

QUANTIZED WEYL ALGEBRAS, THE DOUBLE CENTRALIZER PROPERTY, AND A NEW FIRST FUNDAMENTAL THEOREM FOR $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$

GAIL LETZTER, SIDDHARTHA SAHI, AND HADI SALMASIAN

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}_{m \times n}$ denote the quantized coordinate ring of the space of $m \times n$ matrices, equipped with natural actions of the quantized enveloping algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Let \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} denote the images of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ in $\text{End}(\mathcal{P})$, respectively. We define a q -analogue of the algebra of polynomial-coefficient differential operators inside $\text{End}(\mathcal{P})$, henceforth denoted by \mathcal{PD} , and we prove that $\mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{PD}$ and $\mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{PD}$ are mutual centralizers inside \mathcal{PD} . Using this, we establish a new First Fundamental Theorem of invariant theory for $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. We also compute explicit formulas in terms of q -determinants for generators of the intersections with \mathcal{PD} of the images of the Cartan subalgebras of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. The algebra \mathcal{PD} was originally introduced in [SSV04], but we give a new construction of it using deformed twisted tensor products.

1. INTRODUCTION

The First Fundamental Theorem (FFT) is one of the pinnacles of invariant theory with a history as old as Hermann Weyl's influential book, *The Classical Groups* [Wy39]. In its original form, the FFT for the group GL_n describes the generators of the subalgebra of GL_n -invariants in the polynomial algebra $\mathcal{P}(V^{\oplus k} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus l})$, where $V := \mathbb{C}^n$ denotes the standard GL_n -module.

It was pointed out by R. Howe [Ho95, Sec. 2.3] that the FFT has an equivalent formulation as a double centralizer property, which we now recall. Let $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$ denote the vector space of complex $m \times n$ matrices. Then $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$ has a natural $\text{GL}_m \times \text{GL}_n$ -module structure by left and right matrix multiplication. We equip the algebra $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}(\text{Mat}_{m \times n})$ of polynomials on $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$ and the algebra $\mathcal{PD} := \mathcal{PD}(\text{Mat}_{m \times n})$ of polynomial-coefficient differential operators on $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$ with their canonical $\text{GL}_m \times \text{GL}_n$ -module structures. Then the (infinitesimal) actions of the Lie algebras \mathfrak{gl}_m and \mathfrak{gl}_n on \mathcal{P} are given by certain differential operators of order one, which are usually called *polarization operators*. It follows that there exists a homomorphism of algebras $\phi : U_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{PD}$, where $U_{m,n} := U(\mathfrak{gl}_m) \otimes U(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ is the tensor product of the universal enveloping algebras of \mathfrak{gl}_m and \mathfrak{gl}_n , such that the diagram

$$(1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} U_{m,n} \otimes \mathcal{P} & \xrightarrow{x \otimes f \mapsto x \cdot f} & \mathcal{P} \\ & \searrow x \otimes f \mapsto \phi(x) \otimes f & \nearrow D \otimes f \mapsto Df \\ & \mathcal{PD} \otimes \mathcal{P} & \end{array}$$

commutes. The *operator commutant version* of the FFT, according to [Ho95, Thm 2.3.3], states that the subalgebra $\mathcal{PD}^{\text{GL}_m}$ of GL_m -invariants in \mathcal{PD} is generated by the image of $U(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Since $\mathcal{PD}^{\text{GL}_m} = \mathcal{PD}^{U(\mathfrak{gl}_m)}$, the latter assertion is equivalent to the following: the images of $U(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$ and $U(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ in \mathcal{PD} are mutual centralizers.

In [LZZ11, Sec. 6] the authors extend the original form of the FFT to the quantized enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ by considering a q -analogue of $\mathcal{P}(V^{\oplus k} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus l})$ that carries a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -action, and then describing the generators of the subalgebra of invariants. It is then natural to ask if the operator

commutant version of the FFT also has a q -analogue. It turns out that in the quantized setting, the situation for the operator commutant FFT is more subtle than in the classical case. One major issue is how to quantize the Weyl algebra \mathcal{PD} and, more importantly, the map $\phi : U_{m,n} \rightarrow \mathcal{PD}$. Indeed we provide some justification that the latter map cannot be fully quantized (see Remark 4.1.3). Nevertheless, our first main result (Theorem A) is a positive answer to the above question.

From now on let $\mathbb{k} := \mathbb{C}(q)$ be the field of rational functions in a parameter q . For the operator commutant FFT in the quantized setting we need a quantized Weyl algebra $\mathcal{PD} := \mathcal{PD}_{m \times n}$. The \mathbb{k} -algebra \mathcal{PD} that we consider was already introduced in [SSV04, BKV06]. We give a different construction of \mathcal{PD} as the *deformed twisted tensor product* of $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}_{m \times n}$, the quantized coordinate ring of $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$, and $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_{m \times n}$, the quantized algebra of constant-coefficient differential operators on $\text{Mat}_{m \times n}$ (see Section 3 for precise definitions). The construction of $\mathcal{P}_{m \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{m \times n}$ is analogous to the FRT construction [KS97, Sec. 9.1]. Concretely, the algebra \mathcal{PD} is generated by $2mn$ generators $t_{i,j}$ and $\partial_{i,j}$, where $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, modulo the relations that are given in Section 3. From now on we set

$$U_L := U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m) \quad , \quad U_R := U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \quad , \quad U_{LR} := U_L \otimes U_R.$$

Both \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{PD} are U_{LR} -module algebras (the explicit formulas for the U_{LR} -action on generators are given in Remark 3.4.4). Furthermore, \mathcal{P} is naturally a \mathcal{PD} -module. In particular, we have homomorphisms of associative algebras

$$\phi_U : U_{LR} \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P}) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_{PD} : \mathcal{PD} \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P}).$$

Since \mathcal{P} is a faithful \mathcal{PD} -module (see Proposition 3.5.4 or [BKV06, Prop. 1]), we can identify \mathcal{PD} with $\phi_{PD}(\mathcal{PD})$. Using the latter identification, we set

$$\mathcal{L} := \phi_U(U_L \otimes 1), \quad \mathcal{R} := \phi_U(1 \otimes U_R), \quad \mathcal{L}_{\bullet} := \mathcal{L} \cap \mathcal{PD}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\bullet} := \mathcal{R} \cap \mathcal{PD}.$$

Furthermore, we set

$$(2) \quad \mathsf{L}_{i,j} := \sum_{r=1}^n t_{i,r} \partial_{j,r} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq m \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{R}_{i,j} := \sum_{r=1}^m t_{r,i} \partial_{r,j} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

We adopt the following notation: given an associative algebra \mathcal{X} and two subsets $\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$, we set

$$(3) \quad \mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{Z}} := \{y \in \mathcal{Y} : yz = zy \text{ for all } z \in \mathcal{Z}\}.$$

Our first main theorem is the following.

Theorem A. *Let $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}$, and \mathcal{R}_{\bullet} be the subalgebras of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})$ defined above. We identify \mathcal{PD} with $\phi_{PD}(\mathcal{PD}) \subseteq \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) $\mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{R}_{\bullet}} = \mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{L}_{\bullet}} = \mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{R}_{\bullet}$.
- (iii) \mathcal{L}_{\bullet} is generated by the $\mathsf{L}_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq m$.
- (iv) \mathcal{R}_{\bullet} is generated by the $\mathsf{R}_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Note that in general we have $\mathcal{L}_{\bullet} \subsetneq \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\bullet} \subsetneq \mathcal{R}$. In fact if $m \leq n$ then the restriction of ϕ_U to $U_L \otimes 1$ yields an isomorphism $U_L \cong \mathcal{L}$ but one can show that $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{\bullet})$ is properly contained in the locally finite part of U_L (see Proposition 4.1.2 and Example 10.2.8). Furthermore, unlike the classical polarization operators, in general the $\mathsf{L}_{i,j}$ (respectively, the $\mathsf{R}_{i,j}$) are *not* in the images of the root vectors of U_L (respectively, U_R).

Our second main theorem (Theorem B) explicitly describes the images in \mathcal{PD} of the Cartan subalgebras of U_L and U_R . To state Theorem B we need elements of \mathcal{PD} that are constructed

using q -determinants. Let $\mathbf{i} := (i_1, \dots, i_r)$ and $\mathbf{j} := (j_1, \dots, j_r)$ be r -tuples of integers satisfying $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_r \leq m$ and $1 \leq j_1 < \dots < j_r \leq n$. Define quantum minors $M_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\overline{M}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} \in \mathcal{D}$ by

$$(4) \quad M_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} := \sum_{\sigma} (-q)^{\ell(\sigma)} t_{i_{\sigma(1)}, j_1} \cdots t_{i_{\sigma(r)}, j_r} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{M}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} := \sum_{\sigma} (-q^{-1})^{\ell(\sigma)} \partial_{i_{\sigma(1)}, j_1} \cdots \partial_{i_{\sigma(r)}, j_r},$$

where the summations are over permutations in r letters, and $\ell(\sigma)$ denotes the length of σ . Next for integers $a \leq b$ and $r \geq 1$ we set

$$\mathcal{E}_a^{b,r} := \{(u_1, \dots, u_r), u_i \in \mathbb{Z}, a \leq u_1 < \dots < u_r \leq b\}.$$

For $1 \leq r \leq k \leq n$ we define $\mathbf{D}_{k,r} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ by

$$\mathbf{D}_{k,r} := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{E}_1^m(r)} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{E}_{n-k+1}^n(r)} M_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} \overline{M}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}},$$

and we set $\mathbf{D}_{k,0} := 1$ for $1 \leq k \leq n$. Note that $\mathbf{D}_{k,r} = 0$ when $r > \min\{m, n\}$. Similarly, for $1 \leq r \leq k \leq m$ we define $\mathbf{D}'_{k,r} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ by

$$\mathbf{D}'_{k,r} := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{E}_{m-k+1}^m(r)} \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{E}_1^n(r)} M_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} \overline{M}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}},$$

and we set $\mathbf{D}'_{k,0} := 1$ for $1 \leq k \leq m$. Again $\mathbf{D}'_{k,r} = 0$ when $r > \min\{m, n\}$. Let

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{R}_a := \sum_{r=0}^a (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_{a,r} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq a \leq n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}_b := \sum_{r=0}^b (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}'_{b,r} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq b \leq m.$$

Furthermore, let $U_{\mathfrak{h},L}$ and $U_{\mathfrak{h},R}$ denote the Cartan subalgebras of U_L and U_R , respectively (see Subsection 3.1). We set

$$(6) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{h},\bullet} := \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \cap \phi_U(U_{\mathfrak{h},L} \otimes 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{R}_{\mathfrak{h},\bullet} := \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \cap \phi_U(1 \otimes U_{\mathfrak{h},R}).$$

Theorem B. *The following statements hold.*

- (i) $\mathcal{R}_{\mathfrak{h},\bullet}$ is generated by $\mathbf{R}_1, \dots, \mathbf{R}_n$.
- (ii) $\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{h},\bullet}$ is generated by $\mathbf{L}_1, \dots, \mathbf{L}_m$.

Let us elucidate the relation between Theorem A and the literature on Howe duality and the FFT in the quantized setting. Quantized analogues of $(\mathfrak{gl}_m, \mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -duality have been established in [Zh02] and [NYM93], but these works do not consider the double centralizer property inside a quantized Weyl algebra. To compare our results with those of Lehrer–Zhang–Zhang [LZZ11], we briefly explain their formulation of the FFT for $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. In [LZZ11, Sec. 6] the authors define a q -analogue of the algebra $\mathcal{P}(V^{\oplus k} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus l})$, which they call $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}$. The algebra $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}$ is isomorphic to a twisted tensor product of $\mathcal{P}_{k \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{l \times n}$, but the twisting is only with respect to the universal R -matrix of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. In particular, in the special case $k = l$ the relations on the generators of $\mathcal{A}_{k,k}$ are not symmetric with respect to the indices of the generators. Because of this asymmetry, $\mathcal{A}_{k,k}$ does not appear to be the desired object for proving a double centralizer statement. The twisting that we consider to define $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ uses the universal R -matrices of both U_L and U_R . In addition, unlike $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}$ whose relations are homogeneous, the relation (R6) of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ is not homogeneous. From this viewpoint, $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ resembles the classical Weyl algebra more than $\mathcal{A}_{k,k}$.

Using Theorem A we can easily prove a variant of the FFT analogous to [LZZ11, Thm 6.10]. For a fixed $n \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}$ for $k, l \geq 1$ denote the algebra with kn generators $t_{i,j}$ and ln generators $\partial_{i',j}$, where $1 \leq i \leq k$, $1 \leq i' \leq l$, and $1 \leq j \leq n$, that satisfy relations similar to those of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$, i.e.,

the relations (R1), (R2), (R1'), (R2'), and (R3)–(R6). Then $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}$ is isomorphic to a U_R -invariant subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{m \times n}$ for $m := \max\{k, l\}$, and therefore $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}$ is a U_R -module algebra. The standard degree filtration (corresponding to setting $\deg t_{i,j} = \deg \partial_{i',j} = 1$) is U_R -invariant, hence the associated graded algebra $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k,l})$ is also a U_R -module algebra. Let ϵ_R denote the counit of U_R and set

$$(\mathcal{A}_{k,l})_{(\epsilon_R)} := \{D \in \mathcal{A}_{k,l} : x \cdot D = \epsilon_R(x)D \text{ for } x \in U_R\}.$$

We define $(\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k,l}))_{(\epsilon_R)}$ similarly. For $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq l$ we define operators $L_{i,j}$ in $\mathcal{A}_{k,l}$ and in $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k,l})$ similar to (2).

Theorem C. *The algebras $(\mathcal{A}_{k,l})_{(\epsilon_R)}$ and $(\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k,l}))_{(\epsilon_R)}$ are generated by the $L_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $1 \leq j \leq l$.*

Despite the aforementioned differences between our results and the work of [LZZ11], we borrow at least two key ideas from [LZZ11]. First, we use the natural bialgebra structure of $\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}$ to define a map Γ onto the subalgebra of U_R -invariants in $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ (assuming $m \leq n$). The map Γ , given in Definition 3.6.1, is essentially the same as the map introduced in [LZZ11, Lem. 6.11]. Second, we define a new product on $\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}$ such that the map Γ becomes a homomorphism of algebras modulo the filtration of its codomain (see Proposition 7.1.2). A similar product was used in [LZZ11, Lem. 6.13]. However, our product is given by a more complicated (and asymmetric) formula, because it needs to be simultaneously compatible with *two* universal R -matrices. As a consequence, establishing the desired properties of this product required new ideas.

The results of this paper were obtained as part of a project on Capelli operators for quantum symmetric spaces. From this standpoint, it is natural to ask if one can define quantized Weyl algebras in the latter setting and then realize the action of (a large subalgebra of) the quantized enveloping algebra via elements of this Weyl algebra. We address this question and its connection to Capelli operators in upcoming work [LSS22a, LSS22b].

The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section 2 we review the required background material on Hopf algebras and twisted tensor products. In Section 3 we construct the quantized Weyl algebra $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$, the action of U_{LR} on $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$, and the map Γ mentioned above. The main goal of Section 4 is to prove that the elements x_a and y_b , defined in (27), of the Cartan subalgebra of U_{LR} belong to $\phi^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$. In Section 5 we compute explicit formulas for $\phi_U(x_a)$ and $\phi_U(y_b)$. In Section 6 we establish some properties of the map Γ . The proof of Theorem A occupies Sections 7–9. Theorem B and Theorem C are proved in Sections 10 and 11, respectively. Finally, in Sections 12 and 13 we prove two technical statements whose proofs are postponed for the reader's convenience.

Acknowledgement. The research of S.S. was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-1939600, DMS-2001537, and Simons Foundation grant 509766. The research of H.S. was partially supported by an NSERC Discovery Grant (RGPIN-2018-04044).

2. HOPF ALGEBRAS AND DEFORMED TWISTED TENSOR PRODUCTS

In this section we review some basic notions from Hopf algebras and then define deformed twisted tensor product algebras. Throughout this section \mathbb{K} will denote an arbitrary field.

2.1. The locally finite part. Let H be a Hopf algebra over \mathbb{K} . If $I \subseteq H$ is a two-sided ideal of H as an associative algebra, then we set $E(x, I) := \{\text{ad}_y(x) + I : y \in H\}$ for $x \in H$, where $\text{ad}_y(x) := \sum y_1 x S(y_2)$ is the left adjoint action of H . Furthermore, we set

$$\mathcal{F}(H, I) := \{x \in H : \dim_{\mathbb{K}} E(x, I) < \infty\}.$$

Of course for $I = 0$ this is the locally finite part of H (in the sense of [JL94]), which we will denote by $\mathcal{F}(H)$. We have $E(xy, I) \subseteq E(x, I)E(y, I)$, from which it follows that $\mathcal{F}(H, I)$ is a subalgebra of H .

2.2. Matrix coefficients and the finite dual of H . Given a finite dimensional left H -module V , by the *right dual* of V we mean the dual space V^* equipped with the H -action defined by $\langle x \cdot v^*, v \rangle := \langle v^*, S^{-1}(x) \cdot v \rangle$ for $v^* \in V^*$ and $v \in V$, where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle : V^* \otimes V \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is the canonical pairing. The *matrix coefficients* of V are the linear functionals $\mathfrak{m}_{v^*, v} \in H^*$ defined by

$$\mathfrak{m}_{v^*, v}(x) := \langle v^*, x \cdot v \rangle \quad \text{for } x \in H, v \in V, v^* \in V^*.$$

Indeed $\mathfrak{m}_{v^*, v} \in H^\circ$, where H° denotes the finite dual of H (for the definition of H° see [KS97, Sec. 1.2.8]). Furthermore, for any two H -modules V and W we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_{v^* \otimes w^*, v \otimes w} = \mathfrak{m}_{v^*, v} \mathfrak{m}_{w^*, w} \quad \text{for } v, w \in V \text{ and } v^*, w^* \in W.$$

Recall that H° has a canonical Hopf algebra structure. Let Δ° denote the coproduct of H° , so that $\Delta^\circ(\lambda) = \sum \lambda_1 \otimes \lambda_2$ for $\lambda \in H^\circ$, where $\sum \lambda_1 \otimes \lambda_2$ is uniquely determined by $\langle \lambda, xy \rangle = \sum \langle \lambda_1, x \rangle \langle \lambda_2, y \rangle$ for $x, y \in H$. If $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ is a basis of V and $\{v_i^*\}_{i=1}^d$ is the dual basis of V^* , then $\Delta^\circ(\mathfrak{m}_{v^*, v}) = \sum_{i=1}^d \mathfrak{m}_{v^*, v_i} \otimes \mathfrak{m}_{v_i^*, v}$. The following remark will be used in Section 3.

Remark 2.2.1. Let $H^\bullet \subseteq H^\circ$ be a sub-bialgebra. Then H^\bullet is an H -module algebra with respect to *right translation*, where the action is defined by $\langle x \cdot \lambda, y \rangle := \langle \lambda, yx \rangle$ for $\lambda \in H^\bullet$ and $x, y \in H$. If H is equipped with a linear endomorphism $x \mapsto x^\sharp$ that yields an isomorphism of Hopf algebras $H \rightarrow H^{\text{op}}$, then H^\bullet has another H -module algebra structure defined by $\langle x \cdot \lambda, y \rangle := \langle \lambda, x^\sharp y \rangle$, which we call *left translation*. Given any homomorphism of associative algebras $\tau : H \rightarrow H$, we can define τ -twisted left and right translation actions of H on H^\bullet , given respectively by the formulas

$$\langle x \cdot \lambda, y \rangle := \langle \lambda, \tau(x)^\sharp y \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle x \cdot \lambda, y \rangle := \langle \lambda, y\tau(x) \rangle.$$

Furthermore, when H^\bullet is equipped with the τ -twisted actions,

- (i) if $\tau : H \rightarrow H$ is a homomorphism of coalgebras, then H^\bullet is an H -module algebra.
- (ii) if $\tau : H \rightarrow H$ is an anti-homomorphism of coalgebras, then H^\bullet is an H^{cop} -module algebra.

2.3. H -invariants and the ϵ -isotypic component. In Section 6 we will need the following general remark about the relation between commutants and trivial H -modules. For any H -module V we set $V_{(\epsilon)} := \{v \in V : h \cdot v = \epsilon(h)v\}$, where ϵ denotes the counit of H .

