

# BIPARTITE EXTENSION GRAPHS AND THE DUFLO–SERGANOVA FUNCTOR

MARIA GORELIK

ABSTRACT. We consider several examples when the extension graph admits a bipartition compatible with the action of Duflo–Serganova functors.

## 0. INTRODUCTION

In this paper  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$  is a complex Lie superalgebra and  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_1$  is such that  $[x, x] = 0$ . This text is based on some results and ideas of [27], [18] and [33]. We give a more detailed presentation of some parts of [27], [18] which are slightly different for  $\mathfrak{osp}$  and  $\mathfrak{gl}$ -cases.

This text is not intended for publication; its different parts have been developed in other papers [14] and [12].

0.1. Let  $\mathcal{C}$  be a category of representations of a Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\text{Irr}(\mathcal{C})$  be the set of isomorphism classes of simple modules in  $\mathcal{C}$ . Assume that the modules in  $\mathcal{C}$  are of finite length.<sup>1</sup> In many examples the extension graph of  $\mathcal{C}$  is bipartite, i.e. there exists a map  $\text{dex} : \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$  such that

$$(\text{Dex1}) \quad \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{C}}^1(L_1, L_2) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \text{dex}(L_1) = \text{dex}(L_2).$$

In this paper we are interested in examples when the map  $\text{dex}$  is “compatible” with the Duflo–Serganova functors  $\text{DS}_x$ , i.e.

$$(\text{Dex2}) \quad \text{one has} \quad [\text{DS}_x(L) : L'] = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \text{dex}(L) \neq \text{dex}(L').$$

Note that in (Dex2) we have to choose  $\text{dex}$  on  $\text{Irr}(\mathcal{C})$  and on  $\text{Irr}(\text{DS}_x(\mathcal{C}))$ . If  $\text{dex}$  satisfies (Dex1) and (Dex2), then  $\text{DS}_x(L)$  is completely reducible for each  $L \in \mathcal{C}$ .

We say that a module  $M$  is *pure* if for any subquotient  $L$  of  $M$ ,  $\Pi(L)$  is not a subquotient of  $M$ . Note that (Dex2) implies the purity of  $\text{DS}_x(L)$  for each  $L \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C})$ .

In what follows  $\mathcal{F}\text{in}(\mathfrak{g})$  stands for the full subcategory of finite-dimensional  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules which are completely reducible over  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . In this paper we consider the case when  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a finite-dimensional Kac–Moody superalgebra and  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{F}\text{in}(\mathfrak{g})$ ; for this case we require that (Dex2) holds for each  $x \in X(\mathfrak{g})$ , where

$$X(\mathfrak{g}) := \{x \in \mathfrak{g}_1 \mid [x, x] = 0\}.$$

---

<sup>1</sup>this can be substituted by existence of local composition series constructed in [3].

For other cases it make sense to restrict (Dex2) to certain values of  $x$ : for instance, for affine superalgebras  $\mathfrak{g}$  it makes sense to consider  $x$  such that  $\mathrm{DS}_x(\mathfrak{g})$  is affine and for  $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g})$  it makes sense to consider  $x$  "preserving" the category  $\mathcal{O}$  (see [11], Sections 7 and 8 respectively).

The examples with dex satisfying (Dex1) and (Dex2) include  $\mathcal{F}\mathrm{in}(\mathfrak{g})$  for  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  (this follows from [21]) and the full subcategory of integrable modules in the category  $\mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{gl}(1|n)^{(1)})$  (this follows from [16]). In Section 2 we will check the existence of dex for exceptional Lie superalgebras. We will introduce dex satisfying (Dex1) for  $\mathfrak{osp}(m|n)$ -case; in [13] we will show that (Dex2) holds in this case too. It would be interesting to find other examples with dex satisfying (Dex1) and (Dex2). The strange superalgebras  $\mathfrak{p}_n, \mathfrak{q}_n$  do not admit dex satisfying (Dex1), (Dex2). By [17], for  $n \leq 3$ ,  $\mathcal{F}\mathrm{in}(\mathfrak{q}_n)$  admits dex satisfying (Dex1); this does not hold for larger  $n$ , see [26]. Moreover, the module  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L)$  is not pure for each atypical  $L \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F}\mathrm{in}(\mathfrak{q}_2))$  (and  $x \neq 0$ ), see [11], 5.5.2. By contrast, the module  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L)$  is pure for  $L \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F}\mathrm{in}(\mathfrak{p}_n))$  if  $x$  is of rank 1, see [8].

In [18], C. Gruson and V. Serganova express the character of a simple finite-dimensional  $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$ -module in terms of a basis consisting of "Euler characters". Using dex we will show that all coefficients in such formula have the same sign (equal to  $\mathrm{dex}(L)$ ) (we call this property "positiveness"). The similar formulae hold for the simple modules in  $\mathcal{F}\mathrm{in}(\mathfrak{g})$ , where  $\mathfrak{g}$  is an exceptional Lie superalgebra or  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|n)^{(1)}$  (see [24],[34]). For  $\mathfrak{q}_n$  the character formula of the above form was obtained in [30],[31] (see also [1]). In [14] we will prove a Gruson-Serganova type character formula for  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ -case.

The reduced Grothendieck ring is the quotient of the Grothendieck ring modulo the relation  $[N] + [\Pi N] = 0$ . If  $\mathcal{C}$  is rigid, then  $*$  induces an involution of the reduced Grothendieck ring. By Hinich's Lemma, DS-functor induces a homomorphism  $\mathrm{ds}$  of the reduced Grothendieck rings; this homomorphism, introduced in [21], is compatible with the above involutions (in many cases the reduced Grothendieck ring is isomorphic to the ring of supercharacters so  $\mathrm{ds}$  can be represented as the restriction of supercharacters to a subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{h}$ ; for the algebras from the list (1) the homomorphism  $\mathrm{ds}$  was studied in [22]).

**0.2. The map dex for finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebras.** Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be one of the following superalgebras:

- (1)  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n), \mathfrak{osp}(m|2n)$  for  $m, n \geq 0$ ,  $D(2, 1|a)$ ,  $F(4)$ ,  $G(3)$ ,  $\mathfrak{sl}(m|n)$  for  $m \neq n$ .

Note that the list (1) includes  $\mathfrak{gl}(0|0) = \mathfrak{osp}(1|0) = \mathfrak{osp}(0|0) = 0$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|0) = \mathbb{C}$  and the reductive Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{gl}_m, \mathfrak{o}_m, \mathfrak{sp}_m$ . For each value of  $x$ , the algebra  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  is again one of the algebras from the list (1).

Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . We denote by  $\Lambda_{m|n}$  the integral weight lattice in  $\mathfrak{h}^*$ ; this lattice is equipped by the standard parity function  $p : \Lambda_{m|n} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$  (for

$\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$  and  $G(3)$  the lattice  $\Lambda_{m|n}$  is spanned by  $\varepsilon_i$ s and  $\delta_j$ s with  $p(\varepsilon_i) := \bar{0}$  and  $p(\delta_j) := \bar{1}$ . For our purposes the study of the category  $\mathcal{F}\text{in}(\mathfrak{g})$  of finite dimensional representations of  $\mathfrak{g}$  reduces to study the category  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$  with the modules whose weights lie in  $\Lambda_{m|n}$ . In its turn, the category  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$  decomposes into a direct sum two equivalent categories

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}) \oplus \Pi(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})),$$

where the grading on the modules in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$  is induced by the parity function  $p$ . Our goal is to find a map

$$\text{dex} : \text{Irr}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$$

satisfying (Dex1) and (Dex2). By [33], for each  $L \in \text{Irr}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g}))$  there exists  $x$  such that  $\text{DS}_x(L)$  is a non-zero typical module. Therefore it is enough to define dex on the typical simple modules. If this is done in such a way that  $\text{dex}(\Pi(L)) \neq \text{dex}(L)$ , then dex satisfying (Dex2) is unique and satisfies

$$(2) \quad \text{dex}(\Pi(L)) \neq \text{dex}(L) \quad \text{for each } L \in \text{Irr}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})).$$

**0.3. Reduction to  $\text{DS}_1$ .** In many cases it is enough to check (Dex2) for one particular value of  $x$ . We continue to consider the case when  $\mathfrak{g}$  is as in (1) (the same reasoning work for symmetrizable affine Lie superalgebras for  $x$  as in Section 9 of [11]). We set

$$\text{rank } x := \text{defect } \mathfrak{g} - \text{defect } \mathfrak{g}_x \quad \text{for } x \in X(\mathfrak{g}).$$

By [5],  $\mathfrak{g}_x \cong \mathfrak{g}_y$  if  $x, y \in X(\mathfrak{g})$  are such that  $\text{rank } x = \text{rank } y$ ; we set

$$X(\mathfrak{g})_r := \{x \in X(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \text{rank } x = r\}.$$

Using Lemma 2.4.1 in [11], one can reduce (Dex2) to the case  $x \in X(\mathfrak{g})_1$  (see [13], Section 9 for details). Fix any  $x \in X(\mathfrak{g})_1$  and denote  $\text{DS}_x$  by  $\text{DS}_1$ . Using the results of [5], it is easy to see that for each  $y \in X(\mathfrak{g})_1$  there exists an automorphism  $\phi \in \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$  satisfying  $\phi(x) = y$ ; this automorphism induces an isomorphism  $\bar{\phi} : \mathfrak{g}_x \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathfrak{g}_y$  and  $\text{DS}_x(N^\phi) = (\text{DS}_y(N))^{\bar{\phi}}$ . Thus  $\text{DS}_1$  is “independent” from the choice of  $x$ ; in particular, if the formula (Dex2) holds for  $\text{DS}_x$ , then it holds for each  $y \in X(\mathfrak{g})_1$ . The argument of [13], Section 9 give

*if dex satisfies (Dex1), (2) and (Dex2) holds for some  $x$  of rank 1, then*

$$(3) \quad \text{DS}_{x'}(L) \cong \underbrace{\text{DS}_1(\text{DS}_1 \dots \text{DS}_1(L) \dots)}_{\text{rank } x' \text{ times}} \quad \text{for any } L \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{F}\text{in}(\mathfrak{g})) \text{ and each } x' \in X(\mathfrak{g}).$$

In this way, the computation of  $\text{DS}_x(L)$  reduces to the computation of the multiplicities  $[\text{DS}_1(L') : L'']$  for each quadruple  $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}'', L', L'')$ , where

$$\mathfrak{g}' := \underbrace{\text{DS}_1(\text{DS}_1 \dots \text{DS}_1(\mathfrak{g}) \dots)}_{i \text{ times}}, \quad \mathfrak{g}'' := \text{DS}_1(\mathfrak{g}')$$

and  $L' \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{F}\text{in}(\mathfrak{g}'))$ ,  $L'' \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{F}\text{in}(\mathfrak{g}''))$ .

0.3.1. The multiplicities  $[\mathrm{DS}_1(L') : L'']$  were computed for  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  in [21]. For the exceptional cases we compute the multiplicities in Section 2. For the remaining case  $\mathfrak{osp}(m|n)$  the multiplicities are computed in [13]. In all these cases the following properties hold:

- the module  $\mathrm{DS}_1(L')$  is pure;
- $[\mathrm{DS}_1(L') : L''] \leq 2$ ;
- $[\mathrm{DS}_1(L') : L''] \leq 1$  for  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ ;
- there exists  $\mathrm{dex}$  satisfying (Dex1), (2) and the formula (Dex2) for the case when  $\mathrm{rank} x = 1$ .

By above, this implies (Dex2) (for any  $x \in X(\mathfrak{g})$ ) and shows that  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L)$  is pure, semisimple and can be computed via the formula (3).

0.3.2. In 2.3.3 we compute  $\mathrm{DS}_1(L)$  for  $F(4)$ . The results imply that the image of the Grothendieck ring of  $\mathcal{F}(F(4))$  under the homomorphism  $\mathrm{ds}$  coincides with  $\sigma$ -invariants in the Grothendieck ring of  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$  for  $\sigma$  induced by a Dynkin diagram involution of  $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ . For all other algebras from the list (1) a similar result is obtained in [22].

0.3.3. *Remark.* By [8],  $\mathrm{DS}_1(L)$  is pure and multiplicity free for each  $L \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{F}\mathrm{in}(\mathfrak{p}_n))$ ; however,  $\mathrm{DS}_1(L)$  is not always semisimple, (3) does not hold and  $\mathrm{DS}_1(\mathrm{DS}_1(L))$  is not always pure (see [11], Example 3.4.3).

0.3.4. *Question.* Let  $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{g}$  be a parabolic subalgebra containing  $\mathfrak{b}$  with the property that the defect of the Levi subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{p}$  is less by one than the defect of  $\mathfrak{g}$ . We denote by  $L(\lambda)$  (resp.,  $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$ ) a simple  $\mathfrak{g}$  (resp.,  $\mathfrak{p}$ ) module of the highest weight  $\lambda$ . For  $L(\lambda) \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$  we define  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}^i(L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda))$  as in [18] (see 3.1 below) and consider the multiplicities

$$m_{\lambda,\mu}^{(i)} := [\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}^i(L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)) : L_{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)].$$

One has  $m_{\lambda,\lambda}^{(0)} = 1$ . In all our examples  $m_{\lambda,\mu}^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}$  and, except for the case  $m_{\lambda,\lambda}^{(0)}$ , one has

$$m_{\lambda,\mu}^{(i)} \neq 0 \implies \mathrm{dex}(L(\lambda)) - \mathrm{dex}(L(\mu)) \equiv i + 1 \pmod{2}.$$

It is interesting to know whether these properties hold in other cases.

**0.4. Content of the paper.** In Section 1 we recall the construction of DS-functor.

In Section 2 we consider the cases  $\mathfrak{g} = D(2|1; a)$ ,  $F(4)$ ,  $G(3)$  and  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ . We compute  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L)$  for  $L \in \mathrm{Irr}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g}))$  and check that  $\mathrm{dex}$  satisfies (Dex1), (Dex2) and (2). The modules  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L)$  can be described as follows. To each atypical block  $\mathcal{B}$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$  we assign a  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module  $L'$  (this assignment is injective). By [10], for each atypical block of  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ ,  $G(3)$  the extension graph  $\mathrm{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  is  $D_{\infty}$ ; for the cases  $F(4)$ ,  $D(2|1; a)$  the graphs of atypical blocks are  $A_{\infty}^{\infty}$  and  $D_{\infty}$  (see [10], [25]). If  $\mathrm{Ext}(\mathcal{B}) = D_{\infty}$ , then  $L'$  is simple and  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L) \cong L'$  if  $L \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{B})$  is an “end vertex” of  $D_{\infty}$  and  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L) \cong \Pi^i(L')^{\oplus 2}$  if  $L$  is the  $i$ th vertex

counting from the ends. For  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B}) = A_\infty^\infty$  one has  $\text{DS}_x(L) \cong \Pi^i(L')$  for each  $L \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{B})$ . For  $\mathfrak{g} = F(4)$ ,  $D(2|1; a)$  the module  $L'$  corresponding to  $D_\infty$ -graph is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module satisfying  $(L')^* \cong L'$ , whereas the module  $L'$  corresponding to  $A_\infty^\infty$ -graph is of the form  $L' = V \oplus V^*$ , where  $V$  is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module with  $V^* \not\cong V$ .

In Section 3 we construct for each block  $\mathcal{B}$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$  a graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\times$  and its subgraph  $\Gamma^\times$  defined in terms of the functors  $\Gamma^i$  introduced in [29] and [18] (we follow the definition in [18]). The extension graph  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  is a subgraph of  $\hat{\Gamma}^\times$ ; the graph  $\Gamma^\times$  is useful for Gruson-Serganova type character formulae. In 3.5.7 we introduce a notion of “parametric bipartition” on the graphs  $\hat{\Gamma}^\times$ ,  $\Gamma^\times$ ; a parametric bipartition on  $\hat{\Gamma}^\times$  induces a bipartition on  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$ ; a parametric bipartition on  $\Gamma^\times$  gives a “positive” Gruson-Serganova type character formulae. In Corollary 3.6.3 we show that under a certain conditions (which hold in the  $\mathfrak{osp}$ -case)  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  is a subgraph of  $\Gamma^\times$  and a parametric bipartition on  $\Gamma^\times$  induces a bipartition on  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$ .

The graphs  $\hat{\Gamma}^\times$ ,  $\Gamma^\times$  depend on the choice of triangular decomposition; for the case  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2) \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2|1)$  the graph  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  is a subgraph of  $\Gamma^\times$  for the “mixed” triangular decomposition and is not a subgraph of  $\Gamma^\times$  for the distinguished one, see Remark 3.9.4. By [27], for  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ -case the map  $\text{dex}$  gives a parametric bipartition on  $\hat{\Gamma}^\times$ ; we check that this also holds for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ ,  $D(2|1; a)$ ,  $F(4)$  and  $G(3)$ .

In Section 4 we consider the principal block  $\mathcal{B}$  for  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2n + t|2n)$  with  $t = 0, 1, 2$ . In this case the extension graph of  $\mathcal{B}$  is a subgraph of  $\Gamma^\times$ . We describe  $\text{dex}$  which gives a parametric bipartition on  $\Gamma^\times$ ; this implies (Dex1) and “positiveness” of the Gruson-Serganova character formula.

In Section 5 we give a description of  $\Gamma^\times$  in the  $\mathfrak{osp}$ -case using the language of “arch diagrams” introduced in [13]. The results of this section are not used in the rest of the paper.

In Appendix we explain why  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  is a subgraph of  $\hat{\Gamma}^\times$  (this part essentially follows Sect. 6 of [27]).

