HALL ALGEBRAS OF CYCLIC QUIVERS AND $q$-DEFORMED FOCK SPACES

BANGMING DENG AND JIE XIAO

Abstract. Based on the work of Ringel and Green, one can define the (Drinfeld) double Ringel–Hall algebra $D(Q)$ of a quiver $Q$ as well as its highest weight modules. The main purpose of the present paper is to show that the basic representation $L(\Lambda_0)$ of $D(\Delta_n)$ of the cyclic quiver $\Delta_n$ provides a realization of the $q$-deformed Fock space $\bigwedge^\infty$ defined by Hayashi. This is worked out by extending a construction of Varagnolo and Vasserot. By analysing the structure of nilpotent representations of $\Delta_n$, we obtain a decomposition of the basic representation $L(\Lambda_0)$ which induces the Kashiwara–Miwa–Stern decomposition of $\bigwedge^\infty$ and a construction of the canonical basis of $\bigwedge^\infty$ defined by Leclerc and Thibon in terms of certain monomial basis elements in $D(\Delta_n)$.

1. Introduction

In [39], Ringel introduced the Hall algebra $H(\Delta_n)$ of the cyclic quiver $\Delta_n$ with $n$ vertices and showed that its subalgebra generated by simple representations, called the composition algebra, is isomorphic to the positive part $U^+_v(\hat{sl}_n)$ of the quantized enveloping algebra $U_v(\hat{sl}_n)$. Schiffmann [40] further showed that $H(\Delta_n)$ is the tensor product of $U^+_v(\hat{sl}_n)$ with a central subalgebra which is the polynomial ring in infinitely many indeterminates. Following the approach in [44], the double Ringel–Hall algebra $D(\Delta_n)$ was defined in [6]. Based on [12, 21] and an explicit description of central elements of $H(\Delta_n)$ in [19], it was shown in [6, Th. 2.3.3] that $D(\Delta_n)$ is isomorphic to the quantum affine algebra $U_v(\hat{gl}_n)$ defined by Drinfeld’s new presentation [10].

The $q$-deformed Fock space representation $\bigwedge^\infty$ of the quantized enveloping algebra $U_v(\hat{sl}_n)$ has been constructed by Hayashi [17], and its crystal basis was described by Misra and Miwa [36]. Further, by work of Kashiwara, Miwa, and Stern [27], the action of $U_v(\hat{sl}_n)$ on $\bigwedge^\infty$ is centralized by a Heisenberg algebra which arises from affine Hecke algebras. This yields a bimodule isomorphism from $\bigwedge^\infty$ to the tensor product of the basic representation of $U_v(\hat{sl}_n)$ and the Fock space representation of the Heisenberg algebra.

By defining a natural semilinear involution on $\bigwedge^\infty$, Leclerc and Thibon [29] obtained in an elementary way a canonical basis of $\bigwedge^\infty$. It was conjectured in [28, 29] that for $q = 1$, the coefficients of the transition matrix of the canonical basis on the natural basis of $\bigwedge^\infty$ are equal to the decomposition numbers for Hecke algebras and quantum Schur algebras at roots of unity. These conjecture have been proved, respectively, by Ariki [1] and Varagnolo and Vasserot [45]. For the categorification of the Fock space, see, for example, [42, 18, 43].

In [45], Varagnolo and Vasserot extended the $U_v(\hat{sl}_n)$-action on the Fock space $\bigwedge^\infty$ to that of the extended Ringel–Hall algebra $D(\Delta_n)^{\leq 0}$ of the cyclic quiver $\Delta_n$. They also showed that the canonical basis of the Ringel–Hall algebra $H(\Delta_n)$ in the sense of Lusztig induces a basis of $\bigwedge^\infty$ which conjecturally coincides with the canonical basis constructed by Leclerc–Thibon [29]. This conjecture was proved by Schiffmann [40] by identifying the central subalgebra of $H(\Delta_n)$ with the ring of symmetric functions.
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The main purpose of the present paper is to extend Varagnolo–Vasserot’s construction to obtain a $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$-module structure on the Fock space $\Lambda^\infty$ which is shown to be isomorphic to the basic representation $L(\Lambda_0)$ of $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$. Moreover, the central elements in the positive and negative parts of $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$ constructed by Hubery [19] give rise naturally to the operators introduced in [27] which generate the Heisenberg algebra. Furthermore, the structure of $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$ yields a decomposition of $L(\Lambda_0)$ which induces the Kashiwara–Miwa–Stern decomposition of $\Lambda^\infty$. This also provides a way to construct the canonical basis of $\Lambda^\infty$ in [29] in terms of certain monomial basis elements of $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we review the classification of (nilpotent) representations of both infinite linear quiver $\Delta_\infty$ and the cyclic quiver $\Delta_n$ with $n$ vertices and discuss their generic extensions. Section 3 recalls the definition of Ringel–Hall algebras $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty)$ and $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$ of $\Delta_\infty$ and $\Delta_n$ as well as the maps from the homogeneous spaces of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$ to those of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty)$ introduced in [45]. The images of basis elements of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$ under these maps are described. In Section 4 we first follow the approach in [44] to present the construction of double Ringel–Hall algebras $(\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n))^\ast$ and then study the irreducible highest weight $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$-modules based on the results in [23]. Section 5 recalls from [17, 36, 45] the Fock space representation $\Lambda^\infty$ over $\mathbf{U}_v(\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_\infty)$ ($\cong \mathcal{D}(\Delta_\infty)$) as well as over $\mathbf{U}_v^+(\hat{\mathfrak{sl}}_n)$. In Section 6 we define the $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$-module structure on $\Lambda^\infty$ based on [27, 45]. It is shown in Section 7 that $\Lambda^\infty$ is isomorphic to the basic representation of $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$. In the final section, we present a way to construct the canonical basis of $\Lambda^\infty$ and interpret the “ladder method” construction of certain basis elements in $\Lambda^\infty$ in terms of generic extensions of nilpotent representations of $\Delta_n$.

2. Nilpotent representations and generic extensions

In this section we consider nilpotent representations of both a cyclic quiver $\Delta = \Delta_n$ with $n$ vertices ($n \geq 2$) and the infinite quiver $\Delta = \Delta_\infty$ of type $A_\infty^\infty$ and study their generic extensions. We show that the degeneration order of nilpotent representations of $\Delta_n$ induces the dominant order of partitions.

Let $\Delta_\infty$ denote the infinite quiver of type $A_\infty^\infty$

\[ \cdots \cdots \quad -2 \quad -1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad \cdots \]

with vertex set $I = I_\infty = \mathbb{Z}$, and for $n \geq 2$, let $\Delta_n$ denote the cyclic quiver

\[ \begin{array}{c}
1 \\
\vdots \\
3 \\
\cdots \\
n-2 \\
n-1
\end{array} \]

with vertex set $I = I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} = \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. For each $i \in I_\infty = \mathbb{Z}$, let $\bar{i}$ denote its residue class in $I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$. We also simply write $\bar{i} \pm 1$ to denote the residue class of $i \pm 1$ in $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$.

Given a field $k$, we denote by $\text{Rep}_D^0$ the category of finite dimensional nilpotent representations of $\Delta (= \Delta_\infty$ or $\Delta_n)$ over $k$. (Note that each finite dimensional representation of $\Delta_\infty$ is automatically nilpotent.) Given a representation $V = (V_i, V_{ij}) \in \text{Rep}_D^0$, the vector $\text{dim} V = (\text{dim}_k V_i)_{i \in I}$ is called the dimension vector of $V$. The Grothendieck group of $\text{Rep}_D^0$ is identified with the free abelian group $\mathbb{Z}I$ with basis $I$. Let $\{\varepsilon_i \mid i \in I\}$ denote the standard basis of $\mathbb{Z}I$. Thus, elements in $\mathbb{Z}I$ will be written as $d = (d_i)_{i \in I}$ or $d = \sum_{i \in I} d_i \varepsilon_i$. In case $I = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, we sometimes write $\mathbb{Z}^n$ for $\mathbb{Z}I$.

The Euler form $\langle -, - \rangle : \mathbb{Z}I \times \mathbb{Z}I \to \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by

\[ \langle \text{dim} M, \text{dim} N \rangle = \text{dim}_k \text{Hom}_{D}(M, N) - \text{dim}_k \text{Ext}_{D}^1(M, N). \]
Its symmetrization
\[
(\dim M, \dim N) = (\dim M, \dim N) + (\dim N, \dim M)
\]
is called the symmetric Euler form.

It is well known that the isoclasses of representations in \(\text{Rep}^0\Delta\) are parametrized by the set \(\mathcal{M}\) consisting of all multisegments
\[
m = \sum_{i \in I, l \geq 1} m_{i,l}[i, l],
\]
where all \(m_{i,l} \in \mathbb{N}\), but finitely many, are zero. More precisely, the representation \(M(m) = M_k(m)\) associated with \(m\) is defined by
\[
M(m) = \bigoplus_{i \in I, l \geq 1} m_{i,l}S_i[l],
\]
where \(S_i[l]\) denotes the representation of \(\Delta\) with the simple top \(S_i\) and length \(l\). For each \(d \in \mathbb{N}I\), put
\[
\mathcal{M}^d = \{ m \in \mathcal{M} \mid \dim M(m) = d \}.
\]
Furthermore, we will write \(\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_\infty\) (resp., \(\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_n\)) if \(I = \mathbb{Z}\) (resp., \(I = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}\)).

It is also known that there exist Auslander–Reiten sequences in \(\text{Rep}^0\Delta\), that is, for each \(M \in \text{Rep}^0\Delta\), there is an Auslander–Reiten sequence
\[
0 \rightarrow \tau M \rightarrow E \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0,
\]
where \(\tau M\) denotes the Auslander–Reiten translation of \(M\). It is clear that \(\tau\) induces an isomorphism \(\tau : ZI \rightarrow ZI\) such that \(\tau(\dim M) = \dim \tau M\). In particular, \(\tau(\varepsilon_i) = \varepsilon_{i+1}, \forall i \in I\). If \(\Delta = \Delta_n\), then \(\tau^s = \text{id}\) for all \(s \in \mathbb{Z}\). For \(m \in \mathcal{M}\), let \(\tau m\) be defined by \(M(\tau m) \cong \tau M(m)\).

Given \(d \in \mathbb{N}I\), let \(V = \bigoplus_{i \in I} V_i\) be an \(I\)-graded vector space with dimension vector \(d\). Consider
\[
E_V = \{(x_i) \in \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}_k(V_i, V_{i+1}) \mid x_{n-1} \cdots x_0\text{ is nilpotent if }\Delta = \Delta_n.\}.
\]
Then each element \(x \in E_V\) defines a representation \((V, x)\) of dimension vector \(d\) in \(\text{Rep}^0\Delta\). Moreover, the group
\[
G_V = \prod_{i \in I} \text{GL}(V_i)
\]
acts on \(E_V\) by conjugation, and there is a bijection between the \(G_V\)-orbits and the isoclasses of representations in \(\text{Rep}^0\Delta\) of dimension vector \(d\). For each \(x \in E_V\), by \(O_x\) we denote the \(G_V\)-orbit of \(x\). In case \(k\) is algebraically closed, we have the equalities
\[
(2.0.1) \quad \dim O_x = \dim G_V - \dim \text{End}_{k\Delta}(V,x) = \sum_{i \in I} d_i^2 - \dim \text{End}_{k\Delta}(V,x).
\]

By abuse of notation, for each \(M \in \text{Rep}^0\Delta\), we denote by \(O_M\) the orbit of \(M\).

Following [3, 37, 5], given two representations \(M, N \in \text{Rep}^0\Delta\), there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) extension \(G\) of \(M\) by \(N\) such that \(\dim \text{End}_{k\Delta}(G)\) is minimal. The extension \(G\) is called the \textit{generic extension} of \(M\) by \(N\), denoted by \(M \ast N\). Moreover, generic extensions satisfy the associativity, i.e., for \(L, M, N \in \text{Rep}^0\Delta\),
\[
L \ast (M \ast N) \cong (L \ast M) \ast N.
\]

Let \(\mathcal{M}(\Delta)\) denote the set of isoclasses of representations in \(\text{Rep}^0\Delta\). Define a multiplication on \(\mathcal{M}(\Delta)\) by setting
\[
[M] \ast [N] = [M \ast N].
\]
Then \(\mathcal{M}(\Delta)\) is a monoid with identity \([0]\), the isoclass of zero representation of \(\Delta\).
By [37, 5], the generic extension $M \ast N$ can be also characterized as the unique maximal element among all the extensions of $M$ by $N$ with respect to the degeneration order $\leq_{\text{deg}}$ which is defined by setting $M \leq_{\text{deg}} N$ if $\dim M = \dim N$ and

\[(2.0.2) \quad \dim_k \text{Hom}_k(M, X) \geq \dim_k \text{Hom}_k(N, X), \quad \text{for all } X \in \text{Rep}^0 \Delta.\]

If $k$ is algebraically closed, then $M \leq_{\text{deg}} N$ if and only if $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_M \subseteq \mathcal{C}_N$, where $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_M$ is the closure of $\mathcal{C}_M$. This defines a partial order relation on the set $\mathcal{M}(\Delta)$ of isoclasses of representations in $\text{Rep}^0 \Delta$; see [46, Th. 2] or [5, Lem. 3.2]. By [37, 2.4], for $M, N, M', N' \in \text{Rep}^0 \Delta$,

$$M' \leq_{\text{deg}} M, N' \leq_{\text{deg}} N \implies M' \ast N' \leq_{\text{deg}} M \ast N.$$  

For $m, m' \in \mathcal{M}_n$ (resp., $\mathcal{M}_\infty$), we write $m \leq_{\text{deg}} m'$ (resp., $m \leq^\infty m'$) if $M(m) \leq_{\text{deg}} M(m')$ in $\text{Rep}^0 \Delta_n$ (resp., $\text{Rep} \Delta_\infty$).

By [4, 13], there is a covering functor

$$\mathcal{F} : \text{Rep} \Delta_\infty \longrightarrow \text{Rep}^0 \Delta_n$$

sending $S_i[l]$ to $S_i[l]$ for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $l \geq 1$. Moreover, $\mathcal{F}$ is dense and exact, and the Galois group of $\mathcal{F}$ is the infinite cyclic group $G$ generated by $\tau^n$, i.e., $\tau^n(S_i[l] = S_{i+n}[l])$. For $m \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$, let $\mathcal{F}(m) \in \mathcal{M}_n$ be such that $M(\mathcal{F}(m)) \cong \mathcal{F}(M(m)) \in \text{Rep}^0 \Delta_n$. From (2.0.2) we easily deduce that for $M, N \in \text{Rep} \Delta_\infty$,

\[(2.0.3) \quad M \leq_{\text{deg}} N \implies \mathcal{F}(M) \leq_{\text{deg}} \mathcal{F}(N).\]

The following two classes of representations will play an important role later on. For each $d = (d_i) \in \mathbb{N}I$, we set

$$S_d = \bigoplus_{i \in I} d_i S_i[1] \in \text{Rep}^0 \Delta.$$ 

In other words, $S_d$ is the unique semisimple representation of dimension vector $d$.

Let $\Pi$ be the set of all partitions $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_t)$ (i.e., $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_t \geq 1$). For each $\lambda \in \Pi$, define

$$m_\lambda = \sum_{s=1}^t [1-s, \lambda_s) \in \mathcal{M}.$$ 

Then

$$M(m_\lambda) = S_0[\lambda_1] \oplus S_{-1}[\lambda_2] \oplus \cdots \oplus S_{-t}[\lambda_t] \in \text{Rep}^0 \Delta.$$ 

If $\Delta = \Delta_\infty$, then we sometimes write $m_\lambda = m_\lambda^\infty \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$ to make a distinction. It follows from the definition that $\mathcal{F}(m_\lambda^\infty) = m_\lambda$ for all $\lambda \in \Pi$.

