

JORDAN-HÖLDER PROPERTY FOR SHIFTED QUANTUM AFFINE ALGEBRAS

DAVID HERNANDEZ AND HUA FENG ZHANG

ABSTRACT. We prove that finite length representations of shifted quantum affine algebras in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} are stable by fusion product. This implies that in the topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh}})$ the Grothendieck group of finite length representations forms a non-topological subring. We also conjecture this subring is isomorphic to the cluster algebra discovered in [13]. In the course of our proofs, we establish that any simple representation in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} descends to a truncation, for certain truncation parameters as conjectured in [15] in terms of Langlands dual q -characters.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Generalities on shifted quantum affine algebras	3
3. Truncated shifted quantum affine algebras	9
4. Truncation series from R-matrices	16
5. Invertibility of dominant coefficients and descent to truncations	19
6. Applications	23
References	26

1. INTRODUCTION

Let \mathfrak{g} be a simple complex finite dimensional Lie algebra, and let $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ be the associated non-twisted quantum affine algebra for q a nonzero complex number which is not a root of unity.

In their study of quantized K -theoretic Coulomb branches of $3d \mathcal{N} = 4$ SUSY quiver gauge theories, Finkelberg and Tsymbaliuk [8] introduced a family of associative algebras $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ that are called *shifted quantum affine algebras*. They depend on a shift parameter μ which is an integral coweight of \mathfrak{g} and also implicitly on the deformation parameter q . When $\mu = 0$, the algebra $\mathcal{U}_0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is a central extension of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ and it has essentially the same representation theory. When $\mu \neq 0$ the representation theory becomes very different. In [15], the first author introduced a category \mathcal{O}_μ containing infinite-dimensional representations, and showed that the topological Grothendieck group of the direct sum \mathcal{O}^{sh} of categories \mathcal{O}_μ for all integral coweights has a natural ring structure coming from an operation on simple representations called fusion product.

In the present paper we establish the following Jordan–Hölder property for shifted quantum affine algebras : all fusion products of simple representations in the category \mathcal{O}^{sh} are of finite length.

Our proof is partly based on the study of remarkable quotients of shifted quantum affine algebras, the truncated shifted quantum affine algebras (or truncations), also introduced in [8] to realize quantized K -theoretical Coulomb branches. It was proved in [15] that each truncation has a finite number of simple representations up to isomorphism in the category \mathcal{O}^{sh} ; this is the Jordan–Hölder property for truncations. One crucial point in our present proof is to establish that any simple representation in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} descends to a truncation. This result, which has some interest on his own, is obtained in this paper by using certain polynomiality results related to the universal R-matrix of the quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ as a quasi-triangular Hopf algebra. In more details, truncations are defined in terms of certain power series with coefficients in shifted quantum affine algebras. We interpret these series as limits of transfer matrices obtained from the universal R-matrix.

Our main results, the Jordan–Hölder property and the truncation property, were established previously [18] in a different context for the so-called shifted Yangians. These algebras arise much earlier from quantized Coulomb branches [2] and parallelly from the study of affine Grassmannians slices [20]. The proof in [18] relied in an important way on an extension of the Drinfeld–Jimbo coproduct of the ordinary Yangian, the shifted coproduct constructed in [7]. Such a shifted coproduct is conjectural for shifted quantum affine algebras beyond type A. For that reason we had to write a different proof. Our new approach has the advantage that the truncation parameters can be computed explicitly.

We also apply our methods to a natural subcategory of \mathcal{O}^{sh} , the category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ of representations of the quantum affine algebra. This is a monoidal category whose monoidal structure is defined by the ordinary Drinfeld–Jimbo coproduct instead of the fusion product. We refine the Jordan–Hölder property for category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$: all tensor products of simple representations in this category has finite length. This result seems to be unknown for Yangians. A key step in its proof is a polynomiality property for the Drinfeld–Jimbo coproduct observed in [21].

We obtain several applications of our result.

First, we show that the topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh}})$ admits an ordinary subring $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh},f})$ formed of isomorphism classes of finite length representations. We think this is an interesting ring that deserves further study.

Secondly, in [13] a completed cluster algebra structure was constructed on a topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}})$ of a certain subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}}$. It is conjectured therein that the cluster variables correspond to simple classes. Using our result, we can partly reformulate this conjecture : we conjecture the cluster algebra of [13] is isomorphic to the subring $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh},f})$ of isomorphism classes of finite length representations.

Eventually, a conjectural classification of simple modules of truncations was formulated in [15] in terms of Langlands dual q -characters (obtained as limits of elements in the deformed \mathcal{W} -algebra). We prove any simple module in \mathcal{O}^{sh} descends actually to a truncation, for certain truncation parameters as predicted by the conjecture.

This paper is organized as follows.

In Section 2, we give reminders on shifted quantum affine algebras and their representations.

In Section 3, we give reminders on truncated shifted quantum affine algebras, in their different versions, the original adjoint truncations of [8] and some slight modifications that we introduce (the simply connected truncations and the intermediate truncations), underlying their different advantages. We also recall from [15] the Jordan–Hölder property for truncations (Theorem 3.12).

In Section 4, we recall a result of [21] on the polynomiality of R -matrices (Theorem 4.2) and then we establish polynomiality of A -operators (Theorem 4.4) which are used to define truncations.

In Section 5, we establish one of our main results: any irreducible module in the category \mathcal{O}_μ factorizes through a quotient $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\widehat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of the shifted quantum affine algebra (Theorem 5.4). A similar statement is established for a tensor product of several irreducible modules in category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$. As an intermediate result, we obtain in Proposition 5.3 a sufficient condition for a module in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} to be of finite length.

In Section 6, we obtain several applications from our main result : the existence of subrings of finite length representations (Corollaries 6.1, 6.2, 6.4), their relation to the cluster algebras of [13] (Conjecture 6.5) and then the proof of the descend to truncation in accordance with [15, Conjecture 12.2](Corollary 6.6).

Acknowledgments: The first author would like to thank C. Geiss and B. Leclerc for useful discussions. The second author acknowledges support from the Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01).

2. GENERALITIES ON SHIFTED QUANTUM AFFINE ALGEBRAS

In this section we review basic properties of quantum affine algebras, their shifted versions and their representation theory. The ground field is \mathbb{C} , and $\mathbb{N} := \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

Fix \mathfrak{g} to be a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra. Let \mathfrak{h} be a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , and $I := \{1, 2, \dots, r\}$ be the set of Dynkin nodes. The dual Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h}^* admits a basis of *simple roots* $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}$ and a non-degenerate invariant symmetric bilinear form $(,) : \mathfrak{h}^* \times \mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ normalized in such a way that the $d_i := \frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{2}$ for $i \in I$ are coprime positive integers in $\{1, 2, 3\}$. We have the Cartan matrix $(c_{ij})_{i, j \in I}$ and the symmetrized Cartan matrix $(b_{ij})_{i, j \in I}$ whose entries are integers defined by

$$c_{ij} := \frac{2(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}, \quad b_{ij} := (\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = d_i c_{ij}.$$

Let $r^\vee := \max_{i \in I}(d_i)$ denote the lacing number, h^\vee the dual Coxeter number, and $i \mapsto \bar{i}$ the involution on I induced by the longest Weyl group element, all with respect to the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Let $(\varpi_i^\vee)_{i \in I}$ be the basis of \mathfrak{h} dual to the basis $(\alpha_i)_{i \in I}$ of \mathfrak{h}^* with respect to the natural pairing $\langle , \rangle : \mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$; the ϖ_i^\vee are called *fundamental coweights*. We shall need the coweight lattice in \mathfrak{h} , the root lattice in \mathfrak{h}^* and its cones

$$\mathbf{P}^\vee := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z} \varpi_i^\vee, \quad \mathbf{Q} := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i, \quad \mathbf{Q}_+ := \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{N} \alpha_i, \quad \mathbf{Q}_- := -\mathbf{Q}_+.$$

By a coweight we mean an element μ of the coweight lattice \mathbf{P}^\vee , namely, a \mathbb{Z} -linear combination $\sum_{i \in I} m_i \varpi_i^\vee$ of the fundamental coweights. Notice that $m_i = \langle \mu, \alpha_i \rangle$. We say that μ is *dominant* if all the m_i are non-negative. We say that μ is *antidominant* if $-\mu$ is dominant.

Fix $q \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ which is not a root of unity. For $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ set

$$[t]_q := \frac{q^t - q^{-t}}{q - q^{-1}}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} t \\ n \end{bmatrix}_q := \prod_{m=1}^n [t - m + 1]_q.$$

Set $q_i := q^{d_i}$ for $i \in I$. Define three $I \times I$ -matrices $B(q), C(q)$ and $D(q)$ by the formulas

$$B_{ij}(q) := [b_{ij}]_q, \quad C_{ij}(q) := [c_{ij}]_{q_i}, \quad D_{ij}(q) := \delta_{ij} [d_i]_q.$$

These are invertible matrices and moreover $B(q) = D(q)C(q)$.

2.1. The quantum affine algebra. Let $\theta = \sum_{i=1}^r a_i \alpha_i \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ be the highest positive root of \mathfrak{g} . We enlarge the Cartan matrix $(c_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq r}$ to an affine-type Cartan matrix $(c_{ij})_{0 \leq i, j \leq r}$ as follows:

$$c_{00} := 2, \quad c_{i0} = -\frac{2(\alpha_i, \theta)}{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}, \quad c_{0i} := -\frac{2(\theta, \alpha_i)}{(\theta, \theta)} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq r.$$

Define $q_0 := q^{d_0}$ where $d_0 := \frac{(\theta, \theta)}{2}$.

The *quantum affine algebra* $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ in the Drinfeld–Jimbo realization ¹ is the associative algebra generated by $e_i, f_i, k_i^{\pm 1}$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$ and with relations for $0 \leq i, j \leq r$:

$$\begin{aligned} k_i k_i^{-1} &= 1 = k_i^{-1} k_i, & k_i k_j &= k_j k_i, & k_0 k_1^{a_1} k_2^{a_2} \cdots k_r^{a_r} &= 1, \\ k_i e_j &= q_i^{c_{ij}} e_j k_i, & k_i f_j &= q_i^{-c_{ij}} f_j k_i, & [e_i, f_j] &= \delta_{ij} \frac{k_i - k_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}}, \\ \sum_{s=0}^{1-c_{ij}} (-1)^s \begin{bmatrix} 1 - c_{ij} \\ s \end{bmatrix}_{q_i} x_i^{1-c_{ij}-s} x_j x_i^s &= 0 & \text{if } i \neq j \text{ and } x \in \{e, f\}. \end{aligned}$$

The algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ has a Hopf algebra structure with coproduct given by:

$$\Delta(e_i) = e_i \otimes 1 + k_i \otimes e_i, \quad \Delta(f_i) = 1 \otimes f_i + f_i \otimes k_i^{-1}, \quad \Delta(k_i) = k_i \otimes k_i.$$

The *Borel subalgebra*, denoted by $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$, is the subalgebra generated by $e_i, k_i^{\pm 1}$ for $0 \leq i \leq r$. It is a Hopf subalgebra of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.

The quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ has a second presentation, called Drinfeld new realization [6, 1, 4, 5]. Its generators are $x_{i,m}^\pm, \phi_{i,m}^\pm$ for $(i, m) \in I \times \mathbb{Z}$. Its defining relations are as follows for $(i, j, m, n) \in I^2 \times \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\varepsilon \in \{+, -\}$:

$$(2.1) \quad \phi_{i,m}^+ = 0 \text{ if } m < 0, \quad \phi_{i,m}^- = 0 \text{ if } m > 0, \quad \phi_{i,0}^+ \phi_{i,0}^- = 1,$$

$$(2.2) \quad [\phi_{i,m}^\pm, \phi_{j,n}^\varepsilon] = 0, \quad [x_{i,m}^+, x_{j,n}^-] = \delta_{ij} \frac{\phi_{i,m+n}^+ - \phi_{i,m+n}^-}{q_i - q_i^{-1}},$$

$$(2.3) \quad \phi_{i,m+1}^\varepsilon x_{j,n}^\pm - q^{\pm b_{ij}} \phi_{i,m}^\varepsilon x_{j,n+1}^\pm = q^{\pm b_{ij}} x_{j,n}^\pm \phi_{i,m+1}^\varepsilon - x_{j,n+1}^\pm \phi_{i,m}^\varepsilon,$$

¹To be precise, it is the Drinfeld–Jimbo quantum group attached to the affine Cartan matrix $(c_{ij})_{0 \leq i, j \leq r}$ of zero central charge and without derivation operator.

$$(2.4) \quad x_{i,m+1}^\pm x_{j,n}^\pm - q^{\pm b_{ij}} x_{i,m}^\pm x_{j,n+1}^\pm = q^{\pm b_{ij}} x_{j,n}^\pm x_{i,m+1}^\pm - x_{j,n+1}^\pm x_{i,m}^\pm,$$

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{s=0}^{1-c_{ij}} (-1)^s \begin{bmatrix} 1-c_{ij} \\ s \end{bmatrix}_{q_i} (x_{i,0}^\pm)^{1-c_{ij}-s} x_{j,0}^\pm (x_{i,0}^\pm)^s = 0 \quad \text{if } i \neq j.$$

Let us define three subalgebras of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by generating subsets. The first $U_q^+(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is generated by all the $x_{i,m}^+$, the second $U_q^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ generated by the $x_{i,m}^-$, and the third $U_q^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by the $\phi_{i,m}^\pm$. The algebra $U_q^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is commonly referred to as Drinfeld–Cartan subalgebra. We have a triangular decomposition, that is a linear isomorphism

$$U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \simeq U_q^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \otimes U_q^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \otimes U_q^+(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}).$$

From Beck’s isomorphism [1], we have for $i \in I$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$k_i = \phi_{i,0}^+ \in U_q^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}), \quad e_i = x_{i,0}^+ \in U_q^+(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}), \quad f_i = x_{i,0}^- \in U_q^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}), \\ k_0^{-1} e_0 \in U_q^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}), \quad x_{i,m}^+, x_{i,m+1}^-, \phi_{i,m}^+ \in U_q(\mathfrak{b}).$$

With respect to the conjugate action of the $k_i = \phi_{i,0}^+$, the Hopf algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is graded by the root lattice \mathbf{Q} : an element $x \in U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is of weight $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}$, and we write $\text{wt}(x) = \beta$, if $k_i x k_i^{-1} = q^{(\alpha_i, \beta)} x$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. In terms of Drinfeld generators, we have

$$\text{wt}(x_{i,m}^\pm) = \pm \alpha_i, \quad \text{wt}(\phi_{i,m}^\pm) = 0.$$

Let $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})_\beta$ denote the subspace of elements in $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of weight β . The weight grading descends to the Borel subalgebra and the above three subalgebras.

2.2. Shifted quantum affine algebras. For $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} m_i \varpi_i^\vee$ a coweight, the *shifted quantum affine algebra* $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is the associative algebra generated by $x_{i,m}^\pm, \phi_{i,m}^\pm$ for $(i, m) \in I \times \mathbb{Z}$ subject to Eqs.(2.2)–(2.5) and the following relations [8]:

$$(2.6) \quad \phi_{i,m}^+ = 0 \text{ if } m < 0, \quad \phi_{i,m}^- = 0 \text{ if } m > m_i, \quad \phi_{i,0}^+ \phi_{i,m_i}^- \text{ is central and invertible.}$$

For $i \in I$ and $y \in \{x^\pm, \phi^\pm\}$ let us define the generating series

$$y_i(z) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} y_{i,m} z^m \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})[[z, z^{-1}]].$$

Then $\phi_i^+(z)$ is a power series in z of leading term $\phi_{i,0}^+$, while $\phi_i^-(z)$ is a Laurent series in z^{-1} of leading term $\phi_{i,m_i}^- z^{m_i}$.

The quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is the quotient of the zero-shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by the ideal generated by the central elements $\phi_{i,0}^+ \phi_{i,0}^- - 1$ for $i \in I$.

The shifted quantum affine algebra is also graded by the root lattice: an element $x \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is of weight $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}$ if and only if $\phi_{i,0}^+ x = q^{(\beta, \alpha_i)} x \phi_{i,0}^+$ for all $i \in I$, if and only if $\phi_{i,m_i}^- x = q^{-(\beta, \alpha_i)} x \phi_{i,m_i}^-$ for all $i \in I$.

Define the three subalgebras $\mathcal{U}_\mu^+(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, $\mathcal{U}_\mu^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ and $\mathcal{U}_\mu^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ as in the case of the quantum affine algebra, which give similarly a triangular decomposition. Then we have canonical identifications of algebras

$$(2.7) \quad U_q^\pm(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \cong \mathcal{U}_\mu^\pm(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}), \quad x_{i,m}^\pm \mapsto x_{i,m}^\pm.$$

Proposition 2.1. [15, Proposition 3.4] *For an antidominant coweight μ , there is a unique injective algebra homomorphism from the Borel subalgebra $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ to the shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, denoted by J_μ , which maps $k_0^{-1}e_0 \in U_q^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ to the corresponding element of $\mathcal{U}_\mu^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ with respect to the identification (2.7) and for $m \in \mathbb{N}$:*

$$J_\mu(x_{i,m}^+) = x_{i,m}^+, \quad J_\mu(\phi_{i,m}^+) = \phi_{i,m}^+, \quad J_\mu(x_{i,m+1}^-) = x_{i,m+1}^-.$$

2.3. Representations of shifted quantum affine algebras. We review results on representation theory of shifted quantum affine algebras from [15].

Following [16, §3.1], let $\mathfrak{t}^* := (\mathbb{C}^\times)^I$ be the set of I -tuples of nonzero complex numbers, with the group structure induced by component-wise multiplication. Let μ be a coweight and M be a module over the shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ and $i \in I$, let $\lambda(i) \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ denote the i th component of λ and set

$$M_\lambda := \{v \in M \mid \phi_{i,0}^+ v = \lambda(i)v \text{ for } i \in I\}.$$

If M_λ is nonzero, then it is called the weight space of weight λ . Call M *weight graded* if M is a direct sum of the weight spaces.

Remark 2.2. Our notion of weight graded modules is weaker than that in [15, Definition 4.8] since we have no restrictions on actions of the $\phi_{i,(\mu, \alpha_i)}^-$; this will also be the case for our Definition 2.4 of representation categories below. Such a difference does not affect the rationality and classification results in Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.6.

The root lattice \mathbf{Q} , as the additive group freely generated by the simple roots α_j for $j \in I$, can be embedded into \mathfrak{t}^* so that $\alpha_j \mapsto \bar{\alpha}_j = (q^{b_{ji}})_{i \in I}$. This is injective as q is not a root of unity. The image is denoted by $\overline{\mathbf{Q}} \subset \mathfrak{t}^*$. This embedding is compatible with the weight grading of representations, in the sense that for M is a module over a shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, then

$$\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})_\beta M_\lambda \subset M_{\lambda \bar{\beta}} \text{ for } \beta \in \mathbf{Q} \text{ and } \lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*.$$

Call M *top graded* if there exists $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ such that M is weight graded by $\lambda \overline{\mathbf{Q}}_-$ and the weight space M_λ is one-dimensional. Clearly, in this case, λ is unique. We refer to λ and M_λ as the top weight and the top weight space. Bottom graded modules are defined in the same way with \mathbf{Q}_- replaced by \mathbf{Q}_+ .

We record the following rationality result from [15, Proposition 4.10].

Proposition 2.3. [15] *Let M be a weight graded $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module whose weight spaces are finite-dimensional. Then for each weight λ of M and for $i \in I$, the image of the generating series $\phi_i^\pm(z)$ in $\text{End}(M_\lambda)((z^{\pm 1}))$ are Laurent expansions, around $z = 0$ and $z = \infty$ respectively, of the same operator-valued rational function of degree $\langle \mu, \alpha_i \rangle$.*

The following definition was made in [15, Definition 4.8], mimicking the classical notion of category \mathcal{O} for Kac-Moody algebras.

Definition 2.4. [15] Let μ be a coweight. Define the category \mathcal{O}_μ to be the full subcategory of the category of $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules M satisfying the following properties:

- (i) the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module M is weight graded;
- (ii) all weight spaces of M are finite-dimensional;

- (iii) there exist $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_s \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ such that the weights of M are contained in the union of cones

$$(\lambda_1 \overline{\mathbf{Q}_-}) \cup (\lambda_2 \overline{\mathbf{Q}_-}) \cup \dots \cup (\lambda_s \overline{\mathbf{Q}_-}).$$

Let \mathcal{O}^{sh} the direct sum of all the categories \mathcal{O}_μ , for $\mu \in \mathbf{P}^\vee$.

Define \mathfrak{t}_μ^* to be the set of I -tuples $(\mathbf{f}_i^\pm(z))_{i \in I}$ where $\mathbf{f}_i^+(z) \in \mathbb{C}[[z]]^\times$ is an invertible power series in z and $\mathbf{f}_i^-(z) \in \mathbb{C}((z^{-1}))$ is a Laurent series in z^{-1} whose leading term is of degree $\langle \mu, \alpha_i \rangle$ for $i \in I$. Such an I -tuple is called an ℓ -weight of coweight μ . We also assign the weight $(\mathbf{f}_i^+(0))_{i \in I}$ to an ℓ -weight, and define in this way a map $\varpi : \mathfrak{t}_\mu^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{t}^*$.

Using the triangular decomposition of shifted quantum affine algebras, for $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{t}_\mu^*$, define the Verma module $M_\mu(\mathbf{f})$ to be the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module generated by ω subject to the following relations

$$\phi_i^\pm(z)\omega = \mathbf{f}_i^\pm(z)\omega, \quad x_i^\pm(z)\omega = 0 \quad \text{for } i \in I.$$

It has a unique irreducible quotient, denoted by $L_\mu(\mathbf{f})$. Its nonzero quotients are called modules of highest ℓ -weight \mathbf{f} . They are all top graded of top weight $\varpi(\mathbf{f})$. Lowest ℓ -weight modules are defined in the same way with $x_i^+(z)$ replaced by $x_i^-(z)$, which are bottom graded modules.

Call an ℓ -weight $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{t}_\mu^*$ *rational* if for $i \in I$: the series $\mathbf{f}_i^+(z)$ and $\mathbf{f}_i^-(z)$ are Laurent expansions of the same rational function, denoted by $\mathbf{f}_i(z)$, around $z = 0$ and $z = \infty$ respectively. By abuse of language we identify \mathbf{f} with the I -tuple $(\mathbf{f}_i(z))_{i \in I}$ of rational functions. Call \mathbf{f} *polynomial* if it is rational and each $\mathbf{f}_i(z)$ is polynomial. Let \mathfrak{r}_μ be the set of rational ℓ -weights of coweight μ . Similarly, let \mathfrak{p}_μ be the set of polynomial ℓ -weights of coweight μ ; it is non empty if and only if the coweight μ is dominant.

Example 2.5. [16, Definition 3.7] For $j \in I$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, the I -tuple $(1 - za\delta_{ij})_{i \in I}$ defines an element of $\mathfrak{p}_{\varpi_j}^\vee$, denoted by $\Psi_{j,a}$ and called a *prefundamental ℓ -weight*.

We are ready to state the classification result from [15, Theorem 4.12].

Theorem 2.6. [15] *Let μ be a coweight.*

- (i) *For $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{t}_\mu^*$, the irreducible module $L_\mu(\mathbf{f})$ is in category \mathcal{O}_μ if and only if \mathbf{f} is rational. It is one-dimensional if and only if \mathbf{f} is polynomial.*
- (ii) *The $L_\mu(\mathbf{f})$ for $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{r}_\mu$ form the set of mutually non-isomorphic irreducible modules in the category \mathcal{O}_μ .*

The disjoint union of the \mathfrak{t}_μ^* over all coweights μ forms a multiplicative group under component-wise multiplication. We have $\mathfrak{t}_\mu^* \mathfrak{t}_\nu^* \subset \mathfrak{t}_{\mu+\nu}^*$. The subset of rational ℓ -weights, namely the disjoint union of the \mathfrak{r}_μ over all coweights μ , forms a subgroup denoted by \mathfrak{r} . The subset of polynomial ℓ -weights forms a submonoid denoted by \mathfrak{p} . The subset \mathfrak{p}_0 of constant ℓ -weights is a subgroup that is identified with the group \mathfrak{t}^* of I -tuples of nonzero complex numbers.

At the level of representations, there is the fusion product construction [15, §5] which is compatible with the above multiplication of rational ℓ -weights. Consider V_1 and V_2 respectively in categories \mathcal{O}_{μ_1} and \mathcal{O}_{μ_2} . Assume that V_1 is of highest ℓ -weight \mathbf{f}_1 and V_2 is of highest ℓ -weight \mathbf{f}_2 . On the underlying vector space $V_1 \otimes V_2$ there is

a $\mathcal{U}_{\mu_1+\mu_2}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module structure, called *fusion product*, denoted by $V_1 \star V_2$, which is in category $\mathcal{O}_{\mu_1+\mu_2}$ and of highest ℓ -weight $\mathbf{f}_1\mathbf{f}_2$. In particular, one realizes $L_{\mu_1+\mu_2}(\mathbf{f}_1\mathbf{f}_2)$ as the unique irreducible quotient of $L_{\mu_1}(\mathbf{f}_1) * L_{\mu_2}(\mathbf{f}_2)$.

