

**MASS FORMULAS FOR LOCAL GALOIS REPRESENTATIONS  
AND QUOTIENT SINGULARITIES II: DUALITIES AND  
RESOLUTION OF SINGULARITIES**

MELANIE MACHETT WOOD AND TAKEHIKO YASUDA

ABSTRACT. A total mass is the weighted count of continuous homomorphisms from the absolute Galois group of a local field to a finite group. In the preceding paper, the authors observed that in a particular example, two total masses coming from two different weightings are dual to each other. We discuss the problem how general such a duality holds and relate it to the existence of simultaneous resolution of singularities, using the wild McKay correspondence and the Poincaré duality for stringy invariants. We also exhibit several examples.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the preceding paper [WY15] the authors found a close relationship between mass formulas for local Galois representations, studied in the number theory, and stringy invariants of singular varieties. In the present paper, we discuss dualities of mass formulas in relation with the existence of some kinds of desingularization.

For a local field  $K$  and a finite group  $\Gamma$ , let  $G_K = \text{Gal}(K^{\text{sep}}/K)$  be the absolute Galois group of  $K$  and  $S_{K,\Gamma}$  be the set of continuous homomorphisms  $G_K \rightarrow \Gamma$ . For a function  $c : S_{K,\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , the *total mass* of  $(K, \Gamma, c)$  is defined as

$$M(K, \Gamma, c) := \frac{1}{\#\Gamma} \sum_{\rho \in S_{K,\Gamma}} q^{-c(\rho)}$$

with  $q$  the cardinality of the residue field of  $K$ . For the symmetric group  $S_n$ , fixing the standard representation

$$\iota : S_n \hookrightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathcal{O}_K) \subset \text{GL}_n(K)$$

with  $\mathcal{O}_K$  the integer ring of  $K$ , we can associate the Artin conductor  $\mathbf{a}_\iota(\rho)$  to each continuous homomorphism  $\rho : G_K \rightarrow S_n$ . According to Kedlaya [Ked07], Bhargava's mass formula [Bha07] for étale extensions of a local field is expressed as

$$M(K, S_n, \mathbf{a}_\iota) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} P(n, n-m) q^{-m},$$

where  $P(n, n-m)$  is the number of partitions of the integer  $n$  into exactly  $n-m$  parts. It was found in [WY15] that for another function  $\rho \mapsto \mathbf{w}_{2\iota}(\rho)$  originating in

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E15, 14E16, 11S15, 11G25.

*Key words and phrases.* mass formulas, local Galois representations, quotient singularities, dualities, the McKay correspondence, equisingularities, stringy invariants.

the wild McKay correspondence [Yasa], we have

$$M(K, S_n, -\mathbf{w}_{2\iota}) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} P(n, n-m)q^m.$$

Here  $2\iota$  stands for the direct sum of two copies of the representation  $\iota$ . The right hand sides of the two formulas are interchanged by replacing  $q$  with  $q^{-1}$ : this is what we call a *duality*. It is then natural to ask how general the duality holds: what about other groups and other representations. There exists yet another function  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  on  $S_{K,\Gamma}$  for each representation  $\tau$  of  $\Gamma$  over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . It was shown in [WY15] that if  $\tau$  is a permutation representation, then we have  $\mathbf{a}_\tau = \mathbf{v}_{2\tau}$ . It turns out that the function  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  is more appropriate to discuss dualities for non-permutation representations. The most basic question we would like to ask is: *when are the total masses  $M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  and  $M(K, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$  dual to each other in the same way as  $M(K, S_n, \mathbf{a}_\iota)$  and  $M(K, S_n, -\mathbf{w}_{2\iota})$  are?* We will observe that the duality does not always hold, but is closely related to the existence of a *simultaneous resolution of singularities* or to *equisingularities*.

To discuss the duality more rigorously, we need to consider total masses for all unramified extensions of the given local field  $K$ . For each integer  $r > 0$ , let  $K_r$  be the unramified extension of  $K$  of degree  $r$ . For a representation  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$ , we can naturally generalize functions  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{w}_\tau$  to ones on  $S_{K_r, \Gamma}$ , which we continue to denote by the same symbols. We then regard total masses  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  and  $M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$  as functions in the variable  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ . When they belong to a certain class of nice functions (which we call *admissible*), we can define their dual functions  $\mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau))$  and  $\mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau))$  in such a way that the dual of the function  $q^r$  is  $q^{-r}$ . A duality which we are interested in is now expressed by the equality

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)) = M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau).$$

We call it the *strong duality*.

It is the *wild McKay correspondence* which relates total masses to singularities. Given a representation  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$ , we have the associated  $\Gamma$ -action on the affine space  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d$  and the quotient scheme  $X := \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d/\Gamma$ , which is a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein variety over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . In general, for a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein variety  $Y$  over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , we can define the *stringy point count*  $\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(Y)$  as a volume of the  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -point set  $Y(\mathcal{O}_K)$  (see [Yasb]). This is an analogue of stringy  $E$ -function defined by Batyrev and Dais [BD96, Bat98] and is a generalization of the number of  $k$ -points on a smooth  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety. For a  $k$ -point  $y \in Y(k)$ , we can similarly define the *stringy point count along  $\{y\}$*  (or the *stringy weight of  $y$* ), denoted by  $\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(Y)_y$ , so that we have

$$\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(Y) = \sum_{y \in Y(k)} \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(Y)_y.$$

Yasuda [Yasb] proved that if the representation  $\tau$  is faithful and the morphism  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d \rightarrow X$  is étale in codimension one, then

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(X) &= M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)q^d \text{ and} \\ \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(X)_o &= M(K, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau), \end{aligned}$$

where  $o$  is the origin of  $X(k)$ . This is a version of the wild McKay correspondence discussed in [Yas14, Yasa, WY15, Yasc]. Special cases were previously proved in [Yas14, WY15]. If  $X$  has a nice resolution, then  $\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(X)$  and  $\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}(X)_o$  are explicitly

computed in terms of resolution data. Using it, we can deduce a few properties of the functions  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  and  $M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$ : obtained properties depend on what sort of resolution exists.

*Remark 1.1.* The assumption that the morphism  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d \rightarrow X$  is étale in codimension one is just for notational simplicity. We may drop this assumption by considering the pair of  $X$  and a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on it rather than the variety  $X$  itself.

Let us think of  $X$  as a family of singular varieties over  $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ . If  $X$  admits a kind of simultaneous resolution, then

$$\frac{\sharp_{\text{st}}(X) - \sharp_{\text{st}}(X)_o}{q^r - 1}$$

satisfies a certain self-duality, which can be understood as the Poincaré duality of stringy invariants proved in [BD96, Bat98] over complex numbers. Using the wild McKay correspondence, we can transform this duality into the form:

$$(1.2) \quad M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau) \cdot q^{rd} - M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau) \\ = \mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)) \cdot q^{rd} - \mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)).$$

We call it the *weak duality* between  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  and  $M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$ , which is indeed weaker than the strong duality (1.1)

There are three possibilities; both dualities hold, both dualities fail, and the weak one holds but the strong one does not. Examples we compute show that all of them indeed occur. In the tame case, the strong duality holds. For permutation representations, the weak duality holds in all examples we compute, but the strong duality does not generally hold. When  $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{F}_q[[t]]$  and the given representation  $\tau$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , the strong duality holds in all computed examples. However, when the representation is not defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , then the weak duality tends to fail. These examples suggest that we may think of the two dualities as a test of how equisingular the family  $X$  is.

In particular, when  $\mathcal{O}_K = \mathbb{F}_q[[t]]$  and  $\tau$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$ , the associated quotient scheme  $X = \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{F}_q[[t]]}^d$  would be equisingular in any reasonable sense. If there exists a nice resolution of the  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -variety  $X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathbb{F}_q$ , then we obtain an equally nice simultaneous resolution of  $X$  just by the base change. Therefore, if one believes that there exists as a nice resolution in positive characteristic as in characteristic zero, then at least the weak duality (1.2) would hold for such  $\tau$ . On the contrary, if one finds an example such that the weak duality fails, then it would give an example of an  $\mathbb{F}_q$ -variety without admitting any nice resolution. However, as far as we computed, all examples satisfy even the strong duality.

