

Automorphisms of quantum toroidal algebras from an action of the extended double affine braid group

Duncan Laurie

Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Andrew Wiles Building,
Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2 6GG, United Kingdom.

Abstract

We first construct an action of the extended double affine braid group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ on the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ in untwisted and twisted types. As a crucial step in the proof, we obtain a finite Drinfeld new style presentation for a broad class of quantum affinizations. In the simply laced cases, using our action and certain involutions of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ we produce automorphisms and anti-involutions of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ which exchange the horizontal and vertical subalgebras. Moreover, they switch the central elements C and $k_0^{a_0} \dots k_n^{a_n}$ up to inverse. This can be viewed as the analogue, for these quantum toroidal algebras, of the duality for double affine braid groups used by Cherednik to realise the difference Fourier transform in his celebrated proof of the Macdonald evaluation conjectures. Our work generalises existing results in type A due to Miki which have been instrumental in the study of the structure and representation theory of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1, \text{tor}})$.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Preliminaries	5
3	The affine situation	7
3.1	Quantum affine algebras	7
3.2	Automorphisms and anti-automorphisms	9
3.3	Extended affine braid groups	11

E-mail: duncan.laurie@maths.ox.ac.uk

ORCID: 0009-0006-9331-4835.

2020 *Mathematics subject classification*: 17B37, 17B67, 20F36, 81R50.

Key words and phrases: quantum toroidal algebra, quantum affine algebra, quantum affinization, extended double affine braid group, braid group action.

4	The toroidal situation	13
4.1	Quantum toroidal algebras	13
4.2	Extended double affine braid groups	16
4.3	Braid group actions on quantum toroidal algebras	18
5	Automorphisms and anti-automorphisms of quantum toroidal algebras	24
A	The affine Dynkin diagrams	31
B	Proof of Lemma 4.7	33
	References	35

1 Introduction

Quantum affine algebras were originally introduced by Drinfeld and Jimbo as the quantum groups $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ associated to affine Kac-Moody algebras. Subsequently, Drinfeld [5] provided an alternative realization of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ in the untwisted case as a quantum affinization of the corresponding finite quantum group, as well as a similar realization for twisted types. Proofs of the equivalence of the two presentations were then published in work by Beck [1], Jing and Zhang [13, 15, 16] and Damiani [3, 4]. This new presentation, known as the ‘Drinfeld new realization’, has played a crucial role in studying the rich representation theory of quantum affine algebras. For example, Chari and Pressley [2] classified the finite dimensional representations in terms of Drinfeld polynomials, and Frenkel and Jing [6, 12] constructed vertex representations.

Drinfeld’s quantum affinization resembles the formation of untwisted affine Lie algebras by adjoining a derivation to a central extension of the loop algebra of a finite dimensional simple Lie algebra. This procedure can more generally be applied to any Kac-Moody algebra, and takes affine Kac-Moody algebras to ‘double affine’ or toroidal Lie algebras. Similarly, the quantum affinization process works for the quantum group of any Kac-Moody algebra. In particular, from quantum affine algebras we obtain the quantum toroidal algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$, which were first introduced in [7, 31] for type $A_n^{(1)}$ and then for arbitrary symmetric type in [14, 26]. Furthermore, Nakajima [26] constructed representations of simply laced quantum affinizations geometrically, using the equivariant K-theory of quiver varieties. For the specific case of simply laced quantum toroidal algebras, see also [27, 33].

Just as in the quantum affine setting, representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ are equipped with a level determined by the action of the central elements. It is known that $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ contains horizontal and vertical subalgebras \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v , each isomorphic to a quantum affine algebra. In particular, \mathcal{U}_h is the natural copy of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ from which $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ is formed via quantum affinization, and \mathcal{U}_v is the quantum

affinization of the finite quantum group lying inside it. Then a representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ is said to have level (a, b) if \mathcal{U}_v acts with level a and \mathcal{U}_h with level b .

In type $A_n^{(1)}$, Varagnolo and Vasserot [31] established a Schur-Weyl duality between representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1, \text{tor}})$ and those of the double affine Hecke algebra. This duality was then used to construct a level $(0, 1)$ action on the q -Fock space [29, 32]. Note that [29] also proves the irreducibility of the representation. Nagao [25] showed that this is isomorphic to Nakajima's geometric representation in type $A_n^{(1)}$ – torus fixed points on the equivariant K-theory side are identified with certain simultaneous eigenvectors in the q -Fock space, defined using non-symmetric Macdonald polynomials.

There is also a level $(1, 0)$ vertex representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1, \text{tor}})$ due to Saito [28] (for arbitrary symmetric types see [14]). Motivated by trying to understand the relationship with the q -Fock space representation, Miki [21] constructed an automorphism of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1, \text{tor}})$ using a toroidal braid group action. In particular, his automorphism exchanges the horizontal and vertical subalgebras and swaps their central elements up to inverse. Miki [22] then used this automorphism to study the representation theory of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1, \text{tor}})$, obtaining among other things a classification by Drinfeld polynomials of the irreducibles in a natural class of highest weight representations, and R -matrices on tensor products of these modules. He also clarified the relation between the vertex and q -Fock space representations.

Surprisingly, relatively little has been written about quantum toroidal algebras outside of type $A_n^{(1)}$. The primary aim of this paper is to generalise the results of [21] to other types. In particular, we first construct an action of the extended double affine braid group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ on the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ in all untwisted and twisted types other than $A_1^{(1)}$ and $A_2^{(2)}$. Then in the simply laced case we use this action to obtain automorphisms and anti-involutions of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ which exchange the horizontal and vertical subalgebras.

We expect that – as in type $A_n^{(1)}$ – this will be helpful for studying the representation theory of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$, and we plan to explore these directions in future work. For example, Hernandez [8] obtained a Chari-Pressley style classification of the (type 1) irreducible integrable loop-highest weight modules in terms of Drinfeld polynomials. Conjugating the Drinfeld topological coproduct of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ by our automorphism should produce a tensor product on representations that is well-defined for these modules. Furthermore, twisting the vertex representation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ from [13] by our automorphism should land within this classification, and moreover relate to Nakajima's geometric representation in all simply laced ADE types. The author also plans to utilise our action of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ to obtain further analogues of various braid group phenomena inside the quantum algebra setting.

This paper is organised as follows. Section 2 establishes our notational conventions surrounding the basic structures used in the theory of affine Kac-Moody algebras. In Section 3 we recall the affine situation in more detail, in particular quantum affine algebras; quantum affinization; Jing’s isomorphism [13] between the two presentations of untwisted $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$; and the action of the extended affine braid group due to Lusztig [19] and Beck [1].

In Section 4 we move to the toroidal setting. We define the quantum toroidal algebra, proving that it is generated by its horizontal and vertical subalgebras, and present some natural (anti-)automorphisms. Section 4.2 introduces the extended double affine braid group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ together with its horizontal and vertical subgroups \mathcal{B}_h and \mathcal{B}_v , each of which is isomorphic to an extended affine braid group. For a broad class of quantum affinizations, we then prove a simplified Drinfeld new style presentation involving only finitely many generators and relations (Proposition 4.8). In particular, this includes the quantum toroidal algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ in all types other than $A_1^{(1)}$ and $A_2^{(2)}$, as well as the untwisted quantum affine algebras $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. This allows us to define automorphisms $\mathcal{T}_0, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ which restrict to the braid automorphisms of Lusztig [19] on both the horizontal and vertical subalgebras (Proposition 4.10). We are then able to give an action of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ on $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ in all types (Theorem 4.11). The horizontal and vertical subgroups \mathcal{B}_h and \mathcal{B}_v restrict to the extended affine action of Lusztig and Beck on the horizontal and vertical subalgebras \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v respectively.

The braid group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ possesses a natural involution \mathfrak{t} which interchanges its horizontal and vertical subgroups. In Section 5, using the action on $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ we transfer this over to an anti-involution ψ of the quantum toroidal algebra in all simply laced types (Theorem 5.1). Moreover, ψ exchanges the horizontal and vertical subalgebras and acts on central elements by $C \leftrightarrow (k_0^{a_0} \dots k_n^{a_n})^{-1}$. Composing ψ with a standard anti-automorphism η , we get an automorphism Φ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ which in type $A_n^{(1)}$ recovers that of Miki¹ [21] (Corollary 5.3). We conclude by proving compatibility relations between ψ and $\Phi^{\pm 1}$ and various involutions of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ (Proposition 5.5).

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank my supervisor, Kevin McGerty, for many helpful discussions throughout the preparation of this paper — his guidance and encouragement have been invaluable. This research was financially supported by the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council [grant number EP/T517811/1].

¹More specifically, Miki considers a quantum toroidal algebra $U_{q,\kappa}(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1,\text{tor}})$ involving an extra deformation parameter κ which is not known to exist in other types. Our automorphism Φ in type $A_n^{(1)}$ is equal to that of Miki with κ set to 1.

2 Preliminaries

For our conventions on affine Kac-Moody algebras, we mostly follow [17]. We shall consider an affine Kac-Moody algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ with Cartan matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ and index set $I = \{0, \dots, n\}$. It has a Cartan subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ containing simple coroots α_i^\vee and fundamental coweights λ_i^\vee for each $i \in I$, which form bases for the coroot and coweight lattices Q^\vee and P^\vee . The simple roots α_i and fundamental weights λ_i for each $i \in I$ lie in the dual space $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ and span the root and weight lattices Q and P . As \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces, $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ have bases $\{\lambda_0^\vee, \alpha_0^\vee, \dots, \alpha_n^\vee\}$ and $\{\lambda_0, \alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ respectively. The affine Weyl group $W = \langle s_i : i \in I \rangle$ acts on P^\vee via $s_i(x) = x - \langle \alpha_i, x \rangle \alpha_i^\vee$ for each $i \in I$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the natural pairing between $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}^*$.

Each node $i \in I$ of the affine Dynkin diagram $D(A)$ has a numerical label a_i , and a dual label a_i^\vee coming from the diagram with the same vertex numbering and all arrows reversed. The affine Dynkin diagrams, together with their a_i and a_i^\vee labels, are given in Appendix A – our choice of vertex numbering matches [17, Chapter 4]. Note that $\delta = \sum_{i \in I} a_i \alpha_i$ is the standard non-divisible imaginary root in Q , and that outside type $A_{2n}^{(2)}$ we have $a_0 = 1$.

The corresponding finite dimensional simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} has Cartan matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in I_0}$ where $I_0 = \{1, \dots, n\}$. It has simple roots α_i , simple coroots α_i^\vee , fundamental weights ω_i , and fundamental coweights ω_i^\vee for each $i \in I_0$ and we denote its root, coroot, weight and coweight lattices by \dot{Q} , \dot{Q}^\vee , \dot{P} and \dot{P}^\vee . By mapping each $\omega_i^\vee \mapsto a_0 \lambda_i^\vee - a_i \lambda_0^\vee$ we can embed \dot{P}^\vee inside P^\vee at level 0, so that $\langle \delta, \omega_i^\vee \rangle = 0$ for all $i \in I_0$. The image is invariant under the action of the finite Weyl group $W_0 = \langle s_i : i \in I_0 \rangle$. Similarly, we can view \dot{P} inside the affine weight lattice P by sending each $\omega_i \mapsto a_0^\vee \lambda_i - a_i^\vee \lambda_0$. In order to simplify our notation in later sections we shall moreover define $\omega_0^\vee = 0$ and $\omega_0 = 0$.

We denote by Ω the group of outer automorphisms of the affine Dynkin diagram, which is the quotient of the automorphism group of $D(A)$ by the subgroup which fixes the 0 vertex (and thus restricts to automorphisms of the finite Dynkin diagram). Elements of Ω are indexed by $I_{\min} \subset \{i \in I : a_i = a_0\}$. In particular, for each $i \in I_{\min}$ we define π_i to be the unique outer automorphism sending 0 to i .

The affine Cartan matrix A is symmetrized by the diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(d_0, \dots, d_n)$ where each $d_i = a_i^\vee a_i^{-1}$, which is to say that the product DA is symmetric. The standard non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) on $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ is defined by

$$(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = d_i a_{ij}, \quad (\alpha_i, \lambda_0) = d_0 \delta_{i0}, \quad (\lambda_0, \lambda_0) = 0,$$

for all $i, j \in I$ and in particular satisfies $(\delta, \alpha_i) = 0$. The corresponding isomorphism $\nu : \hat{\mathfrak{h}} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ maps each $\alpha_i^\vee \mapsto d_i^{-1} \alpha_i$ and sends $\lambda_0^\vee \mapsto d_0^{-1} \lambda_0$. Throughout

this paper we shall occasionally identify the elements of $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ with their images under ν without mention.

The affine braid group \mathcal{B} has a Coxeter presentation generated by $\{T_i : i \in I\}$ subject to braid relations $T_i T_j T_i \dots = T_j T_i T_j \dots$ with $a_{ij} a_{ji} + 2$ factors on each side (except in types $A_1^{(1)}$ and $A_2^{(2)}$ where T_0 and T_1 satisfy no relation). This is clearly independent of the orientation of arrows in the underlying Dynkin diagram, and so any affine braid group is isomorphic to one of untwisted type.

In all untwisted and $A_{2n}^{(2)}$ types, let $M = \hat{Q}^\vee$ and $A_i^\vee = \alpha_i$ for each $i \in I$. Conversely, in the remaining twisted types we define $M = \hat{Q}$ and all $A_i^\vee = \alpha_i^\vee$. Then in each case, the Bernstein presentation of \mathcal{B} is generated by the finite braid group $\mathcal{B}_0 = \langle T_i : i \in I_0 \rangle$ and the lattice $\{X_\beta : \beta \in M\}$, with

$$\begin{aligned} \cdot T_i X_\beta &= X_\beta T_i \text{ if } (\beta, A_i^\vee) = 0, \\ \cdot T_i^{-1} X_\beta T_i^{-1} &= X_{s_i(\beta)} \text{ if } (\beta, A_i^\vee) = 1. \end{aligned}$$

When $M = \hat{Q}^\vee$ the correspondence between the two presentations is given by $T_0 = X_{\theta^\vee} T_{s_\theta}^{-1}$ where $\theta = \sum_{i \in I_0} a_i \alpha_i$ is the highest root of \mathfrak{g} and $\theta^\vee = \nu^{-1}(a_0^{-1} \theta)$. Otherwise, θ is the short dominant root in $M = \hat{Q}$ and we instead have $T_0 = X_\theta T_{s_\theta}^{-1}$. See [11, Chapter 3] for more details, noting that the Bernstein presentation there is obtained from ours by applying the automorphism of \mathcal{B} which inverts T_1, \dots, T_n and fixes each X_β .