In the case of polynomial ℓ -weights, there is a simpler tensor product construction. Let ζ be a dominant coweight and $\mathbf{b} \in \mathfrak{p}_\zeta$ be a polynomial ℓ -weight. In [21, Example 10.2] we defined an algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_{\mu-\zeta}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by ²

$$(2.8) \quad x_i^+(z) \mapsto \mathbf{b}_i(z)x_i^+(z), \quad x_i^-(z) \mapsto x_i^-(z), \quad \phi_i^\pm(z) \mapsto \mathbf{b}_i(z)\phi_i^\pm(z).$$

The pullback of a $\mathcal{U}_{\mu-\zeta}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module V along this morphism can be thought of as a tensor product module $L_\zeta(\mathbf{b}) \otimes V$ in the sense of Drinfeld–Jimbo, as explained in *loc.cit.* If V is of highest ℓ -weight $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{t}_{\mu-\zeta}^*$, then the tensor product $L_\zeta(\mathbf{b}) \otimes V$ is of highest ℓ -weight \mathbf{bf} . The tensor product defines a functor from the category of $\mathcal{U}_{\mu-\zeta}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules to the category of $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules.

We refer to the one-dimensional $\mathcal{U}_0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules $L_0(\lambda)$ for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{p}_0$ as *invertible modules*, in the sense that the tensor product functor $L_0(\lambda) \otimes -$ defines an auto-equivalence of the category of $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules whose inverse is given by $L_0(\lambda^{-1}) \otimes -$.

2.4. Category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ for the quantum affine algebra. Recall in the zero-shifted case the quotient map $\mathcal{U}_0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \longrightarrow U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. Define the category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ to be the full subcategory of \mathcal{O}_0 whose objects are $\mathcal{U}_0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules in category \mathcal{O}_0 that factorize through the quotient. Then the Drinfeld–Jimbo Hopf algebra structure on $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ endows the category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ with a monoidal structure. Its simple objects are parameterized by a subset of \mathfrak{r}_0 consisting of rational ℓ -weights $(\mathbf{f}_i(z))_{i \in I}$ of degree 0 such that $\mathbf{f}_i(0)\mathbf{f}_i(\infty) = 1$ for all $i \in I$. Let $\widehat{\mathfrak{r}}$ denote this subset; it is a subgroup of \mathfrak{r} .

We shall need a distinguished family of finite-dimensional irreducible representations in category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$. For $j \in I$, define $\varpi_j \in \mathfrak{p}_0$ to be the I -tuple of complex numbers $(q_i^{\delta_{ij}})_{i \in I}$. The j th *fundamental representation*, denoted by $W^{(j)}$, is the irreducible $\mathcal{U}_0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module in category \mathcal{O}_0 defined by

$$W^{(j)} := L_0(\varpi_j \Psi_{j,q_j^2}^{-1} \Psi_{j,1}).$$

It is a fundamental representation in the sense of Chari–Pressley [3].

Recall the lacing number r^\vee , the dual Coxeter number h^\vee and the involution $i \mapsto \bar{i}$ on I . It is well-known that $W^{(j)}$ is in category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$. It is finite-dimensional of lowest ℓ -weight [11, Lemma 6.8]

$$\varpi_{\bar{j}}^{-1} \Psi_{\bar{j}, q^{r^\vee h^\vee}}^{-1} \Psi_{\bar{j}, q^{r^\vee h^\vee} q_j^2}.$$

In particular, ϖ_j is the top weight of $W^{(j)}$ and $\varpi_{\bar{j}}^{-1}$ is the bottom weight. Let ω_+ and ω_- be spanning vectors of the top weight space and the bottom weight space respectively. Then for $i \in I$ and $s \neq 0$ we have

$$(2.9) \quad h_{i,s}\omega_+ = \delta_{ij} \frac{q_i^{2s} - 1}{s(q - q^{-1})} \omega_+, \quad h_{i,s}\omega_- = \delta_{i\bar{j}} \frac{q^{r^\vee h^\vee s} (1 - q_i^{2s})}{s(q - q^{-1})} \omega_-.$$

²This is slightly more general than the shift homomorphisms from [8, Section 10.(vii)]. It comes from the Drinfeld formal coproduct.

2.5. Category \mathcal{O} for the Borel subalgebra. Weight graded modules over the Borel subalgebra $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ are defined in the usual way based on the joint action of the Cartan generators $k_i = \phi_{i,0}^+$ for $i \in I$. As in Definition 2.4 we have the category \mathcal{O} of $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -modules; see [16, Definition 3.8]. The Hopf algebra structure on $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ makes \mathcal{O} a monoidal category.

The Borel subalgebra admits a triangular decomposition, and given a rational ℓ -weight $\mathbf{f} = (\mathbf{f}_i(z))_{i \in I} \in \mathfrak{r}$, let $L(\mathbf{f})$ denote the unique irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module which contains a nonzero vector ω such that

$$\phi_i^+(z)\omega = \mathbf{f}_i(z)\omega, \quad e_i\omega = 0 \quad \text{for } i \in I.$$

It is top graded as in the shifted case. Recall from Proposition 2.1 the embedding of the Borel subalgebra into an anti-dominantly shifted quantum affine algebra. The following result combines [16, Theorem 3.11] with [15, Corollary 4.11].

Theorem 2.7. [16, 15]

- (i) *The $L(\mathbf{f})$ for $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{r}$ form the set of mutually non-isomorphic irreducible modules in the category \mathcal{O} .*
- (ii) *Let μ be an antidominant coweight. If $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{r}_\mu$, then the pullback of the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module $L_\mu(\mathbf{f})$ along J_μ is irreducible and isomorphic to the $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module $L(\mathbf{f})$.*

The $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module $L(\mathbf{f})$ is one-dimensional if and only if the ℓ -weight \mathbf{f} is *constant*, namely, each rational function $\mathbf{f}_i(z)$ is a nonzero complex number, equivalently, $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{p}_0$. For $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{r}$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{p}_0$, we have canonical $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module isomorphisms

$$L(\mathbf{f}) \otimes L(\lambda) \cong L(\lambda\mathbf{f}) \cong L(\lambda) \otimes L(\mathbf{f}).$$

3. TRUNCATED SHIFTED QUANTUM AFFINE ALGEBRAS

In this section we recall the notion of truncated shifted quantum affine algebras from [8] and their Jordan–Hölder property from [15].

3.1. A-series and T-series. Fix $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} m_i \varpi^\vee$ to be a coweight. Recall the generating series $\phi_i^\pm(z)$ with coefficients in the commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of the shifted quantum affine algebra: $\phi_i^+(z)$ is a power series in z of leading term $\phi_{i,0}^+$, while $\phi_i^-(z)$ is a Laurent series in z^{-1} of leading term $\phi_{i,m_i}^- z^{m_i}$. We normalize them to obtain invertible power series in $z^{\pm 1}$ of constant term 1:

$$\bar{\phi}_i^+(z) := (\phi_{i,0}^+)^{-1} \phi_i^+(z), \quad \bar{\phi}_i^-(z) := (\phi_{i,m_i}^-)^{-1} z^{-m_i} \phi_i^-(z).$$

Define the Drinfeld–Cartan elements $h_{i,s}$, for $i \in I$ and $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$, by³

$$(3.10) \quad \bar{\phi}_i^\pm(z) = \exp(\pm(q - q^{-1}) \sum_{\pm s > 0} h_{i,s} z^s).$$

The $h_{i,s}$ mutually commute and we have for $(i, j, s, m) \in I^2 \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}$:

$$(3.11) \quad [h_{i,s}, x_{j,m}^\pm] = \pm \frac{[b_{ij}s]q}{s} x_{j,m+s}^\pm = \pm \frac{[s]q}{s} B_{ij}(q^s) x_{j,m+s}^\pm.$$

³We follow the convention of [12, (2.2)] so that our $h_{i,s}$ corresponds to $[d_i]h_{i,s}$ in [1]. This makes our formulas in (3.12)–(3.13) and notably (4.32) much simpler.

Recall that the quantum Cartan matrix $B(q)$ is invertible. Let $\tilde{B}(q^s)$, for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$, denote the inverse of $B(q^s)$. Define the A-series $\mathbf{A}_i^\pm(z)$ and the T-series $\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)$, for $i \in I$, to be the following invertible power series in $z^{\pm 1}$ with coefficients in the commutative subalgebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ of constant term 1:

$$(3.12) \quad \mathbf{A}_i^\pm(z) := \exp \left(\pm(q^{-1} - q) \sum_{\pm s > 0} \sum_{j \in I} \tilde{B}_{ji}(q^s) \frac{1 - q_i^{-2s}}{q^s - q^{-s}} h_{j,s} z^s \right),$$

$$(3.13) \quad \mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z) := \exp \left(\pm(q - q^{-1}) \sum_{\pm s > 0} \sum_{j \in I} \tilde{B}_{ji}(q^s) \frac{1}{q^s - q^{-s}} h_{j,s} z^s \right).$$

Remark 3.1. The A-series $\mathbf{A}_i^-(z)$ appeared first as $Y_{i,q_i^{-1}}^{-1} q^{2(\rho, \omega_i)} \tilde{k}_i^{-1}$ in [12, (3.11)], and the T-series $\mathbf{T}_i^-(z)$ appeared first as $T_i(z^{-1})$ in [9, Proposition 5.5] as a limit of a transfer-matrix. The other halves of these series were introduced in [15, §9.2]: our series $\mathbf{A}_i^\pm(z)$, $\mathbf{T}_i^+(z)$ and $\mathbf{T}_i^-(z)$ correspond to the series $Y_i^\pm(z)^{-1} \phi_i^\pm$, $T_i^+(z^{-1})^{-1}$ and $T_i^-(z^{-1})$ in *loc.cit.*. We modify slightly the definition of [15] in order to make the relations (3.14)–(3.16) below more uniform.

We collect the main properties of A-series and T-series.

Proposition 3.2. [12, 15, 21] *In the shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, the following relations hold for $i, j \in I$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$:*

$$(3.14) \quad \mathbf{A}_i^\pm(z) = \frac{\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(zq_i^{-2})}{\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)},$$

$$(3.15) \quad \bar{\phi}_i^\pm(z) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{A}_i^\pm(z)\mathbf{A}_i^\pm(zq_i^2)} \prod_{j \in I: c_{ji} < 0} \prod_{t=1}^{-c_{ji}} \mathbf{A}_j^\pm(zq_j^{c_{ji}+2t}),$$

$$(3.16) \quad \mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)x_{j,m}^- \mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)^{-1} = x_{j,m}^- - \delta_{ij} x_{i,m\pm 1}^- z^{\pm 1}.$$

Proof. The first relation is [15, (9.19)]. The second relation is [15, (9.18)], whose negative part appeared first as [12, (4.9)]. The negative part of the third relation follows from [21, Lemma 9.1], whose proof works directly for the positive part. \square

Eq.(3.15) coincides with [8, (6.23)] after a change of variable $z \mapsto z^{-1}$.

In the case of the zero-shift $\mu = 0$, Eqs.(3.12)–(3.13) make sense in the quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, which is in addition a Hopf algebra. Following [21, Definition 9.2], we define power series $\Theta_i^\pm(z) \in U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})^{\otimes 2}[[z^{\pm 1}]]$ by factorizing the coproduct of the invertible power series $\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)$:

$$(3.17) \quad \Delta(\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)) = (1 \otimes \mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)) \times \Theta_i^\pm(z) \times (\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z) \otimes 1).$$

We record a polynomiality property for the coproduct of the T-series. For $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}$, the evaluation $\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle$ is the coefficient of α_i in β .

