

ONE DIMENSIONAL REPRESENTATIONS OF FINITE W -ALGEBRAS, DIRAC REDUCTION AND THE ORBIT METHOD

LEWIS TOPLEY

Dedicated to my teacher Sasha Premet, with admiration and gratitude.

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study the variety of one dimensional representations of the finite W -algebra for classical Lie algebras, giving a precise description of the dimensions of the irreducible components. We apply this to prove a conjecture of Losev describing the image of his orbit method map. In order to do so we first establish new Yangian-type presentations of semiclassical limits of the W -algebras attached to distinguished nilpotent elements in classical Lie algebras, using Dirac reduction.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Let G be a complex connected reductive algebraic group with Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , nilpotent cone $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$. Identify \mathfrak{g} with \mathfrak{g}^* by a choice of non-degenerate G -invariant trace form on \mathfrak{g} . The primitive spectrum $\text{Prim } U(\mathfrak{g})$ is the set of all primitive ideals of the enveloping algebra, equipped with the Jacobson topology. These ideals are classically studied via their invariants, and the most important of these are the *associated variety* and *Goldie rank*. The associated variety $\mathcal{VA}(I)$ is defined to be the vanishing locus in \mathfrak{g} of the associated graded ideal $\text{gr } I \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g}) = \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}]$ with respect to the PBW filtration. A celebrated theorem of Kostant states that $\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the vanishing locus of the positive degree invariant polynomials $S(\mathfrak{g})_+^G$ whilst Joseph's irreducibility theorem states that $\mathcal{VA}(I)$ is irreducible (see [Ja04] for a detailed survey). Together with Dixmier's lemma, these results show that the associated variety is the closure of a nilpotent orbit. The Goldie rank is defined to be the uniform dimension of the primitive quotient $U(\mathfrak{g})/I$.

It is natural to consider the decomposition $\text{Prim } U(\mathfrak{g}) = \bigcup_{\mathcal{O}} \text{Prim}_{\mathcal{O}} U(\mathfrak{g})$, where the union is taken over all nilpotent G -orbits \mathcal{O} and $\text{Prim}_{\mathcal{O}} U(\mathfrak{g}) = \{I \in \text{Prim } U(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \mathcal{VA}(I) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}\}$. Now fix an orbit $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$ and $e \in \mathcal{O}$, and let $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ denote the finite W -algebra, first associated to (\mathfrak{g}, e) by Premet [Pr02]. The reductive part of the centraliser $G^e(0)$ acts naturally on $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ by algebra automorphisms, and this induces an action of the component group $\Gamma = G^e(0)/G^e(0)^\circ$ on the category of finite dimensional modules. Losev famously gave a new construction of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ via deformation quantization [Lo10a] and used this to show that $\text{Prim}_{\mathcal{O}} U(\mathfrak{g})$ is in bijection with $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)\text{-mod}_{\text{f.d.}}/\Gamma$ [Lo11]. The one dimensional representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ play an especially important role here for two reasons: on one hand the images under Skryabin's equivalence are all completely prime, and therefore play a key role in Joseph's theory of Goldie rank polynomials [Lo15], and on the other hand they classify quantizations of G -equivariant coverings of \mathcal{O} [Lo10b].

1.2. The above narrative leads us to consider the affine scheme $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) := \text{Spec } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ associated to the maximal abelian quotient. By Hilbert's nullstellensatz the closed points classify the one

dimensional representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. The work of Losev and Premet [Lo10a, Pr14] shows that $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is nonempty and in [Pr10, PT14] the first steps were made towards a full description of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

Recall that the sheets of \mathfrak{g} are the maximal irreducible subsets consisting of orbits of constant dimension. They are classified via the theory of decomposition classes which, in turn, are classified by the Lusztig–Spaltenstein induction data. One of the main themes of [PT14], which we build upon in this paper, is the interplay between the sheets of \mathfrak{g} and the structure of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. In the case where \mathfrak{g} is classical (i.e. a simple Lie algebra of type A, B, C or D) we described a combinatorial procedure for describing the sheets of \mathfrak{g} containing a given orbit \mathcal{O} , and we named it the *Kempken–Spaltenstein (KS) algorithm*. This procedure was one of the key tools for [PT14, Theorem 1], which states that for \mathfrak{g} classical the variety $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is an affine space if and only if e lies in a unique sheet of \mathfrak{g} . The first goal of this paper is to elucidate the structure of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ when \mathfrak{g} is classical and e is *singular*, i.e. lies in multiple sheets.

Once again let G be connected and reductive and let $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_l$ be the set of all sheets containing $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})/G$. If $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$ denotes the Slodowy slice to \mathcal{O} at e then we define the *Katsylo variety*

$$(1.1) \quad e + X := (e + \mathfrak{g}^f) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^l \mathcal{S}_i.$$

In [Ka82] Katsylo used this variety to construct a geometric quotient of the variety $\bigcup_{i=1}^l \mathcal{S}_i$. Perhaps the first indication that $e + X$ should influence the representation theory of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ appeared in [Pr10]. Premet used reduction modulo p to show that there is a surjective map on the sets of irreducible components

$$(1.2) \quad \text{Comp } \mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \longrightarrow \text{Comp}(e + X)$$

which restricts to a dimension preserving bijection on some subset of $\text{Comp } \mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. This is our first main result.

Theorem 1.1. *When \mathfrak{g} is a simple Lie algebra of classical type, the map (1.2) is a dimension preserving bijection.*

The dimensions of the irreducible components of $e + X$ can be calculated from the KS algorithm, which depends only on the partition associated to e ; see Proposition 6.2(2) and Proposition 8.2. Thus Theorem 1.1 provides an effective method for computing dimensions of all components of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. We note that these dimensions were calculated in low ranks in [BG18].

1.3. In [Lo16] Losev demonstrated that for every conic symplectic singularity there is an initial object in the category of filtered quantizations of Poisson deformations (see also [ACET20]). We call this the *universal quantization*. Using this result, he then showed that every coadjoint orbit uniquely gives rise to a quantization of the affinization of a certain cover of a nilpotent orbit, and that each such quantization give rise to a completely prime primitive ideal. Thus we have a map $\mathcal{J} : \mathfrak{g}^*/G \rightarrow \text{Prim } U(\mathfrak{g})$, which is known to be an embedding whenever \mathfrak{g} is classical [Lo16, Theorem 5.3]. The search for such a map is motivated by the orbit method of Kostant and Kirillov, and we will refer to the map as *Losev’s orbit method map*. An introduction to the classical theory of the orbit method can be found in [Vo94].

It is important to understand and characterise the primitive ideals appearing in the image of the orbit method map for \mathfrak{g} . Losev has conjectured that they are precisely the ideals one obtains by applying Skryabin's equivalence to the one dimensional representations of the W -algebras associated to \mathfrak{g} , and taking their annihilators. In the final Section of this paper we deduce his conjecture from Theorem 1.1.

Theorem 1.2. *For \mathfrak{g} classical, the image of \mathcal{J} consists of primitive ideals obtained from one dimensional representations of W -algebras under Skryabin's equivalence.*

The main technique appearing in the proof is the application of quantum Hamiltonian reduction to the universal quantizations of affinizations of nilpotent orbit covers.

1.4. There are several new tools involved in the proof of Theorem 1.1, and we now briefly describe the most important ones. One of the basic ideas comes from deformation theory. The finite W -algebra is a filtered quantization of the transverse Poisson structure on the Slodowy slice $\mathbb{C}[e + \mathfrak{g}^f]$ and so there are two natural degenerations associated to $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. On the one hand, we may degenerate $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ to the classical finite W -algebra $S(\mathfrak{g}, e) \cong \mathbb{C}[e + \mathfrak{g}^f]$ and then abelianise, which leads to the spectrum of the maximal Poisson abelian quotient $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}, e) := \text{Spec } S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$. On the other hand we may abelianise and then degenerate, which leads us to the *asymptotic cone* of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$, denoted $\mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) := \text{Spec}(\text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}})$.

One of the general results of this paper states that there is a closed immersion of schemes inducing a bijection on closed points, which we prove using reduction to prime characteristic

$$(1.3) \quad \mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}, e).$$

Furthermore by considering the rank strata and symplectic leaves of the Poisson structure of $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$ we see that the reduced subscheme associated to $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is $e + X$. Therefore the main theorem will follow if we can show that $\text{Comp } \mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is no larger than $\text{Comp } \mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. It is an elementary fact from commutative algebra that $\text{Comp } \mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \leq \text{Comp } \mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ provided $\mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is reduced, and so our approach is to show that $\text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ has no nilpotent elements. By (1.3) it suffices to show that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced.

In this paragraph we take \mathfrak{g} classical. By passing to the completion of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ at the maximal graded ideal and using the fact that the Slodowy slice is transverse to every point of $e + X$ we are able to reduce the problem of showing that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced to the case where e is distinguished. To be more precise, $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced if and only if the completion at the maximal graded ideal is so, and we show that this completion is reduced if and only if $(S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{e})_x^{\wedge})^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced, where x is a point on the Slodowy slice attached to a distinguished element in a larger classical Lie algebra. For the proof we make use of the fact that transverse Poisson manifolds are locally diffeomorphic, which follows from Weinstein's splitting theorem [We83, Theorem 2.1].

1.5. Now Theorem 1.1 will follow if we can show that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced for distinguished elements e . Again we introduce some new ideas to attack this problem. If X is a complex Poisson scheme of finite type and H is a reductive group acting rationally by Poisson automorphisms then the invariant subscheme X^H can be equipped with a Poisson structure via Dirac reduction. The reduced Poisson algebra will be denoted $R(\mathbb{k}[X], H)$. Now if $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$ for G reductive and $H \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a reductive group fixing an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $\{e, h, f\} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ then we prove the following

isomorphism of Poisson algebras

$$(1.4) \quad R(S(\mathfrak{g}, e), H) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(\mathfrak{g}^H, e).$$

Some special cases of (1.4) were discovered by Ragoucy [Ra01].

We apply this isomorphism in the case where $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_n$ and $H = \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is generated by some involution τ . Then $\mathfrak{g}^\tau = \mathfrak{so}_n$ or $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_n$. It follows from the work of Brundan and Kleshchev that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is a quotient of a (semiclassical) shifted Yangian $y_n(\sigma)$ depending on e . If e is distinguished then we can identify an involution τ on $y_n(\sigma)$ defined so that the Poisson homomorphism $y_n(\sigma) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is τ -equivariant. As a consequence we can apply the Dirac reduction procedure to the shifted Yangian $y_n(\sigma)$ and thus obtain a presentation of the Poisson structure on $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. We mention that obtaining presentations of finite W -algebras outside of type **A** is one of the key open problems in the field, and so we hope this result will present fertile ground for further discoveries.

Let \mathfrak{m}_0 be the maximal graded ideal. Finally we use the presentation of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ to calculate generators and certain relations of $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$. Considering the relationship between $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and $e + X$ mentioned earlier we see that the reduced algebra of $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is naturally identified with the coordinate ring on the tangent cone $\mathbb{C}[\text{TC}_e(e + X)]$. Michaël Bulois has recently demonstrated that the sheets of \mathfrak{g} containing e are transversal at e (work in preparation [Bu]), which allows us to calculate the dimensions of the irreducible components of $\text{TC}_e(e + X)$, once again they are determined by the KS algorithm. Using a combinatorial argument we then show that the relations mentioned above give a full presentation for $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$. It follows quickly that both $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ and $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ are reduced, which allows us to conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1.

1.6. Since the presentation of the distinguished semiclassical finite W -algebras in types **B**, **C**, **D** is an important result in its own right we formulate it straight away. For the proof combine Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 4.9.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{so}_n$ or \mathfrak{sp}_n and let e be a distinguished nilpotent element with partition $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$. Then $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is generated as a Poisson algebra by elements*

$$(1.5) \quad \{\eta_i^{(2r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\} \cup \{\theta_i^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < n, r - \frac{\lambda_{i+1} - \lambda_i}{2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$$

together with the following relations

$$(1.6) \quad \{\eta_i^{(2r)}, \eta_j^{(2s)}\} = 0$$

$$(1.7) \quad \{\eta_i^{(2r)}, \theta_j^{(s)}\} = (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} \eta_i^{(2t)} \theta_j^{(2r+s-1-2t)}$$

$$(1.8) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_i^{(s)}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } r + s - 1 \text{ odd}$$

$$(1.9) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_i^{(s)}\} = \sum_{t=r}^{s-1} \frac{1}{2} \theta_i^{(t)} \theta_i^{(2m-t)} + (-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}} \sum_{t=0}^m 2\eta_{i+1}^{(2m-2t)} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2t)} \quad \text{for } r < s, r + s - 1 = 2m$$

$$(1.10) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r+1)}, \theta_{i+1}^{(s)}\} - \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_{i+1}^{(s+1)}\} = \frac{1}{2} \theta_i^{(r)} \theta_{i+1}^{(s)}$$

$$(1.11) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_j^{(s)}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| > 1$$

$$(1.12) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} + \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| = 1 \text{ and } r + s \text{ odd}$$

$$(1.13) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} + \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} = \\ 2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \delta_{i,j+1} \sum_{m_1=0}^{m-1} \sum_{m_2=0}^{m_1} \eta_{i+1}^{(2(m-m_1-1))} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2m_2)} \theta_j^{(2(m_1-m_2)+t)} \\ + 2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \delta_{i+1,j} \sum_{m_1=0}^{m-1} \sum_{m_2=0}^{m-m_1-1} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2m_1)} \eta_{i+1}^{(2m_2)} \theta_j^{(2(m-m_1-m_2-1)+t)} \\ \text{for } |i - j| = 1 \text{ and } r + s = 2m \text{ even}$$

$$(1.14) \quad \eta_i^{(2r)} = 0 \quad \text{for } 2r > \lambda_1$$

$$(1.15) \quad \sum_{t=0}^{\lambda_i/2} \eta_i^{(2t)} \theta_i^{(\lambda_i-2t+s_{1,2}+1)} = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n-1 \text{ when } \mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sp}_n.$$

where we adopt the convention $\eta_i^{(0)} = \tilde{\eta}_i^{(0)} = 1$ and the elements $\{\tilde{\eta}_i^{(r)} \mid r \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ are defined via the recursion

$$(1.16) \quad \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2r)} := - \sum_{t=1}^r \eta_i^{(2t)} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2r-2t)}.$$

1.7. To conclude the introduction we describe the structure of the paper, which is divided into two parts. The first part is very algebraic, dealing with Dirac reduction and the presentation of semiclassical W -algebras in the distinguished case. The second part is more geometric, studying the degenerations of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ using Lusztig–Spaltenstein induction and the tangent cone of the Katsylo variety.

Part I: We begin Section 2 by giving an elementary introduction to the version of Dirac reduction used in this paper. In Subsection 2.3 we prove the isomorphism (1.4), which should have independent interest. In Section 3 we describe the semiclassical shifted Yangian $y_n(\sigma)$ by generators and relations. The main results on the Dirac reduction of $y_n(\sigma)$ are presented in Subsection 3.4, including the canonical grading, the loop filtration, the PBW theorem and the presentation by generators and relations. All of the results about $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ are ultimately deduced from similar results on $y_n(\sigma)$. In Section 4 we recall the definition of Brundan–Kleshchev’s isomorphism $y_n(\sigma) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and show by an explicit calculation that this is τ -equivariant for a suitable choice of involution on $y_n(\sigma)$. By (1.4) this leads to a surjection $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau) \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}^\tau, e)$ and in Subsection 4.5 we complete the picture by describing a full set of Poisson generators for the kernel.

Part II: In Section 5 we gather together some important general facts about degenerations and completions of schemes, as well as reviewing the theory of rank stratification and symplectic leaves of a Poisson scheme. In Section 6 we explain how $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is related to Katsylo variety $e + X$, and recall the aforementioned results of Bulois allowing us to enumerate the irreducible components of $\text{TC}_e(e + X)$ and calculate their dimensions. In Section 7 we introduce quantum finite W -algebras and prove the existence of the closed immersion (1.3). The proof of the latter uses a reduction modulo p argument similar to Premet’s construction of the component map (1.2)

in [Pr10, Theorem 1.2], along with the identification of reduced schemes $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\text{red}} = \mathbb{C}[e + X]$ from Section 6. Finally in Section 8 we describe the Kempken–Spaltenstein algorithm, as well as its relationship with sheets, and then use this to construct an algebraic variety X_λ associated to a distinguished nilpotent orbit \mathcal{O} with partition λ , which we call the *combinatorial Katsylo variety*. In Theorem 8.7 we use the presentation of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ obtained in part I of the paper to demonstrate that $\mathbb{C}[X_\lambda] \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{TC}_e(e + X)]$, and we show that these are isomorphisms by comparing the dimensions of the irreducible components. In particular this implies that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced for e distinguished. Theorem 8.8 reduces the general case to the distinguished case. Finally we conclude the proof of the main theorem in Subsection 8.7, making use of deformation techniques gathered in Section 5.

In Subsection 9.1 we recall the definition of Losev’s orbit method map and we prove a slight refinement of Theorem 1.2. In Subsection 9.2, 9.3 we recall the role of the Namikawa–Weyl group in the classification of quantizations of conic symplectic singularities, and study the relationship with primitive ideals. Finally in Subsection 9.4 we prove the main theorem by applying quantum Hamiltonian reduction to the quantizations of orbit covers arising from generalised Springer maps.

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. Introduction | 1 |
| Notation and conventions | 7 |
| Acknowledgements | 7 |
| Part 1. Presentations of classical W-algebras | 8 |
| 2. Dirac reduction for classical finite W -algebras | 8 |
| 2.1. Invariants via Dirac reduction | 8 |
| 2.2. Classical finite W -algebras | 9 |
| 2.3. Dirac reduction applied to W -algebras | 10 |
| 3. Dirac reduction for shifted Yangians | 13 |
| 3.1. Poisson algebras by generators and relations | 13 |
| 3.2. Chevalley–Serre presentations for shifted current Lie–Poisson algebras | 13 |
| 3.3. The semiclassical shifted Yangian | 16 |
| 3.4. The Dirac reduction of the shifted Yangian | 19 |
| 4. Finite W -algebras for classical Lie algebras | 23 |
| 4.1. Partitions for nilpotent orbits in classical Lie algebras | 23 |
| 4.2. The Dynkin pyramid and the centraliser | 23 |
| 4.3. Symplectic and orthogonal subalgebras | 24 |
| 4.4. Generators of the W -algebra | 26 |
| 4.5. The semiclassical Brundan–Kleshchev homomorphism | 27 |
| Part 2. One dimensional representations of W-algebras | 29 |
| 5. Generalities on Poisson schemes | 29 |
| 5.1. Conic degenerations of affine schemes | 29 |
| 5.2. Completions and nilpotent elements of graded algebras | 30 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 5.3. Poisson schemes | 31 |
| 6. Sheets and induction | 32 |
| 6.1. Lusztig–Spaltenstein induction, sheets and slices | 32 |
| 6.2. Classical finite W -algebras and Slodowy slices | 32 |
| 6.3. The Katsylo variety and the tangent cone | 33 |
| 7. Abelian quotients of finite W -algebras | 34 |
| 7.1. The finite W -algebra | 34 |
| 7.2. Bounding the asymptotic cone | 35 |
| 8. The abelian quotient of the classical W -algebra | 37 |
| 8.1. Rigid, singular and distinguished partitions | 37 |
| 8.2. The Kempken–Spaltenstein algorithm | 38 |
| 8.3. Distinguished elements and induction | 38 |
| 8.4. The combinatorial Katsylo variety | 39 |
| 8.5. The semiclassical abelianisation I: the distinguished case | 41 |
| 8.6. The semiclassical abelianisation II: the general case | 43 |
| 8.7. The abelianisation of the finite W -algebra via deformation theory | 44 |
| 9. The orbit method | 44 |
| 9.1. Losev’s orbit method map | 44 |
| 9.2. The Namikawa–Weyl group and the Poisson automorphism group | 46 |
| 9.3. Primitive ideals arising from generalised Springer maps | 46 |
| 9.4. Quantum Hamiltonian reduction of universal quantizations | 48 |
| References | 50 |

Notation and conventions. The following notation will be used throughout the paper. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ we write $\mathbb{Z}_{>i} = \{i + 1, i + 2, \dots\}$. All algebras and vector spaces defined over \mathbb{C} , except in Section 7 where we use reduction modulo a large prime. We use capital letters G, H, \dots for algebraic groups and gothic script $\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{h}, \dots$ for their Lie algebras. All schemes appearing in this paper will be affine schemes of finite type over \mathbb{C} , thus the reader may almost always think of complex affine varieties, except that the coordinate rings will often be non-reduced (the consideration of nilpotent elements will be vital to our main results). Occasionally we write $\text{m-Spec}(A)$ for the variety of closed points in the prime spectrum of a commutative algebra A . If X is a noetherian scheme then we write $\text{Comp}(X)$ for the set of irreducible components of X .

The associated graded algebra of an almost commutative, filtered associative algebra is equipped with a Poisson structure in the usual manner. If A is a commutative algebra and $I \subseteq A$ an ideal, then we write $\text{gr}_I A$ for the graded algebra with respect to the I -adic filtration.

Acknowledgements. I would like to offer thanks to Simon Goodwin, Ivan Losev, Sasha Premet and Dmytro Matvieievskiy for useful comments on an early draft of this paper. I’m especially grateful to Ivan for suggesting some of the constructions used in the proof of Theorem 1.2, and to Sasha to whom this paper is dedicated - his insightful teaching first introduced to these fascinating problems. I have also benefited from many interesting conversations and email correspondence

with Jon Brundan, Michaël Bulois, Paul Levy, Anne Moreau, and Daniele Valeri, and am grateful for all their help. Some of these results were announced at the conference “Geometric and automorphic aspects of W -algebras”, Lille 2019. This research is supported by the UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship project “Geometric representation theory and W -algebras”, grant number MR/S032657/1.

Part 1. Presentations of classical W -algebras

2. DIRAC REDUCTION FOR CLASSICAL FINITE W -ALGEBRAS

2.1. Invariants via Dirac reduction. Let X be a complex affine Poisson variety and suppose $z_1, \dots, z_n \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ such that the determinant of the matrix $(\{z_i, z_j\})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is a unit. In his seminal paper [Dir50] Dirac defined a new Poisson bracket on $\mathbb{C}[X]$, such that the z_i are Casimirs, thus equipping $\mathbb{C}[X]/(z_1, \dots, z_n)$ with a Poisson structure. In fact this is a special case of the following procedure: say that $I \subseteq \mathbb{C}[X]$ is a *Dirac ideal* if $N_{\mathbb{C}[X]}(I) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]/I$ surjects where $N_{\mathbb{C}[X]}(I) := \{f \in \mathbb{C}[X] \mid \{f, I\} \subseteq I\}$ denotes the Poisson idealiser. Then the subscheme associated to I inherits a Poisson structure from X , and we call this induced structure the *Dirac reduction* [LPV13, 5.4.3].

Now let H be a linearly reductive group acting on X by Poisson automorphisms. We regard the set of invariants X^H as a (not necessarily reduced) affine scheme with global sections $\mathbb{C}[X^H] := \mathbb{C}[X]_H$, where $\mathbb{C}[X]_H = \mathbb{C}[X]/I_H$ and $I_H := (h \cdot f - f \mid h \in H, f \in \mathbb{C}[X])$. Although I_H is usually not a Poisson ideal, it is always a Dirac ideal (this is a corollary of Lemma 2.1) so that X^H acquires the structure of a Poisson scheme.

The following suggests an alternative approach of the Poisson structure on X^H , better-suited to calculations.

Lemma 2.1. *The map $\mathbb{C}[X]^H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X^H]$ is surjective and*

$$(2.1) \quad \mathbb{C}[X]^H / \mathbb{C}[X]^H \cap I_H \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[X^H]$$

is a Poisson isomorphism.

Proof. If $f \in \mathbb{C}[X]^H$, $g \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ and $h \in H$ then $\{f, h \cdot g - g\} = h \cdot \{f, g\} - \{f, g\}$ and so $\mathbb{C}[X]^H \subseteq N_{\mathbb{C}[X]}(I_H)$ is a Poisson subalgebra. Since H is linearly reductive and acts locally finitely we can decompose $\mathbb{C}[X] = \mathbb{C}[X]^H \oplus \mathbb{C}[X]_1$ where $\mathbb{C}[X]_1$ is the kernel of the H -equivariant projection $\mathbb{C}[X] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]^H$. If $V \subseteq \mathbb{C}[X]_1$ is an irreducible H -submodule then $\{h \cdot v - v \mid h \in H, v \in V\} \subseteq V$ is H -stable and nonzero hence equal to V , and it follows that $I_H = (\mathbb{C}[X]_1)$. Therefore the composition $\mathbb{C}[X]^H \hookrightarrow N_{\mathbb{C}[X]}(I_H) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X^H] = \mathbb{C}[X]_H$ is surjective. \square

Now let A be any Poisson algebra with a locally finite action of H by Poisson automorphisms. Write $I_H := (h \cdot a - a \mid h \in H, a \in A)$ and define *the Dirac reduction of A by H* by

$$(2.2) \quad R(A, H) := A^H / A^H \cap I_H$$

If $\tau \in \text{Aut}(A)$ is a semisimple Poisson automorphism of finite order, then we often abuse notation writing $R(A, \tau)$ for $R(A, H)$ where H is the group generated by τ .

Since H is linearly reductive the functor of H -invariants is exact on the category of locally finite H -modules. This implies that $R(-, H)$ is a right exact functor from the category of H -locally finite Poisson algebras, to the category of Poisson algebras.

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose the following:*

- (1) V is a direct sum of locally finite H -modules with H -stable decomposition $V = V^H \oplus V_1$.
- (2) $S(V)$ is a Poisson algebra with H acting by Poisson automorphisms.

Then the natural map $S(V^H) \rightarrow R(S(V), H)$ is an isomorphism of commutative algebras.