**0.5. Acknowledgments.** The author is grateful to I. Entova-Aizenbud, V. Hinich, T. Heidersdorf, C. Hoyt, I. M. Musson, S. Reif, V. Serganova, A. Sherman and C. Stroppel for numerous helpful discussions.

**0.6. Index of definitions and notation.** Throughout the paper the ground field is  $\mathbb{C}$ ;  $\mathbb{N}$  stands for the set of non-negative integers. We will use the standard Kac’s notation [23] for the root systems.

dex, (Dex1), (Dex2), pure	0.1
$\Lambda_{m n}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g}), \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$	0.2
$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^i, {}^i K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\nu}$	3.1
increasing/decreasing paths	3.4.1
decreasingly equivalent	3.4.2
(BB)	Lemma 3.4.4
$\Lambda^\chi, \text{tail}(\lambda), \mathfrak{p}_\lambda$	3.5
$\hat{\Gamma}^\chi, \kappa,$	3.5.1
$\Gamma^\chi, (\text{Tail})$	3.5.2
parametric bipartition	3.5.7
$\mathcal{E}_\lambda$	(13) in 3.7
weight diagram	4.2.1
$\text{Diag}_{k;t}, \lambda(f)$	4.2.4
$\tau$	4.2.5
dex for $\mathfrak{osp}$ -case, $\ \lambda\ , \ \lambda\ _{gr}$	4.3

## 1. DS-FUNCTOR

The DS-functor was introduced in [5]; see also [15] for an expanded exposition. We recall definitions and some results below. In this section  $\mathfrak{g}$  is any superalgebra; we set  $X(\mathfrak{g}) := \{x \in \mathfrak{g}_1 \mid [x, x] = 0\}$ .

**1.1. Construction.** For a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $M$  and  $g \in \mathfrak{g}$  we set  $M^g := \text{Ker}_M g$ . For  $x \in X(\mathfrak{g})$  we set

$$\text{DS}_x(M) := M^x / xM.$$

Notice that  $\mathfrak{g}^x$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_x := \text{DS}_x(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathfrak{g}^x / [x, \mathfrak{g}]$  are Lie superalgebras. Since  $M^x, xM$  are  $\mathfrak{g}^x$ -invariant and  $[x, \mathfrak{g}]M^x \subset xM$ ,  $\text{DS}_x(M)$  is a  $\mathfrak{g}^x$ -module and  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module. Thus

$$\text{DS}_x : M \mapsto \text{DS}_x(M)$$

is a functor from the category of  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules to the category of  $\text{DS}_x(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules.

There are canonical isomorphisms  $\text{DS}_x(\Pi(N)) = \Pi(\text{DS}_x(N))$  and

$$\text{DS}_x(M) \otimes \text{DS}_x(N) = \text{DS}_x(M \otimes N).$$

For a finite-dimensional module  $L$  one has  $\text{DS}_x(L^*) \cong \text{DS}_x(L)^*$ .

**1.2. Hinich's Lemma.** The following result is called *Hinich's Lemma* (see [5]); a similar result is Lemma 2.1 in [21].

A short exact sequence of  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow 0$$

induces a long exact sequence of  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow \text{DS}_x(M_1) \rightarrow \text{DS}_x(N) \rightarrow \text{DS}_x(M_2) \rightarrow \Pi(Y) \rightarrow 0$$

where  $Y$  is some  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module. We will use Hinich's Lemma in the following situation.

Let  $N$  be a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module with a three-step filtration

$$0 = F_0(N) \subset F_1(N) \subset F_2(N) \subset F_3(N) = N$$

with the quotients  $M_1, M_2, M_3$  (where  $M_i := F_i(N)/F_{i-1}(N)$ ).

1.2.1. **Corollary.** *If  $\mathrm{DS}_x(N) = 0$  and*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(\mathrm{DS}_x(M_1), \Pi(\mathrm{DS}_x(M_3))) = 0,$$

*then there exists an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \Pi(\mathrm{DS}_x(M_3)) \rightarrow \mathrm{DS}_x(M_2) \rightarrow \Pi(\mathrm{DS}_x(M_1)) \rightarrow 0.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathrm{DS}_x(N) = 0$ , the Hinich's Lemma gives an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow \mathrm{DS}_x(M_1) \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathrm{DS}_x(N/M_1) \rightarrow \Pi(Y_1) \rightarrow 0$$

which implies  $\mathrm{DS}_x(N/M_1) \cong \Pi(\mathrm{DS}_x(M_1))$ . Using the Hinich's Lemma for  $N/M_1$  we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow Y_2 \rightarrow \mathrm{DS}_x(M_2) \rightarrow \Pi(\mathrm{DS}_x(M_1)) \xrightarrow{\psi} \mathrm{DS}_x(M_3) \rightarrow \Pi(Y_2) \rightarrow 0.$$

By the assumption,  $\psi = 0$ , so  $\mathrm{DS}_x(M_3) \cong \Pi(Y_2)$  which gives the required exact sequence.  $\square$

## 2. THE MAP $\mathrm{dex}$ FOR $\mathfrak{g}$ OF DEFECT 1

The simplest non-trivial extension graphs are  $A_\infty, A_\infty^\infty$  and  $D_\infty$ :

$$(4) \quad \begin{array}{lcl} A_\infty : & & L^0 - L^1 - L^2 - L^3 - L^4 - \dots \\ A_\infty^\infty : & \dots & L^{-2} - L^{-1} - L^0 - L^1 - L^2 - \dots \\ D_\infty : & L^1 - & L^2 - L^3 - L^4 - \dots \\ & & \mid \\ & & L^0 \end{array}$$

(we depict  $\longleftrightarrow$  by  $-$ ). J. Germoni conjectured that the extension graph of each blocks of atypicality 1 for a basic classical Lie superalgebra is either  $A_\infty^\infty$  or  $D_\infty$ ; this conjecture was checked in [9],[10] for all cases except  $F(4)$ , which was completed in [25].

**2.1. Proposition.** *Take a non-zero  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_1$  satisfying  $x^2 = 0$ .*

*Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be a block and  $\text{Irr}(\mathcal{B}) =: \{L^i\}_{i \in I}$ . We assume that each  $L^i \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{B})$  has a projective cover with a three step radical filtration with the following subquotients*

$$(5) \quad L^i; \bigoplus_{j \in \text{Adj}(i)} L^j; L^i, \quad \text{where } \text{Adj}(i) := \{j \in I \mid \text{Ext}^1(L^i, L^j) \neq 0\}.$$

*We set  $M_i := \text{DS}_x(L^i)$ . Assume that for some  $s$  the module  $M_s$  is pure and*

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}_x)}^1(M_s, M_s) = 0.$$

- (i) *For each  $i \in I$  the module  $M_i$  is pure. Moreover, if  $M_s \neq 0$ , then  $M_i \neq 0$  for each  $i \in I$ .*
- (ii) *If  $M_s \neq 0$ , then the extension graph  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  is bipartite.*
- (iii) *Using the notation of (4) we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \text{Ext}(\mathcal{B}) = A_\infty & \text{ then } M_j \cong \Pi^j(M_0)^{\oplus 2} \text{ for } j \geq 1; \\ \text{if } \text{Ext}(\mathcal{B}) = D_\infty & \text{ then } M_j \cong \Pi^{j-1}(M_0)^{\oplus 2} \text{ for } j \geq 2, M_1 \cong M_0; \\ \text{if } \text{Ext}(\mathcal{B}) = A_\infty^\infty & \text{ then } M_j \cong \Pi^j(M_0). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* By [5], the functor  $\text{DS}_x$  (for  $x \neq 0$ ) kills the projective modules in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$ . Using Corollary 1.2.1 and (5) we conclude that for any  $i$  the purity of  $M_i$  implies the existence of an exact sequence

$$(6) \quad 0 \rightarrow \Pi(M_i) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \in \text{Adj}(i)} M_j \rightarrow \Pi(M_i) \rightarrow 0$$

In particular, the purity of  $M_i$  implies the purity of  $M_j$  for each  $j \in \text{Adj}(i)$  and  $M_i = 0$  implies  $M_j = 0$  for  $j \in \text{Adj}(i)$ . Since  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  is connected, this proves (i).

Let  $L'$  be a simple module  $L'$  such that  $[M_s : L'] \neq 0$ . For each  $i \in I$  set  $p_i := [M_i : L']$ ,  $q_i := [M_i : \Pi(L')]$ . By above,  $p_s \neq 0$ . Using (6) and (i) we obtain

$$(7) \quad p_i, q_i \geq 0, \quad 2q_i = \sum_{j \in \text{Adj}(i)} p_j, \quad 2p_i = \sum_{j \in \text{Adj}(i)} q_j, \quad p_i q_i = 0$$

for each  $i \in I$ . In particular, if  $p_j = q_j = 0$  for some  $j$ , then  $p_i = q_i = 0$  for each  $i$ , a contradiction. Hence for each  $i$  either  $p_i \neq 0$  or  $q_i \neq 0$ . It is easy to see from (7) that  $p_i = 0$  if  $L^i, L^s$  are connected by a path of odd length. Hence  $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{B})$  does not have cycles of odd length; this gives (ii). For  $A_\infty$  and  $D_\infty$ , (iii) follows from (7) by induction. For the case  $A_\infty^\infty$  observe that  $m_i := p_i + q_i$  satisfies  $2m_i = m_{i-1} + m_{i+1}$  for  $i \in I = \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $m_i \geq 0$ , we get  $m_i = m_s$  for each  $i$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$



**2.2. DS-functor for small rank  $\mathfrak{g}$ .** Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be one of the Lie superalgebras

$$\mathfrak{osp}(2|2), \mathfrak{osp}(3|2), D(2|1; a), G(3), F(4).$$

Let  $\mathfrak{h}$  be a Cartan subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$ . We denote by  $W$  the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and by  $(-|-)$  the symmetric non-degenerate form on  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  which is induced by a non-degenerate invariant form on  $\mathfrak{g}$ .

**2.2.1.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a base of  $\mathfrak{g}$  which contains an isotropic root  $\beta$ . Fix a non-zero  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ .

Set  $\Delta_x := (\beta^\perp \cap \Delta) \setminus \{\beta, -\beta\}$ . By [5],  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  can be identified with a subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{g}$  generated by the root spaces  $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$  with  $\alpha \in \Delta_x$  and a Cartan subalgebra  $\mathfrak{h}_x \subset \mathfrak{h}$ . If  $\Delta_x$  is not empty, then  $\Delta_x$  is the root system of the Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  and one can choose  $\Sigma_x$  in  $\Delta_x$  such that  $\Delta^+(\Sigma_x) = \Delta^+ \cap \Delta_x$ . If  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(m|2)$ , then  $\mathfrak{g}_x = \mathfrak{o}_{m-2}$ ; for  $\mathfrak{g} = D(2|1; a), G_3, F_4$  one has  $\mathfrak{g}_x = \mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{sl}_2, \mathfrak{sl}_3$  respectively.

**2.2.2. Lemma.** *Let  $L := L(\lambda)$  be a finite-dimensional module and  $(\lambda|\beta) = 0$ . Set  $L' := L_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(\lambda|_{\mathfrak{h}_x})$ . One has*

$$DS_x(L) \cong \begin{cases} L' & \text{for } \mathfrak{osp}(2|2), \mathfrak{osp}(3|2), G(3) \\ L' & \text{for } D(2|1; a), F(4) \text{ if } L' \cong (L')^* \\ L' \oplus (L')^* & \text{for } D(2|1; a), F(4) \text{ if } L' \not\cong (L')^*. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* It is easy to see that  $[DS_x(L) : L'] = 1$ . Set  $\lambda' := \lambda|_{\mathfrak{h}_x}$ . From [5], Sect. 7,  $DS_x(L)$  is a typical module and each simple subquotient of  $DS_x(L)$  is of the form  $L_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(\nu)$  with  $\nu \in \{\lambda', \sigma(\lambda')\}$ , where  $\sigma = \text{Id}$  for  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2|2), \mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$  and  $G(3)$ ,  $\sigma = -\text{Id}$  for  $D(2|1; a)$  and  $\sigma$  is the Dynkin diagram automorphism of  $\mathfrak{g}_x = \mathfrak{sl}_3$  in  $F(4)$ -case. This gives the first formula. For  $D(2|1; a), F(4)$  one has  $L_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(\nu)^* \cong L_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(\sigma(\nu))$ ; this gives the second formula. For  $\mathfrak{g} = D(2|1; a), F(4)$  the Weyl group contains  $-\text{Id}$ , so  $L \cong L^*$  and thus  $DS_x(L) \cong DS_x(L^*)$  by 1.1. This implies the third formula.  $\square$

**2.2.3.** We fix a triangular decomposition of  $\mathfrak{g}_0$  and denote by  $\Delta_0^+$  the corresponding set of positive roots. We consider all bases  $\Sigma$  for  $\Delta$  which satisfy  $\Delta_0^+ \subset \Delta^+(\Sigma)$ . We say that an isotropic root  $\beta$  is of the *first type* if  $\beta$  lies in a base  $\Sigma$  with  $\Delta_0^+ \subset \Delta^+(\Sigma)$ .

Take any base  $\Sigma$  as above and denote by  $\rho$  the corresponding Weyl vector. It is easy to see that a simple atypical module  $L = L(\nu)$  satisfies the assumptions of Lemma 2.2.2 for some  $\Sigma'$  and  $\beta \in \Sigma'$  if and only if  $\nu + \rho$  is orthogonal to an isotropic root of the first type.

**2.3. Blocks of atypicality 1.** The blocks of atypicality 1 for basic classical Lie superalgebras were studied by J. Germoni in [9],[10] and by L. Martirosyan in [25]. These blocks satisfy the assumption of Proposition 2.1 and have the following extension graphs:

$$A_\infty \text{ for } \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(m|n), \mathfrak{osp}(2m|2n), F(4), D(2|1; a) \text{ for } a \in \mathbb{Q};$$

$$D_\infty \text{ for } \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2m+1|2n), \mathfrak{osp}(2m|2n), F(4), G(3), D(2|1; a).$$

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be as in 2.2 and  $\mathcal{B}$  be an atypical block.

We call a block containing the trivial module  $L(0)$  a *principal block*. Clearly,  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L(0))$  is the trivial  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module, so 2.1 gives  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L)$  for each  $L \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{B}_0)$ . For  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$  the principal block is the only atypical block.

Combining 2.1 and 2.2.2, 2.2.3 we see that in order to compute  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L)$  for each  $L$  in  $\mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{B})$ , it is enough to find  $L(\nu) \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{B})$  such that  $\nu + \rho$  is orthogonal to an isotropic root of the first type. Below we will list such  $\nu$  for each non-principal atypical block in the remaining cases  $D(2|1; a)$ ,  $F(4)$  and  $G(3)$ .

2.3.1. *Case  $D(2|1; a)$ .* For  $\mathfrak{g} := D(2|1; a)$  one has  $\mathfrak{g}_x = \mathbb{C}$ . The atypical blocks were described in [10], Thm. 3.1.1.

The extension graph of the principal block  $\mathcal{B}_0$  is  $D_\infty$ , so for  $L^i \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{B}_0)$  we have  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L^i) = \mathbb{C}$  for  $i = 0, 1$  and  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L^i) = \Pi^{i-1}(\mathbb{C})^{\oplus 2}$  for  $i > 1$  (where  $\mathbb{C}$  stands for the trivial even  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module).

If  $a$  is irrational, the principal block is the only atypical block in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$ . Consider the case when  $a$  is rational. Recall that  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  has an orthogonal basis  $\{\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3\}$  with

$$\|\varepsilon_1\|^2 = \frac{a}{2}, \quad \|\varepsilon_2\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \|\varepsilon_3\|^2 = -\frac{1+a}{2};$$

let  $\varepsilon_1^*, \varepsilon_2^*, \varepsilon_3^*$  be the dual basis in  $\mathfrak{h}$ . The lattice  $\Lambda_{2|1}$  is spanned by  $\varepsilon_i$ s; the parity map is given by  $p(\varepsilon_1) = p(\varepsilon_2) = \bar{0}$ ,  $p(\varepsilon_3) = \bar{1}$ . One has

$$D(2|1; 1) = \mathfrak{osp}(4|2), \quad D(2|1; a) \cong D(2|1; -1-a) \cong D(2|1; a^{-1})$$

so we can assume that  $0 < a < 1$  and write  $a = \frac{p}{q}$ , where  $p, q$  are relatively prime positive integers.

The atypical blocks are  $\mathcal{B}_k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  (the principal block is  $\mathcal{B}_0$ ). Consider the block  $\mathcal{B}_k$  with  $k > 0$ . The extension graph of  $\mathcal{B}_k$  is  $A_\infty^\infty$ . By [10], Thm. 3.1.1, the block  $\mathcal{B}_k$  contains a simple module  $L$  with the highest weight  $\lambda_{k;0}$  satisfying  $(\lambda_{k;0} + \rho|\beta) = 0$  for

$$\beta := -\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3.$$

Taking  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$  we can identify  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  with  $\mathbb{C}h$  for  $h := q\varepsilon_1^* + p\varepsilon_2^*$ . Combining 2.2.2 and 2.2.3 we get

$$\mathrm{DS}_x(L) = L_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(k) \oplus L_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(-k),$$

where  $L_{\mathfrak{g}_x}(u)$  stands for the even one-dimensional  $\mathfrak{g}_x$ -module with  $h$  acting by  $u(p^2 + q^2)$ . By Proposition 2.1,  $\mathrm{DS}_x(L^i) \cong \Pi^i(\mathrm{DS}_x(L))$  for each  $L^i \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{B}_k)$  (for  $k > 0$ ).

