

Categories \mathcal{O} for Root-Reductive Lie Algebras: II. Translation Functors and Tilting Modules

Thanasin Nampaisarn

Abstract

This is the second paper of a series of papers on a version of categories \mathcal{O} for root-reductive Lie algebras. Let \mathfrak{g} be a root-reductive Lie algebra over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} of characteristic 0 with a splitting Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b} containing a splitting maximal toral subalgebra \mathfrak{h} . For some pairs of blocks $\bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ and $\bar{\mathcal{O}}[\mu]$, the subcategories whose objects have finite length are equivalence via functors obtained by the direct limits of translation functors. Tilting objects can also be defined in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. There are also universal tilting objects $D(\lambda)$ in parallel to the finite-dimensional cases.

Key words: root-reductive Lie algebras, finitary Lie algebras, highest-weight modules, BGG categories \mathcal{O} , equivalences of categories, translation functors, tilting modules

MSC 2010: 17B10; 17B20; 17B22

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to further study a version of Bernstein-Gel'fand-Gel'fand (BGG) categories \mathcal{O} for root-reductive Lie algebras with respect to Dynkin Borel subalgebras as defined in [9]. For a reductive Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} over an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 whose derived algebra $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ is finite-dimensional, if $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ denotes the BGG category \mathcal{O} of \mathfrak{g} with respect to a certain Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b} of \mathfrak{g} as defined in [6, Chapter 1.1], then we know that some blocks of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ are equivalent via translation functors (see [6, Chapter 1.13] and [6, Chapter 7]).

We denote by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$ for the block of \mathcal{O} containing the simple object $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ with highest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, where \mathfrak{h} is the Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} contained in \mathfrak{b} . Also, $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda]$ is the integral Weyl group for the weight λ (see [6, Chapter 3.4], wherein the notation $W_{[\lambda]}$ is used). The Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b} induces the set of simple reflections $S_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda]$, so that $(W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda], S_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda])$ is a Coxeter system.

In fact, [10, Theorem 11] provides a stronger statement, as it a description of the categorical structure of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ using the Weyl group of \mathfrak{g} . In other words, suppose that \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}' are two reductive Lie algebras with Borel subalgebras \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{b}' ; for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $\lambda' \in (\mathfrak{h}')^*$, if the Coxeter systems $(W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda], S_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda])$ and $(W_{\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda'], S_{\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda'])$ are isomorphic, then the blocks $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}[\lambda']$ are equivalent as categories.

The paper [4] studies Kac-Moody algebras and obtains a similar result to [10, Theorem 11]. If \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}' are complex symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras with Borel subalgebras \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{b}' and Cartan subalgebras \mathfrak{h} and \mathfrak{h}' , where $\mathfrak{h} \subseteq \mathfrak{b} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ and $\mathfrak{h}' \subseteq \mathfrak{b}' \subseteq \mathfrak{g}'$. We denote by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}$ for the corresponding BGG categories \mathcal{O} for the pairs $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b})$ and $(\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{b}')$, respectively. Let $\Lambda \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^*$ be the set of highest weights of simple objects in a block of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$, and write \mathcal{O}_{Λ} for the said block. The notations $\Lambda' \subseteq (\mathfrak{h}')^*$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda'}$ are defined similarly for $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}$. For specific pairs Λ and Λ' , [4, Theorem 4.1] establishes an equivalence between the categories \mathcal{O}_{Λ} and $\mathcal{O}_{\Lambda'}$. One of the necessary conditions for the existence of an equivalence in [4, Theorem 4.1] is that there exists an isomorphism between relevant Coxeter systems.

In the present paper, we shall look at the subcategory $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$ consisting of objects of finite length from the block $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$, where $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is an extended BGG category \mathcal{O} for a root-reductive Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}

with respect to a Dynkin Borel subalgebras \mathfrak{b} , and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Here, \mathfrak{h} is the unique splitting maximal toral subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} contained in \mathfrak{b} . We obtain a similar result to [10, Theorem 11] and [4, Theorem 4.1], with [10, Theorem 11] being the crucial ingredient for our proof.

Another main topic of this paper is tilting theory. In the case where \mathfrak{g} is a reductive Lie algebra with $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ being finite-dimensional, tilting modules in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ are objects with both standard and costandard filtrations (see [6, Chapter 11.1]). For a root-reductive Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , indecomposable objects in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ can potentially have infinite length, in which case the notion of filtrations may not apply to $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. However, if we generalize the definition of filtrations, then it is possible to define tilting modules in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ in a similar manner.

This paper consists of three sections. The first section provides necessary foundations for other sections such as a brief recapitulation of the results from [9] and some relevant definitions such as generalized filtrations. This section also provides a characterization of integrable modules in our version of BGG categories \mathcal{O} for root-reductive Lie algebras, which are usually denoted by $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. The second section provides a visualization of the subcategory of each block of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ consisting of modules of finite length, proving that each subcategory is a direct limit of subcategories of some categories \mathcal{O} for reductive Lie algebras with finite-dimensional derived algebras. The final section deals with the construction and the properties of tilting modules in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$.

Acknowledgement

The author has been supported by ISF Grant 711/18. The author would also like to thank Dr. Inna Entova from Ben-Gurion University of the Negev and Professor Maria Gorelik from Weizmann Institute of Science for the help towards the completion of this paper.

1 Preliminaries

All vector spaces and Lie algebras are defined over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} of characteristic 0. For a vector space V , $\dim V$ is the \mathbb{K} -dimension of V and V^* denotes its algebraic dual $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{K}}(V, \mathbb{K})$. Unless otherwise specified, the tensor product \otimes is defined over \mathbb{K} . For a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ is its universal enveloping algebra.

1.1 Root-Reductive Lie Algebras and Categories $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$

Let \mathfrak{g} be a root-reductive Lie algebra in the sense of [9, Definition 1.1]. Suppose that \mathfrak{h} is a splitting maximal toral subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} in the sense of [9, Definition 1.2], and \mathfrak{b} is a Dynkin Borel subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} (see [9, Definition 1.5]) that contains \mathfrak{h} . Let $\mathfrak{n} := [\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{b}]$ (we sometimes write \mathfrak{b}^+ and \mathfrak{n}^+ for \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{n} , respectively). If \mathfrak{b}^- is the unique Borel subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} such that $\mathfrak{b}^+ \cap \mathfrak{b}^- = \mathfrak{h}$, then we have the following decompositions of vector spaces: $\mathfrak{b}^{\pm} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^{\pm}$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$.

For each \mathfrak{h} -root α of \mathfrak{g} , the \mathfrak{h} -root space of \mathfrak{g} associated to α is given by \mathfrak{g}^{α} . With respect to \mathfrak{b} , the set $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$ of \mathfrak{h} -roots of \mathfrak{g} can be partitioned into two disjoint subsets $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^+$ consisting of positive \mathfrak{b} -roots and $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^-$ consisting of negative \mathfrak{b} -roots. Write $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$ for the Weyl group of $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$. Also, $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}} := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}} \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$. When there is no risk of confusion, we shall write Φ , Φ^+ , Φ^- , W , and Λ for $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$, $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^+$, $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^-$, $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$, and $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$, respectively.

The set of (positive) \mathfrak{b} -simple roots is denoted by $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}$, or $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^+$. The set of negative \mathfrak{b} -simple roots is given by $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^-$. For convenience, we also write Σ , Σ^+ , and Σ^- for $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}$, $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^+$, and $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^-$. For each $\alpha \in \Phi$, let $x_{+\alpha} \in \mathfrak{g}^{+\alpha}$, $x_{-\alpha} \in \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}$, and $h_{\alpha} \in [\mathfrak{g}^{+\alpha}, \mathfrak{g}^{-\alpha}]$ be such that $h_{\alpha} = [x_{+\alpha}, x_{-\alpha}]$ and $\alpha(h_{\alpha}) = 2$ (that is, h_{α} is the coroot of α). Thus, $\{x_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Phi\} \cup \{h_{\alpha} \mid \alpha \in \Sigma\}$ is a Chevalley basis of $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$.

For convenience, we fix a filtration $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}_1 \subseteq \dot{\mathfrak{g}}_2 \subseteq \dot{\mathfrak{g}}_3 \subseteq \dots$ of \mathfrak{g} such that each $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}_n$ is a finite-dimensional reductive Lie algebra with $\dot{\mathfrak{b}}_n := \mathfrak{b} \cap \dot{\mathfrak{g}}_n$ and $\dot{\mathfrak{h}}_n := \mathfrak{h} \cap \dot{\mathfrak{g}}_n$ as a Borel subalgebra and a Cartan subalgebra, respectively. We also define $\mathfrak{g}_n := \dot{\mathfrak{g}}_n + \mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{b}_n := \dot{\mathfrak{b}}_n + \mathfrak{h}$. The notations $\dot{\mathfrak{b}}_n^{\pm}$, $\dot{\mathfrak{b}}_n^{\pm}$, $\dot{\mathfrak{n}}_n^{\pm}$, and $\dot{\mathfrak{n}}_n$ carry similar meanings.

Note that there exists $\rho \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\rho|_{\dot{\mathfrak{b}}_n}$ is the half sum of $\dot{\mathfrak{b}}_n$ -positive roots of each $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}_n$. Then, we define the dot action of W on \mathfrak{h}^* by $w \cdot \lambda = w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$ for each $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. While the map ρ may not be unique, the dot action is independent of the choice of ρ . For a fixed $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, the subgroup $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda]$ (also denoted by $W[\lambda]$) of $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}$ consists of $w \in W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}$ such that $w \cdot \lambda - \lambda \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}$.

Write $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ for the extended category $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ for the pair $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b})$ (see [9, Definition 2.1]). For simplicity, we also write $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ for $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$. For each $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, M^λ denotes the \mathfrak{h} -weight space with respect to the weight λ . Let $(_)^\vee : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the duality functor as defined in [9, Definition 2.2.]. Then, $\Delta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$, or simply $\Delta(\lambda)$, is defined to be the Verma module with highest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ (see [9, Definition 1.9]). We also write $\nabla_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$, or simply $\nabla(\lambda)$, for the co-Verma module with highest weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, namely, $\nabla(\lambda) = (\Delta(\lambda))^\vee$. Write $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda)$, or simply $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$, for the simple quotient of $\Delta(\lambda)$.