Theorem 3.3. [21] *For $i \in I$, the power series $\Theta_i^\pm(z)$ is a sum, over $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, of polynomials in $z^{\pm 1}$ with coefficients in $U_q^-(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})_{-\beta} \otimes U_q^+(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})_\beta$ whose degrees are bounded by $\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle$.*

Proof. The negative part follows from [21, Theorem 9.5] since our $\mathbf{T}_i^-(z)$ corresponds to $T_i(z^{-1})$ in *loc.cit.* For the positive part, let $U_{q^{-1}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ be the quantum affine algebra with deformation parameter q^{-1} . We keep the same notations for generators and generating series of this new quantum group. Then the assignments, for $0 \leq j \leq r$,

$$e_j \mapsto f_j, \quad f_j \mapsto e_j, \quad k_j \mapsto k_j^{-1}$$

extend uniquely to an algebra anti-isomorphism and co-algebra anti-isomorphism $\Omega : U_{q^{-1}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \rightarrow U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. By [1, §4.1] we know that $\Omega(h_{j,s}) = h_{j,-s}$. This together with Eq.(3.13) implies that $\Omega(\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)) = \mathbf{T}_i^\mp(z^{-1})$. The positive part of the theorem follows from the negative part by applying Ω to the factorization (3.17). \square

Example 3.4. In [21, Example 9.6] it is shown for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$ that

$$\Theta_1^-(z) = \exp_q \left((q - q^{-1})x_{1,0}^- \otimes x_{1,-1}^+ z^{-1} \right),$$

where the q -exponential \exp_q is defined by

$$\exp_q(x) := \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{(1)_q(2)_q \cdots (k)_q} x^k \quad \text{with } (k)_q := \frac{q^{2k} - 1}{q^2 - 1}.$$

Following the proof of Theorem 3.3, we replace (q, z^{-1}) in $\Theta_1^-(z)$ by (q^{-1}, z) , apply $\Omega \otimes \Omega$ to the tensor product and then exchange the two tensor factors to get $\Theta_1^+(z)$:

$$\Theta_1^+(z) = \exp_{q^{-1}} \left((q^{-1} - q)x_{1,1}^- \otimes x_{1,0}^+ z \right).$$

3.2. Simply-connected truncations and intermediate truncations. These are quotients of shifted quantum affine algebras whose definitions are variations of the original definition of truncated shifted quantum affines made in in [8, Definition 8.12] which we recall in the next subsection. They will play a central role in the proof of the main result.

Fix a dominant coweight $\nu = \sum_{i \in I} n_i \varpi_i^\vee$ and a polynomial ℓ -weight $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{p}_\nu$. Each component $\mathbf{a}_i(z)$ is a complex polynomial of degree n_i and has a nonzero constant term. Let \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} and $\mathbf{a}_{i,0}$ denote its dominant coefficient and constant term respectively.

Remark 3.5. These polynomials $\mathbf{a}_i(z)$ are sometimes called truncation parameters or flavour parameters [2].

We attach two new I -tuples

$$\mathbf{a}^* = (\mathbf{a}_i^*(z))_{i \in I} \text{ and } \mathbf{a}^\sharp = (\mathbf{a}_i^\sharp(z))_{i \in I}$$

of power series in z and z^{-1} respectively. First define $\lambda_{i,s} \in \mathbb{C}$, for $i \in I$ and $s \neq 0$, by the following relations in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ and $\mathbb{C}[[z^{-1}]]$ respectively:

$$\mathbf{a}_i(z)\mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1} = \exp \left(\sum_{s>0} \lambda_{i,s} z^s \right), \quad \mathbf{a}_i(z)z^{-n_i}\mathbf{a}_{i,n_i}^{-1} = \exp \left(\sum_{s<0} \lambda_{i,s} z^s \right).$$

Then the power series $\mathbf{a}_i^*(z) \in \mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is given by (compare with Eq.(3.12))

$$(3.18) \quad \mathbf{a}_i^*(z) := \exp \left(\sum_{j \in I} \sum_{s > 0} \tilde{B}_{ji}(q^s) \frac{1 - q_i^{-2s}}{q^s - q^{-s}} \lambda_{j,s} z^s \right).$$

Replacing $s > 0$ with $s < 0$ at the right-hand side of the above equation defines the power series $\mathbf{a}_i^\sharp(z) \in \mathbb{C}[[z^{-1}]]$. Both power series have 1 as the constant term.

Let $\mu = \sum_i m_i \varpi_i^\vee$ be another coweight. In the shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ we define for $i \in I$ the modified A-series as power series in z^\pm with coefficients in $\mathcal{U}_\mu^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$:

$$(3.19) \quad \mathcal{A}_i^+(z) := \mathbf{a}_i^*(z) \mathbf{A}_i^+(z), \quad \mathcal{A}_i^-(z) := \mathbf{a}_i^\sharp(z) \mathbf{A}_i^-(z).$$

It should be noted that both series $\mathcal{A}_i^\pm(z)$ depend implicitly on the polynomial ℓ -weight \mathbf{a} . Sometimes we will write $\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a},\pm}(z)$ to indicate their dependence. We obtain the following relations as a modification of (3.15):

$$(3.20) \quad \phi_i^+(z) = \frac{\phi_{i,0}^+ \mathbf{a}_i(z) \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1}}{\mathcal{A}_i^+(z) \mathcal{A}_i^+(z q_i^2)} \prod_{j \in I: c_{ji} < 0} \prod_{t=1}^{-c_{ji}} \mathcal{A}_j^+(z q_j^{c_{ji}+2t}),$$

$$(3.21) \quad \phi_i^-(z) = \frac{\phi_{i,m_i}^- \mathbf{a}_i(z) \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i}^{-1} z^{m_i - n_i}}{\mathcal{A}_i^-(z) \mathcal{A}_i^-(z q_i^2)} \prod_{j \in I: c_{ji} < 0} \prod_{t=1}^{-c_{ji}} \mathcal{A}_j^-(z q_j^{c_{ji}+2t}).$$

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $\mathcal{A}_{i,k}^\pm$ denote the coefficient of z^k in $\mathcal{A}_i^\pm(z) \in \mathcal{U}_\mu^0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})[[z^\pm]]$.

Definition 3.6. The pair (μ, \mathbf{a}) of coweight and polynomial ℓ -weight is called *truncatable* if the unique solution to the linear system

$$\sum_{j \in I} c_{ji} t_j = n_i - m_i \quad \text{for } i \in I$$

is given by nonnegative integers $t_i \in \mathbb{N}$. In this situation, define the *simply-connected truncated shifted quantum affine algebra* $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, or *simply-connected truncation* for short, to be the quotient algebra of $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by the following relations for $i \in I$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$(3.22) \quad \mathcal{A}_{i,k}^+ = 0 \text{ for } k > t_i, \quad \mathcal{A}_{i,k}^- = \mathcal{A}_{i,-t_i}^- \mathcal{A}_{i,k+t_i}^+ \text{ for } k \in \mathbb{Z},$$

$$(3.23) \quad \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} \phi_{i,0}^+ \prod_{j \in I: c_{ji} < 0} (\mathcal{A}_{j,t_j}^+ q_j^{t_j})^{-c_{ji}} = \mathbf{a}_{i,0} \phi_{i,m_i}^- (\mathcal{A}_{i,t_i}^+ q_i^{t_i})^2.$$

Define the *intermediate truncated shifted quantum affine algebra* $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, or *intermediate truncation* for short, to be the quotient algebra of $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by the following relations:

$$(3.24) \quad \phi_{i,0}^+ \phi_{i,0}^- = \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} \prod_{j \in I} (-q_j)^{-t_j c_{ji}} \text{ for } i \in I.$$

Remark 3.7. By taking $k = 0$ in Eq.(3.22) and noting that $\mathcal{A}_{i,0}^- = 1$, we observe that in the quotient \mathcal{A}_{i,t_i}^+ is invertible with inverse $\mathcal{A}_{i,-t_i}^-$. The defining relations of the simply-connected truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ are designed so that in the quotient: the power series $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)$ becomes a polynomial, denoted by $\mathcal{A}_i(z)$, of degree t_i whose constant

term is 1 and whose dominant coefficient is invertible; the power series $\phi_i^+(z)$ and $\phi_i^-(z)$ are Laurent expansions, around $z = 0$ and $z = \infty$ respectively, of precisely the same vector-valued rational function of degree m_i :

$$\frac{\phi_{i,0}^+ \mathbf{a}_i(z) \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1}}{\mathcal{A}_i(z) \mathcal{A}_i(zq_i^2)} \prod_{j \in I: c_{ji} < 0} \prod_{t=1}^{-c_{ji}} \mathcal{A}_j(zq_j^{c_{ji}+2t}).$$

Notice that $\mathcal{A}_i^\pm(z)$ and $\mathcal{U}_\mu^\mathbf{a}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ only depend on the normalized I -tuple $(\mathbf{a}_i(z) \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1})_{i \in I}$ of polynomials of constant term 1 (also called Drinfeld polynomials).

Combining the above remark with Proposition 2.3, we have the following criterion for a $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module to descend to a simply-connected truncation.

Corollary 3.8. *Let μ be a coweight and \mathbf{a} be a polynomial ℓ -weight. Let M be a weight graded $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module whose weight spaces are finite-dimensional. Suppose that for each $i \in I$, the image of the generating series $\mathcal{A}_i^{\mathbf{a},+}(z)$ in $\text{End}(M[[z]])$ is a polynomial with invertible dominant coefficient. Then:*

- (i) *the pair (μ, \mathbf{a}) is truncatable, and*
- (ii) *the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module M factorizes through the simply-connected truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^\mathbf{a}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.*

Example 3.9. Any one-dimensional module descends to a simply-connected truncation: if ζ is a dominant coweight and \mathbf{a} is a polynomial ℓ -weight of coweight ζ , then the one-dimensional $\mathcal{U}_\zeta(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module $L_\zeta(\mathbf{a})$ factorizes through the quotient $\mathcal{U}_\zeta^\mathbf{a}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. This is not true for intermediate truncations due to the additional condition (3.24).

Simply-connected truncations are compatible with fusion products and tensor products by one-dimensional modules. If V_1 is a highest ℓ -weight $\mathcal{U}_{\mu_1}^{\mathbf{a}_1}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module and V_2 is a highest ℓ -weight $\mathcal{U}_{\mu_2}^{\mathbf{a}_2}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module, both in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} , then their fusion product $V_1 * V_2$ is a $\mathcal{U}_{\mu_1 + \mu_2}^{\mathbf{a}_1 \mathbf{a}_2}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module, as proved in [15, Proposition 12.5]. If V is a $\mathcal{U}_\mu^\mathbf{a}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module and \mathbf{b} is a polynomial ℓ -weight of coweight ζ , then by Eq.(2.8) the tensor product $L_\zeta(\mathbf{b}) \otimes V$ is a $\mathcal{U}_{\mu + \zeta}^{\mathbf{a}\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module. Similarly compatibility holds true for intermediate truncations.

3.3. Adjoint truncations. We recall the original truncated shifted quantum affine algebras defined in [8] and their Jordan–Hölder property.

Fix $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} \varpi_i^\vee$ a coweight. The *adjoint shifted quantum affine algebra* $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\text{ad}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is the associative algebra with generators⁴

$$x_{i,m}^\pm, \quad \phi_{i,m}^\pm, \quad \psi_i^\pm \quad \text{for } (i, m) \in I \times \mathbb{Z}$$

subject to all the defining relations (2.2)–(2.6) of the shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ and the following additional relations:

$$(3.25) \quad \psi_i^+ \psi_i^- \text{ is central and invertible, } \phi_{i,0}^+ = \prod_{j \in I} (\psi_j^+)^{c_{ji}}, \quad \phi_{i,m_i}^- = \prod_{j \in I} (\psi_j^-)^{c_{ji}},$$

$$(3.26) \quad \psi_i^+ \phi_{j,m}^\pm = \phi_{j,m}^\pm \psi_i^+, \quad \psi_i^+ x_{j,m}^\pm = q_i^{\pm \delta_{ij}} x_{j,m}^\pm \psi_i^+.$$

⁴Our ψ_i^\pm correspond to $\bar{\phi}_i^\pm$ in [15]. We change the notations to avoid confusion with the normalized series $\bar{\phi}_i^\pm(z)$ of Subsection 3.1.

By definition we have a natural algebra homomorphism from $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ to $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\text{ad}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. The generating series $\mathbf{T}_i^\pm(z)$ and $\mathbf{A}_i^\pm(z)$ make sense in $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\text{ad}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.

Fix $\nu = \sum_{i \in I} \nu_i \varpi_i^\vee$ a dominant coweight and \mathbf{a} a polynomial ℓ -weight of coweight ν as in the situation of Subsection 3.2. Let us view the series $\mathcal{A}_i^\pm(z)$ of Eq.(3.19) as power series in $z^{\pm 1}$ whose coefficients $\mathcal{A}_{i,k}^\pm$ belong to $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\text{ad}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.

The following definition was made in [8, Definition 8.12]. Recall, for $i \in I$, the dominant coefficient \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} and the constant term $\mathbf{a}_{i,0}$ of the polynomial $\mathbf{a}_i(z)$.

