This is a geometry-oriented review of the basic formalism of tilting objects (originally due to Ringel, see [Ri], §5). In the first section we explain that tilting extensions form a natural framework for the gluing construction from [B1] and [MV]. We show that in case of a stratification with contractible strata, the homotopy category of complexes of tilting perverse sheaves is equivalent to the derived category of sheaves smooth along the stratification. Thus tilting objects play the role similar to projective or injective ones (with advantage of being self-dual and having local origin). In the second section we discuss tilting perverse sheaves smooth along the Schubert stratification of the flag space (or, equivalently, tilting objects in the Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand category \( O \)). In this case a Radon transform interchanges tilting, projective, and injective modules. As a corollary, we give a short proof of Soergel’s Struktursatz [S1], and describe the Serre functor for \( D^b(O) \) (as conjectured by M. Kapranov).

We refer to [M] for a much more thorough exposition of many other aspects of the theory.

This article is a modest present to Borya Feigin – with love, and sadness to see him so rarely these days.

§1 Generalities.

We consider algebraic varieties over an algebraically closed field \( k \). Below “perverse sheaf” means either plain perverse \( \mathbb{Q}_l \)-sheaf, \( l \neq \text{char}(k) \), or perverse sheaf with respect to classical topology with coefficients in any field of characteristic 0 (if \( k = \mathbb{C} \)), or holonomic \( \mathcal{D} \)-module (in case \( \text{char}(k) = 0 \)). For a variety \( X \) we denote by \( \mathcal{M}(X) \) the abelian category of perverse sheaves on \( X \), and by \( D(X) \) its bounded derived category (which is the same as the usual “topological” derived category of constructible \( \mathbb{Q}_\ell \)-complexes or complexes of \( \mathcal{D} \)-modules with holonomic cohomology, see [B2]).

1.1 Let \( X \) be an algebraic variety, \( i : Y \hookrightarrow X \) a closed subvariety, \( j : U := X \smallsetminus Y \hookrightarrow X \) the complementary embedding. Let \( M \) be a perverse sheaf on \( X \); then we have\(^3\) \( i^! M \in D(Y)^{\geq 0}, i^* M \in D(Y)^{\leq 0} \). We say that \( M \) is a tilting perverse sheaf with respect to \( Y \) (or a \( Y \)-tilting perverse sheaf) if both \( i^! M, i^* M \) are perverse sheaves. The standard exact triangles together with left (respectively, right) exactness of \( j_* \), \( j_! \) show that \( M \) is tilting if and only if both \( j_* j^* M \) and \( j_! j^* M \)

---

\(^1\)All authors are partially supported by NSF grants: A.B. is supported by grant DMS-0100108, and R.B. by grant DMS-0071967.

\(^2\)Notice that our terminology differs from the one in loc. cit. and some other sources; the term “tilting” there is used for a weaker property.

\(^3\)Here the t-structure is of the middle perversity.
are perverse sheaves and the canonical morphisms $M \to j_*j^*M$, $j_!j^*M \to M$ are, respectively, surjective and injective. The category of $Y$-tilting perverse sheaves is closed under extensions and Verdier duality.

**Proposition.** Let $M_U$ be a perverse sheaf on $U$ such that both $j_!(M_U)$ and $j_!(M_U)$ are perverse sheaves on $X$. Then there exists a $Y$-tilting perverse sheaf $M$ on $X$ such that $M|_U = M_U$. We call such $M$ a $Y$-tilting extension of $M_U$ to $X$.

**Proof.** (a) Set $A := \operatorname{Ker}(j!(M_U) \to j_!(M_U))$, $B := \operatorname{Coker}(j!(M_U) \to j_!(M_U))$. These are perverse sheaves supported on $Y$. Let $c \in \operatorname{Ext}^2(B, A)$ be the Yoneda class of exact sequence $0 \to A \to j!(M_U) \to j_!(M_U) \to B \to 0$.

(b) If $c$ vanishes, then there exists a perverse sheaf $M$ together with a 3 step filtration $M_0 \subset M_1 \subset M$ and identifications $M_0 = A$, $M_1 = j!(M_U)$, $M/M_0 = j_!(M_U)$, $M/M_1 = B$ compatible in the obvious manner with the above exact sequence. Then from the exact sequences

$$0 \to A \to M \to j_!(M_U) \to 0,$$

$$0 \to j!(M_U) \to M \to B \to 0$$

we see that $A \sim i!(M)$, $i^*(M) \sim B$; thus $M$ is $Y$-tilting (we call it a minimal tilting extension of $M_U$ for obvious reasons), and we are done.

