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Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to compute the Drinfel’d polynomials for two types of evaluation representations of quantum affine algebras at roots of unity and construct those representations as the submodules of evaluation Schnizer modules. Moreover, we obtain the necessary and sufficient condition for that the two types of evaluation representations are isomorphic to each other.

1 Introduction

For a generic \( q \), let \( U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \) be the quantum algebra associated with a simple Lie algebra \( \mathfrak{g} \) and \( U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \) be the non-twisted quantum loop algebra of \( \mathfrak{g} \). It is known that every finite dimensional irreducible \( U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \) (resp. \( U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)) modules are highest weight module and classified by highest weight. Moreover, there exists one to one correspondence from the set of their highest weights to dimensional irreducible \( \{ U \in P \} \) respectively. The Drinfel’d polynomials \( \mathfrak{g} \)-modules are highest weight module and classified by highest weights. The theory of finite dimensional \( U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)-modules is introduced in [9]. We denote the \( U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \) (resp. \( U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)) module corresponding to \( \lambda \in Z_{n+1}^\times \) (resp. \( P \in \mathbb{C}_0[t]^n \)) by \( V_q(\lambda) \) (resp. \( \tilde{V}_q(P) \)), where the polynomial \( P \) of \( \tilde{V}_q(P) \) is called “Drinfel’d polynomial”.

In the case \( g = \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1} \), there exist \( \mathbb{C} \)-algebra homomorphisms \( ev^+_{\mathfrak{a}} : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \to U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \) for \( \mathfrak{a} \in \mathbb{C}^\times \) (see [16], [2]). By using these homomorphisms, we can regard \( V_q(\lambda) \) as a \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \)-module, which are called “evaluation representations” and denoted by \( V_q(\lambda)^{\pm}_{\mathfrak{a}} \). By the classification theorem of finite dimensional \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \)-modules([9]), there exists a unique polynomial \( P^\pm_{\mathfrak{a}} \in \mathbb{C}_0[t]^n \) such that \( V_q(\lambda)^{\pm}_{\mathfrak{a}} \) is isomorphic to \( \tilde{V}_q(P^\pm_{\mathfrak{a}}) \) as a \( U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \)-module respectively. The Drinfel’d polynomials \( P^\pm_{\mathfrak{a}} \) are computed by Chari and Pressley in [12]. In this paper, we shall consider evaluation representations at roots of unity.

Let \( \varepsilon \) be a primitive \( l \)-th root of unity. The representation theory of quantum algebras at roots of unity is divided into two types. One is for \( U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}) \), \( U_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \) defined by De Concini-Kac (=non-restricted type) in [12] and the other is for \( U^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}) \), \( U^{res}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \) defined by Lusztig (=restricted type) in [17].

\( U^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}) \) (resp. \( U^{res}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)) has the \( \mathbb{C} \)-subalgebra \( U^{fin}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}) \) (resp. \( U^{fin}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)) which is called “small quantum algebra”. By the tensor product theorem (see [17], [10], in order to understand the representation theory of \( U^{res}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}) \) (resp. \( U^{res}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)), we may consider the one of \( U^{fin}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}) \) (resp. \( U^{fin}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)). Indeed, every finite dimensional irreducible \( U^{fin}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g}) \) (resp. \( U^{fin}_\varepsilon(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}) \)) module is a highest weight module and classified by highest weight. Moreover, there exists one to one correspondence from the set of their highest weights to \( Z_{l}^\times \) (resp. \( \mathbb{C}_0[t]^{n_0} \)), where \( Z_{l} := \{ 0, 1, \cdots, l-1 \} \) (resp. \( \mathbb{C}_l[t] := \{ P \in \mathbb{C}_0[t] | P \text{ is not divisible by } (1 - ct^l) \text{ for all } c \in \mathbb{C}_0 \} \).
We denote the $U^\text{fin}_\varepsilon(g)$ (resp. $U^\text{fin}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g})$) module corresponding to $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+$ (resp. $P \in \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$) by $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)$ (resp. $V^\varepsilon(P)$).

We also obtain the evaluation representations of $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)$ in the case of $U^\varepsilon_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$. We denote them by $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_a^{\pm}$. We can compute the Drinfel’d polynomials of $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_a^{\pm}$ by the similar method to \cite{I} (see Theorem 4.13 in this paper). Moreover, for $a_\pm \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, we shall show that $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_a^{\pm}$ is isomorphic to $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_{a_-}^-$ if and only if

$$a_+ = a_- e^{2(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_k - \sum_{k=n+1}^{n} \lambda_k + i)} \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in \text{supp}(\lambda),$$

where $\text{supp}(\lambda) := \{1 \leq i \leq n | \lambda_i \neq 0\}$. If $g$ is generic, the condition (1) never occurs for $\#(\text{supp}(\lambda)) > 1$. But, in this case, there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+$ which satisfies \cite{I} for $\#(\text{supp}(\lambda)) > 1$ (see Proposition 1.4).

On the other hand, many finite-dimensional irreducible $U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g})$ (resp. $U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g})$) modules are no longer highest or lowest weight modules and they are characterized by several continuous parameters (see \cite{I2, I5}). For $g = \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$, such $U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$-modules are constructed explicitly in \cite{I}, which are called “maximal cyclic representation”. For an arbitrary simple Lie algebra $g$, Schnizer introduced an alternative construction of such $U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{g})$-modules in \cite{I2, I3}, which we call “Schnizer modules”.

By using the theory of the quantum algebra of restricted type, we obtain that every finite dimensional irreducible “nilpotent” $U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$-modules are highest weight module and classified by highest weight (see §3.4 and §5.2). Moreover, there exists the one to one correspondence from the set of their highest weights to $\mathbb{Z}_n^+$ (resp. $\mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$). We denote the $U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$ (resp. $U_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$) module corresponding to $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+$ (resp. $P \in \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$) by $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)$ (resp. $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_{a_-}^-$). We also obtain the evaluation representations of $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_a^{\pm}$, which are denoted by $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_a^{\pm}$. The module $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_a^{\pm}$ is regraded as a $U^\varepsilon_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$-module and $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_a^{\pm}$ is isomorphic to $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_{a_-}^-$ as a $U^\varepsilon_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$-module (see §5.2). Therefore, for $a_\pm \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, we obtain

$$V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_{a_-}^+ \text{ is isomorphic to } V^\varepsilon(\lambda)_{a_-}^- \quad \text{if and only if} \quad (1) \text{ holds.}$$

We can also prove \cite{I} without using the theory of the quantum algebra of restricted type. In \cite{I}, T.N. showed that one can construct $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)$ as the subrepresentation of a maximal cyclic representation by specializing their parameters properly for type $A$. Similarly, in \cite{I}, we found that we can construct $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)$ as a submodule of a Schnizer module if $g = A, B, C$ or $D$, and then we can construct $V^\varepsilon(\lambda)^{\pm}_a$ as the submodule of evaluation of a Schnizer module. By using this fact, we can prove \cite{I} (see §5 alternative proof of Proposition 1.11 (b))

The organization of this paper is as follows. In §2, we introduce basic properties of quantum algebras for generic $g$. In §3, we introduce quantum algebras at roots of unity of non-restricted type and restricted type. Moreover, we prove the isomorphism theorem of these algebras. In §4 (resp. §5), we discuss about the evaluation representations of restricted (resp. non-restricted) type.

## 2 Quantum algebras (generic case)

### 2.1 Notations

We fix the following notations (see \cite{I2, I5}). Let $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ be the finite dimensional simple Lie algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ of type $A_n$ and $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1} = \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1} \otimes \mathbb{C}[t, t^{-1}]$ the loop algebra of $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$. We set $I := \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ and $\bar{I} := I \cup \{0\}$. Let $(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \bar{I}}$ be the generalized Cartan matrix of $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$, that is, $a_{i,i} = 2, a_{i,j} = -1$ if $|i - j| = 1$ or $n$, and $a_{i,j} = 0$ otherwise. Then

\[a_{i,j} = a_{i,j} e^{2(\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \lambda_k - \sum_{k=n+1}^{n} \lambda_k + i)} \quad \text{for all} \quad i \in \text{supp}(\lambda),\]
(a_{i,j})_{i,j \in I} is the Cartan matrix of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\). Let \(\Pi := \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I}\) (resp. \(\bar{\Pi} := \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in \bar{I}}\)) the set of the simple roots of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\) (resp. \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\)) and \(\Pi' := \{\alpha_i'\}_{i \in I}\) (resp. \(\bar{\Pi}' := \{\alpha_i'\}_{i \in \bar{I}}\)) be the set of the simple coroots of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\) (resp. \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\)). Let \(\mathfrak{h}\) be the Cartan subalgebra of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\) and \(\mathfrak{h}^*\) the \(\mathbb{C}\)-dual space of \(\mathfrak{h}\). Then \(\Pi'\) (resp. \(\bar{\Pi}'\)) is a \(\mathbb{C}\)-basis of \(\mathfrak{h}\) (resp. \(\mathfrak{h}^*\)). We have a \(\mathbb{C}\)-bilinear map \(\langle , \rangle : \mathfrak{h}^* \times \mathfrak{h} \to \mathbb{C}\) such that \(\langle \alpha_j, \alpha_i' \rangle = a_{i,j}\) for any \(i, j \in I\). Define the root lattice \(Q := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i\) (resp. the coroot lattice \(Q' := \bigoplus_{i \in \bar{I}} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i'\)) and the affine root lattice \(\bar{Q} := \mathbb{Z} \alpha_0 + Q\) (resp. the affine coroot lattice \(\bar{Q}' := \mathbb{Z} \alpha_0' + Q'\)). For \(i \in I\), we define the fundamental weights \(\{\Lambda_i\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}^*\) by

\[
\Lambda_i := \frac{1}{n+1} \left\{ (n-i+1) \sum_{k=1}^{i} k \alpha_k + i \sum_{k=1}^{n} (n-k+1) \alpha_k \right\}.
\]

Similarly, we define the fundamental coweights \(\{\Lambda_i'\}_{i \in I} \subset \mathfrak{h}\) by replacing \(\alpha\) in \(\Lambda_i\) with \(\alpha'\). Then we have \(\langle \Lambda_i, \alpha_j' \rangle = \delta_{i,j}\) (resp. \(\langle \alpha, \Lambda_i' \rangle = \delta_{i,j}\)) for any \(i, j \in I\). Define the weight lattice \(P := \bigoplus_{i \in I} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i\) (resp. the coweight lattice \(P' := \bigoplus_{i \in \bar{I}} \mathbb{Z} \alpha_i'\)) and define a symmetric bilinear form \(\langle , \rangle : \mathfrak{h}^* \times \mathfrak{h}^* \to \mathbb{C}\) determined by \(\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j \rangle = a_{i,j}\) for any \(i, j \in I\).

Let \(\Delta\) (resp. \(\bar{\Delta}\)) be the set of roots (resp. positive roots) of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\) and \(\theta := \sum_{i \in \bar{I}} \alpha_i\) be the highest root in \(\Delta\). We set \(\delta := \alpha_0 + \theta\). Let \(\bar{\Delta}\) be the affine root system of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\). Then we have \(\Delta = \Delta^r \cup \Delta^m\), where

\[
\Delta^r := \{ \alpha + n\delta \mid \alpha \in \Delta, n \in \mathbb{Z} \}, \quad \Delta^m := \{ n\delta \mid n \in \mathbb{Z}^\times := \{ \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \} \},
\]

and \(\bar{\Delta} = \bar{\Delta}^r \cup \bar{\Delta}^m\), where

\[
\bar{\Delta}^r := \bar{\Delta}^r \cup \Delta^m, \quad \bar{\Delta}^m := \{ \alpha + n\delta \mid \alpha \in \Delta, n \in \mathbb{N} := \{ 1, 2, \ldots \} \} \cup \Delta^r, \quad \bar{\Delta}^m := \{ n\delta \mid n \in \mathbb{N} \}.
\]

Moreover, we set

\[
\Delta^m(I) := I \times \Delta^m = \{ (i, n\delta) \mid i \in I, n \in \mathbb{N} \}, \quad \bar{\Delta}^r(I) := \bar{\Delta}^r \cup \Delta^m(I),
\]

\[
\bar{\Delta}^m(I) := \{ (i, n\delta) \mid i \in I, n \in \mathbb{Z}^\times \}, \quad \bar{\Delta}^m(I) := \bar{\Delta}^r \cup \bar{\Delta}^m(I).
\]

For \(i \in \bar{I}\), let \(s_i\) be the simple reflection on \(\mathfrak{h}^*\), that is, \(s_i(\lambda) = \lambda - \langle \lambda, \alpha_i' \rangle \alpha_i\) for any \(\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*\). The affine Weyl group \(\tilde{W}\) of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\) (resp. Weyl group \(W\) of \(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}\)) is generated by \(\{s_i\}_{i \in \bar{I}}\) (resp. \(\{s_i\}_{i \in I}\)). For \(x \in \mathfrak{h}\), we define \(t_x : \mathfrak{h}^* \to \mathfrak{h}^*\) by \(t_x(\lambda) = \lambda - \langle \lambda, x \rangle \delta\) and set \(T_{\bar{P}'} := \{ t_x \mid x \in P' \}, \quad T_{Q'} := \{ t_x \mid x \in Q' \}\) (resp. \(T_{P'} := \{ t_x \mid x \in P \}, \quad T_{Q} := \{ t_x \mid x \in Q \}\)). Consider the extended affine Weyl group \(\tilde{W} := \tilde{W} \times T_{P'},\) where the structure of the semi-direct product is given by \((s, t_x)(s', t_y) = (s s', t_{x-y} t_y)\) for any \(s, s' \in \tilde{W}\) and \(x, y \in P'\). We set \(\bar{T} := \{ s \circ \bar{T} \mid \bar{T} \in \bar{T} \}, \quad \bar{T}_{Q'} := \{ t_x \mid x \in Q' \}\) (resp. \(T := \{ s \circ T \mid T \in T \}, \quad T_{Q} := \{ t_x \mid x \in Q \}\)). Consider the extended affine Weyl group \(\tilde{W} := \tilde{W} \times T_{P'},\) where the structure of the semi-direct product is given by \((s, t_x)(s', t_y) = (s s', t_{x-y} t_y)\) for any \(s, s' \in \tilde{W}\) and \(x, y \in P'\). We set \(\bar{T} := \{ s \circ \bar{T} \mid \bar{T} \in \bar{T} \}, \quad \bar{T}_{Q'} := \{ t_x \mid x \in Q' \}\) (resp. \(T := \{ s \circ T \mid T \in T \}, \quad T_{Q} := \{ t_x \mid x \in Q \}\)). In particular, the latter isomorphism is given by \(s_i \mapsto (s_i, i d_{\mathfrak{h}^*})\) for \(i \in \bar{I}\) and \(s_0 \mapsto (s_0, t_{\theta'})\), where \(\theta' := \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i'\). The length of an element \(\tau w \in \tilde{W}(\tau \in T, w \in \tilde{W})\) is given by \(l_{\tilde{W}}(\tau w) := l_{\tilde{W}}(w)\), where \(l_{\tilde{W}}\) is the length function of \(\tilde{W}\).

Let \(q\) be an indeterminate. For \(r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}\), we define \(q\)-integers and Gaussian binomial coefficients in the rational function field \(\mathbb{C}(q)\) by

\[
[r] := \frac{q^r - q^{-r}}{q - q^{-1}}, \quad [m]! := [m][m-1] \cdots [1], \quad \begin{bmatrix} r \\ m \end{bmatrix} := \frac{[r][r-1] \cdots [r-m+1]}{[1][2] \cdots [m]}.
\]

Similarly, for \(c \in \mathbb{C}(c \neq 0, \pm 1)\), we define

\[
[r]_c := \frac{c^r - c^{-r}}{c - c^{-1}}, \quad [m]_c! := [m]_c[m-1]_c \cdots [1]_c, \quad \begin{bmatrix} r \\ m \end{bmatrix}_c := \frac{[r]_c[r-1]_c \cdots [r-m+1]_c}{[1]_c[2]_c \cdots [m]_c}.
\]

We set \([0]! := [0]_0! := 1\).
2.2 Definitions

Definition 2.1. The quantum loop algebra $\tilde{U}_q := U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{sl}}_{n+1})$ (resp. the quantum algebra $U_q := U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$, the extended quantum algebra $U_q^e := U_q^e(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1})$) is an associative $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra generated by $\{E_i, F_i, K_\mu \mid i \in \tilde{I} \text{ (resp. } i \in I), \mu \in \tilde{Q} \text{ (resp. } \mu \in Q, \mu \in P)\}$ with the relations

$$K_\mu K_\nu = K_{\mu + \nu}, \quad K_0 = 1, \quad K_{\alpha_0} = K^{-1}_0,$$
$$K_\mu E_j K^{-1}_\mu = q^{(\mu, \alpha_j)} E_j, \quad K_\mu F_j K^{-1}_\mu = q^{-(\mu, \alpha_j)} F_j,$$
$$E_i F_j - F_j E_i = \delta_{i,j} K_{\alpha_i} - K^{-1}_{\alpha_i},$$

$$\sum_{r=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^r E_i^{(r)} E_j E_i^{(1-a_{ij}-r)} = \sum_{r=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^r F_i^{(r)} F_j F_i^{(1-a_{ij}-r)} = 0 \quad i \neq j,$$

where

$$E_i^{(r)} := \frac{1}{[r]!} E_i^r, \quad F_i^{(r)} := \frac{1}{[r]!} F_i^r \quad (r \in \mathbb{Z}_+ := \{0, 1, 2, \cdots \}).$$

Let $\tilde{U}_q^+ \ (\text{resp. } \tilde{U}_q^-, \tilde{U}_q^0)$ be the $\mathbb{C}(q)$-subalgebra of $\tilde{U}_q$ generated by $\{E_i\}_{i \in \tilde{I}}$ (resp. $\{F_i\}_{i \in \tilde{I}}$, $\{K_\mu\}_{\mu \in \tilde{Q}}$). Similarly, let $U_q^+ \ (\text{resp. } U_q^-, U_q^0)$ be the $\mathbb{C}(q)$-subalgebra of $U_q$ generated by $\{E_i\}_{i \in I}$ (resp. $\{F_i\}_{i \in I}$, $\{K_\mu\}_{\mu \in Q}$).

