

# COORDINATE RINGS ON SYMMETRIC SPACES

HUANCHEN BAO AND JINFENG SONG

ABSTRACT. Let  $G_k$  be a connected reductive group over an algebraically closed field  $k$  of char  $\neq 2$ . Let  $\theta_k$  be an algebraic group involution of  $G_k$  and denote the fixed point subgroup by  $K_k$ . We construct an integral model for the symmetric space  $K_k \backslash G_k$  with a natural action of the Chevalley group scheme over integers. We show the coordinate ring  $k[K_k \backslash G_k]$  admits a canonical basis, as well as a good filtration as a  $G_k$ -module. We also construct a canonical basis and an integral form for the space of  $K_k$ -biinvariant functions on  $k[G_k]$ . Our results rely on the construction of quantized coordinate algebras of symmetric spaces, using the theory of canonical bases on quantum symmetric pairs.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Let  $G_k$  be a connected reductive group over an algebraically closed field  $k$ . We denote the coordinate ring of  $G_k$  by  $k[G_k]$ . It is known [9] that  $k[G_k]$  admits an integral form  ${}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}$  that defines the Chevalley group scheme  $G_{\mathbb{Z}}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}$  parameterizing split reductive groups of the given type. Lusztig [9] gave a construction of the ring  ${}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}$  using his theory of canonical bases on quantum groups.

Assume char  $k \neq 2$  and let  $\theta_k$  be an algebraic group involution of the reductive group  $G_k$ . The classification of such involutions is independent of the characteristic of  $k$  (provided  $\neq 2$ ) by Springer [14]. We denote the fixed point subgroup by  $K_k$ . In our previous work [1], we have constructed the symmetric subgroup scheme over  $\mathbb{Z}$  parameterizing such symmetric subgroups.

We study the symmetric space  $K_k \backslash G_k$  in this paper. Let  $k[K_k \backslash G_k]$  be the coordinate ring. The first main result of this paper is the construction of an integral form of  $k[K_k \backslash G_k]$ , hence an integral model parameterizing the symmetric spaces  $K_k \backslash G_k$  for various algebraically closed field  $k$ .

**Theorem 1** (Theorem 4.4 & Theorem 4.8). *There exists a commutative ring  ${}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G) \subset {}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , such that  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G) = k \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} {}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G) \cong k[K_k \backslash G_k]$  for any algebraically closed field of char  $\neq 2$ .*

*There exists a natural basis  $B(K \backslash G)$  on  ${}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)$  which we call the canonical basis.*

We actually construct a quantization  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)$  of the coordinate ring  ${}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)$  over the ring  $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$ , where  ${}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)$  is obtained via a specialization of  $q$  at 1.

The desire to construct quantum homogeneous spaces was the original motivation to study quantum symmetric pairs [11, 12]. However, the existing construction of quantum homogeneous spaces was entirely over the rational field  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ ; cf. [7]. So it can not be specialized even to recover the  $q = 1$  classical case. In order to construct the  $\mathcal{A}$ -form, one is forced to utilize the theory of canonical bases on quantum symmetric pairs developed by the first author and Wang in [2].

1.2. It is a classical result that the coordinate ring  $k[G_k]$  admits a direct sum decomposition  $k[G_k] \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X^+} {}_kV(\lambda)^* \otimes {}_kV(-w_0\lambda)^*$  as  $G_k \times G_k$ -modules if  $k$  is of characteristic 0. In positive characteristics, the coordinate ring  $k[G_k]$  is not semisimple anymore. In this case, we instead have a filtration of  $k[G_k]$  by  $G_k \times G_k$ -submodules indexed by dominant weights in  $X^+$ , such that  $k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} / k[G_k]_{< \lambda} \cong {}_kV(\lambda)^* \otimes {}_kV(-w_0\lambda)^*$  for any  $\lambda \in X^+$ . This is often referred as a good filtration [4, §4.20] of  $k[G_k]$ .

In light of Lusztig's construction of the coordinate ring  $k[G_k]$  using quantum groups, the good filtration on  $k[G_k]$  can then be obtained via dualizing the cell filtration [8, Chapter 29] on quantum groups.

Assume again  $\text{char } k \neq 2$ . The coordinate ring  $k[K_k \backslash G_k]$  of the symmetric space  $K_k \backslash G_k$  is naturally a  $G_k$ -module. If  $k$  is of characteristic 0, it follows from the direct sum decomposition of  $k[G_k]$  that  $k[K_k \backslash G_k] \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X_i^+} {}_k V(-w_0\lambda)^*$  as a  $G_k$ -module. Here  $X_i^+$  is a subset of  $X^+$  consisting of spherical dominant weights (See §2.2.3). Little is known for positive characteristics.

We state the second main result of this paper.

**Theorem 2** (Theorem 4.9). *The  $G_k$ -module  $k[K_k \backslash G_k]$  admits a good filtration indexed by  $X_i^+$ , such that*

$$k[K_k \backslash G_k]_{\leq \lambda} / k[K_k \backslash G_k]_{< \lambda} \cong {}_k V(-w_0\lambda)^*, \quad \text{for any } \lambda \in X_i^+.$$

1.3. The construction of both the commutative ring  ${}_z \mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)$  (or the quantization  ${}_A \mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)$ ) and the good filtration of  $k[K_k \backslash G_k]$  relies on the study of based modules of  $\imath$ quantum groups.

Let  $(U, U^\imath)$  be a quantum symmetric pair [2] associated with the symmetric pair  $(G_k, K_k)$ . The subalgebra  $U^\imath \subset U$  of the quantum group  $U$  is referred as the  $\imath$ quantum group.

We now state the third main result of this paper on based  $U^\imath$ -modules, which is the technical foundation for both Theorem 1 and Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3** (Theorem 3.1). *Let  $M$  be a finite-dimensional based  $U$ -module. Let  $U^{\imath,+}$  be the augmentation ideal of  $U^\imath$ . Then  $M_+ = U^{\imath,+}M$  is a based  $U^\imath$ -submodule of  $M$ , and the coinvariant space  $M/M_+$  is naturally a based  $U^\imath$ -module.*

Based modules and based morphisms are well-behaved with respect to specializations. We are then able to deduce classical results on symmetric spaces via specializations.

1.4. In a subsequent paper, we shall apply results in this paper to construct the Vinberg enveloping variety of the symmetric space  $K_k \backslash G_k$  and an integral model of the wonderful compactification of  $K_k \backslash G_k$ .

**Acknowledgement:** Both authors are supported by MOE grants A-0004586-00-00 and A-0004586-01-00.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Quantum groups.** We recall quantum groups following Lusztig's book [8].

2.1.1. *Definitions.* Let  $(I, Y, X, A, (\alpha_i)_{i \in I}, (\alpha_i^\vee)_{i \in I})$  be a root datum of finite type; cf. [1, §2.1]. Let  $D = \text{diag}(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in I}$  be the diagonal matrix such that  $DA$  is a symmetric matrix, with  $\varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  and  $\{\varepsilon_i \mid i \in I\}$  are relatively prime. Let  $W = \langle s_i \mid i \in I \rangle$  be the Weyl group associated with the root datum with the longest element denoted by  $w_0$ . For  $\lambda, \mu \in X$ , we write  $\lambda \leq \mu$  if  $\mu - \lambda \in \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_i$ . Let  $X^+ = \{\mu \in X \mid \langle \alpha_i^\vee, \mu \rangle \geq 0, \forall i \in I\}$  be the set of *dominant weights*.

Let  $q$  be an indeterminate. We write  $\mathcal{A} = \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}]$  to be the subring of  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ . Let  $U$  be the Drinfeld–Jimbo quantum group associated with the root datum; cf. [8, §3.1]. Recall that  $U$  is an associated  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -algebra with 1. It has generators  $E_i$  ( $i \in I$ ),  $F_i$  ( $i \in I$ ) and  $K_\mu$  ( $\mu \in Y$ ). The algebra  $U$  has a structure of a Hopf algebra. Let  $\varepsilon : U \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(q)$  be the counit, and  $\Delta : U \rightarrow U \otimes U$  be the coproduct; cf. [8, Lemma 3.1.4 & §3.1.11].

