

# Computing representatives of nilpotent orbits of $\theta$ -groups

Willem A. de Graaf  
 Dipartimento di Matematica  
 Università di Trento  
 Italy

## Abstract

We describe two algorithms for finding representatives of the nilpotent orbits of a  $\theta$ -group. The algorithms have been implemented in the computer algebra system GAP (inside the package SLA). We comment on their performance. We apply the algorithms to study the nilpotent orbits of  $\theta$ -groups, where  $\theta$  is an N-regular automorphism of a simple Lie algebra of exceptional type.

## 1 Introduction

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a simple complex Lie algebra, and let  $G$  be a connected algebraic group with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Then  $G$  acts on  $\mathfrak{g}$ . The orbit structure of the action of  $G$  on  $\mathfrak{g}$  has been studied in detail (we refer to [6] for an overview). In particular, the nilpotent orbits have been classified, using a correspondence between nilpotent  $G$ -orbits, and  $G$ -conjugacy classes of  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples.

Kostant and Rallis ([19]) considered decompositions of the form  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}_i$  is the eigenspace of an involution  $\theta$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , corresponding to the eigenvalue  $(-1)^i$ . Let  $G_0 \subset G$  be the connected subgroup with Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . Then the reductive group  $G_0$  acts on  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ , and again the question arises as to what its orbits are. In [19], among many other things, it is shown that there are finitely many nilpotent orbits, and a correspondence between nilpotent orbits and  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples, analogous to the one for  $\mathfrak{g}$ , is established.

This was generalised by Vinberg in the 70's ([29], [30]). He considered the decomposition of  $\mathfrak{g}$  relative to an automorphism  $\theta$  of order  $m$  (or relative to a 1-parameter group of automorphisms if  $m = \infty$ ). Here

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{m-1},$$

where  $\mathfrak{g}_i$  is the eigenspace of  $\theta$  corresponding to the eigenvalue  $\omega^i$ , where  $\omega$  is a primitive  $m$ -th root of unity. Again we get a reductive connected algebraic group  $G_0$ , with Lie

algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ , acting on  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . The group  $G_0$ , together with its action on  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ , is called a  $\theta$ -group. In the sequel we will, by a slight abuse of language, also call  $G_0$  a  $\theta$ -group; the action on  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  is always understood.

**Example 1** Let  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_4(\mathbb{C})$ ; then  $G = \mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbb{C})$  acts on  $\mathfrak{g}$  by conjugation. Let  $\omega \in \mathbb{C}$  be a primitive third root of unity. Let  $\theta$  be the automorphism of order 3 of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , given by the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & \omega^2 \\ \omega^2 & 1 & \omega & \omega \\ \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \omega & \omega^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here, if on position  $(i, j)$  there is  $\omega^k$ , then  $\theta(e_{i,j}) = \omega^k e_{i,j}$ , where  $e_{i,j}$  is the matrix with a 1 on position  $(i, j)$  and zeroes elsewhere. Let  $h_i = e_{i,i} - e_{i+1,i+1}$ . Then we see that  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is spanned by  $h_1, h_2, h_3, e_{3,4}, e_{4,3}$ ; which means that  $\mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2(\mathbb{C}) \oplus T_2$  (where  $T_2$  denotes the subalgebra spanned by  $h_1, h_2$ ). Furthermore,  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  is spanned by  $e_{1,2}, e_{2,3}, e_{2,4}, e_{3,1}$  and  $e_{4,1}$ . As  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ -module (and hence as  $G_0$ -module)  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  splits as a direct sum of two 2-dimensional modules (spanned respectively by  $e_{2,3}, e_{2,4}$  and  $e_{3,1}, e_{4,1}$ ) and a 1-dimensional module (spanned by  $e_{1,2}$ ).

It is of interest to study  $\theta$ -groups for a number of reasons. Firstly, they form a class of algebraic groups for which it is not completely hopeless to list the orbits. Secondly, many interesting representations of algebraic groups arise as  $\theta$ -groups (for example  $\mathrm{SL}(9, \mathbb{C})$  acting on  $\wedge^3(\mathbb{C}^9)$ , which is studied in [31]).

An orbit  $G_0 e$  (with  $e \in \mathfrak{g}_1$ ) is called nilpotent if 0 is contained in its closure. This happens if and only if  $e$  is nilpotent as an element of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (that is, the adjoint map  $\mathrm{ad}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e)$  is nilpotent). The results of Vinberg show that also here there are a finite number of nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . Secondly, there is a correspondence between nilpotent orbits and  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples. Moreover, in [28], [30], Vinberg developed a method for obtaining the nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . It is the objective of this paper to describe algorithmic methods, that can be implemented on computer, for this purpose.

The conjugacy classes (in  $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ ) of the finite order automorphisms of  $\mathfrak{g}$  have been classified by Kac ([18], see also [16]) in terms of so-called Kac diagrams. The connected component of the identity of  $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$  is the group of inner automorphisms of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . It is generated by the  $\exp(\mathrm{ad}_{\mathfrak{g}}(e))$ , for  $e \in \mathfrak{g}$  nilpotent. We have that an automorphism  $\theta$  is inner if and only if  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  contains a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (this follows, for example, directly from [16], Chapter X, Theorem 5.15).

As said before, the purpose of this paper is to describe algorithms for listing the nilpotent orbits of a  $\theta$ -group. For this, our computational setup is as in [12]. In particular, we assume that  $\mathfrak{g}$  is given by a multiplication table relative to a Chevalley basis. Then all structure constants in the multiplication table are integers. From the Kac diagram of an automorphism  $\theta$  it is straightforward to compute the matrix of  $\theta$  relative to the given basis of  $\mathfrak{g}$  (this follows directly from the description of the finite order automorphisms given in [16], Chapter X, Theorem 5.15). Then by linear algebra we can construct bases of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and

$\mathfrak{g}_1$ . In this paper we will focus on the case where  $\theta$  is an inner automorphism of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . This is by far the most common case. Secondly, in this case a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  will also be a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . This implies that  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  are generated by root spaces of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . So, although the matrix of  $\theta$  has coefficients in  $\mathbb{Q}(\omega)$ , the spaces  $\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1$  are defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Therefore, all computations are completely rational, i.e., the field elements that appear all lie in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Several listings of nilpotent orbits of  $\theta$ -groups have appeared in the literature. We mention [31] ( $\mathfrak{g}$  of type  $E_8$ , the order of  $\theta$  equal to 3,  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  of type  $A_8$ ), [2] ( $\mathfrak{g}$  of type  $E_8$ , the order of  $\theta$  equal to 2,  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  of type  $D_8$ ), [9] ( $\mathfrak{g}$  of type  $E_8$ , the order of  $\theta$  equal to 5,  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  of type  $2A_4$  and  $\mathfrak{g}$  of type  $E_7$ , the order of  $\theta$  equal to 3,  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  of type  $A_2 + A_5$ ), [26] ( $\mathfrak{g}$  of type  $E_7$ , the order of  $\theta$  equal to 4,  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  of type  $A_1 + 2A_3$ ). (We remark that in those references all orbits are classified, so also the semisimple orbits, and the ones of mixed type). Furthermore, in [22] and [23] the nilpotent orbits are listed for the cases where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of exceptional type, and the order of  $\theta$  is 2.

Littelmann ([20]) has devised an algorithm to obtain nilpotent orbits of  $\theta$ -groups. His algorithm is tailored towards the case where the  $\theta$ -group is defined by a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading. We note that for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded algebras  $\mathfrak{g}$ , a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  will also be a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  ([30], §1.4). For this reason, the algorithms in this paper work unchanged for  $\mathbb{Z}$ -gradings; however, we will not explicitly consider these. The main step of Littelmann's algorithm consists of computing sets  $w(\Delta)$ , where  $\Delta$  is a basis of the root system, and  $w$  runs through a set of representatives the right cosets of a Weyl subgroup  $W_0$  of the Weyl group  $W$ . For this reason, the algorithm will behave in a similar manner to our first method (described in Section 3). That is, it will work well when the index of  $W_0$  in  $W$  is small.

In [27], Popov has developed an algorithm for computing the Hesselink strata of the nullcone of a representation of a reductive algebraic group. If the group in question is a  $\theta$ -group then this yields an algorithm for computing the nilpotent orbits. Experiments with an implementation of the algorithm (due to A'Campo and Popov) however suggest that for the special case of  $\theta$ -groups the more specialised methods of this paper perform better. (For an example, let  $\theta$  be the N-regular inner automorphism (see Section 6) of order 2 of the Lie algebra of type  $E_6$ . Then  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is of type  $A_5 + A_1$ , and the module  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  is irreducible with highest weight  $(0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$ . For this case Popov's algorithm used 831 seconds, whereas the methods of Sections 3 and 4 needed respectively 5 and 93 seconds.)

This paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we describe two algorithms that we need for tasks related to Weyl subgroups of Weyl groups. In Section 3 we describe the first method for listing nilpotent orbits of  $\theta$ -groups. It uses the classification of the nilpotent orbits of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . For each such orbit it is decided whether it intersects with  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ , and if this is the case, the  $G_0$ -orbits of the intersection are determined. This method works well if the index of the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  in the one of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is small; and the method ceases to work well if this index is large. In that case, the dimensions of the spaces  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  will be small (compared to the dimension of  $\mathfrak{g}$ ). In Section 4 we describe a second method, which is based on Vinberg's theory of carrier algebras. This method works well if the spaces  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  are small-dimensional. In this sense the two algorithms complement each other. All algorithms have been implemented in the computer algebra system GAP4 ([10]), inside

the package SLA ([13]). In Section 5 we briefly report on practical experiences<sup>1</sup> with these implementations. In Section 6, we apply the algorithms to study the nilpotent orbits in case  $\theta$  is an N-regular automorphism of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is of exceptional type, of orders between 2 and the Coxeter number.

**Acknowledgements:** I would like to thank Alexander Elashvili and Oksana Yakimova for inspiring conversations on the subject of this paper.

## 2 Algorithms for Weyl subgroups

Let  $\Phi$  be a root system, with basis of simple roots  $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l\}$ . Then the group generated by the reflections  $s_i = s_{\alpha_i}$  is the Weyl group of  $\Phi$ , which we denote by  $W$ . Let  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$  be roots in  $\Phi$  that form a basis of a root subsystem  $\Psi$  of  $\Phi$ . Then the Weyl group  $W_0$  of  $\Psi$  is a subgroup of  $W$ , generated by the reflections  $s_{\beta_i}$ . The group  $W_0$  is said to be a *Weyl subgroup* of  $W$ . In this section we describe algorithms for two tasks concerning Weyl subgroups of Weyl groups: finding a set of representatives of the right cosets of  $W_0$  in  $W$ , and checking whether two sets of weights are conjugate under  $W_0$ . This is the content of the first two subsections. In the third subsection we describe an application to listing the  $\pi$ -systems in  $\Phi$ , up to  $W$ -conjugacy.

It is straightforward to see that the root system  $\Psi$  has a basis consisting of positive roots in  $\Phi$ . Therefore, in the sequel we assume that the  $\beta_i$  are positive roots.

Let  $P$  denote the weight lattice of  $\Phi$ , spanned by the fundamental weights  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_l$ . Let  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  be a  $W$ -invariant inner product on the space spanned by  $P$ . For two weights  $\lambda, \mu$  we set  $\langle \lambda, \mu^\vee \rangle = 2(\lambda, \mu)/(\mu, \mu)$ . Let  $F$  denote the set of weights  $\mu \in P$  with  $\langle \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0$ . This set is called the fundamental Weyl chamber of  $W$ . It is known that every  $W$ -orbit has a unique point in  $F$ . The fundamental Weyl chamber  $F_0$  of  $W_0$  is the set of all  $\mu \in P$  with  $\langle \mu, \beta_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0$ , for all  $i$ . Every  $W_0$ -orbit in  $P$  contains a unique point in  $F_0$ .

For a  $w \in W$  we denote by  $\ell(w)$  the length of  $w$ , that is, the length of a reduced expression for  $w$  as a word in the generators  $s_i$ . Similarly, for  $u \in W_0$ ,  $\ell_0(u)$  will denote the length of a reduced expression of  $u$  in the generators  $s_{\beta_i}$ .

### 2.1 Listing right cosets

It is known (see [7]) that every right coset of a Weyl subgroup of a Weyl group has a unique representative of shortest length. Also there are algorithms known for finding a set of shortest coset representatives. (For example the computer algebra system MAGMA ([3]), and the GAP3 package Chevie ([11]) contain implementations of such an algorithm.) However, I have not been able to find a reference for such an algorithm in the literature. So for reasons of completeness, this section contains a characterisation of these shortest representatives, that also yields an algorithm to find them.

---

<sup>1</sup>All timings reported in this paper have been obtained on a 2GHz machine, with 1GB of memory for GAP.

**Lemma 2** *Let  $w \in W$  be such that  $w^{-1}(\beta_i) > 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Then  $w$  is the unique element of shortest length in the coset  $W_0w$ . Moreover, every coset  $W_0u$  contains an element with this property.*

**Proof.** We claim the following: let  $v \in W$ , and let  $\beta$  be one of the  $\beta_i$ . Suppose that  $v^{-1}(\beta) > 0$ . Then  $\ell(s_\beta v) > \ell(v)$ .

First we note that this is equivalent to  $\ell(v^{-1}s_\beta) > \ell(v^{-1})$ . We use the fact that for  $u \in W$  we have that  $\ell(u)$  is equal to the number of positive roots  $\alpha \in \Phi^+$  such that  $u(\alpha) < 0$ . Let

$$U = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid s_\beta(\alpha) \in \Phi^+\}.$$

Then  $s_\beta$  permutes  $U$ , hence the number of  $\alpha \in U$  with  $v^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$  is equal to the number of  $\alpha$  in  $U$  with  $v^{-1}s_\beta(\alpha) < 0$ . So  $v^{-1}$  and  $v^{-1}s_\beta$  receive the same ‘‘contribution’’ from  $U$  towards their lengths. Set

$$V = \{\alpha \in \Phi^+ \mid s_\beta(\alpha) \in \Phi^-\}.$$

Then  $-s_\beta$  permutes  $V$ . This implies that the number of  $\alpha \in V$  with  $v^{-1}s_\beta(\alpha) < 0$  is equal to the number of  $\alpha \in V$  with  $v^{-1}(\alpha) > 0$ . We show that this last number is strictly bigger than the number of  $\alpha \in V$  with  $v^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$ . This then implies the claim.

Set  $M_1 = \{\alpha \in V \mid (\mu, \alpha) < 0\}$ , and  $M_2 = \{\alpha \in V \mid (\mu, \alpha) > 0\}$ . Let  $\alpha \in M_1$ . From  $s_\beta(\alpha) < 0$  we get that  $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle > 0$ . But then

$$v^{-1}(s_\beta(\alpha)) = v^{-1}(\alpha) - \langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle v^{-1}(\beta).$$

Now since  $v^{-1}(\alpha) < 0$  and  $v^{-1}(\beta) > 0$  we get that  $v^{-1}s_\beta(\alpha) < 0$ . It follows that  $-s_\beta$  maps  $M_1$  into  $M_2$ . But  $\beta \in M_2$  does not lie in  $-s_\beta(M_1)$ . Hence  $|M_2| > |M_1|$  and we are done.

Now suppose that  $w^{-1}(\beta_i) > 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . Let  $u \in W_0$  be such that  $\ell(uw) > \ell(w)$ . Again let  $\beta$  be one of the  $\beta_i$ , with  $\ell_0(s_\beta u) > \ell_0(u)$ . The latter condition implies that  $u^{-1}(\beta)$  is a linear combination of the  $\beta_i$  with non-negative integer coefficients. Hence  $w^{-1}u^{-1}(\beta) > 0$ . Therefore, by the claim above,  $\ell(s_\beta uw) > \ell(uw)$ . Now by induction on  $\ell_0(u)$  we see that  $\ell(uw) > \ell(w)$  for all  $u \in W_0$ ,  $u \neq 1$ .

Let  $v \in W$ , and  $\beta$  one of the  $\beta_i$ . If  $v^{-1}(\beta) < 0$ , then by arguments similar to the ones used before, we prove that  $\ell(s_\beta v) < \ell(v)$  (this time  $-s_\beta$  maps  $M_2$  into  $M_1$ ). Hence, if  $u \in W_0w$  does not have the property that  $u(\beta_i) > 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , then we can find  $\beta_i$  with  $\ell(s_{\beta_i}u) < \ell(u)$ . Continuing, we eventually find an element in the coset of minimal length.  $\square$

We say that a  $w \in W$  is a shortest representative if it is the unique representative of shortest length of the coset  $W_0w$ .

**Lemma 3** *Let  $w$  be a shortest representative. Write  $w = w's_{\alpha_i}$ , where  $\ell(w') = \ell(w) - 1$ . Then  $w'$  is a shortest representative.*

**Proof.** If not, then we can write  $w' = w_1w''$ , with  $w_1 \in W_0$  and  $\ell(w'') < \ell(w')$ . Hence  $w$  and  $w''s_{\alpha_i}$  lie in the same right  $W_0$ -coset. Hence  $w''s_{\alpha_i}$  is not a shortest representative. Therefore we can write  $w''s_{\alpha_i} = w_2w'''$ , with  $w_2 \in W_0$  and  $w'''$  a shortest representative,

$\ell(w''') < \ell(w''s_{\alpha_i})$ . But then  $w = w_1w_2w'''$ , and this implies  $w = w'''$ . But  $\ell(w''') \leq \ell(w'') < \ell(w') < \ell(w)$ , which is a contradiction.  $\square$

Now let  $R_k$  denote the set of shortest representatives of length  $k$ . Lemmas 2 and 3 lead to the following algorithm for computing  $R_{k+1}$  from  $R_k$ . Initially we put  $R_{k+1} = \emptyset$ . Then for  $1 \leq i \leq l$  and  $w \in R_k$  we do the following: if  $\ell(ws_{\alpha_i}) > \ell(w)$  and  $ws_{\alpha_i}(\beta_j) > 0$  for  $1 \leq j \leq s$  then add  $ws_{\alpha_i}$  to  $R_{k+1}$ .