Throughout this paper we shall work over the field $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{Q}(q^{\min\{d_i\}})$. Setting $q_i = q^{d_i}$ for all $i \in I$, the q_i -integers, q_i -factorials and q_i -binomial coefficients are defined as

$$[s]_i = \frac{q_i^s - q_i^{-s}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \quad [s]_i! = \prod_{\ell=1}^s [\ell]_i, \quad \begin{bmatrix} s \\ r \end{bmatrix}_i = \frac{[s]_i!}{[s-r]_i! [r]_i!}$$

respectively for all non-negative integers $s \geq r$. We then let $(x_i^\pm)^{(s)} = (x_i^\pm)^s / [s]_i!$ and $(x_{i,m}^\pm)^{(s)} = (x_{i,m}^\pm)^s / [s]_i!$ for elements x_i^\pm and $x_{i,m}^\pm$ of certain quantum algebras defined in later sections. Following Jing [13] we define twisted commutators $[b_1, \dots, b_s]_{u_1 \dots u_{s-1}}$ inductively from $[b_1, b_2]_u = b_1 b_2 - u b_2 b_1$ and

$$[b_1, \dots, b_s]_{u_1 \dots u_{s-1}} = [b_1, [b_2, \dots, b_s]_{u_1 \dots u_{s-2}}]_{u_{s-1}}.$$

Outside of type $A_{2n}^{(1)}$ we can fix a length function $o : I \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ satisfying $o(i) = -o(j)$ whenever $a_{ij} < 0$. We shall write $o_{i,j}$ as shorthand for $o(i)/o(j)$. However, in type $A_{2n}^{(1)}$ this is not possible since the affine Dynkin diagram contains an odd length cycle. For our purposes, there are two approximations to a length function to consider in this case: $o(i) = (-1)^i$ and $-o(i) = (-1)^{i+1}$. Furthermore, we define $o_{i,j} = (-1)^{\overline{j-i}}$ for all $i, j \in I$, where $\overline{j-i}$ is the anti-clockwise distance $i \rightarrow j$ in the affine Dynkin diagram.

3 The affine situation

In this section we introduce the quantum affine algebras $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, and outline in the untwisted case their alternative Drinfeld new presentation as the quantum affinizations of finite quantum groups. We then present the automorphisms of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ which form the action of the extended affine braid group $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ due to Lusztig [19] and Beck [1].

3.1 Quantum affine algebras

For an arbitrary symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{s} with generalized Cartan matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$, the corresponding quantum group is given in terms of certain Chevalley style generators as follows.

Definition 3.1. The quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{s})$ is the unital associative \mathbb{k} -algebra generated by elements x_i^\pm and $t_i^{\pm 1}$ for each $i \in I$, subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} & \cdot t_i^{\pm 1} t_i^{\mp 1} = 1, \\ & \cdot [t_i, t_j] = 0, \\ & \cdot t_i x_j^\pm t_i^{-1} = q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} x_j^\pm, \\ & \cdot [x_i^+, x_j^-] = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} (t_i - t_i^{-1}), \\ & \cdot \sum_{s=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^s (x_i^\pm)^{(s)} x_j^\pm (x_i^\pm)^{(1-a_{ij}-s)} = 0 \text{ whenever } i \neq j. \end{aligned}$$

This is called the Drinfeld-Jimbo presentation of the quantum group. In particular, for any affine Kac-Moody algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ we have an associated quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. Depending on the context, some authors include an extra degree operator in their definition for $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. However, we shall not do so in this paper.

In the untwisted case $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ has an alternative *Drinfeld new presentation*, first stated by Drinfeld [5], as the quantum affinization of the finite quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. One may view this as a deformation quantization of the one-dimensional central extension of the loop algebra $\mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}]$. Loosely speaking, the $x_{i,m}^+, x_{i,m}^-, h_{i,r}, k_i$ generators below correspond to the elements $e_i t^m, f_i t^m, h_i t^r, h_i$ respectively inside $\mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}]$, and C is identified with the central extension.

Definition 3.2. The quantum affinization of $U_q(\mathfrak{s})$ is the unital associative \mathbb{k} -algebra $\widehat{U_q(\mathfrak{s})}$ with generators $x_{i,m}^\pm, h_{i,r}, k_i^{\pm 1}, C^{\pm 1}$ ($i \in I, m \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{Z}^*$) and relations

$$\cdot C^{\pm 1} \text{ central,}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cdot C^{\pm 1} C^{\mp 1} = k_i^{\pm 1} k_i^{\mp 1} = 1, \\
& \cdot [k_i, k_j] = [k_i, h_{j,r}] = 0, \\
& \cdot [h_{i,r}, h_{j,s}] = \delta_{r+s,0} \frac{[ra_{ij}]_i}{r} \frac{C^r - C^{-r}}{q_j - q_j^{-1}}, \\
& \cdot k_i x_{j,m}^{\pm} k_i^{-1} = q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} x_{j,m}^{\pm}, \\
& \cdot [h_{i,r}, x_{j,m}^{\pm}] = \pm \frac{[ra_{ij}]_i}{r} C^{\frac{r \mp |r|}{2}} x_{j,r+m}^{\pm}, \\
& \cdot [x_{i,m}^+, x_{j,l}^-] = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} (C^{-l} \phi_{i,m+l}^+ - C^{-m} \phi_{i,m+l}^-), \\
& \cdot [x_{i,m+1}^{\pm}, x_{j,l}^{\pm}]_{q_i^{\pm a_{ij}}} + [x_{j,l+1}^{\pm}, x_{i,m}^{\pm}]_{q_i^{\pm a_{ij}}} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and whenever $i \neq j$, for any integers m and $m_1, \dots, m_{a'}$ where $a' = 1 - a_{ij}$,

$$\cdot \sum_{\pi \in S_{a'}} \sum_{s=0}^{a'} (-1)^s \binom{a'}{s} x_{i,m_{\pi(1)}}^{\pm} \dots x_{i,m_{\pi(s)}}^{\pm} x_{j,m}^{\pm} x_{i,m_{\pi(s+1)}}^{\pm} \dots x_{i,m_{\pi(a')}}^{\pm} = 0.$$

Here, the $\phi_{i,\pm s}^{\pm}$ are given by the formula

$$\sum_{s \geq 0} \phi_{i,\pm s}^{\pm} z^{\pm s} = k_i^{\pm 1} \exp \left(\pm (q_i - q_i^{-1}) \sum_{s' > 0} h_{i,\pm s'} z^{\pm s'} \right)$$

when $s \geq 0$, and are zero otherwise.

The relationship between these two presentations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ in the untwisted case was first studied by Beck [1], who used an action of the extended affine braid group to construct a morphism from the Drinfeld new realization to the Drinfeld-Jimbo realization. Jing [13] then defined an inverse morphism using q -commutators, while Damiani proved the surjectivity [3] and injectivity [4] of Beck's map.

Remark 3.3. The definition of quantum affinization varies slightly between sources. We use the one found for example in [3, 21] since it is more precise regarding the isomorphism between the two presentations of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. The definition found in other works such as [1, 9, 13] can then be obtained by adjoining $C^{\pm 1/2}$ and scaling each $x_{i,m}^{\pm}$ generator by $C^{m/2}$.

Let us now present Jing's isomorphism. For each $i_1 \in I_0$ there exist sequences $\underline{i} = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{h-1})$ in I_0 and $\underline{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{h-2})$ in $\mathbb{Q}_{\leq 0}$ such that

$$(\alpha_{i_1} + \dots + \alpha_{i_s} | \alpha_{i_{s+1}}) = \epsilon_s \text{ for } s = 1, \dots, h-2, \quad (3.1)$$

where $h = \sum_{i \in I} a_i$ is the Coxeter number of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$. Then for any such sequences, the following extends to a \mathbb{k} -algebra isomorphism from the Drinfeld-Jimbo realization of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ to the Drinfeld new realization:

- $x_i^\pm \mapsto x_{i,0}^\pm$ and $t_i \mapsto k_i$ for each $i \in I_0$,
- $x_0^+ \mapsto \left[x_{i_{h-1},0}^-, \dots, x_{i_2,0}^-, x_{i_1,1}^- \right]_{q^{\epsilon_1 \dots q^{\epsilon_{h-2}}}} C k_\theta^{-1}$,
- $x_0^- \mapsto a(-q)^{-\epsilon} C^{-1} k_\theta \left[x_{i_{h-1},0}^+, \dots, x_{i_2,0}^+, x_{i_1,-1}^+ \right]_{q^{\epsilon_1 \dots q^{\epsilon_{h-2}}}}$,
- $t_0 \mapsto C k_\theta^{-1}$,

where $k_\theta = k_1^{a_1} \dots k_n^{a_n}$, $\epsilon = \epsilon_1 + \dots + \epsilon_{h-2}$, and a is a constant depending on type (in particular $a = 1$ when $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is simply laced). Example sequences in all types can be found in [13, Table 2.1].

Remark 3.4. It is clear in both presentations that $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ contains a natural copy of the finite quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ – it is the subalgebra generated by $\{x_i^\pm, t_i^{\pm 1} : i \in I_0\}$ in the Drinfeld-Jimbo, and by $\{x_{i,0}^\pm, k_i^{\pm 1} : i \in I_0\}$ in the Drinfeld new.

So we see that $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ can be formed from \mathfrak{g} either as the quantum group of the affine Kac-Moody algebra $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$, or by performing quantum affinization to $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. This is precisely the commutativity of the following diagram, taken from [9].

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathfrak{g} & \xrightarrow{\text{Affinization}} & \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \\
 \text{Quantization} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Quantization} \\
 U_q(\mathfrak{g}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Quantum Affinization}} & U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})
 \end{array}$$

Since quantum affinization is defined for the quantum group of any Kac-Moody algebra, we can apply it to $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ to obtain a sort of ‘double affine’ quantum group. As we will see in Section 4, this is precisely the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. It should be noted that $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ is not the quantum group of any Kac-Moody algebra, and so cannot be further affinized in this way.

Remark 3.5. In fact, in twisted types there is also a Drinfeld new realization of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. A morphism from the Drinfeld-Jimbo presentation was defined by Jing and Zhang [15, 16], while the proof that it is an isomorphism was again completed by Damiani in [3, 4]. However, we do not include these cases here since they are not required for our purposes.

3.2 Automorphisms and anti-automorphisms

Next we shall present various automorphisms and anti-automorphisms of quantum groups and their quantum affinizations. These are required to describe Lusztig and Beck’s action of the extended affine braid group on $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, and also for our work towards a corresponding toroidal result in Section 4.

First consider a quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{s})$ coming from a generalized Cartan matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ as explained in Section 3.1.

- For each $i \in I$ there is an automorphism \mathbf{T}_i defined by $\mathbf{T}_i(t_j) = t_j t_i^{-a_{ij}}$ and

$$\mathbf{T}_i(x_i^+) = -x_i^- t_i, \quad \mathbf{T}_i(x_j^+) = \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^{-s} (x_i^+)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} x_j^+ (x_i^+)^{(s)} \text{ if } i \neq j,$$

$$\mathbf{T}_i(x_i^-) = -t_i^{-1} x_i^+, \quad \mathbf{T}_i(x_j^-) = \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^s (x_i^-)^{(s)} x_j^- (x_i^-)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} \text{ if } i \neq j.$$

Its inverse \mathbf{T}_i^{-1} is given by $\mathbf{T}_i^{-1}(t_j) = t_j t_i^{-a_{ij}}$ and

$$\mathbf{T}_i^{-1}(x_i^+) = -t_i^{-1} x_i^-, \quad \mathbf{T}_i^{-1}(x_j^+) = \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^{-s} (x_i^+)^{(s)} x_j^+ (x_i^+)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} \text{ if } i \neq j,$$

$$\mathbf{T}_i^{-1}(x_i^-) = -x_i^+ t_i, \quad \mathbf{T}_i^{-1}(x_j^-) = \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^s (x_i^-)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} x_j^- (x_i^-)^{(s)} \text{ if } i \neq j.$$

- Every automorphism π of the associated Dynkin diagram gives rise to an automorphism S_π of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ which permutes the generators accordingly:

$$S_\pi(x_j^\pm) = x_{\pi(j)}^\pm, \quad S_\pi(t_j) = t_{\pi(j)}.$$

- There is an anti-involution σ such that $\sigma(x_j^\pm) = x_j^\pm$ and $\sigma(t_j) = t_j^{-1}$. A quick check verifies that $\mathbf{T}_i^{-1} = \sigma \mathbf{T}_i \sigma$ for all $i \in I$.

Throughout this paper we shall use without comment that $\mathbf{T}_i \mathbf{T}_j(x_i^\pm) = x_j^\pm$ and $\mathbf{T}_i^{-1} \mathbf{T}_j^{-1}(x_i^\pm) = x_j^\pm$ whenever $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = -1$.

Remark 3.6. The automorphisms \mathbf{T}_i and \mathbf{T}_i^{-1} were first introduced in the general case by Lusztig [19, Chapter 37], who denoted them by $T''_{i,1}$ and $T'_{i,-1}$ respectively.

Now consider the quantum affinization $\widehat{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ introduced in Definition 3.2.

- For each $i \in I$ there is an automorphism \mathcal{X}_i given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_i(x_{j,m}^\pm) &= v(j)^{\delta_{ij}} x_{j,m \mp \delta_{ij}}^\pm, & \mathcal{X}_i(h_{j,r}) &= h_{j,r}, \\ \mathcal{X}_i(k_j) &= C^{-\delta_{ij}} k_j, & \mathcal{X}_i(C) &= C, \end{aligned}$$

where v is any $\{\pm 1\}$ -valued function on I , for example a length function.

- There is also an anti-involution η with

$$\eta(x_{i,m}^\pm) = x_{i,-m}^\pm, \quad \eta(h_{i,r}) = -C^r h_{i,-r}, \quad \eta(k_i) = k_i^{-1}, \quad \eta(C) = C.$$

For untwisted $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ in particular, considered with respect to the Drinfeld new realization and letting v be the length function o on I_0 , we shall denote these by \mathbf{X}_i and η' respectively. Note that in this case we have $\mathbf{T}_i^{-1} = \eta' \mathbf{T}_i \eta'$ for all $i \in I_0$.

