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Abstract

We prove a Pieri-Chevalley formula for anti-dominant weights and also a Monk formula in the torus-equivariant $K$-group of the formal power series model of semi-infinite flag manifolds, both of which are described explicitly in terms of semi-infinite Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths (or, equivalently, quantum Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths). In view of recent results of Kato, these formulas give an explicit description of the structure constants for the Pontryagin product in the torus-equivariant $K$-group of affine Grassmannians and that for the quantum multiplication of the torus-equivariant (small) quantum $K$-group of finite-dimensional flag manifolds. Our proof of these formulas is based on standard monomial theory for semi-infinite Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths, which is established in our previous work, and also uses a string property of Demazure-like subsets of the crystal basis of a level-zero extremal weight module over a quantum affine algebra.
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1 Introduction.

In [KNS], we proposed a definition of equivariant (with respect to an Iwahori subgroup) $K$-theory of the formal power series model $Q_G^{\text{rat}} (\supset Q_G)$ of semi-infinite flag manifold, where $G$ is a connected and simply-connected simple algebraic group over $\mathbb{C}$ with Borel subgroup $B$ and maximal torus $H$, and also proved the Pieri-Chevalley formula for dominant integral weights; this formula describes, in terms of semi-infinite Lakshmibai-Seshadri (LS for short) paths, the tensor product of the class of the structure sheaf of a semi-infinite Schubert variety with the class of a line bundle over $Q_G$ associated to a dominant integral weight.

Recently, in [Kat], Kato proved that there exists an embedding of the torus-equivariant $K$-group $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)_{\text{loc}}$ (suitably localized) of the affine Grassmannian $\text{Gr}_G$ into the torus-equivariant $K$-group $K_H(Q_G^{\text{rat}})$ of the formal power series model $Q_G^{\text{rat}} (\supset Q_G)$ of semi-infinite flag manifold, and that under this embedding the (so-called) Pontryagin product corresponds to the tensor product. Also, he proved that there exists an algebra isomorphism from the torus-equivariant (small) quantum $K$-group $qK_H(G/B)_{\text{loc}}$ (suitably localized) of the finite-dimensional flag manifold $G/B$ onto the torus-equivariant $K$-group $K_H(Q_G^{\text{rat}})$ of $Q_G^{\text{rat}}$, and that under this isomorphism the quantum multiplication corresponds to the tensor product. In view of the algebra embedding $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)_{\text{loc}} \hookrightarrow qK_H(G/B)_{\text{loc}}$ obtained there, we see that tensoring with line bundles equips $K_H(Q_G^{\text{rat}})$ with a natural algebra structure, which is compatible with the Pontryagin product in $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)_{\text{loc}}$ and the quantum multiplication in $qK_H(G/B)_{\text{loc}}$. In particular, the structure constants for the Pontryagin product in $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)_{\text{loc}}$ and the quantum multiplication in $qK_H(G/B)_{\text{loc}}$ are exactly the same as those described by the Pieri-Chevalley formula for the tensor product in $K_H(Q_G)$ (which yields the structure constants explicitly as described below).

For the dominant fundamental weights $\varpi_i$, $i \in I$, a Pieri-Chevalley formula for the tensor product with the class of $O_{Q_G}(\varpi_i)$ is established in [KNS]. The class of $O_{Q_G}(\varpi_i)$, when it is interpreted in $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)_{\text{loc}}$, is the formal inverse of a linear combination of the identity 1 and a natural generator (divisor-like class), and its meaning is rather obscure since taking formal inverse sends the class essentially to the outside of $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)$.

Contrastingly, for the anti-dominant fundamental weights $-\varpi_i$, $i \in I$, the tensor product with the class of $O_{Q_G}(-\varpi_i)$, when it is interpreted in $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)_{\text{loc}}$, is the product with the sum of the identity 1 and a divisor-like class in $K_H(\text{Gr}_G)_{\text{loc}}$. Also, the tensor product with the class of $O_{Q_G}(-\varpi_i)$, when it is interpreted in $qK_H(G/B)_{\text{loc}}$, is (the specialization at $q = 1, t = 0$ of) the shift operator constructed in [INT]. Hence a Pieri-Chevalley formula for the class of $O_{Q_G}(-\varpi_i)$, $i \in I$, in $K_H(Q_G)$ carries much clearer information than that for the class of $O_{Q_G}(\varpi_i)$, $i \in I$. Therefore, it is desirable to obtain a Pieri-Chevalley formula for the tensor product in $K_H(Q_G)$, in which a line bundle over $Q_G$ is associated to an arbitrary (not necessarily) anti-dominant integral weight; note that in [KNS], we obtained a Pieri-Chevalley formula for line bundles associated to dominant integral weights, but it turns out to be a much more difficult task to prove the formula in the anti-dominant case than that in the dominant case.

Let us state our Pieri-Chevalley formula more precisely. Denote by $Q^\vee := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i^\vee$
the coroot lattice of $G$, and set $Q^{\vee,+} := \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_i^\vee$. Let $W = \langle s_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ be the (finite) Weyl group of $G$, with $\ell : W \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ the length function and $w_0$ the longest element. Denote by $P$ the integral weight lattice of $G$. Let $\mu \in P^+$ be a dominant integral weight, and set $J_\mu := \{ i \in I \mid \langle \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0 \}$. Denote by $W^{J_\mu}$ the set of minimal-length coset representatives for the cosets in $W/W_{J_\mu}$, where $W_{J_\mu} := \langle s_i \mid i \in J_\mu \rangle$. Let $QLS(\mu)$ denote the set of quantum LS paths of shape $\mu$; an element $\eta \in QLS(\mu)$ is a sequence of elements of $W^{J_\mu}$ that satisfies a certain condition described in terms of the parabolic quantum Bruhat graph (see Definition 3.11). We can endow the set $QLS(\mu)$ with a crystal structure with weights in $P$. For $\eta \in QLS(\mu)$ and $v \in W$, we define an element $\kappa(\eta, v) \in W$ (called the final direction of $\eta$ with respect to $v$) and an element $\zeta(\eta, v) \in Q^{\vee,+}$ in terms of the quantum version of the Deodhar lift introduced in [NS2] and [LNS3], and the weight of a directed path in the quantum Bruhat graph (see (3.27) and (3.28)).

We denote by $\deg(\mu) : QLS(\mu) \to \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ the (tail) degree function on $QLS(\mu)$ introduced in [NS2] and [LNS3], which is also described in terms of the parabolic quantum Bruhat graph (see (3.26)).

One of the main results of this paper is the following Pieri-Chevalley formula for anti-dominant weights in the Iwahori-equivariant $K'_I(Q_G^{\text{rat}})$, defined in [KNS]. Here the Iwahori subgroup $I = ev_0^{-1}(B)$ contains the maximal torus $H$ of $G$, where $ev_0 : G[[z]] \to G$ denotes the evaluation map at $z = 0$, and $\tilde{I} = I \ltimes \mathbb{C}^*$ is the semi-direct product, with $\mathbb{C}^*$ acting on $I$ by loop rotation. Also, we remark that for an element $x = wt_\xi$ of the affine Weyl group $W_{af} = W \ltimes Q^\vee$, the associated semi-infinite Schubert variety $Q_G(x)$ is contained in the semi-infinite flag manifold $Q_G = Q_G(e) \subset Q_G^{\text{rat}}$ if and only if $\xi \in Q^{\vee,+}$.

**Theorem 1** (Pieri-Chevalley formula in $K'_I(Q_G)$). Let $\lambda \in P^+$ be a dominant integral weight, and let $x = wt_\xi \in W_{af}$ be such that $\xi \in Q^{\vee,+}$. Then, in the Iwahori-equivariant $K'_I(Q_G)$, we have

$$
[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(-\lambda)] \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(x)]
= \sum_{v \in W} \left( \sum_{\substack{\eta \in QLS(-w_0 \lambda) \\
\kappa(\eta,v) = w}} (-1)^{\ell(v)-\ell(w)} q^{-\deg(\eta)+(-w_0 \lambda, \xi)} e^{-wt(\eta)} \right) [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G(wt_{\xi+\zeta(\eta,v)})}].
$$

We remark that the sum on the right-hand side of (1.1) is clearly a finite sum, since $W$ is a finite Weyl group and $QLS(-w_0 \lambda)$ is a finite set; in fact, the set $QLS(-w_0 \lambda)$ provides a realization of the crystal basis of the quantum version of a local Weyl module (which is finite-dimensional).

On the basis of the results established in [KNS], our Pieri-Chevalley formula above immediately follows from Theorem 3 (or, more accurately, Corollary 4) below, which asserts an equality for the graded characters of Demazure submodules of level-zero extremal weight modules over the quantum affine algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_{af})$ associated to the affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{af}$. In fact, the argument for deducing the Pieri-Chevalley formula above in
$K'_1(Q_G)$ from the equality in Corollary 4 below is exactly the same as that in [KNS] in the case of dominant integral weights. Namely, we compare the functionals (with values in $\mathbb{Z}[P]/(q^{-1}))$:

$$P \to \mathbb{Z}[P]/(q^{-1}), \quad \mu \mapsto \sum_{i \geq 0} (-1)^i \text{gch} \, H^i(Q_G, \mathcal{E} \otimes Q_{Q_G} \mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(\mu)),$$

(1.2)

where $[\mathcal{E}]$ is taken to be the left-hand side (resp., right-hand side) of the Pieri-Chevalley formula (1.1) above, by use of the equality in Corollary 4 to deduce the desired result; note that this argument is based on the cohomology vanishing result established in [KNS].

Our second main result of this paper is the Pieri-Chevalley formula for anti-dominant weights in the torus-equivariant $K$-group $K_H(Q_{Q_G}^{\text{rat}})$, defined in [Kat]. In [Kat], the torus-equivariant $K$-group $K_H(Q_{Q_G}^{\text{rat}})$ is defined to be the following set (equipped with a structure of $\mathbb{Z}[P]$-module) of possibly infinite sums:

$$\left\{ \sum_{y \in W_{af}} f_y[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(y)] \left\vert \begin{array}{l}
\{f_y\}_{y \in W_{af}} \subset \mathbb{Z}[P] \text{ satisfies the condition that } \\
\text{there is } \zeta_0 \in Q^\vee \text{ such that } f_{vt_\zeta} = 0 \\
\text{for all } v \in W \text{ and } \zeta \in Q^\vee \text{ with } \zeta \neq \zeta_0
\end{array} \right. \right\}.$$

Here we recall from [KNS] that $Q_{Q_G}^{\text{rat}}$ is the direct limit $\lim_{\rightarrow} Q_G$, under the embeddings $t_\xi : Q_G \to Q_G$, $\xi \in Q^{\vee,+}$, and hence the same is true for their Iwahori-equivariant $K$-groups. Also, note that the $K$-group $K'_1(Q_{Q_G}^{\text{rat}})$ contains the subset of possibly infinite linear combinations (with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}[P]/(q^{-1}))$ of the classes of $\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(y)$, $y \in W_{af}$, that converge in $K'_1(Q_{Q_G}^{\text{rat}})$ so that there exists a surjective $\mathbb{Z}[P]$-module homomorphism onto $K_H(Q_{Q_G}^{\text{rat}})$ (given by the specialization $q = 1$) sending each class of $\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(y)$ to the corresponding class in $K_H(Q_{Q_G}^{\text{rat}})$. Therefore, Theorem 4 above immediately implies the following:

**Theorem 2** (Pieri-Chevalley formula in $K_H(Q_G)$). Let $\lambda \in P^+$ be a dominant integral weight, and let $x = wt_\xi \in W_{af}$ be such that $\xi \in Q^{\vee,+}$. Then, in the torus-equivariant $K$-group $K_H(Q_G)$, we have

$$[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(-\lambda)] \cdot [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(x)] = \sum_{v \in W} \sum_{\eta \in \text{QLS}(-w_0 \lambda) \atop \kappa(\eta,v) = w} (-1)^{\ell(v)-\ell(w)} e^{-\text{wt}(\eta)} \left[ \mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(vt_\xi + (\eta,v)) \right].$$

(1.3)

By applying (1.3) to the case that $\lambda = -w_s \varpi_i$, $i \in I$, and $w = e$ (see (5.2), we deduce that $[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(s_i)] = [\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(e)] - e^{\varpi_i}[\mathcal{O}_{Q_G}(w_s \varpi_i)]$; cf. [Kat] Lemma 1.14 (the convention therein is slightly different from ours; see the comment preceding [Kat] Theorem 1.11]). By combining this equality and (1.3), we obtain the following Monk formula, which describes...
the multiplication in $K_H(Q_G)$ by the class of $O_{Q_G(s_i)}$:

$$[O_{Q_G(s_i)}] \cdot [O_{Q_G(w)}] = [O_{Q_G(w)}] + \sum_{v \in W} \left( \sum_{\eta \in QLS(\pi) \atop \kappa(\eta,v)=w} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w) + 1} e^{\varpi_i - \text{wt}(\eta)} [O_{Q_G(\text{wt}(\eta,v))}] \right)$$

(1.4)

for $i \in I$ and $w \in W$. In particular, if $\varpi_i$ is minuscule, then

$$[O_{Q_G(s_i)}] \cdot [O_{Q_G(w)}] = [O_{Q_G(w)}] - e^{\varpi_i - w\varpi_i} \sum_{v \in W} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} [O_{Q_G(\text{wt}(\eta,v))}]$$

(1.5)

where $\max(wW_{I\setminus\{i\}}, \leq^*_i)$ denotes the quantum version of the Deodhar lift (see Proposition 2.25) and $\text{wt}(w \rightarrow v)$ is the weight of a directed path from $w$ to $v$ in the quantum Bruhat graph (see (2.21)). In type $A$, on the basis of the results in [Kat], we can deduce from the Monk formula (1.3) a conjectural Monk formula ([LeP, Conjecture 17.1]) in the quantum $K$-theory of the flag manifold $G/B$, which is also described in terms of the quantum Bruhat graph; the details will appear in a subsequent paper.

Here we should mention that our formula (1.3) can be thought of as a semi-infinite analog of the corresponding formula in [LeS] for the torus equivariant $K$-theory for Kac-Moody thick flag manifolds (see also [GR] for the finite-dimensional case), though our proof is quite different from the one by them and is much more difficult; this is mainly because an ordinary induction argument using a string property of Demazure-like subsets does not suffice in our case in contrast to the case of Kac-Moody thick flag manifolds.

Now, we explain the representation-theoretic (or, crystal-theoretic) aspect of our main results; as mentioned above, Theorems 1 and 2 follow from Theorem 3 and Corollary 4 below, which are proved by using crystal bases of level-zero extremal weight modules. Let $\mu \in P^+$ be a dominant integral weight. Denote by $(W^{J_{af}})_{af}$ the set of Peterson’s coset representatives for the cosets in $W_{af}/(W^{J_{af}})_{af}$ (see (2.2)), with $\Pi^{J_{af}} : W_{af} \rightarrow (W^{J_{af}})_{af}$ the canonical projection. Let $\mathbb{B}^\sim_k(\mu)$ denote the set of semi-infinite LS paths of shape $\mu$; an element $\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\sim_k(\mu)$ is a certain decreasing sequence of elements of $(W^{J_{af}})_{af} \subset W_{af}$ in the semi-infinite Bruhat order $\succeq$ (see Definition 3.2). We can endow the set $\mathbb{B}^\sim_k(\mu)$ with a crystal structure with weights in $P^0_{af} = P \oplus \mathbb{Z}\delta$, where $\delta$ is the (primitive) null root of the untwisted affine Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{af}$ associated to $G$. For $\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\sim_k(\mu)$, let us denote by $\kappa(\pi) \in (W^{J_{af}})_{af}$ the final direction of $\pi$. Recall from [NS3] that for each $z \in W_{af}$, the graded character $gch_{V_z^-}(\mu)$ of the Demazure submodule $V_z^- (\mu)$ of the level-zero extremal weight module $V(\mu)$ over $U_v(\mathfrak{g}_{af})$ is identical to the following sum:

$$\sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\sim_k(\mu) \atop \kappa(\pi) \succeq z} q^{\text{null}(\text{wt}(\pi))} e^{\text{fin}(\text{wt}(\pi))}$$
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where for $\nu \in P^0_{af} = P \oplus \mathbb{Z}\delta$, we write $\nu = \text{fin}(\nu) + \text{nul}(\nu)\delta$. Based on this fact, we make essential use of standard monomial theory for semi-infinite LS paths (established in [KNS]) to prove the following theorem (see Theorem 3.9); we also need a string property of Demazure-like subsets of the crystal basis of a level-zero extremal weight module (see Proposition 6.8).

**Theorem 3.** Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$ be dominant integral weights such that $\mu - \lambda \in P^+$, and set $\lambda_i := (\lambda, \alpha_i^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \mu_i := (\mu, \alpha_i^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in I$; note that $\mu_i - \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all $i \in I$. Then, for $x \in W_{af}$, we have

$$\prod_{i \in I} \prod_{k=\mu_i - \lambda_i + 1}^{\mu_i} \frac{1}{1 - q^{-k}} \text{gch} V_x^-(\mu - \lambda)$$

$$= \sum_{y \in W_{af}} \left( \sum_{\eta \in \mathcal{B}^\infty_2(\lambda)} (-1)^{\ell_\infty^y(y) - \ell_\infty^y(x)} q^{-\text{nul}(\text{wt}(\eta))}\text{e}^{-\text{fin}(\text{wt}(\eta))} \right) \text{gch} V_y^-(\mu),$$

where $\ell_\infty^y : W_{af} \to \mathbb{Z}$ denotes the semi-infinite length function (see Definition 2.2), and $\kappa(\eta, y) \in W_{af}$ denotes the final direction of $\eta$ with respect to $y$ (see (3.15)).

The canonical projection $\text{cl} : W_{af} = W \ltimes Q^\vee \to W$ induces a surjective map from $\mathcal{B}^\infty_2(\mu)$ onto $\text{QLS}(\mu)$, which is also denoted by $\text{cl}$. By using this surjective map, we can reformulate this theorem in terms of the (parabolic) quantum Bruhat graph as follows (see Corollary 3.15).

**Corollary 4.** Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$ be dominant integral weights such that $\mu - \lambda \in P^+$. Then, for $x = \text{wt}_\xi \in W_{af}$, we have

$$\text{gch} V_x^-(\mu - \lambda)$$

$$= \sum_{v \in W} \left( \sum_{\eta \in \text{QLS}(\lambda)} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(w)} q^{-\deg(\eta) + \langle \lambda, \xi \rangle} \text{e}^{-\text{wt}(\eta)} \right) \text{gch} V_v^-(\mu_{\text{wt}_\xi + \zeta(\eta, v)}(\mu)).$$

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we fix our notation for untwisted affine Lie algebras, and then review some basic facts about the (parabolic) semi-infinite Bruhat graph, the (parabolic) quantum Bruhat graph, and analogs of the Deodhar lift for these graphs. In Section 3, after recalling the notions of semi-infinite LS paths and quantum LS paths, we state the formulas (Theorem 3 and Corollary 4) above for the graded characters of Demazure submodules, from which our main results (Theorem 1 and Theorem 2) immediately follow on the basis of the results established in [KNS]. In Section 4, we show some results in standard monomial theory for semi-infinite LS paths, which will be needed in the proof of Theorem 3. In Section 5, we prove a special case of Theorem 3 in which the dominant integral weight $\lambda \in P^+$ is a fundamental weight.
and \( w = e \), the identity element, by using standard monomial theory for semi-infinite LS paths. In Section 6 we show a string property of certain Demazure-like subsets of the crystal of semi-infinite LS paths of a given shape; using this, in Section 7 we prove Theorem 3 in the case that \( \lambda \) is a fundamental weight and \( w \) is an arbitrary element of \( W \). In Section 8 we complete the proof of Theorem 3 by induction on the positive integer \( \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \); the base case that \( \lambda \) is a fundamental weight is already established in Section 7. Also, we reformulate Theorem 3 in terms of the quantum Bruhat graph as Corollary 4 above. In Appendix, we gave several examples of Corollary 4 in the case that \( g \) is of type \( A_2 \) and \( \lambda = \varpi_1 \).
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2 Semi-infinite Bruhat order and quantum Bruhat graph.

2.1 Affine Lie algebras. Let \( g \) be a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra over \( \mathbb{C} \) with Cartan subalgebra \( h \). Denote by \( \{\alpha_i^\vee\}_{i \in I} \) and \( \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I} \) the set of simple coroots and simple roots of \( g \), respectively, and set \( Q := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i \), \( Q^+ := \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_i \), and \( Q^\vee := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\alpha_i^\vee \). \( Q^{\vee,+} := \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\alpha_i^\vee \); for \( \xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee \), we write \( \xi \leq \zeta \) if \( \xi - \zeta \in Q^{\vee,+} \). Let \( \Delta, \Delta^+, \) and \( \Delta^- \) be the set of roots, positive roots, and negative roots of \( g \), respectively, with \( \theta \in \Delta^+ \) the highest root of \( g \); we set \( \rho := (1/2)\sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \alpha \). Also, let \( \varpi_i, i \in I \), denote the fundamental weights for \( g \), and set

\[
P := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}\varpi_i, \quad P^+ := \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\varpi_i.
\]

(2.1)

Let \( g_{af} = (\mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}] \otimes g) \oplus \mathbb{C}c \oplus \mathbb{C}d \) be the (untwisted) affine Lie algebra over \( \mathbb{C} \) associated to \( g \), where \( c \) is the canonical central element and \( d \) is the scaling element (or degree operator), with Cartan subalgebra \( h_{af} = h \oplus \mathbb{C}c \oplus \mathbb{C}d \). We regard an element \( \mu \in h^* \) as an element of \( h_{af}^* \) by setting \( \langle \mu, c \rangle = \langle \mu, d \rangle := 0 \), where \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : h_{af}^* \times h_{af} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \) denotes the canonical pairing of \( h_{af}^* := \text{Hom}_\mathbb{C}(h_{af}, \mathbb{C}) \) and \( h_{af} \). Let \( \{\alpha_i^\vee\}_{i \in I_{af}} \subset h_{af}^* \) and \( \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I_{af}} \subset h_{af}^* \) be the set of simple coroots and simple roots of \( g_{af} \), respectively, where \( I_{af} := I \cup \{0\} \); note that \( \langle \alpha_i, c \rangle = 0 \) and \( \langle \alpha_i, d \rangle = \delta_{i,0} \) for \( i \in I_{af} \). Denote by \( \delta \in h_{af}^* \) the null root of \( g_{af} \); recall that \( \alpha_0 = \delta - \theta \). Also, let \( \Lambda_i \in h_{af}^* \), \( i \in I_{af} \), denote the fundamental weights for \( g_{af} \) such that \( \langle \Lambda_i, d \rangle = 0 \), and set

\[
P_{af} := \left( \bigoplus_{i \in I_{af}} \mathbb{Z}\Lambda_i \right) \oplus \mathbb{Z}\delta \subset h^*, \quad P_{af}^0 := \{ \mu \in P_{af} \mid \langle \mu, c \rangle = 0 \};
\]

(2.2)

notice that \( P_{af}^0 = P \oplus \mathbb{Z}\delta \), and that \( \langle \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = -\langle \mu, \theta^\vee \rangle \) for \( \mu \in P_{af}^0 \). We remark that for each \( i \in I \), \( \varpi_i \) is identical to \( \Lambda_i - \langle \Lambda_i, c \rangle \Lambda_0 \), which is called the level-zero fundamental weight in [Kas3].
Let $W := \langle s_i \mid i \in I \rangle$ and $W_{af} := \langle s_i \mid i \in I_{af} \rangle$ be the (finite) Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}$ and the (affine) Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}_{af}$, respectively, where $s_i$ is the simple reflection with respect to $\alpha_i$ for $i \in I_{af}$. We denote by $\ell : W_{af} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ the length function on $W_{af}$, whose restriction to $W$ agrees with the one on $W$, by $e \in W \subset W_{af}$ the identity element, and by $w_0 \in W$ the longest element. For each $\xi \in Q^\vee$, let $t_\xi \in W_{af}$ denote the translation in $\mathfrak{h}_{af}$ by $\xi$ (see [Kac Sect. 6.5]); for $\xi \in Q^\vee$, we have

$$t_\xi \mu = \mu - \langle \mu, \xi \rangle \delta \quad \text{if} \quad \mu \in \mathfrak{h}_{af}^* \quad \text{satisfies} \quad \langle \mu, c \rangle = 0. \quad (2.3)$$

Then, $\{t_\xi \mid \xi \in Q^\vee\}$ forms an abelian normal subgroup of $W_{af}$, in which $t_\xi t_\zeta = t_{\xi + \zeta}$ holds for $\xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee$. Moreover, we know from [Kac, Proposition 6.5] that

$$W_{af} \cong W \ltimes \{t_\xi \mid \xi \in Q^\vee\} \cong W \ltimes Q^\vee. \quad (2.5)$$

Denote by $\Delta_{af}$ the set of real roots of $\mathfrak{g}_{af}$, and by $\Delta_{af}^+ \subset \Delta_{af}$ the set of positive real roots; we know from [Kac Proposition 6.3] that $\Delta_{af} = \{\alpha + n\delta \mid \alpha \in \Delta, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, and $\Delta_{af}^+ = \Delta^+ \cup \{\alpha + n\delta \mid \alpha \in \Delta, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$. For $\beta \in \Delta_{af}$, we denote by $\beta^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}_{af}$ its dual root, and by $s_\beta \in W_{af}$ the corresponding reflection; if $\beta \in \Delta_{af}$ is of the form $\beta = \alpha + n\delta$ with $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $s_\beta = s_\alpha t_{n\alpha^\vee} \in W \ltimes Q^\vee$.

