

LOCALIZATIONS FOR QUIVER HECKE ALGEBRAS II

MASAKI KASHIWARA, MYUNGHO KIM, SE-JIN OH, AND EUIYONG PARK

ABSTRACT. We prove that the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ of the monoidal category \mathcal{C}_w is rigid, and the category $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ admits a localization via a real commuting family of central objects.

For a quiver Hecke algebra R and an element w in the Weyl group, the subcategory \mathcal{C}_w of the category $R\text{-gmod}$ of finite-dimensional graded R -modules categorifies the quantum unipotent coordinate ring $A_q(\mathfrak{n}(w))$. In the previous paper, we constructed a monoidal category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ such that it contains \mathcal{C}_w and the objects $\{M(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i) \mid i \in I\}$ corresponding to the frozen variables are invertible. In this paper, we show that there is a monoidal equivalence between the category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}})^{\text{rev}}$. Together with the already known left-rigidity of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$, it follows that the monoidal category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is rigid.

If $v \preceq w$ in the Bruhat order, there is a subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ of \mathcal{C}_w which categorifies the doubly-invariant algebra ${}^{N'(w)}\mathbb{C}[N]^{N(v)}$. We prove that the family $(M(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i))_{i \in I}$ of simple R -module forms a real commuting family of graded central objects in the category $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ so that there is a localization $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ in which $M(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)$ are invertible. Since the localization of the algebra ${}^{N'(w)}\mathbb{C}[N]^{N(v)}$ by the family of the isomorphism classes of $M(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)$ is isomorphic to the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[R_{w,v}]$ of the open Richardson variety associated with w and v , the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v}$ categorifies the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[R_{w,v}]$.

Date: August 2.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 18D10, 16D90, 81R10.

Key words and phrases. Categorification, Localization, Monoidal category, Quantum unipotent coordinate ring, Quiver Hecke algebra.

The research of M. Kashiwara was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (B) 20H01795, Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

The research of M. Kim was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) Grant funded by the Korea government(MSIP) (NRF-2017R1C1B2007824 and NRF-2020R1A5A1016126).

The research of S.-j. Oh was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2022R1A2C1004045).

The research of E. Park was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) Grant funded by the Korea Government(MSIP)(NRF-2020R1F1A1A01065992 and NRF-2020R1A5A1016126).

CONTENTS

Introduction	2
1. Preliminaries	7
1.1. Localizations of monoidal categories via braidings	7
1.1.1. Monoidal categories	7
1.1.2. Real commuting family of graded braidings	9
1.2. Quiver Hecke algebras	14
1.2.1. Cartan data	15
1.2.2. Quiver Hecke algebras	15
1.3. Affinizations and R-matrices	20
1.4. Determinantal modules	22
1.5. The categories \mathcal{C}_w and $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$	23
1.6. Graded braidings in $R\text{-gmod}$ associated with a Weyl group element	24
2. Normal sequences and Generalized determinantal modules	27
2.1. Unmixed pair	27
2.2. Normal sequences	30
2.3. Head simplicity of convolutions with $L(i)$	36
2.4. Generalization of determinantal modules	40
3. Rigidity of the category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$	46
3.1. Kernel of the localization functor	46
3.2. Equivalence between $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}}$	49
4. Localization of the category $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$	53
References	57

INTRODUCTION

In the previous work [13], we developed a general procedure for localizations of monoidal categories and studied in detail the case that the categories consist of modules over quiver Hecke algebras. This paper is a continuation of [13]. Roughly speaking, the localization of a monoidal category in [13] is a procedure to find a larger monoidal category in which the prescribed objects are invertible. Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring. For a \mathbf{k} -linear monoidal category \mathcal{T} , a pair (C, R_C) of an object C and a natural transformation $R_C: (C \otimes -) \rightarrow (- \otimes C)$ is called a *braider in \mathcal{T}* if R_C is compatible with the tensor product \otimes . A family $\{(C_i, R_{C_i})\}$ of braidings in \mathcal{T} is called a *real commuting family* if $R_{C_i}(C_i) \in \mathbf{k}^\times \text{id}_{C_i \otimes C_i}$ and

$R_{C_i}(C_j) \circ R_{C_j}(C_i) \in \mathbf{k}^\times \text{id}_{C_j \otimes C_i}$. Then one can construct a \mathbf{k} -linear monoidal category $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$ and a monoidal functor $\Phi: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ such that the object $\Phi(C_i)$ are invertible and the morphisms $\Phi(R_{C_i}(X)): \Phi(C_i) \otimes \Phi(X) \rightarrow \Phi(X) \otimes \Phi(C_i)$ are isomorphisms for all i and all $X \in \mathcal{T}$. Moreover the pair $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}, \Phi)$ is universal with respect to these properties. By the construction, any object in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is of the form $X \otimes (\otimes_i C_i^{\otimes a_i})$ for some $X \in \mathcal{T}$ and $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}$. There is also a *graded version* of localization. Assume that a graded monoidal category \mathcal{T} has a decomposition $\mathcal{T} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ for some abelian group Λ , which is compatible with \otimes , and the grading shift operator q . Then one can define the notion of *graded braider* (C, R_C, ϕ_C) , where $\phi: \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is a group homomorphism and $R_C(X) \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C \otimes X, q^{\phi(\lambda)} X \otimes C)$ for $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$. For a real commuting family of graded braidings in \mathcal{T} , there exists a monoidal category $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ and a functor $\Phi: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ which have the same properties as in the ungraded cases.

One of the motivations to develop such a general procedure is to localize monoidal categories consisting of modules over *quiver Hecke algebras*. Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra and \mathbf{Q}_+ the root lattice of \mathfrak{g} . The quiver Hecke algebra associated with \mathfrak{g} is a family $\{R(\beta)\}_{\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+}$ of \mathbb{Z} -graded associative algebras over \mathbf{k} such that the Grothendieck ring $K(R\text{-gmod})$ is isomorphic to the *quantum unipotent coordinate ring* $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ which is isomorphic to the dual $(U_q^+(\mathfrak{g}))^*$ of the half of the quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ ([15, 22]). Here $R\text{-gmod}$ denotes the direct sum of the categories of finite-dimensional graded $R(\beta)$ -modules. For an $R(\beta)$ -module M and an $R(\gamma)$ -module N , the *convolution product* $M \circ N$ is the $R(\beta + \gamma)$ -module induced from the $R(\beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ -module $M \otimes N$ through the (non-unital) algebra embedding $R(\beta) \otimes R(\gamma) \rightarrow R(\beta + \gamma)$. The category $R\text{-gmod}$ together with the convolution product is a monoidal category and the convolution product corresponds to the multiplication of the algebra $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$. One of main advantages in the case $\mathcal{T} = R\text{-gmod}$ is that for any simple module C in $R\text{-gmod}$, there exists a unique *non-degenerate graded braider* (C, R_C, ϕ_C) . Here a braider is non-degenerate if $R_C(L(i))$ doesn't vanish for any i , where $L(i)$ denotes the unique graded simple module over $R(\alpha_i)$ and $\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$ is the set of simple roots of \mathfrak{g} . Hence one can consider localizations for various monoidal subcategories of $R\text{-gmod}$.

For an element w in the Weyl group W of \mathfrak{g} , there is a subalgebra $A_q(\mathfrak{n}(w))$ of $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ called the *quantum unipotent coordinate ring associated with w* whose limit at $q = 1$ becomes the coordinate ring of the unipotent subgroup $N(w)$ associated with w . Note that the Lie algebra of $N(w)$ is $\mathfrak{n}(w) := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_+ \cap w\Delta_-} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, where Δ_\pm is the set of positive/negative roots of \mathfrak{g} . The algebra $A_q(\mathfrak{n}(w))$ is interesting since it equips a quantum cluster algebra structure ([1, 2, 3]). We

denote the set of frozen variables by $\{D(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)\}_{i \in I}$. Note that the element $D(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)$ is not invertible in the algebra $A_q(\mathbf{n}(w))$. If one localizes $A_q(\mathbf{n}(w))$ at the set $\{D(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)\}_{i \in I}$, then one gets a q -deformation $A_q(N^w)$ of the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[N^w]$, where N^w denotes the *unipotent cell associated with w* which can be identified with an open subset of $N(w)$ (*De Concini-Procesi isomorphism*, see [18, Theorem 4.13]). Now one can naturally associate the algebra $A_q(\mathbf{n}(w))$ with a full subcategory \mathcal{C}_w of R -gmod whose Grothendieck ring $K(\mathcal{C}_w)$ is isomorphic to $A_q(\mathbf{n}(w))$. It is interesting not only that the Grothendieck ring is isomorphic to $A_q(\mathbf{n}(w))$, but also the category \mathcal{C}_w reflects the quantum cluster algebra structure on $A_q(\mathbf{n}(w))$. Indeed, every cluster monomial in $A_q(\mathbf{n}(w))$ corresponds to a real simple module in \mathcal{C}_w , provided \mathfrak{g} is symmetric and \mathbf{k} is a field of characteristic zero ([7]). Now the localization at the category level is exactly as one might imagine: each element $D(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)$ corresponds to a simple module $\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)$ in \mathcal{C}_w , and the set $(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)}, \phi_{\Lambda_i})_{i \in I}$ forms a real commuting family of graded braiders in \mathcal{C}_w ([13, Proposition 5.1]). Hence the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ of \mathcal{C}_w with respect to the family categorifies the q -deformation $A_q(N^w)$ of the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[N^w]$ of the unipotent cell N^w ([13, Corollary 5.4]). We emphasize that the set $(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)}, \phi_{\Lambda_i})_{i \in I}$ is also a real commuting family of graded braiders in the category R -gmod and hence one has the localization $(R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$ of R -gmod with respect to the family. Let us denote $Q_w: R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$ the localization functor. Since the composition $\mathcal{C}_w \hookrightarrow R\text{-gmod} \xrightarrow{Q_w} (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$ factors through the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$, one obtains a functor $\iota_w: \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$, which turns out to be an equivalence ([13, Theorem 5.9]). This property enables us in particular to show that the monoidal category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is left-rigid, i.e., every object in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ admits a left-dual ([13, Corollary 5.11]). This remarkable feature can be understood as a (monoidal) categorification of the quantum twisted map on the algebra $A_q(N^w)$ (see [18] and references therein).

One of the main results of this paper is that the category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is also right-rigid, i.e., every object in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ admits a right-dual (Theorem 3.9). We achieve this by showing that there is a monoidal equivalence between the category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ and $(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}})^{\text{rev}}$ (Theorem 3.7). Here \mathcal{T}^{rev} denotes the monoidal category $(\mathcal{T}, \otimes^{\text{rev}})$ where the reversed tensor product \otimes^{rev} is defined by $X \otimes^{\text{rev}} Y := Y \otimes X$ and $f \otimes^{\text{rev}} g := g \otimes f$ for any objects X, Y and morphisms $f, g \in \mathcal{T}$. Then the left-rigidity of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}}$ implies the right-rigidity of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$. The strategy for constructing the equivalence is briefly as follows. There is an algebra automorphism ψ on $R(\beta)$ (see (1.8)) which induces a monoidal equivalence $\psi_*: R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})^{\text{rev}}$. Then the composition $R\text{-gmod} \xrightarrow{\psi_*} (R\text{-gmod})^{\text{rev}} \xrightarrow{Q_{w^{-1}}} ((R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w^{-1}]})^{\text{rev}}$ factors as

$R\text{-gmod} \xrightarrow{Q_w} (R\text{-gmod})^\sim[w] \xrightarrow{F_{w^{-1}}} ((R\text{-gmod})^\sim[w^{-1}])^{\text{rev}}$, and the functor $F_{w^{-1}}$ is the desired equivalence of categories. One of key conditions to get such a factorization is that $(Q_{w^{-1}} \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i))$ is invertible in $R\text{-gmod}[w^{-1}] \simeq \widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}}$ for each $i \in I$. Hence we need to study the structure of modules $\psi_*(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i))$. Recall that the modules $\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)$ are examples of the *determinantial modules* which have been studied in detail in [11, 13]. In general, for a dominant integral weight Λ and Weyl group elements $v \preceq u$ in the Bruhat order, there exists a distinguished element $D(u\Lambda, v\Lambda)$ of $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$, called the *unipotent quantum minor*, and the *determinantial module* $\mathbf{M}(u\Lambda, v\Lambda)$ is the simple module corresponding to $D(u\Lambda, v\Lambda)$ under the isomorphism $K(R\text{-gmod}) \simeq A_q(\mathfrak{n})$. Even the module $\psi_*(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i))$ is no longer a determinantial module in general, it turns out that it shares many of properties of determinantial modules. We characterize such a family of simple modules and call them the *generalized determinantial modules* (see Theorem 2.18). It enables us to calculate the module $\psi_*(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i))$ quite explicitly and to see that $(Q_{w^{-1}} \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i))$ is invertible in $\widetilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}}$.

The other main result of this paper is a localization of the category $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ for a pair of Weyl group elements w, v such that $v \preceq w$ in the Bruhat order. The category \mathcal{C}_w can be characterized as the full subcategory consisting of modules $M \in R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$ such that $\text{Res}_{\gamma, \beta-\gamma}(M) \neq 0$ implies that $\gamma \in \mathbf{Q}_+ \cap w\mathbf{Q}_-$. Here $\text{Res}_{\alpha, \beta}$ denotes the restriction functor $R(\alpha + \beta)\text{-gmod} \rightarrow R(\alpha) \otimes R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$. Similarly, we define the category $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ as the full subcategory $R\text{-gmod}$ consisting of modules $M \in R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$ such that $\text{Res}_{\beta-\gamma, \gamma}(M) \neq 0$ implies that $\gamma \in \mathbf{Q}_+ \cap v\mathbf{Q}_+$. We set $\mathcal{C}_{w,v} := \mathcal{C}_w \cap \mathcal{C}_{*,v}$. Then the Grothendieck ring $K(\mathcal{C}_{w,v})$ can be understood as a q -deformation of the doubly-invariant algebra $N'(w)\mathbb{C}[N]^{N(v)}$, where N is the unipotent radical, N_- is the opposite of N , and $N'(w) := N \cap (wNw^{-1})$, $N(v) := N \cap (vN_-v^{-1})$ (see [11, Remark 2.19]). It is known that the localization $N'(w)\mathbb{C}[N]^{N(v)}$ at the set $\{D(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is isomorphic to the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[R_{w,v}]$ of the *open Richardson variety* $R_{w,v}$ associated with w and v ([20, Theorem 2.12]). Hence a localization of the category $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ with respect to the set of determinantial modules $\{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)\}_{i \in I}$ would give a categorification of (a q -deformation of) the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[R_{w,v}]$. We show that there exists a graded braider $(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)}, \phi_{w,v,\Lambda_i})$ in the category $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ (Proposition 4.2). The key idea for this is to take a restriction of the braider $R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)}$ in $R\text{-gmod}$. Indeed, for an object $X \in \mathcal{C}_{*,v} \cap (R(\gamma)\text{-gmod})$ one can show that the restriction $\text{Res}_{\gamma+\alpha, \beta}(R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)}(X))$ is equal to $(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i) \circ X) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i) \rightarrow (X \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)$, where $\beta = \Lambda_i - v\Lambda_i$, and $\alpha = v\Lambda_i - w\Lambda_i$. We have such a nice form of restriction because the pairs $(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i), \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i))$ and $(X, \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i))$ are distinguished pairs of simple modules

called *unmixed pairs* (see Section 2.1). Now since $\text{End}(\mathbf{M}(v\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)) \simeq \mathbf{k}$, we obtain the desired homomorphism $R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)}(X)$ from $\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i) \circ X$ to $X \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)$. It follows that the family $\{(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)}, \phi_{w, v, \Lambda_i})\}_{i \in I}$ is a real commuting family of graded braiders in the category $\mathcal{C}_{*, v}$ due to the corresponding properties of the family in $R\text{-gmod}$ $\{(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)}, \phi_{\Lambda_i})\}_{i \in I}$. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*, v}[w]$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w, v}$ be the localization of $\mathcal{C}_{*, v}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{w, v}$, respectively via the family $(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)}, \phi_{w, v, \Lambda_i})$. Then similarly to the case of $(R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$, there is a monoidal equivalence between $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*, v}[w]$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w, v}$ (Theorem 4.5). It is expected that the category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w, v}$ gives a monoidal categorification of a q -deformation of the cluster algebra arising from the open Richardson variety $R_{w, v}$ given in [20].

Let us explain some miscellaneous results in this paper which are not only used for the main theorems but also interesting by themselves. We characterize the simple modules that vanish under the localization functor $Q_w: R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$. Recall that the self-dual simple modules in $R\text{-gmod}$ are in bijection with the crystal basis $B(\infty)$ of $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ ([19]). It turns out that a simple module M doesn't vanish under Q_w if and only if M matches an element b in $B_w(\infty)$, where $B_w(\infty)$ is a subset of $B(\infty)$ introduced in [8], which is the limit of the Demazure crystals. Let I_w be the subspace of $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ spanned by the upper global basis elements corresponding to the elements crystal basis in $B(\infty) \setminus B_w(\infty)$. Then I_w is a two-sided ideal and the quotient $A_q(\mathfrak{n})/I_w$ is called the *quantum closed unipotent cell* in [17]. Then the equivalence $\iota_w: \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$ can be understood as a categorification of the isomorphism in [18, Theorem 4.13], provided \mathfrak{g} is symmetric and \mathbf{k} is a field of characteristic zero (see Remark 3.6).

For simple modules $X \in R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$ and $Y \in R(\gamma)\text{-gmod}$ such that one of them is *affreal* (see Definition 1.10), there is a distinguished homomorphism $\mathbf{r}_{X, Y} := X \circ Y \rightarrow Y \circ X$, called the *R-matrix*. As the *R-matrix* is a crucial feature of the category $R\text{-gmod}$, the integers $\Lambda(X, Y)$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}(X, Y)$ (which is non-negative) play important roles in the representation theory of the quiver Hecke algebras (see, for example, [11]). Let L, M and N be simple modules and assume that L is affreal. Then we show that for any simple subquotient S of $M \circ N$ we have $\tilde{\Lambda}(L, M) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(L, S)$ (Theorem 2.11). This theorem is strong in the sense that $\tilde{\Lambda}(L, S)$ is bounded below by a number which doesn't involve with N at all. A corollary of this theorem (Corollary 2.13) is an analogue of of [12, Lemma 4.17], which holds in the category of finite-dimensional modules over quantum affine algebras.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 1, we recall some preliminaries containing the localization of monoidal categories, quiver Hecke algebras, and determinantal modules, etc. In Section 2, we develop some features in $R\text{-gmod}$, including unmixed pairs, normal

sequences, and generalized determinantal modules. In Section 3, we show that there is a monoidal equivalence between $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ and $(\mathcal{C}_{w^{-1}})^{\text{rev}}$ which implies that $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is rigid. In Section 4, we construct a real commuting family of graded braidings $\{(M(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i), R_{M(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)}, \phi_{w, v, \Lambda_i})\}_{i \in I}$ in the category $\mathcal{C}_{*, v}$. It turns out that the localization $\mathcal{C}_{*, v}[w]$ of $\mathcal{C}_{*, v}$ and the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w, v}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{w, v}$ are monoidally equivalent.

Acknowledgments We thank Yoshiyuki Kimura for his suggestion and fruitful discussion.

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. Localizations of monoidal categories via braidings.

1.1.1. *Monoidal categories.* A *monoidal category* (or *tensor category*) is a datum consisting of

- (a) a category \mathcal{T} ,
- (b) a bifunctor $\cdot \otimes \cdot : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$,
- (c) an isomorphism $a(X, Y, Z) : (X \otimes Y) \otimes Z \xrightarrow{\sim} X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)$ which is functorial in $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{T}$,
- (d) an object $\mathbf{1}$, called an *unit object*, endowed with an isomorphism $\epsilon : \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{1}$

such that

- (1) the diagram below commutes for all $X, Y, Z, W \in \mathcal{T}$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 ((X \otimes Y) \otimes Z) \otimes W & \xrightarrow{a(X \otimes Y, Z, W)} & (X \otimes Y) \otimes (Z \otimes W) \\
 a(X, Y, Z) \otimes W \downarrow & & \downarrow a(X, Y, Z \otimes W) \\
 (X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)) \otimes W & & \\
 a(X, Y \otimes Z, W) \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 X \otimes ((Y \otimes Z) \otimes W) & \xrightarrow{X \otimes a(Y, Z, W)} & X \otimes (Y \otimes (Z \otimes W)),
 \end{array}$$

- (2) the functors $\mathcal{T} \ni X \mapsto \mathbf{1} \otimes X \in \mathcal{T}$ and $\mathcal{T} \ni X \mapsto X \otimes \mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{T}$ are fully faithful.

We have canonical isomorphisms $\mathbf{1} \otimes X \simeq X \otimes \mathbf{1} \simeq X$ for any $X \in \mathcal{T}$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $X \in \mathcal{T}$, we set $X^{\otimes n} = \underbrace{X \otimes \cdots \otimes X}_{n \text{ times}}$, and $X^{\otimes 0} = \mathbf{1}$.