2.3.2. *Case  $G(3)$ .* For  $\mathfrak{g} := G(3)$  the atypical blocks were described in [10], Thm. 4.1.1. The atypical blocks in  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$  are  $\mathcal{B}_k$  for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ; the extension graphs are  $D_\infty$ . The block  $\mathcal{B}_k$  contains a simple module with the highest weight  $\lambda_{k;0}$  satisfying  $(\lambda_{k;0} + \rho|\beta) = 0$  for

$$\beta := -\varepsilon_1 + \delta.$$

Taking  $\Sigma := \{\delta - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 - \delta, \delta\}$  and  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$  we can identify  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  with  $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ -triple corresponding to the root  $\alpha = \varepsilon_1 + 2\varepsilon_2$ . One has  $\lambda_{k;0} = k\alpha$ . Combining 2.2.2 and 2.1 we get

$$\mathrm{DS}_x(L^0) \cong \mathrm{DS}_x(L^1) \cong L_{\mathfrak{sl}_2}(2k), \quad \mathrm{DS}_x(L^i) = \Pi^{i-1}(L_{\mathfrak{sl}_2}(2k))^{\oplus 2} \quad \text{for } i > 1.$$

2.3.3. *Case  $F(4)$ .* For  $\mathfrak{g} := F(4)$  we have  $\mathfrak{g}_x \cong \mathfrak{sl}_3$ . The integral weight lattice is spanned by  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3)$  and  $\frac{1}{2}\delta$ ; the parity is given by  $p(\frac{\varepsilon_i}{2}) = \bar{0}$  and  $p(\frac{\delta}{2}) = \bar{1}$ .

The atypical blocks are described in [25], Thm. 2.1. These blocks are parametrized by the pairs  $(m_1, m_2)$ , where  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $m_1 - m_2 \in 3\mathbb{N}$ . We denote the corresponding block by  $\mathcal{B}_{(m_1; m_2)}$ .

The extension graph of  $\mathcal{B}_{(i; i)}$  is  $D_\infty$ ; the block  $\mathcal{B}_{(0; 0)}$  is principal. For  $i > 0$  the block  $\mathcal{B}_{(i; i)}$  contains a simple module  $L(\lambda)$  with

$$\lambda + \rho = (i+1)(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2) - \beta_1, \quad \text{where } \beta_1 := \frac{1}{2}(-\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3 + \delta).$$

One has  $(\lambda + \rho | \beta_1) = 0$ . Take  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\beta_1}$  and consider the base

$$\Sigma_1 := \{\beta_1; \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3 - \delta); \varepsilon_3; \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2\}.$$

Then  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  can be identified with  $\mathfrak{sl}_3$  corresponding to the set of simple roots  $\{\varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3; \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_3\}$  and Lemma 2.2.2 gives

$$\mathrm{DS}_x(L(\lambda)) = L_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}(i\omega_1 + i\omega_2),$$

where  $\omega_1, \omega_2$  are the fundamental weights of  $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ . By 2.1 we get for  $L^j \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{B}_{(i; i)})$ :

$$\mathrm{DS}_x(L^0) \cong \mathrm{DS}_x(L^1) \cong L_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}(i\omega_1 + i\omega_2), \quad \mathrm{DS}_x(L^j) \cong \Pi^{j-1}(L_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}(i\omega_1 + i\omega_2))^{\oplus 2} \quad \text{for } j > 1.$$

Consider a block  $\mathcal{B}_{(i_1; i_2)}$  for  $i_1 \neq i_2$ . The extension graph of this block is  $A_\infty^\infty$  and this block contains a simple module  $L := L(\lambda')$  with

$$\lambda' + \rho = i_1\varepsilon_1 + i_2\varepsilon_2 + (i_1 - i_2)\varepsilon_3.$$

In particular,  $(\lambda' + \rho | \beta_2) = 0$  for  $\beta_2 := \frac{1}{2}(-\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_3 + \delta)$ . Taking  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\beta_1}$  and

$$\Sigma_2 := \{\beta_2; \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3; -\beta_1; \frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3 + \delta)\}$$

we identify  $\mathfrak{g}_x$  with  $\mathfrak{sl}_3$  corresponding to the set of simple roots  $\{\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3; \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_3\}$ . Combining Lemma 2.2.2 and 2.1 we get

$$\mathrm{DS}_x(L) = L_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}(i_1\omega_1 + i_2\omega_2) \oplus L_{\mathfrak{sl}_3}(i_2\omega_1 + i_1\omega_2), \quad \mathrm{DS}_x(L^i) \cong \Pi^i(\mathrm{DS}_x(L))$$

for each  $L^i$  in the block  $\mathcal{B}_{(i_1; i_2)}$ .

**Corollary.** *The image of the Grothendieck ring of  $\mathcal{F}(F(4))$  under the homomorphism  $\mathrm{ds}$  coincides with  $\sigma$ -invariants in the Grothendieck ring of  $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{sl}_3)$ .*

*Proof.* The condition  $m_1 - m_2$  divisible by 3 is equivalent to  $m_1\omega_1 + m_2\omega_2$  lies in the root lattice of  $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ .  $\square$

**2.4. Conclusion.** Let  $\mathfrak{t}$  be one of the superalgebras in 2.2 or one of Lie algebras  $0, \mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{sl}_2$  or  $\mathfrak{sl}_3$ . We introduce the map  $\text{dex}$  for  $\mathfrak{t}$  by

- for a typical  $L \in \text{Irr}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{t}))$  we take  $\text{dex}(L) := 0$  for  $L \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{t}))$ ;
- for an atypical  $L \in \text{Irr}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{t}))$  we set  $\text{dex}(L) := 0$  if  $\text{DS}_x(L)$  is an even vector space.
- $\text{dex}(\Pi(L)) := \text{dex}(L) + 1 \pmod{2}$ .

One readily sees that  $\text{dex}$  satisfies (Dex1) and (Dex2).

### 3. FUNCTORS $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}}^i$

In this section  $\mathfrak{g}$  is one of the superalgebras  $F(4), G(3), \mathfrak{gl}(m|n), \mathfrak{osp}(m|2n)$  for  $m, n \geq 0$ . We fix any triangular decomposition  $\Delta = \Delta^+ \amalg (-\Delta^+)$  and denote by  $\mathfrak{b}$  the corresponding Borel subalgebra. We consider the standard partial order  $\nu_1 \leq \nu_2$  for  $\nu_2 - \nu_1 \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^+$ .

3.1. Let  $\mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{p}$  be parabolic subalgebras containing  $\mathfrak{b}$  and  $\mathfrak{l}$  be the Levy factor of  $\mathfrak{p}$ . For a finite-dimensional  $\mathfrak{q}$ -module  $V$  denote by  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{q}}(V)$  the maximal finite-dimensional quotient of the induced module  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{p}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{q})} V$ . We denote by  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{p})$  the category of finite-dimensional  $\mathfrak{p}$ -modules with the restriction lying in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{l})$  and by  $\text{Ext}_{\mathfrak{p}}^1$  the functor  $\text{Ext}^1$  in this category. For  $\lambda \in \Lambda_{m|n}$  we denote by  $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$  a simple  $\mathfrak{p}$ -module of the highest weight  $\lambda$  with the grading induced by the parity function on  $\Lambda_{m|n}$ .

In [18], Sect. 3 the authors introduce for  $i = 0, 1, \dots$  an additive functor

$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}}^i : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{p}) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$$

(in [18] these functors are denoted by  $\Gamma_i(G/P; -)$ ) in the following way. For each  $V \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{q})$  we take the vector bundle  $G \times_P V$  over the generalized Grassmanian  $G/P$  and consider the cohomology groups  $H^i(G/P, G \times_P V)$  as  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module. We set

$$\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}}^i(V) := (H^i(G/P, G \times_P V^*))^*.$$

Below we recall several properties of the functors  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}}^i$ ; for the proofs and other properties see [18], Sections 3, 4.

3.1.1. One has  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}}^0(V) = \Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}}(V)$ . For each  $i$  the module  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}}^i(L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda))$  has the same central character as  $L(\lambda)$ .

3.1.2. Each short exact sequence of  $\mathfrak{q}$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow U \rightarrow V \rightarrow U' \rightarrow 0$$

induces a long exact sequence

$$\dots \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}}^1(V) \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}}^1(U') \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}}^0(U) \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}}^0(V) \rightarrow \Gamma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{q}}^0(U') \rightarrow 0.$$

3.1.3. If  $[\Gamma_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}^i(L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)) : L(\nu)] \neq 0$ , then there exist  $I \subset \Delta_1^+$  and  $w \in W$  of length  $i$  such that  $\nu + \rho = w(\lambda + \rho) - \sum_{\alpha \in I} \alpha$ .

3.2. **Poincaré polynomials.** Let  $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{q} \subset \mathfrak{p}$  be as in 3.1. We set

$$\mathfrak{q}' := \mathfrak{q} \cap \mathfrak{l}, \quad \mathfrak{h}' := \mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{l}, \quad \mathfrak{h}'' = \{h \in \mathfrak{h} \mid [h, \mathfrak{l}] = 0\}$$

and notice that  $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}' \oplus \mathfrak{h}''$ . Let  $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_{m|n}$  be such that  $L_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{q})$  and  $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mu) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{p})$ . For  $i = 0, 1, \dots$  we define

$${}^i K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu} := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \lambda|_{\mathfrak{h}''} \neq \nu|_{\mathfrak{h}''}; \\ [\Gamma_{\mathfrak{l},\mathfrak{q}'}^i(L_{\mathfrak{q}'}(\lambda|_{\mathfrak{h}'})) : L_{\mathfrak{l}}(\mu|_{\mathfrak{h}'})] & \text{if } \lambda|_{\mathfrak{h}''} = \nu|_{\mathfrak{h}''} \end{cases}$$

and introduce a Poincaré polynomial in the variable  $z$  by

$$K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu}(z) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} {}^i K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu} z^i.$$

(It is easy to see that this Poincaré polynomial is equal to the Poincaré polynomial defined in [18], Section 4.) When the term  $K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu}$  appears in a formula it is always assumed that  $L_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{q})$  and  $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mu) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{p})$ .

3.2.1. By 3.1.1 we have

$$[\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}(L_{\mathfrak{q}}(\lambda)) : L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mu)] = {}^0 K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu} = K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu}(0).$$

In particular,  $K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\lambda}(0) = 1$  and  $K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu}(0) \neq 0$  implies  $\mu \leq \lambda$ . By [18], Thm. 1 one has

$$(8) \quad K_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\mu}(-1) = \sum_{\nu} K_{\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{q}}^{\lambda,\nu}(-1) K_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}^{\nu,\mu}(-1)$$

where the summation is taken on  $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  with  $\dim L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\nu) < \infty$ .

3.3. **Euler characteristic formula.** Let  $\rho$  be the Weyl vector and  $R$  be the Weyl denominator, i.e.

$$2\rho = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} (-1)^{p(\alpha)} \alpha, \quad R = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} (1 - (-1)^{p(\alpha)} e^{-\alpha})^{(-1)^{p(\alpha)}}.$$

We denote by  $\text{sgn} : W \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$  the standard sign homomorphism and set

$$\mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\mathfrak{p}} := R^{-1} e^{-\rho} \sum_{w \in W} \text{sgn}(w) w \left( \frac{e^{\rho} \text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_1^+(\mathfrak{l})} (1 + e^{-\alpha})} \right).$$

By [18], Prop.1, if  $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda) \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{p})$ , then

$$\sum_{\mu} K_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{p}}^{\lambda,\mu}(-1) \text{ch } L(\mu) = \mathcal{E}_{\lambda,\mathfrak{p}}.$$

3.3.1. Notice that  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, \mathfrak{p}}$  can be zero. For instance, take  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(m|2n)$  with  $m \geq 4$  and  $\mathfrak{b}$  corresponding to the “mixed base”. Then  $\mathcal{E}_{0, \mathfrak{b}} = R^{-1}e^{-\rho} \sum \text{sgn}(w)e^{w\rho} = 0$ . Since  $\text{ch } L(\mu)$  are linearly independent, we have  $K_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^{0, \mu}(-1) = 0$  for all  $\mu$ .

3.4. **Marked graphs.** Consider a directed graph  $(V, E)$  where  $V$  is at most countable and the number of edges between any two vertices is finite.

We say that  $\iota : V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$  (resp.,  $\iota : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ ) defines a  $\mathbb{N}$ -grading (resp.,  $\mathbb{Z}$ -grading) on this graph if for each edge  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  one has  $\iota(\nu) < \iota(\lambda)$ . Notice that for a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded graph the number of paths between any two vertices is finite.

Assume that the set of edges  $E$  is equipped by two functions  $b$  and  $\kappa$ , where  $b : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  and  $\kappa$  is a function from  $E$  to a commutative ring.

3.4.1. For a path  $P := \nu_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \nu_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \nu_3 \dots \xrightarrow{e_s} \nu_{s+1}$  we define

$$\text{length}(P) := s, \quad \kappa(P) := \prod_{i=1}^s \kappa(e_i).$$

We call the path  $P$  *b-decreasing* (resp., *b-increasing*) if  $b(e_1) > b(e_2) > \dots > b(e_s)$  (resp.,  $b(e_1) < \dots < b(e_s)$ ). We consider  $P = \nu$  as a *b-decreasing/increasing* path of zero length with  $\kappa(P) = 1$ . We denote the set of decreasing (resp., increasing) paths from  $\nu$  to  $\lambda$  by  $\mathcal{P}_b^>(\nu, \lambda)$  (resp.,  $\mathcal{P}_b^<(\nu, \lambda)$ ).

3.4.2. **Definition.** We call two functions  $b, b' : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  *decreasingly-equivalent* if for each path  $\nu_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \nu_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \nu_3$  one has

$$b(e_1) > b(e_2) \iff b'(e_1) > b'(e_2).$$

Notice that  $b, b'$  are decreasingly equivalent if and only if  $\mathcal{P}_b^>(\nu, \lambda) = \mathcal{P}_{b'}^>(\nu, \lambda)$ .

3.4.3. Let  $(V, E)$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded graph. We introduce the square matrices  $A^<(\kappa) = (a_{\lambda, \nu}^<)_{\lambda, \nu \in V}$  and  $A^>(\kappa) = (a_{\lambda, \nu}^>)_{\lambda, \nu \in V}$  by

$$a_{\lambda, \nu}^> := \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_b^>(\nu, \lambda)} \kappa(P), \quad a_{\lambda, \nu}^< := \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_b^<(\nu, \lambda)} (-1)^{\text{length}(P)} \kappa(P).$$

Since the graph is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded, these matrices are lower-triangular with  $a_{\lambda, \lambda}^> = a_{\lambda, \lambda}^< = 1$ .

3.4.4. **Lemma.** Let  $(V, E)$  be a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded graph with a finite number of edges between any two vertices. Assume that  $b : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  satisfies the property

$$(BB) \quad \text{for each path } \nu_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} \nu_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} \nu_3 \text{ one has } b(e_1) \neq b(e_2).$$

$$\text{Then } A^>(\kappa) \cdot A^<(\kappa) = A^<(\kappa) \cdot A^>(\kappa) = \text{Id}.$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to [18], Thm. 4. The entries of  $A^{<}(\kappa) \cdot A^{>}(\kappa)$  are of the form

$$\sum_{\mu} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_b^{<}(\nu, \mu)} \sum_{Q \in \mathcal{P}_b^{>}(\mu, \lambda)} (-1)^{\text{length}(Q)} \kappa(PQ),$$

where  $PQ$  stands for the concatenation of  $P$  and  $Q$ . The property (BB) implies that each path of non-zero length which can be presented as the concatenation  $PQ$ , where  $P$  is  $b$ -increasing and  $Q$  is  $b$ -decreasing, has exactly two presentations of this form:  $PQ = P'Q'$  with  $\text{length } Q' = \text{length } Q \pm 1$  (for instance, for a path of length 5 with

$$b(e_1) = 1, \quad b(e_2) = 2, \quad b(e_3) = 4, \quad b(e_4) = 2, \quad b(e_5) = 1$$

the increasing part can be either  $e_1, e_2$  or  $e_1, e_2, e_3$ ). This implies the statement.  $\square$

**3.5. Useful graphs.** We fix a sequence of parabolic subalgebras in  $\mathfrak{g}$ :

$$(9) \quad \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{p}^{(0)} \subset \mathfrak{p}^{(1)} \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{p}^{(k)} = \mathfrak{g}$$

and denote by  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$  the Levy subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$ . We also fix a central character  $\chi : \mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  and denote by  $\Lambda^\chi$  the set of dominant weights corresponding to  $\chi$ :

$$\Lambda^\chi := \{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m|n} \mid \dim L(\lambda) < \infty \text{ and } \text{Ann}_{\mathcal{Z}(\mathfrak{g})} L(\lambda) = \text{Ker } \chi\}.$$

For each  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\chi$  we denote by  $\text{tail}(\lambda)$  the maximal  $s$  such that  $\lambda|_{\mathfrak{l}^{(s)} \cap \mathfrak{h}} = 0$ . We set

$$\mathfrak{p}_\lambda := \mathfrak{p}^{\text{tail}(\lambda)}, \quad \mathfrak{l}_\lambda := \mathfrak{l}^{\text{tail}(\lambda)}.$$

**3.5.1. Graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$ .** Let  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(z)$  be a graph with the set of vertices  $V := \Lambda^\chi$  and the following edges: if  $K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(s)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}}^{\lambda, \nu} \neq \delta_{\nu, \lambda}$  (where  $\delta_{\nu, \lambda}$  is the Kronecker symbol) we join  $\nu, \lambda$  by the edge of the form

$$\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda \text{ with } b(e) = s, \quad \kappa(e) := K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(s)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}}^{\lambda, \nu}(z) - \delta_{\nu, \lambda} \in \mathbb{Z}[z].$$

Note that each two vertices in  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  are connected by at most  $k$  edges.