Proof. Since $S(V) = S(V^H) \oplus (V_1)$ and $S(V^H)$ is H -fixed we must have $S(V)_1 \subseteq (V_1)$. Combining with $V_1 \subseteq S(V)_1$ we deduce that $I_H = (V_1)$ which proves the map $S(V^H) \rightarrow R(S(V), H)$ is an isomorphism of commutative algebras. \square

Remark 2.3. Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie algebra and H a linearly reductive group of automorphisms of \mathfrak{g} acting locally finitely. In this case the composition $S(\mathfrak{g}^H) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g})^H \rightarrow R(S(\mathfrak{g}), H)$ is a Poisson homomorphism and so Lemma 2.2 shows that $S(\mathfrak{g}^H) \xrightarrow{\sim} R(S(\mathfrak{g}), H)$ as Poisson algebras.

2.2. Classical finite W -algebras. For the rest of the Section we fix a connected reductive algebraic group G such that the derived subgroup is simply connected, and write $\mathfrak{g} = \text{Lie}(G)$. Let κ be a choice of non-degenerate trace form on \mathfrak{g} which is preserved by $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$. Pick a nilpotent element $e \in \mathfrak{g}$ and write $\chi := \kappa(e, \cdot) \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Pick an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $\{e, h, f\}$ and write $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ for the grading by $\text{ad}(h)$ -eigenspaces. Throughout the paper we use the notation $\mathfrak{g}(\leq i) = \bigoplus_{j \leq i} \mathfrak{g}(j)$ and similar for $\mathfrak{g}(< i)$. Since $e \in \mathfrak{g}(2)$ we see that χ restricts to a character on $\mathfrak{g}(< -1)$. Make the following notation $\mathfrak{g}(< -1) := \{x - \chi(x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{g}(< -1)\} \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g})$. The nilpotent Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}(< 0)$ is algebraic and we write $\mathfrak{g}(< 0) = \text{Lie } G(< 0)$.

The (classical) finite W -algebra associated to (\mathfrak{g}, e) is a Poisson reduction of $S(\mathfrak{g})$

$$(2.3) \quad S(\mathfrak{g}, e) := (S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi)^{G(< 0)}.$$

In more detail, the Poisson normaliser $N = \{f \in S(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \{f, \mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi\} \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi\}$ is a Poisson subalgebra of $S(\mathfrak{g})$ with $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi$ embedded as a Poisson ideal, and $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is equipped with a Poisson structure via the isomorphism $N/N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi \xrightarrow{\sim} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

The *Kazhdan grading* is defined on $S(\mathfrak{g})$ by placing $\mathfrak{g}(i)$ in Kazhdan degree $i + 2$. Notice that $\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi$ generates a homogeneous ideal and that $S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi$ inherits a connected grading in non-negative degrees, with $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ embedded as a graded subalgebra, with Poisson bracket in degree -2 .

Since the grading is good for e the map $\mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi$ is injective.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\mathfrak{m}_0 \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi$ denote the unique maximal graded ideal.*

- (1) *There exists a Kazhdan graded map $\theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ such that*

$$(2.4) \quad \theta(x) - x \in \mathfrak{m}_0^2.$$

Furthermore θ can be chosen to be equivariant with respect to any reductive group of Poisson automorphisms acting rationally on $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ by graded automorphisms.

- (2) *If θ is any map satisfying (2.4) then $S(\mathfrak{g}^e) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is an isomorphism of commutative algebras.*

Proof. It follows from [GG02, Lemma 2.1] that the restriction homomorphism $S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi \cong \mathbb{C}[\chi + \mathfrak{g}(< -1)^\perp] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\chi + \mathfrak{g}^f] \cong S(\mathfrak{g}^e)$ gives a $G^e(0)$ -equivariant isomorphism $S(\mathfrak{g}, e) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}^e)$ of

commutative algebras, where $\mathfrak{g}(<-1)^\perp := \{\eta \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid \eta(\mathfrak{g}(<-1)) = 0\}$. Taking the inverse isomorphism restricted to $\mathfrak{g}^e \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g}^e)$ gives the desired map θ . If H is any reductive group of Poisson isomorphisms then θ can be replaced with an H -equivariant map using the standard trick of projecting onto isotypic components of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ for the H -action.

Now if θ is any map satisfying (2.4) then $S(\mathfrak{g}^e) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and it suffices to show that this map is surjective. If $x_1, \dots, x_r \in \mathfrak{g}^e$ is a homogenous basis then [Ja04, Lemma 7.1] shows that $\theta(x_1), \dots, \theta(x_r)$ generate a graded radical ideal of finite codimension. The only such ideal is the maximal graded ideal of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and this implies that $\theta(x_1), \dots, \theta(x_r)$ generate $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. \square

2.3. Dirac reduction applied to W -algebras. Now fix a reductive subgroup $H \subseteq \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ fixing our choice of \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple. Make the notation $\mathfrak{g}_0 := \mathfrak{g}^H$ and let \mathfrak{g}_1 denote an H -invariant complement to \mathfrak{g}_0 in \mathfrak{g} . Also write $G_0 \subseteq G$ for the connected component of the subgroup consisting of $g \in G$ such that $[\text{Ad}(g), H] = 1$.

Lemma 2.5. (1) *The restriction of κ to \mathfrak{g}_0 is non-degenerate.*

(2) *G_0 is reductive and $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \text{Lie}(G_0)$.*

Proof. Since \mathfrak{g}_1 is spanned by elements $\{h \cdot x - x \mid h \in H, x \in \mathfrak{g}\}$ it follows that $\kappa(\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1) = 0$. Since κ is non-degenerate we deduce part (1).

Now suppose that κ is defined from a representation $\rho : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{gl}(V)$. If $\mathfrak{n} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_0$ is a nilpotent ideal then by Engel there exists $k > 0$ such that $\rho(\mathfrak{n})^k = 0$. Hence $(\rho(x)\rho(n))^k = 0$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ and $n \in \mathfrak{n}$, so $\kappa(x, n) = 0$. Since κ is non-degenerate the nilradical of \mathfrak{g}_0 is trivial.

If $\text{Ad}_G : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the adjoint representation then we consider $\rho_0 := \text{Ad}_{\text{GL}(\mathfrak{g})} \circ \text{Ad}_G : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(\text{End}(\mathfrak{g}))$ and let $\rho : G \rightarrow \text{GL}(W)$ be any faithful representation admitting ρ_0 as a direct summand. If we identify G (resp. \mathfrak{g}) with its image in $\text{GL}(W)$ (resp. $\mathfrak{gl}(W)$) via ρ (resp. $d_0\rho$), and identify H with a subset of $\text{End}(\mathfrak{g}) \subseteq W$, then G_0 is precisely the subgroup of $\text{GL}(W)$ fixing H , and similar for \mathfrak{g}_0 . Now apply [Hum75, Theorem 13.2] to see that $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \text{Lie}(G_0)$. Since the nilradical of \mathfrak{g}_0 is trivial, G_0 is reductive thanks to [Hum75, Theorem 13.5]. \square

Since \mathfrak{g}_0 is a graded subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} containing e we can consider $S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$. Furthermore H preserves $\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ and the induced action on $S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ stabilises the $G(<0)$ -invariants, so that H acts by Poisson automorphisms on $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

We are now ready to formulate one of our first main theorems, stated in (1.4).

Theorem 2.6. *There is a natural Poisson isomorphism*

$$(2.5) \quad R(S(\mathfrak{g}, e), H) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e).$$

Since κ is non-degenerate on \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}_0 and $\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{g})$ -invariant, it follows that $\mathfrak{g}_0^\perp = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \kappa(x, \mathfrak{g}_0) = 0\}$ is an H -stable complement to \mathfrak{g}_0 in \mathfrak{g} . Hence $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \mathfrak{g}_0^\perp$. This implies

$$(2.6) \quad \chi(\mathfrak{g}_1) = 0.$$

Lemma 2.7. (1) $S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi = S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$;

(2) $S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi = S(\mathfrak{g})(\mathfrak{g}_1(<-1) + \mathfrak{g}_1\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi)$.

Proof. Observe that \mathfrak{g}_0 and \mathfrak{g}_1 are graded subspaces of \mathfrak{g} . It suffices to show that the left hand side is contained in the right, for both (1) and (2).

Let $x \in \mathfrak{g}(<-1)$ and $f \in S(\mathfrak{g})$, and let $f = f_0 + f_1$ and $x = x_0 + x_1$ be the decompositions over $S(\mathfrak{g}) = S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \oplus S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$ and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$ respectively. By (2.6) the projections of $f(x - \chi(x))$ to $S(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ and $S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$ are $f_0(x_0 - \chi(x_0))$ and $f_0x_1 + f_1(x - \chi(x))$ respectively. Therefore if $f(x - \chi(x))$ lies in $S(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ we must have $f_0x_1 + f_1(x - \chi(x)) = 0$ and $f(x - \chi(x)) = f_0(x_0 - \chi(x_0))$, proving (1).

Now suppose that $f(x - \chi(x)) \in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ and that $x = x_0 + x_1$ where $x_i \in \mathfrak{g}_i(<-1)$. Then $f(x_1 - \chi(x_1)) \in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1(<-1)$ by (2.6), whilst $f(x_0 - \chi(x_0)) \in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$ implies that $f \in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$ so that $f(x_0 - \chi(x_0)) \in S(\mathfrak{g})(\mathfrak{g}_1\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi)$. This proves (2). \square

Lemma 2.8. *The ideal $S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ is the direct sum of its intersections with $S(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ and $S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$. Therefore $S(\mathfrak{g}) = S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \oplus S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$ gives a $G_0(<0)$ -module decomposition*

$$(2.7) \quad S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi = S(\mathfrak{g}_0)/S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi \oplus S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1/S(\mathfrak{g})(\mathfrak{g}_1(<-1) + \mathfrak{g}_1\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi).$$

Proof. We begin by proving the claim

$$(2.8) \quad S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi = S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi \oplus S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi.$$

It suffices to show that the right hand side contains the left. Let $f \in S(\mathfrak{g})$ and $x - \chi(x) \in \mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$. Since $\mathfrak{g}(<-1) = \mathfrak{g}_0(<-1) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1(<-1)$ we can consider two cases: (i) if $x \in \mathfrak{g}_1$ then by (2.6) we have $f(x - \chi(x)) \in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$; (ii) if $x \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ then we can write $f = f_0 + f_1 \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \oplus S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$, in which case $f_0(x - \chi(x)) \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ and $f_1(x - \chi(x)) \in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$. Now the Lemma follows from Lemma 2.7. \square

We write $S(\mathfrak{g})_0$ for the H -invariants and $S(\mathfrak{g})_1$ for the unique H -stable complement. Use similar notation for $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Consider the two sets

$$(2.9) \quad N := \{f \in S(\mathfrak{g}) \mid g \cdot f - f \in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi \text{ for all } g \in G(<0)\};$$

$$(2.10) \quad N_0 := \{f \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \mid g \cdot f - f \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi \text{ for all } g \in G_0(<0)\}.$$

By differentiating the locally finite actions on $G(<0)$ on $S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ and of $G_0(<0)$ on $S(\mathfrak{g}_0)/S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$ we see that

$$(2.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \{\mathfrak{g}(<-1), N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0\} &\subseteq N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi; \\ \{\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1), N_0\} &\subseteq N_0 \cap S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi. \end{aligned}$$

We consider the projection

$$(2.12) \quad \rho : S(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0)$$

across the decomposition $S(\mathfrak{g}) = S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \oplus S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$.

Proposition 2.9. (i) $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g})$ and $N_0 \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ are Poisson subalgebras;

(ii) $\rho(N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0) \subseteq N_0$ and the map $\rho : N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \rightarrow N_0$ is a Poisson homomorphism;

(iii) The map $\pi : S(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ restricts to a surjective Poisson homomorphism

$$N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0;$$

(iv) The map $\pi_0 : S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0)/S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$ restricts to a surjective Poisson homomorphism

$$N_0 \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e);$$

- (v) *The kernel of the map $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$ is contained in the kernel of the map $\pi_0 \circ \rho$. Thus ρ induces a Poisson homomorphism $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0 \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$;*
- (vi) *$S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0 \cap S(\mathfrak{g}, e)S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_1$ is contained in the kernel of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0 \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$, inducing a surjective Poisson homomorphism*

$$(2.13) \quad R(S(\mathfrak{g}, e), H) \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e).$$

Proof. Since H acts on $S(\mathfrak{g})$ by Poisson automorphisms the invariant subspace $S(\mathfrak{g})_0$ is a Poisson subalgebra. Therefore the proofs of the two claims in (i) are identical, and we will only prove that $N_0 \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ is a Poisson subalgebra. It is evidently closed under multiplication so we only need to show that it is closed under the bracket. Suppose that $f_1, f_2 \in N_0$, that $g \in G_0(<0)$ and that $g \cdot f_i - f_i = h_i \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$. We have $g \cdot \{f_1, f_2\} = \{g \cdot f_1, g \cdot f_2\} = \{f_1 + h_1, f_2 + h_2\}$ and so (i) will follow if we can show that $\{f_1, h_2\}, \{h_1, f_2\}, \{h_1, h_2\} \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$. Since χ vanishes on $\mathfrak{g}(<-2)$ we have $[\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi, \mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi] \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$, therefore $\{h_1, h_2\} \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$ by the Leibniz rule. To complete the proof of (i) we observe that $N_0 \cap S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$ is a Poisson ideal of N_0 , which follows quickly from (2.11).

We now address (ii). Let $f \in N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0$ and write $f = f_0 + f_1$ according to the decomposition $S(\mathfrak{g}) = S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \oplus S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$. If $g \in G_0(<0)$ then $g \cdot f_0 - f_0 \in S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi = S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$ by Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8. This shows that $\rho(f) = f_0 \in N$.

Finally, to see that $\rho : N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \rightarrow N_0$ is a Poisson homomorphism it suffices to show that $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$ is a Poisson ideal of $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0$. Recall that $\mathfrak{g}_1 = \{h \cdot x - x \mid h \in H, x \in \mathfrak{g}\}$ and $S(\mathfrak{g})_1 = \{h \cdot x - x \mid h \in H, x \in S(\mathfrak{g})\}$. If $f \in S(\mathfrak{g})_0$ then $\{f, h \cdot x - x\} = h \cdot \{f, x\} - \{f, x\} \in S(\mathfrak{g})_1$ for any $x \in S(\mathfrak{g})_1$. Lemma 2.2 shows that the ideals generated by \mathfrak{g}_1 and $S(\mathfrak{g})_1$ coincide, hence $\{S(\mathfrak{g})_0, \mathfrak{g}_1\} \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$, which shows that $S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$ is a Poisson ideal of $S(\mathfrak{g})_0$. This completes the proof of (ii).

The map π restricts to a surjection $N \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ by definition. Since the latter map is H -equivariant we get $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$, which proves (iii), whilst (iv) is proven similarly.

We move on to (v). The kernel of $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0$ is $N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0 \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$. This is mapped to $S(\mathfrak{g}_0) \cap S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi = S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$ by ρ , thanks to Lemma 2.7 and Lemma 2.8. Finally $S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi$ lies in the kernel of π_0 , which proves (v). Now we take $f \in N \cap S(\mathfrak{g})_0$ such that $\pi(f) \in S(\mathfrak{g}, e)S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_1$. Using Lemma 2.8 again we see that $S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ decomposes as the direct sum of the image of $S(\mathfrak{g}_0)$ and the image of $S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$. Therefore $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_1$, and the ideal which it generates, are contained in the image of $S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}_1$. It follows immediately that

$$\begin{aligned} f &\in S(\mathfrak{g})S(\mathfrak{g})_1 + S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi \\ \rho(f) &\in S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi \cap S(\mathfrak{g}_0) = S(\mathfrak{g}_0)\mathfrak{g}_0(<-1)_\chi \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\rho(f)$ is in the kernel of π_0 , completing (vi). This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Thanks to Proposition 2.9 we have $\phi : R(S(\mathfrak{g}, e), H) \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$.

Pick an H -equivariant map $\theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ satisfying the properties of Theorem 2.4, and define $\theta_0 : \mathfrak{g}_0^e \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ via

$$\theta_0(x) := \phi(\theta(x) + S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0 \cap S(\mathfrak{g}, e)S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_1)$$

Property (2.4) for θ implies (2.4) for θ_0 . By Theorem 2.4(2) this implies that ϕ is surjective. Applying Proposition 2.2 we see that $R(S(\mathfrak{g}, e), H)$ is a polynomial algebra generated by the image

of $\theta(\mathfrak{g}_0^e)$ under the map $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0 \rightarrow R(S(\mathfrak{g}, e), H)$. It follows that ϕ maps a basis of $R(S(\mathfrak{g}, e), H)$ to a basis of $S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$, hence it is an isomorphism. \square

3. DIRAC REDUCTION FOR SHIFTED YANGIANS

3.1. Poisson algebras by generators and relations. Let X be a set. The free Lie algebra L_X on X is the initial object in the category of (complex) Lie algebras generated by X and can be constructed as the Lie subalgebra of the free algebra $\mathbb{C}\langle X \rangle$ generated by the vector space spanned by X . When L is a Lie algebra generated by X we say that L has relations $Y \subseteq L_X$ if Y generates the kernel of $L_X \rightarrow L$.

The *free Poisson algebra generated by X* is the initial object in the category of (complex) Poisson algebras generated by X . It can be constructed as the symmetric algebra $S(L_X)$ together with its Poisson structure. If there is a Poisson surjection $S(L_X) \rightarrow A$ then we say that A is *Poisson generated by X* . It is important to distinguish this from A being generated by X as a commutative algebra, as both notions will occur frequently.

We say that a (complex) Poisson algebra A has Poisson generators X and relations $Y \subseteq S(L_X)$ if there is a surjective Poisson homomorphism $S(L_X) \twoheadrightarrow A$ and the kernel is the Poisson ideal generated by Y .

Let X be a set and $Y \subseteq L_X \subseteq S(L_X)$. Write I (resp. J) for the ideal of $S(L_X)$ (resp. L_X) generated by Y . It is easy to see that the natural map $S(L_X) \rightarrow S(L_X)/I$ induces an isomorphism

$$(3.1) \quad S(L_X/J) \xrightarrow{\sim} S(L_X)/I.$$

3.2. Chevalley–Serre presentations for shifted current Lie–Poisson algebras. Throughout this Section we fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Following [BK06] a *shift matrix* is an $n \times n$ array $\sigma = (s_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ of non-negative integers with zero on the diagonal, satisfying

$$(3.2) \quad s_{i,k} = s_{i,j} + s_{j,k}$$

whenever $i \leq j \leq k$ or $k \leq j \leq i$. A shift matrix is said to be *symmetric* if it is equal to its transpose and is said to be *even* if the entries are integers. This nomenclature arises from the fact that shift matrices classify certain gradings [BK06, (7.6)] and an even shift matrix corresponds to a grading supported on the even integers. Symmetric shift matrices correspond to Dynkin gradings, i.e. those which arise from \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triples.

The *current algebra* is the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{c}_n := \mathfrak{gl}_n \otimes \mathbb{C}[t]$. It has a basis consisting of elements $\{e_{i,j}t^r \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ where we write $x \otimes t^r = xt^r$ for $x \in \mathfrak{gl}_n$ and $r \geq 0$. For any shift matrix $\sigma = (s_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ we define the *shifted current algebra* $\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)$ to be the subalgebra spanned by

$$(3.3) \quad \{e_{i,j}t^r \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n, r - s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}.$$

Lemma 3.1. *The Lie subalgebra $\mathfrak{u}_n(\sigma) \subseteq \mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)$ spanned by elements (3.3) with $i < j$ is generated as a complex Lie algebra by*

$$(3.4) \quad \{e_{i,r} \mid 1 \leq i < n, r - s_{i,i+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$$

subject to the relations

$$(3.5) \quad [e_{i;r}, e_{j;s}] = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| \neq 1,$$

$$(3.6) \quad [e_{i;r+1}, e_{i+1;s}] - [e_{i;r}, e_{i+1;s+1}] = 0,$$

$$(3.7) \quad [e_{i;r_1}[e_{i;r_2}, e_{j;r_3}]] + [e_{i;r_2}[e_{i;r_1}, e_{j;r_3}]] = 0 \quad \text{for all } |i - j| = 1.$$

Proof. Write $\underline{0}$ for the $n \times n$ zero matrix. It follows from (3.2) that the linear map $\mathbf{u}_n(\sigma) \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_n(\underline{0})$ defined by $e_{i,j}t^r \mapsto e_{i,j}t^{r-s_{i,j}}$ is a Lie algebra isomorphism and so it suffices to prove the Lemma when $\sigma = \underline{0}$.

Let $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_n$ be the Lie algebra with generators (3.4) and relations (3.5)–(3.7), with $\sigma = \underline{0}$. We inductively define elements $e_{i,j;r} \in \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n$ by setting $e_{i,i+1;r} := e_{i;r}$ and $e_{i,j;r} := [e_{i,j-1;r}, e_{j-1,j;0}]$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq n$. There is a homomorphism $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{u}_n(\underline{0})$ given by $e_{i;r} \mapsto e_{i,i+1}t^r$ and, in order to show that it is an isomorphism, we show that $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_n$ is spanned by the elements $\{e_{i,j;r} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$.

Following (1)–(7) in the proof of [BK05, Lemma 5.8] verbatim we have for all i, j, k, l, r, s

$$(3.8) \quad [e_{i,j;r}, e_{k,l;s}] = \delta_{j,k}e_{i,l;r+s} - \delta_{i,l}e_{k,j;r+s}.$$

Define an ascending filtration on $\hat{\mathbf{u}}_n = \bigcup_{d>0} F_d \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n$ satisfying $F_d \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n = \sum_{d_1+d_2=d} [F_{d_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n, F_{d_2} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n]$ by placing $e_{i;r}$ in degree 1. We prove by induction that $F_d \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n$ is spanned by elements $e_{i,j;r}$ with $j - i \leq d$. The base case $d = 1$ holds by definition. For $d_1 + d_2 = d > 1$ we know by the inductive hypothesis that $F_{d_1} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n$ and $F_{d_2} \hat{\mathbf{u}}_n$ are spanned by elements $e_{i,j;r}$. Using (3.8) we complete the induction, which finishes the proof. \square

Theorem 3.2. $S(\mathbf{c}_n(\sigma))$ is Poisson generated by

$$(3.9) \quad \{d_{i;r} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\} \cup \{e_{i;r} \mid 1 \leq i < n, r - s_{i,i+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\} \\ \cup \{f_{i;r} \mid 1 \leq i < n, r - s_{i+1,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$$

subject to relations

$$(3.10) \quad \{d_{i;r}, d_{j;s}\} = 0,$$

$$(3.11) \quad \{d_{i;r}, e_{j;s}\} = (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1})e_{j;r+s},$$

$$(3.12) \quad \{d_{i;r}, f_{j;s}\} = (\delta_{i,j+1} - \delta_{i,j})f_{j;r+s},$$

$$(3.13) \quad \{e_{i;r_1}, e_{i+1;r_2+1}\} - \{e_{i;r_1+1}, e_{i+1;r_2}\} = 0,$$

$$(3.14) \quad \{f_{i;r_1}, f_{i+1;r_2+1}\} - \{f_{i;r_1+1}, e_{i+1;r_2}\} = 0,$$

$$(3.15) \quad \{e_{i;r}, e_{j;s}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| \neq 1,$$

$$(3.16) \quad \{f_{i;r}, f_{j;s}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| \neq 1,$$

$$(3.17) \quad \left\{e_{i;r_1}, \{e_{i;r_2}, e_{j;r_3}\}\right\} + \left\{e_{i;r_2}, \{e_{i;r_1}, e_{j;r_3}\}\right\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| = 1,$$

$$(3.18) \quad \left\{f_{i;r_1}, \{f_{i;r_2}, f_{j;r_3}\}\right\} + \left\{e_{i;r_2}, \{e_{i;r_1}, e_{j;r_3}\}\right\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| = 1.$$

Proof. By (3.1) it suffices to show that $\mathbf{c}_n(\sigma)$ is generated as a Lie algebra by (3.9) subject to relations (3.10)–(3.14). Let $(\hat{\mathbf{c}}_n(\sigma), \{\cdot, \cdot\})$ denote the Lie algebra with these generators and relations. Define a map from the set (3.9) to $\mathbf{c}_n(\sigma)$ by $d_{i;r} \mapsto e_{i,i}t^r$, $e_{i;r} \mapsto e_{i,i+1}t^r$, $f_{i;r} \mapsto e_{i+1,i}t^r$. One can easily verify using (3.8) that this extends to a surjective Lie algebra homomorphism $\hat{\mathbf{c}}_n(\sigma) \rightarrow \mathbf{c}_n(\sigma)$.

To show that this is an isomorphism it suffices to show that the elements

$$(3.19) \quad \{e_{i,j;r} \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n, r - s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\} \subseteq \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)$$

defined inductively by setting $e_{i,i+1;r} := e_{i,r}$, $e_{i+1,i;r} := f_{i;r}$ and

$$(3.20) \quad e_{i,j;r} := \{e_{i;s_{i,i+1}}, e_{i+1,j;r-s_{i,i+1}}\} \quad \text{for } i < j;$$

$$(3.21) \quad e_{i,j;r} := \{f_{i-1;s_{i,i-1}}, e_{i-1,j;r-s_{i,i-1}}\} \quad \text{for } i > j.$$

form a spanning set. Using (3.10), (3.11), (3.12) and a simple inductive argument one can see that $\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)$ is a direct sum of three subalgebras: the diagonal subalgebra, spanned by the elements $d_{i;r}$, and the upper and lower triangular subalgebras $\mathfrak{u}_n^+(\sigma)$ and $\mathfrak{u}_n^-(\sigma)$ generated by the elements $e_{i;r}$, respectively by the elements $f_{i;r}$.

In order to complete the proof it suffices to show that $\mathfrak{u}_n^+(\sigma)$ and $\mathfrak{u}_n^-(\sigma)$ are spanned by the elements defined in (3.20) and (3.21) respectively. Since the argument is identical for $\mathfrak{u}_n^+(\sigma)$ and $\mathfrak{u}_n^-(\sigma)$ we only need to consider the former, where the claim follows from Lemma 3.1 \square

The following theorem is one of the key stepping stones for understanding the Dirac reduction of the shifted Yangian. The algebra described here is the *twisted shifted current Lie–Poisson algebra*.