Recall that the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ will be formed as the quantum affinization of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, and therefore has a Drinfeld new style presentation. In Section 4.3 we wish to define automorphisms \mathcal{T}_i of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ for each $i \in I$ which are comparable to the automorphisms \mathbf{T}_i of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. In particular, this requires us to write the actions of \mathcal{T}_i on certain Drinfeld new style generators.

To this end, in the case of untwisted $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ let us derive formulae for some of the $\mathbf{T}_i(x_{j,m}^\pm)$ when $i, j \in I_0$. It is clear from the definitions that \mathbf{T}_i commutes with \mathbf{X}_j whenever $j \neq i$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{T}_i(x_{j,m}^+) &= o(j)^m \mathbf{X}_j^{-m} \mathbf{T}_i(x_{j,0}^+) = \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^{-s} (x_{i,0}^+)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} x_{j,m}^+ (x_{i,0}^+)^{(s)}, \\ \mathbf{T}_i(x_{j,m}^-) &= o(j)^m \mathbf{X}_j^m \mathbf{T}_i(x_{j,0}^-) = \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^s (x_{i,0}^-)^{(s)} x_{j,m}^- (x_{i,0}^-)^{(-a_{ij}-s)},\end{aligned}$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. When $i = j$ the $\mathbf{T}_i(x_{j,m}^\pm)$ are calculated recursively on $|m|$ and expressions quickly become complicated. However, thanks to a simplified presentation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ coming from Proposition 4.8, we shall only require the case $m = 0, \mp 1$. Let U_i be the subalgebra of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ generated by $\{x_{i,m}^\pm, h_{i,r}, k_i^{\pm 1}, C^{\pm 1} : m \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{Z}^*\}$, and $h_i : U_q(A_1^{(1)}) \xrightarrow{\sim} U_i$ be the morphism sending

$$\begin{aligned}q &\mapsto q_i, & k_1 &\mapsto k_i, & k_0 &\mapsto Ck_i^{-1}, & x_1^\pm &\mapsto x_{i,0}^\pm, \\ x_0^+ &\mapsto -o(i)Ck_i^{-1}x_{i,1}^-, & x_0^- &\mapsto -o(i)x_{i,-1}^+k_iC^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Then by Corollary 3.8 of [1] we have $\mathbf{T}_i \circ h_i = h_i \circ \mathbf{T}_1$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{T}_i(x_{i,-1}^+) &= h_i \circ \mathbf{T}_1(-o(i)x_0^-k_0) = \sum_{s=0}^2 (-1)^s q_i^s (x_{i,0}^-)^{(s)} x_{i,-1}^+ (x_{i,0}^-)^{(2-s)} k_i, \\ \mathbf{T}_i(x_{i,1}^-) &= h_i \circ \mathbf{T}_1(-o(i)k_0^{-1}x_0^+) = k_i^{-1} \sum_{s=0}^2 (-1)^s q_i^{-s} (x_{i,0}^+)^{(2-s)} x_{i,1}^- (x_{i,0}^+)^{(s)}.\end{aligned}$$

3.3 Extended affine braid groups

Here we introduce the extended affine braid group $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ and present its action on $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ due to Lusztig [19] and Beck [1]. For a more complete introduction to extended affine braid groups, the interested reader may wish to consult [20, Chapters 2-3] and [11, Chapter 9].

Recall from Section 2 the Coxeter and Bernstein presentations of the affine braid group \mathcal{B} . By replacing the lattice M in the latter with a larger lattice N , defined to be \mathring{P}^\vee in all untwisted and $A_{2n}^{(2)}$ types and \mathring{P} otherwise, we obtain a Bernstein presentation for the extended affine braid group.

Definition 3.7. The extended affine braid group $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}$ is generated by the finite braid group $\mathcal{B}_0 = \langle T_i : i \in I_0 \rangle$ and the lattice $\{X_\beta : \beta \in N\}$, subject to

$$\cdot T_i X_\beta = X_\beta T_i \text{ if } (\beta, A_i^\vee) = 0, \quad (3.2)$$

$$\cdot T_i^{-1} X_\beta T_i^{-1} = X_{s_i(\beta)} \text{ if } (\beta, A_i^\vee) = 1. \quad (3.3)$$

There is also a Coxeter style presentation of $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}$. It is clear that \mathcal{B}_0 and $\{X_\beta : \beta \in M\}$ generate a normal subgroup of $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}$ isomorphic to \mathcal{B} , and therefore $\mathring{\mathcal{B}} \cong (\mathring{\mathcal{B}}/\mathcal{B}) \rtimes \mathcal{B}$. When $N = \mathring{P}^\vee$ set $\beta_\theta = \theta^\vee$ and $\beta_i = \omega_i^\vee$ for each $i \in I$, and when $N = \mathring{P}$ set $\beta_\theta = \theta$ and each $\beta_i = \omega_i$. Let $v_i = w_0 w_{0i}$ where w_0 is the longest element² of W_0 and w_{0i} is the longest element of the isotropy subgroup $\langle s_j : j \neq i \rangle$ of β_i . It was shown in [20, Chapter 2] that $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}/\mathcal{B} = \{U_i = X_{\beta_i} T_{v_i}^{-1} : i \in I_{\min}\}$, and further that $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}/\mathcal{B}$ acts on \mathcal{B} by outer automorphisms of the affine Dynkin diagram. More specifically, $U_i T_j U_i^{-1} = T_{\pi_i(j)}$ for all $i \in I_{\min}$ and $j \in I$ and so we have the following.

Proposition 3.8. *The extended affine braid group $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}$ is isomorphic to the semidirect product $\Omega \rtimes \mathcal{B}$.*

The correspondence between the Coxeter and Bernstein presentations of $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}$ is given by $T_0 = X_{\beta_\theta} T_{s_\theta}^{-1}$ and $\pi_i = X_{\beta_i} T_{v_i}^{-1}$ for each $i \in I_{\min}$.

Remark 3.9. There is an automorphism of $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}$ which inverts T_0, \dots, T_n and fixes each element of Ω . Letting Y_β be the image of X_β for all $\beta \in N$, we obtain an *alternative Bernstein presentation* of $\mathring{\mathcal{B}}$ matching that of [11, Proposition 9.1]. In particular, for each $i \in I_0$ and $\beta \in N$ we have the relations

$$\cdot T_i Y_\beta = Y_\beta T_i \text{ if } (\beta, A_i^\vee) = 0, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\cdot T_i Y_\beta T_i = Y_{s_i(\beta)} \text{ if } (\beta, A_i^\vee) = 1. \quad (3.5)$$

It immediately follows that the Coxeter presentation relates to this alternative Bernstein presentation via $T_0 = T_{s_\theta}^{-1} Y_{-\beta_\theta}$ and $\pi_i = Y_{\beta_i} T_{v_i}^{-1}$ for each $i \in I_{\min}$.

Example 3.10. We fix natural representatives for π_i in all affine types where there exists a non-trivial automorphism of the corresponding finite Dynkin diagram.

- In type $A_n^{(1)}$ we have $\Omega \cong \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}$ by identifying $\pi_i = (j \mapsto j + i \pmod{n+1})$ with $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}$ for each $i \in I$.

²For a nice explanation of how to find a reduced expression for any w_0 (and thus w_{0i}) by 2-colouring the Dynkin diagram, see Allen Knutson's answer at <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/54926/longest-element-of-weyl-groups> (last accessed 31st March 2023).

- In type $D_{2n}^{(1)}$ we have $\Omega \cong \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ with non-trivial elements given by

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1 &= (0 \leftrightarrow 1, n-1 \leftrightarrow n), \\ \pi_{n-1} &= (0 \leftrightarrow n-1, 1 \leftrightarrow n), \\ \pi_n &= (0 \leftrightarrow n, 1 \leftrightarrow n-1).\end{aligned}$$

- In type $D_{2n+1}^{(1)}$ we instead have $\Omega \cong \mathbb{Z}_4$ with

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1 &= (0 \leftrightarrow 1, n-1 \leftrightarrow n), \\ \pi_{n-1} &= (0 \mapsto n-1 \mapsto 1 \mapsto n \mapsto 0), \\ \pi_n &= (0 \mapsto n \mapsto 1 \mapsto n-1 \mapsto 0).\end{aligned}$$

- In type $E_6^{(1)}$ we have $\Omega \cong \mathbb{Z}_3$ and non-trivial elements

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1 &= (0 \mapsto 1 \mapsto 5 \mapsto 0), \\ \pi_5 &= (0 \mapsto 5 \mapsto 1 \mapsto 0).\end{aligned}$$

We are now ready to state Lusztig and Beck's affine action.

Theorem 3.11. *The extended affine braid group $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ acts on the quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ via $T_i \rightarrow \mathbf{T}_i$ for each $i \in I$ and $\pi \rightarrow S_\pi$ for each $\pi \in \Omega$. Furthermore, in all untwisted types it follows that $X_{\omega_i^\vee}$ acts by the automorphism \mathbf{X}_i for each $i \in I_0$.*

4 The toroidal situation

We now move to the toroidal setting, where we are able to obtain an action of the extended double affine braid group $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ on the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ in all untwisted and twisted types other than $A_1^{(1)}$ and $A_2^{(2)}$. The construction of certain \mathcal{T}_i automorphisms involved in this action requires a simplified Drinfeld new style presentation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ given in terms of finitely many generators and relations.

4.1 Quantum toroidal algebras

As mentioned in Section 3, the quantum toroidal algebra of type $X_n^{(r)}$ is defined to be the quantum affinization of the quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of type $X_n^{(r)}$.

Definition 4.1. The quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ is the unital associative \mathbb{k} -algebra with generators $x_{i,m}^\pm$, $h_{i,r}$, $k_i^{\pm 1}$, $C^{\pm 1}$ ($i \in I$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}^*$), subject to the following relations:

- $C^{\pm 1}$ central,
- $C^{\pm 1} C^{\mp 1} = k_i^{\pm 1} k_i^{\mp 1} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cdot [k_i, k_j] = [k_i, h_{j,r}] = 0, \\
& \cdot [h_{i,r}, h_{j,s}] = \delta_{r+s,0} \frac{[ra_{ij}]_i}{r} \frac{C^r - C^{-r}}{q_j - q_j^{-1}}, \\
& \cdot k_i x_{j,m}^\pm k_i^{-1} = q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} x_{j,m}^\pm, \\
& \cdot [h_{i,r}, x_{j,m}^\pm] = \pm \frac{[ra_{ij}]_i}{r} C^{\frac{r \mp |r|}{2}} x_{j,r+m}^\pm, \\
& \cdot [x_{i,m}^+, x_{j,l}^-] = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} (C^{-l} \phi_{i,m+l}^+ - C^{-m} \phi_{i,m+l}^-), \\
& \cdot [x_{i,m+1}^\pm, x_{j,l}^\pm]_{q_i^{\pm a_{ij}}} + [x_{j,l+1}^\pm, x_{i,m}^\pm]_{q_i^{\pm a_{ij}}} = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

and whenever $i \neq j$, for any integers m and $m_1, \dots, m_{a'}$ where $a' = 1 - a_{ij}$,

$$\cdot \sum_{\pi \in S_{a'}} \sum_{s=0}^{a'} (-1)^s \begin{bmatrix} a' \\ s \end{bmatrix}_i x_{i,m_{\pi(1)}}^\pm \dots x_{i,m_{\pi(s)}}^\pm x_{j,m}^\pm x_{i,m_{\pi(s+1)}}^\pm \dots x_{i,m_{\pi(a')}}^\pm = 0.$$

Here, the $\phi_{i,\pm s}^\pm$ are given by the formula

$$\sum_{s \geq 0} \phi_{i,\pm s}^\pm z^{\pm s} = k_i^{\pm 1} \exp \left(\pm (q_i - q_i^{-1}) \sum_{s' > 0} h_{i,\pm s'} z^{\pm s'} \right)$$

when $s \geq 0$, and are zero otherwise.

Remark 4.2. In type $A_n^{(1)}$ there is a two-parameter deformation $U_{q,\kappa}(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1,\text{tor}})$ where some of the relations are modified to involve additional central generators $\kappa^{\pm 1}$. Indeed this is the algebra considered by Miki [21], and specialises to the above at $\kappa = 1$. However, such a deformation is not known to exist in other types and thus will not be treated in this paper.

So we see that the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ of type $X_n^{(r)}$ can be obtained from the corresponding finite quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by affinizing twice on the quantum level. In fact, $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ contains two natural quantum affine subalgebras. There is a horizontal subalgebra \mathcal{U}_h of type $X_n^{(r)}$ defined as the image of the homomorphism $h : U_q(X_n^{(r)}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ sending

$$x_i^\pm \mapsto x_{i,0}^\pm, \quad t_i \mapsto k_i,$$

for all $i \in I$. Additionally, there is a vertical subalgebra \mathcal{U}_v of untwisted type $Z_n^{(1)}$, where Z_n is the finite Cartan type of the simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . It is the image of the homomorphism $v : U_q(Z_n^{(1)}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ given by

$$x_{i,m}^\pm \mapsto x_{i,m}^\pm, \quad h_{i,r} \mapsto h_{i,r}, \quad k_i \mapsto k_i, \quad C \mapsto C,$$

\vdots	$x_{0,1}^\pm$	$h_{0,1}$	$x_{1,1}^\pm$	$h_{1,1}$	\cdots	$x_{n,1}^\pm$	$h_{n,1}$
$x_{0,0}^\pm$	$k_0^{\pm 1}$	$x_{1,0}^\pm$	$k_1^{\pm 1}$	\cdots	$x_{n,0}^\pm$	$k_n^{\pm 1}$	
$x_{0,-1}^\pm$	$h_{0,-1}$	$x_{1,-1}^\pm$	$h_{1,-1}$	\cdots	$x_{n,-1}^\pm$	$h_{n,-1}$	
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	$C^{\pm 1}$	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	

Fig. 1 Illustration of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ and its quantum affine subalgebras \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v

for all $i \in I_0$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}^*$. Furthermore, we are able to deduce from the next proposition that \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v together generate the entire quantum toroidal algebra. Figure 1 provides a simple illustration of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ which highlights its generators and their \mathbb{Z} -grading, as well as the horizontal and vertical subalgebras.