The study in this paper thus gives rise to interesting open problems related to dualities and equisingularities and their interaction (see Questions 4.7, 4.8 and 5.2 and Section 6). Further studies are required.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define admissible functions and their duals. In Section 3, we discuss properties of stringy point counts. In Section 4, we define total masses and discuss how the wild McKay correspondence relate dualities of total masses with equisingularities. In Section 5, we exhibit several examples. In the final section, we give concluding remarks.

**1.1. Acknowledgments.** The authors would like to thank Kiran Kedlaya for helpful discussion. Yasuda thanks Max Planck Institute for Mathematics for its hospitality, where he stayed partly during this work. Wood was supported by NSF grants DMS-1147782 and DMS-1301690 and an American Institute of Mathematics Five Year Fellowship.

**1.2. Convention and notation.** We denote the set of positive integers by  $\mathbb{N}$ . A *local field* means a finite extension of either  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  or  $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$  for a prime number  $p$ . For a local field  $K$ , we denote its integer ring by  $\mathcal{O}_K$  and its residue field by  $k$ . We denote the characteristic of  $k$  by  $p$  and the cardinality of  $k$  by  $q$ . For  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote the unramified extension of  $K$  of degree  $r$  by  $K_r$  and its residue field (that is, the extension of  $k$  of degree  $r$ ) by  $k_r$ . For a variety  $X$  defined over either  $\mathcal{O}_K$  or  $k$ , we put  $\sharp X := \sharp X(k)$ , the cardinality of  $k$ -points of  $X$ . More generally, for  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we put  $\sharp^r X := \sharp X(k_r)$ .

## 2. ADMISSIBLE FUNCTIONS AND THEIR DUALS

In this section, we set foundation to discuss dualities of total masses and stringy point counts by introducing *admissible functions*.

**Definition 2.1.** We call a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  *admissible* if there exist numbers  $0 \neq c \in \mathbb{Q}$ ,  $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq m$ ) such that for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$f(r) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l n_i \alpha_i^r}{q^{cr} - 1}.$$

We denote the set of admissible functions by AF. For an admissible function  $f(r)$  as above, we define its *dual function*  $\mathbb{D}f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by

$$(\mathbb{D}f)(r) := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^l n_i \alpha_i^{-r}}{q^{-cr} - 1}.$$

It is easy to see that the set of admissible functions is closed under addition and multiplication, thus AF has a natural ring structure. For  $f \in \text{AF}$ , the dual  $\mathbb{D}f$  is also an admissible function. Therefore  $\mathbb{D}$  gives an involution of the set AF. Moreover it is easily checked that  $\mathbb{D} : \text{AF} \rightarrow \text{AF}$  is a ring isomorphism.

A typical admissible function is a rational function in  $q^{1/n}$  for some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with a denominator of the form  $q^{cr} - 1$ . In that case, the dual function is obtained just by substituting  $q^{-1}$  for  $q$ . Another example is given as follows: let  $k = \mathbb{F}_q$  and  $k_r := \mathbb{F}_{q^r}$ . For a  $k$ -variety  $X$ , the function

$$r \mapsto \sharp^r X := \sharp X(k_r)$$

is admissible from the Grothendieck-Lefschetz trace formula.

**Lemma 2.2.** *The dual function  $\mathbb{D}f$  does not depend on the choice of the expression of  $f(r)$  as  $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^l n_i \alpha_i^r}{q^{cr} - 1}$ .*

*Proof.* Let

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{l'} m_j \beta_j^r}{q^{dr} - 1}$$

be another such expression of  $f(r)$ . For every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have

$$(q^{dr} - 1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^l n_i \alpha_i^r = (q^{cr} - 1) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{l'} m_j \beta_j^r.$$

It suffices to show that for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

$$(q^{-dr} - 1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^l n_i \alpha_i^{-r} = (q^{-cr} - 1) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{l'} m_j \beta_j^{-r}.$$

This follows from the following claim:

*Claim 2.3.* Suppose that for every  $r$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^l n_i \alpha_i^r = \sum_{j=1}^{l'} m_j \beta_j^r.$$

Suppose also that all of  $\alpha_i$ ,  $n_i$ ,  $\beta_j$  and  $m_j$  are nonzero, and that  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l$  are distinct, and so are  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{l'}$ . Then we have  $l = l'$ ,  $\alpha_i = \beta_i$  and  $n_i = m_i$  up to permutation.

In turn, this claim follows from the following one:

*Claim 2.4.* Suppose that  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l$  are distinct nonzero complex numbers and that for every  $r$ ,

$$\sum_{i=1}^l n_i \alpha_i^r = 0.$$

Then  $n_i = 0$  for every  $i$ .

The last claim follows from the regularity of the Vandermonde matrix

$$(\alpha_i^r)_{1 \leq i \leq l, 0 \leq r \leq l-1}.$$

□

For a smooth proper  $k$ -variety  $X$  of pure dimension  $d$ , the Poincaré duality for the  $l$ -adic cohomology shows that the function  $r \mapsto \sharp^r X$  satisfies

$$\sharp^r X = q^{dr} \cdot \mathbb{D}(\sharp^r X).$$

### 3. STRINGY POINT COUNTS

**3.1. Stringy point counts.** Let  $K$  be a local field, that is, a finite extension of either  $\mathbb{Q}_p$  or  $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ . We denote its residue field by  $k$  and its integer ring by  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . An  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety means an integral separated flat  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -scheme of finite type such that there exists an open dense subscheme  $U \subset X$  which is smooth over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . For an  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety  $X$ , we denote by  $X_k$  the closed fiber  $X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} k$  and by  $X_K$  the generic fiber  $X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} K$ . For a constructible subset  $C \subset X_k$ , we let  $X(\mathcal{O}_K)_C$  to the set of  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -points  $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K \rightarrow X$  sending the closed point into  $C$ .

Suppose now that  $X$  is normal. From [Kol13, Definition 1.5],  $X$  has a canonical sheaf  $\omega_{X/\mathcal{O}_K}$ . If  $d$  is the relative dimension of  $X$  over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , then  $\omega_{X/\mathcal{O}_K}$  coincides with  $\Omega_{X/\mathcal{O}_K}^d = \bigwedge^d \Omega_{X/\mathcal{O}_K}$  on the  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth locus of  $X$ . The canonical divisor  $K_X = K_{X/\mathcal{O}_K}$  is defined as a divisor such that  $\omega_{X/\mathcal{O}_K} = \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)$ , which is determined up to linear equivalence. Let us suppose also that  $X$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein, that is,  $K_X$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Cartier. Then, for a constructible subset  $C \subset X_k$ , we can define the *stringy point count along  $C$* ,

$$\sharp_{\text{st}}(X)_C \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\},$$

as a certain  $p$ -adic volume of  $X(\mathcal{O}_K)_C$ . For details, see [Yasb]. However, what is important for our purpose is not the definition but the explicit formula in the next subsection.

For  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $K_r$  be the unramified extension of  $K$  of degree  $r$  and let  $k_r$  be its residue field. We then define  $\#_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C$  to be the stringy point count  $X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K_r}$  along the preimage of  $C$  in  $(X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} \mathcal{O}_{K_r}) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{K_r}} k_r = X \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_K} k_r$ . We often regard  $\#_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C$  as a function in  $r$ . When  $X$  is smooth over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , then  $\#_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C$  is equal to the number of  $k_r$ -points of  $X$  contained in  $C$ .

**3.2. An explicit formula and the Poincaré duality.** Let  $X$  be a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein variety over either  $\mathcal{O}_K$  or  $k$ . For a proper birational morphism  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  with  $Y$  normal, the relative canonical divisor

$$K_{Y/X} := K_Y - f^* K_X$$

is uniquely determined as a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $Y$  supported in the exceptional locus of  $f$ . We are especially interested in the case where  $Y$  is regular and  $K_{Y/X}$  is simple normal crossing. We define simple normal crossing divisors on regular  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -varieties as follows.

