

# Hypercubic Decomposition of Verma Supermodules and Semibricks Realizing the Khovanov Algebra of Defect One

Shunsuke Hirota

*February 21, 2025*

## Abstract

We study some variants of Verma modules of basic Lie superalgebras obtained via changing Borel subalgebras. These allow us to demonstrate that the principal block of  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  is realized as (non-Serre) full subcategories of any atypical block of BGG category  $\mathcal{O}$  of basic Lie superalgebras.

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Main Result

Classical BGG category  $\mathcal{O}$  has been historically important in representation theory. Its super analog has been extensively studied in recent years and is regarded as a highly non-trivial and intriguing object. Notably, many classical aspects of category  $\mathcal{O}$  related to  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  have been generalized to the super analog by numerous authors [10, 15, 16]. Yet, the theory unique to the super case—particularly the theory surrounding  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$ , an intriguing counterpart to  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  in the super world—still appears to have a room for further exploration.

Indeed, the main result of our present work provides a new direction concerning the  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$ -like aspects of the super category  $\mathcal{O}$  through appropriate "semibricks". Experts in the super category  $\mathcal{O}$  are well aware that the atypical block contains long exact sequences of Verma modules  $M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$  (induced from Borel subalgebra  $\mathfrak{b}$ ) and this observation evokes a connection to  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$ . The theorem stated below is nothing but a formalization of this intuition.

A semibrick is, in simple terms, a class of objects in an abelian category that satisfy Schur's lemma. By a classical result of Ringel [17] (presented here as Theorem 3.13), it is known that taking the "filtration closure" of a semibrick yields an extension-closed abelian full subcategory (i.e. wide subcategory). In case of the module category of finite-dimensional algebras, this concept has been shown to correspond bijectively to key structures and has been actively studied in that context in recent years [1].

**Theorem 1.1** ( $\#J = 1$  case of Theorem 3.23). *Let us consider a basic Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{b}$  be a Borel subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\alpha$  a  $\mathfrak{b}$ -isotropic simple root, and  $\lambda$  a weight orthogonal to  $\alpha$ . Then the collection of images  $M^{\mathfrak{b}+r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda + n\alpha)$  of all nonzero homomorphisms between  $\mathfrak{b}$ -Verma modules  $M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + n\alpha) \rightarrow M_i^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + (n+1)\alpha)$ , for all integers  $n$ , forms a semibrick  $H(\alpha, \lambda)$ .*

*Furthermore, let  $\text{Filt } H(\alpha, \lambda)$  denote the filtration closure of  $H(\alpha, \lambda)$  in the category  $\mathcal{O}$ . There exists a functor*

$$\text{Filt } H(\alpha, \lambda) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_0(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)),$$

*which establishes an equivalence of categories.*

This theorem implies that the principal block of  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  is embedded into the super category  $\mathcal{O}$  in many ways. A crucial point here is that this embedding forms a wide subcategory, not a Serre subcategory. Indeed, the left-hand side category generally does not contain the actual simple modules  $L^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ , among others.

The problems involving  $L^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ , including the super Kazhdan-Lusztig conjecture as solved by [9] and [5], are highly nontrivial. On the other hand, if we treat "bricks" as simple objects instead of actual simple modules and take a coarse perspective on the super category  $\mathcal{O}$ , this theorem suggests that the situation becomes much more familiar and well-understood. As a corollary, all problems concerning Ext groups between Verma modules or their variants contained in this category reduce to problems in  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$ .

It is notable that this theorem only becomes apparent through the process of changing Borel subalgebras. In particular, when constructing a module corresponding to indecomposable projective modules, we considered a module induced from the smaller solvable Lie superalgebra, which is the intersection of two adjacent Borel subalgebras.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \alpha) & & M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda) & & M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \alpha) & \\
 & \swarrow & & \searrow & & \swarrow & \\
 \dots & M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - \alpha) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M^{\mathfrak{b} + r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - \alpha) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & M^{\mathfrak{b} + r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \dots \\
 & \swarrow & & \searrow & & \swarrow & & \searrow & & \\
 & M^{r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - 2\alpha) & & M^{r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - \alpha) & & M^{r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) & & & & 
 \end{array}$$

This diagram depicts the key modules and homomorphisms in Theorem 1.1.

An exact sequence (this is an almost split sequence in  $\text{Filt } H(\alpha, \lambda)$  in the sense of Auslander-Reiten [2])

$$0 \rightarrow M^{\mathfrak{b}+r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - \alpha) \rightarrow M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda) \rightarrow M^{\mathfrak{b}+r\alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$$

shows that Verma modules have a natural decomposition. (These modules also appear in references such as [18] and [9].) More generally, by simultaneously handling  $n$  mutually orthogonal odd isotropic simple roots,  $M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$  can be decomposed into  $2^n$   $\mathfrak{b}$ -highest weight modules of the form  $M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_j^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\mu)$  based on the intuition of  $Q_n$ . The modules  $M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_j^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\mu)$  are expected to be studied as thoroughly as Verma modules.

This leads to the following highly nontrivial yet natural question, which asks a refinement of the super Kazhdan-Lusztig conjecture.

**Question 1.2.** What is the multiplicity  $[M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_j^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) : L^{\mathfrak{b}}(\mu)]$ ?

