

Subalgebras of Lie algebras. Example of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ revisited

Yevhenii Yu. Chapovskyi[†], Serhii D. Koval^{†‡} and Olha Zhur[§]

[†] *Institute of Mathematics of NAS of Ukraine, 3 Tereshchenkivska Str., 01024 Kyiv, Ukraine*

[‡] *Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's (NL) A1C 5S7, Canada*

[§] *Faculty of Mechanics and Mathematics, National Taras Shevchenko University of Kyiv, 2 Academician Glushkov Ave., 03127 Kyiv, Ukraine*

E-mails: e.chapovskyi@imath.kiev.ua, skoval@mun.ca, oliazhur@knu.ua

Revisiting the results by Winternitz [*Symmetry in physics, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes* **34**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 215–227], we thoroughly refine his classification of Lie subalgebras of the real order-three special linear Lie algebra and thus present the correct version of this classification for the first time. A similar classification over the complex numbers is also carried out. We follow the general approach by Patera, Winternitz and Zassenhaus but in addition enhance it and rigorously prove its theoretical basis for the required specific cases of classifying subalgebras of real or complex finite-dimensional Lie algebras. As a byproduct, we first construct complete lists of inequivalent subalgebras of the rank-two affine Lie algebra over both the real and complex fields.

To the memory of Jiří Patera and Pavel Winternitz

1 Introduction

The problem of classifying Lie subalgebras of real and complex Lie algebras arises in many fields of mathematics and its applications. In particular, for a system of (partial) differential equations, listing inequivalent Lie subalgebras of its maximal Lie invariance algebra is used for the classification of Lie reductions of the system and in turn can be applied to constructing its (inequivalent) explicit exact solutions, see [15, Chapter 3] and [4, 7, 28, 29] for details and examples. This is why classifications of subalgebras of Lie algebras aroused a lively interest among researchers from the field of symmetry analysis of differential equations. Such classifications are also efficient tools in theoretical physics and in the theory of integrable systems, e.g., [5, 21]. At the same time, they themselves remain to be interesting algebraic problems.

When studying the continuous subgroups of the fundamental groups of physics in the series of papers [2, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22], Patera, Winternitz, Zassenhaus and others developed the general methods for classifying Lie subalgebras of the finite-dimensional Lie algebras with nontrivial ideals and of the direct products of Lie algebras. The latter method was named as the Lie–Goursat method therein. Although these methods became a reference point for carrying out such classifications, to apply them it is usually necessary to examine the properties of the Lie algebra under consideration, its representations and the explicit form of its automorphism group [19, 30]. This makes the subalgebra classification an inherently *ad hoc* problem, which involves cumbersome and complex computations. Due to the above reasons, the subalgebra classification problem was thoroughly and completely solved, to the best of our knowledge, only for a small number of low-dimensional Lie algebras (over the fields of real and complex numbers), see, in particular, [19].

In [29, 30], the classification of subalgebras of real order-three special linear Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ was carried out using the general approach from [21] reinforced by the properties of the defin-

ing representation of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$. This approach made it possible to reduce the classification of subalgebras of the simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ to that of the real rank-two affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R}) = \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$. Despite the brightness of the involved ideas, the classification obtained in [30] has several major drawbacks. First and foremost, the final classification list, which is presented in [30, Table 1], contains misprints, mistakes, redundant subalgebras and incomplete subalgebra families, which at this stage makes the classification inappropriate for further applications. Secondly, the presentation of a complete list of inequivalent subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ was omitted, which makes the main result of [30] difficult to reproduce or double-check. In fact, lists of “twisted” and “nontwisted” subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ was presented in [30, Section 3.3] but the classification was not completed. Moreover, the validity of these lists are yet questionable. The reason for this doubt is that for classifying subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ as the semidirect product $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$, the method from [21] requires a correct list of inequivalent subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$, but the one in [30, Eq. (3.11)] contains a misprint. Although these disadvantages are significant, it is possible to overcome them using [30] as the source of excellent ideas and approaches.

The classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$, where $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} , is important for many problems in algebra, mathematical physics and group analysis of differential equations. For instance, as shown in [1], the group classification problem for normal linear systems of second-order ordinary differential equations with n dependent variables can be easily solved once the classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{F})$ is known. Therefore, having a complete list of the subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$ enables us to solve this problem for $n = 3$. The same problem for $n = 2$ was solved in [1], based on the well-known classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{F})$. Moreover, many systems of linear and nonlinear partial differential equations admit Lie symmetry algebras that are isomorphic to the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{F})$. Such systems are often constituted by equations of the same structure with coupled dependent variables, e.g., as the systems of reaction-diffusion equations [14]. Any (in)homogeneous (real or complex) Monge–Ampère equation with two independent variables possesses a Lie invariance algebra isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$ [10]. We can also refer to the equation of Tîţeica surfaces [27] as one more example of a single partial differential equation, whose Lie invariance algebra is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$.

Another important open problem that relies on listing inequivalent subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is the classification of its realizations, i.e., its representations as Lie algebras of vector fields, with a view towards solving the inverse group classification problem for this algebra, which is constructing systems of differential equations that admit Lie invariance algebras isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$, see, e.g., [24]. The subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$ can be also useful for constructing superintegrable systems and algebraic Hamiltonians [5, 12].

Among the open problems in algebra, the classification of nilpotent Lie algebras over a field \mathbb{F} occupies a significant place. The subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$ also play a specific, but at the same time, important role in solving this problem for Lie algebras of low dimension, namely, the classification of inequivalent maximal abelian nilpotent subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$ is used for classifying five-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras, see [26, Section 8.1].

The study of specific (graded) contractions of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ was initiated in [6]. The usual contractions and degenerations of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$ are also of interest and deserve investigation. It is clear that given a list of inequivalent subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{F})$, one can straightforwardly construct and classify its Inönü–Wigner contractions following, for example, [8, 9, 13] and references therein.

In fact, there were attempts to apply the list of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ from [30] for studying the local limits of connected subgroups of the group $SL_3(\mathbb{R})$ [11]. This gives us an additional reason to revisit the results of [30].

The purpose of the present paper is to correct and refine the classification of subalgebras of the real order-three special linear Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ following [30]. The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we revisit classical approaches for the classification of subalgebras of real

and complex Lie algebras, suggest novel perspectives on them and provide them with a rigorous theoretical framework. Section 3 is devoted to the classification of subalgebras of the affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$. To the best of our knowledge, such an exhaustive classification has never been presented in the literature, cf. [23, Table 1], where only the “appropriate” subalgebras were classified with respect to a weaker equivalence, and [30, Section 3.3], where a complete list of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ was omitted. In Section 4, we carry out the classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$, which essentially relies on the above classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$. After listing the subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ in Theorem 20, we compare the obtained list with that in [30, Table 1] in Section A, Remark 21 and Table 1. Our analysis reveals that Winternitz’s classification has seven missed or incorrect families of subalgebras, seven redundant single subalgebras, one omitted subalgebra and two subalgebras with misprints. In the same way, in Section 5, we carry out the classification of subalgebras of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$. The results of the paper are summarized in Section 6.

Throughout the paper, all Lie algebras and Lie groups are assumed to be finite-dimensional and the underlying field is \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} .

2 Lie algebras and classification of their subalgebras

Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra and G be a connected Lie group corresponding to \mathfrak{g} . The algebra \mathfrak{g} is identified with the algebra of tangent vectors at the origin of the group G with the standard commutator. The group G acts on the algebra \mathfrak{g} by the adjoint representation,

$$\text{Ad}: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g}), \quad g \mapsto \text{Ad}_g,$$

where Ad_g is the derivative at the identity element $e \in G$ of the group conjugation $c_g: h \mapsto ghg^{-1}$, $\text{Ad}_g := (dc_g)_e: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$, where d is the differential and $g, h \in G$. Since the group G is connected, this action coincides with the action of the inner automorphism group $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{g})$ on the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} .

Two subalgebras \mathfrak{s}_1 and \mathfrak{s}_2 of the algebra \mathfrak{g} are called *conjugated* (or *G -equivalent*) if there exists $g \in G$ such that $\text{Ad}_g \mathfrak{s}_1 = \mathfrak{s}_2$. The problem of subalgebra classification consists of determining a complete list of irredundant representatives of the conjugacy classes of subalgebras of the algebra \mathfrak{g} up to the action of the group G . In other words, considering the action of the group G on the set of subalgebras of the algebra \mathfrak{g} , which is induced by the adjoint representation, construct a list of canonical representatives (which are of the simplest form) of the orbits of this action.¹

In view of Levi–Malcev theorem, \mathfrak{g} splits over its radical \mathfrak{r} , $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{f} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$, where \mathfrak{f} is a Levi subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , which is complementary to \mathfrak{r} in \mathfrak{g} . The algebra \mathfrak{g} can take one of the following forms.

1. The algebra \mathfrak{g} is simple.
2. The algebra \mathfrak{g} is the direct product of its subalgebras, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \times \mathfrak{g}_2$.
3. The algebra \mathfrak{g} is a semidirect product of its subalgebras, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_2$.

Cases 1 and 2 include the situation in which \mathfrak{g} is a semisimple Lie algebra, i.e., $\mathfrak{r} = \{0\}$. Moreover, case 2 takes place when the corresponding action of \mathfrak{f} on \mathfrak{r} in the semidirect decomposition $\mathfrak{f} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$ is trivial. It is also evident that case 3 occurs when both the factors \mathfrak{f} and \mathfrak{r} in the Levi decomposition are nontrivial, but also it covers a possibility when \mathfrak{g} is itself a solvable Lie algebra (in this case, the algebra \mathfrak{g} has a codimension-one ideal).

The approaches for classifying Lie subalgebras of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} depend on the structure of \mathfrak{g} , more specifically, it depends on which of the above cases takes place. This is why we revisit the

¹It is natural, that this question can be formulated in a more general setting: given a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} over a field \mathbb{F} , construct a complete and irredundant list of canonical representatives of the orbits of the subalgebras of the algebra \mathfrak{g} under the action of its inner automorphism group $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{g})$.

approaches for the classification of subalgebras of Lie algebras over the fields of real or complex numbers following [30] addressing each of the possible cases separately. In fact, we restrict our consideration of case 3 to the semidirect products of Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}_1 \ltimes \mathfrak{g}_2$, where the ideal \mathfrak{g}_2 is an abelian Lie algebra for the sake of clarity and readability. This assumption is sufficient for classifying subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$, which is the primary objective of the paper. The general case is discussed in [30].

2.1 Subalgebras of simple Lie algebras

The idea for classifying subalgebras of a simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} consists in finding all its maximal subalgebras \mathfrak{m} and then proceed with the classification of subalgebras for each \mathfrak{m} with respect to $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{m})$ -equivalence. This can be done using one of the methods described in Section 2 depending on the structure of \mathfrak{m} . The task of finding all the maximal subalgebras of a Lie algebra is within the domain of representation theory and we elaborate on the main approach at the end of this subsection.

After listing the $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{m})$ -inequivalent subalgebras of \mathfrak{m} the obtained lists must be combined modulo the G -equivalence. The following proposition shows the general idea of how to do this efficiently.

Proposition 1. *Let $\mathfrak{m} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie subalgebra, $M \subset G$ the corresponding Lie subgroup. Choose some subset $C \subset G$ such that $MC = G$. Then Lie subalgebras $\mathfrak{h}_1 \subset \mathfrak{m}$ and $\mathfrak{h}_2 \subset \mathfrak{g}$ are conjugated if and only if there exists an element $g \in C$ such that $\text{Ad}_g \mathfrak{h}_2 \subset \mathfrak{m}$ and moreover $\text{Ad}_g \mathfrak{h}_2$ is equivalent to \mathfrak{h}_1 up to $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{m})$ -equivalence.*

Proposition 1 simplifies the problem of combining lists as follows. For each maximal Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{m} and a Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ suspected to be conjugated to a Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{m} find all elements $g \in C$ such that $\text{Ad}_g \mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{m}$. For all such Lie subalgebras $\text{Ad}_g \mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{m}$ find the corresponding representatives in the list of inequivalent subalgebras of \mathfrak{m} up to $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{m})$ -equivalence. The obtained on this way subalgebras are the only representatives of Lie subalgebras of \mathfrak{m} that are equivalent to \mathfrak{h} modulo $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{g})$ -equivalence.

Remark 2. To find a suitable subset C of G , it is natural to consider exponent of some complement subspace $V \subset \mathfrak{g}$ to the Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{m} . From the notion of canonical coordinate systems on a Lie group it follows that C can be chosen as at most countable union of subsets of the form $\exp Vg$ for some elements $g \in G$. For compact Lie groups, this union can be chosen to be finite. The explicit form of such subsets C must be found on a case-by-case basis depending on the structure of the Lie group G .

To find maximal subalgebras of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , consider a faithful irreducible finite-dimensional representation $\rho: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(V)$. It is convenient to choose V of the least possible dimension, e.g., for the classical Lie algebras choose their defining representations. Since any subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} is a subalgebra in some maximal subalgebra \mathfrak{m} of \mathfrak{g} it is sufficient to consider the maximal subalgebras arising from the *irreducibly* and *reducibly embedded subalgebras* of \mathfrak{g} with respect to the representation ρ .