It is well known that $\tilde{U}_q \ (\text{resp. } U_q)$ have a Hopf algebra structure and its comultiplication is given by

$$\Delta(E_i) = E_i \otimes 1 + K_{\alpha_i} \otimes E_i, \quad \Delta(F_i) = F_i \otimes K_{\alpha_i}^{-1} + 1 \otimes F_i, \quad \Delta(K_\mu) = K_{\mu} \otimes K_{\mu},$$

where $i \in \tilde{I} \ (\text{resp. } I), \mu \in Q$.

We have a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra anti-automorphism $\Omega : \tilde{U}_q \longrightarrow \tilde{U}_q$ and a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra anti-automorphism $\Phi : \tilde{U}_q \longrightarrow \tilde{U}_q$ such that

$$\Omega(q) = q^{-1}, \quad \Omega(E_i) = F_i, \quad \Omega(F_i) = E_i, \quad \Omega(K_\mu) = K_{\mu}^{-1},$$

$$\Phi(E_i) = E_i, \quad \Phi(F_i) = F_i, \quad \Phi(K_\mu) = K_{\mu}^{-1},$$

for $i \in \tilde{I}, \mu \in Q$. Let $T_i$ be the $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra automorphism of $\tilde{U}_q$ introduced by Lusztig [20, §37]:

$$T_i(E_i^{(m)}) = (-1)^m q^{-m(m-1)/2} F_i^{(m)} K_{\alpha_i}^{m} \quad T_i(F_i^{(m)}) = (-1)^m q^{m(m-1)/2} K_{\alpha_i}^{-m} E_i^{(m)},$$

$$T_i(E_j^{(m)}) = \sum_{r=0}^{m-a_{ij}} (-1)^r q^{-r a_{ij}} E_i^{(-a_{ij}-r)} E_j^{(m)} E_i^{(r)} \quad (i \neq j),$$

$$T_i(F_j^{(m)}) = \sum_{r=0}^{m-a_{ij}} (-1)^r q^{r a_{ij}} F_i^{(r)} F_j^{(m)} F_i^{(-a_{ij}-r)} \quad (i \neq j),$$

$$T_i(K_\mu) = K_{s_i(\mu)},$$

where $i \in \tilde{I}, m \in \mathbb{N}, \mu \in Q$. For $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, we define $\tilde{U}_q$-automorphism $T_\tau$ by

$$T_\tau(E_i) := E_{\tau(i)}, \quad T_\tau(F_i) := F_{\tau(i)}, \quad T_\tau(K_{\alpha_i}^{\pm 1}) := K_{\alpha_{\tau(i)}}^{\pm 1} \quad (i \in \tilde{I}).$$

We obtain that

$$T_i^{-1} = \Phi T_i \Phi^{-1}, \quad T_i \Omega = \Omega T_i, \quad T_\tau \Omega = \Omega T_\tau.$$

Let $w \in \hat{W}$ and $w = \tau s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_m} \ (\tau \in \mathcal{T}, i_1, \cdots, i_m \in \tilde{I}, m \in \mathbb{N})$ be a reduced expression of $w$. Then $T_w := T_{\tau} T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_m}$ is a well-defined $\tilde{U}_q$-automorphism, that is, $T_w$ does not depend on the choice of reduced expression of $w$. 

4
2.3 Drinfel’d realization

It is known that $\tilde{U}_q$ has another realization which is called Drinfel’d realization.

**Definition 2.2** ([13]). Let $\mathcal{D}_q$ be an associative $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra generated by $\{X_{i,r}^\pm, H_{i,s}, K_\mu \mid i \in I, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}, s \neq 0, \mu \in Q\}$ with the relations

\[
K_\mu K_\nu = K_{\mu + \nu}, \quad K_0 = 1, \quad [K_\mu, H_{i,s}] = [H_{i,r}, H_{j,s}] = 0,
\]

\[
K_\mu X_{i,r}^\pm K_\mu^{-1} = q^{\pm(\mu, \alpha_i)} X_{i,r}^\pm, \quad [H_{i,s}, X_{i,r}^\pm] = \pm \frac{[r \alpha_{i,j}]}{r} X_{i,r+s},
\]

\[
X_{i,r+1}^\pm X_{j,s}^\pm - q^{\pm s_{i,j}} X_{j,s}^\pm X_{i,r+1}^\pm = q^{\pm s_{i,j}} X_{i,r}^\pm X_{j,s+1}^\pm - X_{j,s+1}^\pm X_{i,r}^\pm,
\]

\[
[H_{i,r}^\pm, X_{j,s}^\pm] = \delta_{i,j} \frac{\Psi_{i,r+s}^+-\Psi_{i,r+s}^-}{q-q^{-1}},
\]

\[
\sum_{\pi \in S_m} \sum_{k=0}^{m} (-1)^k \left[ \begin{array}{c} m \\ k \end{array} \right] X_{i,r_1}^\pm \cdots X_{i,r_{(t)k}}^\pm X_{j,s_1}^\pm X_{i,r_{(t)k+1}}^\pm \cdots X_{i,r_{(t)m}}^\pm = 0, \quad (i \neq j),
\]

for $r_1, \ldots, r_m \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $m := 1 - a_{i,j}$, $S_m$ is the symmetric group on $m$ letters, and $\Psi_{i,r}^\pm$ are determined by

\[
\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \Psi_{i,r}^\pm u^{r} := K_{\alpha_i}^{-1} \exp(\pm(q-q^{-1}) \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} H_{i,s} u^{s}),
\]

and $\Psi_{i,r}^+ := 0$ if $r < 0$.

For $i \in I$, let $t_{\lambda_\gamma} = \tau s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_r}$, ($\tau \in T$, $j_1, \cdots, j_r \in \tilde{I}$) be a reduced expression of $t_{\lambda_\gamma}$ (see §2.1). Then we set $T_{\lambda_\gamma} := T_{\tau} T_{j_1} \cdots T_{j_r}$.

**Theorem 2.3** ([2]). There exists a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra isomorphism $T : \mathcal{D}_q \longrightarrow \tilde{U}_q$ such that

\[
T(X_{i,r}^+) = (-1)^{ir} T_{\lambda_\gamma}^{-1}(E_i), \quad T(X_{i,-r}^-) = (-1)^{ir} T_{\lambda_\gamma}^{-1}(F_i) \quad (i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z}). \quad (2.7)
\]

In particular, by [2] §4 Remark and [7] §2.5, we obtain the inverse map of $T$:

\[
T^{-1}(E_i) = X_{i,0}^+, \quad T^{-1}(F_i) = X_{i,0}^-, \quad T^{-1}(K_\mu) = K_\mu,
\]

\[
T^{-1}(E_0) = (-1)^{m+1} q^{\mu+1}[X_{m,-1,0}^+, \ldots, [X_{m,-1,0}^+, X_m, \ldots, X_{m,-1}, 1-q^{-1}]_{q=1} K_0^{-1},
\]

\[
T^{-1}(F_0) = (-1)^{m+1} [X_{m,0}^+, \ldots, [X_{m,+1,0}^+, X_{m,0}, \ldots, X_{m,+1,0}, X_{m,-1}]_{q=1} q^{-1} K_0. \quad (2.8)
\]

for $m, i \in I$, where $[u, v]_{q=1} := uv - q^{1-1} vu$ for $u, v \in \tilde{U}_q$ ($T$ is independent of the choice of $m$). We identify $\mathcal{D}_q$ with $\tilde{U}_q$ by this isomorphism $T$.

2.4 PBW basis

Let $w_0$ be a longest element in $W$ and $w_0 = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_N}$ be a reduced expression of $w_0$. We set $\gamma_1 := \alpha_{i_1}, \gamma_2 := s_{i_1}(\alpha_{i_2}), \ldots, \gamma_N := s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{N-1}}(\alpha_{i_N})$. By the theory of the classical Lie algebra, we have $\Delta_+ = \{\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_N\}$. Define the root vectors in $U_q$ by

\[
\tilde{E}_\gamma := T_{i_1} \cdots T_{i_{k-1}}(E_{\alpha_{i_k}}), \quad \tilde{F}_\gamma := \Omega(E_{\gamma_k}), \quad (2.9)
\]

for $1 \leq k \leq N$, where $E_{\alpha_i} := E_i, F_{\alpha_i} := F_i$ ($i \in I$). We set

\[
\mathbb{Z}_+^\Delta := \{c : \Delta_+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+ \mid \text{map}\}, \quad B_q^0 := \{K_\mu \mid \mu \in Q\},
\]

\[
B_q^+ := \{\prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} \tilde{E}_\gamma^{(\gamma)} \mid c \in \mathbb{Z}_+^\Delta \}, \quad B_q^- := \Omega(B_q^+), \quad B_q := B_q^{-1} B_q^0 B_q^+ ,
\]

(2.10) where $<$ means that the product is ordered by $\gamma_1 < \cdots < \gamma_N$. 
There exists a $2.5$ Evaluation homomorphisms

**Theorem 2.5 ([18 \S 2.1])**. By the following proposition, we can regard any $\hat{U}_q$ as a reduced expression of $\tilde{U}_q$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq k' \leq \tilde{N}$. We set

$$\beta_k := s_{i_0} s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{k+1}}(\alpha_{i_k}) \quad (k \leq 0), \quad \beta_k := s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_k}(\alpha_{i_k}) \quad (k > 0).$$

Then we have $\Delta^e_+ = \{\beta_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Define a total order on $\Delta_+(I)$ by

$$\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \cdots < (1, \delta) < \cdots < (n, \delta) < \cdots < (n, 2\delta) < \cdots < \beta_2 < \beta_1. \quad (2.11)$$

We set $E_{\alpha_i} := E_i, F_{\alpha_i} := F_i \ (i \in I)$. Define the positive real root vectors in $\hat{U}_q$ by

$$E_{\beta_k} := T_i^{-1} T_{i+1}^{-1} \cdots T_{i+k}^{-1}(E_{\alpha_{i_k}}) \quad (k \leq 0), \quad E_{\beta_k} := T_i T_i \cdots T_{i-k+1}(E_{\alpha_{i_k}}) \quad (k > 0), \quad (2.12)$$

and the positive imaginary root vectors $E_{(i,i)}$ by

$$\exp((q - q^{-1}) \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} E_{(i,s)} t^k) := 1 + \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (q - q^{-1}) E_{(i,s)} t^k, \quad (2.13)$$

where $E_{(i,s)} : = E_{-\alpha_i + s \delta} E_i - q^{-2} E_i E_{-\alpha_i + s \delta}$ for $i \in I, s \in \mathbb{N}$. Define the negative root vectors by $F_{\beta} := \Omega(E_{\beta})$ for $\beta \in \Delta_+(I)$. We set

$$Z_{\Delta_+(I)} := \{c : \Delta_+(I) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z}_+; \text{map } \#\{c(\beta) \neq 0\} < \infty\}, \quad \tilde{B}_q^\circ := \{K_\mu \mid \mu \in Q\},$$

$$\tilde{B}_q := \prod_{\beta \in \Delta_+(I)} E_{(i,s)} \left( c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\Delta_+(I)} \right), \quad \tilde{B}_q := \Omega(\tilde{B}_q^\circ), \quad \tilde{B}_q := \tilde{B}_q \tilde{B}_q^\circ \tilde{B}_q^{\dagger}, \quad (2.14)$$

where $< \,$ is the total order as in (2.11).

**Theorem 2.5 ([3])**. $\tilde{B}_q^\star$ (resp. $\tilde{B}_q$) is a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-basis of $\tilde{U}_q$ (resp. $\tilde{U}_q$) for $\star \in \{-, 0, +\}$.

By $\mathbb{H}$ Lemma 1.5, we obtain

$$X_{++}^+ = (-1)^r E_{\alpha_i + r \delta} \quad (r \geq 0), \quad X_{++}^- = (-1)^{r-1} E_{-\alpha_i - r \delta} K_i^{-1} \quad (r < 0),$$

$$X_{--}^- = (-1)^{r+1} K_i E_{\alpha_i - r \delta} \quad (r > 0), \quad X_{--}^+ = (-1)^r F_{\alpha_i - r \delta} \quad (r < 0),$$

$$H_{i,s} = (-1)^s E_{(i,s)}, \quad \Psi_{++} = (-1)^s (q - q^{-1}) K_i^\dagger E_{(i,s)}, \quad (2.15)$$

for $i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z}, s \in \mathbb{N}$.

### 2.5 Evaluation homomorphisms

There exists a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra homomorphism $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_m) \longrightarrow U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_m)$ such that

$$E_i \mapsto X_{i,0}^+, \quad F_i \mapsto X_{i,0}^-, \quad K_\mu \mapsto K_\mu, \quad (2.16)$$

for $i \in I, \mu \in Q$. Moreover, for $m \in I, 0 \leq k \leq n - m$, there exists a $\mathbb{C}(q)$-algebra homomorphism $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_m) \longrightarrow U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{m+k})$ such that

$$X_{i,r}^+ \mapsto X_{i+k,r}^+, \quad H_{i+k,s} \mapsto H_{i,s}, \quad K_{\alpha_i} \mapsto K_{\alpha_{i+k}}, \quad (2.17)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq m, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}\{s \neq 0\}$. Hence we can regard any $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{m})$-module as a $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{m+k})$-module and $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{m+k})$-module. Let $U_q(\mathfrak{g}_m)$ be the extended quantum algebra in Definition 2.1. By the following proposition, we can regard any $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{m+k})$-module as a $U_q(\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}_{m+k})$-module.
Proposition 2.6 ([16 §2, 7 Proposition 3.4]). For any \( a \in \mathbb{C}^\times \), there exist \( \mathbb{C}(q) \)-algebra homomorphisms \( ev^\pm_a : U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \to U_q^e(\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}) \) such that

\[
\begin{align*}
ev^+_a(E_i) &= E_i, & \ev^+_a(F_i) &= F_i, & \ev^+_a(K_\mu) &= K_\mu, \\
\ev^-_a(E_0) &= q^{-1}aK_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}[F_n, [F_{n-1}, \ldots, [F_2, F_1]_{q^{-1}} \cdots]_{q^{-1}}], \\
\ev^-_a(E_0) &= q^{-1}aK_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}[F_1, [F_2, \ldots, [F_{n-1}, F_n]_{q^{-1}} \cdots]_{q^{-1}}, \\
\ev^-_a(F_0) &= (-1)^{n-1}q^n a^{-1}K_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}[E_n, [E_{n-1}, \ldots, [E_2, E_1]_{q^{-1}} \cdots]_{q^{-1}}, \\
\ev^-_a(F_0) &= (-1)^{n-1}q^n a^{-1}K_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}[E_1, [E_2, \ldots, [E_{n-1}, E_n]_{q^{-1}} \cdots]_{q^{-1}}, 
\end{align*}
\]

for \( i \in I \) and \( \mu \in P \) By [24], we obtain

\[
\begin{align*}
\ev^+_a(E_0) &= q^{-n}aK_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}T_1^{-1} \cdots T_{n-1}^{-1}(F_n), & \ev^-_a(E_0) &= q^{-n}aK_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}T_1 \cdots T_2^{-1}(F_1), \\
\ev^+_a(F_0) &= q^n a^{-1}K_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}T_1 \cdots T_{n-1}^{-1}(E_n), & \ev^-_a(F_0) &= q^n a^{-1}K_A^{-1}K_{A_n}^{-1}T_1^{-1} \cdots T_2^{-1}(E_1).
\end{align*}
\]  

(2.18)

3 Quantum algebras at roots of unity

In the rest of this paper, we fix the following notations. Let \( l \) be an odd integer greater than 2 and \( \varepsilon \) a primitive \( l \)-th root of unity. Moreover, we assume \( g.c.d(l, n+1) = 1 \). By [3] Lemma 2.1 and Corollary 2.1, we obtain that \( g.c.d(l, n+1) = 1 \) if and only if \( \det([ka_{ij}]_{i,j \in I}) \neq 0 \) for any \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \) such that \( k \neq 0 \) mod \( l \).