For any $i_1, \dots, i_p \in I$ we define $\mathcal{U}_{i_1 \dots i_p}$ to be the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ generated by $\{x_{\ell,m}^\pm, h_{\ell,r}, k_\ell^{\pm 1}, C^{\pm 1} : \ell = i_1, \dots, i_p, m \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{Z}^*\}$. Then it is clear that each $\mathcal{U}_i \cong U_q(A_1^{(1)})$, and if $i \neq j$ then

$$\mathcal{U}_{ij} \cong \begin{cases} U_q(A_1^{(1)}) \times U_q(A_1^{(1)}) & \text{if } a_{ij}a_{ji} = 0, \\ U_q(A_2^{(1)}) & \text{if } a_{ij}a_{ji} = 1, \\ U_q(C_2^{(1)}) & \text{if } a_{ij}a_{ji} = 2, \\ U_q(G_2^{(1)}) & \text{if } a_{ij}a_{ji} = 3, \\ U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}}) & \text{in types } A_1^{(1)} \text{ and } A_2^{(2)}. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.3. *For each $i \in I$, the quantum toroidal algebra is generated by \mathcal{U}_h , $x_{i,\mp 1}^\pm$ and $C^{\pm 1}$.*

Proof. Let A be the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ generated by \mathcal{U}_h , $x_{i,\mp 1}^\pm$ and $C^{\pm 1}$. Our strategy is to first show that \mathcal{U}_i is contained in A , and then to show that $x_{j,\mp 1}^\pm \in A$ whenever $a_{ij} < 0$, since the result then follows from the connectedness of the Dynkin diagram. Unpacking the formula in Definition 4.1, we see that $\phi_{i,0}^\pm = k_i^{\pm 1}$, $\phi_{i,\pm r}^\pm = 0$ for $r < 0$, and

$$\phi_{i,\pm r}^\pm = k_i^{\pm 1} \sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{(\pm 1)^\ell (q_i - q_i^{-1})^\ell}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{r_1 + \dots + r_\ell = r \\ \text{all } r_j > 0}} h_{i,\pm r_1} \cdots h_{i,\pm r_\ell}$$

for $r > 0$. This implies that $h_{i,-1} = C^{-1}k_i[x_{i,-1}^+, x_{i,0}^-]$ and $h_{i,1} = Ck_i^{-1}[x_{i,0}^+, x_{i,1}^-]$. Thus by the relations of the quantum toroidal algebra, all $x_{i,m}^\pm$ lie inside A . We also have

$$[x_{i,\pm r}^+, x_{i,0}^-] = \pm \frac{C^{\frac{r\mp r}{2}} k_i^{\pm 1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \sum_{\ell=1}^r \frac{(\pm 1)^\ell (q_i - q_i^{-1})^\ell}{\ell!} \sum_{\substack{r_1 + \dots + r_\ell = r \\ \text{all } r_j > 0}} h_{i,\pm r_1} \dots h_{i,\pm r_\ell}$$

when $r > 0$ and so all $h_{i,\pm r} \in A$ by induction. Therefore $\mathcal{U}_i \subset A$ and we conclude our proof by noting that $x_{j,\mp 1}^\pm = \pm \frac{C^{\pm 1}}{[a_{ij}]_i} [h_{i,\mp 1}, x_{j,0}^\pm]$ whenever $a_{ij} < 0$. \square

Corollary 4.4. *The quantum toroidal algebra is generated by its horizontal and vertical subalgebras.*

Throughout the rest of this paper, we shall require the following standard automorphisms and anti-automorphisms of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$.

- Every automorphism $\pi \in \Omega$ of the underlying affine Dynkin diagram gives rise to an automorphism \mathcal{S}_π defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_\pi(x_{i,m}^\pm) &= o_{i,\pi(i)}^m x_{\pi(i),m}^\pm, & \mathcal{S}_\pi(k_i) &= k_{\pi(i)}, \\ \mathcal{S}_\pi(h_{i,r}) &= o_{i,\pi(i)}^r h_{\pi(i),r}, & \mathcal{S}_\pi(C) &= C, \end{aligned}$$

which restricts to S_π on \mathcal{U}_h .

- There is the anti-involution η with

$$\eta(x_{i,m}^\pm) = x_{i,-m}^\pm, \quad \eta(h_{i,r}) = -C^r h_{i,-r}, \quad \eta(k_i) = k_i^{-1}, \quad \eta(C) = C,$$

which restricts to η' on \mathcal{U}_v and σ on \mathcal{U}_h .

- For each $i \in I$ there is an automorphism \mathcal{X}_i given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_i(x_{j,m}^\pm) &= o(j)^{\delta_{ij}} x_{j,m \mp \delta_{ij}}^\pm, & \mathcal{X}_i(k_j) &= C^{-\delta_{ij}} k_j, \\ \mathcal{X}_i(h_{j,r}) &= h_{j,r}, & \mathcal{X}_i(C) &= C. \end{aligned}$$

If $i \in I_0$ then \mathcal{X}_i restricts to \mathbf{X}_i on \mathcal{U}_v , while \mathcal{X}_0 restricts to the identity.

4.2 Extended double affine braid groups

Just as the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ is in some sense formed by fusing together its horizontal and vertical quantum affine subalgebras, we can similarly define the extended double affine braid group $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ by combining the Coxeter and Bernstein presentations for $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$.

Recall from Section 3.3 that Ω acts naturally on the affine braid group $\mathcal{B} = \langle T_i : i \in I \rangle$. There is also a linear action of Ω on P^\vee given by $\pi(\lambda_i^\vee) = \lambda_{\pi(i)}^\vee$, which preserves $\mathring{P}^\vee \subset P^\vee$ and thus defines an action on $\{X_\beta : \beta \in \mathring{P}^\vee\}$. These actions are compatible with relations (3.2) and (3.3) for $N = \mathring{P}^\vee$ (extended to all $i \in I$) and so the following is well-defined.




Fig. 2 Illustration of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ and its extended affine braid subgroups \mathcal{B}_h and \mathcal{B}_v

Definition 4.5. The extended double affine braid group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ is generated by the affine braid group $\mathcal{B} = \langle T_i : i \in I \rangle$, the lattice $\{X_\beta : \beta \in \check{P}^\vee\}$ and the group Ω , subject to the relations

- $T_i X_\beta = X_\beta T_i$ if $(\beta, \alpha_i) = 0$,
- $T_i^{-1} X_\beta T_i^{-1} = X_{s_i(\beta)}$ if $(\beta, \alpha_i) = 1$,
- $\pi T_i \pi^{-1} = T_{\pi(i)}$,
- $\pi X_\beta \pi^{-1} = X_{\pi(\beta)}$.

Remark 4.6. 1. The action of W on \check{P}^\vee in the definition above is with respect to the embedding $\check{P}^\vee \hookrightarrow P^\vee$ of type $X_n^{(r)}$ rather than $Z_n^{(1)}$.

2. Our group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ is the quotient of the X, Y -extended double affine Artin group of Ion and Sahi [11, Chapter 9] by its central element $X_{\frac{1}{m}\delta}$.

It is clear that $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ contains two extended affine braid subgroups which together generate the entire group: a horizontal subgroup \mathcal{B}_h of type $X_n^{(r)}$ generated by \mathcal{B} and Ω , and a vertical subgroup \mathcal{B}_v of type $Z_n^{(1)}$ generated by T_1, \dots, T_n and $\{X_\beta : \beta \in \check{P}^\vee\}$. We remark that there only exists an isomorphism between \mathcal{B}_h and \mathcal{B}_v which acts by the identity on $\mathcal{B}_0 \cong \mathcal{B}_h \cap \mathcal{B}_v$ in the untwisted case.

From Section 3.3 we know that \mathcal{B}_h and \mathcal{B}_v each have both Coxeter and Bernstein presentations – Table 1 summarises our choice of notation. In particular, for \mathcal{B}_h we use the alternative Bernstein presentation of Remark 3.9 so that while the X_β satisfy relations (3.2) and (3.3) with T_0, \dots, T_n , the Y_μ satisfy relations (3.4) and (3.5) with T_0^v, T_1, \dots, T_n . Note that in all untwisted types, each π_i and ρ_i correspond to the same outer automorphism of the affine Dynkin diagram.

	Coxeter generators	Bernstein generators
\mathcal{B}_h	T_1, \dots, T_n $T_0 = T_{s_\theta}^{-1} Y_{-\beta_\theta}$ $\Omega = \{\pi_i = Y_{\beta_i} T_{v_i}^{-1} : i \in I_{\min}\}$	T_1, \dots, T_n $\{Y_\mu : \mu \in N\}$
\mathcal{B}_v	T_1, \dots, T_n $T_0^v = X_{\theta^\vee} T_{s_\theta}^{-1}$ $\Omega^v = \{\rho_i = X_{\omega_i^\vee} T_{v_i}^{-1} : i \in I_{\min}\}$	T_1, \dots, T_n $\{X_\beta : \beta \in \mathring{P}^\vee\}$

Table 1 Coxeter and Bernstein generators for \mathcal{B}_h and \mathcal{B}_v

We conclude this subsection with several automorphisms of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ which will be important in Section 5. For ease of notation, we restrict to the untwisted case since this is all we shall require.

- There is an involution \mathfrak{t} which inverts T_1, \dots, T_n and interchanges X_β and Y_β for all $\beta \in \mathring{P}^\vee$. It follows that \mathfrak{t} exchanges each π_i and ρ_i , as well as T_0 and $(T_0^v)^{-1}$. It is equal to the composition of the anti-involution \mathfrak{e} of Ion and Sahi [11, Chapter 9] with the anti-automorphism that inverts every element. When restricted to the natural copy of the (non-extended) double affine braid group inside $\check{\mathcal{B}}$, which is generated by $\mathcal{B} = \langle T_0, \dots, T_n \rangle$ and $\{X_\beta : \beta \in \mathring{Q}^\vee\}$, this is the involution of Ion [10, Theorem 2.2].
- There exists an involution γ_v inverting T_0, \dots, T_n and all X_β , while fixing each element of Ω . Similarly, there is an involution $\gamma_h = \mathfrak{t} \circ \gamma_v \circ \mathfrak{t}$ which inverts T_0^v, T_1, \dots, T_n and all Y_μ but fixes each element of Ω^v .

4.3 Braid group actions on quantum toroidal algebras

Here we construct actions of the extended double affine braid groups on the quantum toroidal algebras. We start with a simplified presentation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ involving finitely many generators and relations, which allows us to define automorphisms \mathcal{T}_i for each $i \in I$. Note that our proof relies upon a finite presentation of each subalgebra \mathcal{U}_{ij} that comes from the Drinfeld-Jimbo presentation of the quantum affine algebras. So in fact, our results extend to all quantum affinizations where the underlying Dynkin diagram has at most triple arrows, ie. $a_{ij}a_{ji} \leq 3$ for all distinct $i, j \in I$. In particular, we exclude the quantum toroidal algebras of types $A_1^{(1)}$ and $A_2^{(2)}$ for the remainder of this paper.

Lemma 4.7. *For X of type A_2, C_2 or G_2 , let $(a_{ij})_{i,j=1,2}$ be the corresponding finite type Cartan matrix and take q_1 and q_2 as in Section 2. Define \mathcal{A}_X to be the \mathbb{k} -algebra with generators $\hat{x}_{i,0}^\pm, \hat{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm, \hat{k}_i^{\pm 1}, \hat{C}^{\pm 1}$ ($i = 1, 2$) and relations*

- (i) $\hat{C}^{\pm 1}$ central,
- (ii) $\hat{C}^{\pm 1} \hat{C}^{\mp 1} = \hat{k}_i^{\pm 1} \hat{k}_i^{\mp 1} = 1,$

- (iii) $[\hat{k}_i, \hat{k}_j] = 0$,
- (iv) $\hat{k}_i \hat{x}_{j,m}^\pm \hat{k}_i^{-1} = q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} \hat{x}_{j,m}^\pm$,
- (v) $[\hat{x}_{i,0}^+, \hat{x}_{j,0}^-] = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} (\hat{k}_i - \hat{k}_i^{-1})$,
- (vi) $[\hat{x}_{i,-1}^+, \hat{x}_{i,1}^-] = \frac{\hat{C}^{-1} \hat{k}_i - \hat{C} \hat{k}_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$,
- (vii) $[\hat{x}_{i,0}^+, \hat{x}_{j,1}^-] = [\hat{x}_{i,-1}^+, \hat{x}_{j,0}^-] = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$,
- (viii) $[\hat{x}_{i,0}^+, \hat{x}_{i,-1}^+]_{q_i^2} = [\hat{x}_{i,1}^-, \hat{x}_{i,0}^-]_{q_i^{-2}} = 0$,
- (ix) $[\hat{x}_{1,0}^+, \hat{x}_{2,-1}^+]_{q_1^{a_{12}}} + [\hat{x}_{2,0}^+, \hat{x}_{1,-1}^+]_{q_1^{a_{12}}} = 0$,
- (x) $[\hat{x}_{1,1}^-, \hat{x}_{2,0}^-]_{q_1^{-a_{12}}} + [\hat{x}_{2,1}^-, \hat{x}_{1,0}^-]_{q_1^{-a_{12}}} = 0$,
- (xi) $\sum_{s=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^s \begin{bmatrix} 1-a_{ij} \\ s \end{bmatrix}_i y_i^s y_j y_i^{1-a_{ij}-s} = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$,
- for $(y_i, y_j) = (\hat{x}_{i,0}^\pm, \hat{x}_{j,0}^\pm), (\hat{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm, \hat{x}_{j,0}^\pm), (\hat{x}_{i,0}^\pm, \hat{x}_{j,\mp 1}^\pm)$.

