

# YOKONUMA-SCHUR ALGEBRAS

WEIDENG CUI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we define the Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $YS_q(r, n)$  as the endomorphism algebra of a permutation module for the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$ . We prove that  $YS_q(r, n)$  is cellular by constructing an explicit cellular basis following the approach in [DJM], and we further show that it is a quasi-hereditary cover of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  in the sense of Rouquier following [HM2]. We also introduce the tilting modules for  $YS_q(r, n)$ . In the appendix, we define and study the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Schur algebra in a similar way.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. The Yokonuma-Hecke algebra was first introduced by Yokonuma [Yo] as a centralizer algebra associated to the permutation representation of a Chevalley group  $G$  with respect to a maximal unipotent subgroup of  $G$ . Juyumaya [Ju1] gave a new presentation of the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra, which is commonly used for studying this algebra.

The Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  is a quotient of the group algebra of the modular framed braid group  $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z}) \wr B_n$ , where  $B_n$  is the braid group of type  $A$  on  $n$  strands. It can also be regraded as a deformation of the group algebra of the complex reflection group  $G(r, 1, n)$ , which is isomorphic to the wreath product  $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z}) \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$ , where  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  is the symmetric group on  $n$  letters. It is well-known that there exists another deformation of the group algebra of  $G(r, 1, n)$ , the Ariki-Koike algebra  $H_{r,n}$  [AK]. The Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  is quite different from  $H_{r,n}$ . For example, the Iwahori-Hecke algebra of type  $A$  is canonically a subalgebra of  $H_{r,n}$ , whereas it is an obvious quotient of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$ , but not an obvious subalgebra of it.

In the past few years, many people are largely motivated to study  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  in order to construct its associated knot invariant; see the papers [Ju2], [JuL] and [ChL]. In particular, Juyumaya and Kannan [Ju2, JuK] found a basis of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$ , and then defined a Markov trace on it.

Some other people are particularly interested in the representation theory of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$ , and also its application to knot theory. Chlouveraki and Poulain d'Andecy [ChPA1] gave explicit formulas for all irreducible representations of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  over  $\mathbb{C}(q)$ , and obtained a semisimplicity criterion for it. In their subsequent paper [ChPA2], they defined and studied the affine Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $\widehat{Y}_{r,n}(q)$  and the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}^d(q)$ , and constructed several bases for them, and then showed how to define Markov traces on these algebras. Moreover, they gave the classification of irreducible representations of  $Y_{r,n}^d(q)$  in the generic semisimple case, defined the canonical symmetrizing form on it and computed the associated Schur elements directly.

1.2. Recently, Jacon and Poulain d'Andecy [JaPA] constructed an explicit algebraic isomorphism between the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  and a direct sum of matrix algebras over tensor products of Iwahori-Hecke algebras of type  $A$ , which is in fact a special case of the results by G. Lusztig [Lu, Section 34]. This allows them to give a description of the modular representation theory of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  and a complete classification of all Markov traces for it. Chlouveraki and Sécherre [ChS, Theorem 4.3] proved that the affine Yokonuma-Hecke algebra is a particular case of the pro- $p$ -Iwahori-Hecke algebra defined by Vignéras in [Vi].

Espinoza and Ryom-Hansen [ER] gave a new proof of Jacon and Poulain d'Andecy's isomorphism theorem by giving a concrete isomorphism between  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  and Shoji's modified Ariki-Koike algebra  $\mathcal{H}_{r,n}$ . Moreover, they showed that  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  is a cellular algebra by giving an explicit cellular basis. Combining the results of [DJM] with those of [ER], we [C1] proved that the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}^d(q)$  is cellular by constructing an explicit cellular basis, and showed that the Jucys-Murphy elements for  $Y_{r,n}^d(q)$  are JM-elements in the abstract sense introduced by Mathas [Ma3].

We [CW] have established an equivalence between a module category of the affine (resp. cyclotomic) Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $\widehat{Y}_{r,n}(q)$  (resp.  $Y_{r,n}^d(q)$ ) and its suitable counterpart for a direct sum of tensor products of affine Hecke algebras of type  $A$  (resp. cyclotomic Hecke algebras), which allows us to give the classification of simple modules of affine Yokonuma-Hecke algebras and of the associated cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebras over an algebraically closed field of characteristic  $p$  when  $p$  does not divide  $r$ , and also describe the classification of blocks for these algebras. In addition, the modular branching rules for cyclotomic (resp. affine) Yokonuma-Hecke algebras are obtained, and they are further identified with crystal graphs of integrable modules for affine lie algebras of type  $A$ . In a subsequent paper, we [C2] have established an explicit algebra isomorphism between the affine Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $\widehat{Y}_{r,n}(q)$  and a direct sum of matrix algebras over tensor products of affine Hecke algebras of type  $A$ . As an application, we proved that  $\widehat{Y}_{r,n}(q)$  is affine cellular in the sense of Koenig and Xi, and studied its homological properties.

1.3. In [DJM], they constructed a cellular basis for the cyclotomic  $q$ -Schur algebra  $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$  by firstly constructing a cellular basis for the Ariki-Koike algebra  $H_{r,n}$ . They further obtained a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible  $\mathcal{S}(\Lambda)$ -modules and showed that it is quasi-hereditary. Now, there exists a cellular basis on  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  by [ER], it is natural to try to define and study the corresponding Schur algebra for the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  by using this cellular basis.

In this paper, we will define the Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $YS_q(r, n)$  as the endomorphism algebra of a permutation module associated to the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$ . Combining the results of [DJM] with those of [SS], we prove that  $YS_q(r, n)$  is cellular by constructing an explicit cellular basis, and further prove that it is quasi-hereditary. We also investigate the indecomposable tilting modules for  $YS_q(r, n)$  and prove that they are self-dual.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the definition of the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  and the construction of a cellular basis of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  following [ER]. In Section 3, we will define the Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $YS_q(r, n)$  as the endomorphism algebra of a permutation module associated to the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$ . We

prove that  $YS_q(r, n)$  is cellular by constructing an explicit cellular basis, and further prove that it is quasi-hereditary by combining the results of [DJM] with those of [SS]. In Section 4, following the approach in [HM2], we will construct an exact functor from the category of  $YS_q(r, n)$ -modules to the category of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$ -modules. In Section 5, we introduce the tilting modules for  $YS_q(r, n)$  and the closely related Young modules for  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  following [Ma2]. In the appendix, we will generalize these results to define and study the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Schur algebra by using the cellular basis of  $Y_{r,n}^d(q)$  constructed in [C1]. Since this approach is very similar, we only mention the main results and skip all the details.

Many ideas of this paper originate from the references [DJM, Ma2, SS], although it should be noted that the basic set-up here is different from theirs; anyhow, we expect that the Yokonuma-Schur algebra and its cyclotomic analog defined here deserve further study.

## 2. CELLULAR BASES FOR YOKONUMA-HECKE ALGEBRAS

In this section, we recall the definition of the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  and the construction of a cellular basis of  $Y_{r,n}(q)$  presented in [ER, Section 4].

Let  $r, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $r \geq 1$ , and let  $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/r}$ . Let  $q$  be an indeterminate. Let  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  be the symmetric group on  $n$  letters, which acts on the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  on the right by convention.

Let  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{r}][q, q^{-1}, \zeta]$ . The Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n} = Y_{r,n}(q)$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -associative algebra generated by the elements  $t_1, \dots, t_n, g_1, \dots, g_{n-1}$  satisfying the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
g_i g_j &= g_j g_i && \text{for all } i, j = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ such that } |i-j| \geq 2; \\
g_i g_{i+1} g_i &= g_{i+1} g_i g_{i+1} && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-2; \\
t_i t_j &= t_j t_i && \text{for all } i, j = 1, \dots, n; \\
g_i t_j &= t_{j s_i} g_i && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, n; \\
t_i^r &= 1 && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n; \\
g_i^2 &= 1 + (q - q^{-1}) e_i g_i && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where  $s_i$  is the transposition  $(i, i+1)$ , and for each  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ,

$$e_i := \frac{1}{r} \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} t_i^s t_{i+1}^{-s}.$$

Note that the elements  $e_i$  are idempotents in  $Y_{r,n}$ . The elements  $g_i$  are invertible, with the inverse given by

$$g_i^{-1} = g_i - (q - q^{-1}) e_i \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1. \tag{2.2}$$

Let  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , and let  $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r}$  be a reduced expression of  $w$ . By Matsumoto's lemma, the element  $g_w := g_{i_1} g_{i_2} \cdots g_{i_r}$  does not depend on the choice of the reduced expression of  $w$ , that is, it is well-defined. Let  $l$  denote the length function on  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ . Then we have

$$g_i g_w = \begin{cases} g_{s_i w} & \text{if } l(s_i w) > l(w); \\ g_{s_i w} + (q - q^{-1}) e_i g_w & \text{if } l(s_i w) < l(w). \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Using the multiplication formulae in (2.3), Juyumaya [Ju2] has proved that the following set is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $Y_{r,n}$ :

$$\mathcal{B}_{r,n} = \{t_1^{k_1} \cdots t_n^{k_n} g_w \mid 0 \leq k_1, \dots, k_n \leq r-1 \text{ and } w \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}. \quad (2.4)$$

Thus,  $Y_{r,n}$  is a free  $\mathcal{R}$ -module of rank  $r^n n!$ .

Set  $\mathbf{s} := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $i, k \in \mathbf{s}$  and set

$$e_{i,k} := \frac{1}{r} \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} t_i^s t_k^{-s}. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that  $e_{i,i} = 1$ ,  $e_{i,k} = e_{k,i}$ , and that  $e_{i,i+1} = e_i$ . It can be easily checked that

$$\begin{aligned} e_{i,k}^2 &= e_{i,k} && \text{for all } i, k = 1, \dots, n, \\ t_i e_{j,k} &= e_{j,k} t_i && \text{for all } i, j, k = 1, \dots, n, \\ e_{i,j} e_{k,l} &= e_{k,l} e_{i,j} && \text{for all } i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, n, \\ e_i e_{k,l} &= e_{s_i(k), s_i(l)} e_i && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ and } k, l = 1, \dots, n, \\ e_{j,k} g_i &= g_i e_{j, k s_i} && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ and } j, k = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

In particular, we have  $e_i g_i = g_i e_i$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ .

For any nonempty subset  $I \subseteq \mathbf{s}$  we define the following element  $E_I$  by

$$E_I := \prod_{i,j \in I; i < j} e_{i,j},$$

where by convention  $E_I = 1$  if  $|I| = 1$ .

We also need a further generalization of this. We say that the set  $A = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k\}$  is a set partition of  $\mathbf{s}$  if the  $I_j$ 's are nonempty and disjoint subsets of  $\mathbf{s}$ , and their union is  $\mathbf{s}$ . We refer to them as the blocks of  $A$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{SP}_n$  the set of all set partitions of  $\mathbf{s}$ . For  $A = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k\} \in \mathcal{SP}_n$  we then define  $E_A := \prod_j E_{I_j}$ .

We extend the right action of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  on  $\mathbf{s}$  to a right action on  $\mathcal{SP}_n$  by defining  $Aw := \{I_1 w, \dots, I_k w\} \in \mathcal{SP}_n$  for  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ . Then we can easily get the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For  $A \in \mathcal{SP}_n$  and  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ , we have*

$$g_w E_A = E_{Aw^{-1}} g_w.$$

*In particular, if  $w$  leaves invariant every block of  $A$ , or more generally permutes some of the blocks of  $A$ , then  $g_w$  commutes with  $E_A$ .*

$\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$  is called a composition of  $n$  if it is a finite sequence of nonnegative integers whose sum is  $n$ . A composition  $\mu$  is a partition of  $n$  if its parts are non-increasing. We write  $\mu \models n$  (resp.  $\lambda \vdash n$ ) if  $\mu$  is a composition (resp. partition) of  $n$ , and we define  $|\mu| := n$  (resp.  $|\lambda| := n$ ).

We associate a Young diagram to a composition  $\mu$ , which is the set

$$[\mu] := \{(i, j) \mid i \geq 1 \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq \mu_i\}.$$

We will regard  $[\mu]$  as an array of boxes, or nodes, in the plane. For  $\mu \models n$ , we define a  $\mu$ -tableau by replacing each node of  $[\mu]$  by one of the integers  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , allowing no repeats.

For  $\mu \models n$ , we say that a  $\mu$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{t}$  is row standard if the entries in each row of  $\mathfrak{t}$  increase from left to right. A  $\mu$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{t}$  is standard if  $\mu$  is a partition,  $\mathfrak{t}$  is row standard and the entries in each column increase from top to bottom. For a composition  $\mu$  of  $n$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{t}^\mu$  the  $\mu$ -tableau in which  $1, 2, \dots, n$  appear in increasing order from left to right along the rows of  $[\mu]$ .

The symmetric group  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  acts from the right on the set of  $\mu$ -tableaux by permuting the entries in each tableau. For any composition  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k)$  of  $n$  we define the Young subgroup  $\mathfrak{S}_\mu := \mathfrak{S}_{\mu_1} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\mu_k}$ , which is the row stabilizer of  $\mathfrak{t}^\mu$ .

Let  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$  and  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l)$  be two compositions of  $n$ . We say that  $\lambda \supseteq \mu$  if

$$\sum_{i=1}^j \lambda_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^j \mu_i \text{ for all } j \geq 1.$$

If  $\lambda \supseteq \mu$  and  $\lambda \neq \mu$ , we write  $\lambda \triangleright \mu$ .

We extend the partial order above to tableaux as follows. If  $\mathfrak{v}$  is a row standard  $\lambda$ -tableau and  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , then the entries  $1, 2, \dots, k$  in  $\mathfrak{v}$  occupy the diagram of a composition; let  $\mathfrak{v}_{\downarrow k}$  denote this composition. Let  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$  be two compositions of  $n$ . Suppose that  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a row standard  $\lambda$ -tableau and that  $\mathfrak{t}$  is a row standard  $\mu$ -tableau. We say that  $\mathfrak{s}$  dominates  $\mathfrak{t}$ , and we write  $\mathfrak{s} \supseteq \mathfrak{t}$  if  $\mathfrak{s}_{\downarrow k} \supseteq \mathfrak{t}_{\downarrow k}$  for all  $k$ . If  $\mathfrak{s} \supseteq \mathfrak{t}$  and  $\mathfrak{s} \neq \mathfrak{t}$ , then we write  $\mathfrak{s} \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$ .

Following [ChPA1, Section 4.3], the combinatorial objects appearing in the representation theory of the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}$  will be  $r$ -compositions (resp.  $r$ -partitions). By definition, an  $r$ -composition (resp.  $r$ -partition) of  $n$  is an ordered  $r$ -tuple  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}, \dots, \mu^{(r)})$  of compositions (resp. partitions)  $\mu^{(k)}$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^r |\mu^{(k)}| = n$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ) the set of  $r$ -compositions (resp.  $r$ -partitions) of  $n$ . The Young diagram  $[\boldsymbol{\mu}]$  of an  $r$ -composition  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is the ordered  $r$ -tuple of the Young diagram of its components.

Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}, \dots, \mu^{(r)})$  be an  $r$ -composition of  $n$ . A  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{t} = (\mathfrak{t}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathfrak{t}^{(r)})$  is obtained by placing each node of  $[\boldsymbol{\mu}]$  by one of the integers  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , allowing no repeats. We will call the number  $n$  the size of  $\mathfrak{t}$  and the  $\mathfrak{t}^{(k)}$ 's the components of  $\mathfrak{t}$ .

For each  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , a  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -tableau is called row standard if the numbers increase along any row (from left to right) of each diagram in  $[\boldsymbol{\mu}]$ . For each  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , a  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ -tableau is called standard if the numbers increase along any row (from left to right) and down any column (from top to bottom) of each diagram in  $[\boldsymbol{\lambda}]$ . For  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , we denote by  $\text{r-Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$  the set of row standard  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -tableaux of size  $n$ , which is endowed with an action of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  from the right by permuting the entries in each  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -tableau. For  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $\text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$  denote the set of standard  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ -tableaux of size  $n$ .

For each  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{t}^\mu$  the standard  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -tableau in which  $1, 2, \dots, n$  appear in increasing order from left to right along the rows of the first diagram, and then along the rows of the second diagram, and so on. For each  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}, \dots, \mu^{(r)}) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , we have a Young subgroup

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} := \mathfrak{S}_{\mu^{(1)}} \times \mathfrak{S}_{\mu^{(2)}} \cdots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\mu^{(r)}},$$

which is exactly the row stabilizer of  $\mathfrak{t}^\mu$ .

For each  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  and a row standard  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{s}$ , let  $d(\mathfrak{s})$  be the unique element of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^\mu d(\mathfrak{s})$ . Then  $d(\mathfrak{s})$  is a distinguished right coset representative of  $\mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  in

$\mathfrak{S}_n$ , that is,  $l(wd(\mathfrak{s})) = l(w) + l(d(\mathfrak{s}))$  for any  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu$ . In this way, we obtain a bijection between the set  $\text{r-Std}(\mu)$  of row standard  $\mu$ -tableaux and the set  $\mathcal{D}_\mu$  of distinguished right coset representatives of  $\mathfrak{S}_\mu$  in  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ .

Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}$  be a  $\mu$ -tableau. For  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , we define  $p_{\mathfrak{t}}(j) = k$  if  $j$  appears in the  $k$ -th component  $\mathfrak{t}^{(k)}$  of  $\mathfrak{t}$ . When  $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}^\mu$ , we write  $p_\mu(j)$  instead of  $p_{\mathfrak{t}^\mu}(j)$ .

We now define a partial order on the set of  $r$ -compositions, which is similar to the case of compositions.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)})$  and  $\mu = (\mu^{(1)}, \mu^{(2)}, \dots, \mu^{(r)})$  be two  $r$ -compositions of  $n$ . We say that  $\lambda$  dominates  $\mu$ , and we write  $\lambda \trianglerighteq \mu$  if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |\lambda^{(i)}| + \sum_{j=1}^l \lambda_j^{(k)} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} |\mu^{(i)}| + \sum_{j=1}^l \mu_j^{(k)}$$

for all  $k$  and  $l$  with  $1 \leq k \leq r$  and  $l \geq 0$ . If  $\lambda \trianglerighteq \mu$  and  $\lambda \neq \mu$ , we write  $\lambda \triangleright \mu$ .

