Abstract. We study projective dimension and graded length of structural modules in parabolic-singular blocks of the BGG category $\mathcal{O}$. Some of these are calculated explicitly, others are expressed in terms of two functions. We also obtain several partial results and estimates for these two functions and relate them to monotonicity properties for quasi-hereditary algebras. The results are then applied to study blocks of $\mathcal{O}$ in the context of Guichardet categories, in particular, we show that blocks of $\mathcal{O}$ are not always weakly Guichardet.
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1. Introduction

Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semi-simple complex finite dimensional Lie algebra with a fixed triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$. The corresponding BGG category $\mathcal{O}$ from [BGG] and its parabolic generalisations from [RC] are fundamental objects of study in modern representation theory with numerous applications to, among others, algebra, topology and combinatorics. These categories have many nice properties and symmetries. In particular, they form the original motivating example for the general definition of a highest weight category in [CPS1]. As a highest weight category, (parabolic) category $\mathcal{O}$ has various classes of structural objects, viz.: simple, injective, projective, standard, costandard and tilting (=cotilting) objects. A general natural question, for arbitrary highest weight categories, is what the projective dimensions of these objects are. In the preliminaries we give some overview of the literature on this subject. The first two papers [Ma1, Ma3] in the present series initiated the study of the projective dimension of these structural objects for $\mathcal{O}$, by determining them for the principal block $\mathcal{O}_0$ of the original (i.e. non-parabolic) category $\mathcal{O}$.

Structural modules in $\mathcal{O}_0$ are naturally indexed by elements in the Weyl group $W$ of $\mathfrak{g}$. In most of the cases, the projective dimension is given in terms of the usual length function $\ell$ for $W$ (and some of these answers go back to the original paper [BGG]). However, for injective and tilting module the answer turns out to be significantly more complicated and requires the full power of Kazhdan-Lusztig (KL) combinatorics. For these structural modules, the answer is given in terms of Lusztig’s $a$-function on $W$, defined in [Lu1, Lu2]. A summary of the main results from [Ma1, Ma3] is given in the left column of the following table, where $w_0$ denotes, as usual, the longest element in $W$. 
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SOME HOMOLOGICAL PROPERTIES
OF CATEGORY $\mathcal{O}$. IV

KEVIN COULEMBIER AND VOLODYMYR MAZORCHUK
The principal block $\mathcal{O}_0$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>projective dimensions</th>
<th>graded lengths</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{pd} L(x) = 21(w_0) - 1(x)$</td>
<td>$\text{gl} L(x) = 0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{pd} \Delta(x) = 1(x)$</td>
<td>$\text{gl} \Delta(x) = 1(w_0) - 1(x)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{pd} \nabla(x) = 21(w_0) - 1(x)$</td>
<td>$\text{gl} \nabla(x) = 1(w_0) - 1(x)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{pd} P(x) = 0$</td>
<td>$\text{gl} P(x) = 1(w_0) + 1(x)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{pd} I(x) = 2a(w_0)$</td>
<td>$\text{gl} I(x) = 1(w_0) + 1(x)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{pd} T(x) = a(x)$</td>
<td>$\text{gl} T(x) = 21(w_0) - 21(x)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consequently, the global dimension of $\mathcal{O}_0$ is $21(w_0)$, see also [BGG].

The principal block $\mathcal{O}_0$ is Koszul and hence all structural modules in this block are gradable with respect to the Koszul $\mathbb{Z}$-grading. This raises the natural question of determining the corresponding graded length for these modules. For $\mathcal{O}_0$, this is a standard exercise (which also can be derived from the results of [Br1, Br2]) and the answer is recorded in the right column of the above table. Note that we use the convention that the graded length of a module concentrated in a single degree is zero. Some other papers, for example [Ma3], use the convention that the graded length of a module concentrated in a single degree is one.

The main aim of the present paper is to study both the projective dimension and the graded length for all structural modules in all (in particular, singular) blocks of the parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$. An important motivation for this study stems from the third paper [CM2] of this series where the question of projective dimension for simple objects in singular blocks of $\mathcal{O}$ naturally appeared during the study of blocks of $\mathcal{O}$ in the context of Guichardet categories in the sense of [Fu, Ga]. Another concrete motivation comes from the open question of classification of blocks of category $\mathcal{O}$ for Lie superalgebras, see [Br2], and the approach to that question via i.a. projective dimensions in [CS]. We already apply our results in this paper to these problems.

To be able to present our results, we need some notation. For two integral dominant weights $\lambda$ and $\mu$, we consider the parabolic-singular block $\mathcal{O}^\mu_\lambda$ where the singularity of the block is determined by $\lambda$, while the parabolicity is determined by $\mu$ in the usual way, see for example [Ba]. For $\mu = 0$, we recover the usual category $\mathcal{O}$. Let $X_\lambda$ denote the set of longest representatives in $W$ for cosets $W/W_\lambda$, where $W_\lambda$ is the stabiliser of $\lambda$ with respect to the dot-action of $W$. Then elements in $X_\lambda$ naturally index isomorphism classes of simple object in the corresponding (singular) block $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ of the usual category $\mathcal{O}$.

We define maps $\mathfrak{s}_\lambda$ and $\mathfrak{d}_\lambda$ from $X_\lambda$ to $\{0, 1, 2, \ldots\}$ by

$$\mathfrak{s}_\lambda(x) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} L(x \cdot \lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{d}_\lambda(x) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} \Delta(x \cdot \lambda).$$

Note that, by the above table, we have $\mathfrak{s}_0(x) = 21(w_0) - 1(x)$ and $\mathfrak{d}_0(x) = 1(x)$. Our first collection of main results expresses all projective dimensions and graded lengths of structural modules in $\mathcal{O}^0_\lambda$ in terms of $\mathfrak{s}_\lambda$, $\mathfrak{d}_\lambda$, 1 and $a$ as follows (here $x \in X_\lambda$ is such that it survives in $\mathcal{O}^0_\lambda$ and $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}^0_\lambda}$ is abbreviated by $\text{pd}$, not to confuse with $\text{pd} = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}}$ in the previous table):
Table is that all projective dimensions in regular blocks of parabolic category are determined in terms of the KLV polynomials. Another consequence of the above is that projective dimensions of costandard, injective and tilting modules are not even implicitly computed using a recursive algorithm, in general. Note that, \textit{a priori}, the projective dimensions of standard and costandard modules in terms of the KLV polynomials, see [Vo, Hu, Ir4, CPS2], as these polynomials might be.

Consequently, the global dimension of \( O_\lambda \) equals \( 2a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) - 2a(w_\lambda^0) \). In particular, the above table determines all projective dimensions either explicitly, or implicitly, determined in terms of the KLV polynomials. Another consequence of the above table is that all projective dimensions in arbitrary blocks of parabolic category \( O \) and all graded lengths in arbitrary blocks of non-parabolic category \( O \) vary strictly monotonically along.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{pd } L(x \cdot \lambda) = a_\lambda(x) - 2l(w_0^0) )</td>
<td>( \text{pd } L(x \cdot \lambda) = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{pd } \Delta^p(x \cdot \lambda) = d_\lambda(w_0^p x) - 1(w_0^p) )</td>
<td>( \text{pd } \Delta^p(x \cdot \lambda) = d_\mu(w_0^p x^{-1}) - 1(w_0^p) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{pd } \nabla^p(x \cdot \lambda) = d_\lambda(w_0 x w_0^0) + a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) - 2a(w_\lambda^0) )</td>
<td>( \text{pd } \nabla^p(x \cdot \lambda) = d_\mu(w_0^p x^{-1}) - 1(w_0^p) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{pd } P^p(x \cdot \lambda) = 0 )</td>
<td>( \text{pd } P^p(x \cdot \lambda) = s_\mu(w_0 x^{-1}) - 2l(w_0^0) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{pd } T^p(x \cdot \lambda) = 2a(w_0^0 x) - 2a(w_0^0) )</td>
<td>( \text{pd } T^p(x \cdot \lambda) = s_\mu(w_0 x^{-1}) - 2l(w_0^0) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{pd } T^p(x \cdot \lambda) = a(w_0^0 x w_0^0) - a(w_0^0) )</td>
<td>( \text{pd } T^p(x \cdot \lambda) = 2(s_\mu(w_0^0 x^{-1} w_0^0) - a(w_0^0) - a(w_0^0 w_\lambda^0)) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also obtain several partial results and estimates concerning \( s_\lambda \) and \( d_\lambda \), see Propositions [10, 17, 18] and apply these results to calculate the functions \( s_\lambda \) and \( d_\lambda \) for large classes of cases. In particular, we obtain many examples by connecting the results in [CIS] with the \( a \)-function. To illustrate the difficulty in determining the functions \( s_\lambda \) and \( d_\lambda \) in full generality, we briefly review some of our results and examples. For arbitrary \( g, \lambda \) and all \( x \in X_\lambda \), we have

\[
s_\lambda(x) \leq 1(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) \quad \text{and} \quad d_\lambda(x) \leq 1(xw_0^0),
\]

where these estimates become equalities when \( \lambda = 0 \). In general, these bounds are far from being strict. An extremal case is when \( \lambda \) is such that the algebra, generated by the simple roots for which \( \lambda \) is singular, forms a hermitian symmetric pair with \( g \). In this case we prove that

\[
s_\lambda(x) = a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) \quad \text{and} \quad d_\lambda(x) = a(xw_0^0).
\]

Moreover, for \( g = sl(n) \), we find that, for arbitrary \( \lambda \), the values of \( s_\lambda \) vary between the estimate and the above case:

\[
a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) \leq s_\lambda(x) \leq 1(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_\lambda^0).
\]

By the above discussion, the lower bound is an equality when the singular Weyl group is a maximal Coxeter subgroup of \( W \), while the upper bound is an equality when the singular Weyl group is trivial. In Section [10] we use our general results to calculate \( s_\lambda \) and \( d_\lambda \), for \( g = sl(n) \) and a weight \( \lambda \) for which the singular Weyl group is isomorphic to \( S_{n-2} \). This sheds some light on the general intricate principle which determines the projective dimensions in between maximal and trivial Coxeter subgroups and leads to a modest ansatz to what a general description of \( s_\lambda \) might be.

The second collection of main results is concerned with certain \textit{monotonicity properties} of the functions \( s_\lambda \) and \( d_\lambda \) in the context of quasi-hereditary algebras and their relation to Guichardet categories. Whereas the projective dimensions of simple, standard and costandard modules in \( O_\lambda \) vary strictly monotonically along
the Bruhat order, it turns out that the corresponding property can fail dramatically for singular blocks, as we illustrate by examples in this paper. Motivated by this observation, we define several monotonicity properties for various invariants of quasi-hereditary algebras and obtain strong connections between them. These connections are even stronger in the specific example of parabolic category \(O\). Consequently, we can return to the question of our interest (the functions \(s_\lambda\) and \(d_\lambda\)) and define, for any block in category \(O\), a unique concept of monotonicity, based on the projective dimension of standard modules. We have increasingly strong conditions on a block which we call \textit{almost monotone}, \textit{weakly monotone} and \textit{strictly monotone}. Regular blocks are always strictly monotone. When a block \(O_\lambda\) is almost monotone, we prove that the corresponding functions \(d_\lambda\) and \(s_\lambda\) satisfy

\[
s_\lambda(x) = d_\lambda(w_0 x w_0^\lambda) + a(w_0 v_\lambda^0), \quad \text{for all } x \in X_\lambda.
\]

In particular, we prove that, in the case of a hermitian symmetric pair, the block \(O_\lambda\) is always weakly monotone. Equation (1) was then used to determine \(s_\lambda\) from \(d_\lambda\), immediately demonstrating its usefulness. We also prove that a weakly monotone block is weakly Guichardet and a strictly monotone block is strongly Guichardet.

As mentioned above, we show that blocks are not always almost monotone. Moreover, we prove that equation (1) is not true for some \(\lambda\). We also prove that blocks in category \(O\) are not always weakly Guichardet, disproving [Fu, Conjecture 2.3]. In [CM2, Section 6.2], we already proved that blocks in category \(O\) are not always strongly Guichardet.

The significant breaking of monotonicity does not occur for low-rank cases. In particular, all blocks of category \(O\) for \(\mathfrak{sl}(n)\) are strictly monotone for \(n = 2\), weakly monotone for \(n \leq 3\) and almost monotone for \(n \leq 4\).

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we collect all necessary preliminaries. In Section 3 we discuss the notions of projective dimension and graded length in derived categories. Section 4 is devoted to the study of projective dimensions in parabolic category \(O\). We also show that our results do not extend to the generalisations \(O^R\) of parabolic category \(O\), introduced in [MS1], as we prove that these can have infinite global dimension. In Section 5 we determine the global dimension of all blocks of parabolic category \(O\). Section 6 studies several connections between the projective dimensions and graded lengths. Section 7 contains our main results on projective dimensions of structural modules in parabolic-singular category \(O\). In Section 8 we investigate various monotonicity properties for invariants of quasi-hereditary algebras. In Section 9 we deal with the case of a hermitian symmetric pair. In Section 10 we fully determine projective dimensions in a specific block for \(\mathfrak{sl}(n)\) where the singularity is almost maximal and add some discussion towards a full solution for the function \(s_\lambda\). The projective dimensions of all structural modules for all blocks in category \(O\) for \(\mathfrak{sl}(4)\), as well as the KLV polynomials, are obtained in Section 11 which provides in particular an example which is not weakly Guichardet. We work out some application of some of our results to Lie superalgebras in Section 12. In Section 13 we conclude the paper with some open questions which naturally arose in the paper, besides the obvious main questions of full description of \(s_\lambda\) and \(d_\lambda\).
2. Preliminaries

We set \( \mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots\} \). We work over \( \mathbb{C} \). Unless explicitly stated otherwise, any algebra is assumed to be finite dimensional. We also use the convention that \( \min \emptyset = 0 \), where \( \emptyset \) is the empty set. By a module we mean a left module.

2.1. Quasi-hereditary algebras. For a general introduction to the theory of quasi-hereditary algebras we refer to the work of Cline-Parshall-Scott and Dlab-Ringel, see e.g. [CPS1, DR2, PS]. Consider a finite-dimensional algebra \( A \) with a partial order \( \leq \) on the indexing set \( \Lambda_A \) of non-isomorphic simple \( A \)-modules. The algebra \( (A, \leq) \) is quasi-hereditary if and only if its category of finite dimensional modules \( \text{C}^A := A\text{-mod} \) is a highest weight category with respect to this order, see [CPS1, Theorem 3.6].

Concretely, denote the simple \( A \)-modules by \( L^A(\lambda) \), for all \( \lambda \in \Lambda_A \). The indecomposable projective cover, respectively injective hull, of \( L^A(\lambda) \) is denoted by \( P^A(\lambda) \), respectively \( I^A(\lambda) \). The standard module \( \Delta^A(\lambda) \) is defined as the maximal quotient of \( P^A(\lambda) \) with all simple subquotients of the form \( L^A(\mu) \) with \( \mu \leq \lambda \). The costandard module \( \nabla^A(\lambda) \) is defined as the maximal submodule of \( I^A(\lambda) \) with the same condition on its simple subquotients. We say that the pair \( (A, \leq) \) is a quasi-hereditary algebra if \( [\Delta^A(\mu) : L(\mu)] = 1 \) and, moreover, all projective modules have a filtration with standard subquotients (the so-called standard filtration). This condition is equivalent to the corresponding dual condition for costandard modules.

For each \( \lambda \in \Lambda_A \), there is a unique, up to isomorphism, indecomposable module \( T^A(\lambda) \) which has both a standard filtration and a costandard filtration and for which there is an injection \( \Delta^A(\lambda) \hookrightarrow T^A(\lambda) \) such that the resulting quotient has a standard filtration. This module is called a tilting module, see [Ri]. We refer to the collection of all the introduced modules as the structural modules of the quasi-hereditary algebra \( A \). When there is no confusion possible, we leave out the reference to \( A \) in the indexing poset, structural modules and the module category.

For a quasi-hereditary algebra \( A \), its Ringel dual algebra, see [Ri, MS2], is defined as \( R(A) := \text{End}_A(T) \text{op} \) and \( T := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda} T(\lambda) \).

Then \( R(A) \) inherits a quasi-hereditary structure from \( A \) with respect to the order which is opposite to \( \leq \). Moreover, assuming that \( A \) is basic, we have \( R(R(A)) \cong A \), see [Ri, Section 6]. The module \( T \) is called the characteristic tilting module.

2.2. Projective dimensions. For an abelian category \( \mathcal{C} \), we consider the Yoneda extension functors

\[
\text{Ext}^i_{\mathcal{C}}(-,-) : \mathcal{C}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Set},
\]

see e.g. [Ve Section III.3] or [CM2 Section 2]. These Yoneda extension functors are isomorphic to the derived functors of the Hom functor in case \( \mathcal{C} \) contains enough projective or injective objects. For an object \( X \in \mathcal{C} \), we denote by

\[
\text{pd}_{\mathcal{C}} X \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}
\]

the projective dimension of \( X \) defined as the supremum of all \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) for which \( \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^i(X,-) \) is not trivial. The global (homological) dimension of \( \mathcal{C} \), denoted by \( \text{gld} \mathcal{C} \), is the supremum of the projective dimensions taken over all objects in \( \mathcal{C} \). The finitistic dimension of \( \mathcal{C} \), denoted by \( \text{fnd} \mathcal{C} \), is the supremum of the projective
dimensions taken over all objects in $C$ which have finite projective dimension. Note that in general we have both
\[ \text{gld} C \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{fnd} C \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}. \]

A natural question for any quasi-hereditary algebra is to determine the projective dimensions of its structural modules and its global dimension. This global dimension is always finite, as proved by Parshall and Scott in [PS, Theorem 4.3]. Further results were obtained by König in [K]. In [DR2, Section 4], Dlab and Ringel study the implications of having standard modules with low projective dimensions and in [DR1] they prove that every algebra of global dimension two has a quasi-hereditary structure. In [MO, Corollary 1], the global dimension is linked to the projective dimension of the characteristic tilting module.

For the specific case of the principal block $O_0$ of category $O$ for reductive Lie algebras, the questions of projective dimensions were first addressed in the original paper [BGG]. The second author completed these results in [Ma1, Ma3] by determining all projective dimensions of all structural modules. In the current paper we will focus on these questions for the quasi-hereditary algebras associated to arbitrary blocks of category $O$ and the parabolic generalisations of the latter.

### 2.3. Koszul algebras

Let
\[ B = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} B_i \]
be a quadratic positively graded algebra. We denote its quadratic dual by $B'$, as in [BGS, Definition 2.8.1]. If $B$ is, moreover, Koszul, we denote its Koszul dual by $E(B) = \text{Ext}^*_{B}(B_0, B_0)$. By [BGS, Theorem 2.10.1], we have $E(B) = (B')^{\text{op}}$ for any Koszul algebra $B$. For a positively graded algebra $B$, we denote by $B$-gmod the category of finite dimensional $\mathbb{Z}$-graded $B$-modules.

For a complex $M^\bullet$ of graded modules, we use the convention
\[ (M^\bullet[a]\langle b \rangle)^i = M_{i+a}^j\langle -b \rangle, \]
for the shift $[\cdot]$ in position in the complex and the shift $\langle \cdot \rangle$ in degree in the module. This corresponds to the conventions in [BGS] but differs slightly from the one in [MOS]. A graded module $M$, regarded as an object in the derived category put in position zero without shift in grading, is denoted by $M^\bullet$.

For any Koszul algebra $B$, [BGS, Theorem 2.12.6] introduces the Koszul duality functor $K_B$, which is a covariant equivalence of triangulated categories
\[ K_B : \mathcal{D}^b(B\text{-gmod}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^b(B'\text{-gmod}). \]
We use the convention where $K_B$ bijectively maps isomorphism classes of simple modules (respectively indecomposable projective modules) in $B$-gmod to isomorphism classes of indecomposable injective modules (respectively simple modules) in $B'$-gmod. This agrees with [MOS], but is dual to the convention in [BGS]. The Koszul duality functor $K_B$ satisfies
\[ K_B(N^\bullet[a]\langle b \rangle) = K_B(N^\bullet)[a-b]\langle -b \rangle, \]
see [BGS, Theorem 2.12.5], or [MOS Theorem 22].

