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#### Abstract

We reformulate the Kanade-Russell conjecture modulo 9 via the vertex operators for the level 3 standard modules of type $D_{4}^{(3)}$. Along the same line, we arrive at three partition theorems which may be regarded as an $A_{4}^{(2)}$ analog of the conjecture. Andrews-van Ekeren-Heluani has proven one of them, and we point out that the others are easily proven from their results.


## 1. Introduction

1.1. The Rogers-Ramanujan identities. The Rogers-Ramanujan (RR, for short) identities

$$
\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{q^{n^{2}}}{(q ; q)_{n}}=\frac{1}{\left(q, q^{4} ; q^{5}\right)_{\infty}}, \quad \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{q^{n^{2}+n}}{(q ; q)_{n}}=\frac{1}{\left(q^{2}, q^{3} ; q^{5}\right)_{\infty}}
$$

are undoubtedly one of the most famous $q$-series identities in mathematics (see [2, (19, 48). Here, the Pochhammer symbols are defined by

$$
(a ; q)_{n}=(1-a)(1-a q) \cdots\left(1-a q^{n-1}\right), \quad\left(a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k} ; q\right)_{n}=\left(a_{1} ; q\right)_{n} \cdots\left(a_{k} ; q\right)_{n}
$$

As noted by Schur and MacMahon, the RR identities are equivalent to the following statement, often called the RR partition theorem.

Let $i=1$ or 2 . For each non-negative integer $n$, the number of partitions of $n$ whose successive differences are at least two and whose minimum parts are at least $i$ equals the number of partitions of $n$ whose parts are congruent to $i$ or $5-i$ modulo 5 .
Recall that a partition $\lambda=\left(\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\ell}\right)$ of a non-negative integer $n$ is a weakly decreasing sequence of positive integers (called parts) whose sum $|\lambda|$ is $n$. We denote the length $\ell$ by $\ell(\lambda)$ and put the multiplicities as $m_{j}(\lambda)=\left|\left\{1 \leq i \leq \ell \mid \lambda_{i}=j\right\}\right|$.

Let $\operatorname{Par}(n)$ (resp. Par) denote the set of partitions of $n$ (resp. partitions). We say that two subsets $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ of Par are partition theoretically equivalent (abbreviated to $\mathcal{C} \stackrel{\operatorname{PT}}{\sim} \mathcal{D})$ if we have $|\mathcal{C} \cap \operatorname{Par}(n)|=|\mathcal{D} \cap \operatorname{Par}(n)|$ for $n \geq 0$. For example, the RR partition theorem is briefly written as $\mathrm{RR}_{i} \stackrel{\mathrm{PT}}{\sim} T_{i, 4-i}^{(5)}$ for $i=1,2$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{RR}_{1} & =\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid \lambda_{j}-\lambda_{j+1} \geq 2 \text { for } 1 \leq j<\ell(\lambda)\right\}, \\
\mathrm{RR}_{2} & =\mathrm{RR}_{1} \cap\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid m_{1}(\lambda)=0\right\}, \\
T_{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}}^{(N)} & =\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid \lambda_{j} \equiv a_{1}, \ldots, a_{k}(\bmod N) \text { for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)\right\} .
\end{aligned}
$$

[^0]\[

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{1}^{(1)} \quad \stackrel{1}{\circ} \Leftrightarrow \stackrel{1}{\circ} \quad A_{4}^{(2)} \quad \stackrel{2}{\circ} \Leftarrow \stackrel{2}{\circ} \Leftarrow \stackrel{1}{\circ} \quad \alpha_{0} \quad D_{4}^{(3)} \quad \begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\alpha_{1}
\end{array} \quad-\underset{\alpha_{2}}{\circ} \stackrel{1}{\circ} \stackrel{1}{\circ} \\
& A_{2}^{(2)} \quad \stackrel{2}{\circ} \stackrel{\alpha_{0}}{\rightleftharpoons} \stackrel{1}{\circ} \quad A_{\ell} \quad \underset{\alpha_{1}}{\circ}-\underset{\beta_{2}}{\circ}-\cdots-\underset{\beta_{\ell-1}}{\circ}-\stackrel{\circ}{\beta_{\ell}} \\
& D_{4} \quad \underset{\substack{\circ \\
\circ \\
\beta_{1}}}{\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \beta_{3}} \stackrel{\beta_{2}}{\circ}-\stackrel{\circ}{\beta_{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$
\]

Figure 1. The Dynkin diagrams $A_{1}^{(1)}, A_{2}^{(2)}, A_{4}^{(2)}, D_{4}^{(3)}$ and $A_{\ell}, D_{4}$
1.2. The Kanade-Russell conjecture modulo 9. About a decade ago, KanadeRussell found a celebrated conjectural partition theorem below (see [27, §4]), which is now well-known in the community under the name of the Kanade-Russell conjecture (e.g., see [14, 34, 57]).

Conjecture 1.1 ([27]). For $1 \leq a \leq 3$, we have $\mathrm{KR}_{a} \stackrel{\mathrm{PT}}{\sim} T_{2^{a-1,3,6,9-2^{a-1}}}^{(9)}$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{KR}_{1}=\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid \lambda_{j}-\lambda_{j+2} \geq 3 \text { for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)-2 \text { and } P(\lambda, 0) \text { holds }\right\}, \\
& \mathrm{KR}_{2}=\mathrm{KR}_{1} \cap\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid m_{1}(\lambda)=0\right\} \\
& \mathrm{KR}_{3}=\mathrm{KR}_{1} \cap\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid m_{1}(\lambda)=m_{2}(\lambda)=0\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, the condition $P(\lambda, k)$ for a partition $\lambda$ and an integer $k$ stands for

$$
\lambda_{j}-\lambda_{j+1} \leq 1 \text { implies } \lambda_{j}+\lambda_{j+1} \equiv k(\bmod 3) \text { for } 1 \leq j<\ell(\lambda)
$$

Like the RR partition theorem, the Kanade-Russell conjecture has an equivalent $q$-series identity reformulation [34, §3]. Because the double sums due to Kurşungöz are well-known, we give a reformulation regarding triple sums. Recall that KanadeRussell also conjectured $\mathrm{KR}_{4} \stackrel{\mathrm{PT}}{\sim} T_{2,3,5,8}^{(9)}$ and $\mathrm{KR}_{5} \stackrel{\mathrm{PT}}{\sim} T_{1,4,6,7}^{(9)}$ [27, 47], where
$\mathrm{KR}_{4}=\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid \lambda_{j}-\lambda_{j+2} \geq 3\right.$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)-2, P(\lambda, 2)$ holds and $\left.m_{1}(\lambda)=0\right\}$,
$\mathrm{KR}_{5}=\left\{\lambda \in \operatorname{Par} \mid \lambda_{j}-\lambda_{j+2} \geq 3\right.$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)-2, P(\lambda, 1)$ holds and $\left.m_{2}(\lambda) \leq 1\right\}$.
Proposition 1.2. For $1 \leq a \leq 5$, we have

$$
\sum_{\lambda \in \mathrm{KR}_{a}} x^{\ell(\lambda)} q^{|\lambda|}=\sum_{i, j, k \geq 0} \frac{q^{3\binom{i}{2}+8\binom{j}{2}+6\binom{k}{2}+4 i j+3 i k+6 j k+A_{a, 1} i+A_{a, 2} j+A_{a, 3} k}}{(q ; q)_{i}\left(q^{2} ; q^{2}\right)_{j}\left(q^{3} ; q^{3}\right)_{k}} x^{i+2 j+2 k}
$$

where $A_{1}=(1,4,3), A_{2}=(2,6,6), A_{3}=(3,8,6), A_{4}=(2,6,5)$ and $A_{5}=(1,6,4)$.
Because it is routine to derive a $q$-difference equation for the right (resp. left) hand side by a $q$-analog of Sister Celine's technique [45] (resp. by Andrews' linked partition ideals [1, 2] or the regularly linked sets by Takigiku and the author [53]), we omit an automatic proof of Proposition [1.2, See also §5, [52, §7.1] and [14, §4].
1.3. The main result. Recall that for a standard module (a.k.a., integrable highest weight module) $V$ of an affine Kac-Moody Lie algebra [24, the character $\chi\left(\Omega_{V}\right)$ of the vacuum space $\Omega_{V}$ with respect to the principal Heisenberg subalgebra (see also (2.2) is obtained by the Lepowsky numerator formula [39, Proposition 8.4].

Let $i=1$ or 2 and consider the level 3 standard module $V=V\left((i+1) \Lambda_{0}+(2-\right.$ i) $\Lambda_{1}$ ) of the affine algebra $\mathfrak{g}\left(A_{1}^{(1)}\right)$ (see Figure 11). Lepowsky-Milne observed that

$$
\chi\left(\Omega_{V}\right)=\frac{1}{\left(q^{i}, q^{5-i} ; q^{5}\right)_{\infty}}
$$

is the infinite product in the RR identities 37. In a seminal paper 39] (see also [38]), Lepowsky-Wilson showed (see [39, Theorem 10.4])

$$
\chi\left(\left(\Omega_{V}\right)^{[n]} /\left(\Omega_{V}\right)^{[n-1]}\right)=\frac{q^{n^{2}+n(i-1)}}{(q ; q)_{n}}
$$

for $n \geq 0$, where $\left(\Omega_{V}\right)^{[n]}$ is the associated $Z$-filtration, which coincides with the $s$-filtration $\left(\Omega_{V}\right)_{[n]}[39, \S 5]$ (and $\left(\Omega_{V}\right)^{[-1]}=\left(\Omega_{V}\right)_{[-1]}=\{0\}$ ). For that purpose, Lepowsky-Wilson proved that the set of Z-monomials parameterized by $\mathrm{RR}_{i}$

$$
\left\{Z_{-\lambda_{1}} \cdots Z_{-\lambda_{\ell}} v_{0} \mid\left(\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\ell}\right) \in \operatorname{RR}_{i}\right\}
$$

forms a basis of $\Omega_{V}$, where $v_{0}$ is a highest weight vector of $V$ and $Z_{i}$ is the $Z$-operator (see [39, (3.13)] and a review in §2) associated with the root $\beta_{1}$ of $A_{1}$.

Our main result gives a weaker vertex operator interpretation of the KanadeRussell conjecture in the following way.

Theorem 1.3. For $1 \leq a \leq 3$, the set of Z -monomials parameterized by $\mathrm{KR}_{a}$

$$
\left\{Z_{-\lambda_{1}} \cdots Z_{-\lambda_{\ell}} w_{0} \mid\left(\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\ell}\right) \in \mathrm{KR}_{a}\right\}
$$

spans $\Omega_{V\left(\Lambda^{(a)}\right)}$, where $Z_{i}$ is the $Z$-operator associated with the root $\beta_{1}$ of $D_{4}$ (see Figure [1), $w_{0}^{(a)}$ is a highest weight vector of the standard module $V\left(\Lambda^{(a)}\right)$ of type $D_{4}^{(3)}$ whose highest weight is given by $\Lambda^{(1)}=\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda^{(2)}=3 \Lambda_{0}$ and $\Lambda^{(3)}=\Lambda_{2}$.

