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Abstract

We explain that the Pontryagin product structure on the equivariant $K$-group of an affine Grassmannian considered in [Lam-Schilling-Shimozono, Compos. Math. 146 (2010)] coincides with the tensor structure on the equivariant $K$-group of a semi-infinite flag manifold considered in [K-Naito-Sagaki, arXiv:1702.02408]. Then, we construct an explicit isomorphism between the equivariant $K$-group of a semi-infinite flag manifold with a suitably localized equivariant quantum $K$-group of the corresponding flag manifold. These exhibit a new framework to understand the ring structure of equivariant quantum $K$-groups and the Peterson isomorphism.

Introduction

Let $G$ be a simply connected simple algebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$ with a maximal torus $H$. Let $\text{Gr}$ denote its affine Grassmannian and let $\mathcal{B}$ be its flag variety.

Following a seminal work of Peterson [38] (on the quantum cohomology), many efforts have paid to understand the (small) quantum $K$-group $qK(\mathcal{B})$ of $\mathcal{B}$ in terms of the $K$-group $K(\text{Gr})$ of affine Grassmanians (see [29, 28] and the references therein). One of its form, borrowed from Lam-Li-Mihalcea-Shimozono [28], is a (conjectural) ring isomorphism:

$$K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}} \cong qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{\text{loc}}, \quad (0.1)$$

where subscript $H$ indicate the $H$-equivariant version and the subscript loc denote certain localizations. Here the multiplication in $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$ is the Pontryagin product, that differs from the usual product, while the multiplication of $qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{\text{loc}}$ is standard in quantum $K$-theory [16, 30].

On the other hand, we have another version $\mathcal{Q}_G^{rat}$ of affine flag variety of $G$, called the semi-infinite flag variety ([11, 13, 10]). Almost from the beginning [15], it is expected that $\mathcal{Q}_G^{rat}$ have some relation with the quantum cohomology of $\mathcal{B}$. In fact, we can calculate the equivariant $K$-theoretic $J$-function of $\mathcal{B}$ using $\mathcal{Q}_G^{rat}$ ([17, 5]), and the reconstruction theorem [31, 20] tells us that they essentially recover the ring structure of the (big) quantum $K$-group of $\mathcal{B}$.
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In [23], we have defined and calculated the equivariant $K$-group of $Q_{rat}^{rat}$, that is also expected to have some relation to $qK_H(B)$, and hence also to $K_H(Gr)$. The goal of this paper is to tell exact relations as follows:

**Theorem A** ($\equiv$ Theorem 2.1). We have a dense embedding

$$\Phi : K_H(Gr_G)_{loc} \hookrightarrow K_H(Q_{rat}^{rat})$$

that sends the Pontryagin product on the LHS to the tensor product on the RHS.

By transplanting the path model of $K_H(Q_{rat}^{rat})$, Theorem A yields the multiplication formulas of the classes in $K_H(Gr_G)_{loc}$ ([23, 37]).

Our strategy to prove Theorem A is as follows: the both sides admit the actions of a large algebra $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}Q^\vee$, that makes $K_H(Gr_G)_{loc}$ into a cyclic module. Hence, its $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}Q^\vee$-endomorphism is determined by the image of a cyclic vector. Moreover, the tensor product action of an equivariant line bundle on $K_H(Q_{rat}^{rat})$ yields a $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}Q^\vee$-endomorphism. These make it possible to identify important parts of the Pontryagin action on the LHS that gives a $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}Q^\vee$-endomorphism with the tensor product action on the RHS.

Other part of the exact relation we exhibit is:

**Theorem B** ($\equiv$ Theorem 3.1). We have an isomorphism

$$\Psi : qK_H(B)_{loc} \cong K_H(Q_{rat}^{rat})$$

that sends the quantum product of a primitive line bundle to the tensor product of the corresponding line bundle.

We remark that our proof of Theorem B can be seen as the $q = 1$ specialization of an isomorphism with $K_H(Q_{rat}^{rat})$ replaced with $K_{H \times \mathbb{G}_m}(Q_{rat}^{rat})$, although the author does not know the meaning of the LHS in such a setting. Combining Theorems A and B, we conclude:

**Corollary C** ($\equiv$ Corollary 3.2). We have a commutative diagram, whose bottom arrow is a natural embedding of rings:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
K_H(Q_{rat}^{rat}) & \rightarrow & qK_H(B)_{loc} \\
\Phi \downarrow & & \downarrow \Psi \\
K_H(Gr_G)_{loc} & \rightarrow & qK_H(B)_{loc}
\end{array}
$$

The explicit nature of Corollary C verifies conjectures in [28] on the basis of the normality$^1$ of Zastava space closures that we prove in [22]. In particular, the (inverse) quantum multiplication of a primitive anti-nef line bundle and a Schubert class in $qK_H(B)$ has positive structure constants by [23, Theorem 4.10]. The idea of the construction of $\Psi$ in Theorem B is rather straightforward if we know the crucial “cohomological invariance” between two models of semi-infinite flag manifolds proved in [6, 23], the reconstruction theorem in the form

$^1$A previous version of this paper contained a proof of Theorem 4.1 with a gap. To clarify the whole point, the author decided to separate out the proof of the normality and other related technical results into [22] (see Theorem 4.4). We note that Theorem 4.4 can be also used to fill out the gap in a previous version (arXiv ver. 4, dated 28/July/2018).
of [20], and the J-function calculations from [17, 5]. In order to show that it respects products (Theorem 4.1), we need to analyze the geometry of graph spaces and quasi-map spaces. This analysis includes the proof that the Zastava space closures have rational singularity and is Cohen-Macauley (Corollary 4.5), that might be its own interest.

Note that $Q^\text{rat}_\mathbb{G}$ is the reduced indscheme associated to the formal loop space of $\mathbb{G}$ ([5, 23]). Hence, it is tempting to spell out the following, that unifies the proposals by Givental [15, §4] (cf. Iritani [19]), Peterson [38] (cf. [28]), and Arkhipov-Kapranov [3, §6.2]:

**Conjecture D.** Let $X$ be a smooth convex variety (see [25]) with an action of an algebraic group $H$ so that either $X$ itself is projective or $\mathbb{G}_m \subset H$ contracts $X$ to a projective subvariety. Let $\mathcal{L}X$ be the formal loop space of $X$ (see [3]). Then, we have an inclusion that intertwines the quantum product and tensor product of line bundles:

$$\Psi_X : qK_H(X) \hookrightarrow K_H((\mathcal{L}X)_{\text{red}}),$$

where $K_H((\mathcal{L}X)_{\text{red}})$ denotes the $H$-equivariant $K$-group of the reduced counterpart of $\mathcal{L}X$ (defined as a straight-forward generalization of [23]).

Here we warn that taking reduced part is essential [36, 12] when $X = \mathbb{B}$.

The organization of this paper is as follows: In section one, we recall some basic results from previous works (needed to formulate Theorems A and B), with some complementary results. In section two, we formulate the precise version of Theorem A, exhibit its $SL(2)$-example, and prove Theorem A. In section three, we formulate the precise version of Theorem B, explain why it solves conjectures in [28] (Corollary 3.2), make recollections on quasi-map spaces and J-functions, and construct the map $\Psi$ following ideas of [17, 5, 6, 20] using results from [23]. This proves the main portion of Theorem B, and also Corollary C. In section four, we first state Theorem 4.1 about identification of bases under the map $\Psi$ that completes the proof of Corollary 3.2. Then, we recall basic materials on graph spaces, prove that Zastava space closures have rational singularities using the results from [22], and prove Theorem 4.1.

Finally, a word of caution is in order. The equivariant $K$-groups dealt in this paper are not identical to those dealt in [29] and [23] in the sense that both groups are just dense subset (or intersects with a dense subset) in the original $K$-groups (the both groups are suitably topologized). The author does not try to complete this point as he believes it not essential.

## 1 Preliminaries

A vector space is always a $C$-vector space, and a graded vector space refers to a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded vector space whose graded pieces are finite-dimensional and its grading is bounded from the above. Tensor products are taken over $C$ unless stated otherwise. We define the graded dimension of a graded vector space as

$$\text{gdim } M := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} q^i \dim_C M_i \in \mathbb{Q}[[q^{-1}]].$$

For a (possibly operator-valued) rational function $f(q)$ on $q$, we set $\overline{f(q)} := f(q^{-1})$. 

1
1.1 Groups, root systems, and Weyl groups

Basically, material presented in this subsection can be found in [8, 27].

Let $G$ be a connected, simply connected simple algebraic group of rank $r$ over $\mathbb{C}$, and let $B$ and $H$ be a Borel subgroup and a maximal torus of $G$ so that $H \subset B$. We set $N := [B, B]$ to be the unipotent radical of $B$ and let $N^-$ be the opposite unipotent subgroup of $N$ with respect to $H$. We denote the Lie algebra of an algebraic group by the corresponding German small letter.

We have a (finite) Weyl group $W := N_G(H)/H$. For an algebraic group $G$, we denote its set of $\mathbb{C}[z]$-valued points by $E[z]$, its set of $\mathbb{C}[z]$-valued points by $E[z]$, and its set of $\mathbb{C}(z)$-valued points by $E(z)$. Let $\mathcal{I} \subset G[z]$ be the preimage of $B \subset G$ via the evaluation at $z = 0$ (the Iwahori subgroup of $G[z]$).

Let $P := \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{Z}}(H, \mathbb{C}^\times)$ be the weight lattice of $H$, let $\Delta \subset P$ be the set of roots, let $\Delta_+ \subset \Delta$ be the set of roots that yield root subspaces in $h$, and let $\Pi \subset \Delta_+$ be the set of simple roots. We set $\Delta := -\Delta_+$. Let $Q^\vee$ be the dual lattice of $P$ with a natural pairing $(\bullet, \bullet) : Q^\vee \times P \to \mathbb{Z}$. We define $\Pi^\vee \subset Q^\vee$ to be the set of positive simple coroots, and let $Q^\vee_+ \subset Q^\vee$ be the set of non-negative integer span of $\Pi^\vee$. For $\beta, \gamma \in Q^\vee$, we define $\beta \geq \gamma$ if and only if $\beta - \gamma \in Q^\vee_+$. We set $P_+ := \{ \lambda \in P \mid (\alpha^\vee, \lambda) \geq 0, \forall \alpha^\vee \in \Pi^\vee \}$. Let $I := \{1, 2, \ldots, r\}$. We fix bijections $I \cong \Pi \cong \Pi^\vee$ so that $i \in I$ corresponds to $\alpha_i \in \Pi$, its coroot $\alpha_i^\vee \in \Pi^\vee$, and a simple reflection $s_i \in W$ corresponding to $\alpha_i$. We also have a reflection $s_\alpha \in W$ corresponding to $\alpha \in \Delta_+$. Let $\{w_i\}_{i \in I} \subset P_+$ be the set of fundamental weights (i.e. $(\alpha_i^\vee, w_j) = \delta_{ij}$) and we set $\rho := \sum_{i \in I} w_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \alpha \in P_+$.

Let $\Delta_{af} := \Delta \times \mathbb{Z}\delta \cup \{m\delta\}_{m \neq 0}$ be the untwisted affine root system of $\Delta$ with its positive part $\Delta_+ \subset \Delta_{af}$. We set $\alpha_0 := -\delta + \delta$, $\Pi_{af} := \Pi \cup \{\alpha_0\}$, and $I_{af} := I \cup \{0\}$, where $\delta$ is the highest root of $\Delta_+$. We set $W_{af} := W \ltimes \mathbb{Q}^\vee$ and call it the affine Weyl group. It is a reflection group generated by $\{s_i \mid i \in I_{af}\}$, where $s_0$ is the reflection with respect to $\alpha_0$. Let $\ell : W_{af} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be the length function and let $w_0 \in W$ be the longest element in $W \subset W_{af}$. Together with the normalization $t_{-\delta^\vee} := s_\delta s_0$ (for the coroot $\delta^\vee$ of $\delta$), we introduce the translation element $t_\beta \in W_{af}$ for each $\beta \in Q^\vee$.

