

# THE MOTIVIC SATAKE EQUIVALENCE USING PERVERSE NORI MOTIVES

KHOA BANG PHAM

**ABSTRACT.** In this article, we develop the theory of stratified perverse Nori motives to prove a refinement of the geometric Satake equivalence of Mirković-Vilonen, for which we call the Nori motivic Satake equivalence, in contrast to the "Tate motivic" Satake equivalence of Richarz-Scholbach.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. The (geometric) Satake equivalence.** In geometric representation theory and the geometric Langlands program, the philosophy of Langlands duality suggests that topological data associated with a split reductive group  $G$  is encoded in the algebraic data of its Langlands dual group  $G^\vee$ , and vice versa. The Satake isomorphism [Sat63] (see also [Gro98]) establishes a foundational bridge, providing an isomorphism between the spherical Hecke algebra and the representation ring of the dual group. Through the sheaf-function correspondence, it becomes natural to expect a categorical enhancement of the Satake isomorphism, a result now known as the geometric Satake equivalence. The first complete proof of this equivalence was achieved in the work of Mirković and Vilonen [MV07], using the Tannakian formalism and the theory of perverse sheaves. Their work is built upon ideas from several earlier sources, including [Lus83] [Gin00][BD91]. Following this pioneering work, the geometric Satake equivalence has been intensively studied and generalized. Subsequent developments include the works [Ric12] and [Zhu17] for  $\ell$ -adic sheaves (for further references, see also [BR18][Zhu16]), as well as the recent proof by Fargues and Scholze [FS24] using the theory of spatial diamonds.

Currently, Richarz and Scholbach in [RS21] provide a motivic refinement of the geometric Satake equivalence, called the motivic Satake equivalence. In formula (take base scheme to be a field  $k$  for simplicity) the motivic Satake equivalence reads

$$\mathbf{MTM}(L^+G \backslash LG / L^+G) \simeq \mathrm{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}(G_1^\vee \rtimes \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{Tate}})$$

where  $\mathbf{MTM}$  denotes the category of mixed Tate motives,  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{Tate}}$  is the pro-algebraic unipotent group arising from extensions of mixed Tate motives,  $G_1^\vee$  is the modified Langlands dual group (see for instance, [Zhu16] and references therein). In comparison to the geometric Satake equivalence of Mirković and Vilonen, the work of Richarz and Scholbach take mixed Tate motives as a model for perverse sheaves and hence the appearance of the factor  $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\mathrm{Tate}}$  is understandable. More precisely, their motivic Satake equivalence is built upon their previous work [RS21] on intersection motives; again, using mixed Tate motives as a model for perverse sheaves. Let us first discuss Richarz and Scholbach' work in more depth, which inspire us to write this manuscript.

Intersection cohomology complexes form the foundation of the theory of perverse sheaves, as they generate the entire category. A motivic refinement of these complexes for moduli stacks of shtukas was introduced and investigated in [RS20], independently of the standard conjectures. In their subsequent work [RS21], Richarz and Scholbach utilize these intersection motives to establish a motivic Satake equivalence as noted above. Their approach relies on Tate motives (the subcategory generated by shifts of motives of the form  $\mathbf{1}(m)$ ) as a model for perverse sheaves, and necessitates the Beilinson–Soulé conjecture as well as  $\ell$ -adic realizations. We identify several limitations of this Tate motivic framework:

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14B05, 14F42, 32S30.

*Key words and phrases.* Motivic Satake Isomorphism, Geometric Representation Theory, Six Functors Formalism.

- (1) Restrictive geometric assumptions: The use of Tate motives requires stratifying (ind)-schemes into products of affine spaces, a condition that is highly restrictive even for ordinary schemes. While this suffices for certain applications, such as the motivic Satake equivalence, it limits the generality of the theory.
- (2) A limited category of motives: Tate motives constitute only a small part of the full category of motives. Consequently, the motivic Satake equivalence in [RS21] features the motivic Galois group associated specifically to Tate motives. One naturally expects that employing a more comprehensive theory of motives would yield a larger and more refined Galois group.
- (3) Exclusion of non-trivial local systems: Since Tate motives are generated by the Tate objects  $\mathbb{1}(m)$ , their simple objects are precisely these twists. These behave analogously to trivial local systems, thereby implicitly excluding non-trivial local systems from the framework. This causes some problems: 1) once again, one sees that this results in the appearance of the "Tate motivic Galois group" in the Richarz, Scholbach' motivic Satake equivalence instead of a full motivic Galois group (in whatever sense it might be), 2) there are unnatural phenomena such as smooth-descent equivalence (see [RS21, Lemma 2.10]).
- (4) The motivic Satake category defined in [RS21, Section 6] is independent of the choice of the base field; in fact, if one allows non-trivial local systems, the Satake categories should be related by Galois actions of base field extensions, a phenomenon should be expected at a full motivic level and does not occur at a Tate motivic level.

Furthermore, in [RS21], there is only the  $\ell$ -adic realization taken into account but not the Betti realization (see the new work [CvdHS25]). At a motivic level, we should expect both  $\ell$ -adic realizations (with  $\ell$  varying) and Betti realization and these realizations are compatible. More importantly, in the context of the Satake equivalence, one should be able to "create" (in the language of [RS20]) the motivic  $t$ -structure using either of realizations (though the resulting dual group can be different; just as topological fundamental groups and  $\ell$ -adic fundamental groups). In this article, we overcome these limitations using perverse Nori motives developed in [IM19]. This approach allows us to develop a robust theory of intersection motives that closely mirrors the classical theory of perverse sheaves, all while remaining independent of the standard conjectures. Crucially, this richer theory contains the Tate motives as a subcategory. As our main application, we construct an enhanced version of the motivic Satake equivalence from [RS21], which we term the Nori-motivic Satake equivalence. This stands in contrast to the Tate-motivic Satake equivalence of [RS21], offering a more general and geometrically natural framework. Since we use all Nori motives, the Satake category defined this way is the largest possible (at least inside the category of étale motives  $\mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(-, \mathbb{Q})$ ) such a category that one can expect, and after restricting to a suitable subcategory of motives, we obtain a corresponding version of the Satake equivalence; this of course includes the Tate-Satake equivalence but there are many more. Let us now offer a brief introduction to motives and Nori motives (with a "perverse-sheaf-theoretic" orientation in mind).

**1.2. Why perverse Nori motives?** The theory of motives is a grand program envisioned by Grothendieck to encapsulate, within a single framework, the essential features shared by various cohomology theories developed by his school for smooth projective varieties over a field  $k$ , which are nowadays called Weil cohomology theories. Typical examples include  $\ell$ -adic cohomology, algebraic de Rham cohomology, and Betti cohomology. The notion of pure motives was introduced by Grothendieck, along with the expectation that there should exist a universal Weil cohomology theory reproducing all known properties of the existing ones. A natural candidate for the category of pure motives is the category of Chow motives introduced by Grothendieck. However, this approach immediately leads to the notorious standard conjectures, which remain unproven to this day. It is also natural to imagine that one can define motives for smooth but possibly non-projective varieties, thereby obtaining the notion of mixed motives  $\text{MM}(k)$ , and then recover pure motives through other tools such as resolutions of singularities or semisimplifications. The existence of such a category was conjectured by Beilinson. Furthermore, one may expect the existence of a relative version  $\text{MM}(X)$ , where  $X$  varies over varieties over  $k$ . Instead of directly searching for such a category,

Deligne proposes to first construct its derived version  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathrm{MM}(X))$  and then recover  $\mathrm{MM}(X)$  via a motivic  $t$ -structure. This idea is made precise in [Bei12].

A suitable candidate for the derived category of mixed motives is the category  $\mathbf{DM}(k)$  constructed by Voevodsky in [Voe00]. Along with the construction of  $\mathbf{DM}(k)$ , Voevodsky and Morel develop the so-called  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -homotopy theory of schemes (inspired by techniques from algebraic topology) in [MV99], and build the motivic stable homotopy category  $\mathbf{SH}(k)$ , in which motivic cohomology, algebraic K-theory, and algebraic cobordism are representable. In the thesis of Ayoub [Ayo07a][Ayo07b], it is shown that the constructions of Voevodsky and Morel can be unified into a general construction  $\mathbf{SH}_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}(X)$ , where  $\mathfrak{M}$  is a sufficiently good model category and  $\tau$  is a topology on smooth varieties over  $k$ . If  $\mathfrak{M} = \mathbf{Ch}(\mathbb{Q})$  is the category of chain complexes of  $\mathbb{Q}$ -vector spaces and  $\tau = \text{ét}$  is the étale topology, then the constructible part  $\mathbf{SH}_{\mathfrak{M}}^{\tau}(X) = \mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  is expected to be the derived category  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathrm{MM}(X))$ . Meanwhile, we note that the six operations (as well as vanishing cycles and nearby cycles) for  $\mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  are realized in [Ayo07a][Ayo07b][CD19]. Nowadays, after numerous work, one knows how to define the category  $\mathrm{MM}(X)$ . In [IM19], Ivorra and Morel defines the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  of *motivic perverse sheaves* (also called *perverse Nori motives* as  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(k)$  recovers the category of Nori motives in [Nor11]). In [Tub25b], Tubach proves that under the standard conjectures for fields of characteristic zero,  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  is exactly the desired category of mixed motives  $\mathrm{MM}(X)$  and there is an equivalence of categories

$$\mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$$

and they carry two  $t$ -structures, the constructible  $t$ -structure and the motivic (or perverse motivic)  $t$ -structure. In other words, philosophically, relying on standard conjectures, one can still choose one of two models -  $\mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  or  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  - to study motives. The advantage of the approach taken by Ivorra-Morel is that it automatically provide us the heart which evidently behaves like the category of perverse sheaves and hence is appropriate for many geometrical constructions already done in classical settings. In this manuscript, we follow the Ivorra, Morel's approach to study a form of the geometric Satake equivalence.

**1.3. Formulation of main results.** The first main result is inspired by stratified mixed Tate motives in the sense of [RS20]. Let  $k$  be a field together with a complex embedding  $\sigma: k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . For a  $k$ -variety  $X$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  the category of motivic perverse sheaves on  $X$  constructed in [IM19] and we write  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X) = \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  its bounded derived category. The extension of  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  to ind-schemes is reviewed in the first section.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \longrightarrow X$  be a stratified ind-varieties over  $k$ . Assume that each stratum  $X_w$  is smooth, there is a category of stratified derived Nori motives  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) \subset \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  together with a Betti realization functor*

$$\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$$

where the right hand side is the derived category with cohomologies being local systems along strata. Moreover, the category  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  carries a motivic perverse  $t$ -structure whose heart is the category of stratified motivic perverse sheaves  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+) \subset \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  and the Betti realization above is perverse  $t$ -exact. In particular, there is a faithful, exact functor

$$\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \text{Perv}(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}).$$

The categories  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  and  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  are motivic in the following sense:

- (1) The categories  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  are independent of the complex embedding  $\sigma: k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ .
- (2) There are  $\ell$ -adic realizations

$$\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, X_{\text{ét}}^+, \mathbb{Q}_{\ell})$$

for all primes  $\ell$ . Consequently, there are faithful, exact functors

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \text{Perv}_\ell(X, X^+, \mathbb{Q}_\ell).$$

Crucially, any object in  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  carries a weight filtration and the simple objects are precisely intersection motives  $\mathbf{IC}(X_w, L)$  where  $L \in \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}(X_w)$  are simple motivic local systems. Moreover, if  $k'/k$  is a Galois extension (not necessarily finite), there is a canonical equivalence of categories

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X_{k'}, X_{k'}^+)^{\text{Gal}(k'/k)}.$$

We stress to the fact, unlike the case of schemes (see [IM19, Theorem 6.24]), the category  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  or its subcategory of objects  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+, n)$  pure of weight  $n$  are *not* semisimple in general. However, as one may imagine the ingredients of the Satake equivalence are motivic, then the category  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+, n)$  should be semisimple when  $X = \text{Gr}_G$  is the affine Grassmannian of a reductive group  $G$  and is equipped with the stratification into orbits of the action of the positive loop group  $L^+G$ . The result is summarized below.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $G$  be a connected, split reductive group over a field  $k$ . Let  $\text{Gr}_G$  be its associated affine Grassmannian equipped with the natural action of the positive loop group  $L^+G$ . Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then there is an equivalence of semisimple categories*

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, n),$$

where the right hand side is the category of stratified perverse Nori motives (with the stratifications into  $L^+G$ -orbits) pure of weight  $n$  and the left hand side is its full subcategory of equivariant motives. Consequently, there is an equivalence of categories

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G).$$

More importantly, there is a fiber functor

$$\omega: \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}$$

making  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  a neutral Tannakian category whose dual group is  $G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \rtimes \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}(k)$  with  $G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee}$  the Langlands dual group and  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}(k)$  the motivic Galois group of Nori, i.e., there is an equivalence of categories

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \simeq \text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}(k)).$$

The category  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  is the largest possible choice in the following sense: any reasonable sub-theory of motives inside  $\mathbf{M}(-) \subset \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(-)$  yields a corresponding theory of geometric Satake equivalence. For instance, by restricting to:

- (1) The category of pure objects  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, \text{pure})$ , one obtains the dual group as  $G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}^{\text{pure}}(k)$ .
- (2) The Satake category  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}$  (generated by intersection motives of trivial local systems), one obtains the dual group as  $G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee}$ .
- (3) The category of stratified mixed Artin motives, one obtains the dual group as  $G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)$ .
- (4) The category of stratified mixed Tate motives  $\mathbf{MTM}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  (see [RS20]) or its subcategory of pure objects  $\mathbf{MTM}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, \text{pure})$ , one obtains the dual groups as  $G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}^{\text{Tate}}(k)$  or  $G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathbb{G}_{m, \mathbb{Q}}$ , respectively.

In particular, one can safely say that the ordinary geometric Satake equivalence (using either analytic or  $\ell$ -adic perverse sheaves) is the "Artin part" (i.e., the 0-dimensional part) of the full motivic Satake equivalence.

**1.4. Some results and questions independent of interests.** Besides the main result on the motivic Satake equivalence, we also develop the theory of equivariant perverse Nori motives. Most of the results are already known for ordinary equivariant perverse sheaves in [BL94] (see also [Ach21]). We note that in *loc.cit.*, the derived equivariant categories are constructed by using the classical language of  $n$ -acyclic resolutions. By viewing them at the level of stable  $\infty$ -categories, a lot of proofs can be simplified. However, there are exceptional phenomena that only appear at the motivic level. A notable one is

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X) \subset \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  be the subcategory consisting of objects  $M$  together with an isomorphism  $a^*(M) \simeq \text{pr}_2^*(M)$ . Assume that the standard conjectures hold true, then there is a universal abelian factorization*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{D}_G^b(X, \mathbb{Q}) & \longrightarrow & \text{Perv}_G(X) \\ \downarrow & & & \nearrow & \\ \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X) & & & & \end{array}$$

where  $\mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}), \mathbf{D}_G^b(X, \mathbb{Q})$  are equivariant categories.

**Remark 1.4.** It seems natural to ask whether there is a same statement for all algebraic stacks. To our knowledge, this question is related to the existence of right adjoints of forgetful functors on constructible motives.

**1.5. Structure of the manuscript.** In section 2, we recall fundamental properties of perverse Nori motives and prove some results that are well-known for ordinary perverse sheaves but are not written yet for perverse Nori motives. In section 3, we study (stratified) perverse Nori motives in depths. In section 4, we define the (derived) equivariant categories of perverse Nori motives for schemes and then extend the framework to ind-schemes. In section 5, we study the category of perverse Nori motives on the affine Grassmannian associated with a split reductive group on which we define the convolution product, making it a neutral Tannakian category. In section 6, we determine the dual group associated with the category defined in section 5 and several restrictions to subcategories of motives. Section 7 is independent of the interests related to geometric representation theory: we prove that several well-known results can be upgraded to perverse Nori motives and propose some relevant questions.

**Acknowledgements.** The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Hong Kong RGC GRF grants 16304923 and 16301324.

## 2. PERVERSE NORI MOTIVES

In an unpublished work (see for instance [Nor11] and see also [Ara13][Ivo17][HMS17][ABV15][FG05]), Nori defines a candidate for the category of mixed motives as envisioned by Grothendieck. This category is now called the category of *Nori motives* and it underlies a Tannakian structure, leading to a mysterious pro-algebraic group, called *motivic Galois group*. Among the subsequent work, Ivorra's work [Ivo17] is based on perverse sheaves and in [IM19], Ivorra and Morel study the derived category of perverse Nori motives and prove that they acquire a formalism of four operations  $(f^*, f_*, f_!, f^!)$ . In [Ter24b], Terenzi completes the picture by constructing two remaining operations  $(\otimes, \underline{\text{Hom}})$ . We take their results for granted throughout this work.

**2.1. Motivic Perverse Sheaves (d'après Ivorra-Morel-Terenzi).** We recall the definition of perverse motivic sheaves. We assume that the reader is familiar with the construction of the category of étale motives  $\mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  (see for instance [Ayo14a]) and the construction of the Betti and  $\ell$ -adic (also called étale) realizations (see [Ayo10][Ayo14a]).



**Definition 2.1.** Let  $\sigma: k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a field embedded in  $\mathbb{C}$ . Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety. We define the *category of perverse motivic sheaves*  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  as the universal abelian factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \Lambda) & \xrightarrow{\text{Betti}_X^*} & \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{p\text{H}^0} & \text{Perv}(X^{\text{an}}) \\ \downarrow p\text{H}_{\text{univ}}^0 & & & \nearrow \text{rat}_X & \\ \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) & & & & \end{array}$$

Alternatively, by [IM19, Proposition 6.11], one can use the  $\ell$ -adic realization to obtain  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$ . The resulting category (regardless of the realization functor used) is independent of the choice of the prime  $\ell$  and the embedding  $\sigma$  (see [IM19, Proposition 6.11]). The category

$$\mathbf{DN}^b(X) := \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$$

is called the *category of derived Nori motives* (or *mixed Nori motives*).

We recollect here some theoretically important results (see [IM19][Ter24a][Tub25b]) that we cite frequently throughout this manuscript.

**Theorem 2.2.** *Let  $\sigma: k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a field embedded in  $\mathbb{C}$ . The following statements hold true:*

- (1) (Ivorra and Morel) *The collection  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  with  $X$  quasi-projective  $k$ -varieties forms a stable homotopical 2-functor in the sense of [Ayo07a]. In particular, there exists a formalism of four operations  $(f^*, f_*, f_!, f^!)$ .*
- (2) (Terenzi) *The collection  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  with  $X$  quasi-projective  $k$ -varieties has a six-functors formalism  $(f^*, f_*, f_!, f^!, 1, \otimes, \underline{\text{Hom}})$  compatible with the Betti realization and  $\ell$ -adic realization*

$$\mathbf{DN}^b(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$$

$$\mathbf{DN}^b(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathbb{Q}_{\ell})$$

*at the level of derived categories.*

- (3) (Tubach) *The categories  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  and its six operations admit  $(\infty, 1)$ -categorical enhancements and  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  is a  $h$ -hypersheaf. Moreover, there is a second  $t$ -structure on  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$ , called the *constructible  $t$ -structure* and the canonical functor*

$$\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X, \mathbb{Q})$$

*is constructible  $t$ -exact, which induces a faithful, exact functor on hearts*

$$\mathcal{M}\text{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X) \longrightarrow \text{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X, \mathbb{Q}),$$

*where  $\mathcal{M}\text{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X) = \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))^{\heartsuit}$  is called the *category of motivic constructible sheaves* and  $\text{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X)$  is the *category of ordinary constructible sheaves*. There is also a motivic Beilinson equivalence*

$$\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)) \simeq \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X)).$$

Hence, we have two collections of cohomological functors

$$p\text{H}^i: \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \quad \text{and} \quad {}^{\text{ct}}\text{H}^i: \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X).$$

The reader should not be confused when we call the first, the standard  $t$ -structure (according to the way it is defined)  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  the *motivic perverse  $t$ -structure* (or simply *motivic  $t$ -structure*) and the second  $t$ -structure the *motivic constructible  $t$ -structure*. For the reader's convenience, we record here standard properties of perverse Nori motives. Most of the usual properties known for ordinary perverse sheaves still hold for perverse Nori motives and what is powerful in the Nori setting is that the Tannakian structure is richer.

- (1) The category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear abelian category.

- (2) If  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is affine, quasi-affine, then there exist exact functors

$$f_!, f_*: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y).$$

- (3) If  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is smooth, then there exists an exact functor  $f^\dagger = f^*[d_f]: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$ .
- (4) There is a Verdier duality  $\mathbb{D}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)^{\text{op}}$  commuting with  $f^\dagger$  for any smooth morphism  $f$ .
- (5) There exists a unique weight structure on each  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$ . Moreover, let  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)_w$  be the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  containing motives pure of weight  $w$ , then  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)_w$  is semi-simple. In particular, the full subcategory of pure motives

$$\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)^{\text{pure}} = \{A \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \mid A \text{ pure of some weight}\}$$

is a semi-simple category and it is the maximal semi-simple subcategory of  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  since any object admits a weight filtration.