3.1 Quantum algebras of non-restricted type

Let \( A := \mathbb{C}[q, q^{-1}] \) be the Laurent polynomial ring and \( \mathring{U}_A \) (resp. \( U_A \)) the \( A \)-subalgebra of \( \mathring{U}_q \) (resp. \( U_q \)) generated by \( \{E_i, F_i, K_{\alpha_j}, [K_{\alpha_j}]_0 \mid i \in I, j \in J \} \), where \( [K_{\alpha_j}]_0 := ([K_{\alpha_j} - K_{\alpha_j}^{-1}])/(q - q^{-1}) \). Let \( \mathring{U}_A \) (resp. \( U_A \)) be the \( A \)-subalgebra of \( \mathring{U}_A \) generated by \( \{E_i \mid i \in I \} \) (resp. \( \{F_i \mid i \in I \} \) and \( U_A^+ \) (resp. \( U_A^- \)) the \( A \)-subalgebra of \( U_A \) generated by \( \{F_i \mid i \in I \}) \) (resp. \( \{E_i \mid i \in I \}) \). We have triangular decompositions \( U_A = U_A^-U_A^+U_A^- \) and \( U_A = U_A^+U_A^-U_A^+ \). We set

\[
\begin{align*}
\vec{B}^+_A := & \vec{B}^+_q, & \vec{B}^-_A := & \vec{B}^-_q, & \vec{B}^0_A := & \prod_{i \in I} K_{\alpha_i}^{-[K_{\alpha_i}]_0}, & m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, & \delta_i = 0 \neq 1, \\
\vec{B}^+_A := & \vec{B}^+_q, & \vec{B}^-_A := & \vec{B}^-_q, & \vec{B}^0_A := & \prod_{i \in I} K_{\alpha_i}^{[K_{\alpha_i}]_0}, & m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+, & \delta_i = 0 \neq 1. \n\end{align*}
\]

We have \( T_i(U_A) \subset U_A \) by [24] and \( T_i^{-1}(U_A) \subset \mathring{U}_A \) by [24] for \( i \in I \). Hence, by [24] and [24], we have \( E_i, F_i, K_{\beta}, K_{\varepsilon^r}, H_{i,s} \subset \mathring{U}_A \) for all \( \beta \in \Delta_+(I), i \in I, r, s \in \mathbb{Z} \). Similarly, we obtain \( T_i(U_A) \subset U_A \) and \( E_i, F_i \subset U_A \) for all \( \gamma \in \Delta_+ \) by [24]. Thus we obtain \( \mathring{B}^+_A, \vec{B}_A \subset U_A \) and \( \mathring{B}^-_A, \vec{B}_A \subset U_A \) \( (\ast \in \{-, 0, +\}) \).

Proposition 3.1. \( \mathring{B}^+_A \) (resp. \( B_A \)) is an \( A \)-basis of \( U_A^e \) (resp. \( U_A \)) for \( \ast \in \{-, 0, +\} \).

Proof. By Theorem [24] \( B^+_q \) (resp. \( B^-_q \)) is \( \mathbb{C} \)-linearly independent in \( U_q^e \) (resp. \( U_q \)) for \( \ast \in \{-, 0, +\} \). Thus \( B^+_A \) (resp. \( B^-_A \)) is \( \mathbb{C} \)-linearly independent in \( U_A^e \) (resp. \( U_A \)). Let \( V_A \) (resp. \( V_A \)) be the \( A \)-subalgebra of \( U_A \) (resp. \( U_A \)) generated by \( B^+_A \) (resp. \( B^-_A \)). It is enough to prove that \( U_A^e U_A \subset V_A^* \) for all \( \ast \in \{-, 0, +\} \). Indeed, if we can prove this claim, then we obtain \( U_A^e = V_A^e \) and \( U_A = U_A^e U_A U_A^e = V_A^e V_A U_A = V_A \). So \( U_A \) (resp. \( U_A \)) is generated by
$B_A^\star$ (resp. $B_A$) as $A$-module.
By the following formula, we have $K_{\alpha_1}^{\pm 1}(\prod_{i \in I} K_{\alpha_i}^\delta, [K_{\alpha_i}; 0]^m_i) \in V_0^A$ for all $i \in I$, $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$:

\[
K_{\alpha_1}^2 = K_{\alpha_1}(K_{\alpha_1} - K_{\alpha_1}^{-1}) + 1 = (q - q^{-1})K_{\alpha_1}, [K_{\alpha_1}; 0] \in V_0^A,
K_{\alpha_1} = K_{\alpha_1} - (K_{\alpha_1} - K_{\alpha_1}^{-1}) = K_{\alpha_1} - (q - q^{-1})[K_{\alpha_1}; 0] \in V_0^A.
\]

Thus we obtain $U_0^AV_0^A \subset V_0^A$. By [12] Lemma 1.7, we get the following formula: for $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_+$ such that $\beta > \alpha$,

\[
E_\beta E_\alpha = \sum \epsilon_a \prod \gamma \in \Delta_+ E_{\gamma}^{(\gamma)},
\]

where $\epsilon_a \in A$. So we obtain the case of $* = +$. Similarly, by using the automorphism $\Omega$ (see [5]), we obtain the case of $* = -$. \hfill $\square$

By [5] Proposition 1.7(c), we obtain the following formula: for $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_+(I)$ such that $\beta > \alpha$,

\[
E_\beta E_\alpha = q^{(\alpha, \beta)}E_\alpha E_\beta + \sum_{\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \cdots < \gamma_m < \beta} c_\gamma E_{\gamma_1}^{\alpha_1} \cdots E_{\gamma_m}^{\alpha_m},
\]

where $c_\gamma \in \mathbb{C}[q, q^{-1}]$ for $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_m) \in \Delta_+(I)^m$. So, by the similar way to the proof of Proposition 3.1, we obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.2.** $\widetilde{B}_A^\star$ (resp. $\widetilde{B}_A$) is a $A$-basis of $\widetilde{U}_A^\star$ (resp. $\widetilde{U}_A$) for $* \in \{-, 0, +\}$.

Now we define the quantum algebras of non-restricted type. We regard $\mathbb{C}$ as $A$-module by $g(q).c := g(q)c$ for $g(q) \in A$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and denote it by $\mathbb{C}_\varepsilon$. We define

\[
\widetilde{U}_\varepsilon := \widetilde{U}_A \otimes A \mathbb{C}_\varepsilon \quad (\text{resp. } U_\varepsilon := U_A \otimes A \mathbb{C}_\varepsilon).
\]

Then we call $\widetilde{U}_\varepsilon$ (resp. $U_\varepsilon$) “quantum loop algebra (resp. quantum algebra) of non-restricted type (or De Concini-Kac type)” (see [5], [12]). For $* \in \{-, 0, +\}$, we set $\widetilde{U}_A^\star := \widetilde{U}_A \otimes A 1$ (resp. $U_A^\star := U_A \otimes A 1$). We simply denote $u \otimes 1$ by $u$ for $u \in U_A$ (resp. $U_A$).

**Remark 3.3.** (a) In [5] (resp. [12]), $\widetilde{U}_\varepsilon$ (resp. $U_\varepsilon$) is defined by $\widetilde{U}_\varepsilon := \widetilde{U}_A^\star/(q - \varepsilon)\widetilde{U}_A^\star$ (resp. $U_\varepsilon := U_A^\star/(q - \varepsilon)U_A^\star$), where $A^\varepsilon := \{g(q) \in \mathbb{C}(q) \mid g(q) \text{ has no poles at } q = \varepsilon \}$ (resp. $A$) and $(q - \varepsilon)\widetilde{U}_A^\star$ (resp. $(q - \varepsilon)U_A^\star$) is the two-sided ideal of $\mathbb{C}$-algebra $\widetilde{U}_A^\star$ (resp. $U_A^\star$) generated by $(q - \varepsilon)$. But, by the universality of tensor product, we obtain

\[
\widetilde{U}_A \otimes A \mathbb{C}_\varepsilon \cong \widetilde{U}_A/(q - \varepsilon)\widetilde{U}_A \cong \widetilde{U}_A^\star/(q - \varepsilon)\widetilde{U}_A^\star \quad (\text{as } \mathbb{C}\text{-algebra}),
U_A \otimes A \mathbb{C}_\varepsilon \cong U_A/(q - \varepsilon)U_A \cong U_A^\star/(q - \varepsilon)U_A^\star \quad (\text{as } \mathbb{C}\text{-algebra}).
\]

(b) $\widetilde{U}_\varepsilon$ (resp. $U_\varepsilon$) is the associative algebra over $\mathbb{C}$ on generators $\{E_i, F_i, K_\mu \mid i \in I \text{ (resp. 1)}, \mu \in \tilde{Q} \text{ (resp. } Q)\}$ and defining relations in Definition 2.4 replaced $q$ by $\varepsilon$ (see [5] §1.9 and [12] §1.5).

We set $\widetilde{B}_\varepsilon := \widetilde{B}_A \otimes A 1 \ (* \in \{-, 0, +\})$. Similarly, we define $\widetilde{B}_\varepsilon, B_\varepsilon^\star$ and $B_\varepsilon$.

**Lemma 3.4.** Let $\{v_j\}_j$ be a $A$-basis in $\widetilde{U}_A$ (resp. $U_A$). Then $\{v_j + (q - \varepsilon)\widetilde{U}_A\}_j$ (resp. $\{v_j + (q - \varepsilon)U_A\}_j$) is a $\mathbb{C}$-basis of $\widetilde{U}_A/(q - \varepsilon)\widetilde{U}_A$ (resp. $U_A/(q - \varepsilon)U_A$).
Proposition 3.9. Let \( \{v_j + (q-\varepsilon)\tilde{U}_A\} \) be a C-vector space. So we shall prove that \( \{v_j + (q-\varepsilon)\tilde{U}_A\} \) is linearly independent over \( \mathbb{C} \) in \( \tilde{U}_A/(q-\varepsilon)\tilde{U}_A \). We assume that \( \sum_j c_j (v_j + (q-\varepsilon)\tilde{U}_A) = 0 \) (\( c_j \in \mathbb{C} \), \# \( \{j \mid c_j \neq 0\} < \infty \)). Then \( \sum_j c_j v_j + (q-\varepsilon)\tilde{U}_A \). Since \( \tilde{U}_A \) is generated by \( \{v_j\} \) as \( \mathcal{A} \)-algebra, there exist \( c_j,m \in \mathbb{C} \) (\( m \in \mathbb{Z}, \# \{j,m \mid c_j,m \neq 0\} < \infty \)) such that \( \sum_j c_j v_j = (q-\varepsilon)\sum_{j,m} c_j,m q^m v_j \) in \( \tilde{U}_A \). Since \( \{v_j\} \) is linearly independent over \( \mathcal{A} \) in \( \tilde{U}_A \), we obtain \( c_j = (q-\varepsilon)\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} c_j,m q^m \) for all \( j \). Therefore we obtain \( c_j = c_j,m = 0 \) for any \( j \) and \( m \). Similarly, we obtain the case of \( U_A \). 

By this lemma, Proposition 3.2 and Remark 3.3 a), we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5. \( B^*_\mathcal{A} \) (resp. \( B_\mathcal{A} \)) is a C-basis of \( U^*_\mathcal{A} \) (resp. \( \tilde{U}_\mathcal{A} \)) for \( \ast \in \{-,0,+\} \).

The classical case of this proposition is given in \( \mathbb{R} \) §1.7.

Proposition 3.6. \( B^*_\mathcal{A} \) (resp. \( B_\mathcal{A} \)) is a C-basis of \( U^*_\mathcal{A} \) (resp. \( U_\mathcal{A} \)) for \( \ast \in \{-,0,+\} \).

Let \( Z(\tilde{U}_\mathcal{A}) \) (resp. \( Z(U_\mathcal{A}) \)) be the center of \( \tilde{U}_\mathcal{A} \) (resp. \( U_\mathcal{A} \)) and \( Z_0 \) be the C-subalgebra of \( \tilde{U}_\mathcal{A} \) generated by \( \{E_i^\beta, F_i^\beta, K_i^\mu \mid \beta \in \Delta^\mathcal{A} \} \) for \( \ast \in \{-,0,+,\} \). Then we have \( \tilde{Z}_0 = Z(\tilde{U}) \).

Proposition 3.7. \( U_\mathcal{A} \) is a C-basis of \( U_\mathcal{A} \) for \( \ast \in \{-,0,+,\} \).

Proof. We shall prove that \( B^*_\mathcal{A} \) is a C-basis of \( (U_\mathcal{A}/I_\mathcal{A})^* \). We can also prove the other cases similarly. Let \( V_\mathcal{A}^* \) be the C-subspace of \( (U_\mathcal{A}/I_\mathcal{A})^* \) spanned by \( B_i^* \) and \( u + I_\mathcal{A} \in (U_\mathcal{A}/I_\mathcal{A})^* \). By Theorem 2.4, there exists \( a_c \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( u + I_\mathcal{A} = \sum_{c \in \Delta_+} a_c \prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} E_{c(\gamma)} \) for \( u \in U_\mathcal{A} \). We set \( \mathbb{Z}_{\Delta_+} := \{c : \Delta_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \mid \text{map}\} \), \( B_i^+ := \{\prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} E_{c(\gamma)} \mid c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\Delta_+}\} \), \( B_i^- := \Omega(B_i^+) \), \( B_i^0 := \{K_i + I_\mathcal{A} \mid \mu \in Q\} \), \( B_i := B_i^- B_i^0 B_i^+ \).

Proposition 3.9. \( B_i^* \) is a C-basis of \( (U_\mathcal{A}/I_\mathcal{A})^* \) for \( \ast \in \{-,0,+,\} \).

Proof. We shall prove that \( B_i^* \) is a C-basis of \( (U_\mathcal{A}/I_\mathcal{A})^* \). We can also prove the other cases similarly. Let \( V_i^* \) be the C-subspace of \( (U_\mathcal{A}/I_\mathcal{A})^* \) spanned by \( B_i^* \) and \( u + I_\mathcal{A} \in (U_\mathcal{A}/I_\mathcal{A})^* \). By Theorem 2.4, there exists \( a_c \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( u + I_\mathcal{A} = \sum_{c \in \Delta_+} a_c \prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} E_{c(\gamma)} \) for \( u \in U_\mathcal{A} \). We set \( \mathbb{Z}_{\Delta_+} := \{c : \Delta_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \mid \text{map}\} \), \( B_i^+ := \{\prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} E_{c(\gamma)} \mid c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\Delta_+}\} \), \( B_i^- := \Omega(B_i^+) \), \( B_i^0 := \{K_i + I_\mathcal{A} \mid \mu \in Q\} \), \( B_i := B_i^- B_i^0 B_i^+ \).

Hence we have \( \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} u' E_{c(\gamma)} \) for \( u' \in \mathbb{C}(U_i^*) \) such that \( u' \in \mathbb{C}(U_i) \). Since \( E_i^\beta \) is a central element in \( U_\mathcal{A} \), we have

\[
\sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} u' E_{c(\gamma)} \in \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_+ \setminus \Delta_+} \mathbb{C}(\prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} E_{c(\gamma)}).
\]
Therefore, by Proposition 3.9 we get \(a_c = 0\) for any \(c \in \mathbb{Z}_{1}^{\Delta^+}\). Hence \(B^+_I\) is linearly independent in \((U_r/I_r)^*\).

Let \(I^*_c\) be the two sided ideal of \(U_c\) generated by \(\{E^i_\beta, F^i_\beta, E_{(i,s,\delta)}, F_{(i,s,\delta)}, K^i_\mu - 1 \mid \beta \in \Delta^+_c, i \in I, s \in \mathbb{N}, \mu \in Q\}\) and set \((\hat{U}_c/I_c)^* := \{u + \hat{I}_c \mid u \in \hat{U}_c\} \text{ for } * \in \{-, 0, +\}. We define

\[
\hat{Z}^+_i(\beta) := \{c \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{\Delta^+_c(I)} \mid c(\beta) \in \mathbb{Z}_i, c((i,s,\delta)) = 0 (\beta \in \Delta^+_c, i \in I, s \in \mathbb{N})\},
\]

\[
\hat{B}^+_i := \{ \prod_{\beta \in \Delta^+_c(I)} E^c(\beta) + \hat{I}_c \mid c \in \hat{Z}^+_i(\beta)\}, \quad \hat{B}_i^+ := \Omega(\hat{B}^+_i),
\]

\[
\hat{B}^0_i := \{K^i_\mu \pm \hat{I}_c \mid \mu \in Q_{2i}\}, \quad \hat{B}_i := \hat{B}_i^+ \hat{B}^0_i.
\] (3.2)

Then, by Theorem 2.5 and Proposition 3.7 we obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 3.10.** \(\hat{B}_r^+ (\text{resp. } \hat{B}_r)\) is a \(C\)-basis of \((\hat{U}_c/I_c)^*\) (resp. \((\hat{U}_c/I_c)\)) for * \in \{-, 0, +\}.

The proof of this proposition is similar to the one of Proposition 2.3.

