HIKITA SURJECTIVITY FOR $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$

LINUS SETIABRATA

ABSTRACT. The Hamiltonian reduction $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ of the nilpotent cone in $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ by the torus of diagonal matrices is a Nakajima quiver variety which admits a symplectic resolution $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$, and the corresponding BFN Coulomb branch is the affine closure $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$ of the cotangent bundle of the base affine space. We construct a surjective map $\mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right] \twoheadrightarrow H^*\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}\right)$ of graded algebras, which the Hikita conjecture predicts to be an isomorphism. Our map is inherited from a related case of the Hikita conjecture and factors through Kirwan surjectivity for quiver varieties. We conjecture that many other Hikita maps can be inherited from that of a related dual pair.

1. INTRODUCTION

Certain conical symplectic singularities X are expected to have a *symplectic dual* $X^!$ which satisfies many striking properties. Although there is no formal definition, nor a systematic procedure to find the dual, in many cases there is a consensus on what the dual ought to be. Examples of symplectic dual pairs include nilpotent orbits in $\mathfrak{sl}_n$ and Slodowy slices through conjugate orbits, hypertoric varieties and their Gale duals, and Nakajima quiver varieties and BFN Coulomb branches.

Symplectic duality is expected to interchange seemingly unrelated invariants. For example, if X has a symplectic resolution $\widetilde{X} \to X$, the Hikita conjecture predicts that the cohomology $H^*(\widetilde{X})$ is isomorphic to the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[(X^!)^{T^!}]$ of the scheme-theoretic fixed points of $X^!$ with respect to the maximal torus $T^!$ of the group $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathrm{Pois},\mathbb{C}^\times}(X^!)$ of Poisson automorphisms of $X^!$ commuting with dilations. When $\widetilde{X}$ is a Slodowy variety, the Hikita conjecture amounts to the theorem [dP81] of deConcini–Procesi expressing the cohomology of a Springer fiber as the coordinate ring of the scheme-theoretic intersection of a nilpotent orbit with the Cartan. Hikita [Hik17] observed that a similar phenomenon holds when $\widetilde{X}$ is the cotangent bundle of a partial flag variety, the Hilbert scheme of n points in $\mathbb{C}^2$, and a hypertoric variety. The recent preprint [HKM24] gave a counterexample to the Hikita conjecture (using a conjecturally dual pair from [LMM21]) and proposed a refined version. However, the original version of the Hikita conjecture and various generalizations have been verified for many other dual pairs [KTW+19, KMP21, KS22, Hoa24, Shl24, CHY23].

Throughout, we set G to be $\mathrm{SL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, T the torus of diagonal matrices, B the Borel subgroup of upper triangular matrices, and U the unipotent subgroup of upper triangular matrices with diagonal entries equal to 1. The Hamiltonian reduction of the nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N} := \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$ by the maximal torus is defined to be the categorical quotient $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T := \{x \in \mathcal{N} \colon \mathrm{diag}(x) = 0\}/\!\!/T$ of variety of zero-diagonal nilpotent matrices by the adjoint action of T. The variety $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ has a realization as a Nakajima quiver variety for the so-called *bouquet quiver*. It follows that $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is a conical symplectic singularity ([BS21, Thm 1.2]).

It is believed [DHK21, §8] that the conical symplectic singularities $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ and $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$ should be symplectic dual. There is now good evidence for this belief: Gannon and Williams [GW23] showed that the Coulomb branch of the 3-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ quiver gauge theory associated to the bouquet is $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$. This places conjectured duality between $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ and $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$ in the larger context of duality between Nakajima quiver varieties and BFN Coulomb branches.

Bellamy [Bel23] showed that Coulomb branches are conical symplectic singularities: For $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$, this was proven earlier by Jia [Jia21, Thm 1.1]. More generally, it is known ([Gan24, Thm 1.1]) that $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$ has symplectic singularities in all types, verifying a conjecture of Ginzburg and Kazhdan [GK22, Conj 1.3.6].

Bellamy and Schedler [BS21] characterized the Nakajima quiver varieties admitting a symplectic resolution. We show that $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ satisfies their criteria and hence has a symplectic resolution $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$. We explicitly construct a variety (Corollary 3.17) diffeomorphic to $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$. The variety $T^*(G/U)$ has commuting actions of T (induced by left multiplication on G/U) and B/U (induced by right multiplication on G/U). From these

actions one can form the scheme-theoretic fixed points $\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}$. This scheme is nonreduced and has one closed point, so its coordinate ring is finite-dimensional as a graded $\mathbb{C}$-algebra.

For the conical symplectic singularity $X = \mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$, the Hikita conjecture predicts that

$$H^*\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}\right) \cong \mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right] \tag{1}$$

as graded rings. For $n = 2$ and $n = 3$, the variety $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is the point and the type D_4 Kleinian singularity respectively, while $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$ is the affine space $\mathbb{C}^4$ and the minimal nilpotent orbit in $\mathfrak{so}_8$ ([Jia21, Thm 1.3]), respectively. The Hikita conjecture is known to hold in these examples ([Shl24]).

Our main result states:

Theorem 1.1. *There is a surjective morphism of graded algebras*

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right] \twoheadrightarrow H^*\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}\right).$$

The coordinate ring can be realized as a quotient of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]$ in the following way. The scheme $\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{B/U}$ is a subscheme of $\overline{T^*(G/U)}/\!\!/(B/U) = \mathfrak{g} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}$ and hence $\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}$ is a subscheme of $(\mathfrak{g} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h})^T = \mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}$. We compute the defining ideal of this subscheme: Write $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_n$ for coordinates on $\mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{h}$, and for subsets $S, T \subset [n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$, set

$$f_{S,T} := \prod_{\substack{s\in S\\ t\in T}} (x_s - y_t).$$

Theorem 1.2. *We have*

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right] = \frac{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]}{\left\langle f_{S,T} \colon \begin{array}{c} S, T \subseteq [n] \\ |S| + |T| = n \end{array} \right\rangle}.$$

We show that $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ is diffeomorphic to the quotient of a variety $Y_{\lambda,\delta}$ by a free action of the torus T_{PGL}. From the construction of $Y_{\lambda,\delta}$, there is a natural T-equivariant inclusion $Y_{\lambda,\delta} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Theorem 1.3. *The inclusion $Y_{\lambda,\delta} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ induces a surjection*

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}] \cong H_T^*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \twoheadrightarrow H_T^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta}) \cong H^*(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T})$$

and the kernel contains the functions $\{f_{S,T} \colon |S| + |T| = n\}$.

Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 together imply Theorem 1.1.

As $H^*(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T})$ is a finite-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-algebra, the Hikita conjecture (1) would follow from the equality

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(H^*\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}\right)\right) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right]\right).$$

The arguments in this paper suggest that the surjectivity $\mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right] \twoheadrightarrow H^*\left(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}\right)$ can be inherited from the self-duality $\mathcal{N}^!_{\mathfrak{sl}_n} = \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{sl}_n}$. We use in a crucial way (via Kirwan surjectivity for quiver varieties [MN18]) that $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ can be expressed as a quotient of a subvariety of the universal deformation $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}}$ by a free action of a torus. We also use (via the Gelfand–Graev action [GR15, Wan21]) that $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$ is the Hamiltonian reduction of a quiver representation space by a product of special linear groups $\mathrm{SL}(V_i)$ and that the corresponding Nakajima quiver variety $\overline{T^*(G/U)}/\!\!/(\mathrm{GL}(V)/\mathrm{SL}(V))$ is the nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N}$. We conjecture:

Conjecture 1.4. *Let $X, X^!$ be symplectic dual varieties. Suppose that $X^! = T^*\mathrm{Rep}(Q^!)/\!\!/\!\!/\mathrm{GL}(V^!)$ is a Nakajima quiver variety. Let T denote the maximal torus of the group of Poisson automorphisms of X commuting with dilation. Assume that $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ has a symplectic resolution. Then the Hikita conjecture holds for the pair $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ and $X^{!,\uparrow} \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} T^*\mathrm{Rep}(Q^!)/\!\!/\!\!/\mathrm{SL}(V^!)$.*

For $X = X^! = \mathcal{N}$, Conjecture 1.4 amounts to our case (1) of the Hikita conjecture. In Appendix A, we give other examples of symplectic dual pairs which arise as $(X/\!\!/\!\!/T, X^{!,\uparrow})$.

Our original motivation for studying Conjecture 1.4, and the pair $(\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T, \overline{T^*(G/U)})$ in particular, comes from the theory of BFN Coulomb branches. By definition, $X^!$ is the Higgs branch $\mathcal{M}_H(\mathrm{GL}(V), \mathbf{N})$ of a

certain 3-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ supersymmetric gauge theory. According to the expected duality between Higgs and Coulomb branches, the variety X is the corresponding Coulomb branch $\mathcal{M}_C(\mathrm{GL}(V), \mathbf{N})$. On the other hand, $X^{!,\uparrow}$ is the Higgs branch $\mathcal{M}_H(\mathrm{SL}(V), \mathbf{N})$. According to [BFN18, Prop 3.18], corresponding to the short exact sequence

$$1 \longrightarrow \mathrm{SL}(V) \longrightarrow \mathrm{GL}(V) \longrightarrow \frac{\mathrm{GL}(V)}{\mathrm{SL}(V)} \longrightarrow 1$$

there is an action of the torus $T_F := \mathrm{GL}(V)/\mathrm{SL}(V)$ on $\mathcal{M}_C(\mathrm{GL}(V), \mathbf{N}) = X$ and an isomorphism

$$\mathcal{M}_C(\mathrm{SL}(V), \mathbf{N}) \cong \mathcal{M}_C(\mathrm{GL}(V), \mathbf{N})/\!\!/\!\!/T_F.$$

(For many theories $(\mathrm{GL}(V), \mathbf{N})$ of interest, the T_F action has an explicit description [BFN19a, Rem 3.12].) In conclusion, the expected duality between Higgs and Coulomb branches predicts that $X^{!,\uparrow}$ is symplectic dual to the Hamiltonian reduction $X/\!\!/\!\!/T_F$. We thank Vasily Krylov for also pointing out this connection.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to my advisor Victor Ginzburg for his guidance, patience, and many fruitful suggestions. I thank Gwyn Bellamy, Vasily Krylov, and Travis Schedler for explaining many details in their work, and I thank Xinchun Ma for many inspiring discussions, including one that led to Conjecture 1.4. I also thank Do Kien Hoang, Boming Jia, Joshua Mundinger, Pavel Shlykov, Minh-Tâm Trinh, Xiangsheng Wang, and Yaochen Wu for helpful correspondence, and I thank Gwyn Bellamy, Vasily Krylov, and Joshua Mundinger for useful comments which improved the exposition in this paper.

2. Coordinate ring of $\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}$

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.2. To this end, we express the defining ideal of $\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}$ inside $\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}$ in terms of the Gelfand–Graev action (Proposition 2.5) and uses an explicit description of this action from [Wan21] (Lemma 2.8).