In the present paper, we always work in the situation when both $B$ and $B'$ are finite dimensional.
2.4. Category $O$ and its parabolic generalisations. Consider the BGG category $O$, associated to a triangular decomposition of a finite dimensional complex semisimple (or, more generally, reductive) Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$, see [BGG, Hu]. For any weight $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we denote the simple highest weight module with highest weight $\nu$ by $L(\nu)$. We also introduce an involution on $\mathfrak{h}^*$ by setting $\bar{\nu} = -w_0(\nu)$, where $w_0$ denotes the longest element of the Weyl group $W = W(\mathfrak{g} : \mathfrak{h})$. We denote by $(\cdot, \cdot)$ a $W$-invariant inner product on $\mathfrak{h}^*$.

We denote the set of integral weights by $\Lambda^{\text{int}}$ and the subset of dominant, not necessarily regular, weights by $\Lambda_+^{\text{int}}$. For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_+^{\text{int}}$, the indecomposable block in category $O$ containing $L(\lambda)$ is denoted by $O_\lambda$.

For $B$ the set of simple positive roots and $\mu \in \Lambda_+^{\text{int}}$, set $B_\mu = \{ \alpha \in B \mid (\mu + \rho, \alpha) = 0 \}$. Let $u_\mu$ be the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$ generated by the root spaces corresponding to the roots in $-B_\mu$. Then we have the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{q}_\mu$ of $\mathfrak{g}$, given by

$$q_\mu := u_\mu^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+.$$

The full subcategory of $O_\lambda$ with objects given by the modules in $O_\lambda$ which are $U(\mathfrak{q}_\mu)$-locally finite is denoted by $O_\lambda^{\mu}$. We will refer to this category as a block, see the discussion in Subsection 5.1.

The category $O_\lambda^{\mu}$ is a direct summand of the parabolic version $O^{\mu}$ of category $O$ as introduced in [RC]. By construction, $O_\lambda^{\mu}$ is a Serre subcategory of $O_\lambda$. We denote the corresponding exact full embedding of categories by $\iota^{\mu} : O^{\mu} \hookrightarrow O$. The left adjoint of $\iota^{\mu}$ is the corresponding Zuckerman functor, denoted by $Z^{\mu}$. It is given, for a module $M \in O$, by taking the largest quotient of $M$ which belongs to $O^{\mu}$.

We define the set $X_\lambda$ as the set of longest representatives in $W$ of cosets in $W/W_\lambda$. The non-isomorphic simple objects in the category $O_\lambda$ are then indexed as follows:

$$\{ L(w \cdot \lambda) \mid w \in X_\lambda \}.$$

Now, for $x \in X_\lambda$, the module $L(x \cdot \lambda)$ is an object of $O_\lambda^x$ if and only if $x$ is a shortest representative in $W$ of a coset in $W_\mu \setminus W$. The set of such shortest representatives $x \in X_\lambda$ is denoted by $X_\lambda^x$. When $\lambda = 0$, we simply write $L(x)$ for $L(x \cdot \lambda)$.

Consider the minimal projective generator of $O_\lambda^x$ given by

$$P_\lambda^x := \bigoplus_{x \in X_\lambda^x} P^{\mu}(x \cdot \lambda),$$

where $P^{\mu}(x \cdot \lambda)$ is the indecomposable projective cover of $L(x \cdot \lambda)$ in $O_\lambda^x$. Set $A_\lambda^x := \text{End}_g(P_\lambda^x)$. Then we have the usual equivalence of categories

$$O_\lambda^x \cong \text{mod-}A_\lambda^x; \quad M \mapsto \text{Hom}_g(P_\lambda^x, M).$$

We consider the usual Bruhat order $\preceq$ on $W$, with the convention that $e$ is the smallest element. It restricts to the Bruhat order on $X_\lambda^x$. The order on the weights is defined by $x \cdot \lambda \leq y \cdot \lambda$ if and only if $y \leq x$. From the BGG Theorem on the structure of Verma modules, see e.g. [Hu] Section 5.1, it follows that the algebra $A_\lambda^x$ is quasi-hereditary with respect to the poset of weights $X_\lambda^x \cdot \lambda$.

Consider the translation functor $\theta^{\text{out}}_\lambda : O_0 \rightarrow O_\lambda$ to the $\lambda$-wall. This functor has the adjoint $\theta^{\text{int}}_\lambda : O_\lambda \rightarrow O_0$, which is translation out of the $\lambda$-wall, see [Hu] Chapter 7. For $x \in W$, we denote by $\theta_x$ the unique projective functor on $O_0$ satisfying

$$\theta_x \Delta(e) \cong P(x),$$

where $\Delta$ is the coproduct in category $O$.
see [BGc]. Note that, in particular, \( \theta^\text{out}_\lambda \circ \theta^\text{on}_\lambda = \theta_{w_0}^\lambda \). The contravariant duality on \( O \) which preserves isomorphism classes of simple objects, see [Hu] Section 3.2], is denoted by \( \lambda \). Existence of this duality functors implies that \( (A^\mu_\lambda)^{op} \cong A^\mu_\lambda \).

For any \( x \in X_\lambda^0 \), consider the following structural modules in \( O^\mu_\lambda \):

- the standard module (or generalised Verma module) \( \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \) with simple top \( L(x \cdot \lambda) \),
- the costandard module \( \nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) := d\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \),
- the indecomposable injective envelope \( I^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \) of \( L(x \cdot \lambda) \),
- the indecomposable projective cover \( P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \) of \( L(x \cdot \lambda) \),
- the indecomposable tilting module \( T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \) with highest weight \( x \cdot \lambda \).

When \( \mu \) is regular, meaning that the corresponding parabolic category \( O^\mu \) is the usual category \( O \), we leave out the reference to \( \mu \). Similarly, we will leave out \( \lambda \), or replace it by 0, whenever it is regular. By application of [So1, Theorem 11], all categories \( O^\mu_\lambda \) with \( \lambda \) arbitrary integral regular dominant and \( \mu \) fixed are equivalent to \( O^\mu_0 \), justifying this convention.

As proved in [BGS, Ba], \( A^\mu_\lambda \) has a Koszul grading. The algebra \( A^\mu_\lambda \) is even standard Koszul in the sense of [ADL]. The corresponding graded module category is denoted by \( O^\mu_\lambda = A^\mu_\lambda \text{-gmod} \). We will sometimes replace the notation \( \text{Hom}_{O^\mu} \) by \( \text{hom}_O \).

We, furthermore, choose a normalisation of the grading of structural modules by demanding that simple modules appear in degree zero, projective and standard modules have their top in degree zero, injective and costandard modules have their socle in degree zero, while the grading of the (self-dual) tilting modules is symmetric around zero. Projective, inclusion and Zuckerman functors all admit graded lifts. We denote the corresponding graded lifts by the same symbols as for \( O \) and use the grading convention of [SU]. This means that

\[
\theta^\text{on}_\lambda L(x) = \begin{cases} 
L(x \cdot \lambda)(-1(\lambda_0)), & x \in X_\lambda; \\
0, & \text{otherwise};
\end{cases}
\]

for any \( x \in W \), see [Hu, Theorem 7.9] for the ungraded statement. By applying adjunction to (4), the action of translation out of the wall on projective objects is derived as follows:

\[
\theta^\text{out}_\lambda P(x \cdot \lambda)(0) = P(x)(0),
\]

for any \( x \in X_\lambda \). With our convention we have

\[
\text{hom}_{O_\lambda}(\theta^\text{out}_\lambda M, N) \cong \text{hom}_{O_\lambda}(M, \theta^\text{on}_\lambda N\langle1(\lambda_0)\rangle),
\]

\[
\text{hom}_{O_\lambda}(M, \theta^\text{out}_\lambda N) \cong \text{hom}_{O_\lambda}(\theta^\text{on}_\lambda M\langle1(\lambda_0)\rangle, N),
\]

see also [MOS, Lemma 38].

Throughout the paper we will freely use that, as projective and standard modules have simple top, their graded lengths with respect to the Koszul grading equal their Loewy lengths, see [BGS, Proposition 2.4.1]. In general, the Loewy length of a gradable module is only bounded from above by its graded length.

We also introduce the notation \( M(x, y) = \theta_y L(y) \), for \( x, y \in W \). By [CM1, Proposition 6.9], we have

\[
T^\mu(x) \cong \theta_{w_0w_0'}L(w_0'w_0) \cong M(w_0w_0'x, w_0'w_0),
\]
for any $x \in X^\mu$. The link between regular and singular tilting modules is given by the following:

$$\theta^\text{out}_\lambda T^\mu(y \cdot \lambda)(0) = T^\mu(y w_\lambda^\mu)(1(w_\lambda^\mu)) \quad \forall y \in X^\mu,$$

This follows, for example, from the fact that $\theta^\text{out}_\lambda T^\mu(y \cdot \lambda)(0)$ is a tilting module and [CM1] Theorem 5.4. Equations (7) and (8) prove in particular that all tilting modules in parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ are self-dual.

From Kazhdan-Lusztig theory, see [Hu, Chapter 8], [Br2, Section 3] or [KL, D4], [Vo], it is possible to determine the Kazhdan-Lusztig-Vogan (KLV) polynomials algorithmically. We denote them by

$$p^\mu_\lambda(x,y) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} (-q)^k \dim \text{Ext}^k_{\mathcal{O}^\mu}(\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)),$$

following the convention of [Br2]. It is then immediate that

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}^\mu} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \max_{y \in X^\mu} \deg p^\mu_\lambda(x,y).$$

Moreover, [CPS2] Corollary 3.9 implies that

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}^\mu} L(x \cdot \lambda) = \max_{y \in X^\mu} \left( \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}^\mu} \Delta^\mu(y \cdot \lambda) + \deg p^\mu_\lambda(y,x) \right).$$

These results imply that the projective dimension of simple and standard modules are, in principle, directly determined by the KLV polynomials. However, the KLV polynomials are only determined algorithmically, so we are interested in finding closed expressions.

As noted in the introduction, we will prove that all projective dimensions of structural modules can be obtained from the functions $a_\lambda$ and $d_\lambda$ on $X^\lambda$ for $\lambda \in \Lambda^\mu_{\text{int}}$.

These functions, in turn, can hence be determined in terms of KLV polynomials in the following way:

$$d_\lambda(x) = \max_{y \in X^\lambda} \deg p^\lambda_\lambda(x,y) \quad \text{and} \quad a_\lambda(x) = \max_{y \in X^\lambda} \left( d_\lambda(y) + \deg p^\lambda_\lambda(y,x) \right).$$

The following property of KLV polynomials is well-known, see e.g. [KL] for the case $\lambda = 0$.

**Lemma 1.** For any $x,y \in X^\lambda$ we have $p^\lambda_\lambda(x,y) = 0$ unless $x \succeq y$ and

$$\deg p^\lambda_\lambda(x,y) \leq 1(x) - 1(y).$$

**Proof.** We have to prove that $\text{Ext}^j_{\mathcal{O}^\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) = 0$ unless $x \succeq y$ and $j \leq 1(x) - 1(y)$. We prove the claim by induction on $j$. For $j = 0$, the statement is obvious. For $j > 0$, assume the claim is true for $j - 1$ and consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \to K \to P(x \cdot \lambda) \to \Delta(x \cdot \lambda) \to 0.$$

Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}^\lambda}(-, L(y \cdot \lambda))$ yields a long exact sequence containing

$$0 \to \text{Ext}^{j-1}_{\mathcal{O}^\lambda}(K, L(y \cdot \lambda)) \to \text{Ext}^j_{\mathcal{O}^\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \to 0.$$

As $K$ has a filtration where all subquotients are of the form $\Delta(z \cdot \lambda)$, where $z \in X^\lambda$ and $z < x$, the induction step implies that there must be a $z \in X^\lambda$ such that

$$x > z \succeq y \quad \text{and} \quad j - 1 \leq 1(z) - 1(y),$$

in order for the extension group to be non-zero. This yields the claim for $j$ as well, concluding the proof. \qed
2.5. Koszul and Koszul-Ringel duality for category $\mathcal{O}$.

The Koszul dual algebra of $A^\mu_\lambda$ has been determined in [Ba], see also [So1] [BGS]. The Ringel dual algebra of $A^\mu_\lambda$ has been determined in [CM4], see also [S22] [MS2]. The results are summarised as

$$E(A^\mu_\lambda) \cong A^\mu_\lambda \cong \hat{A}_\lambda$$

and

$$R(A^\mu_\lambda) \cong A^\mu_\lambda \cong \hat{A}_\lambda.$$

Hence the algebra $A^\mu_\lambda$ is Ringel self-dual if $\mu = 0$ or $\lambda = 0$ and Koszul self-dual if $\mu = 0 = \lambda$.

It is sometimes more convenient to work with the composition of the usual Koszul duality functor with the duality $d$ to obtain a contravariant equivalence of triangulated categories $\mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda := dK^\mu_\lambda$,

$$\mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda : \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{O}_\mu^\mu) \to \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{O}_\mu^\mu)$$

where we silently assumed composition with a functor corresponding to the isomorphism $E(A^\mu_\lambda) \cong A^\mu_\lambda$. We also use the Koszul-Ringel duality functor in the convention of [CM4 Section 9.3], see also [Ma2] [MOS] [Ri], which yields a contravariant equivalence of triangulated categories

$$\Phi^\mu_\lambda : \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{O}_\mu^\mu) \to \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{O}_\mu^\mu)$$

where $\Phi^\mu_\lambda(\mathcal{M}[i](j)) = \mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda(\mathcal{M}[i](j))$.

The Koszul and Koszul-Ringel duality functors possess very useful properties with respect to the structural modules.

**Lemma 2.** For any $x \in X^\mu_\lambda$, we have

$$\mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda(L(x \cdot \lambda)^* ) \cong P^\lambda(x^{-1}w_0 \cdot \hat{\mu})^*$$

$$\mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda(\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)^* ) \cong \Delta^\lambda(x^{-1}w_0 \cdot \hat{\mu})^*$$

$$\mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda(P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)^* ) \cong L(x^{-1}w_0 \cdot \hat{\mu})^*$$

$$\Phi^\mu_\lambda(L(x \cdot \lambda)^* ) \cong T^\lambda(x^{-1}w_0 \cdot \mu)^*$$

$$\Phi^\mu_\lambda(\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)^* ) \cong \Delta^\lambda(x^{-1}w_0 \cdot \mu)^*$$

$$\Phi^\mu_\lambda(P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)^* ) \cong L(x^{-1}w_0 \cdot \mu)^*$$

**Proof.** The properties for $\mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda$ are proved in [BGS Proposition 3.11.1], the properties for $\Phi^\mu_\lambda$ are proved in [CM4 Corollary 9.10].

Note that, whereas $\Phi^\mu_\lambda \circ \Phi^\mu_\lambda$ is isomorphic to the identity on $\mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{O}_\mu^\mu)$, the composition $\Phi^\mu_\lambda \circ \Phi^\mu_\lambda$ corresponds to an extension of the equivalence $\mathcal{O}_\mu^\mu \to \mathcal{O}_\mu^\mu$ to the derived category.

The following is proved in [CM4 Proposition 5.8], see also [Ry] [MOS]:

$$i^\lambda \circ \mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda \cong \mathcal{K}^\nu \circ \theta^\mu_{\lambda\mu}$$

and

$$\mathcal{L} Z^\lambda \circ \mathcal{K}^\mu_\lambda \cong \mathcal{K}^\nu \circ \theta^\mu_{\lambda\mu}(1(w_0^0)).$$


We use the left, right and two-sided Kazhdan-Lusztig (KL) preorders on the Weyl group, see [KL], and denote them by $\leq_L$, $\leq_R$ and $\leq_J$ respectively. We use the convention that $e$ is the smallest element. We write $x \sim_L y$ when $x \leq_L y$ and $y \leq_L x$, for $x, y \in W$, and similarly for $\sim_R$ and $\sim_J$. This gives an equivalence relation and the equivalence classes are called the left (respectively right) cells. For these we introduce the notation

$$L(x) = \{ y \in W \mid y \sim_L x \}$$

and

$$R(x) = \{ y \in W \mid y \sim_R x \}.$$
These orders may be used to give an alternative definition of $X^\mu_\lambda$:

$$X^\mu_\lambda = \{ x \in W \mid x \leq_R w_0^\mu w_0 \} \quad \text{and} \quad X_\lambda = \{ x \in W \mid w_0^\lambda \leq_L x \},$$

see e.g. [Ge, Lemma 2.8]. Using equation (13) and the bijection $y \mapsto w_0^\mu y w_0$ on $X^\mu$, allows to reformulate this as

(14)

$$X^\mu = \{ x \in W \mid w_0^\mu \leq_R w_0^\mu x \}.$$  

With our normalisation, Lusztig’s $a$-function satisfies $a(x) \leq a(y)$ if $x \leq_L y$ or $x \leq_R y$. We will sometimes write $a(A)$, respectively $a(L)$, to denote the value $a(x)$, for $x$ arbitrary in a right cell $R$, respectively left cell $L$.

An important role in (parabolic) category $O$ is played by projective-injective modules, see e.g. [Ir1, MS2, So1]. In the following lemma we summarise some properties of such modules.

**Lemma 3** (R. Irving). Consider $O^\mu_\lambda$ for some $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$. For any $x \in X^\mu_\lambda$, the following properties are equivalent:

(a) $P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ is injective.
(b) $P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \cong dP^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \cong I^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$.
(c) $P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ is a tilting module.
(d) $L(x \cdot \lambda)$ appears in the socle of $\Delta^\mu(y \cdot \lambda)$ for some $y \in X^\mu_\lambda$.
(e) $x \in R(w_0^\mu w_0)$.
(f) $glP^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = 2a(w_0^\mu w_0) - 2a(w_0^\mu)$.

Furthermore, the graded length of any indecomposable projective module which is not injective is strictly smaller than $2a(w_0^\mu w_0) - 2a(w_0^\mu)$.

**Proof.** The equivalence of claims (b), (d) and (f) is the main result of [Ir1].

Now we prove the equivalence of claims (a), (b) and (c). As every tilting module in $O^\mu_\lambda$ is self-dual, claim (c) implies claim (b). It is trivial that claim (b) implies claim (a). If claim (a) is true, then $P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ has both a standard and costandard filtration, implying claim (c).

The equivalence of claim (b) and claim (f) follows from [Ir2].

That all non-injective projective modules have strictly lower graded length follows from [Ir2].

**2.7. Guichardet categories.** Consider an abelian category $A$ of finite global dimension and let $S_A$ denote the class of simple objects in $A$. An *initial segment* in $A$ is the Serre subcategory $T$ of $A$ generated by a subset $S_T \subseteq S_A$, for which the following condition is satisfied: for any $L, L' \in S_A$ such that $pd_A L' = pd_A L - 1$, $L \in S_T$ and $\text{Ext}^1_A(L, L') \neq 0$, we have $L' \in S_T$. An initial segment is *saturated* if, for all $L, L' \in S_A$ with $pd_A L = pd_A L'$, we have $L \in S_T$ if and only if $L' \in S_T$.

These constructions have been used in an attempt to obtain extension fullness properties inspired by the result in [CPS1, Theorem 3.9(i)]. For definition of an extension full subcategory we refer to [CM2] or to [He] where this concept is referred to as *entirely extension closed* subcategories.

The following two distinct definitions both correspond to what is called a Guichardet category in, respectively, [Fa1] and [Ga1], we modify the terminology to make this
distinction. We call an abelian category $\mathcal{A}$ of finite global dimension a *weakly Guichardet category* if every saturated initial segment $I$ is extension full in $\mathcal{A}$. If all initial segments are extension full, $\mathcal{A}$ is called a *strongly Guichardet category*.

