

CRYSTAL BASES OF MODIFIED \imath QUANTUM GROUPS OF CERTAIN QUASI-SPLIT TYPES

HIDEYA WATANABE

ABSTRACT. In order to see the behavior of \imath canonical bases at $q = \infty$, we introduce the notion of \imath crystals associated to an \imath quantum group of certain quasi-split type. The theory of \imath crystals clarifies why \imath canonical basis elements are not always preserved under natural homomorphisms. Also, we construct a projective system of \imath crystals whose projective limit can be thought of as the \imath canonical basis of the modified \imath quantum group at $q = \infty$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to introduce the notion of \imath crystals associated to a quantum symmetric pair $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^\imath)$ of certain quasi-split type. This study is motivated by the theory of canonical bases for quantum symmetric pairs (also known as the theory of \imath canonical bases) initiated by Bao and Wang in [1] and developed in [2, 3].

Let (I, I_\bullet, τ) be a Satake diagram of symmetrizable Kac-Moody type (also known as an admissible pair). Namely, I is a Dynkin diagram of symmetrizable Kac-Moody type, $I_\bullet \subset I$ is a subdiagram of finite type, and $\tau \in \text{Aut}(I)$ is a diagram automorphism of order at most two, satisfying certain axioms. From our Dynkin diagram I , we can construct the quantum group $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_I = U_q(I)$. It has a set of generators E_i, F_i, K_h , $i \in I$, $h \in Y$, where Y denotes the coroot lattice. In [10], Kolb defined a right coideal subalgebra $\mathbf{U}^\imath = \mathbf{U}_{\varsigma, \kappa}^\imath \subset \mathbf{U}$ in terms of I_\bullet and τ , where $\varsigma = (\varsigma_i)_{i \in I} \in (\mathbb{C}(q)^\times)^I$ and $\kappa = (\kappa_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}(q)^I$ are parameters. To be more a bit precise, \mathbf{U}^\imath is generated by the quantum group \mathbf{U}_{I_\bullet} associated to the subdiagram I_\bullet , K_h for $h \in Y^\imath := \{h \in Y \mid w_\bullet \tau(h) = -h\}$, and distinguished elements B_i for $i \in I \setminus I_\bullet$. The pair $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^\imath)$ is called the quantum symmetric pair associated to our Satake diagram (I, I_\bullet, τ) and parameters ς, κ . The coideal subalgebra \mathbf{U}^\imath itself is referred to as the \imath quantum group. Kolb's construction generalizes Letzter's construction [12] for I being finite type, which unifies earlier examples constructed by Koornwinder [11], Gavrilik-Klimyk [8], Noumi [15] and others.

It has turned out that the theory of quantum symmetric pairs has many applications in numerous areas of mathematics and physics such as representation theory of Lie algebras, orthogonal polynomials, low-dimensional topology, categorifications, and integrable systems. Such applications are often based on the fact that the \imath quantum group \mathbf{U}^\imath can be thought of as a generalization of the quantum group. To be more precise, when we take a Satake diagram of diagonal type, the embedding $\mathbf{U}^\imath \hookrightarrow \mathbf{U}$ can be identified with the comultiplication map $\Delta : \mathbf{U}_{I'} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_{I'} \otimes \mathbf{U}_{I'}$ for some Dynkin diagram I' (see Example 3.1.1 for details).

From this point of view, the theory of \imath canonical bases are thought of as a generalization of the theory of canonical bases for quantum groups initiated by Lusztig [13]. Namely, the theory of \imath canonical bases for diagonal types recovers the usual theory of canonical

Date: February 17, 2023.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 17B37; Secondary 17B10.

bases. Let us see this in more detail. Let $X = X_I$ denote the weight lattice, and set $X^\iota := X/\{\lambda + w_\bullet \tau(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in X\}$, where w_\bullet denotes the longest element of the Weyl group associated to I_\bullet (recall that I_\bullet is of finite type). Then, the modified ι quantum group is defined as

$$\dot{\mathbf{U}}^\iota := \bigoplus_{\zeta \in X^\iota} \mathbf{U}^\iota \mathbf{1}_\zeta.$$

Here, $\mathbf{1}_\zeta$'s are orthogonal idempotents. When our Satake diagram is of diagonal type, we can identify X with $X_{I'} \oplus X_{I'}$ and X^ι with $X_{I'}$, and hence, the modified ι quantum group is identified with the modified quantum group $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{I'} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X_{I'}} \mathbf{U}_{I'} \mathbf{1}_\lambda$ (recall that we have identified $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U}_{I'} \otimes \mathbf{U}_{I'}$ and $\mathbf{U}^\iota = \Delta(\mathbf{U}_{I'}) \simeq \mathbf{U}_{I'}$).

For each dominant integral weight $\lambda \in X^+$, let $V(\lambda)$ (resp., $V^{\text{low}}(\lambda)$) denote the irreducible highest weight module of highest weight λ , and $v_\lambda \in V(\lambda)$ the highest weight vector (resp., irreducible lowest weight module of lowest weight $-\lambda$, and v_λ^{low} the lowest weight vector). Given $\lambda, \mu \in X^+$, let $V^\iota(\lambda, \mu)$ denote the \mathbf{U} -submodule of $V(\lambda) \otimes V(\mu)$ generated by $v_{w_\bullet(\lambda)} \otimes v_\mu$, where $v_{w_\bullet(\lambda)} \in V(\lambda)$ denotes the canonical basis element of weight $w_\bullet(\lambda)$. Then, Bao and Wang [2, 3] proved that $V^\iota(\lambda, \mu)$ has a distinguished basis, which they called the ι canonical basis, of the form

$$\mathbf{B}^\iota(\lambda, \mu) = \{(b_1 \diamond b_2)_{w_\bullet(\lambda), \mu}^\iota \mid b_1 \in \mathbf{B}_{I_\bullet}, b_2 \in \mathbf{B}\} \setminus \{0\}.$$

Here, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B}_I$ denotes the canonical basis of the Lusztig algebra \mathfrak{f} associated to I . Also, they constructed a projective system of \mathbf{U}^ι -modules

$$V^\iota(\lambda + \tau(\nu), \mu + \nu) \rightarrow V^\iota(\lambda, \mu)$$

which sends $v_{w_\bullet(\lambda + \tau(\nu))} \otimes v_{\mu + \nu}$ to $v_{w_\bullet(\lambda)} \otimes v_\mu$. Although it is not always true that this morphism is based (i.e., it sends an ι canonical basis element to either an ι canonical basis element or zero), Bao and Wang were able to prove that it is asymptotically true. Namely, given $b_1 \in \mathbf{B}_{I_\bullet}$, $b_2 \in \mathbf{B}$, if we take $\lambda, \mu \in X^+$ to be sufficiently dominant, then the ι canonical basis element $(b_1 \diamond b_2)_{w_\bullet(\lambda + \tau(\nu)), \mu + \nu}^\iota$ is sent to $(b_1 \diamond b_2)_{w_\bullet(\lambda), \mu}^\iota$ for all $\nu \in X^+$. Furthermore, they constructed the ι canonical basis $\dot{\mathbf{B}}^\iota$ of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^\iota$ as an asymptotical limit of this projective system (see Theorem 3.2.7 for the precise meaning).

When our Satake diagram is of diagonal type, the \mathbf{U} -module $V^\iota(\lambda, \mu)$ is just the tensor product $V^{\text{low}}(\lambda') \otimes V(\mu')$ for some $\lambda', \mu' \in X_{I'}^+$, and its ι canonical basis coincides with the canonical basis seen as a tensor product $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -module. In this case, the morphisms in the projective system are based.

Thus, we are led to investigate why and how much this property fails for quantum symmetric pairs beyond diagonal type. In this paper, we shall take a crystal theoretic approach. Namely, we focus on the projective system at $q = \infty$.

Until the end of this Introduction, assume that our Satake diagram is quasi-split (i.e., $I_\bullet = \emptyset$), and the Cartan matrix $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ satisfies $a_{i,\tau(i)} \in \{2, 0, -1\}$ for all $i \in I$. Note that every Satake diagram of diagonal type satisfies this assumption. Earlier works [16, 18, 19] of the author suggest that there is a good combinatorial theory which has much information of the representation theory of the ι quantum group associated to our Satake diagram and special parameters $\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{\kappa}$. In this paper, for each $i \in I$, we define a linear operator \tilde{B}_i acting on certain \mathbf{U}^ι -modules which modifies the action of B_i (recall that B_i is one of the generators of \mathbf{U}^ι). Such an operator \tilde{B}_i for $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$ (resp., $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$) has been introduced in [18] (resp., [16]). The \tilde{B}_i for $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$ is new, and it generalizes the operator introduced in [16]. As the Kashiwara operators in the representation theory of quantum groups, our operators \tilde{B}_i are defined in a way such

that we can take the crystal limit, i.e., the $q \rightarrow \infty$ limit. When our Satake diagram is of diagonal type, the \tilde{B}_i coincides with a Kashiwara operator for $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$.

Then, we investigate how the operators \tilde{B}_i act on the tensor product of a \mathbf{U}^z -module on which \tilde{B}_i 's are defined, and a \mathbf{U} -module on which Kashiwara operators are defined (recall that \mathbf{U}^z is a right coideal of \mathbf{U}). Taking the crystal limit, we obtain a combinatorial tensor product rule for \tilde{B}_i . As a special case, let us consider the tensor product of the trivial \mathbf{U}^z -module and a \mathbf{U} -module M . Such a \mathbf{U}^z -module is canonically identified with M regarded as a \mathbf{U}^z -module by restriction. Then, the tensor product rule for \tilde{B}_i gives a \mathbf{U}^z -module structure of M at $q = \infty$. When our Satake diagram is of diagonal type, the \mathbf{U} -module M is of the form $L \otimes N$ for some $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -modules L, N . Then, \tilde{B}_i on $M = L \otimes N$ at $q = \infty$ coincides with the tensor product rule for a Kashiwara operator for $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$.

Following the theory of crystals, we introduce the notion of z crystals which abstract the operators \tilde{B}_i at $q = \infty$. An z crystal is a set \mathcal{B} equipped with several structure maps including linear operators $\tilde{B}_i \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}\mathcal{B})$, $i \in I$. We prove that given an z crystal \mathcal{B}_1 and a crystal \mathcal{B}_2 satisfying certain conditions, the tensor product $\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2 := \mathcal{B}_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2$ of them has an z crystal structure. Taking \mathcal{B}_1 to be ‘‘the trivial z crystal’’, we obtain a way making a crystal into an z crystal. As a result, it turns out that the \mathbf{U}^z -module structure of a \mathbf{U} -module M at $q = \infty$ is described by the crystal basis of M regarded as an z crystal via this method.

Let us return to the projective system $\{V^z(\lambda, \mu)\}_{\lambda, \mu \in X^+}$. Under the assumption on our Satake diagram, the \mathbf{U} -module $V^z(\lambda, \mu)$ is isomorphic to the irreducible highest weight module $V(\lambda + \mu)$. Hence, the projective system becomes $\{V(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in X^+}$ with morphisms $V(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow V(\nu)$ sending $v_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}$ to v_ν . Now, we are able to answer our question why and how much the morphisms $V(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow V(\lambda)$ are not based. That is, when λ is not sufficiently dominant, there is no morphism $\mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ of z crystals sending the highest weight element $b_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}$ to the highest weight element b_λ , where $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ denotes the crystal basis of $V(\lambda)$. Via a further observation, it turns out that there exists a dominant weight $\sigma \in X^+$ such that for each $\lambda, \nu \in X^+$, there exists a morphism $\mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu); \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda; \lambda)$ of z crystals sending $b_{\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}$ to $b_{\sigma + \lambda}$, where

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda; \mu) := \{\tilde{F}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{F}_{i_r} b_\lambda \mid \tilde{F}_{i_1} \cdots \tilde{F}_{i_r} b_\mu \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)\} \setminus \{0\} \subset \mathcal{B}(\lambda).$$

Also, for each $\lambda \in X^+$, there exists an z crystal $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$ isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda; \lambda)$ whose underlying set is $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$. Thus, we obtain a projective system $\{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma\}_{\lambda \in X^+, \overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta}$ of z crystals for each $\zeta \in X^z$, where $\bar{\lambda} \in X^z$ denote the image of $\lambda \in X$. This projective system has the projective limit of the form

$$\mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty),$$

where \mathcal{T}_ζ is a certain z crystal consisting of a single element, and $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ denotes the crystal basis of the negative part \mathbf{U}^- of \mathbf{U} .

Then, we lift these results to the representation theory of z quantum groups. Namely, for each $\lambda \in X^+$, we construct a \mathbf{U}^z -module $V(\lambda)^\sigma$ whose underlying set is $V(\lambda)$. The $V(\lambda)^\sigma$ has a distinguished basis, called the z canonical basis, whose crystal limit is the z crystal $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$. Furthermore, there exists a based \mathbf{U}^z -module homomorphism $V(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma$ which sends $v_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}$ to v_λ . Thus, we obtain a projective system $\{V(\lambda)^\sigma\}_{\lambda \in X^+, \overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta}$ of \mathbf{U}^z -modules and based homomorphisms. In particular, when we can take σ to be 0, this result partially proves Bao and Wang's Conjecture in [2,

Remark 6.18]. It turns out that this projective system has the projective limit, and it is $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^i \mathbf{1}_\zeta$ with the i canonical basis $\dot{\mathbf{B}}^i \mathbf{1}_\zeta$.

From the results above, we should call the i crystal $\bigsqcup_{\zeta \in X^i} \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ the i crystal basis of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^i$, and denote it by $\dot{\mathcal{B}}^i$. The description $\dot{\mathcal{B}}^i = \bigsqcup_{\zeta \in X^i} \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ can be interpreted as the crystal limit of the description $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^i = \bigoplus_{\zeta \in X^i} \mathbf{U}^i \mathbf{1}_\zeta$ since \mathcal{T}_ζ consists of a single element, and $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ can be seen as the crystal limit of \mathbf{U}^- , which is isomorphic to \mathbf{U}^+ as a vector space. When our Satake diagram is of diagonal type, we can take $\sigma = 0$, and can identify $\mathcal{B}(\infty) = \mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$, where $\mathcal{B}(-\infty)_I$ denotes the crystal basis of the positive part of \mathbf{U} . Hence, we recover the projective system $\{V^{\text{low}}(\lambda) \otimes V(\mu)\}_{\lambda, \mu \in X_{I'}^+, -\lambda + \mu = \zeta}$ of $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -modules and based homomorphisms, whose projective limit is $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{I'} \mathbf{1}_\zeta$, and the projective system $\{\mathcal{B}^{\text{low}}(\lambda) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mu)\}_{\lambda, \mu \in X_{I'}^+, -\lambda + \mu = \zeta}$ of crystals, whose projective limit is $\mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$, where \mathcal{T}_ζ denotes a certain crystal consisting of a single element, and $\mathcal{B}^{\text{low}}(\lambda)$ the crystal basis of $V^{\text{low}}(\lambda)$.

As explained above, our construction of the new projective system $\{V(\lambda)^\sigma\}_{\lambda \in X^+}$ is motivated by an observation of the i crystal structures of various \mathbf{U} -modules. However, the construction itself may be possible without the theory of i crystals and our assumption on Satake diagrams and parameters ς, κ . We will treat this in a future work.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall necessary knowledge concerning ordinary quantum groups and crystals. In Section 3, we set up an i quantum group of quasi-split type, and recall Bao-Wang's construction of the projective system and the i canonical basis of the modified i quantum group. Also, we define the notion of i crystals and their morphisms. Basic examples of i crystals are given there. Section 4 is devoted to defining the operators \tilde{B}_i acting on certain \mathbf{U}^i -modules. The tensor product rule is also investigated. Based on the results obtained there, we define the tensor product of an i crystal and a crystal in Section 5. The associativity of this tensor product is stated there, too. The proofs of the well-definedness and the associativity of the tensor product is given in Section 7 because they are lengthy and independent of later argument. In Section 6, we construct the projective system of i crystals and its projective limit mentioned earlier. Then, we finally construct our new projective system of \mathbf{U}^i -modules and based homomorphisms.

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP20K14286 and JP21J00013.

Notation. Throughout this paper, we use the following notation:

- $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}(q)$: the field of rational functions in one variable q .
- \mathbb{K}_∞ : the subring of \mathbb{K} consisting of functions regular at $q = \infty$.
- $\mathbf{A} := \mathbb{C}[q, q^{-1}]$.
- For $a, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $[n]_{q^a} := \frac{q^{an} - q^{-an}}{q^a - q^{-a}}$, $[n]_{q^a}! := \prod_{k=1}^n [k]_{q^a}$, $\begin{bmatrix} m+n \\ n \end{bmatrix}_{q^a} := \frac{[m+n]_{q^a}!}{[m]_{q^a}! [n]_{q^a}!}$.
- $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$: the image of $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ under the quotient map $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.
- For $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\text{sgn}(n) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n > 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 0, \\ -1 & \text{if } n < 0. \end{cases}$

2. QUANTUM GROUPS AND CRYSTALS

In this section, we review basic results concerning the representation theory of quantum groups associated to a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra, abstract crystals, and canonical and crystal bases.

2.1. Quantum groups. Let $A = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in I}$ be a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix with symmetrizing matrix $D = \text{diag}(d_i)_{i \in I}$, i.e., d_i 's are pairwise coprime positive integers satisfying $d_i a_{i,j} = d_j a_{j,i}$ for all $i, j \in I$. Let X, Y be free abelian groups of finite rank equipped with a perfect pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : Y \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. Let $\{\alpha_i \mid i \in I\} \subset X$ and $\{h_i \mid i \in I\} \subset Y$ be linearly independent sets such that

$$\langle h_i, \alpha_j \rangle = a_{i,j} \quad \text{for all } i, j \in I.$$

When I is of finite type, each $\lambda \in X$ is uniquely determined by the values $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$, $i \in I$. We often identify $\lambda \in X$ with $(\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^I$.

The quantum group \mathbf{U} is defined to be a unital associative algebra over \mathbb{K} generated by E_i, F_i, K_h , $i \in I$, $h \in Y$ subject to the following relations: Let $i, j \in I$, $h, h' \in Y$.

$$\begin{aligned} K_0 &= 1, & K_h K_{h'} &= K_{h+h'}, \\ K_h E_i &= q^{\langle h, \alpha_i \rangle} E_i K_h, & K_h F_i &= q^{-\langle h, \alpha_i \rangle} F_i K_h, \\ E_i F_j - F_j E_i &= \delta_{i,j} \frac{K_i - K_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \\ \sum_{r=0}^{1-a_{i,j}} (-1)^r E_i^{(r)} E_j E_i^{(1-a_{i,j}-r)} &= 0 & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \sum_{r=0}^{1-a_{i,j}} (-1)^r F_i^{(r)} F_j F_i^{(1-a_{i,j}-r)} &= 0 & \text{if } i \neq j, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$q_i := q^{d_i}, \quad K_i := K_{d_i h_i}, \quad E_i^{(a)} := \frac{1}{[a]_i!} E_i^a, \quad F_i^{(a)} := \frac{1}{[a]_i!} F_i^a, \quad [a]_i := [a]_{q_i}, \quad [a]_i! := [a]_{q_i}!$$

The quantum group \mathbf{U} is equipped with a Hopf algebra structure with comultiplication Δ given by

$$\Delta(E_i) := E_i \otimes 1 + K_i \otimes E_i, \quad \Delta(F_i) := 1 \otimes F_i + F_i \otimes K_i^{-1}, \quad \Delta(K_h) := K_h \otimes K_h.$$

There is an anti-algebra involution φ on \mathbf{U} such that

$$\varphi(E_i) = q_i^{-1} F_i K_i, \quad \varphi(F_i) = q_i^{-1} E_i K_i^{-1}, \quad \varphi(K_h) = K_h.$$

The complex conjugate $\mathbb{C} \ni z \mapsto z^*$ can be extended to an $\mathbb{R}(q)$ -algebra automorphism on \mathbf{U} by requiring

$$E_i^* = E_i, \quad F_i^* = F_i, \quad K_h^* = K_h.$$

Set $\varphi^* := \varphi \circ * = * \circ \varphi$.

Let $\bar{\cdot} : \mathbb{K} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ denote the \mathbb{C} -algebra automorphism given by $\bar{q} = q^{-1}$. This can be extended to a \mathbb{C} -algebra automorphism ψ , called the bar-involution on \mathbf{U} by

$$\psi(E_i) = E_i, \quad \psi(F_i) = F_i, \quad \psi(K_h) = K_{-h}.$$

For each $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_k\} \subset I$ of finite type, let $\mathbf{U}_J = \mathbf{U}_{j_1, \dots, j_k}$ denote the subalgebra of \mathbf{U} generated by $E_j, F_j, K_j^{\pm 1}$, $j \in J$.

Let \mathbf{U}^- denote the subalgebra of \mathbf{U} generated by $F_i, i \in I$. Also, let $\mathbf{B}(\infty)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ denote the canonical and crystal basis of \mathbf{U}^- with $b_\infty \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ the highest weight element.

Let $\dot{\mathbf{U}} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X} \mathbf{U}1_\lambda$ denote the modified quantum group, and $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}}$ its \mathbf{A} -form. Also, let $\dot{\mathbf{B}}$ and $\dot{\mathcal{B}}$ denote the canonical and crystal basis of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}$, respectively.

For each $\lambda \in X$, let $M(\lambda)$ denote the Verma module of highest weight λ , and $V(\lambda)$ its irreducible quotient. Let v_λ denote the highest weight vector of both $M(\lambda)$ and $V(\lambda)$. When $\lambda \in X^+$, let $\mathbf{B}(\lambda)$ and $(\mathcal{L}(\lambda), \mathcal{B}(\lambda))$ denote the canonical and crystal base of $V(\lambda)$. Let $b_\lambda \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ denote the highest weight element.

2.2. Crystal. A crystal is a set \mathcal{B} equipped with the following structure

- $\text{wt} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X$: map,
- $\varepsilon_i, \varphi_i : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{-\infty\}$: maps, $i \in I$, where $-\infty$ is a formal symbol,
- $\tilde{E}_i, \tilde{F}_i : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \sqcup \{0\}$: maps, $i \in I$, where 0 is a formal symbol,

satisfying the following axioms: Let $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$.

- (1) If $\varphi(b) = -\infty$, then $\tilde{E}_i b = 0 = \tilde{F}_i b$.
- (2) $\varphi_i(b) = \varepsilon_i(b) + \text{wt}_i(b)$, where $\text{wt}_i(b) := \langle h_i, \text{wt}(b) \rangle$; we understand that $-\infty + a = -\infty$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- (3) If $\tilde{E}_i b \neq 0$, then $\text{wt}(\tilde{E}_i b) = \text{wt}(b) + \alpha_i$, $\varepsilon_i(\tilde{E}_i b) = \varepsilon_i(b) - 1$, and $\tilde{F}_i \tilde{E}_i b = b$.
- (4) If $\tilde{F}_i b \neq 0$, then $\text{wt}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \text{wt}(b) - \alpha_i$, $\varphi_i(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_i(b) - 1$, and $\tilde{E}_i \tilde{F}_i b = b$.

Let \mathcal{B} be a crystal. The crystal graph of \mathcal{B} is an I -colored directed graph whose vertex set is \mathcal{B} , and for each $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$, there exists an arrow from b to b' labeled by i if and only if $\tilde{F}_i b = b'$.

Example 2.2.1. Suppose that $I = \{i\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $\mathcal{B}(n) := \{b_k \mid 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ denote the crystal given by

$$\text{wt}_i(b_k) = n - 2k, \quad \varepsilon_i(b_k) = k, \quad \varphi_i(b_k) = n - k, \quad \tilde{E}_i b_k = b_{k-1}, \quad \tilde{F}_i b_k = b_{k+1},$$

where $b_{-1} = b_{n+1} := 0$. The crystal graph of $\mathcal{B}(n)$ is as follows:

$$b_0 \xrightarrow{i} b_1 \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} b_{n-1} \xrightarrow{i} b_n.$$

Let $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ be crystals. A morphism $\mu : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ of crystals is a map $\mu : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2 \sqcup \{0\}$ satisfying the following: Let $b \in \mathcal{B}_1$ and $i \in I$.

- (1) If $\mu(b) \neq 0$, then $\text{wt}(\mu(b)) = \text{wt}(b)$, $\varepsilon_i(\mu(b)) = \varepsilon_i(b)$, and $\varphi_i(\mu(b)) = \varphi_i(b)$.
- (2) If $\tilde{E}_i b, \mu(b), \mu(\tilde{E}_i b) \neq 0$, then $\mu(\tilde{E}_i b) = \tilde{E}_i \mu(b)$.
- (3) If $\tilde{F}_i b, \mu(b), \mu(\tilde{F}_i b) \neq 0$, then $\mu(\tilde{F}_i b) = \tilde{F}_i \mu(b)$.

A crystal morphism $\mu : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ is said to be strict if $\mu(\tilde{E}_i b) = \tilde{E}_i \mu(b)$ and $\mu(\tilde{F}_i b) = \tilde{F}_i \mu(b)$ for all $i \in I, b \in \mathcal{B}_1$; here, we set $\mu(0) = 0$. A strict crystal morphism $\mu : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ is said to be an isomorphism if the underlying map $\mu : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ is bijective; in this case, we denote $\mathcal{B}_1 \simeq \mathcal{B}_2$.

Let $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ be crystals. The tensor product $\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ of \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 is a crystal whose underlying set is $\mathcal{B}_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2$ and whose structure maps are given as follows:

$$\text{wt}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \text{wt}(b_1) + \text{wt}(b_2),$$

$$\varepsilon_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \max(\varepsilon_i(b_1) - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \varepsilon_i(b_2)) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i(b_1) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) > \varphi_i(b_2), \\ \varepsilon_i(b_2) & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) \leq \varphi_i(b_2), \end{cases}$$

$$\varphi_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \max(\varphi_i(b_1), \varphi_i(b_2) + \text{wt}_i(b_1)) = \begin{cases} \varphi_i(b_2) + \text{wt}_i(b_1) & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) < \varphi_i(b_2), \\ \varphi_i(b_1) & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) \geq \varphi_i(b_2), \end{cases}$$


$$\tilde{E}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \begin{cases} \tilde{E}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) > \varphi_i(b_2), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) \leq \varphi_i(b_2), \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{F}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) < \varphi_i(b_2), \\ \tilde{F}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_i(b_1) \geq \varphi_i(b_2). \end{cases}$$

Here, we understand that $-\infty < a$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $-\infty \leq -\infty$.

Remark 2.2.2. The tensor product for crystals is associative [6, Proposition 2.3.2].

Example 2.2.3. Suppose that $I = \{i\}$. Recall from Example 2.2.1 the crystal $\mathcal{B}(n)$. The crystal graph $\mathcal{B}(2) \otimes \mathcal{B}(3)$ is described as follows:



Let us introduce some terminologies. Let \mathcal{B} be a crystal.

(1) \mathcal{B} is said to be seminormal if

$$\varepsilon_i(b) = \max\{m \geq 0 \mid \tilde{E}_i^m b \neq 0\}, \quad \varphi_i(b) = \max\{m \geq 0 \mid \tilde{F}_i^m b \neq 0\}$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$.

(2) \mathcal{B} is said to be upper seminormal if

$$\varepsilon_i(b) = \max\{m \geq 0 \mid \tilde{E}_i^m b \neq 0\}$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$.

Example 2.2.4.

(1) For each $\lambda \in X^+$, the crystal basis $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ of $V(\lambda)$ is a seminormal crystal.