A subalgebra \mathfrak{s} of \mathfrak{g} is called irreducibly embedded if $\rho(\mathfrak{s})$ has no proper invariant subspace of V . Then in view of [3, Proposition 5, p. 56], the algebra \mathfrak{s} must be a reductive Lie algebra, i.e., simple, semisimple or the direct sum of a semisimple and an abelian Lie algebras. Finding such subalgebras becomes a question of representation theory, i.e., \mathfrak{s} must have a faithful representation of dimension $\dim V$.

A subalgebra \mathfrak{s} of \mathfrak{g} is called reducibly embedded if $\rho(\mathfrak{s})$ has a proper invariant subspace $V_0 \subset V$. In this case, it is sufficient to classify such subspaces V_0 of V and find the subalgebra \mathfrak{s} of \mathfrak{g} such that $\rho(\mathfrak{s})$ leaves V_0 invariant. This is again a representation theory problem. In particular, if \mathfrak{g} is $\mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{R})$ or $\mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ then V_0 is completely characterized by its dimension. If \mathfrak{g} is an orthogonal or a symplectic Lie algebra then V_0 is determined by its dimension and signature.

2.2 Subalgebras of direct products

Let G_1, G_2 be connected Lie groups, and $\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2$ the corresponding Lie algebras, $G = G_1 \times G_2$, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \times \mathfrak{g}_2$ and $\pi_i: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_i, i = 1, 2$, are the natural projections.

Proposition 3. *Consider the map Φ that assigns to each Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ the tuple of objects $(\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{h}_2, I, \alpha)$, where $\mathfrak{h}_i \subset \mathfrak{g}_i, i = 1, 2$, are Lie subalgebras, I is an ideal of the Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{h}_2 , and $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_2/I$ is a Lie algebra epimorphism. The map is given by $\mathfrak{h}_i := \pi_i(\mathfrak{h}), I := \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}_2$,*

$$\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \ni x_1 \longmapsto \{x_2 \in \mathfrak{h}_2 \mid (x_1, x_2) \in \mathfrak{h}\} \in \mathfrak{h}_2/I.$$

There exists the inverse Φ^{-1} , which maps a quadruple $(\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{h}_2, I, \alpha)$ to the Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{h} = \{(x_1, x_2) \mid x_1 \in \mathfrak{h}_1, x_2 \in \alpha(x_1)\}.$$

Proof. The essential step of the proof is to show that both the maps from the assertion are well defined. It will immediately follow from their construction that they are inverses of each other.

We start by showing that Φ is well defined. Let \mathfrak{h} be a Lie subalgebra of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Projections π_i are the Lie algebra homomorphisms, and therefore \mathfrak{h}_i are Lie subalgebras in \mathfrak{g}_i .

Further, we have $I = \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}_2 = \ker \pi_1|_{\mathfrak{h}}$, and hence I is an ideal of the Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{h} . Since the restriction $\pi_2|_{\mathfrak{h}}: \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_2$ is surjective by definition, it follows that $I = \pi_2(I)$ is an ideal in \mathfrak{h}_2 .

Next, consider the map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_2/I$. It is easy to see that it is a linear map. For arbitrary elements $(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in \mathfrak{h}$, their commutator $([x_1, y_1], [x_2, y_2])$ also belongs to \mathfrak{h} , hence

$$\alpha([x_1, y_1]) = [x_2, y_2] + I = [x_2 + I, y_2 + I] = [\alpha(x_1), \alpha(y_1)],$$

i.e., α is a Lie algebra homomorphism. It is clear that α is an epimorphism.

To show that Φ^{-1} is well defined, consider a quadruple consisting of Lie subalgebras $\mathfrak{h}_i \subset \mathfrak{g}_i, i = 1, 2$, an ideal $I \subset \mathfrak{h}_2$ and a Lie algebra epimorphism $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}_2/I$. We show that the subspace $\mathfrak{h} := \{(x_1, x_2) \mid x_1 \in \mathfrak{h}_1, x_2 \in \alpha(x_1)\} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a Lie subalgebra. For any elements $(x_1, x_2), (y_1, y_2) \in \mathfrak{h}$, we have that $[x_1, y_1] \in \mathfrak{h}_1$, and moreover

$$\alpha([x_1, y_1]) = [\alpha(x_1), \alpha(y_1)] = [x_2 + I, y_2 + I] = [x_2, y_2] + I.$$

This means that the commutator $([x_1, y_1], [x_2, y_2])$ is an element of \mathfrak{h} , hence \mathfrak{h} is indeed a Lie subalgebra. \square

Proposition 4. *The adjoint representation Ad of the Lie group G and its action on the set of the subalgebras of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} induces the natural action on the quadruples $(\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{h}_2, I, \alpha)$ via the map Φ from Proposition 3, i.e.,*

$$\Phi \circ \text{Ad}_g \circ \Phi^{-1}: (\mathfrak{h}_1, \mathfrak{h}_2, I, \alpha) \longmapsto (\text{Ad}_{g_1} \mathfrak{h}_1, \text{Ad}_{g_2} \mathfrak{h}_2, \text{Ad}_{g_2} I, \text{Ad}_{g_2} \circ \alpha \circ \text{Ad}_{g_1}^{-1}),$$

where $g = (g_1, g_2) \in G$.²

To classify all Lie subalgebras in \mathfrak{g} up to its inner automorphisms, it is sufficient to go through the following steps.

1. Construct a list of representatives $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_i^a$ of the conjugacy classes of Lie subalgebras of \mathfrak{g}_i modulo G_i -equivalence, $i = 1, 2$.³

²By abuse of notations the Lie algebra epimorphism $\text{Ad}_{g_2} \circ \alpha \circ \text{Ad}_{g_1}^{-1}: \text{Ad}_{g_1} \mathfrak{h}_1 \rightarrow \text{Ad}_{g_2} \mathfrak{h}_2 / \text{Ad}_{g_2} I$ is defined via the map $\text{Ad}_{g_1} x \mapsto \text{Ad}_{g_2} x + \text{Ad}_{g_2} I$, where $x \in \mathfrak{h}_1$.

³The notation $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_i^a$ is usually replaced by the one of the form $\mathfrak{h}_{d,k}^*$, where d, k and $*$ mean the subalgebra's dimension, its number in the list of subalgebras of dimension d and the parameters for a subalgebra family, respectively.

2. For each pair $(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b)$ construct representatives \hat{I}_{ab}^c of the conjugacy classes of ideals of $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b$ up to the action of the group $\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b, G_2)$.
3. For each tuple $(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b, \hat{I}_{ab}^c)$ construct representatives of conjugacy classes of Lie algebras epimorphisms $\hat{\alpha}^d: \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b/\hat{I}_{ab}^c$ up to the action of the group

$$\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, G_1) \times (\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b, G_2) \cap \text{Nor}(\hat{I}_{ab}^c, G_2)),$$

where the latter action on the epimorphisms $\alpha: \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b/\hat{I}_{ab}^c$ is given by $(g_1, g_2)\alpha = \text{Ad}_{g_2} \circ \alpha \circ \text{Ad}_{g_1}^{-1}$.

4. For each quadruple $(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b, \hat{I}_{ab}^c, \hat{\alpha}_{abc}^d)$ recover the corresponding Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{h}^{abcd} according to Proposition 3.

Remark 5. The problem of finding normalizer groups $\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, G_1)$ and $\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b, G_2)$ from the above method is a nonlinear problem, which can be sophisticated. However, to slightly simplify the complexity of the computations while applying the algorithm, it is possible to replace the normalizer groups $\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, G_1)$ and $\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b, G_2)$ by their subgroups generated by the exponents of the normalizers of $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b$ in the corresponding Lie algebras, respectively, i.e., the subgroups in G_1 and G_2 respectively generated by the sets $\exp(\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, \mathfrak{g}_1))$ and $\exp(\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_2^b, \mathfrak{g}_2))$. Since these subgroups can be proper in the corresponding normalizer groups, one should check that the resulting list of the Lie subalgebras contains no conjugated pairs.

Remark 6. The algorithm presented in this section is a modified version of the Goursat method described in [30, Section 2.3]. However, the original method can only construct the Lie subalgebras corresponding to the quadruples (h_1, h_2, I, α) , where I is either zero ideal or \mathfrak{h}_2 , in other words, I is an improper ideal. The advantage of our algorithm is that it has an invariant formulation and a proven validity, which allowed us to overcome the latter mistake.

2.3 Subalgebras of semidirect products

Let G_1 and G_2 be connected Lie groups with G_2 isomorphic to \mathbb{R}^n , \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_2 are the corresponding Lie algebras, in particular \mathfrak{g}_2 is an abelian Lie algebra, $G = G_1 \rtimes_{\Psi} G_2$, $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_1 \rtimes_{\psi} \mathfrak{g}_2$, $\pi_i: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are the natural projections, $\Psi: G_1 \rightarrow \text{Aut}(G_2)$ is a homomorphism of Lie groups and $\psi: \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \text{Der}(\mathfrak{g}_2)$ is the corresponding Lie algebra homomorphism.

Proposition 7. Consider the map Γ that assigns to each Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ the triple of objects $(\mathfrak{h}_1, U, \alpha)$, where $\mathfrak{h}_1 \subset \mathfrak{g}_1$ is a Lie subalgebra, $U \subset \mathfrak{g}_2$ is a \mathfrak{h}_1 -submodule and a 1-cocycle $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_2/U$, i.e., a linear map satisfying the identity (see [3, p. 89])

$$\alpha([x, y]) = [\alpha(x), y] + [x, \alpha(y)] = \psi(x)\alpha(y) - \psi(y)\alpha(x).$$

The map is given by $\mathfrak{h}_1 = \pi_1(\mathfrak{h})$, $U = \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}_2$ and

$$\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \ni x \mapsto \{v \in \mathfrak{g}_2 \mid (x, v) \in \mathfrak{h}\} \in \mathfrak{g}_2/U.$$

There exists the inverse Γ^{-1} , which maps a triple $(\mathfrak{h}_1, U, \alpha)$ to the Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ as follows:

$$\mathfrak{h} = \{(x, v) \mid x \in \mathfrak{h}_1, v \in \alpha(x)\}.$$

Proof. In the same manner, as for the direct product case, it suffices to show that both the maps from the statement of the proposition are well-defined. It is clear that they are mutually inverse from their construction.

Starting with Γ , consider a Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{h} in \mathfrak{g} . Then $\mathfrak{h}_1 = \pi_1(\mathfrak{h})$ is a Lie subalgebra in \mathfrak{g}_1 , $U = \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}_2$ is a \mathfrak{h}_1 -invariant subspace in \mathfrak{g}_2 , and hence it is \mathfrak{h}_1 -invariant as well. It is

obvious that $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_2/U$ is a linear map. For any elements $(x_1, v_1), (x_2, v_2) \in \mathfrak{h}$ we have that $[(x_1, v_1), (x_2, v_2)] \in \mathfrak{h}$, that is $([x_1, x_2], \psi(x_1)v_2 - \psi(x_2)v_1) \in \mathfrak{h}$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha([x_1, x_2]) &= \psi(x_1)v_2 - \psi(x_2)v_1 + U \\ &= \psi(x_1)(v_2 + U) - \psi(x_2)(v_1 + U) \\ &= \psi(x_1)\alpha(x_2) - \psi(x_2)\alpha(x_1),\end{aligned}$$

which means that α is a 1-cocycle.

Next, we show that the inverse Γ^{-1} is well-defined as well. Let \mathfrak{h}_1, U and $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_2/U$ be a Lie subalgebra in \mathfrak{g}_1 , a \mathfrak{h}_1 -submodule in \mathfrak{g}_2 and a 1-cocycle, respectively. Consider the subspace $\mathfrak{h} = \{(x, v) \mid x \in \mathfrak{h}_1, v \in \alpha(x)\}$ in \mathfrak{g} . For any elements $(x_1, v_1), (x_2, v_2) \in \mathfrak{h}$ the commutator $[x_1, x_2]$ belongs to \mathfrak{h}_1 , and moreover

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha([x_1, x_2]) &= \psi(x_1)\alpha(x_2) - \psi(x_2)\alpha(x_1) \\ &= \psi(x_1)(v_2 + U) - \psi(x_2)(v_1 + U) \\ &= \psi(x_1)v_2 - \psi(x_2)v_1 + U.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $[(x_1, v_1), (x_2, v_2)] \in \mathfrak{h}$. □

Proposition 8. *Analogously to the case of direct product, the action of the adjoint representation $\text{Ad } G$ on the set of all subalgebras of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} induces the natural action on the triples $(\mathfrak{h}_1, U, \alpha)$ via the map Γ from Proposition 7, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma \circ \text{Ad}(g, 0) \circ \Gamma^{-1}: (\mathfrak{h}_1, U, \alpha) &\longmapsto (\text{Ad } g \mathfrak{h}_1, \Psi(g)U, \Psi(g) \circ \alpha \circ \text{Ad } g^{-1}), \\ \Gamma \circ \text{Ad}(1, v) \circ \Gamma^{-1}: (\mathfrak{h}_1, U, \alpha) &\longmapsto (\mathfrak{h}_1, U, \alpha + \text{ad } v|_{\mathfrak{h}_1}).\end{aligned}$$

To classify all Lie subalgebras in \mathfrak{g} up to its inner automorphisms, it is sufficient to go through the following steps.

