

QUANTIZATION OF VIRTUAL GROTHENDIECK RINGS AND THEIR STRUCTURE INCLUDING QUANTUM CLUSTER ALGEBRAS

IL-SEUNG JANG[‡], KYU-HWAN LEE^{*}, AND SE-JIN OH[†]

ABSTRACT. The quantum Grothendieck ring of a certain category of finite-dimensional modules over a quantum loop algebra associated with a complex finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} has a quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetric type. Partly motivated by a search of a ring corresponding to a quantum cluster algebra of *skew-symmetrizable* type, the quantum *virtual* Grothendieck ring, denoted by $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, is recently introduced by Kashiwara–Oh [48] as a subring of the quantum torus based on the (q, t) -Cartan matrix specialized at $q = 1$. In this paper, we prove that $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ indeed has a quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetrizable type. This task essentially involves constructing distinguished bases of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ that will be used to make cluster variables and generalizing the quantum T -system associated with Kirillov–Reshetikhin modules to establish a quantum exchange relation of cluster variables. Furthermore, these distinguished bases naturally fit into the paradigm of Kazhdan–Lusztig theory and our study of these bases leads to some conjectures on quantum positivity and q -commutativity.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	8
3. t -characters of quantum loop algebra and virtual Grothendieck rings	13
4. Quantization	17
5. Bases of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and Kazhdan–Lusztig analogues	20
6. Subrings of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and the quantum folded T -systems	36
7. Quantum cluster algebra	41
8. Quantum cluster algebra structure on $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$	45
9. Extension to $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$	51
References	64

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background. Let $C = (c_{i,j})$ be a Cartan matrix of finite type, and let \mathfrak{g} be the finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra over \mathbb{C} associated with C . Since its inception as trigonometric

Date: October 11, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 13F60, 17B37, 17B10, 17B67, 18N25.

Key words and phrases. quantum affine algebra, t -quantized Cartan matrix, virtual Grothendieck ring, quantization, Kazhdan–Lusztig theory, cluster algebra, positivity.

[‡] I.-S. Jang was supported by Incheon National University Research Grant in 2023.

^{*} K.-H. Lee was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#712100).

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

solutions to the quantum Yang–Baxter equation [11, 35], the quantum loop algebra $U_q(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$ of \mathfrak{g} has been one of the central objects in representation theory and mathematical physics, and various algebraic and geometric approaches have been taken to study the finite-dimensional modules over $U_q(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$. Moreover, for the last 15 years or so, as categorification became one of the major trends in representation theory and cluster algebra structures were discovered ubiquitously, the category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ of finite-dimensional $U_q(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$ -modules became a focal point of research where these new ideas and methods could be applied fruitfully, since the quantum Grothendieck ring of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ provides a categorification of a (quantum) cluster algebra and generalizes the Kazhdan–Lusztig(KL) theory.

To be more precise, the quantum cluster algebra \mathcal{A} , introduced by Berenstein–Fomin–Zelevinsky (BFZ) in [4, 12], is a non-commutative $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra contained in the quantum torus $\mathbb{Z}[\tilde{X}_k^{\pm 1} | k \in K]$ which is equipped with a distinguished set of generators (*quantum cluster variables*) grouped into subsets (*quantum clusters*), where K is an index set. Each cluster is defined inductively by a sequence of certain combinatorial algebraic operations (*mutations*) from an initial cluster. Since then, numerous connections and applications have been discovered in various fields of mathematics.

It is well-known that the quantum cluster algebra was introduced in an attempt to create an algebraic framework for the dual-canonical/upper-global basis \mathbf{B}^* [53, 40, 41] of the quantum group $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Indeed, it is shown in [22, 23] that the unipotent quantum coordinate algebra $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, which is the graded dual of the half of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$, has a quantum cluster algebra structure, and intensive research has been performed to understand the structure in relation with \mathbf{B}^* (see [42] for a survey). In these efforts, it turned out that categorification provides powerful methods [51, 52, 63, 39].

When \mathfrak{g} is of simply-laced type with its set of positive roots denoted by $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}}^+$, we can consider the path algebra $\mathbb{C}Q$ of the Dynkin quiver Q associated with \mathfrak{g} and obtain the Auslander–Reiten (AR) quiver Γ_Q of $\mathbb{C}Q$. In turn, Γ_Q can be understood as a heart of the AR-quiver $\hat{\Delta}$ of the derived category $D^b(\text{Rep}(\mathbb{C}Q))$, called the repetition quiver.

In [29], which culminates preceding works [62, 53, 66, 59, 65, 25, 28], Hernandez and Leclerc defined the heart subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^Q$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ by using Γ_Q , and proved that the *quantum Grothendieck ring* $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^Q)$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^Q$ is isomorphic to $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ and that the isomorphism sends the basis of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^Q)$ consisting of the elements corresponding to simple objects in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^Q$ to \mathbf{B}^* of $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ (cf. [60]).

To extend the results of [29, 30] to non-simply-laced types, the Q-datum \mathcal{Q} is introduced in [21] as a generalization of the Dynkin quivers of types *ADE*. Through the Q-datum for any finite type, the (combinatorial) AR-quiver $\Gamma_{\mathcal{Q}}$, the repetition quiver $\hat{\Delta}^{\sigma}$, and the heart subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathcal{Q}}$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ are naturally defined, where σ is the Dynkin diagram automorphism of simply-laced \mathfrak{g} whose orbits produce the Dynkin diagram of \mathfrak{g} . One could possibly expect that $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathcal{Q}})$ would be isomorphic to $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ when \mathfrak{g} is of non-simply-laced type, generalizing the result in types *ADE* to all types. However, further studies [47, 61, 31, 18] show that the quantum Grothendieck ring $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathcal{Q}})$ is actually isomorphic to $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ associated with \mathfrak{g} of simply-laced type. Hence the structure of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathcal{Q}})$ is intrinsically relevant to the counterpart of simply-laced type, and the quantum cluster algebra structure associated with $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\mathcal{Q}})$ is still of skew-symmetric type.

1.2. Overview of this paper. Since there are quantum cluster algebras of skew-symmetrizable type, a natural question arises:

Can we extend $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^Q)$ (or $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$) in such a way to have a quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetrizable type?

Partly motivated by this question, Kashiwara and Oh introduced the *quantum virtual Grothendieck ring* $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ inside the quantum torus $\mathcal{X}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ with respect to the (q, t) -Cartan matrix specialized at $q = 1$ in a recent paper [48]. Pursuing the direction further, in this paper, we prove that $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ indeed has a quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetrizable type. In a subsequent paper, our result will be utilized to fully answer the above question and to genuinely extend the results of [29] in the sense that $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ is involved even for \mathfrak{g} of non-simply-laced type. We remark that the evaluation of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ at $q = 1$ coincides with the *folded t -character ring* (Remark 4.12), denote by $\mathcal{K}^-(\mathfrak{g})$, which is introduced by Frenkel–Hernandez–Reshetikhin in [14] to explore a (conjectural) quantum integrable model corresponding to what is called the folded Bethe Ansatz equation (see Remark 3.13).

Though we do not yet have an actual category that will replace $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ for our purpose (cf. [14, Remark 3.2, Remark 5.1]), we can still utilize an algebraic characterization of $\mathcal{K}_t(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ as the intersection of the kernels of screening operators in $\mathcal{Y}_t(\mathfrak{g})$, where $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ is the skeleton subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ is the quantum torus with respect to the (q, t) -Cartan matrix specialized at $t = 1$.

In order to give a quantum cluster algebra structure on $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in this paper, we need to construct quantum cluster variables and exchange relations for mutations. The former requires constructing distinguished bases for $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and the latter amounts to generalizing the quantum T -system associated with Kirillov–Reshetikhin (KR) modules as explained briefly below.

We establish three bases of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, denoted by F_q , E_q , and L_q respectively. The basis F_q is constructed by a generalization of Frenkel–Mukhin (FM) algorithm [15], which plays a crucial role in studying $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Furthermore, it induces two other important bases E_q and L_q of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Then we take a q -commuting subset of F_q consisting of *KR-polynomials* (Definition 5.17) as the quantum cluster of initial seed and develop a *quantum folded T -system* among the KR-polynomials in F_q to serve as the quantum exchange relation. After making compatible pairs available for our use (cf. [48]), we establish a quantum cluster algebra structure on a subalgebra and extend it to $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

It is worthwhile to remark that when \mathfrak{g} is simply-laced, the basis L_q (resp. E_q) comes from simple (resp. standard) modules in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$, and the entries of the transition matrix between L_q and E_q are understood as analogues of the KL-polynomials. Thus our construction of L_q and E_q for all the finite types extends the KL-theory for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$. Moreover, we have conjectures related (i) to positivity on KR-polynomials in F_q and *real* elements in L_q , and (ii) to BFZ-expectation that every quantum cluster monomial is an element in the canonical basis (see Conjecture I below).

Throughout this paper, the interplay between \mathfrak{g} and its simply-laced type counterpart \mathfrak{g} and the Dynkin diagram automorphism σ (cf. (2.3) and (2.4)) provides important viewpoints leading to natural definitions. However, we emphasize that none of our main constructions, including bases F_q , E_q , and L_q , is obtained merely from combining objects in each orbit of σ . That is, none of our results is a consequence of simple folding. Rather, there seem to exist quite intriguing features of non-simply-laced type objects at the quantum level.

In the following subsections, we will review known results in Sections 1.3 and 1.4 with some details, and present our results more rigorously in Section 1.5, and mention our future work in Section 1.6.

1.3. Quantum Grothendieck ring and quantum loop analogue of KL-theory. From the study for q -deformation of \mathcal{W} -algebras, the q -character¹ theory for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ was invented by Frenkel–Reshetikhin [17] and further developed by Frenkel–Mukhin [15], which says that the (non-quantum)

¹In the main body of this paper, we sometimes call it *t-character* by replacing the role of q by t .

Grothendieck ring $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ is isomorphic to the commutative ring generated by the q -characters of fundamental modules $L(Y_{i,p})$ under the Chari–Pressley’s classification [7, 8]. For simply-laced type \mathfrak{g} , Nakajima [59] and Varagnolo–Vasserot [66] constructed a non-commutative t -deformation of $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ in a quantum torus $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathfrak{g})$, denoted by $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$, based on a geometrical point of view. Since the specialization of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ at $\mathfrak{t} = 1$ recovers $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$, we call $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ the quantum Grothendieck ring associated with $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$.

In particular, Nakajima established a KL-type algorithm to describe the composition multiplicity $P_{m,m'}$ of a simple module $L(m')$ inside a standard module $E(m)$ through equations in $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$: Denoting by \mathcal{M}_+ the parametrizing set of simple modules in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$, we have

$$[E(m)] = [L(m)] + \sum_{m' \in \mathcal{M}_+; m' \prec_{\mathbb{N}} m} P_{m,m'} [L(m')].$$

It is proved by Nakajima [58, 59] that the multiplicity $P_{m,m'}$ is equal to the specialization at $t = 1$ of a polynomial $P_{m,m'}(t)$ with non-negative coefficients, which can be understood as a quantum loop analogue of KL-polynomial.

One step further, each q -character of simple module $L(m)$ (resp. standard module $E(m)$) allows a t -deformation in $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$, denoted by $L_t(m)$ (resp. $M_t(m)$), whose coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm 1/2}]$ are non-negative. Its specialization at $t = 1$ recovers the q -character of $L(m)$ (resp. $M(m)$) and the transition map between $\mathbf{L}_{\mathfrak{t}} = \{L_t(m)\}$ and $\mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{t}} = \{E_t(m)\}$ in $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ satisfies the following equation:

$$(1.1) \quad E_t(m) = L_t(m) + \sum_{m' \in \mathcal{M}_+; m' \prec_{\mathbb{N}} m} P_{m,m'}(t) L_t(m') \quad \text{where } P_{m,m'}(t) \in t\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[t].$$

We call $\mathbf{L}_{\mathfrak{t}}$ the *canonical basis* and $\mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{t}}$ the *standard basis* of $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$, respectively (see Remark 5.7 also). In what follows, *positivity* generally means that polynomials of interest have non-negative coefficients as is the case with $P_{m,m'}(t) \in t\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[t]$. We remark that, in these developments, the geometry of quiver varieties plays an essential role.

Despite the absence of fully developed theory of quiver varieties for general type \mathfrak{g} , Hernandez [24, 25] constructed a conjectural KL-theory for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ in a purely algebraic way. Let us explain this more precisely. Using the *quantum Cartan matrix* $C(q)$, Hernandez constructed the quantum torus $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathfrak{g})$ and defined $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ to be the intersection of the kernels of the t -deformed screening operators $S_{i,\mathfrak{t}}$ ’s on $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathfrak{g})$. Then he constructed a basis $\mathbf{F}_{\mathfrak{t}} = \{F_t(m)\}$ by deforming the FM-algorithm and proved the positivity of $F_t(Y_{i,p}) = L_t(Y_{i,p})$. Then the basis $\mathbf{F}_{\mathfrak{t}}$ induces two other bases $\mathbf{E}_{\mathfrak{t}} = \{E_t(m)\}$ and $\mathbf{L}_{\mathfrak{t}} = \{L_t(m)\}$ satisfying (1.1) that enable us to establish a conjectural KL-theory, expecting the positivity of analogues of KL-polynomials and $L_t(m)$ ’s.

Recently, large parts of the conjectures for non-simply-laced g are proved by Fujita–Hernandez–Oh–Oya through so-called *propagation of positivity*. Let \mathfrak{g} be an unfolding of g as follows:

$$(g, \mathfrak{g}) = (B_n, A_{2n-1}), \quad (C_n, D_{n+1}), \quad (F_4, E_6), \quad (G_2, D_4).$$

Then it is proved in [29, 18] that

$$\mathbb{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0) \text{ and } \mathbb{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_g^0) \text{ have the same presentation,}$$

where $\mathbb{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0) := \mathbb{Q}(q^{1/2}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]} \mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$. Hence the ring $\mathbb{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ can be interpreted as the boson-extension of $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ of the simply-laced \mathfrak{g} . Then the KL-theory and positivity are established for type B_n using the quantum Schur–Weyl duality functor [38, 43] between $\mathcal{C}_{A_{2n-1}}^0$ and $\mathcal{C}_{B_n}^0$, and similar conjectures for CFG -types are mostly resolved in [18, 19] using the quantum Schur–Weyl

duality functor [37, 47, 61] for these types and the *degrees* (also called *g-vectors*) of (quantum) cluster algebra theory. As indicated above, the presentation of $\mathbb{K}_\tau(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$ is of simply-laced type even for non-simply-laced g .

1.4. Quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetric type on $\mathcal{K}_\tau(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$. In the seminal paper [30], Hernandez–Leclerc proved that $K(\mathcal{C}_g^-)$ for a subcategory \mathcal{C}_g^- of \mathcal{C}_g^0 has a cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetric type for any \mathfrak{g} of finite type. To show the cluster algebra structure, they employed the T-system among Kirillov–Reshetikhin (KR) modules proved by Nakajima [58] for simply-laced types and by Hernandez [27] for non-simply-laced types. Then the result of [30] is extended to $\mathcal{K}_\tau(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$ in [5, 31, 18, 44, 45, 19] to obtain quantum cluster algebras of skew-symmetric type. Some important features of these works can be summarized as follows:

- (a) The extension to whole category \mathcal{C}_g^0 in [44, 45] involves a categorical language.
- (b) The main idea of the extension to quantum cluster algebra in [5, 31, 18] is the quantization of T-system among KR modules.
- (c) The monoidal categorification result in [45] tells us that every quantum cluster monomial of $\mathcal{K}_\tau(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$ corresponds to an element of \mathbf{L}_τ . This gives an affirmative answer to the BFZ-conjecture [12] on \mathbf{B}^* and the quantum cluster monomials.
- (d) As every KR-polynomial $F_t(m)$ appears as a quantum cluster variable of $\mathcal{K}_\tau(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$, it is proved in [45, 19] that $F_t(m) = L_t(m)$ for any KR-module $L(m)$.

Here we remark that the result of [45] is for $K(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$ and extended to $\mathcal{K}_\tau(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$ in [19].

1.5. Main results of this paper. In this paper, we initiate a study of $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in the perspective of Sections 1.3 and 1.4. Due to lack of a representation theory corresponding to $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, we approach the ring $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by analyzing its construction in [48] and by exploiting (I) and (II), where

- (I) $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is a q -deformation of the commutative ring $\mathcal{K}^-(\mathfrak{g})$, which is the specialization of the refined ring $\overline{\mathcal{K}}_{\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{t}, \alpha}(\mathfrak{g})$ of interpolating $(\mathfrak{q}, \mathfrak{t})$ -characters in [14] at $\mathfrak{q} = 1$ and $\alpha = d$,
- (II) $\mathcal{K}^-(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq K(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$ if \mathfrak{g} is of simply-laced type,

(see Section 3.4 and [48, Introduction]). Here α is a factor to interpolate several characters (see [14, Remark 6.2(1)]) and d is the lacing number of \mathfrak{g} . In particular, if \mathfrak{g} is of non-simply-laced type, there exist a simply-laced \mathfrak{g} containing \mathfrak{g} as a non-trivial Lie subalgebra (e.g. see [36, Proposition 7.9] with (2.4)) and a surjective homomorphism

$$(1.2) \quad \mathcal{K}^-(\mathfrak{g}) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{K}^-(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq \mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{g}),$$

which is induced from the folding of generators of $\mathcal{K}^-(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq K(\mathcal{C}_g^0)$.

The main results of this paper can be summarized into two statements:

- (A) we construct bases \mathbf{F}_q , \mathbf{E}_q , and \mathbf{L}_q of $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, which play similar roles of \mathbf{F}_τ , \mathbf{E}_τ , and \mathbf{L}_τ ,
- (B) we establish *skew-symmetrizable* quantum cluster algebra structures on subrings of $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ (including itself) using the bases in (A).

Here we emphasize that our results can *not* be obtained from the folding in (1.2), as we do *not* have a surjective homomorphism $A_q(\mathfrak{n}) \twoheadrightarrow A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ from the canonical surjection $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{N}] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{N}]$, where $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{N}]$ denotes the unipotent coordinate ring of N of \mathfrak{g} .

1.5.1. Construction of bases and KL-paradigm for $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Let $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(t)$ be the (q, t) -Cartan matrix specialized at $q = 1$, which is called *t-quantized Cartan matrix*. To construct the basis \mathbf{F}_q of $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, we apply a q -deformed version of FM-algorithm with respect to $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(t)$. However, there is no guarantee that the algorithm terminates in finite steps. To avoid this problem, we prove that

the monomials (not including coefficients) of $F_q(X_{i,p})$ ($(i,p) \in \widehat{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}$) in F_q is obtained from those of the q -character of $L(Y_{i,p})$ of type \mathfrak{g} via (1.2) for $(i,p) \in \widehat{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}$. Furthermore, we prove that a similar phenomenon occurs for a KR-polynomial $F_q(m^{(i)}[p,s])$ (Proposition 5.16). This result implies that the outputs of the algorithm are indeed contained in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and form a basis F_q . The basis F_q nicely characterizes an element in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ since each element in F_q has a unique dominant monomial (Theorem 5.23). Here we emphasize once more that general elements in F_q are not susceptible of similar manipulations based on (1.2) even in the specialization at $q = 1$ (Example 3.11), and determining the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -coefficients of $F_q(m^{(i)}[p,s])$ is a completely different problem even for a KR-polynomial $F_q(m^{(i)}[p,s])$.

We investigate properties of the KR-polynomials in F_q in detail, since they will be used as the quantum cluster variables of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ (Propositions 5.19 and 5.25). By applying the framework in [25], we construct the standard basis $\mathbf{E}_q = \{E_q(m)\}$ and the canonical basis $\mathbf{L}_q = \{L_q(m)\}$ fitting into the paradigm of Kazhdan–Lusztig theory:

$$E_q(m) = L_q(m) + \sum_{m' \in \mathcal{M}; m' \prec_N m} P_{m,m'}(q) L_q(m') \quad \text{where } P_{m,m'}(q) \in q\mathbb{Z}[q].$$

1.5.2. Quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetrizable type on $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Based on the construction of bases for $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, we show quantum cluster algebra structures on subrings of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ as the first task in the second part of this paper.

In [48], Kashiwara and Oh constructed a compatible pair (Λ, \widetilde{B}) arising from the isomorphism between the subtorus $\mathcal{X}_{q,Q}(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathcal{X}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and the torus containing $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$, in which the exchange matrix \widetilde{B} is skew-symmetrizable. Here $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$ is a Dynkin quiver of type \mathfrak{g} . Interpreting entries in Λ as pairing of KR-monomials (Theorem 8.1), we form an initial quantum cluster consisting of certain KR-polynomials $F_q(m)$ for each Dynkin quiver $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$ and its corresponding subring $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$.

As a quantum cluster should consist of mutually q -commutative elements, we prove that the family of $F_q(m)$ in the initial cluster are mutually q -commutative, using the truncation homomorphism (Proposition 6.3) and the properties of KR-polynomials. By investigating q -commuting conditions (Lemmas 6.6, 6.7, and 6.8) and multiplicative structure among KR-polynomials $F_q(m)$, we obtain *the quantum folded T-systems* among KR-polynomials $F_q(m)$ (Theorem 6.9):

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p,s]) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p,s)) = q^{\alpha(i,k)} F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p,s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p,s]) + q^{\gamma(i,k)} \prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p,s))^{-c_{j,i}}.$$

Then we prove that $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ has a quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetrizable type (Theorem 8.8) by using the quantum folded T-systems as mutation relations and applying special sequences of mutations. In the proof, we adopt the setup of [30, 5] and use the *valued quivers* (Section 2.4) (equivalent to exchange matrices) for the sequences of mutations. As applications, we obtain a quantum cluster algorithm to compute KR-polynomials $F_q(m)$ (Proposition 8.5) and a sufficient condition for q -commutativity of certain pairs of KR-polynomials $F_q(m)$ (Theorem 8.9).

As the second task, we extend the result on $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ to the whole ring $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. For this purpose, we construct a new quantum seed, whose valued quiver is a “sink-source” quiver reflecting features of \mathfrak{g} and whose initial quantum cluster consists of certain KR-polynomials $F_q(m)$. Here the q -commutativity of the initial quantum cluster follows from Theorem 8.9. Finally, we prove that $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ has a quantum cluster algebra structure of skew-symmetrizable type by establishing (a) a mutation equivalence between the valued quiver of $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ and that of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, and finding out (b) special sequences of mutations that yield every KR-polynomial $F_q(m)$ as a cluster variable.

Since every KR-polynomial $F_q(m)$ appears as a cluster variable and every quantum cluster monomial is expected to be a canonical basis element and *real*, we have the following conjecture:

- Conjecture I.** (a) *Every quantum cluster monomial of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is contained in L_q .*
 (b) *For every KR-polynomial $F_q(m)$, we have $F_q(m) = L_q(m)$ and $F_q(m)$ has non-negative coefficients.*
 (c) *If $L_q(m)$ is real, that is, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, there exists $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $L_q(m)^k = q^t L_q(m^k)$, then it has non-negative coefficients.*

Also, we have two more conjectures on the q -commutativity of KR-polynomials $F_q(m)$ in Conjectures 4 and 5, which can be understood as natural generalizations of the results in [61] and [45, 19], respectively.

1.6. Future work. In a forthcoming paper [33], we study the heart subring $\mathfrak{K}_{q,Q}(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ in terms of a generalization Q of the Dynkin quiver to non-simply-laced type, where the AR-quiver Γ_Q and the repetition quiver $\widehat{\Delta}$ are defined for \mathfrak{g} of any finite type including BCFG. Since it is shown in this paper that $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ has a quantum cluster algebra structure (of skew-symmetrizable type), as it is with $\mathcal{K}_t(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ in [29, 18], it will be shown that each heart subring $\mathfrak{K}_{q,Q}(\mathfrak{g})$ is isomorphic to $A_{\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]}(\mathfrak{n})$ via a certain isomorphism Ψ_Q and that the *normalized* dual-canonical/upper-global basis of $A_{\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]}(\mathfrak{n})$ corresponds to the subset $L_{q,Q} := L_q \cap \mathfrak{K}_{q,Q}(\mathfrak{g})$ under Ψ_Q . This justifies the name of L_q , the *canonical basis*. Here we would like to make an emphasis on the difference between the known result and our new result when g is non-simply-laced: in the previous $\mathcal{K}_t(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^Q)$ -case, the corresponding $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ is of simply-laced type \mathfrak{g} , while in the new $\mathfrak{K}_{q,Q}(g)$ -case, the type of $A_q(n)$ is the same as that of g . Based on some investigation of the heart subrings, we will also clarify the presentation of

$$\mathbb{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}) := \mathbb{Q}(q^{1/2}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]} \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}),$$

which says that $\mathbb{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ can be understood as a boson-extension of $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$, as $\mathbb{K}_t(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ is for $A_q(\mathfrak{n})$ of simply-laced type \mathfrak{g} . Then we will show that the automorphisms of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, arising from the reflections on Dynkin quivers Q and the isomorphisms Ψ_Q , preserve the canonical basis L_q of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and induce a braid group action on $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

Convention. Throughout this paper, we use the following convention.

- For a statement P , we set $\delta(P)$ to be 1 or 0 depending on whether P is true or not. As a special case, we use the notation $\delta_{i,j} := \delta(i = j)$ (Kronecker's delta).
- For $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we write $k \equiv_s l$ if s divides $k - l$ and $k \not\equiv_s l$, otherwise.
- For a monoidal abelian category \mathcal{C} , we denote its Grothendieck ring by $K(\mathcal{C})$. The class of an object $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is denoted by $[X] \in K(\mathcal{C})$.
- A monomial in a Laurent polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[x_j^{\pm 1} \mid j \in J]$ is said to be *dominant* (resp. *anti-dominant*) if it is a product of non-negative (resp. non-positive) powers of x_i 's.
- For elements $\{r_j\}_{j \in J}$ in a ring (R, \star) , parameterized by a totally ordered set $J = \{\dots < j_{-1} < j_0 < j_1 < \dots\}$, we write

$$\overset{\rightarrow}{\star}_{j \in J} r_j := \dots \star r_{j_{-1}} \star r_{j_0} \star r_{j_1} \star \dots$$

- For integers $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} [a, b] &:= \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid a \leq x \leq b\} & (a, b] &:= \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid a < x \leq b\} \\ [a, b) &:= \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid a \leq x < b\} & (a, b) &:= \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid a < x < b\} \end{aligned}$$

We refer to subsets of these forms as *intervals*.

- Let $X = \{x_j \mid j \in J\}$ be a parameterized by an index set J . Then for $j \in J$ and a subset $\mathcal{J} \subset J$, we set

$$(X)_j := x_j \quad \text{and} \quad (X)_{\mathcal{J}} := \{x_j \mid j \in \mathcal{J}\}.$$

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Cartan datum. Let \mathfrak{g} be a Kac–Moody algebra of a symmetrizable type. We denote its Cartan matrix by $\mathbf{C} = (c_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$, Dynkin diagram² by Δ , weight lattice by \mathbf{P} , set of simple roots by $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\}$ and set of simple coroots by $\Pi^\vee = \{h_i \mid i \in I\}$.

Let $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(d_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \mid i \in I)$ denote a diagonal matrix such that


$$\bar{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{C}\mathbf{D}^{-1} \quad \text{become symmetric.}$$

We take \mathbf{D} and the scalar product (\cdot, \cdot) on \mathbf{P} such that

$$(2.1) \quad (\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = d_i c_{i,j} = d_j c_{j,i} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{and} \quad (\alpha_i, \alpha_i) \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

We also denote by Φ_{\pm} the set of positive (resp. negative) roots of \mathfrak{g} . For each $i \in I$, we choose $\varpi_i \in \mathbf{P}$ such that $\langle h_i, \varpi_j \rangle = \delta_{i,j}$ ($j \in I$). The free abelian group $\mathbf{Q} := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i$ is called *the root lattice*.

Throughout this paper, we use the following convention of finite Dynkin diagrams:



Here \textcircled{k} means that $(\alpha_k, \alpha_k) = t$. For $i, j \in I$, we denote by $d(i, j)$ the number of edges between i and j in Δ (whenever it is well-defined). For example, in the finite B_n -case, $d(n, n-1) = d(n-1, n) = 1$ and $d(n, n-2) = d(n-2, n) = 2$, and in the finite D_n -case, $d(n, n-1) = d(n-1, n) = 2$ and $d(n, n-2) = d(n-2, n) = 1$.

We denote by Δ_0 the set of vertices and Δ_1 the set of edges. *Throughout this paper, we consider only connected Dynkin diagrams.* We sometimes use \blacktriangle for non-simply-laced types to distinguish them from those of simply-laced types, and use \triangle for finite types and, when an emphasis is needed, \blacktriangle for finite non-simply-laced types. For each \triangle , our convention amounts to taking

$$\mathbf{D} := \text{diag}((\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2 \mid i \in \triangle_0) \quad \text{such that} \quad \min((\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2) = 1.$$

The Weyl group W of \mathfrak{g} is generated by the reflections s_i ($i \in I$) acting on \mathbf{P} by

$$s_i(\lambda) = \lambda - \langle \lambda, h_i \rangle \alpha_i \quad (\lambda \in \mathbf{P}, i \in I).$$

A *Coxeter element* of W is a product of the form $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{|I|}}$ such that $\{i_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq |I|\} = I$. All Coxeter elements are conjugate in W when Δ is a tree [9, 32], and their common order in W is finite when W is finite [64], in which case the order is called the *Coxeter number* and denoted by h .

²Our convention is a variation of the Coxeter–Dynkin diagram in the sense that we connect vertices with single edges only. See the examples for the finite types. We will call them *Dynkin diagrams* for simplicity.

We call the operation from Q to $s_i Q$ the *reflection of Q at a source i of Q* . Note that for Dynkin quivers $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$ and $Q' = (\Delta, \xi')$ with $\xi_i \equiv_2 \xi'_i$ for all $i \in \Delta_0$, there exists a sequence of reflections, including s_i^{-1} at sink, from Q to Q' .

