Symmetric functions and Springer representations*

Syu KATO†

November 27, 2021

Dedicated to the memory of Tonny Albert Springer

Abstract

The characters of the (total) Springer representations are identified with the Green functions by Kazhdan [Israel J. Math. **28** (1977)], and the latter are identified with Hall-Littlewood's Q-functions by Green [Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (1955)]. In this paper, we present a purely algebraic proof that the (total) Springer representations of $GL(n)$ are Ext-orthogonal to each other, and show that it is compatible with the natural categorification of the ring of symmetric functions.

Introduction

Let G be a connected reductive algebraic group over an algebraically closed field with a Borel subgroup B. Let W be the Weyl groups of G, and let $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathrm{Lie}\, G$ denote the variety of nilpotent elements. The cohomology of the fiber of the Springer resolution

$$\mu : T^*(G/B) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N},$$

affords a representation of W. This is widely recognized as the Springer representation [24], and it is proved to be an essential tool in representation theory of finite and p-adic Chevalley groups [16, 13, 17, 18, 10]. Here and below, we understand that the Springer representation refers to the *total* cohomology of a Springer fiber instead of the top cohomology, commonly seen in the literature.

In [11], we found a module-theoretic realization of Springer representations that is axiomatized as Kostka systems. For $G = GL(n)$, it takes the following form: Let

$$A = A_n := \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n \ltimes \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$$

be a graded ring obtained by the smash product of the symmetric group $\mathfrak{S}_n$ and a polynomial algebra $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ such that deg $\mathfrak{S}_n = 0$ and deg $X_i = 1$ $(1 \le i \le n)$. Let A-gmod be the category of finitely generated graded A-modules. Let $\hom_A$, end_A, and ext_A denote the graded versions of Hom_A, End_A, and Ext_A, respectively. The set of simple graded A-modules is parametrized by $\mathsf{Irr}\, \mathfrak{S}_n$ (up to grading shift), and is denoted as $\{L_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathsf{Irr}\, \mathfrak{S}_n}$. We have a projective cover $P_\lambda \to L_\lambda$ as graded A-modules.

*MSC2010: 14N15,20G44

†Department of Mathematics, Kyoto University, Oiwake Kita-Shirakawa Sakyo Kyoto 606-8502 JAPAN E-mail:syuchan@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp

Theorem A. *For each $\lambda \in \mathsf{Irr}\,\mathfrak{S}_n$, we have two modules $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$ and K_λ in A_n-gmod with the following properties:*

1. *We have a sequence of A_n-module surjections $P_\lambda \twoheadrightarrow \widetilde{K}_\lambda \twoheadrightarrow K_\lambda \twoheadrightarrow L_\lambda$, where the first map is obtained by annihilating all graded Jordan-Hölder components L_μ such that $\mu \not\geq \lambda$ with respect to the dominance order on $\mathsf{Irr}\,\mathfrak{S}_n$;*
2. *The graded ring $\mathrm{end}_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ is a polynomial ring. The (unique) graded quotient $\mathrm{end}_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda) \to \mathbb{C}_0 \cong \mathbb{C}$ yields $K_\lambda \cong \mathbb{C}_0 \otimes_{\mathrm{end}_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)} \widetilde{K}_\lambda$;*
3. *We have the following* ext*-orthogonality:*
$$\mathrm{ext}^i_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda, K^*_\mu) \cong \mathbb{C}^{\oplus \delta_{i,0}\delta_{\lambda,\mu}}.$$

Remark B. If we identify $\lambda \in \mathsf{Irr}\,\mathfrak{S}_n$ with a partition, and hence with a nilpotent element $x_\lambda \in \mathcal{N} \subset \mathfrak{gl}(n, \mathbb{C})$ via the theory of Jordan normal form, then we have

$$K_\lambda \cong H^\bullet(\mu^{-1}(x_\lambda), \mathbb{C}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{K}_\lambda \cong H^\bullet_{\mathrm{Stab}_{GL(n,\mathbb{C})}(x_\lambda)}(\mu^{-1}(x_\lambda), \mathbb{C})$$

with a suitable adjustment of conventions ([11, 12]).

Theorem A follows from works of many people ([8, 9, 27, 15, 14, 2, 5]) in several different ways as well as an exact account ([11, 12]) that works for an arbitrary G. All of these proofs utilize some structures (geometry, cells, or affine Lie algebras) that is hard to see in the category of graded A-modules.

The main goal of this paper is to give a new proof of Theorem A based on a detailed analysis of K^*_λ due to Garsia-Procesi [6] and some algebraic results from [14, 11]. This completes author's attempt [11, Appendix A] to give a proof of Theorem A inside the category of graded A-modules.

As a byproduct, we obtain an interesting consequence: We call $M \in A$-gmod (resp. $M \in A \boxtimes A$-gmod) to be Δ-filtered (resp. $\overline{\Delta}$-filtered) if M admits a decreasing separable filtration (resp. finite filtration) whose associated graded is isomorphic to the direct sum of $\{\widetilde{K}_\lambda\}_\lambda$ (resp. direct sum of $\{L_\lambda \boxtimes K_\mu\}_{\lambda,\mu}$) up to grading shifts.

Theorem C ($\doteq$ Theorem 2.5)**.** *The induction of graded A-modules sends the external tensor product of P_λ and a Δ-filtered module to a Δ-filtered module. Dually, the restriction of graded A_n-modules sends a $\overline{\Delta}$-filtered module of A_n $(= A_0 \boxtimes A_n)$ to a $\overline{\Delta}$-filtered module of $A_r \boxtimes A_{n-r}$ $(0 \leq r \leq n)$.*

Recall that the graded vector spaces

$$\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} K(A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}) \subset \mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} K(\mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod}),$$

are Hopf algebras by Zelevinsky [28], that is identified with the ring Λ of symmetric functions up to scalar extensions (1.1). In particular, this ring is equipped with four bases $\{s_\lambda\}_\lambda, \{Q^\vee_\lambda\}_\lambda, \{Q_\lambda\}_\lambda$, and $\{S_\lambda\}_\lambda$, usually referred to as the Schur functions, the Hall-Littlewood P-functions, the Hall-Littlewood Q-functions, and the big Schur functions, respectively ([19]). We exhibit a natural character identification (that we call the *twisted* Frobenius characteristic)

Modules of A	P_λ	$\widetilde{K}_\lambda$	K_λ	L_λ
Basis of Λ	s_λ	$Q^\vee_\lambda$	Q_λ	S_λ

(0.1)

that intertwines the products with inductions, and the coproducts with restrictions. (The complete symmetric functions and the elementary symmetric functions are expanded positively by the Schur functions, and hence corresponds to a direct sum of projective modules in this table).

Under this identification, Theorem C implies that the multiplication of a Schur function in Λ exhibits positivity with respect to the Hall-Littlewood functions (Corollary 2.7). In addition, we deduce a homological interpretation of skew Hall-Littlewood functions (Corollary 2.8).

In a sense, our exposition here can be seen as a direct approach to an algebraic avatar of the Springer correspondence. We note that interpreting sheaves appearing in the Springer correspondence as constructible functions produces totally different algebraic avatar of the Springer correspondence via Hall algebras (as pursued in Shimoji-Yanagida [22]). Although our Hopf algebra structure is closely related to the Heisenberg categorification (cf. [1]), the author was not able to find a result of this kind in the literature. Nevertheless, he plans to write a follow-up paper that covers the relation with the Heisenberg categorification in an occasion.

Finally, the author was very grateful to find related [25] during the preparation of this paper.