Following [8, §3.1.3], let  $\sigma : U \rightarrow U$  be the algebra anti-automorphism such that  $\sigma(E_i) = E_i$ ,  $\sigma(F_i) = F_i$ , for  $i \in I$ , and  $\sigma(K_\mu) = K_{-\mu}$ , for  $\mu \in Y$ , and let  $\omega : U \rightarrow U$  be the algebra automorphism such that  $\omega(E_i) = F_i$ ,  $\omega(F_i) = E_i$ , for  $i \in I$ , and  $\omega(K_\mu) = K_{-\mu}$ , for  $\mu \in Y$ .

For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we denote by  $V(\lambda)$  the highest weight simple  $U$ -module with highest weight  $\lambda$ . We denote the highest weight vector by  $v_\lambda^+$  and the canonical basis of  $V(\lambda)$  by  $B(\lambda)$ .

2.1.2. *Based modules.* Let  $\mathbf{A} = \mathbb{Q}(q) \cap \mathbb{Q}[[q^{-1}]]$  be the ring of rational functions which are regular at  $q = \infty$ . Let  $(M, B)$  be a finite-dimensional based  $U$ -module over  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ ; cf. [8, §27]. We denote by  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}M$  (resp.,  $L(M)$ ) the  $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule (resp.,  $\mathbf{A}$ -submodule) of  $M$  spanned by  $B$ . For any commutative  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra  $R$ , we write  ${}_R M = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}M$  and still denote the basis by  $B$ . We often consider a commutative ring  $R$  as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra via the ring homomorphism  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow R$ ,  $q \mapsto 1$  unless specified otherwise.

Following [8, Proposition 27.1.8], for any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we have the based submodule  $M[\geq \lambda] \subset M$  (resp.,  $M[> \lambda] \subset M$ ) with basis  $B[\geq \lambda] = B \cap M[\geq \lambda]$  (resp.,  $B[> \lambda] = B \cap M[> \lambda]$ ). We set  $B[\lambda] = B[\geq \lambda] - B[> \lambda]$ . Let  $B[\lambda]^{hi}$  be the subset  $B[\lambda]$  defined in [8, §27.2.3].

For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , let  $\pi_{\lambda} : M \rightarrow M/M[\geq \lambda]$  be the canonical projection map. Then  $M/M[\geq \lambda]$  is naturally a based  $U$ -module with a basis consisting of the image of  $B - B[\geq \lambda]$  under the map  $\pi_{\lambda}$ ; see [8, §27.1.4]. In particular, the map  $\pi_{\lambda} : M \rightarrow M/M[\geq \lambda]$  is based in the sense of [8, §27.1.3]. We often abuse notations and denote by  $B - B[\geq \lambda]$  the basis of  $M/M[\geq \lambda]$ .

For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , the subquotient  $M[\geq \lambda]/M[> \lambda]$  is isomorphic to the based module  $(\bigoplus_{i=1}^{n_{\lambda}} V(\lambda), B')$ , where  $B'$  is given by the union of the canonical bases of the various summands  $V(\lambda)$  and  $n_{\lambda}$  is the cardinality of the subset  $B[\lambda]^{hi} \subset B$ .

We conclude that

(a) *the based module  $(M, B)$  admits a based filtration*

$$0 = M[\geq \lambda_0] \subset M[\geq \lambda_1] \subset M[\geq \lambda_2] \subset \cdots \subset M[\geq \lambda_n] = M, \quad \text{for } \lambda_i \in X^+,$$

such that, for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , the map  $\phi_{\lambda_i} : M[\geq \lambda_i]/M[\geq \lambda_{i-1}] \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} V(\lambda_i)$ ,  $\bar{b} \mapsto (v_{\lambda_i}^+)_b$ , for  $b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}$ , where  $(v_{\lambda_i}^+)_b$  is the highest vector of the copy corresponding to  $b$  of  $V(\lambda_i)$ , defines an isomorphism of based  $U$ -modules.

The following lemma follows from [5, lemma 2.6.3].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $(M, B)$  be a finite-dimensional based  $U$ -module. We have an isomorphism of  $U$ -modules*

$$\phi : M \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} V(\lambda_i),$$

such that (for any  $1 \leq j \leq n$ ),

- (1)  $\phi$  restricts to an isomorphism  $M[\geq \lambda_j] \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^j \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} V(\lambda_i)$ ;
- (2) the induced morphism on  $M[\geq \lambda_j]/M[\geq \lambda_{j-1}]$  agrees with  $\phi_{\lambda_j}$  in §2.1.2 (a);
- (3) for any  $b \in B[\lambda_j]$ , we have  $\phi(b) \in \phi_{\lambda_j}(b) + q^{-1}\phi(L(M[\geq \lambda_{j-1}]))$ ;
- (4)  $\phi$  restricts to isomorphisms as  $\mathbf{A}$ -modules  $L(M[\geq \lambda_j]) \longrightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^j \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} L(V(\lambda_i))$ .

2.1.3. *The modified form.* Let  $\dot{U}$  be the modified quantum group [8, §23.1] and  $\dot{B}$  be its canonical basis ([8, §25.2.1]). The algebra (without unit)  $\dot{U}$  is a  $(U, U)$ -bimodule in a natural way. Let  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\dot{U}$  be the free  $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule of  $\dot{U}$  with basis  $\dot{B}$ . A unital  $\dot{U}$ -module is equivalent to a  $U$ -module with a direct sum decomposition into weight spaces by [8, §23.1.4]. These are the only modules we shall consider in this paper.

Lusztig [8, §29.1] defined a partition of the canonical basis  $\dot{B} = \sqcup_{\lambda \in X^+} \dot{B}[\lambda]$ . For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , let  $\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  (resp.,  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$ ) be the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -subspace (resp.,  $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule) of  $\dot{U}$  spanned by  $\sqcup_{\lambda' \not\leq \lambda} \dot{B}[\lambda']$ . Then  $\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  (resp.,  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$ ) is a two-sided ideal of  $\dot{U}$  (resp.,  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\dot{U}$ ).

The quotient  $\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  is a based  $U$ -module with the canonical basis consisting of the image of  $\dot{B}[\leq \lambda] = \sqcup_{\lambda' \leq \lambda} \dot{B}[\lambda']$ . We abuse notations, and denote the quotient based module by  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda], \dot{B}[\leq \lambda])$ . Similarly we define the subspace  $\dot{U}[\leq \lambda]$ , the  $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\dot{U}[\leq \lambda]$ , and the quotient based module  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda], \dot{B}[\leq \lambda])$ .

2.1.4. *Coordinate rings.* Let  $\mathbf{O}$  be the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -vector space of all  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear forms  $f : \dot{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(q)$  with the following property:  $f$  vanishes on  $\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  for some  $\lambda \in X^+$ . For any  $a \in \dot{B}$ , we define the linear form  $\tilde{a} : \dot{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(q)$ , given by  $\tilde{a}(a') = \delta_{a,a'}$ , for  $a' \in \dot{B}$ . The set  $\{\tilde{a} | a \in \dot{B}\}$  is

a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}$ , called the *canonical basis* of  $\mathbf{O}$ . Note that elements in  $\mathbf{O}$  can be naturally viewed as linear forms of the completion space  $\widehat{\mathbf{U}}$ , where  $\widehat{\mathbf{U}}$  is the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -vector space consisting of formal sums of  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear combinations of  $\mathring{\mathbf{B}}$ .

Let  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$  be the  $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule of  $\mathbf{O}$ , spanned by the canonical basis. Then by [8, §29.5.2],  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$  is a Hopf algebra over  $\mathcal{A}$ . For any commutative  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra  $R$  with 1, we write  ${}_R\mathbf{O} = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ . Unless specified otherwise, we often consider a commutative ring  $R$  as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra via the ring homomorphism  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow R, q \mapsto 1$ .