Remark 2.3.1. Let V be an H -module, and let $\psi : H \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{K}}(V)$ be the algebra homomorphism corresponding to this module structure. One can equip $\text{End}_{\mathbb{K}}(V)$ with an H -module structure, defined by $h \cdot T := \sum \psi(h_1)T\psi(S(h_2))$, where $\Delta(h) = \sum h_1 \otimes h_2$. By standard abstract arguments one can show that $\text{End}_{\mathbb{K}}(V)_{(\epsilon)} = \text{End}_{\mathbb{K}}(V)^{\psi(H)}$, where the right hand side is defined as in (3). The inclusion \supseteq follows from

$$\sum \psi(h_1)T\psi(S(h_2)) = T \sum \psi(h_1)\psi(S(h_2)) = T\psi\left(\sum h_1 S(h_2)\right) = \epsilon(h)T,$$

and the inclusion \subseteq follows from

$$hT = \sum \psi(h_1)\epsilon(h_2)T = \sum \psi(h_1)T\psi(S(h_2))\psi(h_3) = \sum \epsilon(h_1)T\psi(h_2) = T\psi\left(\sum \epsilon(h_1)h_2\right) = Th.$$

2.4. Matrix coefficients of quasitriangular Hopf algebras. In the rest of this section we assume that H has a *universal R -matrix*, that is, an invertible 2-tensor that satisfies

$$(7) \quad \Delta^{\text{cop}} = R\Delta R^{-1} \quad , \quad (\Delta \otimes \text{id})(R) = R_{13}R_{23} \quad , \quad (\text{id} \otimes \Delta)(R) = R_{13}R_{12}.$$

it is well known (see for example [KS97, Sec. 8.1.1]) that

$$(8) \quad R^{-1} = (1 \otimes S^{-1})(R) = (S \otimes 1)(R).$$

Remark 2.4.1. We do not require that R be strictly in $H \otimes H$. Indeed in this paper we are primarily interested in the case where $H = U_{LR}$. It is well known that in this case the universal R -matrix belongs to a suitable completion of $H \otimes H$. In this context the universal R -matrix is an infinite formal sum

$$R := \sum r \otimes r'.$$

However, we only need to consider how R acts on finite dimensional H -modules that are direct sums of tensor products of modules of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ of U_L and U_R , where the type of a module is defined as in [Ja96, Sec. 5.2]. On any such module, all but finitely many terms of R vanish. More generally, we can fix a category \mathcal{C} of finite dimensional H -modules such that \mathcal{C} is closed under taking tensor products and the defining properties (7) of R hold as relations in the endomorphism algebras of objects of \mathcal{C} .

Let \mathcal{C} be a category of H -modules as in Remark 2.4.1. For $V, W \in \text{obj}(\mathcal{C})$ we define

$$R_{V,W} : V \otimes W \rightarrow V \otimes W \quad , \quad v \otimes w \mapsto R(v \otimes w) := \sum r \cdot v \otimes r' \cdot w.$$

We also set $\check{R}_{V,W} := \sigma \circ R_{V,W}$, where $\sigma : V \otimes W \rightarrow W \otimes V$ is the map $v \otimes w \mapsto w \otimes v$. The map $\check{R}_{V,W}$ is an isomorphism of H -modules. Let $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^d$ and $\{w_i\}_{i=1}^{d'}$ be bases of V and W , and let $\{v_i^*\}_{i=1}^d$ and $\{w_i^*\}_{i=1}^{d'}$ be the dual bases of V^* and W^* . We denote the matrix entries of $R_{V,W}$ in the basis $v_i \otimes w_j$ by the R_{ij}^{kl} , so that

$$R_{V,W}(v_i \otimes w_j) = \sum_{k,l} R_{ij}^{kl} v_k \otimes w_l.$$

Set $\mathfrak{t}_{a,b}^V := m_{v_a^*, v_b}$ and $\mathfrak{t}_{a,b}^W := m_{w_a^*, w_b}$. Then $R_{ij}^{kl} = \langle \mathfrak{t}_{k,i}^V \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{l,j}^W, R \rangle$, so that as in [Ja96, Lem. 7.2] we have the well known relations

$$(9) \quad \sum_{k,l} \langle \mathfrak{t}_{k,i}^V \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{l,j}^W, R \rangle \mathfrak{t}_{a,l}^W \mathfrak{t}_{b,k}^V = \sum_{k,l} \langle \mathfrak{t}_{b,k}^V \otimes \mathfrak{t}_{a,l}^W, R \rangle \mathfrak{t}_{k,i}^V \mathfrak{t}_{l,j}^W \quad \text{for all } i, j, a, b.$$

The matrix coefficients of objects of \mathcal{C} span a sub-bialgebra $H^{\circ\circ} \subseteq H^\circ$. From (9) it follows that

$$(10) \quad \sum g_1 f_1 \langle f_2 \otimes g_2, R \rangle = \sum f_2 g_2 \langle f_1 \otimes g_1, R \rangle \quad \text{for } f, g \in H^{\circ\circ}.$$

2.5. Twisted tensor products and their deformations. Let A and B be two H -module algebras, with products m_A and m_B . It is well known (for example see [LZZ11, Thm 2.3]) that the vector space $A \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} B$ can be equipped with an H -module algebra structure with the product

$$(11) \quad (m_A \otimes m_B) \circ (\text{id}_A \otimes (\sigma \circ R) \otimes \text{id}_B).$$

We denote this associative algebra by $A \otimes_R B$. It is sometimes called the *twisted tensor product* of A and B . Let $E_A \subseteq A$ and $E_B \subseteq B$ be H -invariant subspaces that generate A and B , respectively. Thus $A \cong T(E_A)/I_A$ and $B \cong T(E_B)/I_B$, where $T(X)$ denotes the tensor algebra on X , and I_A and I_B denote the corresponding ideals of relations. We consider the map

$$\gamma_{A,B} : E_A \otimes E_B \rightarrow T(E_A \oplus E_B) \quad , \quad \gamma_{A,B}(a \otimes b) := ab.$$

Then the map $E_A \oplus E_B \rightarrow A \otimes_R B$ given by the assignment $a \oplus b \mapsto a \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes b$ yields a canonical isomorphism of associative algebras

$$T(E_A \oplus E_B)/I_{A,B} \cong A \otimes_R B,$$

where $I_{A,B}$ denotes the two-sided ideal generated by I_A , I_B , and relations of the form

$$(12) \quad ba - \gamma_{A,B} \circ \sigma \circ R(b \otimes a) \quad \text{for } a \in E_A, b \in E_B.$$

Now let $\psi : E_B \times E_A \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be an H -invariant bilinear form, that is

$$(13) \quad \sum \psi(x_1 \cdot b, x_2 \cdot a) = \epsilon(x)\psi(b, a) \quad \text{for } a \in E_A, b \in E_B, x \in H,$$

where $\epsilon : H \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ denotes the counit of H . Let $I_{A,B,\psi}$ denote the two-sided ideal of $T(E_A \oplus E_B)$ that is generated by I_A , I_B , and relations of the form

$$(14) \quad ba - \gamma_{A,B} \circ \sigma \circ R(b \otimes a) - \psi(b, a) \quad \text{for } a \in E_A, b \in E_B.$$

Definition 2.5.1. The algebra $A \otimes_{R,\psi} B := T(E_A \oplus E_B)/I_{A,B,\psi}$ is called the *deformed R -twisted tensor product* of A and B relative to E_A and E_B .

For the next proposition, recall that the H -module structure on $E_A \oplus E_B$ induces a canonical H -module algebra structure on $T(E_A \oplus E_B)$.

Proposition 2.5.2. *The H -module algebra structure on $T(E_A \oplus E_B)$ descends to an H -module algebra structure on $A \otimes_{R,\psi} B$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that the relations (14) are preserved under the H -action. Any $x \in H$ acts on $T^0(E_A \oplus E_B) \cong \mathbb{K}$ by $\epsilon(x)$. Thus by (13) for $a \in E_A$, $b \in E_B$, and $x \in H$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & x \cdot (ba - \gamma_{A,B} \circ \sigma \circ R(b \otimes a) - \psi(b, a)) \\ &= \sum ((x_1 \cdot b)(x_2 \cdot a) - \gamma_{A,B} \circ \sigma \circ R(x_1 \cdot b \otimes x_2 \cdot a) - \psi(x_1 \cdot b, x_2 \cdot a)). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Remark 2.5.3. The canonical maps $T(E_A) \rightarrow T(E_A \oplus E_B)$ and $T(E_B) \rightarrow T(E_A \oplus E_B)$ induce H -equivariant homomorphisms of associative algebras

$$A \cong T(E_A)/I_A \rightarrow A \otimes_{R,\psi} B \quad \text{and} \quad B \cong T(E_B)/I_B \rightarrow A \otimes_{R,\psi} B.$$

By the universal property of the tensor product, these maps induce an H -module homomorphism

$$A \otimes B \rightarrow A \otimes_{R,\psi} B, \quad a \otimes b \mapsto I_{A,B,\psi} + ab.$$

This map might not necessarily be a bijection, but when it is so, it transfers the usual $H \otimes H$ -module structure of $A \otimes B$ to $A \otimes_{R,\psi} B$. Note that the latter $H \otimes H$ -module structure is compatible with the former H -module structure: they are related by the coproduct map $H \rightarrow H \otimes H$.

3. THE q -WEYL ALGEBRA $\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}$

In this section we construct $\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}$ as a deformed twisted tensor product of the algebras \mathscr{P} and \mathscr{D} with respect to the universal R -matrix of U_{LR} .

3.1. The algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the quantized enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ is the \mathbb{k} -algebra generated by E_i, F_i , where $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, and $K_{\varepsilon_i}^{\pm 1}$, where $1 \leq i \leq n$, that satisfy the relations $K_{\varepsilon_i} K_{\varepsilon_i}^{-1} = K_{\varepsilon_i}^{-1} K_{\varepsilon_i} = 1$, $K_{\varepsilon_i} K_{\varepsilon_j} = K_{\varepsilon_j} K_{\varepsilon_i}$,

$$K_{\varepsilon_i} E_j K_{\varepsilon_i}^{-1} = q^{\llbracket i, j \rrbracket - \llbracket i, j+1 \rrbracket} E_j, \quad K_{\varepsilon_i} F_j K_{\varepsilon_i}^{-1} = q^{-\llbracket i, j \rrbracket + \llbracket i, j+1 \rrbracket} F_j, \quad E_i F_j - F_j E_i = \llbracket i, j \rrbracket \frac{K_i - K_i^{-1}}{q - q^{-1}},$$

where $K_i := K_{\varepsilon_i} K_{\varepsilon_{i+1}}^{-1}$ and

$$\llbracket a, b \rrbracket := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = b \\ 0 & \text{if } a \neq b, \end{cases}$$

as well as the quantum Serre relations. For $\lambda := \sum_{i=1}^n m_i \varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$ we define

$$K_\lambda := \prod_{i=1}^n K_{\varepsilon_i}^{m_i}.$$

The Cartan subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ is the subalgebra spanned by the K_λ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$. Following [KS97] for the choice of the coproduct Δ on $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$, we set

$$\Delta(E_i) := E_i \otimes K_i + 1 \otimes E_i, \quad \Delta(F_i) := F_i \otimes 1 + K_i^{-1} \otimes F_i, \quad \Delta(K_{\varepsilon_i}) := K_{\varepsilon_i} \otimes K_{\varepsilon_i}.$$

The counit and antipode of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ are given by

$$\epsilon(E_i) = \epsilon(F_i) = 0, \quad \epsilon(K_{\varepsilon_i}^{\pm 1}) = 1, \quad S(E_i) = -E_i K_i^{-1}, \quad S(F_i) = -K_i F_i, \quad S(K_{\varepsilon_i}) = K_{\varepsilon_i}^{-1}.$$

3.2. The universal R -matrix of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Throughout this paper we fix a universal R -matrix for $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. For more details see [VY20, Thm 3.108] or [KS97, Sec. 8.3.2].

Definition 3.2.1. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the standard root vectors of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ are

$$E_{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j} := (-1)^{j-i-1} [E_i, [\dots, E_{j-1}]_{q^{-1}}]_{q^{-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad F_{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j} := (-1)^{j-i-1} [F_{j-1}, [\dots, F_i]_q]_q,$$

where $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and $[x, y]_{q^{\pm 1}} := xy - q^{\pm 1}yx$. The universal R -matrix of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ that we use is

$$(15) \quad \mathcal{R}^{(n)} := \left(e^{h \sum_{i=1}^n H_i \otimes H_i} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{2}} \text{Exp}_q \left((q - q^{-1}) E_{\beta_i} \otimes F_{\beta_i} \right),$$

with the conventions $e^{hH_i} = K_{\varepsilon_i}$, $e^h = q$, $\text{Exp}_q(x) := \sum_{r \geq 0} q^{\binom{r}{2}} \frac{x^r}{[r]_q!}$, and $\beta_{i + \frac{j(j-1)}{2}} := \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{j+1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n-1$.

3.3. The algebras $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$. From now on, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let $\Delta_n^+ := \{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$ denote the standard positive system of the root system of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Let $V^{(n)}$ denote the irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module of highest weight $q^{-\varepsilon_n}$ (all highest weights are considered with respect to Δ_n^+). Thus $V^{(n)} \cong \mathbb{k}^n$ as a vector space and the homomorphism of algebras $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(V^{(n)})$ is uniquely determined by the assignments

$$K_{\varepsilon_i} \mapsto 1 + (q^{-1} - 1) \mathbf{E}_{i,i}, \quad E_i \mapsto \mathbf{E}_{i+1,i}, \quad F_i \mapsto \mathbf{E}_{i,i+1},$$

where the $\mathbf{E}_{i,j}$ are the elementary matrix units associated to the standard basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of $V^{(n)}$ and $1 := \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E}_{i,i}$. Using (15) the R -matrix of $V^{(n)} \otimes V^{(n)}$ can be computed directly, and we obtain

$$\mathcal{R}_{V^{(n)}, V^{(n)}} := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} q \mathbf{E}_{i,i} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i} + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} \mathbf{E}_{i,i} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{j,j} + (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{1 \leq j < i \leq n} \mathbf{E}_{i,j} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{j,i}.$$

For $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ let $t_{i,j}$ denote the matrix coefficient $\mathbf{m}_{e_i^*, e_j}$ of $V^{(n)}$. By (10) the $t_{i,j}$ satisfy the following relations:

$$(R1) \quad t_{k,i}t_{k,j} = qt_{k,j}t_{k,i}, \quad t_{i,k}t_{j,k} = qt_{j,k}t_{i,k} \quad \text{for } i < j.$$

$$(R2) \quad t_{i,l}t_{k,j} = t_{k,j}t_{i,l}, \quad t_{i,j}t_{k,l} - t_{k,l}t_{i,j} = (q - q^{-1})t_{i,l}t_{k,j} \quad \text{for } i < k \text{ and } j < l.$$

Similarly, let $\check{V}^{(n)}$ denote the irreducible $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module with highest weight q^{ε_1} . Again $\check{V}^{(n)} \cong \mathbb{k}^n$ as vector spaces but the map $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\check{V}^{(n)})$ is uniquely determined by the assignments

$$K_{\varepsilon_i} \mapsto 1 + (q - 1)\mathbf{E}_{i,i}, \quad E_i \mapsto \mathbf{E}_{i,i+1}, \quad F_i \mapsto \mathbf{E}_{i+1,i}.$$

The corresponding R -matrix is

$$\mathcal{R}_{\check{V}^{(n)}, \check{V}^{(n)}} := \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} q\mathbf{E}_{i,i} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i} + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} \mathbf{E}_{i,i} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{j,j} + (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \mathbf{E}_{i,j} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{j,i}.$$

If $\partial_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ denotes the matrix coefficient $\mathbf{m}_{e_i^*, e_j}$ of $\check{V}^{(n)}$, then again from (10) it follows that the $\partial_{i,j}$ satisfy relations similar to those between the $t_{i,j}$, with q replaced by q^{-1} . Equivalently,

$$(R1') \quad \partial_{k,j}\partial_{k,i} = q\partial_{k,i}\partial_{k,j}, \quad \partial_{j,k}\partial_{i,k} = q\partial_{i,k}\partial_{j,k} \quad \text{for } i < j.$$

$$(R2') \quad \partial_{k,j}\partial_{i,l} = \partial_{i,l}\partial_{k,j}, \quad \partial_{k,l}\partial_{i,j} - \partial_{i,j}\partial_{k,l} = (q - q^{-1})\partial_{k,j}\partial_{i,l} \quad \text{for } i < k \text{ and } j < l.$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ denote the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^\circ$ generated by the $t_{i,j}$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ denote the subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^\circ$ generated by the $\partial_{i,j}$, for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. It is well known that the relations (R1)–(R2) yield a description of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ by generators and relations (that is, no further relations are required). A similar statement holds for $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ (see [Ta92] for a proof).

From Section 2 it follows that both $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ are bialgebras with the coproducts satisfying

$$t_{i,j} \mapsto \sum_k t_{i,k} \otimes t_{k,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_{i,j} \mapsto \sum_k \partial_{i,k} \otimes \partial_{k,j},$$

and the counits satisfying $t_{i,j}, \partial_{i,j} \mapsto \llbracket i, j \rrbracket$.

It is well known (for example see [No96, Sec. 1.4]) that there exists a unique \mathbb{k} -linear isomorphism of Hopf algebras

$$U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^{\text{op}}, \quad x \mapsto x^{\natural},$$

such that

$$(16) \quad E_i^{\natural} := qK_i F_i, \quad F_i^{\natural} := q^{-1}E_i K_i^{-1}, \quad K_{\varepsilon_i}^{\natural} := K_{\varepsilon_i}.$$

Thus according to Remark 2.2.1, the canonical $(U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n), U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n))$ -bimodule structure of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ by left and right translation equips both $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ with $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module algebra structures. Our next goal is to describe the latter actions explicitly. In what follows, all of the actions are from the left side.

Let $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ on $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ by right translation, as in Remark 2.2.1. We have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)u = \sum u_1 \langle u_2, x \rangle \quad \text{for } x \in U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n), \quad u \in \mathcal{D}_{n \times n},$$

where $\Delta(u) := \sum u_1 \otimes u_2$. Similarly, let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the action of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ on $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ by left translation. This action satisfies

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)u = \sum \langle u_1, x^{\natural} \rangle u_2 \quad \text{for } x \in U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n), \quad u \in \mathcal{D}_{n \times n}.$$

By Remark 2.2.1 both $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ equip $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ with $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module algebra structures.

To define the desired actions on $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$, first we consider two new actions $\mathcal{R}'_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_{\mathcal{D}}$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ on $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$, which are in some sense opposite to $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$, respectively. More precisely, let $\mathcal{R}'_{\mathcal{D}}$ be

the τ -twist of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$, and let $\mathcal{L}'_{\mathcal{D}}$ be the τ -twist of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$, where $\tau(x) := S^{-1}(x)^{\natural}$ for $x \in U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. By Remark 2.2.1(ii) these two actions equip $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ with $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^{\text{cop}}$ -module algebra structures. We have

$$\mathcal{R}'_{\mathcal{D}}(x)u = \sum \langle u_1, S^{-1}(x) \rangle u_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}'_{\mathcal{D}}(x)u = \sum u_1 \langle u_2, S^{-1}(x)^{\natural} \rangle.$$

There exists a unique isomorphism of bialgebras $\iota : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\text{op, cop}}$ satisfying

$$(17) \quad \iota(t_{i,j}) = \partial_{j,i} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

Any $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^{\text{cop}}$ -module algebra structure on $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ corresponds to a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module algebra structure on $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$, defined by $x \cdot u := \iota^{-1}(x \cdot \iota(u))$ for $u \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$. Under this correspondence, $\mathcal{R}'_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{L}'_{\mathcal{D}}$ corresponds to actions $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ on $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$, respectively. We have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)u = \sum \langle \iota(u_2), S^{-1}(x) \rangle u_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}(x)u = \sum \langle \iota(u_1), S^{-1}(x)^{\natural} \rangle u_2,$$

for $x \in U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ and $u \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$. Furthermore, $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ is a $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -module algebra with respect to both $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$.

3.4. The algebras \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} . We define $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{P}_{m \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_{m \times n}$ for $1 \leq m \leq n$ as subalgebras of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$, respectively. A similar definition can be given when $m > n$, although we do not need to consider this case because the proofs of Theorems A and B remain the same (see also Subsection 3.7).

Definition 3.4.1. For positive integers $m \leq n$, we define $\mathcal{P}_{m \times n}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{D}_{m \times n}$) to be the subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$) that is generated by the $t_{i,j}$ (respectively, the $\partial_{i,j}$) where $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$.

The subalgebra of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ generated by $E_i, F_i, K_{\varepsilon_j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$ is isomorphic to $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$. By restricting the $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -actions $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}} \otimes \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{D}}$ to the subalgebra

$$U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \cong U_L \otimes U_R = U_{LR},$$

we obtain U_{LR} -module algebra structures on \mathcal{P} and on \mathcal{D} . Explicitly, the actions of $x \otimes y \in U_L \otimes U_R$ on $u \in \mathcal{P}$ and on $v \in \mathcal{D}$ are given by

$$(18) \quad (x \otimes y) \cdot u = \sum \langle \iota(u_1), S^{-1}(x)^{\natural} \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), S^{-1}(y) \rangle u_2$$

and

$$(19) \quad (x \otimes y) \cdot v = \sum \langle v_1, x^{\natural} \rangle \langle v_3, y \rangle v_2.$$

Definition 3.4.2. For any integer partition λ satisfying $\ell(\lambda) \leq n$, where $\ell(\lambda)$ denotes the length of λ , let V_{λ} denote the irreducible finite dimensional U_R -module of type $(1, \dots, 1)$ with highest weight $q^{\sum_i \lambda_i \varepsilon_i}$ (with respect to Δ_n^+). For λ such that $\ell(\lambda) \leq m$ we use the same notation V_{λ} to denote the analogously defined module of U_L .