For monoidal categories \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{T}' , a functor $F: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$ is called *monoidal* if it is endowed with an isomorphism $\xi_F: F(X \otimes Y) \xrightarrow{\sim} F(X) \otimes F(Y)$ which is functorial in $X, Y \in \mathcal{T}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
F((X \otimes Y) \otimes Z) & \xrightarrow{F(a(X,Y,Z))} & F(X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)) \\
\xi_{F(X \otimes Y, Z)} \downarrow & & \downarrow \xi_{F(X, Y \otimes Z)} \\
F(X \otimes Y) \otimes F(Z) & & F(X) \otimes F(Y \otimes Z) \\
\xi_{F(X, Y) \otimes F(Z)} \downarrow & & \downarrow F(X) \otimes \xi_{F(Y \otimes Z)} \\
(F(X) \otimes F(Y)) \otimes F(Z) & \xrightarrow{a(F(X), F(Y), F(Z))} & F(X) \otimes (F(Y) \otimes F(Z))
\end{array}$$

commutes for all $X, Y, Z \in \mathcal{T}$. We omit to write ξ_F for simplicity. A monoidal functor F is called *unital* if $(F(\mathbf{1}), F(\epsilon))$ is a unit object. In this paper, we simply write a ‘‘monoidal functor’’ for a unital monoidal functor.

We say that a monoidal category \mathcal{T} is an *additive* (resp. *abelian*) monoidal category if \mathcal{T} is additive (resp. abelian) and the bifunctor $\cdot \otimes \cdot$ is bi-additive. Similarly, for a commutative ring \mathbf{k} , a monoidal category \mathcal{T} is *\mathbf{k} -linear* if \mathcal{T} is \mathbf{k} -linear and the bifunctor $\cdot \otimes \cdot$ is \mathbf{k} -bilinear.

An object $X \in \mathcal{T}$ is *invertible* if the functors $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ given by $Z \mapsto Z \otimes X$ and $Z \mapsto X \otimes Z$ are equivalence of categories. If X is invertible, then one can find an object Y and isomorphisms $f: X \otimes Y \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{1}$ and $g: Y \otimes X \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{1}$ such that the diagrams below commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X \otimes Y \otimes X & \xrightarrow{f \otimes X} & \mathbf{1} \otimes X & & Y \otimes X \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{g \otimes Y} & \mathbf{1} \otimes Y \\
X \otimes g \downarrow & & \downarrow & & Y \otimes f \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
X \otimes \mathbf{1} & \longrightarrow & X, & & Y \otimes \mathbf{1} & \longrightarrow & Y.
\end{array}$$

The triple (Y, f, g) is unique up to a unique isomorphism. We write $Y = X^{\otimes -1}$.

For a monoidal category \mathcal{T} , we define a new monoidal category \mathcal{T}^{rev} as the category \mathcal{T} endowed with the new bifunctor \otimes^{rev} defined by $X \otimes^{\text{rev}} Y := Y \otimes X$ and $f \otimes^{\text{rev}} g := g \otimes f$ for any objects X, Y in \mathcal{T} and for any morphisms f, g in \mathcal{T} , respectively. The associativity constraints are given as $a^{\text{rev}}(X, Y, Z) := a(Z, Y, X)^{-1}$. The unit $(\mathbf{1}, \epsilon)$ of \mathcal{T} serves as a unit of \mathcal{T}^{rev} , too. Let $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$ be a monoidal functor. Then $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{C}^{\text{rev}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}^{\text{rev}}$ is again a monoidal functor.

A pair of morphisms $\epsilon: X \otimes Y \rightarrow \mathbf{1}$ and $\eta: \mathbf{1} \rightarrow Y \otimes X$ in \mathcal{T} is called an *adjunction* if the composition $X \simeq X \otimes \mathbf{1} \xrightarrow{X \otimes \eta} X \otimes Y \otimes X \xrightarrow{\epsilon \otimes X} \mathbf{1} \otimes X \simeq X$ is the identity of X , and the

composition $Y \simeq \mathbf{1} \otimes Y \xrightarrow{\eta^{\otimes Y}} Y \otimes X \otimes Y \xrightarrow{Y \otimes \varepsilon} Y \otimes \mathbf{1} \simeq Y$ is the identity of Y . In the case when (ε, η) is an adjunction, we say that X is a *left dual* to Y and Y is a *right dual* to X in \mathcal{T} . A monoidal category \mathcal{T} is *left (respectively, right) rigid* if every object in \mathcal{T} has a left (respectively, right) dual. We call \mathcal{T} is rigid, if it is left rigid and right rigid.

1.1.2. Real commuting family of graded braidings.

In this subsection, we recall the notions of braidings and localization introduced in [13]. We refer the reader to loc. cit. for more details.

Definition 1.1. A left braider, simply a braider in the sequel, of a monoidal category \mathcal{T} is a pair (C, R_C) of an object C and a morphism

$$R_C(X): C \otimes X \longrightarrow X \otimes C$$

which is functorial in $X \in \mathcal{T}$ such that the following diagrams commutes:

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C \otimes X \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{R_C(X) \otimes Y} & X \otimes C \otimes Y \\ & \searrow_{R_C(X \otimes Y)} & \downarrow X \otimes R_C(Y) \\ & & X \otimes Y \otimes C, \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C \otimes \mathbf{1} & \xrightarrow{R_C(\mathbf{1})} & \mathbf{1} \otimes C \\ & \searrow_{\simeq} & \downarrow \wr \\ & & C. \end{array}$$

A braider (C, R_C) is called a central object if $R_C(X)$ is an isomorphism for any $X \in \mathcal{T}$.

Let \mathbf{k} be a commutative ring and let Λ be a \mathbb{Z} -module. A \mathbf{k} -linear monoidal category \mathcal{T} is Λ -graded if \mathcal{T} has a decomposition $\mathcal{T} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ such that $\mathbf{1} \in \mathcal{T}_0$ and \otimes induces a bifunctor $\mathcal{T}_\lambda \times \mathcal{T}_\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\lambda+\mu}$ for any $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$. Let q be an invertible central object in a Λ -graded category \mathcal{T} , which belongs to \mathcal{T}_0 . We write q^n ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$) for $q^{\otimes n}$ for the sake of simplicity.

Definition 1.2. A graded braider is a triple (C, R_C, ϕ) of an object C , a \mathbb{Z} -linear map $\phi: \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and a morphism

$$R_C(X): C \otimes X \longrightarrow q^{\phi(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes C$$

such that the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C \otimes X \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{R_C(X) \otimes Y} & q^{\phi(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes C \otimes Y \\ & \searrow_{R_C(X \otimes Y)} & \downarrow X \otimes R_C(Y) \\ & & q^{\phi(\lambda+\mu)} \otimes X \otimes Y \otimes C \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C \otimes \mathbf{1} & \xrightarrow{R_C(\mathbf{1})} & \mathbf{1} \otimes C \\ & \searrow_{\simeq} & \downarrow \wr \\ & & C \end{array}$$

commute for any $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ and $Y \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$.

We denote by \mathcal{T}_{br} the category of graded braiders in \mathcal{T} . A morphism from (C, R_C, ϕ) to $(C', R_{C'}, \phi')$ in \mathcal{T}_{br} is a morphism $f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C, C')$ such that $\phi = \phi'$ and the following diagram commutes for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C \otimes X & \xrightarrow{f \otimes X} & C' \otimes X \\ R_C(X) \downarrow & & \downarrow R_{C'}(X) \\ q^{\phi(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes C & \xrightarrow{q^{\phi(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes f} & q^{\phi(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes C'. \end{array}$$

For graded braiders (C_1, R_{C_1}, ϕ_1) and (C_2, R_{C_2}, ϕ_2) of \mathcal{T} , let $R_{C_1 \otimes C_2}(X)$ be the composition

$$C_1 \otimes C_2 \otimes X \xrightarrow{R_{C_2}(X)} q^{\phi_1(\lambda)} \otimes C_1 \otimes X \otimes C_2 \xrightarrow{R_{C_1}(X)} q^{\phi_1(\lambda) + \phi_2(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes C_1 \otimes C_2$$

for $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$. Then $(C_1 \otimes C_2, R_{C_1 \otimes C_2}, \phi_1 + \phi_2)$ is also a graded braider of \mathcal{T} . Hence the category \mathcal{T}_{br} is a monoidal category with a canonical faithful monoidal functor $\mathcal{T}_{\text{br}} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$.

Let I be an index set and let $\{(C_i, R_{C_i}, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of graded braiders. We say that $\{(C_i, R_{C_i}, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ is a *real commuting family of graded braiders* in \mathcal{T} if

- (a) $C_i \in \mathcal{T}_{\lambda_i}$ for some $\lambda_i \in \Lambda$, and $\phi_i(\lambda_i) = 0$, $\phi_i(\lambda_j) + \phi_j(\lambda_i) = 0$,
- (b) $R_{C_i}(C_i) \in \mathbf{k}^\times \text{id}_{C_i \otimes C_i}$ for $i \in I$,
- (c) $R_{C_j}(C_i) \circ R_{C_i}(C_j) \in \mathbf{k}^\times \text{id}_{C_i \otimes C_j}$ for $i, j \in I$.

Set

$$\Gamma := \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus I} \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma_{\geq 0} := \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\oplus I}.$$

Let $\{e_i \mid i \in I\}$ be the natural basis of Γ . We define a \mathbb{Z} -linear map

$$L: \Gamma \rightarrow \Lambda, \quad e_i \mapsto \lambda_i \text{ for } i \in I,$$

and a \mathbb{Z} -bilinear map

$$\phi: \Gamma \times \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \quad (e_i, \lambda) \mapsto \phi_i(\lambda).$$

We choose a \mathbb{Z} -bilinear map $H: \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\phi_i(\lambda_j) = H(e_i, e_j) - H(e_j, e_i)$ for any $i, j \in I$. Then we have

$$(1.2) \quad \phi(\alpha, L(\beta)) = H(\alpha, \beta) - H(\beta, \alpha) \quad \text{for any } \alpha, \beta \in \Gamma.$$

Let us denote by ϕ_α the \mathbb{Z} -linear map $\phi(\alpha, -): \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ for each $\alpha \in \Gamma$.

Lemma 1.3 ([13, Lemma 2.3, Lemma 1.16]). *Let $\{(C_i, R_{C_i}, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be a real commuting family of graded braiders in \mathcal{T} .*

(i) There exists a family $\{\eta_{ij}\}_{i,j \in I}$ of elements in \mathbf{k}^\times such that

$$\begin{aligned} R_{C_i}(C_i) &= \eta_{ii} \operatorname{id}_{C_i \otimes C_i}, \\ R_{C_j}(C_i) \circ R_{C_i}(C_j) &= \eta_{ij} \eta_{ji} \operatorname{id}_{C_i \otimes C_j} \end{aligned}$$

for all $i, j \in I$.

(ii) There exist a graded braider $C^\alpha = (C^\alpha, R_{C^\alpha}, \phi_\alpha)$ for each $\alpha \in \Gamma_{\geq 0}$, and an isomorphism $\xi_{\alpha,\beta}: C^\alpha \otimes C^\beta \xrightarrow{\sim} q^{H(\alpha,\beta)} \otimes C^{\alpha+\beta}$ in \mathcal{T}_{br} for $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma_{\geq 0}$ such that

(a) $C^0 = \mathbf{1}$ and $C^{e_i} = C_i$ for $i \in I$,

(b) the diagram in \mathcal{T}_{br}

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C^\alpha \otimes C^\beta \otimes C^\gamma & \xrightarrow{\xi_{\alpha,\beta} \otimes C^\gamma} & q^{H(\alpha,\beta)} \otimes C^{\alpha+\beta} \otimes C^\gamma \\ C^\alpha \otimes \xi_{\beta,\gamma} \downarrow & & \downarrow \xi_{\alpha+\beta,\gamma} \\ q^{H(\beta,\gamma)} \otimes C^\alpha \otimes C^{\beta+\gamma} & \xrightarrow{\xi_{\alpha,\beta+\gamma}} & q^{H(\alpha,\beta)+H(\alpha,\gamma)+H(\beta,\gamma)} \otimes C^{\alpha+\beta+\gamma} \end{array}$$

commutes for any $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \Gamma_{\geq 0}$,

(c) the diagrams in \mathcal{T}_{br}

$$(1.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C^0 \otimes C^0 & \xrightarrow{\xi_{0,0}} & C^0 \\ \downarrow \wr & & \downarrow \wr \\ \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1} & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \mathbf{1} \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} C^\alpha \otimes C^\beta & \xrightarrow{R_{C^\alpha}(C^\beta)} & q^{\phi(\alpha, L(\beta))} \otimes C^\beta \otimes C^\alpha \\ \xi_{\alpha,\beta} \downarrow & & \downarrow \xi_{\beta,\alpha} \\ q^{H(\alpha,\beta)} \otimes C^{\alpha+\beta} & \xrightarrow{\eta(\alpha,\beta) \operatorname{id}_{C^{\alpha+\beta}}} & q^{H(\alpha,\beta)} \otimes C^{\alpha+\beta} \end{array}$$

commute for any $i, j \in I$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \Gamma_{\geq 0}$, where

$$(1.5) \quad \eta(\alpha, \beta) := \prod_{i,j \in I} \eta_{i,j}^{a_i b_j} \in \mathbf{k}^\times \quad \text{for } \alpha = \sum_{i \in I} a_i e_i \text{ and } \beta = \sum_{j \in I} b_j e_j \text{ in } \Gamma.$$

Note that we have $\eta(\alpha, 0) = \eta(0, \alpha) = 1$, and $\eta(\alpha, \beta + \gamma) = \eta(\alpha, \beta) \cdot \eta(\alpha, \gamma)$ and $\eta(\alpha + \beta, \gamma) = \eta(\alpha, \gamma) \cdot \eta(\beta, \gamma)$ for $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \Gamma$.

We define an order \preceq on Γ by

$$\alpha \preceq \beta \quad \text{for } \alpha, \beta \in \Gamma \text{ with } \beta - \alpha \in \Gamma_{\geq 0},$$

and set

$$\mathcal{D}_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k} := \{\delta \in \Gamma \mid \alpha_i + \delta \in \Gamma_{\geq 0} \text{ for any } i = 1, \dots, k\}$$

for $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in \Gamma$.

For $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$, $Y \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta}$, we set

$$\mathbb{H}_\delta^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)) := \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(C^{\delta+\alpha} \otimes X, q^{H(\delta,\beta-\alpha)+\phi(\delta+\beta,\mu)} \otimes Y \otimes C^{\delta+\beta}).$$

For $\delta, \delta' \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta}$ with $\delta \preceq \delta'$ and $f \in \mathbb{H}_\delta^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta))$, we define $\zeta_{\delta',\delta}^{\text{gr}}(f) \in \mathbb{H}_{\delta'}^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta))$ to be the morphism such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C^{\delta'-\delta} \otimes C^{\delta+\alpha} \otimes X & \xrightarrow{C^{\delta'-\delta} \otimes f} & q^{H(\delta,\beta-\alpha)+\phi(\delta+\beta,\mu)} \otimes C^{\delta'-\delta} \otimes Y \otimes C^{\delta+\beta} \\ \downarrow \xi_{\delta'-\delta,\delta+\alpha} \wr & & \downarrow R_{C^{\delta'-\delta}(Y)} \\ q^{H(\delta'-\delta,\delta+\alpha)} \otimes C^{\delta'+\alpha} \otimes X & \xrightarrow{q^{H(\delta'-\delta,\delta+\alpha)} \otimes \zeta_{\delta',\delta}^{\text{gr}}(f)} & q^{H(\delta,\beta-\alpha)+\phi(\delta'+\beta,\mu)} \otimes Y \otimes C^{\delta'-\delta} \otimes C^{\delta+\beta} \\ & & \downarrow \xi_{\delta'-\delta,\delta+\beta} \wr \\ & & q^{H(\delta,\beta-\alpha)+\phi(\delta'+\beta,\mu)+H(\delta'-\delta,\delta+\beta)} \otimes Y \otimes C^{\delta'+\beta}. \end{array}$$

Then, $\zeta_{\delta',\delta}^{\text{gr}}$ is a map from $\mathbb{H}_\delta^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta))$ to $\mathbb{H}_{\delta'}^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta))$ and $\zeta_{\delta'',\delta'}^{\text{gr}} \circ \zeta_{\delta',\delta}^{\text{gr}} = \zeta_{\delta'',\delta}^{\text{gr}}$ for $\delta \preceq \delta' \preceq \delta''$, so that $\{\zeta_{\delta',\delta}^{\text{gr}}\}_{\delta,\delta' \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta}}$ forms an inductive system indexed by $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta}$.

Hence we can define a new category $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ob}(\tilde{\mathcal{T}}) &:= \text{Ob}(\mathcal{T}) \times \Gamma, \\ \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)) &:= \varinjlim_{\substack{\delta \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha,\beta}, \\ \lambda + L(\alpha) = \mu + L(\beta)}} \mathbb{H}_\delta^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha), (Y, \beta)), \end{aligned}$$

where $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ and $Y \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$. For the composition of morphisms in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ and its associativity, see [13, Section 2.2, Section 2.3].

By the construction, we have the decomposition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}} = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Lambda} \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\mu, \quad \text{where } \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_\mu := \{(X, \alpha) \mid X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda, \lambda + L(\alpha) = \mu\}.$$

The category $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is a monoidal category with the following tensor product: For $\alpha, \alpha', \beta, \beta' \in \Gamma$, $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$, $X' \in \mathcal{T}_{\lambda'}$, $Y \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$ and $Y' \in \mathcal{T}_{\mu'}$, we define

$$(X, \alpha) \otimes (Y, \beta) := (q^{-\phi(\beta,\lambda)+H(\alpha,\beta)} \otimes X \otimes Y, \alpha + \beta),$$

and, for $f \in \mathbb{H}_\delta^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha), (X', \alpha'))$ and $g \in \mathbb{H}_\epsilon^{\text{gr}}((Y, \beta), (Y', \beta'))$, we define

$$T_{\delta,\epsilon}^{\text{gr}}(f, g) := \eta(\epsilon, \alpha - \alpha') \tilde{T}_{\delta,\epsilon}^{\text{gr}}(f, g),$$

where $\tilde{T}_{\delta,\epsilon}^{\text{gr}}(f,g)$ is the morphism such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 C^{\delta+\alpha} \otimes X \otimes C^{\epsilon+\beta} \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{f \otimes g} & q^b \otimes X' \otimes C^{\delta+\alpha'} \otimes Y' \otimes C^{\epsilon+\beta'} \\
 \uparrow R_{C^{\epsilon+\beta}(X)} & & \downarrow R_{C^{\delta+\alpha'}(Y')} \\
 q^{-\phi(\epsilon+\beta,\lambda)} \otimes C^{\delta+\alpha} \otimes C^{\epsilon+\beta} \otimes X \otimes Y & & q^c \otimes X' \otimes Y' \otimes C^{\delta+\alpha'} \otimes C^{\epsilon+\beta'} \\
 \downarrow \xi_{\delta+\alpha,\epsilon+\beta} & & \downarrow \xi_{\delta+\alpha',\epsilon+\beta'} \\
 q^a \otimes C^{\delta+\epsilon+\alpha+\beta} \otimes X \otimes Y & \xrightarrow{\tilde{T}_{\delta,\epsilon}^{\text{gr}}(f,g)} & q^d \otimes X' \otimes Y' \otimes C^{\delta+\epsilon+\alpha'+\beta'},
 \end{array}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 a &= -\phi(\epsilon + \beta, \lambda) + \mathbf{H}(\delta + \alpha, \epsilon + \beta), \\
 b &= \mathbf{H}(\delta, \alpha' - \alpha) + \phi(\delta + \alpha', \lambda') + \mathbf{H}(\epsilon, \beta' - \beta) + \phi(\epsilon + \beta', \mu'), \\
 c &= b + \phi(\delta + \alpha', \mu'), \quad d = c + \mathbf{H}(\delta + \alpha', \epsilon + \beta').
 \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$T_{\delta,\epsilon}^{\text{gr}}(f,g) \in \mathbf{H}_{\delta+\epsilon}^{\text{gr}}((X, \alpha) \otimes (Y, \beta), (X', \alpha') \otimes (Y', \beta')).$$

Then the map $T_{\delta,\epsilon}^{\text{gr}}$ is compatible with the maps $\zeta_{\delta,\delta'}^{\text{gr}}$, in the inductive system, and moreover it yields a bifunctor \otimes on $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ ([13, Proposition 2.5])

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}((X, \alpha), (X', \alpha')) \times \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}((Y, \beta), (Y', \beta')) &\xrightarrow{\otimes} \\
 \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}((X, \alpha) \otimes (Y, \beta), (X', \alpha') \otimes (Y', \beta')). &
 \end{aligned}$$

For $(X, \alpha) \in \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$, define $R_{(q,0)}((X, \alpha)) \in \text{Hom}_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}}((q \otimes X, \alpha), (X \otimes q, \alpha))$ as the image of $R_q(X) \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(q \otimes X, X \otimes q) = \mathbf{H}_{-\alpha}^{\text{gr}}((q \otimes X, \alpha), (X \otimes q, \alpha))$. Then $((q, 0), R_{(q,0)})$ is an invertible braider in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\{C_i = (C_i, R_{C_i}, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ be a real commuting family of graded braidings in \mathcal{T} . Then the category $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ defined above becomes a monoidal category. There exists a monoidal functor $\Upsilon: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ and a real commuting family of graded braidings $\{\tilde{C}_i = (\tilde{C}_i, R_{\tilde{C}_i}, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ satisfy the following properties:*

- (i) for $i \in I$, $\Upsilon(C_i)$ is isomorphic to \tilde{C}_i and it is invertible in $(\tilde{\mathcal{T}})_{\text{br}}$,

(ii) for $i \in I$ and $X \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \Upsilon(C_i \otimes X) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \tilde{C}_i \otimes \Upsilon(X) \\ \Upsilon(R_{C_i}(X)) \downarrow \wr & & R_{\tilde{C}_i}(\Upsilon(X)) \downarrow \wr \\ \Upsilon(q^{\phi_i(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes C_i) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & q^{\phi_i(\lambda)} \otimes \Upsilon(X) \otimes \tilde{C}_i \end{array}$$

commutes.