We now fix once and for all a total order on the set of  $r$ -th roots of unity via setting  $\zeta_k := \zeta^{k-1}$  for  $1 \leq k \leq r$ . Set  $S := \{\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_r\}$ . Then we define a set partition  $A_\lambda \in \mathcal{SP}_n$  for any  $r$ -composition  $\lambda$ .

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)}) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Suppose that we choose all  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_p \leq r$  such that  $\lambda^{(i_1)}, \lambda^{(i_2)}, \dots, \lambda^{(i_p)}$  are the nonempty components of  $[\lambda]$ . Define  $a_k := \sum_{j=1}^k |\lambda^{(i_j)}|$  for  $1 \leq k \leq p$ . Then the set partition  $A_\lambda$  associated with  $\lambda$  is defined as

$$A_\lambda := \{\{1, \dots, a_1\}, \{a_1 + 1, \dots, a_2\}, \dots, \{a_{p-1} + 1, \dots, n\}\},$$

which may be written as  $A_\lambda = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_p\}$ , and is referred to the blocks of  $A_\lambda$  in the order given above.

**Definition 2.4.** Let  $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)}) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , and let  $a_k := \sum_{j=1}^k |\lambda^{(i_j)}|$  ( $1 \leq k \leq p$ ) be defined as above. Then we define

$$u_\lambda := u_{a_1, i_1} u_{a_2, i_2} \cdots u_{a_p, i_p},$$

where  $u_{i,k} = \prod_{l=1; l \neq k}^r (t_i - \zeta_l)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  and  $1 \leq k \leq r$ .

**Definition 2.5.** Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . We set  $U_\lambda := u_\lambda E_{A_\lambda}$ , and define  $x_\lambda = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\lambda} q^{l(w)} g_w$ . Then we define the element  $m_\lambda$  of  $Y_{r,n}$  as follows:

$$m_\lambda := U_\lambda x_\lambda = u_\lambda E_{A_\lambda} x_\lambda.$$

Let  $*$  denote the  $\mathcal{R}$ -linear anti-automorphism of  $Y_{r,n}$ , which is determined by  $g_i^* = g_i$  and  $t_j^* = t_j$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , and let  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}$  be two row standard  $\lambda$ -tableaux. We then define  $m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} = g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* m_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{t})}$ .

For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $Y_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda}$  be the  $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of  $Y_{r,n}$  spanned by  $m_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}}$  with  $\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v} \in \text{Std}(\mu)$  for various  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  such that  $\mu \triangleright \lambda$ .

**Theorem 2.7.** (See [ER, Theorem 20].) *The algebra  $Y_{r,n}$  is a free  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with a cellular basis*

$$\mathcal{B}_{r,n} = \{m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } r\text{-partition } \lambda \text{ of } n\},$$

that is, the following properties hold:

(i) *The  $\mathcal{R}$ -linear map determined by  $m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \mapsto m_{\mathfrak{t}\mathfrak{s}}$  ( $m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \in \mathcal{B}_{r,n}$ ) is an anti-automorphism on  $Y_{r,n}$ .*

(ii) *For a given  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\mu)$ , there exist  $r_{\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{t}}(h) \in \mathcal{R}$  such that for all  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\mu)$ , we have*

$$m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}h \equiv \sum_{\mathfrak{v} \in \text{Std}(\mu)} r_{\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{t}}(h)m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{v}} \pmod{Y_{r,n}^{\triangleright\mu}},$$

where  $r_{\mathfrak{v}\mathfrak{t}}(h)$  may depend on  $\mathfrak{v}, \mathfrak{t}$  and  $h$ , but not on  $\mathfrak{s}$ .

For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $\overline{m}_\lambda$  be the image of  $m_\lambda$  under the algebra homomorphism  $Y_{r,n} \rightarrow Y_{r,n}/Y_{r,n}^{\triangleright\lambda}$ . We denote by  $S^\lambda$  the right  $Y_{r,n}$ -submodule of  $Y_{r,n}/Y_{r,n}^{\triangleright\lambda}$  generated by  $\overline{m}_\lambda$ , which is called the Specht module associated to  $\lambda$ . By Theorem 2.7,  $S^\lambda$  is a free  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis  $\{\overline{m}_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{t})} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)\}$ . We can define an associative symmetric bilinear form on  $S^\lambda$  by

$$m_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{s})} g_{d(\mathfrak{t})}^* m_\lambda \equiv \langle \overline{m}_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}, \overline{m}_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{t})} \rangle m_\lambda \pmod{Y_{r,n}^{\triangleright\lambda}}.$$

Let  $\text{rad } S^\lambda = \{u \in S^\lambda \mid \langle u, v \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } v \in S^\lambda\}$ . Consequently,  $\text{rad } S^\lambda$  is a  $Y_{r,n}$ -submodule of  $S^\lambda$ . Let  $D^\lambda = S^\lambda / \text{rad } S^\lambda$  for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . By a general theory of cellular basis, if  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is an algebraically closed field of characteristic  $p \geq 0$  such that  $p$  does not divide  $r$ , the set  $\{D^\lambda \neq 0 \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  gives a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules. In fact, by [ER, Theorem 7 and (46)] (see also [JaPA, §4.1] and [CW, Theorem 6.3]),  $\{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n} \mid D^\lambda \neq 0\}$  is just the set  $\mathcal{K}_{r,n}$ , where

$$\mathcal{K}_{r,n} = \{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n} \mid \lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)}) \text{ with each } \lambda^{(i)} \text{ being an } e\text{-restricted partition}\}.$$

### 3. YOKONUMA-SCHUR ALGEBRA AND ITS CELLULAR BASIS

For an  $r$ -composition  $\lambda$  of  $n$ , a  $\lambda$ -tableau  $S = (S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(r)})$  is a map  $S : [\lambda] \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, r\}$ , which can be regarded as the diagram  $[\lambda]$ , together with an ordered pair  $(i, k)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq r$ ) attached to each node. Given  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , a  $\lambda$ -tableau  $S$  is said to be of type  $\mu$  if the number of  $(i, k)$  in the entry of  $S$  is equal to  $\mu_i^{(k)}$ . Given  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ ,  $\mu(\mathfrak{s})$ , a  $\lambda$ -tableau of type  $\mu$ , is defined by replacing each entry  $m$  in  $\mathfrak{s}$  by  $(i, k)$  if  $m$  is in the  $i$ -th row of the  $k$ -th component of  $\mathfrak{t}^\mu$ .

We define a total order on the set of pairs  $(i, k)$  by  $(i_1, k_1) < (i_2, k_2)$  if  $k_1 < k_2$ , or  $k_1 = k_2$  and  $i_1 < i_2$ . Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Suppose that  $S = (S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(r)})$  is a  $\lambda$ -tableau of type  $\mu$ .  $S$  is said to be semistandard if each component  $S^{(k)}$  is non-decreasing in rows, strictly increasing in columns, and all entries of  $S^{(k)}$  are of the form  $(i, l)$  with  $l \geq k$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$  the set of semistandard  $\lambda$ -tableaux of type  $\mu$ .

Let us consider the special case when  $r = 1$ . Suppose that  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{C}_{1,n}$ . A  $\lambda$ -tableau  $S$  of type  $\mu$  is said to be row semistandard if the entries in each row of  $S$  are non-decreasing.  $S$  is said to be semistandard if  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{1,n}$ ,  $S$  is row semistandard and the entries in each



column are strictly increasing. Assume that  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{C}_{1,n}$  and put  $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda\mu} = \mathcal{D}_\lambda \cap \mathcal{D}_\mu^{-1}$ . Then  $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda\mu}$  is the set of minimal length elements in the double cosets  $\mathfrak{S}_\lambda \backslash \mathfrak{S}_n / \mathfrak{S}_\mu$ , and the map  $d \mapsto \mu(t^\lambda d)$  gives a bijection between the set  $\mathcal{D}_{\lambda\mu}$  and the set of row semistandard  $\lambda$ -tableaux of type  $\mu$ .

Let  $d \in \mathcal{D}_{\lambda\mu}$ , and put  $S = \mu(t^\lambda d)$ ,  $T = \lambda(t^\mu d^{-1})$ . Then  $S$  and  $T$  are both row semistandard, and we have

$$\sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{D}_\mu \\ \lambda(t^\mu y) = T}} q^{l(y)} g_y^* x_\mu = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\lambda d \mathfrak{S}_\mu} q^{l(w)} g_w = \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{D}_\lambda \\ \mu(t^\lambda x) = S}} q^{l(x)} x_\lambda g_x. \quad (3.1)$$

For any  $\kappa \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , we define its type  $\alpha(\kappa)$  by  $\alpha(\kappa) = (n_1, \dots, n_r)$  with  $n_i = |\kappa^{(i)}|$ . Assume that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . We define a subset  $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  of  $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$  by

$$\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu) = \{S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) \mid \alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)\}.$$

Take  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu)$ . One can check that  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  if and only if each entry of  $S^{(k)}$  is of the form  $(i, k)$  for some  $i$ . Moreover, if  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$  is such that  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S$  with  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ , then the entries of the  $i$ -th component of  $\mathfrak{s}$  consist of numbers  $a_i + 1, \dots, a_{i+1}$ , where  $a_i = \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} n_k$ . In particular,  $d(\mathfrak{s}) \in \mathfrak{S}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda)$ .

Take  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ . Let  $\mathfrak{s}_1 = \text{first}(S)$ , which is the unique element of  $\text{Std}(\lambda)$  satisfying the property that  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}_1) = S$  and that  $\mathfrak{s}_1 \triangleright \mathfrak{s}$  for any  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$  such that  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S$ . Let  $\alpha = \alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$ . Then  $d = d(\mathfrak{s}_1) \in \mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ , which is given as  $d = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$  with  $d_k$  a distinguished double coset representative in  $\mathfrak{S}_{\lambda^{(k)}} \backslash \mathfrak{S}_{n_k} / \mathfrak{S}_{\mu^{(k)}}$ . From (3.1) we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s}))} x_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{s})} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\lambda d \mathfrak{S}_\mu} q^{l(w)} g_w = h g_d x_\mu, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $h = \sum g_v$ , the sum running over certain elements  $v \in \mathfrak{S}_\lambda$ .

For each  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , let  $M^\mu = m_\mu Y_{r,n}$ . The following lemma gives a basis of  $M^\mu$  as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module.

**Lemma 3.1.** *For each  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ ,  $\{m_\mu g_d \mid d \in \mathcal{D}_\mu\}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $M^\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $m_\mu g_d = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu} U_\mu g_w d$  for each  $d \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$ , and hence  $\{m_\mu g_d\}$  is linearly independent. Since  $m_\mu t_i = \zeta_{p_\mu(i)} m_\mu$  by [ER, Lemma 11(4)] and  $m_\mu g_w = q^{l(w)} m_\mu$  for  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu$ , then the set  $\{m_\mu g_d \mid d \in \mathcal{D}_\mu\}$  spans  $M^\mu$  by (2.4). Thus,  $\{m_\mu g_d \mid d \in \mathcal{D}_\mu\}$ , or equivalently,  $\{m_\mu g_{d(t)} \mid t \in r\text{-Std}(\mu)\}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $M^\mu$ .  $\square$

We now construct a basis of  $M^\mu$  related to the cellular basis  $\{m_{\mathfrak{st}}\}$ . For  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ , we define

$$m_{\mathfrak{st}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} m_{\mathfrak{st}}.$$

We have

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ . Then  $m_{\mathfrak{st}} \in M^\mu$ .*



*Proof.* By (3.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\mathfrak{St}} &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathfrak{s}) = \mathfrak{S}}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* x_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} g_{d(\mathfrak{t})} \\ &= q^{l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_d^* h^* U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} g_{d(\mathfrak{t})}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $h = \sum g_v$ , where  $v \in \mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ , hence  $U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  commutes with  $h^*$  by [ER, Lemma 11(3)]. Since  $d \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}$  with  $\alpha = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ ,  $U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  commutes with  $g_d^*$  by the same reason. Noting that  $\alpha = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ , we have  $U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = U_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ . Thus, we see that

$$x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_d^* h^* U_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = x_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} U_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_d^* h^* \in m_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} Y_{r,n} = M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}},$$

and  $m_{\mathfrak{St}} \in M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  as required.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.3.** *For each  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ ,  $M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  is free with an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis*

$$\{m_{\mathfrak{St}} \mid \mathfrak{S} \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ and } \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

*Proof.* The basis elements  $m_{\mathfrak{St}}$  contained in the expression of  $m_{\mathfrak{St}}$  are disjoint for different  $m_{\mathfrak{St}}$ . It follows that  $m_{\mathfrak{St}}$  are linearly independent. By Lemma 3.1,  $M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  is a free  $\mathcal{R}$ -module, and its rank is equal to the number of  $\{m_{\mathfrak{St}}\}$  given in the proposition by [SS, Lemma 2.5(ii) and Corollary 4.5(ii)]. Hence, any element in  $M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  can be written as a linear combination of various  $m_{\mathfrak{St}}$  with coefficients in the quotient field of  $\mathcal{R}$ . But since the set  $\{q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} m_{\mathfrak{St}}\}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $Y_{r,n}$ , these coefficients are actually in  $\mathcal{R}$ . This proves the proposition.  $\square$

Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  be such that  $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \alpha$ . Put  $\alpha = (n_1, \dots, n_r)$ . Let us take  $d \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cap \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}$ . We have  $d = (d_1, \dots, d_r)$  with  $d_k \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu^{(k)}\nu^{(k)}}$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{S}_{n_k}$ . Then we can define a map  $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\nu}}^d : M^{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \rightarrow M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  by

$$\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\nu}}^d(m_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} h) = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} d \mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}} q^{l(w)} U_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_w h$$

for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ . In fact, by (3.1), we have

$$\sum_{\substack{y \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cap \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\nu} y) = \mathfrak{T}}} q^{l(y)} U_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_y^* x_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} d \mathfrak{S}_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}} q^{l(w)} U_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_w = \sum_{\substack{x \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \cap \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha} \\ \boldsymbol{\nu}(\boldsymbol{\mu} x) = \mathfrak{S}}} q^{l(x)} m_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_x, \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\mathfrak{S} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\nu} d)$  and  $\mathfrak{T} = \boldsymbol{\nu}(\boldsymbol{\mu} d^{-1})$  are row semistandard tableaux. Noting that  $U_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = U_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$  and  $y \in \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}$ , we have  $U_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} g_y^* x_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = g_y^* U_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} x_{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = g_y^* m_{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ , and  $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\nu}}^d$  is well-defined.

The proof of the next proposition is inspired by that of [SS, Proposition 5.2], although it should be noted that the basic set-up there is different from ours. It allows us to restrict ourselves to considering the subset  $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then*

- (i) *Assume that  $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \neq \alpha(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}, M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}) = 0$ .*
- (ii) *Assume that  $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}, M^{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$  is a free  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis  $\{\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\nu}}^d \mid d \in \mathcal{D}_{\boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\nu}} \cap \mathfrak{S}_{\alpha}\}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose that  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$ . Then, for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ , we have  $\varphi(m_\nu h) = \varphi(m_\nu)h$ ; hence  $\varphi$  is completely determined by  $\varphi(m_\nu)$ . Since  $\varphi(m_\nu) \in M^\mu$ , by Lemma 3.1, there exist some  $c_x \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $\varphi(m_\nu) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}_\mu} c_x m_\mu g_x$ . By [ER, Lemma 10(49)], for each  $k$ , we have

$$\varphi(m_\nu t_k) = \varphi(\zeta_{p_\nu(k)} m_\nu) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}_\mu} \zeta_{p_\nu(k)} c_x m_\mu g_x. \quad (3.4)$$

Now assume that  $c_y \neq 0$  for some  $y \in \mathcal{D}_\mu$ , which is equal to some  $d(\mathfrak{s})$  for some row standard  $\mu$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Then we have

$$(c_y m_\mu g_y) t_k = c_y m_\mu t_{kd(\mathfrak{s})^{-1}} g_y = \zeta_{p_\mu(kd(\mathfrak{s})^{-1})} c_y m_\mu g_y.$$

Since  $\mathfrak{s} = t^\mu d(\mathfrak{s})$ , we have that  $p_\mu(kd(\mathfrak{s})^{-1}) = p_\mathfrak{s}(k)$ , and hence

$$(c_y m_\mu g_y) t_k = \zeta_{p_\mathfrak{s}(k)} c_y m_\mu g_y. \quad (3.5)$$

By comparing (3.4) and (3.5), we have  $p_\nu(k) = p_\mathfrak{s}(k)$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . This implies that  $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\nu)$ . Thus, (i) is proved.

Now assume that  $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\nu) = \alpha$ . Since  $p_\nu(k) = p_\mu(kd(\mathfrak{s})^{-1})$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , we must have  $y = d(\mathfrak{s}) \in \mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ . Let  $d$  be the unique minimal length element in  $\mathfrak{S}_\mu y \mathfrak{S}_\nu$ . Then  $d \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu\nu} \cap \mathfrak{S}_\alpha$ , and a similar argument as in the proof of [Ma1, Theorem 4.8] implies that  $c_d \neq 0$ . Set  $\varphi' = \varphi - c_d \varphi_{\mu\nu}^d$ . Then  $\varphi' \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$ , and  $\varphi'(m_\nu)$  can be written as  $\varphi'(m_\nu) = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{D}_\mu} a_x m_\mu g_x$ , where  $a_x = c_x$  if  $\mathfrak{S}_\mu x \mathfrak{S}_\nu \neq \mathfrak{S}_\mu d \mathfrak{S}_\nu$ , and  $a_x = 0$  for  $x \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu d \mathfrak{S}_\nu$  by the argument as in the proof of [Ma1, Theorem 4.8]. Hence, by induction we can write  $\varphi$  as a linear combination of  $\varphi_{\mu\nu}^d$  with  $d \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu\nu} \cap \mathfrak{S}_\alpha$  as required.

Finally, we have to show that  $\{\varphi_{\mu\nu}^d \mid d \in \mathcal{D}_{\mu\nu} \cap \mathfrak{S}_\alpha\}$  is linearly independent. This follows from the fact that  $\varphi_{\mu\nu}^d(m_\nu)$  is a linearly independent subset of  $M^\mu$ , since the set  $\{U_\mu g_w\}$  is linearly independent by the basis theorem for  $Y_{r,n}$ .  $\square$

We write  $M^{\nu*} = (M^\nu)^* = Y_{r,n} m_\nu$ . As a corollary to Proposition 3.4, we have the next result.