**Proposition 2.1.** Let $\lambda, \mu \in \Pi$.

1. If $\Delta = \Delta_\infty$, then

$$\dim M(m^\infty_\lambda) = \dim M(m^\infty_\mu) \iff \mu = \lambda.$$ 

In particular, for each $m \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$, there exists at most one $\nu \in \Pi$ such that $m = m^\infty_\nu$.

2. If $\Delta = \Delta_n$, then

$$M(m_\mu) \leq_{\text{deg}} M(m_\lambda) \Rightarrow \mu \leq \lambda,$$

where $\leq$ is the dominance order on $\Pi$, i.e., $\mu \leq \lambda \iff \sum_{j=1}^i \mu_j \leq \sum_{j=1}^i \lambda_j, \quad \forall i \geq 1$.

**Proof.** (1) By definition, both the socles of $M(m^\infty_\lambda)$ and $M(m^\infty_\mu)$ are multiplicity-free. Thus, comparing the socles of $S_0[\lambda_1]$ and $S_0[\mu_1]$ gives $\lambda_1 = \mu_1$. The lemma then follows from an inductive argument.

(2) By definition, both the socles of $M(m_\mu)$ and $M(m_\lambda)$ are multiplicity-free. Thus, comparing the socles of $S_0[\mu_1]$ and $S_0[\lambda_1]$ gives $\mu_1 = \lambda_1$. The lemma then follows from an inductive argument.
(2) Suppose $M(m_\lambda) \leq_{\text{deg}} M(m_\mu)$. By viewing $m_\lambda$ and $m_\mu$ as multipartitions in $\mathcal{M}_n$, we obtain by [7, Prop. 2.7] that for each $l \geq 1$,
\[ \sum_{s=1}^{l} \tilde{\mu}_s \geq \sum_{s=1}^{l} \tilde{\lambda}_s, \]
where $\tilde{\lambda} = (\tilde{\lambda}_1, \tilde{\lambda}_2, \ldots)$ and $\tilde{\mu} = (\tilde{\mu}_1, \tilde{\mu}_2, \ldots)$ are the dual partition of $\lambda$ and $\mu$, respectively, that is, $\tilde{\mu} \triangleright \tilde{\lambda}$. By [35, 1.1], $\mu \triangleright \lambda$. \hfill \square

### 3. Ringel–Hall algebra of the quiver $\Delta$

In this section we introduce the Ringel–Hall algebra $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ of $\Delta (= \Delta_n$ or $\Delta_\infty)$ and the maps from homogeneous subspaces of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$ to those of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty)$ defined in [45, 6.1]. We also describe the images of basis elements of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$ under these maps.

The cyclic quiver $\Delta_n$ gives the $n \times n$ Cartan matrix $C_n = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ of type $A_{n-1}$, while $\Delta_\infty$ defines the infinite Cartan matrix $C_\infty = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}}$. Thus, we have the associated quantum enveloping algebras $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{s}l_n})$ and $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$ which are $\mathbb{Q}(v)$-algebras with generators $K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i, D (i \in I = \mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}_n)$ and $K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i (i \in \mathbb{Z})$, respectively, and the quantum Serre relations. In particular, the relations involving the generator $D$ in $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{s}l_n})$ are

\[ DD^{-1} = 1 = D^{-1} D, \ K_i D = DK_i, \ DE_i = v^{\delta_{0,i}} E_i D, \ DF_i = v^{-\delta_{0,i}} F_i D, \ \forall i \in I; \]
see [2, Def. 3.16]. The subalgebra of $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{s}l_n})$ generated by $K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i (i \in I = \mathbb{Z}/\mathbb{Z}_n)$ is denoted by $U_q(\widehat{\mathfrak{s}l_n})$.

By [38, 39, 16], for $\mathfrak{g}, m_1, \ldots, m_t \in \mathcal{M}$, there is a polynomial $\varphi^p_{m_1, \ldots, m_t}(q) \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$ (called Hall polynomial) such that for each finite field $k$,

\[ \varphi^p_{m_1, \ldots, m_t}(|k|) = F_{M_k(m_1), \ldots, M_k(m_t)}, \]

which is by definition the number of the filtrations $M = M_0 \supseteq M_1 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq M_{t-1} \supseteq M_t = 0$ such that $M_{s-1}/M_s \cong M_k(m_s)$ for all $1 \leq s \leq t$. It is also known that for each $m \in \mathcal{M}$, there is a polynomial $a_m(q) \in \mathbb{Z}[q]$ such that for each finite field $k$,

\[ a_m(|k|) = |\text{Aut}_k(M_k(m))|. \]

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \mathbb{Z}[v, v^{-1}]$ be the Laurent polynomial ring over $\mathbb{Z}$ in indeterminate $v$. By definition, the (twisted generic) Ringel–Hall algebra $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ of $\Delta$ is the free $\mathcal{Z}$-module with basis $\{ u_m | m \in \mathcal{M} \}$ and multiplication given by

\[ u_m u_{m'} = v^{(\dim M(m), \dim M(m'))} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} \varphi^p_{m, m}(v^2) u_p. \]

In practice, we also write $u_m = u_{[M(m)]}$ in order to make certain calculations in terms of modules. Furthermore, for each $d \in \mathbb{N} I$, we simply write $u_d = u_{[S_d]}$. Moreover, both $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ and $C(\Delta)$ are $\mathbb{N} I$-graded:

\[ \mathcal{H}(\Delta) = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{N} I} \mathcal{H}(\Delta)_d \text{ and } C(\Delta) = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{N} I} C(\Delta)_d, \]

where $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)_d$ is spanned by all $u_m$ with $m \in \mathcal{M}_d$ and $C(\Delta)_d = C(\Delta) \cap \mathcal{H}(\Delta)_d$. Since the Auslander–Reiten translate $\tau : \text{Rep}^0 \Delta \rightarrow \text{Rep}^0 \Delta$ is an auto-equivalence, it induces an automorphism $\tau : \mathcal{H}(\Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\Delta), u_m \mapsto u_{\tau m}$. We also consider the $\mathbb{Q}(v)$-algebra

\[ \mathcal{H}(\Delta) = \mathcal{H}(\Delta) \otimes_\mathbb{Z} \mathbb{Q}(v). \]
Remark 3.1. We remark that the Hall algebra of $\Delta$ defined in [45] is the opposite algebra of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ given here with $v$ being replaced by $v^{-1}$. Thus, $v$ and $v^{-1}$ should be swaped when comparing with the formulas in [45].

For each $i \in I$, set $u_i = u_{[S_i]}$. We then denote by $C(\Delta)$ the subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ generated by the divided power $u_i^{(t)} = u_i^t/[t]!$, $i \in I$ and $t \geq 1$, called the composition algebra of $\Delta$, where $[t] = [t][t-1] \cdots [1]$ with $[m] = (v^m - v^{-m})/(v - v^{-1})$. It is known that $C(\Delta) = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ and there is an isomorphism $U^+_v(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty) \cong \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ taking $E_i \mapsto u_i$, $i \in I_\infty = \mathbb{Z}$. But, for $n \geq 2$, $C(\Delta_n)$ is a proper subalgebra of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$. By [39],

$$U^+_v(\mathfrak{sl}_n) \cong C(\Delta_n) := C(\Delta_n) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[v], \quad E_i \mapsto u_i, \quad \forall i \in I_n.$$ 

By [40, Th. 2.2], $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$ is decomposed into the tensor product of $C(\Delta_n)$ and a polynomial ring in infinitely many indeterminates which are central elements in $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$. Such central elements have been explicitly constructed in [19]. More precisely, for each $t \geq 1$, let

$$c_t = (-1)^t v^{-2nt} \sum \frac{(-1)^{\dim End(M(m))} a_m(v^2) u_m}{\dim C(\Delta_n)}$$

where the sum is taken over all $m \in \mathfrak{M}_n$ such that $\dim M(m) = t\delta$ with $\delta = (1, \ldots, 1) \in \mathbb{N}I_n$, and $\soc M(m)$ is square-free, i.e., $\dim \soc M(m) \leq \delta$. The following result is proved in [19].

Theorem 3.2. The elements $c_m$ are central in $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$. Moreover, there is a decomposition

$$\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n) = C(\Delta_n) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[v][c_1, c_2, \ldots],$$

where $\mathbb{Z}[v][c_1, c_2, \ldots]$ is the polynomial algebra in $c_t$ for $t \geq 1$. In particular, $\mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)$ is generated by $u_i$ and $c_t$ for $i \in I_n$ and $t \geq 1$.

For each $m \in \mathfrak{M}$, set $d(m) = \dim M(m)$, $d(m) = \dim M(m)$ and define

$$\bar{u}_m = v^{\dim End_k(\Delta(M(m)) - d(m))} u_m.$$

Then $\{\bar{u}_m \mid m \in \mathfrak{M}\}$ is also a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ which plays a role in the construction of the canonical basis. In particular,

$$\bar{u}_i = u_i \quad \text{for each } i \in I \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{u}_d = v \sum (d^2 - d_i) u_d \quad \text{for each } d \in NI.$$ 

Consider the map $\pi : \mathbb{Z}I_\infty \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}I_n, d \mapsto \bar{d}$, where $\pi(d) = \bar{d} = (d_i)$ is defined by

$$d_i = \sum_{j \in \bar{i}} d_j, \quad \forall \bar{i} \in I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}.$$ 

Then for each representation $M \in \text{Rep} \Delta_\infty$,

$$\dim \mathcal{F}(M) = \pi(\dim M).$$

Take $d \in NI_\infty$ with $\bar{d} = \pi(d)$. By [45, 6.1], there is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear map

$$\gamma_d : \mathcal{H}(\Delta_n) \bar{d} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty)(\bar{d}).$$

The first two statements in the following lemma are taken from [45, Sect. 6.1], and the third one follows from the isomorphism $\tau : \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty)$.

Lemma 3.3. (1) For each $d \in NI_\infty$, $\gamma_d(\bar{u}_d) = v^{-h(d)} \bar{u}_d$, where $h(d) = \sum_{i<j, i=j} d_i(d_{j+1} - d_j)$.

(2) Fix $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_n$ with $\bar{d} = \alpha + \beta$. Then for $x \in \mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)_{\alpha}$ and $y \in \mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)_{\beta}$,

$$\sum_{\alpha, \beta} v^{\alpha(a, b)} \gamma_a(x) \gamma_b(y) = \gamma_d(xy),$$

where $\gamma_d(xy)$ is defined by the divided power.
where the sum is taken over all pairs $a, b \in N_\infty$ satisfying $a + b = d$, $\bar{a} = \alpha$, and $\bar{b} = \beta$, and $\kappa(a, b) = \sum_{i>j, i-j} a_i (2b_j - b_{j-1} - b_{j+1})$.

(3) For each $d \in N_\infty$ and $m \in M_d$, $\gamma_{\tau^n(d)}(\bar{u}_m) = \tau^n(\gamma_d(\bar{u}_m))$.

We now describe the images of the basis elements of $H(\Delta_n)_d$ under $\gamma_d$.

**Proposition 3.4.** Let $d \in N_\infty$ and $m \in M_n$ be such that $\alpha := \text{dim } M(m) = \bar{d}$. Then

$$
\gamma_d(\bar{u}_m) \in \sum_{j \in M_\infty, \mathcal{F}(j) \leq \text{deg } m} \mathcal{Z} \bar{u}_j.
$$

**Proof.** Consider the radical filtration of $M = M(m)$

$$M = \text{rad}^0 M \supseteq \text{rad}^1 M \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \text{rad}^{\ell-1} M \supseteq \text{rad}^{\ell} M = 0$$

with $\text{rad}^{s-1} M / \text{rad}^s M \cong S_{\alpha_s}$, where $\ell$ is the Loewy length of $M$ and $\alpha_s \in N_n$ for $1 \leq s \leq \ell$. Then $M = S_{\alpha_1} \ast \cdots \ast S_{\alpha_\ell}$. Moreover, by [8, Sect. 9],

$$\bar{u}_{\alpha_1} \cdots \bar{u}_{\alpha_\ell} = \bar{u}_m + \sum_{p < \deg m} f_{m,p} \bar{u}_p, \text{ where } f_{m,p} \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

On the one hand, by induction with respect to the order $\leq \deg$, we may assume that for each $p \in M_n$ with $p < \deg m$, $\gamma_d(\bar{u}_p)$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-linear combination of $\bar{u}_j$ with $\mathcal{F}(j) < \deg m$. Therefore,

$$\gamma_d(\bar{u}_m) = \gamma_d(\bar{u}_{\alpha_1} \cdots \bar{u}_{\alpha_\ell}) + x,$$

where $x = -\sum_{p < \deg m} f_{m,p} \gamma_d(\bar{u}_p)$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-linear combination of $\bar{u}_j$ with $\mathcal{F}(j) < \deg m$.

On the other hand, by applying (3.3.1) inductively, we obtain

$$\gamma_d(\bar{u}_{\alpha_1} \cdots \bar{u}_{\alpha_\ell}) = \sum_{a_1, \ldots, a_\ell} \sum_{s < \ell} \kappa(a_1, a_s) \bar{u}_{a_1} \cdots \bar{u}_{a_s},$$

where the sum is taken over all sequences $a_1, \ldots, a_\ell \in N_\infty$ satisfying

$$a_1 + \cdots + a_\ell = d \text{ and } \bar{a}_s = \alpha_s, \forall 1 \leq s \leq \ell.$$

By the definition, each term $\bar{u}_{a_1} \cdots \bar{u}_{a_\ell}$ is a $\mathcal{Z}$-linear combination of $\bar{u}_n$ such that $M(\eta)$ admits a filtration

$$M(\eta) = X_0 \supset X_1 \supset \cdots \supset X_{\ell-1} \supset X_\ell = 0$$

such that $X_{s-1}/X_s \cong S_{\alpha_s}$ for all $1 \leq s \leq \ell$. Applying the exact functor $\mathcal{F}$ gives a filtration of $\mathcal{F}(M(\eta))$

$$\mathcal{F}(M(\eta)) = \mathcal{F}(X_0 \supset \mathcal{F}(X_1)) \supset \cdots \supset \mathcal{F}(X_{\ell-1}) \supset \mathcal{F}(X_\ell) = 0$$

such that

$$\mathcal{F}(X_{s-1}) / \mathcal{F}(X_s) \cong \mathcal{F}(X_{s-1}/X_s) \cong S_{\alpha_s}, \forall 1 \leq s \leq \ell.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{F}(M(\eta)) = M(\mathcal{F}(\pi)) \leq \deg S_{\alpha_1} \ast \cdots \ast S_{\alpha_\ell} = M(m),$$

that is, $\mathcal{F}(\eta) \leq \deg m$.