1 Preliminaries

A vector space is always a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space, and a graded vector space refers to a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded vector space whose graded pieces are finite-dimensional and its grading is bounded from the below. Tensor products are taken over $\mathbb{C}$ unless stated otherwise. We define the graded dimension of a graded vector space as

$$\operatorname{gdim} M := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} q^i \dim_{\mathbb{C}} M_i \in \mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!).$$

In case dim $M < \infty$, then we set $M^* := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (M^*)_i$, where $(M^*)_i := (M_{-i})^*$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. We set $[n]_q := \frac{1-q^n}{1-q}$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

For a $\mathbb{C}$-algebra A, let A-mod denote the category of finitely generated left A-modules. If A is a graded algebra in the sense that $A = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} A_i$ and $A_i A_j \subset A_{i+j}$ $(i, j \in \mathbb{Z})$, we denote by A-gmod the category of finitely generated graded A-modules. We also have a full subcategory A-fmod of A-gmod consisting of finite-dimensional modules.

For a graded algebra A, the category A-gmod admits an autoequivalence $\langle n \rangle$ for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $M = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} M_i$ is sent to $M \langle n \rangle := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (M \langle n \rangle)_i$, where $(M \langle n \rangle)_i = M_{i-n}$. For $M, N \in A$-gmod, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \hom_A(M, N) &:= \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \hom_A(M, N)_j, \quad \hom_A(M, N)_j := \operatorname{Hom}_{A\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}}(M \langle j \rangle, N) \\ \operatorname{ext}^i_A(M, N) &:= \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \operatorname{ext}^i_A(M, N)_j, \quad \operatorname{ext}^i_A(M, N)_j := \operatorname{Ext}^i_{A\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}}(M \langle j \rangle, N). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\hom_A(M, N)$ and $\operatorname{ext}^\bullet_A(M, N)$ are graded vector spaces if the global dimension of A is finite. Moreover, $\hom_A(M, N)_j$ consists of graded A-module homomorphisms that raise the degree by j.

For $M \in A$-gmod, the head of M (that we denote by $\mathsf{hd}\, M$) is the maximal semisimple graded quotient of M, and the socle of M (that we denote by $\mathsf{soc}\, M$) is the maximal semisimple graded submodule of M.

For a decreasing filtration

$$M = F_0 M \supset F_1 M \supset F_2 M \supset \cdots$$

of graded vector spaces, we define its k-th associated graded piece as $\mathrm{gr}^F_k M := F_k M / F_{k+1} M$ ($k \ge 0$). We call such a filtration separable if $\bigcap_{k \ge 0} F_k M = \{0\}$.

For an exact category $\mathcal{C}$, let $[\mathcal{C}]$ denote its Grothendieck group. In case $\mathcal{C}$ admits the grading shift functor $\langle n \rangle$ ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$), an element $f = \sum_n a_n q^n \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$ ($a_n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$) defines the direct sum

$$M^{\oplus f} := \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} (M \langle n \rangle)^{\oplus a_n} \qquad M \in \mathcal{C}.$$

We may represent a number that is not important by $\star \in \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$.

1.1 Partitions and the ring of symmetric functions

We employ [19] as the general reference about partitions and symmetric functions. We briefly recall some key notions there. The set of partitions is denoted by $\mathcal{P}$, and the set of partitions of n ($\in \mathbb{Z}_{\ge 0}$) is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_n$. Each of $\mathcal{P}_n$ is equipped with a partial order $\le$ such that (n) is the largest element. We extend the order $\le$ to the whole $\mathcal{P}$ by declaring that elements of $\mathcal{P}_n$ and $\mathcal{P}_m$ are comparable only if $n = m$. Let $m_i(\lambda)$ be the multiplicity of i, let $\ell(\lambda)$ be the partition length, and let $|\lambda|$ be the partition size of $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$. The conjugate partition of $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$ is denoted by λ'. We set

$$n(\lambda) := \sum_{i \ge 1} (i-1)\lambda_i = \sum_{i \ge 1} \binom{\lambda'_i}{2}.$$

For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and $1 \le j \le \ell(\lambda) + 1$, let $\lambda^{(j)} \in \mathcal{P}_n$ be the partition of $(n+1)$ obtained by rearranging $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \neq j} \cap \{\lambda_j + 1\}$, and for $1 \le j \le \ell(\lambda)$, we set $\lambda_{(j)}$ be the partition of $(n-1)$ obtained by rearranging $\{\lambda_i\}_{i \neq j} \cap \{\lambda_j - 1\}$. We set

$$b_\lambda(q) = \prod_{j \ge 1} \left((1-q) \cdots (1 - q^{m_j(\lambda)}) \right).$$

Let Λ be the ring of symmetric functions with their coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}$. Let Λ_q be its scalar extension to $\mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!)$. We have direct sum decompositions $\Lambda = \bigoplus_{n \ge 0} \Lambda_n$ and $\Lambda_q = \bigoplus_{n \ge 0} \Lambda_{q,n}$ into the graded components. The ring Λ is equipped with four distinguished bases

$$\{h_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}}, \quad \{s_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}}, \quad \{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \{m_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}},$$

called (the sets of) complete symmetric functions, Schur functions, elementary symmetric functions, and monomial symmetric functions, respectively. We have equalities

$$h_1 = s_{(1)} = e_1 = m_{(1)}, \quad h_n = s_{(n)}, \quad \text{and} \quad e_n = s_{(1^n)} \qquad n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}.$$

We have a symmetric inner product $(\bullet, \bullet)$ on Λ such that

$$(s_\lambda, s_\mu) = (h_\lambda, m_\mu) = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} \qquad \lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}.$$

The ring Λ has a structure of a Hopf algebra with the coproduct Δ satisfying

$$\Delta(h_n) = \sum_{i+j=n} h_i \otimes h_j, \qquad \Delta(e_n) = \sum_{i+j=n} e_i \otimes e_j$$

and the antipode S satisfying

$$S(h_n) = (-1)^n e_n, \qquad S(e_n) = (-1)^n h_n.$$

The antipode S preserves the inner product $(\bullet, \bullet)$.

1.2 Zelevinsky's picture for symmetric groups

For a (not necessarily non-increasing) sequence $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^\infty$ such that $\sum_j \lambda_j = n$, we define the subgroup

$$\mathfrak{S}_\lambda := \prod_{j \geq 1} \mathfrak{S}_{\lambda_j} \subset \mathfrak{S}_n.$$

We usually omit 0 in $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \ldots)$. Each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$ defines an irreducible representation of L_λ of $\mathfrak{S}_n$. We normalize L_λ such that

$$L_{(n)} \cong \mathsf{triv}, \quad L_{(1^n)} \cong \mathsf{sgn}.$$

For $0 < r < n$, we have induction/restriction functors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ind}_{r,n-r} &: \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_{(r,n-r)}\text{-}\mathsf{mod} \ni (M, N) \mapsto \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n \otimes_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_{(r,n-r)}} (M \boxtimes N) \in \mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod} \\ \mathrm{Res}_{r,n-r} &: \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_{(r,n-r)}\text{-}\mathsf{mod}, \end{aligned}$$

where the latter is the natural restriction. They induce corresponding maps between the Grothendieck groups that we denote by the same letter.