**Theorem 2.2.** [9] *The group scheme  $\text{Spec}_{\mathbb{Z}}\mathbf{O}$  is isomorphic to the Chevalley group scheme  $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbb{Z}}$  over  $\mathbb{Z}$  associated with the given root datum.*

*In particular, the ring  ${}_k\mathbf{O}$  is canonically isomorphic to the coordinate ring  $k[G_k]$  of the connected reductive algebraic group  $G_k$  associated with the given root datum, for any algebraically closed field  $k$ .*

We next recall the Peter–Weyl filtration of  $\mathbf{O}$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ . For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we define

$$\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}(q)}(\mathring{\mathbf{U}}/\mathring{\mathbf{U}}[\not\leq \lambda], \mathbb{Q}(q)), \quad {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} = \mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} \cap {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O} = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A}(\mathring{\mathbf{U}}/\mathring{\mathbf{U}}[\not\leq \lambda]), \mathcal{A}).$$

Then  $\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$  (resp.,  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$ ) is the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -span (resp.,  $\mathcal{A}$ -span) of  $\{\tilde{a} | a \in \mathring{\mathbf{B}}[\leq \lambda]\}$ . We define  $\mathbf{O}_{< \lambda}$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{< \lambda}$  in the similar way.

We then have

$$\mathbf{O} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in X^+} \mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}, \quad {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in X^+} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}.$$

For an algebraically closed field  $k$  and  $\lambda \in X^+$ , set  ${}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} = k \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$ . For any  $\lambda \leq \lambda'$ , since the inclusion  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} \rightarrow {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda'}$  is compatible with bases, we have an inclusion  ${}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} \rightarrow {}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda'}$  as well. Therefore we have  ${}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} \subset {}_k\mathbf{O}$  for any  $\lambda \in X^+$  and  ${}_k\mathbf{O} = \bigcup_{\lambda \in X^+} {}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$ .

Let  $G_k$  be the connected reductive group as in Theorem 2.2. We define  $G_k \times G_k$ -module structure on  ${}_k\mathbf{O} \cong k[G_k]$  as follows

$$((g_1, g_2) \cdot f)(x) = f(g_1^{-1}xg_2), \quad \text{for } (g_1, g_2) \in G_k \times G_k, f \in k[G_k], x \in G_k.$$

Let  ${}_kV(\lambda)^*$  be the dual Weyl module for any  $\lambda \in X^+$ . Dualizing the construction in [8, §29.3], we obtain the following classical Peter–Weyl filtration; cf. [4, Proposition 4.20].

**Theorem 2.3.** *For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , the subspaces  ${}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$  and  ${}_k\mathbf{O}_{< \lambda}$  are  $G_k \times G_k$ -submodules of  ${}_k\mathbf{O}$  such that*

$${}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} / {}_k\mathbf{O}_{< \lambda} \cong {}_kV(\lambda)^* \otimes_k {}_kV(-w_0\lambda)^*.$$

*In particular, the  $G_k \times G_k$ -module  ${}_k\mathbf{O}$  admits a good filtration.*

## 2.2. Quantum symmetric pairs.

**2.2.1.  $\iota$ Quantum groups.** Let  $(I, Y, X, A, (\alpha_i)_{i \in I}, (\alpha_i^\vee)_{i \in I}, I_\bullet, \tau)$  be an  $\iota$ root datum; cf. [1, §2.3.1]. Let  $W_{I_\bullet} = \langle s_i \mid i \in I_\bullet \rangle$  be the parabolic subgroup associated with  $I_\bullet$ , and let  $w_\bullet$  be the longest element of  $W_{I_\bullet}$ . Denote by  $\theta = -w_\bullet \circ \tau$  the involution on both  $X$  and  $Y$ , by slightly abuse of notation. Set

$$X_\iota = X / \langle \lambda - \theta\lambda \mid \lambda \in X \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad Y^\iota = \{ \mu \in Y \mid \theta\mu = \mu \}.$$

We call  $X_\iota$  the *weight lattice*, and call  $Y^\iota$  the  *$\iota$ coweight lattice*. There is a natural pairing  $Y^\iota \times X_\iota \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  inherited from the pairing between  $Y$  and  $X$ . Note that this pairing is not necessarily perfect. For any  $\lambda \in X$ , we write  $\bar{\lambda}$  to denote its image in  $X_\iota$ .

For each  $i \in I_\circ = I - I_\bullet$ , we take a parameter  $\varsigma_i \in \pm q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ . Let  $U^\iota = U_\varsigma^\iota \subset U$  be the  $\iota$ quantum group defined in [2, §3.3]. By definition,  $U^\iota$  is the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -subalgebra of  $U$  generated by elements

$$B_i = F_i + \varsigma_i T_{w_\bullet}(E_{\tau i}) \tilde{K}_i^{-1} \quad (i \in I_\circ), \quad F_i \quad (i \in I_\bullet), \quad E_i \quad (i \in I_\bullet), \quad K_\mu \quad (\mu \in Y^\iota).$$

We write  $B_i = F_i$ , for  $i \in I_\bullet$ . Here  $T_{w_\bullet}$  denotes Lusztig's Braid group operator; cf. [2, §2.2].

The pair  $(U, U^\iota)$  is called a *quantum symmetric pair*. The subalgebra  $U^\iota$  is called an  *$\iota$ quantum group*. In what follows, we assume the parameters  $(\varsigma_i)_{i \in I_\circ}$  are taken as the same

as in [16, Lemma 4.2.1]. The only reason we pick these particular parameters is that the stability conjecture of *icanonical* basis, or equivalently, Theorem 2.4, holds for these parameters.

Let  $\dot{U}^z$  be the modified algebra of  $U^z$  and let  $\dot{B}^z$  be the canonical basis of  $\dot{U}^z$  defined in [2, §3.7 & §6.4]. Let  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\dot{U}^z$  be the  $\mathcal{A}$ -form of  $\dot{U}^z$  [2, Definition 3.19]. For any  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra  $R$ , set  ${}_R\dot{U}^z = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\dot{U}^z$ . A unital  $\dot{U}^z$ -module is equivalent to a  $U^z$ -module with a direct sum decomposition into weight spaces by [2, §3.7]. These are the only modules we shall consider in this paper.

**2.2.2. Based  $U^z$ -modules.** Let  $\psi_z$  be the anti-linear bar involution on  $U^z$  as in [2, Lemma 3.15]. Let  $(M, B)$  be a finite-dimensional based  $U$ -module. We consider  $M$  naturally as a  $U^z$ -module by restriction. Then by [3, Theorem 6.12],  $M$  admits an anti-linear involution  $\psi_z$  such that

$$\psi_z(um) = \psi_z(u)\psi_z(m), \quad u \in U^z, m \in M.$$

Moreover, the  $U^z$ -module  $M$  admits a unique basis, called the *icanonical basis*, denoted by  $B^z = \{b^z | b \in B\}$ , such that

- (1)  $\psi_z(b^z) = b^z$  for any  $b^z$ ;
- (2)  $b^z = b + \sum_{b' \in B} t_{b;b'} b'$ , for  $t_{b;b'} \in q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}[q^{-1}]$ ;
- (3)  $B^z$  forms an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -lattice  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}M$ , and forms an  $\mathbf{A}$ -basis of the  $\mathbf{A}$ -lattice  $L(M)$ ;
- (4)  $(M, B^z)$  is a based  $U^z$ -module in the sense of [3, Definition 6.11].

In particular, we have the based  $U^z$ -modules  $(V(\lambda), B(\lambda)^z)$  for each  $\lambda \in X^+$ . For any based  $U$ - (resp.,  $U^z$ -) module  $M$ , we write  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}M$  to be the  $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule of  $M$  spanned by the canonical basis (resp., *icanonical* basis).

For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , the based  $U$ -submodule  $M[\geq \lambda] \subset M$  is also a based  $U^z$ -submodule by [3, Theorem 6.12] (with respect to different bases). Let  $\phi : M \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} V(\lambda_i)$  be the isomorphism in Lemma 2.1. We conclude that

(a) *the based  $U$ -module  $(M, B)$  admits a based filtration of based  $U^z$ -modules*

$$0 = M[\geq \lambda_0] \subset M[\geq \lambda_1] \subset M[\geq \lambda_2] \subset \cdots \subset M[\geq \lambda_n] = M, \quad \text{for } \lambda_i \in X^+,$$

*such that  $\phi_{\lambda_i} : M[\geq \lambda_i]/M[\geq \lambda_{i-1}] \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} V(\lambda_i)$  as based  $U^z$ -modules for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ ;*

(b) *for any  $b \in B[\lambda_j]$ , we have  $\phi(b^z) = \phi_{\lambda_j}(b^z) + q^{-1}\phi(L(M[\geq \lambda_{j-1}]))$ .*

**2.2.3. Spherical modules.** The following theorem was conjectured in [2, Remark 6.18] and proved in [16, Theorem 4.3.1].