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $Y$  be a regular variety over  $\mathcal{O}_K$  and  $E \subset Y$  a reduced closed subscheme of pure codimension one. We call  $E$  a *simple normal crossing divisor* if

- for every irreducible component  $E_0$  of  $E$  and for every closed point  $x \in E_0$  where  $Y$  is smooth over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , the completion of  $E_0$  at  $x$  is irreducible, and
- for every closed point  $x \in Y$  where  $Y$  is smooth over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , the support of  $E$  is, in a certain Zariski neighborhood, defined by a product  $y_{i_1} \dots y_{i_m}$  for a regular system of parameters  $y_0 = \varpi, y_1, \dots, y_d \in \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{Y,y}$  with  $\varpi$  a uniformizer of  $K$  and  $0 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_m \leq d$ .

We then call a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -divisor on  $Y$  *simple normal crossing* if so is its support.

The reason why we look only at closed points where  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth is that there is no  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -point passing through a closed point where  $Y$  is not  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth, and hence such a point is irrelevant to stringy point counts.

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  be a proper birational morphism of varieties over either  $\mathcal{O}_K$  or  $k$  such that  $X$  is normal and  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein.

- We call  $f$  a *resolution* if  $Y$  is regular.
- We call  $f$  a *WL (weak log) resolution* if  $f$  is a resolution and the support of  $K_{Y/X}$  is simple normal crossing.
- When  $f$  is defined over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , we call  $f$  an *SWL (simultaneous weak log) resolution* if  $f$  is a WL resolution and  $Y$  is smooth over  $\mathcal{O}_K$  or  $k$ .

*Remark 3.3.* The word *weak* indicates that we look only at the support of  $K_{Y/X}$  rather than the whole exceptional locus. In particular, every resolution  $Y \rightarrow X$  with  $K_{Y/X} = 0$  is a WL resolution, whatever the exceptional locus is.

*Remark 3.4.* We cannot usually expect that an SWL resolution exists, unless  $X$  is thought of as an *equisingular* family over  $\mathcal{O}_K$  in some sense. If  $\mathcal{O}_K = k[[t]]$  and if  $X = X_0 \otimes_k k[[t]]$  for some  $k$ -variety  $X_0$ , then  $X$  would be equisingular in any reasonable sense. In this situation, an SWL resolution of  $X$  exists if and only if a WL resolution of  $X_0$  exists.

For a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety  $X$  and a WL resolution  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ , we can uniquely decompose  $K_{Y/X}$  as

$$(3.1) \quad K_{Y/X} = \sum_{h=1}^l a_h A_h + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i B_i + \sum_{j=1}^n c_j C_j,$$

where all the  $A_h, B_i, C_j$  are prime divisors on  $Y$ , the coefficients  $a_h, b_i, c_j$  are nonzero rational numbers, every  $A_h$  is contained in  $X_k$  and  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth at the generic point of  $A_h$ , every  $B_i$  is contained in  $X_k$  and  $Y$  is *not*  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth at the generic point of  $B_i$ , and every  $C_j$  dominates  $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ . We denote by  $A_h^\circ$  the locus in  $A_h$  where  $Y$  is  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth. For a subset  $J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ , we define

$$C_J^\circ := \bigcap_{j \in J} C_j \setminus \bigcup_{j \notin J} C_j.$$

For a constructible subset  $W$  of a  $k$ -variety  $Z$ , let  $\sharp^r(W)$  denote the number of  $k_r$ -points of  $W$ .

**Proposition 3.5** (An explicit formula, [Yasb]). *Let  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  be a WL resolution of a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety  $X$  and write  $K_{Y/X}$  as in (3.1). Let  $Y_{\text{sm}}$  be the  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth locus of  $Y$ .*

- (1) *We have  $\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C < \infty$  for all  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  if and only if for every  $j$  such that  $C_j \cap f^{-1}(C) \cap Y_{\text{sm}} \neq \emptyset$ ,  $c_j > -1$ .*
- (2) *If the two equivalent conditions of (1) hold, then*

$$\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C = \sum_{h=1}^l q^{-ra_h} \sum_{J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \sharp^r(f^{-1}(C) \cap A_h^\circ \cap C_J^\circ) \prod_{j \in J} \frac{q^r - 1}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1}.$$

*Proof.* In [Yasb] it was proved that  $\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C$  is equal to  $\sharp_{\text{st}}(Y, -K_{Y/X})_{f^{-1}(C)}$ , the stringy point count of the pair  $(Y, -K_{Y/X})$  along  $f^{-1}(C)$ . The proposition follows from the explicit formula for the stringy point count of a pair with a simple normal crossing divisor in the same paper.  $\square$

In particular, if  $K$  has characteristic zero and if the generic fiber  $X_K$  has only log terminal singularities (for instance, quotient singularities), then  $\sharp^r(X)_C < \infty$  for every  $r$  and  $C$ . The following is a direct consequence of the proposition.

**Corollary 3.6.** *Suppose that  $X$  is  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein, that there exists a WL resolution  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ , and that for every  $r > 0$ ,  $\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C < \infty$ . Then the function  $\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X)_C$  in the variable  $r$  is admissible.*

The following result was proved by Batyrev–Dais [BD96] and Batyrev [Bat98] in a slightly different setting.

**Corollary 3.7** (The Poincaré duality). *Let  $X$  be a  $d$ -dimensional proper normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety. Suppose that there exists an SWL resolution  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  and that for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X) < \infty$ . We then have*

$$\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X) = \mathbb{D}(\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X)) \cdot q^{dr}.$$

*Proof.* We follow arguments in the proof of [Bat98, Theorem 3.7]. Since  $f$  is an SWL resolution, if we write  $K_{Y/X}$  as in (3.1), then the terms  $\sum a_h A_h$  and  $\sum b_i B_i$

do not appear. Therefore Proposition 3.5 reads

$$\#_{\text{st}}^r(X) = \sum_{J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \#^r(C_J) \prod_{j \in J} \frac{q^r - 1}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1}.$$

Putting

$$C_J := \bigcap_{j \in J} C_j,$$

we have  $C_J := \bigsqcup_{J' \supset J} C_{J'}$  and  $\#^r(C_J) = \sum_{J' \supset J} \#^r(C_{J'})$ . From this and the inclusion-exclusion principle (or the Möbius inversion formula, for instance, see [Sta97]), we deduce

$$\#^r(C_J) = \sum_{J' \supset J} (-1)^{\#J' - \#J} \#^r(C_{J'}).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \#_{\text{st}}^r(X) &= \sum_{J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \left( \sum_{J' \supset J} (-1)^{\#J' - \#J} \#^r(C_{J'}) \right) \prod_{j \in J} \frac{q^r - 1}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1} \\ &= \sum_{J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \#^r(C_J) \prod_{j \in J} \left( \frac{q^r - 1}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1} - 1 \right) \\ &= \sum_{J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \#^r(C_J) \prod_{j \in J} \left( \frac{q^r - q^{r(1+c_j)}}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we have

$$\mathbb{D} \left( \frac{q^r - q^{r(1+c_j)}}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1} \right) = \frac{q^{-r} - q^{r(-1-c_j)}}{q^{r(-1-c_j)} - 1} = \frac{q^r - q^{r(1+c_j)}}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1} \cdot q^{-r}.$$

Since  $\#^r(C_J) = \#^r(C_J \otimes_K k)$  and  $C_J \otimes_K k$  are proper smooth  $k$ -varieties of pure dimension  $d - \#J$ , the Poincaré duality for the  $l$ -adic cohomology gives

$$\mathbb{D}(\#^r(C_J)) = \#^r(C_J) \cdot q^{r(\#J-d)}.$$

Since  $\mathbb{D} : \text{AF} \rightarrow \text{AF}$  is a ring homomorphism, the corollary follows.  $\square$

### 3.3. Set-theoretically free $\mathbb{G}_m$ -actions.

**Definition 3.8.** An action of the group scheme  $\mathbb{G}_m = \mathbb{G}_{m,k} = \text{Spec } k[t, t^{-1}]$  on a  $k$ -variety  $Z$  is said to be *set-theoretically free* if for every field extension  $k'/k$  and every point  $x \in Z(k')$ , the stabilizer subgroup scheme  $\text{Stab}(x) \subset \mathbb{G}_{m,k'}$  consists of a single point.