For each $i \in I_{af}$, we have a subgroup $SL(2, i) \subset G(\mathbb{C})$ that is isomorphic to $SL(2, \mathbb{C})$ or $PGL(2, \mathbb{C})$ corresponding to $\alpha_i \in I_{af}$. We set $B_i := SL(2, i) \cap I$, that is a Borel subgroup of $SL(2, i)$. For each $i \in I$, we denote the parabolic subgroup of $G$ corresponding to $i \in I$ by $P_i$.

Let $W_{af}$ denote the set of minimal length representatives of $W_{af}/W$ in $W_{af}$. We set $Q^\vee_{af} := \{ \beta \in Q^\vee \mid (\beta, \alpha_i) < 0, \forall i \in I \}$.

Let $\leq$ be the Bruhat order of $W_{af}$. In other words, $w \leq v$ holds if and only if any subexpression of a reduced decomposition of $v$ yields a reduced decomposition of $w$ (see [4]). We define the generic (semi-infinite) Bruhat order $\preceq$ as:

$$w \preceq v \iff wt_\beta \leq vt_\beta \quad \text{for every } \beta \in Q^\vee \text{ so that } \langle \beta, \alpha_i \rangle < 0 \text{ for } i \in I.$$  \hfill (1.1)

By [34], this defines a preorder on $W_{af}$. Here we remark that $w \leq v$ if and only if $w \geq \preceq v$ for $w, v \in W$. See also [23, \S 2.2].

For each $\lambda \in P_+$, we denote a finite-dimensional simple $G$-module with a $B$-eigenvector with its $H$-weight $\lambda$ by $L(\lambda)$. Let $R(G)$ be the (complexified) representation ring of $G$. We have an identification $R(G) = (\mathbb{CP})^W \subset \mathbb{CP}$ by
For a semi-simple $H$-module $V$, we set
\[ \text{ch } V := \sum_{\lambda \in P} e^\lambda \cdot \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Hom}_H(\mathbb{C}_\lambda, V). \]

If $V$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded $H$-module in addition, then we set
\[ \text{gch } V := \sum_{\lambda \in P, n \in \mathbb{Z}} q^n e^\lambda \cdot \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Hom}_H(\mathbb{C}_\lambda, V^*_n). \]

Let $B := G/B$ and call it the flag manifold of $G$. It is equipped with the
Bruhat decomposition
\[ B = \bigsqcup_{w \in W} \mathcal{O}_B(w) \]
into $B$-orbits so that $\dim \mathcal{O}_B(w) = \ell(w_0) - \ell(w)$ for each $w \in W \subset W_{af}$. We set $B(w) := \mathcal{O}_B(w) \subset B$.

For each $\lambda \in P$, we have a line bundle $\mathcal{O}_B(\lambda)$ so that
\[ \text{ch } H^0(B, \mathcal{O}_B(\lambda)) = \text{ch } L(\lambda), \quad \mathcal{O}_B(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_B} \mathcal{O}_B(-\mu) \cong \mathcal{O}_B(\lambda - \mu) \quad \lambda, \mu \in P_+. \]

We have a notion of $H$-equivariant $K$-group $K_H(B)$ of $B$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}$ (see e.g. [26]). Explicitly, we have
\[ K_H(B) = \bigoplus_{w \in W} \mathbb{C}P[\mathcal{O}_B(w)] = \mathbb{C}P \otimes_{R(G)} \bigoplus_{\lambda \in P} \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}_B(\lambda)]. \]

The map ch extends to a $\mathbb{C}P$-linear map
\[ \chi : K_H(B) \to \mathbb{C}P, \]
that we call the $H$-equivariant Euler-Poincaré characteristic. The group $K_H(B)$ is equipped with the product structure $\cdot$ induced by the tensor product of line bundles. The following is well-known:

**Theorem 1.1** (see Lenart-Shimozono [33] Remark 4.9). We have an equality
\[ [\mathcal{O}_B(s_i)] = [\mathcal{O}_B] - e^{-\varpi_i}[\mathcal{O}_B(-\varpi_i)] \in K_H(B). \]

### 1.2 Level zero nil-DHAHA

**Definition 1.2.** The level zero nil-DHAHA $\mathcal{H}$ of type $G$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra generated by $\{e^\lambda\}_{\lambda \in P} \cup \{D_i\}_{i \in I_{af}}$ subject to the following relations:

1. $e^{\lambda+\mu} = e^\lambda \cdot e^\mu$ for $\lambda, \mu \in P$;
2. $D_i^2 = D_i$ for each $i \in I_{af}$;
3. For each distinct $i, j \in I_{af}$, we set $m_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ as the minimum number so that $(s_is_j)^{m_{i,j}} = 1$. Then, we have
\[ D_iD_j \cdots = D_jD_i \cdots. \]
4. For each $\lambda \in P$ and $i \in I$, we have

$$D_i e^\lambda - e^s_i \lambda D_i = \frac{e^\lambda - e^{s_i \lambda}}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}};$$

5. For each $\lambda \in P$, we have

$$D_0 e^\lambda - e^s_\vartheta \lambda D_0 = \frac{e^\lambda - e^{s_\vartheta \lambda}}{1 - e^{-\vartheta}}.$$

Let $S := CP \otimes C_{Waf}$ be the smash product algebra, whose multiplication reads as:

$$(e^\lambda \otimes w)(e^\mu \otimes v) = e^{\lambda + \mu} \otimes wv \quad \lambda, \mu \in P, w, v \in W_{af},$$

where $s_0$ acts on $P$ as $s_\vartheta$. Let $C(P)$ denote the fraction field of (the Laurent polynomial algebra) $CP$. We have a scalar extension

$$A := C(P) \otimes CP S = C(P) \otimes C_{Waf}.$$

**Theorem 1.3** ([29] §2.2). We have an embedding of algebras $\iota^* : \mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow A$:

$$e^\lambda \mapsto e^\lambda \otimes 1, \quad D_i \mapsto \frac{1}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes 1 - \frac{e^{\alpha_i}}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes s_i, \quad \lambda \in P, i \in I$$

$$D_0 \mapsto \frac{1}{1 - e^{-\vartheta}} \otimes 1 - \frac{e^{-\vartheta}}{1 - e^{-\vartheta}} \otimes s_0.$$

Since we have a natural action of $A$ on $C(P)$, we obtain an action of $\mathcal{H}$ on $C(P)$, that we call the polynomial representation.

For $w \in W_{af}$, we find a reduced expression $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell} \ (i_1, \ldots, i_\ell \in I_{af})$ and set

$$D_w := D_{s_{i_1}} D_{s_{i_2}} \cdots D_{s_{i_\ell}} \in \mathcal{H}.$$ 

By Definition 1.2 3), the element $D_w$ is independent of the choice of a reduced expression. By Definition 1.2 2), we have $D_i D_{w_0} = D_{w_0}$ for each $i \in I$, and hence $D^2_{w_0} = D_{w_0}$. We have an explicit form

$$D_{w_0} = 1 \otimes \left( \sum_{w \in W} w \right) \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \left( e^{-\alpha/2} - e^{\alpha/2} \right) \otimes 1 \in A \quad (1.2)$$

obtained from the (left $W$-invariance of the) Weyl character formula.

### 1.3 Affine Grassmanians

We define our (thin) affine Grassmannian and (thin) flag manifold by

$$Gr_G := G((z))/G[z] \quad \text{and} \quad X := G((z))/I,$$

respectively. We have a natural map $\pi : X \to Gr_G$ whose fiber is isomorphic to $B$. 


Theorem 1.4 (Bruhat decomposition, [27] Corollary 6.1.20). We have I-orbit decompositions
\[ \text{Gr} = \bigsqcup_{\beta \in Q^\vee} \mathcal{O}^G_{\beta} \quad \text{and} \quad X = \bigsqcup_{w \in W_{af}} \mathcal{O}_w \]
with the following properties:
1. we have \( \mathcal{O}_v \subset \mathcal{O}_w \) if and only if \( v \leq w \);
2. \( \pi(\mathcal{O}_w) \subset \mathcal{O}^G_{\beta} \) if and only if \( w \in t_\beta W \). \( \square \)

Let us set \( \text{Gr}_\beta := \mathcal{O}^G_{\beta} \) and \( X_w := \mathcal{O}_w \) for \( \beta \in Q^\vee \) and \( w \in W_{af} \). For \( w \in W_{af} \), we also set \( \text{Gr}_w := \text{Gr}_\beta \) for \( \beta \in Q^\vee \) so that \( w \in t_\beta W \).

We set
\[ K_H(\text{Gr}) := \bigoplus_{\beta \in Q^\vee} \mathbb{C}P[\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_\beta}] \quad \text{and} \quad K_H(X) := \bigoplus_{w \in W_{af}} \mathbb{C}P[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}]. \]

Theorem 1.5 (Kostant-Kumar [26]). The vector space \( K_H(X) \) affords a regular representation of \( \mathcal{H} \) so that:
1. the subalgebra \( \mathbb{C}P \subset \mathcal{H} \) acts by the multiplication as \( \mathbb{C}P \)-modules;
2. we have \( \Delta_i[\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] = [\mathcal{O}_{X_{s_iw}}] \) (\( s_iw > w \)) or \( [\mathcal{O}_{X_w}] \) (\( s_iw < w \)). \( \square \)

Being a regular representation, we sometimes identify \( K_H(X) \) with \( \mathcal{H}(\text{Gr}) \) through \( e^\lambda := e^\lambda D_w \) for \( \lambda \in \mathcal{P}, w \in W_{af} \) and consider product of two elements in \( \mathcal{H} \cup K_H(X) \).

Theorem 1.6 (Kostant-Kumar [26]). The pullback defines a map \( \pi^* : K_H(\text{Gr}_G) \hookrightarrow K_H(X) \) so that
\[ \pi^*[\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_\beta}] = [X_{t_\beta}]D_{w_0} \quad \beta \in Q^\vee. \]
In particular, \( \text{Im} \pi^* = \mathcal{H}D_{w_0} \) is a \( \mathcal{H} \)-submodule. \( \square \)

Let \( \mathcal{C} := \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}Q^\vee \subset A \) be a subalgebra. By our convention on the \( W_{af} \)-action on \( P \), we deduce that \( \mathcal{C} \) is commutative. We have a natural projection map
\[ \text{pr} : A = \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}W_{af} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C}Q^\vee = \mathcal{C} \]
so that \( \text{pr}(f \otimes t_\beta w) = f \otimes t_\beta \) for each \( f \in \mathbb{C}(P), w \in W, \beta \in Q^\vee \).

Theorem 1.7 (Lam-Schilling-Shimozono). The composition map \( \text{pr} \circ \iota^* \circ \pi^* \) defines an embedding
\[ K_H(\text{Gr}) \hookrightarrow K_H(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{C} \quad (\subset A) \]
whose image is contained in \( K_H(X) \cap \mathcal{C} \). It descends to an embedding
\[ \pi^* : K_H(\text{Gr}) \hookrightarrow K_H(X) \cap \mathcal{C} \quad (\subset A) \]
that is an isomorphism. This equips \( K_H(\text{Gr}) \) a subalgebra structure of a commutative algebra \( \mathcal{C} \).

Proof. By [28, Proposition 2], we deduce that the image of \( D_v \) under the map \( \text{pr} \) is the same for each \( v \in t_\beta W \). Therefore, the assertion follows from the description of [29, \S5.2]. \( \square \)
Thanks to Theorem 1.7, we obtain a commutative product structure of $K_H(\text{Gr})$ inherited from $\mathcal{E}$, that we denote by $\odot$. We call it the Pontryagin product.

Below, we might think of an element of $K_H(\text{Gr})$ as an element of $K_H(X)$ through $\pi^*$, an element of $\mathcal{A}$ through $i^* \circ \pi^*$, and as an element of $\mathcal{E}$ through $r^*$ interchangeably. The next result is probably well-known to experts, but so far the author is unable to find an appropriate reference.