(2) The crystal basis $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ of \mathbf{U}^- is an upper seminormal crystal. Also, we have $\tilde{F}_i b \neq 0$ for all $i \in I$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

(3) For each $\lambda \in X$, let $\mathcal{T}_\lambda = \{t_\lambda\}$ denote the crystal given by

$$\text{wt}(t_\lambda) = \lambda, \quad \varepsilon_i(t_\lambda) = \varphi_i(t_\lambda) = -\infty, \quad \tilde{E}_i t_\lambda = \tilde{F}_i t_\lambda = 0, \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

(4) For each $\lambda, \mu \in X$, we have $\mathcal{T}_\lambda \otimes \mathcal{T}_\mu \simeq \mathcal{T}_{\lambda+\mu}$.

(5) For each $\lambda \in X^+$, there exists an injective crystal morphism $\iota_\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_\lambda \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ such that $\iota_\lambda(b_\lambda) = t_\lambda \otimes b_\infty$. This morphism is not strict.

For each $\lambda \in X^+$, set

$$\mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda) := \{b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \mid t_\lambda \otimes b \in \text{Im } \iota_\lambda\}.$$

Let $\pi_\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \sqcup \{0\}$ be a map defined by

$$\pi_\lambda(b) := \begin{cases} b' & \text{if } b' \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \text{ and } \iota_\lambda(b') = t_\lambda \otimes b, \\ 0 & \text{if } b \notin \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda). \end{cases}$$

Note that for each $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$ and $i \in I$, we have

$$(1) \quad \text{wt}(b) = \text{wt}(\pi_\lambda(b)) - \lambda, \quad \varepsilon_i(b) = \varepsilon_i(\pi_\lambda(b)), \quad \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_i(\pi_\lambda(b)) - \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle.$$

Lemma 2.2.5. *Let $\lambda \in X^+$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$, and $i \in I$.*

- (1) *We have $\tilde{E}_i b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$ if and only if $\varepsilon_i(b) > 0$.*
- (2) *We have $\tilde{F}_i b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$ if and only if $\varphi_i(b) > -\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$.*

Proof. Set $b' := \pi_\lambda(b) \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$. Let us prove the first assertion. Since $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is upper seminormal, the “only if” part is obvious. Hence, let us assume that $\varepsilon_i(b) > 0$. Then, by identity (1),

$$\varepsilon_i(b') = \varepsilon_i(b) > 0.$$

Since $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is seminormal, we obtain $\tilde{E}_i b' \neq 0$. Therefore, we have $\iota_\lambda(\tilde{E}_i b') \neq 0$, and hence,

$$\iota_\lambda(\tilde{E}_i b') = \tilde{E}_i \iota_\lambda(b') = \tilde{E}_i(t_\lambda \otimes b) = t_\lambda \otimes \tilde{E}_i b.$$

This implies that $\tilde{E}_i b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$, as desired.

Next, we prove the second assertion. Noting that $\tilde{F}_i(t_\lambda \otimes b) = t_\lambda \otimes \tilde{F}_i b \neq 0$, we see that we have $\tilde{F}_i b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$ if and only if $\tilde{F}_i b' \neq 0$. Since $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is seminormal, the latter condition is equivalent to that $\varphi_i(b') > 0$. By identity (1), this condition is, in turn, equivalent to that

$$\varphi_i(b) > -\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle.$$

Thus, the assertion follows. \square

Lemma 2.2.6. *Let $\lambda, \mu \in X^+$ be such that $\langle h_i, \mu \rangle \leq \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$ for all $i \in I$. Then, we have $\mathcal{B}(\infty; \mu) \subset \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$.*

Proof. Let $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \mu)$. Then, we can write as

$$b = \tilde{F}_{i_r} \cdots \tilde{F}_{i_1} b_\infty$$

for some $i_1, \dots, i_r \in I$. We show that $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$ by induction on $r \geq 0$. When $r = 0$, we have $b = b_\infty \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$. Hence, assume that $r > 0$. By induction hypothesis, we have $b' := \tilde{E}_{i_r} b = \tilde{F}_{i_{r-1}} \cdots \tilde{F}_{i_1} b_\infty \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$. By Lemma 2.2.5 (2), we obtain

$$\varphi_i(b') > -\langle h_i, \mu \rangle \geq -\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle.$$

This implies, again by Lemma 2.2.5 (2), that $\tilde{F}_{i_r} b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$. This completes the proof. \square

For each $\lambda, \mu \in X^+$ such that $\langle h_i, \mu \rangle \leq \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$ for all $i \in I$, set

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda; \mu) := \pi_\lambda(\mathcal{B}(\infty; \mu)).$$

Note that by Lemma 2.2.6, $\pi_\lambda(\mathcal{B}(\infty; \mu))$ does not contain 0. By identity (1), for each $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda; \mu)$, $i \in I$, and $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \mu)$ with $\pi_\lambda(b') = b$, we obtain

$$(2) \quad \text{wt}(b) = \text{wt}(\pi_\mu(b')) + (\lambda - \mu), \quad \varepsilon_i(b) = \varepsilon_i(\pi_\mu(b')), \quad \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_i(\pi_\lambda(b')) + \langle h_i, \lambda - \mu \rangle.$$

Lemma 2.2.7. *Let $\lambda, \mu \in X^+$ be such that $\langle h_i, \mu \rangle \leq \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$ for all $i \in I$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda; \mu)$, and $i \in I$.*

- (1) *We have $\tilde{E}_i b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda; \mu)$ if and only if $\varepsilon_i(b) > 0$.*
- (2) *We have $\tilde{F}_i b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda; \mu)$ if and only if $\varphi_i(b) > \langle h_i, \lambda - \mu \rangle$.*

Proof. The assertions follow from Lemma 2.2.5 and identity (2). \square

Let \mathcal{B} be a crystal, and $i, j \in I$ with $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i} \in \{0, -1\}$. Consider the following conditions (cf. [6, Chapter 4]):

- (S1) If $b, \tilde{E}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\varepsilon_j(\tilde{E}_i b) - \varepsilon_j(b) \in \{0, -a_{i,j}\}$.
- (S2) If $b, \tilde{E}_j \tilde{E}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\varepsilon_j(\tilde{E}_i b) = \varepsilon_j(b)$, then $\tilde{E}_i \tilde{E}_j b = \tilde{E}_j \tilde{E}_i b$ and $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_j b) = \varphi_i(b)$.
- (S3) If $b, \tilde{E}_i \tilde{E}_j b, \tilde{E}_j \tilde{E}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$, $\varepsilon_j(\tilde{E}_i b) = \varepsilon_j(b) + 1$, and $\varepsilon_i(\tilde{E}_j b) = \varepsilon_i(b) + 1$, then $\tilde{E}_i \tilde{E}_j b \neq \tilde{E}_j \tilde{E}_i b$.
- (S2)' If $b, \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $\varphi_j(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_j(b)$, then $\tilde{F}_i \tilde{F}_j b = \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b$ and $\varepsilon_i(\tilde{F}_j b) = \varepsilon_i(b)$.
- (S3)' If $b, \tilde{F}_i \tilde{F}_j b, \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$, $\varphi_j(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_j(b) + 1$, and $\varphi_i(\tilde{F}_j b) = \varphi_i(b) + 1$, then $\tilde{F}_i \tilde{F}_j b \neq \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b$.

Example 2.2.8. *The crystals $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, \mathcal{T}_λ , and $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ satisfy the conditions above.*

Lemma 2.2.9. *Let \mathcal{B} be a crystal, and $i, j \in I$ with $a_{i,j} = a_{j,i} \in \{0, -1\}$. Assume that \mathcal{B} satisfies conditions (S1)–(S3)'. Then, for each $b \in \mathcal{B}$, the following hold.*

- (1) *If $\tilde{F}_i b \neq 0$, then $\varphi_j(\tilde{F}_i b) - \varphi_j(b) \in \{0, -a_{i,j}\}$.*
- (2) *If $\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b \neq 0$ and $\varphi_j(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_j(b) + 1$, then $\varphi_i(\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_i(b) - 1$.*
- (3) *If $\tilde{E}_i \tilde{E}_j b \neq 0$ and $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_j b) = \varphi_i(b)$, then $\varphi_j(\tilde{E}_i \tilde{E}_j b) = \varphi_j(b)$.*
- (4) *If $\tilde{F}_i b, \tilde{E}_j b \neq 0$, then we have $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_j b) = \varphi_i(b) - 1$ if and only if $\varphi_j(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_j(b)$.*

Proof. Let us prove the first assertion. We compute as

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_j(\tilde{F}_i b) - \varphi_j(b) &= (\varepsilon_j(\tilde{F}_i b) + \langle h_j, \text{wt}(b) - \alpha_i \rangle) - (\varepsilon_j(b) + \langle h_j, \text{wt}(b) \rangle) \\ &= -(\varepsilon_j(\tilde{E}_i \tilde{F}_i b) - \varepsilon_j(\tilde{F}_i b)) - a_{i,j}. \end{aligned}$$

By condition (S1), applied to $\tilde{F}_i b$, the last line of the identity above is either 0 or $-a_{i,j}$. This proves the assertion.

Let us prove the second assertion. Assume contrary that $\varphi_i(\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b) \neq \varphi_i(b) - 1$. Since $\varphi_i(b) - 1 = \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_i b)$, the first assertion implies that $a_{i,j} = -1$ and

$$(3) \quad \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_i b) + 1 = \varphi_i(b).$$

Then, we have

$$\varepsilon_i(\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b) - \text{wt}_i(\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_i(b) - (\text{wt}_i(b) - 1) = \varepsilon_i(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varepsilon_i(\tilde{E}_j \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b).$$

By condition (S2), this implies that

$$\tilde{E}_j \tilde{E}_i \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b = \tilde{E}_i \tilde{E}_j \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b = b,$$

which, in turn, implies that

$$(4) \quad \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b = \tilde{F}_i \tilde{F}_j b.$$

Then, using identity (3), we compute as

$$\varphi_i(\tilde{F}_j b) = \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_i \tilde{F}_j b) + 1 = \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b) + 1 = \varphi_i(b) + 1.$$

By condition (S3)', this, together with our assumption that $\varphi_j(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_j(b) + 1$, implies that

$$\tilde{F}_i \tilde{F}_j b \neq \tilde{F}_j \tilde{F}_i b,$$

which contradicts identity (4). Thus, the assertion follows.

The third assertion can be proved in a similar way to the second one. The fourth assertion follows from the second and third ones. \square

2.3. Based modules. A \mathbf{U} -module is said to have a bar-involution $\psi_M : M \rightarrow M$ if

$$\psi_M(xv) = \psi(x)\psi_M(v) \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbf{U}, v \in M.$$

For example, each $V(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in X^+$ has a unique bar-involution ψ_λ such that $\psi_\lambda(v_\lambda) = v_\lambda$.

A weight module is a \mathbf{U} -module M which possesses a weight space decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X} M_\lambda, \quad M_\lambda := \{v \in M \mid K_h v = q^{(h, \lambda)} v \text{ for all } h \in Y\}.$$

Each weight module M admits a natural $\dot{\mathbf{U}}$ -module structure. An \mathbf{A} -form of M is an \mathbf{A} -lattice $M_{\mathbf{A}}$ such that $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}} M_{\mathbf{A}} \subset M_{\mathbf{A}}$. For example, $V(\lambda)$ is a weight module, and $V(\lambda)_{\mathbf{A}} := \dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}} v_\lambda$ is an \mathbf{A} -form.

An integrable module is a weight module M on which E_i, F_i acts locally nilpotently for all $i \in I$. For example, $V(\lambda)$ is integrable. Let M be an integrable \mathbf{U} -module. Then, for each $J \subset I$ of finite type, as a \mathbf{U}_J -module, M decomposes into the direct sum of finite-dimensional irreducible \mathbf{U}_J -modules.

Let M be a \mathbf{U} -module equipped with a \mathbb{K} -valued Hermitian inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_M$, i.e., a \mathbb{K} -valued Hermitian form satisfying the following (cf. [18, Definition 2.1.2]):

- For each $v \in M \setminus \{0\}$, there exist a positive real number c and an integer d such that $(v, v) \in cq^{2d} + q^{2d-1}\mathbb{C}\llbracket q^{-1} \rrbracket$.
- For each $v \in M$, we have $(v, v) = 0$ if and only if $v = 0$.

It is said to be contragredient if

$$(xu, v)_M = (u, \wp^*(x)v)_M \quad \text{for all } x \in \mathbf{U}, u, v \in M.$$

For example, $V(\lambda)$ possesses a unique contragredient Hermitian inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_\lambda$ such that $(v_\lambda, v_\lambda)_\lambda = 1$.

Given a \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice \mathcal{L}_M of a \mathbb{K} -vector space M , set

$$\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M := \mathcal{L}_M / q^{-1}\mathcal{L}_M,$$

and let $\text{ev}_\infty : \mathcal{L}_M \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ denote the quotient map. For example, when M is a \mathbf{U} -module equipped with a contragredient Hermitian inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_M$, we can take

$$\mathcal{L}_M := \{v \in M \mid (v, v)_M \in \mathbb{K}_\infty\}.$$

The inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_M$ induces a \mathbb{C} -valued Hermitian inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)_M$ on $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$. For example, the canonical basis $\mathbf{B}(\lambda)$ of $V(\lambda)$ forms an almost orthonormal basis of $V(\lambda)$, and hence, the free basis of $\mathcal{L}(\lambda) := \mathcal{L}_{V(\lambda)}$. Furthermore, the crystal basis $\mathcal{B}(\lambda) = \text{ev}_\infty(\mathbf{B}(\lambda))$ forms an orthonormal basis of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}(\lambda) := \overline{\mathcal{L}}_{V(\lambda)}$.

Given an integrable module M , let \tilde{E}_i, \tilde{F}_i , $i \in I$ denote Kashiwara operators acting on it. If M possesses a contragredient Hermitian inner product, then Kashiwara operators preserve \mathcal{L}_M , and hence induce \mathbb{C} -linear operators on $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$. Furthermore, \tilde{E}_i and \tilde{F}_i on $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ are adjoint to each other.

A crystal base of an integrable \mathbf{U} -module M is a pair $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$ consisting of a \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice \mathcal{L}_M of M which is compatible with the weight space decomposition of M and is

preserved by the Kashiwara operators, and a \mathbb{C} -basis \mathcal{B}_M of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ which is compatible with the weight space decomposition of M and which forms a seminormal crystal with respect to the Kashiwara operators.

A based \mathbf{U} -module is a \mathbf{U} -module M with a bar-involution ψ_M , a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$, and an \mathbf{A} -form $M_{\mathbf{A}}$ satisfying the following:

- (1) The quotient map $\text{ev}_\infty : \mathcal{L}_M \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ restricts to an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_M \cap M_{\mathbf{A}} \cap \psi_M(\mathcal{L}_M) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ of \mathbb{C} -vector spaces; let G denote its inverse.
- (2) For each $b \in \mathcal{B}_M$, it holds that $\psi_M(G(b)) = G(b)$.

Given a based \mathbf{U} -modules M, N with crystal bases $\mathcal{B}_M, \mathcal{B}_N$, a \mathbf{U} -module homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ is said to be a based module homomorphism if $f(G(\mathcal{B}_M)) \subset G(\mathcal{B}_N) \sqcup \{0\}$ and $\text{Ker } f$ is spanned by a subset of $G(\mathcal{B}_M)$.

Example 2.3.1. Let $\lambda \in X^+$. As we have seen above, the irreducible highest weight module $V(\lambda)$ possesses a bar-involution ψ_λ , a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(\lambda), \mathcal{B}(\lambda))$, and an \mathbf{A} -form $V(\lambda)_{\mathbf{A}}$. With respect to these structures, $V(\lambda)$ is a based module, and we have $\mathbf{B}(\lambda) = G(\mathcal{B}(\lambda))$.

3. i QUANTUM GROUPS AND i CRYSTALS OF QUASI-SPLIT TYPES

In this section, we recall what the i quantum group of quasi-split type is, and formulate the notion of based \mathbf{U}^i -modules in a similar way to based \mathbf{U} -modules. Also, we introduce the notion of i crystals, which is the fundamental tool in this paper.

3.1. i Quantum groups of quasi-split types. Let τ be a Dynkin diagram involution on I , i.e., τ is a permutation on I such that $\tau^2 = \text{id}$ and $a_{\tau(i), \tau(j)} = a_{i,j}$ for all $i, j \in I$. We further assume that there exist automorphisms (also denoted by τ) on X, Y such that $\tau(\alpha_i) = \alpha_{\tau(i)}$ and $\tau(h_i) = h_{\tau(i)}$ for all $i \in I$, and $\langle \tau(h), \tau(\lambda) \rangle = \langle h, \lambda \rangle$ for all $h \in Y$ and $\lambda \in X$. For each $i \in I$, fix $\varsigma_i \in \mathbb{C}(q)^\times$ and $\kappa_i \in \mathbb{C}(q)$ satisfying the following conditions:

- $\kappa_i = 0$ unless $\tau(i) = i$ and $a_{j,i} \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for all $j \in I$ with $\tau(j) = j$.
- $\varsigma_i = \varsigma_{\tau(i)}$ if $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 0$.

Then, the associated i quantum group $\mathbf{U}^i = \mathbf{U}_{\varsigma, \kappa}^i$ is defined to be the subalgebra of \mathbf{U} generated by $B_i, K_h, i \in I, h \in Y^i$, where

$$B_i := F_i + \varsigma_i E_{\tau(i)} K_i^{-1} + \kappa_i K_i^{-1}, \quad Y^i := \{h \in Y \mid \tau(h) = -h\}.$$

Example 3.1.1. Suppose that our Satake diagram is of diagonal type, i.e., $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 0$ for all $i \in I$. Then, one can choose $I_1, I_2 \subset I$ in a way such that $I = I_1 \sqcup I_2$, $a_{i_1, i_2} = 0$ for all $i_1 \in I_1, i_2 \in I_2$, and $\tau(I_1) = I_2$. According to this decomposition, we obtain $X = X_{I_1} \oplus X_{I_2}$, $Y = Y_{I_1} \oplus Y_{I_2}$. For each $\lambda \in X$ and $h \in Y$, we write $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$, $h = h_1 + h_2$, where $\lambda_i \in X_{I_i}, h_i \in Y_{I_i}$. Let I' be a copy of I_1 , and let $I_1 \rightarrow I' : i \mapsto i'$ denote the isomorphism. This induces isomorphisms $X_{I_1} \rightarrow X_{I'}$; $\lambda \mapsto \lambda'$ and $Y_{I_1} \rightarrow Y_{I'}$; $h \mapsto h'$. For each $i \in I'$, set $i_1 \in I_1$ to be the preimage of i , and $i_2 := \tau(i_1) \in I_2$. Then, there exists an isomorphism $\mathbf{U} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}_{I'} \otimes \mathbf{U}_{I'}$ such that

$$E_i \mapsto \begin{cases} F_{i'} \otimes 1 & \text{if } i \in I_1, \\ 1 \otimes E_{\tau(i)'} & \text{if } i \in I_2, \end{cases} \quad F_i \mapsto \begin{cases} E_{i'} \otimes 1 & \text{if } i \in I_1, \\ 1 \otimes F_{\tau(i)'} & \text{if } i \in I_2, \end{cases} \quad K_h \mapsto K_{-h_1'} \otimes K_{\tau(h_2)'}$$

For each $i \in I$, set $\varsigma_i = 1$ and $\kappa_i = 0$. Then, the associated i quantum group is a subalgebra of $\mathbf{U}_{I'} \otimes \mathbf{U}_{I'}$ generated by

$$B_{i_1} = E_i \otimes 1 + K_i \otimes E_i, \quad B_{i_2} = 1 \otimes F_i + F_i \otimes K_i^{-1}, \quad K_h \otimes K_h$$

for $i \in I'$, $h \in Y_{I'}$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbf{U}^i = \Delta(\mathbf{U}_{I'}).$$

For each $J = \{j_1, \dots, j_k\} \subset I$ of finite type such that $\tau(J) = J$, let $\mathbf{U}_J^i = \mathbf{U}_{j_1, \dots, j_k}^i$ denote the subalgebra of \mathbf{U}^i generated by $B_j, K_j K_{\tau(j)}^{-1}$, $j \in J$.

A set of defining relations is known [7, Theorem 3.1]: For $h, h' \in Y^i$, $i \neq j \in I$, $\bar{p} \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$,

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} K_0 &= 1, & K_h K_{h'} &= K_{h+h'}, \\ K_h B_i &= q^{\langle h, -\alpha_i \rangle} B_i K_h, \\ \sum_{n=0}^{1-a_{i,j}} (-1)^n B_i^{(n)} B_j B_i^{(1-a_{i,j}-n)} &= \delta_{\tau(i),j} \frac{(-1)^{a_{i,\tau(i)}}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} B_i^{(-a_{i,\tau(i)})} \\ &\cdot (q_i^{a_{i,\tau(i)}}(q_i^{-2}; q_i^{-2})_{-a_{i,\tau(i)}} \varsigma_{\tau(i)} k_i - (q_i^2; q_i^2)_{-a_{i,\tau(i)}} \varsigma_i k_i^{-1}) \quad \text{if } \tau(i) \neq i, \\ \sum_{n=0}^{1-a_{i,j}} (-1)^n B_{i, a_{i,j}+\bar{p}}^{(n)} B_j B_{i, \bar{p}}^{(1-a_{i,j}-n)} &= 0 \quad \text{if } \tau(i) = i, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$k_i := K_i K_{\tau(i)}^{-1}, \quad (x; x)_n := \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - x^k), \quad B_i^{(n)} := \frac{1}{[n]_i!} B_i^n,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} B_{i, \bar{0}}^{(n)} &:= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{[2k+1]_i!} B_i \prod_{j=1}^k (B_i^2 - q_i \varsigma_i [2j]_i^2) & \text{if } n = 2k + 1, \\ \frac{1}{[2k]_i!} \prod_{j=1}^k (B_i^2 - q_i \varsigma_i [2j - 2]_i^2) & \text{if } n = 2k, \end{cases} \\ B_{i, \bar{1}}^{(n)} &:= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{[2k+1]_i!} B_i \prod_{j=1}^k (B_i^2 - q_i \varsigma_i [2j - 1]_i^2) & \text{if } n = 2k + 1, \\ \frac{1}{[2k]_i!} \prod_{j=1}^k (B_i^2 - q_i \varsigma_i [2j - 1]_i^2) & \text{if } n = 2k. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Let us introduce a family of 1-dimensional \mathbf{U}^i -modules which will be one of the key ingredients in later argument.

Proposition 3.1.2. *Let $\sigma \in X$ be such that $\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \sigma \rangle = 0$ for all $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$. Then, there exists a 1-dimensional \mathbf{U}^i -module $V(0)^\sigma = \mathbb{K}v_0^\sigma$ such that*

$$B_i v_0^\sigma = 0, \quad K_h v_0^\sigma = q^{\langle h, \sigma \rangle} v_0^\sigma \quad \text{for all } i \in I, h \in Y^i.$$

Proof. The assertion follows from relations (5). \square

Proposition 3.1.3. *Let $\sigma \in X$ with $\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \sigma \rangle = 0$ for all $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$, and M a \mathbf{U} -module. Then, for each $\lambda \in X$, $v \in M_\lambda$, $i \in I$, and $h \in Y^i$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} K_h (v_0^\sigma \otimes v) &= q^{\langle h, \sigma + \lambda \rangle} v_0^\sigma \otimes v, \\ B_i (v_0^\sigma \otimes v) &= v_0^\sigma \otimes (F_i + q_i^{-\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \sigma \rangle} \varsigma_i E_{\tau(i)} K_i^{-1}) v. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the definitions, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(K_h) &= K_h \otimes K_h, \\ \Delta(B_i) &= B_i \otimes K_i^{-1} + 1 \otimes F_i + k_i^{-1} \otimes (\varsigma_i E_{\tau(i)} K_i^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then, the assertion follows. \square

This result shows that the \mathbf{U}^i -module $V(0)^\sigma \otimes M$ behaves much like M viewed as a $\mathbf{U}_{\zeta', \kappa'}^i$ -module with weights shifted by σ , where $\zeta'_i = q_i^{-\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \sigma \rangle} \varsigma_i$ and $\kappa'_i = 0$.

3.2. Based \mathbf{U}^\imath -modules. Let us further assume the following conditions on the parameters ς_i, κ_i :

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \varsigma_i, \kappa_i &\in \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}], \\ \overline{\kappa_i} &= \kappa_i, \\ \varsigma_{\tau(i)} &= q_i^{-a_i, \tau(i)} \overline{\varsigma_i}. \end{aligned}$$

This assumption ensures the existence of the \imath bar-involution ψ^\imath on \mathbf{U}^\imath and the \imath canonical basis $\mathbf{B}^\imath(\lambda)$ of $V(\lambda)$, $\lambda \in X^+$ (see [3]).

A \mathbf{U}^\imath -module M is said to have an \imath bar-involution $\psi_M^\imath : M \rightarrow M$ if

$$\psi_M^\imath(xv) = \psi^\imath(x)\psi_M^\imath(v) \text{ for all } x \in \mathbf{U}^\imath, v \in M.$$

Example 3.2.1.

- (1) The irreducible highest weight module $V(\lambda)$ possesses a unique \imath bar-involution ψ_λ^\imath such that $\psi_\lambda^\imath(v_\lambda) = v_\lambda$.
- (2) The 1-dimensional \mathbf{U}^\imath -module $V(0)^\sigma$ in Proposition 3.1.2 possesses a unique \imath bar-involution $\psi_0^{\imath, \sigma}$ such that $\psi_0^{\imath, \sigma}(v_0^\sigma) = v_0^\sigma$.

Set $X^\imath := X/\{\lambda + \tau(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in X\}$, and $\bar{\cdot} : X \rightarrow X^\imath$ the quotient map. The perfect pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : Y \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ induces a bilinear pairing $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : Y^\imath \times X^\imath \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. For each $\zeta \in X^\imath$ and $i \in I$ with $\tau(i) = i$, the parity of $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$ is independent of $\lambda \in X$ satisfying $\bar{\lambda} = \zeta$. We call $\overline{\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle} \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ the value of ζ at i .

Remark 3.2.2. When I is of finite type, $\zeta \in X^\imath$ is uniquely determined by the values $\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \zeta \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $i \in I$ with $\tau(i) \neq i$, and the values of ζ at $i \in I$ with $\tau(i) = i$. In this way, we often identify ζ with an element of $(\mathbb{Z} \sqcup (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}))^I$.

A \mathbf{U}^\imath -module M is said to be an X^\imath -weight module if it has a decomposition $M = \bigoplus_{\zeta \in X^\imath} M_\zeta$ satisfying the following:

- $K_h v = q^{\langle h, \zeta \rangle} v$ for all $h \in Y^\imath$, $\zeta \in X^\imath$, $v \in M_\zeta$.
- $B_i M_\zeta \subset M_{\zeta - \overline{\alpha_i}}$ for all $i \in I$, $\zeta \in X^\imath$.

Such a decomposition is called an X^\imath -weight space decomposition.

Example 3.2.3.

- (1) Let $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in X} M_\lambda$ be a weight \mathbf{U} -module. Then, it is an X^\imath -weight module with X^\imath -weight space decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{\zeta \in X^\imath} M_\zeta, \quad M_\zeta := \bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda \in X \\ \bar{\lambda} = \zeta}} M_\lambda.$$

We call it the canonical X^\imath -weight module structure of M .

- (2) The 1-dimensional \mathbf{U}^\imath -module $V(0)^\sigma$ possesses an X^\imath -weight module structure given by $V(0)^\sigma = (V(0)^\sigma)_{\bar{\sigma}}$.