Theorem 1.1 (Zelevinsky [28])**.** *We have a $\mathbb{Z}$-module isomorphism*

$$\Psi_0 : \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} [\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod}] \ni [L_\lambda] \mapsto s_\lambda \in \Lambda.$$

with the following properties: For $M \in [\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_r\text{-}\mathsf{mod}]$ and $N \in [\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod}]$, we have

$$\Psi_0(\mathrm{Ind}_{r,n} [M \boxtimes N]) = \Psi_0([M]) \cdot \Psi_0([N]), \qquad \sum_{s=0}^{n} \Psi_0(\mathrm{Res}_{s,n-s} [N]) = \Delta([N]).$$

In particular, we have

$$h_r \cdot \Psi_0([N]) = \Psi_0(\mathrm{Ind}_{r,n} [L_{(1^r)} \boxtimes N]), \qquad e_r \cdot \Psi_0([N]) = \Psi_0(\mathrm{Ind}_{r,n} [L_{(r)} \boxtimes N]).$$

1.3 The algebra A_n and its basic properties

We follow [11, §2] in this section. We set

$$A_n := \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n \ltimes \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n],$$

where $\mathfrak{S}_n$ acts on the ring $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ by

$$(w \otimes 1)(1 \otimes X_i) = (1 \otimes X_{w(i)})(w \otimes 1) \quad w \in \mathfrak{S}_n, 1 \le i \le n.$$

We usually denote w in place of $w \otimes 1$, and $f \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ in place of $1 \otimes f$. The ring A_n acquires the structure of a graded ring by

$$\deg\, w = 0, \quad \deg\, X_i = 1 \quad w \in \mathfrak{S}_n, 1 \le i \le n.$$

The grading of the ring A_n is non-negative, and the positive degree part $A_n^+ := \bigoplus_{j>0} A_n^j$ defines a graded ideal such that $A_n/A_n^+ \cong \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n \cong A_n^0$. In particular, each L_λ can be understood to be a graded A_n-module concentrated in degree 0.

The assignments $w \mapsto w^{-1}$ ($w \in W$) and $X_i \mapsto X_i$ ($1 \le i \le n$) define an isomorphism $A_n \cong A_n^{op}$. Therefore, if $M \in A_n\text{-}\mathsf{fmod}$, then M^* acquires the structure of a graded A_n-module. We have $(L_\lambda)^* \cong L_\lambda$ for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$ as $\mathfrak{S}_n$ is a real reflection group. In the below, we may denote A_n by A for the sake of simplicity.

For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have an idempotent $e_\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n$ such that $L_\lambda \cong \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_n e_\lambda$. We set $P_\lambda := A_n e_\lambda$.

Proposition 1.2 (see [11] §2)**.** *The modules $\{L_\lambda \langle j \rangle\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n, j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is the complete collection of simple objects in A_n-gmod. In addition, P_λ is the projective cover of L_λ in A_n-gmod for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$.* □

We define

$$\widetilde{K}_\lambda := \frac{P_\lambda}{\sum_{\mu \not\geq \lambda, f \in \hom_A(P_\mu, P_\lambda)} \mathrm{Im}\, f} \quad \text{and} \quad K_\lambda := \frac{\widetilde{K}_\lambda}{\sum_{j>0, f \in \hom_A(P_\lambda, \widetilde{K}_\lambda)_j} \mathrm{Im}\, f}.$$

For each $M \in A$-gmod, we set

$$[M : L_\lambda]_q := \mathrm{gdim}\, \hom_A(P_\lambda, M) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} q^i \dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, M_i) \in \mathbb{Z}(\!(q)\!).$$

In case the $q = 1$ specialization of $[M : L_\lambda]_q$ makes sense, we denote it by $[M : L_\lambda]$.

Lemma 1.3 (see [11] §2)**.** *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have*

$$[K_\lambda : L_\mu]_q = \begin{cases} 0 & \lambda \not\leq \mu \\ 1 & \lambda = \mu \end{cases}, \quad [\widetilde{K}_\lambda : L_\mu]_q \in \begin{cases} 0 & \lambda \not\leq \mu \\ 1 + q\mathbb{Z}[\![q]\!] & \lambda = \mu \end{cases}.$$

Proof. Immediate from the definition. □

For $0 \le r \le n$, we consider the subalgebra

$$A_{r,n-r} := \mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_{(r,n-r)} \ltimes \mathbb{C}[X_1, \dots, X_n] \cong A_r \boxtimes A_{n-r} \subset A_n.$$

We have induction/restriction functors

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ind}_{r,n-r} &: A_{r,n-r}\text{-}\mathsf{gmod} \ni M \mapsto A_n \otimes_{A_{r,n-r}} M \in A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod} \\ \operatorname{res}_{r,n-r} &: A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod} \longrightarrow A_{r,n-r}\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}. \end{aligned}$$

Since A_n is free of rank $\frac{n!}{r!(n-r)!}$ over $A_{r,n-r}$, we find that the both functors are exact, and preserves finite-dimensionality of the modules. We sometimes omit the functor $\operatorname{res}_{r,n-r}$ from notation in case there are no possible confusion.

We consider the category $\mathcal{A} := \bigoplus_{n\geq 0} A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}$. We define

$$\operatorname{ind} := \bigoplus_{r,s} \operatorname{ind}_{r,s} : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A}, \qquad \operatorname{res} := \bigoplus_{r,s} \operatorname{res}_{r,s} : \mathcal{A} \to \mathcal{A} \boxtimes \mathcal{A}.$$

Lemma 1.4. *We embed $\mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod}$ into $A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}$ by regarding $M \in \mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod}$ as a semisimple graded A_n-module concentrated in degree 0 for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then, we have*

$$\operatorname{Ind}_{r,n} = \operatorname{ind}_{r,n} \quad \textit{and} \quad \operatorname{Res}_{r,n} = \operatorname{res}_{r,n} \quad r, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$$

on $\bigoplus_{n\geq 0} \mathfrak{S}_n\text{-}\mathsf{mod}$. In particular, $[\mathcal{A}]$ can be understood as a (Hopf) subalgebra of $\mathbb{C}(\!(q)\!) \otimes \Lambda = \Lambda_q$ by extending the scalar in Theorem 1.1. □

The following three theorems are quite well-known to experts.

Theorem 1.5 (Frobenius-Nakayama reciprocity)**.** *For $M \in A_{r,n-r}\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}$ and $N \in A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}$, it holds*

$$\operatorname{ext}^k_{A_n}(\operatorname{ind}_{r,n-r} M, N) \cong \operatorname{ext}^k_{A_{r,n-r}}(M, \operatorname{res}_{r,n-r} N) \qquad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. This follows from the fact that A_n is a free $A_{r,n-r}$-module by the classical Frobenius reciprocity as $\operatorname{ind}_{r,n-r}$ sends a projective resolution of M to a projective resolution of $\operatorname{ind}_{r,n-r} M$. □

Theorem 1.6. *For $M, N \in A_n\text{-}\mathsf{fmod}$, it holds*

$$\operatorname{ext}^k_{A_n}(M, N) \cong \operatorname{ext}^k_{A_n}(N^*, M^*) \qquad k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. We borrow terminology from [7, §2.2]. We have natural isomorphism

$$\hom_{A_n}(M, N) \cong \hom_{A_n}(N^*, M^*).$$

Since the derived functors of the both sides (defined in an appropriate ambient categories) are δ-functors in each variables, it suffices to see that they are universal δ-functors. By approximating N by its injective envelope (and hence N^* by its projective cover), we find that the both sides are effacable on the second variables. Thus, they must coincide by [7, 2.2.1 Proposition]. □

Theorem 1.7. *The global dimension of A is finite. In particular, every $M \in A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}$ admits a graded projective resolution of finite length.*

Proof. See McConnell-Robson-Small [21, 7.5.6]. □

We have a $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$-bilinear symmetric inner product $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{EP}$ on $[\mathcal{A}]$ prolonging

$$A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod} \times A_n\text{-}\mathsf{fmod} \ni (M, N) \mapsto \sum_{i\geq 0} (-1)^i \operatorname{gdim} \operatorname{ext}^i_{A_n}(M, N^*)^* \in \mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!).$$

Lemma 1.8. *The pairing $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{EP}$ is well-defined.*

Proof. Since the Euler-Poincaré form respects the short exact sequences, the form $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{EP}$ must be additive with respect to the both variables.

By the arrangement of duals in the definition of $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{EP}$, we find that replacing M with $M \langle n \rangle$ and replacing N with $N \langle n \rangle$ both result in multiplying q^n ($n \in \mathbb{Z}$). As the category $\mathcal{A}$ has finite direct sums, we conclude that $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{EP}$ must be $\mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}]$-bilinear.