Some small (counter)examples of strongly Guichardet categories are given in [CM2, Section 2.4].

### 3. Projective dimension and graded length in the derived category

In order to make full use of the Koszul duality functor further in the paper, we need to generalise the concepts of graded length and projective dimension of an object of an abelian category to objects in the derived category. That is the aim of this section.

**Definition 4.** For an abelian category $\mathcal{C}$ and $N^\bullet \in \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C})$, set

$$\delta(N^\bullet) := \{ i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \text{there is } M \in \mathcal{C} \text{ for which } \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C})}(N^\bullet, M^\bullet[i]) \neq 0 \}.$$  

The projective dimension of $N^\bullet$ is defined as

$$\text{pd}N^\bullet = \text{pd}_\mathcal{C}N^\bullet := \max \delta(N^\bullet) - \min \delta(N^\bullet) \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{ \infty \}.$$  

For a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded algebra $B$, consider $\mathcal{C}_B = B\text{-gmod}$ and let $P_B := _B B$, the canonical projective generator.

**Definition 5.** For $N^\bullet \in \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C}_B)$, set

$$\sigma(N^\bullet) := \{ i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{hom}_{\mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C}_B)}(P^\bullet_B[-i + j][j], N^\bullet) \neq 0 \}.$$  

The graded length of $N^\bullet \in \mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C}_B)$ is defined to be

$$\text{gl}N^\bullet := \max \sigma(N^\bullet) - \min \sigma(N^\bullet) \in \mathbb{N}.$$  

We start with demonstrating that these notions correspond to the usual notions when restricted to the abelian category.

**Proposition 6.**

(i) For an abelian category $\mathcal{C}$ and $N \in \mathcal{C}$, we have $\text{pd}N^\bullet = \text{pd}_\mathcal{C}N$.

(ii) For a graded algebra $B$ and $N \in B\text{-gmod}$, we have $\text{gl}N^\bullet = \text{gl}N$.

(iii) For a graded algebra $B$, $N^\bullet \in \mathcal{D}^b(B\text{-gmod})$ and $I_B$ an injective cogenerator with the socle contained in degree zero, set

$$\sigma'(N^\bullet) := \{ i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{hom}_{\mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C}_B)}(N^\bullet, I_B^\bullet[i - j][-j]) \neq 0 \}.$$  

Then we have

$$\text{gl}N^\bullet = \max \{ \sigma'(N^\bullet) \} - \min \{ \sigma'(N^\bullet) \}.$$  

**Proof.** Claim (i) follows immediately from

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C})}(N^\bullet, M^\bullet[i]) = \text{Ext}^i_\mathcal{C}(N, M),$$  

which holds for Yoneda extensions by [Ve, Section III.1 and III.3].

Similarly, claim (iii) follows from

$$\text{hom}_{\mathcal{D}^b(\mathcal{C}_B)}(P^\bullet[-i + j][j], N^\bullet) = \text{ext}^{i-j}_{\mathcal{C}_B}(P(j), N) = \text{hom}_{\mathcal{C}_B}(P(i), N).$$
To prove claim (ii), it suffices to prove
\[ \hom_{D^b(C_A)}(I'[a](b), N^\bullet) = \hom_{D^b(C_A)}(N^\bullet, I'[a](b)), \]
for an arbitrary complex \( N^\bullet \), \( a, b \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( P \) the projective cover of a simple module such that \( I \) is the injective hull of that simple module. The equation is clearly true in case \( N^\bullet = N^\bullet[k] \) for some module \( N \) and \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \). As modules generate the derived category as a triangulated category, the general claim follows by standard arguments considering distinguished triangles and corresponding long exact sequences.

\[ \square \]

**Proposition 7.** Consider a Koszul algebra \( B \) such that \( B' \) is finite dimensional. Let \( K_B \) be the corresponding Koszul duality functor. For any \( N^\bullet \in D^b(B-gmod) \), we have
\[ \text{gl} K_B(N^\bullet) = \text{pd} N^\bullet \quad \text{and} \quad \text{pd} K_B(N^\bullet) = \text{gl} N^\bullet. \]

**Proof.** As all finitely generated \( B \)- and \( B' \)-modules have finite length, it suffices to consider simple modules \( M \) in Definition 4 of the projective dimension.

For a simple module \( L \) and \( I^\bullet = K_B(L^\bullet) \), we find
\[ \hom_{D^b(B-gmod)}(N^\bullet, L^\bullet[i](-j)) = \hom_{D^b(B-gmod)}(K_B(N^\bullet), I^\bullet[i](-j)), \]
by [BGS Theorem 2.12.6]. The result then follows from Proposition 6(iii). \( \square \)

## 4. Projective dimensions in parabolic category \( \mathcal{O} \)

### 4.1. The parabolic dimension shift

The principal result in this section implies that the problem of determining the projective dimension of a module in \( \mathcal{O}^\mu \) is equivalent to determining its projective dimension as an object in category \( \mathcal{O} \).

**Theorem 8.**

(i) For \( \lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}} \) and any \( M \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu \), we have
\[ \text{pd} \mathcal{O}_\lambda M = \text{pd} \mathcal{O} M - 21(w_0^\mu). \]

(ii) For any \( M \in \mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu \) with \( p = \text{pd} \mathcal{O}_\lambda M \) and \( x \in X_\lambda \), we have
\[ \text{Ext}^{p+21(w_0^\mu)}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(M, L(x \cdot \lambda)) = \begin{cases} \text{Ext}^{p}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(M, L(x \cdot \lambda)), & \text{if } x \in X_\lambda^\mu; \\ 0, & \text{if } x \not\in X_\lambda^\mu. \end{cases} \]

The first result is, in fact, a special case of a more general result.

**Theorem 9.** Consider \( \lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}} \).

(i) For any \( N^\bullet \in D^b(\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu) \), we have
\[ \text{gl} \theta_{\lambda}^{\text{out}}(N^\bullet) = \text{gl} N^\bullet + 21(w_0^\mu). \]

(ii) For any \( N^\bullet \in D^b(\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu) \), we have
\[ \text{pd} \mathcal{O}_\lambda \iota^\mu(N^\bullet) = \text{pd} \mathcal{O}_\lambda N^\bullet + 21(w_0^\mu). \]

Before proving these, we note the following consequences.

**Corollary 10.** For \( M \) in \( \mathcal{O}_\lambda \), we have
\[ \text{gl} \theta_{\lambda}^{\text{con}} \theta_{\lambda}^{\text{out}} M = \text{gl} \theta_{\lambda}^{\text{out}} M = \text{gl} M + 21(w_0^\lambda). \]
Proof. The equality gl\(\theta^\mu P^\mu(x)(0)\) follows immediately from [CMH] Proposition 5.1. The equality gl\(\theta^\mu M = gl M + 21(w_0^\mu)\) is a special case of Theorem [5] by Proposition [6]. □

Corollary 11. Consider \(\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+\). Let

\[
0 \to N \to Q \to M \to 0
\]

be a short exact sequence in \(O_{\lambda}\). If \(Q\) is projective in \(O^\mu\), then

\[
\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} M = \text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} N + 1.
\]

Proof. Since \(O^\mu_{\lambda}\) is a Serre subcategory of \(O_{\lambda}\), the modules \(M\) and \(N\) belong to \(O^\mu_{\lambda}\). Then we immediately have \(\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} M = \text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} N + 1\). The assertion of the corollary now follows directly from Theorem [5]. □

Now we start the proofs of Theorems [5] and [6].

Lemma 12.

(i) For any \(x \in X^\mu_{\lambda}\), we have

\[
\theta^\mu P^\mu(x)(0) = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)^{c_j}(j - 1(w_0^\mu)),
\]

for \(c_j \in \mathbb{N}\) satisfying \(c_0 = c_{21(w_0^\mu)} = 1\) and \(c_j = 0\) if \(j > 21(w_0^\mu)\).

(ii) For any \(x \in X^\mu_{\lambda}\), the module \(\theta^\mu P^\mu(x)(0)\) is the direct sum of shifted projective objects in \(O^\mu_{\lambda}\), where all occurring degrees are strictly between \(-1(w_0^\mu)\) and \(1(w_0^\mu)\).

Proof. We restrict to \(\mu = 0\). The proof for the general case does not change substantially or, alternatively, the result follows from the non-parabolic case by applying the Zuckerman functor. Claim [6] follows from equation [5] and [CMH] Proposition 5.1.

To see in which degrees the indecomposable projective summands of \(\theta^\mu P(x)\) appear, for \(x \notin X_{\lambda}\), we consider

\[
\text{hom}_{O_{\lambda}}(\theta^\mu P(x), L(y \cdot \lambda)(j) = \text{hom}_{O_{\lambda}}(P(x), \theta^\mu_{w_0^\mu} L(y)(j - 1(w_0^\mu))),
\]

for any \(y \in X_{\lambda}\). As the extremal degrees \(1(w_0^\mu)\) and \(-1(w_0^\mu)\) in \(\theta^\mu_{w_0^\mu} L(y)\) must correspond to the simple top and socle, which is given by \(L(y)\), claim [6] follows. □

Corollary 13.

(i) For \(M \in \mathcal{D}^{\bullet}O_{\lambda}\), the simple modules in the extremal degrees of \(\theta^\mu M\) are all of the form \(L(y)\) with \(y \in X_{\lambda}\).

(ii) More generally, for \(N^\bullet \in \mathcal{D}_c^{\bullet}O^\mu_{\lambda}\), the extremal values in the set \(\sigma(\theta^\mu N^\bullet)\) in Definition [5] only come from indecomposable projective objects of the form \(P^\mu(y)\) with \(y \in X^\mu_{\lambda}\).

Proof. For any \(j \in \mathbb{Z}\) and \(z \in W\), equation [5] implies that we have

\[
\text{hom}_{O_{\lambda}}(P(z)(j), \theta^\nu M) \cong \text{hom}_{O_{\lambda}}(\theta^\nu P(z)(j - 1(w_0^\nu)), M).
\]

Comparing Lemma [12] and [6], then implies that the extremal values of \(j\) which give non-zero morphism spaces will be reached only for \(z \in X_{\lambda}\). The same argument can be used in the derived category. □
Proof of Theorem 8. As the Koszul duality functor (11) intertwines the parabolic inclusion functor and translation out of the wall, see equation (12), claims (i) and (ii) are equivalent by Proposition 7. We focus on proving claim (i). Take $N^*$ to be the Serre subcategory of $D^b(C_0')$. By Corollary 13(ii), it suffices to use projective objects $P^\mu(x)$ with $x \in X^\mu_\lambda$ in Definition 5. Equation (9) and Lemma 12(i) then imply

$$\dim \hom_{D^b(C_0')}(P^\mu(x)^*[−i+j]|j), \theta^\text{out}_i(N^*)$$

$$= \sum_{c_k} \dim \hom_{D^b(C_0')}(P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)^*[−(i+k)+j'], N^*),$$

with $j' = j + k$. This implies indeed that $\text{gl}^{\text{out}}N^* = \text{gl}N^* + 21(w^\mu_0)$.

Proof of Theorem 8. Claim (i) is a special case of Theorem 9, by Proposition 6(ii). Claim (ii) is the Koszul dual of Corollary 13.

An alternative proof for the first part of Theorem 8 can be given analogously to the proof of [CM2, Theorem 21(i)], using the following lemma as a replacement of [CM2, Lemma 23]. We prove this lemma without using the results in Section 3.

Lemma 14. All projective modules $Q$ in integral $O^\mu$ satisfy $\text{pd}_Q Q = 21(w^\mu_0)$. Furthermore, we have

$$\dim \text{Ext}^2_{O^\mu}(P^\mu(x), L(\eta)) = \delta_{\kappa, \eta},$$

for arbitrary $\kappa, \eta \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}}$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}}$ and recall that $P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)/(0) \cong Z^\mu P(x \cdot \lambda)/(0)$, for all $x \in X^\mu_\lambda$. Equations (10) and (12) and Lemma 2 yield

$$\text{Ext}^i_{O^\mu}(P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda), L(\cdot \cdot \lambda)) = \oplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \hom_{D^b(O^\mu)}(i^\mu Z^\mu P(x \cdot \lambda)^*, L(\cdot \cdot \lambda)^*[i])$$

$$= \oplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \hom_{D^b(O^\mu)}\left(P^\lambda(y^{-1}w_0)^*[i−j]|j), \theta^\text{out}_{w_0}(L(x^{-1}w_0)^*[1(w^\mu_0)])\right)$$

$$= \hom_{O^\mu}\left(P^\lambda(y^{-1}w_0)^*[j), \theta^\text{out}_{w_0}(L(x^{-1}w_0)^*[1(w^\mu_0)])\right).$$

The results hence follow from [CM4, Lemma 5.2(ii)].

Remark 15. The proof of Lemma 14 also shows that $P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ has a linear projective resolution in $\hat{O}^\mu$, as a generalisation of [Ma1, Proposition 41].

4.2. The category $O^R$. The constant shift in projective dimension between parabolic and original category $O$ in Theorem 8 will turn out to be useful for the calculations of projective dimensions in original category $O$, besides their obvious interest in the corresponding questions in $O^\mu$. In particular, a seemingly logical idea to generalise the statement in Proposition 10 to arbitrary elements (and hence right cells) outside type $A$, is to investigate whether the principle of Theorem 8 extends to other full Serre subcategories of $O_0$ generalising $O_0'$, introduced in [MS1, Section 3.3]. Unfortunately the answer is negative, as we prove in this section. One of the reasons for that, is the fact that the global dimension of these categories can be infinite.

For $R$ a right cell in $W$, we set

$$\hat{R} := \{w \in W \mid w \leq_R R\},$$
so, in particular, $R(w_0^\mu w_0) = X^\mu$, for any $\mu \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}}$. For any right cell $R$, let $O^R_0$ denote the Serre subcategory of $O_0$ generated by the modules $L(x)$ with $x \in R$. By the above, we have, as a special case, $O^R_0 = O^R_0(w_0^\mu w_0)$.  

**Proposition 16.** In general, the category $O^R_0$ can have infinite global dimension. In particular, simple modules can have infinite projective dimension.

**Proof.** We prove that this is the case for the category $O^R_0$ in [MS1, Example 5.3]. This example considers the case $g = \mathfrak{s}(4)$ and $R = R(s_2)$. We denote $s = s_1$, $t = s_2$ and $r = s_3$. Then we have $R(t) = \{e, t, ts, tr\}$ and the graded filtrations of projective modules in $O^R_0$ look as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>w</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>ts</th>
<th>tr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P^R(w)$</td>
<td>$e$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$ts$</td>
<td>$tr$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$ts$</td>
<td>$e$</td>
<td>$tr$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$ts$</td>
<td>$ts$</td>
<td>$tr$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this description of projective modules in $O^R_0$, we find that the projective resolution of the injective envelope of $L(e)$ in $O^R_0$ is given by

$$0 \to P^R(e) \oplus P^R(t) \to P^R(ts) \oplus P^R(tr) \to P^R(t) \to I^R(e) \to 0.$$  

The other three indecomposable injective modules are, clearly, self-dual and projective. Hence all injective modules have finite global dimension and the finitistic dimension of the category is therefore equal to the maximum of those projective dimensions, see e.g. the proof of [Ma4] Theorem 3. Hence we find

$\text{find } O^R_0 = 3$.

It thus suffices to prove that there exists a module with projective dimension strictly greater than 3. For this we consider the module $M$ of length two with top $L(s_2 s_1)$ and socle $L(s_2)$. For this module we, clearly, have

$$0 \to L(ts) \to P^R(ts) \to M \to 0.$$  

Therefore $\text{pd} M = \text{pd} L(ts) + 1$. Constructing the minimal projective resolution shows that the projective dimension of $L(ts)$ must be greater than two, so that of $M$ must be greater than 3 and therefore infinite. This means that also the projective dimension of $L(ts)$ must be infinite. \hfill $\square$

**Remark 17.** As the global dimension of $O^R_0$ might be infinite, the category $O^R_0$, in general, fails to admit any structure of a highest weight category due to [PS] Theorem 4.3. Moreover, the above calculation even shows that the finitistic dimension may be odd. This suggests that $O^R_0$, in general, is not equivalent to the module category of a properly stratified algebra due to [MO] Theorem 1.

5. Blocks and their global dimension

5.1. Indecomposability. The categories $O^\mu_0$ and $O^\lambda_\mu$ are indecomposable, where one is the Koszul dual of the other claim. However, in general, $O^\lambda_\mu$ may decompose, see [ES] or [BN] Section 8.2.1. At the same time, Brundan proved in [Br1] Section 1 that all blocks $O^\lambda_\mu$ remain indecomposable for $g = \mathfrak{s}(n)$ (whenever they are non-zero). We give an independent proof of this statement.

**Proposition 18** (J. Brundan). For $g = \mathfrak{s}(n)$ and any $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}}$, the subcategory $O^\lambda_\mu$ is an indecomposable block of $O^\mu$, whenever it is non-zero.
**HOMOLOGICAL PROPERTIES OF O. IV**

**Proof.** Assume that the category $O^\mu_\lambda$ decomposes into two subcategories. The restriction of the translation functor $\theta^\alpha_\lambda$ to $O^\mu$ decomposes accordingly. That both parts are not trivial follows from equation (4). It then follows also that $\theta_{w_0}^{\mu_\lambda} = \theta^{\mu_\lambda} \theta^\mu_0$ decomposes, as $\theta^{\mu_\lambda}$ is faithful. However, $\theta_{w_0}^{\mu_\lambda}$ is indecomposable by [KlMa, Theorem 1(i)]. We thus obtain a contradiction. □

Even though, strictly speaking, it is only justified for $g = \mathfrak{sl}(n)$, we will refer to the category $O^\mu_\lambda$ as a block.

**5.2. Homological dimension of blocks.**

**Theorem 19.** The global dimension of each integral non-zero block in parabolic category $O$ is given by

$$\text{gld } O^\mu_\lambda = 2a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) - 2a(w_\mu^0).$$

**Proof.** In case $\mu = 0$, this is precisely [CM2, Theorem 25(ii)]. The combination of that result and Theorem 8 then implies the inequality $\text{gld } O^\mu_\lambda \leq 2a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) - 2a(w_\mu^0).$

To prove the statement, it hence suffices to prove that there is a simple module in $O^\mu_\lambda$ with projective dimension equal to $2a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) - 2a(w_\mu^0)$. By Proposition and Lemma 2, this is equivalent to the claim that there is a projective module in $O_{\hat{\mu}}^\lambda$ with graded length $2a(w_0 w_\lambda^0) - 2a(w_\mu^0)$. The latter is guaranteed by the equivalence of Lemma 3(d) and (f). □

Theorem 19 implies a nice criterion for the semisimplicity of the category $O^\mu_\lambda$. Other criteria for special cases have been obtained in [BN].

**Corollary 20.** A non-zero block $O^\mu_\lambda$ is semisimple if and only if $a(w_\mu^0) = a(w_0 w_\lambda^0)$.

**Remark 21.** From the above results it follows that the inequality $a(w_\mu^0) > a(w_0 w_\lambda^0)$ implies that the block $O^\mu_\lambda$ is zero. However, there are zero blocks $O^\mu_\lambda$ for which $a(w_\mu^0) \leq a(w_0 w_\lambda^0)$. For example, in the case $g = \mathfrak{sl}(4)$, $w_\lambda^0 = s_1$ and $w_\mu^0 = s_1 s_2 s_1$, we have $a(w_\mu^0) = 3 = a(w_0 w_\lambda^0)$, while $O^\mu_\lambda = 0$.

**6. Connections between the projective dimensions and graded lengths**

**6.1. Preliminaries.** In this section we establish some connections between the projective dimensions and the graded lengths of the structural modules in blocks of the parabolic version of category $O$. In Subsection 6.2 this is achieved by applying Koszul and Koszul-Ringel duality. In Subsection 6.3, by making use of the graded lifts of translation functors and in Subsection 6.4, by applying the derived Zuckerman functor.

We start with proving an analogue of Lemma 3 for tilting modules.