1. Construct representatives $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a$ of the conjugacy classes of Lie subalgebras in \mathfrak{g}_1 modulo G_1 -equivalence.
2. For each $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a$ construct representatives \hat{U}_a^b of the orbits of \mathfrak{h}_1 -submodules in \mathfrak{g}_2 up to the group $\Psi(\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, G_1))$.
3. For each pair $(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, \hat{U}_a^b)$ construct representatives $\hat{\alpha}_{ab}^c: \hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_2/\hat{U}_a^b$ of the orbits of cocycles up to the group

$$(\text{Nor}(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, G_1) \cap \text{Nor}(\hat{U}_a^b, G_1)) \ltimes G_2,$$

where the latter action is defined as $(g, v)\alpha = \Psi(g) \circ \alpha \circ \text{Ad } g^{-1} + \text{ad } v|_{\mathfrak{h}_1}$.

4. For each triple $(\hat{\mathfrak{h}}_1^a, \hat{U}_a^b, \hat{\alpha}_{ab}^c)$ recover the corresponding Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{h}^{abc} according to Proposition 7.

Remark 9. The presented algorithm corresponds to the method introduced in [30, Section 2.3]. We reformulate the original method by Winternitz in an invariant way for the case where the ideal \mathfrak{g}_2 in the semidirect product is an abelian Lie algebra and prove its validity. Up to some correction, the steps in the algorithm are the same as the original version.

3 Subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$

Using the approach from Section 2.1, it is shown in Section 4 that the classification of subalgebras of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ essentially reduces to that for the algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$. Moreover, to the best of our knowledge, the latter classification has not been carried out completely in

literature before, cf. [23, Table 1], where this problem has been solved in the more particular case, more specifically, only the “appropriate” subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ were classified with respect to a weaker equivalence. In fact, in [30, Section 3.3] the lists of “twisted” and “nontwisted” subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ were presented without a proof, but combining these lists with respect to $\text{Inn}(\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R}))$ -equivalence was omitted. Furthermore, the classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ requires a correct list of the subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$, but the one in [30, eq. (3.1)] had a mistake: the subalgebra $\langle D \rangle$ (in their notation) was missing. Therefore, the validity of the lists of “twisted” and “nontwisted” subalgebras is doubtful. This is why in this section we present a complete list of inequivalent subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and then in the next section use it in the course of classifying subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$.

The affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ of rank two can be written as a semidirect product $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R}) = \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$, where the algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is spanned by the matrices

$$e_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_2 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_4 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\mathbb{R}^2 = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$, where $f_1 = (1, 0)^\top$, $f_2 = (0, 1)^\top$, is considered as a two-dimensional abelian Lie algebra. The action of $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$ on \mathbb{R}^2 in the semidirect product is given by the faithful representation on \mathbb{R}^2 as on vector space, i.e., by the action of matrices on vectors. Up to the skew-symmetry of the Lie brackets the nontrivial commutation relations in $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ are exhausted by

$$\begin{aligned} [e_1, e_2] &= e_1, & [e_2, e_3] &= e_3, & [e_1, e_3] &= 2e_2, \\ [e_1, f_1] &= f_2, & [e_2, f_1] &= \frac{1}{2}f_1, & [e_2, f_2] &= -\frac{1}{2}f_2, & [e_3, f_2] &= -f_1, \\ [e_4, f_1] &= \frac{1}{2}f_1, & [e_4, f_2] &= \frac{1}{2}f_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since the algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ can be viewed as the semidirect product of the Lie algebras, we use the algorithm from Section 2.3 to classify its subalgebras. The following proposition completes the first step of that algorithm.

Theorem 10 ([19, 25]). *A complete list of inequivalent proper subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is exhausted by the following subalgebras:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{1D:} \quad & \mathfrak{h}_{1.1} = \langle e_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{1.2} = \langle e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{1.3}^\kappa = \langle e_2 + \kappa e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{1.4}^\varepsilon = \langle e_1 + \varepsilon e_4 \rangle, \\ & \mathfrak{h}_{1.5}^\gamma = \langle e_1 + e_3 + \gamma e_4 \rangle, \\ \text{2D:} \quad & \mathfrak{h}_{2.1} = \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{2.2} = \langle e_2, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{2.3} = \langle e_1 + e_3, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{2.4}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1 \rangle, \\ \text{3D:} \quad & \mathfrak{h}_{3.1} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{3.2} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon = \pm 1$, $\kappa \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 11. *A complete list of inequivalent proper subalgebras of the real rank-two affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{1D:} \quad & \mathfrak{s}_{1.1} = \langle f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.2}^\delta = \langle e_1 + \delta f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.3} = \langle e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.4}^\kappa = \langle e_2 + \kappa e_4 \rangle, \\ & \mathfrak{s}_{1.5} = \langle e_2 + e_4 + f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.6}^\varepsilon = \langle e_1 + \varepsilon e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.7}^\gamma = \langle e_1 + e_3 + \gamma e_4 \rangle, \\ \text{2D:} \quad & \mathfrak{s}_{2.1} = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.2}^\delta = \langle e_1 + \delta f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.3} = \langle e_4, f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.4}^\kappa = \langle e_2 + \kappa e_4, f_1 \rangle, \\ & \mathfrak{s}_{2.5}^{\kappa'} = \langle e_2 + \kappa' e_4, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.6} = \langle e_2 + e_4 + f_2, f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.7}^\varepsilon = \langle e_1 + \varepsilon e_4, f_2 \rangle, \\ & \mathfrak{s}_{2.8} = \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.9} = \langle e_2, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.10} = \langle e_1 + e_3, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.11}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1 \rangle, \\ & \mathfrak{s}_{2.12}^\varepsilon = \langle e_2 + \varepsilon e_4 + f_2, e_1 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
3D: \mathfrak{s}_{3.1} &= \langle e_1, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.2} = \langle e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.3}^\kappa = \langle e_2 + \kappa e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \\
\mathfrak{s}_{3.4}^\varepsilon &= \langle e_1 + \varepsilon e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.5}^\gamma = \langle e_1 + e_3 + \gamma e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.6} = \langle e_1, e_4, f_2 \rangle, \\
\mathfrak{s}_{3.7} &= \langle e_2, e_4, f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.8}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.9} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.10} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3 \rangle, \\
4D: \mathfrak{s}_{4.1} &= \langle e_1, e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{4.2} = \langle e_2, e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{4.3} = \langle e_1 + e_3, e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \\
\mathfrak{s}_{4.4}^\gamma &= \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{4.5} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{4.6} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \rangle, \\
5D: \mathfrak{s}_{5.1} &= \langle e_1, e_2, e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{5.2} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3, f_1, f_2 \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$, $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, $\kappa \geq 0$, $\kappa' > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Using Theorem 10, we perform the first step of the algorithm from Section 2.3. Now we should execute steps 2, 3 and 4 for the families of subalgebras from the list given in Theorem 10, including the trivial subalgebra $\{0\}$. The computations below are tedious and cumbersome, this is why for the optimal performance and better presentation we structure the proof as follows. For each subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*$ from Theorem 10 and the trivial subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \{0\}$ we begin with constructing the normalizer subgroup $\text{Nor}(\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R}))$ where it is needed, then classify $\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 . It is clear that there is only one zero-dimensional and one two-dimensional submodule, i.e., $\{0\}$ and $\mathbb{R}^2 = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$. Here i, j and $*$ in notation of the subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*$ stand for the dimension of the subalgebra, its number in the list of i -dimensional subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and the list of subalgebra parameters for a subalgebra family, respectively. We do not introduce separate notations for submodules but rather denote them as vector spaces spanned by some specific basis or as $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ if necessary. Also, we do not use separate notations for cocycles for the sake of text readability, thus for a fixed $\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*$ -submodule $U \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ we start from the most general form of a 1-cocycle $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2/U$ and simplify it using elements of $\text{Nor}(\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})) \times \mathbb{R}^2$. For the obtained inequivalent cocycles we construct the subalgebras following Proposition 7. Note that if $\dim \mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^* = 1$ then any linear map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2/U$ is a 1-cocycle. Otherwise, one should check that the cocycle condition is satisfied, which in case of the affine algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R}) = \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^2$ takes the form

$$\alpha([x, y]) = x\alpha(y) - y\alpha(x) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*.$$

Another important remark is that any cocycle $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2/\mathbb{R}^2$ is the trivial cocycle, thus the subalgebra corresponding to this cocycle is $\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^* \times \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$. We will not mention this trivial case throughout the proof, however, we indicate the obtained in this way subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^* \times \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$ as the last element of the list of subalgebras constructed for each case $\mathfrak{h}_{i,j}^*$.

The following simple observation is useful in the course of cocycle simplification.

Lemma 12. *Let $x \in \text{Mat}_2(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\text{rank } x = 2$. Then any cocycle $\alpha: \langle x \rangle \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is equivalent to the trivial one under the action of the inner automorphism group of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. For any cocycle $\alpha: x \mapsto c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2$, consider the action on it by $(1, x^{-1}(-c_1 f_1 - c_2 f_2))$. \square

$\mathfrak{h}_0 = \langle 0 \rangle$. Clearly, the normalizer subgroup of \mathfrak{h}_0 is the entire group $\text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})$, therefore the inequivalent \mathfrak{h}_0 -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are characterized by their dimensions, so we can chose $\{0\}$, $\langle f_1 \rangle$ and $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$. By this, we obtain the subalgebras $\langle 0 \rangle$, $\mathfrak{s}_{1.1}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{2.1}$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{1.1} = \langle e_1 \rangle$. The normalizer of the subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{1.1}$ in the group $\text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})$ is generated by the lower-triangular matrices, i.e., $(a_{lm})_{l,m=1,2}$ with $a_{12} = 0$, $a_{11}a_{22} > 0$ and $a_{12} \in \mathbb{R}$. The next step is to choose $\text{Nor}(\mathfrak{h}_{1.1}, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R}))$ -inequivalent $\mathfrak{h}_{1.1}$ -submodules U of \mathbb{R}^2 , and the only nontrivial part is to find one-dimensional modules. So, if $\dim U = 1$ then consider $c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2 \in U$, since $e_1(c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) = c_1 f_2$ then $c_1 = 0$, so $U = \langle f_2 \rangle$. Thus, the submodules are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$ and $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$.

The next step is to consider 1-cocycles $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{1.1}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2/U$ and reduce them to the simplest form modulo the action of the group $\text{Nor}(\mathfrak{h}_{1.1}, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})) \times \mathbb{R}^2$. To construct 1-cocycles we note that

any linear map between Lie algebras, whose domain is 1-dimensional, is a 1-cocycle. Starting the consideration from $\mathfrak{h}_{1.1}$ -submodule $\{0\}$, consider a linear map $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2$. Acting on α by $\text{Ad}(\text{diag}(1, 1), c_2 f_1)$ via formula from step 3 in algorithm presented in Section 2.3, we change the general form of the 1-cocycle α to $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto c_1 f_1$. If $c_1 \neq 0$, we simplify it further acting by $\text{Ad}(A, 0)$, where $A = \text{diag}(\text{sgn } c_1, c_1)$, we get $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto f_1$. Otherwise, $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto 0$.

By this, we obtained the candidates for the representatives of the equivalence classes of cocycles, $\hat{\alpha}^1: e_1 \mapsto f_1$ and $\hat{\alpha}^0: e_1 \mapsto 0$. If $\hat{\alpha}^0$ is equivalent to $\hat{\alpha}^1$, then there exists $(g, v) \in \text{Nor}(\langle e_1 \rangle, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$ such that

$$\text{Ad}(g, v)\hat{\alpha}^0 = \hat{\alpha}^1. \quad (1)$$

The left-hand side of (1) can be written as

$$\text{Ad}(g, v)\hat{\alpha}^0 = g \circ \hat{\alpha}^0 \circ \text{Ad } g^{-1} + \text{ad } v|_{\mathfrak{h}_{1.1}}.$$

Since $\hat{\alpha}^0(e_1) = 0$, the term $g \circ \hat{\alpha}^0 \circ \text{Ad } g^{-1}$ vanishes. We have that $\text{ad } v|_{\mathfrak{h}_1}(e_1) \in \langle f_2 \rangle$, which implies that $\text{Ad}(g, v)\hat{\alpha}^0(e_1) \in \langle f_2 \rangle$. This contradicts the equality (1) since $\hat{\alpha}^1(e_1) = f_1$. Hence, $\hat{\alpha}^0$ and $\hat{\alpha}^1$ are not equivalent. The subalgebras that correspond to $\hat{\alpha}^0$ and $\hat{\alpha}^1$ are $\mathfrak{s}_{1.2}^0$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{1.2}^1$.

The next submodule to consider is $\langle f_2 \rangle$. Consider the map $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto c_1 f_1 + \langle f_2 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle f_2 \rangle$. If $c_1 \neq 0$, then, acting on α by $A = \text{diag}(\text{sgn } c_1, c_1)$, we can set $c_1 = 1$. Otherwise, $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto \langle f_2 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle f_2 \rangle$. Hence, the 1-cocycles are $\alpha^1: e_1 \mapsto f_1 + \langle f_2 \rangle$ and $\alpha^0: e_1 \mapsto \langle f_2 \rangle$ and they are inequivalent, so the corresponding subalgebras are $\mathfrak{s}_{2.2}^1$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{2.2}^0$.