Finally, let $U_\vee(\mathfrak{g}_{af})$ (resp., $U^-_\vee(\mathfrak{g}_{af})$) denote the quantized universal enveloping algebra over $\mathbb{C}(v)$ associated to $\mathfrak{g}_{af}$ (resp., $[\mathfrak{g}_{af} : \mathfrak{g}_{af}]$), with $E_i$ and $F_i$, $i \in I_{af}$, the Chevalley generators corresponding to $\alpha_i$ and $-\alpha_i$, respectively. We denote by $U^-_\vee(\mathfrak{g}_{af})$ the negative part of $U_\vee(\mathfrak{g}_{af})$, that is, the $(\mathbb{C}(v))$-subalgebra of $U_\vee(\mathfrak{g}_{af})$ generated by $F_i$, $i \in I_{af}$.

2.2 Parabolic semi-infinite Bruhat graph. In this subsection, we take and fix an arbitrary subset $J \subset I$. We set $Q_J := \bigoplus_{i \in J} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i, Q_J^\vee := \bigoplus_{i \in J} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i^\vee, Q_J^{\vee,+} := \bigoplus_{i \in J} \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \alpha_i^\vee, \Delta_J := \Delta \cap Q_J, \Delta_J^\pm := \Delta^\pm \cap Q_J, W_J := \langle s_i \mid i \in J \rangle$, and $\rho_J := (1/2) \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_J^+} \alpha$; we denote by

$$[\cdot]_J : Q^\vee \to Q^\vee_{\setminus J} \quad \text{resp.,} \quad [\cdot]_J : Q^\vee \to Q_J^\vee \quad (2.4)$$

the projection from $Q^\vee = Q^\vee_{\setminus J} \oplus Q^\vee_J$ onto $Q^\vee_{\setminus J}$ (resp., $Q^\vee_J$) with kernel $Q^\vee_J$ (resp., $Q^\vee_{\setminus J}$). Let $W^J$ denote the set of minimal(-length) coset representatives for the cosets in $W/W^J$; we know from [BB Sect. 2.4] that

$$W^J = \{w \in W \mid w \alpha \in \Delta^\pm \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha \in \Delta_J^\pm\}. \quad (2.5)$$

For $w \in W$, we denote by $[w] = [w]^J \in W^J$ the minimal coset representative for the coset $ww^J$ in $W/W^J$. Also, we set

$$(\Delta_J)_{af} := \{\alpha + n\delta \mid \alpha \in \Delta_J, n \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subset \Delta_{af}, \quad (2.6)$$

$$(\Delta_J)^+_{af} := (\Delta_J)_{af} \cap \Delta^+_{af} = \Delta_J^+ \cup \{\alpha + n\delta \mid \alpha \in \Delta_J, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}, \quad (2.7)$$

$$(W_J)_{af} := W_J \ltimes \{t_\xi \mid \xi \in Q^\vee_J\} = \langle s_\beta \mid \beta \in (\Delta_J)^+_{af} \rangle, \quad (2.8)$$

$$(W^J)_{af} := \{x \in W_{af} \mid x \beta \in \Delta^+_{af} \quad \text{for all} \quad \beta \in (\Delta_J)^+_{af}\}. \quad (2.9)$$
if $J = \emptyset$, then $(W^\emptyset)_{af} = W_{af}$ and $(W_\emptyset)_{af} = \{ e \}$. We know from [P] (see also [LaS, Lemma 10.6]) that for each $x \in W_{af}$, there exist a unique $x_1 \in (W^J)_{af}$ and a unique $x_2 \in (W_J)_{af}$ such that $x = x_1 x_2$; let

$$\Pi^J : W_{af} \twoheadrightarrow (W^J)_{af}, \quad x \mapsto x_1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.10)

denote the projection, where $x = x_1 x_2$ with $x_1 \in (W^J)_{af}$ and $x_2 \in (W_J)_{af}$.

**Lemma 2.1** (see, e.g., [NS4, Lemma 2.1]).

1. It holds that

$$\begin{cases} 
\Pi^J(w) = [w]^J & \text{for all } w \in W, \\
\Pi^J(x t_\xi) = \Pi^J(x) \Pi^J(t_\xi) & \text{for all } x \in W_{af} \text{ and } \xi \in Q^\vee;
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.11)

in particular, $(W^J)_{af} = \{ w \Pi^J(t_\xi) | w \in W^J, \xi \in Q^\vee \}$.

2. For each $\xi \in Q^\vee$, the element $\Pi^J(t_\xi) \in (W^J)_{af}$ is of the form: $\Pi^J(t_\xi) = u t_\xi + \gamma$ for some $u \in W_J$ and $\gamma \in Q_\gamma^J$.

3. For $\xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee$, $\Pi^J(t_\xi) = \Pi^J(t_\zeta)$ if and only if $\xi - \zeta \in Q_\gamma^J$.

**Definition 2.2.** Let $x \in W_{af}$, and write it as $x = wt_\xi$ with $w \in W$ and $\xi \in Q^\vee$. We define the semi-infinite length $\ell^\sim(x)$ of $x$ by: $\ell^\sim(x) = \ell(w) + 2 \langle \rho, \xi \rangle$.

**Definition 2.3.**

1. The (parabolic) semi-infinite Bruhat graph $BG^\sim((W^J)_{af})$ is the $\Delta^+_{af}$-labeled directed graph whose vertices are the elements of $(W^J)_{af}$, and whose directed edges are of the form: $x \xrightarrow{\beta} y$ for $x, y \in (W^J)_{af}$ and $\beta \in \Delta^+_{af}$ such that $y = s_\beta x$ and $\ell^\sim(y) = \ell^\sim(x) + 1$. When $J = \emptyset$, we write $BG^\sim(W_{af})$ for $BG^\sim((W^\emptyset)_{af})$.

2. The (parabolic) semi-infinite Bruhat order is a partial order $\preceq$ on $(W^J)_{af}$ defined as follows: for $x, y \in (W^J)_{af}$, we write $x \preceq y$ if there exists a directed path in $BG^\sim((W^J)_{af})$ from $x$ to $y$; we write $x < y$ if $x \preceq y$ and $x \neq y$.

**Remark 2.4.** On the (finite) Weyl group $W$, the semi-infinite Bruhat order agrees with the ordinary Bruhat order.

Let us recall some of the basic properties of the semi-infinite Bruhat order. Take and fix $\lambda \in P^+$ such that $\{ i \in I | \langle \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0 \} = J$.

**Lemma 2.5** ([INS, Remark 4.1.3]). Let $x \in (W^J)_{af}$ and $i \in I_{af}$. Then,

$$s_i x \in (W^J)_{af} \iff \langle x \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \neq 0 \iff x^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta \setminus \Delta_J) + Z \delta.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)

Moreover, in this case,

$$\begin{cases} 
x \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} s_i x \iff \langle x \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \iff x^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_J^+) + Z \delta, \\
s_i x \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} x \iff \langle x \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle < 0 \iff x^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_J^-) + Z \delta.
\end{cases}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)
Remark 2.6. Let \( x \in (W^J)_{af} \) and \( i \in I_{af} \). Then,
\[
\Pi^J(s_i x) = x \iff \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle = 0 \iff x^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_J + \mathbb{Z} \delta.
\]
(2.14)

Lemma 2.7 ([NS3, Lemma 2.3.6]). Let \( x, y \in (W^J)_{af} \) be such that \( x \preceq y \), and let \( i \in I_{af} \).

1. If \( \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle > 0 \) and \( \langle y, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0 \), then \( s_i x \preceq y \).

2. If \( \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0 \) and \( \langle y, \alpha_i \rangle < 0 \), then \( x \preceq s_i y \).

3. If \( \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle > 0 \) and \( \langle y, \alpha_i \rangle > 0 \), or if \( \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle < 0 \) and \( \langle y, \alpha_i \rangle < 0 \), then \( s_i x \preceq s_i y \).

Lemma 2.8 ([NNS3, Lemmas 4.3.3–4.3.5]).

1. Let \( w, v \in W^J \), and \( \xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee \). If \( w \Pi^J(t_\xi) \geq v \Pi^J(t_\zeta) \), then \( [\xi]^J \geq [\zeta]^J \); for the projection \([\cdot] : Q^\vee \to Q^\vee_{I,J} \), see (2.4).

2. Let \( w \in W^J \), and \( \xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee \). Then, \( w \Pi^J(t_\xi) \geq w \Pi^J(t_\zeta) \) if and only if \( [\xi]^J \geq [\zeta]^J \).

3. Let \( x, y \in (W^J)_{af} \) and \( \beta \in \Delta^+_af \) be such that \( x \xrightarrow{\beta} y \) in \( \text{BG}_\ast ((W^J)_{af}) \). Then,
\[
\Pi^J(x t_\xi) \xrightarrow{\beta} \Pi^J(y t_\zeta) \text{ in } \text{BG}_\ast ((W^J)_{af}) \text{ for all } \xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee.
\]
Therefore, if \( x \preceq y \), then \( \Pi^J(x t_\xi) \preceq \Pi^J(y t_\zeta) \) for all \( \xi \in Q^\vee \).

Lemma 2.9 ([INS, Lemma 6.1.1]). If \( x, y \in W_{af} \) satisfy \( x \preceq y \), then \( \Pi^J(x) \preceq \Pi^J(y) \).

We denote by \( \ast : I \to I, i \mapsto i^\ast \), the Dynkin diagram automorphism (of order 1 or 2) induced by the longest element \( w_0 \in W \) as: \( w_0(\alpha_i) = -\alpha_i \) for \( i \in I \), and then define the \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear automorphism \( \ast : P \oplus \mathbb{Z} \delta \to P \oplus \mathbb{Z} \delta \) (resp., \( \ast : Q^\vee \to Q^\vee \)) by: \( \varpi_i = \varpi_i^\ast \) for \( i \in I \) and \( \delta^\ast = \delta \) (resp., \( (\alpha_i^\gamma)^\ast = \alpha_i^\gamma \)). Also, we define the group automorphism \( \ast : W \to W \) by: \( s_i^\ast = s_i \) for \( i \in I \).

Let \( J \) be a subset of \( I \). We see by Lemma 2.1 that if \( x \in (W^J)_{af} \) is of the form \( x = w \Pi^J(t_\xi) \) with \( w \in W^J \) and \( \xi \in Q^\vee \), then
\[
\Pi^J(x w_0) = [w w_0]^J \Pi^J(t_{-\xi^\ast}),
\]
(2.15)
where \( J^\ast := \{ j^\ast \mid j \in J \} \subset I \); notice that
\[
\Pi^J(\Pi^J(x w_0) w_0) = x.
\]
(2.16)

The next lemma follows from [INS, Proposition A.1.2] and [LNS31, Proposition 4.3].

Lemma 2.10. Let \( x, y \in (W^J)_{af} \), and \( \beta \in \Delta^+_af \). Then, \( x \xrightarrow{\beta} y \) in \( \text{BG}_\ast ((W^J)_{af}) \) if and only if \( \Pi^J(y w_0) \xrightarrow{\beta} \Pi^J(x w_0) \) in \( \text{BG}_\ast ((W^J)_{af}) \). Therefore, \( x \preceq y \) in \( (W^J)_{af} \) if and only if \( \Pi^J(y w_0) \preceq \Pi^J(x w_0) \) in \( (W^J)_{af} \).
2.3 Deodhar lift. Let $J$ be a subset of $I$. For $x \in (W^J)_{af}$, let $\text{Lift}(x)$ denote the set of lifts of $x$ in $W_{af}$ for the projection $\Pi^J : W_{af} \to (W^J)_{af}$, that is, $\text{Lift}(x) := \{ x' \in W_{af} \mid \Pi^J(x') = x \}$; we know from [KNS, Lemma B.1] that if $x = w\Pi^J(t_\xi) \in (W^J)_{af}$ for $w \in W^J$ and $\xi \in Q^J$ (see Lemma 2.11(1)), then $\text{Lift}(x) = \{ w't_\xi \gamma \mid w' \in wW_J, \gamma \in Q^J \}$.

Proposition 2.11 ([KNS, Proposition 2.4]). If $y \in W_{af}$ and $x \in (W^J)_{af}$ satisfy the condition that $x \succeq \Pi^J(y)$, then the set

$$\text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) := \{ x' \in \text{Lift}(x) \mid x' \succeq y \}$$

has a (necessarily unique) minimum element with respect to the semi-infinite Bruhat order on $W_{af}$; we denote this element by $\min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x)$.

Proposition 2.12. If $y \in W_{af}$ and $x \in (W^J)_{af}$ satisfy the condition that $\Pi^J(y) \succeq x$, then the set

$$\text{Lift}_{\preceq y}(x) := \{ x' \in \text{Lift}(x) \mid y \preceq x' \}$$

has a (necessarily unique) maximum element with respect to the semi-infinite Bruhat order on $W_{af}$; we denote this element by $\max \text{Lift}_{\preceq y}(x)$.

Proof. We claim that $x'w_o \in \text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o))$ for all $x' \in \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x)$. By Lemma 2.10, we see that $x'w_o \succeq yw_o$. Hence it follows from Lemma 2.9 that $\Pi^{J^*}(x'w_o) \succeq \Pi^{J^*}(yw_o)$. Also, since $\Pi^J(x') = x$, there exist $z \in W_J$ and $\gamma \in Q_J^+$ such that $x' = xzt_{\gamma}^{-1}$, with $z \in W_J$ and $\gamma \in Q_J^+$. Therefore, we deduce that $\Pi^{J^*}(x'w_o) = \Pi^{J^*}(xw_o)$, which implies that $x'w_o \in \text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o))$. Similarly, we can show that if $x'' \in \text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o))$, then $x''w_o \in \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x)$ (see also (2.16)). Recall from Proposition 2.11 that $\min \text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o))$ denotes the minimum element of $\text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o))$. From Lemma 2.10 and the argument above, we see that $\min \text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o))w_o$ is the maximum element of $\text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x)$. This proves the lemma. 

Corollary 2.13.

1. If $y \in W_{af}$ and $x \in (W^J)_{af}$ satisfy the condition that $\Pi^J(y) \succeq x$, then $\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o) \succeq \Pi^{J^*}(yw_o)$ and

$$\max \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) = \left( \min \text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o)) \right)w_o. \quad (2.19)$$

2. If $y \in W_{af}$ and $x \in (W^J)_{af}$ satisfy the condition that $x \succeq \Pi^J(y)$, then $\Pi^{J^*}(yw_o) \succeq \Pi^{J^*}(xw_o)$ and

$$\min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) = \left( \max \text{Lift}_{\succeq yw_o}(\Pi^{J^*}(xw_o)) \right)w_o. \quad (2.20)$$

Lemma 2.14 (cf. [NNS, Lemma 3.6]). Let $J$ be a subset of $I$. Let $y \in W_{af}$ and $x \in (W^J)_{af}$ be such that $x \succeq \Pi^J(y)$, and set $\bar{x} := \min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x)$. Let $i \in I_{af}$ be such that $y^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z}\delta$.

1. Assume that $x^{-1}\alpha_i \in (\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_I^+) + \mathbb{Z}\delta$; note that $s_i x \in (W^J)_{af}$ by Lemma 2.3. It holds that $s_i x \succeq \Pi^J(s_i y)$ and $\min \text{Lift}_{\succeq s_i y}(s_i x) = s_i \bar{x}$. 
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(2) If $x^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_j^-) + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, then $x \geq \Pi^J(s_i y)$ and $\min \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(x) = \bar{x}$.

(3) If $x^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_j + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, then $\bar{x}^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$. Moreover, we have $x \geq \Pi^J(s_i y)$, and $\min \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(x)$ is identical to $\bar{x}$ or $s_i \bar{x}$.

**Proof.** Although we can show this lemma by combining [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 and Proposition 2.22 below, we give a direct proof here.

(1) Since $x^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_j^+)+\mathbb{Z} \delta$ by the assumption, and since $\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_j^+$ is stable under the action of $W_j$, we see that $\bar{x}^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_j^+)+\mathbb{Z} \delta$. Also, we have $y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ by the assumption, and $\bar{x} \geq y$ by the definition of $\bar{x}$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 2.7(3) that $s_i \bar{x} \geq s_i y$, and hence $\Pi^J(s_i \bar{x}) \geq \Pi^J(s_i y)$ by Lemma 2.9. Here it is easily checked that $\Pi^J(s_i \bar{x}) = s_i x$. From these, we deduce that $s_i x \geq \Pi^J(s_i y)$ and $s_i \bar{x} \in \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(s_i x)$. If we set $z := \min \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(s_i x)$, then $s_i x \geq z \geq s_i y$. Since $\Pi^J(z) = s_i x$ and $(s_i x)^{-1} \alpha_i = -x^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_j^-)+\mathbb{Z} \delta$, it is easily seen that $\bar{x}^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_j^-)+\mathbb{Z} \delta$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 2.7(3) that $\bar{x} \geq z \geq y$. Here we note that $\Pi^J(s_i z) = x$, and hence $s_i z \in \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$. Since $\bar{x} = \min \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$, we obtain $\bar{x} = s_i z$, and hence $z = s_i \bar{x}$, as desired.

(2) As in the proof of (1), we see that $\bar{x}^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^- \setminus \Delta_j^-)+\mathbb{Z} \delta$. Also, we have $y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ by the assumption, and $\bar{x} \geq y$ by the definition of $\bar{x}$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 2.7(1) that $\bar{x} \geq s_i y$, which implies that $x = \Pi^J(\bar{x}) \geq \Pi^J(s_i y)$ by Lemma 2.9. Thus we have $\bar{x} \in \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(x)$. If we set $z := \min \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(x)$, then $\bar{x} \geq z \geq s_i y$. Since $y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, we deduce that $s_i y \succeq y$, and hence $\bar{x} \geq z \geq y$. Since $\bar{x} = \min \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$, we obtain $z = \bar{x}$, as desired.

(3) Suppose, for a contradiction, that $\bar{x}^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$. Then we have $\bar{x} \succ s_i \bar{x}$. Since $y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, it follows from Lemma 2.7(2) that $s_i \bar{x} \geq y$. Also, since $x^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_j + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, we see that $\Pi^J(s_i \bar{x}) = x$. Hence we deduce that $s_i \bar{x} \in \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$. However, since $\bar{x} \succ s_i \bar{x}$ as seen above, this contradicts $\bar{x} = \min \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$. Thus we conclude that $\bar{x}^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$.

Since $\bar{x}^{-1} \alpha_i$, $y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, and $\bar{x} \geq y$, it follows from Lemma 2.7(3) that $s_i \bar{x} \geq s_i y$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.9 we have $x = \Pi^J(s_i \bar{x}) \geq \Pi^J(s_i y)$, and hence $s_i \bar{x} \in \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(x)$. Here we set $z := \min \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(x)$. Assume first that $\bar{x} \geq s_i y$. Then we have $\bar{x} \geq z \geq s_i y$. Since $y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, we have $s_i y \succeq y$, and hence $\bar{x} \geq z \geq y$. Since $\bar{x} = \min \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$, we obtain $z = \bar{x}$. Assume next that $\bar{x} \not\succeq s_i y$. Since $s_i \bar{x} \in \text{Lift}_{\geq s_i y}(x)$ as seen above, we have $s_i \bar{x} \geq z \geq s_i y$. Note that $(s_i \bar{x})^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$. If $z^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, then it follows from Lemma 2.7(2) that $\bar{x} \geq z \geq s_i y$, which contradicts the assumption that $\bar{x} \not\succeq s_i y$. Hence we obtain $z^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$. Since $(s_i \bar{x})^{-1} \alpha_i$ and $(s_i y)^{-1} \alpha_i$ are contained in $\Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, we see by Lemma 2.7(3) that $\bar{x} \geq s_i z \geq y$. Since $x^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_j + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ and $z \in \text{Lift}(x)$, it is easily checked that $\Pi^J(s_i z) = x$. Thus, $s_i z \in \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$. Since $\bar{x} = \min \text{Lift}_{\geq y}(x)$, we obtain $s_i z = \bar{x}$, and hence $z = s_i \bar{x}$. This proves the lemma.

**2.4 Quantum Bruhat graph.** We take and fix a subset $J$ of $I$.

**Definition 2.15.** The (parabolic) quantum Bruhat graph $QBG(W^J)$ is the $(\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_j^+)$-labeled directed graph whose vertices are the elements of $W^J$, and whose directed edges are of the form: $w \xrightarrow{\beta} v$ for $w, v \in W^J$ and $\beta \in \Delta^+ \setminus \Delta_j^+$ such that $v = [w s_{\beta}]$, and such
that either of the following holds: (i) \( \ell(v) = \ell(w) + 1 \); (ii) \( \ell(v) = \ell(w) + 1 - 2\langle \rho - \rho_J, \beta^\vee \rangle \).

An edge satisfying (i) (resp., (ii)) is called a Bruhat (resp., quantum) edge. When \( J = \emptyset \), we write \( \text{QBG}(W) \) for \( \text{QBG}(W^0) \).

Remark 2.16. We know from [LNS41, Remark 6.13] that for each \( w, v \in W^J \), there exists a directed path in \( \text{QBG}(W^J) \) from \( w \) to \( v \).

Let \( w, v \in W^J \), and let \( p : w = v_0 \xrightarrow{\beta_1} v_1 \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \cdots \xrightarrow{\beta_\ell} v_1 = v \) be a directed path in \( \text{QBG}(W^J) \) from \( w \) to \( v \). We define the weight \( \text{wt}^J(p) \) of \( p \) by

\[
\text{wt}^J(p) := \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \ell; v_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\beta_k} v_k} \beta^\vee_k \in Q^{\vee,+};
\]

(2.21)

when \( J = \emptyset \), we write \( \text{wt}(p) \) for \( \text{wt}^\emptyset(p) \). For \( w, v \in W^J \), we take a shortest directed path \( p \) in \( \text{QBG}(W^J) \) from \( w \) to \( v \), and set \( \text{wt}^J(w \Rightarrow v) := [\text{wt}^J(p)]^J \in Q^{\vee,+}_J \); we know from [LNS42, Sect. 4.1] that \( \text{wt}^J(w \Rightarrow v) \) does not depend on the choice of a shortest directed path \( p \). When \( J = \emptyset \), we write \( \text{wt}(w \Rightarrow v) \) for \( \text{wt}^\emptyset(w \Rightarrow v) \).

Lemma 2.17 ([LNS42 Lemma 7.2]). Let \( w, v \in W^J \), and let \( w_1 \in wW_J, v_1 \in vW_J \). Then we have \( \text{wt}^J(w \Rightarrow v) = [\text{wt}(w_1 \Rightarrow v_1)]^J \).

Lemma 2.18 ([NNS1 Lemmas 4.3.6 and 4.3.7]). Let \( w, v \in W^J \), and \( \xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee \). Then,

\[
w\Pi^J(t_\xi) \succeq v\Pi^J(t_\zeta) \iff [\xi]^J \geq [\gamma + \text{wt}(v \Rightarrow w)]^J.
\]

(2.22)

2.5 Tilted Bruhat order. For \( w, v \in W \), we denote by \( \ell(w \Rightarrow v) \) the length of a shortest directed path from \( w \) to \( v \) in \( \text{QBG}(W) = \text{QBG}(W_J \emptyset) \).

Definition 2.19 (tilted Bruhat order). For each \( v \in W \), we define the \( v \)-tilted Bruhat order \( \leq_v \) on \( W \) as follows: for \( w_1, w_2 \in W \),

\[
w_1 \leq_v w_2 \iff \ell(v \Rightarrow w_2) = \ell(v \Rightarrow w_1) + \ell(w_1 \Rightarrow w_2).
\]

(2.23)

Namely, \( w_1 \leq_v w_2 \) if and only if there exists a shortest directed path in \( \text{QBG}(W) \) from \( v \) to \( w_2 \) passing through \( w_1 \); or equivalently, if and only if the concatenation of a shortest directed path from \( v \) to \( w_1 \) and one from \( w_1 \) to \( w_2 \) is one from \( v \) to \( w_2 \).