A set-theoretically free  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action naturally appears as the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action on the quotient variety  $(\mathbb{A}_k^d/\Gamma) \setminus \{o\}$  with the origin removed for a linear action of a finite group  $\Gamma$  on an affine space  $\mathbb{A}_k^d$ . In general, the  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action may have non-reduced stabilizer subgroups and not be free. See [Yas14] for such an example. If  $X$  is the quotient variety  $Z/\mathbb{G}_m$  for a set-theoretically free  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action on a smooth variety  $Z$  and if  $X$  is proper, then the function  $\#^r X$  satisfies the same Poincaré duality as a smooth proper variety does. Note that  $X$  is not necessarily smooth because of non-reduced stabilizers. To prove the duality, we need to use Artin stacks.



Based on works of Laszlo and Olsson [Ols08, LO08a, LO08b], Sun [Sun12] defined étale cohomology groups  $H^i(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \bar{k}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l)$  and  $H_c^i(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \bar{k}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l)$  for Artin stacks  $\mathcal{X}$  of finite type over  $k$  and a prime number  $l \neq p$ . For  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , we define

$$\sharp^r(\mathcal{X}) := \sum_i (-1)^i \mathrm{Tr}(F^r | H_c^i(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \bar{k}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l))$$

with  $F^r$  the  $r$ -iterated Frobenius action. This is a generalization of  $\sharp^r X = \sharp X(k_r)$  for a  $k$ -variety  $X$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be an Artin stack of finite type over  $k$  with finite diagonal, and  $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$  its coarse moduli space. Then we have*

$$\sharp^r(\mathcal{X}) = \sharp^r(\bar{\mathcal{X}}).$$

Moreover, if  $\mathcal{X}$  is smooth and proper of pure dimension  $d$  over  $k$ , then

$$\sharp^r(\mathcal{X}) = \mathbb{D}(\sharp^r(\mathcal{X})) \cdot q^{rd}.$$

*Proof.* In the proof of [Sun12, Proposition 7.3.2], Sun proved that

$$H_c^i(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \bar{k}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l) = H_c^i(\bar{\mathcal{X}} \otimes_k \bar{k}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l)$$

and that if  $\mathcal{X}$  is smooth and proper, then we have the Poincaré duality,

$$H^i(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \bar{k}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l)^\vee = H^{2d-i}(\mathcal{X} \otimes_k \bar{k}, \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l) \otimes \bar{\mathbb{Q}}_l(d).$$

The proposition is a direct consequence of these results.  $\square$

Let  $Z$  be a  $k$ -variety endowed with a set-theoretically free  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action. Then the quotient stack  $\mathcal{W} := [Z/\mathbb{G}_m]$  is an Artin stack with finite diagonal and hence admits a coarse moduli space, which we write as  $W = Z/\mathbb{G}_m$ .

**Proposition 3.10.** *We have*

$$\sharp^r(\mathcal{W}) = \sharp^r(W) = \frac{\sharp^r(Z)}{q^r - 1}.$$

*Proof.* The left equality was proved in the last proposition. We show the right equality. For every field extension  $k'/k$  and every point  $x \in Z(k')$ , we have

$$\mathrm{Stab}(x) = \mathrm{Spec} k'[t, t^{-1}]/(t^{p^a} - 1)$$

for some non-negative integer  $a$ . Let  $U \subset Z$  be the locus where this number  $a$  takes the minimum value, and let  $\bar{U} \subset W$  be its image. The algebraic spaces  $U$  and  $\bar{U}$  are open dense subspaces of  $Z$  and  $W$  respectively. If we put

$$H := \mathrm{Spec} k[t, t^{-1}]/(t^{p^a} - 1),$$

then the given set-theoretically free  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -action on  $U$  induces a free action of the quotient group scheme  $\mathbb{G}_m/H$ , which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{G}_m$ , on  $U$ . This action makes the projection  $U \rightarrow \bar{U}$  a  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -torsor. From Hilbert's Theorem 90 [Mil80, page 124], every  $\mathbb{G}_m$ -torsor is Zariski locally trivial, hence

$$\sharp^r(U) = (q^r - 1) \cdot \sharp^r(\bar{U}).$$

It is now easy to show  $\sharp^r(Z) = (q^r - 1) \cdot \sharp^r(W)$  by induction.  $\square$

**Definition 3.11.** Let  $X$  be an  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety with a  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}$ -action. We suppose that the induced  $\mathbb{G}_{m, k}$ -action on  $X_k$  is set-theoretically free. For the quotient stack  $[X/\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}]$ , we put

$$\sharp_{\text{st}}^r([X/\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}]) := \frac{\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X)}{q^r - 1}.$$

**Definition 3.12.** For a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety  $X$  endowed with a  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}$ -action, we call a resolution  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  an *ESWL (equivariant simultaneous weak log) resolution* if  $f$  is an SWL resolution and  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}$ -equivariant (that is,  $Y$  also has a  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}$ -action so that  $f$  is  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}$ -equivariant).

**Proposition 3.13.** *Let  $X$  be a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety  $X$  endowed with a  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}$ -action. Suppose that the induced action of  $\mathbb{G}_{m, k}$  on  $X_k$  is set-theoretically free and the quotient stack  $[X_k/\mathbb{G}_{m, k}]$  is proper over  $k$ . Suppose also that there exists an ESWL resolution  $f : Y \rightarrow X$ , and that  $\sharp_{\text{st}}^r(X) < \infty$  for all  $r$ . Then*

$$\sharp_{\text{st}}^r([X/\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}]) = \mathbb{D}(\sharp_{\text{st}}^r([X/\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}])) \cdot q^{r(d-1)}$$

with  $d$  the dimension of  $X$  over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ .

*Proof.* From Lemma 3.5, if we write  $K_{Y/X} = \sum_{j=1}^n c_j C_j$ , then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp_{\text{st}}^r([X/\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}]) &= \sum_{J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \frac{\sharp^r(C_J^{\circ})}{q^r - 1} \prod_{i \in J} \frac{q^r - 1}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1} \\ &= \sum_{J \subset \{1, \dots, n\}} \frac{\sharp^r(C_J)}{q^r - 1} \prod_{j \in J} \left( \frac{q^r - q^{r(1+c_j)}}{q^{r(1+c_j)} - 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

in the same way as in the proof of Corollary 3.7. Each  $C_J \cap Y_k$  is stable under the  $\mathbb{G}_{m, k}$ -action and the action on  $C_J \cap Y_k$  is set-theoretically free. Hence  $[(C_J \cap Y_k)/\mathbb{G}_{m, k}]$  is a smooth proper Artin  $k$ -stack of dimension  $d - 1 - \sharp J$  with finite diagonal. From Proposition 3.9,

$$\frac{\sharp^r(C_J)}{q^r - 1} = \mathbb{D} \left( \frac{\sharp^r(C_J)}{q^r - 1} \right) \cdot q^{r(d-1-\sharp J)}.$$

We can show the rest of the proof as in the proof of Corollary 3.7.  $\square$

#### 4. TOTAL MASSES OF LOCAL GALOIS REPRESENTATIONS

**4.1. Total masses.** Let  $K$  be a local field and  $G_K = \text{Gal}(K^{\text{sep}}/K)$  its absolute Galois group. For a finite group  $\Gamma$ , we define  $S_{K, \Gamma}$  to be the set of continuous homomorphisms  $G_K \rightarrow \Gamma$ . To each representation  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \text{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$ , we can associate, among others, three functions  $S_{K, \Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  denoted by  $\mathbf{a}_\tau$ ,  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{w}_\tau$ .