(c) If $c \neq 0$ then we have to correct our exact sequence. To do this notice that by [B2] the Yoneda Ext’s are the same as Ext’s in the usual derived category of sheaves on $X$. The latter can be computed inside the derived category of sheaves on $Y$, and then as Yoneda Ext of perverse sheaves on $Y$. Thus one can find an exact sequence $0 \to A \to C \to D \to B \to 0$ of perverse sheaves supported on $Y$ of the class $-c$. Let $0 \to A \to C' \to D' \to B \to 0$ be the Baer sum of the two Yoneda extensions. Its class vanishes, thus there exists a perverse sheaf $M$ together with a 3 step filtration $M_0 \subset M_1 \subset M$ such that $M_0 = A$, $M_1 = C'$, $M/M_0 = D'$, $M/M_1 = B$ compatible in the obvious manner with the above exact sequence. Since $j!(M_U) \to C' \to M$ we see that $i^*(M) = \operatorname{Coker}(j!(M_U) \to M)$ is a perverse sheaf, and since $M \to D' \to j_!(M_U)$ we see that $i^!(M) = \operatorname{Ker}(M \to j_!(M_U))$ is perverse; thus $M$ is tilting, and we are done. \hfill \Box

**Remarks.** (i) The conditions of Proposition are always satisfied if $j$ is an affine embedding.

(ii) If $Y$ is a divisor given by equation $f = 0$ then the “maximal extension” $\Xi_f(M_U)$ from [B1] is a functorial tilting extension.

1.2 Let us show that the gluing construction from [B1] and [MV] fits naturally into the setting of tilting extensions.

Let $M_U$ be a perverse sheaf on $U$, and let $M^{tilt}$ be a $Y$-tilting extension of $M_U$. Set $\Psi := i^!M^{tilt}$, $\Psi' := i^*M^{tilt}$; let $\tau : \Psi \to \Psi'$ be the composition of the canonical morphisms $\Psi \hookrightarrow M^{tilt} \to \Psi'$.

**Proposition.** The category $\mathcal{E}$ of extensions of $M_U$ to $X$ is canonically equivalent to the category $\mathcal{C}$ of diagrams $\Psi \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Phi \xrightarrow{\beta} \Psi'$ where $\Phi$ is a perverse sheaf on $Y$ and morphisms $\alpha, \beta$ are such that $\beta\alpha = \tau$. 


Proof. (a) The functor $\mathcal{E} \to C$ sends $M \in \mathcal{E}$ to $(\Phi, \alpha, \beta) \in C$ defined as follows. Consider a short complex

$$F = F(M) := (j_!(M_U) \to M \oplus M^{\text{tilt}} \to j_!(M_U))$$

where the differentials are defined by the property that their restriction to $U$ are, respectively, the diagonal embedding and the anti-diagonal projection. Set $\Phi = \Phi(M) := H^0 F$. Notice that the tilting property of $M^{\text{tilt}}$ assures $H^{\neq 0} F = 0$. We have the obvious morphisms

$$\text{Cone}(M^{\text{tilt}} \to j_!(M_U))[-1] \to F \to \text{Cone}(j_!(M_U) \to M^{\text{tilt}}).$$

Passing to cohomology, we get $\Psi \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Phi \xrightarrow{\beta} \Psi'$. It is clear that $(\Phi, \alpha, \beta) \in C$.

(b) The inverse functor $C \to \mathcal{E}$ sends $\Phi = (\Phi, \alpha, \beta) \in C$ to $M = M(\Phi) \in \mathcal{E}$ defined as follows. Consider a short complex

$$G = G(\Phi) := (\Psi \to \Phi \oplus M^{\text{tilt}} \to \Psi')$$

where the differentials are, respectively, the sum of $\alpha$ and the canonical embedding $\Psi \to M^{\text{tilt}}$ and the difference of $\beta$ and the canonical projection $M^{\text{tilt}} \to \Psi'$. Set $M := H^0 G$. Notice that $H^{\neq 0} G = 0$.

It remains to show that functors from (a) and (b) are mutually inverse. To identify $M(\Phi(M))$ with $M$ let us replace $\Psi \to \Phi \to \Psi'$ in the definition of complex $G(\Phi)$ by (1.2.2). We get a complex whose cohomology equals $M(\Phi(M))$. On the other hand, by construction, this complex carries a 3 step filtration with successive quotients equal to the cone of the identity morphism of $\text{Cone}(M^{\text{tilt}} \to j_!(M_U))[−1]$, $M$, and the cone of the identity morphism of $\text{Cone}(j_!(M_U) \to M^{\text{tilt}})[−1]$. Thus its cohomology equals $M$. The construction of the isomorphism $\Phi(M(\Phi)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Phi$ is similar and left to the reader. □

Remark. It follows from the part (b) of the proof that $i^* M = \text{Cone}(\alpha : \Psi \to \Phi)$, $i^! M = \text{Cone}(\beta : \Phi \to \Psi')[−1]$. Thus $M$ is tilting if and only if $\alpha$ is injective and $\beta$ is surjective.