## 1.2 Acknowledgements

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisor, Syu Kato, for his patient and extensive guidance throughout the preparation of this master's thesis, as well as for his helpful suggestions and constructive feedback. The author is also grateful to Istvan Heckenberger for pointing out some errors. The author would like to thank the Kumano Dormitory community at Kyoto University for their generous financial and living assistance.

## 2 Preliminaries

Fix the base field  $k$  as an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0.

From now on, we will denote by  $\mathfrak{g}$  a finite dimensional Lie superalgebra. We denote the even and odd parts of  $\mathfrak{g}$  as  $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}$ , respectively.

In this text, whenever we refer to "dimension", we mean the dimension as a vector space, forgetting the  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading (not the dimension in the sense of the theory of symmetric tensor categories in [13], i.e., the superdimension).

We consider the category  $\mathfrak{g}$ -sMod, where morphisms respects  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading. (This is the module category of a monoid object in the monoidal category of super vector spaces in the sense of [13].)

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$ -smod denote the full subcategory of  $\mathfrak{g}$ -sMod consisting of finite-dimensional modules.

The parity shift functor  $\Pi$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$ -sMod is an exact functor that acts by preserving the underlying  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module structure but reversing the  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -grading, while also preserving all morphisms.

**Theorem 2.1** (PBW Theorem, [16] Theorem 6.1.2). *Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a finite-dimensional Lie superalgebra, and let  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -homogeneous basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then*

$$\{x_1^{a_1} \dots x_n^{a_n} \mid a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \text{ if } x_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}, \text{ and } a_i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ if } x_i \in \mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}}\}$$

*forms a basis for  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ , the universal enveloping algebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ .*

From now on, our  $\mathfrak{g}$  will be a direct sum of one of the finite-dimensional basic Lie superalgebras from the following list:

$$\mathfrak{sl}(m|n), m \neq n, \mathfrak{gl}(m|n), \mathfrak{osp}(m|2n), D(2, 1; \alpha), G(3), F(4).$$

For concrete definitions, we refer to [16] and [8].

**Definition 2.2** ([8, 16]). A Cartan subalgebra of the reductive Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$  is denoted by  $\mathfrak{h}$ .

A basic Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  has a supersymmetric, superinvariant, even bilinear form  $\langle, \rangle$ , which induces a bilinear form  $(, )$  on  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  via duality. The root space  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  associated with  $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  is defined as  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha := \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h, x] = \alpha(h)x \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h}\}$ . The set of roots  $\Delta$  is defined as  $\Delta := \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \neq 0\} \setminus \{0\}$ . Each  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  is either purely even or purely odd and is one-dimensional (our list does not include  $\mathfrak{sl}(n|n)$  and  $\mathfrak{psl}(n|n)$ ). Therefore, the notions of even roots and odd roots are well defined. An odd root  $\alpha$  is said to be *isotropic* if  $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0$ . The sets of all even roots, even positive roots, odd roots and odd isotropic roots are denoted by  $\Delta_{\bar{0}}$ ,  $\Delta_{\bar{0}}^+$ ,  $\Delta_{\bar{1}}$  and  $\Delta_{\otimes}$ , respectively.

**Definition 2.3** ([8, 16]). We fix a Borel subalgebra  $\mathfrak{b}_{\bar{0}}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ . The set of all Borel subalgebras  $\mathfrak{b}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  that contain  $\mathfrak{b}_{\bar{0}}$  is denoted by  $\mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{g})$ .

For a Borel subalgebra  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{g})$ , we express the triangular decomposition of  $\mathfrak{g}$  as  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^{\mathfrak{b}-} \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^{\mathfrak{b}+}$ , where  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^{\mathfrak{b}+}$ .

The sets of positive roots, odd positive roots, and odd isotropic positive roots corresponding to  $\mathfrak{b}$  are denoted by  $\Delta^{\mathfrak{b}+}$ ,  $\Delta_{\bar{1}}^{\mathfrak{b}+}$ , and  $\Delta_{\otimes}^{\mathfrak{b}+}$ , respectively. The set of simple roots (basis) corresponding to  $\Delta^{\mathfrak{b}+}$  is denoted by  $\Pi^{\mathfrak{b}}$ . We define  $\Pi_{\otimes}^{\mathfrak{b}} := \Pi^{\mathfrak{b}} \cap \Delta_{\otimes}$ .

**Theorem 2.4** (Odd reflection [16] 3.5). *For  $\alpha \in \Pi_{\otimes}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ , define  $r_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{b}} \in \text{Map}(\Pi^{\mathfrak{b}}, \Delta)$  by*

$$r_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\beta) = \begin{cases} -\alpha & (\beta = \alpha), \\ \alpha + \beta & (\alpha + \beta \in \Delta), \\ \beta & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

for  $\beta \in \Pi^{\mathfrak{b}}$ . (When there is no risk of confusion,  $r_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{b}}$  is abbreviated as  $r_{\alpha}$ .) A Borel subalgebra  $r_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{b}} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{g})$  exists, with the corresponding basis given by  $\Pi^{r_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{b}}} := \{r_{\alpha}^{\mathfrak{b}}(\beta)\}_{\beta \in \Pi^{\mathfrak{b}}}$ .

It should be noted that the linear transformation of  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  induced by an odd reflection does not necessarily map a Borel subalgebra to another Borel subalgebra.