In conclusion, we obtain that

$$\gamma_d(\bar{u}_m) \in \sum_{j \in M_\infty, \mathcal{F}(j) \leq \text{deg } m} \mathcal{Z} \bar{u}_j.$$  

$\square$
Fix $\lambda \in \Pi$ and write

$$d(\lambda) = \text{dim} M(m_\lambda^\infty) \in \mathbb{N}I_\infty \text{ and } \alpha(\lambda) = \text{dim} M(m_\lambda) \in \mathbb{N}I_n.$$ 

By the definition of $M(m_\lambda^\infty)$ and $M(m_\lambda)$, the radical filtration of $\tilde{M} = M(m_\lambda^\infty)$

$$\tilde{M} = \text{rad}^0 \tilde{M} \supseteq \text{rad} \tilde{M} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \text{rad}^{\ell-1} \tilde{M} \supseteq \text{rad}^\ell \tilde{M} = 0$$

gives rise to the radical filtration of $M(m_\lambda) = \mathcal{F}(\tilde{M})$

$$M(m_\lambda) = \mathcal{F}(\text{rad}^0 \tilde{M}) \supseteq \mathcal{F}(\text{rad} \tilde{M}) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \mathcal{F}(\text{rad}^{\ell-1} \tilde{M}) \supseteq \mathcal{F}(\text{rad}^\ell \tilde{M}) = 0,$$

that is, $\mathcal{F}(\text{rad}^s \tilde{M}) = \text{rad}^s(M(m_\lambda))$ for $1 \leq s \leq \ell$. Let $d(\lambda)_s \in \mathbb{N}I_\infty$ and $\alpha(\lambda)_s \in \mathbb{N}I_n$, $1 \leq s \leq \ell$, be such that

$$\text{rad}^{s-1} \tilde{M} = \text{rad}^s \tilde{M} \cong S_{d(\lambda)_s} \text{ and } \text{rad}^{s-1} M(m_\lambda)/\text{rad}^s M(m_\lambda) \cong S_{\alpha(\lambda)_s}.$$ 

Then $\overline{d(\lambda)}_s = \alpha(\lambda)_s$ for $1 \leq s \leq \ell$. Applying the above proposition to $m_\lambda$ gives the following result.

**Corollary 3.5.** (1) Let $\lambda \in \Pi$ and keep the notation above. Then

$$\gamma_{d(\lambda)}(\tilde{u}_{m_\lambda}) \in v^{\theta(\lambda)}\tilde{u}_{m_\lambda}^\infty + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{M}_\infty, \mathcal{F}(j) < \text{deg} m_\lambda} z\tilde{u}_j,$$

where $\theta(\lambda) = \sum_{s \leq l} \kappa(d(\lambda)_s, d(\lambda)_l) \cdot \sum_{s = 1}^\ell h(d(\lambda)_s)$.

(2) Let $d \in \mathbb{N}I_\infty$ with $d = \alpha(\lambda)$. If $d = \tau^m(d(\lambda))$ for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}$, then

$$\gamma_{d}(\tilde{u}_{m_\lambda}) \in v^{\theta(\lambda)}\tilde{u}_{\tau^m(m_\lambda)} + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{M}_\infty, \mathcal{F}(j) < \text{deg} m_\lambda} z\tilde{u}_j.$$ 

Otherwise,

$$\gamma_{d}(\tilde{u}_{m_\lambda}) \in \sum_{j \in \mathbb{M}_\infty, \mathcal{F}(j) < \text{deg} m_\lambda} z\tilde{u}_j.$$

In the following we briefly recall the canonical basis of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ for $\Delta = \Delta_n$ or $\Delta_\infty$. By [31] and [45, Prop. 7.5], there is a semilinear ring involution $\iota : \mathcal{H}(\Delta) \to \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ taking $v \mapsto v^{-1}$ and $\tilde{u}_d \mapsto \tilde{u}_d$ for all $d \in \mathbb{Z}I_n$. It is often called the bar-involution, usually written as $\bar{x} = \iota(x)$. The canonical basis (or the global crystal basis in the sense of Kashiwara) $B := \{b_m \mid m \in \mathcal{M}\}$ for $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ (at $v = \infty$) can be characterized as follows:

$$b_m = b_m, \quad b_m \in \tilde{u}_m + \sum_{p < \text{deg} m} v^{-1}Z[v^{-1}]\tilde{u}_p;$$

(3.5.1)

see [31]. The canonical basis elements $b_m$ also admit a geometric characterization given in [32, 45]. Let $H_{\mathcal{O}_p}(I\mathcal{C}_m)$ be the stalk at a point of $\mathcal{O}_m$ of the $i$-th intersection cohomology sheaf of the closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}_p}$ of $\mathcal{O}_p$. Then

$$b_m = \sum_{p < \dim \mathcal{C}_m + \dim \mathcal{O}_p} v^{i-\dim \mathcal{C}_m + \dim \mathcal{O}_p}H_{\mathcal{O}_p}(I\mathcal{C}_m)\tilde{u}_p.$$ 

For the cyclic quiver case, by [33], the subset of $B$

$$B_{\text{ap}} := \{b_m \mid m \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{ap}}^n\}$$

is the canonical basis of $\mathcal{C}(\Delta_n)$, where $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ap}}^n$ denotes the set of aperiodic multisegments, that is, those multisegments $m = \sum_{i \in I_n, l \geq 1} m_{i,l}(i,l)$ satisfying that for each $l \geq 1$, there is some $i \in I_n$ such that $m_{i,l} = 0$. In other words, $B_{\text{ap}}$ is the canonical basis of $U_{\gamma}^+(\delta_{I_n})$. Note that for each $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m) \in \Pi$, the corresponding multisegment $m_\lambda$ is aperiodic if and only if $\lambda$ is $n$-regular which, by definition, satisfies $\lambda_s > \lambda_s + n - 1$ for $1 \leq s \leq s + n - 1 \leq m$. 

4. Double Ringel–Hall algebras and highest weight modules

In this section we follow [44, 6] to define the double Ringel–Hall algebra \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta) \) of the quiver \( \Delta = \Delta_n \) or \( \Delta_\infty \) and study the irreducible highest weight modules of \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta_n) \) associated with integral dominant weights in terms of a quantized generalized Kac–Moody algebra.

The Ringel–Hall algebra \( \mathcal{H}(\Delta) \) of \( \Delta \) can be extended to a Hopf algebra \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\geq 0} \) which is a \( \mathbb{Q}(v) \)-vector space with a basis \( \{ u_+^m K_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}I, m \in \mathcal{M} \} \); see [38, 15, 44] or [6, Prop. 1.5.3]. Its algebra structure is given by

\[
K_\alpha K_\beta = K_{\alpha + \beta}, \quad K_\alpha u_+^m = v^{(d(m),\alpha)} u_+^m K_\alpha,
\]

\[
u_+^m u_+^{m'} = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} v^{(d(m),d(m'))} \varphi_{m,m'}^p (v^2) u_+^m \otimes u_+^{m'} K_{d(m')},
\]

where \( m, m' \in \mathcal{M} \) and \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}I \), and its coalgebra structure is given by

\[
\Delta(u_+^m) = \sum_{m',m'' \in \mathcal{M}} v^{(d(m'),d(m''))} \frac{a_{m'}(v^2)}{a_m(v^2)} \varphi_{m',m''}^m(v^2) u_+^{m'} \otimes u_+^{m''} K_{d(m'')},
\]

\[
\Delta(K_\alpha) = K_\alpha \otimes K_\alpha, \quad \varepsilon(u_+^m) = 0 \quad (m \neq 0), \quad \varepsilon(K_\alpha) = 1,
\]

where \( m \in \mathcal{M} \) and \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}I \). We refer to [44] or [6] for the definition of the antipode.

Dually, there is a Hopf algebra \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\leq 0} \) with basis \( \{ K_\alpha u_-^m \mid \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}I, m \in \mathcal{M} \} \). In particular, the multiplication is given by

\[
K_\alpha K_\beta = K_{\alpha + \beta}, \quad K_\alpha u_-^m = v^{-(d(m),\alpha)} u_-^m K_\alpha,
\]

\[
u_-^m u_-^{m'} = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{N}} v^{(d(m'),d(m))} \varphi_{m',m}^p (v^2) u_-^{m'} \otimes u_-^m K_{-d(m')},
\]

where \( m, m' \in \mathcal{M} \) and \( \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}I \). The comultiplication and the counit are given by

\[
\Delta(u_-^m) = \sum_{m',m'' \in \mathcal{M}} v^{(d(m'),d(m''))} \frac{a_{m'} a_{m''}}{a_m(v^2)} \varphi_{m',m''}^m(v^2) u_-^{m'} \otimes u_-^{m''} K_{-d(m')},
\]

\[
\Delta(K_\alpha) = K_\alpha \otimes K_\alpha, \quad \varepsilon(u_-^m) = 0 \quad (m \neq 0), \quad \varepsilon(K_\alpha) = 1,
\]

where \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}I \) and \( m \in \mathcal{M} \).

It is routine to check that the bilinear form \( \psi : \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\geq 0} \times \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\leq 0} \to \mathbb{Q}(v) \) defined by

\[
\psi(K_\alpha u_+^m, K_\beta u_-^{m'}) = v^{(\alpha,\beta)-(d(m),d(m))+2d(m)} \frac{\delta_{m,m'}}{a_m(v^2)}
\]

is a skew-Hopf pairing in the sense of [24]; see, for example, [6, Prop. 2.1.3].

Following [44] or [6, §2.1], with the triple \( (\mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\geq 0}, \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\leq 0}, \psi) \) we obtain the associated reduced double Ringel–Hall algebra \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta) \) which inherits a Hopf algebra structure from those of \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\geq 0} \) and \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\leq 0} \). In particular, for all elements \( x \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\geq 0} \) and \( y \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\leq 0} \), we have in \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{\leq 0} \) the following relations

\[
\sum \psi(x_1, y_1) y_2 x_2 = \sum \psi(x_2, y_2) x_1 y_1,
\]

where \( \Delta(x) = \sum x_1 \otimes x_2 \) and \( \Delta(y) = \sum y_1 \otimes y_2 \). Moreover, \( \mathcal{D}(\Delta) \) admits a triangular decomposition

\[
\mathcal{D}(\Delta) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{+} \otimes \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{0} \otimes \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^{-},
\]
where $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)^\pm$ are subalgebras generated by $u_i^{\pm}$ ($m \in \mathcal{M}$), and $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)^0$ is generated by $K_\alpha$ ($\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}I$).

Thus, $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)^0$ is identified with the Laurent polynomial ring $\mathbb{Q}(v)[K^{\pm 1}_i : i \in I]$

$$\mathcal{H}(\Delta) = \mathcal{H}(\Delta) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}(v) \sim \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^+, \quad u_m \mapsto u_m^+,$$

$$\mathcal{H}(\Delta)^{op} = \mathcal{H}(\Delta)^{op} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}(v) \sim \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^-, \quad u_m \mapsto u_m^-.$$

The canonical basis of $\mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ given in (3.5.1) gives the canonical bases $B^\pm := \{b_m^\pm | m \in \mathcal{M}\}$ of $\mathcal{D}(\Delta)^\pm$ satisfying

$$(4.0.9)\quad b_m^\pm \in \bar{u}_m^\pm + \sum_{p < \deg m} v^{-1}Z[v^{-1}]\bar{u}_p^\pm.$$ 

For $i \in I$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}I$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, we write

$$u_i^\pm = u_i^\pm_{[S_i]}, \quad u_\alpha^\pm = u_\alpha^\pm_{[S_\alpha]}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{u}_m^\pm = v^{\dim \text{End}_\Delta(M(m)) - \dim M(m)}u_m^\pm.$$

It is known that $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_\infty)$ is generated by $u_i^\pm, K_i^{\pm 1}$ ($i \in \mathbb{Z}$) and is isomorphic to $U_v(\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{l}_\infty)$. By [39], the $\mathbb{Q}(v)$-subalgebra of $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$ generated by $u_i^\pm, K_i^{\pm 1}$ ($i \in I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$) is isomorphic to $U_v(\hat{\mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{l}}_n)$, while $\mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$ is isomorphic to $U_v(\hat{\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{l}}_n)$; see [41, 21, 6]. From now on, we write for notational simplicity, $\mathcal{D}(\infty) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_\infty)$ and $\mathcal{D}(n) = \mathcal{D}(\Delta_n)$.

**Remarks 4.1.** (1) The construction of $\mathcal{D}(n)$ is slightly different from that in [6, §2.1]. In particular, the $K_i$ here play a role as $\hat{K}_i = K_iK_{i+1}^{-1}$ there. In particular, they do not satisfy the equality $K_0K_1 \cdots K_{n-1} = 1$.

(2) We can extend $\mathcal{D}(n)$ to the $\mathbb{Q}(v)$-algebra $\bar{\mathcal{D}}(n)$ by adding new generators $D^{\pm 1}$ with relations

$$DD^{-1} = 1 = D^{-1}D, \quad K_iD = DK_i, \quad DE_i = v^{\delta_{0i}}E_iD, \quad Du_m^\pm = v^{-a_0}u_m^\pm D$$

for all $i \in I_n$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}$, where $\mathfrak{d}(m) = (a_i)_{i \in I_n}$. Then $U_v(\hat{\mathfrak{g}\mathfrak{l}}_n)$ clearly becomes a subalgebra of $\bar{\mathcal{D}}(n)$.

As in (3.1.1), define for each $t \geq 1$,

$$c_i^\pm = (-1)^t v^{-2tn} \sum_m (-1)^{\dim \text{End}(M(m))}a_m(v^2)u_m^\pm \in \mathcal{D}(n)^\pm,$$

By Theorem 3.2, the elements $c_i^+$ and $c_i^-$ are central in $\mathcal{D}(n)^+$ and $\mathcal{D}(n)^-$, respectively. Following [21, Sect. 4], define recursively for $t \geq 1$,

$$x_t^\pm = tc_t^\pm - \sum_{s=1}^{t-1} x_s^\pm c_{t-s}^\pm \in \mathcal{D}(n)^\pm.$$ 

Clearly, $x_t^+$ and $x_t^-$ are again central elements in $\mathcal{D}(n)^+$ and $\mathcal{D}(n)^-$, respectively. By applying [19, Cor. 10 & 12], the $x_t^\pm$ are primitive, i.e.,

$$\Delta(x_t^+) = x_t^+ \otimes K_t + 1 \otimes x_t^+ \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta(x_t^-) = x_t^- \otimes 1 + K_{-t}\delta \otimes x_t^-,$$

and they satisfy

$$\psi(x_t^+, x_s^-) = v^{2tn}\{x_t, x_s\} = \delta_{t,s}v^{2tn}v^{-2tn}(1 - v^{-2tn}) = \delta_{t,s}(1 - v^{-2tn})$$

Finally, as in [6, §2.2], we scale the elements $x_t^\pm$ by setting

$$z_t^\pm = \frac{v^tn}{v^t - v^{-t}}x_t^\pm \in \mathcal{D}(n)^\pm \quad \text{for} \ t \geq 1.$$ 

Then

$$(4.1.1)\quad \Delta(z_t^+) = z_t^+ \otimes K_t + 1 \otimes z_t^+, \quad \Delta(z_t^-) = z_t^- \otimes 1 + K_{-t}\delta \otimes z_t^-.$$
and
\[ \psi(z^+_t, z^-_s) = \delta_{t,s} \frac{t(v^{2tn} - 1)}{(v^t - v^{-t})^2}. \]

**Lemma 4.2.** (1) For each \( i \in I_n \),
\[ [u^+_i, u^-_i] = \frac{K_i - K_i^{-1}}{v - v^{-1}}. \]

(2) For \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N} I_n \) and \( t, s \geq 1 \), \( K_\alpha z^+_t = z^+_t K_\alpha \) and
\[ [z^+_t, z^-_s] = \delta_{t,s} \frac{t(v^{2tn} - 1)}{(v^t - v^{-t})^2} (K_t \delta - K_{-\delta}). \]