- (6) There is a canonical equivalence  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(\text{Spec}(k)) \simeq \mathbf{HM}(k)$ , with  $\mathbf{HM}(k)$  the category of Nori motives and hence underlies a pro-algebraic group, namely, the motivic Galois group  $G^{\text{mot}}(k)$ . The category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(\text{Spec}(k))^{\text{pure}}$  is a semi-simple category and equivalent to the category of André motives (see for instance [HMS17]). The dual group  $G^{\text{pure}}(k)$  is pro-reductive and there exists an exact sequence

$$1 \rightarrow \mathcal{U}^{\text{mot}}(k) \rightarrow G^{\text{mot}}(k) \rightarrow G_{\text{pure}}^{\text{mot}}(k) \rightarrow 1$$

with  $\mathcal{U}^{\text{mot}}(k)$  pro-unipotent. By the weak Tannakian formalism of Ayoub (see [Ayo14b][Ayo14c]), there is another motivic Galois group and it is isomorphic to  $G^{\text{mot}}(k)$  by the work of Choudhury and Gallauer [CGAdS17].

- (7) As explained in [IM19][Ter24a], there exists a theory of weights on perverse Nori motives and they share the same formal properties with ordinary  $\ell$ -adic perverse sheaves (see [BBDG18]). Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a  $k$ -morphism.

- The functors  $f^*, f_!$  send  $\mathbf{DN}_{\leq w}^b(X)$  to  $\mathbf{DN}_{\leq w}^b(Y)$ .
- The functors  $f_*, f^!$  send  $\mathbf{DN}_{\geq w}^b(Y)$  to  $\mathbf{DN}_{\geq w}^b(X)$ .
- The functor  $(-) \otimes (-)$  sends  $\mathbf{DN}_{\leq w}^b(X) \times \mathbf{DN}_{\leq v}^b(X)$  to  $\mathbf{DN}_{\leq w+v}^b(X)$ .
- The functor  $\underline{\text{Hom}}$  sends  $\mathbf{DN}_{\leq w}^b(X) \times \mathbf{DN}_{\geq v}^b(X)$  to  $\mathbf{DN}_{\leq v-w}^b(X)$ .
- Let  $X, Y$  be  $k$ -varieties, then the box product

$$(-) \boxtimes (-): \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \times \mathbf{DN}^b(Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X \times_k Y)$$

is weight-exact.

This weight structure is transversal to the canonical  $t$ -structure in the sense of [Bon12] and if  $A, B \in \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  with  $K$  is of weight  $\leq w$  and  $L$  is of weight  $> w$ , then

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))}(A, B) = 0.$$

In particular,

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)}^r(A, B) = 0$$

if  $A, B$  are pure of weight  $i, j$  and  $i < j + r$ .

- (8) Let  $j: U \rightarrow X$  be a quasi-finite morphism between  $k$ -varieties. The intermediate extension functor  $j_{!*}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  is defined by

$$j_{!*} := \text{Im}({}^p\text{H}^0(j_!) \rightarrow {}^p\text{H}^0(j_*)).$$

From [IM19], if  $j$  is an open immersion then  $j_{!*}$  preserves weights and hence defines an exact functor  $j_{!*}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(U)^{\text{pure}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)^{\text{pure}}$ . Moreover, (see for instance, [KW01])

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(U)}(A, B) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)}(j_{!*}(A), j_{!*}(B))$$

for  $A, B \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(U)$ .

**2.2. Motivic Local Systems.** Recall from [Ter24a] that there is a notion of *motivic local system*: let  $X$  be a smooth, geometrically connected  $k$ -variety. The category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X)$  of motivic local systems is defined as the pullback

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Loc}(X^{\text{an}})[- \dim(X)] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Perv}(X^{\text{an}}). \end{array}$$

In other words, a motivic local system is a motivic perverse sheaf mapped to a shifted local system under the Betti realization functor. After a choice of a  $k$ -point  $x \in X(k)$  then in [Ter24a], Terenzi shows that the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X)$  is a neutral Tannakian category whose dual group is the *motivic fundamental group*  $G(X, x)$ . If  $X = \text{Spec}(k)$ , then  $G(X, x)$  is exactly the Nori motivic Galois group, which is isomorphic to the Ayoub motivic Galois group  $G^{\text{mot}}(k)$  (see [CGAdS17]).

**Proposition 2.3.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth  $k$ -variety. Let  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}_\ell(X) \subset \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  be the category of motivic local systems arising from the  $\ell$ -adic realization  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \rightarrow \text{Perv}_\ell(X, \mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ . Then  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}_\ell(X) = \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X)$  under the equivalence  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_\ell(X) = \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  in [IM19, Proposition 6.11].*

*Proof.* First we note that an ordinary (both analytic and  $\ell$ -adic) local system is nothing but a strongly dualisable object. Indeed, for analytic local systems, this is due to [Ayo, Lemma 1.2.9] (see [Ayo14c, Lemme 2.45]). Regarding  $\ell$ -adic local system, one can copy the proof of (i)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (ii) in [Ayo, Lemma 1.2.9] for each  $\text{Sh}(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathbb{Z}/\ell^n\mathbb{Z})$  and then pass to limit. The Betti realization and étale realization commutes with six operations and hence preserve and reflect dual objects, thus the results from [IM19, Proposition 6.11].  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** (1) At first, for applications to the Satake equivalence, we only need the case  $X^{\text{an}}$  is simply connected, hence both the topological and the étale fundamental groups are trivial and the result becomes trivial.

(2) We note that although the category of motivic local systems is independent of the choice of the realization functor, the dual groups arising from the  $\ell$ -adic realization is informally larger than the one arising from the Betti realization. The reason is the category of  $\ell$ -adic local systems is "larger" than the category of analytic local systems (unless in some special cases like being simply connected). For instance, consider the case  $X = \mathbb{G}_{m,k}$ , then  $\pi_1(X^{\text{an}}) = \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\pi_1^{\text{ét}}(X) = \hat{\mathbb{Z}}$ , a rank one  $\ell$ -adic local system with  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell = \mathbb{C}$ -coefficients amounts to a choice  $a \in \mathbb{C}$  and it is induced from an analytic one if and only if  $a \in \overline{\mathbb{Z}}_\ell^\times$ , namely, the topological monodromy can be lifted to the étale monodromy.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $X$  be a smooth  $k$ -variety, then any object  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X)[\dim(X)]$  admits a weight filtration whose graded pieces are in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X)[\dim(X)] \cap \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, n)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .*

*Proof.* Any object  $M$  in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  admits a weight filtration by [IM19, Proposition 6.17] and if  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X)[\dim(X)]$  and all terms in the filtration and their graded pieces are also in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X)[\dim(X)]$  because shifted local systems is a Serre subcategory of  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  (for instance, this holds for analytic perverse sheaves [Ach21, Proposition 3.4.1] and the motivic case follows immediately).  $\square$

**2.3. Smooth Descent.** We recall the following lemma, which is proven in [BBDG18], and whose proof for perverse Nori motives is not written yet in [IM19]. The materials in this subsection will be useful when we discuss equivariant perverse Nori motives.

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $X, Y$  be  $k$ -varieties. Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a smooth surjective morphism. The canonical sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y)}(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)}(f^\dagger(M), f^\dagger(N)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X \times_Y X)}((f')^\dagger(M), (f')^\dagger(N))$$

*is exact. Moreover, if  $f$  has geometrically connected fibers, then  $f^\dagger$  is fully faithful.*



*Proof.* The morphism  $f_{\dagger} = f_*[-d_f]: \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(Y, \mathbb{Q})$  is left exact since its left adjoint  $f^{\dagger} = f^*[-d_f]$  is exact. The compatibility of realization functor as well as its conservativity (on triangulated categories) and exactness (on abelian categories) of rat functors show that  $f_*[-d_f]: \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y))$  is left exact as well. They induce left adjoints of  $f^{\dagger}, f^{\dagger}$

$${}^p f_{\dagger} = {}^p H^0 \circ f_{\dagger}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y)$$

$${}^p f_{\dagger} = {}^p H^0 \circ f_{\dagger}: \text{Perv}(X) \rightarrow \text{Perv}(Y).$$

The exactness of the original sequence is equivalent to the exactness of

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow {}^p f_{\dagger} f^{\dagger}(N) \rightarrow {}^p f'_{\dagger} f'^{\dagger}(N)$$

Since  $\text{rat}_Y$  is faithful, exact functor, it reflects exact sequences so one can apply  $\text{rat}_Y$  to the sequence above, the result then follows from the corresponding statement for ordinary perverse sheaves. If moreover  $f$  has geometrically connected fibers, then  $f^{\dagger}$  is fully faithful if and only if  $N \rightarrow {}^p f_{\dagger} f^{\dagger}(N)$  is an isomorphism for any  $N \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y)$ . This again can be checked after applying  $\text{rat}_Y$  and using its conservativity.  $\square$

**Remark 2.7.** For stratified mixed Tate motives, this is proven in [RS20, Lemma 3.2.12] with the help of the Beilinson-Soulé conjecture.

Next we need smooth descent for perverse Nori motives.

**Definition 2.8.** Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a smooth surjective morphism. Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  be a perverse Nori motive. A *descent datum*  $(M, \phi)$  for  $M$  is an isomorphism

$$\phi: \text{pr}_1^{\dagger}(M) \simeq \text{pr}_2^{\dagger}(M)$$

in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X \times_Y X)$  such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{pr}_1^{\dagger}(M) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{pr}_3^{\dagger}(M) \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & \text{pr}_2^{\dagger}(M) & \end{array}$$

is commutative. We can turn descent data into a category by declaring objects to be descent data and a morphism  $(M, \phi) \rightarrow (N, \phi)$  is a morphism  $q: M \rightarrow N$  in  $\text{Perv}(X)$  making the obvious diagram commutative.

**Proposition 2.9.** *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a smooth surjective morphism. For any  $N \in \text{Perv}(Y)$ , the motivic perverse sheaf  $f^{\dagger}(N)$  admits a canonical descent datum and*

$$f^{\dagger}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Desc}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}}(f)$$

*gives rise to an equivalence of categories.*

*Proof.* Thanks to the functoriality of the functors of type  $(-)^{\dagger}$ , the descent datum of  $f^{\dagger}(N)$  is simply the isomorphism

$$\text{pr}_1^{\dagger} f^{\dagger}(N) \simeq (f')^{\dagger}(N) \simeq \text{pr}_2^{\dagger} f^{\dagger}(N).$$

The functoriality again ensures that a morphism  $M \rightarrow N$  in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y)$  produces a morphism in  $\text{Desc}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}}(f)$ . Let us first prove that  $f^{\dagger}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y) \rightarrow \text{Desc}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}}(f)$  is fully faithful. There is an obvious commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)}(M, N) & \xrightarrow{f^{\dagger}} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y)}(f^{\dagger}(M), f^{\dagger}(N)) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X \times_Y X)}((f')^{\dagger}(M), (f')^{\dagger}(N)) \\ & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\text{Desc}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}}(f)}(f^{\dagger}(M), f^{\dagger}(N)) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(Y)}(f^{\dagger}(M), f^{\dagger}(N)) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X \times_Y X)}(\text{pr}_1^{\dagger} f^{\dagger}(M), \text{pr}_2^{\dagger} f^{\dagger}(N)) \end{array}$$

The top row is exact by 2.6 while the exactness of the bottom row is simply the definition of descent data. Hence, by the five lemma the most-left vertical arrow is an isomorphism and we win. It remains to prove that  $f^\dagger$  is essentially surjective, the proof is as same as the proof of [Ach21, Theorem 3.7.4].  $\square$

### 3. DERIVED NORI MOTIVES ON IND-SCHEMES

**3.1. Reminder on ind-schemes and their stratifications.** For an introduction on ind-schemes, we refer to [Ric19]. Let us briefly review terminologies used in this article. By an *ind-scheme*, we mean an étale sheaves  $X: (\text{AffSch}_k)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$  that admits a presentation  $X = \text{colim}_{i \in I} X_i$  as a filtered colimit of schemes along closed immersions  $\iota_{i \rightarrow j}: X_i \rightarrow X_j$  if  $i < j$ . We call such an ind-scheme an *ind-variety* (over a field  $k$ ) if  $X_i$ 's can be taken to be quasi-projective varieties over  $k$ .

The central objects of the section are stratified ind-varieties, which are already in [RS20] plus some additional hypotheses. An ind-variety  $X$  is *stratified* if there exists a morphism of ind-varieties

$$\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \rightarrow X$$

such that  $\iota$  is bijective on the underlying sets, each stratum  $X_w$  is a quasi-projective  $k$ -variety, each restriction  $\iota|_{X_w}$  is representable by a quasi-compact immersion and each  $\iota(X_w)$  is union of other strata. If  $k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ , then each stratification of  $X$  gives a stratification of the complex variety  $X^{\text{an}}$  in the usual sense. A morphism of ind-varieties  $(X, X^+), (Y, Y^+)$  is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X^+ & \xrightarrow{\iota_X} & X \\ f^+ \downarrow & & \downarrow f \\ Y^+ & \xrightarrow{\iota_Y} & Y \end{array}$$

where  $\pi$  is schematic of finite type, and  $\pi^+$  maps each stratum to a union of strata (this is weaker than requiring mapping each stratum to a stratum as in [RS20]). If  $X \rightarrow Y$  is a morphism of ind-varieties and  $Y$  is stratified then  $X$  can be endowed with the inverse stratification.

**3.2. General properties of derived Nori motives on ind-schemes.** Let  $X = \text{colim}_{i \in I} X_i$  be an ind-variety. Given a coefficient system in the sense of [DG22] (see some earlier sources such as [Ayo07a][Ayo07b][CD19][Hoy1

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}: (\text{Var}_k)^{\text{op}} &\rightarrow \text{CAlg}(\text{Pr}^{\text{L}}) \\ (f: X \rightarrow Y)^{\text{op}} &\mapsto f^*: \mathbf{H}(Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(X) \end{aligned}$$

The six-functors formalism extend to ind-schemes in the following sense.

**Proposition 3.1** (Richarz, Scholbach). *Let  $X, Y$  be ind-schemes and  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of ind-schemes.*

- (1) *The functor  $f_*$  is well-defined. The functor  $f^*$  is well-defined (and left adjoint to  $f_*$ ) if there are presentations  $X = \text{colim}_{i \in I} X_i, Y = \text{colim}_{i \in I} Y_i$  and  $f$  is a colimit of morphisms  $f_i: X_i \rightarrow Y_i$ .*
- (2) *The category  $\mathbf{H}(X)$  is closed monoidal, stable  $\infty$ -categories. If there exists a presentation  $X = \text{colim}_{i \in I} X_i$  with  $X_i$  being quasi-compact, then  $a^*(\mathbb{1}_S)$  is a monoidal unit for  $\mathbf{H}(X)$  (for a counterexample in non-quasi-compact cases, see [RS20, Example 2.4.3]).*
- (3) *If  $f$  is schematic smooth, then  $f_\#$  exists and is left adjoint to  $f^*$ .*
- (4) *The adjunction  $(f_! \dashv f^!)$  is well-defined.*
- (5) *Localization sequences are well-defined for schematic immersions.*
- (6) *Proper and Smooth base change are satisfied whenever the involved operations are well-defined.*

*Proof.* This is [RS20, Theorem 2.4.2].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $X = \operatorname{colim}_{i \in I} X_i$  be an ind-variety. The category  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  carries a perverse  $t$ -structure whose heart is the noetherian and artinian category  $\mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X) = \operatorname{colim}_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X_i)$  and a constructible  $t$ -structure whose heart is the category  $\mathcal{M}\operatorname{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X) = \operatorname{colim}_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X_i)$ . There are obvious induced functors*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rat}_X &: \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \\ \operatorname{rat}_X &: \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Perv}(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \\ \operatorname{rat}_X &: \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X) \longrightarrow \operatorname{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ ,  $\operatorname{Perv}_\ell(X, \mathbb{Q})$ ,  $\operatorname{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ .

*Proof.* Both follows from the fact that an exact triangle  $M_i \longrightarrow M_j \longrightarrow M_k \longrightarrow +1$  in  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  is defined to be a triangle  $(\iota_{i \rightarrow h})_* M_i \longrightarrow (\iota_{i \rightarrow h})_* M_j \longrightarrow (\iota_{i \rightarrow h})_* M_k \longrightarrow 1$  for some  $h \geq i, j, k$  and pushforwards of proper morphisms are  $t$ -exact for both structures.  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.** In the case of perverse sheaves, there is an alternative description using the universal abelian factorization as in the case of ordinary schemes, this is [IM19, Proposition 6.1] (see also, [Nee01, Definition 5.2.1]).

**Lemma 3.4.** *Let  $X = \operatorname{colim}_{i \in I} X_i$  be an ind-variety. The category  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  carries a weight structure that is transversal to the perverse  $t$ -structure. Moreover, six functors preserve weights as in the case of schemes.*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X) = \operatorname{colim}_{i \in I} \mathbf{DN}^b(X_i)$  where transitions are closed immersions hence weight-exact, one simply sets  $M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  of weight  $\leq n$  (resp.  $\geq n$ ) if it comes from an object of weight  $\leq n$  (resp.  $\geq n$ ) in some  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X_i)$ . The transversality and weight preservations are induced by the case of schemes.  $\square$

**Remark 3.5.** From the lemma above, we see that any object in  $\mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X)$  carries a weight filtration (induced from a filtration in some  $\mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X_i)$ ) but unless  $X$  is a scheme, the category of objects pure of weight  $n$  is no longer semisimple. The upcoming sections are devoted to showing semisimplicity appears for stratified motives on affine Grassmannians.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $k'/k$  be a Galois extension (not necessarily finite). Let  $X$  be an ind-variety over  $k$ , there are canonical equivalences*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X_{k'})^{\operatorname{Gal}(k'/k)} &\simeq \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X_k) \\ \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X_{k'})^{\operatorname{Gal}(k'/k)} &\simeq \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Sh}_{\text{ct}}(X_k). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Regarding perverse sheaves, if  $X$  is a scheme, then this is [JT25, Lemma 2.13] and if  $X = \operatorname{colim}_{i \in I} X_i$  is an ind-variety then it suffices to show that  $\operatorname{colim}_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X_{i,k'})^{\operatorname{Gal}(k'/k)} \simeq \mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X_k)^{\operatorname{Gal}(k'/k)}$ .  $\square$

**3.3. Stratified derived Nori Motives.** Let  $X$  be an ind-variety. In general, there is no reason to expect  $\mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X), \operatorname{Perv}(X), \operatorname{Perv}_\ell(X)$  to be semisimple. However, restricting to some given stratification can yield semisimplicity. The most crucial example here is the affine Grassmannians  $\operatorname{Gr}_G$  of a split reductive groups  $G$  with the stratification into  $L^+G$ -orbits; i.e. the category  $\operatorname{Perv}_{L^+G\text{-orbits}}(\operatorname{Gr}_G)$  is semisimple. This is a special feature of the stratification into  $L^+G$ -orbits. Indeed, the category  $\operatorname{Perv}_{\operatorname{Iwahori}}(\operatorname{Gr}_G)$  is no longer semisimple where the stratification is given by Iwahori subgroups. In conclusion, the choice of the stratification matters here. Follow [RS20][RS21], here we study the category of stratified derived Nori motives. The theory of perverse Nori motives is sufficiently good so that we may omit technicalities on Beilinson-Soulé conjecture, cellularities and stratifications as in *loc.cit.* Now suppose that  $X$  is a stratified ind-variety, we would like to define the category of stratified perverse Nori motives  $\mathcal{M}\operatorname{Perv}(X, X^+)$  as a motivic upgrade of  $\operatorname{Perv}_\mathcal{S}(X)$ .

To encode the functoriality from the beginning, we may work with a general setup first. Given a coefficient system

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}: (\mathrm{Var}_k)^{\mathrm{op}} &\longrightarrow \mathrm{CAlg}(\mathrm{Pr}^{\mathrm{L}}) \\ (f: X \rightarrow Y)^{\mathrm{op}} &\longmapsto f^*: \mathbf{H}(Y) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}(X) \end{aligned}$$

so that  $\mathbf{H}$  admits a six-functor formalism  $(f^*, f_*, f_!, f^!, \otimes, \underline{\mathrm{Hom}})$ . Let  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \longrightarrow X$  be a stratified ind-scheme. Assume that for each  $w \in W$ , we are given a subcategory  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w) \subset \mathbf{H}(X_w)$  stable under duality and Tate twists.

**Definition 3.7.** Let  $\mathbf{H}^*(X), \mathbf{H}^!(X) \subset \mathbf{H}(X)$  be the full subcategories consisting of motives  $M$  so that  $\iota_w^*(M) \in \mathbf{H}_w(X_w), \iota_w^!(M)$ , respectively.

**Lemma 3.8.** Let  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \longrightarrow X$  be a stratified ind-variety, then  $\mathbf{H}^*(X), \mathbf{H}^!(X)$  are generated by motives of the forms  $\iota_{w!}(M), \iota_{w*}(M)$  with  $M \in \mathbf{H}_w(X_w)$ , respectively.