For each $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we shall denote by $[\lambda]$ the set of all weights $\mu \in W \cdot \lambda$ such that $\lambda - \mu \in \Lambda$. The definition of *abstract blocks* is given by [2, Definition 4.13]. A *block* in our consideration is the full subcategory of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ consisting of all objects belonging in the same abstract block. Due to [9, Theorem 3.4], we can write each block of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ as $\bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$, where $\bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ is the unique block of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ that contains $\Delta(\lambda)$. If $\Omega_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$, or simply Ω , is the set of all $[\lambda]$, where $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, then

$$\bar{\mathcal{O}} = \bigoplus_{[\lambda] \in \Omega} \bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]. \quad (1.1)$$

Note that, if \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional, then $\bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda] = \mathcal{O}[\lambda]$.

For a given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, let $\text{pr}_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ denote the projection onto the $[\lambda]$ -block. We also write $\text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ for the injection from the $[\lambda]$ -block. When the context is clear, pr^λ and inj^λ are used instead. Note that both functors are exact, and are adjoint to one another.

For each $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$, $\Pi(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid M^\lambda \neq 0\}$ and $\text{ch}_{\mathfrak{h}}(M) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*} \dim(M^\lambda) e^\lambda$ is the formal character of M (with the standard multiplication rule given by $e^\lambda e^\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{\lambda+\mu}$ for all $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$). When the context is clear, $\text{ch}(M)$ denotes $\text{ch}_{\mathfrak{h}}(M)$. We note that $\text{ch}(M) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*} [M : \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)] \text{ch}(\mathfrak{L}(\lambda))$, where $[M : L]$ denotes the multiplicity of a simple object L in M (see [9, Corollary 2.10]). If L is a simple object such that $[M : L] > 0$, then L is called a *composition factor* of M .

1.2 Generalized Filtrations

Let \mathcal{C} be an abelian category. Fix a family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$.

Definition 1.1 A *generalized \mathcal{F} -filtration* of $M \in \mathcal{C}$ is a collection $(M_j)_{j \in J}$ of subobjects M_j of M , where (J, \preceq) is a totally ordered set, such that

- (i) $M_j \subsetneq M_k$ for all $j, k \in J$ such that $j \prec k$,
- (ii) $\bigcap_{j \in J} M_j = 0$,
- (iii) $\bigcup_{j \in J} M_j = M$, and
- (iv) for each $j \in J$, $M_j / \left(\bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k \right)$ is an object in \mathcal{F} . ◆

Definition 1.2 Two generalized \mathcal{F} -filtrations $(M_j)_{j \in J}$ and $(M'_{j'})_{j' \in J'}$ of $M \in \mathcal{C}$ (where \preceq and \preceq' are the respective total orders on J and J') are said to be *\mathcal{F} -equivalent* if there exists a bijection

$f : J \rightarrow J'$ such that $M_j / \left(\bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k \right) \cong M'_{f(j)} / \left(\bigcup_{k' \prec f(j)} M'_{k'} \right)$ for every $j \in J$ that is not the least element of J . ◆

Definition 1.3 We say that \mathcal{F} is a *complete filter* if, for any $M \in \mathcal{C}$, M has a generalized \mathcal{F} -filtration. We say that \mathcal{F} is a *good filter* if any two filtrations $(M_j)_{j \in J}$ and $(M'_{j'})_{j' \in J'}$ of a single object $M \in \mathcal{C}$ are \mathcal{F} -equivalent. \blacklozenge

Definition 1.4 We define $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{C})$ to be the full subcategory of \mathcal{C} whose objects are those with generalized \mathcal{F} -filtrations. \blacklozenge

Consider $\mathcal{C} := \bar{\mathcal{O}}$. We have the following theorem.

Theorem 1.5 Define $\Delta := \{\Delta(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*\}$, $\nabla := \{\nabla(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*\}$, and $\mathbf{L} := \{\mathfrak{L}(\lambda) \mid \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*\}$ as subcollections of the category $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$.

- (a) The collection Δ is a good filter of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. (A generalized Δ -filtration is also called a generalized standard filtration.)
- (b) The collection ∇ is a good filter of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. (A generalized ∇ -filtration is also called a generalized standard filtration.)
- (c) The collection \mathbf{L} is a good and complete filter of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. (A generalized \mathbf{L} -filtration is also known as a generalized composition series.)

Proof Part (c) follows from [9, Corollary 2.10]. By employing duality, Part (b) is a trivial consequence of Part (a). We shall now prove Part (a).

Suppose that $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ has two generalized standard filtrations $(M_j)_{j \in J}$ and $(M'_{j'})_{j' \in J'}$ of $M \in \mathcal{C}$ (where \preceq and \preceq' are the respective total orders on J and J'). Without loss of generality, we may assume that M lies a single block $\bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$.

Let p denote the formal character of $\Delta(0)$. For $j \in J$ and $j' \in J'$ that are not the least elements of J and J' , respectively, suppose that $\mu(j)$ and $\mu'(j')$ denote the highest weights of $M_j / \bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k$ and $M'_{j'} / \bigcup_{k' \prec' j'} M'_{k'}$, respectively. Write a and a' for the sum of all $e^{\mu(j)}$ and the sum of all $e^{\mu'(j')}$, respectively. It follows that $\text{ch}(M) = ap$ and $\text{ch}(M) = a'p$.

We now let q to be the infinite product of $e^0 - e^{-\alpha}$, where α runs over all \mathfrak{b} -positive roots. Since \mathfrak{b} is a Dynkin Borel subalgebra, q is well defined. We can easily show that $pq = e^0$. Therefore,

$$a = ae^0 = a(pq) = (ap)q = \text{ch}(M)q = (a'p)q = a'(pq) = a'e^0 = a'. \quad (1.2)$$

The claim follows immediately. \blacksquare

Corollary 1.6 For each object $M \in \Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ and a given generalized standard filtration $(M_j)_{j \in J}$ of M , the number of times $\Delta(\lambda)$ occurs as a quotient $M_j / \bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k$ is a finite nonnegative integer, which is independent of the choice of the generalized standard filtration $(M_j)_{j \in J}$. This number is denoted by $\{M : \Delta(\lambda)\}$.

For each $M \in \nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ and a given generalized co-standard filtration $(M_j)_{j \in J}$ of M , the number of times $\nabla(\lambda)$ occurs as a quotient $M_j / \bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k$ is a finite nonnegative integer which is independent of the choice of the generalized co-standard filtration. This number is denoted by $\{M : \nabla(\lambda)\}$.

Example 1.7 For fixed $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\mu \preceq \lambda$, the truncated projective cover $\mathfrak{p}^{\preceq \lambda}(\mu)$ of $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ lies in $\Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$, whilst the truncated injective hull $\mathfrak{J}^{\preceq \lambda}(\mu)$ of $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ lies in $\nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. See [9, Section 4]. \blacklozenge

Proposition 1.8 Suppose that $M \in \Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$.

- (a) If λ is a maximal weight of M , then M has a submodule N isomorphic to $\Delta(\lambda)$, and the factor module M/N is in $\Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$.
- (b) If N is a direct summand of M , then $N \in \Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$.
- (c) The module M is a free $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ -module.

Proof For Part (a), let u be a maximal vector of M with weight λ . There exists an index $j \in J$ such that $u \in M_j$ but $u \notin M_{\prec j} := \bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k$. Thus, the map $\psi : \Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow M_j/M_{\prec j}$ sending $g \cdot u' \mapsto g \cdot u + M_{\prec j}$ for each $g \in \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g})$, where u' is a maximal vector of $\Delta(\lambda)$, is a nonzero homomorphism of Verma modules (recalling that $M_j/M_{\prec j}$ is a Verma module). By [9, Theorem 1.1], ψ must be injective. Therefore, $\text{im}(\psi)$ is a Verma submodule with highest weight λ of the Verma module $M_j/M_{\prec j}$. Because λ is a maximal weight of M , we conclude that $\text{im}(\psi) = M_j/M_{\prec j}$ and ψ is an isomorphism of \mathfrak{g} -modules. Hence, the \mathfrak{g} -submodule N of M generated by u is a Verma module isomorphic to $\Delta(\lambda)$. We now note that M/M_j and $M_{\prec j}$ are both in $\Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. Furthermore, because $N \cap M_{\prec j} \cong \ker(\psi) = 0$, we obtain a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M_{\prec j} \rightarrow M/N \rightarrow M/M_j \rightarrow 0$. Hence, M/N has a generalized standard filtration given by patching the generalized standard filtration of $M_{\prec j}$ with the generalized standard filtration of M/M_j .

For Part (b), we may assume without loss of generality that N is an indecomposable direct summand of M . Now, define $N[0] := N$ and $\lambda[0] := \lambda$. We finish the proof using transfinite induction. For an ordinal t with a predecessor s , suppose a module $N[s]$ and a weight $\lambda[s] \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ are given such that $\Delta(\lambda[s]) \subseteq N[s]$. Then, define $N[t] := N[s]/\Delta(\lambda[s])$. If $N[t] = 0$, then we are done. If $N[t] \neq 0$, then by taking $\lambda[t]$ to be a maximal weight of $N[t]$, using the same idea as the paragraph above, we conclude that $\Delta(\lambda[t]) \subseteq N[t]$. On the other hand, if t is a limit ordinal, then we have a directed system of modules $(N[s])_{s < t}$. Define $N[t]$ to be the direct limit of the modules $N[s]$ for $s < t$. As before, if $N[t] = 0$, then we are done. If not, we then take $\lambda[t]$ to be a maximal weight of $N[t]$. Then, again, $\Delta(\lambda[t]) \subseteq N[t]$. Since the multiset of composition factors of N is a countable multiset, this procedure must stop at some countable ordinal τ , where $N[\tau] = 0$. We then obtain a generalized standard filtration of N .

For Part (c), let $(M_j)_{j \in J}$ be a generalized standard filtration of M . For an element $j \in J$ that is not the minimum element of J , take $m_j \in M_j \setminus \bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k$ such that m_j is a weight vector whose weight is the highest weight of $M_j / \bigcup_{k \prec j} M_k$. Then, M is a free $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ -module with basis $\{m_j \mid j \in J\}$. ■

Corollary 1.9 Suppose that $M \in \nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$.

- (a) If λ is a maximal weight of M , then M has a submodule N such that M/N is isomorphic to $\nabla(\lambda)$, and the submodule N is in $\nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$.
- (b) If N is a direct summand of M , then $N \in \nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$.
- (c) The module M is a free $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ -module.