For each  $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  we denote by  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(z_0)$  the subgraph where the edges with  $\kappa(e)(z_0) = 0$  are deleted and the function  $\kappa_{z_0} : E \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is given by

$$\kappa_{z_0}(e) := \kappa(e)(z_0).$$

Note that  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0)$  does not have loops, see 3.2.1.

**3.5.2. Graph  $\Gamma^\chi$ .** Let  $\Gamma^\chi$  (resp.,  $\Gamma^\chi(z_0)$ ) be the graph obtained from  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  (resp., from  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(z_0)$ ) by removing the edges of the form  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  with  $b(e) \leq \text{tail}(\lambda)$ . Thus we have

$$\text{tail}(\lambda) < b(e) \text{ for each edge } \nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda \text{ in } \Gamma^\chi.$$

We will always assume that  $\Gamma^\chi$  satisfies the following condition:

$$(\text{Tail}) \quad \text{tail}(\nu) \leq b(e) \text{ for each edge } \nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda \text{ in } \Gamma^\chi$$

which is tautological for  $k = 1$ .

3.5.3. *Notation.* We denote by  $\mathcal{P}_b^>(\nu, \lambda)$  (resp., by  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_b^>(\nu, \lambda)$ ) the set of  $b$ -decreasing paths from  $\nu$  to  $\lambda$  in the graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  (resp.,  $\tilde{\Gamma}^\chi$ ).

3.5.4. **Corollary.** *Take  $\lambda, \nu \in \Lambda^\chi$ .*

(i) *Assume that for each  $\mu \in \Lambda^\chi$  one has*

$$(\exists i \text{ s.t. } K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(i+1)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(i)}}^{\mu, \eta}(z) \neq 0) \implies \eta \in \Lambda^\chi.$$

*Then*

$$K_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^{\lambda, \nu}(-1) = \sum_{P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_b^>(\nu, \lambda)} \kappa_{-1}(P).$$

(ii) *Assume that  $\Gamma^\chi$  satisfies (Tail) and that for each  $\mu \in \Lambda^\chi$  one has*

$$(\exists i \geq \text{tail}(\mu) \text{ s.t. } K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(i+1)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(i)}}^{\mu, \eta}(z) \neq 0) \implies \eta \in \Lambda^\chi.$$

$$\text{Then } K_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{p}_\lambda}^{\lambda, \nu}(-1) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_b^>(\nu, \lambda)} \kappa_{-1}(P).$$

*Proof.* The assertions follow from the formula (8). □

3.5.5. *Remark.* The graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  is useful for character formulae. Retain notation of 3.3 and notice that  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, \mathfrak{p}}$  has a particularly nice formula if  $\lambda|_{\mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{h}} = 0$  (in this case  $\text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda) = e^\lambda$ ). Thus it makes sense to express  $\text{ch } L(\mu)$  in terms of  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, \mathfrak{p}^{(j)}}$  for  $j \leq \text{tail}(\lambda)$ . By 3.3.1,  $\mathcal{E}_{\lambda, \mathfrak{p}}$  can be zero if “ $\mathfrak{p}$  is too small”; thus it makes sense to consider the maximal “nice”  $\mathfrak{p}$  for each  $\lambda$ , which is  $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda$ .

3.5.6. **Lemma.** *If the zero weight is a minimal dominant weight for  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$  for each  $p$ , then  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0) = \Gamma^\chi(0)$ .*

*Proof.* By 3.1.1, as a  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$ -module  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^0(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}(\lambda))$  is a finite-dimensional quotient of the Verma  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$ -module  $M_{\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}}(\lambda)$ . If the zero weight is a minimal dominant weight for  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$ , then for each  $p \leq \text{tail}(\lambda)$  the module  $L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}(\lambda)$  is a unique finite-dimensional quotient of  $M_{\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}}(\lambda)$ , so  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^0(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}(\lambda)) = L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}(\lambda)$ . Therefore  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0) = \Gamma^\chi(0)$  as required. □

3.5.7. *Definitions.* Let  $\text{dex} : V \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$  be any map.

We say that  $\Gamma^\chi(0)$  (resp., of  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0)$ ) is bipartite *with respect to*  $\text{dex}$  if for each edge  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  in this graph  $\text{dex}(\lambda) \neq \text{dex}(\nu)$ .

Recall that  $\kappa(e)$  is a polynomial with non-negative integral coefficients. We say that  $\text{dex}$  gives a *parametric bipartition* of  $(\Gamma^\chi, \kappa)$  if for each edge  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  one has

$$(10) \quad z^{\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\nu) + 1} \kappa(e) \in \mathbb{Z}[z^2].$$



We say that  $\text{dex}$  gives a *signed bipartition* of  $(\Gamma^\chi(-1), \kappa_{-1})$  if for each edge  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$

$$(11) \quad (-1)^{\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\nu) + 1} \kappa_{-1}(e) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$$

or, equivalently,

$$(12) \quad (-1)^{\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\nu)} (-1)^{\text{length}(P)} \kappa_{-1}(P) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \quad \text{for each path } P \text{ from } \nu \text{ to } \lambda.$$

We say that  $\text{dex}$  gives a *parametric bipartition* of  $(\hat{\Gamma}^\chi, \kappa)$  if each edge  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  with  $\nu \neq \lambda$  satisfies (10). Similarly, we say that  $\text{dex}$  gives a *signed bipartition* of  $(\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(-1), \kappa_{-1})$  if (11) holds for each  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  with  $\nu \neq \lambda$  or, equivalently if (12) holds for any paths without loops.

3.5.8. Recall that  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0)$  does not have loops. If  $\text{dex}$  is a parametric bipartition of  $\Gamma^\chi$  (resp.,  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$ ), then  $\text{dex}$  is a signed bipartition of  $(\Gamma^\chi(-1), \kappa_{-1})$  (resp., of  $(\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(-1), \kappa_{-1})$ ) and  $\Gamma^\chi(0)$  (resp.,  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$ ) is bipartite with respect to  $\text{dex}$ .

3.5.9. *Remark.* In the examples 3.9–3.9.5 below  $\Gamma^\chi$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded graph admitting a parametric bipartition; the same is true for the graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  for the dense flag for a distinguished Borel in  $\mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$ -case, see [27]. The graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  has a loop  $0 \xrightarrow{e} 0$  (and thus is not  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded) for the dense flag for a mixed Borel for  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$  ( $= \mathfrak{sl}(1|2)$ ) and for  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(4|2)$  see 3.9.2 and 3.9.5. By [18], Lemma 26,  $\kappa(e) = z$  for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$  and  $\kappa(e) = z^2$  for  $\mathfrak{osp}(4|2)$  so the formula (10) holds for  $e$  if  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$  and does not hold if  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(4|2)$ . The graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  admits a parametric bipartition in both cases.

3.6. **Graph**  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$ . By 6.3  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) = \dim \text{Ext}^1(L(\nu), L(\lambda))$ . We denote by  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  the graph without loops, with the set of vertices  $\Lambda^\chi$  and  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu))$  edges between  $\nu$  and  $\lambda$  for  $\nu \neq \lambda$  (we will usually consider the undirected edges).

3.6.1. We say that  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  is a subgraph of a directed graph if  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  is a subgraph of the “undirected version” of this graph (we forget the directions of edges).

3.6.2. Recall that  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}(p), \mathfrak{p}(p-1)}^0(L_{\mathfrak{p}(p-1)}(\lambda))$  is the maximal finite-dimensional quotient of  $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}(p-1)}^{\mathfrak{p}(p)}(L_{\mathfrak{p}(p-1)}(\lambda))$ ; this is indecomposable module with the cosocle is isomorphic to  $L_{\mathfrak{p}(p)}(\lambda)$ . Using Corollary 6.5 we obtain the

**Corollary.** *The graph  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  is a subgraph of  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0)$ .*

3.6.3. **Corollary.** *Assume that  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  admits a parametric bipartition  $\text{dex}$ .*

- (i)  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  is bipartite with respect to  $\text{dex}$ .
- (ii)  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}(p), \mathfrak{p}(p-1)}^i(L_{\mathfrak{p}(p-1)}(\lambda))$  is a semisimple  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$ -module for  $i > 0$  and has a semisimple radical for  $i = 0$ ;

- (iii) Assume that  $\Gamma^\chi$  admits a parametric bipartition dex and that the zero weight is a minimal dominant weight for  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$  for each  $p = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$ . Then  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  is a subgraph of  $\Gamma^\chi(0)$  and dex defines a bipartition of  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$ . Moreover, the claims of (ii) hold for  $p > \text{tail}(\lambda)$ .

*Proof.* Corollary 3.6.2 implies (i). For (ii) let  $\text{Ext}_{(p)}$  be the “Ext”-graph for  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$ : the set of vertices for this graph is  $\Lambda^\chi$  and the multiplicity of the edge  $\lambda \rightarrow \nu$  is  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}(\lambda), L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}(\nu))$ . By Corollary 6.5,  $\text{Ext}_{(p)}$  is a subgraph of  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0)$ , so dex gives a bipartition on  $\text{Ext}_{(p)}$ . For  $i > 0$  one has

$$[\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^i(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}(\lambda)) : L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}(\nu)] \neq 0 \implies \text{dex}(\nu) + \text{dex}(\lambda) \equiv i + 1 \pmod{2}.$$

Therefore there are no non-splitting extensions between the subquotients of the  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$ -module  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^i(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}(\lambda))$ ; thus this module is completely reducible. For  $i = 0$  the same holds for  $\nu \neq \lambda$  and  $L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}(\lambda)$  is a unique simple quotient of  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^0(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}(\lambda))$ . Hence the radical of  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^0(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}(\lambda))$  is semisimple. This gives (ii). If the zero weight is a minimal dominant weight for  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$  for each  $p$ , then  $\tilde{\Gamma}^\chi(0) = \Gamma^\chi(0)$  (see Lemma 3.5.6) and so (iii) has the same proof as (ii).  $\square$

**3.6.4. Remark.** We see that in order to have a parametric partition on  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  one has to take a “dense enough” chain of the parabolic subalgebras, since if  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  admits such grading, then the maximal finite-dimensional quotient of  $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}(L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}(\lambda))$  has a Loewy filtration of length  $\leq 2$ . In the examples below we take  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$  of the defect  $p$ .

**3.7. The Gruson-Serganova algorithm.** We assume that  $\Gamma^\chi = (\Lambda^\chi, E)$  is a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded graph which satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 3.5.4 (ii). The following construction is a slight reformulation of the construction described in [18], Sect. 12.

**3.7.1.** Recall that  $\text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{p}_\lambda}(\lambda) = e^\lambda$ . Set

$$(13) \quad \mathcal{E}_\nu := \mathcal{E}_{\nu, \mathfrak{p}_\nu} = R^{-1} e^{-\rho} \sum_{w \in W} \text{sgn}(w) w \left( \frac{e^{\nu+\rho}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{l}_\nu)_1^+} (1 + e^{-\alpha})} \right).$$

Combining 3.3 and Corollary 3.5.4 (ii) we get

$$\sum_{\mu} a_{\lambda, \mu}^> \text{ch } L(\mu) = \mathcal{E}_\lambda,$$

for  $A^>(\kappa_{-1}) = (a_{\lambda, \nu}^>)$  defined as in 3.4.3. The matrix  $A := A^>(\kappa_{-1})$  is lower-triangular with  $a_{\lambda, \lambda} = 1$ . Thus  $A$  is invertible that is

$$\text{ch } L(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu} a'_{\lambda, \mu} \mathcal{E}_\mu,$$

for  $(a'_{\lambda,\mu}) := A^{-1}$ . In the light of Lemma 3.4.4 the entries of  $A^{-1}$  can be expressed in terms of  $b$ -increasing paths from  $\nu$  to  $\lambda$  if  $b : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  would satisfy the property (BB). Unfortunately,  $b$  almost never satisfy (BB); however, it is often possible to find a decreasingly-equivalent function  $b'$  satisfying (BB) (we do not require that  $b'$  satisfies (Tail)). For  $\mathfrak{gl}(M|N)$  and  $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$  the function  $b'$  is given in [27] and [18] respectively; in 4.4.3 below we describe  $b'$  for  $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$ -case. Denoting by  $\mathcal{P}_b^<(\nu, \lambda)$  the set of  $b'$ -increasing paths in  $\Gamma^\chi$  we obtain

$$a_{\lambda,\mu}^> = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_b^>(\mu, \lambda)} \kappa_{-1}(P) = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{b'}^>(\mu, \lambda)} \kappa_{-1}(P), \quad a'_{\lambda,\mu} = \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}_{b'}^<(\mu, \lambda)} (-1)^{\text{length}(P)} \kappa_{-1}(P).$$

3.7.2. Assume that  $\text{dex} : V \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a signed bipartition of  $(\Gamma^\chi(-1), \kappa_{-1})$  (see 3.5.7 for definition). By (12) the number  $(-1)^{\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\mu)} a'_{\lambda,\mu}$  is a non-negative integer. (i.e. the Gruson-Serganova character formula is “positive”). These number can be interpreted as follows. Consider the following modification of the graph  $\Gamma^\chi = (V, E)$ : the graph  $D^\chi$  with the same set of vertices  $V = \Lambda^\chi$  and the set of edges  $E'$  obtained from  $E$  by taking each edge  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  with the multiplicity  $(-1)^{\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\nu)} \kappa_{-1}(e)$  (this number is non-negative since  $\text{dex}$  is a signed bipartition). By above,

$$(-1)^{\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\mu)} a'_{\lambda,\mu} \text{ is the number of } b'\text{-increasing paths from } \mu \text{ to } \lambda \text{ in } D^\chi.$$

For  $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$ -case the graph  $D^\chi$  is described in [18]; we give some details in 4.5 below; the case  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$  will be treated in [14].

3.7.3. The assumption that  $\Gamma^\chi$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded can be weakened using the following trick. Fix a set of “bad vertices”  $\Lambda' \subset \Lambda(\chi)$  and consider a graph  $\Gamma'(\chi)$  obtained from  $\Gamma^\chi$  by erasing all edges ending at  $\lambda \in \Lambda'$ . Assume that  $\Gamma'(\chi)$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded. The above reasoning allows to express  $\text{ch } L(\mu)$  in terms of  $\mathcal{E}_\lambda$  for  $\lambda \in \Lambda(\chi) \setminus \Lambda'$  and  $\text{ch } L(\nu)$  for  $\nu \in \Lambda'$ , see 3.9.5 for examples.

3.8. **Examples.** The Poincaré polynomials for certain chains of parabolic subalgebras were computed for the finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebras in [32], [27], [10], [25] and for  $\mathfrak{q}_n$  in [30]. In all these cases the chain satisfies the following condition:  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$  has defect  $p$ . Below we list some properties of the corresponding graphs (for the  $\mathfrak{gl}$ -case we consider only the principal block in  $\mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$ ).

In all these examples the Poincaré polynomials have the following property: the polynomial  $K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(s)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}}^{\lambda, \mu} - \delta_{\lambda, \mu}$  is non-zero for at most one value of  $s > \text{tail}(\lambda)$ . We denote by  $\kappa^{\lambda, \mu}$  the corresponding non-zero polynomial (if it exists) and set  $\kappa^{\lambda, \mu} = 0$  otherwise.

The above property implies that  $\Gamma^\chi$  does not have multi-edges (and that  $\kappa(\mu \rightarrow \lambda) = \kappa^{\lambda, \mu}$ ). The graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  admits a  $\mathbb{N}$ -grading and satisfies (Tail).

For  $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{q}_n$  the graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  admits a parametric bipartition  $\text{dex}$ .

For  $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{q}_n$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(2m|2n)$ , the polynomials  $\kappa^{\lambda,\mu}$  are monomials, so the condition on the parametric bipartition simply means that  $\kappa^{\lambda,\mu}$  is zero or  $z^i$  for  $i \equiv \text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\mu) + 1$  modulo 2. In these cases  $D^\chi = \Gamma^\chi$ .

For  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2m|2n)$ ,  $\mathfrak{q}_n$  with  $\chi$  of atypicality greater than one,  $\kappa^{\lambda,\mu} \in \{0, z^i, z^i + z^j\}$  and the condition on the parametric bipartition takes the form  $i \equiv \text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\mu) + 1$  and  $i \equiv j$  modulo 2. This holds for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2m|2n)$  in this case  $D^\chi$  is obtained from  $\Gamma^\chi$  by doubling the edges with  $\kappa^{\lambda,\mu} = z^i + z^j$ .

An interesting example is the  $\mathfrak{q}_n$ -case. For  $\chi$  of atypicality greater than one,  $i - j$  can be odd, so  $\Gamma^\chi$  does not admit a parametric bipartition and  $\Gamma^\chi(0)$  is not bipartited. By [26] the Ext-graph is not bipartite. However, the  $(\Gamma^\chi(-1), \kappa_{-1})$  admits a signed bipartition dex. In this case  $D^\chi$  is obtained from  $\Gamma^\chi$  by doubling the edges with even  $j$  and deleting the edges with odd  $j$  ( $\kappa^{\lambda,\mu}(-1) = 0$  if  $j$  is odd). The Gruson-Serganova algorithm gives the Su-Zhang character formula [35].

**3.9. Examples of defect one.** We start from the examples when  $\mathfrak{g}$  has defect 1 and the chain is  $\mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{p}^{(0)} \subset \mathfrak{p}^{(1)} = \mathfrak{g}$ .