### 3.2 Quantum algebras of restricted type

Let \(U_r^\text{res} (\text{resp. } U_r^\text{res} A)\) be the \(A\)-subalgebra of \(U_q (\text{resp. } U_q)\) generated by \(\{E_i^{(m)}, F_i^{(m)}, K_\mu \mid i \in I, m \in \mathbb{N}, \mu \in Q\}\). We set

\[
\left[ K_{a_i}; r \middle| m \right] := \prod_{s=1}^{m} \left[ K_{a_i}; q^{r-s+1} - K_{a_i}^{-1} q^{r-s+1} \right],
\]

for \(m \in \mathbb{N}, r \in \mathbb{Z}, i \in I\). It is known that \(\left[ K_{a_i}; r \middle| m \right] \in U_r^\text{res} (\text{see } [3] \S 9.3A)\). By (2.4) and (2.6), we have \(T^{\pm 1}(U_r^\text{res} A) \subset U_r^\text{res} A (\text{resp. } T^{\pm 1}(U_r^\text{res} A) \subset U_r^\text{res} A)\) for any \(i \in \tilde{I}\) (resp. \(I\)). Hence we obtain \(E_\beta, F_\beta, X_i^{\pm}, H_i, s \in \tilde{U}_r^\text{res} A\) for \(\beta \in \Delta^+_c(I), i \in I, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}(s \neq 0)\) by (2.12) and (2.15). Similarly, we obtain \(\hat{E}_\gamma, \hat{F}_\gamma \in \hat{U}_r^\text{res} A\) for any \(\gamma \in \Delta^+_c\) by (2.19). We define

\[
\hat{U}_r^\text{res} := \hat{U}_r^\text{res} A \otimes C_r \quad (\text{resp. } U_r^\text{res} := U_r^\text{res} A \otimes C_r).
\]

Then we call \(\hat{U}_r^\text{res} (\text{resp. } U_r^\text{res})\) “quantum loop algebra (resp. quantum algebra) of restricted type (or Lusztig type)” (see (17, 19)). We denote \(E_\beta \otimes 1\) by \(e_\beta\) for \(\beta \in \Delta^+_c(I)\). Similarly, we set \(f_\beta := F_\beta \otimes 1, k_\mu := K_\mu \otimes 1, x_i^{\pm} := X_i^{\pm} \otimes 1, \cdots\). Moreover, we set

\[
\hat{\epsilon}_\beta := e_\beta, \quad \hat{f}_\beta := \Omega(\hat{\epsilon}_\beta), \quad \hat{\epsilon}_{(i,m,\delta)} := \left( \frac{1}{[m]} E_{(i,m,\delta)} \right) \otimes 1, \quad \hat{f}_{(i,m,\delta)} := \Omega(\hat{\epsilon}_{(i,m,\delta)}),
\]

\[
\hat{h}_{i,s} := \left[ \frac{1}{[s]} H_{i,s} \right] \otimes 1, \quad \left[ k_{a_i}; r \middle| m \right] := \left[ k_{a_i}; q^{r-s+1} - K_{a_i}^{-1} q^{r-s+1} \right],
\]

for \(\beta \in \Delta^+_c, i \in I, m \in \mathbb{N}, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}(s \neq 0)\). Let \((\hat{U}_r^\text{res})^\pm (\text{resp. } (\hat{U}_r^\text{res})^0)\) be the \(C\)-subalgebra of \(\hat{U}_r^\text{res}\) generated by \(\{(x_i^{\pm})^{(m)} \mid i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}\} \) (resp. \(\{k_\mu \} \) \(\left. \mid \mu \in Q, i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}\} \) \(\left. \mid \mu \in Q, i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}\}\)). We obtain that \(\left[ k_{a_i}; r \middle| m \right]\) is generated by \(\{k_{a_i}, \left[ k_{a_i}; 0 \middle| l \right]\} \) for
\(i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}\). It is known that \(U^*\) has the triangular decomposition, that is, the multiplication map defines an isomorphism of \(\mathcal{C}\)-vector spaces:

\[
(U^*)^- \otimes (U^*)^0 \oplus (U^*)^+ \recht U^* \quad (u^- \otimes u^0 \otimes u^+ \mapsto u^- u^0 u^+).
\tag{3.3}
\]

Moreover, by [15] Proposition 6.1, we have

\[
(B^*)^- \otimes (B^*)^0 \oplus (B^*)^+ \recht B^* \quad (\bar{u}^- \otimes \bar{u}^0 \otimes \bar{u}^+ \mapsto \bar{u}^- \bar{u}^0 \bar{u}^+).
\tag{3.4}
\]

We set

\[
(B^*)^+ := \{ \prod_{\beta \in \Delta_+} e^{(c(\beta))} | c \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_+(I)} \}, \quad (B^*)^- := \Omega((B^*)^+),
\]

\[
(B^*)^0 := \{ \prod_{i \in I} k_{\alpha_i} \left[ \begin{array}{c} k_{\alpha_i} ; 0 \\ m_i \end{array} \right] | m_i \in \mathbb{N}, \delta_i = 0 \text{ or } 1 \}, \quad B^* := (B^*)^- (B^*)^0 (B^*)^+,
\]

(see (2.13)). By [15], we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.11.** \(B^*\) is a \(\mathcal{C}\)-basis of \(\bar{U}^*\).

**Proof.** By [15], we obtain a PBW basis of \(\bar{U}^*_A\). Since any \(A\)-basis of \(\bar{U}^*_A\) become \(\mathcal{C}\)-basis of \(\bar{U}^*_A \otimes_A \mathcal{C}\) canonically (see Lemma 3.4), we obtain this theorem. \(\Box\)

### 3.3 Small quantum algebras

Let \(\bar{U}^*\) (resp. \(U^*\)) be the \(\mathcal{C}\)-subalgebra of \(U^*_\mathcal{C}\) (resp. \(U^*_\mathcal{C}\)) generated by \(\{e_i, f_i, k, \mu | i \in I, \mu \in \mathcal{C} \}\). Then we call \(\bar{U}^*\) (resp. \(U^*\)) “small quantum loop algebra (resp. small quantum algebra)”. Let \(\mathcal{D}_\mathcal{C}\) be the \(\mathcal{C}\)-subalgebra of \(\bar{U}^*_\mathcal{C}\) generated by \(\{x_i, h_i, k, \mu | i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z} \}\) (resp. \(\{h_i, k, \mu | i \in I, s \in \mathbb{Z} \}\)) and \((U^*)^- \vee (U^*)^0 \vee (U^*)^+\) be the \(\mathcal{C}\)-subalgebra of \(U^*_\mathcal{C}\) generated by \(\{e_i, f_i, k, \mu \in \mathcal{C} \}\). Let \(Z_i^\Delta\) be as in (3.4). We set

\[
(B^*)^+ := \{ \prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} e^{(c(\gamma))} | c \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_+(I)} \}, \quad (B^*)^- := \Omega((B^*)^+),
\]

\[
(B^*)^0 := \{ k, \mu \in \mathcal{C}^2 | \}, \quad B^* := (B^*)^- (B^*)^0 (B^*)^+.
\tag{3.5}
\]

**Theorem 3.12.** [18] \S 5, [19] \S 8. \((B^*)^*\) (resp. \(B^*\)) is a \(\mathcal{C}\)-basis of \((U^*)^*\) (resp. \((U^*)^*\)) for \(\alpha \in \{-, 0, +\}\).

Since \(e, f, \delta\) are generated by \(\{e_i, f_i, k, \mu \}_{i \in I} \) respectively, we get \(e, f, \delta\) for any \(\beta \in \Delta_+(I)\). For \(\beta \in \Delta_+(I), i, m \in \mathbb{N}\), we have

\[
e^{\beta} = [l] \epsilon^{\beta}, \quad f^{\beta} = [l] \epsilon^{\beta}, \quad (e, m) \delta = [l] \epsilon^{(e, m) \delta}, \quad f, (i, m) \delta = [l] \epsilon^{(f, i, m) \delta},
\]

\[
\prod_{r=1}^l (k, \alpha_i \epsilon^{1-r} - k, \alpha_i \epsilon^{r-1}) = \prod_{r=1}^l (\epsilon^r - \epsilon^{-r}) \left[ k, \alpha_i ; 0, \frac{1}{l} \right],
\]

(see [17] Lemma 4.4). So we obtain

\[
e^{\beta} = f^{\beta} = e, (i, m) \delta = f, (i, m) \delta = k^{2l} - 1 = 0.
\tag{3.6}
\]
for any \( \beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+ \), \( s \in \mathbb{N} \), \( i \in I \). Let \( Z_{i_0}^{\tilde{\Delta}^+} \) be as in (3.2). Define

\[
(\tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}})^+ := \{ \prod_{\beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+} e_\beta^{(\beta)} | c \in Z_{i_0}^{\tilde{\Delta}^+} \}, \quad (\tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}})^- := \Omega((\tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}})^+),
\]

\[
(\tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}})^0 := \{ k_\mu | \mu \in Q_{2i_0} \}, \quad \tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}} := (\tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}})^-(\tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}})^+.
\]

Since \( e_\beta, f_\beta \in \tilde{U}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}} \) for any \( \beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+ \), we have \( \tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}} \subset \tilde{U}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}} \). Therefore, by Theorem 3.11 we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.13.** \( \tilde{B}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}} \) is linearly independent in \( \tilde{U}_{i_0}^{\text{fin}} \).

### 3.4 Isomorphism theorem

**Proposition 3.14 ([1] Lemma 4.8).** There exists a \( \mathbb{C} \)-algebra isomorphism \( \tilde{\phi} : \tilde{U}_e/I_e \rightarrow U_e^{\text{fin}} \) such that \( \tilde{\phi}(E_i + I_e) = e_i \), \( \tilde{\phi}(F_i + I_e) = f_i \) and \( \tilde{\phi}(K_\mu + I_e) = k_\mu \) for \( i \in I, \mu \in Q \).

We obtain an affine version of the above result:

**Theorem 3.15.** There exists a \( \mathbb{C} \)-algebra isomorphism \( \tilde{\phi} : \tilde{U}_e/I_e \rightarrow \tilde{U}_e^{\text{fin}} \) such that \( \tilde{\phi}(E_i + I_e) = e_i \), \( \tilde{\phi}(F_i + I_e) = f_i \) and \( \tilde{\phi}(K_\mu + I_e) = k_\mu \) for \( i \in I, \mu \in Q \). In particular, \( \tilde{B}_e^{\text{fin}} \) is a \( \mathbb{C} \)-basis of \( \tilde{U}_e^{\text{fin}} \).

**Proof.** Elements in \( \{ e_i, f_i, k_\mu | i \in I, \mu \in Q \} \subset \tilde{U}_e^{\text{fin}} \) satisfy the relations of Definition 4.1. So, by the universality of \( \tilde{U}_e \) (see Remark 3.3 (b)), there exists a surjective \( \mathbb{C} \)-algebra homomorphism \( \phi : \tilde{U}_e \rightarrow \tilde{U}_e^{\text{fin}} \) such that \( E_i \mapsto e_i, F_i \mapsto f_i, K_\mu \mapsto k_\mu \) for \( i \in I, \mu \in Q \).

Since \( e_\beta = E_\beta \otimes 1 \) and \( f_\beta = F_\beta \otimes 1 \) (\( \beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+ \)), we obtain \( \phi(E_\beta) = e_\beta \) and \( \phi(F_\beta) = f_\beta \). Then, by 4.6, we have \( \phi(I_e) = 0 \). Hence there exists a surjective \( \mathbb{C} \)-algebra homomorphism \( \tilde{\phi} : \tilde{U}_e/I_e \rightarrow \tilde{U}_e^{\text{fin}} \) such that \( \tilde{\phi}(E_\beta + I_e) = e_\beta \), \( \tilde{\phi}(F_\beta + I_e) = f_\beta \) and \( \tilde{\phi}(K_\mu + I_e) = k_\mu \) for \( \beta \in \Delta^+ \), \( \mu \in Q \).

Let \( u \in \text{Ker}(\tilde{\phi}) \). By Proposition 3.10 we have

\[
u = \sum_{\mu \in Q_{2i}} \sum_{c, c' \in Z_{i_0}^{\tilde{\Delta}^+}} a(c, \mu, c')(\prod_{\beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+} E_\beta^{(\beta)} + \tilde{I}_e)(K_\mu + \tilde{I}_e)(\prod_{\beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+} F_\beta^{(\beta)} + \tilde{I}_e),\]

where \( a(c, \mu, c') \in \mathbb{C} \). Then we get

\[
u = \tilde{\phi}(u) = \sum_{\mu \in Q_{2i}} \sum_{c, c' \in Z_{i_0}^{\tilde{\Delta}^+}} a(c, \mu, c')(\prod_{\beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+} e_\beta^{(\beta)} k_\mu(\prod_{\beta \in \tilde{\Delta}^+} f_\beta^{(\beta)})).
\]

Hence, by Lemma 3.13 we obtain \( a(c, \mu, c') = 0 \) for any \( c, c' \in Z_{i_0}^{\tilde{\Delta}^+}, \mu \in Q_{2i} \). Thus \( \tilde{\phi} \) is injective. Therefore \( \tilde{\phi} \) is an isomorphism and \( \tilde{B}_e^{\text{fin}} \) is a \( \mathbb{C} \)-basis of \( \tilde{U}_e^{\text{fin}} \). \( \square \)

### 4 Evaluation representations of restricted type

#### 4.1 Representation theory of restricted type

We call a \( U^{\text{res}} \)-module \( \tilde{V} \) (resp. \( U^{\text{res}} \)-module \( V \)) “type 1” if \( k_\mu = 1 \) on \( \tilde{V} \) (resp. \( V \)) for any \( \mu \in Q \). In general, finite dimensional irreducible \( U^{\text{res}} \)-modules (resp. \( U^{\text{res}} \)-modules) are classified into \( 2^n \) types according to \( \{ \sigma : Q \rightarrow \{1, -1\}; \text{homomorphism of group } \} \). It is
known that for any $\sigma : Q \to \{\pm 1\}$, the category of finite dimensional $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{res}}$-module (resp. $U_v^{\text{res}}$-module) of type $\sigma$ is essentially equivalent to the category of the finite dimensional $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{res}}$-module (resp. $U_v^{\text{res}}$-module) of type $1$.

Let $U = U_v^{\text{res}}, \tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}, \tilde{U}_v^{\text{res}}$ or $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$.

**Definition 4.1.** Let $V$ be a $U$-module and $v$ be a nonzero vector in $V$. Suppose that $v$ satisfies

$$
eq_i^{(m)} v = 0 \text{ for any } i \in I, \quad m \in \mathbb{N} \text{ if } U = U_v^{\text{res}}, \quad \neq_i v = 0 \text{ for any } i \in I \text{ if } U = U_v^{\text{fin}},$$

$$(x^i_{r,v})^{(m)} v = 0 \text{ for any } i \in I, \quad m \in \mathbb{N}, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ if } U = \tilde{U}_v^{\text{res}}, \quad x^i_{r,v} v = 0 \text{ for any } i \in I, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ if } U = \tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}},$$

We call $v$ a “primitive vector” in $V$.

**Definition 4.2.** Let $V$ be a $U$-module and $\Lambda : U^0 \to \mathbb{C}$ be a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism. We assume that $V$ is generated as a $U$-module by a primitive vector $v_\Lambda \in V$ such that

$$u_0 v_\Lambda = \Lambda(u_0) v_\Lambda,$$

for any $u_0 \in U^0$. Then we call $V$ a “highest weight $U$-module” generated by a “highest weight vector” $v_\Lambda$ with “highest weight $\Lambda$”.

**Proposition 4.3.** For any $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\Lambda : U^0 \to \mathbb{C}$, there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) irreducible highest weight $U$-module $V$ with highest weight $\Lambda$.

**Proof.** For any $U_v^{\text{res}}$ (resp. $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{res}}$-module) $V$, we can define the weight spaces on $V$ by

$$V_\mu := \left\{ v \in V \mid k_{\alpha_i} v = \varepsilon^{(\mu, \alpha_i)} v, \quad \begin{bmatrix} k_{\alpha_i} \cdot 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix} v = \begin{bmatrix} \langle \mu, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \\ l \end{bmatrix} v \text{ for any } i \in I \right\},$$

where $\mu \in P$ (see [17], [10]). Then, by the theory of highest weight modules, we obtain this proposition in the case of $U = U_v^{\text{res}}$ or $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{res}}$ (see [10] Proposition 7.3). So we shall prove the case of $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$. We can prove the $U_v^{\text{fin}}$ case similarly.

Let $\hat{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$ be the $\mathbb{C}$-subalgebra of $U_v^{\text{res}}$ generated by $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}} \cup \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} k_{\alpha_i} \cdot 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix} \mid i \in I \right\}$. For any $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\Lambda : (\hat{U}_v^{\text{fin}})^0 \to \mathbb{C}$, let $\hat{I}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ (resp. $\tilde{I}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$) be the left ideal of $\hat{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$ (resp. $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$) generated by $\{ x^i_{r,v}, u_0 - \Lambda(u_0), \begin{bmatrix} k_{\alpha_i} \cdot 0 \\ l \end{bmatrix} \mid i \in I, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad u_0 \in (\hat{U}_v^{\text{fin}})^0 \}$ (resp. $\{ x^i_{r,v}, u_0 - \Lambda(u_0) \mid i \in I, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad u_0 \in (\hat{U}_v^{\text{fin}})^0 \}$). We define a $\hat{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module $\hat{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ and a $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ respectively by

$$\hat{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda) := \hat{U}_v^{\text{fin}} / \hat{I}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda), \quad \tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda) := \tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}} / \tilde{I}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda).$$

We set $\hat{\alpha}_\Lambda := 1 + \hat{I}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda) \in \hat{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_\Lambda := 1 + \tilde{I}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda) \in \tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$. Let $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ be the $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-submodule of $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ generated by $\tilde{\alpha}_\Lambda$. Then, by the universality of the $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$, there exists a surjective $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module homomorphism $\phi : \tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda) \to \tilde{N}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ such that $\phi(\tilde{\alpha}_\Lambda) = \tilde{\alpha}_\Lambda$. Let $B$ be a $\mathbb{C}$-basis of $(\hat{M}_v^{\text{fin}})^\ast$. Then, by (4.3), we obtain that $\{ \tilde{w}_B \mid u \in B \}$ is a $\mathbb{C}$-basis of $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ (resp. $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$). Hence $\phi$ is an isomorphism of $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module. So we can regard $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ as $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module. By the similar way to (4.3), we can define the weight spaces on this module. Then, by the theory of the highest weight module, $\tilde{M}_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ has a unique simple quotient of $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module and it is the unique irreducible highest weight $\tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$-module with highest weight $\Lambda$. \qed

For any $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\Lambda : U^0 \to \mathbb{C}$, we denote the unique irreducible highest weight $U$-module with highest weight $\Lambda$ by $V_v^{\text{res}}(\Lambda)$ if $U = U_v^{\text{res}}$, $V_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ if $U = U_v^{\text{fin}}$, and $V_v^{\text{res}}(\Lambda)$ if $U = \tilde{U}_v^{\text{res}}$, and $V_v^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$ if $U = \tilde{U}_v^{\text{fin}}$. Then, by Proposition 4.3 and the uniqueness of the primitive vectors, we obtain the following proposition.
Proposition 4.4. Let $\Lambda$ and $\Lambda'$ : $U^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphisms. Then $V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{res}}(\Lambda)$ (resp. $V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda)$) is isomorphic to $V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{res}}(\Lambda')$ (resp. $V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda')$, $\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda')$) if and only if $\Lambda = \Lambda'$.