Let  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{g})$ . We define  $s\mathcal{O}$  to be the full subcategory of  $\mathfrak{g}$ -sMod, consisting of locally  $\mathfrak{b}$ -finite,  $\mathfrak{h}$ -semisimple modules with finite-dimensional weight spaces. According to Theorem 2.1, the structure as an abelian category depends only on  $\mathfrak{b}_{\bar{0}}$  (however, the highest weight structure depends strongly on  $\mathfrak{b}$ ).

The following is well-known. See, [3, Lemma 2.2] or [6, Proposition 2.2.3].

**Lemma 2.5.** *We can choose  $p \in \text{Map}(\mathfrak{h}^*, \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$  such that*

$$\mathcal{O} := \{M \in s\mathcal{O} \mid \deg M_{\lambda} = p(\lambda) \text{ for } \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*, M_{\lambda} \neq 0\}$$

*forms a Serre subcategory.*

From this point onward, we ignore the parity and work within  $\mathcal{O}$ .

**Definition 2.6.** Let  $k_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b}} = kv_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b}}$  be the one-dimensional  $\mathfrak{b}$ -module corresponding to  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ . The  $\mathfrak{b}$ -Verma module with highest weight  $\lambda$  is defined by

$$M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda) = U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} k_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

(Here, the parity of  $k_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b}}$  is chosen so that  $M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{O}$ .) Its projective cover in  $\mathcal{O}$  is denoted by  $P^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ , while the simple top is denoted by  $L^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ . Similarly, for the even part  $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ , the corresponding Verma module, projective cover in BGG category, and simple module are denoted by  $M_{\bar{0}}(\lambda)$ ,  $P_{\bar{0}}(\lambda)$ , and  $L_{\bar{0}}(\lambda)$ , respectively.

For a module  $M$  in the category  $\mathcal{O}$ , the character  $\text{ch } M$  is a formal sum that encodes the dimensions of the weight spaces of  $M$ . Specifically, if  $M$  has a weight space decomposition  $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda} M_{\lambda}$ , then  $\text{ch } M := \sum_{\lambda} \dim M_{\lambda} e^{\lambda}$ , where  $\lambda$  runs over the weights of  $M$  and  $e^{\lambda}$  denotes the formal exponential corresponding to the weight  $\lambda$ .

### 3 Variants of Verma Modules

We retain the setting of section 2.

#### 3.1 Adjusted Borel subalgebras

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $\Delta^{\mathfrak{a}} \subseteq \Delta_{\overline{1}}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ , and define

$$\mathfrak{a} := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Delta_0^{\pm} \cup \Delta^{\mathfrak{a}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}.$$

Let  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ .

For  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ , we call the above  $\mathfrak{a}$  a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra if the following defines a well-defined one-dimensional representation of  $\mathfrak{a}$ :

$$hv_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}} = \lambda(h)v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}} \quad \text{for any } h \in \mathfrak{h}, \quad \text{and} \quad n_{\mathfrak{a}}v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}} = 0.$$

We denote this representation by  $k_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}} = kv_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ .

**Definition 3.2.** Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  denote a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra. For  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ , define

$$M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) := U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{a})} k_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}}.$$

It is easy to see that  $M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda)$  belongs to  $\mathcal{O}$ . We will simply write  $xv_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}}$  instead of  $x \otimes v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}}$ .

**Example 3.3.** 1. If  $[\mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{a}}, \mathfrak{n}_{\mathfrak{a}}] \cap \mathfrak{h} = 0$ , then  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra for any  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ .

2. If  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}_{\overline{0}}$ , then  $M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\overline{0}}}^{\mathfrak{g}} M_{\overline{0}}(\lambda)$ , where  $\Delta^{\mathfrak{a}} = \emptyset$ .

3. If  $\mathfrak{a} = \mathfrak{b}$ , then  $M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) = M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ , where  $\Delta^{\mathfrak{a}} = \Delta_{\overline{1}}^{\mathfrak{b}^+}$ .

4. The intersection of  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebras is a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra.

5. Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  and let  $\alpha$  be an odd root. Then,  $\mathfrak{g}$  itself is a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra if and only if  $\lambda \in k\alpha$ .

Below, we summarize fundamental results derived from the PBW theorem and Frobenius reciprocity.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  denote a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra. The character of  $M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda)$  is given by

$$\text{ch } M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) = e^{\lambda} \frac{\prod_{\beta \in \Delta_{\overline{1}} \setminus \Delta^{\mathfrak{a}}} (1 + e^{\beta})}{\prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_0^+} (1 - e^{-\gamma})}.$$

In particular, we have  $\lambda = \lambda' \iff M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) \simeq M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda')$ .

**Proposition 3.5.** Let  $\mathfrak{a}$  denote a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra. Let  $M \in \mathcal{O}$  and  $v \in M_{\lambda}$  such that  $\mathfrak{a}v = 0$ . Then there exists a unique homomorphism

$$M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) \rightarrow M \quad \text{sending} \quad v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}} \mapsto v.$$

In particular, if  $\mathfrak{a}' \subseteq \mathfrak{a}$  is an inclusion of  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebras, then  $M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda)$  is a quotient of  $M^{\mathfrak{a}'}(\lambda)$ .