**Theorem 1.8.** Let $w \in W^-_{af}$ and let $\beta \in Q^\vee_<$. We have

$$[O_{\text{Gr}} w] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}}] = [O_{\text{Gr}} w_{t \beta}].$$

**Proof.** By our assumption on $\beta$, we have $\ell(t_\beta) = \ell(w_0) + \ell(w_0 t_\beta)$ (see [35, (2.4.1)]). In particular, the element $[O_{\text{Gr}}]$, viewed as an element of $\mathcal{A}$ through $i^* \circ \pi^*$, is of the form $(\sum_{w \in W} w) \xi$ for some $\xi \in \mathcal{A}$ by (1.2). Hence, it is invariant by the left action of $W$. Since the effect of the map $pr$ is twists by elements of $W$ from the right in a term by term fashion, we deduce the equality

$$[O_{\text{Gr}} w] [O_{\text{Gr}}] = pr([O_{\text{Gr}} w]) [O_{\text{Gr}}] = pr([O_{\text{Gr}} w] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}}]).$$

(1.3)

Since $w \in W^-_{af}$, we have $\ell(w) + \ell(t_\beta) = \ell(w t_\beta)$ (see [38, Lecture 8, page12]). Consequently, we have $D_{w t_\beta} = D_w D_{t_\beta}$. Therefore, (1.3) and Theorem 1.7 implies that

$$[O_{\text{Gr}} w_{t \beta}] = [O_{\text{Gr}} w] [O_{\text{Gr}} w] = [O_{\text{Gr}}] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}}] \in K_H(\text{Gr})$$

as required.

Theorem 1.8 implies that the set

$$\{ [O_{\text{Gr}}] \mid \beta \in Q^\vee_< \} \subset (K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}, \odot)$$

forms a multiplicative system. We denote by $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$ its localization. The action of an element $[O_{\text{Gr}}]$ on $K_H(\text{Gr})$ in Theorem 1.8 is torsion-free, and hence we have an embedding $K_H(\text{Gr}) \hookrightarrow K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$.

**Corollary 1.9.** Let $i \in I$. For $\beta \in Q^\vee_<$, we set

$$h_i := [O_{\text{Gr}} w_{t \beta}] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}} w]^{-1}.$$

Then, the element $h_i$ is independent of the choice of $\beta$.

**Proof.** By Theorem 1.8, we have

$$[O_{\text{Gr}} w_{t \gamma \beta}] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}} w_{t \gamma \beta}]^{-1} = [O_{\text{Gr}} w_{t \beta}] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}} w] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}} w]^{-1} \odot [O_{\text{Gr}} w]^{-1}$$

$$= [O_{\text{Gr}} w_{t \beta}] \odot [O_{\text{Gr}} w]^{-1}$$

for $\gamma \in Q^\vee_<$. Hence, we conclude the assertion.
For each $\gamma \in Q^\vee$, we can write $\gamma = \beta_1 - \beta_2$, where $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in Q_\vee^\vee$. In particular, we have an element

$$t_\gamma := [O_{\text{Gr}_1}] \otimes [O_{\text{Gr}_2}]^{-1}.$$  

**Lemma 1.10.** For each $\gamma \in Q^\vee$, the element $t_\gamma \in K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$ is independent of the choices involved.

**Proof.** Similar to the proof of Corollary 1.9. The detail is left to the readers. \hfill \Box

### 1.4 Semi-infinite flag manifolds

We define the semi-infinite flag manifold as the reduced scheme associated to:

$$Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat} := G((z))/ (H \cdot N((z))).$$

This is a pure ind-scheme of ind-infinite type [23]. Note that the group $Q_\vee \subset H((z))/H$ acts on $Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}$ from the right. The indscheme $Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}$ is equipped with a $G((z))$-equivariant line bundle $O_{Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}}(\lambda)$ for each $\lambda \in P$. Here we normalized so that $\Gamma(Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}, O_{Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}}(\lambda))$ is co-generated by its $H$-weight $\lambda$-part as a $B^{-}(\langle z \rangle)$-module. We warn that this convention is twisted by $-w_0$ from that of [23].

**Theorem 1.11** ([13, 10, 23]). We have an $I$-orbit decomposition

$$Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat} = \bigcup_{w \in W_{\text{af}}} O(w)$$

with the following properties:

1. each $O(w)$ has infinite dimension and infinite codimension in $Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}$;
2. the right action of $\gamma \in Q^\vee$ on $Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}$ yields the translation $O(w) \mapsto O(wt_\gamma)$;
3. we have $O(w) \subset O(v)$ if and only if $w \leq v$. \hfill \Box

We define a $CP$-module $K_H(Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat})$ as:

$$K_H(Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}) := \{ \sum_{w \in W_{\text{af}}} a_w [O_{Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}}(w)] \mid a_w \in CP \exists \beta_0 \in Q^\vee \text{ s.t. } a_{ut_\beta} = 0 \forall u \in W, \beta \neq \beta_0 \},$$

where the sum in the definition is understood to be formal. We define its subset

$$K_H(Q_G(e)) := \{ \sum_{w \in W_{\text{af}}} a_w [O_{Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat}}(w)] \mid a_w \in CP \text{ s.t. } a_{ut_\beta} = 0 \forall u \in W, \beta \geq 0 \}.$$ 

We remark that our $K_H(Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat})$ and $K_H(Q_G(e))$ are $q = 1$ specializations of certain subsets of the equivariant $K$-groups considered in [23]. To this end, we need to verify that the natural actions of the Demazure operators and the tensor product action in [23] yield the corresponding actions on $K_H(Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat})$. The first one is immediate from the expression:

**Theorem 1.12** ([23] Theorem 6.4). The vector space $K_H(Q_{\text{rat}}^\text{rat})$ affords a representation of $\mathcal{H}$ so that:

1. the subalgebra $CP \subset \mathcal{H}$ acts by the multiplication as $CP$-modules;
2. we have

\[ D_i([\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}]) = \begin{cases} 
[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(s,w)}] & (s_i w > \frac{w}{2}) \\
[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}] & (s_i w < \frac{w}{2})
\end{cases}. \]

From the description of Theorem 1.12, we deduce that the right \( Q^\vee \)-action gives \( \mathcal{K} \)-module endomorphisms of \( K_H(Q_G^{rat}) \).

**Theorem 1.13** (cf. [23] Theorem 6.4 see also [21]). For each \( \lambda \in P \), the \( \mathbb{C}P \)-linear extension of the assignment

\[ [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}] \mapsto [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}(\lambda)] \in K_H(Q_G^{rat}) \quad w \in W_{af} \]

defines a \( \mathcal{K} \)-module automorphism (that we call \( \Xi(\lambda) \)) which commutes with the right \( Q^\vee \)-action. Moreover, we have \( \Xi(\lambda) \circ \Xi(\mu) = \Xi(\lambda + \mu) \) for \( \lambda, \mu \in P \).

**Proof.** The latter assertion is automatic provided if the former assertion holds as \( \Xi(\lambda) \) is induced by the tensor product with \( \mathcal{O}_{Q_G^{rat}}(\lambda) \). Hence, we concentrate into the first assertion. The (main) difference between here and [23, Theorem 6.4] is the lack of the \( \mathbb{G}_m \)-action. Thus, it suffices to see that the tensor product action yields a well-defined automorphism of \( K_H(Q_G^{rat}) \) by forgetting the \( q \)-grading.

Since \( \{\Xi(\lambda)\}_\lambda \) must be commutative to each other, it further reduces to prove that \( \Xi(\pm \varpi_i) \) \((i \in I)\) actually define an automorphism of \( K_H(Q_G^{rat}) \). We have \([\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}(\varpi_i)] \in K_H(Q_G^{rat})\) for \( i \in I \) by the Pieri-Chevalley rule [23, Theorem 5.10] as the set of paths with fixed initial/final directions are finite. (This latter reasoning in turn follows as the \( q^{-1} \)-degrees of paths whose initial/final directions are bounded from \( ut_\beta \) and \( vt_\alpha \) \((u, v \in W, \beta, \gamma \in Q^\vee)\) must belong to \( \langle \beta, \varpi_i \rangle, \gamma, \varpi_i \rangle \) by our count of \( q \)-degrees in [23].) This implies that \( \Xi(\varpi_i) \) defines a well-defined automorphism of \( K_H(Q_G^{rat}) \) for each \( i \in I \).

Moreover, the set of paths with the same initial/final direction is unique (see [23, Definition 2.6]), and hence the transition matrix between \( \{[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}(\varpi_i)]\}_{w \in W_{af}} \) and \( \{[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}]\}_{w \in W_{af}} \) is unitriangular (up to diagonal matrix consisting of characters in \( P \)) with respect to \( \leq \hat{\varpi} \). Therefore, we can invert this matrix to obtain \([\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(w)}(-\varpi_i)] \in K_H(Q_G^{rat})\) for \( i \in I \). This implies that \( \Xi(-\varpi_i) \) defines a well-defined automorphism of \( K_H(Q_G^{rat}) \) for each \( i \in I \) as required. \( \square \)

**Lemma 1.14.** For each \( i \in I \), we have

\[ [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(s_i)}] = [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(e)}] - e^{\varpi_i} [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(e)}(-\varpi_i)]. \]

**Proof.** Since \( Q_G(e) \) is a normal scheme (see [23, Theorem 4.26]), a line bundle on it is completely determined via its restriction to an open subscheme whose codimension is at least two. Hence, \( \mathcal{O}_{Q_G(e)}(\varpi_i) \) is determined by its restriction to a dense open \( G_\mathcal{O}^\vee \)-orbit \( \mathcal{O} \), that is an (uncountable dimensional) affine fibration over \( \mathcal{B} \). Here \( \mathcal{O}_G(-\varpi_i) \) is the pullback of \( \mathcal{O}_B(-\varpi_i) \) (cf. [23, Proof of Proposition 5.1]). For \( \mathcal{O}_B(-\varpi_i) \), the corresponding statement holds (Theorem 1.1) and it is known that \( \mathcal{O}_B(-\varpi_i) \) is a \( B \)-divisor twist of \( \mathcal{O}_B \). Thus, the corresponding statement prolongs to the whole \( Q_G(e) \) from \( \mathcal{O} \) as required. \( \square \)

**Remark 1.15.** Lemma 1.14 arises in a discussion with Naito, Orr, and Sagaki in the summer 2017. We obtained several different proofs, and the one presented here is the geometric one. In [37, Proposition 5.3], another proof using path model is presented.
Motivated by Lemma 1.14, we consider a $\mathbb{C}P$-module endomorphism $H_i$ ($i \in I$) of $K_H(Q_{G}^{rat})$ as:

$$H_i : [\mathcal{O}_{Q_{G}(w)}] \mapsto [\mathcal{O}_{Q_{G}(w)}] - e^{\pi_i} [\mathcal{O}_{Q_{G}(w)}(-\pi_i)] \quad w \in W_{af}.$$ 

### 1.5 Equivariant quantum $K$-group of $\mathcal{B}$

We introduce a polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee}$ and the formal power series ring $\mathbb{C}[Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee}]$ with its variables $Q_i = Q^{\alpha_i}$ ($i \in I$). We set $Q^\beta := \prod_{i \in I} Q_i^{(\beta,\pi_i)}$ for each $\beta \in Q^\vee$. We define the $H$-equivariant (small) quantum $K$-group of $\mathcal{B}$ as:

$$qK_H(\mathcal{B}) := K_H(\mathcal{B}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee}].$$

(1.4)

Thanks to (the $H$-equivariant versions of) [16, 30], it is equipped with the commutative and associative product $\star$ (called the quantum multiplication) so that:

1. the element $[\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}] \otimes 1 \in qK_H(\mathcal{B})$ is the identity (with respect to $\cdot$ and $\star$);
2. the map $Q^\beta \star (\beta \in Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee})$ is the multiplication of $Q^\beta$ in the RHS of (1.4);
3. we have $\xi \star \eta \equiv \xi \cdot \eta \mod (Q_i; i \in I)$ for every $\xi, \eta \in K_H(\mathcal{B}) \otimes 1$.