For a reduced expression $\underline{w} = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_l}$ of $w \in W$ or a sequence $\tilde{w} = (i_1, \dots, i_l)_{i_1, \dots, i_l \in \Delta_0}$ of indices, we say that \underline{w} (or \tilde{w}) is *adapted to $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$* if

$$i_k \text{ is a source of } s_{i_{k-1}} s_{i_{k-2}} \cdots s_{i_1} Q \text{ for all } 1 \leq k \leq l.$$

For a Dynkin quiver $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$, let $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_n}$ be a Q -adapted reduced expression of a Coxeter element. Then the height function ξ' of the Dynkin quiver $s_{i_n} \cdots s_{i_1} Q$ is given by

$$(2.8) \quad \xi'_i = \xi_i - 2 \quad \text{for any } i \in \Delta_0.$$

Note that, for \mathfrak{g} of finite type, we can obtain a Dynkin quiver $Q = (\underline{\Delta}, \xi)$ of the same type by assigning orientations to edges in $\underline{\Delta}$, and there exists the Coxeter element τ_Q all of whose reduced expressions are adapted to Q . Note that, in finite type, there exists a unique element w_0 in W whose length is the largest. Also the element w_0 induces an involution $*$: $I \rightarrow I$ given by $w_0(\alpha_i) = -\alpha_{i^*}$.

Convention 1. *Throughout this paper, we take a height function ξ on a finite Dynkin quiver $\underline{\Delta}$ such that $\xi_1 \equiv_2 0$.*

Let $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$ be a Dynkin quiver and σ be a non-trivial Dynkin diagram automorphism of Δ satisfying (2.2). We call a Dynkin quiver Q σ -fixed if $\xi_i = \xi_{\sigma^k(i)}$ for $0 \leq k < |\sigma|$. For a σ -fixed Dynkin quiver $Q = (\underline{\Delta}^{\mathfrak{g}}, \xi)$ of finite simply-laced type \mathfrak{g} and the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})$ obtained via σ in (2.4), we obtain a Dynkin quiver $\overline{Q} = (\underline{\Delta}^{\mathfrak{g}}, \bar{\xi})$ of non-simply-laced type \mathfrak{g} by defining $\bar{\xi}_i = \xi_i$ for all $i \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}$.

2.3. t -quantized Cartan matrix. For an indeterminate x and integers $k \geq l \geq 0$, we set

$$[k]_x := \frac{x^k - x^{-k}}{x - x^{-1}}, \quad [k]_x! := \prod_{u=1}^k [u]_x \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{bmatrix} k \\ l \end{bmatrix}_x := \frac{[k]_x!}{[k-l]_x! [l]_x!}.$$

For an indeterminate q and $i \in I$, we set $q_i = q^{d_i}$ where $D = \text{diag}(d_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \mid i \in I)$ satisfies (2.1). For a given Cartan matrix C , we set $\mathcal{I} = (\mathcal{I}_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ the *adjacent matrix* of C by $\mathcal{I}_{i,j} = -\delta(i \neq j)c_{i,j}$.

In [16], the (q, t) -deformation of Cartan matrix $C(q, t) = (c_{i,j}(q, t))_{i,j \in I}$ is introduced, where

$$c_{i,j}(q, t) := (q_i t^{-1} + q_i^{-1} t) \delta_{i,j} - [\mathcal{I}_{i,j}]_q.$$

Then we have two kinds of specializations of $C(q, t)$, one of which is $C(q) := C(q, 1)$, called the *quantum Cartan matrix*, and the another is $\underline{C}(t) := C(1, t)$, called the *t -quantized Cartan matrix*.

Throughout this paper, we mainly consider the following symmetric matrix

$$(2.9) \quad \underline{B}(t) := \underline{C}(t) D^{-1}.$$

Note that $\underline{B}(t)|_{t=1} = \underline{B} \in \text{GL}_{|I|}(\mathbb{Q})$. We regard $\underline{B}(t)$ as an element of $\text{GL}_{|I|}(\mathbb{Q}(t))$ and denote its inverse by $\tilde{\underline{B}}(t) = (\tilde{\underline{B}}_{i,j}(t))_{i,j \in I}$ provided it exists. Let

$$(2.10) \quad \tilde{\underline{B}}_{i,j}(t) = \sum_{u \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{b}_{i,j}(u) t^u$$

be the Laurent expansion of $\tilde{\underline{B}}_{i,j}(t)$ at $t = 0$. Note that $\tilde{\underline{B}}_{i,j}(t) = \tilde{\underline{B}}_{j,i}(t)$ for all $i, j \in I$. The closed formulae of $\underline{B}(t)$ and $\tilde{\underline{B}}_{i,j}(t)$ for all finite types can be found in [46, 48] (see also references therein).

Lemma 2.2 ([29, 20, 48]). *Let $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(t)$ be associated with \mathbf{C} of finite type. Then, for any $i, j \in I$ and $u \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

- (1) $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(u) = 0$ if $u \leq d(i, j)$ or $d(i, j) \equiv_2 u$,
- (2) $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(d(i, j) + 1) = \max(d_i, d_j)$.

For a Dynkin quiver Q , we choose a subset $\tilde{\Delta}_0$ of $\Delta_0 \times \mathbb{Z}$ as follows:

$$\tilde{\Delta}_0 := \{(i, p) \in I \times \mathbb{Z} \mid p - \xi_i \in 2\mathbb{Z}\}.$$

By Convention 1, $\tilde{\Delta}_0$ does not depend on the choice of Q . For $i, j \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we define an *even function* $\tilde{\eta}_{i,j} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ as follows:

$$(2.11) \quad \tilde{\eta}_{i,j}(u) = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(u) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(-u) \quad \text{for } u \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Lemma 2.3 ([5, 48]). *We have*

$$\tilde{\eta}_{i,j}(u-1) + \tilde{\eta}_{i,j}(u+1) + \sum_{k; d(k,j)=1} \langle h_k, \alpha_j \rangle \tilde{\eta}_{i,k}(u) = \delta_{u,1} \delta_{i,j} \times 2d_i.$$

2.4. Valued quiver. Let \mathbf{K} be a (possibly infinite) countable index set with a decomposition $\mathbf{K} = \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}} \sqcup \mathbf{K}_{\text{fr}}$. We call \mathbf{K}_{ex} the set of *exchangeable indices* and \mathbf{K}_{fr} the set of *frozen indices*.

We call an integer-valued $\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}$ matrix $\tilde{B} = (b_{i,j})_{i \in \mathbf{K}, j \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}}$ an *exchange matrix* if it satisfies the following properties:

- (a) For each $j \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}$, there exist finitely many $i \in \mathbf{K}$ such that $b_{i,j} \neq 0$.
- (b) Its principal part $B := (b_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}}$ is *skew-symmetrizable*; i.e., there exists a sequence $S = (t_i \mid i \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}, t_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1})$ such that $t_i b_{i,j} = -t_j b_{j,i}$ for all $i, j \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}$.

For an exchange matrix \tilde{B} , we associate a *valued quiver* $\mathcal{Q}_{\tilde{B}}$ whose set of vertices is \mathbf{K} and arrows between vertices are assigned by the following rules:

$$(2.13) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{\scriptsize } k \end{array} \xrightarrow{\lceil a, b \rceil} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{\scriptsize } l \end{array} & \text{if } l, k \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}, l \neq k, b_{kl} = a \geq 0 \text{ and } b_{lk} = b \leq 0, \\ \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \text{\scriptsize } k \end{array} \xrightarrow{\lceil a, 0 \rceil} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{\scriptsize } l \end{array} \text{ (resp. } \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \text{\scriptsize } k \end{array} \xleftarrow{\lceil 0, b \rceil} \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{\scriptsize } l \end{array}) & \text{if } l \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}, k \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{fr}} \text{ and } b_{kl} = a \geq 0 \text{ (resp. } b_{kl} = b \leq 0).$$

Here we do not draw an arrow between k and l if $b_{kl} = 0$ (and $b_{lk} = 0$ when $l, k \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}$). Note that \circ denotes a vertex in \mathbf{K}_{fr} , and we call $\lceil a, b \rceil$ the *value* of an arrow.

Convention 2. *For some special values $\lceil a, b \rceil$, we will use the following scheme to draw a valued quiver for convenience: For $l, k \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}, l \neq k$,*

- (1) if $b_{kl} = 1$ and $b_{lk} = -b < 0$, use $\bullet \xrightarrow{\lceil 1, -b \rceil} \bullet$,
- (2) if $b_{kl} = 2$ and $b_{lk} = -b < 0$, use $\bullet \xrightarrow{\lceil 2, -b \rceil} \bullet$,
- (3) if $b_{kl} = 3$ and $b_{lk} = -b < 0$, use $\bullet \xrightarrow{\lceil 3, -b \rceil} \bullet$,

(4) we usually skip $\lceil 1, -1 \rceil$ in an arrow (when $\lceil a, -1 \rceil$ and $1 \leq a \leq 3$) for notational simplicity, and for $l \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{ex}}$ and $k \in \mathbf{K}_{\text{fr}}$,

- (5) if $b_{kl} = 1$ (resp. $b_{kl} = -1$), use $\circ \xrightarrow{\lceil 1, 0 \rceil} \bullet$ (resp. $\circ \xleftarrow{\lceil 0, 1 \rceil} \bullet$),
- (6) if $b_{kl} = 2$ (resp. $b_{kl} = -2$), use $\circ \xrightarrow{\lceil 2, 0 \rceil} \bullet$ (resp. $\circ \xleftarrow{\lceil 0, 2 \rceil} \bullet$),
- (7) if $b_{kl} = 3$ (resp. $b_{kl} = -3$), use $\circ \xrightarrow{\lceil 3, 0 \rceil} \bullet$ (resp. $\circ \xleftarrow{\lceil 0, 3 \rceil} \bullet$).

Throughout this paper, we always apply Convention 2.

Definition 2.4. Let Δ be a Dynkin diagram. We set $\tilde{\Delta}_0 \times \tilde{\Delta}_0$ -matrix $\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\Delta}_0}$ whose entries $b_{(i,p),(j,s)}$ are defined as follows:


$$(2.14) \quad b_{(i,p),(j,s)} = \begin{cases} (-1)^{\delta(s>p)} c_{i,j} & \text{if } |p-s| = 1 \text{ and } i \neq j, \\ (-1)^{\delta(s>p)} & \text{if } |p-s| = 2 \text{ and } i = j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\Delta}_0}$ satisfies (2.12) with a sequence $S := (s_{i,p} \mid s_{i,p} = d_i)$ and without frozen vertices. We denote by $\tilde{\Delta}$ the valued quiver associated to $\tilde{B}_{\tilde{\Delta}_0}$.

We call the arrows $(i,p) \leftarrow (i,p+2)$ in $\tilde{\Delta}$ the *horizontal arrows* and the arrows between (i,p) and $(j,p+1)$ for $d(i,j) = 1$ the *vertical³ arrows*.

Convention 3. We use dashed arrows $\dashleftarrow{\dots}$ for horizontal arrows in $\tilde{\Delta}$ to distinguish them with vertical arrows in $\tilde{\Delta}$.

Example 2.5. Under Conventions 2 and 3, when $\mathbf{\Delta}$ is of finite type B_3 , the valued quiver $\tilde{\mathbf{\Delta}}$ is depicted as



Remark 2.6. The valued quivers for simply-laced finite types coincide with the infinite quivers in [30, Section 2.1.3] where the infinite quivers are denoted by Γ .

Definition 2.7 (cf. [18, Definition 5.5]).

- (1) We denote by $\overline{\Delta}$ the quiver obtained from $\tilde{\Delta}$ by removing all horizontal arrows. We call $\overline{\Delta}$ the *valued repetition quiver* of Δ ⁴.
- (2) A subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \tilde{\Delta}_0 = \overline{\Delta}_0$ is said to be *convex* if it satisfies the following condition: For any oriented path $(x_1 \rightarrow x_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_l)$ consisting of (vertical) arrows in $\overline{\Delta}$, we have $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_l\} \subset \mathcal{R}$ if and only if $\{x_1, x_l\} \subset \mathcal{R}$.
- (3) We say that a convex subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \tilde{\Delta}_0$ has a *upper bound* if there exists $\max\{p \mid (i,p) \in \mathcal{R}\}$ for each $i \in \Delta_0$.
- (4) For a convex subset $\mathcal{R} \subset \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we set $\mathcal{R}_{\text{fr}} := \{(i,p) \mid p = \min\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid (i,k) \in \mathcal{R}\}\}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\text{ex}} := \mathcal{R} \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{fr}}$. We denote by ${}^{\mathcal{R}}\tilde{\Delta}$ the valued quiver associated to ${}^{\mathcal{R}}\tilde{B} := (b_{(i,p),(j,s)})_{(i,p) \in \mathcal{R}, (j,s) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{ex}}}$.
- (5) For a height function ξ on Δ , let ${}^{\xi}\tilde{B} := (b_{(i,p),(j,s)})_{(i,p),(j,s) \in {}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0}$ and denote by ${}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}$ the valued quiver associated to ${}^{\xi}\tilde{B}$, where

$${}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0 := \{(i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0 \mid p \leq \xi_i\}.$$

Note that ${}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0$ is a convex subset of $\tilde{\Delta}$ for any height function ξ on $\mathbf{\Delta}$.

³Visually, they are slant.

⁴When we replace valued arrows with usual arrows, it is the usual repetition quiver $\hat{\Delta}$ (see [48] for non-simply-laced types).

3. t -CHARACTERS OF QUANTUM LOOP ALGEBRA AND VIRTUAL GROTHENDIECK RINGS

In this section, we first review the important properties of t -characters of finite-dimensional representations over quantum loop algebra briefly (see [17, 15, 58, 25, 27] for more details). Then we recall the virtual Grothendieck ring $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ for any finite type \mathfrak{g} (see [14, 48] for non-simply-laced types).

3.1. Quantum loop algebras. Let t be an indeterminate. We denote by $\mathbb{k} := \overline{\mathbb{Q}(t)}$ the algebraic closure of the field $\mathbb{Q}(t)$ inside $\bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \overline{\mathbb{Q}((t^{1/m}))}$. Let \mathfrak{g} be a complex finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra of simply-laced type. Note that, in this case, we can identify $\mathcal{C}(q)$ with $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(t)$ by exchanging q with t .

*Throughout this paper, we use **bold symbols** to emphasize that those symbols are of simply-laced finite types. We also use i, j for indices in $I^{\mathfrak{g}}$ for the same purpose.*

We denote by $U_t(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$ the quantum loop algebra associated to \mathfrak{g} , which is the \mathbb{k} -algebra given by the set of infinite generators, called the Drinfeld generators, subject to certain relations [10, 1]. The quantum loop algebra $U_t(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$ is a quotient of the corresponding (untwisted) quantum affine algebra $U_t(\widehat{\mathfrak{g}})$ and hence has a Hopf algebra structure.

3.2. Finite dimensional modules and their t -characters. We denote by $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ the category of finite-dimensional $U_t(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$ -modules of type $\mathbf{1}$. The category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is a \mathbb{k} -linear rigid non-braided monoidal category. We say that V and W *commute* if $V \otimes W \simeq W \otimes V$ as $U_t(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$ -modules. We denote by $K(\mathcal{C})$ the Grothendieck ring of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. Note that the set of simple objects in $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ are parameterized by the set $(1 + z\mathbb{k}[z])^{I^{\mathfrak{g}}}$ of $I^{\mathfrak{g}}$ -tuples of monic polynomials, which is called *Drinfeld polynomials*.

In this paper, we usually consider the *skeleton* subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. The subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ contains every *prime* simple module in $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ up to *parameter shifts*. To explain $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$, we need to consider the Laurent polynomial \mathcal{Y} generated by the set of variables $\{Y_{i,p}^{\pm 1}\}_{(i,p) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0}$. Let us denote by \mathcal{M} (resp. \mathcal{M}_+ and \mathcal{M}_-) the set of all monomials (resp. dominant monomials and anti-dominant monomials) of \mathcal{Y} . For a monomial \mathbf{m} in \mathcal{Y} , we write

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{m} = \prod_{(i,p) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0} Y_{i,p}^{u_{i,p}(\mathbf{m})} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{m}_- = \prod_{(i,p) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0} Y_{i,p}^{-u_{i,p}(\mathbf{m})}$$

with $u_{i,p}(\mathbf{m}) \in \mathbb{Z}$. For each $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+$, we denote by $L(\mathbf{m})$ the simple module in \mathcal{C} whose Drinfeld polynomial is $(\prod_p (1 - q^p)^{u_{i,p}(\mathbf{m})})_{i \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}}$. Then the subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ can be characterized by the Serre subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ generated by $\{L(\mathbf{m}) \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+\}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0$ is a monoidal rigid subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$. In [17], Frenkel-Reshetikhin proved that there exists an injective ring homomorphism

$$\chi_t : K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y},$$

called the *t -character homomorphism*⁵. The existence of χ_t tells us that the Grothendieck ring $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}})$ is commutative, even though $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ is not braided.

For an interval $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{Z}$, $i \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ and $(i, p) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$, we set dominant monomials

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbf{m}^{(i)}[a, b] := \prod_{(i,s) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0; s \in [a,b]} Y_{i,s} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{m}_{k,p}^{(i)} := \prod_{s=0}^{k-1} Y_{i,p+2s},$$

⁵It is usually called the q -character homomorphism in the literature.

and $\mathbf{m}^{(i)}(a, b)$, $\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[a, b]$, and $\mathbf{m}^{(i)}(a, b)$ are defined similarly.

The simple module $L(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ ($p \leq s$) is called a *Kirillov–Reshetikhin (KR) module*. When $p = s$ and $(i, p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we call $L(Y_{i,p})$ a *fundamental module*. Note that the Grothendieck ring $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ is a polynomial ring in the isomorphism classes of the fundamental modules $L(Y_{i,p})$ [17].

For $\iota \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}$, $a \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}$, we set

$$A_{\iota,a} := Y_{\iota,at^{-1}} Y_{\iota,at} \prod_{j: d(\iota,j)=1} Y_{j,a}^{-1} = Y_{\iota,at^{-1}} Y_{\iota,at} \prod_{j \neq \iota} Y_{j,a}^{c_{j,\iota}}.$$

Note that there is an ordering $\preccurlyeq_{\mathbb{N}}$ on the set of monomials, called the *Nakajima order*, defined as follows:

$$(3.3) \quad \mathbf{m} \preccurlyeq_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{m}' \text{ if and only if } \mathbf{m}^{-1} \mathbf{m}' \text{ is a product of elements in } \{A_{\iota,a} \mid \iota \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}, a \in \mathbb{k}^{\times}\}.$$

Theorem 3.1 ([16, 15]). *For each dominant monomial \mathbf{m} , the monomials appearing in $\chi_t(L(\mathbf{m})) - \mathbf{m}$ are strictly less than \mathbf{m} with respect to $\preccurlyeq_{\mathbb{N}}$.*

The t -characters of KR-modules satisfies a system of functional equations called T -systems:

Theorem 3.2 ([58, Theorem 1.1]). (See also [27, Theorem 3.4].) *For each $(i, p), (i, s) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}$ with $p \leq s$, we have*

$$(3.4) \quad \chi_t(L(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])) \chi_t(L(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}(p, s))) = \chi_t(L(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])) \chi_t(L(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}(p, s))) + \prod_{j: d(\iota,j)=1} \chi_t(L(\mathbf{m}^{(j)}(p, s))).$$

Let ξ be a height function on $\Delta^{\mathfrak{g}}$. We denote by ${}^{\xi}\mathcal{M}_+$ the set of all dominant monomials in the variables $Y_{i,p}$'s for $(i, p) \in {}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0$.

Definition 3.3. We define the subcategory $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\xi}$ as the Serre subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$ such that $\text{Irr } \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\xi} = \{L(\mathbf{m}) \mid \mathbf{m} \in {}^{\xi}\mathcal{M}_+\}$.

Since ${}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0$ is a convex subset of $\tilde{\Delta}_0$, we have the following proposition:

Proposition 3.4. *The category $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\xi}$ is a monoidal subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}$.*

Proof. This assertion follows from the same argument of the proof of [30, Proposition 3.10]. \square

3.3. Truncation. We denote by \mathcal{Y}^{ξ} the Laurent polynomial ring generated by $Y_{i,p}$'s for $(i, p) \in {}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0$. We define a linear map $(\cdot)_{\leq \xi} : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\xi}$ by sending the monomials which contain some $Y_{i,p}$ with $(i, p) \notin {}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}$ to zero and by keeping all the other terms.

Proposition 3.5. *For a height function ξ , the \mathbb{Z} -linear map $(\cdot)_{\leq \xi} : K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\xi}) \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\xi}$ given by*

$$[V] \mapsto {}^{\xi}\chi_t(V) := ((\cdot)_{\leq \xi} \circ \chi_t)(V)$$

gives an injective ring homomorphism $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{\xi}) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\xi}$.

Proof. We can prove the assertion in the same way as in the proof of [28, Proposition 6.1]. \square

3.4. (Virtual) Grothendieck rings. Recall that when \mathfrak{g} is of simply-laced finite type, the t -character homomorphism χ_t is an injection from $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ into $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathfrak{g}}$. Thus we can identify $K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ with

$$\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g}) := \chi_t(K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)).$$

We call $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ the Grothendieck ring of type \mathfrak{g} also.

Proposition 3.6 ([15, Corollary 5.7]). *When \mathfrak{g} is of simply-laced type, we have*

$$\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigcap_{\iota \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}} \left(\mathbb{Z}[Y_{j,l}^{\pm 1} \mid (j,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}, j \neq \iota] \otimes \mathbb{Z}[Y_{\iota,l}(1 + A_{\iota,l+1}^{-1}) \mid (\iota,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}] \right) \subsetneq \mathcal{Y}^{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Now we move on to non-simply-laced finite types. For \mathfrak{g} associated with (\mathfrak{g}, σ) in (2.4), we consider the Laurent polynomial ring defined as follows: We first set

$$\mathcal{Y}^{\mathfrak{g}} := \mathbb{Z}[X_{i,p}^{\pm 1} \mid (i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}].$$

Then there exists a surjective ring homomorphism

$$(3.5) \quad \bar{\sigma} : \mathcal{Y}^{\mathfrak{g}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{Y}^{\mathfrak{g}} \quad \text{sending} \quad Y_{\sigma^k(\iota),p} \longmapsto X_{\bar{\iota},p}$$

for any $(\iota, p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $0 \leq k < |\sigma|$ (see Convention 1). Finally, we set

$$\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g}) := \bar{\sigma}(\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g}))$$

and call it the *virtual Grothendieck ring* of type \mathfrak{g} . We call $\bar{\sigma}(L(\mathbf{m}))$ the *folded t -character* of $L(\mathbf{m})$.

Now we would like to unify the expression for $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ for *any* finite type \mathfrak{g} by replacing variables $Y_{i,p}$'s with $X_{i,p}$'s. Let $\mathcal{X}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the Laurent polynomial ring $\mathbb{Z}[X_{i,p}^{\pm 1} \mid (i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}]$. For $(i, p+1) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}$, we set

$$(3.6) \quad B_{i,p} := X_{i,p-1}X_{i,p+1} \prod_{j: d(i,j)=1} X_{j,p}^{c_{j,i}}.$$

Definition 3.7. [14, §3.4] We define the commutative ring

$$(3.7) \quad \mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigcap_{i \in I_{\mathfrak{g}}} \left(\mathbb{Z}[X_{j,l}^{\pm 1} \mid (j,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}, j \neq i] \otimes \mathbb{Z}[X_{i,l}(1 + B_{i,l+1}^{-1}) \mid (i,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}] \right) \subsetneq \mathcal{X}^{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Remark 3.8. Even though, we unify the expression for $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ by using $X_{i,p}$, \mathcal{X} and $B_{i,p}$, we sometimes use $Y_{i,p}$, \mathcal{Y} and $A_{i,p}$ to emphasize that they are associated with \mathfrak{g} of simply-laced finite type.

Theorem 3.9 ([14, Proposition 3.3, Theorem 4.3]).

- (1) *Every element of $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ is characterized by the multiplicities of the dominant monomials contained in it.*
- (2) *For each $m \in \mathcal{M}_+$, there is a unique element $F(m)$ of $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that m is the unique dominant monomial of $F(m)$ with its coefficient 1. Therefore we have a basis $\{F(m) \mid m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ of $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ parameterized by dominant monomials m .*
- (3) *For each pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})$ obtained via σ , the map $\bar{\sigma}$ induces a surjective ring homomorphism from $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ to $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$.*

An \mathcal{X} -monomial \mathbf{m} is said to be *right-negative* if the factors $X_{j,l}$ appearing in m , for which l is maximal, have negative powers.

Corollary 3.10. For each pair (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}) obtained via σ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathbf{g}}$, assume that

$$(3.8) \quad \text{every monomial in } F(\mathbf{m}) - \mathbf{m} \text{ is right-negative.}$$

Then $\bar{\sigma}(F(\mathbf{m})) = F(\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m})) \in \mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g})$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.9 (3) and (3.8), $\bar{\sigma}(F(\mathbf{m}))$ is an element in $\mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g})$ containing the unique dominant monomial $\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m})$. Thus our assertion follows. \square

Example 3.11. For finite A_5 -type, $\bar{\sigma}(F(Y_{4,-2}Y_{2,0}))$ does not coincide with $F(X_{2,-2}X_{2,0})$ of finite type C_3 , since $\bar{\sigma}(F(Y_{4,-2}Y_{2,0}))$ does not satisfies (3.8). More precisely, $F(Y_{4,-2}Y_{2,0})$ contains $Y_{3,-1}Y_{5,-1}Y_{2,0}Y_{4,0}^{-1}$. On the other hand, $\bar{\sigma}(F(Y_{2,-2}Y_{2,0})) = F(X_{2,-2}X_{2,0})$.

Note that if $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{g}}$ with $\mathbf{m} \preceq_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{m}'$, then we have

$$(3.9) \quad \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}) \preceq_{\mathbb{N}} \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}') \in \mathcal{M}^{\mathbf{g}}.$$

It is proved in [15, 27] that, for $\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s] \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathbf{g}}$, $F(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ satisfies the condition in (3.8) and

$$F(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) = \chi_t(L(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])).$$

Thus we have

$$(3.10) \quad \bar{\sigma}(F(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])) = F(m^{(i)}[p, s])$$

and (3.4) is changed into the following form: For any finite type \mathbf{g} and $(i, p), (i, s) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p \leq s$, we have

$$(3.11) \quad F(m^{(i)}[p, s])F(m^{(i)}(p, s)) = F(m^{(i)}[p, s])F(m^{(i)}(p, s)) + \prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} F(m^{(j)}(p, s))^{-c_{j,i}}.$$

We call (3.11) the *folded T-systems*.

Definition 3.12.

(1) For a height function ξ on $\Delta^{\mathbf{g}}$ of simply-laced finite type, we set

$$\xi\mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g}) := \xi\chi_t(K(\mathcal{C}^{\xi})).$$

(2) For a height function ξ on $\Delta^{\mathbf{g}}$ of non-simply-laced finite type, we set

$$\xi\mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g}) := \bar{\sigma}(\underline{\xi}\mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g})),$$

where $\underline{\xi}$ is the σ -fixed height function on $\Delta^{\mathbf{g}}$ such that

$$\underline{\xi}_{\sigma^k(i)} = \xi_{\bar{i}} \quad \text{for any } 0 \leq k < |\sigma| \text{ and } i \in \sigma^{-1}(\bar{i}).$$

We call $\xi\mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g})$ the *truncated virtual Grothendieck ring* and $\xi\bar{\chi}_t(\mathbf{m})$ the *truncated folded t-character* of $L(\mathbf{m})$ with respect to ξ , defined as below:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \xi\bar{\chi}_t & & \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \\ K(\mathcal{C}^{\xi\mathbf{g}}) & \xrightarrow{\xi\chi_t} & \xi\mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g}) & \xrightarrow{\bar{\sigma}} & \xi\mathfrak{K}(\mathbf{g}) \end{array}$$

Remark 3.13. Let G be a simply-connected complex Lie group associated with \mathfrak{g} of *non-simply-laced type*. In [14], the authors formulate (conjectural) *folded integrable models* of \mathfrak{g} corresponding to *folded Bethe Ansatz equations*. Then $\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{g})$, denoted by $\mathcal{K}_t^-(\mathfrak{g})$ in [14]⁶, plays the role of describing the spectra of the transfer-matrix $t_V(z, u)$ with a finite-dimensional $U_t(\mathcal{L}\mathfrak{g})$ -module V in the folded integrable model, as in the role of $\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq K(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ in the integrable models for simply-laced types (cf. [13, 14] for more details). We remark that our main interest is to study the structure of the *quantization of $\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{g})$* introduced independently in [48] with other motivations related to *canonical basis* and *quantum cluster algebra structure*. In contrast, the authors of [14] mainly focus on a study of the folded integrable models associated with \mathfrak{g} . It would be interesting to find connections between our results and those in [14].

4. QUANTIZATION

In this section, we quantize the Laurent polynomial ring \mathcal{X} with the resulting ring denoted by \mathcal{X}_q , via the inverse matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(t)$ of (2.9) associated with $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(t)$ following [48] (see also [14]), and define its subalgebra $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ that is regarded as a quantization of $\mathfrak{R}(\mathfrak{g})$.

4.1. Quantum torus. Let q be an indeterminate. Let us recall that $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(u)$ ($u \in \mathbb{Z}$) in (2.10) and the even function $\tilde{\eta}_{i,j} : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ defined in (2.11).

Definition 4.1 ([59, 66, 25, 48]). Let $(\mathcal{X}_q, *)$ be the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra with the generators $\{\tilde{X}_{i,p}^{\pm 1} \mid (i, p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0\}$ with the defining relations $\tilde{X}_{i,p} * \tilde{X}_{i,p}^{-1} = \tilde{X}_{i,p}^{-1} * \tilde{X}_{i,p} = 1$ and $\tilde{X}_{i,p} * \tilde{X}_{j,s} = q^{\underline{\mathcal{N}}(i,p;j,s)} \tilde{X}_{j,s} * \tilde{X}_{i,p}$, where $(i, p), (j, s) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$ and

$$(4.1) \quad \underline{\mathcal{N}}(i, p; j, s) := \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(p - s - 1) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(s - p - 1) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(p - s + 1) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(s - p + 1).$$

We call \mathcal{X}_q the *quantum torus associated with $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(t)$* (see Definition 7.1 below).

Remark 4.2. For simply-laced finite types, the quantum torus \mathcal{X}_q was already defined in [59, 66, 25], whereas for non-simply-laced finite types, it is introduced in [48] very recently.

Note that since $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(t)$ is symmetric,

$$\underline{\mathcal{N}}(i, p; j, s) = \underline{\mathcal{N}}(j, p; i, s) = -\underline{\mathcal{N}}(i, s; j, p) = -\underline{\mathcal{N}}(j, s; i, p),$$

and it follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$(4.2) \quad \underline{\mathcal{N}}(i, p; j, s) = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(p - s - 1) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(p - s + 1) \quad \text{if } p > s.$$

Moreover, for $p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $i, j \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$ such that $(i, p), (j, p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, Lemma 2.2 tells that

$$(4.3) \quad \tilde{X}_{i,p} * \tilde{X}_{j,p} = \tilde{X}_{j,p} * \tilde{X}_{i,p}.$$

By specializing q at 1, the quantum torus \mathcal{X}_q recovers the commutative Laurent polynomial ring \mathcal{X} , while \mathcal{X}_q is non-commutative; i.e., there exists a \mathbb{Z} -algebra homomorphism $\text{ev}_{q=1} : \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ given by $q^{\frac{1}{2}} \mapsto 1$ and $\tilde{X}_{i,p} \mapsto X_{i,p}$.

