thank the referee for this beautiful argument. As the unramified calculation of this Eulerian integral will be computed in the PhD thesis of a student of the third author, we will not reproduce it here.

For (12.7) with $m=1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GL}_2,\mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_2,0).$$

This is the model $(\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GL}_2,\mathrm{GL}_2\times\mathrm{GL}_2)$ studied in [46] and the unramified computation in [46] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from Theorem 2.5 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GSp}_2\times\mathrm{GSO}_6$ and Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture (Conjecture 9.11 of [14]) for nontempered Arthur packet of the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GL}_4$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (12.7) with $m=2$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GSp}_4,\mathrm{GL}_4\times\mathrm{GSp}_4,T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4}\otimes std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4})).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Observe that this is the dual to the quadruple in (16), thus both Theorems 1.13 and 1.15 have been proved there.

For (12.7) with $m = 3$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_6)). \tag{29}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$, the integral over the second GSpin_6-copy of a cusp form on GSpin_6 with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces the same cusp form with an extra central value of the Spin L-function. Then the integral over the other copy of GSpin_6 is just the period integral for the Gross-Prasad model $\mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6$. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.4 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$ and the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (12.8), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_4) \times \mathrm{GL}_2, std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4} \times std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})). \tag{30}$$

Note that when we put Eisenstein series on both GL_2 copies, this period integral recovers the Rankin-Selberg integral in [38]. The result in [38] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. This quadruple is self-dual.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 13 is given as follows (ι is trivial for all these cases) where

$$* = (\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_4) \times \mathrm{GL}_2, std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4} \times std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})).$$

Table 15. *Dual quadruples of Table 13.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{GL}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times S(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2), \wedge^2 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$	$\wedge^3 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_6} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_4})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, \mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GSp}_4, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GSp}_4}))$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_4})$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_6))$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_6} \oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6)$
$*$	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$

6.2. The nonreductive case

For (12.1), we first introduce a reductive quadruple which belongs to Table S of [30]. Let $G = (\mathrm{GL}_2)^4$ and $H = S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2)$ where the embedding $H \to G$ is given by mapping the first two GL_2-copies into the first two GL_2-copy, and mapping the last GL_2-copy diagonally into the third and fourth GL_2-copy. Let $\rho_H = std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2})$ where $std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,i}$ represents the standard representation of the i-th GL_2-copy and ι be trivial. This quadruple

$$\Delta_0 = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = ((\mathrm{GL}_2)^4, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2), std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}), 1) \tag{31}$$

is almost the same as (24) except we replace the cusp form on one GL_2-copy by theta series. It is obtained by combining Model (S.3) and (S.11) in Table S of [30] with $n = 4$ and $m = 2$. We claim the dual quadruple is given by

$$\hat{\Delta}_0 = (\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1),\ \hat{\rho} = T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}) \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,3} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,4}.$$

We can use the same argument as in (24) to prove Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15 for this case.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For (12.1), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), \mathrm{GL}_4 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^3).$$

The attached period integral is the same as model in (25) except we replace the cusp form on GL_2 by theta series. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (31) and it is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (12.2), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{10} \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6) \times \mathrm{GL}_2, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), \mathrm{GL}_2 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^4 \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (30). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (12.3), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSO}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), \mathrm{GL}_2 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^3 \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_2}).$$

The attached period integral is the same as the model (26) except we replace the cusp form on one GL_2-copy by theta series. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (31) and it is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (12.6), we first introduce a reductive quadruple from Table S of [30] (it is obtained by combining Model (S.10) and Model (S.3) with $n = 4$)

$$(G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = (\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), 1) \tag{32}$$

where H embeds into G by mapping the first GL_2-copy into the first GL_2-copy and mapping the second GL_2-copy diagonally into the second and third GL_2-copy. We claim the dual quadruple is given by

$$(\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1),\ \hat{\rho} = T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1}) \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,3}$$

where $std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,i}$ is the standard representation of the i-th GL_2-copy. To justify the duality, we will prove Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15 for this case.

We start with Theorem 1.13. By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$, the integral over the first GL_2-copy of a cusp form in π with the theta series gives a cusp form on GL_2 (in the same space π, note though Theorem 2.2 applied to the correspondence does introduce the central value of the standard L-function). Then the integral over the other GL_2-copy is just the period integral for the trilinear GL_2-model. As a result, Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 follow from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ and the result in [25] (trilinear GL_2-model). For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4$ and the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$. This proves Theorem 1.15 in this case. Later in Section 9, we will use a similar argument to prove Theorem 1.21 for some of the cases (more precisely for those cases containing model (S.10) of [30]).

Now we can write down the associated quadruple Δ of (12.6). It is given by

$$(\mathrm{GL}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, 0, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_1).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Fourier-Jacobi period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (32). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (12.7) when $m > 3$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_6), \mathrm{GSpin}_{2m-5} \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^3 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^4).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{m-3} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_7 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6$ whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (29). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The unramified computation in [27] and Theorem 2.4 applied to theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$ proves Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GSp}_{2m} \times \mathrm{GSO}_6$ and the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 14 is given as follows. Here for ι, we only list the root type of the Levi subgroup L of G such that ι is principal in L and

$$* = (\mathrm{GSpin}_{10} \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6) \times \mathrm{GL}_2, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})).$$

Table 16. *Dual quadruples of Table 14.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_3	$\mathrm{HSpin}_{12} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}})$
$*$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{10}} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{10}})$
$(\mathrm{GSO}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	$A_1 \times A_1$	$\wedge^3 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_6})$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_6))$	B_{m-3}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_6} \oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6)$

7. Models in Table 22 of [30]

In this section we will consider Table 22 of [30], this is for the case when $\hat{\rho}$ is the direct sum of four irreducible representations of $\hat{G}$ of the form $T(\rho_1) \oplus T(\rho_2)$. All the representations in Table 22 of [30] are anomaly free (see Remark 2.8(3)), so we need to consider all of them. We still separate the cases based on whether $\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$ is abelian or not.

Table 17. *Reductive models in Table 22 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(22.2), n=2m	$(\mathrm{SL}_n, T(\wedge^2) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_{m-1} \times A_{m-1}$	0
(22.2), n=2m+1	$(\mathrm{SL}_n, T(\wedge^2) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_m \times A_{m-1}$	0
(22.3), m=n	$(\mathrm{SL}_m \times \mathrm{SL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_{n-1} \times A_{n-1}$	0
(22.3), m=n+1	$(\mathrm{SL}_m \times \mathrm{SL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_{n-1} \times A_{n-1}$	0
(22.3), m=n-1	$(\mathrm{SL}_m \times \mathrm{SL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_m \times A_{m-1}$	0
(22.3), m=n-2	$(\mathrm{SL}_m \times \mathrm{SL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_m \times A_{m-1}$	0
(22.4), n=3	$(\mathrm{SL}_3, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_3}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_3}))$	A_1	0
(22.5), m=2	$(\mathrm{Sp}_4, T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}))$	$A_1 \times A_1$	0

Table 18. *Nonreductive models in Table 22 of [30].*

Number in [30]	$(\hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$	$\hat{W}_V$	$\hat{\mathfrak{l}}$
(22.1)	$(\mathrm{Spin}_8, T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}) \oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_8))$	$A_1 \times A_1 \times A_1$	A_1
(22.3), $m > n+1$	$(\mathrm{SL}_m \times \mathrm{SL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_{n-1} \times A_{n-1}$	A_{m-n+1}
(22.3), $m < n-2$	$(\mathrm{SL}_m \times \mathrm{SL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	$A_m \times A_{m-1}$	A_{n-m-2}
(22.4), $n > 3$	$(\mathrm{SL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}))$	A_1	A_{n-3}
(22.5), $m > 2$	$(\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}))$	$A_1 \times A_1$	C_{m-2}

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

7.1. The reductive case

In this subsection we consider the reductive cases, that is, the ones in Table 17. The nilpotent orbit ι is trivial for all these cases so we will ignore it.