Moreover, the functor Υ satisfies the following universal property:

- (iii) If there are another Λ -graded monoidal category \mathcal{T}' with an invertible central object $q \in \mathcal{T}'_0$ with and a Λ -graded monoidal functor $\Upsilon': \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}'$ such that
- (a) Υ' sends the central object $q \in \mathcal{T}_0$ to $q \in \mathcal{T}'_0$,
 - (b) $\Upsilon'(C_i)$ is invertible in \mathcal{T}' for any $i \in I$ and
 - (c) for any $i \in I$ and $X \in \mathcal{T}$, $\Upsilon'(R_{C_i}(X)): \Upsilon'(C_i \otimes X) \rightarrow \Upsilon'(q^{\phi_i(\lambda)} \otimes X \otimes C_i)$ is an isomorphism,

then there exists a monoidal functor \mathcal{F} , which is unique up to a unique isomorphism, such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{T} & \xrightarrow{\Upsilon} & \tilde{\mathcal{T}} \\ & \searrow \Upsilon' & \downarrow \mathcal{F} \\ & & \mathcal{T}' \end{array}$$

commutes.

We denote by $\mathcal{T}[C_i^{\otimes -1} \mid i \in I]$ the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ in Theorem 1.4. Note that

$$(X, \alpha + \beta) \simeq q^{-H(\beta, \alpha)} \otimes (C^\alpha \otimes X, \beta), \quad (\mathbf{1}, \beta) \otimes (\mathbf{1}, -\beta) \simeq q^{-H(\beta, \beta)} (\mathbf{1}, 0)$$

for $\alpha \in \Gamma_{\geq 0}$ and $\beta \in \Gamma$.

Proposition 1.5. *Let $(C_i, R_{C_i}, \phi_i)_{i \in I}$ be a real commuting family of graded braidings in a graded monoidal category \mathcal{T} , and set $\tilde{\mathcal{T}} := \mathcal{T}[C_i^{\otimes -1} \mid i \in I]$. Assume that*

- (a) \mathcal{T} is an abelian category,
- (b) \otimes is exact.

Then $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is an abelian category with exact \otimes , and the functor $\Upsilon: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{T}}$ is exact.

1.2. Quiver Hecke algebras.

1.2.1. *Cartan data.*

Let I be an index set. A *Cartan datum* $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{P}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee, (\cdot, \cdot))$ consists of

- (i) a free abelian group \mathbf{P} , called the *weight lattice*,
- (ii) $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathbf{P}$, called the set of *simple roots*,
- (iii) $\Pi^\vee = \{h_i \mid i \in I\} \subset \mathbf{P}^\vee := \text{Hom}(\mathbf{P}, \mathbb{Z})$, called the set of *simple coroots*,
- (iv) a \mathbb{Q} -valued symmetric bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) on \mathbf{P} ,

which satisfy

- (a) $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for $i \in I$,
- (b) $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle = \frac{2(\alpha_i, \lambda)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}$ for $i \in I$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$,
- (c) $\mathbf{A} := ((h_i, \alpha_j))_{i,j \in I}$ is a *generalized Cartan matrix*, i.e., $\langle h_i, \alpha_i \rangle = 2$ for any $i \in I$ and $\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ if $i \neq j$,
- (d) Π is a linearly independent set,
- (e) for each $i \in I$, there exists $\Lambda_i \in \mathbf{P}$ such that $\langle h_j, \Lambda_i \rangle = \delta_{ij}$ for any $j \in I$.

Let Δ (resp. Δ_+ , Δ_-) be the set of roots (resp. positive roots, negative roots). We set $\mathbf{P}_+ := \{\lambda \in \mathbf{P} \mid \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for } i \in I\}$, $\mathbf{Q} = \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$, and $\mathbf{Q}_+ = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_i$, and write $\text{ht}(\beta) = \sum_{i \in I} k_i$ for $\beta = \sum_{i \in I} k_i \alpha_i \in \mathbf{Q}_+$. For $i \in I$, we define

$$s_i(\lambda) = \lambda - \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \alpha_i \quad \text{for } \lambda \in \mathbf{P},$$

and \mathbf{W} is the subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{P})$ generated by $\{s_i\}_{i \in I}$.

For $w, v \in \mathbf{W}$, we write $w \succcurlyeq v$ if there exists a reduced expression of v which appears in a subexpression of a reduced expression of w (the Bruhat order on \mathbf{W}).

For $w \in \mathbf{W}$, we say that an element $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$ is *w-dominant* if

$$(1.6) \quad (\beta, \lambda) \geq 0 \text{ for any } \beta \in \Delta_+ \cap w^{-1}\Delta_-.$$

This condition is equivalent to

$$\langle h_{i_k}, s_{i_{k+1}} \cdots s_{i_r} \lambda \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq r,$$

where $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r}$ is a reduced expression of w .

Note that any $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ is *w-dominant* for any $w \in \mathbf{W}$.

 1.2.2. *Quiver Hecke algebras.*

Let \mathbf{k} be a field. For $i, j \in I$, we choose polynomials $\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v) \in \mathbf{k}[u, v]$ such that

$$(a) \quad \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v) = \mathcal{Q}_{j,i}(v, u),$$

(b) it is of the form

$$\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v) = \begin{cases} \sum_{p(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) + q(\alpha_j, \alpha_j) = -2(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)} t_{i,j;p,q} u^p v^q & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j, \end{cases}$$

where $t_{i,j;-a_{ij},0} \in \mathbf{k}^\times$.

For $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ with $\text{ht}(\beta) = n$, we set

$$I^\beta := \left\{ \nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in I^n \mid \sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{\nu_k} = \beta \right\},$$

on which the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n = \langle s_k \mid k = 1, \dots, n-1 \rangle$ acts by place permutations.

Definition 1.6. For $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, the quiver Hecke algebra $R(\beta)$ associated with \mathbf{A} and $(\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v))_{i,j \in I}$ is the \mathbf{k} -algebra generated by

$$\{e(\nu) \mid \nu \in I^\beta\}, \{x_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq n\}, \{\tau_l \mid 1 \leq l \leq n-1\}$$

satisfying the following defining relations:

$$e(\nu)e(\nu') = \delta_{\nu, \nu'} e(\nu), \sum_{\nu \in I^\beta} e(\nu) = 1, x_k e(\nu) = e(\nu) x_k, x_k x_l = x_l x_k,$$

$$\tau_l e(\nu) = e(s_l(\nu)) \tau_l, \tau_k \tau_l = \tau_l \tau_k \text{ if } |k-l| > 1,$$

$$\tau_k^2 e(\nu) = \mathcal{Q}_{\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}}(x_k, x_{k+1}) e(\nu),$$

$$(\tau_k x_l - x_{s_k(l)} \tau_k) e(\nu) = \begin{cases} -e(\nu) & \text{if } l = k \text{ and } \nu_k = \nu_{k+1}, \\ e(\nu) & \text{if } l = k+1 \text{ and } \nu_k = \nu_{k+1}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$(\tau_{k+1} \tau_k \tau_{k+1} - \tau_k \tau_{k+1} \tau_k) e(\nu)$$

$$= \begin{cases} \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}}(x_k, x_{k+1}, x_{k+2}) e(\nu) & \text{if } \nu_k = \nu_{k+2}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where

$$\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{i,j}(u, v, w) := \frac{\mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(u, v) - \mathcal{Q}_{i,j}(w, v)}{u - w} \in \mathbf{k}[u, v, w].$$

The algebra $R(\beta)$ has the \mathbb{Z} -grading defined by

$$\deg(e(\nu)) = 0, \quad \deg(x_k e(\nu)) = (\alpha_{\nu_k}, \alpha_{\nu_k}), \quad \deg(\tau_l e(\nu)) = -(\alpha_{\nu_l}, \alpha_{\nu_{l+1}}).$$

We denote by $R(\beta)$ -Mod the category of graded $R(\beta)$ -modules with degree preserving homomorphisms. We write $R(\beta)$ -gmod for the full subcategory of $R(\beta)$ -Mod consisting of the graded modules which are finite-dimensional over \mathbf{k} , and $R(\beta)$ -proj for the full subcategory of $R(\beta)$ -Mod consisting of finitely generated projective graded $R(\beta)$ -modules. We set $R\text{-Mod} := \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+} R(\beta)\text{-Mod}$, $R\text{-proj} := \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+} R(\beta)\text{-proj}$, and $R\text{-gmod} := \bigoplus_{\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+} R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$. The trivial $R(0)$ -module of degree 0 is denoted by $\mathbf{1}$. For simplicity, we write ‘‘a module’’ instead of ‘‘a graded module’’. We define the grading shift functor q by $(qM)_k = M_{k-1}$ for a graded module $M = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} M_k$. For $M, N \in R(\beta)\text{-Mod}$, $\text{Hom}_{R(\beta)}(M, N)$ denotes the space of degree preserving module homomorphisms. We define

$$\text{Hom}_{R(\beta)}(M, N) := \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{R(\beta)}(q^k M, N),$$

and set $\deg(f) := k$ for $f \in \text{Hom}_{R(\beta)}(q^k M, N)$. When $M = N$, we write $\text{END}_{R(\beta)}(M) = \text{Hom}_{R(\beta)}(M, M)$. We sometimes write R for $R(\beta)$ in $\text{Hom}_{R(\beta)}(M, N)$ for simplicity.

For $M \in R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$, we set $M^* := \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(M, \mathbf{k})$ with the $R(\beta)$ -action given by

$$(r \cdot f)(u) := f(\rho(r)u), \quad \text{for } f \in M^*, r \in R(\beta) \text{ and } u \in M,$$

where ρ is the antiautomorphism of $R(\beta)$ which fixes the generators $e(\nu)$, x_k , τ_k . We say that M is *self-dual* if $M \simeq M^*$ in $R\text{-gmod}$.

For $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, set $e(\beta, \beta') := \sum_{\nu \in I^\beta, \nu' \in I^{\beta'}} e(\nu * \nu')$, where $\nu * \nu'$ is the concatenation of ν and ν' . Then there is an injective ring homomorphism

$$R(\beta) \otimes R(\beta') \rightarrow e(\beta, \beta')R(\beta + \beta')e(\beta, \beta')$$

given by $e(\nu) \otimes e(\nu') \mapsto e(\nu, \nu')$, $x_k e(\beta) \otimes 1 \mapsto x_k e(\beta, \beta')$, $1 \otimes x_k e(\beta') \mapsto x_{k+|\beta|} e(\beta, \beta')$, $\tau_k e(\beta) \otimes 1 \mapsto \tau_k e(\beta, \beta')$ and $1 \otimes \tau_k e(\beta') \mapsto \tau_{k+|\beta|} e(\beta, \beta')$. For $a \in R(\beta)$ and $a' \in R(\beta')$, the image of $a \otimes a'$ is sometimes denoted by $a \boxtimes a'$.

For $M \in R(\beta)\text{-Mod}$ and $N \in R(\beta')\text{-Mod}$, we set

$$M \circ N := R(\beta + \beta')e(\beta, \beta') \otimes_{R(\beta) \otimes R(\beta')} (M \otimes N).$$

For $u \in M$ and $v \in N$, the image of $u \otimes v$ by the map $M \otimes N \rightarrow M \circ N$ is sometimes denoted by $u \boxtimes v$. We also write $M \boxtimes N \subset M \circ N$ for the image of $M \otimes N$ in $M \circ N$.

For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, let X be an $R(\alpha + \beta)$ -module. Then $e(\alpha, \beta)X$ is an $R(\alpha) \otimes R(\beta)$ -module. We denote it by

$$\text{Res}_{\alpha, \beta} X.$$

We have

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{R(\alpha) \otimes R(\beta)}(M \otimes N, \mathrm{Res}_{\alpha, \beta}(X)) &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{R(\alpha + \beta)}(M \circ N, X), \\ \mathrm{Hom}_{R(\alpha) \otimes R(\beta)}(\mathrm{Res}_{\alpha, \beta}(X), M \otimes N) &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{R(\alpha + \beta)}(X, q^{(\alpha, \beta)} N \circ M) \end{aligned}$$

for any $R(\alpha)$ -module M , any $R(\beta)$ -module N and any $R(\alpha + \beta)$ -module X .

We denote by $M \nabla N$ the head of $M \circ N$ and by $M \Delta N$ the socle of $M \circ N$. We say that simple R -modules M and N *strongly commute* if $M \circ N$ is simple. A simple R -module L is *real* if L strongly commutes with itself. Note that if M and N strongly commute, then M and N commute, i.e., $M \circ N \simeq N \circ M$ up to a grading shift.

For $i \in I$ and the functors E_i and F_i are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} E_i(M) &= e(\alpha_i, \beta - \alpha_i)M \in R(\beta - \alpha_i)\text{-Mod} \\ F_i(M) &= R(\alpha_i) \circ M \in R(\beta + \alpha_i)\text{-Mod} \end{aligned} \quad \text{for an } R(\beta)\text{-module } M.$$

For $i \in I$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $L(i)$ be the simple $R(\alpha_i)$ -module concentrated on degree 0 and $P(i^n)$ the indecomposable projective $R(n\alpha_i)$ -module whose head is isomorphic to $L(i^n) := q_i^{\frac{n(n-1)}{2}} L(i)^{\circ n}$, where $q_i := q^{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2}$. Then, for $M \in R(\beta)\text{-Mod}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} E_i^{(n)} M &:= \mathrm{Hom}_{R(n\alpha_i)}(P(i^n), e(n\alpha_i, \beta - n\alpha_i)M) \in R(\beta - n\alpha_i)\text{-Mod}, \\ F_i^{(n)} M &:= P(i^n) \circ M \in R(\beta + n\alpha_i)\text{-Mod}. \end{aligned}$$

For $i \in I$ and a non-zero $M \in R(\beta)\text{-Mod}$, we define

$$\mathrm{wt}(M) = -\beta, \quad \varepsilon_i(M) = \max\{k \geq 0 \mid E_i^k M \neq 0\}, \quad \varphi_i(M) = \varepsilon_i(M) + \langle h_i, \mathrm{wt}(M) \rangle.$$

For a simple module M , we set

$$E_i^{\max}(M) := E_i^{(\varepsilon_i(M))} M.$$

We can also define E_i^* , F_i^* , ε_i^* , etc. in the same manner as above if we replace $e(\alpha_i, \beta - \alpha_i)$, $R(\alpha_i) \circ -$, etc. with $e(\beta - \alpha_i, \alpha_i)$, $- \circ R(\alpha_i)$, etc.

We denote by $K(R\text{-proj})$ and $K(R\text{-gmod})$ the Grothendieck groups of R -proj and R -gmod, respectively.

The following proposition will be used frequently.

Proposition 1.7 (Shuffle lemma, [21, Proposition 2.7], [16, Theorem 4.3]). *Let $\{\beta_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq r}$ and $\{\gamma_k\}_{1 \leq k \leq s}$ be two families of elements in \mathbb{Q}_+ such that $\sum_{j=1}^r \beta_j = \sum_{k=1}^s \gamma_k$. Let M_j be*

an $R(\beta_j)$ -module for each $1 \leq j \leq r$. Then $e(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s)(M_1 \circ \dots \circ M_r)$ has a filtration of $\bigotimes_{k=1}^s R(\gamma_k)$ -modules whose graduations are isomorphic to the modules of the form

$$q^N \left(\bigotimes_{k=1}^s R(\gamma_k) e(\beta_{1,k}, \dots, \beta_{r,k}) \right) \bigotimes_{\bigotimes_{j,k} R(\beta_{j,k})} \left(\bigotimes_{j=1}^r e(\beta_{j,1}, \dots, \beta_{j,s}) M_j \right).$$

Here

- $\{\beta_{j,k}\}_{1 \leq j \leq r, 1 \leq k \leq s}$ is a family of elements in \mathbb{Q}_+ such that $\beta_j = \sum_{k=1}^s \beta_{j,k}$ and $\gamma_k = \sum_{j=1}^r \beta_{j,k}$,
- the right action of $\bigotimes_{j,k} R(\beta_{j,k})$ on $\bigotimes_{k=1}^s R(\gamma_k) e(\beta_{1,k}, \dots, \beta_{r,k})$ is induced by the action of $R(\beta_{j,k})$ on $R(\gamma_k) e(\beta_{1,k}, \dots, \beta_{r,k})$,
- the left action of $\bigotimes_{j,k} R(\beta_{j,k})$ on $\bigotimes_{j=1}^r e(\beta_{j,1}, \dots, \beta_{j,s}) M_j$ is induced by the left action of $R(\beta_{j,k})$ on $e(\beta_{j,1}, \dots, \beta_{j,s}) M_j$,
- $N = - \sum_{1 \leq j < j' \leq r, 1 \leq k' < k \leq s} (\beta_{j,k}, \beta_{j',k'})$.

Let us denote by \mathfrak{g} the symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra associated with the Cartan datum $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{P}, \Pi, \Pi^\vee, (\cdot, \cdot))$. Then the quiver Hecke algebra R associated with the same Cartan datum categorifies the negative half $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$ of the quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and its crystal/global basis ([15, 22, 23, 25, 19]). Let $B(\infty)$ be the crystal basis of $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$. Then there is a bijection between $B(\infty)$ and the set of the isomorphism classes of self-dual simple R -modules. For $b \in B(\infty)$, let $S(b)$ be the self-dual simple R -module corresponding to b . Then we have

$$S(\tilde{f}_i(b)) \simeq L(i) \nabla S(b) \quad \text{and} \quad S(\tilde{e}_i(b)) \simeq \text{hd}(E_i(S(b)))$$

for $i \in I$ up to grading shifts, where \tilde{f}_i and \tilde{e}_i denote the Kashiwara operators on $B(\infty)$.

Let $\psi: R(\beta) \xrightarrow{\sim} R(\beta)$ be the ring automorphism

$$(1.8) \quad \begin{aligned} e(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) &\mapsto e(\nu_n, \dots, \nu_1), \\ \psi : \quad x_k &\mapsto x_{n+1-k} \quad (1 \leq k \leq n), \\ \tau_k &\mapsto -\tau_{n-k} \quad (1 \leq k < n), \end{aligned}$$

where $n = |\beta|$. It induces a monoidal functor

$$\psi_*: R\text{-gmod} \xrightarrow{\sim} (R\text{-gmod})^{\text{rev}}.$$

Here, for a monoidal category \mathcal{T} , \mathcal{T}^{rev} is the new monoidal category with the reversed tensor product \otimes^{rev} (see § 1.1.1). Hence, there is a functorial isomorphism

$$\psi_*(M \circ N) \simeq \psi_*(N) \circ \psi_*(M)$$

for graded R -modules M and N . Since ψ is involutive, so is ψ_* . Note that $\psi_*(L(i^n)) \simeq L(i^n)$ for $i \in I$ and $n \geq 0$.

1.3. Affinizations and R-matrices.

Let R be a quiver Hecke algebra. We recall the notions of affinizations and R-matrices introduced in [14]. For $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ and $i \in I$, let

$$(1.9) \quad \mathfrak{p}_{i,\beta} := \sum_{\nu \in I^\beta} \left(\prod_{a \in \{1, \dots, \text{ht}(\beta)\}, \nu_a = i} x_a \right) e(\nu) \in R(\beta).$$

Then $\mathfrak{p}_{i,\beta}$ belongs to the center of $R(\beta)$.

Definition 1.8. *Let M be a simple $R(\beta)$ -module. An affinization of M with degree $d_{\widehat{M}}$ is an $R(\beta)$ -module \widehat{M} with an endomorphism $z_{\widehat{M}}$ of \widehat{M} with degree $d_{\widehat{M}} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and an isomorphism $\widehat{M}/z_{\widehat{M}}\widehat{M} \simeq M$ such that*

- (i) \widehat{M} is a finitely generated free module over the polynomial ring $\mathbf{k}[z_{\widehat{M}}]$,
- (ii) $\mathfrak{p}_{i,\beta}\widehat{M} \neq 0$ for all $i \in I$.

Let $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ with $m = \text{ht}(\beta)$. For $k = 1, \dots, m-1$ and $\nu \in I^\beta$, the intertwiner φ_k is defined by

$$\varphi_k e(\nu) = \begin{cases} (\tau_k x_k - x_k \tau_k) e(\nu) = (x_{k+1} \tau_k - \tau_k x_{k+1}) e(\nu) \\ \quad = (\tau_k (x_k - x_{k+1}) + 1) e(\nu) = ((x_{k+1} - x_k) \tau_k - 1) e(\nu) & \text{if } \nu_k = \nu_{k+1}, \\ \tau_k e(\nu) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 1.9 ([5, Lemma 1.5]).