We have

$$[A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}] = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mathbb{Z}[q^{\pm 1}][P_\lambda] \subset \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n} \mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!)[L_\lambda]$$

by Proposition 1.2. In particular, $\langle L_\lambda, L_\mu \rangle_{EP} \in \mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!)$ ($\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_n$) uniquely determines a well-defined $\mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!)$-bilinear form $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{EP}$ that restricts to $[\mathcal{A}]$. $\square$

2 Main results

Definition 2.1. Fix $0 \le r \le n$. A Δ-filtration (resp. $\overline{\Delta}$-filtration) of $M \in A_n\text{-}\mathsf{gmod}$ is a decreasing separable filtration

$$M = F_0 M \supset F_1 M \supset F_2 M \supset \cdots$$

of graded A_n-modules (resp. graded $A_{r,n-r}$-modules) such that

$$\mathrm{gr}^F_k M \in \{\widetilde{K}_\lambda \langle m \rangle\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n, m \in \mathbb{Z}} \quad (\text{resp. } \mathrm{gr}^F_k M \in \{L_\mu \boxtimes K_\nu \langle m \rangle\}_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_r, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{n-r}, m \in \mathbb{Z}})$$

for each $k \ge 0$. In case M admits a Δ-filtration, then we set

$$(M : \widetilde{K}_\lambda)_q := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} q^m \chi(\mathrm{gr}^F_k M \cong \widetilde{K}_\lambda \langle m \rangle),$$

where $\chi(\mathfrak{X})$ takes value 1 if the proposition $\mathfrak{X}$ is true, and 0 otherwise.

Lemma 2.2 ([11] §2 or [14])**.** *The multiplicity $(M : \widetilde{K}_\lambda)_q$ does not depend on the choice of Δ-filtration.* $\square$

The following theorem is not new (see Remark 2.4). Nevertheless, the author feels it might worth to report a yet another proof based on Garsia-Procesi [6], that differs significantly from other proofs and is carried out within the category of A-modules:

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_n$. We have the followings:*

1. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the graded ring $\mathrm{end}_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ is a polynomial ring generated by homogeneous polynomials of positive degrees;*
2. *The module $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$ is free over $\mathrm{end}_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$, and we have $\mathbb{C}_0 \otimes_{\mathrm{end}_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)} \widetilde{K}_\lambda \cong K_\lambda$. (Here $\mathbb{C}_0$ is the unique graded one-dimensional quotient of $\mathrm{end}_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$);*
3. *We have the* Ext*-orthogonality:*

$$\mathrm{ext}^i_A(\widetilde{K}_\lambda, K^*_\mu) \cong \mathbb{C}^{\oplus \delta_{\lambda,\mu} \delta_{i,0}};$$

4. *Each P_λ admits a Δ-filtration, and we have $(P_\lambda : \widetilde{K}_\mu)_q = [K_\mu : L_\lambda]_q$.*

Proof. Postponed to §2.4. □

Remark 2.4. Theorem 2.3 is originally proved in [11, 12] essentially in this form by using the geometry of Springer correspondence (that works for arbitrary Weyl groups with arbitrary cuspidal data). Theorem 2.3 also follows from results of Haiman [8, 9] that employ the geometry of Hilbert schemes of points on $\mathbb{C}^2$. We also have two algebraic proofs of Theorem 2.3, one is to use a detailed study of two-sided cells of affine Hecke algebras by Xi [27] together with König-Xi [15] and Kleshchev [14], and another is an analogous result for affine Lie algebras (Chari-Ion [2]) together with Feigin-Khoroshkin-Makedonskyi [5].

As a byproduct of our proof, we find:

Theorem 2.5. *Fix $n \geq 0$, and $0 \leq r \leq n$. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_r, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{n-r}$. We have the followings:*

1. *(Garsia-Procesi [6]) The module $\mathrm{res}_{r,n-r} K_\lambda$ admits a $\overline{\Delta}$-filtration;*
2. *The module $\mathrm{ind}_{r,n-r} (P_\mu \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\nu)$ admits a Δ-filtration.*

Proof. Postponed to §2.5. □

Remark 2.6. One cannot swap the roles of $\{\widetilde{K}_\lambda\}_\lambda$ and $\{K_\lambda\}_\lambda$ in Theorem 2.5. In fact, the polynomiality claim in Corollary 2.7 2) is already nontrivial (without a prior knowledge of characters).

Corollary 2.7. *Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}$. We have the followings:*

1. *We have $\Delta(Q_\lambda) \in \sum_{\gamma,\kappa} \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q]\,(S_\gamma \otimes Q_\kappa)$;*
2. *We have $s_\lambda \cdot Q^\vee_\mu \in \sum_\gamma \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q]\, Q^\vee_\nu$. In case $\lambda = (1^n)$, it is the Pieri rule.*

Proof. Apply the twisted Frobenius characteristic to Theorem 2.5 using Lemma 2.18. Here the equality $s_{(1^n)} = Q^\vee_{(1^n)}$ is in [19, III (2.8)] and the Pieri rule is in [19, III (3.2)]. □

Corollary 2.8. *The skew Hall-Littlewood Q-function $Q_{\lambda/\nu}$ expands positively with respect to the big Schur function. In addition, we have a graded $A_{|\lambda|-|\nu|}$-module defined as*

$$\mathrm{hom}_{A_{|\nu|}}(\widetilde{K}_\nu, K^*_\lambda)^*,$$

such that its image under Ψ (defined at (2.3)) is $Q_{\lambda/\nu}$.

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$. The Hall-Littlewood Q-polynomial corresponds to the module K_λ by Theorem 2.14. Therefore, its restriction admits a $\overline{\Delta}$-filtration. In particular, we have

$$[\mathrm{res}_{r,n-r} K_\lambda] = \sum_{\mu,\nu} c^{\mu,\nu}_\lambda [L_\mu \boxtimes K_\nu] \qquad c^{\mu,\nu}_\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}[q].$$

In view of Theorem 1.1, we conclude that

$$Q_{\lambda/\nu} = \sum_\mu c^{\mu,\nu}_\lambda \Psi([L_\mu]) = \sum_\mu c^{\mu,\nu}_\lambda S_\mu,$$

that is the first assertion. In view of Theorem 2.5 1) and Corollary 2.38, we conclude the second assertion. □

2.1 Garsia-Procesi's theorem

For each $\mathtt{I} \subset [1, n]$ and $|\mathtt{I}| \geq r \geq 1$, let $e_r(\mathtt{I})$ be the r-th elementary symmetric function with respect to the variables $\{X_i\}_{i \in \mathtt{I}}$. For $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we set

$$d_r(\lambda) := \lambda'_1 + \cdots + \lambda'_r \quad (1 \leq r \leq n).$$

We set

$$\mathcal{C}_\lambda := \{e_t(\mathtt{I}) \mid r \geq t \geq r - d_r(\lambda), |\mathtt{I}| = r, \mathtt{I} \subset [1, n]\}.$$

Let $I_\lambda \subset \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ be the ideal generated by $\mathcal{C}_\lambda$ (originally introduced in [26]).

Definition 2.9. We set $R_\lambda := \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/I_\lambda$, and call it the Garsia-Procesi module.