An immediate consequence of Theorem 1.3 and the infinite product expression of $\chi\left(\Omega_{V\left(\Lambda^{(a)}\right)}\right)$ is that the Kanade-Russell Conjecture (Conjecture 1.1) is equivalent to the claim that the Z-monomials in Theorem 1.3 are linearly independent.
Corollary 1.4. We have $\left|\mathrm{KR}_{a} \cap \operatorname{Par}(n)\right| \geq\left|T_{2^{a-1}, 3,6,9-2^{a-1}}^{(9)} \cap \operatorname{Par}(n)\right|$ for $n \geq 0$ and $a=1,2,3$.

Our proof is a variant of [39, §6] and thus standard in vertex operator theory (see also similar calculations in [10, 11, 23, 25, 39, 40, 41, 43, 50, 51, [52, [55]) once a suitable set of relations between the $Z$-operators is available. In our case, four kinds of "generalized commutation relations" (see Theorem (3.2) which are sometimes called with adjectives "anti" and "partial" (see [22, §3] and §3.4, §3.5 §3.6, \$3.7) suffice. It would be interesting to find a higher structure (e.g., vertex operator algebra structures as in [21, 22]) in our calculation as well as to find a proof of linear independence (e.g., as in [11, 39, 41, 55]). We remark that the arguments in $\$ 4.7$, $8.8, \$ 4.9$ are related to overlap ambiguities (resp. critical pairs) in noncommutative Gröbner basis theory [6] (resp. theory of term rewriting [9, 44]).
1.4. An $A_{4}^{(2)}$ analog. The work of Lepowsky-Wilson 39] initiated intensive research on explicit realizations of the generalized RR identity

$$
\chi\left(\Omega_{V}\right)=\sum_{n \geq 0} \chi\left(\left(\Omega_{V}\right)^{[n]} /\left(\Omega_{V}\right)^{[n-1]}\right)
$$

for a standard module $V$ of type $X_{N}^{(r)}=\left(a_{i j}\right)_{i, j \in I}$ (see also [39, Theorem 7.5]). We give a brief review for types $A_{1}^{(1)}, A_{2}^{(2)}$ and $A_{2}^{(1)}$ with levels greater than 2.

For $A_{1}^{(1)}$ arbitrary level, Lepowsky-Wilson showed that the Z-monomials parameterized by partitions in the Andrews-Gordon-Bressoud partition theorem (see 48, $\S 3.2$ ] and the references therein) spans $\Omega_{V}$ [40, Corollary 13.2, Lemma 14.3], which were proven to be linearly independent by Meurman-Primc [41, §9, Appendix].

For $A_{2}^{(2)}$ level 3 (resp. 4), Capparelli [10] (resp. Nandi 43) obtained a set of X-monomials that spans $V$ as a module over the principal Heisenberg algebra. Subsequently, they were proven to be linearly independent by [3, 11, 55] (resp. [53]). On corresponding $q$-series identities, see [8, 35, 54] and the references therein.

For $A_{2}^{(1)}$ level 3, the author showed that a set of X-monomials parameterized by certain 2-color partitions (or bipartitions) forms a basis of $V$ as a module over the principal Heisenberg algebra [52, Theorem 1.3].

Although there is much literature devoted to higher levels, such as [12, 20, 29, 42, [54] (resp. [4, 13, 15, 17, 18, 26, 30, [52, 56, 58, 59, 60]) for $A_{2}^{(2)}$ (resp. $A_{2}^{(1)}$ ), relations to representation theory remain unknown except the aforementioned levels. As in [39, (6.8)], it is natural to expect that there exist certain $n\left(X_{N}^{(r)}\right)$-color partitions whose corresponding Z-monomials form a basis of $\Omega_{V}$, where (see [16, §8, §9])

$$
n\left(X_{N}^{(r)}\right)=\frac{\text { the number of roots of type } X_{N}}{\text { the } r \text {-twisted Coxeter number of } X_{N}}=|I|-1
$$

For example, $n\left(A_{1}^{(1)}\right)=n\left(A_{2}^{(2)}\right)=1$ and $n\left(A_{2}^{(1)}\right)=n\left(A_{4}^{(2)}\right)=n\left(D_{4}^{(3)}\right)=2$. Thus, the above results can be regarded as instances of that expectation. On the other hand, for low levels such as level 2, sometimes $\Omega_{V}$ has a basis of Z-monomials parameterized by certain partitions as in [23, 25, 50, 51, 52, 55]. While conjectural, Theorem 1.3 may be thought of as a similar example.

It would be interesting to find more examples similar to Theorem 1.3 for other types $A$ with $n(A)>1$ (or other levels). We note that, as shown in [23], "the Kanade-Russell conjecture modulo 12" [28, which is now a theorem [7, 46, can be understood as a kind of these examples for type $A_{9}^{(2)}$ level 2.

Theorem 1.5. Let $F$ be the set consisting of the following 13 partitions

$$
(1,1,1),(2,1,1),(2,2,1),(3,2,1),(3,3,1),(5,3,3),(4,4,1,1)
$$

$(5,4,1,1),(5,4,2,1),(5,5,2,1),(6,5,3,1,1),(6,6,3,1,1),(7,6,4,2,1)$
and define three sets $I_{1}, I_{2}, I_{3}$ as follows.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I_{1}=\{(1),(5,4,2,2),(9,8,6,4,2,2)\}, \quad I_{2}=\{(1,1),(2,2),(4,3,1)\} \\
& I_{3}=\{(1,1),(2,1),(2,2),(3,2),(3,3),(4,3,1),(4,4,1),(5,4,2),(6,5,3,1)\}
\end{aligned}
$$

For $1 \leq a \leq 3$, let $\mathrm{L}_{a}$ be the set of partitions that does not begin with $\boldsymbol{c}$ for $\boldsymbol{c} \in I_{a}$ and does not match $\left(b_{1}+k, \ldots, b_{p}+k\right)$ for $\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{p}\right) \in F$ and $k \geq 0$ (see \$5). We have $\mathrm{L}_{1} \stackrel{\mathrm{PT}}{\sim} T_{2,3,4,5,11,12,13,14}^{(16)}, \mathrm{L}_{2} \stackrel{\mathrm{PT}}{\sim} T_{1}^{(2)}$ and $\mathrm{L}_{3} \stackrel{\mathrm{PT}}{\sim} T_{1,4,6,7,9,10,12,15}^{(16)}$.

We arrived at the statement of Theorem 1.5 by checking

$$
\left\{Z_{-\lambda_{1}} \cdots Z_{-\lambda_{\ell}} u_{0} \mid\left(\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\ell}\right) \in \mathrm{L}_{a} \cap \operatorname{Par}(n)\right\}
$$

is a set of linearly independent vectors for $1 \leq a \leq 3$ and $0 \leq n \leq 17-2^{a-1}$. Here, $\mathrm{Z}_{i}$ is the $Z$-operator associated with the root $\beta_{1}$ of $A_{4}$ (see Figure 1), and $u_{0}$ is a highest weight vector of the standard module $V\left(\Upsilon^{(a)}\right)$ of type $A_{4}^{(2)}$ whose highest weight is given by $\Upsilon^{(1)}=3 \Lambda_{0}, \Upsilon^{(2)}=\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{1}$ and $\Upsilon^{(3)}=\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{2}$.

After submission to arXiv of the first version of this paper, where Theorem 1.5 was stated as a conjecture, we learned from Matthew Russell that Theorem 1.5 for $a=1$ is a theorem due to Andrews-van Ekeren-Heluani [5, Theorem 3]. In $\$ 5.4$ we point out that the case $a=2,3$ is also easily proven based on their work [5, Proposition 4.4]. Interestingly, they seemed to find Theorem 1.5 for $a=1$ via the
simple vertex algebra associated with the $(3,4)$ Virasoro minimal model of central charge $c=1 / 2$, unlike via the level 3 standard modules of type $A_{4}^{(2)}$.

Organization of the paper. We review the $Z$-operators in $\S 2$ establish the four relations among them in $\S 3$ and prove Theorem 1.3 in $\$ 4$ In $\$ 5$ we advertise the regularly linked sets 53 by demonstrating an automatic derivation of a $q$-difference equation for the generating function of $\mathrm{L}_{a}$ (see Theorem 5.5). By using Theorem 5.5 and [5, Proposition 4.4], we show Theorem 1.5 for $a=2,3$ in $\$ 5.4$.

## 2. The $Z$-operators

In this section, we fix an affine Dynkin diagram $X_{N}^{(r)}$ of type $A D E$.
2.1. The principal automorphisms. Consider a lattice $L=\mathbb{Z}^{N}$ with a symmetric bilinear form $\langle\rangle:, L \times L \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ given by $\langle\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{y}\rangle={ }^{t} \boldsymbol{x} X_{N} \boldsymbol{y}$. Then, the standard basis $\left\{\boldsymbol{e}_{1}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{e}_{N}\right\}$ of $L$, which we write as $\left\{\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{N}\right\}$, is a set of simple roots for the set of roots $\Phi=\{\beta \in L \mid\langle\beta, \beta\rangle=2\}$. The twisted Coxeter automorphism (see [16, §8]) $\nu: L \rightarrow L$ is defined by $\nu=\sigma_{i_{1}} \cdots \sigma_{i_{j}} \sigma^{\prime}$, where
(1) $\sigma_{i}: L \rightarrow L, \boldsymbol{x} \mapsto \boldsymbol{x}-\left\langle\boldsymbol{x}, \beta_{i}\right\rangle \beta_{i}$ is a reflection,
(2) $\sigma^{\prime}: L \rightarrow L, \beta_{i} \mapsto \beta_{\sigma(i)}$ is the Dynkin diagram automorphism of order $r$ induced from that on the set of indices $\sigma:\{1, \ldots, N\} \rightarrow\{1, \ldots, N\}$, and
(3) $\left\{i_{1}, \ldots, i_{j}\right\}$ is a set of complete representatives for the orbits of the action of the cyclic group $\left\{\sigma^{s} \mid 0 \leq s<r\right\}$ of order $r$ on the set of indices $\{1, \ldots, N\}$.
In the following, we fix an integer $m$ to the order of $\nu$ and fix a $m$-th primitive root of unity $\omega$. As in [16, (5.1)], we define a map $\varepsilon: L \times L \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\times}$by

$$
\varepsilon\left(\beta, \beta^{\prime}\right)=\prod_{p=1}^{m-1}\left(1-\omega^{-p}\right)^{\left\langle\nu^{p}(\beta), \beta^{\prime}\right\rangle}
$$