Let $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^\imath = \bigoplus_{\zeta \in X^\imath} \mathbf{U}^\imath \mathbf{1}_\zeta$ denote the modified \imath quantum group, and $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}}^\imath$ its \mathbf{A} -form. Let M be an X^\imath -weight module. Then it has a natural $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^\imath$ -module structure ([18, Subsection 3.3]). An \mathbf{A} -form of M is an \mathbf{A} -lattice $M_{\mathbf{A}}$ such that $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}}^\imath M_{\mathbf{A}} \subset M_{\mathbf{A}}$.

Example 3.2.4.

- (1) $V(\lambda)_{\mathbf{A}}$ is an \mathbf{A} -form of $V(\lambda)$ as a \mathbf{U}^\imath -module with the canonical X^\imath -weight module structure.

- (2) If the 1-dimensional \mathbf{U}^ι -module $V(0)^\sigma$ has an \mathbf{A} -form, it must be the subspace $V(0)_{\mathbf{A}}^\sigma := \mathbf{A}v_0^\sigma$. This is the case when, for example, $\varsigma_i = q_i^{-1}$ and $\kappa_i = [s_i]_i$ for some $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$ (in this case, an explicit generating set of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}}^\iota$ is known [4, 5]).

A based \mathbf{U}^ι -module is an X^ι -weight module M with an \imath bar-involution ψ_M^\imath , a \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice \mathcal{L}_M , a \mathbb{C} -basis \mathcal{B}_M of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$, and an \mathbf{A} -form $M_{\mathbf{A}}$ satisfying the following:

- (1) The quotient map $\text{ev}_\infty : \mathcal{L}_M \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ restricts to an isomorphism $\mathcal{L}_M \cap M_{\mathbf{A}} \cap \psi_M^\imath(\mathcal{L}_M) \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}}_M$ of \mathbb{C} -vector spaces; let G^\imath denote its inverse.
- (2) For each $b \in \mathcal{B}_M$, it holds that $\psi_M^\imath(G^\imath(b)) = G^\imath(b)$.

The Homomorphisms of based \mathbf{U}^ι -modules are defined in the same way as those of based \mathbf{U} -modules.

Example 3.2.5.

- (1) As we have seen so far, $V(\lambda)$ possesses an \imath bar-involution ψ_λ^\imath , a \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$, a \mathbb{C} -basis $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, and an \mathbf{A} -form $V(\lambda)_{\mathbf{A}}$. With respect to these structures, $V(\lambda)$ is a based \mathbf{U}^ι -module, and we have $\mathbf{B}^\imath(\lambda) = G^\imath(\mathcal{B}(\lambda))$.
- (2) If the 1-dimensional \mathbf{U}^ι -module $V(0)^\sigma$ has an \mathbf{A} -form, then it is a based module with respect to the \imath bar-involution $\psi_0^{\imath,\sigma}$, the \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice $\mathcal{L}(0)^\sigma := \mathbb{K}_\infty v_0^\sigma$, the \mathbb{C} -basis $\mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma := \{b_0^\sigma := \text{ev}_\infty(v_0^\sigma)\}$, and the \mathbf{A} -form $V(0)_{\mathbf{A}}^\sigma$. Then, $G^\imath(b_0^\sigma) = v_0^\sigma$.

Proposition 3.2.6. *Let $\sigma \in X$ be such that $\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \sigma \rangle = 0$ for all $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$. Let $\lambda \in X^+$. Suppose that $V(0)^\sigma$ has an \mathbf{A} -form. Then, $V(\lambda)^\sigma := V(0)^\sigma \otimes V(\lambda)$ is a based \mathbf{U}^ι -module with respect to an \imath bar-involution fixing v_λ^σ , a \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)^\sigma := \mathcal{L}(0)^\sigma \otimes \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$, and an \mathbf{A} -form $V(\lambda)_{\mathbf{A}}^\sigma := V(0)_{\mathbf{A}}^\sigma \otimes V(\lambda)_{\mathbf{A}}$.*

Proof. The assertion follows from [3, Theorem 6.15]. □

Let $\lambda, \nu \in X^+$. By [3, Proposition 7.1], there exists \mathbf{U}^ι -module homomorphism

$$\pi = \pi_{\lambda,\nu} : V(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow V(\lambda)$$

such that

$$\pi(v_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}) = v_\lambda.$$

For each $\zeta \in X^\iota$, these homomorphisms form a projective system $\{V(\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in X^+, \bar{\lambda}=\zeta}$ which is asymptotically stable in the following sense:

Theorem 3.2.7 ([3, Theorem 7.2]). *Let $\zeta \in X^\iota$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. Then, there exists a unique $G_\zeta^\imath(b) \in \dot{\mathbf{U}}^\imath \mathbf{1}_\zeta$ such that*

$$G_\zeta^\imath(b)v_\lambda = G^\imath(\pi_\lambda(b))$$

for all $\lambda \gg 0$ with $\bar{\lambda} = \zeta$. Here, $\lambda \gg 0$ means $\langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$ is sufficiently large for all $i \in I$. Moreover, $\dot{\mathbf{B}}^\imath := \{G_\zeta^\imath(b) \mid \zeta \in X^\iota, b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)\}$ forms a basis of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^\imath$.

The basis $\dot{\mathbf{B}}^\imath$ is called the \imath canonical basis of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^\imath$.

Although each $V(\lambda)$ is a based \mathbf{U}^ι -module, the homomorphisms in the projective system above are not necessarily based.

3.3. ι **Crystal.** From now on, we assume the following:

- $a_{i,\tau(i)} \in \{2, 0, -1\}$ for all $i \in I$.
- $\varsigma_i \in \{q_i^a \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for all $i \in I$.
- $\kappa_i \in \{[a]_i \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for all $i \in I$.

Note that the first condition is satisfied for all I of finite or affine type, except of type $A_1^{(1)}$ with nontrivial τ . The second condition, together with axiom (6) in the beginning of Subsection 3.2, forces ς_i to satisfy the following:

- $\varsigma_i = q_i^{-1}$ if $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$.
- $\varsigma_i = 1$ if $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$.
- $\varsigma_i \varsigma_{\tau(i)} = q_i$ if $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$.

Therefore, we have

$$B_i = \begin{cases} F_i + q_i^{-1} E_i K_i^{-1} + [s_i]_i & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ F_i + E_{\tau(i)} K_i^{-1} & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0, \\ F_i + q_i^{s_i} E_{\tau(i)} K_i^{-1} & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1 \end{cases}$$

for some $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $s_i + s_{\tau(i)} = 1$ for all $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$.

Remark 3.3.1. Our assumption on the parameters ς_i, κ_i ensures that $\wp^*(\mathbf{U}^t) = \mathbf{U}^t$ by [2, Proposition 4.6]. In particular, we can talk about contragredient Hermitian inner product on \mathbf{U}^t -modules.

Definition 3.3.2. An ι crystal is a set \mathcal{B} equipped with the following structure:

- $\text{wt}^t : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow X^t$: map.
- $\beta_i : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{-\infty, -\infty_{\text{ev}}, -\infty_{\text{odd}}\}$: map, $i \in I$, where $-\infty, -\infty_{\text{ev}}$, and $-\infty_{\text{odd}}$ are formal symbols.
- $\tilde{B}_i \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(\overline{\mathcal{L}})$, $i \in I$, where $\overline{\mathcal{L}} := \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}$.
- (\cdot, \cdot) : Hermitian inner product on $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ making \mathcal{B} an orthonormal basis.

satisfying the following axioms: Let $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$, $i \in I$.

- (1) If $\beta_i(b) \notin \mathbb{Z}$, then $\tilde{B}_i b = 0$.
- (2) If $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$, then $\text{wt}^t(b') = \text{wt}^t(b) - \overline{\alpha}_i$.
- (3) If $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$, then $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b')$.
- (4) If $\tilde{B}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$, then $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} \tilde{B}_i b = b$.
- (5) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$, then
 - (a) $\beta_i(b) \in \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{-\infty_{\text{ev}}, -\infty_{\text{odd}}\}$.
 - (b) $\overline{\beta_i(b) + s_i} = \text{wt}_i^t(b)$, where $\text{wt}_i^t(b)$ denotes the value of $\text{wt}^t(b)$ at i (see before Remark 3.2.2). We understand that

$$-\infty_{\text{ev}} + a = \begin{cases} -\infty_{\text{ev}} & \text{if } \overline{a} = \overline{0}, \\ -\infty_{\text{odd}} & \text{if } \overline{a} = \overline{1}, \end{cases} \quad -\infty_{\text{odd}} + a = \begin{cases} -\infty_{\text{odd}} & \text{if } \overline{a} = \overline{0}, \\ -\infty_{\text{ev}} & \text{if } \overline{a} = \overline{1} \end{cases}$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $\overline{-\infty_{\text{ev}}} = \overline{0}$, $\overline{-\infty_{\text{odd}}} = \overline{1}$.

- (c) If $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$, then $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i(b)$.
- (6) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$, then
 - (a) $\beta_i(b) \in \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{-\infty\}$.
 - (b) $\beta_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b)$, where $\text{wt}_i^t(b) := \langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \text{wt}^t(b) \rangle$.
 - (c) If $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$, then $b' = \tilde{B}_i b$ and $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i(b) - 1$.
- (7) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$, then

- (a) $\beta_i(b) \in \mathbb{Z} \sqcup \{-\infty\}$.
- (b) $\beta_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^{\tau}(b) - s_i$ or $\beta_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^{\tau}(b) - s_i + 1$, where $\text{wt}_i^{\tau}(b) := \langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \text{wt}^{\tau}(b) \rangle$.
- (c) If $\beta_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^{\tau}(b) - s_i$ and $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$, then $b' = \tilde{B}_i b$ and $\beta_i(b') \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^{\tau}(b') - s_i$.
- (d) If $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$ and $\beta_i(b') \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^{\tau}(b') - s_i$, then $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i(b) - 1$.

Let us fix a complete set I_{τ} of representatives for the τ -orbits on I .

Definition 3.3.3. Let \mathcal{B} be an \imath crystal. The crystal graph of \mathcal{B} is an $(I_{\tau} \times \mathbb{C}^{\times})$ -colored directed graph whose vertex set is \mathcal{B} , and for each $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$, $i \in I_{\tau}$, and $z \in \mathbb{C}^{\times}$, there exists an arrow from b to b' labeled by (i, z) if and only if $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = z$. We often omit the label z when $z = 1$.

Example 3.3.4. Suppose that our Satake diagram is of diagonal type. We retain the notation in Example 3.1.1. If we set $I_{\tau} := I_2$, then an \imath crystal and its crystal graph are nothing but a crystal and its crystal graph associated to the Dynkin diagram I' . Under this identification, $\tilde{B}_{i_1}, \tilde{B}_{i_2}, \beta_{i_1}, \beta_{i_2}$ correspond to $\tilde{E}_i, \tilde{F}_i, \varepsilon_i, \varphi_i$, respectively for each $i \in I'$.

Remark 3.3.5. Since \mathcal{B} is an orthonormal basis, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \sum_{b' \in \mathcal{B}} (\tilde{B}_i b, b') b'$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}$. Hence, the maps \tilde{B}_i , $i \in I_{\tau}$ can be recovered from the crystal graph of \mathcal{B} .

Lemma 3.3.6. Let \mathcal{B} be an \imath crystal, $b, b' \in \mathcal{B}$, and $i \in I$. Then, we have

$$(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b').$$

Proof. By Definition 3.3.2 (3), we have $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b')$ if $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Now, suppose that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = 0$. Assume contrary that $(b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b') \neq 0$. Then, by Definition 3.3.2 (3) again, we obtain

$$(b', \tilde{B}_i b) = (\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b', b) \neq 0,$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, the proof completes. \square

Remark 3.3.7. By Lemma 3.3.6 (see also Remark 3.3.5), the maps $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}$, $i \in I_{\tau}$ can be recovered from the crystal graph.

Definition 3.3.8. Let $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2$ be \imath crystals. A morphism $\mu : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ of \imath crystals is a linear map $\mu : \overline{\mathcal{L}}_1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}}_2$, where $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_j := \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_j$, satisfying the following: Let $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$, $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$, and $i \in I$.

- (1) If $(\mu(b_1), b_2) \neq 0$, then $\text{wt}^{\tau}(b_2) = \text{wt}^{\tau}(b_1)$ and $\beta_i(b_2) = \beta_i(b_1)$.
- (2) If $\tilde{B}_i b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$ and $\mu(b_1), \mu(\tilde{B}_i b_1) \neq 0$, then $\mu(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \tilde{B}_i \mu(b_1)$.

An \imath crystal morphism $\mu : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_2$ is said to be strict if $\mu(\tilde{B}_i b) = \tilde{B}_i \mu(b)$ for all $i \in I$, $b \in \mathcal{B}_1$. A strict \imath crystal morphism is said to be an equivalence if the underlying map $\mu : \overline{\mathcal{L}}_1 \rightarrow \overline{\mathcal{L}}_2$ is a linear isomorphism; in this case, we write $\mathcal{B}_1 \sim \mathcal{B}_2$. A strict \imath crystal morphism is said to be very strict if $\mu(\mathcal{B}_1) \subset \mathcal{B}_2 \sqcup \{0\}$. An \imath crystal equivalence is said to be an isomorphism if it is very strict; in this case, we write $\mathcal{B}_1 \simeq \mathcal{B}_2$.

Remark 3.3.9. Although an \imath crystal isomorphism induces an isomorphism of crystal graphs, it can happen that two equivalent \imath crystals have non-isomorphic crystal graphs.

Example 3.3.10.

- (1) Consider the crystal basis $\mathcal{B}(0) = \{b_0\}$ of the trivial module $V(0)$. It has an i crystal structure given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (a) \quad \text{wt}^i(b_0) &= \bar{0}. \\ (b) \quad \beta_i(b_0) &= \begin{cases} |s_i| & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0, \\ \max(-s_i, 0) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1. \end{cases} \\ (c) \quad \tilde{B}_i b_0 &= \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(s_i)b_0 & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

- (2) For each $\zeta \in X^i$, let $\mathcal{T}_\zeta = \{t_\zeta\}$ denote the i crystal given by

$$\text{wt}^i(t_\zeta) = \zeta, \quad \beta_i(t_\zeta) = \begin{cases} -\infty_{\text{ev}} & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2 \text{ and } \zeta_i = \bar{s}_i, \\ -\infty_{\text{odd}} & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2 \text{ and } \zeta_i \neq \bar{s}_i, \\ -\infty & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{B}_i t_\zeta = 0,$$

where $\zeta_i \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the value of ζ at i .

- (3) Suppose that $I = \{i\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathcal{B}^i(n) = \{b\}$ denote the i crystal given by

$$\text{wt}_i^i(b) = \overline{n + s_i}, \quad \beta_i(b) = |n|, \quad \tilde{B}_i b = \text{sgn}(n)b.$$

The crystal graph of $\mathcal{B}^i(n)$ is as follows:

$$b \begin{array}{c} \curvearrowright \\ (i, \text{sgn}(n)) \end{array}$$

- (4) Suppose that $I = \{i\}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let $\mathcal{B}^i(n; -n) = \{b_+, b_-\}$ denote the i crystal given by

$$\text{wt}_i^i(b_\pm) = \overline{n + s_i}, \quad \beta_i(b_\pm) = n, \quad \tilde{B}_i b_\pm = b_\mp$$

The crystal graph of $\mathcal{B}^i(n; -n)$ is as follows:

$$b_+ \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{i} \\ \xleftarrow{i} \end{array} b_-$$

There exists an i crystal equivalence $\mathcal{B}^i(n) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(-n) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^i(n; -n)$ which sends $b \in \mathcal{B}^i(\pm n)$ to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_+ \pm b_-)$. Note that the crystal graphs of $\mathcal{B}^i(n) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(-n)$ and $\mathcal{B}^i(n; -n)$ are not isomorphic.

- (5) Suppose that $I = \{i, \tau(i)\}$ and $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $\mathcal{B}^i(n) = \{b_k \mid 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ denote the i crystal given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}_i^i(b_k) &= n - 2k, \quad \beta_i(b_k) = n - k, \quad \tilde{B}_i b_k = b_{k+1}, \\ \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^i(b_k) &= -n + 2k, \quad \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_k) = k, \quad \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b_k = b_{k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $b_{-1} = b_{n+1} = 0$. The crystal graph of $\mathcal{B}^i(n)$ (with $I_\tau = \{i\}$) is as follows:

$$b_0 \xrightarrow{i} b_1 \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} b_{n-1} \xrightarrow{i} b_n$$

- (6) Suppose that $I = \{i, \tau(i)\}$ and $a_{i, \tau(i)} = -1$. For each $n_- \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $n_+ \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+) = \{b_k \mid 0 \leq k \leq n_-\}$ denote the \mathcal{U} -crystal given by

$$\text{wt}_i^i(b_k) = n_- + n_+ - 3k,$$

$$\beta_i(b_k) = n_- - k + \max(n_+ - s_i - k, 0) = \begin{cases} n_- + n_+ - s_i - 2k & \text{if } 0 \leq k \leq n_+ - s_i, \\ n_- - k & \text{if } n_+ - s_i < k \leq n_-, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b_k = b_{k+1},$$

$$\text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^i(b_k) = -n_- - n_+ + 3k,$$

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_k) = k + \max(-n_+ - s_{\tau(i)} + k, 0) = \begin{cases} k & \text{if } 0 \leq k \leq n_+ - s_i, \\ -n_+ - s_{\tau(i)} + 2k & \text{if } n_+ - s_i < k \leq n_-, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b_k = b_{k-1},$$

where $b_{-1} = b_{n_-+1} = 0$. The crystal graph of $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+)$ (with $I_\tau = \{i\}$) is as follows:

$$b_0 \xrightarrow{i} b_1 \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} b_{n_- - 1} \xrightarrow{i} b_{n_-}$$

- (7) Suppose that $I = \{i, \tau(i)\}$ and $a_{i, \tau(i)} = -1$. For each $n_- \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$ and $n_+ \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $-1 < n_+ - s_i < n_-$, let $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+; \vee) = \{b_{k, \pm} \mid 0 \leq k \leq n_+ - s_i\} \sqcup \{b_k \mid n_+ - s_i < k \leq n_-\}$ denote the \mathcal{U} -crystal given by

$$\text{wt}_i^i(b_{k, \pm}) = n_- + n_+ - 3k, \quad \text{wt}_i^i(b_k) = n_- + n_+ - 3k,$$

$$\beta_i(b_{k, \pm}) = n_- + n_+ - s_i - 2k, \quad \beta_i(b_k) = n_- - k,$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b_{k, \pm} = \begin{cases} b_{k+1, \pm} & \text{if } k \neq n_+ - s_i, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_{k+1} & \text{if } k = n_+ - s_i, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{B}_i b_k = b_{k+1},$$

$$\text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^i(b_{k, \pm}) = -n_- - n_+ + 3k, \quad \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^i(b_k) = -n_- - n_+ + 3k,$$

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_{k, \pm}) = k, \quad \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_k) = -n_+ - s_{\tau(i)} + 2k,$$

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b_{k, \pm} = b_{k-1, \pm}, \quad \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b_k = \begin{cases} b_{k-1} & \text{if } k \neq n_+ - s_i + 1, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_{k-1, +} + b_{k-1, -}) & \text{if } k = n_+ - s_i + 1, \end{cases}$$

where $b_{-1, \pm} = b_{n_-+1, +} = 0$. The crystal graph of $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+; \vee)$ (with $I_\tau = \{i\}$) is as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} b_{0, +} \xrightarrow{i} b_{1, +} \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} b_{n_+ - s_i, +} \\ \searrow^{(i, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})} \\ b_{n_+ - s_i + 1} \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} b_{n_-} \\ \nearrow_{(i, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})} \\ b_{0, -} \xrightarrow{i} b_{1, -} \xrightarrow{i} \cdots \xrightarrow{i} b_{n_+ - s_i, -} \end{array}$$


There exists an \mathcal{U} -crystal equivalence $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(n_+ - s_i, n_- + s_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+; \vee)$ which sends $b_k \in \mathcal{B}^i(n_+ - s_i, n_- + s_i)$ to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_{k, +} - b_{k, -})$ and $b_k \in \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+)$ to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_{k, +} + b_{k, -})$ when $k \leq n_+ - s_i$, while b_k when $k > n_+ - s_i$.

- (8) Suppose that $I = \{i, \tau(i)\}$ and $a_{i, \tau(i)} = -1$. For each $n_- \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$ and $n_+ \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $-1 < n_+ - s_i < n_-$, let $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+; \wedge) = \{b_{k, \pm} \mid n_+ + s_{\tau(i)} \leq k \leq n_-\} \sqcup \{b_k \mid 0 \leq$

$k < n_+ + s_{\tau(i)}$ denote the i crystal given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}_i^2(b_{k,\pm}) &= n_- + n_+ - 3k, & \text{wt}_i^2(b_k) &= n_- + n_+ - 3k, \\ \beta_i(b_{k,\pm}) &= n_- - k, & \beta_i(b_k) &= n_- + n_+ - s_i - 2k, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_{k,\pm} &= b_{k+1,\pm}, & \tilde{B}_i b_k &= \begin{cases} b_{k+1} & \text{if } k \neq n_+ + s_{\tau(i)} - 1, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_{k+1,+} + b_{k+1,-}) & \text{if } k = n_+ + s_{\tau(i)} - 1, \end{cases} \\ \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^2(b_{k,\pm}) &= -n_- - n_+ + 3k, & \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^2(b_k) &= -n_- - n_+ + 3k, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_{k,\pm}) &= -n_+ - s_{\tau(i)} + 2k, & \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_k) &= k, \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b_{k,\pm} &= \begin{cases} b_{k-1,\pm} & \text{if } k \neq n_+ + s_{\tau(i)}, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b_{k-1} & \text{if } k = n_+ + s_{\tau(i)}, \end{cases} & \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b_k &= b_{k-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $b_{-1,+} = b_{n_-+1,\pm} = 0$. The crystal graph of $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+; \wedge)$ is as follows:



There exists an i crystal equivalence $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(n_- - n_+ - s_{\tau(i)}, -n_+ - 2s_{\tau(i)}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+; \wedge)$ which sends $b_k \in \mathcal{B}^i(n_- - n_+ - s_{\tau(i)}, -n_+ - 2s_{\tau(i)})$ to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_{k+n_++s_{\tau(i)},+} - b_{k+n_++s_{\tau(i)},-})$, and $b_k \in \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+)$ to b_k when $k < n_+ + s_{\tau(i)}$, while $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_{k,+} + b_{k,-})$ when $k \geq n_+ + s_{\tau(i)}$.

Proposition 3.3.11. *Let \mathcal{B} be an i crystal, $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$, and $b \in \mathcal{B}$ with $\tilde{B}_i b \neq 0$. Then, we have $\text{wt}_i^2(\tilde{B}_i b) = \text{wt}_i^2(b) - 2$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{B}_i b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + 1$.*

Proof. Set $b' := \tilde{B}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$. Then, by Definition 3.3.2 (2), we have

$$\text{wt}_i^2(b') = \langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \text{wt}^i(b) - \bar{\alpha}_i \rangle = \text{wt}_i^2(b) - 2.$$

This proves the first assertion. Next, by Definition 3.3.2 (6c), we have $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i(b) - 1$, and hence,

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') = \beta_i(b') - \text{wt}_i^2(b') = \beta_i(b) - \text{wt}_i^2(b) + 1 = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + 1.$$

This proves the second assertion. \square

Proposition 3.3.12. *Let \mathcal{B} be an i crystal, $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$, and $b, b', b'' \in \mathcal{B}$ with $(\tilde{B}_i b, b'), (\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b, b'') \neq 0$. Then, the following hold:*

- (1) $\text{wt}_i^2(b') = \text{wt}_i^2(b) - 3$.
- (2) If $\beta_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^2(b) - s_i$, then $b' = \tilde{B}_i b$, $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i(b) - 1$, and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + 2$.
- (3) If $\beta_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^2(b) - s_i$ and $\beta_i(b'') \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') + \text{wt}_i^2(b'') - s_i$, then $b'' = \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b$, $\beta_i(b'') = \beta_i(b) + 1$, and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) - 2$.
- (4) If $\beta_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^2(b) - s_i$ and $\beta_i(b'') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') + \text{wt}_i^2(b'') - s_i$, then $\beta_i(b'') = \beta_i(b) + 1$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) - 1$.

- (5) $\text{wt}_i^z(b'') = \text{wt}_i^z(b) + 3$.
(6) If $\beta_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^z(b) - s_i$, then $b'' = \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b$, $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) - 1$, and $\beta_i(b'') = \beta_i(b) + 2$.
(7) If $\beta_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^z(b) - s_i$ and $\beta_i(b') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^z(b') - s_i$, then $b' = \tilde{B}_i b$, $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + 1$, and $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i(b) - 2$.
(8) If $\beta_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^z(b) - s_i$ and $\beta_i(b') \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^z(b') - s_i$, then $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + 1$ and $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i(b) - 1$.

Proof. The first assertion follows from Definition 3.3.2 (2) as Proposition 3.3.11.

The second assertion follows from Definition 3.3.2 (7b) – (7d) and the first assertion of the proposition.

Let us prove the third assertion. By Lemma 3.3.6, we have $(\tilde{B}_i b'', b) = (b'', \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b) \neq 0$. Then, the second assertion of the proposition implies that $b = \tilde{B}_i b''$, $\beta_i(b) = \beta_i(b'') - 1$, and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') + 2$. Now, by Definition 3.3.2 (4), we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b = \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} \tilde{B}_i b'' = b''.$$

Thus, the third assertion follows.

Let us prove the fourth assertion. Again, we have $(\tilde{B}_i b'', b) \neq 0$. Then, the first assertion of the proposition and Definition 3.3.2 (7d) imply that $\text{wt}_i^z(b) = \text{wt}_i^z(b'') - 3$ and $\beta_i(b) = \beta_i(b'') - 1$, respectively. Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') &= \beta_i(b'') - \text{wt}_i^z(b'') - s_i \\ &= (\beta_i(b) + 1) - (\text{wt}_i^z(b) + 3) - s_i \\ &= (\beta_i(b) - \text{wt}_i^z(b) - s_i - 1) - 1 \\ &= \beta_i(b) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the fourth assertion follows.

The remaining assertions follow from the first four assertions by interchanging the roles of i and $\tau(i)$. \square

4. MODIFIED ACTION OF B_i

For each $i \in I$, let \mathbf{U}_i^z denote the subalgebra of \mathbf{U}^z generated by $B_i, B_{\tau(i)}, (K_i K_{\tau(i)}^{-1})^{\pm 1}$.

In this section, we shall define linear operators \tilde{B}_i , $i \in I$ acting on \mathbf{U}^z -modules M satisfying the following.

- (C1) For each $i \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 2$, as a \mathbf{U}_i^z -module, the M is isomorphic to a direct sum of various $V^z(n)$ to be defined in Subsection 4.1.
(C2) For each $i \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 0$, as a \mathbf{U}_i^z -module, the M is isomorphic to a direct sum of various $V^z(n)$ to be defined in Subsection 4.2.
(C3) For each $i \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} = -1$, as a \mathbf{U}_i^z -module, the M is isomorphic to a direct sum of various $V^z(n_-, n_+)$ to be defined in Subsection 4.3.

Also, for each $i \in I$, we give an decomposition $M = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} M_{i,k}$ as a vector space, and define $\beta_i(m)$ to be k for all $m \in M_{i,k}$.