The last subalgebra for this case, which is obtained after considering two-dimensional submodule \mathbb{R}^2 , is $\mathfrak{s}_{3.1}$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{1.2} = \langle e_4 \rangle$. Clearly $\text{Nor}(\mathfrak{h}_{1.2}, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})) = \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})$, thus the inequivalent submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_1 \rangle$ and $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$. Since $\text{rank } e_4 = 2$ then in view of Lemma 12, any 1-cocycle $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{1.2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ can be reduced to the trivial one. Therefore, this case results in the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{1.3}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{2.3}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{3.2}$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{1.3}^\kappa = \langle e_2 + \kappa e_4 \rangle$ with $\kappa \geq 0$. This case is by far the most complicated. When $\kappa = 0$ the normalizer $\text{Nor}(\langle e_2 \rangle, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R}))$ is constituted by the matrices

$$\begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & a_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with $a_{11}a_{22} > 0$ and $a_{12}a_{21} < 0$. Otherwise, the normalizer $\text{Nor}(\langle e_2 + \kappa e_4 \rangle, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R}))$, where $\kappa > 0$ is constituted by the matrices $\text{diag}(a_{11}, a_{22})$ satisfying the condition $a_{11}a_{22} > 0$. This is why we split the consideration into three cases: $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, $\kappa = 0$ and $\kappa = 1$, where the first one is the regular one, $\kappa = 0$ is caused by the structure of the normalizer subgroup, and $\kappa = 1$ requires separate consideration since $\text{rank}(e_1 + e_4) = 1$.

$\kappa = 0$. To classify inequivalent one-dimensional $\langle e_2 \rangle$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 we use the fact that $e_2(c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) = c_1 f_1 - c_2 f_2$, thus we can have that either $c_1 = 0$ or $c_2 = 0$. Hence the only one-dimensional submodules are $\langle f_1 \rangle$ and $\langle f_2 \rangle$, however, they are equivalent: consider the action by the matrix $A \in \text{Nor}(\langle \text{diag}(1, -1) \rangle, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R}))$ with entries $a_{11} = a_{22} = 0$ and $a_{12} = -a_{21} = 1$. This means that the representatives of the $\langle e_2 \rangle$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_1 \rangle$ and \mathbb{R}^2 .

In view of Lemma 12, all 1-cocycles can be reduced to the trivial one. Hence, this subcase results in the subalgebras $\langle e_2 \rangle$, $\langle e_2, f_1 \rangle$ and $\langle e_2, f_1, f_2 \rangle$.

$\kappa = 1$. Since $(e_2 + e_4)(c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) = c_1 f_1$, we have that either $c_1 = 0$ or $c_2 = 0$. This is why the inequivalent $\langle e_2 + e_4 \rangle$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_1 \rangle$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$ and \mathbb{R}^2 .

Consider a 1-cocycle $\alpha: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2 \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Since $\text{im}(e_2 + e_4) = \langle f_1 \rangle$ we can reduce the cocycle α to $\alpha: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto c_2 f_2$. If $c_2 = 0$ then the 1-cocycle is trivial, $\hat{\alpha}: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto 0$, otherwise applying $\text{Ad}(\text{diag}(c_2^{-1}, \text{sgn } c_2), 0)$ to $\alpha: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto c_2 f_2$ we obtain $\hat{\alpha}: x^1 \mapsto f_2$. The resulting

two cocycles are inequivalent. Hence, we obtained $\hat{\alpha}^0: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto 0$ and $\hat{\alpha}^1: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto f_2$. The subalgebras corresponding to these cocycles are $\langle e_2 + e_4 \rangle$ and $\langle e_2 + e_4 + f_2 \rangle$.

The next step is to consider submodule $\langle f_1 \rangle$ and a 1-cocycle $\alpha: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto c_2 f_2 + \langle f_1 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle f_1 \rangle$. Analogously to the previous case, if $c_2 = 0$, then the 1-cocycle is trivial, $\hat{\alpha}^0: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto \bar{0} \in \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle f_1 \rangle$. Otherwise, applying $\text{Ad}(\text{diag}(c_2^{-1}, \text{sgn } c_2), 0)$ we can set c_2 to be equal to 1. Hence, the 1-cocycle is equivalent to $\hat{\alpha}^1: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto f_2 + \langle f_1 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle f_1 \rangle$. The resulting two cocycles are inequivalent. Thus the corresponding subalgebras are $\langle e_2 + e_4, f_1 \rangle$ and $\langle e_2 + e_4 + f_2, f_1 \rangle$.

The case with the submodule $\langle f_2 \rangle$ is trivial. Due to the fact that $\text{Im}(e_2 + e_4) = \langle f_1 \rangle$ we can always reduce any cocycle $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{1,3}^\kappa \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle f_2 \rangle$ to a cocycle $\alpha: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto \langle f_2 \rangle \in \mathbb{R}^2 / \langle f_2 \rangle$, in other words, to the trivial one. Hence the subalgebra corresponding to this 1-cocycle is $\langle e_2 + e_4, f_2 \rangle$. And for the last case of a two-dimensional submodule, the subalgebra is $\langle e_2 + e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle$.

$\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \setminus \{1\}$. Since $\text{rank}(e_2 + \kappa e_4) = 2$, each 1-cocycle can be reduced to the trivial one. To classify $\mathfrak{h}_{1,3}^\kappa$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 we use that $(e_2 + \kappa e_4)(c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) = \frac{c_1}{2}(\kappa + 1)f_1 + \frac{c_2}{2}(\kappa - 1)f_2$, thus we straightforwardly get that the inequivalent submodules are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_1 \rangle$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$ and \mathbb{R}^2 . Hence, this subcase gives us the subalgebras $\langle e_2 + \kappa e_4 \rangle$, $\langle e_2 + \kappa e_4, f_1 \rangle$, $\langle e_2 + \kappa e_4, f_2 \rangle$, $\langle e_2 + \kappa e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle$.

The entire case of $\mathfrak{h}_{1,3}^\kappa$ results in the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{1,4}^\kappa$, $\mathfrak{s}_{1,5}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{2,4}^\kappa$, $\mathfrak{s}_{2,5}^{\kappa'}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{2,6}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{3,3}^\kappa$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{1,4}^\varepsilon = \langle e_1 + \varepsilon e_4 \rangle$ with $\varepsilon = \pm 1$. Since $(e_1 + \varepsilon e_4)(c_1 f_1 + c_2 f_2) = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}c_1 f_1 + (c_1 + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}c_2)f_2$, then $c_1 = 0$, so the $\mathfrak{h}_{1,4}^\varepsilon$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$ and $\langle f_1, f_2 \rangle$, which are definitely inequivalent. The matrix $e_1 + \varepsilon e_4$ has the full rank, then by Lemma 12 any cocycle is equivalent to the trivial one. Thus we obtain the families of subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{1,6}^\varepsilon$, $\mathfrak{s}_{2,7}^\varepsilon$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{3,4}^\varepsilon$ from the statement of Theorem 11.

$\mathfrak{h}_{1,5}^\gamma = \langle e_1 + e_3 + \gamma e_4 \rangle$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. The only $\mathfrak{h}_{1,5}^\gamma$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$ and \mathbb{R}^2 . Using the fact that $\text{rank}(e_1 + e_3 + \gamma e_4) = 2$, we can reduce any cocycle to the trivial one using Lemma 12. Thus, we obtain the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{1,7}^\gamma$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{3,5}^\gamma$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{2,1} = \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle$. The normalizer of the subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{2,1}$ is constituted by the lower-triangular matrices from $\text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})$. This is why the only $\mathfrak{h}_{2,1}$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$, \mathbb{R}^2 .

For the submodule $\{0\}$, consider a linear map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{2,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ defined by $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, e_4 \mapsto c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2$. Acting on α by $\text{Ad}(1, -2c_{21}f_1 - 2c_{22}f_2)$, we get $\alpha: e_1 \mapsto c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, e_4 \mapsto 0$. This map is a cocycle if and only if $c_{11} = c_{12} = 0$. In other words, the only possible cocycle is the trivial one.

The consideration for the submodule $\langle f_2 \rangle$ is analogous and it also results in the trivial 1-cocycle.

By this, we obtain subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{2,8}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{3,6}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{4,1}$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{2,2} = \langle e_2, e_4 \rangle$. The normalizer $\text{Nor}(\mathfrak{h}_{2,2}, \text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R}))$ is generated by the diagonal and antidiagonal matrices (as in the case $\mathfrak{h}_{1,3}^\kappa$). Thus, the inequivalent $\langle e_2, e_4 \rangle$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_1 \rangle$ and \mathbb{R}^2 .

For the case of the submodule $\{0\}$ consider the general form of a linear map from $\mathfrak{h}_{2,2}$ to \mathbb{R}^2 , $\alpha: e_2 \mapsto c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, e_4 \mapsto c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2$. Since $\text{rank } e_2 = 2$ then, acting on α by $\text{Ad}(1, -e_2^{-1}(c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2))$, we reduce it to $\alpha: e_2 \mapsto 0, e_4 \mapsto c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2$. This map is a cocycle if and only if $c_{21} = c_{22} = 0$.

The consideration for the submodule $\langle f_1 \rangle$ is analogous and it also results in the trivial 1-cocycle. Hence, we obtain the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{2,9}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{3,7}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{4,2}$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{2,3} = \langle e_1 + e_3, e_4 \rangle$. The matrix $e_1 + e_3$ is the real two-by-two Jordan block with eigenvalue 0, hence it does not have proper invariant subspaces, thus the only inequivalent $\mathfrak{h}_{2,3}$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$ and \mathbb{R}^2 .

Since $\text{rank } e_4 = 2$, any linear map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{2,3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ is equivalent to a map of the form $\alpha: e_1 + e_3 \mapsto c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, e_4 \mapsto 0$. And the latter is a cocycle if and only if it is trivial. By this, we obtain the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{2,10}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{4,3}$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1 \rangle$. The normalizer of the subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^\gamma$ is constituted by the lower-triangular matrices from $\text{GL}_2^+(\mathbb{R})$. Depending on the value of γ , there are three separate cases to consider: $\gamma = -1$, $\gamma = 1$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1, 1\}$, where the first two appear since the matrices $e_2 \pm e_4$ are degenerate.

$\gamma = 1$. The $\mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^1$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$, \mathbb{R}^2 . In the case of the submodule $\{0\}$ consider an arbitrary linear map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\alpha: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, e_1 \mapsto c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2$. Acting on α by $\text{Ad}(1, -c_{11}f_1)$, we can set $c_{11} = 0$. The 1-cocycle condition $\alpha([e_2 + e_4, e_1]) = (e_2 + e_4)\alpha(e_1) - e_1\alpha(e_2 + e_4)$ gives us that $c_{21} = c_{22} = 0$. Thus, the potential 1-cocycles are of the form $\alpha: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto c_{12}f_2, e_1 \mapsto 0$. If $c_{12} = 0$, then α is the trivial cocycle. If $c_{12} \neq 0$, acting on α by $\text{Ad}(\text{diag}(c_{12}, c_{12}^{-1}), 0)$, we can set $c_{12} = 1$. Thus we obtain two inequivalent cocycles $\hat{\alpha}^0: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto 0, e_1 \mapsto 0$ and $\hat{\alpha}^1: e_2 + e_4 \mapsto f_2, e_1 \mapsto 0$. They correspond to the subalgebras $\langle e_2 + e_4, e_1 \rangle$ and $\langle e_2 + e_4 + f_2, e_1 \rangle$.

Consideration of the submodule $\langle f_2 \rangle$ is analogous and it leads to the trivial 1-cocycle. This case corresponds to the subalgebra $\langle e_2 + e_4, e_1, f_2 \rangle$.

$\gamma = -1$. The $\mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^{-1}$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$, \mathbb{R}^2 . In case of submodule $\{0\}$ consider an arbitrary linear map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^{-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$, $\alpha: e_2 - e_4 \mapsto c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, e_1 \mapsto c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2$. Acting on α by $\text{Ad}(1, -c_{22}f_1)$, we can set $c_{22} = 0$. The 1-cocycle condition $\alpha([e_2 - e_4, e_1]) = (e_2 - e_4)\alpha(e_1) - e_1\alpha(e_2 - e_4)$ gives us that $c_{21} = c_{11} = 0$. If $c_{12} = 0$ then the cocycle is trivial. Otherwise we can set $c_{12} = 1$ using $\text{Ad}(\text{diag}(c_{12}, c_{12}^{-1}), 0)$. Thus we obtain two inequivalent cocycles $\hat{\alpha}^0: e_2 - e_4 \mapsto 0, e_1 \mapsto 0$ and $\hat{\alpha}^1: e_2 - e_4 \mapsto f_2, e_1 \mapsto 0$. They correspond to the subalgebras $\langle e_2 - e_4, e_1 \rangle$ and $\langle e_2 - e_4 + f_2, e_1 \rangle$.

For the submodule $\langle f_2 \rangle$ the consideration is analogous and it results in the trivial 1-cocycle, which corresponds to the subalgebra $\langle e_2 - e_4, e_1, f_2 \rangle$.