Moreover, for each \( i \in I_n \) and \( t \geq 1 \),
\[ [u^+_i, z^-_i] = 0 = [u^-_i, z^+_i]. \]

**Proof.** We only prove the formula (4.2.1). The remaining ones are obvious. Since \( \Delta(z^+_t) = z^+_t \otimes K_t \delta + 1 \otimes z^+_t \) and \( \Delta(z^-_s) = z^-_s \otimes 1 + K_{-\delta} \otimes z^-_s \), we have by (4.0.7) that
\[ K_t \delta \psi(z^+_t, z^-_s) + z^+_t \psi(1, z^-_s) + z^-_s K_t \delta \psi(z^+_t, K_{-\delta}) + z^-_s z^-_i \psi(1, K_{-\delta}) = z^+_t z^-_s \psi(K_t \delta, 1) + z^-_s \psi(z^+_t, 1) + 1 + z^+_t K_{-\delta} \psi(K_t \delta, z^-_s) + K_{-\delta} \psi(z^+_t, z^-_s). \]

This implies that
\[ [z^+_t, z^-_s] = \psi(z^+_t, z^-_s)(K_t \delta - K_{-\delta}) = \delta_{t,s} \frac{t(v^{2tn} - 1)}{(v^t - v^{-t})^2} (K_t \delta - K_{-\delta}) \]

since \( \psi(1, z^-_s) = \psi(z^+_t, K_{-\delta}) = \psi(z^+_t, 1) = \psi(K_t \delta, z^-_s) = 0 \) and \( \psi(1, K_{-\delta}) = \psi(K_{-\delta}, 1) = 1. \)

Using arguments similar to those in the proof of [6, Th. 2.3.1], we obtain a presentation of \( \mathcal{D}(n) \). More precisely, \( \mathcal{D}(n) \) is the \( \mathbb{Q}(v) \)-algebra generated by \( K_i^{\pm 1}, u_i^+ = E_i, u_i^- = F_i, \) and \( z^\pm_i \) for \( i \in I_n \) and \( t \geq 1 \) with defining relations:

(DH1) \( K_i K_j = K_j K_i, K_i K_i^{-1} = 1 = K_i^{-1} K_i; \)

(DH2) \( K_i E_j = v^{\alpha_{ij}} E_j K_i, K_i F_j = v^{-\alpha_{ij}} F_j K_i, K_i z^\pm_i = z^\pm_i K_i; \)

(DH3) \([E_i, F_j] = \delta_{i,j} \frac{K_i - K_i^{-1}}{v - v^{-1}}, [E_i, z^+_i] = 0, [z^+_i, F_i] = 0,\]
\[ [z^+_i, z^-_s] = \delta_{t,s} \frac{t(v^{2tn} - 1)}{(v^t - v^{-t})^2} (K_t \delta - K_{-\delta}); \]

(DH4) \[ \sum_{a+b=1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^a \left[ \frac{1 - c_{i,j}}{a} \right] E_i^a E_j^b F_i^b = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j, \]
\[ z^+_i z^-_s = z^-_s z^+_i, E_i z^+_i = z^+_i E_i; \]

(DH5) \[ \sum_{a+b=1-c_{i,j}} (-1)^a \left[ \frac{1 - c_{i,j}}{a} \right] F_i^a F_j^b F_i^b = 0 \text{ for } i \neq j, \]
\[ z^-_i z^-_s = z^-_s z^-_i, F_i z^-_i = z^-_i F_i, \]
where \( i, j \in I_n \) and \( t, s \geq 1 \).

In the following we simply identify \( I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \) with the subset \( \{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\} \) of \( \mathbb{Z} \). Let \( P^\vee = (\oplus_{i \in I_n} \mathbb{Z} h_i) \oplus \mathbb{Z} d \) be the free abelian group with basis \( \{h_i \mid i \in I_n\} \cup \{d\} \). Set \( \mathfrak{h} = P^\vee \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q} \) and define
\[ P = \{ \Lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* = \text{Hom}_\mathbb{Q}(\mathfrak{h}, \mathbb{Q}) \mid \Lambda(P^\vee) \subset \mathbb{Z} \}. \]

Then \( P = (\oplus_{i \in I_n} \mathbb{Z} \Lambda_i) \oplus \mathbb{Z} \omega \), where \( \{\Lambda_i \mid i \in I_n\} \cup \{\omega\} \) is the dual basis of \( \{h_i \mid i \in I_n\} \cup \{d\} \). This gives rise to the Cartan datum \((P^\vee, P, P^\vee, \Pi)\) associated with the Cartan matrix \( C_n = (a_{ij}) \), where
\[ \Pi' = \{ h_i \mid i \in I_n \} \] is set of simple coroots and \( \Pi = \{ \alpha_i \mid i \in I_n \} \) is the set of simple roots defined by
\[ \alpha_i(h_j) = a_{ji}, \quad \alpha_i(d) = \delta_{0,i} \] for all \( i, j \in I_n \).

Finally, let
\[ P^+ = \{ \Lambda \in P \mid \Lambda(h_i) \geq 0, \forall i \in I_n \} = \bigoplus_{i \in I_n} \mathbb{N} \Lambda_i \oplus \mathbb{Z} \omega \]
denote the set of dominant weights.

For each \( \Lambda \in X \), consider the left ideal \( J_\Lambda \) of \( \mathcal{D}(n) \) defined by
\[
\begin{align*}
J_\Lambda &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{D}(n)u_m^+ + \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}I_n} \mathcal{D}(n)(K_\alpha - v^{\Lambda(\alpha)}) \\
&= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} \mathcal{D}(n)u_m^+ + \sum_{i \in I_n} \mathcal{D}(n)(K_i - v^{\Lambda(h_i)}),
\end{align*}
\]
where \( \Lambda(\alpha) = \sum_{i \in I_n} a_i \Lambda(h_i) \) if \( \alpha = \sum_{i \in I_n} a_i \epsilon_i \in \mathbb{Z}I_n \). The quotient module
\[ M(\Lambda) := \mathcal{D}(n)/J_\Lambda \]
is called the Verma module which is a highest weight module with highest vector \( \eta_\Lambda := 1 + J_\Lambda \).

Applying the triangular decomposition (4.0.8) shows that
\[ \mathcal{D}(n)^- \to M(\Lambda), \quad x^- \mapsto x^- + J_\Lambda \]
is an isomorphism of \( \mathbb{Q}(v) \)-vector spaces. Via this isomorphism, \( \mathcal{D}(n)^- \) becomes a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module. It is clear that \( M(\Lambda) \) contains a unique maximal submodule \( M' \). This gives an irreducible \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module \( L(\Lambda) = M(\Lambda)/M' \).

**Remark 4.3.** By the construction, if \( \Lambda, \Lambda' \in P^+ \) satisfy \( \Lambda - \Lambda' \in \mathbb{Z} \omega \), then \( L(\Lambda) = L(\Lambda') \). Therefore, it might be more appropriate to work with the algebra \( \hat{\mathcal{D}}(n) \) defined in Remark 4.1(2).

**Proposition 4.4.** Let \( \Lambda = \sum_{i \in I_n} a_i \Lambda_i + b\omega \in P^+ \) be a dominant weight with \( \sum_{i \in I_n} a_i > 0 \). Then
\[ L(\Lambda) \cong \mathcal{D}(n)^-/(\sum_{i \in I_n} \mathcal{D}(n)^-(u_i^-)^{a_i+1}). \]

**Proof.** As in [8, Sect. 3], we extend the Cartan matrix \( C = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I_n} \) to a Borcherds–Cartan matrix \( \widetilde{C} = (\tilde{a}_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}} \) by setting \( \tilde{a}_{ij} = a_{ij} \) for \( 0 \leq i, j < n \) and \( \tilde{a}_{ij} = 0 \) otherwise. Consider the free abelian group \( \tilde{P}^\vee = (\oplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z} h_i) \oplus (\oplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z} d_i) \) and define
\[ \tilde{P} = \{ \theta \in (\tilde{P}^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Q})^* \mid \theta(\tilde{P}^\vee) \subset \mathbb{Z} \}. \]

We then obtain a Cartan datum of type \( \tilde{C} \)
\[ (\tilde{P}^\vee, \tilde{P}, \tilde{\Pi}^\vee = \{ h_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \}, \tilde{\Pi} = \{ \tilde{a}_i \mid i \in \mathbb{N} \}) \]
where the \( \tilde{a}_i \) are defined by
\[ \tilde{a}_i(h_j) = \tilde{a}_{ji} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{a}_i(d_j) = \delta_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}. \]

Following [25, Def. 2.1] or [23, Def. 1.3], with the above Cartan datum we have the associated quantum generalized Kac–Moody algebra \( U_v(\widetilde{C}) \) which is by definition a \( \mathbb{Q}(v) \)-algebra generated by \( K_i^{\pm 1}, D_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i \) for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) with relations; see [23, (1.4)] for the details. Clearly, the subalgebra of \( U_v(\widetilde{C}) \) generated by \( K_i^{\pm 1}, D_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i \) for \( 0 \leq i < n \) is isomorphic to \( U_v(\tilde{a}_n) \).

In order to make a comparison with \( \mathcal{D}(n) \), we consider the subalgebra \( \tilde{U} \) of \( U_v(\widetilde{C}) \) generated by \( K_i^{\pm 1}, E_i, F_i \) for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \). Then \( \tilde{U} \) admits a triangular decomposition
\[ \tilde{U} = \tilde{U}^- \otimes \tilde{U}^0 \otimes \tilde{U}^+, \]
where \( \tilde{U}^- \), \( \tilde{U}^+ \), and \( \tilde{U}^0 \) are subalgebras generated by \( F_i, E_i \), and \( K_i^{\pm 1} \) for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), respectively. In particular, \( \tilde{U}^0 = \mathbb{Q}(v)[K_i^{\pm 1} : i \in \mathbb{N}] \). It follows from the definition that there is a surjective algebra homomorphism \( \Psi : U \rightarrow D(n) \) given by

\[
\Psi(E_i) = \begin{cases} 
  u_i^+, & \text{if } 0 \leq i < n; \\
  y_{i-n+1}^{\pm 1} & \text{if } i \geq n,
\end{cases} \quad \Psi(F_i) = \begin{cases} 
  u_i^-, & \text{if } 0 \leq i < n; \\
  z_i^{i-n+1} & \text{if } i \geq n,
\end{cases}
\]

and

\[
\Psi(K_i^{\pm 1}) = \begin{cases} 
  K_i^{\pm 1}, & \text{if } 0 \leq i < n; \\
  K_i^{(i-n+1)\delta}, & \text{if } i \geq n,
\end{cases}
\]

where \( y_t = t(v^{2n} - 1)(v - v^{-1})/(v^t - v^{-t})^2 \) for \( t \geq 1 \); see (4.2.1). Hence, each \( D(n) \)-module can be viewed as a \( \tilde{U} \)-module via the homomorphism \( \Psi \). In what follows, we will identify \( \tilde{U}^\pm \) with \( D(n)^\pm \) via \( \Psi \).

As defined in [23, Sect. 2.1], for each \( \theta \in \tilde{P} \), there is an associated irreducible \( \tilde{U} \)-module \( L(\theta) \). By [23, Prop. 3.3], \( L(\theta) \) is integrable if and only if \( \theta \) is dominant, that is,

\[
\theta \in \tilde{P}^+ = \{ \rho \in (\tilde{P}^\vee \otimes \mathbb{Q})^* \mid \rho(\tilde{P}^\vee) \subset \mathbb{N} \}.
\]

Moreover, by [25, Cor. 4.7],

\[
L(\theta) \cong \tilde{U}^-/\left( \sum_{i \in I_n^+} \tilde{U}^- F_i^{\theta(\Lambda)} + \sum_{i \geq n, \theta(\Lambda) = 0} \tilde{U}^- F_i \right).
\]

Viewing the irreducible \( D(n) \)-module \( L(\Lambda) \) as a \( \tilde{U} \)-module, it is then isomorphic to \( L(\Lambda) \), where \( \Lambda \in \tilde{P} \) is defined by

\[
\tilde{\Lambda}(\Lambda_i) = \begin{cases} 
  \Lambda(\Lambda_i) = a_i, & \text{if } 0 \leq i < n; \\
  (i-n+1)\sum_{0 \leq j < n} a_j, & \text{if } i \geq n
\end{cases}
\]

From the assumption \( \sum_{i \in I} a_i > 0 \) it follows that \( \tilde{\Lambda}(\Lambda_i) > 0 \) for all \( i \geq n \). Consequently,

\[
L(\Lambda) \cong L(\Lambda) \cong \tilde{U}^-/\left( \sum_{i \in I_n^+} \tilde{U}^- F_i^{\tilde{\Lambda}(\Lambda_i)} \right) = D(n)^-/\left( \sum_{i \in I_n^+} D(n)^-(u_i^-)^{\tilde{\Lambda}(\Lambda_i)} \right).
\]

For each \( \Lambda \in \tilde{P} \), let \( L_0(\Lambda) \) denote the irreducible \( U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n}) \)-module of highest weight \( \Lambda \). Applying Theorem 3.2 gives the following result.

**Corollary 4.5.** Let \( \Lambda = \sum_{i \in I_n} a_i \Lambda_i + b \omega \in \tilde{P}^+ \) with \( \sum_{i \in I_n} a_i > 0 \). Then \( L_0(\Lambda) \) is the \( U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n}) \)-submodule of \( L(\Lambda) \) generated by the highest weight vector \( \eta_\Lambda \) and there is a vector space decomposition

\[
L(\Lambda) = L_0(\Lambda) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(v)[z_1^-, z_2^-, \ldots].
\]

In particular, if \( L(\Lambda)|_{U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n})} \) denotes the \( U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n}) \)-module via restriction, then

\[
L(\Lambda)|_{U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n})} \cong \bigoplus_{m>0} L_0(\Lambda - m\delta^*) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(v)^{p(m)},
\]

where \( \delta^* = \sum_{i \in I_n^+} \alpha_i \) and \( p(m) \) is the number of partitions of \( m \).

**Proof.** By Theorem 3.2,

\[
D(n)^- = U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(v)[z_1^-, z_2^-, \ldots].
\]

This implies that

\[
L(\Lambda) \cong D(n)^-/(\sum_{i \in I_n^+} D(n)^-(u_i^-)^{\tilde{\Lambda}(\Lambda_i)} ) \cong (U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n})/(\sum_{i \in I_n^+} U_0'(\widehat{\mathfrak{sl}_n}) F_i^{\tilde{\Lambda}(\Lambda_i)}) \otimes \mathbb{Q}(v)[z_1^-, z_2^-, \ldots].
\]
By [34, Cor. 6.2.3], $L_0(\Lambda) \cong U_\ast(\mathfrak{gl}_n)/\langle \sum_{i \in I_n} U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_n)F_i^{n+1} \rangle$. Hence, $L_0(\Lambda)$ is the $U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$-submodule of $L(\Lambda)$ generated by $\eta_\Lambda$ and the desired decomposition is obtained.