Then there is an algebra homomorphism $U_q(X^{(1)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_X$ mapping

$$C \mapsto \hat{C}, \quad x_{i,0}^\pm \mapsto \hat{x}_{i,0}^\pm, \quad x_{i,\mp 1}^\pm \mapsto \hat{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm, \quad k_i \mapsto \hat{k}_i,$$

for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Similar to Jing's isomorphism between the two realizations of the quantum affine algebra as outlined in Section 3.1, introduce elements

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{k}_0 &= \hat{C} \hat{k}_1^{-a_1} \hat{k}_2^{-a_2}, \\ \hat{x}_{0,0}^+ &= \left[\hat{x}_{i_{h-1},0}^-, \dots, \hat{x}_{i_2,0}^-, \hat{x}_{i_1,1}^- \right]_{q^{\epsilon_1 \dots q^{\epsilon_{h-2}}}} \hat{C} \hat{k}_1^{-a_1} \hat{k}_2^{-a_2}, \\ \hat{x}_{0,0}^- &= a(-q)^{-\epsilon} \hat{C}^{-1} \hat{k}_1^{a_1} \hat{k}_2^{a_2} \left[\hat{x}_{i_{h-1},0}^+, \dots, \hat{x}_{i_2,0}^+, \hat{x}_{i_1,-1}^+ \right]_{q^{\epsilon_1 \dots q^{\epsilon_{h-2}}}}, \end{aligned}$$

in \mathcal{A}_X where $\underline{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{h-1})$ and $\underline{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{h-2})$ satisfy (3.1). By relations (ix)-(x) this is independent of the choice of sequences. Since the Drinfeld-Jimbo presentation of $U_q(X^{(1)})$ has finitely many relations, it is a finite check to prove that $x_i^\pm \mapsto \hat{x}_{i,0}^\pm$ and $t_i^{\pm 1} \mapsto \hat{k}_i^{\pm 1}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$ defines an algebra homomorphism $\xi : U_q(X^{(1)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_X$. Note that it is immediate that ξ preserves all relations with non-zero indices. Then to complete our proof we must express C , $x_{1,\mp 1}^\pm$ and $x_{2,\mp 1}^\pm$ in terms of the Drinfeld-Jimbo generators of $U_q(X^{(1)})$ and verify that the images under ξ are equal to \hat{C} , $\hat{x}_{1,\mp 1}^\pm$ and $\hat{x}_{2,\mp 1}^\pm$ respectively (it is trivial that $C = t_0 t_1^{a_1} t_2^{a_2}$ maps to $\hat{C} = \hat{k}_0 \hat{k}_1^{a_1} \hat{k}_2^{a_2}$). See Appendix B for more details. \square

Using this lemma we are able to prove the following simplified presentation for all quantum affinizations where the underlying Dynkin diagram has at most triple arrows.

Proposition 4.8. *Let \mathfrak{s} be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra with generalised Cartan matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ and suppose that $a_{ij}a_{ji} \leq 3$ for all distinct $i, j \in I$. Then the quantum affinization $\widehat{U_q(\mathfrak{s})}$ has a finite presentation with generators $\{x_{i,0}^\pm, x_{i,\mp 1}^\pm, k_i^{\pm 1}, C^{\pm 1} : i \in I\}$ and relations*

- (i) $C^{\pm 1}$ central,
- (ii) $C^{\pm 1} C^{\mp 1} = k_i^{\pm 1} k_i^{\mp 1} = 1$,
- (iii) $[k_i, k_j] = 0$,
- (iv) $k_i x_{j,m}^\pm k_i^{-1} = q_i^{\pm a_{ij}} x_{j,m}^\pm$,
- (v) $[x_{i,0}^+, x_{j,0}^-] = \frac{\delta_{ij}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} (k_i - k_i^{-1})$,
- (vi) $[x_{i,-1}^+, x_{j,1}^-] = \delta_{ij} \frac{C^{-1} k_i - C k_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}$,
- (vii) $[x_{i,0}^+, x_{j,1}^-] = [x_{i,-1}^+, x_{j,0}^-] = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$,
- (viii) $[x_{i,0}^+, x_{i,-1}^+]_{q_i^2} = [x_{i,1}^-, x_{i,0}^-]_{q_i^{-2}} = 0$,
- (ix) $[x_{i,0}^+, x_{j,-1}^+]_{q_i^{a_{ij}}} + [x_{j,0}^+, x_{i,-1}^+]_{q_i^{a_{ij}}} = 0$ whenever $a_{ij} < 0$,
- (x) $[x_{i,1}^-, x_{j,0}^-]_{q_i^{-a_{ij}}} + [x_{j,1}^-, x_{i,0}^-]_{q_i^{-a_{ij}}} = 0$ whenever $a_{ij} < 0$,
- (xi) $\sum_{s=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^s \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ s \end{bmatrix}_i y_i^s y_j y_i^{1-a_{ij}-s} = 0$ whenever $i \neq j$,

for $(y_i, y_j) = (x_{i,0}^\pm, x_{j,0}^\pm), (x_{i,\mp 1}^\pm, x_{j,0}^\pm), (x_{i,0}^\pm, x_{j,\mp 1}^\pm)$.

Proof. Let \mathcal{H} be the algebra generated by $\{\hat{x}_{i,0}^\pm, \hat{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm, \hat{k}_i^{\pm 1}, \hat{C}^{\pm 1} : i \in I\}$, subject to relations (i)-(xi) above with hats over each generator. It is clear that

$$\hat{C} \mapsto C, \quad \hat{x}_{i,0}^\pm \mapsto x_{i,0}^\pm, \quad \hat{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm \mapsto x_{i,\mp 1}^\pm, \quad \hat{k}_i \mapsto k_i,$$

defines a homomorphism $f : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. Let us build its inverse out of morphisms $\mathcal{U}_{ij} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$. By Lemma 4.7, we have for each pair of adjacent nodes $i, j \in I$ an algebra homomorphism $p_{ij} : \mathcal{U}_{ij} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ given by

$$C \mapsto \hat{C}, \quad x_{\ell,0}^\pm \mapsto \hat{x}_{\ell,0}^\pm, \quad x_{\ell,\mp 1}^\pm \mapsto \hat{x}_{\ell,\mp 1}^\pm, \quad k_\ell \mapsto \hat{k}_\ell,$$

for $\ell = i, j$. Then $p_i = p_{ij}|_{\mathcal{U}_i} = p_{ji}|_{\mathcal{U}_i}$ is well-defined and independent of j , since our proof of Proposition 4.3 shows that \mathcal{U}_i is generated by $x_{i,0}^\pm, x_{i,\mp 1}^\pm$,

$k_i^{\pm 1}$ and $C^{\pm 1}$. Furthermore, it is immediate from the presentation of \mathcal{H} that $[\text{im}(p_i), \text{im}(p_j)] = 0$ whenever $a_{ij} = 0$. So we see that

$$C \mapsto \hat{C}, \quad x_{i,0}^{\pm} \mapsto p_i(x_{i,0}^{\pm}), \quad x_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm} \mapsto p_i(x_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm}), \quad k_i \mapsto p_i(k_i),$$

for all $i \in I$ defines an algebra homomorphism $g : U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$, since all relations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ are contained in some \mathcal{U}_{ij} . We have $f \circ g = \text{id}$ by checking on Drinfeld-Jimbo generators of each \mathcal{U}_{ij} with $a_{ij} < 0$, and $g \circ f = \text{id}$ by checking on generators of \mathcal{H} . \square

Remark 4.9. 1. This result gives a finite Drinfeld new style presentation for the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ in all untwisted and twisted types except $A_1^{(1)}$ and $A_2^{(2)}$, as well as for all untwisted quantum affine algebras $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.

2. The relations in Proposition 4.8 are a subset of those in the original definition for $\widehat{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}$ which only involve the generators $x_{i,0}^{\pm}$, $x_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm}$, $k_i^{\pm 1}$, $C^{\pm 1}$ for each $i \in I$. In particular, we do not have ‘shadows’ of other relations appearing in our simplified presentation.

Recall that in Section 3.2 we obtained formulae for $\mathbf{T}_i(x_{j,m}^{\pm})$ when $i, j \in I_0$ and $m = 0, \mp 1$. Thanks to Proposition 4.8, these are enough to define the remaining automorphisms \mathcal{T}_i that are required for our action of $\vec{\mathfrak{B}}$ on $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$.

Proposition 4.10. *For each $i \in I$ there exists an automorphism \mathcal{T}_i of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ such that*

- $\mathcal{T}_i h = h \mathbf{T}_i$ for all $i \in I$,
- $\mathcal{T}_i v = v \mathbf{T}_i$ for all $i \in I_0$,
- $\mathcal{T}_i^{-1} = \eta \mathcal{T}_i \eta$ for all $i \in I$.

Proof. For each $i \in I$, we define the morphism $\mathcal{T}_i : U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}}) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_i(C) &= C, \quad \mathcal{T}_i(k_j) = k_j k_i^{-a_{ij}}, \\ \mathcal{T}_i(x_{i,0}^+) &= -x_{i,0}^- k_i, \quad \mathcal{T}_i(x_{i,0}^-) = -k_i^{-1} x_{i,0}^+, \\ \mathcal{T}_i(x_{i,-1}^+) &= \sum_{s=0}^2 (-1)^s q_i^s (x_{i,0}^-)^{(s)} x_{i,-1}^+ (x_{i,0}^-)^{(2-s)} k_i, \\ \mathcal{T}_i(x_{i,-1}^-) &= k_i^{-1} \sum_{s=0}^2 (-1)^s q_i^{-s} (x_{i,0}^+)^{(2-s)} x_{i,-1}^- (x_{i,0}^+)^{(s)}, \\ \mathcal{T}_i(x_{j,m}^+) &= \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^{-s} (x_{i,0}^+)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} x_{j,m}^+ (x_{i,0}^+)^{(s)} \text{ if } i \neq j, \\ \mathcal{T}_i(x_{j,m}^-) &= \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{ij}} (-1)^s q_i^s (x_{i,0}^-)^{(s)} x_{j,m}^- (x_{i,0}^-)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} \text{ if } i \neq j. \end{aligned}$$

To verify that \mathcal{T}_i is a well-defined homomorphism, we need to show that it preserves every relation in our simplified presentation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. For each $j, \ell \in I$ consider the relations lying inside $\mathcal{U}_{j\ell}$. These are also relations of the subalgebra $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$, to which we may restrict since from the formulae above it is preserved by \mathcal{T}_i . Note that $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$ is isomorphic to the quantum affinization of the quantum group associated to the full Dynkin subdiagram $D_{ij\ell}$ on the nodes i, j, ℓ .

If $D_{ij\ell}$ is a subdiagram of some finite Dynkin diagram, then $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$ is isomorphic to a direct product of quantum affine algebras. Furthermore, $\mathcal{T}_i|_{\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}}$ acts by \mathbf{T}_i on the factor containing \mathcal{U}_i and by the identity on all other factors. Since this is an automorphism of $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$, we see that \mathcal{T}_i preserves all relations lying inside $\mathcal{U}_{j\ell}$.

Otherwise, $D_{ij\ell}$ is the Dynkin diagram of type $A_2^{(1)}$, $C_2^{(1)}$, $G_2^{(1)}$, $A_4^{(2)}$, $D_3^{(2)}$ or $D_4^{(3)}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$ is isomorphic to the corresponding quantum toroidal algebra. Since by definition \mathcal{T}_i restricts to \mathbf{T}_i on the horizontal subalgebra $(\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell})_h$, it preserves all relations lying inside it. Any other relation can then be obtained from one of these by applying \mathcal{X}_j , \mathcal{X}_ℓ or $\mathcal{X}_j\mathcal{X}_\ell$, which commute with \mathcal{T}_i since $i \neq j, \ell$.

Hence we may conclude that \mathcal{T}_i respects all relations in our simplified presentation, and is thus an algebra homomorphism. The first two bullet points in the statement of the proposition are then immediate from the formulae for \mathbf{T}_i on the Drinfeld-Jimbo and Drinfeld new generators of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ in Section 3.2.

To show that \mathcal{T}_i is an automorphism with inverse $\eta\mathcal{T}_i\eta$, it suffices to check this on the invariant subspace \mathcal{U}_{ij} for each $j \neq i$. If $a_{ij} < 0$ then \mathcal{U}_{ij} is isomorphic to $U_q(A_2^{(1)})$, $U_q(C_2^{(1)})$ or $U_q(G_2^{(1)})$, and \mathcal{T}_i and η restrict to \mathbf{T}_i and η' . If $a_{ij} = 0$ then $\mathcal{U}_{ij} \cong \mathcal{U}_i \times \mathcal{U}_j$ and \mathcal{T}_i and η restrict to $\mathbf{T}_i \times \text{id}$ and $\eta' \times \eta'$. In either case, since $(\mathbf{T}_i)^{-1} = \eta'\mathbf{T}_i\eta'$ our proof is complete. \square

We now have all of the automorphisms required to define our braid group action on $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. However, in type $A_{2n}^{(1)}$ we are forced to consider a slightly modified version of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$. First, we must have that $\pi_1 \in \Omega$ has order $4n + 2$ rather than $2n + 1$. This is because, as discussed in Section 2, there is no length function on the affine Dynkin diagram and so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}^{2n+1}(x_{i,m}^\pm) &= (-1)^m x_{i,m}^\pm, & \mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}^{2n+1}(k_i) &= k_i, \\ \mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}^{2n+1}(h_{i,r}) &= (-1)^r h_{i,r}, & \mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}^{2n+1}(C) &= C, \end{aligned}$$

has order two. Let ζ_i be the automorphism mapping each $x_{i,m}^\pm \mapsto -x_{i,m}^\pm$ and fixing the other generators. Then we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}\zeta_i\mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}^{-1} = \zeta_{\pi_1(i)}, \quad \mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}\mathcal{X}_{2n}\mathcal{S}_{\pi_1}^{-1} = \zeta_0\mathcal{X}_0, \quad \mathcal{T}_0^{-1}\mathcal{X}_0\mathcal{T}_0^{-1} = \zeta_0\mathcal{X}_{2n}\mathcal{X}_0^{-1}\mathcal{X}_1,$$

and we adjust the relations of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ accordingly. The involutions \mathfrak{t} , γ_v and γ_h extend naturally to our modified braid group, and our results are not otherwise

impacted. The proof of the next theorem is virtually the same as for the other cases (we shall not include the minor differences) and there is only a slight change in Lemma 5.2.