Proposition 2.20 ([LNS41, Theorem 7.1]). Let \( J \) be a subset of \( I \), and let \( v \in W \). Then each coset \( uW_J, u \in W \), has a unique minimal element with respect to \( \leq_v \); we denote it by \( \min(uW_J, \leq_v) \).

Remark 2.21. Let \( J \) be a subset of \( I \), and let \( u, v \in W \). It is obvious by the definition of the \( v \)-tilted Bruhat order that if \( uW_J = vW_J \), then \( \min(uW_J, \leq_v) = v \).
Proposition 2.22. Let \( J \) be a subset of \( I \). Let \( y \in W_{af} \) and \( x \in (W^J)_{af} \) be such that \( x \succeq \Pi^J(y) \), and write these as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\begin{cases}
y = v_y t_{\xi_y} & \text{with } v_y \in W \text{ and } \xi_y \in Q^y; \\
x = v_x \Pi^J(t_{\xi_x}) & \text{with } v_x \in W^J \text{ and } \xi_x \in Q^y,
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
\]
respectively. Also, write \( \min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) \in W_{af} \) as:

\[
\min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) = wt_\gamma \text{ with } w \in W \text{ and } \gamma \in Q^y.
\]

Then, \( w = \min(v_x W_J, \leq_{v_y}) \) and \( \gamma = [\xi_x]^J + [\xi_y + wt(v_y \Rightarrow w)]_J \).

**Proof.** Since \( wt_\gamma \in \text{Lift}(x) \), we see that \( w \in v_x W_J \) and \( \xi_x - \gamma \in Q^y \). If we set \( w' := \min(v_x W_J, \leq_{v_y}) \), then we have \( w' \leq_{v_y} w \). Suppose, for a contradiction, that \( w' \not\succeq w \).

Then there exists a shortest directed path in \( \text{QBG}(v) \) which implies that \( wt(v_y \Rightarrow w') = wt(v_y \Rightarrow w) + wt(w' \Rightarrow w) \). Since \( w \) and \( w' \) are contained in the same coset \( v_x W_J \), we deduce by Lemma 2.17 that

\[
0 = wt^J(v_x \Rightarrow v_x) = wt^J([w'] \Rightarrow [w]) = wt^J(w' \Rightarrow w),
\]

which implies that \( wt(w' \Rightarrow w) \in Q^y \). Hence we obtain \( w' t_{\gamma - wt(w' \Rightarrow w)} \in \text{Lift}(x) \). Let us show that \( w' t_{\gamma - wt(w' \Rightarrow w)} \succeq \gamma \). Since \( wt_\gamma = \min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) \succeq v_y t_{\xi_y} \), it follows from Lemma 2.18 that \( \gamma \succeq wt(v_y \Rightarrow w) + \xi_y \). Hence we deduce that

\[
\gamma - wt(w' \Rightarrow w) \succeq wt(v_y \Rightarrow w) + \xi_y - wt(w' \Rightarrow w) = wt(v_y \Rightarrow w') + \xi_y.
\]

We see by Lemma 2.18 that \( w' t_{\gamma - wt(w' \Rightarrow w)} \succeq v_y t_{\xi_y} = y \). Therefore, we conclude that \( w' t_{\gamma - wt(w' \Rightarrow w)} \in \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) \). However, by Lemma 2.18 we have \( \min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) = wt_\gamma \succeq w' t_{\gamma - wt(w' \Rightarrow w)} \), which is a contradiction; note that \( w \not\succeq w' \) by our assumption. Thus we obtain \( w = \min(v_x W_J, \leq_{v_y}) \), as desired.

Next, we set \( \gamma' := [\xi_x]^J + [\xi_y + wt(v_y \Rightarrow w)]_J \), and show that \( \gamma = \gamma' \). Since \( \xi_x - \gamma \in Q^y \) as seen above, \( \gamma = [\xi_x]^J + \zeta \) for some \( \zeta \in Q_J \). Also, since \( \min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) = wt_\gamma \succeq v_y t_{\xi_y} = y \), we see by Lemma 2.18 that \( [\xi_x]^J + \zeta \succeq wt(v_y \Rightarrow w) \). Thus we have \( \zeta = [\gamma]^J \succeq [\xi_y + wt(v_y \Rightarrow w)]_J \), and hence \( \gamma = [\xi_x]^J + \zeta \succeq [\xi_x]^J + [\xi_y + wt(v_y \Rightarrow w)]_J = \gamma' \). Let us show \( \gamma' \succeq \gamma \). Since \( \xi_x - \gamma' \in Q^y \) and \( w \in v_x W_J \), it follows that \( wt_{\gamma'} \in \text{Lift}(x) \). Because \( v_x \Pi^J(t_{\xi_x}) = x \preceq \Pi^J(y) = [v_y]^J \Pi^J(t_{\xi_y}) \) by the assumption, it follows from Lemmas 2.17 and 2.18 that \( [\xi_x]^J \succeq [\xi_y + wt(v_y \Rightarrow w)]_J \). Thus we obtain \( \gamma' = [\xi_x]^J + [\xi_y + wt(v_y \Rightarrow w)]_J \succeq \xi_y + wt(v_y \Rightarrow w) \), which implies that \( wt_{\gamma'} \succeq v_y t_{\xi_y} = y \) by Lemma 2.18. Hence we obtain \( wt_{\gamma'} \in \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) \). Since \( wt_\gamma = \min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}(x) \), it follows from Lemma 2.8(2) that \( \gamma' \succeq \gamma \). Thus we conclude that \( \gamma = \gamma' \). This completes the proof of the proposition. \( \square \)

**Corollary 2.23.** Let \( y \in W_{af} \) and \( \xi \in Q^y \) be such that \( [w_o]^J \Pi^J(t_{\xi}) \succeq \Pi^J(y) \). We write \( y = v_y t_{\xi_y} \) with \( v_y \in W \) and \( \xi_y \in Q^y \). Then,

\[
\min \text{Lift}_{\succeq y}([w_o]^J \Pi^J(t_{\xi})) = \min(w_o W_J, \leq_{v_y}) \cdot t_{[\xi]^J + [\xi_o]J},
\]

(2.24)
Proposition 2.25. We set \( w := \min(w_oW_J, \leq_{v_y}) \). By Proposition \ref{prop:25}, we see that
\[
\min \text{ Lift}_{\geq y}(\lfloor \omega \rfloor^J \Pi^J(t_{\xi})) = wt(t_{\xi}^J + \lfloor \omega \rfloor^J + \text{ wt}config(w_y \Rightarrow w_j) \rfloor).
\]
Since \( w_o \in w_oW_J \) and \( w = \min(w_oW_J, \leq_{v_y}) \), we have \( w \leq_{v_y} w_o \). Hence there exists a shortest directed path in \( \text{ QBG}(W) \) from \( v_y \) to \( w_o \) passing through \( w \), which implies that
\[
\text{ wt}(v_y \Rightarrow w_o) = \text{ wt}(v_y \Rightarrow w) + \text{ wt}(w \Rightarrow w_o).
\]
Because \( w_o \) is greater than or equal to \( v_y \) in the ordinary Bruhat order on \( W \), there exists a shortest directed path from \( v_y \) to \( w_o \) in \( \text{ QBG}(W) \) whose directed edges are all Bruhat edges. Hence it follows that \( \text{ wt}(v_y \Rightarrow w_o) = 0 \). Similarly, we have \( \text{ wt}(w \Rightarrow w_o) = 0 \). Therefore, we obtain \( \text{ wt}(v_y \Rightarrow w) = 0 \). This proves the corollary.

Definition 2.24 (dual tilted Bruhat order). For each \( v \in W \), we define the dual \( v \)-tilted Bruhat order \( \leq_v^* \) on \( W \) as follows: for \( w_1, w_2 \in W \),
\[
w_1 \leq_v^* w_2 \iff \ell(w_1 \Rightarrow v) = \ell(w_1 \Rightarrow w_2) + \ell(w_2 \Rightarrow v). \quad (2.25)
\]
Namely, \( w_1 \leq_v^* w_2 \) if and only if there exists a shortest directed path in \( \text{ QBG}(W) \) from \( w_1 \) to \( v \) passing through \( w_2 \); or equivalently, if and only if the concatenation of a shortest directed path from \( w_1 \) to \( w_2 \) and one from \( w_2 \) to \( v \) is one from \( w_1 \) to \( v \).

We see by \cite[Lemma 2.1.3]{NNS} that \( w_1 \leq_v^* w_2 \) if and only if \( w_2w_o \leq_{v w_o} w_1w_o \) for \( w_1, w_2 \in W \) and \( v \in W \). The next proposition follows from Proposition \ref{prop:20} and this observation.

Proposition 2.25. Let \( v \in W \), and let \( J \) be a subset of \( I \). Then each coset \( uW_J \), \( u \in W \), has a unique maximal element with respect to \( \leq_v^* \); we denote it by \( \max(uW_J, \leq_v^*) \). Then we have
\[
\max(uW_J, \leq_v^*) = \min(w_oW_J, \leq_{v w_o}^*) w_o. \quad (2.26)
\]

We can prove the following proposition by using Proposition \ref{prop:25} together with Corollary \ref{cor:13} \ref{cor:13} and \ref{cor:15}.

Proposition 2.26. Let \( J \) be a subset of \( I \). Let \( y \in W_{af} \) and \( x \in (W^J)_{af} \) be such that \( \Pi^J(y) \succeq x \), and write these as:
\[
\begin{cases}
y = v_y t_{\xi_y} & \text{with } v_y \in W \text{ and } \xi_y \in Q^\vee; \\
x = v_x \Pi^J(t_{\xi_x}) & \text{with } v_x \in W^J \text{ and } \xi_x \in Q^\vee,
\end{cases}
\]
respectively. We write \( \text{ max Lift}_{\leq y}(x) \in W_{af} \) as:
\[
\text{ max Lift}_{\leq y}(x) = wt_x \gamma \quad \text{with } w \in W \text{ and } \gamma \in Q^\vee.
\]
Then, \( w = \max(v_xW_J, \leq_{v_y}^*) \) and \( \gamma = [\xi_x]^J + [\xi_y - \text{ wt}(w \Rightarrow v_y)]_J \).
3 Main result.

3.1 Semi-infinite Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths. We fix \( \lambda \in P^+ \subset P^0_{af} \) (see (2.1) and (2.2)), and set
\[
J = J_\lambda := \{ i \in I \mid \langle \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0 \} \subset I. \tag{3.1}
\]

**Definition 3.1.** For a rational number \( 0 < a < 1 \), we define \( BG_{\pi}(W(J)_{af}) \) to be the subgraph of \( BG_{\pi}(W(J)_{af}) \) with the same vertex set but having only the edges of the form \( x \xrightarrow{\beta} y \) with \( a \langle x, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \).

**Definition 3.2.** A semi-infinite Lakshmibai-Seshadri (LS for short) path of shape \( \lambda \) is a pair
\[
\pi = (x; a) = (x_1, \ldots, x_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s), \quad s \geq 1, \tag{3.2}
\]
of a strictly decreasing sequence \( x : x_1 \succ \cdots \succ x_s \) of elements in \( (W^J)_{af} \) and an increasing sequence \( a : 0 = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_s = 1 \) of rational numbers satisfying the condition that there exists a directed path from \( x_{u+1} \) to \( x_u \) in \( BG_{\pi}(W(J)_{af}) \) for each \( u = 1, 2, \ldots, s-1 \). We denote by \( \mathbb{B}_{\pi}(\lambda) \) the set of all semi-infinite LS paths of shape \( \lambda \).

Following [INS] Sect. 3.1 (see also [NS3] Sect. 2.4), we endow the set \( \mathbb{B}_{\pi}(\lambda) \) with a (regular) crystal structure with weights in \( P_{af} \) by the map \( wt : \mathbb{B}_{\pi}(\lambda) \to P_{af} \) and the root operators \( e_i, f_i, i \in I_{af} \) defined as follows. Let \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}_{\pi}(\lambda) \) be of the form (3.2). Define \( \pi : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R} \otimes \mathbb{Z} P_{af} \) to be the piecewise-linear, continuous map whose “direction vector” on the interval \( [a_{u-1}, a_u] \) is \( x_u \lambda \in P_{af} \) for each \( 1 \leq u \leq s \), that is,
\[
\pi(t) := \sum_{k=1}^{u-1} (a_k - a_{k-1}) x_k \lambda + (t - a_{u-1}) x_u \lambda \quad \text{for} \ t \in [a_{u-1}, a_u], \ 1 \leq u \leq s; \tag{3.3}
\]

we know from [INS] Proposition 3.1.3] that \( \pi \) is an (ordinary) LS path of shape \( \lambda \), introduced in [L2] Sect. 4. We set
\[
\text{wt}(\pi) := \pi(1) = \sum_{u=1}^s (a_u - a_{u-1}) x_u \lambda \in P_{af}. \tag{3.4}
\]

Now, we set
\[
\begin{align*}
H^\pi_i(t) &:= \langle \pi(t), \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \quad \text{for} \ t \in [0, 1], \\
m^\pi_i &:= \min \{ H^\pi_i(t) \mid t \in [0, 1] \}. \tag{3.5}
\end{align*}
\]

As explained in [NS3] Remark 2.4.3, all local minima of the function \( H^\pi_i(t), t \in [0, 1] \), are integers; in particular, the minimum value \( m^\pi_i \) is a nonpositive integer (recall that \( \pi(0) = 0 \), and hence \( H^\pi_i(0) = 0 \)).

We define \( e_i \pi \) as follows. If \( m^\pi_i = 0 \), then we set \( e_i \pi := 0 \), where \( 0 \) is an additional element not contained in any crystal. If \( m^\pi_i \leq -1 \), then we set
\[
\begin{align*}
t_1 &:= \min \{ t \in [0, 1] \mid H^\pi_i(t) = m^\pi_i \}, \\
t_0 &:= \max \{ t \in [0, t_1] \mid H^\pi_i(t) = m^\pi_i + 1 \}. \tag{3.6}
\end{align*}
\]
notice that $H_i^\pi(t)$ is strictly decreasing on the interval $[t_0, t_1]$. Let $1 \leq p \leq q \leq s$ be such that $a_{p-1} \leq t_0 < a_p$ and $t_1 = a_q$. Then we define $e_i \pi$ to be

$$e_i \pi := (x_1, \ldots, x_p, s_i x_p, s_i x_{p+1}, \ldots, s_i x_q, x_{q+1}, \ldots, x_s;$$

$$a_0, \ldots, a_{p-1}, t_0, a_p, \ldots, a_q = t_1, \ldots, a_s);$$

(3.7)

if $t_0 = a_{p-1}$, then we drop $x_p$ and $a_{p-1}$, and if $s_i x_q = x_{q+1}$, then we drop $x_{q+1}$ and $a_q = t_1$.

Similarly, we define $f_i \pi$ as follows. Note that $H_i^\pi(1) - m_i^\pi$ is a nonnegative integer. If $H_i^\pi(1) - m_i^\pi = 0$, then we set $f_i \pi := 0$. If $H_i^\pi(1) - m_i^\pi > 1$, then we set

$$\begin{cases}
    t_0 := \max \{ t \in [0, 1] \mid H_i^\pi(t) = m_i^\pi \}, \\
    t_1 := \min \{ t \in [t_0, 1] \mid H_i^\pi(t) = m_i^\pi + 1 \};
\end{cases}

(3.8)

notice that $H_i^\pi(t)$ is strictly increasing on the interval $[t_0, t_1]$. Let $0 \leq p \leq q \leq s - 1$ be such that $t_0 = a_p$ and $a_q < t_1 \leq a_{q+1}$. Then we define $f_i \pi$ to be

$$f_i \pi := (x_1, \ldots, x_p, s_i x_{p+1}, \ldots, s_i x_q, x_{q+1}, \ldots, x_s;$$

$$a_0, \ldots, a_p = t_0, \ldots, a_q, t_1, a_{q+1}, \ldots, a_s);$$

(3.9)

if $t_1 = a_{q+1}$, then we drop $x_{q+1}$ and $a_{q+1}$, and if $x_p = s_i x_{p+1}$, then we drop $x_p$ and $a_p = t_0$.

In addition, we set $e_i 0 = f_i 0 := 0$ for all $i \in I_{af}$.

**Theorem 3.3** (see [INS Theorem 3.15]).

1. The set $\mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda) \cup \{0\}$ is stable under the action of the root operators $e_i$ and $f_i$, $i \in I_{af}$.
2. For each $\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda)$ and $i \in I_{af}$, we set

$$\begin{cases}
    \varepsilon_i(\pi) := \max \{ n \geq 0 \mid e_i^n \pi \neq 0 \}, \\
    \varphi_i(\pi) := \max \{ n \geq 0 \mid f_i^n \pi \neq 0 \}.
\end{cases}

$$

Then, the set $\mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda)$, equipped with the maps $\text{wt}$, $e_i$, $f_i$, $i \in I_{af}$, and $\varepsilon_i$, $\varphi_i$, $i \in I_{af}$, defined above, is a crystal with weights in $P_{af}$.

We denote by $\mathbb{B}_0^\pi(\lambda)$ the connected component of $\mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda)$ containing $\pi_\lambda := (e; 0, 1) \in \mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda)$; for the description of the connected components of $\mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda)$, see §4.1 below.

If $\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda)$ is of the form (3.2), then we deduce from Lemma 2.10 that

$$\pi^* := (\Pi^\pi(x_s w_0), \ldots, \Pi^\pi(x_1 w_0); 1 - a_s, \ldots, 1 - a_1, 1 - a_0)$$

(3.10)

is an element of $\mathbb{B}^\pi(-w_0 \lambda)$; we call $\pi^*$ the dual path of $\pi$ (cf. [L2, §2]). Notice that $(\pi^*)^* = \pi$, and

$$\begin{cases}
    \text{wt}(\pi^*) = - \text{wt}(\pi) & \text{for } \pi \in \mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda), \\
    (e_i \pi)^* = f_i \pi^*, \quad (f_i \pi)^* = e_i \pi^* & \text{for } \pi \in \mathbb{B}^\pi(\lambda) \text{ and } i \in I_{af},
\end{cases}

(3.11)
where $0^*$ is understood to be $0$.

If $\pi \in B_+^\infty (\lambda)$ is of the form (3.2), then we set

$$\iota(\pi) := x_1 \in (W^I)_{af}, \quad \kappa(\pi) := x_s \in (W^I)_{af};$$

(3.12)

we call $\iota(\pi)$ and $\kappa(\pi)$ the initial direction and final direction of $\pi$, respectively. For $x \in W_{af}$, we set

$$B_{<x}^\infty (\lambda) := \{ \pi \in B_+^\infty (\lambda) \mid \kappa(\pi) \supseteq \Pi^I(x) \},$$

(3.13)

$$B_{\leq x}^\infty (\lambda) := \{ \pi \in B_+^\infty (\lambda) \mid \Pi^I(x) \supseteq \iota(\pi) \}.$$  

(3.14)

**Remark 3.4 ([NS3, Lemma 5.3.1 and Proposition 5.3.2 (2)])**. The set $B_{\leq x}^\infty (\lambda) \cup \{0\}$ is stable under the action of $f_i$ for all $i \in I_{af}$. Moreover, for $i \in I_{af}$ such that $\langle x\lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0$, the set $B_{\leq x}^\infty (\lambda) \cup \{0\}$ is stable under the action of $e_i$.

If $\pi = (x_1, \ldots, x_s; a_0, \ldots, a_s) \in B_+^\infty (\lambda)$ and $y \in W_{af}$ satisfy $\Pi^I(y) \supseteq x_1$, that is, if $\pi \in B_{\leq y}^\infty (\lambda)$, then we define $\kappa(\pi, y) \in W_{af}$ by the following recursive formula:

$$\begin{cases}
\hat{x}_0 := y, \\
\hat{x}_u := \max \text{Lift}_{<\hat{x}_{u-1}}(x_u) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq u \leq s, \\
\kappa(\pi, y) := \hat{x}_s;
\end{cases}$$

(3.15)

we call $\kappa(\pi, y) \in W_{af}$ the final direction of $\pi$ with respect to $y$. Similarly, if $\pi = (x_1, \ldots, x_s; a_0, \ldots, a_s) \in B_+^\infty (\lambda)$ and $y \in W_{af}$ satisfy $x_s \supseteq \Pi^I(y)$, that is, if $\pi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty (\lambda)$, then we define $\iota(\pi, y) \in W_{af}$ by the following recursive formula (from $u = s+1$ to $u = 1$):

$$\begin{cases}
\tilde{x}_{s+1} := y, \\
\tilde{x}_u := \min \text{Lift}_{\geq \tilde{x}_{u+1}}(x_u) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq u \leq s, \\
\iota(\pi, y) := \tilde{x}_1;
\end{cases}$$

(3.16)

we call $\iota(\pi, y) \in W_{af}$ the initial direction of $\pi$ with respect to $y$. The next lemma follows from Lemma 2.10 and Corollary 2.13.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let $y \in W_{af}$.

1. If $\pi \in B_{\leq y}^\infty (\lambda)$, then $\pi^* \in B_{\leq w_0}^\infty (-w_0\lambda)$, and $\iota(\pi, y) = (\kappa(\pi^*, yw_0))w_0$.

2. If $\pi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty (\lambda)$, then $\pi^* \in B_{\geq w_0}^\infty (-w_0\lambda)$, and $\kappa(\pi, y) = (\iota(\pi^*, yw_0))w_0$. 
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3.2 Extremal weight modules and their Demazure submodules. Let us take an arbitrary \( \lambda \in P^+ \subset P^0_{\text{af}} \). Let \( V(\lambda) \) denote the (level-zero) extremal weight module of extremal weight \( \lambda \) over \( U_v(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{af}}) \), which is defined to be the integrable \( U_v(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{af}}) \)-module generated by a single element \( v_\lambda \) with the defining relation that “\( v_\lambda \) is an extremal weight vector of weight \( \lambda \)”; recall from [Kas3, Sect. 3.1] and [Kas4, Sect. 2.6] that \( v_\lambda \) is an extremal weight vector of weight \( \lambda \) if and only if (\( v_\lambda \) is a weight vector of weight \( \lambda \) and) there exists a family \( \{ v_x \}_{x \in W_{\text{af}}} \) of weight vectors in \( V(\lambda) \) such that \( v_\lambda = v_x \), and such that for every \( i \in I_{\text{af}} \) and \( x \in W_{\text{af}} \) with \( n := \langle x \lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0 \) (resp., \( \leq 0 \)), the equalities \( E_i v_x = 0 \) and \( F_i^{(n)} v_x = v_{s_i x} \) (resp., \( F_i v_x = 0 \) and \( E_i^{(-n)} v_x = v_{s_i x} \)) hold, where for \( i \in I_{\text{af}} \) and \( k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), the \( E_i^{(k)} \) and \( F_i^{(k)} \) are the \( k \)-th divided powers of the Chevalley generators \( E_i \) and \( F_i \) of \( U_v(\mathfrak{g}_{\text{af}}) \), respectively; note that the weight of \( v_x \) is \( x \lambda \). Also, for each \( x \in W_{\text{af}} \), we define the Demazure submodule \( V_x^- (\lambda) \) of \( V(\lambda) \) by

\[
V_x^- (\lambda) := U_v^- (\mathfrak{g}_{\text{af}}) v_x.
\]

We know from [Kas1, Proposition 8.2.2] that \( V(\lambda) \) has a crystal basis \( \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \) and the corresponding global basis \( \{ G(b) \mid b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \} \). Also, we know from [Kas4, Sect. 2.8] (see also [NS3, Sect. 4.1]) that \( V_x^- (\lambda) \subset V(\lambda) \) is compatible with the global basis of \( V(\lambda) \), that is, there exists a subset \( \mathcal{B}_x^- (\lambda) \) of the crystal basis \( \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \) such that

\[
V_x^- (\lambda) = \bigoplus_{b \in \mathcal{B}_x^- (\lambda)} \mathbb{C}(v) G(b) \subset V(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{b \in \mathcal{B}(\lambda)} \mathbb{C}(v) G(b).
\]

Remark 3.6 ([NS3, Lemma 4.1.2]). For every \( x \in W_{\text{af}} \), we have \( V_x^- (\lambda) = V_{\Pi(x)}^- (\lambda) \) and \( \mathcal{B}_x^- (\lambda) = \mathcal{B}_{\Pi(x)}^- (\lambda) \).