Now, we define $\mathcal{P}_{i,m} \in \tilde{U}_q$ inductively by

$$\mathcal{P}_{i,0} := 1, \quad \mathcal{P}_{i,m} := -\frac{K_{i-1}}{q-2m} \sum_{s=1}^{m} \Psi_{i,s}^{+} \mathcal{P}_{i,m-s}, \quad \mathcal{P}_{i,-m} := \Omega(\mathcal{P}_{i,m}),$$

where $\Omega$ as in \[22\]. We have $\Omega(\Psi_{i,s}^{+}) = \Psi_{i,-s}^{-}$.

Proposition 4.5 (\[10\] §3). For any $i \in I$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have $\mathcal{P}_{i,r} \in \tilde{U}_q^{\text{res}}$. Moreover, $(\tilde{U}_q^{\text{res}})^0$ is generated by $\{k_{\alpha_i}, \left[ \begin{array}{c} k_{\alpha_i} \varepsilon \\ \ v \end{array} \right] : \mathcal{P}_{i,r} \otimes 1 \mid i \in I, r \in \mathbb{Z} \}$ as $\mathbb{C}$-algebra.

We simply denote $\mathcal{P}_{i,r} \otimes 1 \in \tilde{U}_q^{\text{res}}$ by $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{i,r}$. We set

$$\mathbb{C}_0[t] := \{ P \in \mathbb{C}[t] \mid P \text{ is monic, } P(0) \neq 0 \}.$$ 

We call a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ “$l$-acyclic” if it is not divisible by $(1 - ct^l)$ for any $c \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ (see \[14\]) and set

$$\mathbb{C}_l[t] := \{ P \in \mathbb{C}_0[t] \mid P \text{ is } l \text{-acyclic} \}.$$

Definition 4.6. (a) For $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^I$, let $\lambda_i^{(0)} \in \mathbb{Z}_4$ and $\lambda_i^{(1)} \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\lambda_i = \lambda_i^{(0)} + t \lambda_i^{(1)}$ ($i \in I$). We define a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\Lambda_{\lambda}^{\text{res}} : (U_q^{\text{res}})^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Lambda_{\lambda}^{\text{res}}(k_{\alpha_i}) := \varepsilon^{\lambda_i^{(0)}}, \quad \Lambda_{\lambda}^{\text{res}}(\left[ k_{\alpha_i} \varepsilon \\ \ v \right]) := \lambda_i^{(1)} (i \in I).$$

(b) For $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^I$, we define a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\Lambda_{\lambda}^{\text{fin}} : (U_q^{\text{fin}})^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Lambda_{\lambda}^{\text{fin}}(k_{\alpha_i}) := \varepsilon^{\lambda_i} (i \in I).$$

(c) For $P = (P_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}_0[t]^I$, let $p^{(0)}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_4$ and $p^{(1)}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\deg(P_i) = p^{(0)}_i + t p^{(1)}_i$ ($i \in I$). We define a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{res}} : (U_q^{\text{res}})^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{res}}(k_{\alpha_i}) := \varepsilon^{p^{(0)}_i}, \quad \tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{res}}(\left[ k_{\alpha_i} \varepsilon \\ \ v \right]) := p^{(1)}_i (i \in I),$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{res}}(P_i,m)t^m := \frac{P_i(t)}{P_i(0)}, \quad \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{res}}(\tilde{P}_i,-m)m^m := \frac{Q_i(t)}{Q_i(0)},$$

where $Q_i(t) := t^{\deg(P_i)}P_i(t^{-1})$ (see \[10\] §8).

(d) For $P = (P_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}_l[t]^I$, we define a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra homomorphism $\tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{fin}} : (U_q^{\text{fin}})^0 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{fin}}(\psi^{(1)}_i,m)t^m := \varepsilon^{\deg(P_i)} \frac{P_i(\varepsilon^{-2} t)}{P_i(t)} := \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{fin}}(\psi^{(1)}_i,-m)t^m,$$

in the sense that the left and right hand sides are the Laurent expansions of the middle term about $t = 0$ and $t = \infty$, respectively (see \[10\] §8).

By \[10\] §8, we obtain $\tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{fin}} = \tilde{\Lambda}_P^{\text{res}}_{\mid U_q^{\text{fin}}} (P \in \mathbb{C}_l[t]^I)$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^I$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}_4^I$), we set $V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{res}}(\lambda) := V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{res}}(\Lambda_{\lambda}^{\text{res}})$ (resp. $V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(\lambda) := V_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda_{\lambda}^{\text{fin}})$). Similarly, for $P \in \mathbb{C}_0[t]^I$ (resp. $\mathbb{C}_l[t]^I$), we set $\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{res}}(P) := \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{res}}(\Lambda_P^{\text{res}})$ (resp. $\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(P) := \tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(\Lambda_P^{\text{fin}})$) and call $P$ “Drinfel’d polynomial” of $\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{res}}(P)$ (resp. $\tilde{V}_{\varepsilon}^{\text{fin}}(P)$).
Theorem 4.7 ([17], Proposition 11.2.10). For any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \) (resp. \( \mathbb{Z}_+^m \)), \( V^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) (resp. \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \)) is a finite dimensional irreducible \( U^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon \)-module (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module) of type 1. Conversely, for any finite dimensional irreducible \( U^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon \)-module (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module) \( V \) of type 1, there exists a unique \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \) (resp. \( \mathbb{Z}_+^m \)) such that \( V \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) (resp. \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \)) as a \( U^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon \)-module (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module). In particular, for any \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \), \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) as a \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module.

Theorem 4.8 ([10] Theorem 8.2, 9.2, [14] Theorem 2.6). For any \( P \in \mathbb{C}_0[t^n] \) (resp. \( \mathbb{C}[t^n] \)), \( V^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon(P) \) (resp. \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \)) is a finite dimensional irreducible \( U^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon \)-module (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module) of type 1. Conversely, for any finite dimensional irreducible \( U^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon \)-module (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module) \( V \) of type 1, there exists a unique \( P \in \mathbb{C}_0[t^n] \) (resp. \( \mathbb{C}[t^n] \)) such that \( V \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon(P) \) (resp. \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \)) as \( U^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon \)-module (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module). In particular, for any \( P \in \mathbb{C}[t^n] \), \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon(P) \) as \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module.

By the tensor product theorem, in order to understand the representation theory of \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \) (resp. \( U^{\text{rep}}_\varepsilon \)), it is sufficient to consider \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \) (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)) (see [10] and [17]).

4.2 Drinfeld’s polynomials of evaluation representations

For \( m \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \), let \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(m) \) be the \((m+1)\)-dimensional irreducible \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module. By [2.10.3], we can regard \( \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \) as \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2(m+1)) \)-module (\( P \in \mathbb{C}_0[t^n] \)). Then, by [10] §7-9 (in particular, p.321), we obtain the following theorem.

Theorem 4.9 ([10]). For any \( P \in \mathbb{C}[t^n](P \neq 1) \), there exist \( r, m_s \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( c_s \in \mathbb{C}^\times(1 \leq s \leq r) \) such that

\[
\tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \cong \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P_r)
\]

(as a \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module),

where \( P = \prod_{s=1}^r P_s \), \( P_s(t) = \prod_{p=1}^{m_s}(t-c_s e^{m_s+1-2p}) \in \mathbb{C}_0[t^n] \) (\( 1 \leq s \leq r \)). In particular, \( \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P_s) \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(m_s) \) as a \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module.

By this theorem, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.10. Let \( P \in \mathbb{C}[t^n] \), \( m \in \mathbb{N} \). If \( \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(m) \) as a \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module, then there exists \( c \in \mathbb{C}^\times \) such that \( P(t) = \prod_{p=1}^{m}(t-c e^{m+1-2p}) \).

By using this lemma, we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma 4.11. Let \( P = (P_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}[t^n] \), \( \lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n \). We assume \( \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \) is isomorphic to \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) as a \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module. Then, for any \( i \in I(P_i \neq 1) \), there exists \( c_i \in \mathbb{C}^\times \) such that \( P_i(t) = \prod_{p=1}^{\lambda_i}(t-c_i e^{\lambda_i+1-2p}) \).

Proof. Let \( \varphi_P \) be a highest weight vector in \( \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \). Then \( \varphi_P \) is also a highest weight vector in \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \). For \( i \in I \), let \( (\tilde{U}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon)_i \) (resp. \( (U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon)_i \)) be the \( \mathbb{C} \)-subalgebra of \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \) (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)) generated by \( \{x_{i,r}, h_{i,s}, k_{i,a} \mid r, s \in \mathbb{Z}, s \neq 0 \} \) (resp. \( \{e_i, f_i, k_{i,a} \} \)) and \( \tilde{W}_i \) (resp. \( W_i \)) be the \( \tilde{U}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-submodule (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-submodule) of \( \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \) generated by \( \varphi_P \). By [2.11.3], we can regard \( \tilde{W}_i \) (resp. \( W_i \)) as a \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module (resp. \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module). Then, by Lemma 7.6 in [10], we obtain \( \tilde{W}_i \cong V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P_i) \) as \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module. Similarly (more easily), we obtain \( W_i \cong V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\lambda_i) \) as \( U^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \)-module. So, by Lemma 4.10 it is enough to prove \( \tilde{W}_i = W_i \) for \( i \in I \) such that \( P_i \neq 1 \).

By [3.4], \( \tilde{W}_i \) is spanned by \( \{x_{i,r_1} \cdots x_{i,r_m} \varphi_P \mid r_1, \cdots, r_m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \} \) as a \( \mathbb{C} \)-vector space. By Theorem 4.8, we can regard \( V^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \) as a \( \tilde{U}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon \)-module and define the weight spaces on \( \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P) \) by the similar way to [4.3.1]. Then, by the relations of Drinfeld’s realization, we have \( x_{i,r_1} \cdots x_{i,r_m} \varphi_P \in \tilde{V}^{\text{fin}}_\varepsilon(P)_{\lambda-m} \) for any \( m \in \mathbb{N}, r_1, \cdots, r_m \in \mathbb{Z} \). So we
obtain $\tilde{W}_i \subset \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} (\tilde{V}_i^\text{fin}(P))_{\lambda-\omega_m}$. On the other hand, by the assumption of this lemma, $\tilde{V}_i^\text{fin}(P)$ is isomorphic to $\tilde{V}_i^\text{fin}(\lambda)$ as a $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{res}$-module. Hence, by (5.8), $\tilde{V}_i^\text{fin}(P)$ is spanned by \(\prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} f_{\gamma} v_P \mid c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^+\). Since $\prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_+} f_{\gamma} v_P \in (\tilde{V}_i^\text{fin}(P))_{\gamma} \gamma$, we have

$$
\bigoplus_{m \geq 0} (\tilde{V}_i^\text{fin}(P))_{\lambda-\omega_m} = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_i} \mathbb{C} f^m v_P \subset W_i.
$$

Then we have $\tilde{W}_i = W_i$. 

Let $(U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{res})'$ (resp. $(U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin})'$) be the extended algebra of $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{res}$ (resp. $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}$) defined by replacing \(K_\mu \mid \mu \in Q\) with \(K_\mu \mid \mu \in P\) (see Definition 2.2). By (2.15), we obtain $ev_{a}^\pm (U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{res}) \subset (U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{res})'$ $(a \in \mathbb{C}^\times)$. Hence, by Proposition 3.6, we obtain the evaluation $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}$-homomorphisms $(ev_{a}^\pm : U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin} \rightarrow (U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin})')$ defined by

$$(ev_{a}^\pm (e_i)) := e_i, \quad (ev_{a}^\pm (f_i)) := f_i, \quad (ev_{a}^\pm (k_\mu)) := k_\mu,$$

$$(ev_{a}^\pm)_{(e_0)} := \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{z}^{-1} k_\lambda, \quad (ev_{a}^\pm)_{(f_0)} := \mathfrak{a}^{-1} (1-1)^{-1} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{z}^{-1} k_\lambda, \quad (ev_{a}^\pm)_{(e_0)} := \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{z}^{-1} k_\lambda, \quad (ev_{a}^\pm)_{(f_0)} := \mathfrak{a}^{-1} (1-1)^{-1} \mathfrak{a} \mathfrak{z}^{-1} k_\lambda,$$

for $i \in I$, $\mu \in Q$. For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_i$, we regard $V_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}(\lambda)$ as a $(U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin})'$-module through these homomorphisms. Then the evaluation $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}$-representations are defined by the following method.

**Definition 4.12.** Let $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_i^n$. We set

$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{a}_i} := \sum_{j \notin I} \lambda_j (\Lambda_i, \lambda_j) \quad (i \in I), \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{a}^+_i} := \sum_{j \notin I} \lambda_j (\Lambda_i, \lambda_j) (i \in I), \quad \lambda_{\mathfrak{a}^+_i} := \sum_{j \notin I} \lambda_j (\Lambda_i, \lambda_j) (i \in I),$$

We regard $V_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}(\lambda)$ as a $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}$-module by using $(ev_{a}^\pm)$ and denote it by $V_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}(\lambda)^a$. Since $V_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}(\lambda)$ is irreducible as a $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}$-module, $V_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}(\lambda)^a$ is a finite dimensional irreducible $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}$-module of type 1. Thus, by Theorem 4.8, there exists a unique $P_{a}^\pm = (P_{i,a}^\pm)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}[t]^{n}$ such that $V_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}(\lambda)^a \cong V_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}(P_{a}^\pm)$ as a $U_{\epsilon, A}^\text{fin}$-module. Let $i \in I$ such that $P_{i,a}^\pm \neq 0$. Then, by Lemma 4.11, there exist $a_{(\pm, i)} \in \mathbb{C}^\times$ such that $P_{i,a}^\pm (t) = \prod_{p=1}^{\lambda_i} (t - a_{(\pm, i)}^\pm t^{\lambda_i+1-2p})$. Around $t = 0$, we have

$$
\epsilon^{\lambda_i} + (\epsilon^{\lambda_i} - \epsilon^{-\lambda_i}) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (a_{(\pm, i)}^\pm t^{\lambda_i-1})^m = \frac{\epsilon^{\lambda_i} - a_{(\pm, i)}^{-1} \epsilon^{-\lambda_i} t^{\lambda_i-1}}{1 - a_{(\pm, i)}^{-1} \epsilon^{-\lambda_i} t^{\lambda_i-1}} = \epsilon^{\lambda_i} \frac{\epsilon^{2\lambda_i} (t - a_{(\pm, i)}^\pm t^{\lambda_i+1})}{t - a_{(\pm, i)}^{-1} \epsilon^{-\lambda_i} t^{\lambda_i-1}},
$$

(see [6] Corollary 4.2). Thus, by Definition 4.6 (d), we obtain

$$
\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \Lambda_{P_{i,a}^\pm}^\text{fin} (\psi_{i,m}) t^m = \epsilon^{\deg (P_{i,a}^\pm)} \frac{\epsilon^{2\lambda_i} (t - a_{(\pm, i)}^\pm t^{\lambda_i+1})}{P_{i,a}^\pm (t)} = \epsilon^{\lambda_i} + (\epsilon^{\lambda_i} - \epsilon^{-\lambda_i}) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (a_{(\pm, i)}^{-1} \epsilon^{\lambda_i-1} t)^m.
$$

Hence we can calculate $a_{(\pm, i)}$ explicitly by the computation of $\Lambda_{P_{i,a}^\pm}^\text{fin} (\psi_{i,1})$. Therefore, by the similar way to the proof of [7] Theorem 3.5, we obtain the following theorem.
Theorem 4.13. For $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_+^n$, $a \in \mathbb{C}^X$, let $P^\pm_a = (P^\pm_{i,a})_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}[t]_n$ such that $\overline{V}^{\text{fin}}(P^\pm_a) \simeq V^{\text{fin}}(\lambda)_a$. Then, for any $i \in I$ such that $P^\pm_{i,a} \neq 1$, we obtain

$$P^\pm_{i,a} = \prod_{p=1}^{\lambda_i} (t - \varepsilon \lambda_i - 2p + 1, a_{(\pm,i)}),$$

where

$$a_{(\pm,i)} := a^{-1} \varepsilon^{\pm(\lambda^{(i)}+1)},$$

$$\lambda^{(i)} := \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \lambda_k - \sum_{k=i+1}^{n} \lambda_k.$$