Theorem 4.11. *The extended double affine braid group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ acts on the quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ via $T_i \mapsto \mathcal{T}_i$ for all $i \in I$, $X_{\omega_i^\vee} \mapsto \mathcal{Z}_{\omega_i^\vee} := \mathcal{X}_i \mathcal{X}_0^{-a_i}$ for all $i \in I_0$, and $\pi \mapsto \mathcal{S}_\pi$ for all $\pi \in \Omega$.*

Proof. The relations between \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{Z}_β follow from the Coxeter relations between \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{X}_j , namely that $\mathcal{T}_i \mathcal{X}_j = \mathcal{X}_j \mathcal{T}_i$ whenever $i \neq j$ and $\mathcal{T}_i^{-1} \mathcal{X}_i \mathcal{T}_i^{-1} = \mathcal{X}_i \prod_{j \in I} \mathcal{X}_j^{-a_{ij}}$. Commutativity of \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{X}_j for $i \neq j$ is clear from the definitions, while the other relation is checked on each \mathcal{U}_ℓ by restricting to $\mathcal{U}_{i\ell}$ and applying Theorem 3.11, since $\mathcal{U}_{i\ell}$ is a product of quantum affine algebras.

To verify the braid relation between \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{T}_j on elements of \mathcal{U}_ℓ , we restrict to the invariant subalgebra $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$. Similarly to our proof of Proposition 4.10, if $D_{ij\ell}$ is a subdiagram of a finite Dynkin diagram then $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$ is a product of quantum affine algebras and we can use the braid relation between \mathbf{T}_i and \mathbf{T}_j from Theorem 3.11. Otherwise, $\mathcal{U}_{ij\ell}$ is isomorphic to the quantum toroidal algebra of untwisted type A_2 , C_2 or G_2 . We already have the braid relation on $x_{\ell,0}^\pm$ and $k_\ell^{\pm 1}$ using $\mathcal{T}_i h = h \mathbf{T}_i$ and $\mathcal{T}_j h = h \mathbf{T}_j$. Applying \mathcal{X}_ℓ , which commutes with \mathcal{T}_i and \mathcal{T}_j since $\ell \neq i, j$, we derive the braid relation on all of \mathcal{U}_ℓ . The remaining relations follow from the definitions without much difficulty. \square

Remark 4.12. 1. Our extended double affine braid group action restricts to both an action of \mathcal{B}_h on \mathcal{U}_h and an action of \mathcal{B}_v on \mathcal{U}_v , each of which coincides with Lusztig and Beck's action of the extended affine braid group on the quantum affine algebra.

2. In their PhD thesis, motivated by trying to obtain a Damiani-Beck style isomorphism on the toroidal level, Mounzer [23] provides a topological braid group action on a certain completion of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ (verifying the quantum Serre relations is a work in progress in some cases). We note that this action does not restrict to the quantum toroidal algebra and is thus distinct from our results.

It is worth highlighting that these results extend naturally to the quantum affinizations $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{s})$ considered in Proposition 4.8, namely those with $a_{ij} a_{ji} \leq 3$ for all distinct $i, j \in I$. In particular, for each $i \in I$ there exists an automorphism \mathcal{T}_i of $\widehat{U}_q(\mathfrak{s})$ defined exactly as in Proposition 4.10, with inverse $\mathcal{T}_i^{-1} = \eta \mathcal{T}_i \eta$, which restricts to \mathbf{T}_i on the horizontal copy of $U_q(\mathfrak{s})$. Furthermore, for some appropriate generalisation of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ we obtain a braid group action as in Theorem 4.11. In each case, the proofs are the same as above.

Definition 4.13. For any generalised Cartan matrix $(a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ we define $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ to be the group generated by $\{T_i, X_i : i \in I\}$ and the automorphism group Ω of the associated Dynkin diagram, with relations

- $T_i T_j T_i \dots = T_j T_i T_j \dots$ whenever $a_{ij} a_{ji} \leq 3$, where there are $a_{ij} a_{ji} + 2$ factors on each side,
- $X_i X_j = X_j X_i$,
- $T_i X_j = X_j T_i$ whenever $i \neq j$,
- $T_i^{-1} X_i T_i^{-1} = X_i \prod_{j \in I} X_j^{-a_{ij}}$,
- $\pi T_i \pi^{-1} = T_{\pi(i)}$,
- $\pi X_i \pi^{-1} = X_{\pi(i)}$,

for all $i, j \in I$ and $\pi \in \Omega$.

Note that the extended double affine braid group $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ embeds inside the corresponding $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ by sending $T_i \mapsto T_i$, $X_{\omega_i^\vee} \mapsto X_i X_0^{-a_i}$ and $\pi \mapsto \pi$ for each $i \in I$ and $\pi \in \Omega$.

When the underlying Dynkin diagram possesses a length function o , by defining \mathcal{X}_i and \mathcal{S}_π exactly as for $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ in Section 4.1, we obtain the following ‘braid group action’ on $\widehat{U_q(\mathfrak{s})}$.

Theorem 4.14. *The group $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ acts on the quantum affinization $\widehat{U_q(\mathfrak{s})}$ via $T_i \mapsto \mathcal{T}_i$ and $X_i \mapsto \mathcal{X}_i$ for all $i \in I$, and $\pi \mapsto \mathcal{S}_\pi$ for all $\pi \in \Omega$.*

If instead no such o exists and the Dynkin diagram contains an odd length cycle, this should instead hold for a modified version of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ as was the case in type $A_{2n}^{(1)}$.

5 Automorphisms and anti-automorphisms of quantum toroidal algebras

We now look to construct certain automorphisms and anti-involutions of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ which exchange the horizontal and vertical subalgebras. Our current method relies on certain properties of the root system, in particular the a_i labels, and so for the remainder of this paper we restrict our focus to the (untwisted) simply laced cases. We shall return to the other types in future work. For notational simplicity, we will henceforth identify elements of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ with the corresponding automorphisms of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ from Theorem 4.11. We shall also write X_i for $X_{\omega_i^\vee}$ and Y_i for $Y_{\omega_i^\vee}$ for each $i \in I_0$.

Our approach is roughly as follows. We can in some sense build $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ out of the copy of the finite quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ lying inside $\mathcal{U}_h \cap \mathcal{U}_v$ and the braid group action from Theorem 4.11. Twisting the action by certain automorphisms of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ obtains a different ‘twisted’ set of generators for $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. Then mapping the standard generators to their twisted counterparts gives our desired

(anti-)automorphisms.

More specifically, each generator of our simplified presentation of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ from Proposition 4.8 (other than $C^{\pm 1}$) can easily be written as $b(z)$ for some $b \in \tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and $z \in U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. For all $x_{i,0}^{\pm}$ and $k_i^{\pm 1}$ with $i \in I_0$ we may set $b = 1$, and for the other generators we have

- $x_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm} = o(i)X_i(x_{i,0}^{\pm})$ for each $i \in I_0$,
- $x_{0,0}^{\pm} = \pi_j^{-1}(x_{j,0}^{\pm})$ for any $j \in I_{\min} \setminus \{0\}$,
- $x_{0,\mp 1}^{\pm} = o(0)\pi_j^{-1}X_j(x_{j,0}^{\pm})$ for any $j \in I_{\min} \setminus \{0\}$,
- $k_0^{\pm 1} = \pi_j^{-1}(k_j^{\pm 1})$ for any $j \in I_{\min} \setminus \{0\}$,

outside of type $E_8^{(1)}$, where since Ω is trivial we instead write

- $x_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm} = o(i)X_i(x_{i,0}^{\pm})$ for each $i \in I_0$,
- $x_{0,0}^{\pm} = T_1 T_0(x_{1,0}^{\pm})$,
- $x_{0,\mp 1}^{\pm} = o(0)X_{\beta} T_1 T_0(x_{1,0}^{\pm})$ whenever $(\beta, \alpha_0) = 1$,
- $k_0^{\pm 1} = T_1 T_0(k_1^{\pm 1})$.

Recall the involution \mathfrak{t} of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ from Section 4.2. For each $x_{i,m}^{\pm} = b(z)$ above let $\mathbf{x}_{i,m}^{\pm} = \mathfrak{t}(b)(z)$, and for each $k_i^{\pm 1} = b(z)$ define $\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1} = \mathfrak{t}(b)(z^{-1})$. In particular,

$$\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1} = k_i^{\mp 1}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{i,0}^{\pm} = x_{i,0}^{\pm}, \quad \mathbf{x}_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm} = o(i)Y_i(x_{i,0}^{\pm}),$$

for all $i \in I_0$, and outside of $E_8^{(1)}$ we have

$$\mathbf{k}_0^{\pm 1} = \rho_j^{-1}(k_j^{\mp 1}), \quad \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^{\pm} = \rho_j^{-1}(x_{j,0}^{\pm}), \quad \mathbf{x}_{0,\mp 1}^{\pm} = o(0)\rho_j^{-1}Y_j(x_{j,0}^{\pm}),$$

for any $j \in I_{\min} \setminus \{0\}$. In type $E_8^{(1)}$ these are replaced with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k}_0^{\pm 1} &= T_1^{-1}(T_0^v)^{-1}(k_1^{\mp 1}), \\ \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^{\pm} &= T_1^{-1}(T_0^v)^{-1}(x_{1,0}^{\pm}), \\ \mathbf{x}_{0,\mp 1}^{\pm} &= o(0)Y_{\beta} T_1^{-1}(T_0^v)^{-1}(x_{1,0}^{\pm}), \end{aligned}$$

whenever $(\beta, \alpha_0) = 1$. If we also define $\mathbf{C}^{\pm 1} = (k_0^{a_0} \dots k_n^{a_n})^{\mp 1}$ then the following theorem shows that mapping generators to their bold counterparts extends to an anti-involution of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ which exchanges \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v (up to a twist by σ). As an immediate corollary, we can deduce the injectivity of h from that of v .

Theorem 5.1. *There is an anti-involution ψ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ sending*

$$x_{i,m}^{\pm} \mapsto \mathbf{x}_{i,m}^{\pm}, \quad k_i \mapsto \mathbf{k}_i, \quad C \mapsto \mathbf{C},$$

for all $i \in I$ and $m = 0, \mp 1$, determined by the conditions $\psi v = h\sigma$ and $\psi h = v\sigma$.

A brief technical lemma gives various identities required for the proof of the above. Note that in type $A_{2n}^{(1)}$ we restrict to $\rho = \rho_1$ for (5.4).

Lemma 5.2. $\cdot Y_i(\mathbf{x}_{j,0}^\pm) = \mathbf{x}_{j,0}^\pm$ and $Y_i(\mathbf{k}_j^{\pm 1}) = \mathbf{k}_j^{\pm 1}$ for all distinct $i, j \in I_0$,

$$(5.1)$$

$\cdot \mathbf{x}_{i,m}^\pm = h\sigma(x_{i,m}^\pm)$, $\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1} = h\sigma(k_i^{\pm 1})$ and $\mathbf{C}^{\pm 1} = h\sigma(C^{\pm 1})$ for all $i \in I_0$ and $m = 0, \mp 1$,

$$(5.2)$$

$\cdot \mathbf{x}_i^\pm = v\sigma(x_i^\pm)$ and $\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1} = v\sigma(t_i^{\pm 1})$ for all $i \in I$,

$$(5.3)$$

$\cdot \rho(\mathbf{x}_{i,m}^\pm) = o_{i,\rho(i)}^m \mathbf{x}_{\rho(i),m}^\pm$ and $\rho(\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}) = \mathbf{k}_{\rho(i)}^{\pm 1}$ for all $i \in I$, $m = 0, \mp 1$ and $\rho \in \Omega^v$.

$$(5.4)$$

Proof. We know from Proposition 4.10 that $T_i h = h\mathbf{T}_i = h\sigma\mathbf{T}_i^{-1}\sigma$ for all $i \in I$, and it is immediate from the definitions that $\pi h = hS_\pi = h\sigma S_\pi \sigma$ for each $\pi \in \Omega$. Each Y_β can be written as $\pi T_{i_1}^{\pm 1} \dots T_{i_s}^{\pm 1}$ and so as σ^2 is the identity,

$$Y_\beta h = h\sigma S_\pi \mathbf{T}_{i_1}^{\mp 1} \dots \mathbf{T}_{i_s}^{\mp 1} \sigma = h\sigma \mathbf{X}_\beta \sigma. \quad (5.5)$$

Note that (5.2) for $\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm$, $\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}$ and $\mathbf{C}^{\pm 1}$ is trivial, as is (5.3) when $i \in I_0$. Using equation (5.5) we can then deduce (5.1) and the remainder of (5.2). As mentioned in Remark 4.12, \mathcal{B}_v acts on \mathcal{U}_v via Beck's extended affine braid group action. In particular, each $\rho_j v = vS_{\rho_j}$ and so outside of $E_8^{(1)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^\pm &= \rho_j^{-1} v(x_i^\pm) = vS_{\rho_j}^{-1}(x_j^\pm) = v(x_0^\pm) = v\sigma(x_0^\pm), \\ \mathbf{k}_0^{\pm 1} &= \rho_j^{-1} v(t_j^{\mp 1}) = vS_{\rho_j}^{-1}(t_j^{\mp 1}) = v(t_0^{\mp 1}) = v\sigma(t_0^{\pm 1}), \end{aligned}$$

for any $j \in I_{\min} \setminus \{0\}$. On the other hand, in type $E_8^{(1)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^\pm &= T_1^{-1}(T_0^v)^{-1} v(x_{1,0}^\pm) = v\mathbf{T}_1^{-1}\mathbf{T}_0^{-1}(x_{1,0}^\pm) = v(x_0^\pm) = v\sigma(x_0^\pm), \\ \mathbf{k}_0^{\pm 1} &= T_1^{-1}(T_0^v)^{-1} v(t_1^{\mp 1}) = v\mathbf{T}_1^{-1}\mathbf{T}_0^{-1}(t_1^{\mp 1}) = v(t_0^{\mp 1}) = v\sigma(t_0^{\pm 1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then for all $\rho \in \Omega^v$ and $i \in I$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm) &= \rho v(x_i^\pm) = vS_\rho(x_i^\pm) = v(x_{\rho(i)}^\pm) = \mathbf{x}_{\rho(i),0}^\pm, \\ \rho(\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}) &= \rho v(t_i^{\mp 1}) = vS_\rho(t_i^{\mp 1}) = v(t_{\rho(i)}^{\mp 1}) = \mathbf{k}_{\rho(i)}^{\pm 1}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that whenever i , $\rho(i)$ and $\rho(0)$ are non-zero,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\mathbf{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm) &= o(i)\rho Y_i(\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm) = o(i)Y_{\rho(i)} Y_{\rho(0)}^{-a_i} \rho(\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm) \\ &= o(i)Y_{\rho(i)} Y_{\rho(0)}^{-a_i} (\mathbf{x}_{\rho(i),0}^\pm) = o_{i,\rho(i)} \mathbf{x}_{\rho(i),\mp 1}^\pm, \end{aligned}$$