Lemma 2.10 ([6] §3)**.** *The algebra R_λ admits a structure of graded A_n-module generated by $L_{(n)}$. In addition, $[R_\lambda : L_{(n)}]_q = 1$.*

Proof. Since R_λ is the quotient of $P_{(n)}$, it suffices to see that the ideal I_λ is graded and $\mathfrak{S}_n$-stable. Since $\mathcal{C}_\lambda$ consists of homogeneous polynomials and it is stable under the $\mathfrak{S}_n$-action, we conclude the first assertion. For the second assertion, it suffices to notice that $\mathcal{C}_\lambda$ contains all the elementary symmetric polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$, and hence I_λ contains all the positive degree part of $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$. □

Theorem 2.11 (Garsia-Procesi [6] §1)**.** *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$. The $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$-module R_λ admits a decreasing filtration*

$$R_\lambda = F_0 R_\lambda \supset F_1 R_\lambda \supset \cdots \supset F_{\ell(\lambda)} R_\lambda = \{0\} \qquad (2.1)$$

such that $\mathrm{gr}^F_j R_\lambda \cong R_{\lambda_{(j+1)}} \langle j \rangle$ for $0 \leq j < \ell(\lambda)$. In addition, this filtration respects the $\mathfrak{S}_{n-1}$-action, and hence can be regarded as an $A_{1,n-1}$-module filtration. □

Theorem 2.12 ([6] Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 3.2)**.** *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$. It holds:*

1. *We have $(R_\lambda)_{n(\lambda)+1} = \{0\}$;*
2. *We have a $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module isomorphism $R_\lambda \cong \mathrm{ind}^{\mathfrak{S}_n}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda} \mathsf{triv}$.*

In particular, we have $[R_\lambda : L_\mu] \neq 0$ only if $\lambda \leq \mu$. □

In view of [19, III (2.1)], we have the Hall-Littlewood P- and Q- functions in Λ_q indexed by $\mathcal{P}$, that we denote by $Q^\vee_\lambda$ and Q_λ, respectively (we changed notation of P-functions to $Q^\vee$ in order to avoid confusion with projective modules). They satisfy the following relation:

$$Q^\vee_\lambda = b_\lambda^{-1} Q_\lambda \in \Lambda_q.$$

We also have the big Schur function ([19, III (4.6)])

$$S_\lambda := \prod_{i<j} (1 - q R_{ij}) Q_\lambda,$$

where R_{ij} are the raising operators.

Theorem 2.13 ([19] Ⅲ (4.9))**.** *There exists a $\mathbb{Q}(q)$-linear bilinear form $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle$ on Λ_q (referred to as the Hall inner product) characterized as*

$$\langle Q^\vee_\lambda, Q_\mu \rangle = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} = \langle S_\lambda, s_\mu \rangle \tag{2.2}$$

for each $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}$. □

Theorem 2.14 ([6] §5, particularly (5.24))**.** *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$, the polynomial*

$$Q_\lambda := \sum_\mu [K_\lambda : L_\mu]_q \cdot S_\mu \in \Lambda_q$$

is the Hall-Littlewood's Q-function. □

Lemma 2.15. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have $[R_\lambda : L_\lambda]_q = q^{n(\lambda)}$.*

Proof. By [19, p115] and the Frobenius reciprocity, L_λ contains a vector on which $\mathfrak{S}_{\lambda'}$ acts by sign representation. Since the Vandermonde determinant offers the minimal degree realization of the sign representations of each $\mathfrak{S}_{\lambda'_j}$ $(1 \le j \le \lambda_1)$, we find that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, (R_\lambda)_m) \neq 0$ only if $m \ge n(\lambda)$. It must be strict by Theorem 2.12 1). □

Proposition 2.16 ([11] Theorem A.4 and Corollary A.3)**.** *We have*

$$\mathrm{ext}^1_A(K_\lambda, L_\mu) = 0 \qquad \lambda \not\geq \mu.$$

For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the head of K_λ is L_λ, and the socle of K_λ is $L_{(n)} \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$.

Proof. By [11, Theorem A.4], the module K_λ is isomorphic to the module M_λ constructed there. They have the properties in the assertions by construction and [11, Theorem A.4]. □

Proposition 2.17 (De Concini-Procesi [4], Tanisaki [26])**.** *We have an isomorphism $R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle \cong K_\lambda$ as graded A_n-modules.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.15, $R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ is a graded A_n-module such that $L_\lambda \subset \mathsf{hd}\, R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ and $[R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle : L_\mu]_q = 0$ if $\mu \not\geq \lambda$ and $[R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle : L_\lambda]_q = 1$. Thus, we obtain a map $K_\lambda \to R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ of graded A_n-modules. This map is injective as they share $L_{(n)} \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ as their socles.

We prove that $K_\lambda \subset R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ is an equality for every $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$ by induction on n. The case $n = 1$ is clear as the both are $\mathbb{C}$. Thanks to Theorem 2.11 and the induction hypothesis, we deduce that a (graded) direct summand of the head of $R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ as $A_{1,n-1}$-module must be of the shape $L_{\lambda_{(j)}} \langle d \rangle$ for $1 \le j \le \ell(\lambda)$ and $d \ge 0$. The module $L_{\lambda_{(j)}} \langle d \rangle$ arises as the restriction of a (graded) $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module $L_\mu \langle d \rangle$ $(\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n)$ such that $\lambda_{(j)} = \mu_{(k)}$ for $1 \le k \le \ell(\mu)$. In case $\mu = \lambda$, then $[R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle : L_\lambda]_q = 1$ forces $L_{\lambda_{(j)}} \langle d \rangle \subset L_\lambda \subset \mathsf{hd}\, K_\lambda \subset \mathsf{hd}\, R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$.

From this, it is enough to assume $\mu \neq \lambda$ to conclude that $L_{\lambda_{(j)}} \langle d \rangle$ does not yield a non-zero module of $\mathsf{hd}\, R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle / L_\lambda$. By Theorem 2.12 2), we can assume $\mu > \lambda$. Hence, μ is obtained from λ by moving one box in the Young diagram to some strictly larger entries.

In case μ is not the shape (m^r), there exists $1 \le k \le \ell(\mu)$ such that $\mu_{(k)} \neq \lambda_{(j)}$ for every $1 \le j \le \ell(\lambda)$. It follows that $L_{\lambda_{(j)}} \langle d \rangle \subset L_\mu \langle d \rangle \subset R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ contains a $\mathfrak{S}_{n-1}$-module that is not in the head of $R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$ as $A_{1,n-1}$-modules. Thus, this case does not occur.

In case μ is of the shape (m^r), then we have $\lambda = (m^{r-1}, (m-1), 1)$ and $\lambda_{(j)} = (m^{r-1}, (m-1))$. In this case, we have $j = r+1$. In particular, grading shifts of $R^*_{\lambda_{(j)}}$ appears in the filtration of R^*_λ afforded by Theorem 2.11 only once, and its head is a part of L_λ by counting the degree. Therefore, $L_{\lambda_{(j)}} \langle d \rangle$ contributes zero in $\mathsf{hd}\, R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle / L_\lambda$.

From these, we conclude that $\mathsf{hd}\, R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle = L_\lambda$ by induction hypothesis. This forces $K_\lambda = R^*_\lambda \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$, and the induction proceeds. □

2.2 Identification of the forms

Consider the twisted (graded) Frobenius characteristic map

$$\Psi : [\mathcal{A}] \ni [M] \mapsto \sum_\mu [M : L_\mu]_q \cdot S_\mu \in \Lambda_q. \tag{2.3}$$

By Theorem 2.14, we have

$$\Psi([K_\lambda]) = Q_\lambda \qquad (\lambda \in \mathcal{P}). \tag{2.4}$$

Lemma 2.18. *For $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, we have*

$$\Psi(\mathrm{ind}\,(a \boxtimes b)) = \Psi(a) \cdot \Psi(b), \qquad \textit{and} \qquad (\Psi \times \Psi)(\mathrm{res}\, a) = \Delta(\Psi(a)).$$

Proof. This is a straight-forward consequence of Lemma 1.4. The detail is left to the reader. □

Proposition 2.19. *We have*

$$\langle [K_\lambda], [K_\mu] \rangle_{EP} = \langle Q_\lambda, Q_\mu \rangle = \delta_{\lambda,\mu} b_\lambda.$$

In particular, we have

$$\langle a, b \rangle_{EP} = \langle \Psi(a), \Psi(b) \rangle \qquad a, b \in [\mathcal{A}]. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark 2.20. If we prove the identities in Corollary 2.22 directly, then one can prove (2.5) without appealing to [23, 11] by Proposition 2.21 and its proof.