We define  $X_i^+ = \{\lambda \in X^+ | \bar{\lambda} = \bar{0} \in X_i\}$ .

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $\lambda \in X_i^+$ . Then there exists a unique morphism as based  $U^z$ -modules*

$$V(\lambda) \rightarrow V(0), \quad v_{\lambda}^+ \mapsto v_0^+.$$

Note that  $V(\lambda)$  is generated by  $v_{\lambda}^+$  as a  $U^z$ -module. Hence for any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , there exists a non-zero map  $V(\lambda) \rightarrow V(0)$  only if  $\lambda \in X_i^+$ . We draw the following conclusions.

(a) *For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , there exists a unique morphism  $V(\lambda) \rightarrow V(0)$  as based  $U^z$ -modules if and only if  $\lambda \in X_i^+$ .*

(b) *For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we have*

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{U^z\text{-mod}}(V(\lambda), V(0)) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \lambda \in X_i^+; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

**2.2.4. Symmetric subgroups.** We recall the construction of symmetric subgroups via *iquantum* groups following [1, §3].

Let  $k$  be an algebraically closed field with characteristic not 2. Let  $G_k$  be a reductive linear algebraic group over  $k$ , and  $\theta_k$  be an algebraic group involution on  $G_k$ . The pair  $(G_k, \theta_k)$  is then called a *symmetric pair*. The closed subgroup  $K_k = G_k^{\theta_k}$  consisting of  $\theta_k$ -fixed elements in  $G_k$  is called a *symmetric subgroup*. By [14], the classification of symmetric pairs is independent

of the characteristic of  $k$  (provided not 2). By [1, §3], one can associate an  $\mathcal{A}$ -root datum to such a symmetric pair independent of the characteristic of  $k$  (provided not 2).

On the other hand, starting with an  $\mathcal{A}$ -root datum. Let  $U, U^\iota, \dot{U}, \dot{U}^\iota$ , etc., be the various quantum algebras associated with the given datum following §2.1 and §2.2.1. Let  $G_k$  be the reductive group associated with the underlying root datum defined over  $k$ . Set

$${}_k\dot{U} = k \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{A}\dot{U} \quad \text{and} \quad {}_k\dot{U}^\iota = k \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} \mathcal{A}\dot{U}^\iota.$$

Let  ${}_k\widehat{U}$  be the space consisting of formal sums of  $k$ -linear combinations of canonical basis elements of  ${}_k\dot{U}$  defined in [9, §1.1]. By [1, Lemma 3.1], the space  ${}_k\dot{U}^\iota$  is naturally a subspace of  ${}_k\widehat{U}$ . By [9], one can identify elements in the coordinate ring  $k[G_k]$  as  $k$ -linear forms on a completion of the space  ${}_k\dot{U}$ , that is,  $k[G_k] \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}_k({}_k\widehat{U}, k)$ . We define  $\mathcal{I} = \{f \in k[G_k] \mid f({}_k\dot{U}^\iota) = 0\}$ .

**Theorem 2.5** ([1, Theorem 3.8]). *The subspace  $\mathcal{I}$  is a reduced ideal of  $k[G_k]$ , defining a symmetric subgroup  $K_k = G_k^{\theta_k}$ . The root datum associated with the pair  $(G_k, \theta_k)$  is isomorphic to the one we start with.*

**Remark 2.6.** We previously established Theorem 2.5 for quasi-split symmetric pairs in [1], since Theorem 2.4 was only available for the quasi-split cases back then. Theorem 2.4 was later established by Watanabe [16] for all symmetric pairs (of finite type). Hence results in [1, §3] hold in this generality as well; cf. [1, Remark 3.3].

### 3. BASES FOR COINVARIANTS

**3.1. Coinvariant spaces.** Recall the counit  $\varepsilon$  of  $U$  in §2.1.1. Set  $U^{\iota,+} = U^\iota \cap \ker \varepsilon$  to be the augmentation ideal of  $U^\iota$ . Let  $(M, B)$  be a finite-dimensional based  $U$ -module. We then obtain the based  $U^\iota$ -module  $(M, B^\iota)$ . Let  $M_+ = U^{\iota,+}M$  be the  $U^\iota$ -submodule of  $M$ . We define

$$B_*^\iota = \{b^\iota \in B^\iota \mid b^\iota \in B[\lambda]^{hi} \text{ for some } \lambda \in X_i^+\} \subset B^\iota.$$

**Theorem 3.1.** *The  $U^\iota$ -submodule  $M_+ = U^{\iota,+}M$  is a based  $U^\iota$ -submodule of  $M$  with the basis  $\{b^\iota \in B^\iota \mid b^\iota \notin B_*^\iota\}$ .*

*In particular, the space of  $U^\iota$ -coinvariants  $M_*^\iota = M/U^{\iota,+}M$  is naturally a based  $U^\iota$ -module, with the basis given by the image of elements in  $B_*^\iota$ . The natural projection  $M \rightarrow M_*^\iota$  maps  ${}_A M$  to  ${}_A M_*^\iota$ .*

We abuse notations and denote the based quotient by  $(M_*^\iota, B_*^\iota)$ , and write  $({}_A M)_*^\iota = {}_A M_*^\iota$ . We also write  ${}_R M_*^\iota = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_A M_*^\iota$  for any commutative  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra  $R$ .

*Proof.* Let  $M[\geq \lambda_1] \subset M[\geq \lambda_2] \subset \cdots \subset M[\geq \lambda_n]$  be the based filtration of  $M$  as §2.2.2 (a). We define  $F(M) = \bigoplus_{b^\iota \in B_*^\iota} \mathbb{Q}(q)e_{b^\iota}$  to be the trivial  $U^\iota$ -module of dimension  $|B_*^\iota|$ . By definition, we have  $u \cdot x = \varepsilon(u)x$  for any  $u \in U^\iota$  and  $x \in F(M)$ . It is a based  $U^\iota$ -module with basis  $\{e_{b^\iota} \mid b^\iota \in B_*^\iota\}$ .

(a) *There is a unique  $U^\iota$ -module homomorphism  $f : M \rightarrow F(M)$  such that*

$$f : b^\iota \mapsto \begin{cases} e_{b^\iota}, & \text{if } b^\iota \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi} \text{ with } \lambda_i \in X_i^+; \\ 0, & \text{if } b^\iota \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi} \text{ with } \lambda_i \notin X_i^+. \end{cases}$$

By [2, Lemma 6.2] and an straightforward induction on  $n$ , we see that  $M$  is generated as an  $U^\iota$ -module by  $b^\iota$  for various  $b^\iota \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}$  with  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . This shows the uniqueness. It also follows that the integral form  ${}_A M$  is generated by  $b^\iota$  for various  $b^\iota \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}$  with  $1 \leq i \leq n$  as an  ${}_A \dot{U}^\iota$ -module.

We next show the existence. We firstly define  $U^\iota$ -module homomorphisms  $f_i : M \rightarrow F(M)$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$  as follows: if  $\bar{\lambda}_i \neq \bar{0} \in X_i$ , we define  $f_i$  as the zero map; if  $\bar{\lambda}_i = \bar{0} \in X_i$ , we define

$f_i$  as the composition

$$f_i : M \xrightarrow{\phi} \bigoplus_{j=1}^n \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_j]^{hi}} V(\lambda_j) \xrightarrow{p} \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} V(\lambda_i) \xrightarrow{\pi} \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda_i]^{hi}} \mathbb{Q}(q)e_{b^i} \subset F(M), \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\phi$  is the isomorphism from Lemma 2.1,  $p$  is the canonical projection, and  $\pi$  is direct sum of the based U-module morphisms defined in Theorem 2.4.