For (22.2) with $n = 2m$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m}, \mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_m, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m})).$$

The period integral in this case is exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral in [5]. The result in loc. cit. proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (22.2) with $n = 2m + 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{GL}_{m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_m, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{m+1}})).$$

The period integral in this case is exactly the Rankin-Selberg integral in [5]. The result in loc. cit. proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (22.3) with $m = n$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})). \tag{33}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$, the integral over GL_n of a cusp form on GL_n with the theta series associated to $T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$ produces a cusp form on GL_n. Then the integral over the other GL_n-copy is just the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$. This quadruple is self-dual. The Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ in [28], the unramified computation in [48], and Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ proves Conjecture 1.5, Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15. Notice that the theta correspondence introduces an extra central value of the standard L-function in this case.

For (22.3) with $m = n + 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})). \tag{34}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$, the integral over GL_n of a cusp form on GL_n with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces another cusp form on GL_n. Then the integral over the other GL_n-copy is just the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$. The Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ in [28], the unramified computation in [26], and Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 in this case. Again notice that the theta correspondence introduces an extra central value of the standard L-function. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ with the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (22.3) with $m = n - 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})). \tag{35}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$, the integral over GL_n of a cusp form on GL_n with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces another cusp form on GL_n. Then the integral over GL_{n-1} is just the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}$. This quadruple is self-dual. The Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}$ in [28], the unramified computation in [26], and Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ proves Conjecture 1.5, Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15 in this case. As before, the theta correspondence introduces an extra central value of the standard L-function.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For (22.3) with $m = n-2$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-2}, \mathrm{GL}_{n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-2}, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-2}})). \tag{36}$$

By the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-2}$, the integral over GL_{n-2} of a cusp form on GL_{n-2} with the theta series associated to ρ_H produces an Eisenstein series on GL_{n-1} which is induced from the cuspidal automorphic representation on GL_{n-2} and the trivial character. Then the integral over GL_{n-1} is just the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}$. The Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ in [28], the unramified computation in [26], and Theorems 2.2 and 2.4 applied to the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-2}$ proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ with the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_{n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-2}$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (22.4) with $n = 3$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})). \tag{37}$$

The period integral is essentially the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_3 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ except that we replace the cusp form on GL_2 by theta series. The result in [28] and [26] proves Conjecture 1.5(1) and Theorem 1.13 in this case.

For (22.5) with $m = 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_5 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, \mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_4^+ \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_4^- \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_1})). \tag{38}$$

The period integral is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{GSpin}_5 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_4$ except that we replace the cusp form on GSpin_4 by theta series. The unramified computation in [27] proves Theorem 1.13 in this case.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 13 is given as follows (ι is trivial for all these cases).

Table 19. *Dual quadruples of Table 17.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m}, \mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_m, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m}))$	$T(\wedge^2) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{2m}})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{GL}_{m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_m, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{m+1}}))$	$T(\wedge^2) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{2m+1}})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-1}, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-2}, \mathrm{GL}_{n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-2}, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-2}}))$	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{n-2}}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_3}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_3})$
$(\mathrm{GSpin}_5 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, \mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_4^+ \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_4^- \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_1}))$	$T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4})$

7.2. The nonreductive case

For (22.1), we first introduce a reductive quadruple which belongs to Table S of [30]. Let $G = (\mathrm{GL}_2)^3$, $H = S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2)$ and $\rho_H = std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,3})$ where $std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,i}$ represents the standard representation of the i-th GL_2-copy and ι be trivial. This quadruple

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_0 = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = ((\mathrm{GL}_2)^3, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2),\\ std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,3}), 1)\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

is almost the same as (24) except we replace the cusp form on two GL_2-copies by theta series. It is obtained by combining two copies of Model (S.11) in Table S of [30] with $m = 2$. We claim the dual quadruple is given by

$$\hat{\Delta}_0 = (\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1),\ \hat{\rho} = T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,2}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,1} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2,3}).$$

We can use the same argument as in (24) to prove Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15 for this case.

For (22.1), the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSO}_8, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), \mathrm{GL}_2 \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^3).$$

The period integral is the same as (26) except we replace the cusp form on both GL_2-copies by theta series. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (39) and it is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (22.3) when $m > n + 1$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}), (\mathrm{GL}_1)^n \times \mathrm{GL}_{m-n} \times T_{\mathrm{GL}_n}).$$

When $n - m$ is odd (resp. even), the nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period (resp. Fourier-Jacobi period) on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{m-n-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_n$ (resp. $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{m-n} \times \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n$) whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (34) (resp. (33)). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) would follow from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}$ and Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture (Conjecture 9.11 of [14]) for nontempered Arthur packet of the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_{m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_m$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (22.3) when $m < n - 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{m+1}}), T_{\mathrm{GL}_m} \times (\mathrm{GL}_1)^{m-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{n-m-1}).$$

When $n - m - 1$ is odd (resp. even), the nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period (resp. Fourier-Jacobi period) on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{n-m-2} \times \mathrm{GL}_{m+2} \times \mathrm{GL}_m$ (resp. $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{n-m-1} \times \mathrm{GL}_{m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_m$) whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (36) (resp. (35)). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. For the dual side, Conjecture 1.5(2) follows from Theorem 2.2 applied to the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}$ and the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_{m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_m$. This proves Theorem 1.15.

For (22.4) when $n > 3$, we need to introduce another reductive quadruple from Table S of [30] (it is obtained by combining two copies of Model (S.10))

$$(G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = (\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_1}), 1). \tag{40}$$

We claim that the dual quadruple is given by

$$(\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1),\ \hat{\rho} = T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_1}),$$

that is, it is self-dual. We can use the same argument as in (32) to prove Theorem 1.13 and Theorem 1.15 for this case.

The associated quadruple Δ for (22.4) with $n > 3$ is given by

$$(\mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}), \mathrm{GL}_{n-2} \times \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_1).$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

When $n-2$ is odd (resp. even), the nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period (resp. Fourier-Jacobi period) on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{n-3} \times \mathrm{GL}_3$ (resp. $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{n-2} \times \mathrm{GL}_2$) whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (37) (resp. (40)). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case.

For (22.5) when $m > 2$, the associated quadruple Δ is

$$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_1, \mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_4^+ \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_4^- \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_1}), \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GL}_1 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{2m-3}).$$

The nilpotent orbit ι induces a Bessel period on the unipotent radical of the parabolic subgroup $P = MU$ with $M = \mathrm{GL}_1^{m-2} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_5$ whose stabilizer in M is H. In this case Δ_{red} is given by (38). It is clear that Theorem 1.18 holds in this case. The period integral is essentially the Gross-Prasad period for $\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_4$ except that we replace the cusp form on GSpin_4 by theta series. The unramified computation in [27] proves Theorem 1.13.

By the discussion above, the strongly tempered quadruple associated to Table 18 is given as follows. Here for ι, we only list the root type of the Levi subgroup L of G such that ι is principal in L and

$$* = (\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_1, \mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_4^+ \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_4^- \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_1})).$$

Table 20. *Dual quadruples of Table 18.*

(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
$(\mathrm{GSO}_8, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_1	$T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}) \oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_8)$
$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	A_{m-n+1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{m+1}}))$	A_{n-m-2}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n})$
$(\mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_{n-3}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n})$
$*$	B_{m-2}	$T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$

8. Summary

We summarize our findings in this paper into the following 6 tables.