Proof. We shall prove the case of $P^+_a$. We can also prove the case of $P^-_a$ similarly. Let $v_+$ be the highest weight vector in $\overline{V}^{\text{fin}}(P^+_a)$. By (4.4), for any $i \in I$, we have

$$e_0 v_+ = (-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon^{n+1} [f_n, \cdots [f_{i+1}, [f_i, \cdots [f_{i-1}, x^-_{i,1}]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} k_{\theta}^{-1} v_+.$$

Then we get

$$e_n e_0 v_+ = (-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon^{n+1} \sum_{k \in I} \lambda_k + 1 \varepsilon^{-1} [f_n, \cdots [f_{i-1}, x^-_{i,1}, x_i]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} e_n f_n] v_+$$

$$= (-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon^{n+1} \sum_{k \in I} \lambda_k + 1 \varepsilon^{-1} [f_n, \cdots [f_{i-1}, x^-_{i,1}, x_i]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} (\frac{k_{\lambda_n} - k_{\lambda_n}^{-1}}{\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{-1}}) v_+$$

$$= (-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon^{n+1} \sum_{k \in I} \lambda_k + 1 \varepsilon^{-1} [f_n, \cdots [f_{i-1}, x^-_{i,1}, x_i]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} v_+$$

By repeating this, we obtain

$$e_i \cdots e_1 e_{i+1} \cdots e_n e_0 v_+ = (-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon^{n+1} x^-_{i,1} v_+ = (-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon^{-\lambda_i + n+1} x^-_{i,0} x_i v_+. \quad (4.9)$$

On the other hand, by (4.2), we have

$$e_0 v_+ = (a_{i,0}^{-1} e_0 v_+ = a^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1} k_{\lambda_n}^{-1} [f_n, [f_2, f_1]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} v_+.$$

Since $(\Lambda_1 - \Lambda_0, \theta) = 0$, we have

$$k_{\lambda_n}^{-1} [f_n, [f_2, f_1]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} = [f_n, [f_2, f_1]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} k_{\lambda_n}^{-1}.$$

Moreover, we have $k_{\lambda_n} v_+ = e^{\lambda_1} v_+, k_{\lambda_n} v_+ = e^{\lambda_n} v_+$. So, by (4.2), we obtain

$$e_0 v_+ = a^{-1} [f_n, [f_2, f_1]_{\varepsilon^-1}]_{\varepsilon^-1} v_+.$$

By the similar way to the above proof, we have

$$e_{i+1} \cdots e_n e_0 v_+ = a \varepsilon^{n-1} [f_n, f_2, f_1]_{\varepsilon^-1} v_+.$$

Here, we obtain

$$e_{i+1} \cdots e_n e_0 v_+ = a \varepsilon^{n-1} [f_n, f_2, f_1]_{\varepsilon^-1} v_+.$$
By repeating this, we get
\[ e_i \cdots e_1 e_{i+1} \cdots e_n e_0 v_+ = (-1)^{i+1} a_{\varepsilon}^{-\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} \lambda_k - (i-1)+\sum_{k=i+1}^n \lambda_k + n-1} e_i f_i v_+ \]
\[ = (-1)^{i-1} a_{\varepsilon}^{-\lambda(i) - i + n} [\lambda_1]_e v_+. \]  
(4.10)
Thus, by (4.9) and (4.10), we obtain
\[ \psi_{i+1} v_+ = (\varepsilon - \varepsilon^{-1}) i_{a_{\varepsilon}^0} a_{\varepsilon} v_+ = a_{\varepsilon}^{-\lambda(i) - i - 1} (\varepsilon^{\lambda_i} - \varepsilon^{-\lambda_i}) v_+ . \]
On the other hand, by (4.5), we have \( \psi_{i+1}^+ v_+ = \tilde{A} \mathfrak{P}_a (\psi_{i+1}^+) v_+ = a_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \varepsilon^{\lambda_i - 1} (\varepsilon^{\lambda_i} - \varepsilon^{-\lambda_i}) \). It amount to \( a_{\varepsilon}^{-1} \varepsilon^{\lambda(i) + i} \).

For \( \lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n \), we set \( \supp(\lambda) = \{ i \in I | \lambda_i \neq 0 \} \).

**Proposition 4.14.** Let \( \lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n, a_\pm \in \mathbb{C}_\times \).
(a) If \( \lambda = 0 \), then \( V_{\varepsilon}^{\fin}(\lambda)_{a_+}^{\fin} \) is isomorphic to \( V_{\varepsilon}^{\fin}(\lambda)_{a_-}^{\fin} \) as a \( \tilde{U}_\varepsilon^{\fin} \)-module.
(b) In the case of \( \lambda \neq 0 \), \( V_{\varepsilon}^{\fin}(\lambda)_{a_+}^{\fin} \) is isomorphic to \( V_{\varepsilon}^{\fin}(\lambda)_{a_-}^{\fin} \) as a \( \tilde{U}_\varepsilon^{\fin} \)-module if and only if \( a_+ = a_\varepsilon^{2(\lambda(i) + i)} \) for any \( i \in \supp(\lambda) \).

**Proof.** (a) is obvious. So we shall prove (b). By Theorem 4.13, \( V_{\varepsilon}^{\fin}(\lambda)_{a_+}^{\fin} \) is isomorphic to \( V_{\varepsilon}^{\fin}(\lambda)_{a_-}^{\fin} \), if and only if \( \mathfrak{P}_a^{\fin} = \mathfrak{P}_a^{\fin} \). By (4.5) and Theorem 4.13, we obtain \( \mathfrak{P}_a^{\fin} = \mathfrak{P}_a^{\fin} \), if and only if \( a_+ = a_\varepsilon^{2(\lambda(i) + i)} \) for any \( i \in \supp(\lambda) \).

**Proposition 4.15.** Let \( \lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^n \ (\lambda \neq 0), a_\pm \in \mathbb{C}_\times \). Let \( i_1, \cdots, i_m \in I \) such that \( \supp(\lambda) = \{ i_1, \cdots, i_m \} \) and \( i_1 < \cdots < i_m \). Then \( a_+ = a_\varepsilon^{2(\lambda(i) + i)} \) for any \( i \in \supp(\lambda) \) if and only if the following conditions (a) and (b) hold.
(a) For any \( 2 \leq r \leq m \),
\[ \lambda_{i_r} \equiv (-1)^{r-1} \lambda_{i_1} + (-1)^r i_r - i_r + 2 \sum_{k=2}^{r-1} (-1)^{r-1+k} i_k \neq 0 \] (mod \( l \)).
(b)
\[ a_+ = \begin{cases} a_\varepsilon^{2 \sum_{k=1}^{r-1} (-1)^{k-1} i_k} & \text{if } m \text{ is odd}, \\ a_\varepsilon^{2(\lambda_1 + \sum_{k=2}^{r-1} (-1)^{k} i_k)} & \text{if } m \text{ is even}. \end{cases} \]

**Proof.** We assume \( a_+ = a_\varepsilon^{2(\lambda(i) + i)} \) for any \( i \in \supp(\lambda) \). Then \( \varepsilon^{2(\lambda(i) + i)} = \varepsilon^{2(\lambda(j) + j)} \) for any \( i, j \in \supp(\lambda) \). Hence, for \( 2 \leq r \leq m \), we have \( \lambda_{i_r} - \lambda_{i_{r-1}} + i_r - i_{r-1} \equiv 0 \) (mod \( l \)). By (4.8), for \( 1 \leq r \leq m \), we obtain
\[ \lambda_{i_r} = \sum_{k=1}^{r-1} \lambda_k - \sum_{k=i_{r+1}}^n \lambda_k = \sum_{k=1}^{r-1} \lambda_k - \sum_{k=r+1}^m \lambda_k. \]
Thus, for \( 2 \leq r \leq m \), we get
\[ \lambda_{i_r} - \lambda_{i_{r-1}} + i_r - i_{r-1} = \lambda_{i_r} - \lambda_{i_{r-1}} + i_r - i_{r-1} \equiv 0 \] (mod \( l \)).
Hence \( (-1)^r \lambda_{i_r} - (-1)^{r-1} \lambda_{i_{r-1}} \equiv (-1)^{r-2} i_{r-1} + (-1)^{r-1} i_r \). Therefore, we obtain
\[ (-1)^r \lambda_{i_r} = -\lambda_{i_1} + \sum_{k=2}^r \{( -1)^k \lambda_{i_k} - ( -1)^k \lambda_{i_{k-1}} \} = -\lambda_{i_1} + \sum_{k=2}^r \{( -1)^{k-1} i_k + ( -1)^{k+2} i_{k-1} \} \]
\[ = -\lambda_{i_1} + i_1 + (-1)^{r-1} i_r + 2 \sum_{k=2}^{r-1} (-1)^{k-1} i_k \] (\( 2 \leq r \leq m \)).
Thus we have (a). In particular, if \( \lambda_{i_r} \) is as in (a), then \( \lambda_{i_{r-1}} + \lambda_{i_r} = i_{r-1} - i_r \) for any \( 2 \leq r \leq m \) and \( \lambda^{(i)} + i \equiv \lambda^{(j)} + j \) for any \( i, j \in \text{supp}(\lambda) \). Hence, for \( 1 \leq r \leq m \), we have \( \lambda^{(i_r)} + i_r \equiv \lambda^{(i_1)} + i_1 \equiv - \sum_{k=2}^{m} \lambda_{i_k} + i_1 \). If \( m \) is odd, then we get

\[
- \sum_{k=2}^{m} \lambda_{i_k} + i_1 = -(\lambda_{i_2} + \lambda_{i_3}) - \cdots - (\lambda_{i_m-1} + \lambda_{i_m}) + i_1
\]

\[
= (-i_2 + i_3) + \cdots + (-i_{m-1} + i_m) + i_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{m} (-1)^{k-1} i_k.
\]

Similarly, we have the case that \( m \) is even. Therefore we obtain (b). So we can prove “only if part” of this proposition. The proof of “if part” follows the proof of “only if part”. \( \square \)

**Remark 4.16.** For \( \lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}^n_\ast \), let \( V_q(\lambda) \) be the finite dimensional irreducible \( U_q \)-module with highest weight \( \lambda \) of type \( 1 \). For \( a \in \mathbb{C}^\times \), let \( V_q(\lambda)_a^\pm \) be the evaluation representation of \( V_q(\lambda) \) arising from \( ev_a^\pm \) (see [7]). In the case that \( q \) is not a root of unity, for any \( a_\pm \in \mathbb{C}^\times \), \( V_q(\lambda)_a^\pm \) is not isomorphic to \( V_q(\lambda)_{a^\pm} \) if \( \#(\text{supp}(\lambda)) > 1 \). But, in the case that \( q \) is a root of unity, there exist \( \lambda \in Z^q_\ast \) and \( a_k \in \mathbb{C}^\times \) such that \( V_q^{\text{fin}}(\lambda)_{a_k}^+ \) is isomorphic to \( V_q^{\text{fin}}(\lambda)_{a_k}^- \) even if \( \#(\text{supp}(\lambda)) > 1 \) by Proposition 4.14 [17].

## 5 Evaluation representations of non-restricted type

### 5.1 Schnitzer modules and evaluation representations

We fix the following notations. Let \( N := \frac{1}{2} n(n + 1) \) be the number of the positive roots of \( \mathfrak{sl}_{n+1} \). Let \( V_N \) be a \( N \)-dimensional \( \mathbb{C} \)-vector space and \( \{v(m) \in V_N \mid m = (m_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{Z}^N_\ast \} \) be a \( \mathbb{C} \)-basis of \( V_N \). For \( m \in \mathbb{Z}^N, m' \in \mathbb{Z}^N \), we set \( v(m + lm') := v(m) \). For \( i, j \in I \), we define \( \epsilon_{i,j}, \alpha_{i,j} \in \mathbb{Z}^N_\ast \) by

\[
\epsilon_{i,j} := (\delta_{i,s} \delta_{j,s})_{1 \leq r \leq n} (i \leq j), \quad \alpha_{i,j} := \sum_{k=j+1}^{i} \epsilon_{k-1,n-i+k} - \sum_{k=j}^{i} \epsilon_{k,n-i+k} (j \leq i),
\]

where \( \delta_{i,j} \) is the Kronecker’s symbol. For \( i, j \in I \), \( a = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^N \), \( c = (c_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{C}^N \), we define

\[
M_{i,j}(c) := \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} (c_{i,k} - c_{i-1,k}) + \sum_{k=i}^{j} (c_{i,k} - c_{i+1,k}) (i \leq j),
\]

\[
N_{i,j}(c) := c_{j-1,n-i+j} - c_{j,n-i+j} (j \leq i),
\]

\[
\mu_{i}(c) := \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_{i-1,k} - 2 \sum_{k=i}^{n} c_{i,k} + \sum_{k=i+1}^{n} c_{i+1,k},
\]

\[
a(c) := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} a_{i,j}^c.
\]

where \( c_{i,j} = 0 \) if the index \((i,j)\) is out of range.

**Theorem 5.1** [23 Theorem 3.2, 22]. Let \( a = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^N \), \( b = (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{C}^N \), and \( \lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}^n \). Then there exists a \( \mathbb{C} \)-algebra homomorphism \( \rho := \rho(a,b,\lambda) : \)
$U_\varepsilon \rightarrow \text{End}(V_N)$ such that for $i \in I$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_I^N$

$$\rho(E_i)(v(m)) = \sum_{j=1}^{i} a(\alpha_{i,j})[N_{i,j}(m + b)]_\varepsilon v(m + \alpha_{i,j}), \quad (5.6)$$

$$\rho(F_i)(v(m)) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a(i,j) [M_{i,j}(m + b) - \lambda_i]_\varepsilon v(m + \epsilon_{i,j}), \quad (5.7)$$

$$\rho(K_{\alpha_i})(v(m)) = \varepsilon^\mu(m+b)+\lambda_i v(m). \quad (5.8)$$

We denote the $I^N$-dimensional $U_\varepsilon$-module associated with $(\rho(a, b, \lambda), V_N)$ by $V_\varepsilon(a, b, \lambda)$.

Now, for $i \in I$ and $r = (r_1, \ldots, r_i) \in I^i$, we set

$$F_0 := [F_i, \ldots [F_2, F_1]_{e-1}]_{e-1}, \quad E_0 := [E_i, \ldots [E_2, E_1]_{e-1}]_{e-1}, \quad (5.9)$$

$$\epsilon_r := \sum_{s=1}^{i} \epsilon_{k,r_k}, \quad \alpha_r := \sum_{s=1}^{i} \alpha_{k,r_k}. \quad (5.10)$$

For $1 \leq s \leq i$, we set

$$R_{s,i} := \{ r^s_i = (r^s_{1,i}, \ldots, r^s_{i,i}) \in I^i \mid r^s_{1,i} \geq \cdots \geq r^s_{s-1,i} \geq r^s_{s,i} < r^s_{s+1,i} < \cdots < r^s_{i,i} \},$$

$$R^F_{s,i} := \{ r^s_i = (r^s_{1,i}, \ldots, r^s_{i,i}) \in R_{s,i} \mid k \leq r^s_{k,i} \leq a \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq i \},$$

$$R^E_{s,i} := \{ r^s_i = (r^s_{1,i}, \ldots, r^s_{i,i}) \in R_{s,i} \mid 1 \leq r^s_{k,i} \leq k \text{ for } 1 \leq k \leq i \},$$

$$R^F_{i} := \bigcup_{s=1}^{i} R^F_{s,i}, \quad R^E_{i} := \bigcup_{s=1}^{i} R^E_{s,i}. \quad (5.11)$$

Moreover, for $c \in \mathbb{C}^N$, set

$$C_i(c, r^s_i) := \sum_{k=1}^{i} M_{k,r^s_{k,i}}(c) - \sum_{k=s+1}^{i} M_{k,r^s_{k,i}}(c), \quad (r^s_i \in R^F_{i}),$$

$$D_i(c, r^s_i) := \sum_{k=1}^{i} N_{k,r^s_{k,i}}(c) - \sum_{k=s+1}^{i} N_{k,r^s_{k,i}}(c), \quad (r^s_i \in R^E_{i}). \quad (5.12)$$

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $a = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^N$, $b = (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{C}^N$, $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $i \in I$, and $m = (m_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{Z}_I^N$. We have

$$F_{\theta_i}v(m) = \sum_{r^s_i \in R^F_i} (-1)^{i+s} a(\epsilon_{r^s_i})c^{C_i(m+b,r^s_i)} - \lambda^{s-i+1-s}[M_{s,r^s_{s,i}}(m+b) - \lambda_s]_\varepsilon v(m + \epsilon_{r^s_i}),$$

$$E_{\theta_i}v(m) = \sum_{r^s_i \in R^E_i} (-1)^{i+s} a(\alpha_{r^s_i})c^{D_i(m+b,r^s_i)+1-s}[N_{s,r^s_{s,i}}(m+b) - \lambda_s]_\varepsilon v(m + \alpha_{r^s_i}),$$

in $V_\varepsilon(a, b, \lambda)$, where $\lambda^{s,i} := \sum_{k=1}^{i} \lambda_k - \sum_{k=s+1}^{i} \lambda_k$.