Theorem 3.3. *If σ is even and symmetric then $S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma))$ admits a Poisson automorphism*

$$(3.22) \quad \tau : e_{i,j}t^r \mapsto (-1)^{r-1+s_{i,j}} e_{j,i}t^r.$$

The Dirac reduction $R(S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma), \tau) = S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau)$ is Poisson generated by

$$(3.23) \quad \{\eta_{i;2r-1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\} \cup \{\theta_{i;r} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq s_{i,i+1}}\}$$

subject to the relations

$$(3.24) \quad \{\eta_{i;2r-1}, \eta_{j;2s-1}\} = 0,$$

$$(3.25) \quad \{\eta_{i;2r-1}, \theta_{j;s}\} = (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1})\theta_{j;2r-1+s},$$

$$(3.26) \quad \{\theta_{i;r}, \theta_{j;s}\} = 0 \text{ if } |i - j| > 1,$$

$$(3.27) \quad \{\theta_{i;r}, \theta_{i+1;s+1}\} = \{\theta_{i;r+1}, \theta_{i+1;s}\},$$

$$(3.28) \quad \{\theta_{i;r}, \theta_{i;s}\} = \begin{cases} 2(-1)^{s-1+s_{i,i+1}}(\eta_{i;r+s} - \eta_{i+1;r+s}) & \text{if } r + s \text{ is odd} \\ 0 & \text{if } r + s \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

$$(3.29) \quad \left\{ \theta_{i;r_1}, \{ \theta_{i;r_2}, \theta_{j;r_3} \} \right\} + \left\{ \theta_{i;r_2}, \{ \theta_{i;r_1}, \theta_{j;r_3} \} \right\} = 0 \text{ for } |i - j| = 1, r_1 + r_2 \text{ odd.}$$

$$(3.30) \quad \left\{ \theta_{i;r_1}, \{ \theta_{i;r_2}, \theta_{j;r_3} \} \right\} + \left\{ \theta_{i;r_2}, \{ \theta_{i;r_1}, \theta_{j;r_3} \} \right\} = \\ 2(-1)^{r_2-1+s_{i,i+1}}(\delta_{i+1,j} + \delta_{i,j+1})\theta_{j;r_1+r_2+r_3} \\ \text{for } |i - j| = 1, r_1 + r_2 \text{ even.}$$

Proof. Relation (3.8) implies that τ gives a Poisson automorphism. By Remark 2.3 we can identify $R(S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma), \tau)$ with $S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau)$, so it suffices to check that $S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau)$ has the stated Poisson presentation. Use (3.1) to reduce the claim to a statement about Lie algebras.

Consider the Lie algebra $\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ which is generated by the set (3.23) subject to relations (3.24)–(3.30). We define a map from the set (3.23) to $\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ by sending $\eta_{i;2r-1} \mapsto e_{i,i}t^{2r-1} \in \mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau$,

and sending $\theta_{i;r} \mapsto \theta_{i,i+1}t^r \in \mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau$. One can check that this determines a surjective Lie algebra homomorphism $\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau \rightarrow \mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau$, indeed, checking that relations (3.24)–(3.30) hold amongst the corresponding elements of $\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ is a routine calculation using (3.8).

In order to complete the proof of (2) it is sufficient to show that this map is an isomorphism. For $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq s_{i,j}}$ we inductively define elements

$$(3.31) \quad \theta_{i,j;r} := \{\theta_{i,i+1;s_{i,i+1}}, \theta_{i+1,j;r-s_{i,i+1}}\} \in \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau.$$

where $\theta_{i,i+1;r} := \theta_{i;r}$. It remains to check that $\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ is spanned by the elements

$$(3.32) \quad \{\eta_{i;2r-1} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\} \cup \{\theta_{i,j;r} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r - s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$$

We define a filtration $\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau = \bigcup_{i>0} F_i \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ by placing the generators (3.23) in degree 1 and satisfying $F_d \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau = \sum_{d_1+d_2=d} \{F_{d_1} \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau, F_{d_2} \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau\}$. By convention $F_0 \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau = 0$. The associated graded Lie algebra $\text{gr } \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau = \bigoplus_{i>0} F_i \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau / F_{i-1} \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ is generated by elements

$$(3.33) \quad \bar{\eta}_{i;2r-1} := \eta_i t^{2r-1} + F_0 \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$$

$$(3.34) \quad \bar{\theta}_{i;r} := \theta_i t^r + F_0 \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau \text{ for } 1 \leq i < n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq s_{i,i+1}}.$$

These generators of $\text{gr } \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ satisfy the top graded components of the relations (3.24)–(3.30).

Let \mathfrak{a} be an abelian Lie algebra with basis $\{d_i t^r \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$. Let $\mathfrak{u}_n(\sigma)$ be the Lie subalgebra of $\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)$ described in Lemma 3.1. Then $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_n(\sigma)$ is a Lie algebra with \mathfrak{a} an abelian ideal. Comparing the top components (3.24)–(3.30) to (3.5)–(3.7) we see that there is surjective Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_n(\sigma) \rightarrow \text{gr } \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ defined by $d_i t^r \mapsto \bar{\eta}_{i;2r-1}$ and $e_{i,i+1} t^r \mapsto \bar{\theta}_{i;r}$. The algebra $\mathfrak{a} \oplus \mathfrak{u}_n(\sigma)$ has basis consisting of element $d_i t^r, e_{j,k} t^s$ where $i = 1, \dots, n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, 1 \leq j < k \leq n, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq s_{j,k}}$. It follows that $\text{gr } \widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ is spanned by elements $\bar{\eta}_{i;2r-1}, \bar{\theta}_{j,k;s}$ where the indexes vary in the ranges specified in (3.32), and $\bar{\theta}_{j,k;s}$ defined inductively from (3.34), analogously to (3.31). We deduce that $\widehat{\mathfrak{c}}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ is spanned by the required elements, which completes the proof. \square

3.3. The semiclassical shifted Yangian. In this Section we fix $n > 0$, an even shift matrix σ of size n and $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. The (*semiclassical*) *shifted Yangian* $y_n(\sigma)$ is the Poisson algebra generated by the set

$$(3.35) \quad \{d_i^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r > 0\} \cup \{e_i^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < n, r > s_{i,i+1}\} \\ \cup \{f_i^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < n, r > s_{i+1,i}\}$$

subject to the following relations

$$(3.36) \quad \{d_i^{(r)}, d_j^{(s)}\} = 0,$$

$$(3.37) \quad \{e_i^{(r)}, f_j^{(s)}\} = -\delta_{i,j} \sum_{t=0}^{r+s-1} d_{i+1}^{(r+s-1-t)} \tilde{d}_i^{(t)},$$

$$(3.38) \quad \{d_i^{(r)}, e_j^{(s)}\} = (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} d_i^{(t)} e_j^{(r+s-1-t)},$$

$$(3.39) \quad \{d_i^{(r)}, f_j^{(s)}\} = (\delta_{i,j+1} - \delta_{i,j}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} f_j^{(r+s-1-t)} d_i^{(t)},$$

$$(3.40) \quad \{e_i^{(r)}, e_i^{(s)}\} = \sum_{t=r}^{s-1} e_i^{(t)} e_i^{(r+s-1-t)} \quad \text{if } r < s,$$

$$(3.41) \quad \{f_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(s)}\} = \sum_{t=s}^{r-1} f_i^{(r+s-1-t)} f_i^{(t)} \quad \text{if } r > s,$$

$$(3.42) \quad \{e_i^{(r+1)}, e_{i+1}^{(s)}\} - \{e_i^{(r)}, e_{i+1}^{(s+1)}\} = e_i^{(r)} e_{i+1}^{(s)},$$

$$(3.43) \quad \{f_i^{(r)}, f_{i+1}^{(s+1)}\} - \{f_i^{(r+1)}, f_{i+1}^{(s)}\} = f_{i+1}^{(s)} f_i^{(r)},$$

$$(3.44) \quad \{e_i^{(r)}, e_j^{(s)}\} = 0 \quad \text{if } |i-j| > 1,$$

$$(3.45) \quad \{f_i^{(r)}, f_j^{(s)}\} = 0 \quad \text{if } |i-j| > 1,$$

$$(3.46) \quad \{e_i^{(r)}, \{e_i^{(s)}, e_j^{(t)}\}\} + \{e_i^{(s)}, \{e_i^{(r)}, e_j^{(t)}\}\} = 0 \quad \text{if } |i-j| = 1, r \neq s,$$

$$(3.47) \quad \{f_i^{(r)}, \{f_i^{(s)}, f_j^{(t)}\}\} + \{f_i^{(s)}, \{f_i^{(r)}, f_j^{(t)}\}\} = 0 \quad \text{if } |i-j| = 1, r \neq s.$$

for all admissible i, j, r, s, t . In these relations, the notation $d_i^{(0)} = \tilde{d}_i^{(0)} := 1$ is used, and the elements $\tilde{d}_i^{(r)}$ for $r > 0$ are defined recursively by

$$(3.48) \quad \tilde{d}_i^{(r)} := - \sum_{t=1}^r d_i^{(t)} \tilde{d}_i^{(r-t)}$$

In order to describe the structure of $y_n(\sigma)$ as a commutative algebra we make the notation

$$(3.49) \quad e_{i,i+1}^{(r)} := e_i^{(r)} \text{ for } 1 \leq i < n, \quad s_{i,i+1} < r;$$

$$(3.50) \quad f_{i,i+1}^{(r)} := f_i^{(r)} \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad s_{i+1,i} < r,$$

and inductively define

$$(3.51) \quad e_{i,j}^{(r)} := \{e_{i,j-1}^{(r-s_{j-1,j})}, e_{j-1}^{(s_{j-1,j}+1)}\} \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \quad s_{i,j} < r;$$

$$(3.52) \quad f_{i,j}^{(r)} := \{f_{j-1}^{(s_{j,j-1}+1)}, f_{i,j-1}^{(r-s_{j,j-1})}\} \text{ for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n, \quad s_{j,i} < r.$$

The shifted Yangian admits a Poisson grading $y_n(\sigma) = \bigoplus_{r \geq 0} y_n(\sigma)_r$, which we call the *canonical grading*. It places $d_i^{(r)}, e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(r)}$ in degree r and the bracket lies in degree -1 , meaning $\{\cdot, \cdot\} : y_n(\sigma)_r \times y_n(\sigma)_s \rightarrow y_n(\sigma)_{r+s-1}$. There is also an important Poisson filtration $y_n(\sigma) = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} F_i y_n(\sigma)$, called the *loop filtration*, which places $d_i^{(r)}, e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(r)}$ in degree $r-1$. Again the bracket is in degree -1 so that $F_r y_n(\sigma) \times F_s y_n(\sigma) \rightarrow F_{r+s-1} y_n(\sigma)$. The associated graded Poisson algebra is denoted $\text{gr } y_n(\sigma)$.

The following theorem is a semiclassical analogue of [BK06, Theorem 2.1], which we ultimately deduce from the noncommutative setting.

Theorem 3.4. *There is a Poisson isomorphism $S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{gr } y_n(\sigma)$ defined by*

$$(3.53) \quad \begin{aligned} e_{i;r-1} &\longmapsto e_i^{(r)} + F_{r-2} y_n(\sigma) && \text{for } 1 \leq i < n, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>s_{i,i+1}}; \\ f_{i;r-1} &\longmapsto f_i^{(r)} + F_{r-2} y_n(\sigma) && \text{for } 1 \leq i < n, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>s_{i+1,i}}; \\ d_{i;r-1} &\longmapsto d_i^{(r)} + F_{r-2} y_n(\sigma) && \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence $y_n(\sigma)$ is isomorphic to the polynomial algebra on infinitely many variables

$$(3.54) \quad \{d_i^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r > 0\} \cup \{e_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r > s_{i,j}\} \\ \cup \{f_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r > s_{j,i}\}.$$

Proof. Comparing the top graded components of the relations (3.36)–(3.47) with respect to the loop filtration, with relations (3.10)–(3.18), it is straightforward to see that (3.53) gives a surjective Poisson homomorphism. To prove the theorem we demonstrate that the ordered monomials in the elements (3.54) are linearly independent.

Consider the set

$$X := \{E_i^{(r)}, F_i^{(s)}, D_j^{(t)} \mid 1 \leq i < n, 1 \leq j \leq n, s_{i,i+1} < r, s_{i+1,i} < s, 0 < t\}.$$

In [BK06, §2] the shifted Yangian $Y_n(\sigma)$ is defined as a quotient of the free algebra $\mathbb{C}\langle X \rangle$ by the ideal generated by the relations [BK06, (2.4)–(2.15)]. Let $L := L_X$ be the free Lie algebra on X and define a grading $L = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} L_i$ by placing $E_i^{(r)}, F_i^{(r)}, D_i^{(r)}$ in degree $r - 1$. Then we place a filtration on the enveloping algebra $U(L)$ so that L_i lies in degree $i + 1$. By the PBW theorem for $U(L_X)$ we see that $\text{gr} U(L) \cong S(L)$.

The universal property of $U(L)$ ensures that there is a surjective algebra homomorphism $U(L) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\langle X \rangle$ and by [Ser06, I, Ch. IV, Theorem 4.2] this is an isomorphism. Identifying these algebras, the filtration on $U(L)$ descends to $Y_n(\sigma) = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} F'_i Y_n(\sigma)$, and this resulting filtration is commonly referred to as the canonical filtration [BK06, §5]. The associated graded algebra $\text{gr} Y_n(\sigma)$ is equipped with a Poisson structure in the usual manner. Comparing relations (3.36)–(3.47) with the top graded components of relations [BK06, (2.4)–(2.15)] we see that the Poisson surjection $S(L) \rightarrow \text{gr} Y_n(\sigma)$ factors through $S(L) \rightarrow y_n(\sigma)$. As a result there is a surjective Poisson homomorphism $\pi : y_n(\sigma) \rightarrow \text{gr} Y_n(\sigma)$ given by $e_i^{(r)} \mapsto E_i^{(r)} + F'_{r-1} Y_n(\sigma)$, $f_i^{(r)} \mapsto F_i^{(r)} + F'_{r-1} Y_n(\sigma)$, $d_i^{(r)} \mapsto D_i^{(r)} + F'_{r-1} Y_n(\sigma)$. Following [BK06, (2.18), (2.19)] we introduce elements $E_{i,j}^{(r)}, F_{i,j}^{(r)}$ of $Y_n(\sigma)$ lying in filtered degree r . By the definition of the filtration and the elements (3.51), (3.52) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(e_{i,j}^{(r)}) &= E_{i,j}^{(r)} + F'_{r-1} Y_n(\sigma); \\ \pi(f_{i,j}^{(r)}) &= F_{i,j}^{(r)} + F'_{r-1} Y_n(\sigma). \end{aligned}$$

By [BK06, Theorem 2.3(iv)] the ordered monomials in $E_{i,j}^{(r)}, F_{i,j}^{(r)}, D_i^{(r)}$ are linearly independent in $Y_n(\sigma)$ and so we deduce that the images of these monomials in $\text{gr} Y_n(\sigma)$ are linearly independent. This completes the proof. \square

We record two formulas for future use, which are semiclassical analogues of [BT18, (4.32)]

Lemma 3.5. *The following hold for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$, $r > 0$ and $s > s_{j,j+1}$:*

$$(3.55) \quad \{\tilde{d}_i^{(r)}, e_j^{(s)}\} = (\delta_{i,j+1} - \delta_{i,j}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} \tilde{d}_i^{(t)} e_j^{(r+s-1-t)},$$

$$(3.56) \quad \{\tilde{d}_i^{(r)}, f_j^{(s)}\} = (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} f_j^{(r+s-1-t)} \tilde{d}_i^{(t)}.$$

Proof. We only sketch (3.55), as the proof of (3.56) is almost identical. The argument is by induction based on (3.48). Note that $\tilde{d}_i^{(1)} = -d_i^{(1)}$ and so (3.55) is equivalent to (3.38) in this

case. We have $\{\tilde{d}_i^{(r)}, e_j^{(s)}\} = \{\sum_{t=0}^{r-1} d_i^{(r-t)} \tilde{d}_i^{(t)}, e_j^{(s)}\}$ and relation (3.38) together with the inductive hypothesis imply that the coefficient of $e_j^{(s+t)}$ is $(\delta_{i,j+1} - \delta_{i,j})(d_i^{(r-1-t)} + \sum_{m=t+1}^{r-1} (\tilde{d}_i^{(r-m)} d_i^{(m-t-1)} - d_i^{(r-m)} \tilde{d}_i^{(m-t-1)})$. Using $d_i^{(0)} = \tilde{d}_i^{(0)} = 1$ we see that all quadratic terms cancel, whilst the linear term equates to $(\delta_{i,j+1} - \delta_{i,j}) \tilde{d}_i^{(r-1-t)}$, which concludes the induction. \square

3.4. The Dirac reduction of the shifted Yangian. In this Section we suppose that σ is symmetric and even. Examining the relations (3.36)–(3.47) we see that there is unique Poisson automorphism τ of $y_n(\sigma)$ determined by

$$(3.57) \quad \begin{aligned} \tau(d_i^{(r)}) &:= (-1)^r d_i^{(r)}; \\ \tau(e_i^{(r)}) &:= (-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}} f_i^{(r)}; \\ \tau(f_i^{(r)}) &:= (-1)^{r+s_{i+1,i}} e_i^{(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Examining the relations (3.36)–(3.47) we see that τ extends to an involutive Poisson automorphism of $y_n(\sigma)$. Our present goal is to give a complete description of the Dirac reduction $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$.

For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>s_{i,i+1}}$ we write

$$(3.58) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{e}_i^{(r)} &:= e_i^{(r)} + (-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}} f_i^{(r)} \in y_n(\sigma); \\ \check{e}_i^{(r)} &:= e_i^{(r)} - (-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}} f_i^{(r)} \in y_n(\sigma), \end{aligned}$$

so that $\hat{e}_i^{(r)}$ and $d_j^{(2s)}$ are τ -invariants, whilst $\check{e}_i^{(r)}$ and $d_j^{(2s-1)}$ each span a non-trivial representation of the cyclic group of order 2 generated by τ . We can recover $e_i^{(r)}$ and $f_i^{(r)}$ via

$$(3.59) \quad \begin{aligned} e_i^{(r)} &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{e}_i^{(r)} + \check{e}_i^{(r)}); \\ f_i^{(r)} &= \frac{1}{2}(-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}}(\hat{e}_i^{(r)} - \check{e}_i^{(r)}). \end{aligned}$$

Now let $\check{y}_n(\sigma)$ be the ideal of $y_n(\sigma)$ generated by

$$\{\check{e}_i^{(r)}, d_j^{(2s-1)} \mid i = 1, \dots, n-1, j = 1, \dots, n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>s_{i,i+1}}, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}.$$

Also write $\check{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau := \check{y}_n(\sigma) \cap y_n(\sigma)^\tau$. By Lemma 2.2 we see that $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau) = y_n(\sigma)^\tau / \check{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ is Poisson generated by elements

$$(3.60) \quad \begin{aligned} \theta_i^{(r)} &:= \hat{e}_i^{(r)} + \check{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n-1, r > s_{i,i+1}, \\ \eta_j^{(2r)} &:= d_j^{(2s)} + \check{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n, r > 0, \end{aligned}$$

with Poisson brackets induced by the bracket on $y_n(\sigma)$. Furthermore $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ is generated as a commutative algebra by elements

$$(3.61) \quad \{\eta_i^{(2r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\} \cup \{\theta_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r - s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$$

where the $\theta_{i,j}^{(r)} := e_{i,j}^{(r)} + (-1)^{r+s_{i,j}} f_{i,j}^{(r)} + \check{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau \in R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$. Using an inductive argument and (3.37) we see the elements $\theta_{i,j}^{(r)}$ can also be defined via the following recursion

$$(3.62) \quad \begin{aligned} \theta_{i,i+1}^{(r)} &:= \theta_i^{(r)} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < n, r - s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \\ \theta_{i,j}^{(r)} &:= \{\theta_{i,j-1}^{(r-s_{j-1,j})}, \theta_{j-1}^{(s_{j-1,j}+1)}\} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r - s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}. \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma can be deduced from (3.38), (3.39), (3.55), (3.56).

Lemma 3.6. *The following equalities hold in $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$:*

$$(3.63) \quad \{d_i^{(2r-1)}, \check{e}_j^{(s)}\} + \check{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau = (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} \eta_i^{(2t)} \theta_j^{(2(r-t-1)+s)}$$

$$(3.64) \quad \{\tilde{d}_i^{(2r-1)}, \check{e}_j^{(s)}\} + \check{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau = (\delta_{i,j+1} - \delta_{i,j}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2t)} \theta_j^{(2(r-t-1)+s)}$$

Thanks to Theorem 3.4 that $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ comes equipped with the *canonical grading* $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau) = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)_i$ which places $\theta_i^{(r)}, \eta_i^{(r)}$ in degree r and the Poisson bracket in degree -1 . Another crucial feature is the *loop filtration* $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau) = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} F_i R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ which places $\theta_i^{(r)}, \eta_i^{(r)}$ in degree $r-1$ and the bracket in degree -1 . Both of these structures are naturally inherited from $y_n(\sigma)$.

The following is our main structural result on the Dirac reduction of the shifted Yangian.

Theorem 3.7. *The Dirac reduction $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ is Poisson generated by elements*

$$(3.65) \quad \{\eta_i^{(2r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\} \cup \{\theta_i^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < n, r - s_{i,i+1} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$$

together with the following relations

$$(3.66) \quad \{\eta_i^{(2r)}, \eta_j^{(2s)}\} = 0$$

$$(3.67) \quad \{\eta_i^{(2r)}, \theta_j^{(s)}\} = (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1}) \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} \eta_i^{(2t)} \theta_j^{(2r+s-1-2t)}$$

$$(3.68) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_i^{(s)}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } r + s - 1 \text{ odd}$$

$$(3.69) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_i^{(s)}\} = \sum_{t=r}^{s-1} \frac{1}{2} \theta_i^{(t)} \theta_i^{(2m-t)} + (-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}} \sum_{t=0}^m 2\eta_{i+1}^{(2m-2t)} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2t)} \quad \text{for } r < s, r + s - 1 = 2m$$

$$(3.70) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r+1)}, \theta_{i+1}^{(s)}\} - \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_{i+1}^{(s+1)}\} = \frac{1}{2} \theta_i^{(r)} \theta_{i+1}^{(s)}$$

$$(3.71) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_j^{(s)}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| > 1$$

$$(3.72) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} + \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} = 0 \quad \text{for } |i - j| = 1 \text{ and } r + s \text{ odd}$$

$$(3.73) \quad \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} + \{\theta_i^{(s)}, \{\theta_i^{(r)}, \theta_j^{(t)}\}\} = \\ 2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \delta_{i,j+1} \sum_{m_1=0}^{m-1} \sum_{m_2=0}^{m_1} \eta_{i+1}^{(2(m-m_1-1))} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2m_2)} \theta_j^{(2(m_1-m_2)+t)} \\ + 2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \delta_{i+1,j} \sum_{m_1=0}^{m-1} \sum_{m_2=0}^{m-m_1-1} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2m_1)} \eta_{i+1}^{(2m_2)} \theta_j^{(2(m-m_1-m_2-1)+t)} \\ \text{for } |i - j| = 1 \text{ and } r + s = 2m \text{ even}$$

where we adopt the convention $\eta_i^{(0)} = \tilde{\eta}_i^{(0)} = 1$ and the elements $\{\tilde{\eta}_i^{(r)} \mid r \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$ are defined via the recursion

$$(3.74) \quad \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2r)} := - \sum_{t=1}^r \eta_i^{(2t)} \tilde{\eta}_i^{(2r-2t)}.$$

Proof. First we show that the elements $\tilde{\eta}_i^{(2r)} := \tilde{d}_i^{(2r)} + \tilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau \in R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ satisfy the recursion (3.74). By Theorem 3.4 the subalgebra of $y_n(\sigma)$ generated by $\{d_i^{(r)} \mid i = 1, \dots, n, r > 0\}$ is a graded polynomial ring with $d_i^{(r)}$ in degree r . By induction $\tilde{d}_i^{(r)}$ lies in degree r . This forces $\tilde{d}_i^{(2r-1)} \in \tilde{y}_n(\sigma)$ for all $r > 0$ and so (3.48) equals (3.74) modulo $\tilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau$, confirming the claim.

We now deduce relations (3.66)–(3.73) from (3.36)–(3.47). First of all (3.66) follows immediately from (3.36). By (3.38) and (3.39) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{d_i^{(2r)}, \hat{e}_j^{(s)}\} &= (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1}) \sum_{t=0}^{2r-1} d_i^{(t)} \left(e_j^{(2r+s-1-t)} - (-1)^{s+s_{j,j+1}} f_j^{(2r+s-1-t)} \right) \\ &= (\delta_{i,j} - \delta_{i,j+1}) \left(\sum_{t=0}^{r-1} d_i^{(2t)} \hat{e}_j^{(2r+s-1-2t)} + \sum_{t=0}^{r-1} d_i^{(2t+1)} \check{e}_j^{(2r+s-2t-2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Projecting to $R(y_n(\sigma), \tau) = y_n(\sigma)^\tau / \tilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ we see that the elements (3.60) satisfy (3.67).

Note that (3.37) implies that

$$(3.75) \quad \{e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(s)}\} = \{e_i^{(s)}, f_i^{(r)}\} \text{ for } r, s > s_{i,i+1}.$$

Together with (3.40) and (3.41) we deduce for all $r < s$

$$\begin{aligned} \{\hat{e}_i^{(r)}, \hat{e}_i^{(s)}\} &= \{e_i^{(r)}, e_i^{(s)}\} + (-1)^{r+s} \{f_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(s)}\} + (-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}} \{e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(s)}\} - (-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}} \{e_i^{(s)}, f_i^{(r)}\} \\ &= \sum_{t=r}^{s-1} e_i^{(t)} e_i^{(r+s-1-t)} - \sum_{t=r}^{s-1} f_i^{(r+s-1-t)} f_i^{(t)} - ((-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}} - (-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}}) \{e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(s)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting in (3.59) we see that

$$e_i^{(t)} e_i^{(r+s-1-t)} - f_i^{(r+s-1-t)} f_i^{(t)} = \frac{1}{4} (1 - (-1)^{r+s-1}) \hat{e}_i^{(t)} \hat{e}_i^{(r+s-1-t)} + \tilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau.$$

Combining with (3.37) we have now deduced (3.68) and (3.69).