- Table 21 contains reductive strongly tempered quadruples for which we have provided evidence for Conjecture 1.5(1) and (2) (i.e., Theorem 1.13 and 1.15).
- Table 22 contains the remaining reductive strongly tempered quadruples. For all of them except $(\mathrm{GL}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times S(\mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2), \wedge^2 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$, we have provided evidence for Conjecture 1.5(1) (i.e. Theorem 1.13).
- Table 23 contains nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples for which we have provided evidence for Conjecture 1.5 and 2.10 (i.e., Theorem 1.13, 1.15 and 1.18).
- Table 24 contains nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples for which we have provided evidence for Conjecture 1.5(1) and 2.10 (i.e., Theorem 1.13 and 1.18).
- Table 25 contains nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples for which we have provided evidence for Conjecture 1.5(2) and 2.10 (i.e. Theorem 1.15 and 1.18).
- Table 26 contains the remaining nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples. For each of them, we have only provided evidence for Conjecture 2.10 (i.e., Theorem 1.18).

For quadruples (G, H, ρ_H, ι) in Table 21 and 22, the nilpotent orbit ι is trivial. For all the quadruples $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ in Table 21–26, the dual quadruple is given by $(\hat{G}, \widehat{G/Z_\Delta}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ where $\hat{\rho}$ is given in the tables and $Z_\Delta = Z_G \cap ker(\rho_H)$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 21. *Reductive strongly tempered quadruples 1.*

№	(G, H, ρ_H)	$\hat{\rho}$
1	$(SO_{2m+1} \times SO_{2m}, SO_{2m}, 0)$	$std_{Sp_{2m}} \otimes std_{SO_{2m}}$
2	$(SO_{2m+2} \times SO_{2m+1}, SO_{2m+1}, 0)$	$std_{Sp_{2m}} \otimes std_{SO_{2m+2}}$
3	$(GSp_6 \times GSpin_7, S(GSp_6 \times GSpin_7), std_{Sp_6} \otimes Spin_7)$	$std_{Sp_6} \otimes Spin_7$
4	$(GSp_6 \times GSpin_9, S(GSp_6 \times GSpin_8), std_{Sp_6} \otimes HSpin_8)$	$std_{Sp_8} \otimes Spin_7$
5	$(GL_n \times GL_n, GL_n, T(std_{GL_n}))$	$T(std_{GL_n} \otimes std_{GL_n})$
6	$(GL_{n+1} \times GL_n, GL_n, 0)$	$T(std_{GL_{n+1}} \otimes std_{GL_n})$
7	$(GSp_4 \times GL_2, G(SL_2 \times SL_2), T(std_{GL_2,2}))$	$T(Std_{GSp_4} \otimes Std_{GL_2})$
8	$(GSp_4 \times GL_3, H = G, T(std_{GSp_4} \otimes std_{GL_3}))$	$T(Std_{GSp_4} \otimes Std_{GL_3})$
9	$(GSp_4 \times GL_4, S(GSp_4 \times GL_4), std_{Sp_4} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{GL_4}))$	$T(Std_{GSp_4} \otimes Std_{GL_4})$
10	$(GSp_4 \times GL_5, S(GSp_4 \times GL_4), std_{Sp_4} \otimes \wedge^2)$	$T(Std_{GSp_4} \otimes Std_{GL_5})$
11	$(GSpin_7 \times GL_3, GSpin_6 \times GL_3, T(HSpin_6 \otimes std_{GL_3}))$	$T(Std_{GSp_6} \otimes Std_{GL_3})$
12	$(SO_{2m+1} \times Sp_{2m}, H = G, std_{SO_{2m+1}} \otimes std_{Sp_{2m}} \oplus std_{Sp_{2m}})$	$std_{SO_{2m+1}} \otimes std_{Sp_{2m}} \oplus std_{Sp_{2m}}$
13	$(SO_{2m+1} \times Sp_{2m-2}, SO_{2m} \times Sp_{2m-2}, std_{SO_{2m}} \otimes std_{Sp_{2m-2}})$	$std_{SO_{2m-1}} \otimes std_{Sp_{2m}} \oplus std_{Sp_{2m}}$
14	$(GL_4 \times GSO_4, S(GSp_4 \times GSO_4), std_{SO_4} \times std_{Sp_4})$	$std_{SL_2} \otimes std_{SO_6} \oplus std_{SO_6} \otimes std_{SL_2}$
15	$(GL_4 \times GL_2, GL_2 \times GL_2, 0)$	$std_{SL_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{SL_4})$
16	$(GL_4 \times GSp_4, GL_4 \times GSp_4, T(std_{GL_4} \otimes std_{GSp_4}))$	$std_{Sp_4} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{SL_4})$
17	$(GSpin_7 \times GSpin_6, GSpin_6 \times GSpin_6, T(HSpin_6 \otimes HSpin_6))$	$std_{Sp_6} \otimes std_{Spin_6} \oplus T(HSpin_6)$
18	$(GL_n \times GL_n, GL_n \times GL_n, T(std_{GL_n} \otimes std_{GL_n} \oplus std_{GL_n}))$	$T(std_{GL_n} \otimes std_{GL_n}) \oplus T(std_{GL_n})$
19	$(GL_{n+1} \times GL_n, GL_n \times GL_n, T(std_{GL_n} \otimes std_{GL_n}))$	$T(std_{GL_{n+1}} \otimes std_{GL_n}) \oplus T(std_{GL_n})$
20	$(GL_n \times GL_{n-1}, GL_n \times GL_{n-1}, T(std_{GL_n} \otimes std_{GL_{n-1}} \oplus std_{GL_n}))$	$T(std_{GL_{n-1}} \otimes std_{GL_n}) \oplus T(std_{GL_n})$
21	$(GL_n \times GL_{n-2}, GL_{n-1} \times GL_{n-2}, T(std_{GL_{n-1}} \otimes std_{GL_{n-2}}))$	$T(std_{GL_n} \otimes std_{GL_{n-2}}) \oplus T(std_{GL_n})$
22	$((GL_2)^5, S(GL_2 \times GL_2 \times GL_2), std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_2})$	$*$
23	$\sharp$	$**$
24	$(GL_2 \times GL_2 \times GL_2, GL_2 \times GL_2, T(std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_2}))$	$***$
25	$\sharp\sharp$	$****$
26	$(GL_2 \times GL_1, GL_2 \times GL_1, T(std_{GL_2} \oplus std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_1}))$	$T(std_{GL_2} \oplus std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_1})$

$$\sharp = ((GL_2)^4, S(GL_2 \times GL_2 \times GL_2), std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_2} \oplus T(std_{GL_2,2})).$$

$$\sharp\sharp = ((GL_2)^3, S(GL_2 \times GL_2 \times GL_2), std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_2} \otimes std_{GL_2} \oplus T(std_{GL_2,2}) \oplus T(std_{GL_2,3})).$$

$$* = std_{GL_2,1} \otimes std_{GL_2,2} \otimes std_{GL_2,3} \oplus std_{GL_2,1} \otimes std_{GL_2,4} \otimes std_{GL_2,5}.$$

$$** = T(std_{GL_2,1} \otimes std_{GL_2,2}) \oplus std_{GL_2,1} \otimes std_{GL_2,3} \otimes std_{GL_2,4}.$$

$$*** = T(std_{GL_2,1}) \oplus std_{GL_2,1} \otimes std_{GL_2,2} \otimes std_{GL_2,3}.$$

$$**** = T(std_{GL_2,1} \otimes std_{GL_2,2}) \oplus T(std_{GL_2,1} \otimes std_{GL_2,3}).$$

