

REPRESENTATIONS OF WEAKLY TRIANGULAR CATEGORIES

MENGMENG GAO, HEBING RUI, LINLIANG SONG

ABSTRACT. A new class of locally unital and locally finite dimensional algebras A over an arbitrary algebraically closed field is discovered. Each of them admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition, a generalization of an upper finite triangular decomposition. Any locally unital algebra which admits an upper finite Cartan decomposition is Morita equivalent to some special locally unital algebra A which admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition. It is established that the category $A\text{-lfdmod}$ of locally finite dimensional left A -modules is an upper finite fully stratified category in the sense of Brundan-Stroppel. Moreover, A is semisimple if and only if its centralizer subalgebras associated to certain idempotent elements are semisimple. Furthermore, certain endofunctors are defined and give categorical actions of some Lie algebras on the subcategory of $A\text{-lfdmod}$ consisting of all objects which have a finite standard filtration. In the case A is the locally unital algebra associated to one of cyclotomic oriented Brauer categories, cyclotomic Brauer categories and cyclotomic Kauffman categories, A admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition. This leads to categorifications of representations of the classical limits of coideal algebras, which come from all integrable highest weight modules of \mathfrak{sl}_∞ or $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$. Finally, we study representations of A associated to either cyclotomic Brauer categories or cyclotomic Kauffman categories in details, including explicit criteria on the semisimplicity of A over an arbitrary field, and on $A\text{-lfdmod}$ being upper finite highest weight category in the sense of Brundan-Stroppel, and on Morita equivalence between A and direct sum of infinitely many (degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Upper finite weakly triangular categories	4
2.1. Upper finite weakly triangular decompositions	4
2.2. Cyclotomic oriented Brauer categories	4
2.3. Quotient algebras	6
3. Upper finite fully stratified categories	7
3.1. Standardization and costandardization functors	7
3.2. Stratified categories and highest weight categories	9
3.3. Duality	11
3.4. Semisimplicity	12
4. Weakly cellular bases	12
5. Endofunctors and categorical actions	15
5.1. Assumptions	16
5.2. Endofunctors	16
5.3. Characters	20
5.4. Categorical actions on $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$	21
5.5. Block decomposition	22
6. Cyclotomic Brauer categories and cyclotomic Kauffman categories	23
6.1. (Degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras	23
6.2. Representations of cyclotomic Brauer categories	25
6.3. Representations of cyclotomic Kauffman categories	28
6.4. Blocks	31
References	31

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout the paper, \mathbb{k} is an arbitrary algebraically closed field. All algebras, categories and functors will be assumed to be \mathbb{k} -linear.

Motivated by attempting to categorify representations of the classical limits of coideal algebras, which come from all integrable highest weight modules of \mathfrak{sl}_∞ or $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ by using representations of cyclotomic Brauer categories $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ and cyclotomic Kauffman categories $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ [24, 44], we investigate a locally unital algebra A which admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition in this paper. This work is also influenced by Brundan-Stroppel's work in [18]. A notion of an upper finite fully stratified category was introduced in [18] in the study of representations of locally unital and locally finite dimensional algebras. If a locally unital algebra is an upper finite based stratified algebra, then the category $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category [18]. Conversely, an upper finite fully stratified category with tilting-rigid property can be realized as $A\text{-lfdmod}$ for some upper finite based stratified algebra A . Introduced by Brundan and Stroppel, an upper finite Cartan decomposition of a locally unital algebra is a generalization of an upper finite triangular decomposition [18, 47]. It is important that a locally unital algebra with an upper finite Cartan decomposition is an upper finite based stratified algebra [18] although it is not easy to verify that an algebra has an upper finite Cartan decomposition in certain cases. The notion of upper finite weakly triangular decomposition given in this paper is another generalization of an upper finite triangular decomposition. While it is not clear to us whether an algebra A coming from $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$, $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ or cyclotomic oriented Brauer categories $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ [14] admits an upper finite Cartan decomposition, it is rather easy to verify that such A does admit an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition (see Propositions 2.2, 6.3, 6.6). Our first main result is that $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category if A is a locally unital algebra which admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition (see Theorem 3.10). The second main result is that a locally unital algebra A which admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition is semisimple if and only if its centralizer subalgebras associated to certain idempotent elements are semisimple (see Theorem 3.15). As applications, we study the locally unital algebras associated to $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$, $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ or $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$. When A comes from either $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ or $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$, we classify irreducible A -modules and show that $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite highest weight category in the sense of Brundan-Stroppel if all the (degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras are semisimple. Furthermore, an explicit sufficient condition is given for A being Morita equivalent to direct sum of infinitely many (degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras. Finally we give an explicit criterion for A being semisimple over an arbitrary field. The last main result is on categorifications of representations of the classical limits of coideal algebras, which come from all integrable highest weight modules of \mathfrak{sl}_∞ or $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ by using representations of $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ (see Theorems 6.5, 6.8).

Now, we discuss the contents of this paper in details. For any small finite dimensional \mathbb{k} -linear category \mathcal{A} , one often replaces \mathcal{A} with its associated locally unital algebra

$$A = \bigoplus_{a,b \in \text{ob } \mathcal{A}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, b), \quad (1.1)$$

whose representations are equivalent to those for \mathcal{A} . Brundan and Stroppel considered A which admits an upper finite Cartan decomposition [18, Definition 5.23]. In this case, A has three subspaces A^\flat , A° and A^\sharp satisfying certain axioms. The key point is that A° is a locally unital subalgebra of A and A^\flat (resp., A^\sharp) is projective right (resp., left) A° -module. Many \mathbb{k} -linear categories come into their theory. Archetypal examples include the Brauer category [31, 45], the oriented Brauer category [14], the oriented skein category [13] and those triangular categories in [47]. All locally unital algebras associated to these categories admit upper finite triangular decompositions.

On the other hand, when $q \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ is not a root of unity, the category of right modules for the Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebra [11] shares similar properties to those for the Brauer algebra [12] over \mathbb{C} . See [20, 41] on the classification of blocks for these algebras. Since the Brauer category (resp., Kauffman category [48]) is the category version of Brauer (resp., Birman-Murakami-Wenzl) algebras, it is natural to expect that $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is also an upper finite fully stratified category where A is associated to the Kauffman category. In fact, it is the case. However, it is not clear to us whether A admits an upper finite Cartan decomposition although A has three similar subspaces.

We introduce the notion of an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition for a locally unital algebra A in Definition 2.1. In this case, we have three subspaces A^-, A° and A^+ and we do not assume that A° is a subalgebra! Any locally unital algebra which admits an upper finite triangular

decomposition has an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition. However, the converse is not true in general since A° may not be a subalgebra!

Influenced by Brundan-Stroppel's work in [18], we consider a class of quotient algebras A_{\prec_a} of A such that each A_{\prec_a} still admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition and $A_{\prec_a}\bar{1}_a$ (resp., $\bar{1}_a A_{\prec_a}$) is a projective right (resp., left) \bar{A}_a -module in general (see Definition 2.9 and Lemma 3.2). This leads us to construct exact tensor functors and exact hom functors from $\bar{A}_a\text{-fdmod}$ to $A_{\prec_a}\text{-lfdmod}$ and hence to $A\text{-lfdmod}$, where $\bar{A}_a\text{-fdmod}$ is the category of all finite dimensional left \bar{A}_a -modules. Such functors are called standardization functors and costandardization functors in the sense of [33]. Consequently, we are able to prove that $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category if A admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition. This result has its own interests and important applications elsewhere. For example, we show in [25] that the representations of $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ with suitably chosen parameters can be used to give tensor product categorifications (in the general sense of Losev-Webster [33]) of integrable lowest weight and integrable highest weight representations for the Lie algebra \mathfrak{sl}_∞ or $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_p$ introduced by Webster in [49]. When $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$, such a result was expected by Brundan et. al in [14, page 77].

After proving that $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category, we consider its subcategory $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ consisting of all objects with a finite standard filtration. We focus on the locally unital algebras A which come from certain quotients of two kinds of strict monoidal categories, say \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 in section 5. Under some mild assumptions, we are able to prove that there is a short exact sequence of exact functors from the category $\bar{A}^\circ\text{-fdmod}$ to the category $A\text{-lfdmod}$ in (5.22), where \bar{A}° is the direct sum of all possible \bar{A}_a 's. Consequently, there is a categorical \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -action on $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ if we assume that there is a categorical \mathfrak{g} -action on the category $\bar{A}^\circ\text{-pmod}$ of finite generated projective modules for some Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g} , where \mathfrak{g}^\sharp is a suitable Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . In other words, $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ can be used to categorify certain representations of \mathfrak{g}^\sharp . In particular, when \mathcal{C}_1 (resp., \mathcal{C}_2) is the affine Brauer category (resp., affine Kauffman category), A comes from $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ (resp., $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$). In this case, \mathfrak{g} is the direct sum of certain \mathfrak{sl}_∞ or $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ for some positive integer e . Such a result can be regarded as categorifications related to cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras [36] and cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras [5]. When $\mathfrak{g}^\sharp = \mathfrak{g}$, the category $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is Morita equivalent to the direct sum of categories of left modules for infinitely many (degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras. However, the most interesting case is $\mathfrak{g}^\sharp \neq \mathfrak{g}$. In this case, $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}^\sharp)$ is (the infinite rank limit of) the quantum symmetric pair (in the sense of Letzter [32] in the finite type or Kolb [30] in the Kac-Moody setting) at the limit q to 1. Using the \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -action on $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ as above, it is possible to connect deeper representations (decomposition numbers, etc.) of cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras and cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras over the complex field \mathbb{C} to the Kazhdan-Lusztig theory (ι -canonical basis, etc.) of certain \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -modules studied in [6–10]. This is a project in progress.

Thanks to the results on the semisimplicity of cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras and cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras in [38, 39, 42], we are able to give an explicit criterion on the semisimplicity of A associated to $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$. In the non-semisimple case, blocks of A are determined. In particular, when the (degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras are semisimple and $\text{char } \mathbb{k} \neq 2$, we use results on the classification of blocks for cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras and cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras in [40, 41] to classify blocks of A completely. In this case, $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite highest weight category in the sense of [18].

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we introduce the notion of an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition for a locally unital \mathbb{k} -algebra. As an example, we prove that $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ admits this structure. In section 3, we give a systematic understanding of $A\text{-lfdmod}$ if A admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition. In particular, we prove that $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category in the sense of Brundan-Stroppel. We also give a criterion on the semisimplicity of A . Weakly cellular structures of centralizer subalgebras of A will be given in section 4 under the assumption (3.7). Using truncation functors, we establish an explicit relationship between $A\text{-lfdmod}$ and representations of all centralizer subalgebras of A . In section 5, we investigate properties of certain endofunctors on $A\text{-lfdmod}$. This gives a categorical \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -action on $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$. In section 6, we apply general theory in sections 2-5 to study representations of $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ and $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ and categorify those representations of the classical limits of coideal algebras, which come from all integrable highest weight modules of \mathfrak{sl}_∞ or $\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$.

2. UPPER FINITE WEAKLY TRIANGULAR CATEGORIES

In this paper, \mathcal{A} is a small finite dimensional \mathbb{k} -linear category whose object set is J . Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, b) < \infty,$$

for all $a, b \in J$. Assume that there is an equivalence relation \sim on J such that each equivalence class contains finitely many objects. Define

$$I = J / \sim, \quad (2.1)$$

the set of all equivalence classes of J . For any $\mathbf{a} \in I$, let

$$1_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{b \in \mathbf{a}} 1_b, \quad (2.2)$$

where 1_b is the identity morphism in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(b, b)$. When each equivalence class contains a unique object, I can be identified with J . In this case, we replace each equivalence class by the object in it.

The \mathbb{k} -algebra A associated to \mathcal{A} is given in (1.1), where the multiplication is induced by the composition of morphisms in \mathcal{A} . For any subspace $B \subseteq A$ and any $a, b \in J$, let $B_{a,b} = 1_a B 1_b$. Similarly, let $B_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} = \bigoplus_{c \in \mathbf{a}, d \in \mathbf{b}} 1_c B 1_d$ for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in I$. Then $B_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}} = 1_{\mathbf{a}} B 1_{\mathbf{b}}$. When $b = a$ (resp., $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$), $B_{a,b}$ (resp., $B_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}$) is denoted by B_a (resp., $B_{\mathbf{a}}$). Then $A_{a,b} = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(b, a)$ and

$$A = \bigoplus_{a,b \in J} A_{a,b}. \quad (2.3)$$

So, A is a locally unital and locally finite dimensional \mathbb{k} -algebra, and the set $\{1_a \mid a \in J\}$ serves as the system of mutually orthogonal idempotents of A . Conversely, any locally unital and locally finite dimensional algebra can be obtained in this way [15, Remark 2.1].

2.1. Upper finite weakly triangular decompositions. Let A be given in (2.3).

Definition 2.1. The data (I, A^-, A°, A^+) is called a *weakly triangular decomposition* of A if:

- (W1) (I, \preceq) is a poset, where I is given in (2.1).
- (W2) A^\diamond are subspaces (not subalgebras!) of A , where $\diamond \in \{\pm, \circ\}$. Moreover, $A^\pm = \bigoplus_{b,c \in J} A_{b,c}^\pm$ and $A^\circ = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{a} \in I} \bigoplus_{b,c \in \mathbf{a}} A_{b,c}^\circ$.
- (W3) $A_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^- = 0$ and $A_{\mathbf{b},\mathbf{a}}^+ = 0$ unless $\mathbf{a} \preceq \mathbf{b}$. Furthermore, $A_{\mathbf{a}}^- = A_{\mathbf{a}}^+ = \bigoplus_{c \in \mathbf{a}} \mathbb{k}1_c$.
- (W4) $A^- \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} A^\circ \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} A^+ \cong A$ as \mathbb{k} -spaces where $\mathbb{k} = \bigoplus_{b \in J} \mathbb{k}1_b$. The required isomorphism is given by the multiplication on A .

Following [18], (I, \preceq) is upper finite if $\{\mathbf{b} \in I \mid \mathbf{a} \preceq \mathbf{b}\}$ is finite for all $\mathbf{a} \in I$. We call (I, A^-, A°, A^+) an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition if (I, \preceq) is upper finite. In this case, the category \mathcal{A} is called an upper finite weakly triangular category and the algebra A is said to admit an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition. Furthermore, if $I = J$, A^- , A° , A^+ , A^-A° and $A^\circ A^+$ are locally unital subalgebras of A , then A admits a *triangular decomposition* in the sense of [18, Definition 5.24]. The algebra A associated to a triangular category in [47, Definition 4.2] admits an upper finite triangular decomposition. Furthermore, A° is assumed to be semisimple in [47]. Any triangular decomposition is a weakly triangular decomposition and the converse is not true in general since A° may not be a subalgebra. Similar reason shows that a weakly triangular decomposition may not be a Cartan decomposition in the sense of Brundan-Stroppel [18]. Archetypal examples on upper finite weakly triangular categories are triangular categories in [47] together with cyclotomic Brauer categories [44], cyclotomic Kauffman categories [24] and cyclotomic oriented Brauer categories [14]. However, it is not clear to us whether A admits either an upper finite triangular decomposition or an upper finite Cartan decomposition if A comes from one of cyclotomic Brauer categories, cyclotomic Kauffman categories and cyclotomic oriented Brauer categories.

2.2. Cyclotomic oriented Brauer categories. Fix $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{k}^m$ where m is any fixed positive integer. Let $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ be the cyclotomic oriented Brauer category associated to the polynomial $f(t) = \prod_{i=1}^m (t - u_i)$ (denoted by $\mathcal{OB}^f(\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_m)$ in [14]). The objects in $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ are given by


$$J = \langle \uparrow, \downarrow \rangle, \quad (2.4)$$

the set of all finite sequences of the symbols \uparrow, \downarrow , including the empty word \emptyset . In order to explain that $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ is an upper finite weakly triangular category, we need a basis of any morphism space in $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ [14].

We begin by recalling an (a, b) -Brauer diagram [31, Definition 2.1] for any $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$. It is a diagram on which $a + b$ points are placed on two parallel horizontal lines, and a points on the lower line and b points on the upper line, and each point joins precisely to one other point. If two points at the upper (resp., lower) line join each other, then this strand is called a cup (resp., cap). Otherwise, it is called a vertical strand.

Any (a, b) -Brauer diagram can also be considered as a partitioning of the set $\{1, 2, \dots, a + b\}$ (hence there is no (a, b) -Brauer diagram if $a + b$ is odd). Two (a, b) -Brauer diagrams are said to be equivalent if they give the same partitioning of $\{1, 2, \dots, a + b\}$.

An oriented Brauer diagram is obtained by adding consistent orientation to each strand in a Brauer diagram as above. Given any oriented Brauer diagram d , let a (resp., b) be the element in J which is indicated from the orientation of the endpoints of the lower line (resp., upper line) and d is called of type $a \rightarrow b$. For example, the following diagram is of type $\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow \rightarrow \downarrow\uparrow$:



Two oriented Brauer diagrams of type $a \rightarrow b$ are said to be equivalent if their underlying Brauer diagrams are equivalent.

A dotted oriented Brauer diagram of type $a \rightarrow b$ is a oriented Brauer diagram of type $a \rightarrow b$ such that there are finitely many \bullet 's (called dots) on each strand. A normally ordered dotted oriented Brauer diagram of type $a \rightarrow b$ is a dotted oriented Brauer diagram of type $a \rightarrow b$ such that:

- whenever a dot appears on a strand, it is on the outward-pointing boundary,
- there are at most $m - 1$ dots on each strand.

Suppose $m = 4$. The right one is a normally ordered dotted oriented Brauer diagram of type $\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow \rightarrow \downarrow\uparrow$ and the left one is not:



where $\bullet 3$ represents that there are three \bullet 's on the outward-pointing boundary of this strand. Two normally ordered dotted oriented Brauer diagrams are said to be equivalent if the underlying oriented Brauer diagrams are equivalent and there are the same number of dots on their corresponding strands. Let $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}_{a,b}$ be the set of all equivalence classes of normally ordered dotted oriented Brauer diagrams of type $a \rightarrow b$. Thanks to [14, Theorem 1.5], $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u})}(a, b)$ has basis given by $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}_{a,b}$ and two equivalent diagrams represent the same morphism in $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u})$. So, each equivalence class can be identified with any element in it. Let $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} = \bigcup_{a,b \in J} \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}_{a,b}$.

Proposition 2.2. *The cyclotomic oriented Brauer category $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u})$ is an upper finite weakly triangular category.*

Proof. Let A be the algebra associated to $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u})$. Suppose $a = a_1 a_2 \cdots a_h$, where $a_i \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$, $1 \leq i \leq h$. Define $\ell_{\downarrow}(a) = |\{i : a_i = \downarrow\}|$ and $\ell_{\uparrow}(a) = |\{i : a_i = \uparrow\}|$, where $|D|$ is the cardinality of a set D . When $h = 0$, i.e., a is the empty word, $\ell_{\downarrow}(a) = \ell_{\uparrow}(a) = 0$. For any $a, b \in J$, write $a \sim b$ if $(\ell_{\uparrow}(a), \ell_{\downarrow}(a)) = (\ell_{\uparrow}(b), \ell_{\downarrow}(b))$. Then \sim is an equivalence relation on J . As sets, $\mathbb{N}^2 \cong J / \sim$. For the data in (W1), define

$$I = \mathbb{N}^2 \text{ and } (r, s) \preceq (r_1, s_1) \text{ if } r = r_1 + k \text{ and } s = s_1 + k \text{ for some } k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (2.5)$$

Obviously, (I, \preceq) is upper finite. For the data in (W2), define

- A^- : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of elements in $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}$ on which there are neither caps nor crossings among vertical strands and there are no dots on vertical strands.
- A° : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of elements in $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}$ on which there are neither cups nor caps.
- A^+ : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of elements in $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}$ on which there are neither cups nor crossings among vertical strands and there are no dots on vertical strands.

Obviously, $\{1_a\} = \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A_a^- = \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A_a^+$, where 1_a is defined in an obvious way. For example, if $a = \uparrow\uparrow\downarrow$, then

$$1_a = \uparrow \uparrow \downarrow$$

By the definitions of A^\pm in (a) and (c), $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A_{a,b}^- = \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A_{b,a}^+ = \emptyset$ if $(\ell_\uparrow(a), \ell_\downarrow(a)) \not\preceq (\ell_\uparrow(b), \ell_\downarrow(b))$. Moreover, $A_{b,c}^\pm = 0$ if $b \sim c$ and $b \neq c$. So, (W3) follows.