For each family of nonnegative integers $\{m_t \mid t \geq 1\}$ satisfying all but finitely many $m_t$ are zero, $L_0(\Lambda) \otimes \prod_{t \geq 1} (\mathbb{Z}^t)^m_t$ is a $U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$-submodule of $L(\Lambda)$ since $[u_i^+, z_j^-] = 0$ for all $i \in I_n$ and $t \geq 1$. It is easy to see that

$$L_0(\Lambda) \otimes \prod_{t \geq 1} (\mathbb{Z}^t)^m_t \cong L_0(\Lambda - \sum_{t \geq 1} m_t \delta^+).$$

We conclude that

$$L(\Lambda)|_{U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_n)} \cong \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} L_0(\Lambda - m\delta^+)^{\otimes p(m)}.$$

By [34, Th. 14.4.11], for each $\Lambda \in P^+$, the canonical basis $\{b_m^- \mid m \in \mathfrak{m}_{ap}^\Lambda\}$ of $U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$ gives rise to the canonical basis $\{b_m^- \eta_\Lambda \neq 0 \mid m \in \mathfrak{m}_{ap}^\Lambda\}$ of $L_0(\Lambda)$. On the other hand, the crystal basis theory for the quantum generalized Kac-Moody algebra $U(\hat{C})$ has been developed in [23]. Since all the $F_i$ for $i \geq n$ correspond to imaginary simple roots and are central in $\hat{U}^\ast = D(n)^\ast$, applying the construction in [23, Sect. 6] shows that the set

$$\mathcal{B'} := \{(\prod_{i \geq n} F_i^{m_i})b_m^- \mid m \in \mathfrak{m}_{ap}^\Lambda \text{ and all } m_i \in \mathbb{N} \text{ but finitely many are zero}\}$$

forms the global crystal basis of $\hat{U}^\ast = D(n)^\ast$. We remark that $\mathcal{B'}$ does not coincide with the canonical basis $\mathcal{B}^\ast$ of $D(n)^\ast$.

5. The $q$-deformed Fock space I: $D(\infty)$-module

In this section we introduce the $q$-deformed Fock space $\Lambda^\infty$ from [17] and review its module structure over $D(\infty) = U_v(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$ defined in [36, 45], as well as its $U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$-module structure. We also provide a proof of [45, Prop. 5.1] by using the properties of representations of $\Delta_\infty$. Throughout this section, we identify $D(\infty)$ with $U_v(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$ via taking $u_i^+ \mapsto E_i$, $u_i^- \mapsto F_i$ for all $i \in I_\infty = \mathbb{Z}$.

For each partition $\lambda \in \Pi$, let $T(\lambda)$ denote the tableau of shape $\lambda$ whose box in the intersection of the $i$-th row and the $j$-th column is equipped with $j - i$ (The box is then said to be with color $j - i$). For example, if $\lambda = (4, 2, 2, 1)$, then $T(\lambda)$ has the form

```
-3
-2 -1
-1 
0 1 2 3
```

For given $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, a removable $i$-box of $T(\lambda)$ is by definition a box with the color $i$ which can be removed in such a way that the new tableau has the form $T(\mu)$ for some $\mu \in \Pi$. On the contrary, an indent $i$-box of $T(\lambda)$ is a box with the color $i$ which can be added to $T(\lambda)$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda \in \Pi$, define

$$n_i(\lambda) = |\{i\text{-boxes of } T(\lambda)\}| - |\{\text{removable } i\text{-boxes of } T(\lambda)\}|.$$

Let $\Lambda^\infty$ be the $\mathbb{Q}(v)$-vector space with basis $\{|\lambda\rangle \mid \lambda \in \Pi\}$. Following [45, 4.2], there is a left $U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$-module structure on $\Lambda^\infty$ defined by

$$K_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = v^{n_i(\lambda)}|\lambda\rangle, \quad E_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = |\nu\rangle, \quad F_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = |\mu\rangle, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}, \lambda \in \Pi,$$

where $|\nu\rangle$ is the unique vector in $U_\ast(\mathfrak{sl}_n)$-module structure on $\Lambda^\infty$ defined by

$$K_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = v^{n_i(\lambda)}|\lambda\rangle, \quad E_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = |\nu\rangle, \quad F_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = |\mu\rangle, \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{Z}, \lambda \in \Pi,$$
where $\mu, \nu \in \Pi$ are such that $T(\mu) - T(\lambda)$ and $T(\lambda) - T(\nu)$ are a box with color $i$. As remarked in [36, Sect. 2], $\wedge^{\infty}$ is isomorphic to the basic representation of $U_{\nu}(\mathfrak{sl}_{\infty})$ with the canonical basis $\{ |\lambda \rangle \mid \lambda \in \Pi \}$.

**Lemma 5.1.** (1) For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda, \mu \in \Pi$, if $u_i^- \cdot |\mu\rangle = |\lambda\rangle$, then there is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow S_i \rightarrow M(m_\lambda) \rightarrow M(m_\mu) \rightarrow 0.$$

(2) Let $m = [i, l]$ for some $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $l \geq 1$. Then $\tilde{u}_m^- \cdot |0\rangle \in \mathbb{Z}|\lambda\rangle$ if $i \leq 0$ and $i + l - 1 \geq 0$ and 0 otherwise, where $\lambda = (i + l, 1^{(-i)})$. In particular, if $i = 0$, then $\tilde{u}_m^- \cdot |0\rangle = |\lambda\rangle$.

**Proof.** (1) This follows directly from the definition.

(2) We proceed induction on $l$. The statement is trivial if $l = 1$. Suppose now $l > 1$. By the definition, $M(m) = S_i[l]$ with $\dim M(m) = \sum_{j=l}^{i+l-1} \varepsilon_j$. Then

$$u_{i+l-1}^- \cdots u_{i+1}^- u_i^- = v^{1-l} u_m^- + \sum_{j < \deg m} v^{1-l} u_j^-.$$

For each $\mathfrak{z}$ with $\mathfrak{z} < \deg m$, $M(\mathfrak{z})$ is decomposable. Thus, we may write

$$M(\mathfrak{z}) = M(\eta) \oplus M(\mathfrak{z}_1),$$

where $\eta \in \mathfrak{M}_\infty$ and $\mathfrak{z}_1 = [j, i + l - j]$ for some $i < j \leq i + l - 1$. This implies that

$$u_\eta^- u_{\mathfrak{z}_1}^- = u_\mathfrak{z}_1^-.$$

By the induction hypothesis,

$$u_{k_1}^- \cdot |0\rangle \in \mathbb{Z}|\mu\rangle$$

and 0 otherwise, where $\mu = (i + l, 1^{(-j)})$. Let now $j \geq 0$ and $i + l - 1 \geq 0$ and let $k_1, \ldots, k_{j-i}$ be a permutation of $i, i+1, \ldots, j-1$. Then

$$(u_{k_1}^- u_{k_2}^- \cdots u_{k_{j-i}}^-) \cdot |\mu\rangle = 0$$

unless $k_1 = i, k_2 = i+1, \ldots, k_{j-i} = j-1$, and moreover

$$(u_i^- u_{i+1}^- \cdots u_{j-1}^-) \cdot |\mu\rangle = |\lambda\rangle.$$  

Since $u_{\mathfrak{z}_1}^-$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of the monomials $u_{k_1}^- u_{k_2}^- \cdots u_{k_{j-i}}^-$, we have $\tilde{u}_m^\mathfrak{z}^- \cdot |0\rangle \in \mathbb{Z}|\lambda\rangle$.

Now let $i = 0$. Then $u_{\mathfrak{z}_1}^- \cdot |0\rangle = 0$ for each $\mathfrak{z}_1 = [j, i + l - j]$ with $0 < j \leq i + l - 1$. Hence,

$$\tilde{u}_m^- \cdot |\lambda\rangle = v^{1-l} u_m^- \cdot |0\rangle = (u_{i-1}^- \cdots u_i^- u_0^-) \cdot |0\rangle + \sum_{j < \deg m} u_j^- \cdot |0\rangle = |\lambda\rangle.$$

□

**Lemma 5.2.** Let $m = \sum_{l \geq 1} m_{i,l} [i, l] \in \mathfrak{M}_\infty$ and $\lambda \in \Pi$.

(1) If there is $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\sum_{l \geq 1} m_{j,l} \geq 2$, then $\tilde{u}_m^- \cdot |\lambda\rangle = 0$. In particular, for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \geq 2$, $(u_i^-)^{(t)} \cdot |\lambda\rangle = 0$.

(2) The element $\tilde{u}_m^- \cdot |\lambda\rangle$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of $|\mu\rangle$ with $\mu \in \Pi$.

**Proof.** (1) For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, we put

$$m_i = \sum_{l \geq 1} m_{i,l} \quad \text{and} \quad M_i = \bigoplus_{l \geq 1} m_{i,l} S_i[l].$$

Then $M = M(m) = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} M_i$, where all but finitely many $M_i$ are zero and

$$u_m^- = v^{-\sum_{i>\lambda}} (\dim M_i, \dim M_i) \cdots u_{M_i}^- u_{M_i}^- \cdots.$$
Suppose there is \( j \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( m = m_j \geq 2 \). Then \( M_j \) admits a decomposition
\[
M_j = S_j[a_1] \oplus \cdots \oplus S_j[a_m] \quad \text{with} \quad a_1 \geq \cdots \geq a_m \geq 1.
\]
This implies that
\[
u_{[S_j[a_m]]} \cdots u_{[S_j[a_1]]} = v^{b_j} u_{[M_j]},
\]
where \( b_j = \sum_{1 \leq p < q \leq m} \langle \dim S_j[m_p], \dim S_j[m_q] \rangle \). Hence, it suffices to show that for each \( \mu \in \Pi \),
\[
u_{[M_j]} \cdot |\mu\rangle = v^{-b_j} \langle \nu_{[S_j[a_m]]} \cdots u_{[S_j[a_1]]} \rangle \cdot |\mu\rangle = 0.
\]
By the definition, \( u_{[S_j[a_1]]} \cdot |\mu\rangle \) is a \( \mathbb{Q}(v) \)-linear combination of \( \nu \) which are obtained from \( \mu \) by adding a \((j + r)\)-box for each \( 0 \leq r < a_1 \). Thus, each such \( \nu \) does not admit an indent \( j \)-box. Thus, \( u_{[S_j[a_1]]} \cdot |\nu\rangle = 0 \) and, hence, \( (u_{[S_j[a_m]]} \cdots u_{[S_j[a_1]]}) \cdot |\mu\rangle = 0 \). We conclude that \( \widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\lambda\rangle = 0 \).

(2) It is known that \( \widetilde{u}_{m} \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of monomials of divided powers \( (u_{i})^{(t)} \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( t \geq 1 \). Since by (1), \( (u_{i})^{(t)} \cdot |\mu\rangle = 0 \) for all \( i \in \mathbb{Z}, \mu \in \Pi \) and \( t \geq 2 \), it follows that \( \widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\lambda\rangle \) is then a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of \( (u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_m}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle \), where \( m = \dim M(m) \) and \( i_1, \ldots, i_m \in \mathbb{Z} \). By the definition, \( (u_{i_1} \cdots u_{i_m}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle \) either is zero or lies in \( \Pi \). Therefore, \( \widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\lambda\rangle \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of \( |\mu\rangle \) with \( \mu \in \Pi \). \( \square \)

**Proposition 5.3.** (1) For each \( m \in \mathcal{M}_\infty \),
\[
\widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \in \mathcal{Z}|\lambda\rangle \quad \text{for some} \quad \lambda \in \Pi \quad \text{with} \quad m_\lambda \leq_{\deg m} \infty m.
\]

(2) For each \( \lambda \in \Pi \),
\[
\widetilde{u}_{m_\lambda} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = |\lambda\rangle.
\]
In particular, \( b_{m_\lambda} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = |\lambda\rangle \).

**Proof.** (1) If \( \widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = 0 \), there is nothing to prove. Now suppose \( \widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \neq 0 \). By Lemma 5.2(2), we write
\[
\widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \Pi} f_\lambda(v)|\lambda\rangle,
\]
where all \( f_\lambda(v) \in \mathcal{Z} \) but finitely many are zero. If \( f_\lambda(v) \neq 0 \), then \( \dim M(m_\lambda) = \dim M(m) \).
By Lemma 2.1(1), such a \( \lambda \in \Pi \) is unique. Hence, we may suppose \( \widetilde{u}_{m} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = f(v)|\lambda\rangle \) for some \( 0 \neq f(v) \in \mathcal{Z} \) and \( \lambda \in \Pi \). It remains to show that \( m_\lambda \leq_{\deg m} \infty m \).

Applying Lemma 5.2(1) implies that
\[
M = M(m) = S_{i_1} [a_1] \oplus \cdots \oplus S_{i_t} [a_t],
\]
where \( i_1 < \cdots < i_t \) and \( a_1, \ldots, a_t \geq 1 \). Then
\[
u_{[S_{i_1}[a_1]]} \cdots u_{[S_{i_t}[a_t]]} = v^a u_{m},
\]
where \( a = \sum_{1 \leq p < q \leq t} \langle \dim S_{i_q}[a_q], \dim S_{i_p}[a_p] \rangle \).

We proceed induction on \( t \) to show that \( M(m_\lambda) \leq_{\deg m} M = M(m) \). If \( t = 1 \), this follows from Lemma 5.1(2). Let now \( t > 1 \) and let \( \mu \in \Pi \) be such that
\[
u_{[S_{i_2}[a_2]]} \cdots u_{[S_{i_t}[a_t]]} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = g(v)|\mu\rangle \quad \text{for some} \quad 0 \neq g(v) \in \mathcal{Z}.
\]
Then \( u_{[S_{i_1}[a_1]]} \cdot |\mu\rangle = v^a f(v) g(v)^{-1} |\lambda\rangle \). By the induction hypothesis,
\[
M(m_\mu) \leq_{\deg m} S_{i_2}[a_2] \oplus \cdots \oplus S_{i_t}[a_t].
\]
By writing \( u_{[S_{i_1}[a_1]]} \) as a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of \( u_{i} \)'s and applying Lemma 5.1(1), there exists \( X \in \text{Rep} \Delta_{\infty} \) satisfying \( \dim X = \dim S_{i_1}[a_1] \) with an exact sequence
\[
0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow M(m_\lambda) \rightarrow M(m_\mu) \rightarrow 0.
\]
Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be a basis of $\bigwedge^\infty$. By using an argument similar to that in the proof of Lemma 5.1(2), we obtain that
\[
\text{dim} \bigoplus_{s < t} \mathfrak{p}_s \mathfrak{p}_t = M(\mathfrak{p}),
\]
that is, $\mathfrak{p} \leq_{\text{deg}} \mathfrak{m}$.