and the cases $i = 0$ and $\rho(0) = 0$ are trivial. Outside of type $A_{2n}^{(1)}$ it is immediate from the definitions that $\rho(\mathbf{x}_{\rho^{-1}(0),\mp 1}^\pm) = o_{i,0} \mathbf{x}_{0,\mp 1}^\pm$. In type $A_{2n}^{(1)}$, from the other identities this is equivalent to $\rho_1^2(\mathbf{x}_{2n,\mp 1}^\pm) = \mathbf{x}_{1,\mp 1}^\pm$, and the equality $\rho_1^2 Y_{2n} Y_{2n-1}^{-1} = \zeta_0 \zeta_1 Y_1 \rho_1^2$ implies that $\rho_1^2(\mathbf{x}_{2n,\mp 1}^\pm) = \zeta_0 \zeta_1 (\mathbf{x}_{1,\mp 1}^\pm)$. Then using (5.2) and $\mathbf{X}_1 = S_{\pi_1} \mathbf{T}_n \dots \mathbf{T}_1$ we can obtain an explicit expression for $\mathbf{x}_{1,\mp 1}^\pm$ in terms of $\{x_{i,0}^\pm, k_i^{\pm 1} : i \in I\}$, from which we deduce that $\zeta_0 \zeta_1 (\mathbf{x}_{1,\mp 1}^\pm) = \mathbf{x}_{1,\mp 1}^\pm$. \square

i	Y_{μ_i}	$Y_{\mu'_i}$
1	$Y_7 Y_8^{-1}$	$Y_1 Y_7^{-1}$
2	$Y_8 Y_6^{-1}$	$Y_2 Y_8^{-1}$
3	$Y_6 Y_4^{-1}$	$Y_3 Y_6^{-1}$
4	$Y_7 Y_8 Y_5^{-1}$	$Y_4 Y_7^{-1} Y_8^{-1}$
5	$Y_8^2 Y_4^{-1} Y_7^{-1}$	$Y_5 Y_8^{-2}$
6	$Y_3 Y_4^{-1}$	$Y_6 Y_3^{-1}$
7	$Y_1 Y_8^{-1}$	$Y_7 Y_1^{-1}$
8	$Y_2 Y_6^{-1}$	$Y_8 Y_2^{-1}$

Table 2 Elements $Y_{\mu_i}, Y_{\mu'_i} \in \check{\mathcal{B}}$ for each $i \in I_0$ in type $E_8^{(1)}$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. To show that ψ is an anti-homomorphism, we must check that relations (i)-(xi) of Proposition 4.8 still hold if we reverse the order of multiplication and replace each generator with its image. Denote these modified relations by (i)-(xi). Every relation with indices in I_0 follows immediately from the Drinfeld new presentation of \mathcal{U}_h using (5.2). Moreover, relations involving only $\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm$ and $\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}$ terms follow from the Drinfeld-Jimbo presentation of \mathcal{U}_v by (5.3).

When $|\Omega| > 2$ all other relations can be reached by applying some $\rho \in \Omega^v$ and (5.4) to a relation with indices in I_0 . In type $E_7^{(1)}$, the same reasoning gives all relations apart from those involving indices $\{i, j\} = \{0, 6\}$ which are not contained in \mathcal{U}_v . If $(\beta, \alpha_0) = 0$ then $(\rho_6(\beta), \alpha_6) = 0$ so by (5.4) and (5.5),

$$\begin{aligned} Y_\beta(\mathbf{k}_0^{\pm 1}) &= Y_\beta \rho_6(\mathbf{k}_6^{\pm 1}) = \rho_6 Y_{\rho_6(\beta)} h\sigma(k_6^{\pm 1}) \\ &= \rho_6 h\sigma X_{\rho_6(\beta)}(k_6^{\pm 1}) = \rho_6 h\sigma(k_6^{\pm 1}) \\ &= \mathbf{k}_0^{\pm 1}, \end{aligned}$$

and $Y_\beta(\mathbf{x}_{0,m}^\pm) = \mathbf{x}_{0,m}^\pm$ for $m = 0, \mp 1$ via similar equalities. Therefore, taking for example $Y_\mu = Y_4^{-1} Y_5 Y_6$ we can obtain the remaining relations as follows.

(iv) For $m = \mp 1$ apply Y_μ and $\rho_6 Y_\mu$ to the $m = 0$ cases.

(vi)-(vii) Apply Y_μ , $\rho_6 Y_\mu$ and $Y_\mu \rho_6 Y_\mu$ to the corresponding relations in (v).

(xi) Apply Y_μ , $\rho_6 Y_\mu$ and $Y_\mu \rho_6 Y_\mu$ to the cases involving $\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^\pm$ and $\mathbf{x}_{6,0}^\pm$.

In type $E_8^{(1)}$ we proceed in an analogous fashion. Table 2 lists for each $i \in I_0$ some Y_{μ_i} which fixes $\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm$ and $\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}$ and sends $\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^\pm \mapsto o(0)\mathbf{x}_{0,\mp 1}^\pm$, and some $Y_{\mu'_i}$ which fixes $\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^\pm$ and $\mathbf{k}_0^{\pm 1}$ and maps $\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm \mapsto o(i)\mathbf{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm$. Let us verify the conditions on Y_{μ_i} and $Y_{\mu'_i}$. In all cases $Y_{\mu_i}(\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^\pm) = o(0)\mathbf{x}_{0,\mp 1}^\pm$ is immediate by definition, and (5.1) gives

$$Y_{\mu_i}(\mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}) = \mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}, \quad Y_{\mu_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm) = \mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm, \quad Y_{\mu'_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^\pm) = o(i)\mathbf{x}_{i,\mp 1}^\pm.$$




Fig. 3 Illustrations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ displaying the two generating sets

The other properties follow from $Y_{\mu'_i} T_1^{-1} (T_0^v)^{-1} = T_1^{-1} (T_0^v)^{-1} Y_{\mu'_i}$ when $i \neq 1$, and $Y_{\mu'_1} T_1 (T_0^v) = T_1^{-1} (T_0^v)^{-1} Y_2 Y_7^{-1}$. We can then obtain the remaining relations for ψ to be an anti-homomorphism as follows.

- (iv) For $m = \mp 1$ apply Y_{μ_i} and $Y_{\mu'_i}$ to the $m = 0$ cases.
- (vi)-(vii) Apply Y_{μ_i} , $Y_{\mu'_i}$ and $Y_{\mu_i} Y_{\mu'_i}$ to the corresponding relations in (v).
- (ix)-(x) The case $\{i, j\} = \{0, 1\}$ comes from applying both sides of

$$o(0)Y_{\mu_1} T_1^{-1} = -o(1)Y_{\mu'_1} (T_0^v)^{-1} Y_7^2 Y_8^{-1} (T_0^v)^{-1} T_1^{-1}$$

to $\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$, since using Lemma 5.2 and Remark 4.12 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^+ &\xrightarrow{T_1^{-1}} [\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^+, \mathbf{x}_{1,0}^+]_{q^{-1}} \xrightarrow{o(0)Y_{\mu_1}} [\mathbf{x}_{0,-1}^+, \mathbf{x}_{1,0}^+]_{q^{-1}} \\ \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^+ &\xrightarrow{(T_0^v)^{-1} T_1^{-1}} \mathbf{x}_{1,0}^+ \xrightarrow{(T_0^v)^{-1} Y_7^2 Y_8^{-1}} [\mathbf{x}_{1,0}^+, \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^+]_{q^{-1}} \xrightarrow{o(1)Y_{\mu'_1}} [\mathbf{x}_{1,-1}^+, \mathbf{x}_{0,0}^+]_{q^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^-$.

- (xi) Apply Y_{μ_i} , $Y_{\mu'_i}$ and $Y_{\mu_i} Y_{\mu'_i}$ to the cases involving $\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^{\pm}$.

We have therefore shown that ψ is an anti-homomorphism. The conditions $\psi v = h\sigma$ and $\psi h = v\sigma$ are then immediate from (5.2) and (5.3), and moreover determine ψ since \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v generate $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. Furthermore, it also follows that $\psi^2 = \text{id}$ on \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v and so ψ is in fact an anti-involution. \square

Figure 3 contains simple illustrations of the quantum toroidal algebra which highlight where elements of the two generating sets $\{x_{i,0}^{\pm}, x_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm}, k_i^{\pm 1}, C^{\pm 1} : i \in I\}$ and $\{\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^{\pm}, \mathbf{x}_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm}, \mathbf{k}_i^{\pm 1}, \mathbf{C}^{\pm 1} : i \in I\}$ lie inside $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. In particular, we see how the bold generators in some sense give $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ as a quantum affinization of its vertical rather than horizontal subalgebra, with \mathcal{U}_v in a Drinfeld-Jimbo presentation and \mathcal{U}_h in a Drinfeld new presentation (although the multiplication is of course reversed).

Corollary 5.3. *There is an automorphism $\Phi := \eta\psi$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ with inverse $\Phi^{-1} = \eta\Phi\eta = \psi\eta$, determined by the conditions $\Phi v = h$ and $\Phi h = v\eta'\sigma$.*

Remark 5.4. 1. In type $A_n^{(1)}$ this is precisely the automorphism of Miki [21] with the extra deformation parameter κ set to 1.

2. Note in particular the actions on central elements: ψ exchanges C and $(k_0^{a_0} \dots k_n^{a_n})^{-1}$, while Φ maps $C \mapsto k_0^{a_0} \dots k_n^{a_n}$ and $k_0^{a_0} \dots k_n^{a_n} \mapsto C^{-1}$.

The following proposition provides compatibilities between the action of $\check{\mathcal{B}}$ on $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ and the (anti-)automorphisms ψ and $\Phi^{\pm 1}$, which can therefore be viewed as quantum toroidal analogues of the corresponding involutions of the braid group.

Proposition 5.5. *For all $b \in \check{\mathcal{B}}$ we have*

$$\cdot \psi \circ b = \mathfrak{t}(b) \circ \psi, \quad (5.6)$$

$$\cdot \Phi \circ b = \gamma_v(\mathfrak{t}(b)) \circ \Phi, \quad (5.7)$$

$$\cdot \Phi^{-1} \circ b = \gamma_h(\mathfrak{t}(b)) \circ \Phi^{-1}. \quad (5.8)$$

Proof. We start with the first identity. Note that since $\psi^2 = \text{id}$, having the relation for some $b \in \check{\mathcal{B}}$ immediately implies it for b^{-1} and $\mathfrak{t}(b)$ as well. By Proposition 4.10 and Theorem 5.1,

$$\psi T_i h = v\sigma \mathbf{T}_i = v\mathbf{T}_i^{-1}\sigma = T_i^{-1}\psi h,$$

$$\psi T_i v = h\sigma \mathbf{T}_i = h\mathbf{T}_i^{-1}\sigma = T_i^{-1}\psi v,$$

for all $i \in I_0$, which gives the case $b = T_i$ since \mathcal{U}_h and \mathcal{U}_v generate $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. For $b = \pi_j$ we have that $\rho_j\psi(C^{\pm 1}) = \mathbf{C}^{\pm 1} = \psi\pi_j(C^{\pm 1})$ follows from $X_\beta\psi(C^{\pm 1}) = \mathbf{C}^{\pm 1} = \psi Y_\beta(C^{\pm 1})$ and the identity with $T_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, T_n^{\pm 1}$. From (5.4),

$$\rho_j\psi(x_{i,m}^\pm) = \mathbf{x}_{\rho_j(i),m}^\pm = \psi\pi_j(x_{i,m}^\pm),$$

$$\rho_j\psi(k_i^{\pm 1}) = \mathbf{k}_{\rho_j(i)}^{\pm 1} = \psi\pi_j(k_i^{\pm 1}),$$

for all $i \in I$ and $m = 0, \mp 1$, and therefore $\rho_j\psi = \psi\pi_j$. When Ω is non-trivial the proof is complete since \mathcal{B}_0, Ω and Ω^v generate $\check{\mathcal{B}}$. In type $E_8^{(1)}$ it remains to check that $T_0\psi = \psi(T_0^v)^{-1}$. First note that $T_0\psi v = h\mathbf{T}_0\sigma = h\sigma\mathbf{T}_0^{-1} = \psi(T_0^v)^{-1}v$ so we are done on \mathcal{U}_v . Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} T_0\psi(k_0) &= T_0(C^{-1}k_1^{a_1} \dots k_n^{a_n}) = (C^{-1}k_0^2 k_1^{a_1} \dots k_n^{a_n}) \\ &= \psi(C^{-2}k_0 k_1^{2a_1} \dots k_n^{2a_n}) = \psi T_{s_\theta}(C^{-2}k_0) \\ &= \psi T_{s_\theta} X_{-\theta^\vee}(k_0) = \psi(T_0^v)^{-1}(k_0), \end{aligned}$$

and for any $i \in I_0$, with $Y_{\mu'_i}$ as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0\psi(\mathbf{x}_{i,1}^-) &= \sum_{s=0}^{-a_{0i}} (-1)^s q^s (x_{0,0}^-)^{(s)} x_{i,1}^- (x_{0,0}^-)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} \\
&= \psi \left(\sum_{s=0}^{-a_{0i}} (-1)^s q^s (\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^-)^{(s)} \mathbf{x}_{i,1}^- (\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^-)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} \right) \\
&= o(i)\psi Y_{\mu'_i} \left(\sum_{s=0}^{-a_{0i}} (-1)^s q^s (\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^-)^{(s)} \mathbf{x}_{i,0}^- (\mathbf{x}_{0,0}^-)^{(-a_{ij}-s)} \right) \\
&= o(i)\psi Y_{\mu'_i} (T_0^v)^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^-) = o(i)\psi (T_0^v)^{-1} Y_{\mu'_i}(\mathbf{x}_{i,0}^-) \\
&= (T_0^v)^{-1}(\mathbf{x}_{i,1}^-),
\end{aligned}$$

and similarly for $\mathbf{x}_{i,-1}^+$. This verifies that $T_0\psi = \psi(T_0^v)^{-1}$ on \mathcal{U}_h and so we have proved the first identity. It is immediate from the definitions that $\pi = \eta\pi\eta$ for each $\pi \in \Omega$ and $X_\beta^{-1} = \eta X_\beta \eta$ for any $\beta \in \hat{P}^\vee$. Furthermore, since $T_i^{-1} = \eta T_i \eta$ for all $i \in I$ we deduce the second identity from the first. The final identity then follows from $(\gamma_v \circ \mathfrak{t})^{-1} = \gamma_h \circ \mathfrak{t}$. \square








Our automorphism Φ should have a range of applications pertaining to the representation theory of simply laced $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$. For example, by conjugating the Drinfeld topological coproduct of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ with Φ we hope to study tensor products of the type 1 integrable loop-highest weight modules classified by Hernandez [8], as well as their associated R -matrices, thus extending work of Miki [22] in type $A_n^{(1)}$.