For any $(g, h, k) \in (\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A^{-1}b, \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A_{b,c}^\circ, \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap 1_c A^+)$, the composition $g \circ h \circ k$ is not normally ordered in general, i.e., the dots on the vertical strands may not be on the outward-pointing boundary. For example:

$$g \circ h \circ k = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array}$$

if $(g, h, k) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \downarrow \\ \downarrow \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array} \right)$. Thanks to [14, Theorem 1.5], $\mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}(\mathbf{u})$ is a quotient category of the affine oriented Brauer category $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}$, a \mathbb{k} -linear strict monoidal category. By the defining relations of $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{O}\mathcal{B}$ in [14, (1.10)], one has

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ \uparrow \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \curvearrowright \text{---} \\ \text{---} \curvearrowleft \text{---} \end{array}. \quad (2.6)$$

and (2.6) explain how to move dots pass crossings in any diagram [14, page 81]. Consequently, dots can be slid freely up to a linear combination of some elements in $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}$ with fewer dots. This shows that the multiplication map from $A^- \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} A^\circ \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} A^+$ to A sends any basis element $g \otimes h \otimes k$, $(g, h, k) \in (\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A^{-1}b, \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap A_{b,c}^\circ, \mathbb{O}\mathbb{B} \cap 1_c A^+)$, to a unique corresponding basis element in $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}$ (up to a linear combination of some elements in $\mathbb{O}\mathbb{B}$ with fewer dots). Furthermore, the multiplication map is obviously surjective. So, it is the required isomorphism and (W4) holds. \square

If we allow $m = 1$, then (I, A^-, A°, A^+) given in the proof of Proposition 2.2 is the same as that for the oriented Brauer category in [37]. In fact, it is an upper finite triangular decomposition in the sense of [18].

2.3. Quotient algebras. To conclude this section, we give some elementary observations about the structure of A , where A always admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition.

Definition 2.3. For any $a \in J$ and $\mathfrak{a} \in I$, define

- $Y(a) = \bigcup_{b \in J} Y(b, a)$, where $Y(b, a)$ is a basis of $A_{b,a}^-$.
- $X(a) = \bigcup_{b \in J} X(a, b)$, where $X(a, b)$ is a basis of $A_{a,b}^+$.
- $H(\mathfrak{a}) = \bigcup_{b, c \in \mathfrak{a}} H(b, c)$, where $H(b, c)$ is a basis of $A_{b,c}^\circ$.

Since we are assuming that \mathcal{A} is finite dimensional, all $Y(b, a)$, $X(b, a)$ and $H(a, b)$ are finite sets. The partial order \preceq on I induces a partial order on J such that $a \prec b$ if $a \in \mathfrak{a}$ and $b \in \mathfrak{b}$ with $\mathfrak{a} \prec \mathfrak{b}$. Thanks to (W3), $X(a, a) = Y(a, a) = \{1_a\}$ for any $a \in J$, and $Y(b, a) = X(a, b) = \emptyset$ unless $b \preceq a$. The following result follows from Definition 2.1, immediately.

Lemma 2.4. For all $a, c \in J$, $A_{a,c}$ has basis $\{yhx \mid (y, h, x) \in \bigcup_{d \succeq c, b \succeq a, b \sim d} Y(a, b) \times H(b, d) \times X(d, c)\}$.

Definition 2.5. For any $\mathfrak{a} \in I$, and $\diamond \in \{\succ, \not\preceq, \not\prec\}$, let $A^{\diamond \mathfrak{a}}$ be the two-sided ideal of A generated by $I^{\diamond \mathfrak{a}} = \{1_{\mathfrak{b}} \mid \mathfrak{b} \diamond \mathfrak{a}\}$.

A subset $K \subseteq I$ is said to be an upper set (or a coideal) of I if $\{\mathfrak{b} \mid \mathfrak{a} \preceq \mathfrak{b}\} \subseteq K$ for any $\mathfrak{a} \in K$. Obviously, $I^{\succ \mathfrak{a}}$, $I^{\not\preceq \mathfrak{a}}$ and $I^{\not\prec \mathfrak{a}}$ are upper sets.

Lemma 2.6. For any $h_1, h_2 \in A_{\mathfrak{a}}^\circ$, there is an $h_3 \in A_{\mathfrak{a}}^\circ$ such that $h_1 h_2 \equiv h_3 \pmod{A^{\succ \mathfrak{a}}}$.

Proof. The result follows immediately from (W3) and Lemma 2.4. \square

Lemma 2.7. Suppose $\mathfrak{a} \in I$.

- (1) The two-sided ideal $A1_{\mathfrak{a}}A$ is the same as the two-sided ideal generated by all $1_b, b \in \mathfrak{a}$.
- (2) Any $g \in A1_{\mathfrak{a}}A$ is a linear combination of elements yhx , where $(y, h, x) \in Y(c) \times H(c, d) \times X(d)$ such that $c, d \in \mathfrak{b}$ with $\mathfrak{b} \succeq \mathfrak{a}$.

Proof. (1) is obviously since $1_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{b \in \mathbf{a}} 1_b$ and all 1_b 's are pairwise orthogonal idempotents. We prove (2) by induction on \preceq . Thanks to Lemma 2.4 and (W3), we can assume $g = y_1 h_1 x_1 y_2 h_2 x_2$, where $(y_1, h_1, x_1) \in Y(b_1) \times H(b_1, c_1) \times X(c_1, a)$ and $(y_2, h_2, x_2) \in Y(a, b_2) \times H(b_2, c_2) \times X(c_2)$ with $a \in \mathbf{a}$ and $b_i, c_i \in \mathbf{b}_i$ for some $\mathbf{b}_i \in I$ with $\mathbf{b}_i \succeq \mathbf{a}$, $i = 1, 2$. If $\mathbf{b}_i \succ \mathbf{a}$ for some $i = 1, 2$, then $g \in A1_{\mathbf{b}_i}A$, and the result follows from induction assumption. So, it is enough to consider the case $\mathbf{b}_1 = \mathbf{b}_2 = \mathbf{a}$. Thanks to (W3), $x_1 = 1_a = y_2$ and hence $g = y_1 h_1 h_2 x_2$. By Lemma 2.6, $g = y_1 h_3 x_2 + h_4$ for some $h_3 \in A_{\mathbf{a}}^{\circ}$ and $h_4 \in A1_c A$ with $c \succ \mathbf{a}$. So, the result follows from induction assumption again. \square

Lemma 2.8. *For any upper set I^\uparrow of I , let A^\uparrow be the two-sided ideal of A generated by $\{1_{\mathbf{a}} \mid \mathbf{a} \in I^\uparrow\}$. Then $S_{a,c}$ is a \mathbb{k} -basis of $A_{a,c}^\uparrow$ for all $a, c \in J$, where*

$$S_{a,c} := \{yhx \mid (y, h, x) \in \bigcup_{b,d \in \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{a} \in I^\uparrow} Y(a, b) \times H(b, d) \times X(d, c)\}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, it is enough to prove that A^\uparrow is the \mathbb{k} -space spanned by S , where $S = \bigcup_{a,c \in J} S_{a,c}$. For any $yhx \in S$, $yhx = y1_{\mathbf{a}}hx$ for some $\mathbf{a} \in I^\uparrow$ and hence the subspace spanned by S is contained in A^\uparrow . On the other hand, any element in A^\uparrow is a linear combination of elements of $A1_{\mathbf{b}}A$ for some $\mathbf{b} \in I^\uparrow$. By Lemma 2.7(2), any element in $A1_{\mathbf{b}}A$ is a linear combination of some $y_1 h_1 x_1$ in $A1_c A$ with $c \succeq \mathbf{b}$, where $(y_1, h_1, x_1) \in Y(c) \times H(c, d) \times X(d)$ such that $c, d \in \mathbf{c}$. Since I^\uparrow is an upper set, $\mathbf{c} \in I^\uparrow$. So, A^\uparrow is contained in the \mathbb{k} -space spanned by S . \square

For any $x \in A$, let \bar{x} be its image in any quotient algebra of A . The following definition is motivated by [18].

Definition 2.9. For any $\mathbf{a} \in I$, define $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}} = A/A^{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$, $A_{\prec \mathbf{a}} = A/A^{\prec \mathbf{a}}$ and $\bar{A}_{\mathbf{a}} = \bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}\bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}$.

Proposition 2.10. *Suppose $\mathbf{a} \in I$. We have*

- (1) $\{\bar{h} \mid h \in H(\mathbf{a})\}$ is a \mathbb{k} -basis of $\bar{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$.
- (2) Both $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$ and $A_{\prec \mathbf{a}}$ admit upper finite weakly triangular decompositions.
- (3) $A_{\prec \mathbf{a}} \cong \bar{A}_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}/Q$, where Q is the two-sided ideal of $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$ generated by $\bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}$.
- (4) $\pi_{\mathbf{a}}(A_{\mathbf{a}}) = \bar{A}_{\mathbf{a}}$ where $\pi_{\mathbf{a}} : A \twoheadrightarrow A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$ is the canonical epimorphism.

Proof. By Lemmas 2.4, 2.8, we immediately have (1). Moreover, for any $e, c \in J$, $1_e A_{\diamond \mathbf{a}} 1_c$ has basis

$$\{\bar{y}\bar{h}\bar{x} \mid (y, h, x) \in \bigcup_{b,d \in \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b} \diamond \mathbf{a}} Y(e, b) \times H(b, d) \times X(d, c)\},$$

where $\diamond \in \{\preceq, \prec\}$. So, (2) follows. (3) follows immediately from (2) and Lemma 2.8. (4) follows from (1), Lemma 2.4 and the basis of $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$ given above. \square

3. UPPER FINITE FULLY STRATIFIED CATEGORIES

For any locally unital \mathbb{k} -algebra $A = \bigoplus_{a,b \in J} 1_a A 1_b$, a left A -module means a module M such that $M = \bigoplus_{a \in J} 1_a M$. It is locally finite dimensional if $\dim 1_a M < \infty$ for all $a \in J$. Let $A\text{-mod}$ (resp., $A\text{-lfmod}$, resp., $A\text{-pmod}$) be the category of all (resp., locally finite dimensional, resp., finitely generated projective) left A -modules. When A is finite dimensional, $A\text{-fdmod}$ is the category of all finite dimensional left A -modules. If A is locally finite dimensional, then any finitely generated module is locally finite dimensional (e.g. [15, § 2.2]).

Throughout this section, A always admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition in the sense of Definition 2.1. In particular, A is locally finite dimensional and hence $A\text{-pmod} \subset A\text{-lfmod}$.

3.1. Standardization and costandardization functors. Recall $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$ and $A_{\prec \mathbf{a}}$ in Definition 2.9 and $A^{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$, $A^{\prec \mathbf{a}}$ in Definition 2.5. Obviously, $A^{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$ and $A^{\prec \mathbf{a}}$ are idempotent ideals. So, $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}\text{-lfmod}$ and $A_{\prec \mathbf{a}}\text{-lfmod}$ are Serre subcategories of $A\text{-lfmod}$. Since $\bar{A}_{\mathbf{a}} = \bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}\bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $\bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}$ is an idempotent, by [37, Theorem II.4.3], the exact idempotent truncation functor

$$j^{\mathbf{a}} : A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}\text{-lfmod} \rightarrow \bar{A}_{\mathbf{a}}\text{-fdmod}$$

satisfying $j^{\mathbf{a}}V = \bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}V$ for any $V \in A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}\text{-lfmod}$, is the quotient functor by the Serre subcategory \mathcal{C} of $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}\text{-lfmod}$ consisting of modules V with $\bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}V = 0$. So $\mathcal{C} = B\text{-lfmod}$, where $B = A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}/Q$ and Q is the two-sided ideal of $A_{\preceq \mathbf{a}}$ generated by $\bar{1}_{\mathbf{a}}$. By Proposition 2.10(3), $B \cong A_{\prec \mathbf{a}}$ and hence $\mathcal{C} = A_{\prec \mathbf{a}}\text{-lfmod}$,

i.e., $\overline{A}_a\text{-fdmod}$ is the Serre quotient category $A_{\prec a}\text{-lfdmod}/A_{\prec a}\text{-lfdmod}$. It's known that j^a has the left (resp., right) adjoint $j_!^a$ (resp., j_*^a), where

$$j_!^a := A_{\prec a}\overline{1}_a \otimes_{\overline{A}_a} ?, \quad j_*^a := \bigoplus_{b \in I} \text{Hom}_{\overline{A}_a}(\overline{1}_a A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_b, ?). \quad (3.1)$$

They give two functors $\Delta, \nabla : \bigoplus_{a \in I} \overline{A}_a\text{-fdmod} \rightarrow A\text{-lfdmod}$ such that

$$\Delta = \bigoplus_{a \in I} j_!^a, \quad \nabla = \bigoplus_{a \in I} j_*^a. \quad (3.2)$$

Following [33], $j_!^a$'s and j_*^a 's are called the *standardization functors and costandardization functors*, respectively.

Let $\{L_a(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \overline{A}_a\}$ be the complete set of pairwise inequivalent irreducible \overline{A}_a -modules. For each $\lambda \in \overline{A}_a$, let $P_a(\lambda)$ (resp., $I_a(\lambda)$) be the projective cover (resp., injective hull) of $L_a(\lambda)$.

Definition 3.1. For any $\lambda \in \overline{A}_a$, define $\Delta(\lambda) = \Delta(P_a(\lambda))$, $\overline{\Delta}(\lambda) = \Delta(L_a(\lambda))$, $\nabla(\lambda) = \nabla(I_a(\lambda))$ and $\overline{\nabla}(\lambda) = \nabla(L_a(\lambda))$, and call them the standard, proper standard, costandard and proper costandard modules, respectively. In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\lambda) &= j_!^a(P_a(\lambda)), & \overline{\Delta}(\lambda) &= j_!^a(L_a(\lambda)), \\ \nabla(\lambda) &= j_*^a(I_a(\lambda)), & \overline{\nabla}(\lambda) &= j_*^a(L_a(\lambda)). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose $a \in I$.*

- (1) $A_{\prec a}\overline{1}_a$ (resp., $\overline{1}_a A_{\prec a}$) is a projective right (resp., left) \overline{A}_a -module. Furthermore, it is a free right (resp., left) \overline{A}_a -module if a contains a unique element in J .
- (2) Both $j_!^a$ and j_*^a are exact and so are Δ and ∇ .
- (3) For any $b \in a$, $A_{\prec a}\overline{1}_b \cong j_!^a(\overline{A}_a \overline{1}_b)$ as A -modules.

Proof. By Proposition 2.10(1), \overline{A}_a has basis $\{\overline{h} \mid h \in H(b, c), b, c \in a\}$. Consider the right \overline{A}_a -homomorphism

$$\phi : \bigoplus_{b \in a, y \in Y(b)} \overline{1}_b \overline{A}_a \rightarrow A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a$$

such that the image of $\overline{1}_b \overline{h}$ in the y th copy of $\overline{1}_b \overline{A}_a$ is $\overline{y} \overline{h} \in A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a$ for all $h \in H(b, c)$. By Proposition 2.10(1)–(2), ϕ sends a basis of $\bigoplus_{b \in a, y \in Y(b)} \overline{1}_b \overline{A}_a$ to a basis of $A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a$. So, ϕ is a linear isomorphism. Now $A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a$ is projective since $\overline{1}_b \overline{A}_a$ is a projective right \overline{A}_a -module. Similarly, $\overline{1}_a A_{\prec a}$ is a projective left \overline{A}_a -module. If a contains only one element b , then $1_a = 1_b$. So, $\overline{1}_b \overline{A}_a = \overline{A}_a$, proving the last statement in (1). By (1), $\overline{1}_a A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_b$ is a finitely generated and projective left \overline{A}_a -module. So, (2) follows.

Consider the isomorphism of A -modules

$$\psi : A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a \otimes_{\overline{A}_a} \overline{A}_a \rightarrow A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a, \quad \overline{y} \otimes \overline{h} \mapsto \overline{y} \overline{h}$$

for any $h \in H(c, b)$, $y \in Y(c)$, $b, c \in a$. Recall that $1_a = \sum_{b \in a} 1_b$. We have $A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a = \bigoplus_{b \in a} A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_b$ and

$$A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a \otimes_{\overline{A}_a} \overline{A}_a = \bigoplus_{b \in a} A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_a \otimes_{\overline{A}_a} \overline{A}_a 1_b = \bigoplus_{b \in a} j_!^a(\overline{A}_a \overline{1}_b).$$

Moreover, the restriction of ψ to $j_!^a(\overline{A}_a \overline{1}_b)$ gives a homomorphism of A -modules ψ_b from $j_!^a(\overline{A}_a \overline{1}_b)$ to $A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_b$. Furthermore, ψ_b is an isomorphism since it sends generating elements of $j_!^a(\overline{A}_a \overline{1}_b)$ to the basis $\{\overline{y} \overline{h} \mid h \in H(c, b), y \in Y(c), c \in a\}$ of $A_{\prec a} \overline{1}_b$. \square

Definition 3.3. Let $\rho : \overline{\Lambda} \rightarrow I$ be the function such that $\rho(\lambda) = a$ for any $\lambda \in \overline{A}_a$, where $\overline{\Lambda} = \bigcup_{a \in I} \overline{A}_a$. Following [18], for any given sign function $\varepsilon : I \rightarrow \{\pm\}$, define

$$\Delta_\varepsilon(\lambda) = \begin{cases} \Delta(\lambda), & \text{if } \varepsilon(\rho(\lambda)) = +, \\ \overline{\Delta}(\lambda), & \text{if } \varepsilon(\rho(\lambda)) = -. \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

An A -module V has a finite Δ -flag if it has a finite filtration such that its sections are isomorphic to $\Delta(\lambda)$ for various $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$. Similarly we have the notion of finite Δ_ε -flag. The following result is motivated by [18, Theorem 5.14].

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose $\varepsilon : I \rightarrow \{\pm\}$ is a sign function.*

- (1) For any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$, there is a projective A -module P such that P has a finite Δ_ε -flag with top section $\Delta_\varepsilon(\lambda)$, and other sections are of forms $\Delta_\varepsilon(\mu)$ for $\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$ with $\rho(\mu) \succeq \rho(\lambda)$.
- (2) For any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$, $\Delta(\lambda)$ has a unique irreducible quotient denoted by $L(\lambda)$.
- (3) $\{L(\mu) \mid \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}\}$ is a complete set of pairwise inequivalent irreducible A -modules.

Proof. Suppose $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}_a$ for some $a \in I$. We claim that the projective A -module $A1_a$ is the required P in (1). In fact, since I is upper finite, there are $b_i \in I$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $a = b_1$, $X(b_i, a) \neq \emptyset$ for some $b_i \in \mathbf{b}_i$ and $a \in \mathbf{a}$ and $b_i \preceq b_j \Rightarrow i \leq j$. Let P_i be the subspace of $A1_a$ spanned by

$$\{yhx \mid (y, h, x) \in \bigcup_{b_j, c_j \in \mathbf{b}_j, a \in \mathbf{a}} Y(b_j) \times H(b_j, c_j) \times X(c_j, a), i+1 \leq j \leq n\}.$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.7(2), $A1_a = P_0 \supseteq P_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq P_n = 0$ is a filtration of A -modules such that P_{i-1}/P_i has basis given by $\{yhx + P_i \mid (y, h, x) \in Y(b_i) \times H(b_i, c_i) \times X(c_i, d), b_i, c_i \in \mathbf{b}_i, d \in \mathbf{a}\}$. Define the \mathbb{k} -linear isomorphism

$$\varphi: \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbf{a}, c_i \in \mathbf{b}_i} \bigoplus_{x \in X(c_i, d)} A_{\preceq \mathbf{b}_i} \overline{1}_{c_i} \rightarrow P_{i-1}/P_i \quad (3.4)$$

sending the basis vector $\overline{y}h\overline{1}_{c_i}$ in the x th copy of $A_{\preceq \mathbf{b}_i} \overline{1}_{c_i}$ to $yhx + P_i$, $(y, h) \in Y(b_i) \times H(b_i, c_i)$ for any $b_i \in \mathbf{b}_i$. Then φ is an A -homomorphism. To see this, take $(y, h) \in Y(c, b_i) \times H(b_i, c_i)$ and any element $u \in 1_d A1_c$ for any $c, d \in J$. By Lemma 2.7(2), we have

$$uyh = \sum c_{p,q} y_p h_q + z$$

for some $c_{p,q} \in \mathbb{k}$, $y_p \in Y(d, b'_i)$, $h_q \in H(b'_i, c_i)$, $b'_i \in \mathbf{b}_i$ and $z \in A1_e A$ with $e \succ \mathbf{b}_i$. Since z acts on $x + P_i$ as zero, $u\varphi(yh\overline{1}_{c_i}) = \sum c_{p,q} y_p h_q x + P_i$. On the other hand, any \overline{z} is zero in $A_{\preceq \mathbf{b}_i}$. So,

$$\varphi(uyh\overline{1}_{c_i}) = \varphi(\sum c_{p,q} y_p h_q) = \sum c_{p,q} y_p h_q x + P_i = u\varphi(yh\overline{1}_{c_i}).$$

This proves that φ is an A -isomorphism. Thanks to Lemma 3.2(3),

$$A_{\preceq \mathbf{b}_i} \overline{1}_{c_i} \cong j_i^{\mathbf{b}_i}(\overline{A}_{\mathbf{b}_i} \overline{1}_{c_i}) \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{b}_i}} \Delta(\mu)^{\oplus n(\mu)}$$

if $\overline{A}_{\mathbf{b}_i} \overline{1}_{c_i} \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}_{\mathbf{b}_i}} P_{\mathbf{b}_i}(\mu)^{\oplus n(\mu)}$. So, $A1_a$ has a finite Δ -flag such that each section is of form $\Delta(\mu)$ with $\rho(\mu) \succeq a$. If $i = 1$, then $\mathbf{b}_1 = a$. In this case for $c_1, d \in a$, $X(c_1, d) = \{1_d\}$ if $c_1 = d$ and \emptyset otherwise. So,

$$\bigoplus_{d \in \mathbf{a}, c_1 \in \mathbf{a}} \bigoplus_{x \in X(c_1, d)} A_{\preceq a} \overline{1}_{c_1} = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbf{a}} A_{\preceq a} \overline{1}_d = A_{\preceq a} \overline{1}_a \cong A_{\preceq a} \overline{1}_a \otimes_{\overline{A}_a} \overline{A}_a = j_1^a(\overline{A}_a) \cong \bigoplus_{\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}_a} \Delta(\mu)^{\oplus \dim L_a(\mu)}.$$

So, we can choose $\Delta(\lambda)$ as the top section and $A1_a$ is the required P in (1) if $\varepsilon(\rho(\lambda)) = +$ for any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$. By Lemma 3.2(2), Δ is exact. So, for any $\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}_b$, $\Delta(\mu)$ has a finite $\overline{\Delta}$ -flag such that each section is of form $\overline{\Delta}(\nu)$ for some $\nu \in \overline{\Lambda}_b$. Therefore, $A1_a$ is still the required P in (1) for any ε .