The algebras \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} are naturally graded by degree of monomials. For $d \geq 0$ let $\mathcal{P}^{(d)}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{D}^{(d)}$) denote the graded component of degree d of \mathcal{P} (respectively, \mathcal{D}). Furthermore, let $\Lambda_{m,d}$ be the set of integer partitions λ such that $\ell(\lambda) \leq m$ and $|\lambda| = d$, where $|\lambda|$ denotes the size of λ . The following proposition is well known and its proof can be found for example in [NYM93, Ta92, Zh02].

Proposition 3.4.3. *As U_{LR} -modules,*

$$\mathcal{P}^{(d)} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,d}} V_{\lambda}^* \otimes V_{\lambda}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}^{(d)} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,d}} V_{\lambda} \otimes V_{\lambda}.$$

Remark 3.4.4. The action of $U_L \otimes U_R$ on the generators of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} can be computed explicitly. For U_R , the action is given by

$$\begin{aligned} E_k \cdot \partial_{i,j} &= \llbracket k+1, j \rrbracket \partial_{i,k} & , & \quad F_k \cdot \partial_{i,j} = \llbracket k, j \rrbracket \partial_{i,k+1} & \quad , & \quad K_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot \partial_{i,j} = q^{\llbracket k, j \rrbracket} \partial_{i,j}, \\ E_k \cdot t_{i,j} &= -\llbracket k, j \rrbracket q^{-1} t_{i,k+1} & , & \quad F_k \cdot t_{i,j} = -\llbracket k+1, j \rrbracket q t_{i,k} & \quad , & \quad K_{\varepsilon_k} \cdot t_{i,j} = q^{-\llbracket k, j \rrbracket} t_{i,j}, \end{aligned}$$

where $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. For U_L the formulas are similar but the action occurs in the first index (thus, they are obtained by replacing $\partial_{i,j}$ by $\partial_{j,i}$ and $t_{i,j}$ by $t_{j,i}$).

3.5. The algebras $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\text{gr}}$ and $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$. Let $m \leq n$ be positive integers and let U_{LR} be defined as in Section 1. Let $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ denote the universal R -matrix of U_{LR} that is defined by

$$(20) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{R}} := ((\mathcal{R}_L)_{21}^{-1} \otimes (\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1})_{32},$$

where $\mathcal{R}_L := \mathcal{R}^{(m)}$ and $\mathcal{R}_R := \mathcal{R}^{(n)}$ (see Definition 3.2.1). Let $\mathcal{P} \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}} \mathcal{D}$ denote the twisted tensor product of \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} , defined as in Subsection 2.5, where we set $A := \mathcal{P}$, $E_A := \mathcal{P}^{(1)}$, $B := \mathcal{D}$, $E_B := \mathcal{D}^{(1)}$, and $R := \tilde{\mathcal{R}}$. For convenience in notation we set

$$\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\text{gr}} := \mathcal{P} \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}} \mathcal{D}.$$

Next we define the quantum Weyl algebra $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{m \times n}$ as a deformation of $\mathcal{P} \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}} \mathcal{D}$, using Definition 2.5.1. Let $\psi_{\circ} : \mathcal{D}^{(1)} \times \mathcal{P}^{(1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{k}$ be the \mathbb{k} -bilinear form that is uniquely defined by

$$\psi_{\circ}(\partial_{i,j}, t_{k,l}) := \delta_{i,k} \delta_{j,l} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, k \leq m, \text{ and } 1 \leq j, l \leq n.$$

Note that ψ_{\circ} is U_{LR} -invariant. Again for convenience in notation we set

$$(21) \quad \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} := \mathcal{P} \otimes_{\tilde{\mathcal{R}}, \psi_{\circ}} \mathcal{D}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ is the algebra generated by the $2mn$ generators $t_{i,j}$ and $\partial_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$, modulo the relations (R1)–(R2), (R1')–(R2'), and other mixed relations coming from (14). We now compute the mixed relations between the $t_{i,j}$ and the $\partial_{i,j}$ explicitly. As a U_{LR} -module,

$$\mathcal{P}^{(1)} \cong \check{V}^{(m)} \otimes \check{V}^{(n)} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}^{(1)} \cong V^{(m)} \otimes V^{(n)}.$$

By a direct calculation using Definition 3.2.1 we obtain

$$((\mathcal{R}_L)_{21}^{-1})_{\check{V}^{(m)}, V^{(m)}} = q \sum_{1 \leq i \leq m} \mathbf{E}_{i,i} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{i,i} + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq m} \mathbf{E}_{i,i} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{j,j} + (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \mathbf{E}_{j,i} \otimes \mathbf{E}_{j,i}.$$

The formula for $((\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1})_{\check{V}^{(n)}, V^{(n)}}$ is similar, with m replaced by n . From here, and by a direct calculation, we obtain the relations (R3)–(R6) given below:

$$(R3) \quad \partial_{c,b} t_{d,a} = t_{d,a} \partial_{c,b} \text{ if } b \neq a \text{ and } c \neq d.$$

$$(R4) \quad \partial_{c,b} t_{c,a} = q t_{c,a} \partial_{c,b} + \sum_{c' > c} (q - q^{-1}) t_{c',a} \partial_{c',b} \text{ if } b \neq a.$$

$$(R5) \quad \partial_{c,a} t_{d,a} = q t_{d,a} \partial_{c,a} + \sum_{a' > a} (q - q^{-1}) t_{d,a'} \partial_{c,a'} \text{ if } c \neq d.$$

$$(R6) \quad \partial_{c,d} t_{c,d} = 1 + \sum_{c' \geq c} \sum_{d' \geq d} q^{\llbracket c', c \rrbracket + \llbracket d', d \rrbracket} (q - q^{-1})^{2 - \llbracket c', c \rrbracket - \llbracket d', d \rrbracket} t_{c',a'} \partial_{c',a'}.$$

Remark 3.5.1. By Proposition 2.5.2, the actions of U_{LR} on \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} carry over to $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$, and make the latter a U_{LR} -module algebra. As in Remark 3.4.4, we denote the action of $x \in U_{LR}$ on $D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ by $x \cdot D$.

Remark 3.5.2. Using Bergman's Diamond Lemma and some straightforward (although tedious) computations one can show that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ has a \mathbb{k} -basis consisting of monomials of the form

$$(22) \quad t_{1,1}^{a_{1,1}} \cdots t_{1,n}^{a_{1,n}} \cdots t_{m,1}^{a_{m,1}} \cdots t_{m,n}^{a_{m,n}} \partial_{m,n}^{b_{m,n}} \cdots \partial_{m,1}^{b_{m,1}} \cdots \partial_{1,n}^{b_{1,n}} \cdots \partial_{1,1}^{b_{1,1}}, \quad a_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}.$$

This was also pointed out in [SSV04, Sec. 10]. In [LSS22a] we give a more conceptual proof of this assertion using the theory of PBW deformations of quadratic algebras. The analogous statements for \mathcal{P} and for \mathcal{D} are well known (for example see [NYM93, Thm 1.4]).

Let \mathcal{I} denote the left ideal of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ generated by $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$. By Remark 3.5.2 we have a U_{LR} -invariant decomposition $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \cong \mathcal{I} \oplus \mathcal{P}$. This decomposition equips $\mathcal{P} \cong \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}/\mathcal{I}$ with a $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ -module structure given by

$$(23) \quad \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \quad D \otimes (f + \mathcal{I}) \mapsto (Df) + \mathcal{I} \quad \text{for } D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}, f \in \mathcal{P}.$$

To distinguish the action of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ on \mathcal{P} from the product of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$, we denote the action of $D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ on $f \in \mathcal{P}$ by $D \cdot f$.

Lemma 3.5.3. *The map (23) is U_{LR} -equivariant.*

Proof. This follows from Remark 3.5.1 and U_{LR} -invariance of \mathcal{I} . □

Proposition 3.5.4. *\mathcal{P} is a faithful $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ -module.*

Proof. This is proved in [SSV04, Thm 2.6] using analytic tools. See Section 12 for a purely algebraic proof. □

From Remark 3.5.2 it follows that the map

$$(24) \quad \mathbf{P} : \mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}, \quad \mathbf{P}(a \otimes b) := ab$$

is an isomorphism of vector spaces. For $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ we set $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(r,s)} := \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{P}^{(r)} \otimes \mathcal{D}^{(s)})$. By Proposition 3.4.3 and using the coproduct map $U_{LR} \rightarrow U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ to obtain a U_{LR} -module from a $U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ module, we obtain an isomorphism of U_{LR} -modules

$$(25) \quad \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(r,s)} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,r} \\ \mu \in \Lambda_{m,s}}} (V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\mu) \otimes (V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\mu).$$

Remark 3.5.5. By Remark 2.5.3, the above map \mathbf{P} transfers the $U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ -module structure of $\mathcal{P} \otimes \mathcal{D}$ to $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$. Note that the latter $U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ -module structure on $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ is compatible with the U_{LR} -module structure of Remark 3.5.1 through the coproduct map $U_{LR} \rightarrow U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$.

Remark 3.5.6. The map \mathbf{P} does *not* induce an isomorphism of associative algebras $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\text{gr}} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$. However, the products of the domain and the range of \mathbf{P} are the same modulo lower order terms. That is, for $a \otimes a' \in \mathcal{P}^{(r)} \otimes_{\bar{\mathbb{R}}} \mathcal{D}^{(r')}$ and $b \otimes b' \in \mathcal{P}^{(s)} \otimes_{\bar{\mathbb{R}}} \mathcal{D}^{(s')}$ we have

$$\mathbf{P}(a \otimes a')\mathbf{P}(b \otimes b') - \mathbf{P}((a \otimes a')(b \otimes b')) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\min\{u, u'\}} \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(u-i, u'-i)},$$

where $u := r + s$ and $u' := r' + s'$.

3.6. The maps Γ and ${}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n$. Recall that $1 \leq m \leq n$. In this subsection our goal is to define a map $\Gamma : \mathcal{P}_{m \times m} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ that is a bijection onto $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}}$ (see Lemma 6.2.2). A similar map was also used in [LZZ11]. To define Γ , first for $n \geq 1$ we set

$$(26) \quad \Gamma_n : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}, \quad \Gamma_n(u) := \sum u_1 \iota(u_2),$$

and

$${}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\text{gr}}, \quad {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u) := \sum u_1 \otimes \iota(u_2),$$

where $\iota : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ is the anti-isomorphism of bialgebras defined in (17) and as usual $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}}(u) = \sum u_1 \otimes u_2$ is the coproduct of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ in Sweedler's notation.

Let us identify $\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}$ with the subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ generated by the $t_{i,j}$ satisfying $1 \leq i, j \leq m$. Similarly, we identify \mathcal{P} (respectively, \mathcal{D}) with a subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ (respectively, of $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$) as in Definition 3.4.1. By tensoring the embeddings $\mathcal{P} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ we can consider $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\text{gr}}$ as a subspace (although *not* a subalgebra) of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\text{gr}}$. It is straightforward to check that ${}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\text{gr}}$. Thus the following definition is valid.

Definition 3.6.1. For $u \in \mathcal{P}_{m \times m}$ we define $\Gamma(u) := \text{P} \circ {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u)$.

3.7. Convention. Unless stated otherwise, from now on we assume $1 \leq m \leq n$. In particular, we prove Theorems A and B under this assumption. Analogous arguments can be given in the case $m > n$. In our proofs we also need to consider the algebras $\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}$, $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{m \times m}$, $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$, $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$, and $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\text{gr}}$. For further clarity, we do not suppress the subscripts $m \times m$ and $n \times n$ for these algebras.

4. DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS ASSOCIATED TO THE K_λ

Recall that we assume $1 \leq m \leq n$. For $1 \leq a \leq m$ and $1 \leq b \leq n$ we set

$$(27) \quad \lambda_{L,a} := - \sum_{i=a}^m 2\varepsilon_i, \quad x_a := K_{\lambda_{L,a}} \otimes 1 \in U_{LR}, \quad \lambda_{R,b} := - \sum_{i=b}^n 2\varepsilon_i, \quad y_b := 1 \otimes K_{\lambda_{R,b}} \in U_{LR}.$$

The key result of this section is Proposition 4.2.1, which proves that $x_a, y_b \in \phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$. We set

$$\mathring{U}_{LR} := \phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}) := \{x \in U_{LR} : \phi_U(x) \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}\}.$$

Furthermore, we set $\mathring{U}_L := \{x \in U_L : x \otimes 1 \in \mathring{U}_{LR}\}$ and $\mathring{U}_R := \{x \in U_R : 1 \otimes x \in \mathring{U}_{LR}\}$.

4.1. A necessary local finiteness condition for \mathring{U}_{LR} . Recall that the adjoint action of U_{LR} is $\text{ad}_y(x) := \sum y_1 x S(y_2)$ for $x, y \in U_{LR}$. We equip $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})$ with the U_{LR} -module structure of Remark 2.3.1. We denote the latter action by $x \cdot T$ for $x \in U_{LR}$ and $T \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})$.

Lemma 4.1.1. \mathring{U}_{LR} is an ad-invariant subalgebra of U_{LR} . Furthermore, $\phi_U(\text{ad}_y(x)) = y \cdot \phi_U(x)$ for $x \in \mathring{U}_{LR}$ and $y \in U_{LR}$.

Proof. Set $D := \phi_U(x) \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$. By Lemma 3.5.3, for $f \in \mathcal{P}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_U(\text{ad}_y(x)) \cdot f &= \sum y_1 \cdot (D \cdot (S(y_2) \cdot f)) = \sum (y_1 \cdot D)(y_2 \cdot (S(y_2) \cdot f)) \\ &= \sum (y_1 \cdot D) \cdot ((y_2 S(y_2)) \cdot f) = \sum (y_1 \cdot D) \cdot (\epsilon(y_2) f) = (y \cdot D) \cdot f = (y \cdot \phi_U(x)) \cdot f. \end{aligned}$$

This proves that $\phi_U(\text{ad}_y(x)) = y \cdot \phi_U(x)$ and in particular $\text{ad}_y(U_{LR}) \subseteq U_{LR}$. \square

From Proposition 3.4.3 it follows that the map $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}} : U_L \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})$ is an injection (the argument is similar to the proof of [KS97, Thm 7.1.5.13]). Let \mathcal{K}_n denote the kernel of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}} : U_R \rightarrow \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})$.

Proposition 4.1.2. $\dot{U}_L \subseteq \mathcal{F}(U_L)$ and $\dot{U}_R \subseteq \mathcal{F}(U_R, \mathcal{K}_n)$.

Proof. Since the action of U_{LR} on \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{D} is degree preserving, it follows that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ is a locally finite U_{LR} -module. The assertions of the proposition follow from the fact that the maps $\dot{U}_L \xrightarrow{\phi_U} \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ and $\dot{U}_R/(\dot{U}_R \cap \mathcal{K}_n) \xrightarrow{\phi_U} \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ are injective and U_{LR} -equivariant (this is Lemma 4.1.1). \square

Remark 4.1.3. The proof of Proposition 4.1.2 implies the following “no-go theorem”: it is impossible to construct a nontrivial quantized Weyl algebra $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}}$ such that $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}}$ acts locally finitely on \mathcal{P} , the action $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}} \otimes \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}$ is U_{LR} -equivariant, and there exists a homomorphism of algebras $U_{LR} \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}}$ that is compatible with the action in the sense of the commutative diagram (1).

4.2. U_{LR} as a \dot{U}_{LR} -module. By a slight abuse of notation we consider the x_a and the y_b as elements of U_L and U_R , respectively.

Proposition 4.2.1. *Let x_a and y_b be defined as in (27), where $1 \leq a \leq m$ and $1 \leq b \leq n$. Then $x_a \in \dot{U}_L$ and $y_b \in \dot{U}_R$.*

Proof. We only prove the assertion for x_a (for y_b the argument is similar). First we verify the case $a = m$. By Remark 3.4.4 we have $x_m \cdot t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = q^{2 \sum_{i=1}^r \llbracket m, a_i \rrbracket} t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r}$, and it is straightforward to check that the operator $D'_{1,0} + (q^2 - 1)D'_{1,1} = 1 + (q^2 - 1) \sum_{j=1}^n t_{m,i} \partial_{m,i}$ acts on \mathcal{P} the same way, so that $\phi_U(x_m) = D'_{1,0} + (q^2 - 1)D'_{1,1}$. To complete the proof, by Lemma 4.1.1 it suffices to verify that for any $a < m$, the element $x_a = K_{\lambda_{L,a}}$ lies in the $\text{ad}(U_L)$ -invariant subalgebra of U_L that is generated by $x_{a+1} = K_{\lambda_{L,a+1}}$ and $x_m = K_{\lambda_{L,m}}$. Denoting the standard generators of U_L by $E_i, F_i, K_i^{\pm 1}$, we set

$$E'_{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j} := [E_i, [\dots, E_{j-1}]_q]_q \quad \text{and} \quad F'_{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_j} := [F_{j-1}, [\dots, F_i]_{q^{-1}}]_{q^{-1}} \quad \text{for } i < j.$$

Let $u := E'_{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m} K_{-\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m}$ and $v := F'_{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m} K_{\lambda_{L,a+1}}$. By a simple induction we can verify that

$$u = (1 - q^2)^{-1} \text{ad}_{E_a} \cdots \text{ad}_{E_{m-1}}(K_{\lambda_{L,m}}) \quad \text{and} \quad v = (1 - q^{-2})^{-1} \text{ad}_{F_{m-1}} \cdots \text{ad}_{F_a}(K_{\lambda_{L,a+1}}),$$

so that $u, v \in \dot{U}_L$ by Lemma 4.1.1. For $x, y \in U_L$ set $[x, y] := xy - yx$. We obtain

$$(28) \quad [E'_{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m}, F'_{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m}] K_{-\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m} K_{\lambda_{L,a+1}} = uv - q^{-2}vu \in \dot{U}_L.$$

But the left hand side of (28) is equal to

$$(q - q^{-1})^{-1} (K_{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m} - K_{\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m}^{-1}) K_{-\varepsilon_a - \varepsilon_m} K_{\lambda_{L,a+1}} = (q - q^{-1})^{-1} (K_{-2\varepsilon_m} K_{\lambda_{L,a+1}} - K_{\lambda_{L,a}}).$$

It follows immediately that $K_{\lambda_{L,a}} \in \dot{U}_L$. \square

Proposition 4.2.2. U_L is generated as an algebra by \dot{U}_L and $\{K_{\varepsilon_i}\}_{i=1}^m$. Similarly, U_R is generated as an algebra by \dot{U}_R and $\{K_{\varepsilon_i}\}_{i=1}^n$.

Proof. We give the proof for U_L (for U_R the proof is similar). Let \mathcal{A} denote the subalgebra of U_L generated by \dot{U}_L and $\{K_{\varepsilon_i}\}_{i=1}^m$. Set $\rho := \sum_{i=1}^m i\varepsilon_i$. Then $K_{-2\rho} = x_1 \cdots x_m$, hence by Proposition 4.2.1 we have $K_{-2\rho} \in \dot{U}_L$. Lemma 4.1.1 implies that $E_i K_{-2\rho} = (1 - q^2)^{-1} \text{ad}_{E_i}(K_{-2\rho}) \in \dot{U}_L$, so that $E_i \in \mathcal{A}$. By a similar argument we can prove that $F_i \in \mathcal{A}$ as well, hence $\mathcal{A} = U_L$. \square

5. EXPLICIT FORMULAS FOR $\phi_U(x_a)$ AND $\phi_U(y_b)$

In this section we compute explicit formulas for $\phi_U(x_a)$ and $\phi_U(y_b)$, where x_a and y_b are defined in (27). We remark that in Section 10 we prove that the x_a and the y_b generate $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{h}, \bullet})$ and $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathfrak{h}, \bullet})$, respectively. Recall that the action of $D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ on $f \in \mathcal{P}$ is denoted by $D \cdot f$.