From the above properties, we can localize $qK_H(\mathcal{B})$ in terms of $\{Q^\beta\}_{\beta \in Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee}}$ to obtain a ring $qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{loc}$.

We set

$$qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B}) := qK_H(\mathcal{B}) \otimes \mathbb{C}[[q]][[Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee}]].$$

We sometimes identify $K_H(\mathcal{B})$ with the submodule $K_H(\mathcal{B}) \otimes 1$ of $qK_H(\mathcal{B})$ or $qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B})$. We set $p_i := [\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}(\pi_i)]$ for $i \in I$, and we sometimes consider it as an endomorphism of $qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B})$ through the scalar extension of the product of $K_H(\mathcal{B})$ (i.e. the classical product). For each $i \in I$, let $q^{[(\beta,\pi_i)]}$ denote the $(\mathbb{C}P)((q))$-endomorphism of $qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B})$ so that

$$q^{[(\beta,\pi_i)]}(\xi \otimes Q^\beta) = q^{[(\beta,\pi_i)]}(\xi \otimes Q^\beta) \quad \xi \in K_H(\mathcal{B}), \beta \in Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee}.$$ 

Following [20, §2.4], we consider the operator $T \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{C}P}([q]) qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B})$ (obtained from the same named operator in [20] by setting $0 = t \in K(\mathcal{B})$). Then, we have the shift operator (also obtained from an operator $A_i(q, t)$ in [20] by setting $t = 0$) defined by

$$A_i(q) = T^{-1} \circ p_i^{-1} q^{[(\beta,\pi_i)]} \circ T \in \text{End} qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B}) \quad i \in I.$$ 

(1.5)

An element $J(Q, q) := T([\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}]) \in qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B})$ is called the (equivariant $K$-theoretic) small quantum $J$-function, and is computed in [17, 5] (cf. Theorem 3.7).

**Theorem 1.16** (Reconstruction theorem [20] Proposition 2.20). For each

$$f(q, x_1, \ldots, x_r, Q) \in \mathbb{C}P[q^{\pm 1}, x_1, \ldots, x_r][Q_{\mathcal{B}}^{\vee}],$$

we have the following equivalence:

$$f(q, p_1^{-1} q^{[(\beta,\pi_1)]} \cdots, p_r^{-1} q^{[(\beta,\pi_r)]}, Q)J(Q, q) = 0 \in qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B})$$

$$\iff f(q, A_1(q), \ldots, A_r(q), Q)[\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{B}}] = 0 \in qK_{H \times G_m}(\mathcal{B}).$$
Remark 1.17. The original form of Theorem 1.16 is about big quantum $K$-group. We have made the specialization $t = 0$ to deduce our form. It should be noted that 1) this equivariant setting is automatic from the construction, and 2) we state Theorem 1.16 for unmodified quantum $J$-function instead of the modified one employed in [20, Proposition 2.20].

For each $i \in I$, we set $a_i := A(1)$ (thanks to [20, Remark 2.14]).

**Theorem 1.18** ([20] Corollary 2.9). For $i \in I$, the operator $a_i$ defines the multiplication by $a_i([O_B])$ in $qK_H(\mathcal{B})$.

**Proof.** By [20, Corollary 2.9], the set $\{a_i\}_{i \in I}$ defines mutually commutative endomorphisms of $qK_H(B)$ that commutes with the $\star$-multiplication. Since $\text{End}_R R \cong R$ for every ring $R$, we conclude the assertion. □

**Theorem 1.19** (Anderson-Chen-Tseng [2] Lemma 5 see also [1]). For each $i \in I$, we have $A_i(q)([O_B]) = [O_B(-\varpi_i)]$.

2 Relation with affine Grassmanians

We work in the same settings as in the previous section.

**Theorem 2.1.** We have a $\mathcal{H}$-module embedding

$$\Phi : K_H(Gr_G)_{\text{loc}} \hookrightarrow K_H(Q_G^{\text{rat}})$$

that sends the Pontryagin product on the LHS to the tensor product on the RHS. More precisely, we have: For each $i \in I$ and $\xi \in K_H(Gr_G)_{\text{loc}}$, it holds

$$\Phi(h_i \circ \xi) = H_i(\xi).$$

**Remark 2.2.** It is known that $\{h_i\}_{i \in I}, CP$, and $\{t_\beta\}_{\beta \in Q^\vee}$ generates the ring $K_H(Gr_G)_{\text{loc}}$. One way to prove it is to compare $K_H(Q_G^{\text{rat}})$ with its original definition in [23, §5].

2.1 Example: $SL(2)$-case

Assume that $G = SL(2)$. We make an identification $P_+ = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} z$, and $Q_+ = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}(\alpha^\vee = \alpha)$. We have $W = \{e, s\}$. Let $t$ denote the right translation of $Q_{SL(2)}$ corresponding to $\alpha^\vee$, and let $q$ denote the character of $\mathbb{C}^*$ that acts on the variable $z$ (in $G((z))$) by degree one character (so-called the loop rotation action).

The Pieri-Chevalley rule for $\varpi$ ([23, Theorem 5.10]) yields the equations:

$$[O_{Q_G(e)}(\varpi)] = \frac{1}{1 - q^{-1} e^\varpi} [O_{Q_G(e)}] + e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_G(s)}]$$

$$[O_{Q_G(s)}(\varpi)] = \frac{1}{1 - q^{-1} e^{\varpi}} [q^{-1} e^\varpi O_{Q_G(e)}] + e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_G(s)}].$$

2 Dave Anderson kindly informed me that they might temporary withdraw [2] in order to update some portion irrelevant to the proof of Lemma 5.
Proposition 2.3. The $K$-action of $H_{Gr}$ induces a $K$-action on $C$ as:

$$[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}(\varpi)] = \frac{1}{1 - e^\varpi} (e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}] + e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}])$$

$$[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}(\varpi)] = \frac{1}{1 - e^\varpi} (e^{-\varpi} t[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}] + e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}]).$$

Inverting this equation yields that

$$[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}(-\varpi)] = e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}] - e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}]$$

$$[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}(-\varpi)] = -e^{-\varpi} t[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}] + e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}].$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}] - e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}(-\varpi)] = [O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}]$$

$$[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}] - e^{-\varpi}[O_{Q_{Gr}(s)}(-\varpi)] = e^\alpha t[O_{Q_{Gr}(e)}],$$

By Theorem 2.1, this transplants to

$$[O_{Gr_{st}a}] \circ [O_{Gr_{st}ma}] = [O_{Gr_{st}-(m+1)a}]$$

$$[O_{Gr_{st}a}] \circ [O_{Gr_{st}ma}] = e^\alpha [O_{Gr_{st}ma}] + (1 - e^\alpha)[O_{Gr_{st}-(m+1)a}].$$

for $m > 0$. This coincides with the calculation in [28, (17)].

### 2.2 Transporting the $K$-action to $C$

**Proposition 2.3.** The $K$-action of $K_H(Gr)$ induces a $K$-action on $C$ as:

$$D_0(f \otimes t_\beta) = \frac{f}{1 - e^{\theta}} \otimes t_\beta = \frac{e^{-\theta}s_\theta(f)}{1 - e^{-\theta}} \otimes t_{s(\beta \cdot \theta^{-1})}$$

$$D_i(f \otimes t_\beta) = \frac{f}{1 - e^{\theta}} \otimes t_\beta = \frac{e^{\alpha_i}s_i(f)}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_{s_i \beta}$$

$$e^\mu(f \otimes t_\beta) = e^\mu f \otimes t_\beta$$

**Proof.** For $i \in I_{af}$, the action of $D_i$ on $\mathcal{A}$ is the left multiplication of $\frac{1}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes 1 - \frac{e^{\alpha_i}}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes s_i$ (if we understand $\alpha_0 = -\theta$). Applying to an element $f \otimes t_\beta u \in \mathcal{A}$ ($f \in C(P), \beta \in Q^\vee, u \in W$), we deduce

$$D_i(f \otimes t_\beta u) = \frac{f}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_\beta u = \frac{e^{\alpha_i}s_i(f)}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_{s_i \beta} s_i u \quad i \neq 0,$$

$$D_0(f \otimes t_\beta u) = \frac{f}{1 - e^{-\theta}} \otimes t_\beta u = \frac{e^{-\theta}s_\theta(f)}{1 - e^{-\theta}} \otimes s_\theta t_\beta u$$

$$= \frac{f}{1 - e^{-\theta}} \otimes t_\beta u = \frac{e^{-\theta}s_\theta(f)}{1 - e^{-\theta}} \otimes s_\theta t_{-\theta^{-1}} t_\beta u$$

$$= \frac{f}{1 - e^{-\theta}} \otimes t_\beta u = \frac{e^{-\theta}s_\theta(f)}{1 - e^{-\theta}} \otimes t_{s(\beta \cdot \theta^{-1})} s_\theta u.$$

Hence, applying pr yields the desired formula on $D_i$ for $i \in I_{af}$. Together with the left multiplication of $e^\mu \otimes 1$, these formula transplants the $K$-action from $K_H(Gr)$ to $K_H(Gr) \cap C$. 
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Since \( K_H(\text{Gr}) = \mathbb{C} \cap K_H(X) \), we have \( \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} K_H(\text{Gr}) \subset \mathbb{C} \). By comparing the leading terms of \( \{[Gr_\beta]\}_{\beta \in Q^+} \subset \mathbb{C} \) with respect to the Bruhat order (on the second component of \( \mathbb{C} \subset A = \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes \mathbb{C} W_a \)), we derive \( \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} K_H(\text{Gr}) \). It follows that \( \mathbb{C} \subset \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} K_H(\text{Gr}) \). Hence, the above formulas define the \( H \)-action on \( \mathbb{C} \) as the scalar extension of that on \( K_H(\text{Gr}) \subset \mathbb{C} \) as required (one can also directly check the relations of \( H \)).

Below, we may write the action of \( D_i \) on \( \mathbb{C} \) by \( D_i^\# \) to distinguish with the action on \( K_H(X) \) or \( A \).

**Corollary 2.4.** Let \( i \in I \). Let \( \xi \in \mathbb{C} \) be so that \( D_i^\#(\xi) = \xi \). Then, \( \xi \) is a \( \mathbb{C} \)-linear combination of

\[ f \otimes t_\beta + s_i(f) \otimes t_{s_i,\beta} \quad f \in \mathbb{C}(P), \beta \in Q^+. \]

**Proof.** By Proposition 2.3, the action of \( D_i^\# \) preserves \( \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes t_\beta + \mathbb{C}(P) \otimes t_{s_i,\beta} \) for each \( i \in I \) and \( \beta \in Q^+ \). Hence, it suffices to find a condition that \( a \otimes t_\beta + b \otimes t_{s_i,\beta} \) (\( a, b \in \mathbb{C}(P) \)) is stable by the action of \( D_i^\# \). It reads as:

\[ D_i^\#(a \otimes t_\beta + b \otimes t_{s_i,\beta}) = \frac{a - e^{\alpha_i}s_i(b)}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_\beta + \frac{b - e^{\alpha_i}s_i(a)}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_{s_i,\beta} = a \otimes t_\beta + b \otimes t_{s_i,\beta}. \]

This is equivalent to \( b = s_i(a) \) (or \( s_i(a + b) = a + b \) in the case of \( s_i,\beta = \beta \)) as required.