Using the adjoint triple in (3.1) and [18, Lemma 2.22], we have that $\Delta(\lambda)$ is an indecomposable projective module in $A_{\preceq a}\text{-lfdmod}$ with the simple head $L(\lambda)$. This proves (2). Moreover, $L(\lambda)$ is the unique (up to isomorphism) irreducible $A_{\preceq a}$ -module such that

$$\overline{1}_a L(\lambda) \cong L_a(\lambda). \quad (3.5)$$

So, $\{L(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}\}$'s are pairwise inequivalent. Suppose that L is any irreducible A -module. Then there exists $a \in I$ such that $1_a L \neq 0$, and hence L is a quotient of $A1_a$. By (1) together with arguments on induction for the length of the Δ -flag of $A1_a$, there is a $\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$ with $\rho(\mu) \succeq a$ such that $\text{Hom}_A(\Delta(\mu), L) \neq 0$, forcing $L = L(\mu)$, the simple head of $\Delta(\mu)$. \square

3.2. Stratified categories and highest weight categories. Let $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ be the full subcategory of $A\text{-mod}$ consisting of all modules with a finite Δ -flag. Since $\Delta(\lambda) \in A\text{-lfdmod}$ for any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$, $A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ is a subcategory of $A\text{-lfdmod}$.

Theorem 3.5. *The category $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category in the sense of [18, Definition 3.36]. The corresponding stratification ρ is in Definition 3.3, and the standard, proper standard, costandard and proper costandard objects are defined in Definition 3.1.*

Proof. By Theorem 3.4(3), the function ρ in Definition 3.1 is a stratification of $A\text{-lfdmod}$ in the sense of [18, Definition 3.1]. For any $\mathfrak{a} \in I$, using Theorem 3.4(3) again for the upper finite weakly triangular structures of $A_{\preceq \mathfrak{a}}$ and $A_{\prec \mathfrak{a}}$ (see Proposition 2.10(2)), we see that the Serre subcategory $A\text{-lfdmod}_{\preceq \mathfrak{a}}$ (resp., $A\text{-lfdmod}_{\prec \mathfrak{a}}$) generated by $\{L(\lambda) \mid \rho(\lambda) \preceq \mathfrak{a}\}$ (resp., $\{L(\lambda) \mid \rho(\lambda) \prec \mathfrak{a}\}$) is $A_{\preceq \mathfrak{a}}\text{-lfdmod}$ (resp., $A_{\prec \mathfrak{a}}\text{-lfdmod}$). So, the adjoint triple $(j_!^{\mathfrak{a}}, j^{\mathfrak{a}}, j_*^{\mathfrak{a}})$ agree with the adjoint triple between $A\text{-lfdmod}_{\preceq \mathfrak{a}}$ and its Serre quotient $A\text{-lfdmod}_{\preceq \mathfrak{a}}/A\text{-lfdmod}_{\prec \mathfrak{a}}$. Hence, the standard, proper standard, costandard and proper costandard objects defined in Definition 3.1 are the required objects. Thanks to Theorem 3.4(1), $A\text{-lfdmod}$ satisfies the property $(\widehat{P\Delta_\varepsilon})$ in [18] for any ε as follows:

$(\widehat{P\Delta_\varepsilon})$: For each $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$, there exists a projective object P_λ admitting a finite Δ_ε -flag with $\Delta_\varepsilon(\lambda)$ at the top and other sections $\Delta_\varepsilon(\mu)$ for $\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$ with $\rho(\mu) \succeq \rho(\lambda)$.

In our case, P_λ is $A1_{\mathfrak{a}}$ if $\rho(\lambda) = \mathfrak{a}$. By [18, Definition 3.36], $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category. \square

Remark 3.6. Brundan and Stroppel introduced the notion of upper finite based stratified algebra B [18, Definition 5.17] and proved that $B\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category [18, Theorem 5.22]. They also proved that any locally unital algebra which admits an upper finite Cartan decomposition is an upper finite based stratified algebra [18, Theorem 5.30]. In this paper, we give another sufficient condition for $A\text{-lfdmod}$ being an upper finite fully stratified category for a locally unital algebra. By [18, Definition 5.17], any upper finite based stratified algebra is Morita equivalent to A which admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition such that $\overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is a basic algebra and the set of primitive idempotents is $\{\overline{1}_b \mid b \in \mathfrak{a}\}$ for all $\mathfrak{a} \in I$ (i.e., $\overline{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}} = \mathfrak{a}$).

The following result follows from Proposition 2.2 and Theorem 3.5, immediately. This is the first step to give tensor product categorifications of integrable lowest weight and integrable highest weight representations for \mathfrak{sl}_∞ or $\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}}_p$ introduced by Webster in [49]. Details will be given in [25].

Theorem 3.7. *Let A be the \mathbb{k} -algebra associated to the cyclotomic oriented Brauer category $\mathcal{OB}(\mathbf{u})$ in Proposition 2.2. Then $A\text{-lfdmod}$ is an upper finite fully stratified category in the sense of [18, Definition 3.36] with respect to the stratification $\rho : \overline{\Lambda} \rightarrow I$ in Definition 3.3, where I is given in (2.5).*

Suppose L is a simple A -module and $V \in A\text{-mod}$. Define

$$[V : L] = \sup\{i \mid V_{i+1}/V_i \cong L\}$$

the supremum being taken over all filtrations by submodules $0 = V_0 \subset \cdots \subset V_n = V$. The number $[V : L]$ is called the composition multiplicity of L in V although V may not have a composition series. Using the adjoint triple $(j_!^{\mathfrak{a}}, j^{\mathfrak{a}}, j_*^{\mathfrak{a}})$ yields the following result (see also [18, Lemma 3.3]).

Lemma 3.8. *For any $\lambda, \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$, and $\lambda \neq \mu$,*

- (1) $[\overline{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\mu)] = 1$ and $[\overline{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\lambda)] = 0$ unless $\rho(\mu) \succ \rho(\lambda)$,
- (2) $[\overline{\nabla}(\mu) : L(\mu)] = 1$ and $[\overline{\nabla}(\mu) : L(\lambda)] = 0$ unless $\rho(\mu) \succ \rho(\lambda)$.

For any $V \in A\text{-mod}^\Delta$, let $(V : \Delta(\lambda))$ be the multiplicity of $\Delta(\lambda)$ in a Δ -flag of V . By [18, Lemma 3.49] and Theorem 3.5, $\dim \text{Ext}_A^i(\Delta(\nu), \overline{\nabla}(\mu)) = \delta_{i,0} \delta_{\nu,\mu}$, $i \geq 0, \nu, \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$. So,

$$(V : \Delta(\lambda)) = \dim \text{Hom}_A(V, \overline{\nabla}(\lambda)), \quad (3.6)$$

which is independent of a flag.

Proposition 3.9. *For any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$, let $P(\lambda)$ be the projective cover of $L(\lambda)$. We have:*

- (1) $P(\lambda) \in A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ with top section $\Delta(\lambda)$.
- (2) $(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu)) = [\overline{\nabla}(\mu) : L(\lambda)]$, which is non-zero for $\mu \neq \lambda$ only if $\rho(\mu) \succ \rho(\lambda)$. In particular, $(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\lambda)) = 1$.

Proof. Since $P(\lambda)$ is projective, $\text{Ext}_A^1(P(\lambda), \overline{\nabla}(\mu)) = 0$ for all $\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$. By [18, Theorem 3.39] and Theorem 3.5, for any finitely generated A -module M , $M \in A\text{-mod}^\Delta$ if and only if $\text{Ext}_A^1(M, \overline{\nabla}(\mu)) = 0$ for all $\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$. So, $P(\lambda) \in A\text{-mod}^\Delta$. Since $P(\lambda)$ is the projective cover of $L(\lambda)$, by Theorem 3.4(2), $\Delta(\lambda)$ must appear as the top section. This proves (1). Finally, (2) follows immediately from (3.6) and Lemma 3.8(2). \square

For any $\mathfrak{a} \in I$, let $\overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}} = \bigoplus_{\omega \in \mathbf{B}_{\mathfrak{a}}} \overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a},\omega}$ be the block decomposition of $\overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}}$. Define $\mathbf{B} = \bigcup_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} \mathbf{B}_{\mathfrak{a}}$. The partial order on I induces a partial order on \mathbf{B} such that $\omega \prec \omega'$ if $\omega \in \mathbf{B}_{\mathfrak{a}}$, $\omega' \in \mathbf{B}_{\mathfrak{b}}$ and $\mathfrak{a} \prec \mathfrak{b}$.

Define $\tilde{\rho} : \overline{\Lambda} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$ such that for $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}_a$, $\tilde{\rho}(\lambda) = \omega$ if $L_a(\lambda) \in \overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod. It is clear that $\tilde{\rho}$ is a new stratification of A -fdmod in the sense of [18, Definition 3.1].

For any $\omega \in \mathbf{B}_a$, let A_{\prec_a} -fdmod $_{\preceq\omega}$ be the Serre subcategory of A_{\prec_a} -fdmod with irreducible objects $\{L(\lambda) \mid \tilde{\rho}(\lambda) \preceq \omega\}$. Similarly we have A_{\prec_a} -fdmod $_{\prec\omega}$. Note that A_{\prec_a} -fdmod $_{\prec\omega} = A_{\prec_a}$ -fdmod by Theorem 3.4(3). Let $j^{a,\omega}$ be the restriction of j^a to A_{\prec_a} -fdmod $_{\preceq\omega}$. Since $j^{a,\omega}(M) \in \overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod for any $M \in A_{\prec_a}$ -fdmod $_{\preceq\omega}$, $j^{a,\omega}$ is actually a functor from A_{\prec_a} -fdmod $_{\preceq\omega}$ to $\overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod. Moreover, $j^{a,\omega}$ induces an equivalence of categories between A_{\prec_a} -fdmod $_{\preceq\omega}/A_{\prec_a}$ -fdmod $_{\prec\omega}$ and $\overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod.

Let $j_!^{a,\omega}$ and $j_*^{a,\omega}$ be the restriction of $j_!^a$ and j_*^a to $\overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod, respectively. Then

$$\Delta = \bigoplus_{\omega \in \mathbf{B}_a, a \in I} j_!^{a,\omega}, \quad \nabla = \bigoplus_{\omega \in \mathbf{B}_a, a \in I} j_*^{a,\omega}.$$

Moreover, $j_!^{a,\omega}$ and $j_*^{a,\omega}$ are actually functors from $\overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod to $A_{\preceq a}$ -fdmod $_{\preceq\omega}$. In fact, for any $M \in \overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod, $j_!^{a,\omega}(M)$ has a $\overline{\Delta}$ -flag, and $\overline{\Delta}(\mu)$ appears as a section if $[M : L_a(\mu)] \neq 0$. In this case, $\tilde{\rho}(\mu) = \omega$. By Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.2(2), we see that $j_!^{a,\omega}(M) \in A_{\preceq a}$ -fdmod $_{\preceq\omega}$. The result on $j_*^{a,\omega}$ follows from similar arguments. Furthermore, since $(j_!^a, j^a, j_*^a)$ is an adjoint triple, so is $(j_!^{a,\omega}, j^{a,\omega}, j_*^{a,\omega})$.

Theorem 3.10. *The category A -fdmod is an upper finite fully stratified category in the sense of [18, Definition 3.36] with respect to the stratification $\tilde{\rho}$. In particular, A -fdmod is an upper finite highest weight category in the sense of [18, Definition 3.36] if \overline{A}_a is semisimple for all $a \in I$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.9, for any λ the projective module $P(\lambda)$ is the required P_λ in $(\widehat{P\Delta}_\varepsilon)$ for $\tilde{\rho}$ and any sign function $\varepsilon : \mathbf{B} \rightarrow \{\pm\}$. So, the first statement holds. If \overline{A}_a is semisimple for all $a \in I$, then the stratum $\overline{A}_{a,\omega}$ -fdmod is simple for any ω and hence A -fdmod is an upper finite highest weight category. \square

3.3. Duality. In this subsection, we assume that there is an anti-involution $\sigma_A : A \rightarrow A$ such that

$$\sigma_A(1_a) = 1_a \quad (3.7)$$

for any $a \in J$. Then σ_A stabilizes both A_a and $A^{\neq a}$, and results in an anti-involution $\sigma_{A_{\prec a}}$ on $A_{\prec a}$. Restricting $\sigma_{A_{\prec a}}$ to \overline{A}_a yields an anti-involution $\sigma_{\overline{A}_a}$ on \overline{A}_a . For any $V \in A$ -fdmod, let

$$V^\otimes = \bigoplus_{a \in J} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}(1_a V, \mathbb{k}). \quad (3.8)$$

Then V^\otimes is an A -module such that for any $x \in A$ and $f \in V^\otimes$, $(xf)(v) = f(\sigma_A(x)v)$. This induces an exact contravariant duality functor \otimes on A -fdmod. Similarly, we have the contravariant duality functor on $\bigoplus_{a \in I} \overline{A}_a$ -fdmod.

Lemma 3.11. *As functors from $\bigoplus_{a \in I} \overline{A}_a$ -fdmod to A -fdmod, $\otimes \circ \Delta \cong \nabla \circ \otimes$.*

Proof. The required natural isomorphism is $\phi : \otimes \circ \Delta \rightarrow \nabla \circ \otimes$ such that the A -isomorphism $\phi_V : \Delta(V)^\otimes \rightarrow \nabla(V^\otimes)$ sends α to $\bar{\alpha}$ for any finite dimensional \overline{A}_a -module V , where

$$\bar{\alpha}(f)(v) = \alpha(\sigma_{A_{\prec a}}(f) \otimes v)$$

for all $v \in V$ and $f \in \overline{A}_a A_{\prec a} \overline{A}_b$. The inverse of ϕ_V is the homomorphism $\nabla(V^\otimes) \rightarrow \Delta(V)^\otimes$, sending β to $\tilde{\beta}$, where $\tilde{\beta}(f \otimes v) = \beta(\sigma_{A_{\prec a}}(f))(v)$. \square

Assumption 3.12. For all $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}$, $M^\otimes \cong M$ as $\overline{A}_{\rho(\lambda)}$ -modules, where $M \in \{P_{\rho(\lambda)}(\lambda), L_{\rho(\lambda)}(\lambda)\}$.

Lemma 3.13. *Keep the Assumption 3.12. Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$. We have*

- (1) $\Delta(\lambda)^\otimes \cong \nabla(\lambda)$, $\overline{\Delta}(\lambda)^\otimes \cong \overline{\nabla}(\lambda)$ and $L(\lambda)^\otimes \cong L(\lambda)$.
- (2) $[\Delta(\lambda) : L(\mu)] = [\nabla(\lambda) : L(\mu)]$ and $[\overline{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\mu)] = [\overline{\nabla}(\lambda) : L(\mu)]$.

Proof. The first and the second isomorphisms in (1) follow from Lemma 3.11 and Assumption 3.12. Suppose $a = \rho(\lambda)$. Thanks to (3.7), we have

$$1_a L(\lambda)^\otimes = (1_a L(\lambda))^\otimes = L_a(\lambda)^\otimes \cong L_a(\lambda) = 1_a L(\lambda).$$

Since $L(\lambda)$ is the unique irreducible module (up to isomorphism) in $A_{\prec a}$ -fdmod such that $1_a L(\lambda) = L_a(\lambda)$, and \otimes is an involution, $L(\lambda)^\otimes$ is irreducible, forcing $L(\lambda) \cong L(\lambda)^\otimes$. Finally, (2) follows from (1) since \otimes is exact. \square

3.4. Semisimplicity. We are going to give a criterion on the semi-simplicity of A over \mathbb{k} .

Lemma 3.14. *Suppose $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is semisimple over \mathbb{k} . If $\lambda, \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$ and $\mu \neq \lambda$ then $(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu)) = 0$.*

Proof. If $(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu)) \neq 0$, by Proposition 3.9, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow P(\lambda) \rightarrow \Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow 0 \quad (3.9)$$

such that $N \in A\text{-mod}^{\Delta}$ and $(N : \Delta(\mu)) \neq 0$. Let $\mathfrak{a} = \rho(\lambda)$. Then $1_{\mathfrak{a}}L(\lambda) = \overline{1}_{\mathfrak{a}}L(\lambda) = L_{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) \neq 0$. Applying the idempotent $1_{\mathfrak{a}}$ on (3.9) yields

$$0 \rightarrow 1_{\mathfrak{a}}N \rightarrow 1_{\mathfrak{a}}P(\lambda) \rightarrow 1_{\mathfrak{a}}\Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.10)$$

By the general result on the exact functor defined by an idempotent (e.g., [18, Lemma 2.22]), $1_{\mathfrak{a}}P(\lambda)$ is the projective cover of the irreducible $A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ -module $1_{\mathfrak{a}}L(\lambda)$. Since we are assuming that $A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is semisimple, $1_{\mathfrak{a}}P(\lambda) = 1_{\mathfrak{a}}L(\lambda)$, forcing $1_{\mathfrak{a}}\Delta(\lambda) = 1_{\mathfrak{a}}P(\lambda)$ and $1_{\mathfrak{a}}N = 0$. In particular, $1_{\mathfrak{a}}\Delta(\mu) = 1_{\mathfrak{a}}\overline{\Delta}(\mu) = 0$. Note that Assumption 3.12 holds automatically when $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is semisimple (hence $\overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is semisimple for all $\mathfrak{a} \in I$ by Proposition 2.10(4)). By Lemma 3.13(2) and Proposition 3.9(2),

$$[1_{\mathfrak{a}}\overline{\Delta}(\mu) : 1_{\mathfrak{a}}L(\lambda)] = [\overline{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\lambda)] = [\overline{\nabla}(\mu) : L(\lambda)] = (P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu)) \neq 0$$

whenever $1_{\mathfrak{a}}L(\lambda) \neq 0$. This is a contradiction since $1_{\mathfrak{a}}\overline{\Delta}(\mu) = 0$. \square

Theorem 3.15. *The \mathbb{k} -algebra A is semisimple if and only if $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is semisimple.*

Proof. Let $B = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} A_{\mathfrak{a}}$. For any $M \in A_{\mathfrak{a}}\text{-mod}$ and any $\mathfrak{a} \in I$,

$$1_{\mathfrak{a}}A \otimes_B M = 1_{\mathfrak{a}}A1_{\mathfrak{a}} \otimes_B M \cong M$$

as $A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ -modules. If A is semisimple, then $A \otimes_B M$ is a direct sum of simple A -modules, and hence $1_{\mathfrak{a}}A \otimes_B M$ is a direct sum of simple $A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ -modules. So, $A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is semisimple for any $\mathfrak{a} \in I$, forcing B to be semisimple.

Conversely, suppose B is semisimple. Thanks to Proposition 3.9 and Lemma 3.14, $P(\lambda) = \Delta(\lambda)$ and the exact functor Δ sends projective $(\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} \overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}})$ -modules $P_{\rho(\lambda)}(\lambda)$'s to projective A -modules $P(\lambda)$'s. Since $\{P_{\mathfrak{a}}(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}_{\mathfrak{a}}, \mathfrak{a} \in I\}$ gives a complete set of representatives of all indecomposable objects in $(\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} \overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}})\text{-pmod}$, thanks to the general result on locally unital algebras in [15, Corollary 2.5], Δ is an equivalence between $(\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} \overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}})\text{-mod}$ and $A\text{-mod}$. Since $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{a} \in I} \overline{A}_{\mathfrak{a}}$ (a quotient of B by Proposition 2.10(4)) is semisimple, so is A . \square

4. WEAKLY CELLULAR BASES

In this section, we consider a \mathbb{k} -algebra A which admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition in the sense of Definition 2.1 such that $I = J$. Furthermore, on each A , there is an anti-involution σ_A satisfying (3.7). We will prove that any \mathbb{k} -algebra $A_{\mathfrak{a}}$ is a weakly cellular algebra if \overline{A}_b is a cellular algebra for any $b \in J$. We start by recalling the definition of a cellular algebra in [27].

A cellular algebra H is an associative \mathbb{k} -algebra which has basis $\{c_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^{\lambda} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T(\lambda), \forall \lambda \in \Upsilon\}$ such that

- (C1) $(\Upsilon, \trianglelefteq)$ is a poset,
- (C2) $T(\lambda)$ is a finite set for any $\lambda \in \Upsilon$,
- (C3) $\sigma(c_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^{\lambda}) = c_{\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{s}}^{\lambda}$, where σ is a \mathbb{k} -linear anti-involution on H ,
- (C4) $c_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^{\lambda} x \equiv \sum_{\mathfrak{u}} r_{\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{u}}(x) c_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{u}}^{\lambda} \pmod{H^{\triangleright \lambda}}$ for any $x \in H$, where
 - a) $r_{\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{u}}(x)$'s $\in \mathbb{k}$ and are independent of \mathfrak{s} ,
 - b) $H^{\triangleright \lambda}$ is spanned by $\{c_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^{\mu} \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T(\mu), \mu \in \Upsilon, \mu \triangleright \lambda\}$.