Denote by \( u_\lambda \) the element of \( \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \) such that \( G(u_\lambda) = v_\lambda \); recall that \( \pi_\lambda = (e; 0, 1) \in \mathbb{B}^\Delta (\lambda) \). We know the following from [KNS, Theorem 3.2.1] and [NS3, Theorem 4.2.1].

**Theorem 3.7.** There exists an isomorphism of crystals from \( \mathcal{B}(\lambda) \) to \( \mathbb{B}^\Delta^\pm (\lambda) \), which sends \( u_\lambda \) to \( \pi_\lambda \), and sends \( \mathcal{B}_x^- (\lambda) \) to \( \mathbb{B}^\Delta^\pm (\lambda) \) for all \( x \in W_{\text{af}} \).

Recall that \( P^0_{\text{af}} = P \oplus \mathbb{Z} \delta; \) for \( \nu \in P^0_{\text{af}} \), we write \( \nu = \text{fin}(\nu) + \text{nul}(\nu) \delta \) with \( \text{fin}(\nu) \in P \) and \( \text{nul}(\nu) \in \mathbb{Z} \). Let \( e^\nu \) be the formal exponential for \( \nu \in P^0_{\text{af}} \), and define a variable \( q \) to be \( e^\delta \); note that the formal exponential \( e^\nu \) with \( \nu \in P^0_{\text{af}} \) is identical to \( q^{\text{nul}(\nu)} e^{\text{fin}(\nu)} \). Following [KNS, Sect. 2.4], we define the graded character \( \text{gch} V_x^- (\lambda) \) of \( V_x^- (\lambda) \) to be

\[
\text{gch} V_x^- (\lambda) := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left( \sum_{\gamma \in Q} \dim (V_x^- (\lambda)_{\lambda + \gamma + k\delta}) e^\gamma \right) q^k;
\]

if \( x = wt_\xi \) for \( w \in W \) and \( \xi \in Q' \), then \( \text{gch} V_x^- (\lambda) \) is an element of \( (\mathbb{Z}[P])[[q^{-1}]] q^{-(\lambda, \xi)} \) (see [KNS, (2.22)]). It follows from Theorem 3.7 that

\[
\text{gch} V_x^- (\lambda) = \sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\Delta^\pm (\lambda)} e^{\text{wt}(\pi)} = \sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\Delta^\pm (\lambda)} q^{\text{nul}(\text{wt}(\pi))} e^{\text{fin}(\text{wt}(\pi))}.
\]

**Proposition 3.8 ([KNS, Proposition D.1]).** For each \( x \in W_{\text{af}} \) and \( \xi \in Q' \), the equality \( \text{gch} V_{x^\xi}^- (\lambda) = q^{-(\lambda, \xi)} \text{gch} V_x^- (\lambda) \) holds.
3.3 Statement of the main result in terms of semi-infinite LS paths. Let \( \lambda, \mu \in P^+ \) be such that \( \lambda - \mu \in P^+ \), and define \( J_\lambda, J_\mu, J_{\lambda - \mu} \subset I \) as in \((3.1)\). Write \( \lambda \) and \( \mu \) as: \( \lambda = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \omega_i \) and \( \mu = \sum_{i \in I} \mu_i \omega_i \), respectively, where \( \lambda_i, \mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), with \( \lambda_i - \mu_i \geq 0 \) for all \( i \in I \). The following theorem is one of the main results of this paper.

**Theorem 3.9.** For \( x \in W_{af} \), it holds that

\[
\prod_{i \in I} \prod_{k=\lambda_i-\mu_i+1}^{\lambda_i} \frac{1}{1-q^{-k}} \text{gch} V_x^{-}(\lambda - \mu) = \sum_{y \in W_{af}} \sum_{\pi \in B_k^\mu(x) \supseteq \beta} (-1)^{\ell(y) - \ell(x)} q^{-\text{null}(\pi)} e^{-\text{fin}(\pi)} \text{gch} V_y^{-}(\lambda). \tag{3.21}
\]

The outline of our proof of this theorem is as follows. First, we prove \((3.21)\) in the case that \( \mu \) is a fundamental weight and \( x \) is a translation element in \( W_{af} \) (see \((5.2)\)); we show a key formula in this case in Proposition \((5.3)\) on the basis of standard monomial theory for semi-infinite LS paths, established in \([KNS]\) (see \((\Pi)\)). Next, by making use of Demazure operators (see \((5.1)\)), we show \((3.21)\) in the case that \( \mu \) is a fundamental weight, and \( x \) is an arbitrary element of \( W \) (see \((7.2)\)). Finally, using Proposition \((4.4)\) we prove \((3.21)\) in the general case (see \((8.1)\)).

3.4 Quantum Lakshmibai-Seshadri paths. In this subsection, we fix \( \mu \in P^+ \), and take \( J = J_\mu \) as \((3.1)\).

**Definition 3.10.** For a rational number \( 0 < a < 1 \), we define \( \text{QBG}_{af}(W^J) \) to be the subgraph of \( \text{QBG}(W^J) \) with the same vertex set but having only those directed edges of the form \( w \xrightarrow{\beta} v \) for which \( a \langle \mu, \beta \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \) holds.

**Definition 3.11.** A quantum LS path of shape \( \mu \) is a pair

\[
\eta = (w; a) = (w_1, \ldots, w_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s), \quad s \geq 1,
\]

of a sequence \( w_1, \ldots, w_s \) of elements in \( W^J \) with \( w_u \neq w_{u+1} \) for any \( 1 \leq u \leq s - 1 \) and an increasing sequence \( 0 = a_0 < a_1 < \cdots < a_s = 1 \) of rational numbers satisfying the condition that there exists a directed path in \( \text{QBG}_{af}(W^J) \) from \( w_{u+1} \) to \( w_u \) for each \( u = 1, 2, \ldots, s - 1 \).

Denote by \( \text{QLS}(\mu) \) the set of all quantum LS paths of shape \( \mu \). In the same manner as for \( \mathbb{B}_k^\mu(\mu) \), we can endow the set \( \text{QLS}(\mu) \) with a crystal structure with weights in \( P \cong P_{af}^0/\mathbb{Z} \mathbf{d} \subset P_{af}/\mathbb{Z} \mathbf{d} \); for the details, see \([LNS3, \text{Sec. 4.2}]\) and \([NNS3, \text{Sec. 2.5}]\).

Define a projection \( cl : (W^J)_{af} \rightarrow W^J \) by \( cl(x) := w \) for \( x \in (W^J)_{af} \) of the form \( x = wJ(t) \) with \( w \in W^J \) and \( \xi \in Q^\vee \). For \( \pi = (x_1, \ldots, x_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s) \in \mathbb{B}_k^\mu(\mu) \), we define

\[
cl(\pi) := (cl(x_1), \ldots, cl(x_s); a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s); \tag{3.23}
\]
here, for each \(1 \leq p < q \leq s\) such that \(\text{cl}(x_p) = \cdots = \text{cl}(x_q)\), we drop \(\text{cl}(x_p), \ldots, \text{cl}(x_{q-1})\) and \(a_p, \ldots, a_{q-1}\); we set \(\text{cl}(0) := 0\) by convention. We know from \([\text{NS3}, \text{Sect. 6.2}]\) that \(\text{cl}(\pi) \in \text{QLS}(\mu)\) for all \(\pi \in \mathbb{B}^\infty(\mu)\). Also, we know the following lemma from \([\text{NS3}, \text{Lemma 6.2.3}]\); recall that \(\mathbb{B}^\infty(\mu)\) denotes the connected component of \(\mathbb{S}^\infty(\mu)\) containing \(\pi_\mu = (\varepsilon; 0, 1)\).

**Lemma 3.12.** For each \(\eta \in \text{QLS}(\mu)\), there exists a unique \(\pi_\eta \in \mathbb{B}^\infty(\mu)\) such that \(\text{cl}(\pi_\eta) = \eta\) and \(\kappa(\pi_\eta) = \kappa(\eta) \in W^J\).

**Remark 3.13.** For \(\eta = (w_1, \ldots, w_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s) \in \text{QLS}(\mu)\), define \(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{s-1}, \xi_s \in Q^\vee\) by the following recursive formula (from \(u = s\) to \(u = 1\)):

\[
\xi_s = 0, \quad \xi_u = \xi_{u+1} + \text{wt}(w_{u+1} \Rightarrow w_u) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq u \leq s - 1;
\]

for the definition of \(\text{wt}(w_{u+1} \Rightarrow w_u)\), see \([2.4]\). Then we know from \([\text{NNS3, Proposition 2.32}]\) that

\[
\pi_\eta = (w_1 \Pi^J(t_{\xi_1}), \ldots, w_{s-1} \Pi^J(t_{\xi_{s-1}}), w_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s);
\]

the weight \(\text{wt}(\pi_\eta) \in P^0_{af} = P \oplus \mathbb{Z}\delta\) of \(\pi_\eta\) is written as:

\[
\text{wt}(\pi_\eta) = \text{wt}(\eta) + \deg(\eta)\delta,
\]

where \(\deg: \text{QLS}(\mu) \to \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}\) is the (tail) degree function (see \([\text{LNS}^2, \text{Corollary 4.8}]\)):

\[
\deg(\eta) = -\sum_{u=1}^{s-1} a_u \langle \mu, \text{wt}(w_{u+1} \Rightarrow w_u) \rangle.
\]

For \(\eta = (w_1, \ldots, w_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s) \in \text{QLS}(\mu)\) and \(v \in W\), define \(\kappa(\eta, v) \in W\) by the following recursive formula (cf. \((3.15)\) and Proposition \(2.26)\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{w}_0 & := v, \\
\hat{w}_u & := \max\{w_u W_J, \leq^*_v \hat{w}_{u-1}\} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq u \leq s, \\
\kappa(\eta, v) & := \hat{w}_s;
\end{align*}
\]

we call \(\kappa(\eta, v) \in W_{af}\) the final direction of \(\eta\) with respect to \(v\). We set

\[
\zeta(\eta, v) := \text{wt}(\hat{w}_1 \Rightarrow v) + \sum_{u=1}^{s-1} \text{wt}(\hat{w}_{u+1} \Rightarrow \hat{w}_u).
\]

**Remark 3.14.** Keep the notation and setting of Remark \(3.13\). We see from Lemma \(2.17\) that \([\zeta(\eta, v) - \text{wt}(\hat{w}_1 \Rightarrow v)]^J = [\xi_1]^J\). Hence, by Lemma \(2.1(2)\), we have \(i(\pi_\eta) = w_1 \Pi^J(t_{\zeta(\eta, v)-\text{wt}(\hat{w}_1 \Rightarrow v)})\).
3.5 Reformulation of the main result in terms of QLS paths. Let \( \lambda, \mu \in P^+ \) be such that \( \lambda - \mu \in P^+ \), and define \( J_\lambda, J_\mu, J_{\lambda-\mu} \subset I \) as in \([3.1]\). The following is a corollary of Theorem \([3.9]\).

**Corollary 3.15.** For \( x \in W \), it holds that

\[
gch V_x^{-}(\lambda - \mu) = \sum_{v \in W} \sum_{\eta \in \text{QLS}(\mu)} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(x) - \deg(\eta)} e^{-\wt(\eta)} \chi_{\kappa(\eta,v)x} \chi_{\kappa(\eta,v)\lambda} \chi_{\kappa(\eta,v)\mu} \gch V_{x(\eta,v)}^{-}(\lambda).
\]

(3.29)

We will give a proof of this corollary in \([8.2]\).

4 Standard monomial theory for semi-infinite LS paths.

4.1 Connected components of \( B_\infty^x(\lambda) \). Let \( \lambda \in P^+ \), and write it as \( \lambda = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \omega_i \), with \( \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \); note that \( J = J_\lambda = \{ i \in I \mid \lambda_i = 0 \} \) (see \([3.1]\)). We define \( \text{Par}(\lambda) \) to be the set of \( I \)-tuples of partitions \( \chi = (\chi^{(i)})_{i \in I} \) such that \( \chi^{(i)} \) is a partition of length (strictly) less than \( \lambda_i \) for each \( i \in I \); a partition of length less than \( \emptyset \) is understood to be the empty partition \( \emptyset \). Also, for \( \chi = (\chi^{(i)})_{i \in I} \in \text{Par}(\lambda) \), we set \( |\chi| := \sum_{i \in I} |\chi^{(i)}| \), where \( \chi^{(i)} \). For a partition \( \chi = (\chi_1 \geq \chi_2 \geq \cdots \geq \chi_{\ell} \geq 0) \), we set \( |\chi| := \chi_1 + \cdots + \chi_{\ell} \).

Here we recall from \([\text{INS}]\) Sect. 7 the parametrization of the set \( \text{Conn}(B_\infty^x(\lambda)) \) of connected components of \( B_\infty^x(\lambda) \) in terms of \( \text{Par}(\lambda) \). We set \( \text{Turn}(\lambda) := \{ k/\lambda_i \mid i \in I \setminus J \) and \( 0 \leq k \leq \lambda_i \} \). By \([\text{INS}]\) Proposition 7.1.2, each connected component of \( B_\infty^x(\lambda) \) contains a unique element of the form:

\[
(\Pi^J(t_{\xi_1}), \ldots, \Pi^J(t_{\xi_{s-1}}), e; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{s-1}, a_s) \tag{4.1}
\]

where \( s \geq 1, \xi_1, \ldots, \xi_{s-1} \) are elements of \( Q_{I\setminus J}^\vee \) such that \( \xi_1 > \cdots > \xi_{s-1} > 0 =: \xi_s \) (for the notation, see \([2.1]\) and \([2.2]\), and \( a_u \in \text{Turn}(\lambda) \) for all \( 0 \leq u \leq s \). For each element of the form \([1.1]\) (or equivalently, each connected component of \( B_\infty^x(\lambda) \)), we define an element \( \chi = (\chi^{(i)})_{i \in I} \in \text{Par}(\lambda) \) as follows. First, let \( i \in I \setminus J \); note that \( \lambda_i \geq 1 \). For each \( 1 \leq k \leq \lambda_i \), take \( 0 \leq u \leq s \) in such a way that \( a_u \) is contained in the interval \((1/(k-1)/\lambda_i, k/\lambda_i)\). Then we define the \( k \)-th entry \( \chi^{(i)}_{k} \) of the partition \( \chi^{(i)} \) to be \( \{ \omega_i, u \} \), the coefficient of \( \alpha_i^\vee \) in \( \xi_u \); we know from (the proof of) \([\text{INS}]\) Proposition 7.2.1] that \( \chi^{(i)}_{k} \) does not depend on the choice of \( u \) above. Since \( \xi_1 > \cdots > \xi_{s-1} > 0 =: \xi_s \), we see that \( \chi^{(i)}_{1} \geq \cdots \geq \chi^{(i)}_{\lambda_i-1} \geq \chi^{(i)}_{\lambda_i} = 0 \). Hence, for each \( i \in I \setminus J \), we obtain a partition \( \chi^{(i)} \) of length less than \( \lambda_i \). For \( i \in J \), we set \( \chi^{(i)} := \emptyset \). Thus we obtain an element \( \chi = (\chi^{(i)})_{i \in I} \in \text{Par}(\lambda) \), and hence a map from \( \text{Conn}(B_\infty^x(\lambda)) \) to \( \text{Par}(\lambda) \). Moreover, we know from \([\text{INS}]\) Proposition 7.2.1] that this map is bijective; we denote by \( \pi_\chi \in \mathbb{B}^x_\infty(\lambda) \) the element of the form \([1.1]\) corresponding to \( \chi \in \text{Par}(\lambda) \) under this bijection. For \( \chi \in \text{Par}(\lambda) \), we denote by \( \mathbb{B}_\chi^x(\lambda) \) the connected component of \( \mathbb{B}^x_\infty(\lambda) \) containing \( \pi_\chi \).

**Remark 4.1.** Let \( \chi = (\chi^{(i)})_{i \in I} \in \text{Par}(\lambda) \), with \( \chi^{(i)} = (\chi^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots) \) for \( i \in I \); note that \( \chi^{(i)}_1 = 0 \) if \( \chi^{(i)} = \emptyset \). We set

\[
i(\chi) := \sum_{i \in I} \chi^{(i)}_1 \alpha_i^\vee \in Q^\vee
\]

(4.2)
we see from the definition that \( \varepsilon(\pi_x) = \Pi^f(t_i(\pi_x)) \).

### 4.2 Affine Weyl group action.

Let \( \mathcal{B} \) be a regular crystal in the sense of [Kas3 Sect. 2.2] (or, a normal crystal in the sense of [HK p. 389]); for example, \( \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda) \) for \( \lambda \in P^+ \) is a regular crystal by Theorem 3.7, and hence so is \( \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^\vee(\mu) \) for \( \lambda, \mu \in P^+ \). We know from [Kas1 Sect. 7] that the affine Weyl group \( W_{af} \) acts on \( \mathcal{B} \) as follows: for \( b \in \mathcal{B} \) and \( i \in I_{af} \),

\[
s_i \cdot b := \begin{cases} f_i^n b & \text{if } n := \langle \text{wt}(b), \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0, \\ e_i^{-n} b & \text{if } n := \langle \text{wt}(b), \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0. \end{cases}
\] (4.3)

The following lemma is shown by induction on the (ordinary) length \( \ell(x) \) of \( x \) and the tensor product rule for crystals (see also [KNS Lemma 7.2]).

**Lemma 4.2.**

1. Let \( \lambda \in P^+ \), and take \( J = J_\lambda \) as (3.1). If \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda) \) is of the form (4.1), then for \( x \in W_{af} \),

\[
x \cdot \pi = (\Pi^J(x t_{\xi_1}), \ldots, \Pi^J(x t_{\xi_{n-1}}), \Pi^J(x) ; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_{n-1}, a_n).
\] (4.4)

2. Let \( \lambda, \mu \in P^+ \). Let \( \sigma \in \text{Par}(\lambda), \chi \in \text{Par}(\mu) \), and \( \xi, \zeta \in Q^\vee \). Then, for \( x \in W_{af} \),

\[
x \cdot ((t_\xi \cdot \pi_\sigma) \otimes (t_\zeta \cdot \pi_\chi)) = (xt_\xi \cdot \pi_\sigma) \otimes (xt_\zeta \cdot \pi_\chi).
\] (4.5)

### 4.3 Standard monomial theory.

Let \( \lambda = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \omega_i, \mu = \sum_{i \in I} \mu_i \omega_i \in P^+ \), and define \( J_\lambda, J_\mu, J_{\lambda+\mu} \subset I \) as in (3.1). Following [KNS Proposition 3.4], we define \( S^\vee(\lambda+\mu) \) to be the subset of \( \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^\vee(\mu) \) consisting of those elements \( \pi \otimes \eta \) satisfying the following condition: there exists \( y \in W_{af} \) such that \( \kappa(\eta) \geq \Pi^J(\lambda)(y) \) and \( \kappa(\pi) \geq \Pi^J(\lambda)(\eta, y) \); for the definition of \( \varepsilon(\eta, y) \in W_{af} \), see (3.10). We know from [KNS Theorem 3.1] that \( S^\vee(\lambda+\mu) \) is a subcrystal of \( \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^\vee(\mu) \), and it is isomorphic, as a crystal, to \( \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda+\mu) \). Now, we briefly recall from the proof of [KNS Theorem 3.1] the description of the isomorphism from \( \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda+\mu) \) to \( S^\vee(\lambda+\mu) \subset \mathbb{B}^\vee(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^\vee(\mu) \) (which we denote by \( \Phi_{\lambda,\mu} \)). Let \( \text{Par}(\lambda, \mu) \) be the subset of those elements \( (\sigma, \chi, \xi) \in \text{Par}(\lambda) \times \text{Par}(\mu) \times Q^\vee \) satisfying the condition that \( c_i \geq \chi^{(i)}_1 \) for all \( I \setminus (J_\lambda \cup J_\mu) \), where \( \chi = (\chi^{(i)})_{i \in I} \) with \( \chi^{(i)} = (\lambda^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \chi^{(i)}_{\mu_i-1} \geq 0) \) for \( i \in I \), and \( \xi = \sum_{i \in I \setminus (J_\lambda \cup J_\mu)} c_i \alpha_i^\vee \). By [KNS Proposition 7.8], there exists a bijection from \( \text{Par}(\lambda, \mu) \) to the set of connected components of \( S^\vee(\lambda+\mu) \), which sends \( (\sigma, \chi, \xi) \in \text{Par}(\lambda, \mu) \) to the connected component of \( S^\vee(\lambda+\mu) \) containing the element \( (t_\xi \cdot \pi_\sigma) \otimes \pi_\chi \). Here, we define a map \( \Theta : \text{Par}(\lambda, \mu) \to \text{Par}(\lambda+\mu) \) as follows. Let \( (\sigma, \chi, \xi) \in \text{Par}(\lambda, \mu) \), and write \( \sigma \in \text{Par}(\lambda), \chi \in \text{Par}(\mu), \xi \in Q^\vee \) as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma &= (\sigma^{(i)})_{i \in I}, & \text{with } \sigma^{(i)} &= (\sigma^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \sigma^{(i)}_{\lambda_i-1} \geq 0) \quad \text{for } i \in I, \\
\chi &= (\chi^{(i)})_{i \in I}, & \text{with } \chi^{(i)} &= (\chi^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \chi^{(i)}_{\mu_i-1} \geq 0) \quad \text{for } i \in I, \\
\xi &= \sum_{i \in I \setminus (J_\lambda \cup J_\mu)} c_i \alpha_i^\vee; & \text{recall that } c_i \geq \chi^{(i)}_1 \text{ for all } i \in I \setminus (J_\lambda \cup J_\mu).
\end{align*}
\] (4.6)
For each \( i \in I \), we set

\[
\omega^{(i)} := \left( \sigma^{(i)}_1 + c_i \geq \cdots \geq \sigma^{(i)}_{\lambda_i - 1} + c_i \geq c_i \geq \chi^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \chi^{(i)}_{\mu_i - 1} \right),
\]

(4.7)

which is a partition of length less than \( \lambda_i + \mu_i \). Define \( \Theta(\sigma, \chi, \xi) := (\omega^{(i)})_{i \in I} \in \text{Par}(\lambda + \mu) \); we can deduce that this map \( \Theta \) is bijective. We know from [KNS, Sect. 7] that there exists an isomorphism

\[
\Phi_{\lambda\mu} : \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda + \mu) \rightarrow S^{\bar{T}}(\lambda + \mu) \quad (\leftrightarrow \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu))
\]

(4.8)
of crystals, which sends \( \pi_\omega \) to \( (t_\xi \cdot \pi_\sigma) \otimes \pi_\chi \) if \( \Theta^{-1}(\omega) = (\sigma, \chi, \xi) \) for \( \omega \in \text{Par}(\lambda + \mu) \).

4.4 Standard monomial theory for Demazure crystals. Let \( \lambda = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \omega_i, \mu = \sum_{i \in I} \mu_i \omega_i \in P^+, \) and define \( J_\lambda, J_\mu, J_{\lambda + \mu} \subset I \) as in (3.1). For \( \pi \otimes \eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu) \), we set

\[
(\pi \otimes \eta)^* := \eta^* \otimes \pi^* \in \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu)^* \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda)^*;
\]

(4.9)

for the definition of the dual paths \( \eta^* \) and \( \pi^* \), see (3.10). Then we have

\[
\begin{cases}
\text{wt}((\pi \otimes \eta)^*) = -\text{wt}(\pi \otimes \eta), \\
(e_i(\pi \otimes \eta))^* = f_i((\pi \otimes \eta)^*), \quad (f_i(\pi \otimes \eta))^* = e_i((\pi \otimes \eta)^*)
\end{cases}
\]

(4.10)

for \( \pi \otimes \eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu) \) and \( i \in I_{af} \); cf. (3.11). Also, for \( y \in W_{af} \), we set

\[
S^{\bar{T}}_{\geq y}(\lambda + \mu) := \Phi_{\lambda\mu}(\mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}_{\geq y}(\lambda + \mu)), \quad S^{\bar{T}}_{\leq y}(\lambda + \mu) := \Phi_{\lambda\mu}(\mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}_{\leq y}(\lambda + \mu)).
\]

(4.11)

**Theorem 4.3.** Keep the notation and setting above. Let \( y \in W_{af} \).

(1) An element \( \pi \otimes \eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu) \) is contained in \( S^{\bar{T}}_{\geq y}(\lambda + \mu) \) if and only if \( \kappa(\eta) \geq \Pi^y(y) \) and \( \kappa(\pi) \geq \Pi^{\lambda}(\iota(\eta, y)) \).

(2) An element \( \pi \otimes \eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu) \) is contained in \( S^{\bar{T}}_{\leq y}(\lambda + \mu) \) if and only if \( \iota(\pi) \leq \Pi^{\lambda}(y) \) and \( \iota(\eta) \leq \Pi^{\mu}(\kappa(\pi, y)) \).