*Proof.* The case of scheme is [SW18, Lemma 4.4]. Consider an ind-variety  $X$ , we write  $X = \mathrm{colim}_{w \in W} \overline{X}_w$  and  $\overline{X}_w$  is stratified by  $\coprod_{v \leq w} X_v$ . Now for any  $M \in \mathbf{H}^*(X)$ , we can write  $M = \mathrm{colim}_{w \in W} \iota_{\leq w,*}(M_{\leq w})$  and in fact we can choose a representative  $M \simeq \iota_{\leq w,*}(M_{\leq w})$  where  $\iota_{\leq w}: \overline{X}_w \longrightarrow X$  is canonical and  $M_{\leq w} \in \mathbf{H}(\overline{X}_w)$ . The condition  $\iota_v^!(M) \in \mathbf{H}_v(X_v)$  is equivalent to  $\iota_v^!(M_{\leq w}) \in \mathbf{H}_v(X_v)$  for all  $v \in W$  (here and in sequel, we are making an abuse of notation when we write  $\iota_v$  for both inclusions  $\iota_v: X_v \longrightarrow \overline{X}_{\leq w}$  and  $\iota_v: X_v \longrightarrow X$ ) so by the case of schemes, we can write  $M_{\leq w} = \mathrm{colim}_{v \leq w} \iota_{v!}(M_v)$  with  $M_v \in \mathbf{H}_v(X_v)$  and hence  $M = \mathrm{colim}_{w \in W, v \leq w} \iota_{v!}(M_v)$  as desired.  $\square$

**Definition 3.9.** The stratification  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \longrightarrow X$  is called *Whitney-Nori* for the theory  $\mathbf{H}$  if  $\iota_{w*} \iota_{s,*}(M) \in \mathbf{H}_w(X_w)$  for all  $w, s \in W, M \in \mathbf{H}_s(X_s)$  (by duality, this is equivalent to requiring  $\iota_{w*} \iota_{s,!}(M) \in \mathbf{H}_w(X_w)$  for all  $w, s \in W, M \in \mathbf{H}_s(X_s)$ ). By the lemma above, the following categories are identical:

- (1)  $\langle \iota_{w,*}(M_w) \mid w \in W, M_w \in \mathbf{H}(X_w) \rangle$ .
- (2)  $\langle \iota_{w,!}(M_w) \mid w \in W, M_w \in \mathbf{H}(X_w) \rangle$ .
- (3)  $\langle M \in \mathbf{H}(X) \mid \iota_w^!(M) \in \mathbf{H}_w(X_w) \rangle$ .
- (4)  $\langle M \in \mathbf{H}(X) \mid \iota_w^*(M) \in \mathbf{H}_w(X_w) \rangle$

and will be denoted by  $\mathbf{H}(X, X^+)$ .

**Lemma 3.10.** The category  $\mathbf{H}(X, X^+)$  is stable under Verdier duality.

*Proof.* Indeed, by definition 3.9, given  $M_w \in \mathbf{H}_w(X_w)$ , we have that  $\mathbb{D} \iota_{w,*}(M_w) \simeq \iota_{w,!} \mathbb{D}(M_w) \in \mathbf{H}(X, X^+)$  because  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w)$  is stable under duality.  $\square$

**Example 3.11.** Here are some typical examples:

- (1) The choice  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w) = 0$  yields the category  $\mathbf{H}(X, X^+) = 0$ .
- (2) The choice  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w) = \mathbf{H}(X_w)$  yields the category  $\mathbf{H}(X, X^+) = \mathbf{H}(X)$ .
- (3) Let  $\mathbf{H}$  be either the complex derived category  $\mathbf{D}_{\mathrm{ct}}^b((-)^{\mathrm{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$  or the  $\ell$ -adic derived category  $\mathbf{D}_{\mathrm{ct}}^b((-)^{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}, \mathbb{Q}_{\ell})$  and  $X_w$  be smooth varieties, then  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w)$  can be chosen to those complexes with constructible cohomology being local systems or  $\ell$ -adic local systems. The resulting categories are known as complexes constructible with respect to the given stratification (instead of all stratifications).
- (4) Let  $\mathbf{H}$  be any coefficient system, then one can choose  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w) = \langle \mathbf{1}_{X_w}(n) \rangle \subset \mathbf{H}(X_w)$  to be the full subcategory of Tate motives (the case  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{DA}^{\mathrm{\acute{e}t}}(-, \mathbb{Q})$  of étale motives is studied in [SW18][RS20][RS21]) then  $\mathbf{H}(X, X^+)$  is known as *stratified mixed Tate motives*.
- (5) Let  $\mathbf{H}$  be any coefficient system, then one can choose  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w) = \langle e_! \mathbf{1}_Y(n) \mid e: Y \rightarrow X_w \text{ finite} \rangle \subset \mathbf{H}(X_w)$  to be the full subcategory of Artin motives, we call  $\mathbf{H}(X, X^+)$  the category of *stratified mixed Artin motives*.

We note that both Artin motives and Tate motives lie in motivic local systems. For Tate motives, this is trivial and for Artin motives, we note that  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w) = \langle e_! \mathbb{1}_Y(n) \mid e: Y \rightarrow X_w \text{ finite} \rangle = \langle e_! \mathbb{1}_Y(n) \mid e: Y \rightarrow X_w \text{ finite, étal} \rangle$  (see [AZ12, Lemma 2.5]) and by [Ach21, Lemma 2.1.14 and Lemma 1.7.14],  $e_!^{\text{an}} \mathbb{1}_Y(n)$  (operations on the analytic side) is a local system.

With these examples, we have the following well-motivated definition.

**Definition 3.12.** Let  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{DN}^b$  be derived Nori motives, we choose  $\mathbf{H}_w(X_w)$  to be those complexes with constructible cohomology (see lemma 3.2) being motivic local systems, then the category  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  is called the *category of stratified derived Nori motives*. Concretely,

$$\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) = \left\{ M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \mid {}^{\text{ct}}\mathbf{H}^n(\iota_w^*(M)) \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w) \right\}.$$

Clearly, there are induced realizations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Betti}_{X, X^+}^* : \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \\ \mathfrak{R}_{X, X^+}^{\text{ét}} : \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, X_{\text{ét}}^+, \mathbb{Q}_{\ell}) \end{aligned}$$

for all primes  $\ell$ .

**Remark 3.13.** By restricting to suitable subcategories, we also have realizations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Betti}_{X, X^+}^* : \mathbf{DTM}(X, X^+) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \\ \mathfrak{R}_{X, X^+}^{\text{ét}} : \mathbf{DTM}(X, X^+) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Betti}_{X, X^+}^* : \mathbf{DAM}(X, X^+) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \\ \mathfrak{R}_{X, X^+}^{\text{ét}} : \mathbf{DAM}(X, X^+) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 3.14.** Under the standard conjecture, we have an equivalence  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X) \simeq \mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  (see [Tub25b]) and the restriction of  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, X_{\text{ét}}^+, \mathbb{Q}_{\ell})$  to the full subcategory generated by Tate motives is precisely the realization functor in [RS20, Lemma 3.2.8].

**Remark 3.15.** We also have an alternative description, avoiding the constructible  $t$ -structure, using only the perverse  $t$ -structure: indeed, in the description above, one may simply replace  ${}^{\text{ct}}\mathbf{H}^n$  everywhere with  ${}^p\mathbf{H}^n[-\dim(X_w)]$ ; since the strata are smooth, this causes no problem because perverse  $t$ -structures on smooth varieties are shifts by dimensions of constructible  $t$ -structures.

The category  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  is motivic in the following sense:

**Corollary 3.16.** *The category  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  is independent of the choice of the embedding  $k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ . Moreover, one has that*

$$\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) = \left\{ M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \mid \text{Betti}_X^*(M) \in \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \right\} = \left\{ M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \mid \mathfrak{R}_{X, \ell}^{\text{ét}}(M) \in \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, X_{\text{ét}}^+, \mathbb{Q}_{\ell}) \right\}$$

*In other words, one can "create" the  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  using either the Betti or the  $\ell$ -adic realization functors.*

*Proof.* It suffices to prove that  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w)$  is independent of the choices of embeddings and realizations. Regard embeddings, this is [JT25, Lemma 2.22]. Concern realization functors, this is proposition 2.3.  $\square$

**3.4. Stratified perverse Nori motives.** Now we want to define the category of stratified, perverse Nori motives  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$ . Ideally, we should define the *category of stratified motivic perverse sheaves* as  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+) = \text{rat}_X^{-1}(\text{Perv}_{(X^+)^{\text{an}}}(X^{\text{an}}))$  and the functor  $\text{rat}_X$  restricts to a faithful, exact functor

$$\text{rat}_X : \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \text{Perv}_{(X^+)^{\text{an}}}(X^{\text{an}}).$$

However, as in the usual setting  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  should be the heart of some  $t$ -structure on  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  but it is not clear that whether one can pullback the  $t$ -structure on  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$  (or  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, X_{\text{ét}}^+, \mathbb{Q}_{\ell})$ )



to  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  since they are not faithful (and the conservativity conjecture says that we only expect the Betti realization to be conservative). Fortunately, we can proceed like the ordinary constructible derived categories and give the second definition of  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$ , which are to us easier to work with than the definition above given in terms of generators.

**Proposition 3.17.** *Let  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \rightarrow X$  be a stratified ind-scheme with  $X_w$ 's being smooth over  $k$ , then there is a  $t$ -structure on  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  with*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)^{\leq 0} &= \left\{ M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) \mid {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_w^*(M)) = 0 \ \forall w \in W, n > -\dim(X_w) \right\} \\ \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)^{\geq 0} &= \left\{ M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) \mid {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_w^!(M)) = 0 \ \forall w \in W, n < -\dim(X_w) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The heart of this  $t$ -structure is the category of stratified motivic perverse sheaves  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+) = \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X) \cap \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$ . The functor  $\mathrm{rat}_X: \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X) \rightarrow \mathrm{Perv}(X^{\mathrm{an}})$  restricts to a faithful, exact functor of abelian  $\mathbb{Q}$ -categories

$$\mathrm{rat}_{(X, X^+)}: \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+) \rightarrow \mathrm{Perv}(X^{\mathrm{an}}, X^{+, \mathrm{an}}).$$

Similarly, there are induced  $t$ -structure on derived Artin motives  $\mathbf{DA}^b(X, X^+)$  and derived Tate motives  $\mathbf{DT}^b(X, X^+)$  whose hearts are  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}\mathrm{Artin}(X, X^+)$  and  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}\mathrm{Tate}(X, X^+)$ , respectively.

*Proof.* The existence of the  $t$ -structure follows from recollement (see [BBDG18, 1.4.10]). Concern the last part, we know the analogous description for  $\mathbf{D}_{\mathrm{ct}}^b((-)^{\mathrm{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$  and since  $\mathrm{rat}$  is conservative, exact and commutes with  $f^*, f^!$  (see [IM19, Theorem 5.1]), it reflects the identity  ${}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_w^*(M)) = 0, {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_w^!(M)) = 0$  and hence an induced functor.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.18.** *The category  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+)$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear, abelian, Noetherian and Artinian category and the inclusion  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+) \subset \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X)$  is a Serre subcategory.*

*Proof.* Clearly,  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+)$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear, abelian. The properties of being Noetherian and Artinian follows from the property of being a Serre subcategory so it suffices to treat this last claim. If  $X$  is smooth and  $X = X^+$  then  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+) = \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Loc}(X)[\dim(X)] \subset \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X)$  because the same holds for ordinary local systems and perverse sheaves (see for instance [Ach21, Proposition 3.4.1]). Now for general  $X$ , a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow 0$$

in  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X)$  induces long exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_w^*(M')) \rightarrow {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_w^*(M)) \rightarrow {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_w^*(M'')) \rightarrow {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^{n+1}(\iota_w^*(M')) \rightarrow \dots$$

and hence  ${}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}(\iota_w^*(M)) \in \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Loc}(X_w)$  if and only if  ${}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}(\iota_w^*(M')), {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}(\iota_w^*(M'')) \in \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Loc}(X_w)$  for every  $w \in W$  (the same for  $\iota_w^!$ 's operations) thanks to the first observation and hence  $M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  if and only if  $M', M'' \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$ . The rest then follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+) = \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X) \cap \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.19.** *Let  $X$  be an ind-variety over  $k$  with a Whitney-Nori stratification. Let  $k'/k$  be a Galois extension, there is an equivalence of categories*

$$\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+) \simeq \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X_{k'}, X_{k'}^+)^{\mathrm{Gal}(k'/k)}.$$

*Proof.* Indeed, this follows from the corresponding statement for motivic local systems (see [JT25]) and proposition 3.29.  $\square$

By restricting to suitable subcategories, we obtain some variants. We would like to keep them in track in the rest of the paper.

**Definition 3.20.** Let  $X$  be an ind-variety over  $k$  with a Whitney-Nori stratification.

- (1) The category of stratified Tate motives  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Tate}(X, X^+) = \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Tate}(X) \cap \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(X, X^+)$  is the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Tate}(X)$ .

- (2) The category of stratified Artin motives  $\mathcal{M} \text{ Artin}(X, X^+) = \mathcal{M} \text{ Artin}(X) \cap \mathcal{M} \text{ Perv}(X, X^+)$  is the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{M} \text{ Artin}(X)$ .

They all enjoy descent properties, namely, if  $k'/k$  is a Galois extension, then there are equivalences of categories

$$\mathcal{M} \text{ Tate}(X, X^+) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{ Tate}(X_{k'}, X_{k'}^+)^{\text{Gal}(k'/k)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{M} \text{ Artin}(X, X^+) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{ Artin}(X_{k'}, X_{k'}^+)^{\text{Gal}(k'/k)}$$

**3.5. Functoriality.** Functorialities of perverse Nori motives behave like normal perverse sheaves. The restriction to stratified one requires further assumptions.

**Lemma 3.21.** *Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a morphism of stratified ind-schemes where  $X$  is endowed with the inverse stratification, then the functor  $f^*: \mathbf{DN}^b(Y) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  restricts to a perverse  $t$ -exact functor*

$$f^\dagger: \mathbf{DN}^b(Y, Y^+) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$$

and hence a fully faithful exact functor

$$f^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \text{ Perv}(Y, Y^+) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{ Perv}(X, X^+)$$

provided that  $f$  is smooth. Moreover:

- (1) The restrictions  $f^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \text{ Artin}(Y, Y^+) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{ Artin}(X, X^+)$  and  $f^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \text{ Tate}(Y, Y^+) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{ Tate}(X, X^+)$  are well-defined.
- (2) The restriction  $f^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \text{ Tate}(Y, Y^+) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{ Tate}(X, X^+)$  is an equivalence of categories.

*Proof.* We take remark 3.15 into account. First,  $f^\dagger$  is well-restricted because  ${}^p\text{H}^n(\iota_w^!(f^\dagger(M))) = {}^p\text{H}^n(f^{+, \dagger} \iota_w^!(M)) = f^{+, \dagger} {}^p\text{H}^n(\iota_w^*(M))$ , which belongs to  $f^{+, \dagger} \mathcal{M} \text{ Loc}(Y_w)[- \dim(X_w)] = f^{+, *}\mathcal{M} \text{ Loc}(Y_w)[- \dim(X_w) + \dim(f_w)] \subset \mathcal{M} \text{ Loc}(Y_w)[- \dim(Y_w)]$  (note that smoothness of  $f$  here is necessary for base change and dimensions, the case  $\iota_w^*$  is easier). The perverse  $t$ -exactness is argued similarly. The full faithfulness is a consequence of smooth descent in proposition 2.6. The equivalence on Tate motives follows from the fact that  $f^\dagger$  is essentially surjective on generators  $\mathbb{1}(n)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.22.** This is an enhancement of [RS20, Lemma 3.2.12][RS21, Lemma 2.10]. In fact, the result in *loc.cit.* establishes an equivalence on Tate motives by relying on the Beilinson-Soulé vanishing conjecture. Meanwhile, here (and for ordinary perverse sheaves) one should only expect a fully faithful functor. The reason behind this is for Tate motives, the functors  $f^*, f^\dagger$  are automatically surjective since they preserve the unit object and twists. Such a surjectivity already fails for ordinary perverse sheaves by taking  $X, Y$  to be schemes (for instance  $Y = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{C}), X = \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1$ ).

**Lemma 3.23.** *Let  $i: Z \hookrightarrow X$  be a quasi-finite morphism of stratified ind-varieties, then the functors  $i^*, i_!$  are right perverse  $t$ -exact, the functors  $i^!, i_*$  are left perverse  $t$ -exact.*

*Proof.* This is obvious since these exactness already hold true for schemes.  $\square$

We recall the notion of a stratified semismall morphism (see for instance, [BR18, Section 6.1]): a morphism  $f: (X, X^+) \rightarrow (Y, Y^+)$  is semismall if it is proper,  $f(X_w)$  is a union of strata, and for each  $y \in Y_{w'} \subset f(X_w)$ , one has

$$\dim(X_y \times X_w) \leq \frac{1}{2}(\dim(X_w) - \dim(Y_{w'}))$$

and we say that  $f$  is a locally trivial fibration if for such  $X_w, Y_{w'}$ , the morphism  $X_w \times (Y_{w'} \times_Y X) \rightarrow Y_{w'}$  is a locally trivial fibration in the Zariski topology.

**Proposition 3.24.** *Let  $f: (X, X^+) \rightarrow (Y, Y^+)$  be a stratified semismall morphism and locally trivial fibration. Assume that strata of  $X^+, Y^+$  are smooth, if  $M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$ , then  $f_*(M) \in \mathbf{DN}^b(Y, Y^+)$ . Moreover, if  $M \in \mathcal{M} \text{ Perv}(X, X^+)$ , then  $f_*(M) \in \mathcal{M} \text{ Perv}(Y, Y^+)$ . Consequently,  $f_*$  also restricts to Artin and Tate motives.*

*Proof.* We are beneficial from the corresponding analytic statements (see for instance [BR18]) and the conservativity of the realization functor.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.25.** *The category  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  is stable under  $(-) \otimes (-)$  and  $\underline{\mathbf{Hom}}(-, -)$  (consequently, by duality).*

*Proof.* Again, we are beneficial from the corresponding analytic statements and the conservativity of the realization functor.  $\square$

**3.6. Intersection Motives.** Let  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \longrightarrow X$  be a stratified ind-scheme. We have factorizations  $\iota_w: X_w \xrightarrow{j_w} \overline{X}_w \xrightarrow{i_w} X$  where  $j_w$  is an open immersion and  $i_w$  is a closed immersion. For any  $w \in W$ ,  $L \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w)$ , we define the *Nori intersection motive*

$$\mathbf{IC}_w(L) = \mathbf{IC}(X_w, L) = (i_w)_*(j_w)_!(L[\dim(X_w)]).$$

It is obvious that the motive  $\mathbf{IC}_w(L)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  and  $\text{rat}_X(\mathbf{IC}_w(L)) = \mathbf{IC}_w(\text{rat}_X(L))$  in  $\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$ . Most of formal properties of intersection cohomology complexes hold true for intersection motives. We summarize some ingredients need in the upcoming sections. The proofs are analogous to the classical setting.

**Proposition 3.26.** *Let  $X$  be an ind-variety. Let  $i: Z \hookrightarrow X$  be a closed immersion with open complement  $j: U \longrightarrow X$ . Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$ .*

- (1) *If  $M$  has no quotient supported on  $Z$ , then there is a short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow {}^p\mathbf{H}^0(i_*i^!(M)) \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow j_{!*}j^*(M) \longrightarrow 0$$

- (2) *If  $M$  has no subobject supported on  $Z$ , then there is a short exact sequence*

$$0 \longrightarrow j_{!*}j^*(M) \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow {}^p\mathbf{H}^0(i_*i^*(M)) \longrightarrow 0$$

*Proof.* The proof is a formal manipulation of four operations. One can consult [Ach21, Lemma 3.3.8] for instance.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.27.** *Let  $L \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w)$  be a motivic local system, then  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{IC}_w(L)) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_w(L^\vee)(\dim(X_w))$ .*

*Proof.* Note that it is not clear whether one can apply the realization functor since it is not clear whether there exists a canonical morphism between  $\mathbb{D}(\mathbf{IC}_w(L)), \mathbf{IC}_w(L^\vee)(\dim(X_w))$ . However, as in classical case, intersection motives have universal properties and we can proceed like in, for instance, [Ach21, Lemma 3.3.13].  $\square$

The following will be particularly useful for use in the proof of (a corollary of) Kazhdan-Lusztig parity vanishing.

**Proposition 3.28.** *Let  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \longrightarrow X$  be a Whitney-Nori stratification of an ind-variety  $X$ . Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  (so that  $\mathbb{D}(M) \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  by lemma 3.10). Let  $w \in W$  and  $L \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w)$ , then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1)  $M \simeq \mathbf{IC}_w(L)$ .  
(2)  $M$  is supported on  $\overline{X}_w$ ,  $M|_{X_w} \simeq L[\dim(X_w)]$  and for each  $X_{w'} \in \overline{X}_w \setminus X_w$ , one has that

$$\iota_{w'}^*(M) \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X_{w'}, X_{w'})^{\leq -\dim(X_{w'})-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \iota_{w'}^!(M) \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X_{w'}, X_{w'})^{\geq -\dim(X_{w'})+1}$$

where by an abuse of notation  $\iota_{w'}: X_{w'} \hookrightarrow \overline{X}_w \setminus X_w \hookrightarrow X$  is the obvious inclusion.

*Proof.* The direction (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) is obvious by definition. The direction (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) can be obtained by repeating the proof of ordinary perverse sheaves (see for instance [Ach21, Lemma 3.3.11]).  $\square$

We can then classify simple objects in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$ . The following is an analogue of [RS20, Theorem 3.3.8].