Let  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  with  $\bar{\lambda}_i = \bar{0} \in X_i$  and  $b \in B[\lambda_j]$ . By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$f_i(b^i) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } j < i; \\ e_{b^i}, & \text{if } j = i \text{ and } b \in B[\lambda_j]^{hi}; \\ 0, & \text{if } j = i \text{ and } b \notin B[\lambda_j]^{hi}; \\ c_{b^i} e_{b^i}, & \text{if } i < j, \text{ for some } c_{b^i} \in q^{-1}\mathbb{Z}[q^{-1}]. \end{cases} \quad (\heartsuit)$$

Hence a suitable  $\mathbb{Z}[q^{-1}]$ -linear combination of  $f_i$ 's will be the desired map  $f$ .

(b) *The map  $f$  commutes with the bar involution  $\psi_i$ , that is,  $f(\psi_i(x)) = \psi_i(f(x))$  for any  $x \in M$ .*

Since  $\{b^i | b \in B[\lambda_j]^{hi}\}$  is a set of generators of  $M$  as a  $U^i$ -module, the claim follows immediately from the fact that they are  $\psi_i$ -invariant.

(c) *The map  $f$  preserves the  $\mathbf{A}$ -lattice, that is,  $f(L(M)) = L(f(M))$ .*

Since all three maps  $\phi, p, \pi$  in (3.1) preserve the  $\mathbf{A}$ -lattices, the map  $f_i$  preserves the  $\mathbf{A}$ -lattices. Since  $f$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}[q^{-1}]$ -linear combination of  $f_i$ 's, the claim follows.

(d) *The map  $f$  is a morphism of based  $U^i$ -modules.*

Thanks to (b) and (c), it suffices to consider the induced map  $f_\infty : L(M)/q^{-1}L(M) \rightarrow L(F(M))/q^{-1}L(F(M))$  at  $q = \infty$ ; cf. [8, §27.1.5].

Let  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  with  $\bar{\lambda}_i = \bar{0} \in X_i$  and  $b \in B[\lambda_j]$ . At  $q = \infty$ , we obtain from  $(\heartsuit)$  that

$$f_{i,\infty}(b^i) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } j \neq i; \\ e_{b^i}, & \text{if } j = i \text{ and } b \in B[\lambda_j]^{hi}; \\ 0, & \text{if } j = i \text{ and } b \notin B[\lambda_j]^{hi}. \end{cases}$$

Since  $f$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}[q^{-1}]$ -linear combination of  $f_i$ 's, claim (d) follows.

(e) *We have  $\ker f = M_+$ .*

We have  $M_+ \subset \ker f$ , since the action of  $U^i$  on  $F(M)$  is trivial, i.e., via the counit  $\varepsilon$ . Then it follows by dimension counting that  $M_+ = \ker f$ .

Now the theorem is proved.  $\square$

Retain the same notations from Theorem 3.1. Let  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}M_+$  be the  $\mathcal{A}$ -submodule of  $M$  spanned by elements in  $B^i - B_*^i$ . Then  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}M_+ = M_+ \cap {}_{\mathcal{A}}M$  is an  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}U^i$ -module. For any commutative  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra  $R$ , set  ${}_R M_+ = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}M_+$ .

**3.2. Coinvariant functors.** For any based morphism  $f : (M, B) \rightarrow (M', B')$  of finite-dimensional based U-modules, we naturally have the based morphism  $f : (M, B^i) \rightarrow (M', (B')^i)$  of based  $U^i$ -module. We then have the induced morphism  $f_*^i : M_*^i \rightarrow (M')_*^i$  of  $U^i$ -modules.

**Proposition 3.2.** (1) *The morphism  $f_*^i : M_*^i \rightarrow (M')_*^i$  is a based morphism of  $U^i$ -modules.*

*Therefore  $(\cdot)_*^i$  is a functor from the category of finite-dimensional based U-modules to the category of finite-dimensional based  $U^i$ -modules.*

(2) *The functor  $(\cdot)_*^i$  is an exact functor.*

*Proof.* We show part (1). Let  $\lambda \in X^+$  and  $b \in B[\lambda]^{hi}$ . Since  $f$  is a morphism of based U-modules, we have  $f(b) \in (B'[\lambda])^{hi} \sqcup \{0\}$  by investigating the induced map at  $q = \infty$ . Therefore,  $f$  maps  $B_*^i$  to  $(B')_*^i \sqcup \{0\}$ . The claim now follows from Theorem 3.1.

We show part (2). The right exactness is trivial. To show the left exactness, suppose we have an injective based U-module homomorphism  $f : (M, B) \rightarrow (M', B')$ . Then  $f$  is automatically an injective based  $U^i$ -module homomorphism  $f : (M, B^i) \rightarrow (M', (B')^i)$ . Hence  $f(b) \neq 0$  for

$b \in B^i$ . In particular  $f(b) \neq 0$  for  $b \in B_*^i$ . Since  $f$  maps  $B^{hi}[\lambda]$  to  $B'[\lambda]^{hi}$  for any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we see that  $f$  maps  $B_*^i$  to  $(B')_*^i$ . We conclude that  $f_*^i$  is injective, since it is injective on the set of basis.  $\square$

Recall §2.1.3 that for  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we have the short exact sequence of based U-modules

$$0 \longrightarrow \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda] \longrightarrow \dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda] \longrightarrow \dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] \longrightarrow 0.$$

For any  $\lambda \leq \lambda'$  in  $X^+$ , we also have the short exact sequence of based U-modules

$$0 \longrightarrow \dot{U}[\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda'] \longrightarrow \dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda'] \longrightarrow \dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda] \longrightarrow 0.$$

**Corollary 3.3.** (1) For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we have the following short exact sequence of based  $U^i$ -modules

$$0 \longrightarrow (\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda])_*^i \longrightarrow (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda])_*^i \longrightarrow (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i \longrightarrow 0.$$

(2) For any  $\lambda \leq \lambda'$  in  $X^+$ , we have the short exact sequence of based  $U^i$ -modules

$$0 \longrightarrow (\dot{U}[\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda'])_*^i \longrightarrow (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda'])_*^i \longrightarrow (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda])_*^i \longrightarrow 0.$$

(3) For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we have  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda])_*^i \neq (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i$  if and only if  $\lambda \in X_i^+$ .

*Proof.* The short exact sequences in part (1) and (2) follow from the exactness of the functor  $(\cdot)_*^i$  in Proposition 3.2.

It follows from §2.2.2 that  $\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda] \cong \bigoplus_{b \in B[\lambda]^{hi}} V(\lambda)$ . Then by §2.2.3, we see  $(\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda])_*^i \neq 0$  if and only if  $\lambda \in X_i^+$ . Then part (3) follows from the short exact sequence in (1) now.  $\square$

#### 4. COORDINATE RINGS OF SYMMETRIC SPACES

**4.1. The quantum coordinate ring  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$ .** Let  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  be the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -subspace of  $\mathbf{O}$  consisting of linear forms on  $\dot{U}$  that vanish on the subspace  $U^{i,+} \dot{U}$ .

**Proposition 4.1.** (1) The subspace  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  is closed under multiplication.

(2) The coproduct  $\Delta$  of  $\mathbf{O}$  restricts to  $\Delta : \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \rightarrow \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \otimes \mathbf{O}$ .

*Proof.* Part (1) follows if we can show  $\Delta(U^{i,+}) \subset U^{i,+} \otimes U + U \otimes U^{i,+}$ . Since the subspace  $U^{i,+}$  is the two-sided ideal of  $U^i$ , generated by  $B_i$  ( $i \in I$ ),  $E_i$  ( $i \in I_\bullet$ ) and  $K_\mu - 1$  ( $\mu \in Y^i$ ), it will suffice to check  $\Delta(x) \in U^{i,+} \otimes U + U \otimes U^{i,+}$ , when  $x$  is a generator. This is direct and will be skipped. Part (2) follows from the fact that  $U^{i,+} \dot{U}$  is a right ideal of  $\dot{U}$   $\square$

Let  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) = \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \cap {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ . Thanks to Proposition 4.1 (1), we see that  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  is an  $\mathcal{A}$ -subalgebra of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ . For any commutative  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra  $R$ , we write  ${}_R\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) = R \otimes_{{}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}} \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$ . For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we define  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \cap \mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \cap {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$ . We similarly define  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda}$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda}$ .

**4.2. Canonical basis on  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$ .** For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we have the finite-dimensional based U-module  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda], \dot{B}[\leq \lambda])$  by §2.1.3. Then  $\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda]$  is naturally a based  $U^i$ -module with basis  $\dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i$ .