Let $\mathfrak{a}=\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} L$ be a complexification of $L$ and define a complex vector space $\mathfrak{g}=\mathfrak{a} \oplus \bigoplus_{\beta \in \Phi} \mathbb{C} x_{\beta}$, where $x_{\beta}$ is a formal symbol attached to a root $\beta$. It is known that $\mathfrak{g}$ with brackets determined by

$$
\left[\beta_{i}, x_{\beta}\right]=\left\langle\beta_{i}, \beta\right\rangle x_{\beta}=-\left[x_{\beta}, \beta_{i}\right], \quad\left[x_{\beta}, x_{\beta^{\prime}}\right]= \begin{cases}\varepsilon(-\beta, \beta) \beta & \left(\text { if }\left\langle\beta, \beta^{\prime}\right\rangle=-2\right) \\ \varepsilon\left(\beta, \beta^{\prime}\right) x_{\beta+\beta^{\prime}} & \text { (if } \left.\left\langle\beta, \beta^{\prime}\right\rangle=-1\right) \\ 0 & \text { (if } \left.\left\langle\beta, \beta^{\prime}\right\rangle \geq 0\right)\end{cases}
$$

where $\beta, \beta^{\prime} \in \Phi$ and $1 \leq i \leq N$, is isomorphic to the Kac-Moody Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}\left(X_{N}\right)$ of type $X_{N}$. The form $\langle$,$\rangle is extended to \mathfrak{g}$ by $\left\langle\beta_{i}, x_{\beta}\right\rangle=0=\left\langle x_{\beta}, \beta_{i}\right\rangle$ and $\left\langle x_{\beta}, x_{\beta^{\prime}}\right\rangle=\varepsilon\left(\beta, \beta^{\prime}\right) \delta_{\beta+\beta^{\prime}, 0}$. The map $\nu$ is also extended to $\mathfrak{g}$ by $\nu\left(x_{\beta}\right)=x_{\nu(\beta)}$. Then, $\nu$ is a principal automorphism of $\mathfrak{g}$, and $\langle$,$\rangle is a non-degenerate invariant$ form which is $\nu$-invariant (see [16, §6, §9]).
2.2. The Lepowsky-Wilson $Z$-algebras. The $\nu$-twisted affinization $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ given by

$$
\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}=\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left(\mathfrak{g}_{(i)} \otimes t^{i}\right) \oplus \mathbb{C} c \oplus \mathbb{C} d
$$

where $\mathfrak{g}_{(i)}=\left\{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \nu^{i}(x)=\omega^{i} x\right\}$, with brackets determined by

$$
\left[x \otimes t^{i}, y \otimes t^{j}\right]=[x, y] \otimes t^{i+j}+\frac{i \delta_{i+j, 0}}{m}\langle x, y\rangle c, \quad\left[d, x \otimes t^{i}\right]=t x \otimes t^{i}
$$

and by the condition that $c$ is central, is isomorphic to $\mathfrak{g}\left(X_{N}^{(r)}\right)$ (see [24, Chapter 8] and [16, Proposition 9.4]).

For $k \in \mathbb{C}^{\times}$, as in 39, §3], let $C_{k}$ be the full subcategory of the category of $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$-modules whose objects $V$ satisfy the following three conditions.
(1) $c$ acts as a scalar multiplication by $k$, i.e., $V$ has level $k$.
(2) $V$ has a simultaneous eigenspace decomposition $V=\bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{t}^{*}} V_{\lambda}$ with respect to the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{t}=\left(\mathfrak{g}_{(0)} \otimes 1\right) \oplus \mathbb{C} c \oplus \mathbb{C} d$ (see [16, §9.3]).
(3) For $z \in \mathbb{C}$, there exists $i_{0} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $V_{z+i}=\{0\}$ for $i>i_{0}$.

For an object $V$ in $\mathrm{C}_{k}$, the Lepowsky-Wilson $Z$-algebra $Z_{V}$ (in the principal picture) is defined to be the subalgebra of End $V$ generated by $c, d$ and $Z_{i}(\beta)$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\beta \in \Phi$ [39, p.222], where $\mathrm{pr}_{i}: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{(i)}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the projection and

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z(\beta, \zeta) & =\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} Z_{i}(\beta) \zeta^{i}=E^{-}(\beta, \zeta, k) X(\beta, \zeta) E^{+}(\beta, \zeta, k) \\
X(\beta, \zeta) & =\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left(\operatorname{pr}_{i}\left(x_{\beta}\right) \otimes t^{i}\right) \zeta^{i} \\
E^{ \pm}(\beta, \zeta, r) & =\sum_{ \pm i \geq 0} E_{i}^{ \pm}(\beta) \zeta^{i}=\exp \left(m \sum_{ \pm j>0} \frac{\mathrm{pr}_{j}(\beta) \otimes t^{j}}{r j} \zeta^{j}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

As in [39, Proposition 4.7], the vacuum space $\Omega_{V}$ is defined as

$$
\Omega_{V}=\left\{v \in V \mid a v=0 \text { for } a \in \widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{+}\right\}
$$

where $\widehat{\mathfrak{a}}=[\widetilde{\mathfrak{a}}, \widehat{\mathfrak{a}}]=\widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{+} \oplus \widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{-} \oplus \mathbb{C} c$ is the principal Heisenberg subalgebra defined by

$$
\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}=\widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{+} \oplus \widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{-} \oplus \mathbb{C} c \oplus \mathbb{C} d, \quad \widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{ \pm}=\bigoplus_{ \pm i>0}\left(\mathfrak{g}_{(i)} \cap \mathfrak{a}\right) \otimes t^{i}
$$

For a complex vector space $U$, let $U\left\{\zeta_{1}, \ldots, \zeta_{r}\right\}$ be the complex vector space of formal Laurent series in the variables $\zeta_{1}, \ldots, \zeta_{r}$ with coefficients in $U$, i.e.,

$$
U\left\{\zeta_{1}, \ldots, \zeta_{r}\right\}=\left\{\sum_{n_{1}, \ldots, n_{r} \in \mathbb{Z}} u_{n_{1}, \ldots, n_{r}} \zeta_{1}^{n_{1}} \cdots \zeta_{r}^{u_{r}} \mid u_{n_{1}, \ldots, n_{r}} \in U\right\}
$$

The equalities in the following citations are those in $\operatorname{End}(V)\left\{\zeta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right\}$ or $\operatorname{End}(V)\{\zeta\}$, where $V$ is an object in $\mathrm{C}_{k}, \beta, \beta^{\prime} \in \Phi$ and $r, s \geq 1, p \in \mathbb{Z}$. As usual, the formal delta is defined by $\delta(\zeta)=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \zeta^{n}$ and let $D=\zeta \cdot d / d \zeta$ so that $D \delta(\zeta)=\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} n \zeta^{n}$.

Theorem 2.1 ([39, Theorem 3.10], [16, Theorem 7.3]).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& F_{\beta, \beta^{\prime}}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta, \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta^{\prime}, \zeta_{2}\right)-F_{\beta^{\prime}, \beta}\left(\zeta_{2} / \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta^{\prime}, \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta, \zeta_{1}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{m} \sum_{p \in C_{-1}} \varepsilon\left(\nu^{p}(\beta), \beta^{\prime}\right) Z\left(\nu^{p}(\beta)+\beta^{\prime}, \zeta_{2}\right) \delta\left(\omega^{-p} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right)+\frac{k\left\langle x_{\beta}, x_{-\beta}\right\rangle}{m^{2}} \sum_{p \in C_{-2}} D \delta\left(\omega^{-p} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \\
& \text { where } C_{\ell}=\left\{0 \leq p<m \mid\left\langle\nu^{p}(\beta), \beta^{\prime}\right\rangle=\ell\right\} \text { and } F_{\beta, \beta^{\prime}}(x)=\prod_{p=0}^{m-1}\left(1-\omega^{-p} x\right)^{\left\langle\nu^{p}(\beta), \beta^{\prime}\right\rangle / k}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proposition 2.2 ([39, Proposition 3.4]).

$$
E^{+}\left(\beta, \zeta_{1}, r\right) E^{-}\left(\beta^{\prime}, \zeta_{2}, s\right)=E^{-}\left(\beta^{\prime}, \zeta_{2}, s\right) E^{+}\left(\beta, \zeta_{1}, r\right) F_{\beta, \beta^{\prime}}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right)^{1 / r s}
$$

Proposition 2.3 ([39, Theorem 3.3], [16, Theorem 7.2]). $Z\left(\nu^{p}(\beta), \zeta\right)=Z\left(\beta, \omega^{p} \zeta\right)$.
Proposition 2.4 ([39, Proposition 3.2.(3)]). $D E^{ \pm}(\beta, \zeta, r)=\frac{m}{r} \beta^{ \pm}(\zeta) E^{ \pm}(\beta, \zeta, r)$, where $\beta^{ \pm}(\zeta)=\sum_{ \pm j>0}\left(\operatorname{pr}_{j}(\beta) \otimes t^{j}\right) \zeta^{j}$.
2.3. The basic representations. As shown in [16, Theorem 9.7], giving (an isomorphism class of) a basic representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ is the same as giving a $\nu$-invariant (i.e., $\rho(\nu(\beta))=\rho(\beta)$ for $\beta \in L$ ) group homomorphism $\rho: L \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\times}$. The corresponding basic representation $V^{(\rho)}$ is given by the underlying $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$-module $V=$ Ind $\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}_{+} \oplus \mathbb{C} c \oplus \mathbb{C} d \mathbb{C}\left(\cong U\left(\widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{-}\right)\right.$), where $\widehat{\mathfrak{a}}_{+} \oplus \mathbb{C} d$ (resp. c) acts trivially (resp. as the identity) on $\mathbb{C}$ and the action by $X(\beta, \zeta)=\frac{\rho(\beta)}{m} E^{-}(-\beta, \zeta, 1) E^{+}(-\beta, \zeta, 1)$.

## 3. The (partial) generalized (anti)commutation relations

3.1. The affine type $D_{4}^{(3)}$. We apply the general theory reviewed in $\S 2$ to $D_{4}^{(3)}$ (see Figure 11). Our convection of the Dynkin diagram automorphism $\sigma$ is given by $\sigma(1)=3, \sigma(3)=4, \sigma(4)=1, \sigma(2)=2$, and that of the twisted Coxeter automorphism is given by $\nu=\sigma_{1} \sigma_{2} \sigma^{\prime}$.