**Theorem 3.29.** *Let  $j: U \rightarrow X$  be a locally closed immersion of ind-varieties. If  $M$  is a simple object in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(U)$ , then  $j_{!*}(M)$  is a simple object in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$ . Moreover, if there exists a Whitney-Nori stratification  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \rightarrow X$  consisting of smooth varieties  $X_w$ , then any simple object in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  is of the form  $\mathbf{IC}_w(L)$  with  $L$  being a simple object in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w)$  (hence necessarily pure of some weight).*

*Proof.* We see that objects of the forms  $j_{!*}(M)$  and  $i_{w*}j_{w,!}(M)$  are simple. In the case of a given stratification, one might assume that  $X$  is a stratified scheme. It suffices to prove that any object in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  admits a filtration by objects of the form  $i_{w*}j_{w,!}(M)$  with  $M$  being an object in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w)$ . We can proceed by noetherian induction. Assume that the result holds for strict closed subschemes of  $X$ . Let  $j: U \hookrightarrow X$  be an open stratum with closed complement  $i: X \setminus U = Z \hookrightarrow X$ . Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  be an object then  $j^*(M) \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(U)$  by lemma 3.21. Thus,  $j_{!*}j^*(M) = \mathbf{IC}(U, j^*M)$  is of the desired form (and simple if  $M$  is simple). Let  $M' = \text{Coker}({}^p\text{H}^0(i_*i^!M) \rightarrow M)$ . Note that  $j^*(M') \simeq j^*(M)$  so  $M'$  is supported on  $Z$  so it admits a filtration of the desired form. By proposition 3.26, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow {}^p\text{H}^0(i_*i^!M) \rightarrow M \rightarrow M' \rightarrow 0$$

Similarly, there is also short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbf{IC}(U, j^*M) \rightarrow M' \rightarrow {}^p\text{H}^0(i_*i^*M') \rightarrow 0.$$

By induction, both  ${}^p\text{H}^0(i_*i^!M)$ ,  ${}^p\text{H}^0(i_*i^*M')$  admit filtrations by intersection motives of desired forms and hence  $M$  must admit a filtration of the desired form as well.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.30.** *Given the hypothesis of theorem 3.29, simple objects of  $\mathcal{M}\text{Tate}(X, X^+)$  are of the forms  $\mathbf{IC}_w(\mathbb{1}_{X_w}(n))$ .*

*Proof.* This is obvious thanks to the one above.  $\square$

**Remark 3.31.** In comparison with ordinary perverse sheaves or stratified mixed Tate motives (see [RS20, Theorem 3.3.8]), the theory of perverse sheaves using Nori motives has a richer source of simple objects and does not rely on the Beilinson-Soulé conjecture and the cellularity of strata.

**Corollary 3.32.** *Let  $X$  be an ind-scheme with a Whitney-Nori stratification  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \rightarrow X$ . If  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  is a semisimple object, then  $\text{rat}_X(M) \in \text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  is a semisimple object.*

*Proof.* It suffices to assume that  $M$  is simple. The object  $M$  is necessarily of the form  $\mathbf{IC}(X_w, M_w)$  for some  $w \in W$  and  $M_w \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(X_w)$  being simple. By virtue of [Ter24a, Lemma 6.12] (built upon the work [Tub25b][Jac25]), the object  $\text{rat}_{X_w}(M_w)$  is semisimple in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  and hence also semisimple in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  by lemma 3.18 and as a consequence

$$\text{rat}_X(\mathbf{IC}(X_w, M_w)) = \mathbf{IC}(X_w, \text{rat}_{X_w}(M_w))$$

is semisimple as well.  $\square$

**3.7. Weight structure (revisited).** Let us declare that a motive  $M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$  (and hence  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X, X^+)$ ) has weight  $\leq n$  (resp,  $\geq n$  or pure of weight  $n$ ) if the underlying motive  $M \in \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  has the corresponding property.

**Corollary 3.33.** *Let  $f: (X, X^+) \rightarrow (Y, Y^+)$  be a morphism of Whitney-Nori stratified ind-schemes, if the operations  $(f^*, f_*, f_!, f^!, \otimes, \underline{\text{Hom}}, \boxtimes)$  are well-defined, then they enjoy the same properties as in section 2.1.*

*Proof.* This is obvious, given the case of schemes.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.34.** *Let  $j: (U, U^+) \rightarrow (X, X^+)$  be a locally closed immersion of Whitney-Nori stratified ind-varieties and  $L \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(U, U^+, n)$  be an object pure of weight  $n$ , then  $j_{!*}(L)$  is pure of weight  $n$ .*

*Proof.* This is similar to the classical case.  $\square$

## 4. EQUIVARIANT PERVERSE NORI MOTIVES

In this section, our ultimate goal is to define the (stratified) equivariant perverse Nori motives  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$ . We propose four definitions of this category (where the fourth definition, to our best knowledge, is not available in the ordinary setting). The functorialities between equivariant perverse Nori motives shall be used implicitly throughout next sections. At the end, we study the such category where algebraic groups are replaced by pro-algebraic groups.

**4.1. Equivariant Six Operations.** Given a coefficient system

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}: (\text{Var}_k)^{\text{op}} &\longrightarrow \text{CAlg}(\text{Pr}^{\text{L}}) \\ (f: X \rightarrow Y)^{\text{op}} &\longmapsto f^*: \mathbf{H}(Y) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}(X) \end{aligned}$$

and suppose that  $\mathbf{H}$  is a  $h$ -hypersheaf, then we can extend to all algebraic stacks over  $k$  by taking the right Kan extension. Indeed, let  $\mathfrak{X}$  be an algebraic stack with a smooth presentation  $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}$ , we can consider the Čech nerve  $C_\pi^\bullet$  whose  $n$ -degree is

$$C_\pi^n = \underbrace{X \times_{\mathfrak{X}} \cdots \times_{\mathfrak{X}} X}_{n \text{ times}}$$

and define

$$\mathbf{H}(\mathfrak{X}) := \lim \mathbf{H}(C_\pi^\bullet) = \lim \left( \mathbf{H}(X) \begin{smallmatrix} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{smallmatrix} \mathbf{H}(X \times_{\mathfrak{X}} X) \begin{smallmatrix} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{smallmatrix} \cdots \right).$$

The enhancement developed in [LZ17] (see also [Kha19][Hoy17]) allows us to extend all six operations from schemes to algebraic stacks. In particular, one can talk about étale motives  $\mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{Q})$ , derived Nori motives  $\mathbf{DN}^b(\mathfrak{X})$  as well as  $\ell$ -adic motives  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(\mathfrak{X}, \mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ . The six-functors formalism for schemes extends word by word to algebraic stacks, we will be particularly interested in quotient stacks. Let  $G$  be algebraic  $k$ -group acting on a  $k$ -variety  $X$ . We also say that  $X$  is a  $G$ -variety and hence have at hand the quotient stack  $[X/G]$ . We define

$$\mathbf{H}_G(X) := \mathbf{H}([X/G]) := \lim \left( \mathbf{H}(X) \begin{smallmatrix} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{smallmatrix} \mathbf{H}(X \times_{\mathfrak{X}} X) \begin{smallmatrix} \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \\ \xleftarrow{\quad} \end{smallmatrix} \cdots \right).$$

In particular, one has the equivariant counterpart of étale motive  $\mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  as well as of derived Nori motives  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X)$ . The Betti realization functors and  $\ell$ -adic realization functors extend to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Betti}_{[X/G]}^*: \mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) \\ \mathfrak{R}_{[X/G], \ell}^{\text{ét}}: \mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X_{\text{ét}}, \mathbb{Q}_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

The results are summarized below.

**Theorem 4.1** (Liu, Zheng, Khan, Hoyois). *Let  $X, Y$  be  $G$ -varieties and  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a  $G$ -equivariant morphism. There are equivariant categories  $\mathbf{H}_G(-)$  together with a full package of equivariant six-functor formalism  $(f_\#, f^*, f_*, f_!, f^!, \otimes, \mathbb{1}, \underline{\text{Hom}})$ .*

In particular, the theorem above applies to  $\mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(-, \mathbb{Q})$  and  $\mathbf{DN}^b(-)$ . Now in addition to the properties above, which parallel the usual six operations in the equivariant setting, there are further distinctive operations that make the theory particularly rich and interesting. The operations colored in **red** are possibly nonexistent.

- (1) Let  $G$  be an algebraic group. Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety and  $H \leq G$  be a subgroup. We denote by  $p: X/H \rightarrow X/G$  the projection. The operations

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_H^G &:= p^*: \mathbf{H}_G(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_H(X) \\ \text{Av}_{H*}^G &:= p_*: \mathbf{H}_H(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X) \\ \text{Av}_{H!}^G &:= p_\# = p_!(\dim(G/H))[2 \dim(G/H)]: \mathbf{H}_H(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X) \end{aligned}$$



are called *restriction functors*, *right and left averaging functors*, respectively. If  $K \subset H \subset G$ , then

$$\mathrm{Res}_K^H \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G = \mathrm{Res}_K^G.$$

- (2) Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $H \trianglelefteq G$  be a normal subgroup and let  $X$  be a  $G/H$ -variety. We denote by  $q: X/G \rightarrow X/(G/H)$  the projection.

$$\mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^G := q^*: \mathbf{H}_{G/H}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X)$$

$$\mathrm{Inv}_{H*}^G := q_*: \mathbf{H}_H(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X)$$

$$\mathrm{Inv}_{H!}^G := q_!(-\dim(G/H))[-2\dim(G/H)]: \mathbf{H}_H(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X)$$

are called *inflation functors*, *right and left invariant functors*, respectively. If  $K \trianglelefteq H \trianglelefteq G$  be normal subgroups, then

$$\mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^G \simeq \mathrm{Infl}_{G/K}^G \circ \mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^{G/K}.$$

The reason for the potential nonexistence of adjoints of inflations can be seen as a part of a more general question involving constructibilities of four operations of Artin stacks and they exist only when one allows suitable bounded below and above versions  $\mathbf{H}^+$ ,  $\mathbf{H}^-$  (see [Ach21, Section 6.8] for some useful comments). For general stacks, the question of constructibility can be subtle and some achievements are obtained in [Tub25a, Theorem 3.8]) for mixed Hodge modules. Here we can avoid this problem since we do not need  $\mathrm{Inv}_{H*}^G, \mathrm{Inv}_{H!}^G$ . Nevertheless, by following the traditional approaches, we show that  $\mathrm{Av}_{H*}^G, \mathrm{Av}_{H!}^G$  are indeed well-defined. The restriction functors and inflation functors satisfy additional properties:

**Lemma 4.2.** *The following statements hold true:*

- (1)  $\mathrm{Res}_H^G$  commutes with six operations of  $G$ -equivariant morphisms.
- (2)  $\mathrm{Infl}_H^G$  commutes with six operations of  $(G/H)$ -equivariant morphisms.
- (3) Restrictions and inflations commute in the following sense: Let  $H, K \leq G$  be subgroups with  $K \trianglelefteq G$  normal. Let  $X$  be a  $(G/K)$ -variety, then there is a natural isomorphism

$$(4.1) \quad \mathrm{Res}_H^G \circ \mathrm{Infl}_{G/K}^G \simeq \mathrm{Infl}_{H/(H \cap K)}^H \circ \mathrm{Res}_{H/(H \cap K)}^{G/K}.$$

*Proof.* These all follow from the functorialities of pullbacks.  $\square$

There are also non-trivial properties listed in the following

**Theorem 4.3.** (1) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Suppose that  $X$  admits a geometric quotient  $p: X \rightarrow X/G$ , then*

$$p^*: \mathbf{H}_G(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}(X/G)$$

*is an equivalence of stable  $\infty$ -categories.*

- (2) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Let  $H \trianglelefteq G$  be a normal subgroup so that  $X$  is a principal  $H$ -variety with quotient  $p: X \rightarrow X/H$ . The functor*

$$p^* \circ \mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^G: \mathbf{H}_{G/H}(X/H) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X)$$

*is an equivalence of stable  $\infty$ -categories.*

- (3) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $H \leq G$  be a subgroup. Let  $X$  be a  $H$ -variety and  $i: X \rightarrow G \times^H X$  be unit section, i.e., on points  $i(x) = (1, x)$ . If  $\mathbf{H}(-)$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear, there is an isomorphism of functors*

$$i^*[\dim(G/H)] \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G \simeq i^![\dim(G/H)](\dim(G/H)) \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G: \mathbf{H}(G \times^H X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_H(X).$$

*Moreover, these functors are equivalences of stable  $\infty$ -categories.*

- (4) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $H \leq G$  be a subgroup. Let  $X$  be a  $H$ -variety. Let  $\bar{a}: G \times^H X \rightarrow X$  be the morphism induced by the action morphism. There are isomorphisms of functors*

$$\mathrm{Av}_{H*}^G \simeq \bar{a}_* \circ (i^* \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G)^{-1}: \mathbf{H}_H(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X)$$

$$\mathrm{Av}_{H!}^G \simeq \bar{a}_! \circ (i^* \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G)^{-1}: \mathbf{H}_H(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X)$$

*Proof.* Part (1) is a special case of part (2), for which we argue as follows: if  $X/H$  exists as a scheme, the projection  $X/H \rightarrow (X/G)/(G/H)$  is a smooth cover of  $(X/H)/(G/H) = X/G$  and hence they yields the same category thanks to the universal property of limits. Regarding part (3), by relative purity (i.e.  $f^! \simeq f^*(d)[2d]$ ), there are commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{H}_H(X) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}_2^\dagger \mathrm{Infl}_{1 \times H}^{H \times H}} & \mathbf{H}_{H \times H}(X) \\ & \searrow \mathrm{pr}_2^\dagger \mathrm{Infl}_{1 \times H}^{G \times H} & \nearrow \tilde{i}^* \mathrm{Res}_{H \times H}^{G \times H} [-\dim(G/H)] \\ & \mathbf{H}_{G \times H}(G \times X) & \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{H}_H(X) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{pr}_2^\dagger \mathrm{Infl}_{1 \times H}^{H \times H}} & \mathbf{H}_{H \times H}(X) \\ & \searrow \mathrm{pr}_2^\dagger \mathrm{Infl}_{1 \times H}^{G \times H} & \nearrow \tilde{i}^* [\dim(G/H)](\dim(G/H)) \\ & \mathbf{H}_{G \times H}(G \times X) & \end{array}$$

with  $\tilde{i}: H \times X \hookrightarrow G \times X$  the canonical immersion, the rest is formally same as in [Ach21, Theorem 6.5.10]. Concern part (4), it suffices to show that, for instance,  $\bar{a}_* \circ (i^* \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G)^{-1}$  is a right adjoint of  $\mathrm{Res}_H^G$ . Equivalently,  $(i^* \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G) \circ \bar{a}^* \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G$  is the identity functor. This is clear since  $\bar{a} \circ i = \mathrm{id}_X$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Let  $H \leq G$  be a closed subgroup of finite index. Then  $\mathrm{Av}_{H!}^G \simeq \mathrm{Av}_{H*}^G$ .*

*Proof.* This is clear since  $G \times^H X = (G/H) \times X$  is then proper over  $X$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** (1) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $H \subset G$  be a subgroup such that  $G/H$  is unipotent. Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety, the functor*

$$\mathrm{Res}_H^G: \mathbf{H}_G(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_H(X)$$

*is fully faithful.*

- (2) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and let  $U \trianglelefteq G$  be a connected, unipotent, normal subgroup. Let  $X$  be a  $(G/U)$ -variety, the functor*

$$\mathrm{Infl}_{G/U}^G: \mathbf{H}_{G/U}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_G(X)$$

*is an equivalence of stable  $\infty$ -categories.*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $G$  act on  $(G/H) \times X$  by the rule  $g \cdot ([g'], x) = ([gg'], gx)$ . The projection  $\mathrm{pr}_2: (G/H) \times X \rightarrow X$  is then  $G$ -equivariant. Let  $\bar{a}: G \times^H X \rightarrow X$  be the morphism induced by the action morphism. Let  $i: X \rightarrow G \times^H X$  be the unit section. There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G \times^H X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & (G/H) \times X \\ & \searrow \bar{a} & \swarrow \mathrm{pr}_2 \\ & X & \end{array}$$

where the horizontal arrow  $(g, x) \mapsto ([g], gx)$  is an isomorphism. Since  $G/H$  is a unipotent, it is isomorphic to an affine space. By the  $\mathbb{A}^1$ -homotopy axiom, we obtain that  $\mathrm{pr}_2^*: \mathbf{H}(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}((G/H) \times X)$  is fully faithful and hence  $\bar{a}^*$  must be fully faithful as well. There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{H}_G(X) & \xrightarrow{\bar{a}^*} & \mathbf{H}_G(G \times^H X) \\ \mathrm{Res}_H^G \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathrm{Res}_H^G \\ \mathbf{H}_H(X) & \xleftarrow{i^*} & \mathbf{H}_H(G \times^H X). \end{array}$$

Since  $\bar{a} \circ i = \mathrm{id}_X$ , we must have that  $\mathrm{Res}_H^G: \mathbf{H}_G(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_H(X)$  is fully faithful because  $i^* \circ \mathrm{Res}_H^G$  is an equivalence thanks to [induction equivalence](#).

- (2) By 4.1, there is an isomorphism of functors  $\text{Res}_U^G \circ \text{Infl}_{G/U}^G \simeq \text{Infl}_1^U \circ \text{Res}_1^{G/U} \simeq \text{id}$ . This implies that  $\text{Res}_U^G$  is essentially surjective and thanks to the preceding that  $\text{Res}_U^G$  is fully faithful and hence an equivalence. Consequently,  $\text{Infl}_{G/U}^G$  must be an equivalence as well.  $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** (1) A purely topological method can be used in the case of derived categories  $\mathbf{D}^b(-)$  since in this case their equivariant versions can be defined in terms of  $n$ -acyclic resolutions. This approach is taken in [BL94] (see also [Ach21]).

(2) In some sense, the proposition above says that if we are only interested in affine algebraic groups, then it suffices to study equivariant categories  $\mathbf{H}_G(X)$  only for  $G$  being *reductive* since we can always consider  $G/R_u(G)$  with  $R_u(G)$  being the unipotent radical of  $G$ .

**4.2. Equivariant Perverse Nori Motives.** In this section, we freely use the materials on (derived) equivariant Nori motives given in the appendix. Let  $G$  be an algebraic group acting on a  $k$ -variety  $X$ , the easiest definition of an equivariant Nori motives  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$  is a motive in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  such that there exists an isomorphism  $a^\dagger(M) \simeq \text{pr}_2^\dagger(M)$ , where

$$a, \text{pr}_2: G \times_k X \longrightarrow X$$

denote the action, the projection, respectively. It turns out that there are at least three more candidates for the definition of this category (one more in comparison to the classical theory) and the content of this section is to show that they are indeed equivalent. Let  $G$  be a connected algebraic group<sup>1</sup> and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Let

$$a: G \times_k X \longrightarrow X \quad \text{and} \quad p: G \times_k X \longrightarrow X$$

be the action morphism and the projection, respectively. Follow [BR18, Appendix], we propose first three categories of equivariant perverse Nori motives:

- (1) We endow  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X)$  with the  $t$ -structure of limit of stable  $\infty$ -categories  $\{\mathbf{DN}^b(G^n \times_k X)\}_{n \in \Delta}$ . As in [BL94], we define the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)$  as the heart of a  $t$ -structure on the equivariant category  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X)$  so that the forgetful functor  $\text{Res}_G^b: \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  is  $t$ -exact and  $(\text{Res}_G^b)^{-1}(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)) = \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)$ . In other words, there is a homotopy pullback square (on the left)

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) & & \mathbf{DN}^b(X) \xrightarrow{H_X^0} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{DN}^b(X) & & \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) \xrightarrow{H_{X,G}^0} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X) \end{array}$$

and by taking adjoints, one gets the commutative square (on the right), where vertical arrows are obtained as right adjoints of pullbacks.

- (2) We define the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\dagger(X)$  whose objects are pair  $(M, \theta)$  where  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  and  $\theta: a^\dagger(M) \xrightarrow{\sim} p^\dagger(M)$  is an isomorphism such that

$$e^*(\theta) = \text{id}_M \quad \text{and} \quad (m \times \text{id}_X)^*(\theta) = (\text{pr}_{23})^*(\theta) \circ (\text{id}_G \times a)^*(\theta)$$

<sup>1</sup>The connectedness is important here, as remarked in [BR18, Appendix A].

and whose morphisms  $(M, \theta) \longrightarrow (M', \theta')$  are morphisms  $f: M \longrightarrow M'$  in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a^\dagger(M) & \xrightarrow{\theta} & \text{pr}_2^\dagger(M) \\ a^*(f) \downarrow & & \downarrow p^*(f) \\ a^\dagger(M') & \xrightarrow{\theta'} & \text{pr}_2^\dagger(f) \end{array}$$

commutes.

- (3) We define the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\dagger(X)$  as the full subcategory of  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  consisting of motives  $M$  such that there is an isomorphism  $a^\dagger(M) \simeq p^\dagger(M)$  in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$ ; equivalently, an isomorphism  $a^*(M) \simeq p^*(M)$  in  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X)$ .

By spelling out the definition of  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)$ , we see that

$$\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X) = \lim \left( \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\quad} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \end{array} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(G \times_k X) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\quad} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \end{array} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(G \times_k G \times_k X) \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\quad} \\ \xrightarrow{\quad} \end{array} \cdots \right).$$

Since  $(\Delta^{\text{op}})^+$  is cofinal in  $(\Delta^{\text{op}})$  and  $e^\dagger[-\dim(G)]$  is exact, we can compute the limit above after adding unit sections. Now because  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)$  is an ordinary category, the higher data  $n \geq 2$  does not affect the limit. Hence,  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)$  is equivalent to the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\dagger(X)$ . There are functors

$$\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X) \simeq \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\dagger(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\dagger(X)$$

where the right arrow is the forgetful functor and under  $\text{rat}_X$ , they become equivalences of categories. However, in the motivic setting, there should be at least one more candidate: However, in the motivic setting, one has at least one more candidate.