Hereafter, when we write  $\text{Ext}^1$ , we mean  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}}^1$  unless otherwise specified. The following Lemma is a generalization of [14, Proposition 3.1] and serves as a fundamental result in this subsection.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $M \in \mathcal{O}$ , and let  $\mathfrak{a}$  be a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra. If  $M_{\lambda+\beta} = 0$  for all  $\beta \in \Delta_{\mathfrak{0}}^{\pm} \sqcup \Delta^{\mathfrak{a}}$ , then*

$$\text{Ext}^1(M, M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda)) = 0.$$

**Proof.** Suppose we have a short exact sequence in  $\mathcal{O}$ :

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \xrightarrow{\psi} M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) \rightarrow 0.$$

A preimage  $v$  of  $v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{a}}$  in  $E$  also satisfies  $\mathfrak{a}v = 0$  by assumption. Therefore, by the universal property of  $M^{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda)$ , the sequence splits.  $\square$

### 3.2 Hypercubic decomposition of Verma modules

In this subsection, we focus on  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebras, which are important for our study.

**Definition 3.7.** Let  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{g})$  and  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ . Let  $\Pi^{\mathfrak{b}} = \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I}$ . A subset  $J \subset I$  is called a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda)$ -hypercubic collection if  $\{\alpha_j\}_{j \in J}$  is a collection of distinct isotropic  $\mathfrak{b}$ -simple roots that are pairwise orthogonal and orthogonal to  $\lambda$ .

Let  $\Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}}$  denote the sum of the simple roots indexed by  $J$ . Let  $E_J^{\mathfrak{b}}$  (resp.  $F_J^{\mathfrak{b}}$ ) denote the product of the  $\mathfrak{b}$ -positive (resp.  $\mathfrak{b}$ -negative) root vectors indexed by  $J$ . This product is independent of the order of multiplication.

Simple roots that are orthogonal to each other are unaffected by mutual odd reflections. Therefore, the Borel subalgebra  $r_J \mathfrak{b}$  determined by applying the sequence of odd reflections indexed by  $J$  to  $\mathfrak{b}$  is well-defined and independent of the order of the indices.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $J$  be a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda)$ -hypercubic collection, and let  $J' \subseteq J$ . Then the following hold:*

1.  $J'$  is a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda)$ -hypercubic collection;
2.  $J$  is a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda \pm \Sigma_{J'}^{\mathfrak{b}})$ -hypercubic collection;
3.  $\mathfrak{b} \cap r_{J'} \mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$  is a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra;
4.  $\mathfrak{b} + r_{J'} \mathfrak{b} + r_J \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{b} + r_J \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$  is a  $\lambda$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra;
5.  $E_J^{\mathfrak{b}} = F_J^{r_{J'} \mathfrak{b}}$  and  $\Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}} = -\Sigma_J^{r_{J'} \mathfrak{b}}$ ;
6.  $\text{ch } M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda) = \text{ch } M^{r_{J'} \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}})$ ;
7.  $\dim \text{Hom}(M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda), M^{r_{J'} \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}})) = 1$ , and the image of this nonzero homomorphism is isomorphic to  $M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_{J'} \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ ;
8.  $\dim \text{Hom}(M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda), M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}})) = 1$ , and the image of this nonzero homomorphism is isomorphic to  $M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_J \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ .

**Proof.** Statements (1) through (5) are clear from orthogonality.

For (6), it is well known, as also stated in [9, Lemma 6.9].

For (7), since the characters are equal by (6), it is clear that the dimension of the Hom space is 1.

The image of this homomorphism is a module generated by  $E_J^{\mathfrak{b}} v_{\lambda - \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}}}^{r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}$ , so the claim follows from Theorem 2.1, Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.5.

For (8), since we have  $\#\{D \subset \Delta^{\mathfrak{b}^+} \mid \sum_{\beta \in D} \beta = \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}}\} = 1$ , it follows that  $\dim M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}})_{\lambda} = 1$ . Thus, the Hom space is one-dimensional.

The image of the nonzero homomorphism is a submodule of  $M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}})$  generated by  $F_J^{\mathfrak{b}} v_{\lambda + \Sigma_J^{\mathfrak{b}}}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ , so the claim follows from Theorem 2.1, Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.5.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $J$  be a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda)$ -hypercubic collection. Then,  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda)$  has a simple top  $L^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ . In particular, it is indecomposable.*

**Proof.** The PBW basis for  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda)$  can be written in the form of PBW monomials as

$$F F_{J_1}^{\mathfrak{b}} E_{J_2}^{\mathfrak{b}} v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}},$$

where  $J_1, J_2 \subset J$ , and  $F$  is a product of independent  $\mathfrak{b}$ -negative root vectors that cannot be indexed by  $J$ .

By orthogonality, it is easy to see that the submodule generated by elements of the form

$$F_{J_1}^{\mathfrak{b}} E_{J_2}^{\mathfrak{b}} v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}$$

that are not equal to  $v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}$  does not contain  $v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}$ .

By Theorem 2.1, Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.5, we have the following isomorphism:

$$M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) \Big/ \sum_{J_1 \subset J, J_2 \subset J, (J_1, J_2) \neq (J, J)} U(\mathfrak{g}) F_{J_1}^{\mathfrak{b}} E_{J_2}^{\mathfrak{b}} v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}} \cong M^{\mathfrak{b} + r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda).$$

Thus,  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, J^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda)$  has a simple top  $L^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$  and is therefore indecomposable.  $\square$

**Remark 3.10.** Let  $\alpha \in \Pi_{\otimes}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ . Then  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda)$  is indecomposable if and only if  $(\lambda, \alpha) \neq 0$ .