2.1. **Scheme-theoretic fixed points.** For an algebraic group H acting on an affine variety X, the scheme-theoretic fixed points X^H [DG70, VIII,Ex 6.5(d),(e)] (see also [Fog73, Thm 2.3]) is the (non-reduced, in general) affine scheme defined by

$$X^H \stackrel{\mathrm{def}}{=} \mathrm{Spec}\left(\frac{\mathbb{C}[X]}{\langle f - h(f) \colon f \in \mathbb{C}[X], h \in H\rangle}\right).$$

When a torus T acts on X, the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[X]$ decomposes into a direct sum of weight spaces $\oplus_{\alpha\in\Lambda_T}\mathbb{C}[X]_\alpha$, and there is an isomorphism (cf. [KS22, Prop 1.4])

$$\frac{\mathbb{C}[X]}{\langle f - t(f) \colon f \in \mathbb{C}[X], t \in T\rangle} \cong \frac{\mathbb{C}[X]_0}{\sum_{\alpha\neq 0}\mathbb{C}[X]_\alpha\mathbb{C}[X]_{-\alpha}}. \tag{2}$$

2.2. **Geometry of $T^*(G/U)$ and Gelfand-Graev action.** Write $T^*(G/U)$ for the cotangent bundle of the base affine space G/U, and write $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ for the Grothendieck simultaneous resolution of $\mathfrak{g}$. Using the Killing form to identify $\mathfrak{g} \leftrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^*$, there are identifications $T^*(G/U) \cong G \times_U \mathfrak{b} := \frac{G\times\mathfrak{b}}{U}$ and $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \cong G \times_B \mathfrak{b} := \frac{G\times\mathfrak{b}}{B}$. Write $\mathcal{B} := G/B$ for the flag variety.

The quotient $T^*(G/U) \to \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ makes $T^*(G/U)$ into a B/U-torsor. Write $\Lambda_{B/U}$ for the (B/U)-weight lattice. For $\alpha \in \Lambda_{B/U}$, write $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha)$ for the pullback of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha)$ along $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathcal{B}$, so that a regular function on $T^*(G/U)$ of B/U-weight α is precisely a section of $\mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha)$. As the left T-action on $T^*(G/U)$ descends to $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, we get an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{C}[T^*(G/U)] = \bigoplus_{\alpha\in\Lambda_{B/U}} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))$$

of T-representations.

Lemma 2.3 ([Bro93, Prop 2.6], cf. also [GR15, Lem 3.6.2]). *If $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_{B/T}$ are dominant weights, the multiplication map $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\lambda)) \otimes \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mu)) \to \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\lambda + \mu))$ is surjective.*

Proof. For any dominant weight $\alpha \in \Lambda_{B/U}$, let $V_\alpha \subset \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))$ denote the space of sections obtained by pulling back sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha)$ along the vector bundle map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathcal{B}$. A result of Broer [Bro93, Prop 2.6] implies that when α is dominant the subspace X_α generates $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))$ as a $\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}]$-module.

The lemma follows from the fact that the multiplication map $X_\lambda \otimes X_\mu \to X_{\lambda+\mu}$ is surjective ([BK04, Thm 3.1.2(c)].) □

The coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[T^*(G/U)]$ is also equipped with an action of W, called the *Gelfand-Graev action*, which restricts to isomorphisms

$$w.\colon \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(w.\alpha))$$

of T-representations. Given a weight $\beta \in \Lambda_T$ of T, let $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_\beta$ denote the β-weight space of $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))$. Note that the Gelfand-Graev action preserves $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(0))$ as well as its 0-weight space $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(0))_0$.

It is known [GR15, Prop 5.5.1] that the restriction of the Gelfand-Graev action to $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(0)) = \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]$ agrees with the one induced by the W-action on $\mathfrak{g} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}$ given by acting trivially on $\mathfrak{g}$ and naturally on $\mathfrak{h}$.

2.4. **Fixed points in $\overline{T^*(G/U)}$.** Consider the algebra

$$R := \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(0))_0$$

and the ideals

$$I := \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\neq(0,0)} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_\beta \cdot \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha))_{-\beta}$$
$$J := \sum_{\beta\neq 0} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(0))_\beta \cdot \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(0))_{-\beta}$$

of R. Equation (2) implies that $R/J = \mathbb{C}[(\mathfrak{g} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h})^T] = \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]$ and that

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right] = R/I \cong \frac{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]}{I/J}.$$

By construction, the Gelfand-Graev action on R descends to the W-action on $R/J = \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]$ given by acting on the second $\mathfrak{h}$ factor.

Proposition 2.5. *The ideal I/J of the ring R/J is generated by the image of the W-orbit of*

$$\sum_{\omega_i,\lambda} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\omega_i))_\lambda \cdot \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\omega_i))_{-\lambda}$$

under the projection $R \to R/J$. (The sum runs over fundamental weights $\omega_i \in \Lambda_{B/U}$ and all weights $\lambda \in \Lambda_T$.)

Proof. Let $\alpha \in \Lambda_{B/U}$ be a nonzero dominant weight of B/U and let $\beta \in \Lambda_T$ be any weight of T. Pick a fundamental weight $\omega_i \in \Lambda_{B/U}$ so that $\alpha - \omega_i$ is dominant. Note that $w_0.(-\alpha)$, $w_0.(-\omega_i)$, and $w_0.(-\alpha+\omega_i)$ are all dominant as well. Lemma 2.3 implies that the multiplication maps

$$(\dagger) \qquad \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_T} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha-\omega_i))_{\beta-\lambda} \otimes \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\omega_i))_\lambda \longrightarrow \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_\beta$$

$$(\ddagger) \qquad \sum_{\lambda\in\Lambda_T} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha+\omega_i))_{-\beta-\lambda} \otimes \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\omega_i))_\lambda \longrightarrow \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha))_{-\beta}$$

are surjective. Taking the tensor product of the maps in (†) and (‡) and composing with multiplication $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_\beta \otimes \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha))_{-\beta} \twoheadrightarrow \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_\beta \cdot \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha))_{-\beta}$ gives a surjective map

$$\sum_{\lambda,\mu\in\Lambda_T} \underbrace{\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha-\omega_i))_{\beta-\lambda} \otimes \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha+\omega_i))_{-\beta-\mu}}_{\subset\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}]_{-\lambda-\mu}} \otimes \underbrace{\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\omega_i))_\lambda \otimes \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\omega_i))_\mu}_{\subset\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}]_{\lambda+\mu}}$$
$$\longrightarrow \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_\beta \cdot \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha))_{-\beta}.$$

Under the projection map $I \to I/J$, the images of the subspaces on the left hand side vanish unless $\lambda+\mu = 0$. We deduce that the ideal of R/J generated by the image of

$$\sum_{\lambda} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\omega_i))_{\lambda} \otimes \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\omega_i))_{-\lambda}$$

contains the image of $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_{\beta} \cdot \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha))_{-\beta}$.

Since I/J is generated by the image of

$$W \left(\sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \Lambda^+_{B/T} \setminus 0 \\ \beta \in \Lambda_T}} \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))_{\beta} \cdot \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\alpha))_{-\beta} \right),$$

the result follows. □

Recall that $V_\alpha \subset \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\alpha))$ denotes the space of sections obtained by pulling back sections of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\alpha)$ along the vector bundle map $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathcal{B}$. The space V_α is stable under the T-action. Fix a basis $h_{(\omega_i,\lambda),j}$ for each weight space $(V_{\omega_i})_\lambda$.

Proposition 2.6. *The W-orbits of*

$$h_{(\omega_i,\mu),j} \cdot (w_0.h_{(\omega_{n-i},-\mu),k})$$

generate I/J as an ideal of R/J.

Proof. Let

$$f_1 \in \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\omega_i))_\lambda, \qquad f_2 \in \Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\omega_i))_{-\lambda}.$$

Because V_{ω_i} and $V_{\omega_{n-i}}$ generate $\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\omega_i))$ and $w_0.\Gamma(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \mathcal{O}_{\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(-\omega_i))$ respectively as a $\mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}]$-module, we can write

$$f_1 = \sum_k g_k h_{(\omega_i,\mu_k),k}, \qquad g_k \in \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}]_{\lambda-\mu_k}$$

$$f_2 = w_0.\left(\sum_k g'_k h_{(\omega_{n-i},\mu'_k),k} \right), \qquad g'_k \in \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}]_{-\lambda-\mu'_k}$$

and hence

$$f_1 f_2 = \sum_{k,\ell} g_k (w_0.g'_\ell) \cdot h_{(\omega_i,\mu_k),k} \cdot (w_0.h_{(\omega_{n-i},\mu'_\ell),\ell}).$$

Under the projection map $I \to I/J$, the images of the terms on the right hand side vanish unless $\mu_k + \mu'_\ell = 0$. We conclude that the image of $f_1 f_2$ in I/J can be written as a R/J-linear combination of $h_{(\omega_i,\mu),j} \cdot (w_0.h_{(\omega_{n-i},-\mu),k})$.

The claim now follows from Proposition 2.5. □

For subsets $S, T \subset [n]$ with $|S| = |T|$, define the function

$$\Delta_{S,T} \colon \mathrm{SL}_n \to \mathbb{C}$$
$$g = (g_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]} \mapsto \det(g_{st})_{s\in S, t\in T}$$

The functions $\Delta_S := \Delta_{S,\{1,\dots,|S|\}}$ are U-invariant under right translations and descend to sections of certain line bundles on the flag variety $\mathcal{B}$: specifically, for each i, the set of functions $\{\Delta_S \colon |S| = i\}$ forms a weight basis for the representation $\Gamma(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_i))$. The T-weight of Δ_S is $\sum_{s\in S} \mu_s$, where $\mu_i \colon T \to \mathbb{C}^\times$ is the character $\mu_i \colon (t_1, \dots, t_n) \mapsto t_i$.

Let p denote the projection $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \frac{G\times\mathfrak{b}}{B} \to G/B = \mathcal{B}$ onto the first factor; the map p makes $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ into a vector bundle over $\mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $p \colon \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathcal{B}$ denote the vector bundle map. The W-orbits of*

$$p^*\Delta_S \cdot (w_0.p^*\Delta_{[n]\setminus S})$$

generate I/J as an ideal of $R/J = \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]$.