$\gamma \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \{-1, 1\}$. The inequivalent submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$ and \mathbb{R}^2 . For submodule $\{0\}$ consider a linear map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^\gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ given by $\alpha: e_2 + \gamma e_4 \mapsto c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, e_1 \mapsto c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2$. Since $\text{rank}(e_2 + \gamma e_4) = 2$ we can reduce α to $\alpha: e_2 + \gamma e_4 \mapsto 0, e_1 \mapsto c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2$ in an analogous way as in Lemma 12. The 1-cocycle condition $\alpha([e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1]) = (e_2 + \gamma e_4)\alpha(e_1) - e_1\alpha(e_2 + \gamma e_4)$ gives us that $c_{21} = c_{22} = 0$. Thus α is a trivial cocycle, which corresponds to the subalgebra $\langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1 \rangle$.

The cases with submodule $\langle f_2 \rangle$ also give us only a trivial 1-cocycle, which correspond to the subalgebra $\langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1, f_2 \rangle$.

The entire case of $\mathfrak{h}_{2,4}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1 \rangle$ gives us the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{2,11}^\gamma$, $\mathfrak{s}_{2,12}^\epsilon$, $\mathfrak{s}_{3,8}^\gamma$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{4,4}^\gamma$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{3,1} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4 \rangle$. The $\mathfrak{h}_{3,1}$ -submodules of \mathbb{R}^2 are $\{0\}$, $\langle f_2 \rangle$ and \mathbb{R}^2 . Consider a linear map $\alpha: \mathfrak{h}_{3,1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ given on the basis by $\alpha: (e_1, e_2, e_4) \mapsto (c_{11}f_1 + c_{12}f_2, c_{21}f_1 + c_{22}f_2, c_{31}f_1 + c_{32}f_2)$. Since $\text{rank } e_2 = 2$ we can set $c_{21} = c_{22} = 0$. The 1-cocycle conditions $\alpha([e_1, e_2]) = e_1\alpha(e_2) - e_2\alpha(e_1)$ and $\alpha([e_2, e_4]) = e_2\alpha(e_4) - e_4\alpha(e_2)$ give us that $c_{11} = c_{12} = c_{31} = c_{32} = 0$. Thus, α is the trivial cocycle.

The consideration of the rest of the submodules also gives us the trivial cocycles. Hence, in this case, we obtain the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{3,9}$, $\mathfrak{s}_{4,5}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{5,1}$.

$\mathfrak{h}_{3,2} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3 \rangle$. The algebra $\mathfrak{h}_{3,2}$ is simple, then by the Whitehead theorem, each cocycle is a coboundary, thus each 1-cocycle is trivial. This leads to the subalgebras $\mathfrak{s}_{3,10}$ and $\mathfrak{s}_{5,2}$ in the statement of the theorem.

$\mathfrak{h}_{4,1} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \rangle$. Each 1-cocycle is clearly trivial, thus this case results in the subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}_{4,6}$ and in the entire algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$. \square

4 Subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$

The real order-three special linear Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ is the algebra of traceless 3×3 matrices with the standard matrix commutator as the Lie bracket and it is spanned by the matrices

$$E_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E_2 := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad E_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this way, the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ is defined through its faithful irreducible representation of the minimal dimension, which is exactly the vector space \mathbb{R}^3 . Using this representation, we should find all *irreducibly* and *reducibly embedded* maximal subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$.

4.1 Irreducibly embedded subalgebras

Recall that an irreducibly embedded subalgebra must be reductive, i.e., semisimple or the direct product of semisimple Lie algebra with an abelian one (over a field of characteristic zero). We can show that the only semisimple Lie algebras admitting faithful three-dimensional representation are the special orthogonal algebras $\mathfrak{so}_3(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{so}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$. For this purpose, consider the following chain of propositions.

Proposition 13 (see details in [3, p. 56]). *Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{F})$ be a linear Lie algebra that has no invariant subspaces. Then \mathfrak{g} is reductive, i.e., $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s} \oplus \mathfrak{z}$, where \mathfrak{s} is a semisimple Lie algebra and \mathfrak{z} is an abelian Lie algebra.*

Lemma 14. *Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{R})$ be a linear Lie algebra that has no invariant subspaces. If the complexification $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ has an invariant subspace $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$, then $\mathbb{C}^n = U \oplus \overline{U}$, where U and \overline{U} are irreducible $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ -submodules, in particular, $n = 2 \dim U$.*

Proof. Suppose $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} U < \frac{n}{2}$, then the linear space $\Re U$ is a \mathfrak{g} -invariant subspace of \mathbb{R}^n and $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} \Re U < n$, which is a contradiction. Here \Re denotes the real part function extended to the vector space U . If $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} U > \frac{n}{2}$, then $\dim_{\mathbb{R}} U > n$ and Grassmann's identity for vector spaces gives us that $U \cap \mathbb{R}^n \neq 0$. The latter subspace is a \mathfrak{g} -invariant subspace of \mathbb{R}^n , which is again a contradiction. Therefore, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} U = \frac{n}{2}$.

If $U \cap \overline{U} \neq 0$, then it admits a basis consisting of elements of \mathbb{R}^n and hence $U \cap \overline{U} \cap \mathbb{R}^n \neq 0$ is a \mathfrak{g} -invariant subspace of \mathbb{R}^n , which contradicts the statement of the proposition. \square

The proposition below follows immediately from Schur's lemma.

Proposition 15. *Let $\mathfrak{g} \subset \mathfrak{gl}_n(\mathbb{C})$ be a reductive linear Lie algebra, $\mathbb{C}^n = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_k$ be the decomposition of \mathbb{C}^n in the sum of its irreducible submodules. Then any central element $x \in Z(\mathfrak{g})$ is of the form $x = \bigoplus_{i=1}^k \lambda_i 1_{V_i}$, where $\lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}$ and 1_{V_i} stands for the identity matrix on V_i for each i .*

Proposition 16 (see details in [3, p. 68]). *Let \mathfrak{g} be a real reductive Lie algebra. Then its complexification $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}$ is a complex reductive Lie algebra and $Z(\mathfrak{g}^{\mathbb{C}}) = Z(\mathfrak{g})^{\mathbb{C}}$.*

Lemma 14 and Propositions 13, 15 and 16 imply that irreducibly embedded Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ are semisimple. Their complexifications are complex semisimple Lie algebras of dimension less than eight that have faithful representation on \mathbb{C}^3 . The following proposition shows that irreducibly embedded Lie subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ can only be real forms of $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$.

Proposition 17. *The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ has no faithful representations on \mathbb{C}^3 .*

Proof. Ad absurdum. Suppose that $\rho: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ is a faithful representation of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Denoting the direct summands of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \oplus \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ as \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_2 respectively, consider the restriction $\rho|_{\mathfrak{g}_1}$ of ρ on the first summand. If $\rho|_{\mathfrak{g}_1}$ is irreducible, then $[\rho(\mathfrak{g}_1), \rho(\mathfrak{g}_2)] = \rho([\mathfrak{g}_1, \mathfrak{g}_2]) = 0$ implies $\rho(\mathfrak{g}_2) \subset \mathbb{C}1_{\mathbb{C}^3}$ by Schur's lemma. Since the Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{g}_2 is simple, it follows that $\rho(\mathfrak{g}_2) = 0$, which contradicts the fact that the representation ρ is faithful. Therefore, the representation $\rho|_{\mathfrak{g}_1}$ is reducible and thus completely reducible. Moreover, since $\dim \mathbb{C}^3 = 3$ the representation $\rho|_{\mathfrak{g}_1}$ has a one-dimensional invariant subspace $\mathbb{C}\langle v \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ and, in particular, $\rho|_{\mathfrak{g}_1} v = 0$.

Consider \mathfrak{g}_1 -submodule $K := \cap_{x \in \mathfrak{g}_1} \ker \rho(x)$ of \mathbb{C}^3 . It is clear that $\mathbb{C}\langle v \rangle \subset K$. The dimension of the submodule K cannot be equal to three since the action of \mathfrak{g}_1 on \mathbb{C}^3 would be trivial in this case. If $\dim K = 2$, Weyl's theorem gives us that \mathfrak{g}_1 -submodule K has a \mathfrak{g}_1 -invariant complement in \mathbb{C}^3 . The latter implies that the quotient representation of $\rho|_{\mathfrak{g}_1}$ on the space \mathbb{C}^3/K is faithful, which cannot be possible since $\dim \mathbb{C}^3/K = 1$. Therefore, $\dim K = 1$ and $\mathbb{C}\langle v \rangle = K = \cap_{x \in \mathfrak{g}_1} \ker \rho(x)$.

The equality $[\rho(\mathfrak{g}_1), \rho(\mathfrak{g}_2)] = 0$ implies that $\mathbb{C}\langle v \rangle$ is an invariant subspace of the representation ρ and hence $\mathbb{C}\langle v \rangle = \cap_{x \in \mathfrak{g}} \ker \rho(x)$. Using the arguments analogous to those in the previous paragraph, we can show that the quotient representation $\bar{\rho}: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(\mathbb{C}^3/\mathbb{C}\langle v \rangle)$ is faithful as well, which is a contradiction, since $6 = \dim \mathfrak{g} \not\leq \dim \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{C}) = 4$. \square

4.2 Reducibly embedded subalgebras

A maximal subalgebra $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$, which is reducibly embedded, has a proper invariant subspace $V \subset \mathbb{R}^3$. Up to a change of basis, we can choose the invariant subspaces $V_1 = \langle (1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0) \rangle$ and $V_2 = \langle (0, 0, 1) \rangle$, thus the maximal subalgebras are

$$\mathfrak{a}_1 := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & -a_{11} - a_{22} \end{pmatrix} \mid a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R} \right\} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle,$$

$$\mathfrak{a}_2 := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & 0 \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & -a_{11} - a_{22} \end{pmatrix} \mid a_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R} \right\} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle.$$

Both the subalgebras \mathfrak{a}_1 and \mathfrak{a}_2 are isomorphic to the rank-two real affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$, thus Theorem 11 provides the lists of their inequivalent subalgebras up to the corresponding inner automorphism groups. Each of these lists may contain subalgebras that are conjugated modulo the action of the Lie group $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$. Therefore, our next task is to identify all such subalgebras in both the lists and get rid of all but one of them. It is clear that solving this problem for one of the subalgebras, without loss of generality say for \mathfrak{a}_1 , automatically solves this problem for the other one.

The isomorphism between the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ and \mathfrak{a}_1 is given by a linear map ρ_1 defined on the chosen bases of the algebras via the correspondence $(e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, f_1, f_2) \mapsto (E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2)$, thus a complete list of inequivalent subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 (with respect to the action of its inner automorphism group) constituted by the subalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{i,j}^* := \rho_1 \mathfrak{s}_{i,j}^*$, where $\mathfrak{s}_{i,j}^*$ are subalgebras listed in Theorem 11. To find out which subalgebras among $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{i,j}^*$ are equivalent under the action of the group $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ we use the following elementary observation, which is a specific case of the general approach discussed in Section 2.1, see Proposition 1 and Remark 2.

Lemma 18. *Any matrix S from $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ can be decomposed into a product of matrices $A \in H \subset \mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ and M , $S = AM$, where H is isomorphic to the group $\mathrm{Aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$,*

$$H := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b & x \\ c & d & y \\ 0 & 0 & (ad - bc)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c, d, x, y \in \mathbb{R} \text{ such that } ad - bc \neq 0 \right\}$$

and M is of one of the following forms:

$$M_1(c_1, c_2) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ c_1 & c_2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_2(c_1, c_2) := \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ c_1 & 1 & c_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_3(c_1, c_2) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & c_1 & c_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the parameters c_1 and c_2 are arbitrary real numbers.

Corollary 19. *Among the subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 the following are inequivalent with respect to the action of $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$:*

- 1D: $\langle E_1 + \delta P_1 \rangle, \langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D \rangle, \langle D \rangle, \langle E_2 + \kappa D \rangle, \langle E_1 + D \rangle,$
- 2D: $\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_1 + \delta P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_2, D \rangle, \langle E_1 + E_3, D \rangle, \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1 \rangle,$
- 3D: $\langle E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_2 + \kappa D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_1 + \varepsilon D, P_1, P_2 \rangle,$
 $\langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_1, E_2, D \rangle, \langle E_1, E_2, E_3 \rangle,$
- 4D: $\langle E_1, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_1 + E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle,$
 $\langle E_1, E_2, D, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4 \rangle,$
- 5D: $\langle E_1, E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle,$

where $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$, $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, $\kappa \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. To find $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent subalgebras among $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{i,j}^*$ due to Lemma 18 it is clearly sufficient to consider the action of the set $M := \{M_k(c_1, c_2) \mid k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ and } c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}$ on this list. Naturally, the action by M does not preserve the set of subalgebras $\{\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{i,j}^*\}$, moreover, it also does not preserve the set of subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 , in other words the set $M(\mathfrak{h}) := \{M_k(c_1, c_2)\mathfrak{h}M_k(c_1, c_2)^{-1} \mid k \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ and } c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}\}$ may contain the subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ that are not subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 . In fact, as the computations below show us, the subset of $M(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{i,j}^*)$, whose elements are subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 , is no more than finite and of small cardinality for each subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{i,j}^*$. Thus to find the canonical representative of the equivalence class of the subalgebra \mathfrak{h} we select from $M(\mathfrak{h})$ those subalgebras that are also subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 (excluding \mathfrak{h} itself) and find their canonical representatives from the list of subalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{i,j}^*$.