**Corollary 3.5.** *Let  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$  and  $M^{\nu*} \cap M^\mu$  are canonically isomorphic as  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules.*

*Proof.* Every homomorphism  $\varphi$  in  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$  is determined by  $\varphi(m_\nu)$ , and moreover,  $\varphi(m_\nu) \in M^{\nu*} \cap M^\mu$  by Proposition 3.4. As a result, the map  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu) \rightarrow M^{\nu*} \cap M^\mu$  given by  $\varphi \mapsto \varphi(m_\nu)$  is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules.  $\square$

**Remark 3.6.** It is shown in [CR, 61.2] that whenever  $A$  is a quasi-hereditary algebra,  $a \in A$  and  $J$  is an ideal of  $A$  then  $\text{Hom}_A(aA, J) \cong Aa \cap J$ . By [ChPA1, Proposition 10] (see also [C1, Corollary 4.5]),  $Y_{r,n}$  is quasi-Frobenius, so this gives another proof of Corollary 3.5.

Let  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  and  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . We assume that  $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\nu) = \alpha(\lambda)$ . For  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ ,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$ , put

$$m_{ST} = \sum_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}},$$

where the sum is taken over all  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$  such that  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S$  and  $\nu(\mathfrak{t}) = T$ .

**Proposition 3.7.** *Suppose that  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  with  $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\nu)$ . Then the set*

$$\{m_{ST} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu) \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$$

*is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $M^{\nu*} \cap M^\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Since

$$m_{ST} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \mu(\mathfrak{s})=S}} m_{T\mathfrak{s}}^* = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \\ \nu(\mathfrak{t})=T}} m_{ST},$$

we see that  $m_{ST} \in M^{\nu*} \cap M^\mu$  by Lemma 3.2. Moreover, the elements  $m_{ST}$  are linearly independent since the basis elements  $m_{\mathfrak{s}t}$  involved in the  $m_{ST}$  are distinct. Now suppose that  $h \in M^{\nu*} \cap M^\mu$ . Since  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ , we may express  $h$  with respect to the standard basis, that is, we may write  $h = \sum r_{\mathfrak{s}t} m_{\mathfrak{s}t}$  for some  $r_{\mathfrak{s}t} \in \mathcal{R}$ . Since  $h \in M^\mu$ , by Proposition 3.3 if  $r_{\mathfrak{s}t} \neq 0$  then  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $r_{\mathfrak{s}t} = r_{\mathfrak{s}'t}$  whenever  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) = \mu(\mathfrak{s}')$ . Similarly, since  $h \in M^{\nu*}$ , if  $r_{\mathfrak{s}t} \neq 0$  then  $\nu(\mathfrak{t}) \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$  for some  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $r_{\mathfrak{s}t} = r_{\mathfrak{s}t'}$  whenever  $\nu(\mathfrak{t}) = \nu(\mathfrak{t}')$ . Consequently, if  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) = \mu(\mathfrak{s}') \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  and  $\nu(\mathfrak{t}) = \nu(\mathfrak{t}') \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$ , then  $r_{\mathfrak{s}t} = r_{\mathfrak{s}'t} = r_{\mathfrak{s}t'} = r_{\mathfrak{s}t'}$ . This proves the proposition.  $\square$

**Definition 3.8.** Suppose that  $M_n^r = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} M^\mu$ . We define the Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $\text{YS}_n^r = \text{YS}_q(r, n)$  as the endomorphism algebra

$$\text{YS}_n^r = \text{End}_{Y_{r,n}}(M_n^r),$$

which is isomorphic to  $\bigoplus_{\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$ .

Let  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$ . In view of Proposition 3.7, we can define  $\varphi_{ST} \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$  by

$$\varphi_{ST}(m_\nu h) = m_{ST} h \tag{3.6}$$

for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ . We extend  $\varphi_{ST}$  to an element of  $\text{YS}_n^r$  by defining  $\varphi_{ST}$  to be zero on  $M^\kappa$  for  $\nu \neq \kappa \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . For any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) = \bigcup_{\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ . We denote by  $\text{YS}_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda}$  the  $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of  $\text{YS}_n^r$  spanned by  $\varphi_{ST}$  such that  $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\nu)$  with  $\nu \triangleright \lambda$ . Then we have the next theorem.

**Theorem 3.9.** *The Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $\text{YS}_n^r$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with a basis*

$$\{\varphi_{ST} \mid S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

*Moreover, this basis satisfies the following properties:*

(i) *The  $\mathcal{R}$ -linear map  $*$  :  $\text{YS}_n^r \rightarrow \text{YS}_n^r$  determined by  $\varphi_{ST}^* = \varphi_{TS}$ , for all  $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$  and all  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , is an anti-automorphism of  $\text{YS}_n^r$ .*

(ii) *Let  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$  and  $\varphi \in \text{YS}_n^r$ . Then for each  $V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ , there exists  $r_V = r_{V,T,\varphi} \in \mathcal{R}$  such that for all  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ , we have*

$$\varphi_{ST}\varphi \equiv \sum_{V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)} r_V \varphi_{SV} \pmod{\text{YS}_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda}}.$$

*In particular, this basis  $\{\varphi_{ST}\}$  is a cellular basis of  $\text{YS}_n^r$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of [Ma1, Theorem 4.14] and [DJM, Theorem 6.6]. By Corollary 3.5 and Proposition 3.7, the set  $\{\varphi_{ST}\}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $YS_n^r$ . Next we need to verify (i) and (ii).

(i) Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , and take  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ ,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$ . Then  $\varphi_{ST}^*(m_\mu) = m_{TS} = (m_{ST})^* = (\varphi_{ST}(m_\nu))^*$ . By the  $\mathcal{R}$ -linearity, we have  $\varphi^*(m_\mu) = (\varphi(m_\nu))^*$  for any  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$ . Given  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\mu)$  and  $\psi \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\kappa, M^\lambda)$ , we may assume that  $\mu = \kappa$  since otherwise  $\psi\varphi = 0$ . Write  $\varphi(m_\nu) = x_1 m_\nu$  and  $\psi(m_\mu) = x_2 m_\mu$  for some  $x_1, x_2 \in Y_{r,n}$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\psi\varphi)^*(m_\lambda) &= (\psi\varphi(m_\nu))^* = (x_2 x_1 m_\nu)^* = m_\nu x_1^* x_2^* \\ &= \varphi^*(m_\mu) x_2^* = \varphi^*(m_\mu x_2^*) = \varphi^* \psi^*(m_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $(\psi\varphi)^* = \varphi^* \psi^*$  and  $*$  is an anti-automorphism.

(ii) Take  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ ,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$ . We may assume that  $\varphi \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\kappa, M^\nu)$  for some  $\kappa \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  with  $\alpha(\kappa) = \alpha(\nu)$ . We have  $\varphi(m_\kappa) = m_\nu h$  for some  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ . Then  $\varphi_{ST}\varphi(m_\kappa) = m_{ST}h$ . By Corollary 3.5, we see that  $m_{ST}h \in M^{\kappa^*} \cap M^\mu$ . Hence by Proposition 3.7, we may write  $m_{ST}h = \sum_{U,V} r_{UV} m_{UV}$ , where  $r_{UV} \in \mathcal{R}$ , and the sum is over  $U \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\alpha, \mu)$  and  $V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\alpha, \kappa)$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . By applying Theorem 2.7(ii), we can write  $m_{ST}h$  as

$$m_{ST}h = \sum_{V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \kappa)} r_V m_{SV} + \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n} \\ \alpha \triangleright \lambda}} \sum_{\substack{U' \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\alpha, \mu) \\ V' \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\alpha, \kappa)}} r_{U'V'} m_{U'V'},$$

where  $r_V, r_{U'V'} \in \mathcal{R}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\varphi_{ST}\varphi \equiv \sum_{V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \kappa)} r_V \varphi_{SV} \pmod{YS_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda}}.$$

We are done.  $\square$

For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $T^\lambda = \lambda(t^\lambda)$ . Then  $T^\lambda \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \lambda)$  and  $T^\lambda$  is the unique semistandard  $\lambda$ -tableau of type  $\lambda$ . Moreover  $t = t^\lambda$  is the unique element in  $\text{Std}(\lambda)$  such that  $\lambda(t) = T^\lambda$ . Thus,  $m_{T^\lambda T^\lambda} = m_{t^\lambda t^\lambda} = m_\lambda$ , and  $\varphi_\lambda = \varphi_{T^\lambda T^\lambda}$  is the identity map on  $M^\lambda$ .

The Weyl module  $W^\lambda$  is defined as the right  $YS_n^r$ -submodule of  $YS_n^r/YS_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda}$  spanned by the image of  $\varphi_\lambda$ . For each  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ , we denote by  $\varphi_S$  the image of  $\varphi_{T^\lambda S}$  in  $YS_n^r/YS_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda}$ . Then by Theorem 3.9, we see that  $W^\lambda$ , as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module, is free with basis  $\{\varphi_S \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)\}$ .

The Weyl module  $W^\lambda$  possesses an associative symmetric bilinear form, which is completely determined by the equation

$$\varphi_{T^\lambda S} \varphi_{TT^\lambda} \equiv \langle \varphi_S, \varphi_T \rangle \varphi_\lambda \pmod{YS_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda}}$$

for all  $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)$ . Note that  $\langle \varphi_S, \varphi_T \rangle = 0$  unless  $S$  and  $T$  are semistandard tableaux of the same type. Let  $L^\lambda = W^\lambda / \text{rad} W^\lambda$ , where  $\text{rad} W^\lambda = \{x \in W^\lambda \mid \langle x, y \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } y \in W^\lambda\}$ .

**Proposition 3.10.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field. Then for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ,  $L^\lambda$  is an absolutely irreducible  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module. Moreover,  $\{L^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  is a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -modules.*

*Proof.* For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , we have

$$\varphi_{T\lambda T\lambda} \varphi_{T\lambda T\lambda} \equiv \langle \varphi_{T\lambda}, \varphi_{T\lambda} \rangle \varphi_\lambda \pmod{\text{YS}_{r,n}^{\triangleright\lambda}}.$$

But since  $\varphi_{T\lambda T\lambda} \varphi_{T\lambda T\lambda} = \varphi_\lambda$  is the identity map on  $M^\lambda$ , we see that  $\langle \varphi_{T\lambda}, \varphi_{T\lambda} \rangle = 1$ , and so  $L^\lambda$  is nonzero. Then the assertions follow from [GL, (3.4)].  $\square$

If  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $d_{\lambda\mu}$  denote the composition multiplicity of  $L^\mu$  as a composition factor of  $W^\lambda$ . Then  $(d_{\lambda\mu})_{\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}}$  is the decomposition matrix of  $\text{YS}_n^r$ . The theory of cellular algebras [GL, (3.6)] yields the following result.

**Corollary 3.11.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field.  $(d_{\lambda\mu})_{\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}}$  is unitriangular. That is, for  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , we have  $d_{\mu\mu} = 1$  and  $d_{\lambda\mu} \neq 0$  only if  $\lambda \succeq \mu$ .*

Combining Proposition 3.10 with [GL, (3.10)], we have the next result.

**Corollary 3.12.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field. The Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $\text{YS}_n^r$  is quasi-hereditary.*

**Remark 3.13.** For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and for each  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ , let  $m_{\mathfrak{t}} \in S^\lambda$  be the image of  $m_{\mathfrak{t}\lambda\mathfrak{t}}$  under the map  $Y_{r,n}/Y_{r,n}^{\triangleright\lambda}$ . Then  $\{m_{\mathfrak{t}}\} = \{\overline{m}_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{t})}\}$  gives an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $S^\lambda$ . For  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ , put  $m_T = \sum_{\mathfrak{t}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{t})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}^\lambda))} m_{\mathfrak{t}} \in S^\lambda$ , where the sum is taken over all  $\mathfrak{t}$  such that  $\mu(\mathfrak{t}) = T$ . Since  $m_T$  is the image of  $m_{T\lambda T}$ , one obtains a well-defined map  $\varphi_T \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M^\mu, S^\lambda)$  by  $\varphi_T(m_\mu) = m_T$ , which is regarded as an element of  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M_n^r, S^\lambda)$  by extending by 0 outside. In a similar way as in [Ma1, Proposition 4.15], we see that  $W^\lambda$  is isomorphic to the  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -submodule of  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M_n^r, S^\lambda)$  with basis  $\{\varphi_T \mid T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda)\}$ .

#### 4. SCHUR FUNCTORS

In this section, we will follow the approach in [HM2, §4.3] to define an exact functor from the category of  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -modules to the category of  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules. For an algebra  $A$ , let  $A\text{-mod}$  be the category of finite dimensional right  $A$ -modules.

Let  $\dot{\mathcal{C}}_{r,n} = \mathcal{C}_{r,n} \cup \{\omega\}$ , where  $\omega$  is a dummy symbol. Set  $M^\omega = Y_{r,n}$  and  $\dot{M}_n^r = M_n^r \oplus M^\omega$ . The extended Yokonuma-Schur algebra is the algebra

$$\dot{\text{YS}}_n^r = \text{End}_{Y_{r,n}}(\dot{M}_n^r).$$

Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , and set  $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \omega) := \text{Std}(\lambda)$ . Let  $m_\omega = 1$  so that  $M^\omega = m_\omega Y_{r,n}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{t}^\omega = 1$  and  $m_{\mathfrak{t}^\omega\mathfrak{t}^\omega} = 1$ . We regard  $\text{YS}_n^r$  as a subalgebra of  $\dot{\text{YS}}_n^r$  in the obvious way.

Extending (3.6), if  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ,  $\mu, \nu \in \dot{\mathcal{C}}_{r,n}$ , and  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ ,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$ , we define

$$\varphi_{ST}(m_\nu h) = m_{ST} h$$

for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ . Then  $\varphi_{ST} \in \dot{\text{YS}}_n^r$ . For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , set  $\dot{\mathcal{J}}_0^+(\lambda) = \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) \cup \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \omega) = \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) \cup \text{Std}(\lambda)$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** *The algebra  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  is a cellular algebra with a cellular basis*

$$\{\varphi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{T}} \mid \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T} \in \dot{\mathcal{J}}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

Moreover, if  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field, then  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  is a quasi-hereditary algebra with Weyl modules  $\{\dot{W}^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  and simple modules  $\{\dot{L}^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$ .

*Proof.* By definition,  $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  is a subalgebra of  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  and, as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module,

$$\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r = \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r \oplus \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{Y}_{r,n}}(M^\omega, M_n^r) \oplus \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{Y}_{r,n}}(M_n^r, M^\omega) \oplus \text{End}_{\mathcal{Y}_{r,n}}(M^\omega, M^\omega).$$

For  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \dot{\mathcal{C}}_{r,n}$ , there are isomorphisms of  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules  $M^\mu \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{Y}_{r,n}}(M^\omega, M^\mu)$  given by  $m_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{t}} \mapsto \varphi_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{t}}$ , for  $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{J}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  and  $\mathcal{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$  with some  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . For  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \dot{\mathcal{C}}_{r,n}$ , there are isomorphisms of  $\mathcal{R}$ -modules  $M^{\nu*} \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{Y}_{r,n}}(M^\nu, M^\omega)$  given by  $m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathcal{T}} \mapsto \varphi_{\mathfrak{s}\mathcal{T}}$ , for  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$  and  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{J}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$  with some  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , where  $m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathcal{T}} = m_{\mathcal{T}\mathfrak{s}}^*$ . Therefore, the elements in the statement of this proposition give a basis of  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  by Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.9.

Now suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field. Repeating the arguments from Theorem 3.9 and Proposition 3.10 shows that  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  is a quasi-hereditary cellular algebra.  $\square$

By Proposition 4.1, there exist Weyl modules  $\dot{W}^\lambda$  and simple modules  $\dot{L}^\lambda = \dot{W}^\lambda / \text{rad } \dot{W}^\lambda$  for  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$ , for each  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Let  $\{\varphi_{\mathcal{S}} \mid \mathcal{S} \in \dot{\mathcal{J}}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$  be the basis of  $\dot{W}^\lambda$ . For each  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , let  $\varphi_\mu$  be the identity map on  $M^\mu$ . We extend  $\varphi_\mu$  to an element of  $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  by defining  $\varphi_\mu$  to be zero on  $M^\kappa$  for  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \boldsymbol{\kappa} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . In particular,  $\varphi_\mu = \varphi_{\mathcal{T}^\mu \mathcal{T}^\mu}$  if  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . As an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module, every  $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r$ -module  $M$  has a weight space decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} M_\mu, \quad \text{where } M_\mu = M\varphi_\mu. \quad (4.1)$$

Set  $\varphi_n^r = \sum_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} \varphi_\mu$  and let  $\varphi_\omega$  be the identity map on  $M^\omega = \mathcal{Y}_{r,n}$ . Then  $\varphi_n^r$  is the identity element of  $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  and  $\varphi_n^r + \varphi_\omega$  is the identity element of  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$ . By definition,  $\varphi_n^r$  and  $\varphi_\omega$  are both idempotents in  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$  and  $\varphi_n^r \dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r \varphi_n^r \cong \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r$ . Therefore, by [HM2, (2.10)], there are exact functors

$$\dot{\mathcal{F}}_n^\omega : \dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod}, \quad \dot{\mathcal{G}}_n^\omega : \mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod} \rightarrow \dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod}$$

given by  $\dot{\mathcal{F}}_n^\omega(M) = M\varphi_n^r$  and  $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_n^\omega(N) = N \otimes_{\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r} \varphi_n^r \dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$ . By [HM, §2.4], there are functors  $\mathcal{H}_n^\omega := \mathcal{H}_{\varphi_n^r}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_n^\omega := \mathcal{O}_{\varphi_n^r}$ ,  $\mathcal{O}_\omega^n := \mathcal{O}_{\varphi_n^r}$  from  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod}$  to  $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod}$  such that  $\mathcal{H}_n^\omega(M) = M/\mathcal{O}_n^\omega(M)$ .