Proof. The map $p^*\colon \Gamma(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\omega_i)) \xrightarrow{\sim} V_{\omega_i}$ is an isomorphism of G-representations, so $\{p^*\Delta_S\colon |S| = i\}$ forms a weight basis of V_{ω_i}. Proposition 2.6 implies that $p^*\Delta_S \cdot (w_0.p^*\Delta_{[n]\setminus S})$ generates I/J as an ideal of R/J. □

Finally, we will use an explicit description of the Gelfand-Graev action in type A on the regular semisimple locus. Recall the identification $T^*(G/U) \cong \frac{G\times\mathfrak{b}}{U}$. Let $(T^*(G/U))^{\mathrm{rs}}$ denote the image of

$$\varphi\colon G \times \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{rs}} \hookrightarrow G \times \mathfrak{b} \to G \times_U \mathfrak{b} = T^*(G/U).$$

Lemma 2.8 ([Wan21, Prop 4.5.1]). *Let $y = \mathrm{diag}(y_1, \dots, y_n) \in \mathfrak{h}^{\mathrm{rs}}$. Let $s_k(y)$ denote the $n \times n$ matrix obtained from the identity matrix by replacing the $\{k, k+1\}$-th submatrix by*

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{y_k - y_{k+1}} \\ y_{k+1} - y_k & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Gelfand–Graev action of the transposition s_k interchanging $k \longleftrightarrow k+1$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_k\colon (T^*(G/U))^{\mathrm{rs}} &\to (T^*(G/U))^{\mathrm{rs}} \\ [g, y] &\mapsto [g s_k(y), \mathrm{Ad}_{s_k^{-1}}(y)]. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.9. *Let $w_0^{(n)}$ denote the longest element in S_n. The action of $w_0^{(n)}$ on $(T^*(G/U))^{\mathrm{rs}}$ is given by*

$$[(g_{ij}), (y_i)] \mapsto \left[\left(g_{i,n+1-j} \frac{\prod_{\ell>j}(y_{n+1-j} - y_{n+1-\ell})}{\prod_{\ell<j}(y_{n+1-j} - y_{n+1-\ell})} \right), w_0^{(n)}.(y_i) \right]$$

Example 2.10. For $n = 4$, the matrix $\left(g_{i,n+1-j} \frac{\prod_{\ell>j}(y_{n+1-j} - y_{n+1-\ell})}{\prod_{\ell<j}(y_{n+1-j} - y_{n+1-\ell})} \right)$ is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} g_{14}(y_4-y_1)(y_4-y_2)(y_4-y_3) & g_{13}\frac{(y_3-y_1)(y_3-y_2)}{y_3-y_4} & g_{12}\frac{y_2-y_1}{(y_2-y_3)(y_2-y_4)} & g_{11}\frac{1}{(y_1-y_2)(y_1-y_3)(y_1-y_4)} \\ g_{24}(y_4-y_1)(y_4-y_2)(y_4-y_3) & g_{23}\frac{(y_3-y_1)(y_3-y_2)}{y_3-y_4} & g_{22}\frac{y_2-y_1}{(y_2-y_3)(y_2-y_4)} & g_{21}\frac{1}{(y_1-y_2)(y_1-y_3)(y_1-y_4)} \\ g_{34}(y_4-y_1)(y_4-y_2)(y_4-y_3) & g_{33}\frac{(y_3-y_1)(y_3-y_2)}{y_3-y_4} & g_{32}\frac{y_2-y_1}{(y_2-y_3)(y_2-y_4)} & g_{31}\frac{1}{(y_1-y_2)(y_1-y_3)(y_1-y_4)} \\ g_{44}(y_4-y_1)(y_4-y_2)(y_4-y_3) & g_{43}\frac{(y_3-y_1)(y_3-y_2)}{y_3-y_4} & g_{42}\frac{y_2-y_1}{(y_2-y_3)(y_2-y_4)} & g_{41}\frac{1}{(y_1-y_2)(y_1-y_3)(y_1-y_4)} \end{bmatrix}$$

△

Proof of Lemma 2.9. We argue by induction. When $n = 2$, Lemma 2.8 asserts that the action of $w_0^{(2)} = s_1$ is given by

$$\sigma_1\colon \left[\begin{bmatrix} g_{11} & g_{12} \\ g_{21} & g_{22} \end{bmatrix}, (y_1, y_2) \right] \mapsto \left[\begin{bmatrix} g_{21}(y_2 - y_1) & g_{11}\frac{1}{y_1 - y_2} \\ g_{22}(y_2 - y_1) & g_{12}\frac{1}{y_1 - y_2} \end{bmatrix}, (y_2, y_1) \right],$$

as claimed.

Let M denote the $n \times n$ matrix with

$$m_{ij} = \begin{cases} g_{i,n-j} \frac{\prod_{\ell>j}(y_{n-j} - y_{n-\ell})}{\prod_{\ell<j}(y_{n-j} - y_{n-\ell})} & \text{if } j \le n-1 \\ g_{i,n} & \text{if } j = n \end{cases}$$

Let $\iota\colon S_{n-1} \hookrightarrow S_n$ denote the standard embedding. By induction, $\iota(w_0^{(n-1)})$ acts on $(T^*(\mathrm{SL}_n/U))^{\mathrm{rs}}$ by

$$[(g_{ij}), (y_i)] \mapsto \left[M, \iota(w_0^{(n-1)}).(y_i) \right].$$

Using the equality $w_0^{(n)} = s_1 \dots s_{n-1} \iota(w_0^{(n-1)})$, repeated application of Lemma 2.8 gives the result. □

Theorem 1.2. *We have*

$$\mathbb{C}\left[\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}\right] = \frac{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}]}{\langle f_{S,T} \rangle}.$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $S \subset [n]$ with $|S| = i$. By Lemma 2.9, the restriction of the function $w_0.p^*\Delta_S$ to $(T^*(G/U))^{\mathrm{rs}}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}[g,y] &\mapsto \det\left(g_{s,n-t}\frac{\prod_{\ell>t}(y_{n+1-t}-y_{n+1-\ell})}{\prod_{\ell<t}(y_{n+1-t}-y_{n+1-\ell})}\right)_{\substack{s\in S\\ t\in[i]}}\\ &= \det(g_{s,n-t})_{\substack{s\in S\\ t\in[i]}}\frac{\prod_{\substack{a>b\\ a>n-|S|}}(y_a-y_b)}{\prod_{\substack{a<b\\ a>n-|S|}}(y_a-y_b)}\\ &= \varepsilon_S\det(g_{s,n-t})_{\substack{s\in S\\ t\in[i]}}\prod_{\substack{a>n-|S|\\ b\le n-|S|}}(y_a-y_b), \qquad \varepsilon_S\in\{\pm1\}.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, the function $p^*\Delta_S\cdot(w_0.p^*\Delta_{[n]\setminus S})$ restricts to $(T^*(G/U))^{\mathrm{rs}}$ as

$$[g,y]\mapsto \varepsilon_S\det(g_{st})_{\substack{s\in S\\ t\in[i]}}\det(g_{st})_{\substack{s\in[n]\setminus S\\ t\in[n]\setminus[i]}}\prod_{\substack{a>i\\ b\le i}}(y_a-y_b).$$

Given a permutation w, pick a matrix $P_w\in \mathrm{SL}_n$ whose entries are nonzero only at positions $(i,w(i))$, and whose nonzero entries are equal to ±1. The function $p^*\Delta_S\cdot(w_0.p^*\Delta_{[n]\setminus S})$ restricts to a nonzero function only when $w(S)=[i]$ and in this case it is given by the formula

$$[P_w,y]\mapsto \varepsilon'_S\prod_{\substack{a>i\\ b\le i}}(y_a-y_b), \qquad \varepsilon'_S\in\{\pm1\}.$$

It follows that the image of $p^*\Delta_S\cdot(w_0.p^*\Delta_{[n]\setminus S})\in R=\mathbb{C}[T^*(G/U)]_{(0,0)}$ under the projection $R\to R/J=\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}\times_{\mathfrak{h}/W}\mathfrak{h}]$ is given by the formula

$$(w.y,y)\mapsto\begin{cases}\varepsilon'_S\prod_{s\in[n]\setminus S}(y_{w(s)}-y_1)\dots(y_{w(s)}-y_i) & \text{if } w(S)=[i]\\ 0 & \text{else}\end{cases}$$

By construction, this is the restriction of

$$\varepsilon'_Sf_{[n]\setminus S,[i]}=\varepsilon'_S\prod_{\substack{s\in[n]\setminus S\\ t\in[i]}}(x_s-y_t)$$

to $\mathfrak{h}\times_{\mathfrak{h}/W}\mathfrak{h}$.

The claim follows from the fact that the W-orbit of $f_{[n]\setminus S,[i]}$ is $\{f_{[n]\setminus S,T}\colon |T|=i\}$. □

Remark 2.11. The set $\{f_{S,T}\colon |S|+|T|=n\}$ is not a minimal generating set of the ideal $\langle f_{S,T}\rangle$; for example one can compute that

$$f_{S,T}=(-1)^{|S||T|}f_{[n]\setminus S,[n]\setminus T}$$

as functions on $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h}\times_{\mathfrak{h}/W}\mathfrak{h}]$. △

3. Symplectic resolution of $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$

In this section we prove that $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is a Nakajima quiver variety (Proposition 3.8) with a symplectic resolution $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ (Theorem 3.10). Using a standard construction for Nakajima quiver varieties in general, we give an explicit description of the diffeomorphism type of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ in Corollary 3.17: the variety $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ is diffeomorphic to the quotient $Y_{\lambda,\delta}/(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ for sufficiently generic $\lambda,\delta\in\{(x_1,\dots,x_n)\in\mathbb{C}^n\colon x_1+\dots+x_n=0\}$, where

$$Y_{\lambda,\delta}:=\left\{(x,F_\bullet)\in\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}\colon \begin{array}{c} x|_{F_k/F_{k-1}}=\lambda_k\mathrm{Id}\\ \mathrm{diag}(x)=\delta\end{array}\right\},$$

and the torus $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ acts on $Y_{\lambda,\delta}$ by

$$(t_1,\dots,t_{n-1})\cdot(x,F_\bullet)=(\mathrm{Ad}_{t'}(x),t'\cdot F_\bullet), \qquad t':=\mathrm{diag}(t_1,\dots,t_{n-1},1).$$

3.1. **Nakajima quiver varieties.** Let $Q = (I, E)$ be a quiver, and fix dimension vectors $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^I$. Let $s, t \colon E \to I$ denote the source and target maps respectively. Write

$$\mathbb{M}(Q, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) := \bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{v_{s(e)}}, \mathbb{C}^{v_{t(e)}}) \oplus \bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{v_{t(e)}}, \mathbb{C}^{v_{s(e)}}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{w_i}, \mathbb{C}^{v_i}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{v_i}, \mathbb{C}^{w_i})$$

$$(\heartsuit) \qquad \cong T^* \left(\bigoplus_{e \in E} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{v_{s(e)}}, \mathbb{C}^{v_{t(e)}}) \oplus \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathrm{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^{w_i}, \mathbb{C}^{v_i}) \right).$$

The vector space $\mathbb{M}$ is equipped with a canonical symplectic form and an action of the group

$$\mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}} := \prod_{i \in I} \mathrm{GL}(v_i)$$

induced by the action of $\mathrm{GL}(v_i)$ on $\mathbb{C}^{v_i}$.

Write $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}} := \mathrm{Lie}(\mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}})$ and let $\mu \colon \mathbb{M} \to \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*$ denote the moment map of this action.

The Nakajima quiver variety is the GIT quotient

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\lambda, \theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) := \mu^{-1}(\lambda) /\!\!/_{\theta} \mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}}$$

where $\lambda \in Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*)$ and $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$ is a stability condition, encoding a character $\chi_\theta \colon \mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}} \to \mathbb{C}^\times$ via $\chi_\theta((g_i)_{i \in I}) := \prod_{i \in I} \det(g_i)^{\theta_i}$.

Given dimension vectors $\mathbf{v} = (v_i)_{i \in I}$ and $\mathbf{v}' = (v_i')_{i \in I}$, write $\mathbf{v}' < \mathbf{v}$ if $v_i' \leq v_i$ for all i and $\mathbf{v}' \neq \mathbf{v}$.