Definition 4.0.1. Let M be an X^z -weight \mathbf{U}^z -module satisfying conditions (C1)–(C3) above. We say that a pair $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$ is an z -crystal base of M if \mathcal{L}_M is a \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice of M and \mathcal{B}_M is a \mathbb{C} -basis of $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_M$ satisfying the following:

- $\mathcal{L}_M = \bigoplus_{\zeta \in X^z} \mathcal{L}_{M, \zeta}$, where $\mathcal{L}_{M, \zeta} := \mathcal{L}_M \cap M_\zeta$.

- $\mathcal{B}_M = \bigsqcup_{\zeta \in X^\imath} \mathcal{B}_{M,\zeta}$, where $\mathcal{B}_{M,\zeta} := \mathcal{B}_M \cap \text{ev}_\infty(\mathcal{L}_{M,\zeta})$; this enables us to define a map $\text{wt}^\imath : \mathcal{B}_M \rightarrow X^\imath$.
- \mathcal{L}_M is stable under \tilde{B}_i for all $i \in I$; this induces a linear map \tilde{B}_i on $\bar{\mathcal{L}}_M$.
- $\mathcal{L}_M = \bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathcal{L}_M \cap M_{i,k})$, and $\mathcal{B}_M = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathcal{B}_M \cap \text{ev}_\infty(\mathcal{L}_M \cap M_{i,k}))$ for all $i \in I$, where $M_{i,k}$ denotes the subspace of M appearing in the decomposition above. This enables us to define a map $\beta_i : \mathcal{B}_M \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$.
- \mathcal{B}_M forms an \imath crystal with respect to the structure maps above and the Hermitian inner product making \mathcal{B}_M an orthonormal basis.

Also, we say that the \mathcal{B}_M is an \imath crystal basis of M .

Since the operators \tilde{B}_i and maps β_i are defined in terms of \mathbf{U}_i^\imath -modules, we assume, until the end of this section, that $I = \{i, \tau(i)\}$ for some $i \in I_\tau$.

4.1. The $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$ case. Suppose that $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$. In this case, we have $\mathbf{U} = U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$, and $\mathbf{U}^\imath = \mathbb{K}[B_i]$. Hence, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, there exists a 1-dimensional irreducible \mathbf{U}^\imath -module $V^\imath(n) = \mathbb{K}v$ such that

$$B_i v = [n]_i v.$$

This \mathbf{U}^\imath -module has an X^\imath -weight module structure such that $V^\imath(n) = V^\imath(n)_{\bar{n}}$; note that $X^\imath = X/2X \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.

Set

$$\mathcal{L}^\imath(n) := \mathbb{K}_\infty v, \quad b := \text{ev}_\infty(v),$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}^\imath(n) := \{b\}.$$

Let M be an X^\imath -weight module isomorphic to a direct sum of $V^\imath(n)$'s. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $M[n]$ denote the isotypic component of M of type $V^\imath(n)$. Then, we have

$$M = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} M[n].$$

For each $v \in M[n]$, we set

$$\beta_i(v) := |n|, \quad \tilde{B}_i v := \text{sgn}(n)v.$$

Then, one can equip an \imath crystal structure on $\mathcal{B}^\imath(n)$. Note that this \imath crystal is the same as the one in Example 3.3.10 (3).

Lemma 4.1.1. *For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the pair $(\mathcal{L}^\imath(n), \mathcal{B}^\imath(n))$ is an \imath crystal base of $V^\imath(n)$. In particular, the crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(0), \mathcal{B}(0))$ of the trivial \mathbf{U} -module $V(0)$ is an \imath crystal base such that the \imath crystal structure of $\mathcal{B}(0)$ is isomorphic to the \imath crystal $\mathcal{B}^\imath(s_i)$.*

Proof. The first assertion is straightforwardly verified. The second assertion follows from the fact that $V(0) \simeq V^\imath(s_i)$ as \mathbf{U}^\imath -modules. \square

Proposition 4.1.2. *Let M be a \mathbf{U}^\imath -module isomorphic to a direct sum of various $V^\imath(n)$ with an \imath crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$, and N an integrable \mathbf{U} -module with a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_N, \mathcal{B}_N)$. Then, the tensor product $M \otimes N$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of various $V^\imath(n)$. Moreover, for each $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_M$, $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_N$, the value $\beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)$ and the vector $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)$ are*

4.2. **The $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$ case.** Suppose that $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$. In this case, we have $\mathbf{U} \simeq U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$, and there exists an algebra isomorphism $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow \mathbf{U}^i$ which sends $E, F, K^{\pm 1}$ to $B_{\tau(i)}, B_i, k_i^{\pm 1}$. Hence, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, there exists an $(n+1)$ -dimensional irreducible \mathbf{U}^i -module $V^i(n) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n \mathbb{K}v_k$ such that

$$B_{\tau(i)}v_0 = 0, \quad B_i^{(k)}v_0 = v_k, \quad k_iv_0 = q_i^n v_0.$$

Here, we understand that $v_{-1} = v_{n+1} = 0$. This \mathbf{U}^i -module has an X^i -weight module structure such that

$$V^i(n) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n V^i(n)_{\zeta_k}, \quad V^i(n)_{\zeta_k} = \mathbb{K}v_k,$$

where $\zeta_k \in X^i$ is such that $\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \zeta_k \rangle = n - 2k$.

Set

$$\mathcal{L}^i(n) := \bigoplus_{k=0}^n \mathbb{K}_{\infty} v_k, \quad b_k := \text{ev}_{\infty}(v_k),$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}^i(n) := \{b_k \mid 0 \leq k \leq n\}.$$

Let M be an X^i -weight module isomorphic to a direct sum of $V^i(n)$'s. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, let $M[n]$ denote the isotypic component of M of type $V^i(n)$. For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $0 \leq k \leq n$, set

$$M[n; k] := B_i^k(M[n] \cap \text{Ker } B_{\tau(i)}).$$

Then, we have

$$M = \bigoplus_{0 \leq k \leq n} M[n; k].$$

For each $v \in M[n, k]$, we set

$$\beta_i(v) := n - k, \quad \beta_{\tau(i)}(v) := k, \quad \tilde{B}_i v := \frac{1}{[k+1]_i} B_i v, \quad \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} v := \frac{1}{[n-k+1]_i} B_{\tau(i)} v.$$

Note that $M[n; k] \subset M_{\zeta_k}$, where $\zeta_k \in X^i$ is as before, and $\tilde{B}_i, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}$ define a \mathbb{K} -linear endomorphism on M .

Then, one can equip an i crystal structure on $\mathcal{B}^i(n)$. Note that this i crystal is the same as the one in Example 3.3.10 (5).

Remark 4.2.1. If we interchange i and $\tau(i)$, then $V^i(n)$ becomes $V^{\tau(i)}(n)$ with v_k being replaced by v_{n-k} . Hence, our definition of β_j, \tilde{B}_j for $j \in \{i, \tau(i)\}$ is independent of the choice of I_{τ} .

Lemma 4.2.2. *For each $n \geq 0$, the pair $(\mathcal{L}^i(n), \mathcal{B}^i(n))$ is an i crystal base of $V^i(n)$. In particular, the crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(0), \mathcal{B}(0))$ of the trivial \mathbf{U} -module $V(0)$ is an i crystal base such that the i crystal structure of $\mathcal{B}(0)$ is isomorphic to the i crystal $\mathcal{B}^i(0)$.*

Proof. The first assertion is straightforwardly verified. The second assertion follows from the easily verified fact that $V(0) \simeq V^i(0)$ as \mathbf{U}^i -modules. \square

Proposition 4.2.3. *Let M be a \mathbf{U}^i -module isomorphic to a direct sum of various $V^i(n)$ with an i crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$, and N an integrable \mathbf{U} -module with a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_N, \mathcal{B}_N)$.*

Then, the tensor product $M \otimes N$ is isomorphic to a direct sum of various $V^i(n)$. Moreover, for each $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_M$, $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_N$ and $j \in \{i, \tau(i)\}$, the value $\beta_j(b_1 \otimes b_2)$ and the vector $\tilde{B}_j(b_1 \otimes b_2)$ are well-defined; we have

$$\beta_j(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \max(\varphi_j(b_2) + \text{wt}_j^t(b_1) - \text{wt}_{\tau(j)}(b_2), \beta_j(b_1) - \text{wt}_{\tau(j)}(b_2), \varepsilon_{\tau(j)}(b_2)),$$

$$\tilde{B}_j(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_j b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_j(b_2) > \beta_{\tau(j)}(b_1), \varphi_{\tau(j)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_j^t(b_1), \\ \tilde{B}_j b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_j(b_2) \leq \beta_{\tau(j)}(b_1) > \varphi_{\tau(j)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_j^t(b_1), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(j)} b_2 & \text{if } \varphi_j(b_2), \beta_{\tau(j)}(b_1) \leq \varphi_{\tau(j)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_j^t(b_1). \end{cases}$$

Proof. The assertion can be proved essentially in the same way as [16, Theorem 6.3.5]. \square

Corollary 4.2.4. *Let M be an integrable \mathbf{U} -module with a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$. Then, for each $b \in \mathcal{B}_M$ and $j \in \{i, \tau(i)\}$, the value $\beta_j(b_1 \otimes b_2)$ and the vector $\tilde{B}_j(b_1 \otimes b_2)$ are well-defined; we have*

$$\beta_j(b) = \max(\varphi_j(b) - \text{wt}_{\tau(j)}(b), \varepsilon_{\tau(j)}(b)),$$

$$\tilde{B}_j b = \begin{cases} \tilde{F}_j b & \text{if } \varphi_j(b) > \varphi_{\tau(j)}(b), \\ \tilde{E}_{\tau(j)} b & \text{if } \varphi_j(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(j)}(b). \end{cases}$$

Proof. The assertion follows from Lemma 4.2.2 and Proposition 4.2.3 by identifying \mathcal{B}_M with $\mathcal{B}^i(0) \otimes \mathcal{B}_M$. \square

Example 4.2.5. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and consider the $(m+1)(n+1)$ -dimensional irreducible \mathbf{U} -module $V(m, n) = \bigoplus_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq m \\ 0 \leq l \leq n}} \mathbb{K}v_{k,l}$ given by

$$E_i v_{0,0} = E_{\tau(i)} v_{0,0} = 0, \quad F_{\tau(i)}^{(k)} F_i^{(l)} v_{0,0} = v_{k,l}, \quad K_i v_{0,0} = q_i^n v_{0,0}, \quad K_{\tau(i)} v_{0,0} = q_i^m v_{0,0}.$$

It has a crystal basis $\mathcal{B}(m, n) := \{b_{k,l} \mid 0 \leq k \leq m, 0 \leq l \leq n\}$ given by

$$\text{wt}_i(b_{k,l}) = n - 2l, \quad \varepsilon_i(b_{k,l}) = l, \quad \varphi_i(b_{k,l}) = n - l, \quad \tilde{E}_i b_{k,l} = b_{k,l-1}, \quad \tilde{F}_i b_{k,l} = b_{k,l+1},$$

$$\text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_{k,l}) = m - 2k, \quad \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b_{k,l}) = k, \quad \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_{k,l}) = m - k, \quad \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_{k,l} = b_{k-1,l}, \quad \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)} b_{k,l} = b_{k+1,l}.$$

Hence, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b_{k,l} = \begin{cases} b_{k,l+1} & \text{if } n - l > m - k, \\ b_{k-1,l} & \text{if } n - l \leq m - k. \end{cases}$$

For example, when $(m, n) = (2, 3)$, the \tilde{B}_i on $\mathcal{B}(m, n)$ is described as follows (the label “ i ” is omitted since we have $I_\tau = \{i\}$):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} b_{2,0} & \longrightarrow & b_{2,1} & \longrightarrow & b_{2,2} & \longrightarrow & b_{2,3} \\ & & & & & & \downarrow \\ b_{1,0} & \longrightarrow & b_{1,1} & \longrightarrow & b_{1,2} & & b_{1,3} \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ b_{0,0} & \longrightarrow & b_{0,1} & & b_{0,2} & & b_{0,3} \end{array}$$

From above, we see that the \tilde{B}_i (resp., $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}$) on a crystal basis of an integrable \mathbf{U} -module coincides with the $\tilde{F}_{\tau(i)'} (resp., \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)'})$ on the tensor product of crystal bases of two integrable \mathbf{U}' -modules (see Examples 2.2.3, 3.1.1, and 3.3.4).

4.3. **The $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$ case.** Suppose that $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$. In this case, we have $\mathbf{U} \simeq U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} k_i B_i &= q_i^{-3} B_i k_i, & k_i B_{\tau(i)} &= q_i^3 B_{\tau(i)} k_i, \\ B_i^2 B_{\tau(i)} - [2]_i B_i B_{\tau(i)} B_i + B_{\tau(i)} B_i^2 &= -[2]_i B_i \{k_i; -1 - s_i\}_i, \\ B_{\tau(i)}^2 B_i - [2]_i B_{\tau(i)} B_i B_{\tau(i)} + B_i B_{\tau(i)}^2 &= -[2]_i \{k_i; -1 - s_i\}_i B_{\tau(i)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\{k_i; a\}_i := q_i^a k_i + q_i^{-a} k_i^{-1}$$

for each $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Set

$$t := B_{\tau(i)} B_i - q_i B_i B_{\tau(i)} - [k_i; -s_i]_i,$$

where

$$[k_i; a]_i := \frac{q_i^a k_i - q_i^{-a} k_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}.$$

Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we have

$$(7) \quad B_{\tau(i)} B_i^{(k)} = B_i^{(k-1)} (t + [k_i; -s_i - 2(k-1)]_i) + q_i^k B_i^{(k)} B_{\tau(i)}.$$

For each $n_- \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $n_+ \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $V^\iota(n_-, n_+) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n_-} \mathbb{K} v_n$ be a \mathbf{U}^ι -module given by

$$B_{\tau(i)} v_0 = 0, \quad B_i^{(k)} v_0 = v_k, \quad k_i v_0 = q_i^{n_- + n_+} v_0, \quad t v_0 = [n_- - n_+ + s_i]_i v_0,$$

where, $v_{-1} = v_{n_-+1} = 0$. Then, $V^\iota(n_-, n_+)$ is an irreducible (see [17, Theorem 4.4.7]) X^ι -weight module such that

$$V^\iota(n_-, n_+) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n_-} V^\iota(n_-, n_+)_{\zeta_k}, \quad V^\iota(n_-, n_+)_{\zeta_k} = \mathbb{K} v_k,$$

where $\zeta_k \in X^\iota$ is such that $\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \zeta_k \rangle = n_- + n_+ - 3k$. Furthermore, $V^\iota(n_-, n_+)$ admits a contragredient Hermitian inner product (\cdot, \cdot) such that $(v_0, v_0) = 1$.

Remark 4.3.1. Note that we have

$$B_i v_{n_-} = 0, \quad B_{\tau(i)}^{(k)} v_{n_-} \in \mathbb{K}^\times v_{n_- - k}, \quad k_{\tau(i)} v_{n_-} = q_i^{2n_- - n_+}, \quad t' v_{n_-} = [n_+ + s_{\tau(i)}] v_{n_-},$$

where

$$t' := B_i B_{\tau(i)} - q_i B_{\tau(i)} B_i - [k_{\tau(i)}; -s_{\tau(i)}]_i.$$

This shows that if we exchange the roles of i and $\tau(i)$, then n_+, k are replaced by $n_- - n_+, n_- - k$, respectively.

Lemma 4.3.2. For each $0 \leq k \leq n_-$, we have

$$(v_k, v_k) = q_i^{k(-n_- - n_+ + \frac{3}{2}k + s_i - \frac{1}{2})} \begin{bmatrix} n_- \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i \prod_{l=1}^k \{n_+ - s_i - l + 1\}_i \in \mathbb{Z}[q, q^{-1}],$$

where

$$\{a\}_i := q_i^a + q_i^{-a}$$

for each $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consequently, if we write $(v_k, v_k) = \text{lt}(v_k)^2 + \text{lower terms}$ for some $\text{lt}(v_k) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}q^{\mathbb{Z}}$, then we obtain

$$\text{lt}(v_k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n_+ - s_i \geq n_- \text{ or ,} \\ & -1 < n_+ - s_i < n_- \text{ and } k < n_+ - s_i + 1, \\ \sqrt{2}q_i^{\frac{1}{2}(k-n_++s_i-1)(k-n_++s_i)} & \text{if } -1 < n_+ - s_i < n_- \text{ and } k \geq n_+ - s_i + 1, \\ q_i^{\frac{1}{2}k(k-2n_++2s_i-1)} & \text{if } n_+ - s_i \leq -1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let us see that

$$\wp^*(B_i) = q_i^{-1}E_iK_i^{-1} + q_i^{s_i}K_i^{-1}q_i^{-1}F_{\tau(i)}K_{\tau(i)} = q_i^{s_i-2}B_{\tau(i)}k_i^{-1}.$$

Also, by identity (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\tau(i)}v_k &= B_{\tau(i)}B_i^{(k)}v_0 \\ &= ([n_- - n_+ + s_i]_i + [n_- + n_+ - s_i - 2k + 2]_i)v_{k-1} \\ &= [n_- - k + 1]_i\{n_+ - s_i - k + 1\}_iv_{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} (v_k, v_k) &= \frac{1}{[k]_i}(v_{k-1}, q_i^{s_i-2}B_{\tau(i)}k_i^{-1}v_k) \\ &= \frac{q_i^{-n_- - n_+ + 3k + s_i - 2}[n_- - k + 1]_i\{n_+ - s_i - k + 1\}_i}{[k]_i}(v_{k-1}, v_{k-1}) \\ &= \prod_{l=1}^k \frac{q_i^{-n_- - n_+ + 3l + s_i - 2}[n_- - l + 1]_i\{n_+ - s_i - l + 1\}_i}{[l]_i}(v_0, v_0) \\ &= q_i^{k(-n_- - n_+ + \frac{3}{2}k + s_i - \frac{1}{2})} \begin{bmatrix} n_- \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i \prod_{l=1}^k \{n_+ - s_i - l + 1\}_i. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first half of the assertion. The remaining assertion follows from this identity by noting that the leading term of $\{a\}_i$ is $2^{\delta_{a,0}}q_i^{|a|}$. \square

For each k , set

$$\tilde{v}_k := \text{lt}(v_k)^{-1}v_k.$$

Such \tilde{v}_k is characterized up to a multiple of $1 + q^{-1}\mathbb{K}_\infty$ by the conditions that $\tilde{v}_k \in \mathbb{K}^\times v_k$ and $(\tilde{v}_k, \tilde{v}_k) \in 1 + q^{-1}\mathbb{K}_\infty$. Now, we define linear operators $\tilde{B}_i, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i\tilde{v}_k &= \begin{cases} \tilde{v}_{k+1} & \text{if } 0 \leq k < n_-, \\ 0 & \text{if } k = n_-, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}\tilde{v}_k &= \begin{cases} \tilde{v}_k & \text{if } 0 < k \leq n_-, \\ 0 & \text{if } k = 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\tilde{B}_i, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}$ are independent of the choice of I_τ up to $1 + q^{-1}\mathbb{K}_\infty$ (see Remark 4.3.1). In particular, they are actually independent at $q = \infty$.

Set

$$\mathcal{L}^n(n_-, n_+) := \bigoplus_{k=0}^{n_-} \mathbb{K}_\infty \tilde{v}_k, \quad b_k := \text{ev}_\infty(\tilde{v}_k)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+) := \{b_k \mid 0 \leq k \leq n_-\}.$$

Let M be an X^i -weight module isomorphic to a direct sum of $V^i(n_-, n_+)$'s. The linear operators $\tilde{B}_i, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}$ on $V^i(n_-, n_+)$'s can be extended to M . For each n_-, n_+ , let $M[n_-, n_+]$ denote the isotypic component of M of type $V^i(n_-, n_+)$. For each $0 \leq k \leq n_-$, set

$$M[n_-, n_+; k] := B_i^k(M[n_-, n_+] \cap \text{Ker } B_{\tau(i)}).$$

Then, we have

$$M = \bigoplus_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq n_- \\ n_+ \in \mathbb{Z}}} M[n_-, n_+; k].$$

For each $v \in M[n_-, n_+; k]$, we set

$$\beta_i(v) = n_- - k + \max(n_+ - s_i - k, 0), \quad \beta_{\tau(i)}(v) = k + \max(-n_+ - s_{\tau(i)} + k, 0).$$

Again, note that $\beta_i, \beta_{\tau(i)}$ are independent of the choice of I_τ (see Remark 4.3.1).

Then, one can equip an i crystal structure on $\mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+)$. Note that this i crystal is the same as the one in Example 3.3.10 (6).

Lemma 4.3.3. *For each $n_- \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $n_+ \in \mathbb{Z}$, the pair $(\mathcal{L}^i(n_-, n_+), \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+))$ is an i crystal base of $V^i(n_-, n_+)$. In particular, the crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(0), \mathcal{B}(0))$ of the trivial \mathbf{U} -module $V(0)$ is an i crystal base such that the i crystal structure of $\mathcal{B}(0)$ is isomorphic to the i crystal $\mathcal{B}^i(0, 0)$.*

Proof. The first assertion is straightforwardly verified. The second assertion follows from the easily verified fact that $V(0) \simeq V^i(0, 0)$ as \mathbf{U}^i -modules. \square

Below, we aim to describe the tensor product rule for \tilde{B}_i . Recall that $\mathbf{U} \simeq U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$. Let us take this isomorphism in a way such that the natural representation $V_{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathbb{K}u_{-1} \oplus \mathbb{K}u_0 \oplus \mathbb{K}u_1$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$ has the following \mathbf{U} -module structure:

$$E_i u_{-1} = E_{\tau(i)} u_{-1} = 0, \quad K_i u_{-1} = q_i u_{-1}, \quad K_{\tau(i)} u_{-1} = u_{-1}, \quad F_i u_{-1} = u_0, \quad F_{\tau(i)} u_0 = u_1.$$

Let (\cdot, \cdot) denote the contragredient Hermitian inner product on the \mathbf{U} -module $V_{\mathfrak{h}}$ such that $(u_{-1}, u_{-1}) = 1$. Also, set $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{h}} := \mathcal{L}_{V_{\mathfrak{h}}}, \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathfrak{h}} := \bar{\mathcal{L}}_{V_{\mathfrak{h}}}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{h}} := \{b_j := \text{ev}_{\infty}(u_j) \mid j = -1, 0, 1\}$. Then, $(\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{h}}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{h}})$ is the crystal base of $V_{\mathfrak{h}}$.

Set $V := V^i(n_-, n_+) \otimes V_{\mathfrak{h}}, \mathcal{L} := \mathcal{L}_{V^i(n_-, n_+)} \otimes \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{h}}$, and

$$\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+) \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{h}} = \{b \otimes b' \mid (b, b') \in \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+) \times \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{h}}\}.$$

The following propositions describe \tilde{B}_i on \mathcal{L} modulo $q^{-1}\mathcal{L}$. The proofs are based on straightforward calculation with no technical argument needed, hence we omit them.

Proposition 4.3.4. *If $n_- = 0$, then we have*

$$V \simeq V^i(1, n_+) \oplus V^i(0, n_+ + 1),$$

with highest weight vectors

$$v_{+0} := v_0 \otimes u_{-1} + q_i^{-(n_+ - s_i)} v_0 \otimes u_1,$$

$$v_{0+} := v_0 \otimes u_{-1} - q_i^{+(n_+ - s_i)} v_0 \otimes u_1.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$B_i v_{+0} = q_i^{-(n_+ - s_i)} \{n_+ - s_i\}_i v_0 \otimes u_0$$

By normalizing the three vectors above, we see that $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ forms an i -crystal base of V such that the crystal graph of \mathcal{B} is described as follows (the label “ i ” is omitted since we have $I_\tau = \{i\}$). The same applies to the following propositions).