Using (3.2), (3.37), (3.42), (3.43) we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \{\hat{e}_i^{(r+1)}, \hat{e}_{i+1}^{(s)}\} - \{\hat{e}_i^{(r)}, \hat{e}_{i+1}^{(s+1)}\} &= \{e_i^{(r+1)}, e_{i+1}^{(s)}\} - \{e_i^{(r)}, e_{i+1}^{(s+1)}\} \\ &\quad + (-1)^{r+s+1+s_{i,i+2}} (\{f_i^{(r+1)}, f_{i+1}^{(s)}\} - \{f_i^{(r)}, f_{i+1}^{(s+1)}\}) \\ &= e_i^{(r)} e_{i+1}^{(s)} + (-1)^{r+s+s_{i,i+2}} f_{i+1}^{(s)} f_i^{(r)} \end{aligned}$$

Substituting in (3.59) we see that this is equal to the right hand side of (3.70) modulo $\tilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau$.

Finally take $|i - j| = 1$. Expanding in terms of generators (3.35) and applying relations (3.37), (3.46), (3.47) together with the Jacobi identity and (3.75) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \{\widehat{e}_i^{(r)}, \{\widehat{e}_i^{(s)}, \widehat{e}_j^{(t)}\}\} + \{\widehat{e}_i^{(s)}, \{\widehat{e}_i^{(r)}, \widehat{e}_j^{(t)}\}\} \\
&= (-1)^{s+t+s_{i,i+1}+s_{j,j+1}} \{e_i^{(r)}, \{f_i^{(s)}, f_j^{(t)}\}\} + (-1)^{r+t+s_{i,i+1}+s_{j,j+1}} \{e_i^{(s)}, \{f_i^{(r)}, f_j^{(t)}\}\} \\
&\quad + (-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}} \{f_i^{(r)}, \{e_i^{(s)}, e_j^{(t)}\}\} + (-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}} \{f_i^{(s)}, \{e_i^{(r)}, e_j^{(t)}\}\} \\
&= (-1)^{s+t+s_{i,i+1}+s_{j,j+1}} (1 + (-1)^{r+s}) \{\{e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(s)}\}, f_j^{(t)}\} - (-1)^{r+s_{i,i+1}} (1 + (-1)^{r+s}) \{\{e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(s)}\}, e_j^{(t)}\}
\end{aligned}$$

If $r + s$ is odd this vanishes, which proves (3.72). Now assume that $r + s = 2m$ is even. Using (3.37) and Jacobi the last line of the previous equation reduces to

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \{\{e_i^{(r)}, f_i^{(r)}\}, \widetilde{e}_j^{(t)}\} \\
& 2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \left\{ \sum_{m_1=0}^{2m-1} d_{i+1}^{(2m-1-m_1)} \widetilde{d}_i^{(m_1)}, \widetilde{e}_j^{(t)} \right\} \\
&= 2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \sum_{m_1=0}^{2m-1} (d_{i+1}^{(2m-1-m_1)} \{\widetilde{d}_i^{(m_1)}, \widetilde{e}_j^{(t)}\} + \{d_{i+1}^{(2m-1-m_1)}, \widetilde{e}_j^{(t)}\} \widetilde{d}_i^{(m_1)}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that $d_i^{(2r-1)} \in \widetilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ for all i, r we simplify this expression modulo $\widetilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ to get

$$2(-1)^{s+s_{i,i+1}-1} \left(\sum_{m_1=0}^{m-1} d_{i+1}^{(2m-2m_1-2)} \{\widetilde{d}_i^{(2m_1+1)}, \widetilde{e}_j^{(t)}\} + \sum_{m_1=0}^{m-1} \{d_{i+1}^{(2(m-m_1)-1)}, \widetilde{e}_j^{(t)}\} \widetilde{d}_i^{(2m_1)} \right) + \widetilde{y}_n(\sigma)^\tau$$

Finally using (3.63) and (3.64) this expression coincides with the right hand side of (3.73).

We have shown that the generators (3.65) satisfy (3.66)–(3.73), and it remains to show that these are a complete set of relations.

Let $\widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ denote the Poisson algebra with generators (3.65) and relations (3.66)–(3.73). We have shown that there is a Poisson homomorphism $\widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau) \twoheadrightarrow R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ sending the elements (3.65) to the elements (3.60) with the same names. To complete the proof we show that this map sends a spanning set to a basis.

We define a loop filtration on $\widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau) = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} F_i \widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ by placing $\theta_i^{(r)}, \eta_i^{(r)}$ in degree $r - 1$ and the bracket in degree -1 . Examining the top filtered degree pieces of the relations (3.66)–(3.73) with respect to the loop filtration, we see from Theorem 3.3 that there is a surjective Poisson homomorphism $S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau) \twoheadrightarrow \text{gr } \widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$. We deduce that $\text{gr } \widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ is generated as a commutative algebra by elements $\theta_{i,j}^{(r)} + F_{r-2} \widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau), \eta_i^{(2r)} + F_{r-2} \widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ with indexes varying in the same ranges as (3.61). Again the elements $\theta_{i,j}^{(r)} \in \widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ are defined via the recursion (3.62). By a standard filtration argument we deduce that the elements of $\widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ with the same names as (3.61) generate $\widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ as a commutative algebra. We have shown that $\widehat{R}(y_n(\sigma), \tau) \twoheadrightarrow R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ maps a spanning set to a basis. This completes the proof. \square

Let $\text{gr } R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ denote the graded algebra for the loop filtration. In the last paragraph of the proof of Theorem 3.7 we obtained the following important result.

Corollary 3.8. *There is a Poisson isomorphism $S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{gr } R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$ given by*

$$(3.76) \quad \begin{aligned} \theta_{i;r-1} &\longmapsto \theta_i^{(r)} + F_{r-2} y_n(\sigma) && \text{for } 1 \leq i < n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>s_{i,i+1}}; \\ \eta_{i;2r-1} &\longmapsto \eta_i^{(2r)} + F_{2r-2} y_n(\sigma) && \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}. \end{aligned}$$

4. FINITE W -ALGEBRAS FOR CLASSICAL LIE ALGEBRAS

In this section \mathbb{C} continues to be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, and we fix the following additional notation:

- $N > 0$ is an integer and $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$ such that $\varepsilon^N = 1$.
- $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_N(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathfrak{g}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is a classical Lie subalgebra such that

$$\mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \begin{cases} \mathfrak{so}_N & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1, \\ \mathfrak{sp}_N & \text{if } \varepsilon = -1. \end{cases}$$

- $G = \text{GL}_N(\mathbb{C})$ and $G_0 \subseteq G$ is the connected algebraic subgroup satisfying $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \text{Lie}(G_0)$.
- $\kappa : \mathfrak{g}_0 \times \mathfrak{g}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is the trace form associated to the natural representation \mathbb{C}^N of G .

4.1. Partitions for nilpotent orbits in classical Lie algebras. We refer to the G_0 -orbits in \mathfrak{g}_0 consisting of nilpotent elements as *nilpotent orbits*. Nilpotent G -orbits in \mathfrak{g} are classified by partitions, corresponding to the sizes of Jordan blocks, and for each nilpotent G -orbit $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ the intersection $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \cap \mathfrak{g}_0$ is a union of either one or two nilpotent G_0 -orbits. Therefore an approximate classification of nilpotent G_0 -orbits is achieved by describing the partitions $\lambda \vdash N$ for which $\mathcal{O}_\lambda \cap \mathfrak{g}_0 \neq \emptyset$. The set of such partitions is denoted $\mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$, and they are characterised as follows.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \vdash N$. Then $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$ if and only if there exists an involution $i \mapsto i'$ on the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that:*

- (1) $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i'}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- (2) $i = i'$ if and only if $\varepsilon(-1)^{\lambda_i} = 1$;
- (3) $i' \in \{i-1, i, i+1\}$. □

Whenever we choose $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$ we will assume that a choice of involution has been fixed in accordance the Lemma. We also adopt the convention that our partitions are non-decreasing $\lambda_1 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_n$. For completeness we mention that $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$ corresponds to one orbit unless $\varepsilon = 1$ and all parts of λ are even, which case there are two G_0 -orbits of nilpotent elements of \mathfrak{g}_0 with Jordan blocks given by λ and these are permuted by the outer automorphism group of \mathfrak{g}_0 , see [CM93, Section 5.1] for example.

4.2. The Dynkin pyramid and the centraliser. Choose $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{P}(N)$. We recalled the notion of a shift matrix in Section 3.2, following [BK06]. The *symmetric shift matrix* for λ is the even, symmetric shift matrix $\sigma = (s_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ defined by

$$(4.1) \quad s_{i,j} := \frac{|\lambda_i - \lambda_j|}{2}$$

For $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i$ we let $b_{i,j}$ denote the j th box in the i th row and we identify \mathbb{C}^N with the vector space spanned by the symbols $b_{i,j}$. The general linear Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}_N$ has a

basis

$$(4.2) \quad \{e_{i,j;k,l} \mid 1 \leq i, k \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq \lambda_i, 1 \leq l \leq \lambda_k\}$$

where $e_{i,j;k,l}b_{r,s} = \delta_{k,r}\delta_{l,s}e_{i,j;r,s}$, so that

$$(4.3) \quad [e_{i_1,j_1;k_1,l_1}, e_{i_2,j_2;k_2,l_2}] = \delta_{k_1,i_2}\delta_{l_1,j_2}e_{i_1,j_1;k_2,l_2} - \delta_{k_2,i_1}\delta_{l_2,j_1}e_{i_2,j_2;k_1,l_1}$$

We pick the nilpotent element in $\mathfrak{g}(2)$ by the rule

$$(4.4) \quad e := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_i-1} e_{i,j;i,j+1}$$

It has Jordan blocks of sizes $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$. We also define a semisimple element $h \in \mathfrak{gl}_N$ by

$$(4.5) \quad h := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_i} (\lambda_i - 1 - 2j)e_{i,j;i,j}$$

It is easy to see that the pair $\{e, h\}$ can be completed to an \mathfrak{sl}_2 triple $\{e, h, f\}$. We refer to the grading $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ induced by $\text{ad}(h)$ as the *Dynkin grading for e* . It is well-known that this is a good grading in the sense of [BG07]. It satisfies

$$(4.6) \quad \deg(e_{i,j;k,l}) = 2(l - j) + \lambda_i - \lambda_k.$$

For $1 \leq i, k \leq n$ and $r = s_{i,k}, s_{i,k} + 1, \dots, s_{i,k} + \min(\lambda_i, \lambda_k) - 1$, we define elements

$$(4.7) \quad c_{i,k}^{(r)} = \sum_{2r=2(l-j)+\lambda_i-\lambda_k} e_{i,j;k,l}$$

The following fact is well known. See [BK06, Lemma 7.3] where the notation $c_{i,j}^{(r)}$ differs from ours by a shift in r .

Lemma 4.2. *The centraliser \mathfrak{g}^e has basis*

$$(4.8) \quad \{c_{i,k}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i, k \leq n, r - s_{i,k} = 0, 1, \dots, \min(\lambda_i, \lambda_k) - 1\}$$

with Lie bracket

$$(4.9) \quad [c_{i,j}^{(r)}, c_{k,l}^{(s)}] = \delta_{j,k}c_{i,k}^{(r+s)} - \delta_{i,l}c_{k,j}^{(r+s)}.$$

Furthermore \mathfrak{g}^e is a Dynkin graded Lie subalgebra with $c_{i,k}^{(r)}$ lying in degree $2r$. □

4.3. Symplectic and orthogonal subalgebras. In this Section we assume that $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$ and that the involution on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ coming from Lemma 4.1 is trivial.

Consider the matrix

$$(4.10) \quad J := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^{\lambda_i} (-1)^j e_{i,j;i,\lambda_i+1-j}$$

This block diagonal matrix can be described as follows. For each index $i = 1, \dots, n$ there is a block of size λ_i , each of these blocks has entries ± 1 on the antidiagonal and zeroes elsewhere. Thus when $\varepsilon = 1$ the matrix J is symmetric and when $\varepsilon = -1$ it is anti-symmetric. It follows that

$$(4.11) \quad J^{-1} = \varepsilon J.$$

Now define an involution of \mathfrak{gl}_N by the rule

$$(4.12) \quad \tau : X \mapsto -J^{-1}X^\top J$$

Lemma 4.3. *For all admissible indexes we have:*

- (i) $\tau(e_{i,j;k,l}) = (-1)^{j-l-1} e_{k,\lambda_k+1-l;i,\lambda_i+1-j}$;
- (ii) $\tau(e) = e$ and $\tau(h) = h$;
- (iii) $\tau(c_{i,k}^{(r)}) = (-1)^{r-\frac{\lambda_k-\lambda_i}{2}-1} c_{k,i}^{(r)}$.

Proof. Using (4.11) and multiplying matrices we have $\tau(e_{i,j;k,l}) = -\varepsilon(-1)^{\lambda_k+j-l} e_{k,\lambda_k+1-l;i,\lambda_i+1-j}$ and so (i) follows from Lemma 4.1(2). Now (ii) and (iii) follow by applying (i) to (4.4), (4.5) and (4.7). \square

We decompose $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1$ into eigenspaces for τ so that \mathfrak{g}_0 is the space of τ -invariants. Then we have

$$(4.13) \quad \mathfrak{g}_0 \cong \begin{cases} \mathfrak{so}_N & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1; \\ \mathfrak{sp}_N & \text{if } \varepsilon = -1. \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 4.3(ii) we have $\{e, h\} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_0$, and \mathfrak{g}_1 is a \mathfrak{g}_0 -module. Write G_0 for the connected component of the group of elements $g \in \mathrm{GL}_N$ such that $gJg^\top = J$. This is a classical group satisfying $\mathrm{Lie}(G_0) = \mathfrak{g}_0$.

As τ preserves $\mathfrak{g}(-2)$ we also have that $\mathfrak{g}(-2) = \mathfrak{g}_0(-2) \oplus \mathfrak{g}_1(-2)$. Writing $f = f_1 + f_2$ with $f_1 \in \mathfrak{g}_0(-2)$ and $f_2 \in \mathfrak{g}_1(-2)$ and using the fact that $h \in \mathfrak{g}$ we deduce that $h = [e, f_1]$ and $[e, f_2] = 0$. Since the Dynkin grading is good for e in \mathfrak{g} this yields $f_2 = 0$. We conclude that the \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $\{e, h, f\}$ is contained in \mathfrak{g}_0 .

Our next result explains the relationship between the shifted current algebras and the centralisers described above.

Lemma 4.4. (1) *There is a surjective Lie algebra homomorphism*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma) &\twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^\varepsilon; \\ e_{i,j}t^r &\mapsto c_{i,j}^{(r)} \end{aligned}$$

where $c_{i,j}^{(r)} := 0$ for $r \geq s_{i,j} + \lambda_1$. The kernel is Poisson generated by $e_{1,1}t^r$ with $r \geq \lambda_1$.

(2) *If σ is even and symmetric the homomorphism from (1) restricts to $\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{g}_0^\varepsilon$.*

(i) *For $\varepsilon = 1$ the kernel is Poisson generated by $\{\eta_{1,2r-1} \mid 2r-1 \geq \lambda_1\}$.*

(ii) *For $\varepsilon = -1$ the kernel is Poisson generated by those same elements along with*

$$\{\theta_{i,\lambda_i+s_{i,i+1}} \mid i = 1, \dots, n-1\}.$$

Proof. Part (1) is explained in [GT19c, Lemma 2.6]. For the first claim in part (2) compare (3.22) with Lemma 4.3(iii) to see that the map is τ -equivariant.

We go on to describe the kernel in (2). First of all observe that the elements listed there are τ -fixed elements of the kernel of $\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma) \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{g}^\varepsilon$; for $\varepsilon = -1$ we use (3.11), (3.12). Now observe that $\mathfrak{g}_0^\varepsilon$ has a spanning set consisting of elements of the form $c_{i,j}^{(r)} + \tau(c_{i,j}^{(r)})$. By Lemma 4.2 we can show that the elements in (2) generate the kernel by checking that the ideal \mathfrak{i} which they generate contains

$$(4.14) \quad \{\eta_{i,r} \mid i = 1, \dots, n, r \geq \lambda_i\} \cup \{\theta_{i,r} \mid i = 1, \dots, n-1, r \geq s_{i,i+1} + \lambda_i\}.$$

First take $\varepsilon = 1$ so that λ_1 is odd, by Lemma 4.1. Using relation (3.67) we see that \mathfrak{i} contains $\{\eta_{1;\lambda_1}, \theta_{1;r}\} = \theta_{1;\lambda_1+r}$ for $r \geq s_{1,2}$, whilst (3.70) shows that $\eta_{1;\lambda_2+r} - \eta_{2;\lambda_2+r} \in \mathfrak{i}$ for all $r \geq 0$. In particular $\eta_{2;\lambda_2+r} \in \mathfrak{i}$ for $r \geq 0$. By Theorem 3.3 the subalgebra of $\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)^\tau$ generated by $\theta_{i,r}, \eta_{i;r}$ with $2 \leq i$ is isomorphic to a current Lie algebra of smaller rank so the description of the kernel follows by induction.

For $\varepsilon = -1$, λ_1 is even and the ideal \mathfrak{i} contains $\{\eta_{1;\lambda_1+1}, \theta_{1;s}\} = \theta_{1;\lambda_1+1+s}$ for $s \geq s_{1,2}$. Together with $\theta_{1;\lambda_1+s_{1,2}}$ this gives all elements of the form $\theta_{1;r}$ listed in (4.14). Now the induction proceeds in the same way as the case $\varepsilon = 1$. \square

4.4. Generators of the W -algebra. Here we recall formulas for generators of $S(\mathfrak{gl}_N, e)$, due to Brundan and Kleshchev [BK06]. Their notation is slightly different, however it is a simple exercise to translate between the two settings. In this Section we continue to assume that the involution on $\{1, \dots, n\}$ coming from Lemma 4.1 is trivial. This implies that λ is even.

Now for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, $0 \leq x < n$ and $r > 0$, we let

$$(4.15) \quad t_{i,k;x}^{(r)} := \sum_{s=1}^r (-1)^{r-s} \sum_{\substack{(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m) \\ m=1, \dots, s}} (-1)^{\#\{q=1, \dots, s-1 | k_q \leq x\}} e_{i_1, j_1; k_1, l_1} \cdots e_{i_s, j_s; k_s, l_s} \in S(\mathfrak{g}(\geq 0))$$

where the sum is taken over all indexes such that for $m = 1, \dots, s$

$$(4.16) \quad 1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_s, k_1, \dots, k_s \leq n, 1 \leq j_m \leq \lambda_{i_m} \text{ and } 1 \leq l_m \leq \lambda_{k_m}$$

satisfying the following six conditions:

- (a) $\sum_{m=1}^s (2l_m - 2j_m + \lambda_{i_m} - \lambda_{k_m}) = 2(r - s)$;
- (b) $2l_m - 2j_m + \lambda_{i_m} - \lambda_{k_m} \geq 0$ for each $m = 1, \dots, s$;
- (c) if $k_m > x$, then $l_m < j_{m+1}$ for each $m = 1, \dots, s - 1$;
- (d) if $k_m \leq x$ then $l_m \geq j_{m+1}$ for each $m = 1, \dots, s - 1$;
- (e) $i_1 = i, k_s = k$;
- (f) $k_m = i_{m+1}$ for each $m = 1, \dots, s - 1$.

Keeping $r > 0$ fixed and choosing $s \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ we make the notation $\mathcal{X}_{i,k}^{(r,s)}$ for the set of ordered sets $(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)_{m=1}^s$ in the range (4.16) satisfying the conditions (a)–(f) and consider the map

$$(4.17) \quad v(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m) := (k_{s+1-m}, \lambda_{k_{s+1-m}} + 1 - l_{s+1-m}, i_{s+1-m}, \lambda_{i_{s+1-m}} + 1 - j_{s+1-m})$$

defined on ordered sets in the range (4.16).

Lemma 4.5. *The map v defines a bijection $\mathcal{X}_{i,k}^{(r,s)} \xrightarrow{1-1} \mathcal{X}_{k,i}^{(r,s)}$.*

Proof. The index bounds (4.16) ensure that $\mathcal{X}_{i,k}^{(r,s)}$ is finite. Since v^2 is the identity map it will suffice to show that v is well defined $\mathcal{X}_{i,k}^{(r,s)} \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{k,i}^{(r,s)}$. We fix $(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)_{m=1}^s \in \mathcal{X}_{i,k}^{(r,s)}$ and check that conditions (a)–(f) hold for $v(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)$. For example,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=1}^s (2(\lambda_{i_{s+1-m}} + 1 - j_{s+1-m}) - 2(\lambda_{l_{s+1-m}} + 1 - k_{s+1-m}) + (\lambda_{k_{s+1-m}} - \lambda_{i_{s+1-m}})) \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^s (2l_m - 2j_m + \lambda_{i_m} - \lambda_{k_m}) = 2(r - s) \end{aligned}$$

This shows that (a) for $(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)_{m=1}^s$ implies (a) for $v(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)_{m=1}^s$. Conditions (b)–(f) can be checked similarly. \square

Now we define a map $\theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}(\geq 0))$ by

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} c_{i,i}^{(r)} &\longmapsto t_{i,i;i-1}^{(r-1)} && \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n \text{ and } 0 \leq r < \lambda_i; \\ c_{i,k}^{(r)} &\longmapsto t_{i,k;i}^{(r-1)} && \text{for } 1 \leq i < k \leq n \text{ and } r - s_{i,k} = 0, \dots, \min(\lambda_i, \lambda_k) - 1; \\ c_{k,i}^{(r)} &\longmapsto t_{k,i;i}^{(r-1)} && \text{for } 1 \leq i < k \leq n \text{ and } r - s_{j,k} = 0, \dots, \min(\lambda_i, \lambda_k) - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing (4.6) with Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.3 we see that τ induces involutions on \mathfrak{g}^e and $S(\mathfrak{g}(\geq 0))$, and these will all be denoted τ . The hardest part of the following result is the assertion that the image of the map θ described in (4.18) lies in $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$, which follows from a result of Brundan and Kleshchev. We add to this the observation that θ is τ -equivariant.

Proposition 4.6. $\theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is τ -equivariant. In particular we have

$$(4.19) \quad \tau(t_{i,k;m}^{(r-1)}) = (-1)^{r - \frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_i}{2} - 1} t_{k,i;m}^{(r-1)} \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k \leq n \text{ and all } m, r.$$

Proof. The assertion that the image of θ lies in $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is an immediate consequence of [BK06, Corollary 9.4], upon taking the top graded term with respect to the Kazhdan filtration of the finite W -algebra (see also [GT19b, §4] for a short summary). Thanks to Lemma 4.3(iii) the τ -equivariance will follow from (4.19). Fix indexes $1 \leq i \leq k \leq n$, $0 \leq x < n$ and $0 < r$. Choose $s \in \{1, \dots, r\}$. Let $(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)_{m=1}^s \in \mathcal{X}_{i,i}^{(r,s)}$. Thanks to Lemma 4.3(i) we have

$$(4.20) \quad \tau\left(\prod_{m=1}^s e_{i_m, j_m; k_m, l_m}\right) = (-1)^{\sum_{m=1}^s (j_m - l_m + 1)} \prod_{t=1}^s e_{v(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)}$$

Conditions (a), (e) (f) imply that $\sum_m (j_m - l_m + 1) = \frac{\lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{k_s}}{2} - r$. Hence the sign on the right hand side of (4.20) is equal to $(-1)^{r - \frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_i}{2}}$. Furthermore condition (f) ensures that $\#\{m = 1, \dots, s-1 \mid k_m \leq x\} = \#\{m = 2, \dots, s \mid i_m \leq x\}$. Combining these observations together with Lemma 4.5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(t_{i,k;x}^{(r)}) &= \sum_{s=1}^r (-1)^{r-s} \sum_{(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)_{m \in \mathcal{X}_{i,k}^{(r,s)}}} (-1)^{\#\{m=1, \dots, s-1 \mid k_m \leq x\}} \tau\left(\prod_m e_{i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m}\right) \\ &= (-1)^{r - \frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_i}{2}} \sum_{s=1}^r (-1)^{r-s} \sum_{(i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m)_{m \in \mathcal{X}_{k,i}^{(r,s)}}} (-1)^{\#\{m=1, \dots, s-1 \mid k_m \leq x\}} \prod_m e_{i_m, j_m, k_m, l_m} \\ &= (-1)^{r - \frac{\lambda_k - \lambda_i}{2}} t_{k,i;i-1}^{(r)} \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Remark 4.7. Comparing the linear terms appearing in (4.15) with the basis (4.7) for \mathfrak{g}^e one can check that θ is a Poincaré–Birkhoff–Witt map satisfying the properties of Theorem 2.4.

4.5. The semiclassical Brundan–Kleshchev homomorphism. Recall that in (3.57) we defined a Poisson involution of $y_n(\sigma)$ which is denoted τ .

Proposition 4.8. *There is a unique τ -equivariant surjective Poisson homomorphism*

$$(4.21) \quad \varphi : y_n(\sigma) \longrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$$

determined by

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} d_i^{(r)} &\longmapsto t_{i,i;i-1}^{(r)} && \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}; \\ e_i^{(r)} &\longmapsto t_{i,i+1;i}^{(r)} && \text{for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r - s_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}; \\ f_i^{(r)} &\longmapsto t_{i+1,i;i}^{(r)} && \text{for } 1 \leq i < j \leq n, r - s_{j,i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}. \end{aligned}$$

The kernel is the Poisson ideal generated by $\{d_1^{(r)} \mid r > \lambda_1\}$. The canonical grading on $y_n(\sigma)$ in Theorem 3.4 corresponds to the Kazhdan grading on $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

Proof. The fact that (4.22) defines a graded Poisson homomorphism follows from [BK06, Theorem 10.1] upon taking the associated graded map with respect to the canonical and Kazhdan filtrations. The τ -equivariance can be checked by comparing Proposition 4.6 with formulas (3.57).