Definition 3.2 ([MN18, Defn 3.1])**.** The stability condition θ is *nondegenerate* if $\sum_i \theta_i \cdot v_i' \neq 0$ for all nonzero dimension vectors $\mathbf{v}' < \mathbf{v}$. △

In the special case $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{e}_j$ (i.e., exactly one vertex is framed and the framing is one-dimensional), and the stability parameter $\theta = (\theta_i)_{i \in I}$ is in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^I$ (hence is nondegenerate), the locus of θ-stable points is particularly easy to compute using King stability conditions [Kin94, Prop 3.1].

Lemma 3.3 ([Nak98, Lem 3.8, Lem 3.10])**.** *Let $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{e}_j$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^I$. Given a point $p \in \mathbb{M}(Q, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$, write $j(p)$ for the framing map $\mathbb{C}^{v_i} \to \mathbb{C}$. The following are equivalent:*

(1) p is θ-stable
(2) p is θ-semistable
(3) $\ker(j(p))$ contains no nonzero p-stable I-graded subspace.

The action of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}}$ is free on the stable locus $\mathbb{M}(Q, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})^{\theta\text{-s}}$ and consequently

$$\mathfrak{M}_{\lambda, \theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = (\mu^{-1}(\lambda) \cap \mathbb{M}^{\theta\text{-s}})/\mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}}.$$

The inclusion $\mu^{-1}(0)^{\theta\text{-s}} \hookrightarrow \mu^{-1}(0)$ induces a map in equivariant cohomology

$$H^*_{\mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}}}(\mathrm{pt}) \cong H^*_{\mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}}}(\mu^{-1}(0)) \to H^*_{\mathbb{G}_{\mathbf{v}}}(\mu^{-1}(0)^{\theta\text{-s}}) \cong H^*(\mathfrak{M}_{0,\theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}))$$

called the *Kirwan map*. (The last isomorphism follows from Lemma 3.3.)

A special case of *Kirwan surjectivity*, due to McGerty–Nevins, reads:

Theorem 3.4 ([MN18, Thm 1.2])**.** *Let $\mathfrak{M}_{0,\theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ be a smooth Nakajima quiver variety. Then the Kirwan map is surjective.*

We say that a Nakajima quiver variety is *unframed* if $\mathbf{w} = 0$. When the dimension vector $\mathbf{v}$ of an unframed Nakajima quiver variety is in a certain combinatorially defined set $\Sigma_0(Q)$, Bellamy and Schedler provide a criterion for $\mathfrak{M}$ to admit a projective symplectic resolution given by deforming the stability parameter.

Following the notation in [BS21], the Ringel form on $\mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ is defined by

$$\langle \alpha, \beta \rangle := \sum_{i \in Q_0} \alpha_i \beta_i - \sum_{\alpha \in Q_1} \alpha_{t(a)} \beta_{h(a)}.$$

Definition 3.5 ([BS21, §2.2])**.** The vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is *anisotropic* if $\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle < 0$. △

Proposition 3.6 ([BS21, Thm 1.5])**.** *Let $\mathbf{v} \in \Sigma_0(Q)$. Then the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{0})$ admits a projective symplectic resolution if $\mathbf{v}$ is indivisible. If $\mathbf{v}$ is anisotropic, a resolution is given by moving to a generic stability parameter.*

3.7. **Presentation of $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ as a Nakajima quiver variety.** The *(trimmed) bouquet quiver* Q_n is the quiver with vertices $\{s_1,\dots,s_{n-1}\}\sqcup\{b_1,\dots,b_{n-1}\}$ and edges

$$\{(s_i,s_{i+1})\colon i\in[n-1]\}\sqcup\{(s_{n-1},b_i)\colon i\in[n-1]\}.$$

See Figure 1 for an example. We write dimension vectors $\mathbf{v}$ for Q_n as tuples $(v_{s_1},\dots,v_{s_{n-1}};v_{b_1},\dots,v_{b_{n-1}})$. The vertices s_i and b_i are called *stem* and *bouquet* vertices. Associated to this partition of the vertices of Q_n, we write

$$\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}}:=\prod_{\substack{i\in I(Q_n)\\ i=s_j}}\mathrm{GL}(v_i),\qquad \mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}:=\prod_{\substack{i\in I(Q_n)\\ i=b_j}}\mathrm{GL}(v_i),$$

and $\mu_{\mathrm{stem}},\mu_{\mathrm{bouq}}$ for the corresponding moment maps.

The *abundant bouquet quiver* Q_n^+ has an extra bouquet vertex: it is the quiver with vertices $\{s_1,\dots,s_{n-1}\}\sqcup\{b_1,\dots,b_n\}$ and edges

$$\{(s_i,s_{i+1})\colon i\in[n-1]\}\sqcup\{(s_{n-1},b_i)\colon i\in[n]\}.$$

See Figure 1 for an example. We write dimension vectors $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ for Q_n^+ as tuples $(v_{s_1},\dots,v_{s_{n-1}};v_{b_1},\dots,v_{b_n})$.



FIGURE 1. Left: The bouquet quiver Q_4, with vertices labelled. Right: The abundant bouquet quiver Q_4^+, with vertices labelled.

A special case of the Crawley-Boevey trick [CB01, pg. 261] says that the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{\lambda,\theta}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}})$ for the trimmed bouquet Q_n is isomorphic to the unframed Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{\hat\lambda,\hat\theta}(\hat{\mathbf{v}},\mathbf{0})$ for the abundant bouquet quiver Q_n^+, where:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{v}}&:=(\mathbf{v},1),\\ \hat\lambda&:=\left(\lambda,-\sum_{i\in V(Q_n)}\lambda_i v_i\right),\\ \hat\theta&:=\left(\theta,-\sum_{i\in V(Q_n)}\theta_i v_i\right).\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 3.8. *The variety $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is isomorphic to the unframed Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\hat{\mathbf{v}},\mathbf{0})$ for the quiver Q_n^+ and dimension vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}=(1,\dots,n-1;1,\dots,1)$.*

Proof. Observe that the restriction of Q_n to the stem vertices is a type A_{n-1} Dynkin quiver, and write $\hat{\mathbf{v}}|_{\mathrm{stem}}:=(1,\dots,n-1)$ for the restriction of $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ to the stem vertices. The Hamiltonian reduction $\mathbb{M}(Q_n^+,\hat{\mathbf{v}},\mathbf{0})/\!\!/\!\!/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}}:=\mu_{\mathrm{stem}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/\!\!/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}}$ is the Nakajima quiver variety

$$\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\hat{\mathbf{v}}|_{\mathrm{stem}},n\,\mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}}),$$

which is known [Nak94, Thm 7.2] to be nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N}$. The map μ_{bouq} descends to $\mathbb{M}(Q_n^+,\hat{\mathbf{v}},\mathbf{0})/\!\!/\!\!/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}}\cong\mathcal{N}$ and coincides with the map sending a nilpotent matrix $x=(x_{ij})_{i,j\in[n]}$ to the tuple $(x_{11},\dots,x_{n-1,n-1})$ of diagonal entries of x, and the residual action of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}$ coincides with the adjoint action of the torus $T':=\{\mathrm{diag}(t_1,\dots,t_{n-1},1)\}$ on $\mathcal{N}$.

By Hamiltonian reduction in stages ([MMO+07, Thm 5.2.9], see also [Mor14, Thm 3.3.1]),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\hat{\mathbf{v}},\mathbf{0})&\cong(\mathbb{M}(Q_n^+,\hat{\mathbf{v}},\mathbf{0})/\!\!/\!\!/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}})/\!\!/\!\!/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}\\ &\cong\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}\\ &=\mu_{\mathrm{bouq}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/T'.\end{aligned}$$

As nilpotent matrices are traceless we have $\mu_{\mathrm{bouq}}^{-1}(0) = \{x \in \mathcal{N} \colon \mathrm{diag}(x) = 0\}$. Furthermore, the composite $T' \hookrightarrow T_{\mathrm{GL}_n} \twoheadrightarrow T_{\mathrm{PGL}_n}$ is an isomorphism, and the adjoint action of T factors through $T \to T_{\mathrm{PGL}_n}$; it follows that

$$\mu_{\mathrm{bouq}}^{-1}(0)/\!\!/T' \cong \{x \in \mathcal{N} \colon \mathrm{diag}(x) = 0\}/\!\!/T. \qquad \square$$

Remark 3.9. By the Crawley-Boevey trick, $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is also isomorphic to the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}})$ for the quiver Q_n and dimension vector $\mathbf{v} = (1, 2, \ldots, n-1; 1, \ldots, 1)$. $\triangle$

Theorem 3.10. *The variety $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ has a symplectic resolution $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ given by moving to a generic stability parameter.*

Proof. A routine computation (Lemma B.2) shows that the dimension vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is in the set $\Sigma_0(Q_n^+)$. Lemma B.3 guarantees that $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is anisotropic when $n \geq 4$. The claim follows from Proposition 3.6.

For $n = 3$, the quiver Q_n^+ is the affine $\widetilde{D}_4$ Dynkin quiver, and the dimension vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is the minimal imaginary root; thus $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is the Kleinian singularity of type D_4. The claim is then a special case of Kronheimer's construction [Kro89] of the minimal resolution via quiver varieties. $\square$

As the diffeomorphism type of a smooth Nakajima variety does not depend on the choice of (generic) moment map and stability parameter ([Nak94, Cor 4.2]), Theorem 3.10 implies the following claim.

Proposition 3.11 (cf. [Nak94, Cor 4.2])**.** *Let $\theta := (1, \ldots, 1)$. For sufficiently generic $(\nu; \gamma) \in Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*)$, the variety $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ is diffeomorphic to $\mathfrak{M}_{(\nu;\gamma),\theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}})$.*

3.12. **Stable loci conditions.** Our next goal is to use King stability conditions to compute stable loci explicitly (Lemma 3.13) in order to give an explicit description of the diffeomorphism type of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$.

As in the previous subsection, let $\theta := (1, \ldots, 1)$. We use the notation of Subsection 3.1 for the quiver Q_n. Viewing $\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ as quiver varieties for Q_n, an element $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \alpha, \beta)$ of the corresponding representation space $\mathbb{M}(Q_n, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}})$ consists of maps $x_i \colon \mathbb{C}^i \to \mathbb{C}^{i+1}$, $y_i \colon \mathbb{C}^{i+1} \to \mathbb{C}^i$ between stem vertices, along with n maps $\alpha_i \colon \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{C}$ and n maps $\beta_i \colon \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$, where for $i \in [n-1]$ the maps α_i, β_i are incident to s_{n-1} and b_i and α_n, β_n are framing maps on s_{n-1}; see Figure 2.



FIGURE 2. An element of the representation space $\mathbb{M}(Q_4, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e}_{s_3})$. (The boxed $\mathbb{C}$ is the framing associated with the vertex s_3.)

For $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \alpha, \beta)$ in $\mathbb{M}$, it will be useful to combine the α and β into the maps

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi \colon \mathbb{C}^{n-1} &\to \mathbb{C}^n \\ v &\mapsto (\alpha_1(v), \ldots, \alpha_n(v)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \psi \colon \mathbb{C}^n &\to \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \\ (v_1, \ldots, v_n) &\mapsto \beta_1(v_1) + \cdots + \beta_n(v_n). \end{aligned}$$

The map $\varphi\psi \colon \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ is given by the matrix M whose ij-th entry is $M_{ij} = \alpha_j \beta_i(1)$.