**Proof.** Part (1) follows from [KNS, Theorem 3.5]. Let us prove part (2). By using [KNS, Lemma 7.2 and Remark 7.3] and (3.11), (4.10), we deduce that the following diagram is commutative:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda + \mu) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\lambda\mu}} & \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu^* + \lambda^*) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{\mu^*\lambda^*}} & \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\mu^*) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\bar{T}}(\lambda^*)
\end{array}
\]
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where \( \lambda^* = -w_0\lambda \) and \( \mu^* = -w_\circ\mu \). Also, it follows from Lemma 2.10 that \( (B_{\geq y}^\infty(\lambda + \mu))^* = B_{\geq yw_0}^\infty(\mu^* + \lambda^*) \). Therefore, we obtain

\[
S_{\leq x}^\infty(\lambda + \mu) = \left( S_{\geq xw_0}^\infty(\mu^* + \lambda^*) \right)^*.
\]

Hence part (2) follows from part (1) and Lemma 3.5. This proves the theorem.

**Proposition 4.4.** Let \( \psi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\lambda + \mu) \), and write \( \Phi_{\lambda\mu}(\psi) \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\lambda) \otimes B_{\geq y}^\infty(\mu) \) as \( \Phi_{\lambda\mu}(\psi) = \pi \otimes \eta \), with \( \pi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\lambda) \) and \( \eta \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\mu) \). Let \( y \in W_{af} \).

1. If \( \psi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\lambda + \mu) \), then \( \iota(\psi, y) = \iota(\pi, \iota(\eta, y)) \).

2. If \( \psi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\lambda + \mu) \), then \( \kappa(\psi, y) = \kappa(\eta, \kappa(\pi, y)) \).

The proposition above does not seem to be an immediate consequence of any results obtained, e.g., in [NNS3]. So, in order to prove this proposition, we need some technical lemmas.

**Lemma 4.5.** Let \( \nu \in P^+ \) and \( y \in W_{af} \). Let \( \psi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\nu) \) and \( i \in I \) be such that \( \psi' := f_i\psi \neq 0 \); note that \( \psi' \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\nu) \) by Remark 3.4. If \( \varepsilon_i(\psi) \geq 1 \), then \( \iota(\psi', y) = \iota(\psi, y) \). If \( \varepsilon_i(\psi) = 0 \), then \( \iota(\psi, y) - i^*\alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z\delta \). Moreover, \( \iota(\psi', y) \) is identical to \( \iota(\psi, y) \) or \( s_i\iota(\psi, y) \).

**Proof.** We set \( J = J_i \subset I \) as in (3.1). Write \( \psi \in B_{\geq y}^\infty(\nu) \) as \( \psi = (x_1, \ldots, x_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s) \), and define \( y = \tilde{x}_{s+1}, \tilde{x}_s, \ldots, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_1 = \iota(\psi, y) \) by the same formula as (3.16). Assume that \( \psi' = f_i\psi \) is of the form:

\[
\psi' = f_i\psi = (x_1, \ldots, x_p, s_ix_{p+1}, \ldots, s_i x_q, x_q, x_{q+1}, \ldots, x_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_p = t_0, \ldots, a_{q-1}, t_1, a_q, a_{q+1}, \ldots, a_s)
\]

for some \( 0 \leq p < q \leq s \) (see (3.8) and (3.9)); remark that \( \langle x_u\nu, \alpha_i \rangle > 0 \) for all \( p + 1 \leq u \leq q \) (see the comment after (3.8)), which implies that

\[
x_u^{-1}\alpha_i \in (\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta^+_f) + Z\delta,
\]

and hence \( \tilde{x}_u^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z\delta \)

(4.13)

for all \( p + 1 \leq u \leq q \). We set \( (y_1, \ldots, y_q) := (x_1, \ldots, x_p, s_ix_{p+1}, \ldots, s_ix_q) \), and define \( \tilde{y}_q, \ldots, \tilde{y}_1 \) by

\[
\begin{cases}
\tilde{y}_q := \min \text{Lift}_{\geq \tilde{x}_q}(y_q), \\
\tilde{y}_u := \min \text{Lift}_{\geq \tilde{y}_{u+1}}(y_u) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq u \leq q - 1;
\end{cases}
\]

we have \( \iota(\psi', y) = \tilde{y}_1 \). Since \( \langle x_q\nu, \alpha_i \rangle > 0 \), that is, \( x_q^{-1}\alpha_i \in (\Delta^+ \setminus \Delta^+_f) + Z\delta \), and since \( \tilde{x}_q^{-1}\alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z\delta \) by (4.13), we see by Lemma 2.14(1) and (2) that \( \tilde{y}_q = \min \text{Lift}_{\geq \tilde{x}_q}(y_q) = \min \text{Lift}_{\geq \tilde{y}_{q}}(s_ix_q) = s_i(\min \text{Lift}_{\geq \tilde{y}_{q}}(x_q)) = s_i\tilde{x}_q \). Also, we deduce by Lemma 2.14(1), together with (4.13), that \( \tilde{y}_u = s_i\tilde{x}_u \) for \( p + 1 \leq u \leq q - 1 \).
Assume first that $\varepsilon_i(\psi) \geq 1$; in order to prove that $\iota(\psi', y) = \widetilde{y}_1 = \tilde{x}_1 = \iota(\psi, y)$, it suffices to show that
\begin{equation}
\widetilde{y}_u = \tilde{x}_u \quad \text{for some } 1 \leq u \leq p.
\end{equation}
(4.14)
Since $\varepsilon_i(\psi) \geq 1$, we see by the definition of the root operator $e_i$ (see (3.6)) that there exists $1 \leq u \leq p$ such that $\langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle < 0$. We set $k := \max\{1 \leq u \leq p \mid \langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle < 0\}$; note that
\begin{equation}
x_k^{-1} \alpha_i \in (\Delta^- \setminus \Delta^-) + \mathbb{Z} \delta.
\end{equation}
(4.15)
By the definition of the root operator $f_i$ (see (3.3)), we see that $\langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0$ for all $k + 1 \leq u \leq p$. Suppose, for a contradiction, that $\tilde{x}_u^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ for some $k + 1 \leq u \leq p$. Set $m := \max\{k + 1 \leq u \leq p \mid \tilde{x}_u^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta\}$; remark that $\tilde{x}_{m+1}^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ (for the case $m = p$, see (4.13)). Also, we have $x_{m+1}^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ since $\langle x_m \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0$, and $\tilde{x}_m^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ by the definition of $m$. However, this is a contradiction by Lemma 2.14(3) (applied to $\tilde{x}_m = \min \text{Lift}_{\tilde{x}_{m+1}}(x_m)$). Therefore, we conclude that
\begin{equation}
\tilde{x}_u^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta \quad \text{for all } k + 1 \leq u \leq p.
\end{equation}
(4.16)
Here, it follows from Lemma 2.14(3) that $\tilde{y}_p = \min \text{Lift}_{\tilde{x}_p}(y_p) = \min \text{Lift}_{\tilde{s}_i \tilde{x}_p}(x_p)$ is identical to $\tilde{x}_p$ or $s_i \tilde{x}_p$. If $\tilde{y}_p = \tilde{x}_p$, then (4.14) holds for $u = p$. Hence we may assume that $\tilde{y}_p = s_i \tilde{x}_p$. In this case, it follows again from Lemma 2.14(3) that $\tilde{y}_{p-1} = \min \text{Lift}_{\tilde{s}_i \tilde{x}_p}(x_{p-1})$ is identical to $\tilde{x}_{p-1}$ or $s_i \tilde{x}_{p-1}$. If $\tilde{y}_{p-1} = \tilde{x}_{p-1}$, then (4.14) holds for $u = p - 1$. Hence we may assume that $\tilde{y}_{p-1} = s_i \tilde{x}_{p-1}$. By repeating this argument, we may assume that
\begin{equation}
\tilde{y}_u = s_i \tilde{x}_u \quad \text{for all } k + 1 \leq u \leq p.
\end{equation}
(4.17)
Then, by Lemma 2.14(2) and (4.15), (4.16), $\tilde{y}_k = \min \text{Lift}_{\tilde{s}_i \tilde{x}_k}(y_k) = \min \text{Lift}_{\tilde{s}_i \tilde{x}_k}(x_k)$ is identical to $\tilde{x}_k$. Thus we obtain $\iota(\psi', x) = \tilde{y}_1 = \tilde{x}_1 = \iota(\psi, x)$.

Assume next that $\varepsilon_i(\psi) = 0$. Suppose, for a contradiction, that $\iota(\psi, y)^{-1} \alpha_i = \tilde{x}_1^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$. We set $l := \min\{2 \leq u \leq p + 1 \mid \tilde{x}_u^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta\}$ (recall (4.13)); note that $\tilde{x}_u^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ for all $1 \leq u \leq l - 1$, which implies that $\langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = (\tilde{x}_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee) \leq 0$ for all $1 \leq u \leq l - 1$. Since $\varepsilon_i(\psi) = 0$, we deduce by the definition of the root operator $e_i$ that $\langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0$ for all $1 \leq u \leq l - 1$, and hence $x_u^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ for all $1 \leq u \leq l - 1$. In particular, we obtain $x_l^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ and $\tilde{x}_l^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$. However, since $\tilde{x}_l^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$, this is a contradiction by Lemma 2.14(3) (applied to $\tilde{x}_{l-1} = \min \text{Lift}_{\tilde{x}_l}(x_{l-1})$). Thus we obtain $\iota(\psi, y)^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$.

Now, recall that $\psi' = f_i \psi$ is of form (4.12). Since $\varepsilon_i(\psi) = 0$ by our assumption, we see by the definition of the root operators $e_i$ and $f_i$ that
\begin{equation}
H_i^\psi(t) \geq 0 \quad \text{for } t \in [a_0, a_p] = [0, t_0], \quad \text{with } H_i^\psi(0) = H_i^\psi(t_0) = 0.
\end{equation}
(4.18)
If there exists $1 \leq u \leq p$ such that $\langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle < 0$, then we deduce by the same argument as for (4.14) that $\iota(\psi', x) = \tilde{y}_1 = \tilde{x}_1 = \iota(\psi, x)$. Hence we may assume that $\langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 0$ for all $1 \leq u \leq p$. In this case, we have $\langle x_u \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0$ for all $1 \leq u \leq p$ by (4.18). By the same argument as for (4.16), we deduce that $\tilde{x}_u^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ for all $1 \leq u \leq p$. Furthermore, by the same argument as for (4.17), we see that $\iota(\psi', x)$ is identical to $\iota(\psi, x)$ or $s_i \iota(\psi, x)$. This proves the lemma. \qed
Lemma 4.6. Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$, and $y \in W_{af}$. Let $\pi \otimes \eta \in S^\infty_{\leq \ell}(\lambda + \mu)$ and $i \in I$ be such that $\pi' \otimes \eta' := f_i(\pi \otimes \eta) \neq 0$, where $\pi' \in B^\infty_\xi(\lambda)$ and $\eta' \in B^\infty_\zeta(\mu)$; notice that $\pi' \otimes \eta' \in S^\infty_{\leq \ell}(\lambda + \mu)$ by Remark 3.3. If $\varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) \geq 1$, then $\nu(\pi', \nu(\eta', y)) = \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$. If $\varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) = 0$, then $\nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z\delta$. Moreover, $\nu(\pi', \nu(\eta', y))$ is identical to $\nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$ or $s_i \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$.

Proof. If $\varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) = 0$, then we see by the tensor product rule for crystals that $\varepsilon_i(\pi) = 0$. Because $\pi \in B^\infty_{\leq \ell}(\lambda)$ by Theorem 4.3(1), we see by Lemma 4.5 that $\nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z\delta$ in this case.

Now, assume that $f_i(\pi \otimes \eta) = f_i \pi \otimes \eta$, that is, $\pi' = f_i \pi$ and $\eta' = \eta$; note that $\phi_i(\pi) > \varepsilon_i(\eta)$ by the tensor product rule for crystals, and that $\nu(\eta', y) = \nu(\eta, y)$. If $\varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) \geq 1$, then we see by the tensor product rule for crystals and the inequality $\phi_i(\pi) > \varepsilon_i(\eta)$ that $\varepsilon_i(\pi) = \varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) \geq 1$. Hence it follows from Lemma 4.5 applied to $\pi \in B^\infty_{\leq \ell}(\eta, y)(\lambda)$, that $\nu(\pi', \nu(\eta', y)) = \nu(\pi', \nu(\eta, y)) = \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$. If $\varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) = 0$, then we have $\varepsilon_i(\pi) = 0$, as seen above. Therefore we see by Lemma 4.5 applied to $\pi \in B^\infty_{\leq \ell}(\eta, y)(\nu)$, that $\nu(\pi', \nu(\eta', y)) = \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$ is identical to $\nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$ or $s_i \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$.

Assume that $f_i(\pi \otimes \eta) = \pi \otimes f_i \eta$, that is, $\pi' = \pi$ and $\eta' = f_i \eta$. We see by Lemma 4.5 that $\nu(\eta', y)$ is identical to $\nu(\eta, y)$ or $s_i \nu(\eta, y)$. If $\nu(\eta', y) = \nu(\eta, y)$, then it is obvious that $\nu(\pi', \nu(\eta', y)) = \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$. Assume that $\nu(\eta', y) = s_i \nu(\eta, y)$; we see by Lemma 4.5 that $\nu(\eta', y) = s_i \nu(\eta, y)$ only if $\varepsilon_i(\eta) = 0$; note that $\nu(\eta, y)^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z\delta$. Write $\pi \in B^\infty_{\leq \ell}(\eta, y)(\nu)$ as $\pi = (x_1, \ldots, x_s; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s)$, and define

$$\nu(\eta, y) = \tilde{x}_{s+1}, \tilde{x}_s, \ldots, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_1 = \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y)),$$

$$\nu(\eta', y) = s_i \nu(\eta, y) = \tilde{y}_{s+1}, \tilde{y}_s, \ldots, \tilde{y}_2, \tilde{y}_1 = \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta', y)),$$

by the same formula as (3.16). If $\varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) \geq 1$, then we see by the tensor product rule for crystals and $\varepsilon_i(\eta) = 0$ that $\varepsilon_i(\pi) \geq 1$. Hence, by the same argument as for (4.14) (with $p$ replaced by $s$), we deduce that $\tilde{y}_u = \tilde{x}_u$ for some $1 \leq u \leq s$, which implies that $\nu(\pi', \nu(\eta', y)) = \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$. Also, if $\varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) = 0$, then we have $\varepsilon_i(\pi) = 0$, as seen above. By the same argument as in the last paragraph of the proof of Lemma 4.5, we deduce that $\nu(\pi', \nu(\eta', y))$ is identical to $\nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$ or $s_i \nu(\pi, \nu(\eta, y))$. Thus we have proved the lemma.

Lemma 4.7. Let $\lambda, \mu \in P^+$, and $v \in W$. If we set $v' := \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda}, \leq v)$, then

$$\min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda + \mu}, \leq v) = \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda}, \leq v').$$

(4.19)

Proof. We set $w := \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda + \mu}, \leq v)$ and $w' := \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda}, \leq v')$. We prove the assertion by descending induction on $\ell(v)$. If $v = w_0$, then we see by Remark 2.21 that $w = w_0 = v' = w'$. Assume now that $\ell(v) < \ell(w_0)$, and take $i \in I$ such that $\ell(s_i v) = \ell(v) + 1$, or equivalently, $v^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$. We set

$$w_1 := \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda + \mu}, \leq s_i v), \quad v'_1 := \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda}, \leq s_i v), \quad w'_1 := \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda}, \leq v'_1);$$

by our induction hypothesis, we have $w_1 = w'_1$.
Case 1. Assume that $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- \setminus \Delta^-_{\lambda+\mu}$, or equivalently, $i^* \notin J_{\lambda+\mu} = J_\lambda \cap J_\mu$. We deduce from [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 (2) that $w_1 = w$. If $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- \setminus \Delta^-_{\mu}$, or equivalently, if $i^* \notin J_\mu$, then we deduce from [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 (2) that $v'_1 = v'$, and hence $w'_1 = w'$. Hence, by our induction hypothesis, we obtain $w = w'$. Thus we may assume that $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{\mu}$, or equivalently, $i^* \in J_\mu$. In this case, it follows from [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 (3) that $(v')^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$, and $v'_1$ is identical to $v'$ or $s_i v'$. If $v'_1 = v'$, then we obtain $w = w'$ in exactly the same way as above. Assume now that $v'_1 = s_i v'$. Since $i^* \notin J_{\lambda+\mu} = J_\lambda \cap J_\mu$ and since $i^* \in J_\mu$, we see that $i^* \notin J_\lambda$, which implies that $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- \setminus \Delta^-_{J_\lambda}$. Hence it follows from [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 (2) that

$$w'_1 = \min(w_0 W_{J_\lambda}, \leq v'_1) = \min(w_0 W_{J_\lambda}, \leq s_i v') = \min(w_0 W_{J_\lambda}, \leq v') = w'.$$

Hence, by our induction hypothesis, we obtain $w = w'$.

Case 2. Assume that $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{J_{\lambda+\mu}}$, or equivalently, $i^* \in J_{\lambda+\mu} = J_\lambda \cap J_\mu$. In this case, it follows from [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 (3) that $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$, and $w_1$ is identical to $w$ or $s_i w$. Similarly, since $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{J_{\lambda+\mu}} \subset \Delta_{J_\mu}$ by the assumption, we have $(v')^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$, and $v'_1$ is identical to $v'$ or $s_i v'$. Since $(v')^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$, and since $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta_{J_{\lambda+\mu}} \subset \Delta_\lambda$ by the assumption, it follows from [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 (3) that $(v')^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$. In addition, if $v'_1 = s_i v'$, then it follows from [NNS3] Lemma 3.6 (3) that $w'_1$ is identical to $w'$ or $s_i w'$; if $v'_1 = v'$, then $w'_1 = w'$. In both cases, $w'_1$ is identical to $w'$ or $s_i w'$. Since $w_1 = w'$ by our induction hypothesis, we deduce that $w$ is identical to $w'$ or $s_i w'$. Since $w_0^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$ and $(w')^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+$ as seen above, we obtain $w = w'$, as desired. This proves the lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 4.4. We give a proof only for part (1), since we can show part (2) by taking the dual paths $\psi^*$ and $(\pi \otimes \eta)^* = \eta^* \otimes \pi^*$, and then by applying Lemma 4.3 and part (1) to them. First, we claim that there exists $i_1, \ldots, i_n \in I_{af}$ such that

$$f_{i_1} f_{i_2} \cdots f_{i_{n-1}} f_{i_n} \psi = (w_0 t_{\gamma}) \cdot \pi_\omega$$

for some $\gamma \in Q^\vee$ and $\omega \in \text{Par}(\lambda + \mu)$; for the definition of $\pi_\omega$, see [NS3]. Indeed, by [NS3] Lemma 5.4.1, there exist $j_1, \ldots, j_m \in I_{af}$ such that $f_{j_1} f_{j_2} \cdots f_{j_{m-1}} f_{j_m} \psi = t_{\gamma} \cdot \pi_\omega$ for some $\gamma \in Q^\vee$ and $\omega \in \text{Par}(\lambda + \mu)$. We deduce from definition (1.3) that the action of $w_0 \in W$ on the (extremal) element $t_{\gamma} \cdot \pi_\omega$ is only by the root operators $f_i$, $i \in I$. Hence we have verified the claim above (see also [NNS3] Lemma 3.11). Here it follows from Remark 3.4 that $f_{i_k} f_{i_{k+1}} \cdots f_{i_{n-1}} f_{i_n} \psi \in E_{\Sigma_y}^T(\lambda + \mu)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n + 1$. Now we proceed by induction on $n$. Assume that $n = 0$, that is, $\psi = (w_0 t_{\gamma}) \cdot \pi_\omega$. We write $\Theta^{-1}(\omega)$ as $\Theta^{-1}(\omega) = (\sigma, \chi, \xi) \in \text{Par}(\lambda, \mu)$; see (4.6) and (4.7). By Lemma 4.2 (2),

$$\pi \otimes \eta = \Phi_{\lambda+\mu}(\psi) = \Phi_{\lambda+\mu}(w_0 t_{\gamma}) \cdot \pi_\omega = ((w_0 t_{\xi+\gamma}) \cdot \pi_\sigma) \otimes ((w_0 t_{\gamma}) \cdot \pi_\chi).$$

Write $y$ as $y = vt_\zeta$, with $v \in W$ and $\zeta \in Q^\vee$. By Lemma 4.2 (1), Corollary 2.23 and Remark 2.24, we deduce that

$$t(\psi; y) = \min(w_0 W_{J_{\lambda+\mu}}, \leq v) \cdot f_{i[\omega(\chi)]}^{-1} f_{i[\omega(\chi)+\gamma]_{\lambda+\mu}}.$$
We first remark that

\[ \epsilon(\eta, y) = \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda} \leq \nu') \cdot t_{[\mu(\chi) + \gamma]}^{\nu} + \kappa_{J^\lambda} \]

and then

\[ \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)) = \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda} \leq \nu') \cdot t_{[\mu(\chi) + \gamma]}^{\nu} + \kappa_{J^\lambda} \]

It follows from Lemma 4.7 that \( \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda} \leq \nu') = \min(w_0 W_{J^\lambda} \leq \nu') \). Also, we see by definitions (4.6) and (4.7) that

\[ [\epsilon(\omega) + \gamma]_{J^\lambda + \mu} + [\xi]_{J^\lambda + \mu} = [\xi + \gamma + \epsilon(\sigma)]^{J^\lambda} + [[\epsilon(\chi) + \gamma]^{J^\mu} + [\xi]_{J^\lambda}]_{J^\lambda}. \]

From these, we obtain \( \epsilon(\psi, y) = \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)) \) in the case \( n = 0 \), as desired.

Assume now that \( n > 0 \); for simplicity of notation, we set \( \psi' := f_i \psi \) and \( i := i_n \). Also, write \( \Phi_{\lambda, \mu}(\psi') = f_i(\pi \otimes \eta) \in B^\pi(\lambda) \otimes B^\eta(\mu) \) as \( \Phi_{\lambda, \mu}(\psi') = \pi' \otimes \eta', \) with \( \pi' \in B^\pi(\lambda) \) and \( \eta' \in B^\eta(\mu). \) By our induction hypothesis, we have \( \epsilon(\psi', y) = \epsilon(\pi', \epsilon(\eta', y)). \)

If \( \varepsilon_i(\psi) = \varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) \geq 1 \), then it follows from Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6, together with our induction hypothesis, that \( \epsilon(\psi, y) = \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)) = \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)). \) Assume that \( \varepsilon_i(\psi) = \varepsilon_i(\pi \otimes \eta) = 0. \) Then we see again by Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 together with our induction hypothesis, that \( \epsilon(\psi, y) \) is equal to \( \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)) \) or \( s_i \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)), \) and that \( \epsilon(\psi, y) = \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)) \) or \( \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)) \) is a negative root, which is a contradiction. Therefore we obtain \( \epsilon(\psi, y) = \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)). \) This completes the proof of Proposition 4.4. \( \square \)

**Corollary 4.8** (cf. [NNS3, Lemma 3.12]). Let \( \psi \in B^\pi(\lambda + \mu), \) and write \( \Phi_{\lambda, \mu}(\psi) \in B^\pi(\lambda) \otimes B^\mu(\mu) \) as \( \Phi_{\lambda, \mu}(\psi) = \pi \otimes \eta, \) with \( \pi \in B^\pi(\lambda) \) and \( \eta \in B^\mu(\mu). \) Then,

\[ \epsilon(\pi) = \Pi^{J^\lambda}(\epsilon(\psi)) \text{ and } \kappa(\eta) = \Pi^{J^\mu}(\kappa(\psi)). \]  

**Proof.** We first remark that \( J^\lambda + \mu \subset J^\lambda \) and \( J^\lambda + \mu \subset J^\mu, \) which implies that \( \Pi^{J^\lambda} \circ \Pi^{J^\lambda + \mu} = \Pi^{J^\lambda} \) and \( \Pi^{J^\mu} \circ \Pi^{J^\lambda + \mu} = \Pi^{J^\mu}, \) respectively. We take \( y \in W_{af} \) in such a way that \( \psi \in B^\pi(\lambda + \mu). \) By the definition, we see that \( \Pi^{J^\lambda}(\epsilon(\psi, y)) = \epsilon(\psi) \) and \( \Pi^{J^\lambda}(\epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y))) = \epsilon(\pi). \) Since \( \epsilon(\psi, y) = \epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)), \) by Proposition 4.4(1), we see that

\[ \Pi^{J^\lambda}(\epsilon(\psi)) = \Pi^{J^\lambda}(\Pi^{J^\lambda}(\epsilon(\psi, y))) = \Pi^{J^\lambda}(\Pi^{J^\lambda}(\epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y)))) = \Pi^{J^\lambda}(\epsilon(\pi, \epsilon(\eta, y))) = \epsilon(\pi), \]

as desired. Similarly, we can prove that \( \kappa(\eta) = \Pi^{J^\mu}(\kappa(\psi)). \) This proves the corollary. \( \square \)

### 5 Proof of Theorem 3.9: part 1.

#### 5.1 Formula for graded characters.

Let us take an arbitrary \( r \in I \); note that \( J_{a r} = I \setminus \{ r \} \) (see 3.1). It is easily checked that the map \( (W^{J_{a r}})_{\text{af}} \rightarrow W_{\text{af}} W_{\text{af}}, x \mapsto x W_{\text{af}}, \) is bijective. The next lemma follows from [INS Proposition 4.2.1] and [NS1 Lemma 2.1.5].
Lemma 5.1. If \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (w_r) \) satisfies \( \kappa(\pi) = \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \) for some \( \xi \in Q^\vee \), then \( \pi = (\Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi); 0, 1) \).