- (4) Consider the equivariant Betti realization

$$\text{Betti}_G^*: \mathbf{DA}_{G,\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{G^{\text{an}},\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}).$$

We define the fourth candidate  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$  as the universal abelian factorization

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{DA}_{G,\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Betti}_{X,G}^*} & \mathbf{D}_{G^{\text{an}},\text{ct}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow{pH^0} \text{Perv}_{G^{\text{an}}}(X^{\text{an}}) \\ \downarrow pH_{\text{univ}}^0 & \nearrow \text{rat}_X^G & \\ \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X) & & \end{array}$$

where  $\text{rat}_X^G$  is a faithful exact functor and  $pH_{\text{univ},G}^0$  is a cohomological functor. Obviously, if  $G = \{1\}$ , we have the usual motivic perverse category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  defined in [IM19].

The goal of this section is to prove that first three categories are equivalent (as known in the classical setting) when  $G$  is connected and they are equivalent to the fourth one if we assume the standard conjectures. Let us discuss operations of equivariant perverse sheaves.

**Proposition 4.7.** *Let  $? \in \{\#, \dagger, \dagger, \emptyset\}$ .*

- (1) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $X, Y$  be  $G$ -varieties. Let  $f: X \longrightarrow Y$  be a smooth, surjective morphism of  $G$ -varieties. There is a well-defined functor*

$$f^\dagger: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^?(Y) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^?(X)$$

*compatible with  $f^\dagger$  of ordinary perverse sheaves.*

- (2) *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Let  $H \leq G$  be a subgroup of  $G$ . There is well-defined functor*

$$\text{Res}_H^G: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^?(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_H^?(X)$$

*compatible with  $\text{Res}_H^G$  of ordinary perverse sheaves.*

- (3) Let  $G$  be an algebraic group. Let  $H \trianglelefteq G$  be a normal subgroup. There is well-defined functor

$$\mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^G: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_{G/H}^?(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^?(X)$$

compatible with  $\mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^G$  of ordinary perverse sheaves.

Moreover, the same statements hold true if one replaces analytic perverse sheaves  $\mathrm{Perv}_G(-)$  with  $\ell$ -adic perverse sheaves  $\mathrm{Perv}_{G,\ell}(-)$ .

*Proof.* For  $? \in \{\#, \dagger, \wr\}$ , the existences of these operations follow from the explicit description and the commutativities follow from the similar descriptions of analytic perverse sheaves (or  $\ell$ -adic ones). For  $? = \emptyset$ , everything follows from the definition of universal factorizations.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.8.** *Let  $G$  be a smooth algebraic group.*

- (1) *Let  $X, Y$  be  $G$ -varieties. Let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a smooth, surjective  $G$ -equivariant morphism. The functor*

$$f^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\dagger(Y) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\dagger(X)$$

*is faithful. If  $f$  has geometrically connected fibers, then  $f^\dagger$  is fully faithful.*

- (2) *Let  $H \trianglelefteq G$  be a connected, normal subgroup. Given  $G/H$ -variety  $X$ , the functor*

$$\mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^G: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_{G/H}^\dagger(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\dagger(X)$$

*is fully faithful. If moreover,  $G$  is connected, then  $\mathrm{Infl}_{G/H}^G$  is an equivalence of categories.*

- (3) *Let  $X$  be a principal  $G$ -variety and let  $p: X \rightarrow X/G$  be the quotient morphism. The functor*

$$p^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}^\dagger(X/G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\dagger(X)$$

*is an equivalence of categories.*

- (4) *Let  $H \leq G$  be a closed subgroup. Let  $X$  be a  $H$ -variety and let  $i: X \rightarrow G \times^H X$  be the morphism  $i(x) = (1, x)$ . The functor*

$$i^*[-\dim(G/H)]: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\dagger(G \times^H X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_H^\dagger(X)$$

*is an equivalence of categories.*

- (5) *Assume that  $G$  is connected, then the inclusion  $\mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\dagger(X) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\wr(X)$  is an equivalence of categories.*

*Proof.* Given propositions 2.6, 2.9, the proofs of (1), (2), (3), (5) are similar to the ones in classical cases. One can consult [Ach21, Propositions 6.2.6, 6.2.8, 6.2.10, Proposition 6.2.17]. Part (4) will follow from part 3 in theorem 4.3.  $\square$

Now let us show that the properties above still hold true for  $\mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(-)$  without assuming any equivalence with  $\mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G^\dagger(-)$  or referring to the standard conjectures.

**Proposition 4.9.** *The statements (1)  $\rightarrow$  (4) in proposition 4.8 hold true for  $\mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(-)$ .*

*Proof.* For the first part, let  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  be a smooth morphism of  $G$ -varieties. By the universal property, there exists  $f^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(X)$  compatible with  $f_G^\dagger: \mathrm{Perv}_G(Y) \rightarrow \mathrm{Perv}_G(X)$ . The faithfulness of  $f_G^\dagger$  follows from the faithfulnesses of  $f_G^\dagger$  and  $\mathrm{rat}_{(-)}: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(-) \rightarrow \mathrm{Perv}_G(-)$ . Let us assume that  $f$  has connected fibers. As in the proof of proposition 2.6, the functors

$$\begin{aligned} f^\dagger: \mathbf{D}_{\mathrm{ct},G}^b(Y, \mathbb{Q}) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{\mathrm{ct},G}^b(X, \mathbb{Q}) \\ f^\dagger: \mathrm{Perv}_G(Y) &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Perv}_G(X) \end{aligned}$$

admit right adjoints given by  $f_*[-d_f]$ ,  $H_G^0 \circ f_*[-d_f]$ , respectively. The universal factorization gives us a functor  $f_{\dagger,G}: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(Y)$  compatible with  $H_G^0 \circ f_*[-d_f]$ . We claim that this is a right adjoint of  $f_G^\dagger: \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(Y) \rightarrow \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_G(X)$ . Indeed, we can use the compatibilities of the two diagrams



and apply  $\text{rat}_?$  functors to check the triangle identities. To prove that  $f_G^\dagger$  is fully faithful, one proceeds as in the proof of proposition 2.6).

Part (2), (3), (4) follows from the universal properties and the fact that the involved functors (both derived and non-derived) are equivalences (see theorem 4.3).  $\square$

The following question seems to be natural, given the proposition above: are there natural isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\#(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\dagger(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^l(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X).$$

for connected algebraic groups. In some sense, are properties (1)  $\rightarrow$  (4) in proposition 4.8 sufficient to determine equivariant perverse sheaves? More generally, after dropping connectedness, is it true that  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\#(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X)$ . We give the positive answer to this question, under the validity of standard conjectures!

**Proposition 4.10.** *Let  $G$  be a connected smooth algebraic group. Let  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Assuming the standard conjectures, there is a canonical  $t$ -structure on  $\mathbf{DA}_{G,\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  whose heart is  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X)$  and the functor*

$$\text{Nori}_{X,G}^*: \mathbf{DA}_{G,\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X).$$

*is  $t$ -exact and an equivalence of stable  $\infty$ -categories.*

*Proof.* The Nori realization functor  $\text{Nori}_X^*: \mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  is defined for any scheme and it is an equivalence if motivic  $t$ -structures exist for fields of characteristic zero (see [Tub25b, Theorem 4.22]). Pass to ind-completions, we obtain a functor  $\text{Nori}_X^*: \mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Ind}(\mathbf{DN}^b(X))$  with a right adjoint  $\text{Nori}_{X,*}$ . Both  $\mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(-, \mathbb{Q})$  and  $\text{Ind}(\mathbf{DN}^b(-))$  are  $h$ -hypersheaves (for the latter, see [Tub25b, Theorem 3.24]) so  $\mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  and  $\mathbf{DN}_G(X, \mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  are conservative. The equivalence of  $\mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  and  $\mathbf{DN}_G(X)$  can be checked by applying forgetful functors to  $\text{Nori}_{X,G}^* \text{Nori}_{X,G,*} \longrightarrow \text{id}$  and  $\text{id} \longrightarrow \text{Nori}_{X,G,*} \text{Nori}_{X,G}^*$  and then using the equivalence  $\mathbf{DA}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq \mathbf{DN}(X)$ . Restricting to constructible motives gives us the desired result.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.11.** *Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Assume that standard conjectures hold true, then there is a canonical equivalence of categories*

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\#(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X).$$

*In particular, if  $G$  is connected, there are canonical equivalences*

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\#(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\dagger(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^l(X) \simeq \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X).$$

*Proof.* Under the standard conjectures, there is an equivalence  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) \simeq \mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q})$  thanks to proposition 4.10. In particular, there is a commutative diagram of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\#(X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Perv}_G(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) & & \\ \downarrow i & & \downarrow i & \searrow & \\ \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{D}_G^b(X, \mathbb{Q}) & \xrightarrow{pH^0} & \text{Perv}_G(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q}) \\ \downarrow H_{\text{univ}}^0 & & & \nearrow & \\ \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X) & & & \nearrow & \\ \downarrow F & & & \nearrow & \\ \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\#(X) & & & \nearrow & \end{array}$$

where  $H_{\text{univ}}^0$  arises from the universal factorization. In particular,  $F \circ H_{\text{univ}}^0 = H^0$  and  $F \circ {}^p H_{\text{univ}}^0 \circ i = \text{id}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)}$ . This implies that  $F$  is essentially surjective. It remains to show that  $F$  is fully faithful. There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)}(F(M), F(N)) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)}(\text{Res}^G(M), \text{Res}^G(N)) \\ \uparrow F & \nearrow & \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)}(M, N) & & \end{array}$$

so we win if we can show that both

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)}(F(M), F(N)) &\longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)}(\text{Res}^G(M), \text{Res}^G(N)) \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)}(M, N) &\longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)}(\text{Res}^G(M), \text{Res}^G(N)) \end{aligned}$$

are bijective. Clearly the first one is bijective. Let us show that the second one is also bijective. The functor  $\text{Res}^G: \mathbf{D}_G^b(X, \mathbb{Q}) \rightarrow \mathbf{D}^b(X, \mathbb{Q})$  is  $t$ -exact by definition with right adjoint  $\text{Av}_{1*}^G$  and hence  $H^0 \circ \text{Av}_{1*}^G$  is a right adjoint of  $\text{Res}_1^G: \text{Perv}_G(X) \rightarrow \text{Perv}(X)$ . The universal property shows that there is a functor  $T: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$  compatible with  $H^0 \circ \text{Av}_{1*}^G$ . Using the "triangle identities" trick as in the proof of proposition 4.9, we see that  $T$  is indeed a right adjoint of  $\text{Res}_1^G: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$ . To show that  $\text{Res}^G: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X)$  is fully faithful, it remains to check that  $\text{id} \rightarrow T \circ \text{Res}_1^G$  is an isomorphism but this is clearly true after applying  $\text{rat}^G$  and the conservativity of  $\text{rat}^G$  ends the proof.  $\square$

**Convention 4.12.** From now on, we write  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$  to indicate the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)$ . This should cause no confusion thanks to the previous theorem.

**4.3. Equivariant perverse Nori motives on (stratified) ind-schemes.** In this subsection, we investigate equivariant perverse Nori motives on stratified ind-varieties. We first study the derived version and recover the heart via the perverse  $t$ -structure.

**Definition 4.13.** Let  $G = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n$  be a pro-algebraic group acting on an stratified ind-variety  $\iota: X^+ = \coprod_{w \in W} X_w \rightarrow X$ . The category of  $G$ -equivariant stratified derived Nori motives  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X, X^+)$  is defined as the pullback

$$\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X, X^+) := \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+) \times_{\mathbf{DN}^b(X)} \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X).$$

Clearly,  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X, X^+)$  is the full subcategory of  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X)$  whose images under the forgetful functor  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  are in  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+)$ .

Let us assume the following situation to ensure that there is a well-behave heart on  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X, X^+)$ .

**Hypothesis 1.** (1) We assume that the index set  $I = \mathbb{N}$  each  $X_i$  is induced by a corresponding  $G_i$ -action (in fact, one can do more general setting but this is what usually happens in practice).  
 (2) Assume that each  $X_w$  is stable under  $G$ -action. By taking suitable closure  $\overline{X}_w$ , each  $X_i$  can be stratified  $X_i^+ = X^+ \times_X X_i = \coprod_{w \in W_i} X_w \rightarrow X_i$  for some finite set  $W_i \subset W$ .

**Proposition 4.14.** Let  $G = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} G_n$  be a pro-algebraic group so that each  $G_m \rightarrow G_n$  is surjective for  $n \leq m$  and  $\text{Ker}(G_m \rightarrow G_n)$  is a smooth, connected, unipotent group. Let  $X = \text{colim}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} X_n$  be an ind-scheme on which  $G$  acts. Assume hypothesis 1 holds true then

$$\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X, X^+) = \text{colim}_{i \in I} \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X_i, X_i^+) = \text{colim}_{i \in I} \lim_{j \geq i} \mathbf{DN}_{G_j}^b(X_i)$$

and carries a  $t$ -structure whose heart is

$$\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X, X^+) = \text{colim}_{i \in I} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X_i, X_i^+) = \text{colim}_{i \in I} \lim_{j \geq i} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{G_j}(X_i, X_i^+),$$

called the category of  $G$ -equivariant stratified Nori motives.

*Proof.* Since each  $\text{Ker}(G_{n+1} \rightarrow G_n)$  is smooth, connected, unipotent, its underlying scheme is isomorphic to some  $\mathbb{A}_k^m$  and hence  $\mathbf{DN}_{G_j}^b(X_i)$  does not depend on  $j \geq i$  thanks to proposition 4.5, thus we can safely denote by  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X_i)$  this category. The pushforwards along the closed immersions

$$\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X_j) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X_i)$$

are then well-defined and thus the category

$$\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) = \text{colim}_{i \in I} \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X_i) = \text{colim}_{i \in I} \lim_{j \geq i} \mathbf{DN}_{G_j}^b(X_i)$$

is well-defined as well. Taking fiber product on both side gives us the desired equality. Regard the  $t$ -structure, the pushforwards  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X_j) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X_i)$  are  $t$ -exact and fully faithful so the hypotheses of [RS20, Lemma 3.2.18] is fulfilled and the heart is computed in the expected way.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.15.** *With the hypotheses of proposition 4.14, there exists a  $t$ -exact forgetful functor*

$$\text{Res}^G : \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X, X^+).$$

*In particular,*

$$(\text{Res}^G)^{-1}(\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+)) = \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X, X^+)$$

*and if each  $G_n$  is connected, then*

$$\text{Res}^G : \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+)$$

*is fully faithful.*

*Proof.* For each  $i \in I$ , we have a family of compatible,  $t$ -exact forgetful functors  $\text{For}^{G_n} : \mathbf{DN}_{G_n}^b(X_i) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X_i)$  for  $n \geq n_i$  with  $(\text{For}^{G_n})^{-1}(\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X_i)) = \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{G_n}(X_i)$ . Then we can take colimit to obtain the desired  $\text{For}^G : \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$ . The last assertion follows from the fact that colimit of fully faithful functors remains fully faithful.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.16.** *With the hypotheses of proposition 4.14, there exists a realization functor*

$$\text{rat}_{(X, X^+)} : \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_{G^{\text{an}}}^b(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$$

*where the right hand side is defined in [BL94][BR18]. This functor restricts to a functor*

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X, X^+) \longrightarrow \text{Perv}_{G^{\text{an}}}(X^{\text{an}}, X^{+, \text{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$$

*which is compatible with forgetful functors on both sides.*

*Proof.* This is simply functoriality since both sides are defined in the same way.  $\square$

Let  $L \in \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_G(X_w)$  be an equivariant motivic local system (see definition 7.3), we have an associate equivariant intersection motive  $\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(L)$  defined similarly as in the non-equivariant setting (see also [BL94, Section 5.2]).

**Proposition 4.17.** *Let  $j : U \rightarrow X$  be a  $G$ -equivariant locally closed immersion of ind-varieties. If  $M$  is a simple object in  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(U)$ , then  $j_{!*}(M)$  is a simple object in  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X, X^+)$ . Under hypothesis 1, any simple object in  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X, X^+)$  is of the form  $\mathbf{IC}_w(L)$  with  $L$  being a simple object in  $\mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_G(X_w)$ . Consequently, if  $X_w^{\text{an}}$ 's are simply connected, then the inclusion  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X, X^+) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X, X^+)$  induces a bijection on simple objects.*

*Proof.* The proof is formally the same as in theorem 3.29. If  $X_w^{\text{an}}$ 's are simply connected, then  $\mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_G(X_w) = \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}(X_w)$  since it is the case that  $\text{Loc}_G(X_w) = \text{Loc}(X_w) = 1$  and hence a desired bijection because equivariant intersection motives are mapped to non-equivariant intersection motives.  $\square$

## 5. (DERIVED) SATAKE CATEGORY OF AFFINE GRASSMANNIANS

**5.1. Recollections on Affine Grassmannians.** Let  $G$  be a connected reductive group over  $k$ . The *affine Grassmannian*  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  is the étale sheafification associated with the presheaf

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{LG}/\mathrm{L}^+G: \mathrm{Alg}_k &\longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets} \\ R &\longmapsto G(R((t)))/G(R[[t]]). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{LG}: \mathrm{Alg}_k &\longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets} & R &\longmapsto G(R((t))) \\ \mathrm{L}^+G: \mathrm{Alg}_k &\longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets} & R &\longmapsto G(R[[t]]) \end{aligned}$$

called the *loop functor*, *arc functor*, respectively. For  $i \geq 0$  and a functor  $X: \mathrm{Alg}_{k[t]/(t^{i+1})} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$ , the functor

$$\mathrm{L}_i^+G: \mathrm{Alg}_k \longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets} \quad R \longmapsto G(R[t]/(t^{i+1})).$$

is called *i-th jet functor*. We know that  $\mathrm{L}_i^+G$  and  $\mathrm{L}^+G \simeq \mathrm{colim}_i \mathrm{L}_i^+G$  are schemes and the kernel of each  $\mathrm{L}_{i+1}^+G \longrightarrow \mathrm{L}_i^+G$  is a vector group. Moreover,  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  is an-ind scheme on which  $\mathrm{L}^+G$  acts. Let us choose  $T \leq B \leq G$ , a maximal torus  $T$  contained in a Borel subgroup  $B$ . Let  $B^+$  denote the opposite Borel with respect to  $T$ . We denote by  $X^*(T), X_*(T)$  the characters and cocharacters, respectively. Let  $R \subset X^*(T), R^\vee \subset X_*(T)$  be the root and coroot systems of  $(G, T)$ , respectively. Let  $R_+ \subset R \subset X^*(T), R_+^\vee \subset R^\vee \subset X_*(T)$  be positive roots and positive coroots with respect to the choice of Borel  $B$ , respectively. Let  $W(G, T) = N_G(T)/T$  be the Weyl group and  $\pi_1(G) = X_*(T)/\mathbb{Z}R^\vee$  be the fundamental group. Materials below can be found in [Zhu16] (and references therein). The Cartan decomposition (namely, the stratification into  $\mathrm{L}^+G$ -orbits) implies that

$$(\mathrm{Gr}_G)_{\mathrm{red}} = \coprod_{\lambda \in X_*(T)^+} \mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda$$

where each  $\mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda$  is a smooth, quasi-projective variety of dimension  $\langle 2\rho, \lambda \rangle$ , called *Schubert cells*. Schubert cells are affine bundles over partial flag varieties so in particular they are simply connected in the analytic topology. One also knows that

$$\overline{\mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda} = \coprod_{\mu \in X_*(T)^+, \mu \leq \lambda} \mathrm{Gr}_G^\mu.$$

The connected components of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$  are parametrized by  $X_*(T)/\mathbb{Z}R^\vee$ . Given  $c \in X_*(T)/\mathbb{Z}R^\vee$ , the associated component is given by

$$\mathrm{Gr}_G^c = \coprod_{\lambda \in X_*(T)^+ + \lambda - c \in \mathbb{Z}R^\vee} \mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda.$$

Since  $\langle \rho, \lambda \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$  for any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}R^\vee$ , the parity of  $\mathrm{L}^+G$ -orbits is constant on each component of  $\mathrm{Gr}_G$ . A component is called *even* or *odd* if the corresponding dimension is even or odd.