We say that $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ is a \mathcal{X}_q -*monomial* if it is a product of the generators $\tilde{X}_{i,p}^{\pm 1}$ and $q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}$. For a \mathcal{X}_q -monomial $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{X}_q$, we set $u_{i,p}(\tilde{m}) := u_{i,p}(\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}))$ (see (3.1)). An \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \tilde{m} is said to be *right-negative* if $\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m})$ is right-negative. Note that a product of right negative \mathcal{X} -monomials

⁶In our introduction, we use $\mathcal{K}^-(\mathfrak{g})$ instead.

(resp. \mathcal{X}_q -monomials) is right negative. A \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \tilde{m} is called *dominant* if $\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m})$ is dominant. Moreover, for \mathcal{X}_q -monomials \tilde{m}, \tilde{m}' in \mathcal{X}_q , we define

$$\tilde{m} \preceq_N \tilde{m}' \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}) \preceq_N \text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}').$$

For $i \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we call \mathcal{X} -monomial m (resp. \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \tilde{m}) *i-dominant* if $u_{i,p}(m) \geq 0$ (resp. $u_{i,p}(\tilde{m}) \geq 0$) for all p such that $(i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$. For $J \subset \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we call \mathcal{X} -monomial m (resp. \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \tilde{m}) *J-dominant* if m (resp. \tilde{m}) is *j-dominant* for all $j \in J$. For monomials \tilde{m}, \tilde{m}' in \mathcal{X}_q , we define

$$(4.4) \quad \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\tilde{m}, \tilde{m}') := \sum_{(i,p),(j,s) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0} u_{i,p}(\tilde{m}) u_{j,s}(\tilde{m}') \underline{\mathcal{N}}(i,p;j,s).$$

There exists the \mathbb{Z} -algebra anti-involution $\overline{(\cdot)}$ on \mathcal{X}_q ([25, 48]) given by

$$(4.5) \quad q^{\frac{1}{2}} \mapsto q^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \tilde{X}_{i,p} \mapsto q_i \tilde{X}_{i,p}.$$

Thus, for any \mathcal{X}_q -monomial $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{X}_q$, there exists a unique $r \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ such that $q^r \tilde{m}$ is $\overline{(\cdot)}$ -invariant. A monomial of this form is called *bar-invariant* and denoted by $\underline{\tilde{m}}$. For an example,

$$\mathbf{X}_{i,p} := q^{\frac{d_i}{2}} \tilde{X}_{i,p} \text{ is bar-invariant.}$$

More generally, for a family $(u_{i,p} \mid (i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0)$ of integers with finitely many non-zero components, the expression

$$(4.6) \quad q^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,p) < (j,s)} u_{i,p} u_{j,s} \underline{\mathcal{N}}(j,s;i,p)} \xrightarrow[*]{\rightarrow} \mathbf{X}_{i,p}^{u_{i,p}}$$

does not depend on the choice of an ordering on $\tilde{\Delta}_0$ and is bar-invariant.

Remark 4.3. Note that the relations in Definition 4.1 do not change when we replace $\tilde{X}_{i,p}$ with $\mathbf{X}_{i,p}$, and $\underline{\tilde{m}}$ depends only on $\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m})$. Therefore, for every monomial m in \mathcal{X} , we denote by \underline{m} the bar-invariant monomial in \mathcal{X}_q corresponding to m . Also the notation $Y_{i,p}$ of $(\mathbf{Y}_t, *)$ in [29, Section 3] corresponds to $\mathbf{X}_{i,p}$, the bar-invariant monomial, in this paper.

For $(i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we set

$$(4.7) \quad \tilde{B}_{i,p} := \underline{B}_{i,p} \in \mathcal{X}_q.$$

Definition 4.4. Let \mathbf{B}_q^- be the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{X}_q generated by $\tilde{B}_{i,p}^{-1}$'s for $(i,p) \in I \times \mathbb{Z}$. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we denote by \mathbf{B}_q^{-k} the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -span of the monomials $\xrightarrow[*]{\rightarrow} \tilde{B}_{i_s, p_s}^{-1}$ for $1 \leq s \leq k$.

For bar-invariant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials \underline{m}_1 and \underline{m}_2 , we set $\underline{m}_1 \cdot \underline{m}_2 := \underline{m_1 m_2}$, and for \underline{m}_k ($k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$), we set

$$(4.8) \quad \prod_k \underline{m}_k := \underline{\prod_k m_k}.$$

Definition 4.5 (cf. [18, Definition 5.5]). For a subset $S \subset \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we denote by ${}^S \mathcal{X}_q$ the quantum subtorus of \mathcal{X}_q generated by $\tilde{X}_{i,p}^{\pm 1}$ for $(i,p) \in S \subset \tilde{\Delta}_0$. In particular, for a height function ξ on $\tilde{\Delta}$, we denote by ${}^\xi \mathcal{X}_q$ the quantum subtorus generated by $\tilde{X}_{i,p}^{\pm 1}$ for $(i,p) \in {}^\xi \tilde{\Delta}_0$.

Proposition 4.6 ([48, Proposition 5.7]). *For $i, j \in I$ and $p, s, t, u \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $(i, p), (j, s + 1), (i, t + 1), (j, u + 1) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we have*

$$\tilde{X}_{i,p} * \tilde{B}_{j,s}^{-1} = q^{\beta(i,p;j,s)} \tilde{B}_{j,s}^{-1} * \tilde{X}_{i,p} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{B}_{i,t}^{-1} * \tilde{B}_{j,u}^{-1} = q^{\alpha(i,t;j,u)} \tilde{B}_{j,u}^{-1} * \tilde{B}_{i,t}^{-1}.$$

Here,

$$(4.9) \quad \beta(i, p; j, s) = \delta_{i,j}(-\delta_{p-s,1} + \delta_{p-s,-1})(\alpha_i, \alpha_i),$$

$$(4.10) \quad \alpha(i, t; j, u) = \begin{cases} \pm(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) & \text{if } (i, t) = (j, u \pm 2), \\ \pm 2(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) & \text{if } d(i, j) = 1 \text{ and } t = u \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

4.2. Quantization $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$. We briefly recall the construction of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, defined in [59, 66, 25, 48], by mainly following the argument in [24, 25]. For each $i \in I$, we define the free \mathcal{X}_q -left module

$$(4.11) \quad {}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q} := \bigoplus_{r: (i,r) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0} \mathcal{X}_q \cdot \tilde{s}_{i,r}$$

whose basis elements are denoted by $\tilde{s}_{i,r}$. We also regard ${}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ as a \mathcal{X}_q -bimodule by defining right \mathcal{X}_q -module action \cdot as follows:

$$(4.12) \quad \tilde{s}_{i,r} \cdot \tilde{m} = q_i^{-2u_{i,r}(\tilde{m})} \tilde{m} \cdot \tilde{s}_{i,r},$$

where \tilde{m} is an \mathcal{X}_q -monomial (see Remark 4.11, cf. [25, Lemma 4.6]). Let $\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ be the quotient of ${}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ by the \mathcal{X}_q -submodule generated by the elements

$$(4.13) \quad \tilde{B}_{i,r+1} \tilde{s}_{i,r} - q_i \tilde{s}_{i,r+2} \quad \text{for } (i, r) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0.$$

By following arguments in [25, Proposition 4.8] and [5, Lemma 4.3.1], we have the following lemma:

Lemma 4.7. *For each l with $(i, l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, the \mathcal{X}_q -left module $\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ is free over any $\{\tilde{s}_{i,r_0}\}$, where $(i, r_0) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$.*

For all $i \in I$, we define

$$(4.14) \quad S_{i,q} : \mathcal{X}_q \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\hspace{2cm}} \\ \tilde{S}_{i,q} \xrightarrow{\hspace{1cm}} \end{array} {}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{X}_{i,q},$$

where each map is defined as follows (recall (4.11) for definition of ${}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$):

(a) the map $\tilde{S}_{i,q}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{S}_{i,q}(\tilde{m}) = \frac{1}{q_i^{-2} - 1} \sum_{r: (i,r) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0} [\tilde{s}_{i,r}, \tilde{m}]$$

for an \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \tilde{m} , where ${}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ is regarded as the \mathcal{X}_q -bimodule,

(b) the map from ${}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ to $\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$, denoted by an double-headed arrow, is the surjective map sending an element of ${}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ to its image in $\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ (recall (4.13)).

By direct computation, we have the following:

Proposition 4.8. *The map $S_{i,q}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -linear map and derivation with respect to $*$, that is,*

$$(4.15) \quad S_{i,q}(\tilde{m}_1 * \tilde{m}_2) = \tilde{m}_1 \cdot S_{i,q}(\tilde{m}_2) + S_{i,q}(\tilde{m}_1) \cdot \tilde{m}_2,$$

where the \cdot indicates the \mathcal{X}_q -bimodule actions of $\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ induced from ${}^L\mathcal{X}_{i,q}$.

Definition 4.9. For $i \in \mathbb{A}_0$, we denote by $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{X}_q generated by

$$\tilde{X}_{i,l} * (1 + q_i^{-1} \tilde{B}_{i,l+1}^{-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{X}_{j,s}^{\pm 1} \quad \text{for } j \in \mathbb{A}_0 \setminus \{i\} \quad \text{and} \quad (i,l), (j,s) \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_0.$$

By using the same arguments as in [15, 24, 25], we have

$$(4.16) \quad \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g}) = \text{Ker}(S_{i,q}).$$

Therefore, we call $S_{i,q}$ the i -th q -screening operator with respect to $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Definition 4.10. [48] We set

$$\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}) := \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$$

and call it the *quantum virtual Grothendieck ring associated to $\underline{\mathbb{C}}(t)$* .

Remark 4.11. Using the fact that $S_{i,q}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -linear derivation (or by its definition with (4.12)), one can check that $S_{i,q}(\tilde{X}_{j,l}^{-1}) = -\delta_{i,j} \tilde{X}_{i,l}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{s}_{i,l}$. Then it follows from the definition of $S_{i,q}$, (4.12) and (4.13) that

$$S_{i,q}(\tilde{X}_{i,l}^{-1} + q_i^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,l}^{-1} * \tilde{B}_{i,l-1}) = (-\tilde{X}_{i,l}^{-1}) \tilde{s}_{i,l} + (q_i^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,l}^{-1} * \tilde{B}_{i,l-1}) \tilde{s}_{i,l-2} = 0.$$

In fact, $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ is realized as the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{X}_q generated by $\tilde{X}_{i,l}^{-1} + q_i^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,l}^{-1} * \tilde{B}_{i,l-1}$ and $\tilde{X}_{j,s}^{\pm 1}$ for $j \in \mathbb{A}_0 \setminus \{i\}$ and $(i,l), (j,s) \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_0$ (cf. (4.16)).

Remark 4.12. Since the following diagram commutes (cf. [25])

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{X}_q & \xrightarrow{S_{i,q}} & \mathcal{X}_{i,q} \\ \text{ev}_{q=1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{ev}_{q=1} \\ \mathcal{X} & \xrightarrow{S_i} & \mathcal{X}_i \end{array}$$

where S_i is the i -th screening operator with respect to $\underline{\mathbb{C}}(t)$, $\text{ev}_{q=1}(\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})) \subset \mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$. However, the opposite inclusion is not trivial (for non-simply-laced types). We resolve this issue in the next section.

5. BASES OF $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ AND KAZHDAN–LUSZTIG ANALOGUES

Let $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g})$ be a pair in (2.4). It is known in [57, 56] (see also [25]) that the basis \mathbf{F}_q of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ with properties (5.1) below can be constructed algorithmically by using a deformed Frenkel–Mukhin (FM for short) algorithm (cf. [15]) with respect to $\mathbb{C}(q)$ (so-called t -algorithm [25]). This basis enables us to construct other important bases of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ (see (5.6), Theorem 5.6). In the second part of this section, we will construct a basis F_q of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by a deformed FM-algorithm with respect to $\underline{\mathbb{C}}(t)$, and verify that it has similar properties to (5.1) by following the framework in [25]. Moreover, we also construct other bases \mathbf{E}_q and \mathbf{L}_q of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ from the basis F_q in the spirit of [57, 25] in which they studied analogues of Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials [49] (see Theorem 5.27, Remarks 5.7 and 5.28).

5.1. **Bases of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.** Note that $\mathbf{C}(q)$ coincides with $\underline{\mathbf{C}}(t)$ for simply-laced finite types, when we replace q with t . Thus,

throughout this subsection, we switch the roles of q and t . Also, we use \mathbf{A}_t^- instead of \mathbf{B}_q^- .

This makes our notations more compatible with the literature where only simply-laced types are considered.

In [25] (cf. [57, 59]), the algorithm for constructing basis $\mathbf{F}_t := \{F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \underline{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ was proposed, so called *t-algorithm*. The structure and properties of the algorithm can be summarized as follows:

- (a) For each dominant \mathcal{Y}_t -monomial $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}$, we construct an element $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}})$ by adding monomials $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}' \in \tilde{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{A}_t^{-k}$ in an inductive way as k increases from 0. In the process, the coefficient for each monomial is also determined in an inductive way.
 - (b) If there appears a unique $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}'$ with the smallest $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ satisfying
 - (i) $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}'$ is anti-dominant and $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}' \in \tilde{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{A}_t^{-k}$ is generated in the performing step,
 - (ii) any monomial generated in the previous step is contained in $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{A}_t^{-s}$ ($0 \leq s < k$), not anti-dominant, and strictly larger than $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}'$ with respect to \prec_N ,
- (5.1) then, the coefficient of $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}'$ is contained in $t^{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}}$. Furthermore, the sum of all monomials with coefficients obtained from the steps so far, denoted by $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}})$, is contained in the kernel of $S_{i,t}$ for all i . Hence $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}})$ is an element of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ and the *t-algorithm* terminates.

Furthermore, each $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}})$ satisfies the following properties:

- (1) $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}) \in \mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \tilde{\mathbf{m}}\mathbf{A}_t^-$.
- (2) $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}})$ is bar-invariant if $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}$ is bar-invariant.
- (3) Every monomial of $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}) - \tilde{\mathbf{m}}$ is strictly less than $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}$ with respect to \prec_N .

The *t-algorithm* might progress infinitely many times. In fact, $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}})$ was constructed in a completion of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ at first. Interestingly, the property (1) in (5.1) is guaranteed once we prove

$$(5.2) \quad F_t(\tilde{Y}_{i,p}) \in \mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g}).$$

More precisely, (5.2) implies $\mathbf{E}_t := \{E_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \underline{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\} \subset \mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$, where $E_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ is given in (5.6). Then it is known (e.g. see the proof of [25, Proposition 6.3] for more detail) that \mathbf{E}_t has the unit-triangular property with \mathbf{F}_t , that is, $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ can be written as a linear combination of elements in $\mathbf{E}_t \subset \mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$, so the proof for (1) in (5.1) is reduced to prove (5.2). Then (5.2) is deduced from [57, 59].

Remark 5.1. Another characterization of $\mathfrak{K}_{i,t}(\mathfrak{g})$ in Remark 4.11 allows us to consider the lowest ℓ -weight version of the *t-algorithm*, that is, a *t-deformation* of *reversed* Frenkel–Mukhin algorithm which is an algorithm starting from the lowest ℓ -weight monomial. For instance, the formulas in [25, Lemma 4.13] can be re-formulated in terms of anti-dominant monomial with $\tilde{A}_{i,k}$'s. The reversed algorithm seems to be already known to experts in the theory of q -characters (e.g. see [15], [55]).

Let $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-$ be an anti-dominant (bar-invariant) \mathcal{Y}_t -monomial. We denote by $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-)$ the unique element of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by the *reversed t-algorithm* (referred above) with respect to $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-$. Then one can verify that $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-)$ satisfies similar properties to (5.1) after modifying notations and terminologies associated with $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-$. For example, the property (3) in (5.1) associated with $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-$ is restated as every monomial appearing in $F_t(\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-) - \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-$ is strictly *greater* than $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_-$ with respect to \prec_N . Throughout this section, we often refer to these properties.

Theorem 5.2. [58, Theorem 3.1] [27, Theorem 4.1, Lemma 4.4] For $(\iota, p), (\iota, s) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p < s$, the element $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s]) \in \mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ is of the form

$$F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s]) = \underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s] * (1 + \widetilde{A}_{\iota, s+1}^{-1} * \chi),$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s] := \underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s]$ and χ is a (non-commutative) $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -polynomial in $\widetilde{A}_{j, k+1}^{-1}$ ($j, k \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$). In particular, we have

$$F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s]) = F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota^*)}[p + \mathbf{h}, s + \mathbf{h}]),$$

where $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota^*)}[p + \mathbf{h}, s + \mathbf{h}] := (\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota^*)}[p + \mathbf{h}, s + \mathbf{h}])_-$. Furthermore, $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s])$ satisfies the following properties:

- (1) $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s])$ has the unique (anti-)dominant monomial $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s]$ (resp. $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota^*)}[p + \mathbf{h}, s + \mathbf{h}]$).
- (2) Each \mathcal{Y}_t -monomial of $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s]) - \underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s] - \underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota^*)}[p + \mathbf{h}, s + \mathbf{h}]$ is a product of $\widetilde{Y}_{j, u}^{\pm 1}$ with $p \leq u \leq s + \mathbf{h}$, having at least one of its factors from $p < u < s + \mathbf{h}$, and is right-negative. In particular, each \mathcal{Y}_t -monomial of $F_t(\widetilde{Y}_{\iota, p}) - \widetilde{Y}_{\iota, p} - \widetilde{Y}_{\iota^*, p+\mathbf{h}}$ is a product of $\widetilde{Y}_{j, u}^{\pm 1}$ with $p < u < p + \mathbf{h}$.
- (3) For $((\iota, p), (j, p) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0, j \neq \iota)$, $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s])$ and $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(j)}[p, s])$ commute; i.e., $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s]) * F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(j)}[p, s]) = F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(j)}[p, s]) * F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s])$.

It is well known that, for $r \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ and $\iota \in \Delta_0$,

$$(5.3) \quad \mathsf{T}_r(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p, s])) = F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(\iota)}[p + r, s + r]),$$

where T_r is the $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra automorphism of \mathcal{Y}_t sending $\widetilde{Y}_{i, p}$ to $\widetilde{Y}_{i, p+r}$.

Theorem 5.3. [25, Theorem 5.11]

- (a) For every dominant (resp. anti-dominant) monomials $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{Y}_t$, $F_t(\widetilde{\mathbf{m}})$ is the unique element in $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ such that $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ is the unique dominant (resp. anti-dominant) monomial of $F_t(\widetilde{\mathbf{m}})$.
- (b) Every monomial appearing in $F_t(\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}) - \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ is strictly less (resp. strictly greater) than $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}$ with respect to $\prec_{\mathbb{N}}$.
- (c) The set $\mathbf{F}_t := \{F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \underline{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ forms a bar-invariant $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -basis of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$.


Remark 5.4. We remark that an element in $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ is characterized by the multiplicities of its dominant monomials by Theorem 5.3. Then it yields that $\text{ev}_{t=1}(F_t(\widetilde{\mathbf{m}})) = F(\text{ev}_{t=1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}))$.

Example 5.5. We present $F_t(\widetilde{Y}_{2,0})$ of type D_4 (cf. [57, Example 5.3.2]) by organizing the monomials appearing in $F_t(\widetilde{Y}_{2,0})$ as a directed graph $\Gamma(\widetilde{Y}_{2,0})$ such that $F_t(\widetilde{Y}_{2,0})$ is the sum of the monomials on the vertices of the directed graph, see (5.5). Note that in this example, we write the \mathcal{Y}_t -monomials according to the order given by

$$(5.4) \quad (\iota, p) < (j, s) \iff (p < s) \text{ or } (p = s \text{ and } \iota < j).$$

We use the convention of [17, 57] for the directed oriented graph $\Gamma(\widetilde{Y}_{2,0})$: For monomials $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_1$ and $\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_2$, we use an colored directed edge $f(t) \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_1 \xrightarrow{\iota, k} g(t) \widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_2$ if $\text{ev}_{t=1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_2) = \text{ev}_{t=1}(\widetilde{\mathbf{m}}_1 \widetilde{A}_{\iota, k}^{-1})$, where

$f(t), g(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$. Then the directed colored graphs $\Gamma(\tilde{Y}_{2,0})$ of $F_t(\tilde{Y}_{2,0})$ is given as below:



For a dominant monomial $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathbf{g}}$, we set

$$(5.6) \quad E_t(\mathbf{m}) := t^a \left(\overset{\rightarrow}{*} \left(\underset{p \in \mathbb{Z}}{*} \left(\underset{i \in I^{\mathbf{g}}; (i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0}{*} F_t(\tilde{Y}_{i,p})^{u_{i,p}(\mathbf{m})} \right) \right) \right),$$

where a is an element in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ such that \mathbf{m} appears in $E_t(\mathbf{m})$ with the coefficient 1. Here $\overset{\rightarrow}{*} F_t(\tilde{Y}_{i,p})^{u_{i,p}(\mathbf{m})}$ is well-defined by Theorem 5.2 (3). Note that $E_t(\mathbf{m})$ contains \mathbf{m} as its maximal monomial with respect to $\prec_{\mathbb{N}}$. In particular, by Theorem 5.3, we have

$$(5.7) \quad E_t(\mathbf{m}) = F_t(\mathbf{m}) + \sum_{\mathbf{m}' \prec_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{m}} C_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'} F_t(\mathbf{m}')$$

with $C_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'} \in \mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$. Note that the set $\mathbf{E}_t := \{E_t(\mathbf{m}) \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+\}$ also forms a $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -basis since

$$(5.8) \quad \#\{\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{M}_+ \mid \mathbf{m}' \prec_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{m}\} < \infty \quad \text{for each } \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+.$$

We call \mathbf{E}_t the *standard basis* of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathbf{g})$.

Note that $Y_{i,p}$ is a minimal element in \mathcal{M}_+ with respect to the partial order $\prec_{\mathbb{N}}$. Thus (5.7) tells that

$$E_t(Y_{i,p}) = F_t(Y_{i,p}).$$

Using the bases \mathbf{F}_t and \mathbf{E}_t , the third basis $\mathbf{L}_t := \{L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})\}$ of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ have been constructed in an inductive way using $\prec_{\mathbb{N}}$ such that

$$(5.9) \quad E_t(\underline{Y}_{i,p}) = F_t(\underline{Y}_{i,p}) = L_t(\underline{Y}_{i,p})$$

and $L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ for general $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+$ is characterized as in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.6. [59] (see also [25]) *For a dominant monomial $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}$, there exists a unique element $L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ in $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$ such that $\overline{L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})} = L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ and*

$$(5.10) \quad E_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) = L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) + \sum_{\mathbf{m}' \prec_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbf{m}} P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t) L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}'}) \quad \text{with } P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t) \in t\mathbb{Z}[t].$$

We call \mathbf{L}_t the *canonical basis* of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$.

Remark 5.7. In a highly influential paper [49], Kazhdan and Lusztig conjectured a realization of the composition multiplicities of Verma modules for \mathfrak{g} in terms of a certain class of polynomials defined by Iwahori–Hecke algebras, so-called *Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials* (KL polynomials, for short). The *Kazhdan–Lusztig conjecture* is that the specialization of the KL polynomials at 1 coincides with the composition multiplicities of Verma modules. This is proved independently by Beilinson–Bernstein [2, 3] and Brylinski–Kashiwara [6]. Moreover, it is shown in [50] that the KL polynomials can be interpreted as the Poincaré polynomials for local intersection cohomology of Schubert varieties. This geometric interpretation gives the positivity of the KL polynomials.

A similar story has been developed in the representation theory of quantum loop algebras. In [57, 56, 59], it is proved by Nakajima that the specialization of $P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t)$ at $t = 1$ gives the composition multiplicity of $L(\underline{\mathbf{m}'})$ in the standard module $E(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$. Furthermore, $P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t)$ coincides with the Poincaré polynomial of intersection cohomology of graded quiver varieties, which implies the positivity of $P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t)$. Consequently, the polynomials $P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t)$'s may be viewed as analogs of KL polynomials. It is worthwhile to remark that the recent development associated with $P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t)$ in the direction of quantum loop algebras beyond ADE-types, see [18, 19].

Theorem 5.8. [59]

- (a) *For a dominant monomial $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}$, every monomial in $L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ has a quantum positive coefficient; that means, each coefficient of a monomial in $L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ contained in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$. In particular, we have $\text{ev}_{t=1}(L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})) = \chi_q(L(\underline{\mathbf{m}}))$.*
- (b) *For each monomial $\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$, we have $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]) = L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s])$.*
- (c) *The coefficient $P_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{m}'}(t)$ in (5.10) is actually contained in $t\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[t]$.*

Remark 5.9. Let recapitulate the main points in this subsection. From the t -algorithm, we obtain a basis $\{F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$. One crucial step is to prove that $F_t(\underline{Y}_{i,p})$ is contained in $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$. Then it is proved in [59, 25] that there are frameworks for constructing other two bases $\{E_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ and $\{L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$. In particular, the basis $\{L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ is constructed using the other two bases through the induction on \mathcal{M}_+ via $\prec_{\mathbb{N}}$, and there are uni-triangular transition maps (5.7) and (5.10) between the three bases.

As $L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ can be understood as a t -quantization of $L(\underline{\mathbf{m}})$ by Theorem 5.8(a), the T -system among KR modules is also t -quantized as follows:

Theorem 5.10. [29, Proposition 5.6] (see also [58, Section 4]) For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p < s$, there exists an equation in $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$:

$$(5.11) \quad L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]) * L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}(p, s)) = t^x L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]) * L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}(p, s)) + t^y \prod_{j, d(i, j)=1} L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(j)}(p, s)),$$

where $L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(j)}(p, s))$ and $L_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(j')}(p, s))$ ($j, j' \in I$) are pairwise commute and

$$y = \frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,i}(2(s-p)+1) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,i}(2(s-p)-1)}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad x = y - 1.$$

5.2. Bases of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Assume that \mathfrak{g} is of *non-simply-laced finite type*. Since $\mathbb{C}(q)$ can not be identified with $\underline{\mathbb{C}}(t)$ anymore,

we come back to the convention of the previous sections (not the previous subsection).

Let $\mathfrak{K}_q^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$ be a completion of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ defined by the method in [25, Section 5.2]. By following the construction of $\{F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \mid \underline{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ in [24, 25], we can establish an analog of the t -algorithm in [25, Definition 5.19] on $\mathfrak{K}_q^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$, called q -algorithm under the setting of Section 4.2. Roughly speaking, the algorithm is given inductively by computing all possible quantized i -expansions (cf. [25, Lemma 4.13]) while determining “correct” coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ of resulting monomials [25, Definition 5.19] (cf. [15, Section 5.5]).

The q -algorithm employs the t -algorithm by considering the another quantization $\underline{\mathbb{C}}(t)$ of the Cartan matrix \mathbb{C} . Thus, in the computational view point, $\widetilde{X}_{i,p}$ and $q_i \widetilde{B}_{i,p}$ in the q -algorithm play the roles of $\widetilde{Y}_{i,p}$ and $t \widetilde{A}_{i,p}$ in the t -algorithm:

$$(5.12) \quad \widetilde{Y}_{i,p} \longmapsto \widetilde{X}_{i,p}, \quad t \widetilde{A}_{i,p} \longmapsto q_i \widetilde{B}_{i,p}.$$

We say that

- (a) the q -algorithm is *well-defined for step s* if the k -th coefficients defined as in [25, Definition 5.19] with (5.12) are verified for all $k \leq s$,
- (b) the q -algorithm *never fails* if it is well-defined for all steps.

When the q -algorithm never fails, it yields, for each dominant monomial \widetilde{m} in \mathcal{X}_q ,

$$(5.13) \quad F_q(\widetilde{m}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q^\infty(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigcap_{i \in I} \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}^\infty(\mathfrak{g}),$$

containing \widetilde{m} as a unique dominant monomial in $F_q(\widetilde{m})$. Here, $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$ is the completion of $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ satisfying $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}^\infty(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \mathcal{X}_q = \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g}) = \text{Ker}(S_{i,q})$ (see Lemma 5.32 below for more detail). It is straightforward to check that the q -algorithm is well-defined and never fails by following the framework of [25, Section 5.3]. Since the proof is quite parallel to [25], the details are left to the reader. As a result, we have the following.

Proposition 5.11. *Let $\mathfrak{K}_q^{\infty, f}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -submodule of $\mathfrak{K}_q^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$ generated by elements in $\mathfrak{K}_q^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$ with finitely many dominant monomials. Then the set*

$$\{F_q(\widetilde{m}) \mid \widetilde{m} \text{ is a dominant monomial in } \mathcal{X}_q\}$$

is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -basis of $\mathfrak{K}_q^{\infty, f}(\mathfrak{g})$. Indeed, $\mathfrak{K}_q^{\infty, f}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{K}_q^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$

Instead of the rigorous proofs of the above results, let us illustrate the q -algorithm in Example 5.12 below by using results and notations in the parts after the example, frequently.

Example 5.12. We consider $F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5})$ for type G_2 . Let us briefly summarize the procedure of q -algorithm. For \mathcal{X} -monomials m_1 and m_2 , we use an colored directed edge $m_1 \xrightarrow{i,p} m_2$ if $m_2 = m_1 B_{i,p}^{-1}$. For \mathcal{X} -monomials m and m' , we say that m' is generated from m if there exists a finite sequence $\{(i_1, p_1), (i_2, p_2), \dots, (i_\ell, p_\ell)\} \subset I \times \mathbb{Z}$ such that

$$m = m_0 \xrightarrow{i_1, p_1} m_1 \xrightarrow{i_2, p_2} \dots \xrightarrow{i_{\ell-1}, p_{\ell-1}} m_\ell = m',$$

where m_k is a \mathcal{X} -monomial of $E_J(m_{k-1})$ defined in (5.31) for $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ for some $J \subset I$. We collect all possible \mathcal{X} -monomials generated from $X_{2,5}$, and then enumerate them by

$$(5.14) \quad \dots < m_v < \dots < m_0 = X_{2,5},$$

where $<$ is a total order compatible with $\prec_{\mathbb{N}}$ at $q = 1$. Let \tilde{m}_v be a \mathcal{X}_q -monomial determined inductively from $F_{J,q}(\tilde{m}_u) \in \bigcap_{i \in J} \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ for some $u < v$ and $J \subset I$, where $F_{J,q}(\tilde{m}_u)$ contains \tilde{m}_u as a unique J -dominant monomial. Note that \tilde{m}_v is uniquely determined up to a coefficient in $q^{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}}$. For this reason, we fix an order (5.4) on spectral parameters to write them uniquely.