1.3 Suppose that our variety $X$ carries a stratification $\{X_\nu\}$; let $i_\nu : X_\nu \hookrightarrow X$ be the locally closed embeddings of the strata. We say that a perverse sheaf $M$ is tilting with respect to our stratification if for every $\nu$ both complexes $i^!_\nu M, i^{\dagger}_\nu M$ are perverse sheaves on $X_\nu$.

Assume that each $i_\nu$ is an affine embedding.

**Proposition.** A perverse sheaf $M$ is tilting with respect to our stratification if and only if it satisfies the following two conditions:

1. $M$ can be represented as a successive extension of perverse sheaves of type $i^{\dagger}_\nu N_\nu$ where $N_\nu$ is a perverse sheaf on $X_\nu$.

2. Same with $i^{\dagger}_\nu$ replaced by $i^!_\nu$.

$^4$This is an immediate generalization of the proof of [B1] 3.1 that dealt with the particular case $M^{\text{tilt}} = \Xi_f(M_U)$. 
Proof. Our conditions obviously imply that $M$ is tilting (notice that $i^*_\mu i_{\nu*} N_\nu$ equals $N_\nu$ if $\mu = \nu$ and 0 otherwise). Conversely, suppose that $M$ is tilting. Choose a closed filtration $X \supset X_1 \supset \ldots \supset X_n \supset X_{n+1} = \emptyset$ such that $X_i \setminus X_{i+1}$ is a single stratum. Set $j : U := X \setminus X_n \hookrightarrow X$. Using induction by $n$ we can assume that $j^* M$ is a successive extension of perverse sheaves $j^* i_{\nu*} N_\nu$. Thus $j_* j^* M$ is a successive extension of $j_* j^* i_{\nu*} N_\nu = i_{\nu*} N_\nu$, and the tilting property assures that $M$ is an extension of $j_* j^* M$ by a perverse sheaf $i_{n*} i_n^* M$. So condition 1 holds. Condition 2 is checked in the dual manner.

1.4 We are in situation of 1.3; assume in addition that every $X_\nu$ is smooth and connected. Let $D = D(X, \{X_\nu\}) \subset D(X)$ be the full subcategory of complexes constant along $\{X_\nu\}$, i.e., those $F \in D(X)$ that for every $\nu$ the complex $i_\nu^* F$ has constant cohomology sheaves. To assure that $D$ is a reasonable object to deal with, we assume the following two properties:

- The cohomology groups with constant coefficients $H^1(X_\nu)$ vanish. Then $D$ is a triangulated subcategory of $D(X)$. Notice that $D$ is generated by objects $i_\nu^* M_\nu$ where $M_\nu$ are constant (perverse) sheaves on $X_\nu$.

- One has $i_{\nu*} M_\nu \in D$, i.e. $D$ is preserved by the Verdier duality. Then $D$ is a $t$-category with core $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}(X, \{X_\nu\}) := \mathcal{M} \cap D$; its irreducible objects are middle extensions of constant perverse sheaves of rank 1 on strata.

Suppose, in addition, that $H^2(X_\nu) = 0$ for every $\nu$.

Remark.\footnote{We thank the referee to whom this remark is due.} Under the above assumptions the category $\mathcal{M}$ is what different authors call an abstract Kazhdan-Lusztig category, or a highest weight category, or a quasi-hereditary category (see e.g. [BGS], §3.2 and reference therein). Statements parallel to the next two Propositions are true (and apparently well-known to the experts) for a general category of this sort.

Let $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(X, \{X_\nu\}) \subset \mathcal{M}$ be the full subcategory of tilting sheaves with respect to our stratification.

Proposition. The support of an indecomposable object $M \in \mathcal{T}$ is irreducible, i.e., it is the closure of some stratum $X_\nu$, and $i_\nu^* M$ is a constant (perverse) sheaf of rank 1 on $X_\nu$. The map $M \mapsto \text{Supp} M$ is a bijection between the set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects in $\mathcal{T}$ and the set of strata.

Proof. Use induction by the number $n$ of strata. We follow notation of the proof of Proposition 1.3. By induction our statement is true for the category $\mathcal{T}_U$ of tilting sheaves on $U$ equipped with the induced stratification. For every object $M_U \in \mathcal{T}_U$ the complexes $j_*(M_U)$, $j_!(M_U)$ are perverse sheaves (use 1.3). The class $c$ from part (a) of the proof of Proposition 1.1 vanishes since $H^2(X_n) = 0$, so $M_U$ admits a minimal tilting extension $M \in \mathcal{T}$ (see ibid., part (b)). Remark in 1.2 implies that for indecomposable $M_U$ the above $M$ is indecomposable, and every indecomposable tilting extension of $M_U$ is isomorphic to $M$. It also implies that every tilting extension of a decomposable $M_U$ is decomposable. We are done.