Then, the order $m$ of $\nu$ is 12 , and the set of roots $\left\{\beta_{j}^{(i)} \mid i=1,2\right.$ and $\left.0 \leq j<m\right\}$, where $\beta_{j}^{(i)}=\nu^{j}\left(\beta_{i}\right)$ is given by $\nu^{6}=-\mathrm{id}$ and

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\beta_{1}^{(1)}=\beta_{1}+\beta_{2}+\beta_{3}, & \beta_{2}^{(1)}=\beta_{1}+\beta_{2}+\beta_{3}+\beta_{4}, & \beta_{3}^{(1)}=\beta_{1}+2 \beta_{2}+\beta_{3}+\beta_{4} \\
\beta_{4}^{(1)}=\beta_{2}+\beta_{3}+\beta_{4}, & \beta_{5}^{(1)}=\beta_{2}+\beta_{4}, & \beta_{1}^{(2)}=-\beta_{1}-\beta_{2} \\
\beta_{2}^{(2)}=-\beta_{3}, \quad \beta_{5}^{(2)}=-\beta_{4}, & \beta_{3}^{(2)}=-\beta_{1}-\beta_{2}-\beta_{4}, & \beta_{4}^{(2)}=-\beta_{2}-\beta_{3}
\end{array}
$$

3.2. Summary. Recall $m=12$. As in $\S 2, \omega$ is a fixed primitive $m$-th root of unity, a solution of the $m$-th cyclotomic polynomial $\Phi_{m}(x)=x^{4}-x^{2}+1$. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{S}=4+4 \omega-2 \omega^{3}, \quad \mathrm{~T}=-24-28 \omega+14 \omega^{3}, \quad \mathrm{U}=42+48 \omega-24 \omega^{3} \\
& \mathrm{M}=-6-8 \omega+4 \omega^{3}, \quad \mathrm{~N}=14+16 \omega-8 \omega^{3}, \quad \mathrm{P}=4-8 \omega^{2}-6 \omega^{3}, \quad \mathrm{Q}=2-4 \omega^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition 3.1. For integers $a_{0}, \ldots, a_{5}$, we define a formal power series

$$
H_{a_{0}, \ldots, a_{5}}(x)=\prod_{p=0}^{5}\left(1-\omega^{-p} x\right)^{a_{p} / 3}\left(1+\omega^{-p} x\right)^{-a_{p} / 3}
$$

We also define $G_{i}(x)=\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(i)} x^{p}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 6$ by

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
G_{1}=H_{2,1,1,0,-1,-1}, & G_{2}=H_{-1,1,1,0,-1,-1}, \quad G_{3}=H_{-1,1,-2,0,2,-1} \\
G_{4}=H_{2,-2,-2,0,2,2}, & G_{5}=H_{2,-2,1,0,-1,2}, \quad G_{6}=G_{4}-\frac{P}{Q} G_{5}
\end{array}
$$

The four relations in Theorem 3.2 will be proven in this order in $\$ 3.4, ~ \$ 3.5, ~ \S 3.6$ $\$ 3.7$ after preparation in $\$ 3.3$.
Theorem 3.2. Let $W=\left(V^{(\rho)}\right)^{\otimes 3}$ be the triple tensor product of the basic representation $V^{(\rho)}$ of type $D_{4}^{(3)}$, where $\rho: \mathbb{Z}^{4} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\times}$is the trivial group homomorphism. Put $Z_{i}=Z_{i}\left(\beta_{1}\right)$ and $Z_{i}^{\prime}=Z_{i}\left(\beta_{2}\right)$. In the $Z$-algebra $Z_{W}$, for $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have
$\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(1)}\left(\mathbf{Z}_{A-p} \mathbf{Z}_{B+p}-\mathbf{Z}_{B-p} \mathbf{Z}_{A+p}\right)$
$=\frac{\varepsilon\left(\nu^{4} \beta_{1}, \beta_{1}\right)}{m}\left(\omega^{-2 A+2 B}-\omega^{2 A-2 B}\right) \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}+\frac{\varepsilon\left(\nu^{5} \beta_{1}, \beta_{1}\right)}{m}\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}-\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right) \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}^{\prime}+\frac{3 \varepsilon\left(\beta_{1},-\beta_{1}\right)}{m^{2}} \delta_{A+B, 0} A(-1)^{A}$,
$\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(2)}\left(\mathbf{Z}_{A-p} \mathbf{Z}_{B+p}+\mathbf{Z}_{B-p} \mathbf{Z}_{A+p}\right)$
$=\frac{\mathrm{S}}{m}\left(\omega^{-2 A+2 B}+\omega^{2 A-2 B}\right) \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}+\frac{\mathrm{T}}{m}\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}+\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right) \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}^{\prime}+\frac{3 \mathrm{U}}{m^{2}} \delta_{A+B, 0}(-1)^{A}+\frac{4}{m}(-1)^{A+B} \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}$.

If $A+B$ is not divisible by 3, then we have
$\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(3)}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{A-p} \mathrm{Z}_{B+p}+\mathrm{Z}_{B-p} \mathrm{Z}_{A+p}\right)=\frac{\mathrm{M}}{m}\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}+\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right) \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}^{\prime}+\frac{3 \mathrm{~N}}{m^{2}} \delta_{A+B, 0}(-1)^{A}+\frac{12}{m}(-1)^{A+B} \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}$,
$\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(6)}\left(\mathrm{Z}_{A-p} \mathrm{Z}_{B+p}-\mathrm{Z}_{B-p} \mathrm{Z}_{A+p}\right)=\frac{\mathrm{P}}{m}\left(\omega^{-2 A+2 B}-\omega^{2 A-2 B}\right) \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}+\frac{12}{m^{2}}\left(1-\frac{3 \mathrm{P}}{\mathrm{Q}}\right) \delta_{A+B, 0}(-1)^{A} A$.
3.3. Auxiliary Fourier expansions. Let ${ }^{-}: \mathbb{C}\{x\} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\{x\}$ be a $\mathbb{C}$-linear map defined by $\overline{\sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} c_{p} x^{p}}=\sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} c_{p} x^{-p}$, which is also a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism when restricted to $\mathbb{C}[[x]]$ (or $\mathbb{C}\left[\left[x^{-1}\right]\right]$ ). The following results are elementary complex analysis exercises, and we omit the detail (see also [55, Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.5]).

Proposition 3.3.

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{1}^{2} G_{2}+\overline{G_{1}^{2} G_{2}} & =\mathrm{S}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{4} x\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{-4} x\right)\right)+\mathrm{T}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{5} x\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{-5} x\right)\right)+\mathrm{U} \delta(-x), \\
G_{1}^{-1} G_{2}+\overline{G_{1}^{-1} G_{2}} & =2 \delta(x), \\
G_{1}^{2} G_{3}+\overline{G_{1}^{2} G_{3}} & =\mathrm{M}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{5} x\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{-5} x\right)\right)+\mathrm{N} \delta(-x), \\
G_{1}^{-1} G_{3}+\overline{G_{1}^{-1} G_{3}} & =6 \delta(x)-2\left(\delta\left(\omega^{2} x\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{-2} x\right)\right), \\
G_{1}^{2} G_{4}-\overline{G_{1}^{2} G_{4}} & =4 D \delta(-x), \\
G_{1}^{-1} G_{4}-\overline{G_{1}^{-1} G_{4}} & =\mathrm{P}\left(\delta(\omega x)-\frac{1}{3} \delta\left(\omega^{2} x\right)+\frac{1}{3} \delta\left(\omega^{-2} x\right)-\delta\left(\omega^{-1} x\right)\right), \\
G_{1}^{2} G_{5}-\overline{G_{1}^{2} G_{5}} & =12 D \delta(-x)+\mathrm{Q}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{4} x\right)-\delta\left(\omega^{-4} x\right)\right), \\
G_{1}^{-1} G_{5}-\overline{G_{1}^{-1} G_{5}} & =\mathrm{Q}\left(\delta(\omega x)-\delta\left(\omega^{-1} x\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

3.4. A proof of the generalized commutation relation. Apply Theorem 2.1 for $k=3$ and $\beta=\beta^{\prime}=\beta_{1}$ by using $F_{\beta, \beta^{\prime}}=G_{1}$ and $C_{-1}=\{4,5,7,8\}$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \nu^{ \pm 4}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=\nu^{ \pm 2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \quad \nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=\nu^{9}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \quad \nu^{7}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=\nu^{4}\left(\beta_{2}\right) \\
& \varepsilon\left(\nu^{4}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)=\mathrm{P}=-\varepsilon\left(\nu^{-4}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right), \quad \varepsilon\left(\nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)=-52+104 \omega^{2}+90 \omega^{3}=-\varepsilon\left(\nu^{7}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

We get the result by comparing the coefficients of $\zeta_{1}^{A} \zeta_{2}^{B}$ of the identity in Theorem 2.1 using Proposition 2.3.
3.5. A proof of the generalized anticommutation relation. As in 39, Lemma 9.1], for $\gamma \in \Phi$, we have $Z(\gamma, \zeta)=Z^{(1)}(\gamma, \zeta)+Z^{(2)}(\gamma, \zeta)+Z^{(3)}(\gamma, \zeta)$, where, for $1 \leq j \leq 3, m Z^{(j)}(\gamma, \zeta)$ is the tensor product of three factors, the $i(\neq j)$-th (resp. $j$-th) tensorand being (see also [55, (3.6), (3.7), (3.8)] and §2.2, \$2.3)

$$
E^{-}(\gamma, \zeta, 3) E^{+}(\gamma, \zeta, 3) \quad\left(\text { resp. } E^{-}(\gamma, \zeta, 3)^{-2} E^{+}(\gamma, \zeta, 3)^{-2}\right)
$$

Recall $F_{\beta_{1}, \beta_{1}}=G_{1}$ as in $\$ 3.4$ where $F_{\beta, \beta^{\prime}}$ is defined as in Theorem 2.1 for $k=3$. By Proposition 2.2 together with

$$
\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3} \cdot 2+\frac{-2}{3} \cdot \frac{-2}{3}=\frac{2}{3}, \quad \frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{-2}{3}+\frac{-2}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{3}=-\frac{1}{3}
$$

we see the following two results.
First, as in [55, (3.26)], we have $Z^{(j)}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) Z^{(j)}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{m^{2}} F_{\beta_{1}, \beta_{1}}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right)^{2} \mathrm{I}^{(j)}$, where $\mathbf{I}^{(j)}$ is the tensor product of three factors, the $i$-th tensorand being

$$
E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right)^{1-3 \delta_{i j}} E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right)^{1-3 \delta_{i j}} E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right)^{1-3 \delta_{i j}} E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right)^{1-3 \delta_{i j}}
$$

Here, $1 \leq i \leq 3$ and $\delta_{i j}$ is the Kronecker delta.
Second, for $1 \leq s \neq t \leq 3$, take a unique $1 \leq u \leq 3$ such that $\{s, t, u\}=\{1,2,3\}$. Then, as in [55, (3.34)], we have $Z^{(s)}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) Z^{(t)}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{m^{2}} F_{\beta_{1}, \beta_{1}}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right)^{-1} \mathrm{~J}^{(s, t)}$, where $\mathrm{J}^{(s, t)}$ is the tensor product of three factors, the $s$-th tensorand being

$$
E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right)^{-2} E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right) E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right)^{-2} E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right),
$$

the $t$-th tensorand being

$$
E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right) E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right)^{-2} E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right) E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right)^{-2}
$$

and the $u$-th tensorand being

$$
E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right) E^{-}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right) E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}, 3\right) E^{+}\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right)
$$