Indeed, we have the following exact sequences:

$$0 \rightarrow M^{r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - \alpha) \rightarrow M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) \rightarrow M^{r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \alpha) \rightarrow M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) \rightarrow M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda) \rightarrow 0.$$

If  $(\lambda, \alpha) \neq 0$ , then  $M^{r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - \alpha) \simeq M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$  and  $M^{r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda) \simeq M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \alpha)$ .

Therefore,

$$\text{Ext}^1(M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \alpha), M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)) = \text{Ext}^1(M^{r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda), M^{r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda - \alpha)) = 0$$

by Lemma 3.6. Thus  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda)$  is not indecomposable.

If  $(\lambda, \alpha) = 0$ , the claim follows as a special case of Lemma 3.9. Thus  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r, \alpha^{\mathfrak{b}}}(\lambda)$  is indecomposable.

### 3.3 Semibricks

Here, following [12], we review the basics of semibricks.

**Definition 3.11.** Let  $\mathcal{E}$  be an additive category.

- An object  $S$  in  $\mathcal{E}$  is called a *brick* if  $\text{End}_{\mathcal{E}}(S) = k$ .
- A collection  $S$  of all bricks in  $\mathcal{E}$  is called a *semibrick* if  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}}(S, T) = 0$  holds for every pairwise nonisomorphic elements  $S$  and  $T$  in  $\mathcal{E}$ .

From here on, let  $\mathcal{A}$  denote an abelian category.

- We denote by  $\text{sim } \mathcal{A}$  the collection of isomorphism classes of simple objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ .
- For a collection  $\mathcal{C}$  of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ , we denote by  $\text{Filt } \mathcal{C}$  the subcategory of  $\mathcal{A}$  consisting of objects  $X \in \mathcal{A}$  such that there exists a chain  $0 = X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \cdots \subset X_l = X$  of submodules with  $X_i/X_{i-1} \in \mathcal{C}$  for each  $i$ . We call this the filtration closure of  $\mathcal{C}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We say that an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  is *length* if  $\text{sim } \mathcal{A}$  is a set and  $\mathcal{A} = \text{Filt}(\text{sim } \mathcal{A})$  holds.

For example, categories such as  $\mathfrak{g}\text{-smod}$ ,  $s\mathcal{O}$  and  $\mathcal{O}$  are length categories, but  $\mathfrak{g}\text{-sMod}$  is not a length category.

**Definition 3.12.** A full subcategory  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is called a *wide subcategory* if it is closed under kernels, cokernels, and extensions. In other words, it is an extension-closed sub-abelian category.

The following is a classical result by Ringel.

**Theorem 3.13** ([17] 2.1, [12] 2.5). *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an abelian category. Then the assignments  $S \mapsto \text{Filt } S$  and  $\mathcal{W} \mapsto \text{sim } \mathcal{W}$  establish a one-to-one correspondence between the following two classes.*

- (1) *The class of semibricks  $S$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .*
- (2) *The class of length wide subcategories  $\mathcal{W}$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ .*

For example, a Serre subcategory is the only wide subcategory that can be obtained by applying  $\text{Filt}$  to a subclass of  $\text{sim } \mathcal{A}$ .

**Lemma 3.14.** *Fix  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{g})$ . Consider the collection of  $\mathfrak{b}$ -highest weight modules  $\{S(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$ , where the  $\mathfrak{b}$ -highest weight of  $S(\lambda)$  is  $\lambda$ . If for any pair  $\lambda, \lambda' \in \Lambda$ ,  $S(\lambda)_{\lambda'} = 0$ , then  $\{S(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in \Lambda}$  is a semibrick.*

**Proof.** Since endomorphisms of the  $\mathfrak{b}$ -highest weight module send the  $\mathfrak{b}$ -highest weight vector to a  $\mathfrak{b}$ -highest weight vector (or 0), it is a brick. If  $S(\lambda)_{\lambda'} = 0$ , then by the property that homomorphisms preserve weights and any homomorphism sending a  $\mathfrak{b}$ -highest weight vector to zero is zero, we have  $\text{Hom}(S(\lambda'), S(\lambda)) = 0$ . This proves the hom-orthogonality.  $\square$

The following examples arise naturally, although they are in a different direction from the main theorem.



Suppose  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ , and let  $\alpha_1$  and  $\alpha_3$  be  $\mathfrak{b}$ -simple odd isotropic roots such that

$$(\lambda, \alpha_1) = (\lambda, \alpha_3) = 0, \quad (\alpha_1, \alpha_3) \neq 0.$$

Denote by  $M_1$  and  $M_3$  the images of the nonzero homomorphisms from  $M^{r_1\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \alpha_1)$  and  $M^{r_3\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \alpha_3)$  to  $M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ , respectively. Define  $M_2$  as the quotient  $M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)/(M_1 + M_3)$ .