Let us fix \( \lambda \in P^+ \). Recall from (4.8) the following isomorphism of crystals:

\[
\Phi_{\lambda w_r} : \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{S}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \quad (\leftrightarrow \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\omega_r)).
\]

Lemma 5.2. Let \( \xi \in Q^\vee \), and set

\[
\mathbb{B} := \{ \psi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \mid \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(\kappa(\psi)) = \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \}.
\]

Then,

\[
\Phi_{\lambda w_r}(\mathbb{B}) = \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda) \otimes \{ (\Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi); 0, 1) \}.
\]

Proof. First, we prove the inclusion \( \subset \) in (5.2). Let \( \psi \in \mathbb{B} \), and write \( \Phi_{\lambda w_r}(\psi) \) as \( \Phi_{\lambda w_r}(\psi) = \pi \otimes \eta \), with \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda) \) and \( \eta \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\omega_r) \). Then we see from Corollary 4.8 that \( \kappa(\eta) = \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(\kappa(\psi)) = \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \). Hence it follows from Lemma 5.1 that \( \eta = (\Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi); 0, 1) \). Also, since \( \psi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \), we see from Theorem 4.3(1) that \( \kappa(\pi) \supset \Pi^J_{\lambda}(\iota(\eta, t_\xi)) \); it is obvious that \( \iota(\eta, t_\xi) = t_\xi \) since \( \eta = (\Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi); 0, 1) \) as shown above. Hence we obtain \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda) \). Thus we have proved the inclusion \( \subset \).

Next, we prove the opposite inclusion \( \supset \) in (5.2). Let \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda) \), and set \( \eta = (\Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi); 0, 1) \); recall that \( \iota(\eta, t_\xi) = t_\xi \). Therefore, by Theorem 4.3(1), we have \( \pi \otimes \eta \in S_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) = \Phi_{\lambda w_r}(\mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r)) \). Let \( \psi \) be the unique element of \( \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \) such that \( \pi \otimes \eta = \Phi_{\lambda w_r}(\psi) \). Then, by Corollary 4.8, \( \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(\kappa(\psi)) = \kappa(\eta) = \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \), which implies that \( \psi \in \mathbb{B} \). This proves the lemma.

Proposition 5.3. Let \( \lambda \in P^+ \) and \( r \in I \). For \( \xi \in Q^\vee \), it holds that

\[
gch V_{t_\xi}^- (\lambda + \omega_r) = e_{t_\xi}^{\omega_r} gch V_{t_\xi}^- (\lambda) + gch V_{s_r t_\xi}^- (\lambda + \omega_r).
\]

Proof. Define \( \mathbb{B} \) as in (5.1). By Lemma 5.2 and (3.20), it suffices to prove that

\[
\mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) = \mathbb{B} \cup \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + s_r t_\xi).
\]

Suppose, for a contradiction, that \( \mathbb{B} \cap \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + s_r t_\xi) \neq \emptyset \). Let \( \psi \in \mathbb{B} \cap \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + s_r t_\xi) \). Since \( \psi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \), we have \( \kappa(\psi) \supset \Pi^J_{\lambda + \omega_r}(s_r t_\xi) \). Since \( \psi \in \mathbb{B} \), we have \( \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(\kappa(\psi)) = \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \). Also, it is checked by Lemma 2.1 together with \( J_{\lambda + \omega_r} \subset J_{\omega_r} \), that \( \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(\Pi^J_{\lambda + \omega_r}(s_r t_\xi)) = s_r \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \). Therefore, by Lemma 2.9 we see that

\[
\Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) = \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(\kappa(\psi)) \supset \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(s_r \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi)) = s_r \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi).
\]

However, since \( \langle \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \omega_r, \alpha_r^\vee \rangle = \langle t_\xi \omega_r, \alpha_r^\vee \rangle = 1 > 0 \), it follows from Lemma 2.5 that \( s_r \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) > \Pi^J_{\omega_r}(t_\xi) \), which is a contradiction. Thus we obtain \( \mathbb{B} \cap \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \neq \emptyset \).

We prove the equality in (5.4). The inclusion \( \subset \) is obvious; note that \( s_r t_\xi > t_\xi \). Let us prove the opposite inclusion \( \supset \). Let \( \psi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\prec (\lambda + \omega_r) \), and assume that \( \psi \notin \mathbb{B} \) to
conclude that \( \psi \in \mathbb{B}_{\geq s_r t_\xi} (\lambda + \varpi_r) \). We write \( \kappa(\psi) \in (W^J_{\lambda + \varpi_r})_{af} \) as \( \kappa(\psi) = w \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\gamma) \) with \( w \in W^J_{\lambda + \varpi_r} \) and \( \gamma \in Q' \); note that \([\gamma]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \geq [\xi]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \) by Lemma 2.8(1). It is easily checked by Lemma 2.1 that \( \Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(\kappa(\psi)) = \Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(w \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\gamma)) = [w]^{J_{\varpi_r}} \Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(t_\gamma) \); since \( \psi \notin B \), it follows that \([w]^{J_{\varpi_r}} \neq e \) or \( \gamma - \xi \notin Q'_{\varpi_r} \). If \([w]^{J_{\varpi_r}} \neq e \), then a reduced expression for \( w \) contains \( s_r \), which implies that \( w \geq s_r \) (note that \( s_r \in W^J_{\lambda + \varpi_r} \)).

Therefore, by Lemma 2.8(3), \( \kappa(\psi) = w \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\gamma) \geq s_r \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\gamma) \). Also, since \([\gamma]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \geq [\xi]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \) as seen above, we have \( s_r \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\gamma) \geq s_r \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\xi) \) by Lemma 2.8(2); note that \( s_r \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\xi) = \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(s_r t_\xi) \) by Lemma 2.1. Combining these inequalities, we obtain \( \kappa(\psi) \geq \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(s_r t_\xi) \), and hence \( \psi \in \mathbb{B}_{\geq s_r t_\xi} (\lambda + \varpi_r) \). Assume now that \( \gamma - \xi \notin Q'_{\varpi_r} \), or equivalently, \( \langle \varpi_r, \gamma - \xi \rangle \neq 0 \). Since \([\gamma]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \geq [\xi]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \) as seen above, and since \( r \in I \setminus J_{\lambda + \varpi_r} \), it follows that \( \langle \varpi_r, \gamma - \xi \rangle > 0 \), which implies that \([\gamma]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \geq [\xi + \alpha_r]^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}} \).

Therefore, by Lemma 2.8(2), \( \kappa(\psi) = w \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\gamma) \geq w \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\xi + \alpha_r) \). Also, since \( w \geq e \), it follows by Lemma 2.8(3) that \( w \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\xi + \alpha_r) \geq \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\xi + \alpha_r) \). Finally, notice that \( s_r t_\xi \prec t_\xi + \alpha_r \) and \( s_r t_\xi \prec t_\xi + \alpha_r \) in \( BG^{\geq}(W_{af}) \). Therefore, by Lemma 2.9, \( \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(t_\xi + \alpha_r) \geq \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(s_r t_\xi) \). Combining these inequalities, we obtain \( \kappa(\psi) \geq \Pi^{J_{\lambda + \varpi_r}}(s_r t_\xi) \), and hence \( \psi \in \mathbb{B}_{\geq s_r t_\xi} (\lambda + \varpi_r) \). This completes the proof of the proposition. □

5.2 1st step in the proof of Theorem 3.9. We prove (3.21) in the case that \( \mu = \varpi_r \) for \( r \in I \), and \( x = t_\xi \) for \( \xi \in Q' \). In this case, the right-hand side of (3.21) is identical to

\[
\sum_{y \in W_{af}} \sum_{y \geq t_\xi} \frac{(-1)^{c_X(y)}}{e \cdot \text{gch}(y)} V_y^-(\lambda).
\]

Let \( y \in W_{af} \) be such that \( y \geq t_\xi \). If \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}^{\geq}(\varpi_r) \) satisfies \( \kappa(\pi, y) = t_\xi \in W_{af} \), then we see that \( \kappa(\pi) = \Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(t_\xi) \). Hence it follows from Lemma 5.1 that \( \pi = (\Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(t_\xi); 0, 1) \).

Therefore, for \( y \in W_{af} \) such that \( y \geq t_\xi \),

\[
\begin{cases}
\pi \in \mathbb{B}^{\geq}(\varpi_r) | \kappa(\pi) = \Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(y), \kappa(\pi, y) = t_\xi \end{cases} = \{(\Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(t_\xi); 0, 1)\} \quad \text{or} \quad \emptyset
\]

this equality holds iff \( \max \text{Lift}_{\leq y}(\Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(t_\xi)) = t_\xi \)

Lemma 5.4. Let \( y \in W_{af} \) be such that \( y \geq t_\xi \), and write it as \( y = vt_\zeta \) with \( v \in W \) and \( \zeta \in Q^{\vee, +} \). Then,

\[
\max \text{Lift}_{\leq y}(\Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(t_\xi)) = t_\xi \iff v \in \{e, s_r\} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta - \xi \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} \alpha_r.
\]

Proof. Write \( \max \text{Lift}_{\leq y}(\Pi^{J_{\varpi_r}}(t_\xi)) = wt_\gamma \) with \( w \in W \) and \( \gamma \in Q^{\vee} \). We see from Proposition 2.20 that

\[
w = \max(eW_{J_{\varpi_r}}, \leq^\ast) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma = [\xi]^{J_{\varpi_r}} + [\zeta - \text{wt}(w \Rightarrow v)]_{J_{\varpi_r}}.
\]

We first prove the implication \( \Rightarrow \); assume that \( w = e \) and \( \gamma = \xi \). Because \( v \) is greater than or equal to \( e \) in the (ordinary) Bruhat order on \( W \), there exists a shortest directed path from \( e \) to \( v \) in \( QBG(W) \) whose directed edges are all Bruhat edges. Therefore,
we have \( \text{wt}(w \Rightarrow v) = \text{wt}(e \Rightarrow v) = 0 \). Hence we obtain \( \gamma = [\xi]^J_{\varpi_r} + [\xi]_{J_{\varpi_r}} \), which implies that \( \zeta - \xi \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_r \). Suppose, for a contradiction, that \( s_j \) appears in a reduced expression for \( v \) for some \( j \in J_{\varpi_r} = I \setminus \{ r \} \). Then, \( v \) is greater than or equal to \( s_j \) in the Bruhat order on \( W \), Therefore, there exists a shortest directed path from \( e \) to \( v \) in \( QBG(W) \) passing through \( s_j \) (whose directed edges are all Bruhat edges); in particular, \( \ell(e \Rightarrow v) > \ell(s_j \Rightarrow v) \). However, since \( \max(w_{J_{\varpi_r}}, \leq^*_v) = e \) by our assumption, and since \( s_j \in e W_{J_{\varpi_r}} \), it follows from the definition of \( \leq^*_v \) that \( \ell(s_j \Rightarrow v) = \ell(s_j \Rightarrow e) + \ell(e \Rightarrow v) \); in particular, \( \ell(s_j \Rightarrow v) < \ell(e \Rightarrow v) \), which is a contradiction. Hence we conclude that \( v \in \{ e, s_r \} \).

We next prove the implication \( \Leftarrow \). Assume that \( v = e \). Then it is obvious that \( w = e \), and hence \( \text{wt}(w \Rightarrow v) = \text{wt}(e \Rightarrow e) = 0 \). Thus we get \( \gamma = [\xi]^J_{\varpi_r} + [\xi]_{J_{\varpi_r}} \). Since \( \zeta - \xi \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_r \) by the assumption, we have \( \gamma = \xi \). Assume now that \( v = s_r \). By the definition of \( \leq^*_v \), we have \( \ell(e \Rightarrow s_r) = \ell(e \Rightarrow w) + \ell(w \Rightarrow s_r) \). Since \( \ell(e \Rightarrow s_r) = 1 \), we see that \( \ell(w \Rightarrow s_r) = 0 \) or \( 1 \). Since \( w \in e W_{J_{\varpi_r}} \) and \( s_r \notin e W_{J_{\varpi_r}} \), it follows that \( w \neq s_r \), which implies that \( \ell(w \Rightarrow s_r) = 1 \). Therefore, we obtain \( \ell(e \Rightarrow w) = 0 \), and hence \( w = e \). The same argument as above shows that \( \gamma = \xi \). This proves the lemma.

By Lemma \[5.4\] and \[5.6\], we see that the right-hand side of \( \langle 5.5 \rangle \) (and hence that of \[8.21\]) is identical to
\[
\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \sum_{v \in \{ e, s_r \}} (-1)^{t_{\xi \varpi_r}}(vt_{\xi \varpi_r}) e^{-t_{\xi \varpi_r}} \text{gch} \left( V_{vt_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda) \right) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} q^{-m\lambda_r} e^{-t_{\xi \varpi_r}} \left( \text{gch} \left( V_{\xi_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda) \right) - \text{gch} \left( V_{s_r\xi_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda) \right) \right) \quad \text{by Proposition \[3.8\] (5.7)}
\]

By Proposition \[3.1\] we have \( \text{gch} V_{\xi_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda) - \text{gch} V_{s_r\xi_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda) = e^{t_{\xi \varpi_r}} \text{gch} \left( V_{\xi_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda - \varpi_r) \right) \). Substituting this equality into \( \langle 5.7 \rangle \), we deduce that the right-hand side of \( \langle 5.7 \rangle \) is identical to:
\[
\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} q^{-m\lambda_r} \text{gch} V_{\xi_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda - \varpi_r) = \frac{1}{1 - q^{-\lambda_r}} \text{gch} V_{\xi_{\xi \varpi_r}}^{-}(\lambda - \varpi_r).
\]

This proves Theorem \[3.9\] in the case that \( \mu = \varpi_r \) and \( x = t_{\xi} \).

6 String property and Demazure operators.

6.1 Recursion formula for graded characters in terms of Demazure operators.
Recall that \( e^h = q \). For each \( i \in I_{af} \), we define a \( \mathbb{C}(q) \)-linear operator \( D_i \) on \( \mathbb{C}(q)[P] \) by
\[
D_i e^\nu := \frac{e^{\mu - \rho} - e^{s_i(\nu - \rho)}}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} e^\rho = \frac{e^\mu - e^{\alpha_i} e^{s_i \nu}}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}} \quad \text{for } \nu \in P;
\]

note that \( D_i^2 = D_i \), and that
\[
D_i e^\nu = \begin{cases} 
  e^\nu (1 + e^{\alpha_i} + e^{2\alpha_i} + \cdots + e^{-(\nu, \alpha_i^\vee)\alpha_i}) & \text{if } \langle \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0, \\
  0 & \text{if } \langle \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 1, \\
  -e^\nu (e^{-\alpha_i} + e^{-2\alpha_i} + \cdots + e^{-(\nu, \alpha_i^\vee) + 1)\alpha_i}) & \text{if } \langle \nu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \geq 2.
\end{cases} \quad (6.1)
\]
We define $T_i$ by

$$T_i := D_i - 1,$$

that is,

$$T_i e^\nu = \frac{e^{\alpha_i} (e^\nu - e^{\delta_i})}{1 - e^{\alpha_i}};$$

note that $T_i^2 = -T_i$ and $T_i D_i = D_i T_i = 0$. We can easily verify the following lemma.

**Lemma 6.1** (Leibniz rule). For $\nu_1, \nu_2 \in P$ and $i \in I_{af}$, it holds that

$$D_i (e^{\nu_1} e^{\nu_2}) = (D_i e^{\nu_1 + \rho}) e^{\nu_2 - \rho} + e^{\delta_i} (D_i e^{\nu_2}), \quad (6.2)$$

$$T_i (e^{\nu_1} e^{\nu_2}) = (T_i e^{\nu_1}) e^{\nu_2} + e^{\delta_i} (T_i e^{\nu_2}). \quad (6.3)$$

Now, we take an arbitrary $\mu \in P^+$, and define $J_\mu \subset I$ as in (3.1). Fix $i \in I_{af}$. A subset $S \subset \mathbb{B}_\infty^\mu (\mu)$ is called an $i$-string if $S$ is of the form $S = \{ \pi, f_i \pi, \ldots, f_i^{\varphi_i (\pi)} \pi, f_i^{\varphi_i (\pi)} \pi \}$ for some $\pi \in \mathbb{B}_\infty^\mu (\mu)$ such that $e_i \pi = 0$; in this case, we call $\pi_H := \pi_H^S := \pi$ and $\pi_L := \pi_L^S := f_i^{\varphi_i (\pi)} \pi$ the $i$-highest element and $i$-lowest element in $S$, respectively. Note that $\pi_H = \pi_L$ if and only if $\# S = 1$.

**Remark 6.2.** The crystal $\mathbb{B}_\infty^\mu (\mu)$ decomposes into a disjoint union of (infinitely many) $i$-strings for each $i \in I_{af}$.

The next lemma follows from the definition of the root operator $f_i$ (see also [NS3] Lemma 2.4.5 and its proof; cf. [LL] 5.3 Lemma).

**Lemma 6.3.** Keep the notation and setting above. Set $w := \kappa (\pi_H) \in (W J_\mu)_{af}$ and $N := \varphi_i (\pi_H) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$; note that $f_i^N \pi_H = \pi_L$.

1. If $N \geq 1$, then $\kappa (f_i^k \pi_H) = w$ for all $0 \leq k \leq N - 1$.
2. If $\langle w \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0$, then $\kappa (f_i^k \pi_H) = w$ for all $0 \leq k \leq N$.
3. If $\langle w \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0$, then $N \geq 1$, and $\kappa (f_i^N \pi_H) = s_i w \succ w$.

The following corollary is an immediate consequence of Lemma 6.3.

**Corollary 6.4** (cf. [LL] 5.4 Lemma). Let $i \in I_{af}$ and $y \in W_{af}$. For each $i$-string $S \subset \mathbb{B}_\infty^\mu (\mu)$, the intersection $\mathbb{B}_\infty^{\sum y} (\mu) \cap S$ is identical to $\emptyset$, $S$, or $\{ \pi_L^S \}$.

A proof of the next lemma is straightforward.

**Lemma 6.5.** Let $i \in I_{af}$, and let $S \subset \mathbb{B}_\infty^\mu (\mu)$ be an $i$-string, with $\pi_H = \pi_H^S$ and $\pi_L = \pi_L^S$ the $i$-highest element and $i$-lowest element in $S$, respectively. Then,

$$D_i \left( \sum_{\pi \in S} e^{w \pi} \right) = \sum_{\pi \in S} e^{w \pi}, \quad T_i \left( \sum_{\pi \in S} e^{w \pi} \right) = 0, \quad (6.4)$$

$$D_i e^{w \pi_L} = \sum_{\pi \in S} e^{w \pi}, \quad T_i e^{w \pi_L} = \sum_{\pi \in S \setminus \{ \pi_L \}} e^{w \pi}, \quad (6.5)$$

$$D_i e^{w \pi_H} = \sum_{\pi \in S \setminus \{ \pi_H, \pi_L \}} e^{w \pi}, \quad T_i e^{w \pi_H} = \sum_{\pi \in S \setminus \{ \pi_L \}} e^{w \pi}. \quad (6.6)$$
Let $y \in \mathcal{W}_{af}$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{af}$ be such that $s_i y < y$, or equivalently, $y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^- + \mathbb{Z} \delta$ (see Lemma 2.3); note that $\langle y \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0$, and that $\langle y \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0$ if and only if $\Pi^{J_{\mu}}(s_i y) = \Pi^{J_{\mu}}(y)$. It follows from [NS3, Proposition 5.3.2] that the set $\mathcal{B}^\pi_{\geq s_i y}(\mu) \cup \{0\}$ is stable under the action of the root operator $e_i$, and that

$$\mathcal{B}^\pi_{\geq s_i y}(\mu) = \\{ e_i^k \pi \mid \pi \in \mathcal{B}^\pi_{\geq y}(\mu), 0 \leq k \leq \varepsilon_i(\pi) \}. \quad (6.7)$$

Using Corollary 6.4 and (6.7), (6.5), together with Remark 6.2, we can easily show the following proposition (see also [LL, Sect. 5.5] and [Kas2, Proposition 9.2.3]).

**Proposition 6.6.** Let $y \in \mathcal{W}_{af}$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{af}$ be such that $s_i y < y$. Then,

$$g_{\text{ch}} V^{-}_{s_i y}(\mu) = D_i g_{\text{ch}} V^{-}_{y}(\mu). \quad (6.8)$$

**Remark 6.7.** Since $D_i^2 = D_i$, we deduce that for $y \in \mathcal{W}_{af}$ such that $s_i y > y$,

$$D_i g_{\text{ch}} V^{-}_{y}(\mu) = g_{\text{ch}} V^{-}_{y}(\mu). \quad (6.9)$$

Also, by (6.8) and (6.9), we have

$$T_i g_{\text{ch}} V^{-}_{y}(\mu) = \begin{cases} g_{\text{ch}} V^{-}_{s_i y}(\mu) - g_{\text{ch}} V^{-}_{y}(\mu) & \text{if } s_i y < y, \\ 0 & \text{if } s_i y > y. \end{cases} \quad (6.10)$$

### 6.2 String property for Demazure-like subsets of $\mathcal{B}^\pi_{\mu}$. We take an arbitrary $\mu \in P^+$, and define $J_{\mu} \subset \mathcal{I}$ as in (3.1). For $u, v \in \mathcal{W}_{af}$, we set

$$\mathcal{B}^\pi_{(\cdot, v = u)} (\mu) := \{ \pi \in \mathcal{B}^\pi_{\mu} \mid \kappa(\pi) \geq \Pi^{J_{\mu}}(v), u(\pi, v) = u \}. \quad (6.11)$$

Fix $i \in \mathcal{I}_{af}$. For an $i$-string $S \subset \mathcal{B}^\pi_{\mu}$, we set

$$S_{u, v} := \mathcal{B}^\pi_{(\cdot, v = u) \cap \mu} (\mu) \cap S. \quad (6.12)$$

**Proposition 6.8.** Keep the notation and setting above. In addition, assume that $s_i u > u$ and $s_i v > v$. Then we have the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1</th>
<th>Case 2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#S</td>
<td>≥ 2</td>
<td>≥ 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (i)    | $S_{u, v}$ | $S$    | $\{ \pi_H \}$ | \$ \$
| (ii)   | $S_{s_i u, v}$ | $\emptyset$ | $S \setminus \{ \pi_H \}$ | \$ \$
| (iii)  | $S_{u, s_i v}$ | $\{ \pi_L \}$ | $S$    | $\emptyset$    |
| (iv)   | $S_{s_i u, s_i v}$ | $\emptyset$ | $\emptyset$ | $\{ \pi_L \}$ | $S \setminus \{ \pi_H \}$ | \$ \$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case 1.1</th>
<th>Case 1.2</th>
<th>Case 2.1</th>
<th>Case 2.2</th>
<th>Case 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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Proof. We set \( w := \kappa(\pi_H) \) and \( N := \varphi_i(\pi_H) = \varepsilon_i(\pi_L) \geq 0 \). Since \( s_i v \succ v \) by the assumption, we see by Corollary 6.4 and (6.7) that

\[
B_{\geq \pi_L}(\mu) \cap S = S \quad \text{or} \quad \emptyset. \tag{6.14}
\]

Also, we see by (6.7) that \( B_{\geq \pi_L}(\mu) \supset B_{\geq s_i v}(\mu) \). Therefore,

\[
B_{\geq s_i v}(\mu) \cap S = \emptyset \quad \Rightarrow \quad B_{\geq s_i v}(\mu) \cap S = \emptyset. \tag{6.15}
\]

Assume that \( B_{\geq s_i v}(\mu) \cap S = S \). If \( \langle w \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0 \) (resp., if \( \langle w \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \) and \( w \succeq \Pi^J(\pi_H) \)), then we deduce from Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 2.7 (1) (resp., from Lemma 6.3) that \( B_{\geq s_i v}(\mu) \cap S = S \);

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle w \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle &\leq 0, \quad \text{or} \\
\langle w \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle &> 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w \succeq \Pi^J(\pi_H) \quad \Rightarrow \quad B_{\geq s_i v}(\mu) \cap S = S. \tag{6.16}
\end{align*}
\]

Also, it follows from Lemma 6.3 and Lemma 2.7 (3) that

\[
\langle w \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad w \not\succeq \Pi^J(\pi_H) \quad \Rightarrow \quad B_{\geq s_i v}(\mu) \cap S = \{ \pi_L \}. \tag{6.17}
\]

Claim 6.8.1. Let \( y \in W_{af} \) be such that \( B_{\geq \pi_L}(\mu) \cap S = S \).