(2) Write $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_t)$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_t \geq 1$. Since
\[
M(\mathfrak{m}) = S_0[\lambda_1] \oplus S_{-1}[\lambda_2] \oplus \cdots \oplus S_{1-t}[\lambda_t],
\]
we have that
\[
\sum_{1 \leq r < s \leq t} \langle \dim S_{1-r}[\lambda_r], \dim S_{1-s}[\lambda_s] \rangle = \sum_{1 \leq r < s \leq t} \text{dim} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(S_{1-r}[\lambda_r], S_{1-s}[\lambda_s]).
\]
By using an argument similar to that in the proof of Lemma 5.1(2), we obtain that
\[
v^{-}u_{\mathfrak{m}_\lambda} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = \langle u_{[1-t][\lambda_t]} \cdots u_{[1-2][\lambda_2]} u_{[0][\lambda_1]} \rangle \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = v^{\lambda_1-1} \langle u_{[1-t][\lambda_t]} \cdots u_{[1-2][\lambda_2]} \rangle \cdot |\lambda_1\rangle = c^{\lambda_1+\cdots+\lambda_t} \langle u_{[1-t][\lambda_t]} \cdots u_{[1-2][\lambda_2]} \rangle \cdot |\lambda_1, \lambda_2\rangle = v^{\lambda_1+\cdots+\lambda_t} \cdot |\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_t\rangle = v^{\lambda_1+\cdots+\lambda_t} \cdot |\lambda\rangle.
\]
Since
\[
\text{dim} \text{End}_{\Delta}(M(\mathfrak{m})) = \sum_{1 \leq r < s \leq t} \text{dim} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(S_{1-r}[\lambda_r], S_{1-s}[\lambda_s]) = c + t
\]
and $\text{dim} M(\mathfrak{m}) = \lambda_1 + \cdots + \lambda_t$, it follows that
\[
\sum_{1 \leq r < s \leq t} \langle \dim S_{1-r}[\lambda_r], \dim S_{1-s}[\lambda_s] \rangle = \sum_{1 \leq r < s \leq t} \text{dim} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(S_{1-r}[\lambda_r], S_{1-s}[\lambda_s]) = c + t.
\]
By (4.0.9),
\[
b_{\mathfrak{m}_\lambda}^{-} \in \mathfrak{m}_\lambda^{-} + \sum_{\mathfrak{p} <_{\text{deg}} \mathfrak{m}_\lambda} v^{-1}Z[v^{-1}] \mathfrak{p}^{-}.
\]
Let $\mathfrak{p} <_{\text{deg}} \mathfrak{m}_\lambda$ and suppose $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda^{-} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \neq 0$. By (1), there exists $\mu \in \Pi$ with $\mathfrak{m}_\mu \leq_{\text{deg}} \mathfrak{p}$ such that $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda^{-} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = f(v) |\mu\rangle$ for some $f(v) \in Z$. Thus, $\mathfrak{m}_\mu <_{\text{deg}} \mathfrak{m}_\lambda$. By Lemma 2.1(1), $\mu = \lambda$ since $\text{dim} M(\mathfrak{m}_\mu) = \text{dim} M(\mathfrak{m}_\lambda)$. This is a contradiction. Hence, $\mathfrak{p}_\lambda^{-} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = 0$. We conclude that
\[
b_{\mathfrak{m}_\lambda}^{-} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = \mathfrak{p}_\lambda^{-} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = |\lambda\rangle.
\]

As a consequence of the proposition above, we obtain [45, Prop. 5.1] as follows.

**Corollary 5.4.** The subspace $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{p}^{-}(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$ spanned by $b_{\mathfrak{m}}^{-}$ with $\mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{M} - \{\mathfrak{m}_\lambda | \lambda \in \Pi\}$ is a left ideal of $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{p}^{-}(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$. Moreover, the map
\[
\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{p}^{-}(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)/\mathcal{I} \longrightarrow \bigwedge^\infty, \quad b_{\mathfrak{m}_\lambda}^{-} + \mathcal{I} \longmapsto |\lambda\rangle, \quad \lambda \in \Pi
\]
is an isomorphism of $\mathcal{U}_\mathfrak{p}^{-}(\mathfrak{sl}_\infty)$-modules.

**Proof.** This follows from Proposition 5.3(2) and the fact that the set
\[
\{b_{\mathfrak{m}}^{-} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \neq 0 | \mathfrak{m} \in \mathfrak{M}_\infty\}
\]
is a basis of $\bigwedge^\infty$; see [34, Th. 14.4.11].
Finally, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\lambda \in \Pi$, put
\[ n_i^- (\lambda) = \sum_{j<i, j \in I} n_j (\lambda), \quad n_i^+ (\lambda) = \sum_{j>i, j \in I} n_j (\lambda), \quad \text{and} \quad n_i (\lambda) = \sum_{j \in I} n_j (\lambda). \]

By [17, 36], there is a $U_v(\widehat{sl}_n)$-module structure on $\wedge_\infty$ defined by
\[ (6.0.3) \]
\[ K_\gamma \cdot |\lambda\rangle = v^{n_i (\lambda)} |\lambda\rangle, \quad E_\gamma \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_{j \in I} v^{n_j (\lambda)} E_j \cdot |\lambda\rangle, \quad F_\gamma \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_{j \in I} v^{-n_j (\lambda)} F_j \cdot |\lambda\rangle, \]
where $\gamma \in I_n = \mathbb{Z} / n\mathbb{Z}$.

6. The $q$-deformed Fock space II: $\mathcal{D}(n)$-module

In this section we first recall the left $\mathcal{D}(n)^{\leq 0}$-module structure on the Fock space $\wedge_\infty$ defined by Varagnolo and Vasserot in [45] and then extend their construction to obtain a $\mathcal{D}(n)$-module structure on $\wedge_\infty$.

For each $x = \sum_m x_m u_m \in \mathcal{H}(\Delta)$ with $\Delta = \Delta_n$ or $\Delta_\infty$, we write
\[ x^\pm = \sum_m x_m u_m^\pm \in \mathcal{D}(\Delta)^\pm. \]

Then for each $d \in \mathbb{N}I_\infty$, the map $\gamma_d : \mathcal{H}(\Delta_n)_d \to \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty)_d$ defined in Section 3 induces $\mathbb{Q}(v)$-linear maps
\[ \gamma_d^\pm : \mathcal{D}(n)^\pm_d \to \mathcal{D}(\infty)^\pm_d \]
such that $\gamma_d^\pm (x^\pm) = (\gamma_d (x))^\pm$ for each $x \in \mathcal{H}(\Delta_\infty)$.

Following [45, 6.2], for each $\bar{\imath} \in I_n = \mathbb{Z} / n\mathbb{Z}$, $\lambda \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}(n)_d$, define
\[ (6.0.2) \]
\[ K_\gamma \cdot |\lambda\rangle = v^{n_i (\lambda)} |\lambda\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad x \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_d (\gamma_d (x) K_{d'}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle, \]
where the sum is taken over all $d \in \mathbb{N}I_\infty$ such that $\bar{d} = \alpha$ and $d' = \sum_{i>j, i=j} d_j \varepsilon_i$. By [45, Cor. 6.2], this defines a left $\mathcal{D}(n)^{\leq 0}$-module structure on $\wedge_\infty$ which extends the Hayashi action of $U_v^{\geq 0}(\widehat{sl}_n)$ on $\wedge_\infty$ defined in (5.4.1).

Dually, for each $\lambda \in \Pi$ and $x \in \mathcal{D}(n)_d$, define
\[ (6.0.3) \]
\[ x \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_d (\gamma_d^\pm (x) K_{d'}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle, \]
where the sum is taken over all $d \in \mathbb{N}I_\infty$ such that $\bar{d} = \alpha$ and $d'' = \sum_{i<j, i=j} d_j \varepsilon_i$. 

**Proposition 6.1.** The formula (6.0.3) defines a left $\mathcal{D}(n)^{\geq 0}$-module structure on $\wedge_\infty$ which extends the Hayashi action of $U_v^{\geq 0}(\widehat{sl}_n)$ on $\wedge_\infty$.

**Proof.** Let $x \in \mathcal{D}(n)_\alpha^{\pm}$ and $y \in \mathcal{D}(n)_\beta^{\pm}$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}I_n$. By the definition, we have, on the one hand, that
\[ (xy) \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_d (\gamma_d^\pm (xy) K_{d'}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle \]
and, on the other hand, that
\[ x \cdot (y \cdot |\lambda\rangle) = \sum_{a,b} (\gamma_a^+(x) K_{a''} \gamma_b^+(y) K_{b''}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle, \]
where the sum is taken over all $a, b \in \mathbb{N}I_\infty$ such that $\bar{a} = \alpha$ and $\bar{b} = \beta$. 
Since \( K_{\alpha'} \gamma^+_\beta(y) = v^{(\alpha', b)} \gamma^+_\beta(y) K_{\alpha'} \), we obtain that
\[
x \cdot (y \cdot |\lambda\rangle) = \sum_d \sum_{a+b=d} v^{(\alpha', b)} (\gamma^+_a (x) \gamma^+_b (y) K_{\alpha'}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle.
\]
By the definition,
\[
(a'', b) = ( \sum_{i<j, i=j} a_j \varepsilon_i, \sum_i b_i \varepsilon_i ) = \sum_{i<j, i=j} b_i (2a_j - a_{j-1} - a_{j+1}) = \kappa(a, b).
\]
Applying Lemma 3.3(2) gives that
\[
(xy) \cdot |\lambda\rangle = x \cdot (y \cdot |\lambda\rangle).
\]
Hence, \( \bigwedge^\infty \) becomes a left \( \mathcal{D}(n)^{>0} \)-module.
For each \( i \in I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \) and \( \lambda \in \Pi \), we have
\[
u^+_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_{j \in i} (u^+_j K_{-\varepsilon^*_j}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle.
\]
Since \( \varepsilon''_j = \sum_{l<j, l=j} \varepsilon_l \) for each \( j \in \tilde{i} \), it follows that
\[
K_{\varepsilon''_j} \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \prod_{l<j, l=j} K_{\varepsilon_l} \cdot |\lambda\rangle = v^{\sum_{l<j, l=j} n_l(\lambda)} |\lambda\rangle = v^{\varepsilon''_j(\lambda)} |\lambda\rangle.
\]
This implies that
\[
u^+_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_{j \in i} v^{\varepsilon''_j(\lambda)} u^+_j \cdot |\lambda\rangle,
\]
which coincides with the formula for \( E_i \cdot |\lambda\rangle \) in (5.4.1), as required. 

The main purpose of this section is to prove that formulas (6.0.2) and (6.0.3) indeed define a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module structure on \( \bigwedge^\infty \). The strategy is to pass to the semi-infinite \( \nu \)-wedge spaces defined in [27].

Let \( \Omega \) denote the \( \mathbb{Q}(v) \)-vector space with basis \( \{ \omega_i \mid i \in \mathbb{Z} \} \). By [6, Prop. 3.5], \( \Omega \) admits a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module structure defined by
\[
\begin{align*}
\nu^+_i \cdot \omega_s &= \delta_{i+1,s} \omega_{s-1}, & \nu^-_i \cdot \omega_s &= \delta_{i,s} \omega_{s+1} \\
K^\pm_i \cdot \omega_s &= v^{\pm \delta_{i,s} \mp \delta_{i+1,s}} \omega_s, & z^\pm_m \cdot \omega_s &= \omega_{s \mp mn}
\end{align*}
\]
for all \( i \in I_n \) and \( s, m \in \mathbb{Z} \) with \( m \geq 1 \). In particular, \( K^\pm_i \cdot \omega_s = \omega_s \) for each \( s \in \mathbb{Z} \). This is an extension of the \( U^\prime_q(\mathfrak{sl}_n) \)-action on \( \Omega \) defined in [27, 1.1] as well as an extension of the \( \mathcal{D}(n)^{>0} \)-action on \( \Omega \) defined in [45, 8.1]; see [6, 3.5].

For a fixed positive integer \( r \), consider the \( r \)-fold tensor product \( \Omega^{\otimes r} \) which has a basis
\[
\{ \omega_i = \omega_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{i_r} \mid i = (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r \}.
\]
The Hopf algebra structure of \( \mathcal{D}(n) \) induces a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module structure on the \( r \)-fold tensor product \( \Omega^{\otimes r} \). By (4.1.1), we have for each \( t \geq 1 \),
\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta^{(r-1)}(z^+_t) &= \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1 \otimes z^+_t \otimes K_{t\delta} \otimes \cdots \otimes K_{t\delta} \\
\Delta^{(r-1)}(z^-_t) &= \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} K_{-t\delta} \otimes \cdots \otimes K_{-t\delta} \otimes z^-_t \otimes 1 \otimes \cdots \otimes 1.
\end{align*}
\]
This implies particularly that for each \( t \geq 1 \) and \( \omega_1 = \omega_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{i_r} \in \Omega^\otimes r \),
\[
(6.1.3) \quad z_t^\pm \cdot \omega_1 = \sum_{s=1}^r \omega_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{i_{s-1}} \otimes \omega_{s+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{i_r}.
\]

By (4.0.3) and (4.0.5), for each \( \alpha \in N I_\alpha \), we have
\[
(6.1.4) \quad \Delta^{(r-1)}(\tilde{u}_{\alpha}^+) = \sum_{\alpha = \alpha^{(1)} + \cdots + \alpha^{(r)}} v^{\sum_{s=1}^r (\alpha^{(s)}, \alpha^{(t)})} \times \\
\Delta^{(r-1)}(\tilde{u}_{\alpha}^-) = \sum_{\alpha = \alpha^{(1)} + \cdots + \alpha^{(r)}} v^{\sum_{s=1}^r (\alpha^{(s)}, \alpha^{(t)})} \times \\
\tilde{u}_{\alpha^{(1)}}(K_{\alpha^{(1)}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{u}_{\alpha^{(r)}}(K_{\alpha^{(1)} + \cdots + \alpha^{(r-1)}}) \otimes \cdots \otimes \tilde{u}_{\alpha^{(r)}}(K_{\alpha^{(1)} + \cdots + \alpha^{(r-1)}}) \otimes \tilde{u}_{\alpha^{(r)}}(K_{\alpha^{(1)} + \cdots + \alpha^{(r-1)}}).
\]

This gives the following lemma; see [45, Lem. 8.3] and [6, Cor. 3.5.8].

**Lemma 6.2.** Let \( \alpha \in NI_\alpha \) and \( \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r \). Then
\[
(6.2.1) \quad \tilde{u}_{\alpha}^+ \cdot \omega_1 = \sum_{n} v^{c^+(i, i - n)} \omega_1 - n,
\]
where the sum is taken over the sequences \( \mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_r) \in \{0, 1\}^r \) satisfying \( \alpha = \sum_{s=1}^r n_s \varepsilon_{i_s - 1} \) and
\[
c^+(i, i - n) = \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq r} n_s (n_t - 1) \langle \varepsilon_{i_s}, \varepsilon_{i_t} \rangle;
\]
\[
(6.2.2) \quad \tilde{u}_{\alpha}^- \cdot \omega_1 = \sum_{n} v^{c^-(i, i + n)} \omega_1 + n,
\]
where the sum is taken over the sequences \( \mathbf{n} = (n_1, \ldots, n_r) \in \{0, 1\}^r \) satisfying \( \alpha = \sum_{s=1}^r n_s \varepsilon_{i_s} \) and
\[
c^-(i, i + n) = \sum_{1 \leq s < t \leq r} n_t (n_t - 1) \langle \varepsilon_{i_s}, \varepsilon_{i_t} \rangle.
\]

On the other hand, let \( \hat{H}(r) \) be the Hecke algebra of affine symmetric group of type A which is by definition a \( \mathbb{Q}(v) \)-algebra with generators \( T_i \) and \( X_j \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, r - 1, j = 1, \ldots, r \) and relations:
\[
(T_i + 1)(T_i - v^2) = 0, \\
T_i T_{i+1} T_i = T_{i+1} T_i T_i, \quad T_i T_j = T_j T_i \ (|i - j| > 1), \\
X_i X_i^{-1} = 1 = X_i X_j, \quad X_i X_j = X_j X_i, \\
T_i X_i T_i = v^2 X_i+1, \quad X_j T_i = T_i X_j \ (j \neq i, i+1).
\]

This is the so-called **Bernstein presentation** of \( \hat{H}(r) \).