- (i) $\varphi_k^2 e(\nu) = (Q_{\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}}(x_k, x_{k+1}) + \delta_{\nu_k, \nu_{k+1}}) e(\nu)$.
- (ii) $\{\varphi_k\}_{k=1, \dots, m-1}$ satisfies the braid relation.
- (iii) For a reduced expression $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_t} \in \mathfrak{S}_m$, we set $\varphi_w := \varphi_{i_1} \cdots \varphi_{i_t}$. Then φ_w does not depend on the choice of reduced expression of w .
- (iv) For $w \in \mathfrak{S}_m$ and $1 \leq k \leq m$, we have $\varphi_w x_k = x_{w(k)} \varphi_w$.
- (v) For $w \in \mathfrak{S}_m$ and $1 \leq k < m$, if $w(k+1) = w(k) + 1$, then $\varphi_w \tau_k = \tau_{w(k)} \varphi_w$.

For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we set $w[m, n]$ to be the element of \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} such that

$$w[m, n](k) := \begin{cases} k+n & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq m, \\ k-m & \text{if } m < k \leq m+n. \end{cases}$$

Let $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ and set $m := \text{ht}(\beta)$ and $n := \text{ht}(\gamma)$. For $M \in R(\beta)\text{-Mod}$ and $N \in R(\gamma)\text{-Mod}$, the $R(\beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ -linear map $M \otimes N \rightarrow N \circ M$ defined by

$$u \otimes v \mapsto \varphi_{w[n,m]}(v \boxtimes u)$$

can be extended to an $R(\beta + \gamma)$ -module homomorphism (up to a grading shift)

$$\mathbf{R}_{M,N}: M \circ N \longrightarrow N \circ M.$$

Let \widehat{M} be an affinization of a simple R -module M , and let N be a non-zero R -module. We define a homomorphism (up to a grading shift)

$$\mathbf{R}_{\widehat{M},N}^{\text{norm}} := z_{\widehat{M}}^{-s} \mathbf{R}_{\widehat{M},N}: \widehat{M} \circ N \longrightarrow N \circ \widehat{M},$$

where s is the largest integer such that $\mathbf{R}_{\widehat{M},N}(\widehat{M} \circ N) \subset z_{\widehat{M}}^s(N \circ \widehat{M})$. We define

$$\mathbf{r}_{M,N}: M \circ N \longrightarrow N \circ M$$

to be the homomorphism (up to a grading shift) induced from $\mathbf{R}_{\widehat{M},N}^{\text{norm}}$ by specializing at $z_{\widehat{M}} = 0$. By the definition, $\mathbf{r}_{M,N}$ never vanishes. We now define

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda(M, N) &:= \deg(\mathbf{r}_{M,N}), \\ \widetilde{\Lambda}(M, N) &:= \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda(M, N) + (\text{wt}(M), \text{wt}(N))), \\ \mathfrak{d}(M, N) &:= \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda(M, N) + \Lambda(N, M)). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have ([13, Lemma 3.11])

$$\mathfrak{d}(M, N) \text{ and } \widetilde{\Lambda}(M, N) \text{ are non-negative integers.}$$

We also have (cf. [7, Lemma 3.15])

$$(1.10) \quad \Lambda(M, N_1 \circ N_2) = \Lambda(M, N_1) + \Lambda(M, N_2)$$

for non-zero modules N_1, N_2 and a simple module M which admits an affinization.

Definition 1.10. *We say that an R -module module M is affreal if M is real simple and M admits an affinization.*

Proposition 1.11 ([14, Proposition 2.10]). *Let M and N be simple R -modules. Assume that one of them is affreal. Then we have*

$$\text{Hom}(M \circ N, N \circ M) = \mathbf{k} \mathbf{r}_{M,N}.$$

In the case that N has an affinization $(\widehat{N}, z_{\widehat{N}})$, we can define $R_{M, \widehat{N}}^{\text{norm}}$ in a similar way as above. Then we have $\deg R_{\widehat{M}, N}^{\text{norm}} = \deg R_{M, \widehat{N}}^{\text{norm}}$, and $R_{\widehat{M}, N}^{\text{norm}}|_{z_{\widehat{M}}=0} = R_{M, \widehat{N}}^{\text{norm}}|_{z_{\widehat{N}}=0}$ up to a constant multiple if M or N is real. Hence $\Lambda(M, N)$ and $\mathbf{r}_{M, N}$ (up to a constant multiple) are well defined when either M or N is affreal. Moreover, they do not depend on the choice of affinizations.

1.4. Determinantal modules.

Let $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and let t_i be an indeterminate for each $i \in I$. Set

$$a_{\Lambda, i}(t_i) := t_i^{\langle h_i, \Lambda \rangle} \in \mathbf{k}[t_i] \quad \text{for } i \in I.$$

Let $\lambda \in \Lambda - \mathbf{Q}_+$, and write $\beta := \Lambda - \lambda \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ and $n := \text{ht}(\beta)$. The *cyclotomic quiver Hecke algebra* is the quotient of $R(\beta)$ given by

$$(1.11) \quad R^\Lambda(\lambda) := \frac{R(\beta)}{\sum_{i \in I} R(\beta) a_{\Lambda, i}(x_n e(\beta - \alpha_i, \alpha_i)) R(\beta)}.$$

See [13] for more details.

Let $R^\Lambda(\lambda)\text{-Mod}$ be the category of graded $R^\Lambda(\lambda)$ -modules.

We define the functors

$$\begin{aligned} F_i^\Lambda &: R^\Lambda(\lambda)\text{-Mod} \rightarrow R^\Lambda(\lambda - \alpha_i)\text{-Mod}, \\ E_i^\Lambda &: R^\Lambda(\lambda)\text{-Mod} \rightarrow R^\Lambda(\lambda + \alpha_i)\text{-Mod} \end{aligned}$$

by $F_i^\Lambda M = R^\Lambda(\lambda - \alpha_i) e(\alpha_i, \beta) \otimes_{R^\Lambda(\lambda)} M$ and $E_i^\Lambda M = e(\alpha_i, \beta - \alpha_i) M$ for $M \in R^\Lambda(\lambda)\text{-Mod}$. Similarly, for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} F_i^{\Lambda(m)} M &= R^\Lambda(\lambda - m\alpha_i) \otimes_{R(\Lambda - \lambda + m\alpha_i)} F_i^{(m)} M \in R^\Lambda(\lambda - m\alpha_i)\text{-Mod}, \\ E_i^{\Lambda(m)} M &= E_i^{(m)} M \in R^\Lambda(\lambda + m\alpha_i)\text{-Mod}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbf{P}$, we write $\lambda \preceq \mu$ if there exists a sequence of real positive roots β_k ($1 \leq k \leq \ell$) such that $\lambda = s_{\beta_\ell} \cdots s_{\beta_1} \mu$ and $(\beta_k, s_{\beta_{k-1}} \cdots s_{\beta_1} \mu) \geq 0$ for $1 \leq k \leq \ell$. Here $s_\beta(\lambda) = \lambda - (\beta^\vee, \lambda) \beta$ with $\beta^\vee = \frac{2}{(\beta, \beta)} \beta$.

Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbf{W}\Lambda$ such that $\lambda \preceq \mu$. The module $\mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu)$, called the *determinantal module*, is defined as follows. Choose $w, v \in \mathbf{W}$ such that $\lambda = w\Lambda$ and $\mu = v\Lambda$, and then take their reduced expressions $\underline{w} = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_l}$ and $\underline{v} = s_{j_1} \cdots s_{j_t}$, and set $m_k = \langle h_{i_k}, s_{i_{k+1}} \cdots s_{i_l} \Lambda \rangle$ for $k = 1, \dots, l$, and $n_k = \langle h_{j_k}, s_{j_{k+1}} \cdots s_{j_t} \Lambda \rangle$ for $k = 1, \dots, t$. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}(\lambda, \Lambda) &:= F_{i_1}^{\Lambda(m_1)} \cdots F_{i_l}^{\Lambda(m_l)} \mathbf{k}, \\ \mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu) &:= E_{j_1}^{*(n_1)} \cdots E_{j_t}^{*(n_t)} \mathbf{M}(\lambda, \Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

The determinantal module $\mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu)$ does not depend on the choice of w, v and their reduced expressions.

We summarize properties of determinantal modules.

Proposition 1.12 ([4], [11, Lemma 1.7, Proposition 4.2] and [13, Theorem 3.26]). *Let $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$, and $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbf{W}\Lambda$ with $\lambda \preceq \mu$.*

(i) $\mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu)$ is a real simple R^Λ -module with an affinization.

(ii) If $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \leq 0$ and $s_i \lambda \preceq \mu$, then

$$\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu)) = -\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad E_i^{(-\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle)} \mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu) \simeq \mathbf{M}(s_i \lambda, \mu).$$

(iii) If $\langle h_i, \mu \rangle \geq 0$ and $\lambda \preceq s_i \mu$, then

$$\varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu)) = \langle h_i, \mu \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad E_i^{*\langle h_i, \mu \rangle} \mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu) \simeq \mathbf{M}(\lambda, s_i \mu).$$

(iv) For $\Lambda, \Lambda' \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and $w, v \in \mathbf{W}$ such that $v \preceq w$, we have

$$\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda', v\Lambda') \simeq q^{-(v\Lambda, v\Lambda' - w\Lambda')} \mathbf{M}(w(\Lambda + \Lambda'), v(\Lambda + \Lambda')).$$

(v) For $\lambda, \mu, \zeta \in \mathbf{W}\Lambda$ with $\lambda \preceq \mu \preceq \zeta$, we have $\mathbf{M}(\lambda, \zeta) \simeq \mathbf{M}(\lambda, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}(\mu, \zeta)$.

1.5. The categories \mathcal{C}_w and $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$. In this subsection, we recall the definition of categories $\mathcal{C}_w, \mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ appeared in [11] (see also [24]).

For $M \in R(\beta)\text{-Mod}$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}(M) &:= \{\gamma \in \mathbf{Q}_+ \cap (\beta - \mathbf{Q}_+) \mid e(\gamma, \beta - \gamma)M \neq 0\}, \\ \mathbf{W}^*(M) &:= \{\gamma \in \mathbf{Q}_+ \cap (\beta - \mathbf{Q}_+) \mid e(\beta - \gamma, \gamma)M \neq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $M = 0$, then $\mathbf{W}(M) = \emptyset$, and if $M \neq 0$, then $0, \beta \in \mathbf{W}(M)$.

Proposition 1.13 ([24, Proposition 3.7]). *For any R -module M , we have*

$$\mathbf{W}(M) \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(\mathbf{W}(M) \cap \Delta_+).$$

Here, for a subset $A \subset \mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{Q}$, we denote by $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(A)$ the smallest subset of $\mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{Q}$ that is stable by the multiplication of $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and contains $A \cup \{0\}$.

For $w \in \mathbf{W}$, we denote by \mathcal{C}_w the full subcategory of $R\text{-gmod}$ consisting of objects M such that

$$\mathbf{W}(M) \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(\Delta_+ \cap w\Delta_-).$$

By Proposition 1.13, this condition is equivalent to

$$\mathbf{W}(M) \cap \Delta_+ \subset w\Delta_-.$$

Similarly, for $v \in W$, we denote by $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ the full subcategory of $R\text{-gmod}$ consisting of objects M such that

$$W^*(M) \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(\Delta_+ \cap v\Delta_+).$$

For $w, v \in W$, we define $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ to be the full subcategory of $R\text{-gmod}$ whose objects are contained in both of the subcategories \mathcal{C}_w and $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$.

The categories \mathcal{C}_w , $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$, and $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ are stable under convolution products, grading shifts, extensions, taking subquotients.

1.6. Graded braidings in $R\text{-gmod}$ associated with a Weyl group element.

Definition 1.14. *A graded braider (M, R_M, ϕ) in $R\text{-gmod}$ is called non-degenerate if*

$$R_M(L(i)): M \circ L(i) \rightarrow q^{\phi(\alpha_i)} L(i) \circ M$$

is a non-zero homomorphism for each $i \in I$.

If (M, R_M, ϕ) is non-degenerate, then $\phi(\alpha_i) = -\Lambda(M, L(i))$ and $R_M(L(i)) = c \mathbf{r}_{M, L(i)}$ for some $c \in \mathbf{k}^\times$.

Theorem 1.15 ([13, Proposition 4.1, Lemma 4.3]). *Let R be a quiver Hecke algebra and let M be a simple R -module. Then there exists a non-degenerate graded braider (M, R_M, ϕ) in $R\text{-gmod}$. If (M, R'_M, ϕ') is another non-degenerate graded braider, then $\phi = \phi'$ and there exists a group homomorphism $c: \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{k}^\times$ such that $R'_M(X) = c(\beta)R_M(X)$ for any $X \in R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$.*

Fix an element w in the Weyl group W . For $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$, set

$$\mathbf{C}_\Lambda = \mathbf{C}_{w, \Lambda} := \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C}_i := \mathbf{C}_{\Lambda_i} \quad (i \in I).$$

For $i \in I$, we set

$$\lambda_i := \begin{cases} w\Lambda_i + \Lambda_i & \text{if } w\Lambda_i \neq \Lambda_i, \\ 0 & \text{if } w\Lambda_i = \Lambda_i. \end{cases}$$

Note that $\mathbf{C}_i \simeq \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $w\Lambda_i = \Lambda_i$. We have

$$(1.12) \quad \Lambda(\mathbf{C}_i, L(j)) = (\alpha_j, \alpha_j) \varepsilon_j^*(\mathbf{C}_i) + (\alpha_j, w\Lambda_i - \Lambda_i) = (\lambda_i, \alpha_j).$$

Applying Theorem 1.15, we have a non-degenerate graded braider $(\mathbf{C}_i, R_{\mathbf{C}_i}, \phi_i)$ for $i \in I$.

Proposition 1.16 ([13, Proposition 5.1]). *The family $(\mathbf{C}_i, R_{\mathbf{C}_i}, \phi_i)_{i \in I}$ is a real commuting family of non-degenerate graded braidings in $R\text{-gmod}$ and*

$$\phi_i(\beta) = -(\lambda_i, \beta) \quad \text{for any } \beta \in \mathbf{Q}.$$

Theorem 1.17 ([13, Theorem 5.2]). *For $i \in I$ and any $R(\beta)$ -module N in \mathcal{C}_w , $R_{C_i}(N)$ is an isomorphism.*

We set $\Gamma := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\Lambda_i$ and define a \mathbb{Z} -bilinear map $H: \Gamma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined by

$$H(\Lambda_i, \Lambda_j) := -\tilde{\Lambda}(C_i, C_j) = (\Lambda_i, w\Lambda_j - \Lambda_j).$$

Then, for $i, j \in I$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_i(-\text{wt}(C_j)) &= (w\Lambda_i + \Lambda_i, w\Lambda_j - \Lambda_j) = (\Lambda_i, w\Lambda_j) - (\Lambda_j, w\Lambda_i) \\ &= H(\Lambda_i, \Lambda_j) - H(\Lambda_j, \Lambda_i). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 1.16, we have the localization of \mathcal{C}_w by the non-degenerate graded braidings $\{C_i \mid i \in I\}$ which we denote by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w := \mathcal{C}_w[C_i^{\circ-1} \mid i \in I].$$

By the choice above of H , for $\Lambda = \sum_{i \in I} m_i \Lambda_i \in \Gamma_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$C_\Lambda \simeq (\mathbf{1}, \Lambda), \quad C_\Lambda^{\circ-1} \simeq q^{H(\Lambda, \Lambda)}(\mathbf{1}, -\Lambda).$$

Thus, for $\Lambda = \sum_{i \in I} a_i \Lambda_i \in \Gamma \subset \mathbf{P}$, we simply write $C_\Lambda := (\mathbf{1}, \Lambda) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$. We have

$$C_\Lambda \circ C_{\Lambda'} \simeq q^{H(\Lambda, \Lambda')} C_{\Lambda + \Lambda'}.$$

The following is a summary of the results in [13] on the localization $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ of \mathcal{C}_w and the localization functor $\Phi_w: \mathcal{C}_w \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$:

- (i) the objects $\Phi_w(C_i)$ are invertible in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$,
- (ii) $\Phi_w(R_{C_\Lambda}(X))$ is an isomorphism for any $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and $X \in \mathcal{C}_w$,
- (iii) for any simple object S of \mathcal{C}_w , the object $\Phi_w(S)$ is simple in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$,
- (iv) every simple object of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is isomorphic to $C_\Lambda \circ \Phi_w(S)$ for some simple object S of \mathcal{C}_w and $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}$,
- (v) for two simple objects S and S' in \mathcal{C}_w and $\Lambda, \Lambda' \in \mathbf{P}$, $C_\Lambda \circ \Phi_w(S) \simeq C_{\Lambda'} \circ \Phi_w(S')$ in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ if and only if $q^{H(\Lambda, \mu)} C_{\Lambda + \mu} \circ S \simeq q^{H(\Lambda', \mu)} C_{\Lambda' + \mu} \circ S'$ in \mathcal{C}_w for some $\mu \in \mathbf{P}$ such that $\Lambda + \mu, \Lambda' + \mu \in \mathbf{P}_+$,
- (vi) the category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is abelian and every objects has finite length.
- (vii) the grading shift functor q and the contravariant functor $M \mapsto M^*$ on \mathcal{C}_w are extended to $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$.
- (viii) for any simple module $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$, there exists a unique $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $q^n M$ is self-dual.

Theorem 1.18 ([13, Theorem 5.7]). *Every simple object in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ has a right dual.*

Applying Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 1.16 again, we obtain the localization

$$(R\text{-gmod})^{\sim}[w] := R\text{-gmod}[\mathbf{C}_i^{\circ-1} \mid i \in I]$$

of the category $R\text{-gmod}$ by the real commuting family $\{\mathbf{C}_i \mid i \in I\}$ of non-degenerated graded braiders. We denote the localization functor by

$$Q_w : R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})^{\sim}[w].$$

Since \mathcal{C}_w is a full subcategory of $R\text{-gmod}$, there is a fully faithful monoidal functor

$$\iota_w : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})^{\sim}[w].$$

Set $I_w := \{i \in I \mid w\Lambda_i \neq \Lambda_i\}$. Note that $I_w = \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}$ for any reduced expression $\underline{w} = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_l}$ of w .

Theorem 1.19 ([13, Theorem 5.8, Theorem 5.9]). *Assume that $I = I_w$.*

- (i) *The functor $\iota_w : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})^{\sim}[w]$ is an equivalence of categories.*
- (ii) *The category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is left rigid, i.e., every object of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ has a left dual.*

We shall prove later in Theorem 3.9 that $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is rigid.

Proposition 1.20. *Assume that $I = I_w$. Let $X \in R\text{-gmod}$ be a simple module. Then we have*

- (i) *$Q_w(X)$ is either a simple module or zero,*
- (ii) *$Q_w(X) \simeq q^{H(\Lambda, \Lambda)} \mathbf{C}_{-\Lambda} \circ Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda} \nabla X)$ for any $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$.*

Proof. (i) follows from [13, Proposition 4.8 (i)].

(ii) Since there is an epimorphism $Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda}) \circ Q_w(X) \twoheadrightarrow Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda} \nabla X)$, we may assume that $Q_w(X) \neq 0$.

Applying the exact monoidal functor Q_w ,

$$\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda} \circ X \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{C}_{\Lambda} \nabla X \twoheadrightarrow X \circ \mathbf{C}_{\Lambda},$$

we obtain

$$Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda}) \circ Q_w(X) \twoheadrightarrow Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda} \nabla X) \twoheadrightarrow Q_w(X) \circ Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda})$$

whose composition is an isomorphism. Hence we obtain $Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda} \nabla X) \simeq Q_w(\mathbf{C}_{\Lambda}) \circ Q_w(X)$. \square

2. NORMAL SEQUENCES AND GENERALIZED DETERMINANTIAL MODULES

2.1. **Unmixed pair.** We say that an ordered pair (M, N) of R -modules is *unmixed* if

$$\mathbf{W}^*(M) \cap \mathbf{W}(N) \subset \{0\}.$$

Proposition 2.1 ([24, Lemma 2.6], [11, Proposition 2.12]). *Let $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ with $|\beta| = m$ and $|\gamma| = n$. Let M and N be an $R(\beta)$ -module and an $R(\gamma)$ -module, respectively. Assume that (M, N) is an unmixed pair. Then, we have $e(\beta, \gamma)(M \circ N) = M \boxtimes N$ and $e(\beta, \gamma)(N \circ M) = \tau_{w[n, m]}(N \boxtimes M)$. There is an $R(\beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ -module isomorphism $q^{-(\beta, \gamma)} M \otimes N \rightarrow e(\beta, \gamma)(N \circ M)$ given by*

$$r(u \otimes v) = \tau_{w[n, m]}(v \otimes u) \quad \text{for any } u \in M \text{ and } v \in N.$$

In particular, it induces a homomorphism $r: M \circ N \rightarrow q^{(\beta, \gamma)} N \circ M$.

We denote by $\mathbf{r}_{M, N}$ the above morphism r .

Proposition 2.2 ([24, Lemma 2.6]). *Let (M, N) be an unmixed pair of simple R -modules. Then we have*

$$\text{Hom}(M \circ N, N \circ M) = \mathbf{k} \mathbf{r}_{M, N}.$$

Moreover, the image of $\mathbf{r}_{M, N}: M \circ N \rightarrow q^{(\beta, \gamma)} N \circ M$ is simple and isomorphic to $M \nabla N$ and $q^{(\beta, \gamma)} N \Delta M$.