Thanks to (C4), $H^{\triangleright \lambda}$ is a two-sided ideal of H . Goodman keeps (C1), (C2), (C4) and replaces (C3) by (4.1) as follows:

$$\sigma(c_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^{\lambda}) \equiv c_{\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{s}}^{\lambda} \pmod{H^{\triangleright \lambda}}. \quad (4.1)$$

He calls the corresponding algebra a weakly cellular algebra [26]. It has been pointed in [26] that all results for the representation theory of cellular algebras in [27] are still true for weakly cellular algebras.

Thanks to [27], for any $\lambda \in \Upsilon$, there is a cell module, say $S(\lambda)$ with respect to the (weakly) cellular basis as above. It is known that there is an invariant form on $S(\lambda)$. Let $\overline{\Upsilon} = \{\lambda \in \Upsilon \mid S(\lambda)/\text{rad} \neq 0\}$ where rad is the radical of this invariant form. Then the non-zero quotient module $S(\lambda)/\text{rad}$, denoted by $D(\lambda)$, is absolutely irreducible. Later on, we will say that $S(\lambda)$ has the simple head $D(\lambda)$ if

$D(\lambda) \neq 0$. Following [27], such $D(\lambda)$'s consist of a complete set of pairwise inequivalent simple H -modules. For any $\lambda, \mu \in \Upsilon$, say λ and μ are *cell-link* for a (weakly) cellular algebra H if $\lambda \in \overline{\Upsilon}$ such that $[S(\mu) : D(\lambda)] \neq 0$ [27, Page 14]. We will use cell-link to study blocks of the \mathbb{k} -algebras associated to cyclotomic Brauer categories and cyclotomic Kauffman categories at the end of this paper.

Lemma 4.1. *For all $a, c \in J$, $|X(c, a)| = |Y(a, c)|$.*

Proof. We can assume $c \succeq a$ without loss of any generality. Otherwise, $X(c, a) = Y(a, c) = \emptyset$. Since we are assuming that there is an anti-involution σ_A satisfying (3.7),

$$\sigma_A(A_{a,c}) = A_{c,a} \quad (4.2)$$

for all $a, c \in J$. In particular, $\dim A_{c,a} = \dim A_{a,c}$. By Lemma 2.4,

$$|Y(a, c)||H(c)| + \sum_{b \succ c} |Y(a, b)||H(b)||X(b, c)| = |H(c)||X(c, a)| + \sum_{b \succ c} |Y(c, b)||H(b)||X(b, a)|. \quad (4.3)$$

If c is maximal, then $|Y(a, c)||H(c)| = |H(c)||X(c, a)|$, forcing $|Y(a, c)| = |X(c, a)|$. Otherwise, by induction assumption, $|Y(a, b)| = |X(b, a)|$ and $|Y(c, b)| = |X(b, c)|$ for all $b \succ c$. By (4.3), we still have $|Y(a, c)| = |X(c, a)|$. \square

Theorem 4.2. *For any $b \in J$, suppose \overline{A}_b is a cellular algebra with respect to the anti-involution $\sigma_{\overline{A}_b}$ induced by σ_A . Then A_a is a weakly cellular algebra for any $a \in J$.*

Proof. For any $a \in J$, suppose that \overline{A}_a has cellular basis

$$\{\overline{h}_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T_a(\lambda), \forall \lambda \in \Lambda_a\}, \quad (4.4)$$

where $\overline{h}_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda = \pi_a(h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda)$, $h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \in A_a$ and π_a is given in Proposition 2.10(4). We use T_a and Λ_a here to emphasize that both of them depend on a . Thanks to Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.10(1),(4), we can choose all $h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \in A_a^\circ$ such that

$$\{h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \mid \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T_a(\lambda), \lambda \in \Lambda_a\} \text{ is a basis of } A_a^\circ. \quad (4.5)$$

Moreover, by Lemma 2.4 and Lemma 2.7(2), $A_a \cap A^{\succ b}$ has basis given by

$$\{y_1 h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_1 \mid (x_1, y_1) \in X(c, a) \times Y(a, c), \forall \lambda \in \Lambda_c, \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T_c(\lambda), c \succ b\}. \quad (4.6)$$

Replacing $c \succ b$ by $c \succeq b$ in (4.6) yields a basis of $A_a \cap A^{\succeq b}$.

We claim that we still get a basis of $A_a \cap A^{\succ b}$ if y_1 in (4.6) is replaced by $\sigma_A(x_2)$, $x_2 \in X(c, a)$. If b is maximal, then $A_a \cap A^{\succ b} = 0$, and there is nothing to prove. In general, by Lemma 2.7(2) and (4.2), for $\lambda \in \Lambda_c$ and $y_1 \in Y(a, c)$,

$$y_1 h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \equiv \sum_{x_2 \in X(c, a), \mu \in \Lambda_c, \mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}' \in T_c(\mu)} r_{x_2, \mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}'} \sigma_A(x_2) h_{\mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}'}^\mu \pmod{A^{\succ c}},$$

for some $r_{x_2, \mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}'} \in \mathbb{k}$. Hence,

$$y_1 h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_1 \equiv \sum_{x_2 \in X(c, a), \mu \in \Lambda_c, \mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}' \in T_c(\mu)} r_{x_2, \mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}'} \sigma_A(x_2) h_{\mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}'}^\mu x_1 \pmod{A_a \cap A^{\succ c}}.$$

By Lemma 4.1, the cardinalities of two sets are equal. So, our claim follows. Similarly, we obtain another basis of $A_a \cap A^{\succeq b}$. Define

$$\Gamma_a = \{b \in J \mid b \succeq a, X(b, a) \neq \emptyset\}. \quad (4.7)$$

Since $A_a = A_a \cap A^{\succeq a}$, A_a has basis given by

$$S_a = \bigcup_{b \in \Gamma_a} \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Lambda_b} \{\sigma_A(x_2) h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_1 \mid x_1, x_2 \in X(b, a), \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t} \in T_b(\lambda)\}. \quad (4.8)$$

To see that S_a is a weakly cellular basis, we need to verify (C1),(C2), (C4) and (4.1). Suppose

$$\Lambda_{\succeq a}^\# = \bigcup_{b \in \Gamma_a} \Lambda_b. \quad (4.9)$$

For any $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_{\succeq a}^\#$, write $\lambda \trianglelefteq \mu$ if either $\rho(\lambda) \prec \rho(\mu)$ or $\rho(\lambda) = \rho(\mu)$ and $\lambda \trianglelefteq \mu$ in $\Lambda_{\rho(\lambda)}$. Then $(\Lambda_{\succeq a}^\#, \trianglelefteq)$ is the required poset in (C1) for A_a . Obviously, (C2) holds.

Suppose $\lambda \in \Lambda_b \subseteq \Lambda_{\succeq a}^\sharp$. Then $b \succeq a$ and $X(b, a) \neq \emptyset$. By Lemma 2.4, $\text{Ker } \pi_b|_{A_b} = A_b \cap A^{\succ b}$. Since $\overline{\sigma_A(h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda)} = \sigma_{\overline{A_b}}(\overline{h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda}) = \overline{h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda}$ we have $\sigma_A(h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda) \equiv h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \pmod{A_b \cap A^{\succ b}}$. So,

$$\sigma_A(\sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_1) \equiv \sigma_A(x_1)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_2 \pmod{A_a \cap A^{\succ b}}.$$

Thanks to (4.6), $A_a \cap A^{\succ b} \subset A_a^{\triangleright \lambda}$, where $A_a^{\triangleright \lambda}$ is the subspace spanned by all $\sigma_A(x_2')h_{\mathfrak{s}', \mathfrak{t}'}^\mu x_1'$ with $\mu \triangleright \lambda$ in $\Lambda_{\succeq a}^\sharp$. This proves (4.1) for S_a . Finally, we verify (C4). More explicitly, we want to prove

$$\sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_1 u \equiv \sum_{\mathfrak{v} \in T_b(\lambda), x_3 \in X(b, a)} r_{\mathfrak{v}, x_3} \sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{v}}^\lambda x_3 \pmod{A_a^{\triangleright \lambda}}, \quad (4.10)$$

for any $u \in A_a$, where $r_{\mathfrak{v}, x_3}$'s are independent of x_2 and \mathfrak{s} . In fact, thanks to Lemma 2.7(2) and (W3), there is a $z \in A^{\succ b}$ such that

$$x_1 u = 1_b x_1 u = \sum r_{h', x_3} h' x_3 + z,$$

where the summation is over $(h', x_3) \in H(b) \times X(b, a)$. Since $A_a A^{\succ b} A_a \subset A_a \cap A^{\succ b}$, we have $\sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda z \in A_a \cap A^{\succ b} \subset A_a^{\triangleright \lambda}$. So,

$$\sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_1 u \equiv \sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda \sum r_{h', x_3} h' x_3 \equiv \sum_{\mathfrak{v} \in T_b(\lambda), x_3 \in X(b, a)} r_{\mathfrak{v}, x_3} \sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{v}}^\lambda x_3 \pmod{A_a^{\triangleright \lambda}},$$

where the second \equiv follows from Lemma 2.6 and (C4) for $\overline{A_b}$. Obviously, the scalars $r_{\mathfrak{v}, x_3}$'s are independent of x_2 and \mathfrak{s} . \square

In the remaining part of this section, we keep conditions in Theorem 4.2. So, $\overline{A_a}$ (resp., A_a) has a cellular basis (resp., weakly cellular basis) as above. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$, let $S_a(\lambda)$ be the corresponding left cell module of $\overline{A_a}$. Without loss of any generality, we can assume that $S_a(\lambda)$ has basis

$$\{\overline{h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda} + \overline{A_a^{\triangleright \lambda}} \mid \mathfrak{s} \in T_a(\lambda)\} \quad (4.11)$$

where \mathfrak{t} is any fixed element in $T_a(\lambda)$. Let $\overline{\Lambda}_a = \{\lambda \in \Lambda_a \mid S_a(\lambda)/\text{rad} \neq 0\}$, where rad is the radical of the invariant form induced by the corresponding cellular basis. Then $\overline{\Lambda}_a$ parameterizes all pairwise inequivalent simple $\overline{A_a}$ -modules. Let $L_a(\lambda) = S_a(\lambda)/\text{rad}$, $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}_a$. Similarly, for each $\lambda \in \Lambda_b \subseteq \Lambda_{\succeq a}^\sharp$ (see (4.9)), the left cell module $\tilde{S}_a(\lambda)$ has basis

$$\{\sigma_A(x_2)h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda x_1 + A_a^{\triangleright \lambda} \mid x_2 \in X(b, a), \mathfrak{s} \in T_b(\lambda)\}, \quad (4.12)$$

where x_1 is any fixed element in $X(b, a)$ and \mathfrak{t} is in (4.11). Suppose simple A_a -modules are parameterized by $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\succeq a}^\sharp \subseteq \Lambda_{\succeq a}^\sharp$ in the sense that $\tilde{S}_a(\lambda)$ has the simple head $\tilde{L}_a(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_{\succeq a}^\sharp$.

For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$, let

$$\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = \Delta(S_a(\lambda)). \quad (4.13)$$

Thanks to (4.11) and Lemma 3.2(1), $\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ has basis $\bigcup_{b \preceq a} V_b$, where

$$V_b = \{y \otimes_{\overline{A_a}} (\overline{h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\lambda} + \overline{A_a^{\triangleright \lambda}}) \mid y \in Y(b, a), \mathfrak{s} \in T_a(\lambda)\}. \quad (4.14)$$

Let $\rho : \bigcup_{a \in J} \Lambda_a \rightarrow J$ such that $\rho(\lambda) = a$ if $\lambda \in \Lambda_a$, where $\Lambda = \bigcup_{a \in J} \Lambda_a$. Then $\rho|_{\overline{\Lambda}}$ is ρ in Definition 3.3.

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose $(\lambda, \mu) \in \overline{\Lambda} \times \Lambda$.*

- (1) $1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\mu) = 0$ if $\rho(\mu) \notin \Gamma_a$; and $1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\mu) \cong \tilde{S}_a(\mu)$ if $\rho(\mu) \in \Gamma_a$ (see (4.7)).
- (2) $[\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\lambda)] = \sum_{\nu \in \overline{\Lambda}_{\rho(\mu)}} [S_{\rho(\mu)}(\mu) : L_{\rho(\mu)}(\nu)](P(\lambda) : \Delta(\nu))$ if Assumption 3.12 holds.
- (3) $1_a L(\lambda) = \tilde{L}_a(\lambda)$ if $\lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_{\succeq a}^\sharp \cap \overline{\Lambda}$, and $1_a L(\lambda) = 0$ if $\lambda \notin \tilde{\Lambda}_{\succeq a}^\sharp \cap \overline{\Lambda}$.

Proof. The first part of (1) is obvious. Suppose $\rho(\mu) = b \in \Gamma_a$. Thanks to (4.14), V_a is a basis of $1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\mu)$. By (4.12), $\{yh_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\mu x + A_a^{\triangleright \mu} \mid y \in Y(a, b), \mathfrak{s} \in T_b(\mu)\}$ is a basis of $\tilde{S}_a(\mu)$ for some fixed $(x, \mathfrak{t}) \in X(b, a) \times T_b(\mu)$. Let $\phi : \tilde{S}_a(\mu) \rightarrow 1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\mu)$ be the \mathbb{k} -linear isomorphism such that

$$\phi(yh_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\mu x + A_a^{\triangleright \mu}) = y \otimes_{\overline{A_b}} (\overline{h_{\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{t}}^\mu} + \overline{A_b^{\triangleright \mu}}).$$

Thanks to Lemma 2.7(2) and (W3), it is routine to check that ϕ is an A_a -homomorphism, proving (1).

Since Δ is an exact functor, $\tilde{\Delta}(\mu)$ has a finite $\bar{\Delta}$ -flag such that each section is of form $\bar{\Delta}(\nu)$ for some $\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_{\rho(\mu)}$. Furthermore, $(\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : \bar{\Delta}(\nu)) = [S_{\rho(\mu)}(\mu) : L_{\rho(\mu)}(\nu)]$ by Lemma 3.2(2). So,

$$\begin{aligned} [\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\lambda)] &= \sum_{\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_{\rho(\mu)}} (\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : \bar{\Delta}(\nu)) [\bar{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)] = \sum_{\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_{\rho(\mu)}} [S_{\rho(\mu)}(\mu) : L_{\rho(\mu)}(\nu)] [\bar{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)] \\ &= \sum_{\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_{\rho(\mu)}} [S_{\rho(\mu)}(\mu) : L_{\rho(\mu)}(\nu)] (P(\lambda) : \Delta(\nu)), \text{ by Lemma 3.13(2), Proposition 3.9(2).} \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_b$. If $1_a L(\lambda) \neq 0$, by Lemma 3.8, $1_a \bar{\Delta}(\lambda) \neq 0$ and $b \succeq a$. Since 1_a is an idempotent, $\{1_a L(\lambda) \neq 0 \mid \lambda \in \bigcup_{b \succeq a} \bar{\Lambda}_b\}$ consists of a complete set of all pairwise inequivalent simple A_a -modules. So,

$$\{1_a L(\lambda) \neq 0 \mid \lambda \in \bigcup_{b \succeq a} \bar{\Lambda}_b\} = \{\tilde{L}_a(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \tilde{\Lambda}_{\succeq a}^\#\}.$$

In order to prove (3), it suffices to verify that $1_a L(\lambda) \cong \tilde{L}_a(\lambda)$ if $1_a L(\lambda) \neq 0$. If the result were false, then there is $\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_c$ with $c \succeq a$ such that $0 \neq 1_a L(\nu) \cong \tilde{L}_a(\lambda)$, for some $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_b$ with $b \succeq a$ and $\lambda \neq \nu$. Since $L_c(\nu)$ is a simple head of $S_c(\nu)$, there is an epimorphism $\tilde{\Delta}(\nu) \rightarrow L(\nu)$. Applying 1_a yields an epimorphism $\tilde{S}_a(\nu) \cong 1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\nu) \rightarrow 1_a L(\nu)$. So, $[\tilde{S}_a(\nu) : \tilde{L}_a(\lambda)] \neq 0$ and hence $\lambda \preceq \nu$ and $\rho(\nu) \succeq b$. On the other hand, since 1_a is an idempotent,

$$[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\nu)] = [1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : 1_a L(\nu)] = [\tilde{S}_a(\lambda) : 1_a L(\nu)] = [\tilde{S}_a(\lambda) : \tilde{L}_a(\lambda)] \neq 0.$$

By (2), $\rho(\nu) \preceq b$, forcing $\rho(\nu) = b$. So, $[S_b(\lambda) : L_b(\nu)] = [1_b \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : 1_b L(\nu)] = [\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\nu)] \neq 0$. This proves $\nu \preceq \lambda$. Therefore, $\lambda = \nu$, a contradiction, and (3) follows. \square

Corollary 4.4. *Keep the Assumption 3.12. Suppose $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_a$. Then $P(\lambda)$ has a finite $\tilde{\Delta}$ -flag such that $\mu \in \bigcup_{b \succeq a} \bar{\Lambda}_b$ if $\tilde{\Delta}(\mu)$ appears as a section. Furthermore, the multiplicity of $\tilde{\Delta}(\mu)$ in this flag is $[\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\lambda)]$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.9(1), $P(\lambda)$ has a finite Δ -flag. Thanks to [27, Lemmas 2.9, 2.10], any finitely generated projective module for a cellular algebra has a cell filtration. So, $P(\lambda)$ has a finite $\tilde{\Delta}$ -flag. Let $(P(\lambda) : \tilde{\Delta}(\mu))$ be the multiplicity of $\tilde{\Delta}(\mu)$ in this flag. Suppose $\mu \in \bar{\Lambda}_b$. Thanks to Lemma 3.2(2), Proposition 3.9 and Lemma 3.13(2) (the place that we need the Assumption 3.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned} (P(\lambda) : \tilde{\Delta}(\mu)) &= \sum_{\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_b} (P(\lambda) : \Delta(\nu)) (\Delta(\nu) : \tilde{\Delta}(\mu)) = \sum_{\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_b} [\bar{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)] (P_b(\nu) : S_b(\mu)), \\ [\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\lambda)] &= \sum_{\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_b} [\bar{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)] (\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : \bar{\Delta}(\nu)) = \sum_{\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_b} [\bar{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)] [S_b(\mu) : L_b(\nu)]. \end{aligned}$$

By [35, Lemmas 2.18, 2.19], $(P_b(\nu) : S_b(\mu)) = [S_b(\mu) : L_b(\nu)]$, and hence $(P(\lambda) : \tilde{\Delta}(\mu)) = [\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\lambda)]$. Thanks to Propositions 4.3(2), 3.9(2), $\mu \in \bigcup_{b \succeq a} \bar{\Lambda}_b$ if $(P(\lambda) : \tilde{\Delta}(\mu)) \neq 0$. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Keep the Assumption 3.12. For any $\lambda, \mu \in \bar{\Lambda}$, $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ are in the same block (and write $L(\lambda) \sim L(\mu)$) if there is a sequence $\lambda = \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n = \mu$ such that each pair λ_i and λ_{i+1} are cell-link in a weakly cellular algebra A_a for some $a \in J$.*

Proof. By assumption and Proposition 4.3(1)(3), there is a sequence $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ such that $\lambda_1 = \lambda$, $\lambda_n = \mu$ and either $[1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda_i) : 1_a L(\lambda_{i+1})] \neq 0$ or $[1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda_{i+1}) : 1_a L(\lambda_i)] \neq 0$ for some a which depends on i . So, either $[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda_i) : L(\lambda_{i+1})] \neq 0$ or $[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda_{i+1}) : L(\lambda_i)] \neq 0$.

It remains to prove that $\tilde{\Delta}(\nu)$ is in a single block for any $\nu \in \bar{\Lambda}_a$ and any $a \in J$. Suppose $\nu' \in \bar{\Lambda}_a$ such that $[S_a(\nu) : L_a(\nu')] \neq 0$. By [35, Lemmas 2.18, 2.19], $S_a(\nu)$ appears as a section in a cell filtration of $P_a(\nu')$. Thanks to Lemma 3.2(2), $\tilde{\Delta}(\nu)$ appears in a $\tilde{\Delta}$ -flag of $\Delta(\nu')$. Since $\Delta(\nu')$ is indecomposable (see Theorem 3.4(2)), $\tilde{\Delta}(\nu)$ has to be in a single block. \square

5. ENDOFUNCTORS AND CATEGORICAL ACTIONS

Adapting the usual string calculus for strict monoidal categories, we have that the composition of morphisms in a strict monoidal category is given by vertical stacking and the tensor product of morphisms is given by horizontal concatenation. In this section, we consider two kinds of \mathbb{k} -linear strict monoidal categories \mathcal{C}_1 and \mathcal{C}_2 generated by a single generating object \lfloor . So the set of objects is \mathbb{N}

and m represents $\mathbb{1}^{\otimes m}$. Furthermore, the generating morphisms of \mathcal{C}_1 contain at least three morphisms $\frown : 2 \rightarrow 0$, $\smile : 0 \rightarrow 2$, and $\mathbb{1} : 1 \rightarrow 1$ satisfying at least two relations:

$$\begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \smile \end{array} = \mathbb{1} = \begin{array}{c} \smile \\ \frown \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \frown \end{array} = - \begin{array}{c} \smile \\ \smile \end{array}, \quad (5.1)$$

I II

where $\mathbb{1} : 1 \rightarrow 1$ is the identity morphism. Archetypal example is the affine Brauer category in [44]. For \mathcal{C}_2 , there are at least four generating morphisms $\frown : 2 \rightarrow 0$, $\smile : 0 \rightarrow 2$, $\mathbb{1} : 1 \rightarrow 1$, $\mathbb{1} : 1 \rightarrow 1$ satisfying the relation (5.1)I and at least two more relations as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} \end{array} = \mathbb{1} = \begin{array}{c} \mathbb{1} \\ \mathbb{1} \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \frown \\ \smile \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \smile \\ \frown \end{array}. \quad (5.2)$$

I II

So, $\mathbb{1} : 1 \rightarrow 1$ is invertible with inverse $\mathbb{1} : 1 \rightarrow 1$. Archetypal example is the affine Kauffman category in [24].