**5.2. Semisimplicity of pure objects.** Thanks to the tools that we develop in preceding sections, we have at hands a category of stratified Nori motives  $\mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, \mathrm{L}^+G)$  and its equivariant counterpart  $\mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{L}^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, \mathrm{L}^+G)$ . Moreover, there are faithful, exact realization functors

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{L}^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, \mathrm{L}^+G) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{L}^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) & \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{L}^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, \mathrm{L}^+G) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Perv}_{\mathrm{L}^+G, \ell}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \\ \mathrm{For}^{\mathrm{L}^+G} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathrm{For}^{\mathrm{L}^+G} & \mathrm{For}^{\mathrm{L}^+G} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathrm{For}^{\mathrm{L}^+G} \\ \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, \mathrm{L}^+G) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) & \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, \mathrm{L}^+G) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Perv}_\ell(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \end{array}$$

Now we would like to study this category more deeply. For each  $\lambda \in X_*(T)^+$ , let  $j_\lambda: \text{Gr}_G^\lambda \longrightarrow \overline{\text{Gr}}_G^\lambda$ ,  $i_\lambda: \overline{\text{Gr}}_G^\lambda \hookrightarrow \text{Gr}_G$  be the associated immersions. We recall the definition of the *Nori's intersection motive*

$$\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M) := (i_\lambda)_*(j_\lambda)_!(M[\langle 2\rho, \lambda \rangle]) \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$$

where  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\lambda)$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we define  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$  to be the full subcategory whose objects are  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \cap \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$  and we define  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, \text{pure}) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *The forgetful functor*

$$\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$$

*is fully faithful and induces a bijection on simple objects.*

*Proof.* This is an immediate consequence of proposition 4.17 since each Schubert cell is an affine bundle over the partial flag variety, hence simply connected in the analytic topology.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.2** (Kazhdan-Lusztig parity vanishing). *For  $\lambda \in X_*(T)^+$*

$$\text{ctH}^n(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(L)) \neq 0 \quad \forall \quad n \not\equiv \langle 2\rho, \lambda \rangle \pmod{2}$$

*where  $L \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\lambda)$  is a motivic local system.*

*Proof.* We note that  $\text{rat}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(L)) = \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(\text{rat}(L))$  and  $\text{rat}(L) \in \text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\lambda) = \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}$  since  $\text{Gr}_G^\lambda$  is simply connected. Thus  $\text{rat}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(L)) = \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(\mathbb{Q})^{\oplus m}$  for some  $m$ . At this step we are beneficial from the corresponding statements in [Gai01][Hai04] (see also, for instance, [BR18]). The result then follows from the compatibility  $\text{rat}_{\text{Gr}_G} \circ \text{ctH}^n = \text{ctH}^n \circ \text{rat}_{\text{Gr}_G}$  (see lemma 3.2) and the conservativity of  $\text{rat}_{\text{Gr}_G}$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu \in X_*(T)^+$  and  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\lambda), N \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)$  be motivic local systems, then*

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{DN}^b(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), \mathbf{IC}_\mu(N)[+1]) = \begin{cases} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{DN}^b(\text{Gr}_G^\lambda)}(M, N[+1]) & \lambda = \mu \\ 0 & \lambda \neq \mu \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We follow the argument in [BR18, Proof of Proposition 4.4][RS21, Corollary 5.5] (see also [Gai01]).

(1) **First case**  $\lambda = \mu$ . If  $\lambda = \mu$ , let us consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Gr}_G^\lambda & \xrightarrow{j} & \overline{\text{Gr}}_G^\lambda & \xleftarrow{i} & \overline{\text{Gr}}_G^\lambda \setminus \text{Gr}_G^\lambda \\ & \searrow j_\lambda & \downarrow i_\lambda & \swarrow & \\ & & \text{Gr}_G & & \end{array}$$

There is a localization sequence

$$i_{\lambda!}j_!j^*i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M) \longrightarrow i_{\lambda!}i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M) \longrightarrow i_{\lambda!}i_*i^*i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M) \longrightarrow +1$$

resulting in long exact sequences (by applying  $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{DN}^b(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)}((-), \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1])$ )

$$\dots \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(j_!j^*i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(i_*i^*i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) \longrightarrow \dots$$

In this sequence, let us claim that

$$\begin{cases} \text{Hom}(j_!j^*i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) &= \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{DN}^b(\text{Gr}_G^\lambda)}(M, N[+1]) & (1) \\ \text{Hom}(i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) &= \text{Hom}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) & (2) \\ \text{Hom}(i_*i^*i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) &= 0 & (3) \\ \text{Hom}(i_*i^*i_\lambda^*\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), i_\lambda^!\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+2]) &= 0 & (4) \end{cases}$$



Indeed, (1), (2) are trivial by adjunctions and recollements. Let us prove (3), (4). or  $\nu < \lambda$ , we denote by  $j_\nu: \mathrm{Gr}_G^\nu \hookrightarrow \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_G^\lambda \setminus \mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda = \coprod_{\nu < \lambda} \mathrm{Gr}_G^\nu$  the obvious inclusion, we have

$$i_\lambda^! i_\lambda^! (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M)) = \bigoplus_{\nu < \lambda} j_\nu^! i_\lambda^! (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M)) \quad \text{and} \quad i_\lambda^* i_\lambda^* (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)) = \bigoplus_{\nu < \lambda} j_\nu^* i_\lambda^* (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N))$$

For (3), we have

$$\mathrm{Hom}((i_\lambda i)^* \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), (i_\lambda i)^! \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N)[+1]) = \bigoplus_{\nu < \lambda} \mathrm{Hom}(j_\nu^* i_\lambda^* (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M)), j_\nu^! i_\lambda^! (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N))[+1]).$$

By proposition 3.28,  $j_\nu^* i_\lambda^* (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M))$  lives in perverse degree  $\leq -\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle - 1$  and  $j_\nu^! i_\lambda^! (\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(N))[+1]$  lives in perverse degree  $\geq -\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle$  so the hom group must be zero. For (4), we have the same argument but now the degree increases by one so let us show that  ${}^p\mathrm{H}^{-\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle - 1}((j_\nu i_\lambda)^* \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M)) = 0$ . Since  $\mathrm{Gr}_G^\nu$  is smooth of dimension  $\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle$  one has that

$$\begin{aligned} {}^p\mathrm{H}^{-\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle - 1}((j_\nu i_\lambda)^* \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M)) &= {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^{-\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle - 1}((j_\nu i_\lambda)^* \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M))[\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle] \\ &= (j_\nu i_\lambda)^* {}^{\mathrm{ct}}\mathrm{H}^{-\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle - 1}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M))[\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle] \end{aligned}$$

By Kazhdan-Lusztig parity vanishing 5.2 and the fact that  $\langle 2\rho, \nu \rangle \equiv \langle 2\rho, \lambda \rangle \pmod{2}$ , this motive vanishes and hence we win this case.

- (2) **Second case neither  $\lambda \leq \mu$  nor  $\mu \leq \lambda$ .** The proof is identical to the second case of [BR18, Proof of proposition 4.4], in which there is no need to use Kazhdan-Lusztig parity vanishing.
- (3) **Third case:  $\lambda \neq \mu$  and  $\lambda \leq \mu$  or  $\mu \leq \lambda$ .** Since Verdier duality is an anti-autoequivalence mapping  $\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M)$  to  $\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M^\vee)(\langle 2\rho, \lambda \rangle)$  and  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(N)$  to  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(N^\vee)(\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle)$  (see lemma 3.27), we can, without loss of generality, assume that  $\mu \leq \lambda$ , i.e.,  $\mathrm{Gr}_G^\mu \subset \overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_G^\lambda$ . Let us consider a triangle

$$\mathbf{IC}_\mu(N) \longrightarrow (i_\lambda j_\mu)_* (i_\lambda j_\mu)^* \mathbf{IC}_\mu(N) \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow +1.$$

Note that  $(i_\lambda j_\mu)_* (i_\lambda j_\mu)^* \mathbf{IC}_\mu(N) \simeq (i_\lambda j_\mu)_* (N[\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle])$  and hence the triangle induces a short exact sequence

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), P) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), \mathbf{IC}_\mu(N)[+1]) \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), (i_\lambda j_\mu)_* (N[\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle + 1])).$$

The first group is zero without using Kazhdan-Lusztig parity vanishing. The third group

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), (i_\lambda j_\mu)_* (N[\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle + 1])) = \mathrm{Hom}((i_\lambda j_\mu)^* \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M), N[\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle + 1]))$$

is also zero because in general  $(i_\lambda j_\mu)^* \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(M)$  lives in constructible degree  $\leq -\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle - 1$  but by Kazhdan-Lusztig parity vanishing 5.2 and the fact that  $\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle \equiv \langle 2\rho, \lambda \rangle \pmod{2}$ , it actually lives in constructible degrees  $\leq -\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle - 2$ .

□

We note that in a Noetherian and Artinian category, any object is a direct sum of indecomposable objects. Moreover, if the category itself is semisimple, then being indecomposable is equivalent to being simple.

**Corollary 5.4.** *Let  $M \in \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ , then there exist  $\mu_i \in X_*(T)^+$  and indecomposable motives  $L_i \in \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^{\mu_i})$  with  $i = \overline{1}, \overline{n}$  such that  $M \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{IC}_{\mu_i}(L_i)$ . An object  $\mathbf{IC}_\lambda(L) \in \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  is simple if and only if  $L \in \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda)$  is simple.*

*Proof.* By the discussion above, any object  $M$  is decomposed into indecomposable objects so we may assume that  $M$  itself is indecomposable. We proceed by induction on the length  $l(M)$  of  $M$ . If  $l(M) = 1$ , then  $M$  is simple and hence  $M = \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(L)$  for some  $\lambda \in X_*(T)^+$  and  $L \in \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda, n)$  by theorem 3.29. It is clear that  $L$  must be indecomposable as  $M$  is, but  $\mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda, n)$  is semisimple by 2.5[IM19, Theorem 6.24], being indecomposable is equivalent to being simple. Thus,  $M$  is of the desired form. If  $l(M) \geq 2$ ,

let  $M' \subset M$  be a subobject with  $l(M') = 1$  and hence simple, by induction  $M/M' = \bigoplus_{i=2}^n \mathbf{IC}_{\mu_i}(L_i)$  and  $M' = \mathbf{IC}_{\mu_1}(L_1)$  with  $L_1$  simple and  $L_2, \dots, L_n$  indecomposable. Since  $M'$  is simple, the group

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{DN}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)}(\mathbf{IC}_{\mu_1}(L_1), \bigoplus_{i=2}^n \mathbf{IC}_{\mu_i}(L_i)[+1]) = \bigoplus_{i=2}^n \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)}^1(\mathbf{IC}_{\mu_1}(L_1), \mathbf{IC}_{\mu_i}(L_i))$$

must vanish by virtues of proposition 5.3 and hence  $M$  is of the desired form.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.5.** *The categories  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$  (with  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) and  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, \text{pure})$  are semisimple.*

*Proof.* By lemma above, each object  $M \in \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$  is of the form  $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{IC}_{\mu_i}(L_i)$  with  $L_i \in \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^{\mu_i}, n)$  being indecomposable. Since each  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^{\mu_i}, n) \subset \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^{\mu_i}, n)$  is a Serre subcategory and the latter one is semisimple by [IM19, Theorem 6.24], the objects  $L_i$  are necessarily simple in  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^{\mu_i}, n)$ . Each object  $\mathbf{IC}_{\mu_i}(L_i)$  must be simple as well, hence  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$  is semisimple. In particular,  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, \text{pure}) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$  is semisimple as well.  $\square$

**Theorem 5.6.** *The forgetful functor*

$$\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, n) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G, n)$$

*is an equivalence of categories for  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$  or  $n = \text{pure}$ .*

*Proof.* By proposition 4.15, this functor is fully faithful. As a consequence, both sides are semisimple by corollary 5.5 and hence this is an equivalence of semisimple categories.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.7.** *The forgetful functor*

$$\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$$

*is an equivalence of categories.*

*Proof.* This is an obvious consequence of the theorem above since both sides admit weight filtration.  $\square$

**5.3. Convolution product of affine Grassmannians.** To define convolution product on  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ , we first work at the derived level, namely,  $\mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  (the same construction should hold for  $\mathbf{D}_{L^+G^{\text{an}}}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G^{\text{an}}, L^+G^{\text{an}})$ ). At first, we construct a convolution product on the whole category  $\mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$  and then show that it preserves stratified motives. We consider morphisms

$$\mathrm{Gr}_G \times \mathrm{Gr}_G \xleftarrow{p} \mathrm{LG} \times \mathrm{Gr}_G \xrightarrow{q} \mathrm{LG} \times^{L^+G} \mathrm{Gr}_G \xrightarrow{m} \mathrm{Gr}_G$$

where

- (1) The  $L^+G$ -action on  $\mathrm{LG} \times \mathrm{Gr}_G$  is given by  $g \cdot (h, [k]) = (hg^{-1}, [gk])$ .
- (2) The  $L^+G$ -action on  $\mathrm{LG} \times^{L^+G} \mathrm{Gr}_G$  is given by  $g \cdot [h, k] = [hg^{-1}, gk]$  and the stratification is given by  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_G^{\lambda, \mu} = q(p^{-1}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\lambda \times \mathrm{Gr}_G^\mu))$ .

and  $q(g, [h]) = [g, h]$ ,  $m([g, h]) = [gh]$ ,  $p$  is the projection. These morphisms are equivariant and preserve stratifications into orbits. Let  $M, N$  be two motives in  $\mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ , the functor

$$q^*: \mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{LG} \times^{L^+G} \mathrm{Gr}_G) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{DN}_{L^+G \times L^+G}^b(\mathrm{LG} \times \mathrm{Gr}_G)$$

is an equivalence of categories by means of theorem 4.3, in which the  $L^+G \times L^+G$ -action on  $\mathrm{LG} \times \mathrm{Gr}_G$  is given by  $(g_1, g_2) \cdot (g, [h]) = (g_1g, [g_2h])$ . The motives  $p^*(M \otimes N)$  is in  $\mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{LG} \times \mathrm{Gr}_G)$  and hence descends to a motive  $M \boxtimes N$  in  $\mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{LG} \times^{L^+G} \mathrm{Gr}_G)$  by the formula

$$q^*(M \boxtimes N) \simeq p^*(M \otimes N).$$

We define the convolution product by the formula

$$M \star N := m_*(M \boxtimes N) \in \mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G).$$

The formation of the convolution is universal and hence applicable to other theories. In particular, there are isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Betti}^*(M \widetilde{\boxtimes} N) \simeq \mathrm{Betti}^*(M) \widetilde{\boxtimes} \mathrm{Betti}^*(N) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{R}_\ell^{\mathrm{et}}(M \widetilde{\boxtimes} N) \simeq \mathfrak{R}_\ell^{\mathrm{et}}(M) \widetilde{\boxtimes} \mathfrak{R}_\ell^{\mathrm{et}}(N)$$

$$\mathrm{Betti}^*(M \star N) \simeq \mathrm{Betti}^*(M) \star \mathrm{Betti}^*(N) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{R}_\ell^{\mathrm{et}}(M \star N) \simeq \mathfrak{R}_\ell^{\mathrm{et}}(M) \star \mathfrak{R}_\ell^{\mathrm{et}}(N)$$

(see also [RS21, Proposition 3.1.4]). Properties of usual convolution products (analytic or  $\ell$ -adic) are directly translated to Nori motives.

**Proposition 5.8.** *The convolution product on  $\mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$  restricts to convolution products*

$$(-) \star (-): \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \times \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$$

$$(-) \star (-): \mathbf{DT}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \times \mathbf{DT}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DT}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$$

$$(-) \star (-): \mathbf{DA}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \times \mathbf{DT}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DT}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$$

*Proof.* The Tate part is trivial because all relevant operations preserve Tate motives. It remains to treat the case  $\mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ . By definition, we have to show that if  $A, B \in \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  then the underlying non-equivariant motive of  $A \star B$  is in  $\mathbf{DN}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ . By virtues of the cohomological interpretation in proposition 3.17, we need to show that

$${}^p\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_\mu^*(m_*(A \widetilde{\boxtimes} B))) \in \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\mu)[- \dim(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\mu)].$$

This is easy since one can apply  $\mathrm{Betti}^*$  and reduce to

$${}^p\mathrm{H}^n(\iota_\mu^* m_*(\mathrm{Betti}^*(A) \widetilde{\boxtimes} \mathrm{Betti}^*(B))) \in \mathrm{Loc}(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\mu)[- \dim(\mathrm{Gr}_G^\mu)].$$

By definition, the motive  $\mathrm{Betti}^*(A) \widetilde{\boxtimes} \mathrm{Betti}^*(B)$  is in  $\mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(LG \times^{L^+G} \mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  with the stratifications by  $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_G^{\lambda, \mu}$  and hence the result follows from the fact that  $m$  is stratified semismall, locally trivial.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.9.** *The convolution product is associative, namely, there is a natural isomorphism*

$$(M_1 \star M_2) \star M_3 \simeq M_1 \star (M_2 \star M_3)$$

with  $M_1, M_2, M_3 \in \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$  and moreover if  $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}_{L+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$  then

$${}^p\mathrm{H}^n(M_1 \star M_2) = 0 \quad \forall n > 0.$$

In particular,  $M_1 \star^0 M_2 = {}^p\mathrm{H}^0(M_1 \star M_2)$  defines a product on  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}_{L+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}\mathrm{Perv}\mathrm{Artin}_{L+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$

*Proof.* Regard the associativity, one can argue as in [RS21, Lemma 3.7] or alternative one checks the associativity under the Betti (resp.  $\ell$ -adic) realization and uses the established result in the analytic setting (resp.  $\ell$ -adic). Concern the vanishing of cohomology, one uses the fact that Betti realization is conservative and commutes with cohomology (since it is exact), the vanishing is then translated to [BR18, Proposition 6.1] where one can investigate the vanishing of pushforwards of proper, semismall, locally trivial maps of analytic varieties.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.10.** *The convolution product*

$$(-) \star (-): \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \times \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$$

is weight-exact, i.e., if  $A, B \in \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)^{w \leq 0}$ , then  $A \star B \in \mathbf{DN}_{L+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)^{w \leq 0}$  and likewise for  $w \geq 0$ .

*Proof.* The box product  $(-) \boxtimes (-)$  is weight-exact on schemes. The morphism  $p: LG \times \mathrm{Gr}_G \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_G \times \mathrm{Gr}_G$  is smooth and hence weight exact and  $q^*$  is a smooth equivalence, hence respects as well. Thus  $(-) \widetilde{\boxtimes} (-)$  has the same weight as  $(-) \boxtimes (-)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 5.11.** *The composition*

$$\mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \mathbf{DN}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G) \xrightarrow{\epsilon!} \mathbf{DN}^b(k)$$

is a monoidal functor when  $\mathbf{DN}_{L^+G}^b(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  is endowed with the convolution product and  $\mathbf{DN}^b(k)$  is endowed with the tensor product.

*Proof.* The proof is similar to [RS21, Proposition 5.13] (see also [Zhu16, Lemma 5.2.3][Zhu17, Lemma 2.18]). Indeed, this is [RS21, Proposition 5.13] by choosing  $\mathbf{f} = 0$  to be the trivial facet and replacing Tate motives by Nori motives.  $\square$

**5.4. Fusion and commutativity of convolution product.** We would like to show that the convolution product is commutative. Suppose we are given a natural morphism  $M_1 \star M_2 \longrightarrow M_2 \star M_1$  so that under the Betti realization, this becomes the natural commutativity constraint of the complex convolution product then we win thanks to the conservativity. As in the analytic and  $\ell$ -cases, this is possible. Let us recall the definition of the Beilinson–Drinfeld Grassmannian. Let  $X = \mathbb{A}_k^1$ , we define the following Grassmannians via their moduli interpretations

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{G,X} : \mathrm{Alg}_k \longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$$

$$R \longmapsto \left\{ (\mathcal{F}, \nu, x) \left| \begin{array}{l} x \in X(R) \\ \mathcal{F} : G\text{-bundle on } X_R \\ \nu : \mathcal{F}_{|X_R \setminus x} \simeq G \times (X_R \setminus x) \end{array} \right. \right\} / \mathrm{iso}$$

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{G,X^2} : \mathrm{Alg}_k \longrightarrow \mathbf{Sets}$$

$$R \longmapsto \left\{ (\mathcal{F}, \nu, x_1, x_2) \left| \begin{array}{l} x_1, x_2 \in X(R) \\ \mathcal{F} : G\text{-bundle on } X_R \\ \nu : \mathcal{F}_{|X_R \setminus (x_1 \cup x_2)} \simeq G \times (X_R \setminus (x_1 \cup x_2)) \end{array} \right. \right\} / \mathrm{iso}$$

(for more details and other moduli interpretations, one can consult [BR18, Section 7.4, Chapter I]). There is a canonical projection  $\mathrm{Gr}_{G,X^2} \longrightarrow X^2$  and a diagonal morphism  $\Delta : X \longrightarrow X^2$ . Now it is clear from the moduli interpretations that

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{G,X^2} \times_{X^2} \Delta(X) \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_{G,X}$$

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{G,X^2} \times_{X^2} (X^2 \setminus \Delta(X)) \simeq (\mathrm{Gr}_{G,X} \times \mathrm{Gr}_{G,X} \times_{X^2} (X^2 \setminus \Delta(X))).$$

Let us denote by  $i : \mathrm{Gr}_{G,X} \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_{G,X^2}$  and  $\tau : \mathrm{Gr}_{G,X} = \mathrm{Gr}_G \times X \longrightarrow \mathrm{Gr}_X$  the corresponding embedding and projection, respectively.

**Proposition 5.12.** *There is a canonical isomorphism*

$$M_1 \star M_2 \simeq M_2 \star M_1$$

for  $M_1, M_2 \in \mathcal{M} \mathrm{Perv}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ .

*Proof.* First we see that, there are canonical isomorphisms

$$i^*[-1](\tau^\circ(M_1) \star \tau^\circ(M_2)) \simeq \tau^\circ(M_1 \star M_2) \simeq i^! [1](\tau^\circ(M_1) \star \tau^\circ(M_2)).$$

The morphisms among three terms are constructed canonically, so they are compatible with realizations and hence we can use [BR18, Lemma 7.8] and the conservativity of the Betti realization. Alternatively, one can copy the argument in *loc.cit.*. Second, we claim that

$$j_{!*}((\tau^\circ(M_1) \boxtimes \tau^\circ(M_2))|_U) \simeq \tau^\circ(M_1) \star \tau^\circ(M_2)$$

with  $U = X^2 \setminus \Delta(X)$ . Indeed, this is similar to [BR18, Lemma 7.10, Chapter I] or otherwise one can use the conservativity of the Betti realization again. Finally, to deduce the commutativity constraint, one repeats [BR18, Section 7.6, Chapter I].  $\square$

**5.5. The unit object.** In this section, we will see how the intersection motives decompose and prove that  $\mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1})$  is the unit of the convolution product.

**Proposition 5.13.** *Let  $L \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)$ ,  $\mu \in X_*(T)^+$ , there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$\mathbf{IC}_0(L) \star \mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_\mu(L)$$

*Moreover, let  $L' \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)$ , then there is a canonical isomorphism*

$$\mathbf{IC}_0(L) \star \mathbf{IC}_\mu(L') \simeq \mathbf{IC}_\mu(L \otimes L')$$

*In particular,  $\mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1})$  is the unit object of the convolution product.*

*Proof.* The proof is as same as the proof of [RS21, Lemma 5.4]. However, one can also argue as follows. First, one can find a canonical morphism  $\mathbf{IC}_0(L) \star \mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}) \rightarrow \mathbf{IC}_\mu(L)$ , then there is another way to prove this. Then one proves that  $\mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1}) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1})$ . If  $L$  is simple (the semisimple case then follows), one can apply the realization (note that  $\text{rat}(L) = \mathbb{Q}[\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle]$ ). In general, we use the fact that  $L$  admits a weigh filtration whose graded pieces are pure motives. Now we see that for a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow L' \rightarrow L \rightarrow L'' \rightarrow 0$$

the statement  $\mathbf{IC}_0(L) \star \mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_\mu(L)$  is equivalent to the same statement for  $L', L''$  (here we used the case  $\mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1}) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1})$ ). Thus, we can finish by an induction on the length of the filtration and the case of simple (motivic) local systems.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.14.** *Let  $\mu, \lambda \in X_*(T)$ , then there is a decomposition*

$$\mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbf{IC}_{\mu+\lambda}(\mathbb{1}(\langle 2\rho, \mu + \lambda \rangle)) \oplus \bigoplus_{\nu < \mu + \lambda} \mathbf{IC}_\nu(\mathbb{1}(\langle 2\rho, \mu + \lambda \rangle))^{\oplus n_\nu}$$

*for integers  $n_\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ . In particular, if  $\text{Gr}_G^\mu, \text{Gr}_G^\lambda$  are singletons, then*

$$\mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbf{IC}_{\mu+\lambda}(\mathbb{1})$$

*Proof.* Note that by general theory (see corollary 5.4), there exist indecomposable motives  $L_i$  such that  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(\mathbb{1}) = \bigoplus_{\nu \in X_*(T)^+} \mathbf{IC}_\nu(L_i)^{\oplus n_\nu}$  (a finite sum). Under the Betti realization, only those  $\nu \leq \mu + \lambda$  survive and  $n_{\mu+\lambda} = 1$ . Let us show that all  $L_\nu$  are of the form  $\mathbb{1}(m_\nu)$  for some  $m_\nu$ . The motives  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}), \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(\mathbb{1})$  are pure of weights  $\langle 2\rho, \mu \rangle, \langle 2\rho, \lambda \rangle$ , respectively. Consequently, by proposition 5.9,  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1})$  is pure of weight  $\langle 2\rho, \mu + \lambda \rangle$  and is a Tate motive. Hence  $\mathbf{IC}_\nu(L_\nu)$  is also pure and it is supported on  $\text{Gr}_G^{\leq \nu}$ . Consequently,  $L_\nu$  itself is also a Tate motive pure of weight  $\langle 2\rho, \mu + \lambda \rangle$ , hence is of the form  $\mathbb{1}(\langle 2\rho, \mu + \lambda \rangle)$ .  $\square$

**5.6. The Tannakian structure (the fiber functor).** Note that by the work of Nori, the category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(k)$  is endowed with a neutral Tannakian structure whose dual group is the motivic Galois group. Let us briefly review the construction (for details see [HMS17]). The category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(k)$  can be identified with the category  $\mathbf{HM}(k)$  (see [IM19, Proposition 2.11]; see also [Ivo17]) built from the quiver  $\text{Pair}_k$  whose objects are triplets  $(X, Y, n)$  with  $X$  a  $k$ -variety,  $Y \subset X$  a closed subvariety and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . After a technical modification, the natural tensor product

$$(X, Y, n) \otimes (X', Y', n') = (X \times X', Y \times Y' \cup X \times Y', n + n')$$

becomes a genuine product. The category  $\mathbf{HM}(k)$  is a neutral Tannakian category whose fiber functor is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_{\text{Nori}}^* : \mathbf{HM}(k) &\longrightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}} \\ (X, Y, n) &\longmapsto H^n(X(\mathbb{C}), Y(\mathbb{C}), \mathbb{Q}). \end{aligned}$$

In this section, we show that the  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  is a neutral Tannakian category.

**Definition 5.15.** Let  $G$  be a connected reductive group over  $k$ , we define the *motivic fiber functor* to be the composition

$$\omega^{\text{mot}}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \xrightarrow{\text{forgetful}} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \xrightarrow{\epsilon!} \mathbf{DN}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(k)) \xrightarrow{\text{Gr}^{\text{ct}}} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(k) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{H}_{\text{Nori}}^*} \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

where

$$\text{Gr}^{\text{ct}}(M) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} {}^{\text{ct}}\text{H}^i(M)$$

is the total constructible cohomology functor (viewed as a complex with trivial differentials).

**Lemma 5.16.** *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) & \xrightarrow{\omega^{\text{mot}}} & \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}} \\ \downarrow \text{rat} & \nearrow \omega^{\text{Betti}} & \\ \text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, \mathbb{Q}) & & \end{array}$$

where  $\omega^{\text{Betti}}$  is the ordinary fiber functor of the Satake equivalence in [MV07].

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $\omega^{\text{Betti}}$  can be expressed as the following composition

$$\omega^{\text{Betti}}: \text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \xrightarrow{\text{forgetful}} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \xrightarrow{\epsilon!} \mathbf{D}^b(\mathbb{Q}) \xrightarrow{\text{Gr}^{\text{ct}}} \text{Perv}(k) = \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}.$$

but this is obvious since the ordinary fiber functor is simply  $\omega^{\text{Betti}}(M) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} {}^{\text{ct}}\text{H}^n(\text{Gr}_G, M)$  (here we use hypercohomology).  $\square$

**Theorem 5.17.** *The category  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  endowed with the fiber functor*

$$\omega^{\text{mot}}: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}$$

*is a neutral Tannakian category over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .*

*Proof.* We divide the proof into several steps, following the definition of a neutral Tannakian category.

- (1) (Monoidal Structure) By lemma 5.16, this is obvious since  $\text{rat}$  and  $\omega^{\text{Betti}}$  are monoidal.
- (2) ( $\mathbb{Q}$ -linearity, exactness, faithfulness) These all follow from lemma 5.16.
- (3) (Commutativity Constraints) This is the content of proposition 5.12.
- (4) (Neutral Object) By proposition 5.13, we know that

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G)}(\mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1}), \mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1})) \simeq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(k)}(\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}) \neq 0$$

and this group is embedded in  $\text{Hom}_{\text{Perv}(k)}(\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}) = \mathbb{Q}$  and hence must equal  $\mathbb{Q}$  as well.

- (5) (Dual Objects) Let  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_{L^+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  be a motive such that  $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(\omega(M)) = 1$ , we claim that  $M$  admits a strong dual. By the faithfulness,  $M$  must be indecomposable and hence of the form  $\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(L) = \mathbf{IC}_0(L) \star \mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1})$  with  $\mu \in X_*(T)^+$  and  $L \in \mathcal{M}\text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^{\mu})$  an indecomposable motivic local system. We note that by proposition 5.13 and monoidality

$$\omega^{\text{mot}}(\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(L)) = \omega^{\text{mot}}(\mathbf{IC}_0(L)) \otimes \omega^{\text{mot}}(\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1})) = \omega^{\text{Betti}}(\mathbf{IC}_0(\text{rat}(L))) \otimes \omega^{\text{Betti}}(\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1})).$$

Note that  $L$  is strongly dualisable, so if  $L^{\vee}$  is its strong dual, then  $\mathbf{IC}_0(L) \star \mathbf{IC}_0(L^{\vee}) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_0(L \otimes L^{\vee}) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1})$  thanks to proposition 5.13. Moreover,  $\dim \omega^{\text{mot}}(\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1})) = \dim \omega^{\text{Betti}}(\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{Q})) = 1$  so according to [BR18, Proposition 5.13],  $\mu$  is orthogonally to all roots in  $X_*(T)$  and  $\text{Gr}_G^{\mu}$  is a singleton so that  $\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_{-\mu}(\mathbb{1}) = \mathbf{IC}_0(\mathbb{1})$  thanks to lemma 5.14.  $\square$



**Corollary 5.18.** *For each  $\mu \in X_*(T)^+$ , suppose that we are give choose a subcategory  $\mathcal{M} \text{Loc}'(\text{Gr}_G^\mu) \subset \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)$  that contains  $\mathbb{1}$  and is closed under tensor product, dual. Let  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}'_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \subset \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  be the full subcategory generated by intersection motives of the form  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(L')$  with  $L' \in \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}'(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)$ , then the fiber functor*

$$\omega^{\text{mot}}: \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}$$

*restricts to a fiber functor*

$$\omega^{\text{mot}}: \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}'_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G) \longrightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}$$

*In particular, one can restrict the fiber functor to stratified Artin or Tate motives.*

*Proof.* One can copy the proof of theorem 5.17. □

## 6. THE DUAL GROUPS

In the previous section, we know that  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  is a neutral Tannakian category. In this section, we identity its dual group. Furthermore, we also study its dual groups when restricting to suitable subcategories of motives.

**6.1. The Satake categories.** First we would like to understand the Satake category. We have the following definition.

**Definition 6.1.** (1) The *Satake category*  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}$  is full subcategory of  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  whose objects are direct sums of intersection motives of the form  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbb{1}(n))$  with  $\mu \in X_*(T)^+$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .  
 (2) The *pure motivic Satake category*  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}$  is full subcategory of  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$  whose objects are direct sums of intersection motives of the form  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(L)$  with  $\mu \in X_*(T)^+$ ,  $L \in \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)$  a simple motivic local system.  
 (3) The *motivic Satake category*  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{mot}}$  is the category  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G)$ , i.e., whose objects are direct sums of intersection motives of the form  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(L)$  with  $\mu \in X_*(T)^+$ ,  $L \in \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)$  a motivic local system.

**Lemma 6.2.** *The Satake categories  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}$ ,  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}$  are semisimple and any object in  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{mot}}$  admits weight filtration by objects in  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}$ .*

*Proof.* For semisimplicity, it suffices to show that

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}, L^+G)}(\mathbf{IC}_\mu(L), \mathbf{IC}_\lambda(L')) = \begin{cases} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(\text{Gr}_G^\mu)}(L, L') & \mu = \lambda \\ 0 & \mu \neq \lambda. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, if  $\mu = \lambda$ , this follows from the full faithfulness of the intermediate extension and if  $\mu \neq \lambda$ , we can assume that  $L$  is simple since we can always take a weight filtration and in such a case  $\mathbf{IC}_\mu(L)$  is simple so any nonzero morphism is an isomorphism, which is impossible if  $\mu \neq \lambda$  due to the support reasoning. For weight filtration, this is theorem 3.29 and lemma 2.5. □

**Proposition 6.3.** *The Satake categories  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}$ ,  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}$ ,  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{mot}}$  are closed under convolution product.*

*Proof.* The case  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}$  is precisely lemma 5.14 and these others are proven analogously. □

**Remark 6.4.** Under the standard conjectures, one has an equivalence  $\mathbf{DA}_{\text{ct}}^{\text{ét}}(X, \mathbb{Q}) \simeq \mathbf{DN}^b(X)$  and the category  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}$  is exactly the Satake category in [RS21, Definition 6.2]. In particular, it should be independent of the ground field by [RS21, Corollary 6.6]. However, by adding more motivic local systems, the motivic Satake categories  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}$ ,  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{mot}}$  are no longer independent of the ground field, as showed below.

**Proposition 6.5.** *If  $f: \text{Spec}(k') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(k)$  is a Galois extension of subfields of  $\mathbb{C}$ , then the natural functor*

$$f^*: \text{Sat}_{G,k} \rightarrow \text{Sat}_{G \otimes_k k', k'} \\ \mathbf{IC}_\mu(L) \mapsto f^*(\mathbf{IC}_\mu(L)) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_\mu(f^*(L))$$

*induces equivalences of categories*

$$(\text{Sat}_{G_{k'}, k'}^{\text{mot}})^{\text{Gal}(k'/k)} \simeq \text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{mot}} \quad (\text{Sat}_{G_{k'}, k'}^{\text{pure}})^{\text{Gal}(k'/k)} \simeq \text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}$$

*Meanwhile, the categories  $\text{Sat}_{G_{k'}, k'}^{\text{naive}}, \text{Sat}_{G_k, k}^{\text{naive}}$  are equivalent.*

*Proof.* The Galois descent is a consequence of [JT25, Lemma 2.22] and the fact that pullbacks of étale morphism preserve weights. The equivalence of  $\text{Sat}_{G_{k'}, k'}^{\text{naive}}, \text{Sat}_{G_k, k}^{\text{naive}}$  is clear since the functor is essentially surjective and the functor  $f^*$  is smooth, hence fully faithfully.  $\square$

**Theorem 6.6.** *Let  $k$  be a subfield of  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $G$  be a reductive group over  $k$ . Then there are equivalences of Tannakian categories*

$$(\text{Sat}_{G,k}, \star, \omega) \simeq (\text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee}), \otimes, \text{forgetful}) \\ (\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}, \star, \omega) \simeq (\text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}^{\text{pure}}(k)), \otimes, \text{forgetful}) \\ (\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{mot}}, \star, \omega) \simeq (\text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}(k)), \otimes, \text{forgetful})$$

*Proof.* Let us treat the second equivalence for instance. Let  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\circ}$  be the dual group of  $\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}$ . Let  $R$  be a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -algebra, then by definition

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\circ}(R) = \text{Aut}^{\star}(\omega)(R) = \{R\text{-linear automorphism } g_X: \omega(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} R \rightarrow \omega(X) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} R + \text{compatibilities}\}.$$

The morphism  $\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\circ} \rightarrow G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}^{\text{pure}}(k)$  is defined as follows: we write  $X = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_0(L_i))$  with  $L_i$  indecomposable motivic local systems, then

$$\mathcal{G}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\circ}(R) \rightarrow G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee}(R) \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}^{\text{pure}}(k)(R) \\ g_X \mapsto \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (g_{\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1})} \otimes g_{\mathbf{IC}_0(L_i)}).$$

We claim that this is an isomorphism of functors (hence of corresponding pro-algebraic groups). From the explicit description, this map is clearly injective. To show the surjectivity, it is enough to show that if

$$\mathbf{IC}_{\mu}(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_0(L) \simeq \mathbf{IC}_{\mu'}(\mathbb{1}) \star \mathbf{IC}_0(L')$$

then  $\mu = \mu'$  and  $L = L'$ . Indeed,  $\mu = \mu'$  by support and  $L \simeq L'$  obtained by restricting both sides to  $\text{Gr}_G^{\mu}$ .  $\square$

Let  $\mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}^{\text{Tate}}(k)$  be the motivic Galois group of the theory of Tate motives, one recovers [RS21, Theorem 6.14] simply by restricting to mixed Tate motives.

**Corollary 6.7.** *Let  $k$  be a subfield of  $\mathbb{C}$  and  $G$  be a split reductive group over  $k$ . Then there are equivalences of Tannakian categories*

$$(\mathbf{MAM}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G), \star, \omega) \simeq (\text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)), \otimes, \text{forgetful}) \\ (\mathbf{MAM}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, \text{pure}), \star, \omega) \simeq (\text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \text{Gal}(\bar{k}/k)), \otimes, \text{forgetful}) \\ (\mathbf{MTM}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G), \star, \omega) \simeq (\text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathcal{G}_{\text{mot}}^{\text{Tate}}(k)), \otimes, \text{forgetful}) \\ (\mathbf{MTM}_{L+G}(\text{Gr}_G, L^+G, \text{pure}), \star, \omega) \simeq (\text{Rep}_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\text{fd}}(G_{\mathbb{Q}}^{\vee} \times \mathbb{G}_{m, \mathbb{Q}}), \otimes, \text{forgetful})$$

where  $\mathbf{MAM}$  is the category of mixed Artin motives and  $\mathbf{MTM}$  is the category of stratified mixed Tate motives defined in [RS20][RS21].

**Corollary 6.8.** *Let  $t$  be an intermediate, then there are isomorphisms of  $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebras*

$$K_0(\text{Sat}_{G,k}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm 1/2}][\{\mathbf{IC}_\mu(\mathbf{1}(n)) \mid \mu \in X_*(T)^+\}] \simeq K_0(\text{Rep}(G^\vee)).$$

$$K_0(\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{mot}}) \simeq K_0(\text{Sat}_{G,k}^{\text{pure}}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm 1/2}][\{\mathbf{IC}_\mu(L) \mid \mu \in X_*(T)^+\}] \simeq K_0(\text{Rep}(G^\vee)) \times K_0(\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{mot}}(k)))$$

In particular, one has that

$$K_0(\text{Sat}_{1,k}^{\text{mot}}) \simeq \mathbb{Z} \times K_0(\text{Rep}(\mathcal{G}^{\text{mot}}(k))).$$

*Proof.* The first isomorphism follows from the classical Satake isomorphism (see for instance, [Ach21, Theorem 9.4.1]). The two next isomorphisms are obvious thanks to the existence of weight filtrations.  $\square$

## 7. FURTHER TOPICS RELATED TO EQUIVARIANT PERVERSE NORI MOTIVES

The content of this section is independent of the main stream of the manuscript. In this section, we show that many phenomena occurring in the setting of ordinary derived categories are in fact of motivic nature.

### 7.1. Equivariant perverse Nori motives w.r.t finite groups.

**Definition 7.1.** Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be triangulated category endowed with a  $t$ -structure whose heart is  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{T}$ . Let  $M, N \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $n > 0$ , a morphism  $f: M \rightarrow N[n]$  in  $\mathcal{T}$  is *effaceable* if there exists an epimorphism  $p: M' \rightarrow M$  and a monomorphism  $i: N \rightarrow N'$  such that  $i[n] \circ f \circ p: M' \rightarrow N'[n]$  is zero.

In [Bei87], Beilinson constructs a realization functor  $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$  from the derived category of the heart  $\mathcal{A}$  of a bounded  $t$ -structure on a triangulated category  $\mathcal{T}$  and proves that this realization is an equivalence of and only if any morphism of the form  $M \rightarrow N[n]$  with  $M, N \in \mathcal{A}$  is effaceable.

**Proposition 7.2.** *Let  $G$  be a finite group and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety, the Beilinson realization functor*

$$\text{real}: \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G^\#(X)) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}_G^b(X)$$

*is an equivalence of stable  $\infty$ -categories.*

*Proof.* By corollary 4.4, left average functor equals right average functors and by theorem 4.3 they are  $t$ -exact (since they are combinations of  $t$ -exact functors). Given  $M \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$ , the unit morphism  $\text{Av}_1^G \text{Res}_1^G(M) \rightarrow M$  is surjective (note that  $\text{Av}_1^G \text{Res}_1^G(M) \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$  by the previous observation) in  $\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$ ; indeed, this follows from the fact that  $\text{rat}_X^G: \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X) \rightarrow \text{Perv}_G(X)$  is exact and the same holds for ordinary equivariant perverse sheaves (see for instance [Ach21, Theorem 6.6.12]).

Now let  $M, N \in \mathcal{M}\text{Perv}_G(X)$  and consider a morphism  $f: M \rightarrow N[n]$  in  $\mathbf{DN}_G^b(X)$ , then  $\text{Res}_1^G(f)$  is effaceable in  $\mathbf{DN}^b(X) = \mathbf{D}^b(\mathcal{M}\text{Perv}(X))$  (see for instance [Ach21, Lemma A.5.17]), the rest then is same as [Ach21, Theorem 6.6.12].  $\square$

**7.2. Motivic equivariant fundamental groups.** Let  $G$  be an algebraic group and  $X$  be a principal  $G$ -variety, then every  $G$ -equivariant perverse sheaf on  $X$  is a shifted (by  $\dim(X)$ ) local system. Moreover, there is an equivalence of categories (see [Ach21, Proposition 6.2.13])

$$\text{Loc}_G(X) \simeq k[G^x/(G^x)^\circ] - \text{Mod}^{\text{fg}}$$

where  $G^x \subset G$  is a stabilizer of some point  $x \in G$  and  $(G^x)^\circ$  is its identity component. This reminds us of the equivalence  $\text{Loc}^{\text{ft}}(X) \simeq \mathbb{Q}[\pi_1(X)] - \text{Mod}^{\text{fg}}$  in the non-equivariant setting. For this reason, we call  $\pi_1^G(X, x) = G^x/(G^x)^\circ$  the *equivariant fundamental group* of  $X$ . We claim that there is a motivic avatar of this group. Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety. We call the category  $\text{Loc}(X) \cap \text{Sh}_G(X)$  by the name *equivariant local systems*, denoted  $\text{Loc}_G(X)$ . If moreover  $X$  is smooth, the subcategory  $\text{Loc}_{G,p}(X) := \text{Loc}_G(X)[- \dim(X)]$  of  $\mathbf{D}_{\text{ct}}^b(X, \mathbb{Q})$  is called the category of *equivariant shifted local systems*.