Proof. The first assertion follows from (1.7). For any non-zero submodule S of $N \circ M$, we have $e(\beta, \gamma)S = \tau_{w[n, m]}(N \boxtimes M)$ by (1.7) and Proposition 2.2. It follows that $N \circ M$ has a simple socle which is generated by $\tau_{w[n, m]}(N \boxtimes M)$. Since the image of $\mathbf{r}_{M, N}$ is generated by $\tau_{w[n, m]}(N \boxtimes M)$, we get the second assertion. \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let (M, N) be an unmixed pair of simple modules such that one of them is affreal. Then we have*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(M, N) = 0.$$

Proof. Let r be the morphism in the above proposition. Since $r = \mathbf{r}_{M, N}$ up to a constant multiple, we have $\Lambda(M, N) = -(\beta, \gamma)$. It follows that $\tilde{\Lambda}(M, N) = \frac{1}{2}(\Lambda(M, N) + (\beta, \gamma)) = 0$, as desired. \square

Proposition 2.4. *Let $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, and let L be an $R(\alpha)$ -module, M an $R(\beta)$ -module and N an $R(\gamma)$ -module. Assume that*

$$(\mathbf{W}^*(L) + \mathbf{W}^*(M)) \cap \mathbf{W}(N) = \{0\}.$$

Then we have

$$(2.1) \quad e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(L \circ M \circ N) \simeq (L \circ M) \otimes N,$$

$$(2.2) \quad e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(L \circ N \circ M) \simeq q^{-(\beta, \gamma)}(L \circ M) \otimes N,$$

$$(2.3) \quad e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(N \circ L \circ M) \simeq q^{-(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)}(L \circ M) \otimes N.$$

Assume further that L, M, N are simple. Then we have

$$(2.4) \quad e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(L \circ (M \nabla N)) \simeq (L \circ M) \otimes N,$$

$$(2.5) \quad e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)((L \nabla N) \circ M) \simeq q^{-(\beta, \gamma)}(L \circ M) \otimes N.$$

Proof. The isomorphisms (2.1) and (2.3) follow from Proposition 2.1 since $W^*(L \circ M) \cap W(N) \subset \{0\}$.

Let us prove the second isomorphism (2.2). By the shuffle lemma (Proposition 1.7), the $R(\alpha + \beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ -module $e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)L \circ N \circ M$ has a filtration whose graduations are of the form

$$G := (R(\alpha + \beta)e(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1) \otimes R(\gamma)e(\alpha_2, \beta_2, \gamma_2)) \otimes_A (e(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)L \otimes e(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)N \otimes e(\beta_1, \beta_2)M)$$

up to grade shifts. Here

- $\alpha_k, \beta_k, \gamma_k \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ ($k = 1, 2$) such that $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$, $\beta = \beta_1 + \beta_2$, $\gamma = \gamma_1 + \gamma_2$, $\alpha + \beta = \alpha_1 + \beta_1 + \gamma_1$ and $\gamma = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + \gamma_2$,
- $A = R(\alpha_1) \otimes R(\alpha_2) \otimes R(\gamma_1) \otimes R(\gamma_2) \otimes R(\beta_1) \otimes R(\beta_2)$,
- $A \rightarrow R(\alpha + \beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ is given by $a_1 \otimes a_2 \otimes c_1 \otimes c_2 \otimes b_1 \otimes b_2 \mapsto (a_1 c_1 b_1) \otimes (a_2 c_2 b_2)$.

If $G \neq 0$, then $\alpha_2 \in W^*(L)$ and $\beta_2 \in W^*(M)$, $\gamma_1 \in W(N)$. Since $\alpha_2 + \beta_2 = \gamma_1$, we have $\alpha_2 = \beta_2 = \gamma_1 = 0$. Hence only one G survives, and we have

$$G = (R(\alpha + \beta)e(\alpha, \beta) \otimes R(\gamma)) \otimes_{R(\alpha) \otimes R(\gamma) \otimes R(\beta)} (L \otimes N \otimes M),$$

where $R(\alpha) \otimes R(\gamma) \otimes R(\beta) \rightarrow R(\alpha + \beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ is given by $a \otimes c \otimes b \mapsto (a \cdot b) \otimes c$. Hence we obtain $G \simeq (L \circ M) \otimes N$. It implies the isomorphism (2.2). Note that

$$q^{-(\beta, \gamma)}(L \circ M) \otimes N \rightarrow e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(L \circ N \circ M)$$

is induced by $q^{-(\beta, \gamma)}L \otimes M \otimes N \rightarrow L \otimes (N \circ M)$.

Finally, let us show the isomorphisms (2.4) and (2.5).

We have commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(L \circ M \circ N) & \twoheadrightarrow & e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(L \circ (M \nabla N)) \twoheadrightarrow e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)q^{(\beta, \gamma)}(L \circ N \circ M) \\
 \downarrow \wr & & \downarrow \wr \\
 (L \circ M) \otimes N & \xrightarrow{\sim} & q^{(\beta, \gamma) - (\beta, \gamma)}(L \circ M) \otimes N,
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)(L \circ N \circ M) & \twoheadrightarrow & e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)((L \nabla N) \circ M) \twoheadrightarrow e(\alpha + \beta, \gamma)q^{(\alpha, \gamma)}(N \circ L \circ M) \\
 \downarrow \wr & & \downarrow \wr \\
 q^{-(\beta, \gamma)}(L \circ M) \otimes N & \xrightarrow{\sim} & q^{(\alpha, \gamma) - (\alpha + \beta, \gamma)}(L \circ M) \otimes N.
 \end{array}$$

Here the vertical arrows are isomorphisms by (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3). Hence we obtain (2.4) and (2.5). \square

Proposition 2.5. *Let M be an affreal simple module, and L an R -module. We assume that*

$$\Lambda(M, S) = \Lambda(M, L) \text{ for any simple quotient } S \text{ of } L.$$

Then the head of $M \circ \text{hd}(L)$ is equal to the head of $M \circ L$.

Proof. Note that, for any simple quotient S , the following diagram commutes up to a constant multiple by [7, Proposition 3.2.8]:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 M \circ L & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{M,L}} & L \circ M \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 M \circ S & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{M,L}} & S \circ M.
 \end{array}$$

In particular, we have

$$(2.6) \quad \text{the composition } M \circ L \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{M,L}} L \circ M \rightarrow S \circ M \text{ does not vanish.}$$

Let K be a maximal submodule of $M \circ L$. In order to see the proposition, it is enough to show that $M \circ T \subset K$ for some maximal module T of L . Let us consider the following commutative diagram where r is the R -matrix $\mathbf{r}_{M,L} : M \circ L \rightarrow L \circ M$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 M \circ K & \xrightarrow{\quad} & & \xrightarrow{\quad} & K \circ M \\
 \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\
 M \circ M \circ L & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}_{M,M}} & M \circ M \circ L & \xrightarrow{M \circ r} & M \circ L \circ M.
 \end{array}$$

Hence we have $M \circ \mathbf{r}(K) \subset K \circ M$. Hence there exists a submodule $P \subset L$ such that $\mathbf{r}(K) \subset P \circ M$ and $M \circ P \subset K$. Hence $P \neq L$. Let us take a maximal submodule $T \subsetneq L$ such that $P \subset T$. Since the composition $M \circ L \xrightarrow{\mathbf{r}} L \circ M \rightarrow (L/T) \circ M$ does not vanish by (2.6), $K \subset \mathbf{r}^{-1}(T \circ M) \neq M \circ L$. Hence we obtain $\mathbf{r}^{-1}(T \circ M) = K$. Hence $M \circ T \subset \mathbf{r}^{-1}(T \circ M) = K$. \square

Corollary 2.6. *Let N_j ($j = 1, \dots, n$) be a simple module, and set $L := N_1 \circ \dots \circ N_n$. Let M be an affreal simple module. We assume that M and N_j commute. Then $M \circ \text{hd}(L)$ is semisimple and is equal to the head of $M \circ L$.*

Proof. By [7, Proposition 3.2.10], we have $\Lambda(M, S) = \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda(M, N_i)$ for any quotient S of L . Note that every simple quotient of L commutes with M . Thus $M \circ \text{hd}(L)$ is semisimple. Then by the proposition above,

$$M \circ \text{hd}(L) \simeq \text{hd}(M \circ \text{hd}(L)) = \text{hd}(M \circ L),$$

as desired. \square

2.2. Normal sequences.

Definition 2.7. *Let (M_1, \dots, M_r) be a sequence of simple modules in $R\text{-gmod}$ such that M_k is affreal except for possibly one k . The sequence (M_1, \dots, M_r) is called a normal sequence if the composition of r -matrices*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_{M_1, \dots, M_r} &:= (\mathbf{r}_{M_{r-1}, M_r}) \circ \dots \circ (\mathbf{r}_{M_2, M_r} \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{r}_{M_2, M_3}) \circ (\mathbf{r}_{M_1, M_r} \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{r}_{M_1, M_2}) \\ &: M_1 \circ \dots \circ M_r \longrightarrow M_r \circ \dots \circ M_1 \end{aligned}$$

does not vanish.

Note that if (M_1, \dots, M_r) is a normal sequence, then $\text{Im}(\mathbf{r}_{M_1, \dots, M_r})$ is simple, and it is isomorphic to the head of $M_1 \circ \dots \circ M_r$ and to the socle of $M_r \circ \dots \circ M_1$.

Lemma 2.8 ([10, Lemma 2.7, Lemma 2.8]). *Let (L_1, \dots, L_r) be a sequence of simple modules in $R\text{-gmod}$ such that L_k are affreal except for possibly one k . Then the following three conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) (L_1, \dots, L_r) is a normal sequence.
- (b) (L_2, \dots, L_r) is a normal sequence and

$$\Lambda(L_1, \text{hd}(L_2 \circ \dots \circ L_r)) = \sum_{2 \leq j \leq r} \Lambda(L_1, L_j).$$

(c) (L_1, \dots, L_{r-1}) is a normal sequence and

$$\Lambda(\text{hd}(L_2 \circ \dots \circ L_{r-1}), L_r) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq r-1} \Lambda(L_j, L_r).$$

Proposition 2.9. *Let M_j ($j = 1, \dots, n$) be an affreal module. We assume that*

$$(2.7) \quad \tilde{\Lambda}(M_j, M_k) = 0 \text{ if } 1 \leq j < k \leq n \text{ and } 3 \leq k.$$

Then (M_1, \dots, M_n) is a normal sequence.

Remark that if (M_1, \dots, M_n) satisfies condition (2.7), then $(M_1^{m_1}, \dots, M_n^{m_n})$ also satisfies (2.7) for any $m_1, \dots, m_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Proof. Let us show it by induction on n . We may assume that $n \geq 3$. We have

$$0 \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(\text{hd}(M_1 \circ \dots \circ M_{n-1}), M_n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{\Lambda}(M_i, M_n) = 0,$$

which implies

$$\Lambda(\text{hd}(M_1 \circ \dots \circ M_{n-1}), M_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \Lambda(M_i, M_n).$$

Now the conclusion follows from Lemma 2.8. □

For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $v \in \mathfrak{S}_m$ and $w \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, let $v \star w$ be the element of \mathfrak{S}_{m+n} defined by

$$(v \star w)(k) = \begin{cases} v(k) & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq m, \\ w(k-m) + m & \text{if } m < k \leq m+n. \end{cases}$$

Let \preceq be the Bruhat order on \mathfrak{S}_m . For $1 \leq k < m$ and $w \in \mathfrak{S}_m$, we have

$$s_k w \preceq w \quad \text{if and only if} \quad w^{-1}(k) > w^{-1}(k+1).$$

Note also that

$$\text{if } u \preceq w, s_k w \preceq w \text{ and } u \preceq s_k u, \text{ then } u \preceq s_k w \text{ and } s_k u \preceq w.$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{S}_{\ell, m}$ the set of minimal length left coset representatives in $\mathfrak{S}_{\ell+m}$ with respect to the subgroup $\mathfrak{S}_\ell \times \mathfrak{S}_m$. Namely,

$$\mathfrak{S}_{\ell, m} = \{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{\ell+m} \mid w \text{ is increasing on } [1, \ell] \text{ and on } [\ell+1, \ell+m]\}.$$

The following lemma will be used in the proof of Theorem 2.11, one of the main results of this section. In the lemma, $\mathbf{1}_n$ denotes the unit of \mathfrak{S}_n .

Lemma 2.10. *Let $\ell, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}$, $v \in \mathfrak{S}_{n, \ell}$. Set $v_0 = w[n, \ell]$. Then one has*

- (i) if $1 \leq k < m + \ell$ satisfies $s_k w \preceq w$, then
 - (a) $w^{-1}(k+1) \leq m < w^{-1}(k) \leq m + \ell$,
 - (b) $s_k w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}$,
 - (c) $(s_k w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v) \preceq (w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)$,
- (ii) $\ell((w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)) = \ell(v) + \ell(w)$,
- (iii) $\mathbf{1}_m \star v \preceq (w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)$,
- (iv) $(w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0) \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n,\ell}$,
- (v) If $\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0 \preceq (w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)$, then $v = v_0$.

Proof. (i) Let us set $a := w^{-1}(k+1) < b := w^{-1}(k)$. Then we have $w(b) < w(a)$. Hence we have $a \leq m < b$. We have

$$s_k w(i) = \begin{cases} w(i) < k & \text{if } 1 \leq i < a, \\ k & \text{if } i = a, \\ w(i) > k + 1 & \text{if } a < i \leq m, \\ w(i) < k & \text{if } m < i < b, \\ k + 1 & \text{if } i = b, \\ w(i) > k & \text{if } b < i \leq m + \ell. \end{cases}$$

Hence we have $s_k w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}$.

Now we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)^{-1} \cdot (w \star \mathbf{1}_n)^{-1}(k) &= (\mathbf{1}_m \star v^{-1})(b) > m, \\ (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)^{-1} \cdot (w \star \mathbf{1}_n)^{-1}(k+1) &= (\mathbf{1}_m \star v^{-1})(a) = a \leq m. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $(s_k w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v) \preceq (w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)$.

(ii) follows from (i) by induction on $\ell(w)$.

(iii) follows from (i).

(iv) For $1 \leq k \leq m + n + \ell$, we have

$$(w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0)(k) = \begin{cases} w(k) \leq m + \ell & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq m, \\ k + \ell > m + \ell & \text{if } m < k \leq m + n, \\ w(k - n) & \text{if } m + n < k \leq m + n + \ell. \end{cases}$$

Hence $(w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0)$ is increasing on $[1, m + n]$ and $[m + n + 1, m + n + \ell]$.

(v) We shall prove it by induction on $\ell(w)$. When $w = \mathbf{1}_{m+\ell}$, it is obvious. Assume that $\ell(w) > 0$. Take k such that $1 \leq k < m + \ell$ and $s_k w \preceq w$. Set $x = (w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v)$. Then $s_k x \preceq x$ by (i).

On the other hand, we have, for any i such that $1 \leq i \leq m + \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{1}_m \star w[n, \ell])^{-1}(i) &= (\mathbf{1}_m \star w[\ell, n])(i) \\ &= \begin{cases} i & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq m, \\ i + n & \text{if } m < i \leq m + \ell. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Hence $(\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0)^{-1}$ is increasing on $[1, m + \ell]$ and hence $\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0 \preceq s_k(\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0)$. Since $s_k x \preceq x$ and $\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0 \preceq x$, we obtain

$$\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0 \preceq s_k x = (s_k w \star \mathbf{1}_n) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_m \star v).$$

Thus the induction hypothesis implies that $v = v_0$. □

Theorem 2.11. *Let L be an affreal simple module, and let M, N be simple modules.*

(i) *For any simple quotient S of $M \circ N$, we have*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(L, M) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(L, S).$$

(ii) *For any simple quotient S of $M \circ N$, we have*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(N, L) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(S, L).$$

(iii) *For any simple submodule S of $M \circ N$, we have*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(L, N) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(L, S).$$

(iv) *For any simple submodule S of $M \circ N$, we have*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(M, L) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(S, L).$$

Proof. We shall prove only (i), since the other statements are obtained from (i) by applying $\psi_*: (R\text{-gmod})^{\text{rev}} \xrightarrow{\sim} R\text{-gmod}$ or the duality functor \star .

Let (\tilde{L}, z) be an affinization of L with $\deg z = 1$.

Let $L \in R(\alpha)\text{-gmod}$, $M \in R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$, $N \in R(\gamma)\text{-gmod}$, and $\ell = |\alpha|$, $m = |\beta|$, $n = |\gamma|$. Set $w_0 = w[m, \ell] \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+\ell}$ and $v_0 = w[n, \ell] \in \mathfrak{S}_{n+\ell}$. Note that $R(\alpha + \beta)e(\beta, \alpha) = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}} \tau_w(R(\beta) \boxtimes R(\alpha))$. Write

$$\varphi_{w[m, \ell]}e(\beta, \alpha) = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}} \tau_w a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)},$$

where $a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)} \in R(\beta) \boxtimes R(\alpha) \subset e(\beta, \alpha)R(\beta + \alpha)e(\beta, \alpha)$. Similarly we define $a_v^{(\gamma, \alpha)} \in R(\gamma) \boxtimes R(\alpha)$ for $v \in \mathfrak{S}_{n, \ell}$. Note that

$$(2.8) \quad a_{v_0}^{(\gamma, \alpha)} = \sum_{\nu \in I^\gamma, \mu \in I^\alpha} \left(\prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n < j \leq n + \ell, \\ \nu_i = \mu_{j-n}}} (x_i - x_j) \right) e(\nu) \boxtimes e(\mu).$$

Then we have

$$R_{\tilde{L}, M}(u \boxtimes x) = \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}} \tau_w a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)}(x \boxtimes u) \quad \text{for } u \in \tilde{L} \text{ and } x \in M.$$

Note that $a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)}(x \boxtimes u) \in M \boxtimes \tilde{L}$.

By the shuffle lemma, we have

$$M \circ \tilde{L} = \bigoplus_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}} \tau_w(M \boxtimes \tilde{L}).$$

Hence, in order to see (i), it is enough to show that

$$(2.9) \quad a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)}(M \boxtimes \tilde{L}) \subset z^{-2\tilde{\Lambda}(L, S) + \deg a_{w_0}^{(\beta, \alpha)}}(M \boxtimes \tilde{L})$$

for all $w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}$.

Let $\xi: R(\beta) \boxtimes R(\alpha) \rightarrow R(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)$ be the algebra homomorphism $b \boxtimes a \mapsto b \boxtimes e(\gamma) \boxtimes a$. Then, for $u \in \tilde{L}$, $x \in M$ and $y \in N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\tilde{L}, M \circ N}(u \boxtimes x \boxtimes y) &= (M \circ R_{\tilde{L}, N}) \left(\left(\sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}} \tau_w a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)}(x \boxtimes u) \right) \boxtimes y \right) \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}} (\tau_w \boxtimes e(\gamma)) (e(\beta) \boxtimes \varphi_{w[n, \ell]}) \xi(a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)})(x \boxtimes y \boxtimes u) \\ &= \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m, \ell}, v \in \mathfrak{S}_{n, \ell}} (\tau_w \boxtimes e(\gamma)) (e(\beta) \boxtimes \tau_v) (e(\beta) \boxtimes a_v^{(\gamma, \alpha)}) \xi(a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)})(x \boxtimes y \boxtimes u). \end{aligned}$$

Let us denote by $h: M \otimes N \rightarrow S$ the composition $M \otimes N \rightarrow M \circ N \rightarrow S$. It is $R(\beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ -linear and injective, since $M \otimes N$ is a simple $R(\beta) \otimes R(\gamma)$ -module.

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{\tilde{L},S}(u \boxtimes h(x \otimes y)) &= \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}, v \in \mathfrak{S}_{n,\ell}} \tau_{(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v)} a_{w,v}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)}(h(x \otimes y) \boxtimes u) \\
 &= \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}} \tau_{(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0)} a_{w,v_0}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)}(h(x \otimes y) \boxtimes u) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}, \\ v \in \mathfrak{S}_{n,\ell} \setminus \{v_0\}}} \tau_{(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v)} a_{w,v}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)}(h(x \otimes y) \boxtimes u),
 \end{aligned}$$

where $a_{w,v}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)} = (e(\beta) \boxtimes a_v^{(\gamma,\alpha)}) \xi(a_w^{(\beta,\alpha)}) \in R(\beta) \boxtimes R(\gamma) \boxtimes R(\alpha)$.