Let $\mathbf{I}=\mathbf{I}^{(1)}+\mathbf{I}^{(2)}+\mathbf{I}^{(3)}$ and $\mathbf{J}=\sum_{1 \leq s \neq t \leq 3} \mathbf{J}^{(s, t)}$. By Proposition 3.3 and in virtue of "the residue theorem" 39, Proposition 3.9.(2)], we see as in [55, (3.26), (3.34)]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{2}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)+G_{2}\left(\zeta_{2} / \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) \\
& = \\
& =\frac{\mathrm{S}}{m^{2}}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{4} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{I}\left(\omega^{-4} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{-4} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{I}\left(\omega^{4} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)\right)+\frac{\mathrm{U}}{m^{2}} \delta\left(-\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{I}\left(-\zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{\mathrm{T}}{m^{2}}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{5} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{I}\left(\omega^{-5} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{-5} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{I}\left(\omega^{5} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)\right)+\frac{2}{m^{2}} \delta\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{J}\left(\zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{I}^{(j)}\left(-\zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=1$ (see also [55, (3.29)]) and $\mathbf{J}^{(s, t)}\left(\zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=$ $m Z^{(u)}\left(-\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)$ (see also [55, (3.36)]). It is also easy to see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{I}^{(j)}\left(\omega^{-4} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=m Z^{(j)}\left(\nu^{-2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \zeta_{2}\right), \quad \mathbf{I}^{(j)}\left(\omega^{4} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=m Z^{(j)}\left(\nu^{2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \zeta_{2}\right), \\
& \mathbf{I}^{(j)}\left(\omega^{-5} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=m Z^{(j)}\left(\nu^{4}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \zeta_{2}\right), \quad \mathbf{I}^{(j)}\left(\omega^{5} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=m Z^{(j)}\left(\nu^{9}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \zeta_{2}\right),
\end{aligned}
$$

by Proposition 2.3 and $\nu^{\mp 4}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=\nu^{\mp 2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \nu^{-5}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=\nu^{4}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=$ $\nu^{9}\left(\beta_{2}\right)$ (see also [55, (3.27), (3.28)] and 83.1). Thus, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{2}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)+G_{2}\left(\zeta_{2} / \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) \\
& =\frac{\mathrm{S}}{m} \delta\left(\omega^{-4} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)+\frac{\mathrm{S}}{m} \delta\left(\omega^{4} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{-2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)+\frac{3 \mathrm{U}}{m^{2}} \delta\left(-\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \\
& +\frac{\mathrm{T}}{m} \delta\left(\omega^{-5} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{9}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)+\frac{\mathrm{T}}{m} \delta\left(\omega^{5} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{4}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)+\frac{4}{m} \delta\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(-\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We get the result by comparing the coefficients of $\zeta_{1}^{A} \zeta_{2}^{B}$ as in $\$ 3.4$,
3.6. A proof of the partial generalized anticommutation relation. As in \$3.5. $G_{3}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)+G_{3}\left(\zeta_{2} / \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right)$ is expanded as
$\frac{3 \mathrm{~N}}{m^{2}} \delta\left(-\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right)+\frac{\mathrm{M}}{m}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{-5} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{9}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{5} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{4}\left(\beta_{2}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)\right)$
$+\frac{12}{m} \delta\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(-\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)-\frac{2}{m^{2}}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{2} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{J}\left(\omega^{-2} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)+\delta\left(\omega^{-2} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{J}\left(\omega^{2} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)\right)$.
Let $\mathrm{J}\left(\omega^{ \pm 2} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{~K}_{i}^{ \pm} \zeta_{2}^{i}$. In order to complete the proof, it is enough to show $\mathrm{K}_{i}^{ \pm}=0$ when $i \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}$. The argument is the same as [55, Corollary 3.9]. We duplicate it below for completeness.

We see that $\mathrm{K}^{(s, t)}\left(\zeta_{2}\right)=\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathrm{~K}_{i}^{(s, t)} \zeta_{2}^{i}$ defined as $\mathrm{J}^{(s, t)}\left(\omega^{-2} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)$ is the tensor product of three factors, the $v$-th tensorand being $E^{-}\left(\gamma_{v}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right) E^{+}\left(\gamma_{v}, \zeta_{2}, 3\right)$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{s} & =-2 \nu^{-2}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=\beta_{1}+2 \beta_{2}+2 \beta_{3}+2 \beta_{4} \\
\gamma_{t} & =\nu^{-2}\left(\beta_{1}\right)-2 \beta_{1}=-2 \beta_{1}-\beta_{2}-\beta_{3}-\beta_{4} \\
\gamma_{u} & =\nu^{-2}\left(\beta_{1}\right)+\beta_{1}=\beta_{1}-\beta_{2}-\beta_{3}-\beta_{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

for $v=s, t, u$. Note that $\gamma_{t}=\nu^{4}\left(\gamma_{s}\right)$ and $\gamma_{u}=\nu^{-4}\left(\gamma_{s}\right)$. Thus, we have

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{K}^{(3,1)}\left(\zeta_{2}\right)=\mathrm{K}^{(1,2)}\left(\omega^{4} \zeta_{2}\right), & \mathrm{K}^{(2,3)}\left(\zeta_{2}\right)=\mathrm{K}^{(1,2)}\left(\omega^{-4} \zeta_{2}\right), \\
\mathrm{K}^{(3,2)}\left(\zeta_{2}\right)=\mathrm{K}^{(2,1)}\left(\omega^{4} \zeta_{2}\right), & \mathrm{K}^{(1,3)}\left(\zeta_{2}\right)=\mathrm{K}^{(2,1)}\left(\omega^{-4} \zeta_{2}\right),
\end{array}
$$

and $\mathrm{J}\left(\omega^{-2} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)=\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}\left(1+\omega^{4 i}+\omega^{-4 i}\right)\left(\mathrm{K}_{i}^{(1,2)}+\mathrm{K}_{i}^{(2,1)}\right) \zeta_{2}^{i}$, which shows $\mathrm{K}_{i}^{-}=0$ when $i \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}$. The proof of $\mathrm{K}_{i}^{+}=0$ when $i \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}$ is the same.
3.7. A proof of the partial generalized commutation relation. We note $D \delta\left(-\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{I}^{(j)}=D \delta\left(-\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right)$ by the same argument as [55, Proposition 3.10] in virtue of "the residue theorem" [39, Proposition 3.9.(3)], Proposition 2.4 and $\frac{-2}{3}+\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{3}=0$ (see also [55, Lemma 3.6]). Thus, as in 33.6] we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& G_{6}\left(\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right)-G_{6}\left(\zeta_{2} / \zeta_{1}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\beta_{1}, \zeta_{1}\right) \\
& =\frac{12}{m^{2}}\left(1-\frac{3 \mathrm{P}}{\mathrm{Q}}\right) D \delta\left(-\zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right)+\frac{\mathrm{P}}{m}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{-4} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)-\delta\left(\omega^{4} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) Z\left(\nu^{-2}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \zeta_{2}\right)\right) \\
& \quad+\frac{\mathrm{P}}{3 m^{2}}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{-2} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{J}\left(\omega^{2} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)-\delta\left(\omega^{2} \zeta_{1} / \zeta_{2}\right) \mathrm{J}\left(\omega^{-2} \zeta_{2}, \zeta_{2}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

because by Proposition 3.3 we know

$$
\begin{aligned}
G_{1}^{2} G_{6}-\overline{G_{1}^{2} G_{6}} & =4\left(1-\frac{3 \mathrm{P}}{\mathrm{Q}}\right) D \delta(-x)-\mathrm{P}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{4} x\right)-\delta\left(\omega^{-4} x\right)\right), \\
G_{1}^{-1} G_{6}-\overline{G_{1}^{-1} G_{6}} & =\frac{\mathrm{P}}{3}\left(\delta\left(\omega^{-2} x\right)-\delta\left(\omega^{2} x\right)\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We get the result by comparing the coefficients of $\zeta_{1}^{A} \zeta_{2}^{B}$ as in $\$ 3.6$.

## 4. A proof of Theorem 1.3

Recall $\Lambda^{(a)}$ and $w_{0}^{(a)}$ for $1 \leq a \leq 3$ in Theorem 1.3 and let $V=V\left(\Lambda^{(a)}\right)$. By $\chi\left(\Omega_{V\left(\Lambda^{(a)}\right)}\right)=1 /\left(q^{2^{a-1}}, q^{3}, q^{6}, q^{9-2^{a-1}} ; q^{9}\right)_{\infty}$, we have $Z_{-1} w_{0}^{(2)}=0, Z_{-1} w_{0}^{(3)}=0$ and $Z_{-2} w_{0}^{(3)}=0$.
4.1. An elimination of $Z_{i}^{\prime}$. In virtue of [39, Theorem 7.1], we have $\Omega_{V}=Z_{V} w_{0}^{(a)}$. By substituting $A=B$ or $A=B+1$ of the second equality in Theorem 3.2(i.e., the generalized anticommutation relation proven in $\S(3.5)$, we see that $\Omega_{V}=Z_{V}^{(1)} w_{0}^{(a)}$ holds, where $Z_{V}^{(1)}$ is a subalgebra of $Z_{V}$ generated by $Z_{i}$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

### 4.2. A Synopsis.

Definition 4.1 ([39, §6], [55, §4]). For $\boldsymbol{i}=\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{\ell}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\ell}$ and $\boldsymbol{j}=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{\ell^{\prime}}\right) \in$ $\mathbb{Z}^{\ell^{\prime}}$, where $\ell$ and $\ell^{\prime}$ are non-negative integers, we say that $\boldsymbol{i}$ is higher than $\boldsymbol{j}$ (denoted by $\boldsymbol{i}>\boldsymbol{j}$ ) if $\ell<\ell^{\prime}$ or

$$
\ell=\ell^{\prime}, \boldsymbol{i} \neq \boldsymbol{j} \text { and } i_{p}+\cdots+i_{\ell} \geq j_{p}+\cdots+j_{\ell} \text { for } 1 \leq p \leq \ell
$$

For $\boldsymbol{j}=\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{\ell^{\prime}}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\ell^{\prime}}$, we define $T(\boldsymbol{j})$ (resp. $T^{=}(\boldsymbol{j})$ ), which is also denoted by $T\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{\ell^{\prime}}\right)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.T^{=}\left(j_{1}, \ldots, j_{\ell^{\prime}}\right)\right)$, to be a vector space spanned by all $Z_{i_{1}} \cdots \mathrm{Z}_{i_{\ell}}$ with $\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{\ell}\right)>\boldsymbol{j}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{\ell}\right) \geq \boldsymbol{j}\right)$. In order to prove Theorem 1.3) it is enough to show the following seven statements.
(F1) For $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $A>B$, we have $\mathbf{Z}_{A} \mathbf{Z}_{B} \in \mathbf{T}(A, B)+R_{k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(F2) For $A \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $2 A \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}, \mathrm{Z}_{A} \mathrm{Z}_{A} \in \mathrm{~T}(A, A)+R_{k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(F3) For $A \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $2 A+1 \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}, \mathbf{Z}_{A} \mathbf{Z}_{A+1} \in \mathrm{~T}(A, A+1)+R_{k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(F4) For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \in \mathrm{~T}(3 i, 3 i, 3 i)+R_{k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(F5) For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $Z_{3 i} Z_{3 i} Z_{3 i+2} \in \mathrm{~T}(3 i, 3 i, 3 i+2)+R_{k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(F6) For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\mathbf{Z}_{3 i-2} \mathbf{Z}_{3 i} \mathbf{Z}_{3 i} \in \mathrm{~T}(3 i-2,3 i, 3 i)+R_{k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(I) $V\left(\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{1}-\delta\right)$ and $V\left(\Lambda_{2}-2 \delta\right)$ are $\widetilde{\mathfrak{g}}$-submodules of $W$.