**Definition 7.3.** Let  $G$  be an algebraic group over  $k$  and  $X$  be a  $G$ -variety. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}^G} & \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}(X) \\ \text{rat}_X^G \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{rat}_X \\ \text{Perv}_G(X) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}^G} & \text{Perv}(X). \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_G(X) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}^G} & \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}(X) \\ \text{rat}_X^G \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{rat}_X \\ \text{Loc}_G(X) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}^G} & \text{Loc}(X). \end{array}$$

We define the full subcategory

$$\mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X) = \{M \in \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}(X) \mid \text{rat}_X \text{ For}^G(M) \in \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X)\} \subset \mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G^\#(X)$$

Now our intuition is that the category  $\mathcal{M} \text{Perv}_G(X)$  should underly a Tannakian formalism.

**Theorem 7.4.** Let  $G$  an algebraic group of dimension  $d$  and  $X$  be a principal  $G$ -variety. The category  $\mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X)$  endowed with

$$\begin{aligned} (-) \otimes (-) &: \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X) \times \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X) \\ (M, N) &\longmapsto (M[-d] \otimes N[-d])[d] \end{aligned}$$

is a neutral Tannakian category over  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

*Proof.* The proof is as same as the proof of [Ter24a, Theorem 6.3].  $\square$

**Definition 7.5.** Let  $x \in X(k)$  be a  $k$ -point. This defines a fiber functor

$$x^*: \mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X) \longrightarrow \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X) \longrightarrow \text{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}}$$

and the Tannakian dual of  $\mathcal{M} \text{Loc}_{G,p}(X)$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{G}_G(X, x)$ , called the *motivic equivariant fundamental group* of  $(X, x)$ . If  $X = \text{Spec}(k)$ , we denote the corresponding group by  $\mathcal{G}_G^{\text{mot}}(k)$ , called the *equivariant motivic Galois group*.

**Remark 7.6.** Let  $X$  be a  $k$ -variety with a  $k$ -point  $x \in X(k)$ . Thanks to Grothendieck, there is a split exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \pi_1^{\text{ét}}(\overline{X}, \overline{x}) \longrightarrow \pi_1^{\text{ét}}(X, x) \longrightarrow \text{Gal}(\overline{k}/k) \longrightarrow 1.$$

In the works of Terenzi [Ter24b] and Jacobsen [Jac25], there is a motivic avatar of the sequence above

$$1 \longrightarrow \pi_1^{\text{mot}}(X, x) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}(X, x) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}^{\text{mot}}(k) \longrightarrow 1,$$

where  $\mathcal{G}^{\text{mot}}(k) = \mathcal{G}_1(k)$ ,  $\mathcal{G}(X, x) = \mathcal{G}_1(X, x)$  as above and  $\pi_1^{\text{mot}}(X, x)$  is the motivic Galois group arising from local systems of geometric origin. A fundamental theorem in [Jac25] shows that  $\pi_1^{\text{mot}}(X, x)$  is the Malcev completion of the topological fundamental group  $\pi_1(X, x)$ . One might pose a similar question: how can one relate  $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{G}_G(X, x) \longrightarrow \mathcal{G}_G^{\text{mot}}(k))$  with  $\pi_1^G(X, x) = G^x/(G^x)^\circ$ ?

**7.3. Relation with Ayoub's weak Tannakian formalism.** In [Ayo14b][Ayo14c] (see also, [Ivo21]), Ayoub develops his weak Tannakian formalism, proving that

$$\text{Betti}_k^* \text{Betti}_{k,*}(\mathbb{Q}) \in \mathbf{D}(\mathbb{Q}).$$

is in fact a Hopf algebra in  $\mathbf{D}(\mathbb{Q})$ . By using an explicit resolution, he is able to show that  $\text{Betti}_k^* \text{Betti}_{k,*}(\mathbb{Q})$  has no cohomology in negative degrees; thus  $\mathbf{H}_0(\text{Betti}_k^* \text{Betti}_{k,*}(\mathbb{Q}))$  is a genuine  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Hopf algebra whose dual is called the motivic Galois group  $\mathcal{G}^A(k)$ . The work [CGAdS17] says that this motivic Galois group is isomorphic to Nori's fundamental group  $\mathcal{G}^N(k) = \mathcal{G}^{\text{mot}}(k)$  (as before). One can do the same things for the equivariant setting.

**Proposition 7.7.** Let  $G$  be an algebraic group. Let

$$(\text{Betti}_{k,G}^* \dashv \text{Betti}_{k,G,*}): \mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(k, \mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}_G(k, \mathbb{Q})$$

be associated equivariant Betti realizations. The canonical projection transform

$$\text{Betti}_{k,G,*}(A) \otimes M \longrightarrow \text{Betti}_{k,G,*}(A \otimes \text{Betti}_{k,G}^*(M))$$

is an isomorphism for  $A \in \mathbf{D}_G(k, \mathbb{Q})$  and  $M \in \mathbf{DA}_G^{\text{ét}}(k, \mathbb{Q})$ .

*Proof.* If  $\text{Betti}_{k,G,*}$  commutes with  $\text{Res}_1^G$  then the result follows from the non-equivariant case (see the proof of [Ayo14c, Proposition 2.7]). However, the commutation of  $\text{Betti}_{k,G,*}$  and  $\text{Res}_1^G$  is clear since the latter one is pullback of a smooth morphism.  $\square$

**Remark 7.8.** Clearly, the functor  $\text{Betti}_{k,G}^*$  admits a section just as in the non-equivariant setting and so by the general nonsense ([Ayo14c, Théorèmes 1.21 et 1.45]), the object  $\text{Betti}_{k,G}^* \text{Betti}_{k,G,*}(\mathbb{Q})$  admits a structure of a Hopf algebra in  $\mathbf{D}_G(k, \mathbb{Q})$ . Is this an actual Hopf algebra? And if it is the case, can we compare its dual group with  $\mathcal{G}_G(k)$  defined in the previous section.

**7.4. Fourier-Laumon transforms.** Let  $\mathbf{H}: (\text{Var}_k)^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{CAlg}(\text{CAT}_{\infty})$  be a coefficient system. Let  $S$  be a  $k$ -variety. Let  $V$  be a vector bundle of rank  $r$  over  $S$  whose dual bundle is denoted by  $V^{\vee}$ . There are natural  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -actions on  $V$  and  $V^{\vee}$  given by scaling. The Fourier-Laumon transform is an equivalence of categories

$$\text{Four}: \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(V) \longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(V^{\vee}).$$

To define the Fourier-Laumon transform, let us consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V \times_S V^{\vee} & \xrightarrow{m} & \mathbb{A}_S^1 \\ \text{pr}_1 \swarrow & & \searrow \text{pr}_2 \\ V & & V^{\vee} \end{array}$$

where  $\text{pr}_1, \text{pr}_2$  are canonical projections,  $m$  is the standard pairing. Let  $\mu: \mathbb{G}_{m,S} \times_S \mathbb{G}_{m,S} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_{m,S}$  be the multiplication morphism. Let  $V \times_S V^{\vee}$  be endowed with the  $\mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2$ -action given by the action of  $\mathbb{G}_{m,S}$  on each factor. The morphism  $m: V \times_S V^{\vee} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_S^1$  is then  $\mu$ -equivariant. We define three subgroups of  $\mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2$  by formulas

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \{(1, \lambda) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{G}_{m,S}\} \subset \mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2 \\ K_2 &= \{(\lambda, 1) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{G}_{m,S}\} \subset \mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2 \\ K_{\mu} &= \{(\lambda, \lambda^{-1}) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{G}_{m,S}\} \subset \mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2 \end{aligned}$$

Let  $j: \mathbb{G}_{m,S} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_S^1$  be the canonical open immersion. We have a definition.

**Definition 7.9.** The *Fourier-Laumon transform* is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Four}_V: \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(V) &\longrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(V^{\vee}) \\ M &\longmapsto \text{Inv}_{K_2,!} \text{pr}_{2,!} \left( \text{pr}_1^* \text{Infl}_{\mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2/K_1}^{\mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2}(M) \otimes m^* \text{Infl}_{\mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2/K_{\mu}}^{\mathbb{G}_{m,S}^2}(\mathcal{J}) \right) [r] \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{J} = j_*(\mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{G}_m})[1](1) \in \mathbf{H}_{\mathbb{G}_m}(\mathbb{A}_S^1)$  is the *Fourier kernel*.

The formation of  $\text{Four}$  is universal in the sense that if  $\mathfrak{R}: \mathbf{H}^1 \rightarrow \mathbf{H}^2$  is a morphism of coefficient systems, then  $\text{Four} \circ \mathfrak{R}_{V^{\vee}, \mathbb{G}_m} \simeq \mathfrak{R}_{V, \mathbb{G}_m} \circ \text{Four}$ . In particular, if  $\text{Four}$  is an equivalence for  $\mathbf{H}^2$  and  $\mathfrak{R}$  is conservative then  $\text{Four}$  is an equivalence for  $\mathbf{H}^1$ .

**Proposition 7.10.** The Fourier-Laumon transform  $\text{Four}_V: \mathbf{DN}_{\mathbb{G}_m}^b(V) \rightarrow \mathbf{DN}_{\mathbb{G}_m}^b(V^{\vee})$  is an equivalence of categories. More precisely,  $\text{Four}_{V'} \circ \text{Four}_V(-) \simeq (-)(-r)$ .

*Proof.* The statement for  $\mathbf{D}_c^b(X^{\text{an}}, \mathbb{Q})$  is well-known (see for instance [Lau03]) and hence the result follows due to the observation above.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [ABV15] Joseph Ayoub and Luca Barbieri-Viale. Nori 1-motives. *Math. Ann.*, 361(1-2):367–402, 2015. [↑5](#)
- [Ach21] Pramod N. Achar. *Perverse sheaves and applications to representation theory*, volume 258 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, [2021] ©2021. [↑5](#), [↑8](#), [↑10](#), [↑13](#), [↑14](#), [↑16](#), [↑19](#), [↑20](#), [↑21](#), [↑23](#), [↑37](#)
- [Ara13] Donu Arapura. An abelian category of motivic sheaves. *Adv. Math.*, 233:135–195, 2013. [↑5](#)
- [Ayo] Joseph Ayoub. Anabelian presentation of the motivic galois group in characteristic zero. [↑8](#)
- [Ayo07a] Joseph Ayoub. Les six opérations de Grothendieck et le formalisme des cycles évanescents dans le monde motivique. I. *Astérisque*, (314):x+466 pp. (2008), 2007. [↑3](#), [↑6](#), [↑10](#)
- [Ayo07b] Joseph Ayoub. Les six opérations de Grothendieck et le formalisme des cycles évanescents dans le monde motivique. II. *Astérisque*, (315):vi+364 pp. (2008), 2007. [↑3](#), [↑10](#)
- [Ayo10] Joseph Ayoub. Note sur les opérations de Grothendieck et la réalisation de Betti. *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 9(2):225–263, 2010. [↑5](#)
- [Ayo14a] Joseph Ayoub. La réalisation étale et les opérations de Grothendieck. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 47(1):1–145, 2014. [↑5](#)
- [Ayo14b] Joseph Ayoub. L’algèbre de Hopf et le groupe de Galois motiviques d’un corps de caractéristique nulle, I. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 693:1–149, 2014. [↑7](#), [↑38](#)
- [Ayo14c] Joseph Ayoub. L’algèbre de Hopf et le groupe de Galois motiviques d’un corps de caractéristique nulle, II. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 693:151–226, 2014. [↑7](#), [↑8](#), [↑38](#), [↑39](#)
- [AZ12] Joseph Ayoub and Steven Zucker. Relative Artin motives and the reductive Borel-Serre compactification of a locally symmetric variety. *Invent. Math.*, 188(2):277–427, 2012. [↑13](#)
- [BBDG18] Alexander Beilinson, Joseph Bernstein, Pierre Deligne, and Ofer Gabber. Faisceaux pervers. *Astérisque*, (100):vi+180, 2018. Second edition [of 0751966]. [↑7](#), [↑8](#), [↑14](#)
- [BD91] Alexander Beilinson and Vladimir Drinfeld. Quantization of Hitchin’s integrable system and Hecke eigensheaves. 1991? [↑1](#)
- [Bei87] A. A. Beilinson. On the derived category of perverse sheaves. In *K-theory, arithmetic and geometry (Moscow, 1984–1986)*, volume 1289 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 27–41. Springer, Berlin, 1987. [↑37](#)
- [Bei12] A. Beilinson. Remarks on Grothendieck’s standard conjectures. In *Regulators*, volume 571 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 25–32. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2012. [↑3](#)
- [BL94] Joseph Bernstein and Valery Lunts. *Equivariant sheaves and functors*, volume 1578 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994. [↑5](#), [↑21](#), [↑26](#)
- [Bon12] Mikhail V. Bondarko. Weight structures and ‘weights’ on the hearts of  $t$ -structures. *Homology Homotopy Appl.*, 14(1):239–261, 2012. [↑7](#)
- [BR18] Pierre Baumann and Simon Riche. Notes on the geometric Satake equivalence. In *Relative aspects in representation theory, Langlands functoriality and automorphic forms*, volume 2221 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 1–134. Springer, Cham, 2018. [↑1](#), [↑15](#), [↑21](#), [↑26](#), [↑28](#), [↑29](#), [↑31](#), [↑32](#), [↑34](#)
- [CD19] Denis-Charles Cisinski and Frédéric Déglise. *Triangulated categories of mixed motives*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, [2019] ©2019. [↑3](#), [↑10](#)
- [CGAdS17] Utsav Choudhury and Martin Gallauer Alves de Souza. An isomorphism of motivic Galois groups. *Adv. Math.*, 313:470–536, 2017. [↑7](#), [↑8](#), [↑38](#)
- [CvdHS25] Robert Cass, Thibaud van den Hove, and Jakob Scholbach. Central motives on parahoric flag varieties, 2025. [↑2](#)
- [DG22] Brad Drew and Martin Gallauer. The universal six-functor formalism. *Ann. K-Theory*, 7(4):599–649, 2022. [↑10](#)
- [FG05] E. Friedlander and D.R. Grayson. *Handbook of K-Theory*. Handbook of K-Theory. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2005. [↑5](#)
- [FS24] Laurent Fargues and Peter Scholze. Geometrization of the local langlands correspondence, 2024. [↑1](#)
- [Gai01] D. Gaiety. Construction of central elements in the affine Hecke algebra via nearby cycles. *Invent. Math.*, 144(2):253–280, 2001. [↑28](#)
- [Gin00] Victor Ginzburg. Perverse sheaves on a loop group and langlands’ duality, 2000. [↑1](#)
- [Gro98] Benedict H. Gross. On the Satake isomorphism. In *Galois representations in arithmetic algebraic geometry (Durham, 1996)*, volume 254 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 223–237. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998. [↑1](#)
- [Hai04] Thomas J. Haines. A proof of the kazhdan-lusztig purity theorem via the decomposition theorem of bbd. [https://math.umd.edu/~tjh/KL\\_purity1.pdf](https://math.umd.edu/~tjh/KL_purity1.pdf), 2004. Manuscript, University of Maryland. [↑28](#)
- [HMS17] Annette Huber and Stefan Müller-Stach. *Periods and Nori motives*, volume 65 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer, Cham, 2017. With contributions by Benjamin Friedrich and Jonas von Wangenheim. [↑5](#), [↑7](#), [↑33](#)



- [Hoy17] Marc Hoyois. The six operations in equivariant motivic homotopy theory. *Adv. Math.*, 305:197–279, 2017. [↑10](#), [↑18](#)
- [IM19] Florian Ivorra and Sophie Morel. The four operations on perverse motives, 2019. [↑2](#), [↑3](#), [↑4](#), [↑5](#), [↑6](#), [↑7](#), [↑8](#), [↑11](#), [↑14](#), [↑22](#), [↑29](#), [↑30](#), [↑33](#)
- [Ivo17] Florian Ivorra. Perverse Nori motives. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 24(4):1097–1131, 2017. [↑5](#), [↑33](#)
- [Ivo21] Florian Ivorra. Some topics in the theory of Tannakian categories and applications to motives and motivic Galois groups. *Publications mathématiques de Besançon. Algèbre et théorie des nombres*, pages 45–97, 2021. [↑38](#)
- [Jac25] Emil Jacobsen. Malcev completions, hodge theory, and motives, 2025. [↑17](#), [↑38](#)
- [JT25] Emil Jacobsen and Luca Terenzi. A comparison of categories of nori motivic sheaves, 2025. [↑11](#), [↑13](#), [↑14](#), [↑36](#)
- [Kha19] Adeel A. Khan. Virtual fundamental classes of derived stacks i, 2019. [↑18](#)
- [KW01] Reinhardt Kiehl and Rainer Weissauer. *Weil conjectures, perverse sheaves and l’adic Fourier transform*, volume 42 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001. [↑7](#)
- [Lau03] Gérard Laumon. Transformation de Fourier homogène. *Bull. Soc. Math. France*, 131(4):527–551, 2003. [↑39](#)
- [Lus83] George Lusztig. Singularities, character formulas, and a  $q$ -analog of weight multiplicities. In *Analysis and topology on singular spaces, II, III (Luminy, 1981)*, volume 101 of *Astérisque*, pages 208–229. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1983. [↑1](#)
- [LZ17] Yifeng Liu and Weizhe Zheng. Enhanced six operations and base change theorem for higher artin stacks, 2017. [↑18](#)
- [MV99] Fabien Morel and Vladimir Voevodsky.  $\mathbf{A}^1$ -homotopy theory of schemes. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (90):45–143 (2001), 1999. [↑3](#)
- [MV07] I. Mirković and K. Vilonen. Geometric Langlands duality and representations of algebraic groups over commutative rings. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 166(1):95–143, 2007. [↑1](#), [↑34](#)
- [Nee01] Amnon Neeman. *Triangulated Categories. (AM-148), Volume 148*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, 2001. [↑11](#)
- [Nor11] Madhav Nori. Alpbach 2011 - School on Algebraic Groups and Number Theory, 2011. Accessed via the Internet Archive. [↑3](#), [↑5](#)
- [Ric12] Timo Richarz. A new approach to the geometric satake equivalence, 2012. [↑1](#)
- [Ric19] Timo Richarz. Notes on affine grassmannians. Lecture notes / summer school notes, Technische Universität Darmstadt, 2019. Preliminary notes based on lectures at the Summer School “Buildings and affine Grassmannians”, Luminy, 2019. [↑10](#)
- [RS20] Timo Richarz and Jakob Scholbach. The intersection motive of the moduli stack of shtukas. *Forum Math. Sigma*, 8:Paper No. e8, 99, 2020. [↑1](#), [↑2](#), [↑3](#), [↑4](#), [↑9](#), [↑10](#), [↑11](#), [↑12](#), [↑13](#), [↑15](#), [↑16](#), [↑17](#), [↑26](#), [↑36](#)
- [RS21] Timo Richarz and Jakob Scholbach. The motivic Satake equivalence. *Math. Ann.*, 380(3-4):1595–1653, 2021. [↑1](#), [↑2](#), [↑11](#), [↑12](#), [↑15](#), [↑28](#), [↑31](#), [↑32](#), [↑33](#), [↑35](#), [↑36](#)
- [Sat63] Ichirō Satake. Theory of spherical functions on reductive algebraic groups over  $p$ -adic fields. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (18):5–69, 1963. [↑1](#)
- [SW18] Wolfgang Soergel and Matthias Wendt. Perverse motives and graded derived category  $\mathcal{O}$ . *J. Inst. Math. Jussieu*, 17(2):347–395, 2018. [↑12](#)
- [Ter24a] Luca Terenzi. On the functoriality of universal abelian factorizations, 2024. [↑6](#), [↑7](#), [↑8](#), [↑17](#), [↑38](#)
- [Ter24b] Luca Terenzi. Tensor structure on perverse nori motives, 2024. [↑5](#), [↑38](#)
- [Tub25a] Swann Tubach. Mixed hodge modules on stacks. *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, 13, 2025. [↑19](#)
- [Tub25b] Swann Tubach. On the nori and hodge realisations of voevodsky motives, 2025. [↑3](#), [↑6](#), [↑13](#), [↑17](#), [↑24](#)
- [Voe00] Vladimir Voevodsky. Triangulated categories of motives over a field. In *Cycles, transfers, and motivic homology theories*, volume 143 of *Ann. of Math. Stud.*, pages 188–238. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 2000. [↑3](#)
- [Zhu16] Xinwen Zhu. An introduction to affine grassmannians and the geometric satake equivalence, 2016. [↑1](#), [↑27](#), [↑32](#)
- [Zhu17] Xinwen Zhu. Affine Grassmannians and the geometric Satake in mixed characteristic. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 185(2):403–492, 2017. [↑1](#), [↑32](#)