**Lemma 4.2.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field. Then the functors  $\dot{\mathcal{F}}_n^\omega$  and  $\dot{\mathcal{G}}_n^\omega$  induce mutually inverse equivalences of categories between  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}\mathcal{S}_n^r\text{-mod}$ . Moreover,  $\dot{\mathcal{F}}_n^\omega(\dot{W}^\lambda) \cong W^\lambda$  and  $\dot{\mathcal{F}}_n^\omega(\dot{L}^\lambda) \cong L^\lambda$  for all  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a  $\dot{\mathcal{Y}}\mathcal{S}_n^r$ -module. Then, extending (4.1),  $M$  has a weight space decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \dot{\mathcal{C}}_{r,n}} M_\mu, \quad \text{where } M_\mu = M\varphi_\mu.$$

Then, essentially by definition,  $\dot{F}_n^\omega(M) = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}} M_\lambda$ . That is,  $\dot{F}_n^\omega$  removes the  $\omega$ -weight space of  $M$ . In particular,  $\dot{F}_n^\omega(\dot{W}^\lambda) = W^\lambda$  and  $\dot{F}_n^\omega(\dot{L}^\lambda) = L^\lambda$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . The fact that  $\dot{F}_n^\omega(\dot{L}^\mu) = L^\mu$  for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  implies that  $O_\omega^n(M) = M$ ,  $O_\omega^n(M) = 0$  for all  $M \in \text{YS}_n^r\text{-mod}$ . Therefore,  $H_n^\omega$  is the identity functor and  $\dot{G}_n^\omega \cong H_n^\omega \circ \dot{G}_n^\omega$ . Hence, this lemma is an application of the theory of quotient functors given in [HM2, Theorem 2.11].  $\square$

The identity map  $\varphi_\omega$  on  $Y_{r,n} = M^\omega$  is idempotent in  $\text{YS}_n^r$  and there is an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{R}$ -algebras  $\varphi_\omega \text{YS}_n^r \varphi_\omega \cong Y_{r,n}$ . Therefore, by [HM2, (2.10)], there are functors

$$\dot{F}_n^r : \text{YS}_n^r\text{-mod} \rightarrow Y_{r,n}\text{-mod}, \quad \dot{G}_n^r : Y_{r,n}\text{-mod} \rightarrow \text{YS}_n^r\text{-mod}$$

given by  $\dot{F}_n^r(M) = M\varphi_\omega = M_\omega$  and  $\dot{G}_n^r(N) = N \otimes_{Y_{r,n}} \varphi_\omega \text{YS}_n^r$ .

**Proposition 4.3.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field. Then there is an exact functor  $F_n^r : \text{YS}_n^r\text{-mod} \rightarrow Y_{r,n}\text{-mod}$  given by  $F_n^r(M) = (M \otimes_{\text{YS}_n^r} \varphi_n^r \text{YS}_n^r) \varphi_\omega$ , for  $M \in \text{YS}_n^r\text{-mod}$ , such that if  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , then  $F_n^r(W^\lambda) \cong S^\lambda$ , and*

$$F_n^r(L^\mu) \cong \begin{cases} D^\mu & \text{if } \mu \in \mathcal{K}_{r,n}; \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu \notin \mathcal{K}_{r,n}. \end{cases} \quad (4.2)$$

*Proof.* By definition,  $F_n^r = \dot{F}_n^r \circ \dot{G}_n^\omega$ , so  $F_n^r$  is an exact functor from  $\text{YS}_n^r\text{-mod}$  to  $Y_{r,n}\text{-mod}$ . The functor  $\dot{F}_n^r$  is nothing more than projection onto the  $\omega$ -weight space. Hence, if  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , then  $\dot{F}_n^r(\dot{W}^\lambda)$  is spanned by the maps  $\{\varphi_t \mid t \in \text{Std}(\lambda)\}$ , since  $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \omega) = \text{Std}(\lambda)$ . The map  $\varphi_t \mapsto m_t$ , for  $t \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ , defines an isomorphism  $\dot{F}_n^r(\dot{W}^\lambda) \cong S^\lambda$  of  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules. Therefore,  $F_n^r(W^\lambda) \cong S^\lambda$  by Lemma 4.2.

By [HM2, Theorem 2.11],  $F_n^r(L^\mu)$  is an irreducible  $Y_{r,n}$ -module whenever it is nonzero. Using the fact that  $F_n^r(W^\lambda) \cong S^\lambda$  and Corollary 3.11, a straightforward argument by induction on the dominance ordering shows that  $F_n^r(L^\mu) \cong D^\mu$  if  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_{r,n}$  and that  $F_n^r(L^\mu) = 0$  otherwise.  $\square$

Since  $F_n^r$  is exact, we obtain the promised relationship between the decomposition numbers of  $\text{YS}_n^r$  and  $Y_{r,n}$ .

**Corollary 4.4.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field and that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ,  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_{r,n}$ . Then we have  $[S^\lambda : D^\mu] = [W^\lambda : L^\mu]$ .*

**Lemma 4.5.** (A double centralizer property) *There are canonical isomorphisms of algebras such that  $\text{YS}_n^r = \text{End}_{Y_{r,n}}(\dot{M}_n^r)$  and  $Y_{r,n} = \text{End}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(\dot{M}_n^r)$ . In particular, the functor  $\dot{F}_n^r$  is fully faithful on projectives.*

*Proof.* The first isomorphism is the definition of  $\text{YS}_n^r$ , whereas the second follows directly from the definition of  $\text{YS}_n^r$  because

$$Y_{r,n} \cong \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(Y_{r,n}, Y_{r,n}) \cong \varphi_\omega \text{YS}_n^r \varphi_\omega \cong \text{End}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(\varphi_\omega \text{YS}_n^r),$$

and  $\varphi_\omega \text{YS}_n^r \cong \dot{M}_n^r$  as a right  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module.  $\square$



**Corollary 4.6.**  $YS_n^r$  is a quasi-hereditary cover of  $Y_{r,n}$  in the sense of Rouquier [Ro, Definition 4.34].

*Proof.* Recall that  $\dot{M}_n^r \cong \varphi_\omega \dot{YS}_n^r$  is a projective  $\dot{YS}_n^r$ -module. Using the Morita equivalence between  $\dot{YS}_n^r$  and  $YS_n^r$ , we see that  $M_n^r$  is a projective  $YS_n^r$ -module. Because  $\dot{F}_n^r$  is fully faithful on projective modules by Lemma 4.5 and  $F_n^r$  is the composition of  $\dot{F}_n^r$  with an equivalence of categories, so is  $F_n^r$ . This implies that  $YS_n^r$  is a quasi-hereditary cover of  $Y_{r,n}$  in the sense of Rouquier [Ro, Definition 4.34].  $\square$

## 5. TILTING MODULES

In this section, we introduce the tilting modules for  $YS_n^r$  and the closely related Young modules for  $Y_{r,n}$  following [Ma2]. Throughout this section we assume that  $\mathbb{K}$  is a field, which can be regarded as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -algebra.

**5.1. Young modules.** Recall from (4.1) that every  $YS_n^r$ -module has a weight space decomposition. Analogously, as a right  $YS_n^r$ -module, the regular representation of  $YS_n^r$  has a decomposition into a direct sum of left weight spaces

$$YS_n^r = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} Z^\mu, \quad \text{where } Z^\mu = \varphi_\mu YS_n^r \text{ for } \mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}.$$

The next lemma gives some properties of the right  $YS_n^r$ -module  $Z^\mu$ .

**Lemma 5.1.** *Assume that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then the following hold:*

(i)  $Z^\mu$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with a basis

$$\{\varphi_{ST} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu), T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu) \text{ for some } \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n} \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

(ii) Let  $\mathcal{M}^\mu = \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M_n^r, M^\mu)$ . As right  $YS_n^r$ -modules, we have  $Z^\mu \cong \mathcal{M}^\mu$ .

(iii) As  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules, we have  $F_n^r(Z^\mu) \cong M^\mu$ .

*Proof.* (i) It follows from Theorem 3.9.

(ii) It follows from (i).

(iii) We have

$$\begin{aligned} F_n^r(Z^\mu) &= \dot{F}_n^r \circ \dot{G}_n^\omega(\varphi_\mu YS_n^r) = \dot{F}_n^r(\varphi_\mu YS_n^r \otimes_{YS_n^r} \varphi_n^r \dot{YS}_n^r) \\ &\cong \dot{F}_n^r(\varphi_\mu \dot{YS}_n^r) \cong \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(Y_{r,n}, M^\mu) \cong M^\mu. \end{aligned}$$

We are done.  $\square$

The next lemma claims that each  $Z^\mu$  has a Weyl filtration.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Assume that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $Z^\mu$  has a Weyl filtration*

$$Z^\mu = M_1 \supset M_2 \supset \cdots \supset M_k \supset M_{k+1} = 0$$

such that for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$  there exists some  $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  with  $\alpha(\lambda_i) = \alpha(\mu)$  satisfying  $M_i/M_{i+1} \cong W^{\lambda_i}$ . Moreover,  $\#\{1 \leq i \leq k \mid \lambda_i = \lambda\} = \#\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  with  $\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$ .

*Proof.* Choose a total ordering  $\{S_1, \dots, S_k\}$  on the set  $\cup_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}} \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  such that  $i > j$  whenever  $\lambda_i \triangleright \lambda_j$ , where  $S_i \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda_i, \mu)$ ,  $S_j \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda_j, \mu)$ . For each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ , let  $M_i$  be the  $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of  $Z^\mu$  with basis  $\{\varphi_{S_j T} \mid j \geq i \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda_j)\}$ . Then  $M_i$  is a  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module by Theorem 3.9. Further, there is an isomorphism of  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -modules  $W^{\lambda_i} \cong M_i/M_{i+1}$  given by  $\varphi_T \mapsto \varphi_{S_i T} + M_{i+1}$  for  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda_i)$ , because  $M_i \cap \text{YS}_{r,n}^{\triangleright \lambda_i} \subseteq M_{i+1}$ . Since  $\text{YS}_n^r$  is quasi-hereditary,  $[Z^\mu : W^\lambda]$  is independent of the choice of Weyl filtration.  $\square$

Applying the Schur functor  $F_n^r$ , by Proposition 4.3 and Lemma 5.1(iii), we also have the following result.

**Corollary 5.3.** *Assume that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $M^\mu$  has a Specht filtration*

$$M^\mu = M_1 \supset M_2 \supset \dots \supset M_k \supset M_{k+1} = 0$$

such that for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$  there exists some  $\lambda_i \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  with  $\alpha(\lambda_i) = \alpha(\mu)$  satisfying  $M_i/M_{i+1} \cong S^{\lambda_i}$ . Moreover,  $\#\{1 \leq i \leq k \mid \lambda_i = \lambda\} = \#\mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  with  $\alpha(\lambda) = \alpha(\mu)$ .

Since  $\varphi_\mu$  is an idempotent in  $\text{YS}_n^r$ ,  $Z^\mu$  is a projective  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module. Notice that if  $\mathcal{T}_0(\lambda, \mu) \neq \emptyset$ , then  $\lambda \triangleright \mu$ . Thus,  $W^\lambda$  appears in  $Z^\mu$  only if  $\lambda \triangleright \mu$ . For each  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $P^\mu$  be the projective cover of  $L^\mu$ . Then by [Ma1, Lemma 2.16],  $P^\mu$  has a filtration by Weyl modules in which  $W^\lambda$  appears with multiplicity  $[P^\mu : W^\lambda] = [W^\lambda : L^\mu]$ . From these facts, we can easily get the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.4.** *Assume that  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then*

$$Z^\mu \cong P^\mu \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \triangleright \mu} c_{\lambda\mu} P^\lambda$$

for some non-negative integer  $c_{\lambda\mu}$ .

Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$ ,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$ . Recall that  $\mathcal{M}^\mu$  is defined as  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(M_n^r, M^\mu)$ . Thus, we can define a  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module homomorphism  $\Phi_{ST} : \mathcal{M}^\nu \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^\mu$  by  $\Phi_{ST}(f) = \varphi_{ST} f$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{M}^\nu$ . In fact, these maps give a basis of  $\text{Hom}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(\mathcal{M}^\nu, \mathcal{M}^\mu)$ .

**Lemma 5.5.** *Suppose that  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(\mathcal{M}^\nu, \mathcal{M}^\mu)$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis  $\{\Phi_{ST} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu), T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$ .*

For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $Y^\lambda = F_n^r(P^\lambda)$ , which we call a Young module of  $Y_{r,n}$ .

**Proposition 5.6.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field and that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then the following hold:*

- (i) *Each  $Y^\lambda$  is an indecomposable  $Y_{r,n}$ -module.*
- (ii) *If  $\mu$  is another  $r$ -partition of  $n$ , then  $Y^\lambda \cong Y^\mu$  if and only if  $\lambda = \mu$ .*
- (iii) *We have*

$$M^\lambda \cong Y^\lambda \oplus \bigoplus_{\nu \triangleright \lambda} c_{\nu\lambda} Y^\nu.$$

(iv) *The Young module  $Y^\lambda$  has a Specht filtration in which  $S^\mu$  appears with multiplicity  $[Y^\lambda : S^\mu] = [W^\mu : L^\lambda]$ .*

*Proof.* (i) By Corollary 4.6, the functor  $F_n^r$  is fully faithful on projective modules, so  $\text{End}_{Y_{r,n}}(Y^\lambda) \cong \text{End}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(P^\lambda)$  is a local ring since  $P^\lambda$  is indecomposable.

(ii) If  $Y^\lambda \cong Y^\mu$ , then  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(Y^\lambda, Y^\mu)$  contains an isomorphism and this lifts to give an isomorphism  $P^\mu \cong P^\lambda$ , so  $\lambda = \mu$ .

(iii) Applying the Schur functor  $F_n^r$ , it follows from Lemma 5.1(iii) and Lemma 5.4.

(iv) Recall that  $P^\lambda$  has a Weyl filtration  $P^\lambda = P_1 \supset P_2 \supset \cdots \supset P_k \supset P_{k+1} = 0$ . Moreover, for each  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ,  $\#\{1 \leq i \leq k \mid P_i/P_{i+1} \cong W^\mu\} = [P^\lambda : W^\mu] = [W^\mu : L^\lambda]$ . Setting  $Y_i = F_n^r(P_i)$ , and using Proposition 4.3, gives a filtration of  $Y^\lambda$  with the required properties.  $\square$

The next proposition identify the projective Young modules, and its proof is similar to that of [HM2, Proposition 5.9].

**Proposition 5.7.** *Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_{r,n}$ . Then  $Y^\mu$  is the projective cover of  $D^\mu$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $P^\mu$  is the projective cover of  $L^\mu$  and  $F_n^r(P^\mu) = Y^\mu$ ,  $F_n^r(L^\mu) = D^\mu$  if  $\mu \in \mathcal{K}_{r,n}$ . Since  $F_n^r$  is exact, there is a surjective map  $Y^\mu \mapsto D^\mu$ . Therefore, it suffices to show that  $Y^\mu$  is projective since it is indecomposable by Proposition 5.6(i).

Recall that  $\text{YS}_n^r = \text{End}_{Y_{r,n}}(\dot{M}_n^r)$ , where  $\dot{M}_n^r = M_n^r \oplus Y_{r,n}$ . There is also a Schur functor  $\dot{F}_n^r$  from  $\text{YS}_n^r\text{-mod}$  to  $Y_{r,n}\text{-mod}$  given by  $\dot{F}_n^r(M) = M\varphi_\omega$ . In particular,  $\dot{F}_n^r(\dot{M}_n^r) \cong Y_{r,n}$  as right  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules.

As a  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module,  $\dot{M}_n^r \cong \varphi_\omega \text{YS}_n^r$ . In particular,  $\dot{M}_n^r$  is a projective  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module. If  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $\dot{P}^\lambda$  be the projective cover of the irreducible  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module  $\dot{L}^\lambda$ . The multiplicity of  $\dot{P}^\lambda$  as a summand of  $\dot{M}_n^r$  is equal to

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(\dot{M}_n^r, \dot{L}^\lambda) = \dim \text{Hom}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(\varphi_\omega \text{YS}_n^r, \dot{L}^\lambda) = \dim \dot{L}^\lambda \varphi_\omega = \dim D^\lambda.$$

Consequently,  $\dot{M}_n^r \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_{r,n}} (\dim D^\lambda) \dot{P}^\lambda$  as a  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module. By definition,  $Y^\lambda = F_n^r(P^\lambda) = \dot{F}_n^r(\dot{P}^\lambda)$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Therefore,

$$Y_{r,n} \cong \dot{F}_n^r(\dot{M}_n^r) \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{K}_{r,n}} (\dim D^\lambda) Y^\lambda$$

as a right  $Y_{r,n}$ -module. The result follows.  $\square$

**5.2. Twisted Young modules.** Let  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{r}][\dot{q}, \dot{q}^{-1}, \zeta]$ , where  $\dot{q}$  is an indeterminate, and let  $Y_{r,n}^\mathcal{Z}$  be the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra over  $\mathcal{Z}$ . It is easy to see that  $Y_{r,n}^\mathcal{Z}$  has a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -algebra involution  $'$  which is determined by

$$g_i' = g_i, \quad \dot{q}' = -\dot{q}^{-1}, \quad \text{and } t_j' = t_j, \quad \zeta_j' = \zeta_{r-j+1}$$

for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n$ .

For each  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , let  $y_\mu = (x_\mu)' = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_\mu} (-\dot{q})^{-l(w)} g_w$ , and set  $n_\mu := (U_\mu x_\mu)' = U_\mu' y_\mu$ . Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ . We define  $n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} := g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* n_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{t})}$ . Then by definition we have  $n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} = (m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}})'$ . Because  $'$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -algebra involution,  $\{n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\}$  is a cellular basis of  $Y_{r,n}^\mathcal{Z}$  by Theorem 2.7. The ring  $\mathcal{R}$  is naturally a  $\mathcal{Z}$ -module under specialization; that is,  $\dot{q}$  acts on  $\mathcal{R}$  as multiplication by  $q$ . Because  $Y_{r,n}$  is  $\mathcal{R}$ -free, this induces an isomorphism of  $\mathcal{R}$ -algebras  $Y_{r,n} \cong Y_{r,n}^\mathcal{Z} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{R}$  via  $g_i \mapsto g_i \otimes 1_{\mathcal{R}}$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ) and  $t_j \mapsto t_j \otimes 1_{\mathcal{R}}$  ( $1 \leq j \leq n$ ).