**Corollary 2.5.** Let \( i \in I \). Let \( \xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{C} \) be so that \( D_i^\#(\xi) = \xi \). Then, we have

\[ D_i^\#(\xi') = \xi D_i^\#(\xi'). \]

**Proof.** By Corollary 2.4, it suffices to prove

\[ D_i^\#(f \otimes t_\beta + s_i(f) \otimes t_{s_i,\beta})g \otimes t_\gamma = (f \otimes t_\beta + s_i(f) \otimes t_{s_i,\beta})D_i^\#(g \otimes t_\gamma) \]

for every \( f, g \in \mathbb{C}(P) \) and \( \beta, \gamma \in Q^+ \). We derive as:

\[ D_i^\#((f \otimes t_\beta + s_i(f) \otimes t_{s_i,\beta})g \otimes t_\gamma) = D_i^\#(fg \otimes t_{\beta+\gamma} + s_i(f)g \otimes t_{s_i,\beta+\gamma}) = \frac{fg}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_{\beta+\gamma} - \frac{e^{\alpha_i}s_i(f)g}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_{s_i,\beta+\gamma} + \frac{s_i(f)g}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_{s_i,\beta+\gamma} - \frac{e^{\alpha_i}fs_i(g)}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \otimes t_{\beta+\gamma} = (f \otimes t_\beta + s_i(f) \otimes t_{s_i,\beta})(g \otimes t_\gamma) \]

This completes the proof.

**Lemma 2.6.** Let \( \xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{C} \) be so that \( D_i^\#(\xi) = \xi \) for every \( i \in I \). Then, we have

\[ D_0^\#(\xi \xi') = \xi D_0^\#(\xi'). \]
Proof. By Corollary 2.4, we deduce that $w \xi w^{-1} = \xi \in \mathcal{A}$ for every $w \in W$. In particular, we have $s_\alpha s_\beta = \xi$. Therefore, it suffices to prove
\[
D^\#_o ((f \otimes t_\beta + s_\alpha(f) \otimes t_{s_\alpha \beta})g \otimes t_\gamma) = (f \otimes t_\beta + s_\alpha(f) \otimes t_{s_\alpha \beta})D^\#_o (g \otimes t_\gamma)
\]
for every $f, g \in \mathbb{C}(P)$ and $\beta, \gamma \in Q^\vee$. We derive as:
\[
D^\#_o ((f \otimes t_\beta + s_\alpha(f) \otimes t_{s_\alpha \beta})g \otimes t_\gamma) = D^\#_o (fg \otimes t_{\beta+\gamma} + s_\alpha(f)g \otimes t_{s_\alpha \beta+\gamma})
\]
\[
= \frac{fg}{1 - e^{-\sigma}} \otimes t_{\beta+\gamma} - \frac{e^{-\sigma}s_\alpha(fg)}{1 - e^{-\sigma}} \otimes t_{s_\alpha \beta + s_\alpha(\gamma - \omega_\nu)}
\]
\[
+ \frac{s_\alpha(f)g}{1 - e^{-\sigma}} \otimes t_{s_\alpha \beta+\gamma} - \frac{e^{-\sigma}s_\alpha(g)}{1 - e^{-\sigma}} \otimes t_{\beta + s_\alpha(\gamma - \omega_\nu)}
\]
\[
= (f \otimes t_\beta + s_\alpha(f) \otimes t_{s_\alpha \beta})D^\#_o (g \otimes t_\gamma).
\]
This completes the proof.

Theorem 2.7. For each $\beta \in Q^\vee$ and $i \in I_{af}$, we have
\[
D_i([\mathcal{O}_{Gr, \beta}] \otimes \xi) = [\mathcal{O}_{Gr, i}] \otimes D_i(\xi) \quad \xi \in K_H(Gr).
\]

Proof. By construction, we have
\[
\pi^*([\mathcal{O}_{Gr, \beta}]) = D_{-\beta}D_w = D_iD_{-\beta}D_{w_0} \quad i \in I,
\]
where the second identity follows from $\ell(t_{-\beta}) = \ell(st_{-\beta}) + 1$. By Proposition 2.3, we deduce that $\pi^*([\mathcal{O}_{Gr, \beta}])$ satisfies the $D^\#_o$-invariance for each $i \in I$. Therefore, Corollaries 2.5 and 2.6 imply the result.

Corollary 2.8. For $\beta \in Q^\vee$ and $i \in I_{af}$, we have $D_i = t_{-\beta} \circ D_i \circ t_\beta$. In particular, we have a natural extension of the $\mathcal{H}$-action from $K_H(Gr)$ to $K_H(Gr)_{loc}$.

Proof. The first assertion is a direct consequence of Theorem 2.7. As we have $K_H(Gr)_{loc} = K_H(Gr)[t_\beta \mid \beta \in Q^\vee]$, the latter assertion follows.

2.3 Inclusion as $\mathcal{H}$-modules

Lemma 2.9. Let $i \in I_{af}$. For each $w \in W_{af}$, we have
\[
D_i([\mathcal{O}_{Gr, w}]) = \begin{cases} 
[\mathcal{O}_{Gr, s_w \circ \beta \circ \omega_i}] & (s_w \circ \beta \circ \omega_i > w) \\
[\mathcal{O}_{Gr, s_w \circ \beta \circ \omega_i}] & (s_w \circ \beta \circ \omega_i < w)
\end{cases}.
\]

Proof. By Theorem 1.8 and Corollary 2.8, we can replace $[\mathcal{O}_{Gr, \beta}]$ with $[\mathcal{O}_{Gr, t_{-\beta}}]$ for $\beta \in Q^\vee$ so that $\langle \beta, \omega_i \rangle \ll 0$ for all $i \in I$. Therefore, the assertion is a rephrasement of Theorem 1.5 and Theorem 1.6 as $s_w \circ \beta \circ \omega_i > w$ is equivalent to $s_w t_{-\beta} > w t_{-\beta}$ (see (1.1)).

Lemma 2.10. The vector space $K_H(Gr)_{loc}$ is a cyclic module with respect to the action of $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t_\gamma \mid \gamma \in Q^\vee]$ with its cyclic vector $[\mathcal{O}_{Gr, \beta}]$.

Proof. By construction, it suffices to find every $([\mathcal{O}_{Gr, \beta}])_{\beta \in Q^\vee}$ in the linear span of $\mathcal{H} \cdot \{ t_\gamma \circ [\mathcal{O}_{Gr, \beta}] \}_{\gamma \in Q^\vee}$. This follows from a repeated application of the actions of $\{ D_i \}_{i \in I_{af}}$ and Theorem 1.8 (cf. [21, Theorem 4.6]).
Corollary 2.11. An endomorphism $\psi$ of $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$ as a $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t_\gamma \mid \gamma \in Q^\vee]$-module is completely determined by the image of $[\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}}].$

Proposition 2.12. By sending $[\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}}] \mapsto [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(z)}]$, we have a unique injective $\mathcal{H}$-module morphism

$$K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}} \hookrightarrow K_H(Q_G^{rat})$$

so that twisting by $t_\beta$ corresponds to the right action of $\beta \in Q^\vee$. This map particularly gives

$$[\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}}] \mapsto [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(ut\beta)}], \quad u \in W, \beta \in Q^\vee.$$

Proof. The comparison of the $D_i$-actions on the basis elements in Lemma 2.9 and Theorem 1.12 implies that we indeed obtain a $\mathcal{H}$-module inclusion, by enhancing the assignment $[\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}}] \mapsto [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(ut\beta)}]$ for $u \in W, \beta \in Q^\vee$ into a $\mathcal{CP}$-module homomorphism. We know the actions of $t_\beta$ and $\beta$ on both sides by Theorem 1.8 and Theorem 1.11, that coincide on elements that generates $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$ by the actions of $\mathcal{CP}$ and $\{t_\beta\}_{\beta \in Q^\vee}$. Hence, we deduce a $\mathcal{H}$-module embedding $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}} \hookrightarrow K_H(Q_G^{rat})$ that intertwines the $t_\beta$-action to the right $\beta$-action. Such an embedding must be unique by Corollary 2.11. $\Box$

2.4 Proof of Theorem 2.1

This subsection is entirely devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.1. The embedding part of Theorem 2.1 is already proved in Proposition 2.12.

Let $i \in I$. We have an endomorphism $\Xi(-\varpi_i)$ of $K_H(Q_G^{rat})$ that commutes with the right $Q^\vee$-action and the left $\mathcal{H}$-action. By Lemma 1.14, the image of $[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(z)}]$ under $\Xi(-\varpi_i)$ belongs to the image of $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$. In particular, $\Xi(-\varpi_i)$ induces an endomorphism of $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$.

In order to identify the endomorphisms $h_i \circ$ and $H_i$, it suffices to compare some linear combination with the well-understood element, namely $\text{id}$. Therefore, we compare the endomorphisms of $K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}$ (as $\mathcal{CP}$-modules) induced by

$$\Theta_i := e^{-\varpi_i}(\text{id} - h_i \circ)$$

and

$$\Xi(-\varpi_i) = e^{-\varpi_i}(\text{id} - H_i).$$

The both endomorphisms send $[\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}}]$ to

$$e^{-\varpi_i}([\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}} - [\mathcal{O}_{Gr_{t\beta}}]] \circ [\mathcal{O}_{Gr_{t\beta}}])^{-1} \quad (\beta \in Q^\vee)$$

by Proposition 2.12, Lemma 1.9, and Lemma 1.14.

We prove that the both of $\Theta_i$ and $\Xi(-\varpi_i)$ commute with the $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t_\gamma \mid \gamma \in Q^\vee]$-action. It is Theorem 1.13 for $\Xi(-\varpi_i)$. Hence, we concentrate on the action of $\Theta_i$.

The action of $\Theta_i$ commutes with $\mathcal{CP} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t_\gamma \mid \gamma \in Q^\vee]$ as $(K_H(\text{Gr})_{\text{loc}}, \circ)$ is a commutative ring. Thus, Corollaries 2.5 and 2.6 (and Theorem 2.7) reduces the problem to

$$D_j(e^{-\varpi_i}([\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}} - [\mathcal{O}_{Gr_{t\beta}}]]) = e^{-\varpi_i}([\mathcal{O}_{\text{Gr}_{\text{loc}}} - [\mathcal{O}_{Gr_{t\beta}}]]) \quad j \in I, \beta \in Q^\vee.$$
If \( j \neq i \), then we have \( s_j s_i t_\beta < s_i t_\beta \) and \( s_j t_\beta < t_\beta \). Moreover, we have 
\[
D_j(e^{-\varpi_i}) = e^{-\varpi_i}.
\]
It follows that 
\[
D_j(e^{-\varpi_i}([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}])) = e^{-\varpi_i} D_j([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}])
\]
\[
= e^{-\varpi_i}([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}]).
\]
If \( j = i \), then we compute as 
\[
D_i(e^{-\varpi_i}([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}])) = e^{-\varpi_i + \alpha_i} D_i([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}])
\]
\[
+ e^{-\varpi_i} - e^{-\varpi_i + \alpha_i} - \frac{1 - e^{\alpha_i}}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}}([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}])
\]
\[
= e^{-\varpi_i + \alpha_i}([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}])
\]
\[
+ e^{-\varpi_i}([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}])
\]
\[
= e^{-\varpi_i}([O_{Gr_a}] - [O_{Gr_{s_j t_\beta}}]).
\]

Hence, \( \Theta_i \) defines an endomorphism of \( K_H(Gr) \) that commutes with the \( \mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t, \gamma | \gamma \in Q^\vee] \)-action.

Therefore, Corollary 2.11 guarantees \( \Theta_i = \Xi(-\varpi_i) \in \text{End}(K_H(Gr)_{loc}) \). From this, we also deduce \( h_i \circ = H_i \in \text{End}(K_H(Gr)_{loc}) \) as required.

3 Relation with quantum \( K \)-group

We continue to work in the setting of the previous section.

**Theorem 3.1.** We have a \( CP \)-module isomorphism 
\[
\Psi : qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{loc} \overset{\cong}{\longrightarrow} K_H(Q^\text{rat}_G),
\]
that sends \([O_{B}]\) to \([O_{Q^\text{rat}(\mathcal{C})}]\), quantum product of a line bundle \( O_B(-\varpi_i) \) \((i \in I)\) to the tensor product of \( O_{Q^\text{rat}_G}(-\varpi_i) \), and the multiplication by \( Q^\beta \) to the right multiplication of \( \beta \) for each \( \beta \in Q^\vee \).