1.5 We are in situation 1.4, and assume, in addition, that $H^{>0}(X_\nu) = 0$.\footnote{We thank the referee to whom this remark is due.}
Proposition. One has canonical equivalences of triangulated categories

\[ K^b(\mathcal{T}) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^b\mathcal{M} \xrightarrow{\sim} D. \]

Here \( K^b\mathcal{T} \) is the homotopy category of bounded complexes in \( \mathcal{T} \).

Proof. The functors \( K^b(\mathcal{T}) \to D^b\mathcal{M} \to D \) in (1.5.1) are the obvious ones.

(i) Let us show that the composition \( K^b\mathcal{T} \to D \) is an equivalence of categories. By Proposition 1.4 the image of \( K^b\mathcal{T} \) generates \( D \), so it suffices to prove that for every \( M, N \in \mathcal{T} \) one has \( \text{Ext}^0_D(M, N) = 0 \). By Proposition 1.3, one needs to check that \( \text{Ext}^0_D(M, N) = 0 \) for \( M = i_\mu! M_\mu, N = i_\nu* N_\nu \), where \( M_\mu, N_\nu \) are constant perverse sheaves on strata \( X_\mu, X_\nu \) respectively. This follows by adjunction if \( \mu \neq \nu \), and by the vanishing of the higher cohomology of strata if \( \mu = \nu \).

(ii) Let us show that \( D^b\mathcal{M} \to D \) is an equivalence of categories. This is a t-exact functor which identifies the cores, so it suffices to check that the morphism of the \( \delta \)-bifunctors \( \text{Ext}^*_{D^b\mathcal{M}} \to \text{Ext}^*_D \) on \( \mathcal{M} \times \mathcal{M} \) is an isomorphism, or, equivalently, that \( \text{Ext}^*_D \) is effaceable. By (i) our functor \( D^b\mathcal{M} \to D \) admits a right inverse, so \( \text{Ext}^*_D \) is a quotient functor of \( \text{Ext}^*_D^b \mathcal{M} \), hence it is effaceable, q.e.d. \( \square \)

Remark. An alternative proof of the second equivalence in (1.5.1) can be found in [BGS], Corollary 3.3.2 on page 500.

§2 The case of Schubert stratification.

2.1. Let \( G \) be a semisimple algebraic group. Let \( X = G/B \) be the flag variety stratified by the Schubert cells \( X_w, w \in W \), where \( W \) is the Weyl group. Our stratified space satisfies conditions of 1.5. Set \( D := D(X, \{X_w\}) \), and let \( \mathcal{O} \subset D \) be the category of perverse sheaves.

For \( w \in W \) let \( L_w, T_w \in \mathcal{O} \) be, respectively, irreducible and indecomposable tilting objects supported on the closure of \( X_w \); let \( I_w \) and \( P_w \) be, respectively, an injective hull and projective cover of \( L_w \). Let \( \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{P}, \mathcal{I} \) be the categories of, respectively, tilting, projective, and injective objects. We also let \( \Delta_w = i_w! (M_w) \), \( \nabla_w = i_w*(M_w) \) where \( M_w \) is the constant perverse sheaf of rank 1 on \( X_w \).

Let \( \mathcal{O}_{>0} \subset \mathcal{O} \) be the Serre subcategory generated by \( L_w, w \neq e \) (where \( e \in W \) is the identity); \( \mathcal{O}_0 = \mathcal{O}/\mathcal{O}_{>0} \), and \( \pi : \mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{O}_0 \) be the projection functor (or its extension to the derived categories). We can identify \( \mathcal{O}_0 \) with the category of modules over \( \text{End}(P_e) \); the functor \( \pi \) is then identified with \( X \to \text{Hom}(P_e, X) \).

Proposition. The functor \( \pi|_{\mathcal{T}} \) is fully faithful.

We will need the following standard fact:

Lemma. The socle of \( \Delta_w \) and the cosocle of \( \nabla_w \) are isomorphic to \( L_e \).

Proof of Lemma. Let us prove the statement about \( \Delta_w \); the one about \( \nabla_w \) then follows by Verdier duality. We argue by induction in the length \( \ell(w) \). If \( w = e \) there is nothing to prove, and if \( \ell(w) = 1 \) then the statement follows from the existence of a non-split exact sequence

\[ 0 \to \Delta_e \to \Delta_w \to L_w \to 0 \]
of perverse sheaves on \( \mathbb{P}^1 \).