5.1. Some technical statements about the action. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1.1. *Assume that either $i \notin \{a_1, \dots, a_r\}$ or $j \notin \{b_1, \dots, b_r\}$, then $\partial_{i,j} t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r}$ belongs to the left ideal of \mathcal{PD} that is generated by the $\partial_{i', j'}$ satisfying $i' \geq i$ and $j' \geq j$. In particular, $\partial_{i,j} \cdot (t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r}) = 0$.*

Proof. We use induction on r . For $r = 1$ the assertion follows from relations (R3)–(R6). Next suppose $r > 1$. If $i \neq a_1$ and $j \neq b_1$ then $\partial_{i,j} t_{a_1, b_1} = t_{a_1, b_1} \partial_{i,j}$ and we can use the induction hypothesis. If $i = a_1$ then $j \notin \{b_1, \dots, b_r\}$ and we can write

$$\partial_{i,j} t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = q t_{i, b_1} \partial_{i, j} t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} + (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{i' > i} t_{i', b_1} \partial_{i', j} t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r},$$

and again the induction hypothesis is applicable to each summand on the right hand side. The argument for the case $j = b_1$ is similar. \square

In Subsection 5.3 we need more refined information about the monomials in the $t_{i,j}$ that are generated by $\partial_{i,j} \cdot t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r}$. To this end we use the following technical lemma, whose proof is postponed until Section 13. Let us call two r -tuples (m_1, \dots, m_r) and (m'_1, \dots, m'_r) of integers *order equivalent*, if they satisfy the following property: $m_i < m_j$ if and only if $m'_i < m'_j$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq r$.

Lemma 5.1.2. *Let $1 \leq a_1, \dots, a_r \leq m$ and $1 \leq b_1, \dots, b_r \leq n$. We denote the order equivalence classes of (a_1, \dots, a_r) and (b_1, \dots, b_r) by \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} , respectively. Then*

$$\partial_{a_i, b_j} \cdot t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \sum_{\sigma_s, \tau_s} c_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(i, j, \sigma_s, \tau_s) t_{a_{\sigma_s(1)}, b_{\tau_s(1)}} \cdots t_{a_{\sigma_s(s)}, b_{\tau_s(s)}},$$

where $c_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(i, j, \sigma_s, \tau_s) \in \mathbb{k}$ and the inner sum is over all pairs of injective maps

$$\sigma_s : \{1, \dots, s\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{i\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_s : \{1, \dots, s\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{j\}.$$

In particular, the coefficients $c_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(i, j, \sigma_s, \tau_s)$ only depend on $i, j, \sigma_s, \tau_s, \mathbf{a}$ and \mathbf{b} .

We do not know explicit formulas for the coefficients $c_{\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}}(i, j, \sigma_s, \tau_s)$. However, for our purposes Lemma 5.1.2 suffices.

Proof. Set $f := \partial_{a_r, b_r} \cdot (t_{c_1, d_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r})$ and assume that $f \neq 0$. Then by Lemma 5.1.1 we have $a_r \in \{c_1, \dots, c_r\}$ and $b_r \in \{d_1, \dots, d_r\}$. Lemma 5.1.2 implies that f can be expressed as a linear combination of monomials of the form $t_{c'_1, d'_1} \cdots t_{c'_s, d'_s}$ for $s \leq r$, where $\{c'_i\}_{i=1}^s \subseteq \{c_1, \dots, c_r\} \setminus \{a_r\}$ and $\{d'_i\}_{i=1}^s \subseteq \{d_1, \dots, d_r\} \setminus \{b_r\}$. The claim follows by iterating the above reasoning. \square

Lemma 5.1.3. *Suppose that $f, g \in \mathcal{PD}$ satisfy $\partial_{i_1, j_1} \cdots \partial_{i_r, j_r} \cdot f = g$ for some $1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_r \leq m$ and $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_r \leq n$. Then for any $1 \leq i'_1 \leq \dots \leq i'_s \leq m$ and $1 \leq j'_1 \leq \dots \leq j'_s \leq n$ that satisfy $\min\{j_u\}_{u=1}^r > \max\{j'_u\}_{u=1}^s$ we have*

$$\partial_{i_1, j_1} \cdots \partial_{i_r, j_r} \cdot (f t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s}) = g t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s}.$$

Proof. Recall that \mathcal{I} is the left ideal of \mathcal{PD} generated by $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$ (see Subsection 3.5). Set $f' := \partial_{i_r, j_r} \cdot f$. Then $\partial_{i_r, j_r} f = f' + \sum_{(i', j')} b_{i', j'} \partial_{i', j'}$, where the $b_{i', j'} \in \mathcal{PD}$ and the sum is over all pairs (i', j') that satisfy $i_r \leq i' \leq m$ and $j_r \leq j' \leq n$. In particular $j' \notin \{j'_1, \dots, j'_s\}$, hence by Lemma 5.1.1 we obtain

$$\partial_{i_r, j_r} f t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s} = f' t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s} + \sum_{(i', j')} b_{i', j'} \partial_{i', j'} t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s} \in f' t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s} + \mathcal{I}.$$

This means $\partial_{i_r, j_r} \cdot (f t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s}) = f' t_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots t_{i'_s, j'_s}$. The proof is completed by induction on r . \square

5.2. Eigenvalues of $\mathbf{D}_{n,r}$ and q -factorial Schur polynomials. For any integer partition ν such that $\ell(\nu) \leq n$, let s_ν denote the q -factorial Schur polynomial in n variables associated to ν , defined by

$$s_\nu(x_1, \dots, x_n; q) := \frac{\det \left(\prod_{k=0}^{\nu_j + n - j - 1} (x_i - q^k) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}}{\prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} (x_i - x_j)}.$$

It is proved in [BKV06, Thm 1] that when $m = n$, for any integer partition λ satisfying $\ell(\lambda) \leq n$ the restriction of $\mathbf{D}_{n,r}$ to the irreducible U_{LR} -submodule $V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\lambda^*$ of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ is a scalar multiple of identity, the scalar being

$$(29) \quad \frac{(-1)^r q^{r-r^2-2r(n-r)}}{(1-q^2)^r} s_{(1^r)}(q^{2(\lambda_1+n-1)}, \dots, q^{2(\lambda_{n-1}+1)}, q^{2\lambda_n}; q^2).$$

The polynomials s_ν are specializations of the interpolation Macdonald polynomials R_λ defined in [Sah96]. As in [Sah11, Sec. 0.3], let $R_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t)$ denote the unique symmetric polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}(q, t)$ that satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) $\deg R_\lambda = |\lambda|$.
- (ii) $R_\lambda(q^{\mu_1}, \dots, q^{\mu_i} t^{1-i}, \dots, q^{\mu_n} t^{1-n}; q, t) = 0$ for all partitions $\mu \neq \lambda$ that satisfy $|\mu| \leq |\lambda|$.
- (iii) R_λ can be expressed as $R_\lambda = m_\lambda + \sum_{\mu \neq \lambda} c_{\mu, \lambda} m_\mu$, where the m_μ denote the monomial symmetric polynomials.

It is known [Kn97, Prop. 2.8] that

$$s_\lambda(x_1, \dots, x_n; q) = q^{(n-1)|\lambda|} R_\lambda(q^{1-n} x_1, \dots, q^{1-n} x_n; q, q).$$

In the rest of this section we will need Okounkov's binomial theorem for interpolation Macdonald polynomials [Ok97]. We remark that in [Ok97] the interpolation Macdonald polynomials are defined slightly differently, and are denoted by the P_λ^* , but one can show that

$$(30) \quad P_\lambda^*(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, t) = R_\lambda(x_1, x_2 t^{-1}, x_n t^{-n+1}; q, t).$$

For two integer partitions λ, μ such that $\ell(\lambda), \ell(\mu) \leq n$, let $\begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix}_{q,t}$ denote the (q, t) -binomial coefficient defined in [Ok97]. Thus

$$(31) \quad \begin{bmatrix} \lambda \\ \mu \end{bmatrix}_{q,t} := \frac{P_\mu^*(q^{\lambda_1}, \dots, q^{\lambda_n}; q, t)}{P_\lambda^*(q^{\lambda_1}, \dots, q^{\lambda_n}; q, t)}.$$

Lemma 5.2.1. *For $0 \leq r \leq n$ we have $\begin{bmatrix} 1^n \\ 1^r \end{bmatrix}_{q,q} = q^{-r(n-r)} \frac{(q^n-1) \cdots (q^{n-r+1}-1)}{(q^r-1) \cdots (q-1)}$.*

Proof. The proof is a straightforward but somewhat tedious calculation based on a general combinatorial formula in [Sah11, Thm 0.8] for the (q, t) -binomial coefficients. We give a brief outline of this calculation. In the notation of [Sah11], the value of (31) can be expressed as a sum of the form $\sum_T wt(T)$, where T is a standard tableau of shape $\lambda \setminus \mu$. For $\lambda := (1^n)$ and $\mu := (1^r)$, there is only one such tableau. By direct calculation one obtains

$$\lambda^i = (1^{n-i}), \quad a_{\lambda^i, \lambda^{i+1}} = \frac{t^{-n+i+1}(1-t^{n-i})}{1-t}, \quad \frac{|\overline{\lambda^i}| - |\overline{\lambda^{i+1}}|}{|\overline{\lambda^i}| - |\overline{\lambda^{i+1}}|} = \frac{t^i(1-t)}{1-t^{i+1}}.$$

From these, the assertion of the lemma follows immediately. \square

Lemma 5.2.2. *Set $\nu_r := (1^r)$ for $0 \leq r \leq n$. Then*

$$\sum_{r=0}^n q^{-\binom{r}{2}-r(n-r)} s_{\nu_r}(q^{n-1}x_1, \dots, q^{n-i}x_i, \dots, x_n; q) = x_1 \cdots x_n.$$

Proof. This is stated in [BKV06, Prop. 10] without a proof. We show that it is a special case of Okounkov's binomial theorem [Ok97, Eq. (1.11)]. More specifically, from (30) it follows that $P_{\nu_r}^*(x_1, \dots, x_n; q, q) = q^{(1-n)r} s_{\nu_r}(q^{n-1}x_1, \dots, x_n; q)$. We now consider the identity [Ok97, Eq. (1.11)] for $t := q$ and $\lambda := (1^n)$. Then the left hand side of [Ok97, Eq. (1.11)] is equal to $x_1 \cdots x_n$, whereas its right hand side is equal to

$$\sum_{r=0}^n \begin{bmatrix} 1^n \\ 1^r \end{bmatrix}_{q,q} q^{-\binom{r}{2}} \frac{(q^r - 1) \cdots (q - 1)}{(q^n - 1) \cdots (q^{n-r+1} - 1)} s_{\nu_r}(q^{n-1}x_1, \dots, x_n; q).$$

To complete the proof, we use Lemma 5.2.1. □

5.3. The explicit formulas. In this subsection we prove the following statement.

Proposition 5.3.1. *For $1 \leq a \leq m$ and $1 \leq b \leq n$ we have*

$$(32) \quad \phi_U(x_a) = \sum_{r=0}^{m-a+1} (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}'_{m-a+1,r} \quad \text{and} \quad \phi_U(y_b) = \sum_{r=0}^{n-b+1} (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_{n-b+1,r}.$$

Let us first prove Proposition 5.3.1 in the special case $a = b = 1$. For $0 \leq r \leq m$ set

$$(33) \quad \mathbf{D}_r := \mathbf{D}_{n,r} = \mathbf{D}'_{m,r}.$$

Proposition 5.3.2. *Let x_a and y_b be defined as in (27). Then $\phi_U(x_1) = \phi_U(y_1) = \sum_{r=0}^m (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_r$, where \mathbf{D}_r is defined as in (33).*

Proof. We prove that x_1, y_1 , and $\sum_{r=0}^m (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_r$ act by the same scalar on each irreducible U_{LR} -submodule $V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\lambda^*$ of \mathcal{P} associated to an integer partition λ satisfying $\ell(\lambda) \leq \min\{m, n\}$. By Remark 3.4.4, both x_1 and y_1 act on $\mathcal{P}^{(d)}$ by the scalar q^{2d} . Thus by Proposition 3.4.3 it suffices to verify that for every partition λ satisfying $\ell(\lambda) \leq \min\{m, n\}$ and $|\lambda| = d$, the restriction of $\sum_{r=0}^m (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_r$ to $V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\lambda^*$ is multiplication by the scalar q^{2d} .

Step 1. First we prove the assertion in the case $m = n$. By the formula for the eigenvalues of \mathbf{D}_r given in (29) it is enough to verify that

$$(34) \quad \sum_{r=0}^n q^{r-r^2-2r(n-r)} s_{\nu_r}(q^{2(\lambda_1+n-1)}, \dots, q^{2(\lambda_{n-1}+1)}, q^{2\lambda_n}; q^2) = q^{2(\lambda_1+\dots+\lambda_n)}.$$

Equality (34) follows from Lemma 5.2.2 after substituting q by $q^{\frac{1}{2}}$.

Step 2. From now on we assume $m < n$. From the relations (R3)–(R6) of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ it follows that there exists a unique embedding of algebras $\eta : \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ satisfying $\eta(t_{i,j}) = t_{i+n-m,j}$ and $\eta(\partial_{i,j}) = \partial_{i+n-m,j}$. Define $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ to be $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r := \sum_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}} M_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} \bar{M}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}}$, where the summation is over all r -tuples $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{E}_1^n(r)$, so that $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r$ is the operator $\mathbf{D}_{n,r}$ in $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$. By Lemma 5.1.1 and Lemma 5.1.2, $\bar{M}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} \cdot (\eta(\mathcal{P})) = 0$ unless $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{E}_{n-m+1}^n(r)$. It follows that for every $f \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r \cdot \eta(f) = \eta(\mathbf{D}_r) \cdot \eta(f)$ when $0 \leq r \leq m$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r \cdot \eta(f) = 0$ when $m < r \leq n$.

Step 3. Recall that \mathcal{I} denotes the left ideal of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ that is generated by $\mathcal{D}^{(1)}$. Let \mathcal{I}' denote the left ideal of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ that is generated by $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(1)}$. Let $\eta : \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ be as in Step 2. For

$D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ and $f \in \mathcal{P}$ we have $(D \cdot f - Df) \in \mathcal{I}$, hence

$$\eta(D \cdot f) - \eta(D)\eta(f) = \eta(D \cdot f - Df) \in \mathcal{I}'.$$

But also $\eta(D) \cdot \eta(f) - \eta(D)\eta(f) \in \mathcal{I}'$. From the last two relations we obtain $\eta(D) \cdot \eta(f) - \eta(D \cdot f) \in \mathcal{I}'$. But in addition $\eta(D) \cdot \eta(f) - \eta(D \cdot f) \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$, hence $\eta(D) \cdot \eta(f) = \eta(D \cdot f)$.

Step 4. Let $f \in \mathcal{P}^{(d)}$. From Step 3 and Step 2 it follows that

$$\eta \left(\sum_{r=0}^m (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_r \cdot f \right) = \eta \left(\sum_{r=0}^m (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_r \right) \cdot \eta(f) = \sum_{r=0}^n (q^2 - 1)^r \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r \cdot \eta(f).$$

From Step 1 it follows that $\sum_{r=0}^n (q^2 - 1)^r \tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r \cdot \eta(f) = q^{2d} \eta(f)$. Since η is an injection, we obtain $\sum_{r=0}^m (q^2 - 1)^r \mathbf{D}_r \cdot f = q^{2r} f$. \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 5.3.1 in the general case. We give the proof for x_a only (the proof for y_b is similar). Every element of \mathcal{P} is a linear combination of monomials of the form $t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}$ where $i_1 \geq \cdots \geq i_k$. Choose $k' \leq k$ such that $i_{k'} \geq a$ and $i_{k'+1} < a$. Then

$$x_a \cdot t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} = q^{2k'} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}.$$

Set $D := \sum_{r=0}^{m-a+1} (q^2 - 1) \mathbf{D}'_{m-a+1, r}$. From Lemma 5.1.3 it follows that

$$D \cdot (t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}) = (D \cdot t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_{k'}, j_{k'}}) t_{i_{k'+1}, j_{k'+1}} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}.$$

It suffices to prove that

$$(35) \quad D \cdot t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_{k'}, j_{k'}} = q^{2k'} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_{k'}, j_{k'}}.$$

Set $\tilde{m} := m - a + 1$. There exists an embedding of algebras $\eta : \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{m} \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ that is uniquely defined by $\eta(t_{i,j}) = t_{i+a-1, j}$ and $\eta(\partial_{i,j}) = \partial_{i+a-1, j}$. We define $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{m} \times n}$ by $\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r := \sum_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}} M_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}} \bar{M}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\mathbf{i}}$ where the summation is over $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{E}_1^{\tilde{m}}(r)$ and $\mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{E}_1^n(r)$. Similar to the proof of Proposition 5.3.2 we have $\eta(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r) = \mathbf{D}'_{m-a+1, r}$ and $\eta(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r \cdot f) = \eta(\tilde{\mathbf{D}}_r) \cdot \eta(f)$ for $f \in \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{m} \times n}$. Thus (35) follows from the assertion of Proposition 5.3.2 for $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{\tilde{m} \times n}$.

6. SOME PROPERTIES OF Γ

The main goal of this section is to relate $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}}$ to the image of Γ . The proofs of Lemma 6.2.1 and Lemma 6.2.2 are similar to some results in [LZZ11].

6.1. Invariants and the operators $L_{i,j}$, $R_{i,j}$. Recall from (3) that $\mathcal{Y}^{\mathcal{Z}}$ denotes the centralizer of \mathcal{Z} in \mathcal{Y} .

Lemma 6.1.1. $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}\bullet} = \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}}$ and $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{R}\bullet} = \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{R}}$.

Proof. We only give the proofs of the two assertions for \mathcal{L} . The inclusion $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}\bullet} \supseteq \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}}$ is trivial because $\mathcal{L}\bullet \subseteq \mathcal{L}$. To prove $\text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}\bullet} \subseteq \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}}$, choose any $T \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}\bullet}$. From (32) it follows that T commutes with $\phi_U(K_{2\varepsilon_a} \otimes 1) = \phi_U(x_a^{-1} x_{a+1})$ for $1 \leq a \leq m$ (we assume $x_{m+1} := 1$). From Proposition 3.4.3 it follows that $\phi_U(K_{\varepsilon_i} \otimes 1)$ is a diagonalizable operator whose eigenvalues are powers of q . In particular, the eigenspaces of $\phi_U(K_{2\varepsilon_i} \otimes 1)$ and $\phi_U(K_{\varepsilon_i} \otimes 1)$ are the same. Thus T also commutes with $\phi_U(K_{\varepsilon_i} \otimes 1)$. Finally, Proposition 4.2.2 implies that $T \in \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P})^{\mathcal{L}}$. \square

Set $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{(\varepsilon_L)} := \{D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} : x \cdot D := \varepsilon_L(x)D \text{ for } x \in U_L\}$ where ε_L denotes the counit of U_L . We define $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{(\varepsilon_R)}$ similarly.

Lemma 6.1.2. $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{(\epsilon_L)}$ and $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{(\epsilon_R)}$.

Proof. Follows immediately from Remark 2.3.1. \square

Lemma 6.1.3. $\mathbf{L}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Proof. This follows from Lemma 6.1.2 and a straightforward calculation of the action of the standard generators of U_L and U_R . \square

Lemma 6.1.4. The U_L -submodule of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ that is generated by $\mathbf{L}_{m,m}$ contains $\mathbf{L}_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq m$. Similarly, the U_R -submodule of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ that is generated by $\mathbf{R}_{n,n}$ contains $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Proof. We only give the proof for the U_L -submodule. Denote this submodule by \mathcal{M} . We compute the actions of the standard generators of U_L using Remark 3.4.4. By a straightforward computation we obtain $F_{m-i} \cdot \mathbf{L}_{m-i+1,m} = -q\mathbf{L}_{m-i,m}$. Furthermore, if $m-j \neq i$ then $E_{m-j} \cdot \mathbf{L}_{i,m-j+1} = -q\mathbf{L}_{i,m-j}$. Using these relations it follows that $\mathbf{L}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}$ for $j > i$. By switching the roles of the E_i and the F_i we obtain that $\mathbf{L}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{M}$ for $i > j$. Finally,

$$F_{m-i} \cdot \mathbf{L}_{m-i+1,m-i} = -q\mathbf{L}_{m-i,m-i} + q^{-1}\mathbf{L}_{m-i+1,m-i+1}.$$

Since $\mathbf{L}_{m,m} \in \mathcal{M}$, by an inductive argument it follows that $\mathbf{L}_{i,i} \in \mathcal{M}$. \square

Corollary 6.1.5. $\mathbf{L}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq m$ and $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{R}_{\bullet}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Proof. From the proof of Proposition 4.2.1 we have $\phi_U(x_m) = 1 + (q^2 - 1)\mathbf{L}_{m,m}$, hence $\mathbf{L}_{m,m} \in \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}$. Lemma 4.1.1 implies that \mathcal{L}_{\bullet} is U_L -invariant. Thus by Lemma 6.1.4 we have $\mathbf{L}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}$. The proof of the inclusion $\mathbf{R}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{R}_{\bullet}$ is similar. \square

6.2. \mathcal{R} -invariants and the image of Γ . Recall the decomposition (25) of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(r,s)}$. By Lemma 6.1.2, and since $\dim \text{Hom}_{U_R}(V_{\lambda}, V_{\mu}) = \delta_{\lambda,\mu}$, we have

$$(36) \quad \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(r,s)}\right)^{\mathcal{R}} = 0 \text{ for } r \neq s \text{ and } \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(r,r)}\right)^{\mathcal{R}} \cong \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,r}} V_{\lambda}^* \otimes V_{\lambda},$$

as U_L -modules. In the rest of this section $\Gamma : \mathcal{P}_{m \times m} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ is the map introduced in Definition 3.6.1 and we denote the counit of $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ by $\epsilon_{\mathcal{D}}$.