We write $R_{\tilde{L},S}^{\text{norm}} = z^{-s} R_{\tilde{L},S}$. Note that

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(L, S) = (\deg a_{w_0, v_0}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)} - s)/2 = (\deg a_{w_0}^{(\beta,\alpha)} + \deg a_{v_0}^{(\gamma,\alpha)} - s)/2.$$

Thus we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.10) \quad &\sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}} \tau_{(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0)} a_{w,v_0}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)}(h(x \otimes y) \boxtimes u) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}, \\ v \in \mathfrak{S}_{n,\ell} \setminus \{v_0\}}} \tau_{(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v)} a_{w,v}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)}(h(x \otimes y) \boxtimes u) \\
 &\hspace{15em} \in z^s (S \circ \tilde{L}).
 \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 2.10, we have $(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v) \not\geq \mathbf{1}_m \star v_0$ for $v \in \mathfrak{S}_{n,\ell} \setminus \{v_0\}$. Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tau_{(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v)} a_{w,v}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)}(S \boxtimes \tilde{L}) &\subset \tau_{(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v)}(S \boxtimes \tilde{L}) \\
 &\subset \sum_{g \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n,\ell}, g \not\geq \mathbf{1}_m \star v_0} \tau_g(S \boxtimes \tilde{L}).
 \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the shuffle lemma implies

$$S \circ \tilde{L} = \bigoplus_{g \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n,\ell}} \tau_g(S \boxtimes \tilde{L}).$$

By Lemma 2.10, we have $(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0) \in \mathfrak{S}_{m+n,\ell}$, and $(w \star \mathbf{1}_n)(\mathbf{1}_m \star v_0) \geq \mathbf{1}_m \star v_0$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 a_{w,v_0}^{(\beta,\gamma,\alpha)}(h(x \otimes y) \boxtimes u) &\in z^s (S \boxtimes \tilde{L}) \cap (h(M \otimes N) \boxtimes \tilde{L}) \\
 &= h(M \otimes N) \boxtimes z^s \tilde{L} \quad \text{for any } w \in \mathfrak{S}_{m,\ell}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Since we have $a_{v_0}^{(\gamma, \alpha)}|_{N \boxtimes \tilde{L}} \in \mathbf{k}^\times z^c \text{id}_{N \boxtimes \tilde{L}}$ with $c = \deg a_{v_0}^{(\gamma, \alpha)}$ by (2.8), we have

$$z^c (a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)}(x \boxtimes u)) \boxtimes y \in z^s (M \boxtimes \tilde{L} \boxtimes N).$$

Finally, we obtain

$$a_w^{(\beta, \alpha)}(x \boxtimes u) \in z^{s-c} (M \boxtimes \tilde{L}) = z^{-2\tilde{\Lambda}(L, S) + \deg a_{w_0}^{(\beta, \alpha)}} (M \boxtimes \tilde{L}).$$

It is nothing but (2.9). \square

Corollary 2.12. *Let L be an affreal simple module, and let M, N be simple modules. Let S be a simple quotient of $M \circ N$.*

If $\tilde{\Lambda}(L, N) = 0$, then we have

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(L, S) = \tilde{\Lambda}(L, M)$$

and hence

$$\Lambda(L, S) = \Lambda(L, M) + \Lambda(L, N).$$

Proof. We have

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(L, M) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(L, S) \leq \tilde{\Lambda}(L, M \circ N) = \tilde{\Lambda}(L, M) + \tilde{\Lambda}(L, N) = \tilde{\Lambda}(L, M),$$

where the first inequality follows from Theorem 2.11. Hence we have $\tilde{\Lambda}(L, S) = \tilde{\Lambda}(L, M)$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}(L, S) = \tilde{\Lambda}(L, M) + \tilde{\Lambda}(L, N)$, which is equivalent to $\Lambda(L, S) = \Lambda(L, M) + \Lambda(L, N)$, as desired. \square

Corollary 2.13. *Let L be an affreal simple module, and let M, N be simple modules. Assume that M or N is affreal.*

- (i) *If $\tilde{\Lambda}(L, N) = 0$, then (L, M, N) is a normal sequence.*
- (ii) *If $\tilde{\Lambda}(N, L) = 0$, then (N, M, L) is a normal sequence.*

Proof. (i) By Corollary 2.12, we have $\Lambda(L, M \nabla N) = \Lambda(L, M) + \Lambda(L, N)$. Hence (L, M, N) is a normal sequence by Lemma 2.8.

- (ii) A similar proof to (i) works for (ii). \square

2.3. Head simplicity of convolutions with $L(i)$.

Definition 2.14. *For $i \in I$, $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ and a simple $R(\beta)$ -module M , define*

$$\mathfrak{d}_i(M) := \varepsilon_i(M) + \varepsilon_i^*(M) + \langle h_i, \text{wt}(M) \rangle.$$

Recall the following lemma.

Lemma 2.15 ([11, Corollary 3.8]). *For $i \in I$, $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ and a simple module $R(\beta)$ -module M , we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\Lambda}(L(i), M) &= \frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{2} \varepsilon_i(M), \\ \tilde{\Lambda}(M, L(i)) &= \frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{2} \varepsilon_i^*(M), \\ \mathfrak{d}(L(i), M) &= \frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{2} \mathfrak{d}_i(M).\end{aligned}$$

For an $R(\beta)$ -module M and $i \in I$, set

$$\mathrm{wt}_i(M) := \langle h_i, \mathrm{wt}(M) \rangle = -\langle h_i, \beta \rangle.$$

Proposition 2.16 (cf. [19]). *Let $i \in I$ and let M be a simple module.*

(i) *If $\mathfrak{d}_i(M) = 0$, then we have $L(i) \nabla M \simeq L(i) \circ M \simeq M \circ L(i) \simeq M \nabla L(i)$ (up to a grading shift) and $\mathfrak{d}_i(L(i) \circ M) = 0$.*

If $\mathfrak{d}_i(M) > 0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}_i(L(i) \nabla M) &= \mathfrak{d}_i(M \nabla L(i)) = \mathfrak{d}_i(M) - 1, \\ \varepsilon_i(M \nabla L(i)) &= \varepsilon_i(M), \quad \varepsilon_i^*(L(i) \nabla M) = \varepsilon_i^*(M).\end{aligned}$$

(ii) *We have*

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned}\mathfrak{d}_i(L(i^n) \nabla M) &= \max(\mathfrak{d}_i(M) - n, 0), \\ \mathfrak{d}_i(M \nabla L(i^n)) &= \max(\mathfrak{d}_i(M) - n, 0).\end{aligned}$$

(iii) *We have*

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_i(M \nabla L(i^n)) &= \max(\varepsilon_i(M), n - \mathrm{wt}_i(M) - \varepsilon_i^*(M)), \\ \varepsilon_i^*(L(i^n) \nabla M) &= \max(\varepsilon_i^*(M), n - \mathrm{wt}_i(M) - \varepsilon_i(M)).\end{aligned}$$

Proof. (i) The first statement follows from [7, Lemma 3.2.3] and [13, Corollary 3.18]. Assume that $\mathfrak{d}_i(M) > 0$. By [13, Corollary 3.18], we have $\mathfrak{d}_i(M \nabla L(i)) < \mathfrak{d}_i(M)$. On the other hand we have

$$\varepsilon_i(M \nabla L(i)) \geq \varepsilon_i(M), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\varepsilon_i^*(M \nabla L(i)) + \mathrm{wt}_i(M \nabla L(i)) = \varepsilon_i^*(M) + 1 + \mathrm{wt}_i(M) - 2 = \varepsilon_i^*(M) + \mathrm{wt}_i(M) - 1.$$

Hence, we obtain $\mathfrak{d}_i(M \nabla L(i)) \geq \mathfrak{d}_i(M) - 1$. It follows that $\mathfrak{d}_i(M \nabla L(i)) = \mathfrak{d}_i(M) - 1$ and $\varepsilon_i(M \nabla L(i)) = \varepsilon_i(M)$. For the statements for $L(i) \nabla M$ can be similarly proved.

(ii) follows from (i).

(iii) By (ii), we have

$$\max(\mathfrak{d}_i(M) - n, 0) = \mathfrak{d}_i(M \nabla L(i^n)) = \varepsilon_i(M \nabla L(i^n)) + \varepsilon_i^*(M) + n + \text{wt}_i(M) - 2n.$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i(M \nabla L(i^n)) &= \max(\varepsilon_i(M) + \varepsilon_i^*(M) + \text{wt}_i(M) - n, 0) - \varepsilon_i^*(M) - \text{wt}_i(M) + n \\ &= \max(\varepsilon_i(M), -\varepsilon_i^*(M) - \text{wt}_i(M) + n). \end{aligned}$$

The statement for ε_i^* is similarly proved. \square

Theorem 2.17. *Let $i \in I$ and let M be a simple module. Assume that $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ satisfy*

$$\mathfrak{d}_i(M) \geq a + b.$$

Then $L(i^a) \circ M \circ L(i^b)$ has a simple head and a simple socle. In particular, we have

$$\tilde{F}_i^a(\tilde{F}_i^*)^b M \simeq (\tilde{F}_i^*)^b \tilde{F}_i^a M.$$

Proof. Assume that M is an $R(\beta)$ -module with $n = |\beta|$, and set $L_1 = L(i)^{\circ a}$ and $L_2 = L(i)^{\circ b}$

(i) First assume that $\varepsilon_i(M) = \varepsilon_i^*(M) = 0$. We shall show that

(12) the graded $(R(a\alpha_i) \boxtimes R(\beta) \boxtimes R(b\alpha_i))$ -module $L_1 \boxtimes M \boxtimes L_2$ appears only once in $e(i^a, \beta, i^b)(L_1 \circ M \circ L_2)$ as a composition factor (including the grading).

By the shuffle lemma, we have

$$e(i^a, \beta, i^b)(L_1 \circ M \circ L_2) = \bigoplus_{\substack{w \in \mathfrak{S}'_{a+n+b}, \\ \nu \in I^{\beta+(a+b)\alpha_i}}} e(i^a, \beta, i^b) \tau_w e(\nu)(L(i)^{\boxtimes a} \boxtimes M \boxtimes L(i)^{\boxtimes b}).$$

Here \mathfrak{S}'_{a+n+b} is the set of $w \in \mathfrak{S}_{a+n+b}$ such that $w|_{[a+1, a+n]}$ is increasing. Since $\varepsilon_i(M) = 0$ and $\varepsilon_i^*(M) = 0$, we may assume that $\nu_{a+1} \neq i$ and $\nu_{a+n} \neq i$. We may assume $\nu_{w^{-1}k} = i$ for $k \in [1, a] \sqcup [a+n+1, a+n+b]$. Hence we have

$$a+1 \leq w(a+1) \quad \text{and} \quad w(a+n) \leq a+n.$$

Hence we have $w|_{[a+1, a+n]} = \text{id}_{[a+1, a+n]}$. Thus we obtain

$$e(i^a, \beta, i^b)(L_1 \circ M \circ L_2) = \sum_{v \in \mathfrak{S}''_{a+n+b}} (R(a\alpha_i) \boxtimes e(\beta) \boxtimes R(b\alpha_i)) \tau_v (L(i)^{\boxtimes a} \boxtimes M \boxtimes L(i)^{\boxtimes b}).$$

Here \mathfrak{S}''_{a+n+b} is the set of $v \in \mathfrak{S}_{a+n+b}$ such that $v^{-1}|_{[1,a]}$ and $v^{-1}|_{[a+n+1,a+n+b]}$ are increasing and $v|_{[a+1,a+n]} = \text{id}_{[a+1,a+n]}$. The above gives an $R(a\alpha_i) \boxtimes R(\beta) \boxtimes R(b\alpha_i)$ -submodule filtration of $e(i^a, \beta, i^b)(L_1 \circ M \circ L_2)$ which is compatible with \preceq on \mathfrak{S}''_{a+n+b} .

More precisely, we have the following equality in the Grothendieck group of $(R(a\alpha_i) \otimes R(\beta) \otimes R(b\alpha_i))\text{-gmod}$:

$$[e(i^a, \beta, i^b)(L_1 \circ M \circ L_2)] = \sum_{v \in \mathfrak{S}''_{a+n+b}} q^{N(v)} [L_1 \otimes M \otimes L_2].$$

Here, $N(v)$ is the homogeneous degree of $e(i^a, \beta, i^b)\tau_v$.

For $v \in \mathfrak{S}''_{a+n+b}$, let k be the number of $s \in [1, a]$ such that $v^{-1}(s) \in [a+n+1, a+n+b]$. Then k is also equal to the number of $t \in [a+n+1, a+n+b]$ such that $v^{-1}(t) \in [1, a]$. Then $0 \leq k \leq \min(a, b)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned} [1, a] \cap v([1, a]) &= [1, a - k], \\ [1, a] \cap v([a+n+1, a+n+b]) &= [a - k + 1, a], \\ [a+n+1, a+n+b] \cap v([1, a]) &= [a+n+1, a+n+k], \\ [a+n+1, a+n+b] \cap v([a+n+1, a+n+b]) &= [a+n+k+1, a+n+b]. \end{aligned}$$

Then the homogeneous degree $N(v)$ of $e(i^a, \beta, i^b)\tau_{v^{-1}}$ is equal to

$$N(v) := -2k(\alpha_i, \beta) - (\alpha_i, \alpha_i)\sharp A(v).$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} A(v) &:= \{(s, t) \mid s \in [1, a], t \in [a+n+1, a+n+b], v(s) > v(t)\} \\ &= A_1 \sqcup A_2 \sqcup A_3 \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \{(s, t) \mid s \in [a - k + 1, a], t \in [a+n+k+1, a+n+b], \\ &\quad v(s) > v(t)\}, \\ A_2 &= \{(s, t) \mid s \in [1, a - k], t \in [a+n+1, a+n+k], v(s) > v(t)\}, \\ A_3 &= \{(s, t) \mid s \in [a - k + 1, a], t \in [a+n+1, a+n+k]\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, one has

$$\sharp A(v) = \sharp A_1 + \sharp A_2 + \sharp A_3 \leq k(b - k) + k(a - k) + k^2 = k(a + b) - k^2.$$

Since $-(\alpha_i, \beta) = \frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{2} \mathfrak{d}_i(M)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N(v) &= (\alpha_i, \alpha_i)(k \mathfrak{d}_i(M) - \sharp A(v)) \\ &\geq (\alpha_i, \alpha_i) \left(k(a + b) - (k(a + b) - k^2) \right) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_i) k^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $N(v) = 0$ implies $k = 0$ which is equivalent to $v = \text{id}$. Thus we obtain (2.12).

Any R -submodule K of $L_1 \circ M \circ L_2$ is a proper submodule if and only if $L_1 \boxtimes M \boxtimes L_2$ does not appear in the $(R(a\alpha_i) \boxtimes R(\beta) \boxtimes R(b\alpha_i))$ -module $e(i^a, \beta, i^b)K$ as a composition factor. Since the last property is stable by taking sums, a proper maximal submodule of $L_1 \circ M \circ L_2$ is unique, and hence $L(i^a) \circ M \circ L(i^b)$ has a simple head. By duality, $L(i^a) \circ M \circ L(i^b)$ has a simple socle.

(ii) General case. Set $b' = \varepsilon_i^*(M)$ and $a' = \varepsilon_i(E_i^{*(b')}M)$ and $M_0 = E_i^{(a')}E_i^{*(b')}(M)$. Then $\varepsilon_i(M_0) = \varepsilon_i^*(M_0) = 0$ and we have $M \simeq (L(i^{a'}) \nabla M_0) \nabla L(i^{b'})$. Then, (2.11) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{d}_i(L(i^{a'}) \nabla M_0) &= \max(\mathfrak{d}_i(M_0) - a', 0), \\ \mathfrak{d}_i(M) &= \max(\mathfrak{d}_i(L(i^{a'}) \nabla M_0) - b', 0) \\ &= \max(\mathfrak{d}_i(M_0) - a' - b', 0). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain $\mathfrak{d}_i(M_0) \geq a + a' + b + b'$. Therefore, (i) implies that the convolution $L(i^a) \circ L(i^{a'}) \circ M_0 \circ L(i^{b'}) \circ L(i^b)$ has a simple head. Hence $L(i^a) \circ M \circ L(i^b)$ has a simple head. \square

2.4. Generalization of determinantal modules. Recall that $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$ is w -dominant if $(\beta, \lambda) \geq 0$ for any $\beta \in \Delta_+ \cap w^{-1}\Delta_-$. In this case, we have $\lambda - w\lambda \in \mathbf{Q}_+$.

Theorem 2.18. *Let $w \in W$ and let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$. Assume that λ is w -dominant. Then there exists a self-dual simple $R(\lambda - w\lambda)$ -module $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ which satisfies the following conditions.*

- (a) *If $i \in I$ satisfies $\langle h_i, w\lambda \rangle \geq 0$, then $\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$.*
- (b) *If $i \in I$ satisfies $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \leq 0$, then $\varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$.*
- (c) *If $i \in I$ satisfies $s_i w \prec w$, then $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq L(i^m) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{s_i w}(s_i w\lambda, \lambda)$ where $m = \langle h_i, s_i w\lambda \rangle = \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*
- (d) *If $i \in I$ satisfies $ws_i \prec w$, then $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_{ws_i}(w\lambda, s_i \lambda) \nabla L(i^m)$ where $m = \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle = \varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.*

(e) For any $\mu \in P_+$ such that $\lambda + \mu \in P_+$, we have

$$\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w(\lambda + \mu), \lambda + \mu)$$

up to a grading shift.

Moreover such an $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ is unique up to an isomorphism.

Proof. The uniqueness of $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ follows from (e) together with [6, Corollary 3.7].

Let us show the existence of $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ satisfying (a)–(e) for a w -dominant λ by induction on $\ell(w)$. Assume that $\ell(w) > 0$.

Take $i \in I$ such that $w' := s_i w \prec w$. Then there exists $\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)$ satisfying (a)–(e) with w' instead of w , since λ is w' -dominant. By (a), we have $\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$. Set $m = \langle h_i, w'\lambda \rangle \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) := L(i^m) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)$. Then $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ is self-dual by [7, Lemma 3.1.4], since $\tilde{\Lambda}(L(i^m), \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$ by Corollary 2.3.

Let us take $\mu \in P_+$ such that $\eta := \lambda + \mu \in P_+$. Then we have

$$\mathbf{M}(w'\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w'\eta, \eta) \quad \text{up to a grading shift}$$

by (e) for w' . Set $n = \langle h_i, w'\mu \rangle \geq 0$. Note that n is non-negative, since any dominant weight is w -dominant. Then $m + n = \langle h_i, w'\eta \rangle$. Since $\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$ by (a) for w' , the triple $(L(i^{m+n}), \mathbf{M}(w'\mu, \mu), \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda))$ is a normal sequence by Corollary 2.13 and Corollary 2.3. Hence, we conclude that the convolution $L(i^{m+n}) \circ \mathbf{M}(w'\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)$ has a simple head.

We have epimorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} L(i^{m+n}) \circ \mathbf{M}(w'\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \\ &\simeq L(i^m) \circ L(i^n) \circ \mathbf{M}(w'\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \\ &\twoheadrightarrow L(i^m) \circ \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \\ &\underset{*}{\simeq} \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \circ L(i^m) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \\ &\twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where \simeq follows from [11, Lemma 4.9].

On the other hand, by (e) for w' , we have

$$\begin{aligned} L(i^{m+n}) \circ \mathbf{M}(w'\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \\ \twoheadrightarrow L(i^{m+n}) \circ \mathbf{M}(w'\eta, \eta) \twoheadrightarrow \mathbf{M}(w\eta, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain $\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w\eta, \eta)$.

Thus we obtain (e). Since $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ satisfying (e) is unique, $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ satisfies (c).

Let us show (b). Let us take $j \in I$ such that $w' := s_j w < w$. Set $m = \langle h_j, w'\lambda \rangle \geq 0$. Then, by (c) we have

$$\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq L(j^m) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda).$$

Hence, if $i \neq j$, then we have $\varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) = \varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$, where the last equality follows from (b) for w' .

Assume that $i = j$. Since $\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$ by (a) for w' , Proposition 2.16 implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) &= \varepsilon_i^*(L(j^m) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)) \\ &= \max(\varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)), m - \text{wt}_i(\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda))) \\ &= \max(0, m - \langle h_i, w'\lambda - \lambda \rangle) = \max(0, \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let us show (d). It is trivial for $\ell(w) \leq 1$. Hence we assume that $\ell(w) > 1$. Let us take $j \in I$ such that $s_j w s_i < w s_i$. Set $w' = s_j w$ and $n = \langle h_j, w'\lambda \rangle \geq 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) &\simeq L(j^n) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{M}_{w s_i}(w\lambda, s_i\lambda) &\simeq L(j^n) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where the second isomorphism follows from (d) for the pair $w s_i$ and $s_i\lambda$.

By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda) \nabla L(i^m)$$

where $m = \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$. Let us show that $L(j^n) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda) \circ L(i^m)$ has a simple head.

If $i = j$, Theorem 2.17 implies that $L(j^n) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda) \circ L(i^m)$ has a simple head, since we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_i(\mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda)) &= \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda)) + \varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda)) + \text{wt}_i(\mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda)) \\ &= \langle h_i, w'\lambda - s_i\lambda \rangle = n + m, \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows from (a) and (b) for $w' s_i$.

If $i \neq j$, $L(j^n) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda) \circ L(i^m)$ has a simple head by Corollary 2.13.

Hence we conclude that $L(j^n) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda) \circ L(i^m)$ has a simple head in any case. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) &\simeq L(j^n) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \text{hd}(L(j^n) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w' s_i}(w'\lambda, s_i\lambda) \circ L(i^m)) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}_{w s_i}(w\lambda, s_i\lambda) \nabla L(i^m). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we obtain (d).

Finally let us show (a). Let us take $j \in I$ such that $w' := ws_j < w$. Set $m = \langle h_j, \lambda \rangle$. Then by (d) we have

$$\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_{ws_j}(w\lambda, s_j\lambda) \nabla L(j^m).$$

By the induction hypothesis, $\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_{ws_j}(w\lambda, s_j\lambda)) = 0$. Hence if $i \neq j$ then $\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) = 0$. If $i = j$, then $\varepsilon_i^*(\mathbf{M}_{ws_i}(w\lambda, s_i\lambda)) = 0$ by (b) and hence Proposition 2.16 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) &= \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_{ws_i}(w\lambda, s_i\lambda) \nabla L(i^m)) \\ &= \max\left(\varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_{ws_i}(w\lambda, s_i\lambda)), m - \langle h_i, \text{wt}(\mathbf{M}_{ws_i}(w\lambda, s_i\lambda)) \rangle\right) \\ &= \max(0, m - \langle h_i, w\lambda - s_i\lambda \rangle) = \max(0, -\langle h_i, w\lambda \rangle) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square

Lemma 2.19. *Let $w \in W$ and let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbf{P}$ be w -dominant weights. We assume that $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ and $\mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu)$ strongly commute. Then we have*

$$\mathbf{M}_w(w(\lambda + \mu), \lambda + \mu) \simeq \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu)$$

up to a grading shift.