Put $J \subsetneq I$. We denote by $(s(m_v)(q))_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ and $(s_J(m_v)(q))_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ sequences in $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]^{\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ defined inductively as follows:

$$(5.15) \quad \begin{aligned} s_J(m_v)(q) &= \sum_{u < v} (s(m_u)(q) - s_J(m_u)) c_J(q)(m_v), \\ s(m_v)(q) &= \begin{cases} s_J(m_v)(q) & \text{if } m_v \text{ is not } J\text{-dominant,} \\ 0 & \text{if } m_v \text{ is dominant,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $s(m_0)(q) = 1$, $s_J(m_0)(q) = 0$ and $c_J(q)(m_v)$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -coefficient of \tilde{m}_v in $F_{J,q}(\tilde{m}_u)$. Here we assume that $F_{J,q}(\tilde{m}_u) = 0$ if m_u is not J -dominant, so $c_J(q)(m_u) = 0$ in this case. Note that the sequences $(s(m_v)(q))_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ and $(s_J(m_v)(q))_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ are well-defined, and $s(m_v)(q)$ does not depend on the choice of $J \subsetneq I$ (e.g. see Remark 5.13). Finally, we verify that the sum of all $s(\tilde{m}_v)(q) \tilde{m}_v$ for $v \geq 0$ is in $\ker(S_{i,q})$ for all $i \in I$ (e.g. see (5.16)). In other words, $F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5}) = \sum_{v \geq 0} s(\tilde{m}_v)(q) \tilde{m}_v \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

We emphasize that the monomials in (5.14) might be infinitely countable, but non-zero $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -coefficients of them should be finite (see Proposition 5.16). Thus, the formula on the right-hand side makes sense, and it is actually a finite sum. For $n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, we use $\tilde{X}_{i,p}^n$ to denote $\tilde{X}_{i,p}^{*n}$ for simplicity. In fact, one may observe that $F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5}) \in \ker(S_{i,q})$ for $i = 1, 2$ (see the complete computation in [34]). For example, $F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5})$ is written as

$$(5.16) \quad \begin{aligned} F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5}) &= F_{1,q}(\tilde{X}_{2,5}) + q^3 F_{1,q}(\tilde{X}_{1,6}^3 * \tilde{X}_{2,7}^{-1}) + (q^{-3} + q^{-1} + q) F_{1,q}(\tilde{X}_{1,6} * \tilde{X}_{1,8} * \tilde{X}_{2,9}^{-1}) \\ &\quad + (q^{-3} + q^3) F_{1,q}(\tilde{X}_{2,7} * \tilde{X}_{2,9}^{-1}) + q^6 F_{1,q}(\tilde{X}_{1,8}^3 * \tilde{X}_{2,9}^{-2}) + q^{-3} F_{1,q}(\tilde{X}_{2,11}^{-1}) \end{aligned}$$

which is clearly in $\ker(S_{1,q})$ (recall Proposition 5.31). The case of $i = 2$ is similar. In general, for a dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \tilde{m} , the q -algorithm allows us to write $F_q(\tilde{m})$ as a linear combination of $F_{i,q}(\cdot)$'s over $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$. This fact plays a crucial role in the construction of $F_q(\tilde{m})$. We present that the directed colored graphs $\Gamma(X_{2,5})$ and $\Gamma(\tilde{X}_{2,5})$ of $F(X_{2,5}) \in \mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ are given

as follows, respectively:

$$(5.17) \quad \begin{array}{c} X_{2,5} \\ \downarrow 2,6 \\ X_{1,6}^3 X_{2,7}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,7 \\ 3X_{1,6}^2 X_{1,8}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,7 \\ 3X_{1,6} X_{2,7} X_{1,8}^{-2} \\ \swarrow 1,7 \quad \searrow 2,8 \\ \begin{array}{c} X_{2,7}^2 X_{1,8}^{-3} \\ \downarrow 2,8 \\ 2X_{2,7} X_{2,9}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 2,8 \\ X_{1,8}^3 X_{2,9}^{-2} \\ \swarrow 1,9 \quad \searrow 2,8 \\ \begin{array}{c} 3X_{1,8}^2 X_{2,9}^{-1} X_{1,10}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,9 \\ 3X_{1,8} X_{1,10}^{-2} \\ \downarrow 1,9 \\ X_{2,9} X_{1,10}^{-3} \\ \downarrow 2,10 \\ X_{2,11}^{-1} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} 3X_{1,6} X_{1,8} X_{2,9}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,9 \\ 3X_{1,6} X_{1,10}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,7 \\ 3X_{2,7} X_{1,8}^{-1} X_{1,10}^{-1} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \tilde{X}_{2,5} \\ \downarrow 2,6 \\ q^3 \tilde{X}_{1,6}^3 * \tilde{X}_{2,7}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,7 \\ (q^{-2} + 1 + q^2) \tilde{X}_{1,6}^2 * \tilde{X}_{1,8}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,7 \\ (1 + q^2 + q^4) \tilde{X}_{1,6} * \tilde{X}_{2,7} * \tilde{X}_{1,8}^{-2} \\ \swarrow 1,7 \quad \searrow 2,8 \\ \begin{array}{c} q^9 \tilde{X}_{2,7}^2 * \tilde{X}_{1,8}^{-3} \\ \downarrow 2,8 \\ (q^{-3} + q^3) \tilde{X}_{2,7} * \tilde{X}_{2,9}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 2,8 \\ q^6 \tilde{X}_{1,8}^3 * \tilde{X}_{2,9}^{-2} \\ \swarrow 1,9 \quad \searrow 2,8 \\ \begin{array}{c} (q^{-2} + 1 + q^2) \tilde{X}_{1,8}^2 * \tilde{X}_{2,9}^{-1} * \tilde{X}_{1,10}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,9 \\ (q^{-3} + q^{-1} + 1) \tilde{X}_{1,8} * \tilde{X}_{1,10}^{-2} \\ \downarrow 1,9 \\ q^3 \tilde{X}_{2,9} * \tilde{X}_{1,10}^{-3} \\ \downarrow 2,10 \\ q^{-3} \tilde{X}_{2,11}^{-1} \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} (q^{-3} + q^{-1} + q) \tilde{X}_{1,6} * \tilde{X}_{1,8} * \tilde{X}_{2,9}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,9 \\ (q^{-4} + q^{-2} + 1) \tilde{X}_{1,6} * \tilde{X}_{1,10}^{-1} \\ \downarrow 1,7 \\ (q^{-2} + 1 + q^2) \tilde{X}_{2,7} * \tilde{X}_{1,8}^{-1} * \tilde{X}_{1,10}^{-1} \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}$$

Here $F(X_{2,5})$ is obtained from $\text{ev}_{t=1}(\mathbb{T}_5(F_t(\tilde{Y}_{2,0})))$ (see Example 5.5 for $F_t(\tilde{Y}_{2,0})$) by folding the \mathcal{Y} -monomials (recall Remark 5.4).

Remark 5.13. Each $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -coefficient determined by the q -algorithm does not depend on the choice of J , which can be proved as in [25, Lemma 5.20]. Let us recall that $F(X_{i,p})$ is obtained from $F(Y_{i,p})$ by folding the monomials of $F(Y_{i,p})$ via (3.5) (see Corollary 3.10). However, we would like to emphasize that we do not know yet whether $F_q(\tilde{X}_{i,p})$ could be obtained directly from $F_t(\tilde{Y}_{i,p})$ by folding \mathcal{Y}_t -monomials with some modification of coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$.

Definition 5.14. For $f \in \mathcal{X}_q$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}(f) &:= \{\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}) \mid \tilde{m} \text{ is a monomial in } f\}, & \underline{\mathcal{M}}(f) &:= \{\underline{m} \mid m \in \mathcal{M}(f)\}, \\ \mathcal{M}_+(f) &:= \{\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}) \mid \tilde{m} \text{ is a dominant monomial in } f\}, & \underline{\mathcal{M}}_+(f) &:= \{\underline{m} \mid m \in \underline{\mathcal{M}}_+(f)\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $P \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, a monomial m in P is called *maximal monomial* (resp. *minimal monomial*) if its weight is not lower (resp. not higher) than any other monomial in P with respect to \preccurlyeq_N .

Lemma 5.15. (cf. [15, Lemma 5.6]) *For $P \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, any maximal (resp. minimal) monomial in P is dominant (resp. anti-dominant).*

Proof. Let us first consider a maximal monomial in P , denoted by \tilde{m} . Take $i \in I$. By Definition 4.9 and Proposition 4.6, we have

$$P \in \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}][\tilde{X}_{j,l}^{\pm 1}]_{(j,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0, j \neq i} \otimes \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}][\tilde{X}_{i,l} + q_i^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,l} * \tilde{B}_{i,l+1}^{-1}]_{(i,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0}.$$

Hence, the element P can be written in the following form:

$$P = \sum \tilde{m}_{(1)} * \tilde{p}_{(2)},$$

where $\tilde{m}_{(1)} \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}][\tilde{X}_{j,l}]_{(j,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0, j \neq i}$ are monomials and, $\tilde{p}_{(2)} \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}][\tilde{X}_{i,l} + q_i^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,l} * \tilde{B}_{i,l+1}^{-1}]_{(i,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0}$ are of the form

$$\tilde{p}_{(2)} = n c(q) \underset{\substack{\rightarrow \\ (i,l) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0, \\ \text{finite}}}{*} (\tilde{X}_{i,l} + q_i^{-1} \tilde{X}_{i,l} * \tilde{B}_{i,l+1}^{-1})^{n_{i,l}}$$

for some $n_{i,l} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c(q) \in q^{\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}}$. In particular, the maximal monomial \tilde{m} is a monomial in $\tilde{m}_{(1)} * \tilde{p}_{(2)}$. Since $X_{i,l} B_{i,l+1}^{-1} \prec_N X_{i,l}$ the monomial \tilde{m} should be obtained from $\tilde{m}_{(1)}$ and $\tilde{X}_{i,l}$'s. Otherwise, it contradicts the assumption that m is a maximal monomial. Since $i \in I$ is arbitrary and $P \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, the maximal monomial m should be dominant. In the case of minimal monomials, the proof is almost identical because of another characterization of $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ in Remark (4.11). \square

For an interval $[a, b]$, $i \in I$, $(i, t) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we define

$$(5.18) \quad m^{(i)}[a, b] := \prod_{\substack{(i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0 \\ p \in [a,b]}} X_{i,p} \quad \text{and} \quad m_{k,t}^{(i)} := \prod_{s=0}^{k-1} X_{i,t+2s}.$$

We define $m^{(i)}(a, b)$, $m^{(i)}[a, b]$, and $m^{(i)}(a, b)$ in a similar way.

The following proposition plays a crucial role in proving fundamental results established on $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

Proposition 5.16. *For $p < s$, let $m^{(i)}[p, s]$ be given such that $\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) = m^{(i)}[p, s]$ (i.e. $\bar{i} = i$).*

- (1) *For each $m' \in \mathcal{M}(F_q(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]))$, there exists $\mathbf{m}' \in \mathcal{M}(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]))$ such that $\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}') = m'$.*
- (2) *We have $F_q(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. We will give a proof of Proposition 5.16 in Section 5.3. \square

Definition 5.17. We call an element of the form $F_q(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s])$ a *KR-polynomial*. In particular, we call $F_q(X_{i,p})$ a *fundamental polynomial*. We also call a monomial of the form $m^{(i)}[p, s]$ a *KR-monomial*.

Corollary 5.18. *For $p < s$, let $m^{(i)}[p, s]$ be such that $\bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) = m^{(i)}[p, s]$ (i.e. $\bar{i} = i$). Then we have*

$$\bar{\sigma} \left(\mathcal{M}(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s])) \right) = \mathcal{M}(F_q(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s])).$$

Proof. The inclusion \supset follows from Proposition 5.16 (1). Let us prove the opposite inclusion \subset . Let $m \in \bar{\sigma} \left(\mathcal{M}(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s])) \right)$ be an \mathcal{X} -monomial, where we write $m = \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m})$ for some \mathcal{Y} -monomial $\mathbf{m} \in \mathcal{M}(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]))$. We have seen

$$(5.19) \quad \text{ev}_{t=1} \left(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s]) \right) = F(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$$

(see Remark 5.4), and then the quantum positivity for $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p, s])$ in Theorem 5.8 with (5.19) implies that all the coefficients of $F(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ should be positive. In particular, the coefficient of \mathbf{m} in $F(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ is positive. Since it follows from Corollary 3.10 and Theorem 5.2 that

$$(5.20) \quad \bar{\sigma} \left(F(\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) \right) = F(m^{(i)}[p, s]),$$

the \mathcal{X} -monomial m appears in $F(m^{(i)}[p, s])$ with a positive coefficient. But, we have

$$\text{ev}_{q=1} \left(F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) \right) = F(m^{(i)}[p, s])$$

(see Corollary 5.24), which implies that there exists a term $f(q)\underline{m}$ in $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ such that $\text{ev}_{q=1}(f(q)\underline{m}) = f(1)m$ is a term in $F(m^{(i)}[p, s])$ with $f(1) > 0$. \square

Proposition 5.19. *For each $(i, p) \in \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0$, we have*

- (a) $F_q(\mathcal{X}_{i,p}) = F_q(\mathcal{X}_{i^*,p+h}^{-1})$ contains only one anti-dominant monomial $\mathcal{X}_{i^*,p+h}^{-1}$.
- (b) All \mathcal{X}_q -monomials of $F_q(\mathcal{X}_{i,p}) - \mathcal{X}_{i,p} - \mathcal{X}_{i,p+h}^{-1}$ are products of $\tilde{X}_{j,u}^{\pm 1}$ with $p < u < p+h$.
- (c) $F_q(\tilde{X}_{i,p})$ and $F_q(\tilde{X}_{j,p})$ ($(i, p), (j, p) \in \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0, j \neq i$) commute.


Proof. Since $F_q(\mathcal{X}_{i,p})$ is an element in $\mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, it contains an anti-dominant monomial by Lemma 5.15. Then Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 5.16 tell that $F_q(\mathcal{X}_{i,p})$ has the unique antidominant monomial $\mathcal{X}_{i^*,p+h}^{-1}$. Thus (a) follows. By (3.9), (b) follows from (a), Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 5.16. Finally, (c) follows from the same argument as in [25, Lemma 5.12 (iv)]. \square

Example 5.20. As in Example 5.12, one may compute the formula of $F_q(\tilde{X}_{1,10})$ given by

$$\tilde{X}_{1,10} + q^2 \tilde{X}_{2,11} \tilde{X}_{1,12}^{-1} + q^2 \tilde{X}_{1,12}^2 \tilde{X}_{2,13}^{-1} + (q^{-1} + q) \tilde{X}_{1,12} \tilde{X}_{1,14}^{-1} + q^3 \tilde{X}_{2,13} \tilde{X}_{1,14}^{-2} + \tilde{X}_{1,14} \tilde{X}_{2,15}^{-1} + q^{-1} \tilde{X}_{1,16}^{-1}.$$

Then $F_q(\mathcal{X}_{1,10}) = (\mathcal{X}_{1,10} * \tilde{X}_{1,10}^{-1}) F_q(\tilde{X}_{1,10}) = q^{\frac{1}{2}} F_q(\tilde{X}_{1,10}) \in \mathfrak{R}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is bar-invariant. Note that $\tilde{X}_{1,10} * \tilde{X}_{2,10} = \tilde{X}_{2,10} * \tilde{X}_{1,10}$ and there is no dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial in $\mathcal{M}_+(F_q(\tilde{X}_{1,10}) * F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,10}))$ except for $\tilde{X}_{1,10} * \tilde{X}_{2,10}$ (cf. Example 5.12). Hence we have $F_q(\tilde{X}_{1,10}) * F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,10}) = F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,10}) * F_q(\tilde{X}_{1,10})$.

Example 5.21. By the q -algorithm starting from $\tilde{X}_{i,p}$ as in Example 5.12, one can compute the explicit formulas of $F_q(\tilde{X}_{i,p})$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$ of the finite type B_3 as follows:



For a dominant monomial $m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}$, we set

$$(5.21) \quad E_q(\underline{m}) := q^b \left(\begin{array}{c} \vec{*} \\ * \\ p \in \mathbb{Z} \end{array} \left(\begin{array}{c} * \\ i \in I; (i,p) \in \Delta_0 \end{array} F_q(X_{i,p})^{u_{i,p}(m)} \right) \right) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}),$$

where b is an element in $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ such that \underline{m} appears in $E_q(\underline{m})$ with the coefficient 1. By Proposition 5.16, we have

$$(5.22) \quad E_q(\underline{m}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$$

and there are finitely many dominant monomials in $E_q(\underline{m})$. As we regard $E_q(\underline{m})$ as an element of $\mathfrak{K}_q^{\infty, f}(\mathfrak{g})$ (recall Proposition 5.11), we obtain a uni-triangular transition map as in (5.7) between $\{E_q(\underline{m})\}$ and $\{F_q(\underline{m})\}$ in $\mathfrak{K}_q^{\infty, f}(\mathfrak{g})$ by Proposition 5.11:

$$(5.23) \quad E_q(\underline{m}) = F_q(\underline{m}) + \sum_{m' \prec_N m} C_{m,m'} F_q(\underline{m}') \quad \text{in } \mathfrak{K}_q^{\infty, f}(\mathfrak{g}),$$

where $C_{m,m'} \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$. Note that the summation in (5.23) is finite since $E_q(\underline{m})$ has finitely many dominant monomials. Hence, (5.23) implies that $F_q(\underline{m})$ can be written as a linear combination of $E_q(\underline{m}')$ for $\underline{m}' \prec_N \underline{m}$, so $F_q(\underline{m}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by (5.21) and (5.22). Until now, we have proved the following.

Proposition 5.22. *The sets*

$$E_q := \{E_q(\underline{m}) \mid m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\} \quad \text{and} \quad F_q := \{F_q(\underline{m}) \mid m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$$

are $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -bases of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, respectively.

In particular, we call E_q the *standard basis* of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Now let us further investigate the basis F_q of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, which is characterized as follows:

Theorem 5.23. *Let $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ be a dominant (resp. anti-dominant) monomial.*

- (a) *The Laurent (non-commutative) polynomial $F_q(\tilde{m})$ is the unique element in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ such that \tilde{m} is the unique dominant (resp. anti-dominant) monomial occurring in $F_q(\tilde{m})$.*
- (b) *Every monomial in $F_q(\tilde{m}) - \tilde{m}$ is strictly less (resp. greater) than \tilde{m} with respect to \prec_N .*
- (c) *The set F_q forms a bar-invariant $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -basis of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. We prove only the dominant case because the proof for the anti-dominant case is almost identical. Let us first prove (a). Thanks to (5.23), $F_q(\tilde{m})$ can be written as a linear combination of $E_q(\tilde{m}')$ for $\tilde{m}' \prec_N \tilde{m}$, where the sum is finite due to Proposition 5.16((2)). Hence, $F_q(\tilde{m}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Note that $F_q(\tilde{m})$ has the unique dominant monomial \tilde{m} by its construction through the q -algorithm (see (5.15)). Let $G_q(\tilde{m})$ be another element in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ such that \tilde{m} is the unique dominant monomial occurring in $G_q(\tilde{m})$. Then $F_q(\tilde{m}) - G_q(\tilde{m}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ has no dominant monomial and should be 0 by Lemma 5.15, otherwise it has a dominant monomial different from \tilde{m} . Thus, the uniqueness of $F_q(\tilde{m})$ in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ follows. Second, the (b) is a direct consequence of the q -algorithm.

Finally, let us prove the (c). The linear independence follows from the uniqueness of the dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial of $F_q(\underline{m})$. Take an element $\chi \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. We enumerate $\mathcal{M}_+(\chi)$ by m_0, m_1, \dots, m_L . Let us write $\lambda_k \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ be the coefficients of \underline{m}_k in χ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, L$. Then, the element $\chi - \sum_{k=0}^L \lambda_k F_q(\underline{m}_k) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ has no dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial. If it is non-zero, then it has at least one dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial by Lemma 5.15, which yields a contradiction. Hence, we conclude that the set $\{F_q(\underline{m}) \mid m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ generates $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. \square

Corollary 5.24. *Let $\tilde{m} \in \mathcal{X}_q$ be a dominant monomial. Then we have*

$$\text{ev}_{q=1}(F_q(\tilde{m})) = F(\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m})).$$

Proof. It follows from (4.17) that $\text{ev}_{q=1}(F_q(\tilde{m})) \in \mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$, where $\text{ev}_{q=1}(F_q(\tilde{m}))$ has the unique dominant monomial $\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}) \in \mathcal{X}$ by Theorem 5.23 (a). Thus our assertion is proved from Theorem 3.9(2). \square

As in the simply-laced cases (5.3), we have

$$(5.24) \quad \mathbb{T}_r(F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p+r, s+r]) \quad \text{for any } r \in 2\mathbb{Z},$$

where $r \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ and \mathbb{T}_r is the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra automorphism of \mathcal{X}_q sending $\tilde{X}_{i,p}$ to $\tilde{X}_{i,p+r}$.

Proposition 5.25. *For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0$ with $p < s$, the element $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ is of the form*

$$(5.25) \quad F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) = \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] * (1 + \tilde{B}_{i,s+1}^{-1} * \chi)$$

where χ is a (non-commutative) $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -polynomial in $\tilde{B}_{j,k+1}^{-1}$, $(j, k) \in \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0$. In particular, we have

$$(5.26) \quad F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i^*)}[p+h, s+h])$$

and

- (1) $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ contains the unique dominant monomial $\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$,
- (2) $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ contains the unique anti-dominant monomial $\underline{m}^{(i^*)}[p+h, s+h]$,
- (3) each \mathcal{X}_q -monomial of $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) - \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] - \underline{m}^{(i^*)}[p+h, s+h]$ is a product of $\tilde{X}_{j,u}^{\pm 1}$ with $p \leq u \leq s+h$, having at least one of its factors from $p < u < s+h$, and is right-negative. In particular, each monomial of $F_q(\tilde{X}_{i,p}) - \tilde{X}_{i,p} - \tilde{X}_{i^*,p+h}$ is a product of $\tilde{X}_{j,u}^{\pm 1}$ with $p < u < p+h$.

Proof. (1) follows from Theorem 5.23 (a). (2) and (5.26) follow from the reversed version of the q -algorithm (see Remark 5.1) and (1). Finally, (5.25) and (3) are the direct consequences of Theorem 5.2 and Proposition 5.16. \square

Conjecture 1. *For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0$ with $p < s$, every monomial in $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ has a quantum positive coefficient; that means, each coefficient of a monomial in $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ is contained in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$.*

Remark 5.26. In the proof of Corollary 5.18, we have seen that the coefficients of monomials in $F(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ are positive. In Section 8, we will provide a quantum cluster algebra theoretic algorithm for computing $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$, which starts from an initial quantum cluster variable $\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$ (see Proposition 8.5 below). This may be viewed as an evidence of Conjecture 1, which is compatible with the quantum positivity conjecture of quantum cluster algebras ([4]).

By the following theorem, we have the third basis, denoted by

$$\mathbb{L}_q := \{L_q(\underline{m}) \mid m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\},$$

and called the *canonical basis* of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. We remark that the reason why we call it the canonical basis is further explained in [33].

Theorem 5.27. *For $m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}$, there exists a unique element $L_q(\underline{m})$ in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ such that*

$$(a) \quad \overline{L_q(\underline{m})} = L_q(\underline{m}),$$

$$(b) \ E_q(\underline{m}) = L_q(\underline{m}) + \sum_{m' \prec_N m} P_{m,m'}(q) L_q(\underline{m}') \text{ with } P_{m,m'}(q) \in q\mathbb{Z}[q].$$

Proof. For $\underline{m} \in \mathcal{M}_+^g$, we will construct $L_q(\underline{m})$ inductively using some dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials below, which are all less than \underline{m} with respect to the Nakajima order \prec_N .

Step 1. Let us first collect all dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials obtained from \underline{m} in an inductive way. Let $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_1 := \underline{\mathcal{M}}_+(E_q(\underline{m})) = \{\underline{m}_{1,1}, \underline{m}_{1,2}, \dots, \underline{m}_{1,\ell_1} = \underline{m}\}$. Then we define

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}_n := \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq \ell_{n-1}} \underline{\mathcal{M}}_+(E_q(\underline{m}_{n-1,k})),$$

where $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_{n-1} = \{\underline{m}_{n-1,1}, \underline{m}_{n-1,2}, \dots, \underline{m}_{n-1,\ell_{n-1}}\}$ for $n \geq 2$. Note that

$$\underline{\mathcal{M}}_+(E_q(\underline{m})) = \underline{\mathcal{M}}_1 \subset \underline{\mathcal{M}}_2 \subset \underline{\mathcal{M}}_3 \subset \dots$$

The above chain has finite length, that is, there exists N such that $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_n = \underline{\mathcal{M}}_{n+1}$ for $n \geq N$ because we can apply the same argument as in the proof of [25, Lemma 3.13 and Lemma 3.14]. For simplicity, let us relabel the dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials in $\underline{\mathcal{M}}_N$ as follows:

$$(5.27) \quad \underline{m}_1 < \underline{m}_2 < \dots < \underline{m}_M = \underline{m}.$$

where $<$ is also a total order compatible with \prec_N . In particular, $E_q(\underline{m}_1)$ has no dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial other than \underline{m}_1 by construction.

Step 2. We construct $L_q(\underline{m})$ by inductive argument on (5.27) as follows. Since $E_q(\underline{m}_1)$ has the unique dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \underline{m}_1 by construction, we have $E_q(\underline{m}_1) = F_q(\underline{m}_1)$. If we set $L_q(\underline{m}_1) = E_q(\underline{m}_1)$, then the initial step is done because $\overline{E_q(\underline{m}_1)} = \overline{F_q(\underline{m}_1)} = F_q(\underline{m}_1) = E_q(\underline{m}_1)$.

Suppose that $L_q(\underline{m}_k)$ is well-defined and uniquely determined for $1 \leq k \leq M-1$. By the property (b), one can write

$$L_q(\underline{m}_k) = E_q(\underline{m}_k) + \sum_{\underline{m}_l \prec_N \underline{m}_k} Q_{\underline{m}_l, \underline{m}_k}(q) E_q(\underline{m}_l).$$

By (5.23), $L_q(\underline{m}_k)$ can be written as a linear combination of $F_q(\underline{m}_l)$ for $1 \leq l \leq k$. In particular, the coefficient of $F_q(\underline{m}_k)$ is 1 due to the property (a). Hence, the finiteness described in (5.27) implies that

$$(5.28) \quad F_q(\underline{m}_k) \text{ can be written as a linear combination of } L_q(\underline{m}_l) \text{ for } 1 \leq l \leq k.$$

By replacing $F_q(\underline{m}')$ in (5.23) with (5.28), we have

$$(5.29) \quad E_q(\underline{m}) = F_q(\underline{m}) + \sum_{1 \leq l \leq M-1} \alpha_l(q) L_q(\underline{m}_l).$$

Let us take $\beta_l(q) \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ such that $\beta_l(q)$ is symmetric in q and q^{-1} , and $\alpha_l(q) - \beta_l(q) \in q\mathbb{Z}[q]$ for all $1 \leq l \leq M-1$. This is possible by the following way. Let us write $\alpha_l(q)$ by $\alpha_l^+(q) + \alpha_l^0(q) + \alpha_l^-(q)$, where $\alpha_l^\pm(q) \in q^{\pm 1}\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ and $\alpha_l^0(q) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then we define $\beta_l(q) = \beta_l^+(q) + \beta_l^0(q) + \beta_l^-(q)$ by setting $\beta_l^+(q) = \alpha_l^-(q^{-1})$, $\beta_l^-(q) = \alpha_l^+(q)$ and $\beta_l^0(q) = \alpha_l^0(q)$. Now, we define

$$L_q(\underline{m}) = F_q(\underline{m}) + \sum_{1 \leq l \leq M-1} \beta_l(q) L_q(\underline{m}_l) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Then, $L_q(\underline{m})$ satisfies the properties (a) and (b) due to our choice of $\beta_l(q)$, which is the desired element of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Note that it follows from Proposition 5.22 and (b) that L_q is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -basis of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

Step 3. Let us prove the uniqueness of $L_q(\underline{m})$. Assume that $L'_q(\underline{m}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ satisfies (a) and (b). By (5.27) and (b), we have

$$L'_q(\underline{m}_1) = E_q(\underline{m}_1) = L_q(\underline{m}_1).$$

By induction on (5.27), we suppose that $L_q(\underline{m}_k) = L'_q(\underline{m}_k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq M-1$. By (b) and induction hypothesis, $E_q(\underline{m})$ is written as

$$E_q(\underline{m}) = L_q(\underline{m}) + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M-1} P_{m, m_k}(q) L_q(\underline{m}_k) = L'_q(\underline{m}) + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M-1} P'_{m, m_k}(q) L_q(\underline{m}_k),$$

where $P_{m, m_k}(q), P'_{m, m_k}(q) \in q\mathbb{Z}[q]$. Hence we have

$$(5.30) \quad L_q(\underline{m}) = L'_q(\underline{m}) + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M-1} (P'_{m, m_k}(q) - P_{m, m_k}(q)) L_q(\underline{m}_k).$$

By taking the bar involution on both sides of (5.30), it follows from (a) that for $1 \leq k \leq M-1$,

$$\overline{P'_{m, m_k}(q) - P_{m, m_k}(q)} = P_{m, m_k}(q) - P'_{m, m_k}(q) \in q\mathbb{Z}[q] \cap q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}[q^{-1}] = \{0\}.$$

This implies that $L'_q(\underline{m}) = L_q(\underline{m})$ by (5.30). \square

Remark 5.28. In the viewpoint of Kazhdan–Lusztig theory (explained briefly in Remark 5.7), we regard the polynomials $P_{m, m'}(q)$'s as new KL-type polynomials, which generalize Nakajima's KL-type polynomials, since the t -quantized Cartan matrices for types ADE are equal to the quantum Cartan matrices and the basis in Theorem 5.27 essentially coincides with Nakajima's as explained in [25, 26]. It would be very interesting to find a geometric or representation theoretic interpretation behind $P_{m, m'}(q)$ in the spirit of Kazhdan–Lusztig theory.