Definition 1.10 Let $\mathcal{D}_\mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{g}$ (or simply, \mathcal{D}) denote the subcategory $\Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}}_\mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{g}) \cap \nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}}_\mathfrak{b}^\mathfrak{g})$. The objects in \mathcal{D} are called *tilting modules*. ♦

1.3 Integrable Modules

Definition 1.11 Let \mathfrak{a} be an arbitrary Lie algebra. An \mathfrak{a} -module M is said to be *integrable* (or *\mathfrak{a} -integrable*) if, for any $m \in M$ and $a \in \mathfrak{a}$, the elements $m, a \cdot m, a^2 \cdot m, \dots$ span a finite-dimensional subspace of M . ♦

Definition 1.12 Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

- (a) We say that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is *integral* (with respect to \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{h}) if $h_\alpha(\lambda)$ is an integer for all $\alpha \in \Phi$.
- (b) If $h_\alpha(\lambda) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for every $\alpha \in \Phi^+$, then λ is said to be *dominant-integral* (with respect to \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{h}).
- (c) If $h_\alpha(\lambda) \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\alpha \in \Phi$, then λ is said to be *nonintegral* (with respect to \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{h}).
- (d) If $h_\alpha(\lambda) \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for all but finitely many $\alpha \in \Phi$, then λ is said to be *almost nonintegral* (with respect to \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{h}). \blacklozenge

Theorem 1.13 A module $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is integrable if and only if it is a direct sum of simple integrable modules in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. All simple integrable modules in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ are of the form $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$, where $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is dominant-integral. Nonisomorphic simple integrable modules belong in different blocks of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$.

Proof For the first statement, we may assume that M is an indecomposable module (by means of [9, Corollary 2.6]). We shall prove that M is simple. Let u be a highest-weight vector of M associated to the weight λ . We claim that λ is dominant-integral and $M \cong \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$.

First, by considering M as a \mathfrak{g}_n -module, we easily see that M is a direct sum of simple finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_n -modules. In particular, the \mathfrak{g}_n -submodule M_n generated by u is a simple direct summand of M . Note that $M_1 \subseteq M_2 \subseteq M_3 \subseteq \dots$. If M' is the union of $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} M_n$ where each M_n is a simple \mathfrak{g}_n -module, then M' is a simple \mathfrak{g} -module isomorphic to $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$. Clearly, λ must be a dominant-integral weight with respect to the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_n with the Borel subalgebra \mathfrak{b}_n . Therefore, λ is dominant-integral with respect to \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{b} .

If $M \neq M'$, then M/M' has a highest-weight vector of the form $u' + M'$, where $v \in M$. Using the same argument, the submodule M'' of M/M' generated by $u' + M'$ is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{L}(\mu)$ for some dominant-integral weight $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ with respect to \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{b} . Since M is indecomposable, by [9, Proposition 3.2], we conclude that $\mu \in [\lambda]$. However, the only dominant-integral weight in $[\lambda]$ is λ itself. Consequently, $\mu = \lambda$. This shows that the only possible composition factor of M is $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$. However, there are no nontrivial extensions of $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ by itself (see [9, Proposition 3.8(d)]).

Finally, we shall prove that every simple module of the form $\mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$ is integrable if $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is dominant-integral. Let v be a highest-weight vector of $L := \mathfrak{L}(\lambda)$. Define $L_n := \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}_n) \cdot v$ for every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Clearly, each $L_n \cong \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\lambda)$ is finite-dimensional with $L_1 \subseteq L_2 \subseteq L_3 \subseteq \dots$, and $L = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} L_n$.

Fix $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Now, for $n \geq k$, observe that each L_n is a direct sum of simple finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_k -modules. Consequently, for each $n \geq k$, $L_{n+1} = L_n \oplus F_n^k$ with F_n^k being a direct sum of simple finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_k -modules. That is, $L = L_k \oplus \bigoplus_{n \geq k} F_n^k$ is a direct sum of simple finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_k -modules. It follows immediately that L is an integrable \mathfrak{g} -module. \blacksquare

Corollary 1.14 Let $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{integrable}}$ denote the full subcategory of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$ consisting of integrable modules. Then, $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\text{integrable}}$ is semisimple.

The theorem below gives another way to verify whether a module $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is \mathfrak{g} -integrable. Recall that $\Pi(M)$ is the set of \mathfrak{h} -weights of M .

Theorem 1.15 Let $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$. The following conditions on M are equivalent:

- (i) M is \mathfrak{g} -integrable;
- (ii) M is \mathfrak{n}^- -integrable;
- (iii) for all $w \in W$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, $\dim(M^\lambda) = \dim(M^{w\lambda})$;

(iv) the set $\Pi(M)$ is stable under the natural action of W .

Proof The direction (i) \Rightarrow (ii) is obvious. For (ii) \Rightarrow (iii), we note that $w \in W_n$ for any sufficiently large positive integer n . Let $M_n^{(\lambda)}$ be the \mathfrak{g}_n -submodule of M given by

$$M_n^{(\lambda)} := \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}_n) \cdot M^\lambda. \quad (1.3)$$

Because M is \mathfrak{n}^- -integrable, M^λ is finite-dimensional, $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}_n) = \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}_n^-) \cdot \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{h}) \cdot \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}_n^+)$, and M is locally $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^+)$ -finite, we see that M is locally $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}_n^-)$ -finite, whence $M_n^{(\lambda)}$ is a finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_n -submodule of M . For all sufficiently large n , we have $(M_n^{(\lambda)})^{w\lambda} = M^{w\lambda}$. Since the support of a finite-dimensional module is invariant under the action of the Weyl group, the claim follows.

The statement (iii) \Rightarrow (iv) is trivial. We now prove (iv) \Rightarrow (i). Let $M_n^{(\lambda)}$ be the module (1.3). Because M is locally $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^+)$ -finite, $\Pi(M)$ is invariant under $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$, and M has finite-dimensional \mathfrak{h} -weight spaces, we conclude that the weights $M_n^{(\lambda)}$ must lie in the orbit of λ under $W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}_n}$, making $M_n^{(\lambda)}$ a finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_n -module. Hence, $M = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \bigcup_{\lambda \in \Pi(M)} M_n^{(\lambda)}$ is an integrable \mathfrak{g} -module. ■

2 Translation Functors

2.1 Some Functors between Extended Categories \mathcal{O}

Fix a positive integer n . Let $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$. Define \mathfrak{p}_{n+1} to be the parabolic subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_n + \mathfrak{b}_{n+1}$ of \mathfrak{g}_{n+1} . It can be easily seen that M_n is a \mathfrak{p}_{n+1} -module, where \mathfrak{b}_{n+1} acts on M_n via $x_\alpha \cdot m = 0$ for all $m \in M_n$ and $\alpha \in \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^+ \setminus \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}$.

Definition 2.1 Define $I_{n+1} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}$ to be the parabolic induction functor

$$I_{n+1}M_n := \mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}) \underset{\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{p}_{n+1})}{\otimes} M_n \quad (2.1)$$

for all $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$. ◆

Proposition 2.2 The functor $I_{n+1} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}$ is exact.

Proof The $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{p}_{n+1})$ -module $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1})$ is a free module due to the Poincaré-Birkhoff-Witt (PBW) Theorem. Thus, $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1})$ is a flat $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{p}_{n+1})$ -module. ■

Remark 2.3 Observe that the functor $I_{n+1} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}$ is right-adjoint to the forgetful functor $F_n : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$, and left-adjoint to $G_n := \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{p}_{n+1})}(\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}), _) : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$. That is,

$$\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}}(M_{n+1}, I_{n+1}M_n) \cong \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}}(F_n M_{n+1}, M_n) \quad (2.2)$$

and

$$\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}}(I_{n+1}M_n, M_{n+1}) \cong \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}}(M_n, G_n M_{n+1}), \quad (2.3)$$

for all $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$ and $M_{n+1} \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}$. ◆

Definition 2.4 Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Define $R_{n+1}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]$ to be the truncation functor, where for each $M_{n+1} \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}$, $R_{n+1}^\lambda M_{n+1}$ is the sum of all submodules N_{n+1} of M_{n+1} such that all composition factors of N_{n+1} are not of the form $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\mu)$, with $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda$. ◆

We have the following proposition. The proof is trivial.

Proposition 2.5 Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

- (a) The functor $R_{n+1}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{h}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]$ is left-exact.
- (b) The functor $R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{h}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]$ is left-exact.
- (c) The functor $R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{h}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]$ is left-exact.

Definition 2.6 Let $Q_{n+1}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]$ be given by

$$Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n := I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda M_n / R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda M_n \quad (2.4)$$

for all $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$. ◆

Theorem 2.7 The functor $Q_{n+1}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]$ is an exact functor.

Proof Fix an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow N_n \rightarrow M_n \rightarrow K_n \rightarrow 0$ of objects in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$. Because $W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda$ is finite, the length k of the \mathfrak{g}_n -module K_n is finite. We shall prove by induction on k .

For $k = 0$, there is nothing to prove. For $k = 1$, we see that K_n is a simple \mathfrak{g}_n -module. Therefore, $K_n \cong \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu)$ for some $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda$. It can be easily seen that $Q_{n+1}^\lambda \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} = \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\mu)$. Consider two exact sequences of \mathfrak{g}_{n+1} -modules:

$$0 \rightarrow I_{n+1} N_n \rightarrow I_{n+1} M_n \rightarrow I_{n+1} K_n \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.5)$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda N_n \rightarrow R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda M_n \rightarrow R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda K_n. \quad (2.6)$$

By definition of Q_{n+1}^λ , we obtain the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda K_n. \quad (2.7)$$

Because $Q_{n+1}^\lambda K_n$ is simple, either $Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n \cong Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n$ or the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda K_n \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.8)$$

must be exact.

Write $L_n := \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu)$ and $L_{n+1} := \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\mu)$. Let d denote the largest possible nonnegative integer such that there exists a quotient of N_n isomorphic to $L_n^{\oplus d}$. Then, $d + 1$ is the largest possible nonnegative integer such that there exists a quotient of M_n isomorphic to $L_n^{\oplus(d+1)}$. Then, there exists a \mathfrak{g}_n -submodule Y_n of N_n such that $N_n/Y_n \cong L_n^{\oplus d}$. We claim that $Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n / Q_{n+1}^\lambda Y_n \cong L_{n+1}^{\oplus d}$.

As before, we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda Y_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n \rightarrow L_{n+1}^{\oplus d}$. This implies that $Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n / Q_{n+1}^\lambda Y_n \cong L_{n+1}^{\oplus t}$ for some integer t such that $0 \leq t \leq d$. If $t < d$, then $Q_{n+1}^\lambda Y_n$ has L_{n+1} as a quotient. Hence, $I_{n+1} Y_n$ has L_{n+1} as a quotient. Since $(I_{n+1} Y_n)^\mu$ is spanned by $1_{\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1})} \otimes y_n$, where $y_n \in Y_n^\mu$, and by the action of \mathfrak{p}_{n+1} on Y_n , we conclude that L_n must also be a quotient of Y_n . This contradicts the definition of d .