Proof. Let us argue by induction on $\ell(w)$. If $\ell(w) > 0$, take $i \in I$ such that $w' := s_i w < w$. Set $m = \langle h_i, w'\lambda \rangle$ and $n = \langle h_i, w'\mu \rangle$. Then $m = \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda))$ and $n = \varepsilon_i(\mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu))$ by Theorem 2.18 (c), and hence $\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)$ commutes with $\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\mu, \mu)$ by [11, Lemma 3.1]. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_i^{(m+n)}(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu)) &\simeq \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\mu, \mu) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'(\lambda + \mu), \lambda + \mu) \end{aligned}$$

by the induction hypothesis, which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu) &\simeq L(i^{m+n}) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'(\lambda + \mu), \lambda + \mu) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}_w(w(\lambda + \mu), \lambda + \mu) \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 2.18 (c). \square

Remark 2.20. For w -dominant $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ and $\mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu)$ do not commute in general. For example, when $\mathfrak{g} = A_2$, $I = \{1, 2\}$, $w = s_1 s_2$, $\lambda = \Lambda_1$, $\mu = s_1 \Lambda_1$, $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq L(1)$ and $\mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu) \simeq L(2)$ do not commute.

Conjecturally, $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ and $\mathbf{M}_w(w\mu, \mu)$ commute if λ and μ are in the same Weyl chamber (i.e., $(\beta, \lambda)(\beta, \mu) \geq 0$ for any real root β).

Lemma 2.21. *Let $w \in W$ and let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$ be a w -dominant weight. Then, for any $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_+$, we have*

$$\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_w(w(\lambda + \mu), \lambda + \mu)$$

up to a grading shift.

Proof. Let us take $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}_+$ such that $\Lambda + \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_+$. Since $\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda) \circ (\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w(\Lambda + \mu), \Lambda + \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ has a simple head, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda) \nabla (\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) \\ &\simeq \text{hd}(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}(w(\Lambda + \mu), \Lambda + \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}(w(\Lambda + \mu + \lambda), \Lambda + \mu + \lambda) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w(\mu + \lambda), \mu + \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we obtain

$$\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_w(w(\mu + \lambda), \mu + \lambda),$$

as desired. \square

Remark 2.22. (i) If $\lambda \in W\Lambda$ for some $\Lambda \in \mathcal{P}_+$, then $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ coincides with the determinantal module $\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)$.

(ii) The simple module $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ may not be real. For example, for $\mathfrak{g} = A_1^{(1)}$, $I = \{0, 1\}$, $\lambda = \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_0$ and $w = s_0s_1$, the module $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq L(0) \nabla L(1)$ is not real.

(iii) In general, the class $[(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda))] \in U_q^-(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq K(R\text{-gmod})$ depends on the choice of $\{Q_{i,j}(u, v)\}_{i,j \in I}$. For example, for $\mathfrak{g} = A_1^{(1)}$, $I = \{0, 1\}$, $\lambda = 2(\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_0)$ and $w = s_0s_1$, the class of the module $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq L(0^2) \nabla L(1^2)$ depends on the choice of $Q_{01}(u, v)$ (see [9, Example 3.3]).

(iv) Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}$. Let $w \in W$ be an element such that $\mu = w\lambda$ and λ is w -dominant. Then $\mathbf{M}_w(\mu, \lambda)$ does depend on the choice of w in general.

Let $\mathfrak{g} = A_2^{(1)}$, $I = \{0, 1, 2\}$, and $\lambda = \Lambda_1 + \Lambda_2 - 2\Lambda_0$, $w = s_2s_1s_0s_2s_1$, and $v = s_1s_2s_0s_1s_2$. Then $\mu = w\lambda = v\lambda = \lambda - 3(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) - \alpha_0$. We have

$$\mathbf{M}_w(\mu, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda_1, \lambda_1) \circ \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda_2, \lambda_2) \simeq \langle 2, 1, 0, 2, 1 \rangle \circ \langle 1, 2 \rangle,$$

$$\mathbf{M}_v(\mu, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_v(v\lambda_2, \lambda_2) \circ \mathbf{M}_v(v\lambda_1, \lambda_1) \simeq \langle 1, 2, 0, 1, 2 \rangle \circ \langle 2, 1 \rangle$$

where $\lambda_k = \Lambda_k - \Lambda_0$ ($k = 1, 2$). Note that for $(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in I^n$ such that $(\alpha_{\nu_k}, \alpha_{\nu_{k+1}}) < 0$ and $\alpha_{\nu_k} \neq \alpha_{\nu_{k+2}}$, we denote by $\langle \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n \rangle$ the one-dimensional $R(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_{\nu_k})$ -module such that $e(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \langle \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n \rangle = \langle \nu_1, \dots, \nu_n \rangle$.

(v) When $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$ is w -dominant and $\mu, \lambda + \mu \in \mathbf{P}_+$, we have $\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w(\lambda + \mu), \lambda + \mu)$ as seen in Theorem 2.18. However, $\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu)$ and $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ may not commute in general. For example, take $\mathfrak{g} = A_1^{(1)}$, $w = s_0s_1$, $\lambda = \Lambda_1 - \Lambda_0$ as in (ii). If we take $\mu = \Lambda_0$, then, $\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_1, \Lambda_1) \simeq L(0) \nabla \langle 0, 1 \rangle \simeq L(0^2) \nabla L(1)$ and $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \nabla \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \simeq \langle 0, 1, 0 \rangle$ is one-dimensional.

Recall the definition of ψ (see (1.8)).

Lemma 2.23. *Let $w \in W$ and let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$. Assume that λ is w -dominant. Then we have an isomorphism of graded modules*

$$\psi_*(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) \simeq \mathbf{M}_{w^{-1}}(-\lambda, -w\lambda).$$

Proof. Let us argue by induction on $\ell(w)$. Take $i \in I$ such that $w' = s_i w < w$. Set $n = \langle h_i, w'\lambda \rangle \geq 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_*(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) &\simeq \psi_*\left(L(i^n) \nabla \mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)\right) \simeq \psi_*(\mathbf{M}_{w'}(w'\lambda, \lambda)) \nabla L(i^n) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}_{w'^{-1}}(-\lambda, -w'\lambda) \nabla L(i^n) \\ &\simeq \mathbf{M}_{w'^{-1}s_i}(-\lambda, -s_i w'\lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}_{w^{-1}}(-\lambda, -w\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

where the first and fourth isomorphisms follow from Theorem 2.18 (c) and (d). \square

Lemma 2.24. *Let $w \in W$ and let $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$. Assume that λ is w -dominant. Then for any $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$, we have*

$$(2.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \Lambda(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda), \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) &= -(w\Lambda + \Lambda, \text{wt}(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda))), \\ \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda), \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) &= -(\Lambda, \text{wt}(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda))). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let us take $\mu \in \mathbf{P}_+$ such that $\eta := \lambda + \mu \in \mathbf{P}_+$. Set $M_\Lambda = \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda)$, $M_\lambda = \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$, $M_\mu = \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu)$ and $M_\eta = \mathbf{M}(w\eta, \eta)$. Then we have

$$M_\mu \nabla M_\lambda \simeq M_\eta \quad \text{up to a grading shift.}$$

Since M_Λ commutes with M_μ , by [11, Theorem 4.12] we have

$$\begin{aligned} -(w\Lambda + \Lambda, \text{wt}(M_\mu) + \text{wt}(M_\lambda)) &= -(w\Lambda + \Lambda, \text{wt}(M_\eta)) = \Lambda(M_\Lambda, M_\eta) \\ &= \Lambda(M_\Lambda, M_\mu \nabla M_\lambda) = \Lambda(M_\Lambda, M_\mu) + \Lambda(M_\Lambda, M_\lambda) \\ &= -(w\Lambda + \Lambda, \text{wt}(M_\mu)) + \Lambda(M_\Lambda, M_\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality in (2.13) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda), \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) &= \Lambda(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda), \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) + (\text{wt}(M_\Lambda), \text{wt}(M_\lambda)) \\ &= -(w\Lambda + \Lambda, \text{wt}(M_\lambda)) + (w\Lambda - \Lambda, \text{wt}(M_\lambda)) \\ &= -2(\Lambda, \text{wt}(M_\lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

□

3. RIGIDITY OF THE CATEGORY $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$

3.1. Kernel of the localization functor. There exists a unique family of subsets $\{B_w(\infty)\}_{w \in \mathbf{W}}$ of $B(\infty)$ satisfying the following properties (see [8]):

- (1) $B_w(\infty) = \{u_\infty\}$ if $w = 1$,
- (2) if $s_i w < w$, then

$$B_w(\infty) = \bigcup_{k \geq 0} \tilde{f}_i^k B_{s_i w}(\infty).$$

For $i \in I$ and a simple module M , set $\tilde{E}_i^{\max} M := E_i^{(n)} M$ where $n = \varepsilon_i(M)$.

Let $w \in \mathbf{W}$ and $\underline{w} = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_l}$ a reduced expression of w .

For $b \in B(\infty)$, we denote by $S(b)$ the self-dual simple R -module corresponding to b .

Proposition 3.1. *Let M be a self-dual simple R -module. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \tilde{E}_{i_{l-1}}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_2}^{\max} \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} M \simeq \mathbf{1}$.
- (b) There exists $(a_k)_{1 \leq k \leq l} \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^l$ such that

$$\text{wt}(M) = - \sum_{k=1}^l a_k \alpha_{i_k} \quad \text{and} \quad e(i_1^{a_1}, \dots, i_{l-1}^{a_{l-1}}, i_l^{a_l}) M \neq 0.$$

- (c) There exists $(a_k)_{1 \leq k \leq l} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^l$ such that $L(i_1^{a_1}) \circ \cdots \circ L(i_{l-1}^{a_{l-1}}) \circ L(i_l^{a_l}) \twoheadrightarrow M$.
- (d) $M \simeq S(b)$ for some $b \in B_w(\infty)$.

Proof. (a) \Rightarrow (b) \Leftrightarrow (c) are trivial. (a) \Leftrightarrow (d) follows from that

$$B_w(\infty) = \{b \in B(\infty) \mid \tilde{e}_{i_l}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{e}_{i_1}^{\max} b \simeq \mathbf{1}\},$$

which is [8, Proposition 3.2.5].

Assume (c). We will show (a) by induction on l . When $l = 0$, it is trivial. Assume that $l > 0$. Let $n = \varepsilon_{i_1}(M)$ and $M_0 = \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} M \simeq E_{i_1}^{(n)} M$. Then there exists a non-zero

homomorphism

$$K := E_{i_1}^{(n)} (L(i_1^{a_1}) \circ \cdots \circ L(i_{l-1}^{a_{l-1}}) \circ L(i_l^{a_l})) \xrightarrow{\phi} M_0.$$

Then by the shuffle lemma, there exists a filtration $(F_s)_{0 \leq s \leq t}$ of K such that

$$F_s/F_{s-1} \simeq L(i_1^{b_1}) \circ \cdots \circ L(i_l^{b_l})$$

for some $b_1, \dots, b_l \geq 0$.

Take the smallest s such that $\phi(F_s) \neq 0$. Then ϕ induces a non-zero homomorphism $F_s/F_{s-1} \rightarrow M_0$. Since M_0 is simple, we obtain a surjective homomorphism $L(i_1^{b_1}) \circ \cdots \circ L(i_l^{b_l}) \rightarrow M_0$ for some $b_1, \dots, b_l \geq 0$. Since $\varepsilon_{i_1}(M_0) = 0$, we conclude that $b_1 = 0$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \tilde{E}_{i_{l-1}}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_2}^{\max} M_0 \simeq \mathbf{1}$ and hence

$$\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \tilde{E}_{i_{l-1}}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_2}^{\max} \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} M \simeq \mathbf{1},$$

as desired. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let M be a simple R -module. The followings are equivalent.*

- (a) $\Lambda(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), M) < -(w\lambda + \lambda, \text{wt}(M))$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$,
- (b) $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} M \not\simeq \mathbf{1}$.

Note that the first condition is equivalent to $\tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), M) < -(\lambda, \text{wt}(M))$.

Proof. We will proceed by induction on $l = \ell(w)$.

If $l = 0$, then $\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{1}$. Hence $0 < -(2\lambda, \text{wt}(M))$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ if and only if $\text{wt}(M) \neq 0$. This is equivalent to $M \not\simeq \mathbf{1}$.

Assume that $l > 0$. Set $i := i_1$, $w' := s_i w$, $s := \langle h_{i_1}, w'\lambda \rangle$ and $M_0 := \tilde{E}_{i_1}^n(M)$, where $n = \varepsilon_{i_1} M$. For $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), M) &= \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), L(i^n) \nabla M_0) = \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), L(i^n)) + \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), M_0) \\ &= (\lambda, n\alpha_i) + \tilde{\Lambda}(L(i^s) \nabla \mathbf{M}(w'\lambda, \lambda), M_0) = (\lambda, n\alpha_i) + \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w'\lambda, \lambda), M_0), \end{aligned}$$

where the second and the third equalities follow from that $\mathfrak{d}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), L(i)) = 0$, the last follows from Corollary 2.12 together with $\tilde{\Lambda}(L(i^s), M_0) = 0$.

Hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), M) + (\lambda, \text{wt}(M)) &= (\lambda, n\alpha_i) + \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w'\lambda, \lambda), M_0) + (\lambda, \text{wt}(M)) \\ &= \tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w'\lambda, \lambda), M_0) + (\lambda, \text{wt}(M_0)). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), M) + (\lambda, \text{wt}(M)) < 0$ if and only if $\tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w'\lambda, \lambda), M_0) + (\lambda, \text{wt}(M_0)) < 0$. It is obvious that $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} M \not\simeq \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_2}^{\max} M_0 \not\simeq \mathbf{1}$. Hence the induction hypothesis implies that $\tilde{\Lambda}(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda), M) < -(\lambda, \text{wt}(M))$ if and only if $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} M \not\simeq \mathbf{1}$. \square

Assume that $I = I_w := \{i_1, \dots, i_l\}$. Recall that $Q_w: R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})^{\sim}[w] \simeq \mathcal{C}_w$ is the localization of $R\text{-gmod}$ via the real commuting family of graded braidings $\{(C_i, R_{C_i}, \phi_i)\}_{i \in I}$.

Then we have the following proposition.

Proposition 3.3 (cf. [17]). *Assume $I = I_w$. Let X be a module in $R(\beta)\text{-gmod}$. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (a) $Q_w(X) \simeq 0$,
- (b) every simple subquotient S of X satisfies that $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} S \not\simeq \mathbf{1}$,
- (c) every simple subquotient S of X is isomorphic to $S(b)$ for some $b \notin B_w(\infty)$,
- (d) $e(i_1^{a_1}, \dots, i_l^{a_l})X = 0$ for any $(a_k)_{1 \leq k \leq l} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^l$ such that $\beta = \sum_{k=1}^l a_k \alpha_{i_k}$.

Proof. For a simple module S in $R\text{-gmod}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$, $R_{C_\lambda}(S) = 0$ if and only if $\Lambda(C_\lambda, S) < -(w\lambda + \lambda, \text{wt}(S))$ by [13, Proposition 4.4, Proposition 5.1]. Recall that by the definition of localization, the identity $\text{id}_{Q_w(S)}$ is the limit of the morphisms $R_{C_\lambda}(S)$ for $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$. Hence $Q_w(S) \simeq 0$ if and only if $R_{C_\lambda}(S) = 0$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$. Thus the desired result follows from Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.2. \square

Corollary 3.4. *For any w -dominant $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}$, we have*

$$Q_w(\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)) \not\simeq 0.$$

Proof. We have $\tilde{E}_{i_l}^{\max} \cdots \tilde{E}_{i_1}^{\max} \mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq \mathbf{1}$. \square

Remark 3.5. Even if λ is w -dominant, $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda)$ may not belong to \mathcal{C}_w . For example, take $\mathfrak{g} = A_2$, $w = s_1 s_2$ and $\lambda = s_1 \Lambda_1$. Then $\mathbf{M}_w(w\lambda, \lambda) \simeq L(2)$ does not belong to \mathcal{C}_w , since $\alpha_2 \notin \Delta_+ \cap w\Delta_-$.

Remark 3.6. Let us denote by $\text{Ker } Q_w$ the full subcategory of $R\text{-gmod}$ consisting of objects X satisfying $Q_w(X) \simeq 0$. The Grothendieck group $K(\text{Ker } Q_w)$ is a two-sided ideal of

$K(R\text{-gmod})$. Then we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{C}_w & \xrightarrow{\Phi_w} & \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota_w & & \\
 R\text{-gmod} & \xrightarrow{Q_w} & R\text{-gmod}/\text{Ker } Q_w & \longrightarrow & (R\text{-gmod})^{\sim}[w].
 \end{array}$$

Taking their Grothendieck groups, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 A_q(\mathfrak{n}(w)) & \longrightarrow & A_q(\mathfrak{n}(w))D(w\Lambda, \Lambda_i)^{-1}; i \in I & & \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow [\iota_w] & & \\
 A_q(\mathfrak{n}) & \longrightarrow & A_q(\mathfrak{n})/I_w & \longrightarrow & (A_q(\mathfrak{n})/I_w)[[D(w\Lambda, \Lambda_i)]^{-1}; i \in I],
 \end{array}$$

where I_w is the ideal corresponding to $\text{Ker } Q_w$, and $D(w\Lambda, \Lambda)$ denotes the quantum unipotent minor corresponding to $\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda)$. Recall that if \mathfrak{g} is symmetric and \mathbf{k} is of characteristic zero, then one can identify the isomorphism classes of self-dual simple modules with the elements of the upper global basis. In this case, the ideal I_w coincides with the ideal $(U_{w,q}^-)^\perp$ in [18, Definition 3.37]. And the above diagram recovers [18, Theorem 4.13], which asserts that $[\iota_w]$ is an isomorphism.

3.2. Equivalence between $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}}$. For $w \in \mathbf{W}$, let us denote by \mathcal{C}_w^* the full subcategory of $R\text{-gmod}$ consisting of R -modules $M \in R\text{-gmod}$ such that

$$\mathbf{W}^*(M) \subset \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}(\Delta_+ \cap w\Delta_-).$$

Recall that, for a subset S of $\mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbf{Q}$, we write $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} S$ for the subset of linear combinations of elements in $S \cup \{0\}$ with non-negative coefficients.

Set $\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^* = \psi_*(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda)) \simeq \mathbf{M}(-\Lambda, -w^{-1}\Lambda)$ for $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and $\mathbf{C}_i^* = \mathbf{C}_{\Lambda_i}^*$. Then $\{\mathbf{C}_i^* \mid i \in I\}$ is a family of central objects of \mathcal{C}_w^* . We denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$ the localization $\mathcal{C}_w^*[\mathbf{C}_i^{*\otimes -1} \mid i \in I]$ of \mathcal{C}_w^* .

Then the anti-automorphism ψ (see (1.8)) of R induces equivalences of monoidal categories

$$\begin{aligned}
 \psi_* : (\mathcal{C}_w)^{\text{rev}} &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathcal{C}_w^*, \\
 \psi_* : (\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w)^{\text{rev}} &\xrightarrow{\simeq} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*.
 \end{aligned}$$

Recall that for a monoidal category \mathcal{T} , \mathcal{T}^{rev} is the category \mathcal{T} endowed with the new tensor product \otimes^{rev} defined by $X \otimes^{\text{rev}} Y := Y \otimes X$.

When $I = I_w := \{i \in I \mid w\Lambda_i \neq \Lambda_i\}$, we denote by

$$Q_w^*: R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$$

the localization functor, which is induced by $Q_w: R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ and ψ_* . That is, Q_w^* is the composition $R\text{-gmod} \xrightarrow{\psi_*} (R\text{-gmod})^{\text{rev}} \xrightarrow{Q_w} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^{\text{rev}} \xrightarrow{\psi_*} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$. Note that the composition

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^* \rightarrow R\text{-gmod} \xrightarrow{Q_w^*} \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$$

coincides with the localization functor of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$ by its central objects $\{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^*\}_{\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+}$.

The following theorem is one of the main results of this paper.

Theorem 3.7. *There is an equivalence of monoidal categories $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^*$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}}$. More precisely, we have a quasi-commutative diagram (when $I_w = I$)*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R\text{-gmod} & & \\ Q_w^* \downarrow & \searrow^{Q_{w^{-1}}} & \\ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w^* & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w^{-1}}. \end{array}$$

Proof. We may assume that $I = I_w$ without loss of generality. Recall the localization functor $Q_w: R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}$ from $R\text{-gmod}$ to its localization via the real commuting family of graded braidings $(\mathbf{C}_i, R_{\mathbf{C}_i}, \phi_i)_{i \in I}$. Then there is a monoidal equivalence of categories (Theorem 1.19)

$$\iota_w: \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w \xrightarrow{\sim} (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]}.$$

Now we consider the chain of the morphisms

$$R\text{-gmod} \xrightarrow{\psi_*} (R\text{-gmod})^{\text{rev}} \xrightarrow{Q_w} ((R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]})^{\text{rev}}.$$

We claim that the composition $Q_w \circ \psi_*$ factors as

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{Q_w \circ \psi_*} & \\ R\text{-gmod} & \xrightarrow{Q_{w^{-1}}} (R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w^{-1}]} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}_w} ((R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]})^{\text{rev}}. \end{array}$$

By Theorem 1.4, it is enough to show that

- (a) $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{C}_\lambda^-)$ is invertible in $((R\text{-gmod})\tilde{[w]})^{\text{rev}}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$, where $\mathbf{C}_\lambda^- := \mathbf{M}(w^{-1}\lambda, \lambda)$, and
- (b) for any $i \in I$ and $X \in R\text{-gmod}$, $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(R_{\mathbf{C}_i^-}(X)): (Q_w \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{C}_i^- \circ X) \rightarrow (Q_w \circ \psi_*)(X \circ \mathbf{C}_i^-)$ is an isomorphism.