1D. It is clear that $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent one-dimensional subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 are completely characterized by the (real) Jordan normal form of the chosen generator, this is why the inequivalent one-dimensional subalgebras are $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{1,2}^\delta, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{1,7}^\gamma, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{1,3}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{1,4}^\kappa$ with $\kappa \geq 0$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{1,6}^1$.

2D. For a two-dimensional subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \in \{\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,1}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,2}^\delta, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,9}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,10}\}$ the set $M(\mathfrak{h})$ contains only one element that is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{a}_1 . This element is the subalgebra \mathfrak{h} itself. This means that none of the subalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,1}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,2}^\delta, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,9}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,10}$ is equivalent to another one from the entire list.

For a fixed value of κ the only elements of $M(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,4}^\kappa)$ that are subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 are $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,4}^\kappa$ itself and $\langle E_2 + \tilde{\kappa}D, E_3 \rangle$, where $\tilde{\kappa} = (1 - \kappa)/(3\kappa + 1)$. The latter subalgebra is equivalent to the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^{\tilde{\kappa}}$. Analogous consideration for the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,5}^{\kappa'}$ gives us that it is $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalent to $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^{\tilde{\kappa}}$ for $\tilde{\kappa} := (\kappa' - 1)/(3\kappa' + 1)$.

For the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,6}$ the set $M(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,6}) \setminus \{\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,6}\}$ contains only one subalgebra of \mathfrak{a}_1 , which is $\langle E_2, E_3 \rangle$, and it is equivalent to $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^0$. Analogously, we show that both the subalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,3}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,7}^\varepsilon$ are equivalent to $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^{1/3}$.

The only elements of $M(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,12}^{-1})$ and $M(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,12}^1)$ that are themselves are subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 and distinct from $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,12}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,12}^1$ are subalgebras $\langle E_1 + E_2 - D, P_2 \rangle$ and $\langle E_2, P_2 \rangle$ and they are equivalent to $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^{-1}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^1$, respectively.

Analogously, we consider the subalgebra $\mathfrak{s}_{2,8}$: the only element of the set $M(\mathfrak{s}_{2,8}) \setminus \{\mathfrak{s}_{2,8}\}$, which is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{a}_1 , is the subalgebra $\langle E_2 + \frac{1}{3}D, P_2 \rangle$. And the latter subalgebra is equivalent to the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^{1/3}$.

This case results in the subalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,1}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,2}^\delta, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,9}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,10}, \hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2,11}^\gamma$.

3D. Similarly to the previous case, we start by considering the subalgebras whose image under the action of M contains precisely one subalgebra of \mathfrak{a}_1 . These are $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.1}$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.2}$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.3}^\kappa$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.4}^\varepsilon$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.5}^\gamma$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.7}$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.8}^\gamma$ for $\gamma \neq 1/3$, so they are inequivalent to any from the list. One more simplification is that the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.10}$ is a Levi factor of \mathfrak{a}_1 , which is unique in the list, so it has no equivalent subalgebras in the list.

The only element of the set $M(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.6}) \setminus \{\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.6}\}$, which is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{a}_1 is the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.8}^{1/3}$.

The only element of the set $M(\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.7})$ distinct from $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.7}$, is the subalgebra $\langle E_2, E_3, D \rangle$, which is equivalent to $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.9}$.

By this we obtain the subalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.1}$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.2}$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.3}^\kappa$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.4}^\varepsilon$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.5}^\gamma$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.8}^\gamma$, $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.9}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.10}$.

4D and **5D.** The image under the action of M of any four-dimensional subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{4.j}^*$ contains only one subalgebra of \mathfrak{a}_1 , the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{4.j}^*$ itself. Thus they are $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent.

In the case of five-dimensional subalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{5.1}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{5.2}$, while the former is solvable the latter is not, thus they cannot be conjugated under an inner automorphism. \square

4.3 Inequivalent subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$

To construct a list of all $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent subalgebras of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$, we consider its maximal subalgebras \mathfrak{a}_1 , \mathfrak{a}_2 , $\mathfrak{so}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{so}_3(\mathbb{R})$ and combine their lists of $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent subalgebras up to $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalence.

1. The list of $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent subalgebras of the algebra \mathfrak{a}_1 is given in Corollary 19.
2. To the list from Corollary 19 we need to add subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_2 , that are $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent to the subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 . Clearly, if a subalgebra $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{a}_2$ leaves two-dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^3 invariant, then it is equivalent to a subalgebra from \mathfrak{a}_1 . Thus, among the list of $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_2 we should drop such, whose arbitrary element is a block-diagonal or a lower-triangular matrix. The only proper subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_2 that remain are $\langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D, R_1, R_2 \rangle$, $\langle E_1 + E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle$ and $\langle E_1, E_2, E_3, R_1, R_2 \rangle$, where $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.
3. Add the irreducibly embedded subalgebras $\mathfrak{so}_3(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{so}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$. Their proper subalgebras are conjugated to subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 , thus they should not be included.

Theorem 20. *A complete list of proper $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -inequivalent subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ is exhausted by the following:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{1D: } & \mathfrak{f}_{1.1}^\delta = \langle E_1 + \delta P_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{1.2}^\gamma = \langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{1.3} = \langle D \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{1.4}^\kappa = \langle E_2 + \kappa D \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{1.5} = \langle E_1 + D \rangle, \\
\text{2D: } & \mathfrak{f}_{2.1} = \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{2.2}^\delta = \langle E_1 + \delta P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{2.3} = \langle E_2, D \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{2.4} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1 \rangle, \\
\text{3D: } & \mathfrak{f}_{3.1} = \langle E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.2} = \langle D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.3}^\kappa = \langle E_2 + \kappa D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{3.4}^\varepsilon = \langle E_1 + \varepsilon D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.5}^\gamma = \langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.6}^\gamma = \langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D, R_1, R_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.8} = \langle E_1, E_2, D \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.9} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{3.10} = \langle E_1 + E_3, P_1 - R_2, P_2 + R_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.11} = \langle E_1 + E_3, P_1 + R_2, P_2 - R_1 \rangle, \\
\text{4D: } & \mathfrak{f}_{4.1} = \langle E_1, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{4.2} = \langle E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{4.3} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{4.4}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{4.5} = \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{4.6} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{4.7} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D \rangle, \\
\text{5D: } & \mathfrak{f}_{5.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{5.2} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{5.3} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, R_1, R_2 \rangle, \\
\text{6D: } & \mathfrak{f}_{6.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{6.2} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$, $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, $\kappa \geq 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Remark 21. We compare the subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ from Theorem 20 and [30, Table 1] in detail in Section A. The results are summarized in Table 1. We mark with a dagger symbol † the subalgebras and subalgebra families from [30, Table 1] that have misprints or improper restrictions on the parameters. In this short remark we focus our attention only on the mistakes in the list [30, Table 1], such as wrong parameter constraints, omitted subalgebras and conjugated subalgebras that are listed as distinct. We discuss sublists of subalgebras from [30, Table 1] of each possible dimension separately.

In the list of one-dimensional subalgebras the family of subalgebras $W_{1.2}^{(a)}$ with $a \geq 0$ correspond to the family $f_{1.2}^a$ in the list in Theorem 20. Therefore, the family $f_{1.2}^\gamma$ with $\gamma < 0$ is missed in [30, Table 1]. The constraints on the parameter α in the family $W_{1.1}^{(\alpha)}$ are also incorrect and should be replaced with $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2]$.

For the two-dimensional subalgebras, the subalgebras $W_{2.8}$ and $W_{2.9}$ are conjugated with the subalgebras $W_{2.7}^{(-1/3)}$ and $W_{2.7}^{(1/3)}$, respectively. The subalgebras $W_{2.3}$ and $W_{2.1}$ are conjugated. The subalgebra $W_{2.10}$ is $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalent to the subalgebra $W_{2.7}^{(1)}$.

The list of three-dimensional subalgebras has many mistakes. The subalgebras $W_{3.2}$ and $W_{3.11}$ are conjugated. The family $W_{3.5}^{(a)}$ is incomplete, it should be replaced by $f_{3.7}^\gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $W_{3.11} \sim W_{3.2} \sim f_{3.7}^{1/3}$, $W_{3.7} \sim f_{3.7}^1$, where by \sim we mean $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalent. Both the families $W_{3.8}^{(a)}$ and $W_{3.9}^{(a)}$ are incomplete, the constraints on the parameter a are incorrect and both should be replaced by $a \in \mathbb{R}$. The subalgebra $f_{3.4}^1$ is missed.

For the family of four-dimensional subalgebras $W_{4.6}^{(\alpha)}$ we have that $W_{4.6}^{(0)} = W_{4.6}^{(\pi)}$. In fact, the requirement $\alpha \in [0, \pi)$ gives us the correct subalgebra family.

In the list of five- and six-dimensional subalgebras, the linear spans $W_{5.2}$ and $W_{6.2}$ have misprints and, in fact, do not form subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$.

In total, the classification list from [30] has seven families of subalgebras missed or incorrect, seven redundant subalgebras, one omitted subalgebra and two subalgebras with misprints.

5 Subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$

We classify the subalgebras of the complex order-three special linear Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ using the same method as in Section 4. This is why we adopt the same notations from that section for convenience. The algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ is spanned by the matrices $E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2, R_1, R_2$. The only irreducibly embedded subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ with respect to its defining representation on \mathbb{C}^3 is the subalgebra isomorphic to $\mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C})$. The reducibly embedded subalgebras are $\mathfrak{a}_1 := \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ and $\mathfrak{a}_2 := \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle$. Both the latter subalgebras are isomorphic to the complex rank-two affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{C}) = \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \ltimes \mathbb{C}^2$, where $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{C}) = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \rangle = \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \times \langle e_4 \rangle$.

We present the result of the classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ as the sequence of assertions without proof. Starting with listing inequivalent subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{C})$, we construct the list of inequivalent subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{C})$ using the method from Section 2.3. This step is essential in the course of listing subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ and its proof can be derived from that one in Section 3. The list of inequivalent subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is presented in Theorem 23. The last step is to combine the obtained lists of subalgebras of the maximal subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ modulo the $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{C})$ -equivalence as it is done in Section 4.3, which results in Theorem 25.

Theorem 22. *A complete list of inequivalent proper subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is exhausted by the following subalgebras:*

$$\begin{aligned} 1\mathrm{D}: \quad & \mathfrak{h}_{1.1} = \langle e_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{1.2} = \langle e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{1.3}^{\rho, \varphi} = \langle e_2 + \rho e^{i\varphi} e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{1.4} = \langle e_1 + e_4 \rangle, \\ 2\mathrm{D}: \quad & \mathfrak{h}_{2.1} = \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{2.2} = \langle e_2, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{2.3}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1 \rangle, \\ 3\mathrm{D}: \quad & \mathfrak{h}_{3.1} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{h}_{3.2} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $-\pi/2 < \varphi \leq \pi/2$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 23. A complete list of inequivalent proper subalgebras of the real rank-two affine Lie algebra $\text{aff}_2(\mathbb{C})$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
1\text{D}: & \mathfrak{s}_{1.1} = \langle f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.2}^\delta = \langle e_1 + \delta f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.3} = \langle e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.4}^{\rho, \varphi} = \langle e_2 + \rho e^{i\varphi} e_4 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{s}_{1.5} = \langle e_2 + e_4 + f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{1.6} = \langle e_1 + e_4 \rangle, \\
2\text{D}: & \mathfrak{s}_{2.1} = \langle f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.2}^\delta = \langle e_1 + \delta f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.3} = \langle e_4, f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.4}^{\rho, \varphi} = \langle e_2 + \rho e^{i\varphi} e_4, f_1 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{s}_{2.5}^{\rho', \varphi} = \langle e_2 + \rho' e^{i\varphi} e_4, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.6} = \langle e_2 + e_4 + f_2, f_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.7} = \langle e_1 + e_4, f_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{s}_{2.8} = \langle e_1, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.9} = \langle e_2, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.10}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{2.11}^\varepsilon = \langle e_2 + \varepsilon e_4 + f_2, e_1 \rangle, \\
3\text{D}: & \mathfrak{s}_{3.1} = \langle e_1, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.2} = \langle e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.3}^{\rho, \varphi} = \langle e_2 + \rho e^{i\varphi} e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{s}_{3.4} = \langle e_1 + e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.5} = \langle e_1, e_4, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.6} = \langle e_2, e_4, f_1 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{s}_{3.7}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.8} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{3.9} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3 \rangle, \\
4\text{D}: & \mathfrak{s}_{4.1} = \langle e_1, e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{4.2} = \langle e_2, e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{4.3}^\gamma = \langle e_2 + \gamma e_4, e_1, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{s}_{4.4} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{4.5} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4 \rangle, \\
5\text{D}: & \mathfrak{s}_{5.1} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_4, f_1, f_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{s}_{5.2} = \langle e_1, e_2, e_3, f_1, f_2 \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}$, $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $\rho' \in \mathbb{R}_{> 0}$, $-\pi/2 < \varphi \leq \pi/2$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$.