Assume now that \( w = w' s \), where \( s \) is the simple reflection corresponding to a simple root \( \alpha \), and \( \ell(w) > \ell(w') \). Let \( X^\alpha \) be the corresponding partial flag variety, and \( pr_\alpha : X \to X^\alpha \) be the projection; thus \( pr_\alpha \) is a fibration with projective lines as fibers. Set \( X_w^\alpha = pr_\alpha(X_w) \); \( X_w' = pr_\alpha^{-1}(X_w^\alpha) \), and let \( i_w^\alpha : X_w^\alpha \to X^\alpha \), \( i_w' : X_w' \to X \) be the embeddings. Then \( i_w' \) is an affine morphism because it is a base change of the affine morphism \( i_w^\alpha \). Hence the functor \( pr_\alpha \) is trivial over \( pr(X_w) \), so we have \( X^{\alpha'}_w \cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times X_w' \). Applying the functor \( i_w' \circ pr_\alpha^{-1}[\ell(w) - 1] \) to (2.1.1) (where \( pr_1 : X'_w \to \mathbb{P}^1 \) is the projection) we get an exact sequence in \( \mathcal{O} \)

\[
0 \to i_w!(M_1) \to i_w!(M_2) \to i_w!(M_3) \to 0,
\]

where \( M_1, M_2, M_3 \) are constant perverse sheaves on the corresponding varieties. Let \( L_u \subset \Delta_w \) be a simple subobject. Suppose first that the composition \( L \to i_w!(M_3) \) is nonzero. It is easy to see that this only can happen if \( \ell(u \cdot s_\alpha) < \ell(u) \) so that \( L_u = pr_\alpha(A')[1] \) for a certain irreducible perverse sheaf \( A' \) on \( X^\alpha \). We arrive to a contradiction since \( Hom(L_u, i_w!(M_2)) = Hom(A'[1], pr_\alpha i_w!(M_2)) =
\]

\[
\text{Ext}^{\alpha} (L', i_w^\alpha(M_1[-1])) = 0 \text{ (here } M_4 \text{ is a rank } 1 \text{ perverse}
\]

constant sheaf on \( X_w^\alpha \); and we use the notation \( f_\bullet := f_s = f_i \) for a proper morphism \( f \). Thus we have \( L \subset i_w!(M_1) \), so we get the desired statement by induction. \( \square \)

**Proof of Proposition.** Let \( A \) be an abelian category, and \( B \subset A \) be a Serre subcategory. Define the left and right orthogonals to \( B \) in \( A \) by

\[
\mathcal{B} = \{ A \in A \mid Hom(A, X) = 0 \ \forall X \in B \}\]

\[
B^\perp = \{ A \in A \mid Hom(X, A) = 0 \ \forall X \in B \}.\]

It follows from the definitions that if \( A \in \perp_B \) and \( B \in B^\perp \), then \( Hom_A(A, B) \cong Hom_A(B, A) \). The lemma implies that \( \Delta_w \in \mathcal{O}_{>0}^\perp, \nabla_w \in \perp \mathcal{O}_{>0} \) for all \( w \). Hence \( T \subset \perp \mathcal{O}_{>0} \cap \mathcal{O}_{>0}^\perp \), so our proposition is proved. \( \square \)

**2.2.** We recall the intertwining functors (Radon transforms) acting on \( D \). Let \( \ell(w) = \dim(X_w) \) be the length function. For \( w \in W \) let \( X^2_w \subset X^2 \) be the \( G \)-orbit corresponding to \( w \) (thus \( X^2_w = G(X_w) \times X_w) \)). Let \( pr_i^w : X^2_w \to X \) for \( i = 1, 2 \) be the projections. Set \( R_i^w(X) = pr_2^w pr_1^w[X(\ell(w))] \), where \( \ell(w) \) or \( \ell(w) = 1 \). We need a standard

**Fact.** For \( \ell(w) = 1 \), or \( \ell(w) = 1 \) we have:

(a) \( R_i^w \circ R_i^{w_2} \cong R_i^{w_1}$\)

(b) \( R_i^w \circ R_i^{w_1} \cong id \cong R_i^{w_1} \circ R_i^w \).

(c) \( \pi \circ R_i^w \cong \pi \).

**Proof.** (a) and (b) are well known (see e.g. [BB]). Using (a) we see that it is enough to check (c) for \( w \) of length 1; so assume that \( w = s_\alpha \) is a simple reflection. We treat the case \( \ell(w) = 1 \), the other case follows. Let \( X^2_{s_\alpha} \) be the closure of \( X^2_{s_\alpha} \), and let \( pr_1^w, pr_2^w : X^2_{s_\alpha} \to X \) be the projections. Thus \( pr_1^w, pr_2^w \) are fibrations with fiber \( \mathbb{P}^1 \). For \( M \in D \) we have a canonical exact triangle

\[
\delta_*(M) \to i_* pr_1^w M[1] \to pr_2^w M[1] \to \delta_* (M) \]


where $\delta : X \to X^2$ is the diagonal embedding, and $i : X^2_{2,\alpha} \to X^2$ is the embedding. Applying $pr_{2!}$ to it, we see that it suffices to check that

$$\pi(pr_{2!}pr_1^!M) = 0$$

(2.2.1)