We define  $\dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i_*$  following §3.1. For any  $a \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i$ , and hence  $a^i \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i$ , we define the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear form

$$\tilde{a}^i : \dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda] \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(q), \quad \text{such that } \tilde{a}^i(b^i) = \delta_{a^i, b^i} \text{ for all } b^i \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i.$$

Then we see that  $\{\tilde{a}^i | a^i \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i\}$  forms a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$ .

Let  $\lambda, \lambda' \in X^+$  be such that  $\lambda' \geq \lambda$ . The natural projection  $\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda'] \rightarrow \dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda]$  is a morphism of based U-modules. It is then automatically a morphism of based  $U^i$ -modules by [2, §6]

$$(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda'], \dot{B}[\leq \lambda']^i) \rightarrow (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\leq \lambda], \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i).$$

Therefore



(a) the union  $\cup_{\lambda \in X^+} \{\tilde{a}^i | a^i \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i\}$  forms a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ .

**Remark 4.2.** There is no natural  $\iota$ canonical basis  $\dot{B}^i$  on the whole modified form  $\dot{U}$ . One could consider a topological basis via certain completion similar to [8, Chapter 30]. However, due the finiteness assumption on the elements in  $\mathbf{O}$ , we do naturally have the dual basis  $\cup_{\lambda \in X^+} \{\tilde{a}^i | a^i \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i\}$ .

**Lemma 4.3.** *The set  $B(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = \{\tilde{a}^i | a^i \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]_*^i\}$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}$ . In particular,  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}$  is a free  $\mathcal{A}$ -module.*

*Similar statements hold for  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda}$  and  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda}$ .*

*Proof.* Recall the exact functor  $(\cdot)_*^i$  in §3.2. By definition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} &= \{f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}(q)}((\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]), \mathbb{Q}(q)) \mid f((\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_+) = 0\} \\ &= \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Q}(q)}((\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i, \mathbb{Q}(q)). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma follows immediately by Theorem 3.1.  $\square$

By dualizing Corollary 3.3, we have the natural embeddings (for  $\lambda \leq \lambda'$  in  $X^+$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} &\rightarrow \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda'} \text{ mapping } B(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} \text{ into } B(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda'}, \\ \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda} &\rightarrow \mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} \text{ mapping } B(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda} \text{ into } B(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

We set  $B(K \setminus G)_{\lambda} = B(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} - B(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda}$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *The set*

$$B(K \setminus G) = \bigcup_{\lambda \in X^+} B(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in X^+} B(K \setminus G)_{\lambda} = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in X^+} B(K \setminus G)_{\lambda}$$

*is a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$ .*

*Moreover, for any commutative  $\mathcal{A}$ -algebra  $R$  with 1, the ring  ${}_R\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  is naturally a free  $R$ -submodule of  ${}_R\mathbf{O} = R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ .*

*Proof.* We have  $B(K \setminus G)_{\lambda} \neq \emptyset$  if and only if  $\lambda \in X^+$  by Corollary 3.3. The first claim follows immediately.

We know  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \subset {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$  be definition. Since  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  is spanned by the subset  $B(K \setminus G)$  of the  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis  $\cup_{\lambda \in X^+} \{\tilde{a}^i | a^i \in \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i\}$  of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ , the injectivity is clearly preserved after the base change  $R \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} -$ .  $\square$

We call  $B(K \setminus G)$  the canonical basis of  $\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$ .

**Corollary 4.5.** *The coproduct of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$  induces the coproduct on the  $\mathcal{A}$ -forms*

$${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \longrightarrow {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}. \quad (4.1)$$

*Proof.* It is known that the coproduct restricts to integral forms  $\Delta : {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O} \rightarrow {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$ . The the corollary follows from Proposition 4.1 and the fact that  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  is spanned by a subset the basis of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}$  in §4.2 (a).  $\square$

**4.3. The right action.** For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , since  $\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  is a two-sided ideal of  $\dot{U}$ , the space  $\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  is a  $(U, U)$ -bimodule. One can define the notion of based right  $U$ -modules in parallel with [8, §27]. It follows by [6] that  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda], \dot{B}[\leq \lambda])$  is also a based right  $U$ -module. By the construction of the functor  $(\cdot)_*^i$ , the space  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i$  admits a right  $U$ -action. Recall that  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i$  is a (left) based  $U^i$ -module with  $\iota$ canonical basis  $B[\leq \lambda]_*^i$ .

**Lemma 4.6.** (1)  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda], \dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i)$  is naturally a based right  $U$ -module.

(2) The right  $U$ -modules  $((\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i, B[\leq \lambda]_*^i)$  and  $((\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i, \dot{B}[\not\leq \lambda]_*^i)$  are based.

*Proof.* We show part (1). We verify (the right module variant of the) conditions in [8, §27.1.2]. Conditions (a), (b) are trivial. Since the canonical basis and  $\iota$ canonical basis coincide at  $q = \infty$ , condition (d) follows. We define the bar involution on  $\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  by  $\psi_i = \Upsilon\psi$  following [2, Proposition 5.1], where  $\psi$  is the bar involution fixing canonical basis, and  $\Upsilon$  is an element in a certain completion of  $U$ . The  $\iota$ canonical basis  $\dot{B}[\leq \lambda]^i$  is fixed by  $\psi_i$  by definition. For  $u \in \dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  and  $x \in U$ , we have

$$\psi_i(ux) = \Upsilon\psi(ux) = \Upsilon\psi(u)\psi(x) = \psi_i(u)\psi(x).$$

Hence the right  $U$ -action on  $\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]$  is bar-equivariant with respect to  $\psi_i$ . This verifies condition (c) in [8, §27.1.2].

Now it follows from Theorem 3.1 that  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_+$  is a based right  $U$ -submodule, and  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i$  is a based quotient of right  $U$ -submodule.  $\square$

The following short exact sequence of based  $U^i$ -modules in Corollary 3.3

$$0 \longrightarrow (\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i \longrightarrow (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i \longrightarrow (\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i \longrightarrow 0$$

is also an exact sequence as based right  $U$ -modules, thanks to Lemma 4.6.

Recall the anti-algebra automorphism  $\sigma$  and the algebra homomorphism  $\omega$  in §2.1.1. For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , let  ${}^{\sigma\omega}V(\lambda)$  be the right  $U$ -module with the same underlying vector space as  $V(\lambda)$ , and with the  $U$ -action twisted by  $\sigma \circ \omega$ . It was proved in [6] the canonical basis  $\dot{B}$  is  $\sigma$ -stable; it was proved in [10] that the canonical basis  $\dot{B}$  is  $\omega$ -stable. Then we can conclude that  $({}^{\sigma\omega}V(\lambda), B(\lambda))$  is a based right  $U$ -module.

**Proposition 4.7.** *For each  $\lambda \in X^+$ , we have an isomorphism of based right  $U$ -modules,*

$$\left( (\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i, \dot{B}[\lambda]_*^i \right) \cong \begin{cases} ({}^{\sigma\omega}V(\lambda), B(\lambda)), & \text{if } \lambda \in X_i^+; \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda \notin X_i^+. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By [8, Proposition 29.2.2 & Proposition 29.3.1], we have the  $(U, U)$ -bimodule isomorphism

$$\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] \cong V(\lambda) \boxtimes {}^{\sigma\omega}V(\lambda),$$

such that we have the induced bijection of bases  $B[\lambda] \cong B(\lambda) \times B(\lambda)$ . Here  $\boxtimes$  denotes the external tensor product emphasizing the bimodule structure.