Corollary 24. Among the subalgebras of \mathfrak{a}_1 the following are inequivalent with respect to the action of $\text{SL}_3(\mathbb{C})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
1\text{D}: & \langle E_1 + \delta P_1 \rangle, \quad \langle D \rangle, \quad \langle E_2 + \rho e^{i\varphi} D \rangle, \quad \langle E_1 + D \rangle, \\
2\text{D}: & \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_1 + \delta P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_2, D \rangle, \quad \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1 \rangle, \\
3\text{D}: & \langle E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_2 + \kappa D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_1 + D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \\
& \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_1, E_2, D \rangle, \quad \langle E_1, E_2, E_3 \rangle, \\
4\text{D}: & \langle E_1, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \\
& \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4 \rangle, \\
5\text{D}: & \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $-\pi/2 < \varphi \leq \pi/2$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$.

Theorem 25. A complete list of proper $\text{SL}_3(\mathbb{C})$ -inequivalent subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ is exhausted by the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
1\text{D}: & \mathfrak{f}_{1.1}^\delta = \langle E_1 + \delta P_1 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{1.2} = \langle D \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{1.3}^{\rho, \varphi} = \langle E_2 + \rho e^{i\varphi} D \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{1.4} = \langle E_1 + D \rangle, \\
2\text{D}: & \mathfrak{f}_{2.1} = \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{2.2}^\delta = \langle E_1 + \delta P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{2.3} = \langle E_2, D \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{2.4}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1 \rangle, \\
3\text{D}: & \mathfrak{f}_{3.1} = \langle E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.2} = \langle D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.3}^{\rho, \varphi} = \langle E_2 + \rho e^{i\varphi} D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{3.4} = \langle E_1 + D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.5}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{3.6} = \langle E_1, E_2, D \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{3.7} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3 \rangle, \\
4\text{D}: & \mathfrak{f}_{4.1} = \langle E_1, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{4.2} = \langle E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{4.3}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \\
& \mathfrak{f}_{4.4} = \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{4.5} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D \rangle, \\
5\text{D}: & \mathfrak{f}_{5.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{5.2} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{5.3} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, R_1, R_2 \rangle, \\
6\text{D}: & \mathfrak{f}_{6.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \quad \mathfrak{f}_{6.2} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$, $\rho \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $-\pi/2 < \varphi \leq \pi/2$ and $\gamma \in \mathbb{C}$.

6 Conclusion

In the present paper, we have reexamined and corrected the classification of subalgebras of real and complex order-three special linear Lie algebras, following the bright paper [30]. This has been a long-standing and challenging problem with a number of applications in algebra and mathematical physics.

The initial point of the study is the review of the classical approaches for subalgebra classification that were developed by Patera, Winternitz, Zassenhaus and others in the series of papers [2, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22] for the specific cases of finite-dimensional real and complex Lie algebras. We also have suggested new points of view on these methods and rigorously presented their theoretical framework. As a result, we have suggested the schemes for the classification of subalgebras of a Lie algebra based on whether it is simple, a direct product, or a semidirect product of its subalgebras in the Sections 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3, respectively.

To carry out the classification of subalgebras of a simple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ we used the approach outlined in Section 2.1, which for the specific case of $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ required us to go through the following steps:

- (i) using the defining representation \mathbb{R}^3 of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ find all its maximal reducibly and irreducibly embedded subalgebras;
- (ii) for the obtained maximal subalgebras construct the lists of inequivalent subalgebras with respect to their corresponding inner automorphism groups;
- (iii) combine the obtained lists modulo the action of the group $SL_3(\mathbb{R})$.

Following [30] in the Sections 4.1 and 4.2 it is shown that the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ contains two irreducibly embedded maximal subalgebras, namely the special orthogonal Lie algebras $\mathfrak{so}_3(\mathbb{R})$ and $\mathfrak{so}_{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$, and two reducibly embedded maximal subalgebras \mathfrak{a}_1 and \mathfrak{a}_2 , each of which is isomorphic to the rank-two affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$. In view of step (ii), classifying the subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ is an essential step in the course of solving the primary problem. This is why, we devoted the entire Section 3 for constructing a list of inequivalent subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$. To the best of our knowledge, such list has never been presented in full completeness in the literature before, cf. [23, Table 1], where the authors classified only the “appropriate” subalgebras modulo a weaker equivalence than that one generated by the action of the group $SL_3(\mathbb{R})$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ can be viewed as the semidirect product $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$. Therefore, to classify subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ we applied the approach from Section 2.3 to the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R}) \ltimes \mathbb{R}^2$. As a result, we present a complete list of inequivalent subalgebras of the rank-two affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ in Theorem 11. In fact, the classification of subalgebras of the algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$ were initiated in [30, Section 3.3], where its inequivalent “twisted” and “nontwisted” subalgebras were listed, however this classification were not completed. Moreover, the validity of these lists is questionable, since to construct them it is essential to have the correct classification of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$, which in [30, eq. (3.11)] was presented with a mistake and a number of misprints. This was an additional motivation for us to thoroughly and comprehensively classify the subalgebras of $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{R})$.

To complete the classification for $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$, in Section 4.3 we merged the lists of inequivalent subalgebras of the maximal subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ modulo the $SL_3(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalence using Lemma 18. The latter lemma applies the method outlined in Section 2.1, namely Proposition 1 and Remark 2, to this particular case of the algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$. The classification results are presented in Theorem 20. We have also discussed the differences between the lists in Theorem 20 with that in [30, Table 1] in Section A and Remark 21. We found out that the classification in [30, Table 1] contains seven families of subalgebras either missing or incorrect, seven single subalgebras are superfluous, one subalgebra is omitted and two subalgebras with misprints.

Following the same method as discussed in two preceding paragraphs (or, more specifically, in Section 4), we have classified the subalgebras of the order-three complex special linear Lie

algebra $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ in Section 5 and as a byproduct obtained such classification for the rank-two complex affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{C})$. We have presented the list of inequivalent subalgebras of the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{aff}_2(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$ in Theorem 23 and Theorem 25, respectively.

Some of the applications of the classifications we obtained and the possible avenues for future research have been discussed in Section 1.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Roman O. Popovych, Vyacheslav M. Boyko, Maryna O. Nesterenko, Oleksandra O. Vinnichenko and Alex Bihlo for valuable discussions, references and comments. The research of YeYuCh and SDK was supported in part by the NAS of Ukraine under the project 0116U003059. SDK also acknowledges support through the Canada Research Chairs program and the NSERC Discovery Grant program.

References

- [1] Boyko V.M., Lokaziuk O.V. and Popovych R.O., Admissible transformations and Lie symmetries of linear systems of second-order ordinary differential equations, [arXiv:2105.05139](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.05139), 50 pp.
- [2] Burdet G., Patera J., Perrin M. and Winternitz P., The optical group and its subgroups, *J. Math. Phys.* **19** (1978), 1758–1780.
- [3] Bourbaki N., *Lie Groups and Lie Algebras. Chapters 1–3*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [4] Bluman G.W., Cheviakov A.F. and Anco S.C., *Applications of symmetry methods to partial differential equations*, Springer, New York, 2010.
- [5] Campoamor-Stursberg R., Latini D., Marquette I. and Zhang Y.-Z., Polynomial algebras from commutants: Classical and Quantum aspects of \mathcal{A}_3 , *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **2667** (2023), 012037.
- [6] Hrivnák J., Novotný P., Patera J. and Tolar J., Graded contractions of the Pauli graded $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{C})$, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **418** (2006), 498–550.
- [7] Hydon P.E., *Symmetry methods for differential equations. A beginner’s guide*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [8] İnönü E. and Wigner E.P., On the contraction of groups and their representations, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **39** (1953), 510–524.
- [9] İnönü E. and Wigner E.P., On a particular type of convergence to a singular matrix, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **40** (1954), 119–121.
- [10] Khabirov S.V., Nonisotropic one-dimensional gas motions constructed by means of the contact group of the nonhomogeneous Monge–Ampère equation, *Math. USSR Sb.* **71** (1992), 447–462.
- [11] Lazarovich N. and Leitner A., Local limits of connected subgroups of $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* **359** (2021), 363–376.
- [12] Marquette I., Zhang J. and Zhang Y.-Z., Algebraic structures and Hamiltonians from the equivalence classes of 2D conformal algebras, 2023, [arXiv:2309.11030](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.11030).
- [13] Nesterenko M. and Popovych R.O., Contractions of low-dimensional Lie algebras, *J. Math. Phys.* **47** (2006), 123515, [arXiv:math-ph/0608018](https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0608018).
- [14] Nikitin A.G. and Wiltshire J., Systems of reaction diffusion equations and their symmetry properties, *J. Math. Phys.* **43** (2001), 1666–1688.
- [15] Olver P.J., *Application of Lie groups to differential equations*, Springer, New York, 1993.
- [16] Patera J., Sharp R.T., Winternitz P. and Zassenhaus H., Subgroups of the Poincaré group and their invariants, *J. Math. Phys.* **17** (1976), 977–985.
- [17] Patera J., Sharp R.T., Winternitz P. and Zassenhaus H., Invariants of real low dimension Lie algebras, *J. Math. Phys.* **17** (1976), 986–994.

- [18] Patera J., Sharp R.T., Winternitz P. and Zassenhaus H., Continuous subgroups of the fundamental groups of physics. III. The de Sitter groups, *J. Math. Phys.* **18** (1977), 2259–2288.
- [19] Patera J. and Winternitz P., Subalgebras of real three and four-dimensional Lie algebras, *J. Math. Phys.* **18** (1977), 1449–1455.
- [20] Patera J., Winternitz P., Sharp R.T. and Zassenhaus H., Subgroups of the similitude group of three-dimensional Minkowski space, *Canad. J. Phys.* **54** (1976), 950–961.
- [21] Patera J., Winternitz P. and Zassenhaus H., Continuous subgroups of the fundamental groups of physics. I. General method and the Poincaré group, *J. Math. Phys.* **16** (1975), 1597–1614.
- [22] Patera J., Winternitz P. and Zassenhaus H., Continuous subgroups of the fundamental groups of physics. II. The similitude group, *J. Math. Phys.* **16** (1975), 1615–1624.
- [23] Poheketa O. and Popovych R.O., Extended symmetry analysis of generalized Burgers equations, *J. Math. Phys.* **58** (2017), 101501.
- [24] Popovych R.O. and Bihlo A., Symmetry preserving parameterization schemes, *J. Math. Phys.* **53** (2012), 073102, [arXiv:1010.3010](https://arxiv.org/abs/1010.3010).
- [25] Popovych R.O., Boyko V.M., Nesterenko M.O. and Lutfullin M.W., Realizations of real low-dimensional Lie algebras, [arXiv:math-ph/0301029v7](https://arxiv.org/abs/math-ph/0301029v7) (2005) (extended version of *J. Phys. A* **36** (2003), 7337–7360).
- [26] Šnobl, L. and Winternitz P., *Classification and identification of Lie algebras*, CRM Monogr. Ser., 33 American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2014.
- [27] Udriște C. and Bilă N., Symmetry group of Țițeica surfaces PDE, *Balkan J. Geom. Appl.* **4** (1999), 123–140.
- [28] Maltseva D.S. and Popovych R.O., Point-symmetry pseudogroup, Lie reductions and exact solutions of Boiti–Leon–Pempinelli system, *Phys. D: Nonlinear Phenom.* **460** (2024), 134081.
- [29] Winternitz P., Lie groups, singularities and solutions of nonlinear partial differential equations. *Direct and inverse methods in nonlinear evolution equations, Lecture Notes in Phys.* **632** Springer, Berlin, 2003, pp. 223–273.
- [30] Winternitz P., Subalgebras of Lie algebras. Example of $\mathfrak{sl}(3, \mathbb{R})$, *Symmetry in physics, CRM Proc. Lecture Notes* **34**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 215–227.

A Classifications comparison

We thoroughly compare the list of subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$ provided by Theorem 20 with that in [30, Table 1]. The results of this comparison are summarized in Table 1, where by the dagger symbol † we mark the subalgebras or subalgebra families listed in [30, Table 1] with misprints, incorrect constraints on the parameters or conjugated with other subalgebras. We use the notation \rightsquigarrow in the Comments column of Table 1 to indicate that the parameters on the left hand side are incorrect and should be replaced by those on the right hand side. We use \sim to denote $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -conjugacy. The following matrices from $\mathrm{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ will be useful in the course of comparison:

$$Q(\varepsilon) := \exp(\varepsilon(E_1 + E_3)), \quad S_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad S_2 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where ε is a real parameter.

1D. It is clear that $\mathfrak{f}_{1.3} = W_{1.1}^{(\pi/2)}$. For the bases elements of the subalgebras $W_{1.4} = \langle E_3 \rangle$ and $W_{1.5} = \langle -E_3 + P_2 \rangle$ we have that $-E_3 = J_2(0) \oplus J_1(0)$ and $-E_3 + P_2 = J_3(0)$, where $J_n(\lambda)$ is the Jordan block of size n with the eigenvalue λ . Thus, $W_{1.4}$ and $W_{1.5}$ are equivalent to $\mathfrak{f}_{1.1}^0$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{1.1}^1$, respectively.

The subalgebra family $\mathfrak{f}_{1.4}^\kappa$ with $\kappa \geq 0$ corresponds to the family $W_{1.1}^{(\alpha)} = \langle E_2 + 3 \tan(\alpha)D \rangle$, where $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$. The parameter restrictions on α in [30, Table 1] are incorrect.