This is clear since $pr_{2!}pr_1^!M = pr_\alpha^*pr_{\alpha!}M$ (we use notation of the proof of Lemma 2.1). Indeed, the pull-back functor from $X_\alpha$ identifies irreducible perverse sheaves constant along the Schubert stratification on $X_\alpha$ with irreducible objects of $\mathcal{O}$ constant along the fibers of $p_\alpha$, so $L_e$ cannot occur in $pr_\alpha^*pr_{\alpha!}M$. \hfill $\square$

2.3. The following result, inspired by W. Soergel’s article [S2], appears in [BG] (see loc.cit. Theorem 6.10(i)); it was also found independently by R. Rouquier (unpublished). We include a proof for the reader’s convenience.

Let $w_0 \in W$ be the longest element.

**Proposition.** We have $R^{i_1}_{w_0}(I_w) \cong T_{w,w_0}$; $R^i_{w_0}(T_w) = P_{w,w_0}$.

**Lemma.** Assume we are in the situation of 1.5; denote by $M_\nu$ a constant perverse sheaf of rank 1 on $X_\nu$. Let $M \in D(X, \{X_\nu\})$ be any perverse sheaf.

If $Ext^a(M, i_{\nu!}(M_\nu)) = 0$ for every $a > 0$ and $\nu$, then $M$ is projective.

If $Ext^a(i_{\nu*}(M_\nu), M) = 0$ for every $a > 0$ and $\nu$, then $M$ is injective.

**Proof of Lemma.** We prove the first statement, the second one is similar. We will say that an object $A$ of a triangulated category is filtered by objects $B_i$ if there exist objects $A_0 = 0, A_1, \ldots, A_n = A$ and exact triangles $A_{i-1} \to A_i \to B_i$. Then the definition of the perverse $t$ structure implies that any perverse sheaf $N$ is filtered (as an object of the triangulated category $D(X, \{X_\nu\})$) by objects of the form $i_{\nu!}(M_\nu)[d]$, $d \leq 0$. Thus the condition implies that $Ext^a(M, N) = 0$ for all $a > 0$. \hfill $\square$

**Proof of Proposition.** We prove the first isomorphism, the second one is similar. Let us first see that $R^i_{w_0}(T_w)$ is a projective object of $\mathcal{O}$. By Fact above we have

$$R^i_{w_0}(\nabla_w) = R^i_{w_0,w} \circ R^i_{w-1}(R^i_{w}(\Delta_e)) = R^i_{w_0}(\Delta_e) = \Delta_{w_0,w}.$$ 

It follows that $R^i_{w_0}(\nabla_w) \in D$ is filtered by the objects $\nabla_w$, in particular, it lies in $\mathcal{O}$. We also have

$$Ext^a(R^i_{w_0}(T_w), \Delta_w) = Ext^a(R^i_{w_0}(T_w), R^i_{w_0}(\nabla_{w_0,w})) = Ext^a(T_w, \nabla_{w_0,w}) = 0$$

for $a > 0$, where the last equality follows from the fact that $T_w$ is filtered by objects $\Delta_w$, and $Ext^{>0}(\Delta_w, \nabla) = 0$. Thus, by Lemma, we see that $R^i_{w_0}(T_w)$ is projective. Moreover, $R^i_{w_0}(T_w)$ is indecomposable, and it follows from the above that it is filtered by objects of the form $\Delta_{w_i}$ where $w_1 = w_0 w$, and $w_i > w_0 w$ for $i > 1$. It follows that $R^i_{w_0}(T_w) \cong P_{w_0,w}$. We have proved the second isomorphism; by Verdier duality it implies that $R^i_{w_0}(T_w) \cong I_{w_0,w}$; and applying $R^i_{w_0}$ to both sides we get the first isomorphism. \hfill $\square$

2.4 **Corollary.** (Soergel’s Struktursatz, [S1], p.433) The functors $\pi|_I$, $\pi|_P$ are fully faithful. \hfill $\square$
2.5. Recall some definitions of Bondal and Kapranov [BK]. Let \( \mathcal{D} \) be a \( k \)-linear category such that \( \text{Hom}(X, Y) \) is a finite-dimensional vector space for all \( X, Y \in \mathcal{D} \). Suppose that \( \mathcal{D} \) admits an endofunctor \( S \) equipped with a natural isomorphism \( \alpha : \text{Hom}(X, S(Y)) \cong \text{Hom}(Y, X)^* \). Such \((S, \alpha)\) is evidently unique.\(^6\) It is called the Serre functor if \( S \) is actually an auto-equivalence of \( \mathcal{D} \).\(^7\) If \( \mathcal{D} \) is a triangulated category, then \( S \) is naturally a triangulated functor.