Remark 5.29. We emphasize that the basis $L_q = \{L_q(\underline{m}) \mid m \in \mathcal{M}_+^{\mathfrak{g}}\}$ of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is quite different from the L_t of $\mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq \mathcal{K}_t(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$, that is, $L_q(\underline{m})$ cannot be obtained from $L_t(\underline{m})$ by folding \mathcal{Y}_t -monomials with some modification of coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$, where $m = \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m})$. We give an example to illustrate this phenomenon. Let us consider $L_t(\tilde{Y}_{1,1})$ and $L_t(\tilde{Y}_{4,-2})$ of the finite type A_5 . One may observe that $L_t(\tilde{Y}_{1,1})$ q -commutes with $L_t(\tilde{Y}_{4,-2})$, which implies that $L_t(\tilde{Y}_{1,1} * \tilde{Y}_{4,-2})$ coincides with $L_t(\tilde{Y}_{1,1}) * L_t(\tilde{Y}_{4,-2})$ up to $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ [29, Corollary 5.5]. On the other hand, for type C_3 , $L_q(\tilde{X}_{1,1})$ does not q -commute with $L_q(\tilde{X}_{2,-2})$. This implies that $L_q(\tilde{X}_{1,1} * \tilde{X}_{2,-2})$ is not equal to $L_q(\tilde{X}_{1,1}) * L_q(\tilde{X}_{2,-2})$ up to $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$. In fact, $L_q(\tilde{X}_{1,1} * \tilde{X}_{2,-2})$ has two dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials, while $L_t(\tilde{Y}_{1,1} * \tilde{Y}_{4,-2})$ has only one dominant \mathcal{Y}_t -monomial.

Conjecture 2. For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_0$ with $p < s$, we have

$$L_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]),$$

where $\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] := \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$ denotes the bar-invariant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial corresponding to $m^{(i)}[p, s]$ (5.18) as in Remark 4.3.

Example 5.30. Let us illustrate Theorem 5.27 in the case of $L_q(\underline{X}_{2,5} \underline{X}_{1,10})$ for type G_2 .

Step 1. By (5.21), we have

$$E_q(\underline{X}_{2,5} \underline{X}_{1,10}) = q^{\frac{3}{2}} F_q(\mathbf{X}_{2,5}) * F_q(\mathbf{X}_{1,10}).$$

Let us recall the formulas of $F_q(\underline{X}_{2,5})$ and $F_q(\underline{X}_{1,10})$ in Examples 5.12 and 5.20, respectively. Then we observe that there exist two bar-invariant dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials with $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -coefficients in $E_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10})$, namely, $\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}$ and $(q^{-1} + q + q^3) \underline{X}_{1,6}$.

Step 2. By *Step 1*, we have

$$E_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}) = F_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}) + (q^{-1} + q + q^3) F_q(\underline{X}_{1,6}),$$

which corresponds to (5.29) in this case, that is, $M = 2$ and $\alpha_1(q) = q^{-1} + q + q^3$. Set $\beta_1(q) = q + q^{-1}$ by construction in the proof of Theorem 5.27. Then we have

$$L_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}) = F_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}) + (q^{-1} + q) F_q(\underline{X}_{1,6}),$$

which is bar-invariant. Note that $L_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10})$ has two dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials $\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}$ and $\underline{X}_{1,6}$. Moreover, we verify

$$E_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}) = L_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10}) + P_{X_{2,5}X_{1,10}, X_{1,6}}(q) L_q(\underline{X}_{1,6}),$$

where $P_{X_{2,5}X_{1,10}, X_{1,6}}(q) = q^3 \in q\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q]$, that is, $L_q(\underline{X}_{2,5}\underline{X}_{1,10})$ is the unique element in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ satisfying the properties (a) and (b) in Theorem 5.27.

5.3. Proof of Proposition 5.16. To prove Proposition 5.16, we utilize some analogues of the results in [25], where we will skip some proof of them when they can be obtained from the corresponding arguments in [25].

For $J^{\mathfrak{g}} \subset I^{\mathfrak{g}}$, we set $\overline{J^{\mathfrak{g}}} = \{\bar{\iota} \mid \iota \in J^{\mathfrak{g}}\} \subset I^{\mathfrak{g}}$. Let $J \subset I$ be given such that $J = \overline{J^{\mathfrak{g}}}$ for some $J^{\mathfrak{g}} \subset I^{\mathfrak{g}}$. Let us define $\mathfrak{K}_J(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathcal{X}$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{K}_J(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigcap_{j \in J} \left(\mathbb{Z}[X_{k,l}^{\pm 1} \mid (k,l) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}, j \neq k \in I] \otimes \mathbb{Z}[X_{j,l}(1 + B_{j,l+1}^{-1}) \mid (j,l) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0^{\mathfrak{g}}] \right).$$

Note that $\mathfrak{K}_J(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$. We also define $\mathfrak{K}_{J,q}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathcal{X}_q$ as above by replacing the letters X and B with \tilde{X} and \tilde{B} , respectively.

Proposition 5.31. *Let $J \subset I$ with $|J| \leq 2$. For a J -dominant monomial m , there exists a unique $F_{J,q}(\underline{m}) \in \mathfrak{K}_{J,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that \underline{m} is the unique J -dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial of $F_{J,q}(\underline{m})$. Moreover,*

$$\{F_{J,q}(\underline{m}) \mid m \text{ is } J\text{-dominant}\} \text{ is a } \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]\text{-basis of } \mathfrak{K}_{J,q}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

For $m \in \mathcal{M}_+^J$, we define

$$(5.31) \quad E_J(m) = \prod_{j \in J; (j,p) \in \Delta_0} F_J(X_{j,p})^{u_{j,p}(m)} \in \mathfrak{K}_J(\mathfrak{g}),$$

where $F_J(X_{j,p}) := \text{ev}_{q=1}(F_{J,q}(X_{i,p}))$ is a unique element in $\mathfrak{K}_J(\mathfrak{g})$ such that $X_{j,p}$ is the unique dominant monomial of $F_J(X_{j,p})$ (cf. Remark 4.12 and Remark 5.4). Let $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the completion of $\mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ given by the method in [25, Section 5.2.2]. Put $\mathfrak{K}_{J,q}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigcap_{j \in J} \mathfrak{K}_{j,q}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Lemma 5.32.

- (1) *A non-zero element of $\mathfrak{K}_{J,q}^{\infty}$ has at least one J -dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial.*
- (2) *We have*

$$\mathfrak{K}_{J,q}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{K}_{J,q}^{\infty}(\mathfrak{g}) \cap \mathcal{X}_q.$$

For $i \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}$, take $\iota \in I^{\mathfrak{g}}$ such that $\bar{\iota} = i$ and put

- $D_{\mathbf{m}^{(\iota)}[p,s]}^{\mathfrak{g}} = (\mathbf{m}^{(k)})_{k \geq 0}$: the countable set as in [25, Section 5.2.3] associated with $\mathbf{m}^{(\iota)}[p, s]$,

- $D_{m^{(i)}[p,s]}^{\mathfrak{g}} = (m^{(k)})_{k \geq 0}$: the analogue of the above one for $m^{(i)}[p,s]$ in terms of (5.31).

Remark 5.33. The set $D_{\mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p,s]}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ may be an infinitely countable set. If we enumerate the monomials in the countable set as follows:

$$\dots < \mathbf{m}^{(2)} < \mathbf{m}^{(1)} < \mathbf{m}^{(0)} = \mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p,s].$$

Then the t -algorithm determines $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -coefficients of the monomials $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(k)}$'s. Let $(\mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}^{(r)}))_{r \geq 0}$ be the sequence of $\mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -coefficients for $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(r)}$'s determined by the t -algorithm starting from $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p,s]$. It was known in [26] that the sequence $(\mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}_k))_{k \geq 0}$ should have finitely many non-zero coefficients, that is, $F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p,s]) \in \mathfrak{K}_t(\mathfrak{g})$. Note that $\mathcal{M}(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p,s])) \subset \{ \underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(k)} \mid k \geq 0 \}$.

Let us enumerate the finite set $\mathcal{M}(F_t(\underline{\mathbf{m}}^{(i)}[p,s]))$ as follows:

$$\mathbf{m}_N < \dots < \mathbf{m}_2 < \mathbf{m}_1 < \mathbf{m}_0 = \mathbf{m}^{(i)}[p,s],$$

where $<$ is a total order compatible with \prec_N . In particular, \mathbf{m}_N is an anti-dominant \mathcal{Y} -monomial, i.e. $\mathbf{m}_N = \mathbf{m}_-^{(i^*)}[p+h, s+h]$ by Theorem 5.2. It follows from Corollary 3.10 and Theorem 5.2 that

$$\mathbf{M} := \{ \bar{\sigma}(\mathbf{m}_k) \mid 1 \leq k \leq N \} \subset D_{m^{(i)}[p,s]}^{\mathfrak{g}}.$$

Then we enumerate the \mathcal{X} -monomials in \mathbf{M} by

$$(5.32) \quad m_-^{(i)}[p+h, s+h] = \mathbf{m}_{N'} <' \dots <' \mathbf{m}_1 <' \mathbf{m}_0 = m^{(i)}[p,s],$$

where $<'$ is a total order compatible with \prec_N .

Definition 5.34. Set $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(m^{(i)}[p,s]) = 1$ and $\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_J^{\mathfrak{g}}(m^{(i)}[p,s]) = 0$. For $J \subset I$ with $|J| \leq 2$ and $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}$ such that $\mathbf{m} \neq m^{(i)}[p,s]$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_J^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}' \in \mathbf{M} \\ \mathbf{m} <' \mathbf{m}'}} (\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}') - \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_J^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}')) [F_{J,q}(\underline{\mathbf{m}}')]_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}}, \\ \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}) &= \begin{cases} \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_J^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}) & \text{if } \mathbf{m} \text{ is not } J\text{-dominant,} \\ 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{m} \text{ is dominant,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $[F_{J,q}(\underline{\mathbf{m}}')]_{\underline{\mathbf{m}}}$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -coefficient of $\underline{\mathbf{m}}$ in $F_{J,q}(\underline{\mathbf{m}}')$. Here $F_{J,q}(\underline{\mathbf{m}}')$ is assumed to be 0 when \mathbf{m}' is not J -dominant.

Since the proof of the following lemma is similar to [24], so we omit it, but the complete proof can be found in [34].

Lemma 5.35. *The sequences $(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_J^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}))_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}}$ and $(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}))_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}}$ are well-defined, and $(\tilde{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}))_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}}$ is not depend on the choice of J with $|J| \leq 2$.*

By Proposition 5.31 and Lemma 5.35, we set $\chi := \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}} \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}) \underline{\mathbf{m}} \in \mathcal{X}_q$, and

$$\chi_i := \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbf{M}} \mu_i(\mathbf{m}) F_{i,q}(\underline{\mathbf{m}}) \in \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g}),$$

where $\mu_i(\mathbf{m}) = \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m}) - \tilde{\mathfrak{c}}_i^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathbf{m})$. Now, we are ready to prove Proposition 5.16.

Proof of Proposition 5.16. Let us compute the coefficient of \underline{m}' in $\chi - \chi_i$ for $\underline{m}' \in \mathbf{M}$.

Case 1. \underline{m}' is not i -dominant. By definition of $\tilde{c}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}')$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{coefficient of } \underline{m}' \text{ in } \chi - \chi_i) &= \tilde{c}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}') - \sum_{\substack{\underline{m} \in \mathbf{M} \\ \underline{m}' \leq' \underline{m}}} \mu_i(\underline{m}) [F_{i,q}(\underline{m})]_{\underline{m}'} \\ &= (\tilde{c}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}') - \tilde{c}_i^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}')) [F_{i,q}(\underline{m}')]_{\underline{m}'} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $F_{i,q}(\underline{m}') = 0$ since \underline{m}' is not i -dominant.

Case 2. \underline{m}' is i -dominant. By uniqueness of i -dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial for $F_{i,q}(\underline{m})$ with $\underline{m}' \leq' \underline{m}$, we have $\tilde{c}_i^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}') = 0$, and the coefficient of \underline{m}' in χ_i is $\mu_i(\underline{m}') = \tilde{c}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}') - \tilde{c}_i^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}') = \tilde{c}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\underline{m}')$. This implies that the coefficient of \underline{m}' in $\chi - \chi_i$ is 0 in this case.

By *Case 1* and *Case 2*, we have $\chi = \chi_i \in \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ and then $\chi \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Note that χ has unique dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial $\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$ by Definition 5.34 (or our choice of \mathbf{M}). Since $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) - \chi \in \mathfrak{K}_q^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$ has no dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomial, we conclude $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) = \chi \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by Lemma 5.32. \square

6. SUBRINGS OF $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ AND THE QUANTUM FOLDED T -SYSTEMS

In this section, we prove the quantum folded T -systems, which play a crucial role in this paper. To do this, we consider a subring $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ for a height function ξ . We mainly employ the framework in [29, 30] (see also [5]).

6.1. Subring. Let \mathbf{S} be a convex set of $\tilde{\Delta}_0$ (recall Definition 2.7 (2)). We denote by ${}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{X}$ the subring of \mathcal{X} generated by $X_{i,p}^{\pm 1}$ for $(i, p) \in \mathbf{S}$. Let ${}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+$ be the set all dominant monomials in the variables $X_{i,p}$'s for $(i, p) \in \mathbf{S}$. We define the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -module $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\mathbf{S}}(\mathfrak{g})$ as the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -submodule of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ given by

$$(6.1) \quad \mathfrak{K}_{q,\mathbf{S}}(\mathfrak{g}) := \bigoplus_{m \in {}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+} \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}] F_q(\underline{m}).$$

Lemma 6.1 (cf. [18, Lemma 5.6]). *The set ${}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+$ is an ideal of the partially ordered set $(\mathcal{M}_+, \preceq_{\mathbb{N}})$; i.e., it is closed under taking smaller elements in \mathcal{M}_+ with respect to $\preceq_{\mathbb{N}}$.*

Proof. Let $m \in {}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+$ and $mM \in \mathcal{M}_+$ where $M \in \mathbf{B}_q^{-k}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. For a factor $B_{i,p}^{-1}$ of M , the monomial m should have factors $X_{i,p-1}$ and $X_{i,p+1}$ due to (3.6). Thus we have an oriented path from $(i, p+1)$ to a vertex in \mathbf{S} and another oriented path from a vertex in \mathbf{S} to $(i, p-1)$ (these paths are possibly of length zero) in $\tilde{\Delta}_0$. Hence we have an oriented path whose end points are in \mathbf{S} factoring through both $(i, p-1)$ and $(i, p+1)$. By convexity of \mathbf{S} and the definition of $B_{i,p}$ (3.6), $M \in {}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{X}$ and $mM \in {}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+$ as we desired. \square

Proposition 6.2. *For a convex subset \mathbf{S} in $\tilde{\Delta}_0$, the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -module $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\mathbf{S}}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$ -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Moreover, we have*

$$(6.2) \quad \mathfrak{K}_{q,\mathbf{S}}(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigoplus_{m \in {}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+} \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}] E_q(\underline{m}) = \bigoplus_{m \in {}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+} \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}] L_q(\underline{m}).$$

Proof. Let $m_1, m_2 \in {}^{\mathbf{S}}\mathcal{M}_+$. By Theorem 5.23 and Proposition 5.25, $F_q(\underline{m}_1) * F_q(\underline{m}_2) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is written as shown below.

$$(6.3) \quad F_q(\underline{m}_1) * F_q(\underline{m}_2) = \sum_{\substack{m \in \mathcal{M}_+ \\ m \preceq_{\mathbb{N}} m_1 m_2}} c_m F_q(\underline{m}),$$

where $c_{\underline{m}} \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}] \setminus \{0\}$. Then it follows from Lemma 6.1 that $m \in {}^S\mathcal{M}_+$ for a monomial $m \prec_N m_1 m_2$ above. Hence, we conclude that $\mathfrak{K}_{q,S}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -subalgebra of $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by definition (6.1) of $\mathfrak{K}_{q,S}(\mathfrak{g})$.

Since $\mathfrak{K}_{q,S}(\mathfrak{g})$ is given by (6.1), (6.2) follows from $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -analogue of (5.7) and (b) in Theorem 5.27. \square

6.2. Truncation. Let ξ be a height function of Δ . For a (non-commutative) Laurent polynomial $x \in \mathcal{X}_q$, we denote by $x_{\leq \xi}$ the element of ${}^\xi\mathcal{X}_q$ obtained from x by discarding all the monomials containing $\tilde{X}_{i,p}^{\pm 1}$ with $(i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0 \setminus {}^\xi\tilde{\Delta}_0$.

The map

$$(\cdot)_{\leq \xi} : \mathcal{X}_q \longrightarrow {}^\xi\mathcal{X}_q \quad \text{given by} \quad x \longmapsto x_{\leq \xi}$$

is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -linear map, which is not $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra homomorphism. For $m \in \mathcal{M}_+$, we denote by $F_q(\underline{m})_{\leq \xi}$ the image of $F_q(\underline{m})$ under the map $(\cdot)_{\leq \xi}$.

Let us recall Definition 2.7 and (6.1). We set

$$(6.4) \quad \mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g}) := \mathfrak{K}_{q,{}^\xi\tilde{\Delta}_0}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Proposition 6.3. *For a height function ξ on Δ , the map $(\cdot)_{\leq \xi}$ restricts to the injective $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra homomorphism*

$$(\cdot)_{\leq \xi} : \mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g}) \hookrightarrow {}^\xi\mathcal{X}_q.$$

Proof. The injectivity follows from Theorem 5.23. Let us take $m_1, m_2 \in {}^\xi\mathcal{M}_+$. We consider a linear expansion of $F_q(\underline{m}_1) * F_q(\underline{m}_2)$ as in (6.3). Then we claim that

$$(6.5) \quad F_q(\underline{m}_1)_{\leq \xi} * F_q(\underline{m}_2)_{\leq \xi} = \sum_{\substack{m \in {}^S\mathcal{M}_+ \\ m \prec_N m_1 m_2}} c_{\underline{m}} F_q(\underline{m})_{\leq \xi} \quad (c_{\underline{m}} \neq 0).$$

Take a \mathcal{X}_q -monomial \tilde{m}' (resp. \tilde{m}'') appearing in $F_q(\underline{m}_1)_{\leq \xi}$ (resp. $F_q(\underline{m}_2)_{\leq \xi}$). If $\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}'\tilde{m}'') \in \mathcal{M}_+$, then $\text{ev}_{q=1}(\tilde{m}'\tilde{m}'') \in {}^S\mathcal{M}_+$ by Lemma 6.1. Furthermore, by Theorem 5.23 and definition of ${}^\xi\mathcal{X}_q$, $F_q(\underline{m}_1)_{\leq \xi} * F_q(\underline{m}_2)_{\leq \xi}$ is written as a linear combination of $\{F_q(\underline{m})_{\leq \xi} \mid m \in {}^S\mathcal{M}_+\}$. Thus, $F_q(\tilde{m}'\tilde{m}'')_{\leq \xi}$ appears in the right-hand side of (6.5) up to $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$. This proves the above claim.

Finally, we have

$$(\cdot)_{\leq \xi}(F_q(\underline{m}_1) * F_q(\underline{m}_2)) = \sum_{\substack{m \in {}^S\mathcal{M}_+ \\ m \prec_N m_1 m_2}} c_{\underline{m}} F_q(\underline{m})_{\leq \xi} = F_q(\underline{m}_1)_{\leq \xi} * F_q(\underline{m}_2)_{\leq \xi}.$$

by Proposition 6.2 and (6.5), which completes the proof. \square

Definition 6.4. For $m \in \mathcal{M}_+$, we say $L_q(m)$ (resp. $F_q(m)$) *real* if, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have $(L_q(m))^k = q^t L_q(m^k)$ (resp. $(F_q(m))^k = q^t F_q(m^k)$) for some $t \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Corollary 6.5. *For each KR-monomial $\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$, $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ is real.*

Proof. Let ξ be a height function with $\xi_i = s$. Then we have

$$(F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]))_{\leq \xi} = \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s],$$

by (5.25) in Proposition 5.25. Since

$$\text{ev}_{q=1} \left((F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])^{*n})_{\leq \xi} \right) = (m^{(i)}[p, s])^n = \text{ev}_{q=1} \left((F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]^{*n}))_{\leq \xi} \right),$$

our assertion follows from Proposition 6.3. \square

Conjecture 3. For $m \in \mathcal{M}_+$, if $L_q(m)$ is real, then $L_q(m)$ has a quantum positive coefficient.

6.3. Quantum folded T -system. For $f, g \in \mathcal{X}_q$, we say that f and g q -commute or are q -commutative if $fg = q^k gf$ for some $k \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. In this subsection, we shall prove the functional equations among KR-polynomials $F_q(m^{(i)}[p, s])$'s, called the *quantum folded T -system*. For simply-laced finite type, the quantum folded T -system is nothing but the quantum T -system, investigated in [29] (see also [31, 18]).

Lemma 6.6. For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p < s$, let $j, j' \in \Delta_0$ such that $d(i, j) = d(i, j') = 1$. Then we have

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s)) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s)).$$

Proof. Note that one can take a height function on Δ such that $\xi_j = \xi_{j'} = s - 1$ and $\xi_j = \max\{\xi_i \mid i \in I\}$. By (5.25),

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s))_{\leq \xi} = \underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s) \quad \text{and} \quad F_q(\underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s))_{\leq \xi} = \underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s).$$

By Proposition 6.3, we have

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s)) = q^\beta F_q(\underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s))$$

for some $\beta \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$.

Now, let us prove that $\beta = 0$ by induction on $k = (p - s)/2$. When $k = 1$, we have $\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s) = \tilde{X}_{j, p+1}$. In this case, $\beta = 0$ by (4.3). Suppose that $k > 1$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s - 2) * \underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s - 2) = \underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s - 2) * \underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s - 2).$$

Then we have

$$\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s) * \underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s) = q^{\mathcal{N}(\tilde{X}_{j, s-1}, \underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s)) + \mathcal{N}(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s), \tilde{X}_{j', s-1})} \underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s) * \underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s).$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(\tilde{X}_{j, s-1}, \underline{m}^{(j')}(p, s)) &= \sum_{i=0}^{(p-s)/2-1} \mathcal{N}(j, s-1; j', p+1+2i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{(p-s)/2-1} \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j, j'}(s-p-2i-3) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j, j'}(s-p-2i-1), \\ \mathcal{N}(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s), \tilde{X}_{j', s-1}) &= -\mathcal{N}(\tilde{X}_{j', s-1}, \underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s)) = -\sum_{i=0}^{(p-s)/2-1} \mathcal{N}(j', s-1; j, p+1+2i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{(p-s)/2-1} -\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j', j}(s-p-2i-3) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j', j}(s-p-2i-1), \end{aligned}$$

our assertion follows from the fact that $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j, j'}(u) = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j', j}(u)$ for all $u \in \mathbb{Z}$ (cf. [48, Section 4]). \square

Lemma 6.7. *For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p < s$, we have*

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]).$$

Proof. Let us first show that $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ and $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s))$ are q -commutative. Since $[p, s] \neq (p, s)$, we cannot apply the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 6.6. Instead, to show their q -commutativity, we shall apply the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -reduction argument as in [31, Remark 9.10] (see also [18, Proposition 6.10]). We should remark that the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -reduction argument in [31, Remark 9.10] is based on [27, Proposition 5.3, Lemma 5.6] (cf. [31, Lemma 9.9]). By (3.10), one can prove the $\mathfrak{K}(\mathfrak{g})$ -analogues of [27, Proposition 5.3, Lemma 5.6]. Although we do not know the positivity of $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ yet, it is enough to know \mathcal{X}_q -monomials (except for their coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}]$) appearing in $F_q(\underline{m})$ for applying the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -reduction argument to our first claim. This is done by Proposition 5.16 (see also Section 5.3).

Now, let us prove our first claim. The multiplicities of bar-invariant dominant monomials in the polynomials $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s))$ and $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ are the same as those in the corresponding polynomials for the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -case up to overall power of $q^{1/2}$. This follows from the fact that the q -commutation relations between $\widetilde{B}_{i,s}^{-1}, \widetilde{B}_{i,s'}^{-1}$ and between $\widetilde{X}_{i,s}, \widetilde{B}_{i,s'}^{-1}$ are the same as in the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -case by Proposition 4.6. Thus, as the corresponding (non-commutative) polynomials in the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -case commute up to a power of q , we obtain the q -commutativity.

Finally, to complete our assertion, it suffices to show that

$$\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] * \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) = \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) * \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s].$$

By an induction on $(p - s)/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s], \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) &= \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\widetilde{X}_{i,s}, \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s - 2)) + \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s - 2], \widetilde{X}_{i,s-2}) \\ &\stackrel{*}{=} \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\widetilde{X}_{i,s}, \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) + \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s], \widetilde{X}_{i,s-2}) \\ &\stackrel{\dagger}{=} \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\widetilde{X}_{i,s}, \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) + \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s), \widetilde{X}_{i,s}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\stackrel{*}{=}$ follows from $\underline{\mathcal{N}}(\widetilde{X}_{i,t}, \widetilde{X}_{i,t}) = 0$ and $\stackrel{\dagger}{=}$ follows from $\underline{\mathcal{N}}(\widetilde{X}_{i,t}, \widetilde{X}_{i,t'}) = \underline{\mathcal{N}}(\widetilde{X}_{i,t \pm 2}, \widetilde{X}_{i,t' \pm 2})$. \square

For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p < s$, we set $m(i; p, s) := \prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} m^{(j)}(p, s)^{-c_{j,i}}$, where $m^{(j)}(p, s)$ is given as in (5.18).

Lemma 6.8. *For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p < s$, we have*

$$F_q(\underline{m}(i; p, s)) = \prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s))^{-c_{j,i}},$$

where the order of the product does not matter.

Proof. By Lemma 6.6, $\prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s))^{-c_{j,i}}$ is well-defined. Let ξ be a height function on Δ such that $\xi_i = s$ and $\xi_j = s - 1$ for $j \in \Delta_0$ with $d(i, j) = 1$. Then we have

$$\left(\prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s))^{-c_{j,i}} \right)_{\leq \xi} = \underline{m}(i; p, s),$$

which implies the assertion. \square

Now, we are in a position to state and prove the quantum folded T -system (cf. Theorem 5.10).

Theorem 6.9 (Quantum folded T -system). *For $(i, p), (i, s) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p < s$ and $k = (s - p)/2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we have*

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) = q^{\alpha(i, k)} F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) + q^{\gamma(i, k)} \prod_{j; d(i, j)=1} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s))^{-c_{j, i}},$$

where $\gamma(i, k) = \frac{1}{2} (\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2k - 1) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2k + 1))$ and $\alpha(i, k) = \gamma(i, k) - d_i$.

Proof. First, we claim that

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) = q^\alpha F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) \cdot F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) + q^\gamma F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s))$$

for some $\alpha, \gamma \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$. By using the q -algorithm and the argument in [27, Lemma 5.6] (or [31, Theorem 9.6, Lemma 9.9]), the product of $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ and $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s))$ has exactly distinct k dominant monomials

$$M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k,$$

where $\text{ev}_{q=1}(M_1) = m^{(i)}[p, s]m^{(i)}(p, s)$. Moreover, M_1, \dots, M_{k-1} exhaust the dominant monomials occurring in $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s))$ and

$$\text{ev}_{q=1}(M_k) = \left(m^{(i)}[p, s] B_{i, s-1}^{-1} B_{i, s-3}^{-1} \cdots B_{i, p+1}^{-1} \right) m^{(i)}(p, s) = m^{(i)}(p, s).$$

Hence, our claim follows from Theorem 5.23 and Lemma 6.8.

Second, we compute $\alpha = \alpha(i, k)$ and $\gamma = \gamma(i, k)$ explicitly. By Theorem 5.23, Lemma 6.6 implies that

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) = \prod_{j; d(i, j)=1} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s))^{-c_{j, i}}.$$

Also, by Lemma 6.7, we also have

$$F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s)) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]).$$

Thus it suffices to compute α, γ such that

$$\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] * \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) = q^\alpha \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] * \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) = q^\alpha \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) * \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$$

and

$$\left(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] \cdot \widetilde{B}_{i, s-1}^{-1} \cdot \widetilde{B}_{i, s-3}^{-1} \cdots \widetilde{B}_{i, p+1}^{-1} \right) * \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) = q^\gamma \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s).$$

The coefficient α can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \sum_{a=1}^{k-1} \mathcal{N}(i, p; i, p+2a) + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{N}(i, p; i, p+2k) \\ &= \sum_{a=1}^{k-1} (\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2a+1) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2a-1)) + \frac{1}{2} (\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2k+1) - \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2k-1)) \\ &= -\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(1) + \frac{1}{2} (\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2k+1) + \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i, i}(2k-1)) = -d_i + \frac{1}{2} (\widetilde{\eta}_{i, i}(2k+1) + \widetilde{\eta}_{i, i}(2k-1)). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\underline{m} := \left(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s] \cdot \tilde{B}_{i, s-1}^{-1} \cdot \tilde{B}_{i, s-3}^{-1} \cdots \tilde{B}_{i, p+1}^{-1} \right)$ is contained in $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$ with coefficient 1, and $\underline{m} \cdot \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) = \prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} \underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s)^{-c_{j,i}}$. Thus we have

$$\underline{m} * \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) = \left(\left(\underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) \right)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} \underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s)^{-c_{j,i}} \right) * \underline{m}^{(i)}(p, s) = q^\gamma \prod_{j; d(i,j)=1} \underline{m}^{(j)}(p, s)^{-c_{j,i}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j; d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \sum_{a=1}^k \sum_{b=1}^k \mathcal{N}(j, p+2a-1; i, p+2b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j; d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \sum_{a=1}^k \sum_{b=1}^k \left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(a-b)-2) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(a-b)) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(b-a)) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(b-a)+2) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j; d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \sum_{a=1}^k \left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(a-k)-2) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(a-1)) - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(1-a)) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(k-a)+2) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j; d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \sum_{a=1}^k \left(-\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(a-1)) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2(k-a)+2) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j; d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{j,i}(2k) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j; d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \tilde{\eta}_{j,i}(2k) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j; d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \tilde{\eta}_{i,j}(2k). \end{aligned}$$

Then our proof is completed by Lemma 2.3. \square

Example 6.10. Let us recall the formula of $F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5})$ in (5.17). Also, $F_q(\mathbf{X}_{2,5}) = q^{\frac{3}{2}} F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5}) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and it is bar-invariant with respect to (4.5). Note that $F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,7}) = \mathbb{T}_2(F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,5}))$ and $F_q(\mathbf{X}_{2,7}) = q^{\frac{3}{2}} F_q(\tilde{X}_{2,7})$. Clearly, these computations implies that $F_q(\mathbf{X}_{2,5}) * F_q(\mathbf{X}_{2,7})$ has two dominant \mathcal{X}_q -monomials, namely, $\underline{X}_{2,5} \underline{X}_{2,7}$ and $\underline{X}_{1,6}^3$. By Theorem 5.23, we should have

$$(6.6) \quad F_q(\mathbf{X}_{2,5}) * F_q(\mathbf{X}_{2,7}) = q^{\frac{3}{2}} F_q(\underline{X}_{2,5} \underline{X}_{2,7}) + q^{\frac{9}{2}} F_q(\underline{X}_{1,6})^3.$$

On the other hand, we obtain

$$d_2 = 3, \quad \gamma(2, 1) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{2,2}(1) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{2,2}(3) \right) = \frac{9}{2}, \quad \alpha(2, 1) = \gamma(2, 1) - d_2 = \frac{3}{2}, \quad -c_{1,2} = 3,$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{2,2}(1) = 3$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{2,2}(3) = 6$ from (2.10). Hence (6.6) illustrates Theorem 6.9.