The subalgebra family $\mathfrak{f}_{1.2}^\gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ corresponds to the subalgebra family $W_{1.2}^{(a)} = \langle \frac{1}{2}(E_1 + E_3) + aD \rangle$. The constraints on a should be modified, namely, we require $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Acting on the subalgebra $W_{1.3} = \langle D - E_3 \rangle$ by the matrix S_1 we obtain the subalgebra $\mathfrak{f}_{1.5}$.

2D. We have $\mathfrak{f}_{2.1} = W_{2.5}$, $\mathfrak{f}_{2.3} = W_{2.2}$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{2.4} = W_{2.1}$. By applying the matrix S_1 to the subalgebras $W_{2.4}$, $W_{2.6}$ and $W_{2.7}^{(a)}$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$, we get the subalgebras $\mathfrak{f}_{2.2}^0$, $\mathfrak{f}_{2.2}^1$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^{-a}$, respectively.

As for the remaining two-dimensional subalgebras from [30, Table 1] we have the following. Acting on $W_{2.3}$ by $Q(\pi/4)$ we obtain $\mathfrak{f}_{2.4}$, which coincides with $W_{2.1}$. The product $S_1 Q(\pi)$ maps the subalgebra $W_{2.8} = \langle E_2 - \frac{1}{3}D + P_1, E_3 \rangle$ to $\langle E_2 + \frac{1}{3}D + P_2, E_1 \rangle$, which is equivalent to $\mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^{1/3}$. The subalgebra $W_{2.9}$ is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{a}_1 and is equivalent to $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2.5}^{1/3}$, therefore, in view of the proof of Lemma 19, it is $\text{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalent to $\mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^{-1/3}$. Acting on the subalgebra $W_{2.10}$ by the matrix S_1 we obtain the subalgebra $\langle E_2 + D, E_1 + P_1 \rangle$, which is equivalent to $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{2.11}^1$, and thus it is $\text{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -equivalent to $\mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^{-1}$ by the proof of Lemma 19.

3D. We have the following equalities: $W_{3.6}^{(\pi/2)} = \mathfrak{f}_{3.2}$, $W_{3.12} = \mathfrak{f}_{3.9}$, $W_{3.13} = \mathfrak{f}_{3.10}$, $W_{3.14} = \mathfrak{f}_{3.11}$ and $W_{3.3} = \mathfrak{f}_{3.3}^{1/3}$. The subalgebra family $W_{3.8}^{(a)} = \langle E_1 + E_3 + 2aD, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ with $a \geq 0$ corresponds to $\mathfrak{f}_{3.5}^{2a}$. The family $\mathfrak{f}_{3.5}^\gamma$, where $\gamma < 0$, is omitted in [30, Table 1].

The subalgebra family $W_{3.6}^{(\alpha)} = \langle E_2 + \frac{1}{3} \tan(\alpha)D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ with $\alpha \in [0, \pi/2)$ corresponds to the subalgebra family $\mathfrak{f}_{3.3}^\kappa$ with $\kappa \geq 0$.

The matrix S_1 maps the subalgebras $W_{3.1}$, $W_{3.4}$ and $W_{3.10}$ to the subalgebras $\mathfrak{f}_{3.8}$, $\mathfrak{f}_{3.1}$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{3.4}^{-1}$, respectively.

By acting on $W_{3.2}$ with S_1 we obtain the subalgebra $\hat{\mathfrak{s}}_{3.6}$ from the proof of Lemma 19, which is equivalent to $\mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^{1/3}$. Similarly we obtain that $W_{3.7}$ and $W_{3.11}$ are conjugated with $\mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^1$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^{1/3}$, respectively.

Acting by S_1 on the subalgebra family $W_{3.5}^{(a)} = \langle E_2 + aD, E_3, P_1 \rangle$, where $-\frac{1}{2} \leq a \leq \frac{1}{6}$ and $a \neq -\frac{1}{6}$, we obtain the subalgebra family $\mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^{-a}$. The parameter restrictions on a for the family $W_{3.5}^{(a)}$ in the original text are incorrect.

Applying the matrix S_2 to the subalgebra family $W_{3.9}^{(a)} = \langle P_2 + R_1 + aD, E_3, P_1 \rangle$, where $a \leq 0$, we obtain the family $\langle E_1 + E_3 + \frac{3}{2}aE_2 - \frac{1}{2}aD, R_1, R_2 \rangle$ with $a \leq 0$, which is equivalent to $\mathfrak{f}_{3.6}^\gamma$ with $\gamma \geq 0$. The subalgebras $\mathfrak{f}_{3.6}^\gamma$ with $\gamma < 0$ are missed in [30, Table 1].

4D. It is clear that $W_{4.1} = \mathfrak{f}_{4.7} \simeq \mathfrak{gl}_2(\mathbb{R})$, $W_{4.3} = \mathfrak{f}_{4.2}$ and $W_{4.4} = \mathfrak{f}_{4.3}$. The matrix S_1 maps the subalgebra $W_{4.2}$ to $\mathfrak{f}_{4.5}$ and the matrix S_2 maps the subalgebra $W_{4.5}$ to $\mathfrak{f}_{4.6}$.

Acting by the matrix $Q(\pi/2)$ on the subalgebra family $W_{4.6}^{(\alpha)}$ we obtain that $W_{4.6}^{(\pi/2)}$ is conjugated with $\mathfrak{f}_{4.1}$ and the family $W_{4.6}^{(\alpha)}$, where $\alpha \in [0, \pi) \setminus \{\pi/2\}$, correspond to the family $\mathfrak{f}_{4.4}^\gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. We also have that $W_{4.6}^{(0)} = W_{4.6}^{(\pi)}$, thus the parameter restrictions on α for the family $W_{4.6}^{(\alpha)}$ in the original text should be modified.

5D and 6D. We have $\mathfrak{f}_{5.1} = W_{5.3}$, $\mathfrak{f}_{5.2} = W_{5.1}$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{6.1} = W_{6.1}$. The linear spans $W_{5.2}$ and $W_{6.2}$ in [30, Table 1] have misprints and do not form subalgebras of $\mathfrak{sl}_3(\mathbb{R})$.

Table 1. Comparison of the classifications lists

dim	List in Theorem 20	List in [30, Table 1]	Comments on [30, Table 1]
1	$\mathfrak{f}_{1.1}^0 = \langle E_1 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{1.1}^1 = \langle E_1 + P_1 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{1.2}^\gamma = \langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D \rangle, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ $\mathfrak{f}_{1.3} = \langle D \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{1.4}^\kappa = \langle E_2 + \kappa D \rangle, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ $\mathfrak{f}_{1.5} = \langle E_1 + D \rangle$	$W_{1.4} = \langle E_3 \rangle$ $W_{1.5} = \langle E_3 - P_2 \rangle$ $\dagger W_{1.2}^{(\alpha)} = \langle \frac{1}{2}(E_1 + E_3) + aD \rangle, a \geq 0$ $W_{1.1}^{(\pi/2)} = \langle D \rangle$ $\dagger W_{1.1}^{(\alpha)} = \langle \cos(\alpha)E_2 + 3\sin(\alpha)D \rangle, \alpha \in [0, \pi)$ $W_{1.3} = \langle D - E_3 \rangle$	$a \geq 0 \rightsquigarrow a \in \mathbb{R}$ $\alpha \in [0, \pi) \rightsquigarrow \alpha \in [0, \pi/2]$
2	$\mathfrak{f}_{2.1} = \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{2.2}^0 = \langle E_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{2.2}^1 = \langle E_1 + P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{2.3} = \langle E_2, D \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{2.4} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1 \rangle, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$	$W_{2.5} = \langle P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $W_{2.4} = \langle E_3, P_1 \rangle$ $W_{2.6} = \langle E_3 - P_2, P_1 \rangle$ $W_{2.2} = \langle E_2, D \rangle$ $\dagger W_{2.1} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D \rangle \sim W_{2.3} = \langle E_3, D \rangle$ $W_{2.7}^{(a)} = \langle E_2 + aD, E_3 \rangle, a \in \mathbb{R}$ $\dagger W_{2.8} = \langle E_2 - \frac{1}{3}D + P_1, E_3 \rangle \sim W_{2.7}^{(-1/3)}$ $\dagger W_{2.9} = \langle E_2 + \frac{1}{3}D + P_2, P_1 \rangle \sim W_{2.7}^{(1/3)}$ $\dagger W_{2.10} = \langle E_2 + D, E_3 + P_2 \rangle \sim W_{2.7}^{(1)}$	$W_{2.1} \sim W_{2.3}$ $W_{2.8} \sim W_{2.7}^{(-1/3)} \sim \mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^{1/3}$ $W_{2.9} \sim W_{2.7}^{(1/3)} \sim \mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^{-1/3}$ $W_{2.10} \sim W_{2.7}^{(-)} \sim \mathfrak{f}_{2.5}^{-1}$
3	$\mathfrak{f}_{3.1} = \langle E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.2} = \langle D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.3}^\kappa = \langle E_2 + \kappa D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \kappa \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.4}^{-1} = \langle E_1 - D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.4}^1 = \langle E_1 + D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.5}^\gamma = \langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.6}^\gamma = \langle E_1 + E_3 + \gamma D, R_1, R_2 \rangle, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$	$W_{3.4} = \langle E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $W_{3.6}^{(\pi/2)} = \langle D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\dagger W_{3.6}^{(\alpha)} = \langle \cos(\alpha)E_2 + \frac{1}{3}\sin(\alpha)D, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \alpha \in [0, \pi/2) \setminus \{\pi/4\},$ $\dagger W_{3.3} = \langle E_2 + \frac{1}{3}D, P_1, P_2 \rangle = W_{3.6}^{(\pi/4)}$ $W_{3.10} = \langle E_3 + D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ missed	$W_{3.6}^{(\alpha)}$ can be united with $W_{3.3}$ $a \leq 0 \rightsquigarrow a \in \mathbb{R}$ $a \leq 0 \rightsquigarrow a \in \mathbb{R}$

Table 1. Comparison of the classifications lists (continuation)

dim	List in Theorem 20	List in [30, Table 1]	Comments on [30, Table 1]
3	$\mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_2 \rangle, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.8} = \langle E_1, E_2, D \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.9} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.10} = \langle E_1 + E_3, P_1 - R_2, P_2 + R_1 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{3.11} = \langle E_1 + E_3, P_1 + R_2, P_2 - R_1 \rangle$	$\dagger W_{3.5}^{(a)} = \langle E_2 + aD, E_3, P_1 \rangle, -\frac{1}{2} \leq a \leq \frac{1}{6}, a \neq -\frac{1}{6}$ $\dagger W_{3.2} = \langle D, P_1, E_3 \rangle \sim W_{3.11} = \langle E_2 + \frac{1}{3}D + P_2, E_3, P_1 \rangle$ $\dagger W_{3.7} = \langle E_2 + D, E_3 + P_2, P_1 \rangle \sim W_{3.5}^{(-1)}$ $W_{3.1} = \langle E_2, E_3, D \rangle$ $W_{3.12} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3 \rangle$ $W_{3.13} = \langle E_1 + E_3, P_1 - R_2, P_2 + R_1 \rangle$ $W_{3.14} = \langle E_1 + E_3, P_1 + R_2, P_2 - R_1 \rangle$	$a \in [-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{6}) \cup (-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}] \rightsquigarrow a \in \mathbb{R}$ $W_{3.2} \sim W_{3.11} \sim W_{3.5}^{(-1/3)} \sim \mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^{1/3}$ $W_{3.7} \sim W_{3.5}^{(-1)} \sim \mathfrak{f}_{3.7}^1$
4	$\mathfrak{f}_{4.1} = \langle E_1, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{4.2} = \langle E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{4.3} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{4.4}^\gamma = \langle E_2 + \gamma D, E_1, P_1, P_2 \rangle, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ $\mathfrak{f}_{4.5} = \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{4.6} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{4.7} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D \rangle$	$W_{4.6}^{(\pi/2)} = \langle D, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $W_{4.3} = \langle E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $W_{4.4} = \langle E_1 + E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\dagger W_{4.6}^{(\alpha)} = \langle \cos(\alpha)E_2 + \frac{1}{3}\sin(\alpha)D, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle, 0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi$ $W_{4.2} = \langle E_2, E_3, D, P_1 \rangle$ $W_{4.5} = \langle P_2 + R_1, E_2 + \frac{1}{3}D, E_3, P_1 \rangle$ $W_{4.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D \rangle$	$0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi \rightsquigarrow \alpha \in [0, \pi)$
5	$\mathfrak{f}_{5.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{5.2} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{5.3} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, R_1, R_2 \rangle$	$W_{5.3} = \langle E_2, D, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $W_{5.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\dagger W_{5.2} = \langle E_2 - D, E_3, P_2, R_2, P_2 \rangle$	$W_{5.2}$ has a misprint
6	$\mathfrak{f}_{6.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\mathfrak{f}_{6.2} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, R_1, R_2 \rangle$	$W_{6.1} = \langle E_1, E_2, E_3, D, P_1, P_2 \rangle$ $\dagger W_{6.2} = \langle E_2, E_3, P_2, D, R_1, P_2 \rangle$	$W_{6.2}$ has a misprint

Here \dagger indicates an incorrect subalgebra or subalgebra family from [30, Table 1], \rightsquigarrow means that the parameters on the left hand side should be replaced by those on the right hand side, \sim denotes $\text{SL}_3(\mathbb{R})$ -conjugacy.