Proof of Proposition 2.19. The equations in Theorem 2.13, that are equivalent to the Cauchy identity [19, (4.4)], are spacial cases of [23, Corollary 4.6]. It is further transformed into the main matrix equality of the so-called Lusztig-Shoji algorithm in [23, Theorem 5.4]. The latter is interpreted as the orthogonality relation with respect to $\langle \bullet, \bullet \rangle_{EP}$ in [11, Theorem 2.10]. In particular, Kostka polynomials defined in [19] and [23] are the same (for symmetric groups and the order $\le$ on $\mathcal{P}$). This implies the first equality in view of (2.4). The second equality is read-off from the relation between Q_λ and $Q^\vee_\lambda$. The last assertion follows as $\{Q_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathcal{P}}$ forms a $\mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!)$-basis of Λ_q, and the Hall inner product is non-degenerate. □

Proposition 2.21. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$, we have $\Psi([P_\lambda]) = s_\lambda$.*

Proof. For each $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}$, we have

$$\delta_{\lambda,\mu} = \langle s_\lambda, S_\mu \rangle = \langle s_\lambda, \Psi([L_\mu]) \rangle$$

by Theorem 2.13. On the other hand, we have

$$\delta_{\lambda,\mu} = \mathrm{gdim}\, \hom_{A_n}(P_\lambda, L_\mu) = \sum_{k \geq 0} (-1)^k \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{ext}^k_{A_n}(P_\lambda, L_\mu) = \langle [P_\lambda], [L_\mu] \rangle_{EP}.$$

As the Hall inner product is non-degenerate (Theorem 2.13) and is the same as the Euler-Poincaré pairing (Proposition 2.19), this forces $\Psi([P_\lambda]) = s_\lambda$. □

Corollary 2.22. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} s_\lambda &= \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n} S_\mu \cdot \mathrm{gdim}\, \hom_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\mu, P_\lambda) \\ &= \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n} S_\mu \cdot \mathrm{gdim}\, \hom_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\mu, L_\lambda \otimes \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]) \\ &= \frac{1}{(1-q)(1-q^2)\cdots(1-q^n)} \sum_{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_n} S_\mu \cdot \mathrm{gdim}\, \hom_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\mu, L_\lambda \otimes R_{(1^n)}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. In view of Proposition 2.21, the first equality is obtained by just expanding $[P_\lambda]$ using the definition of the twisted Frobenius characteristic. The second and the third equalities follow from

$$P_\lambda \cong L_\lambda \otimes \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \cong L_\lambda \otimes R_{(1^n)} \otimes \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$$

as $\mathfrak{S}_n$-modules, where the latter isomorphism is standard ([3]). □

Corollary 2.23. *For each $M \in A_n$*-gmod*, we have*

$$\Psi([M]) = \sum_\lambda \langle [M], [K_\lambda] \rangle_{EP} Q^\vee_\lambda.$$

Proof. This follows by $\Psi([K_\lambda]) = Q_\lambda$, Theorem 2.13, and Proposition 2.19. □

2.3 An end-estimate

Lemma 2.24. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module L_λ contains a unique non-zero $\mathfrak{S}_\lambda$-fixed vector (up to scalar).*

Proof. This follows from Theorem 2.12 2) and the Frobenius reciprocity. □

For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} A_\lambda &:= \bigotimes_{j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} A_{\lambda_j} \subset A_n, \qquad \text{and} \\ \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda &:= A_n \otimes_{A_\lambda} (\widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_1)} \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_2)} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)})}). \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

Lemma 2.25. *We have $\widetilde{K}_{(n)} \cong L_{(n)} \otimes \mathbb{C}[Y]$, where $\mathbb{C}[Y]$ is the quotient of the polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ by the submodule generated by degree one part that is complementary to $\mathbb{C}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n)$ as $\mathfrak{S}_n$-modules.*

Proof. We have $P_{(n)} \cong \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. Its degree one part is $L_{(n)} \oplus L_{(n-1,1)}$ as $\mathfrak{S}_n$-modules, and quotient out by $L_{(n-1,1)}$ yields a polynomial ring $\mathbb{C}[Y]$ generated by the image of $\mathbb{C}(X_1 + \cdots + X_n) \cong L_{(n)}$. □

Lemma 2.26. *Let $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$. We have a unique graded A_n-module map $\widetilde{K}_\lambda \to \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ of degree 0 up to scalar.*

Proof. We have $(\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)_0 = \mathrm{Ind}^{\mathfrak{S}_n}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda} \mathsf{triv}$, in which L_λ appears without multiplicity by the Littlewood-Richardson rule. All the $\mathfrak{S}_\lambda$-modules appearing in $(\widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_1)} \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_2)} \boxtimes \cdots)$ are trivial. It follows that $[\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda : L_\mu]_q \neq 0$ if and only if $[\mathrm{Ind}^{\mathfrak{S}_n}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda} \mathsf{triv} : L_\mu] \neq 0$. Again by the Littlewood-Richardson rule, we find that the latter implies $\lambda \le \mu$. Therefore, a $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module map $L_\lambda \to (\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)_0$ extends uniquely to a graded A_n-module map $\widetilde{K}_\lambda \to \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ by the definition of $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$. □

In the setting of Lemma 2.26, we set

$$\widetilde{K}'_\lambda := \mathrm{Im}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda \to \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda).$$

For each $1 \le j \le \ell(\lambda)$, we have an endomorphism ψ^λ_j on $\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ extending

$$\psi^\lambda_j(\widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_1)} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_\ell)}) = \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_1)} \langle \delta_{j,1} \rangle \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_\ell)} \langle \delta_{j,\ell} \rangle \subset \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda.$$

Consider the group

$$\mathfrak{S}(\lambda) := \prod_{j \ge 1} \mathfrak{S}_{m_j(\lambda)}.$$

Lemma 2.27. *The group $\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)$ yields automorphisms of $\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ as A_n-modules.*

Proof. The group $\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)$ permutes $\widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_j)}$s in (2.6) in such a way the size of the factors (i.e. the values of λ_j) are invariant. This is a A_λ-module endomorphism by Lemma 2.25. Thus, its induction $\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ inherits these endomorphisms as required. □

Let $B(\lambda)$ denote the subring of $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)$ generated by $\{\psi^\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)}$. The action of $\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)$ permutes ψ^λ_i and ψ^λ_j such that $\lambda_i = \lambda_j$. Thus, $\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)$ acts on $B(\lambda)$ as automorphisms. The invariant part $B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}$ is a polynomial ring.

Lemma 2.28. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have*

$$\hom_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, B(\lambda) L_0) \xrightarrow{\cong} \hom_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda),$$

where $L_\lambda \cong L_0 \subset (\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)_0$ is the multiplicity one copy as $\mathfrak{S}_n$-modules.