In this case  $b(e) = 1$  for each  $e \in \hat{\Gamma}^\chi$ , so the condition (BB) does not hold if  $\Gamma^\chi$  contains paths of length two. Moreover, the decreasing paths in  $\Gamma^\chi$  are the paths containing at most one edge. Thus any function  $b' : E \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  satisfying  $b'(e_1) < b'(e_2)$  for each path  $\cdot \xrightarrow{e_1} \cdot \xrightarrow{e_2} \cdot$  in  $\Gamma^\chi$  is decreasingly equivalent to  $b$  and satisfies (BB).

We will depict an edge  $e$  in  $\Gamma^\chi$  (resp., in  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$ ) as  $\nu \xrightarrow{j;\kappa(e)} \lambda$  (resp., as  $\nu \xrightarrow{\kappa(e)} \lambda$ ) with  $j = b'(e)$ .

Except for  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  one has tail  $\lambda = \delta_{0,\lambda}$ ; for  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  one has tail  $\lambda = 1$  for each atypical weight  $\lambda$ . Recall that the condition (Tail) in this case is tautological.

Except for  $F(4), G(3)$  we take  $\chi$  corresponding to the principal block (i.e.,  $\chi$  is the central character of the trivial module  $L(0)$ ).

In all these examples the Poincaré polynomials  $\kappa(e) \in \{1, z\}$ ; the graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  admits a parametric partition dex (which means that  $\kappa(e) = 1$  if  $e$  connects the vertices with different value of dex and  $\kappa(e) = z$  otherwise). In particular,  $D^\chi = \Gamma^\chi$ .

**3.9.1. Example:  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$ .** We take  $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  with  $\Delta^+ = \{\alpha\}$ .

The simple modules in the principal block are  $\{L(s\alpha) | s \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . As a vector space  $L(s\alpha) \cong \Pi^s(\mathbb{C})$ , so  $\text{sdim } L(s\alpha) = (-1)^s$ ; we define  $\text{dex}(L(s\alpha)) := s$  modulo 2. For a non-zero  $x \in \mathfrak{g}_1$  one has  $\text{DS}_x(L(s\alpha)) = \Pi^s(\mathbb{C})$ . We have

$$\begin{array}{cccccccc} \hat{\Gamma}^\chi & \dots & \xrightarrow{(1)} & -\alpha & \xrightarrow{(1)} & 0 & \xrightarrow{(1)} & \alpha & \xrightarrow{(1)} & \dots \\ \Gamma^\chi & \dots & & -\alpha & & 0 & & \alpha & & \dots \\ \text{Ext}(\chi) & \dots & \longleftrightarrow & -\alpha & \longleftrightarrow & 0 & \longleftrightarrow & \alpha & \longleftrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

Clearly,  $\text{dex}(L(s\alpha)) := s \text{ modulo } 2$  defines a parametric partition on  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  and a bipartition on  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$ ; the graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  does not admit a  $\mathbb{N}$ -grading.

3.9.2. *Example:  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$ .* Take  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2|2) \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2|1)$  with the base  $\Sigma = \{\delta_1 \pm \varepsilon_1\}$ .

The simple modules in the principal block are  $\{L(\lambda_s) | s \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ , where  $\lambda_s := |s|\delta_1 + s\varepsilon_1$ . Note that 0 is a minimal dominant weight, so the assumption of Corollary 3.6.3 (iii) holds. The extension graph  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  is  $A_\infty^\infty$ . The Poincaré polynomials  $K_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^{\lambda, \nu}$  were computed in [18], Sect. 12. One has

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} \Gamma^\chi & & \dots & \xleftarrow{(2;1)} & \lambda_{-1} & \xleftarrow{(1;1)} & \lambda_0 & \xrightarrow{(1;1)} & \lambda_1 & \xrightarrow{(2;1)} & \dots \\ \text{Ext}(\chi) = A_\infty^\infty & & \dots & \longleftrightarrow & \lambda_{-1} & \longleftrightarrow & \lambda_0 & \longleftrightarrow & \lambda_1 & \longleftrightarrow & \dots \end{array}$$

By [18], Lemmata 25, 26 the graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  can be obtained from the graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  by adding a loop around  $\lambda_0$  which is marked by  $(1; z)$ . Observe that  $\text{dex}(\lambda_j) := p(\lambda) \equiv j \text{ modulo } 2$  is a parametric partition on  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  and is a bipartition on  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$ . The function  $\|\lambda_i\|_{gr} := |i|$  gives a  $\mathbb{N}$ -grading on  $\Gamma^\chi$ ; the graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  does not admit a  $\mathbb{N}$ -grading (since it has a loop).

The Gruson-Serganova formula is

$$(14) \quad \text{ch } L(\lambda_{\pm j}) = \sum_{s=0}^j (-1)^{j-s} \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_{\pm s}} \quad \text{for } j \geq 0.$$

3.9.3. *Example:  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ .* Take  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$  with the base  $\Sigma = \{\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1\}$ . The simple modules in the principal block are  $\{L(\lambda_s)\}_{s=0}^\infty$ , where  $\lambda_0 := 0$  and  $\lambda_s := (s-1)\delta_1 + s\varepsilon_1$  for  $s > 1$ ; 0 is a minimal dominant weight. The Poincaré polynomials  $K_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^{\lambda, \nu}$  were computed in [10]. One has

$$\hat{\Gamma}^\chi : \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} \lambda_1 & \xrightarrow{(1)} & \lambda_2 & \xrightarrow{(1)} & \lambda_3 & \xrightarrow{(1)} & \dots \\ & \nwarrow (z) & \uparrow (1) & & & & \\ & & \lambda_0 & & & & \end{array}$$

The map  $\text{dex}(\lambda_0) := 0$ ,  $\text{dex}(\lambda_i) := i - 1 \text{ modulo } 2$  for  $i \neq 0$  is a parametric partition on  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  (one has  $\text{dex}(\lambda_i) = p(\lambda_i)$ ). The graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  is

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \lambda_1 & \xrightarrow{(2;1)} & \lambda_2 & \xrightarrow{(3;1)} & \lambda_3 & \xrightarrow{(4;1)} & \dots \\ & \nwarrow (1; z) & \uparrow (2;1) & & & & \\ & & \lambda_0 & & & & \end{array}$$

and the “undirected version” of  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  coincides with  $\Gamma^\chi(0)$ . The function  $\|\lambda_i\|_{gr} := i$  gives an  $\mathbb{N}$ -grading  $\Gamma^\chi$  (note that the graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  is not  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded).

The Gruson-Serganova formula is  $\text{ch } L(\lambda_0) = \mathcal{E}_0 = 1$  and

$$(15) \quad \text{ch } L(\lambda_1) = \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_0} + \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_1}, \quad \text{ch } L(\lambda_j) = 2(-1)^{j-1}\mathcal{E}_{\lambda_0} + \sum_{s=1}^j (-1)^{j-s}\mathcal{E}_{\lambda_s} \quad \text{for } j > 1.$$

3.9.4. *Remark.* For  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$  we have two bases: the “mixed” base  $\{\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1; \delta_1\}$  and the base  $\{\delta_1 - \varepsilon_1; \varepsilon_1\}$ . The computations in [10] are performed for the second base; it is not hard to see that for the first base the results are the same.

For  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2) \cong \mathfrak{sl}(1|2)$  we have two bases: the “mixed” base  $\{\delta_1 \pm \varepsilon_1\}$  and the distinguished base  $\{\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1; 2\delta_1\}$ . The graphs for the mixed base are given in 3.9.2; the graphs for the distinguished base are the same as in 3.9.1 (notice that 0 is a minimal dominant weight for the mixed base, whereas for the distinguished base the set of dominant weights does not have minimal elements).

3.9.5. *Cases  $\mathfrak{osp}(4|2)$ ,  $G(3)$  and  $F(4)$ .* Recall that  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$  is either  $D_\infty$  or  $A_\infty^\infty$ , see 2.3. The graphs  $\hat{\Gamma}(\chi)$  for a certain distinguished Borel subalgebras were computed in [10], [25]: this graph is the same as for  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$  (resp., as for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$ ) if  $\text{Ext}(\chi) = D_\infty$  and (resp., if  $\text{Ext}(\chi) = A_\infty^\infty$ ).

For the principal blocks the graph  $\text{Ext}^1(\chi)$  is  $D_\infty$  and so the graph  $\hat{\Gamma}(\chi)$  is the same as for  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ . Since  $\text{tail } 0 = 1$  and  $\text{tail } \lambda = 0$  for each  $\lambda \neq 0$ , the graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  is the same as for  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ .

For the non-principal blocks one has  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi = \Gamma^\chi$  (since  $\text{tail } \lambda = 0$  for each  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\chi$ ).

The character formulae for these cases were obtained in [10],[25]. The above approach give other type of character formulae.

By above, for the principal block  $\Gamma^\chi$  is the same as for  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ , so we obtain the same character formula (15). Consider a non-principal block. By above,  $\Gamma^\chi = \hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  is the same as the graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$  or for  $\mathfrak{osp}(3|2)$ . In both cases  $\Gamma^\chi$  have cycles and all these cycles contain  $\lambda_0$ ; the graph  $\Gamma'$  which is obtained from  $\Gamma^\chi$  by erasing all edges ending at  $\lambda^0$  is  $\mathbb{N}$ -graded. Using 3.7.3, we get Gruson-Serganova type character formulae which can be obtained from (14) and (15) respectively by changing  $\mathcal{E}_0$  by  $\text{ch } L(\lambda_0)$  (notice that  $\text{ch } L(\lambda_0)$  is given by the Kac-Wakimoto formula).

**3.10. Remark on Gruson-Serganova type character formulae.** Let  $\mathcal{B}$  one of the blocks of atypicality 1 considered in Section 2. Then  $\Gamma^\chi$  is one of the graphs appeared in 3.9.2, 3.9.3 and we call  $\lambda_0$  a *Kostant weight*; notice that  $\lambda_0$  is uniquely defined in terms of  $\Gamma^\chi$  which has fewer automorphisms than  $\text{Ext}(\chi)$ .

Take  $L(\lambda_i) \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{B})$  and write  $\text{ch } L(\lambda_i) = \sum_i a_i \mathcal{E}_{\lambda_i}$  using (14), (15). By 2.3 one has  $\text{DS}_x(L(\lambda_i)) = \Pi^s(\text{DS}_x(L(\lambda_0)))^{a_0}$  for  $s = 0$  if  $a_0 > 0$  and  $s = 1$  if  $a_0 < 0$ . This can be translated to the language of supercharacters in the following manner.

Retain notation of 0.2. Denote by  $\text{Sch}(\mathfrak{g})$  the image of the map  $\text{sch} : \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\Lambda_{m|n}]$ . Since  $\text{sch}(\Pi(V)) = -\text{sch}(V)$  one has  $\text{sch}(\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})) = \text{sch}(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}))$ . For Lie superalgebras (1) the ring  $\text{Sch}(\mathfrak{g})$  is isomorphic to the reduced Grothendieck ring of  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$  and  $\text{DS}_x$  induces an algebra homomorphism  $ds'_x : \text{Sch}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \text{Sch}(\mathfrak{g}_x)$  given by  $f \mapsto f|_{\mathfrak{h}_x}$ , see [22].

For  $V \in \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g})$  one has  $\text{sch } V = \pi(\text{ch } V)$ , where  $\pi : \mathbb{Z}[\Lambda_{m|n}] \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}[\Lambda_{m|n}]$  is the involution  $\pi(e^\mu) := p(\mu)e^\mu$ . In particular,  $\{\pi(\mathcal{E}_\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}))\}$  forms a basis of  $\text{Sch}(\mathfrak{g})$ . If  $\mathfrak{g}$  has defect 1, then the kernel of the map  $ds'_x : \text{Sch}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \text{Sch}(\mathfrak{g}_x)$  is spanned by the basis elements  $\pi(\mathcal{E}_\lambda)$  for  $\lambda$ s which are not Kostant weights. A similar property hold for the  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|n)^{(1)}$ -case; in [14] we will show that this holds for  $\mathfrak{osp}(m|n)$ -case as well (the situation is more complicated for  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$ ).

**3.11. Example:**  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(k|k)$ . Take  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(k|k)$  with a distinguished Borel subalgebra  $\mathfrak{b}$ . For  $p = 0, \dots, k$  we denote by  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$  a parabolic subalgebra containing  $\mathfrak{b}$  with the Levi factor  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)} \cong \mathfrak{gl}(p|p)$  ( $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$  is unique since  $\mathfrak{b}$  is a distinguished Borel). We consider the corresponding chain of parabolic subalgebras (9).

The Poincaré polynomials  $K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p+1)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p)}}^{\lambda, \nu}$  were computed in [32], [27] Cor. 3.8. The graph  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$  is  $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded and does not have multi-edges. For the principal block the condition (Tail) holds. The map  $p(\lambda)$  defines a parametric partition on  $\hat{\Gamma}^\chi$ . By [27], Sect. 6,  $\text{Ext}(\chi) = \hat{\Gamma}^\chi(0)$  (this can be also deduced from [2]). One has  $\text{Ext}(\chi) \neq \Gamma^\chi(0)$  (see the example of  $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$  above).

#### 4. CASE $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$

In this section  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$ . The category  $\mathcal{F}\text{in}(\mathfrak{g})$  was studied in [18] and [6]. In this section we deduce the existence of dex satisfying (Dex1) from the results of [18]. Another approach is developed in [6], [7]. By [18], each block of atypicality  $k$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(\mathfrak{g})$  is equivalent either to a principal  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$ -block  $\mathcal{B}$  or to  $\Pi(\mathcal{B})$ , where  $t = 1$  for odd  $M$  and  $t = 0, 2$  for even  $M$ , and this equivalence is “compatible with character formula”, see Remark 4.6.

We fix a “mixed” base consisting of odd roots, see 4.1.1 below. We denote by  $\chi$  the central character of the principal block  $\mathcal{B}$  and retain notation of 3.5. For each  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\chi$  we set  $\text{dex}(L(\lambda)) = p(\lambda)$  if  $t = 0, 1$ ; for  $t = 2$  we define  $\text{dex}(L(\lambda))$  via a one-to-one correspondence between the simple modules in the principal blocks for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2n+1|2n)$  and  $\mathfrak{osp}(2n+2|2n)$ , see 4.3 below.

The multiplicities  ${}^i K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^{\lambda, \nu}$  were computed by C. Gruson and V. Serganova in [18] (see [20] for small rank examples). We will recall their results and describe the graphs  $\Gamma^\chi, D^\chi$  in 4.4. We will see that  $\Gamma^\chi$  is  $\mathbb{N}$ -graded and satisfies (Tail). We will check that dex is a parametric partition and that  $b$  and  $b'$  are decreasingly-equivalent. As a result Corollary 3.6.3 holds for the block  $\mathcal{B}$  and the character formula (15) in [18] can be rewritten in the form (17).

Everywhere in this section, except for Remark 4.6, we take  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2k + t|2k)$  for  $t = 0, 1, 2$ .

**4.1. Notation.** We take  $\mathfrak{g} := \mathfrak{osp}(2k + t|2k)$  for  $t = 0, 1, 2$ . The integral weight lattice  $\Lambda_{k+\ell|k}$  is spanned by  $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^{k+\ell} \cup \{\delta_i\}_{i=1}^k$ , where  $\ell := 0$  for  $t = 0, 1$  and  $\ell := 1$  for  $t = 2$ ; the parity function is given by  $p(\varepsilon_i) = \bar{0}$ ,  $p(\delta_j) = \bar{1}$  for all  $i, j$ .

4.1.1. We fix a triangular decomposition corresponding to the “mixed” base:

$$\Sigma := \begin{cases} \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_k - \delta_k, \delta_k & \text{for } \mathfrak{osp}(2k + 1|2k) \\ \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \dots, \varepsilon_{k-1} - \delta_k, \delta_k \pm \varepsilon_k & \text{for } \mathfrak{osp}(2k|2k) \\ \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_k - \delta_k, \delta_k \pm \varepsilon_{k+1} & \text{for } \mathfrak{osp}(2k + 2|2k). \end{cases}$$

We have  $\rho = 0$  for  $t = 0, 2$  and  $\rho = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^k (\delta_i - \varepsilon_i)$  for  $t = 1$ .

4.1.2. We consider the embeddings

$$\mathfrak{osp}(t|0) \subset \mathfrak{osp}(2 + t|2) \subset \mathfrak{osp}(4 + t|4) \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{osp}(2k + t|2k) = \mathfrak{g}$$

where  $\mathfrak{osp}(2p + t|2p)$  corresponds to the last  $2p + \ell$  roots in  $\Sigma$ ; we denote the subalgebra  $\mathfrak{osp}(2p + t|2p)$  by  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{l}^{(k)} = \mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{l}^{(0)} = 0$  for  $t = 0, 1$ ,  $\mathfrak{l}^{(0)} = \mathbb{C}$  to  $t = 2$ .

For  $p = 0, \dots, k$  we consider the parabolic subalgebra  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)} := \mathfrak{l}^{(p)} + \mathfrak{b}$ . Notice that  $\mathfrak{l}^{(p)}$  is the Levi subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$ ; as in 3.5, we denote by  $\text{tail}(\lambda)$  the maximal index  $q$  such that  $\lambda|_{\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{t}_q} = 0$ .