The first one  $\mathbf{a}_\tau$  is called the *Artin conductor*. For  $\rho \in S_{K, \Gamma}$ , let  $H$  be the image of  $\rho$  and  $L/K$  the associated Galois extension having  $H$  as the Galois group. The Galois group  $H$  has the filtration by ramification subgroups with lower numbering

$$H \supset H_0 \supset H_1 \supset \dots,$$

(see [Ser79]). We define

$$\mathbf{a}_\tau(\rho) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(H_0 : H_i)} \text{codim}(K^d)^{H_i}.$$

The second function  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  is defined as follows. For  $\rho \in S_{K, \Gamma}$ , let  $\text{Spec } M \rightarrow \text{Spec } K$  be the corresponding étale  $\Gamma$ -torsor and  $\mathcal{O}_M$  the integer ring of  $M$ . Note that the

spectrum of the extension  $L$  mentioned above is a connected component of  $\text{Spec } M$ . Then the free  $\mathcal{O}_M$ -module  $\mathcal{O}_M^{\oplus d}$  has two (left)  $\Gamma$ -actions: firstly the action induced from the map

$$\Gamma \xrightarrow{\tau} \text{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K) \subset \text{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_M)$$

and secondly the diagonal action induced from the given  $\Gamma$ -action on  $\mathcal{O}_M$ . We define the associated *tuning submodule*  $\Xi \subset \mathcal{O}_M^{\oplus d}$  to be the subset of those element on which the two actions coincide. It turns out that  $\Xi$  is a free  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -module of rank  $d$ . We define

$$\mathbf{v}_\tau(\rho) := \frac{1}{\#\Gamma} \cdot \text{length} \left( \frac{\mathcal{O}_M^{\oplus d}}{\mathcal{O}_M \cdot \Xi} \right).$$

Note that we may also use  $\mathcal{O}_L$  and the subgroup  $H = \text{Im}(\rho)$  in the definition of  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  instead of  $\mathcal{O}_M$  and  $\Gamma$ .

The last function  $\mathbf{w}_\tau$  is called the *weight function*. Let  $\rho \in S_{K,\Gamma}$ ,  $M$  and  $\Xi \subset \mathcal{O}_M^{\oplus d}$  be as above. We identify  $\Xi$  with the subgroup of  $\Gamma$ -equivariant maps of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_K}(\mathcal{O}_K^{\oplus d}, \mathcal{O}_M) = \mathcal{O}_M^{\oplus d}$ . For an  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -basis  $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_d$  of  $\Xi$ , we define an  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -algebra homomorphism  $u^* : \mathcal{O}_K[x_1, \dots, x_d] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_M[y_1, \dots, y_d]$  by  $u^*(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^n \phi_j(x_i) y_j$ . Let  $u : \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_M}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d$  be the corresponding morphism of schemes and  $o : \text{Spec } k \hookrightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d$  the  $k$ -point at the origin. We define

$$\mathbf{w}_\tau(\rho) := \dim u^{-1}(o) - \mathbf{v}_\tau(\rho).$$

*Remark 4.1.* Our definition of  $\mathbf{w}_\tau$  follows the one in [Yasb] and is slightly different from the one in the preceding paper [WY15]. Let us consider the left  $\Gamma$ -action on  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d$  induced from the one on  $\mathcal{O}_K[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ . In precise, an element  $\gamma \in \Gamma$  gives the automorphism of  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d$  corresponding to the automorphism on  $\mathcal{O}_K[x_1, \dots, x_d]$  given by the inverse  $\gamma^{-1}$  of  $\gamma$ . In [WY15] we defined

$$\mathbf{w}_\tau(\rho) := \text{codim}((\mathbb{A}_k^d)^{H_0}, \mathbb{A}_k^d) - \mathbf{v}_\tau(\rho),$$

where  $H_0$  is the 0-th ramification subgroup of  $H$ , that is, the inertia subgroup. However, as proved in [Yasb], the two definitions coincide in the following three cases which we are mainly concerned with.

- (1) The order of the given group  $\Gamma$  is invertible in  $k$ .
- (2) The given representation  $\tau$  is a permutation representation.
- (3) The given local field  $K$  has positive characteristic, and hence  $K = k((t))$ , and the image of  $\tau$  is contained in  $\text{GL}_d(k)$ .

**Definition 4.2.** For a function  $c : S_{K,\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , we define the *total mass* of  $(K, \Gamma, c)$  as

$$M(K, \Gamma, c) := \frac{1}{\#\Gamma} \cdot \sum_{\rho \in S_{K,\Gamma}} q^{-c(\rho)} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}.$$

For  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $K_r/K$  be the unramified extension of degree  $r$ . We continue to denote the induced representations  $\Gamma \xrightarrow{\tau} \text{GL}_n(\mathcal{O}_K) \hookrightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathcal{O}_{K_r})$  by  $\tau$ . Then we can consider total masses  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{a}_\tau)$ ,  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  and  $M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$ , and regard them as functions in  $r$ .

Kedlaya studied total masses for  $c = \mathbf{a}_\tau$  and used it to interpret and generalize Bhargava's mass formula [Bha07]. Wood [Woo08] studied ones for different choices of  $c$ . On the context of the wild McKay correspondence, explained below, functions  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{w}_\tau$  are concerned. For permutation representations, functions  $\mathbf{a}_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{v}_\tau$  are related as follows.

**Lemma 4.3** ([WY15]). *If  $\tau$  is a permutation representation, then*

$$2\mathbf{v}_\tau = \mathbf{v}_{\tau \oplus \tau} = \mathbf{a}_\tau.$$

**4.2. The wild McKay correspondence.** A representation  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$  defines  $\Gamma$ -actions on the polynomial ring  $\mathcal{O}_K[x_1, \dots, x_d]$  as above. Let  $X$  be the quotient variety  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d / \Gamma = \mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K[x_1, \dots, x_d]^\Gamma$ , which is a normal  $\mathbb{Q}$ -Gorenstein  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -variety. The following theorem, which we call the wild McKay correspondence, connect total masses and stringy point counts. This was proved in [WY15, Yas14] for special cases and in [Yasb] in full generality.

**Theorem 4.4** (The wild McKay correspondence). *Suppose that the representation  $\tau$  is faithful and the quotient morphism  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d \rightarrow X$  is étale in codimension one. We have*

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X) &= M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau) \cdot q^{dr} \text{ and} \\ \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X)_o &= M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau). \end{aligned}$$

The following corollary is a direct consequence of this theorem and Proposition 3.5.

**Corollary 4.5.** *If  $X$  admits a WL resolution and if  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau) < \infty$  (resp.  $M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau) < \infty$ ) for every  $r \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the function  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  (resp.  $M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$ ) is admissible.*

**4.3. Dualities of total masses.** To discuss dualities, let us now assume that both functions  $M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  and  $M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$  have finite values for all  $r$  and are admissible. The quotient variety  $X$  associated to a faithful representation  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$  has a natural  $\mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}$ -action. Let  $X^*$  be the complement of the zero section  $\mathrm{Spec} \mathcal{O}_K \hookrightarrow X$ . The  $\mathbb{G}_{m, k}$ -action on  $X_k^*$  is set-theoretically free. From definition, we have

$$\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r([X^* / \mathbb{G}_{m, \mathcal{O}_K}]) = \frac{\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X) - \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X)_o}{q^r - 1}.$$

If there exists an ESWL resolution  $Y \rightarrow X^*$ , then from Proposition 3.13, we have

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X) - \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X)_o}{q^r - 1} = \mathbb{D} \left( \frac{\sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X) - \sharp_{\mathrm{st}}^r(X)_o}{q^r - 1} \right) \cdot q^{r(d-1)}.$$

*Remark 4.6.* When  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathrm{GL}_d(k)$  with  $k$  a perfect field of characteristic  $p > 0$ , the motivic version of (4.1) was checked in [Yas14, Prop. 6.36], by using not resolution but an explicit formula for motivic total masses.

If  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d \rightarrow X$  is étale in codimension one, then the wild McKay correspondence, Theorem 4.4, shows that the last equality is equivalent to:

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau) \cdot q^{rd} - M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau) \\ = \mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)) \cdot q^{rd} - \mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)). \end{aligned}$$

We call this the *weak duality*. The equality may be regarded as a constraint imposed by the existence of an ESWL resolution of  $X^*$ . If this duality fails for some representation  $\tau$ , then the associated  $X^*$  would have no ESWL resolution. In particular, it is interesting to ask the following question.

**Question 4.7.** *Suppose that  $K$  has positive characteristic so that  $K = k((t))$ , that  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$  is a faithful representation factoring through  $\mathrm{GL}_n(k)$  and that the quotient morphism  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d/\Gamma$  is étale in codimension one. Then, does the weak duality always hold?*

If this has the negative answer and some representation  $\tau$  does not satisfy (4.2), then the associated  $k$ -variety  $X_k = \mathbb{A}_k^d/\Gamma$  does not admit any  $\mathbb{G}_{m,k}$ -equivariant WL resolution.