7. QUANTUM CLUSTER ALGEBRA

In this section we recall the definition of skew-symmetrizable quantum cluster algebras of infinite rank, following [4], [22, §8], [30] and [45].

7.1. Quantum seed. Let K be an index set described in Section 2.4. Let $L = (\lambda_{i,j})_{i,j \in K}$ be a skew symmetric integer-valued $K \times K$ -matrix. Let q be an indeterminate.

Definition 7.1. We define $(\mathcal{P}(L), \star)$ as the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra, called the *quantum torus associated to L* , generated by a family of elements $\{Z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}$ with the defining relations

$$Z_i \star Z_j = q^{\lambda_{i,j}} Z_j \star Z_i \quad (i, j \in \mathbb{K}).$$

We denote by $\mathfrak{F}(L)$ the skew field of fractions of $\mathcal{P}(L)$.

For $\mathbf{a} = (a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{K}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus \mathbb{K}}$, we define the element $Z^{\mathbf{a}}$ of $\mathfrak{F}(L)$ as

$$(7.1) \quad Z^{\mathbf{a}} := q^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i>j} a_i a_j \lambda_{i,j}} \overrightarrow{\star}_{i \in \mathbb{K}} Z_i^{a_i}$$

(cf. (4.6)). Here we take a total order $<$ on the set \mathbb{K} . Note that $Z^{\mathbf{a}}$ does not depend on the choice of a total order on \mathbb{K} . We have

$$Z^{\mathbf{a}} \star Z^{\mathbf{b}} = q^{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in \mathbb{K}} a_i b_j \lambda_{i,j}} Z^{\mathbf{a}+\mathbf{b}}.$$

Let (\mathcal{A}, \star) be a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra. We say that a family $\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}$ of elements of \mathcal{A} is *L -commuting* if it satisfies $z_i \star z_j = q^{\lambda_{i,j}} z_j \star z_i$ for any $i, j \in \mathbb{K}$. In that case we can define $z^{\mathbf{a}}$ for any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\oplus \mathbb{K}}$ as in (7.1). We say that an L -commuting family $\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}$ is *algebraically independent* if the algebra map $\mathcal{P}(L) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ given by $Z_i \mapsto z_i$ is injective.

Let $\tilde{B} = (b_{i,j})_{i \in \mathbb{K}, j \in \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}}$ be an integer-valued $\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}$ -exchange matrix satisfying (2.12). We say that the pair (L, \tilde{B}) is *compatible with a diagonal matrix* $\text{diag}(\mathbf{d}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \mid i \in \mathbb{K})$, if we have

$$(7.2) \quad \sum_{k \in \mathbb{K}} b_{ki} \lambda_{kj} = \delta_{i,j} \mathbf{d}_i, \quad \text{equivalently,} \quad (L\tilde{B})_{ji} = -\delta_{i,j} \mathbf{d}_i,$$

for any $i \in \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}$ and $j \in \mathbb{K}$. We also call the pair (L, \tilde{B}) a *compatible pair* for short.

Let (L, \tilde{B}) be a compatible pair and \mathcal{A} a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra. We say that $\mathcal{S} = (\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}, L, \tilde{B})$ is a *quantum seed* in \mathcal{A} if $\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}$ is an algebraically independent L -commuting family of elements of \mathcal{A} . The set $\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}$ is called the *quantum cluster* of \mathcal{S} and its elements the *quantum cluster variables*. The quantum cluster variables z_i ($i \in \mathbb{K}_{\text{fr}}$) are called the *frozen variables*. The elements $z^{\mathbf{a}}$ ($\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{\oplus \mathbb{K}}$) are called the *quantum cluster monomials*.

7.2. Mutation. For $k \in \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}$, we define a $\mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{K}$ -matrix $E = (e_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{K}}$ and a $\mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}} \times \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}$ -matrix $F = (f_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}}$ as follows:

$$e_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \delta_{i,j} & \text{if } j \neq k, \\ -1 & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ \max(0, -b_{i,k}) & \text{if } i \neq j = k, \end{cases} \quad f_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \delta_{i,j} & \text{if } i \neq k, \\ -1 & \text{if } i = j = k, \\ \max(0, b_{k,j}) & \text{if } i = k \neq j. \end{cases}$$

The *mutation* $\mu_k(L, \tilde{B}) := (\mu_k(L), \mu_k(\tilde{B}))$ of a compatible pair (L, \tilde{B}) in direction k is given by

$$\mu_k(L) := (E^T) L E, \quad \mu_k(\tilde{B}) := E \tilde{B} F.$$

We define

$$(7.3) \quad a'_i = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = k, \\ \max(0, b_{i,k}) & \text{if } i \neq k, \end{cases} \quad a''_i = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = k, \\ \max(0, -b_{i,k}) & \text{if } i \neq k. \end{cases}$$

and set $\mathbf{a}' := (a'_i)$ and $\mathbf{a}'' := (a''_i) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus \mathbb{K}}$.

Let \mathcal{A} be a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra contained in a skew field K . Let $\mathcal{S} = (\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}, L, \tilde{B})$ be a quantum seed in \mathcal{A} . Define the elements $\mu_k(z)_i$ of K by

$$(7.4) \quad \mu_k(z)_i := \begin{cases} z^{\mathbf{a}'} + z^{\mathbf{a}''} & \text{if } i = k, \\ z_i & \text{if } i \neq k. \end{cases}$$

Then $\{\mu_k(z)_i\}$ is an algebraically independent $\mu_k(L)$ -commuting family in K . We call

$$\mu_k(\mathcal{S}) := (\{\mu_k(z)_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}, \mu_k(L), \mu_k(\tilde{B}))$$

the *mutation of \mathcal{S} in direction k* . It becomes a new quantum seed in K ; that means,

- (1) $(\mu_k(L), \mu_k(\tilde{B}))$ is compatible with the diagonal matrix of (L, \tilde{B}) ,
- (2) $\{\mu_k(z)_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}$ is $\mu_k(L)$ -commuting.

Definition 7.2. Let $\mathcal{S} = (\{z_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}}, L, \tilde{B})$ and $\mathcal{S}' = (\{z'_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{K}'}, L', \tilde{B}')$ be quantum seeds in a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra \mathcal{A} .

- (i) We say that \mathcal{S}' is *mutated from \mathcal{S}* if the following condition is satisfied: For any finite subset J of \mathbb{K}' , there exist
 - (a) a finite sequence (k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r) in \mathbb{K}_{ex} ,
 - (b) an injective map $\sigma: J \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, depending on the choice of J , such that
 - (1) $\sigma(J_{\text{ex}}) \subset \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}$, where $J_{\text{ex}} := J \cap (\mathbb{K}')_{\text{ex}}$,
 - (2) $z'_j = \mu(z)_{\sigma(j)}$ for all $j \in J$,
 - (3) $(\tilde{B}')_{(i,j)} = \mu(\tilde{B})_{\sigma(i), \sigma(j)}$ for any $(i, j) \in J \times J_{\text{ex}}$,
where $\mu := \mu_{k_r} \circ \dots \circ \mu_{k_1}$.
- (ii) We say that the quantum seeds \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' are *mutation equivalent* if \mathcal{S}' is mutated from \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S} is also mutated from \mathcal{S}' . In this case, we write $\mathcal{S} \simeq \mathcal{S}'$.

7.3. Mutation of valued quiver. Recall that we can associate the valued quiver $\mathcal{Q}_{\tilde{B}}$ to an exchange matrix \tilde{B} . Here we describe the algorithm transforming a valued quiver \mathcal{Q} into a new valued quiver $\mu_k(\mathcal{Q})$ ($k \in \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}$), which corresponds to $\mu_k(\tilde{B})$.

Algorithm 7.3. For $k \in \mathbb{K}_{\text{ex}}$, the valued quiver mutation μ_k transforms \mathcal{Q} into a new valued quiver $\mu_k(\mathcal{Q})$ via the following rules, where we assume (i) $ac > 0$ or $bd > 0$, and (ii) we do not perform (NC) and (C) below, if i and j are frozen at the same time:

(NC) For each full-subquiver $i \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\lceil e, f \rceil} \\ \xrightarrow{\lceil a, b \rceil} k \xrightarrow{\lceil c, d \rceil} j \end{array}$ in \mathcal{Q} , we change the value of the arrow from i to j into $\lceil e + ac, f - bd \rceil$:

$$i \xrightarrow{\lceil e+ac, f-bd \rceil} j.$$

(C) For each full-subquiver $i \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\lceil e, f \rceil} \\ \xrightarrow{\lceil a, b \rceil} k \xrightarrow{\lceil c, d \rceil} j \end{array}$ with $(e, f) \neq (0, 0)$ in \mathcal{Q} , we change the valued arrow between i and j as follows:

$$\begin{cases} i \xleftarrow{\lceil e-bd, f+ac \rceil} j & \text{if } f + ac \leq 0 \leq e - bd, \\ i \xrightarrow{\lceil f+ac, e-bd \rceil} j & \text{if } f + ac \geq 0 \geq e - bd. \end{cases}$$

(\mathcal{R}) Reverse the direction of each arrow incident to the vertex k and change the value $\lceil a, b \rceil$ of each arrow into $\lceil -b, -a \rceil$.


Here if there is no arrow between i and j in (\mathcal{NC}) and (\mathcal{C}) , then put $e = f = 0$ and follow the same rule.

Example 7.4. Consider the following 9×6 integer-valued matrix:


$$(7.5) \quad \tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & 0 & -2 & 1 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

By taking $K_{\text{ex}} = \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and $K_{\text{fr}} = \{7, 8, 9\}$, one can see that its principal part is skew-symmetrizable with $S = \text{diag}(2, 2, 1, 2, 2, 1)$.

Using Convention 2, the valued quiver \mathcal{Q} associated to \tilde{B} in (7.5) can be drawn as



Here \boxed{k} denotes $k \in K_{\text{fr}}$. Then $\mu_2(\mathcal{Q})$, $\mu_5(\mathcal{Q})$, are depicted as follows:



7.4. Quantum cluster algebra. Let $\mathcal{S} = (\{z_i\}_{i \in K}, L, \tilde{B})$ be a quantum seed in a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra \mathcal{A} . The *quantum cluster algebra* $\mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S})$ associated to the quantum seed \mathcal{S} is the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -subalgebra of the skew field K generated by all the quantum cluster variables in the quantum seeds obtained from \mathcal{S} by any *finite* sequence of mutations. Here we call \mathcal{S} the *initial quantum seed* of the quantum cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S})$.

Lemma 7.5. Let \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' be quantum seeds in \mathcal{A} . If \mathcal{S}' is mutated from \mathcal{S} , then $\mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S}')$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S})$. Furthermore, if \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{S}' are mutation equivalent to each other, then we have

$$\mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S}') \simeq \mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S}).$$

Proof. This assertion follows from Definition 7.2. \square

Definition 7.6. A *quantum cluster algebra structure* associated with a quantum seed \mathcal{S} in a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra \mathcal{A} , contained in a skew field K , is a family \mathcal{F} of quantum seeds in \mathcal{A} satisfying the following conditions:

- (a) For any quantum seed \mathcal{S} in \mathcal{F} , the quantum cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S})$ is isomorphic to \mathcal{A} as a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1/2}]$ -algebra.

- (b) Any mutation of a quantum seed in \mathcal{F} is in \mathcal{F} .
 (c) For any pair $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{S}'$ of quantum seeds in \mathcal{F} , we have $\mathcal{S}' \simeq \mathcal{S}$.

8. QUANTUM CLUSTER ALGEBRA STRUCTURE ON $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$

In this section, we will prove that the ring $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ has a quantum cluster algebra structure based on the recent work [48] by Kashiwara–Oh. As applications, we obtain

- a quantum cluster algebra algorithm to compute the KR-polynomials $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b])$ for KR-monomials $m^{(i)}[a, b]$,
- a q -commutativity for KR-polynomials $F_q(\underline{m}_{k,r}^{(i)})$ and $F_q(\underline{m}_{l,t}^{(j)})$ satisfying certain conditions on the pair of their KR-monomials $(m_{k,r}^{(i)}, m_{l,t}^{(j)})$.

In this section, we shall employ the framework in [30, 5] for our goal.

8.1. Compatible pair. Let \mathbf{S} be a convex subset of $\tilde{\Delta}_0$ with an upper bound (recall Definition 2.7). For each $j \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, we set

$$\xi_j := \max(s \mid (j, s) \in \mathbf{S}).$$

Recall the exchange matrices in Definition 2.4 and Definition 2.7.

Theorem 8.1. [48, Theorem 7.1] (*see also [19]*) *Define*

$$\Lambda_{(i,p),(j,s)} = \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[p, \xi_i], m^{(j)}[s, \xi_j]) \quad (i, p), (j, s) \in \mathbf{S}.$$

Then the pair $((\Lambda_{(i,p),(j,s)})_{(i,p),(j,s) \in \mathbf{S}}, {}^{\mathbf{S}}\tilde{B})$ is compatible with $\text{diag}(2d_{i,p} := 2d_i \mid (i, p) \in \mathbf{S})$.

Recall that the subset ${}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0$ is convex without frozen indices. Thus the pair $({}^{\xi}L, {}^{\xi}\tilde{B})$ is compatible with $\text{diag}(2d_{i,p} := 2d_i \mid (i, p) \in {}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0)$, where

$$(8.1) \quad {}^{\xi}L = (\Lambda_{(i,p),(j,s)})_{(i,p),(j,s) \in {}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}_0} \quad \text{and} \quad \Lambda_{(i,p),(j,s)} = \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[p, \xi_i], m^{(j)}[s, \xi_j]).$$

8.2. Sequence of mutations. Let us consider the valued quiver ${}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}$ associated to the height function ξ of Q . Note that, for a source i of Q ,

- (8.2)
 - (i) the vertex (i, ξ_i) is located at the boundary of ${}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}$ determined by ξ , and vertically sink and horizontally source,
 - (ii) $s_i\xi$ is a height function defined as in (2.7).

For a source i of Q , we set a sequence of mutations

$$(8.3) \quad {}_i^{\xi}\mu := \cdots \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i - 4)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i - 2)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i)}$$

and call it the *forward shift* at i (see [30] for $\mathcal{K}_{\mathfrak{t}}(\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^0)$ -cases).

Proposition 8.2. *For a Dynkin quiver $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$ and a source i , we have*

$${}_i^{\xi}\mu({}^{\xi}\tilde{\Delta}) \simeq {}^{s_i\xi}\tilde{\Delta}.$$

Proof. We shall prove our assertion by an inductive argument on the sequence ${}_i^{\xi}\mu$. For this, we observe first two steps $\mu_{(i, \xi_i)}$ and $\mu_{(i, \xi_i - 2)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i)}$.

Step 1. Let us consider $\mu_{(i, \xi_i)}(\xi \tilde{\Delta})$. In this case, the vertex (i, ξ) in $\xi \tilde{\Delta}$ (marked with * below) is vertically sink and horizontally source in $\xi \tilde{\Delta}$ by (2.14) and (8.2) (i) as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(j, \xi_j - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j) \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \end{array} \\
\longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i - 4) & \longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i - 2) & \longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i)^* \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} \\
(j', \xi_{j'} - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'} - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'})
\end{array}$$

Here j and j' are indices in Δ_0 such that $d(i, j) = d(i, j') = 1$. Note that, in order to observe the behavior with respect to $\mu_{(i, \xi_i)}$, it suffices to consider the full-subquiver described as above.

Applying Algorithm 7.3, $\mu_{(i, \xi_i)}(\xi \tilde{\Delta})$ can be depicted as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(j, \xi_j - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j) \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \end{array} \\
\longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i - 4) & \longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i - 2)^* & \longrightarrow & (i, \xi_i) \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} \\
(j', \xi_{j'} - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'} - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'})
\end{array}$$

in which the vertex $(i, \xi_i - 2)$ (marked with * above) becomes vertically sink and horizontally source.

Step 2. Let us consider $(\mu_{(i, \xi_i - 2)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i)})(\xi \tilde{\Delta})$. Applying Algorithm 7.3 again, $(\mu_{(i, \xi_i - 2)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i)})(\xi \tilde{\Delta})$ becomes

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
(j, \xi_j - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j) \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \end{array} \\
\longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i - 4)^* & \longrightarrow & (i, \xi_i - 2) & \longrightarrow & (i, \xi_i) \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} \\
(j', \xi_{j'} - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'} - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'})
\end{array}$$

which is isomorphic to

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j, \xi_j) \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}} \end{array} \\
(8.4) \quad \longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i - 6) & \longleftarrow & (i, \xi_i - 4)^* & \longrightarrow & (i, \xi_i - 2) & \longrightarrow & (i, \xi_i) \\
\begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \lrcorner \\ \searrow \\ \lrcorner \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i}} \\ \xrightarrow{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}} \end{array} \\
\longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'} - 4) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'} - 2) & \longleftarrow & (j', \xi_{j'})
\end{array}$$

Here the vertex $(i, \xi_i - 4)$ (marked with * in (8.4)) becomes also vertically sink and horizontally source.

By *Step 1* and *Step 2*, we observe that the full-subquiver consisting of the rightmost 6-vertices in (8.4) are isomorphic to the rightmost 6-vertices of ${}^{si}\xi \tilde{\Delta}$. Furthermore, since the local circumstance of $(i, \xi_i - 4)$ in $(\mu_{(i, \xi_i - 2)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i)})(\xi \tilde{\Delta})$ is the same as the one of $(i, \xi_i - 2)$ in $\mu_{(i, \xi_i)}(\xi \tilde{\Delta})$, we can apply an induction on k for the valued quiver

$$(\mu_{(i, \xi_i - 2k)} \cdots \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i - 4)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i - 2)} \circ \mu_{(i, \xi_i)})(\xi \tilde{\Delta}) \quad \text{for all } k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}.$$

Finally, our assertion comes from the definition of ${}^{si}\xi \tilde{\Delta}$. \square

The following proposition is a direct consequence of Proposition 8.2 and the definition of $\xi \tilde{\Delta}$.

Proposition 8.3. *Let i, j be sources of $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$. Then we have*

$$({}^j_{s_i \xi} \mu \circ {}^i_{\xi} \mu)(\xi \tilde{\Delta}) \simeq ({}^i_{s_j \xi} \mu \circ {}^j_{\xi} \mu)(\xi \tilde{\Delta}).$$

Thus, for any Q -adapted reduced expression $s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_n}$ of the Coxeter element τ_Q ,

$$(8.5) \quad {}^Q \mu := {}^{i_n}_{s_{i_n} \cdots s_{i_1} \xi} \mu \circ \cdots \circ {}^{i_2}_{s_{i_1} \xi} \mu \circ {}^{i_1}_{\xi} \mu \text{ is well-defined.}$$

Theorem 8.4. *For Dynkin quivers $Q = (\Delta, \xi)$ and $Q = (\Delta, \xi')$, there exists a sequence of mutations μ such that*

$$\mu(\xi \tilde{\Delta}) \simeq \xi' \tilde{\Delta} \quad \text{as valued quivers.}$$

In particular, we have

$${}^Q \mu(\xi \tilde{\Delta}) \simeq \xi \tilde{\Delta} \quad \text{as valued quivers.}$$

Proof. This assertion follows from (2.6), (2.8) and Proposition 8.2. \square

8.3. Quantum cluster algebra structure on $\mathfrak{K}_{q, \xi}(\mathfrak{g})$. For each $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote by $({}^s) \xi$ the height function such that $({}^s) \xi_i \in \{s, s-1\}$ for all $i \in \Delta_0$ and $({}^s) Q = (\tilde{\Delta}, ({}^s) \xi)$. For a height function ξ , we set

$${}^\xi \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}) := \bigoplus_{m \in {}^\xi \mathcal{M}_+} \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}](F_q(\underline{m}))_{\leq \xi} \subset {}^\xi \mathcal{X}_q.$$

Note that ${}^\xi \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}) = (\cdot)_{\leq \xi}(\mathfrak{K}_{q, \xi}(\mathfrak{g})) \simeq \mathfrak{K}_{q, \xi}(\mathfrak{g})$.

For simplicity of notations, we set

- (a) ${}^s \tilde{\Delta} := ({}^s) \xi \tilde{\Delta}$, ${}^s \mathcal{X}_q := ({}^s) \xi \mathcal{X}_q$, $(-)_{\leq s} := (-)_{\leq ({}^s) \xi}$,
- (b) ${}^s L := ({}^s) \xi L$, ${}^s B := ({}^s) \xi B$,
- (c) ${}^s \mu := ({}^s) Q \mu$, ${}^s \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}) := ({}^s) \xi \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathfrak{K}_{q, s}(\mathfrak{g}) := \mathfrak{K}_{q, ({}^s) \xi}(\mathfrak{g})$.

From now on, we fix $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\tilde{\Delta}$. Let us denote by ${}^s \mathcal{A}_q$ the quantum cluster algebra whose initial seed is

$$(8.6) \quad {}^s \mathcal{S} := (\{v_{i, p} := \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]\}_{(i, p) \in {}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0}, {}^s L, {}^s B).$$

For $n \geq 0$, let $v_{i, p}^{(n)}$ be the quantum cluster variable obtained at vertex (i, p) after applying the sequence of mutations ${}^s \mu$ n -times. Then we give a quantum cluster algebra algorithm to compute $F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b])$ for KR-monomials $m^{(i)}[a, b]$.

Proposition 8.5. (cf. [30, Theorem 3.1], [5, Proposition 6.3.1]) *For each $(i, p) \in {}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0$ and $n \geq 0$,*

$$(8.7) \quad v_{i, p}^{(n)} = {}^s F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p-2n, s-2n]) := (F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p-2n, s-2n]))_{\leq s}.$$

In particular, if $2n \geq \mathfrak{h}$, we have

$$v_{i, p}^{(n)} = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p-2n, s-2n]).$$

Proof. Let us apply induction on n for this assertion. For $n = 0$, it follows from (5.25) in Proposition 5.25. Let $n \geq 0$ and $(i, p) \in {}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0$. Suppose we have applied ${}^s \mu$ n -times on ${}^s \mathcal{S}$, and $(n+1)$ -times on all vertices preceding (i, p) in the sequence ${}^s \mu$, and that all those previous vertices satisfy (8.7).

Thanks to Theorem 8.4, the corresponding valued quivers coincide up to a shift of spectral parameters in labeling of vertices. Then, the argument in the proof of Proposition 8.2 tells us that the vertex (i, p) is vertically sink or horizontally source, that is, one of the following configurations:

(8.8)

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} (j, p + {}^{(s)}\xi_{j,i}) \\ \swarrow \scriptstyle r-{}^{(s)}\xi_{j,i}, \xi_{i,j} \\ (i, p-2) \longleftarrow (i, p) \longrightarrow (i, p+2) \\ \searrow \scriptstyle r-{}^{(s)}\xi_{j',i}, \xi_{i,j'} \\ (j', p + {}^{(s)}\xi_{j',i}) \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} (j, p + {}^{(s)}\xi_{j,i}) \\ \swarrow \scriptstyle r-{}^{(s)}\xi_{j,i}, \xi_{i,j} \\ (i, p-2) \longleftarrow (i, p) \longrightarrow (i, p+2) \\ \searrow \scriptstyle r-{}^{(s)}\xi_{j',i}, \xi_{i,j'} \\ (j', p + {}^{(s)}\xi_{j',i}) \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

where ${}^{(s)}\xi_{k,i} := (-1)^{\delta({}^{(s)}\xi_k < {}^{(s)}\xi_i)}$ for $k \in \underline{\Delta}_0$ with $d(i, k) = 1$. In this proof, we only consider the first one in (8.8) since the computation below is almost identical for the other cases.

By the definition of ${}^{(s)}\xi$, we have ${}^{(s)}\xi_{j,i} = {}^{(s)}\xi_{j',i}$ for all $j, j' \in \underline{\Delta}_0$ with $d(j, i) = d(j', i) = 1$. Now let us assume that i is a source of ${}^{(s)}\xi$ since the proof for the cases when i is a sink of ${}^{(s)}\xi$ is similar. Then the quantum exchange relation has the form

$$(8.9) \quad v_{i,p}^{(n+1)} * v_{i,p}^{(n)} = q^\alpha v_{i,p+2}^{(n+1)} \cdot v_{i,p-2}^{(n)} + q^\beta \prod_{j; d(j,i)=1} (v_{i,p-1}^{(n)})^{-c_{j,i}}$$

for some $\alpha, \beta \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$, where

(8.10)

$$q^\alpha \left(v_{i,p+2}^{(n+1)} \cdot v_{i,p-2}^{(n)} \right) * (v_{i,p}^{(n)})^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad q^\beta \left(\prod_{j; d(j,i)=1} (v_{i,p-1}^{(n)})^{-c_{j,i}} \right) * (v_{i,p}^{(n)})^{-1} \text{ are bar-invariant.}$$

Here the dot product \cdot is given in (4.8).

The rest of this proof is devoted to show that the above quantum exchange relation coincides with the truncated image of the quantum folded T -system in Theorem 6.9. For this, it suffices to assume that $s = 0$ and hence $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$. For each $(i, p) \in {}^0\tilde{\Delta}_0$, we set $k := \max(u \mid p + 2u \leq 0)$. By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$u_{i,p}^{(n+1)} * {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k,p-2n}^{(i)}) = q^\alpha \left({}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k-1,p-2n}^{(i)}) \cdot {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k+1,p-2n-2}^{(i)}) \right) + q^\gamma \prod_{j; d(j,i)=1} {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k,p-1-2n}^{(j)})^{-c_{j,i}}$$

On the other hand, the corresponding truncated image of the quantum folded T -system in Theorem 6.9 is

$$(8.11) \quad {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k,p-2n-2}^{(i)}) * {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k,p-2n}^{(i)}) = q^{\alpha'} \left({}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k-1,p-2n}^{(i)}) \cdot {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k+1,p-2n-2}^{(i)}) \right) + q^{\gamma'} \prod_{j; d(j,i)=1} {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k,p-1-2n}^{(j)})^{-c_{j,i}},$$

where

$$\gamma' = \frac{1}{2} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,i}(2k-1) + \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,i}(2k+1) \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha' = \gamma' + d_i.$$

By using the dominant monomials in (8.11) and bar-invariance in (8.10),

$$q^\alpha \left(\underline{m}_{k-1,p-2n}^{(i)} \cdot \underline{m}_{k+1,p-2n-2}^{(i)} \right) * (\underline{m}_{k,p-2n}^{(i)})^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad q^\gamma \left(\prod_{j; d(j,i)=1} (\underline{m}_{k,p-1-2n}^{(j)})^{-c_{j,i}} \right) * (\underline{m}_{k,p-2n}^{(i)})^{-1}$$

are bar-invariant. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \left(\sum_{b=0}^{k-2} (\tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2(a-b)+1) - \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2(a-b)-1)) + \sum_{b=0}^k (\tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2(a-b)+3) - \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2(a-b)+1)) \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=0}^{k-1} (\tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2a+1) - \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2a-2k+3) + \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2a+3) - \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2a-2k+1)) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2k+1) + \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2k-1)) + \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(1) = \alpha'
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \gamma &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j;d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \left(\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} \left(\sum_{b=0}^{k-1} \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2(a-b)+2) - \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2(a-b)) \right) \right) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j;d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \left(\sum_{a=0}^{k-1} (\tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2a+2) - \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2a-2k+2)) \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j;d(i,j)=1} -c_{j,i} \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2k) \\
 &\stackrel{\dagger}{=} \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2k+1) + \tilde{\eta}_{i,i}(2k-1)) = \gamma'.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here $\stackrel{\dagger}{=}$ holds by Lemma 2.3.

Since ${}^0F_q(m_{k,p-2n}^{(i)})$ is invertible in the skew-field of fractions ${}^0\mathfrak{F}_q$ of the quantum torus ${}^0\mathcal{X}_q$, we conclude that

$$v_{i,p}^{(n+1)} = {}^0F_q(\underline{m}_{k,p-2n-2}^{(i)}),$$

as desired. The second assertion follows from Proposition 5.25. \square

Let ${}^{(s)}\mathcal{T}_q$ be the quantum torus associated with sL generated by $v_{i,p}$ for $(i,p) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0$. Then, ${}^{(s)}\mathcal{T}_q$ is isomorphic to ${}^s\mathcal{X}_q$. Thus, ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q$ can be understood as a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -subalgebra in ${}^{(s)}\mathcal{T}_q$.

By following the argument in the proof of [5, Lemma 6.4.1], we have the following lemma:

Lemma 8.6. *The assignment*

$$\Omega : v_{i,p} \mapsto F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s])$$

extends to a well-defined injective $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra homomorphism

$$\Omega : {}^{(s)}\mathcal{T}_q \mapsto \mathcal{X}_q.$$

Moreover, the restriction of Ω to the quantum cluster algebra ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q$ has its image in the quantum torus \mathcal{X}_q and the $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra homomorphisms Ω and $(\cdot)_{\leq s}$ satisfy the following commutative diagram:

$$(8.12) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} {}^s\mathcal{A}_q & \xrightarrow{\Omega} & \mathcal{X}_q \\ & \searrow {}^s\Omega & \downarrow (\cdot)_{\leq s} \\ & & {}^s\mathcal{X}_q \end{array}$$

where ${}^s\Omega$ is the map induced from the assignment $v_{i,p} \rightarrow \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$.