Hereafter, we will identify the algebra  $Y_{r,n}$  and  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathcal{Z}} \otimes_{\mathcal{Z}} \mathcal{R}$  via the isomorphism above. Thus, we have the following result.

*The Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with a cellular basis  $\{n_{\mathfrak{st}} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$ .*

Now we can apply the general theory of cellular algebras. For each  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , we define the dual Specht module  $S_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  to be the right  $Y_{r,n}$ -module  $(n_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} + Y_{\triangleright \boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{r,n})Y_{r,n}$ , where  $Y_{\triangleright \boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{r,n} = (Y_{r,n}^{\triangleright \boldsymbol{\lambda}})'$  is the two-sided ideal of  $Y_{r,n}$  with basis  $n_{\mathfrak{uv}}$  with  $\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\nu})$  for various  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  such that  $\boldsymbol{\nu} \triangleright \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ . Then  $S_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  is  $\mathcal{R}$ -free with basis  $\{n_{\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})\}$ , where  $n_{\mathfrak{t}} = n_{\mathfrak{t}\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\mathfrak{t}}} + Y_{\triangleright \boldsymbol{\lambda}}^{r,n}$ . Let  $D_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} = S_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}/\text{rad}S_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ , where  $\text{rad}S_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  is the radical of the bilinear form on  $S_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  which is defined with respect to the cellular basis  $\{n_{\mathfrak{st}}\}$ .

For each  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , let  $N^{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = n_{\boldsymbol{\mu}}Y_{r,n}$ . If  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ , we define

$$n_{S\mathfrak{t}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathfrak{s})=S}} (-q)^{-l(d(\mathfrak{s}))-l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} n_{\mathfrak{st}}.$$

From the definition, we have  $n_{S\mathfrak{t}} = (m_{S\mathfrak{t}})'$ . Therefore, Proposition 3.3 and the usual specialization argument show that the following holds.

**Corollary 5.8.** *Suppose that  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $N^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis  $\{n_{S\mathfrak{t}} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ and } \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$ .*

Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Suppose that  $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ . For  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$ ,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ , let

$$n_{ST} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \\ \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathfrak{s})=S, \boldsymbol{\nu}(\mathfrak{t})=T}} (-q)^{-l(d(\mathfrak{s}))-l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} n_{\mathfrak{st}}.$$

We can now define the twisted Yokonuma-Schur algebra as

$$\text{YS}_r^n = \text{End}_{Y_{r,n}}(N_n^r),$$

where  $N_n^r = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} N^{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ . For  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu})$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ , we can also define the homomorphism  $\varphi'_{ST}$  by  $\varphi'_{ST}(n_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}h) = \delta_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\boldsymbol{\nu}} n_{ST}h$  for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $\varphi'_{ST} \in \text{YS}_r^n$ . The proof of the next proposition is in exactly the same way as that of [Ma2, Proposition 4.3], and we skip the details.

**Proposition 5.9.** (i) *The twisted Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $\text{YS}_r^n$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with a cellular basis*

$$\{\varphi'_{ST} \mid S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

- (ii) *The twisted Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $\text{YS}_r^n$  is quasi-hereditary.*  
 (iii) *The  $\mathcal{R}$ -algebras  $\text{YS}_n^r$  and  $\text{YS}_r^n$  are canonically isomorphic.*

Let  $W_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  and  $L_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$  ( $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ) be the Weyl modules and simple modules of  $\text{YS}_r^n$ , respectively; they are defined in exactly the same way as the corresponding modules for  $\text{YS}_n^r$ . As in Section 4, we can define an exact Schur functor  $F_r^n$  from  $\text{YS}_r^n\text{-mod}$  to  $Y_{r,n}\text{-mod}$ .

Moreover, we have  $F_r^n(W_\lambda) \cong S_\lambda$ ,  $F_r^n(L_\lambda) \cong D_\lambda$  and  $[W_\lambda : L_\mu] = [S_\lambda : D_\mu]$  whenever  $D_\mu \neq 0$ .

For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $P_\lambda$  be the projective cover of  $L_\lambda$ . Define  $Y_\lambda = F_r^n(P_\lambda)$ , which is called a twisted Young module. The next proposition can be proved in exactly the same way as in Proposition 5.6.

**Proposition 5.10.** *Suppose that  $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{K}$  is a field and that  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then we have*

- (i) *Each  $Y_\mu$  is an indecomposable  $Y_{r,n}$ -module.*
- (ii) *If  $\lambda$  is another  $r$ -partition of  $n$ , then  $Y_\lambda \cong Y_\mu$  if and only if  $\lambda = \mu$ .*
- (iii)

$$N^\mu \cong Y_\mu \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \triangleright \mu} c_{\lambda\mu} Y_\lambda,$$

where the integers  $c_{\lambda\mu}$  are the same as those appearing in Lemma 5.4.

(iv) *The twisted Young module  $Y_\mu$  has a dual Specht filtration in which the number of subquotients equal to  $S_\lambda$  is  $[W_\lambda : L_\mu]$ .*

**5.3. Non-degenerate bilinear forms.** If  $\sigma$  is a composition, its conjugate is the partition  $\sigma' = (\sigma'_1, \sigma'_2, \dots)$ , where  $\sigma'_i$  is the number of nodes in column  $i$  of the diagram of  $\sigma$ . If  $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)}) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , its conjugate  $\lambda'$  is the  $r$ -partition  $\lambda' = ((\lambda^{(r)})', \dots, (\lambda^{(1)})')$ . Similarly, the conjugate of a standard  $\lambda$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{t} = (\mathfrak{t}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathfrak{t}^{(r)})$  is the standard  $\lambda'$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{t}' = ((\mathfrak{t}^{(r)})', \dots, (\mathfrak{t}^{(1)})')$ , where  $(\mathfrak{t}^{(k)})'$  is the tableau obtained by interchanging the rows and columns of  $\mathfrak{t}^{(k)}$ .

If  $\mathfrak{v}$  is a standard tableau, let  $\mathfrak{v}_{\downarrow k}$  be the subtableau of  $\mathfrak{v}$  which contains  $1, 2, \dots, k$ , and let  $\text{shape}(\mathfrak{v}_{\downarrow k})$  be the associated  $r$ -composition. Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Suppose that  $\mathfrak{s}$  is a standard  $\lambda$ -tableau and that  $\mathfrak{t}$  is a standard  $\mu$ -tableau, we say that  $\mathfrak{s}$  dominates  $\mathfrak{t}$ , and write  $\mathfrak{s} \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$  if  $\text{shape}(\mathfrak{s}_{\downarrow k}) \triangleright \text{shape}(\mathfrak{t}_{\downarrow k})$  for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . If  $\mathfrak{s} \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$  and  $\mathfrak{s} \neq \mathfrak{t}$ , then we write  $\mathfrak{s} \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{s} \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$  if and only if  $\mathfrak{t}' \triangleright \mathfrak{s}'$ . We extend the dominance order to pairs of standard tableaux by defining  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \triangleright (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$  if  $\mathfrak{s} \triangleright \mathfrak{u}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \triangleright \mathfrak{v}$ . We write  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \triangleright (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$  if  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \triangleright (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$  and  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \neq (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$ .

For each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , let  $\mathfrak{t}_\lambda = (\mathfrak{t}^{\lambda'})'$ ; that is,  $\mathfrak{t}_\lambda$  is the standard  $\lambda$ -tableau with the numbers  $1, 2, \dots, n$  entered in order first down the columns of  $\mathfrak{t}_\lambda^{(r)}$ , and then the columns of  $\mathfrak{t}_\lambda^{(r-1)}$  and so on. If  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ , we define two elements  $d(\mathfrak{t})$  and  $d'(\mathfrak{t})$  in  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  by  $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}^\lambda d(\mathfrak{t})$  and  $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{t}_\lambda d'(\mathfrak{t})$ . Conjugating either of the two equations shows that  $d'(\mathfrak{t}) = d(\mathfrak{t}')$ . Let  $w_\lambda = d(\mathfrak{t}_\lambda)$ . In particular, we have  $w_\lambda = w_{\lambda'}^{-1}$ . Moreover, it is easy to see that  $w_\lambda = d(\mathfrak{t})d'(\mathfrak{t})^{-1}$  and  $l(w_\lambda) = l(d(\mathfrak{t})) + l(d'(\mathfrak{t}))$  for all  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ .

Recall that there is a unique anti-automorphism  $*$  on  $Y_{r,n}$  such that  $g_i^* = g_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-1$  and  $t_j^* = t_j$  for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Given a right  $Y_{r,n}$ -module  $M$ , we define its contragredient dual  $M^\circledast$  to be the dual module  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(M, \mathcal{R})$  equipped with the right  $Y_{r,n}$ -action  $(\varphi h)(m) = \varphi(mh^*)$  for all  $\varphi \in M^\circledast$ ,  $h \in Y_{r,n}$  and  $m \in M$ . A module  $M$  is self-dual if  $M \cong M^\circledast$ . Equivalently,  $M$  is self-dual if and only if  $M$  possesses a non-degenerate associative bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , where  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  is associative if  $\langle xh, y \rangle = \langle x, yh^* \rangle$  for all  $x, y \in M$  and  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ .

Recall that the following Jucys-Murphy elements  $J_i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ) in  $Y_{r,n}$  have been introduced in [ChPA1] by induction

$$J_1 := 1 \text{ and } J_{i+1} := g_i J_i g_i \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (5.1)$$

If  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ , for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , we define the content of  $k$  in  $\mathfrak{t}$  as the element  $c_{\mathfrak{t}}(k) := q^{2(j-i)}$  if  $k$  appears in row  $i$  and column  $j$  of some component  $\mathfrak{t}^{(s)}$  of  $\mathfrak{t}$ . The following proposition is proved in [ER].

**Proposition 5.11.** (See [ER, Proposition 3].) *Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}$  are two standard  $\lambda$ -tableaux. For each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , there exist  $r_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}} \in \mathcal{R}$  such that*

$$m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} J_k = \text{res}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k) m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} + \sum_{(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})} r_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}} m_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}}, \quad (5.2)$$

where the sum is over the pair  $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \in \text{Std}^2(\mu) = \text{Std}(\mu) \times \text{Std}(\mu)$  such that  $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \triangleright (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$  and  $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\lambda)$  with  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Moreover, we have

$$m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} t_k = \zeta_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)} m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}. \quad (5.3)$$

**Remark 5.12.** There are two ways to define the dominance order on  $\text{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_{r,n}) = \{(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$ . If  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \in \text{Std}^2(\lambda)$  and  $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \in \text{Std}^2(\mu)$ , then we define

$$(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \blacktriangleright (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \text{ if } \lambda \triangleright \mu, \text{ or } \lambda = \mu \text{ and } \mathfrak{s} \triangleright \mathfrak{u} \text{ and } \mathfrak{t} \triangleright \mathfrak{v}.$$

By definition,  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \triangleright (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$  implies that  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \blacktriangleright (\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})$ , but the inverse is false in general. In fact, it is proved in [ER] that the equality (5.2) holds under the dominance order  $\blacktriangleright$ . But it is easy to see that the equality (5.2) still holds under the stronger dominance order  $\triangleright$ . Besides, the proof of Proposition 5.11 essentially reduces to the case of  $r = 1$ , from which we can easily get the second condition  $\alpha(\mu) = \alpha(\lambda)$  in the summation of (5.2). These facts are crucial to the following arguments.

Let  $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(q, \zeta)$ . We shall first consider the split semisimple  $\mathbb{K}$ -algebra  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}} := Y_{r,n}^Z \otimes_Z \mathbb{K}$ . In particular, we can apply all the results in [Ma3, Section 3].

We shall follow the arguments of [Ma3, Section 3] to construct a ‘‘seminormal’’ basis of  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$ . For  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , we define the following two sets:

$$\mathcal{C}(k) := \{c_{\mathfrak{t}}(k) \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\},$$

and

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}(k)} := \{\zeta_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

**Definition 5.13.** Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and that  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$ .

(i) Let

$$F_{\mathfrak{t}} = \prod_{k=1}^n \left( \prod_{\substack{c \in \mathcal{C}(k) \\ c \neq c_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)}} \frac{J_k - c}{c_{\mathfrak{t}}(k) - c} \cdot \prod_{\substack{\bar{c} \in \overline{\mathcal{C}(k)} \\ \bar{c} \neq \zeta_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)}}} \frac{t_k - \bar{c}}{\zeta_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)} - \bar{c}} \right). \quad (5.4)$$

(ii) We set  $f_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} := F_{\mathfrak{s}} m_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} F_{\mathfrak{t}}$  and  $g_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} := F_{\mathfrak{s}} n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} F_{\mathfrak{t}}$

By Proposition 5.11, we can now apply the general theory developed in [Ma3, Section 3] to get the following results.

**Proposition 5.14.** (i) Suppose that  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$  for some  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . In  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$  we have

$$m_{\mathfrak{st}} = f_{\mathfrak{st}} + \sum_{(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})} r_{\mathfrak{uv}} f_{\mathfrak{uv}}, \quad (5.5)$$

where  $r_{\mathfrak{uv}} \in \mathbb{K}$  and the sum is over the pair  $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \in \text{Std}^2(\boldsymbol{\mu})$  ( $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ) such that  $r_{\mathfrak{uv}} \neq 0$  only if  $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \triangleright (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$  and  $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ ;

$$n_{\mathfrak{st}} = g_{\mathfrak{st}} + \sum_{(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v})} s_{\mathfrak{uv}} g_{\mathfrak{uv}}, \quad (5.6)$$

where  $s_{\mathfrak{uv}} \in \mathbb{K}$  and the sum is over the pair  $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \in \text{Std}^2(\boldsymbol{\nu})$  ( $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ) such that  $s_{\mathfrak{uv}} \neq 0$  only if  $(\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}) \triangleright (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$  and  $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ .

(ii) The set  $\{f_{\mathfrak{st}} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  is a  $\mathbb{K}$ -basis of  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$ .

(iii) For  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ ,  $\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ , we have

$$f_{\mathfrak{st}} J_k = c_{\mathfrak{t}}(k) f_{\mathfrak{st}}, \quad f_{\mathfrak{st}} t_k = \zeta_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)} f_{\mathfrak{st}}, \quad f_{\mathfrak{st}} F_{\mathfrak{u}} = \delta_{\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{u}} f_{\mathfrak{su}}, \quad (5.7)$$

and moreover, there exists a scalar  $0 \neq \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}} \in \mathbb{K}$  such that

$$f_{\mathfrak{st}} f_{\mathfrak{uv}} = \begin{cases} \gamma_{\mathfrak{t}} f_{\mathfrak{sv}} & \text{if } \boldsymbol{\lambda} = \boldsymbol{\mu} \text{ and } \mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{u}; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.8)$$

In particular,  $\gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}$  depends only on  $\mathfrak{t}$  and the set  $\{f_{\mathfrak{st}} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  is a cellular basis of  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$ .

(iv) For  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ , we have  $F_{\mathfrak{t}} = \frac{1}{\gamma_{\mathfrak{t}}} f_{\mathfrak{tt}}$ . Moreover, these elements  $\{F_{\mathfrak{t}} \mid \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  give a complete set of pairwise orthogonal primitive idempotents for  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$ .

(v) For  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ , we have

$$F_{\mathfrak{t}} J_k = J_k F_{\mathfrak{t}} = c_{\mathfrak{t}}(k) F_{\mathfrak{t}}, \quad F_{\mathfrak{t}} t_k = t_k F_{\mathfrak{t}} = \zeta_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)} F_{\mathfrak{t}}. \quad (5.9)$$

(vi) The Jucys-Murphy elements  $J_1, \dots, J_n, t_1, \dots, t_n$  generate a maximal commutative subalgebra of  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$ .

From the definitions, we see that for  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ , we have  $(c_{\mathfrak{t}}(k))' = c_{\mathfrak{t}'}(k)$  and  $\zeta'_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}}(k)} = \zeta_{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{t}'}(k)}$ . This implies the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.15.** For  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ , we have  $F_{\mathfrak{t}}' = F_{\mathfrak{t}'}$ , and hence  $g_{\mathfrak{st}} = f_{\mathfrak{st}}'$  in  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$ .

By Proposition 5.14(iv) and Lemma 5.15, we can easily get the following result.

**Lemma 5.16.** Suppose that  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ ,  $\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v} \in \text{Std}(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ . Then in  $Y_{r,n}^{\mathbb{K}}$ , we have  $f_{\mathfrak{st}} g_{\mathfrak{uv}} = 0$  unless  $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{u}'$ .

By Proposition 5.14(i) and Lemma 5.16, we can easily get the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.17.** Let  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Suppose that  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}$  are standard  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ -tableaux and that  $\mathfrak{u}$  and  $\mathfrak{v}$  are standard  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ -tableaux. If  $m_{\mathfrak{st}} n_{\mathfrak{uv}} \neq 0$ , then  $\mathfrak{u}' \triangleright \mathfrak{t}$  and  $\alpha(\boldsymbol{\mu}') = \alpha(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ .



Recall that  $\{t_1^{k_1} \cdots t_n^{k_n} g_w \mid 0 \leq k_1, \dots, k_n \leq r-1 \text{ and } w \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $Y_{r,n}$ . We can define an  $\mathcal{R}$ -linear map  $\tau : Y_{r,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$  by

$$\tau(t_1^{k_1} \cdots t_n^{k_n} g_w) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k_1 \equiv k_2 \equiv \cdots \equiv 0 \pmod{r} \text{ and } w = 1; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.10)$$

This map  $\tau$  was introduced in [ChPA1, Proposition 10] and was shown to be a trace form; that is,  $\tau(ab) = \tau(ba)$  for all  $a, b \in Y_{r,n}$ . Moreover, we have

$$\tau(t_1^{k_1} \cdots t_n^{k_n} g_w g_{w'} t_1^{l_1} \cdots t_n^{l_n}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } w^{-1} = w' \text{ and } k_i + l_i \equiv 0 \pmod{r} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In particular, we get that  $\tau(h^*) = \tau(h)$  for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ .

We now define a symmetric associative bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$  on  $Y_{r,n}$  by  $\langle h_1, h_2 \rangle = \tau(h_1 h_2^*)$ . We then have the following crucial result.