**Lemma 3.15.** *Under the above assumptions, we have:*

$$M_1 \cap M_3 = 0.$$

**Proof.** Let  $f_1, f_3$ , and  $f$  be the root vectors corresponding to  $-\alpha_1, -\alpha_3$ , and the even root  $-\alpha_1 - \alpha_3$ , respectively. Then, we have

$$f_1 f_3 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} + f_3 f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} = f v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

Suppose there exist  $y, z \in U(\mathfrak{n}^-)$  such that

$$y f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} = z f_3 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

Using the notation from the PBW theorem Theorem 2.1, express  $y$  in the basis where  $x_n = f_1$  and  $x_{n-1} = f_3$ .

Define  $y_1$  as the sum of PBW monomials in  $y$  where  $f_3$  does not appear. Since terms containing  $f_1$  in  $y$  can be ignored, we write

$$(y - y_1) f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} = y_2 f_3 f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}$$

for some  $y_2$ , where  $y_2$  is the sum of PBW monomials in which neither  $f_1$  nor  $f_3$  appears.

Then, we obtain

$$y f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} = (y_1 + y_2 f_3) f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} = y_1 f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} - y_2 f_1 f_3 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}} + y_2 f v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}.$$

Here, using the notation from the PBW theorem Theorem 2.1, the right-hand side is expressed in the PBW basis where  $x_n = f_3$  and  $x_{n-1} = f_1$ .

Since we can assume that  $z f_3 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}$  is already represented in this PBW basis, it cannot be equal to  $y f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}$  unless  $y_1 = y_2 = 0$ .

Therefore,  $M_1$ , which is generated by  $f_1 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}$ , and  $M_3$ , which is generated by  $f_3 v_\lambda^{\mathfrak{b}}$ , must intersect trivially.  $\square$

**Example 3.16.** Under the above setting, the following forms a semibrick by Lemma 3.14:

$$Z(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3) := \{M_1, M_2, M_3\}.$$


Let  $\text{Filt } Z(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3)$  denote the filtration closure of  $Z(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3)$  in the category  $\mathcal{O}$ .

By Lemma 3.15, since  $M_1 + M_3 \cong M_1 \oplus M_3$ , the corresponding projective covers of  $M_1, M_2$  and  $M_3$  in  $\text{Filt } Z(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3)$  are

$$M^{r_1\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \alpha_1), \quad M^{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda), \quad \text{and} \quad M^{r_3\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \alpha_3),$$

respectively (these are Ext-orthogonal to the three bricks by Lemma 3.6).

The composition of the homomorphisms between the three projective covers can be easily computed since their characters are the same. In particular, it can be verified that  $\text{Filt } Z(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3)$  is equivalent to the category of finite-dimensional modules over a finite-dimensional algebra defined by the following quiver and relations.



The relations are:

$$ab = ba = cd = dc = 0.$$

On the other hand, let  $N_3$  and  $N_2$  be the images of the nonzero homomorphisms from  $M^{r_3^b}(\lambda - \alpha_3)$  and  $M^b(\lambda)$  to  $M^{r_1^b}(\lambda - \alpha_1)$ , respectively. Then, the set

$$Z(r_1 \mathbf{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3) := \{M^{r_1^b}(\lambda - \alpha_1)/N_2, N_2/N_3, N_3\}$$

also forms a semibrick, and the projective covers of the bricks in  $\text{Filt } Z(r_1 \mathbf{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3)$  are again

$$M^{r_1^b}(\lambda - \alpha_1), \quad M^b(\lambda), \quad \text{and} \quad M^{r_3^b}(\lambda - \alpha_3).$$

Therefore,  $\text{Filt } Z(\mathbf{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3)$  and  $\text{Filt } Z(r_1 \mathbf{b}, \lambda, \alpha_1, \alpha_3)$  are equivalent as categories.

### 3.4 Representation Theory of $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}$

In this subsection, let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}$ . Then,

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}} = \mathfrak{b}_{\bar{0}} = \mathfrak{h} \cong (\mathfrak{gl}(1) \oplus \mathfrak{gl}(1))^{\oplus n}.$$

By embedding each  $i$ -th copy of  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  into  $\mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$  via the assignments:

$$E_{11} \mapsto E_{ii}, \quad E_{12} \mapsto E_{i,n-i+1}, \quad E_{21} \mapsto E_{n-i+1,i}, \quad E_{22} \mapsto E_{n-i+1,n-i+1}.$$

and by identifying their Cartan subalgebras. Let  $E_{ii} \in \mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$  be associated with the dual basis elements  $\varepsilon_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 2n$ , and define  $\delta_i = \varepsilon_{n+i}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . We have

$$\Delta = \Delta_{\bar{1}} = \Delta_{\otimes} = \{\pm(\varepsilon_i - \delta_{n-i+1}) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

Let  $\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}$  be the standard Borel subalgebra such that

$$\Delta^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}^+} = \Delta_{\bar{1}}^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}^+} = \Delta_{\otimes}^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}^+} = \Pi^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}^+} = \Pi_{\otimes}^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}^+} = \{\varepsilon_i - \delta_{n-i+1} \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

The graph whose vertices are the Borel subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}$  and whose edges correspond to odd reflections between them can be naturally identified with the hypercube graph  $Q_n$ .

The Verma module is  $2^n$ -dimensional, therefore  $s\mathcal{O} = \mathfrak{g}\text{-smod}$ .

Let the block containing the trivial module (i.e., the principal block) be denoted by  $\mathcal{O}_0(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n})$ .