Let sR_q be the image of the quantum cluster algebra ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q$ under the map Ω :

$$R_{q,s} := \Omega({}^s\mathcal{A}_q).$$

Proposition 8.7. (cf. [30, Theorem 5.1], [5, Proposition 6.4.2]) *We have*

$$R_{q,s} = \mathfrak{K}_{q,s}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Proof. Let us recall $v_{i,p} := \underline{m}^{(i)}[p, s]$ and $({}^s)\xi_i \in \{s-1, s\}$. By Proposition 8.5 and Lemma 8.6, we have

$$\Omega\left(v_{i,({}^s)\xi_i}^{(n)}\right) = F_q\left(X_{i,({}^s)\xi_i-2n}\right) \quad \text{for } i \in \mathbb{A}_0 \text{ and } n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Since $\mathfrak{K}_{q,s}(\mathfrak{g})$ is generated by $F_q(X_{i,p})$ for all $(i, p) \in {}^s\tilde{\mathbb{A}}$ as a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -algebra by Theorem 5.23 (see also (5.21) below), we have the following inclusion:

$$\mathfrak{K}_{q,s}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset R_{q,s}.$$

Next, let us prove the reverse inclusion. As we see in Section 4.2, there exist $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -derivations $S_{i,q} : \mathcal{X}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{i,q}$ such that

$$(8.13) \quad \bigcap_{i \in \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_0} \text{Ker}(S_{i,q}) = \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Let us prove by induction that all cluster variables Z in ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q$ satisfy $\Omega(Z) \in \mathfrak{K}_{q,s}(\mathfrak{g})$. Let Z be a quantum cluster variable in ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q$. If Z belongs to the initial cluster variables, it is done by definition of Ω . Let us assume that Z does not belong to the initial cluster variables. Then Z is obtained from a finite sequence of mutations. Then we have

$$ZZ_1 = q^\alpha M_1 + q^\beta M_2,$$

where Z_1 , M_1 and M_2 are quantum cluster monomials of ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q$. By the induction hypothesis,

$$(8.14) \quad \Omega(Z_1), \Omega(M_1), \Omega(M_2) \in \mathfrak{K}_{q,s}(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Note that $\Omega(Z_1) \neq 0$. By Lemma 8.6, we have

$$\Omega(Z) * \Omega(Z_1) = q^\alpha \Omega(M_1) + q^\beta \Omega(M_2).$$

Since $S_{i,q}$ ($i \in \mathbb{A}_0$) is a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm\frac{1}{2}}]$ -linear derivation (Proposition 4.8),

$$\begin{aligned} S_{i,q}(\Omega(Z) * \Omega(Z_1)) &= \Omega(Z) \cdot S_{i,q}(\Omega(Z_1)) + S_{i,q}(\Omega(Z)) \cdot \Omega(Z_1) \\ &= q^\alpha S_{i,q}(\Omega(M_1)) + q^\beta S_{i,q}(\Omega(M_2)). \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis and (8.13), we have

$$S_{i,q}(\Omega(Z_1)) = S_{i,q}(\Omega(M_1)) = S_{i,q}(\Omega(M_2)) = 0.$$

Then Lemma 4.7 tells us that $S_{i,q}(\Omega(Z)) = 0$, that is, $\Omega(Z) \in \mathfrak{K}_{i,q}(\mathfrak{g})$ for all $i \in \mathbb{A}_0$. Hence, $\Omega(Z) \in \mathfrak{K}_{q,s}(\mathfrak{g})$ due to (8.13) and (8.14), as we desired. \square

Now, we present the main result in this section.

Theorem 8.8. *For each height function ξ on \mathbb{A} , $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ has a quantum cluster algebra structure whose initial quantum seed is*

$$(8.15) \quad \mathcal{S}_\xi = (\{F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, \xi_i])\}_{(i,p) \in \xi\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_0}, {}^\xi L, {}^\xi \tilde{B}).$$

Proof. Our assertion for ${}^{(s)}\xi$ already holds by Proposition 8.7. Let $j \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0$ be a source of ${}^{(s)}\xi$. Then we have

$$(8.16) \quad {}^{(s)}\xi^j \mu \left(\mathcal{S}_{(s)\xi} \right) = \left(\{F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)})[p - 2\delta_{i,j}, {}^{(s)}\xi_i - 2\delta_{i,j}]\}_{(i,p) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0}, {}^{s_j(s)}\xi L, {}^{s_j(s)}\xi \tilde{B} \right) = \mathcal{S}_{s_j(s)\xi},$$

by Proposition 8.2 and Proposition 8.5. Let Q (resp. ${}^{(s)}Q$) be the Dynkin quiver of Δ corresponding to ξ (resp. ${}^{(s)}\xi$). Since any Dynkin quivers of Δ are connected by a finite sequence of reflections (up to constant on their height functions), so are Q and ${}^{(s)}Q$. Then the quantum seed $\mathcal{S}_{(s)\xi}$ is mutation equivalent to \mathcal{S}_ξ by (8.16) and \mathbb{T}_r ($r \in 2\mathbb{Z}$). Hence, it follows from Lemma 7.5 and Proposition 8.7 that $\mathfrak{K}_{q,s}(\mathfrak{g}) \simeq \mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S}_{(s)\xi}) \simeq \mathcal{A}_{q^{1/2}}(\mathcal{S}_\xi) \simeq \mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$, so $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ has a quantum cluster algebra structure. \square

As an application of Theorem 8.8, we obtain q -commutativities of $F_q(\underline{m}_{k,r}^{(i)})$ and $F_q(\underline{m}_{l,t}^{(j)})$ satisfying certain conditions as follows.

Theorem 8.9. *For a pair $(m_{k,r}^{(i)}, m_{l,t}^{(j)})$, $(F_q(\underline{m}_{k,r}^{(i)}), F_q(\underline{m}_{l,t}^{(j)}))$ is a q -commuting pair if*

- (a) $r - d(i, j) \leq t \leq t + 2(l - 1) \leq r + 2(k - 1) + d(i, j)$ or
- (b) $t - d(i, j) \leq r \leq r + 2(k - 1) \leq t + 2(l - 1) + d(i, j)$.

In particular, $F_q(m_{k,r}^{(i)})$ q -commutes with $F_q(X_{j,p})$ if

$$r - d(i, j) \leq p \leq r + 2(k - 1) + d(i, j).$$

Proof. Under the conditions (a) and (b), there exists a height function ξ on Δ such that $\xi_i = r + 2(k - 1)$ and $\xi_j = t + 2(l - 1)$. Then we have

$$F_q(\underline{m}_{k,r}^{(i)}) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[\xi_i - 2(k - 1), \xi_i]) \quad \text{and} \quad F_q(\underline{m}_{l,t}^{(j)}) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[\xi_j - 2(l - 1), \xi_j])$$

which can be viewed as initial quantum cluster variables in \mathcal{S}_ξ . Thus our assertion follows from Theorem 8.8. \square

The conjecture below is proved in [61] when \mathfrak{g} is of finite AD -type.

Conjecture 4. *For a pair $(m_{k,r}^{(i)}, m_{l,t}^{(j)})$, $F_q(\underline{m}_{k,r}^{(i)})$ and $F_q(\underline{m}_{l,t}^{(j)})$ q -commute unless there exist $1 \leq u \leq h$ and $0 \leq s \leq \min(k, l) - 1$ satisfying*

$$(8.17) \quad |k + r - l - t| = u + |k - l| + 2s \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i,j}(u - 1) \neq 0.$$

9. EXTENSION TO $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$

In this section, we will extend Theorem 8.8 to $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, that is, the quantum virtual Grothendieck ring $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ has also a quantum cluster algebra structure (of skew-symmetrizable type) isomorphic to its subalgebra $\mathfrak{K}_{q,\xi}(\mathfrak{g})$ for each height function ξ on $\tilde{\Delta}$.

9.1. Sink-source quiver. For an integer $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, recall the height function ${}^{(s)}\xi$ on Δ . Now let us consider a new valued quiver ${}^s\overleftarrow{\Delta}$ whose set of vertices is ${}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0$ and the exchange matrix ${}^s\mathfrak{B}$ is given


as follows:

$$(9.1) \quad \mathbf{b}_{(i,p),(j,t)} = \begin{cases} -c_{i,j} & \text{if either (a) } t - p = 1, i \neq j \text{ and } p \equiv_4 \xi_i = s - 1, \\ & \text{or (b) } p - t = 1, i \neq j \text{ and } p \not\equiv_4 \xi_i = s, \\ c_{i,j} & \text{if either (a')} p - t = 1, i \neq j \text{ and } p \equiv_4 \xi_i = s, \\ & \text{or (b')} t - p = 1, i \neq j \text{ and } p \not\equiv_4 \xi_i = s - 1, \\ 1 & \text{if either (A) } |p - t| = 2, i = j \text{ and } p \equiv_4 \xi_i = s, \\ & \text{or (B) } |p - t| = 2, i = j \text{ and } p \not\equiv_4 \xi_i = s - 1, \\ -1 & \text{if either (A')} |p - t| = 2, i = j \text{ and } p \not\equiv_4 \xi_i = s, \\ & \text{or (B')} |p - t| = 2, i = j \text{ and } p \equiv_4 \xi_i = s - 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$


Note that ${}^s\mathfrak{B}$ satisfies (2.12) with the sequence $S = (s_{i,p} \mid s_{i,p} = d_i)$ and without frozen vertices.

Example 9.1. Here are a couple of examples of ${}^{\leftarrow}\mathfrak{D}$ for non-simply-laced types:

(1) For $s = 0$ and \mathfrak{g} of type B_3 , ${}^0\mathfrak{D}$ can be depicted as follows:



(2) For $s = 0$ and \mathfrak{g} of type G_2 , ${}^0\mathfrak{D}$ can be depicted as follows:



Remark 9.2. Note that every vertex (i, p) in ${}^{\leftarrow}\mathfrak{D}_0$ is either

- (i) vertically sink and horizontally source, or
- (ii) vertically source and horizontally sink.

More precisely, when

- (i)' $\xi_i = s$ and $p \equiv_4 s$, or $\xi_i = (s - 1)$ and $p \not\equiv_4 s - 1$, (i, p) satisfies (i),
- (ii)' $\xi_i = s$ and $p \not\equiv_4 s$, or $\xi_i = (s - 1)$ and $p \equiv_4 s - 1$, (i, p) satisfies (ii).

For each $(i, p) \in {}^{\leftarrow}\mathfrak{D}_0 = {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0$, we assign ${}^s\mathbf{u}_{i,p} \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ at (i, p) , which is defined by

$$(9.2) \quad {}^s\mathbf{u}_{i,p} := F_q \left(\underline{m}^{(i)} [{}^s o_{i,p}, {}^s o_{i,p} + 2 {}^s l_{i,p}] \right),$$

where

$$(9.3) \quad {}^s l_{i,p} := \binom{(s)\xi_i - p}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \text{and} \quad {}^s o_{i,p} := (s)\xi_i - 2 \times \left\lfloor \frac{{}^s l_{i,p} + \delta \binom{(s)\xi_i = s}{2}}{2} \right\rfloor.$$

Example 9.3. By replacing vertices (i, p) 's in ${}^{\leftarrow}\mathfrak{D}_0$ with $\mathbf{u}_{i,p}$ in Example 9.1, we can obtain the following pictures:

(1) For $s = 0$ and \mathfrak{g} of type B_3 , we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \cdots & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(1)}[-2, 2]) & \longrightarrow & F_q(m^{(1)}[-2, 0]) & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(1)}[0, 0]) \\
 & & \nearrow & & \searrow & & \nearrow \\
 \cdots & \rightarrow & F_q(m^{(2)}[-3, 1]) & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(2)}[-1, 1]) & \longrightarrow & F_q(m^{(2)}[-1, -1]) \\
 & & \searrow & & \swarrow & & \searrow \\
 \cdots & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(3)}[-2, 2]) & \longrightarrow & F_q(m^{(3)}[-2, 0]) & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(3)}[0, 0])
 \end{array}$$

(2) For $s = 0$ and \mathfrak{g} of type G_2 , we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \cdots & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(1)}[-2, 2]) & \longrightarrow & F_q(m^{(1)}[-2, 0]) & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(1)}[0, 0]) \\
 & & \nearrow & & \searrow & & \nearrow \\
 \cdots & \rightarrow & F_q(m^{(2)}[-3, 1]) & \longleftarrow & F_q(m^{(2)}[-1, 1]) & \longrightarrow & F_q(m^{(2)}[-1, -1])
 \end{array}$$

Let us define a matrix ${}^s\Lambda = ({}^s\Lambda_{(i,p),(j,t)})_{(i,p),(j,t) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0}$ such that

$${}^s\Lambda_{(i,p),(j,t)} = \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[{}^s o_{i,p}, {}^s o_{i,p} + 2 {}^s l_{i,p}], m^{(j)}[{}^s o_{j,t}, {}^s o_{j,t} + 2 {}^s l_{j,t}]).$$

Theorem 9.4. *The pair $({}^s\Lambda, {}^s\mathfrak{B})$ is compatible with $\text{diag}(2d_{i,p} := 2d_i \mid (i,p) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0)$.*

Proof. Let $(i,p), (j,t) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0$. In this proof, we only consider the case of $\xi_j = s$ and $t \equiv_4 \xi_j$, since the other cases are similar. Set $a_1 = {}^s o_{i,p}$, $a_2 = a_1 + 2 {}^s l_{i,p}$, $b_1 = {}^s o_{j,t}$ and $b_2 = b_1 + 2 {}^s l_{j,t}$. By (9.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 -({}^s\Lambda {}^s\mathfrak{B})_{(i,p),(j,t)} &= \delta(t \neq \xi_j) {}^s\Lambda_{(i,p),(j,t+2)} + {}^s\Lambda_{(i,p),(j,t-2)} + \sum_{k; d(j,k)=1} c_{k,j} {}^s\Lambda_{(i,p),(k,t-1)} \\
 &= \delta(t \neq \xi_j) \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[a_1, a_2], m^{(j)}[b_1, b_2 - 2]) + \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[a_1, a_2], m^{(j)}[b_1 - 2, b_2]) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{k; d(j,k)=1} c_{k,j} \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[a_1, a_2], m^{(k)}[b_1 - 1, b_2 - 1]) \\
 &\stackrel{*}{=} \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[a_1, a_2], B_{j,b_1-1} B_{j,b_1+3} \cdots B_{j,b_2-1})
 \end{aligned}$$

where $*$ holds by (3.6) and (4.4). Then it follows from (4.9) in Proposition 4.6 that

$$\begin{aligned}
 -({}^s\Lambda {}^s\mathfrak{B})_{(i,p),(j,t)} &= \underline{\mathcal{N}}(m^{(i)}[a_1, a_2], B_{j,b_1-1} B_{j,b_1+3} \cdots B_{j,b_2-1}) \\
 &= \sum_{x=0}^{\frac{a_2-a_1}{2}} \sum_{y=0}^{\frac{b_2-b_1}{2}} \delta_{i,j} (-\delta(a_1 + 2x - b_1 - 2y = -2) + \delta(a_1 + 2x - b_1 - 2y = 0)) 2d_i \\
 &= \delta_{i,j} \sum_{x=0}^{\frac{a_2-a_1}{2}} (-\delta(a_1 + 2x - b_1 = -2) + \delta(a_1 + 2x - b_2 = 0)) 2d_i.
 \end{aligned}$$

If $i = j$, we have the following:

- (1) $[a_1, a_2]$ and $[b_1, b_2]$ are inclusive, that is, either $[a_1, a_2] \subset [b_1, b_2]$ or $[b_1, b_2] \subset [a_1, a_2]$;
- (2) if $a_k = b_k$, then $b_l - a_l = 2$ or 0 for $\{k, l\} = \{1, 2\}$.

Thus we can conclude that

$$-({}^s\Lambda {}^s\mathfrak{B})_{(i,p),(j,t)} = \delta((i,p) = (j,t)) 2d_i,$$

as we desired. \square

Lemma 9.5. *The set $\{{}^s u_{i,p}\}_{(i,p) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0}$ forms a q -commuting family in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. From Theorem 8.9, our assertion easily follows. \square

Theorem 9.6. *The family of quantum seeds*

$$(9.4) \quad \mathfrak{S}_s = (\{\mathbf{u}_{i,p}\}_{(i,p) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0}, {}^s\Lambda, {}^s\mathfrak{B}) \quad \text{for } s \in \mathbb{Z},$$

gives a quantum cluster algebra structure on $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

The rest of this paper will be devoted to proving Theorem 9.6. Let ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ be the quantum cluster algebra generated by the quantum seed \mathfrak{S}_s . To prove Theorem 9.6, we need to show that

$$(9.5) \quad {}^s\mathcal{A}_q(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g}).$$

Then the proof of (9.5) is separated into two steps as follows:

Step 1. For the inclusion ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, we will prove the following proposition in Section 9.2.

Proposition 9.7. *For any finite sequence μ of mutations, a cluster variable in $\mu(\mathfrak{S}_s)$ is contained in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.*

The key observation for proving Proposition 9.7 is that the mutated variables from \mathfrak{S}_s are understood as the ones from $\mathcal{S}_{s'}$ for some $s' \in \mathbb{Z}$, which implies ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$.

Step 2. The opposite inclusion will be proved as the following proposition is shown in Section 9.3.

Proposition 9.8. *For $(i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$, there exists a finite sequence μ of mutations such that $\mu(\mathfrak{S}_s)$ contains $F_q(X_{i,p})$ as its cluster variable.*

Since $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ is generated by $F_q(X_{i,p})$ for $(i,p) \in \tilde{\Delta}_0$ by Theorem 5.21 (see also (5.21) below), the opposite inclusion for proving (9.5) follows from Proposition 9.8.

9.2. Proof of Theorem 9.6: Step 1. For $k \leq s$, we set

$$\langle k \rangle := \{(i,k) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle k, s \rangle := \{(i,p) \in {}^s\tilde{\Delta}_0 \mid k \leq p \leq s\}.$$

We understand $\langle k, s \rangle = \emptyset$ for $k > s$.

Lemma 9.9. *For the valued quiver ${}^s\tilde{\Delta}$, we have*

$$\mu_{(i_1,s)} \circ \mu_{(i_2,s)} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{(i_r,s)}({}^s\tilde{\Delta}) \simeq \mu_{(j_1,s)} \circ \mu_{(j_2,s)} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{(j_r,s)}({}^s\tilde{\Delta}),$$

where $\{(i_t, s)\}_{1 \leq t \leq r} = \{(j_t, s)\}_{1 \leq t \leq r} = \langle s \rangle$. Thus, $\mu_{\langle s \rangle}$ is well-defined on ${}^s\tilde{\Delta}$, that is, $\mu_{\langle s \rangle}({}^s\tilde{\Delta})$ is uniquely determined.

Proof. Note that (a) each $(i_k, s) \in \langle s \rangle$ is vertically sink and horizontally source, (b) all the length 2 paths passing through (i_k, s) start from $(i', s-1)$ and end at $(i_k, s-2)$ where $d(i', i_k) = 1$, and (c) there is no arrow between (i_k, s) and $(i_{k'}, s)$ for $i_k \neq i_{k'}$.

$${}^s\tilde{\Delta} = \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i_k, s-4) & \longleftarrow & (i_k, s-2) & \longleftarrow & (i_k, s) \\ & & \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \text{---} \\ \longleftarrow \end{array} & \\ & & \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \text{---} \\ \longleftarrow \end{array} & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i', s-3) & \longleftarrow & (i', s-1) & & \\ & & \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \text{---} \\ \longleftarrow \end{array} & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s-4) & \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s-2) & \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s) \end{array}$$

As in the previous cases, $\mu_{\langle s-3 \rangle}$ is well-defined, $\mu_{\langle s-3 \rangle}$ yields arrows from $(i, s-2)$ to $(i', s-3 \pm 2)$ as $\mu_{\langle s-1 \rangle}$ did, and hence $\mu_{\langle s-3, s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta})$ can be depicted as follows:

$$(9.10) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i_k, s-6) & \longleftarrow & (i_k, s-4) & \longrightarrow & (i_k, s-2) & \longleftarrow & (i_k, s) \\ & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i', s-5) & \longleftarrow & (i', s-3) & \longrightarrow & (i', s-1) & & \\ & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s-6) & \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s-4) & \longrightarrow & (i_{k'}, s-2) & \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s) \end{array}$$

Then one can see that

- (i) the full-subquiver of $\mu_{\langle s-2, s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta})$ obtained by excluding vertices in $\langle s \rangle$ is isomorphic to the valued quiver $\mu_{\langle s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta})$ in (9.6),
- (ii) the full-subquiver of $\mu_{\langle s-3, s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta})$ obtained by excluding vertices in $\langle s-1, s \rangle$ is isomorphic to the valued quiver $\mu_{\langle s-1, s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta})$ in (9.8).

Thus the induction works. \square

Remark 9.11. In the previous lemmas, we observe the following:

- (1) Each $\mu_{(i,p)}$ in $\mu_{\langle k, s \rangle}$ happens when (i, p) is vertically sink and horizontally source, and the arrows adjacent to (i, p) are given as follows: for any j with $d(i, j) = 1$,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \begin{array}{ccc} (i, p-2) & \longleftarrow & (i, p) & \longrightarrow & (i, p+2) \\ & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{j, i}, c_{i, j}} & & \\ & (j, p-1) & & & \end{array} & \text{if } p \equiv_2 s, \\ \begin{array}{ccc} (i, p-2) & \longleftarrow & (i, p) & \longrightarrow & (i, p+2) \\ & & \nwarrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{j, i}, c_{i, j}} & & \\ & (j, p+1) & & & \end{array} & \text{if } p \not\equiv_2 s. \end{array} \right.$$

- (2) Each $\mu_{(i,p)}$ in $\mu_{\langle k, s \rangle}$ does not affect on the local circumstance of the vertex (j, s) for $|s-p| > 2$ in the valued quiver obtained by applying the preceding mutations on $\widetilde{s\Delta}$.

Example 9.12. By applying $\mu_{\langle s-4 \rangle}$ on the valued quiver $\mu_{\langle s-3, s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta})$ in (9.10), we observe that the local circumstance of vertices in $\langle s-1, s \rangle$ are preserved as explained in Remark 9.11 (2):

$$(9.11) \quad \mu_{\langle s-4, s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta}) = \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i_k, s-6) & \longrightarrow & (i_k, s-4) & \longrightarrow & (i_k, s-2) & \longrightarrow & (i_k, s) \\ & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} \\ (i', s-7) & \longleftarrow & (i', s-5) & \longrightarrow & (i', s-3) & \longrightarrow & (i', s-1) & & \\ & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} & & \nearrow \scriptstyle \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s-6) & \longrightarrow & (i_{k'}, s-4) & \longrightarrow & (i_{k'}, s-2) & \longrightarrow & (i_{k'}, s) \end{array}$$

For notational simplicity, let us keep the following notations:

- $\Upsilon_s(\langle k, s \rangle) := \mu_{\langle k, s \rangle}(\widetilde{s\Delta})$ (in (9.7)), $\Upsilon_s := \widetilde{s\Delta}$, $\Theta_s := \overleftarrow{s\Delta}$, $\Omega_s := \overrightarrow{s\Delta}$,
- for a valued quiver Γ , a quiver ${}^X\Gamma$ denotes the full-subquiver of Γ whose vertices are in $X \subseteq \Gamma_0$,

where $\overrightarrow{s\Delta}$ is the quiver obtained from $\overleftarrow{s\Delta}$ by reversing the orientation of arrows in $\overleftarrow{s\Delta}$. By Remark 9.11 (2), we have

$$(9.12) \quad \langle -\infty, k-3 \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle k, s \rangle) \simeq \langle -\infty, k-3 \rangle \Upsilon_s,$$

for any $k \leq s$. The lemma below concerns $\langle k-3, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle k, s \rangle)$.

Lemma 9.13. For $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, as a finite quiver,

- (a) $\langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r+1, s \rangle) \simeq \langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s$.
 (b) $\langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle) \simeq \langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s$ and

$$\langle s-2r-3, s-2r+2 \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle) \simeq \begin{cases} \langle s-3, s \rangle \Omega_s & \text{if } r = 0, \\ \langle s-5, s \rangle \Theta_s & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. (a) Recall $\langle s-2r+1, s \rangle = \emptyset$ if $r = 0$, so this case trivially holds. The cases of $r = 1$ and $r = 2$ are already verified in (9.8) and (9.10), respectively. One observes that in the general case (i.e. $r \geq 3$), the mutation patterns in the intermediate steps are identical with (9.6) and (9.9) up to the shift of the second parameters. This completes the proof of (a).

(b) Let us consider the cases of $0 \leq r \leq 2$ precisely as follows:

Case 1. $r = 0$. By (9.6), $\langle s-3, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s \rangle)$ and $\langle s+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s \rangle)$ are

$$(9.13) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & (i_k, s-2) \longrightarrow & (i_k, s) \\ & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} \\ (i', s-3) \longleftarrow & (i', s-1) & \longrightarrow \\ & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} \\ & (i_{k'}, s-2) \longrightarrow & (i_{k'}, s) \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \emptyset,$$

Case 2. $r = 1$. By (9.9), $\langle s-5, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2, s \rangle)$ and $\langle s-1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2, s \rangle)$ are

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (i_k, s-4) \longrightarrow & (i_k, s-2) \longleftarrow & (i_k, s) \\ \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} \\ (i', s-5) \longleftarrow & (i', s-3) \longrightarrow & (i', s-1) \\ \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} \\ (i_{k'}, s-4) \longrightarrow & (i_{k'}, s-2) \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s) \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & (i_k, s) \\ & & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} \\ (i', s-1) & & \\ & & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} \\ & & (i_{k'}, s) \end{array}$$

Case 3. $r = 2$. By (9.11), $\langle s-7, s-2 \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle)$ and $\langle s-3, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle)$ are

$$(9.14) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (i_k, s-6) \longrightarrow & (i_k, s-4) \longleftarrow & (i_k, s-2) \\ \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} \\ (i', s-7) \longleftarrow & (i', s-5) \longrightarrow & (i', s-3) \\ \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} \\ (i_{k'}, s-6) \longrightarrow & (i_{k'}, s-4) \longleftarrow & (i_{k'}, s-2) \end{array} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} (i_k, s-2) \longleftarrow & & (i_k, s) \\ \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_k, i'}, c_{i', i_k}} & \nearrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_k}, c_{i_k, i'}} \\ (i', s-3) \longleftarrow & & (i', s-1) \\ \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i_{k'}, i'}, c_{i', i_{k'}}} & \nwarrow \Gamma_{-c_{i', i_{k'}}, c_{i_{k'}, i'}} \\ (i_{k'}, s-2) \longleftarrow & & (i_{k'}, s) \end{array}$$

One may further observe from *Case 1–Case 3* that

- $\langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle) \simeq \langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s$ for $r \geq 1$ (by similar argument as in (a)),
- $\langle s-2r-3, s-2r+2 \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle)$ stabilizes for $r \geq 1$ up to the shift of the second parameters, which is isomorphic to $\langle s-5, s \rangle \Theta_s$ as a finite quiver, where $\langle s-3, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s \rangle) \simeq \langle s-3, s \rangle \Omega_s$.

Hence we complete the proof of (b). \square

For $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we define

$$\mu_{\langle s-2r, s \rangle} := \begin{cases} \mu_{\langle s \rangle} \circ \mu_{\langle s-4, s \rangle} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{\langle s-2r+4, s \rangle} \circ \mu_{\langle s-2r, s \rangle} & \text{if } r \equiv 0, \\ \mu_{\langle s-2, s \rangle} \circ \mu_{\langle s-6, s \rangle} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{\langle s-2r+4, s \rangle} \circ \mu_{\langle s-2r, s \rangle} & \text{if } r \equiv 1. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 9.13 (b), $\langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle) \simeq \langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s$. By Lemma 9.10 and Remark 9.11 (2), $\mu_{\langle s-2r+4, s \rangle}$ is well-defined on $\langle s-2r+1, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle)$. Thus it makes sense to define

$$\Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle) := \mu_{\langle s-2r, s \rangle}(\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}^s).$$

Then we have a generalization of Lemma 9.13.

Proposition 9.14. *For $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have*

$$\langle s-2r-3, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-2r, s \rangle) \simeq \begin{cases} \langle s-2r-3, s \rangle \Omega_s & \text{if } r \equiv_2 0, \\ \langle s-2r-3, s \rangle \Theta_s & \text{if } r \equiv_2 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We first consider the case $0 \leq r \leq 2$, and then the general case $r \geq 3$.

Case 1. $0 \leq r \leq 2$. The assertion for $r = 0$ and $r = 1$ is shown by (9.6) and (9.9), respectively. Let us consider the case $r = 2$. By (9.11), we may consider $\langle s-7, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle)$ by separating it into two parts $\langle s-7, s-2 \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle)$ and $\langle s-2, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle)$, where each one is shown in (9.14). Then $\langle s-7, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle)$ is understood as a concatenation of $\langle s-7, s-2 \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle)$ and $\mu_{\langle s \rangle}(\langle s-2, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle))$ due to Remark 9.11 (2), where the common vertices are overlapped. Since $\mu_{\langle s \rangle}(\langle s-2, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle s-4, s \rangle))$ is isomorphic to the valued quiver in (9.13), the assertion for $r = 2$ is proved.