For $\mathcal{C} \in \{\mathcal{C}_1, \mathcal{C}_2\}$, let \mathbb{D} be the set of all diagrams obtained by tensor product and composition of generating morphisms in \mathcal{C} together with $\mathbb{1}$. Fix any right tensor ideal K of \mathcal{C} and consider the quotient category $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}/K$ and its associated algebra

$$A = \bigoplus_{a, b \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, b). \quad (5.3)$$

Since \mathcal{A} is a quotient category of \mathcal{C} , any diagram in \mathbb{D} can be interpreted as an element in A . The monoidal functor $\tau = ? \otimes \mathbb{1} : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ stabilizes any right tensor ideal of \mathcal{C} . It induces an algebra homomorphism

$$\tau_A : A \rightarrow A \quad (5.4)$$

sending f to $f \mathbb{1}$ for all $f \in \mathbb{D}$.

5.1. Assumptions. In this section, we keep the following assumptions.

- (A1) The \mathbb{k} -algebra A in (5.3) admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition such that $I = J = \mathbb{N}$. The partial order \preceq on \mathbb{N} is defined such that $i \preceq j$ if $i = j + 2s$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (A2) For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \mathbb{1} \in Q(m+1)$ for all $f \in Q(m)$, where $Q \in \{X, Y, H\}$ (see Definition 2.3).
- (A3) For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a $D(m+1) \subseteq H(m+1)$ such that $|H(m+1)| = |D(m+1)||H(m)|$ and $H(m+1) = \{d \circ \tau_A(d') \mid (d, d') \in D(m+1) \times H(m)\}$.

By (A1), we can use previous results on upper finite weakly triangular decompositions. Thanks to (A2) and Lemma 2.4, τ_A is an algebra monomorphism. Since A comes from a quotient category of the \mathbb{k} -linear strict monoidal category \mathcal{C} , $d \circ \tau_A(d')$ can be expressed via the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{c} \boxed{d} \\ \cdots \\ \boxed{d'} \end{array} \mathbb{1}. \quad (5.5)$$

5.2. Endofunctors. Suppose $A_L = \bigoplus_{m, n \in \mathbb{N}} 1_m A_L 1_n$ and $A_R = \bigoplus_{m, n \in \mathbb{N}} 1_m A_R 1_n$ such that

$$1_m A_L 1_n = 1_{m+1} A 1_n, \quad 1_m A_R 1_n = 1_m A 1_{n+1}. \quad (5.6)$$

Then both A_L and A_R are (A, A) -bimodules such that the right (resp., left) action of A on A_L (resp., A_R) is given by the usual multiplication, whereas the left (resp., right) action of A on A_L (resp., A_R) is given as follows:

$$a \cdot f = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a} \\ \cdots \\ \boxed{f} \end{array}, \quad g \cdot a = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{g} \\ \cdots \\ \boxed{a} \end{array}, \quad (5.7)$$

for all $(f, g, a) \in A_L \times A_R \times A$. Let

$$E = A_L \otimes_A ?, \quad F = A_R \otimes_A ?. \quad (5.8)$$

Lemma 5.1. *We have*

- (1) $E \cong F$ as functors,
- (2) E is self-adjoint and exact.

Proof. Define $\phi : A_L \rightarrow A_R$ and $\psi : A_R \rightarrow A_L$ such that

$$\phi(f) = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \boxed{f} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg|, \quad \psi(g) = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{g} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg|,$$

where $f \in 1_{m+1}A$ and $g \in A1_{m+1}$. By (5.1)I, we have

$$\psi\phi(f) = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \boxed{f} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg| \Bigg| = f, \quad \phi\psi(g) = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{g} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg| \Bigg| = g.$$

This proves $\phi^{-1} = \psi$. Finally, it is easy to see that both ϕ and ψ are (A, A) -homomorphisms. So $A_L \cong A_R$ as (A, A) -bimodules and (1) follows. The unit $\beta : \text{Id}_{A\text{-mod}} \rightarrow F^2$ is given by the bimodule homomorphism $A \xrightarrow{\beta'} A_R \otimes_A A_R$ such that

$$\beta'(f) = (1_m \frown) \otimes (f |)$$

for all $f \in 1_m A$, and the counit $\alpha : F^2 \rightarrow \text{Id}_{A\text{-mod}}$ is given by the bimodule homomorphism $A_R \otimes_A A_R \xrightarrow{\alpha'} A$ such that

$$\alpha'(f \otimes g) = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \boxed{g} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg|,$$

for all $(f, g) \in A1_{n+1} \times 1_n A1_{m+1}$. For all admissible diagrams $a \in 1_m A$, $g \in A_R 1_n$ and $f \in 1_n A_R$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Id}_{A_R} \otimes \alpha')(\beta' \otimes \text{Id}_{A_R})(a \otimes g) &= (\text{Id}_{A_R} \otimes \alpha')((1_m \frown) \otimes (a |) \otimes g) \\ &= (1_m \frown) \otimes \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a} \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \boxed{g} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg| = (1_m \frown) \circ \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a} \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \boxed{g} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg| \otimes 1_n = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{a} \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \boxed{g} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg| \otimes 1_n \stackrel{(5.1)I}{=} (a \cdot g) \otimes 1_n \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha' \otimes \text{Id}_{A_R})(\text{Id}_{A_R} \otimes \beta')(f \otimes a) &= (\alpha' \otimes \text{Id}_{A_R})(f \otimes (1_m \frown) \otimes (a |)) \\ &= \begin{array}{c} \boxed{f} \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \\ | \quad | \\ \text{---} \cdot \cdot \cdot \text{---} \end{array} \Bigg| \otimes (a |) \stackrel{(5.1)I}{=} 1_n \otimes f \cdot a. \end{aligned}$$

So, $(\text{Id}_{A_R} \otimes \alpha')(\beta' \otimes \text{Id}_{A_R}) : A \otimes_A A_R \rightarrow A_R \otimes_A A$ and $(\alpha' \otimes \text{Id}_{A_R})(\text{Id}_{A_R} \otimes \beta') : A_R \otimes_A A \rightarrow A \otimes_A A_R$ are identity morphism of (A, A) -bimodules A_R (under the obvious isomorphisms $A \otimes_A A_R \cong A_R$ and $A_R \cong A_R \otimes_A A$), and hence

$$\alpha F \circ F \beta = \text{Id}_F = F \alpha \circ \beta F.$$

This shows that F is self-adjoint and exact. Now, (2) follows from (1), immediately. \square

Recall the algebra monomorphism τ_A in (5.4). Then $\tau_A|_{A_{m-1}} : A_{m-1} \rightarrow A_m$ is an algebra monomorphism. Since $n-1 \preceq m-1 \Leftrightarrow n \preceq m$ and $\tau_A(1_n) = 1_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tau_A(A^{\neq m-1}) \subseteq A^{\neq m}$. By Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.10(2), τ_A induces an algebra monomorphism

$$\bar{\tau}_{m-1} : A_{\preceq m-1} \rightarrow A_{\preceq m}.$$

Restricting $\bar{\tau}_{m-1}$ to \bar{A}_{m-1} gives a monomorphism from \bar{A}_{m-1} to \bar{A}_m . So, \bar{A}_{m-1} can be identified with a subalgebra of \bar{A}_m via $\bar{\tau}_{m-1}$ and \bar{A}_m can be viewed as an $(\bar{A}_m, \bar{A}_{m-1})$ -bimodule and an $(\bar{A}_{m-1}, \bar{A}_m)$ -bimodule. By (A3) and Proposition 2.10(1), \bar{A}_m is a free right \bar{A}_{m-1} -module with basis $\{\bar{h} \mid h \in D(m)\}$. Furthermore, we have two exact functors

$$\text{ind}_{m-1}^m = \bar{A}_m \otimes_{\bar{A}_{m-1}}?, \quad \text{res}_{m-1}^m = \bar{A}_m \otimes_{\bar{A}_m}?. \quad (5.9)$$

Let $\bar{A}^\circ = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{A}_m$. Define $\bar{A}_L^\circ = \bigoplus_{m, n \in \mathbb{N}} 1_m A_L^\circ 1_n$ and $\bar{A}_R^\circ = \bigoplus_{m, n \in \mathbb{N}} 1_m A_R^\circ 1_n$ such that

$$\bar{1}_m \bar{A}_L^\circ \bar{1}_n = \bar{1}_{m+1} \bar{A}^\circ \bar{1}_n, \quad \bar{1}_m \bar{A}_R^\circ \bar{1}_n = \bar{1}_m \bar{A}^\circ \bar{1}_{n+1}. \quad (5.10)$$

Proof. At moment, we define $B_1 \otimes B_2 = \{b_1 \otimes b_2 \mid b_1 \in B_1, b_2 \in B_2\}$ for any sets B_1, B_2 . When $B \in \{H(m), Y(m)\}$ and $b \in B$, let \bar{b} be the image of b in $A_{\leq m}$ and set $\bar{B} = \{\bar{b} \mid b \in B\}$.

Thanks to Lemma 3.2(1) and (5.10), $A_{\leq m-1} \bar{\mathbb{I}}_{m-1} \otimes_{\bar{A}_{m-1}} \bar{A}_L \bar{\mathbb{I}}_m$ has basis $\bar{Y}(m-1) \otimes \bar{H}(m)$ (if $m = 0$, this set is \emptyset by convention). Similarly, $A_{\leq m+1} \bar{\mathbb{I}}_{m+1} \otimes_{\bar{A}_{m+1}} \bar{A}_R \bar{\mathbb{I}}_m$ has basis $\bar{Y}(m+1) \otimes \bar{H}(m+1)$. Since $A_L \otimes_A A_{\leq m} \cong A_{\leq m}$ as vector spaces, $A_L \otimes_A A_{\leq m} \bar{\mathbb{I}}_m$ has basis $\tilde{Y}(m) \otimes \bar{H}(m)$. To prove (5.17), it suffices to show the following is a short exact sequence of (A, \bar{A}°) -bimodules

$$0 \rightarrow A_{\leq m-1} \bar{\mathbb{I}}_{m-1} \otimes_{\bar{A}_{m-1}} \bar{A}_L \bar{\mathbb{I}}_m \xrightarrow{\varphi} A_L \otimes_A A_{\leq m} \bar{\mathbb{I}}_m \xrightarrow{\psi} A_{\leq m+1} \bar{\mathbb{I}}_{m+1} \otimes_{\bar{A}_{m+1}} \bar{A}_R \bar{\mathbb{I}}_m \rightarrow 0 \quad (5.18)$$

for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where

$$\varphi(\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}) = (f \downarrow) \otimes \bar{g}, \quad \psi(f \otimes \bar{g}) = \overline{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \hline f \\ \hline \end{array}} \otimes (\bar{g} \uparrow),$$

for any admissible basis elements f, \bar{f} and \bar{g} . First of all, it is routine to check that both φ and ψ are well-defined (A, \bar{A}°) -homomorphisms. Furthermore, we have $\bar{f} \overline{\quad} = 0$ in $A_{\leq m+1}$ if $f \in Y(m-1)$. So, for all $\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g} \in \bar{Y}(m-1) \otimes \bar{H}(m)$,

$$\psi(\varphi(\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g})) = \overline{\bar{f} \overline{\quad}} \otimes (\bar{g} \uparrow) = 0.$$

It remains to prove that φ gives a bijective map between $\bar{Y}(m-1) \otimes \bar{H}(m)$ and \tilde{Y}_1 and the restriction of ψ to \tilde{Y}_2 gives a bijective map between \tilde{Y}_2 and $\bar{Y}(m+1) \otimes \bar{H}(m+1)$, where $\tilde{Y}_i = Y_i(m) \otimes \bar{H}(m)$, and $Y_1(m), Y_2(m)$ are given in (A4). If so, since $\tilde{Y}(m) \otimes \bar{H}(m) = \tilde{Y}_1 \sqcup \tilde{Y}_2$, we have the exactness of (5.18).

Obviously, φ sends $\bar{Y}(m-1) \otimes \bar{H}(m)$ to \tilde{Y}_1 and the inverse map φ_1 of φ sends $\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g} \mapsto \bar{f}_1 \otimes \bar{g}$ for any $\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g} \in \tilde{Y}_1$, where f_1 is obtained from f by deleting the rightmost vertical strand. For any $f \in Y(m+1)$, $d \in D(m+1)$ and $g_1 \in H(m)$, by (5.1)I, we have

$$\psi\left(\overline{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline f \\ \hline d \\ \hline \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \hline \end{array}} \otimes \bar{g}_1\right) = \overline{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline f \\ \hline d \\ \hline \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \hline \end{array}} \otimes \bar{g}_1 \uparrow = \bar{f} \otimes \overline{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline d \\ \hline \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \hline g_1 \\ \hline \end{array}} = \bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}, \quad (5.19)$$

where $g = d \circ \tau_A(g_1)$. By (A3) ψ sends \tilde{Y}_2 to $\bar{Y}(m+1) \otimes \bar{H}(m+1)$.

Suppose $g \in H(m+1)$. Thanks to (A3), $g = d \circ \tau_A(g_1)$ for some $d \in D(m+1)$ and $g_1 \in H(m)$. For any $\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g} \in \bar{Y}(m+1) \otimes \bar{H}(m+1)$, define

$$\psi_1(\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}) = \overline{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline f \\ \hline d \\ \hline \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \hline \end{array}} \otimes \bar{g}_1.$$

Thanks to (A3)-(A4), $\psi_1(\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}) \in \tilde{Y}_2$. Moreover, by (5.19) $\psi\psi_1(\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}) = \bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}$. Using (5.1)I yields

$$\psi_1\psi(f \otimes \bar{g}) = \overline{\begin{array}{|c|} \hline \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \hline f \\ \hline \cdot \cdot \cdot \\ \hline \end{array}} \otimes \bar{g} = f \otimes \bar{g}.$$

So, ψ_1 is the inverse map of ψ . This completes the proof. \square

The $X_i 1_m$ in (5.12) also induces a linear map $X \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(A_L)$ such that the restriction of X to $1_{m+1}A$ is given by the left multiplication of $X_{m+1} 1_{m+1}$.

Lemma 5.5. *The endomorphism X is an (A, A) -bimodule homomorphism. If φ and ψ are given in (5.18), then*

- (1) $(X \otimes Id) \circ \varphi = \varphi \circ (Id \otimes \bar{X}_L^\circ)$,
- (2) $(Id \otimes (\bar{X}_R^\circ)^{-1}) \circ \psi = \psi \circ (X \otimes Id)$ if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_2$,
- (3) $(Id \otimes \bar{X}_R^\circ) \circ \psi = -\psi \circ (X \otimes Id)$ if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1$.

Proof. For any $g \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(m, n)$,

$$X_{n+1} 1_{n+1} \circ (g \downarrow) = g \downarrow = (g \downarrow) \circ X_{m+1} 1_{m+1}. \quad (5.20)$$

So, X is an (A, A) -homomorphism. Suppose $(f, g) \in Y(m-1) \times H(m)$ and $m \geq 1$. By (5.20),

$$(X \otimes \text{Id}) \circ \varphi(\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}) = (X \otimes \text{Id})((f \mid) \otimes \bar{g}) = (f \downarrow) \otimes \bar{g} = f \otimes \bar{X}_{m+1} \bar{g} = \varphi \circ (\text{Id} \otimes \bar{X}_L^\circ)(\bar{f} \otimes \bar{g}),$$

proving (1). If $(f, g) \in Y(m) \times H(m)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Id} \otimes (\bar{X}_R^\circ)^{-1}) \circ \psi(f \otimes \bar{g}) &= (\text{Id} \otimes (\bar{X}_R^\circ)^{-1}) \left(\overbrace{\boxed{f}}^{\text{---}} \otimes (\bar{g} \mid) \right) = \overbrace{\boxed{f}}^{\text{---}} \otimes (\bar{g} \downarrow) \\ &= \overbrace{\boxed{f}}^{\text{---}} \otimes (\bar{g} \mid) \stackrel{(5.2)\text{II}}{=} \overbrace{\boxed{f}}^{\text{---}} \otimes (\bar{g} \mid) = \psi \circ (X \otimes \text{Id})(f \otimes \bar{g}), \end{aligned}$$

proving (2). Replacing (5.2)II by (5.1)II, one can verify (3) by arguments similar to those for (2). We omit details. \square

Definition 5.6. If $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1$, we define $\sharp : \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ such that $i^\sharp = -i$ for any $i \in \mathbb{k}$. If $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_2$, we define $\sharp : \mathbb{k}^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{k}^\times$ such that $i^\sharp = i^{-1}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{k}^\times$.

For each $i \in \mathbb{k}$, let

$$E_i := A_{L,i} \otimes A^?, \quad (5.21)$$

where $A_{L,i}$ is the generalized i -eigenspace of X on A_L .

Theorem 5.7. For each $i \in \mathbb{k}$, E_i is an exact functor. Furthermore, there is a short exact sequence of functors from \bar{A}° -fdmod to A -lfdmod:

$$0 \rightarrow \Delta \circ \bar{E}_i \rightarrow E_i \circ \Delta \rightarrow \Delta \circ \bar{F}_{i^\sharp} \rightarrow 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Proof. Since E_i is a summand of the exact functor E , so is \bar{E}_i . Thanks to Lemma 5.5, the short exact sequence of (5.22) follows from (5.17) by passing to appropriate generalized eigenspaces. \square

5.3. Characters. Fix an $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\{X_i 1_m \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ generates a finite dimensional commutative subalgebra of A_m , where $X_i 1_m$'s are given in (5.12). For any $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m) \in \mathbb{k}^m$, there is an idempotent $1_{\mathbf{i}} \in A_m$ which projects any A_m -module M onto $M_{\mathbf{i}}$, the simultaneous generalized eigenspace of $X_1 1_m, \dots, X_m 1_m$ with respect to \mathbf{i} .

Assumption 5.8. In the remaining part of this section, we keep the following assumptions.

- (A5) There is a \mathbb{k} -linear monoidal contravariant functor $\sigma : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ such that $\sigma^2 = \text{Id}$ and σ preserves the generating object \mid and the right ideal K . Hence σ induces an anti-involution $\sigma_A : A \rightarrow A$ with $\sigma_A(1_m) = 1_m$ for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (A6) For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, \bar{A}_m is a cellular algebra with cellular basis given in (4.4). The corresponding cell module is $S_m(\lambda)$ (see (4.11)), $\forall \lambda \in \Lambda_m$.
- (A7) For any $i \in \mathbb{k}$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and any $\lambda \in \Lambda_m$, there are $\mathcal{A}_{i,\lambda} \subseteq \Lambda_{m+1}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{i,\lambda} \subseteq \Lambda_{m-1}$ such that $\bar{E}_i S_m(\lambda)$ (resp., $\bar{F}_i S_m(\lambda)$) has a multiplicity-free filtration with sections $S_{m-1}(\mu)$ (resp., $S_{m+1}(\mu)$) for $\mu \in \mathcal{R}_{i,\lambda}$ (resp., $\mu \in \mathcal{A}_{i,\lambda}$).
- (A8) $\mu \in \mathcal{A}_{i,\lambda}$ if and only if $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}_{i,\mu}$, for any $i \in \mathbb{k}$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \Lambda_m$.
- (A9) $\bar{A}_0 = \mathbb{k} \bar{1}_0 \cong \mathbb{k}$.

Recall that $\bar{\Lambda} = \bigcup_{m \in \mathbb{N}} \bar{\Lambda}_m$, where $\bar{\Lambda}_m$ parameterizes all the pairwise inequivalent simple \bar{A}_m -modules in the sense that the cell module $S_m(\lambda)$ has the simple head $L_m(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_m$. So, $\Lambda_0 = \bar{\Lambda}_0$, the set containing a single element, say \emptyset . To simplify the notation, we denote $S_m(\lambda)$ by $S(\lambda)$.

Let Ξ be the graph such that the set of vertices is Λ and any edge is of form $\lambda - \mu$ whenever $\mu \in \mathcal{A}_{i,\lambda}$ or $\mu \in \mathcal{R}_{i,\lambda}$ (equivalently by (A8), $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}_{i,\mu}$ or $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_{i,\mu}$) for some $i \in \mathbb{k}$.