Table 22. *Reductive strongly tempered quadruples 2.*

№	(G, H, ρ_H)	$\hat{\rho}$
1	$(GSp_6 \times GSp_4, G(Sp_4 \times Sp_2), 0)$	$Spin_5 \otimes Spin_7$
2	$(GSp_6 \times GSO_4, S(GSO_4 \times G(Sp_4 \times SL_2)), std_{SO_4} \times std_{Sp_4})$	$std_{SL_2} \otimes Spin_7 \oplus Spin_7 \otimes std_{SL_2}$
3	$*$	$std_{Sp_4} \otimes std_{Spin_8} \oplus HSpin_8 \otimes std_{SL_2}$
4	$(GL_6 \times GL_2, GL_2 \times S(GL_4 \times GL_2), \wedge^2 \otimes std_{GL_2})$	$\wedge^3 \oplus T(std_{SL_6} \otimes std_{SL_2})$
5	$**$	$std_{SL_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{SL_4} \otimes std_{SL_2})$
6	$(GL_{2m}, GL_m \times GL_m, T(std_{GL_m}))$	$T(\wedge^2) \oplus T(std_{GL_{2m}})$
7	$(GL_{2m+1}, GL_{m+1} \times GL_m, T(std_{GL_{m+1}}))$	$T(\wedge^2) \oplus T(std_{GL_{2m+1}})$
8	$(GL_3, GL_2 \times GL_1, T(std_{GL_2}))$	$T(std_{SL_3}) \oplus T(std_{SL_3})$
9	$(GSpin_5 \times GL_1, GSpin_4 \times GL_1, T(HSpin_4^+ \oplus HSpin_4^- \otimes std_{GL_1}))$	$T(std_{Sp_4}) \oplus T(std_{Sp_4})$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

$$* = (\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}).$$

$$** = (\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_4) \times \mathrm{GL}_2, std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes \wedge^2 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_4} \times std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})).$$

Table 23. *Nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples 1.*

№	(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
1	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, 0)$	B_{m-n}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}$
2	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{SO}_{2n}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, 0)$	D_{n-m}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}}$
3	$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSp}_6, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times \mathrm{GSp}_6), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6} \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_8)$	B_{m-4}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7$
4	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{SO}_2, 0)$	B_{m-1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n}})$
5	$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	B_{m-2}	$T(Std_{\mathrm{GSp}_{2m}} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$
6	$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_3, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_3, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	B_{m-3}	$T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_3})$
7	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}, \mathrm{SO}_{2n} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2n-2}})$	B_{m-n}	$std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2n-1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}$
8	$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2k} \times \mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), std_{\mathrm{SO}_4} \times std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4})$	D_{k-2}	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
9	$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, \mathrm{GSpin}_6 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes \mathrm{HSpin}_6))$	B_{m-3}	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SO}_6} \oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6)$

Table 24. *Nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples 2.*

№	(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
1	$(\mathrm{GSp}_6 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_2	$std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_7$
2	$(\mathrm{GSp}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), 0)$	A_2	$std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \otimes \mathrm{Spin}_9$
3	$(\mathrm{GSp}_{10}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_4	Spin_{11}
4	$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_5	HSpin_{12}
5	$(\mathrm{GL}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	$A_2 \times A_2$	$\wedge^3$
6	$(E_7, \mathrm{PGL}_2, 0)$	E_6	std_{E_7}
7	$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m}, \mathrm{GL}_m, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m}))$	$(A_1)^m$	$T(\wedge^2)$
8	$(\mathrm{GL}_{2m+1}, \mathrm{GL}_m, 0)$	$(A_1)^m$	$T(\wedge^2)$
9	$(\mathrm{GSpin}_{2k}, \mathrm{GSpin}_3, T(\mathrm{Spin}_3))$	D_{k-1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k}})$
10	$(\mathrm{GSp}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_2	$T(\mathrm{Spin}_7)$
11	$(\mathrm{GSp}_8, G(\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{SL}_2), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_2	$T(\mathrm{Spin}_9)$
12	$(GE_6, \mathrm{GL}_3, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_3}))$	D_4	$T(std_{E_6})$
13	$*$	B_{m-2}	$T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$

$$* = (\mathrm{GSpin}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{GL}_1, \mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_1, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_4^+ \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_4^- \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_1})).$$

Table 25. *Nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples 3.*

№	(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
1	$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n, 0)$	A_{m-n-1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n})$
2	$(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_n, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GL}_4), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes \wedge^2)$	A_{n-5}	$T(Std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes Std_{\mathrm{SL}_m})$
3	$(\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2k}, \mathrm{SO}_{2m+1} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m}, std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2m+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}})$	C_{k-m}	$std_{\mathrm{SO}_{2k+1}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}}$
4	$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathrm{GL}_n, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_n}))$	A_{m-n+1}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n})$
5	$(\mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_m \times \mathrm{GL}_{m+1}, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_{m+1}}))$	A_{n-m-2}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n})$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Table 26. *Nonreductive strongly tempered quadruples 4.*

№	(G, H, ρ_H)	ι	$\hat{\rho}$
1	$(\mathrm{GSp}_{12}, \mathrm{GSp}_4, 0)$	$A_2 \times A_2$	Spin_{13}
2	$(\mathrm{PGSO}_{10}, \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	A_3	$T(\mathrm{HSpin}_{10})$
3	$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GSp}_4 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0)$	$A_1 \times A_1$	$\mathrm{HSpin}_{12}^{+} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_{12}^{-}$
4	$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12} \times \mathrm{PGL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0)$	A_3	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_{12}$
5	$*$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_{12}$
6	$(\mathrm{GSO}_8 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), 0)$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
7	$(\mathrm{GSpin}_7, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2), std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})$	A_1	$\wedge^3 \oplus std_{\mathrm{Sp}_6}$
8	$(\mathrm{GSO}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_3	$\mathrm{HSpin}_{12} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}})$
9	$**$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{10}} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{10}})$
10	$(\mathrm{GSO}_8 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_1	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8})$
11	$(\mathrm{GL}_6, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, 0)$	$A_1 \times A_1$	$\wedge^3 \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_6})$
12	$(\mathrm{GSO}_8, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSO}_4), T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2} \oplus std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_1	$T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}) \oplus T(\mathrm{HSpin}_8)$
13	$(\mathrm{GL}_n, \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std_{\mathrm{GL}_2}))$	A_{n-3}	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n}) \oplus T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_n})$

$$* = (\mathrm{GSpin}_4 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_{12}, S(\mathrm{GSpin}_8 \times G(\mathrm{Sp}_4 \times \mathrm{SL}_2)), std_{\mathrm{Sp}_4} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}).$$

$$** = (\mathrm{GSpin}_{10} \times \mathrm{GL}_2, S(\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GSpin}_6) \times \mathrm{GL}_2, T(\mathrm{HSpin}_6 \otimes std_{\mathrm{GL}_2})).$$

9. Table S of [30]

In this section we will discuss Table S of [30]. This table contains several models from Tables 1, 2, 11, 12, 22 of [30] with some A_1 components (i.e. $\hat{G} = \hat{G}_1 \times \hat{G}_2$ where $\hat{G}_1$ is of Type A_1). Then one can obtain more multiplicity free representations by gluing those representations together via the A_1-components. Two of the models in Table S contain two A_1-components (i.e. (S.1) and (S.2)) and hence it can be used to create infinite many multiplicity free representations. We refer the reader to [30] for the details of the gluing process (also see (41)). In this section we will discuss how to write down the dual of those models by defining a gluing process for the dual of models in Table S.

We first recall Table S from [30]. Note that underlined section of the SL_2 part is where we can glue the representations. Model (S.1) and (S.2) contains two underlined SL_2 and we can use it glue representations with any arbitrary length.