Definition 3.10. [8] Assume the pair (μ, \mathbf{a}) to be truncatable as in Definition 3.6 and let $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathfrak{p}_0$ be an I -tuple of nonzero complex numbers such that

$$(3.27) \quad \prod_{j \in I} \mathbf{z}_j^{c_j i} = \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} \quad \text{for } i \in I.$$

The *adjoint truncated shifted quantum affine algebra* $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ associated to this triple $(\mu, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z})$, or *adjoint truncation* for short, is the quotient algebra of $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\text{ad}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by Eq.(3.22) and the following relations for $i \in I$:

$$(3.28) \quad \psi_i^+ \psi_i^- = (-q_i)^{-t_i} \mathbf{z}_i, \quad \mathcal{A}_{i,t_i}^+ = (-1)^{t_i} (\psi_i^+)^2.$$

Remark 3.11. (i) The A-series in [15, (10.21)] used to define the truncated shifted quantum affine algebra are related to our series as follows:

$$A_i^+(z) := (\psi_i^+)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_i^+(z), \quad A_i^-(z) := \mathbf{z}_i (\psi_i^-)^{-1} \mathcal{A}_i^-(z).$$

Our definition above is a translation of [15, Definition 10.3] in terms of the $\mathcal{A}_i^\pm(z)$.

(ii) Comparing Definitions 3.6 and 3.10 we observe that the natural algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\text{ad}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ descends to an algebra homomorphism $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ from the simply-connected truncation to the adjoint truncation. The latter is not injective as it factorizes further through the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. In summary, we have the following commutative diagram of algebra homomorphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) & \longrightarrow & \overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & \swarrow & \\ \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\text{ad}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) & & \end{array}$$

(iii) Simply-connected truncations are compatible with spectral parameter automorphisms. For $c \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ there exists a unique algebra automorphism τ_c of $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ which maps any generating series $f(z)$ to $f(cz)$. If (μ, \mathbf{a}) is truncatable, then τ_c descends to an algebra isomorphism

$$\tau_c : \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}) \longrightarrow \mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{b}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$$

where $\mathbf{b} \in \mathfrak{p}$ is the I -tuple $(\mathbf{a}_i(cz))_{i \in I}$. Neither the adjoint truncations nor the intermediate truncation have this compatibility.

One main advantage of adjoint truncations over simply connected truncations is the following Jordan–Hölder property.

Theorem 3.12. [15] *Let $(\mu, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z})$ be as in Definition 3.10 and let V be a $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module in category \mathcal{O}_μ . If the module structure can be extended to the adjoint truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, then the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module V is of finite representation length.*

Proof. By [15, Theorem 11.15] simple $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}$ -modules in category \mathcal{O}_μ remain simple as $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules and there are finitely many of them. Apply the standard arguments of category \mathcal{O} as in [19, Chapter 9] to conclude. \square

The simply-connected truncations do not satisfy the Jordan–Hölder property. As a counterexample, the following infinite direct sum of invertible $\mathcal{U}_0(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules

$$L_0(\overline{\alpha_1}^{-1}) \oplus L_0(\overline{\alpha_1}^{-2}) \oplus L_0(\overline{\alpha_1}^{-3}) \oplus \dots$$

is in category \mathcal{O}_0 , factorizes through $\mathcal{U}_0^1(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, but is of infinite representation length. Later we will see that intermediate truncations satisfy the Jordan–Hölder property.

3.4. From intermediate truncations to adjoint truncations. Each module over an adjoint truncation is necessarily a module over an intermediate truncation by restriction. Conversely, we explain in this subsection how to extend a module over an intermediate truncation to an adjoint truncation, under an additional condition.

Definition 3.13. Let (μ, \mathbf{a}) be a truncatable pair as in Definition 3.6. Call a module V over the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ *balanced* if

- (i) it is top graded with top weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$;
- (ii) for $i \in I$, there exists $u_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ such that for $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, the operator \mathcal{A}_{i, t_i}^+ acts on the weight space $V_{\lambda - \beta}$ as the scalar $u_i q_i^{-2\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle}$.

The above balancing condition (ii) can be thought of as a characterization of the weight spaces in terms of the operators \mathcal{A}_{i, t_i}^+ . It can be proved directly for highest ℓ -weight $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules in category \mathcal{O}_μ based on the commutation relations between \mathcal{A}_{i, t_i}^+ and $x_{j, n}^\pm$ in [8, §6]. We will prove a more general statement later.

Proposition 3.14. *Let $(\mu, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z})$ be a triple as in Definition 3.10 and let V be a balanced module over the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. Then, up to a tensor product **by** a sign module, the module structure can be extended to the adjoint truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.*

Proof. Combining Eqs.(3.23) and (3.24) we have

$$(3.29) \quad (\phi_{i, 0}^+)^2 = \prod_{j \in I} ((-1)^{t_i} \mathcal{A}_{i, t_i}^+)^{c_{ji}} \in \overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}).$$

Let $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I}$ be the top weight of V and let $(u_i)_{i \in I}$ be as in Definition 3.13. Choose a square root $\kappa_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ of $(-1)^{t_i} u_i$ for each $i \in I$. The above relation implies

$$(3.30) \quad \lambda_i = \varepsilon_i \prod_{j \in I} \kappa_j^{c_{ji}} \quad \text{with } \varepsilon_i = \pm 1.$$

By Eq.(2.8), tensor product with the one-dimensional sign module $L_0((\varepsilon_i)_{i \in I})$ does not affect the action of the $\mathcal{A}_i^\pm(z)$ and the module remains balanced. Without loss of generality we may assume $\varepsilon_i = 1$ for all $i \in I$.

For $i \in I$, define $\theta_i \in \text{GL}(V)$ by letting its action on each weight space $V_{\lambda\bar{\beta}^{-1}}$ for $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ to be the nonzero scalar $\kappa_i q_i^{-\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle}$. We claim that the following relations hold in the $\mathcal{U}_\mu^\alpha(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module V for $i \in I$:

$$(3.31) \quad \mathcal{A}_{i,t_i}^+ = (-1)^{t_i} \theta_i^2, \quad \phi_{i,0}^+ = \prod_{j \in I} \theta_j^{c_{ji}}.$$

The first relation is a direct consequence of Definition 3.13(ii). For the second relation, by Eq.(3.30) with $\varepsilon_i = 1$ and by definition of weight spaces, both sides act on any weight space as λ_i times integer powers of q . As q is not a root of unity, it suffices to show that their squares coincide, which is exactly Eq.(3.29).

We show that the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module structure on V can be extended to the adjoint truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ by setting

$$\psi_i^+ \mapsto \theta_i, \quad \psi_i^- \mapsto \mathbf{z}_i (-q_i)^{-t_i} \theta_i^{-1}.$$

It suffices to prove the relations (3.25), (3.26) and (3.28). The first half of (3.28) follows from definition, and the second half of (3.28) and the first two relations of (3.25) follow directly from Eq.(3.31). Since the θ_i are defined using the weight grading, they mutually commute and by our choice of κ_i we get Eq.(3.26). The remaining third relation of (3.25) follows from Eqs.(3.24) and (3.27). \square

4. TRUNCATION SERIES FROM R-MATRICES

In this section we reconstruct the A-series $\mathbf{A}_i^+(z)$ of Eq.(3.12) from suitable evaluations of the universal R-matrix of the quantum affine algebra. Then we deduce from a previous work (Theorem 4.2 established in [21]) the polynomiality of A-series acting on a tensor product of several irreducible modules in category \mathcal{O} for the Borel subalgebra (Theorem 4.4).

4.1. The Universal R-matrix. The quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is quasi-triangular as a Hopf algebra. We shall need the reduced part of the universal R-matrix. Recall the inverse $(\tilde{B}_{ij}(q))_{i,j \in I}$ of the symmetric quantum Cartan matrix $([b_{ij}]_q)_{i,j \in I}$ and the Drinfeld–Cartan elements $h_{i,s}$ from Eq.(3.10) viewed in the quantum affine algebra. The *abelian part* of the universal R-matrix is a power series in z with coefficients in $U_q(\mathfrak{b}) \otimes U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ defined by [4]

$$(4.32) \quad \mathcal{R}_0(z) := \exp \left(\sum_{j,k \in I} \sum_{s>0} \frac{s(q^{-1} - q) \tilde{B}_{jk}(q^s)}{[s]_q} h_{j,s} \otimes h_{k,-s} z^s \right).$$

The triangular parts $\mathcal{R}_\pm(z)$ are sums, over the positive root cone \mathbf{Q}_+ , of power series $\mathcal{R}_\pm^\beta(z)$ in the form

$$(4.33) \quad \mathcal{R}_\pm^0(z) = 1 \otimes 1, \quad \mathcal{R}_\pm^\beta(z) \in (U_q(\mathfrak{b})_{\pm\beta} \otimes U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})_{\mp\beta})[[z]].$$

The *reduced part* of the universal R-matrix is given by the factorization [4]:

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}(z) := \mathcal{R}_+(z) \mathcal{R}_0(z) \mathcal{R}_-(z).$$

It is a power series in z with coefficients in a suitable completion of the tensor product algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{b}) \otimes U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. At the level of representations the completion is inessential: given an arbitrary $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module V and a finite-dimensional $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module W , we can evaluate $\overline{\mathcal{R}}(z)$ at $V \otimes W$ to get a linear operator [12]

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{V,W}(z) : V \otimes W \longrightarrow (V \otimes W)[[z]].$$

As a particular example, we take W to be a fundamental representation defined before Eq.(2.9). The following result is proved implicitly in [12, §3.3]. See also [11, Lemma 2.6] for a closer argument. We view the positive series $\mathbf{A}_i^+(z)$ of Eq.(3.12) as a power series in z with coefficients in $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ so that it acts on the $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module V .

Proposition 4.1. *Let $i \in I$ and V be a $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module. In the fundamental module $W^{(i)}$ fix ω to be a nonzero vector of top weight ϖ_i . Then for $v \in V$, we have*

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{V,W^{(i)}}(z)(v \otimes \omega) \equiv \mathbf{A}_i^+(z)v \otimes \omega \text{ mod. } \left(\sum_{\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+ \setminus \{0\}} V \otimes W_{\varpi_i \beta^{-1}}^{(i)} \right) [[z]].$$

Proof. From the weight decomposition of Eq.(4.33) only the term $\beta = 0$ contributes in $\mathcal{R}_-(z)(v \otimes \omega)$. It suffices to prove $\mathcal{R}_0(z)(v \otimes \omega) = \mathbf{A}_i^+(z)v \otimes \omega$. Combining Eq.(2.9) with (4.32) recovers (3.12). \square

4.2. Polynomiality of R-matrices. Recall from Definition 2.5 the prefundamental ℓ -weights $\Psi_{i,a}$ for $i \in I$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Each polynomial ℓ -weight $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{p}$ factorizes uniquely as the product of a constant ℓ -weight and a monomial in the prefundamental ℓ -weights:

$$\mathbf{f} = \lambda \Psi_{i_1, a_1} \Psi_{i_2, a_2} \cdots \Psi_{i_n, a_n} \quad \text{with } \lambda \in \mathfrak{p}_0.$$

We associate to \mathbf{f} its T-series as a generalization of Eq.(3.13):

$$T_{\mathbf{f}}(z) := \mathbf{T}_{i_1}^-(z^{-1}a_1^{-1}) \mathbf{T}_{i_2}^-(z^{-1}a_2^{-1}) \cdots \mathbf{T}_{i_n}^-(z^{-1}a_n^{-1}) \in U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})[[z]].$$

For $i \in I$, let $t_{\mathbf{f},i}^+(z)$ (resp. $t_{\mathbf{f},i}^-(z)$) denote the eigenvalue of $T_{\mathbf{f}}(z)$ acting on the top weight space (resp. the bottom weight space) of the i th fundamental representation $W^{(i)}$ of $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. Both are invertible power series in z of constant term 1. The following result is [21, Theorem 11.4] applied to $W^{(i)}$.