Another consequence of [BK06, Theorem 10.2] is that the elements $\{d_1^{(r)} \mid r > \lambda_1\}$ lie in the kernel of the homomorphism. Write I for the Poisson ideal generated by these elements. Combining Theorem 2.4 and Lemma 4.2 we can show that $I = \text{Ker } \varphi$ by demonstrating that the quotient $y_n(\sigma)/I$ is generated as a commutative algebra by

$$(4.23) \quad \begin{aligned} &\{e_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, s_{i,j} < r \leq s_{i,j} + \lambda_{\min(i,j)}\} \cup \{d_i^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 < r \leq \lambda_i\} \\ &\cup \{f_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, s_{j,i} < r \leq s_{j,i} + \lambda_{\min(i,j)}\}. \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 3.4 we can identify $S(\mathfrak{c}_n(\sigma)) = \text{gr } y_n(\sigma)$ as Poisson algebras, with respect to the loop filtration. The associated graded ideal $\text{gr } I$ contains elements $\{d_{i;r} \mid r \geq \lambda_1\}$, and so applying Lemma 4.4(1) we see that $\text{gr } y_n(\sigma)/I$ is generated by the top graded components of the elements (4.23). Applying a standard argument on filtered algebras we deduce that $y_n(\sigma)/I$ is generated by the requisite elements. \square

Recall that the Dirac reduction functor is right exact. Applying Theorem 2.6 we obtain an approximate description of the W -algebra for \mathfrak{g}_0 .

Theorem 4.9. *There is a surjective Poisson homomorphism $\varphi : R(y_n(\sigma), \tau) \twoheadrightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$.*

- If $\varepsilon = 1$ the kernel of φ is Poisson generated by $\{\eta_1^{(2r)} \mid 2r > \lambda_1\}$.
- If $\varepsilon = -1$ the kernel of φ is Poisson generated by

$$(4.24) \quad \left\{ \eta_i^{(2r)} \mid 2r > \lambda_1 \right\} \cup \left\{ \sum_{t=0}^{\lambda_i/2} \eta_i^{(2t)} \theta_i^{(\lambda_i - 2t + s_{1,2} + 1)} \mid i = 1, \dots, n-1 \right\}.$$

Proof. The elements $d_1^{(2r)}$ with $2r > \lambda_1$ lie in the kernel of $y_n(\sigma) \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and project to $\eta_1^{(2r)}$ under $y_n(\sigma)^\tau \rightarrow R(y_n(\sigma), \tau)$. Similarly for $\varepsilon = -1$ we can use (3.63) to see that the elements $\{d_i^{(\lambda_i+1)}, \check{e}_i^{(s)}\} + y_n(\sigma)^\tau = \sum_{t=0}^{\lambda_i/2} \eta_i^{(2t)} \theta_i^{(\lambda_i - 2t + s_{1,2} + 1)}$ lie in the kernel.

To complete the proof we use a loop filtration argument identical to the proof of Proposition 4.8 to show that the ideal generated by the stated elements is large enough. For this one can apply Corollary 3.8 and Lemma 4.4(2), and we leave the details to the reader \square

Thanks to Lemma 4.2 the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_0 is spanned by elements $c_{i,j}^{(r)} + \tau(c_{i,j}^{(k)})$. Using (4.15) along with Theorem 2.4 and Theorem 4.9 we see that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is generated (as a commutative algebra) by the images of elements

$$(4.25) \quad \left\{ \eta_i^{(2r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq 2r \leq \lambda_i \right\} \cup \left\{ \theta_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, s_{i,j} < r \leq s_{i,j} + \lambda_i \right\}$$

By slight abuse of notation we denote the images by the same names.

Corollary 4.10. *If \mathfrak{m}_0 is the unique graded maximal ideal of $S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ then we have a Poisson isomorphism $S(\mathfrak{g}_0^e) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ to the \mathfrak{m}_0 -adic graded algebra defined by*

$$(4.26) \quad c_{i,i+1}^{(r)} + \tau(c_{i,i+1}^{(r)}) \longmapsto \theta_i^{(r+1)} + \mathfrak{m}_0^2 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i < n, \quad s_{i,j} \leq r < s_{i,j} + \lambda_i;$$

$$(4.27) \quad c_{i,i}^{(r)} + \tau(c_{i,i}^{(r)}) \longmapsto \eta_i^{(r+1)} + \mathfrak{m}_0^2 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad 0 \leq r < \lambda_i.$$

Proof. The graded algebra $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$ is Poisson, and it is straightforward to check, using Theorem 3.7, that (4.26) gives a Lie algebra homomorphism $\mathfrak{g}_0^e \rightarrow \text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$. By the universal property of the Lie–Poisson algebra we get a Poisson homomorphism $S(\mathfrak{g}_0^e) \rightarrow \text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}_0, e)$. By Theorem 2.4 we see that this map is an isomorphism. \square

Part 2. One dimensional representations of W -algebras

5. GENERALITIES ON POISSON SCHEMES

5.1. Conic degenerations of affine schemes. We begin the second Part of the paper by recording two basic results, allowing us to compare the number of irreducible components of certain complex schemes of finite type. The first records an obvious bound on the dimensions of components of subschemes, whilst the second allows us to bound the number of components of a deformation of a reduced conic affine scheme.

We define \mathcal{P} be the set of all finite sequences of all non-negative integers of arbitrary length. We define a dominance (partial) order on \mathcal{P} as follows. If $d = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$ and $d' = (d'_1, \dots, d'_m)$ then we say that $d > d'$ if there is an index $j = 1, \dots, \min(n, m)$ such that $d_i = d'_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, j$ and $d_{j+1} > d'_{j+1}$. Here we adopt the convention $d'_{m+1} = d_{n+1} = 0$.

If X is a complex scheme of finite type then we write $X = \bigcup_{i=1}^l X_i$ for the decomposition into irreducible components, ordered so that $\dim X_i \geq \dim X_j$ for $i < j$. We define *the dimension vector of X* to be the sequence $d(X) := (\dim X_1, \dim X_2, \dots, \dim X_l) \in \mathcal{P}$.

The following useful fact can be checked by considering the dimension vector of all proper closed subschemes of a scheme X .

Lemma 5.1. *Let X, Y be complex schemes of finite type with a closed embedding $Y \rightarrow X$. Then $d(X) \geq d(Y)$ with equality if and only if the underlying reduced schemes are isomorphic.*

Let A be a finitely generated \mathbb{C} -algebra. We say that $A = \bigcup_{i \geq 0} \mathcal{F}_i A$ is a *standard filtration of A* if there is a surjection $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \twoheadrightarrow A$ for some n , along with integers $m_1, \dots, m_n \geq 0$ such that $\mathcal{F}_m A$ is spanned by the image of $\{x_1^{k_1} \cdots x_n^{k_n} \mid k_1 m_1 + \cdots + k_n m_n \leq m\}$. If $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ is the affine scheme then we refer to $\mathbb{C}X = \text{Spec}(\text{gr } A)$ as the *asymptotic cone of X* .

Lemma 5.2. *If $\mathbb{C}X$ is reduced then $\# \text{Comp}(X) \leq \# \text{Comp}(\mathbb{C}X)$.*

Proof. If $\text{gr } A$ is reduced then so is A . We begin by choosing a presentation for the standard filtration. Let $R = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n] = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} R_i$ be a graded polynomial ring with x_i in degree m_i . Write $\mathcal{F}_i R = \bigoplus_{j=0}^i R_j$. We let $\phi : R \rightarrow A$ be the homomorphism inducing the standard filtration, set $I := \text{Ker}(\phi)$ and denote the minimal prime ideals over I by $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_m \subseteq A$, so that $I = \bigcap_i \mathfrak{p}_i$. Using

[MR01, Proposition 7.6.13], for example, we see that there is a natural isomorphism $\text{gr } A \cong R/\text{gr } I$ and we view X and $\mathbb{C}X$ as subschemes of $\text{Spec } R = \mathbb{A}^n$.

For $g \in F_i R$ we write $\bar{g} = g + F_{i-1} R \in \text{gr } R$. For any ideal J of R we write $V(J) \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n$ for the corresponding variety of closed points. We have inclusions $\text{gr}(J)\text{gr}(K) \subseteq \text{gr}(JK) \subseteq \text{gr}(J) \cap \text{gr}(K)$ for any ideals $J, K \subseteq R$ (see [Pr02, §5.2]), and so

$$(5.1) \quad V(\text{gr } I) = \bigcup_{i=1}^m V(\text{gr } \mathfrak{p}_i).$$

We prove the contrapositive of the lemma, so assume that $m = \# \text{Comp}(X) > \# \text{Comp}(\mathbb{C}X)$. Then, a fortiori, we must have $V(\text{gr } \mathfrak{p}_j) \subseteq \bigcup_{i \neq j} V(\text{gr } \mathfrak{p}_i)$ for some j , say $j = 1$. Equivalently $\bigcap_{i \neq 1} \sqrt{\text{gr } \mathfrak{p}_i} \subseteq \sqrt{\text{gr } \mathfrak{p}_1}$, which implies $\bigcap_{i \neq 1} \text{gr } \mathfrak{p}_i \subseteq \sqrt{\text{gr } \mathfrak{p}_1}$. Since $I \subsetneq \mathfrak{p}_2 \mathfrak{p}_3 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m$ it follows that $\text{gr } I \subsetneq \text{gr}(\mathfrak{p}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m)$ and so we may choose g_2, \dots, g_m with $g_i \in \mathfrak{p}_i$ such that $g := g_2 \cdots g_m$ satisfies $\bar{g} \notin \text{gr } I$. On the other hand, we have $\bar{g} \in \text{gr}(\mathfrak{p}_2 \cdots \mathfrak{p}_m) \subseteq \bigcap_{i=2}^m \text{gr}(\mathfrak{p}_i) \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^m \sqrt{\text{gr}(\mathfrak{p}_i)} = \sqrt{\text{gr}(I)}$, where the last equality follows from (5.1). Thus we conclude that $\bar{g} \in \sqrt{\text{gr}(I)} \setminus \text{gr } I$, so that $\mathbb{C}X$ is not reduced. This completes the proof. \square

5.2. Completions and nilpotent elements of graded algebras. If $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}(A)$ then, as usual, $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ denotes the localisation and $A_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\wedge}$ the completion at the maximal ideal of $A_{\mathfrak{p}}$. The kernel of $A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the set of elements annihilating some element of $A \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, whilst the kernel of $A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{p}}^{\wedge}$ is $\bigcap_{k>0} \mathfrak{p}^k$. When \mathfrak{p} is a maximal ideal it follows from Krull's intersection theorem that these kernels are equal (see the remark following [AM69, Theorem 10.17]).

Now let $A = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A_i$ be a finitely generated, connected graded algebra with unique maximal graded ideal \mathfrak{m}_0 . The connected grading induces a one parameter family of automorphisms of A , and a \mathbb{C}^{\times} -action on $\text{m-Spec}(A)$ contracting to the unique fixed point \mathfrak{m}_0 . For $a \in A$ make the notation

$$\Xi_a := \left\{ \mathfrak{m} \in \text{m-Spec}(A) \mid a \notin \text{Ker}(A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}) \right\}.$$

Lemma 5.3. *The following hold:*

- (1) $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{m}} \bigcap_{i>0} \mathfrak{m}^i = 0$ where the intersection is taken over all maximal ideals of A .
- (2) If $a \in A_i$ for some i then Ξ_a is closed and conic for the contracting \mathbb{C}^{\times} -action.

Proof. Since A is finitely generated over \mathbb{C} the intersection $\bigcap_{\mathfrak{m} \in \text{m-Spec}(A)} \mathfrak{m} = \text{Rad}(A)$ is a graded ideal, however for every $i > 0$ we have $A_i \cap \mathfrak{m}_0^{i+1} = 0$ and so (1) follows.

If $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{m-Spec}(A)$, we remarked above that the kernel of $A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ is equal to the kernel of $A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{m}}$. Writing $\text{Ann}(a) = \{b \in A \mid ab = 0\}$, it follows that $\text{Ker}(A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}) = \{a \in A \mid ab = 0 \text{ for some } b \notin \mathfrak{m}\} = \{a \in A \mid \text{Ann}(a) \not\subseteq \mathfrak{m}\}$. We have shown that $\Xi_a = \{\mathfrak{m} \in \text{m-Spec}(A) \mid \text{Ann}(a) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}\}$, which is conic and closed since $\text{Ann}(a)$ is a graded ideal (see [Pr02, 5.3] for more detail). \square

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that $A = \bigoplus_{i>0} A_i$ is a finitely generated, connected graded algebra with unique maximal graded ideal \mathfrak{m}_0 . The following are equivalent:*

- (i) A is reduced.
- (ii) $A_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge}$ is reduced.
- (iii) $A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ is reduced for every maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} \in \text{Spec}(A)$.

Furthermore if $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} A$ is reduced then these equivalent conditions hold.

Proof. We prove (ii) \Rightarrow (i) by contraposition. So suppose that $0 \neq f \in \text{Rad}(A)$ is a nonzero element. Without loss of generality we may assume f is homogeneous. By Lemma 5.3(1) we have $\text{Ker}(A \rightarrow \prod_{\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{m}\text{-Spec}(A)} A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}) = 0$, which means that f maps to a nonzero element of $A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ for some \mathfrak{m} , implying $\mathfrak{m} \in \Xi_f$. Using Lemma 5.3(2) we see Ξ_f is conic and closed, so it must contain \mathfrak{m}_0 , which implies that $A_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge}$ has nilpotent elements. This proves (ii) \Rightarrow (i).

To see (i) \Rightarrow (iii) we first of all observe that the property of being reduced is preserved by localisation for any commutative ring, and then apply [Ma86, §32, Remark 1]. Clearly (iii) \Rightarrow (ii).

We prove that that if A is non-reduced then $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} A$ is non-reduced. Let $0 \neq f \in \text{Rad}(A)$ and suppose (without loss of generality) that f is homogeneous. There are two cases: either $f \in \mathfrak{m}_0^i \setminus \mathfrak{m}_0^{i+1}$ for some $i > 0$, or $f \in \bigcap_{i>0} \mathfrak{m}_0^i$. In the first case $f + \mathfrak{m}_0^{i+1}$ is a nonzero nilpotent element of $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} A$, which proves that $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} A$ is non-reduced.

We now show that the second case cannot happen. Suppose $f \in \bigcap_{i>0} \mathfrak{m}_0^i = \text{Ker}(A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge})$, or equivalently, $\mathfrak{m}_0 \notin \Xi_f$. By Lemma 5.3(2) we must have $\Xi_f = \emptyset$ which implies that $f \in \text{Ker}(A \rightarrow A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge})$ for all maximal ideals \mathfrak{m} . By Lemma 5.3(1) we see $f \in \bigcap_{\mathfrak{m}} \bigcap_{i>0} \mathfrak{m}^i = 0$. This contradiction completes the proof. \square

5.3. Poisson schemes. If A is a Poisson algebra then the *abelianisation* A^{ab} is the largest Poisson commutative quotient of A . It is constructed by factoring by the ideal generated by $\{A, A\}$.

When X is a complex manifold it can be stratified into immersed submanifolds known as symplectic leaves (see [We83] for an introduction). Therefore the closed points of a regular complex Poisson scheme can be decomposed into a disjoint union of symplectic leaves. More generally the closed points of a singular affine Poisson scheme can be decomposed into symplectic leaves by an iterative procedure [BG03, 3.5].

The stratification by leaves can be coarsened to a stratification by rank, which is especially transparent in the case of affine schemes: if A is finitely generated by elements x_1, \dots, x_n and carries a Poisson structure, then we can form the matrix $\pi = (\{x_i, x_j\})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ and consider the subschemes $X_0 \subseteq X_1 \subseteq \dots \subseteq X$ where X_k is defined by the ideal of A generated by all $(k+1) \times (k+1)$ minors of π .

It follows from [BG03, Proposition 3.6] that the locally closed set $X_k \setminus X_{k-1}$ is the union of all symplectic leaves of dimension k , and it is known as *the k th rank stratum*. In particular X_0 is the union of symplectic leaves of dimension zero. Note that $X_0 = \text{Spec}(A^{\text{ab}})$ by definition. These observations prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.5. *The following reduced subschemes of X coincide:*

- (1) $\text{Spec}(A^{\text{ab}})_{\text{red}}$;
- (2) *The union of all zero dimensional symplectic leaves of $\text{Spec}(A)$.* \square

If A is a Poisson algebra and I is an ideal then the completion $A_{\hat{I}}$ can be equipped with a Poisson structure in a unique way such that $A \rightarrow A_{\hat{I}}$ is Poisson. In particular, for $a := (a_i + I^i)_{i>0}, b := (b_i + I^i)_{i>0} \in A_{\hat{I}} \subseteq \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}} A/I^i$ we define $\{a, b\} = (c_i + I^i)_{i>0}$ where $c_i = \{a_j, b_k\}$ for any choice of $j, k \geq i + 1$. The definition of $A_{\hat{I}}$ ensures that this does not depend on j, k modulo I^i . When I is Poisson this structure has an easier description: here every A/I^i is a Poisson algebra and the bracket on $A_{\hat{I}}$ coincides with the inverse limit in the category of Poisson algebras.

The next lemma states that Poisson abelianisation and completion commute.

Lemma 5.6. *Let A be finitely generated and Poisson, and pick $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{m}\text{-Spec}(A^{\text{ab}})$. Then there is a natural isomorphism*

$$(A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge})^{\text{ab}} \xrightarrow{\sim} (A^{\text{ab}})_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}.$$

Proof. According to Lemma 5.5 the point \mathfrak{m} is a zero dimensional symplectic leaf, and it follows that \mathfrak{m} is a Poisson ideal. In particular, $A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ is a projective limit of Poisson algebras. We let B denote the ideal of A generated by the Poisson brackets $\{A, A\}$, let $\widehat{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ be the ideal of $A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ generated by $\{A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}, A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}\}$ and let $B_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ be the ideal $A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge} \otimes_A B$, which we identify with an ideal of $A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ using [AM69, Proposition 10.13]. Considering the exact sequence of A -modules $B \rightarrow A \rightarrow A^{\text{ab}}$, we deduce $(A^{\text{ab}})_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge} \cong A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}/B_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ from [AM69, Proposition 10.12].

We must show that $B_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge} = \widehat{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$. We certainly have an inclusion $B_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge} \subseteq \widehat{B}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ and so the claim will follow from the universal property of $(A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge})^{\text{ab}}$ if we can show that $A_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}/B_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$ is an abelian Poisson algebra. As we noted earlier, the latter is isomorphic to $(A^{\text{ab}})_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\wedge}$. Since this is a projective limit of abelian Poisson algebras the claim follows. \square

6. SHEETS AND INDUCTION

6.1. Lusztig–Spaltenstein induction, sheets and slices. Let G be a complex connected reductive group and $P \subseteq G$ a parabolic subgroup with Levi decomposition $P = LN$, and write $\mathfrak{l} = \text{Lie}(L)$. If $\mathfrak{v} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is any quasi-affine subvariety then we write $\mathfrak{v}_{\text{reg}}$ for the set of elements $v \in \mathfrak{v}$ such that $\dim \text{Ad}(G)v$ attains the maximal value.

For any choice of nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$ and $z \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ it is not hard to see that $\text{Ad}(G)(z + \mathcal{O}_0 + \mathfrak{n})$ contains a dense G -orbit. This orbit is (*Lusztig–Spaltenstein*) *induced from* $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$ and is denoted $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(z + \mathcal{O}_0)$. Remarkably the induced orbit depends only on the G -conjugacy class of $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$, not on the choice of P admitting L as a Levi factor [Lo16, Lemma 4.1]. We call this G -orbit an *induction datum*, and when $z = 0$ we say that the orbit of $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0)$ is the induction datum, suppressing z .

If an orbit cannot be obtained by induction from a proper Levi subalgebra then it is called *rigid*, otherwise it is called *induced*. Rigid orbits are necessarily nilpotent. We say that an induction datum $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0)$ is *rigid* if \mathcal{O}_0 is a rigid orbit in \mathfrak{l} . When G is almost simple of classical type the conjugacy classes of Levi subalgebras and nilpotent orbits can be described combinatorially, and induction can be totally understood in terms of partitions [CM93, §7].

The sheets of a Lie algebra are the irreducible components of the rank varieties which consist of points whose orbit has a fixed dimension. These were classified in terms of rigid induction data by Borho [Bo81]. For each induction datum $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0)$ define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0) &:= \text{Ad}(G)(\mathcal{O}_0 + \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})_{\text{reg}}) \\ \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0) &:= \overline{\mathcal{D}(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0)}_{\text{reg}}. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 6.1. *Then the sheets of \mathfrak{g} are the sets $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0)$ where $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0)$ varies over conjugacy classes of rigid data. Furthermore $\dim \mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0) = \dim \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}) + \dim \text{Ad}(G)e$.*

6.2. Classical finite W -algebras and Slodowy slices. Resume the notation $\kappa, \{e, h, f\}, \chi$ used in Section 2.2, so $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ is the $\text{ad}(h)$ -grading.

Using κ we can identify \mathfrak{g} with \mathfrak{g}^* as G -modules, so that $S(\mathfrak{g})$ is identified with the coordinate ring $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}]$. Then $S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(<-1)_\chi$ is identified with the defining ideal of

$$e + \mathfrak{g}(<-1)^\perp = \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \kappa(x - e, \mathfrak{g}(<-1)) = 0\} = e + \mathfrak{g}(\leq 1).$$

It follows from [GG02, Lemma 2.1] that the adjoint action map of G restricts to an isomorphism

$$G(<0) \times e + \mathfrak{g}^f \xrightarrow{\sim} e + \mathfrak{g}(\leq 1).$$

Via this isomorphism we identify $S(\mathfrak{g}, e) = \mathbb{C}[e + \mathfrak{g}^f]$.

Let $\gamma : \mathbb{C}^\times \rightarrow G$ be the cocharacter with differential $d_1\gamma(1) = h$. There is a \mathbb{C}^\times -action on \mathfrak{g} given by $t \mapsto t^2 \text{Ad}(\gamma(t)^{-1})$ which restricts to a contracting \mathbb{C}^\times -action on $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$. The grading on $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ induced by this action coincides with the Kazhdan grading on $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Since $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is Poisson graded in degree -2 this shows that the \mathbb{C}^\times -action permutes the symplectic leaves of $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$.

6.3. The Katsylo variety and the tangent cone. The Slodowy slice $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$ reflects the local geometry of \mathfrak{g} in a neighbourhood of the adjoint orbit of e . Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_l$ be the sheets of \mathfrak{g} containing e . Recall from the introduction that we define the *Katsylo variety* to be

$$(6.1) \quad e + X := (e + \mathfrak{g}^f) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^l \mathcal{S}_i.$$

Let \mathfrak{m}_0 denote the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{C}[e + X]$ corresponding to e . One of the main tools in this paper is the tangent cone $\text{TC}_e(e + X) = \text{Spec}(\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} \mathbb{C}[e + X])$, which we equip with the reduced scheme structure.

Proposition 6.2. (1) $\text{Spec } S(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\text{red}}^{\text{ab}} = e + X$ as reduced schemes.

(2) Let \mathfrak{g} be a classical Lie algebra. We have bijections

$$\text{Comp}\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^l \mathcal{S}_i\right) \xrightarrow{1-1} \text{Comp}(e + X) \xrightarrow{1-1} \text{Comp } \text{TC}_e(e + X).$$

The first bijection reduces dimension by $\dim \text{Ad}(G)e$ whilst the second is dimension preserving.

Proof. By Lemma 5.5 we know that the reduced scheme associated to $\text{Spec } S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is the union of zero dimensional symplectic leaves of $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$. By [GG02, 3.2] we know that the symplectic leaves of $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$ are the irreducible components of the non-empty intersections $\mathcal{O} \cap (e + \mathfrak{g}^f)$ where $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ is an adjoint orbit. Since $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$ intersects orbits transversally it follows that the zero dimensional leaves are precisely the components of $\mathcal{O} \cap (e + \mathfrak{g}^f)$ where $\dim \mathcal{O} = \dim \text{Ad}(G)e$. Since the contracting \mathbb{C}^\times -action permutes the leaves of $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$, these are precisely the orbits lying in the sheets containing e . This proves (1).

To prove the first bijection in (2) it suffices to show that for every sheet \mathcal{S}_i the intersection $\mathcal{S}_i \cap (e + \mathfrak{g}^f)$ is irreducible. It was proven in [Im05, Theorem 6.2] that $\mathcal{S}_i \cap (e + \mathfrak{g}^f)$ can be expressed as the image of a morphism from an irreducible variety, which gives the first bijection. The main result of *loc. cit.* shows that the varieties \mathcal{S}_i are smooth. Since they are smoothly

equivalent to $\mathcal{S}_i \cap (e + \mathfrak{g}^f)$ the latter are also smooth, and so

$$\mathrm{TC}_e(e + X) = \bigcup_{i=1}^l \mathrm{T}_e(\mathcal{S}_i \cap e + \mathfrak{g}^f).$$

Now the second bijection will follow if we can show that $\mathrm{T}_e(\mathcal{S}_i \cap e + \mathfrak{g}^f)$ is never contained in $\mathrm{T}_e(\mathcal{S}_j \cap e + \mathfrak{g}^f)$ for $i \neq j$ which is a consequence of the fact that the sheets $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_l$ intersect transversally at e [Bu]. Finally the claims about dimensions follow from the fact that $e + \mathfrak{g}^f$ is transversal to adjoint orbits. \square

7. ABELIAN QUOTIENTS OF FINITE W -ALGEBRAS

7.1. The finite W -algebra. We now recall the definition of the (quantum) finite W -algebra. Once again G is a connected complex reductive group with simply connected derived subgroup. A nondegenerate trace form on \mathfrak{g} is denoted κ . We pick an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple (e, h, f) in $\mathfrak{g} = \mathrm{Lie}(G)$ and consider the grading $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}(i)$ given by $\mathrm{ad}(h)$ -eigenspaces. Write $\chi := \kappa(e, \cdot) \in \mathfrak{g}^*$. Recall the notation $\mathfrak{g}(< -1)$ and $G(< 0)$.