Table 27. *Table S of [30].*

№ in [30]	$\hat{G}$	$\hat{\rho}$
(S.1)	$\underline{\mathrm{SL}_2} \times \mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.2)	$\underline{\mathrm{SL}_2} \times \mathrm{Spin}_8 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8} \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.3)	$\mathrm{SO}_n \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$std_{\mathrm{SO}_n} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.4)	$\mathrm{Spin}_{12} \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$\mathrm{HSpin}_{12} \oplus std_{\mathrm{Spin}_{12}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.5)	$\mathrm{Spin}_9 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$\mathrm{Spin}_9 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.6)	$\mathrm{Spin}_8 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$T(std_{\mathrm{Spin}_8}) \oplus \mathrm{HSpin}_8 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.7)	$\mathrm{Spin}_7 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$\mathrm{Spin}_7 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.8)	$\mathrm{SL}_2 \times \mathrm{Spin}_7 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$std_{\mathrm{SL}_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{Spin}_7} \oplus \mathrm{Spin}_7 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.9)	$\underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	std_{SL_2}
(S.10)	$\underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$
(S.11)	$\mathrm{SL}_m \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_m} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$
(S.12)	$\mathrm{SL}_4 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$T(std_{\mathrm{SL}_4}) \oplus \wedge^2 \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.13)	$\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes \mathrm{Sym}^2$
(S.14)	$\mathrm{Sp}_{2m} \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$T(std_{\mathrm{Sp}_{2m}} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2})$
(S.15)	$\mathrm{Spin}_5 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$\mathrm{Spin}_5 \oplus std_{\mathrm{Spin}_5} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$
(S.16)	$G_2 \times \underline{\mathrm{SL}_2}$	$std_{G_2} \otimes std_{\mathrm{SL}_2}$

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is clear that if one glue some anomaly-free representations with some non anomaly-free representations in Table S, one will get a non anomaly-free representation. Hence we can consider them separately. We first consider the anomaly-free representations in Table S, this corresponds to Model (S.1), (S.2), (S.3) when n is even, (S.4)-(S.7), (S.10)-(S.12) and (S.14). For each of them we have already write down its dual quadruple in the previous sections. We just need to describe how to glue the dual together[12].

Let $\hat{\Delta} = (\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho}, 1)$ be one of such model and let $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ be its dual. If the model is not (S.1), (S.2) or (S.10), then $\hat{G} = \hat{G}_1 \times \hat{G}_2$ and $G = G_1 \times G_2$ with $\hat{G}_1, G_1$ being of Type A_1. Moreover, by our description of Δ in the previous sections, we know that the projection map $H \to G_1$ is surjective and we can write the group HG_1 (i.e. the group generated by H and G_1) as $G_1 \times H_1 \times H_2$ with $H_2 = H \cap G_2$ and $H_1 \simeq G_1$ is in the centralizer of H_2 in $G_1 H \cap G_2$. Moreover the image of the diagonal embedding from H_1 into $G_1 \times H_1$ belongs to H. In particular, the representation ρ_H induces a representation (still denoted by ρ_H) on $H_1 \times H_2$ (on H_2-part this is given by restriction and on H_1 part it is given by restriction and the diagonal embedding from H_1 into $G_1 \times H_1$). Finally, the nilpotent orbit ι is the product of some nilpotent orbit of G_2 with the trivial nilpotent orbit of G_1. For example, consider Model (S.3) when $n = 4$, the dual is the trilinear GL_2 model

$$(G, H, \rho_H, \iota) = (\mathrm{PGL}_2^3, \mathrm{PGL}_2, 0, 1)$$

and in this case

$$G_1 = \{(1, 1, h) |\ h \in \mathrm{PGL}_2\},\ H = \{(h, h, h) |\ h \in \mathrm{PGL}_2\},\ H_1 = \{(h, h, 1) |\ h \in \mathrm{PGL}_2\},\ H_2 = \{1\}.$$

If the Model is (S.1) or (S.2), then $\hat{G} = \hat{G}_{11} \times \hat{G}_{12} \times \hat{G}_2$ and $G = G_{11} \times G_{12} \times G_2$ with $\hat{G}_{11}, \hat{G}_{12}, G_{11}, G_{12}$ being of Type A_1. Moreover, by our description of Δ in the previous section, we know that the projection map $H \to G_{11} \times G_{12}$ is surjective and we can write the group $HG_{11}G_{12}$ as $G_{11} \times G_{12} \times H_{11} \times H_{12} \times H_2$ with $H_2 \subset H$, $H_{1i} \simeq G_{1i}$, and the image of the diagonal embedding from H_{1i} into $G_{1i} \times H_{1i}$ belongs to H for $i = 1, 2$. Also the representation ρ_H would be 0 in this case. Finally, the nilpotent orbit ι is the product of some nilpotent orbit of G_2 with the trivial nilpotent orbit of $G_{11} \times G_{12}$.

Lastly, if the model is $(S.10)$, then $\hat{\Delta} = (\mathrm{SL}_2, \mathrm{SL}_2, T(std), 1)$ and $\Delta = (\mathrm{PGL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_1, 0, 1)$. In particular $\hat{G} = \hat{G}_1$ and $G = G_1$ are of Type A_1.

Now we can describe the gluing process on the dual side. Suppose we are gluing two representations $(\hat{G}, \hat{G}, \hat{\rho})$ and $(\hat{G}', \hat{G}', \hat{\rho}')$. In particular we can write

$$\hat{G} = \hat{G}_1 \times \hat{G}_2,\ \hat{G}' = \hat{G}_1' \times \hat{G}_2'$$

and we are gluing $\hat{G}_1$ with $\hat{G}_1'$. The goal is to write down the dual of

$$\hat{\Delta}_{glue} = (\hat{G}_2 \times \hat{G}_1 \times \hat{G}_2', \hat{G}_2 \times \hat{G}_1 \times \hat{G}_2', \hat{\rho} \oplus \hat{\rho}', 1). \tag{41}$$

Here we consider $\hat{\rho}$ (or $\hat{\rho}'$) as a representation of $\hat{G}_2 \times \hat{G}_1 \times \hat{G}_2'$ where the $\hat{G}_2'$ (or $\hat{G}_2$) component acts trivially. Let $\Delta = (G, H, \rho_H, \iota)$ and $\Delta' = (G', H', \rho_H', \iota')$ be the dual of $\hat{\Delta}$ and $\hat{\Delta}'$.

There are two cases. First we consider the case when both representations are not (S.10). In this case, by our discussion above, we have the decomposition[13]

$$G_1 H = G_1 \times H_1 \times H_2,\ G_1' H' = G_1' \times H_1' \times H_2'.$$

[12](S.1) is Model 1 of Table 23 with n=4, (S.2) is Model 6 of Table 26, (S.3) when n is even is Model 2 of Table 23 with $m = 1$, (S.4) is Model 4 of Table 26, (S.5) is Model 2 of Table 24, (S.6) is Model 10 of Table 26, (S.7) is Model 1 of Table 24, (S.10) is Model 6 of Table 21 with $n = 1$, (S.11) is Model 1 of Table 25 with $n = 2$, (S.12) is Model 15 of Table 21, and (S.14) is Model 5 of Table 23.

[13]If we are in the case of (S.1) or (S.2), then G_1 would be one of the G_{1i} and H_1 would be the corresponding H_{1i}

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Then the dual would be given by

$$\Delta_{glue} = (G_2 \times G_1 \times G_2', H_2 \times H_1 \times G_1 \times H_1' \times H_2', \rho_H \oplus \rho_H' \oplus \rho', \iota \times \iota')$$

where ρ' is the tensor product representation of $H_1 \times G_1 \times H_1'$. Note that when the model is not (S.1), (S.2) or (S.10), we have explained how to view ρ_H (resp. ρ_H') as a representation of $H_1 \times H_2$ (resp. $H_1' \times H_2'$). In the cases of $(S.1)$ or $(S.2)$ the representation ρ_H (resp. ρ_H') is just 0. Also note that ι (resp. ι') is the product of some nilpotent orbit of G_2 (resp. G_2') with the trivial nilpotent orbit of $G_1 = G_1'$ and hence we can view $\iota \times \iota'$ as a nilpotent orbit of $G_1 \times G_1 \times G_2'$. Model (24) and (31) are examples of this case.