Lemma 6.2.1. $\ker(\Gamma) = 0$.

Proof. By definition of Γ it suffices to prove the assertion in the case $m = n$. In the latter case, if $\Gamma(u) = 0$ then

$$0 = (1 \otimes \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}})(\Gamma(u)) = \sum u_1 \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}}(\iota(u_2)).$$

It follows that $\iota(u) = \sum \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}}(\iota(u)_1) \iota(u)_2 = \sum \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}}(\iota(u_2)) \iota(u_1) = \iota((1 \otimes \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}})(\Gamma(u))) = 0$, hence $u = 0$. \square

Lemma 6.2.2. $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}) = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}}$.

Proof. First we prove that $\Gamma(\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}) \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}}$. By definition of Γ it suffices to prove the assertion in the special case $m = n$. In this case, for $x \in U_R$ and $u \in \mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} x \cdot \Gamma(u) &= \sum (x_1 \cdot u_1)(x_2 \cdot \iota(u_2)) \\ &= \sum (u_{11} \langle \iota(u_{12}), S^{-1}(x_1) \rangle) (\iota(u_2)_1 \langle \iota(u_2)_2, x_2 \rangle) \\ &= \sum \langle \iota(u_2), S^{-1}(x_1) \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), x_2 \rangle u_1 \iota(u_4) \\ &= \sum \epsilon_R(x) \langle \iota(u_2), 1 \rangle u_1 \iota(u_3) \\ &= \epsilon_R(x) \sum u_1 \iota(u)_2 \epsilon_{\mathcal{D}}(\iota(u)_3) = \epsilon_R(x) \sum u_1 \iota(u_2) = \epsilon_R(x) \Gamma(u). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Gamma(u) \in \mathcal{PD}_{(\epsilon_R)} = \mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{R}}$ by Lemma 6.1.2.

Since Γ maps $\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}^{(r)}$ into $\mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{R}} \cap \mathcal{PD}^{(r,r)}$, by Lemma 6.2.1 it suffices to prove that these two vector spaces have equal dimensions for all $r \geq 0$. From (36) and Proposition 3.4.3 it follows that both spaces have dimension equal to $\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,r}} (\dim V_\lambda)^2$. \square

7. PROOF OF THEOREM A : THE SPECIAL CASE $m = n$

Our goal in this section is to prove Theorem A in the special case $m = n$. Throughout this section we assume that $m = n$, so that $U_L \cong U_R \cong U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Recall that $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ are subspaces of the finite dual $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^\circ$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. Henceforth we denote the canonical pairing between $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^\circ$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ by $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. We use $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ for the pairing of $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^\circ \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)^\circ$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n) \otimes U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ too.

7.1. A new product on $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$. Let us write

$$(\mathcal{R}_L)_{21}^{-1} := \sum r_L \otimes r'_L \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1} := \sum r_R \otimes r'_R,$$

so that for the universal R -matrix $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}$ of (20) we have

$$(37) \quad \tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \sum r_L \otimes r_R \otimes r'_L \otimes r'_R.$$

We also set $\mathcal{S}_L := (\mathcal{R}_L)_{21} = \sum r_L \otimes S^{-1}(r'_L)$ and $\mathcal{S}_R := (\mathcal{R}_R)_{21} = \sum r_R \otimes S^{-1}(r'_R)$, where we use (8). For the next definition, recall that the action of U_{LR} on \mathcal{P} is defined by (18) and (19).

Definition 7.1.1. For $u, v \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ we set

$$u \star v := \sum ((1 \otimes S(r_R)) \cdot u_1) ((r'_L \otimes 1) \cdot v_1) \langle \iota(u_2), r'_L \sharp \rangle \langle \iota(v_2), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle,$$

where $x \mapsto x^\sharp$ is defined in (16) and the summation ranges over the summands on the right hand sides of (37), $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}}(u) := \sum u_1 \otimes u_2$, and $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}}(v) := \sum v_1 \otimes v_2$.

From formula (18) it follows that

$$(38) \quad u \star v = \sum \langle \iota(u_2), r_R \rangle \langle \iota(v_1), S^{-1}(r'_L)^\sharp \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), r'_L \sharp \rangle \langle \iota(v_3), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle u_1 v_2$$

In the next proposition we consider ${}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n$ as a map into the algebra $\mathcal{PD}_{n \times n}^{\text{gr}}$.

Proposition 7.1.2. ${}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u \star v) = {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u) {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(v)$ for $u, v \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$.

Proof. We compute both sides and prove that they are equal. For the right hand side we have

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u) {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(v) &= \sum (u_1 \otimes \iota(u_2)) (v_1 \otimes \iota(v_2)) \\ &= \sum u_1 ((r'_L \otimes r'_R) \cdot v_1) \otimes ((r_L \otimes r_R) \cdot \iota(u_2)) \iota(v_2) \\ &= \sum \langle \iota(v_1), S^{-1}(r'_L)^\sharp \rangle \langle \iota(v_3), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle \langle \iota(u_4), r'_L \sharp \rangle, \langle \iota(u_2), r_R \rangle u_1 v_2 \otimes \iota(u_3) \iota(v_4) \\ &= \sum \langle \iota(u_4) \otimes \iota(v_1), \mathcal{S}_L^\sharp \rangle u_1 v_2 \otimes \langle \iota(u_2) \otimes \iota(v_3), \mathcal{S}_R \rangle \iota(u_3) \iota(v_4). \end{aligned}$$

For the left hand side we have

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u \star v) &= {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n \left(\sum \langle \iota(u_2), r_R \rangle \langle \iota(v_1), S^{-1}(r'_L)^\sharp \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), r'_L \sharp \rangle \langle \iota(v_3), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle u_1 v_2 \right) \\ &= \sum \langle \iota(u_2), r_R \rangle \langle \iota(v_1), S^{-1}(r'_L)^\sharp \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), r'_L \sharp \rangle \langle \iota(v_3), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle u_{11} v_{21} \otimes \iota(v_{22}) \iota(u_{12}) \\ &= \sum \langle \iota(u_3), r_R \rangle \langle \iota(v_1), S^{-1}(r'_L)^\sharp \rangle \langle \iota(u_4), r'_L \sharp \rangle \langle \iota(v_4), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle u_1 v_2 \otimes \iota(v_3) \iota(u_2) \\ &= \sum \langle \iota(u_4) \otimes \iota(v_1), \mathcal{S}_L^\sharp \rangle u_1 v_2 \otimes \langle \iota(u_3) \otimes \iota(v_4), \mathcal{S}_R \rangle \iota(v_3) \iota(u_2). \end{aligned}$$

After changing the indices as $(u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) = (u_1, u_{21}, u_{22}, u_3)$ and $(v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) = (v_1, v_2, v_{31}, v_{32})$, the equality ${}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u \star v) = {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(u) {}^{\text{gr}}\Gamma_n(v)$ reduces to

$$(39) \quad \sum \langle f_1 \otimes g_1, (\mathcal{S}_R)_{21} \rangle f_2 g_2 = \sum \langle f_2 \otimes g_2, (\mathcal{S}_R)_{21} \rangle g_1 f_1,$$

for $f := \iota(v_3)$ and $g := \iota(u_2)$. But $(\mathcal{S}_R)_{21} = \mathcal{R}_R$. Thus (39) follows from (10). \square

For the next proposition, recall that $\Gamma_n : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ is the map defined in (26).

Proposition 7.1.3. *For $u \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r)}$ and $v \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(s)}$ we have $\Gamma_n(u \star v) \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(r+s, r+s)}$ and*

$$(\Gamma_n(u \star v) - \Gamma_n(u)\Gamma_n(v)) \in \bigoplus_{d=0}^{r+s-1} \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(d,d)} \cap \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}} \right).$$

Proof. The first assertion follows from the fact that $u \star v \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r+s)}$, which is a direct consequence of Definition 7.1.1. The second assertion follows from Proposition 7.1.2 and Remark 3.5.6. \square

7.2. The map Υ . Let us now consider the map $\Upsilon : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ defined by

$$(40) \quad \Upsilon(u \otimes v) := \sum \langle \iota(u_2), r_L^\natural \rangle \langle \iota(v_2), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle ((1 \otimes S(r_R)) \cdot u_1) \otimes ((r'_L \otimes 1) \cdot v_1),$$

so that if $\mathfrak{m} : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ denotes the product of the algebra $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ then

$$(41) \quad u \star v = \mathfrak{m} \circ \Upsilon(u \otimes v).$$

Proposition 7.2.1. *Υ induces linear bijections $\mathcal{P}_{n,n}^{(r)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(s)} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n,n}^{(r)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(s)}$ for all $r, s \geq 0$.*

Proof. From the defining formula of Υ and the fact that the coproduct of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ maps $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r)}$ into $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r)}$ it follows that Υ leaves $\mathcal{P}_{n,n}^{(r)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(s)}$ invariant. Since the latter space is finite dimensional, it suffices to prove that Υ is an injection. To this end, we define maps

$$\Upsilon_1, \Upsilon_2 : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n \times n} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n},$$

given by

$$\Upsilon_1(u \otimes v) := \sum \langle \iota(u_2) \otimes \iota(v_2), (\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1} \rangle u_1 \otimes v_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Upsilon_2(u \otimes v) := \sum ((1 \otimes S(r'_L)) \cdot u) \otimes (S^{-1}(r'_L) \otimes 1) \cdot v).$$

Recall that $(\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1} = \sum r_R \otimes r'_R$. By $\sum \langle \iota(u_1), 1 \rangle u_2 = \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)u = u$ and $\sum \langle \iota(v_2), 1 \rangle v_1 = \mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{P}}(1)v = v$ we obtain

$$\Upsilon_1(u \otimes v) = \sum (\langle \iota(u_1), 1 \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), r_R \rangle u_2) \otimes (\langle \iota(v_2), 1 \rangle \langle \iota(v_3), r'_R \rangle v_1),$$

Using (40) we obtain $\Upsilon_1 \circ \Upsilon(u \otimes v) = \sum \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{A}'$, where

$$\mathbf{A} := \sum \langle \iota(u_1), 1 \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), r_R \rangle \langle \iota(u_4), r_R \rangle \langle \iota(u_5), r_L^\natural \rangle u_2,$$

and

$$\mathbf{A}' := \sum \langle \iota(v_1), S^{-1}(r'_L)^\natural \rangle \langle \iota(v_3), 1 \rangle \langle \iota(v_4), r'_R \rangle \langle \iota(v_5), S^{-1}(r'_R) \rangle v_2.$$

From the coproduct of $\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}$ and the formulas for \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{A}' we obtain

$$\Upsilon_1 \circ \Upsilon(u \otimes v) = \sum (\langle \iota(u_1), 1 \rangle \langle \iota(u_3), r_L^\natural r_R r'_R \rangle u_2) \otimes (\langle \iota(v_1), S^{-1}(r'_L)^\natural \rangle \langle \iota(v_3), S^{-1}(r'_R) r'_R \rangle v_2).$$

From (18) it follows that

$$(42) \quad \Upsilon_1 \circ \Upsilon(u \otimes v) = \sum (1 \otimes S(r_R) S(r_R) S(r'_L)^\natural) \cdot u \otimes ((r'_L \otimes S(r'_R) r'_R)) \cdot v.$$

Since $(\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1}$ is another universal R -matrix of U_R (see for example [KS97, Sec. 8.1.1]), by (8) we have $\sum S(r_R) \otimes r'_R = (S \otimes 1)((\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1}) = (\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}$ and

$$\sum S(r_R) \otimes S(r'_R) = (S \otimes S) \left(\sum r_R \otimes r'_R \right) = (S \otimes S)((\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1}) = (\mathcal{R}_R)_{21}^{-1}.$$

Consequently, from (42) we obtain

$$\Upsilon_1 \circ \Upsilon(u \otimes v) = \sum ((1 \otimes S(r'_L)) \cdot u) \otimes ((r'_L \otimes 1) \cdot v).$$

Next let $\eta : U_L \rightarrow U_L$ be the map $x \mapsto S(x^\natural)$. Then η is an algebra automorphism, so that $\sum S(r'_L) \otimes r'_L = (\eta \otimes 1)(\mathcal{R}_L)$ is invertible, with inverse

$$\sum \alpha \otimes \beta := (\eta \otimes 1)(\mathcal{R}_L^{-1}) = (\eta \otimes S^{-1})(\mathcal{R}_L).$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon_2 \circ \Upsilon_1 \circ \Upsilon(u \otimes v) &= \Upsilon_2 \left(\sum (1 \otimes S(r'_L)) \cdot u \otimes (r'_L \otimes 1) \cdot v \right) \\ &= \sum (1 \otimes \alpha S(r'_L)) \cdot u \otimes (\beta r'_L \otimes 1) \cdot v = u \otimes v. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of injectivity of Υ . \square

7.3. Completing the proof of Theorem A when $m = n$. We conclude the proofs of parts (i) and (iii) of Theorem A. Parts (ii) and (iv) follow by symmetry. From $\mathcal{L} \subseteq \text{End}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathcal{P}_{n \times n})^{\mathcal{R}}$, it follows that $\mathcal{L}_{\bullet} \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}_{\bullet}}$. Furthermore, Lemma 6.1.1 implies that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}_{\bullet}}$. Let \mathcal{B} denote the subalgebra of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ that is generated by the $\mathsf{L}_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Lemma 6.1.3 implies that $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}_{\bullet}}$. Since the subspaces $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(r,s)}$ for $r, s \geq 0$ are U_{LR} -invariant and by (36) we have $(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(r,s)})^{\mathcal{R}} = 0$ for $r \neq s$, in order to prove that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{L}_{\bullet} = \mathcal{B}$ it suffices to verify that

$$(43) \quad (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(r,r)})^{\mathcal{R}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\bullet} \cap \mathcal{B}_r \quad \text{for } r \geq 0,$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}_r := \text{Span}_{\mathbb{k}} \{ \mathsf{L}_{i_1, j_1} \cdots \mathsf{L}_{i_s, j_s} : 1 \leq s \leq r \text{ and } 1 \leq i_u, j_u \leq n \text{ for } 1 \leq u \leq s \}.$$

We prove (43) by induction on r . For $r = 0$, it is trivial. For $r = 1$, Lemma 6.2.2 implies that $(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(1,1)})^{\mathcal{R}}$ is spanned by the $\mathsf{L}_{i,j} = \Gamma_n(t_{i,j})$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Recall from Corollary 6.1.5 that $\mathsf{L}_{i,j} \in \mathcal{L}_{\bullet}$. This completes the proof of (43) for $r = 1$. Finally, assume $r > 1$. Then by Proposition 7.2.1 the map

$$\Upsilon : \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r-1, r-1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r-1, r-1)}$$

is a bijection. From (41) it follows that the map

$$\mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(1)} \otimes \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r-1)} \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r)}, \quad u \otimes v \mapsto u \star v,$$

is a surjection. Next choose any $D \in (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(r,r)})^{\mathcal{R}}$. Then by Proposition 6.2.2 we have $D = \Gamma_n(u)$ where $u \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r)}$. We can express u as a linear combination of products of the form $u' \star u''$ where $u' \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(1)}$ and $u'' \in \mathcal{P}_{n \times n}^{(r-1)}$. By Proposition 7.1.3 we have

$$\Gamma_n(u' \star u'') = \Gamma_n(u')\Gamma_n(u'') + D' \quad \text{where } D' \in \bigoplus_{s=0}^{r-1} (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(s,s)})^{\mathcal{R}}.$$

Finally, since Γ_n maps $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(r)}$ into $\left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{(r,r)}\right)^{\mathcal{R}}$ for $r \geq 0$, from the induction hypothesis it follows that $\Gamma_n(u') \in \mathcal{L}_\bullet \cap \mathcal{B}_1$, $\Gamma_n(u'') \in \mathcal{L}_\bullet \cap \mathcal{B}_{r-1}$, and $D' \in \mathcal{L}_\bullet \cap \mathcal{B}_{r-1}$. Consequently, $\Gamma_n(u \star u') \in \mathcal{L}_\bullet \cap \mathcal{B}_r$.

8. PROOF OF THEOREM A IN THE GENERAL CASE: PARTS (I) AND (III)

The goal of this section is to prove parts (i) and (iii) of Theorem A when $m < n$. The idea is to reduce the assertions to the case of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$, for which the theorem was already proved in Section 7.

Notation. Recall that when we consider $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ we have $U_L \cong U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. To avoid confusion between U_L in this case and the case of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{m \times m}$ (where as before $U_L \cong U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_m)$), in this section (only) we use $U_L^{(n)}$, $\mathcal{L}^{(n)}$, and $\mathcal{L}_\bullet^{(n)}$ instead of U_L , \mathcal{L} , and \mathcal{L}_\bullet to denote the algebras that pertain to $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$.

Recall the embedding of algebras $\eta : \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$ that is uniquely defined by setting

$$\eta(t_{i,j}) := t_{n-m+i,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta(\partial_{i,j}) := \partial_{n-m+i,j}.$$

From Remark 3.5.2 and the defining relations (R1)–(R6) of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ it follows that η is well-defined and injective. Let $\mathcal{S}_L \subseteq U_L^{(n)} \otimes U_L^{(n)}$ be defined by

$$\mathcal{S}_L := \{K_{\varepsilon_i}^{-1} \otimes 1, 1 \otimes K_{\varepsilon_i} : 1 \leq i \leq n - m\}.$$

From Remark 3.4.4 it follows that η is $U_R \otimes U_R$ -equivariant, hence also U_R -equivariant (where the U_R -action is induced by the $U_R \otimes U_R$ -action, via the coproduct map $\Delta : U_R \rightarrow U_R \otimes U_R$). Thus by Lemma 6.1.2 we have

$$(44) \quad \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{(\varepsilon_R)} = \eta^{-1} \left(\eta(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}) \cap (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n})_{(\varepsilon_R)} \right) = \eta^{-1} \left(\eta(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}) \cap \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}^{(n)}} \right),$$

where $\mathcal{R}^{(n)}$ is the image of U_R in $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$. From Remark 3.4.4 it also follows that

$$(45) \quad \eta(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}) = \{D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n} : a \cdot D = D \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{S}_L\}.$$

Recall from Section 7 that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}^{\mathcal{R}^{(n)}}$ is generated by the $L_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. The products of the form $L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r}$ are joint eigenvectors for elements of \mathcal{S}_L . Furthermore from (45) it follows that $L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r} \in \eta(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$ if and only if $i_u, j_u > n - m$ for all $1 \leq u \leq r$. It follows from (44) that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}}$ is spanned by the products of the form $L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r}$ where $1 \leq i_u, j_u \leq m$ for all $1 \leq u \leq r$. Thus Corollary 6.1.5 implies that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_\bullet$. Since \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{R} commute, we also have $\mathcal{L}_\bullet \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}}$. Consequently, $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{R}} = \mathcal{L}_\bullet$ and \mathcal{L}_\bullet is generated by the $L_{i,j}$ where $1 \leq i, j \leq m$.

9. PROOF OF THEOREM A IN THE GENERAL CASE: PARTS (II) AND (IV)

In this section we prove parts (ii) and (iv) of Theorem A when $m < n$. We remark that the argument of Section 8 is not symmetric with respect to m and n , since it uses the embedding $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$. The proof given in this section is based on a reduction to $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{m \times m}$. This technique is also used in [LZZ11]. However, because of the presence of two R -matrices, in our case the argument is more complicated (in particular, we need Proposition 9.2.1).

Notation. Similar to Section 8, we will work with both $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{m \times m}$ simultaneously. Thus, to avoid confusion we use $U_R^{(m)}$, $\mathcal{L}^{(m)}$, $\mathcal{R}^{(m)}$ and $\mathcal{R}_\bullet^{(m)}$ to denote the subalgebras of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{m \times m}$ defined analogously to U_R , \mathcal{L} , \mathcal{R} , and \mathcal{R}_\bullet .