Lemma 3.13. *We have*

$$\mathbb{M}^{\theta\text{-s}} = \left\{ (\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta) \colon \begin{array}{c} x_i, \varphi \text{ injective} \\ \varphi\psi \text{ satisfies } (*) \end{array} \right\},$$

where the key stability condition is given by:

$(*)$ $\quad x \colon \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}^n$ does not preserve any nonzero coordinate subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{n-1} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$.

Proof. The condition that $\varphi\psi$ satisfies $(*)$ is equivalent to:

$(**)$ $\quad$ For all nonempty $S \subseteq [n-1]$, there exists $i \in S$ such that $\operatorname{img} \beta_i \not\subset \ker \alpha_j$ for some $j \notin S$.

(Above, j may be equal to n.) In other words, there may not exist a subset $S \subseteq [n-1]$ where $\operatorname{img} \alpha_i \subset \ker \beta_j$ whenever $i \in S$ and $j \notin S$: such an S exists if and only if $\varphi\psi$ fixes the coordinate subspace $\mathbb{C}^S \subset \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$.

By Lemma 3.3, the point $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$ is θ-stable if and only if the only $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$-stable subspace of $\ker \alpha_n$ is zero.

We first claim that if any x_k has nonzero kernel, the subspace

$$\ker x_k \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{k-1} y_i y_{i+1} \dots y_{k-1}(\ker x_k)$$

of $\ker \alpha_n$ is $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$-stable, as

$$\begin{aligned} x_i y_i y_{i+1} \dots y_{k-1}(\ker x_k) &= y_{i+1} x_{i+1} y_{i+1} \dots y_{k-1}(\ker x_k) \\ &= \dots \\ &= y_{i+1} y_{i+2} \dots y_{k-1} x_{k-1} y_{k-1}(\ker x_k) \\ &= y_{i+1} y_{i+2} \dots y_{k-1} y_k x_k (\ker x_k) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, if φ has nonzero kernel, then the subspace

$$\ker \varphi \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-2} y_i y_{i+1} \dots y_{n-2} \ker \varphi$$

of $\ker \alpha_n$ is $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$-stable: as above, one iteratively applies the moment map equations $x_j y_j = y_{j+1} x_{j+1}$ when $j \le n-3$, and then applies the moment map condition $x_{n-2} y_{n-2} = \psi\varphi$.

Next, suppose that there is a nonzero coordinate subspace $\mathbb{C}^S \subset \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ fixed by $\varphi\psi$. Identifying $\mathbb{C}^S$ with the direct sum of the one-dimensional vector spaces $\mathbb{C}$ at the vertices $\{b_i \colon i \in S\}$, we claim the subspace

$$\mathbb{C}^S \oplus \psi(\mathbb{C}^S) \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n-2} y_i y_{i+1} \dots y_{n-2} \psi(\mathbb{C}^S)$$

of $\ker \alpha_n$ is $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$-stable: applying moment map equations we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} x_i(y_i y_{i+1} \dots y_{n-2} \psi(\mathbb{C}^S)) &= y_{i+1} \dots y_{n-2} \psi\varphi\psi(\mathbb{C}^S) \\ &= y_{i+1} \dots y_{n-2} \psi(\mathbb{C}^S) \end{aligned}$$

because $\varphi\psi$ fixes $\mathbb{C}^S$; furthermore, the equality the equality $\alpha_i = \pi_i \varphi$ (with $\pi_i \colon \mathbb{C}^n \to \mathbb{C}$ the projection to the i-th coordinate) implies

$$\alpha_i \psi(\mathbb{C}^S) \subseteq \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & \text{if } i \in S \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

because $\varphi\psi$ fixes $\mathbb{C}^S$, while $\beta_i(\mathbb{C}) = \psi(\mathbb{C}^{\{i\}})$ implies

$$\beta_i(\mathbb{C}) \subset \psi(\mathbb{C}^S) \qquad \text{when } i \in S.$$

We deduce that

$$\mathbb{M}^{\theta\text{-s}} \subseteq \left\{ (\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta) \colon \begin{array}{c} x_i, \varphi \text{ injective} \\ \varphi\psi \text{ satisfies } (*) \end{array} \right\}.$$

We now show that if x_i, φ are injective and $\varphi\psi$ satisfies $(*)$ then $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$ is θ-stable. Let $V = \bigoplus_{i\in[n-1]} V_{s_i} \oplus \bigoplus_{i\in[n-1]} V_{b_i}$ be an $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$-stable subspace of $\ker \alpha_n$. Let S denote the set of $i \in [n-1]$ for which V_{b_i} is

nonzero. Since V is (α,β)-stable, we know $\operatorname{img}\beta_i \subset \ker\alpha_j$ whenever $i \in S$ and $j \notin S$ (cf. (**)); thus S must be empty. Since φ is injective and $V \subset \ker\alpha_n$, we deduce $V_{s_{n-1}} = 0$ as well. Finally, since the x_i are injective we conclude that $V_{s_i} = 0$ for $i \in [n-1]$. □

Lemma 3.14. *The group $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}}$ acts freely on $\{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta) \in \mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*))\colon x_i, \varphi \text{ injective}\}$, and there is an isomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned}\{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta) \in \mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*))\colon x_i,\varphi \text{ injective}\}/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}} &\xrightarrow{\sim} \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}\\ [(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)] &\longmapsto \left(\varphi\psi - \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{tr}(\varphi\psi)\cdot\mathrm{Id}, F_\bullet\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $F_\bullet$ is the flag defined by $F_k = \operatorname{img}(\varphi x_{n-2}\dots x_k)$. Furthermore,

$$(\varphi\psi)|_{F_k/F_{k-1}} = \nu_{n-1} + \dots + \nu_k, \tag{3}$$

where $\nu = (\nu_1,\dots,\nu_{n-1}) := \mu_{\mathrm{stem}}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)$. (In particular, $(\varphi\psi)|_{F_n/F_{n-1}} = 0$.)

Proof. Recall that the restriction of Q_n to the stem vertices is the type A_{n-1} Dynkin quiver, and observe that $\mathbb{M}(Q_n,\mathbf{v},\mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}})$ and $\mathbb{M}(Q_n|_{\mathrm{stem}},\mathbf{v}|_{\mathrm{stem}},n\mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}})$ are isomorphic as vector spaces via the map $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta)\mapsto(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\varphi,\psi)$.

It is well known that

$$\{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta) \in \mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*))\colon x_i,\varphi \text{ injective}\} = \mu_{\mathrm{stem}}^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{stem}}^*))^{\theta'\text{-s}},$$

where $\theta' := (1,\dots,1)$ is a stability condition for $Q_n|_{\mathrm{stem}}$. As μ_{stem} is the moment map for $Q_n|_{\mathrm{stem}}$, Lemma 3.3 implies that $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}}$ acts freely on $\{(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\alpha,\beta) \in \mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*))\colon x_i,\varphi \text{ injective}\}$. Furthermore, [DKS13, Thm 7.18] (see also [Wan21, (4.5)]) implies that there is an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned}(\mu_{\mathrm{stem}})^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{stem}}^*))^{\theta'\text{-s}}/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}} &\xrightarrow{\sim} \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}\\ [(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y},\psi,\varphi)] &\longmapsto \left(\varphi\psi - \frac{1}{n}\mathrm{tr}(\varphi\psi)\cdot\mathrm{Id}, F_\bullet\right).\end{aligned}$$

It is left to prove Equation (3). To this end, fix any $v \in F_k$, so that $v = \varphi x_{n-2}\dots x_k(w)$ for some w. The moment map equations give

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi\psi(v) &= \varphi\psi\varphi x_{n-2}\dots x_k(w)\\ &= \varphi\circ[x_{n-2}y_{n-2} + \nu_{n-1}\mathrm{Id}]\circ x_{n-2}\dots x_k(w)\\ &= \varphi x_{n-2}y_{n-2}x_{n-2}\dots x_k(w) + \nu_{n-1}v\\ &= \varphi x_{n-2}\circ[x_{n-3}y_{n-3} + \nu_{n-2}\mathrm{Id}]\circ x_{n-3}\dots x_k(w) + \nu_{n-1}v\\ &= \varphi x_{n-2}x_{n-3}y_{n-3}x_{n-3}\dots x_k(w) + \nu_{n-1}v + \nu_{n-2}v\\ &\vdots\\ &= \underbrace{\varphi x_{n-2}\dots x_k x_{k-1}y_{k-1}(w)}_{\in F_{k-1}} + \nu_{n-1}v + \dots + \nu_k v,\end{aligned}$$

so that $\varphi\psi$ preserves $F_\bullet$ and $\varphi\psi|_{F_k/F_{k-1}} = \nu_{n-1} + \dots + \nu_k$. □

Proposition 3.15. *For any $\nu \in Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{stem}}^*)$ and $\gamma \in Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{bouq}}^*)$, we have*

$$\mu^{-1}(\nu,\gamma)^{\theta\text{-s}}/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}} = \left\{(x,F_\bullet)\in\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}\colon \begin{array}{c} x|_{F_k/F_{k-1}} = \lambda_k\\ \mathrm{diag}(x) = \delta\\ x \text{ satisfies } (*)\end{array}\right\}$$

where the action of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}} \cong (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ is given by

$$(t_1,\dots,t_{n-1})\cdot(x,F_\bullet) = (\mathrm{Ad}_{t'}(x), t'\cdot F_\bullet), \qquad t' := \mathrm{diag}(t_1,\dots,t_{n-1},1), \tag{4}$$

and where λ and δ are given by

$$\lambda_i = \sum_{j=i}^{n-1} \nu_j - \frac{1}{n}(\nu_1 + 2\nu_2 + \cdots + (n-1)\nu_{n-1}), \qquad i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \tag{5}$$

$$\delta_i = \gamma_i - \frac{1}{n}(\nu_1 + 2\nu_2 + \cdots + (n-1)\nu_{n-1}), \qquad i \in \{1, \dots, n\}. \tag{6}$$

(Above, we set $\sum_{j=n}^{n-1} \nu_j := 0$ and $\gamma_n := 0$.) In particular,

$$\mathfrak{M}_{(\nu,\gamma),\theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}}) = \left\{ (x, F_\bullet) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \colon \begin{array}{c} x|_{F_k/F_{k-1}} = \lambda_k \\ \operatorname{diag}(x) = \delta \\ x \text{ satisfies } (*) \end{array} \right\} /\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}.$$

Proof. Lemmas 3.13 and 3.14 imply that

$$\mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbf{v}}^*))^{\theta\text{-s}}/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{stem}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\theta := \{(x, F_\bullet) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \colon x \text{ satisfies } (*)\}.$$

Equation (3) implies that μ_{stem} and μ_{bouq} are given by the formulas

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\mathrm{stem}} \colon \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\theta &\to Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{stem}}^*) \\ (x, F_\bullet) &\mapsto (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{n-1}), \qquad \nu_i = x|_{F_i/F_{i-1}} - x|_{F_{i+1}/F_i} \\ \mu_{\mathrm{bouq}} \colon \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\theta &\to Z(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathrm{bouq}}^*) \\ (x, F_\bullet) &\mapsto (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{n-1}), \qquad \gamma_i = x_{ii} + \frac{1}{n}(\nu_1 + 2\nu_2 + \cdots + (n-1)\nu_{n-1}). \end{aligned}$$

The action of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}} \cong (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{n-1}$ on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}^\theta$ is given by the formula (4). □

Proposition 3.16. *For a generic $(\nu; \gamma)$, the condition $(*)$ automatically holds, that is,*

$$\left\{ (x, F_\bullet) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \colon \begin{array}{c} x|_{F_\bullet/F_{\bullet-1}} = \lambda \\ \operatorname{diag}(x) = \delta \\ x \text{ satisfies } (*) \end{array} \right\} = \underbrace{\left\{ (x, F_\bullet) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \colon \begin{array}{c} x|_{F_\bullet/F_{\bullet-1}} = \lambda \\ \operatorname{diag}(x) = \delta \end{array} \right\}}_{=Y_{\lambda,\delta}},$$

where λ and δ are given by (5) and (6). In particular,

$$\mathfrak{M}_{(\nu,\gamma),\theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{e}_{s_{n-1}}) = Y_{\lambda,\delta}/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}},$$

where the action of $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}$ is given by (4).