Proof. We shall prove the $F_{\theta_i}$-case by the induction on $i$. We can prove the $E_{\theta_i}$-case similarly. If $i = 1$, then we have

$$F_{\theta_i}v(m) = \sum_{r^s_1 \in R^F_1} a(\epsilon_{1,r^s_1})[M_{1,r^s_1}(m+b) - \lambda_1]_\varepsilon v(m + \epsilon_{1,r^s_1}).$$
We replace $r_{i,1}^1$ with $j$. Then we obtain

\[ F_{\theta_1} v(m) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a(\epsilon_{1,j}) [M_{1,j}(m+b) - \lambda_1] \epsilon v(m + \epsilon_{1,j}) = F_1 v(m). \]

Now we assume that $i > 1$ and we get the case of $(i - 1)$. For $i \leq j \leq n$, $r^*_{i-1} \in R^E_{i-1}$, we set

\begin{align*}
M(r^*_{i-1}, j) &:= [M_{s,r^*_{i-1}}(m+b) - \lambda_s] \epsilon [M_{i,j}(m+b) - \lambda_i + M_{i,j} (\epsilon_{r^*_{i-1}})] \epsilon \\
&= -\varepsilon^{C_{i-1}(r^*_{i-1})^{-1}} [M_{s,r^*_{i-1}}(m+b) - \lambda_s + M_{s,r^*_{i-1}} (\epsilon_{i,j})] \epsilon [M_{i,j}(m+b) - \lambda_i] \epsilon.
\end{align*}

Then, by the assumption of the induction, we have

\[ F_{\theta_j} v(m) = [F_i, F_{\theta_{i-1}}] \epsilon v(m) \]

\[ = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sum_{r^*_{i-1} \in R^E_{i-1}} (-1)^{i+s-1} a_{i,j} a(\epsilon_{r^*_{i-1}}) \epsilon^{C_{i-1}(m+b,r^*_{i-1}) - \lambda^{(s,i-1)}} + 1 - s M(r^*_{i-1}, j) \epsilon v(m + \epsilon_{r^*_{i-1}} + \epsilon_{i,j}). \]

Now we set

\[ \xi(j > j') := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j > j', \\ 0 & \text{if } j \leq j', \end{cases} \quad \xi(j \leq j') := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j \leq j', \\ 0 & \text{if } j < j'. \end{cases} \]

Then, for any $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, $1 \leq i' \leq j' \leq n$, we get

\[ M_{i,j}(\epsilon_{i',j'}) = -\delta_{i,i'} \xi(j > j') + \delta_{i,j'} \xi(j > j') + \delta_{i,j'} \xi(j \geq j') - \delta_{i+1,j'} \xi(j \geq j'), \]

Hence, for any $i \leq j \leq n$, $1 \leq s \leq i - 1$, $r^*_{i-1} \in R^E_{i-1}$, we have

\begin{align*}
M_{i,j}(\epsilon_{s,i-1}) &= -\xi(j > r^*_{s-1,i-1}) - M_{s,r^*_{s-1,i-1}}(\epsilon_{s,i}) = -\delta_{s,i-1} \xi(r^*_{s-1,i-1} \geq j), \\
C_{i-1}(i,j, r^*_{i-1}) &= \xi(i-1 > s) \xi(r^*_{i-1,i-1} \geq j).
\end{align*}

Thus, we have

\begin{align*}
M(r^*_{i-1}, j) &= [M_{s,r^*_{i-1}}(m+b) - \lambda_s] \epsilon [M_{i,j}(m+b) - \lambda_i - \xi(j > r^*_{i-1,i-1})] \epsilon \\
&= -\varepsilon^{C_{i-1}(r^*_{i-1})^{-1}} [M_{s,r^*_{i-1}}(m+b) - \lambda_s - \delta_{s,i-1} \xi(r^*_{s-1,i-1} \geq j)] \epsilon [M_{i,j}(m+b) - \lambda_i] \epsilon.
\end{align*}

Since $[c] \epsilon = \varepsilon^{-1} \epsilon$ and $[c-1] \epsilon = \varepsilon^{-1} \epsilon$, we have

\begin{align*}
M(r^*_{i-1}, j) &= -\varepsilon^{M_{s,i,j}(m+b) + \lambda_i} [M_{s,r^*_{i-1}}(m+b) - \lambda_s] \epsilon \quad (s \leq i - 1, \ r^*_{i-1, i-1} < j), \\
M(r^*_{i-1}, j) &= 0 \quad (s < i - 1, \ j \leq r^*_{i-1, i-1}), \\
M(r^*_{i-1}, j) &= \varepsilon^{M_{i,j}(m+b) - \lambda_i} \epsilon \quad (j \leq r^*_{i-1, i-1}),
\end{align*}

where $\tilde{M}(r^*_{i-1}, j) := M_{i-1,r^*_{i-1,i-1}}(m+b) - \lambda_i - 1$. Therefore we obtain

\[ F_{\theta_0} v(m) = \sum_{j > r^*_{i-1,i-1}} \sum_{r^*_{i-1} \in R^E_{i-1}} (-1)^{i+s} a(\epsilon_{r^*_{i-1}} + \epsilon_{i,j}) \epsilon^{C_{i-1}(m+b,r^*_{i-1}) - M_{s,i,j}(m+b) - \lambda^{(s,i-1)}} + 1 - s [M_{s,r^*_{i-1}}(m+b) - \lambda_s] \epsilon v(m + \epsilon_{r^*_{i-1}} + \epsilon_{i,j}) \]

\[ + \sum_{j \leq r^*_{i-1,i-1}} \sum_{r^*_{i-1} \in R^E_{i-1,i-1}} (-1)^{i+s} a(\epsilon_{r^*_{i-1}} + \epsilon_{i,j}) \epsilon^{C_{i-1}(m+b,r^*_{i-1}) - M_{s,i,j}(m+b) - \lambda^{(s,i-1)}} + 1 - s [M_{i,j}(m+b) - \lambda_i] \epsilon v(m + \epsilon_{r^*_{i-1}} + \epsilon_{i,j}). \]
Here, if we set
\[ r^s_i = (r^s_{i,i}, \cdots, r^s_{i,i-1}) := \begin{cases} (r^s_{i,i-1}, \cdots, r^s_{i,i-1, j}) & \text{if } s \leq i - 1 \text{ and } j > r^s_{i-1,i-1} \\ (r^s_{i,i-1}, \cdots, r^s_{i,i-1, j}) & \text{if } s = i \text{ and } j \leq r^s_{i-1,i-1} \end{cases} \]
then we have \( F_{\theta_s} \)-case.

For \( s \in I \), we set
\[
R^s := \{ r^s = (r^s_k)_{k \in I} \in \mathbb{P}^n \mid r^s_0 \geq \cdots \geq r^s_{s-1} \geq r^s_s < r^s_{s+1} < \cdots < r^s_n \}, \\
R^E_+ := \{ r^s = (r^s_k)_{k \in I} \in R^i_s \mid k \leq r^s_k \leq n \text{ for any } k \in I \}, \\
R^E := \{ r^s = (r^s_k)_{k \in I} \in R^i_s \mid 1 \leq r^s_k \leq n \text{ for any } k \in I \}, \\
R^F := \bigsqcup_{s=1}^{n} R^E_+, \quad R^E := \bigsqcup_{s=1}^{n} R^E.
\]
(5.13)

Note if \( r^s = (r^s_k)_{k \in I} \in R^F_+ \) (resp. \( R^E \)), then \( r^s_k = k \) for any \( s \leq k \leq n \) (resp. \( r^s_k = 1 \) for any \( 1 \leq k \leq s \)). Moreover, for \( c \in \mathbb{C}^N \), we set
\[
C(c, r^s) := c_{s-1,s-1} - c_{n,n} + \sum_{k=1}^{n} c_{1,k} + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} \sum_{p=r^s_{k+1}}^{r^s_{k-1}} c_{k,p} - \sum_{k=1}^{s} \sum_{p=r^s_{k+1}}^{r^s_{k-1}} c_{k,p} \quad (r^s \in R^E_+), \\
D(c, r^s) := - \sum_{k=s+1}^{n} c_{1,k} - \sum_{k=s+1}^{n} (c_{r^s_k-1,n-k} - c_{r^s_k,n-k+r^s_k}) \quad (r^s \in R^E).
\]
(5.14)

where \( r^s_0 := n \). Then, by Lemma \( \text{(5.2)} \) we obtain the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.3.** Let \( a = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^N \), \( b = (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{C}^N \), \( \lambda = (\lambda_t)_{t \in I} \in \mathbb{C}^n \), and \( m = (m_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{Z}^N \). We have
\[
F_{\theta_s}(m) = \sum_{r^s \in R^F} (-1)^{s+n} a(\varepsilon_{r^s}) e^{C(m+b,r^s)-\lambda(r^s+1)-s}
\]
\[ [-m_{s-1,s-1} + m_{s,s} - b_{s-1,s-1} + b_{s,s} - \lambda_s] e^{v(m + \varepsilon_r)}, \]
\[ E_{\theta_s}(m) = \sum_{r^s \in R^E} (-1)^{s+n} a(\varepsilon_{r^s}) e^{D(m+b,r^s+1)-s}[m_{1,n-1} - b_{1,n-1} + 1] e^{v(m + \varepsilon_r)}, \]
in \( V_\varepsilon(a,b,\lambda) \), where \( \lambda \) as in \( \text{(4.3)} \).

Let \( U_\varepsilon^{\prime} \) (resp. \( U_\varepsilon \)) be the extended algebra of \( U_\varepsilon \) (resp. \( U_\varepsilon^{\prime} \)) defined by replacing \{\( K_\mu | \mu \in Q \)\} with \{\( K_\mu | \mu \in P \)\} (see Definition \( \text{(2.1)} \)). By \( \text{(2.13)} \), we have \( ev^\pm_a(U_\varepsilon) \subset U_\varepsilon^{\prime} \) (\( a \in \mathbb{C}^\times \)). So we obtain the evaluation homomorphisms \( ev^\pm_a : U_\varepsilon \rightarrow U_\varepsilon \) as in Proposition \( \text{(2.6)} \).

On the other hand, by \( \text{(2.1)} \), we can regard an arbitrary Schnizer module \( V_\varepsilon(a,b,\lambda) \) as a \( U_\varepsilon^{\prime} \)-module if we define
\[
K_\lambda, v(m) := e^{-\sum_{s=i}^{n} \varepsilon_{r^s_{i,i}}(m_{i,i} + b_{i,i}) + \lambda_i} v(m),
\]
(5.15)
for any \( i \in I, m \in \mathbb{Z}^N \), where \( \lambda \), as in \( \text{(4.3)} \).

**Definition 5.4.** Let \( a = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^N \), \( b = (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{C}^N \), \( \lambda = (\lambda_t)_{t \in I} \in \mathbb{C}^n \), and \( a \in \mathbb{C}^\times \). Then we define \( \bar{ev}^\pm_a := ev^\pm_a(a,b,\lambda) := \rho(a,b,\lambda) \circ ev^\pm_{a^\lambda} : U_\varepsilon \rightarrow \text{End}(V_\varepsilon) \), where \( \rho = \rho(a,b,\lambda) \) as in Theorem \( \text{(5.7)} \) and \( a^\lambda \) are as in \( \text{(4.4)} \). We denote the \( l^N \)-dimensional \( U_\varepsilon \)-module associated with \( (\bar{ev}^\pm_a, V_\varepsilon) \) by \( V_\varepsilon(a,b,\lambda)^\pm \).
For $c \in C^N$, we set
\[ C_E(c, r^s) := c_{s-1, s-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} \sum_{p=r_k^s+1}^{r_k^s-1} c_{k,p} + \sum_{k=1}^{s} \sum_{p=r_k^s+1}^{r_k^s} c_{k,p} \quad (r^s \in R^F), \]
\[ D_F(c, r^s) := -c_{n,n} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-s+1} c_{1,k} - \sum_{k=s+1}^{n} (c_{r_k^s-1, n-k+r_k^s} - c_{r_k^s, n-k+r_k^s}) \quad (r^s \in R^F). \]

(5.16)

**Theorem 5.5.** Let $a = (a_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in (C^\times)^N$, $b = (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in C^N$, $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in C^n$, and $a \in C^\times$. Then, for any $i \in I$ and $m \in Z^+_l$, we obtain
\[ \tilde{\epsilon}^+ v_i^a(E_i)(v(m)) = \rho(E_i)(v(m)), \quad \tilde{\epsilon}^+ v_i^a(F_i)(v(m)) = \rho(F_i)(v(m)), \]
\[ \tilde{\epsilon}^+ v_i^a(K_i)(v(m)) = \rho(K_i)(v(m)), \]
\[ \tilde{\epsilon}^+ v_i^a(E_0)(v(m)) = a \sum_{r^s \in R^F} (-1)^{s+n} a(\epsilon_r, s) \epsilon^{(C_E(m+b, r^s) - \lambda(s) - s + n)} \]
\[ \tilde{\epsilon}^+ v_i^a(F_0)(v(m)) = a^{-1} \sum_{r^s \in R^F} (-1)^{s-1} a(\alpha_r, s) \epsilon^{(C_E(m+b, r^s) - s + n+1)} \]
where $\epsilon_r, \alpha_r$ as in (5.17), $R^F, R^E$ as in (5.18), and $C_E(m+b, r^s), D_F(m+b, r^s)$ as in (5.16).

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, Theorem 5.4, Lemma 5.3 and (5.15), we obtain the $\tilde{\epsilon}^+ v_i^a$-case. Similarly, we obtain the $\tilde{\epsilon} - v_i^a$-case. \qed

**5.2 Nilpotent modules**

**Definition 5.6.** Let $V$ be a $\tilde{U}_e$-module (resp. $U_e$-module). We assume $E_i^j = F_i^j = E_{i,s} \delta = 0$ on $V$ for any $\beta = i, s \in \mathbb{N}$ (resp. $E_i^j = F_i^j = 0$ on $V$ for any $\gamma = i, s \in \mathbb{N}$). Then we call $V$ “nilpotent” $\tilde{U}_e$-module (resp. $U_e$-module). In particular, if $K_i^j = 1$ on $V$ for any $i \in I$, then we call $V$ nilpotent $\tilde{U}_e$-module (resp. $U_e$-module) of “type 1”.

For $\lambda \in Z^n_l$, let $V^\text{fin}_e(\lambda)$ be the $U_e^\text{fin}$-module in §4.1. By Proposition 5.14 we can regard $V^\text{fin}_e(\lambda)$ as a nilpotent $U_e$-module. We denote $U_e$-module $V^\text{fin}_e(\lambda)$ by $V^\text{nil}_e(\lambda)$. By Proposition 5.7 and Proposition 5.8 we obtain the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.7.** For any $\lambda \in Z^n_l$, $V^\text{nil}_e(\lambda)$ is a finite dimensional irreducible nilpotent $U_e$-module of type 1. Conversely, for any finite dimensional irreducible nilpotent $U_e$-module $V$ of type 1, there exists a unique $\lambda \in Z^n_l$ such that $V$ is isomorphic to $V^\text{nil}_e(\lambda)$.

We can construct $V^\text{nil}_e(\lambda)$ as a $U_e$-submodule of Schnizer module $V_e(a, b, \lambda)$ as follows (11, 21). For $i, j \in I$ ($i \leq j$), $\lambda \in Z^n_l$, we set
\[ a_{i,j}^{(0)} := 1, \quad b_{i,j}^{(0)} := 0, \quad a^{(0)} := (a_{i,j}^{(0)})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n}, \quad b^{(0)} := (b_{i,j}^{(0)})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n}, \quad \rho^{(0)} := \rho(a^{(0)}, b^{(0)}, \lambda), \quad V^\alpha_e(\lambda) := V_e(a^{(0)}, b^{(0)}, \lambda). \]

(5.17)

We denote $v(0)$ in $V^\alpha_e(\lambda)$ by $v(0)$. For $\lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in Z^n_l$, we define $m^\lambda = (m_{i,j}^\lambda)_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in Z^n_l$ by
\[ m_{i,j}^\lambda \equiv \sum_{k=1}^{i} \lambda_{j-k+1} \pmod{l} \quad 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n. \]

(5.19)
Proposition 5.8. Let \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n \) and \( v \in V_\varepsilon(\lambda) \).

(a) We have \( E_i v = 0 \) for any \( i \in I \) if and only if \( v \in \mathbb{C} \varepsilon(0) \).

(b) We have \( F_i v = 0 \) for any \( i \in I \) if and only if \( v \in \mathbb{C} \varepsilon(m^\lambda) \).

Proof. By (5.19), we obtain (a). So we shall prove (b).

“If part”. By (5.19), we have

\[
m_{i,j} - m_{i-1,j} = \lambda_i, \quad m_{i,j} - m_{i-1,j} = \lambda_j - \lambda_i, \quad \lambda_i = 0
\]

for any \( 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \). Hence, by (5.2), we get

\[
M_{i,j}(m^\lambda) = m_{i,j} - m_{i-1,j} + \sum_{k=0}^{j-1} (m_{i,k} - m_{i-1,k}) + \sum_{k=i+1}^{j} (m_{i,k} - m_{i+1,k})
\]

for any \( 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n \). Therefore, by (5.19), we obtain

\[
F_i v(m^\lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [M_{i,j}(m^\lambda) - \lambda_i] \varepsilon v(m^\lambda + \epsilon_i) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} [\lambda_i - \lambda_i \varepsilon v(m^\lambda + \epsilon_i)] = 0 \quad (i \in I).
\]

“Only if part”. Let \( v = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n} c_m v(m) \in V(\lambda)(c_m \in \mathbb{C}) \). We assume that \( F_i v = 0 \) for any \( i \in I \). Set

\[
\mathbb{Z}_p^n(r) := \{(m_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n \mid m_{i,j} = m_{i,j} \text{ if } j - i < r \} \quad (r = 1, \ldots, n), \quad \mathbb{Z}_p^n(0) := \mathbb{Z}_p^n.
\]

Then we have

\[
\mathbb{Z}_p^n = \mathbb{Z}_p^n(0) \supset \mathbb{Z}_p^n(1) \supset \cdots \supset \mathbb{Z}_p^n(n) = \{m^\lambda\}.
\]

We shall prove that there exist \( c_m \) (\( m \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n(r) \)) such that \( v = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n(r)} c_m v(m) \) by the induction on \( r \). Indeed, if we can prove this claim, then we obtain \( v = c_m v(m^\lambda) \in \mathbb{C} \varepsilon(m^\lambda) \). If \( r = 0 \), then there is nothing to prove. So we assume that \( r > 0 \) and we obtain the case of \( (r-1) \).