Here, $R_{k}$ is the set of expansions of the form (see also [39, (6.19)])

$$
\xi=\sum_{\ell^{\prime} \geq 0} \sum_{\boldsymbol{p}=\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{\ell^{\prime}}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\ell^{\prime}}} c_{\boldsymbol{p}} \mathrm{Z}_{p_{1}} \cdots \mathrm{Z}_{p_{\ell^{\prime}}}
$$

which may be infinite formal sums, where $\operatorname{Supp}_{i}(\xi)$ is finite for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\operatorname{Supp}_{k}(\xi)=\emptyset$. Recall (see [39, (4.8)]) that $\operatorname{Supp}_{i}(\xi)$ is defined to be the set

$$
\left\{\boldsymbol{p}=\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{\ell^{\prime}}\right) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\ell^{\prime}} \mid c_{\boldsymbol{p}} \neq 0 \text { and } p_{\ell^{\prime \prime}}+\cdots+p_{\ell^{\prime}} \leq i \text { for } 1 \leq \ell^{\prime \prime} \leq \ell^{\prime}\right\}
$$

The statement ( $\mathrm{F} a$ ) (resp. (I)) is proven in $\S 4 . a+3$ (resp. 4.10 ) for $1 \leq a \leq 6$.
4.3. Convention. In the following, for $1 \leq a \leq 4$, we denote by $\theta_{A, B}^{(a)}$ the left-hand side minus the right-hand side of the $a$-th equation in Theorem 1.3. Note that $\theta_{A, B}^{(3)}$ and $\theta_{A, B}^{(4)}$ are defined for $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A+B \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}$.

In the calculation, we use the following explicit values and $c_{0}^{(p)}=1$ for $1 \leq p \leq 5$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{T} & =-24-28 \omega+14 \omega^{3}, \quad \mathrm{M}=-6-8 \omega+4 \omega^{3}, \quad \mathrm{P}=4-8 \omega^{2}-6 \omega^{3}, \\
\mathrm{Q} & =2-4 \omega^{2}, \quad \varepsilon\left(\nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)=-52+104 \omega^{2}+90 \omega^{3}, \quad c_{0}^{(6)}=-1-2 \omega-\omega^{3}, \\
c_{1}^{(1)} & =\frac{-6-4 \omega+2 \omega^{3}}{3}, \quad c_{1}^{(2)}=\frac{-4 \omega+2 \omega^{3}}{3}, \quad c_{1}^{(3)}=\frac{6-4 \omega+2 \omega^{3}}{3}, \\
c_{1}^{(4)} & =\frac{8 \omega-4 \omega^{3}}{3}, \quad c_{1}^{(5)}=\frac{-6+8 \omega-4 \omega^{3}}{3}, \quad c_{1}^{(6)}=\frac{4 \omega-2 \omega^{3}}{3} .
\end{aligned}
$$

4.4. A proof of (F1). For $A>B$, we define

$$
\Delta_{A, B}=\theta_{A, B}^{(1)} \mathrm{T}\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}+\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right)-\theta_{A, B}^{(2)} \varepsilon\left(\nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}-\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right)
$$

The coefficient $d_{A, B}$ of $Z_{A} Z_{B}$ in $\Delta_{A, B}$ is given by

$$
d_{A, B}=c_{0}^{(1)} \mathrm{T} \cdot\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}+\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right)-c_{0}^{(2)} \varepsilon\left(\nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right) \cdot\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}-\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right)
$$

One can check by case-by-case substitution that it is non-zero if $A+5 \not \equiv B$ $(\bmod 12)$.

In the case $A+5 \equiv B(\bmod 12)$, we consider $-\theta_{A+1, B-1}^{(1)}+\theta_{A+1, B-1}^{(2)}$. Then, the coefficient of $Z_{A} Z_{B}$ (resp. $\mathbf{Z}_{A+1} Z_{B-1}$ ) is $c_{1}^{(2)}-c_{1}^{(1)}=2(\neq 0)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.c_{0}^{(2)}-c_{0}^{(1)}=0\right)$, and that of $Z_{A+B}^{\prime}$ is 0 because the following two values are equal.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon\left(\nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}-\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right) & =\omega^{A+8}\left(-52+104 \omega^{2}+90 \omega^{3}\right)(\omega-1), \\
\mathrm{T}\left(\omega^{4 A+9 B}+\omega^{9 A+4 B}\right) & =\omega^{A+8}\left(-24-28 \omega+14 \omega^{3}\right)(\omega+1) .
\end{aligned}
$$

4.5. A proof of (F2). Consider $\theta_{A, A}^{(2)}-\frac{T}{M} \theta_{A, A}^{(3)}$. The coefficient of $Z_{A} Z_{A}$ is $2(-1-$ $\left.2 \omega+\omega^{3}\right)$, which is non-zero.
4.6. A proof of (F3). Consider $c_{0}^{(6)}\left(\theta_{A, A+1}^{(2)}-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}} \theta_{A, A+1}^{(3)}\right)+\left(1-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}}\right) \theta_{A, A+1}^{(4)}$. The coefficient of $Z_{A} Z_{A+1}$ is non-zero because of

$$
c_{0}^{(6)}\left(\left(c_{0}^{(2)}+c_{1}^{(2)}\right)-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}}\left(c_{0}^{(3)}+c_{1}^{(3)}\right)\right)+\left(1-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}}\right)\left(c_{0}^{(6)}-c_{1}^{(6)}\right)=8\left(2+2 \omega-\omega^{3}\right)
$$

4.7. A proof of $(\mathbf{F} 4)$. Recall $\$ 4.4$ and 4.6 . We define

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{A, B}^{\prime} & =\Delta_{A, B} / d_{A, B}=\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(A, B)} \mathrm{Z}_{A-p} \mathrm{Z}_{B+p}+d^{(A, B)} \mathrm{Z}_{A+B}+e^{(A, B)}, \\
\Delta_{C, C+1}^{\prime} & =\left(c_{0}^{(6)}\left(\theta_{C, C+1}^{(2)}-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}} \theta_{C, C+1}^{(3)}\right)+\left(1-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}}\right) \theta_{C, C+1}^{(4)}\right) /\left(8\left(2+2 \omega-\omega^{3}\right)\right) \\
& =\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(C, C+1)} \mathrm{Z}_{C-p} \mathrm{Z}_{C+1+p}+d^{(C, C+1)} \mathrm{Z}_{2 C+1}+e^{(C, C+1)}
\end{aligned}
$$

for $A, B, C \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $A>B$ and $A+5 \not \equiv B(\bmod 12), 2 C+1 \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}$. Note that $c_{0}^{(A, B)}=c_{0}^{(C, C+1)}=1$ and $c_{p}^{(C, C+1)}$ does not depend on $C$.

Consider $\Delta_{3 i, 3 i+1}^{\prime} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i-1}-\mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \Delta_{3 i+1,3 i-1}^{\prime}$. It is zero, and has the expansion

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{1 \leq p \leq k-6 i} c_{p}^{(3 i, 3 i+1)} Z_{3 i-p} Z_{3 i+1+p} Z_{3 i-1} \\
& -\left(c_{1}^{(3 i+1,3 i-1)} Z_{3 i} Z_{3 i} Z_{3 i}+\sum_{2 \leq r \leq k+1-3 i} c_{r}^{(3 i+1,3 i-1)} Z_{3 i} Z_{3 i+1-r} Z_{3 i-1+r}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

modulo $R_{k}$. For $p \geq 1$, we have $\mathrm{Z}_{3 i+1+p} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i-1} \in \mathrm{~T}=(3 i+p, 3 i)+R_{k}$ by $\S 4.4$ This, together with $\mathbf{Z}_{3 i+1-r} \mathbf{Z}_{3 i-1+r} \in \mathbf{T}(3 i, 3 i)$ for $r \geq 2$, implies

$$
\mathbf{Z}_{3 i-p} \mathbf{Z}_{3 i+1+p} \mathbf{Z}_{3 i-1}, \mathbf{Z}_{3 i} \mathbf{Z}_{3 i+1-r} \mathbf{Z}_{3 i-1+r} \in \mathbf{T}(3 i, 3 i, 3 i)+R_{k}
$$

Thus, we have $-c_{1}^{(3 i+1,3 i-1)} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \in T(3 i, 3 i, 3 i)+R_{k}$ and

$$
c_{1}^{(3 i+1,3 i-1)}=\frac{c_{1}^{(1)} \mathrm{T}\left(1+\omega^{10}\right)-c_{1}^{(2)} \varepsilon\left(\nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)\left(1-\omega^{10}\right)}{\mathrm{T}\left(1+\omega^{10}\right)-\varepsilon\left(\nu^{5}\left(\beta_{1}\right), \beta_{1}\right)\left(1-\omega^{10}\right)}=\frac{\omega\left(2-\omega^{2}\right)}{3} .
$$

4.8. A proof of (F5). Recall 4.5 and define
$\Delta_{A, A}^{\prime}=\left(\theta_{A, A}^{(2)}-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}} \theta_{A, A}^{(3)}\right) /\left(2\left(-1-2 \omega+\omega^{3}\right)\right)=\sum_{p \geq 0} c_{p}^{(A, A)} \mathrm{Z}_{A-p} \mathrm{Z}_{A+p}+d^{(A, A)} \mathrm{Z}_{2 A}+e^{(A, A)}$
for $A \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $2 A \notin 3 \mathbb{Z}$. Note that $c_{0}^{(A, A)}=1$ and $c_{p}^{(A, A)}$ does not depend on $A$. By a similar argument as in 9.7 applied to $\Delta_{3 i, 3 i+1}^{\prime} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i+1}-\mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \Delta_{3 i+1,3 i+1}^{\prime}$, we have $-c_{1}^{(3 i+1,3 i+1)} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i+2} \in \mathrm{~T}(3 i, 3 i, 3 i+2)+R_{k}$ and

$$
c_{1}^{(3 i+1,3 i+1)}=\frac{2\left(c_{1}^{(2)}-\frac{\mathrm{T}}{\mathrm{M}} c_{1}^{(3)}\right)}{2\left(-1-2 \omega+\omega^{3}\right)}=\frac{3+2 \omega-\omega^{3}}{3}
$$

4.9. A proof of (F6). Apply a similar argument as in 4.8 to $\Delta_{3 i-1,3 i-1}^{\prime} \mathrm{Z}_{3 i}-\mathrm{Z}_{3 i-1} \Delta_{3 i-1,3 i}^{\prime}$, we have $c_{1}^{(3 i-1,3 i-1)} Z_{3 i-2} Z_{3 i} Z_{3 i} \in \mathrm{~T}(3 i-2,3 i, 3 i)+R_{k}$.
4.10. A proof of (I). We assume that readers are familiar with Kashiwara crystals 32]. Note that $3 \Lambda_{0}-\alpha_{0}=\Lambda_{0}+\Lambda_{1}-\delta$ and $3 \Lambda_{0}-2 \alpha_{0}-\alpha_{1}=\Lambda_{2}-2 \delta$ (see [24, $\S 6.2, \S 12.4]$ ). In order to prove (I), it is enough to show that $\emptyset \otimes \emptyset \otimes \widetilde{f}_{0} \emptyset$ and $\emptyset \otimes \widetilde{f}_{0} \emptyset \otimes \widetilde{f}_{1} \widetilde{f}_{0} \emptyset$ are maximal (i.e., are sent to $\mathbf{0}$ by $\widetilde{e}_{0}, \widetilde{e}_{1}, \widetilde{e}_{2}$ ), where $\emptyset$ is the highest weight element in the highest weight crystal $B\left(\Lambda_{0}\right)$. This follows from $\widetilde{f}_{1} \widetilde{f}_{0} \emptyset \neq \mathbf{0}$, which is easily checked by explicit realizations such as Kyoto path models [31, Littelmann path models [36], etc.