Now let's prove Theorem 1.21 in this case. The idea is similar to the proof of Conjecture 1.5 for Model (24). Roughly speaking, we will show that the period integral associated to Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) is a combination of the period integrals associated to $\Delta, \Delta', \Delta_1$ (resp. $\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\Delta}', \hat{\Delta}_1$)[14] where

$$\Delta_1 = (\mathrm{SL}_2^3, \mathrm{SL}_2^3, std \otimes std \otimes std, 1), \hat{\Delta}_1 = (\mathrm{PGL}_2^3, \mathrm{PGL}_2, 0, 1).$$

In particular, Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta_{glue}, \hat{\Delta}_{glue})$ will follow from Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta, \hat{\Delta})$, $(\Delta', \hat{\Delta}')$ and $(\Delta_1, \hat{\Delta}_1)$. As Conjecture 1.5 is know for $(\Delta_1, \hat{\Delta}_1)$ (by the Rallis inner product formula and the work of Harris-Kudla [25] for the triple product period), we know that Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta_{glue}, \hat{\Delta}_{glue})$ will follow from Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta, \hat{\Delta})$ and $(\Delta', \hat{\Delta}')$. This proves Theorem 1.21.

It remains to explain why the period integral associated to Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) is a combination of the period integrals associated to $\Delta, \Delta', \Delta_1$ (resp. $\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\Delta}', \hat{\Delta}_1$). We start with the period integral associated to Δ_{glue}. In this case we start with an automorphic form $\phi = \phi_{G_2}\phi_{G_1}\phi_{G_2'}$ on $G_2 \times G_1 \times G_2'$. We first integrate over G_1 (note that the projection of nilpotent orbit $\iota \times \iota'$ to G_1 is the trivial orbit, so the unipotent integral associated to $\iota \times \iota'$ commutes with the integral over G_1). Since the symplectic representation ρ_H (resp. ρ_H') is on the group $H_1 \times H_2$ (resp. $H_1' \times H_2'$), the integral over G_1 is just the integral of ϕ_{G_1} with theta function associated to ρ' (recall that ρ' is the tensor product representation of $H_1 \times G_1 \times H_1'$). By the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{Sp}_2 \times \mathrm{SO}_4$, the integral

$$\int_{G_1(k)\backslash G_1(\mathbb{A})} \phi_{G_1}(g_1)\Theta_{\rho'}(h_1, g_1, h_1')dg_1$$

gives an automorphic form $\phi_{H_1 \times H_1'}(h_1, h_1')$ in the irreducible space $\pi \otimes \pi$ on $H_1 \times H_1'$ (assuming $\phi \in \pi$ of $G_1 \simeq H_1 \simeq H_2$). We may as well assume $\phi_{H_1 \times H_1'}(h_1, h_1')$ has the form $\phi_{H_1}(h_1)\phi_{H_1'}(h_1')$. Note that by Rallis inner product formula $\|\phi_{G_1}\|$" = "$\|\phi_{H_1}\|\|\phi_{H_1'}\|$. Then the remaining integrals (i.e. the unipotent integral associated to $\iota \times \iota'$ and integral over $H_2 \times H_1 \times H_1' \times H_2'$) become the product of the period integrals of the automorphic forms $\phi_{G_2} \times \phi_{H_1}$ and $\phi_{H_1'} \times \phi_{G_2'}$ associated to the quadruples $(G_2 \times H_1, H_2 \times H_1, \rho_H, \iota)$ and $(H_1' \times G_2', H_1' \times H_2', \rho_H', \iota')$ respectively[15]. But these two quadruples are just Δ and Δ' via the isomorphism $H_1 \simeq G_1 \simeq G_1' \simeq H_1'$. As a result, Conjecture 1.5(1) for Δ_{glue} would follow from Conjecture 1.5(1) for Δ and Δ'.

For the other direction, the period integral associated to $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$ is given by

$$\int_{\hat{G}_1(k)\backslash \hat{G}_1(\mathbb{A})} \int_{\hat{G}_2(k)\backslash \hat{G}_2(\mathbb{A})} \int_{\hat{G}_2'(k)\backslash \hat{G}_2'(\mathbb{A})} \phi_{\hat{G}_1}(g_1)\phi_{\hat{G}_2}(g_2)\phi_{\hat{G}_2'}(g_2')\Theta_{\hat{\rho}}(g_1, g_2)\Theta_{\hat{\rho}'}(g_1, g_2')dg_2'dg_2dg_1. \tag{42}$$

By Conjecture 1.5(2) for Δ and Δ', we know that

[14] $(\Delta_1, \hat{\Delta}_1)$ is just Model 2 in Table 21 when $m = 1$, the period integral associated to Δ_1 is the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{Sp}_2 \times \mathrm{SO}_4$ while the period integral associated to $\hat{\Delta}_1$ is the triple product integral

[15] note here for the embedding of $H_1 \times H_2$ (respectively $H_1' \times H_2'$), the component H_1 (resp. H_1') diagonally embeds into $G_2 \times H_1$ (resp. $H_1' \times G_2'$)

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

- the integral

$$\int_{\hat{G}_2(k)\backslash\hat{G}_2(\mathbb{A})} \phi_{\hat{G}_2}(g_2)\Theta_{\hat{\rho}}(g_1,g_2)dg_2$$

is nonvanishing only if the Arthur parameter of $\phi_{\hat{G}_2}$ factors through $H_1\times H_2\to G_2$, i.e. it is the lifting of an Arthur packet $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1}\otimes\Pi_{\hat{H}_2}$ of $\hat{H}_1(\mathbb{A})\times\hat{H}_2(\mathbb{A})$. Moreover, if this is the case and the packet $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1}\otimes\Pi_{\hat{H}_2}$ is tempered, then the automorphic function

$$\phi_1(g_1):=\int_{\hat{G}_2(k)\backslash\hat{G}_2(\mathbb{A})} \phi_{\hat{G}_2}(g_2)\Theta_{\hat{\rho}}(g_1,g_2)dg_2,\ g_1\in\hat{G}_1(\mathbb{A})$$

belongs to the packet $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1}$ (as $H_1\simeq G_1$ we can view $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1}$ as a packet for $\hat{G}_1$);

- the integral

$$\int_{\hat{G}_2'(k)\backslash\hat{G}_2'(\mathbb{A})} \phi_{\hat{G}_2'}(g_2')\Theta_{\hat{\rho}'}(g_1,g_2')dg_2'$$

is nonvanishing only if the Arthur parameter of $\phi_{\hat{G}_2'}$ factors through $H_1'\times H_2'\to G_2'$, i.e. it is the lifting of an Arthur packet $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1'}\otimes\Pi_{\hat{H}_2'}$ of $\hat{H}_1'(\mathbb{A})\times\hat{H}_2'(\mathbb{A})$. Moreover, if this is the case and the packet $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1'}\otimes\Pi_{\hat{H}_2'}$ is tempered, then the automorphic function

$$\phi_1'(g_1):=\int_{\hat{G}_2'(k)\backslash\hat{G}_2'(\mathbb{A})} \phi_{\hat{G}_2'}(g_2')\Theta_{\hat{\rho}'}(g_1,g_2')dg_2',\ g_1\in\hat{G}_1(\mathbb{A})$$

belongs to the packet $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1'}$ (as $H_1'\simeq G_1$ we can view $\Pi_{\hat{H}_1'}$ as a packet for $\hat{G}_1$).