9.1. The embedding of $\mathcal{PD}_{m \times m}$ into \mathcal{PD} . Similar to Section 8, there exists an embedding of associative algebras $\eta' : \mathcal{PD}_{m \times m} \rightarrow \mathcal{PD}$ that is uniquely defined by

$$\eta'(t_{i,j}) := t_{i,n-m+j} \quad \text{and} \quad \eta'(\partial_{i,j}) := \partial_{i,n-m+j}.$$

In what follows we use the actions of various subalgebras of $U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ on \mathcal{PD} (see Remark 3.5.5). Let $\mathcal{S}_R \subseteq U_R \otimes U_R$ be defined by $\mathcal{S}_R := \{K_{\varepsilon_i}^{-1} \otimes 1, 1 \otimes K_{\varepsilon_i} : 1 \leq i \leq n-m\}$. Then

$$\eta'(\mathcal{PD}_{m \times m}) = \mathcal{PD}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)} := \{D \in \mathcal{PD} : a \cdot D = D \text{ for all } a \in \mathcal{S}_R\}.$$

Let us embed $U_R^{(m)}$ into U_R as a subalgebra via the homomorphism that is uniquely defined by

$$E_i \mapsto E_{i+n-m}, \quad F_i \mapsto E_{i+n-m}, \quad K_{\varepsilon_i} \mapsto K_{\varepsilon_{i+n-m}},$$

and then use the latter embedding to identify $U_{LR}^{(m)} := U_L \otimes U_R^{(m)}$ with a subalgebra of U_{LR} . With respect to the latter embedding, the map η' is $U_{LR}^{(m)}$ -equivariant. Since η' is also U_L -equivariant, by reasoning similar to (44) we obtain an isomorphism

$$(46) \quad \mathcal{PD}_{m \times m}^{\mathcal{L}^{(m)}} = (\mathcal{PD}_{m \times m})_{(\varepsilon_L)} \xrightarrow{\eta'} \eta'(\mathcal{PD}_{m \times m}) \cap \mathcal{PD}_{(\varepsilon_L)} = \mathcal{PD}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)} \cap \mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Thus by an argument similar to that of (36), we obtain isomorphisms of $U_R^{(m)} \otimes U_R^{(m)}$ -modules

$$(47) \quad \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,r}} \left(V_\lambda^{(m)}\right)^* \otimes V_\lambda^{(m)} \cong \left(\mathcal{PD}_{m \times m}^{(r,r)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}^{(m)}} \cong \left(\mathcal{PD}^{(r,r)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathcal{PD}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)} \\ \cong \left(\mathcal{PD}^{(r,r)}\right)_{(\varepsilon_L)} \cap \mathcal{PD}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)} \cong \left(\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,r}} V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\lambda\right) \cap \mathcal{PD}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)},$$

where $V_\lambda^{(m)}$ (respectively, V_λ) denotes the $U_R^{(m)}$ -module (respectively, U_R -module) associated to λ .

Lemma 9.1.1. $\mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{L}}$ is generated as a $U_R \otimes U_R$ -submodule of \mathcal{PD} by $\mathcal{PD}^{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathcal{PD}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)}$.

Proof. By (47) it suffices to prove that for $\lambda \in \Lambda_{m,r}$ we have isomorphisms of $U_R^{(m)} \otimes U_R^{(m)}$ -modules

$$(48) \quad (V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\lambda) \cap \mathcal{PD}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)} \cong \left(V_\lambda^{(m)}\right)^* \otimes V_\lambda^{(m)}.$$

Set $\mathcal{X} := \{K_{\varepsilon_1}, \dots, K_{\varepsilon_{n-m}}\} \subseteq U_R$. For any U_R -module W we define

$$W_{(\mathcal{X})} := \{w \in W : x \cdot w = w \text{ for } x \in \mathcal{X}\}.$$

To prove (48), it is sufficient to verify that $(V_\lambda)_{(\mathcal{X})} \cong V_\lambda^{(m)}$ and $(V_\lambda^*)_{(\mathcal{X})} \cong \left(V_\lambda^{(m)}\right)^*$. These assertions are probably well known. They follow easily from Gelfand–Tsetlin theory for $U_q(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$ -modules (see for example [KS97, Sec. 7.3.3]). Also, by considering the standard generators of U_R corresponding to the positive system $\{\varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n-1}, \dots, \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_1\}$ they can be reduced to [LZZ11, Thm 6.4]. \square

Remark 9.1.2. Recall from (37) that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \sum r_L \otimes r_R \otimes r'_L \otimes r'_R = \mathcal{T}_{1,3} \mathcal{T}_{2,4},$$

where $\mathcal{T}_{1,3} := \sum r_L \otimes 1 \otimes r'_L \otimes 1$ and $\mathcal{T}_{2,4} := \sum 1 \otimes r_R \otimes 1 \otimes r'_R$. Now fix $\eta := a \otimes b \in U_R \otimes U_R$ and set $\tilde{\eta} := 1 \otimes a \otimes 1 \otimes b \in U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$. Then $\tilde{\eta} \mathcal{T}_{1,3} = \mathcal{T}_{1,3} \tilde{\eta}$, and from invertibility of $\mathcal{T}_{2,4}$ it follows that

$$\tilde{\eta} \mathcal{T}_{2,4} = \mathcal{T}_{2,4} \mathcal{U}_{a,b},$$

where $\mathcal{U}_{a,b} := \mathcal{T}_{2,4}^{-1} \tilde{\eta} \mathcal{T}_{2,4}$. It follows that $\tilde{\eta} \tilde{\mathcal{R}} = \tilde{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{U}_{a,b}$.

9.2. **The $U_R \otimes U_R$ -action on $\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}^{\text{gr}}$.** Recall the map \mathbf{P} defined in (24). We set

$${}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i,j} := \mathbf{P}^{-1}(\mathbf{R}_{i,j}) = \sum_{r=1}^m t_{r,i} \otimes \partial_{r,j} \in \mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}^{\text{gr}} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

For the next proposition, recall that $\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}^{\text{gr}}$ is a $U_R \otimes U_R$ -module.

Proposition 9.2.1. *Let $a \otimes b \in U_R \otimes U_R$. Also, fix a non-negative integer r and suppose that $1 \leq i_u, j_u \leq n$ are given for $1 \leq u \leq r$. Then $(a \otimes b) \cdot ({}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i_1, j_1} \cdots {}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i_r, j_r})$ is a linear combination of products of the form ${}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots {}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i'_r, j'_r}$, where $1 \leq i'_u, j'_u \leq n$ for $1 \leq u \leq r$.*

Proof. We prove the assertion by induction on r . For $r = 0$ the assertion is trivial, and for $r = 1$ it follows from the explicit formulas for the action of $U_R \otimes U_R$ on the ${}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i,j}$ (see Remark 3.4.4). Next assume $r > 1$. Set $\alpha := {}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i_1, j_1}$ and $\beta := {}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i_2, j_2} \cdots {}^{\text{gr}}\mathbf{R}_{i_r, j_r}$. Then we can express α and β as summations $\alpha = \sum f \otimes \partial$ and $\beta = \sum f' \otimes \partial'$, where $f, f' \in \mathscr{P}$ and $\partial, \partial' \in \mathscr{D}$. We express $\tilde{\mathcal{R}} \cdot (\partial \otimes f')$ as a summation

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}(\partial \otimes f') := \sum \delta \otimes h,$$

where the $\delta = \delta(\partial, f') \in \mathscr{D}$ and the $h = h(\partial, f') \in \mathscr{P}$. Furthermore, for $a \otimes b \in U_R \otimes U_R$ we express $\mathcal{U}_{a,b}$ as a summation $\mathcal{U}_{a,b} := \sum 1 \otimes u_{a,b} \otimes 1 \otimes u'_{a,b}$. (see Remark 9.1.2). Then using formula (11) for the product of $\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}^{\text{gr}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (a \otimes b) \cdot \alpha\beta &= (a \otimes b) \cdot \left(\sum (f \otimes \partial)(f' \otimes \partial') \right) \\ &= (a \otimes b) \cdot \left(\sum fh \otimes \delta\partial' \right) \\ &= \sum a \cdot (fh) \otimes b \cdot (\delta\partial') \\ &= \sum (a_1 \cdot f)(a_2 \cdot h) \otimes (b_1 \cdot \delta)(b_2 \cdot \partial') \\ &= \sum ((a_1 \cdot f) \otimes 1)((a_2 \otimes b_1) \cdot (h \otimes \delta))(1 \otimes (b_2 \cdot \partial')) \\ &= \sum ((a_1 \cdot f) \otimes 1)((a_2 \otimes b_1) \cdot ((\sigma \circ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}) \cdot (\partial \otimes f')))(1 \otimes (b_2 \cdot \partial')) \\ &= \sum ((a_1 \cdot f) \otimes 1)((\sigma \circ \tilde{\mathcal{R}}) \cdot ((u_{b_1, a_2} \otimes u'_{b_1, a_2}) \cdot (\partial \otimes f')))(1 \otimes (b_2 \cdot \partial')) \\ &= \sum ((a_1 \cdot f) \otimes (u_{b_1, a_2} \cdot \partial))((u'_{b_1, a_2} \cdot f') \otimes (b_2 \cdot \partial')). \end{aligned}$$

To complete the proof, we use the induction hypothesis for $\sum (a_1 \cdot f) \otimes (u_{b_1, a_2} \cdot \partial) = (a_1 \otimes u_{b_1, a_2}) \cdot \alpha$ and $\sum (u'_{b_1, a_2} \cdot f') \otimes (b_2 \cdot \partial') = (u'_{b_1, a_2} \otimes b_2) \cdot \beta$, for all possibilities of $a_1, u_{b_1, a_2}, u'_{b_1, a_2}$, and b_2 . Since f, ∂, f' and ∂' belong to the finite dual of U_R , only finitely many such possibilities result in nonzero summands. \square

9.3. **Completing the proofs of parts (ii) and (iv).** Let \mathcal{B}' denote the subalgebra of $\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}$ that is generated by the $\mathbf{R}_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. By Lemma 6.1.4 we have $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}^{\mathscr{L}}$. Next we prove the reverse inclusion. As in (36) we have $\left(\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}^{(r,s)} \right)^{\mathscr{L}} = 0$ for $r \neq s$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\left(\mathscr{P}\mathscr{D}^{(r,r)} \right)^{\mathscr{L}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}'_r$ for $r \geq 0$, where

$$\mathcal{B}'_r := \text{Span}_{\mathbb{k}} \{ \mathbf{R}_{i_1, j_1} \cdots \mathbf{R}_{i_s, j_s} : 0 \leq s \leq r \text{ and } 1 \leq i_u, j_u \leq n \text{ for } 1 \leq u \leq s \}.$$

We prove the latter assertion by induction on r . For $r = 0$ the assertion is trivially true. For $r = 1$, by (25) we have

$$\left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(1,1)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}} = \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(1,1)}\right)_{(\epsilon_L)} \cong \check{V}^{(n)} \otimes V^{(n)},$$

where $V^{(n)}$ and $\check{V}^{(n)}$ are as in Subsection 3.3. The dimension of the right hand side is n^2 , hence $\left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(1,1)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}}$ is spanned by the $R_{i,j}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. Next assume that $r > 1$. From (46) and the special case of Theorem A for $\mathcal{P}_{m \times m}$ (see Section 7) it follows that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)}$ is generated by the $R_{i,j}$ for $n - m + 1 \leq i, j \leq n$. In particular, $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}} \cap \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{(\mathcal{S}_R)} \subseteq \mathcal{B}'$. Thus by Lemma 9.1.1 and Proposition 9.2.1 it suffices to prove that \mathcal{B}'_r is $U_R \otimes U_R$ -invariant for $r \geq 0$.

Take an element of \mathcal{B}' of the form $R_{i_1, j_1} \cdots R_{i_s, j_s}$ where $s \leq r$, and an element $a \otimes b \in U_R \otimes U_R$. By Lemma 6.1.3 we have $R_{i_1, j_1} \cdots R_{i_s, j_s} \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}}$. Thus by Remark 3.5.6 and $U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ -equivariance of P (see Remark 3.5.5) we obtain

$$(49) \quad R_{i_1, j_1} \cdots R_{i_s, j_s} - P(\text{gr}R_{i_1, j_1} \cdots \text{gr}R_{i_s, j_s}) \in \bigoplus_{u=0}^{s-1} \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(u,u)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Since the actions of U_L and $U_R \otimes U_R$ commute, using Lemma 6.1.2 we obtain

$$(a \otimes b) \cdot \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(u,u)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(u,u)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}}.$$

Also by the induction hypothesis

$$(a \otimes b) \cdot \left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(u,u)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}'_u \text{ for } 0 \leq u \leq s-1.$$

Consequently, from $U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ -equivariance of P we obtain

$$(50) \quad (a \otimes b) \cdot R_{i_1, j_1} \cdots R_{i_s, j_s} - P\left((a \otimes b) \cdot (\text{gr}R_{i_1, j_1} \cdots \text{gr}R_{i_s, j_s})\right) \in \mathcal{B}'_{s-1}.$$

Proposition 9.2.1 implies that $(a \otimes b) \cdot (\text{gr}R_{i_1, j_1} \cdots \text{gr}R_{i_s, j_s})$ is a linear combination of products of the form $\text{gr}R_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots \text{gr}R_{i'_s, j'_s}$. From the proof of (49) and the induction hypothesis that $\left(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{(u,u)}\right)^{\mathcal{L}} \subseteq \mathcal{B}'_u$ for $u < r$ we obtain

$$(51) \quad P\left(\text{gr}R_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots \text{gr}R_{i'_s, j'_s}\right) - R_{i'_1, j'_1} \cdots R_{i'_s, j'_s} \in \mathcal{B}'_{s-1}.$$

From (50) and (51) it follows that \mathcal{B}'_r is $U_R \otimes U_R$ -invariant. This completes the proof of $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}}$. It only remains to prove that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{R}_{\bullet}$. To this end, note that by Lemma 6.1.3 we have $\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\bullet} \subseteq \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}^{\mathcal{L}} = \mathcal{B}'$, so that $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{R}_{\bullet}$.

10. PROOF OF THEOREM B

In this section we prove Theorem B(i). The proof of Theorem B(ii) is analogous. As a byproduct, in Corollary 10.5.1 we obtain explicit generators for $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{L}_{\mathfrak{h}, \bullet})$ and $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathfrak{h}, \bullet})$. For convenience, in this section we simplify our notation by writing K_{λ} instead of $1 \otimes K_{\lambda} \in U_{\mathfrak{h}, R}$.

10.1. Parity condition on the λ . For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$ expressed as $\lambda := \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \varepsilon_i$ and $\mu := \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \varepsilon_i$ we set $\langle \lambda, \mu \rangle := \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i \mu_i$. We also set $\lambda < \mu$ if there exists $1 \leq r < n$ such that $\lambda_i = \mu_i$ for all $i \leq r$ and $\lambda_{r+1} < \mu_{r+1}$. This defines a total order on $\mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$. The following lemma is trivial.

Lemma 10.1.1. *Let \mathcal{I} be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$ and let λ_{\max} denote the maximum of \mathcal{I} with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be such that $\gamma_n \geq 1$ and $\gamma_i \geq 1 + \max_{\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{I}} \left\{ \sum_{i < j \leq n} |\lambda_j - \mu_j| \gamma_j \right\}$ for $i < n$. Set $\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \varepsilon_i$. Then $\langle \lambda_{\max}, \gamma \rangle > \langle \mu, \gamma \rangle$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\lambda_{\max}\}$.*

Proposition 10.1.2. *Let \mathcal{I} be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$. Let $x := \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda K_\lambda \in U_{\mathfrak{h}, R}$ where $c_\lambda \in \mathbb{k}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$, and assume that $x \in \phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$. Then for all $\lambda := \sum \lambda_i \varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ we have $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$.*

Proof. Step 1. Set $D := \phi_U(x)$. By Lemma 4.1.1 we have $\phi_U(\text{ad}_y(x)) = y \cdot D$ for $y \in U_R$. Since the U_R -action on $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ is locally finite, $\phi_U(\text{ad}_{U_R}(x))$ is a finite dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$. Furthermore for every $f \in \mathcal{P}$, if we set $W_f := \text{ad}_{U_R}(x) \cdot f := \{\text{ad}_y(x) \cdot f : y \in U_R\}$, then $\dim W_f \leq \dim(\phi_U(\text{ad}_{U_R}(x)))$. Note that the latter upper bound is independent of f .

Step 2. Set $\alpha_i := \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}$. It suffices to prove that $\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$ and $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. For $r \geq 1$ we have

$$\text{ad}_{E_i^r} K_\lambda = \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \left(1 - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle - 2j} \right) E_i^r K_\lambda K_i^{-r}.$$

Now take a nonzero $U_{\mathfrak{h}, R}$ -weight vector $f \in \mathcal{P}$ of weight $q^{-\gamma}$ for $\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \varepsilon_i$, where $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ is an n -tuple of non-negative integers. Such weight vectors are in the span of the monomials of the form

$$t_{1,1}^{a_{1,1}} \cdots t_{m,1}^{a_{m,1}} t_{1,2}^{a_{1,2}} \cdots t_{m,2}^{a_{m,2}} \cdots t_{1,n}^{a_{1,n}} \cdots t_{m,n}^{a_{m,n}},$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^m a_{i,j} = \gamma_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ad}_{E_i^r}(x) \cdot f &= \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda \text{ad}_{E_i^r} K_\lambda \right) \cdot f \\ &= q^{r\langle \gamma, \alpha_i \rangle} \left(\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \left(1 - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle - 2j} \right) \right) E_i^r \cdot f. \end{aligned}$$

Step 3. For any $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$, if $\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ then $\prod_{j=0}^{r-1} (1 - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle - 2j}) = 0$ for all sufficiently large r . Thus, if we set $\mathcal{I}' := \{\lambda \in \mathcal{I} : \langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle \notin 2\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}\}$ then for all sufficiently large r we have

$$(52) \quad \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \left(1 - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle - 2j} \right) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}'} c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \left(1 - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle - 2j} \right).$$

Note that the lower bound on r is independent of γ .

Step 4. Assume that $\mathcal{I}' \neq \emptyset$. After possibly scaling x , we can assume that the c_λ are nonzero polynomials in q . Let λ_{\max} denote the maximum of \mathcal{I}' with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Let $r \in \mathbb{N}$ be sufficiently large such that (52) holds. Choose γ as in Lemma 10.1.1. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}'$ let $q^{N(\lambda)}$ be the lowest power of q that occurs after expanding and simplifying $c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} (1 - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle - 2j})$. We have

$$N(\lambda_{\max}) \leq -\langle \lambda_{\max}, \gamma \rangle + \deg c_\lambda(q),$$

and for all other $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}'$ we have

$$N(\lambda) \geq -\deg c_\lambda(q^{-1}) - \langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle - r|\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle| - r(r-1).$$

By the choice of γ , for $\lambda \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\lambda_{\max}\}$ we have $\langle \lambda_{\max}, \gamma \rangle \geq 1 + \langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle$. Thus $\langle \lambda_{\max}, k\gamma \rangle \geq k + \langle \lambda, k\gamma \rangle$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, after replacing γ by $k\gamma$ for k sufficiently large we obtain $N(\lambda_{\max}) < N(\lambda)$

for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\lambda_{\max}\}$. Together with Step 3, this proves that for the latter choice of γ we have

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_{\lambda} q^{-\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1} \left(1 - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha_i \rangle - 2j}\right) \neq 0.$$

Step 5. In Step 4 we can also choose γ such that $\gamma_i - \gamma_{i+1} \geq r+1$, or equivalently $\langle -\gamma, \alpha_i \rangle \leq -r-1$. A standard argument based on representation theory of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ implies $E_i^r \cdot f \neq 0$. Since the vectors $E_i^s \cdot f$ for $0 \leq s \leq r$ have distinct $U_{\mathfrak{h}, R}$ -weights, they are linearly independent. From Step 2 and Step 4 it follows that the vectors $\text{ad}_{E_i^s}(x) \cdot f$ for $0 \leq s \leq r$ are also linearly independent, hence $\dim W_f \geq r+1$. Since r can be arbitrarily large, this contradicts Step 1. \square

10.2. Some technical lemmas. Given any two ordered pairs of integers (i, j) and (i', j') , we set $(i, j) \triangleleft (i', j')$ if $i \leq i'$ and $j \leq j'$ and at least one of the latter inequalities is strict. Let $\mathcal{S}_{a,b}$ denote the left ideal of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ that is generated by the $\partial_{i,j}$ where $i \geq a$ and $j \geq b$. For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ we set

$$(53) \quad \mathbf{c}(a) := \begin{cases} \sum_{i=0}^a q^{2i} & \text{if } a \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 10.2.1. *Let $a \geq 0$ and let $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then $\partial_{1,k} t_{1,k}^{a+1} = \mathbf{c}(a) t_{1,k}^a + D$ where $D \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$.*

Proof. Follows by induction on a . For $a = 0$ the assertion follows from the relation

$$(54) \quad \partial_{1,k} t_{1,k} = 1 + q^2 t_{1,k} \partial_{1,k} + D_1 \quad \text{where } D_1 \in \sum_{(1,k) \triangleleft (i,\ell)} \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} \partial_{i,\ell}.$$

Suppose that $\partial_{1,k} t_{1,k}^a = \mathbf{c}(a-1) t_{1,k}^{a-1} + D_2$ with $D_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$. Using (54) we obtain

$$\partial_{1,k} t_{1,k}^{a+1} = (1 + q^2 t_{1,k} \partial_{1,k} + D_1) t_{1,k}^a = (1 + q^2 \mathbf{c}(a-1) t_{1,k}^a + q^2 t_{1,k} D_2 + D_1) t_{1,k}^a.$$

From Lemma 5.1.1 it follows that $D_1 t_{1,k}^a \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$. Consequently, $\mathbf{c}(a) = 1 + q^2 \mathbf{c}(a-1)$. \square

Lemma 10.2.2. *Let $a, b \geq 0$ and let $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

- (i) *If $b > a$ then $\partial_{1,k}^{b+1} t_{1,k}^{a+1} \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$.*
- (ii) *If $b \leq a$ then $\partial_{1,k}^{b+1} t_{1,k}^{a+1} = \mathbf{c}(a, b) t_{1,k}^{a-b} + D$ where $D \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$. Furthermore $\mathbf{c}(a, 0) = \mathbf{c}(a)$ and $\mathbf{c}(a, b+1) = \mathbf{c}(a, b) \mathbf{c}(a-b-1)$ for $b < a$.*

Proof. (i) Follows from writing $\partial_{1,k}^{b+1} t_{1,k}^{a+1} = \partial_{1,k}^{b-a} \partial_{1,k}^{a+1} t_{1,k}^{a+1}$ and Lemma 10.2.1.