**Theorem 5.18.** *Suppose that  $\lambda = (\lambda^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda^{(r)}) \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and we choose all  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq r$  such that  $\lambda^{(i_1)}, \lambda^{(i_2)}, \dots, \lambda^{(i_p)}$  are the nonempty components of  $[\lambda]$ . Define  $c_k := |\lambda^{(i_k)}|$  for  $1 \leq k \leq p$ . Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Suppose that  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}$  are two standard  $\lambda$ -tableaux and that  $\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v}$  are two standard  $\mu$ -tableaux. Then we have*

$$\langle m_{\mathfrak{st}}, n_{\mathfrak{uv}} \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{r^p (\zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_p})^{-2}}{r^{\sum_{k=1}^p \binom{c_k}{2}}} & \text{if } (\mathfrak{u}', \mathfrak{v}') = (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}); \\ 0 & \text{if } (\mathfrak{u}', \mathfrak{v}') \not\subseteq (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}). \end{cases} \quad (5.11)$$

*Proof.* Suppose first that  $\langle m_{\mathfrak{st}}, n_{\mathfrak{uv}} \rangle \neq 0$ . By definition,  $\langle m_{\mathfrak{st}}, n_{\mathfrak{uv}} \rangle = \tau(m_{\mathfrak{st}} n_{\mathfrak{vu}})$ , so  $m_{\mathfrak{st}} n_{\mathfrak{vu}} \neq 0$ ; hence  $\mathfrak{v}' \supseteq \mathfrak{t}$  by Lemma 5.17. Since  $\tau$  is a trace form and  $\tau(h^*) = \tau(h)$  for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ , we also have  $\tau(m_{\mathfrak{st}} n_{\mathfrak{vu}}) = \tau(n_{\mathfrak{vu}} m_{\mathfrak{st}}) = \tau(m_{\mathfrak{ts}} n_{\mathfrak{uv}})$ ; hence  $m_{\mathfrak{ts}} n_{\mathfrak{uv}} \neq 0$  and  $\mathfrak{u}' \supseteq \mathfrak{s}$  by Lemma 5.17. Therefore, if  $\langle m_{\mathfrak{st}}, n_{\mathfrak{uv}} \rangle \neq 0$ , then  $(\mathfrak{u}', \mathfrak{v}') \supseteq (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$ .

Now assume that  $(\mathfrak{u}', \mathfrak{v}') = (\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t})$ . Then  $g_{w_\lambda} = g_{d(\mathfrak{t})} g_{d(\mathfrak{v}')^*}^* = g_{d(\mathfrak{s})} g_{d(\mathfrak{s}')^*}^*$ . Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle m_{\mathfrak{st}}, n_{\mathfrak{s}'\mathfrak{t}'} \rangle &= \tau(m_{\mathfrak{st}} n_{\mathfrak{s}'\mathfrak{t}'}) \\ &= \tau(g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* m_\lambda g_{d(\mathfrak{t})} g_{d(\mathfrak{v}')^*}^* n_{\lambda'} g_{d(\mathfrak{s}')}) \\ &= \tau(g_{d(\mathfrak{s}')^*} g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* m_\lambda g_{w_\lambda} n_{\lambda'}) \\ &= \tau(g_{w_\lambda}^* m_\lambda g_{w_\lambda} n_{\lambda'}) \\ &= \tau(m_\lambda g_{w_\lambda} n_{\lambda'} g_{w_\lambda}^{-1}) \\ &= \tau(u_\lambda E_{A_\lambda} x_\lambda g_{w_\lambda} U_{\lambda'}' y_{\lambda'} g_{w_\lambda}) \\ &= \tau(u_\lambda E_{A_\lambda} g_{w_\lambda} u_{\lambda'}' E_{A_{\lambda'}} y_{\lambda'} g_{w_\lambda} x_\lambda). \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

By definition, we have

$$w_\lambda = \left( \begin{array}{cccc|cc|ccc} 1 & 2 & \cdots & |\lambda^{(i_1)}| & \cdots & \cdots & n - |\lambda^{(i_p)}| + 1 & \cdots & n \\ j_1 & j_2 & \cdots & j_{|\lambda^{(i_1)}|} & \cdots & \cdots & k_1 & \cdots & k_{|\lambda^{(i_p)}|} \end{array} \right), \quad (5.13)$$

where  $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{|\lambda^{(i_1)}|}\} = \{n - |\lambda^{(i_1)}| + 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\{k_1, \dots, k_{|\lambda^{(i_p)}|}\} = \{1, \dots, |\lambda^{(i_p)}|\}$ .

By (5.13), we have

$$w_{\lambda}^{-1} = \left( \begin{array}{cccc|ccc} 1 & 2 & \cdots & |\lambda^{(i_p)}| & \cdots & \cdots & n - |\lambda^{(i_1)}| + 1 & \cdots & n \\ k_1 & k_2 & \cdots & k_{|\lambda^{(i_p)}|} & \cdots & \cdots & j_1 & \cdots & k_{|\lambda^{(i_1)}|} \end{array} \right), \quad (5.14)$$

where  $\{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{|\lambda^{(i_p)}|}\} = \{n - |\lambda^{(i_p)}| + 1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\{j_1, \dots, j_{|\lambda^{(i_1)}|}\} = \{1, \dots, |\lambda^{(i_1)}|\}$ .

Define  $A_{\lambda} = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_p\}$  as in Definition 2.3. By assumption, we have  $\lambda' = ((\lambda^{(r)})', \dots, (\lambda^{(1)})') \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  with  $(\lambda^{(i_p)})', (\lambda^{(i_{p-1})})', \dots, (\lambda^{(i_1)})'$  being all the nonempty components of  $[\lambda']$ . Suppose that  $A_{\lambda'} = \{I'_p, \dots, I'_1\}$ , where  $I'_p = \{1, 2, \dots, |\lambda^{(i_p)}|\}, \dots$ , and  $I'_1 = \{n - |\lambda^{(i_1)}| + 1, \dots, n\}$ . By definition 2.4, we have

$$u'_{\lambda'} E_{A_{\lambda'}} = \prod_{l \neq r+1-(r+1-i_p)} (t_{|\lambda^{(i_p)}|} - \zeta_l) \cdots \prod_{l \neq r+1-(r+1-i_1)} (t_n - \zeta_l) \cdot E_{I'_p} E_{I'_{p-1}} \cdots E_{I'_1}. \quad (5.15)$$

By (5.15), Lemma 2.1, together with the fact that  $g_w t_k = t_{(k)w^{-1}} g_w$ , we get that

$$g_{w_{\lambda}} u'_{\lambda'} E_{A_{\lambda'}} = u_{\lambda} E_{A_{\lambda}} g_{w_{\lambda}}. \quad (5.16)$$

By (5.12) and (5.16), we have

$$\langle m_{st}, n_{s't'} \rangle = \tau(E_{A_{\lambda}} u_{\lambda} U_{\lambda} g_{w_{\lambda}} y_{\lambda'} g_{w_{\lambda'}} x_{\lambda}). \quad (5.17)$$

By [ER, Lemma 10(49)], we have

$$t_i U_{\lambda} = \zeta_{i_k} U_{\lambda} \text{ if } i \in I_k \text{ for some } 1 \leq k \leq p. \quad (5.18)$$

Recall that  $S = \{\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \dots, \zeta_r\}$ . We also have, for any fixed  $r$ -th root of unity  $\xi$ ,

$$\prod_{\xi \neq \alpha \in S} (\xi - \alpha) = r \xi^{-1}. \quad (5.19)$$

By (5.18) and (5.19), we get that

$$u_{\lambda} U_{\lambda} = r^p (\zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_p})^{-1} U_{\lambda}. \quad (5.20)$$

Combining (5.17) and (5.20), we get that

$$\langle m_{st}, n_{s't'} \rangle = r^p (\zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_p})^{-1} \tau(E_{A_{\lambda}} u_{\lambda} g_{w_{\lambda}} y_{\lambda'} g_{w_{\lambda'}} x_{\lambda}). \quad (5.21)$$

By (5.10) and  $\zeta_1 \cdots \zeta_r = (-1)^{r-1}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(E_{A_{\lambda}} u_{\lambda}) &= \prod_{k=1}^p \frac{1}{r^{\binom{|\lambda^{(i_k)}|}{2}}} \cdot \prod_{k=1}^p \left( \prod_{l \neq i_k} (-1)^{r-1} \zeta_l \right) \\ &= (\zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_p})^{-1} \frac{1}{r^{\sum_{k=1}^p \binom{c_k}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.22)$$

By (5.21) and (5.22), we have

$$\langle m_{st}, n_{s't'} \rangle = \frac{r^p (\zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_p})^{-2}}{r^{\sum_{k=1}^p \binom{c_k}{2}}} \tau(g_{w_{\lambda}} y_{\lambda'} g_{w_{\lambda'}} x_{\lambda}). \quad (5.23)$$

Since  $\mathfrak{S}_\lambda \cap w_\lambda \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda'} = \{1\}$  and  $w_\lambda = w_{\lambda'}^{-1}$  is a distinguished  $(\mathfrak{S}_\lambda, \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda'})$ -double coset representative, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{w_\lambda} y_{\lambda'} g_{w_{\lambda'}} x_\lambda &= \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda'} \\ v \in \mathfrak{S}_\lambda}} g_{w_\lambda} \cdot (-q)^{-l(u)} g_u \cdot g_{w_\lambda^{-1}} \cdot q^{l(v)} g_v \\ &= \sum_{\substack{u \in \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda'} \\ v \in \mathfrak{S}_\lambda}} (-1)^{l(u)} q^{l(v)-l(u)} g_{w_\lambda} g_{uv} w_\lambda^{-1} v. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get  $\tau(g_{w_\lambda} y_{\lambda'} g_{w_{\lambda'}} x_\lambda) = 1$ . Therefore, by (5.23), we have

$$\langle m_{\text{st}}, n_{\text{st}'} \rangle = \frac{r^p (\zeta_{i_1} \cdots \zeta_{i_p})^{-2}}{r^{\sum_{k=1}^p \binom{c_k}{2}}}.$$

We have proved the theorem.  $\square$

**Remark 5.19.** Theorem 5.18 implies that  $\tau$  is non-degenerate. Consequently,  $Y_{r,n}$  is a symmetric algebra.

The next corollary can be proved in exactly the same way as in [Ma2, Corollary 5.7] using Theorem 5.18, which justify the term dual Specht module.

**Corollary 5.20.** *Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then  $S^{\lambda'} \cong S_\lambda^{\otimes}$ .*

If  $S = (S^{(1)}, \dots, S^{(r)})$  is a  $\lambda$ -tableau of type  $\mu$ , we define the conjugate of  $S$  by  $S' = ((S^{(r)})', \dots, (S^{(1)})')$  which is a  $\lambda'$ -tableau of type  $\mu$ , where  $(S^{(j)})'$  is the tableau obtained by interchanging the rows and columns of  $S^{(j)}$  for each  $j$ . A  $\lambda$ -tableau  $S$  is called column semistandard if  $S'$  is semistandard. For  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , let  $\mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu) = \{S \mid S' \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda', \mu)\}$ .

The proof of the next lemma is in exactly the same way as that of [Ma2, Lemma 5.8] by making use of Lemma 5.17. We skip the details.

**Lemma 5.21.** *Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and that  $m_\mu n_{\text{uv}} \neq 0$  or  $n_\mu m_{\text{uv}} \neq 0$  for some standard  $\lambda$ -tableaux  $\mathbf{u}$  and  $\mathbf{v}$ . Then  $\mu(\mathbf{u})$  is column semistandard and  $\alpha(\lambda') = \alpha(\mu)$ ; that is,  $\mu(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu)$ .*

**Remark 5.22.** As mentioned in [HM1, p. 15], it is unfortunate that Mathas confused the two partial orders  $\triangleright$  and  $\blacktriangleright$  on  $\text{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_{r,n})$  in [Ma2] and [Ma3]. Anyhow, we can adapt the approach in [Ma3, Section 3] to get Proposition 5.14 and then Lemmas 5.17 and 5.21. We leave the details to the reader; see also [HM1, Section 2] for details.

If  $S \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu)$ , let  $\dot{S}$  be the unique standard  $\lambda$ -tableau such that  $\mu(\dot{S}) = S$  and  $d(\dot{S})$  is a distinguished  $(\mathfrak{S}_\lambda, \mathfrak{S}_\mu)$ -double coset representative; that is,  $d(\dot{S})$  is the unique element of minimal length in its double coset.

**Proposition 5.23.** *Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $M^\mu$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis  $\{m_\mu n_{\dot{S}\mathbf{t}} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu) \text{ and } \mathbf{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  and  $N^\mu$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis  $\{n_\mu m_{\dot{S}\mathbf{t}} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu) \text{ and } \mathbf{t} \in \text{Std}(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$ .*

*Proof.* We only prove the claim for  $M^\mu$ . Recall that  $\{n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}\}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $Y_{r,n}$ , so  $M^\mu$  is spanned by the elements  $m_\mu n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}$ , where  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \in \text{Std}^2(\mathcal{P}_{r,n})$ . Furthermore, if  $m_\mu n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}} \neq 0$  then  $\mu(\mathfrak{s})$  is column semistandard and  $\alpha(\lambda') = \alpha(\mu)$  if  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \in \text{Std}^2(\lambda)$  by Lemma 5.21. Hence,  $M^\mu$  is spanned by the elements  $m_\mu n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}$ , where  $\mu(\mathfrak{s})$  is column semistandard and  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \in \text{Std}^2(\lambda)$  for various  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  with  $\alpha(\lambda') = \alpha(\mu)$ .

For each such element  $m_\mu n_{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{t}}$ , where  $(\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}) \in \text{Std}^2(\nu)$  with  $\alpha(\nu') = \alpha(\mu)$ . Since  $\mu(\mathfrak{s}) = S$  is column semistandard, we choose  $\dot{S} \in \text{Std}(\nu)$  as above and get that  $\mu(\mathfrak{t}^\nu d(\mathfrak{s})) = \mu(\mathfrak{t}^\nu d(\dot{S}))$ . Thus,  $d(\mathfrak{s})$  and  $d(\dot{S})$  lie in the same  $(\mathfrak{S}_\nu, \mathfrak{S}_\mu)$ -double coset. By definition  $d(\dot{S})$  is the unique element of minimal length in its double coset, therefore we get  $m_\mu g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* n_\nu = \pm q^a m_\mu g_{d(\dot{S})}^* n_\nu$  for some integer  $a$ . Because  $M^\mu$  is  $\mathcal{R}$ -free and the number of elements in our spanning set is exactly the rank of  $M^\mu$ , thus we have proved the first claim. The second statement can be proved in a similar way.  $\square$

Combining Lemma 5.21 and Proposition 5.23, we get the next result.

**Corollary 5.24.** *Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and that  $\mathfrak{u}$  and  $\mathfrak{v}$  are two standard  $\lambda$ -tableaux. Then  $m_\mu n_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}} \neq 0$  if and only if  $\mu(\mathfrak{u})$  is column semistandard and  $\alpha(\lambda') = \alpha(\mu)$ . Similarly,  $n_\mu m_{\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{v}} \neq 0$  if and only if  $\mu(\mathfrak{u})$  is column semistandard and  $\alpha(\lambda') = \alpha(\mu)$ .*

Using Proposition 5.23 we can get the following result by repeating the argument of Lemma 5.2.

**Corollary 5.25.** *Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then there exist filtrations*

$$M^\mu = H^1 \supset H^2 \supset \dots \supset H^k \supset H^{k+1} = 0 \text{ and } N^\mu = H_1 \supset H_2 \supset \dots \supset H_k \supset H_{k+1} = 0$$

of  $M^\mu$  and  $N^\mu$ , respectively, and  $r$ -partitions  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$  such that  $\mu' \triangleright \lambda_i$ ,  $H^i/H^{i+1} \cong S_{\lambda_i}$  and  $H_i/H_{i+1} \cong S^{\lambda_i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Moreover, for any  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  we have  $\#\{1 \leq i \leq k \mid \lambda_i = \lambda\} = \#\mathcal{J}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu)$ .

Now we can define a bilinear form  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\mu$  on  $M^\mu$  by

$$\langle m_{\text{St}}, m_\mu n_{\dot{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{v}} \rangle_\mu = \langle m_{\text{St}}, n_{\dot{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{v}} \rangle,$$

where  $m_{\text{St}}$  and  $m_\mu n_{\dot{\mathfrak{U}}\mathfrak{v}}$  run over the bases of Propositions 3.3 and 5.23, respectively.

The next proposition can be proved in exactly the same way as in [Ma2, Proposition 5.13]. We omit the details and leave them to the reader.

**Proposition 5.26.** *Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_\mu$  is a non-degenerate associative bilinear form on  $M^\mu$ . In particular,  $M^\mu$  is self-dual. Similarly,  $N^\mu$  is self-dual.*

By induction and using Propositions 5.6 and 5.10 we can get the next result.

**Corollary 5.27.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then the Young module  $Y^\lambda$  and twisted Young module  $Y_\lambda$  are both self-dual.*

**5.4. Tilting modules.** Recall that a  $\text{YS}_n^r$ -module  $T$  is a tilting module if it has both a filtration by Weyl modules  $W^\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ) and a filtration by dual Weyl modules. Since  $\text{YS}_n^r$  is quasi-hereditary, by [Ri], for each  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  there exists a unique indecomposable tilting module  $T^\lambda$  such that  $[T^\lambda : W^\lambda] = 1$  and  $[T^\lambda : W^\mu] \neq 0$  only if  $\lambda \triangleright \mu$ . Moreover, any tilting module  $T$  can be written as a direct sum of these  $T^\lambda$ 's. The  $T^\lambda$  are the partial

tilting modules of  $YS_n^r$ . A full tilting module for  $YS_n^r$  is any tilting module which contain every  $T^\lambda$  ( $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ ) as a direct summand.

For each  $\nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ , let  $\theta_\nu \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(Y_{r,n}, N^\nu)$  be the map, which is defined by  $\theta_\nu(h) = n_\nu h$  for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ . We define

$$E^\nu := \dot{F}_n^\omega(\theta_\nu \dot{Y}S_n^r).$$

Since  $E^\nu$ , by definition, is the set of maps from  $M_n^r$  to  $N^\nu$  which factor through  $\theta_\nu$ , we get that  $E^\nu$  is a right  $YS_n^r$ -module.