**Remark.** The implementation of this algorithm in GAP4 appears to work well. For example for  $W_0$  of type  $2A_4$  inside  $W$  of type  $E_8$  (this is obtained by taking the set of simple roots, adding the lowest root, and deleting an appropriate simple root), the GAP4 implementation takes 2.1 seconds, whereas Chevie and MAGMA V2.14-11 need respectively 9.4 and 89.7 seconds. In this example there are 48384 cosets.

## 2.2 Checking conjugacy

Let  $\Gamma_1 = \{\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m\}$  and  $\Gamma_2 = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\}$  be two subsets of  $P$ . In this section we describe how we can check efficiently whether there exists a  $w \in W_0$  with  $w(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$ . For this we first focus on the problem of deciding whether there is a  $w \in W_0$  with  $w(\mu_i) = \lambda_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ .

First we observe that it is straightforward to compute, for given  $\mu \in P$ , a  $w \in W_0$  and a  $\lambda \in F_0$  with  $w(\mu) = \lambda$ . (Note that  $\lambda$  is uniquely determined by  $\mu$ .) Indeed, we find the smallest index  $i$  with  $\langle \mu, \beta_i^\vee \rangle < 0$ . If there is no such  $i$  then  $\mu \in F_0$  and we are done. Otherwise, we set  $\mu_1 = s_{\beta_i}(\mu)$ , and we continue with  $\mu_1$  in place of  $\mu$ . This algorithm terminates as  $\mu_1 > \mu$  in the usual partial order on  $P$  (which is defined by  $\nu < \eta$  if  $\eta - \nu$  is a sum of positive roots). Furthermore, by tracing the  $s_{\beta_i}$  that we applied we find  $w$ .

This means that the problem is easily solved if the sets  $\Gamma_i$  have only one element. Indeed, we compute  $u, v \in W_0$  such that  $u(\mu_1)$  and  $v(\lambda_1)$  lie in  $F_0$ . If  $u(\mu_1) = v(\lambda_1)$  then they are conjugate, and  $w = v^{-1}u$  is such that  $w(\mu_1) = \lambda_1$ . Otherwise they are not conjugate.

If the  $\Gamma_i$  are larger, then, as a first step, we decide whether there is a  $w_1 \in W_0$  with  $w_1(\mu_1) = \lambda_1$ . If there is no such  $w_1$  then our problem has no solution, and we stop. Otherwise we compute such a  $w_1$ .

Now we need an intermezzo on stabilisers. Let  $v \in W_0$  be such that  $v(\lambda_1) = \lambda \in F_0$ . For a weight  $\nu$  we consider its stabiliser  $\text{Stab}_{W_0}(\nu) = \{u \in W_0 \mid u(\nu) = \nu\}$ . We note that we have an isomorphism  $\sigma : \text{Stab}_{W_0}(\lambda_1) \rightarrow \text{Stab}_{W_0}(\lambda)$ , by  $\sigma(u) = vuv^{-1}$ . Now as  $\lambda \in F_0$  we have that  $\text{Stab}_{W_0}(\lambda)$  is generated by the  $s_{\beta_i}$  with  $\langle \lambda, \beta_i^\vee \rangle = 0$  (cf. [12], Proposition 8.3.9 - there it is proved for the full Weyl group, but the proof goes through also for Weyl subgroups). Hence  $\text{Stab}_{W_0}(\lambda_1)$  is generated by all  $v^{-1}s_{\beta_i}v = s_{v^{-1}\beta_i}$ , where  $\beta_i$  is such that  $\langle \lambda, \beta_i^\vee \rangle = 0$ . We conclude that  $\text{Stab}_{W_0}(\lambda_1)$  is a Weyl subgroup of  $W$ ; moreover, we can compute the reflections that generate it.

It is straightforward to see that  $\text{Stab}_{W_0}(\lambda_1)w_1$  is exactly the set of elements of  $W_0$  that send  $\mu_1$  to  $\lambda_1$ . Now set  $\mu'_i = w_1(\mu_i)$  for  $i \geq 1$ . Then by induction on the size of  $\Gamma_i$  we can decide whether there exists a  $w \in \text{Stab}_{W_0}(\lambda_1)$  with  $w(\mu'_i) = \lambda_i$  for  $2 \leq i \leq m$ . Now if such

a  $w$  exists, then  $v = ww_1 \in W_0$  has the property that  $v(\mu_i) = \lambda_i$ . Otherwise, such a  $v$  does not exist.

Now we return to the more general problem, i.e., to decide whether there exists a  $w \in W_0$  with  $w(\Gamma_1) = \Gamma_2$ . We assume that the  $\mu_i$  and  $\lambda_i$  are ordered in such a way that the matrix  $B_1 = ((\mu_i, \mu_j))_{i,j=1}^m$  is equal to the matrix  $B_2 = ((\lambda_i, \lambda_j))_{i,j=1}^m$ . Then we compute all permutations  $\tau$  of  $\Gamma_1$  that leave  $B_1$  invariant, i.e., such that

$$(\mu_i, \mu_j) = (\tau(\mu_i), \tau(\mu_j)) \text{ for } 1 \leq i, j \leq m.$$

Then for each such  $\tau$  we check whether there is  $w \in W_0$  with  $w\tau(\mu_i) = \lambda_i$ .

**Remark.** This algorithm works rather well in practice. First of all, usually there are not many permutations  $\tau$  that leave  $B_1$  invariant. Secondly, the basic operation of the algorithm is to compute a  $\lambda \in F_0$  conjugate to a given weight; and this can be done in few steps. We have used an implementation in GAP4 of Dynkin's algorithm for classifying so-called  $\pi$ -systems (cf. Section 2.3), up to  $W$ -conjugacy, in the Lie algebra of type  $E_8$ . A list of 76  $\pi$ -systems was constructed, and the algorithm for deciding conjugacy under the Weyl group of type  $E_8$  was called 3873 times. The total time used was about 71 seconds.

## 2.3 Dynkin's $\pi$ -systems

Let  $\Gamma \subset \Phi$ ; then  $\Gamma$  is called a  $\pi$ -system if

- C1) for all  $\alpha, \beta \in \Gamma$  we have  $\alpha - \beta \notin \Phi$ ,
- C2)  $\Gamma$  is linearly independent.

We have that  $\Gamma \subset \Phi$  is a basis of a root subsystem of  $\Phi$  if and only if it is a  $\pi$ -system.

In [8] Dynkin gave a neat algorithm to classify  $\pi$ -systems of maximal rank (i.e., of rank equal to the rank of  $\Phi$ ). This works as follows. Let  $\Gamma$  be a  $\pi$ -system, and  $D \subset \Gamma$  a subset corresponding to a connected component of the Dynkin diagram of  $\Gamma$ . Then  $D$  is a basis of a root subsystem of  $\Phi$ . To  $D$  we add the lowest root of that root subsystem. Secondly, we erase a root from  $D$ , different from the one added. This yields a  $\pi$ -system  $\Gamma'$ ; which is said to be obtained from  $\Gamma$  by an *elementary transformation*. Dynkin showed that all  $\pi$ -systems of maximal rank can be obtained (up to  $W$ -conjugacy) from  $\Delta$ , by a series of elementary transformations. So in order to get a list of all  $\pi$ -systems, up to  $W$ -conjugacy, one does the following:

1. Find all maximal  $\pi$ -systems that can be obtained from  $\Delta$  by performing elementary transformations.
2. From this set erase  $W$ -conjugate copies, to obtain the set  $M$ .
3. Let  $M'$  be the set obtained from  $M$  by adding all subsets of each element of  $M$ .
4. From  $M'$  erase  $W$ -conjugate copies.

We remark that for checking whether two  $\pi$ -systems are  $W$ -conjugate, the algorithm from Section 2.2 can be used.

**Remark.** Using our implementation in GAP of this algorithm, we have obtained the same tables for the root systems of exceptional type as Dynkin ([8]). For the root systems of classical type this algorithm has been applied by Lorente and Gruber ([21]). However, with our implementation of the algorithm we obtained tables that for many root systems contain more  $\pi$ -systems.

### 3 Listing nilpotent orbits I

Now we return to the set up of Section 1. That is,  $\theta$  is an automorphism of  $\mathfrak{g}$  of order  $m$ , and  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathfrak{g}_i$  is the corresponding  $\mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z}$ -grading. We describe a method for finding representatives of the nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ .

#### 3.1 Preliminary lemmas

We start with three lemmas which, for the case  $m = 2$ , have been proved in [19]. The proofs for general  $m$  are entirely similar, and therefore we omit them. A triple  $(h, e, f)$  of elements of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , with  $[h, e] = 2e$ ,  $[h, f] = -2f$ ,  $[e, f] = h$ , is called an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple.