By [45, Sect. 8.2], there is a right \( \hat{H}(r) \)-module structure on \( \Omega^\otimes r \) defined by
\[
(6.2.3) \quad \omega_1 \cdot T_{i_k} = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
v^2 \omega_1, & \text{if } i_k = i_{k+1}; \\
v \omega_{i_{k+1}}, & \text{if } -n < i_k < i_{k+1} < 0; \\
\nu \omega_{i_{k+1}} + (v^2 - 1) \omega_1, & \text{if } -n < i_{k+1} < i_k < 0,
\end{array} \right.
\]
where \( \mathbf{i} = (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r \), \( \omega_1 = \omega_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{i_r} \) and
\[
\omega_{i_{k+1}} = \omega_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{i_{k+1}} \otimes \omega_{i_{k+1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{i_r}.
\]
Following [45, Lem. 8.2] and [6, Prop. 3.5.5], the tensor space \( \Omega^{\otimes r} \) is indeed a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-\( \hat{\mathcal{H}}(r) \)-bimodule. Set

\[
\Xi^r = \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \text{Im} \left( 1 + T_i \right) \subseteq \Omega^{\otimes r},
\]

which is clearly a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-submodule of \( \Omega^{\otimes r} \). Thus, the quotient space \( \Omega^{\otimes r}/\Xi^r \) becomes a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module. For each \( i = (i_1, \ldots, i_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^r \), write

\[
\land \omega_i = \omega_{i_1} \land \ldots \land \omega_{i_r} = \omega_1^{\otimes r} \in \Omega^{\otimes r}/\Xi^r.
\]

By [27, Prop. 1.3], the set

\[
\{ \land \omega_i \mid i_1 > \cdots > i_r \}
\]

forms a basis of \( \Omega^{\otimes r}/\Xi^r \).

For each \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \), let \( \mathcal{B}_m \) denote the set of sequences \( i = (i_1, i_2, \ldots) \in \mathbb{Z}^\infty \) satisfying that \( i_s = m - s + 1 \) for \( s \gg 0 \), and set \( \mathcal{B}_\infty = \cup_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{B}_m \). As in [45, Sect. 10.1], let \( \Omega^\infty \) denote the space spanned by semi-infinite monomials

\[
\omega_i = \omega_{i_1} \otimes \omega_{i_2} \otimes \cdots, \quad \text{where} \quad i = (i_1, i_2, \ldots) \in \mathcal{B}_\infty.
\]

Then the affine Hecke algebra \( \hat{\mathcal{H}}(\infty) \) acts on \( \Omega^\infty \) via the formulas in (6.2.3). Set

\[
\Xi^\infty = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \text{Im} \left( 1 + T_i \right) \subseteq \Omega^\infty.
\]

For each \( i = (i_1, i_2, \ldots) \in \mathcal{B}_\infty \) as above, write

\[
\land \omega_i = \omega_{i_1} \land \omega_{i_2} \land \cdots = \omega_1^{\otimes \infty} \in \Omega^\infty/\Xi^\infty.
\]

By [27, Prop. 1.4], the \( \mathcal{U}'_n(\mathfrak{sl}_n) \)-module structure on \( \Omega^{\otimes r}/\Xi^r \) induces a \( \mathcal{U}'_n(\mathfrak{sl}_n) \)-module structure on \( \Omega^\infty/\Xi^\infty \). Moreover, the map

\[
\kappa : \land^\infty \longrightarrow \Omega^\infty/\Xi^\infty, \quad |\lambda| \longmapsto \land \omega_\lambda
\]

is an injective homomorphism of \( \mathcal{U}'_n(\mathfrak{sl}_n) \)-modules.

Following [27, 1.4], for each \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \), write

\[
|m| = \omega_m \land \omega_{m-1} \land \omega_{m-2} \land \cdots.
\]

Clearly, for each \( i = (i_1, i_2, \ldots) \in \mathcal{B}_m \), there exists a sufficiently large \( N \) such that

\[
\omega_i = (\omega_{i_1} \land \cdots \land \omega_{i_N}) \land \omega_t.
\]

By [27, Lem. 2.2] and (6.1.4), for given \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N}I \) and \( i \in \mathcal{B}_m \), there is \( t \gg 0 \) such that

\[
u^-_\alpha \cdot (\land \omega_i) = (\nu^-_\alpha \cdot (\omega_{i_1} \land \cdots \land \omega_{i_t})) \land |m - t|.
\]

Hence, the \( \mathcal{D}(n)^{\leq 0} \)-module structure on \( \Omega^{\otimes r}/\Xi^r \) induces a \( \mathcal{D}(n)^{\leq 0} \)-module structure on \( \Omega^\infty/\Xi^\infty \); see [45, Sect. 10.1]. Moreover, by [45, Lem. 10.1], the map \( \kappa : \land^\infty \longrightarrow \Omega^\infty/\Xi^\infty \) is a \( \mathcal{D}(n)^{\leq 0} \)-module homomorphism.

Dually, for each given \( i \in \mathcal{B}_m \), there is \( t \gg 0 \) such that

\[
u^+_\alpha \cdot (\land \omega_i) = (\nu^+_\alpha \cdot (\omega_{i_1} \land \cdots \land \omega_{i_t})) \land (K_\alpha \cdot |m - t|).
\]

Thus, \( \Omega^\infty/\Xi^\infty \) becomes a left \( \mathcal{D}(n)^{\geq 0} \)-module as well. We have the following result.

**Proposition 6.3.** The map \( \kappa \) is a \( \mathcal{D}(n)^{\geq 0} \)-module homomorphism.
Proof. We need to show that for each \( \lambda \in \Pi \) and \( \alpha \in N \Pi\),
\[
\kappa(\tilde{u}_\alpha^+ \cdot |\lambda\rangle) = \tilde{u}_\alpha^+(\wedge \omega_\lambda).
\]
For simplicity, write \( i = i_\lambda \). By (6.0.3),
\[
\tilde{u}_\alpha^+ \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_{d} (\gamma_d^+ (\tilde{u}_\alpha^+) K_{d^\nu}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_{d} v^{-h(d)} (\tilde{u}_d^+ K_{d^\nu}) \cdot |\lambda\rangle,
\]
where the sum is taken over all \( d \in N \Pi\) such that \( \tilde{d} = \alpha \) and \( h(d) = \sum_{i<j,i=\tilde{j}} d_i(d_{j+1} - d_j) \).

For each fixed \( d = (d_i) \in N \Pi\) with \( d = \alpha \), we have
\[
\tilde{u}_d^+ = \cdots \tilde{u}_{d_1 \epsilon_1}^+ \tilde{u}_{d_0 \epsilon_0}^+ \tilde{u}_{d_{-1} \epsilon_{-1}}^+ \cdots = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{u}_{d_i \epsilon_i}^+.
\]
By the definition, \( \tilde{u}_d^+ \cdot |\lambda\rangle \neq 0 \) implies that
\[
d = \sum_{s \geq 1} n_s \epsilon_{i_s - 1},
\]
where \( n_s \in \{0, 1\} \) for all \( s \geq 1 \). Moreover, if this is the case, then
\[
\tilde{u}_d^+ \cdot |\lambda\rangle = |\mu_n\rangle,
\]
where \( n = (n_1, n_2, \ldots) \) and \( \mu_n = \mu \in \Pi \) is determined by \( i_\mu = i - n \). Therefore, for \( d \in N \Pi\) with \( d = \sum_{s \geq 1} n_s \epsilon_{i_s - 1} \), we have that
\[
K_{d^\nu} \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \prod_{\tilde{i}_s = i_t, i_s > i_t} K_{\tilde{i}_s}^{n_s} \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \left( \prod_{\tilde{i}_s = i_t, i_s > i_t} v^{n_s \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (\delta_{i_t - i_s - 1})} \right) \cdot |\lambda\rangle
\]
and
\[
h(d) = \sum_{i_s > i_t} -n_s n_t (\delta_{i_s, i_t} - \delta_{i_s, i_t + 1}) = -\sum_{i_s > i_t} n_s n_t (\epsilon_{i_t}, \epsilon_{i_s}).
\]
Since \( i_s > i_t \) if and only if \( s < t \), we conclude that
\[
\tilde{u}_d^+ \cdot |\lambda\rangle = \sum_{n} v^{x(n)} |\mu_n\rangle,
\]
where the sum is taken over the sequences \( n = (n_1, n_2, \ldots) \in \{0, 1\}^\infty \) satisfying \( \alpha = \sum_{s=1}^{r} n_s \epsilon_{i_s - 1} \)
and
\[
x(n) = \sum_{1 \leq s < t} n_s (n_t - 1) (\epsilon_{i_t}, \epsilon_{i_s}).
\]
This together with (6.2.1) implies that
\[
\kappa(\tilde{u}_\alpha^+ \cdot |\lambda\rangle) = \sum_{n} v^{x(n)} \kappa(|\mu_n\rangle) = \sum_{n} v^{x(n)} \wedge \omega_{\alpha n} = \tilde{u}_\alpha^+ (\wedge \omega_{\lambda}) = \tilde{u}_\alpha^+ (\kappa(|\lambda\rangle)).
\]
This finishes the proof.

As a consequence of the results above, to prove that the formulas (6.0.2) and (6.0.3) define a \( D(n)\)-module structure on \( \wedge^\infty \), it suffices to show that the \( D(n)^{<0}\)-module and \( D(n)^{>0}\)-module structures on \( \Omega^\infty / \Xi^\infty \) define a \( D(n)\)-module structure. In other words, we need to show that the actions of \( K_t^{\pm 1}, u_t^{\pm 1}, u_t^- (i \in I_0) \) and \( z_t^+, z_s^- (s \geq 1) \) on \( \Omega^\infty / \Xi^\infty \) satisfy the relations (DH1)–(DH5) in Section 4. In the following we only check the relations
\[
[z_t^+, z_s^-] = \delta_{t,s} \frac{t(2n - 1)}{(t - v)^2} (K_{t\delta} - K_{-\delta}).
\]
The other relations either follow from [27] or can be checked directly.

By [27, §2], for each $t \geq 1$, there are Heisenberg operators $B_t^\pm : \Omega^\infty / \Xi^\infty \to \Omega^\infty / \Xi^\infty$ taking

$$B_t(\wedge \omega_i) \mapsto \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \wedge \omega_i \wedge e_s,$$

where $i \in \mathscr{R}_{\infty}$ and $e_s = (\delta_i)_s, i \geq 1 \in \mathbb{Z}^\infty$. Note that for each $i \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}$, $\wedge \omega_i \wedge e_s = 0$ for $s \gg 0$.

**Proposition 6.4.** For each $t \geq 1$ and $i \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}$,

$$B_t^+(\wedge \omega_i) = v^t z^+_i \cdot (\wedge \omega_i) \quad \text{and} \quad B_t^- (\wedge \omega_i) = z^-_i \cdot (\wedge \omega_i).$$

**Proof.** As in [27, (49)], for each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, write

$$|m| = \omega_m \wedge \omega_{m-1} \wedge \omega_{m-2} \wedge \cdots \in \Omega^\infty / \Xi^\infty.$$ 

Then $z_t^+ \cdot |m| = 0$ and $K_\delta \cdot |m| = q|m|$. Write

$$\wedge \omega_i = \omega_i \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_i\wedge |N - m|.$$ 

Applying (6.1.2) gives that

$$z_t^+ \cdot (\wedge \omega_i)$$

$$= \sum_{s=0}^{N} \omega_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_{i_s} \wedge z_t^+ \cdot \omega_{i_{s+1}} \wedge K_\delta \cdot \omega_{i_{s+2}} \wedge \cdots \wedge K_\delta \cdot \omega_{i_{N}} \wedge K_\delta \cdot |N - m|$$

$$= \sum_{s=0}^{N} v^t \omega_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_{i_s} \wedge \omega_{i_{s+1}} \wedge \omega_{i_{s+2}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \omega_{i_{N}} \wedge |N - m|$$

$$= v^t B_t^+ (\wedge \omega_i) \quad \text{(since $B_t^+(|N - m|) = 0$),}$$

that is, $B_t^+(\wedge \omega_i) = v^t z_t^+ \cdot (\wedge \omega_i)$. The second equality can be proved similarly. $\square$

**Corollary 6.5.** Let $t, s \geq 1$. Then for each $i \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}$,

$$[z_t^+, z_s^-] \cdot (\wedge \omega_i) = \delta_{t,s} t \frac{(v^{2nt} - 1)}{(v^t - v^{-t})^2} (K_\delta - K_{-\delta}) \cdot (\wedge \omega_i).$$

**Proof.** By [27, Prop. 2.2 & 2.6] (with $q = v$),

$$[B_t^+, B_s^-] = \delta_{t,s} \frac{t(1 - v^{2nt})}{1 - v^{2nt}}.$$

This together with Proposition 6.4 implies that for each $i \in \mathcal{B}_{\infty}$,

$$[z_t^+, z_s^-] \cdot (\wedge \omega_i) = v^t [B_t^+, B_s^-] \delta_{t,s} \cdot (\wedge \omega_i) = \delta_{t,s} \frac{tv^t(1 - v^{2nt})}{1 - v^{2nt}} (\wedge \omega_i).$$

On the other hand,

$$\delta_{t,s} \frac{t(v^{2nt} - 1)}{(v^t - v^{-t})^2} (K_\delta - K_{-\delta}) \cdot (\wedge \omega_i) = \delta_{t,s} \frac{t(v^{2nt} - 1)}{(v^t - v^{-t})^2} (v^t - v^{-t})(\wedge \omega_i)$$

$$= \delta_{t,s} \frac{tv^t(1 - v^{2nt})}{1 - v^{2nt}} (\wedge \omega_i).$$

This gives the desired equality. $\square$

In conclusion, $\wedge \omega_i$ becomes a $\mathcal{D}(n)$-module which is obtained by the restriction of the $\mathcal{D}(n)$-module structure on $\Omega^\infty / \Xi^\infty$ via the map $\kappa$. 

7. An isomorphism from \( L(\Lambda_0) \) to \( \bigwedge^\infty \)

In this section we show that the Fock space \( \bigwedge^\infty \) as a \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module is isomorphic to the basic representation \( L(\Lambda_0) \) defined in Section 5. As an application, the decomposition of \( L(\Lambda_0) \) in Corollary 4.5 induces the Kashiwara–Miwa–Stern decomposition of \( \bigwedge^\infty \) in [27].

**Proposition 7.1.** For each \( m \in \mathcal{M}_n \), \( \overline{u}_m \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \) is a \( \mathbb{Z} \)-linear combination of those \( |\mu\rangle \) satisfying \( m_\mu \leq_{\text{deg}} m \).

**Proof.** By (6.0.2),
\[
\overline{u}_m \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = \sum_{d} (\gamma_d(\overline{u}_m)K_{-d'}) \cdot |\emptyset\rangle,
\]
where \( d' = \sum_{i<j} d_i \varepsilon_i \). Since \( K_i \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = v^{\delta_{i,0}}|\emptyset\rangle \) for \( i \in \mathbb{Z} \), it follows that \( K_{-d'} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = v^{-\sum_{j<0} d_j} |\emptyset\rangle \). By Proposition 3.4,
\[
\gamma_d(\overline{u}_m) \in \sum_j \mathbb{Z} \overline{u}_j,
\]
where the sum is taken over \( j \in \mathcal{M}_\infty \) with \( \mathcal{F}(\overline{u}_j) \leq_{\text{deg}} m \). Further, by Proposition 5.3(1),
\[
\overline{u}_j \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \in \mathbb{Z} |\mu\rangle
\]
for some \( \mu \in \Pi \) with \( m_\mu \leq_{\text{deg}} \mathcal{F}(\overline{u}_j) \leq_{\text{deg}} m \). This implies that
\[
m_\mu = \mathcal{F}(m_\mu) \leq_{\text{deg}} \mathcal{F}(\overline{u}_j) \leq_{\text{deg}} m.
\]
This finishes the proof. \( \square \)

For each \( \mathbf{d} = (d_i) \in NI_\infty \), set
\[
\sigma(\mathbf{d}) = - \sum_{i<0, i=0} d_i.
\]
For \( \lambda \in \Pi \), we write \( \sigma(\lambda) = \sigma(\text{dim} M(m_\lambda)) \). The following result was proved in [45, 9.2 & 10.1]. We provide here a direct proof for completeness.