## 5. Automatic derivations via the regularly linked sets

Recall Theorem 1.5. The purpose of this section is to give an automatic derivation of the generating function $f_{\mathrm{L}_{a}}(x, q)$, where we write $f_{\mathcal{C}}(x, q)=\sum_{\lambda \in \mathcal{C}} x^{\ell(\lambda)} q^{|\lambda|}$ for $\mathcal{C} \subseteq$ Par, by the regularly linked sets 53, which generalize Andrews' linked partition ideals [1, 2] by finite automata in formal language theory [33].
5.1. A survey of [53] for modulus 1. As in [53, §3], for a non-empty set $\Sigma$, let $\Sigma^{*}$ be the set of words $w_{1} \cdots w_{\ell}$ of finite length of $\Sigma$. By the word concatenation - and the empty word $\varepsilon$, the set $\Sigma^{*}$ is regarded as a free monoid generated by $\Sigma$. For $A, B \subseteq \Sigma^{*}$, we define the sum, the product, and the Kleene star by

$$
A+B=A \cup B, \quad A B=\left\{w w^{\prime} \mid w \in A, w^{\prime} \in B\right\}, \quad A^{*}=\{\varepsilon\}+A+A^{2}+\cdots .
$$

Definition 5.1. For a positive integer $m$ and subsets $\mathrm{F}, \mathrm{I} \subseteq \operatorname{Par} \backslash\{\emptyset\}$, let C be $a$ subset of Par which consists of partitions $\lambda$ such that
(1) $m_{j}(\lambda)<m$ for $j \geq 1$,
(2) $\lambda$ does not begin with $\boldsymbol{c}$ for $\boldsymbol{c} \in \mathbf{I}$, and
(3) $\lambda$ does not match $\left(b_{1}+k, \ldots, b_{p}+k\right)$ for $\left(b_{1}, \ldots, b_{p}\right) \in \mathrm{F}$ and $k \geq 0$.

Here, $\emptyset$ is the empty partition (i.e., the partition of 0 ). Recall that as in [53, Definition 1.1], we say that a partition $\lambda=\left(\lambda_{1}, \ldots, \lambda_{\ell}\right)$ begins with (resp. matches) $\left(d_{1}, \ldots, d_{r}\right)$ if $\ell \geq r$ and $\left(\lambda_{\ell-r+1}, \cdots, \lambda_{\ell}\right)=\left(d_{1}, \ldots, d_{r}\right)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left(\lambda_{i+1}, \ldots, \lambda_{i+r}\right)=$ $\left(d_{1}, \ldots, d_{r}\right)$ for some $\left.0 \leq i \leq \ell-r\right)$.
Definition 5.2. For a non-empty partition $\lambda$ and $m \geq 1$, let $\operatorname{sat}_{\mathrm{m}}(\lambda)\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.^{\text {sat }} \mathrm{sat}_{\mathrm{m}}^{\prime}(\lambda)\right)$ be a finite subset of Par which consists of partitions $\mu$ such that $\mu_{1}=\lambda_{1}, m_{j}(\mu)<\mathrm{m}$ for $j \geq 1$, and $\mu$ matches $\lambda$ (resp. $\mu_{1}=\lambda_{1}, m_{\lambda_{1}}(\mu)<\mathrm{m}$, and $\mu$ begins with $\lambda$ ).

Example 5.3. For $\lambda=(5,3,2)$, we have sat ${ }_{3}^{\prime}(\lambda)=\{(5,5,3,2),(5,3,2)\}$. Similarly, sat $_{3}(\lambda)$ consists of the following partitions.

$$
(5,5,3,2,2),(5,3,2,2),(5,5,3,2),(5,3,2),(5,5,3,2,2,1,1),(5,3,2,2,1,1)
$$

$(5,5,3,2,1,1),(5,3,2,1,1),(5,5,3,2,2,1),(5,3,2,2,1),(5,5,3,2,1),(5,3,2,1)$.
Let $\mathrm{K}=\{0, \ldots, \mathrm{~m}-1\}$ and define a map $\pi: \mathrm{K} \rightarrow$ Par by $\pi(i)=(\underbrace{1, \ldots, 1}_{i})$ for $i \in \mathrm{~K}$. As in [53, Definition 2.5], we have an injection

$$
\pi^{\bullet}: \operatorname{Seq}(\mathrm{K}, \pi) \hookrightarrow \operatorname{Par}
$$

where $\operatorname{Seq}(\mathrm{K}, \pi)$ is the set of infinite sequences $\boldsymbol{i}=\left(i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots\right)$ in K (i.e., $i_{j} \in \mathrm{~K}$ for $j \geq 1)$ such that $i_{j} \neq 0$ holds only for finitely many $j$, and the partition $\mu=\pi^{\bullet}(\boldsymbol{i})$ is characterized by $m_{j}(\mu)=i_{j}$ for $j \geq 1$.

By construction, $\pi^{\bullet}$ gives a bijection to C when restricted to the set

$$
\left\{\left(i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots\right) \in \operatorname{Seq}(\mathrm{K}, \pi) \mid\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{j}\right) \notin \mathrm{K}^{*} \cdot \iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}(\mathrm{~F})\right) \cdot \mathrm{K}^{*}+\iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}^{\prime}(\mathrm{I})\right) \cdot \mathrm{K}^{*} \text { for } j \geq 1\right\}
$$

where $\iota(\nu)=m_{1}(\nu) \cdots m_{\nu_{1}}(\nu) \in \mathrm{K}^{\nu_{1}}\left(\subseteq \mathrm{~K}^{*}\right)$ (i.e., $\iota(\nu)=\left(m_{1}(\nu), \ldots, m_{\nu_{1}}(\nu)\right) \in$ $\mathrm{K}^{\nu_{1}}$ ) for a non-empty partition $\nu$, and $\operatorname{sat}_{m}(\mathrm{~F})=\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathrm{F}} \operatorname{sat}_{\mathrm{m}}(\lambda)$, $\operatorname{sat}_{m}^{\prime}(\mathrm{I})=\bigcup_{\lambda \in \mathrm{I}} \operatorname{sat}_{\mathrm{m}}^{\prime}(\lambda)$.

Remark 5.4. By the notation in [53, Definition 3.8], the set above is written as $\operatorname{avoid}\left(\operatorname{Seq}(\mathrm{K}, \pi), \iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}(\mathrm{~F})\right), \iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}^{\prime}(\mathrm{I})\right)\right)$. Note also that $\mathrm{F}=\emptyset($ resp. $\mathrm{I}=\emptyset)$ is allowed while we exclude the case that the empty partition $\emptyset$ belongs to F (resp. I) to satisfy the condition " $X, X^{\prime} \subseteq \Sigma^{+}$" in [53, Definition 3.7], where $\Sigma^{+}=\Sigma^{*} \backslash\{\varepsilon\}$.

From now on, we assume $\iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}(\mathrm{~F})\right), \iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}^{\prime}(\mathrm{I})\right) \subseteq \mathrm{K}^{*}$ are regular [53, Definition 3.3] so that the right-hand side of (11) below is regular [53, Proposition 3.5]. For example, the assumption is satisfied if F and I are finite (as in $\$ 5.2$ and $\$ 5.3$ ).

Let $\mathcal{M}=(Q, \mathrm{~K}, \delta, s, F)$ be a deterministic finite automaton (DFA, for short) such that (see [53, Definition 3.1], [53, Definition 3.2] and [53, Appendix A])

$$
\begin{equation*}
L(\mathcal{M})=\mathrm{K}^{*} \cdot \iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}(\mathrm{~F})\right) \cdot \mathrm{K}^{*}+\iota\left(\operatorname{sat}_{m}^{\prime}(\mathrm{I})\right) \cdot \mathrm{K}^{*} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Then, [53, Theorem 3.14] gives a simultaneous $q$-difference equation

$$
f_{\mathrm{C}^{(v)}}(x, q)=\sum_{u \in Q \backslash F}\left(\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathrm{~K} \\ u=\delta(v, a)}} x^{\ell(\pi(a))} q^{|\pi(a)|}\right) f_{\mathrm{C}^{(u)}}(x q, q),
$$

where (see [53, Definition 3.11] and [53, (3.7)]) $M_{v}=(Q, \mathrm{~K}, \delta, v, F)$ and

$$
\mathrm{C}^{(v)}=\pi^{\bullet}\left(\left\{\left(i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots\right) \in \operatorname{Seq}(\mathrm{K}, \pi) \mid\left(i_{1}, \ldots, i_{j}\right) \notin L\left(M_{v}\right) \text { for } j \geq 1\right\}\right)
$$

Because of $\mathrm{C}^{(s)}=\mathrm{C}$, it gives a $q$-difference equation for $f_{\mathrm{C}}(x, q)$ in virtue of the Murray-Miller algorithm (see a review in [53, Appendix B]).
5.2. An application to $\mathrm{L}_{3}$. Apply $\mathrm{m}=3, \mathrm{~F}=F$ (or $\mathrm{F}=F \backslash\{(1,1,1)\}$ ) and $I=I_{3}$ (see Theorem [1.5), we get the minimum DFA (unique up to isomorphism) $\mathcal{M}=\left(Q, \mathrm{~K}, \delta, q_{0},\left\{q_{3}\right\}\right)$ where $Q=\left\{q_{0}, \ldots, q_{10}\right\}, \mathrm{K}=\{0,1,2\}$ and the values $\delta(v, a)$ of the transition function $\delta: Q \times \mathrm{K} \rightarrow Q$ are displayed as follows.

| $a \backslash v$ | $q_{0}$ | $q_{1}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{4}$ | $q_{5}$ | $q_{6}$ | $q_{7}$ | $q_{8}$ | $q_{9}$ | $q_{10}$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | $q_{1}$ | $q_{4}$ | $q_{1}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{6}$ | $q_{8}$ | $q_{6}$ | $q_{4}$ | $q_{6}$ | $q_{5}$ | $q_{4}$ |
| 1 | $q_{2}$ | $q_{5}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{7}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{7}$ | $q_{2}$ | $q_{10}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ |
| 2 | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{9}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ | $q_{3}$ |

Thus, we have a simultaneous $q$-difference equation

$$
\left(\begin{array}{c}
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{0}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{1}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{2}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{4}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{5}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{6}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{7}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{8}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{9}\right)}(x, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{10}\right)}(x, q)
\end{array}\right)=\left(\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & 1 & x q & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & x q & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & x q & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & x q & 0 & x^{2} q^{2} \\
0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & x q & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & x q \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0
\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}
f_{\mathrm{C}}\left(q_{0}\right) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{1}\right)}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{2}\right)}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}}\left(q_{4}\right) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{5}\right)}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{6}\right)}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{7}\right)}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{8}\right)}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{9}\right)}(x q, q) \\
f_{\mathrm{C}\left(q_{10}\right)}(x q, q)
\end{array}\right)
$$

The pseudo-code in [53, Algorithm 1] stops at the 9-th iteration and gives a $q$-difference equation for $f_{\mathrm{C}^{\left(q_{0}\right)}}(x, q)$, which is written in Theorem 5.5 below.