Proof. By construction, $\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ is a direct sum of (grading shifts of) copies of $\mathrm{Ind}^{\mathfrak{S}_n}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda} \mathsf{triv}$ as a $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module. The $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module L_λ is multiplicity one in $\mathrm{Ind}^{\mathfrak{S}_n}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda} \mathsf{triv}$ by the Littlewood-Richardson rule. The action of $B(\lambda)$ preserves the $\mathfrak{S}_n$-isotypic part. As the action of $B(\lambda)$ sends $(\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)_0$ to all the contributions of $\mathrm{Ind}^{\mathfrak{S}_n}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda} \mathsf{triv}$ in $\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$, we conclude the assertion. □

Proposition 2.29. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have*

$$\mathrm{gdim}\,\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda) = b_\lambda^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \cong B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}.$$

Proof. Since $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ has $(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)_0 \cong L_\lambda$ as its unique simple graded quotient, $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)$ is determined by the image of $(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)_0$. In addition, $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ is fixed under the action of $\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)$ as $L_\lambda \subset (\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)_0$ is. Therefore, Lemma 2.28 implies $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \subset B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}$. Thus, we have the inequality $\le$ in the assertion by

$$\begin{aligned} b_\lambda^{-1} &= \prod_{j \ge 1} \frac{1}{(1-q)\cdots(1-q^{m_j(\lambda)})} \\ &= \prod_{j\ge 1} \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_{m_j(\lambda)}]^{\mathfrak{S}_{m_j(\lambda)}} = \mathrm{gdim}\, B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)} \end{aligned}$$

(see Corollary 2.22 for the second equality). We have an identification

$$(\widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_1)} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)})}) \cong e\left(\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}(\lambda) \otimes (\widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_1)} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_{(\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)})})\right) \subset \widetilde{K}_\lambda, \quad (2.7)$$

where $e = \frac{1}{|\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)|} \sum_{w \in \mathfrak{S}(\lambda)} w$. The actions of $\psi_1^\lambda, \ldots, \psi_{\ell(\lambda)}^\lambda$ on the first term of (2.7) are induced by the multiplication of $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. Hence, the action of $B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda) \ltimes \mathfrak{S}_\lambda} = B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}$ on the first two terms of (2.7) are realized by the multiplication of $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. Thus, the inequality must be in fact an equality and $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda) = B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}$. □

Let us consider the image of the center $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ in $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)$ by $Z(\lambda)$ and $Z'(\lambda)$, respectively.

Lemma 2.30. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have a quotient map*

$$\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda) \longrightarrow \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)$$

as an algebra that induces a surjection $Z(\lambda) \to Z'(\lambda)$. In addition, $Z'(\lambda)$ is precisely the image of $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ in $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)$.

Proof. By the construction of $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$, we have

$$\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{hom}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda, \widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \cong \mathrm{hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, \widetilde{K}'_\lambda).$$

In view of Proposition 2.29 and Lemma 2.28, we have

$$\mathrm{hom}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda, \widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \cong \mathrm{hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, \widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \cong \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda).$$

This proves the first assertion, as the action of $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ on $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ factors through $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$. The second assertion follows as the action of $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ on $\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ induces an endomorphism of $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda$. □

Lemma 2.31. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the algebra $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ is a finitely generated module over $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$.*

Proof. Since we have a surjection $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(P_\lambda) \to \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$, it suffices to see that $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(P_\lambda)$ is a finitely generated module over $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$. We have

$$\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(P_\lambda) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_{(n)}, \mathrm{End}_{\mathbb{C}}(L_\lambda) \otimes \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]).$$

The RHS is a finitely generated module over $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$ as required. □

For two power series with integer coefficients

$$f(q) = \sum_m f_m q^m, g(q) = \sum_m g_m q^m \in \mathbb{Z}(\!(q)\!),$$

we say $f(q) \le g(q)$ if we have $f_m \le g_m$ for every $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. We say $f(q) \ll g(q)$ if

$$\lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{\sup\{f_k \mid k \le m\}}{\sup\{g_k \mid k \le m\}} = 0. \tag{2.8}$$

Theorem 2.32 ([20]). *Let R be a finitely generated graded integral algebra with $\mathbb{C} = R_0$, and let S be its proper graded quotient algebra. For a finitely generated graded S-module M, we have*

$$\operatorname{gdim} M \ll \operatorname{gdim} R.$$

Proof. This follows form [20, Theorem 13.4] if we take into account the Krull dimension inequality dim $R >$ dim S, and the completion with respect to the grading makes R and S into local rings. □

Lemma 2.33. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$ and an algebra quotient $Z'(\lambda) \to \mathbb{C}$, the actions of $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ on $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{Z'(\lambda)} \widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ and $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{Z'(\lambda)} \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ have joint eigenvalues of shape*

$$\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_{\lambda_1}, \alpha_{\lambda_1+1} = \cdots = \alpha_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}, \ldots, \alpha_{n-\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}+1} = \cdots = \alpha_n \tag{2.9}$$

up to $\mathfrak{S}_n$-permutation.

Proof. By Lemma 2.31, the modules $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{Z'(\lambda)} \widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ and $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{Z'(\lambda)} \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ must be finite-dimensional. Hence, the actions of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ have joint eigenvalues. Their values can be read-off from (2.6). □

Theorem 2.34. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have*

$$\operatorname{gdim} \ker \left(\operatorname{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda) \to \operatorname{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \right) \ll \operatorname{gdim} \operatorname{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda).$$

Proof. We set $Z := Z(\lambda)$ and $Z' := Z'(\lambda)$ during this proof. The specialization $\mathbb{C} \otimes_Z \widetilde{K}_\lambda$ with respect to a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n} \subset Z$ decomposes into the generalized eigenspaces with respect to $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, whose set of joint eigenvalues in $\mathbb{C}$ have multiplicities $\mu_1, \mu_2, \ldots, \mu_\ell$ that constitute a partition μ of n. We have

$$[\mathbb{C} \otimes_Z \widetilde{K}_\lambda : L_\gamma]_{\mathfrak{S}_n} = 0 \qquad \lambda \not\le \gamma \tag{2.10}$$

by the definition of $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$ and the fact that $\mathfrak{S}_n$ has semi-simple representation theory. Being the cyclic A_n-module generator, we have $[\mathbb{C} \otimes_Z \widetilde{K}_\lambda : L_\lambda]_{\mathfrak{S}_n} \neq 0$.

We can choose a non-zero generalized eigenspace

$$M \subset \mathbb{C} \otimes_Z \widetilde{K}_\lambda$$

of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ that can be regarded as an (ungraded) A_λ-module. We choose

$$L_{\mu^{[1]}} \boxtimes L_{\mu^{[2]}} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes L_{\mu^{[\ell]}} \subset M \qquad \ell = \ell(\mu) \tag{2.11}$$

as $\mathfrak{S}_\mu$-modules with partitions $\mu^{[1]}, \ldots, \mu^{[\ell]}$ of $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_\ell$, respectively. Since each piece of the external tensor products of (2.11) have distinct eigenvalues, we deduce

$$\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{S}_\mu}^{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_{\mu^{[1]}} \boxtimes L_{\mu^{[2]}} \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes L_{\mu^{[\ell]}}) \hookrightarrow M \tag{2.12}$$

By the Littlewood-Richardson rule, the smallest label (with respect to $\le$) of $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module that appears in the LHS of (2.12) is attained by $\kappa \in \mathcal{P}_n$ such that

$$m_i(\kappa) = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} m_i(\mu^{[j]}) \qquad i \ge 0.$$

For an appropriate choice in (2.11), we attain $\kappa = \lambda$ by (1.3). It follows that μ defines a division of entries of λ into small groups. In view of (2.9), the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{n} \subset Z$ is the pullback of a maximal ideal of Z'. In other words, we find that $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ shares with the same support as Z' in $\mathrm{Spec}\, \mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]^{\mathfrak{S}_n}$.

We define graded A_n-modules N_r ($r \ge 1$) as:

$$N_r := \ker\left(\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda) \to \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)\right)^r / \left(\ker\left(\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda) \to \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)\right)\right)^{r+1}.$$

We show that each N_r is supported in a proper subset of $\mathrm{Spec}\, Z'$. Equivalently, we show that the general specializations of $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)$ with respect to (2.9) are the same. In view of the above construction of the partitions μ and κ, we have necessarily $\lambda = \mu$ and $\mu^{(i)} = (\mu_i)$ for each $i \ge 1$ as otherwise smaller partitions arise. In view of Lemma 2.25, a thickening of (2.12) as (ungraded) A_λ-modules must be achieved by the actions of

$$X_1 + \cdots + X_{\lambda_1}, X_{\lambda_1+1} + \cdots + X_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}, \ldots, X_{n-\lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}+1} + \cdots + X_n. \tag{2.13}$$

As these are contained in the action of $B(\lambda)$, we conclude that the general specializations of $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ and $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)$ are the same.