By a similar argument, if X_n is a \mathfrak{g}_n -submodule of M_n such that $M_n/X_n \cong L_n^{\oplus(d+1)}$, then $Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n / Q_{n+1}^\lambda X_n \cong L_{n+1}^{\oplus(d+1)}$. Thus, $Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n \cong Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n$ cannot hold. Therefore, we must have an exact sequence (2.8).

Suppose now that $k > 1$. Consider two exact sequences of \mathfrak{g}_n -modules: $0 \rightarrow N_n \rightarrow M_n \rightarrow K_n \rightarrow 0$ and $0 \rightarrow Z_n \rightarrow K_n \rightarrow L_n \rightarrow 0$ for some simple object $L_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ and for some \mathfrak{g}_n -submodule X_n of K_n . Ergo, we can find exact sequences $0 \rightarrow U_n \rightarrow M_n \rightarrow L_n \rightarrow 0$, $0 \rightarrow N_n \rightarrow U_n \rightarrow Z_n \rightarrow 0$, where U_n is a \mathfrak{g}_n -submodule of M_n . By induction hypothesis,

$$0 \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda Z_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda K_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda L_n \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.9)$$

$$0 \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda U_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda L_n \rightarrow 0, \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda U_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda Z_n \rightarrow 0 \quad (2.11)$$

are exact sequences. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n) &= \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda U_n) + \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda L_n) \\ &= \left(\text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n) + \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda Z_n) \right) + \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda L_n) \\ &= \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n) + \left(\text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda Z_n) + \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda L_n) \right) \\ &= \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n) + \text{ch}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda K_n). \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

By (2.7), we conclude that $0 \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda K_n \rightarrow 0$ must be an exact sequence. The proof is now complete. \blacksquare

Corollary 2.8 *The functor Q_{n+1}^λ is an equivalence between $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ and the image $Q_{n+1}^\lambda \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$. More specifically, for any $\mu \in [\lambda]$ and $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$, we have*

$$[M_n : \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu)] = [Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n : \mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\mu)]. \quad (2.13)$$

Furthermore, Q_{n+1}^λ preserves the length of every object.

Proposition 2.9 *For every $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$, there exists an injective \mathfrak{g}_n -module homomorphism $\iota_{M_n} : M_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n$ such that, for all objects $M_n, N_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ along with a \mathfrak{g}_n -module homomorphism $f_n : M_n \rightarrow N_n$, the following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_n & \xrightarrow{f_n} & N_n \\ \downarrow \iota_{M_n} & & \downarrow \iota_{N_n} \\ Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n & \xrightarrow{Q_{n+1}^\lambda f_n} & Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n. \end{array} \quad (2.14)$$

Proof For each $v \in M_n$, we define $\iota_{M_n}(v) := \left(1_{\mathfrak{u}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1})} \otimes v \right) + R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda M_n \in Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n$.

It is easy to see that ι_{M_n} satisfies the requirement. \blacksquare

Proposition 2.10 *Let $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ and $N_{n+1} \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]$. Suppose that all composition factors of N_{n+1} take the form $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\mu)$ with $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda$. If $f : M_n \rightarrow N_{n+1}$ is a \mathfrak{g}_n -module homomorphism, then there exists a unique \mathfrak{g}_{n+1} -module homomorphism $\tilde{f} : Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n \rightarrow N_{n+1}$ such that the following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_n & \xrightarrow{f} & N_{n+1} \\ \downarrow \iota_{M_n} & \nearrow \tilde{f} & \\ Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n & & \end{array} \quad (2.15)$$

Proof For each $u \in \mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1})$ and $v \in M_n$, let the map \tilde{f} send $\begin{pmatrix} u & \otimes & v \\ & \mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{p}_{n+1}) & \end{pmatrix} + K_{n+1} \in Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n$, $K_{n+1} := R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda M_n$, to $u \cdot f(v) \in N_{n+1}$. Then, extend \tilde{f} by linearity.

We claim that \tilde{f} is a well defined homomorphism of \mathfrak{g}_{n+1} -modules. Suppose that u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k are elements of $\mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1})$ and v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k are vectors in M_n such that $\sum_{j=1}^k \begin{pmatrix} u_j & \otimes & v_j \\ & \mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{p}_{n+1}) & \end{pmatrix} \in K_{n+1}$.

We want to prove that $\sum_{j=1}^k u_j \cdot f(v_j) = 0$. Write $z := \sum_{j=1}^k u_j \cdot f(v_j)$.

The \mathfrak{g}_{n+1} -submodule Z_{n+1} of N_{n+1} generated by z cannot have a composition factor of the form $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\xi)$ with $\xi \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda$. However, since all composition factors N_{n+1} are of the form $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\mu)$ with $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda$, we conclude that $Z_{n+1} = 0$. Thus, $z = 0$. \blacksquare

Proposition 2.11 *Let $M_n, N_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ and $f_{n+1} : Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n \rightarrow Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n$ be given. Then, there exists a \mathfrak{g}_n -module homomorphism $\hat{Q}_n^\lambda f_{n+1} : M_n \rightarrow N_n$ such that the following diagram is commutative:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} M_n & \xrightarrow{\hat{Q}_n^\lambda f_{n+1}} & N_n \\ \iota_{M_n} \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota_{N_n} \\ Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n & \xrightarrow{f_{n+1}} & Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n. \end{array} \quad (2.16)$$

For $M_{n+1} \in \text{im}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda)$, suppose that $M_{n+1} = Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n$ for some $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$. Define the \mathfrak{g}_n -module $\hat{Q}_n^\lambda M_{n+1} \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ to be M_n itself. Then, $\hat{Q}_n^\lambda : \text{im}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda) \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ is the inverse equivalence of $Q_n^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \text{im}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda)$.

Proof Let $K_{n+1} := R_{n+1}^\lambda I_{n+1} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda N_n$. For each $v \in M_n$, suppose that u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k are elements of $\mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{g}_{n+1})$ and v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k are vectors in N_n such that $f_{n+1}(\iota_{M_n}(v)) = \sum_{j=1}^k \begin{pmatrix} u_j & \otimes & v_j \\ & \mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{p}_{n+1}) & \end{pmatrix} + K_{n+1}$.

Denote by u'_j the projection of u_j onto $\mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{g}_n)$ (in the PBW basis of $\mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{g}_n)$). Set $f_n(v) := \sum_{j=1}^k u'_j \cdot v_j$.

Then, $\hat{Q}_n^\lambda f_{n+1} := f_n$ satisfies the required condition. \blacksquare

Corollary 2.12 *Let $M_n, N_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$. Then,*

$$\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]}(M_n, N_n) \cong \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda]}(Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n, Q_{n+1}^\lambda N_n). \quad (2.17)$$

Therefore, the image $Q_{n+1}^\lambda \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ is the full subcategory of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}$ whose objects have composition factors of the form $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(\mu)$ with $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda$.

For each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, fix a set \mathcal{S}_n of representatives of $[\lambda] \in \Omega_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$. We can further assume that $\mathcal{S}_n \supseteq \mathcal{S}_{n+1}$ for every positive integer n . Then, $\mathcal{S} := \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} \mathcal{S}_n$ is a set of representatives of $[\lambda] \in \Omega_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Proposition 2.13 *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{S}$, the direct limit of $(Q_{n+1}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}[\lambda])_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is the full subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$ of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$ consisting of \mathfrak{g} -modules of finite length.*

Proof For convenience, write $\mathcal{O}[\lambda]$ for $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. First, we define $q_n^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}[\lambda]$ as follows. For a given $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, write M_{n+k} for $Q_{n+k}^\lambda Q_{n+k-1}^\lambda \cdots Q_{n+1}^\lambda M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+k}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+k}}[\lambda]$. Using Proposition 2.9 above and noting that $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] = \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ (whose objects are finitely generated),

we see that $(\iota_{M_{n+k}} : M_{n+k} \rightarrow M_{n+k+1})_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ is a directed system whose direct limit M is clearly in $\mathcal{O}[\lambda]$. We set $q_n^\lambda M_n$ to be the direct limit M . It is easy to see that $q_{n+1}^\lambda Q_{n+1}^\lambda = q_n^\lambda$.

Let $p_n^\lambda : \mathcal{O}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$ be the functor defined as follows: $p_n^\lambda M := \sum_{\xi \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda} \mathbf{u}(\mathfrak{g}_n) \cdot M^\xi$ for every $M \in \mathcal{O}[\lambda]$. We can easily show that $p_n^\lambda q_n^\lambda = \text{Id}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]}$ and $p_{n+k}^\lambda q_n^\lambda = Q_{n+k}^\lambda Q_{n+k-1}^\lambda \cdots Q_{n+1}^\lambda$.

Suppose that there exists a category $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ along with functors $\tilde{q}_n^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ such that $\tilde{q}_{n+1}^\lambda Q_{n+1}^\lambda = \tilde{q}_n^\lambda$ for all $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Define $t_n^\lambda : \mathcal{O}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ via $t_n^\lambda M := \tilde{q}_n^\lambda p_n^\lambda M$ for all $M \in \mathcal{O}[\lambda]$. Since M is a \mathfrak{g} -module of finite length, $t_{n_0(M)}^\lambda M = t_{n_0(M)+1}^\lambda M = t_{n_0(M)+2}^\lambda M = \dots$ for some positive integer $n_0(M)$. Let $t^\lambda : \mathcal{O}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ be given by $t^\lambda M := t_{n_0(M)}^\lambda M$ for every $M \in \mathcal{O}[\lambda]$. We can easily see that $t^\lambda q_n^\lambda = \tilde{q}_n^\lambda$ for every positive integer n .

Note that the functor $t^\lambda : \mathcal{O}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \tilde{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ above is unique with the property that $t^\lambda q_n^\lambda = \tilde{q}_n^\lambda$ for every positive integer n . Therefore, $\mathcal{O}[\lambda]$ is the required direct limit. \blacksquare

Corollary 2.14 *Let $q_n^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$ be as given in the proof of the previous proposition. Then, q_n^λ is an exact functor.*

Corollary 2.15 *Let $Q_{n+1} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}$ be the functor defined by*

$$Q_{n+1} M_n = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{S}} \text{inj}_{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}, \mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^\lambda Q_{n+1}^\lambda \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^\lambda M_n \quad (2.18)$$

for all $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$. Then, the direct limit of $(Q_{n+1} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ is the full subcategory $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ (or simply, \mathcal{O}) of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ along with a family of exact functors $(q_n : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}})_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$, where $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ is given by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda]$.