Proof. As λ is generic, x is semisimple and there are eigenvectors v_k so that $x(v_k) = \lambda_k v_k$. If x preserves $\mathbb{C}^S \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$, then there exist $|S|$ many eigenvectors $v_{i_1}, \dots, v_{i_{|S|}}$ of x in $\mathbb{C}^S$. It follows that

$$\sum_{s \in S} \delta_s = \operatorname{tr}(x|_{\mathbb{C}^S}) = \sum_{j=1}^{|S|} \lambda_{i_j},$$

contradicting genericity of (ν, γ). □

Corollary 3.17. *For sufficiently generic $(\nu; \gamma)$, the variety $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ is diffeomorphic to $Y_{\lambda,\delta}/\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}$.*

Proof. Combine Propositions 3.11 and 3.16. □

4. Cohomology of $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1.3. We construct vector bundles $\mathcal{E}_{S,T}$ on $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ whose Euler class is $f_{S,T}$ (Lemma 4.1), along with a section whose zero locus is djsoint from $Y_{\lambda,\delta}$ (Lemma 4.4) and has maximal codimension (Lemma 4.5).

For a generic $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, write $\mathcal{O}_\lambda := \{(x, F_\bullet) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \colon x|_{F_k/F_{k-1}} = \lambda_k \mathrm{Id}|_{F_k/F_{k-1}}\}$. By forgetting the flag, the subvariety $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ can be identified with a regular semisimple orbit in $\mathfrak{g}$; in particular the group GL_n acts transitively on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ and the stabilizer is a maximal torus.

For $k \in [n]$, let $\mathcal{F}_k$ denote the tautological bundle over the flag variety $\mathcal{B}$ where the fiber over $F_\bullet \in \mathcal{B}$ is the vector space F_k. The bundle $\mathcal{F}_k$ has a natural T-equivariant structure. Also let χ_k denote the trivial bundle $\mathcal{B} \times \mathbb{C}$, endowed with the action of T given by $t \cdot (F_\bullet, z) = (tF_\bullet, \alpha_k(t)z)$, where $\alpha_k \colon T \to \mathbb{C}^\times$ is the character $t = (t_1, \dots, t_n) \mapsto t_k$.

It is well-known (see e.g. [AF24, Ex 3.1.2, Prop 4.4.1]) that there is an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}] &\xrightarrow{\sim} H_T^*(\mathcal{B}) \\ x_k &\mapsto c_1^T((\mathcal{F}_k/\mathcal{F}_{k-1})^\vee) \\ y_k &\mapsto c_1^T(\chi_k). \end{aligned}$$

As $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is a retract of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, there is an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} (\diamondsuit) \qquad \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}] &\xrightarrow{\sim} H_T^*(\mathcal{O}_\lambda), \\ x_k &\mapsto c_1^T(i^*p^*((\mathcal{F}_k/\mathcal{F}_{k-1})^\vee)) \\ y_k &\mapsto c_1^T(i^*p^*(\chi_k)), \end{aligned}$$

where $p \colon \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}} \to \mathcal{B}$ and $i \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ denote the vector bundle map and inclusion respectively.

Lemma 4.1. *Under the isomorphism ($\diamondsuit$), the equivariant Euler class of the bundle*

$$\mathcal{E}_{S,T} := i^*p^*\left(\left(\bigoplus_{s\in S}(\mathcal{F}_s/\mathcal{F}_{s-1})^\vee\right) \otimes \left(\bigoplus_{t\in T}\chi_t^\vee\right)\right)$$

corresponds to the polynomial $f_{S,T}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}] \cong H_T^*(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$.

Proof. The bundle $\mathcal{E}_{S,T}$ is a direct sum of the line bundles

$$\mathcal{E}_{\{s\},\{t\}} = i^*p^*((\mathcal{F}_s/\mathcal{F}_{s-1})^\vee \otimes \chi_t^\vee), \qquad s \in S, t \in T,$$

and the equivariant Euler class of $\mathcal{E}_{\{s\},\{t\}}$ is identified with $x_s - y_t$ under ($\diamondsuit$). □

For an integer s and a point $(x, F_\bullet) \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda$, write

$$M_x^{(s)} := (x - \lambda_1 \cdot \mathrm{Id}) \circ \cdots \circ (x - \lambda_{s-1} \cdot \mathrm{Id}).$$

Also write $z_1, \dots, z_n$ for the coordinate functions on $\mathbb{C}^n$.

Lemma 4.2. *There is a T-equivariant section of $\mathcal{E}_{\{s\},\{t\}} \to \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{\{s\},\{t\}} \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda &\to \mathcal{E}_{\{s\},\{t\}} \\ (x, F_\bullet) &\mapsto ((x, F_\bullet), (z_t \circ M_x^{(s)})|_{F_s} \otimes 1) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Observe that the linear map $M_x^{(s)}$ preserves the flag $F_\bullet$ and acts by the zero map on each F_k/F_{k-1} for $1 \le k \le s-1$. In particular $M_x^{(s)}$ acts by the zero matrix on F_{s-1}; thus, the function

$$(z_t \circ M_x^{(s)})|_{F_s} \colon F_s \to \mathbb{C}$$

vanishes on F_{s-1}. Hence φ is a section of $\mathcal{E}_{\{s\},\{t\}} \to \mathcal{O}_\lambda$.

Furthermore, for any $a = \mathrm{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in T$, we compute that

$$\begin{aligned} (z_t \circ M_{axa^{-1}}^{(s)})|_{aF_s} \otimes 1 &= (a_t z_t \circ M_x^{(s)})|_{aF_s} \otimes 1 \\ &= (z_t \circ M_x^{(s)})|_{aF_s} \otimes a_t; \end{aligned}$$

hence φ is equivariant. □

Lemma 4.3. *The zero locus of*

$$\varphi_{S,T} := \bigoplus_{\substack{s\in S \\ t\in T}} \varphi_{\{s\},\{t\}} \colon \mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \mathcal{E}_{S,T}$$

is the set

$$Z_{S,T} := \{(x, F_\bullet) \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda \colon v_s \in \mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T} \text{ for all } s \in S\}, \qquad \text{where } x(v_s) = \lambda_s v_s.$$

For subsets $S, T \subset [n]$ with $|S| + |T| = n$, every $(x, F_\bullet) \in Z_{S,T}$ satisfies $x(\mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}) = \mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}$.

Proof. The zero locus of $\varphi_{S,T}$ consists of points $(x, F_\bullet) \in O_\lambda$ such that $(z_t \circ M_x^{(s)})|_{F_s} \colon F_s \to \mathbb{C}$ is the zero function for all $s \in S$ and $t \in T$. This is equivalent to the condition that $v_s \in \mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}$ for all $s \in S$.

When $|S| = n - |T|$, the eigenvectors v_s of x span $\mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}$. It follows that every $(x, F_\bullet) \in Z_{S,T}$ preserves the coordinate subspace $\mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}$. □

Lemma 4.4. *For subsets $S, T \subset [n]$ with $|S| + |T| = n$ and generic (λ, δ), the varieties $Z_{S,T}$ and $Y_{\lambda,\delta}$ are disjoint.*

Proof. Recall that $Y_{\lambda,\delta} = \{(x, F_\bullet) \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda \colon \operatorname{diag}(x) = \delta\}$. Lemma 4.3 asserts that any $(x, F_\bullet) \in Z_{S,T}$ satisfies $x(\mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}) = \mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}$, so that

$$\sum_{i \in [n]\setminus T} \delta_i = \operatorname{tr}(x|_{\mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}}) = \sum_{s \in S} \lambda_s,$$

contradicting the genericity of (λ, δ). □

Lemma 4.5. *For subsets $S, T \subset [n]$ with $|S| + |T| = n$, we have $\operatorname{codim}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(Z_{S,T}) = \operatorname{rk}(\mathcal{E}_{S,T}) = |S| \cdot |T|$.*

Proof. The group GL_n acts transitively on $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ by conjugation, and the stabilizer of any point is a maximal torus. The subspace $Z_{S,T} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_\lambda$ is an orbit of the subgroup

$$\begin{aligned} G &:= \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_n \colon g(\mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}) = \mathbb{C}^{[n]\setminus T}\} \\ &= \{(g_{ij}) \in \mathrm{GL}_n \colon g_{ab} = 0 \text{ for all } a \in [n] \setminus T \text{ and } b \in T\} \end{aligned}$$

and in particular the stabilizer of any point is an n-dimensional torus. Rearranging the equality $\dim(\mathrm{GL}_n) - \dim(\mathcal{O}_\lambda) = \dim(G) - \dim(Z_{S,T})$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{codim}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(Z_{S,T}) &= \operatorname{codim}_{\mathrm{GL}_n}(G) \\ &= (n - |T|)|T| \\ &= |S| \cdot |T|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 1.3. *The inclusion $Y \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ induces a surjection*

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{h} \times_{\mathfrak{h}/W} \mathfrak{h}] \cong H_T^*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \twoheadrightarrow H_T^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta}) \cong H^*(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T})$$

and the kernel contains the functions $\{f_{S,T} \colon |S| + |T| = n\}$.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. We first prove surjectivity. There are inclusions

$$\mu^{-1}(\lambda, \delta)^{\theta\text{-s}} \hookrightarrow \{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \alpha, \beta) \in \mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbf{v})^*) \colon x_i, \varphi \text{ injective}\} \hookrightarrow \mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbf{v}^*)).$$

Since $\mu^{-1}(\lambda, \delta)^{\theta\text{-s}}/\mathbb{G}_\mathbf{v}$ is a smooth Nakajima quiver variety, the composite map induced on cohomology

$$H_{\mathbb{G}_\mathbf{v}}^*(\mathrm{pt}) \cong H_{\mathbb{G}_\mathbf{v}}^*(\mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbf{v}^*))) \to H_{\mathbb{G}_\mathbf{v}}^*\left(\{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \alpha, \beta) \in \mu^{-1}(Z(\mathfrak{g}_\mathbf{v})^*) \colon x_i, \varphi \text{ injective}\}\right) \xrightarrow{\eta} H_{\mathbb{G}_\mathbf{v}}^*(\mu^{-1}(\lambda, \delta)^{\theta\text{-s}})$$

is surjective by Kirwan surjectivity (Theorem 3.4); in particular, the map η is surjective. Lemma 3.14 implies that the map η descends to the map

$$\eta \colon H_{\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}}^*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \twoheadrightarrow H_{\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}}^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta})$$

induced by the inclusion $Y_{\lambda,\delta} \hookrightarrow \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$, where $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}}$ acts as the torus of diagonal matrices whose bottom right entry is 1.