**4.2. Highest weights in the principal block.** For  $\lambda \in \Lambda_{k+\ell|k}$  we set

$$a_i := -(\lambda|\delta_i)$$

and notice that  $p(\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i$ . By [18],  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\times$  if and only if  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  are non-negative integers with  $a_{i+1} > a_i$  or  $a_i = a_{i+1} = 0$ , and

$$\lambda + \rho = \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} a_i(\varepsilon_i + \delta_i) + a_k(\delta_k + \xi\varepsilon_k) & \text{for } t = 0 \\ \sum_{i=1}^k a_i(\varepsilon_i + \delta_i) & \text{for } t = 2 \\ \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} (a_i + \frac{1}{2})(\varepsilon_i + \delta_i) + \frac{1}{2}(\delta_s + \xi\varepsilon_s) + \sum_{i=s+1}^k \frac{1}{2}(\delta_i - \varepsilon_i) & \text{for } t = 1 \end{cases}$$

for  $\xi \in \{\pm 1\}$ . For  $t = 1$  we have  $1 \leq s \leq k + 1$  and  $a_s = a_{s+1} = \dots = a_k = 0$  if  $s \leq k$  (for  $s = k + 1$  we have  $\lambda + \rho = \sum_{i=1}^k (a_i + \frac{1}{2})(\varepsilon_i + \delta_i)$ ).



4.2.1. Take  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\chi$  and define  $a_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$  as above. We assign to  $\lambda$  a “weight diagram”, which is a number line with one or several symbols drawn at each position with non-negative integral coordinate:

we put the sign  $\times$  at each position with the coordinate  $a_i$ ;

for  $t = 2$  we add  $>$  at the zero position;

we add the “empty symbol”  $\circ$  to all empty positions.

For  $t \neq 2$  a weight  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\chi$  is not uniquely determined by the weight diagram constructed by the above procedure. Therefore, for  $t = 0$  with  $a_k \neq 0$  and for  $t = 1$  with  $s \leq k$ , we write the sign of  $\xi$  before the diagram ( $+$  if  $\xi = 1$  and  $-$  if  $\xi = -1$ ).

Notice that each position with a non-zero coordinate contains either  $\times$  or  $\circ$ . For  $t = 0, 1$  the zero position is occupied either by  $\circ$  or by several symbols  $\times$ ; we write this as  $\times^i$  for  $i \geq 0$ . Similarly, for  $t = 2$  the zero position is occupied by  $\overset{\times^i}{>}$  with  $i \geq 0$ .

4.2.2. Notice that  $\text{tail}(\lambda)$  is equal to the number of symbols  $\times$  at the zero position of the weight diagram for all cases except when  $t = 1$  and the diagram has the sign  $+$ ; in the latter case the number of symbols  $\times$  at the zero position is  $\text{tail}(\lambda) + 1$ .

4.2.3. *Examples.* The weight diagram of 0 is  $\times^k$  for  $t = 0$ ,  $-\times^k$  for  $t = 1$  and  $\overset{\times^k}{>}$  for  $t = 2$ ; one has  $\text{tail}(0) = k$ .

The diagram  $+\circ\times\times$  corresponds to the  $\mathfrak{osp}(4|4)$ -weight  $\lambda = \lambda + \rho = (\varepsilon_2 + \delta_2) + 2(\varepsilon_1 + \delta_1)$  with  $\text{tail}(\lambda) = 0$ .

The diagram  $+\times^3$  corresponds to  $\mathfrak{osp}(7|6)$ -weight  $\lambda = \varepsilon_1$  with  $\text{tail}(\varepsilon_1) = 2$ .

The empty diagram correspond to  $\mathfrak{osp}(0|0) = \mathfrak{osp}(1|0) = 0$ ; the diagram  $>$  corresponds to the weight 0 for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2|0) = \mathbb{C}$ .

4.2.4. For  $t = 0, 1, 2$  we denote by  $\text{Diag}_{k;t}$  the set of (signed) weight diagrams. The above procedure gives a one-to-one correspondence between  $\Lambda^\chi$  and  $\text{Diag}_{k;t}$ . For each diagram  $f \in \text{Diag}_{k;t}$  we denote by  $\lambda(f)$  the corresponding weight in  $\Lambda^\chi$ .

In all cases the weight diagrams in  $\text{Diag}_{k,t}$  contains  $k$  symbols  $\times$ .

For a diagram  $f$  and  $a \in \mathbb{N}$  we denote by  $f(a)$  the symbols at the position  $a$ . For  $t = 0$  (resp.,  $t = 1$ ) a diagram in  $\text{Diag}_{k,t}$  has a sign if and only if  $f(0) = \circ$  (resp.,  $f(0) \neq \circ$ ).

4.2.5. *Map  $\tau$ .* Following [18], we introduce a bijection  $\tau : \text{Diag}_{k;2} \rightarrow \text{Diag}_{k;1}$ . For  $f \in \text{Diag}_{k;2}$  the diagram  $\tau(f) \in \text{Diag}_{k;1}$  is constructed by the following procedure:

we remove  $>$  and then shift all entires at the non-zero positions of  $f$  by one position to the left; then we add a sign in such a way that  $\text{tail}(f) = \text{tail}(\tau(f))$ : the sign  $+$  if  $f(1) = \times$

and the sign  $-$  if  $f(1) = \circ$  and  $f(0) \neq >$ . For instance,

$$\tau(\overset{\times}{>} \circ \times) = - \times \times, \quad \tau(\overset{\times}{>}) = - \times, \quad \tau(> \times) = + \times, \quad \tau(> \circ \times) = \circ \times.$$

One readily sees that  $\tau$  is a one-to-one correspondence.

**4.3. The maps  $||\lambda||, ||\lambda||_{gr}, \text{dex}$ .** Let  $\{a_i\}_1^k$  be the coordinates of the symbols  $\times$  in a diagram of  $\lambda$ . We set

$$||\lambda|| := \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i & \text{for } t = 0, 1 \\ ||\tau(f)|| & \text{for } t = 2, \end{cases} \quad ||\lambda||_{gr} := \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^k a_i & \text{for } t = 0, 2 \\ ||\tau^{-1}(f)|| & \text{for } t = 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\text{dex}(\lambda) := ||\lambda|| \pmod{2}.$$

Clearly,  $||\lambda||, ||\lambda||_{gr} \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $||\lambda||_{gr} = 0$  if and only if  $\lambda = 0$ .

**4.4. Graph  $\Gamma^\times$ .** Retain notation of Section 3. Consider the chain of parabolic subalgebras (9) with  $\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}$ ,  $p = 0, 1, \dots, k$  defined in 4.1.2.

The Poincaré polynomials  $K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^{\lambda, \nu}(z)$  for  $p > \text{tail } \lambda$  were computed in [18], Sect. 11. It is proven that the map  $\tau : \text{Diag}_{k;2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{Diag}_{k;1}$  (see 4.2.5) preserves these polynomials (i.e.,  $K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^{\tau(\lambda), \tau(\nu)} = K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^{\lambda, \nu}$ ); the coefficients  ${}^i K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^{\lambda, \nu}$  are 0 or 1 and for  $t = 0, 2$  one has  ${}^i K_{\mathfrak{p}^{(p)}, \mathfrak{p}^{(p-1)}}^{\lambda, \nu} = 1$  if and only if the diagram of  $\lambda$  can be obtained from the diagram of  $\nu$  by a “move” of degree  $i$  which ends at the  $p$ th symbol  $\times$  in the diagram of  $\lambda$ ; we will give some details in 4.4.1 below and give a description in terms of “arch diagrams” in Section 5.

**4.4.1. Moves for  $t = 0, 2$ .** Consider the cases  $t = 0, 2$ . Take  $f \in \text{Diag}_{k;t}$ . For each  $p, q \in \mathbb{N}$  denote by  $l_f(p, q)$  the number of symbols  $\times$  minus the number of symbols  $\circ$  strictly between the positions  $p$  and  $q$  in  $f$ .

A diagram  $f \in \text{Diag}_{k;t}$  can be transformed to a diagram  $g$  by a “move” of degree  $d$  if  $f$  satisfies certain conditions, and  $g$  is obtained from  $f$  by moving either one symbol  $\times$  from a position  $p$  to an empty position  $q$  with  $q > p$  or moving two symbols  $\times$  from the zero position to empty positions  $p, q$  with  $p < q$ . If  $f$  has a sign, then  $g$  has the same sign. In both cases we say that the move “ends at the position  $q$ ”. We will not specify all conditions on  $f$ , but notice that these conditions depend only on  $l_f(s, q)$  for  $s < q$ .

By above,  $\text{tail}(f) - \text{tail}(g)$  is 0, 1 or 2; the degree  $d$  satisfies the formula

$$(16) \quad d = \begin{cases} l_f(p, q) & \text{if } \text{tail}(f) - \text{tail}(g) \neq 1 \\ l_f(p, q) \text{ or } 2\text{tail}(g) + l_f(p, q) & \text{if } t = 0, \text{tail}(f) - \text{tail}(g) = 1 \\ 2\text{tail}(g) + l_f(p, q) + 1 & \text{if } t = 2, \text{tail}(f) - \text{tail}(g) = 1, \end{cases}$$

The conditions on  $f$  imply that  $d \geq 0$ . Except for the case  $t = 0$  with  $\text{tail}(f) - \text{tail}(g) = 1$ ,  $g$  can be obtained from  $f$  by at most one move; for  $t = 0$  it is possible sometimes to obtain  $g$  from  $f$  by two moves of different degrees. We give below examples of several moves and their degrees

$$\begin{array}{ll} \dots \times \circ \dots \longrightarrow \dots \circ \times \dots & d = 0 \\ \dots \times \times \times \circ \circ \dots \longrightarrow \dots \circ \times \times \circ \times \dots & d = 1 \\ \times \circ \dots \longrightarrow (\pm) \circ \times \dots & d = 0 \\ \times^2 \circ \dots \longrightarrow \times \times \dots & d = 0, 2. \end{array}$$

**4.4.2. Corollary.** *Take  $t = 0$  or  $t = 2$ . Let  $\nu, \lambda \in \Lambda^x$  be two weights with the diagrams  $f$  and  $g$  respectively. Assume that  $g$  is obtained from  $f$  by a move of degree  $d$ . Then*

- (i)  $\|\lambda\|_{gr} > \|\nu\|_{gr}$  and  $\lambda > \nu$ ;
- (ii) if the move ends in the  $i$ th symbol  $\times$  in  $g$ , then  $\text{tail } \nu \leq i$ ;
- (iii)  $\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\nu) + d \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ .

*Proof.* The inequality  $\|\lambda\|_{gr} > \|\nu\|_{gr}$  follows from the fact that  $\tau$  preserves  $\|\cdot\|_{gr}$  and that we move symbol(s)  $\times$  to the right. The inequality  $\lambda > \nu$  follows from the fact that we move the symbol(s)  $\times$  to the right; (ii) is obvious. For (iii) retain notation of 4.4.1 and observe that

$$l_f(p, q) \equiv q - p + 1, \quad \text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\nu) \equiv \|\lambda\| - \|\nu\| \pmod{2}.$$

For  $t = 0$  one has  $d \equiv l_f(p, q)$  by (16), and  $\|\lambda\| - \|\nu\| = q - p$  if  $\text{tail}(g) - \text{tail}(f) \neq 2$  and  $q + p$  otherwise. For  $t = 2$  the formula (16) gives  $d \equiv l_f(p, q) + \text{tail}(\lambda) - \text{tail}(\nu)$ ; in this case  $\|\lambda\| - \|\nu\| \equiv q - p + \text{tail}(\lambda) - \text{tail}(\nu)$ . This gives (iii).  $\square$

**4.4.3.** Retain notation of 3.5. For  $t = 0, 2$  the graph  $\Gamma^x = (\Lambda^x, E)$  has the edges  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  with  $b(e) = j$  if and only if the diagram of  $\lambda$  can be obtained from the diagram of  $\nu$  by a move which ends at the  $j$ th symbol  $\times$  in the diagram of  $\lambda$ ; in this case we denote by  $b'(e) = q$  the coordinate of the  $j$ th symbol  $\times$  in the diagram of  $\lambda$ . For the edge as above the Poincaré polynomial is the sum of  $z^d$  for all  $d$  such that  $\lambda$  can be obtained from the diagram of  $\nu$  by a move of degree  $d$ . By (16)  $\kappa(e) = z^d$  except for the case  $t = 0$  with  $\text{tail}(\nu) - \text{tail}(\lambda) = 1$ ; in the latter case  $\kappa(e) = z^d$  or  $z^d(1 + z^{2\text{tail}(\lambda)})$  (see Section 5 for details).

By above,  $\tau$  gives a bijection between the graphs  $\Gamma^x$  for  $t = 2$  and  $t = 1$  and this bijection is compatible with the functions  $b$  and  $\kappa$ . For  $t = 1$  we define  $b'$  on  $\Gamma^x$  using this bijection.

**4.4.4. Corollary.**

- (i) *The map  $\text{dex}(\lambda)$  is a parametric bipartition on  $(\Gamma^x, \kappa)$ .*
- (ii) *If  $\nu \rightarrow \lambda$  is an edge in  $\Gamma^x$ , then  $\nu < \lambda$  and  $\|\nu\|_{gr} < \|\lambda\|_{gr}$ . In particular,  $\|\lambda\|_{gr}$  defines a  $\mathbb{N}$ -grading on  $\Gamma^x$ .*

- (iii) *The graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  satisfies the assumption (Tail).*
- (iv) *The functions  $b, b'$  are decreasingly equivalent and  $b'$  satisfies the property (BB) of Lemma 3.4.4.*

*Proof.* Consider the cases  $t = 0, 2$ . Corollary 4.4.2 implies (i)–(iii). For (iv) take a path  $\lambda(f_1) \xrightarrow{e_1} \lambda(f_2) \xrightarrow{e_2} \lambda(f_3)$  in  $\Gamma^\chi$ . Since  $f_3$  is obtained from  $f_2$  by a move which ends at the symbol  $\times$  with the coordinate  $b'(e_2)$ , the position with this coordinate in  $f_2$  is empty, so  $b'(e_1) \neq b'(e_2)$ . Hence  $b'$  satisfies (BB). It remains to verify that  $b$  and  $b'$  are decreasingly equivalent. Set  $j := b(e_1)$ ,  $q := b'(e_1)$ . Then  $q$  is the coordinate of the  $j$ th symbol  $\times$  in  $f_2$  and  $q > 0$ . The condition  $b(e_1) > b(e_2)$  means that for  $i \geq j$  the  $i$ th symbols  $\times$  in  $f_2$  and  $f_3$  have the same coordinates, whereas the condition  $q > b'(e_2)$  means that for  $s \geq q$  one has  $f_2(s) = f_3(s)$ . Clearly, these conditions are equivalent, so  $b$  and  $b'$  are decreasingly equivalent.

Consider the remaining case  $t = 1$ . Since  $\tau$  preserves dex, tail and  $\|\cdot\|_{gr}$ , almost all assertions for  $t = 1$  follows from the corresponding assertions for  $t = 2$ . The only exception is the inequality  $\nu < \lambda$  in (ii), which follows from the following observation: for an edge  $\nu \rightarrow \lambda$  in  $\Gamma^\chi$  for  $t = 1$ , the diagram of  $\lambda$  is obtained from the diagram of  $\nu$  either by moving symbol(s)  $\times$  to the right or by changing the sign from  $-$  to  $+$ .  $\square$

**4.4.5. Corollary.** *Take  $\lambda, \nu \in \Lambda^\chi$  with  $\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) \neq 0$ . Then*

- (i) *either  $\lambda$  can be obtained from  $\nu$  by a move of zero degree or  $\nu$  can be obtained from  $\lambda$  by a move of zero degree;*
- (ii)  $\text{dex}(\lambda) \neq \text{dex}(\nu)$ .

*Proof.* By Corollary 4.4.4, the graph  $\Gamma^\chi$  satisfies the assumptions of Corollary 3.6.3 (iii), which implies the assertions.  $\square$

**4.5. Gruson-Serganova character formula.** We retain notation of 3.3; for  $\nu \in \Lambda^\chi$  we introduce the “Euler character”  $\mathcal{E}_\nu$  by (13).

4.5.1. A character formula is given by Theorem 4 in [18]. Using Corollary 4.4.4 we can write this formula for  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\chi$  in the following way:

$$(17) \quad \text{ch } L(\lambda) = \sum_{\nu \in \Lambda^\chi} (-1)^{\text{dex}(\lambda) - \text{dex}(\nu)} d_{<}^{\lambda, \nu} \mathcal{E}_\nu,$$

where  $d_{<}^{\lambda, \nu}$  is the number of increasing paths from  $\nu$  to  $\lambda$  in the graph  $D^\chi$ , where  $D^\chi$  is obtained from  $\Gamma^\chi$  by doubling the edges  $e$  with  $\kappa(e) \neq z^d$  (i.e.,  $D^\chi = \Gamma^\chi$  for  $t \neq 0$ , see 4.4.3).

Notice that  $d_{<}^{\lambda, \nu}$  are non-negative integers,  $d_{<}^{\lambda, \lambda} = 1$  and  $d_{<}^{\lambda, \nu} \neq 0$  implies  $\nu \leq \lambda$  and  $\|\nu\| \leq \|\lambda\|$  (in particular, the right-hand side of (17) is finite).

4.6. *Remark.* Recall that each block of atypicality  $k$  for  $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$  is equivalent to the principal block of  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$  where  $t = 1$  for odd  $M$  and  $t = 0, 2$  for even  $M$ . For a dominant weight  $\lambda$  of atypicality  $k$  let  $\bar{\lambda}$  be the image of  $\lambda$  in  $\Lambda^\chi$  (that is the  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$ -module  $L(\bar{\lambda})$  is the image of  $\mathfrak{osp}(M|N)$ -module  $L(\lambda)$  under the above equivalence). It turns out that this equivalence “preserve tails”, i.e.  $\text{tail}(\lambda) = \text{tail}(\bar{\lambda})$ .