For any $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda$, a path $\gamma : \lambda \rightsquigarrow \mu$ is of length $\ell(\gamma)$ if there are $\lambda_i \in \Lambda$, $0 \leq i \leq \ell(\gamma)$ such that $\lambda_0 = \lambda$, $\lambda_{\ell(\gamma)} = \mu$ and $\lambda_{j-1} - \lambda_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\gamma)$. Furthermore, the edge $\lambda_{j-1} - \lambda_j$ is colored by $i_j \in \mathbb{k}$ such that $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{A}_{i_j, \lambda_{j-1}}$ or $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{R}_{i_j^\sharp, \lambda_{j-1}}$. In this case, we say that γ is of content $c(\gamma) = (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{\ell(\gamma)})$. When $\ell(\gamma) = 0$, there is a unique path from \emptyset to \emptyset with length 0 and the corresponding content is \emptyset .

Definition 5.9. For any $V \in A$ -lfdmod, define

$$\text{ch}V = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{k}^m} (\dim 1_{\mathbf{i}} V) e^{\mathbf{i}}, \quad (5.23)$$

where $1_{\mathbf{i}} V$ is the simultaneous generalized eigenspace of $X_1 1_m, \dots, X_m 1_m$ corresponding to \mathbf{i} .

Proposition 5.10. *For any $\lambda \in \Lambda$, $ch\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = \sum_{\gamma} e^{c(\gamma)}$ where the summation ranges over all paths $\gamma : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \lambda$ and $\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ is given in (4.13).*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\dim 1_{\mathbf{i}}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = |\{\gamma : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \lambda \mid c(\gamma) = \mathbf{i}\}|$ for all $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{k}^m$ (resp., $(\mathbb{k}^{\times})^m$) and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ if $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1$ (resp., \mathcal{C}_2).

Suppose $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$. By Lemma 3.2(1), $\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ has a basis $\{\bar{y} \otimes w \mid y \in Y(n), w \in \mathcal{S}(\lambda)\}$, where $\mathcal{S}(\lambda)$ is a basis of $S(\lambda)$. So,

$$\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{N}} 1_{n+2d}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda), \quad 1_n\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = S(\lambda). \quad (5.24)$$

We prove the result by induction on $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $m = 0$. If $\lambda \neq \emptyset$, then $1_{\emptyset}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = 0$. Otherwise, $1_{\emptyset}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = \mathbb{k}$. So, the result holds for $m = 0$.

Suppose that $m > 0$. First, we have $1_{m-1}E\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = 1_m A \otimes_A \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$, and an A_{m-1} -isomorphism $\phi : 1_m A \otimes_A \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) \rightarrow 1_m \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$, sending $b \otimes v$ to bv for all $(b, v) \in 1_m A \times \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$. Note that $1_{m-1}E_i\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = 1_{m-1}(A_L)_i \otimes_A \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = (1_m A)_i \otimes_A \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$, where $(1_m A)_i$ is the generalized i -eigenspace of $X_m 1_m$ with respect to the left action on $1_m A$. Restricting ϕ to $1_{m-1}E_i\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ gives an isomorphism between $1_{m-1}E_i\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ and the generalized i -eigenspace of $X_m 1_m$ on $1_m \tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ and hence

$$\dim 1_{\mathbf{i}'}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) = \dim 1_{\mathbf{i}'}E_{i_m}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda), \quad (5.25)$$

for any $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{k}^m$, where $\mathbf{i}' = (i_1, \dots, i_{m-1})$. Thanks to (5.22) and (A7)-(A8), $E_{i_m}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ has a multiplicity-free $\tilde{\Delta}$ -filtration such that $\tilde{\Delta}(\mu)$ appears as a section if and only if either $\mu \in \mathcal{R}_{i_m, \lambda}$ or $\mu \in \mathcal{A}_{i_m, \lambda}^{\#}$. Now the result follows from (5.25) and induction on m . \square

Corollary 5.11. *Suppose $\lambda \in \Lambda, \mu \in \bar{\Lambda}_m$. If $[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$, then there are two paths $\gamma : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \lambda$ and $\delta : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \mu$ of length m such that $c(\gamma) = c(\delta)$.*

Proof. Thanks to (3.5), $1_m L(\mu) = L_m(\mu)$ for any $\mu \in \bar{\Lambda}_m$. Pick an $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{k}^m$ such that $1_{\mathbf{i}}L(\mu) \neq 0$. Since $[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$, we have $1_{\mathbf{i}}\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) \neq 0$.

Thanks to Lemma 3.8(1), $[\bar{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\mu)] = 1$. Since Δ is exact and $L_m(\mu)$ is the simple head of $S(\mu)$, $[\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$, forcing $1_{\mathbf{i}}\tilde{\Delta}(\mu) \neq 0$. Now, the result follows from Proposition 5.10, immediately. \square

Definition 5.12. Let $\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{I}_0 \cup \mathbb{I}_0^{\#}$, where $\mathbb{I}_0 = \{i \in \mathbb{k} \mid \bar{E}_i \neq 0\}$ and $\mathbb{I}_0^{\#} = \{i^{\#} \mid i \in \mathbb{I}_0\}$.

Theorem 5.13. *Keep the Assumption 3.12. If $\mathbb{I}_0 \cap \mathbb{I}_0^{\#} = \emptyset$, then*

- (1) $P(\mu) = \Delta(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \bar{\Lambda}$,
- (2) $\Delta : \bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-mod} \rightarrow A\text{-mod}$ is an equivalence of categories.

Proof. Take an arbitrary $\mu \in \bar{\Lambda}_m$. If $P(\mu) \neq \Delta(\mu)$, by Lemma 3.13(2) (the place we have to keep the Assumption 3.12) and Proposition 3.9, $[\bar{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$ for some $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_n$ and $\lambda \neq \mu$. Since Δ is exact and $L_n(\lambda)$ is the simple head of $S(\lambda)$, there is an epimorphism from $\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda)$ to $\bar{\Delta}(\lambda)$. So, $[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$. By Corollary 5.11, there are two paths $\gamma : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \lambda$ and $\delta : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \mu$ such that $c(\gamma) = c(\delta) \in \mathbb{k}^m$.

We claim $n = m$. Otherwise, $n + 2s = m$ for some $s \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore, there is an edge, say $\lambda_{j-1} - \lambda_j$ such that $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{R}_{i, \lambda_{j-1}}$ for some $i \in \mathbb{k}$. So, $\mathbb{I}_0 \cap \mathbb{I}_0^{\#} \neq \emptyset$, a contradiction. Thanks to Lemma 3.2(1), $1_m \bar{\Delta}(\lambda) = L_m(\lambda)$. Since $1_m L(\mu) = L_m(\mu)$, it is a composition factor of the simple \bar{A}_m -module $L_m(\lambda)$, forcing $\lambda = \mu$, a contradiction. So, $P(\mu) = \Delta(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \bar{\Lambda}$.

By (1), the exact functor Δ sends projective \bar{A}° -modules $P_m(\lambda)$'s to projective A -modules $P(\lambda)$'s for any $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_m, m \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\{P_m(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_m, m \in \mathbb{N}\}$ gives a complete set of representatives of all indecomposable objects of $\bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-pmod}$. Thanks to the general result on locally unital algebras in [15, Corollary 2.5], Δ is an equivalence of categories, proving (2). \square

5.4. Categorical actions on $A\text{-mod}^{\Delta}$. Let $K_0(\bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-pmod})$ be the split Grothendieck group of $\bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-pmod}$, and let $K_0(A\text{-mod}^{\Delta})$ be the Grothendieck group of $A\text{-mod}^{\Delta}$. Define

$$[\bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-pmod}] = \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} K_0(\bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-pmod}), \quad [A\text{-mod}^{\Delta}] = \mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} K_0(A\text{-mod}^{\Delta}). \quad (5.26)$$

Let \mathfrak{g} be a Kac-Moody Lie algebra (over the complex field \mathbb{C}) with Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} . Its Chevalley generators are $\{e_i, f_i \mid i \in \mathbb{I}_0\}$ subject to the Serre relations. We say that there is a categorical \mathfrak{g} -action on $\bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-pmod}$ if \bar{E}_i and \bar{F}_i are biadjoint with each other and $[\bar{A}^{\circ}\text{-pmod}]$ is a \mathfrak{g} -module on which the

Chevalley generators e_i and f_i act via the endomorphisms induced by the exact functors \overline{E}_i and \overline{F}_i in (5.15) for any $i \in \mathbb{I}_0$.

Theorem 5.14. *Let \mathfrak{g}^\sharp be the Lie subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} generated by $\{\tilde{e}_i \mid i \in \mathbb{I}\}$, where \mathbb{I} is given in Definition 5.12, $\tilde{e}_i = e_i + f_{i^\sharp}$ and $e_i = 0$ (resp., $f_{i^\sharp} = 0$) if $i \notin \mathbb{I}_0$ (resp., $i^\sharp \notin \mathbb{I}_0$). If there is a categorical \mathfrak{g} -action on \overline{A}° -pmod, then $[A\text{-mod}^\Delta]$ is a left \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -module on which \tilde{e}_i acts via the exact functor E_i in Theorem 5.7 for any $i \in \mathbb{I}$.*

Proof. We are assuming that A satisfies assumptions (A1)-(A9), all previous results in this section are available. The exact functor Δ gives a linear isomorphism

$$\Delta : [\overline{A}^\circ\text{-pmod}] \rightarrow [A\text{-mod}^\Delta] \quad (5.27)$$

which sends $[P_m(\lambda)]$ to $[\Delta(\lambda)]$ for all $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}_m$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. If we define

$$e_i[\Delta(\lambda)] = [\Delta(\overline{E}_i P_m(\lambda))], \quad f_i[\Delta(\lambda)] = [\Delta(\overline{F}_i P_m(\lambda))],$$

for all $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}_m, m \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \mathbb{I}_0$, then $[A\text{-mod}^\Delta]$ is also a left \mathfrak{g} -module, and hence the linear isomorphism Δ in (5.27) is a \mathfrak{g} -isomorphism. In particular, it is a \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -isomorphism. For any $i \in \mathbb{I}$, by Theorem 5.7,

$$[E_i \Delta(\lambda)] = [\Delta(\overline{E}_i P_m(\lambda))] + [\Delta(\overline{F}_{i^\sharp} P_m(\lambda))] = \tilde{e}_i([\Delta(\lambda)]).$$

□

Remark 5.15. Since E is self-adjoint (see Lemma 5.1), it sends projective module to projective module and so does E_i . This makes $[A\text{-pmod}]$ as a \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -submodule of $[A\text{-mod}^\Delta]$ (see Proposition 3.9(1)), i.e., there is also a categorical \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -action on $A\text{-pmod}$. Moreover, by Proposition 3.9(2), $[A\text{-pmod}] \cong [A\text{-mod}^\Delta]$ as \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -modules.

5.5. Block decomposition. Let \mathfrak{g} be the Kac-Moody algebra in subsection 5.4. Fix simple roots $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in \mathbb{I}_0\}$. The weight lattice is

$$P = \{\omega \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \langle h_i, \omega \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for all } i \in \mathbb{I}_0\},$$

where $h_i = [e_i, f_i]$. For any $\lambda, \mu \in P$, write

$$\lambda \preceq \mu \quad \text{if } \overline{\lambda} = \overline{\mu} \text{ and } \lambda \leq \mu, \quad (5.28)$$

where $\overline{\lambda}$ is the image of λ in P/Q^\sharp , $Q^\sharp = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{I}_0 \cap \mathbb{I}_0^\sharp} \mathbb{Z}(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i^\sharp})$ and \leq is the usual dominance order on P such that $\lambda \leq \mu$ if $\mu - \lambda \in \text{NII}$. Then \preceq is another partial order on P . In Proposition 5.16 and Theorem 5.17, we keep the following assumption:

(A10) For any $\mu \in \Lambda_m$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$, any two paths $\gamma, \delta : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \mu$ of length m have the same contents up to a permutation.

For any $\mu \in \Lambda_m$ and any path $\gamma : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \mu$ of length m , define

$$\text{wt}(\mu) = - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq m} \alpha_{i_j} \in P, \quad (5.29)$$

where $(i_1, \dots, i_m) = c(\gamma)$. By (A10), $\text{wt}(\mu)$ in (5.29) is independent of a path.

Proposition 5.16. *Suppose $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}$. If $[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$, then $\text{wt}(\mu) \preceq \text{wt}(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Suppose $\gamma : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \lambda$ and $\delta : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \mu$ are two paths such that $c(\gamma) = c(\delta) = (i_1, \dots, i_m)$. We claim $\text{wt}(\mu) \preceq \text{wt}(\lambda)$ if $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and $\mu \in \Lambda_m$.

In fact, the claim is trivial if $m = 0$. In this case, $\lambda = \mu = \emptyset$. Suppose $m > 0$. Removing the last edge in both γ and δ yields two shorter paths $\gamma' : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \lambda'$ and $\delta' : \emptyset \rightsquigarrow \mu'$ such that $c(\gamma') = c(\delta')$ and $\mu' \in \Lambda_{m-1}$. By induction assumption on $m - 1$, $\text{wt}(\mu') \preceq \text{wt}(\lambda')$.

We have either $\lambda \in \mathcal{A}_{i_m, \lambda'}$ or $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}_{i_m, \lambda'}$. In the first case, thanks to (5.29), $\text{wt}(\lambda') = \text{wt}(\lambda) + \alpha_{i_m}$. Since $\mu \in \Lambda_m$, $\text{wt}(\mu') = \text{wt}(\mu) + \alpha_{i_m}$. So, $\text{wt}(\mu) \preceq \text{wt}(\lambda)$. In the second case, $\lambda \in \mathcal{R}_{i_m, \lambda'}$ (hence $i_m \in \mathbb{I}_0 \cap \mathbb{I}_0^\sharp$), and $\text{wt}(\lambda') = \text{wt}(\lambda) - \alpha_{i_m}^\sharp$ and $\text{wt}(\mu') = \text{wt}(\mu) + \alpha_{i_m}$. So,

$$\text{wt}(\lambda) - \text{wt}(\mu) = \text{wt}(\lambda') - \text{wt}(\mu') + \alpha_{i_m} + \alpha_{i_m}^\sharp \in \text{NII}, \quad \overline{\text{wt}(\lambda)} = \overline{\text{wt}(\mu)},$$

and hence $\text{wt}(\mu) \preceq \text{wt}(\lambda)$. Now, our result follows immediately from Corollary 5.11 and the above claim. □

Theorem 5.17. *Keep the Assumption 3.12. Suppose $\lambda, \mu \in \bar{\Lambda}$. If $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ are in the same block, then $\text{wt}(\lambda) = \text{wt}(\mu)$.*

Proof. Suppose $[P(\mu) : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$. By Corollary 4.4, $P(\mu)$ has a $\tilde{\Delta}$ -flag and

$$[P(\mu) : L(\lambda)] = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda} [\tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\mu)][\tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)]. \quad (5.30)$$

So there is at least $\nu \in \Lambda$ such that $[\tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\mu)][\tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$. Thanks to Proposition 5.16, $\text{wt}(\lambda) \preceq \text{wt}(\nu)$ and $\text{wt}(\mu) \preceq \text{wt}(\nu)$, forcing $\text{wt}(\lambda) = \text{wt}(\nu) = \text{wt}(\mu)$. \square

Remark 5.18. Suppose that the blocks of $\bar{\Lambda}_m$ are given by wt in the sense that $L_m(\lambda) \sim L_m(\mu)$ if and only if $\text{wt}(\lambda) = \text{wt}(\mu)$. Then the stratification of the upper finite stratified category $A\text{-lfdmod}$ in Theorem 3.10 can be refined such that ρ is replaced by the weight function $\text{wt} : \bar{\Lambda} \rightarrow P$ with the order \preceq on P given in (5.28). See [45] for Brauer category. In the current case, the result follows from arguments similar to those for Brauer category in [45]. Of course, we need the fact that $\text{wt}(\mu) \prec \text{wt}(\lambda)$ if $[\tilde{\Delta}(\lambda) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$ and $\lambda \neq \mu$. One can check this fact by Proposition 5.16 and Proposition 3.9.

6. CYCLOTOMIC BRAUER CATEGORIES AND CYCLOTOMIC KAUFFMAN CATEGORIES

In this section we apply the general theory in sections 2–5 to study cyclotomic Brauer categories and cyclotomic Kauffman categories. First of all we recall some results on (degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras. Throughout, m is a fixed positive integer.

6.1. (Degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebras. Given $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \subset (\mathbb{k}^\times)^m$, the cyclotomic Hecke algebra $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}(\mathbf{u})$ is the associative \mathbb{k} -algebra generated by L_1, T_1, \dots, T_{n-1} subject to the relations:

- (1) $(T_i - q)(T_i + q^{-1}) = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$ and $q \in \mathbb{k}^\times$,
- (2) $T_i T_j = T_j T_i$, $1 \leq i < j - 1 \leq n - 2$,
- (3) $T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_{i+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq n - 2$,
- (4) $T_1 L_1 T_1 L_1 = L_1 T_1 L_1 T_1$,
- (5) $L_1 T_i = T_i L_1$, $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$,
- (6) $(L_1 - u_1) \cdots (L_1 - u_m) = 0$.

It is known that $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}(\mathbf{u})$ is a cellular algebra with certain cellular basis (see [21, Theorem 3.26]). The corresponding cell modules are denoted by $S(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,n}$, where $\Lambda_{m,n}$ is the set of all m -tuple of partitions (or m -partition) $(\lambda^{(1)}, \lambda^{(2)}, \dots, \lambda^{(m)})$ of n . When all u_j 's are in the same q^2 -orbit in the sense that $u_i u_j^{-1} \in q^{2\mathbb{Z}}$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$, it is proved in [3] that $S(\lambda)$ has the simple head $D(\lambda)$ if and only if $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_{m,n}$, where $\bar{\Lambda}_{m,n}$ is the set of all \mathbf{u} -Kleshchev m -partitions of n . If \mathbf{u} is a disjoint union of certain q^2 -orbits, then the above result on the classification of simple modules is still available. In this case, one can use Morita equivalence theorem for cyclotomic Hecke algebra in [22, Theorem 1.1].

Let $L_i = T_{i-1} L_{i-1} T_{i-1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$. Then L_1, L_2, \dots, L_n are known as the *Jucys-Murphy elements* of $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}(\mathbf{u})$. Thanks to the results on representations of $\mathcal{H}_{m,n}(\mathbf{u})$, all generalized eigenvalues of L_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, are of forms $u_j q^{2k}$, $1 \leq j \leq m$ and $1 - n \leq k \leq n - 1$ (e.g. [28, §3]). When \mathbf{u} is a q^2 -orbit, define $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}} = \{u_1 q^{2j} \mid j \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Let $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ be the Kac-Moody Lie algebra with respect to the Cartan matrix $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$, where

$$a_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } ij^{-1} = 1, \\ -1, & \text{if } ij^{-1} = q^{\pm 2} \text{ and } e \neq 2, \\ -2, & \text{if } ij^{-1} = q^2 \text{ and } e = 2, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6.1)$$

and e is the quantum characteristic of q^2 . In this case, $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}} = \mathfrak{sl}_{\infty}$ if $e = \infty$ and $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}} = \hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_e$ if $e < \infty$. Recall that the content of a node x with respect to an m -partition λ is $c(x) = u_j q^{2(k-l)}$, if x is at the l th row and k th column of the j th component of the Young diagram $[\lambda]$ with respect to λ [35]. Fix simple roots $\Pi = \{\alpha_i \mid i \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda(m)} \mathbb{C}v_{\lambda},$$

where $\Lambda(m) = \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \Lambda_{m,n}$. Then $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ is a left $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ -module (e.g. [2]) such that for any $i \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$,

- (1) $e_i v_{\lambda} = \sum_{\mu} v_{\mu}$, where μ 's are obtained from λ by removing a removable node of content i .

- (2) $f_i v_\lambda = \sum_{\mu} v_\mu$, where μ 's are obtained from λ by adding an addable node of content i .
(3) The action of the Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} is defined so that v_λ is a weight vector of weight

$$\text{wt}(\lambda) := \omega_{\mathbf{u}} - \sum_{x \in [\lambda]} \alpha_{c(x)}, \quad (6.2)$$

where $\omega_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{j=1}^m \omega_{u_j}$, and ω_i 's (resp., e_i, f_i) are fundamental weights (resp., Chevalley generators) for any $i \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$.

Let $V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$ be the $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ -submodule of $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ generated by v_\emptyset . Then $V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$ is the integrable highest weight module with the highest weight $\omega_{\mathbf{u}}$. Let $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u}) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{m,n}(\mathbf{u})$. As $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ -modules [2]

$$[\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-pmod}] \cong V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}}). \quad (6.3)$$

The required isomorphism ϕ is given by

$$\phi([Y(\lambda)]) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(m)} [S(\mu) : D(\lambda)] v_\mu, \quad (6.4)$$

for any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}(m) := \bigcup_{n=0}^{\infty} \overline{\Lambda}_{m,n}$, where $Y(\lambda)$ is the projective cover of $D(\lambda)$ (e.g. [29, § 5.3]) and the actions of e_i and f_i are given by i -restriction functor \overline{E}_i and i -induction functor \overline{F}_i for all $i \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$ (see, e.g. [29, § 7.4]).