The composite map $\mathbb{G}_{\mathrm{bouq}} \to T_{\mathrm{GL}} \to T_{\mathrm{PGL}}$ is an isomorphism, and it follows that η is a surjection $H_{T_{\mathrm{PGL}}}^*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \twoheadrightarrow H_{T_{\mathrm{PGL}}}^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta})$. Corollary 3.17 guarantees that $H_{T_{\mathrm{PGL}}}^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta}) \cong H^*(\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T})$.

We now show that the kernel contains the functions $f_{S,T}$. As the quotient $T = T_{\mathrm{SL}} \to T_{\mathrm{PGL}}$ induces isomorphisms $H_T^*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \cong H_{T_{\mathrm{PGL}}}^*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}})$ and $H_T^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta}) \cong H_{T_{\mathrm{PGL}}}^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta})$ it suffices to show that $f_{S,T}$ vanishes under $H_T^*(\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \twoheadrightarrow H_T^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta})$. Lemma 4.1 asserts that $\mathrm{eu}^T(\mathcal{E}_{S,T}) = f_{S,T}$. As the zero locus $Z_{S,T}$ of our section $\varphi_{S,T}$ of $\mathcal{E}_{S,T}$ has maximum possible codimension (Lemma 4.5), we have $\mathrm{eu}^T(\mathcal{E}_{S,T}) = [Z_{S,T}]^T$ in $H_T^*(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)$ ([AF24, §2.3]). Finally, fundamental classes $[V]^T \in H_T^*(X)$ vanish under the restriction $H_T^*(X) \to H_T^*(X \setminus V)$ ([AF24, pg. 398]), and the varieties Z and $Y_{\lambda,\delta}$ are disjoint (Lemma 4.4); in particular $f_{S,T} = [Z_{S,T}]^T$ vanishes under $H_T^*(\mathcal{O}_\lambda) \to H_T^*(Y_{\lambda,\delta})$. Since the inclusion $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \to \widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ induces an isomorphism in cohomology, the result follows. □

Remark 4.6. Theorem 1.3 implies that $\widetilde{\mathcal{N}/\!\!/\!\!/T}$ has vanishing odd cohomology. (The vanishing of odd cohomology is known for all smooth quiver varieties [Nak01, Thm 7.3.5].)

Because $\overline{T^*(G/U)}^{T\times B/U}$ is a zero-dimensional (non-reduced) scheme, its coordinate ring is also finite-dimensional as a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra.

As Theorem 1.3 gives a surjective map between two finite-dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-algebras, the Hikita conjecture in fact predicts that the map in Theorem 1.3 is an isomorphism. △

Appendix A. Other examples of Conjecture 1.4

Let $e \in \mathcal{N}$ be a nilpotent matrix with Jordan type given by a partition λ, and let $e^\vee$ be a nilpotent matrix with Jordan type given by the transpose partition λ'. The closure X of the nilpotent orbit containing e is a symplectic singularity and its symplectic dual $X^!$ is the Slodowy slice in $\mathcal{N}$ through $e^\vee$ ([Hik17]). This behavior is an instance of the "matching of strata" phenomenon in [Kam22, §5.3]. Below, we give examples of Conjecture 1.4 arising from the duality between nilpotent orbits and Slodowy slices.

Example A.1. Let $X = \overline{\mathbb{O}_{\min}}$ be the minimal nilpotent orbit closure in type A_n. Then $X^!$ is the Slodowy slice through a subregular nilpotent matrix; in particular $X^! \cong \mathbb{C}^2/A_n$ can be expressed as the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{0})$ for the affine $\widetilde{A}_n$ Dynkin quiver.

The coordinate ring of the Hamiltonian reduction $X/\!\!/\!\!/T := \{x \in \overline{\mathbb{O}_{\min}} : \operatorname{diag}(x) = 0\}/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}$; thus $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is a point. On the other hand, $X^{!,\uparrow} \cong T^*\mathbb{C}^n$ is smooth and the fixed point subscheme $(X^{!,\uparrow})^{T^{!,\uparrow}}$ is one reduced point.

In this case, the Hikita conjecture

$$H^*\left(\widetilde{X/\!\!/\!\!/T}\right) \cong \mathbb{C}\left[(X^{!,\uparrow})^{T^{!,\uparrow}}\right]$$

holds as both sides are isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}$. △

Example A.2. Let X be the Slodowy slice through a nilpotent matrix whose Jordan type has one block of size $n-2$ and another block of size 2, so that $X^!$ is the nilpotent orbit closure

$$X^! = \{x \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{sl}_n} : x^2 = 0, \dim \operatorname{img}(x) = 2\}.$$

The variety $X^!$ has an interpretation as the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}((2),(n))$ associated to the quiver with one vertex and no edges [KP79].

A result of Maffei [Maf05] guarantees that X is the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$ for the A_{n-1} Dynkin quiver, where $\mathbf{v} = (1,2,2,\dots,2,2,1)$ and $\mathbf{w} = (0,1,0,\dots,0,1,0)$. The torus T acting on X can be identified with the residual action of $\prod_{i\in I}\mathrm{GL}(w_i)$; in particular $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\mathbf{v}',\mathbf{0})$ for the affine $\widetilde{D}_n$ Dynkin quiver with $\mathbf{v}'$ equal to the minimal imaginary root (see Figure 3). In particular $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is the Kleinian singularity $\mathbb{C}^2/D_n$.



FIGURE 3. Left: The A_{n-1} Dynkin quiver defining the Slodowy slice X. Right: The affine $\widetilde{D}_n$ Dynkin quiver, with dimension vector $\mathbf{v}'$, defining $X/\!\!/\!\!/T = \mathbb{C}^2/D_n$.

On the other hand, $X^{!,\uparrow} = T^*\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^2,\mathbb{C}^n)/\!\!/\!\!/\mathrm{SL}_2$ is the minimal nilpotent orbit closure in $\mathfrak{so}_{2n}$ [Jia21, Prop 3.18]. In this case, the Hikita conjecture for $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ and $X^{!,\uparrow}$ was verified in [Shl24]. △

Remark A.3. Now swap the roles of X and $X^!$ in Example A.2: Let X be the nilpotent orbit closure

$$X = \{x \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathfrak{sl}_n} : x^2 = 0, \dim \operatorname{img}(x) = 2\}.$$

Then $X^!$ is the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})$ for the type A_{n-1} quiver, where $\mathbf{v}=(1,2,2,\dots,2,2,1)$ and $\mathbf{w}=(0,1,0,\dots,0,1,0)$ and X is the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}((2),(n))$ associated to the quiver with one vertex and no edges.

In this case, the Hamiltonian reduction $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is the Nakajima quiver variety $\mathfrak{M}_{0,0}(\mathbf{v},\mathbf{0})$ associated to the star shaped quiver Q_n^{star} with vertices $\{*\}\sqcup\{1,2,\dots,n\}$, edges $\{\{*,i\}\colon i\in[n]\}$, and dimension vector $\mathbf{v}''=(2;1,\dots,1)$ (see Figure 4).



FIGURE 4. Left: The quiver defining the nilpotent orbit X in the case $n=8$. Right: The star quiver Q_n^{star}, with dimension vector $\mathbf{v}''$, defining $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$, also for $n=8$.

By [BFN19b, Thm 5.1, Prop 5.20] (see also [DG19, (4.58)]), the corresponding BFN Coulomb branch $\mathcal{M}_C$ associated to Q_n^{star} can be identified with the Hamiltonian reduction $\mathbb{M}(Q,\mathbf{v},\mathbf{w})/\!\!/\!\!/\prod_{i\in I}\mathrm{SL}(v_i)$, where Q is the type A_{n-3} Dynkin quiver, $\mathbf{v}=(2,2,\dots,2,2)$, and $\mathbf{w}=(2,0,\dots,0,2)$. In particular, $X/\!\!/\!\!/T$ is conjecturally symplectic dual to $\mathcal{M}_C=X^{!,\uparrow}$ (see Figure 5).



FIGURE 5. The variety $\mathcal{M}_C$, for $n=8$, as a Hamiltonian reduction of the form $(T^*\operatorname{Hom}(\mathbb{C}^2,\mathbb{C}^2))^6/\!\!/\!\!/(\mathrm{SL}_2)^5$.

The variety $\widetilde{X/\!\!/\!\!/T}=\mathfrak{M}_{\theta,0}(\mathbf{v}'',\mathbf{0})$ has appeared in the literature as the *hyperpolygon space* and the cohomology is known [Kon02, Thm 7.1] (see also [HP05, Thm 3.1, Thm 3.2]) to be

$$H^*(\widetilde{X/\!\!/\!\!/T})=\mathbb{C}[z_1,\dots,z_n,p]/I,$$

where I is the ideal generated by all elements $p-z_i^2$ as well as all monomials of degree $2(n-2)$, where $\deg(z_i):=2$ and $\deg(p):=4$. The Hikita conjecture predicts that this ring is also the coordinate ring of $(X^{!,\uparrow})^{T^{!,\uparrow}}$. To the best of our knowledge, this case of the Hikita conjecture is still open. △

APPENDIX B. BELLAMY–SCHEDLER CRITERION

Recall that the Ringel form on $\mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ is defined by

$$\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle:=\sum_{i\in Q_0}\alpha_i\beta_i-\sum_{\alpha\in Q_1}\alpha_{t(a)}\beta_{h(a)}.$$

The corresponding Euler form is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}(\alpha,\beta)&:=\langle\alpha,\beta\rangle+\langle\beta,\alpha\rangle\\ &=2\sum_{i\in Q_0}\alpha_i\beta_i-\sum_{a\in Q_1}(\alpha_{t(a)}\beta_{h(a)}+\beta_{t(a)}\alpha_{h(a)}).\end{aligned}\tag{$\star$}$$

We use a criterion by Crawley-Boevey to determine when $\mathbf{v}$ is in Σ_0:

Proposition B.1 ([CB01, Cor 5.7]). *If $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^I$ then $\mathbf{v} \in \Sigma_0$ if and only if $\mathbf{v} > 0$ and $(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}) \leq -2$ whenever $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^I$ and $0 < \mathbf{w} < \mathbf{v}$.*

Henceforth, the quiver Q is fixed to be the augmented bouquet quiver Q_n^+.