**Lemma 4** *Let  $e \in \mathfrak{g}_1$  be nilpotent. Then there are  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $f \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$  such that  $(h, e, f)$  is an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple.*

The proof is the same as the first part of the proof of [19], Proposition 4. This lemma is also part of the content of [30], Theorem 1. We call an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$  with the properties of Lemma 4 a *normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple*, in analogy to [19]. The group  $G_0$  acts on normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples by  $g \cdot (h, e, f) = (g \cdot h, g \cdot e, g \cdot f)$ .

**Lemma 5** *Let  $A$  be the set of nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . Let  $B$  be the set of  $G_0$ -orbits of normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples. Let  $\varphi : A \rightarrow B$  be defined as follows:  $\varphi(G_0 \cdot e) = G_0 \cdot (h, e, f)$ , where  $(h, e, f)$  is any normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple containing  $e$ . Then  $\varphi$  is well-defined, and bijective.*

The proof is analogous to the second part of the proof of [19], Proposition 4.

**Lemma 6** *Let  $(h, e, f)$  and  $(h_1, e_1, f_1)$  be normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples. They are conjugate under  $G_0$  if and only if  $h$  and  $h_1$  are.*

Here the proof follows the one of [19], Lemma 4.

We say that an  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$  is *normal* if it lies in a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$ . By Lemmas 4, 5 and 6 listing the nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  is equivalent to listing the  $G_0$ -orbits of normal  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ .



### 3.2 Deciding normality

We call an  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$  *admissible* if there are  $e, f \in \mathfrak{g}$  such that  $(h, e, f)$  is an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple. Let  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  be a fixed Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . In this section we describe an algorithm for deciding whether a given admissible  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$  is normal.

**Proposition 7** *Let  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$  be admissible and write  $\mathfrak{g}_i(k) = \{x \in \mathfrak{g}_i \mid [h, x] = kx\}$ . Set*

$$U = \{u \in \mathfrak{g}_1(2) \mid [\mathfrak{g}_0(0), u] = \mathfrak{g}_1(2)\}.$$

*Then  $U$  is dense in  $\mathfrak{g}_1(2)$ . Moreover, an  $e \in U$  lies in a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$  or there is no normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple containing  $h$ .*

**Proof.** Consider the subalgebra

$$\mathfrak{a} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_{i \bmod m}(2i).$$

Then  $\mathfrak{a}$  is reductive. Indeed, let  $\kappa$  be the Killing form of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . By standard arguments (i.e., analogous to [17], Chapter IV, §1.I) we see that  $\kappa(\mathfrak{g}_i(k), \mathfrak{g}_j(l)) = 0$  unless  $j = -i$  and  $l = -k$ . So, since  $\mathfrak{g}$  is the direct sum of the  $\mathfrak{g}_i(k)$ , the restriction of  $\kappa$  to  $\mathfrak{g}_i(2i) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_{-i}(-2i)$  is nondegenerate. This implies that the restriction of  $\kappa$  to  $\mathfrak{a}$  is nondegenerate, and hence that  $\mathfrak{a}$  is reductive (see [4], §6, no. 4). Hence  $\mathfrak{g}_0(0)$  is reductive as well. Set  $G_{0,h} = \{g \in G_0 \mid g \cdot h = h\}$ . Then  $G_{0,h}$  is the subgroup of  $G$  corresponding to  $\mathfrak{g}_0(0)$ . Since  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded reductive Lie algebra,  $\mathfrak{g}_1(2)$  has a finite number of  $G_{0,h}$ -orbits (see [29], §2.6), and therefore a unique dense one. Denote this orbit by  $U$ . Let  $u \in \mathfrak{g}_1(2)$ ; then the  $G_{0,h}$ -orbit of  $u$  is dense if and only if its tangent space  $[\mathfrak{g}_0(0), u]$  is equal to  $\mathfrak{g}_1(2)$ . So we get that  $U = \{u \in \mathfrak{g}_1(2) \mid [\mathfrak{g}_0(0), u] = \mathfrak{g}_1(2)\}$ . Now let  $e \in \mathfrak{g}_1(2)$  lie in a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$ . Let  $K$  denote the Lie algebra spanned by  $h, e, f$ , i.e.,  $K$  is isomorphic to  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ . Then  $\mathfrak{a}$  is a  $K$ -module. From  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -representation theory it follows that  $\text{ade} : \mathfrak{g}_0(0) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_1(2)$  is surjective. Consider the orbit  $G_{0,h} \cdot e \subset \mathfrak{g}_1(2)$ ; its tangent space is  $[\mathfrak{g}_0(0), e] = \mathfrak{g}_1(2)$ . Therefore,  $e \in U$ . But then, since  $U$  is a single  $G_{0,h}$ -orbit, all  $u \in U$  lie in a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple,  $(h, u, f_u)$ . So, if a given element in  $U$  does not lie in such a triple, then it follows that there is no normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple containing  $h$ .  $\square$

This proposition immediately implies that the following algorithm is correct.

**Algorithm 8** Input: an admissible  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ .

Output: TRUE if  $h$  is normal, FALSE otherwise.

1. Compute the spaces  $\mathfrak{g}_1(2)$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_{-1}(-2)$ .
2. If  $h \notin [\mathfrak{g}_1(2), \mathfrak{g}_{-1}(-2)]$  then return FALSE.
3. By trying a few random elements find an  $e \in \mathfrak{g}_1(2)$  with  $[\mathfrak{g}_0(0), e] = \mathfrak{g}_1(2)$ .
4. By solving a system of linear equations we decide whether there is an  $f \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1}(-2)$  such that  $(h, e, f)$  is a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple. If such an  $f$  exists, then return TRUE, otherwise return FALSE.

**Remark.** In the third step we need to find random elements. This can be done as follows. Let  $\Omega$  be a finite set of integers (containing, say, all integers from 0 to  $n$ , for some  $n > 0$ ). Let  $u_1, \dots, u_s$  be a basis of  $\mathfrak{g}_1(2)$ . Then we choose randomly, independently, and uniformly  $s$  elements  $\alpha_i \in \Omega$  and form the element  $e = \sum_{i=1}^s \alpha_i u_i$ . If  $n$  is large enough then  $e$  will lie in the  $U$  from Proposition 7 with high probability; so we expect to find such an  $e$  within a few steps.

The problem is how  $n$  should be chosen. In practice, usually a small  $n$  suffices. However, one can also proceed as follows. First we choose a small  $n$ . Then every time the random  $e$  does not lie in  $U$  we increase  $n$ .

Also we remark that the correctness of the output does not depend on the way  $\Omega$  is chosen. The output is always correct; only the running time depends on the choice of  $\Omega$ .

**Remark.** It is possible to dispense with the second step. However, practical experience has shown that the algorithm on the average becomes more efficient when we include it.

### 3.3 Finding the nilpotent orbits

Now we assume that the automorphism  $\theta$  is inner. Hence the Cartan subalgebra  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is also a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Since  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is reductive we can write  $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{l} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ , where  $\mathfrak{r}$  is the centre of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $\mathfrak{l} = [\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_0]$  is semisimple. Note that  $G_0 = L \times R$ , with  $L$  and  $R$  the subgroups corresponding to  $\mathfrak{l}$  and  $\mathfrak{r}$  respectively. The action of  $R$  on  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is trivial; so the  $G_0$ -action on  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  has the same orbits as the  $L$ -action. Set  $\mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}} = \mathfrak{h}_0 \cap \mathfrak{l}$ ; then  $\mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{l}$ . (Indeed, it is a maximal toral subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{l}$ , hence a Cartan subalgebra, as  $\mathfrak{l}$  is semisimple.) Let  $W_{\mathfrak{l}} = N_L(\mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}})/C_L(\mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}})$  be the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{l}$ . This group acts on  $\mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$ , and a closed Weyl chamber is a fundamental domain for this action. Let  $\Psi$  be the root system of  $\mathfrak{l}$  relative to  $\mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$ . Let  $\Pi = \{\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m\}$  be a set of simple roots in  $\Psi$ . Then the set of all  $h \in \mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$  with  $\beta_i(h) \geq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq m$  is a fundamental Weyl chamber  $C_{\mathfrak{l}}$ . The next lemma implies that we can assume that the candidates for normal  $h \in \mathfrak{g}_0$  lie in  $C_{\mathfrak{l}} \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ .

**Lemma 9** *Let  $(h_1, e_1, f_1)$  be a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple. Then there is a unique normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$  that is  $G_0$ -conjugate to  $(h_1, e_1, f_1)$ , and such that  $h = h' + u$ , with  $h' \in C_{\mathfrak{l}}$  and  $u \in \mathfrak{r}$ .*

**Proof.** Observe that  $h_1$  lies in a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ , which is  $G_0$ -conjugate to  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ . So by acting with an element of  $G_0$  we find a conjugate normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h_2, e_2, f_2)$  such that  $h_2 \in \mathfrak{h}_0$ . Write  $h_2 = h_3 + u$ , with  $h_3 \in \mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$  and  $u \in \mathfrak{r}$ . Now  $h_3$  has a unique  $W_{\mathfrak{l}}$ -conjugate  $h_4$  lying in  $C_{\mathfrak{l}}$ . So we find a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h_4 + u, e_4, f_4)$ , conjugate to the original one. Moreover, a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h_5 + v, e_5, f_5)$  with  $h_5 \in C_{\mathfrak{l}}$ , and  $v \in \mathfrak{r}$  and  $h_5 \neq h_4$  cannot be  $G_0$ -conjugate to  $(h_1, e_1, f_1)$ , because two elements of  $\mathfrak{h}_0^{\mathfrak{l}}$  are  $L$ -conjugate if and only if they are  $W_{\mathfrak{l}}$ -conjugate.  $\square$

Let  $\Phi$  be the root system of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ . Let  $W$  be the corresponding Weyl group. Then  $W$  acts on  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ . It is well-known that the action of  $W$  on  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  can be realised

as follows. Let  $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_l\}$  be a basis of simple roots of  $\Phi$ . Let  $h_{\alpha_i}$  be the unique element of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  with  $\alpha_j(h_{\alpha_i}) = \langle \alpha_j, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle$ . Then for the simple reflections  $s_{\alpha_i}$  we have  $s_{\alpha_i}(h) = h - \alpha_i(h)h_{\alpha_i}$ . Let  $C \subset \mathfrak{h}_0$  be the fundamental Weyl chamber, i.e.,  $C$  consists of all  $h \in \mathfrak{h}_0$  with  $\alpha_i(h) \geq 0$  for  $1 \leq i \leq l$ . Since  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  is also a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ , we have that  $\Psi$  is a root subsystem of  $\Phi$ . This implies that  $W_1$  is a Weyl subgroup of  $W$ . We note that  $C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$  is the fundamental Weyl chamber corresponding to the action of  $W_1$  on  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ . We choose the positive roots in  $\Psi$  such that they are also positive in  $\Phi$ . Then  $C \subset C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ . Since  $W_1$  is a Weyl subgroup of  $W$ , by using the algorithm of Section 2.1, we can compute a set  $\{w_1, \dots, w_m\}$  of shortest length right coset representatives of  $W_1$  in  $W$ .

Now we have the following algorithm.

**Algorithm 10** Input: an admissible  $h \in C$ .

Output: the list of all normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples  $(h', e', f')$  with  $h' \in C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ , and such that  $h'$  is  $W$ -conjugate to  $h$ .

1. Set  $\mathcal{H} = \{w_i(h) \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ . (Here the  $w_i$  are the shortest length right coset representatives, as above.)
2. Set  $T = \emptyset$ . For each  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  we test whether  $h$  is normal using Algorithm 8. If this is the case then we find a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple containing  $h$ . We add it to  $T$ .
3. Return  $T$ .

**Proposition 11** *Algorithm 10 is correct.*

**Proof.** Note that by Lemma 2, the right coset representatives  $w_j$  are exactly the elements of  $W$  that map  $C$  into  $C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ . So  $\mathcal{H}$  is exactly the set of  $h' \in C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$  that are  $W$ -conjugate to  $h$ . From this set we take the normal elements.  $\square$

**Remark.** Note that it is straightforward to find an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple containing a normal element of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ . In fact, Algorithm 8 finds one.

The nilpotent  $G$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}$  have been classified in terms of so-called weighted Dynkin diagrams (see [5], [6]). From such a diagram it is straightforward to find a  $h \in C$  lying in an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$  (cf. [14]). This also implies that  $e$  is a representative of the corresponding nilpotent  $G$ -orbit. Let  $h_1, \dots, h_t$  denote the elements of  $C$  so obtained.

**Lemma 12** *Let  $h \in \mathfrak{h}_0$  be normal. Then there is a unique  $h_i$  such that  $h$  is  $W$ -conjugate to  $h_i$ .*

**Proof.** The  $h_i$  lie in  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples  $(h_i, e_i, f_i)$ . Let  $(h, e, f)$  be a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple. Then there is  $e_i$  such that  $e$  is  $G$ -conjugate to  $e_i$ . But that implies that the triples  $(h, e, f)$  and  $(h_i, e_i, f_i)$  are  $G$ -conjugate. Hence  $h$  and  $h_i$  are  $G$ -conjugate. Now two elements of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  are  $G$ -conjugate if and only if they are  $W$ -conjugate.  $\square$

Now we apply Algorithm 10 to each of the  $h_i$ , obtaining sets of  $T_i$ . Let  $T$  be their union. We claim that for each nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbit in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  the set  $T$  contains exactly one  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple

$(h, e, f)$  such that  $e$  is a representative of the orbit. Indeed, let  $e' \in \mathfrak{g}_1$  be nilpotent, lying in a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h', e', f')$ . Then  $h'$  is  $G_0$ -conjugate to an  $h'' \in \mathfrak{h}_0$  (as  $h'$  lies in a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ , which is  $G_0$ -conjugate to  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ ). By the previous lemma  $h''$  is  $W$ -conjugate to exactly one  $h_i$ . But by Lemma 9,  $h''$  is  $W_0$ -conjugate to a unique  $h \in C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ . Hence Proposition 11 implies that  $T_i$  contains an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$ . We conclude that  $T_i$  contains at least one  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$  such that  $h$  is  $G_0$ -conjugate to  $h'$ . If there were another one,  $(h_1, e_1, f_1)$ , then  $h$  and  $h_1$  would be  $G_0$ -conjugate, and since they both lie in  $C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ , they would be equal by Lemma 9.

**Remark.** The algorithm also works when  $\theta$  is an outer automorphism. However, in that case  $W_1$  is no longer a subgroup of  $W$ ; therefore in Algorithm 10, the set  $\mathcal{H}$  needs to be the intersection  $W \cdot h \cap C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ . The need to compute the entire orbit  $W \cdot h$  makes the algorithm much less efficient.

**Remark.** In [22] also a method based on computing the set  $\mathcal{H}$ , as in Algorithm 10 is developed. However, in order to decide whether a given  $h' \in C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$  is normal, a more complicated procedure is used.

## 4 Listing nilpotent orbits II

In this section we describe an algorithm for finding representatives of nilpotent orbits using Vinberg's theory of carrier algebras. Again we divide the section into various subsections. We recall that  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathfrak{g}_i$  is the grading of  $\mathfrak{g}$  relative to the automorphism  $\theta$ . Throughout we let  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  be a fixed Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . By  $W_0$  we denote the Weyl group of the root system of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  (relative to  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ ).

### 4.1 $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebras

We consider semisimple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebras  $\mathfrak{s}$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$ , where  $\mathfrak{s}_k \subset \mathfrak{g}_{k \bmod m}$ . The following terminology is used:

- $\mathfrak{s}$  is called *regular* if it is normalised by a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ .
- A regular  $\mathfrak{s}$  is called *standard* if it is normalised by  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ .
- A regular  $\mathfrak{s}$  is called *complete* if it is not a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra of a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded regular semisimple subalgebra of the same rank.
- $\mathfrak{s}$  is called *locally flat* if  $\dim \mathfrak{s}_0 = \dim \mathfrak{s}_1$ .

Let  $\mathfrak{s}$  be a standard  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded semisimple subalgebra. Then  $\mathfrak{s}$  is contained in a unique complete standard  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded semisimple subalgebra, of the same rank ([30], Proposition 3). We call it the *completion* of  $\mathfrak{s}$ .

Let  $e' \in \mathfrak{g}_1$  be nilpotent; then after replacing  $e'$  by a  $G_0$ -conjugate  $e$  we get that  $e$  lies in a complete standard locally flat  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra  $\mathfrak{s}$ , called the *carrier algebra* of  $e$ . Moreover,  $e \in \mathfrak{s}_1$  is in general position, which means that  $[\mathfrak{s}_0, e] = \mathfrak{s}_1$  ([30], Theorem 2).

Let  $e, e' \in \mathfrak{g}_0$  be nilpotent elements lying in carrier algebras  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}'$ . As  $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}'$  are normalised by  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ , their respective root systems  $\Psi, \Psi'$  are sets of weights of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ ; therefore,  $W_0$  acts on their elements. We have that  $e, e'$  are  $G_0$ -conjugate if and only if  $\Psi, \Psi'$  are  $W_0$ -conjugate ([30], Corollary to Theorem 2).

**Example 13** We consider the set up of Example 1. Let  $e = e_{2,3} + e_{3,1}$ . Let  $\mathfrak{s}_i$  for  $i = -2, -1, 0, 1, 2$  respectively be the spaces spanned by  $\{e_{1,2}\}$ ,  $\{e_{3,2}, e_{1,3}\}$ ,  $\{e_{1,1} - e_{3,3}, e_{2,2} - e_{3,3}\}$ ,  $\{e_{2,3}, e_{3,1}\}$ , and  $\{e_{2,1}\}$ . Then  $\mathfrak{s} = \mathfrak{s}_{-2} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{s}_2$  is the carrier algebra of  $e$ .