(1) When $n_+ - s_i > 0$, we have $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathcal{B}^i(1, n_+) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(0, n_+ + 1)$:

$$\begin{array}{c} b_{-1} \xrightarrow{i} b_0 \xrightarrow{\tau(i)} b_1 \\ b_0 \quad \bullet \longrightarrow \bullet \quad \bullet \end{array}$$

(2) When $n_+ - s_i = 0$, we have $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathcal{B}^i(1, n_+; \vee)$:

$$\begin{array}{c} b_{-1} \xrightarrow{i} b_0 \xrightarrow{\tau(i)} b_1 \\ b_0 \quad \bullet \xrightarrow{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}} \bullet \xleftarrow{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}} \bullet \end{array}$$

(3) When $n_+ - s_i < 0$, we have $\mathcal{B} \simeq \mathcal{B}^i(1, n_+) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(0, n_+ + 1)$:

$$\begin{array}{c} b_{-1} \xrightarrow{i} b_0 \xrightarrow{\tau(i)} b_1 \\ b_0 \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \longleftarrow \bullet \end{array}$$

Proposition 4.3.5. *If $n_- > 0$, then, we have*

$$V \simeq V^i(n_- + 1, n_+) \oplus V^i(n_-, n_+ + 1) \oplus V^i(n_- - 1, n_+ - 1),$$

with highest weight vectors

$$\begin{aligned} v_{+0} &:= v_0 \otimes u_{-1} + q_i^{n_-(n_+-s_i)} v_0 \otimes u_1, \\ v_{0+} &:= v_0 \otimes u_{-1} - q_i^{-n_+(n_+-s_i)} v_0 \otimes u_1, \\ v_{--} &:= v_1 \otimes u_{-1} + q_i^{-n_-(n_+-s_i)-1} v_1 \otimes u_1 - q_i^{-n_-(n_+-s_i)} [n_-]_i \{n_+ - s_i\}_i v_0 \otimes u_0. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for each $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_i^{(k)} v_{+0} &= q_i^{-k} v_k \otimes u_{-1} + q_i^{n_-(n_+-s_i)} v_k \otimes u_1 + q_i^{-(n_+-s_i)+k-1} \{(n_+ - s_i) - k + 1\}_i v_{k-1} \otimes u_0, \\ B_i^{(k)} v_{0+} &= q_i^{-k} v_k \otimes u_{-1} - q_i^{-n_+(n_+-s_i)} v_k \otimes u_1 + (1 - q_i^{-2(n_- - k + 1)}) v_{k-1} \otimes u_0, \\ B_i^{(k)} v_{--} &= q_i^{-k} [k + 1]_i v_{k+1} \otimes u_{-1} + q_i^{-n_-(n_+-s_i)-1} [k + 1]_i v_{k+1} \otimes u_1 \\ &\quad - q_i^{-n_-(n_+-s_i)+k} [n_- - k]_i \{(n_+ - s_i) - k\}_i v_k \otimes u_0. \end{aligned}$$


Proposition 4.3.6. *Suppose that $0 < n_- < n_+ - s_i$. Set*

$$\tilde{v}_{+0} := v_{+0}, \quad \tilde{v}_{0+} := -q_i^{n_-(n_+-s_i)} v_{0+}, \quad \tilde{v}_{--} := v_{--}.$$

Then, modulo $q^{-1}\mathcal{L}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i^k \tilde{v}_{+0} &\equiv \begin{cases} \tilde{v}_0 \otimes u_{-1} & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \tilde{v}_{k-1} \otimes u_0 & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq n_- + 1, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i^k \tilde{v}_{0+} &\equiv \tilde{v}_k \otimes u_1 \quad \text{if } 0 \leq k \leq n_-, \\ \tilde{B}_i^k \tilde{v}_{--} &\equiv \tilde{v}_{k+1} \otimes u_{-1} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq k \leq n_- - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ forms an i crystal base of V such that \mathcal{B} is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}^i(n_- + 1, n_+) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(n_-, n_+ + 1) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(n_- - 1, n_+ - 1)$. The crystal graph of \mathcal{B} is described as follows:




Proposition 4.3.7. *Suppose that $0 < n_- = n_+ - s_i$. Set*

$$\tilde{v}_{+0} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}v_{+0}, \quad \tilde{v}_{0+} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}v_{0+}, \quad \tilde{v}_{--} := v_{--}.$$

Then, modulo $q^{-1}\mathcal{L}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tilde{B}_i^k \tilde{v}_{+0} &\equiv \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{v}_0 \otimes u_{-1} + \tilde{v}_0 \otimes u_1) & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{v}_{k-1} \otimes u_0 + \tilde{v}_k \otimes u_1) & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq n_-, \\ \tilde{v}_{n_-} \otimes u_0 & \text{if } k = n_- + 1, \end{cases} \\
 \tilde{B}_i^k \tilde{v}_{0+} &\equiv \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{v}_0 \otimes u_{-1} - \tilde{v}_0 \otimes u_1) & \text{if } k = 0, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{v}_{k-1} \otimes u_0 - \tilde{v}_k \otimes u_1) & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq n_-, \end{cases} \\
 \tilde{B}_i^k \tilde{v}_{--} &\equiv \tilde{v}_{k+1} \otimes u_{-1} \quad \text{if } 0 \leq k \leq n_- - 1,
 \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{B})$ forms an i crystal basis of V such that \mathcal{B} is isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}^i(n_- + 1, n_+; \vee) \sqcup \mathcal{B}^i(n_- - 1, n_+ - 1)$. The crystal graph of \mathcal{B} is described as follows:



Proposition 4.3.8. *Suppose that $-1 < n_+ - s_i < n_-$. Set*

$$\tilde{v}_{+0} := q_i^{-n_+ + (n_+ - s_i)} v_{+0}, \quad \tilde{v}_{0+} := v_{0+}, \quad \tilde{v}_{--} := v_{--}.$$

the value $\beta_j(b \otimes b_k)$ and the vector $\tilde{B}_j(b \otimes b_k)$ are well-defined; if we set $\text{wt}_j^i := \text{wt}_j^i(b)$ and $\beta_j := \beta_j(b)$, then we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b \otimes b_{-1}) &= \begin{cases} \beta_i + 1 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 0 \text{ and } \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \beta_i & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b \otimes b_{-1}) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 0, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)} - 1 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} > 0, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i(b \otimes b_{-1}) &= \begin{cases} b \otimes b_0 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 0 < \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b \otimes b_0 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 0 = \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i b \otimes b_{-1} + b \otimes b_0) & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 0 < \beta_i \neq \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \tilde{B}_i b \otimes b_{-1} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}(b \otimes b_{-1}) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b \otimes b_{-1} & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 2 \text{ and } \beta_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b) = 0, \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b \otimes b_{-1} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \beta_i(b \otimes b_0) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \beta_i = 0, \\ \beta_i - 1 & \text{if } \beta_i > 0, \end{cases} \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b \otimes b_0) &= \begin{cases} \beta_{\tau(i)} + 2 & \text{if } \beta_i = 0 \text{ and } \beta_i \neq \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)} + 1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i(b \otimes b_0) &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \beta_i \leq 1, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\tilde{B}_i b \otimes b_0 & \text{if } \beta_i = 2 \text{ and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b) = 0, \\ \tilde{B}_i b \otimes b_0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}(b \otimes b_0) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b \otimes b_{-1} + b \otimes b_1) & \text{if } \beta_i = 0 = \beta_{\tau(i)} \text{ and } \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b \otimes b_0 + b \otimes b_1) & \text{if } \beta_i = 0 < \beta_{\tau(i)} \text{ and } \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ b \otimes b_1 & \text{if } \beta_i = 0 \text{ and } \beta_i \neq \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b \otimes b_{-1} & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 0 < \beta_i \neq \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ b \otimes b_{-1} & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)} = 0 < \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b \otimes b_0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \beta_i(b \otimes b_1) &= \beta_i + 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b \otimes b_1) &= \beta_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b \otimes b_1) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b \otimes b_0 & \text{if } \beta_i = 0 \text{ and } \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ b \otimes b_0 & \text{if } \beta_i = 0 \text{ and } \beta_i \neq \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i, \\ \tilde{B}_i b \otimes b_1 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}(b \otimes b_1) &= \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b \otimes b_1. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.3.12. *Let M be an integrable \mathbf{U} -module with a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$. Then, the values $\beta_i(b), \beta_{\tau(i)}(b)$ are defined for all $b \in \mathcal{B}_M$. Also, $\tilde{B}_i, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}$ preserve \mathcal{L}_M .*

Proof. Since M can be embedded into a direct sum of $V_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\otimes N}$ for various $N \geq 0$, the assertion follows inductively from Lemma 4.3.3 and Proposition 4.3.11 by identifying $\mathcal{B}(0) \otimes \mathcal{B}_M$ with \mathcal{B}_M . \square

Remark 4.3.13. Let M be as before. The $\beta_j(b), \widetilde{B}_j b$ for $j \in \{i, \tau(i)\}$, $b \in \mathcal{B}_M$ can be inductively calculated by Proposition 4.3.11. Explicit formulas for them will be given later.

5. TENSOR PRODUCT RULE FOR \imath CRYSTAL

In this section, we shall construct an \imath crystal from an \imath crystal \mathcal{B}_1 and a crystal \mathcal{B}_2 satisfying certain conditions, whose underlying set is $\mathcal{B}_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2$. The construction is motivated by the representation theoretic results in the previous section.

5.1. Statements. Given an \imath crystal \mathcal{B}_1 and a crystal \mathcal{B}_2 , consider the direct product $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_1 \times \mathcal{B}_2$, and identify $\overline{\mathcal{L}} := \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}$ with $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \overline{\mathcal{L}}_2$, where $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_i := \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_i$ with $i = 1, 2$. Then, $\{b_1 \otimes b_2 \mid b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2\}$ forms an orthonormal basis of $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ with respect to the Hermitian inner product induced by those on $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_1$ and $\overline{\mathcal{L}}_2$ making \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 orthonormal bases;

$$(b_1 \otimes b_2, b'_1 \otimes b'_2) := (b_1, b'_1)(b_2, b'_2).$$

We identify $(b_1, b_2) \in \mathcal{B}$ with $b_1 \otimes b_2$, and write $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$.

For $i \in I$ and $b = b_1 \otimes b_2 \in \mathcal{B}$, set

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b) &:= \begin{cases} \varphi_i(b_2) + \overline{\delta_{\beta_i(b_1)+1, \varphi_i(b_2)}} & \text{if } a_{i, \tau(i)} = 2, \\ \varphi_i(b_2) & \text{if } a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \\ B_i(b) &:= \begin{cases} \beta_i(b_1) & \text{if } a_{i, \tau(i)} = 2, \\ \beta_i(b_1) - \text{wt}_i^{\tau(i)}(b_1) + s_i & \text{if } a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \\ E_i(b) &:= \begin{cases} \varphi_i(b_2) & \text{if } a_{i, \tau(i)} = 2, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_i^{\tau(i)}(b_1) + s_i & \text{if } a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where we set $s_i = 0$ for all $i \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 0$. Note that we have $B_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1)$ if $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 0$, and

$$B_i(b) = \begin{cases} \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) & \text{if } \beta_i(b_1) = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) + \text{wt}_i^{\tau(i)}(b_1) - s_i, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) + 1 & \text{if } \beta_i(b_1) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) + \text{wt}_i^{\tau(i)}(b_1) - s_i \end{cases}$$

if $a_{i, \tau(i)} = -1$. Also, note that when $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 2$, we have

$$F_i(b) = \begin{cases} E_i(b) & \text{if } \overline{\beta_i(b_1)} = \overline{\varphi_i(b_2)}, \\ E_i(b) + 1 & \text{if } \overline{\beta_i(b_1)} \neq \overline{\varphi_i(b_2)}. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 5.1.1. Let \mathcal{B}_1 be an \imath crystal, \mathcal{B}_2 a crystal. Assume that \mathcal{B}_2 satisfies conditions (S1)–(S3)' in Subsection 2.2 for all $i, \tau(i) \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2$. For each $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$, $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$, and $i \in I$, set $b := b_1 \otimes b_2$, $\beta_i := \beta_i(b_1)$, $\text{wt}^{\tau(i)} := \text{wt}^{\tau(i)}(b_1)$, $\text{wt}_i^{\tau(i)} := \text{wt}_i^{\tau(i)}(b_1)$, $\varepsilon_i := \varepsilon_i(b_2)$, $\varphi_i := \varphi_i(b_2)$, $\text{wt} := \text{wt}(b_2)$, $\text{wt}_i := \text{wt}_i(b_2)$. Then, $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ is equipped with an \imath crystal structure as follows: Let $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$, $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$, and $i \in I$.

$$(1) \text{ wt}^{\tau(i)}(b) = \text{wt}^{\tau(i)} + \overline{\text{wt}}.$$

(2) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \max(F_i(b), B_i(b), E_i(b)) - \text{wt}_i \\ &= \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i + 1 & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \beta_i - \text{wt}_i & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ \varepsilon_i & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b), \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b). \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Here, we understand that $-\infty < -\infty_{\text{ev}}, -\infty_{\text{odd}} < a$ for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.

(3) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \max(F_i(b), B_i(b), E_i(b)) + \text{wt}_i^2 - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} \\ &= \begin{cases} \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^2 - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \beta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b), \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b). \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

(4) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \max(F_i(b), B_i(b), E_i(b)) + \text{wt}_i^2 - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ &= \begin{cases} \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^2 - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \beta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b). \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Also, the following hold:

(a) When $F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b)$,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b) = E_i(b) + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here and below, whenever talking about $\varphi_i(b_2)$ for $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2 \sqcup \{0\}$, we further impose that $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$.

(b) When $F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b)$,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } B_i(b) = E_i(b) + 1, \text{ and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i - 2, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 + b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) & \text{if } F_i(b) = B_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Here and below, whenever talking about $\beta_i(b_1)$ for $b_1 \in \mathcal{L}_1$, we further impose that $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$.

(c) When $F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b)$,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 & \text{if } E_i(b) = F_i(b) \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) = \varphi_i, \\ & \text{or } E_i(b) = B_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)} \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) < E_i(b), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 + b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) & \text{if } E_i(b) = F_i(b) > \beta_{\tau(i)} \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) = \varphi_i - 1, \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since the proof of this proposition is lengthy and independent of the later argument, we put it in Subsection 7.1.

Remark 5.1.2. The tensor product rule above for $I = \{i, \tau(i)\}$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq -1$ coincides with the one given in Propositions 4.1.2 and 4.2.3. When $a_{i, \tau(i)} = -1$ and $\mathcal{B}_2 = \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{q}}$, it coincides with the one given in Proposition 4.3.11.

Proposition 5.1.3. *The tensor product of an i crystal and a crystal is associative. Namely, let \mathcal{B}_1 be an i crystal, and $\mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{B}_3$ crystals such that $\mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{B}_3, \mathcal{B}_2 \otimes \mathcal{B}_3$ satisfy conditions (S1)–(S3)' for all $i, \tau(i) \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2$. Then, the canonical map*

$$\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes (\mathcal{B}_2 \otimes \mathcal{B}_3) \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2) \otimes \mathcal{B}_3; \quad b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) \mapsto (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3$$

gives rise to an isomorphism of i crystals.

Since the proof of this proposition is lengthy and independent of the later argument, we put it in Subsection 7.2.

Remark 5.1.4. Suppose that $I = \{i, \tau(i)\}$ for some $i \in I$. Let $V_{\mathfrak{q}}$ denote the natural representation of \mathbf{U} , and $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{q}}$ its crystal basis. By Remark 5.1.2 and Proposition 5.1.3, the β_i and \tilde{B}_i on $\mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\otimes N} = \mathcal{B}(0) \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\mathfrak{q}}^{\otimes N}$ combinatorially defined in this section coincide with the ones representation theoretically defined in the previous section.

5.2. Consequences. In this subsection, we list some consequences of Propositions 5.1.1 and 5.1.3.

Corollary 5.2.1. *Let \mathcal{B} be a crystal satisfying conditions (S1)–(S3)' for all $i, \tau(i) \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2$. For each $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$, set $\varphi_i := \varphi_i(b)$, $\varepsilon_i := \varepsilon_i(b)$, $\text{wt} := \text{wt}(b)$, and $\text{wt}_i := \text{wt}_i(b)$. Then, it has an i crystal structure as follows: Let $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$.*

- (1) $\text{wt}^i(b) = \overline{\text{wt}}$.
- (2) If $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 2$, then

$$\beta_i(b) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i + 1 & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} \neq \overline{\varphi_i}, \\ |s_i| - \text{wt}_i & \text{if } |s_i| > \varphi_i, \\ \varepsilon_i & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} = \overline{\varphi_i}, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} \neq \overline{\varphi_i}, \\ \text{sgn}(s_i) b & \text{if } |s_i| > \varphi_i, \\ \tilde{E}_i b & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} = \overline{\varphi_i}, \end{cases}$$

(3) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \max(\varphi_i, 0, \varphi_{\tau(i)}) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} \\ &= \begin{cases} \varphi_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i > 0, \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ -\text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i \leq 0 > \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i, 0 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \begin{cases} \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i > 0, \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ 0 & \text{if } \varphi_i \leq 0 > \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_i, 0 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

(4) If $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \max(\varphi_i, \max(0, s_i), \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ &= \begin{cases} \varphi_i - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i > \max(s_i, 0), \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i, \\ \max(-s_i, 0) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i \leq \max(s_i, 0) > \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i, \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i, \max(s_i, 0) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

(a) When $\varphi_i > \max(s_i, 0), \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i$,

$$\tilde{B}_i(b) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \tilde{F}_i b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(b) When $\varphi_i \leq \max(s_i, 0) > \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i$,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i = s_i > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(c) When $\varphi_i, \max(s_i, 0) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i$,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b) = \varphi_i, \\ & \text{or } \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i = 0 \geq s_i \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b) < 0, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b + \tilde{F}_i b) & \text{if } \varphi_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i > \max(0, -s_{\tau(i)}) \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b) = \varphi_i - 1, \\ \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Recall from Example 3.3.10 (1) that the crystal $\mathcal{B}(0) = \{b_0\}$ has an \mathfrak{r} crystal structure. By Proposition 5.1.1, the tensor product $\mathcal{B}(0) \otimes \mathcal{B}$ has an \mathfrak{r} crystal structure. For each $b \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}F_i(b_0 \otimes b) &= \begin{cases} \varphi_i + \delta_{s_i+1, \varphi_i} & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ \varphi_i & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \\ B_i(b_0 \otimes b) &= \begin{cases} |s_i| & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ \max(0, s_i) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \\ E_i(b_0 \otimes b) &= \begin{cases} \varphi_i & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2. \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

Now, the assertion follows from Proposition 5.1.1 by identifying $b_0 \otimes b$ with b . \square

Corollary 5.2.2. *Let \mathcal{B} be a seminormal crystal satisfying conditions (S1)–(S3)' for all $i, \tau(i) \in I$ with $a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2$. For each $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$, set $\varphi_i := \varphi_i(b)$, $\varepsilon_i := \varepsilon_i(b)$, $\text{wt} := \text{wt}(b)$, and $\text{wt}_i := \text{wt}_i(b)$. Then, it has an ι crystal structure as follows: Let $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$.*

(1) $\text{wt}^{\iota}(b) = \overline{\text{wt}}$.

(2) If $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 2$, then

$$\beta_i(b) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i + 1 & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} \neq \overline{\varphi_i}, \\ |s_i| - \text{wt}_i & \text{if } |s_i| > \varphi_i, \\ \varepsilon_i & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} = \overline{\varphi_i}, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} \neq \overline{\varphi_i}, \\ \text{sgn}(s_i) b & \text{if } |s_i| > \varphi_i, \\ \tilde{E}_i b & \text{if } |s_i| \leq \varphi_i \text{ and } \overline{s_i} = \overline{\varphi_i}, \end{cases}$$

(3) If $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 0$, then

$$\beta_i(b) = \max(\varphi_i, \varphi_{\tau(i)}) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}$$

$$= \begin{cases} \varphi_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i > \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i > \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_i \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}. \end{cases}$$

(4) If $a_{i, \tau(i)} = -1$, then

$$\beta_i(b) = \max(\varphi_i, \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)},$$

$$= \begin{cases} \varphi_i - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i > \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i, \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } \varphi_i \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i. \end{cases}$$

(a) When $\varphi_i > \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i$,

$$\tilde{B}_i(b) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \tilde{F}_i b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(b) When $\varphi_i \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i$,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b) = \varphi_i, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b + \tilde{F}_i b) & \text{if } \varphi_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + s_i > \max(0, -s_{\tau(i)}) \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b) = \varphi_i - 1, \\ \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Noting that we have $\varphi_i(b) \geq 0$ for all $i \in I$, the assertion is immediate from Corollary 5.2.1. \square

Theorem 5.2.3. *Let M be an integrable \mathbf{U} -module with a crystal base $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$. Then, as a \mathbf{U}^{ι} -module, it satisfies the conditions (C1)–(C3) in the beginning of Section 3, and the pair $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$ is an ι crystal base of M such that the ι crystal structure of \mathcal{B}_M is given by Corollary 5.2.2.*

Proof. By the definition of ι crystal base (Definition 4.0.1), it suffices to show that for each $i \in I$, the pair $(\mathcal{L}_M, \mathcal{B}_M)$ is an ι crystal base of M , regarded as a \mathbf{U}_i^{ι} -module.

First, we prove the assertion for the trivial module $V(0) = \mathbb{K}v_0$ with crystal base $(\mathcal{L}(0) = \mathbb{K}_\infty v_0, \mathcal{B} = \{b_0\})$, where $b_0 := \text{ev}_\infty(v_0)$. By Lemmas 4.1.1, 4.2.2, and 4.3.3, we have

$$\beta_i(b_0) = \begin{cases} |s_i| & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ \max(-s_i, 0) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \quad \tilde{B}_i b_0 = \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(s_i)b_0 & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2. \end{cases}$$

This shows that $\mathcal{B}(0)$ is an ι crystal basis of $V(0)$ whose ι crystal structure is as in Example 3.3.10 (1).

Next, let us investigate how β_i and \tilde{B}_i act on $M \simeq V(0) \otimes M$ for each $i \in I$. Since M is integrable, as a $\mathbf{U}_{i,\tau(i)}$ -module, it can be embedded into a direct sum of tensor powers $V_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\otimes N}$ of the natural representation of $\mathbf{U}_{i,\tau(i)}$ for various $N \geq 0$. Therefore, we may assume that $M \simeq V_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\otimes N}$ for some $N > 0$ as a \mathbf{U}_i^{\vee} -module. Now, the assertion follows from Remark 5.1.4. \square

Proposition 5.2.4. *Let $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_3$ be ι crystals, $\mathcal{B}_2, \mathcal{B}_4$ crystals, $\mu_1 : \mathcal{B}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_3$ an ι crystal morphism, $\mu_2 : \mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_4$ a crystal morphism. Let $\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2 : \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_3 \otimes \mathbb{C}\mathcal{B}_4$ denote the \mathbb{C} -linear map given by $(\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(b_2)$. Then, the following hold:*

- (1) $\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2$ is an ι crystal morphism.
- (2) If μ_1 and μ_2 are strict, then so is $\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2$.
- (3) If μ_1 is very strict and μ_2 is strict, then $\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2$ is very strict.
- (4) If μ_1 is an equivalence and μ_2 is an isomorphism, then $\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2$ is an equivalence.
- (5) If μ_1 and μ_2 are isomorphisms, then so is $\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2$.

Proof. First, we confirm Definition 3.3.8 (1). Let $b_i \in \mathcal{B}_i$ be such that $(\mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(b_2), b_3 \otimes b_4) \neq 0$. Then, we have $(\mu_1(b_1), b_3) \neq 0$ and $\mu_2(b_2) = b_4$. Setting $b := b_1 \otimes b_2$ and $b' := b_3 \otimes b_4$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}^t(b_3 \otimes b_4) &= \text{wt}^t(b_3) + \overline{\text{wt}(b_4)} = \text{wt}^t(b_1) + \overline{\text{wt}(b_2)} = \text{wt}^t(b_1 \otimes b_2), \\ \beta_i(b_3 \otimes b_4) &= \begin{cases} \max(F_i(b'), B_i(b'), E_i(b')) - \text{wt}_i(b_4) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ \max(F_i(b'), B_i(b'), E_i(b')) + \text{wt}_i^t(b_3) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_4) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \max(F_i(b), B_i(b), E_i(b)) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ \max(F_i(b), B_i(b), E_i(b)) + \text{wt}_i^t(b_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2 \end{cases} \\ &= \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.8 (1).

Next, let us confirm Definition 3.3.8 (2). Suppose that $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$. Then, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b), \end{cases}$$

We claim that

$$\tilde{B}_i(b_3 \otimes b_4) = \begin{cases} b_3 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b_3 \otimes b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ b_3 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b). \end{cases}$$

First, consider the case when $F_i(b') > B_i(b'), E_i(b')$. If our claim fails, then we have $F_i(b') = E_i(b') + 1$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_4) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_4) + 1$. Since $\tilde{F}_i b_2 \neq 0$, we have $\mu_2(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \tilde{F}_i \mu_2(b_2) = \tilde{F}_i b_4$, and hence,

$$\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_4) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_4) + 1 = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) + 1.$$

This, together with $F_i(b) = F_i(b') = E_i(b') + 1 = E_i(b) + 1$ implies that $\tilde{B}_i b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$, which is a contradiction. Thus, we obtain $\tilde{B}_i b' = b_3 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_4$. By the same way, our claim follows in the case when $F_i(b'), B_i(b') \leq E_i(b')$.

Next, consider the case when $F_i(b') \leq B_i(b') > E_i(b')$. Since $\tilde{B}_i b \in \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$, we have $\tilde{B}_i b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$. If it holds that $F_i(b') = B_i(b') \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_3)$, then we obtain $F_i(b) = B_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1)$, and hence, $\tilde{B}_i b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 + b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2)$. This is a contradiction. On the other hand, if $B_i(b') = E_i(b') + 1$ and $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_3) = \beta_i(b_3) - 2$, then it follows that $\mu_1(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \tilde{B}_i \mu_1(b_1) = \tilde{B}_i b_3$. Therefore, we have $B_i(b) = E_i(b) + 1$ and $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i(b_1) - 2$, and hence, $\tilde{B}_i b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2$. This causes a contradiction, too. Thus, we obtain $\tilde{B}_i b' = \tilde{B}_i b_3 \otimes b_4$.

Now, we compute as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i(\mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(b_2)) &= \sum_{b_3 \in \mathcal{B}_3} (\mu_1(b_1), b_3) \tilde{B}_i(b_3 \otimes b_4) \\ &= \begin{cases} \sum_{b_3 \in \mathcal{B}_3} (\mu_1(b_1), b_3) b_3 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \sum_{b_3 \in \mathcal{B}_3} (\mu_1(b_1), b_3) \tilde{B}_i b_3 \otimes b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ \sum_{b_3 \in \mathcal{B}_3} (\mu_1(b_1), b_3) b_3 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b) \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \mu_1(b_1) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i \mu_1(b_1) \otimes b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b), \\ \mu_1(b_1) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_4 & \text{if } F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b) \end{cases} \\ &= (\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.8 (2). Thus, the first assertion of the proposition follows.

Let us prove the second assertion. By the first assertion, it suffices to show that $\tilde{B}_i(\mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(b_2)) = (\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2))$ for all $b_1 \otimes b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ and $i \in I$. Let $b_3 \otimes b_4 \in \mathcal{B}_3 \otimes \mathcal{B}_4$ be such that $(\mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(b_2), b_3 \otimes b_4) \neq 0$. By the definition of \tilde{B}_i on tensor products, and the strictness of μ_1, μ_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= c_F b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 + c_B \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 + c_E b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_3 \otimes b_4) &= c_F b_3 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_4 + c_B \tilde{B}_i b_3 \otimes b_4 + c_E b_3 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_4 \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_F, c_B, c_E \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i(\mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(b_2)) &= \sum_{b_3 \in \mathcal{B}_3} (\mu_1(b_1), b_3) \tilde{B}_i(b_3 \otimes b_4) \\ &= \sum_{b_3 \in \mathcal{B}_3} (\mu_1(b_1), b_3) (c_F b_3 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_4 + c_B \tilde{B}_i b_3 \otimes b_4 + c_E b_3 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_4) \\ &= c_F \mu_1(b_1) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_4 + c_B \tilde{B}_i \mu_1(b_1) \otimes b_4 + c_E \mu_1(b_1) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_4 \\ &= c_F \mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(\tilde{F}_i b_2) + c_B \mu_1(\tilde{B}_i b_1) \otimes \mu_2(b_2) + c_E \mu_1(b_1) \otimes \mu_2(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) \\ &= (\mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the second assertion. The remaining assertions are now obvious. Thus, the proof completes. \square

6. ι CRYSTAL BASIS OF THE MODIFIED ι QUANTUM GROUP

In this section, we construct projective systems of ι crystals and very strict morphisms, and describe their projective limits explicitly. Then, we lift this result to based \mathbf{U}^ι -modules.

6.1. ι Crystal basis of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^\iota$. For the rest of this paper, we fix $\sigma \in X^+$ such that

$$\langle h_i, \sigma \rangle = \begin{cases} |s_i| & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2, \\ 0 & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0, \\ \max(s_i, 0) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1 \text{ and } i \in I_\tau, \\ \max(-s_{\tau(i)}, 0) & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1 \text{ and } i \notin I_\tau. \end{cases}$$

Note that we have

$$\langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \sigma \rangle = \begin{cases} s_i & \text{if } i \in I_\tau, \\ -s_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } i \notin I_\tau \end{cases}$$

for all $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$.

Recall from Section 3 the 1-dimensional \mathbf{U}^ι -module $V(0)^\sigma = \mathbb{K}v_0^\sigma$ and its \mathbb{K}_∞ -lattice $\mathcal{L}(0)^\sigma = \mathbb{K}_\infty v_0^\sigma$. Set $b_0^\sigma := \text{ev}_\infty(v_0^\sigma)$, $\mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma := \{b_0^\sigma\}$.

Lemma 6.1.1. *The pair $(\mathcal{L}(0)^\sigma, \mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma)$ is an ι crystal base of $V(0)^\sigma$; its ι crystal structure is given as follows:*

$$\text{wt}^\iota(b_0^\sigma) = \bar{\sigma}, \quad \beta_i(b_0^\sigma) = 0, \quad \tilde{B}_i b_0^\sigma = 0.$$

Proof. The assertion is clear from the \mathbf{U}^ι -module structure of $V(0)^\sigma$. \square

Lemma 6.1.2. *Let $\nu \in X^+$. Then, there exists a very strict ι crystal morphism $\gamma_\nu : \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma$ such that*

$$\gamma_\nu(b) = \delta_{b, b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}} b_0^\sigma.$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.2.2, we have

$$\text{wt}^\iota(b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}) = \bar{\sigma}, \quad \beta_i(b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}) = 0, \quad \tilde{B}_i b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)} = 0.$$

This, together with Lemma 6.1.1, shows that $\{b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}\}$ forms an ι crystal isomorphic to $\mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma$. Thus, the assertion follows. \square

Recall that for each $\lambda \in X^+$, we set

$$V(\lambda)^\sigma := V(0)^\sigma \otimes V(\lambda), \quad \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma := \mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda),$$

and

$$v^\sigma := v_0^\sigma \otimes v, \quad b^\sigma := b_0^\sigma \otimes b$$

for all $v \in V(\lambda)$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$.