Lemma B.2. *The dimension vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = (1, 2, \ldots, n-1; 1, 1, \ldots, 1)$ is in Σ_0.*

Proof. We use Proposition B.1. Write $\mathbf{w} = (w_{s_1}, \ldots, w_{s_{n-1}}; w_{b_1}, \ldots, w_{b_n})$, so that

$$\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{w} = (1 - w_{s_1}, 2 - w_{s_2}, \ldots, (n-1) - w_{s_{n-1}}; 1 - w_{b_1}, \ldots, 1 - w_{b_n}).$$

Replacing $\mathbf{w}$ with $\hat{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{w}$ if necessary, we may assume that $w_{s_{n-1}} \leq (n-1) - w_{s_{n-1}}$. Equation ($\star$) reads

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{w}, \hat{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{w}) = 2\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} w_{s_i}(i - w_{s_i}) + 2\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{b_i}(1 - w_{b_i}) \\ - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\Big(w_{s_i}(i+1-w_{s_{i+1}}) + w_{s_{i+1}}(i - w_{s_i})\Big) - \sum_{i=1}^{n}\Big(w_{s_{n-1}}(1 - w_{b_i}) + (n-1-w_{s_{n-1}})w_{b_i}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

Since $w_{b_i} \in \{0, 1\}$ we know $w_{b_i}(1 - w_{b_i}) = 0$. Furthermore, since $w_{s_{n-1}} \leq n - 1 - w_{s_{n-1}}$ the quantity $(\mathbf{w}, \hat{\mathbf{v}} - \mathbf{w})$ maximized when $1 - w_{b_i} = 1$ for all i. We conclude

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{w}) &\leq 2\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} w_{s_i}(i - w_{s_i}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\Big(w_{s_i}(i+1-w_{s_{i+1}}) + w_{s_{i+1}}(i - w_{s_i})\Big) - nw_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= 2\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} w_{s_i}(i - w_{s_i}) - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\Big(w_{s_i}(i+1-w_{s_{i+1}}) + w_{s_{i+1}}(i - w_{s_i})\Big) - nw_{s_{n-1}} \\ &= 2(-w_{s_2}^2 - \cdots - w_{s_{n-1}}^2) + 2(w_{s_1}w_{s_2} + w_{s_2}w_{s_3} + \cdots + w_{s_{n-2}}w_{s_{n-1}}) - 2w_{s_1} \\ &= 2(-w_{s_1}^2 - w_{s_2}^2 - \cdots - w_{s_{n-1}}^2) + 2(w_{s_1}w_{s_2} + w_{s_2}w_{s_3} + \cdots + w_{s_{n-2}}w_{s_{n-1}}),\end{aligned}$$

where the first and last equality follow from the fact that $w_{s_1} \in \{0, 1\}$.

Let m and M be the minimum and maximum index so that $w_{s_m}, w_{s_M} \neq 0$. Then

$$2(-w_{s_1}^2 - w_{s_2}^2 - \cdots - w_{s_{n-1}}^2) + 2(w_{s_1}w_{s_2} + w_{s_2}w_{s_3} + \cdots + w_{s_{n-2}}w_{s_{n-1}})$$

is equal to

$$2(-w_{s_m}^2 - w_{s_{m+1}}^2 - \cdots - w_{s_M}^2) + 2(w_{s_m}w_{s_{m+1}} + \cdots + w_{s_{M-1}}w_{s_M}).$$

The AM-GM inequality implies that

$$-w_{s_m}^2 - 2w_{s_{m+1}}^2 - \cdots - 2w_{s_{M-1}}^2 - w_{s_M}^2 + 2w_{s_m}w_{s_{m+1}} + \cdots + 2w_{s_{M-1}}w_{s_M} \leq 0.$$

It follows that

$$2(-w_{s_m}^2 - w_{s_{m+1}}^2 - \cdots - w_{s_M}^2) + 2(w_{s_m}w_{s_{m+1}} + \cdots + w_{s_{M-1}}w_{s_M}) \leq -w_{s_m}^2 - w_{s_M}^2 \leq -2$$

since $w_{s_m}, w_{s_M} \neq 0$. □

Recall that the vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$ is *anisotropic* if $\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle < 0$.

Lemma B.3. *For $n \geq 4$, the dimension vector $\hat{\mathbf{v}} = (1, 2, \ldots, n-1; 1, \ldots, 1)$ is anisotropic.*

Proof. We compute that

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \hat{\mathbf{v}}, \hat{\mathbf{v}} \rangle &= \sum_{i \in Q_0} v_i^2 - \sum_{e \in Q_1} v_{t(e)}v_{h(e)} \\ &= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i^2\right) + n - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i(i+1)\right) \\ &= n - \frac{n(n-1)}{2}\end{aligned}$$

is negative when $n \geq 4$. □

REFERENCES

[AF24] David Anderson and William Fulton, *Equivariant Cohomology in Algebraic Geometry*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 210, Cambridge University Press, 2024.

[Bel23] Gwyn Bellamy, *Coulomb branches have symplectic singularities*, Lett. Math. Phys. **113** (2023).

[BS21] Gwyn Bellamy and Travis Schedler, *Symplectic resolutions of quiver varieties*, Sel. Math. New Ser. **27** (2021).

[BFN18] Alex Braverman, Michael Finkelberg, and Hiraku Nakajima, *Towards a mathematical definition of Coulomb branches of 3-dimensional $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauge theories, II*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **22** (2018), no. 5, 1071-1147.

[BFN19a] ———, *Coulomb branches of 3d $\mathcal{N} = 4$ quiver gauge theories and slices in the affine Grassmannian*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **23** (2019), no. 1, 75-166.

[BFN19b] ———, *Ring objects in the equivariant derived Satake category arising from Coulomb branches*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **23** (2019), no. 3, 253-344.

[BK04] Michel Brion and Shrawan Kumar, *Frobenius splitting methods in geometry and representation theory*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 231, Birkhäuser Boston, 2004.

[Bro93] Bram Broer, *Line bundles on the cotangent bundle of the flag variety*, Invent. Math **113** (1993), 1-20.

[CHY23] Xiaojun Chen, Weiqiang He, and Sirui Yu, *Quantization of the minimal nilpotent orbits and the quantum Hikita conjecture* (2023), available at arXiv:2302.13249.

[CB01] William Crawley-Boevey, *Geometry of the Moment Map for Representations of Quivers*, Compos. Math. **126** (2001), 257-293.

[DHK21] Andrew Dancer, Amihay Hanany, and Frances Kirwan, *Symplectic duality and implosions*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys (2021), 1367–1387.

[DKS13] Andrew Dancer, Frances Kirwan, and Andrew Swann, *Implosion for hyperkähler manifolds*, Compos. Math. (2013).

[dP81] Corrado de Concini and Claudio Procesi, *Symmetric functions, conjugacy classes and the flag variety*, Invent. Math. **62** (1981), no. 2, 203-219.

[DG70] Michel Demazure and Alexander Grothendieck, *Schémas en groupes (SGA 3)*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 152, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1970.

[DG19] Tudor Dimofte and Niklas Garner, *Coulomb Branches of Star-Shaped Quivers*, J. High Energy Phys. **2019** (2019), no. 4.

[Fog73] John Fogarty, *Fixed point schemes*, Amer. J. Math. **95** (1973), no. 1, 35-51.

[Gan24] Tom Gannon, *Proof of the Ginzburg–Kazhdan conjecture*, Adv. Math. **448** (2024).

[GW23] Tom Gannon and Harold Williams, *Differential operators on the base affine space of SL_n and quantized Coulomb branches* (2023), available at arXiv:2312.10278.

[GK22] Victor Ginzburg and David Kazhdan, *Differential operators on G/U and the Gelfand-Graev action*, Adv. Math. **403** (2022).

[GR15] Victor Ginzburg and Simon Riche, *Differential operators on G/U and the affine Grassmannian*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu (2015).

[HP05] Megumi Harada and Nicholas Proudfoot, *Hyperpolygon spaces and their cores*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), no. 4, 1445-1467.

[Hik17] Tatsuyuki Hikita, *An algebro-geometric realization of the cohomology ring of Hilbert scheme of points in the affine plane*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **8** (2017), 2538-2561.

[Hoa24] Do Kien Hoang, *Hikita conjecture for classical Lie algebras* (2024), available at arXiv:2409.13914.

[HKM24] Do Kien Hoang, Vasily Krylov, and Dmytro Matvieievskyi, *Around Hikita–Nakajima conjecture for nilpotent orbits and parabolic Slodowy varieties* (2024), available at arXiv:2410.20512.

[Jia21] Boming Jia, *The Geometry of the Affine Closure of $T^*(\mathrm{SL}_n/U)$* (2021), available at arXiv:2112.08649.

[Kam22] Joel Kamnitzer, *Symplectic resolutions, symplectic duality, and Coulomb branches*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **54** (2022), 1515–1551.

[KMP21] Joel Kamnitzer, Michael McBreen, and Nicholas Proudfoot, *The quantum Hikita conjecture*, Adv. Math. **390** (2021).

[KTW+19] Joel Kamnitzer, Peter Tingley, Ben Webster, Alex Weekes, and Oded Yacobi, *Highest weights for truncated shifted Yangians and product monomial crystals*, J. Comb. Algebra **3** (2019), no. 3, 237-303.

[Kin94] Alastair King, *Moduli of representations of finite dimensional algebras*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford **45** (1994), 515-530.

[Kon02] Hiroshi Konno, *On the cohomology ring of the HyperKähler analogue of the Polygon Spaces*, Contemp. Math. **309** (2002), 129-149.

[KP79] Hanspeter Kraft and Claudio Procesi, *Closures of conjugacy classes of matrices are normal*, Invent. Math. **53** (1979), no. 3, 227-247.

[Kro89] Peter Kronheimer, *The construction of ALE spaces as hyper-Kähler quotients*, J. Differential Geom. **29** (1989), no. 3, 665-683.

[KS22] Vasily Krylov and Pavel Shlykov, *Hikita–Nakajima conjecture for the Gieseker variety* (2022), available at arXiv:2202.09934.

[LMM21] Ivan Losev, Lucas Mason-Brown, and Dmytro Matvieievskyi, *Unipotent Ideals and Harish-Chandra Bimodules* (2021), available at arXiv:2108.03453.

[Maf05] Andrea Maffei, *Quiver varieties of type A*, Comment. Math. Helv. **80** (2005), no. 1, 1-27.

[MMO+07] Jerrold Marsden, Gerard Misiołek, Juan-Pablo Ortega, Matthew Pearlmutter, and Tudor Ratiu, *Hamiltonian Reduction by Stages*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1913, Springer Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007.

[MN18] Kevin McGerty and Tom Nevins, *Kirwan surjectivity for quiver varieties*, Invent. Math. **212** (2018), no. 1, 161-187.

[Mor14] Stephen Morgan, *Quantum Hamiltonian reduction of W-algebras and category $\mathcal{O}$*, University of Toronto, 2014. PhD thesis.

[Nak94] Hiraku Nakajima, *Instantons on ALE spaces, quiver varieties, and Kac-Moody aglebras*, Duke Math. J. **76** (1994), no. 2.

[Nak98] ———, *Quiver varieties and Kac-Moody algebras*, Duke Math. J. **91** (1998), no. 3, 515-560.

[Nak01] ———, *Quiver varieties and finite dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), no. 1, 145-238.

[Shl24] Pavel Shlykov, *Hikita conjecture for the minimal nilpotent orbit*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. (2024), available at arXiv:2202.09934. to appear.

[Wan21] Xiangsheng Wang, *A new Weyl group action related to the quasi-classical Gelfand-Graev action*, Sel. Math. **27** (2021).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO
Email address: linus@math.uchicago.edu