Introducing  $\text{dex}(\lambda) := \text{dex}(\bar{\lambda})$  we obtain  $\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) = 0$  if  $\text{dex}(\lambda) = \text{dex}(\nu)$ . By [18], the formula (17) holds for an arbitrary dominant weight  $\lambda$  if we introduce  $\mathcal{E}_\nu$  by the formula (13) and set  $d_{<}^{\lambda, \nu} := d_{<}^{\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\nu}}$ .

## 5. ARCH DIAGRAMS

In the cases when  $\mathfrak{g}$  is not exceptional and the flag of parabolic is standard, the description of  $\Gamma^\chi$  in [27],[18] can be conveniently presented in terms of arc diagrams introduced in [19], [13], where the examples are presented. Below we will present this description of  $\Gamma^\chi$  for the principal blocks in  $\mathfrak{gl}(k|k)$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$ .

Our diagrams differs from the arc- or cup diagrams of [6]; we will call these diagrams “arch diagram”.

We take  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(k|k)$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$  and the central character  $\chi$  corresponding to the principal block. For  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(k|k)$  we take  $\Sigma = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_k - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \delta_2, \dots, \delta_{k-1} - \delta_k\}$  and the flag (9) with  $\mathfrak{l}^{(i)} \cong \mathfrak{gl}(i|i)$ . For  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$  we retain notation of 4.1.

5.1. **Arch diagram.** Take  $\lambda \in \Lambda^\chi$ .

For  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$  we assign to  $\lambda$  the weight diagram as in 4.2. For  $\mathfrak{gl}(k|k)$ -case  $\lambda + \rho = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i(\varepsilon_i - \delta_{k+1-i})$  and we assign to  $\lambda$  a weight diagram with the symbols  $\times$  at the positions  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  and the empty symbols  $\circ$  in other positions.

A *generalized arch diagram* is the following data:

- a weight diagram  $f$ , where the symbols  $\times$  at the zero position are drawn vertically and  $>$  (if it is present) is drawn in the bottom,
- a collection of non-intersecting arches, where each arch is
  - either  $\text{arc}(a; b)$  connecting the symbol  $\times$  with the empty symbol at the position  $b$ ;
  - or  $\text{arc}(0; b, b')$  connecting the symbol  $\times$  at the zero position with two empty symbols at the positions  $b < b'$ ;

An empty position is called *free* if this position is not an end of an arch.

We call  $\text{arc}(a; b)$  a *two-legged arch supported at  $a$*  and  $\text{arc}(0; b, b')$  a *three-legged arch supported at 0*.

A generalized arch diagram is called *arch diagram* if

- each symbol  $\times$  is the left end of exactly one arch;
- there are no free positions under the arches;
- for the  $\mathfrak{gl}$ -case all arches are two-legged;
- for the  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k|2k)$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+1|2k)$ -cases the lowest  $\times$  at the zero position supports a two-legged arch and the other symbols  $\times$  at the zero position support three-legged arches;
- for the  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+2|2k)$ -case all symbols  $\times$  at the zero position support three-legged arches.

Each weight diagram  $f$  admits a unique arch diagram which we denote by  $\text{Arc}(f)$ ; this diagram can be constructed in the following way: we pass from right to left through the weight diagram and connect each symbol  $\times$  with the next empty symbol(s) to the right by an arch.

5.1.1. *Partial order.* We consider a partial order on the set of arches by saying that one arch is smaller than another one if the first one is "below" the second one; one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{arc}(a; b) > \text{arc}(a'; b') &\iff a < a' < b \\ \text{arc}(0; b_1, b_2) > \text{arc}(a'; b') &\iff a' < b_2, \end{aligned}$$

in addition, any two distinct three-legged arches are comparable.

5.1.2. For a weight diagram  $f$  we denote by  $l_f(p, q)$  the number of  $\times$  – the number of  $\circ$  strictly between the positions  $p$  and  $q$ . We denote by  $(f)_p^q$  the diagram which obtained from  $f$  by moving  $\times$  from the position  $p$  to a free position  $q > p$ ; such diagram is defined only if

$$f(p) \in \{\times^i, \overset{\times^i}{>}\} \text{ for } s \geq 1, \quad f(q) = \circ.$$

For instance, for  $f = \times^2 \circ \times$  one has  $(f)_0^3 = \times \circ \times \times$  and  $(f)_0^2, (f)_1^5$  are not defined. If  $f(0) = \times^i$  or  $\overset{\times^i}{>}$  for  $i > 1$ , we denote by  $(f)_{0,0}^{p,q}$  the diagram which obtained from  $f$  by moving two symbols  $\times$  from the zero position to free positions  $p$  and  $q$  with  $p < q$ ; for example,  $(\times^2 \times)_{0,0}^{3,4} = \circ \times \circ \times \times$ .

5.2. **Description of  $\Gamma^\times$  in diagrammatic terms.** Below we present the description for the cases  $\mathfrak{gl}(k|k)$ ,  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k|2k)$  and  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+2|2k)$  (the map  $\tau$  gives a bijection between the graphs for  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+1|2k)$  and  $\mathfrak{osp}(2k+2|2k)$ ).

Take  $\nu, \lambda \in \Lambda^\times$  and denote by  $f$  and  $g$  their weight diagrams. We denote by  $l_f(a, b)$  the number of  $\times$  minus the number of  $\circ$  with the coordinates strictly between  $a$  and  $b$ . Note that  $l_f(a, b) = l_{f'}(a, b)$  if  $f' = (f)_a^b$ .

The graph  $\Gamma^\times$  contains an edge  $\nu \xrightarrow{e} \lambda$  if and only if  $g = (f)_a^p$  or  $g = (f)_{0,0}^{p,q}$  and the following conditions hold.

5.2.1. *Case  $g = (f)_a^p$  and  $f(a) = \times$ .* In this case  $\text{Arc}(f)$  contains a two-legged arch  $\text{arc}(a; a_-)$  with  $a < p \leq a_-$ ; one has  $\kappa(e) = z^{l_f(a,p)}$  and  $l_f(a, b) = l_g(a, b)$ .

5.2.2. *Case  $g = (f)_0^p$  and  $f(0) \neq \times$ .* In this case  $\text{Arc}(f)$  contains three-legged arches (i.e., either  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2k|2k)$  and  $\text{tail}(f) \geq 2$  or  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2k+2|2k)$  and  $\text{tail}(f) \geq 1$ ). For this case we denote by  $\text{arc}(0; a', a_+)$  the highest three-legged arch in  $\text{Arc}(f)$  (for example, for  $\nu = 0$  this is  $\text{arc}(0; 2k-2, 2k-1)$  if  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2k|2k)$ ,  $k > 1$  and  $\text{arc}(0; 2k-1, 2k)$  if  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2k+2|2k)$ ). In this case  $p \leq a_+$ .

If  $f(0) = \times^{i+1}$  for  $i \geq 0$  (then  $t = 2$ ) we have  $\kappa(e) = z^{2i+1+l_f(0,p)}$ . In the remaining case  $f(0) = \times^{i+1}$ ,  $i > 0$  (then  $t = 0$ ) there is a unique two-legged arch  $\text{arc}(0; a_-)$  supported at the zero position and  $\kappa(e) = z^{2i+l_f(0,p)}$  if  $p > a_-$  and  $\kappa(e) = z^{2i+l_f(0,p)} + z^{l_f(0,p)}$  if  $p \leq a_-$ .

For example, for  $f = \times^3 \times \circ \circ \circ \times$  and  $g = (f)_0^2 = \times^2 \times \times \circ \circ \times$  one has  $\kappa(e) = z + z^5$  and for  $g' = (f)_0^4 = \times^2 \times \circ \circ \times \times$  one has  $\kappa(e') = z^3$ .

5.2.3. *Case  $g = (f)_{0,0}^{p,q}$ .* In this case  $\text{Arc}(f)$  contains a three-legged arch  $\text{arc}(0; p, a_2)$  supported at the zero position which is not the highest arch and  $p < q \leq a_2$ ; one has  $\kappa(e) = z^{l_f(p,q)}$ .

Examples.

For  $t = 0$ ,  $\text{tail}(f) \leq 2$  (resp.,  $t = 2$ ,  $\text{tail}(f) \leq 1$ ) there are no suitable three-legged arches.

For  $f = \times^3 \circ \circ \times \times$  there is only one suitable three-legged arch, which is  $\text{arc}(0; 2, 7)$ . Thus  $p = 2$ ,  $q \in \{5, 6, 7\}$  and  $\kappa(e) = z^{7-q}$ .

For  $f = \times^2 \circ \times \times \circ \times$  there is only one suitable three-legged arch, which is  $\text{arc}(0; 1, 8)$ . Thus  $p = 1$ ,  $q \in \{4, 6, 7, 8\}$  with  $\kappa(e) = 2$  for  $q = 5, 6$  and  $\kappa(e) = 8 - q$  for  $q = 7, 8$ .

**5.3. Applications to Ext-graph.** Take  $\nu, \lambda \in \Lambda^\times$  with  $\nu < \lambda$  and denote by  $f$  and  $g$  their weight diagrams.

By [27], in the  $\mathfrak{gl}$ -case  $\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) \neq 0$  if and only if  $g = (f)_a^p$ , where  $\text{arc}(a, p) \in \text{Arc}(f)$  (i.e.  $g$  can be obtained from  $f$  by moving a symbol  $\times$  along the arch supported by this symbol).

By above, for  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(2k+t|2k)$  with  $t = 0, 2$  if  $\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) \neq 0$ , then either  $g = (f)_a^p$ , where  $\text{arc}(a, p) \in \text{Arc}(f)$  or  $g = (f)_0^{a_+}$  where  $\text{arc}(0; a', a_+)$  is the highest arch supported at 0, or  $g = (f)_{0,0}^{a_1, a_2}$ , where  $\text{arc}(0; a_1, a_2)$  is not the highest arch supported at 0.

## 6. APPENDIX: USEFUL FACTS ABOUT $\text{Ext}^1$

6.1. We start from the following lemma which express  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(L', L)$  in terms of indecomposable extensions.

**Lemma.** *Let  $A$  be an associative algebra and  $L, L'$  be simple non-isomorphic modules over  $A$  with  $\text{End}_A(L) = \text{End}_A(L') = \mathbb{C}$ . Let  $N$  be a module with*

$$(18) \quad \text{Soc } N = L^{\oplus m}, \quad N / \text{Soc } N = L'.$$

(i) *If  $N$  is indecomposable, then  $m \leq \dim \text{Ext}^1(L', L)$ .*

(ii) *If  $m \leq \dim \text{Ext}^1(L', L)$ , then there exists an indecomposable  $N$  satisfying (18).*

*Proof.* Consider any exact sequence of the form

$$(19) \quad 0 \rightarrow L^{\oplus m} \xrightarrow{\iota} N \xrightarrow{\phi} L' \rightarrow 0.$$

For each  $i = 1, \dots, m$  let  $p_i$  be the projection from  $L^{\oplus m}$  to the  $i$ th component and  $\theta_i$  is the corresponding embedding  $p_i \theta_i = \text{Id}_L$ . Consider a commutative diagram

$$(20) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L^{\oplus m} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & N & \xrightarrow{\phi} & L' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \theta_i & \uparrow p_i & \downarrow \psi_i & & \downarrow \text{Id} & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & L & \xrightarrow{\iota_i} & M^i & \xrightarrow{\phi_i} & L' & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

where  $\psi_i : N \rightarrow M^i$  is a surjective map with  $\text{Ker } \psi_i = \text{Ker } p_i$ .

The bottom line is an element of  $\text{Ext}^1(L', L)$ , which we denote by  $\Phi_i$ . If  $m > \dim \text{Ext}^1(L', L)$ , then  $\{\Phi_i\}_{i=1}^m$  are linearly dependent and we can assume that  $\Phi_1 = 0$ , so  $\Phi_1$  splits. Let  $\tilde{p} : M^1 \rightarrow L$  be the projection, i.e.  $\iota_1 \tilde{p} = \text{Id}_L$ . Consider the maps

$$L \xrightarrow{\iota \circ \theta_1} N \xrightarrow{\tilde{p} \circ \psi_1} L.$$

The composed map

$$\tilde{p} \circ \psi_1 \circ \iota \circ \theta_1 : L \rightarrow L$$

is surjective, so it is an isomorphism. Hence  $N$  is decomposable. This establishes (i).

For (ii) let  $\{\Phi_i\}_{i=1}^m$  be linearly independent elements in  $\text{Ext}^1(L', L)$ , i.e.

$$\Phi_i : \quad 0 \rightarrow L \xrightarrow{\iota_i} M^i \xrightarrow{\phi_i} L' \rightarrow 0.$$

Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow L^{\oplus m} \longrightarrow \oplus M_i \rightarrow (L')^{\oplus m} \rightarrow 0.$$

Let  $\text{diag}(L')$  be the diagonal copy of  $L'$  in  $(L')^{\oplus m}$  and let  $N$  be the preimage of  $\text{diag}(L')$  in  $\oplus M^i$ . This gives the exact sequence of the form (19) and the commutative diagram (20). Let us show that  $N$  is indecomposable. Assume that  $N$  decomposable, so  $N = N_1 \oplus N_2$ . Since  $L' \not\cong L$  one has  $\phi(N_1) = 0$  or  $\phi(N_2) = 0$ , so  $N_1$  or  $N_2$  lies in the socle of  $N$ . Therefore  $N$  can be written as  $N = L^1 \oplus N''$  with  $L^1 \cong L$ . Since  $\dim \text{Hom}(L, N) = m$  one has  $\dim \text{Hom}(L, N'') = m - 1$ . Changing the basis in the span of  $\{\Phi_i\}_{i=1}^m$ , we can assume that  $\text{Ker } p_1 \subset N''$ . Since  $\text{Ker } \psi_1 = \text{Ker } p_1$ , the exact sequence  $\Phi_1$  splits, a contradiction. Hence  $N$  is indecomposable. This completes the proof.  $\square$



**6.2. Notation.** Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a Lie superalgebra of at most countable dimension.

Let  $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$  be a finite-dimensional subalgebra satisfying

(H1)  $\mathfrak{h}$  acts diagonally on  $\mathfrak{g}$  and  $\mathfrak{g}_0^{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathfrak{h}$ .

We choose  $h \in \mathfrak{h}$  satisfying

(H2)  $\mathfrak{g}^h = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}}$  and each non-zero eigenvalue of  $\text{ad } h$  has a non-zero real part.

(The assumption on  $\dim \mathfrak{g}$  ensures the existence of  $h$ ).

We write  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}} \oplus (\oplus_{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g})} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha})$ , with  $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$  and

$$\mathfrak{g}_{\alpha} := \{g \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h, g] = \alpha(h)g \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h}\}.$$

We introduce the triangular decomposition  $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}) = \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}) \amalg \Delta^-(\mathfrak{g})$ , with

$$\Delta^{\pm}(\mathfrak{g}) := \{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \pm \text{Re } \alpha(h) > 0\},$$

and define the partial order on  $\mathfrak{h}^*$  by  $\lambda > \nu$  if  $\nu - \lambda \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^-$ . We set  $\mathfrak{n}^{\pm} := \oplus_{\alpha \in \Delta^{\pm}} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}$  and consider the Borel subalgebra  $\mathfrak{b} := \mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$ .

**6.2.1.** Take  $z \in \mathfrak{h}$  satisfying

$$(21) \quad \alpha(z) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \text{ for } \alpha \in \Delta^+ \text{ and } \alpha(z) \in \mathbb{R}_{\leq 0} \text{ for } \alpha \in \Delta^-.$$

Consider the superalgebras

$$\mathfrak{t} := \mathfrak{t}(z) := \mathfrak{g}^z, \quad \mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{p}(z) := \mathfrak{g}^z + \mathfrak{b}.$$

Notice that  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{t} \rtimes \mathfrak{m}$ , where  $\mathfrak{m} := \oplus_{\alpha \in \Delta: \alpha(z) > 0} \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}$ . Both triples  $(\mathfrak{p}(z), \mathfrak{h}, h)$ ,  $(\mathfrak{t}(z), \mathfrak{h}, h)$  satisfy (H1), (H2). One has  $\mathfrak{t}^{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathfrak{p}^{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}}$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^+(\mathfrak{p}) &= \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}), & \Delta^+(\mathfrak{t}) &= \{\alpha \in \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \alpha(z) = 0\} \\ \Delta^-(\mathfrak{p}) &= \Delta^-(\mathfrak{t}) = \{\alpha \in \Delta^-(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \alpha(z) = 0\} \end{aligned}$$

**6.2.2. Modules  $M(\lambda), L(\lambda)$ .** For a semisimple  $\mathfrak{h}$ -module  $N$  we denote by  $N_{\nu}$  the weight space of the weight  $\nu$  and by  $\Omega(N)$  the set of weights of  $N$ .

We denote by  $\mathcal{O}$  the full category of finitely generated modules with a diagonal action of  $\mathfrak{h}$  and locally nilpotent action of  $\mathfrak{n}$ .

By Dixmier generalization of Schur's Lemma (see [4]), up to a parity change, the simple  $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -modules are parametrized by  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ ; we denote by  $C_{\lambda}$  a simple  $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -module, where  $\mathfrak{h}$  acts by  $\lambda$ . We view  $C_{\lambda}$  as a  $\mathfrak{b}$ -module with the zero action of  $\mathfrak{n}$  and set

$$M(\lambda) := \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} C_{\lambda};$$

this module has a unique simple quotient which we denote by  $L(\lambda)$ . (The module  $M(\lambda)$  is a Verma module if  $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}} = 0$ ). We introduce similarly the modules  $M_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$ ,  $L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$  for the algebra  $\mathfrak{p}$  and  $M_{\mathfrak{t}}(\lambda)$ ,  $L_{\mathfrak{t}}(\lambda)$  for the algebra  $\mathfrak{t}$ .