By the similar way to the proof of “if part”, for any \( m \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n(r-1) \), we have \( M_{i,j}(m) = \lambda_i \) if \( j - i < r - 1 \). Moreover, for any \( m \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n(r-1) \) and \( i \in I \) such that \( i + r - 1 \leq n \), we get

\[
M_{i,i+r-1}(m) = \sum_{k=i}^{i+r-2} m_{i,k} - \sum_{k=i-1}^{i+r-2} m_{i-1,k} + \sum_{k=i}^{i+r-1} m_{i,k} - \sum_{k=i}^{i+r-1} m_{i+1,k}
\]

\[
= M_{i,i+r-1}(m^\lambda) - m_{i-1,i+r-2} + m_{i,i+r-1} + m_{i-1,i+r-2} - m_{i,i+r-1}
\]

\[
= \lambda_i - m_{i-1,i+r-2} - m_{i,i+r-1} - \lambda_{i+r-1}.
\]

Therefore, by (5.19), we get

\[
F_i v = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n(r-1)} c_m [m_{i,i+r-1} - m_{i-1,i+r-2} - \lambda_{i+r-1}] \varepsilon v(m + \epsilon_{i,i+r-1})
\]

\[
+ \sum_{j=i+r}^{n} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n(r-1)} c_m [M_{i,j}(m) - \lambda_i] \varepsilon v(m + \epsilon_{i,j}) = 0 \quad (i \leq n - r + 1).
\]

Now, for \( 1 \leq s \leq n - r + 1 \), we set

\[
\mathbb{Z}_p^n(r-1,s) := \{(m_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^n(r-1) \mid m_{i,i+r-1} - m_{i-1,i+r-2} - \lambda_{i+r-1} \equiv 0 \pmod{l} \text{ if } s \leq i \leq n - r + 1 \}.
\]
We have $m_{i,i+r-1} - m_{i-1,i+r-2} \equiv \lambda_{i+r-1}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n - r + 1$ if and only if $m_{i,i+r-1} = m^{\lambda}_{i,i+r-1}$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n - r + 1$. Hence we get

$$Z^n_l(r - 1) \supset Z^n_l(r - 1, n - r + 1) \supset \cdots \supset Z^n_l(r - 1, 1) = Z^n_l(r).$$

So it is enough to prove that there exist $c_m (m \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s))$ such that $v = \sum_{m \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s)} c_m v(m)$ for any $1 \leq s \leq n - r + 1$. We shall prove this claim by the induction on $s$. By (5.21), we obtain

$$F_{n-r+1} = \sum_{m \in Z^n_l(r - 1)} c_m [m_{n-1,n} - m_{n-r+1,n} - \lambda_n] v(m + \epsilon_{n-r+1,n}) = 0.$$

Thus, $c_m [m_{n-r+1,n} - m_{n-r+1,n} - \lambda_n] = 0$ for any $m \in Z^n_l(r - 1)$. So if $c_m \neq 0$ for any $m \in Z^n_l(r - 1)$, then $m_{n-r+1,n} - m_{n-r+1,n} \equiv \lambda_n$. Hence $v = \sum_{m \in Z^n_l(r - 1, n - r + 1)} c_m v(m)$.

Now we assume that $s < n - r + 1$ and we obtain the case of $(s + 1)$. By (5.21), we get

$$F_s v = \sum_{m \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s+1)} c_m [m_{s,s+r-1} - m_{s-1,s+r-2} - \lambda_{s+r-1}] v(m + \epsilon_{s,s+r-1})$$

$$+ \sum_{j=s+r \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s+1)} c_m [M_{s,j}(m) - \lambda_s] v(m + \epsilon_{s,j}) = 0.$$

Here, for $m = (m_{i,j})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s + 1)$, we obtain

$$(m + \epsilon_{s,s+r-1})_{s+1,s+r} - (m + \epsilon_{s,s+r-1})_{s,s+r-1} \equiv (m_{s+1,s+r} - m_{s,s+r-1}) - 1$$

$$\equiv \lambda_{s+r} - 1,$$

$$(m + \epsilon_{s,j})_{s+1,s+r} - (m + \epsilon_{s,j})_{s,s+r-1} \equiv m_{s+1,s+r} - m_{s,s+r-1}$$

$$\equiv \lambda_{s+r} \ (s + r \leq j \leq n).$$

Hence, by the linear independence, we obtain $c_m [m_{s,s+r-1} - m_{s-1,s+r-2} - \lambda_{s+r-1}] = 0$ for any $m \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s + 1)$. So if $c_m \neq 0$, then $m_{s,s+r-1} - m_{s-1,s+r-2} \equiv \lambda_{s+r}$ for any $m \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s + 1)$. Then we have $v = \sum_{m \in Z^n_l(r - 1, s)} c_m v(m)$. \qed

For $\lambda \in Z^n_l$, let $V^0(\lambda)$ be as in (5.13) and $L^{\text{nil}}(\lambda)$ the $U_\epsilon$-submodule of $V^0(\lambda)$ generated by $v_\lambda(0)$.

**Theorem 5.9** ([11], [21]). *For any $\lambda \in Z^n_l$, $L^{\text{nil}}(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to $V^0(\lambda)$ as a $U_\epsilon$-module.*

For $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$, $\lambda \in Z^n_l$, let $V^0(\lambda)_a^\pm$ (resp. $L^{\text{nil}}(\lambda)_a^\pm$) be the evaluation representation of $V^0(\lambda)$ (resp. $L^{\text{nil}}(\lambda)_a$) (see Definition 5.4). Then $L^{\text{nil}}(\lambda)_a^\pm$ is the $U_\epsilon$-submodule of $V^0(\lambda)_a^\pm$ generated by $v_\lambda(0)$ respectively.

Now, let $\phi : \tilde{U}_\epsilon / I_\epsilon \to \tilde{U}_\epsilon^{\text{fin}}$ (resp. $\phi : U_\epsilon / I_\epsilon \to U_\epsilon^{\text{fin}}$) be the isomorphism in Theorem 3.13 (resp. Proposition 2.12). Let $I'_\epsilon$ be the two sided ideal of $U'_\epsilon$ generated by $\{E^i_{\gamma}, F^i_{\gamma}, K^\pm, 1 \mid \gamma \in \Delta_+, \mu \in P\}$. Then we can regard $\phi$ as an isomorphism from $U'_\epsilon / I'_\epsilon$ to $(U_\epsilon^{\text{fin}})^\gamma$. Let $\tilde{\pi} : \tilde{U}_\epsilon \to \tilde{U}_\epsilon / I_\epsilon$ (resp. $\pi : U'_\epsilon \to U'_\epsilon / I'_\epsilon$) be the projection and $\phi_a^\pm : \tilde{U}_\epsilon \to U_\epsilon$ (resp. $(\phi_a^\pm)^{\text{ev}} : \tilde{U}_\epsilon^{\text{fin}} \to (U_\epsilon^{\text{fin}})^\gamma$) the evaluation homomorphism in Proposition 2.4 (resp. (12))). Then, by the definition of these maps, the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{c}
\tilde{U}_\epsilon \\
\downarrow \phi \\
U_\epsilon
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\tilde{U}_\epsilon / I_\epsilon \\
\downarrow \tilde{\pi} \\
U'_\epsilon / I'_\epsilon
\end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\phi_a^{\text{ev}} \\
\downarrow \phi_a^1 \\
(U_\epsilon^{\text{fin}})^\gamma
\end{array}$$

(5.22)
Proposition 5.10. For any \( a \in \mathbb{C}^x \) and \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+ \), \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is a finite dimensional irreducible \( U^\mathbb{m} \)-module of type 1.

Proof. We shall prove the case of \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \). Since we can prove the case of \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a}^- \) similarly. By Theorem 3.9, \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is a finite dimensional irreducible \( \bar{U} \)-module of type 1. So we shall prove that \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is a nilpotent \( U \)-module.

For \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+ \), let \( \rho_\lambda^0 \) as in (3.18). We define \( \tilde{\rho}_\lambda^0 : \bar{U}_e/I_e \rightarrow \text{End}(L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)) \) by \( \tilde{\rho}_\lambda^0(u + I_e) := \rho_\lambda^0(u) \) for any \( u \in \bar{U}_e \). Since \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is a nilpotent \( U \)-module, \( \tilde{\rho}_\lambda^0 \) is well defined. Then, for any \( u \in \bar{U}_e \), \( v \in L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \), we have \( u.v = \tilde{\rho}_\lambda^0 \circ \pi(u)(v) \) on \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \). Hence, for any \( u \in \bar{U}_e \) and \( v \in L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \), we get

\[
u.v = \tilde{\rho}_\lambda^0 \circ \pi \circ \text{ev}_a^+(u)(v) = \tilde{\rho}_\lambda^0 \circ (\tilde{\phi}^\dagger)^{-1} \circ (\text{ev}_a^\mathbb{m})^+ \circ \tilde{\phi} \circ \tilde{\pi}(u)(v) \quad \text{on} \quad L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+,
\]

by (5.22). Since \( \tilde{\pi}(\bar{l}_e) = 0 \), we obtain \( \bar{l}_e = 0 \) on \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \). Therefore \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is a nilpotent \( \bar{U} \)-module.

By Theorem 3.15 and Proposition 5.10, we can regard \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) as a \( \bar{U}^\mathbb{m} \)-module. We denote \( \bar{U}^\mathbb{m} \)-module \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) by \( \bar{L}^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \). Let \( \mathbb{P}_a^\pm \) be as in (4.10) and \( \bar{V}^\mathbb{m}(\mathbb{P}_a^\pm) \) the evaluation representation of \( \bar{U}^\mathbb{m} \) in §4. Then, by Theorem 4.13, 5.9, \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is isomorphic to \( \bar{V}^\mathbb{m}(\mathbb{P}_a^\pm) \) as a \( \bar{U}^\mathbb{m} \)-module. Hence, by Proposition 4.14, we obtain the following proposition.

Proposition 5.11. Let \( \lambda = (\lambda_i)_{i \in I} \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+ \), \( a_\pm \in \mathbb{C}^x \).

(a) If \( \lambda = 0 \), then \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is isomorphic to \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_-}^- \) as a \( \bar{U} \)-module.

(b) In the case of \( \lambda \neq 0 \), \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is isomorphic to \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_-}^- \) as a \( U \)-module if and only if \( a_+ = a_- \varepsilon^{2(\lambda_0^{(i)} + i)} \) for any \( i \in \text{supp}(\lambda) \).

5.3 Alternative proof of Proposition 5.11(b)

We can also prove Proposition 5.11(b) without using the theory of restricted type. We give here the alternative proof.

“Proof of only if part.” We assume that \( \lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_n^+ \). Then there exists a \( \bar{U} \)-module isomorphism \( \phi : L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \rightarrow L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_-}^- \). By Proposition 5.31, there exists \( d \in \mathbb{C}^x \) such that \( \phi(v\lambda(0)) = dv\lambda(0) \). Since \( L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \) is generated by \( v\lambda(0) \) as a \( \bar{U} \)-module, we obtain \( \phi(v) = dv \) for any \( v \in L^\mathbb{m}(\lambda)_{a_+}^+ \).

Hence,

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0)v\lambda(0) & = d^{-1}\phi(\mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0)v\lambda(0)) = d^{-1}\mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0)v\lambda(0) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0)v\lambda(0) \\
\mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0)v\lambda(0) & = d^{-1}\phi(\mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0)v\lambda(0)) = d^{-1}\mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0)v\lambda(0) = \mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0)v\lambda(0).
\end{align*}
\]

(5.23)

For \( c = (c_{ij})_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \in C^N \), \( r^* \in R^F \), let \( C_E(c, r^*) \) be as in (5.10). Then \( C_E(c, r^*) = 0 \) for any \( r^* \in R^F \). By Theorem 3.7, we obtain

\[
\mathbb{e}_a^+(-n)(E_0)v\lambda(0) = a_\pm \sum_{r^* \in R^F} (-1)^{s+n_+} \varepsilon^{-\lambda^{(i)}+s+n_+}[-\lambda_\dagger]_\varepsilon v(r^*).
\]

(5.24)

Since \( \{v(\varepsilon_{r^*}) \mid r^* \in R^F \} \) is linearly independent, by (5.73) and (5.24), we have \( a_\pm \varepsilon^{-\lambda^{(i)}-s}[\lambda_\dagger]_\varepsilon \) for any \( s \in I \). Hence \( a_\pm = a_\pm \varepsilon^{2(\lambda_0^{(i)} + i)} \) for any \( i \in \text{supp}(\lambda) \).

“Proof of if part.” We assume that \( a_\pm = a_\pm \varepsilon^{2(\lambda_0^{(i)} + i)} \) for any \( i \in \text{supp}(\lambda) \). By the definition of \( \mathbb{e}_a^\pm \), we have \( \mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0) \), \( \mathbb{e}_a^+(F_i) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(F_i) \), and \( \mathbb{e}_a^+(K_{\alpha_i}) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(K_{\alpha_i}) \) on \( V^\mathbb{m}(\lambda) \) for any \( i \in I \). So it is enough to prove that \( \mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0) \) and \( \mathbb{e}_a^+(F_0) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(F_0) \) on \( V^\mathbb{m}(\lambda) \). By (5.24), we obtain \( \mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0)v\lambda(0) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0)v\lambda(0) \). On the other hand, for any \( j_1, \ldots, j_r \in I \), we get

\[
\begin{align*}
\mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0)(F_{j_1} \cdots F_{j_r})v\lambda(0) & = \mathbb{e}_a^+(F_{j_1} \cdots F_{j_r})(\mathbb{e}_a^+(E_0)v\lambda(0)) \\
& = \mathbb{e}_a^-(F_{j_1} \cdots F_{j_r})(\mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0)v\lambda(0)) = \mathbb{e}_a^-(E_0)(F_{j_1} \cdots F_{j_r})v\lambda(0).
\end{align*}
\]
Since \( L^\text{nil}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) is spanned by \( U_\varepsilon^- v_\lambda(0) \) as a \( \mathbb{C} \)-vector space, we obtain \( \tilde{ev}_{a_-}(E_0) = \tilde{ev}_{a_-}(E_0) \).

Now, for \( c = (c_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} \in \mathbb{C}^N \), \( r^s \in R^E \), let \( D_F(c, r^s) \) be as in Proposition 5.5 and \( m^\lambda \) be as in (5.19). Then, for any \( r^s \in R^E \), we have

\[
D_F(m^\lambda, r^s) = -m^\lambda_{n,n} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-s+1} m^\lambda_{1,k} - \sum_{k=s+1}^{n} \left( m^\lambda_{r_k, r_n + r_k} - m^\lambda_{r_k, r_n - r_k} \right)
\]

(see (5.20)). Hence, by Theorem 5.5, we get

\[
\tilde{ev}_{a_\pm}(F_0) v(m^\lambda) \equiv a_\pm^{-1} \sum_{r^s \in R^E} (-1)^{s-1} \varepsilon^{\pm (\lambda(n-s+1) - s + n + 1) - n} [-\lambda_{n-s+1}] v(m^\lambda + \alpha_{r^s}).
\]

By the assumption, if \( \lambda_{n-s+1} \neq 0 \), then we have \( a_+ = a_- \varepsilon^{2(\lambda(n-s+1) + (n-s+1))} \). So we obtain

\[
a_+^{-1} \varepsilon^{\lambda(n-s+1) - s + n + 1} = a_-^{-1} \varepsilon^{-2\lambda(n-s+1) - 2(n-s+1) + \lambda(n-s+1) - s + n + 1} = a_-^{-1} \varepsilon^{-(\lambda(n-s+1) - s + n + 1)}.
\]

We have that \( \tilde{ev}_{a_+}(F_0) v(m^\lambda) = \tilde{ev}_{a_-}(F_0) v(m^\lambda) \).

On the other hand, by the similar way to the proof of Proposition 5.6 in [21], we obtain that there exists a nonzero vector \( v_\lambda \in L^\text{nil}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) such that \( F_i v_\lambda = 0 \) for any \( i \in I \). Hence, by Proposition 5.8 (b), we obtain \( v(m^\lambda) \in L^\text{nil}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \). Then \( L^\text{nil}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \) is spanned by \( U_\varepsilon^+ v(m^\lambda) \) as a \( \mathbb{C} \)-vector space. Therefore, by the similar way to the proof of \( E_0 \)-case, we obtain \( \tilde{ev}_{a_+}(F_0) = \tilde{ev}_{a_-}(F_0) \) on \( L^\text{nil}_\varepsilon(\lambda) \).
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