Lemma 6.1.3. *Let $\lambda \in X^+$. Then, there exists a very strict ι crystal morphism $\rho_\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$ such that*

$$\rho_\lambda(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b)) = \pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. Consequently, there exists an injective very strict ι crystal morphism $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda)$ which sends $\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma$ to $\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$.

Proof. By [14, Proposition 25.1.2], there exists an injective strict crystal morphism $\eta_{\sigma,\lambda} : \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\sigma) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ such that

$$\eta_{\sigma,\lambda}(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b)) = b_\sigma \otimes \pi_\lambda(b) \quad \text{for all } b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda),$$

and

$$\eta_{\sigma,\lambda}(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b)) \notin b_\sigma \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \setminus \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda).$$

By Lemma 6.1.2 and Proposition 5.2.4, there exists a very strict q crystal morphism

$$\rho_\lambda : \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda) \xrightarrow{\eta_{\sigma,\lambda}} \mathcal{B}(\sigma) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\gamma_0 \otimes 1} \mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda) = \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma.$$

Then, it is clear that this morphism has the required property. \square

Proposition 6.1.4. *Let $\lambda, \nu \in X^+$. Then, there exists a very strict q crystal morphism*

$$\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i : \mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$$

such that

$$\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i(\pi_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b)^\sigma) = \pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 6.1.3, there exists a very strict q crystal morphism

$$\mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \xrightarrow{\eta_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu),\lambda}} \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \xrightarrow{\gamma_\nu \otimes 1} \mathcal{B}(0)^\sigma \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda) = \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$$

which sends $\pi_{\sigma+\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b)$ to $\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma$. On the other hand, by Lemma 6.1.3, we have a very strict q crystal morphism

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)).$$

Combining these two morphisms, we obtain a very strict q crystal morphism

$$\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i : \mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma.$$

Then, it is clear that this morphism satisfies the required property. \square

Now, for each $\zeta \in X^i$, we obtain a projective system $\{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma\}_{\lambda \in X^+, \bar{\lambda} = \zeta}$ of q crystals with very strict morphisms $\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i : \mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$. We shall describe its projective limit in the category of q crystals and very strict morphisms. To do so, we prepare three lemmas.

Lemma 6.1.5. *Let $\lambda \in X^+$. Then, there exists an q crystal isomorphism $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ which sends b^σ to $t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$.*

Proof. Let us compare the q crystal structures of $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$ and $\mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$. To do so, recall from Lemma 2.2.9 (4) that $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b) = \varphi_i(b) - 1$ is equivalent to $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b)$. Then, the q crystal structure of $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$ is described as follows: Let $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ and $i \in I$.

- (1) $\text{wt}^i(b^\sigma) = \bar{\sigma} + \overline{\text{wt}(b)}$.
- (2) When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$.

$$\beta_i(b^\sigma) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i(b) + 1 & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{1}, \\ \varepsilon_i(b) & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{0}, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b^\sigma = \begin{cases} (\tilde{F}_i b)^\sigma & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{1}, \\ (\tilde{E}_i b)^\sigma & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{0}. \end{cases}$$

(3) When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$.

$$\beta_i(b^\sigma) = \begin{cases} \varphi_i(b) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b) & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b) & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b^\sigma = \begin{cases} (\tilde{F}_i b)^\sigma & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b)^\sigma & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b). \end{cases}$$

(4) When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$. Setting $s'_i := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in I_\tau, \\ 1 & \text{if } i \notin I_\tau, \end{cases}$ we have

$$F_i(b^\sigma) = \varphi_i(b),$$

$$B_i(b^\sigma) = s'_i,$$

$$E_i(b^\sigma) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i.$$

This implies that $B_i(b^\sigma) \leq E_i(b^\sigma)$. Therefore, we obtain the following:

(a) When $\varphi_i(b) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i$. In this case, we have

$$\beta_i(b^\sigma) = \varphi_i(b) - s'_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b),$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b^\sigma = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{F}_i b)^\sigma & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + 1, \\ (F_i b)^\sigma & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(b) When $\varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i$. In this case, we have

$$\beta_i(b^\sigma) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b),$$

$$\tilde{B}_i b^\sigma = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b)^\sigma & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b) = \varphi_i(b), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b)^\sigma + (\tilde{F}_i b)^\sigma) & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i > 0 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b)^\sigma & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, the \mathcal{U} -crystal structure of $\mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ is described as follows:

(1) $\text{wt}^t(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) = \bar{\sigma} + \overline{\text{wt}(b)}$.

(2) When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$.

$$\beta_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_i(b) + 1 & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{1}, \\ \varepsilon_i(b) & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{0}, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b = \begin{cases} t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{1}, \\ t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{E}_i b & \text{if } \overline{\varphi_i(b)} = \bar{0}. \end{cases}$$

(3) When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$.

$$\beta_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) = \begin{cases} \varphi_i(b) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b) & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b) & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{B}_i t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b = \begin{cases} t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b). \end{cases}$$

(4) When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$. Setting $s'_i := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in I_\tau, \\ 1 & \text{if } i \notin I_\tau, \end{cases}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) &= \varphi_i(b), \\ B_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) &= -\infty, \\ E_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $B_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) < E_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b)$. Therefore, we obtain the following:

(a) When $\varphi_i(b) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) &= \varphi_i(b) - s'_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + 1, \\ t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{F}_i b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(b) When $\varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) &= \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i(t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes b) &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b) = \varphi_i(b), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b + \tilde{F}_i b) & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s'_i \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), \\ t_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proof completes (note that $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b)$ implies that $\tilde{F}_i b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, and hence, $\varphi_i(b) > 0$). \square

Lemma 6.1.6. *Let $\zeta \in X^i$ and $\mu \in X$. Then, we have an i crystal isomorphism $\mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{T}_\mu \simeq \mathcal{T}_{\zeta + \bar{\mu}}$.*

Proof. For each $i \in I$ with $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$, let $\zeta_i \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ denote the value of ζ at i . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wt}^i(t_\zeta \otimes t_\mu) &= \zeta + \bar{\mu}, \\ \beta_i(t_\zeta \otimes t_\mu) &= \begin{cases} -\infty_{\text{ev}} & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2 \text{ and } \zeta_i + \overline{\langle h_i, \mu \rangle} = \bar{s}_i, \\ -\infty_{\text{odd}} & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2 \text{ and } \zeta_i + \overline{\langle h_i, \mu \rangle} \neq \bar{s}_i, \\ -\infty & \text{if } a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i(t_\zeta \otimes t_\mu) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

This datum coincides with that of $t_{\zeta + \bar{\mu}} \in \mathcal{T}_{\zeta + \bar{\mu}}$. Hence, the assertion follows. \square

Lemma 6.1.7. *Let $\lambda \in X^+$. Then, there exists an injective very strict i crystal morphism $\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ which sends $\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma$ to $t_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes b$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$.*

Proof. By Lemmas 6.1.5 and 6.1.6, we have an injective i crystal morphism

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma \simeq \mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma}} \otimes (\mathcal{T}_\lambda \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)) \simeq \mathcal{T}_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$$

which sends $\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma$ to $t_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes b$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$. Hence, to prove the assertion, it suffices to show that for each $i \in I$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$, and $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ with $(\tilde{B}_i(t_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes b), t_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes b') \neq 0$, we have $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$.

Let $i \in I$, $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$. Since there are at most two $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ satisfying $(\tilde{B}_i(t_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes b), t_{\bar{\sigma} + \lambda} \otimes b') \neq 0$, we may take $\nu \in X^+$ such that $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ for all such b' .

As before, we have an injective \mathcal{U} crystal morphism

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}_{\overline{\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty) = \mathcal{T}_{\overline{\sigma + \lambda}} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty).$$

Therefore, if we write $\widetilde{B}_i(t_{\overline{\sigma + \lambda}} \otimes b) = \sum_{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))} c_{b'} t_{\overline{\sigma + \lambda}} \otimes b'$ for some $c_{b'} \in \mathbb{C}$, we obtain

$$\widetilde{B}_i \pi_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}(b)^\sigma = \sum_{b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))} c_{b'} \pi_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}(b')^\sigma.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 6.1.4, we have an injective very strict \mathcal{U} crystal morphism

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma$$

whose image is $\{b^\sigma \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu); \lambda)\}$. Therefore, we obtain $\pi_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}(b') \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu); \lambda)$ for all b' with $c_{b'} \neq 0$. In other words, we have $b' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$ for all b' with $c_{b'} \neq 0$. This proves our claim, and hence, the assertion follows. \square

Theorem 6.1.8. *Let $\zeta \in X^\natural$. For each $\lambda \in X^+$ such that $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$, there exists a very strict \mathcal{U} crystal morphism*

$$\pi_\lambda^\natural : \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma; \quad t_\zeta \otimes b \mapsto \pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma.$$

Moreover, $\mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ and π_λ^\natural 's form the projective limit of $\{\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma\}_{\lambda \in X^+, \overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta}$ in the category of \mathcal{U} crystals and very strict morphisms.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in X^+$ be such that $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$, and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$. By Lemma 6.1.7, we have an injective very strict \mathcal{U} crystal morphism

$$\mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma \hookrightarrow \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$$

which sends $\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma$ to $t_\zeta \otimes b$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda)$. Therefore, there exists a very strict \mathcal{U} crystal morphism

$$\pi_\lambda^\natural : \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma; \quad t_\zeta \otimes b \mapsto \pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma.$$

Then, we have

$$\pi_{\lambda, \nu}^\natural \circ \pi_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}^\natural = \pi_\lambda^\natural$$

for all $\nu \in X^+$.

Let us prove the universality. Let \mathcal{B} be an \mathcal{U} crystal and $\mu_\lambda : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$ a very strict \mathcal{U} crystal morphism such that $\pi_{\lambda, \nu}^\natural \circ \mu_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)} = \mu_\lambda$ for all $\lambda, \nu \in X^+$ with $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$. Define a map $\mu : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ as follows. Let $b \in \mathcal{B}$. If $\mu_\lambda(b) = 0$ for all $\lambda \in X^+$ with $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$, then set $\mu(b) := 0$. If $\mu_\lambda(b) = m_\lambda(b)^\sigma$ for some $\lambda \in X^+$ with $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$ and $m_\lambda(b) \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$, then set $\mu(b) := t_\zeta \otimes m(b)$, where $m(b) \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is such that $\pi_\lambda(m(b)) = m_\lambda(b)$. In order to see the well-definedness, let $\lambda' \in X^+$ be such that $\overline{\sigma + \lambda'} = \zeta$ and $\mu_{\lambda'}(b) = m_{\lambda'}(b)^\sigma$ for some $m_{\lambda'}(b) \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda')$. Let $m'(b) \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ be such that $\pi_{\lambda'}(m'(b)) = m_{\lambda'}(b)$. We want to show that $m(b) = m'(b)$. Since $\overline{\lambda - \lambda'} = \bar{0}$, there exists $\nu, \nu' \in X^+$ such that $\lambda - \lambda' = \nu' + \tau(\nu') - (\nu + \tau(\nu))$. Set $\lambda'' := \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu) = \lambda' + \nu' + \tau(\nu')$. Since

$$\pi_{\lambda, \nu}^\natural(\mu_{\lambda''}(b)) = \mu_\lambda(b) = m_\lambda(b)^\sigma,$$

we see that $\mu_{\lambda''}(b) \neq 0$. Hence, there exists $b'' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ such that $\mu_{\lambda''}(b) = \pi_{\lambda''}(b'')^\sigma$. This implies that

$$\pi_\lambda(b'')^\sigma = \pi_{\lambda, \nu}^\natural(\pi_{\lambda''}(b'')^\sigma) = \pi_{\lambda, \nu}^\natural(\mu_{\lambda''}(b)) = m_\lambda(b)^\sigma = \pi_\lambda(m(b))^\sigma$$

and hence,

$$b'' = m(b).$$

Similarly, we obtain $b'' = m'(b)$. Thus, we obtain $m(b) = m'(b)$, as desired. Hence, μ is well-defined.

For each $\lambda \in X^+$ such that $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$, we have

$$\pi_\lambda^\iota(\mu(b)) = \pi_\lambda^\iota(t_\zeta \otimes m(b)) = \pi_\lambda(m(b))^\sigma = m_\lambda(b)^\sigma = \mu_\lambda(b).$$

Here, we set $m(b) = 0$ if $\mu(b) = 0$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\pi_\lambda^\iota \circ \mu = \mu_\lambda.$$

It remains to show that μ is a very strict ι crystal morphism. Let $b \in \mathcal{B}$ and $i \in I$. Let us write $\tilde{B}_i b = \sum_{b' \in \mathcal{B}} c_{b'} b'$ and $\tilde{B}_i \mu(b) = \sum_{b'' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)} d_{b''} t_\zeta \otimes b''$ for some $c_{b'}, d_{b''} \in \mathbb{C}$. We can take $\lambda \in X^+$ such that $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$ and $\mu_\lambda(b'), \pi_\lambda(b'') \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)$ for all $b' \in \mathcal{B}$ and $b'' \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ with $c_{b'}, d_{b''} \neq 0$ and $\mu(b') \neq 0$. Then, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{c_{b'} \neq 0 \\ \mu(b') \neq 0}} c_{b'} \mu_\lambda(b') = \mu_\lambda(\tilde{B}_i b) = \tilde{B}_i \mu_\lambda(b) = \tilde{B}_i \pi_\lambda^\iota(\mu(b)) = \pi_\lambda^\iota(\tilde{B}_i \mu(b)) = \sum_{d_{b''} \neq 0} d_{b''} \pi_\lambda(b'')^\sigma.$$

This implies that $c_{b'} = d_{b''}$ if $\mu_\lambda(b') = \pi_\lambda(b'')^\sigma$. Therefore, noting that $\mu_\lambda(b') = \pi_\lambda(b'')^\sigma$ implies that $\mu(b') = t_\zeta \otimes b''$, we obtain

$$\mu(\tilde{B}_i b) = \sum_{\substack{c_{b'} \neq 0 \\ \mu(b') \neq 0}} c_{b'} \mu(b') = \sum_{d_{b''} \neq 0} d_{b''} t_\zeta \otimes b'' = \tilde{B}_i \mu(b).$$

Thus, the proof completes. \square

Example 6.1.9. Suppose that our Satake diagram is of diagonal type. We retain notation in Examples 3.1.1. Let us see the ι crystal structure of $\mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, $\zeta \in X^\iota$. For each $i \in I_\tau = I_2$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \varphi_i(b), & B_i(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= -\infty, & E_i(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) - \zeta_i, \\ F_{\tau(i)}(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b), & B_{\tau(i)}(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= -\infty, & E_{\tau(i)}(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \varphi_i(b) + \zeta_i, \end{aligned}$$

where $\zeta_i := \langle h_i - h_{\tau(i)}, \zeta \rangle$. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \max(\varphi_i(b) + \zeta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b), \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b)), \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \max(\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) - \zeta_i - \text{wt}_i(b), \varepsilon_i(b)), \\ \tilde{B}_i(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \begin{cases} t_\zeta \otimes \tilde{F}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) - \zeta_i, \\ t_\zeta \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) - \zeta_i, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \begin{cases} t_\zeta \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)} b & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) > \varphi_i(b) + \zeta_i, \\ t_\zeta \otimes \tilde{E}_i b & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) \leq \varphi_i(b) + \zeta_i. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Under the identification $\mathbf{U} \simeq \mathbf{U}_{I'} \otimes \mathbf{U}_{I'}$, the crystal $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is identified with $\mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$, where $\mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'}$ denotes the crystal basis of the positive part of $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$. If we write $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ as $b_1 \otimes b_2 \in \mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$, the \mathbf{U} -crystal structure of $\mathcal{B}(\infty)$ and the $\mathbf{U}_{I'} \otimes \mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -crystal structure of $\mathcal{B}(\infty) = \mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$ are related as follows: Let $k \in I'$.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{k_1}(b) &= \varepsilon_k(b_1), & \varphi_{k_2}(b) &= \varphi_k(b_2), & \varepsilon_{k_1}(b) &= \varphi_k(b_1), & \varepsilon_{k_2}(b) &= \varepsilon_k(b_2), \\ \tilde{F}_{k_1} b &= \tilde{E}_k b_1 \otimes b_2, & \tilde{F}_{k_2} b &= b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_k b_2, & \tilde{E}_{k_1} b &= \tilde{F}_k b_1 \otimes b_2, & \tilde{E}_{k_2} b &= b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_k b_2. \end{aligned}$$

Also, X^ι is identified with $X_{I'}$ in a way such that $\zeta_k := \langle h_k, \zeta \rangle = \langle h_{k_2} - h_{k_1}, \zeta \rangle = \zeta_{k_2}$.

In Example 3.3.4, we see that an ι crystal can be thought of as a crystal over $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$. Then, the $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -crystal structure of the ι crystal $\mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is described as follows: Let $k \in I'$ and $\mathcal{B}(\infty) \ni b = b_1 \otimes b_2 \in \mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \beta_{k_2}(t_\zeta \otimes b) = \max(\varphi_k(b_2) + \zeta_k + \text{wt}_k(b_1), \varphi_k(b_1)), \\ \varepsilon_k(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \beta_{k_1}(t_\zeta \otimes b) = \max(\varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k - \text{wt}_k(b_2), \varepsilon_k(b_2)), \\ \tilde{F}_k(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \tilde{B}_{k_2}(t_\zeta \otimes b) = \begin{cases} t_\zeta \otimes (b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_k b_2) & \text{if } \varphi_k(b_2) > \varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k, \\ t_\zeta \otimes (\tilde{F}_k b_1 \otimes b_2) & \text{if } \varphi_k(b_2) \leq \varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{E}_k(t_\zeta \otimes b) &= \tilde{B}_{k_1}(t_\zeta \otimes b) = \begin{cases} t_\zeta \otimes (\tilde{E}_k b_1 \otimes b_2) & \text{if } \varepsilon_k(b_1) > \varphi_k(b_2) + \zeta_k, \\ t_\zeta \otimes (b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_k b_2) & \text{if } \varepsilon_k(b_1) \leq \varphi_k(b_2) + \zeta_k. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, the $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -crystal structure of $\mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$ is described as follows: Let $k \in I'$, $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'}$, and $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$. First, we have

$$\varepsilon_k(b_1 \otimes t_\zeta) = \varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k, \quad \varphi_k(b_1 \otimes t_\zeta) = \varphi_k(b_1).$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k(b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes b_2) &= \max(\varphi_k(b_1), \varphi_k(b_2) + \zeta_k + \text{wt}_k(b_1)), \\ \varepsilon_k(b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes b_2) &= \max(\varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k - \text{wt}_k(b_2), \varepsilon_k(b_2)), \\ \tilde{F}_k(b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes b_2) &= \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes \tilde{F}_k b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k < \varphi_k(b_2), \\ \tilde{F}_k b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k \geq \varphi_k(b_2), \end{cases} \\ \tilde{E}_k(b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes b_2) &= \begin{cases} \tilde{E}_k b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k > \varphi_k(b_2), \\ b_1 \otimes t_\zeta \otimes \tilde{E}_k b_2 & \text{if } \varepsilon_k(b_1) - \zeta_k \leq \varphi_k(b_2). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the ι crystal $\mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is essentially the same as the $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -crystal $\mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$.

6.2. Stability of the ι canonical bases. In this subsection, we lift the results obtained in the previous subsection to based \mathbf{U}^ι -modules. Lemmas 6.2.1–6.2.4 are preparations for this purpose.

Given a sequence $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_r) \in I^r$, set

$$F_{\mathbf{i}} := F_{i_1} \cdots F_{i_r}, \quad B_{\mathbf{i}} := B_{i_1} \cdots B_{i_r}.$$

We understand that $F_{\mathbf{i}} = 1 = B_{\mathbf{i}}$ when $r = 0$. Let $\mathcal{I} \subset \bigsqcup_{r \geq 0} I^r$ be such that $\{F_{\mathbf{i}} \mid \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}\}$ forms a basis of \mathbf{U}^- . By [10, Proposition 6.2], the set $\{B_{\mathbf{i}} K_h \mid \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}, h \in Y^r\}$ forms a basis of \mathbf{U}^ι .

For each $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, set $\mathcal{I}_r := \mathcal{I} \cap I^r$, $\mathcal{I}_{<r} := \bigsqcup_{s < r} \mathcal{I}_s$. For each $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}_r$, set $|\mathbf{i}| := r$. Then, for each $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}$, we have

$$(8) \quad B_{\mathbf{i}} - F_{\mathbf{i}} \in \sum_{\mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{I}_{<|\mathbf{i}|}} F_{\mathbf{i}'} \mathbf{U}^{\geq 0},$$

where $\mathbf{U}^{\geq 0}$ denotes the subalgebra of \mathbf{U} generated by $K_h, E_i, h \in Y, i \in I$.

Lemma 6.2.1. *Let M be a weight \mathbf{U} -module, $\lambda \in X$, and $v \in M_\lambda$. Suppose that $E_i v = 0$ for all $i \in I$. Then, we have*

$$\mathbf{U}^\iota v = \mathbf{U} v.$$

Proof. The submodule $\mathbf{U}^v v$ is spanned by vectors of the form $B_{\mathbf{i}} v$, $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}$. By equation (8), we have

$$B_{\mathbf{i}} v = F_{\mathbf{i}} v + \sum_{\mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{I}_{<|\mathbf{i}|}} c_{\mathbf{i}', \mathbf{i}} F_{\mathbf{i}'} v$$

for some $c_{\mathbf{i}', \mathbf{i}} \in \mathbb{K}$. This implies that $F_{\mathbf{i}} v \in \mathbf{U}^v v$. Since $\{F_{\mathbf{i}} v \mid \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}\}$ spans $\mathbf{U} v$, the assertion follows. \square

Lemma 6.2.2. *Let $\lambda \in X$. Then, as a \mathbf{U}^v -module, we have*

$$M(\lambda) \simeq \mathbf{U}^v / \sum_{h \in Y^v} \mathbf{U}^v (K_h - q^{(h, \lambda)}).$$

Proof. By Lemma 6.2.1, we have $M(\lambda) = \mathbf{U}^v v_\lambda$. Hence, there exists a surjective \mathbf{U}^v -module homomorphism $f : \mathbf{U}^v \rightarrow M(\lambda)$ such that $f(1) = v_\lambda$. It is clear that $\sum_{h \in Y^v} \mathbf{U}^v (K_h - q^{(h, \lambda)}) \subset \text{Ker } f$. Let us prove the opposite direction. Let $x \in \text{Ker } f$. We can write $x = \sum_{(\mathbf{i}, h) \in \mathcal{I} \times Y^v} c_{\mathbf{i}, h} B_{\mathbf{i}} K_h$. Then, we have

$$(9) \quad 0 = x v_\lambda = \sum_{(\mathbf{i}, h)} c_{\mathbf{i}, h} q^{(h, \lambda)} B_{\mathbf{i}} v_\lambda.$$

On the other hand, by equation (8), we have

$$B_{\mathbf{i}} v_\lambda = F_{\mathbf{i}} v_\lambda + \sum_{\mathbf{i}' \in \mathcal{I}_{<|\mathbf{i}|}} c_{\mathbf{i}', \mathbf{i}} F_{\mathbf{i}'} v_\lambda$$

for some $c_{\mathbf{i}', \mathbf{i}} \in \mathbb{K}$. Since $\{F_{\mathbf{i}} v_\lambda \mid \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}\}$ forms a basis of $M(\lambda)$, we see that $\{B_{\mathbf{i}} v_\lambda \mid \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}\}$ forms a basis of $M(\lambda)$. This, together with identity (9), implies that

$$\sum_{h \in Y^v} c_{\mathbf{i}, h} q^{(h, \lambda)} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Let $\mathbf{U}^{v, 0}$ denote the subalgebra of \mathbf{U}^v generated by K_h , $h \in Y^v$, and, consider the algebra homomorphism $g : \mathbf{U}^{v, 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ which sends K_h to $q^{(h, \lambda)}$. Then, we have $\sum_{h \in Y^v} c_{\mathbf{i}, h} K_h \in \text{Ker } g$. Since the subalgebra of $\mathbf{U}^{v, 0}$ generated by $K_h - q^{(h, \lambda)}$, $h \in Y^v$ is contained in the kernel of g , and the quotient algebra is one-dimensional, we see that the subalgebra coincides with the kernel of g . Therefore, we obtain

$$\sum_h c_{\mathbf{i}, h} K_h \in \sum_{h' \in Y^v} \mathbf{U}^{v, 0} (K_{h'} - q^{(h', \lambda)}) \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}.$$

Since $x = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{I}} B_{\mathbf{i}} (\sum_{h \in Y^v} c_{\mathbf{i}, h} K_h)$, we conclude that

$$x \in \sum_{h \in Y^v} \mathbf{U}^v (K_h - q^{(h, \lambda)}),$$

as desired. Thus, the proof completes. \square

Lemma 6.2.3. *Let $\lambda \in X$. Set $N(\lambda)$ to be the \mathbf{U}^v -submodule of $M(\lambda)$ generated by $b_i^{(h_i, \lambda)+1} v_\lambda$, $i \in I$, where for each $n \geq 0$, we set $b_i^{n+1} := B_i^{n+1}$ if $a_{i, \tau(i)} \neq 2$, and*

$$b_i^{n+1} := \begin{cases} \prod_{l=0}^n (B_i - \text{sgn}(s_i)[|s_i| - n + 2l]_i) & \text{if } n < |s_i|, \\ B_i \prod_{l=1}^{\frac{n-|s_i|}{2}} (B_i^2 - [2l]_i^2) \\ \cdot \prod_{l=n-|s_i|+1}^n (B_i - \text{sgn}(s_i)[|s_i| - n + 2l]_i) & \text{if } n \geq |s_i| \text{ and } \bar{n} = \bar{s}_i, \\ \prod_{l=1}^{\frac{n-|s_i|+1}{2}} (B_i^2 - [2l-1]_i^2) \\ \cdot \prod_{l=n-|s_i|+1}^n (B_i - \text{sgn}(s_i)[|s_i| - n + 2l]_i) & \text{if } n \geq |s_i| \text{ and } \bar{n} \neq \bar{s}_i \end{cases}$$

if $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$. Then, we have $V(\lambda) = M(\lambda)/N(\lambda)$.

Proof. Set $n_i := \langle h_i, \lambda \rangle$. Since

$$V(\lambda) = M(\lambda) / \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{U} F_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda,$$

and $E_i F_j^{n_j+1} v_\lambda = 0$ for all $i, j \in I$, it suffices, by Lemma 6.2.1, to show that $b_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda = F_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda$ for all $i \in I$. Let us first consider the case when $a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2$. Since $B_i = F_i + q_i^{s_i} E_{\tau(i)} K_i^{-1}$ and $E_{\tau(i)} F_i = F_i E_{\tau(i)}$, we have

$$B_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda = F_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda,$$

as desired.

Next, let us consider the case when $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$. From example 4.1.4 and the definitions of \tilde{B}_i and β_i , we see that B_i acts on the $(n_i + 1)$ -dimensional irreducible \mathbf{U}_i -module diagonally with eigenvalues

- $\{\text{sgn}(s_i)[|s_i - n_i| + 2l]_i \mid 0 \leq l \leq n_i\}$ when $n_i < |s_i|$,
- $\{0\} \sqcup \{\pm[2l]_i \mid 1 \leq l \leq \frac{n_i - |s_i|}{2}\} \sqcup \{\text{sgn}(s_i)[|s_i| - n_i + 2l]_i \mid n_i - |s_i| + 1 \leq l \leq n_i\}$ when $n_i \geq |s_i|$ and $\bar{n}_i = \bar{s}_i$,
- $\{\pm[2l - 1]_i \mid 1 \leq l \leq \frac{n_i - |s_i| + 1}{2}\} \sqcup \{\text{sgn}(s_i)[|s_i| - n_i + 2l]_i \mid n_i - |s_i| + 1 \leq l \leq n_i\}$ when $n_i \geq |s_i|$ and $\bar{n}_i \neq \bar{s}_i$.