2.2 Some Category Equivalences

Take $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. We define the following notations:

- $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}[\lambda] := \left\{ \alpha \in \Phi \mid \lambda(h_\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$ (also denoted by $\Phi[\lambda]$,
- $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^\pm[\lambda] := \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] \cap \Phi^\pm$ (also denoted by $\Phi^\pm[\lambda]$,
- $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda]$ or $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^+[\lambda]$ is the set of simple roots with respect to the set of positive roots $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^+[\lambda]$ of the root system $\Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}[\lambda]$ (also denoted by $\Sigma[\lambda]$ or $\Sigma^+[\lambda]$,
- $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^-[\lambda] := -\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}^+[\lambda]$ (also denoted by $\Sigma^-[\lambda]$,
- $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}[\lambda] := \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}} \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}[\lambda]$ (also denoted by $\Lambda[\lambda]$,
- $\mathfrak{h}[\lambda] := \text{span}_{\mathbb{K}} \{h \in \mathfrak{h} \mid \lambda(h) \in \mathbb{Z}\}$,
- $\mathfrak{g}[\lambda] := \mathfrak{h}[\lambda] \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi[\lambda]} \mathfrak{g}^\alpha$,
- $\mathfrak{b}[\lambda] := \mathfrak{b}[\lambda] \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi^+[\lambda]} \mathfrak{g}^\alpha$ (also denoted by $\mathfrak{b}^+[\lambda]$,
- $\mathfrak{n}[\lambda] := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi^+[\lambda]} \mathfrak{g}^\alpha$ (also denoted by $\mathfrak{n}^+[\lambda]$,
- $\mathfrak{n}^-[\lambda] := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi^-[\lambda]} \mathfrak{g}^\alpha$,

- $\lambda^\natural := \lambda|_{\mathfrak{h}[\lambda]} \in (\mathfrak{h}[\lambda])^*$, and
- $\underline{W}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda]$ (also denoted by $\underline{W}[\lambda]$) is the subgroup of $W_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{h}}$ consisting of elements w such that $w \cdot \lambda = \lambda$.

Proposition 2.16 *Let n be a positive integer and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Then, there exists a categorical equivalence $\mathcal{E}_n^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n[\lambda]}^{\mathfrak{g}_n[\lambda]}[\lambda^\natural]$ which sends $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu)$ to $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_n[\lambda]}^{\mathfrak{g}_n[\lambda]}(\mu^\natural)$ for all $\mu \in [\lambda] \cap (W_{\mathfrak{g}_n,\mathfrak{h}} \cdot \lambda)$.*

Proof This proposition is a direct consequence of [10, Theorem 11]. ■

Corollary 2.17 *For each $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, there exists a categorical equivalence $\mathcal{E}^\lambda : \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}[\lambda]}^{\mathfrak{g}[\lambda]}[\lambda^\natural]$ which sends $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)$ to $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}[\lambda]}^{\mathfrak{g}[\lambda]}(\mu^\natural)$ for all $\mu \in [\lambda]$.*

Proof This corollary follows from the previous proposition, Corollary 2.8, Proposition 2.13, and Corollary 2.12. ■

However, as a result of [10, Theorem 11], and Corollary 2.17, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.18 *Let \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}' be root-reductive Lie algebras with Dynkin Borel subalgebras \mathfrak{b} and \mathfrak{b}' , respectively. Suppose that $S_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda]$ is the set of simple reflections with respect to elements of $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}[\lambda],\mathfrak{b}[\lambda]}^+$, and $S_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda']$ is the set of simple reflections with respect to elements of $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}'[\lambda'],\mathfrak{b}'[\lambda']}^+$. Suppose that there exists an isomorphism $\varphi : W_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] \rightarrow W_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda']$ of Coxeter systems $(W_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda], S_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda])$ and $(W_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda'], S_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda'])$ such that*

$$\varphi(\underline{W}_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda]) = \underline{W}_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda']. \quad (2.19)$$

Then, there exists an equivalence of categories $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda] \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}[\lambda']$.

Proof By Corollary 2.17, we have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda] \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}[\lambda]}^{\mathfrak{g}[\lambda]}[\lambda^\natural]$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}[\lambda'] \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'[\lambda']}^{\mathfrak{g}'[\lambda']}[(\lambda')^\natural]$. Therefore, it suffices to assume that λ and λ' are both integral weights; that is, $\lambda = \lambda^\natural$, $\lambda' = (\lambda')^\natural$, $\mathfrak{g}[\lambda] = \mathfrak{g}$, $\mathfrak{b}[\lambda] = \mathfrak{b}$, $\mathfrak{g}'[\lambda'] = \mathfrak{g}'$, and $\mathfrak{b}'[\lambda'] = \mathfrak{b}'$.

Let n be a positive integer. Define $S_{\mathfrak{g}_n,\mathfrak{b}_n}$ to be the set of simple reflections with respect to the elements of $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}_n,\mathfrak{b}_n}^+$. The notation $S_{\mathfrak{g}'_n,\mathfrak{b}'_n}$ is defined similarly. Set $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}_1,\mathfrak{b}_1}^+ = \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_{t_1}\}$, and for $n > 1$, let $\Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}_n,\mathfrak{b}_n}^+ = \Sigma_{\mathfrak{g}_{n-1},\mathfrak{b}_{n-1}}^+ \cup \{\alpha_{t_{n-1}+1}, \alpha_{t_{n-1}+2}, \dots, \alpha_{t_n}\}$. Assume that φ sends the simple reflection with respect to α_n to the simple reflection with respect to α'_n for every positive integer n .

Define \mathfrak{g}_n'' to be the subalgebra of \mathfrak{g}' generated by \mathfrak{h}' and the root spaces corresponding to the roots $\pm\alpha'_1, \pm\alpha'_2, \dots, \pm\alpha'_{t_n}$. Take $\mathfrak{b}_n'' := \mathfrak{g}_n'' \cap \mathfrak{b}'$. We note that the direct limits \mathfrak{g}'' and \mathfrak{b}'' of the directed systems $(\mathfrak{g}_n'')_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ and $(\mathfrak{b}_n'')_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}$ are precisely \mathfrak{g}' and \mathfrak{b}' , respectively. Hence, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}''}^{\mathfrak{g}''}[\lambda'] = \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}[\lambda']$.

The existence of φ implies that, for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the Coxeter systems $(W_{\mathfrak{g}_n,\mathfrak{b}_n}, S_{\mathfrak{g}_n,\mathfrak{b}_n})$ and $(W_{\mathfrak{g}_n'',\mathfrak{b}_n'}, S_{\mathfrak{g}_n'',\mathfrak{b}_n'})$ are isomorphic. Therefore, by [10, Theorem 11], there exists an equivalence of categories $\varepsilon_n : \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n'}^{\mathfrak{g}_n'}[\lambda']$. Applying direct limit, we obtain an equivalence $\varepsilon : \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}[\lambda']$. ■

Open Question 2.19 *Is the converse of Theorem 2.18 true? In other words, if $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda] \cong \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}'}^{\mathfrak{g}'}[\lambda']$, then does there exist an isomorphism $\varphi : W_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] \rightarrow W_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda']$ of Coxeter systems $(W_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda], S_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}[\lambda])$ and $(W_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda'], S_{\mathfrak{g}',\mathfrak{b}'}[\lambda'])$ such that (2.19) is true?*

2.3 Construction of Translation Functors

Definition 2.20 For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we say that λ is *restricted* if $\lambda(h_\alpha) = 0$ for all but finitely many $\alpha \in \Sigma_{\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{b}}^+$. For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we say that λ and μ are *compatible* if $\lambda - \mu \in \Lambda$ and $\lambda - \mu$ is a restricted weight. The notation $\lambda \parallel \mu$ means that λ and μ are compatible. ◆

Denote by $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ the \mathbb{Q} -span of the coroots $h_{\alpha} \in \mathfrak{h}$ with $\alpha \in \Phi = \Phi_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$. Take $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$ to be $\mathbb{R} \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Q}}$. Let $E := E_{\mathfrak{h}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ denote the real vector space $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}, \mathbb{R})$. A root $\alpha \in \Phi$ can be identified with the unique element (which we also denote by α) of E which sends $1 \otimes \beta \in \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}$ to $\alpha(h_{\beta}) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\beta \in \Phi$. Similarly, if $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfies $\lambda(h_{\beta}) \in \mathbb{Q}$ for all $\beta \in \Phi$, then we identify it with the unique element of E that sends $h_{\beta} \mapsto \lambda(h_{\beta})$ for all $\beta \in \Phi$.

We decompose E into facets, where a *facet* F of E is a nonempty subset of E determined by the partition of Φ into disjoint subsets $\Phi^+(F)$, $\Phi^0(F)$, and $\Phi^-(F)$, where $\lambda \in F$ if and only if all three conditions below are satisfied:

- $(\lambda + \rho)(h_{\alpha}) > 0$ when $\alpha \in \Phi^+(F)$,
- $(\lambda + \rho)(h_{\alpha}) = 0$ when $\alpha \in \Phi^0(F)$, and
- $(\lambda + \rho)(h_{\alpha}) < 0$ when $\alpha \in \Phi^-(F)$.

The closure \bar{F} of a facet F is defined to be the set of all $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that

- $(\lambda + \rho)(h_{\alpha}) \geq 0$ when $\alpha \in \Phi^+(F)$,
- $(\lambda + \rho)(h_{\alpha}) = 0$ when $\alpha \in \Phi^0(F)$, and
- $(\lambda + \rho)(h_{\alpha}) \leq 0$ when $\alpha \in \Phi^-(F)$.

Recall that \mathcal{S} is a (fixed) set of representatives of $[\lambda] \in \Omega_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ (on which the definitions of Q_{n+1} and q_n depend). Now, for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $\lambda \parallel \mu$, there exists a unique dominant-integral weight $\nu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}(\lambda - \mu)$. Define for all sufficiently large n (i.e., for all positive integers n such that $\nu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}_n}(\lambda - \mu)$) the translation functor $(\theta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n})_{\lambda}^{\mu} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\mu]$. That is,

$$(\theta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n})_{\lambda}^{\mu} M_n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{pr}_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mu} (\mathfrak{g}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\nu) \otimes M_n) \quad (2.20)$$

for every $M_n \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}[\lambda]$. Recall that $(\theta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n})_{\lambda}^{\mu}$ is an exact functor and it commutes with duality (see, for example, [6, Proposition 7.1]).