We denote  $\lambda = m_1(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) + \dots + m_n(\varepsilon_n - \delta_n)$  more compactly as the tuple  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ .

Then,

$$\mathcal{O}_0(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}) = \text{Filt}\{L^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}}(\lambda)\}_{(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n}.$$

$I = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  is clearly a  $(\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}, 0)$ -hypercubic collection.

**Remark 3.17.**  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}} + r_I \mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}$  is a  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra, and


$$M^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}} + r_I \mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}}(m_1, \dots, m_n) = L^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}}(m_1, \dots, m_n)$$

is one-dimensional.

$\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}} = \mathfrak{b}_{\bar{0}} = \mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}$  is also a  $(m_1, \dots, m_n)$ -adjusted Borel subalgebra, and

$$M^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}}(m_1, \dots, m_n) = P^{\mathfrak{b}_{\text{st}}}(m_1, \dots, m_n) = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}}^{\mathfrak{g}} P_{\bar{0}}(m_1, \dots, m_n)$$

**Remark 3.18.** As is well known,  $\mathcal{O}_0(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1))$  is simply the category of finite-dimensional representations of the path algebra  $K_1^\infty$  of the infinite quiver:



modulo the relations  $a_i b_i = b_{i-1} a_{i-1}$  and  $a_i a_{i+1} = 0 = b_{i+1} b_i$  for all  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

As described in [4],  $K_1^\infty$  is the simplest nontrivial example of an algebra that belongs to the class of (generalized) Khovanov algebras. As shown in [4] (originally due to Serganova) any atypicality 1 block of  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ -smod is equivalent to  $\mathcal{O}_0(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1))$ .

### 3.5 Realizing the Principal Block of $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}$

Let  $J$  be a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda)$ -hypercubic collection of size  $n$ .

**Definition 3.19.** As defined in [4](5.6), for  $M \in \mathfrak{g}$ -sMod, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}^{\text{fin}} \left( \bigoplus_{(m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J} M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}} \left( \lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j \right), M \right) &:= \\ \bigoplus_{(m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J} \text{Hom} \left( M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}} \left( \lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j \right), M \right) &\subseteq \\ \text{Hom} \left( \bigoplus_{(m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J} M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}} \left( \lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j \right), M \right). & \end{aligned}$$

In particular, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{End}^{\text{fin}} \left( \bigoplus_{(m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J} M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}} \left( \lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j \right) \right) &:= \\ \text{Hom}^{\text{fin}} \left( \bigoplus_{(m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J} M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}} \left( \lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j \right), \bigoplus_{(m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J} M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_I \mathfrak{b}} \left( \lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j \right) \right). & \end{aligned}$$

This algebra is not unital but locally unital, and it is not finite-dimensional but locally finite-dimensional.

**Proposition 3.20.** *The algebra structure of*

$$\text{End}^{\text{fin}}\left(\bigoplus_{(m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J} M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b}}\left(\lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j\right)\right)$$

*depends only on the size of  $J$ , and it does not depend on  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\mathfrak{b}$ , or  $\lambda$ .*

**Proof.** Let  $J_1, J_2 \subset J$ . By Theorem 2.1, Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 3.5, we have the following isomorphism:

$$U(\mathfrak{g})F_{J_1}^{\mathfrak{b}}E_{J_2}^{\mathfrak{b}}v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b}} \Big/ \sum_{J_1 \subset J'_1 \subset J, J_2 \subset J'_2 \subset J, (J'_1, J'_2) \neq (J_1, J_2)} U(\mathfrak{g})F_{J'_1}^{\mathfrak{b}}E_{J'_2}^{\mathfrak{b}}v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b}} \cong M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_J \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \Sigma_{J_1}^{\mathfrak{b}} + \Sigma_{J_2}^{\mathfrak{b}}).$$

The module  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$  is filtered by  $4^n$  bricks of the form  $M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_J \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda - \Sigma_{J_1}^{\mathfrak{b}} + \Sigma_{J_2}^{\mathfrak{b}})$ , and the relations between these bricks are determined by the relations between their highest weight vectors of the form  $F_{J_1}^{\mathfrak{b}}E_{J_2}^{\mathfrak{b}}v_{\lambda}^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b}}$ .

By the orthogonality of the roots, we can see that this structure does not depend on  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\mathfrak{b}$ , or  $\lambda$ . □

**Remark 3.21.** In particular, applying the above when  $J$  has size 1, by Remark 3.17, we obtain the following:

For  $\mathfrak{b} \in \mathfrak{B}(\mathfrak{g})$ ,  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ ,  $\alpha \in \Pi_{\otimes}^{\mathfrak{b}}$ , if  $(\lambda, \alpha) = 0$ , then there is an isomorphism of algebras:

$$\text{End}^{\text{fin}}\left(\bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_{\alpha} \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + n\alpha)\right) \cong K_1^{\infty}.$$

**Proposition 3.22.** *Let  $J$  be a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda)$ -hypercubic collection. Then, the set*

$$H(J, \lambda) := \left\{ M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_J \mathfrak{b}}\left(\lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j\right) \mid (m_j)_{j \in J} \in \mathbb{Z}^J \right\}$$

*forms a semibrick. Moreover,  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b}}\left(\lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j\right)$  is the projective cover of  $M^{\mathfrak{b}+r_J \mathfrak{b}}\left(\lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j\right)$  in  $H(J, \lambda)$ .*