Let us return to our situation. The Serre functor on \( D \) exists by the results [BK] (compare [BK], Corollary 3.5 with either Theorem 2.11 or Corollary 2.10 in loc. cit.). In fact, the bounded derived category \( D^b(A) \) has the Serre functor whenever \( A \) is an Artinian abelian category of finite homological dimension having enough projectives and finitely many isomorphism classes of irreducible objects.

The following result was conjectured by Kapranov:

**Proposition.** The Serre functor \( S \) for \( D \) is isomorphic to \((R_{w_0}^*)^2\) as a triangulated functor.

**Proof.** It takes two steps:

(i) Our functors send \( \mathcal{P} \) to \( \mathcal{I} \) and their restrictions to \( \mathcal{P} \) are isomorphic.

(ii) Any isomorphism of functors \((R_{w_0}^*)^2|_\mathcal{P} \cong |S|_\mathcal{P}\) extends in a canonical way to an isomorphism of triangulated functors \((R_{w_0}^*)^2 \cong S\).

**Proof of (i).** Notice that for each \( w \in W \) one has \( S(P_w) \cong I_w \cong (R_{w_0}^*)^2(P_w) \) as follows, respectively, from [BK] 3.2(3) and 2.3.

We will prove that any isomorphism \( S(P_e) \cong (R_{w_0}^*)^2(P_e) \) extends uniquely to an isomorphism of functors \(|S|_\mathcal{P} \cong (R_{w_0}^*)^2|_\mathcal{P} \).

According to 2.4, we can replace our functors by their composition with \( \pi \). By Fact 2.2(c), one has \( \pi (R_{w_0}^*)^2 \cong \pi \), so we can reformulate our claim as follows: Any isomorphism \( \alpha : \pi S(P_e) \cong \pi (P_e) \) extends uniquely to an isomorphism of functors \( \pi |S|_\mathcal{P} \cong \pi |P|_\mathcal{P} \). Since \( \pi = \text{Hom}(P_e, \cdot) \), it suffices to check that \( \alpha \) commutes with the action of \( \text{End}(P_e) \). As follows from the definition of the Serre functor, \( S \) commutes with any endomorphism of the identity functor \( \text{Id}_D \). Now any endomorphism of \( P_e \) comes from an endomorphism of \( \text{Id}_D \), as follows from 2.4 and commutativity of \( \text{End}(P_e) \) established in [S1], Lemma 5 on p. 430,\(^8\) and we are done.

**Proof of (ii).** For a \( k \)-linear functor \( \phi : \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{I} \) let \( C(\phi) : C^b(\mathcal{P}) \to C^b(\mathcal{I}) \) be its DG extension to the category of bounded complexes and \( D(\phi) \) the triangulated endofunctor of \( D = K^b(\mathcal{P}) = K^b(\mathcal{I}) \) defined by \( C(\phi) \). We have seen that the restrictions of \( S \) and \((R_{w_0}^*)^2 \) to \( \mathcal{P} \) are isomorphic functors \( \mathcal{P} \to \mathcal{I} \). We will show that there are canonical identifications of triangulated endofunctors \( S \cong D(S|_\mathcal{P}) \), \((R_{w_0}^*)^2 \cong D((R_{w_0}^*)^2|_\mathcal{P}) \); this yields (ii).

---

\(^6\)And for given \( S \) all possible \( \alpha \) form a torsor with respect to an obvious action of the group of automorphisms of the identity functor \( \text{Id}_\mathcal{P} \).

\(^7\)Additional requirements on \( S \) imposed in the definition of the Serre functor in [BK] are actually redundant, see the proof of Proposition 3.4 in loc. cit.

\(^8\)In fact, Soergel’s “Endomorphismensatz” (loc. cit. p. 428; see also [B]) provides a very explicit description of \( \text{End}(P_e) \), see Remark (ii) below.
The statement about $S$ is clear. Indeed, since $S$ is the Serre functor, we have a natural isomorphism $\text{Hom}(X, S(Y)) \cong \text{Hom}(Y, X)^*$ for $X \in \mathcal{O}$, $Y \in \mathcal{P}$. It extends canonically to a natural DG isomorphism $\text{Hom}(X, S(Y)) \cong \text{Hom}(Y, X)^*$ for $X \in C^b(\mathcal{O})$, $Y \in C^b(\mathcal{P})$, which makes $D(S|_P)$ the Serre functor.