When $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \amalg \dots \amalg \mathbf{u}_k$, a disjoint union of certain q^2 -orbits with $m_j = \#\mathbf{u}_j$, arrange u_i 's so that $u_l \in \mathbf{u}_j$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} m_i + 1 \leq l \leq \sum_{i=1}^j m_i$. We have the Cartan matrix D_j with respect to $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}_j}$ in the sense of (6.1), and $D = \text{diag}(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_k)$ where D is the Cartan matrix with respect to $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}_j}$. So,

$$\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}} \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^k \mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}_j}}. \quad (6.5)$$

Similarly, for any $j, 1 \leq j \leq k$, we have the $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}_j}}$ -module $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}_j}$ and its $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}_j}}$ -submodule $V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}_j})$ generated by v_\emptyset . Thanks to (6.5), $V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$ can be identified with $V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}_1}) \otimes V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}_2}) \otimes \dots \otimes V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}_k})$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ can be identified with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}_1} \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}_k}$. The following result should be well-known to the expert. We need it when we study the cyclotomic Kauffman categories later on.

Lemma 6.1. *As $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ -modules, $[\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-pmod}] \cong V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$ and the required isomorphism ϕ is given by*

$$\phi([Y(\lambda)]) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(m)} [S(\mu) : D(\lambda)] v_\mu.$$

Moreover, the Chevalley generators e_i, f_i act on $[\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-pmod}]$ via the endomorphisms induced by the i -restriction and i -induction functors $\overline{E}_i, \overline{F}_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$.

Proof. For any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}(m)$, let $b_\lambda := \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(m)} [S(\mu) : D(\lambda)] v_\mu$. Then the elements b_λ 's are linearly independent since the rectangular matrix $([S(\mu) : D(\lambda)])$ is unitriangular. This shows that the linear map

$$\phi_{\mathbf{u}} : [\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-pmod}] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}, [Y(\lambda)] \mapsto b_\lambda \quad (6.6)$$

is injective. There is a non-degenerate Cartan pairing

$$(\cdot, \cdot) : K_0(\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-pmod}) \times K_0(\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-fdmod}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

such that $([Y(\lambda)], [D(\mu)]) = \dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})}(Y(\lambda), D(\mu)) = \delta_{\lambda, \mu}$. It is known that \overline{E}_i and \overline{F}_i are biadjoint with each other, and hence $[\overline{E}_i]$ and $[\overline{F}_i]$ are biadjoint with respect to the above pairing, where $[F]$ is the linear map induced by the exact functor F . There is also a non-degenerate symmetric bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) on $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ so that $\{v_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Lambda(m)\}$ is an orthonormal basis, and moreover, e_i is biadjoint to f_i with this form. So, the $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ -module $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ can be identified with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}^*$ and the dual map of $\phi_{\mathbf{u}}$ is :

$$\phi_{\mathbf{u}}^* : \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}} \rightarrow [\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-fdmod}], v_\lambda \mapsto \sum_{\mu \in \overline{\Lambda}(m)} [S(\lambda) : D(\mu)] [D(\mu)].$$

Note that $\phi_{\mathbf{u}}^*(v_\lambda) = [S(\lambda)]$. It is clear from the brunching rule of $S(\lambda)$ (e.g. [4, Corollary 1.12] or [28, Proposition 3.7]) that $\phi_{\mathbf{u}}^*$ intertwines e_i, f_i with $[\overline{E}_i], [\overline{F}_i]$, respectively. It is routine to check that $(\phi_{\mathbf{u}}(x), y) = (x, \phi_{\mathbf{u}}^*(y))$ for any $x \in K_0(\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-pmod})$ and $y \in \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi_{\mathbf{u}}([\overline{E}_i Y(\lambda)]), v_\mu) &= ([\overline{E}_i Y(\lambda)], \phi_{\mathbf{u}}^*(v_\mu)) = ([Y(\lambda)], [\overline{F}_i](\phi_{\mathbf{u}}^*(v_\mu))) \\ &= ([Y(\lambda)], \phi_{\mathbf{u}}^*(f_i v_\mu)) = (\phi_{\mathbf{u}}([Y(\lambda)]), f_i v_\mu) = (e_i \phi_{\mathbf{u}}([Y(\lambda)]), v_\mu). \end{aligned}$$

Similar equality holds for \overline{F}_i and f_i . So, $\phi_{\mathbf{u}}$ intertwines $[\overline{E}_i]$, $[\overline{F}_i]$ with e_i , f_i , respectively. This proves that $[\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u})\text{-pmod}]$ is an $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ -module on which e_i and f_i act via restriction functor \overline{E}_i and induction functor \overline{F}_i for all $i \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$, and $\phi_{\mathbf{u}}$ is an $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ -homomorphism. It remains to prove that the image of $\phi_{\mathbf{u}}$ is the submodule $V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$. Thanks to (6.3), this is true if there is only one orbit in \mathbf{u} . So, the result holds for $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u}_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq k$, where $\mathcal{H}(\mathbf{u}_j) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{m_j, n}(\mathbf{u}_j)$. In general, we can partition λ into k parts such that $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k)$ and λ_j is an m_j -partition. By the Morita equivalence theorem [22, Theorem 1.1, Proposition 4.11], $[S(\mu) : D(\lambda)] = \prod_{j=1}^k [S(\mu_j) : D(\lambda_j)]$. Identifying $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}}$ with $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}_1} \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{u}_k}$ yields $b_{\lambda} = b_{\lambda_1} \otimes \dots \otimes b_{\lambda_k}$. So, the image of $\phi_{\mathbf{u}}$ is $V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$. \square

Remark 6.2. Let $H_{m, n}(\mathbf{u})$ be the degenerate cyclotomic Hecke algebra [29] over \mathbb{k} with respect to the parameters $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{k}^m$. In this case, u_i and u_j are in the same orbit if and only if $u_i - u_j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Similar to the non-degenerate case, we write

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_1 \amalg \dots \amalg \mathbf{u}_k,$$

a disjoint union of certain orbits with $m_j = \sharp \mathbf{u}_j$, where u_i 's are arranged such that $u_l \in \mathbf{u}_j$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{j-1} m_i + 1 \leq l \leq \sum_{i=1}^j m_i$. Moreover, $H_{m, n}(\mathbf{u})$ is a cellular algebra with cellular basis given in [5, Theorem 6.3]. Let $H(\mathbf{u}) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} H_{m, n}(\mathbf{u})$ and $H(\mathbf{u}_j) = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} H_{m_j, n}(\mathbf{u}_j)$. By arguments similar to those in the proof of Lemma 6.1, one can see that there is a result similar to that in Lemma 6.1 for $H(\mathbf{u})$. See remarks after [5, Theorem 8.5] in which Ariki et. al stated that there is a Morita equivalence theorem for degenerate cyclotomic Hecke algebra similar to those for cyclotomic Hecke algebra in [22, Theorem 1.1]. In this case, the complete set of inequivalent simple $H_{m, n}(\mathbf{u})$ -modules are parameterized by $\overline{\Lambda}_{m, n}$, the set of all \mathbf{u} -restricted m -partitions of n [29]. Furthermore,

- $c(x) = u_j + k - l$ if the box x is at the l th row and k th column of the j th component of the Young diagram with respect to λ (e.g. [5, § 6]),
- $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}_j} = \{u_i + n \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where u_i is any element in \mathbf{u}_j , and $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}} = \bigcup_{j=1}^k \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}_j}$,
- $\mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ is the Kac-Moody Lie algebra with respect to the Cartan matrix $(a_{i, j})_{i, j \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ such that

$$a_{i, j} = \begin{cases} 2, & \text{if } i = j; \\ -1, & \text{if } i = j \pm 1 \text{ and } p \neq 2; \\ -2, & \text{if } i = j - 1 \text{ and } p = 2; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

where p is the characteristic of \mathbb{k} .

6.2. Representations of cyclotomic Brauer categories. Suppose $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \in \mathbb{k}^m$ and $\text{char } \mathbb{k} = p \neq 2$. The (specialized) cyclotomic Brauer category $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ with respect to the polynomial $f(t) = \prod_{i=1}^m (t - u_i)$ (denoted by $\mathcal{CB}^f(\omega)$ in [44, Theorem C]) is introduced in [44, Definition 1.7]. It is a quotient category of the affine Brauer category \mathcal{AB} (a \mathbb{k} -linear strict monoidal category). Furthermore, the affine Brauer category \mathcal{AB} is one of \mathcal{C}_1 since it satisfies (5.1).

Let A be the algebra associated to $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$. When $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ is the Brauer category, i.e., $m = 1$, thanks to [45], A admits an upper finite triangular decomposition in the sense of [18]. Hence A admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition in the sense of Definition 2.1.

A dotted (a, b) -Brauer diagram is an (a, b) -Brauer diagram given in subsection 2.2 on which there are finite many \bullet on each strand. A normally ordered dotted (a, b) -Brauer diagram is a dotted (a, b) -Brauer diagram on which

- (a) there are at most $m - 1$ dots on the boundary of the lower row¹ if they appear on a vertical strand,
- (b) there are at most $m - 1$ dots on the leftmost boundary of a cap (resp., rightmost boundary of a cup) if they appear on a cap (resp., cup).

Suppose $m = 4$. The right one is a normally ordered dotted $(5, 5)$ -Brauer diagram and the left one is not:

(6.7)

¹The original definition in [44, Definition 1.3] is upper row here. However, using [44, (3.3)] the basis theorem remains true if it is replaced by the lower row by induction on the number of dots.

In the above diagrams, $\bullet 3$ represents that there are three \bullet 's on the leftmost boundary on the cap. Two normally ordered dotted (a, b) -Brauer diagrams are said to be equivalent if the underlying Brauer diagrams are equivalent and there are the same number of dots on their corresponding strands.

Let $\mathbb{B}_{a,b}$ be the set of all equivalence classes of normally ordered dotted (a, b) -Brauer diagrams. Thanks to [44, Theorem C], $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})}(a, b)$ is of maximal dimension if and only if the \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds in the sense of [44, Definition 1.8]². In this case, $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})}(a, b)$ has basis given by $\mathbb{B}_{a,b}$ and two equivalent diagrams represent the same morphism in $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$. So, we can identify each equivalence class with any element in it. Let $\mathbb{B} = \bigcup_{a,b \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{B}_{a,b}$.

Proposition 6.3. *If \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds in the sense of [44, Definition 1.8], then $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ is an upper finite weakly triangular category.*

Proof. The objects in $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ are given by $I = J = \mathbb{N}$. So, we have the data in (W1) with (\mathbb{N}, \preceq) given in (A1). Obviously, (\mathbb{N}, \preceq) is upper finite. For the data in (W2), we define

- (a) A^- : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of all elements in \mathbb{B} on which there are neither caps nor crossings among vertical strands and there are no dots on vertical strands,
- (b) A° : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of all elements in \mathbb{B} on which there are neither cups nor caps,
- (c) A^+ : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of all elements in \mathbb{B} on which there are neither cups nor crossings among vertical strands and there are no dots on vertical strands.

So, $\{1_a\} = \mathbb{B} \cap A_a^- = \mathbb{B} \cap A_a^+$. Moreover, if $a \not\preceq b$ (i.e., $a \neq b + 2s$ for all $s \in \mathbb{N}$), then $\mathbb{B} \cap A_{a,b}^- = \mathbb{B} \cap A_{b,a}^+ = \emptyset$ and hence (W3) follows.

For any $(g, h, k) \in (A^- 1_a \cap \mathbb{B}, A_a^\circ \cap \mathbb{B}, 1_a A^+ \cap \mathbb{B})$, the composition $g \circ h \circ k$ is not normally ordered in general, i.e., the dots on the vertical strands may not be on the lower line. For example:

$$g \circ h \circ k = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array}$$

if $(g, h, k) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array}, \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} \right)$. By the defining relation for affine Brauer category \mathcal{AB} in [44],

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \bullet \end{array}. \quad (6.8)$$

The local relation (6.8) explains that the dots on each strand of $g \circ h \circ k$ can slid freely up to a linear combination of some elements in \mathbb{B} with fewer dots [44, (3.3)]. So, all dots can be slid such that the resulting diagram is normally ordered. This shows that the multiplication map from $A^- \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A^\circ \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} A^+$ to A sends any basis element to a unique corresponding basis element in \mathbb{B} (up to a linear combination of some elements in \mathbb{B} with fewer dots). Furthermore, the multiplication map is obviously surjective. So, it is the required isomorphism and (W4) holds. \square

We are going to show that Assumption 3.12 and (A1)-(A10) hold for A associated to $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ provided that the \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds. In this case, $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}_1 = \mathcal{AB}$. If so, then all the results in sections 2-5 can be applied to $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$.

The Brauer category has been studied in [45]. So, we assume $m > 1$. Thanks to Proposition 6.3, (A1) holds. Define (see Definition 2.3)

$$Y(b, a) = \mathbb{B} \cap A_{b,a}^-, \quad H(a) = \mathbb{B} \cap A_a^\circ, \quad X(a, b) = \mathbb{B} \cap A_{a,b}^+. \quad (6.9)$$

Then (A2) holds obviously. To prove that (A3) holds, we define

$$S_i 1_a = 1_a S_i = \left[\begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{---} \\ \dots \end{array} \right] \in A_a, \quad (6.10)$$

²We do not need explicit description on [44, Definition 1.8] in the current paper.

for any admissible $i, a \in \mathbb{N}$. If we know a from the context, we simply denote $S_i 1_a$ by S_i . Let

$$D(a+1) = \{S_{i,a+1} X_{a+1}^j \mid 1 \leq i \leq a+1, 0 \leq j \leq m-1\} \subseteq A_{a+1},$$

where X_i is in (5.12) and $S_{i,a+1} = S_i \circ S_{i+1} \circ \cdots \circ S_a$, if $i < a+1$ and $S_{a+1,a+1} = 1_{a+1}$. Then

$$D(a+1) \subseteq H(a+1), \quad |H(a+1)| = |H(a)||D(a+1)|.$$

Given any $g \in H_{a+1}$ such that the i th vertex on the top row is connected with the rightmost vertex on the bottom row and the corresponding strand has no dots, there is some $\tilde{g} \in H(a)$ such that $S_{i,a+1}^{-1} \circ g = \tilde{g} \downarrow$. Then $g = S_{i,a+1} \tau_A(\tilde{g})$. Since $X_{a+1} \tau_A(d') = \tau_A(d') X_{a+1}$, we have $H(a+1) = \{d \circ \tau_A(d') \mid (d, d') \in D(a+1) \times H(a)\}$. So, (A3) holds.

Let $Y_1(a)$ be the subset of $Y(a)$ consists of all $d \in Y(a)$ such that the rightmost vertex on the top row of d is on the rightmost vertical strand. By (6.9), $Y_1(a) = \tau_A(Y(a-1))$ and $Y(a) = Y_1(a) \downarrow K_2(a)$, where the rightmost vertex on the top row of d is on a cup if $d \in K_2(a)$. By (5.1) (or [44, Lemma 3.1]),

$$\downarrow \cup = - \cup \downarrow. \quad (6.11)$$

We have $Y_2(a) \subseteq K_2(a)$ up to a sign since

$$(f \downarrow) \circ (S_{i,a+1} \downarrow) \circ (1_a \cup) \in Y(a),$$

for any $f \in Y(a+1)$ where $Y_2(a)$ is in (A3). Conversely, suppose $f \in K_2(a)$. Then the rightmost vertex on the top row of f is connected with another vertex, say the i th vertex on the top row. If there are j \bullet 's on the corresponding cup, then there is a $f_1 \in Y(a+1)$ such that

$$f = (f_1 \downarrow) \circ (S_{i,a+1} \downarrow) \circ (1_a \cup \downarrow j).$$

So, $K_2(a) \subseteq Y_2(a)$ up to a sign by (6.11) and hence $Y_2(a) = K_2(a)$ up to a sign. Since $Y(a)$ is a basis of $A^{-1} 1_a$, (A4) follows.

There is a monoidal contravariant functor $\sigma : \mathcal{AB} \rightarrow \mathcal{AB}$ switching \cup and \downarrow and fixing the generating object \downarrow and all other generating morphisms (see [44]). Moreover, $\sigma^2 = \text{Id}$ and σ induces an anti-involution σ_A on A and (A5) holds. By [44, (4.45)], there is an algebra isomorphism $\phi : A_a \cong W_{m,a}$, where $W_{m,a}$ is the cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebra in [5]. Moreover, it's known that $W_{m,a}/\phi(N_a) \cong H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$, where N_a is the two-sided ideal of A_a generated by $\downarrow \downarrow \cdots \downarrow$ and $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ is the degenerate cyclotomic Hecke algebra [29]. Note that $\text{Ker} \pi_a|_{A_a} = N_a$, where π_a is given in Proposition 2.10(4). So, the above isomorphism results in an induced isomorphism $\bar{\phi} : \bar{A}_a = A_a/N_a \rightarrow H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$. The anti-involution $\sigma_{\bar{A}_a}$ on $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u}) \cong \bar{A}_a$ coincides with the usual anti-involution of $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ fixing all generators. By the well-known results for $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ in [35] we have (A6)-(A10). In this case, $\Lambda_n = \Lambda_{m,n}$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_n = \bar{\Lambda}_{m,n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The function \sharp in Definition 5.6 satisfies $i^\sharp = -i$ and \mathbb{I}_0 in Definition 5.12 is $\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$ in Remark 6.2. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,a}$, $\mathcal{A}_{i,\lambda}$ (resp., $\mathcal{B}_{i,\lambda}$) is the set of all $\mu \in \Lambda_{m,a+1}$ (resp., $\Lambda_{m,a-1}$) such that μ is obtained from λ by adding (resp., removing) a box with content i .

Since $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ is a cellular algebra, by [35, Chapter 2, Exercise 7], we have

$$D(\lambda)^\circledast \cong D(\lambda) \quad (6.12)$$

for all $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_{m,a}$. It is proved in [16, Theorem A.2] that $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ is a symmetric algebra. By [23, Theorem 4.4.4], $\text{soc} Y(\lambda) = \text{hd} Y(\lambda) = D(\lambda)$ for any $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_{m,a}$. Thanks to (6.12), $Y(\lambda)^\circledast \cong Y(\lambda)$. So, Assumption 3.12 holds for \bar{A}_a for all $a \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 6.4. *Let A be the \mathbb{k} -algebra associated to the cyclotomic Brauer category $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$. Suppose the \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds.*

- (1) *The complete set of pairwise inequivalent simple A -modules are indexed by $\bar{\Lambda}(m)$, i.e., the set of all \mathbf{u} -restricted m -partitions in the sense of [29].*
- (2) *A -lfdmod is an upper finite fully stratified category in the sense of [18, Definition 3.36] with respect to the stratification $\rho : \bar{\Lambda}(m) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho(\lambda) = n$ if $\lambda \in \bar{\Lambda}_{m,n}$.*
- (3) *A -lfdmod is an upper finite highest weight category in the sense of [18, Definition 3.36] if $p = 0$ and $u_i - u_j \notin \mathbb{Z}1_{\mathbb{k}}$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$.*
- (4) *A is Morita equivalent to $\bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} H_{m,n}(\mathbf{u})$ if $u_i + u_j \notin \mathbb{Z}1_{\mathbb{k}}$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq m$.*
- (5) *A is semisimple over \mathbb{k} if and only if $p = 0$ and $2u_i \notin \mathbb{Z}1_{\mathbb{k}}$, $u_i \pm u_j \notin \mathbb{Z}1_{\mathbb{k}}$ for all different positive integers $i, j \leq m$.*

Proof. (1) follows from Proposition 6.3 and Theorem 3.4(3) together with [29, Theorem 5.4]. See Remark 6.2 when \mathbf{u} are divided into several orbits. (2) follows immediately from Proposition 6.3 and Theorem 3.5. (3) follows from Theorem 3.10 and [5, Theorem 6.11], where [5, Theorem 6.11] gives a necessary and sufficient condition for degenerate cyclotomic Hecke algebra being semisimple over \mathbb{k} . (4) follows from Theorem 5.13 since $\mathbb{I}_0 \cap \mathbb{I}_0^\sharp = \emptyset$ under the assumptions. Finally, (5) follows from Proposition 6.3, Theorem 3.15 and [38, Theorem 7.9], where [38, Theorem 7.9] gives a necessary and sufficient condition for cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras being semisimple over \mathbb{k} . \square

Suppose $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_{\mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}}$ in Remark 6.2 and $\omega_{\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{j=1}^m \omega_{u_j}$ where ω_i 's are fundamental weights indexed by $i \in \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$. Recall the Lie subalgebra \mathfrak{g}^\sharp of \mathfrak{g} in Theorem 5.14 with $\mathbb{I}_0 = \mathbb{I}_{\mathbf{u}}$.

Theorem 6.5. *Let A be the \mathbb{k} -algebra associated to the cyclotomic Brauer category $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ such that the \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds. As \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -modules, $[A\text{-mod}^\Delta] \cong V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$. The corresponding isomorphism ϕ^\sharp satisfies $\phi^\sharp([\Delta(\lambda)]) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(m)} [S(\mu) : D(\lambda)] v_\mu$ for any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}(m)$. Moreover, \tilde{e}_i acts via the exact functor E_i in Theorem 5.7 for any $i \in \mathbb{I}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 6.3, A admits an upper finite weakly triangular decomposition. We have verified the Assumptions (A1)-(A9) before Theorem 6.4. So, we are able to use Theorem 5.14. By the degenerate case of Lemma 6.1 (see Remark 6.2), we immediately have the result. In this case, $\overline{E}_i, \overline{F}_i$ in Theorem 5.14 are those in Remark 6.2 for the degenerate cyclotomic Hecke algebras with the same notation. \square

6.3. Representations of cyclotomic Kauffman categories. Suppose $q, q - q^{-1} \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, u_2, \dots, u_m) \in (\mathbb{k}^\times)^m$. The cyclotomic Kauffman category $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ with respect to the polynomial $f(t) = \prod_{i=1}^m (t - u_i)$ (denoted by \mathcal{CK}^f in [24, Theorem 1.15]) is introduced in [24, Definition 1.11]. Moreover, $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ is a quotient of the affine Kauffman category \mathcal{AK} (a strict monoidal category) which is one of \mathcal{C}_2 in section 5.