The generalised Gelfand–Graev module is defined to be

$$Q := U(\mathfrak{g})/U(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi = U(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}(< -1))} \mathbb{C}_\chi$$

where \mathbb{C}_χ is the one dimensional representation of $\mathfrak{g}(< -1)$ afforded by χ . The finite W -algebra is the quantum Hamiltonian reduction

$$U(\mathfrak{g}, e) := Q^{G(< 0)}.$$

It inherits a natural algebra structure from $U(\mathfrak{g})$ via $\bar{u}_1 \bar{u}_2 = \overline{u_1 u_2}$ where \bar{u} denotes the projection of $u \in U(\mathfrak{g})$ to Q , and $\bar{u}_1, \bar{u}_2 \in Q^{G(< 0)}$ (see [GG02], for example). The Kazhdan filtration on $U(\mathfrak{g})$ is defined by placing $\mathfrak{g}(i)$ in degree $i + 2$. This descends to a non-negative filtration on Q and $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ and we write $\mathrm{gr} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ for the associated graded algebra. The graded algebra $\mathrm{gr} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ naturally identifies with a subalgebra of $\mathrm{gr} Q = S(\mathfrak{g})/S(\mathfrak{g})\mathfrak{g}(< -1)_\chi$, and we have the following fundamental fact (see [Pr02, Proposition 6.3], [GG02, Theorem 4.1]).

Lemma 7.1. *$\mathrm{gr} U(\mathfrak{g}, e) = S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ as Kazhdan graded algebras.*

One of the main objects of study in this paper is the maximal abelian quotient $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$, which is defined to be the quotient by the derived ideal which is generated by all commutators $[u, v]$ with $u, v \in U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

The Kazhdan filtration descends to $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ and we write $\mathrm{gr} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ for the associated Kazhdan graded algebra. Our main results describe the structure of the following affine schemes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) &:= \mathrm{Spec} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}, \\ \mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) &:= \mathrm{Spec} \mathrm{gr}(U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}). \end{aligned}$$

The closed points of the first of these parameterises the one dimensional representations of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$, whilst the second is the asymptotic cone of the first (cf. Section 5.1).

7.2. Bounding the asymptotic cone. The next result is equivalent to (1.3), and we view it as a version of Premet's theorem [Pr10, Theorem 1.2] for the asymptotic cone of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Our methods are adapted from his work.

Theorem 7.2. *There is a surjective homomorphism*

$$S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} \rightarrow \text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$$

which induces an isomorphism of reduced algebras.

First of all we prove the existence of the surjection

Lemma 7.3. *There is a surjective homomorphism $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} \rightarrow \text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$.*

Proof. Let $\theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ be a PBW map coming from Theorem 2.4 and let $\Theta : \mathfrak{g}^e \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ be a filtered lift of θ . Using the Leibniz rule for the biderivation $[\cdot, \cdot]$ we see that the derived ideal D of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is generated by the set $\{[\Theta(u), \Theta(v)] \mid u, v \in \mathfrak{g}^e\}$. Similarly the bracket ideal B in $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is generated by $\{\{\theta(u), \theta(v)\} \mid u, v \in \mathfrak{g}^e\}$. If u, v are homogeneous for the $\text{ad}(h)$ -grading on \mathfrak{g} then the image of $[\Theta(u), \Theta(v)]$ in the graded algebra $\text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e) = S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is $\{\theta(u), \theta(v)\}$, using the identification of Lemma 7.1. This shows that $B \subseteq \text{gr } D$. Hence we have $\text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} = S(\mathfrak{g}, e)/\text{gr } D \rightarrow S(\mathfrak{g}, e)/B = S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$. \square

In order to show that this surjection gives an isomorphism of reduced algebras we use reduction modulo p . This process was pioneered by Premet in the theory of W -algebras and used systematically to great effect in subsequent work [Pr07, Pr10, To17, PT20]. Rather than repeating the details in full we state the important properties of the modular reduction procedure which we need for our proof.

Let Π be the set of bad primes for the root system of G . Pick a Chevalley \mathbb{Z} -form $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{Z}} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ and write $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{Z}} = \mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Z}} \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi} \mathbb{Z}x_{\alpha}$. Let $T \subseteq G$ denote the complex torus with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}$. When \mathbb{k} is an algebraically closed field we let $G_{\mathbb{k}}$ denote the reductive algebraic group with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}} := \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{k}$ and let $T_{\mathbb{k}}$ denote the algebraic torus in $G_{\mathbb{k}}$ with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{Z}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{k}$.

It follows from the observations of [PT20, §3.3] that for every nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ there is an element $e \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{Z}} \cap \mathcal{O}$ and a cocharacter $\lambda \in X_*(T)$ such that for all algebraically closed fields \mathbb{k} of characteristic $p \notin \Pi$.

- (1) The Bala–Carter labels of the adjoint orbits of e and $e_{\mathbb{k}} := e \otimes 1 \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ coincide.
- (2) The differential $d_1\lambda(\mathbb{C})$ equals $\mathbb{C}h$ where h lies in an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple containing e .
- (3) After canonically identifying to cocharacter lattices $X_*(T) = X_*(T_{\mathbb{k}})$ the grading on $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ induced by λ is good for e , meaning $e_{\mathbb{k}} \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}(2)$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}^e \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}(\geq 0)$.

Fix an orbit $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ and a choice of e, λ as above. Let \mathbb{k} be algebraically closed, and assume $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) = p$ is large enough so that there is a G -equivariant trace form $\kappa_{\mathbb{k}}$. Write $\chi_{\mathbb{k}}$ for the element of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}^*$ corresponding to $e_{\mathbb{k}}$ via $\kappa_{\mathbb{k}}$. Using the grading $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}(i)$ coming from λ we let \mathfrak{v} denote a homogeneous complement to $[\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}}]$ in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$. If $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_l$ denote the sheets of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$ containing $e_{\mathbb{k}}$ then we define

$$e_{\mathbb{k}} + X_{\mathbb{k}} = (e_{\mathbb{k}} + \mathfrak{v}) \cap \bigcup_{i=1}^l \mathcal{S}_i.$$

In the following we write $e + X_{\mathbb{C}}$ for the complex Katsylo variety (6.1), and write $X_{\mathbb{k}}^{\vee} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}^*$ for the image of $X_{\mathbb{k}}$ under the G -equivariant isomorphism $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}^*$ coming from the trace form.

Lemma 7.4. *For $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) \gg 0$ there are dimension preserving bijections*

$$(7.1) \quad \text{Comp } \mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \xrightarrow{1-1} \text{Comp } \mathbb{k}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})$$

$$(7.2) \quad \text{Comp } X_{\mathbb{C}} \xrightarrow{1-1} \text{Comp } X_{\mathbb{k}}.$$

Proof. The first bijection (7.1) can be obtained by reciting the proof of [Pr10, Lemma 3.1] verbatim, whilst the second (7.2) was constructed in the proof of [Pr10, Theorem 3.2]. \square

Since $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}} = \text{Lie}(G_{\mathbb{k}})$ is algebraic there is a $G_{\mathbb{k}}$ -equivariant restricted structure on $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$. The p -centre $Z_p(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}})$ is a central subalgebra of $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}})$ which identifies with $\mathbb{k}[(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}^*)^{(1)}]$, the coordinate ring on the Frobenius twist of the dual space of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}$, as $G_{\mathbb{k}}$ -algebras.

The modular finite W -algebra is defined in precisely the same manner as the complex analogue: $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}}) = Q_{\mathbb{k}}^{G_{\mathbb{k}}(\langle -1 \rangle)}$ where $Q_{\mathbb{k}} = U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}})/U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}})\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}(\langle -1 \rangle)_{\chi}$ and $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}(\langle -1 \rangle)_{\chi} = \{x - \chi_{\mathbb{k}}(x) \mid x \in \mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}(\langle -1 \rangle)\}$ [Pr10, GT19a]. If $\phi : U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}) \rightarrow Q_{\mathbb{k}}$ is the natural projection then the p -centre of $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})$ is defined to be $(\phi Z_p(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}))^{G_{\mathbb{k}}(\langle -1 \rangle)}$; see [GT19a, Section 8] for more detail. It follows from Lemma 8.2 of *loc. cit.* that $Z_p(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}}) = \mathbb{k}[(\chi_{\mathbb{k}} + \mathfrak{v}^{\vee})^{(1)}]$ where $\mathfrak{v}^{\vee} = \kappa_{\mathbb{k}}(\mathfrak{v}, \cdot) \subseteq \mathfrak{g}^*$, and the maximal ideals of the p -centre will be referred to as p -characters. For $\eta \in \chi_{\mathbb{k}} + \mathfrak{v}^{\vee}$ we define the reduced finite W -algebra $U_{\eta}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})$ to be the quotient of $U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})$ by the ideal generated by the corresponding maximal ideal of $Z_p(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})$ (identifying $\chi_{\mathbb{k}} + \mathfrak{v}^{\vee}$ with its Frobenius twist as sets).

Lemma 7.5. *There is a finite, dominant morphism*

$$\mathbb{k}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}}) \rightarrow X_{\mathbb{k}}.$$

Proof. Consider the homomorphism $Z_p(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}}) \rightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})^{\text{ab}}$ and denote the kernel by K . The maximal ideals of $Z_p(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})/K$ correspond to the p -characters $\eta \in \chi_{\mathbb{k}} + \mathfrak{v}^{\vee}$ such that $U_{\eta}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})$ admits a one dimensional module. Using Premet's equivalence [Pr02, Theorem 2.5(ii) and Proposition 2.6] we see that these are the p -characters $\eta \in (\chi_{\mathbb{k}} + \mathfrak{v}^{\vee})^{(1)}$ such that $U_{\eta}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}})$ admits a module of dimension $p^{\frac{1}{2} \dim \text{Ad}^*(G_{\mathbb{k}})\chi_{\mathbb{k}}}$. By the main result of [PT20] this is precisely the set of η such that $\dim \text{Ad}^*(G_{\mathbb{k}})\eta = \dim \text{Ad}^*(G_{\mathbb{k}})\chi_{\mathbb{k}}$. We claim that this set is equal to $(\chi_{\mathbb{k}} + X_{\mathbb{k}}^{\vee})^{(1)}$. In the current setting, $\chi_{\mathbb{k}} + \mathfrak{v}^{\vee}$ admits a contracting \mathbb{k}^{\times} -action defined in the same manner as the one parameter group of automorphisms appearing in Section 6.2, using the cocharacter appearing in (3) above. This contracting action preserves the sheets of $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}^*$ and this implies the claim.

Let R denote the reduced algebra corresponding $Z_p(\mathfrak{g}, e)/K$. Since $Z_p(\mathfrak{g}, e) = \mathbb{k}[(\chi + \mathfrak{v}^{\vee})^{(1)}]$ as Kazhdan filtered algebras we see that $R = \mathbb{k}[(\chi + X_{\mathbb{k}}^{\vee})^{(1)}]$ is also an identification of Kazhdan filtered algebras. Since $\chi + X_{\mathbb{k}}^{\vee}$ is stable under the contracting \mathbb{k}^{\times} -action inducing the Kazhdan grading, it follows that $R \cong \text{gr } R$. We conclude that there is a finite injective algebra homomorphism $R \hookrightarrow \text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$, which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 7.2. Recall that finite morphisms are closed, and so a finite dominant morphism is surjective. Now it follows from Lemma 7.5 that there is a surjective map $\text{Comp } \mathbb{k}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}}) \rightarrow \text{Comp } X_{\mathbb{k}}$ such that for every $Z \in \text{Comp } X_{\mathbb{k}}$ there exists an element of $\text{Comp } \mathbb{k}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{k}}, e_{\mathbb{k}})$ mapping to Z of the same dimension. Combining with Lemma 7.4 we deduce that there is surjection $\text{Comp } \mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Comp}(e + X_{\mathbb{C}})$ which respects dimensions in the same manner. In particular we

have $d(\mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e)) \geq d(e + X_{\mathbb{C}})$, where d denotes the dimension vector defined in Section 5.1. Thanks to Lemma 5.1, Proposition 6.2(1) and Lemma 7.3 the embedding $\mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \hookrightarrow \text{Spec } S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} = e + X_{\mathbb{C}}$ is an isomorphism on the underlying reduced schemes. \square

The next result follows immediately from the theorem.

Corollary 7.6. *If $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced then so are $\text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ and $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$.* \square

8. THE ABELIAN QUOTIENT OF THE CLASSICAL W -ALGEBRA

8.1. Rigid, singular and distinguished partitions. We introduce three classes of partition which correspond to important families of nilpotent orbit in classical Lie algebras of type B, C, D.

Let $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ and $N > 0$ such that $\varepsilon^N = 1$. Recall the notation $\mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon}(N)$ from Section 4.1. According to Lemma 4.1 the partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon}(N)$ are characterised by the existence of an involution $i \mapsto i'$ satisfying the following conditions: (1) $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i'}$, (2) $\varepsilon(-1)^{\lambda_i} = 1$ if and only if $i \neq i'$, and (3) $i' \in \{i-1, i, i+1\}$. Whenever we choose $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon}(N)$ we fix such an involution. We also adopt the convention that $\lambda_0 = 0$ and $\lambda_{n+1} = \infty$.

For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon}(N)$ a *2-step* is a pair of indexes $(i, i+1)$ such that:

- $\varepsilon(-1)^{\lambda_i} = \varepsilon(-1)^{\lambda_{i+1}} = -1$;
- $\lambda_{i-1} < \lambda_i \leq \lambda_{i+1} < \lambda_{i+2}$.

We note that $\lambda_n < \lambda_{n+1}$ always holds because of our convention $\lambda_{n+1} = \infty$. We write $\Delta(\lambda)$ for the set of 2-steps for λ . A 2-step $(i, i+1) \in \Delta(\lambda)$ is called *bad* if one of the following conditions holds:

- $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1} \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$;
- $\lambda_{i+2} - \lambda_{i+1} \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

We note that the second condition never holds for $i = n-1$, whilst if the first condition holds for $i = 1$ then we necessarily have $\varepsilon = -1$. If the first of these two conditions holds then we refer to $i-1$ as the *bad boundary* of the 2-step whilst if the second condition holds then $i+2$ is the bad boundary. We say that a partition is *singular* if it admits a bad 2-step, and non-singular otherwise.

We say that a partition is *rigid* if the following two conditions hold:

- $\Delta(\lambda) = \emptyset$;
- $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1} < 2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We say that a partition is *distinguished* if the following two conditions hold:

- $\lambda_i < \lambda_{i+1}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$;
- $i = i'$ for all i .

Lemma 8.1. [CM93, PT14] *Let e be a nilpotent element with Jordan block sizes given by the partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{\varepsilon}(N)$ in a classical Lie algebra preserving a non-degenerate form Ψ on \mathbb{C}^N such that $\Psi(u, v) = \varepsilon\Psi(v, u)$ for $u, v \in \mathbb{C}^N$. The following hold:*

- (i) *e lies in a unique sheet of \mathfrak{g} if and only if λ is non-singular.*
- (ii) *e is distinguished in the sense of Bala–Carter theory if and only if λ is distinguished.*
- (iii) *e is rigid in the sense of Lusztig–Spaltenstein induction if and only if λ is rigid.* \square

8.2. The Kempken–Spaltenstein algorithm. Keep fixed a choice of $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$. We say that i is an *admissible index* for λ if Case 1 or Case 2 occurs:

- Case 1:** $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1} > 1$;
Case 2: $(i-1, i) \in \Delta(\lambda)$ and $\lambda_{i-1} = \lambda_i$.

When i is an admissible index we define $\lambda^{(i)} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N - 2(n - i + 1))$ as follows:

- Case 1:** $\lambda^{(i)} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_i - 2, \lambda_{i+1} - 2, \dots, \lambda_n - 2)$;
Case 2: $\lambda^{(i)} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{i-2}, \lambda_{i-1} - 1, \lambda_i - 1, \lambda_{i+1} - 2, \dots, \lambda_n - 2)$

Now we extend this definition inductively from indexes to sequences. We say that (i) is an admissible sequence for λ if i is an admissible index. We inductively extend these definitions to sequences of indexes by saying that $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_l)$ is an *admissible sequence* for λ and define $\lambda^{\mathbf{i}} = (\lambda^{(i_1, \dots, i_{l-1})})^{(i_l)}$ if $\mathbf{i}' = (i_1, \dots, i_{l-1})$ is an admissible sequence for λ and i_l is an admissible index for $\lambda^{\mathbf{i}'}$. A sequence \mathbf{i} is called *maximal admissible* if $\lambda^{\mathbf{i}}$ does not admit any admissible indexes. These definitions first appeared in [PT14], where the opposite ordering of partitions was used.

We define *admissible multisets* to be the multisets taking values in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ obtained from admissible sequences by forgetting the ordering. If \mathbf{i} is an admissible sequence then write $[\mathbf{i}]$ for the corresponding admissible multiset.

For $\varepsilon = \pm 1$ let \mathfrak{g} be a classical Lie algebra in accordance with Lemma 8.1, and let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a nilpotent orbit with partition λ . According to Proposition 8 and Corollary 8 of [PT14], for each admissible multiset $[\mathbf{i}]$, there is a procedure for choosing:

- (1) a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l}_{\mathbf{i}} \cong \mathfrak{gl}_{i_1} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{gl}_{i_l} \times \mathfrak{g}_0$, where \mathfrak{g}_0 is a classical Lie algebra of the same Dynkin type as \mathfrak{g} and natural representation of dimension $N - 2 \sum i_j$.
- (2) a nilpotent orbit $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{i}} = \{0\} \times \cdots \times \{0\} \times \mathcal{O}_{\lambda^{\mathbf{i}}}$ where $\mathcal{O}_{\lambda^{\mathbf{i}}} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}_0$ has partition $\lambda^{\mathbf{i}}$.

These choices satisfy $\mathcal{O} = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_{\mathbf{i}}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{i}})$. Furthermore $[\mathbf{i}] \mapsto (\mathfrak{l}_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{i}})$ sets up a one-to-one correspondence between maximal admissible multisets and rigid induction data for \mathcal{O} . Combining with Theorem 6.1 this proves.

Proposition 8.2. *The sheets of \mathfrak{g} containing e are in bijection with maximal admissible multisets for λ . The dimension of sheet corresponding to \mathbf{i} is $|\mathbf{i}| + \dim(\text{Ad}(G)e)$. \square*

8.3. Distinguished elements and induction. The proof of the main theorem reduces to the distinguished case, and the following result is one of the crucial steps.

Lemma 8.3. *Let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be a nilpotent orbit with partition $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$ in a classical Lie algebra of rank r . There exists a sequence of indexes i_1, \dots, i_l and a classical Lie algebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ of rank $r + \sum_j (n - i_j + 1)$ of the same Dynkin type as \mathfrak{g} such that:*

- (1) $\mathfrak{gl}_{n-i_1+1} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{gl}_{n-i_l+1} \times \mathfrak{g}$ embeds as a Levi subalgebra $\mathfrak{l} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$;
- (2) Identifying \mathcal{O} with the as a nilpotent orbit $\{0\} \times \cdots \times \{0\} \times \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$ we have that $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathcal{O})$ is a distinguished orbit in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Furthermore we can assume that the first part of the partition of $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathcal{O})$ is arbitrarily large.

Proof. If $i = 2, \dots, n$ is an index such that $i' = i - 1$ then we replace λ by

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-2}, \lambda_{i-1} + 1, \lambda_i + 1, \lambda_{i+1} + 2, \dots, \lambda_n + 2).$$

By iterating this procedure we can eventually obtain a partition with $i = i'$ for all i . If $i = 2, \dots, n$ is an index such that $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i-1}$ then we replace our new partition by

$$(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{i-1}, \lambda_i + 2, \lambda_{i+1} + 2, \dots, \lambda_n + 2).$$

Iterating this procedure we eventually replace λ with a distinguished partition $\tilde{\lambda} \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N + \sum_{i \in \mathbf{i}} 2(n - i + 1))$ where $\mathbf{i} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$ is some multiset consisting of indexes which were chosen in the above iterations. By applying the latter procedure at index $i = 1$ we can make the first part of $\tilde{\lambda}$ as large as we choose.

Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the classical Lie algebra of the same type as \mathfrak{g} with natural representation of dimension $N + \sum_{j \in \mathbf{i}} 2(n - j + 1)$. By Lemma 8.1 every orbit with partition $\tilde{\lambda}$ is distinguished. Since $\tilde{\lambda}^{\mathbf{i}} = \lambda$ the remarks of the previous Section show that there is a unique orbit $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ with partition λ and a unique induction datum $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O})$ such that \mathfrak{l} and \mathcal{O} satisfy the properties described in the current proposition, and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}} = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathcal{O})$. \square

8.4. The combinatorial Katsylo variety. In this section we introduce an affine algebraic variety X_λ , determined by a choice of partition, which we call *the combinatorial Katsylo variety*. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$ such that $i = i'$ for all i and $\lambda_1 > 1$. In particular λ is distinguished.

This condition ensures that $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1} \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for all $i = 2, \dots, n$ and that $(i, i + 1) \in \Delta(\lambda)$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$. We set

$$(8.1) \quad \begin{aligned} s_1 &:= \lfloor \frac{\lambda_1}{2} \rfloor; \\ s_i &:= \frac{\lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1}}{2} \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Introduce a set of variables

$$(8.2) \quad S_\lambda := \{x_{i,r} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq r \leq s_i\} \cup \{y_j \mid (j, j + 1) \in \Delta(\lambda)\}$$

and we consider the following collection of quadratic elements Q_λ in the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[S_\lambda]$

$$(8.3) \quad \begin{aligned} Q_\lambda &:= \{x_{i,1}y_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n - 1, \lambda_{i-1} - \lambda_i \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{>0}\} \\ &\cup \{x_{i+2,1}y_i, y_i y_{i+1} \mid i = 1, \dots, n - 2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally we define X_λ to be the algebraic variety with coordinate ring

$$(8.4) \quad \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda] := \mathbb{C}[S_\lambda]/(Q_\lambda).$$

In order to understand these varieties it suffices to consider a minimal partition. For this purpose we define a partition $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ by

$$(8.5) \quad \alpha = \begin{cases} (2, 4, \dots, 2n) & \text{if } \varepsilon = -1; \\ (3, 5, \dots, 2n + 1) & \text{if } \varepsilon = 1. \end{cases}$$

It follows directly from the definitions that $\mathbb{C}[X_\lambda] \cong \mathbb{C}[X_\alpha] \otimes \mathbb{C}[x_{i,r} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 < r \leq s_i]$, which implies that

$$(8.6) \quad X_\lambda \cong X_\alpha \times \mathbb{A}^{[\lambda_n/2] - n}.$$

For our purposes it is now sufficient to study X_α .

Let P_n be the set of subsets $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n - 1\}$ such that for all $i = 1, \dots, n - 2$ either $i \in S$ or $i + 1 \in S$ or both. For $S \in P_n$ we let $S^c := \{1, \dots, n - 1\} \setminus S$ be the complementary set. We define a

map from P_n to the set of subsets of $\{x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{n,1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}[X_\alpha]$ by

$$(8.7) \quad \iota : S \mapsto \{y_i \mid i \in S\} \cup \{x_i \mid i \in S^c \text{ or } i - 2 \in S^c\}.$$

Lemma 8.4. $S \mapsto (\iota S)$ is a bijection from P_n to the set of minimal prime ideals of $\mathbb{C}[X_\alpha]$ and

$$(8.8) \quad \dim \mathbb{C}[X_\alpha]/(\iota S) = |\{x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}\} \setminus \iota S|$$

Proof. The torus $T := (\mathbb{C}^\times)^{2n-1}$ acts on $\mathbb{C}[x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{n,1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}]$ by automorphisms rescaling generators, and this action descends to $\mathbb{C}[X_\alpha]$. Since T is connected it preserves the irreducible components of X_α , hence preserves the minimal primes of $\mathbb{C}[X_\alpha]$. Since the T -weight spaces on $\mathbb{C}[x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{n,1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}]$ are one dimensional, it follows that each minimal prime \mathfrak{p} is generated by $\mathfrak{p} \cap \{x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{n,1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}\}$.

By inspection we see that for each $S \in P_n$ the set ιS contains at least one of the factors of each quadratic relation (8.3) in $\mathbb{C}[X_\alpha]$ and is minimal with respect to this property. This implies that ι maps P_n to minimal primes.

The injectivity of $S \mapsto (\iota S)$ is clear and it remains to show that every minimal prime \mathfrak{p} is in the image. Suppose that \mathfrak{p} is generated by some subset $S \subseteq \{x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{n,1}, y_1, \dots, y_{n-1}\}$. Using the primality of \mathfrak{p} it is straightforward to check that $S' := \{1 \leq i \leq n-1 \mid y_i \in S\} \in P_n$ and $(\iota S') \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Now by minimality we have $\mathfrak{p} = (\iota S')$. \square

Proposition 8.5. There is a bijection $\mathbf{i} \mapsto X_\lambda^{\mathbf{i}}$ between maximal admissible multisets for λ and irreducible components of X_λ such that $\dim X_\lambda^{\mathbf{i}} = |\mathbf{i}|$.

Proof. It is not hard to see that the admissible multisets for λ are of the form $\mathbf{i} \cup \mathbf{j}$ where \mathbf{i} is an admissible multiset for α and \mathbf{j} is the multiset taking values in $\{1, \dots, n\}$ such that j occurs with multiplicity $(\lambda_j - \lambda_{j-1})/2 - 1$. Combining this with (8.6) it suffices to prove the current proposition in the case $\lambda = \alpha$.

By Lemma 8.4 the irreducible components of X_α are parameterised by P_n . In order to prove the first claim of the theorem we construct a bijection from P_n to the set of maximal admissible multisets.