Theorem 4.2. [21] *Let $s \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n}_k \in \mathfrak{p}$ be polynomial ℓ -weights for $1 \leq k \leq s$. Set V to be the tensor product of $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -modules*

$$V := L\left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_1}{\mathbf{n}_1}\right) \otimes L\left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_2}{\mathbf{n}_2}\right) \otimes \cdots \otimes L\left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_s}{\mathbf{n}_s}\right).$$

For $i \in I$ define the power series

$$\alpha_{V,i}(z) := \frac{t_{\mathbf{n}_1,i}^-(zq^{2r^\vee h^\vee})}{t_{\mathbf{m}_1,i}^+(z)} \frac{t_{\mathbf{n}_2,i}^-(zq^{2r^\vee h^\vee})}{t_{\mathbf{m}_2,i}^+(z)} \cdots \frac{t_{\mathbf{n}_s,i}^-(zq^{2r^\vee h^\vee})}{t_{\mathbf{m}_s,i}^+(z)} \in \mathbb{C}[[z]].$$

Then the linear operator $\alpha_{V,i}(z)\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{V,W^{(i)}}(z)$ sends $V \otimes W^{(i)}$ to $V \otimes W^{(i)}[z]$.

Proof. In the case that the \mathbf{m}_k and \mathbf{n}_k are monomials of prefundamental ℓ -weights this is [21, Theorem 11.4]. In general one factorizes $\mathbf{m}_k = \lambda_k \mathbf{m}'_k$ and $\mathbf{n}_k = \mu_k \mathbf{n}'_k$ with $\lambda_k, \mu_k \in \mathfrak{p}_0$ constant and $\mathbf{m}'_k, \mathbf{n}'_k$ monomials of the prefundamental ℓ -weights. Define the tensor product module V' in the similar way using the \mathbf{m}'_k and \mathbf{n}'_k . Then $V \cong D \otimes V'$ as $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -modules where D is one-dimensional of highest ℓ -weight

$$\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \cdots \lambda_s (\mu_1 \mu_2 \cdots \mu_s)^{-1} \in \mathfrak{p}_0.$$

The polynomiality of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{V, W^{(i)}}(z)$ follows from that of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{V', W^{(i)}}(z)$. \square

4.3. Local A-polynomiality. Recall from Eq.(3.18) which assigns to a polynomial ℓ -weight $\mathbf{a} \in \mathfrak{p}$ an I -tuple \mathbf{a}^* of power series in z with constant term 1. Recall also the involution $i \mapsto \bar{i}$ on I .

The following intermediate result allows a computation of eigenvalues of T-series acting on highest ℓ -weight vectors in terms of the above map $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \mathbf{a}^*$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{p}$ be a polynomial ℓ -weight factorized as follows:*

$$\mathbf{f} = \lambda \Psi_{i_1, a_1} \Psi_{i_2, a_2} \cdots \Psi_{i_n, a_n} \quad \text{with } \lambda \in \mathfrak{p}_0.$$

Then as I -tuples of power series in z we have

$$\left(\frac{1}{t_{\mathbf{f}, i}^+(z)} \right)_{i \in I} = \mathbf{f}^*, \quad (t_{\mathbf{f}, i}^-(z))_{i \in I} = (\Psi_{\bar{i}_1, a_1 q^{-r^{\vee} h^{\vee}}} \Psi_{\bar{i}_2, a_2 q^{-r^{\vee} h^{\vee}}} \cdots \Psi_{\bar{i}_n, a_n q^{-r^{\vee} h^{\vee}}})^*.$$

Proof. We prove the second equality as the same idea works for the first. By definition both sides are multiplicative with respect to \mathbf{f} and are independent of the constant term λ . It suffices to consider the case $\mathbf{f} = \Psi_{k, a}$ for $k \in I$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Combining Eq.(3.13) with Eq.(2.9) we get the eigenvalue of $T_{\mathbf{f}}(z) = \mathbf{T}_k^-(z^{-1} a^{-1})$ acting on the bottom weight space of W_i as follows (set $c := q^{r^{\vee} h^{\vee}}$ and notice $B(q) = B(q^{-1})$):

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\mathbf{f}, i}^-(z) &= \exp \left(\sum_{s>0} \sum_{j \in I} \tilde{B}_{jk}(q^s) \frac{q^{-1} - q}{q^{-s} - q^s} \delta_{j\bar{i}} \frac{c^{-s}(1 - q_j^{-2s})}{s(q^{-1} - q)} a^s z^s \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\sum_{s>0} \tilde{B}_{\bar{i}k}(q^s) \frac{c^{-s}(1 - q_i^{-2s})}{s(q^{-s} - q^s)} a^s z^s \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $q_i = q_{\bar{i}}$ and $B_{ij}(q) = B_{\bar{i}\bar{j}}(q) = B_{ji}(q)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\mathbf{f}, i}^-(z) &= \exp \left(\sum_{s>0} \tilde{B}_{\bar{k}i}(q^s) \frac{c^{-s}(1 - q_i^{-2s})}{s(q^{-s} - q^s)} a^s z^s \right) \\ &= \exp \left(\sum_{s>0} \sum_{j \in I} \tilde{B}_{ji}(q^s) \frac{1 - q_i^{-2s}}{q^s - q^{-s}} \delta_{j\bar{k}} \frac{-c^{-s} a^s}{s} z^s \right). \end{aligned}$$

This recovers Eq.(3.18) by taking $\lambda_{j, s} = \delta_{j\bar{k}} \frac{-c^{-s} a^s}{s}$. Since

$$\exp \left(- \sum_{s>0} \frac{c^{-s} a^s}{s} z^s \right) = 1 - c^{-1} a z,$$

we get that $t_{\mathbf{f},i}^-(z)$ is the i th component of $\Psi_{k,c^{-1}a}^*$. \square

Let $\mathbf{n} \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ denote the monoid automorphism of \mathfrak{p} which fixes the constant ℓ -weights and sends $\Psi_{i,a}$ to $\Psi_{\tilde{i},aq^{r^\vee h^\vee}}$ for $i \in I$ and $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. The main result of this section, about a local polynomiality property of A-series, reads

Theorem 4.4. *Let $s \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n}_k \in \mathfrak{p}$ be polynomial ℓ -weights for $1 \leq k \leq s$. Set V to be the tensor product of $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -modules*

$$V := L\left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_1}{\mathbf{n}_1}\right) \otimes L\left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_2}{\mathbf{n}_2}\right) \otimes \cdots \otimes L\left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_s}{\mathbf{n}_s}\right).$$

Define the following polynomial ℓ -weight

$$\mathbf{a} := \mathbf{m}_1 \mathbf{m}_2 \cdots \mathbf{m}_s \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_2 \cdots \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_s.$$

Then for $i \in I$, the image of the generating series $\mathbf{a}_i^*(z) \mathbf{A}_i^+(z)$ in $(\text{End}V)[[z]]$ stabilizes the subspace $V[z]$ of $V[[z]]$.

Proof. By Lemma 4.3 we can identify the power series $\alpha_{V,i}(z)$ of Theorem 4.2 with $\mathbf{a}_i^*(z)$. Then apply the polynomiality of Theorem 4.2 to Proposition 4.1. \square

The above theorem does not imply the *global* polynomiality of $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)$ acting on V : the degrees of $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)$ restricted to weight spaces may not be upper bounded. This is more complicated than the Yangian situation: the corresponding A-series is a Laurent series in z^{-1} with fixed leading term z^{t_i} so that local polynomiality [18, Theorem 8.4] implies already the global polynomiality.

5. INVERTIBILITY OF DOMINANT COEFFICIENTS AND DESCENT TO TRUNCATIONS

In this section we prove one of the main results of this paper : any irreducible module in the category \mathcal{O}_μ factorizes through a truncated shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ for an explicit truncation parameter \mathbf{a} (Theorem 5.4). Similar statement is established for a tensor product of several irreducible modules in category $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$. As an intermediate result, we give in Proposition 5.3 a sufficient condition for a module in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} to descend to a truncation. In our proofs, a key step is the invertibility of the dominant coefficients for certain operator-valued polynomials.

5.1. T-polynomiality.

Definition 5.1. Let μ be a coweight and V be a top graded module over the shifted quantum affine algebra $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ with top weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^*$. For $i \in I$, define $f_i^V(z) \in \mathbb{C}[[z]]$ to be the eigenvalue of $\mathbf{T}_i^+(z) \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})[[z]]$ acting on V_λ and set

$$\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z) := f_i^V(z)^{-1} \mathbf{T}_i^+(z)|_V \in \text{End}V[[z]].$$

We say that V is *T-polynomial* if for all $i \in I$: on each weight space $V_{\lambda\beta^{-1}}$ with $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, the operator $\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z)$ is a polynomial in z of degree $\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle$ whose dominant coefficient is invertible.

In the above definition, we do not require V to be in category \mathcal{O}_μ . Also, the definition makes sense for $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -modules by viewing $\mathbf{T}_i^+(z)$ as a power series with coefficients in $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$. Our main examples of T-polynomial modules are as follows.

Proposition 5.2. (i) *Any highest ℓ -weight module over a shifted quantum affine algebra is T-polynomial.*

(ii) *Any tensor product of T-polynomial $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules is T-polynomial.*

Proof. The idea is the same as that of [21, Proposition 6.2] in the Yangian situation, based on Eqs.(3.16), (3.17) and Theorem 3.3.

(i) Let V be a highest ℓ -weight module over $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ with top weight λ and let ω be a nonzero vector in the top weight space of V . Then the weight space $V_{\lambda\bar{\beta}^{-1}}$ for $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ is spanned by the $x_{i_1, m_1}^- x_{i_2, m_2}^- \cdots x_{i_s, m_s}^- \omega$ such that $\beta = \alpha_{i_1} + \alpha_{i_2} + \cdots + \alpha_{i_s}$. Applying $\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z)$ to such a vector and making use of Eq.(3.16):

$$\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z)x_{j, m}^- = (x_{j, m}^- - z\delta_{ij}x_{j, m+1}^-)\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z)$$

we get that $\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z)$ acting on $V_{\lambda\bar{\beta}^{-1}}$ is a polynomial of degree bounded above by the number of i s in the sequence $i_1 i_2 \cdots i_s$, namely $\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle$. Furthermore, its coefficient of $z^{\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle}$, denoted by $D_{i, \beta}^V \in \text{End}(V_{\lambda\bar{\beta}^{-1}})$, acts as

$$x_{i_1, m_1}^- x_{i_2, m_2}^- \cdots x_{i_s, m_s}^- \omega \mapsto (-1)^{\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle} x_{i_1, m_1 + \delta_{i_1 i}}^- x_{i_2, m_2 + \delta_{i_2 i}}^- \cdots x_{i_s, m_s + \delta_{i_s i}}^- \omega.$$

It suffices to prove the invertibility of $D_{i, \beta}^V$. Let $h_i^V(z) \in \mathbb{C}[[z^{-1}]]$ be the eigenvalue of $\mathbf{T}_i^-(z) \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})[[z^{-1}]]$ acting on the top weight space of V . Then from the negative part of Eq.(3.16) we have a similar polynomiality of $h_i^V(z)^{-1}\mathbf{T}_i^-(z)$ acting on each weight space $V_{\lambda\bar{\beta}^{-1}}$. Its coefficient of $z^{\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle}$ acts as

$$x_{i_1, m_1}^- x_{i_2, m_2}^- \cdots x_{i_s, m_s}^- \omega \mapsto (-1)^{\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle} x_{i_1, m_1 - \delta_{i_1 i}}^- x_{i_2, m_2 - \delta_{i_2 i}}^- \cdots x_{i_s, m_s - \delta_{i_s i}}^- \omega.$$

This is exactly the inverse of $D_{i, \beta}^V$.

(ii) Let V and W be T-polynomial $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules with top weights λ_1 and λ_2 respectively. A careful look at the arguments in the proof of [21, Proposition 6.2(ii)] shows that the dominant coefficient is uni-triangular: if $v \in V_{\lambda_1\bar{\gamma}_1^{-1}}$ and $w \in W_{\lambda_2\bar{\gamma}_2^{-1}}$ with $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, then $D_{i, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2}^{V \otimes W}(v \otimes w)$ is equal to $D_{i, \gamma_1}^V(v) \otimes D_{i, \gamma_2}^W(w)$ plus a finite sum of vectors in $V_{\lambda_1\bar{\gamma}_1^{-1}\bar{\beta}^{-1}} \otimes W_{\lambda_2\bar{\gamma}_2^{-1}\bar{\beta}}$ for $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+ \setminus \{0\}$. Then the invertibility of $D_{i, \gamma_1 + \gamma_2}^{V \otimes W}$ follows from the invertibility of D_{i, γ_1}^V and D_{i, γ_2}^W . \square

The proof of invertibility used the Drinfeld–Cartan generators $h_{j, s}$ for $s < 0$ and does not work for highest ℓ -weight modules of the Borel subalgebra. For example, when $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$, the infinite-dimensional simple $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module $L(1 - z)$ is not T-polynomial because $\mathbf{T}_1^+(z)$ acts identically as 1; see [16, §7.1].