**Definition 5.28.** Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . For  $S \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \nu)$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  let  $\theta_{ST}$  be the homomorphism in  $E^\nu$  determined by  $\theta_{ST}(m_\alpha h) = \delta_{\alpha\mu} n_\nu m_{\dot{S}T} h$  for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$  and all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ .

**Proposition 5.29.** *Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $E^\nu$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis*

$$\{\theta_{ST} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \nu) \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\dot{E}^\nu = \theta_\nu \dot{Y}S_n^r$ . Then  $\dot{E}^\nu$  is a right  $YS_n^r$ -module and  $E^\nu = \dot{F}_n^\omega(\dot{E}^\nu)$ . By Proposition 4.1,  $\dot{E}^\nu$  is spanned by the maps  $\theta_\nu \varphi_{ST}$ , where  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \sigma)$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  for various  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\sigma, \mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . By definition,  $\theta_\nu \varphi_{ST} = 0$  unless  $\sigma = \omega$ , that is,  $S$  is a standard  $\lambda$ -tableau; so  $\dot{E}^\nu$  is spanned by the elements  $\theta_\nu \varphi_{\mathfrak{s}T}$  with  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\lambda)$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  for  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Furthermore,  $\theta_\nu \varphi_{\mathfrak{s}T}(m_\mu h) = n_\nu m_{\mathfrak{s}T} h$  for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$ . Thus,  $\theta_\nu \varphi_{\mathfrak{s}T} \neq 0$  if and only if  $\nu(\mathfrak{s})$  is column semistandard and  $\alpha(\lambda') = \alpha(\nu)$  by Corollary 5.24, and in this case  $\theta_\nu \varphi_{\mathfrak{s}T} = \pm q^a \theta_{ST}$  for some  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $S = \nu(\mathfrak{s})$ . Hence these elements  $\{\theta_{ST} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \nu) \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  span  $\dot{E}^\nu$ .

On the other hand, the elements  $\{\theta_{ST}\}$  are linearly independent by Proposition 5.23, so they are a basis of  $\dot{E}^\nu$ . Since the functor  $\dot{F}_n^\omega$  removes the  $\omega$ -weight space of  $\dot{E}^\nu$ , therefore  $\dot{F}_n^\omega$  maps the basis  $\{\theta_{ST}\}$  of  $\dot{E}^\nu$  to the elements stated in the proposition, or to zero if  $\mu = \omega$ . Hence,  $\{\theta_{ST} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \nu) \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $E^\nu$ .  $\square$

The next proposition can be proved in exactly the same way as in [Ma2, Theorem 6.5] by using Proposition 5.29. We skip the details.

**Proposition 5.30.** *Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $E^\nu$  admits a  $YS_n^r$ -module filtration  $E^\nu = E_1 \supset E_2 \supset \cdots \supset E_k \supset E_{k+1} = 0$  such that  $E_i/E_{i+1} \cong W^{\lambda_i}$  for some  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\nu' \triangleright \lambda_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Moreover, if  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ , then  $\#\{1 \leq i \leq k \mid \lambda_i = \lambda\} = \#\mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \nu)$ .*

From Proposition 5.30 we can easily get the next corollary.

**Corollary 5.31.** *Suppose that  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then  $[E^\lambda : W^{\lambda'}] = 1$  and  $[E^\lambda : W^\mu] \neq 0$  only if  $\lambda' \triangleright \mu$ .*

**Definition 5.32.** Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$  and  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . For  $A \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$  and  $B \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu)$  let  $\theta'_{AB}$  be the homomorphism determined by  $\theta'_{AB}(m_\alpha h) = \delta_{\alpha\mu} n_{AB} m_\mu h$  for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}$  and all  $\alpha \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ .

**Proposition 5.33.** *Let  $\nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $E^\nu$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis*

$$\{\theta'_{AB} \mid A \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu) \text{ and } B \in \mathcal{T}^{\text{cs}}(\lambda, \mu) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n} \text{ and } \mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}\}.$$

*Proof.* We first show that  $\theta'_{AB} \in E^\nu$ . By Corollary 5.8,  $n_{A\dot{B}} = n_\nu x$  for some  $x \in Y_{r,n}$ . Therefore, we have

$$\theta'_{AB}(m_\mu h) = n_{A\dot{B}} m_\mu h = n_\nu x m_\mu h = \theta_\nu(x m_\mu h).$$

That is,  $\theta'_{AB}$  factors through  $\theta_\nu$  so that  $\theta'_{AB} \in E^\nu$  as claimed. Moreover, the elements stated in the proposition are linearly independent by applying  $*$  to Proposition 5.23. Therefore, the elements  $\{\theta'_{AB}\}$  give a basis of  $E^\nu$  by counting dimensions using Proposition 5.29.  $\square$

The contragredient dual  $E^\circledast$  of a  $YS_n^r$ -module  $E$  can be defined in exactly the same way as that of  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules. Again, we say that  $E$  is self-dual if  $E \cong E^\circledast$ .

Using the two bases  $\{\theta_{ST}\}$  and  $\{\theta'_{AB}\}$  in Propositions 5.29 and 5.33, we now define a bilinear form  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\nu$  on  $E^\nu$  by

$$\{\theta_{ST}, \theta'_{AB}\}_\nu = \begin{cases} \langle m_{ST}, n_{A\dot{B}} \rangle & \text{if Type(T) = Type(B);} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The next theorem can be proved in exactly the same way as in [Ma2, Theorem 6.17]. We skip the details.

**Theorem 5.34.** *Suppose that  $\nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_\nu$  defines a non-degenerate associative bilinear form on  $E^\nu$ ; that is,  $E^\nu$  is self-dual.*

Using Corollary 5.31 and Theorem 5.34 we can easily get the next result.

**Corollary 5.35.** *Let  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then we have*

(i)  $E^\lambda$  is a tilting module. Moreover,  $E^\lambda \cong T^{\lambda'} \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda' \triangleright \mu} e_{\lambda\mu} T^\mu$  for some non-negative integers  $e_{\lambda\mu}$ .

(ii)  $T^\lambda$  is self-dual. Moreover, the tilting modules of  $YS_n^r$  are the indecomposable direct summands of the modules  $\{E^\lambda \mid \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}$ .

Recall that the Schur functor  $F_n^r : YS_n^r\text{-mod} \rightarrow Y_{r,n}\text{-mod}$  defined in Proposition 4.3.

**Lemma 5.36.** *Suppose that  $\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $F_n^r(E^\mu) \cong N^\mu$  as  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.3 we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_n^r(E^\mu) &= F_n^r(\dot{F}_n^\omega(\theta_\mu YS_n^r)) = \dot{F}_n^r(\theta_\mu YS_n^r) \\ &= \theta_\mu YS_n^r \varphi_\omega \cong \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(Y_{r,n}, N^\mu) \\ &\cong N^\mu \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

Let  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Recall that for each  $S \in \mathcal{J}_0^+(\lambda, \mu)$  and  $T \in \mathcal{J}_0^+(\lambda, \nu)$  there is a  $Y_{r,n}$ -module homomorphism  $\varphi'_{ST} : N^\nu \rightarrow N^\mu$ ; this induces a  $YS_n^r$ -module homomorphism  $\Phi'_{ST} : E^\nu \rightarrow E^\mu$  defined by  $\Phi'_{ST}(\theta) = \varphi'_{ST}\theta$  for  $\theta \in E^\nu$ . The next proposition, which can be proved in exactly the same way as in [Ma2, Proposition 7.1], shows that these maps  $\{\Phi'_{ST}\}$  give a basis of all the  $YS_n^r$ -module homomorphisms from  $E^\nu$  to  $E^\mu$ .

**Proposition 5.37.** *Suppose that  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}$ . Then  $\text{Hom}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(E^\nu, E^\mu)$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with basis*

$$\{\Phi'_{\text{ST}} \mid \text{S} \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \mu) \text{ and } \text{T} \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\lambda, \nu) \text{ for some } \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}\}.$$

By definition  $E_n^r = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}} E^\mu$  is a full tilting module for  $\text{YS}_n^r$ . Define the Ringel dual of  $\text{YS}_n^r$  to be the algebra  $\text{End}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(E_n^r)$ . If  $A$  is an algebra, let  $A^{\text{op}}$  be the opposite algebra in which the order of multiplication is reserved. The following corollary gives a description of the Ringel dual of  $\text{YS}_n^r$ .

**Corollary 5.38.** *There exist canonical isomorphisms of  $\mathcal{R}$ -algebras*

$$\text{End}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(E_n^r) \cong (\text{YS}_n^r)^{\text{op}}.$$

**Corollary 5.39.** *Suppose that  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then  $F_n^r(T^{\lambda'}) \cong Y_\lambda$  as  $Y_{r,n}$ -modules.*

*Proof.* By Lemma 5.36 the natural map  $\text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}}(N^\nu, N^\mu) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{YS}_n^r}(E^\nu, E^\mu)$  is injective; by Proposition 5.9(i) and Proposition 5.37 this is an isomorphism. Consequently, if an indecomposable tilting module  $T^\nu$  is a direct summand of  $E^\lambda$  then  $F_n^r(T^\nu)$  is an indecomposable direct summand of  $N^\lambda$ . Now,  $E^\lambda \cong T^{\lambda'} \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda' \triangleright \mu} e_{\lambda\mu} T^\mu$  by Corollary 5.35(i) and  $F_n^r(E^\lambda) \cong N^\lambda \cong Y_\lambda \oplus \bigoplus_{\nu \triangleright \lambda} c_{\nu\lambda} Y_\nu$  by Proposition 5.10(iii). Hence, the result follows by induction on the dominance order.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.40.** *Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}$ . Then  $[T^\lambda : (W^\mu)^\otimes] = [W^{\mu'} : L^{\lambda'}]$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that  $F_n^r(W^\mu) \cong S^\mu$  by Proposition 4.3. By definition, it is easy to see that the functor  $F_n^r$  commutes with duality. Then we have  $F_n^r((W^\mu)^\otimes) \cong (F_n^r(W^\mu))^\otimes \cong S_{\mu'}$  by Corollary 5.20. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} [T^\lambda : (W^\mu)^\otimes] &= [F_n^r(T^\lambda) : F_n^r((W^\mu)^\otimes)] = [Y_{\lambda'} : S_{\mu'}] \\ &= [W_{\mu'} : L_{\lambda'}] = [W^{\mu'} : L^{\lambda'}], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition 5.9(iii).  $\square$

## 6. APPENDIX. CYCLOTOMIC YOKONUMA-SCHUR ALGEBRAS

In this appendix, we will generalize the results above to define and study the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Schur algebra by using the cellular basis of the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}^d$  constructed in [C1]. Since this approach is very similar, we only mention the main results and skip all the details of the proofs.

We first recall the definition of  $Y_{r,n}^d$  and the construction of a cellular basis of it.

By definition, The affine Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $\widehat{Y}_{r,n} = \widehat{Y}_{r,n}(q)$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -associative algebra generated by the elements  $t_1, \dots, t_n, g_1, \dots, g_{n-1}, X_1^{\pm 1}$ , in which the generators  $t_1, \dots, t_n, g_1, \dots, g_{n-1}$  satisfy the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} g_i g_j &= g_j g_i && \text{for all } i, j = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ such that } |i-j| \geq 2; \\ g_i g_{i+1} g_i &= g_{i+1} g_i g_{i+1} && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-2; \\ t_i t_j &= t_j t_i && \text{for all } i, j = 1, \dots, n; \\ g_i t_j &= t_{js_i} g_i && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ and } j = 1, \dots, n; \\ t_i^r &= 1 && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n; \\ g_i^2 &= 1 + (q - q^{-1}) e_i g_i && \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, n-1, \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$



where  $s_i$  is the transposition  $(i, i + 1)$ , and for each  $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ ,

$$e_i := \frac{1}{r} \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} t_i^s t_{i+1}^{-s},$$

together with the following relations concerning the generators  $X_1^{\pm 1}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 X_1^{-1} &= X_1^{-1} X_1 = 1; \\ g_1 X_1 g_1 X_1 &= X_1 g_1 X_1 g_1; \\ g_i X_1 &= X_1 g_i && \text{for all } i = 2, \dots, n-1; \\ t_j X_1 &= X_1 t_j && \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

We define inductively the following elements in  $\widehat{Y}_{r,n}$ :

$$X_{i+1} := g_i X_i g_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n-1. \quad (6.3)$$

Let  $d \geq 1$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_d$  be some invertible indeterminates. Set  $f_1 := (X_1 - v_1) \cdots (X_1 - v_d)$ . Let  $\mathcal{J}_d$  denote the two-sided ideal of  $\widehat{Y}_{r,n}$  generated by  $f_1$ , and define the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}^d = Y_{r,n}^d(q)$  to be the quotient

$$Y_{r,n}^d = \widehat{Y}_{r,n} / \mathcal{J}_d.$$

It has been proved in [C1] (see also [ChPA2, Theorem 4.15]) that the set of the following elements

$$\{t_1^{\beta_1} \cdots t_n^{\beta_n} X_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots X_n^{\alpha_n} g_w \mid 0 \leq \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \leq d-1, 0 \leq \beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \leq r-1, w \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$$

forms an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $Y_{r,n}^d$ .

Let  $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ . Following [ChPA2, Section 3.1], the combinatorial objects appearing in the representation theory of the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebra  $Y_{r,n}^d$  will be  $m$ -compositions (resp.  $m$ -partitions) with  $m = rd$ , which can also be identified with  $r$ -tuples of  $d$ -compositions (resp.  $d$ -partitions). We will call such an object an  $(r, d)$ -composition (resp.  $(r, d)$ -partition). By definition, an  $(r, d)$ -composition (resp.  $(r, d)$ -partition) of  $n$  is an ordered  $r$ -tuple  $\underline{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(r)}) = ((\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(r)}))$  of  $d$ -compositions (resp.  $d$ -partitions)  $(\lambda_1^{(k)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(k)})$  ( $1 \leq k \leq r$ ) such that  $\sum_{k=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^d |\lambda_j^{(k)}| = n$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$ ) the set of  $(r, d)$ -compositions (resp.  $(r, d)$ -partitions) of  $n$ . We will say that the  $l$ -th composition (resp. partition) of the  $k$ -th  $r$ -tuple has position  $(k, l)$ .

A triplet  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta, k, l)$  consisting of a node  $\theta$ , an integer  $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ , and an integer  $l \in \{1, \dots, d\}$  is called an  $(r, d)$ -node. We shall say that the  $(r, d)$ -node  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  has position  $(k, l)$ . We shall denote by  $[\underline{\lambda}]$  the set of  $(r, d)$ -nodes such that the subset consisting of the  $(r, d)$ -nodes having position  $(k, l)$  forms a usual composition (resp. partition)  $\lambda_l^{(k)}$ , for any  $k \in \{1, \dots, r\}$  and  $l \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ .

Let  $\underline{\lambda} = ((\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(r)}))$  be an  $(r, d)$ -composition of  $n$ . An  $(r, d)$ -tableau  $\mathbf{t} = ((\mathbf{t}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{t}_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\mathbf{t}_1^{(r)}, \dots, \mathbf{t}_d^{(r)}))$  of shape  $\underline{\lambda}$  is obtained by placing each  $(r, d)$ -node of  $[\underline{\lambda}]$  by one of the integers  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , allowing no repeats. We will call the number  $n$  the size of  $\mathbf{t}$  and the  $\mathbf{t}_l^{(k)}$ 's the components of  $\mathbf{t}$ . Each  $(r, d)$ -node  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  of  $\mathbf{t}$  is labelled by  $((a, b), k, l)$  if it lies in row  $a$  and column  $b$  of the component  $\mathbf{t}_l^{(k)}$  of  $\mathbf{t}$ .

For each  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , an  $(r, d)$ -tableau of shape  $\underline{\mu}$  is called row standard if the numbers increase along any row (from left to right) of each diagram in  $[\underline{\mu}]$ . For each  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$ , an  $(r, d)$ -tableau of shape  $\underline{\lambda}$  is called standard if the numbers increase along any row (from left to right) and down any column (from top to bottom) of each diagram in  $[\underline{\lambda}]$ . From now on, we denote by  $\text{Std}(\underline{\lambda})$  the set of all standard  $(r, d)$ -tableaux of size  $n$  and of shape  $\underline{\lambda}$ , which is endowed with an action of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  from the right by permuting the entries in each  $(r, d)$ -tableau.

For each  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{t}^{\underline{\lambda}}$  the standard  $(r, d)$ -tableau of shape  $\underline{\lambda}$  in which  $1, 2, \dots, n$  appear in increasing order from left to right along the rows of the first diagram, and then along the rows of the second diagram, and so on.

For each  $\underline{\lambda} = ((\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(r)})) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , we have a Young subgroup

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\underline{\lambda}} := \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_1^{(1)}} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_d^{(1)}} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_1^{(r)}} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_d^{(r)}},$$

which is exactly the row stabilizer of  $\mathfrak{t}^{\underline{\lambda}}$ .

For each  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$  and a row standard  $(r, d)$ -tableau  $\mathfrak{s}$  of shape  $\underline{\lambda}$ , let  $d(\mathfrak{s})$  be the element of  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  such that  $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{t}^{\underline{\lambda}} d(\mathfrak{s})$ . Then  $d(\mathfrak{s})$  is a distinguished right coset representative of  $\mathfrak{S}_{\underline{\lambda}}$  in  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ , that is,  $l(wd(\mathfrak{s})) = l(w) + l(d(\mathfrak{s}))$  for any  $w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\underline{\lambda}}$ . In this way, we obtain a correspondence between the set of row standard  $(r, d)$ -tableaux of shape  $\underline{\lambda}$  and the set of distinguished right coset representatives of  $\mathfrak{S}_{\underline{\lambda}}$  in  $\mathfrak{S}_n$ .

We now define a partial order on the set of  $(r, d)$ -compositions.

**Definition 6.1.** Let  $\underline{\lambda} = ((\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(r)}))$  and  $\underline{\mu} = ((\mu_1^{(1)}, \dots, \mu_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\mu_1^{(r)}, \dots, \mu_d^{(r)}))$  be two  $(r, d)$ -compositions of  $n$ . We say that  $\underline{\lambda}$  dominates  $\underline{\mu}$ , and we write  $\underline{\lambda} \triangleright \underline{\mu}$  if and only if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^d |\lambda_j^{(i)}| + \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} |\lambda_j^{(k)}| + \sum_{i=1}^p \lambda_{l,i}^{(k)} \geq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \sum_{j=1}^d |\mu_j^{(i)}| + \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} |\mu_j^{(k)}| + \sum_{i=1}^p \mu_{l,i}^{(k)}$$

for all  $k, l$  and  $p$  with  $1 \leq k \leq r$ ,  $1 \leq l \leq d$  and  $p \geq 0$ . If  $\underline{\lambda} \triangleright \underline{\mu}$  and  $\underline{\lambda} \neq \underline{\mu}$ , we write  $\underline{\lambda} \triangleright \underline{\mu}$ .