**Lemma 22.**

(i) For $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$ and $x \in X^\mu_\lambda$, the following properties are equivalent:

(a) $T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ is projective.

(b) $w_0^\mu x w_0^\lambda \in R(w_0^\mu)$.

(c) $\text{gl } T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = 2a(w_0 w_\lambda) - 2a(w_\mu^0)$. 


(ii) The graded length of any indecomposable tilting module which is not projective is strictly smaller than $2a(w_0^\mu w_0) - 2a(w_0^\lambda)$.

Proof. The implication $\text{(ib)} \Rightarrow \text{(ic)}$ follows from Lemma 3.

The combination of [Ma3, Proposition 1] and equation (7) imply that

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{gl} T^\mu(x) &= 2a(w_0^\mu w_0), & \text{if } w_0^\mu x \in R(w_0^\mu); \\
\text{gl} T^\mu(x) &= 2a(w_0^\mu w_0), & \text{otherwise}.
\end{align*}
$$

Using equation (5) and Corollary 10 we then obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\text{gl} T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) &= 2a(w_0^\mu w_0) - 2a(w_0^\lambda), & \text{if } w_0^\lambda x w_0^\lambda \in R(w_0^\mu); \\
\text{gl} T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) &= 2a(w_0^\mu w_0) - 2a(w_0^\lambda), & \text{otherwise}.
\end{align*}
$$

This implies claim (ii) and shows that $\text{(ic)}$ follows from Lemma 3(e) and equation (13).

Next we prove the implications $\text{(ib)} \Rightarrow \text{(ia)}$ for the case $\lambda = 0$. As by the above we already have $\text{(ib)} \Leftarrow \text{(ia)}$, it suffices to prove that the number of non-isomorphic indecomposable projective tilting modules in $O_{\mu}$ is equal to the cardinality of the set $w_0^\mu R(w_0^\mu) \cap X^\mu$. By equation (14), the latter set is just $R(w_0^\mu)$. The claim thus follows from Lemma 3(e) and equation (13).

Finally we prove $\text{(ic)} \Rightarrow \text{(ia)}$ for general $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$, relying on the result for $\lambda = 0$. If $\text{gl} T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = 2a(w_0^\mu w_0) - 2a(w_0^\lambda)$, then equation (8) and Corollary 10 in combination with the case $\lambda = 0$ imply that $T^\mu(x w_0^\lambda) = \text{projective in } O_{\mu}^\mu$. This implies that $\theta_{\lambda}^\mu T^\mu(x w_0^\lambda) \cong T^\mu(x) \otimes |\lambda| \text{ is projective in } O_{\lambda}^\mu$. □

6.2. Applying duality functors.

Proposition 23. For $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$ and $x \in X^\lambda_\text{int}$, we have the following links between graded lengths and projective dimensions:

(i) $\text{pd}_{O_{\mu}} L(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{gl} P^\lambda(x^{-1} w_0^\lambda \cdot \hat{\mu})$.

(ii) $\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{gl} \Delta^\lambda(x^{-1} w_0 \cdot \hat{\mu})$.

(iii) $\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} L(x \cdot \lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \text{gl} T^\lambda(w_0^\lambda x w_0^\lambda \cdot \mu) + a(w_0^\lambda w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu)$.

(iv) $\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} \nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{gl} \Delta^\lambda(w_0^\lambda x w_0^\mu \cdot \mu) + a(w_0^\lambda w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu)$.

Before proving this we note the following immediate corollary.

Corollary 24. For all $x \in X^\lambda_\text{int}$, we have

(i) $\text{gl} P^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \frac{1}{2} \text{gl} T^\mu(w_0^\mu x w_0^\lambda \cdot \hat{\lambda}) + a(w_0^\lambda w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu)$,

(ii) $\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} \nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} \Delta^\mu(x w_0^\mu \cdot \lambda) + a(w_0^\lambda w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu)$.

We also have the following bounds for projective dimensions.

Proposition 25. Consider arbitrary $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$.

(i) For arbitrary simple and standard modules $L$ and $\Delta$ in $O_{\lambda}^\mu$, we have

$$
\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} \Delta \leq a(w_0^\lambda w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu) \leq \text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} L.
$$

(ii) The equality $\text{pd}_{O_{\lambda}} L = a(w_0^\lambda w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu)$ holds if and only if the simple module $L$ is a standard module.
(iii) The equality $pd_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = a(w_0^x w_0^\lambda) - a(w_0^\mu)$, for $x \in X_\lambda^\mu$, holds if and only if $x \in w_0^\mu L(w_0^x w_0^\lambda) w_0^\lambda$.

Now we prove all these statements.

Proof of Proposition 24. Claims (i) and (iii) follow immediately from the combination of Lemma 2 and Proposition 7.

As $A_\mu^\lambda$ is Koszul, for any $x \in X_\lambda^\mu$ and any simple module $L$ in $\mathcal{O}_\mu^\lambda$, we have:

$$\text{Ext}^i_{\mathcal{O}_\mu^\lambda}(L(x \cdot \lambda), L) \cong \text{ext}^i_{\mathcal{O}_\mu^\lambda}(L(x \cdot \lambda), L(j)).$$

Going to the derived category and using equation (11) and Lemma 2 yields

$$\hom_{D^b(C_{\lambda}^\mu)}(L(x \cdot \lambda)^\bullet, L^\bullet[j](j)) = \hom_{D^b(C_{\mu}^\lambda)}(T^\bullet(j), T^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu)^\bullet),$$

for some tilting module $T$ in $\mathcal{O}_\mu^\lambda$. Set $p(x)$ to equal the extremal non-zero degree of $T^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu)$. As tilting modules are self-dual with respect to $d$, we have $glT^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu) = 2p(x)$. Lemma 22 then implies that

$$pd_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu} L(x \cdot \lambda) \leq p(x) + a(w_0^x w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu).$$

Now consider a simple subquotient $L'$ in extremal degree of $T^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu)$. This must be in the socle, so, in particular, in the socle of a standard module in a standard filtration of $T^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu)$. Lemma 3 then implies that the indecomposable projective cover of $L'$ is a tilting module with graded length given by $2a(w_0^x w_0^\mu) - 2a(w_0^\mu)$. We can set $T$ equal to this tilting module showing that the above inequality is, in fact, an equality. This proves claim (ii).

Now we consider a linear complex $T^\bullet_{\mu}$ of tilting modules for $\nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ and a linear complex $T^\bullet_{\lambda}$ of tilting modules for some arbitrary simple module $L$. Both exist, see e.g. [CMH Corollary 9.10]. Then we have

$$\text{Ext}^i_{\mathcal{O}_\mu^\lambda}(\nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda), L) \cong \text{Hom}_{D^b(C_{\lambda}^\mu)}(T^\bullet_{\mu}, T^\bullet_{\lambda}[j]).$$

The homomorphisms between the two complexes in the right-hand side can be computed in the homotopy category $K^b(\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu)$ by [HM Lemma III.2.1]. From [CMH Corollary 9.10 and Lemma 9.11], we therefore find that

$$pd_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu} \nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \leq glT^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu) + \frac{1}{2} glT^\mu,$$

where $T^\lambda$ is the characteristic tilting module in $\mathcal{O}_\mu^\lambda$. For the latter module, we have $glT^\mu \leq 2a(w_0^x w_0^\mu) - 2a(w_0^\mu)$ by Lemma 22. On the other hand, we can apply equation (11) to obtain

$$\text{Ext}^i_{\mathcal{O}_\mu^\lambda}(\nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda), L) \cong \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{hom}_{D^b(C_{\lambda}^\mu)}(T^\bullet[i - j](i), \Delta^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu)),$$

with $T$ the tilting module $\Phi^\mu_0(L)$. We claim that the summand for $i = j$ on the right-hand side of the above is non-zero for $j = gl\Delta^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu) + a(w_0^x w_0^\mu) - a(w_0^\mu)$, which proves claim (iv). Indeed, as in the proof of claim (iii), we can take a simple module in the socle of $\Delta^\lambda(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\mu \cdot \mu)$ and use its projective cover as $T$, by Lemma 3.

Lemma 26. For any $x \in X_\lambda^\mu$, the quantity

$$pd_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu} L(x \cdot \lambda) - a(w_0^x w_0^\mu) + a(w_0^\mu)$$

is given by the maximum, over $y \in X_\lambda^\mu$, of the values

$$pd_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu} \Delta^\mu(w_0^x y w_0^\lambda w_0^\mu \cdot \lambda) - \min\{j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \text{Ext}^j_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu}(\Delta^\mu(y \cdot \lambda), L(x \cdot \lambda)) \neq 0\}. $$
Proof. We freely use the standard properties of (graded) quasi-hereditary algebras
\[ \text{hom}_{O_k}(T^\lambda(x \cdot \mu), \nabla^\lambda(y \cdot \mu)(-j)) = (T^\lambda(x \cdot \mu) : \Delta^\lambda(y \cdot \mu)(-j)) \]
and
\[ \text{Ext}^k_{O_k}(T^\lambda(x \cdot \mu), \nabla^\lambda(y \cdot \mu)) = 0, \quad \text{for } k > 0. \]

By \cite[Lemma 2.4]{Ma2}, we have
\[ \frac{1}{2} \text{gl}(T^\lambda(x \cdot \mu)) = \max_{y \in X^\mu_\lambda} \left( \text{gl} \Delta^\lambda(y \cdot \mu) - \min_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \text{hom}_{O_k}(T^\lambda(x \cdot \mu), \nabla^\lambda(y \cdot \mu)(-j)) \neq 0 \right\} \right). \]

By the above vanishing of extensions, the homomorphism in the second line of can be calculated in the derived category. Then we apply equation (11) and Lemma 2 to obtain
\[ \text{hom}_{D^b(O_k)}(T^\lambda(x \cdot \mu)^*, \nabla^\lambda(y \cdot \mu)^*(-j)) \cong \text{hom}_{D^b(O_k)}(\Delta^\mu(w_0^x y^{-1} w_0^\lambda \cdot \lambda)^*, L(w_0^x x^{-1} w_0^\lambda \cdot \lambda)^*[j](j)). \]

Applying this and Proposition 23(ii) to equation (15) yields
\[ \text{pd}_{O_k} L(x \cdot \lambda) - a(w_0 w_0^\lambda) + a(w_0^\mu) = \max_{y \in X^\mu_\lambda} \left( \text{gl} \Delta^\lambda(y \cdot \mu) - \min_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \text{Ext}^j_{O_k}(\Delta^\mu(w_0^x y^{-1} w_0^\lambda \cdot \lambda), L(x \cdot \lambda)) \neq 0 \right\} \right), \]
where we also used the fact that \( O_k^\mu \) is standard Koszul.

Application of Proposition 23(iii) then concludes the proof. \qed

Lemma 27. Set \( S^\mu_\lambda := X^\mu_\lambda \cap w_0^\mu R(w_0^\mu) w_0^\lambda. \)

(i) Every simple module in \( O_k^\mu \) is a subquotient of the module
\[ \bigoplus_{x \in S^\mu_\lambda} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda). \]

(ii) For any \( x \in X^\mu_\lambda \), we have
\[ \begin{align*}
\text{gl} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) &= a(w_0^x w_0^\lambda) - a(w_0^\lambda), & \text{if } x \in S^\mu_\lambda; \\
\text{gl} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) &= a(w_0^x w_0^\lambda) - a(w_0^\lambda), & \text{otherwise.}
\end{align*} \]

Note that \( S_\lambda = \{ w_0^\lambda \} \) and \( S^\mu_0 = w_0^\mu R(w_0^\mu). \)

Proof. Consider an arbitrary simple object \( L \) in \( O_k^\mu \) and the standard module \( \Delta \) which has simple top \( L \). Take a smallest quotient \( \widetilde{\Delta} \) of \( \Delta \) which still contains a simple subquotient which has an injective module as projective cover. This quotient \( \widetilde{\Delta} \) exists by Lemma 3 and has simple socle which we denote by \( L' \). By construction, \( L' \) has, as injective envelope, a projective-injective module \( I' \). By Lemma 3, \( I' \) is a a tiling module. We denote by \( \Delta' \) the unique standard module which injects into \( I' \) such that the quotient has a standard flag.

Now we have two submodules \( \widetilde{\Delta} \) and \( \Delta' \) of \( I' \). We claim that \( \widetilde{\Delta} \) is a submodule of \( \Delta' \). Indeed, the module \( Q \) defined by the short exact sequence
\[ 0 \to \Delta' \to I' \to Q \to 0, \]
has a standard filtration. In particular, the socle of \( Q \) consists of simple modules whose projective cover is injective by Lemma 34(i). By construction, \( L' \) does not
appear in the socle of $(\Delta' + \Delta)/\Delta' \cong \widehat{\Delta}/(\Delta' \cap \widehat{\Delta})$. Since $L'$ was the only simple subquotient of $\Delta$ whose projective cover is injective, we get $\text{Hom}_O((\Delta' + \Delta)/\Delta', Q) = 0$. This means exactly that $\Delta \subset \Delta'$.

The inclusion $\Delta \subset \Delta'$ implies that $L$, being the top of $\Delta$, must be a subquotient of $\Delta'$. Now, by Lemma 22 and the construction of $I'$ and $\Delta'$, we have $\Delta' \cong \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ for some $x \in S_\lambda^\mu$. As $L$ was chosen arbitrarily, this concludes the proof of claim (i).

Next we prove claim (ii). Equation (15) implies $T$ equation (15) shows that, for $x$ for some $\lambda$ length. This completes the proof.

Remark 28. Let $\mu \in \Lambda_{+}^\text{int}$. Then projective-injective modules in $O_\lambda^\mu$ are indexed by elements in $R(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu)$. Each indecomposable projective-injective module $P^\mu(x)$ is also tilting and hence isomorphic to some $T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$. The set of $\psi^\mu(x)$ which appear in this way is exactly $w_0^\mu R(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu)w_0^\mu = S_\lambda^\mu$, cf. Lemma 27. However, it is not true, in general, that $\psi^\mu(x) = w_0^\mu x w_0^\mu$. For example, in case $g = s_3$ and $w_0^\mu = s_1$, we have $R((w_0^\mu w_0^\mu)w_0^\mu) = \{s_2, s_2 s_1\}$, $S_\lambda^\mu = \{s_2, e\}$ and $\psi^\mu(s_2) = e \neq s_1 \cdot s_2 \cdot s_1^2 s_2 s_1$. It would be interesting to find an explicit formula for the bijection $\psi^\mu : \mathbf{R}(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu) \rightarrow w_0^\mu R(w_0^\mu)$. Note that we have the following alternative description: or any $x \in \mathbf{R}(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu)$, $L(x)$ is the simple socle of $\Delta^\mu(\psi^\mu(x))$. In particular, $\psi^\mu(d_\mu) = e$, with $d_\mu$ the Duflo involution in $\mathbf{R}(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu)$.

Proof of Proposition 25. First we prove claim (i). The inequality for simple modules follows from Proposition 23(iv). The inequality for standard modules follows from Lemma 21(i).

The Koszul dual of claim (i) is, according to Lemma 2 and Proposition 7, the statement that the graded length of an indecomposable projective object in $O_\mu^\lambda$ is given by $\text{a}(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu) - \text{a}(w_0^\mu)$ if and only if it is a standard module. The combination of Lemma 27 and the BGG reciprocity in [H1, Theorem 9.8] implies that every projective module in $O_\mu^\lambda$ must contain a standard module with graded length $\text{a}(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu) - \text{a}(w_0^\mu)$ as a subquotient in its standard filtration. By positivity of the grading, the fact that the graded length of the projective module is exactly $\text{a}(w_0^\mu w_0^\mu) - \text{a}(w_0^\mu)$ hence implies that it is isomorphic to such a standard module. This proves claim (i).

Claim (ii) follows from Lemma 27(i).

The arguments in this subsection lead to the following observation.

Lemma 29. Take $M$ to be a simple, standard or costandard module in $O_\lambda^\mu$ and denote its projective dimension by $p = \text{pd}_O^\text{proj} M$. Then, for any $y \in X_\lambda^\mu$, we have $\text{Ext}^p_{O_\lambda^\mu}(M, L(y \cdot \lambda)) \neq 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad y \in L(w_0^\mu)$.

Proof. First, take $M$ to be a costandard module. By the proof of Proposition 23(iv), in order to have an extension with a simple module $L$ in the maximal possible degree, $L$ needs to be such that $\Phi_\lambda^\mu(L)$ is a projective tilting module. Lemmata 2 and 27 therefore show that $L = L(x \cdot \lambda)$ with $y^{-1} \in R(w_0^\mu)$. 

Now set $M = \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$. Assume $y \in X^\mu_\lambda$ is such that
\[
\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^2(\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \neq 0.
\]
Koszul duality, see e.g. [BGS Proposition 1.3.1], then implies that $L(y^{-1}w_0 \cdot \widehat{\mu})$ appears in the maximal degree of $\Delta^\lambda(x^{-1}w_0 \cdot \mu)$. Hence $L(y^{-1}w_0 \cdot \widehat{\mu})$ appears in the socle of a standard module in $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$. Lemma 3.4 and 5.4 thus imply that $y^{-1}w_0 \sim_R w_0^0 w_0$. The result hence follows from equation (13).

Finally, the claim for a simple module follows from the case of a standard module and [CPS2 Corollary 3.9].

In particular, this means that equation (7) can be simplified to
\[
\text{max}_{y \in L(w_0^0)} \deg p_\lambda(x, y).
\]

6.3. Applying translation functors.

**Proposition 30.** For any $x \in X^\mu_\lambda$, we have
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad \text{gl} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{gl} \Delta^\mu(xw_0^\lambda) - 1(w_0^\lambda); \\
(ii) & \quad \text{gl} T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{gl} T^\mu(xw_0^\lambda) - 21(w_0^\lambda); \\
(iii) & \quad \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} T^\mu(xw_0^\lambda); \\
(iv) & \quad \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} I^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} I^\mu(x).
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** Corollary 10 and [CM4 Theorem 5.5] imply
\[
\text{gl} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \max_{u \in W_\lambda} \{\text{gl} \Delta^\mu(xu) + l(u)\} - 21(w_0^\lambda).
\]
This proves $\text{gl} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) \leq \text{gl} \Delta^\mu(xw_0^\lambda) - 1(w_0^\lambda)$. On the other hand, [CM4 Theorem 5.4] yields
\[
\text{gl}_\lambda \Delta^\mu(xw_0^\lambda)(0) = \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)(0).
\]
By equation (4), this means that $L(x)$, the simple subquotient of lowest degree in $\Delta^\mu(xw_0^\lambda)$ which does not get canceled by $\text{id}_\lambda$, sits in degree $1(w_0^\lambda)$. This implies the inequality in the other direction and concludes the proof of claim (i).

Claim (ii) follows immediately from equation (3) and Corollary 11.

Equations (3) and (8), in combination with the identity $\text{id}_\lambda^{\text{in}} \text{id}_\lambda^{\text{out}} \cong \text{id}_{\text{in} \cup \text{out} \circ W_\lambda}$, show that translating out of and onto the wall exchange multiples of, on the one hand, $I^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ and $I^\mu(x)$ and, on the other hand, $T^\mu(x \cdot \lambda)$ and $T^\mu(xw_0^\lambda)$. As translation functors are exact and preserve the categories of projective modules, this implies claim (iii) and (iv).

**Corollary 31.**
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) & \quad \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} \Delta(w_0^\mu x \cdot \lambda) - 1(w_0^\mu); \\
(ii) & \quad \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^j(\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda), L) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{j-1}(w_0^\mu)(\Delta(w_0^\mu x \cdot \lambda), L).
\end{align*}
\]
Proof. Claim (i) follows from the combination of Proposition 23(iii) with Proposition 23(iii).