Note that  $V(\lambda)_*^i \cong \mathbb{Q}(q)$  if  $\lambda \in X_i^+$ ; and  $V(\lambda)_*^i$  is the zero module if  $\lambda \notin X_i^+$  by §2.2.3. Then we have the following right  $U$ -module isomorphisms

$$(\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_*^i \cong V(\lambda)_*^i \boxtimes {}^{\sigma\omega}V(\lambda) \cong \begin{cases} {}^{\sigma\omega}V(\lambda), & \text{if } \lambda \in X_i^+; \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda \notin X_i^+. \end{cases}$$

The compactibility on bases is clear. We finish the proof.  $\square$

**4.4. Symmetric spaces.** Let  $k$  be an algebraically closed field of characteristic  $\neq 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow k$  be the ring homomorphism given by  $q \mapsto 1$ . Set

$${}_k\mathbf{O} = k \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O} \quad \text{and} \quad {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) = k \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G).$$

The  $k$ -algebra  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  is naturally a subalgebra of  ${}_k\mathbf{O}$  by Theorem 4.4. For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , set  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = k \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}$ . Still by Theorem 4.4, the  $k$ -algebra  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}$  is a  $k$ -subalgebra of  ${}_k\mathbf{O}$ , and moreover we have  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \cap {}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$ . As a result, we have

$${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) = \cup_{\lambda \in X^+} {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}. \quad (4.2)$$

Let  $(G_k, \theta_k)$  be the symmetric pair associated with our root datum, as constructed in §2.2.4. Recall that by Theorem 2.2, the  $k$ -algebra  ${}_k\mathbf{O}$  is canonically isomorphic to the algebra  $k[G_k]$  of regular functions on  $G_k$ . Let  $K_k = G_k^{\theta_k}$  be the symmetric subgroup.

**Theorem 4.8.** *As regular functions on  $G_k$ , we have*

$${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) = \{f \in {}_k\mathbf{O} \mid f(hg) = f(g), \text{ for any } h \in K_k, g \in G_k\}. \quad (4.3)$$

Therefore  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  is isomorphic to the coordinate ring of the symmetric space  $K_k \setminus G_k$ . Moreover, the basis  $B(K \setminus G)$  of  ${}_A\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  specializes to a basis of  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$ .

*Proof.* For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , let us write

$${}^{K_k}k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} = \{f \in k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} \mid f(hg) = f(g), \text{ for any } h \in K_k, g \in G_k\}.$$

It will suffice to prove that

$${}^{K_k}k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} = {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}, \quad \text{for any } \lambda \in X^+.$$

Let  $\mathcal{I} \subset k[G_k]$  be the defining ideal of the closed subgroup  $K_k$ , and  $\delta : k[G_k] \rightarrow k[G_k] \otimes k[G_k]$  be the coproduct of  $k[G_k]$ . Then we have

$${}^{K_k}k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} = \{f \in k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} \mid \delta(f) - 1 \otimes f \in \mathcal{I} \otimes k[G_k]\}.$$

By [9, §3.1], under the isomorphism  $k[G_k] \cong {}_k\mathbf{O}$ , the constant function 1 is the dual canonical basis element  $\tilde{1}_0$ . Recall from Theorem 2.5 that

$$\mathcal{I} = \{f \in k[G_k] \mid f({}_k\dot{U}^i) = 0\}.$$

Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{K_k}k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} &= \{f \in k[G_k]_{\leq \lambda} \mid f(yx) = \tilde{1}_0(y)f(x), \text{ for } y \in {}_k\dot{U}^i, x \in {}_k\dot{U}\} \\ &= \{f \in \text{Hom}_k({}_k(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]), k) \mid f({}_k(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_+) = 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the last equality follows from the fact that, the integral form of the based  $U^i$ -module  ${}_A(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_+$  is spanned by  $yx - \tilde{1}_0(y)x$ , for  $y \in {}_A\dot{U}^i$ ,  $x \in {}_A(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])$ , as an  $\mathcal{A}$ -module.

On the other hand, recall that

$${}_A\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = \{f \in \text{Hom}_A({}_A(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]), \mathcal{A}) \mid f({}_A(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_+) = 0\}.$$

By Theorem 3.1, we have

$${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = \{f \in \text{Hom}_k({}_k(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]), k) \mid f({}_k(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])_+) = 0\}.$$

This completes the proof of the equality (4.3).

For the last assertion, it is known that the symmetric space  $K_k \setminus G_k$  is affine by [13, Proposition 2.2]. Therefore the coordinate ring  $k[K_k \setminus G_k]$  is isomorphic to the subalgebra of  $K_k$ -invariant functions in  $k[G_k]$  (cf. [15, Exercise 5.5.9 (8)]). We complete the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

Thanks to Theorem 4.8, the base change of the coproduct in Corollary 4.5 gives the map

$$k[K_k \setminus G_k] \longrightarrow k[K_k \setminus G_k] \otimes_k k[G_k],$$

which is the comorphism of the action map  $K_k \setminus G_k \times_k G_k \longrightarrow K_k \setminus G_k$ .

We hence have the following geometric reformulation of Theorem 4.8.

(a) *The space  $\text{Spec } {}_Z\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)$  admits a natural right action of the Chevalley group scheme  $G_Z$ , whose geometric fiber over any algebraically closed field  $k$  of characteristic not 2 is isomorphic to the symmetric space  $K_k \setminus G_k$  with the natural right action of  $G_k$ .*

**4.5. Filtrations.** The coordinate ring  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \cong k[K_k \setminus G_k]$  admits a left  $G_k$ -action by

$$(g \cdot f)(x) = f(xg), \quad \text{for } x \in K_k \setminus G_k, f \in k[K_k \setminus G_k], g \in G_k.$$

Recall the Peter–Weyl filtration  $\{{}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda} \mid \lambda \in X^+\}$  of the coordinate ring  ${}_k\mathbf{O} \cong k[G_k]$  in Theorem 2.3. For  $\lambda \in X^+$ , recall

$${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda} = {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G) \cap {}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}.$$

Since each subspace  ${}_k\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$  is a  $(G_k, G_k)$ -subbimodule of  ${}_k\mathbf{O}$ , we deduce that  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{\leq \lambda}$  is a  $G_k$ -submodule. Similarly we have the  $G_k$ -submodule  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \setminus G)_{< \lambda}$ .

**Theorem 4.9.** *For  $\lambda \in X^+$ . We have the  $G_k$ -module isomorphisms*

$${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{\leq \lambda} / {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{< \lambda} \cong \begin{cases} {}_kV(-w_0\lambda)^*, & \text{if } \lambda \in X_i^+; \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda \notin X_i^+. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* By the construction of canonical basis of  ${}_A\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)$ , we have the following canonical isomorphism as vector spaces,

$$\begin{aligned} {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{\leq \lambda} / {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{< \lambda} &\cong k \otimes_{{}_A} ({}_A\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{\leq \lambda} / {}_A\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{< \lambda}) \\ &\cong k \otimes_{{}_A} \left( \text{Hom}_{{}_A}({}_A\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] / \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]_*, {}_A) \right) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_k({}_k(\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] / \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]_*), k). \end{aligned}$$

The second identity follows from the exact sequence in Corollary 3.3. The left  $G_k$ -action is given by

$$(g \cdot f)(x) = f(xg), \quad g \in G_K, x \in ({}_k(\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] / \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]_*), f \in \text{Hom}_k({}_k(\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] / \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]_*), k).$$

By Proposition 4.7, we have the right  $G_k$ -module isomorphism

$${}_k(\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] / \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda]_*) \cong \begin{cases} {}_k^{\sigma\omega}V(\lambda), & \text{if } \lambda \in X_i^+; \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda \notin X_i^+. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $\sigma \circ \omega(g) = \text{Ad}_h \circ \omega(g^{-1})$  for any  $g \in G_k$  and some  $h$  in a maximal torus of  $G_k$ . Therefore as left  $G_k$ -modules, we have

$${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{\leq \lambda} / {}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G)_{< \lambda} \cong \begin{cases} {}_kV(-w_0\lambda)^*, & \text{if } \lambda \in X_i^+; \\ 0, & \text{if } \lambda \notin X_i^+. \end{cases} \quad \square$$

For a rational  $G_k$ -module  $V$ , an ascending chain  $F^0 = (0) \subset F^1 \subset F^2 \subset \dots$  of  $G_k$ -submodules is called a *good filtration* if  $\cup_j F^j = V$ , and for each  $j \geq 1$ , the quotient  $F^j / F^{j-1}$  is isomorphic to  ${}_kV(\lambda_j)^*$  for some  $\lambda_j \in X^+$ .

By Theorem 2.3,  $k[G_k]$  has a good filtration as a  $G_k \times G_k$ -module. Theorem 4.9 generalises this result to arbitrary symmetric pairs, which we restate as follows.