The admissible multisets for α have multiplicities ≤ 2 . Thanks to [PT14, Lemma 6] we know that a maximal admissible multiset is totally determined by the collection of indexes in $\{2, \dots, n\}$ which occur with multiplicity 2: this is the set of indexes such that Case 2 occurs at some point in the KS algorithm. Therefore the collection of indexes of multiplicity 2 is only constrained by the fact that if i has multiplicity 2 then neither $i-1$ nor $i+1$ have multiplicity 2. It follows that if $S \in P_n$ then there is a unique maximal admissible sequence \mathbf{i} for α such that the indexes in $\{2, \dots, n\} \setminus (S+1)$ occur with multiplicity 2. This gives the desired bijection.

It remains to prove the claim regarding dimensions. Let $S \subseteq P_n$ and enumerate $\{1, \dots, n-1\} \setminus S = (i_1, \dots, i_l)$. By the remarks of the previous paragraph the maximal admissible sequence associated to $S \in P_n$ is determined as follows: first we let $\mathbf{i}' = (i_1 + 1, i_1 + 1, i_2 + 1, i_2 + 1, \dots, i_l + 1, i_l + 1)$ and then we let \mathbf{i} be the maximal admissible sequence obtained from \mathbf{i}' by applying Case 1 of the KS algorithm to $\alpha^{\mathbf{i}'}$ as many times as possible. The set of indexes where Case 1 can be applied to $\alpha^{\mathbf{i}'}$ are precisely

$$(8.9) \quad \{1 \leq i \leq n \mid \alpha_i^{\mathbf{i}'} - \alpha_{i-1}^{\mathbf{i}'} = 2\} = \{1 \leq i \leq n \mid i \neq i_l \text{ and } i - 2 \neq i_l \text{ for all } l\}$$

and it follows that the length of the maximal admissible sequence associated to S is

$$(8.10) \quad n - 1 - |S| + \#\{1 \leq i \leq n \mid i, i - 2 \in S^c\}.$$

According to (8.7) and Lemma 8.4 the dimension of the component of X_α corresponding to S is

$$(8.11) \quad 2n - 1 - |S| - \#\{1 \leq i \leq n \mid i \in S^c \text{ or } i - 2 \in S^c\}$$

It is straightforward to see that (8.10) and (8.11) are equal. \square

8.5. The semiclassical abelianisation I: the distinguished case. Let $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) \in \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon(N)$ be a distinguished partition satisfying $\lambda_1 > 1$. The indexes s_1, \dots, s_{n-1} defined in (8.1) allow us to construct an $n \times n$ symmetric shift matrix via $\sigma = (s_{i,j})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ by setting $s_{i+1, i} = s_{i, i+1} := s_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n - 1$. By (3.2) these values determine the entire matrix, which coincides with (4.1).

Next we describe generators of $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ and certain relations between them.

Lemma 8.6. *Let $\mathfrak{m}_0 \subseteq S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ be unique maximal Kazhdan graded ideal. Then $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is generated by elements*

$$(8.12) \quad \{\bar{\theta}_i^{(s_{i+1}+1)} \mid i = 1, \dots, n - 1\} \cup \{\bar{\eta}_i^{(2r)} \mid i = 1, \dots, n, r = 1, \dots, s_i\}$$

These elements satisfy the following relations

$$(8.13) \quad \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_{i+1}+1)} \bar{\theta}_{i+1}^{(s_{i+2}+1)} = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n - 2;$$

$$(8.14) \quad \bar{\theta}_1^{(s_2+1)} \eta_1^{(2s_1)} = 0 \quad \text{for } \varepsilon = -1;$$

$$(8.15) \quad \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_{i+1}+1)} (\bar{\eta}_i^{(2s_i)} - \bar{\eta}_{i-1}^{(2s_i)}) = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 2, \dots, n - 1;$$

$$(8.16) \quad \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_{i+1}+1)} (\bar{\eta}_{i+2}^{(2s_{i+2})} - \bar{\eta}_{i+1}^{(2s_{i+2})}) = 0 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n - 2$$

where the elements $\eta_i^{(r)}$ are taken to be zero if they lie outside the range prescribed by (8.12).

Proof. By Theorem 3.7 and Corollary 4.9 we see that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is generated (as a commutative algebra) by elements (3.61). We write $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(r)} := \theta_{i,j}^{(r)} + \mathfrak{m}_0^2$ and $\bar{\eta}_i^{(r)} := \eta_i^{(r)} + \mathfrak{m}_0^2$. By Corollary 4.10 we see that $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ is generated by elements $\{\bar{\eta}_i^{(2r)} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 < 2r \leq \lambda_i\} \cup \{\bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(r)} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n, s_{i,j} < r \leq s_{i,j} + \lambda_i\}$, and these elements satisfy the relations of \mathfrak{g}^e .

If we identify a subset of these elements which span a vector space complement to $[\mathfrak{g}^e, \mathfrak{g}^e]$ in \mathfrak{g}^e then it follows that these elements generate $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$. Now [PT14, Theorem 6] implies that the elements (8.12) span such a complement, although we warn the reader that the notation there is slightly different.

In order to complete the proof we show that they satisfy the quadratic relations (8.13)–(8.16). Relation (8.13) follows directly from (3.70).

Now suppose that $i = 1$ and that $\varepsilon = -1$, so that λ_1 is even. Using (3.67) and (4.24) we see that the ideal of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ generated by Poisson brackets contains the element

$$\sum_{t=0}^{\lambda_1/2} \eta_1^{(2t)} \theta_1^{(\lambda_1 - 2t + s_{1,2} + 1)} - \sum_{t=0}^{\lambda_1/2 - 1} \eta_1^{(2t)} \{\eta_1^{(2)}, \theta_1^{(\lambda_1 - 2t + s_{1,2})}\} = \eta_1^{(\lambda_1)} \theta_1^{(s_{1,2} + 1)}.$$

Note that $\lambda_1 = 2s_1$ in this case by Lemma 4.1. Projecting this expression into $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ we see that (8.14) lies in the kernel of $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e) \twoheadrightarrow \text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$. The relations (8.15), (8.16) can be

deduced similarly by considering the quadratic terms appearing in (3.67), (3.73) and projecting into $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Since the arguments for these two cases are almost identical we just sketch (8.16).

Fix $i = 1, \dots, n - 2$. Using (3.73) we consider the expression $\{\theta_{i+1}^{(s_i+2+1)}, \{\theta_{i+1}^{(s_i+2+1)}, \theta_i^{(s_i+1+1)}\}\}$. There is a unique linear term $\theta_i^{(2s_i+2+s_i+1+1)}$ corresponding to $m = m_1 - 1$ and $m_2 = 0$. By (3.67) this term lies in the ideal of $y_n(\sigma)$ generated by the brackets, so we may subtract it to obtain an element of the bracket ideal. Now consider the quadratic terms. If we choose any term such that $m_2 < m_1$ then this term has a factor of $\theta_i^{(2(m_1-m_2)+s_i+1+1)}$ and so these terms lie in the bracket ideal again by (3.67). After subtracting the the only remaining quadratic terms are $\eta_{i+2}^{(2s_i+1)}\theta_i^{(s_i+1+1)}$ and $\tilde{\eta}_{i+1}^{(2s_i+1)}\theta_i^{(s_i+1+1)}$ which correspond to $m_1 = m_2 = 0$ and $m_1 = m_2 = m - 1$ respectively. Finally one checks using (3.74) that $\tilde{\eta}_{i+1}^{(2s_i+1)} = -\eta_{i+1}^{(2s_i+1)}$ modulo \mathfrak{m}_0^2 , and so

$$\eta_{i+2}^{(2s_i+1)}\theta_i^{(s_i+1+1)} + \tilde{\eta}_{i+1}^{(2s_i+1)}\theta_i^{(s_i+1+1)} + \mathfrak{m}_0^3 = \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_i+1+1)}(\bar{\eta}_{i+2}^{(2s_i+2)} - \bar{\eta}_{i+1}^{(2s_i+2)}).$$

The proof of (8.15) is almost identical, instead examining $\{\theta_{i+1}^{(s_i+2+1)}, \{\theta_{i+1}^{(s_i+2+1)}, \theta_i^{(s_i+1+1)}\}\}$. \square

Theorem 8.7. *There is an isomorphism $\text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[\text{TC}_e(e + X)]$. In particular $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced.*

Proof. Let A denote the algebra with generators (8.12) and relations (8.13)–(8.16). Before we proceed we outline the argument. First of all we will show that $A \cong \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda]$ where X_λ is the combinatorial Katsylo variety from Section 8.4. By Lemma 8.6 we have that $A \twoheadrightarrow \text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ and since the reduced algebra of $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is $\mathbb{C}[e + X]$ by Proposition 6.2(1), we see that $\mathbb{C}[X_\lambda] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{TC}_e(e + X)]$. We then combine deductions of the previous sections to see that the components of X_λ and $\text{TC}_e(e + X)$ have the same dimensions. Since X_λ is reduced we deduce that we have isomorphisms $\mathbb{C}[X_\lambda] \cong \text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} \cong \mathbb{C}[\text{TC}_e(e + X)]$, from which the theorem follows.

Step (i): First we define an isomorphism $A \cong \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda]$. Notice that the algebra endomorphism of A defined by $\bar{\eta}_i^{(2s_i-1)} \mapsto \bar{\eta}_i^{(2s_i-1)} + \bar{\eta}_i^{(2s_i-1)}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, and acting identically on the other generators is a unimodular substitution. By slight abuse of notation we denote the images of the the generators under the inverse automorphism by the same symbols. With this new set of generators the relations now take the form

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_i+1)}\bar{\theta}_{i+1}^{(s_i+1+1)} &= 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n - 2; \\ \bar{\theta}_1^{(s_1+1)}\bar{\eta}_1^{(2s_1)} &= 0 & \text{for } \varepsilon = -1; \\ \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_i+1)}\bar{\eta}_i^{(2s_i)} &= 0 & \text{for } i = 2, \dots, n - 1; \\ \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_i+1)}\bar{\eta}_{i+2}^{(2s_i+2)} &= 0 & \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n - 3 \end{aligned}$$

Now comparing these elements with (8.3) we see there is an isomorphism $A \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda]$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\eta}_i^{(2r)} &\longmapsto x_{i, s_i+1-r}; \\ \bar{\theta}_i^{(s_i+1+1)} &\longmapsto y_i. \end{aligned}$$

Step (ii): Now we use the tangent cone $\text{TC}_e(e + X)$. By Proposition 6.2(1) and Lemma 8.6 we have

$$(8.17) \quad \mathbb{C}[X_\lambda] \twoheadrightarrow \text{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{TC}_e(e + X)]$$

Applying Proposition 6.2(2), Proposition 8.2 and Proposition 8.5 we have

$$d(X_\lambda) = d(e + X) = d(\mathrm{TC}_e(e + X)).$$

Now by Lemma 5.1 we see that the surjections (8.17) are isomorphisms on the underlying varieties of closed points. Since $\mathbb{C}[X_\lambda]$ is reduced these maps are algebra isomorphisms and $\mathrm{gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_0} S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is reduced. Applying Lemma 5.4 we see that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is reduced, as claimed. \square

8.6. The semiclassical abelianisation II: the general case. The following result uses the local geometry of Poisson manifolds to reduce the claim to the distinguished case, and then apply Theorem 8.7.

Theorem 8.8. $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is reduced.

Proof. Part (i): We let $\mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be the adjoint orbit of e in \mathfrak{g} , and let $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ be the Lie algebra and distinguished nilpotent orbit introduced in Lemma 8.3. Pick $\tilde{e} \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ and an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $(\tilde{e}, \tilde{h}, \tilde{f})$. Write \tilde{G} for the simply connected, connected complex algebraic group with $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathrm{Lie}(\tilde{G})$. Recall that $\mathfrak{l} = \mathfrak{gl}_{n-i_1+1} \times \cdots \times \mathfrak{gl}_{n-i_l+1} \times \mathfrak{g}$ embeds as a Levi subalgebra of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. If we choose $e \in \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g} \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$ then \mathcal{O} identifies with the adjoint L -orbit and we have the following isomorphism

$$S(\mathfrak{l}, e) \cong S(\mathfrak{gl}_{i_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes S(\mathfrak{gl}_{i_l}) \otimes S(\mathfrak{g}, e)$$

Therefore $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is reduced if and only if $S(\mathfrak{l}, e)^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is reduced. This holds if and only if $(S(\mathfrak{l}, e)_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge})^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is reduced, where \mathfrak{m}_0 is the maximal ideal of e , thanks to Lemma 5.4 and Lemma 5.6.

Part (ii): Now pick a regular element $s \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ so that $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^s \cong \mathfrak{l}$. Write $x = s + e \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. We will explain below that x can be viewed as a point of $\tilde{e} + \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\tilde{f}} = \mathrm{Spec} S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{e})$, and by slight abuse of notation we will also write \mathfrak{m}_0 for the maximal ideal of x in $S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{e})$. We claim that $S(\mathfrak{l}, e)_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge} \cong S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{e})_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge}$ as Poisson algebras. Note that $(S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{e})_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge})^{\mathrm{ab}}$ is reduced by Lemma 5.4 and Theorem 8.7. Thanks to part (i) the current proof will follow from the claim.

Part (iii): Pick an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple (e, h, f) for e inside \mathfrak{l} , then define $y = s + f \in \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. By \mathfrak{sl}_2 -theory the affine variety $x + \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^y$ is a transverse slice to the adjoint orbit $\mathrm{Ad}(\tilde{G})x$ at the point x . Also pick an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $(\tilde{e}, \tilde{h}, \tilde{f})$ in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$. After replacing the latter triple by some conjugate we can actually assume that $x \in \tilde{e} + \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\tilde{f}}$. By construction we have $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}}(\mathcal{O}) = \mathrm{Ad}(\tilde{G})\tilde{e}$. It follows that x lies in a sheet of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}$ containing \tilde{e} , and so we have $x \in \tilde{e} + \tilde{X}$, where the latter variety is defined in parallel with (6.1).

Now we choose small neighbourhoods $U_x \subseteq \tilde{e} + \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\tilde{f}}$ and $V_x \subseteq x + \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^y$ of x in the complex topologies. Similarly let $W_e \subseteq e + \mathfrak{l}^f$ be a small neighbourhood of e . It is well-known that U_x, V_x, W_e all carry transverse Poisson structures on the ring of analytic functions, see [LPV13, 5.3.3] for example. Write $\mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{an}}(M)$ for the ring of analytic functions on a complex manifold M . There is a natural restriction map $\mathbb{C}[e + \mathfrak{l}^f] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{an}}(W_e)$ which is a Poisson homomorphism. Thanks to [Ser55, Proposition 3] this induces an isomorphism $S(\mathfrak{l}, e)_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge} \cong \mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{an}}(W_e)_e^{\wedge}$ of complete Poisson algebras. Similarly we have a Poisson isomorphism $S(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}, \tilde{e})_{\mathfrak{m}_0}^{\wedge} \cong \mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{an}}(U_x)_x^{\wedge}$.

Now the claim will follow from the existence of an isomorphism $\mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{an}}(U_x)_x^{\wedge} \cong \mathbb{C}^{\mathrm{an}}(W_e)_e^{\wedge}$ of complete Poisson algebras. First of all we observe that $x \in \tilde{e} + \tilde{X}$ implies that both $\tilde{e} + \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^{\tilde{f}}$ and $x + \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}^y$ are transverse slices to $\mathrm{Ad}(\tilde{G})x$ at x . Therefore by [LPV13, Proposition 5.29] we have an isomorphism $U_x \rightarrow V_x$ of analytic Poisson manifolds sending x to x . Furthermore by [DSV07, Proposition 2.1] we see that there is a similar isomorphism $V_x \rightarrow W_e$ sending x to e . This completes the proof. \square

8.7. The abelianisation of the finite W -algebra via deformation theory. Here we prove the first main theorem (Theorem 1.1), which states that Premet's component map (1.2) is a bijection. First of all we apply Proposition 7.6 and Theorem 8.8 to see that both $\text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ and $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ are reduced. Now apply Lemma 5.2 and Theorem 7.2 to see that

$$\# \text{Comp } \mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \leq \# \text{Comp } \mathbb{C}\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) = \# \text{Comp}(e + X).$$

Since Premet's map (1.2) is surjective and restricts to a dimension preserving bijection from some subset, the theorem follows.

Remark 8.9. Premet asked whether the abelian quotient $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ of a finite W -algebra is reduced [Pr10, Question 3.1]. Combining Proposition 7.6 with Theorem 8.8 we are able to give an affirmative answer in the case of classical Lie algebras.

The problem of understanding whether $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is reduced for exceptional Lie algebra is rather subtle. The methods of this paper will certainly not work in general: in the introduction to [Pr14] it is explained that there are four orbits in exceptional Lie algebra such that the associated finite W -algebra is known to admit precisely two one dimensional representations (these correspond to the first four columns of [PT20, Table 1]). For these W -algebras it is not hard to see that the reduced algebra associated to $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{C}[x]/(x^2 - 1)$ as filtered algebras, with the generator x in some positive degree. This ensures that $\text{gr } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ is not reduced, and Proposition 7.6 implies that $S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}}$ admits nilpotent elements.

9. THE ORBIT METHOD

9.1. Losev's orbit method map. In this Section we suppose that G is semisimple and simply connected. Using the Killing form we identify \mathfrak{g} with \mathfrak{g}^* for the rest of the paper. Let us recall the construction of *the orbit method map* $\mathfrak{g}/G \rightarrow \text{Prim } U(\mathfrak{g})$ from [Lo16].

We say that a Poisson algebra has degree -2 if $\{\cdot, \cdot\} : A_i \times A_j \rightarrow A_{i+j-2}$. In this case a filtered quantization of A is a pair (\mathcal{A}, ι) consisting of a non-commutative filtered algebra with $[\mathcal{F}_i \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{F}_j \mathcal{A}] \subseteq \mathcal{F}_{i+j-2} \mathcal{A}$ and an isomorphism $\iota : \text{gr } \mathcal{A} \rightarrow A$ of filtered Poisson algebras. Filtered Poisson deformations are defined similarly, the only difference being that \mathcal{A} is a filtered Poisson algebra.

Let $\mathfrak{l} = \text{Lie}(L)$ be a Levi subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} , $\mathcal{O}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$ a nilpotent adjoint orbit, and $z \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ an element of the centre. Recall that $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$ is referred to as an induction datum. If P is a choice of parabolic with Levi decomposition $\mathfrak{p} = \text{Lie}(P) = \mathfrak{l} \ltimes \mathfrak{n}$, then the *generalised Springer map* is

$$(9.1) \quad G \times_P (z + \mathcal{O}_0 + \mathfrak{n}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$$

In general this is a finite morphism onto the image, which contains a unique dense adjoint orbit. This orbit does not depend on P , only on its Levi factor [Lo16, Lemma 4.1], and it is denoted $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(z + \mathcal{O}_0)$. Recall that $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$ is known as an *induction datum for* $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(z + \mathcal{O}_0)$. We say that the datum is *proper* if $\mathfrak{l} \neq \mathfrak{g}$. If the generalised Springer map (9.1) is birational then we say that the induction datum is *birational*. If \mathcal{O} does not admit any proper, birational induction data then it is said to be *birationally rigid*. The datum $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$ is said to be a *birationally minimal* if:

- (1) \mathcal{O}_0 is birationally rigid in \mathfrak{l} ;
- (2) $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$ is a birational orbit datum for \mathcal{O} .

According to [Lo16, Theorem 4.4] there is a unique birationally minimal induction datum $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, \xi)$ associated to each orbit $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{g}^*/G$.

Suppose that \mathcal{O}_0 is birationally rigid in \mathfrak{l} . Then according to [Lo16, Proposition 4.2] there is a non-empty open subset $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{reg}} \subseteq \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ such that (9.1) is birational for all $z \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{reg}}$. This subset does not depend on the choice of P , only on L , and we warn the reader that this notation different to that used in Section 6.1. The *birational sheet* corresponding to $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0)$ is the union of all orbits of maximal dimension in $\text{Ad}(G)(\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})^{\text{reg}} + \mathcal{O}_0 + \mathfrak{n})$.

Pick $\mathfrak{l}, P, \mathfrak{n}$ as above, and a birationally rigid orbit $\mathcal{O}_0 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$. By [Ja04, Proposition 8.3] the affinization $X_0 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}_0]$ is isomorphic to the normalisation of $\overline{\mathcal{O}_0}$. Consider the map $G \times_P (X_0 \times \mathfrak{n}) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_0)}$. The preimage of the induced orbit is a finite covering which we denote $G/H \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_0)$. The affinization $X = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[G/H]$ is a normal conical Poisson variety in degree -2.

Writing $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ there is an important Poisson deformation $X_{\mathfrak{P}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}$ of X and a filtered quantization $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ of $\mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]$ over the same base, described in [Lo16, §2, §3]. We mention that \mathfrak{P} is actually a certain cohomology group, and we use [Lo16, Proposition 4.7] to identify it with $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$ throughout this paper. By the results of [Lo16, §4] the Poisson deformation can be described very explicitly using Lusztig–Spaltenstein induction: the group P acts on $\mathfrak{P} \times X_0 \times \mathfrak{n}$ as above and taking global sections of the structure sheaf on $\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{P}} := G \times_P (\mathfrak{P} \times X_0 \times \mathfrak{n})$ we obtain $\mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]$. In words, $X_{\mathfrak{P}}$ is the affinization of $\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{P}}$. The $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]$ -algebra structure arises from the projection $\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{P}} \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}$. The Poisson structure is equipped with a Hamiltonian G -action and the comoment map $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]$ lifts to a quantum comoment map $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}}$.

Lemma 9.1. *The quantum comoment map induces a finite morphism $\mathfrak{P} \rightarrow \text{Spec } Z(\mathfrak{g})$.*

Proof. Taking the associated graded algebra it suffices to show that the comoment map $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]$ induces a finite morphism $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}/G = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}]^G$. The latter map is just the composition $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}) \hookrightarrow \mathfrak{t} \twoheadrightarrow \mathfrak{t}/W = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}]^G$ where \mathfrak{t} is a maximal torus and W the Weyl group, hence finite. \square

Now we can define the *orbit method map*. Pick an orbit $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{g}/G$. This corresponds to a unique birationally minimal induction datum $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$, and we pick a parabolic P for L . Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}}$ be the quantization of $\mathbb{C}[G \times_P (X_0 \times \mathfrak{n})]$ with parameter z . Then Losev defines

$$(9.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} : \mathfrak{g}/G &\longrightarrow \text{Prim } U(\mathfrak{g}) \\ \mathcal{O} &\longmapsto \text{Ker}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{O}}). \end{aligned}$$

Recall the notation $\text{Prim}_{\mathcal{O}} U(\mathfrak{g})$ from the introduction. The following refinement of Theorem 1.2, uses the notation of Section 7.

Theorem 9.2. *Let $e \in \mathcal{O} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ be an element of a nilpotent orbit in a classical Lie algebra. The following sets coincide:*

- (1) *The image of \mathcal{J} intersected with $\text{Prim}_{\mathcal{O}} U(\mathfrak{g})$.*
- (2) *The ideals $\text{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(Q \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}, e)} \mathbb{C}_{\eta})$ where $\mathbb{C}_{\eta} \in U(\mathfrak{g}, e)\text{-mod}$ is one dimensional.*

The proof of the theorem will occupy the rest of the section. First of all we describe the associated variety of the primitive ideal $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O})$. This was stated in [Lo16, §5.4], but we provide a proof for completeness.

Lemma 9.3. *For $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{g}^*/G$ we let \mathcal{S} be a sheet of \mathfrak{g}^* containing \mathcal{O} . Then*

$$\mathcal{VA}(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O})) = \mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}^*).$$

Proof. Let $(\mathfrak{l}, \mathcal{O}_0, z)$ be the birationally minimal orbit datum inducing to \mathcal{O} . For $t \in \mathbb{C}$ we can consider the orbit $\mathcal{O}(t)$ which is dense in the image of the generalised Springer map $G \times_P (tz + \mathcal{O}_0 + \mathfrak{n}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$. By definition we have $\mathcal{O}(1) = \mathcal{O}$ and $\mathcal{O}(0) = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_0)$, whilst $\dim \mathcal{O}(t)$ is constant. It follows that \mathcal{O} and $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_0)$ lie in a sheet. Since \mathcal{O}_0 is nilpotent and every sheet contains a unique nilpotent orbit, $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}^*) = \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_0)$ for every sheet containing \mathcal{O} .

Now write X for the dense orbit in $G \times_P (X_0 + \mathfrak{n})$. Since gr is exact on strictly filtered vector spaces, the graded ideal $\text{gr } \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O})$ is the kernel of the comoment map $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{g}] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X]$. This factors through the comoment map for $\mathbb{C}[\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_0)]$, which shows that $\text{gr } \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{O})$ is the defining ideal of $\overline{\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_0)}$. This completes the proof. \square

9.2. The Namikawa–Weyl group and the Poisson automorphism group. Keep the notation of the previous section. There are two groups at play in the theory of universal quantizations. The first of these is the Namikawa–Weyl group W , described in [Lo16, §2.3] in the general setting. This group acts on $\mathfrak{P}, \mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}}$ compatibly, and it follows from *op. cit.* that the algebras $\mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]^W$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}}^W$ satisfy universal properties for Poisson deformations and filtered quantizations respectively (see also [ACET20] for an elementary discussion of the universal properties). To be slightly more precise it is known that every other deformation and quantization are obtained from these algebras by base change.

Now let A be the group of Poisson automorphisms of X . As explained in [Lo16, §3.7] the universal properties of $\mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]^W$ and $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}}^W$ imply that there is a natural action of A on $\mathbb{C}[X_{\mathfrak{P}}]^W$ by graded Poisson automorphisms and on $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}}^W$ by filtered algebra automorphisms. These actions preserve $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]^W$ and the induced actions on \mathfrak{P}/W are called the Poisson and quantum actions respectively.

When X is the affinization of a finite cover $G/H \rightarrow \text{Ad}(G)e$ there is a map $\Gamma = G^e/(G^e)^{\circ} \rightarrow A$ defined by letting $\gamma(G^e)^{\circ}$ act on gH by $g\gamma^{-1}H$. In fact one can show that the image of this map consists of all $G \times \mathbb{C}^{\times}$ -equivariant Poisson automorphisms of G/H .