In some examples, even a stronger equality,

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbb{D}(M(K_r, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)) = M(K_r, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau),$$

holds: we call this the *strong duality*. A special case of this was the duality involving Bhargava's formula and the Hilbert scheme of points observed in [WY15] (see Section 5.4). Actually, as far as the authors know, even the strong duality holds in all examples satisfying the assumption as in Question 4.7. It is thus natural to ask:

**Question 4.8.** *With the same assumption as in Question 4.7, does the strong duality always hold?*

## 5. EXAMPLES

**5.1. The tame case.** We first consider the tame case. Suppose  $p \nmid \#\Gamma$ . Let  $\tau : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$  be a representation. Then  $S_{K,\Gamma}$  is a finite set and every  $\rho \in S_{K,\Gamma}$  factors through the Galois group  $G_K^{\mathrm{tame}}$  of the maximal tamely ramified extension  $K^{\mathrm{tame}}/K$ . It is topologically generated by two elements  $a$  and  $b$  with one relation  $bab^{-1} = a^q$  (see [NSW08, page 410]). Here  $a$  is the topological generator of the inertia subgroup of  $G_K^{\mathrm{tame}}$ . Therefore  $S_{K,\Gamma}$  is in a one-to-one correspondence with

$$\{(g, h) \in \Gamma^2 \mid hgh^{-1} = g^q\}.$$

The last set admits the involution  $(g, h) \mapsto (g^{-1}, h)$ . Let  $\iota$  be the corresponding involution of  $S_{K,\Gamma}$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *For  $\rho \in S_{K,\Gamma}$ , we have  $\mathbf{v}_\tau(\iota(\rho)) = \mathbf{w}_\tau(\rho)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $K'$  be the completion of the maximal unramified extension of  $K$ . Both  $\rho$  and  $\iota(\rho)$  define the same cyclic extension  $L/K'$  of order  $l := \mathrm{ord}(g)$  with  $(g, h) \in \Gamma^2$  corresponding to  $\rho$ . We can regard the element  $a \in G_K^{\mathrm{tame}}$  also as a generator of  $\mathrm{Gal}(L/K')$ . Let  $\varpi \in L$  be a uniformizer and  $\zeta \in K'$  an  $l$ -th root of unity such that  $a(\varpi) = \zeta\varpi$ .

If  $\zeta^{a_1}, \dots, \zeta^{a_d}$  with  $0 \leq a_i < l$  are the eigenvalues of  $g \in \Gamma \subset \mathrm{GL}_d(K')$ , then, from [WY15, Lem. 4.3], we have

$$\mathbf{v}_\tau(\rho) = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^d a_i.$$

In the tame case, our definition of  $\mathbf{w}_\tau$  coincides with the one in [WY15] (see Remark 4.1). Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}_\tau(\rho) &= \#\{i \mid a_i \neq 0\} - \mathbf{v}_\tau(\rho) \\ &= \frac{1}{l} \sum_{a_i \neq 0} l - a_i \\ &= \mathbf{v}_\tau(\iota(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

□

From the lemma,

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(K, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_\tau) &= \frac{1}{\#\Gamma} \sum_{\rho \in S_{K,\gamma}} q^{\mathbf{w}_\tau(\rho)} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\#\Gamma} \sum_{\rho \in S_{K,\gamma}} q^{\mathbf{v}_\tau(\iota(\rho))} \\
 &= \frac{1}{\#\Gamma} \sum_{\rho \in S_{K,\gamma}} q^{\mathbf{v}_\tau(\rho)} \\
 &= \mathbb{D}(M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_\tau)).
 \end{aligned}$$

The strong duality thus holds in the tame case. Moreover it is a term-wise duality:  $q^{\mathbf{w}_\tau(\rho)}$  and  $q^{\mathbf{v}_\tau(\iota(\rho))}$  are dual to each other. This is no longer true in wild cases satisfying dualities.

**5.2. Quadratic extensions: characteristic zero.** We consider an unramified extension  $K$  of  $\mathbb{Q}_2$  and compute some total masses counting quadratic extensions of  $K$ . Namely we consider the case  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ . Quadratic extensions are divided into 4 classes: let  $\mathfrak{m}_K$  be the maximal ideal of  $\mathcal{O}_K$ .

- The trivial extension  $K \times K$ .
- The unramified field extension of degree two.
- Ramified extensions with discriminant  $\mathfrak{m}_K^2$ . There are  $2(q-1)$  of them.
- Ramified extensions with discriminant  $\mathfrak{m}_K^3$ . There are  $2q$  of them.

For instance, this follows from Krasner's formula [Kra66] (see also [Ser78]).

They are in one-to-one correspondence with elements of  $S_{K,\Gamma}$ . Let  $\sigma$  be the two-dimensional representation of  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  by the transposition and for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sigma_n$  the direct sum of  $n$  copies of  $\sigma$ . From [WY15, Lem. 2.6], the values  $\mathbf{a}_\sigma(\rho)$ ,  $\rho \in S_{K,\Gamma}$  are respectively 0, 0, 2, 3 depending on the corresponding class above of quadratic extensions. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_n}) &= M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{a}_{\sigma_n}/2) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + 1 + 2(q-1)q^{-2n/2} + 2q \cdot q^{-3n/2}) \\
 &= 1 + q^{-n+1} - q^{-n} + q^{-3n/2+1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

As for the total mass with respect to  $-\mathbf{w}_{\sigma_n}$ , we have  $\mathbf{w}_{\sigma_n}(\rho) = n - \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_n}(\rho)$  if  $\rho$  corresponds to a totally ramified extension, and  $\mathbf{w}_{\sigma_n}(\rho) = \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_n}(\rho)$  otherwise. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{w}_{\sigma_n}) &= \frac{1}{2}(1 + 1 + 2(q-1)q^{-n+n} + 2q \cdot q^{-3n/2+n}) \\
 &= q + q^{-n/2+1}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We easily see that the strong duality holds for  $n = 1$ . For  $n > 1$ , the strong duality does not hold, but the weak one holds.

This phenomenon seems to be rather general. For a few other examples of permutation representations  $\sigma$  of cyclic groups, the authors checked that the weak duality holds, but the strong duality does not always hold. From these computations as well as the example in section 5.4, it is natural to ask:

**Question 5.2.** *Suppose that the given representation  $\tau$  is a permutation representation. Does the weak duality (4.2) always hold? Does the quotient scheme  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d/\Gamma$  always admit an ESWL resolution?*

**5.3. Quadratic extensions: characteristic two.** Next we consider the case  $K = \mathbb{F}_q((t))$  with  $q$  a power of two and  $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ . As in the last example, there are exactly two unramified quadratic extensions of  $K$ : the trivial one  $K \times K$  and the unramified field extension. As for the ramified extensions, for  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , there are exactly  $2(q-1)q^{i-1}$  extensions with discriminant  $\mathfrak{m}_K^{2i}$ . There is no extension with discriminant of odd exponent. This again follows from Krasner's formula.

Let  $\sigma$  be the two dimensional  $\Gamma$ -representation by transposition and  $\sigma_n$  the direct sum of  $n$  copies of it as above. We have

$$\begin{aligned} M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_{\sigma_n}) &= 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (q-1)q^{i-1}q^{-in} \\ &= 1 + \frac{(q-1)q^{-n}}{1-q^{-n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M(K, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_{\sigma_n}) &= 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (q-1)q^{i-1}q^{-in+n} \\ &= 1 + \frac{q-1}{1-q^{-n+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

We see that the strong duality and hence the weak duality hold for every  $n$ . Thus the answer to Question 4.8 in this case is positive.

For an integer  $m \geq 0$ , let us now consider the representation  $\tau_m : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathcal{O}_K)$  given by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & t^m \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have  $\tau_0 \cong \sigma$ . If  $m > 0$ , then  $\tau_m$  is not defined over  $k = \mathbb{F}_q$ .