By the above two facts, the integral (42) becomes

$$\int_{\hat{G}_1(k)\backslash\hat{G}_1(\mathbb{A})} \phi_{\hat{G}_1}(g_1)\phi_1(g_1)\phi_1'(g_1)dg_1$$

which is exactly a triple product integral on $\hat{H}_1\times\hat{G}_1\times\hat{H}_1'$. In particular, Conjecture 1.5(2) for Δ_{glue} follows from the work of Harris-Kudla [25] for the triple product period and Conjecture 1.5(2) for Δ and Δ'. This finishes the proof of Theorem 1.21 for this case.

Remark 9.1. Our argument above demonstrates that the period integral associated with Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) can be expressed as a combination of the period integrals associated with Δ,Δ',Δ_1 (resp. $\hat{\Delta},\hat{\Delta}',\hat{\Delta}_1$). Since the period integral of Δ_1 (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_1$) is the theta correspondence for $\mathrm{SO}_4\times\mathrm{Sp}_2$ (resp. trilinear GL_2-model), both of which are well understood, it follows that the nonvanishing statement in Conjecture 1.5 for Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) can be deduced from the corresponding nonvanishing statement for $\Delta,\ \Delta'$ (resp. $\hat{\Delta},\ \hat{\Delta}'$).

Moreover, if the local relative character associated with Δ,Δ' (resp. $\hat{\Delta},\hat{\Delta}'$) is equal to the L-value in Conjecture 1.5 at unramified places, then the same holds for the local relative character associated with Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$).

In principle, as in the context of Theorem 1.15 and Remark 1.17, our approach here could also be used to completely prove Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta_{glue},\hat{\Delta}_{glue})$, assuming the conjecture holds for $(\Delta,\hat{\Delta})$ and $(\hat{\Delta},\hat{\Delta}')$, subject to verifying two additional conditions:

- At ramified places, one must establish a local identity between the local relative character of the period for Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) and those for Δ,Δ',Δ_1 (resp. $\hat{\Delta},\hat{\Delta}',\hat{\Delta}_1$).
- It is necessary to verify that the global constant defined in (14.26) of [1] for Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) matches those for Δ,Δ',Δ_1 (resp. $\hat{\Delta},\hat{\Delta}',\hat{\Delta}_1$).

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In this paper, we do not pursue this direction further. This remark also applies to the next case discussed below.

Next we consider the case when at least one of the representation is (S.10). We may assume that $(\hat{G}', \hat{G}', \hat{\rho}')$ is $(S.10)$. Then we have the decomposition

$$G_1 H = G_1 \times H_1 \times H_2,\ G' \simeq G_1.$$

The dual of

$$\hat{\Delta}_{glue} = (\hat{G}_2 \times \hat{G}_1, \hat{G}_2 \times \hat{G}_1, \hat{\rho} \oplus T(std_{G_1}), 1).$$

would be given by

$$\Delta_{glue} = (G_2 \times G_1, H_2 \times H_1 \times G_1, \rho_H \oplus T(\rho'), \iota)$$

where ρ' is the tensor product representation of $H_1 \times G_1$. Model (32) and (40) are examples of this case.

Now let's prove Theorem 1.21 in this case. The idea is similar to the proof of Conjecture 1.5 for Model (32). Roughly speaking, we can show that the period integral associated to Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) is a combination of the period integrals associated to Δ, Δ_2 (resp. $\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\Delta}_2$) where[16]

$$\Delta_2 = (\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std \otimes std), 1),\ \hat{\Delta}_2 = (\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2, \mathrm{GL}_2, T(std), 1).$$

In particular, Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta_{glue}, \hat{\Delta}_{glue})$ will follow from Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta, \hat{\Delta})$, and $(\Delta_2, \hat{\Delta}_2)$. As Conjecture 1.5 is know for $(\Delta_2, \hat{\Delta}_2)$ (by the theory of Rankin-Selberg integral and the Rallis inner product formula), we know that Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta_{glue}, \hat{\Delta}_{glue})$ will follow from Conjecture 1.5 for $(\Delta, \hat{\Delta})$. This proves Theorem 1.21.

It remains to explain why the period integral associated to Δ_{glue} (resp. $\hat{\Delta}_{glue}$) is a combination of the period integrals associated to Δ, Δ_2 (resp. $\hat{\Delta}, \hat{\Delta}_2$). The argument is very similar to the previous case as well as the case of the Model 32, we will skip it here.

This completes the description of the dual BZSV quadruples associated to representations glued from anomaly-free representations in Table S of [30], as well as the proof of Theorem 1.21 for those cases.

It remains to consider the non anomaly-free representations in Table S of [30], which are (S.3) when n is odd, (S.8), (S.9), (S.13), (S.15) and (S.16). It is easy to see that if we glue the model (S.8), (S.13) or (S.15) with any other models, then the representation we get is not anomaly-free. Hence we just need to consider (S.3) when n is odd, (S.9) and (S.16). There are 6 different cases.

If we glue (S.3) when n is odd with (S.9), we get the model (11.11) of Table 11 with $m = 1$, this has already been considered in Section 5. If we glue (S.9) with itself, the representation we get is just $T(std)$ of SL_2 which is model (S.10). For the remaining four cases, the generic stabilizer of the representation is not connected[17].

Acknowledgments. We thank Yiannis Sakellaridis, Akshay Venkatesh and Hiraku Nakajima for many helpful discussions. We thank Friedrich Knop for answering our question for some cases in [30]. We thank an anonymous referee for the many insightful and constructive comments, especially for the period integral associated to the quadruple (28).

Competing interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare.

Financial support. The work of the first author is partially supported by the Simons Travel Grant. The second author's work is partially supported by the NSF grant DMS-2103720, DMS-2349836 and a Simons Travel Grant. The work of the third author is partially supported by AcRF Tier 1 grants A-0004274-00-00 and A-0004279-00-00 of the National University of Singapore.

[16] $(\Delta_2, \hat{\Delta}_2)$ is just Model 5 in Table 21 when $n = 2$, the period integral associated to Δ_2 is the theta correspondence of $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$ while the period integral associated to $\hat{\Delta}_2$ is the Rankin-Selberg integral of $\mathrm{GL}_2 \times \mathrm{GL}_2$

[17] while in this paper we suggested the form of dual quadruples for some representations with nonconnected stabilizer, it is not clear to us what the dual should be for the cases here