1. If \( y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z \delta \), then \( \iota(\pi_H, y)^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z \delta \).

2. If \( N \geq 1 \), then \( \iota(\pi_H, y)^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z \delta \) and \( \iota(f_i^N \pi_H, y) \in \{ \iota(\pi_H, y), s_i \iota(\pi_H, y) \} \).

3. If \( N \geq 2 \), then

\[
\iota(f_i \pi_H, y) = \iota(f_i^2 \pi_H, y) = \cdots = \iota(f_i^{N-1} \pi_H, y) = \iota(\overbrace{f_i f_i \cdots f_i}^{= \pi_L} \pi_H, y). \tag{6.18}
\]

Proof of Claim 6.8.1. Since \( \varepsilon_i(\pi_H) = 0 \), part (2) follows from Lemma 4.5, applied to the case that \( \nu = \mu \) and \( \psi = \pi_H \). Also, part (3) follows from Lemma 4.5, applied to the case that \( \nu = \mu \) and \( \psi = f_i^k \pi_H \) for each \( 1 \leq k \leq N - 1 \); note that \( \varepsilon_i(f_i^k \pi_H) \geq 1 \) if \( k \geq 1 \). Hence it remains to show part (1) in the case that \( N = 0 \). Let \( \Lambda \in P^+ \) be an arbitrary regular dominant integral weight, that is, \( \langle \Lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \) for all \( i \in I \), or equivalently, \( J_\Lambda = \emptyset \). We set \( \eta := \langle y; 0, 1 \rangle \in B_{\geq \pi_L}(\Lambda) \); we see that \( \iota(\eta, y) = y \), and hence \( \pi_H \otimes \eta \in S_{\geq \pi_L}(\mu + \Lambda) \subset B_{\geq \pi_L}(\mu) \otimes B_{\geq \pi_L}(\Lambda) \) by Theorem 4.3 (1). Since \( y^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z \delta \) by the assumption, we see that \( \varepsilon_i(\pi_H \otimes \eta) = 0 \) and \( \varphi_i(\pi_H \otimes \eta) \geq 1 \) by the tensor product rule for crystals. Set \( \psi := \Phi^{-1}_\mu(\pi_H \otimes \eta) \in B_{\geq \pi_L}(\mu + \Lambda) \). Since \( \varepsilon_i(\psi) = 0 \) and \( \varphi_i(\psi) \geq 1 \), it follows from Lemma 4.5 that \( \iota(\psi, y)^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z \delta \). By Proposition 4.4 and the fact that \( \iota(\eta, y) = y \) seen above, we deduce that \( \iota(\psi, y) = \iota(\pi_H, \iota(\eta, y)) = \iota(\pi_H, y) \). Hence we obtain \( \iota(\pi_H, y)^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + Z \delta \), as desired. \( \square \)
Claim 6.8.2. Assume that $\mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\mu) \cap S = S$; note that $\pi_L \in \mathbb{B}_{\leq s,v}(\mu)$ by (6.16) and (6.17). If $N \geq 1$, then $\iota(\pi_L, s_i v) = \iota(\pi_L, v)$, and hence

$$\begin{align*}
\text{if } N \geq 2; \text{ see } 6.13, \\
\iota(f_i \pi_H, s_i v) & = \iota(f_1^2 \pi_H, v) = \cdots = \iota(f_i^{N-1} \pi_H, v) = \iota(f_i^N \pi_H, v) \\
\text{if } N \geq 2 \text{ and } \mathbb{B}_{\geq s,v}(\mu) \cap S = S; \text{ see } 6.16 \text{ and } 6.18
\end{align*}$$

(6.19)

Proof of Claim 6.8.2. Take an (arbitrary) regular weight $\Lambda \in P^+$; note that $\langle v \Lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0$ since $s_i v \succ v$ by the assumption. Set $\pi_v := (v; 0, 1) \in \mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\Lambda)$. Since $s_i v \succ v$, we see by Theorem 4.3(1) that $\pi_L \otimes \pi_v \in \mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\mu + \Lambda) \subset \mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\mu) \otimes \mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\Lambda)$; we set $\psi := \Phi_{\mu \Lambda}^{-1}(\pi_L \otimes \pi_v) \in \mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\mu + \Lambda)$. Recall that $N = \varepsilon_i(\pi_L) \geq 1$ by the assumption, which implies that $\varepsilon_i(\psi) = \varepsilon_i(\pi_L \otimes \pi_v) \geq 1$ by the tensor product rule for crystals. Also, we have $\varphi_i(\pi_v) = \langle v \Lambda, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0$, which implies that $\varphi_i(\psi) \geq 1$, and hence $f_i \psi \neq 0$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.5 we have

$$\iota(\psi, v) = \iota(f_i \psi, v). \quad (6.20)$$

Here, it follows from Proposition 4.4(1) that $\iota(\psi, v) = \iota(\pi_L, \iota(\pi_v, v))$; it is easily checked that $\iota(\pi_v, v) = v$. Hence we obtain

$$\iota(\psi, v) = \iota(\pi_L, v). \quad (6.21)$$

Observe that $\Phi_{\mu \Lambda}(f_i \psi) = f_i(\pi_L \otimes \pi_v) = \pi_L \otimes (f_i \pi_v)$ by the tensor product rule for crystals, where $f_i \pi_v = (s_i v, v; 0, a, 1)$ for some $0 < a < 1$. It follows from Proposition 4.4(1) that $\iota(f_i \psi, v) = \iota(\pi_L, \iota(f_i \pi_v, v))$; it is easily checked that $\iota(f_i \pi_v, v) = s_i v$. Hence we obtain

$$\iota(f_i \psi, v) = \iota(\pi_L, s_i v). \quad (6.22)$$

From (6.20), (6.21), and (6.22), we conclude that $\iota(\pi_L, v) = \iota(\pi_L, s_i v)$, as desired. $\blacksquare$

Claim 6.8.3. Assume that $\mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\mu) \cap S = S$. If $N = 0$, then $\iota(\pi_L, s_i v)$ is identical to $\iota(\pi_L, v)$ or $s_i \iota(\pi_L, v)$.

Proof of Claim 6.8.3. The proof is similar to that of Claim 6.8.2 instead of (6.20), we can show by Lemma 4.5 that

$$\iota(f_i \psi, v) \in \{ \iota(\psi, v), s_i \iota(\psi, v) \}. \quad (6.23)$$

Also, equations (6.21) and (6.22) hold also in this case. Substituting (6.21) and (6.22) into (6.23), we obtain $\iota(\pi_L, s_i v) \in \{ \iota(\pi_L, v), s_i \iota(\pi_L, v) \}$, as desired. $\blacksquare$

In order to show that $S_{u,v} = S, \{ \pi_H \}$, or $\emptyset$, let us assume that $S_{u,v} \neq \emptyset$; by (6.14), we have $\mathbb{B}_{\geq v}^t(\mu) \cap S = S$. If $\# S = 1$ (or equivalently, $N = 0$), then it is obvious that
\( S_{u,v} = \{ \pi_H \} \). Assume now that \( \#S \geq 2 \) (or equivalently, \( N \geq 1 \)). Since \( s_iu \succ u \) by the assumption, we see from Claim 6.8.1 that either (6.24) or (6.25) below holds:

\[
\ell(\pi_H, v) = \ell(f_i\pi_H, v) = \cdots = \ell(f_i^N\pi_H, v); \quad \ell(\pi_H, u) = \ell(f_i\pi_H, u) = \cdots = \ell(f_i^N\pi_H, u). 
\]  

(6.24)

\[
\ell(\pi_H, v) < \ell(f_i\pi_H, v) = \cdots = \ell(f_i^N\pi_H, v). \quad \ell(\pi_H, u) < \ell(f_i\pi_H, u) = \cdots = \ell(f_i^N\pi_H, u). 
\]  

(6.25)

If (6.24) (resp., (6.25)) holds, then \( S_{u,v} = S \) (resp., \( S_{u,v} = \{ \pi_H \} \)). Thus we have proved that \( S_{u,v} = S, \{ \pi_H \}, \) or \( \emptyset \), as desired. Hence we have the following possibilities (Cases 1, 2a, 2b, and 3).

**Case 1.** Assume that \( \#S \geq 2 \) and \( S_{u,v} = S \). Since (6.24) holds in this case, it is obvious that \( S_{s_iu,v} = \emptyset \). Recall that \( w = \kappa(\pi_H) \).

**Subcase 1.1.** Assume that \( \langle w\mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \) and \( w \not\leq \Pi^{J_\mu}(s_iu) \). It follows from (6.17) that \( B_{\geq s_iu}(\mu) \cap S = \{ \pi_L \} \). By Claim 6.8.2 and (6.24), we have \( \ell(\pi_L, s_iu) = u \). Hence we conclude that \( S_{u,s_iu} = \{ \pi_L \} \) and \( S_{s_iu,s_iu} = \emptyset \).

**Subcase 1.2.** Assume that \( \langle w\mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0 \), or that \( \langle w\mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \) and \( w \geq \Pi^{J_\mu}(s_iu) \). It follows from (6.16) that \( B_{\leq s_iu}(\mu) \cap S = S \). By Claim 6.8.1 (2), (6.19), (6.24), and the assumption \( s_iu \succ u \), we deduce that

\[
\ell(\pi_H, s_iu) = \ell(f_i\pi_H, s_iu) = \cdots = \ell(f_i^N\pi_H, s_iu). 
\]  

(6.26)

Therefore, we conclude that \( S_{u,s_iu} = S \) and \( S_{s_iu,s_iu} = \emptyset \).

**Case 2a.** Assume that \( \#S \geq 2 \) and \( S_{u,v} = \{ \pi_H \} \). Since (6.25) holds in this case, it is obvious that \( S_{s_iu,v} = S \setminus \{ \pi_H \} \).

**Subcase 2a.1.** Assume that \( \langle w\mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \) and \( w \not\leq \Pi^{J_\mu}(s_iu) \). It follows from (6.17) that \( B_{\geq s_iu}(\mu) \cap S = \{ \pi_L \} \). By Claim 6.8.2 and (6.25), we have \( \ell(\pi_L, s_iu) = s_iu \). Hence we conclude that \( S_{u,s_iu} = \emptyset \) and \( S_{s_iu,s_iu} = \{ \pi_L \} \).

**Subcase 2a.2.** Assume that \( \langle w\mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \leq 0 \), or that \( \langle w\mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle > 0 \) and \( w \geq \Pi^{J_\mu}(s_iu) \). It follows from (6.16) that \( B_{\leq s_iu}(\mu) \cap S = S \). By Claim 6.8.1 (2), (6.19), (6.25), and the assumption \( s_iu \succ u \), we deduce that

\[
\ell(\pi_H, s_iu) < \ell(f_i\pi_H, s_iu) = \cdots = \ell(f_i^N\pi_H, s_iu). 
\]  

(6.27)

Therefore, we conclude that \( S_{u,s_iu} = \{ \pi_H \} \) and \( S_{s_iu,s_iu} = S \setminus \{ \pi_H \} \).
Case 2b. Assume that \( \#S = 1 \) (or equivalently, \( N = 0 \); in this case, \( S = \{ \pi_H \} = \{ \pi_L \} \)) and \( S_{u,v} = \{ \pi_H \} = S \). It is obvious that \( S_{s_i,u,v} = \emptyset = S \setminus \{ \pi_H \} \).

Since \( S = \{ \pi_H \} = \{ \pi_L \} \), we have \( \mathbb{B}_{\leq s_i}(\mu) \cap S = S \) by (6.16) and (6.17). Also, it follows from Claim 6.8.3 that \( \iota(\pi_L, s_i v) \) is identical to \( \iota(\pi_L, v) \) or \( s_i \iota(\pi_L, v) \); in this case, \( \pi_L = \pi_H \) and \( \iota(\pi_H, v) = u \). Therefore, \( \iota(\pi_H, s_i v) \in \{ u, s_i u \} \).

Subcase 2b.1. If \( \iota(\pi_H, s_i v) = s_i u \), then \( S_{u, s_i v} = \emptyset \) and \( S_{s_i u, s_i v} = \{ \pi_H \} = \{ \pi_L \} \).

Subcase 2b.2. If \( \iota(\pi_H, s_i v) = u \), then \( S_{u, s_i v} = \{ \pi_H \} \) and \( S_{s_i u, s_i v} = \emptyset = S \setminus \{ \pi_H \} \).

Case 3. Assume that \( S_{u,v} = \emptyset \); we show that \( S_{s_i,u,v} = S_{u,s_i,v} = S_{s_i,u,s_i,v} = \emptyset \). By (6.14) and (6.15), we may (and do) assume that \( \mathbb{B}_{s_i}^{\pi}(\mu) \cap S = S \). We set \( z := \iota(\pi_H, v) \); remark that \( z \neq u \) since \( S_{u,v} = \emptyset \). We see from Claim 6.8.1 that \( z^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta \), and \( \iota(f_i^k \pi_H, v) \in \{ z, s_i z \} \) for all \( 0 \leq k \leq N \). Therefore, if at least one of \( S_{s_i,u,v}, S_{u,s_i,v}, \) and \( S_{s_i,u,s_i,v} \) is nonempty, then \( z \) is identical to \( u \) or \( s_i u \). Since \( z^{-1} \alpha_i \in \Delta^+ + \mathbb{Z} \delta \), and \( s_i u \succ u \) by the assumption, we obtain \( z = u \), which is a contradiction.

This completes the proof of Proposition 6.8.

7 Proof of Theorem 3.9: part 2.

7.1 Recursion formula for the right-hand side of (3.21). Let us take an arbitrary \( \mu \in P^+ \). Recall from (3.10) and (3.11) the definition and properties of the dual path \( \pi^* \in \mathbb{B}_{\leq s_i}^\pi(-w_0 \mu) \) for \( \pi \in \mathbb{B}_{\leq s_i}^\pi(\mu) \). We deduce by Lemmas 2.10 and 3.5 that for \( x, y \in W_{af} \) such that \( y \succeq x \),

\[
\sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{B}_{\leq s_i}^\pi(\mu)} e^{-\text{wt}(\pi)} = \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{B}_{\leq s_i}^\pi(-w_0 \mu), \iota(\eta, yw_0) = xw_0} e^{\text{wt}(\eta)} =: a_\mu(x, y).
\]  

The next lemma follows from Proposition 6.8 (applied to the case that \( u = xw_0 \) and \( v = yw_0 \)) and Lemma 6.5 together with Remark 6.2.

Lemma 7.1. Let \( x, y \in W_{af} \) be such that \( y \succeq x \), and \( s_i x \prec x, s_i y \prec y \). We have

\[
a_\mu(s_i x, y) = -s_i \mathbb{T}_i a_\mu(x, y), \quad (7.2)
\]

\[
a_\mu(s_i x, s_i y) = -s_i \mathbb{T}_i a_\mu(x, s_i y) + s_i (a_\mu(x, y) - a_\mu(x, s_i y)), \quad (7.3)
\]

\[
s_i a_\mu(s_i x, s_i y) + s_i a_\mu(s_i x, y) = a_\mu(s_i x, y) + a_\mu(x, y), \quad (7.4)
\]

\[
s_i a_\mu(s_i x, s_i y) + s_i a_\mu(s_i x, y) = a_\mu(s_i x, s_i y) + a_\mu(x, y), \quad (7.5)
\]

\[
s_i a_\mu(s_i x, s_i y) - s_i a_\mu(s_i x, s_i y) = a_\mu(s_i x, y) - a_\mu(s_i x, s_i y). \quad (7.6)
\]
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For simplicity of notation, we set

\[(W_{af})^+_x := \{y \in W_{af} \mid y \succeq x\} \text{ for } x \in W_{af},\]

\[v_{\lambda}(x, y) := (-1)^{r_F(y) - r_F(x)} \text{gcd } V^{-}_y(\lambda) \text{ for } \lambda \in P^+ \text{ and } x, y \in W_{af}.\]

Also, for \(\lambda, \mu \in P^+\) such that \(\lambda - \mu \in P^+\), we define \(F(x) = F_{\lambda\mu}(x)\) to be the right-hand side of (3.21); we see that

\[F(x) = \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_x} a_{\mu}(x, y)v_{\lambda}(x, y). \tag{7.7}\]

Proposition 7.2 (cf. (6.9) and (6.10)). Let \(\lambda, \mu \in P^+\) be such that \(\lambda - \mu \in P^+\). For \(x \in W_{af}\) and \(i \in I_{af}\) such that \(s_i x \prec x\), it holds that \(T_i F_{\lambda\mu}(x) = F_{\lambda\mu}(s_i x) - F_{\lambda\mu}(x)\), and hence \(F_{\lambda\mu}(s_i x) = D_i F_{\lambda\mu}(x)\).

Proof. We set

\[(W_{af})^+_x := \{y \in (W_{af})^+_x \mid s_i y \succ y\}, \quad (W_{af})^-_x := \{y \in (W_{af})^-_x \mid s_i y \prec y\};\]

we have

\[F(x) = F^+(x) + F^-(x), \quad \text{where } F^\pm(x) := \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^\pm_x} a_{\mu}(x, y)v_{\lambda}(x, y).\]

We compute as follows:

\[T_i F^+(x) \overset{\text{(6.3)}}{=} \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_x} (T_i a_{\mu}(x, y))v_{\lambda}(x, y) + \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_x} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, y))(T_i v_{\lambda}(x, y)) = 0 \text{ by (6.10)}\]

\[= \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_x} (a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) - a_{\mu}(x, y) - s_i a_{\mu}(s_i x, y))v_{\lambda}(x, y)\]

\[= - \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_x} a_{\mu}(x, y)v_{\lambda}(x, y) + \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_x} (a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) - s_i a_{\mu}(s_i x, y))v_{\lambda}(x, y),\]

and

\[T_i F^-(x) \overset{\text{(6.3)}}{=} \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-_x} (T_i a_{\mu}(x, y))v_{\lambda}(x, y) + \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-_x} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, y))(T_i v_{\lambda}(x, y))\]

\[= \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-_x} (-s_i a_{\mu}(s_i x, y))v_{\lambda}(x, y) - \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-_x} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, y))(v_{\lambda}(x, s_i y) + v_{\lambda}(x, y)) \overset{\text{(7.2)}}{=}- \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-_x} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) + s_i a_{\mu}(x, y))v_{\lambda}(x, y) - \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-_x} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, y))v_{\lambda}(x, s_i y)\]
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Therefore, we obtain

$$
T_i F(x) = T_i F^+(x) + T_i F^-(x)
$$

$$
= -F(x) + \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+} (a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) - s_i a_{\mu}(s_i x, y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, y) - \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, s_i y).
$$

(7.8)

Since $s_i x \prec x$ by the assumption, we deduce by Lemma 2.7(1) that $(W_{af})^-_{\geq s_i x} = (W_{af})^-_{\geq x}$. Hence it follows that

$$
\sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+} (a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) - s_i a_{\mu}(s_i x, y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, y) = \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_{\geq s_i x}} a_{\mu}(s_i x, y) \nu_{\lambda}(s_i x, y).
$$

Also, we see by Lemma 2.7(3) that $y \in (W_{af})^-_{\geq x}$ if and only if $s_i y \in (W_{af})^+_{\geq s_i x}$. Hence we deduce that

$$
\sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, s_i y) = \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_{\geq s_i x}} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, s_i y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, y).
$$

Therefore, the right-hand side of (7.8) plus $F(x)$ is identical to

$$
\sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+} a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) \nu_{\lambda}(s_i x, y)
$$

$$
+ \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_{\geq s_i x}} (a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) - s_i a_{\mu}(s_i x, y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, y) - \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^-_{\geq s_i x}} (s_i a_{\mu}(x, s_i y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, s_i y).
$$

=; G(x)

(7.9)

Because $(W_{af})^+_{\geq x} \subset (W_{af})^+_{\geq s_i x}$ by the assumption that $s_i x \prec x$, we see that

$$
G(x) = \sum_{y \in (W_{af})^+_{\geq x}} (a_{\mu}(x, s_i y) - s_i a_{\mu}(s_i x, y) - s_i a_{\mu}(x, s_i y)) \nu_{\lambda}(x, y)
$$

= -a_{\mu}(s_i x, y) \text{ by (7.5)}
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\[
- \sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} \sum_{y \not\geq x} (s_i a_\mu(x, s_i y))v_\lambda(x, y). \tag{7.10}
\]

Here we claim that for \( y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+ \) such that \( y \not\geq x \),
\[
s_i a_\mu(x, s_i y) = a_\mu(s_i x, y). \tag{7.11}
\]

In order to show this equality, it suffices to prove the following claim.

**Claim 7.2.1.** Let \( y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+ \) be such that \( y \not\geq x \). Let \( S \subset \mathbb{B}^\infty(-w_0 \mu) \) be an \( i \)-string such that \( y \not\geq x \) by Lemma 2.10. However, this contradicts the assumption that \( y \not\geq x \). Hence, \( S = \emptyset \). Since \( s_i x \not\geq yw_0 \) and \( yw_0 \not\geq s_i yw_0 \) by the assumption, the set \( S = \emptyset \) as seen above, we obtain (7.12) by rows (i) and (iv) in Table (6.13). This proves the claim (and hence (7.11)).

**Proof of Claim 7.2.1.** Suppose, for a contradiction, that \( S = \emptyset \). If \( \pi \in S = \emptyset \), then \( xw_0 = \iota(\pi, yw_0) \geq yw_0 \), and hence \( y \geq x \) by Lemma 2.10. However, this contradicts the assumption that \( y \not\geq x \). Hence, \( S = \emptyset \). Since \( s_i xw_0 \not\geq yw_0 \) and \( yw_0 \not\geq s_i yw_0 \) by the assumption, the set \( S = \emptyset \) as seen above, we obtain (7.12) by rows (i) and (iv) in Table (6.13). This proves the claim (and hence (7.11)).

Substituting (7.11) into (7.10), we see that
\[
G(x) = - \sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} a_\mu(s_i x, y)v_\lambda(s_i x, y) - \sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} a_\mu(s_i x, y)v_\lambda(x, y)
\]
\[
= \sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} a_\mu(s_i x, y)v_\lambda(s_i x, y) + \sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} a_\mu(s_i x, y)v_\lambda(s_i x, y)
\]
\[
= \sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} a_\mu(s_i x, y)v_\lambda(s_i x, y).
\]

The right-hand side of (7.8) plus \( F(x) \) (see (7.9)) is identical to
\[
\sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} a_\mu(s_i x, y)v_\lambda(s_i x, y) + \sum_{y \in (W_{af})_{\geq s_i x}^+} a_\mu(s_i x, y)v_\lambda(s_i x, y) = F(s_i x).
\]

Substituting this equality into (7.8), we conclude that \( T_1 F(x) = F(s_i x) - F(x) \), as desired. This completes the proof of Proposition 7.2. □
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7.2 2nd step in the proof of Theorem [3.9]. We prove (3.21) in the case that \( \lambda = \sum_{i \in I} \lambda_i \omega_i \in P^+ \) be such that \( \lambda - \omega_r \in P^+ \), and let \( x \in W_{af} \). We deduce from \([AK] \) Lemma 1.4 \( \) (see also \([NS3] \) (1a) and (2a) in the proof of Lemma 5.4.1) \( \) that there exist \( i_1, \ldots, i_n \in I_{af} \) and \( \xi \in Q \) such that

\[
x = s_{i_n} s_{i_{n-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} t_\xi < s_{i_{n-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} t_\xi < \cdots < s_{i_2} s_{i_1} t_\xi < s_{i_1} t_\xi < t_\xi.
\]

By Propositions 6.6 and 7.2, we see that

\[
\text{by Propositions 6.6 and 7.2, we see that.}
\]

\[
\text{We prove (3.21) in the case that}
\]

\[
|\lambda_{i_1}| = 1.
\]

respectively. In \( \S 5.2 \), we proved that

\[
\frac{1}{1 - q^{-\lambda_r}} \gch V_{t_\xi}^-(\lambda - \omega_r) = F_{\lambda \omega_r}(t_\xi).
\]

From these equalities, we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{1 - q^{-\lambda_r}} \gch V_x^-(\lambda - \omega_r) = F_{\lambda \omega_r}(x),
\]

as desired.