To compute the functions  $\mathbf{v}_{\tau_m}$  and  $\mathbf{w}_{\tau_m}$ , let  $L$  be a ramified quadratic extension of  $K$  with discriminant  $\mathfrak{m}_K^{2i}$ ,  $\iota$  its unique  $K$ -involution and  $\varpi$  its uniformizer. Then  $\delta(\varpi) := \iota(\varpi) - \varpi \in \mathcal{O}_K$  and  $v_K(\delta(\varpi)) = i$  with  $v_K$  the normalized valuation of  $K$ . Therefore the tuning submodule  $\Xi$  is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &= \{(x, y) \in \mathcal{O}_L^{\oplus 2} \mid x + t^m y = \iota(x), y = \iota(y)\} \\ &= \{(x, t^{-m}\delta(x)) \mid x \in \mathcal{O}_L, v_K(\delta(x)) \geq m\} \\ &= \{(x, t^{-m}\delta(x)) \mid x \in \mathcal{O}_K \cdot 1 \oplus \mathcal{O}_K \cdot t^a \varpi\} \\ &= \langle (1, 0), (t^a \varpi, t^{a-m}\delta(\varpi)) \rangle_{\mathcal{O}_K}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $a = \sup\{0, m-i\}$ . Therefore,

$$\frac{\mathcal{O}_L^{\oplus 2}}{\mathcal{O}_L \cdot \Xi} \cong \frac{\mathcal{O}_L}{\mathcal{O}_L \cdot t^{a-m}\delta(\varpi)} \cong \frac{\mathcal{O}_L}{\mathcal{O}_L \cdot t^{a-m+i}}.$$

For  $\rho \in S_{K, \Gamma}$  corresponding to  $L$ ,

$$\mathbf{v}_{\tau_m}(\rho) = a - m + i = \begin{cases} 0 & (i \leq m) \\ i - m & (i > m). \end{cases}$$

The map  $u^* : \mathcal{O}_K[x, y] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_L[X, Y]$  in the definition of  $\mathbf{w}$  is explicitly given as

$$u^*(x) = X + t^a \varpi Y, \quad u^*(y) = t^{a-m} \delta(\varpi) Y.$$

The induced morphism  $\mathrm{Spec} k[X, Y] \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} k[x, y]$  is an isomorphism if  $i \leq m$  and a linear map of rank one if  $i > m$ . Therefore

$$\mathbf{w}_{\tau_m}(\rho) = \begin{cases} 0 & (i \leq m) \\ 1 - i + m & (i > m). \end{cases}$$

To obtain quotient morphisms which are étale in codimension one, we consider the direct sums  $v_{m,n} := \tau_m \oplus \sigma_n$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} M(K, \Gamma, \mathbf{v}_{v_{m,n}}) &= 1 + \sum_{i=1}^m (q-1) q^{i-1} \cdot q^{-in} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} (q-1) q^{i-1} \cdot q^{-i+m-in} \\ &= 1 + (q-1) q^{-n} \frac{1 - q^{(1-n)m}}{1 - q^{1-n}} + (q-1) \frac{q^{m-(m+1)n-1}}{1 - q^{-n}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M(K, \Gamma, -\mathbf{w}_{v_{m,n}}) &= 1 + \sum_{i=1}^m (q-1) q^{i-1} \cdot q^{-in+n} + \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} (q-1) q^{i-1} \cdot q^{1-i+m-in+n} \\ &= 1 + (q-1) \frac{1 - q^{(1-n)m}}{1 - q^{1-n}} + (q-1) \frac{q^{m-mn}}{1 - q^{-n}} \end{aligned}$$

One can easily see that the weak duality does not generally hold, for instance, by putting  $(m, n) = (1, 1)$ . From our viewpoint, this is explained by that the entry  $t^m$  in the matrix defining  $\tau_m$  causes the degeneration of singularities of  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d / \Gamma$ , namely makes the family over  $\mathcal{O}_K$  non-equisingular.

**5.4. Bhargava's formula.** We discuss an example from the preceding paper [WY15] and the duality observed there. Let  $S_n$  be the  $n$ -th symmetric group and  $\sigma : S_n \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_d(\mathcal{O}_K)$  the standard permutation representation. According to Kedlaya [Ked07], Bhargava's mass formula for étale extensions of a local field [Bha07] is formulated as

$$M(K, S_n, \mathbf{a}_\sigma) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} P(n, n-m) \cdot q^{-m}.$$

Here  $P(n, n-m)$  denotes the number of partitions of  $n$  into exactly  $n-m$  parts.

Let

$$\tau := \sigma \oplus \sigma : S_n \rightarrow \mathrm{GL}_{2n}(\mathcal{O}_K).$$

From Lemma 4.3, we have

$$M(K, S_n, \mathbf{v}_\tau) = M(K, S_n, \mathbf{a}_\sigma) = \sum_{m=0}^{n-1} P(n, n-m) \cdot q^{-m}.$$

In [WY15], we verified that

$$M(K, S_n, -\mathbf{w}_\tau) = \sum_{m=0}^n P(n, n-m) \cdot q^m.$$

These show that the functions  $M(K_r, S_n, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$  and  $M(K_r, S_n, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$  satisfy the strong duality (4.3). Thus the answer to Question 5.2 is positive in this situation.



The quotient scheme  $X = \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^{2n}/S_n$  associated to  $\tau$  is nothing but the  $n$ -th symmetric product of the affine plane over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . It admits a special ESWL resolution, namely the Hilbert-Chow morphism

$$f : \text{Hilb}^n(\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^2) \rightarrow X$$

from the Hilbert scheme of  $n$  points on  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^2$  defined over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ .

Using a stratification of  $\text{Hilb}^n(\mathbb{A}_k^2)$  into affine spaces [ES87, CV08], we can directly show

$$\sharp \text{Hilb}^n(\mathbb{A}_k^2) = \sum_{m=0}^n P(n, n-m) \cdot q^{2n-m}.$$

These together with Theorem 4.4 gives a new proof of Bhargava's formula without using Serre's mass formula [Ser78] unlike in [Bha07, Ked07].

**5.5. Kedlaya's formula.** We suppose  $p \neq 2$  and let  $G$  be the group of signed permutation matrices in  $\text{GL}_n(\mathcal{O}_K)$ . A signed matrix is a matrix such that every row or every column contains one and only one nonzero entry which is either 1 or -1. The group is isomorphic to the wreath product  $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) \wr S_n$ . Let

$$\iota : G \hookrightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathcal{O}_K)$$

be the inclusion and  $\tau := \iota \oplus \iota$ .

**Lemma 5.3.** *We have  $\mathbf{a}_\iota = \mathbf{v}_\tau$ .*

*Proof.* We construct a representation  $\iota' : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_{2n}(\mathcal{O}_K)$  by replacing entries of matrices in  $G$  as follows: replace 0 with  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , 1 with  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and -1 with  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ . The obtained  $\iota'$  is a permutation representation of  $G$ , and from Lemma 4.3,

$$\mathbf{a}_{\iota'} = \mathbf{v}_{\iota' \oplus \iota'}.$$

If  $\tau : G \rightarrow \text{GL}_n(\mathcal{O}_K)$  is the trivial representation, then  $\iota' \cong \iota \oplus \tau$ . The facts that  $\mathbf{a}_\tau \equiv \mathbf{v}_\tau \equiv 0$  and that  $\mathbf{a}_{\iota \oplus \tau} = \mathbf{a}_\iota + \mathbf{a}_\tau$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{\iota \oplus \tau} = \mathbf{v}_\iota + \mathbf{v}_\tau$ , which were proved in [WY15], prove the lemma.  $\square$

We then have

$$(5.1) \quad M(K, G, \mathbf{v}_\tau) = M(K, G, \mathbf{a}_\iota) = \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{i=0}^j P(j, i) P(n-j) q^{i-n},$$

where the right equality is due to Kedlaya [Ked07, Remark 8.6] and  $P(m)$  denotes the number of partitions of  $m$ .

We can construct a resolution of  $X := \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^{2n}/G$  as follows. First consider the involution of  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^2 = \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K[x, y]$  sending  $x$  to  $-x$  and  $y$  to  $-y$ . Let

$$Z := \mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^2/(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) = \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K[x^2, xy, y^2]$$

be the associated quotient scheme. We have a natural isomorphism

$$X \cong S^n Z := Z^n/S_n.$$

Since  $Z$  is the trivial family of  $A_1$ -singularity over  $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$  (actually it is a toric variety), there exists the minimal resolution  $W \rightarrow Z$  of  $Z$  such that  $W$  is  $\mathcal{O}_K$ -smooth, the exceptional locus is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^1$  and  $K_{W/Z} = 0$ . Let  $\text{Hilb}^n(W)$

be the Hilbert scheme of  $n$  points of  $W$  over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , which is again smooth over  $\mathcal{O}_K$ . We have the proper birational morphism

$$f : \text{Hilb}^n(W) \xrightarrow{\text{Hilbert-Chow}} S^n W \rightarrow S^n Z \xrightarrow{\sim} X$$

and  $K_{\text{Hilb}^n(W)/X} = 0$ .