**Definition 6.2.** Let  $\underline{\lambda} = ((\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(r)})) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ . Suppose that we choose all  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p \leq r$  such that  $(\lambda_1^{(i_1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(i_1)}), (\lambda_1^{(i_2)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(i_2)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(i_p)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(i_p)})$  are nonempty. Define  $a_k := \sum_{j=1}^k |\lambda^{(i_j)}|$  for  $1 \leq k \leq p$ , where  $|\lambda^{(i_j)}| = \sum_{l=1}^d |\lambda_l^{(i_j)}|$ . Then the set partition  $A_{\underline{\lambda}}$  associated with  $\underline{\lambda}$  is defined as

$$A_{\underline{\lambda}} := \{\{1, \dots, a_1\}, \{a_1 + 1, \dots, a_2\}, \dots, \{a_{p-1} + 1, \dots, n\}\},$$

which may be written as  $A_{\underline{\lambda}} = \{I_1, I_2, \dots, I_p\}$ , and is referred to the blocks of  $A_{\underline{\lambda}}$  in the order given above.

**Definition 6.3.** Let  $\underline{\lambda} = ((\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(r)})) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , and let  $a_k := \sum_{j=1}^k |\lambda^{(i_j)}|$  ( $1 \leq k \leq p$ ) be defined as above. Then we define

$$u_{\underline{\lambda}} := u_{a_1, i_1} u_{a_2, i_2} \cdots u_{a_p, i_p}.$$

**Definition 6.4.** Let  $\underline{\lambda} = ((\lambda_1^{(1)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(1)}), \dots, (\lambda_1^{(r)}, \dots, \lambda_d^{(r)})) \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ . Associated with  $\underline{\lambda}$  we can define the following elements  $a_i^k$  and  $b_k$ :

$$a_i^k := \sum_{m=1}^{l-1} |\lambda_m^{(k)}|, \quad b_k := \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \sum_{i=1}^d |\lambda_i^{(j)}| \quad \text{for } 1 \leq k \leq r \text{ and } 1 \leq l \leq d.$$

Associated with these elements we can define an element  $u_{\mathbf{a}}^+ := u_{\mathbf{a},1} u_{\mathbf{a},2} \cdots u_{\mathbf{a},r}$ , where

$$u_{\mathbf{a},k} := \prod_{l=1}^d \prod_{j=1}^{a_l^k} (X_{b_k+j} - v_l).$$

We can now define the key ingredient of the cellular basis for  $Y_{r,n}^d$ .

**Definition 6.5.** Let  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$  and define  $u_{\mathbf{a}}^+$  as above. Let  $x_{\underline{\lambda}} = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\underline{\lambda}}} q^{l(w)} g_w$ . Then we define the element  $m_{\underline{\lambda}}$  of  $Y_{r,n}^d$  as follows:

$$m_{\underline{\lambda}} := U_{\underline{\lambda}} u_{\mathbf{a}}^+ x_{\underline{\lambda}} = u_{\underline{\lambda}} E_{A_{\underline{\lambda}}} u_{\mathbf{a}}^+ x_{\underline{\lambda}}. \quad (6.4)$$

Let  $*$  denote the  $\mathcal{R}$ -linear anti-automorphism of  $Y_{r,n}^d$ , which is determined by

$$g_i^* = g_i, \quad t_j^* = t_j, \quad X_j^* = X_j \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n-1 \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq n.$$

**Definition 6.6.** Let  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , and let  $\mathfrak{s}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}$  be two row standard  $(r, d)$ -tableaux of shape  $\underline{\lambda}$ . We then define  $m_{\mathfrak{st}} = g_{d(\mathfrak{s})}^* m_{\underline{\lambda}} g_{d(\mathfrak{t})}$ .

For each  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$ , let  $Y_{r,n}^{d, \triangleright \underline{\lambda}}$  be the  $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of  $Y_{r,n}^d$  spanned by  $m_{\mathfrak{uv}}$  with  $\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{v} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\mu})$  for various  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$  such that  $\underline{\mu} \triangleright \underline{\lambda}$ .

**Theorem 6.7.** (See [C1, Theorem 6.18].) *The algebra  $Y_{r,n}^d$  is a free  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with a cellular basis*

$$\mathcal{B}_{r,n}^d = \{m_{\mathfrak{st}} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\lambda}) \text{ for some } (r, d)\text{-partition } \underline{\lambda} \text{ of } n\},$$

that is, the following properties hold:

(i) The  $\mathcal{R}$ -linear map determined by  $m_{\mathfrak{st}} \mapsto m_{\mathfrak{ts}}$  ( $m_{\mathfrak{st}} \in \mathcal{B}_{r,n}^d$ ) is an anti-automorphism on  $Y_{r,n}^d$ .

(ii) For a given  $h \in Y_{r,n}^d$ ,  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\mu})$ , there exist  $r_{\mathfrak{vt}}(h) \in \mathcal{R}$  such that for all  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\mu})$ , we have

$$m_{\mathfrak{st}} h \equiv \sum_{\mathfrak{v} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\mu})} r_{\mathfrak{vt}}(h) m_{\mathfrak{sv}} \pmod{Y_{r,n}^{d, \triangleright \underline{\mu}}},$$

where  $r_{\mathfrak{vt}}(h)$  may depend on  $\mathfrak{v}, \mathfrak{t}$  and  $h$ , but not on  $\mathfrak{s}$ .

For  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , a  $\underline{\lambda}$ -tableau  $S = ((S_1^{(1)}, \dots, S_d^{(1)}), \dots, (S_1^{(r)}, \dots, S_d^{(r)}))$  is a map  $S : [\underline{\lambda}] \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, d\} \times \{1, \dots, r\}$ , which can be regarded as the diagram  $[\underline{\lambda}]$ , together with an ordered triple  $(i, j, k)$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq d$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq r$ ) attached to each node. Given  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$  and  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , a  $\underline{\lambda}$ -tableau  $S$  is said to be of type  $\underline{\mu}$  if the number of  $(i, j, k)$  in the entry of  $S$  is equal to  $\mu_{j,i}^{(k)}$ . Given  $\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\lambda})$ ,  $\underline{\mu}(\mathfrak{s})$ , a  $\underline{\lambda}$ -tableau of type  $\underline{\mu}$ ,

is defined by replacing each entry  $m$  in  $\mathfrak{s}$  by  $(i, j, k)$  if  $m$  is in the  $i$ -th row of the  $(k, j)$ -th component of  $\mathfrak{t}^\underline{\mu}$ .

We define a total order on the set of triples  $(i, j, k)$  by  $(i_1, j_1, k_1) < (i_2, j_2, k_2)$  if  $k_1 < k_2$ , or  $k_1 = k_2$  and  $j_1 < j_2$ , or  $k_1 = k_2$ ,  $j_1 = j_2$ , and  $i_1 < i_2$ . Let  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$  and  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ . Suppose that  $S = ((S_1^{(1)}, \dots, S_d^{(1)}), \dots, (S_1^{(r)}, \dots, S_d^{(r)}))$  is a  $\underline{\lambda}$ -tableau of type  $\underline{\mu}$ .  $S$  is said to be semistandard if each component  $S_j^{(k)}$  is non-decreasing in rows, strictly increasing in columns, and all entries of  $S_j^{(k)}$  are of the form  $(i, h, l)$  with  $h \geq j$  and  $l \geq k$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{T}_0(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$  the set of semistandard  $\underline{\lambda}$ -tableaux of type  $\underline{\mu}$ .

For any  $\underline{\kappa} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , we define its type  $\alpha(\underline{\kappa})$  by  $\alpha(\underline{\kappa}) = (n_1, \dots, n_r)$  with  $n_i = |\kappa^{(i)}|$ . Assume that  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$  and  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ . We define a subset  $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$  of  $\mathcal{T}_0(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$  by

$$\mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu}) = \{S \in \mathcal{T}_0(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu}) \mid \alpha(\underline{\lambda}) = \alpha(\underline{\mu})\}.$$

For each  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ , let  $M^\underline{\mu} = m_\underline{\mu} Y_{r,n}^d$ . We now construct a basis of  $M^\underline{\mu}$  related to the cellular basis  $\{m_{\mathfrak{st}}\}$  in Theorem 6.7. For  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\lambda})$ , we define

$$m_{\mathfrak{st}} = \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{s} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\lambda}) \\ \underline{\mu}(\mathfrak{s}) = S}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} m_{\mathfrak{st}}.$$

The following theorem can be proved in exactly the same way as in [DJM, Theorem 4.14] by combining [DJM] with [C1].

**Theorem 6.8.** *Let  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$  and  $\mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\lambda})$  for some  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$  and  $\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ . Then  $m_{\mathfrak{st}} \in M^\underline{\mu}$ . Moreover,  $M^\underline{\mu}$  is free with an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis*

$$\{m_{\mathfrak{st}} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu}) \text{ and } \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d\}.$$

Let  $\underline{\mu}, \underline{\nu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$  and  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$ . We assume that  $\alpha(\underline{\mu}) = \alpha(\underline{\nu}) = \alpha(\underline{\lambda})$ . For  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$ ,  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\nu})$ , put

$$m_{\mathfrak{ST}} = \sum_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}} q^{l(d(\mathfrak{s})) + l(d(\mathfrak{t}))} m_{\mathfrak{st}},$$

where the sum is taken over all  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in \text{Std}(\underline{\lambda})$  such that  $\underline{\mu}(\mathfrak{s}) = S$  and  $\underline{\nu}(\mathfrak{t}) = T$ . We then have the next proposition by making use of Theorem 6.8.

**Proposition 6.9.** *Suppose that  $\underline{\mu}, \underline{\nu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$  with  $\alpha(\underline{\mu}) = \alpha(\underline{\nu})$ . Then the set*

$$\{m_{\mathfrak{ST}} \mid S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu}) \text{ and } T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\nu}) \text{ for some } \underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d\}$$

*is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -basis of  $M^{\underline{\nu}^*} \cap M^\underline{\mu}$ .*

**Definition 6.10.** Suppose that  $M_n^{r,d} = \bigoplus_{\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d} M^\underline{\mu}$ . We define the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $YS_n^{r,d}$  as the endomorphism algebra

$$YS_n^{r,d} = \text{End}_{Y_{r,n}^d}(M_n^{r,d}),$$

which is isomorphic to  $\bigoplus_{\underline{\mu}, \underline{\nu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d} \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}^d}(M^\underline{\nu}, M^\underline{\mu})$ .

Let  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\nu})$ . In view of Proposition 6.9, we can define  $\varphi_{ST} \in \text{Hom}_{Y_{r,n}^d}(M^{\underline{\nu}}, M^{\underline{\mu}})$  by

$$\varphi_{ST}(m_{\nu}h) = m_{ST}h$$

for all  $h \in Y_{r,n}^d$ . We extend  $\varphi_{ST}$  to an element of  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$  by defining  $\varphi_{ST}$  to be zero on  $M^{\underline{\kappa}}$  for any  $\underline{\nu} \neq \underline{\kappa} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d$ . For each  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$ , let  $\mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}) = \bigcup_{\underline{\mu} \in \mathcal{C}_{r,n}^d} \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}, \underline{\mu})$ . We denote by  $\text{YS}_{r,n}^{d, \triangleright \underline{\lambda}}$  the  $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$  spanned by  $\varphi_{ST}$  such that  $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\alpha})$  with  $\underline{\alpha} \triangleright \underline{\lambda}$ . Then we can prove the following theorem by a similar argument as in [DJM, Theorem 6.6].

**Theorem 6.11.** *The Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module with a basis*

$$\{\varphi_{ST} \mid S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda}) \text{ for some } \underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d\}.$$

Moreover, this basis satisfies the following properties.

(i) *The  $\mathcal{R}$ -linear map  $*$  :  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d} \rightarrow \text{YS}_n^{r,d}$  determined by  $\varphi_{ST}^* = \varphi_{TS}$ , for all  $S, T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda})$  and all  $\underline{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_{r,n}^d$ , is an anti-automorphism of  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$ .*

(ii) *Let  $T \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda})$  and  $\varphi \in \text{YS}_n^{r,d}$ . Then for each  $V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda})$ , there exists  $r_V = r_{V,T,\varphi} \in \mathcal{R}$  such that for all  $S \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda})$ , we have*

$$\varphi_{ST}\varphi \equiv \sum_{V \in \mathcal{T}_0^+(\underline{\lambda})} r_V \varphi_{SV} \pmod{\text{YS}_{r,n}^{d, \triangleright \underline{\lambda}}}.$$

In particular, this basis  $\{\varphi_{ST}\}$  is a cellular basis of  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$ .

Now we can apply the general theory of cellular algebras in view of Theorem 6.11. For example, we can easily give a complete set of non-isomorphic irreducible  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$ -modules over an arbitrary field, and further prove that  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$  is a quasi-hereditary algebra. For the cyclotomic Yokonuma-Schur algebra  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$ , we can also define the Schur functor from the category of  $\text{YS}_n^{r,d}$ -modules to the category of  $Y_{r,n}^d$ -modules and the tilting modules for it in exactly the same way as in Sections 4 and 5, we skip all the details and leave them to the reader.

## REFERENCES

- [AK] S. Ariki and K. Koike, A Hecke algebra of  $(\mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z}) \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$  and construction of its irreducible representations, *Adv. Math.* **106** (1994) 216-243.
- [ChL] M. Chlouveraki and S. Lambropoulou, The Yokonuma-Hecke algebras and the HOMFLYPT polynomial, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* **22** (2013) 35 pp.
- [ChPA1] M. Chlouveraki and L. Poulain d'Andecy, Representation theory of the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra, *Adv. Math.* **259** (2014) 134-172.
- [ChPA2] M. Chlouveraki and L. Poulain d'Andecy, Markov traces on affine and cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebras, arXiv: 1406.3207.
- [ChS] M. Chlouveraki and V. Sécherre, The affine Yokonuma-Hecke algebra and the pro- $p$ -Iwahori-Hecke algebra, arXiv: 1504.04557.
- [CW] W. Cui and J. Wan, Modular representations and branching rules for affine and cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebras, arXiv: 1506.06570.
- [C1] W. Cui, Cellularity of cyclotomic Yokonuma-Hecke algebras, arXiv: 1506.07321.
- [C2] W. Cui, Affine cellularity of affine Yokonuma-Hecke algebras, arXiv: 1510.02647.

- [CR] C.W. Curtis and I. Reiner, Representation theory of finite groups and associative algebras, Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. XI Interscience Publishers, a division of John Wiley & Sons, New York-London 1962 xiv+685 pp.
- [DJM] R. Dipper, G. James and A. Mathas, Cyclotomic  $q$ -Schur algebras, *Math. Z.* **229** (1998) 385-416.
- [ER] J. Espinoza and S. Ryom-Hansen, Cell structures for the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra and the algebra of braids and ties, arXiv: 1506.00715.
- [GL] J.J. Graham and G.I. Lehrer, Cellular algebras, *Invent. Math.* **123** (1996) 1-34.
- [HM1] J. Hu and A. Mathas, Graded induction for Specht modules, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **6** (2012) 1230-1263.
- [HM2] J. Hu and A. Mathas, Quiver Schur algebras for linear quivers, *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc.* (3) **110** (2015) 1315-1386.
- [JM] G.D. James and A. Mathas, The Jantzen sum formula for cyclotomic  $q$ -Schur algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **352** (2000) 5381-5404.
- [JP] N. Jacon and L. Poulain d'Andecy, An isomorphism theorem for Yokonuma-Hecke algebras and applications to link invariants, arXiv: 1501.06389.
- [Ju1] J. Juyumaya, Sur les nouveaux générateurs de l'algèbre de Hecke  $\mathcal{H}(G, U, 1)$ . (French) On new generators of the Hecke algebra  $\mathcal{H}(G, U, 1)$ , *J. Algebra* **204** (1998) 49-68.
- [Ju2] J. Juyumaya, Markov trace on the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra, *J. Knot Theory Ramifications* **13** (2004) 25-39.
- [JuK] J. Juyumaya and S. Kannan, *Braid relations in the Yokonuma-Hecke algebra*, *J. Algebra* **239** (2001) 272-297.
- [JuL] J. Juyumaya and S. Lambropoulou,  $p$ -adic framed braids II. With an appendix by Paul Gérardin, *Adv. Math.* **234** (2013) 149-191.
- [Lu] G. Lusztig, Character sheaves on disconnected groups. VII, *Represent. Theory (electronic)* **9** (2005) 209-266.
- [Ma1] A. Mathas, Iwahori-Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group, University Lecture Series, 15. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999. xiv+188 pp.
- [Ma2] A. Mathas, Tilting modules for cyclotomic Schur algebras, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **562** (2003) 137-169.
- [Ma3] A. Mathas, Seminormal forms and Gram determinants for cellular algebras, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **619** (2008) 141-173.
- [Ri] C. Ringel, The category of modules with good filtrations over a quasi-hereditary algebra has almost split sequences, *Math. Z.* **208** (1991) 209-223.
- [Ro] R. Rouquier,  $q$ -Schur algebras and complex reflection groups, *Mosc. Math. J.* **8** (2008) 119-158.
- [SS] N. Sawada, T. Shoji, Modified Ariki-Koike algebras and cyclotomic  $q$ -Schur algebras, *Math. Z.* **249** (2005) 829-867.
- [Vi] M.-F. Vignéras, The pro- $p$ -Iwahori-Hecke algebra of a reductive  $p$ -adic group I, preprint (2013).
- [Yo] T. Yokonuma, Sur la structure des anneaux de Hecke d'un groupe de Chevalley fini, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. A-B* **264** (1967) 344-347.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, SHANDONG UNIVERSITY, JINAN, SHANDONG 250100, P.R. CHINA.

*E-mail address:* `cwdeng@amss.ac.cn`