**Proof.** Combine Theorem 3.10 and Theorem 1.19 (cf. Theorem 1.18).

**Corollary 3.2.** We have a natural ring embedding 
\[
\Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi : K_H(Gr)_{loc} \hookrightarrow qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{loc},
\]
so that the numerical equalities predicted in [28] hold.

**Proof.** For the first assertion, combine Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 3.1 to obtain the map \( \Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi \) that has dense image. Note that the both sides are rings and the identity \([O_{Gr_a}]\) goes to the identity \([O_B] \). The map \( \Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi \) commutes with the natural \( Q^\gamma \)-actions given by \( t_\gamma \) and \( Q^\gamma \) for each \( \gamma \in Q^\vee \). Moreover, the action of \( \Theta_i \) (see §2.4) and the quantum multiplication by \([O_B(-\varpi_i)]\) corresponds for each \( i \in I \) (by Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 3.1). Therefore, the \( \circ \)-multiplication by the element \( h_i \) and \( * \)-multiplication by \([O_{B(s_i)}] = ([O_B] - e^{\varpi_i}[O_{B(-\varpi_i)}]) \) coincide for each \( i \in I \). Since the ring \( K_H(Gr)_{loc} \) is generated by \( \{h_i\}_{i \in I} \) up to the \( CP \)-action and \( \{t_\gamma\}_\gamma \)-action (Remark 2.2), we conclude that \( \Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi \) is a ring embedding.
For the second assertion, note that the combination of Proposition 2.12 and Theorem 4.1 asserts that
\[ \Psi^{-1} \circ \Phi([O_{Gr,\beta}] \circ [O_{Gr,\beta}]^{-1}) = [O_{\mathcal{B}(w)}] \text{ for some } \beta \in Q^\vee. \]
Therefore, we deduce [28, Conjecture 2] by the fact that \( h_i \) corresponds to \([O_{\mathcal{B}(w)}] \ast \) for each \( i \in I \) (and they commute with the natural \( CP \times Q^\vee \)-action). Hence [28, Conjecture 1] also holds as required.

In view of [28], we obtain another proof of the finiteness of quantum \( K \)-theory of \( \mathcal{B} \) originally proved in Anderson-Chen-Tseng [1, 2]. We reproduce the reasoning here for the sake of reference:

**Corollary 3.3 (Anderson-Chen-Tseng [1, 2]).** For each \( w, v \in W \), we have
\[ [O_{\mathcal{B}(w)}] \ast [O_{\mathcal{B}(v)}] \in \bigoplus_{\beta \in Q^\vee, w \in W} CP[O_{\mathcal{B}(w)}]Q^\beta. \]
In other words, the multiplication rule of \( qK_G(\mathcal{B}) \) is finite.

**Remark 3.4.** Our proof of Corollary 3.3 itself depends on Theorem 1.19 due to Anderson-Chen-Tseng [2]. However, this last part of the derivation has different flavor from their strategy.

**Proof of Corollary 3.3 due to Lam-Li-Mihalcea-Shimozono [28].** By Corollary 3.2 (cf. Theorem 1.8), the assertion follows from
\[ [O_{Gr,\beta}] \circ [O_{Gr,\gamma}] \in \bigoplus_{\kappa \in Q^\vee} CP[O_{Gr,\kappa}] \forall \beta, \gamma \in Q^\vee. \]
By definition, this is a product inside the ring \( C \) that has \( \{[O_{Gr,\kappa}]\}_\kappa \) as its \( CP \)-basis (Theorem 1.7). Hence, the assertion follows.

### 3.1 Quasi-map spaces

Here we recall basics of quasi-map spaces from [13, 10].

We have \( W \)-equivariant isomorphisms \( H^2(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{Z}) \cong P \) and \( H_2(\mathcal{B}, \mathbb{Z}) \cong Q^\vee \). This identifies the (integral points of the) nef cone of \( \mathcal{B} \) with \( P_+ \subset P \) and the effective cone of \( \mathcal{B} \) with \( Q^\vee_+ \). A quasi-map \((f, D)\) is a map \( f : \mathbb{P}^1 \to \mathcal{B} \) together with a \( \Pi^\vee \)-colored effective divisor
\[ D = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi^\vee, x \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})} m_x(\alpha^\vee)\alpha^\vee \otimes (x) \in Q^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Z} \text{ Div } \mathbb{P}^1 \text{ with } m_x(\alpha^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}. \]
We call \( D \) the defect of the quasi-map \((f, D)\). Here we define the degree of the defect by
\[ |D| := \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi^\vee, x \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{C})} m_x(\alpha^\vee)\alpha^\vee \in Q^\vee_+. \]

For each \( \beta \in Q^\vee_+ \), we set
\[ \Omega(\mathcal{B}, \beta) := \{ f : \mathbb{P}^1 \to X \mid \text{quasi-map s.t. } f_*[\mathbb{P}^1] + |D| = \beta \}, \]
where \( f_*[\mathbb{P}^1] \) is the class of the image of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) multiplied by the degree of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \to \text{Im } f \).
We denote \( \Omega(\mathcal{B}, \beta) \) by \( \Omega(\beta) \) in case there is no danger of confusion.
for each $\beta$.

In this subsection, we reformulate results provided in Givental-Lee [17] and Theorem 3.7.

on how they work.

Braverman-Finkelberg [5]. Hence, the both “theorems” in this subsection are understood as blends of their results, and their “proofs” are just explanations on how they work.

Definition 3.5 (Drinfeld-Plücker data). Consider a collection $\mathcal{L} = \{(\psi_\lambda, \mathcal{L}^\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in P_+}$ of inclusions $\psi_\lambda : \mathcal{L}^\lambda \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ of line bundles $\mathcal{L}^\lambda$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$. The data $\mathcal{L}$ is called a Drinfeld-Plücker data (DP-data) if the canonical inclusion of $G$-modules

$\eta_{\lambda, \mu} : \mathcal{L}(\lambda + \mu) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{L}(\lambda) \otimes \mathcal{L}(\mu)$

induces an isomorphism

$\eta_{\lambda, \mu} \otimes \text{id} : \psi_{\lambda+\mu}(\mathcal{L}^{\lambda+\mu}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \psi_\lambda(\mathcal{L}^\lambda) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}} \psi_\mu(\mathcal{L}^\mu)$

for every $\lambda, \mu \in P_+$.

Theorem 3.6 (Drinfeld, see Finkelberg-Mirković [13]). The variety $\mathcal{Q}(\beta)$ is isomorphic to the variety formed by isomorphism classes of the DP-data $\mathcal{L} = \{(\psi_\lambda, \mathcal{L}^\lambda)\}_{\lambda \in P_+}$ such that $\deg \mathcal{L}^\lambda = -\langle \beta, \lambda \rangle$. In particular, $\mathcal{Q}(\beta)$ is irreducible.

For each $w \in W$, let $\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) \subset \mathcal{Q}(\beta)$ be the closure of the set formed by quasi-maps that are defined at $z = 0$, and their values at $z = 0$ are contained in $\mathcal{B}(w) \subset \mathcal{B}$. (Hence, we have $\mathcal{Q}(\beta) = \mathcal{Q}(\beta, e).$) If $\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) \neq \emptyset$, then we have

$\dim \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) = 2 \langle \beta, \rho \rangle + \dim \mathcal{B}(w)$

by [13, Proposition 3.5], and the intersection of $\mathcal{Q}(\beta) \cap \mathcal{O}(w) \subset \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)$ is open dense. In view of Theorem 1.11 and [13, Lemma 8.5.2], this further implies that the intersection of $\mathcal{Q}(\beta)$ with $\mathcal{I}$-orbits of $Q_{\mathbb{C}}^{\text{aff}}$ preserves codimensions (if they have non-empty intersection; see also [22]).

For each $\lambda \in P$ and $w \in W$, we have a $G$-equivariant line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)$ obtained by the (tensor product of the) pull-backs $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}(\pi_i)$ of the $i$-th $\mathcal{O}(1)$ via the embedding

$\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) \hookrightarrow \prod_{i \in I} \mathbb{P}(L(\pi_i))^* \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[z]_{\leq \langle \beta, \pi_i \rangle}$.

for each $\beta \in Q_+^\vee$. Using this, we set

$\chi(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_\mathcal{Q}(\lambda)) := \sum_{i \geq 0} \text{gch} H^i(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{C}[P][q^{-1}]$ \quad $\beta \in Q_+^\vee, \lambda \in P_+$,

where the grading $q$ is understood to count the degree of $z$ detected by the $G_m$-action. Here we understand that $\chi(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = 0$ if $\beta \notin Q_+^\vee$.

We have embeddings $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{Q}(\beta) \subset Q_{\mathcal{O}(e)}$ so that the line bundles $\mathcal{O}(\lambda)$ ($\lambda \in P$) corresponds to each other by restrictions ([6, 21, 23]).

3.2 Quantum $J$-functions and generating functions

In this subsection, we reformulate results provided in Givental-Lee [17] and Braverman-Finkelberg [5]. Hence, the both “theorems” in this subsection are understood as blends of their results, and their “proofs” are just explanations on how they work.

Theorem 3.7. For each $\beta \in Q_+^\vee$, it holds:
1. the composition of maps
\[ \mathbb{C}P[q][Q_+^\gamma] \cong K_G(\mathcal{B})[q][Q_+^\gamma] \subset K_H(\mathcal{B})[q][Q_+^\gamma] \]
sends an element \( J'(Q, q) \) to \( J(Q, q) \);

2. for each \( \lambda \in P \), we have an identity in \( \mathbb{C}P[q^{-1}][Q_+^\gamma] \):
\[ D_{w_0}(J'(Qq^\lambda, q)e^{w_0\lambda} J'(Q, q^{-1})) = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\gamma} \chi(\Omega(\beta), \mathcal{O}_Q(\lambda))Q^\beta, \]
where we understand that \( Qq^\lambda \) sends \( Q^\beta \) to \( Q^\beta q^{-(\beta, \lambda)} \) for each \( \lambda \in P \).

Proof. For the first assertion, it is actually \( J'(Q, q) \) that is calculated as the graded character of the ring of regular function of Zastava spaces in [5, 7]. A brief explanation can be found in [5, §1.3]. In view of this, the second assertion follows by the argument from [17, §2.2].

For \( \vec{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r \), we set \( x^{\vec{n}} := x_1^{n_1} \cdots x_r^{n_r} \). For \( \lambda \in P \), we set \( \lambda[\vec{n}] := \lambda - \sum_{i=1}^r n_i \omega_i \).

Theorem 3.8. For each \( \sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\gamma, \vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} f_{\beta, \vec{n}}(q)x^{\vec{n}}Q^\beta \in \mathbb{C}P[q^{-1}, x_1, \ldots, x_r][Q_+^\gamma] \)
so that
\[ \sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\gamma, \vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} f_{\beta, \vec{n}}(q) \left( \prod_{j=1}^r (p_i^{-1}q^{Q(\omega_j)})^{n_j} \right) Q^\beta J(Q, q) = 0, \quad (3.3) \]
we have the following equalities:
\[ \sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\gamma, \vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} f_{\beta, \vec{n}}(q)q^{-(\beta, \lambda[\vec{n}])} \chi(\Omega(\gamma - \beta), \mathcal{O}_Q(\lambda[\vec{n}]))) = 0 \quad \lambda \in P_+, \gamma \in Q_+^\gamma. \]

Proof. The assertion is [17, §4.2] (see also [6, Lemma 5] and [7, §5]), that employs the localization theorem applied to the graph spaces with no marked points (we refer to §4.1 for notation).