We now compute  $\sharp f^{-1}(o)(k)$ . Let  $E \subset W_k$  be the exceptional divisor of  $W_k \rightarrow Z_k$ , which is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{P}_k^1$ . Each  $k$ -point of  $f^{-1}(o)$  corresponds to a zero-dimensional subscheme of  $W_k$  of length  $n$  supported in  $E$ . There exists a stratification

$$E = E_1 \sqcup E_0$$

such that  $E_1 \cong \mathbb{A}_k^1$  is a coordinate line of an open subscheme  $\mathbb{A}_k^2 \cong U \subset W_k$  and  $E_0 \cong \text{Spec } k$  is the origin of another open subscheme  $\mathbb{A}_k^2 \cong U' \subset W_k$ . Let  $C_m$  be the set of zero-dimensional subschemes  $U$  of length  $m$  supported in  $E_1$  and  $D_m$  the set of zero-dimensional subschemes of  $U'$  of length  $m$  supported in  $E_0$ . From [CV08, Corollary 3.1],

$$\sharp C_m = P(m)q^m$$

and

$$\sharp D_m = \sum_{i=0}^m P(m, i)q^{m-i}.$$

Since  $f^{-1}(o)(k)$  decomposes as

$$f^{-1}(o)(k) = \bigsqcup_{j=0}^n C_{n-j} \times D_j,$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sharp f^{-1}(o)(k) &= \sum_{j=0}^n \left( P(n-j)q^{n-j} \sum_{i=0}^j P(j, i)q^{j-i} \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{i=0}^j P(j, i)P(n-j)q^{n-i}. \end{aligned}$$

From the wild McKay correspondence,

$$M(K, G, -\mathbf{w}_\tau) = \sum_{j=0}^n \sum_{i=0}^j P(j, i)P(n-j)q^{n-i}.$$

Comparing this with (5.1), we verify the strong duality for  $M(K_r, G, -\mathbf{w}_\tau)$  and  $M(K_r, G, \mathbf{v}_\tau)$ .

In a similar way as to compute  $\sharp f^{-1}(o)(k)$ , we can directly compute  $\sharp \text{Hilb}^n(W)(k)$  and obtain a new proof of Kedlaya's formula (5.1).

## 6. CONCLUDING REMARKS AND EXTRA PROBLEMS

As far as we computed, we observed the following phenomena. The weak duality and the strong duality may fail. Tame representations satisfy both the strong and weak dualities. Permutation representations satisfy the weak duality but not necessarily the strong duality. When  $K = \mathbb{F}_q((t))$ , representations defined over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  satisfy both the strong and weak dualities.

We may interpret these as follows. We might be able to measure by the two dualities how equisingular the family  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathcal{O}_K}^d/\Gamma$  is. If the strong duality holds, then

the family would be very equisingular. If only the weak duality holds, then the family would be moderately so. If both dualities fail, then it is rather far from being equisingular. It may be interesting to look for a numerical invariant refining this measurement.

As we saw, the weak duality is derived from the Poincaré duality of stringy invariants if there exists an ESWL resolution. What about the strong duality? Is there any geometric interpretation of it?

Although it is still conjectural, there would be the motivic counterparts of total masses, stringy point counts and the McKay correspondence between them (see [WY15, Yas14, Yasa, Yasc]). We may discuss dualities in this motivic context as well. Indeed, some dualities for motivic invariants were verified in [Yas14, Yasc].

## REFERENCES

- [Bat98] Victor V. Batyrev. Stringy Hodge numbers of varieties with Gorenstein canonical singularities. In *Integrable systems and algebraic geometry (Kobe/Kyoto, 1997)*, pages 1–32. World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1998.
- [BD96] Victor V. Batyrev and Dimitrios I. Dais. Strong McKay correspondence, string-theoretic Hodge numbers and mirror symmetry. *Topology*, 35(4):901–929, 1996.
- [Bha07] Manjul Bhargava. Mass formulae for extensions of local fields, and conjectures on the density of number field discriminants. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (17):Art. ID rnm052, 20, 2007.
- [CV08] Aldo Conca and Giuseppe Valla. Canonical Hilbert-Burch matrices for ideals of  $k[x, y]$ . *Michigan Math. J.*, 57:157–172, 2008. Special volume in honor of Melvin Hochster.
- [ES87] Geir Ellingsrud and Stein Arild Strømme. On the homology of the Hilbert scheme of points in the plane. *Invent. Math.*, 87(2):343–352, 1987.
- [Ked07] Kiran S. Kedlaya. Mass formulas for local Galois representations. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (17):Art. ID rnm021, 26, 2007. With an appendix by Daniel Gulotta.
- [Kol13] János Kollár. *Singularities of the minimal model program*, volume 200 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013. With a collaboration of Sándor Kovács.
- [Kra66] Marc Krasner. Nombre des extensions d’un degré donné d’un corps  $\mathfrak{P}$ -adique. In *Les Tendances Géom. en Algèbre et Théorie des Nombres*, pages 143–169. Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1966.
- [LO08a] Yves Laszlo and Martin Olsson. The six operations for sheaves on Artin stacks. I. Finite coefficients. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (107):109–168, 2008.
- [LO08b] Yves Laszlo and Martin Olsson. The six operations for sheaves on Artin stacks. II. Adic coefficients. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.*, (107):169–210, 2008.
- [Mil80] James S. Milne. *Étale cohomology*, volume 33 of *Princeton Mathematical Series*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1980.
- [NSW08] Jürgen Neukirch, Alexander Schmidt, and Kay Wingberg. *Cohomology of number fields*, volume 323 of *Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2008.
- [Ols08] M Olsson. Fujiwara’s theorem for equivariant correspondences. *preprint*, 2008.
- [Ser78] Jean-Pierre Serre. Une “formule de masse” pour les extensions totalement ramifiées de degré donné d’un corps local. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B*, 286(22):A1031–A1036, 1978.
- [Ser79] Jean-Pierre Serre. *Local fields*, volume 67 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1979. Translated from the French by Marvin Jay Greenberg.
- [Sta97] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Vol. 1*, volume 49 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. With a foreword by Gian-Carlo Rota, Corrected reprint of the 1986 original.
- [Sun12] Shenghao Sun.  $L$ -series of Artin stacks over finite fields. *Algebra Number Theory*, 6(1):47–122, 2012.
- [Woo08] Melanie Matchett Wood. Mass formulas for local Galois representations to wreath products and cross products. *Algebra Number Theory*, 2(4):391–405, 2008.

- [WY15] Melanie Matchett Wood and Takehiko Yasuda. Mass formulas for local Galois representations and quotient singularities I: a comparison of counting functions. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnv074, 2015.
- [Yasa] Takehiko Yasuda. Toward motivic integration over wild Deligne-Mumford stacks. arXiv:1302.2982, to appear in the proceedings of “Higher Dimensional Algebraic Geometry - in honour of Professor Yujiro Kawamata’s sixtieth birthday”.
- [Yasb] Takehiko Yasuda. The wild McKay correspondence and  $p$ -adic measures. arXiv:1412.5260.
- [Yasc] Takehiko Yasuda. Wilder McKay correspondences. arXiv:1404.3373, to appear in Nagoya Mathematical Journal.
- [Yas14] Takehiko Yasuda. The  $p$ -cyclic McKay correspondence via motivic integration. *Compos. Math.*, 150(7):1125–1168, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON, 480 LINCOLN DRIVE, MADISON, WI 53705 USA, AND AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, 360 PORTAGE AVE, PALO ALTO, CA 94306-2244 USA

*E-mail address:* `mmwood@math.wisc.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, OSAKA UNIVERSITY, TOYONAKA, OSAKA 560-0043, JAPAN, AND MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, VIVATSGASSE 7, 53111 BONN, GERMANY

*E-mail address:* `takehikoyasuda@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp`, `highernash@gmail.com`