5.2. Global A-polynomiality. In the next proposition 5.3 we give a sufficient condition for a module in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} to descend to a truncation, by passing from local A-polynomiality to global A-polynomiality.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $(\mu, \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z})$ be a triple of coweight, polynomial ℓ -weight and constant ℓ -weight satisfying Eq.(3.27). Let V be a T -polynomial module in category \mathcal{O}_μ . Assume that for each $i \in I$, the image of the generating series $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z) := \mathbf{a}_i^*(z)\mathbf{A}_i^+(z)$ in $(\text{End}V)[[z]]$ stabilizes $V[z]$. Then*

- (i) *The pair (μ, \mathbf{a}) is truncatable in the sense of Definition 3.6 and the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module V factorizes through the simply-connected truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.*
- (ii) *There exists $\lambda' \in \mathfrak{p}_0$ such that the $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module structure on $L_0(\lambda') \otimes V$ can be extended to the adjoint truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.*
- (iii) *The $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module V is of finite representation length.*

Proof. (i) By assumption the eigenvalue of the generating series $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)$ acting on the one-dimensional top weight space V_λ is a polynomial $p_i(z)$ with constant term 1. Its dominant term is of the form $u_i z^{r_i}$ with $u_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and $r_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Combining Eq.(3.14) with Definition 5.1 we have

$$\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z) = p_i(z)\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(zq_i^{-2}) \in (\text{End}V)[[z]].$$

Restrict the above equation to a weight space $V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}}$ with $\beta \in \mathbf{Q}_+$, we get an equality of polynomials with coefficients in the finite-dimensional algebra $\text{End}(V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}})$. Let $z^n E_{i,\beta}^V$ and $z^{\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle} D_{i,\beta}^V$ denote the dominant terms of $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)$ and $\overline{\mathbf{T}}_i^V(z)$ respectively acting on $V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}}$. By comparing the dominant terms at both sides we get

$$E_{i,\beta}^V z^n D_{i,\beta}^V z^{\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle} = u_i z^{r_i} D_{i,\beta}^V (zq_i^{-2})^{\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle} \in \text{End}(V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}})[z].$$

Since $D_{i,\beta}^V$ is invertible, the polynomial $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)|_{V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}}}$ is of degree $n = r_i$ independent of β , and its dominant coefficient $E_{i,\beta}^V$ is the nonzero scalar $u_i q_i^{-2\langle \varpi_i^\vee, \beta \rangle}$.

As a consequence, the generating series $\mathcal{A}_i^+(z)$ acting on V is a polynomial of fixed degree r_i with invertible dominant coefficient. We apply Corollary 3.8 to get (i).

(ii) We use the notations of Definition 3.6 so that $r_i = t_i$ and $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} m_i \varpi_i^\vee$. We show first that for $i \in I$ the central element $\phi_{i,0}^+ \phi_{i,m_i}^-$ acts on V as a scalar. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I}$ be the top weight of V . Let $\beta = \sum_{j \in I} s_j \alpha_j \in \mathbf{Q}_+$ with $s_j \in \mathbb{N}$. By definition of weight, $\phi_{i,0}^+$ acts on the weight space $V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}}$ as the scalar

$$\lambda_i \prod_{j \in I} q^{-s_j b_{ji}} = \lambda_i \prod_{j \in I} q_j^{-s_j c_{ji}} =: \lambda_{i,\beta}.$$

Since V is a module over $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$, from Eq.(3.23) and the above computation of action of the \mathcal{A}_j^+ we see that ϕ_{i,m_i}^- acts on $V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}}$ as the scalar

$$\lambda_{i,\beta} \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1} \prod_{j \in I} (u_j q_j^{-2s_j} q_j^{t_j})^{-c_{ji}} = \lambda_i \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1} \prod_{j \in I} (u_j q_j^{t_j})^{-c_{ji}} \times \prod_{j \in I} q_j^{s_j c_{ji}}.$$

It follows that $\phi_{i,0}^+ \phi_{i,m_i}^-$ acts on the weight space $V_{\lambda\overline{\beta}^{-1}}$ as the following scalar

$$\lambda_i^2 \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1} \prod_{j \in I} (u_j q_j^{t_j})^{-c_{ji}} =: v_i.$$

Clearly v_i is independent of β . So $\phi_{i,0}^+ \phi_{i,m_i}^-$ acts on V as the scalar v_i .

Next, for each $i \in I$ choose a square root λ'_i of

$$v_i^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{i,0}^{-1} \mathbf{a}_{i,n_i} \prod_{j \in I} (-q_j)^{-t_j c_{ji}} = \lambda_i^{-2} \prod_{j \in I} ((-1)^{t_j} u_j)^{c_{ji}}.$$

Take $\lambda' = (\lambda'_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathfrak{t}^*$ and $V' := L_0(\lambda') \otimes V$. One verifies directly that the module V' descends to the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. Since tensor product with an invertible module does not change the action of the series $\mathcal{A}_i^\pm(z)$, the computation of the action of \mathcal{A}_{i,t_i}^+ of (i) still makes sense in V' , which implies that V' is balanced in the sense of Definition 3.13. We apply Proposition 3.14 to get (ii).

(iii) Since $L_0(\lambda') \otimes V$ is a module over an adjoint truncation, by Theorem 3.12 it is of finite length. The same holds true for the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module V as the functor of tensor product by an invertible module is an auto-equivalence of the module category \mathcal{O}_μ . \square

5.3. Main result. Recall the monoid automorphism $\mathbf{a} \mapsto \tilde{\mathbf{a}}$ of \mathfrak{p} defined before Theorem 4.4.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $s \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{m}_k, \mathbf{n}_k \in \mathfrak{p}$ be polynomial ℓ -weights of coweights μ_k and ν_k respectively for $1 \leq k \leq s$. Define the coweight μ and the polynomial ℓ -weight \mathbf{a} by*

$$\mu = \mu_1 + \mu_2 + \cdots + \mu_s - \nu_1 - \nu_2 - \cdots - \nu_s, \quad \mathbf{a} := \mathbf{m}_1 \mathbf{m}_2 \cdots \mathbf{m}_s \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_1 \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_2 \cdots \tilde{\mathbf{n}}_s.$$

Then the pair (μ, \mathbf{a}) is truncatable. Moreover, for any constant ℓ -weight \mathbf{z} satisfying Eq.(3.27), the following statements hold true.

- (i) *The following fusion product module over $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is of finite length in category \mathcal{O}_μ and, up to tensor product by an invertible module, the module structure can be extended to the adjoint truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$:*

$$L_{\mu_1 - \nu_1} \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_1}{\mathbf{n}_1} \right) * L_{\mu_2 - \nu_2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_2}{\mathbf{n}_2} \right) * \cdots * L_{\mu_s - \nu_s} \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_s}{\mathbf{n}_s} \right).$$

- (ii) *Assume that $\frac{\mathbf{m}_k}{\mathbf{n}_k} \in \hat{\mathfrak{t}}$ for $1 \leq k \leq s$. The following tensor product module over $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ is of finite length in category $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and, up to tensor product by an invertible module, the module structure can be extended to $\mathcal{U}_0^{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$:*

$$L_0 \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_1}{\mathbf{n}_1} \right) \otimes L_0 \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_2}{\mathbf{n}_2} \right) \otimes \cdots \otimes L_0 \left(\frac{\mathbf{m}_s}{\mathbf{n}_s} \right).$$

Proof. By Proposition 5.2, both the fusion product and the tensor product are T-polynomial. By Proposition 5.3, it suffices to show that both modules factorize through the simply-connected truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$.

(i) Since fusion product is compatible with truncation, one may assume $s = 1$ consider a single irreducible module $V := L_\mu(\frac{\mathbf{m}_1}{\mathbf{n}_1})$. Notice that V is an irreducible subquotient of the tensor product module $L_{\mu_1}(\mathbf{m}_1) \otimes L_{-\nu_1}(\frac{1}{\mathbf{n}_1})$ defined after Eq.(2.8). Such a tensor product is compatible with truncation. So we may assume further $\mathbf{m}_1 = 1$.

Since the coweight μ is antidominant, we can regard the $\mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module V as a $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module by the algebra homomorphism J_μ of Proposition 2.1. By Theorem 2.7 this gives us $L(\frac{1}{\mathbf{n}_1})$. Apply Theorem 4.4 to this $U_q(\mathfrak{b})$ -module and notice that J_μ preserves

positive A-series, we see that the generating series $\mathbf{a}_i^*(z)\mathbf{A}_i^+(z) \in \mathcal{U}_\mu(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})[[z]]$ maps V to $V[z]$. Proposition 5.3(i) applies.

(ii) For the tensor product modules, one uses directly the Hopf algebra inclusion $U_q(\mathfrak{b}) \subset U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ and applies again Theorem 4.4 and Proposition 5.3(i). \square

It follows from Theorem 5.4 and the proof of Proposition 5.3(i) that in the category \mathcal{O}_μ : each simple module factorizes through a certain simply-connected truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$; up to tensor product with invertible modules all simple $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules factorize through the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$; up to tensor product with sign modules all simple $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules extend to the adjoint truncation $\mathcal{U}_\mu^{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. From Theorem 3.12 and its proof we deduce the Jordan–Hölder property for intermediate truncations.

Corollary 5.5. *Let (μ, \mathbf{a}) be a truncatable pair. Up to isomorphism there are finitely many simple $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules in category \mathcal{O}_μ . Each $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module in category \mathcal{O}_μ is of finite length.*

Example 5.6. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$. Fix $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ and consider the simple $\mathcal{U}_{-1}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -module $L_{-\varpi_1^\vee}(\frac{b}{1-za})$. It is isomorphic to the tensor product $L_0(b) \otimes L_{-\varpi_1^\vee}(\frac{1}{1-za})$. It has a basis $(w_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with respect to which (see [15, Example 11.19])

$$\phi_1^\pm(z)w_n = bq^{-2n} \frac{1 - zaq^2}{(1 - zaq^{-2n})(1 - zaq^{2-2n})} w_n.$$

Clearly, $L_{-\varpi_1^\vee}(\frac{b}{1-za})$ factorizes through the simply-connected truncation $\mathcal{U}_{-\varpi_1^\vee}^{1-zaq^2}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ with the action of A-series given by

$$\mathcal{A}_1^+(z)w_n = (1 - zaq^{-2n})w_n, \quad \mathcal{A}_1^-(z)w_n = (1 - z^{-1}a^{-1}q^{2n})w_n.$$

It factorizes through the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{-\varpi_1^\vee}^{1-zaq^2}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ if and only if $b^2 = a^2$. Let \mathbf{z} be a square root of $-aq^2$ so that the triple $(-\varpi_1^\vee, 1 - zaq^2, \mathbf{z})$ satisfies Eq.(3.27). Then the module extends to the adjoint truncation $\mathcal{U}_{-\varpi_1^\vee}^{1-zaq^2, \mathbf{z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ if and only if $b = a$.

6. APPLICATIONS

We discuss several applications of our main result: subring structures for subcategories of finite length representations in the topological Grothendieck ring (Corollaries 6.1, 6.2 and 6.4), their relation to the cluster algebras of [13] (Conjecture 6.5) and descent to truncation in accordance with [15, Conjecture 12.2](Corollary 6.6).

6.1. Grothendieck rings. Let \mathcal{O}_μ^f be the category of modules in \mathcal{O}_μ of finite length. Its Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{O}_\mu^f)$ is the free abelian group generated by the isomorphism classes $[L_\mu(\mathbf{f})]$ for $\mathbf{f} \in \mathfrak{r}_\mu$. It admits a natural completion $K_0(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$ which we will view as the Grothendieck group of the category \mathcal{O}_μ (this is the version used in [15]). Let $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh},f})$ be the direct sum, over all coweights, of $K_0(\mathcal{O}_\mu^f)$. Then the completion

$$K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh}}) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathbf{P}^\vee} K_0(\mathcal{O}_\mu)$$

of $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh},f})$ is endowed with a commutative ring structure by fusion product [15, §5.4]:

$$[L_{\mu_1}(\mathbf{f}_1)][L_{\mu_2}(\mathbf{f}_2)] = [L_{\mu_1}(\mathbf{f}_1) * L_{\mu_2}(\mathbf{f}_2)] \quad \text{for } \mathbf{f}_1 \in \mathfrak{r}_{\mu_1} \text{ and } \mathbf{f}_2 \in \mathfrak{r}_{\mu_2}.$$

We shall refer to $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh}})$ as topological Grothendieck ring. As a consequence of our main Theorem 5.4, we obtain the following.