**Corollary 4.10.** *The coordinate ring of the symmetric space  $K_k \backslash G_k$  has a good filtration as a  $G_k$ -module.*

**Remark 4.11.** Let  $B_k \subset G_k$  be a Borel subgroup with the unipotent radical  $N_k \subset B_k$ . Then the similar arguments in the proof of Theorem 4.8 and Theorem 4.9 can be applied to give a construction of an integral form and a good filtration of the coordinate ring  $k[N_k \backslash G_k]$ .

The construction of the (integral form of) ring  $k[N_k \backslash G_k]$  will actually be easier, since one only need to consider Lusztig's (dual) canonical bases. The good filtration of the  $G_k$ -module  $k[N_k \backslash G_k]$  actually splits, thanks to the left multiplication by the maximal torus.

**4.6. Spherical functions.** Let  $\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K)$  be the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -subspace of  $\mathbf{O}$  consisting of linear forms on  $\dot{U}$  that vanish on the subspace  $U^{i,+}\dot{U} + \dot{U}U^{i,+}$ . The following proposition can be proved similarly to Proposition 4.1, whose proof we omit.

**Proposition 4.12.** *The subspace  $\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K)$  is closed under multiplication.*

We define  ${}_A\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K) = \mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K) \cap {}_A\mathbf{O}$ , and  $\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K)_{\leq \lambda} = \mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K) \cap \mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$  for  $\lambda \in X^+$ . We similarly define  $\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K)_{< \lambda}$ ,  ${}_A\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K)_{\leq \lambda}$ , and  ${}_A\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G / K)_{< \lambda}$ .

By Lemma 4.6 (1), for  $\lambda \in X^+$ ,  $(\dot{U} / \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda], \mathbb{B}[\leq \lambda]^i)$  is a based right  $U$ -module, hence a based right  $U^i$ -module. We denote its canonical basis by  ${}^i\mathbb{B}[\leq \lambda]^i = \{{}^i b^i | b \in \mathbb{B}[\leq \lambda]\}$  as a right  $U^i$ -module. Following §4.2, we define the  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -linear form

$${}^i\tilde{a}^i : \dot{U} / \dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda] \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}(q), \quad {}^i\tilde{a}^i({}^i b^i) = \delta_{i, a^i, {}^i b^i} \text{ for all } {}^i b^i \in {}^i\mathbb{B}[\leq \lambda]^i.$$

Then  $\{{}^i\tilde{a}^i | a^i \in {}^i\mathbb{B}[\leq \lambda]^i\}$  forms a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of  ${}_A\mathbf{O}_{\leq \lambda}$ .

By Lemma 4.6 (2),  $((\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])^i_*, \mathbf{B}[\leq \lambda]^i_*)$  is a based right  $U$ -module. We denote its canonical basis by  ${}^i\mathbf{B}[\leq \lambda]^i_*$  as a right  $U^i$ -module. By the right variant of Theorem 3.1, we see that  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])^i_* U^{i,+}$  is a based right  $U^i$ -submodule of  $(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])^i_*$ . By applying the right variant of the construction in §3.1, we get a subset  ${}^i\mathbf{B}[\leq \lambda]^i_*$  of the basis  ${}^i\mathbf{B}[\leq \lambda]^i_*$ , such that the based quotient  $({}^i_*(\dot{U}/\dot{U}[\not\leq \lambda])^i_*, {}^i\mathbf{B}[\leq \lambda]^i_*)$  is a based right  $U^i$ -module. Similar to §4.2, we see that  $\mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)_{\leq \lambda} = \{{}^i\tilde{a}^i | {}^i\tilde{a}^i \in {}^i\mathbf{B}[\leq \lambda]^i_*\}$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)_{\leq \lambda}$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)_{\leq \lambda}$ . For any  $\lambda \in X^+$ , the natural embedding

$$\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)_{< \lambda} \rightarrow \mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)_{\leq \lambda} \text{ maps } \mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)_{< \lambda} \text{ to } \mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)_{\leq \lambda}.$$

We define

$$\mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)_{\lambda} = \mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)_{\leq \lambda} - \mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)_{< \lambda} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K) = \bigsqcup_{\lambda \in X^+} \mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)_{\lambda}.$$

The following theorem is analogous to Theorem 4.4 and Theorem 4.8. The proof will be omitted.

**Theorem 4.13.** (1) *The set  $\mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}(q)$ -basis of  $\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)$  and an  $\mathcal{A}$ -basis of  ${}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)$ .*

(2) *For any algebraically closed field  $k$  of char  $\neq 2$ , we have*

$${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K) = \{f \in {}_k\mathbf{O} | f(hg) = f(gh) = f(g), \forall g \in G_k, h \in K_k\}.$$

*Here  ${}_k\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K) = k \otimes_{\mathcal{A}} {}_{\mathcal{A}}\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)$ .*

We call  $\mathbf{B}(K \backslash G/K)$  the canonical basis of  $\mathbf{O}(K \backslash G/K)$ .

## REFERENCES

- [1] Huanchen Bao and Jinfeng Song, *Symmetric subgroup schemes, Frobenius splittings, and quantum symmetric pairs* (2022), available at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2212.13426>.
- [2] Huanchen Bao and Weiqiang Wang, *Canonical bases arising from quantum symmetric pairs*, *Invent. Math.* **213** (2018), no. 3, 1099–1177, DOI 10.1007/s00222-018-0801-5. MR3842062
- [3] ———, *Canonical bases arising from quantum symmetric pairs of Kac-Moody type*, *Compos. Math.* **157** (2021), no. 7, 1507–1537, DOI 10.1112/S0010437X2100734X. MR4277109
- [4] Jens Carsten Jantzen, *Representations of algebraic groups*, 2nd ed., *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, vol. 107, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003. MR2015057
- [5] Masaki Kashiwara, *On crystal bases of the  $Q$ -analogue of universal enveloping algebras*, *Duke Math. J.* **63** (1991), no. 2, 465–516, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-91-06321-0. MR1115118
- [6] ———, *Crystal bases of modified quantized enveloping algebra*, *Duke Math. J.* **73** (1994), no. 2, 383–413, DOI 10.1215/S0012-7094-94-07317-1. MR1262212
- [7] Gail Letzter, *Quantum symmetric pairs and their zonal spherical functions*, *Transform. Groups* **8** (2003), no. 3, 261–292, DOI 10.1007/s00031-003-0719-9. MR1996417
- [8] George Lusztig, *Introduction to quantum groups*, *Modern Birkhäuser Classics*, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2010. Reprint of the 1994 edition. MR2759715
- [9] ———, *Study of a  $\mathbf{Z}$ -form of the coordinate ring of a reductive group*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **22** (2009), no. 3, 739–769, DOI 10.1090/S0894-0347-08-00603-6. MR2505299
- [10] ———, *The quantum group  $\dot{U}$  and flag manifolds over the semifield  $\mathbb{Z}$*  (2022), available at <https://browse.arxiv.org/abs/2209.02433>.
- [11] Masatoshi Noumi, *Macdonald’s symmetric polynomials as zonal spherical functions on some quantum homogeneous spaces*, *Adv. Math.* **123** (1996), no. 1, 16–77, DOI 10.1006/aima.1996.0066. MR1413836
- [12] Masatoshi Noumi and Tetsuya Sugitani, *Quantum symmetric spaces and related  $q$ -orthogonal polynomials*, *Group theoretical methods in physics (Toyonaka, 1994)*, *World Sci. Publ.*, River Edge, NJ, 1995, pp. 28–40. MR1413733
- [13] T. A. Springer, *Some results on algebraic groups with involutions*, *Algebraic groups and related topics (Kyoto/Nagoya, 1983)*, *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, vol. 6, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1985, pp. 525–543, DOI 10.2969/aspm/00610525. MR0803346
- [14] ———, *The classification of involutions of simple algebraic groups*, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **34** (1987), no. 3, 655–670. MR0927604
- [15] ———, *Linear algebraic groups*, 2nd ed., *Modern Birkhäuser Classics*, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2009. MR2458469

- [16] Hideya Watanabe, *Stability of canonical bases of locally finite type* (2023), available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.12199v1>.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE, SINGAPORE.  
*Email address:* huanchen@nus.edu.sg

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE, SINGAPORE.  
*Email address:* j\_song@u.nus.edu