Theorem 2.21 *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be such that $\lambda \parallel \mu$. If λ^{\natural} and μ^{\natural} are in the same facet for the action of the integral Weyl group $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] = W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\mu]$ on $E_{\mathfrak{h}[\lambda]}^{\mathfrak{g}[\lambda]} = E_{\mathfrak{h}[\mu]}^{\mathfrak{g}[\mu]}$, then there exists an equivalence of categories $(\Theta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}})_{\lambda}^{\mu} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\mu]$.*

Proof For convenience, write $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_n$ for $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$. For $\zeta, \xi \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we also denote by $(\theta_n)_{\xi}^{\zeta}$ the functor $(\theta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n})_{\xi}^{\zeta}$. We also write W and W_n for $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}}$ and $W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}_n}$, respectively.

Let n_0 be the smallest integer such that $\nu \in W_{n_0}(\lambda - \mu)$. For each integer $n \geq n_0$, let $\xi_n \in W_n[\lambda] \cdot \lambda$ be the antidominant weight that is linked to λ , and let $\zeta_n \in W_n[\mu] \cdot \mu$ be the antidominant weight that is linked to μ .

Since λ^{\natural} and μ^{\natural} are in the same facet for the action of $W[\lambda] = W[\mu]$ on $E_{\mathfrak{h}[\lambda]}^{\mathfrak{g}[\lambda]} = E_{\mathfrak{h}[\mu]}^{\mathfrak{g}[\mu]}$, there exists $w_n \in W_n[\lambda] = W_n[\mu]$ such that $w_n \cdot \lambda = \xi_n$ and $w_n \cdot \mu = \zeta_n$. From [6, Theorem 7.8], we conclude that

$$\Theta_n := (\theta_n)_{\xi_n}^{\zeta_n} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\mu] \quad (2.21)$$

is an equivalence of categories whose equivalence is

$$\Theta'_n := (\theta_n)_{\zeta_n}^{\xi_n} : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\mu] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\lambda]. \quad (2.22)$$

Recall the functors $\hat{Q}_n^{\lambda} : \text{im}(Q_{n+1}^{\lambda}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_n^{\lambda}$ and $\hat{Q}_n^{\lambda} : \text{im}(Q_{n+1}^{\lambda}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_n^{\lambda}$ and $\hat{Q}_n^{\mu} : \text{im}(Q_{n+1}^{\mu}) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_n^{\mu}$ from Proposition 2.11. Furthermore, due to [6, Proposition 7.8] any object in $\text{im}(\Theta_{n+1} Q_{n+1}^{\lambda})$ must

have composition factors of the form $\mathfrak{L}_{\mathfrak{b}_{n+1}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n+1}}(w \cdot \zeta_n)$, where $w \in W_n[\mu] \cdot \mu$. Therefore, $\text{im}(\Theta_{n+1}Q_{n+1}^\lambda)$ is a subcategory of $\text{im}(Q_{n+1}^\mu)$. Let

$$\mathcal{E}_n := \Theta'_n \hat{Q}_n^\mu \Theta_{n+1} Q_{n+1}^\lambda : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\lambda]. \quad (2.23)$$

Clearly, \mathcal{E}_n is an auto-equivalence of $\bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\lambda]$ (since Q_{n+1}^λ is an equivalence on to its image, Θ_{n+1} and Θ_n are both equivalences, and \hat{Q}_n^μ is an equivalence). Consequently,

$$\Theta_{n+1} Q_{n+1}^\lambda = Q_{n+1}^\mu \Theta_n \mathcal{E}_n \cong Q_{n+1}^\mu \Theta_n. \quad (2.24)$$

Write \mathcal{O} for $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$. We can now let $\Theta : \mathcal{O}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}[\mu]$ be the direct limit of the directed system of functors $(\Theta_n : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\mu])_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$. Similarly, $\Theta' : \mathcal{O}[\mu] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}[\lambda]$ is the direct limit of the directed system of functors $(\Theta'_n : \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\mu] \rightsquigarrow \bar{\mathcal{O}}_n[\lambda])_{n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$. As each Θ_n is an equivalence of categories with inverse Θ'_n , we deduce that Θ is also an equivalence of categories with inverse Θ' . We set $(\Theta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}})_{\lambda}^{\mu}$ to be the functor Θ . \blacksquare

From the previous theorem, we have defined a "translation functor" $(\Theta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}})_{\lambda}^{\mu}$ when μ and λ are compatible and lie in the same facet for the action of $W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] = W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\mu]$. For arbitrary $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\lambda \parallel \mu$, it is not clear whether the same construction yields a functor $(\Theta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}})_{\lambda}^{\mu} : \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\lambda] \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}[\mu]$.

3 Tilting Modules

3.1 Extensions of Modules with Generalized Standard and Costandard Filtrations

In this subsection, we shall write Hom and Ext for $\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}$ and $\text{Ext}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}$. We shall first prove that any extension of a module with generalized costandard filtration by a module with generalized standard filtration is trivial.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $M \in \Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ and $N \in \nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. Then, $\text{Ext}^1(M, N) = 0$.*

Proof If M has a direct sum decomposition $M = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A} M_{\alpha}$, then $\text{Ext}^1(M, N) \cong \prod_{\alpha \in A} \text{Ext}^1(M_{\alpha}, N)$.

Thus, we may assume without loss of generality that M is indecomposable.

We first prove the theorem when $N = \nabla(\mu)$ for some $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Let $\Pi_{\succ \mu}(M)$ denote the set of weights of M that are greater than μ . Note that M is in the block $\bar{\mathcal{O}}[\lambda]$ for some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. If $\Pi_{\succ \mu}(M)$ has infinitely many maximal elements, then we enumerate the maximal elements of $\Pi_{\succ \mu}(M)$ by $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots$. Note that $\lambda_i \in W[\lambda] \cdot \lambda$ for all $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. This implies that $\lambda - \mu$ is not a finite integer combination of the simple roots. Therefore, μ and λ are not in the same Weyl orbit. Thus, $\text{Ext}^1(M, N) = \text{Ext}^1(M, \nabla(\mu)) = 0$. From now on, we assume that $\Pi_{\succ \mu}(M)$ has finitely many maximal elements.

We perform induction on the sum $m := \sum_{\xi \succ \mu} \dim M^{\xi}$, which is finite due to the assumption in the previous paragraph. If $m = 0$, then by [9, Proposition 3.8(a)] and [9, Proposition 3.9(a)], we get $\text{Ext}^1(M, \nabla(\mu)) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\Delta(\mu), M^{\vee}) = 0$.

Let now m be a positive integer. Fix a maximal weight $\xi \in \Pi_{\succ \mu}(M)$. By Proposition 1.8(a), there exists a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow 0$, where M' is isomorphic to $\Delta(\xi)$, and M'' has a generalized standard filtration. From the long exact sequence of Ext^{\bullet} , we get the following exact sequence

$$\text{Ext}^1(M'', \nabla(\mu)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(M, \nabla(\mu)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(M', \nabla(\mu)). \quad (3.1)$$

However, due to [9, Proposition 3.9(c)], we get $\text{Ext}^1(M', \nabla(\mu)) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\Delta(\xi), \nabla(\mu)) = 0$. By induction hypothesis, $\text{Ext}^1(M'', \nabla(\mu)) = 0$. Therefore, $\text{Ext}^1(M, \nabla(\mu)) = 0$ as well.

For each ordinal number γ , we shall define a submodule $X_\gamma \in \Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ of N^\vee such that N^\vee/X_γ is also in $\Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. First, we set $X_0 := 0$. If γ is an ordinal with predecessor γ' , then we have by Proposition 1.8(a) that $N^\vee/X_{\gamma'}$ has a submodule Y_γ such that $Y_\gamma \cong \Delta(\mu_\gamma)$ for some $\mu_\gamma \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ that is a maximal weight of $N^\vee/X_{\gamma'}$. Take X_γ to be the preimage of Y_γ under the canonical projection $N^\vee \rightarrow (N^\vee/X_{\gamma'})$. If γ is a limit ordinal, then we set X_γ to be $\bigcup_{\gamma' < \gamma} X_{\gamma'}$.

From the above construction, there exists the smallest ordinal κ such that $N^\vee = X_\kappa$, and N^\vee is in fact the direct limit of $(X_\gamma)_{\gamma \leq \kappa}$. Thus, N is the inverse limit of $(N_\gamma)_{\gamma \leq \kappa}$, where $N_\gamma := (X_\gamma)^\vee$. We claim that $\text{Ext}^1(M, N_\gamma) = 0$ for all ordinals $\gamma \leq \kappa$.

If γ has a predecessor γ' , then there exists a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \nabla(\mu_\gamma) \rightarrow N_\gamma \rightarrow N_{\gamma'} \rightarrow 0$. From the long exact sequence of Ext^\bullet , we have the following exact sequence

$$\text{Ext}^1(M, \nabla(\mu_\gamma)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(M, N_\gamma) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(M, N_{\gamma'}). \quad (3.2)$$

By the induction hypothesis, $\text{Ext}^1(M, N_{\gamma'}) = 0$. Since we have proven that $\text{Ext}^1(M, \nabla(\mu_\gamma)) = 0$, we can then conclude that $\text{Ext}^1(M, N_\gamma) = 0$. If γ is a limit ordinal, then $X_\gamma = \varinjlim_{\gamma' < \gamma} X_{\gamma'}$; ergo,

$$\text{Ext}^1(M, N_\gamma) \cong \text{Ext}^1((N_\gamma)^\vee, M^\vee) = \text{Ext}^1(X_\gamma, M^\vee). \quad (3.3)$$

Now, let E be a \mathfrak{g} -module such that there exists an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M^\vee \xrightarrow{i} E \xrightarrow{p} X_\gamma \rightarrow 0$. For each $\gamma' < \gamma$, we know that $\text{Ext}^1(X_{\gamma'}, M^\vee) \cong \text{Ext}^1(M, N_{\gamma'}) = 0$ by induction hypothesis, whence $p^{-1}(X_{\gamma'}) = i(M^\vee) \oplus \tilde{X}_{\gamma'}$, where $M_{\gamma'}$ and $\tilde{X}_{\gamma'}$ are submodules of $p^{-1}(X_{\gamma'})$ such that $M_{\gamma'} \cong M^\vee$ and $\tilde{X}_{\gamma'} \cong X_{\gamma'}$. We shall now define $v_{\gamma'} \in \mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}$ whenever γ' has a predecessor γ'' .