Case 2. $r \geq 3$. The proof idea in this case is identical with *Case 1*, that is, by using the same argument as in *Case 1*, we observe that the finite valued quiver

$$\Gamma_1 := \langle s-2r-3, s-2r+6 \rangle \left(\mu_{\langle s-2r+4, s \rangle} \circ \mu_{\langle s-2r, s \rangle}(\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}^s) \right)$$

is a concatenation of

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} (i_k, s-2r-2) \longrightarrow (i_k, s-2r) \longleftarrow (i_k, s-2r+2) \\ \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \\ (i', s-2r-3) \longleftarrow (i', s-2r-1) \longrightarrow (i', s-2r+1) \\ \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \\ (i_{k'}, s-2r-2) \longrightarrow (i_{k'}, s-2r) \longleftarrow (i_{k'}, s-2r+2) \end{array} & \text{and} & \begin{array}{c} (i_k, s-2r+2) \longrightarrow (i_k, s-2r+4) \longleftarrow (i_k, s-2r+6) \\ \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_k, i_k}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \\ (i', s-2r+1) \longleftarrow (i', s-2r+3) \longrightarrow (i', s-2r+5) \\ \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_{k'}, i_{k'}}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_{k'}, i_{k'}}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \quad \nearrow \text{---} c_{i_{k'}, i_{k'}}^{i', i'} \text{---} \searrow \\ (i_{k'}, s-2r+2) \longrightarrow (i_{k'}, s-2r+4) \longleftarrow (i_{k'}, s-2r+6) \end{array} \end{array}$$

where we regard the common vertices to be overlapped in the concatenation. Since

$$\langle s-2r+5, s \rangle \left(\mu_{\langle s-2r+4, s \rangle} \circ \mu_{\langle s-2r, s \rangle}(\widetilde{\mathbb{A}}^s) \right) \simeq \langle s-2r+5, s \rangle \Upsilon_s \quad \text{by Lemma 9.13 (b),}$$

and $\mu_{\langle s-2r+8, s \rangle}$ does not contribute to Γ_1 , we complete the proof by applying the same argument to $\langle s-2r+5, s \rangle \Upsilon_s$ as in *Case 1*. \square

Let us write μ in Proposition 9.7 as

$$(9.15) \quad \mu = \mu(i_l, p_l) \circ \mu(i_{l-1}, p_{l-1}) \circ \cdots \circ \mu(i_1, p_1).$$

Take $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $t \ll \min(p_k \mid 1 \leq k \leq l)$ and $s-t \equiv_4 2$. By our choice of t , it follows from Proposition 9.14 that

$$\langle t-3, s \rangle \Upsilon_s(\langle t, s \rangle) \simeq \langle t-3, s \rangle \Theta_s \quad \text{as a valued quiver,}$$

where

$$(9.16) \quad s-t = 4u+2 \quad \text{for some } u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Recall the quantum seeds

$$(9.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}_s &= (\{ {}^s \mathbf{v}_{i,p} := F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, {}^{(s)}\xi_i]) \}_{(i,p) \in {}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0}, {}^s L, {}^s \tilde{B}) \text{ associated to } {}^{(s)}\xi \text{ in (8.15),} \\ \mathfrak{S}_s &= \left(\left\{ {}^s \mathbf{u}_{i,p} = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[{}^s o_{i,p}, {}^s o_{i,p} + 2 {}^s l_{i,p}]) \right\}_{(i,p) \in {}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0}, {}^s \Lambda, {}^s \mathfrak{B} \right) \text{ in (9.4).} \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 9.15. *Every mutation $\mu_{(i,p)}$ in $\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}$ on the cluster $\{ {}^s \mathbf{v}_{i,p} \}$ corresponds to the quantum folded T-system in Theorem 6.9. Furthermore, each mutation $\mu_{(i,p)}$ of the quantum cluster variable sitting at (i,p) corresponds to \mathbb{T}_{-2} .*

Proof. First, let us consider a mutation $\mu_{(i,p)}$ in $\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}$. When $(i,p) = (i,s)$ (i.e. one of the vertices located in the right-most of ${}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0$), the local circumstance of (i,s) described in Remark 9.11 (1) tells us that the quantum exchange relation is given by

$$\mu_{(i,s)}(F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,s})) * F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,s}) = q^{\alpha(i,1)} F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[s-2, s]) + q^{\gamma(i,1)} \prod_{j; d_{j,i}=1} F_q(\mathbf{X}_{j,s-1})^{-c_{j,i}},$$

where $q^{\alpha(i,1)}$ and $q^{\gamma(i,1)}$ are determined to be bar-invariant as in the sense of (8.9). Consequently, it corresponds to the quantum folded T-system in Theorem 6.9 and hence $\mu_{(i,s)}(F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,s})) = F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,s-2})$ as we desired. Note that another mutation at (i',s) does not affect the mutation at (i,s) as shown in Lemma 9.9.

Second, let us consider a mutation at $(j,s-1)$, which appears later than any (i,s) in $\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}$. Let us keep in mind that the cluster variable located at (i',s) is already mutated by former mutations, which is $F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i',s-2})$. Then the quantum exchange relation is given as follows (recall Remark 9.11 (1)):

$$\mu_{(j,s-1)}(F_q(\mathbf{X}_{j,s-1})) * F_q(\mathbf{X}_{j,s-1}) = q^{\alpha(j,1)} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[s-3, s-1]) + q^{\gamma(j,1)} \prod_{i; d_{j,i}=1} F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,s-2})^{-c_{i,j}},$$

which coincides with the quantum folded T-system in Theorem 6.9. Hence $\mu_{(j,s-1)}(F_q(\mathbf{X}_{j,s-1})) = F_q(\mathbf{X}_{j,s-3})$, as we desired.

Finally, by using this argument and the local circumstance of (k,p) in the order for applying $\mu_{(k,p)}$, described in Remark 9.11 (1), one can conclude that each mutation $\mu_{(i,p)}$ in $\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}$ corresponds to shifting the second parameters of cluster variables by -2 . The assertion for mutations in $\mu_{\langle t+4r,s \rangle}$ ($r \geq 1$) follows from Lemma 9.13 (b), Remark 9.11 (2) and the argument for mutations in $\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}$. \square

Recall $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ in (9.16) depending on $\langle t,s \rangle$. For $(j,a) \in {}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0$ with $t \leq a \leq s$, we remark that

(A) there exists $0 \leq e \leq u$ such that $s - 4e - 2 \leq a < \min(s+1, s-4e+2)$, equivalently

$$a \in \{s-4e-2, s-4e-1, s-4e, s-4e+1\},$$

(B) ${}^{(s)}\xi_j = s$ if $a = s-4e-2$ or $s-4e$, and ${}^{(s)}\xi_j = s-1$, otherwise,

(C) since $\mu_{(j,a)}$ appears $(u+1-e)$ -times in $\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}$ and ${}^s \mathbf{v}_{j,a} = F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[a, s - \delta({}^{(s)}\xi_j \neq s)])$, it follows from Proposition 9.15 that

$$(\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}(\{ {}^s \mathbf{v}_{k,p} \}))_{(j,a)} = F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[a' + 2e, s' + 2e - \delta(a \neq_2 s)]).$$

Proposition 9.16. *For $(j,a) \in {}^s \tilde{\Delta}_0$ with $t \leq a \leq s$,*

$$(\mu_{\langle t,s \rangle}(\{ {}^s \mathbf{v}_{k,p} \}))_{(j,a)} = F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[{}^{s'} o_{j,a'}, {}^{s'} o_{j,a'} + 2 {}^{s'} l_{j,a'}]),$$

where $s' = s - 2(u+1)$ and $a' = a - 2(u+1)$ for $u \in \mathbb{Z}$ in (C).

Proof. We have

$$(s' o_{j,a'}, s' l_{j,a'}) = \begin{cases} (s' - 2(e+1), 2e+1) & \text{if } s-a = 4e+2, \\ (s' - 2e, 2e) & \text{if } s-a = 4e, \\ (s' - 2e, 2e) & \text{if } (s-1) - a = 4e, \\ (s' - 2(e-1), 2e-1) & \text{if } (s-1) - a = 4e-2, \end{cases}$$

where the integers on the left-hand side are defined in (9.3). Then one can easily check that

$$s' o_{j,a'} = a' + 2e \quad \text{and} \quad s' o_{j,a'} + 2 s' l_{j,a'} = s' + 2e - \delta(a \not\equiv_2 s),$$

which implies our assertion. \square

Now, we are ready to prove Proposition 9.7.

Proof of Proposition 9.7. Write μ in Proposition 9.7 as in (9.15). Let us set

$$Z := (\mu(\{s\mathbf{u}_{k,p}\}))_{(i_l, p_l)}.$$

By Proposition 9.14 and Proposition 9.16, we have

$$(\{s' \mathbf{v}_{k',p'}\})_{\langle t', s' \rangle} = (\{s \mathbf{u}_{k,p}\})_{\langle t, s \rangle},$$

that is, Z can be understood as a mutated variable from $\{s' \mathbf{v}_{k',p'}\}$ as follows:

$$Z = (\mu \circ \mu_{\langle t', s' \rangle})(\{s' \mathbf{v}_{k',p'}\})_{(i_l, p'_l)},$$

Here $t' = t + 2(u+1)$, $s' = s + 2(u+1)$ and $p'_l = p_l + 2(u+1)$. Since

$$\mathcal{S}_{s'} = (\{F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[p, (s')\xi_i])\}_{(i,p) \in s' \tilde{\Delta}_0}, s' L, s' \tilde{B})$$

is an initial quantum seed of the quantum cluster algebra $\mathfrak{K}_{q,s'}(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, Z is contained in $\mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$, which completes the proof. \square

9.3. Proof of Theorem 9.6: Step 2. For $k \leq s$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \langle k \rangle^- &:= \{(i, k) \in {}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta}_0 \mid (i, k) \text{ is vertically sink and horizontally source in } {}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta}_0\}, \\ \langle k \rangle^+ &:= \{(i, k) \in {}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta}_0 \mid (i, k) \text{ is vertically source and horizontally sink in } {}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta}_0\}. \end{aligned}$$

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq s} \sqcup \{-\infty\}$,

$$\langle k, s \rangle^- := \bigsqcup_{k \leq t \leq s} \langle t \rangle^- \quad \text{and} \quad \langle k, s \rangle^+ := \bigsqcup_{k \leq t \leq s} \langle t \rangle^+.$$

If $k > s$, then we understand those sets as empty set. Note that there is no arrows between vertices in $\langle k, s \rangle^\pm$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq s} \sqcup \{-\infty\}$.

Lemma 9.17. For $\{(i_t, p_t)\}_{1 \leq t \leq r} = \{(j_t, q_t)\}_{1 \leq t \leq r} = \langle k, s \rangle^\pm$, as a valued quiver,

$$\mu_{(i_1, p_1)} \circ \mu_{(i_2, p_2)} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{(i_r, p_r)}({}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta}) \simeq \mu_{(j_1, q_1)} \circ \mu_{(j_2, q_2)} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{(j_r, q_r)}({}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta}),$$

that is, $\mu_{\langle k, s \rangle^\pm}({}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta})$ is uniquely determined.

We remark that an analog of Lemma 9.17 by replacing ${}^{\leftarrow} s \overline{\Delta}$ with ${}^{\rightarrow} s \overline{\Delta}$ also holds.

Proof. In this proof, we only consider the case of $\langle k, s \rangle^+$ since the proof of $\langle k, s \rangle^-$ is similar. Let $(i, p), (j, s) \in \langle k, s \rangle^+$ such that $(i, p) \neq (j, s)$. The neighborhood of (i, p) on the valued quiver $\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square}$ is depicted as follows:

$$\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square} = \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longleftarrow & (j, p-3) & \longrightarrow & (j, p-1) & \longleftarrow & (j, p+1) & \longrightarrow & (j, p+3) & \longleftarrow & \cdots \\ & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i,d}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{j,i,d}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}}} & & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i, p-4) & \longrightarrow & (i, p-2) & \longrightarrow & (i, p) & \longrightarrow & (i, p+2) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\ & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i',d}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i',d}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}}} & & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (j', p-3) & \longrightarrow & (j', p-1) & \longleftarrow & (j', p+1) & \longrightarrow & (j', p+3) & \longleftarrow & \cdots \end{array}$$

By Algorithm 7.3, we have

$$\mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square}) = \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longleftarrow & (j, p-3) & \longrightarrow & (j, p-1) & \longleftarrow & (j, p+1) & \longrightarrow & (j, p+3) & \longleftarrow & \cdots \\ & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i,d}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{j,i,d}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}}} & & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i, p-4) & \longrightarrow & (i, p-2) & \longrightarrow & (i, p) & \longrightarrow & (i, p+2) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\ & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i',d}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i',d}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}}} & & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (j', p-3) & \longrightarrow & (j', p-1) & \longleftarrow & (j', p+1) & \longrightarrow & (j', p+3) & \longleftarrow & \cdots \end{array}$$

Here one can observe that

- $\mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square})$ has arrows between $(i, p \pm 2)$ and $(j, p+1)$ for $d(i, j) = 1$, where $(i, p \pm 2), (j, p+1) \in \langle k, s \rangle^-$,
- the arrows adjacent to $(j, p-1)$ and $(j, p+3)$ are not changed by $\mu_{(i,p)}$.

Hence, for $(x, y) \in \{(j, p-1), (j, p+3) \mid d(i, j) = 1\}$, the mutation $\mu_{(x,y)}(\mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square}))$ yields arrows between $(x, y \pm 2)$ and $(k, y+1)$ for $d(x, k) = 1$, one of which disappears due to an arrow from $\mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square})$. For instance,

$$\mu_{(j', p-1)}(\mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square})) = \begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longleftarrow & (j, p-3) & \longrightarrow & (j, p-1) & \longleftarrow & (j, p+1) & \longrightarrow & (j, p+3) & \longleftarrow & \cdots \\ & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j}, c_{j,i,d}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{j,i,d}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j,i}, c_{i,j}}} & & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (i, p-4) & \longrightarrow & (i, p-2) & \longrightarrow & (i, p) & \longrightarrow & (i, p+2) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \\ & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i',d}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}}} & & \nwarrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{i,j'}, c_{j',i',d}}} & & \nearrow_{\Gamma_{-c_{j',i}, c_{i,j'}}} & & \\ \cdots & \longleftarrow & (j', p-3) & \longrightarrow & (j', p-1) & \longrightarrow & (j', p+1) & \longrightarrow & (j', p+3) & \longrightarrow & \cdots \end{array}$$

Here the arrow from $(i, p-2)$ to $(j', p+1)$ on $\mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square})$ disappeared by the new arrow from $(j', p+1)$ to $(i, p-2)$ generated when we apply the mutation $\mu_{(j', p-1)}$ to $(\mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square}))$. In fact, one may observe that

$$\mu_{(i,p)} \circ \mu_{(j', p-1)} = \mu_{(j', p-1)} \circ \mu_{(i,p)} \quad \text{on } \overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square},$$

and the arrows among (i, p) , $(i, p-2)$, $(j', p+1)$ and $(j', p-1)$ in $\mu_{(j', p-1)} \circ \mu_{(i,p)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square})$ are reversed. Furthermore, one may generalize the above as follows:

$$\mu_{(i,p)} \circ \mu_{(j,s)} = \mu_{(j,s)} \circ \mu_{(i,p)} \quad \text{on } \mu_{(i_k, p_k)} \circ \cdots \circ \mu_{(i_r, p_r)}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square})$$

for $(i, p), (j, s) \in \langle k, s \rangle^+ \setminus \{(i_k, p_k), (i_{k+1}, p_{k+1}), \dots, (i_r, p_r)\}$, which proves our assertion. \square


For $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq s} \sqcup \{-\infty\}$, put

$$\Theta_s(\langle k, s \rangle^\pm) := \mu_{\langle k, s \rangle^\pm}(\overleftarrow{s}\overline{\square}), \quad \Omega_s(\langle k, s \rangle^\pm) := \mu_{\langle k, s \rangle^\pm}(\overrightarrow{s}\overline{\square}).$$

Lemma 9.18. *We have*


$$\Omega_s(\langle -\infty, s \rangle^\pm) \simeq \Theta_s \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta_s(\langle -\infty, s \rangle^\pm) \simeq \Omega_s \quad \text{as valued quivers.}$$

Case 1. $\mu_{\langle -\infty, 0 \rangle +}(\overleftarrow{\mathcal{Q}})$.



where the parameters of quantum cluster variables located at vertices that are vertically sink and horizontally source are shifted by 2, and the orientation of all arrows is reversed.

Case 2. $\mu_{\langle -\infty, 0 \rangle -}(\overleftarrow{\mathcal{Q}})$.



where the parameters of quantum cluster variables located at vertices that are vertically sink and horizontally source are shifted by -2 , and the orientation of all arrows is reversed.

Thus we can conclude that

$$\mu_{\langle -\infty, 0 \rangle +}(\mathfrak{S}_0) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_{\langle -\infty, 0 \rangle -}(\mathfrak{S}_0) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{-1}.$$

Following Example 9.20, it is straightforward to check the following proposition.

Proposition 9.21. *For $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have*

$$\mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle \pm}(\mathfrak{S}_s) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{s \pm 1}.$$

For $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, put

$$\mathfrak{U} := \mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle \pm}(\{\mathfrak{s}u_{i,p}\}).$$

Proposition 9.22. *Every mutation $\mu_{(i,p)}$ in $\mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle \pm}$ on the cluster \mathfrak{U} corresponds to the quantum folded T -system in Theorem 6.9. Furthermore, each mutation $\mu_{(i,p)}$ on the quantum cluster variable at (i,p) in $\mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle \pm}$ corresponds to $\mathbb{T}_{\mp 2}$.*

Proof. Set

$$\{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{z}_{i,p}^+\} := \mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle +}(\{\mathfrak{s}u_{i,p}\}) \quad \text{and} \quad \{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{z}_{i,p}^-\} := \mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle -}(\{\mathfrak{s}u_{i,p}\}).$$

In this proof, we only consider the case of $\{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{z}_{i,p}^+\}$ since the proof of $\{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{z}_{i,p}^-\}$ is parallel. Let $(i,p) \in \langle -\infty, s \rangle^\pm$.

Case 1. $(i,p) \in \langle -\infty, s \rangle^+$. By replacing vertices in $\overrightarrow{\mathcal{Q}}$ with $\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{z}_{k,q}^+$'s, we have the following:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_q(\underline{m}^{(k)}[a+1, b+1]) & & \\ \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \text{r-}\mathfrak{c}_{k,i}, \mathfrak{c}_{i,k-j} \\ \searrow \text{r-}\mathfrak{c}_{j,i}, \mathfrak{c}_{i,j} \end{array} & & \\ F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b+2]) \longleftarrow F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b+2]) \longrightarrow F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b]) & & \text{for } j, k \text{ with } d(i, j), d(i, k) \leq 1 \\ \begin{array}{c} \nearrow \text{r-}\mathfrak{c}_{k,i}, \mathfrak{c}_{i,k-j} \\ \searrow \text{r-}\mathfrak{c}_{j,i}, \mathfrak{c}_{i,j} \end{array} & & \\ F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[a+1, b+1]) & & \end{array}$$

where $\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{z}_{i,p}^+ = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b+2])$. Hence the mutation rule for quantum cluster variables can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{(i,p)}(F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b+2])) * F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b+2]) &= q^{\alpha(i, (b+2-a)/2)} F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b]) \cdot F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b+2]) \\ &\quad + q^{\gamma(i, (b+2-a)/2)} \prod_{j: d(i,j)=1} F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[a+1, b+1])^{-\mathfrak{c}_{j,i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\mu_{(i,p)}(F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b+2])) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b]).$$

Case 2. $(i, p) \in \langle -\infty, s \rangle^-$. The arrows adjacent to (i, p) for $(i, p) \in \langle -\infty, s \rangle^-$ are depicted as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & F_q(\underline{m}^{(k)}[a+1, b+1]) & \\ & \nearrow \text{r-}\epsilon_{i,k}, \epsilon_{k,i} & \\ F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b+2]) & \longrightarrow F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b]) & \longleftarrow F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b]) \\ & \searrow \text{r-}\epsilon_{i,j}, \epsilon_{j,i} & \\ & F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[a+1, b+1]) & \end{array} \quad \text{for } j, k \text{ with } d(i, j), d(i, k) \leq 1$$

where ${}^s\mathfrak{z}_{i,p}^+ = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b])$. Then as in *Case 1*, we have

$$\mu_{(i,p)}(F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a, b])) = F_q(\underline{m}^{(i)}[a+2, b+2]). \quad \square$$

Now, we are ready to prove Proposition 9.8.

Proof of Proposition 9.8. Let us define

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_+ := \mu_{\langle -\infty, s+1 \rangle^-} \circ \mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle^+} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_- := \mu_{\langle -\infty, s-1 \rangle^+} \circ \mu_{\langle -\infty, s \rangle^-}.$$

It follows from Propositions 9.19, 9.21 and 9.22 that

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_+(\mathfrak{S}_s) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{s+2} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_-(\mathfrak{S}_s) \simeq \mathfrak{S}_{s-2}.$$

By applying $\boldsymbol{\mu}_+$ repeatedly, we obtain $F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,p})$ for $(i, p) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p \geq s$ as a cluster variable of ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q(\mathfrak{g})$. Similarly, we obtain every $F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,p})$ for $(i, p) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ with $p \leq s$ as a cluster variable of ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ by using the repetition of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_-$. Thus the cluster algebra ${}^s\mathcal{A}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ contains every $F_q(\mathbf{X}_{i,p})$ associated to $\widetilde{\Delta}_0$ as its cluster variables. \square

Conjecture 5. *Let s be an arbitrary integer. If $F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[a, b]) \in \mathfrak{K}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ q -commutes with ${}^s\mathbf{u}_{i,p}$ for all ${}^s\mathbf{u}_{i,p} \in \mathfrak{S}_s$, then there exists $(j, l) \in \widetilde{\Delta}_0$ such that*

$${}^s\mathbf{u}_{j,l} = F_q(\underline{m}^{(j)}[a, b]).$$

REFERENCES

1. Jonathan Beck, *Braid group action and quantum affine algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **165** (1994), no. 3, 555–568.
2. Alexandre Beilinson and Joseph Bernstein, *Localisation de g -modules*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. **292** (1981), no. 1, 15–18.
3. ———, *A proof of Jantzen conjectures*, I. M. Gel'fand seminar, Adv. Soviet Math., vol. 16, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1993, pp. 1–50.
4. Arkady Berenstein and Andrei Zelevinsky, *Quantum cluster algebras*, Adv. Math. **195** (2005), no. 2, 405–455.
5. Léa Bittmann, *A quantum cluster algebra approach to representations of simply laced quantum affine algebras*, Math. Z. **298** (2021), no. 3–4, 1449–1485.
6. Jean-Luc Brylinski and Masaki Kashiwara, *Kazhdan-Lusztig conjecture and holonomic systems*, Invent. Math. **64** (1981), no. 3, 387–410.
7. Vyjayanthi Chari and Andrew Pressley, *Quantum affine algebras and their representations*, Representations of groups (Banff, AB, 1994) **16** (1995), 59–78.
8. Vyjayanthi Chari, Andrew Pressley, et al., *A guide to quantum groups*, Cambridge university press, 1995.
9. AJ Coleman, *Killing and the coxeter transformation of Kac-Moody algebras*, Invent. Math. **95** (1989), no. 3, 447–477.
10. Vladimir Gershonovich Drinfeld, *A new realization of yangians and of quantum affine algebras*, Doklady Akademii Nauk, vol. 296, Russian Academy of Sciences, 1987, pp. 13–17.

11. ———, *Quantum groups*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 1, 2 (Berkeley, Calif., 1986), Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1987, pp. 798–820.
12. Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky, *Cluster algebras. I. Foundations*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (2002), no. 2, 497–529.
13. Edward Frenkel and David Hernandez, *Baxter's relations and spectra of quantum integrable models*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), no. 12, 2407–2460.
14. Edward Frenkel, David Hernandez, and Nicolai Reshetikhin, *Folded quantum integrable models and deformed W -algebras*, Lett. Math. Phys. **112** (2022).
15. Edward Frenkel and Evgeny Mukhin, *Combinatorics of q -characters of finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **216** (2001), no. 1, 23–57.
16. Edward Frenkel and Nicolai Reshetikhin, *Deformations of W -algebras associated to simple Lie algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **197** (1998), no. 1, 1–32.
17. ———, *The q -characters of representations of quantum affine algebras and deformations of \mathcal{W} -algebras*, Recent developments in quantum affine algebras and related topics (Raleigh, NC, 1998), Contemp. Math., vol. 248, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1999, pp. 163–205.
18. Ryo Fujita, David Hernandez, Se-jin Oh, and Hironori Oya, *Isomorphisms among quantum Grothendieck rings and propagation of positivity*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **785** (2022), 117–185.
19. ———, *Isomorphisms among quantum Grothendieck rings and cluster algebras*, arXiv preprint (2023), arXiv:2304.02562, 2023.
20. Ryo Fujita and Kota Murakami, *Deformed Cartan matrices and generalized preprojective algebras I: Finite type*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (2022), rmac054.
21. Ryo Fujita and Se-jin Oh, *Q -data and representation theory of untwisted quantum affine algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **384** (2021), no. 2, 1351–1407.
22. Christof Geiß, Bernard Leclerc, and Jan Schröer, *Cluster structures on quantum coordinate rings*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) **19** (2013), no. 2, 337–397.
23. Ken Goodearl and Milen Yakimov, *Quantum cluster algebra structures on quantum nilpotent algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **247** (2017), no. 1169, vii+119.
24. David Hernandez, *t -analogues des opérateurs d'écrantage associés aux q -caractères*, Int. Math. Res. Not. (2003), no. 8, 451–475.
25. ———, *Algebraic approach to q, t -characters*, Adv. Math. **187** (2004), no. 1, 1–52.
26. ———, *Monomials of q and q, t -characters for non simply-laced quantum affinizations*, Math. Z. **250** (2005), no. 2, 443–473.
27. ———, *The Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture and solutions of T -systems*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **596** (2006), 63–87.
28. David Hernandez and Bernard Leclerc, *Cluster algebras and quantum affine algebras*, Duke Math. J. **154** (2010), no. 2, 265–341.
29. ———, *Quantum Grothendieck rings and derived Hall algebras*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **701** (2015), 77–126.
30. ———, *A cluster algebra approach to q -characters of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **18** (2016), no. 5, 1113–1159.
31. David Hernandez and Hironori Oya, *Quantum Grothendieck ring isomorphisms, cluster algebras and Kazhdan-Lusztig algorithm*, Adv. Math. **347** (2019), 192–272.
32. James E. Humphreys, *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*, no. 29, Cambridge university press, 1990.
33. Il-Seung Jang, Kyu-Hwan Lee, and Se-jin Oh, *Braid group action on quantum virtual grothendieck ring through constructing presentations*, arXiv preprint (2023), arXiv:2305.19471.
34. ———, *Quantization of virtual grothendieck rings and their structure including quantum cluster algebra*, arXiv preprint (2023), arXiv:2304.07246v1.
35. Michio Jimbo, *Quantum R matrix for the generalized Toda system*, Comm. Math. Phys. **102** (1986), no. 4, 537–547.
36. Victor G. Kac, *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Cambridge university press, 1990.
37. Seok-Jin Kang, Masaki Kashiwara, and Myungho Kim, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R -matrices of quantum affine algebras, II*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), no. 8, 1549–1602.
38. ———, *Symmetric quiver Hecke algebras and R -matrices of quantum affine algebras*, Invent. Math. **211** (2018), no. 2, 591–685.
39. Seok-Jin Kang, Masaki Kashiwara, Myungho Kim, and Se-jin Oh, *Monoidal categorification of cluster algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **31** (2018), no. 2, 349–426.

40. Masaki Kashiwara, *On crystal bases of the q -analogue of universal enveloping algebras*, Duke Math. J. **63** (1991), no. 2, 465–516.
41. ———, *Global crystal bases of quantum groups*, Duke Math. J. **69** (1993), no. 2, 455–485.
42. ———, *Crystal bases and categorifications—Chern Medal lecture*, Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians—Rio de Janeiro 2018. Vol. I. Plenary lectures, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2018, pp. 249–258.
43. Masaki Kashiwara, Myungho Kim, and Se-jin Oh, *Monoidal categories of modules over quantum affine algebras of type a and b* , Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society **118** (2019), no. 1, 43–77.
44. Masaki Kashiwara, Myungho Kim, Se-jin Oh, and Euiyong Park, *Monoidal categorification and quantum affine algebras*, Compositio Mathematica **156** (2020), no. 5, 1039–1077.
45. ———, *Monoidal categorification and quantum affine algebras II*, arXiv preprint (2021), arXiv:2103.10067v3, 2021.
46. Masaki Kashiwara and Se-jin Oh, *t -quantized cartan matrix and R -matrices for cuspidal modules over quiver hecke algebras*, arXiv preprint (2023), arxiv:2302.08700.
47. ———, *Categorical relations between langlands dual quantum affine algebras: doubly laced types*, Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics **49** (2019), no. 4.
48. ———, *The (q, t) -Cartan matrix specialized at $q = 1$ and its applications*, Math. Z. **303** (2023), no. 2, Paper No. 42.
49. David Kazhdan and George Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter groups and Hecke algebras*, Invent. Math. **53** (1979), no. 2, 165–184.
50. ———, *Schubert varieties and Poincaré duality*, Geometry of the Laplace operator (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Univ. Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii, 1979), Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., XXXVI, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R.I., 1980, pp. 185–203.
51. Mikhail Khovanov and Aaron D. Lauda, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups I*, Representation Theory of the American Mathematical Society **13** (2009), no. 14, 309–347.
52. ———, *A diagrammatic approach to categorification of quantum groups II*, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society (2011), 2685–2700.
53. George Lusztig, *Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), no. 2, 447–498.
54. ———, *Introduction to quantum groups*, Progress in Mathematics, vol. 110, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993.
55. Adriano Moura, *An introduction to Finite-dimensional Representations of Classical and Quantum Affine Algebras*, 2011.
56. Hiraku Nakajima, *Quiver varieties and finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **14** (2001), no. 1, 145–238.
57. ———, *T -analogue of the q -characters of finite dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, Physics and combinatorics, 2000 (Nagoya), World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2001, pp. 196–219.
58. ———, *t -analogs of q -characters of Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules of quantum affine algebras*, Represent. Theory **7** (2003), 259–274.
59. ———, *Quiver varieties and t -analogs of q -characters of quantum affine algebras*, Ann. of Math. (2) **160** (2004), no. 3, 1057–1097.
60. ———, *Quiver varieties and cluster algebras*, Kyoto J. Math. **51** (2011), no. 1, 71–126.
61. Se-jin Oh and Travis Scrimshaw, *Simplicity of tensor products of kirillov–reshetikhin modules: nonexceptional affine and g types*, arXiv preprint (2019), arXiv:1910.10347 (2019).
62. Claus Michael Ringel, *Hall algebras and quantum groups*, Invent. Math. **101** (1990), no. 3, 583–591.
63. Raphaël Rouquier, *2-Kac-Moody algebras*, arXiv preprint (2008), arXiv:0812.5023 (2008).
64. David E. Speyer, *Powers of Coxeter elements in infinite groups are reduced*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **137** (2009), no. 4, 1295–1302.
65. Bertrand Toën, *Derived Hall algebras*, Duke Math. J. **135** (2006), no. 3, 587–615.
66. Michela Varagnolo and Eric Vasserot, *Perverse sheaves and quantum Grothendieck rings*, Studies in memory of Issai Schur (Chevaleret/Rehovot, 2000), Progr. Math., vol. 210, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 2003, pp. 345–365.

(I.-S. Jang) [†]DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INCHEON NATIONAL UNIVERSITY, INCHEON 22012, KOREA

Email address: ilseungjang@inu.ac.kr

URL: <https://sites.google.com/view/isjang/home/>

(K.-H. Lee) ^{*}DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT, STORRS, CT 06269, U.S.A.

Email address: khlee@math.uconn.edu

URL: <https://www.math.uconn.edu/~khlee/>

(S.-j. Oh) [†]DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SUNGKYUNKWAN UNIVERSITY, SUWON, SOUTH KOREA

Email address: sejin092@gmail.com

URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/mathsejinoh/>