Another possible direction concerns the relationship between the level $(1,0)$ vertex representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ due to Saito and Jing [13, 28], and the type 1 representations constructed geometrically by Nakajima [26, 27] using the equivariant K-theory of quiver varieties on the affine Dynkin diagrams. The expectation is that twisting these vertex representations by Φ should be isomorphic to (the dual of) a Fock space representation.

Of course, this result is well-known in type $A_n^{(1)}$ [22, 30] and moreover provides an instance of the celebrated boson-fermion correspondence from mathematical physics. We note that in the other simply laced types, Fock space representations of $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{tor}})$ have only been described geometrically at this stage. In particular, there does not yet exist a definition in terms of the q -wedge construction by Kashiwara-Miwa-Petersen-Yung [18].

Nevertheless, such an identification would likely allow us to relate various geometric features on the quiver variety side with more algebraic or combinatorial elements on the other. Indeed, interesting affine phenomena have already turned out to be meaningful in the geometric setting, for example in work of Nagao [24, 25] in type $A_n^{(1)}$.

A The affine Dynkin diagrams






Fig. 4 The untwisted affine Dynkin diagrams. Black labels are vertex numbers, blue labels are a_i values, and in the non-symmetric cases a_i^\vee values are in red




Fig. 5 The twisted affine Dynkin diagrams. Black labels are vertex numbers, blue labels are a_i values, and red labels are a_i^\vee values

Type A_2	Type C_2	Type G_2
$\alpha_1 \xrightarrow{-1} \alpha_2$	$\alpha_1 \xrightarrow{-1} \alpha_2 \xrightarrow{0} \alpha_1$	$\alpha_1 \xrightarrow{-1} \alpha_2 \xrightarrow{-1/3} \alpha_2 \xrightarrow{0} \alpha_1 \xrightarrow{-2/3} \alpha_2$
$\alpha_2 \xrightarrow{-1} \alpha_1$	$\alpha_2 \xrightarrow{-1} \alpha_1 \xrightarrow{0} \alpha_1$	$\alpha_2 \xrightarrow{-1} \alpha_1 \xrightarrow{-1/3} \alpha_2 \xrightarrow{0} \alpha_1 \xrightarrow{-2/3} \alpha_2$

Table 3 Sequences $\alpha_{i_1} \xrightarrow{\epsilon_1} \dots \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{h-2}} \alpha_{i_{h-1}}$ for $i_1 = 1, 2$ in types A_2 , C_2 and G_2

B Proof of Lemma 4.7

Here we provide some details regarding the proof of Lemma 4.7. Table 3 contains example sequences $(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{h-1})$ in I_0 and $(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{h-2})$ in $\mathbb{Q}_{\leq 0}$ for $i_1 = 1, 2$, which allow us to write expressions for $\hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ and $\hat{k}_0^{\pm 1}$.

We first need to confirm that the Drinfeld-Jimbo relations of $U_q(X^{(1)})$ involving x_0^{\pm} and $k_0^{\pm 1}$ are preserved under the map $\xi : U_q(X^{(1)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_X$ that sends $x_i^{\pm} \mapsto \hat{x}_{i,0}^{\pm}$ and $t_i^{\pm 1} \mapsto \hat{k}_i^{\pm 1}$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$. We outline a method for each below, referencing which relations (i)-(xi) in \mathcal{A}_X should be applied at each stage. The author notes that many of the relations are easily checked with the help of a computer algebra package such as Magma.

- Both $\hat{k}_0^{\pm 1} \hat{k}_0^{\mp 1} = 1$ and $[\hat{k}_0, \hat{k}_j] = 0$ are trivial by (i)-(iii).
- All $\hat{k}_0 \hat{x}_{\ell,0}^{\pm} \hat{k}_0^{-1} = q_0^{\pm a_{0\ell}} \hat{x}_{\ell,0}^{\pm}$ and $\hat{k}_{\ell} \hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm} \hat{k}_{\ell}^{-1} = q_0^{\pm a_{\ell 0}} \hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ are deduced from (i)-(iv).
- The relation $[\hat{x}_{0,0}^+, \hat{x}_{0,0}^-] = \frac{\hat{k}_0 - \hat{k}_0^{-1}}{q_0 - q_0^{-1}}$ is proved as follows:
 1. Input the expressions for $\hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ with $i_1 = 1$ and expand everything out.
 2. Factor the $\hat{C}^{\pm 1}$, $\hat{k}_1^{\pm 1}$ and $\hat{k}_2^{\pm 1}$ terms using (i) and (iv), then cancel them.
 3. Move any $\hat{x}_{i,m}^-$ terms in front of all $\hat{x}_{i,m}^+$ terms with (v)-(vii), then pull any $\hat{C}^{\pm 1}$, $\hat{k}_1^{\pm 1}$ and $\hat{k}_2^{\pm 1}$ factors created out to one side with (i) and (iv).
 4. Cancel all remaining summands other than $\frac{\hat{k}_0 - \hat{k}_0^{-1}}{q_0 - q_0^{-1}}$ using the relations (viii) and (xi) which involve $\hat{x}_{1,0}^{\pm}$, $\hat{x}_{1,\pm 1}^{\pm}$ and $\hat{x}_{2,0}^{\pm}$.
- For $[\hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}, \hat{x}_{\ell,0}^{\mp}] = 0$ with $\ell \in I_0$:
 1. Input the expression for $\hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ with $i_1 \neq \ell$ and expand everything out.
 2. Factor the $\hat{C}^{\pm 1}$, $\hat{k}_1^{\pm 1}$ and $\hat{k}_2^{\pm 1}$ terms using (i) and (iv).
 3. Cancel everything by (viii) and (xi) with $y_i = \hat{x}_{\ell,0}^{\mp}$ and $y_j = \hat{x}_{i_1,0}^{\mp}, \hat{x}_{i_1,\pm 1}^{\mp}$.
- For the quantum Serre relations between $\hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ and $\hat{x}_{\ell,0}^{\pm}$ with $\ell \in I_0$:
 1. Input the expression for $\hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ with $i_1 \neq \ell$ and expand everything out.
 2. Factor the $\hat{C}^{\pm 1}$, $\hat{k}_1^{\pm 1}$ and $\hat{k}_2^{\pm 1}$ terms using (i) and (iv).

3. Move all $\hat{x}_{\ell,0}^{\pm}$ terms to one side using relations (v) and (vii).
4. Pull any $\hat{k}_{\ell}^{\pm 1}$ factors created in the previous step out to one side with (iv).
5. Cancel everything by (viii).

Next we must give $x_{1,\mp 1}^{\pm}$ and $x_{2,\mp 1}^{\pm}$ in terms of the Drinfeld-Jimbo generators of $U_q(X^{(1)})$. This can be done using Beck's extended affine braid group action from Theorem 3.11. In particular, writing each X_{ω_i} in the Coxeter presentation of $\hat{\mathcal{B}}$ allows us to present its action with respect to the Drinfeld-Jimbo realization of $U_q(X^{(1)})$. Then since $o(i)X_{\omega_i}$ sends $x_{i,0}^{\pm}$ to $x_{i,\mp 1}^{\pm}$ we can obtain the desired expressions, thus allowing us to find the images of $x_{1,\mp 1}^{\pm}$ and $x_{2,\mp 1}^{\pm}$ under ξ . To complete the proof we check that these are equal to $\hat{x}_{1,\mp 1}^{\pm}$ and $\hat{x}_{2,\mp 1}^{\pm}$ respectively by inserting the definitions of $\hat{x}_{0,0}^{\pm}$ and $\hat{k}_0^{\pm 1}$ in terms of the generators of \mathcal{A}_X and applying the relevant relations.

References

- [1] J. Beck, *Braid group action and quantum affine algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys. **165** (1994), no. 3, 555–568. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02099423>.
- [2] V. Chari and A. Pressley, *Quantum affine algebras and their representations*, “Representations of Groups”, CMS Conf. Proc. (Banff, AB, 1994), Vol. 16, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995, pp. 59–78. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.hep-th/9411145>.
- [3] I. Damiani, *Drinfeld Realization of Affine Quantum Algebras: The Relations*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **48** (2012), no. 3, 661–733. <https://doi.org/10.2977/prims/86>.
- [4] ———, *From the Drinfeld realization to the Drinfeld–Jimbo presentation of affine quantum algebras: injectivity*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **51** (2015), no. 1, 131–171. <https://doi.org/10.4171/prims/150>.
- [5] V. G. Drinfeld, *A new realization of Yangians and quantized affine algebras*, Sov. Math. Dokl. **36** (1988), 212–216. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440\(93\)90070-U](https://doi.org/10.1016/0393-0440(93)90070-U).
- [6] I. Frenkel and N. Jing, *Vertex representations of quantum affine algebras*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **85** (1988), no. 24, 9373–9377. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.85.24.9373>.
- [7] V. Ginzburg, M. Kapranov, and E. Vasserot, *Langlands reciprocity for algebraic surfaces*, Math. Res. Lett. **2** (1995), no. 2, 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.4310/MRL.1995.v2.n2.a4>.
- [8] D. Hernandez, *Representations of quantum affinizations and fusion product*, Transform. Groups **10** (2005), no. 2, 163–200. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00031-005-1005-9>.
- [9] ———, *Quantum toroidal algebras and their representations*, Sel. Math. New Ser. **14** (2009), no. 3, 701–725. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-009-0502-4>.
- [10] B. Ion, *Involutions of double affine Hecke algebras*, Compos. Math. **139** (2003), no. 1, 67–84. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:COMP.0000005078.39268.8d>.
- [11] B. Ion and S. Sahi, *Double affine Hecke algebras and congruence groups*, Memoirs, vol. 268, American Mathematical Society, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/1305>.
- [12] N. Jing, *Twisted vertex representations of quantum affine algebras*, Invent. Math. **102** (1990), no. 3, 663–690. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5023790>.
- [13] ———, *On Drinfeld realization of quantum affine algebras*, The Monster and Lie Algebras: Proceedings of a Special Research Quarter at the Ohio State University (1996), Vol. 7, De Gruyter, Berlin, New York, 1998, pp. 195–206. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110801897.195>.
- [14] ———, *Quantum Kac-Moody Algebras and Vertex Representations*, Lett. Math. Phys. **44** (1998), no. 4, 261–271. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007493921464>.
- [15] N. Jing and H. Zhang, *Drinfeld Realization of Twisted Quantum Affine Algebras*, Commun. Algebra **35** (2007), no. 11, 3683–3698. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927870701404713>.
- [16] ———, *Addendum to “Drinfeld Realization of Twisted Quantum Affine Algebras”*, Commun. Algebra **38** (2010), no. 9, 3484–3488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927870902933213>.
- [17] V. Kac, *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Cambridge University Press, 1990. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511626234>.
- [18] M. Kashiwara, T. Miwa, J.-U. H. Petersen, and C. M. Yung, *Perfect crystals and q -deformed Fock spaces*, Sel. Math. New Ser. **2** (1996), no. 3, 415–499. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01587950>.
- [19] G. Lusztig, *Introduction to quantum groups*, Progress in Mathematics no. 110, Birkhäuser Boston, 1993. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-8176-4717-9>.

- [20] I. G. Macdonald, *Affine Hecke algebras and orthogonal polynomials*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics no. 157, Cambridge University Press, 2003. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511542824>.
- [21] K. Miki, *Toroidal braid group action and an automorphism of toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1,tor})$ ($n \geq 2$)*, Lett. Math. Phys. **47** (1999), no. 4, 365–378. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007556926350>.
- [22] ———, *Representations of quantum toroidal algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1,tor})$ ($n \geq 2$)*, J. Math. Phys. **41** (2000), no. 10, 7079–7098. <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1287436>.
- [23] E. Mounzer, *Quantum Toroidal Algebras and their Representation Theory*, Ph.D. Thesis, Université Paris-Saclay, 2022, <https://theses.hal.science/tel-03617958>.
- [24] K. Nagao, *Quiver varieties and Frenkel–Kac construction*, J. Algebra **321** (2009), no. 12, 3764–3789. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2009.03.012>.
- [25] ———, *K-theory of quiver varieties, q -Fock space and nonsymmetric Macdonald polynomials*, Osaka J. Math. **46** (2009), no. 3, 877–907. <https://doi.org/10.18910/9634>.
- [26] H. Nakajima, *Quiver varieties and finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, J. Am. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), no. 1, 145–238. <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-00-00353-2>.
- [27] ———, *Geometric construction of representations of affine algebras*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians (Beijing, 2002), Vol. 1, Higher Ed. Press, Beijing, 2002, pp. 423–438. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.math/0212401>.
- [28] Y. Saito, *Quantum toroidal algebras and their vertex representations*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **34** (1998), no. 2, 155–177. <https://doi.org/10.2977/prims/1195144759>.
- [29] Y. Saito, K. Takemura, and D. Uglov, *Toroidal actions on level 1 modules of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n)$* , Transform. Groups **3** (1998), no. 1, 75–102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01237841>.
- [30] A. Tsymbaliuk, *Several realizations of Fock modules for toroidal $\check{U}_{q,d}(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$* , Algebr. Represent. Theory **22** (2019), 177–209. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10468-017-9761-5>.
- [31] M. Varagnolo and E. Vasserot, *Schur duality in the toroidal setting*, Commun. Math. Phys. **182** (1996), no. 2, 469–483. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02517898>.
- [32] ———, *Double-loop Algebras and the Fock Space*, Invent. Math. **133** (1998), no. 1, 133–159. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s002220050242>.
- [33] ———, *On the K-theory of the cyclic quiver variety*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **18** (1999), 1005–1028. <https://doi.org/10.1155/S1073792899000525>.