6.2.3. Set  $N(\mathfrak{g}; m)$ . Let  $\lambda \neq \nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  be such that  $Re(\lambda - \nu)(h) \geq 0$ . If

$$0 \rightarrow L(\nu) \rightarrow E \rightarrow L(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$$

is a non-split exact sequence, then  $E$  is generated by  $E_\lambda \cong C_\lambda$ , so  $E$  is a quotient of  $M(\lambda)$  and  $\nu < \lambda$ .

For  $\lambda, \nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  we denote by  $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}; m)$  the set of indecomposable  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules  $N$  such that

$$(22) \quad \text{Soc } N = L(\nu)^{\oplus m}, \quad N / \text{Soc } N = L(\lambda)$$

By Lemma 6.1 one has

$$(23) \quad \dim \text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) = \max\{m \mid \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}; m) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Note that each module  $N \in \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}; m)$  is a quotient of  $M(\lambda) = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L_{\mathfrak{b}}(\lambda)$ . We set

$$(24) \quad m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu) := \max\{m \mid \exists N \in \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}; m) \text{ which is a quotient of } \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)\}.$$

6.2.4. **Corollary.** Take  $\lambda \neq \nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  with  $Re(\lambda - \nu)(h) \geq 0$ .

- (i) If  $\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) \neq 0$ , then  $\lambda > \nu$ ;
- (ii)  $\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{O}}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu))$ ;
- (iii)  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) = m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu) \leq \dim M(\lambda)_{\nu}$ .

6.3. **Remark.** If  $\mathfrak{g}$  is a Kac-Moody superalgebra, then  $\mathfrak{g}$  admits antiautomorphism which stabilizes the elements of  $\mathfrak{h}$  and the category  $\mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g})$  admits a duality functor  $\#$  with the property  $L^{\#} \cong L$  for each simple module  $L \in \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g})$ . In this case

$$\dim \text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) = \dim \text{Ext}^1(L(\nu), L(\lambda)).$$

6.4. The following lemma is a slight reformulation of Lemma 6.3 in [27].

**Lemma.** Take  $\lambda, \nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  with  $\lambda > \nu$ .

- (i)  $m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu) \leq m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu)$  if  $\nu - \lambda \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^-(\mathfrak{p})$ ;
- (ii)  $m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu) = m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu)$  if  $\nu - \lambda \notin \mathbb{N}\Delta^-(\mathfrak{p})$ .

*Proof.* Write  $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{g}^z \rtimes \mathfrak{m}$  as in 6.2.1. For each  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $M$  set

$$\text{Res}(M) := \{v \in M \mid zv = \lambda(z)v\}.$$

Note that  $\text{Res}(M)$  is a  $\mathfrak{g}^z$ -module; we view  $\text{Res}(M)$  as a  $\mathfrak{p}$ -module with the zero action of  $\mathfrak{m}$ . This defines an exact functor  $\text{Res} : \mathfrak{g}\text{-Mod} \rightarrow \mathfrak{p}\text{-Mod}$ . By the PBW Theorem

$$\text{Res}(M(\mu)) = \begin{cases} M_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mu) & \text{if } \mu(z) = \lambda(z) \\ 0 & \text{if } (\lambda - \mu)(z) < 0 \end{cases}$$

Let us show that

$$(25) \quad \text{Res}(L(\mu)) = \begin{cases} L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mu) & \text{if } \mu(z) = \lambda(z) \\ 0 & \text{if } (\lambda - \mu)(z) < 0. \end{cases}$$

Indeed, since  $\text{Res}$  is exact,  $\text{Res}(L(\mu))$  is a quotient of  $\text{Res}(M(\mu))$ ; this gives the second formula. For the first formula assume that  $\mu(z) = \lambda(z)$  and that  $E$  is a proper submodule of  $\text{Res}(L(\mu))$ . Since  $E$  is a  $\mathfrak{p}$ -module we have  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})E = \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)E$ . Since  $\text{Res}(L(\mu))$  is a quotient of  $\text{Res}(M(\mu))$  and

$$(\text{Res}(M(\mu)))_\mu = (M_{\mathfrak{p}}(\mu))_\mu$$

is a simple  $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}}$ -module, one has  $\gamma < \mu$  for each  $\gamma \in \Omega(E)$ . Therefore  $(\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)E)_\mu = 0$ , so  $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})E$  is a proper  $\mathfrak{g}$ -submodule of  $L(\mu)$ . Hence  $E = 0$ , so  $\text{Res}(L(\mu))$  is simple. This establishes (25).

Now we fix a non-negative integer  $m \leq m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu)$  and  $N \in \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}; m)$ .

Consider the case when  $\nu - \lambda \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^-(\mathfrak{p})$ . Then  $\lambda(z) = \nu(z)$ , so  $\text{Res}(L(\nu)) = L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\nu)$ . Since  $\text{Res}$  is exact one has

$$\text{Soc}(\text{Res } N) = L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\nu)^{\oplus m}, \quad \text{Res}(N)/\text{Soc}(\text{Res}(N)) = L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$$

and  $\text{Res}(N)$  is a quotient of  $M_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$ . Therefore  $m \leq m(\mathfrak{p}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu)$ . This gives (i).

For (ii)  $\nu - \lambda \notin \mathbb{N}\Delta^-(\mathfrak{p})$ . Let us show that  $N$  is a quotient of  $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$ . Write

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda) = M(\lambda)/J, \quad L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda) = M_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)/J'$$

where  $J$  (resp.,  $J'$ ) is the corresponding submodule of  $M(\lambda)$  (resp., of  $M_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$ ). Since  $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$  is exact and  $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} M_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda) = M(\lambda)$  one has  $J \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} J'$ ; in particular, each maximal element in  $\Omega(J)$  lies in  $\Omega(J')$ . Note that

$$\Omega(J') \subset \lambda - \mathbb{N}\Delta^+(\mathfrak{l}).$$

Let  $\phi : M(\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow N$  be the canonical surjection. Since  $J_{\lambda} = 0$ ,  $\phi(J)$  is a proper submodule of  $N$ , so  $\phi(J)$  is a submodule of  $\text{Soc}(N) = L(\nu)^{\oplus m}$ .

If  $\phi(J) \neq 0$ , then  $\nu$  is a maximal element in  $\Omega(J)$  and so  $\lambda - \nu \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^+(\mathfrak{l})$ , which contradicts to  $\nu - \lambda \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^-(\mathfrak{p})$ . Therefore  $\phi$  induces a map  $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda) = M(\lambda)/J \twoheadrightarrow N$ . Therefore

$$m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu) \leq m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu).$$

Since  $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L_{\mathfrak{p}}(\lambda)$  is a quotient of  $M(\lambda)$ , we have  $m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu) \geq m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu)$ . Thus  $m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu) = m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu)$  as required.  $\square$

**6.5. Corollary.** *Let  $z_1, \dots, z_{k-1} \in \mathfrak{h}$  satisfying (21) be such that  $\mathfrak{t}^{z_i} \subset \mathfrak{t}^{z_{i+1}}$ . Set  $\mathfrak{t}^{(i)} := \mathfrak{t}^{z_i}$  and consider the chain*

$$\mathfrak{h} =: \mathfrak{t}^{(0)} \subset \mathfrak{p}^{(1)} \subset \mathfrak{p}^{(2)} \subset \dots \subset \mathfrak{t}^{(k)} := \mathfrak{g}.$$

*For  $\lambda \neq \nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  with  $\lambda > \nu$  one has*

$$\text{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) \leq m(\mathfrak{t}^{(s)}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu),$$

*where  $s$  is minimal such that  $\nu - \lambda \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^-(\mathfrak{t}^{(s)})$  and  $\mathfrak{p} := (\mathfrak{t}^{(s-1)} + \mathfrak{b}) \cap \mathfrak{t}^{(s)}$ .*

*Proof.* Take  $\mathfrak{p}^{(i)} := \mathfrak{t}^{(i)} + \mathfrak{b}$ . Combining Corollary 6.2.4 and Lemma 6.4 we obtain

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) = m(\mathfrak{g}; \mathfrak{b}; \lambda; \nu) \leq m(\mathfrak{p}^{(s)}; \mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}; \lambda; \nu).$$

Recall that  $\mathfrak{p}^{(i)} = \mathfrak{t}^{(i)} \rtimes \mathfrak{m}^{(i)}$ , where  $\mathfrak{m}^{(i)}$  is the maximal ideal in  $\mathfrak{p}^{(i)}$  which lie in  $\mathfrak{n}$ . One has  $\mathfrak{m}^{(s)} \subset \mathfrak{m}^{(s-1)}$ . In particular,  $\mathfrak{m}^{(s)}$  annihilates  $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}}^{\mathfrak{p}^{(s)}} L_{\mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}}(\lambda)$ , so

$$m(\mathfrak{p}^{(s)}; \mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}; \lambda; \nu) = m(\mathfrak{t}^{(s)}; \mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}/\mathfrak{m}^{(s)}; \lambda; \nu).$$

Since

$$\mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)} = \mathfrak{t}^{(s-1)} + \mathfrak{b} \subset \mathfrak{p}^{(s)} = \mathfrak{t}^{(s)} \rtimes \mathfrak{m}^{(s)}$$

the image of  $\mathfrak{p}^{(s-1)}$  in  $\mathfrak{t}^{(s)} = \mathfrak{p}^{(s)}/\mathfrak{m}^{(s)}$  coincides with  $\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{t}^{(s)}$ .  $\square$

6.5.1. *Remark.* Consider the special case when  $\mathfrak{g}^{\mathfrak{h}} = \mathfrak{h}$  and  $\mathfrak{t}^{(s)} = \mathfrak{l}' \times \mathfrak{h}''$ , where  $\mathfrak{h}'' \subset \mathfrak{h}$ . Take

$$\mathfrak{h}' := \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{h}, \quad \mathfrak{b}' := \mathfrak{l} \cap \mathfrak{b}, \quad \mathfrak{p}' := \mathfrak{l}' \cap \mathfrak{p}.$$

and let  $h'$  be the image of  $z_s$  in  $\mathfrak{h}'$ . Then the triple  $(\mathfrak{l}'; \mathfrak{h}'; h')$  satisfies (H1), (H2) and  $\mathfrak{b}'$  is the Borel subalgebra of  $\mathfrak{l}'$ . For each  $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$  we set

$$\lambda' := \lambda|_{\mathfrak{h}'}$$

Since  $\nu - \lambda \in \mathbb{N}\Delta^-(\mathfrak{t}^{(s)})$  one has

$$m(\mathfrak{t}^{(s)}; \mathfrak{p}; \lambda; \nu) = m(\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{p}', \lambda', \nu').$$

Assume, in addition, that  $L_{\mathfrak{l}'}(\lambda')$ ,  $L_{\mathfrak{l}'}(\nu')$  are finite-dimensional. It is not hard to see that  $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}'}^{\mathfrak{l}'}(L_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\lambda'))$  admits a unique maximal finite-dimensional subquotient which we denote by  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{p}'}(L_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\lambda'))$  and that for any finite-dimensional quotient  $N'$  of  $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{p}'}^{\mathfrak{l}'}(L_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\lambda'))$  there exists an epimorphism  $\Gamma_{\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{p}'}(L_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\lambda')) \rightarrow N'$ . This implies

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(L(\lambda), L(\nu)) \leq m(\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{p}', \lambda', \nu') \leq [\Gamma_{\mathfrak{l}', \mathfrak{p}'}(L_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\lambda')) : L_{\mathfrak{l}'}(\nu')].$$

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Brundan, *Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomials and character formulae for Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{q}(n)$* , Adv. Math. **182** (2004), 28–77.
- [2] J. Brundan, C. Stroppel, *Highest weight categories arising from Khovanov’s diagram algebra. IV: the general linear supergroup.*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS), **14**, 2, (2012).
- [3] V. Deodhar, O. Gabber, V. Kac, *Structure of some categories of representations of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Adv. in Math. **45** (1982), 92–116.
- [4] J. Dixmier, *Représentations irréductibles des algèbres de Lie nilpotentes*, An. Acad. Brasil. Ci. **35**, 4(1963) 91–519 (French).
- [5] M. Duflo, V. Serganova, *On associated variety for Lie superalgebras*, arXiv:0507198.
- [6] M. Ehrig, C. Stroppel, *On the category of finite-dimensional representations of  $OSP(r|2n)$ , Part I*, Representation theory — current trends and perspectives, 109–170, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2017.
- [7] M. Ehrig, C. Stroppel, *On the category of finite-dimensional representations of  $OSP(r|2n)$ , Part II*, preprint.

- [8] I. Entova-Aizenbud, V. Serganova, *Duflo-Serganova functor and superdimension formula for the periplectic Lie superalgebra*, arXiv: 1910.02294, (2019)
- [9] J. Germoni, *Indecomposable representations of special linear Lie superalgebras*, J. of Algebra, **209**, (1998), 367–401.
- [10] J. Germoni, *Indecomposable representations of  $\mathfrak{osp}(3, 2)$ ,  $D(2, 1; \alpha)$  and  $G(3)$*  in Colloquium on Homology and Representation Theory, Vaqueras, 1998, Bol. Acad. Nac. Cienc. (Córdoba) **65** (2000), 147–163.
- [11] M. Gorelik, *Depths and cores in the light of DS-functors*, arXiv: 2010.05721.
- [12] M. Gorelik, *On modified extension graphs of a fixed atypicality*, arXiv:2204.02759.
- [13] M. Gorelik, T. Heidersdorf, *Semisimplicity of the DS functor for the orthosymplectic Lie superalgebra*, arXiv: 2010.14975.
- [14] M. Gorelik, T. Heidersdorf, *Gruson-Serganova character formulas and the Duflo-Serganova cohomology functor*, arXiv:2104.12634.
- [15] M. Gorelik, C. Hoyt, V. Serganova, A. Sherman, *The Duflo-Serganova functor, vingt ans après*, arXiv: 2203.00529.
- [16] M. Gorelik, V. Serganova, *Integrable modules over affine Lie superalgebras  $\mathfrak{sl}(1|n)^{(1)}$* , Comm. Math. Phys. **364** (2018), no. 2, 635–654
- [17] N. Grantcharov, V. Serganova, *Extension quiver for Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{q}_3$* , arXiv:2008.10649.
- [18] C. Gruson, V. Serganova, *Cohomology of generalized supergrassmanians and character formulae for basic classical Lie superalgebras*, Proc. London Math. Soc., (3), **101** (2010), 852–892.
- [19] C. Gruson, V. Serganova, *Bernstein-Gelfand-Gelfand reciprocity and indecomposable projective modules for classical algebraic supergroups*, Mosc. Math. J., **13** (2013), no. 2, 281–313.
- [20] C. Gruson, V. Serganova, *Category of finite-dimensional modules over an orthosymplectic Lie superalgebra: small rank examples*, in Symmetries, integrable systems and representations, 155–173, Springer Proc. Math. Stat., 40, Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [21] T. Heidersdorf, R. Weissauer, *Cohomological tensor functors on representations of the general linear supergroup*, arXiv:1406.0321, to appear in Mem. Am. Math. Soc.
- [22] C. Hoyt, S. Reif, *Grothendieck rings for Lie superalgebras and the Duflo-Serganova functor*, Algebra Number Theory **12** (2018), no. 9, 2167–2184.
- [23] V. G. Kac, *Lie superalgebras*, Adv. in Math., **26**, no. 1 (1977), 8–96.
- [24] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *Integrable highest weight modules over affine superalgebras and Applel’s function*, Commun. Math. Phys. **215** (2001), 631–682.
- [25] L. Martirosyan, *The representation theory of the exceptional Lie superalgebras  $F(4)$  and  $G(3)$* , J. of Algebra, **419** (2014), 167–222.
- [26] V. Mazorchuk, V. Miemietz, *Serre functors for Lie algebras and superalgebras*, Ann. de l’Institut Fourier **62** (2012), no.1, 47–75.
- [27] I. Musson, V. Serganova, *Combinatorics of character formulas for the Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$* , Transform. Groups **16** (2011), no. 2, 555–578.
- [28] I. Penkov, *Characters of typical irreducible finite-dimensional  $\mathfrak{q}(n)$ -modules*, Funct. Anal. Appl. **20** (1986), 30–37.
- [29] I. Penkov, *Borel-Weil-Bott theory for classical Lie supergroups*, J. Soviet Math. **51** (1990), 2108–2140 (Russian).
- [30] I. Penkov, V. Serganova, *Characters of finite-dimensional irreducible  $\mathfrak{q}(n)$ -modules*, Lett. Math. Phys. **40** (1997), 147–158.
- [31] I. Penkov, V. Serganova, *Characters of irreducible  $G$ -modules and cohomology of  $G/P$  for the supergroup  $G = Q(N)$* , J. Math. Sci., **84**, (1997), 1382–1412.
- [32] V. Serganova, *Kazhdan–Lusztig polynomials and character formula for the Lie superalgebra  $\mathfrak{gl}(m|n)$* , (N.S.) **2**, Selecta Math. (1996), 607–651.

- [33] V. Serganova, *On a superdimension of an irreducible representation of a basic classical Lie superalgebras*, in Supersymmetry in mathematics and physics, 253–273, Lecture Notes in Math., 2027, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [34] V. Serganova, *Kac-Moody superalgebras and integrability*, in Developments and trends in infinite-dimensional Lie theory, 169–218, Progr. Math., 288, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2011.
- [35] Yucai Su, R. B. Zhang, *Character and dimension formulae for queer Lie superalgebra*, Commun. Math. Phys. 333, No. 3, 1465–1481 (2015).

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, THE WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, REHOVOT 76100, ISRAEL

*Email address:* maria.gorelik@weizmann.ac.il