Theorem 5.5. For $1 \leq a \leq 3$, we have $\sum_{r=0}^{8} p_{r}^{(a)}(x, q) f_{\mathrm{L}_{a}}\left(x q^{r}, q\right)=0$, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p_{0}^{(1)}=\left(1-x q^{5}\right)\left(1-x^{2} q^{9}\right), \quad p_{1}^{(1)}=-\left(1-x q^{5}\right)\left(1+x q+x q^{2}-x q^{3}-x q^{4}+x^{2} q^{6}-x^{2} q^{8}-x^{2} q^{9}\right), \\
& p_{2}^{(1)}=x q\left(1-q^{2}-q^{3}+x q^{2}+x q^{3}-2 x q^{5}-x q^{6}+x q^{7}+x q^{8}-x^{2} q^{9}+x^{2} q^{11}+x^{2} q^{12}-x^{3} q^{13}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{3}^{(1)}=-x^{2} q^{3}\left(1-q^{2}\right)\left(1+q-q^{3}+x q^{3}+x q^{4}+x q^{5}-x q^{6}-x q^{7}-x^{2} q^{10}-x^{2} q^{11}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{4}^{(1)}=-x^{2} q^{5}(1+q)\left(1+x q^{4}\right)\left(1-x q+x q^{4}-x q^{5}-x q^{6}+x^{2} q^{8}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{5}^{(1)}=x^{3} q^{9}\left(1-q^{2}\right)\left(1+q-x q-x q^{2}-x q^{3}+x q^{4}+x q^{5}-x^{2} q^{6}-x^{2} q^{7}+x^{2} q^{9}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{6}^{(1)}=-x^{3} q^{10}\left(1+x q^{4}-x q^{6}-x q^{7}-x^{2} q^{5}-x^{2} q^{6}+2 x^{2} q^{8}+x^{2} q^{9}-x^{2} q^{10}-x^{2} q^{11}-x^{3} q^{11}+x^{3} q^{13}+x^{3} q^{14}\right), \\
& p_{7}^{(1)}=x^{4} q^{15}\left(1-x q^{3}\right)\left(1-q^{2}-q^{3}+x q^{3}+x q^{4}-x q^{5}-x q^{6}+x^{2} q^{10}\right), \quad p_{8}^{(1)}=x^{4} q^{18}\left(1-x q^{3}\right)\left(1-x^{2} q^{7}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{0}^{(2)}=\left(1-x q^{3}\right)\left(1-x q^{5}\right)\left(1-x q^{6}\right)\left(1-x^{2} q^{9}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{1}^{(2)}=-\left(1-x q^{5}\right)\left(1-x q^{6}\right)\left(1+x q-x q^{3}-x q^{4}-x^{2} q^{4}+x^{2} q^{6}-x^{2} q^{9}-x^{3} q^{10}+x^{3} q^{11}+x^{3} q^{12}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{2}^{(2)}=-x q^{3}\left(1-x q^{5}\right)\left(1-x q^{6}\right)\left(q-x+x^{2} q^{3}-x^{2} q^{5}-x^{2} q^{8}+x^{3} q^{9}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{3}^{(2)}=-x^{2} q^{3}\left(1-q^{2}\right)\left(1-x q^{6}\right)\left(1+q^{2}-x q^{5}-x^{2} q^{6}-2 x^{2} q^{9}-x^{2} q^{11}+x^{3} q^{11}+x^{3} q^{13}+x^{3} q^{14}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{4}^{(2)}=-x^{2} q^{6}(1+q)\left(1+x q^{4}\right)\left(1-x+x q-x q^{2}-2 x q^{4}+x q^{5}-2 x q^{6}+x^{2} q^{3}-x^{2} q^{4}+x^{2} q^{5}+x^{2} q^{6}\right. \\
& \left.+x^{2} q^{9}+x^{2} q^{10}+x^{2} q^{11}-x^{3} q^{8}+x^{3} q^{9}-x^{3} q^{10}-2 x^{3} q^{12}+x^{3} q^{13}-2 x^{3} q^{14}+x^{4} q^{16}\right), \\
& p_{5}^{(2)}=x^{3} q^{8}\left(1-q^{2}\right)\left(1-x q^{2}\right)\left(1+q^{2}+q^{3}-x q^{3}-2 x q^{6}-x q^{8}-x^{2} q^{10}+x^{3} q^{13}+x^{3} q^{15}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{6}^{(2)}=-x^{3} q^{11}\left(1-x q^{2}\right)\left(1-x q^{3}\right)\left(1+x q^{2}-x q^{4}-x q^{7}-x^{2} q^{7}+x^{3} q^{16}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{7}^{(2)}=x^{4} q^{17}\left(1-x q^{2}\right)\left(1-x q^{3}\right)\left(1-q-q^{2}+x q^{2}-x q^{4}+x q^{7}-x^{2} q^{7}+x^{2} q^{9}+x^{2} q^{10}-x^{3} q^{14}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{8}^{(2)}=x^{4} q^{19}\left(1-x q^{2}\right)\left(1-x q^{3}\right)\left(1-x q^{5}\right)\left(1-x^{2} q^{7}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{0}^{(3)}=\left(1-x^{2} q^{9}\right)\left(1-x^{2} q^{10}\right), \quad p_{1}^{(3)}=-\left(1-x^{2} q^{10}\right)\left(1+x q+x q^{2}-x q^{4}-x q^{5}-x^{2} q^{9}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{2}^{(3)}=x q^{2}\left(1-q^{2}-q^{3}+x q+x q^{2}+x q^{3}-x q^{4}-2 x q^{5}-x q^{6}+x q^{8}\right. \\
& \left.+x^{2} q^{8}-x^{2} q^{10}+x^{2} q^{12}+x^{2} q^{13}-x^{3} q^{12}-x^{3} q^{13}+x^{3} q^{15}+x^{3} q^{16}-x^{4} q^{18}\right), \\
& p_{3}^{(3)}=-x^{2} q^{5}(1+q)\left(1-q^{3}\right)\left(1-q+x q+x q^{3}-x q^{5}+x^{2} q^{8}-x^{2} q^{9}-x^{3} q^{13}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{4}^{(3)}=-x^{2} q^{7}(1+q)\left(1-x q^{2}+x q^{3}+x q^{5}-x q^{6}-x^{2} q^{3}-x^{2} q^{5}+x^{2} q^{6}+2 x^{2} q^{8}\right. \\
& \left.-x^{2} q^{9}-x^{2} q^{10}-x^{2} q^{11}-x^{3} q^{10}+x^{3} q^{11}+x^{3} q^{13}-x^{3} q^{14}+x^{4} q^{16}\right), \\
& p_{5}^{(3)}=x^{3} q^{11}(1+q)\left(1-q^{3}\right)\left(1-x q^{3}+x q^{4}-x^{2} q^{4}-x^{2} q^{6}+x^{2} q^{8}-x^{3} q^{11}+x^{3} q^{12}\right) \text {, } \\
& p_{6}^{(3)}=-x^{3} q^{14}\left(1+x q^{2}+x q^{3}-x q^{5}-x q^{6}-x^{2} q^{6}+x^{2} q^{8}-x^{2} q^{10}-x^{2} q^{11}-x^{3} q^{7}-x^{3} q^{8}\right. \\
& \left.-x^{3} q^{9}+x^{3} q^{10}+2 x^{3} q^{11}+x^{3} q^{12}-x^{3} q^{14}-x^{4} q^{14}+x^{4} q^{16}+x^{4} q^{17}\right), \\
& p_{7}^{(3)}=-x^{4} q^{22}\left(1-x^{2} q^{6}\right)\left(1-x-x q+x q^{3}+x q^{4}-x^{2} q^{7}\right), \quad p_{8}^{(3)}=x^{4} q^{23}\left(1-x^{2} q^{6}\right)\left(1-x^{2} q^{7}\right) \text {. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Remark 5.6. The $q$-difference equations in Theorem 5.5 can be obtained by Andrews' linked partition ideals (see [53, Appendix E]) because F and I are finite. Yet, an approach via the regularly linked sets has an advantage: the minimum forbidden patterns and forbidden prefixes are automatically detected [53, Appendix D]. In other words, one has a chance to get smaller simultaneous $q$-difference equations.
5.3. A proof of Theorem 5.5. For $L_{1}\left(\right.$ resp. $\left.L_{2}\right)$, the calculations are similar. One only needs to perform the automatic calculation (e.g., by computer algebra as in [53, Remark 4.3]) for the minimum DFA $\mathcal{M}$ such that (11) for $\mathrm{m}=3, \mathrm{~F}=F$ (or $\mathrm{F}=F \backslash\{(1,1,1)\})$ and $\mathbf{I}=I_{1}$ (resp. $\mathbf{I}=I_{2}$ ). We omit the details.
5.4. A proof of Theorem 1.5. Note that the case $a=1$ was shown in 5y

$$
f_{\mathrm{L}_{1}}(x, q)=\sum_{m, k \geq 0} \frac{q^{m^{2}+3 k m+4 k^{2}}}{(q ; q)_{k}(q ; q)_{m}}\left(1-q^{k}+q^{k+m}\right) x^{2 k+m}
$$

(see [5, Theorem 1.7.c)]) and by a finite version of a $q$-series identity [5, Proposition 4.3]. We follow a more or less similar line.

We perform an automatic calculation of a $q$-difference equation for each of

$$
\begin{aligned}
& g_{2}(x, q)=\sum_{m, k \geq 0} \frac{q^{m^{2}+3 k m+4 k^{2}+k+m}}{(q ; q)_{k}(q ; q)_{m}}\left(1+x q^{3 k+1}\right) x^{2 k+m}, \\
& g_{3}(x, q)=\sum_{m, k \geq 0} \frac{q^{m^{2}+3 k m+4 k^{2}+2 k}}{(q ; q)_{k}(q ; q)_{m}}\left(1-x^{2} q^{4 m+8 k+6}\right) x^{2 k+m},
\end{aligned}
$$

via a $q$-analog of Sister Celine's technique (see [52, §7.1]). We see that it is the same as that of $f_{\mathrm{L}_{a}}(x, q)$ in Theorem 5.5 for $a=2,3$, which implies that we have $f_{\mathrm{L}_{a}}(x, q)=g_{a}(x, q)$. By taking the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$ in [5, Proposition 4.4], we have

$$
f_{\mathrm{L}_{2}}(1, q)=\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{q^{2 k^{2}+k}}{(q ; q)_{2 k+1}}, \quad f_{\mathrm{L}_{3}}(1, q)=\sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{q^{2 k^{2}+2 k}}{(q ; q)_{2 k+1}}
$$

Thanks to Slater's list [49, (9), (38)], the right-hand side of the former (resp. latter) equals $1 /\left(q ; q^{2}\right)_{\infty}\left(\operatorname{resp} .1 /\left(q, q^{4}, q^{6}, q^{7}, q^{9}, q^{10}, q^{12}, q^{15} ; q^{16}\right)_{\infty}\right)$.
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