This implies that

$$(10) \quad b_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda = 0 \quad \text{in } V(\lambda).$$

On the other hand, b_i is of the form

$$b_i^{n_i+1} = B_i^{n_i+1} + \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} c_k B_i^k$$

for some $c_k \in \mathbb{K}$. Then, equation (8) implies that

$$b_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda = F_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda + \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} c'_k F_i^k v_\lambda$$

for some $c'_k \in \mathbb{K}$, and hence, $b_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda = \sum_{k=0}^{n_i} c'_k F_i^k v_\lambda$ in $V(\lambda)$. Since $\{F_i^k v_\lambda \mid 0 \leq k \leq n_i\}$ forms a linearly independent set of $V(\lambda)$, identity (10) implies that $c'_k = 0$ for all k . Therefore, we obtain

$$b_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda = F_i^{n_i+1} v_\lambda,$$

as desired. Thus, the proof completes. \square

Let us recall that we have fixed $\sigma \in X^+$ at the beginning of Subsection 6.1.

Lemma 6.2.4. *Let $\nu \in X^+$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$. Then, we have*

$$\beta_i(b) = 0, \quad \tilde{B}_i b = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in I$$

if and only if $b = b_{\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)}$.

Proof. By Corollary 5.2.2, we see that $\beta_i(b) = 0$ and $\tilde{B}_i b = 0$ if and only if

- $|s_i| \leq \varphi$, $\bar{s}_i = \overline{\varphi_i(b)}$, and $\varepsilon_i(b) = 0$ when $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$,
- $\varphi_i(b) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b) + s_i$ and $\varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b) = 0$ when $a_{i,\tau(i)} \neq 2$.

It is easily verified that $b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}$ satisfies the latter condition. Conversely, if b satisfies the latter condition, we have $\varepsilon_i(b) = 0$ for all $i \in I$. This implies that $b = b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}$. Thus, the proof completes. \square

Now, recall from Proposition 3.2.6 (see also Example 3.2.4) that $V(\lambda)^\sigma$ is a based \mathbf{U}^i -module for all $\lambda \in X^+$.

Proposition 6.2.5. *Let $\nu \in X^+$. Then, there exists a based \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\gamma_\nu : V(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow V(0)^\sigma$ such that $\gamma_\nu(v_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}) = v_0^\sigma$.*

Proof. Recall that $V(0)^\sigma$ is isomorphic to the quotient of \mathbf{U}^i factored by the left \mathbf{U}^i -submodule generated by $B_i, i \in I$ and $K_h - q^{\langle h, \sigma \rangle}, h \in Y^i$. On the other hand, by Lemmas 6.2.2 and 6.2.3, $V(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ is isomorphic to the quotient of \mathbf{U}^i factored by the left \mathbf{U}^i -submodule generated by $b_i^{\langle h_i, \sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu) \rangle + 1}, i \in I$ and $K_h - q^{\langle h, \sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu) \rangle}, h \in Y^i$. Noting that $b_i^{\langle h_i, \sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu) \rangle + 1} \in \mathbf{U}^i B_i$ and $\langle h, \sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu) \rangle = \langle h, \sigma \rangle$ for all $i \in I$ and $h \in Y^i$, we see that there exists a surjective \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\gamma_\nu : V(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \rightarrow V(0)^\sigma$ such that $\gamma_\nu(v_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}) = v_0^\sigma$.

Let us show that γ_ν is a based \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism. Set $K := \text{Ker } \gamma_\nu$. Since φ^* preserves \mathbf{U}^i , the complement $K^\perp \subset V(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ of K is isomorphic to $V(0)^\sigma$. Hence, there exists $v'_0 \in V(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ such that $K^\perp = \mathbb{K}v'_0$. We may assume that $v'_0 \in \mathcal{L}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ and $b'_0 := \text{ev}_\infty(v'_0) \neq 0$. Since $K^\perp \simeq V(0)^\sigma$, we must have

$$\beta_i(v'_0) = 0, \quad \tilde{B}_i v'_0 = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \in I.$$

Since $(\mathcal{L}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)), \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)))$ is an i crystal base, b'_0 is a linear combination of vectors $b \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ such that $\beta_i(b) = 0$ for all $i \in I$ (cf. Definition 4.0.1). Also, by Theorem 5.2.3 and Example 3.3.10 (3), (5), and (6), we see that if $b \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ satisfies $\beta_i(b) = 0$ for all $i \in I$, then we have $\tilde{B}_i b = 0$ for all $i \in I$. Therefore, the element b'_0 is a linear combination of elements $b \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$ with $\beta_i(b) = 0$ and $\tilde{B}_i b = 0$ for all $i \in I$. By Lemma 6.2.4, this implies that

$$b'_0 = b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}.$$

Let $b \in \mathcal{B}(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))$. Then, we have

$$(G^i(b), v'_0) \equiv (b, b'_0) = (b, b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}) = \delta_{b, b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}} \pmod{q^{-1}\mathbb{K}_\infty}.$$

Hence, we see that

$$\gamma_\nu(G^i(b)) = \gamma_\nu\left(\frac{(G^i(b), v'_0)}{(v'_0, v'_0)}v'_0\right) = \frac{(G^i(b), v'_0)}{(v'_0, v'_0)}v_0^\sigma \in (\delta_{b, b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}} + q^{-1}\mathbb{K}_\infty)v_0^\sigma.$$

On the other hand, since $G^i(b) \in V(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu))_{\mathbf{A}} = \dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}}^i v_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}$, we have $\gamma_\nu(G^i(b)) \in \dot{\mathbf{U}}_{\mathbf{A}}^i v_0^\sigma = V(0)_{\mathbf{A}}^\sigma$. Similarly, since $G^i(b)$ is bar-invariant, so is $\gamma_\nu(G^i(b))$. Thus, we obtain

$$\gamma_\nu(G^i(b)) = 0$$

if $b \neq b_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu)}$. This completes the proof. \square

Proposition 6.2.6. *Let $\lambda \in X^+$. Then, there exists a based \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\rho_\lambda : V(\sigma + \lambda) \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma$ such that $\rho_\lambda(G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b))) = G^i(\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma)$ for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.*

Proof. Let $\eta_{\sigma, \lambda} : V(\sigma + \lambda) \rightarrow V(\sigma) \otimes V(\lambda)$ denote the \mathbf{U} -module homomorphism such that $\eta(v_{\sigma+\lambda}) = v_\sigma \otimes v_\lambda$. By [14, Proposition 25.1.2], we have

$$\eta_{\sigma, \lambda}(G(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b))) \in v_\sigma \otimes G(\pi_\lambda(b)) + q^{-1}\mathcal{L}(\sigma) \otimes \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \quad \text{for all } b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda),$$

and

$$(\eta_{\sigma,\lambda}(G(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b))), v_\sigma \otimes G(b')) \in q^{-1}\mathbb{K}_\infty \quad \text{for all } b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty) \setminus \mathcal{B}(\infty; \lambda), b' \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda).$$

Composing γ_0 in Proposition 6.2.5 on the first factor, we obtain a \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism

$$\rho_\lambda := (\gamma_0 \otimes \text{id}) \circ \eta_{\sigma,\lambda} : V(\sigma + \lambda) \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma.$$

Then, we see that $\rho_\lambda(G^i(b))$ is \imath bar-invariant, and belongs to the intersection of the \mathbb{K}_∞ -form and the \mathbf{A} -form. Moreover, for each $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$, we have

$$\text{ev}_\infty(\rho_\lambda(G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b)))) = \pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma.$$

By above, we conclude that

$$\rho_\lambda(G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda}(b))) = G^i(\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma)$$

as desired. Thus, the proof completes. \square

Proposition 6.2.7. *Let $\lambda, \nu \in X^+$. Then, there exists a based \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i : V(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma$ such that*

$$\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i(G^i(\pi_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b)^\sigma)) = G^i(\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma)$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$.

Proof. Consider the linear map $\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i : V(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma$ given by

$$\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i(G^i(\pi_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b)^\sigma)) = G^i(\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma), \quad b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty).$$

In order to prove the assertion, it suffices to show that $\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i$ is a \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism. Note that the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V(\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)) & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu),\lambda}} & V(\sigma + \nu + \tau(\nu)) \otimes V(\lambda) \\ \rho_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)} \downarrow & & \downarrow \gamma_\nu \otimes \text{id} \\ V(\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu))^\sigma & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i} & V(\lambda)^\sigma \end{array}$$

commutes. For each $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ and $x \in \mathbf{U}^i$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i(x \cdot G^i(\pi_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b)^\sigma)) &= \pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i(x \cdot \rho_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b)))) \\ &= (\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i \circ \rho_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)})(x \cdot G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b))) \\ &= ((\gamma_\nu \otimes \text{id}) \circ \eta_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu),\lambda})(x G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b))) \\ &= x((\gamma_\nu \otimes \text{id}) \circ \eta_{\sigma+\nu+\tau(\nu),\lambda})(G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b))) \\ &= x(\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i \circ \rho_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)})(G^i(\pi_{\sigma+\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b))) \\ &= x \cdot G^i(\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma) \\ &= x \cdot \pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i(G^i(\pi_{\lambda+\nu+\tau(\nu)}(b)^\sigma)). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i$ is a \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism. Hence, the proof completes. \square

Now, for each $\zeta \in X^i$, we obtain a projective system $\{V(\lambda)^\sigma\}_{\lambda \in X^+, \bar{\lambda} = \zeta}$ of based \mathbf{U}^i -modules and based homomorphisms $\pi_{\lambda,\nu}^i$.

Theorem 6.2.8. *Let $\zeta \in X^i$. Then, for each $\lambda \in X^+$ such that $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$, there exists a based \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\pi_\lambda^i : \dot{\mathbf{U}}^i \mathbf{1}_\zeta \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma$ such that*

$$\pi_\lambda^i(G_\zeta^n(b)) = G^n(\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma)$$

for all $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. Moreover, $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^i \mathbf{1}_\zeta$ is the projective limit of $\{V(\lambda)^\sigma\}_{\lambda \in X^+, \overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta}$ in the category of based \mathbf{U}^i -modules and based homomorphisms.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in X^+$ be such that $\overline{\sigma + \lambda} = \zeta$. There exists a \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^i \mathbf{1}_\zeta \rightarrow V(\sigma + \lambda)$ which sends $\mathbf{1}_\zeta$ to $v_{\sigma + \lambda}$. Combining ρ_λ , we obtain a \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\pi_\lambda^i : \dot{\mathbf{U}}^i \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma$ which sends $\mathbf{1}_\zeta$ to v_λ^σ . Then, for each $\nu \in X^+$, we have

$$\pi_{\lambda, \nu}^i \circ \pi_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}^i = \pi_\lambda^i.$$

Let us show that π_λ^i is based. Let $b \in \mathcal{B}(\infty)$. By Theorem 3.2.7 there exists $\nu \in X^+$ such that

$$G_\zeta^n(b)v_{\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)} = G^n(\pi_{\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}(b)).$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\lambda^i(G_\zeta^n(b)) &= \pi_{\lambda, \nu}^i \circ \pi_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}^i(G_\zeta^n(b)) \\ &= \pi_{\lambda, \nu}^i \circ \rho_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}(G^n(\pi_{\sigma + \lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}(b))) \\ &= \pi_{\lambda, \nu}^i(G^n(\pi_{\lambda + \nu + \tau(\nu)}(b)^\sigma)) \\ &= G^n(\pi_\lambda(b)^\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

The universality can be proved in a similar way to Theorem 6.1.8. Thus, the proof completes. \square

Remark 6.2.9. The previous theorem partly settles Bao and Wang's conjecture in [2, Remark 6.18]. Actually, when $s_i = 0$ for all $i \in I_\tau$, we can take $\sigma = 0$, and in this case, the previous theorem states that the i canonical bases are stable (or strongly compatible in Bao-Wang's terminology).

The very strict i crystal morphism $\pi_\lambda^i : \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\lambda)^\sigma$ can be thought of as the crystal limit of the based \mathbf{U}^i -module homomorphism $\pi_\lambda^i : \dot{\mathbf{U}}^i \mathbf{1}_\zeta \rightarrow V(\lambda)^\sigma$. Hence, it is reasonable to denote $\bigsqcup_{\zeta \in X^i} \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ by $\dot{\mathcal{B}}^i$, and call it the i crystal basis of $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^i$.

Example 6.2.10. Suppose that our Satake diagram is of diagonal type. As we have seen in Example 6.1.9, the i crystal $\mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ is essentially the same as the $\mathbf{U}_{I'}$ -crystal $\mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$. Therefore, our description $\dot{\mathcal{B}}^i = \bigsqcup_{\zeta \in X^i} \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)$ of the i crystal basis of the modified i quantum group $\dot{\mathbf{U}}^i$ is essentially the same as Kashiwara's description [9, Theorem 3.1.1] $\dot{\mathcal{B}} = \bigsqcup_{\zeta \in X_{I'}} \mathcal{B}(-\infty)_{I'} \otimes \mathcal{T}_\zeta \otimes \mathcal{B}(\infty)_{I'}$ of the crystal basis of the modified quantum group $\dot{\mathbf{U}}_{I'}$.

7. PROOFS

In this section, we give proofs of Propositions 5.1.1 and 5.1.3, and complete our argument.

7.1. Proof of Proposition 5.1.1. Let $b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$, $b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_2$, and $i \in I$. Set $b := b_1 \otimes b_2$, $\beta_i := \beta_i(b_1)$, $\text{wt}^i := \text{wt}^i(b_1)$, $\text{wt}_i^i := \text{wt}_i^i(b_1)$, $\varepsilon_i := \varepsilon_i(b_2)$, $\varphi_i := \varphi_i(b_2)$, $\text{wt} := \text{wt}(b_2)$, $\text{wt}_i := \text{wt}_i(b_2)$.

Lemma 7.1.1. *Suppose that $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$. Then, the following hold:*

(1) *If $B_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}$, then*

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^i(b) - s_i = \max(E_i(b) - 1, B_i(b), F_i(b)) + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}.$$

(2) *If $B_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}$, then*

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^i(b) - s_i = \max(E_i(b) - 1, B_i(b) - 1, F_i(b)) + \text{wt}_i^i - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}.$$

Proof. The assertions follow from definitions and direct calculation. \square

First, we confirm Definition 3.3.2 (2). Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. By the definition of $\tilde{B}_i b$, we see that b' is either $b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$, $b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2$, or $b'_1 \otimes b_2$ for some $b'_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1$ with $(\tilde{B}_i b_1, b'_1) \neq 0$. Each element has weight $\text{wt}^i(b) - \overline{\alpha}_i$. This confirms the axiom.

Below, we confirm the remaining axioms

7.1.1. *When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$.* By the definition of $\beta_i(b)$, we have $\beta_i(b) \notin \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $\beta_i, \varphi_i \notin \mathbb{Z}$. In this case, we have $\beta_i(b) = \beta_i - \text{wt}_i \in \{-\infty_{\text{ev}}, -\infty_{\text{odd}}\}$ and

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 = 0.$$

Hence, Definition 3.3.2 (1) and (5a) are satisfied.

(1) When $\beta_i \leq \varphi_i$ and $\overline{\beta}_i \neq \overline{\varphi}_i$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= \varepsilon_i + 1, \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\text{wt}_i^i = \overline{\beta}_i + s_i$ and $\text{wt}_i = \varphi_i - \varepsilon_i$, we see that

$$\text{wt}_i^i(b) = \overline{\beta}_i + s_i + \text{wt}_i = \overline{s_i - \varepsilon_i + 1} = \overline{\beta_i(b) + s_i}.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (5b).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 = \tilde{B}_i b$. Since $\varphi_i(b'_2) = \varphi_i - 1 \geq \beta_i$ (note that $\beta_i \leq \varphi_i$ and $\overline{\beta}_i \neq \overline{\varphi}_i$ implies $\beta_i < \varphi_i$) and $\overline{\varphi_i(b'_2)} \neq \overline{\varphi}_i \neq \overline{\beta}_i$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= \varepsilon_i(b'_2) = \varepsilon_i + 1 = \beta_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b' &= b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2 = b_1 \otimes b_2 = b. \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3), (4), and (5c).

(2) When $\beta_i > \varphi_i$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= \beta_i - \text{wt}_i, \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{wt}_i^i = \overline{\beta}_i + s_i$, we obtain

$$\text{wt}_i^i(b) = \text{wt}_i^i + \overline{\text{wt}_i} = \overline{\beta_i + s_i + \text{wt}_i} = \overline{\beta_i(b) + s_i}.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (5b).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\widetilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $(\widetilde{B}_i b_1, b'_1) \neq 0$, and $b'_2 = b_2$. Since $\beta_i(b'_1) = \beta_i$, we obtain $\beta_i(b'_1) > \varphi_i$. Hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b') &= \beta_i(b'_1) - \text{wt}_i(b'_2) = \beta_i - \text{wt}_i = \beta_i(b), \\ \widetilde{B}_i b' &= \widetilde{B}_i b'_1 \otimes b'_2 = \widetilde{B}_i b'_1 \otimes b_2, \\ (b, \widetilde{B}_i b') &= (b_1, \widetilde{B}_i b'_1) = (\widetilde{B}_i b_1, b'_1) = (\widetilde{B}_i b, b').\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3) and (5c). Furthermore, if $\widetilde{B}_i b \in \mathcal{B}$, we have $b'_1 = \widetilde{B}_i b_1$, and hence,

$$\widetilde{B}_i b' = \widetilde{B}_i b'_1 \otimes b_2 = b_1 \otimes b_2 = b.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (4).

(3) When $\beta_i \leq \varphi_i$ and $\overline{\beta}_i = \overline{\varphi}_i$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \varepsilon_i, \\ \widetilde{B}_i b &= b_1 \otimes \widetilde{E}_i b_2.\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $\text{wt}_i^t = \overline{\beta_i + s_i}$ and $\text{wt}_i = \varphi_i - \varepsilon_i$, we see that

$$\text{wt}_i^t(b) = \overline{\beta_i + s_i + \text{wt}_i} = \overline{s_i - \varepsilon_i} = \overline{\beta_i(b) + s_i}.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (5b).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\widetilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \widetilde{E}_i b_2 = \widetilde{B}_i b$. Since $\varphi_i(b'_2) = \varphi_i + 1 > \beta_i$ and $\overline{\varphi_i(b'_2)} \neq \overline{\varphi_i} = \overline{\beta_i}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b') &= \varepsilon_i(b'_2) + 1 = \varepsilon_i = \beta_i(b), \\ \widetilde{B}_i b' &= b'_1 \otimes \widetilde{F}_i b'_2 = b_1 \otimes b_2 = b.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3), (4), and (5c).

7.1.2. *When $a_{i, \tau(i)} = 0$.* By the definition of $\beta_i(b)$, we have $\beta_i(b) \notin \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $\varphi_i, \beta_i, \varphi_{\tau(i)} = -\infty$. In this case, we have $\beta_i(b) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} = -\infty$ and

$$\widetilde{B}_i b = b_1 \otimes \widetilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 = 0.$$

Hence, Definition 3.3.2 (1) and (6a) are satisfied.

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b) &= \max(\varphi_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^t - \text{wt}_i, \beta_{\tau(i)} - \text{wt}_i, \varepsilon_i) + (\text{wt}_i^t + \text{wt}_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}) \\ &= \max(\varepsilon_{\tau(i)}, \beta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}) = \beta_i(b).\end{aligned}$$

This confirms 3.3.2 (6b).

(1) When $\varphi_i > \beta_{\tau(i)}, \varphi_{\tau(i)} - \text{wt}_i^t$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ \widetilde{B}_i b &= b_1 \otimes \widetilde{F}_i b_2.\end{aligned}$$

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\widetilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \widetilde{F}_i b_2 = \widetilde{B}_i b$. We compute as

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^t < \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t, \\ \varphi_i(b'_2) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^t(b'_1) &= (\varphi_i - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b'), B_{\tau(i)}(b') \leq E_{\tau(i)}(b')$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varepsilon_i(b'_2) = \varepsilon_i + 1, \\ \beta_i(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^2(b') = (\varepsilon_i + 1) + (\text{wt}_i^2 + \text{wt}_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} - 2) = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' &= b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2 = b_1 \otimes b_2 = b.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3), (4), and (6c).

(2) When $\varphi_i \leq \beta_{\tau(i)} > \varphi_{\tau(i)} - \text{wt}_i^2$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \beta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2.\end{aligned}$$

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 = \tilde{B}_i b$. We compute as

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^2 = \beta_i, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i - 1, \\ \varphi_i(b'_2) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^2(b'_1) &= \varphi_i + (\text{wt}_i^2 - 2) \leq \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^2 - 2 = \beta_i - 2.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b') \leq B_{\tau(i)}(b') > E_{\tau(i)}(b')$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) - \text{wt}_i(b'_2) = (\beta_{\tau(i)} + 1) - \text{wt}_i, \\ \beta_i(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^2(b') = (\beta_{\tau(i)} - \text{wt}_i + 1) + (\text{wt}_i^2 + \text{wt}_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} - 2) = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' &= \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1 \otimes b'_2 = b_1 \otimes b_2 = b.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3), (4), and (6c).

(3) When $\varphi_i, \beta_{\tau(i)} \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} - \text{wt}_i^2$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2.\end{aligned}$$

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 = \tilde{B}_i b$. We compute as

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^2 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \varphi_i(b'_2) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^2(b'_1) &= \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^2 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b') > B_{\tau(i)}(b'), E_{\tau(i)}(b')$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}^2(b'_1) - \text{wt}_i(b'_2) = (\varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1) - \text{wt}_i^2 - \text{wt}_i, \\ \beta_i(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^2(b') = (\varphi_{\tau(i)} - \text{wt}_i^2 - \text{wt}_i + 1) + (\text{wt}_i^2 + \text{wt}_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} - 2) = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' &= b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)}b'_2 = b_1 \otimes b_2 = b.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3), (4), and (6c).

7.1.3. *When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$.* By the definition of $\beta_i(b)$, we have $\beta_i(b) \notin \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $\varphi_i, \beta_i, \varphi_{\tau(i)} = -\infty$. In this case, we have $\beta_i(b) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} = -\infty$, and

$$\tilde{B}_i b = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 = 0.$$

Hence, Definition 3.3.2 (1) and (7a) are satisfied.

(1) When $B_i(b) < F_i(b) = E_i(b) + 1$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= F_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = (\varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b) - s_i &= F_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 \notin \mathcal{B}.\end{aligned}$$

For the second line of the identity above, we used Lemma 7.1.1. This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (4), (7b), and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}F_i(b') &= \varphi_i - 1 < F_i(b), \\ B_i(b') &= B_i(b) < F_i(b), \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 1 = F_i(b),\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b') &= E_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b') = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= (E_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) \neq \beta_i(b').\end{aligned}$$

For the last line of the identity above, we used Lemma 7.1.1. This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d).

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned}F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 \leq \beta_i + 1 < \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 2, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= (\varphi_i - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 = \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i < \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \tilde{E}_i b'_2 &= b_2 \neq 0, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{E}_i b'_2) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) - 1.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2 + b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)} b'_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b + b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)} b'_2),$$

which shows that

$$(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b').$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3).

(2) When $F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) = E_i(b) + 1$ and $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i - 2$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{\tau(i)} &= B_i(b), \\ \beta_i(b) &= B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = (\varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b) - s_i &= B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 \notin \mathcal{B}.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (4), (7b), and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= \varphi_i \leq B_i(b), \\ B_i(b') &= (\beta_i - 2) - (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) + s_i = B_i(b) + 1, \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 3 = B_i(b) + 2, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= E_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= (E_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d).

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) + (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) - s_i + 1 = \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - 1 = \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) - s_i + 1 = \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - 2 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} - 1, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i - 2 = \varphi_{\tau(i)} - 1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b'_1 \otimes b'_2 + b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)} b'_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b + b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)} b_2),$$

which shows that

$$(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b').$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3).

(3) When $E_i(b) < F_i(b) = B_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}$. Since $B_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}$, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, \quad \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i - 1, \quad \beta_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_{\tau(i)} + 2$$

if $\tilde{B}_i b_1 \neq 0$. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b) - s_i &= F_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 + b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \notin \mathcal{B}. \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (4), (7b), and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2$ or $b' = b'' = b''_1 \otimes b''_2 = b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= \varphi_i = B_i(b), \\ B_i(b') &= (\beta_i - 1) - (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) + s_i = B_i(b) + 2, \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 3 \leq B_i(b) + 2, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= B_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b'_1) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= (B_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

Also, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b'') &= \varphi_i - 1 = B_i(b) - 1, \\ B_i(b'') &= B_i(b), \\ E_i(b'') &\leq E_i(b) + 1 \leq B_i(b). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_i(b'') &= B_i(b'') + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2'') = \beta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2'') = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') + \text{wt}_i^s(b'') - s_i &= (B_i(b'') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2'') \neq \beta_i(b''). \end{aligned}$$

Identities (11) and (12) confirm Definition 3.3.2 (7d).

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \beta_i, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= (\beta_{\tau(i)} + 2) + (\text{wt}_i^s - 3) - s_i + 1 = \beta_i - 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - 2 = \beta_i - 2, \\ \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1 &= b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1) &= \beta_{\tau(i)} = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) - 2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1 \otimes b'_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b.$$

The last identity shows that

$$(13) \quad (\tilde{B}_i b, b') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b').$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b'') &\leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1 < \beta_i + 1, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b'') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 = \beta_i, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b'') &= (\varphi_i - 1) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 = \beta_i, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i, \\ \tilde{E}_i b''_2 &= b_2 \neq 0, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{E}_i b''_2) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \beta_i. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b''_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b''_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b.$$

The last identity shows that

$$(14) \quad (\tilde{B}_i b, b'') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'').$$

Identities (13) and (14) confirm Definition 3.3.2 (3).

(4) When $B_i(b) \leq E_i(b) = F_i(b)$ and $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= E_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b) - s_i &= F_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \notin \mathcal{B}.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (4), (7b), and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}F_i(b') &= \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i, \\ B_i(b') &= B_i(b) \leq \varphi_i, \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 1 = \varphi_i + 1,\end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b') &= E_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} - 1 = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= (E_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) \neq \beta_i(b').\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d).

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned}F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 \leq B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 = \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)}b'_2 &= b_2 \neq 0, \\ \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_{\tau(i)}b'_2) &= \varphi_i = \varphi_i(b'_2).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\varphi_i(\tilde{F}_{\tau(i)}b'_2) = \varphi_i(b'_2)$ is equivalent to $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{E}_i b'_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) - 1$ By Lemma 2.2.9, this implies that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2 + b_2),$$

which shows that

$$(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b').$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3).

(5) When $F_i(b) \leq E_i(b) = B_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}$ and $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) < E_i(b)$. Since $B_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}$, we have

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b_1 \in \mathcal{B}_1, \quad \beta_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b_1) = \beta_{\tau(i)} - 1, \quad \beta_i(\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b_1) = \beta_i + 2$$

if $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b_1 \neq 0$. Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_i(b) &= E_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i &= B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \notin \mathcal{B}.\end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (4), (7b), and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) < E_i(b), \\ B_i(b') &= B_i(b) = E_i(b), \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 1, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= E_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} - 1 = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^s(b') - s_i &= (E_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d).