## 4.2 The completion

Let  $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  be a standard semisimple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra. Set  $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{h}_0 \cap \mathfrak{s}_0$ ; then  $\mathfrak{t}$  is a maximal torus in  $\mathfrak{s}_0$ . Indeed, if  $\mathfrak{t}$  could be enlarged to a bigger torus, then so could  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ , but the latter is a maximal torus in  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . It follows that  $\mathfrak{t}$  is a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{s}_0$ , and therefore of  $\mathfrak{s}$  (as  $\mathfrak{s}$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded). Let  $\Pi$  be a basis of simple roots of the root system of  $\mathfrak{s}$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{t}$ . Every root has a degree:  $\deg(\alpha) = k$  if  $\mathfrak{s}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{s}_k$ . We can choose  $\Pi$  so that  $\deg(\alpha) \geq 0$  for all  $\alpha \in \Pi$ . Furthermore, if  $\mathfrak{s}$  is locally flat then  $\deg(\alpha) \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $\alpha \in \Pi$  ([30], §4.2).

Let  $h_0 \in \mathfrak{t}$  be such that  $\alpha(h_0) = \deg(\alpha)$  for  $\alpha \in \Pi$ . Then

$$\mathfrak{s}_k = \{x \in \mathfrak{s} \mid [h_0, x] = kx\}.$$

Therefore,  $h_0$  is called a *defining element* of  $\mathfrak{s}$ . It is uniquely defined by the choice of  $\mathfrak{t}$  and  $\Pi$ .

Set

$$\mathfrak{z} = \{u \in \mathfrak{h}_0 \mid \alpha(u) = 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Pi\}. \quad (1)$$

Note that since  $\mathfrak{s}$  is regular, the elements of  $\Pi$  are weights of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ , in particular we can view  $\Pi$  as a subset of  $\mathfrak{h}_0^*$ . Therefore, the definition of  $\mathfrak{z}$  makes sense. Furthermore,  $\mathfrak{h}_0 = \mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{z}$ . Indeed,  $\mathfrak{t} \cap \mathfrak{z} = 0$ ,  $\dim \mathfrak{z} + \dim \mathfrak{t} = \dim \mathfrak{h}_0$ .

Now define the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra  $\mathfrak{u}$  by

$$\mathfrak{u}_k = \{x \in \mathfrak{g}_{k \bmod m} \mid [\mathfrak{z}, x] = 0 \text{ and } [h_0, x] = kx\}.$$

**Proposition 14**  $\mathfrak{u} = \mathfrak{s}' \oplus \mathfrak{z}$ , where  $\mathfrak{s}'$  is a standard complete  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra of the same rank as  $\mathfrak{s}$ , and containing  $\mathfrak{s}$ . In other words,  $\mathfrak{s}'$  is the completion of  $\mathfrak{s}$ .

**Proof.** (cf. [30], Proposition 2). Note that  $[\mathfrak{z}, \mathfrak{s}] = 0$ , and hence  $\mathfrak{s} \subset \mathfrak{u}$ . Furthermore,  $\mathfrak{t} \oplus \mathfrak{z}$  is also a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{u}_0$ . Hence the rank of  $\mathfrak{u}$  is equal to the rank of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . By [30], Lemma 2,  $\mathfrak{u}$  is reductive. Hence  $\mathfrak{z}$  is the centre of  $\mathfrak{u}$ . So  $\mathfrak{s}' = [\mathfrak{u}, \mathfrak{u}]$  is semisimple, contains  $\mathfrak{s}$ , and is of the same rank as  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Moreover, by [30], Proposition 1,  $\mathfrak{s}'$  is complete. Finally, as  $\mathfrak{h}_0 \subset \mathfrak{u}$ , also  $\mathfrak{s}'$  is standard.  $\square$

Now for the remainder of this section we suppose that the automorphism  $\theta$  is inner. Then  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  is also a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Therefore,  $\mathfrak{s}$  is spanned by root spaces of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . By  $\Phi$  we denote the root system of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with respect to  $\mathfrak{h}_0$ . Furthermore, for  $\alpha \in \Phi$ ,  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  will be the corresponding root space.

Set

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_0 &= \{\alpha \in \Phi \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{g}_0 \text{ and } \alpha(h_0) = 0, \alpha(\mathfrak{z}) = 0\}, \\ \Psi_1 &= \{\alpha \in \Phi \mid \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \text{ and } \alpha(h_0) = 1, \alpha(\mathfrak{z}) = 0\}.\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

Let  $\mathfrak{s}'$  be the completion of  $\mathfrak{s}$ . Then from Proposition 14 it follows that  $\mathfrak{s}'_0$  is the sum of  $\mathfrak{t}$  and the  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in \Psi_0$ . Also,  $\mathfrak{s}'_1$  is the sum of the  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  for  $\alpha \in \Psi_1$ . So  $\mathfrak{s}'$  is locally flat if and only if  $|\Pi| + |\Psi_0| = |\Psi_1|$ . Moreover,  $h_0$  is also a defining element of  $\mathfrak{s}'$ .

We summarise the above in the following algorithm. The input will be a basis of simple roots  $\Pi \subset \Phi$  of the root system of a standard semisimple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra  $\mathfrak{s}$ . We assume that  $\deg(\alpha) \in \{0, 1\}$  for  $\alpha \in \Pi$  and that we have given a decomposition  $\Pi = \Pi_0 \cup \Pi_1$ , where  $\Pi_i$  contains the roots of degree  $i$ . The output will be a defining element  $h_0$  of the completion  $\mathfrak{s}'$  if  $\mathfrak{s}'$  is locally flat. Otherwise the output will be **fail**. The algorithm takes the following steps:

1. Compute a basis of  $\mathfrak{t} = \mathfrak{h}_0 \cap \mathfrak{s}_0$ . (This can for instance be done by taking root vectors  $x_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ ,  $x_{-\alpha} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \in \Pi$ ; then  $\mathfrak{t}$  will be spanned by the  $[x_\alpha, x_{-\alpha}]$ .)
2. Compute  $h_0 \in \mathfrak{t}$ , with  $\alpha(h_0) = \deg(\alpha)$  for  $\alpha \in \Pi$ .
3. Compute a basis of  $\mathfrak{z} \subset \mathfrak{h}_0$ , where  $\mathfrak{z}$  is as in (1).
4. Compute  $\Psi_0$  and  $\Psi_1$ , as in (2).
5. If  $|\Pi| + |\Psi_0| \neq |\Psi_1|$  then return **fail**. Otherwise return  $h_0$ .

**Example 15** Let  $\mathfrak{g}$ ,  $\mathfrak{s}$  be as in Examples 1, 13. After some small calculations we get  $h_0 = -e_{1,1} + e_{1,2}$  and  $\mathfrak{z}$  is spanned by  $e_{1,1} + e_{2,2} + e_{3,3} - 3e_{4,4}$ . Using this it is straightforward to see that the completion of  $\mathfrak{s}$  is  $\mathfrak{s}$  itself.

### 4.3 Obtaining the nilpotent orbits

On the basis of what was said in the previous subsections we describe an algorithm for listing the nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . Also in this subsection we assume the automorphism  $\theta$  to be inner. Let  $\Phi_0$  (respectively,  $\Phi_1$ ) be the set of roots  $\alpha$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  such that  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$  (respectively,  $\subset \mathfrak{g}_1$ ). We note that  $\Phi_0$  is a root sub-system of  $\Phi$ . Let  $\Delta_0$  be a basis of simple roots of  $\Phi_0$ .

In the first step in our algorithm we obtain a set  $\mathcal{P}$  of  $\pi$ -systems (cf. Section 2.3) contained in  $\Phi_0 \cup \Phi_1$ . This set is required to contain, up to  $W_0$ -conjugacy, bases of the root systems of all locally flat, standard, semisimple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebras of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . However, the set may be bigger than necessary, i.e., it may include  $W_0$ -conjugate  $\pi$ -systems, and it

may have  $\pi$ -systems that are bases of root systems of  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebras that are not locally flat.

First we note the following. Let  $\Pi = \Pi_0 \cup \Pi_1$  be a basis of the root system of a standard semisimple  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Here  $\Pi_i \subset \Phi_i$  contains the roots of degree  $i$ . Then  $\Pi_0$  is a  $\pi$ -system in  $\Phi_0$ . This means that the following steps will produce a suitable list  $\mathcal{P}$ :

1. Use the algorithm in Section 2.3 to get the set  $\mathcal{P}_0$  of  $\pi$ -systems in  $\Phi_0$ , up to  $W_0$ -conjugacy.
2. For all  $\Pi_0 \in \mathcal{P}_0$  we find all maximal  $\Pi_1 \subset \Phi_1$  such that  $\Pi_0 \cup \Pi_1$  is a  $\pi$ -system. This yields a set  $\mathcal{P}'_1$  of  $\pi$ -systems in  $\Phi_0 \cup \Phi_1$ .
3. From  $\mathcal{P}'_1$  we erase  $W_0$ -conjugate copies (see Section 2.2), to get a set  $\mathcal{P}''_1$ .
4. Finally, set  $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$ . For all  $\Pi_0 \cup \Pi_1$  in  $\mathcal{P}''_1$  we add all  $\Pi_0 \cup \Pi'_1$  to  $\mathcal{P}$ , where  $\Pi'_1$  runs through the subsets of  $\Pi_1$ .