Corollary 6.1. *The subgroup $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh},f})$ of the topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh}})$ is a subring.*

As above, the Grothendieck group $K_0(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^f)$ of the category $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^f$ of finite length $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{g}})$ -modules in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}$ can also be completed to a group $K_0(\widehat{\mathcal{O}})$. This completed group has a commutative ring structure induced by the Drinfeld–Jimbo coproduct, or equivalently by the fusion product. The resulting topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\widehat{\mathcal{O}})$ can be viewed as a subring of $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh}})$.

Corollary 6.2. *The subgroup $K_0(\widehat{\mathcal{O}}^f)$ of the topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\widehat{\mathcal{O}})$ is a subring.*

Remark 6.3. The picture is very different in the case of the Borel subalgebra of a quantum affine algebra. Consider the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{O}^f)$ and the topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O})$ as above, but for representations of the Borel algebra. It is known from [17, Remark 5.12] that the subgroup $K_0(\mathcal{O}^f)$ is not a subring. For example, in the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -case, the tensor product of a positive prefundamental representation (associated with a prefundamental ℓ -weight) by a negative prefundamental representations (associated with the inverse of a prefundamental ℓ -weight) has infinite length. Note however that certain important subcategories of finite-length representations of the Borel algebra are stable by tensor product; see [17, Proposition 5.11].

6.2. Cluster algebras. The relation between representations of shifted quantum affine algebras and cluster algebras was investigated in [13].

Fix a square root \sqrt{q} of q and define ϖ'_i to be the constant ℓ -weight $(\sqrt{q}^{\delta_{ij}d_i})_{j \in I}$. Then $(\varpi'_i)^2$ is precisely ϖ_i defined in Subsection 2.4. In [13] the following remarkable subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}}$ of \mathcal{O}^{sh} is introduced. It is the abelian subcategory of modules in \mathcal{O}^{sh} whose simple constituents have as highest ℓ -weights Laurent monomials in variables Ψ_{i,q^r} and ϖ'_j , for $i, j \in I$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, with an additional condition on the couple (i, r) ; see [13, Definition 9.13]. The category $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}}$ is stable by fusion product so that its topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}})$ is well-defined as a subring of $K_0(\mathcal{O}^{\text{sh}})$.

Let $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh},f}$ be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}}$ consisting of finite length representations. Consider its Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh},f})$ as a subgroup of $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}})$. The following result is a direct consequence of Corollary 6.1.

Corollary 6.4. *The subgroup $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh},f})$ of the topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}})$ is a subring.*

It is proved in [13, Theorem 9.15] that there exists an injective ring morphism

$$F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}}).$$

Here \mathcal{A} is a cluster algebra of infinite rank introduced in [13]; to be precise our \mathcal{A} and $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}})$ correspond to $[\underline{P}] \otimes_{[P]} \mathcal{A}_{w_0}$ and $[\underline{P}] \otimes_{[P]} K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}})$ in *loc.cit.* Moreover, it is proved that the topological completion of the image of F is the whole topological Grothendieck ring $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}})$.

Recall that a cluster algebra is generated as ring by cluster variables. It is conjectured in [13] that all cluster variables of \mathcal{A} are mapped by F to certain isomorphism classes of simple objects in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh}}$. If this is true, using Corollary 6.4, we get that the image of F is included in the subring $K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh,f}})$.

We are now in the situation to formulate the following conjecture, which gives a finer categorical interpretation of the cluster algebra \mathcal{A} .

Conjecture 6.5. *The ring morphism F induces a ring isomorphism*

$$\mathcal{A} \simeq K_0(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\text{sh,f}}).$$

This is established for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2$ in [13, Remark 9.32]. This is an isomorphism of rings (not of topological rings).

6.3. Classification of simple modules by Langlands dual q -character. In [15] the first author proposed a general conjecture to classify simple representations of truncated shifted quantum affine algebras in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} in terms of Langlands dual q -characters. To each polynomial ℓ -weight \mathbf{a} is associated a representation V^L of the Langlands dual quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L)$ which has a “Langlands dual q -characters” $\chi_q^L(V^L)$ defined in [15] (and that can be computed algorithmically). Then, the monomials of $\chi_q^L(V^L)$ are conjectured to give the highest ℓ -weights of the simple representations up to sign twist of the corresponding adjoint truncation.

Since the adjoint truncation and the intermediate truncation have the same classification (up to sign twist) of simple modules in category \mathcal{O}^{sh} , the conjecture of [15] can be equivalently stated for the intermediate truncation. Indeed, it suffices to replace in [15, Conjecture 12.2] the category $\mathcal{O}_{\mu, \mathcal{Z}}^\lambda$ by the subcategory $\overline{\mathcal{O}}_\mu^{\mathcal{Z}}$ of modules in \mathcal{O}_μ that factor through the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_\mu^{\mathcal{Z}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$. Then we can omit the parameters z'_i in the collection $\mathcal{Z} = (\mathbf{Z}, z'_1, z'_2, \dots, z'_n)$.

The statement of Theorem 5.4 with one factor $s = 1$ gives the following.

Corollary 6.6. *Any simple module in category \mathcal{O}_μ descends to a simply-connected truncation, with the truncation parameters as predicted by [15, Conjecture 12.2].*

This generalizes the result obtained in [15] for simple finite-dimensional representations in \mathcal{O}_μ by a different method.

Example 6.7. Recall the prefundamental ℓ -weight in Example 2.5. Consider a negative prefundamental representation $L_{-\varpi_i^\vee}(\Psi_{i,a}^{-1})$ in $\mathcal{O}_{-\varpi_i^\vee}$. According to Theorem 5.4, up to tensor product with an invertible module this representation descends to the intermediate truncation $\overline{\mathcal{U}}_{-\varpi_i^\vee}^{\mathbf{a}}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})$ where $\mathbf{a} = \Psi_{i, aq^{r^\vee h^\vee}}$. In the notations of [15], this means this representation belongs to the category $\mathcal{O}_{-\varpi_i^\vee}^{\varpi_i^\vee, \mathbf{a}}$. But $Z_{i,a}^{-1}$ is the lowest weight term in the Langlands dual q -character $\chi_q^L(V_i^L(a^{-1}q^{-r^\vee h^\vee}))$ of the fundamental

representation $V_{\bar{j}}(a^{-1}q^{-r^\vee h^\vee})$ of the twisted quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L)$; see [14, Remark 12.3 (v)]⁵. The two statements coincide as predicted by [15, Conjecture 12.2].

Proof. In the proof of [15, Theorem 12.8] for finite-dimensional representations, a reduction to (finite-dimensional) fundamental representations is used. Similarly, it suffices to prove the result for prefundamental representations as any simple module in a category \mathcal{O}_μ is a subquotient of a fusion product of prefundamental modules [15, Corollary 5.6] (up to twist by invertible modules). Then the truncations are compatible with fusion products [15, Proposition 12.5]. The result is clear for positive prefundamental representations as from [15, Example 11.3], as $L_{\varpi_i^\vee}(\Psi_{i,a})$ belongs to $\mathcal{O}_{\varpi_i^\vee, \Psi_{i,a}}$. The result for negative prefundamental representations follows from our main Theorem as explained in Remark 6.7. \square

Example 6.8. Let $\mu = \varpi_i^\vee - \varpi_j^\vee$ and $\Psi = \Psi_{i,a} \Psi_{j,b}^{-1}$ for some $i, j \in I$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. Note that, in general, $L_\mu(\Psi)$ is not isomorphic to the fusion product of $L_{i,a}^+$ by $L_{j,b}^-$, but is isomorphic to a quotient of the fusion product. Now, $L_\mu(\Psi)$ is in the category $\mathcal{O}_{\varpi_i^\vee + \varpi_j^\vee, \mathbf{a}}$ where $\mathbf{a} = \Psi_{i,a} \Psi_{\bar{j}, bq^{r^\vee h^\vee}}$. This corresponds to the fact that $Z_{i,a^{-1}} Z_{j,b^{-1}}^{-1}$ is a monomial occurring in the Langlands dual q -character of the module $V_i(a^{-1}) \otimes V_{\bar{j}}(b^{-1}q^{-r^\vee h^\vee})$ of the Langlands dual quantum affine algebra $U_q(\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Beck, *Braid group action and quantum affine algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys. **165** (1994): 555–568.
- [2] A. Braverman, M. Finkelberg, and H. Nakajima, *Coulomb branches of 3d $\mathcal{N} = 4$ quiver gauge theory and slices in the affine Grassmannian*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **23** (2019): 75–166, with appendices by A. Braverman, M. Finkelberg, J. Kamnitzer, R. Kodera, H. Nakajima, B. Webster, and A. Weekes. (arXiv:1604.03625)
- [3] V. Chari and A. Pressley, *Quantum affine algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys. **142** (1991), 261–283.
- [4] I. Damiani, *La \mathcal{R} -matrice pour les algèbres quantiques de type affine non tordu*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. **31** (1998): 493–523.
- [5] I. Damiani, *From the Drinfeld realization to the Drinfeld–Jimbo presentation of affine quantum algebras: the injectivity*, Publ. RIMS Kyoto Univ. **51** (2015): 131–171.
- [6] V. Drinfeld, *A new realization of Yangians and of quantum affine algebras*, Soviet Math. Dokl. **36** (1988): 212–216.
- [7] M. Finkelberg, J. Kamnitzer, K. Pham, L. Rybnikov, and A. Weekes, *Comultiplication for shifted Yangians and quantum open Toda lattice*, Adv. Math. **327** (2018): 349–389.
- [8] M. Finkelberg and A. Tsymbaliuk, *Multiplicative slices, relativistic Toda and shifted quantum affine algebras*, Representations and nilpotent orbits of Lie algebraic systems, Progress in Mathematics **330** (2019): 133–304. (arXiv:1708.01795)
- [9] E. Frenkel and D. Hernandez, *Baxter’s relations and spectra of quantum integrable models*, Duke Math. J. **164**, no. 12 (2015): 2407–2460.
- [10] E. Frenkel, D. Hernandez and N. Reshetihin, *Folded quantum integrable models and deformed W -algebras*, Lett. Math. Phys. **112** (2022), no. 4, 80.
- [11] E. Frenkel and E. Mukhin, *Combinatorics of q -characters of finite-dimensional representations of quantum affine algebras*, Commun. Math. Phys. **216** (2001): 23–57.

⁵In the construction of [10], this is true up to the positivity Conjecture 6.11 therein.

- [12] E. Frenkel and N. Reshetikhin, *The q -character of representations of quantum affine algebras and deformations of \mathcal{W} -algebras*, Recent Developments in Quantum Affine Algebras and related topics, Contemp. Math. **248** (1999): 163–205. (arXiv:9810055)
- [13] C. Geiss, D. Hernandez and B. Leclerc, *Representations of shifted quantum affine algebras and cluster algebras I: The simply laced case*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3) **129** (2024), no. 3, No. e12630.
- [14] D. Hernandez, *Kirillov-Reshetikhin conjecture: the general case*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **2010**, no. 1, 149–193.
- [15] D. Hernandez, *Representations of shifted quantum affine algebras*, Intern. Math. Res. Notices **2023** no. 13 (2023): 11035–11126.
- [16] D. Hernandez and M. Jimbo, *Asymptotic representations and Drinfeld rational fractions*, Compos. Math. **148**, no. 5 (2012): 1593–1623.
- [17] D. Hernandez and B. Leclerc, *Cluster algebras and category \mathcal{O} for representations of Borel subalgebras of quantum affine algebras*, Alg. Number Th. **10**, no. 9 (2016): 2015–2052.
- [18] D. Hernandez and H. Zhang, *Shifted Yangians and polynomial R -matrices*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **60** (2024), no. 1, 1–69.
- [19] V. Kac, *Infinite dimensional Lie algebras*, 3rd ed., Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990.
- [20] J. Kamnitzer, B. Webster, A. Weekes and O. Yacobi, *Yangians and quantizations of slices in the affine Grassmannian*, Algebra Number Theory **8** (2014): 857–893.
- [21] H. Zhang, *Theta series for quantum loop algebras and Yangians*, Commun. Math. Phys. **405** (2024), no. 10, No. 230.

DH: UNIVERSITÉ PARIS CITÉ AND SORBONNE UNIVERSITÉ, CNRS, IMJ-PRG, F-75006, PARIS, FRANCE

Email address: david.hernandez@imj-prg.fr

HZ: CNRS, UMR 8524-LABORATOIRE PAUL PAINLEVÉ, UNIV. LILLE, F-59000 LILLE, FRANCE

Email address: huafeng.zhang@univ-lille.fr