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

References

[1] D. Ben-Zvi, Y. Sakellaridis and A. Venkatesh, *Relative Langlands duality*. preprint, arXiv:2409.04677.
[2] R. Beuzart-Plessis, 'A local trace formula for the Gan-Gross-Prasad conjecture for unitary groups: the archimedean case', *Astérisque* **418** (2020).
[3] A. Braverman, M. Finkelberg, V. Ginzburg and R. Travkin, 'Mirabolic Satake equivalence and supergroups', *Compos. Math.* **157**(8) (2021), 1724–1765.
[4] A. Braverman, M. Finkelberg and R. Travkin, 'Gaiotto conjecture for $\mathrm{Rep}_q(\mathrm{GL}(n-1|n))$', *Pur. App. Math. Quart.*, **21**(2) (2025), 663–695.
[5] D. Bump and S. Friedberg, 'The exterior square automorphic L-functions on $\mathrm{GL}(n)$', in *Festschrift in honor of I. I. Piatetski-Shapiro on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday, Part II (Ramat Aviv, 1989)*, volume 3 of *Israel Math. Conf. Proc.* (Weizmann, Jerusalem, 1990), 47–65.
[6] D. Bump and D. Ginzburg, 'Spin L-functions on symplectic groups', *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* **8** (1992), 153–160.
[7] D. Bump and D. Ginzburg, 'Spin L-functions on GSp_8 and GSp_{10}', *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **352**(2) (2000), 875–899.
[8] D. Bump and D. Ginzburg, 'Symmetric square L-functions on GL(r)', *Ann. of Math. (2)*, **136**(1) (1992), 137–205.
[9] Y. Cai, S. Friedberg, D. Ginzburg and E. Kaplan, 'Doubling constructions and tensor product L-functions: the linear case', *Invent. Math.* **217** (2019), 985–1068.
[10] S. Devalapurkar, 'ku-theoretic spectral decompositions for spheres and projective spaces', arXiv:2402.03995
[11] M. Finkelberg, R. Travkin and R. Yang, 'Gaiotto Conjecture for $\mathrm{Rep}_q(\mathrm{F}(4))$', 2024, arXiv:2406.05521.
[12] T. Feng and J. Wang, 'Geometric Langlands duality for periods', *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **35** (2025), 463–541.
[13] W. Gan, B. Gross and D. Prasad, 'Symplectic local root numbers, central critical L values, and restriction problems in the representation theory of classical groups', *Sur les conjectures de Gross et Prasad. I. Astérisque* **346** (2012), 1–109. ISBN: 978-2-85629-348-5.
[14] W. Gan, B. Gross and D. Prasad 'Branching laws for classical groups: the non-tempered case', *Compositio Mathematica*, **156**(11) (2020), 2298–2367.
[15] D. Ginzburg, 'On standard L-functions for E_6 and E_7', *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **465** (1995), 101–131.
[16] D. Ginzburg, 'On the standard L-function for G_2', *Duke Math. J.* **69**(2) (1993), 315–333.
[17] D. Ginzburg, 'On spin L-functions for orthogonal groups', *Duke Math. J.* **77**(3) (1995), 753–798.
[18] D. Ginzburg and J. Hundley, 'Multivariable Rankin-Selberg integrals for orthogonal groups', *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **58** (2004), 3097–3119.
[19] W. Gan and B. Jun, 'Generalized Whittaker models as instances of relative Langlands duality', arXiv:2309.08874.
[20] W. T. Gan, Y. Qiu and S. Takeda, 'The regularized Siegel-Weil formula (the second term identity) and the Rallis inner product formula', *Invent. Math.* **198**(3) (2014), 739–831.
[21] S. Gelbart and H. Jacquet, 'A relation between automorphic representations of GL(2) and GL(3)', *Ann. Sci. Ecole Normale Sup., 4e serie*, **11** (1978), 471–552.
[22] D. Ginzburg, D. Jiang and S. Rallis, 'Nonvanishing of the central critical value of the third symmetric power L-functions', *Forum Math.* **13**(1) (2001), 109–132.
[23] B. Gross, 'On the motive of a reductive group', *Invent.Math.* **130**(2) (1997), 287–313.
[24] D. Ginzburg, S. Rallis and D. Soudry, 'L-functions for symplectic groups', *Bulletin de la S. M. F.* **126**(2) (1998), 181–244.
[25] M. Harris and S. Kudla, *On a Conjecture of Jacquet*. Contributions to automorphic forms, geometry, and number theory (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2004), 355–371.
[26] N. Harris, 'The refined Gross–Prasad conjecture for unitary groups', *International Mathematics Research Notices*, **2014**(2) (2014), 303–389.
[27] A. Ichino and T. Ikeda, 'On the periods of automorphic forms on special orthogonal groups and the Gross–Prasad conjecture', *Geometric and Functional Analysis* **19**(5) (2010), 1378–1425.
[28] H. Jacquet, I. I. Piatetskii-Shapiro and J. A. Shalika, 'Rankin-Selberg Convolutions', *Am. J. Math.* **105**(2) (Apr., 1983), 367–464.
[29] H. Jacquet and J. Shalika, 'Exterior square L-functions', in *Automorphic Forms, Shimura Varieties, and L- functions, Vol. II (Ann Arbor, MI, 1988)*, volume 11 of *Perspect. Math.* (Academic Press, Boston, MA, 1990), 143–226.
[30] F. Knop, 'Classification of multiplicity free symplectic representations', *J. Algebra* **301**(2) (2006), 531–553.
[31] F. Knop and B. Schalke, 'The dual group of a spherical variety', *Trans. Moscow Math. Soc.* 2017, 187–216.
[32] S. Kudla and S. Rallis, 'A regularized Siegel–Weil formula: the first term identity', *Ann. Math.* **140** (1994), 1–80.
[33] E. Lapid and Z. Mao, 'A conjecture on Whittaker–Fourier coefficients of cusp forms', *J. Number Theory* **146** (2015), 448–505.
[34] J.-S. Li, 'Nonvanishing theorems for the cohomology of certain arithmetic quotients', *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **428** (1992), 177–217.
[35] I. Losev, 'Coisotropic representations of reductive groups', *Trudy Mosc. Mat. Ob-va* **66** (2005), 157–181 (in Russian). English translation in: *Trans. Moscow Math. Soc.* (2005), 143–168.
[36] Z. Mao, C. Wan and L. Zhang, 'The relative Langlands duality for some strongly tempered spherical varieties', *Inventiones mathematicae*, 2025, arXiv:2310.17837.
[37] S. J. Patterson and I. I. Piatetski-Shapiro, 'The symmetric-square L-function attached to a cuspidal automorphic representation of GL_3', *Math. Ann.* **283**(4) (1989), 551–572.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[38] A. Pollack and S. Shah, 'Multivariate Rankin-Selberg integrals on GL_4 and $GU_{2,2}$', *Canadian Mathematical Bulletin*, **61**(4) (2018), 822–835.
[39] Y. Sakellaridis, 'Functorial transfer between relative trace formulas in rank one', *Duke Math. J.* **170**(2) (2021), 279–364.
[40] Y. Sakellaridis, 'Spherical functions on spherical varieties', *Amer. J. Math.* **135**(5) (2013), 1291–1381.
[41] Y. Sakellaridis and A. Venkatesh, 'Periods and harmonic analysis on spherical varieties', *Astérisque* **396** (2017), viii+360.
[42] S. Takeda, 'The twisted symmetric square L-function of GL(r)', *Duke Math. J.* **163**(1) (2014), 175–266.
[43] R. Travkin and R. Yang, 'Twisted Gaiotto equivalence for GL(M|N)', 2023, arXiv:2306.09556.
[44] J.-L. Waldspurger, ' *Une formule intégrale reliée à la conjecture locale de Gross-Prasad, 2e partie: extension aux représentations tempérées.* in "Sur les conjectures de Gross et Prasad. I"', *Astérisque* **346** (2012), 171–312.
[45] C. Wan, 'Multiplicity One Theorem for the Ginzburg-Rallis Model: the tempered case', *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **371** (2019), 7949–7994.
[46] C. Wan and L. Zhang, 'Periods of automorphic forms associated to strongly tempered spherical varieties', accepted by *Memoir of AMS* **313**(1590) (2025).
[47] C. Wan and L. Zhang, *A Conjecture for Multiplicities of Strongly Tempered Spherical Varieties*. Pacific Journal of Mathematics **337**(2) (2025), 339–363.
[48] H. Xue, 'Fourier–Jacobi periods and the central value of Rankin–Selberg L-functions', *Israel J. Math.* **212** (2016), 547–633.
[49] S. Yamana, 'L-functions and theta correspondence for classical groups', *Invent. Math.* **196** (2014), 651–732.

https://doi.org/10.1017/fms.2026.10190 Published online by Cambridge University Press