In the second step of our algorithm we find a list of normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triples corresponding to the nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . This step consists in running through the list  $\mathcal{P}$ , where for every  $\Pi_0 \cup \Pi_1$  we do the following. First we apply the algorithm of Section 4.2. If the result is **fail**, then we go to the next element of  $\mathcal{P}$ . Otherwise the result is a defining element  $h_0 \in \mathfrak{h}_0$  of the completion  $\mathfrak{s}'$  of the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded semisimple subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  with root system spanned by  $\Pi_0 \cup \Pi_1$ . Furthermore,  $\mathfrak{s}'$  is locally flat. As outlined in Section 4.1,  $\mathfrak{s}'$  corresponds to a nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbit in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . We obtain this orbit as follows. We observe that  $\tilde{h} = 2h_0$  is such that there is a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(\tilde{h}, \tilde{e}, \tilde{f})$ , where  $\tilde{e}$  is a representative of the orbit we are after ([30], §4.2). Using the notation of Section 3.3, we compute the unique  $h \in C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$  that is  $W_0$ -conjugate to  $\tilde{h}$ . There is a normal  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$ , where  $e$  lies in the orbit we are interested in. If the element  $h$  has not occurred before, then we find such an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple, and add it to our list. Otherwise, we go to the next element of  $\mathcal{P}$ .

**Remark.** On the algorithms of this section some variations are possible. Firstly, in the set  $\mathcal{P}$  we can erase all  $W_0$ -conjugate copies of  $\pi$ -systems, not just of the maximal ones. This yields a much smaller set, which makes the second step easier to execute. However, practical experiences show that this leads to a less efficient algorithm (i.e., there is much more work involved in checking  $W_0$ -conjugacy for all pairs of elements of  $\mathcal{P}$ , than in computing the elements  $h \in C_1 \oplus \mathfrak{r}$ ). The advantage of only checking the maximal  $\pi$ -systems for  $W_0$ -conjugacy, is that with each instance also a lot of subsystems are shown to be  $W_0$ -conjugate.

Secondly, the algorithm of Section 4.2 could just return the  $h_0$ , and not worry about flatness. In that case, if the corresponding graded subalgebra is not locally flat, then  $2h_0$  may not correspond to a nilpotent orbit. This can then be checked using the methods of Section 3. However, practical experience shows that this leads to a less efficient algorithm as well.

**Remark.** It is straightforward to extend the algorithm to outer automorphisms. Indeed, in that case,  $\Phi_0$  is the same as before, whereas  $\Phi_1$  becomes the set of weights of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ .

## 5 Practical experiences

The algorithms of this paper have been implemented in the language of GAP4. In this section we report on their running times on some sample inputs. As input we have taken a few N-regular automorphisms of the Lie algebra of type  $E_7$  (see Section 6). The running times are displayed in Table 1. The set  $\mathcal{H}$  is the union of all sets, denoted with the same letter, that occur in the first step of Algorithm 10 (recall that this algorithm is called several times). This means that  $\mathcal{H}$  is the set of all admissible elements of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  that are tested for normality. Secondly, the set  $\mathcal{P}$  is as in Section 4.3.

$ \theta $	Method I			Method II		$\dim \mathfrak{g}_0$	$\dim \mathfrak{g}_1$	# orbits
	$ W_1 \setminus W $	$ \mathcal{H} $	time	$ \mathcal{P} $	time			
2	72	721	41		$\infty$	63	70	94
3	672	4627	83	4227	529	43	45	75
4	4032	22939	475	4014	165	33	35	113
5	10080	52109	1650	2494	31	27	27	82
6	40320		$\infty$	4302	50	21	24	233

Table 1: Running times of the algorithms, with input an N-regular automorphism  $\theta$  of the Lie algebra of type  $E_7$ . The first column has the order of  $\theta$ . The next three columns display data relative to the algorithm of Section 3: the second column has the index of  $W_1$  in  $W$ , the third column has the size of  $\mathcal{H}$ , and the fourth column lists the time taken. The next two columns display data relative to the algorithm of Section 4: the fifth column has the size of the set  $\mathcal{P}$ , and the sixth column the total time taken. The last three columns list, respectively, the dimensions of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  and the total number of nilpotent orbits found. All running times are in seconds. An  $\infty$  indicates that the computation did not terminate within one hour.

From the Table we see that Method I behaves well when the dimension of the space  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  is big, because then the index of  $W_1$  in  $W$  is small, which results in far fewer admissible elements of  $\mathfrak{h}_0$  that need to be checked for normality. On the contrary, Method II behaves badly in that case, as the set  $\mathcal{P}$  gets too big. However, this method gets quickly better when the dimensions of the spaces  $\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1$  decrease. So indeed the two methods complement each other.



## 6 N-regular automorphisms

Let  $m \geq 2$  be an integer. By results of Antonyan and Panyushev (see [25]) there is a unique (up to conjugacy) inner automorphism of order  $m$  such that  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  contains a regular nilpotent element. For outer automorphisms a similar statement holds (see [25]). For the Lie algebra of type  $E_6$  this means that if there are outer automorphisms of order  $m$ , then there is exactly one (up to conjugacy) such that  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  contains a regular nilpotent element.

Automorphisms such that  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  contains a regular nilpotent elements are called *N-regular*. These N-regular automorphisms have a number of special properties (see [25]), but it is not immediately obvious which inner automorphisms are N-regular.

By using the algorithms of the previous sections we can find the N-regular automorphisms of order  $m$ . Indeed, we can list representatives of all conjugacy classes of inner automorphisms of order  $m$ . For each element of the list we obtain the nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . In particular, we find representatives of these orbits. By computing their weighted Dynkin diagrams we check whether a regular nilpotent element occurs among them (we refer to [15] for an algorithm to compute weighted Dynkin diagrams).

In Tables 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 we give the Kac diagrams of the N-regular inner automorphisms of the Lie algebras of exceptional type, of orders between 2 and  $h - 1$  (where  $h$  is the Coxeter number). Furthermore, Table 3 contains the Kac-diagrams of N-regular outer automorphisms of the Lie algebra of type  $E_6$ . These Kac diagrams are extended Dynkin diagrams with labels that define the automorphism. It turns out that in our tables only the labels 0 and 1 occur. Therefore, we give the Kac diagram by colouring the nodes of the extended Dynkin diagram. A black node has label 1, a non-black node has label 0.

The contents of the tables are as follows: the first column contains the order of the N-regular automorphism, and the second column its Kac diagram. The third column lists the number of nilpotent orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . Let  $\mathcal{N}$  denote the variety of all nilpotent elements in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . It is known ([19], [30]) that  $\mathcal{N}$  splits in irreducible components  $\mathcal{N}_i$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . The component  $\mathcal{N}_i$  is the closure of an orbit  $G_0e_i$ , where  $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}_1$  is nilpotent, such that the orbit  $G_0e_i$  is of maximal possible dimension. Therefore, all components are of the same dimension, and we can compute the  $e_i$  as follows. First we list representatives of all nilpotent orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ . Let  $e$  be such a representative; then the dimension of its orbit is equal to the dimension of  $[\mathfrak{g}_0, e]$ . Hence, by simple linear algebra, we can compute the dimension of each orbit. The  $e_i$  are then the representatives of the orbits of maximal dimension. In particular, we get the number of irreducible components, and their dimension. That is the content of the fourth and fifth column. The last column displays the rank of  $\mathfrak{g}_1$ , that is the codimension of a nilpotent orbit of maximal dimension. (It is also the dimension of a Cartan subspace, cf. [29]).

When the order of  $\theta$  is 2, then all nilpotent orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  of maximal dimension are conjugated in the group  $G$  ([19], Theorem 6). A similar statement fails to hold for larger orders. Following [24], we say that an N-regular automorphism for which all nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbits in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  of maximal dimension lie in the same  $G$ -orbit, is *very N-regular*. We checked which  $\theta$  are very N-regular by computing the weighted Dynkin diagrams of the orbits  $Ge_i$ , where  $G_0e_i$  is a nilpotent  $G_0$ -orbit in  $\mathfrak{g}_1$  of maximal dimension. If  $\theta$  is *not* very N-regular

then the number in the fourth column has an added \*. The situation where  $\mathcal{N}$  has more than one component, and  $\theta$  is very N-regular, appears to occur very rarely.

**Remark.** There is also a more direct method for constructing the N-regular inner automorphisms of order  $m$  (cf. [1]). Let  $e \in \mathfrak{g}$  be a regular nilpotent element lying in an  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple  $(h, e, f)$ . Since  $e$  is even, all eigenvalues of  $\text{ad}_{\mathfrak{g}}h$  are even integers. Let

$$\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(2k)$$

be the grading of  $\mathfrak{g}$  into  $\text{ad}_{\mathfrak{g}}h$ -eigenspaces. For  $0 \leq i \leq m - 1$  let  $\mathfrak{g}_i$  be the sum of all  $\mathfrak{g}(2k)$  such that  $k \bmod m = i$ . Then  $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathfrak{g}_i$  is the grading of  $\mathfrak{g}$  corresponding to an N-regular automorphism of order  $m$ . It is inner as  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  contains a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . Some work is still needed to obtain the Kac diagram from the grading.