8 Proof of Theorem [3.9]: part 3.

8.1 Final step in the proof of Theorem [3.9]. Keep the notation and setting of Theorem [3.9]. We show (3.21) by induction on \( |\mu| := \sum_{i \in I} \mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \). If \( |\mu| = 1 \), that is, if \( \mu = \omega_r \) for some \( r \in I \), then we proved (3.21) in \( \S 7.2 \). Assume now that \( |\mu| > 1 \), and take \( r \in I \) such that \( \mu_r \geq 1 \). We set \( \nu := \mu - \omega_r \in P_+ \). We compute now that \( |\mu| > 1 \), and take \( r \in I \) such that \( \mu_r \geq 1 \). We set \( \nu := \mu - \omega_r \in P_+ \). We compute as follows:

\[
\prod_{i \in I} \prod_{k = \lambda_i - \mu_i + 1} \frac{1}{1 - q^{-k}} \gch V_x^-(\lambda - \mu) = \prod_{i \in I} \prod_{k = \lambda_i - \mu_i + 1} \frac{1}{1 - q^{-k}} \gch V_x^-(\lambda - \omega_r - \nu)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{1 - q^{-\lambda_r}} \sum_{y \in W_{af}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{E}^\lambda(x)} (-1)^{\ell_F(y) - \ell_F(x)} e^{-\wt(\nu)} \gch V_y^-(\lambda - \omega_r)
\]

by our induction hypothesis

\[
= \sum_{y \in W_{af}} \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{E}^\lambda(x)} (-1)^{\ell_F(y) - \ell_F(x)} e^{-\wt(\nu)} \times
\]

\[
\sum_{z \in W_{af}} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{E}^\lambda(z)} (-1)^{\ell_F(z) - \ell_F(y)} e^{-\wt(\eta)} \gch V_z^-(\lambda)
\]
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by the formula shown in (8.2)

\[
\sum_{z,y \in \mathbb{W}_{af}} \sum_{\eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\nu)} \sum_{\pi \in \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\eta}}(\nu)} (-1)^{\ell^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(z) - \ell^{\overrightarrow{\eta}}(x)} e^{-(\text{wt}(\pi) + \text{wt}(\eta))} \text{gch } V_z^-(\lambda) =: \text{H}(x).
\]

We see by Theorem 4.3 (2) that for each \(z \in \mathbb{W}_{af}\) with \(z \geq x\), the set

\[
\bigcup_{z \geq y \geq x} \left\{ \eta \in \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\nu) \mid \ell(\eta) \leq \Pi^{I_{\nu}}(z), \kappa(\eta, z) = y \right\} \times \left\{ \pi \in \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\eta}}(\nu) \mid \ell(\pi) \leq \Pi^{I_{\nu}}(y), \kappa(\pi, y) = x \right\}
\]

is in bijective with the set \(\{ \eta \otimes \pi \in S_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\nu) \mid \kappa(\pi, \kappa(\eta, z)) = x \}\) by the map \((\eta, \pi) \mapsto \eta \otimes \pi\). Hence we have

\[
\text{H}(x) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{W}_{af}} \sum_{\eta \otimes \pi \in S_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\nu)} (-1)^{\ell^{\overrightarrow{\eta}}(x) - \ell^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(z)} e^{-(\text{wt}(\pi) + \text{wt}(\eta))} \text{gch } V_z^-(\lambda).
\]

Moreover, it follows from Proposition 4.4 (2) that the set \(\{ \eta \otimes \pi \in S_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\nu) \mid \kappa(\pi, \kappa(\eta, z)) = x \}\) is in bijective with \(\{ \psi \in \mathbb{B}_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\nu}}(\pi) \mid \kappa(\psi, z) = x \}\) by the map \(\Phi_{\nu, \nu} : \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\mu) = \mathbb{B}_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\nu}}(\pi) \sim S_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\nu) \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B}_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\nu}}(\pi) \otimes \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\nu}}(\nu)\). Therefore we conclude that

\[
\text{H}(x) = \sum_{z \in \mathbb{W}_{af}} \sum_{\psi \in \mathbb{B}_{\leq z}^{\overrightarrow{\nu}}(\pi)} (-1)^{\ell^{\overrightarrow{\psi}}(\eta) - \ell^{\overrightarrow{\psi}}(\mu)} e^{-\text{wt}(\psi)} \text{gch } V_z^-(\lambda).
\]

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.9

**8.2 Proof of Corollary 3.15**Fix \(x \in \mathbb{W}\). Let \(X\) be the subset of \(\mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\mu) \times \mathbb{W}_{af}\) consisting of those elements \((\pi, y)\) satisfying the conditions that \(\ell(\pi) \leq \Pi^{I_{\nu}}(y)\) and \(\kappa(\pi, y) = x\); note that \(y \geq \kappa(\pi, y) = x\) if \((\pi, y) \in X\). Then the right-hand side of (8.2) can be rewritten as:

\[
\sum_{(\pi, y) \in X} (-1)^{\ell^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(y) - \ell^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(x)} e^{-\text{wt}(\pi)} \text{gch } V_y^-(\lambda).
\]

(8.1)

Also, let \(Y\) be the subset of \(\text{QLS}(\mu) \times \mathbb{W}\) consisting of those elements \((\eta, v)\) satisfying the condition that \(\kappa(\eta, v) = x\). We define the map \(\text{cl} : \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\mu) \times \mathbb{W}_{af} \rightarrow \text{QLS}(\mu) \times \mathbb{W}\) by \(\text{cl}(\pi, y) := (\text{cl}(\pi), \text{cl}(y))\) for \((\pi, y) \in \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\mu) \times \mathbb{W}_{af}\) (for the map \(\text{cl} : \mathbb{W}_{af} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}\), see (3.4)). We claim that \(\text{cl}(X) = Y\).

Let \((\eta, v) \in \text{QLS}(\mu) \times \mathbb{W}\), and let \((\pi, y) \in \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\mu) \times \mathbb{W}_{af}\). Write \(\pi \in \mathbb{B}^{\overrightarrow{\pi}}(\mu)\) as:

\[
\pi = (x_1, \ldots, x_a; a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_s), \quad \text{with}
\]

\[
x_u = w_u I_{\nu}(\xi_u) \quad \text{for } w_u \in W^I_{\nu} \text{ and } \xi_u \in Q^\nu, \quad 1 \leq u \leq s.
\]

(8.2)
Assume that $\text{cl}(\pi, y) = (\eta, v)$. If we take $1 \leq u_1 < \cdots < u_r = s$ in such a way that

$$
\begin{align*}
w_1 = \cdots = w_{u_1} &\neq w_{u_1+1} = \cdots = w_{u_2} \neq w_{u_2+1} = \cdots \\
&\cdots \neq w_{u_{r-1}+1} = \cdots = w_s = w_r, \\
\end{align*}
$$

then $\eta \in \text{QLS}(\mu)$ is of the form $\eta = (w_{u_1}, \ldots, w_{u_r}; a_0, a_{u_1}, \ldots, a_{u_r})$. Since $\text{cl}(y) = v$, we see that $y \in \text{W}_{af}$ is of the form $y = vt_\zeta$ for some $\zeta \in Q^\vee$. If $\iota(\pi) \preceq \Pi^J_\mu(y)$, then we deduce by Proposition 2.26 that

$$
\kappa(\pi, y) = \kappa(\eta, v) \cdot t_{[\xi_j]}^\mu + [\zeta - \zeta(\eta, v)]^\mu. 
$$

Moreover, if $\kappa(\pi, y) = x \in \text{W}$, or if $(\pi, y) \in \mathfrak{X}$, then we see by (8.3) that $\kappa(\eta, v) = x$ since $\kappa(\eta, v) \in \text{W}$. Thus we obtain $(\eta, v) \in \mathfrak{X}$, which implies that $\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{Y}$.

By exactly the same argument as for Lemma 3.12 (that is, for [NS3 Lemma 6.2.3]; see also [LNS3 Lemma 2.3.2]), we can show that for each $\eta \in \text{QLS}(\mu)$ and $\chi \in \text{Par}(\mu)$, there exists a unique element $\pi_{\chi, \eta} \in \mathfrak{B}_X(\mu)$ such that $\text{cl}(\pi_{\chi, \eta}) = \eta$ and $\kappa(\pi_{\chi, \eta}) = \kappa(\eta) \in W^{J_\mu}$; for the definitions of $\text{Par}(\mu)$ and $\mathfrak{B}_X(\mu)$, see [4.1] Notice that if $\chi = (\emptyset)_{\in I}$, then $\pi_{\chi, \eta}$ is identical to $\pi_\eta$ in Lemma 3.12. We deduce by [INS Lemma 7.1.4] that if $\iota(\pi_{\eta}) = w\Pi^J_\mu(t_\zeta)$ for some $w \in W^{J_\mu}$ and $\xi \in Q^\vee$, then $\iota(\pi_{\chi, \eta}) = w\Pi^J_\mu(t_{\xi + \iota(\chi)})$ for $\iota(\chi)$, see Remark 4.1. Also, observe that $\text{wt}(\pi_{\chi, \eta}) = \text{wt}(\pi_{\eta}) - |\chi|$. Fix $(\eta, v) \in \mathfrak{Y}$. We claim that for $(\pi, y) \in \mathfrak{B}_X(\mu) \times \text{W}_{af}$,

$$
\text{cl}(\pi, y) = (\eta, v) \text{ and } (\pi, y) \in \mathfrak{X} \iff 
\begin{cases}
\pi = \pi_{\chi, \eta} & \text{for some } \chi \in \text{Par}(\mu), \\
y = vt_{\zeta(\eta, v) + \gamma} & \text{for some } \gamma \in \mathfrak{Y}^{J_\mu} \text{ such that } \gamma \preceq \iota(\chi); 
\end{cases}
$$

notice that the opposite inclusion $\text{cl}(\mathfrak{X}) \subseteq \mathfrak{Y}$ follows from this claim. First, we show the implication $\Rightarrow$. Write $\pi \in \mathfrak{B}_X(\mu)$ in the form (8.2). If we write $y \in \text{W}_{af}$ as $y = vt_\zeta$ with $\zeta \in Q^\vee$ (recall that $\text{cl}(y) = v$), then we see by (8.3) that

$$
x = \kappa(\pi, y) = \kappa(\eta, v) \cdot t_{[\xi_j]}^\mu + [\zeta - \zeta(\eta, v)]^\mu = x \cdot t_{[\xi_j]}^\mu + [\zeta - \zeta(\eta, v)]^\mu; 
$$

recall that $(\pi, y) \in \mathfrak{X}$ and $(\eta, v) \in \mathfrak{Y}$. Therefore, we deduce that $[\xi_j]^\mu + [\zeta - \zeta(\eta, v)]^\mu = 0$, and hence $[\xi_j]^\mu = 0$ and $[\zeta - \zeta(\eta, v)]^\mu = 0$. By the equality $[\xi_j]^\mu = 0$ and Lemma 2.13, we have $\kappa(\pi) = x_s = w_s\Pi^J_\mu(t_\zeta) = w_s \in W^{J_\mu}$. Since $\text{cl}(\pi) = \eta$ by our assumption, we see by the definition that $\pi = \pi_{\chi, \eta}$ if $\pi \in \mathfrak{B}_X(\mu)$ with $\chi \in \text{Par}(\mu)$ (see the previous paragraph). Since $\iota(\pi_{\eta}) = w_1\Pi^J_\mu(t_{\zeta(\eta, v) - \text{wt}(\widetilde{w}_1 \Rightarrow v)})$ by Remark 3.14, it follows that

$$
\iota(\pi) = \iota(\pi_{\chi, \eta}) = w_1\Pi^J_\mu(t_{\zeta(\eta, v) - \text{wt}(\widetilde{w}_1 \Rightarrow v) + \iota(\chi)}). 
$$

Since $(\pi, y) \in \mathfrak{X}$, we have $\Pi^J_\mu(y) = \Pi^J_\mu(vt_\zeta) \succeq \iota(\pi)$. Hence it follows from Lemmas 2.18 and 2.17 (recall that $\widetilde{w}_1 \in w_1W_{J_\mu}$) that

$$
[\zeta]^\mu \geq [\zeta(\eta, v) - \text{wt}(\widetilde{w}_1 \Rightarrow v) + \iota(\chi) + \text{wt}(w_1 \Rightarrow v)]^\mu = [\zeta(\eta, v) + \iota(\chi)]^\mu; 
$$
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recall that \( \iota(\chi) \in Q^\gamma_{J,\mu} \). Combining this inequality with the equality \([\zeta - \zeta(\eta, v)]_J = 0\) shown above, we obtain \( \zeta = \zeta(\eta, v) + \gamma \) for some \( \gamma \in Q^\gamma_{J,\mu} \) such that \( \gamma \geq \iota(\chi) \). Thus we have proved the implication \( \Rightarrow \). Next, we show the implication \( \Leftarrow \). It is obvious that \( \text{cl}(\pi) = \text{cl}(\pi_{\chi,\eta}) = \eta \) and \( \text{cl}(y) = v \). Also, we have \( \iota(\pi) = \iota(\pi_{\chi,\eta}) = w_1 \Pi^I_{\mu}(t_{\zeta(\eta, v)} - \text{wt}(\tilde{w}_1 \Rightarrow v) + \iota(\chi)) \) as shown in (8.6), where \( w_1 = \iota(\eta) \) and \( \tilde{w}_1 = \max(w_1 W_{J,\mu}, \leq v) \). Because

\[
[\zeta(\eta, v) + \gamma]_I = [\zeta(\eta, v) + \iota(\chi)]_I = [\zeta(\eta, v) - \text{wt}(\tilde{w}_1) = v + \iota(\chi) + \text{wt}(w_1) \Rightarrow \gamma]_I
\]

by Lemma 2.17 it follows from Lemma 2.18 that

\[
\Pi^I_{\mu}(y) = \Pi^I_{\mu}(\eta) = \eta, \quad \Pi^I_{\mu}(t_{\zeta(\eta, v)} + \gamma) \geq \eta, \quad \Pi^I_{\mu}(t_{\zeta(\eta, v)} - \text{wt}(\tilde{w}_1) + \iota(\chi)) = \iota(\pi_{\chi,\eta}) = \iota(\pi).
\]

Finally, by the same argument as for (8.5) (applied to the case that \( \zeta_s = 0 \) and \( \zeta = \zeta(\eta, v) + \gamma \)), we deduce that \( \kappa(\pi, y) = \kappa(\eta, v) \cdot t_{[0]_I[\gamma] + [\zeta(\eta, v) + \gamma] - \zeta(\eta, v)]_J = x \). Thus we have shown the implication \( \Leftarrow \), thereby completing the proof of (8.4).

By (8.3), we can rewrite (8.1) (which is identical to the right-hand side of (3.21)) as:

\[
\sum_{\eta \in \text{QLS}(\mu)} \sum_{x \in \text{Par}(\mu)} \sum_{\gamma \in Q^\gamma_{J,\mu}} (1) \sum_{\gamma \geq \iota(\chi)} (-1)^{\tilde{\xi}(v \zeta(\eta, v) + \gamma)} e^{-\text{wt}(\pi_{\chi,\eta})} \text{gch } V^{-\text{wt}(\pi_{\chi,\eta})}(\lambda)
\]

\[
= \sum_{\eta \in \text{QLS}(\mu)} \sum_{x \in \text{Par}(\mu)} \sum_{\gamma \in Q^\gamma_{J,\mu}} (1) \sum_{\gamma \geq \iota(\chi)} (-1)^{\ell(v) - \ell(x)} e^{-\text{wt}(\pi_{\chi,\eta})} q^{-\ell(\lambda, \gamma)} \text{gch } V^{-\text{wt}(\pi_{\chi,\eta})}(\lambda).
\]

Therefore, in order to prove (3.29) in Corollary 3.15 it suffices to show that

\[
\sum_{\chi \in \text{Par}(\mu)} \sum_{\gamma \in Q^\gamma_{J,\mu}} q^{\chi - (\lambda, \gamma)} = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J, \mu} \prod_{k = \lambda_i - \mu_j + 1}^{\lambda_i} \frac{1}{1 - q^{-k}}. \quad (8.7)
\]

For each \( i \in I \setminus J, \mu \), we denote by \( \text{Par}(\mu_i) \) the set of partitions of length less than \( \mu_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \). We rewrite (8.7) as:

\[
\prod_{i \in I \setminus J, \mu} \sum_{\chi^{(i)} = (\chi^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots \leq \chi^{(i)}_{\mu_i - 1} \geq 0)} \sum_{\gamma^{(i)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}^{(i)}} q^{\chi^{(i)} - \lambda_i e_i} = \prod_{i \in I \setminus J, \mu} \prod_{k = \lambda_i - \mu_j + 1}^{\lambda_i} \frac{1}{1 - q^{-k}}.
\]

\[
= \sum_{\chi^{(i)}, c_i \in P^{(i)}} q^{\chi^{(i)} - \lambda_i c_i} = \sum_{\tau \in P^{(i)}} q^{-|\tau|}.
\]
where for each $i \in I \setminus J$, we set
\[
P_1^{(i)} := \{ (\chi^{(i)}, c_i) \mid \chi^{(i)} = (\chi^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \chi^{(i)}_{\mu_i} \geq 0) \in \text{Par}(\mu_i) \text{ and } c_i \in \mathbb{Z}, c_i \geq \chi^{(i)}_1 \},
\]
\[
P_2^{(i)} := \{ \tau = (\tau_1 \geq \tau_2 \geq \cdots \geq \tau_m \geq 0) \mid m \geq 0, \lambda_i - \mu_i + 1 \leq \tau_m \leq \tau_1 \leq \lambda_i \};
\]
recall that $\lambda_i \geq \mu_i$ for every $i \in I \setminus J$. We show that for each $i \in I \setminus J$,
\[
\sum_{(\chi^{(i)}, c_i) \in P_1^{(i)}} q^{\chi^{(i)}_1 - \lambda_i c_i} = \sum_{\tau \in P_2^{(i)}} q^{-|\tau|}.
\] (8.8)

Let $(\chi^{(i)}, c_i) \in P_1^{(i)}$, and write $\chi^{(i)} \in \text{Par}(\mu_i)$ as $\chi^{(i)} = (\chi^{(i)}_1 \geq \cdots \geq \chi^{(i)}_{\mu_i} \geq 0)$. Observe that
\[
(\lambda_i - \mu_i + 1) \text{ times}
\]
is a partition of length less than or equal to $\lambda_i$. We define $\Psi(\chi^{(i)}, c_i)$ to be the conjugate (or transposed) partition of the partition (8.9); it is easily checked that $\Psi(\chi^{(i)}, c_i) \in P_2^{(i)}$. Also, we can easily check that the map $\Psi : P_1^{(i)} \to P_2^{(i)}$ is bijective, and $|\Psi(\chi^{(i)}, c_i)| = -|\chi^{(i)}| + \lambda_i c_i$ for all $(\chi^{(i)}, c_i) \in P_1^{(i)}$. Thus we have shown (8.8), as desired. This completes the proof of Corollary 3.15.

Appendix.

A Example.

Here we apply Corollary 3.15 to the case that $g$ is of type $A_2$ and $\mu = \varpi_1$. Note that $J_\mu = J_{\varpi_1} = \{2\}$, and $W^{J_\mu} = W^{J_{\varpi_1}} = \{ e, s_1, s_2s_1 \}$, $W_\mu = W_{J_{\varpi_1}} = \{ e, s_2 \}$. The quantum Bruhat graph (in type $A_2$) is as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\alpha_1 \quad \alpha_2 \\
\alpha_2 \quad \alpha_1
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
w_0 \\
\theta
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
s_1s_2 \\
s_2s_1
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
s_1 \\
s_2
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
e
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Bruhat}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{quantum}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]
Recall that $\theta$ denotes the highest root $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. We see by direct computation that

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& eW_{J^v_1} & s_1W_{J^v_1} & s_2s_1W_{J^v_1} \\
\hline
e & e & 0 & s_1 & \alpha_1^\vee & w_0 & \theta^\vee \\
s_2 & s_2 & 0 & s_1 & \alpha_1^\vee & s_2s_1 & \alpha_1^\vee \\
s_1 & e & 0 & s_1 & 0 & w_0 & \theta^\vee \\
s_1s_2 & s_2 & 0 & s_1s_2 & 0 & w_0 & \alpha_1^\vee \\
s_2s_1 & s_2 & 0 & s_2s_1 & 0 & w_0 & 0 \\
w_0 & s_2 & 0 & s_1s_2 & 0 & w_0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\quad(A.1)
\]

Here, for $v \in W$ and $w \in W_{J^v_1}$,

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|}
\hline
wW_{J^v_1} & v \max(wW_{J^v_1}, \leq^v) =: \hat{w} \ 	ext{wt}(\hat{w} \Rightarrow v) \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Since $\mu = \varpi_1$ is a minuscule weight, we see by the definition of QLS paths that

\[
\text{QLS}(\mu) = \text{QLS}(\varpi_1) = \{(e; 0, 1), (s_1; 0, 1), (s_2s_1; 0, 1)\};
\]

note that if we set $\eta_w := (w; 0, 1) \in \text{QLS}(\varpi_1)$ for each $w \in W_{J^v_1}$, then $\pi_{\eta} = (w; 0, 1) \in B_{2, 0}^+ (\mu)$, and hence $\text{wt}(\pi_{\eta}) = \text{wt}(\eta_w) = w_0\varpi_1$. Therefore, we deduce from Corollary 3.15 that for $\lambda \in P^+$ such that $\lambda - \varpi_1 \in P^+$ and $x \in W$,

\[
gch V_x^- (\lambda - \varpi_1) = \sum_{v \in W} (-1)^{t(v) - t(x)} e^{-x\varpi_1} gch V_{wt(x \Rightarrow v)}^- (\lambda). \quad(A.2)
\]

For example, if $x = s_2$, then it follows from (A.1) that

\[
\{v \in W \mid \max(s_2W_{J^v_1}, \leq^v) = s_2\} = \{s_2, s_1s_2, s_2s_1, w_0\},
\]

and hence

\[
\text{e}^{\varpi_1} gch V_{s_2}^- (\lambda - \varpi_1) = gch V_{s_2}^- (\lambda) - gch V_{s_1s_2}^- (\lambda) - gch V_{s_2s_1}^- (\lambda) + gch V_{w_0}^- (\lambda).
\]

Similarly, if $x = e$, then

\[
\text{e}^{\varpi_1} gch V_e^- (\lambda - \varpi_1) = gch V_e^- (\lambda) - gch V_{s_1}^- (\lambda) \quad \text{(cf. Proposition 5.3)};
\]

if $x = s_1$, then

\[
\text{e}^{s_1\varpi_1} gch V_{s_1}^- (\lambda - \varpi_1) = -q^{-(\lambda, \alpha_1^\vee)} gch V_e^- (\lambda) + q^{-(\lambda, \alpha_1^\vee)} gch V_{s_2}^- (\lambda) + gch V_{s_1}^- (\lambda) - gch V_{s_2s_1}^- (\lambda);
\]
if $x = s_1s_2$, then
\[
\mathbf{e}^{s_1\omega_1} \operatorname{gch} V^-_{s_1s_2}(\lambda - \omega_1) = \operatorname{gch} V^-_{s_1s_2}(\lambda) - \operatorname{gch} V^-_{w_0}(\lambda);
\]
if $x = s_2s_1$, then
\[
\mathbf{e}^{s_2s_1\omega_1} \operatorname{gch} V^-_{s_2s_1}(\lambda - \omega_1) = -q^{-(\lambda,\alpha_1^\vee)} \operatorname{gch} V^-_{s_2}(\lambda) + \operatorname{gch} V^-_{s_2s_1}(\lambda);
\]
if $x = w_0$, then
\[
\mathbf{e}^{s_2s_1\omega_1} \operatorname{gch} V^-_{w_0}(\lambda - \omega_1) = q^{-(\lambda,\theta^\vee)} \operatorname{gch} V^-_{w_0}(\lambda) + q^{-(\lambda,\alpha_1^\vee)} \operatorname{gch} V^-_{s_1s_2}(\lambda) + \operatorname{gch} V^-_{w_0}(\lambda).
\]
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