Here we demonstrate an alternative proof (it depends on the argument in the previous paragraph through Theorem 3.7, though). We can substitute \( Q \) with \( Qq^\lambda \) in (3.3) multiplied with \( e^{w_0\lambda} \). By factoring out the effect of additional powers of \( q \) coming from \( q^{Q(\omega_j)} \)'s, we derive a formula
\[ \sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\gamma, \vec{n} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} f_{\beta, \vec{n}}(q) \otimes_{R(G)[q^{\pm 1}]} q^{-(\beta, \lambda[\vec{n}])} Q^\beta J(Qq^{\lambda[\vec{n}]}, q)e^{w_0(\lambda[\vec{n}]}) = 0. \]

Applying Theorem 3.7 2), we conclude the desired equation.

3.3 Identification of defining equations

Proposition 3.9. For each \( \lambda \in P \), we have
\[ \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\Omega(\beta), \mathcal{O}_Q(\beta)(\lambda)) = \operatorname{gch} H^0(Q_G(e), \mathcal{O}_QG(e)(\lambda)) \in \mathbb{C}[P][q^{-1}]. \quad (3.4) \]
Moreover, we have
\[ H^{>0}(Q_G(e), \mathcal{O}_QG(e)(\lambda)) = \{0\}. \]
Proof. The limit in (3.4) exists, and it gives the character of the (dual of the) global Weyl module by [6, §4.2] and [7] (here we use Theorem 3.7 2)).

**Theorem 3.10.** We have a well-defined \( CP \)-linear isomorphism

\[
\Psi : qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{\text{loc}} \to K_H(\mathcal{Q}_{G}^{\text{rat}})
\]

that sends \([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{B}]\) to \([\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}_G(\lambda)}]\), the quantum multiplication by \(a_i\) to the endomorphism \(\Xi(-w_i)\) \((i \in I)\), and the multiplication by \(Q^\beta\) to the right multiplication \(\beta\) for each \(\beta \in Q^V\).

**Proof.** By Theorem 1.16, it suffices to start from

\[
f = \sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_G^V, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_G^\mathcal{O}} f_{\beta,\bar{a}}(q)x^{\bar{a}}Q^\beta \in \text{Ann}_{CP[\mathbb{P}^{1},x_1,\ldots,x_r]}J(Q,q)
\]

(where \(x_i\) acts on \(J(Q,q)\) as \(p_i^{-1}q^{Q_i\bar{a}_i}\) for each \(i \in I\) and find the corresponding relation in \(K_H(\mathcal{Q}_G^{\text{rat}})\)). By Theorem 3.8, the equation

\[
f(q,p_1^{-1}q^{Q_1\bar{a}_1},\ldots,p_r^{-1}q^{Q_r\bar{a}_r},Q)J(Q,q) = 0
\]

implies

\[
\sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_G^V, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_G^\mathcal{O}} f_{\beta,\bar{a}}(q)q^{-\langle \beta,\lambda|\bar{a}\rangle} \chi(Q(\gamma-\beta), P_{Q(\gamma-\beta)}(\lambda|\bar{a})) = 0 \quad \lambda \in P_+, \gamma \in Q_G^V.
\]

By Proposition 3.9 and [23, Proposition D.1], this further implies

\[
\sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_G^V, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_G^\mathcal{O}} f_{\beta,\bar{a}}(q)g_{\text{ch}} H^0(\mathcal{Q}(\ell_\beta), P_{\mathcal{Q}(\ell_\beta)}(\lambda|\bar{a})) = 0 \quad \lambda \in P_+.
\]

Taking [23, Corollary 5.9] into account (and the fact that our \(K\)-group intersects with the dense subset of the \(K\)-group in [23, §6]), we derive

\[
\sum_{\beta \in \mathcal{Q}_G^V, \bar{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_G^\mathcal{O}} f_{\beta,\bar{a}}(1)|\mathcal{Q}(\ell_\beta)(-\sum_{i=1}^rn_iw_i)| = 0 \in K_H(\mathcal{Q}_G^{\text{rat}}).
\]

This induces a \(CP\)-linear map \(\Psi : qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{\text{loc}} \to K_H(\mathcal{Q}_G^{\text{rat}})\) that sends \([\mathcal{O}_\mathcal{B}]\) to \([\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}_G(\lambda)}]\), and the multiplication by \(Q^\beta\) to the right multiplication by \(\beta\) for each \(\beta \in Q^V\). In Theorem 3.7 2), the multiplication by \(p_i^{-1}q^{Q_i\bar{a}_i}\) on the first factor \(J'(Q^\lambda, q)\) results in the line bundle twist by \(\mathcal{O}(\ell_\beta)(-w_i)\). Hence, it corresponds to the line bundle twist by \(\mathcal{Q}(\ell_\beta)(-w_i)\) in \(K_H(\mathcal{Q}_G^{\text{rat}})\). In view of Theorem 1.16 (and the definition of the shift operators), the quantum multiplication by \(a_i\) becomes the endomorphism \(\Xi(-w_i)\) \((i \in I)\) via \(\Psi\).

As \(K_H(\mathcal{Q}_G^{\text{rat}})\) is topologically generated by \([\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}_G(\lambda)}]\ (\lambda \in P_+)\) with the \(CP\)-multiplications and the translations (by the definition of the \(K\)-group [23, §6]), the map \(\Psi\) must be surjective. It must be injective as the both sides are free modules of rank \(|W|\) over the commutative ring \(CP \otimes (CQ^V \otimes \mathcal{Q}_G^{\text{rat}})\).
4 Identification of the bases

Keep the setting of the previous sections. We prove the following result in order to complete the proof of Corollary 3.2.

Theorem 4.1. The map $\Psi$ constructed in Theorem 3.1 restricts to an isomorphism $qK_H(\mathcal{B}) \cong K_H(\mathcal{Q}(e))$, and we have

$$\Psi([O_{\mathcal{B}(w)}]) = [O_{\mathcal{Q}(w)}] \quad w \in W.$$  

4.1 Graph and map spaces and their line bundles

For each non-negative integer $n$ and $\beta \in Q_+^\vee$, we set $\mathcal{B}_{n,\beta}$ to be the space of stable maps of genus zero curves with $n$-parked points to $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathcal{B})$ of bidegree $(1, \beta)$, that is also called the graph space of $\mathcal{B}$. A point of $\mathcal{B}_{n,\beta}$ is a genus zero curve $C$ with $n$-marked points, together with a map to $\mathbb{P}^1$ of degree one. Hence, we have a unique $\mathbb{P}^1$-component of $C$ that maps isomorphically onto $\mathbb{P}^1$. We call this component the main component of $C$ and denote it by $C_0$.

The space $\mathcal{B}_{n,\beta}$ is a normal projective variety by [14, Theorem 2] that have at worst quotient singularities arising from the automorphism of curves. The natural $(H \times \mathbb{G}_m)$-action on $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathcal{B})$ induces a natural $(H \times \mathbb{G}_m)$-action on $\mathcal{B}_{n,\beta}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{B}_{0,\beta}$ has only finitely many isolated $(H \times \mathbb{G}_m)$-fixed points, and thus we can apply the formalism of Atiyah-Bott-Lefschetz localization (cf. [17, p200L26] and [6, Proof of Lemma 5]).

We have a morphism $\pi_{n,\beta} : \mathcal{B}_{n,\beta} \to \Omega(\beta)$ that factors through $\mathcal{B}_{0,\beta}$ (Givental’s main lemma [18]; see [10, §8] and [14, §1.3]). Let $ev_j : \mathcal{B}_{n,\beta} \to \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathcal{B}$ $(1 \leq j \leq n)$ be the evaluation at the $j$-th marked point, and let $ev_j : \mathcal{B}_{n,\beta} \to \mathcal{B}$ be its composition with the second projection.

Theorem 4.2 (Braverman-Finkelberg [5, 6, 7]). The morphism $\pi_{0,\beta}$ is a rational resolution of singularities.

Since $\Omega(\beta)$ is irreducible (Theorem 3.6), Theorem 4.2 asserts that $\mathcal{B}_{n,\beta}$ is irreducible (as a special feature of flag varieties, see [14, §1.2]).

For each $\lambda \in P$, we have a line bundle $O_{\mathcal{B}_{n,\beta}}(\lambda) := \pi_{n,\beta}^* O_{\Omega(\beta)}(\lambda)$. For a $(H \times \mathbb{G}_m)$-equivariant sheaf on a projective $(H \times \mathbb{G}_m)$-variety $\mathcal{X}$, let $\chi(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{F}) \in \mathbb{C}P[q, q^{-1}]$ denote its Euler-Poincaré characteristic (that enhances the element $\chi(\Omega(\beta, w), O_{\Omega(\beta, w)})$ defined in §3.1).

4.2 Cohomology calculation

Let $\mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}$ denote the subvariety of $\mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}$ so that the first marked point projects to $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$, and the second marked point projects to $\infty \in \mathbb{P}^1$ through the projection of quasi-stable curves $C$ to the main component $C_0 \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Let us denote the restriction of $ev_i$ $(i = 1, 2)$ to $\mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}$ by the same letter. By Theorem 4.2, $\mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}$ also gives a resolution of singularities of $\Omega(\beta)$. Let $O_{\mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}}(\lambda)$ denote the restriction of $O_{\mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}}(\lambda)$ to $\mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}$ for each $\lambda \in P$.

Note that the evaluation $ev_1 : \mathcal{B}_{2,\beta} \to \mathcal{B}$ is homogeneous with respect to the $G$-action. It follows that $ev_1$ is a submersion. In particular, $ev_1^{-1}(\mathcal{B}(w)) \subset \mathcal{B}_{2,\beta}$ is normal and has rational singularities (that we denote by $X(\beta, w)$) for
each \( w \in W \). The map \( \pi_{2,\beta} \) restricts to a \((B \times \mathbb{G}_m)\)-equivariant birational proper map

\[
\pi_{\beta,w} : \mathcal{X}(\beta, w) \to \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)
\]

by inspection.

For \( i \in I \), we set \( E_i \) to be the prime divisor of \( \mathcal{Q}(\beta) \) corresponding to the closed subset whose points have defect of color \( \alpha_i \) at some point in \( \mathbb{P}^1 \). We set \( E := \sum_{i \in I} E_i \). Its proper pullback to \( \mathcal{X}(\beta, e) \) consists of the sum of the boundary components of \( \mathcal{X}(\beta, e) = \mathcal{Z}_{2,\beta}^{GB} \) with their multiplicity one (or zero).

The following result is essentially due to Braverman-Finkelberg:

**Theorem 4.3** (Braverman-Finkelberg [5] §5, cf. [2] §2.1). We have

\[
\omega_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta)}(E) \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta)}(-2\rho).
\]

Moreover, we have

\[
\pi_{\beta,e}^*\omega_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta)}(R_1) \cong \omega_{\mathcal{X}(\beta,e)},
\]

for a sum \( R_1 \) of exceptional divisors with non-negative integer coefficients.

**Proof.** Braverman-Finkelberg [5, §5] asserts that the canonical bundle of the Zastava space \( \mathcal{Z}(\beta) \) twisted by \( E \) is trivial. It carries the \( B \)-action and the its inflation to \( G \) is isomorphic to the open dense subset \( \mathcal{Q} \) of \( \mathcal{Q}(\beta) \) whose point have no defect at 0. In other words, the canonical sheaf on \( \mathcal{Z} \cong G \times B \mathcal{Z}(\beta) \) (twisted by the inflation of \( E \)) is the pullback of that of \( G/B \), that is \( \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Z}}(-2\rho) \). Since \( \mathcal{Q} \subset \mathcal{Q}(\beta) \) have codimension two complement and \( \mathcal{Q}(\beta) \) is normal ([6, §2.4]), we conclude the first assertion. The discrepancy of \( \omega_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta)} \) along \( \pi_{0,\beta} \) can be read-off from [5, §5] since the image of each boundary divisor of \( \mathcal{Z}_{0,\beta}^{GB} \) is not contained in \( \mathcal{Q}(\beta) \setminus \mathcal{Z} \) (as the boundary divisor contains a parameter corresponding to the coordinate of \( \mathbb{P}^1 \) obtained as the image of a non-main component of the quasi-stable curve \( C \)). The map \( \mathcal{X}(\beta, e) \to \mathcal{Z}_{0,\beta}^{GB} \) is a birational proper map between smooth manifolds. It yields non-negative integer as its discrepancy (cf. [24, §2.3]). Hence, we obtain the second assertion.