Lemma 9.4. *Let $(\mathfrak{l}_i, \mathcal{O}_i), i = 1, 2$ be induction data giving covers $X_i, i = 1, 2$ of the induced orbit. Suppose $\mathfrak{l}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}_2$ and $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_1}^{\mathfrak{l}_2}(\mathcal{O}_1) = \mathcal{O}_2$. Write W_1 for the Namikawa–Weyl group of X_1 . If $G/H \subseteq X_2$ is the dense orbit then the image of H in Γ fixes pointwise the image of $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)$ in $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)/W_1$ under the Poisson action.*

Proof. Choose $e \in \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_i}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_i) \cap (\mathcal{O}_i + \mathfrak{n}_i)$. If \tilde{e}_i is an element of the fibre of $G \times_{P_i} (\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}_i] \times \mathfrak{n}_i) \rightarrow \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_i}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_i)$ over e then we can take $H_i = G^{\tilde{e}_i}$. We have $H_i \subseteq P_i$ because \tilde{e}_i lies in the fibre of $\tilde{X}_i \rightarrow G/P_i$ over the identity coset. The right action of G^e on G descends to an action on $\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)}$. For $h \in H_1$ we see that the action on the central fibre over $0 \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_i)$ coincides with the action via Poisson automorphisms, and that the action on $\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)}$ induces the Poisson action on the quotient $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)/W_1$. The inclusion $H_2 \subseteq P_2$ now ensures that H_2 stabilises the fibres of $X_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)}$ over $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)$ hence induces the trivial action on the image of $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)/W_1$. \square

9.3. Primitive ideals arising from generalised Springer maps. For every birationally rigid orbit $\mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$ in a Levi subalgebra there is a corresponding orbit cover, and a universal quantization

of the affinization. Every fibre of this quantization gives rise to primitive ideal of $U(\mathfrak{g})$, taking the kernel of the quantum comoment map, and the collection of ideals obtained this way will be denoted $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{Prim} U(\mathfrak{g})$. We also consider the subset $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ obtained by only considering the rigid orbits $\mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}$ in Levi subalgebras.

Proposition 9.5. *Suppose that \mathfrak{g} is classical. Then the image of \mathcal{J} is equal to \mathcal{C} and $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{R}$.*

Proof. The image of \mathcal{J} is contained in \mathcal{C} by construction and so we prove the opposite inclusion. Let $\mathcal{O}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}_1$ be birationally rigid and let X_1 be the dense orbit in $G \times_{P_1} (\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}_1] \times \mathfrak{n}_1)$. Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)}$ be the quantization of the Poisson deformation of X_1 . Pick $z \in \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)$. We shall show that $\text{Ker}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_z)$ lies in the image of \mathcal{J} . If the generalised Springer map for the datum $(\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathcal{O}_1, z)$ is an isomorphism then $\text{Ker}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_z)$ lies in the image of \mathcal{J} by construction. So assume that this map is not birational.

One can check that $G \times_{P_1} (z + \mathcal{O}_1 + \mathfrak{n}_1) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_1}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_1)}$ is birational if and only if the map $G^z \times_{P^z} (z + \mathcal{O}_1 + \mathfrak{n}_1^z) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_1^z}^{\mathfrak{g}^z}(\mathcal{O}_1)}$ is birational (see [Am20, Remark 3.2] for more detail). Therefore by assumption the latter map is not birational. Define $\mathfrak{l}_2 := \mathfrak{g}^z, \mathcal{O}_2 := \overline{\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_1^z}^{\mathfrak{g}^z}(\mathcal{O}_1)}$. Then after making an appropriate choice of parabolic P_2 we have a factorisation $G \times_{P_1} (\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}_1] \times \mathfrak{n}_1) \rightarrow G \times_{P_2} (\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}_2] \times \mathfrak{n}_2) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{l}_1}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{O}_1)}$. Let $H_1, H_2 \subseteq G^e$ be the subgroup such that G/H_i is the dense orbit in $G \times_{P_i} (\text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{O}_i] \times \mathfrak{n}_i)$. Since \mathfrak{g} is classical the component group Γ of G^e is abelian [Ja04, §4], and so the image of H_1 in Γ is normal. It follows that $G/H_1 \rightarrow G/H_2$ is a Galois cover with Galois group H_2/H_1 , and that $\mathbb{C}[G/H_1]^{H_2} \cong \mathbb{C}[G/H_2]$ (invariants under the right action). Now by Lemma 9.4 and [Lo16, Proposition 3.21] the group H_2 acts on the filtered quantization \mathcal{A}_z of G/H_1 with parameter z , by filtered automorphisms, and these automorphisms lift the action on $\mathbb{C}[G/H_1]$. Since the action factors through a finite group the filtration splits for H_2 and we deduce that $\text{gr}(\mathcal{A}_z^{H_2}) \cong \mathbb{C}[G/H_2]$. In other words, $\mathcal{A}_z^{H_2}$ is a filtered quantization of G/H_2 . We deduce that $\mathcal{A}_z^{H_2}$ is isomorphic to a fibre of the universal quantization of G/H_2 . Since the image of the comoment map $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[G/H_1]$ is H_2 -invariant we conclude that the kernels of $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_z$ and $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_z^{H_2}$ are equal. However $G/H_1 \twoheadrightarrow G/H_2 \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{O}$ and G/H_2 is a cover of the induced orbit of strictly lower degree than G/H_2 . By induction we know that this kernel lies in the image of \mathcal{J} , which therefore equals \mathcal{C} .

To complete the proof it remains to show that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$. We take a birationally rigid orbit $\mathcal{O}_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}_2$ which is not rigid. Let $(\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ be a rigid induction datum such that the sheet corresponding to $(\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ contains the birational sheet corresponding to $(\mathfrak{l}_2, \mathcal{O}_2)$. Such a choice is always possible because the closure of a birational sheet is irreducible. We may assume that $\mathfrak{l}_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{l}_2$ so that $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2) \subseteq \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)$, and we retain the notation H_1, H_2 as above. Now take the quantization $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)}$ of the cover corresponding to $(\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$. There is a map $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]$ given by restriction of functions. The base change $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)]} \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]$ is a flat $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]$ -algebra carrying an action of H_2 by algebra automorphisms fixing the base pointwise. Since the action of H_2 factors through a finite group the previous paragraph shows that $(\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)]} \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)])^{H_2}$ is a quantization of a flat deformation of $\mathbb{C}[G/H_2]$. If $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)}^{W_2}$ denotes the quantization of $\mathbb{C}[G/H_2]$ constructed in [Lo16, §3] then the universal property of Theorem 3.4 of *loc. cit.* implies that there is a unique map $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]^{W_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]$ such that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)}^{W_2} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)/W_2]} \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)] \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)]} \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)])^{H_2}$$

Furthermore the morphism is G -equivariant and so we get induced maps from $Z(\mathfrak{g})$ to $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)/W_2]$ and $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]$ which form a commutative triangle with $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]^{W_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]$. Using Lemma 9.1 we see $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]$ is finite over $Z(\mathfrak{g})$, hence it is also finite over $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)]^{W_2}$. In particular $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2) \rightarrow \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)/W_2$ is a finite morphism, hence closed and surjective. This shows that the primitive ideals which appear as kernels of the moment maps for fibres of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_2)}^{W_2}$ already appear as kernels for fibres of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_1)}$. It follows that $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ and this completes the proof. \square

9.4. Quantum Hamiltonian reduction of universal quantizations. Now we keep fixed $e \in \mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})$, the adjoint orbit $\mathcal{O} := \text{Ad}(G)e$, an \mathfrak{sl}_2 -triple $\{e, h, f\}$ for e and write $G^e(0)$ for the point-wise stabiliser of the triple. Also $\mathfrak{g}^e(0) = \text{Lie } G^e(0)$ is consistent with the grading notation from Section 2.2. The component group is $\Gamma := G^e/(G^e)^\circ \cong G^e(0)/G^e(0)^\circ$.

The category $\text{HC}(\mathfrak{g})$ of Harish-Chandra $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -bimodules consists of $U(\mathfrak{g})$ -bimodules, finitely generated on both sides, which are locally finite for $\text{ad}(\mathfrak{g})$. It follows from [GG02] that $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ admits $G^e(0)$ -action by filtered automorphisms, and a quantum comoment map $\mathfrak{g}^e(0) \hookrightarrow U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$. Therefore one can define the category $\text{HC}^{G^e(0)} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ of $G^e(0)$ -equivariant Harish-Chandra $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ -bimodules to be the category of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ -bimodules, finitely generated on both sides, with a compatible $G^e(0)$ -action which differentiates to the $\text{ad}(\mathfrak{g}^e(0))$ -action (see [Lo11] for example).

Losev has constructed a pair of adjoint functors $(\bullet_\dagger, \bullet^\dagger)$ with $\bullet_\dagger : \text{HC} U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightleftarrows \text{HC}^{G^e(0)} U(\mathfrak{g}, e) : \bullet^\dagger$ which behave nicely when applied to quantizations of nilpotent orbit covers. The definition first appeared in [Lo11] and depends on the decomposition theorem from [Lo10a] which we will not describe here. Instead we recall from [Lo11, §3.5] that \bullet_\dagger is isomorphic to a quantum Hamiltonian reduction $M_\dagger \cong (M/M\mathfrak{g}(\langle -1 \rangle)_\chi)^{\text{ad}(\mathfrak{g}(\langle 0 \rangle))}$, which is in the spirit of the definitions used in this paper.

Let $(\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathcal{O}_1)$ be a rigid induction datum for \mathcal{O} leading to a finite cover $X_1 = G/H \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$. Let \mathcal{A} denote the family of filtered quantizations of $\mathbb{C}[X_1]$ over $\mathfrak{P} = \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l})$. Since $\mathcal{A} \in \text{HC} U(\mathfrak{g})$, there is a natural $G^e(0)$ -action on $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \in \text{HC}^{G^e(0)} U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$.

Lemma 9.6. *The algebra \mathcal{A}_\dagger is commutative and $\mathcal{A}_\dagger^{G^e(0)} = (\mathcal{A}_\dagger)^{G^e(0)} \cong \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]$.*

Proof. For $z \in \mathfrak{P}$ write $I_z \subseteq \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]$ for the corresponding maximal ideal, and $(-)\otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z$ for the specialisation of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]$ -modules. Since $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}] \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ is central, the image of the map $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{A}\mathfrak{g}(\langle -1 \rangle)_\chi$ lies in the space of $\text{ad}(\mathfrak{g}(\langle 0 \rangle))$ -invariants, giving $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\dagger$.

We claim that $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z \cong (\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z)_\dagger$. Since \bullet_\dagger is exact [Lo11, Lemma 3.3.2] there is a surjective map $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \twoheadrightarrow (\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z)_\dagger$ which factors to $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z \twoheadrightarrow (\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z)_\dagger$. Write $U(\mathfrak{g})_{\phi(z)}$ for the central reduction at $\phi(z) \in \text{Spec } Z(\mathfrak{g})$ where $\phi : \mathfrak{P} \rightarrow \text{Spec } Z(\mathfrak{g})$ is induced by the quantum comoment map. By Lemma 9.1 it will suffice to check that $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g})} U(\mathfrak{g})_{\phi(z)} \cong (\mathcal{A} \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g})} U(\mathfrak{g})_{\phi(z)})_\dagger$. Using the fact that \bullet_\dagger is a tensor functor [Lo11, Theorem 1.3.1(3)] this will follow from the claim that $(U(\mathfrak{g})_{\phi(z)})_\dagger \cong U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_{\phi(z)}$. Using [Gi09, Lemma 4.4.1] we can deduce the claim from the semiclassical limit: we must show that $(\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})]/\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g})]\mathfrak{g}(\langle -1 \rangle)_\chi)^{\text{ad}(\mathfrak{g}(\langle 0 \rangle))} \cong \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}(\mathfrak{g}) \cap (e + \mathfrak{g}^f)]$, which follows directly from [GG02, Lemma 2.1].

Now write $\mathcal{A}_\dagger^{\text{ab}}$ for the abelian quotient of \mathcal{A}_\dagger , defined by the ideal generated by commutators. Write C for the cokernel of the projection $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\dagger^{\text{ab}}$ in the category of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]$ -modules. By [Lo16, Lemma 5.2(1)] $\mathcal{A}_\dagger \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z$ is commutative for all z . Since the functor $(-)\otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z$ is right exact

on $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]$ -modules we have $C \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z = 0$ for all z . This forces $C = 0$, which implies that \mathcal{A}_\dagger is commutative.

Since the image of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ lies in the centre it is G -invariant, and so the image of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\dagger$ is $G^e(0)$ -invariant. Consider the cokernel C_0 of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\dagger^{G^e(0)}$ in the category of $\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]$ -modules. Using [Lo16, Lemma 5.2(1)] and a similar argument to the previous paragraph we see that $C_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}]} \mathbb{C}_z = 0$ for all z , and deduce $C_0 = 0$. This completes the current proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.2. Let $\mathcal{O} \in \mathfrak{g}$ be nilpotent and let Z denote the union of all sheets containing \mathcal{O} . It follows from Lemma 9.3 that the image of \mathcal{J} intersected with $\text{Prim}_{\mathcal{O}} U(\mathfrak{g})$ is precisely $\mathcal{J}(Z)$.

Let $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_l$ be the sheets of \mathfrak{g} containing \mathcal{O} and let $(\mathfrak{l}_1, \mathcal{O}_1), \dots, (\mathfrak{l}_l, \mathcal{O}_l)$ be the corresponding rigid induction data. If we write $\mathfrak{P}_i := \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_i)$ then each datum $(\mathfrak{l}_i, \mathcal{O}_i)$ gives rise to a cover X_i of \mathcal{O} and a quantization $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}_i}$ of the Poisson deformation $X_{\mathfrak{P}_i} \rightarrow \mathfrak{P}_i$ of X_i . These each come equipped with comoment maps $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}_i}$. For $z \in \mathfrak{P}_i$ write $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}_i, z}$ for the specialisation at z . We write $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{O}}$ for the set of ideals $\{K_{i,z} := \text{Ker}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}_i, z}) \mid i = 1, \dots, l, z \in \mathfrak{P}_i\}$. Since $\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}_i, z}$ quantizes an irreducible variety it follows that $K_{i,z}$ is completely prime, and by the Dixmier–Mœglin equivalence $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq \text{Prim } U(\mathfrak{g})$ [Di96, 8.5.7]. The argument in Lemma 9.3 shows that actually $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{O}} \subseteq \text{Prim}_{\mathcal{O}} U(\mathfrak{g})$ and, applying Proposition 9.5, the current proof will be complete if we can show that $\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{O}}$ is equal to the set of annihilators $\text{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})}(Q \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g}, e)} \mathbb{C}_\eta)$ of one dimensional $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ -modules \mathbb{C}_η .

Consider the $B := \prod_i \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{P}_i]$ -algebra $\mathcal{A} := \prod_i \mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{P}_i}$ together with the product of quantum comoment maps $U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. By [Lo16, Lemma 5.1] we get a map $U(\mathfrak{g}, e) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_\dagger$ which factors through the $G^e(0)$ -invariants.

Both algebras are filtered and we consider the graded homomorphism of Rees algebras $R_h U(\mathfrak{g}, e) \rightarrow R_h(\mathcal{A}_\dagger^{G^e(0)}) \cong R_h B$ (apply Lemma 9.6). Consider the ideal $D = (h^{-2}[a, b] \mid a, b \in U(\mathfrak{g}, e)) \subseteq R_h U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$, which contains the commutator ideal. Write $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_h^{\text{ab}}$ for the quotient $R_h U(\mathfrak{g}, e)/D$. We obtain a morphism of schemes over $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{C}}^1 = \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[h]$

$$\phi : \mathbb{C} \times \bigcup_{i=1}^l \mathfrak{P}_i = \text{Spec } B \rightarrow \text{Spec } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_h^{\text{ab}}.$$

We claim that for $i = 1, \dots, l$ the image $\phi(\mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{P}_i)$ is not contained in $\bigcup_{j \neq i} \phi(\mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{P}_j)$.

Suppose the opposite. Let $S = e + \mathfrak{g}^f$ be the Slodowy slice for e . We have $\text{Spec } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0^{\text{ab}} = \text{Spec } S(\mathfrak{g}, e)^{\text{ab}} \cong \mathbb{C}[S \cap \bigcup_i \mathcal{S}_i]$ as reduced schemes, by Proposition 6.2. Let \tilde{S} denote the preimage of S under the moment map $\tilde{X}_{\mathfrak{P}_i} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$. The image of the morphism $\phi_0 : \bigcup_i \mathfrak{P}_i \rightarrow \text{Spec } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_0^{\text{ab}}$ identifies with the union of images of the maps $\tilde{S} \rightarrow S$ and the latter is equal to $S \cap \bigcup_i \mathcal{S}_i$. Our assumption that $\phi(\mathbb{C} \times \mathfrak{P}_i)$ is contained in the image of the union of the other components implies $S \cap \mathcal{S}_i = \phi_0(\mathfrak{P}_i) \subseteq \bigcup_{j \neq i} \phi_0(\mathfrak{P}_j) = S \cap \bigcup_{j \neq i} \mathcal{S}_j$, which is impossible. The contradiction confirms the claim.

Finally we consider the morphism ϕ_1 over $(h-1) \in \text{Spec } \mathbb{C}[h]$. It follows from Lemma 9.1 that ϕ_1 is a finite morphism, hence closed. By the previous paragraph the dimensions of the irreducible components of $\phi_1(\bigcup_i \mathfrak{P}_i)$ are given by $\dim \mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{l}_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$. By Theorem 1.1 these are the dimensions of the irreducible components of $\mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g}, e) \cong \text{Spec } U(\mathfrak{g}, e)_1^{\text{ab}}$ and so by Lemma 5.1 we have ϕ surjective.

This shows that for each i, z there is a one dimensional representation \mathbb{C}_η of $U(\mathfrak{g}, e)$ such that $(K_{i,z})_\dagger = \text{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g}, e)} \mathbb{C}_\eta$. The functor \bullet_\dagger admits a right adjoint \bullet^\dagger , first constructed in [Lo10a].

By [Lo11, Theorem 1.3.1(1)] both $\bullet_{\dagger}, \bullet^{\dagger}$ are left exact, i.e. transform kernels into kernels. It follows that $((K_{i,z})_{\dagger})^{\dagger} = (\text{Ker}(U(\mathfrak{g}, e) \rightarrow (\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_{i,z}})_{\dagger}))^{\dagger} = \text{Ker}(U(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow ((\mathcal{A}_{\mathfrak{p}_{i,z}})_{\dagger})^{\dagger})$. Thanks to [Lo16, Lemma 5.2(3)] this is equal to $K_{i,z}$. Finally by [Lo10a, Theorem 1.2.2(ii)] we have $K_{i,z} = (\text{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g},e)} \mathbb{C}_{\eta})^{\dagger} = \text{Ann}_{U(\mathfrak{g})} Q \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{g},e)} \mathbb{C}_{\eta}$. The proof of the theorem is complete. \square

REFERENCES

- [Am20] F. AMBROSIO, Birational sheets in reductive groups, *Math. Z.* (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00209-020-02597-3>.
- [ACET20] F. AMBROSIO, G. CARNOVALE, F. ESPOSITO, L. TOPLEY, Universal filtered quantizations of nilpotent Slodowy slices, [arXiv:2005.07599](https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.07599) (2020).
- [AM69] M. F. ATIYAH, I. G. MACDONALD Introduction to commutative algebra. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont. 1969 ix+128 pp.
- [Bo81] W. BORHO, Über Schichten halbeinfacher Lie-Algebren. *Invent. Math.* **65** (1981), 283–317.
- [BG18] J. BROWN, S. M. GOODWIN, On the variety of 1-dimensional representations of finite W -algebras in low rank. *J. Algebra* **511** (2018), 499–515.
- [BG03] K. BROWN & I. GORDON, Poisson orders, symplectic reflection algebras and representation theory. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **559** (2003), 193–216.
- [BG07] J. BRUNDAN AND S. M. GOODWIN, Good grading polytopes. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **94** (2007), 155–180.
- [BK05] J. BRUNDAN & A. KLESHCHEV, Parabolic presentations of the Yangian $Y(\mathfrak{gl}_n)$. *Comm. Math. Phys.* **254** (2005), no. 1, 191–220.
- [BK06] J. BRUNDAN, A. KLESHCHEV, Shifted Yangians and finite W -algebras. *Adv. Math.* **200** (2006), 136–195.
- [BT18] J. BRUNDAN AND L. TOPLEY, The p -centre of Yangians and shifted Yangians. *Mosc. Math. J.* **18** (2018), 617–657.
- [Bu] M. BULOIS, Geometry of sheets in ordinary and symmetric Lie algebras. *in preparation*.
- [CM93] D.H. COLLINGWOOD and W. MCGOVERN, “Nilpotent orbits in semisimple Lie algebras”. Van Nostrand Reinhold, New York, 1993.
- [Dir50] P. A. M. DIRAC, Generalized Hamiltonian dynamics. *Canad. J. Math.* **2** (1950), 129–148.
- [Di96] J. DIXMIER, Enveloping algebras. Revised reprint of the 1977 translation. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 11. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [DSV07] P. DAMIANOU, H. SABOURIN, P. VANHAECKE, Transverse Poisson structures to adjoint orbits in semisimple Lie algebras. *Pacific J. Math.* **232** (2007), no. 1, 111–138.
- [GG02] W. L. GAN, V. GINZBURG, Quantization of Slodowy slices. *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* **5** (2002), 243–255.
- [Gi09] V. GINZBURG, Harish–Chandra bimodules for quantized Slodowy slices. *Represent. Theory* **13** (2009), 236–271.
- [GT19a] S. M. GOODWIN & L. TOPLEY, Modular finite W -algebras, *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* (2019), no. 18, 5811–5853.
- [GT19b] ———, Minimal-dimensional representations of reduced enveloping algebras for \mathfrak{gl}_n . *Compos. Math.* **155** (2019), no. 8, 1594–1617.
- [GT19c] ———, Restricted shifted Yangians and restricted finite W -algebras. [arXiv:1903.03079](https://arxiv.org/abs/1903.03079) (2019).
- [Hum75] J. E. HUMPHREYS, “Linear algebraic groups”. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 21. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1975.
- [Im05] A. IM HOF, “The Sheets of a Classical Lie Algebra”. Inauguraldissertation zur Erlangung der Würde eines Doktors der Philosophie, 2005, available at <http://edoc.unibas.ch>
- [Ja04] J.C. JANTZEN, “Nilpotent orbits in representation theory”, in: B. Orsted (ed.), “Representation and Lie theory”, *Progr. in Math.*, **228**, 1–211, Birkhäuser, Boston 2004.

- [Ka82] P. KATSYLO, Sections of sheets in a reductive algebraic Lie algebra. *Math. USSR-Izv.* **20** (1983), 449—458.
- [LPV13] C. LAURENT-GENGOUX, A. PICHEREAU, P. VANHAECKE, “Poisson structures”. Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], 347. Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [Lo10a] I. Losev, Quantized symplectic actions and W -algebras. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **23** (2010), no. 1, 35–59.
- [Lo10b] ———, Quantizations of nilpotent orbits vs 1-dimensional representations of W -algebras. [arXiv:1004.1669](https://arxiv.org/abs/1004.1669), 2010.
- [Lo11] ———, Finite dimensional representations of W -algebras. *Duke Math. J.* **159** (2011), no.1, 99–143.
- [Lo15] ———, Dimensions of irreducible modules over W -algebras and Goldie ranks. *Invent. Math.* **200** (2015), no. 3, 849—923.
- [Lo16] ———, Deformations of symplectic singularities and Orbit method for semisimple Lie algebras. [arXiv:1605.00592](https://arxiv.org/abs/1605.00592), 2016.
- [LS79] G. LUSZTIG & N. SPALTENSTEIN, Induced unipotent classes, *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, **19** (1979), 41–52.
- [Ma86] H. MATSUMARA, “Commutative ring theory”, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986.
- [MR01] J. C. MCCONNELL & J.C. ROBSON “Non-commutative Noetherian rings”. Revised edition. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 30. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001.
- [Pr02] A. PREMÉT Special transverse slices and their enveloping algebras. With an appendix by Serge Skryabin. *Adv. Math.* **170** (2002), no. 1, 1–55.
- [Pr07] ———, Primitive ideals, non-restricted representations and finite W -algebras. *Mosc. Math. J.* **7** (2007) 743–762.
- [Pr10] ———, Commutative quotients of finite W -algebras. *Adv. Math.* **225** (2010), no. 1, 269–306.
- [Pr14] ———, Multiplicity-free primitive ideals associated with rigid nilpotent orbits. *Transform. Groups* **19** (2014), no. 2, 569–641.
- [PT14] A. PREMÉT, L. TOPLEY, Derived subalgebras of centralisers and finite W -algebras. *Compos. Math.* **150** (2014), no. 9, 1485–1548.
- [PT20] ———, Modular representations of Lie algebras of reductive groups and Humphreys’ conjecture. [arXiv:2010.10800](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.10800), 2020.
- [Ra01] E. RAGOUCY, Twisted Yangians and folded W -algebras. *Internat. J. Modern Phys. A* **16** (2001), no. 13, 2411–2433.
- [Ser55] J.-P. SERRE, Géométrie algébrique et géométrie analytique. (French) *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **6** (1955/56), 1–42.
- [Ser06] ———, Lie algebras and Lie groups. 1964 lectures given at Harvard University. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, 1500. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006.
- [Sl80] P. SŁODOWY, “Simple Singularities and Simple Algebraic Groups”. *Lecture Notes in Mathematics* 815, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1980.
- [To17] L. TOPLEY, A Morita theorem for modular finite W -algebras, *Math. Z.* **285** (2017), 685–705.
- [Vo94] D. VOGAN, “The orbit method and unitary representations for reductive Lie groups”. Based on Lectures to the European School of Group Theory, Sandbjerg, Denmark, 1994. Available online <http://www-math.mit.edu/~dav/dmkrev.pdf>.
- [We83] A. WEINSTEIN, The local structure of Poisson manifolds. *J. Differential Geom.* **18** (1983), no. 3, 523–557.

Email:

L.Topley@bham.ac.uk

Address:

School of Mathematics, University of Birmingham, Birmingham B15 2TT, United Kingdom.