The isomorphism

$$\text{Ext}^j_{O\lambda}(\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda), L) \cong \text{Ext}^j_{O\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L).$$

follows from [CM4] Theorem 5.15 and the adjunction between the derived Zuckerman functor and the parabolic inclusion functor. Now, as $L$ is $s$-finite for any simple reflection $s \in W_\mu$, we can use the computation in the proof of [Ma1], Proposition 3(i), which can be applied to singular blocks by the results in [CM1], Section 5, to obtain

$$\text{Ext}^j_{O\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L) \cong \text{Ext}^{j+1(w_0)}_{O\lambda}(\Delta(w_0^\lambda x \cdot \lambda), L).$$

This proves claim (ii). □

Lemma 32. For $\lambda, \mu \in A^+_\text{int}$, we have:

(i) $\text{pd}_{O\lambda} \Delta(x \cdot \lambda) = 0$, for $x \in X_\lambda$, if and only if $x = w_0^\lambda$;

(ii) $\Delta^\mu(x) = L(x)$, for $x \in X^\mu$, if and only if $x = w_0^\mu w_0$;

(iii) $T^\mu(x) = L(x)$, for $x \in X^\mu$, if and only if $x = w_0^\mu w_0$;

(iv) $\text{pd}_{O\lambda} L(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{a}(w_0^\mu w_0)$, for $x \in X_\lambda$, if and only if $x = w_0$.

Proof. The Verma module $\Delta(w_0^\lambda \cdot \lambda)$ is projective. Now, assume that $\Delta(x \cdot \lambda)$ is projective for some $x \in X_\lambda$. Then $\theta\lambda^w \Delta(x \cdot \lambda)$ must be projective. As, for any projective module $P(y)$ in $O_0$, by the BGG reciprocity, we have

$$(P(y) : \Delta(e)) = [\Delta(e) : L(y)] \neq 0,$$

the module $\Delta(e)$ must appear as a subquotient of a standard filtration of the module $\theta\lambda^w \Delta(x \cdot \lambda)$. Claim (i) therefore follows from [CM4] Theorem 5.5.

Claim (ii) follows from claim (i) by Proposition 23(iii). Claim (iii) follows immediately from claim (i). Claim (iv) follows from claim (iii) by Proposition 23(iii). □

Lemma 33. For a simple reflection $s$ and $x \in X^\mu$ such that $xs > x$ and $xs \in X^\mu$, we have

$$\text{gl} \Delta^\mu(xs) \leq \text{gl} \Delta^\mu(x) \leq \text{gl} \Delta^\mu(xs) + 1.$$
The fact that \( Z(g) \) does not act diagonally on \( \theta_s L \), implies, for \( L \in \Delta^\mu(x)_d \), that there must be something in degree \( d-1 \) of \( \theta_s \Delta^\mu(x) \) which survives the projection onto \( \Delta^\mu(x) \). This gives \( gl(\Delta^\mu(x)) \geq d-1 \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 34.** For any \( x \in X^\mu \), we have
\[
\text{gl}(P^\mu(x)) = \frac{1}{2} \text{gl}(\theta_s L(d_\mu)) + a(w^\mu_0 w_0),
\]
where \( d_\mu \) is the Duflo involution in \( R(w^\mu_0 w_0) \).

**Proof.** We have \( P^\mu(x)(0) \cong \theta_s \Delta^\mu(e)(0) \). Furthermore, for \( y \in R(w^\mu_0 w_0) \), the only subquotient of \( \Delta^\mu(e) \) of the form \( L(y) \), by definition, \( L(d_\mu) \) appearing in degree \( a(w^\mu_0 w_0) \). By Lemma 3, the graded length of \( P^\mu(x) \) is given by the highest degree in which some \( L(y) \) with \( y \in R(w^\mu_0 w_0) \) appears. Now, \( \theta_s \) acting on an arbitrary simple module \( L(z) \) gives a module in which all appearing submodules \( L(w) \) satisfy \( w \leq_R z \). Hence the only simple subquotients in \( \theta_s \Delta^\mu(e) \) of the form \( L(y) \), where \( y \in R(w^\mu_0 w_0) \), must come from \( \theta_s L(d_\mu)(a(w^\mu_0 w_0)) \). As \( \theta_s L(d_\mu) \) is a self-dual module, the claim follows. \( \square \)

6.4. Applying Zuckerman functors.

**Proposition 35.** For any \( x \in X^\mu \), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) \quad & \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} I^\mu(x) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} I(x) - 21(w^\mu_0); \\
(ii) \quad & \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} T^\mu(x) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} T(w^\mu_0 x) - 1(w^\mu_0).
\end{align*}
\]

Before proving this proposition, we need two preparatory lemmata.

**Lemma 36.** For any \( x \in X^\mu \), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) \quad & \mathcal{L}Z^\mu(I(x)^\bullet) \cong I^\mu(e)^\bullet[21(w^\mu_0)]; \\
(ii) \quad & \mathcal{L}Z^\mu(T(w^\mu_0 x)^\bullet) \cong T^\mu(x)^\bullet[1(w^\mu_0)].
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** To prove claim (i), it suffices to consider the case \( x = e \), as \( I^\mu(x) = \theta_s I^\mu(e) \) and \( I(x) = \theta_s I(e) \), for any \( x \in X^\mu \), and Zuckerman functors commute with projective functors. From [EW] Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, we find that
\[
\mathcal{L}_k Z^\mu \nabla(e) \cong \begin{cases} 
\text{d} \mathcal{L}_{21(w^\mu_0)} - k Z^\mu \Delta(e), & \text{if } k \leq 21(w^\mu_0); \\
0, & \text{if } k > 21(w^\mu_0).
\end{cases}
\]

It is well-known that \( \mathcal{L}_j Z^\mu \Delta(e) \cong \delta_{j0} \Delta^\mu(e) \), see for instance [CM4] Theorem 5.15. The result hence follows by observing that \( I(e) = \nabla(e) \) and \( P^\mu = \nabla^\mu(e) \).

Equation (7) and [CM4] Theorem 5.15 imply that
\[
\mathcal{L}Z^\mu T(w^\mu_0 x)^\bullet \cong \theta_{w^\mu_0 w^\mu_0} \mathcal{L}(w^\mu_0 w_0)^\bullet[1(w^\mu_0)] \cong T^\mu(x)^\bullet[1(w^\mu_0)].
\]

This proves claim (ii). \( \square \)

For the next lemma we note that \( w^\mu_0 X^\mu = \{ x \in W \mid w^\mu_0 x \leq_R x \} \) is a collection of right cells, which follows from equation (1).

**Lemma 37.** For all \( x, y \in X^\mu \), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
(i) \quad & x \leq_R y \Rightarrow \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} I^\mu(x) \geq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} I^\mu(y); \\
(ii) \quad & w^\mu_0 x \leq_R w^\mu_0 y \Rightarrow \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} T^\mu(x) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_e} T^\mu(y).
\end{align*}
\]
Consequently, both the function \( x \mapsto \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0}^\mu I^\mu(x) \), where \( x \in X^\mu \), and the function \( y \mapsto \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0}^\mu T^\mu(w_0^\mu y) \), where \( y \in w_0^\mu X^\mu \), are constant on right cells.

Proof. Consider \( x, y \in W \) and \( M \in \mathcal{O}_0 \). We claim that \( x \leq_R y \) implies
\[ \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} \theta_z M \geq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} \theta_y M. \]
This is a standard consequence of the connection between the composition of projective functors and the right KL order, see e.g. [Ma1, Equation (1)]. This connection means the following: if \( x \leq_R y \), then there is some projective functor \( \theta \) on \( \mathcal{O}_0 \) such that \( \theta_y \) is a direct summand of \( \theta \circ \theta_x \). Consequently, \( \theta_y M \) is a direct summand of \( \theta \theta_x M \). As \( \theta \) is an exact functor preserving projectivity of modules, the bound on the projective dimensions follows.

The statements in the lemma are direct consequences of the above paragraph, by equations (3) and (7). \( \square \)

**Proof of Proposition 33.** For \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( M \in \mathcal{O}_0^\mu \), we consider the extension group
\[ \text{Ext}_j^\mu(\mathcal{O}_0, I^\mu(x), M) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{O}_0^\mu)}(I^\mu(x)^{\bullet}, M^{\bullet}[j]). \]
By Lemma 36(ii) and adjunction, the latter space can be computed as follows:
\[ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{O}_0^\mu)}(LZ^\mu I(x)^{\bullet}, M^{\bullet}[j + 21(w_0^\mu)]) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{O}_0)}(I(x)^{\bullet}, M^{\bullet}[j + 21(w_0^\mu)]). \]
We therefore find an isomorphism
\[ \text{Ext}_j^\mu(\mathcal{O}_0, I^\mu(x), M) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_0}^{j+21(w_0^\mu)}(I(x), M), \quad \text{for all } M \in \mathcal{O}_0^\mu. \]
Equation (18) implies immediately that
\[ \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} I^\mu(x) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} I(x) - 21(w_0^\mu). \]
To prove that this is an equality, it suffices to consider some fixed element \( x \) for every right cell in \( X^\mu \), by Lemma 37. Hence in each such right cell we can choose \( x \) to be the corresponding Duflo involution. In this case, the proof of [Ma3, Lemma 23] implies that the extension groups in equation (18) are non-zero for
\[ j + 21(w_0^\mu) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} I(x) = 2a(w_0 x) \]
and \( M = \theta_x \theta_x L(x) \in \mathcal{O}_0^\mu \). This concludes the proof of claim (i).

As in the proof of claim (i), Lemma 36(i) implies
\[ \text{Ext}_j^\mu(T^\mu(x), M) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_0}^{j+1(w_0^\mu)}(T(w_0^\mu x), M), \quad \text{for all } M \in \mathcal{O}_0^\mu. \]
This yields the inequality \( \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} T^\mu(x) \leq \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} T(w_0^\mu x) - 1(w_0^\mu) \). To prove that this is actually an equality, by Lemma 37 it suffices to prove this for the case where \( w_0^\mu x \) is a Duflo involution. We set \( w := w_0^\mu x \) and define \( y \in W \) to be the unique element in \( R(w) \) such that \( y^{-1}w_0 \) is a Duflo involution. The proof of [Ma3, Lemma 19] then implies that
\[ \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_0}^j(T(w_0^\mu x), L(w_0 y^{-1})) \neq 0, \quad \text{where } p = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} T(w_0^\mu x). \]
Now, by the definition of \( y \) and the properties of the KL orders in Subsection 4.a, we have
\[ w_0 y^{-1} = yw_0 \sim_R w_0^\mu x w_0, \quad \text{where } w_0^\mu x w_0 \in X^\mu. \]
This means that \( w_0 y^{-1} \in X^\mu \), i.e. \( L(w_0 y^{-1}) \in \mathcal{O}_0^\mu \), so we can use \( M = L(w_0 y^{-1}) \) and \( j + 1(w_0^\mu) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_0} T(w_0^\mu x) \) in equation (19). This completes the proof. \( \square \)
6.5. **Applying twisting and shuffling functors.** For the principal block, we have the following well-known formula:

(20) \( \dim \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_0}^{1(x)-1(y)}(\Delta(x), L(y)) = 1 \), for all \( x, y \in W \) with \( x \geq y \), see [Ca]. The corresponding statement is false for singular blocks. The origin of this lies in the following statement.

**Proposition 38.** Consider \( x \in X_\lambda \) such that \( x = sx' \), for a simple reflection \( s \) and \( x' < x \). For \( y \in X_\lambda \) with \( y \leq x \), set \( n = 1(x) - 1(y) \). Then we have

\[
\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{n}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) = \begin{cases} 
0, & \text{if } y > sy \text{ and } sy \notin X_\lambda; \\
\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{n}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), L(y' \cdot \lambda)), & \text{if } y > sy = y' \in X_\lambda; \\
\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{n-1}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)), & \text{if } y < sy.
\end{cases}
\]

This leads, by induction on \( 1(x) \), to the following analogue of equation (20):

**Corollary 39.** For any \( x, y \in X_\lambda \) with \( x \geq y \), we have

\( \dim \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{1(x)-1(y)}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \leq 1 \).

**Remark 40.** Contrary to the principal block \( \mathcal{O}_0 \), to determine the projective dimension of the module \( \Delta(x \cdot \lambda) \) in general, it is not sufficient to consider extensions of the form

\( \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{1(x)-1(y)}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \).

By equation (16) and Proposition 25(i), a counterexample is found as soon as

\( a(u_0 u_0^\lambda) < 1(u_0) - \max \{1(x) \mid x \in \mathbb{L}(u_0^\lambda) \} \).

This is the case for the examples in Subsections 11.3 and 11.4.

In the following proof we use the twisting functor \( T_s \) and its adjoint \( G_s \) as defined in e.g. [AS], see also [KhMa].

**Proof of Proposition 38.** By [CM1] Lemma 5.4, Corollary 5.6 and Proposition 5.11, we have

\( \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{n}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \cong \text{Hom}_{D^b(\mathcal{O}_\lambda)}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), R G_s L(y \cdot \lambda)[n]) \),

where, by [AS] Theorem 4.1,

\( R G_s L(y \cdot \lambda) = d \theta_\lambda^{\text{fin}} L T_s L(y) \).

Assume that \( sy > y \). Then, by [CM1] Theorem 5.12(i)], we have

\( R G_s L(y \cdot \lambda) = L(y \cdot \lambda)[-1] \).

Assume that \( sy < y \). Set \( y = sy' \) with \( 1(y) = 1 + 1(y') \). Then \( LT_s L(y) = T_s L(y) \).

The module \( T_s L(y) \) has simple top \( L(y) \) and semisimple radical \( R \) which is of the form

\( R \cong L(y') \oplus \bigoplus_i L(z_i) \),

where all \( z_i \) satisfy \( sz_i > z_i \) and \( z_i > y' \), see [AS] Theorem 6.3(3) and Section 7] (we note that, from [Ir3] Corollary 5.2.4], we even have \( z_i > y \). This means that we have

\( \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{n}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}^{n}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), M) \),

where the module \( M := d \theta_\lambda^{\text{fin}} T_s L(y) \) fits into a short exact sequence

\( 0 \to L(y \cdot \lambda) \to M \to \theta_\lambda^{\text{fin}} R \to 0 \).
Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x',\lambda),-)$ to this short exact sequence yields a long exact sequence containing

$$\text{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x',\lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x',\lambda), M) \rightarrow$$

$$\rightarrow \text{Ext}^{n+1}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x',\lambda), \theta^n R) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^{n+1}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x',\lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)).$$

First note that

$$\text{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x',\lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) = \text{Ext}^{n+1}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x',\lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) = 0$$

by Lemma 1, so

$$\text{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \cong \text{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), \theta^n R).$$

In the above, the contributions of $\theta^n R L(z_i)$ must always vanish by Lemma 1 since $z_i > y'$, yielding

$$\text{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \cong \text{Ext}^n_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), \theta^n L(y' \cdot \lambda)).$$

This concludes the proof. \hfill \Box

We note that the last case in Proposition 38 does not depend on the fact that $n = 1(x) - 1(y)$; it is also possible to give an analogue using the results on shuffling functors in [CM4] Section 6 and 7.

**Lemma 41.** Consider $x, y \in X_\lambda$ and a simple reflection $s \in W$.

(i) If $x = sx'$ with $x' < x$, then

$$\text{Ext}^{j+1}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \cong \text{Ext}^j_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)), \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

(ii) If $x = ys'$ with $x' < x$, where $s$ is orthogonal to all simple reflections in $W_\lambda$, then

$$\text{Ext}^{j+1}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)) \cong \text{Ext}^j_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x' \cdot \lambda), L(y \cdot \lambda)), \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

7. **Projective dimensions of structural modules**

**Definition 42.** We define the maps $s_\lambda : X_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ and $d_\lambda : X_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ as follows:

$$s_\lambda(x) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(L(x \cdot \lambda)) \quad \text{and} \quad d_\lambda(x) = \text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda}(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda)).$$

7.1. **Projective dimensions.** The results in Section 3 and in [Ma1, Ma3] allow one to write all projective dimensions and graded lengths of the structural modules in some arbitrary block $\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu$ in terms of $s_\lambda$ and $d_\lambda$.

**Theorem 43** (Simple and (co)standard modules). For $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$, we have:

(i) $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda^\mu} L(x \cdot \lambda) = s_\lambda(x) - 21(w_0^\mu), \quad \text{for } x \in X_\lambda^\mu$;

(ii) $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\mu} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = d_\lambda(w_0^\mu x) - 1(w_0^\mu), \quad \text{for } x \in X_\lambda^\mu$;

(iii) $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\mu} \nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = d_\lambda(w_0^\mu x w_0^\lambda) + a(w_0^\mu x_0^\lambda) - 2a(w_0^\mu), \quad \text{for } x \in X_\lambda^\mu$;

(iv) $\text{gl} \Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{gl} \nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = d_\mu(w_0^\mu x^{-1}) - 1(w_0^\mu), \quad \text{for } x \in X_\lambda^\mu$;

$\text{gl} \Delta(x \cdot \lambda) = \text{gl} \nabla(x \cdot \lambda) = 1(w_0) - 1(x), \quad \text{for } x \in X_\lambda.$
Proposition 46 (simple modules). For any $x \in X_\lambda$, we have:

(i) $a(w_0^\mu x) \leq s_\lambda(x) \leq 2a(w_0^\mu)$,

(ii) $s_\lambda(x) = 2a(w_0^\mu)$ if and only if $x \in L(w_0^\mu)$,

(iii) $s_\lambda(x) = a(w_0^\mu)$ if and only if $x = w_0$,

(iv) $s_\lambda(x) \leq 1(w_0 x) + a(w_0^\mu)$.

Moreover, in case $R(x)$ contains an element $w_0^\mu w_0$ for some $\mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$ or in case $g$ is of type $A$, we have:

(v) $s_\lambda(x) \geq a(w_0 x) + a(w_0^\mu)$.

Proposition 47. For any $x \in X_\lambda$, we have

$$s_\lambda(x) \geq d_\lambda(w_0^\mu x) + a(w_0^\mu).$$

Proposition 48 (standard modules). For any $x \in X_\lambda$, we have:

(i) $0 \leq d_\lambda(x) \leq a(w_0^\mu)$,

(ii) $d_\lambda(x) = a(w_0^\mu)$ if and only if $xw_0^\lambda \in L(w_0^\mu)$. 

(iii) $d_{\lambda}(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = w_{0}^\lambda$.
(iv) $d_{\lambda}(x) \leq 1(xw_{0}^\lambda)$.

Before proving these three propositions, we need to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 49.** Assume that $g$ is of type $A$. Then, for any $y, z \in W$, we have:

$$gl M(y, z) \geq 2a(y), \quad \text{for } y \leq_{R} z^{-1}.$$  

**Proof.** Our proof of this statement uses techniques and results from the abstract 2-representation theory developed in [MM1, MM2]. We refer the reader to these two papers and references therein for more details.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the fiat 2-category of projective functors on $\mathcal{O}_0$ (or, equivalently, Soergel bimodules over the coinvariant algebra) associated to $g$, as in [MM1 Subsection 7.1]. Then indecomposable 1-morphisms in $\mathcal{F}$ are exactly $\theta_w$, where $w \in W$, up to isomorphism. Let $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$ denote the 2-full fiat 2-subcategory of $\mathcal{F}$ where indecomposable 1-morphisms are all 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{F}$ which are isomorphic to $\theta_y$ or $\theta_w$, where $w \geq y$. Apart from the two-sided cell corresponding to the identity 1-morphism $\theta_e$, all other two-sided cells in $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$ are, by construction, greater than or equal to the two-sided cell containing $\theta_y$ with respect to the two-sided order.

Let $\mathcal{X}_{y,z}$ be the full subcategory $\text{add}(X)$ of $\mathcal{O}_0$, where

$$X = L(z) \oplus \bigoplus_{w \geq y} \theta_w L(z).$$

By construction, the action of $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$ on $\mathcal{O}_0$ restricts to $\mathcal{X}_{y,z}$ and this gives a finitary 2-representation of $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$.