In the course of the proof, we forget grading shifts.

First note that

$$(3.2) \quad \text{For } X \in R\text{-gmod}, Q_w(\psi_*(X)) \simeq 0 \text{ if and only if } Q_{w^{-1}}(X) \simeq 0,$$

which follows from Proposition 3.3.

(a) By Lemma 2.23 and Theorem 2.18 (e), we have

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \psi_*(\mathbf{M}(w^{-1}\lambda, \lambda)) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu) \nabla \mathbf{M}_w(-\lambda, -w^{-1}\lambda) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w\eta, \eta),$$

where $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and $\mu, \eta \in \mathbf{P}_+$ such that $\eta - \mu = -w^{-1}\lambda$. Hence, Proposition 1.20 implies that

$$Q_w(\psi_*\mathbf{C}_\lambda^-) \simeq \mathbf{C}_{-w^{-1}\lambda}^-.$$

Hence (a) follows.

(b) It is enough to show that $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(X)) \neq 0$ for any $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and any simple module X in $R\text{-gmod}$ with $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(X) \neq 0$.

Indeed, when X is simple, since $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-)$ is invertible by (a), the objects $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^- \circ X)$ and $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(X \circ \mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-)$ are simple in $((R\text{-gmod})[w])^{\text{rev}}$ so that $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(X))$ is an isomorphism. For general $X \in R\text{-gmod}$, the morphism $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(X))$ is an isomorphism by induction on the length of X .

Note that for any simple $X \in R\text{-gmod}$ such that $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(X) \neq 0$, there exists $\mu \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and a simple module Y in $\mathcal{C}_{w^{-1}}$ such that there exists an epimorphism in $R\text{-gmod}$.

$$(3.4) \quad f: \mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ X \twoheadrightarrow Y.$$

Indeed, if $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(X) \neq 0$, then $Q_{w^{-1}}(X) \neq 0$ by (3.2). Therefore $Q_{w^{-1}}(X) \simeq \mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ Y$ for some $\mu \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and a simple $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{w^{-1}}$, equivalently $Q_{w^{-1}}(\mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ X) \simeq Q_{w^{-1}}(Y)$. Hence there is a non-zero homomorphism $\mathbf{C}_{\mu'}^- \circ \mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ X \rightarrow \mathbf{C}_{\mu'}^- \circ Y$ in $R\text{-gmod}$, which is an epimorphism since $\mathbf{C}_{\mu'}^- \circ Y$ is simple. Then, replacing $\mathbf{C}_{\mu'}^- \circ \mathbf{C}_\mu^-$ and $\mathbf{C}_{\mu'}^- \circ Y$ with \mathbf{C}_μ^- and Y respectively, we obtain an epimorphism (3.4).

Then for any $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$, the following diagram is commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& & \mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ \mathbf{C}_\Lambda^- \circ X \\
& \nearrow^{R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(\mathbf{C}_\mu^-) \circ X} & \\
\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^- \circ \mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ X & \xrightarrow{R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(\mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ X)} & \mathbf{C}_\mu^- \circ X \circ \mathbf{C}_\Lambda^- \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow f \\
\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^- \circ Y & \xrightarrow{R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(Y)} & Y \circ \mathbf{C}_\Lambda^- .
\end{array}$$

Assume that $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(X)) = 0$. Applying $Q_w \circ \psi_*$ to the above diagram, we obtain $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(Y)) = 0$. Because $R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-}(Y)$ is an isomorphism, we have $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^- \circ Y) \simeq 0$. Since $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(\mathbf{C}_\Lambda^-)$ is invertible by (a), we obtain $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(Y) \simeq 0$, which implies $Q_{w^{-1}}(Y) \simeq 0$ by (3.2), which contradicts that Y is a simple module in $\mathcal{C}_{w^{-1}}$. Thus we obtain (b).

Thus we obtain the diagram (3.1).

By changing the roles of w and w^{-1} in the above argument, we obtain the lower square in the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
R\text{-gmod} & \xrightarrow{Q_{w^{-1}}} & (R\text{-gmod})\widetilde{[w^{-1}]} \\
\psi_* \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}_w \\
(R\text{-gmod})^{\text{rev}} & \xrightarrow{Q_w} & (R\text{-gmod})\widetilde{[w]}^{\text{rev}} \\
\psi_* \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{F}_{w^{-1}} \\
R\text{-gmod} & \xrightarrow{Q_{w^{-1}}} & (R\text{-gmod})\widetilde{[w^{-1}]} .
\end{array}$$

Since ψ_* is involutive, the composition $\mathcal{F}_{w^{-1}} \circ \mathcal{F}_w$ is isomorphic to the identity functor on $(R\text{-gmod})\widetilde{[w^{-1}]}$ by Theorem 1.4 (iii). It follows that \mathcal{F}_w is an equivalence of categories, as desired. \square

Corollary 3.8. *Assume that $I = I_w$. Let X be a simple module in $R\text{-gmod}$ satisfying $Q_w(X) \neq 0$. Then the triple*

$$(\mathbf{M}(w\mu, \mu), X, \psi_*(\mathbf{M}(w^{-1}\Lambda, \Lambda)))$$

is a normal sequence for any $\mu, \Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$.

Proof. In the course of the proof the above theorem, we showed that $(Q_w \circ \psi_*)(R_{C_\Lambda^-}(\psi_*(X))) \neq 0$ for any simple module $X \in R\text{-gmod}$ such that $Q_w(X) \neq 0$ and any $\Lambda \in P_+$. That is,

$$X \circ \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-) \xrightarrow{\psi_*(R_{C_\Lambda^-})} \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-) \circ X$$

does not vanish under the functor Q_w . Hence the homomorphism

$$C_\mu \circ X \circ \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-) \xrightarrow{C_\mu \circ \psi_*(R_{C_\Lambda^-})} C_\mu \circ \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-) \circ X \xrightarrow{R_{C_\mu}(\psi_*(C_\Lambda^-) \circ X)} \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-) \circ X \circ C_\mu$$

is non-zero for any $\mu \in P_+$. Since $C_\mu, \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-)$ and X are simple modules, the above homomorphism is equal to the composition of the r-matrices $\mathbf{r}_{X, \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-)}$, $\mathbf{r}_{C_\mu, \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-)}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{C_\mu, X}$ up to a constant multiple. Thus $(C_\mu, X, \psi_*(C_\Lambda^-))$ is a normal sequence. \square

Recall that the category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w-1}$ is left rigid, i.e., every object of $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w-1}$ has a left dual in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w-1}$ ([13, Corollary 5.11]). It follows that $(\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w)^{\text{rev}}$ is left rigid by the above theorem. Hence we obtain the following theorem as its corollary.

Theorem 3.9. *The category $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is a rigid monoidal category.*

4. LOCALIZATION OF THE CATEGORY $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$

Through this section, we assume that $w, v \in W$ satisfies $v \preceq w$ and $I_w = I$.

Let N be a (not necessarily simple) module in $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ and $\lambda \in P_+$. Set $\alpha := v\lambda - w\lambda$, $\beta := \lambda - v\lambda$ and $\gamma := -\text{wt}(N)$. Note that the R-matrix $\mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda), \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)}$ decomposes into

$$\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda) \xrightarrow{\iota} q^{(\alpha, \beta)} \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda)$$

by [11, Proposition 4.6].

Let $\rho_{w,v,\lambda}(N)$ be the composition of the following chain of homomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N \circ \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ \mathbf{r}_{N, \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)}} q^{(\beta, \gamma)} \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) \circ N \\ &\xrightarrow{\pi \circ N} q^{(\beta, \gamma)} \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda) \circ N \xrightarrow{R_{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)}(N)} q^{-(w\lambda + v\lambda, \gamma)} N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $R_{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)}$ is the non-degenerate braider associated with $\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)$, and $\mathbf{r}_{N, \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)}$ is well-defined because $(N, \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda))$ is unmixed (Proposition 2.1). Note that we have

$$\mathbf{r}_{N, \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)}(u \otimes v) = \tau_{w[\text{ht}(\beta), \text{ht}(\gamma)]}(v \otimes u) \quad \text{for any } u \in N \text{ and } v \in \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)$$

and hence $\Lambda(N, \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)) = -(\beta, \gamma)$. Since $\phi_{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)}(\gamma) = -(w\lambda + \lambda, \gamma)$, we have

$$-\deg(\rho_{w,v,\lambda}(N)) = (\beta, \gamma) - (w\lambda + \lambda, \gamma) = -(w\lambda + v\lambda, \gamma).$$

Lemma 4.1. *For any $R(\gamma)$ -module $N \in \mathcal{C}_{*,v}$, We have*

$$e(\alpha + \gamma, \beta) (\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda) \circ N) \simeq q^{-(\beta, \gamma)} (\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)$$

and

$$e(\alpha + \gamma, \beta) (N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)) \simeq (N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda)) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda).$$

Proof. To obtain the first isomorphism, it is enough to apply (2.5) in Proposition 2.4 by taking $(\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda), N, \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda))$ as (L, M, N) , and for the second we can apply (2.4) by taking $(N, \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda), \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda))$ as (L, M, N) . \square

Proposition 4.2. *For any $R(\gamma)$ -module $N \in \mathcal{C}_{*,v}$, there exists a unique homomorphism*

$$\psi_{w,v,\lambda}(N): \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N \rightarrow q^{-(w\lambda+v\lambda, \gamma)} N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda)$$

such that the following diagrams are commutative.

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) & \xrightarrow{\psi_{w,v,\lambda}(N)} & q^{-(w\lambda+v\lambda, \gamma)} (N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda)) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) \\ \downarrow \wr & & \downarrow \wr \\ q^{(\beta, \gamma)} e(\alpha + \gamma, \beta) (\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda) \circ N) & \xrightarrow{R_{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)}(N)} & q^{-(w\lambda+v\lambda, \gamma)} e(\alpha + \gamma, \beta) (N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)), \end{array}$$

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N \circ \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) & & \\ \psi_{w,v,\lambda}(N) \circ \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) \downarrow & \searrow \rho_{w,v,\lambda}(N) & \\ q^{-(w\lambda+v\lambda, \gamma)} N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) & \longrightarrow & q^{-(w\lambda+v\lambda, \gamma)} N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda). \end{array}$$

Proof. Applying $e(\alpha + \gamma, \beta)$ to

$$R_{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda)}(N): \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda) \circ N \rightarrow q^{-(w\lambda+\lambda, \gamma)} N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, \lambda),$$

we obtain by Lemma 4.1

$$q^{-(\beta, \gamma)} (\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda) \rightarrow q^{-(w\lambda+\lambda, \gamma)} (N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda)) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda).$$

Since we have $\text{END}(\mathbf{M}(v\lambda, \lambda)) \simeq \mathbf{k} \text{id}$, we obtain

$$\psi_{w,v,\lambda}(N): \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N \rightarrow q^{-(w\lambda+v\lambda, \gamma)} N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda).$$

The commutativity of (4.2) is then obvious. \square

Definition 4.3. For $N \in \mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ we define

$$R_{\mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda)}(N) := \psi_{w,v,\lambda}(N) : \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda) \circ N \rightarrow q^{\phi_{w,v,\lambda}(-\text{wt}(N))} N \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda),$$

where

$$\phi_{w,v,\lambda}(\gamma) = -(w\lambda + v\lambda, \gamma) \quad \text{for } \gamma \in \mathbf{Q}.$$

Theorem 4.4. The family $\{(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)}, \phi_{w,v,\Lambda_i})\}_{i \in I}$ is a real commuting family of graded braidings in the category $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$, and also it is a family of central objects in $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$.

Proof. We know that $\{(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i), R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, \Lambda_i)}, \phi_{w,\text{id},\Lambda_i})\}_{i \in I}$ is a real commuting family of graded braidings in the category $R\text{-gmod}$ (Proposition 1.16), and also it is a family of central objects in \mathcal{C}_w (Theorem 1.17). Hence our assertion follows from Proposition 4.2. \square

Set

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*,v}[w] := \mathcal{C}_{*,v}[\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)^{\circ-1} \mid i \in I],$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v} := \mathcal{C}_{w,v}[\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda_i, v\Lambda_i)^{\circ-1} \mid i \in I].$$

Since $\mathcal{C}_{w,v}$ is a full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$, the canonical embedding induces a fully faithful monoidal functor

$$\iota_{w,v} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v} \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*,v}[w].$$

Theorem 4.5. The functor $\iota_{w,v} : \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v} \hookrightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*,v}[w]$ is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. Let us denote by $Q_{w,v} : \mathcal{C}_{*,v} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*,v}[w]$ the localization functor. It is enough to show that for every object $X \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*,v}[w]$, there exists an object $Z \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v}$ such that $\iota_{w,v}(Z) \simeq X$. Since $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v}$ is closed under taking extension by [13, Proposition 2.10], we may assume further that X is a simple object. Since every simple object in $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{*,v}[w]$ is of the form $Q_{w,v}(Y) \circ \mathbf{M}(w\lambda, v\lambda)^{\circ-1}$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and a simple object $Y \in \mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ ([13, Proposition 4.8]), we may assume that X is a simple module in $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$.

Let X be a simple module in $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$. We shall show that $Q_{w,v}(X) \in \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{w,v}$.

Recall that $Q_w : R\text{-gmod} \rightarrow (R\text{-gmod})^{\sim}[w] \simeq \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_w$ is the localization functor.

(i) Assume first that $Q_w(X) \neq 0$. Then, there exists $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ and a simple module $Y \in \mathcal{C}_w$ such that

$$Q_w(X) \simeq \mathbf{C}_\Lambda^{\circ-1} \circ Y,$$

where $\mathbf{C}_\Lambda = \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, \Lambda)$. Hence we have an epimorphism in $R\text{-gmod}$ (by replacing Λ if necessary)

$$\mathbf{C}_\Lambda \circ X \twoheadrightarrow Y.$$

Note that by Lemma 4.1 we have

$$(4.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{*,\Lambda-v\Lambda}(\mathbf{C}_\Lambda \circ X) &\simeq (\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda) \circ X) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda), \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Res}_{*,\Lambda-v\Lambda}(X \circ \mathbf{C}_\Lambda) &\simeq X \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Set $\beta = \Lambda - v\Lambda = -\text{wt}((\mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda)))$. Applying $\text{Res}_{*,\beta}$ to the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{C}_\Lambda \circ X & \xrightarrow{R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda}(X)} & X \circ \mathbf{C}_\Lambda \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & Y & \end{array}$$

we get a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda) \circ X) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}_{*,\beta}(R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda}(X))} & (X \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda) \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ & \text{Res}_{*,\beta}(Y) & \end{array}$$

Let $\psi: \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda) \circ X \rightarrow X \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)$ be the homomorphism such that

$$\psi \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda) = \text{Res}_{*,\beta}(R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda}(X)).$$

Set $Z := \text{Im}(\psi)$. Since $\psi = c \mathbf{r}_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda), X}$ for some $c \in \mathbf{k}^\times$, Z is simple. Since X and $\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)$ belong to $\mathcal{C}_{*,v}$, so does Z . Note that Z belongs to \mathcal{C}_w , because

$$\mathbf{W}(Z) \subset \mathbf{W}(Y) \in \mathbf{Q}_+ \cap w\mathbf{Q}_-.$$

Since Z is the image of $\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda) \circ X \xrightarrow{R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)}} X \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)$, we have

$$Q_{*,v}(X) \simeq \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)^{\circ-1} \circ Q_{*,v}(Z) \simeq \iota_{w,v}(\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)^{\circ-1} \circ Q_{w,v}(Z)).$$

(ii) Assume that $X \in \mathcal{C}_{*,v}$ satisfies $Q_w(X) \simeq 0$. Then there exists $\Lambda \in \mathbf{P}_+$ such that $R_{\mathbf{C}_\Lambda}(X): \mathbf{C}_\Lambda \circ X \rightarrow X \circ \mathbf{C}_\Lambda$ vanishes. Applying $\text{Res}_{*,\beta}$ ($\beta = \Lambda - v\Lambda$), we deduce from (4.3) that

$$R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)}(X) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda): (\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda) \circ X) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda) \rightarrow (X \circ \mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)) \otimes \mathbf{M}(v\Lambda, \Lambda)$$

vanishes. Hence $R_{\mathbf{M}(w\Lambda, v\Lambda)}(X)$ vanishes, which means that $Q_{w,v}(X) \simeq 0$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Geiß, B. Leclerc and J. Schröer, *Cluster structures on quantum coordinate rings*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **19** (2013), no. 2, 337–397.
- [2] K. R. Goodearl and M. T. Yakimov, *Quantum cluster algebras and quantum nilpotent algebras*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **111** (2014), no. 27, 9696–9703.
- [3] ———, *Quantum cluster algebra structures on quantum nilpotent algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **247** (2017), no. 1169, vii+119.
- [4] S.-J. Kang and M. Kashiwara, *Categorification of Highest Weight Modules via Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier Algebras*, Invent. Math. **190** (2012), no. 3, 699–742.
- [5] S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara and M. Kim, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R-matrices of quantum affine algebras*, Invent. Math. **211** (2018), no. 2, 591–685.
- [6] S.-J. Kang, M. Kashiwara, M. Kim and S.-j. Oh, *Simplicity of heads and socles of tensor products*, Compos. Math. **151** (2015), no. 2, 377–396.
- [7] ———, *Monoidal categorification of cluster algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **31** (2018), no. 2, 349–426.
- [8] M. Kashiwara, *The crystal base and Littelmann’s refined Demazure Character formula*, Duke Math., **71** (1993), no. 3, 839–858.
- [9] ———, *Notes on parameters of quiver Hecke algebras*, Proceedings of the Japan Academy, Series A, Mathematical Sciences **88**, (2012) no. 7, 97–102.
- [10] M. Kashiwara, and M. Kim, *Laurent phenomenon and simple modules of quiver Hecke algebras*, Compos. Math. **155**, (2019), no. 12, 2263–2295.
- [11] M. Kashiwara, M. Kim, S.-j. Oh, and E. Park, *Monoidal categories associated with strata of flag manifolds*, Adv. Math. **328** (2018), 959-1009.
- [12] ———, *Monoidal categorification and quantum affine algebras*, Compos. Math. **156**, (2020), no. 5, 1039–1077.
- [13] ———, *Localizations for quiver Hecke algebras*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **17** (2021), no. 4, 1465–1548.
- [14] M. Kashiwara and E. Park, *Affinizations and R-matrices for quiver Hecke algebras*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. **20**, 1161–1193.
- [15] M. Khovanov and A. Lauda, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups I*, Represent. Theory **13** (2009), 309–347.
- [16] A. Kleshchev and R. Muth, *Stratifying KLR algebras of affine ADE types.*, J. Algebra **475** (2017), 133–170.
- [17] Y. Kimura, *Quantum unipotent subgroup and dual canonical basis*, Kyoto J. Math. **52** (2012), no. 2, 277–331.
- [18] Y. Kimura and H. Oya, *Twist automorphisms on quantum unipotent cells and dual canonical bases*, International Mathematics Research Notices 2021, no. 9, 6772–6847.
- [19] A. Lauda and M. Vazirani, *Crystals from categorified quantum groups*, Adv. Math. **228** (2011), no. 2, 803–861.
- [20] B. Leclerc, *Cluster structures on strata of flag varieties*. Adv. Math. **300** (2016) 190–228.
- [21] P. J. McNamara, *Finite dimensional representations of Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras I: Finite type* J. reine angew. Math. **707** (2015), 103–124

- [22] R. Rouquier, *2-Kac-Moody algebras*, arXiv:0812.5023v1.
- [23] ———, *Quiver Hecke algebras and 2-Lie algebras*, Algebra Colloq. **19** (2012), no. 2, 359–410.
- [24] P. Tingley and B. Webster, *Mirković-Vilonen polytopes and Khovanov-Lauda-Rouquier algebras*, Compos. Math. **152** (2016), no. 8, 1648–1696.
- [25] M. Varagnolo and E. Vasserot, *Canonical bases and KLR algebras*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **659** (2011), 67–100.

(M. Kashiwara) KYOTO UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN & KOREA INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY, SEOUL 02455, KOREA

Email address, M. Kashiwara: masaki@kurims.kyoto-u.ac.jp

(M. Kim) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYUNG HEE UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 02447, KOREA

Email address, M. Kim: mkim@khu.ac.kr

(S.-j. Oh) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, EWHA WOMANS UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 03760, KOREA

Email address, S.-j. Oh: sejin092@gmail.com

(E. Park) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SEOUL, SEOUL 02504, KOREA

Email address, E. Park: epark@uos.ac.kr