Table 2: N-regular inner automorphisms of  $E_6$ .

order	Kac diagram	# orbits	# components	dim	rank
2		37	1	36	4
3		62	3	24	3
4		43	3*	18	2
5		60	1	15	1
6		133	9*	12	2
7		53	1	11	0
8		70	4*	9	1

<i>N</i> -regular automorphisms of $E_6$ .					
9		118	$6^*$	8	1
10		79	1	8	0
11		63	1	7	0

Table 3: *N*-regular outer automorphisms of  $E_6$ .













order	Kac diagram	# orbits	# components	dim	rank
2		23	1	36	6
4		20	1	18	2
6		34	$5^*$	12	3
8		22	$3^*$	9	1
10		25	$2^*$	8	1
12		30	$4^*$	6	1
14		19	1	6	0
16		15	1	5	0














Table 4: *N*-regular inner automorphisms of  $E_7$ .

order	Kac diagram	# orbits	# components	dim	rank
2		94	2	63	7
3		75	1	42	3
4		113	1	33	2

<i>N</i> -regular automorphisms of $E_7$ .					
5		82	1	26	1
6		233	10*	21	3
7		112	3*	18	1
8		163	2*	17	1
9		132	4*	14	1
10		199	4*	13	1
11		99	1	12	0
12		217	5*	11	1
13		111	1	10	0
14		238	7*	9	1
15		159	1	9	0
16		159	1	9	0
17		127	1	8	0

Table 5: N-regular inner automorphisms of  $E_8$ .

order	Kac diagram	# orbits	# components	dim	rank
2		115	1	120	8
3		101	1	80	4
4		144	2*	60	4
5		105	1	48	2
6		270	7*	40	4
7		144	1	35	1
8		219	2*	30	2
9		206	2*	28	1
10		300	7*	24	2
11		167	1	23	0
12		398	10*	20	2
13		165	1	19	0

<i>N</i> -regular automorphisms of $E_8$ .					
14		333	4*	18	1
15		354	5*	16	1
16		264	1	16	0
17		179	1	15	0
18		397	5*	14	1
19		199	1	13	0
20		438	7*	12	1
21		287	1	12	0
22		319	1	12	0
23		233	1	11	0
24		478	8*	10	1
25		319	1	10	0
26		319	1	10	0

N-regular automorphisms of $E_8$ .					
27		319	1	10	0
28		319	1	10	0
29		255	1	9	0

Table 6: N-regular inner automorphisms of  $F_4$ .

order	Kac diagram	# orbits	# components	dim	rank
2		26	1	24	4
3		19	1	16	2
4		29	3*	12	2
5		15	1	11	0
6		35	6*	8	2
7		13	1	7	0
8		30	4*	6	1
9		19	1	6	0
10		19	1	6	0
11		15	1	5	0

Table 7: N-regular inner automorphisms of  $G_2$ .

order	Kac diagram	# orbits	# components	dim	rank
2		5	1	6	2
3		6	2*	4	1
4		4	1	4	0
5		3	1	3	0

## References

- [1] L. V. Antonyan. Homogeneous nilpotent elements of periodically graded semisimple Lie algebras. In *Problems in group theory and homological algebra (Russian)*, Matem-

- atika, pages 55–64. Yaroslav. Gos. Univ., Yaroslavl', 1987.
- [2] L. V. Antonyan and A. G. Èlashvili. Classification of spinors of dimension sixteen. *Trudy Tbiliss. Mat. Inst. Razmadze Akad. Nauk Gruzin. SSR*, 70:5–23, 1982.
  - [3] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust. The Magma algebra system. I. The user language. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 24(3-4):235–265, 1997. Computational algebra and number theory (London, 1993).
  - [4] N. Bourbaki. *Groupes et Algèbres de Lie, Chapitre I*. Hermann, Paris, 1971.
  - [5] R. W. Carter. *Finite Groups of Lie Type, conjugacy classes and complex characters*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester, 1985.
  - [6] David H. Collingwood and William M. McGovern. *Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras*. Van Nostrand Reinhold Mathematics Series. Van Nostrand Reinhold Co., New York, 1993.
  - [7] Matthew Dyer. Reflection subgroups of Coxeter systems. *J. Algebra*, 135(1):57–73, 1990.
  - [8] E. B. Dynkin. Semisimple subalgebras of semisimple Lie algebras. *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.*, 6:111–244, 1957.
  - [9] L. Yu. Galitski and D. A. Timashev. On classification of metabelian Lie algebras. *J. of Lie Theory*, 9:125–156, 1999.
  - [10] The GAP Group. *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.4*, 2004. (`\protect\vrule width0pt\protect\href{http://www.gap-system.org}{http://www.gap-syst`
  - [11] Meinolf Geck, Gerhard Hiss, Frank Lübeck, Gunter Malle, and Götz Pfeiffer. CHEVIE—a system for computing and processing generic character tables. *Appl. Algebra Engrg. Comm. Comput.*, 7(3):175–210, 1996. Computational methods in Lie theory (Essen, 1994).
  - [12] W. A. de Graaf. *Lie Algebras: Theory and Algorithms*, volume 56 of *North-Holland Mathematical Library*. Elsevier Science, 2000.
  - [13] W. A. de Graaf. SLA - computing with Simple Lie Algebras. a GAP package, 2009. (`\protect\vrule width0pt\protect\href{http://science.unitn.it/~string~degraaf/sla.ht`
  - [14] Willem A. de Graaf. Computing with nilpotent orbits in simple Lie algebras of exceptional type. *LMS J. Comput. Math.*, 11:280–297 (electronic), 2008.
  - [15] Willem A. de Graaf and Alexander G. Elashvili. Induced nilpotent orbits of the simple Lie algebras of exceptional type. *Georgian Mathematical Journal*, 16(2):257–278, 2009. `arXiv:0905.2743v1[math.RT]`.



- [16] Sigurdur Helgason. *Differential geometry, Lie groups, and symmetric spaces*, volume 80 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers], New York, 1978.
- [17] N. Jacobson. *Lie Algebras*. Dover, New York, 1979.
- [18] V. G. Kac. Automorphisms of finite order of semisimple Lie algebras. *Funkcional. Anal. i Priložen.*, 3(3):94–96, 1969.
- [19] B. Kostant and S. Rallis. Orbits and representations associated with symmetric spaces. *Amer. J. Math.*, 93:753–809, 1971.
- [20] P. Littelmann. An effective method to classify nilpotent orbits. In *Algorithms in algebraic geometry and applications (Santander, 1994)*, volume 143 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 255–269. Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996.
- [21] M. Lorente and B. Gruber. Classification of semisimple subalgebras of simple Lie algebras. *J. Mathematical Phys.*, 13:1639–1663, 1972.
- [22] Dragomir Ž. Đoković. Classification of nilpotent elements in simple exceptional real Lie algebras of inner type and description of their centralizers. *J. Algebra*, 112(2):503–524, 1988.
- [23] Dragomir Ž. Đoković. Classification of nilpotent elements in simple real Lie algebras  $E_{6(6)}$  and  $E_{6(-26)}$  and description of their centralizers. *J. Algebra*, 116(1):196–207, 1988.
- [24] Dmitri I. Panyushev. Periodic automorphisms of Takiff algebras, contractions, and  $\theta$ -groups. [arXiv:0710.2113v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/0710.2113v1) [math.RT].
- [25] Dmitri I. Panyushev. On invariant theory of  $\theta$ -groups. *J. Algebra*, 283(2):655–670, 2005.
- [26] D. D. Pervushin. Invariants and orbits of the standard  $(\mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbf{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_4(\mathbf{C}) \times \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbf{C}))$ -module. *Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat.*, 64(5):133–146, 2000. English translation in *Izv. Math.* 64 (2000), no. 5, 1003–1015.
- [27] V. L. Popov. The cone of Hilbert null forms. *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova*, 241(Teor. Chisel, Algebra i Algebr. Geom.):192–209, 2003.
- [28] È. B. Vinberg. The classification of nilpotent elements of graded Lie algebras. *Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR*, 225(4):745–748, 1975.
- [29] È. B. Vinberg. The Weyl group of a graded Lie algebra. *Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat.*, 40(3):488–526, 709, 1976. English translation: *Math. USSR-Izv.* 10, 463–495 (1976).

- [30] È. B. Vinberg. Classification of homogeneous nilpotent elements of a semisimple graded Lie algebra. *Trudy Sem. Vektor. Tenzor. Anal.*, (19):155–177, 1979. English translation: *Selecta Math. Sov.* 6, 15-35 (1987).
- [31] È. B. Vinberg and A. G. Èlašvili. A classification of the three-vectors of nine-dimensional space. *Trudy Sem. Vektor. Tenzor. Anal.*, 18:197–233, 1978. English translation: *Selecta Math. Sov.*, 7, 63-98, (1988).