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 < \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ \beta_i(b'_1) &= \beta_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 + b),$$

which shows that

$$(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b').$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3).

(6) When $B_i(b) \leq E_i(b) = F_i(b) > \beta_{\tau(i)}$ and $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) = \varphi_i - 1$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= E_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^s(b) - s_i &= F_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b), \\ \tilde{B}_i b &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 + b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \notin \mathcal{B}. \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (4), (7b), and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have either $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2$ or $b' = b'' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 = b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) = \varphi_i - 1, \\ B_i(b') &= B_i(b) \leq \varphi_i, \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 1 \leq \varphi_i + 1, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= E_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon - 1 = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^s(b') - s_i &= (E_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

Also, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b'') &= \varphi_i - 1, \\ B_i(b'') &= B_i(b) \leq \varphi_i, \\ E_i(b'') &\leq E_i(b) = \varphi_i. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta_i(b'') &= E_i(b'') + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2'') = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b_2'') = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)} - 1 = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'') + \text{wt}_i^s(b'') - s_i &= (E_i(b'') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2'') \neq \beta_i(b''). \end{aligned}$$

Identities (15) and (16) confirm Definition 3.3.2 (7d).

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 < \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)}b'_2 &= b_2 \neq 0, \\ \varphi_i(\tilde{F}_{\tau(i)}b'_2) &= \varphi_i = \varphi_i(b'_2) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)}b'_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b,$$

which shows that

$$(17) \quad (\tilde{B}_i b, b') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b').$$

Also, noting that $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i - 1$ is equivalent to $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b'') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b'') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 < \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b'') &= \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i = \varphi_{\tau(i)}, \\ \tilde{E}_i b''_2 &= b_2 \neq 0, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{E}_i b''_2) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b''_2). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b''_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b''_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b,$$

which shows that

$$(18) \quad (\tilde{B}_i b, b'') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'').$$

Identities (17) and (18) confirm Definition 3.3.2 (3).

(7) When $F_i(b) > B_i(b), E_i(b)$, and $\tilde{B}_i b = b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= F_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varphi_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i &= F_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7b) and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2 = \tilde{B}_i b$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= \varphi_i - 1, \\ B_i(b') &= B_i(b) < \varphi_i, \\ E_i(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i \leq E_i(b) + 1 \leq \varphi_i. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $E_i(b') < \varphi_i$. Otherwise, by the last inequality, we must have $E_i(b) + 1 = F_i(b)$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1$. However, in this case, it holds that $\tilde{B}_i b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$, which contradicts our assumption that $\tilde{B}_i b = b'$. Thus, our claim follows. Then, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= F_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2), \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= F_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d).

Now, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1 < \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 \leq B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1 < \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i + 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b'), B_{\tau(i)}(b') \leq E_{\tau(i)}(b')$. We claim that $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2$. Otherwise, we have either $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2$ or $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2 + b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_{\tau(i)} b'_2)$. In each case, by consideration above, we obtain $\tilde{B}_i (b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i \tilde{E}_i b'_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b'$, which is a contradiction because $b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2 = b$. Thus, it follows that

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = b'_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b'_2 = b.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3) and (4).

- (8) When $F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b)$, $\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2$, and $B_i(b) = \beta_{\tau(i)}$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b) - s_i &= B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7b) and (7c).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $(\tilde{B}_i b_1, b'_1) \neq 0$ and $b'_2 = b_2$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= F_i(b) \leq B_i(b), \\ B_i(b') &= \beta_i(b'_1) - (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) + s_i = \begin{cases} B_i(b) + 1 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) = B_i(b), \\ B_i(b) + 2 & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) \neq B_i(b), \end{cases} \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 3 \leq B_i(b) + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Let us consider the case when $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) = B_i(b')$ and $E_i(b') < B_i(b) + 2$. By Proposition 3.3.12, we have $b'_1 = \tilde{B}_i b'$, $\beta_i(b'_1) = \beta_i - 2$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= B_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= B_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d). Also, We compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \beta_i, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i + 1 = \beta_i(b'_1) + 1 = \beta_i - 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) - s_i + 1 \leq \beta_i - 2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b') \leq B_{\tau(i)}(b') > E_{\tau(i)}(b')$. Now, as in the previous case, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1 \otimes b'_2 = b.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3) and (4).

Next, let us consider the case when $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) = B_i(b')$ and $E_i(b') = B_i(b) + 2$. In this case, we have $b'_1 = \tilde{B}_i b'$, $\beta_i(b'_1) = \beta_i - 2$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= E_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} - 1 = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= (E_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d). We compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \beta_i, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i + 1 = \beta_i(b') + 1 = \beta_i - 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) - s_i + 1 \leq \beta_i - 2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b') \leq B_{\tau(i)}(b') > E_{\tau(i)}(b')$. Hence, we have

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1 \otimes b'_2 = b.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3) and (4).

Finally, let us consider the case when $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) \neq B_i(b')$. By Proposition 3.3.12, we have $\beta_i(b') = \beta_i - 1$, $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b') = \beta_{\tau(i)} + 1$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= B_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} - 1 = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i &= (B_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7d). We compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \beta_i, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^t(b') - s_i + 1 = \beta_i(b') + 1 = \beta_i - 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + (\text{wt}_i^t - 3) - s_i + 1 \leq \beta_i - 2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b') \leq B_{\tau(i)}(b') > E_{\tau(i)}(b')$. Hence, we have

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1 \otimes b'_2,$$

which implies that $\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = b$ if $b' = \tilde{B}_i b$, and that

$$(\tilde{B}_i b, b') = (\tilde{B}_i b_1, b'_1) = (b_1, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b'_1) = (b, \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b').$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3) and (4).

- (9) When $F_i(b) \leq B_i(b) > E_i(b)$, $\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2$, and $B_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b) + \text{wt}_i^t(b) - s_i &= \begin{cases} (B_i(b) - 1) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b) < B_i(b), \\ B_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^t - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} & \text{if } F_i(b) = B_i(b). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7b).

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $(\tilde{B}_i b_1, b'_1) \neq 0$ and $b'_2 = b_2$. Since $B_i(b) \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}$, it follows from Proposition 3.3.12 that $b'_1 = \tilde{B}_i b_1$, $\beta_i(b'_1) \neq B_i(b')$, and $\beta_i(b'_1) = \beta_i - 1$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= F_i(b) \leq B_i(b), \\ B_i(b') &= \beta_i(b'_1) - (\text{wt}_i^s - 3) + s_i = B_i(b) + 2, \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 3 \leq B_i(b) + 2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= B_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^s(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^s(b') - s_i &= (B_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^s(b'_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7c) and (7d) (note that $\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 = b' \in \mathcal{B}$).

We compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} < \beta_i, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)}(b'_1) + \text{wt}_i^s(b'_1) - s_i + 1 = \beta_i(b'_1) = \beta_i - 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i + (\text{wt}_i^s - 3) - s_i + 1 \leq \beta_i - 2. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $F_{\tau(i)}(b') \leq B_{\tau(i)}(b') > E_{\tau(i)}(b')$. Hence, we have

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b' = \tilde{B}_{\tau(i)} b'_1 \otimes b'_2 = b.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3) and (4).

(10) When $F_i(b), B_i(b) \leq E_i(b)$ and $\tilde{B}_i b = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2$. In this case, we have

$$\beta_i(b) = E_i(b) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)} = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}.$$

Let $b' = b'_1 \otimes b'_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ be such that $(\tilde{B}_i b, b') \neq 0$. Then, we have $b' = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 = \tilde{B}_i b$. By our assumption, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b') &= \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) \leq \varphi_i \leq E_i(b), \\ B_i(b') &= B_i(b) \leq E_i(b), \\ E_i(b') &= E_i(b) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b') &= E_i(b') + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) = \beta_i(b) - 1, \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b') + \text{wt}_i^s(b') - s_i &= (E_i(b') - 1) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b'_2) \neq \beta_i(b'). \end{aligned}$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (7c) and (7d).

We compute as

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ B_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \beta_{\tau(i)} + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 \leq \beta_i + 1 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1, \\ E_{\tau(i)}(b') &= \varphi_i(b'_2) + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 \leq \varphi_i + \text{wt}_i^s - s_i + 1 \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $F_{\tau(i)}(b') > B_{\tau(i)}(b'), E_{\tau(i)}(b')$. Assume contrary that $E_{\tau(i)}(b') = F_{\tau(i)}(b')$. In this case, we must have $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) = \varphi_i$ and $F_i(b) = E_i(b)$. This implies that $\tilde{B}_i b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2$, which contradicts our assumption that $\tilde{B}_i b = b'$. Next, assume contrary that $B_{\tau(i)}(b') = F_{\tau(i)}(b')$. In this case, we must have $B_i(b) =$

$\beta_{\tau(i)}$, $B_i(b) = E_i(b)$. If $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) < E_i(b)$, then it follows that $\tilde{B}_i b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2$, which causes a contradiction again. Hence, we obtain $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = E_i(b)$. Since $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) \leq \varphi_i \leq E_i(b)$, we must have $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i$ and $F_i(b) = E_i(b)$. This implies that $\tilde{B}_i b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2$, which is a contradiction. Thus, our claim follows. Consequently, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_{\tau(i)}b' = b'_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b'_2 = b.$$

This confirms Definition 3.3.2 (3) and (4).

Now, we have exhausted all the cases. Hence, the proof completes.

7.2. Proof of Proposition 5.1.3. Let $b_i \in \mathcal{B}_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, and set $b := b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3)$, $b' := (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3$. It suffices to show that $\beta_i(b) = \beta_i(b')$ and $\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'$ for all $i \in I$.

For a later use, we note the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \max(\varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2), \varphi_i(b_2)), \\ \tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \begin{cases} b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2) > \varphi_i(b_2), \\ \tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3 & \text{if } \varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2) \leq \varphi_i(b_2), \end{cases} \\ \varepsilon_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \max(\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2), \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2)) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_3) \\ \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \begin{cases} \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \otimes b_3 & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) > \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2), \\ b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_3 & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) \leq \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

7.2.1. When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 2$. Setting

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= \varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2) + \delta_{\overline{\beta_i(b_1)+1, \varphi_i(b_3)+\text{wt}_i(b_2)}}, \\ A_2 &:= \varphi_i(b_2) + \delta_{\overline{\beta_i(b_1)+1, \varphi_i(b_2)}}, \\ A_3 &:= \beta_i(b_1), \\ A_4 &:= \varphi_i(b_2), \\ A_5 &:= \varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2), \end{aligned}$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b) &= \max(A_1, A_2), \quad B_i(b) = A_3, \quad E_i(b) = \max(A_4, A_5), \\ F_i(b') &= A_1 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \quad B_i(b') = \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \quad E_i(b') = A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ F_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= A_2, \quad B_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = A_3, \quad E_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = A_4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b) &= \max(\max(A_1, A_2), A_3, \max(A_4, A_5)) - \text{wt}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) \\ &= \max(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) - \text{wt}_i(b_3), \\ \beta_i(b') &= \max(A_1 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) - \text{wt}_i(b_2), A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2)) - \text{wt}_i(b_3) \\ &= \max(A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) - \text{wt}_i(b_3). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\beta_i(b) = \beta_i(b')$. Also, we compute as

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b &= \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \max(A_1, A_2) > A_3, \max(A_4, A_5), \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \max(A_1, A_2) \leq A_3 > \max(A_4, A_5), \\ b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \max(A_1, A_2), A_3 \leq \max(A_4, A_5), \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 > A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_1 \leq A_2 > A_3, A_4, A_5, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_1, A_2 \leq A_3 > A_4, A_5, \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_1, A_2, A_3 \leq A_4 > A_5, \\ b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \leq A_5, \end{cases} \\ \tilde{B}_i b' &= \begin{cases} (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3 & \text{if } A_1 > \max(A_2, A_3, A_4), A_5, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_1 \leq \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) > A_5, \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_i b_3 & \text{if } A_1, \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) \leq A_5, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3 & \text{if } A_1 > A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5, \\ (b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_1 \leq A_2 > A_3, A_4, A_5, \\ (\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_1, A_2 \leq A_3 > A_4, A_5, \\ (b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_i b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_1, A_2, A_3 \leq A_4 > A_5, \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_i b_3 & \text{if } A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \leq A_5. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain $\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'$.

7.2.2. *When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = 0$.* Setting

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= \varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ A_2 &:= \varphi_i(b_2), \\ A_3 &:= \beta_i(b_1) - \text{wt}_i^2(b_1), \\ A_4 &:= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_i^2(b_1), \\ A_5 &:= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_i^2(b_1), \end{aligned}$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b) &= \max(A_1, A_2), & B_i(b) &= A_3, & E_i(b) &= \max(A_4, A_5), \\ F_i(b') &= A_1 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), & B_i(b') &= \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) - \text{wt}_i(b_2), & E_i(b') &= A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ F_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= A_2, & B_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= A_3, & E_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= A_4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we can compute as before to obtain $\beta_i(b) = \beta_i(b')$ and $\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'$.

7.2.3. *When $a_{i,\tau(i)} = -1$.* Setting

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &:= \varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ A_2 &:= \varphi_i(b_2), \\ A_3 &:= \beta_i(b_1) - \text{wt}_i^2(b_1) + s_i, \\ A_4 &:= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_i^2(b_1) + s_i, \\ A_5 &:= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2) - \text{wt}_i^2(b_1) + s_i, \end{aligned}$$

we see that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b) &= \max(A_1, A_2), & B_i(b) &= A_3, & E_i(b) &= \max(A_4, A_5), \\ F_i(b') &= A_1 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), & B_i(b') &= \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) - \text{wt}_i(b_2), & E_i(b') &= A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ F_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= A_2, & B_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= A_3, & E_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= A_4. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we can compute as before to obtain $\beta_i(b) = \beta_i(b')$.

Note also that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) + \text{wt}_i^t(b_1) - s_i - \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2), \\ \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) &= \max(A_4 - 1, \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), A_2) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) \\ &= \begin{cases} \max(A_4 - 1, A_3, A_2) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) = A_3, \\ \max(A_4 - 1, A_3 - 1, A_2) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \neq A_3. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(1) When $A_1 > A_2, A_3, A_4, A_5$. In this case, we have

$$\tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) = b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3,$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = \max(A_4, A_5) + 1, \\ & \text{and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) = \max(\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2), \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2))$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) = \max(A_4, A_5)$, we have $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1$ if and only if $A_4 \leq A_5$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + 1$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that $A_1 = A_5 + 1$ implies $A_4 \leq A_1 - 1 = A_5$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3 & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + 1, \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

(2) When $A_1 \leq A_2 > A_3, A_4, A_5$ and $A_4 > A_5$. In this case, we have

$$\tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) = \tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3,$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_4 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2)$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2)$, we have $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1$ if and only if $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) + 1$. Therefore, we

obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_4 + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) + 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, since $A_2 > A_3, A_4$, we have

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = A_2 - \text{wt}_i(b_2) = B_i(b'),$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_2 = A_5 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

However, since $A_2 > A_4 > A_5$, it never happens that $A_2 = A_5 + 1$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b' &= \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_2 = A_4 + 1 \text{ and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) + 1, \\ (b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

(3) When $A_1 \leq A_2 > A_3, A_4, A_5$ and $A_4 \leq A_5$. In this case, we have

$$\tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) = \tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3,$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_5 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2) + 1$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + \text{wt}_{\tau(i)}(b_2)$, we always have $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_5 + 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, since $A_2 > A_3, A_4$, we have

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = A_2 - \text{wt}_i(b_2) = B_i(b'),$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_2 = A_5 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $A_2 > A_3, A_4$, we have $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ if and only if $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2$. In this case, we always have $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2$. Otherwise, we have

either $\tilde{F}_i b_2 = 0$ or $A_2 = A_4 + 1$ and $\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) + 1$. Noting that $A_2 = A_4 + 1$ implies $A_2 = A_5 + 1$, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_2 = A_5 + 1, \\ (b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

(4) When $A_1, A_2 \leq A_3 > A_4, A_5$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) = A_3$. In this case, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_3 = \max(A_4, A_5) + 1, \\ & \text{and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i(b_1) - 2, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, since $A_2 \leq A_3 > A_4$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) = A_3$, we have

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = A_3 - \text{wt}_i(b_2) = B_i(b'),$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_3 = A_5 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

Since $A_2 \leq A_3 > A_4$, we have $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ if and only if $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 \in \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$. In this case, the equality $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2$ is equivalent to that $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i(b_1) - 2$ and $A_3 + 1 \geq A_4 + 3$ since we have

$$(19) \quad \begin{aligned} F_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) &= F_i(b_1 \otimes b_2), \\ B_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) &= B_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) + (\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) - \beta_i(b_1)) + 3, \\ E_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) &= E_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) + 3. \end{aligned}$$

Now, consider the case when $A_4 > A_5$. In this case, it never happens that $A_3 = A_5 + 1$. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b' &= \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_3 = A_4 + 1 \text{ and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i(b_1) - 2, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the case when $A_4 \leq A_5$. Noting that $A_3 = A_4 + 1$ implies $A_3 = A_5 + 1$, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_3 = A_5 + 1 \text{ and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i(b_1) - 2, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2 \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In each case, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

- (5) When $A_1, A_2 \leq A_3 > A_4, A_5$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \neq A_3$. In this case, it never happens that $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i(b_1) - 2$, and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) + b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3)) & \text{if } \max(A_1, A_2) = A_3, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) + b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3)) & \text{if } A_2 < A_1 = A_3, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) + b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3)) & \text{if } A_1 \leq A_2 = A_3, \\ \tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since $A_2 \leq A_3 > A_4$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \neq A_3$, we have

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \max(A_3 - 1, A_2) - \text{wt}_i(b_2) = \begin{cases} B_i(b') & \text{if } A_2 = A_3, \\ B_i(b') - 1 & \text{if } A_2 < A_3, \end{cases}$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_3 = A_5 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_3 > A_2, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \neq A_3$, it never happens that $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i b_1) = \beta_i(b_1) - 2$. Hence, by identities (19), it never happens that $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2$.

Now, consider the case when $A_1 > A_2$. In this case, we have $A_2 < A_3$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b' &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_3, \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_1 < A_3 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_3, \\ (\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_1 < A_3. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the case when $A_1 \leq A_2$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b' &= \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_2) \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_3, \\ (\tilde{B}_i b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_2 < A_3. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

In each case, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

- (6) When $A_1, A_2, A_3 \leq A_4 > A_5$ and $A_1 > A_2$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3, \\ \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \varphi_i(b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2) - 1 = \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) - 1 = A_1 - 1, \\ \tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) = A_4, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) = A_3 = A_4, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3) + b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3)) & \text{if } A_1 = A_4 > \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) = A_3 = A_4, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3) + b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3)) & \text{if } A_1 = A_4 > A_3, \text{ or} \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_4 = A_3 \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = \begin{cases} B_i(b') - 1 & \text{if } A_4 > A_3, A_2, \text{ or} \\ & A_4 \leq A_3 > A_2 \text{ and } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \neq A_3, \\ B_i(b') & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_4 = A_5 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_4 > A_3, \text{ or} \\ & A_1 = A_4 = A_3 \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since $A_2, A_3 \leq A_4$, we have $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \in \mathcal{B}_1 \otimes \mathcal{B}_2$ if and only if $\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) = b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2 \neq 0$. In this case it never happens that $\beta_i(b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2$ since we have.

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) &= \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) \leq A_2, \\ B_i(b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) &= A_3, \\ E_i(b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) &= A_4 + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b' &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_4 > A_3, \text{ or} \\ & A_1 = A_4 = A_3 \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} ((b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_4 > A_3, \text{ or} \\ & A_1 = A_4 = A_3 \neq \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_3 = A_4 = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ (b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

(7) When $A_1, A_2, A_3 \leq A_4 > A_5$ and $A_1 \leq A_2$. In this case, we have

$$\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) = \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \otimes b_3,$$

$$\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \begin{cases} \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i(b_2), \\ \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) - 1 & \text{if } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i(b_2) - 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) = \tilde{F}_ib_2 \otimes b_3,$$

$$\varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_ib_2 \otimes b_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_ib_2) = \begin{cases} \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1 & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_ib_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2) + 1, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_ib_2) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2). \end{cases}$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_ib = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_4 \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i(b_2), \\ & \text{or } A_3 = A_4 = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) < A_4, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_4 > \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ + b_1 \otimes (\tilde{F}_ib_2 \otimes b_3)) & \text{and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i(b_2) - 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\tilde{B}_ib' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_4 = A_5 + 1, \\ & \text{and } \beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_ib_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_4 \text{ and } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \neq B_i(b'), \\ \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As in the previous case, it never happens that $\beta_i(\tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2)) = \beta_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) - 2$. Also, since $A_1 \leq A_2$, the condition that $A_1 = A_4$ implies $A_2 = A_4$, which, in turn, shows that $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = B_i(b')$. Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_ib' &= \tilde{B}_i(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes b_3 \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_2 = A_4 \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i(b_2), \\ & \text{or } A_3 = A_4 = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) < A_4, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{if } A_2 = A_4 > \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ + (b_1 \otimes \tilde{F}_ib_2) \otimes b_3) & \text{and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) = \varphi_i(b_2) - 1, \\ (b_1 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_2) \otimes b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\tilde{B}_ib = \tilde{B}_ib'.$$

(8) When $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \leq A_5$ and $A_1 > A_2$. In this case, we have

$$\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) = b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_3,$$

$$\varphi_i(b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_3) = \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2) = \begin{cases} \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3), \\ \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) - 1 & \text{if } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3) - 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) = b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_ib_3,$$

$$\varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_ib_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_ib_3) = \begin{cases} \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1 & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_ib_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + 1, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) & \text{if } \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_ib_3) = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3), \end{cases}$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3), \\ & \text{or } A_3 = A_5 = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) + \text{wt}_i(b_2) < A_5, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 > \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ + b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3)) & \text{and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3) - 1, \\ b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3), \\ & \text{or } A_5 = \max(A_2, A_3, A_4), \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = B_i(b'), \\ & \text{and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) < A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{if } A_1 = A_5, \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) < A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3) - 1, \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Since we have $A_2 < A_1$, we have $A_5 = \max(A_2, A_3, A_4)$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = B_i(b')$ if and only if $A_3 = A_5$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) = A_3$. Also, we have $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) < A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2)$ if and only if either $A_3 < A_5$, or $A_3 = A_5$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \neq B_i(b')$. This condition is equivalent to that either $A_3 < A_5$, or $A_3 = A_5$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) < A_3$. This is, in turn, equivalent to $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) < A_5$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3), \\ & \text{or } A_3 = A_5 = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) < A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 > \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1), \\ + (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{F}_i b_3) & \text{and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3) - 1, \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

(9) When $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4 \leq A_5$ and $A_1 \leq A_2$. In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3, \\ \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) &= \varphi_i(b_2) = \varphi_i(b_2 \otimes b_3), \\ \tilde{F}_i(b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3, \\ \varphi_{\tau(i)}(\tilde{F}_i b_2 \otimes b_3) &= \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_3) + 1 = \varphi_{\tau(i)}(b_2 \otimes b_3) + 1, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) & \text{if } A_2 = A_5, \text{ or} \\ & A_3 = A_5 = \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) \text{ and } A_2 < A_5, \\ b_1 \otimes (b_2 \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

On the other hand, since $A_1 = A_5$ implies $A_2 = A_5$, and hence, $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = B_i(b')$, we have

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{if } A_1 = A_5 \text{ and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) = \varphi_i(b_3), \text{ or} \\ & A_5 = \max(A_2, A_3, A_4), \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = B_i(b'), \\ & \text{and } \varphi_i(\tilde{E}_i b_3) < A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2), \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now, consider the case when $A_1 = A_5$. In this case, we automatically have $A_2 = A_5$ and $\beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = B_i(b')$. Then, regardless of the value $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3)$, we obtain

$$\tilde{B}_i b' = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 = \tilde{B}_i b.$$

Next, consider the case when $A_1 < A_5$. In this case, we always have $\varphi_i(\tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3) \leq A_1 - \text{wt}_i(b_2) < A_5 - \text{wt}_i(b_2)$. Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{B}_i b' &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{if } A_5 = \max(A_2, A_3, A_4) \text{ and } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1 \otimes b_2) = B_i(b'), \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{if } A_2 = A_5, \text{ or} \\ & A_2 < A_3 = A_5 \text{ and } \beta_{\tau(i)}(b_1) = A_3, \\ (b_1 \otimes b_2) \otimes \tilde{E}_{\tau(i)} b_3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude

$$\tilde{B}_i b = \tilde{B}_i b'.$$

Now, we have exhausted all the cases. Hence, the proof completes.

Declarations. Data sharing not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study. The author has no conflicts of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Bao and W. Wang, A New Approach to Kazhdan-Lusztig Theory of Type B via Quantum Symmetric Pairs, *Astérisque* 2018, no. 402, vii+134 pp.
- [2] H. Bao and W. Wang, Canonical bases arising from quantum symmetric pairs, *Invent. Math.* 213 (2018), no. 3, 1099–1177.
- [3] H. Bao and W. Wang, Canonical bases arising from quantum symmetric pairs of Kac-Moody type, *Compos. Math.* 157 (2021), no. 7, 1507–1537.
- [4] C. Berman and W. Wang, Formulae of ι -divided powers in $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 222 (2018), no. 9, 2667–2702.
- [5] C. Berman and W. Wang, Formulae of ι -divided powers in $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$, II, arXiv:1806.00878.
- [6] D. Bump and A. Schilling, *Crystal Bases, Representations and combinatorics*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2017. xii+279 pp.
- [7] X. Chen, M. Lu, and W. Wang, A Serre presentation for the ι quantum groups, arXiv:1810.12475v4.
- [8] A. M. Gavriliuk and A. U. Klimyk, q -deformed orthogonal and pseudo-orthogonal algebras and their representations, *Lett. Math. Phys.* 21 (1991), no. 3, 215–220.
- [9] M. Kashiwara, Crystal bases of modified quantized enveloping algebra, *Duke Math. J.* 73 (1994), no. 2, 383–413.
- [10] S. Kolb, Quantum symmetric Kac-Moody pairs, *Adv. Math.* 267 (2014), 395–469.
- [11] T. H. Koornwinder, Orthogonal polynomials in connection with quantum groups, *Orthogonal polynomials (Columbus, OH, 1989)*, 257–292, NATO Adv. Sci. Inst. Ser. C Math. Phys. Sci., 294, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1990.
- [12] G. Letzter, Symmetric pairs for quantized enveloping algebras, *J. Algebra* 220 (1999), no. 2, 729–767.

- [13] G. Lusztig, Canonical bases arising from quantized enveloping algebras, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 3 (1990), no. 2, 447–498.
- [14] G. Lusztig, *Introduction to Quantum Groups*, Reprint of the 1994 edition. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2010. xiv+346 pp.
- [15] M. Noumi, Macdonald’s symmetric polynomials as zonal spherical functions on some quantum homogeneous spaces, *Adv. Math.* 123 (1996), no. 1, 16–77.
- [16] H. Watanabe, Crystal basis theory for a quantum symmetric pair $(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{U}^j)$, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2020, no. 22, 8292–8352.
- [17] H. Watanabe, Classical weight modules over q quantum groups, *J. Algebra* 578 (2021), 241–302.
- [18] H. Watanabe, Based modules over the q quantum group of type AI, to appear in *Math. Z.*
- [19] H. Watanabe, A new tableau model for irreducible polynomial representations of the orthogonal group, arXiv:2107.00170.

(H. WATANABE) OSAKA CENTRAL ADVANCED MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, OSAKA METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY, OSAKA, 558-8585, JAPAN

Email address: watanabehideya@gmail.com