(ii) We use induction on b . For $b = 0$ this is Lemma 10.2.1. If $b+1 \leq a$ then

$$\partial_{1,k}^{b+2} t_{1,k}^{a+1} = \partial_{1,k} \partial_{1,k}^{b+1} t_{1,k}^{a+1} = \mathbf{c}(a, b) \partial_{1,k} t_{1,k}^{a-b} + \partial_{1,k} D = \mathbf{c}(a, b) \mathbf{c}(b-a-1) t_{1,k}^{a-b-1} + \mathbf{c}(a, b) D_1 + \partial_{1,k} D,$$

where $D_1, D \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$. Part (ii) follows immediately. \square

Lemma 10.2.3. *Let $a, b \geq 0$ and let $1 \leq k \leq n$. Assume that $f \in \mathcal{P}$ is a product of the $t_{1,j}$ for $j \leq k-1$. Then the following hold:*

- (i) *If $b > a$ then $\partial_{1,k}^b t_{1,k}^a f \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$.*
- (ii) *If $b \leq a$ then $\partial_{1,k}^{b+1} t_{1,k}^{a+1} f = \mathbf{c}(a, b) t_{1,k}^{a-b} f + D$ where $D \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$ and $c_{a,b}$ is as in Lemma 10.2.2.*

Proof. (i) Follows from Lemma 10.2.2(i) and Lemma 5.1.1.

(ii) From Lemma 10.2.2(ii) we have $\partial_{1,k}^{b+1} t_{1,k}^{a+1} f = \mathbf{c}(a, b) t_{1,k}^{a-b} f + Df$, where $D \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$. The assumption on f and Lemma 5.1.1 imply that $Df \in \mathcal{S}_{1,k}$. \square

Remark 10.2.4. It is easy to verify that $\mathbf{c}(a, b) = \mathbf{c}(a)\mathbf{c}(a-1)\cdots\mathbf{c}(a-b)$ for $a \geq b \geq 0$. We extend the domain of $\mathbf{c}(a, b)$ to pairs (a, b) satisfying $a, b \geq -1$ by setting $\mathbf{c}(a, b) = 0$ for $-1 \leq a < b$ and $\mathbf{c}(a, b) = 1$ for $a \geq b = -1$. Note that $\mathbf{c}(a, b)$ is always a polynomial in q^2 with integer coefficients.

For a k -tuple of non-negative integers $\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_k)$, where $k \leq n$, we set $t^{\mathbf{a}} := t_{1,k}^{a_k} \cdots t_{1,1}^{a_1}$ and $\partial^{\mathbf{a}} := \partial_{1,1}^{a_1} \cdots \partial_{1,k}^{a_k}$.

Lemma 10.2.5. *Let $1 \leq k' < k_r < \dots < k_1 \leq n$. Also, let $a_1, \dots, a_{k'} \geq 0$ and $b_1, \dots, b_r \geq 0$. Set $\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_{k'})$ and $f := t^{\mathbf{a}} := t_{1,k'}^{a_{k'}} \cdots t_{1,1}^{a_1}$. Then*

$$\partial_{1,k'}^b t_{1,k_1}^{b_1} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} f = f_1 + D,$$

where $f_1 \in \mathcal{P}$ and $D \in \mathcal{I}_{1,k'}$. If $a_{k'} < b$ then $f_1 = 0$. If $a_{k'} \geq b$ then

$$f_1 = q^{b(b_1+\cdots+b_r)} \mathbf{c}(a_{k'} - 1, b - 1) t_{1,k_1}^{b_1} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} t^{\mathbf{a}'} \quad \text{where } \mathbf{a}' := (a_1, \dots, a_{k'-1}, a_{k'} - b).$$

Proof. The assertion is trivial for $b = 0$. If $b_1 = \dots = b_r = 0$ then the assertion follows from Lemma 10.2.3(ii) and Remark 10.2.4. Next assume without loss of generality that $b_1 \geq 1$. First suppose that $b = 1$. Using Lemma 5.1.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{1,k'} t_{1,k_1}^{b_1} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} f &= q t_{1,k_1} \partial_{1,k'} t_{1,k_1}^{b_1-1} t_{1,k_2}^{b_2} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} f \\ &+ (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{1 < i \leq m} t_{i,k_1} \partial_{i,k'} t_{1,k_1}^{b_1-1} t_{1,k_2}^{b_2} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} f = q t_{1,k_1} \partial_{1,k'} t_{1,k_1}^{b_1-1} t_{1,k_2}^{b_2} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} f + D_1, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_1 \in \mathcal{I}_{2,k'}$. By repeating the above calculation and then using Lemma 10.2.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{1,k'} t_{1,k_1}^{b_1} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} f &= q^{b_1+\cdots+b_r} t_{1,k_1}^{b_1} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} \partial_{1,k'} t^{\mathbf{a}} + D_2, \\ (55) \quad &= q^{b_1+\cdots+b_r} \mathbf{c}(a_{k'} - 1) t_{1,k_1}^{b_1} \cdots t_{1,k_r}^{b_r} t^{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{e}_{k'}} + D_2, \end{aligned}$$

where $D_2 \in \mathcal{I}_{1,k'}$, $\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{e}_{k'} := (a_1, \dots, a_{k'-1}, a_{k'} - 1)$, and we define $\mathbf{c}(-1) = 0$. The proof is completed by applying the $\partial_{1,k'}$ to both sides of (55) iteratively and repeating the argument. \square

For the next lemma, recall that we denote the action of $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ on \mathcal{P} by $D \otimes f \mapsto D \cdot f$.

Lemma 10.2.6. *Let $\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ and $\mathbf{b} := (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ be n -tuples of non-negative integers. Then the following statements hold.*

- (i) $\partial^{\mathbf{b}} \cdot t^{\mathbf{a}} = 0$ if $b_i > a_i$ for at least one $1 \leq i \leq n$.
- (ii) Assume that $a_i \geq b_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then

$$(56) \quad \partial^{\mathbf{b}} \cdot t^{\mathbf{a}} = \left(q^{\sum_{i=2}^n (a_i - b_i)(b_1 + \cdots + b_{i-1})} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{c}(a_i - 1, b_i - 1) \right) t^{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}},$$

and

$$(57) \quad t^{\mathbf{b}} \partial^{\mathbf{b}} \cdot t^{\mathbf{a}} = \left(q^{\sum_{i=2}^n (2a_i - 2b_i)(b_1 + \cdots + b_{i-1})} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbf{c}(a_i - 1, b_i - 1) \right) t^{\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}}.$$

Proof. (i) Follows from Lemma 10.2.3 and Lemma 10.2.5.

(ii) By Lemma 10.2.5, $\partial^{\mathbf{b}} t^{\mathbf{a}} = \mathbf{c}(a_n - 1, b_n - 1) \partial^{\mathbf{b}' } t_{1,n}^{a_n - b_n} t^{\mathbf{a}' } + D_1$ where $\mathbf{a}' := (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1})$, $\mathbf{b}' := (b_1, \dots, b_{n-1})$ and $D_1 \in \mathcal{I}_{1,n}$. Again by Lemma 10.2.5,

$$\partial^{\mathbf{b}' } t_{1,n}^{a_n - b_n} t^{\mathbf{a}'} = q^{(a_n - b_n)b_{n-1}} \mathbf{c}(a_{n-1} - 1, b_{n-1} - 1) \partial^{\mathbf{b}'' } t_{1,n}^{a_n - b_n} t_{1,n-1}^{a_{n-1} - b_{n-1}} t^{\mathbf{a}'' } + D_2,$$

where $\mathbf{a}'' := (a_1, \dots, a_{n-2})$, $\mathbf{b}'' := (b_1, \dots, b_{n-2})$ and $D_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{1, n-1}$. Continuing in this fashion we finally obtain (56). For (57) we should compute the scalar relating $t^{\mathbf{b}} t^{\mathbf{a}-\mathbf{b}}$ and $t^{\mathbf{a}}$. This is straightforward using the relations $t_{1,i} t_{1,j} = q t_{1,j} t_{1,i}$ for $i < j$. \square

Remark 10.2.7. By an argument similar to Remark 3.5.2, we can show that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ has a basis consisting of monomials of the form

$$(58) \quad t_{m,n}^{a_{m,n}} \cdots t_{m,1}^{a_{m,1}} \cdots t_{1,n}^{a_{1,1}} \cdots t_{1,1}^{a_{1,1}} \partial_{1,1}^{b_{1,1}} \cdots \partial_{1,n}^{b_{1,n}} \cdots \partial_{m,1}^{b_{m,1}} \cdots \partial_{m,n}^{b_{m,n}}, \quad a_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}.$$

Here the $\partial_{i,j}$ (respectively, the $t_{i,j}$) are sorted according to the lexicographic order (respectively, the reverse lexicographic order) on indices. Now let $D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ and let $\mathbf{a} := (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ be an n -tuple of non-negative integers. Recall the notation $\partial^{\mathbf{a}} := \partial_{1,1}^{a_1} \cdots \partial_{1,n}^{a_n}$ and $t^{\mathbf{a}} := t_{1,n}^{a_n} \cdots t_{1,1}^{a_1}$ for an n -tuple of integers (a_1, \dots, a_n) . Assume that $D \cdot t^{\mathbf{a}} = c t^{\mathbf{a}}$ for some $c \in \mathbb{k}$. We can write D as $D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$ where

- (i) D_1 is a linear combination of basis vectors of the form $t^{\mathbf{b}'} \partial^{\mathbf{b}'}$ where \mathbf{b}' is an n -tuple of non-negative integers,
- (ii) D_2 is a linear combination of basis vectors of the form $t^{\mathbf{a}'} \partial^{\mathbf{b}'}$ where \mathbf{a}' and \mathbf{b}' are n -tuples of non-negative integers and $\mathbf{a}' \neq \mathbf{b}'$, and
- (iii) D_3 is a linear combination of the remaining basis vectors in (58).

Using Lemma 5.1.1 and then Lemma 10.2.6 we obtain $D \cdot t^{\mathbf{a}} = (D_1 + D_2) \cdot t^{\mathbf{a}} = D_1 \cdot t^{\mathbf{a}}$.

Example 10.2.8. Set $\lambda := \varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_n$ and $x := K_\lambda \in U_R$. Then $x \cdot t_{1,1}^r = q^{-r} t_{1,1}^r$ for $r \geq 1$. From Remark 10.2.7 and Lemma 10.2.6 it follows that if $\phi_U(1 \otimes x) \in \mathcal{R}_\bullet$ then the eigenvalue of $t_{1,1}^r$ with respect to $\phi_U(1 \otimes x)$ should be a ratio of two polynomials such as $\phi_1(q)/\phi_2(q)$ where $\deg \phi_2$ is bounded above (independently of r). Consequently, $\phi_U(1 \otimes x) \notin \mathcal{R}_\bullet$ and in particular $\mathcal{R}_\bullet \subsetneq \mathcal{R}$. Thus, K_λ is a locally finite element of U_R that does not belong to $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$.

10.3. Proof of $\lambda_1 \leq 0$.

Proposition 10.3.1. *Let \mathcal{I} be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$. Let $x := \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda K_\lambda \in U_{\mathfrak{b}, R}$ where $c_\lambda \in \mathbb{k}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$, and assume that $x \in \phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$. Then for all $\lambda := \sum \lambda_i \varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{I}$ we have $\lambda_1 \leq 0$.*

Proof. By scaling x by an element of \mathbb{k} if necessary, we can assume that the c_λ are polynomials in q . Set $D := \phi_U(x)$, so that $D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$. For a weight $\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \varepsilon_i$, we set $t^\gamma := t_{1,n}^{\gamma_n} \cdots t_{1,1}^{\gamma_1}$. Then

$$D \cdot t^\gamma = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle} t^\gamma.$$

Write $D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$ as in Remark 10.2.7 and suppose that $D_1 = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{Z}} \tilde{c}(\mathbf{a}) t^{\mathbf{a}} \partial^{\mathbf{a}}$ where \mathcal{Z} is a finite set of n -tuples of non-negative integers and the $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{a}) \in \mathbb{k}$. Then by Lemma 10.2.6 we obtain $D \cdot t^\gamma = D_1 \cdot t^\gamma = \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \tilde{c}(\mathbf{a}) \phi_{\mathbf{a}}(q^2) t^\gamma$ where the $\phi_{\mathbf{a}}$ are polynomials with integer coefficients. Note that the $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{a})$ are independent of γ , but the $\phi_{\mathbf{a}}$ can depend on γ .

Set $\tilde{\lambda} := \lambda_{\max}$ where λ_{\max} is the maximum of \mathcal{I} according to the total order introduced in Subsection 10.1. By Lemma 10.1.1 we can choose γ such that we have $\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle > \langle \mu, \gamma \rangle$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\tilde{\lambda}\}$. If the assertion of the proposition is not true, then $\tilde{\lambda}_1 > 0$ and thus by choosing γ_1 sufficiently large we can also assume that $\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle \geq 1$. Thus for a sufficiently large integer $k \geq 1$, the lowest power of q that occurs in $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, k\gamma \rangle}$ is from the summand $c_{\tilde{\lambda}} q^{-\langle \tilde{\lambda}, k\gamma \rangle}$, and is equal to $d - k\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle$, where d is the lowest power of q that occurs in $c_{\tilde{\lambda}}$. By comparing with $\sum_{\mathbf{a}} \tilde{c}(\mathbf{a}) \phi_{\mathbf{a}}(q^2)$ it follows that $d - k\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle \geq -\sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{Z}} \deg \tilde{c}_{\mathbf{a}}(q^{-1})$. The right hand side is independent of k and γ . However, this is a contradiction since k can be arbitrarily large and $\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle \geq 1$. \square

10.4. **Proof of $\lambda_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}$.**

Proposition 10.4.1. *Let \mathcal{I} be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$. Let $x := \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda K_\lambda \in U_{\mathfrak{h},R}$ where $c_\lambda \in \mathbb{k}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$, and assume that $x \in \phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$. Then for every $\lambda := \sum \lambda_i \varepsilon_i \in \mathcal{I}$ we have $\lambda_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}$.*

Proof. We assume that the assertion is false, and arrive at a contradiction.

Step 1. Recall from Proposition 4.2.1 that the y_b are in $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$. The $K_\lambda \in U_{\mathfrak{h},R}$ satisfying $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i+1} \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $\lambda_1 \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}$ can be expressed as products of the y_b . Thus by Proposition 10.1.2 and Proposition 10.3.1 we can assume that $\lambda_1 \in \{-1, -3, -5, \dots\}$ for all $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$.

Step 2. By scaling x if necessary, we can assume that the c_λ are polynomials in q . Set $D := \phi_U(x)$ so that $D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$. We keep using the notation t^γ for $\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i \varepsilon_i$ from the proof of Proposition 10.3.1. Then $D \cdot t^\gamma = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, \gamma \rangle} t^\gamma$. Next we express D as $D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3$ according to Remark 10.2.7. Suppose that $D_1 = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b}) t^{\mathbf{b}} \partial^{\mathbf{b}}$, where \mathcal{Z} is a finite set of n -tuples of non-negative integers and the $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b}) \in \mathbb{k}$. By scaling x again if necessary, we can assume that the $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b})$ are also polynomials in q . From Lemma 10.2.6(ii) it follows that $t^{\mathbf{b}} \partial^{\mathbf{b}} \cdot t^\gamma = \phi_{\mathbf{b}}(q^2) t^\gamma$ where $\phi_{\mathbf{b}}$ is a polynomial and

$$(59) \quad \deg \phi_{\mathbf{b}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i (b_1 + \cdots + b_i + 1) - \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{b_i(1+b_i)}{2} + b_i(b_1 + \cdots + b_i) \right).$$

Step 3. Let $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{I}$ be such that $-\tilde{\lambda}$ is the maximum of $-\mathcal{I} := \{-\lambda : \lambda \in \mathcal{I}\}$ with respect to the total order $<$ of Subsection 10.1. Using Lemma 10.1.1 for $-\mathcal{I}$, we can choose γ such that $-\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle > -\langle \mu, \gamma \rangle$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{I} \setminus \{\tilde{\lambda}\}$. Since $\lambda_1 \in \{-1, -3, -5, \dots\}$, by choosing the parity of γ_1 suitably we can also assume that $-\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle$ is an odd integer. Then for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, the highest power of q that occurs in $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda q^{-\langle \lambda, k\gamma \rangle}$ is from the summand $c_{\tilde{\lambda}} q^{-\langle \tilde{\lambda}, k\gamma \rangle}$, and is equal to $d - k\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle$, where $d := \deg c_{\tilde{\lambda}}$.

Step 4. For $\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{Z}$ define $\lambda_{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$ by

$$\lambda_{\mathbf{b}} := (b_1 + 1)\varepsilon_1 + (b_1 + b_2 + 1)\varepsilon_2 + \cdots + (b_1 + \cdots + b_n + 1)\varepsilon_n.$$

Note that the map $\mathbf{b} \mapsto \lambda_{\mathbf{b}}$ is an injection. Let $\mathbf{b}_{\max} \in \mathcal{Z}$ be such that $\lambda_{\mathbf{b}_{\max}} = \max\{\lambda_{\mathbf{b}} : \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{Z}\}$, where the maximum is taken with respect to $<$. From (59) and Lemma 10.1.1 applied to the set $\{\lambda_{\mathbf{b}} : \mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{Z}\}$ it follows that we can choose γ and k in Step 3 such that the highest power of q that occurs in $\sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b}) \phi_{\mathbf{b}}(q^2)$ is from the summand $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b}_{\max}) \phi_{\mathbf{b}_{\max}}(q^2)$, and is equal to $d' + 2 \deg \phi_{\mathbf{b}_{\max}}$, where $d' := \deg \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b}_{\max})$. Note that the $\phi_{\mathbf{b}}$ depend on γ and k , but the $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b})$ only depend on x and in particular they are independent of the choices of γ and k .

Step 5. Recall that t^γ is an eigenvector of D , hence $D \cdot t^\gamma = D_1 \cdot t^\gamma = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{b}) \phi_{\mathbf{b}}(q^2)$ by Remark 10.2.7. By comparing the highest power of q in the eigenvalue from Step 3 and Step 4 it follows that

$$(60) \quad d' + 2 \deg \phi_{\mathbf{b}_{\max}} = d - k\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle.$$

Since d' is independent of γ and k , the parity of the left hand side of (60) does not change by varying k and γ . However, recall that $\langle \tilde{\lambda}, \gamma \rangle$ is an odd integer and the only constraint on k is that it should be sufficiently large. Thus, we can choose k such that the parities of the two sides of (60) are different. This is a contradiction. \square

10.5. **Completing the proof of Theorem B.** Theorem B(i) is an immediate consequence of the following corollary and Proposition 5.3.1.

Corollary 10.5.1. *Let \mathcal{I} be a finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_n$. Let $x := \sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{I}} c_\lambda K_\lambda \in U_{R, \mathfrak{h}}$ where $c_\lambda \in \mathbb{k}$ for $\lambda \in \mathcal{I}$, and assume that $x \in \phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})$. Then x is in the subalgebra of $U_{\mathfrak{h}, R}$ that is generated by the y_b for $1 \leq b \leq n$.*

Proof. Follows immediately from Proposition 10.1.2, Proposition 10.3.1, and Proposition 10.4.1. \square

Note that Corollary 10.5.1 also describes the generators of $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathfrak{h}, \bullet})$. An analogous statement holds for U_R : the algebra $\phi_U^{-1}(\mathcal{R}_{\mathfrak{h}, \bullet})$ is generated by the x_a for $1 \leq a \leq m$.