**Corollary 7.2.** For each \( \lambda \in \Pi \),
\[
\overline{u}_{m_{\lambda}} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \in |\lambda\rangle + \sum_{\mu<\lambda} \mathbb{Z} |\mu\rangle.
\]
In particular, the \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module \( \bigwedge^\infty \) is generated by \( |\emptyset\rangle \) and the set
\[
\{ \overline{u}_{m_{\lambda}} |\emptyset\rangle | \lambda \in \Pi \}
\]
is a basis of \( \bigwedge^\infty \).

**Proof.** Applying Corollary 3.5 gives that
\[
\overline{u}_{m_{\lambda}} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{d}} (\gamma_d(\overline{u}_{m_{\lambda}})K_{-d'}) \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = \sum_{\mathbf{d}} v^{\sigma(\mathbf{d})} \gamma_d(\overline{u}_{m_{\lambda}}) \cdot |\emptyset\rangle
\]
\[
= \sum_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} v^{\delta(\lambda)+\sigma(\lambda)} \overline{u}_{r m_{\lambda} (m_\lambda)} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{M}_\infty, \mathcal{F}(\overline{u}_j) \leq_{\text{deg}} m_{\lambda}} f_{\lambda,j} \overline{u}_j \cdot |\emptyset\rangle,
\]
where \( f_{\lambda,j} \in \mathbb{Z} \). By Proposition 5.3 and its proof,
\[
\overline{u}_{m_{\lambda}} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = |\lambda\rangle \text{ and } \overline{u}_{r m_{\lambda} (m_\lambda)} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = 0 \text{ for } r > 0.
\]
Furthermore, for each \( r < 0 \), \( \overline{u}_{r m_{\lambda} (m_\lambda)} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle \in \mathbb{Z} |\mu\rangle \) such that \( m_\mu \leq_{\text{deg}} r m_{\lambda} (m_\lambda) \). Then \( m_\mu = \mathcal{F}(m_\mu) \leq_{\text{deg}} \mathcal{F}(r m_{\lambda} (m_\lambda)) = m_{\lambda} \), which implies that \( \mu \leq \lambda \). Since \( M(r m_{\lambda} (m_\lambda)) \) does not have a
composition factor isomorphic to $S_{\lambda - 1}$, $\mu$ does not contain a box with color $\lambda_1 - 1$. Thus, $\mu \neq \lambda$ and $\mu < \lambda$.

Finally, by Proposition 7.1, for each $j \in \mathcal{M}_\infty$ with $\mathcal{F}(j) <_{\deg} m_\lambda$, $u_j^{-1} |\emptyset\rangle$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of $|\mu\rangle$ satisfying $m_\mu <_{\deg} \mathcal{F}(j)$. Thus, $m_\mu <_{\deg} \mathcal{F}(j) <_{\deg} m_\lambda$, which by Lemma 2.1 implies that $\mu < \lambda$. Hence, each $u_j^{-1} |\emptyset\rangle$ is a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear combination of $|\mu\rangle$ with $\mu < \lambda$. Consequently, $\theta(\lambda) + \sigma(\lambda) = 0$.

Write $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_m)$ with $\lambda_1 \geq \cdots \geq \lambda_m \geq 1$ and set $|\lambda\rangle = \sum_{s=1}^m \lambda_s$. We proceed induction on $|\lambda\rangle$ to show that $\theta(\lambda) + \sigma(\lambda) = 0$. By the definition,

$$\theta(\lambda) = \sum_{s<\ell} \kappa(d_s, d_{\ell}) - \sum_{s=1}^\ell h(d_s),$$

where $\ell = \lambda_1$ is the Loewy length of $M = M(m_\infty^\lambda)$ and $S_{d_s} \cong \text{rad}^{s-1} M/\text{rad}^s M$ for $1 \leq s \leq \ell$. Let $1 \leq t \leq m$ be such that $\lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_t > \lambda_{t+1}$ and define $\lambda' = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_{t-1}, \lambda_{t+1}, \lambda_{t+2})$.

Then $|\lambda'| = |\lambda| - 1$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\theta(\lambda') + \sigma(\lambda') = 0$.

For each $1 \leq s \leq \ell$, let $d_s' \in NI_\infty$ be defined by setting $S_{d_s'} \cong \text{rad}^{s-1} M'/\text{rad}^s M'$, where $M' = M(m_\infty^\lambda)$. Then $d_{s'} = d_s$ for $1 \leq s < \ell$.

This implies that

$$\sum_{s=1}^\ell h(d_s) - \sum_{s=1}^\ell h(d_{s'}) = h(d_{\ell}) - h(d_{\ell}') = -\delta_{\ell,1}$$

and

$$\sum_{s<\ell} \kappa(d_s, d_{\ell}) - \sum_{s<\ell} \kappa(d_{s'}, d_{\ell}') = \sum_{1 \leq s < \ell} \kappa(d_s, \varepsilon_{\ell-t}).$$

Hence,

$$\theta(\lambda) - \theta(\lambda') = \sum_{1 \leq s < \ell} \kappa(d_s, \varepsilon_{\ell-t}) + \delta_{\ell,1}.$$
By the definition, for each \( i \in I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \),
\[
K_i |\emptyset\rangle = v^{\delta_i,0} |\emptyset\rangle.
\]
This together with the corollary above implies that \( \bigwedge^\infty \) is a highest weight \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module of highest weight \( \Lambda_0 \). Consequently, there is a unique surjective \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-module homomorphism
\[
\varphi : \mathcal{D}(n)^- \rightarrow \bigwedge^\infty, \quad \eta_{\Lambda_0} \mapsto |\emptyset\rangle.
\]
**Theorem 7.3.** The homomorphism \( \varphi \) induces an isomorphism of \( \mathcal{D}(n) \)-modules
\[
\bar\varphi : L(\Lambda_0) \rightarrow \bigwedge^\infty.
\]
**Proof.** By definition, we have
\[
F_i \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i \in I_n \setminus \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad F_0^2 \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = 0.
\]
Therefore, \( \varphi \) induces a surjective homomorphism
\[
\bar\varphi : L(\Lambda_0) = \mathcal{D}(n)^-/ (\sum_{i \in I_n} \mathcal{D}(n)^- F_i^{\Lambda_0(h_i)+1}) \rightarrow \bigwedge^\infty.
\]
Since \( L(\Lambda_0) \) is simple, we conclude that \( \bar\varphi \) is an isomorphism. \( \square \)

Combining the theorem with Corollary 4.5 gives the decomposition of \( \bigwedge^\infty \) obtained by Kashiwara, Miwa and Stern in [27, Prop. 2.3].

**Corollary 7.4.** As a \( U'_{\hat{sl}_n} \)-module, \( \bigwedge^\infty \) has a decomposition
\[
\bigwedge^\infty |U'_{\hat{sl}_n} \rangle \cong \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} L_0(\Lambda_0 - m\delta^*) \oplus Z[t].
\]

8. The Canonical Basis for \( \bigwedge^\infty \)

In this section we show that the canonical basis of \( \bigwedge^\infty \) defined in [29] can be constructed by using the monomial basis of the Ringel–Hall algebra of \( \Delta_n \) given in [8]. We also interpret the “ladder method” in [28] in terms of generic extensions defined in Section 2.

Recall that there is a bar-involution \( a \mapsto a = \xi^{-1} \) on \( \mathcal{D}(n)^- \) which takes \( \xi = v^{-1} \) and fixes all \( \bar{u}_\alpha \) for \( \alpha \in NI_n \). Then it induces a semilinear involution on the basic representation \( L(\Lambda_0) \) by setting
\[
\bar{a} \eta_{\Lambda_0} = \bar{a} \eta_{\Lambda_0} \quad \text{for all} \quad a \in \mathcal{D}(n)^-.
\]
On the other hand, by [29], there is a semilinear involution \( x \mapsto \xi x \) on \( \bigwedge^\infty \) which, by [45], satisfies
\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] \( |\emptyset\rangle = |\emptyset\rangle \),
  \item[(ii)] \( ax = \bar{a} \xi x \) for all \( a \in \mathcal{D}(n)^- \) and \( x \in \bigwedge^\infty \).
\end{itemize}
Therefore, the isomorphism \( L(\Lambda_0) \rightarrow \bigwedge^\infty \) given in Theorem 7.3 is compatible with the bar-involutions.

It is proved in [29, Th. 3.3] that for each \( \lambda \in \Pi \),
\[
|\lambda\rangle = |\lambda\rangle + \sum_{\mu < \lambda} a_{\mu,\lambda} |\mu\rangle, \quad \text{where} \quad a_{\mu,\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]
Then applying the standard linear algebra method to the basis \( \{ |\lambda\rangle \mid \lambda \in \Pi \} \) in [31] (or see [11] for more details) gives rise to an “IC basis” \( \{ b_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Pi \} \) which is characterized by
\[
b_\lambda = b_\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad b_\lambda \in |\lambda\rangle + \sum_{\mu < \lambda} \xi^{-1} Z[v^{-1}]|\mu\rangle,
\]
The basis \( \{ b_\lambda \mid \lambda \in \Pi \} \) is called the canonical basis of \( \bigwedge^\infty \). In other words, the basis elements \( b_\lambda \) are uniquely determined by the polynomials \( a_{\mu,\lambda} \).
Remark 8.1. Varagnolo and Vasserot [45] have conjectured that
\[ b_m^{-} \cdot |\emptyset\rangle = b_{\lambda} \] for each \( \lambda \in \Pi \).
This conjecture was proved by Schiffmann [40].

In the following we provide a way to deduce (8.0.1) by using the monomial basis of the Ringel–Hall algebra of \( \Delta_n \) given in [8]. As in [8, Sect. 3], set
\[ I^e = I_n \cup \{ \text{all sincere vectors in } \mathbb{N}I_n \} \]
and consider the set \( \Sigma \) of all words on the alphabet \( I \). Since \( \mathcal{D}(n)^- \) is isomorphic to the opposite Ringel–Hall algebra of \( \Delta_n \), we define
\[ M \ast' N = N \ast M. \]
This gives the map
\[ \varphi^\text{op} : \Sigma \rightarrow \mathcal{M}, \ w = a_1a_2\cdots a_t \mapsto S_{a_1} \ast' S_{a_2} \ast' \cdots \ast' S_{a_t}. \]
By [8, Sect. 9], for each \( m \in \mathcal{M} \), there is a distinguished word \( w_m \in (\varphi^\text{op})^{-1}(m) \) which defines a monomial \( m^{(w_m)} \) on \( \bar{u}_\alpha \) with \( \alpha \in \bar{I} \) such that
\[ m^{(w_m)} = \bar{u}_m + \sum_{p < \deg m} \theta_{p,m} \bar{u}_p \text{ for some } \theta_{m,p} \in \mathbb{Z}; \]
see [8, (9.1.1)]. If \( m = m_\lambda \) for some \( \lambda \in \Pi \), we simply write \( w_{m_\lambda} = w_\lambda \). Thus,
\[ m^{(w_\lambda)} = \bar{u}_{m_\lambda} + \sum_{p < \deg m_\lambda} \theta_{p,m_\lambda} \bar{u}_p. \]
This together with Proposition 7.1 and Corollary 7.2 implies that
\[ m^{(w_\lambda)}|\emptyset\rangle = |\lambda\rangle + \sum_{\mu < \lambda} \tau_{\mu,\lambda}|\mu\rangle, \]
where \( \tau_{\mu,\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z} \). Since the monomials \( m^{(w_\lambda)} \) are bar-invariant, we deduce that for each \( \lambda \in \Pi \),
\[ |\lambda\rangle = |\lambda\rangle + \sum_{\mu < \lambda} a'_{\mu,\lambda}|\mu\rangle \text{ for some } a'_{\mu,\lambda} \in \mathbb{Z}. \]
Comparing with (8.0.1) gives that
\[ a_{\mu,\lambda} = a'_{\mu,\lambda} \text{ for all } \mu < \lambda. \]
In case \( \lambda \) is \( n \)-regular, then \( m_\lambda \) is aperiodic and the word \( w_\lambda \) can be chosen in \( \Omega \), the subset of all words on the alphabet \( I_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \); see [8, Sect. 4]. In other words, \( m^{(w_\lambda)} \) is a monomial of the divided powers \( \bar{u}_i^{-}(t) = F_i(t) \) for \( i \in I_n \) and \( t \geq 1 \). We now interpret the “ladder method” in [28, Sect. 6] in terms of the generic extension map. Let \( \lambda = (\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_t) \in \Pi \) be \( n \)-regular. Recall the corresponding nilpotent representation
\[ M(m_\lambda) = \bigoplus_{a=1}^t S_{1-a}[\lambda_a], \]
where \( 1 - a \) is viewed as an element in \( I_n \). Take \( 1 \leq s \leq t \) with \( \lambda_1 = \cdots = \lambda_s > \lambda_{s+1} \) (\( \lambda_{t+1} = 0 \) by convention) and let \( k \geq 0 \) be maximal such that
\[ \lambda_{s+l(n-1)+1} = \cdots = \lambda_{s+(l+1)(n-1)+1} \text{ and } \lambda_{s+l(n-1)+1} = \lambda_{s+l(n-1)+1} + 1 \text{ for } 0 \leq l \leq k - 1. \]
Let \( i_1 \in I \) be such that \( \text{soc } (S_{1-a}[\lambda_s]) = S_{i_1} \). Then for each \( a = s + l(n - 1) \) with \( 0 \leq l \leq k \),
\[ \text{soc } (S_{1-a}[\lambda_a]) = S_{i_1}. \]
Define $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_t) \in \Pi$ by setting
\[
\mu_a = \begin{cases} 
\lambda_a - 1, & \text{if } a = s + l(n-1) \text{ for some } 0 \leq l \leq k; \\
\lambda_a, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}
\]
It is easy to see from the construction that $\mu$ is again $n$-regular. Moreover, by applying an argument similar to that in the proof of [5, Prop. 3.7],
\[(k+1)S_1 \ast \cdots \ast M(m_\mu) = M(m_\mu) \ast (k+1)S_1 = M(m_\lambda).
\]
Repeating the above process, we finally obtain a sequence $i_1, \ldots, i_d$ in $I_n$ and positive integers $k_1 = k+1, \ldots, k_d$ such that
\[(k_1S_1) \ast \cdots \ast (k_dS_d) = M(m_\lambda).
\]
In other word, the word $w_\lambda := i_1^{k_1} \cdots i_d^{k_d}$ lies in $(G^\text{op})^{-1}(m_\lambda)$. It can be also checked that the word $w_\lambda$ is distinguished. Thus, the corresponding monomial
\[m_{(w_\lambda)} = (u_{i_1}^{-1})^{(k_1)} \cdots (u_{i_d}^{-1})^{(k_d)} = F_{i_1}^{(k_1)} \cdots F_{i_d}^{(k_d)}
\]
gives rise to the equality (8.1.2) for the element $m_{(w_\lambda)}|\emptyset\rangle$. We remark that $m_{(w_\lambda)}|\emptyset\rangle$ coincides with the element $A(\lambda)$ constructed in [28, (8)] by using the “ladder method” of James and Kerber [22].
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