Consider the weak Jordan-Hölder series of this 2-representation in the sense of [MM2 Subsection 4.3]. Subquotients of this series are simple transitive 2-representations of $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$. The 2-category $\mathcal{F}$, and hence also the 2-category $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$, satisfy all assumptions of [MM2 Theorem 18], see [MM1 Subsection 7.1]. Therefore any simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$ is equivalent to a cell 2-representation in the sense of [MM1].

In the following we will use the term Loewy length of an object in a finitary category for its Loewy length in the abelianisation of the category. Take $N'$ to be an indecomposable direct summand of $M(y, z)$. It’s Loewy length is smaller than or equal to the graded length of $M(y, z)$. Let $R$ be the right cell which corresponds to the cell 2-representation of $\mathcal{F}^{(y)}$ which has, as an indecomposable direct summand, the image $N$ of $N'$. Note that the Loewy length of $N$ is not greater than that of $N'$.

As mentioned, this 2-representation must be equivalent to the cell 2-representation constructed on a subcategory of $\mathcal{O}_0$ in [MM1 Section 7.1]. In particular the relevant subquotient category of $\mathcal{X}_{y,z}$ is equivalent to the category of $\mathcal{X}_{y,z}$ in [MM1 Section 7.1].

This means that the Loewy length of $N$ is equal to the Loewy length of a module of the form $\theta_w L(d)$, where $d$ is the Duflo involution in $R$. All these modules have simple top by [Ma3 Theorem 6], so their Loewy length is given by $2a(R)$ by [Ma3 Proposition 1(c)]. Putting all inequalities together implies $gl M(y, z)$ is at least $2a(R)$.

Since $a$ is weakly monotone with respect to KL-orders, it remains to observe that the combination of $M(y, z) \neq 0$ (which is equivalent to $y \leq_{R} z^{-1}$) and the above construction implies $R \neq \{e\}$, so $R \geq_{J} y$ and $a(R) \geq a(y)$. The claim of the lemma follows. \qed
Proof of Proposition 46. The lower bound of claim (i) follows from Proposition 25(i). The upper bound follows from the global dimension in Theorem 19.

Claim (ii) follows from Lemma 3(e) and (f) and Proposition 23(i).

Claim (iii) is just Lemma 32(iv).

Proposition 23(iii) implies that claim (iv) is equivalent to the claim
\[ \text{gl} T^\lambda(w_0^\lambda x - 1) \leq 2w_0x. \]

The latter is known to be true. Indeed, by equation (7), it is a special case of the property
\[ \text{gl} \theta_y L \leq 2y, \quad \text{for } y \in W, \]
for any simple module $L$. This inequality follows by induction on the length of $y$ using \[Ma1\] Equation (1) and the fact that the action of $\theta_s$ for simple reflection $s$ can only increase the graded length of a module by 2.

For claim (v), we first assume that there is some $\mu \in \Lambda_+^0$ such that $x \sim_R w_0^\mu$. In particular, $x \in X^\mu$, so Proposition 25(i) and Theorem 8(i) imply
\[ \text{pd} O_\lambda x = a(w_0^\mu w_0^\lambda) \geq a(w_0^\mu) + a(w_0^\mu). \]

By $x \sim_R w_0^\mu w_0$ and equation (13), we find $a(w_0^\mu) = a(xw_0)$.

In type $A$, Lemma 49 and Equation (7) imply that
\[ \text{gl} T^\mu(y) \geq 2\text{a}(w_0^\mu w_0), \quad \text{for all } y \in X^\mu. \]

Claim (v) for type $A$ hence follows from Proposition 23(iii).

Proof of Proposition 47. By Proposition 23(iii) and (iii), the statement is equivalent to the condition
\[ \frac{1}{2}\text{gl} T^\lambda(w_0^\lambda x - 1) + a(w_0w_0^\lambda) \geq \text{gl} \Delta^\lambda(w_0^\lambda x - 1) + a(w_0w_0^\lambda). \]

The latter is an immediate consequence of Equation (15).

Proof of Proposition 48. The upper bound in claim (i) follows from Proposition 25(i). Claim (ii) is Proposition 25(iii) and claim (iii) is just Lemma 32(iii).

Claim (iv) is a consequence of the combination of inequalities in Propositions 46(iv) and 47.

We end this subsection with some consequences of the main results. Propositions 16 and 48 are sufficient to determine $s_\lambda$ and $d_\lambda$ (and hence the projective dimensions of all structural modules in all parabolic versions of) all blocks $O_\lambda$ where the global dimension is not greater than 4. Note that, by Theorem 19, this correspond to the cases where $a(w_0^\lambda w_0) \leq 2$.

**Proposition 50.** Let $\lambda \in \Lambda_+^0$ be such that $a(w_0w_0^\lambda) \leq 2$. Then, for all $x \in X_\lambda$, we have
\[ s_\lambda(x) = a(w_0x) + a(w_0w_0^\lambda), \quad d_\lambda(x) = a(xw_0^\lambda). \]

In particular, the inequalities in both Proposition 46(iv) and Proposition 47 are always equalities in such blocks.
Proposition 51. Consider a fixed $x \in X_{\lambda}$. Assume that there is some $\mu \in \Lambda_{\text{int}}^+$ for which $x \in X^\mu$.

(i) If $L(x \cdot \lambda)$ is a standard module in $\mathcal{O}^\mu_{\lambda}$, then

$$\lambda(x) = \lambda(w_0w_0^\mu) + \lambda(w_0^\mu),$$

$$\lambda_\lambda(w_0^\mu) = \lambda(w_0w_0^\mu).$$

(ii) If $L(x \cdot \lambda)$ is not a standard module in $\mathcal{O}^\mu_{\lambda}$, then

$$\lambda(x) > \lambda(w_0w_0^\mu) + \lambda(w_0^\mu).$$

Proof. Consider the condition for claim (i). Proposition 25 implies that in this case

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{O}^\mu_{\lambda}} L(x \cdot \lambda) = \lambda(w_0w_0^\mu) - \lambda(w_0^\mu).$$

The first result thus follows from Theorem 8. As $\Delta^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = L(x \cdot \lambda)$, the second formula follows from Corollary 31. Claim (ii) follows from Proposition 25 and (ii) and Theorem 8.

8. Monotonicity for quasi-hereditary algebras

8.1. General principles. In this subsection we will consider indices which are empty or equal to 0 or 1. We denote the corresponding set of indices by $\{*, 0, 1\}$ and set $c_*= -1$, $c_0 = 0$ and $c_1 = 1$.

We consider the following possible monotonicity properties of projective dimensions for modules over a quasi-hereditary algebra $(B, \leq)$, where we have $\gamma \in \{*, 0, 1\}$ and $C = B$-mod:

- $\mathcal{S}_\gamma(B)$: For all $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ with $\alpha < \beta$, $\text{pd}_C L(\alpha) \leq \text{pd}_C L(\beta) + c_\gamma$;
- $\mathcal{C}_\gamma(B)$: For all $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ with $\alpha < \beta$, $\text{pd}_C \nabla(\alpha) \leq \text{pd}_C \nabla(\beta) + c_\gamma$;
- $\mathcal{D}_\gamma(B)$: For all $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda$ with $\alpha < \beta$, $\text{pd}_C \Delta(\alpha) \geq \text{pd}_C \Delta(\beta) - c_\gamma$.

Obviously, we have

$$\mathcal{S}_\gamma(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_0(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(B),$$

$$\mathcal{C}_\gamma(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}_1(B),$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\gamma(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_0(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_1(B).$$

We also define the following two possible properties:

- $\mathcal{P}(B)$: For all $\alpha \in \Lambda$, $\text{pd}_C L(\alpha) = \text{pd}_C \nabla(\alpha)$;
Then consider an \( \alpha \in \Lambda \), \( \text{gl} T(\alpha) = \text{gl} \Delta(\alpha) + \text{gl} \nabla(\alpha) \).

Here, for the second property, we assume that the algebra \( B \) is graded.

There are some immediate links between these properties, as we summarise in the following two propositions.

**Proposition 52.** For any quasi-hereditary algebra \( B \), we have

\[
\mathcal{S}_0(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{C}(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(B).
\]

Consequently, we have

\[
\mathcal{S}_0(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0(B) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{S}(B) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}(B).
\]

**Proposition 53.** Consider a standard Koszul quasi-hereditary algebra \( B \) with a simple preserving duality. If \( \mathcal{D}_1(B) \) is true and the grading on \( R(E(B)) \) induced from the Koszul grading on \( E(B) \) is positive, then \( \mathcal{S}(E(B)) \) is true.

The monotonicity properties for quasi-hereditary algebras are also closely related to the question whether the corresponding module categories are Guichardet.

**Lemma 54.** Consider a quasi-hereditary algebra \( B \) such that every covering \( \alpha \leq \beta \) in the poset \( \Lambda \) implies

\[
\text{Ext}^1_c(L(\alpha), L(\beta)) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{pd} L(\alpha) - \text{pd} L(\beta) \leq 1.
\]

(i) If \( \mathcal{S}_0(B) \) is true, then \( B\text{-mod} \) is weakly Guichardet.

(ii) If \( \mathcal{S}(B) \) is true, then \( B\text{-mod} \) is strongly Guichardet.

The remainder of this subsection is devoted to the proofs of these statements.

**Proof of Proposition 52.** We consider the short exact sequence

\[
0 \to L(\alpha) \to \nabla(\alpha) \to Q \to 0,
\]

which defines the module \( Q \).

Assume that \( \mathcal{S}_0(B) \) is true. Then \( \text{pd}_c Q \leq \text{pd}_c L(\alpha) \) and \( \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \leq \text{pd}_c L(\alpha) \).

For any object \( M \in \mathcal{C} \), the contravariant left exact functor \( \text{Hom}_c(-, M) \) applied to (22) yields a long exact sequence. For \( p = \text{pd}_c L(\alpha) \), a part of this long exact sequence is given by

\[
\text{Ext}^p_c(Q, M) \to \text{Ext}^p_c(\nabla(\alpha), M) \to \text{Ext}^p_c(L(\alpha), M) \to 0.
\]

By the definition of \( p \), the last extension group is not always trivial, implying \( \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \geq \text{pd}_c L(\alpha) \) and hence \( \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) = \text{pd}_c L(\alpha) \).

Now assume that \( \mathcal{C}(B) \) is true. We prove that \( \text{pd}_c L(\lambda) = \text{pd}_c \nabla(\lambda) \) by induction along the partial order on \( \Lambda \). Consider a minimal element \( \alpha \in \Lambda \), then \( \nabla(\alpha) \cong L(\alpha) \).

Then consider an \( \alpha \in \Lambda \) such that \( \text{pd}_c L(\lambda) = \text{pd}_c \nabla(\lambda) \) for all \( \lambda < \alpha \). In particular, \( \text{pd}_c L(\lambda) < \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \) for all \( \lambda < \alpha \) which yields \( \text{pd}_c Q < \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \).

By the same reasoning as in the above paragraph, we hence obtain the exact sequence (23) with \( p := \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \), where now also the first term vanishes. This implies \( \text{pd}_c L(\alpha) \geq \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \).

The inequality \( \text{pd}_c L(\alpha) \leq \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \) follows from Equation (23) for \( p > \text{pd}_c \nabla(\alpha) \), where the first term still vanishes.

The statements \( \mathcal{S}_0(B) \Rightarrow \mathcal{C}_0(B) \) and \( \mathcal{S}(B) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{C}(B) \) follow from the above properties and the observation that, when \( \mathcal{P}(B) \) is true, \( \mathcal{S}_\gamma(B) \) is equivalent to \( \mathcal{C}_\gamma(B) \), for any \( \gamma \in \{\ast, 0, 1\} \).

\( \square \)
Corollary 55. Assume that $\mathfrak{S}(B)$ or $\mathfrak{C}(B)$ is true. Then we have
$$\text{Ext}_P^p(L(\alpha), M) \cong \text{Ext}_C^p(\nabla(\alpha), M),$$
where $p = \text{pd}_C L(\alpha) = \text{pd}_C \nabla(\alpha), M \in \mathcal{C}$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda$.

Proof. Under our assumptions, the first term in Equation (23) is zero implying the isomorphism of extension groups. □

Lemma 56. Consider a positively graded quasi-hereditary algebra $B$ which satisfies
$$\text{gl} \nabla(\alpha) \leq \text{gl} \nabla(\beta) + 1 \text{ and } \text{gl} \Delta(\alpha) \leq \text{gl} \Delta(\beta) + 1, \quad \text{for all } \alpha \leq \beta.$$ 
If also the induced grading on $R(B)$ is also positive, then $\mathfrak{O}(B)$ is true.

Proof. By definition it follows that positivity of the grading on $R(B)$ is equivalent to the fact that any subquotient of a standard filtration of any tilting module $T^B(\alpha)(0)$ in the graded lift of $C_B$ is of the form $\Delta^B(\beta)(-j)$ where $j = 0$ if $\beta = \alpha$ and $j > 0$ otherwise, see e.g. [Ma2] Section 2.3. Similarly, any subquotient of a costandard filtration of $T^B(\alpha)(0)$ is either of the form $\nabla^B(\alpha)(0)$ or $\nabla^B(\beta)(j)$ with $j > 0$ and $\beta < \alpha$.

Using the standard filtration then implies that, for $j > 0$, we have $T^B(\alpha)_j \neq 0$ if $\Delta^B(\alpha)_j \neq 0$ and, by the assumptions, $T^B(\alpha)_j = 0$ if $\Delta^B(\alpha)_j = 0$. The costandard filtration then similarly yields the maximal $j > 0$ for which $T^B(\alpha)_{-j}$ is non-zero, concluding the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 54. Consider $D = E(B)$. By the standard Koszulity of $B$ and $\mathfrak{D}_1(B)$, it follows that $\text{gl} \Delta^D(\alpha) \leq \text{gl} \Delta^D(\beta) + 1$, if $\alpha \leq \beta$, for $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda_D$. Hence the result follows from applying Lemma 56 to $D$. □

Proof of Lemma 54. If $\mathfrak{S}(B)$ is true, it follows that every initial segment is generated by the simple modules corresponding to an ideal in the poset $\Lambda$. If $\mathfrak{S}_0(B)$ is true, then it still follows that every saturated initial segment is generated by the simple modules corresponding to an ideal in the poset $\Lambda$. The result therefore follows from [CPS1] Theorem 3.9(i)]. □

8.2. General results for $A^\mu_n$. We set $\mathfrak{P}(\mu, \lambda) := \mathfrak{P}(A^\mu_n)$ etc. For the quasi-hereditary algebras corresponding to parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ we can improve substantially on the relations between the different monotonicity properties in Propositions 52 and 53. This leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 57. Consider fixed $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$. We have the following links between the monotonicity properties

$$\mathfrak{S}(\mu, \lambda) \xrightarrow{\text{st}} \mathfrak{S}_0(\mu, \lambda) \xrightarrow{\text{st}} \mathfrak{P}(\mu, \lambda) \xrightarrow{\text{st}} \mathfrak{C}(\mu, \lambda)$$

Furthermore, we have
$$\mathfrak{S}_\gamma(0, \lambda) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{S}_\gamma(\mu, \lambda), \quad \mathfrak{C}_\gamma(0, \lambda) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{C}_\gamma(\mu, \lambda) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{D}_\gamma(0, \lambda) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{D}_\gamma(\mu, \lambda),$$
for all $\gamma \in \{*, 0, 1\}$, as well as $\mathfrak{P}(0, \lambda) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{P}(\mu, \lambda)$ and $\mathfrak{O}(\mu, 0) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{O}(\mu, \lambda)$. 

Note that \(\mathcal{P}(0,0), \mathcal{O}(0,0), \mathcal{S}(0,0), \mathcal{C}(0,0)\) and \(\mathcal{B}(0,0)\) are all true by [Ma1]. We will prove in Theorems 57 and 59 that analogous properties do not hold for arbitrary blocks. Before proving Theorem 57, we introduce the following definition, motivated by the result.

**Definition 58.** For \(\lambda \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}\), we say that the block \(\mathcal{O}_\lambda\) is

- strictly monotone if \(\mathcal{D}(0,\lambda)\) is true,
- weakly monotone if \(\mathcal{D}_0(0,\lambda)\) is true,
- almost monotone if \(\mathcal{D}_1(0,\lambda)\) is true.

**Corollary 59.** Let \(\lambda \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}\).

(i) If \(\mathcal{O}_\lambda\) is almost monotone, then
\[
\mathbf{s}_\lambda(x) = \mathbf{d}_\lambda(w_0xw_0^\lambda) + \mathbf{a}(w_0w_0^\lambda), \quad \text{for all } x \in X_\lambda.
\]

(ii) If \(\mathcal{O}_\lambda\) is weakly monotone, it is weakly Guichardet. If \(\mathcal{O}_\lambda\) is strictly monotone, it is strongly Guichardet.

Now we prove Theorem 57 and Corollary 59.

**Proof of Theorem 57.** The implication \(\mathcal{S}_\gamma(0,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from Theorem 8(i). The implication \(\mathcal{D}_\gamma(0,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\gamma(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from Corollary 31(i). The combination of Corollaries 31(ii) and 24(i) implies that
\[
\mathbf{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} \nabla^\mu(x \cdot \lambda) = \mathbf{pd}_{\mathcal{O}_\lambda} \nabla(x \cdot \lambda) - 2\mathbf{a}(w_0^\mu), \quad \text{for all } x \in X_\lambda^\mu,
\]
which yields the implication \(\mathfrak{L}_\gamma(0,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{L}_\gamma(\mu,\lambda)\). The combination of Equation (24) and Theorem 8(ii) gives the implication \(\mathcal{P}(0,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mu,\lambda)\). Further, the implication \(\mathcal{O}(0,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from Proposition 30 and (ii).

Now we prove implications in the diagram. The implications of the form \(\mathcal{S}(\mu,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mu,\lambda)\) are trivial, see Equation (21). The implications \(\mathcal{D}_1(\mu,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from Proposition 52.

Assume that \(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{\mu},\lambda)\) is true, then by the above \(\mathcal{O}(\lambda,\mu)\) is also true. It follows, moreover, that the graded length of tilting modules in \(\mathcal{O}_\lambda\) is weakly monotone along the Bruhat order, as this property is inherited from the corresponding property of standard modules. Proposition 23 then shows that \(\mathcal{S}(\mu,\lambda)\) follows, proving the implication \(\mathcal{D}_0(\hat{\mu},\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mu,\lambda)\). The implication \(\mathcal{D}(\hat{\mu},\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mu,\lambda)\) follows similarly.

The implication \(\mathcal{P}(\mu,\lambda) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{O}(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from Proposition 23 and (i). The implication \(\mathcal{L}_\gamma(\mu,\lambda) \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{D}_\gamma(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from Corollary 24. The implication \(\mathcal{S}(\mu,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\gamma(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from the combination of the above implications and Proposition 52.

Finally, the implication \(\mathcal{S}_\gamma(\mu,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mu,\lambda)\) follows from the combination of the other implications.

**Proof of Corollary 59.** Claim (i) is the combination of Corollary 24 and the statement \(\mathcal{D}_1(0,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}(0,\lambda)\) in Theorem 57.

Claim (ii) follows from Lemma 54 the statement \(\mathcal{D}_\gamma(0,\lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\gamma(0,\lambda)\) for \(\gamma \in \{*,0\}\) in Theorem 57 and the Kazhdan-Lusztig conjecture.
8.3. Not all blocks in category $O$ are almost monotone. In this subsection we consider an example of a singular block for type $A$ which shows that the non-
monotonicity in projective dimensions of standard modules can be arbitrarily high. Consequently we show that equation (11) is not valid in this block, which is equivalent
to saying that $P(0, \lambda)$ does not hold.

According to equation (16), the projective dimension of $\Delta(x \cdot \lambda)$ is determined by its extensions with simple modules $L(y \cdot \lambda)$ with $y \in L(w_0^\lambda)$. The maximal degree in
which such an extension can appear is bounded by $1(y) - 1(x)$, see e.g. Lemma [1]
The variation in length between the elements in $L(w_0^\lambda)$ therefore gives an natural
rough indication of the level in which monotonicity in the projective dimension of standard modules might be broken. Indeed, for the examples in Section [11] we find
that, when the maximal difference in length between elements in $L(w_0^\lambda)$ is 1, the
block is weakly monotone and when this difference is 2, it is almost monotone. In
the block we will consider in this subsection we will take $w_0^\lambda$ such that this maximal
variation in length becomes arbitrarily high.