Assume $m = 1$. Then $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ is the Kauffman category and $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})}(a, b)$ has basis given by all equivalence classes of reduced totally descending (a, b) -tangle diagrams [48]. We depict the reduced totally descending tangle diagrams as follows. Roughly speaking, an (a, b) -tangle diagram is a diagram obtained from an (a, b) -Brauer diagram by replacing its crossings via either over crossings or under crossings. We label the endpoints at the upper (resp., lower) line of an (a, b) -tangle diagram by $\overline{1}, \overline{2}, \dots, \overline{b}$ (resp., $1, 2, \dots, a$) from left to right and assume $i < i + 1 < \overline{j} < \overline{j} - 1$ for all admissible i and j . A reduced totally descending (a, b) -tangle diagram is an (a, b) -tangle diagram on which

- (1) two strands cross each other at most once,
- (2) neither a strand crosses itself nor there is a loop,
- (3) the strand (i, j) passes over the strand (k, l) whenever $\min\{i, j\} < \min\{k, l\}$ and (i, j) crosses (k, l) , where $i, j, k, l \in \{\overline{1}, \overline{2}, \dots, \overline{b}, 1, 2, \dots, a\}$.

Two reduced totally descending (a, b) -tangle diagrams are said to be equivalent if their underlying Brauer diagrams are equivalent.

Suppose that $m \geq 1$. A reduced totally descending dotted (a, b) -tangle diagram is a reduced totally descending (a, b) -tangle diagram on which there are finitely many dots (i.e., \bullet or \circ) on each strand. A normally ordered reduced totally descending dotted (a, b) -tangle diagram is a reduced totally descending dotted (a, b) -tangle diagram with dots (\bullet or \circ) on it such that:

- (1) Whenever a dot (\bullet or \circ) appears on a vertical strand, it is on the boundary of the lower row.
- (2) Whenever a dot (\bullet or \circ) appears on a cap (resp., cup), it is on the leftmost boundary of the cap (resp., the rightmost boundary of a cup).
- (3) \circ and \bullet can not occur on the same strand simultaneously.
- (4) If there are i (resp., j) \bullet 's near each endpoint at upper (resp., lower) row, then

$$-i, j \in \left\{ \lfloor \frac{m-1}{2} \rfloor, \lfloor \frac{m-1}{2} \rfloor - 1, \dots, -\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \rfloor \right\},$$

where h " \bullet " is the same as $-h$ " \circ " if $h < 0$.

In particular, the identity element 1_a in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})}(a, a)$ is $\left[\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array} \right]$, where the number of strands is a . When $m = 1$, a normally ordered reduced totally descending dotted tangle diagram is just a reduced totally descending tangle diagram. We give an example on normally ordered reduced totally

descending dotted tangle diagrams. Suppose $m = 5$. The right one is a normally ordered reduced totally descending dotted $(3, 3)$ -tangle diagram and the left one is not:

(6.13)

Two normally ordered reduced totally descending dotted (a, b) -tangle diagrams are said to be equivalent if their underlying Brauer diagrams are equivalent and there are the same number of \bullet or \circ on their corresponding strands.

Let $\mathbb{DB}_{a,b}$ be the set of all equivalence classes of normally ordered reduced totally descending dotted (a, b) -tangle diagrams. Thanks to [24, Theorem 1.15], $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})}(a, b)$ is of maximal dimension if and only if the \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds in the sense of [24, Definition 1.13]³. In this case, $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})}(a, b)$ has basis given by $\mathbb{DB}_{a,b}$ and two equivalent diagrams represent the same morphism in $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$. So, we can identify each equivalence class with any element in it. Let $\mathbb{DB} = \bigcup_{a,b \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{DB}_{a,b}$.

Proposition 6.6. *If \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds in the sense of [24, Definition 1.13], then the cyclotomic Kauffman category $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ is an upper finite weakly triangular category.*

Proof. Let A be the algebra associated to $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$. The upper finite data in (W1) is given by (\mathbb{N}, \preceq) in (A1). For the data in (W2), let

- (a) A^- : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of all elements in \mathbb{DB} on which there are neither caps nor crossings among vertical strands and there are no dots on vertical strands.
- (b) A° : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of all elements in \mathbb{DB} on which there are neither cups nor caps.
- (c) A^+ : the \mathbb{k} -space with basis consisting of all elements in \mathbb{DB} on which there are neither cups nor crossings among vertical strands and there are no dots on vertical strands.

Then one can check (W3) by arguments similar to those for (W3) in subsection 6.2. We omit details here.

For any $(g, h, k) \in (A^-1_a \cap \mathbb{DB}, A_a^\circ \cap \mathbb{DB}, 1_a A^+ \cap \mathbb{DB})$, the composition $g \circ h \circ k$ is not normally ordered in general. Let $\mathbb{N}_{a,b}$ be the set of all such $g \circ h \circ k$'s, where $(g, h, k) \in (A_{b,c}^- \cap \mathbb{DB}, A_c^\circ \cap \mathbb{DB}, A_{c,a}^+ \cap \mathbb{DB})$ for all possible c , and $c \succeq b, a$. Each $g \circ h \circ k$ in $\mathbb{N}_{a,b}$ satisfies conditions (2)-(4) as above. However, it does not satisfy condition (1) since the dots on the vertical strands may not be on the lower line. We say that a movement is of type I if it is one of the movements as follows:

Movement I: , $t = -1, 1$.

Applying the movements of type I on each $g \circ h \circ k$ in $\mathbb{N}_{a,b}$ we obtain the set $\mathbb{DB}_{a,b}$. For example, the left one in (6.13) is the composition of

$$\left(\text{cup with dot}, \text{dot}, \text{crossing} \right)$$

and the right one in (6.13) is obtained from the left one by applying a movement in type I as above. Thanks to [24, Theorem 1.15], $A_{b,a}$ has basis given by $\mathbb{DB}_{a,b}$. By [24, Proposition 6.15(1)], any set obtained from $\mathbb{DB}_{a,b}$ by applying movements of type I' is also linear independent over \mathbb{C} , where the movement of type I' is . So, it is linear independent over the suitable domain in which we used to define $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ in [24] and hence it is a basis of $A_{b,a}$. By base change, we obtain the corresponding result over \mathbb{k} .

Thanks to the defining relation for \mathcal{AK} in [24], we have

$$\text{crossing with dot on upper} = \text{crossing with dot on lower}, \quad \text{crossing with dot on upper} = \text{crossing with dot on lower}, \quad \text{crossing with dot on upper} = \text{crossing with dot on lower}, \quad \text{crossing with dot on upper} = \text{crossing with dot on lower}. \quad (6.14)$$

By a movement of type II, we mean that we exchange two diagrams via each equality in (6.14). So, any set obtained from $\mathbb{DB}_{a,b}$ by applying movements of types I' and II is also a basis of $A_{b,a}$. Note

³We do not need the explicit description of [24, Definition 1.13]. Furthermore, this condition automatically holds when $m = 1$.

Theorem 6.8. *Let A be the \mathbb{k} -algebra associated to the cyclotomic Kauffman category $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ such that the \mathbf{u} -admissible condition holds. As \mathfrak{g}^\sharp -modules, $[A\text{-mod}^\Delta] \cong V(\omega_{\mathbf{u}})$. The corresponding isomorphism ϕ^\sharp satisfies $\phi^\sharp([\Delta(\lambda)]) = \sum_{\mu \in \Lambda(m)} [S(\mu) : D(\lambda)] v_\mu$ for any $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}(m)$. Moreover, \tilde{e}_i acts via the exact functor E_i in Theorem 5.7 for any $i \in \mathbb{I}$.*

Remark 6.9. Suppose that $\lambda, \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}(m)$. The multiplicity of $(P(\lambda) : \Delta(\mu))$ can be solved via the equations in Proposition 4.3(2). So, $\phi^\sharp([P(\lambda)])$ in Theorem 6.5 (resp., Theorem 6.8) is determined by the decomposition numbers $[1_a \tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : 1_a L(\gamma)]$ (which is equal to $[\tilde{S}_a(\nu) : 1_a L(\gamma)]$ by Proposition 4.3(1)) of A_a for all $a \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall $\overline{A}_a \cong H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ (resp., $\mathcal{H}_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$). Using the well-known cellular basis of $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ in [5, Theorem 6.3] (resp., $\mathcal{H}_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$ in [21, Theorem 3.26]), one can check that the cell module $\tilde{S}_a(\lambda)$ of A_a in (4.12) coincides with the cell modules $C(f, \lambda)$ in [38] for cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras (resp., in [46] for cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras) for all $\lambda \in \bigcup_{k \geq a} \Lambda_{m,k}$. If $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}$, the decomposition numbers of $H_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$, $\mathcal{H}_{m,a}(\mathbf{u})$, Brauer algebras [19] and Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras [43] and cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras [44] are known. In the remaining cases, we have no further information.

6.4. Blocks. Let A be the \mathbb{k} -algebra associated to either the cyclotomic Brauer category $\mathcal{CB}(\mathbf{u})$ or the cyclotomic Kauffman category $\mathcal{CK}(\mathbf{u})$ such that the \mathbf{u} -admissible conditions hold. Since Assumption 3.12 and (A1)-(A10) hold for A , Theorem 5.17 gives a partial results on blocks.

Proposition 6.10. *For any $\lambda, \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}(m)$, $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\mu)$ are in the same block if and only if there is a sequence $\lambda = \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n = \mu$ such that each pair λ_i and λ_{i+1} are cell-link in a weakly cellular algebra A_a for some $a \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.5, it suffices to prove only if part of this result. Suppose $\lambda \in \overline{\Lambda}_{m,c}, \mu \in \overline{\Lambda}_{m,d}$ and

$$\text{Hom}_A(P(\lambda), P(\mu)) = [P(\mu) : L(\lambda)] \neq 0. \quad (6.16)$$

There are three cases we have to discuss as follows.

First, we assume $\min\{c, d\} > 0$. Thanks to (5.30) there is at least a $\nu \in \Lambda(m)$ such that $[\tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\mu)][\tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$. So $\rho(\nu) \succeq d, c$. Let $k = \max\{c, d\}$. Then $k \neq 0$. Note that the cell modules $1_k \tilde{\Delta}(\nu)$'s coincide with cell modules of A_k studied in [38] and [46] (see Remark 6.9). By [38, Theorem 3.12] and [46, Theorem 5.3], $\bigcup_{0 \neq n \geq k} \overline{\Lambda}_{m,n} \subseteq \tilde{\Lambda}_{\succeq k}$, where $\tilde{\Lambda}_{\succeq k} \subseteq \Lambda_{\succeq k}$ parameterizes inequivalent simple A_k -modules and $\Lambda_{\succeq k} = \bigcup_{n \geq k} \Lambda_{m,n}$. Thanks to Proposition 4.3(3), $1_k L(\lambda) \neq 0$ and $1_k L(\mu) \neq 0$. Hence $[1_k \tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : 1_k L(\mu)][1_k \tilde{\Delta}(\nu) : 1_k L(\lambda)] \neq 0$, and λ, ν, μ is the required sequence.

Secondly, we assume $c = 0$. Then $\lambda = \emptyset$. Thanks to Proposition 3.9(1) and (6.16), there is at least a ν such that $[\Delta(\nu) : L(\lambda)](P(\mu) : \Delta(\nu)) \neq 0$. Since $1_0 L(\lambda) \cong \mathbb{k}$, by Lemma 3.2(1), $1_0 \Delta(\nu) \neq 0$ only if $\nu = \emptyset$. By Proposition 3.9(2), Lemma 3.13(2) and (6.16), $[\tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset) : L(\mu)] = (P(\mu) : \Delta(\emptyset)) \neq 0$ and hence $[\tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset) : L(\mu)] \neq 0$. Therefore $[1_d \tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset) : 1_d L(\mu)] \neq 0$. By Proposition 4.3, λ, μ is the required sequence.

Finally, we assume $d = 0$, and hence $\mu = \emptyset$. By Proposition 3.9, $P(\emptyset) = \Delta(\emptyset)$. Since $P_0(\emptyset) = S_0(\emptyset) = \mathbb{k}$, We have $\Delta(\emptyset) = \tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset)$. Therefore, $[\tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset) : L(\lambda)] = [P(\emptyset) : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$ and $[1_c \tilde{\Delta}(\emptyset) : 1_c L(\lambda)] \neq 0$. By Proposition 4.3, λ, μ is the required sequence. \square

When the Hecke algebra (resp., (degenerate) cyclotomic Hecke algebra) is semisimple over \mathbb{k} (with characteristic not two), a necessary and sufficient condition on cell-link for the Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebra (resp., the cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebra and the cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebra) is given in [41, Propositions 4.6, 4.10] (resp., [40, Propositions 5.10, 5.21]). Using Proposition 6.10 yields an explicit combinatorial description on the blocks of A . We omit details since it is a routine work. In the remaining cases, we have no further information.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. ARIKI, "On the semi-simplicity of the Hecke algebra of $(Z/rZ) \wr \mathfrak{S}_n$ ", *J. Algebra.*, **169**, (1994), 216–225.
- [2] S. ARIKI, "On the decomposition numbers of the Hecke algebra of $G(m, 1, n)$ ", *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, **36**, Number 4 (1996), 789–808.
- [3] S. ARIKI, "On the classification of simple modules for cyclotomic Hecke algebras of type $G(m, 1, n)$ and Kleshchev multipartitions", *Osaka J. Math.*, **38**, (2001), 827–837.
- [4] S. ARIKI, A. MATHAS, "The number of simple modules of the Hecke algebras of type $G(r, 1, n)$ ", *Math. Zeit.*, **233** (2000), 601–623.

- [5] S. ARIKI, A. MATHAS, H. RUI, “Cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras”, *Nagoya Math. J.*, Special issue in honor of Prof. G. Lusztig’s sixty birthday, **182** (2006), 47–134.
- [6] H. BAO, “Kazhdan-Lusztig theory of the super type D and quantum symmetric pairs”, *Represent. Theory.*, **21**(2017), 247–276.
- [7] H. BAO, W. WANG, “A new approach to Kazhdan-Lusztig theory of type B via quantum symmetric pairs”, *Asterisque*, **402**(2018), vii+134.
- [8] H. BAO, W. WANG, “Canonical bases arising from quantum symmetric pairs”, *Invent. math.*, **213**(2018), 1099–1177.
- [9] H. BAO, W. WANG, “Canonical bases arising from quantum symmetric pairs of Kac-Moody type”, arXiv:1811.0984v1[math. QA].
- [10] H. BAO, W. WANG, H. WATANABE, “Canonical bases for tensor products and Kazhdan-Lusztig theory”, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **224**(2020), 106347.
- [11] J. BIRMAN, H. WENZL, “Braids, link polynomials and a new algebra”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **313** (1989), no. 1, 249–273.
- [12] R. BRAUER, “On algebras which are connected with the semisimple continuous groups”, *Ann. of Math.*, **38**, (1937), 857–872.
- [13] J. BRUNDAN, “Representations of the oriented skein category”, arXiv:1712.08953 [math.RT].
- [14] J. BRUNDAN, J. COMES, D. NASH, A. REYNOLDS, “A basis theorem for the affine oriented Brauer category and its cyclotomic quotients”, *Quantum Topology*, **8**, (2017), 75–112.
- [15] J. BRUNDAN, N. DAVISON, “Categorical actions and crystals”, *Contemp. Math.* **684**, (2017), 116–159.
- [16] J. BRUNDAN, A. KLESHCHEV, “Schur-Weyl duality for higher levels”, *Selecta Math.* **14**, (2008), 1–57.
- [17] J. BRUNDAN, A. KLESHCHEV, “Graded decomposition numbers for cyclotomic Hecke algebras”, *Adv. in Math.* **222**, (2009), 1883–1942.
- [18] J. BRUNDAN, C. STROPPEL, “Semi-infinite highest weight categories”, arXiv:1808.08022 [math.RT].
- [19] A. COX, M. DE VISSCHER, “Diagrammatic Kazhdan-Lusztig theory for the (walled) Brauer algebra”, *J. Algebra*, **340**, (2011), 151–181.
- [20] A. COX, M. DE VISSCHER, P. MARTIN, “The blocks of the Brauer algebra in characteristic zero”, *Represent. Theory*, **13**, (2009), 272–308.
- [21] R. DIPPER, G. JAMES, A. MATHAS, “Cyclotomic q -Schur algebras”, *Math. Zeit.*, **229**, (1998), 385–416.
- [22] R. DIPPER, A. MATHAS, “Morita equivalences of Ariki-Koike algebras”, *Math. Zeit.*, **240**, (2002), 570–610.
- [23] M. HAZEWINKEL, N. GUBARENI, V. KIRICHENKO, “Algebras, Rings and Modules”, *Mathematics and Its Applications*, **586**, (2007), 570–610.
- [24] M. GAO, H. RUI, L. SONG, “A basis theorem for the affine Kauffman category and its cyclotomic quotients”, preprint, 2020.
- [25] M. GAO, H. RUI, L. SONG, “Representations of cyclotomic oriented Brauer categories”, in preparation.
- [26] F. GOODMAN, “Cellularity of cyclotomic Birman-Wenzl-Murakami algebras”, *J. Algebra* **321** (2009), 3299–3320.
- [27] J. J. GRAHAM and G. I. LEHRER, “Cellular algebras”, *Invent. Math.* **123** (1996), 1–34.
- [28] G. JAMES, A. MATHAS, “The Jantzen sum formula for cyclotomic q -Schur algebras”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **352** (2000), 5381–5404.
- [29] A. KLESHCHEV, “Representation theory of symmetric groups and related Hecke algebras”, *Bulletin of the AMS*, **47**(3) (2010), 419–481.
- [30] S. KOLB, “Quantum symmetric Kac-Moody pairs”, *Adv. in Math.*, **267** (2014), 395–469.
- [31] G. LEHRER, R. B. ZHANG, “The Brauer Category and Invariant Theory”, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.*, **17** (9) (2015), 2311–2351
- [32] G. LETZTER, “Quantum symmetric pairs and their zonal spherical functions”, *Transf. Groups*, **8** (2003), 261–292.
- [33] I. LOSEV, B. WEBSTER, “On Uniqueness of tensor products of irreducible categorifications”, *Selecta Math.*, **21** (2015) :345–377.
- [34] A. MALLE, A. MATHAS, “Symmetric cyclotomic Hecke algebras”, *J. Algebra*, **205**, (1998), 275–293.
- [35] A. MATHAS, “Iwahori-Hecke algebras and Schur algebras of the symmetric group”, *University Lecture Series*, **15**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999.
- [36] R. HAERING-OLDENBURG, “Cyclotomic Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras”, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **161**, (2001), 113–144.
- [37] A. REYNOLDS, “Representation of Oriented Brauer categories”, PhD thesis, University of Oregon, 2015.
- [38] H. RUI, M. SI, “On the structure of cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl algebras”, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **212** (2008), no.10, 2209–2235.
- [39] H. RUI, M. SI, “Gram determinants and semisimplicity criteria for Birman-Wenzl algebras”, *J. Reine Angew. Math* **631** (2009), no.1, 153–179.
- [40] H. RUI, M. SI, “Non-vanishing Gram determinants for cyclotomic Nazarov-Wenzl and Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras”, *J. Algebra*, **335** (2011), 188–219.
- [41] H. RUI, M. SI, “Blocks of Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras”, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2011, no. 2, 452–486.
- [42] H. RUI, M. SI, “The representations of cyclotomic BMW algebras, II”, *Algebr. Represent. Theory* (2012), no.15, 551–579.
- [43] H. RUI, L. SONG, “Decomposition matrices of Birman-Murakami-Wenzl algebras”, *J. Algebra*, **444** (2015), 246–271.

- [44] H. RUI, L. SONG, “Affine Brauer category and parabolic category \mathcal{O} in types B, C, D ”, *Math. Zeit.*, 293, (2019), 503–550.
- [45] H. RUI, L. SONG, “Representations of Brauer category and categorifications”, *J. Algebra*, **557**, (2020), 1–36.
- [46] H. RUI, J. XU, “The representations of cyclotomic BMW algebras”, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **213** (2009), no. 12, 2262–2288.
- [47] S. SAM, A. SNOWDEN, “The representation theory of Brauer categories, I Triangular categories”, *preprint*, 2020.
- [48] V. TURAEV, “Operator invariants of tangles, and R -matrices.”, *Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya*, **35**, (1990), no.2, 411–444.
- [49] B. WEBSTER, “Canonical bases and higher representation theory ”, *Compos. Math.*, **151**, (2015), no.1, 121–166.

M.G. SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, TONGJI UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200092, CHINA
Email address: 1810414@tongji.edu.cn

H.R. SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, TONGJI UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200092, CHINA
Email address: hbrui@tongji.edu.cn

L.S. SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, TONGJI UNIVERSITY, SHANGHAI, 200092, CHINA
Email address: llsong@tongji.edu.cn