If $\gamma' = 1$, then $X_{\gamma'} \cong \Delta(\mu_{\gamma'})$ for some $\mu_{\gamma'} \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. For each ordinal δ such that $\gamma' \leq \delta < \gamma$, define $\mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}^\delta$ to be the span of all possible $v_{\gamma'}^\delta \in p^{-1}(X_{\gamma'})$ such that $v_{\gamma'}^\delta$ is a weight vector of weight $\mu_{\gamma'}$ that lies in some submodule $\tilde{X}_\delta \cong X_\delta$ of $p^{-1}(X_\delta)$ such that $p^{-1}(X_\delta) = i(M^\vee) \oplus \tilde{X}_\delta$ and that $v_{\gamma'}^\delta$ generates $\tilde{X}_{\gamma'} \cong \Delta(\mu_{\gamma'})$. Note that $\mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}^\delta$ is a finite-dimensional vector space with positive dimension, and $\mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}^{\delta'} \supseteq \mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}^\delta$ if $\gamma' < \delta' < \delta < \gamma$. Therefore, $\mathcal{X}_{\gamma'} := \bigcap_{\delta \in [\gamma', \gamma)} \mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}^\delta \neq 0$. We can choose $v_{\gamma'} \in \mathcal{X}_{\gamma'} \setminus \{0\}$ arbitrarily.

Let now γ' be an ordinal such that $1 < \gamma' < \gamma$ and γ' has a predecessor γ'' . Suppose v_τ are all known for each $\tau < \gamma'$ such that τ has a predecessor. Set $Z_{\gamma''}$ to be the \mathfrak{g} -module generated by all such v_τ . The choices of our vectors v_τ are to ensure that $Z_{\gamma''} \cong X_{\gamma''}$ is such that $p^{-1}(X_{\gamma''}) = i(M^\vee) \oplus Z_{\gamma''}$. Assume that $X_{\gamma'}/X_{\gamma''} \cong \Delta(\mu_{\gamma'})$ for some $\mu_{\gamma'} \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. For each ordinal δ such that $\gamma' \leq \delta < \gamma$, define $\mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}^\delta$ to be the span of all possible $v_{\gamma'}^\delta \in p^{-1}(X_{\gamma'})$ such that $v_{\gamma'}^\delta$ is a weight vector of weight $\mu_{\gamma'}$ that lies in some submodule $\tilde{X}_\delta \cong X_\delta$ of $p^{-1}(X_\delta)$ such that $p^{-1}(X_\delta) = i(M^\vee) \oplus \tilde{X}_\delta$ and that $v_{\gamma'}^\delta + Z_{\gamma''}$ generates $\tilde{X}_{\gamma'}/Z_{\gamma''} \cong \Delta(\mu_{\gamma'})$. We employ the same strategy as the previous paragraph by choosing $v_{\gamma'} \in \mathcal{X}_{\gamma'} \setminus Z_{\gamma''}$, where $\mathcal{X}_{\gamma'} := \bigcap_{\delta \in [\gamma', \gamma)} \mathcal{X}_{\gamma'}^\delta$.

Now, we let \tilde{X}_γ be the submodule of E generated by $v_{\gamma'}$ for all ordinals $\gamma' < \gamma$ with predecessors. It follows immediately that $\tilde{X}_\gamma \cong X_\gamma$, $i(M^\vee) \cap \tilde{X}_\gamma = 0$, and $i(M^\vee) + \tilde{X}_\gamma = E$. Thus, $E = i(M^\vee) \oplus \tilde{X}_\gamma$. Then, the projection $\varpi : E \rightarrow i(M^\vee)$ gives a retraction map $E \rightarrow M^\vee$. Therefore, the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M^\vee \rightarrow E \rightarrow X_\gamma \rightarrow 0$ splits. That is, $\text{Ext}^1(X_\gamma, M^\vee) = 0$. Then, (3.3) implies that $\text{Ext}^1(M, N_\gamma) = 0$ as well. By transfinite induction, $\text{Ext}^1(M, N) = \text{Ext}^1(M, N_\kappa) = 0$. \blacksquare

Conjecture 3.2 *Let $M \in \Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$ and $N \in \nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. Then, $\text{Ext}^k(M, N) = 0$ for every integer $k > 1$.*

Proposition 3.3 *Let $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ be a tilting module.*

(a) *The dual M^\vee is also a tilting module.*

(b) *If $N \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is a tilting module, then $M \oplus N$ is also a tilting module.*

(c) Any direct summand of M is a tilting module.

Proof Parts (a) and (b) are trivial. Part (c) follows from Proposition 1.8(b) and Corollary 1.9. ■

Proposition 3.4 *Let M and N be tilting modules in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$. Then, $\text{Ext}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}^1(M, N) = 0$. If Conjecture 3.2 is true, then we also have that $\text{Ext}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}^k(M, N) = 0$ for all integers $k > 1$.*

3.2 Construction of the Tilting Modules $D(\lambda)$

Proposition 3.5 *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Then, $\Delta(\lambda) \otimes \nabla(\mu)$ is a tilting module in $\bar{\mathcal{O}}$.*

Proof Let $M := \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \nabla(\mu)$. First, observe that, for all $\nu \preceq \lambda + \mu$, we have

$$\dim(M^\nu) = \sum_{\xi \preceq 0} \dim \left((\Delta(\lambda))^{\nu - \mu + \xi} \right) \cdot \dim \left((\Delta(\mu))^{\mu - \xi} \right) \quad (3.4)$$

Because there are only finitely many weights of $\Delta(\lambda)$ that is greater than or equal to $\nu - \mu$, we see that $\dim(M^\nu) < \infty$. Therefore, $M \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$.

Since $(\Delta(\lambda) \otimes \nabla(\mu))^\vee \cong (\Delta(\lambda))^\vee \otimes (\nabla(\mu))^\vee \cong \nabla(\lambda) \otimes \Delta(\mu) \cong \Delta(\mu) \otimes \nabla(\lambda)$, it suffices to show that $M := \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \nabla(\mu)$ has a generalized standard filtration.

Let u be a maximal vector of $\Delta(\lambda)$. Pick a basis v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots of $\nabla(\mu)$ consisting of weight vectors. Then, define $w_i := u \otimes v_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. We first prove that w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots generate M as a $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ -module. Let M' be the $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ -submodule of M generated by w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots .

Fix a Chevalley basis of \mathfrak{g} consisting of $x_{\pm\alpha}$ for positive roots α , and h_α for simple positive roots α . We then fix a PBW basis B of $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$. For each $t \in B$, the *degree* of t , denoted by $\deg(t)$, is defined to be k if there exists positive roots $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ such that $t = x_{-\alpha_1} x_{-\alpha_2} \cdots x_{-\alpha_k}$.

We shall prove that $(t \cdot u) \otimes v_i \in M'$. If $\deg(t) = 0$, then there is nothing to prove. Suppose now that $\deg(t) > 0$. Then, we can write

$$t = x_{-\alpha_1} x_{-\alpha_2} \cdots x_{-\alpha_k} \quad (3.5)$$

for some integer $k > 0$. By induction hypothesis, we know that $m := (x_{-\alpha_2} \cdots x_{-\alpha_k} \cdot u) \otimes v_i$ lies in M' . Using

$$x_{-\alpha_1} \cdot m = (t \cdot u) \otimes v_i + (x_{-\alpha_2} \cdots x_{-\alpha_k} \cdot u) \otimes (x_{-\alpha_1} \cdot v_i), \quad (3.6)$$

we conclude that $(t \cdot u) \otimes v_i$ is in M' , as both $x_{-\alpha_1} \cdot m$ and $(x_{-\alpha_2} \cdots x_{-\alpha_k} \cdot u) \otimes (x_{-\alpha_1} \cdot v_i)$ are in M' .

From the paragraph above, $M = M'$. We now need to show that M is a free module over $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ generated by w_1, w_2, w_3, \dots . Let now M_k denote the $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ -submodule of M generated by w_1, w_2, \dots, w_k , and N_k the $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ submodule of N generated by w_k alone. Then, we can easily see that $M_k \cap N_{k+1} = 0$ for each $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Thus, $M_k = N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus \dots \oplus N_k$, making

$$M = N_1 \oplus N_2 \oplus N_3 \oplus \dots \quad (3.7)$$

as a $\mathfrak{U}(\mathfrak{n}^-)$ -module. Consequently, M has a generalized standard filtration. ■

Theorem 3.6 *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. There exists a unique, up to isomorphism, an indecomposable tilting module $D_b^g(\lambda) \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$, also denoted by $D(\lambda)$, such that $\dim \left((D(\lambda))^\lambda \right) = 1$ and all weights μ of $D(\lambda)$ satisfies $\mu \preceq \lambda$.*

Proof Consider the \mathfrak{g} -module $M := \Delta(\lambda) \otimes \nabla(0)$. Define $D(\lambda)$ to be the indecomposable summand of M that contains M^λ . By Proposition 3.3(c), we know that $D(\lambda)$ is a tilting module.

Suppose T is another indecomposable tilting module such that $\dim(T^\lambda) = 1$ and every weight μ of T satisfies $\mu \preceq \lambda$. Since T has a generalized standard filtration and λ is a maximal weight of T , by

Proposition 1.8(a), we know that $\Delta(\lambda)$ is a submodule of T and $T/\Delta(\lambda)$ has a generalized standard filtration. From Proposition 3.4, we know that $\text{Ext}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}^1(T/\Delta(\lambda), D(\lambda)) = 0$.

Now from the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow T \rightarrow T/\Delta(\lambda) \rightarrow 0$ and from the long exact sequence of Ext-groups, we have the following exact sequence

$$\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(T/\Delta(\lambda), D(\lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(T, D(\lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(\Delta(\lambda), D(\lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}^1(T/\Delta(\lambda), D(\lambda)). \quad (3.8)$$

Since $\text{Ext}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}^1(T/\Delta(\lambda), D(\lambda)) = 0$, the map $\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(T, D(\lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(\Delta(\lambda), D(\lambda))$ is surjective. Ergo, the embedding $\Delta(\lambda) \hookrightarrow D(\lambda)$ lifts to a homomorphism $\varphi : T \rightarrow D(\lambda)$.

Similarly, we also have a homomorphism $\psi : D(\lambda) \rightarrow T$ such that ψ is an isomorphism on the copies of $\Delta(\lambda)$ in $D(\lambda)$ and T . Thus, the endomorphism $\varphi \circ \psi : D(\lambda) \rightarrow D(\lambda)$ is an isomorphism on $\Delta(\lambda) \subseteq D(\lambda)$. As $D(\lambda)$ is indecomposable, we know from [9, Theorem 2.5] that every endomorphism of $D(\lambda)$ is either an isomorphism or a locally nilpotent map. Since $\varphi \circ \psi$ preserves the weight space $(D(\lambda))^\lambda$, the map $\varphi \circ \psi$ is not locally nilpotent. Hence, $\varphi \circ \psi$ is an isomorphism. Consequently, both φ and ψ must be isomorphism, whence $T \cong D(\lambda)$. \blacksquare

Corollary 3.7 *If $T \in \bar{\mathcal{O}}$ is an indecomposable tilting module, then $T \cong D(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. In particular, all tilting modules are self-dual.*

Proof Let λ be a maximal weight of T . Using the same argument as the theorem above, we can easily see that $T \cong D(\lambda)$.