11. PROOF OF THEOREM C

11.1. Proof for $\mathcal{A}_{k, l}$. The case $k = l$ is a direct consequence of Theorem A. From now on we assume that $k < l$ and assume that $m = l$ (the case $k > l$ is similar). Note that unlike the previous sections it is possible that $m > n$. There exists an embedding

$$\kappa_{k, l} : \mathcal{A}_{k, l} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}_{l \times n},$$

that is uniquely defined by the assignments $t_{i, j} \mapsto t_{i+l-k, j}$ and $\partial_{i, j} \mapsto \partial_{i+l-k, j}$. Recall from Remark 3.5.5 that $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$ is a $U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}$ -module, and set

$$\overline{U}_L := 1 \otimes 1 \otimes U_L \otimes 1 \subseteq U_L \otimes U_R \otimes U_L \otimes U_R = U_{LR} \otimes U_{LR}.$$

We remark that \overline{U}_L acts trivially on the subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}_{k, l}$ that is generated by the $t_{i, j}$. The $K_{\varepsilon_i} \in \overline{U}_L$ act diagonally on $\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D}$, and

$$(61) \quad \kappa_{k, l}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l}) = \{D \in \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} : K_{\varepsilon_i} \cdot D = D \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq l - k\}.$$

Let $D \in (\mathcal{A}_{k, l})_{(\varepsilon_R)}$. Since $\kappa_{k, l}$ is U_R -equivariant, $\kappa_{k, l}(D) \in (\kappa_{k, l}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l}))_{(\varepsilon_R)}$. By Theorem A and Lemma 6.1.2 we can express $\kappa_{k, l}(D)$ as a linear combination of products of the form $L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r}$ where $1 \leq i_a, j_a \leq l$ for $1 \leq a \leq r$. These products are joint eigenvectors of the $K_{\varepsilon_i} \in \overline{U}_L$. Moreover, from (61) it follows that $L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r} \in \kappa_{k, l}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l})$ if and only if $i_a > l - k$ for $1 \leq a \leq r$. Thus, in expressing $\kappa_{k, l}(D)$ as a linear combinations of the products $L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r}$, only those satisfying $i_a > l - k$ for all $1 \leq a \leq r$ can occur with nonzero coefficients. Applying $\kappa_{k, l}^{-1}$ concludes the proof.

11.2. Proof for $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l})$. The argument is standard, and is based on reduction to the case $\mathcal{A}_{k, l}$. We assume $k \leq l$ (the argument for the case $k > l$ is similar). The monomials of the form (22), where $a_{i, j} = 0$ for $i > k$ and $b_{i, j} = 0$ for $i > l$, constitute a basis of $\mathcal{A}_{k, l}$. For $d \geq 0$ let \mathcal{V}_d be the span of such monomials of total degree d (that is, $\sum_{i, j} (a_{i, j} + b_{i, j}) = d$). The \mathcal{V}_d form a U_R -invariant splitting of the filtration of $\mathcal{A}_{k, l}$ and naturally correspond to an isomorphism of U_R -modules $F : \mathcal{A}_{k, l} \rightarrow \text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l})$. Furthermore, with respect to the vector space grading $\mathcal{A}_{k, l} = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} \mathcal{V}_d$, the products of $\mathcal{A}_{k, l}$ and $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l})$ are the same up to terms of lower degree.

Let $D \in (\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l}))_{(\varepsilon_R)}$ and write $F^{-1}(D) = \sum_{d \geq 0} D_d$ where $D_d \in \mathcal{V}_d$. From (36) it follows that $D_d \neq 0$ only if d is even. Set $d_\circ := \max\{d \geq 0 : D_{2d} \neq 0\}$, so that $D_{2d_\circ} \neq 0$ but $D_d = 0$ for $d > 2d_\circ$. From Subsection 11.2 it follows that $F^{-1}(D)$ is a linear combination of products of the form $L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r}$. From the proof of Theorem A it also follows that in the latter linear combination only products satisfying $r \leq d_\circ$ occur. Thus, say $F^{-1}(D) = \sum_{r \leq d_\circ} \sum_{\vec{i}, \vec{j}} c_{\vec{i}, \vec{j}} L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots L_{i_r, j_r}$ for some $c_{\vec{i}, \vec{j}} \in \mathbb{k}$. Setting ${}^{\text{gr}}L_{i, j} := F(L_{i, j})$, it follows that $F^{-1}\left(D - \sum_{r \leq d_\circ} \sum_{\vec{i}, \vec{j}} c_{\vec{i}, \vec{j}} {}^{\text{gr}}L_{i_1, j_1} \cdots {}^{\text{gr}}L_{i_r, j_r}\right) \in \bigoplus_{d < 2d_\circ} \mathcal{V}_d$. Theorem C for $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_{k, l})$ follows from iterating the above degree reduction process.

12. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.5.4

In this section we give a purely algebraic proof that \mathcal{PD} acts faithfully on \mathcal{P} . Recall that we use the *dot* symbol to denote the action of \mathcal{PD} on \mathcal{P} . Set $\mathcal{P}^{(\leq k)} := \bigoplus_{i=0}^k \mathcal{P}^{(i)}$.

12.1. Some technical lemmas.

Lemma 12.1.1. $\partial_{i,j} \cdot \mathcal{P}^{(\leq k)} \subseteq \mathcal{P}^{(\leq k-1)}$.

Proof. Follows by induction on k and the mixed relations (R3)–(R6) in Subsection 3.5. \square

Define a total order \prec on the set of pairs (i, j) with $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$ as follows: we set $(i, j) \prec (i', j')$ if either $i + j < i' + j'$, or $i + j = i' + j'$ and $i < i'$.

Lemma 12.1.2. Assume that $(i_r, j_r) \prec (i, j)$ for $1 \leq r \leq k$. Then $\partial_{i,j} \cdot (t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}) = 0$.

Proof. We use induction on k . From $(i_1, j_1) \prec (i, j)$ it follows that either $i > i_1$ or $j > j_1$. If $i > i_1$ then by the mixed relations (R3) or (R5) we have

$$\partial_{i,j} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} = c_1 t_{i_1, j_1} \partial_{i,j} t_{i_2, j_2} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} + \delta_{j, j_1} c_2 \sum_{j' > j} t_{i_1, j'} \partial_{i, j'} t_{i_2, j_2} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k},$$

for some $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{k}$. The claim now follows from the induction hypothesis, because $i + j' > i + j$ and therefore $(i, j) \prec (i, j')$. When $j > j_1$ the argument is similar. \square

Lemma 12.1.3. Assume that $(i_r, j_r) \prec (i, j)$ for $1 \leq r \leq k$. Let $\mathbf{c}(a)$ be as in (53). Then $\partial_{i,j} \cdot (t_{i,j}^a t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}) = \mathbf{c}(a-1) t_{i,j}^{a-1} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}$ for $a \geq 1$.

Proof. The mixed relation (R6) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{i,j} t_{i,j}^a t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} &= t_{i,j}^{a-1} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} + q^2 t_{i,j} \partial_{i,j} t_{i,j}^{a-1} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} \\ &+ (q^2 - 1) \sum_{i' > i} t_{i', j} \partial_{i', j} t_{i,j}^{a-1} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} + (q^2 - 1) \sum_{j' > j} t_{i, j'} \partial_{i, j'} t_{i,j}^{a-1} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k} \\ &+ (q - q^{-1})^2 \sum_{i' > i, j' > j} t_{i', j'} \partial_{i', j'} t_{i,j}^{a-1} t_{i_1, j_1} \cdots t_{i_k, j_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\min\{i' + j, i + j', i' + j'\} > i + j$, the assertion follows by induction on a and Lemma 12.1.2. \square

Remark 12.1.4. Using Remark 3.5.2 and by straightforward arguments based on the relations between the $t_{i,j}$ and the $\partial_{i,j}$ one can prove that \mathcal{PD} has a basis consisting of monomials of the form

$$(62) \quad \left(\prod_{i,j} t_{i,j}^{a_{i,j}} \right) \left(\prod_{i,j} \partial_{i,j}^{b_{i,j}} \right),$$

where the $\partial_{i,j}$ (respectively, the $t_{i,j}$) occur in ascending (respectively, descending) order relative to the total order \prec .

12.2. Completing the proof of Proposition 3.5.4. Let $D \in \mathcal{PD}$ and assume that $D \neq 0$. Then $D = \sum_{d \geq 0} D_d$ where each D_d is a linear combination of monomials of the form (62) with $\sum_{i,j} b_{i,j} = d$. Set $d_o := \min\{d : D_d \neq 0\}$. By Lemma 12.1.1, for $f \in \mathcal{P}^{(d_o)}$ we have $D \cdot f = D_{d_o} \cdot f$. Let \mathcal{T} denote the set of all the mn -tuples $\mathbf{b} := (b_{i,j})$ for which a monomial of the form (62) occurs in D_{d_o} with a nonzero coefficient. We sort the components of the $\mathbf{b} := (b_{i,j})$ according to \prec on

the pairs (i, j) . In other words, we assume that $\mathbf{b} := (b_{1,1}, b_{1,2}, b_{2,1}, \dots, b_{m-1,n}, b_{m,n-1}, b_{m,n})$. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} := (\tilde{b}_{i,j})$ be the minimum of \mathcal{T} in the reverse lexicographic order. Thus, we have

$$\tilde{b}_{m,n} = \min\{b_{m,n} : (b_{i,j}) \in \mathcal{T}\},$$

then also $\tilde{b}_{m-1,n} = \min\{b_{m-1,n} : (b_{i,j}) \in \mathcal{T} \text{ and } b_{m,n} = \tilde{b}_{m,n}\}$, and so on. From Lemma 12.1.2 and Lemma 12.1.3 it follows that $D_d \cdot \prod_{i,j} t^{\tilde{b}_{i,j}} \neq 0$.

13. PROOF OF LEMMA 5.1.2

Define a subset $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ of $\{1, \dots, r\}$ as follows: $k \in S_{\mathbf{a}}$ if and only if $a_k > a_1$ and for all $k' < k$ we have $a_k \neq a_{k'}$. Define $S_{\mathbf{b}}$ similarly, relative to (b_1, \dots, b_r) . Note that $S_{\mathbf{a}}$ and $S_{\mathbf{b}}$ only depend on \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} , respectively. Lemma 5.1.1 and the mixed relations (R3)–(R6) of Subsection 3.5 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{a_i, b_j} \cdot t_{a_1, b_1} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} &= q^{\llbracket a_i, a_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket b_j, b_1 \rrbracket} t_{a_1, b_1} \partial_{a_i, b_j} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} \\ &+ \llbracket a_i, a_1 \rrbracket q^{\llbracket b_j, b_1 \rrbracket} (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{u \in S_{\mathbf{a}}} t_{a_u, b_1} \partial_{a_u, b_j} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} \\ (63) \quad &+ \llbracket b_j, b_1 \rrbracket q^{\llbracket a_i, a_1 \rrbracket} (q - q^{-1}) \sum_{v \in S_{\mathbf{b}}} t_{a_1, b_v} \partial_{a_i, b_v} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} \\ &+ \llbracket a_i, a_1 \rrbracket \llbracket b_j, b_1 \rrbracket (q - q^{-1})^2 \sum_{u \in S_{\mathbf{a}}, v \in S_{\mathbf{b}}} t_{a_u, b_v} \partial_{a_u, b_v} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} \\ &+ \llbracket a_i, a_1 \rrbracket \llbracket b_j, b_1 \rrbracket t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r}. \end{aligned}$$

We now proceed by induction on r to simplify each line on the right hand side. For the first line, Lemma 5.1.1 implies that $\partial_{a_i, b_j} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = 0$ unless both of the following conditions hold:

- (i) Either $i \geq 2$, or $i = 1$ but $a_1 = a_{i'}$ for some $i' \geq 2$.
- (ii) Either $j \geq 2$, or $j = 1$ but $b_1 = b_{j'}$ for some $j' \geq 2$.

Now set

$$i_{\circ} := \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i \geq 2, \\ \min\{i' : i' \geq 2, a_1 = a_{i'}\} & \text{if } i = 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad j_{\circ} := \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j \geq 2, \\ \min\{j' : j' \geq 2, b_1 = b_{j'}\} & \text{if } j = 1. \end{cases}$$

Let \mathbf{a}' and \mathbf{b}' be the order equivalence classes of (a_2, \dots, a_r) and (b_2, \dots, b_r) , respectively. By the induction hypothesis,

$$\partial_{a_i, b_j} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = \partial_{a_{i_{\circ}}, b_{j_{\circ}}} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = \sum_{s=0}^{r-2} \sum_{\sigma'_s, \tau'_s} c_{\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}'}(i_{\circ}, j_{\circ}, \sigma'_s, \tau'_s) t_{a_{\sigma'_s(1)}, b_{\tau'_s(1)}} \cdots t_{a_{\sigma'_s(s)}, b_{\tau'_s(s)}},$$

where the maps $\sigma'_s : \{1, \dots, s\} \rightarrow \{2, \dots, r\} \setminus \{i_{\circ}\}$ and $\tau'_s : \{1, \dots, s\} \rightarrow \{2, \dots, r\} \setminus \{j_{\circ}\}$ are injections. Corresponding to the pair (σ'_s, τ'_s) we define a pair of injections

$$\sigma_{s+1} : \{1, \dots, s+1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{i\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{s+1} : \{1, \dots, s+1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{j\},$$

by

$$\sigma_{s+1}(1) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \geq 2, \\ i_{\circ} & \text{if } i = 1, \end{cases} \quad , \quad \sigma_{s+1}(u) := \sigma'_s(u-1) \text{ for } 2 \leq u \leq s+1,$$

and

$$\tau_{s+1}(1) := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \geq 2, \\ j_{\circ} & \text{if } j = 1, \end{cases} \quad , \quad \tau_{s+1}(u) := \tau'_s(u-1) \text{ for } 2 \leq u \leq s+1.$$

Set

$$c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(1)}(i, j, \sigma_{s+1}, \tau_{s+1}) := q^{\llbracket a_i, a_1 \rrbracket + \llbracket b_j, b_1 \rrbracket} c_{\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}'}(i_\circ, j_\circ, \sigma'_s, \tau'_s).$$

For the second line, first note that such terms exist only if $a_i = a_1$. From $a_u > a_1$ and $a_i = a_1$ it follows that $u \notin \{1, i\}$. Lemma 5.1.1 implies that $\partial_{a_u, b_j} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = 0$ unless $b_j = b_{j'}$ for some $2 \leq j' \leq r$. Set

$$j_\circ := \begin{cases} j & \text{if } j \geq 2, \\ \min\{j' : j' \geq 2, b_j = b_{j'}\} & \text{if } j = 1, \end{cases}$$

so that $j_\circ \geq 2$. Note that j_\circ is uniquely determined by j and \mathbf{b} . The induction hypothesis yields

$$\partial_{a_u, b_j} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = \partial_{a_u, b_{j_\circ}} \cdot t_{a_2, b_2} \cdots t_{a_r, b_r} = \sum_{s=0}^{r-2} \sum_{\sigma'_s, \tau'_s} c_{\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}'}(u, j_\circ, \sigma'_s, \tau'_s) t_{a_{\sigma'_s(1)}, b_{\tau'_s(1)}} \cdots t_{a_{\sigma'_s(s)}, b_{\tau'_s(s)}},$$

where $\sigma'_s : \{1, \dots, s\} \rightarrow \{2, \dots, r\} \setminus \{u\}$ and $\tau'_s : \{1, \dots, s\} \rightarrow \{2, \dots, r\} \setminus \{j_\circ\}$ are injections. Corresponding to the latter pair (σ'_s, τ'_s) we define a pair of injections

$$\sigma_{s+1} : \{1, \dots, s+1\} \rightarrow \{1, 2, \dots, r\} \setminus \{i\} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau_{s+1} : \{1, \dots, s+1\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{j\}$$

by

$$\sigma_{s+1}(1) := u, \quad \sigma_{s+1}(u') := \begin{cases} \sigma'_s(u' - 1) & \text{if } \sigma'_s(u' - 1) \neq i \\ 1 & \text{if } \sigma'_s(u' - 1) = i \end{cases} \quad \text{for } 2 \leq u' \leq s+1,$$

and

$$\tau_{s+1}(1) = \begin{cases} j_\circ & \text{if } j = 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } j \geq 2, \end{cases}, \quad \tau_{s+1}(u') := \tau'_s(u' - 1) \quad \text{for } 2 \leq u' \leq s+1.$$

Set

$$c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(2)}(i, j, \sigma_{s+1}, \tau_{s+1}) := q^{\llbracket b_j, b_1 \rrbracket} (q - q^{-1}) c_{\mathbf{a}', \mathbf{b}'}(u, j_\circ, \sigma'_s, \tau'_s).$$

We can treat the third, fourth, and fifth lines on the right hand side of (63) similarly, thereby obtaining coefficients $c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(k)}(i, j, \sigma, \tau) \in \mathbb{k}$ for $3 \leq k \leq 5$. Finally we set

$$c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}(i, j, \sigma, \tau) := \sum_{k=1}^5 c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(k)}(i, j, \sigma, \tau).$$

In defining the coefficients $c_{\mathbf{a},\mathbf{b}}^{(k)}(i, j, \sigma, \tau)$ we only refer to the indices of the a_i and the b_j or the constraints $\llbracket a_i, a_j \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket b_i, b_j \rrbracket$. Thus these coefficients only depend on $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, i, j, \sigma, \tau$.

REFERENCES

- [BKV06] O. Bershtein, Y. Kolisnyk, L. Vaksman, *On a q -analogue of the Wallach-Okounkov formula*. Lett. Math. Phys. 78 (2006), no. 1, 97–109.
- [Ho95] R. Howe, *Perspectives on invariant theory: Schur duality, multiplicity-free actions and beyond*. The Schur lectures (1992) (Tel Aviv), 1–182, Israel Math. Conf. Proc., 8, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1995.
- [Ja96] J. C. Jantzen, *Lectures on quantum groups*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 6. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996. viii+266.
- [JL94] A. Joseph, G. Letzter, *Separation of variables for quantized enveloping algebras*. Amer. J. Math. 116 (1994), no. 1, 127–177.
- [KS97] A. Klimyk, K. Schmudgen, *Quantum groups and their representations*. Texts and Monographs in Physics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. xx+552
- [Kn97] F. Knop, *Symmetric and non-symmetric quantum Capelli polynomials*. Comment. Math. Helv. 72 (1997), no. 1, 84–100.

- [LZZ11] G. I. Lehrer, H. Zhang, and R. B. Zhang, *A quantum analogue of the first fundamental theorem of classical invariant theory*, Commun. Math. Phys. 301 (2011), 131–174.
- [LSS22a] G. Letzter, S. Sahi, H. Salmasian, *Weyl algebras and Capelli operators for quantum homogeneous spaces*, preprint.
- [LSS22b] G. Letzter, S. Sahi, H. Salmasian, *The Capelli eigenvalue problem for quantum groups*, preprint.
- [NYM93] M. Noumi, H. Yamada, K. Mimachi, *Finite dimensional representations of the quantum group $GL_q(n, \mathbb{C})$ and the Zonal spherical functions on $U_q(n-1) \backslash U_q(n)$* . Japan. J. Math. (N.S.) 19 (1993), no. 1, 31–80.
- [No96] M. Noumi, *Macdonald’s Symmetric Polynomials as Zonal Spherical Functions on Some Quantum Homogeneous Spaces*, Adv. Math. 123 (1996), 16–77.
- [Ok97] A. Okounkov, *Binomial formula for Macdonald polynomials and applications*. Math. Res. Lett. 4 (1997), no. 4, 533–553.
- [Sah96] S. Sahi, *Interpolation, integrality, and a generalization of Macdonald’s polynomials*. Internat. Math. Res. Notices 1996 (1996), no. 10, 457–471.
- [Sah11] S. Sahi, *Binomial coefficients and Littlewood–Richardson coefficients for interpolation polynomials and Macdonald polynomials*. Representation theory and mathematical physics, 359–369, Contemp. Math., 557, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011.
- [SSV04] D. Shklyarov, S. Sinel’shchikov, L. Vaksman, *Fock representations and quantum matrices*. Internat. J. Math. 15 (2004), no. 9, 855–894.
- [Ta92] M. Takeuchi, *Some topics on $GL_q(n)$* . J. Algebra 147 (1992), no. 2, 379–410.
- [VY20] C. Voigt, R. Yuncken, *Complex semisimple quantum groups and representation theory*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 2264. Springer, Cham, (2020). x+374 pp.
- [Wy39] H. Weyl, *The Classical Groups. Their Invariants and Representations*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1939. xii+302 pp.
- [Zh02] R. B. Zhang, *Howe duality and the quantum general linear group*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 131 (2003), no. 9, 2681–2692.

GAIL LETZTER, MATHEMATICS RESEARCH GROUP, NATIONAL SECURITY AGENCY
Email address: `gletzter@verizon.net`

SIDDHARTHA SAHI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, RUTGERS UNIVERSITY
Email address: `sahi@math.rutgers.edu`

HADI SALMASIAN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA
Email address: `hadi.salmasian@uottawa.ca`