**Theorem 4.4** ([22] Theorem B, Corollary C, Corollary 4.15). For each \( w \in W \) and \( \beta \in Q^f_\nu \), we have:

1. The variety \( \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) \) is normal;
2. We have \( H^{>0}(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta,w)}(\lambda)) = \{0\} \) for each \( \lambda \in P_+ \);
3. For \( \beta' \in Q^f_\nu \) such that \( \beta < \beta' \) and \( \lambda \in P_+ \), the natural restriction map

\[
H^0(\mathcal{Q}(\beta', w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta',w)}(\lambda)) \to H^0(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta,w)}(\lambda))
\]

is surjective;
4. Let \( i \in I \) so that \( s_i w < w \). The inflation map \( \pi_i : P_i \times B \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) \to \mathcal{Q}(\beta, s_i w) \) satisfies \( R^>0(\pi_i)_* \mathcal{O}_{P_i \times B \mathcal{Q}(\beta,w)} = \{0\} \) and \( (\pi_i)_* \mathcal{O}_{P_i \times B \mathcal{Q}(\beta,w)} \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta,s_i w)} \).

**Corollary 4.5.** For each \( w \in W \) and \( \beta \in Q^f_\nu \), the variety \( \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) \) admits rational singularities. In particular, \( \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w) \) is Cohen-Macaulay.
Proof. Applying the Stein factorization and Theorem 4.4 1) to $X(\beta, w) \rightarrow Q(\beta, w)$, we deduce $O_{Q(\beta, w)} \cong (\tau_{\beta,w})_{*}O_{Q(\beta, w)}$.

We first consider the case $w = w_0$. We have a commutative diagram (by $G \times B X(\beta, w_0) \cong X(\beta, e)$):

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X(\beta, e) & \xrightarrow{f} & \Omega(\beta, w_0) \\
\downarrow{\xi} & & \downarrow{\xi} \\
G \times B \Omega(\beta, w_0) & \xrightarrow{g} & \Omega(\beta)
\end{array}
$$

The exceptional locus of $\xi$ arises as the (inflation of the) $B$-stable divisor in $\Omega(\beta, w_0)$ corresponding to quasi-maps with defects at $0 \in \mathbb{P}^1$. In view of the embedding $\Omega(\beta, w_0) \subset Q_G(w_0)$ and Theorem 1.11 (see also (3.1) and discussion around there), we deduce that an irreducible components of such a divisor is of the form $\Omega(\beta', w')$ for some $w' \in W, \beta' \in Q_\gamma^\Delta$. Here, [32, §4.2] asserts that we have $\gamma \in \Delta_+$ so that

$$
\beta' = \beta - \gamma', w' = s_\gamma w_0.
$$

Let us consider the set $Y$ of quasimaps $\psi : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow B$ so that $\psi(0) \in B(w_0)$, $\psi(\infty) \in \Omega_B(s_\gamma w_0)^H$, and $\psi([\mathbb{P}^1]) \leq \gamma' \in H_2(B, \mathbb{Z})$. An element of $Y$ cannot be $G_m$-fixed in $\Omega(\gamma')$ since it cannot be constant. By the action of the one-parameter subgroup of $I$ corresponding to the root $\gamma + \delta$, we can explicitly construct such a map, and hence $Y$ is not empty. In addition, we have an $G_m$-action on $Y$ without fixed point, that means $\dim Y \geq 1$. Note that we can move $\psi(\infty)$ by the action of $B$ (inside $\Omega_B(s_\gamma w_0)$, that has dimension $\dim B(s_\gamma w_0)$). Moreover, we have $\dim \Omega(\gamma', w_0) = \dim B(s_\gamma w_0) + 1$ by (3.1). It follows that $BY$ must define a Zariski open subset of an irreducible variety $\Omega(\gamma', w_0)$, and $\dim Y = 1$. Hence, $Y$ must be a disjoint union of finitely many single $G_m$-orbits.

By the $B$-action, the number of connected components of $Y$ is the degree of $f$ along the generic point of $\Omega(\beta', w') \subset \Omega(\beta, w)$. Since $g$ has connected fiber by the Stein factorization, so is $f$. In particular, we conclude $Y \cong G_m$, and hence $\psi$ is unique (up to automorphism). The uniqueness of $\psi$ ensures that $f$ is an isomorphism along the (generic point of the) exceptional locus of $\xi$. Hence, the discrepancy of $f$ is that of $g$ minus the contribution from the exceptional locus of $\xi$. As the discrepancy of $g$ is strictly positive by Theorem 4.3, so is $f$.

Therefore, Elkik’s criterion [9, Théorème 1] implies that $\Omega(\beta, w_0)$ has canonical singularity, and hence is rational as in [5, after the proof of Lemma 5.2]. This proves the case $w = w_0$.

For general $w$, let $w w_0 = s_i_1, s_i_2 \ldots s_i_k$ (with $i_1, \ldots, i_k \in I$ and $k = \ell(w_0 w)$) be a reduced expression. We set

$$
Q' := P_{i_1} \times B \cdots \times B \Omega(\beta, w_0) \text{ and } X' := P_{i_1} \times B \cdots \times B X(\beta, w_0).
$$

Then, we have:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
X' & \xrightarrow{\xi} & X(\beta, w) \\
\downarrow{\pi} & & \downarrow{\pi_{\beta,w}} \\
Q' & \xrightarrow{\xi} & Q(\beta, w)
\end{array}
$$

We have $R^{>0} \pi_* O_{X'} = \{0\}$ and $\pi_* O_{X'} = O_{Q'}$ by the case $w = w_0$, and we have $R^{>0} \xi_* O_{X'} = \{0\}$ and $\xi_* O_{X'} = O_{X(\beta, w)}$ as $X(\beta, w)$ has a rational singularity [24,
Theorem 5.10]. We have $\mathbb{R}^{>0}\xi,\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'} = \{0\}$ and $\xi,\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}'} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}$ by Theorem 4.4 4). Therefore, the above commutative diagram implies $\mathbb{R}^{>0}(\pi_{\beta, w})_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Y}(\beta, w)} = \{0\}$ and $(\pi_{\beta, w})_*\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}(\beta, w)} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}$. This implies that $\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)$ admits a rational singularity with its resolution $X' \to \mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)$. Hence, $\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)$ is also Cohen-Macauley [24, Theorem 5.10] as desired.

Corollary 4.6. Let $\lambda \in P_+$. For each $w \in W$ and $\beta \in Q'$, we have

$$H^{>0}(\mathcal{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = \{0\}.$$ 

Proof. Apply [24, Theorem 5.10] to Theorem 4.4 2).

Proposition 4.7. Let $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in P_+$. We have

$$\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathcal{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = gch H^0(\mathcal{Q}_G(w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}_G(w)}(\lambda)).$$

Proof. By Corollary 4.6, we have

$$\chi(\mathcal{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = gch H^0(\mathcal{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}(\beta, w)}(\lambda))$$

for every $\beta \in Q'$. By Corollary 4.5, we deduce

$$H^0(\mathcal{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = H^0(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}(\lambda))$$

for every $\lambda \in P_+$ and $\beta \in Q'$. By Theorem 4.4 2), we have

$$\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathcal{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{X}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) \quad \lambda \in P_+$$

and it is uniquely determined by Theorem 4.4 3). In addition, the comparison of Theorem 4.4 3) with [21, Theorem 4.12] implies

$$\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = gch H^0(\mathcal{Q}_G(w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}_G(w)}(\lambda)) \quad \lambda \in P_+.$$

Combining these implies the desired equality.

4.3 Proof of Theorem 4.1

The whole of this subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem 4.1. In this subsection, $\otimes$ is understood to be $\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_Z}$, where $Z$ is the variety we are considering.

By the proof of Theorem 3.10 and the properties of $*$-products of $H$-equivariant quantum $K$-theory (see §1.5), $qK_H(\mathcal{B})$ is the subspace of $qK_H(\mathcal{B})_{\text{loc}}$ (topologically) generated by $\mathbb{C}P, Q^v_\gamma$, and $[\mathcal{O}_B(\pm \nu_i)] * (i \in I)$. As each of them (transferred by $\Psi$) preserves $K_H(\mathcal{Q}_G(e))$ and $\Psi([\mathcal{O}_B]) = [\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{Q}_G(e)}]$, we deduce that $\Psi$ embeds $qK_H(\mathcal{B})$ into $K_H(\mathcal{Q}_G(e))$.

In view of the definition of our shift operators (1.5) and the proof of Theorem 3.10, the map $\Psi$ is obtained through the functional limit $\lim_{\beta \to \infty} F^\beta_\beta(\bullet)$ on $\lambda \in P_+$:

$$\sum_{\beta \in Q^v_\gamma} F^\lambda_\beta(\bullet)Q^\beta := \sum_{\beta \in Q^v_\gamma} \chi(\mathcal{S}_B^\beta, \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{S}_B^\beta}(\lambda) \otimes \text{ev}_1^\gamma(\bullet) \otimes \text{ev}_2^\beta(\mathcal{O}_B))Q^\beta$$

$$= \chi(T(\prod_{i \in I} A_i(q)^{-2\langle \nu_i, \lambda \rangle}(\bullet)) \cdot \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{O}_B))$$
(where the second equality is a reformulation of [20, Proposition 2.13]) that enhances
\[
\sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\vee} F_\lambda^\beta ([\mathcal{O}_B]) Q^\beta = \sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\vee} \chi(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_{2,\beta}}^\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_{2,\beta}}}^\mathfrak{B})(\lambda) \otimes \text{ev}_1^*(\mathcal{O}_B) \otimes \text{ev}_2^*(\mathcal{O}_B)) Q^\beta \\
= \sum_{\beta \in Q_+^\vee} \chi(\mathfrak{q}(\beta), \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{q}(\beta)}(\lambda)) Q^\beta = D_{w_0}(J'(Q q^\lambda, q) e w_0^\lambda J'(Q, q^{-1})) \text{,}
\]
as it commutes with the $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}$-action and the $\mathbb{C}Q^\vee$-action, and intertwines the shift operator $A_i(q)$ with the line bundle twist by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_{2,\beta}}}^\flat (-\varpi_i)$ for each $i \in I$.

We have
\[
\lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathfrak{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}(\beta, w)}(\lambda)) = \text{gch} H^0(\mathcal{O}_Q(w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{O}_G(\beta,w)}(\lambda))
\]
for each $\lambda \in P_+$ by Proposition 4.7.

Thus, we have
\[
\lim_{\beta \to \infty} F_\lambda^\beta ([\mathcal{O}_B(w)]) = \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_{2,\beta}}^\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_{2,\beta}}}^\mathfrak{B})(\lambda) \otimes \text{ev}_1^*(\mathcal{O}_B(w)) \otimes \text{ev}_2^*(\mathcal{O}_B)) \\
= \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_{2,\beta}}^\mathfrak{B}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_{2,\beta}}}^\mathfrak{B})(\lambda) \otimes \text{ev}_1^*(\mathcal{O}_B(w))) \text{ (4.1)} \\
= \lim_{\beta \to \infty} \chi(\mathfrak{X}(\beta, w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{X}(\beta,w)}(\lambda)) = \text{gch} H^0(\mathcal{O}_Q(w), \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{O}_Q(\lambda)}) \text{,}
\]
for each $\lambda \in P_+$ and $w \in W$.

Therefore, we conclude
\[
\Psi([\mathcal{O}_B(w)]) = [\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{O}_Q(\lambda)}] \quad w \in W.
\]
This proves the second assertion. By examining the $\mathbb{C}\mathbb{P}$-bases between $qK_H(\mathfrak{B})$ and $K_H(\mathcal{O}_Q(e))$, we also deduce $\text{Im} \Psi = K_H(\mathcal{O}_Q(e))$. These complete the proofs of all the assertions.
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