For the second part of the corollary, we let T be an arbitrary tilting module. We can then see from the paragraph above and [9, Corollary 2.6] that $T = \bigoplus_{\alpha} D(\lambda_{\alpha})$, where $\lambda_{\alpha} \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ for all $\alpha \in A$.

Since duality commutes with direct sum, it suffices to show that $D(\lambda)$ is self-dual for a fixed $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. As $D(\lambda)$ is an indecomposable tilting module, $(D(\lambda))^\vee$ is also an indecomposable tilting module. By the theorem above, we conclude that $(D(\lambda))^\vee \cong D(\lambda)$. \blacksquare

3.3 Multiplicities of Verma Factors in a Tilting Module

In this subsection, we shall again write Hom and Ext for $\text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}$ and $\text{Ext}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}$. We first need the following theorem.

Theorem 3.8 *Suppose that $M \in \Delta(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. For every $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we have*

$$\{M, \Delta(\lambda)\} = \dim \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(M, \nabla(\lambda)). \quad (3.9)$$

Proof Without loss of generality, assume that M is indecomposable. We consider the set $\Pi_{\succeq \lambda}(M)$ of weights of M that is greater than or equal to λ . If this set is infinite, we can easily see that M is not in the same block as $\Delta(\lambda)$. Therefore, $\{M, \Delta(\lambda)\} = 0$ and $\dim \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(M, \nabla(\lambda)) = 0$. Therefore, the assertion is true. From now on, we assume that $\Pi_{\succeq \lambda}(M)$ is finite.

Define $m := \sum_{\xi \succeq \lambda} \dim M^\xi$. Then, m is a nonnegative integer. We can then perform induction on m , the base case $m = 0$ being obvious. Let now $m > 0$. Suppose that $\mu \succeq \lambda$ is a maximal weight of M . By Proposition 1.8(a), M has a submodule $\Delta(\mu)$ such that $M/\Delta(\mu)$ has a generalized standard filtration. From the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \Delta(\mu) \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/\Delta(\mu) \rightarrow 0$ and the long exact sequence of Ext-groups, we get the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M/\Delta(\mu), \nabla(\lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, \nabla(\lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\Delta(\mu), \nabla(\lambda)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(M/\Delta(\mu), \nabla(\lambda)). \quad (3.10)$$

Because $M/\Delta(\mu)$ has a generalized standard filtration and $\nabla(\lambda)$ obviously has a generalized co-standard filtration, Theorem 3.1 ensures that $\text{Ext}^1(M/\Delta(\mu), \nabla(\lambda)) = 0$. Furthermore, because $\dim \text{Hom}(\Delta(\mu), \nabla(\lambda)) = \delta_{\mu, \lambda}$, where δ is the Kronecker delta, we conclude that

$$\dim \text{Hom}(M, \nabla(\lambda)) = \dim \text{Hom}(M/\Delta(\mu), \nabla(\lambda)) + \delta_{\mu, \lambda}. \quad (3.11)$$

On the other hand,

$$\{M, \Delta(\lambda)\} = \{M/\Delta(\mu), \Delta(\lambda)\} + \{\Delta(\mu) : \Delta(\lambda)\} = \{M/\Delta(\mu), \Delta(\lambda)\} + \delta_{\mu, \lambda}. \quad (3.12)$$

By induction hypothesis, $\{M/\Delta(\mu), \Delta(\lambda)\} = \dim \text{Hom}(M/\Delta(\mu), \nabla(\lambda))$, so $\dim \text{Hom}(M, \nabla(\lambda))$ and $\{M, \Delta(\lambda)\}$ are equal. \blacksquare

Corollary 3.9 *Suppose that $M \in \nabla(\bar{\mathcal{O}})$. For every $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we have*

$$\{M, \nabla(\lambda)\} = \dim \text{Hom}_{\bar{\mathcal{O}}}(M^\vee, \nabla(\lambda)). \quad (3.13)$$

Fix $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. For each positive integer n , we consider the restriction $\tilde{D}_n(\lambda) := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}} D(\lambda)$. Because

$$\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}} \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\nu \preceq \lambda \\ \lambda - \nu \notin \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}_n}}} \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\nu) \quad (3.14)$$

we can easily see that $\tilde{D}_n(\lambda)$ is a \mathfrak{g}_n -module with generalized standard filtration. As the duality functor commutes with the restriction functor, we conclude that $\tilde{D}_n(\lambda)$ is a tilting \mathfrak{g}_n -module.

Suppose that $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfies $\mu \preceq \lambda$ and $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] \cdot \lambda$. Let $n_0(\mu, \lambda)$ be the smallest positive integer n such that $\lambda - \mu \in \Lambda_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}_n}$. Due to Theorem 1.5(a), Equation (3.14) implies that

$$\{D_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) : \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)\} = \{\tilde{D}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}(\lambda) : \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}(\mu)\}. \quad (3.15)$$

Since $D_{\mathfrak{b}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}(\lambda)$ is the only indecomposable direct summand of $\tilde{D}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}(\lambda)$ that can contribute to the multiplicity of $\Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}(\mu)$ in $\tilde{D}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}(\lambda)$, we get

$$\{D_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) : \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)\} = \{D_{\mathfrak{b}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}(\lambda) : \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}^{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}(\mu)\}. \quad (3.16)$$

Recall from [6, Theorem 3.8] that, for each $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and for each positive integer n , $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$ has enough projectives. We let $\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\lambda)$ denote the projective cover of the module $\mathfrak{l}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\lambda)$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}$.

Theorem 3.10 *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ with $\mu \preceq \lambda$ and $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] \cdot \lambda$. Write $n := n_0(\mu, \lambda)$. Fix $\xi \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that ξ is a \mathfrak{b}_n -antidominant weight in $W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{b}_n}[\lambda] \cdot \lambda$. If w_n^0 is the longest element of $W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}}$, then*

$$\{D_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) : \nabla_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)\} = \{D_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) : \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)\} = \{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(w_n^0 \cdot \lambda), \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(w_n^0 \cdot \mu)\} \quad (3.17)$$

Proof Due to [1, Theorem 6.10], we have $\{D_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\lambda), \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu)\} = \{\mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(w_n^0 \cdot \lambda), \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(w_n^0 \cdot \mu)\}$. The theorem follows immediately from (3.16). \blacksquare

Write $P_{x, y}^W(q) \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$ for the Kazhdan-Lusztig polynomial for elements x, y in a Coxeter group W . Due to (3.16), we may assume without loss of generality that λ and μ are integral weights of $\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}$. We then have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.11 *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ with $\mu \preceq \lambda$ and $\mu \in W_{\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{b}}[\lambda] \cdot \lambda$. Suppose that λ is a regular integral weight with respect to $\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}$. Fix $\xi \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that ξ is a $\mathfrak{b}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}$ -antidominant weight in $W_{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}, \mathfrak{b}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}}[\lambda] \cdot \lambda$. If $\lambda = x \cdot \xi$ and $\mu = y \cdot \xi$ for some $x, y \in W_{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}, \mathfrak{h}}$, then*

$$\{D_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) : \nabla_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)\} = \{D_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\lambda) : \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mu)\} = P_{y, x}^{W_{\mathfrak{g}_{n_0(\mu, \lambda)}, \mathfrak{h}}}(1). \quad (3.18)$$

Proof For simplicity, write $n := n_0(\mu, \lambda)$. From [11, Theorem 4.4], we have

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}}(\Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu), D_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\lambda)) = \dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}}(\Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(y \cdot \xi), D_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(x \cdot \xi)) = P_{y, x}^{W_{\mathfrak{g}_n, \mathfrak{h}}}(1). \quad (3.19)$$

From Theorem 3.8, we have $\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}}(\Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu), D_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\lambda)) = \{D_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\lambda), \Delta_{\mathfrak{b}_n}^{\mathfrak{g}_n}(\mu)\}$. By (3.16), the claim follows immediately. \blacksquare

References

- [1] A. Beilinson and V. Ginzburg, *Wall-Crossing Functors and \mathcal{D} -Modules*, Representation Theory, **3** (1999), 1–31.
- [2] A. Chirvasitu and I. Penkov, *Representation Categories of Mackey Lie Algebras as Universal Monoidal C*, Pure and Applied Mathematics Quarterly, **13** (2017), No. 1, 77–121.
- [3] P. Fiebig, *Centers and Translation Functors for the Category \mathcal{O} over Kac-Moody Algebras*, Mathematische Zeitschrift, **243** (2003), 689–717.
- [4] P. Fiebig, *The Combinatorics of Category \mathcal{O} over Symmetrizable Kac-Moody Algebras*, Transformation Groups, **11** (2006), 29–49.
- [5] J. E. Humphreys, *Reflection Groups and Coxeter Groups*, Cambridge University Press, New York, (1992).
- [6] J. E. Humphreys, *Representations of Semisimple Lie Algebras in the BGG Category \mathcal{O}* , American Mathematical Society, Providence, (2000).
- [7] D. Kazhdan and G. Lusztig, *Representations of Coxeter Groups and Hecke Algebras*, Inventiones Mathematicae, **53** (1979), 165–184.
- [8] I. Penkov and V. Serganova, *Categories of Integrable $\mathfrak{sl}(\infty)$ -, $\mathfrak{o}(\infty)$ -, $\mathfrak{sp}(\infty)$ -modules*, Contemporary Mathematics, **557** (2011), 335–357.
- [9] T. Nampaisarn, *Categories \mathcal{O} for Root-Reductive Lie Algebras: I. Definition and Basic Properties*, preprint 2020.
- [10] W. Soergel, *Kategorie \mathcal{O} , perverse Garben und Moduln über den Koinvarianten zur Weylgruppe*, Journal of the American Mathematical Society, **3** (1990), No. 2, 421–445.
- [11] W. Soergel, *Andersen Filtration und Hard Lefschetz*, Geometric And Functional Analysis, **17** (2008) 2066–2089.
- [12] C. A. Weibel, *An Introduction to Homological Algebra*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **38** (1994).

BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
E-mail address: namphais@post.bgu.ac.il