**Proof.** The set  $H(J, \lambda)$  forms a semibrick by Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 3.14. By Lemma 3.9,  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_J \mathfrak{b}}\left(\lambda + \sum_{j \in J} m_j \alpha_j\right)$  is indecomposable. Its projectivity in  $H(J, \lambda)$  follows from Lemma 3.6. □

**Theorem 3.23.** *Let  $J$  be a  $(\mathfrak{b}, \lambda)$ -hypercubic collection of size  $n$ .*

*Let  $\text{Filt } H(J, \lambda)$  denote the filtration closure of  $H(J, \lambda)$  in the category  $\mathcal{O}$ . Then, there exists a functor*

$$\text{Filt}(H(J, \lambda)) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_0(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}),$$

*establishing an equivalence of categories.*

**Proof.** By Proposition 3.20 and The locally finite version of abstract Morita theory, we have that  $\text{Filt}(H(J, \lambda))$  is independent of  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\mathfrak{b}$ , and  $\lambda$ . See [4, Theorem 5.11] for details.

In particular, when  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}$ , it follows from Proposition 3.22 and Remark 3.17 that

$$\text{Filt}(H(J, \lambda)) = \mathcal{O}_0(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}).$$

□

**Remark 3.24.**  $\mathcal{O}$  is not a wide subcategory of  $\mathfrak{g}\text{-sMod}$  (see Exercise 3.1 in [14]). Thus, taking the filtration closure within  $\mathcal{O}$  is essential.

**Remark 3.25.** Theorem 3.23 establishes an equivalence of abelian categories. In particular, the Ext groups between modules of the form  $M^{\mathfrak{b} \cap r_{J_1} \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \sum_{j \in J_1} m_j \alpha_j)$  and  $M^{\mathfrak{b} + r_{J_2} \mathfrak{b}}(\lambda + \sum_{j \in J_2} m_j \alpha_j)$  ( $J_1, J_2 \subset J$ ) reduce to problems involving modules over  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)^{\oplus n}$ . In particular, we can generalize [11, Theorem 6.1] and a part of [7, Proposition 34] in a more transparent manner to the setting of arbitrary basic Lie superalgebras and Borel subalgebras.

## References

- [1] Sota Asai. Semibricks. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2020 (16):4993–5054, 2020.
- [2] Maurice Auslander and Idun Reiten. Representation theory of artin algebras iii almost split sequences. *Communications in Algebra*, 3(3):239–294, 1975.
- [3] Jonathan Brundan. Representations of the general linear lie superalgebra in the bgg category . In *Developments and Retrospectives in Lie Theory: Algebraic Methods*, pages 71–98. Springer, 2014.
- [4] Jonathan Brundan and Catharina Stroppel. Highest weight categories arising from khovanov’s diagram algebra iv: the general linear supergroup. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 14(2):373–419, 2012.
- [5] Jonathan Brundan, Ivan Losev, and Ben Webster. Tensor product categorifications and the super kazhdan–lusztig conjecture. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2017(20):6329–6410, 2017.
- [6] Chih-Whi Chen and Kevin Coulembier. The primitive spectrum and category for the periplectic lie superalgebra. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 72(3): 625–655, 2020.
- [7] Chih-Whi Chen and Volodymyr Mazorchuk. Some homological properties of category for lie superalgebras. *Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society*, 114(1):50–77, 2023.
- [8] Shun-Jen Cheng and Weiqiang Wang. *Dualities and representations of Lie superalgebras*. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.

- [9] Shun-Jen Cheng, Ngau Lam, Weiqiang Wang, et al. The brundan-kazhdan-lusztig conjecture for general linear lie superalgebras. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 164(4):617–695, 2015.
- [10] Kevin Coulembier and Volodymyr Mazorchuk. Primitive ideals, twisting functors and star actions for classical lie superalgebras. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 2016(718):207–253, 2016.
- [11] Kevin Coulembier and Vera Serganova. Homological invariants in category for the general linear superalgebra. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 369(11):7961–7997, 2017.
- [12] Haruhisa Enomoto. Schur’s lemma for exact categories implies abelian. *Journal of Algebra*, 584:260–269, 2021.
- [13] Pavel Etingof, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. *Tensor categories*, volume 205. American Mathematical Soc., 2015.
- [14] James E Humphreys. *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in the BGG category  $\mathcal{O}$* , volume 94. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
- [15] Volodymyr Mazorchuk. Parabolic category  $\mathcal{O}$  for classical lie superalgebras. In *Advances in Lie Superalgebras*, pages 149–166. Springer, 2014.
- [16] Ian Malcolm Musson. *Lie superalgebras and enveloping algebras*, volume 131. American Mathematical Soc., 2012.
- [17] Claus Michael Ringel. Representations of  $k$ -species and bimodules. *Journal of Algebra*, 41:269–302, 1976. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:122262365>.
- [18] Vera Serganova. Kac–moody superalgebras and integrability. *Developments and trends in infinite-dimensional Lie theory*, pages 169–218, 2011.

SHUNSUKE HIROTA

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KYOTO UNIVERSITY

Kitashirakawa Oiwake-cho, Sakyo-ku, 606-8502, Kyoto

*E-mail address:* [hirota.shunsuke.48s@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp](mailto:hirota.shunsuke.48s@st.kyoto-u.ac.jp)