**Proposition 60.** Consider $g = \mathfrak{sl}(n+1)$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\text{int}}^+$ with $w_0^\lambda = s_n$. The block
$O_\lambda$ is

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{weakly monotone, but not strictly monotone,} & \text{if } n = 2 \\
\text{almost monotone, but not weakly monotone,} & \text{if } n = 3 \\
\text{not almost monotone,} & \text{if } n \geq 4.
\end{cases}
\]

**Theorem 61.** Integral category $O$ for $\mathfrak{sl}(n+1)$ contains blocks $O_\lambda$ such that $P(0, \lambda)$
is not true, if and only if $n > 3$.

**Proof of Proposition 60.** The case $n = 2$ is dealt with in [CM1] Section 6.2. The
case $n = 3$ will be considered in Subsection 11.2. So, we consider the case $n \geq 4$.

We take $x, y \in X_\lambda$ defined as

\[
25 \quad x = s_2 s_3 \cdots s_n s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n \quad \text{and} \quad y = s_2 s_3 \cdots s_{n-1} s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n.
\]

Then we have $x \cdot \lambda \leq y \cdot \lambda$ and $1(x) - 1(y) = 1$. However, we claim that

\[
26 \quad \text{pd}_{O_\lambda} \Delta(x \cdot \lambda) \leq n - 1,
\]

\[
\text{pd}_{O_\lambda} \Delta(y \cdot \lambda) \geq 2n - 3,
\]

which implies the proposition as, for $n \geq 4$, we have $(2n - 3) - (n - 1) > 1$.

First we prove the second of the inequalities in (26). As the module $L(s_n \cdot \lambda)$ is $s_i$-
finite for all $1 \leq i < n$, we can use the procedure in the proof of [Ma1 Proposition 3]
(see also [CS, Lemma 3.6(ii)]) iteratively. It follows immediately that

\[
\text{Ext}_{O_\lambda}^{2n-3}(\Delta(y \cdot \lambda), L(s_n \cdot \lambda)) \cong \text{Hom}_{O_\lambda}(\Delta(s_n \cdot \lambda), L(s_n \cdot \lambda)).
\]

To prove the other estimate in (26) we employ equation (16), which implies that
we only need to consider extensions with $L(z_i \cdot \lambda)$ where

\[
z_i = s_1 s_{i+1} \cdots s_n, \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.
\]

As $s_1 x \cdot \lambda = x \cdot \lambda$ while $s_1 z_i \cdot \lambda < z_i \cdot \lambda$ unless $i = 1$, application of [CS Lemma 3.6(i)]
gives

\[
\text{Ext}_{O_\lambda}^*(\Delta(x \cdot \lambda), L(z_i \cdot \lambda)) = 0
\]

unless $i = 1$.

An upper bound on the projective dimension of $\Delta(x \cdot \lambda)$ is hence given by Lemma [1]
as the difference between $1(x) = 2n - 1$ and $1(z_1) = n$. \qed
Consider Proposition 63. We start the proof of this theorem, by linking the main results of [CIS] to Lusztig’s. Furthermore, the block $O$ subalgebra $q$ to a hermitian symmetric pair. Then, for all $W$ that is a hermitian symmetric pair’. By this we mean that for the reductive Lie algebra $g$, generated by the Cartan subalgebra of $g$, and all root vectors corresponding to $B_\lambda$ and $-B_\lambda$, the pair $(g, l)$ is a hermitian symmetric pair. In particular, this implies that $W_\lambda$ is a maximal Coxeter subgroup of $W$.

**Theorem 62.** Consider a reductive Lie algebra $g$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$ which corresponds to a hermitian symmetric pair. Then, for all $x \in X_\lambda$, we have

(i) $s_\lambda(x) = a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_0^\lambda)$,

(ii) $d_\lambda(x) = a(x w_0^\lambda)$.

Furthermore, the block $O_\lambda$ is weakly monotone.

We start the proof of this theorem, by linking the main results of [CIS] to Lusztig’s $a$-function.

**Proposition 63.** Consider $\mu \in \Lambda^+_\text{int}$, such that the Levi subalgebra $l$ of the parabolic subalgebra $q_\mu$ forms a hermitian symmetric pair $(g, l)$.

(i) For any $x \in X^\mu$, the set $\Sigma_x$ from [CIS] Definition 2.2] satisfies

\[
\text{card } \Sigma_x = a(x).
\]

(ii) The auxiliary integral constant $p$ attached to any hermitian symmetric pair in [CIS] Table 2.1] satisfies

\[
p = a(w_0^\mu w_0) = \text{card } \{\text{distinct right cells in } X^\mu\} - 1.
\]
(iii) For any two \(x, y \in X^\mu\), we have
\[ x \preceq_R y \quad \text{or} \quad y \preceq_R x. \]
We will use freely that the Bruhat order on \(X^\mu\) is generated by right multiplication with simple reflections, see e.g. [EHP, Corollary 3.12].

Proof. First we prove claim (iii). Assume we have two \(x, y \in X^\mu\) which are not right comparable. By [CIS, Theorem 1.4], \(\Sigma_x\) and \(\Sigma_y\) cannot have the same cardinality, so without loss of generality we assume that \(\text{card } \Sigma_x > \text{card } \Sigma_y\). There must be some simple reflection \(s\) such that \(x' = xs < x\) and \(xs \in X^\mu\). By [CIS, Lemma 5.9], \(x'\) satisfies \(\text{card } \Sigma_{x'} = \text{card } \Sigma_x - 1\). We can repeat this construction until we obtain some \(x''\) which, by construction, satisfies \(x'' \preceq_R x\), and, at the same time, satisfies \(\text{card } \Sigma_{x''} = \text{card } \Sigma_y\). Applying [CIS, Theorem 1.4] once more, yields \(x'' \sim_R y\) and thus \(x \preceq_R y\), a contradiction.

Now we prove claim (i). By claim (iii), there is some number \(q\) such that we can decompose \(X^\mu\) into right cells as
\[ X^\mu = R_0 \cup R_1 \cup \cdots \cup R_q, \]
where we have \(R_i \preceq_R R_j\) if and only if \(i \leq j\). By construction, we must have \(R_0 = R(e) = \{e\}\) and \(R_q = R(w_0^\mu w_0)\).

We define two sequences of numbers,
\[ \sigma(i) := \text{card } \Sigma_x \quad \text{and} \quad a(i) := a(x), \]
for an arbitrary \(x \in R_i\). By [CIS, Definition 2.2], we have \(\text{card } \Sigma_x = 0 = a(e)\). Then, by claim (iii) and [CIS, Lemma 5.9], we have \(\sigma(i) = i\). The combination of Lemma 27(ii) and the remark below [CIS, Theorem 1.4], then implies that we have
\[ \sigma(q) = q = a(w_0^\mu w_0) = a(q). \]
Now, as the sequence of number \(a(i)\) must be strictly monotone, we also find
\[ a(R_i) = a(i) = i = \sigma(i), \]
proving claim (i).

By the above, to prove claim (ii), it suffices to show that \(p\) corresponds to the maximal graded length (in our convention) of a standard module in \(O^\mu\). For HS.6 and HS.7 in [CIS, Table 2.1], this follows immediately from comparing to [CIS, Tables 7.1 and 7.2]. For HS.2 and HS.4, this follows by immediate computation, see e.g. the displayed equation on [CIS, page 73]. For HS.1, HS.3 and HS.5, this follows from the proof by induction on \(p\) in [CIS, Section 5].

We also have the following lemma.

**Lemma 64.** Consider \(\mu \in A^+_\text{int}\) as in Proposition 63. Then, for any \(x, y \in X^\mu\), the condition \(x \preceq_R y\) implies
\[ \text{gl } \Delta^\mu(x) \geq \text{gl } \Delta^\mu(y). \]

Proof. This follows immediately from the fact that the Bruhat order is generated by simple reflections and Lemma 33.

**Proof of Theorem 62.** First we prove claim (ii). By Lemma 2, the statement is equivalent to the claim that
\[ \text{gl } \Delta^\mu(x) = a(w_0^\mu x w_0), \]
for μ as in Proposition 63 and any x ∈ Xμ. As by [CIS], we have the equality glΔμ(x) = cardΣw∈x, the claim follows from Proposition 63.

Now Lemma 64 implies that Oλ is weakly monotone in the sense of Definition 65 Claim (i) therefore follows from claim (ii) and Corollary 59(i). □

10. A family of non-maximal singularities

In this subsection we completely determine projective dimensions of simple modules in the block Oλ, for g = sl(n) with λ ∈ Λ+ int satisfying

\[ W_λ = S_1 \times S_1 \times S_{n-2} \subset S_n. \]

We assume n > 3, as otherwise this is a regular block. We define x_1, x_3' ∈ X_λ as x_1 = s_{n-1}s_{n-2}⋯s_2w_0^0 and x_3' = s_{n-1}s_{n-2}⋯s_1w_0^0. Making use of the Robinson-Schensted correspondence allows to conclude that X_λ is the union of the following left cells:

\[ L_0 := \{ w_0 \}, L_1 := L(x_1), L_1' := L(x_3'), L_2 := L(s_1w_0^0) \text{ and } L_3 := L(w_0^0), \]

with values

\[ a(w_0L_0) = 0, a(w_0L_1) = a(w_0L_1') = 1, a(w_0L_2) = 2 \text{ and } a(w_0L_3) = 3. \]

We will write out these cells explicitly, for n = 4, in Subsection 11.2.

The cells L_1 and L_1' belong to the same two-sided cell and contain n − 1 elements each. The cell L_1 consists of the elements x_j defined as

\[ x_j = s_j s_{j-2}⋯s_1x_1, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq n-1. \]

The cell L_1' consists of the elements x_j' defined as

\[ x_j' = \begin{cases} s_j s_{j-2}⋯s_1 x_1', & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq n-2; \\ s_{n-3}s_{n-2}⋯s_1(s_{n-1}x_1'), & \text{for } j = n-1; \end{cases} \]

where we note that s_n x_1' < x_1'. In particular, we have

\[ 1(x_j) - 1(w_0^0) = j + n - 3, \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq n-1, \]

and

\[ 1(x_j') - 1(w_0^0) = \begin{cases} j + n - 2, & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq n-2; \\ 2n - 5, & \text{for } j = n-1. \end{cases} \]

Now we can state the result.

**Proposition 65.** Consider g = sl(n) with λ ∈ Λ+ int such that

\[ W_λ = S_1 \times S_1 \times S_{n-2} \subset S_n \]

and n > 3. We have

\[ s_λ(x) = a(w_0x) + a(w_0w_0^0) \quad \text{if } x \notin L_1 \cup L_1', \]

so s_λ(L_i) = 3 + i, for i ∈ {0, 2, 3}.

For x ∈ L_1 \cup L_1', we have

\[ s_λ(x) = \begin{cases} 4 = a(w_0x) + a(w_0w_0^0), & \text{for } x \in L_1 \setminus \{x_n-1\} \cup \{x_{n-1}\}; \\ 5 = a(w_0x) + a(w_0w_0^0) + 1, & \text{for } x \in L_1 \setminus \{x_{n-1}\} \cup \{x_n-1\}. \end{cases} \]
Proof. For \( x \in \mathbb{L}_0 \) and \( x \in \mathbb{L}_3 \), this follows from Proposition 46 and 61. The projective dimensions are 3, respectively 6. For \( x \in \mathbb{L}_2 \), this follows from Proposition 46 and 45, the projective dimension is 5. For \( x \in \mathbb{L}_1 \cup \mathbb{L}_1' \), Proposition 46 allows to conclude that the projective dimensions are either 4 or 5.

For \( 1 \leq j \leq n - 1 \), we choose \( \mu_j \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}} \) such that \( w_{0j}^\mu_j = s_j \). We have

\[
\mathcal{X}^\mu \cap \mathbb{L}_1 = \{x_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}^\mu \cap \mathbb{L}_1' = \{x_j'\}.
\]

In particular, this implies that \( \mathcal{O}_x^\mu \) is not zero, so there must be a simple standard module in \( \mathcal{O}_x^\mu \). Proposition 51(i), with \( a(w_{0j}^\mu_j) = 1 \), implies that such standard modules must have projective dimension 4 in \( \mathcal{O}_x \). The obtained projective dimensions for simple modules corresponding to \( \mathbb{L}_0 \cup \mathbb{L}_2 \cup \mathbb{L}_3 \) imply that this simple standard module must be either \( L(x_j \cdot \lambda) \) or \( L(x_j' \cdot \lambda) \). As we have

\[
x_j' > x_j \quad \text{with} \quad 1(x_j') = 1(x_j) + 1, \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq j \leq n - 2,
\]

we find that for those cases \( L(x_j \cdot \lambda) \) is a simple standard module in \( \mathcal{O}_x^\mu \), while \( L(x_j \cdot \lambda) \) is not. Their projective dimensions hence follow from Proposition 51. As we also have

\[
x_{n-1}' < x_{n-1} \quad \text{with} \quad 1(x_{n-1}) = 1(x_{n-1}') + 1,
\]

Proposition 51 determines also the remaining projective dimensions. \( \square \)

Remark 66. For \( \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(n) \) and arbitrary \( \lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}} \), Proposition 56 allows to conclude that, for any \( x \in \mathcal{X}_\lambda \), we have

\[
a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_0^x) \leq a_{\lambda}(x) \leq 1(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_0^x).
\]

The upper bound is known to be an equality when \( \mathcal{X}_\lambda = \{e\} \), whereas the lower bound is an equality when \( \mathcal{X}_\lambda \) is a maximal Coxeter subgroup of \( \mathcal{W} \), by Theorem 62. The example of Proposition 66 deals with the case where \( \mathcal{X}_\lambda \) is very large but not maximal. We clearly see how \( s_{\lambda}(x) \) starts moving away from the lower bound towards the upper bound in the following way. The set \( \mathcal{X}_\lambda \) with pre-order \( \leq_L \) is no longer totally ordered (contrary to the case of maximal singularity by Proposition 65). For those two cells which are incomparable with respect to the left order, the values of \( s_{\lambda}(x) \) can be higher than the lower bound, where precisely the length function and the right order come into play. This is made precise in the following corollary. This gives a unifying formula for the cases of maximal singularity and the singularity considered in this section. Note that it clearly does not hold for the regular case and hence is only a small step towards a general description.

Corollary 67. Consider \( \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(n) \) with \( \lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}} \) either as in Proposition 65 or such that \( \mathcal{W}_\lambda \) is a maximal Coxeter subgroup of \( \mathcal{W} \). For any \( x \in \mathcal{X}_\lambda \), we have

\[
s_{\lambda}(x) = \begin{cases} a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_0^x), & \text{if } 1(x) = \min\{1(y) \mid y \in \mathcal{R}(x) \cap \mathcal{X}_\lambda\}; \\
a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_0^x) + 1, & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}
\]

Proof. When \( \mathcal{W}_\lambda \) is a maximal Coxeter subgroup, \( \lambda \) corresponds to a hermitian symmetric pair, so this follows from the considerations in Section 9.

So it suffices to consider the case in Proposition 65. From the Robinson-Schensted correspondence it follows that the only right KL relations on \( \mathbb{L}_1 \cup \mathbb{L}_1' \) are given by \( x_j \sim_R x_j' \), for \( 1 \leq j \leq n - 1 \). Note that this is consistent with the construction of parabolic subcategories in the proof of Proposition 65. With this observation, the result follows immediately from Proposition 65. \( \square \)
11. The blocks of category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathfrak{sl}(4)$

11.1. General description. In this section we calculate the projective dimensions of structural modules in all blocks of the parabolic category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(4)$. Theorems \[\text{(9)}\] and \[\text{(10)}\] imply that it suffices to consider standard and simple modules in category $\mathcal{O}$. Note that, from [Ma1] Theorem 11, it follows that every non-integral block is equivalent to a block in category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathfrak{sl}(3)$ or $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$. These are already well-understood, see e.g. [CM2] Section 6.2. Also the regular blocks are understood by [Ma1], so we are left with $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ for singular $\lambda$.

Up to equivalence, see [So1] Theorem 11, there are possibilities for $w^\lambda_0$, viz.:

$$s_3, \quad s_2, \quad s_1s_3 \quad \text{and} \quad s_1s_2s_1.$$

We calculate the projective dimensions of standard and simple objects purely relying on KL combinatorics, by applying equation \[\text{(9)}\]. Note that the third and fourth choice for $w^\lambda_0$ correspond to special cases of both Proposition 60 and Theorem 62 whereas the second choice is a special case of Proposition 65 (which however only determined $s_3$). Our alternative derivation in this section confirms those theoretical statements. The full knowledge of the KLV polynomials and Lusztig’s canonical basis will also be essential to prove our result about Guichardet categories as explained below.

We will find that all blocks are almost monotone. However, $\mathcal{O}_\lambda$ for $w^\lambda_0 = s_3$ is not weakly monotone. Therefore Corollary \[\text{(10)}\] does not guarantee that this block is weakly Guichardet. We prove explicitly that the block is not weakly Guichardet, from which we obtain the following conclusion.

Theorem 68. Category $\mathcal{O}$ for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(4)$ contains an integral block which is not weakly Guichardet.

In this section we identify $\Lambda_{\text{int}}$ with $\mathbb{Z}^4$ by mapping $\kappa$ to $(\langle \kappa + \rho, \epsilon_i \rangle)_{1 \leq i \leq 4}$. As usual, the generators of the Weyl group are denoted by $s_i$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $s_i$ the reflection corresponding to $\epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1}$.