Consider $(R^*_{w_0})^2$. This is the restriction to $D$ of the endofunctor $(R^*_{w_0})^2$ of the derived category $D(X)$ of constructible complexes on $X$. The latter functor has “geometric origin” hence it lifts canonically to a triangulated endofunctor $(R^*_{w_0})^2$ of the filtered derived category $DF(X)$ of finitely filtered constructible complexes. Recall (see [BBD] 3.1) that there is a canonical fully faithful embedding $C^b(\mathcal{M}(X)) \hookrightarrow DF(X)$ whose essential image consists of those filtered complexes $P$ that $\text{gr}^i P \in \mathcal{M}(X)[-i]$ for any $i$ (the inverse functor identifies such $P$ with the complex of perverse sheaves $\ldots \rightarrow \text{gr}^1 P \rightarrow \text{gr}^{i+1} P \rightarrow \ldots$ where the differential is the third side of the triangle $\text{gr}^i P \rightarrow P_i/P_{i+1} \rightarrow \text{gr}_i P$). The equivalence $D^b(O) \cong D \subset D(X)$ from 1.5.1 comes from the composition $C^b(O) \hookrightarrow C^b(\mathcal{M}(X)) \hookrightarrow DF(X) \rightarrow D(X)$ where the third arrow is the forgetting of filtration functor. Now the restriction of $(R^*_{w_0})^2$ to $C^b(\mathcal{P}) \subset C^b(\mathcal{M}(X))$ is $C^b(\mathcal{P}) \rightarrow C^b(\mathcal{P}) \subset C^b(\mathcal{M}(X)) \subset DF(X)$ where the arrow is $C((R^*_{w_0})^2|_P)$. Since $(R^*_{w_0})^2$ lifts $(R^*_{w_0})^2$, we are done.

2.6 Remarks. (i) Let $\tilde{W}$ be the braid group associated to the root system of $G$, and for $w \in W$ let $\tilde{w} \in \tilde{W}$ be its canonical (minimal length) lifting. According to 2.2, for $? = *, !$ the map $w \mapsto R^?_w$ extends to a weak action of $\tilde{W}$ on $D$ (extending it to a strong action in the sense of $[D]$ requires more work; this is done in [R]). Notice that $\tilde{w} \tilde{v}^2$ is a central element in $\tilde{W}$. This conforms with the general fact that for any triangulated category $D$ with a Serre functor $S$, and any other functor $F : D \rightarrow D$ which admits a left adjoint $LF$ we have a canonical isomorphism

$$F \circ S \cong S \circ L(F)$$

(where $L(LF)$ denotes the left adjoint to $LF$). In particular, if $F$ is invertible we have $LF \cong F^{-1}$, so $L(LF) \cong F$, i.e. $F$ commutes with $S$.

(ii) In the step (i) of the proof of Proposition we have shown that the set of isomorphism of functors $(R^*_{w_0})^2|_P \cong S|_P$ identifies canonically with the $Z^*$-torsor of invertible elements in the $Z$-module $K := \text{Hom}((R^*_{w_0})^2(P_e), S(P_e))$ where $Z := \text{End}(P_e)$. Now $K \cong \text{Hom}(P_e, (R^*_{w_0})^2(P_e))^* \cong \text{Hom}(\pi(P_e), \pi((R^*_{w_0})^2(P_e))^*)$ which equals $\text{Hom}(\pi(P_e), \pi(P_e))^* \cong \text{Hom}(P_e, P_e)^* \cong Z^*$ (the $k$-linear dual to $Z$) by 2.2(c). Thus we have a canonical isomorphism of $Z$-modules $K \cong Z^*$. According to [S1], [B], there is a canonical isomorphism of algebras $Z \cong H^*(X^\vee)$, where $X^\vee$ is the flag space for the Langlands dual group $G^\vee$. So the trace map $H^*(X^\vee) \rightarrow k$ provides a canonical generator of the $Z$-module $Z^*$. It yields a canonical isomorphism of functors $(R^*_{w_0})^2|_P \cong S|_P$ hence, by step (ii) of the proof of Proposition, an identification of the triangulated functors $(R^*_{w_0})^2 \cong S$.

\footnote{Actually [S1], [B] work with modules over the enveloping algebra, so one has to invoke the localization theorem to derive the computation of $\text{End}(P_e)$ from their results. There is an equivalent, purely topological, construction (see [BGS], p. 525) of the morphism $H^*(X^\vee) \rightarrow A$. One knows that $H^*(X^\vee)$ is generated by $H^2(X^\vee)$, and the Chern class for the $T^\vee$-torsor $G^\vee/N^\vee$ over $X^\vee$ provides a canonical identification $t \cong H^2(X^\vee)$, where $t$ is the Cartan algebra of $G$. So our morphism is determined by a linear map $t \rightarrow Z$. Our perverse sheaves are monodromic (of unipotent monodromy) with respect to the action of (any) maximal torus $T \subset G$ on $X$. Now $t \rightarrow Z$ is the logarithm of the monodromy map.}
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