11.2. The case $w^\lambda_0 = s_3$. Note that in this case we have

$$\mathcal{L}(w^\lambda_0) = \{s_3, s_2s_3, s_1s_2s_3\}.$$

We calculate algorithmically Lusztig’s canonical basis. For this, we follow the conventions and notations of [BZ2] Section 3. The canonical basis is given by:

$$
\begin{align*}
\hat{b}_{2100} &= \hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{1200} &= \hat{v}_{1200} + q\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{2010} &= \hat{v}_{2010} + q\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{1020} &= \hat{v}_{1020} + q(\hat{v}_{1200} + \hat{v}_{2010}) + q^2\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{0210} &= \hat{v}_{0210} + q(\hat{v}_{2010} + \hat{v}_{1200}) + q^2\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{2001} &= \hat{v}_{2001} + q\hat{v}_{2010} + q^2\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{1002} &= \hat{v}_{1002} + q(\hat{v}_{1020} + \hat{v}_{2001}) + q^2(\hat{v}_{2010} + \hat{v}_{1200}) + q^3\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{0120} &= \hat{v}_{0120} + q(\hat{v}_{1020} + \hat{v}_{2010}) + q^2(\hat{v}_{2010} + \hat{v}_{1200}) + q^3\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{0201} &= \hat{v}_{0201} + q(\hat{v}_{2001} + \hat{v}_{2010}) + q^2(\hat{v}_{2010} + \hat{v}_{1200}) + q^3\hat{v}_{2100} \\
\hat{b}_{0102} &= \hat{v}_{0102} + q(\hat{v}_{1002} + \hat{v}_{0201} + \hat{v}_{2010} + \hat{v}_{1200}) + q^2(\hat{v}_{1020} + \hat{v}_{0210} + \hat{v}_{2001} + \hat{v}_{2100}) + q^3(\hat{v}_{2010} + \hat{v}_{1200}) + q^4\hat{v}_{2100}
\end{align*}
$$
\[ b_{0021} = \dot{v}_{0021} + q(\dot{v}_{0120} + \dot{v}_{0201}) + q^2(\dot{v}_{1020} + \dot{v}_{0210} + \dot{v}_{2001}) + q^3(\dot{v}_{1200} + \dot{v}_{2010}) + q^4\dot{v}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{b}_{0012} = \dot{v}_{0012} + q(\dot{v}_{0102} + \dot{v}_{0201}) + q^2(\dot{v}_{1002} + \dot{v}_{0120} + \dot{v}_{0201}) + q^3(\dot{v}_{1020} + \dot{v}_{0210} + \dot{v}_{2001}) + q^4(\dot{v}_{1200} + \dot{v}_{2010}) + q^5\dot{v}_{2100} \]

Consequently, the KLV polynomials are described by the inversion of the above triangular transformation matrix.

\[ \dot{v}_{2100} = \dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{1200} = \dot{b}_{1200} - q\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{2010} = \dot{b}_{2010} - q\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{1020} = \dot{b}_{1020} - q(b_{1200} + b_{2010}) + q^2\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{0210} = \dot{b}_{0210} - q(\dot{b}_{2010} + b_{1200}) + q^2\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{2001} = \dot{b}_{2001} - q\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{1002} = \dot{b}_{1002} - q(b_{1020} + b_{2001}) + q^2\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{0120} = \dot{b}_{0120} - q(b_{1020} + b_{0210}) + q^2(b_{2010} + b_{1200}) - q^3\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{0201} = \dot{b}_{0201} - q(b_{2001} + b_{0210}) + q^2\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{0102} = \dot{b}_{0102} - q(\dot{b}_{1002} + b_{0210} + b_{2001} + b_{1200}) + q^2(b_{1020} + b_{0210} + b_{2001}) - q^3\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{0021} = \dot{b}_{0021} - q(b_{1200} + b_{0120} + b_{0201}) + q^2\dot{b}_{2100} \]
\[ \dot{v}_{0012} = \dot{b}_{0012} - q(b_{0102} + b_{0021}) + q^2(b_{1200} + b_{0120} + b_{0201}) - q^3\dot{b}_{2010} \]

This gives the projective dimensions of simple and standard modules using Equation (9). These are given in the following table, where we also denote the corresponding elements of \( X_{\lambda} \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pd \Delta(2100)</th>
<th>pd L(2100)</th>
<th>pd L(1200)</th>
<th>pd L(2010)</th>
<th>pd L(1020)</th>
<th>pd L(0210)</th>
<th>pd L(2001)</th>
<th>pd L(1002)</th>
<th>pd L(0120)</th>
<th>pd L(0201)</th>
<th>pd L(0021)</th>
<th>pd L(0012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s_3</td>
<td>s_1s_3</td>
<td>s_2s_3</td>
<td>s_2s_1s_3</td>
<td>s_1s_2s_3</td>
<td>s_3s_2s_3</td>
<td>s_3s_2s_1s_3</td>
<td>s_3s_1s_2s_3</td>
<td>s_3s_1s_2s_3</td>
<td>s_3s_1s_2s_3</td>
<td>s_3s_1s_2s_3</td>
<td>s_3s_1s_2s_3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It follows that this block is almost monotone, but not weakly monotone.

To write out the left cells, we use the notation of Subsection 10. This gives:

\[ L'_1 = \{(1002), (0102), (0120)\}, \quad L'_2 = \{(1200), (1020)\}, \]
\[ L_1 = \{(2001), (0201), (0021)\}, \quad L_3 = \{(2100), (2010), (0210)\}. \]

The symmetrised Ext^1-quivar hence has the following form (each unoriented arrow in this quiver corresponds to two arrows in the usual Ext^1-quivar going in opposite
directions), where we also mark, on the side, the projective dimension of each simple:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
(2100) & [6] & & \\
(0012) & [3] & & \\
\end{array}
\]

Note that this Ext\(^1\)-quiver can be embedded in the one in [ST2, Appendix A], as described in [CMH, Proposition 3.1]. In particular, (2100) gets mapped to 2 and (0012) to 24.

Proof of Theorem \(\square\). Consider \(\kappa = s_1 s_3 \cdot \lambda\), represented by (1200). The Serre subcategory of \(O_\lambda\) generated by \(L(\nu)\) for \(\nu \leq \kappa\) is extension full by [CPS1]. We denote this subcategory by \(A\) and also use \(L = L(1200)\) and \(\Delta = \Delta(1200)\). By using the results on the projective dimensions and the Ext\(^1\)-quiver, it follows that the Serre subcategory generated by the simple modules in \(A\) that are not isomorphic to \(L(0210)\) or \(L(0201)\), is a saturated initial segment in \(O_\lambda\), which we denote by \(I\). It suffices to prove that \(I\) is not extension full in \(A\).

It follows immediately that \(\Delta\) is the projective cover of \(L\) in \(A\). Take \(K\) equal to the smallest submodule of \(\Delta\) which contains all occurrences of \(L(0210)\) and \(L(0201)\) (they appear once each by the Lusztig’s canonical basis and the BGG reciprocity).

It follows from standard homological arguments that the module \(P_I\), defined by the short exact sequence

\[
0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow \Delta \rightarrow P_I \rightarrow 0,
\]

is an indecomposable projective cover of \(L\) in \(I\). From Lusztig’s canonical basis it follows furthermore that \(L(0210)\) appears in the top of \(K\), so we can define \(M\) by the short exact sequence \(M \rightarrow K \rightarrow L(0210)\). As \([\Delta : L] = 1\), we find that the first term in the exact sequence

\[
\text{Hom}_A(M, L) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1_A(L(0210), L) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1_A(K, L)
\]

is zero. However, \(\text{Ext}^1_A(L(0210), L) \cong \text{Ext}^1_{O\lambda}(L(0210), L)\) is non-zero by the Ext\(^1\)-quiver, so \(\text{Ext}^1_A(K, L) \neq 0\). As \(\Delta\) is projective in \(A\), the exact sequence

\[
\text{Ext}^1_A(\Delta, L) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1_A(K, L) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(P_I, L) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^2_A(\Delta, L),
\]

then yields

\[
\text{Ext}^2_A(P_I, L) \neq 0 = \text{Ext}^2_A(P_I, L),
\]

concluding the proof. \(\square\)
11.3. The case $w_0^3 = s_2$. In this case, we have

$$L(s_2) = \{s_2, s_1s_2, s_3s_2\}.$$ 

As in the previous subsection, we can compute the following KLV polynomials:

- $\hat{v}_{2110} = \hat{b}_{2110}
- \hat{v}_{1210} = \hat{b}_{1210} - q\hat{b}_{2110}
- \hat{v}_{2101} = \hat{b}_{2101} - q\hat{b}_{2110}
- \hat{v}_{1201} = \hat{b}_{1201} - q(\hat{b}_{1210} + \hat{b}_{2101}) + q^2\hat{b}_{2110}
- \hat{v}_{1120} = \hat{b}_{1120} - q\hat{b}_{1210}
- \hat{v}_{2011} = \hat{b}_{2011} - q\hat{b}_{2101}
- \hat{v}_{1021} = \hat{b}_{1021} - q(\hat{b}_{1120} + \hat{b}_{1201} + b_{2011}) + q^2(\hat{b}_{1210} + \hat{b}_{2101})
- \hat{v}_{1102} = \hat{b}_{1102} - q(\hat{b}_{1120} + \hat{b}_{1201}) + q^2\hat{b}_{1210}
- \hat{v}_{0211} = \hat{b}_{0211} - q(\hat{b}_{2011} + \hat{b}_{1201}) + q^2\hat{b}_{2101}
- \hat{v}_{0121} = \hat{b}_{0121} - q(\hat{b}_{0211} + \hat{b}_{1021}) + q^2(\hat{b}_{1201} + \hat{b}_{1120} + \hat{b}_{2101}) - q^3\hat{b}_{2110}
- \hat{v}_{0112} = \hat{b}_{0112} - q(\hat{b}_{1012} + \hat{b}_{0121}) + q^2\hat{b}_{1021} - q^3\hat{b}_{2110}.

These yield the following projective dimensions.

$$\begin{align*}
\text{pd } \Delta(2110) &= 0 \quad \text{pd } L(2110) = 6 & s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(1210) &= 1 \quad \text{pd } L(1210) = 6 & s_1s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(2101) &= 1 \quad \text{pd } L(2101) = 6 & s_3s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(1201) &= 2 \quad \text{pd } L(1201) = 5 & s_1s_3s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(1120) &= 1 \quad \text{pd } L(1120) = 5 & s_2s_1s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(2011) &= 1 \quad \text{pd } L(2011) = 5 & s_2s_3s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(1021) &= 2 \quad \text{pd } L(1021) = 5 & s_2s_1s_3s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(1102) &= 2 \quad \text{pd } L(1102) = 4 & s_3s_2s_1s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(0211) &= 2 \quad \text{pd } L(0211) = 4 & s_1s_2s_3s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(0121) &= 3 \quad \text{pd } L(0121) = 4 & s_1s_2s_1s_3s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(1012) &= 3 \quad \text{pd } L(1012) = 4 & s_3s_2s_1s_3s_2 \\
\text{pd } \Delta(0112) &= 3 \quad \text{pd } L(0112) = 3 & s_1s_3s_2s_1s_3s_2
\end{align*}$$

This block is thus weakly monotone.

11.4. The case $w_0^3 = s_1s_3$. In this case, we have

$$L(s_1s_3) = \{s_1s_3, s_2s_1s_3\}$$

and the KLV polynomials are given by:

$$\begin{align*}
\hat{v}_{1100} &= \hat{b}_{1100} \\
\hat{v}_{1010} &= \hat{b}_{1010} - q\hat{b}_{1100} \\
\hat{v}_{0110} &= \hat{b}_{0110} - q\hat{b}_{1010} \\
\hat{v}_{1001} &= \hat{b}_{1001} - q\hat{b}_{0101} \\
\hat{v}_{0101} &= \hat{b}_{0101} - q(\hat{b}_{0110} + \hat{b}_{1001} + b_{1100}) + q^2\hat{b}_{1010} \\
b_{0011} &= b_{0011} - q\hat{b}_{0101} + q^2b_{1100}.
\end{align*}$$
These yield the following projective dimensions.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pd } & \Delta(1100) = 0 & \text{pd } & L(1100) = 4 & s_1s_3 \\
\text{pd } & \Delta(1010) = 1 & \text{pd } & L(1010) = 4 & s_2s_1s_3 \\
\text{pd } & \Delta(0110) = 1 & \text{pd } & L(0110) = 3 & s_1s_2s_1s_3 \\
\text{pd } & \Delta(1001) = 1 & \text{pd } & L(1001) = 3 & s_3s_2s_1s_3 \\
\text{pd } & \Delta(0101) = 2 & \text{pd } & L(0101) = 3 & s_1s_3s_2s_1s_3 \\
\text{pd } & \Delta(0011) = 2 & \text{pd } & L(0011) = 2 & s_2s_1s_3s_2s_1s_3
\end{align*}
\]

This block is thus weakly monotone.

12. Lie superalgebras

In this section we obtain the projective dimension of arbitrary injective modules in the BGG category for classical Lie superalgebras.

Consider a simple classical Lie superalgebra \(g\), see [CW, Mu], with an arbitrary choice of positive roots \(\Delta^+\). To make a distinction between notation for the Lie superalgebra \(g\) and its underlying Lie algebra \(g_0\), we denote the BGG category for \(g\) by \(O\), simple modules by \(L(\kappa)\), for \(\kappa \in h_0^*\), and their indecomposable injective envelope in \(O\) by \(\mathcal{I}(\kappa)\), whereas we maintain the same notation for the Lie algebra \(g_0\) as before. However, by \(2p = 2p_0 - 2p_1\) we now mean the sum of all even positive roots minus the sum of all odd positive roots. Note that the functors \(\text{Res}^g_{g_0}\) and \(\text{Ind}^g_{g_0}\) induce exact functors between \(O\) and \(O\) preserving projective and injective modules.

First we prove a generalisation of [CS, Theorem 6.1(iii)]

**Proposition 69.** For any \(\kappa \in h_0^*\), let \(\nu \in h_0^\perp\) be such that \(L(\nu)\) appears in the socle or top of \(\text{Res}^g_{g_0} L(\kappa)\) (up to parity shift). Then we have

\[
\text{pd } O\mathcal{I}(\kappa) = \text{pd } O\mathcal{I}(\nu).
\]

Note that \(\text{Res}^g_{g_0} L(\kappa)\) is self-dual, hence its top and socle are isomorphic. Moreover \(L(\kappa)\) is in the top of \(\text{Res}^g_{g_0} L(\kappa)\) if and only if it is a direct summand.

**Proof.** For simplicity, in this proof we ignore the parity shifts of all involved modules. Assume that \(L(\nu) \hookrightarrow \text{Res}^g_{g_0} L(\kappa)\). By adjunction, we have a morphism \(\text{Ind}^g_{g_0} L(\nu) \to L(\kappa)\). So, we have, in particular,

\[
\text{Hom}_{g_0}(\text{Res}^g_{g_0} L(\kappa), I(\nu)) = [\text{Res}^g_{g_0} L(\kappa) : L(\nu)] \neq 0
\]

and

\[
\text{Hom}_{g}(\text{Ind}^g_{g_0} L(\nu), \mathcal{I}(\kappa)) = [\text{Ind}^g_{g_0} L(\nu) : \mathcal{I}(\kappa)] \neq 0.
\]

Applying adjunction and the fact that \(\text{Res}^g_{g_0}\) and \(\text{Ind}^g_{g_0}\) preserve injective modules to these statements, yields inclusions

\[
\mathcal{I}(\kappa) \hookrightarrow \text{Ind}^g_{g_0} I(\nu) \quad \text{and} \quad I(\nu) \hookrightarrow \text{Res}^g_{g_0} \mathcal{I}(\kappa).
\]

Since the exact functors \(\text{Res}^g_{g_0}\) and \(\text{Ind}^g_{g_0}\) map projective resolutions to projective resolutions, we find

\[
\text{pd } O\mathcal{I}(\kappa) \leq \text{pd } O\mathcal{I}(\nu) \leq \text{pd } O\mathcal{I}(\kappa).
\]

The claim follows.
For $\kappa \in \Lambda_{\text{int}}$, we denote by $\mathcal{I}(\kappa) \subset \Delta^+_0$ the set of positive roots $\alpha$ for which $\mathcal{L}(\kappa)$ is $\alpha$-free. We denote the corresponding set for the $g_0$-module $L(\kappa)$ by $D(\kappa)$. We also define $x^g_\kappa$, respectively $x^D_\kappa$, as the unique elements of the Weyl group for which we have

$$\{\alpha \in \Delta^+_0 \mid x^g_\kappa(\alpha) \in \Delta^+_0\} = \mathcal{I}(\kappa), \quad \{\alpha \in \Delta^+_0 \mid x^D_\kappa(\alpha) \in \Delta^+_0\} = D(\kappa).$$

Note that $x^D_\kappa$ is equivalently defined as longest element of the Weyl group for which we have $\kappa + \rho_0 \in x^D_\kappa(\Lambda^+_0 + \rho_0)$.

**Theorem 70.** For $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\text{int}}$, we have

$$\text{pd}_O \mathcal{I}(\lambda) = 2a(w_0 x^g_\lambda).$$

**Proof.** In case $g$ is even, i.e. a reductive Lie algebra, this is just a reformulation of Theorem [44][45] for $\mu = 0$. The extension of the characterisation to superalgebras thus follows from Proposition [68] as the property that $L(\nu)$ appears in the socle or top of $\text{Res}^O_{g_0} \mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ implies that $D(\nu) = \mathcal{I}(\lambda)$ and hence $x^D_\nu = x^g_\lambda$. $\square$

For any $\lambda \in \Lambda_{\text{int}}$, we set $[\lambda] \subset \Lambda_{\text{int}}$ equal to the set of all $\mu$ of the form

$$\mu = w(\lambda + \rho + k_1 \gamma_1 + \cdots + k_n \gamma_n) - \rho,$$

where $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\{\gamma_i\}$ is a maximal set of mutually orthogonal, linearly independent isotropic roots orthogonal to $\lambda + \rho$. This number $n$ is known as the *degree of atypicality* of $\lambda$ and is, clearly, a constant for any $\mu \in [\lambda]$.

**Lemma 71.** The indecomposable block in $O$ containing $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$ is the Serre subcategory of $O$ generated by all $\mathcal{L}(\mu)$ with $\mu \in [\lambda]$. We denote this block by $O_{[\lambda]}$.

**Proof.** According to [56][57] Lemma 2.1], the set $[\lambda]$ is precisely the set of integral weights $\mu$ such that $\mathcal{L}(\mu)$ admits the same central character as $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$. It hence suffices to show that any such $\mathcal{L}(\mu)$ is in the same indecomposable block as $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$. This is a standard exercise, which can be carried out by the methods in the proof of [CMW] Theorem 3.12] and Serganova’s technique of odd reflections, see e.g. [MU] or [CM1] Lemma 2.3]. $\square$

As shown in the proof of [MA] Theorem 3], the finitistic dimension of $O_{[\lambda]}$ is equal to the maximal projective dimension of an injective module in $O_{[\lambda]}$ and is subsequently always finite. Theorem [77] and Lemma [71] thus determine implicitly these finitistic dimensions of blocks. Obtaining a closed expression would require some further work. However, we immediately have the following consequence, where we use the concept of generic weights from [CM1] Definition 7.1].

**Corollary 72.** If $[\lambda]$ contains a generic weight, then

$$\text{fnd} O_{[\lambda]} = 21(w_0).$$

**Proof.** Theorem [70] implies that $\text{fnd} O_{[\lambda]} \leq 21(w_0)$ for any block. The assumption and the remark before [CM1] Lemma 2.2] imply that $[\lambda]$ contains a $\nu$ which is dominant (for both the $p$-shifted and for the $\rho_0$-shifted action) and which is generic as well. As $\nu$ is generic it is in particular regular, so $\text{pd}_O L(\nu) = 21(w_0)$. By [CM1] Lemma 2.2], $L(\nu)$ appears in the top of $\text{Res}^O_{g_0} \mathcal{L}(\nu)$, so Proposition [69] concludes the proof. $\square$
13. Open questions

The following questions naturally arise from the results in this paper:

(I) Is there a direct argument which explains the observation in Remark 45?

(II) Does the formula
\[ s_\lambda(x) \geq a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_0^\lambda) \]
of Proposition 47 hold outside type A as well?

(III) Is it possible to generalise Theorem 62 in the following way: does the formula
\[ s_\lambda(x) = a(w_0 x) + a(w_0 w_0^\lambda) \]
hold for arbitrary \( \lambda \in \Lambda^+_{\text{int}} \) such that \( W_\lambda \) is a maximal Coxeter subgroup of \( W \)? Note that the question whether the equality \( d_\lambda(x) = a(xw_0^\lambda) \) holds for arbitrary maximal Coxeter subgroups has the negative answer by [Col, Section 8].

(IV) What is the finitistic dimension of the category \( \mathcal{O}^R_0 \) for a fixed arbitrary right cell \( R \)? Do injective modules in \( \mathcal{O}^R_0 \) always have finite projective dimension?

(V) Is it possible to construct an explicit combinatorial formula for the bijection \( \psi^{\mu} : R(w_0^\mu w_0) \to w_0^\mu R(w_0^\mu) \) in Remark 28?

(VI) What is the subset \( U^{\mu}_\lambda \subset X^{\mu}_\lambda \) of all \( x \) for which \( L(x \cdot \lambda) \) is standard in \( \mathcal{O}^\mu_\lambda \)? Note that we have \( U^{\mu}_\lambda = \{ w_0^\mu w_0 \} \) and \( U_\lambda = \{ w_0 \} \). In general, \( U^{\mu}_\lambda \) will not consist of one element, in particular, since \( \mathcal{O}^\mu_\lambda \) can decompose into a non-trivial direct sum. Does every summand contain a unique simple standard module?

(VII) The diagram in Theorem 57 can be applied to show that \( \mathcal{C}_1(\mu, \lambda) \Rightarrow \mathcal{S}_1(\mu, \lambda) \). Does the implication in the other direction also hold?
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