Therefore, Theorem 2.32 implies

$$\mathrm{gdim}\, N_r \ll \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \qquad r > 0.$$

By Lemma 2.31 (and the support containment), we have only finitely many r with $N_r \neq \{0\}$. Again using Theorem 2.32, we conclude

$$\mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda) - \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda) = \sum_{r \ge 1} \mathrm{gdim}\, N_r \ll \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda)$$

as required. □

Proposition 2.35. *For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$, the module $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ admits a decreasing separable filtration whose associated graded is the direct sum of grading shifts of K_λ. For a non-trivial A_n-module quotient M_λ of $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda$, we have*

$$\mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, M_\lambda) \ll b_\lambda^{-1}.$$

Proof. Consider the submodule $\widetilde{N} \subset \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ generated by the unique copy $L_{(n)} \subset \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda}^{\mathfrak{S}_n} \mathsf{triv} = (\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)_0$. In view of Lemma 2.28, we find

$$\mathrm{hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_{(n)}, \widetilde{N}) \cong B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)} \cong \mathrm{hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, \widetilde{K}'_\lambda). \tag{2.14}$$

Consequently, we have $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{N}) \cong B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}$.

Let N and K be the specializations of $\widetilde{N}$ and $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$ with respect to a maximal ideal of $B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}$ such that the joint eigenvalues $\alpha_{\lambda_1}, \alpha_{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell(\lambda)}$ in Lemma 2.33 are distinct. Let M be a joint $\{X_i\}_i$-eigenspace of K or N, that is a $\mathfrak{S}_\lambda$-module. The eigenvalue condition implies

$$N \supset \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda}^{\mathfrak{S}_n} M \subset K. \tag{2.15}$$

The $\mathfrak{S}_n$-module L_λ appears in N or K only if $L_\mu \subset \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{S}_\lambda}^{\mathfrak{S}_n} \mathsf{triv}$. Applying the Littlewood-Richardson rule to the middle term of (2.15), we deduce $M \cong \mathsf{triv}$. In particular, we have $[N : L_\lambda]_{\mathfrak{S}_n} > 0 < [K : L_{(n)}]_{\mathfrak{S}_n}$. By the semi-continuity of the specializations, we deduce

$$[\mathbb{C}_0 \otimes_{B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}} \widetilde{N} : L_\lambda] > 0, \quad \text{and} \quad [\mathbb{C}_0 \otimes_{B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}} \widetilde{K}'_\lambda : L_{(n)}] > 0. \tag{2.16}$$

From this, we conclude $\mathbb{C}_0 \otimes_{B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}} \widetilde{K}'_\lambda \cong K_\lambda$. Thus, the torsion free $B(\lambda)^{\mathfrak{S}(\lambda)}$-action on $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda \subset \widetilde{K}^+_\lambda$ yields the first assertion.

For each $L_{(n)} \langle m \rangle \subset \widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ ($m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$), we have $\widetilde{N} \langle m \rangle \subset \widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ as $L_{(n)} \langle m \rangle$ is obtained from $L_{(n)} \subset (\widetilde{K}^+_\lambda)_0$ by the action of $B(\lambda)$. In particular, we have $\widetilde{N} \langle m \rangle \subset \ker(\widetilde{K}'_\lambda \to M_\lambda)$ for some m as $\mathsf{soc}\, K_\lambda = L_{(n)} \langle n(\lambda) \rangle$. We have $L_\lambda \langle m' \rangle \subset \widetilde{N}$ for some $m' \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ by (2.16). As it induces an inclusion $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda \langle m' \rangle \subset \widetilde{N}$, we deduce

$$\mathrm{gdim}\, \hom_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, M_\lambda) \le (1 - q^{m+m'}) \mathrm{gdim}\, \hom_{\mathfrak{S}_n}(L_\lambda, \widetilde{K}_\lambda) = (1 - q^{m+m'}) b_\lambda^{-1}.$$

This implies the second assertion. ☐

Corollary 2.36. *Keep the setting of Proposition 2.29. Assume that M is a graded A_n-module generated by the subspace*

$$M^{\mathrm{top}} \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^{m} L_\lambda \langle d_j \rangle \subset M \quad \textit{such that} \quad \mathrm{gch}\, M = b_\lambda^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m} q^{d_j} \mathrm{gch}\, K_\lambda.$$

Then, we have $M \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \widetilde{K}'_\lambda \langle d_j \rangle$.

Proof. In view of the fact that $[M : L_\mu]_q = 0$ for $\mu \not\geq \lambda$, we have a surjection

$$f : \bigoplus_{j=1}^{m} \widetilde{K}_\lambda \langle d_j \rangle \longrightarrow\!\!\!\!\!\rightarrow M.$$

Consider the quotient M' of M by $\sum_{j=1}^m f(\ker(\widetilde{K}_\lambda \to \widetilde{K}'_\lambda) \langle d_j \rangle)$. Let $f' : \bigoplus_{j=1}^m \widetilde{K}'_\lambda \langle d_j \rangle \to M'$ be the map induced from f. Let us choose a maximal subset $S \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $\bigoplus_{j \in S} \widetilde{K}'_\lambda \langle d_j \rangle$ injects into M' by f'. We take the quotient M'' of M' by this image. Then, the image K_j of $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda \langle d_j \rangle$ ($j \notin S$) in M'' under the induced map must be a proper quotient of $\widetilde{K}'_\lambda \langle d_j \rangle$.

Suppose that $S \neq \{1, \ldots, m\}$. Corollary 2.35 and Theorem 2.32 forces

$$\mathrm{gdim}\, M'' \le \sum_{j \notin S} \mathrm{gdim}\, K_j \ll \mathrm{gch}\, \widetilde{K}'_\lambda.$$

By Theorem 2.34, we have $\operatorname{gdim} M - \operatorname{gdim} M' \ll b_\lambda^{-1}$. Thus, we have

$$\operatorname{gdim} M - \sum_{j \in S} q^j \operatorname{gch} \widetilde{K}'_\lambda \ll \sum_{j \notin S}^{m} q^{d_j} \operatorname{gch} \widetilde{K}'_\lambda = b_\lambda^{-1} \sum_{j \notin S} q^{d_j} \operatorname{gch} K_\lambda,$$

that is a contradiction. Therefore, we have $S = \{1, 2, \ldots, m\}$. This implies that f' is an isomorphism. In view of Proposition 2.29, we conclude that $M = M'$ by the comparison of graded characters. □

2.4 Proof of Theorem 2.3

We prove Theorem 2.3 and $\widetilde{K}_\lambda = \widetilde{K}'_\lambda$ ($\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$) by induction on n. Theorem 2.3 holds for $n = 1$ as $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{(1)\}$, $P_{(1)} = \widetilde{K}_{(1)} = \widetilde{K}'_{(1)} = \mathbb{C}[X]$, $K_{(1)} = \mathbb{C}$, and

$$\operatorname{ext}^k_{\mathbb{C}[X]}(\mathbb{C}[X], \mathbb{C}) \cong \mathbb{C}^{\delta_{k,0}}.$$

We assume the assertion for all $1 \le n < n_0$ and prove the assertion for $n = n_0$. We fix $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0 - 1}$ and set

$$\operatorname{ind}(\lambda) := \operatorname{ind}_{1, n_0 - 1}(\mathbb{C}[X] \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\lambda).$$

For each $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, Theorem 1.5 implies

$$\operatorname{ext}^k_{A_{n_0}}(\operatorname{ind}(\lambda), K_\mu^*) \cong \operatorname{ext}^k_{A_{1, n_0 - 1}}(\mathbb{C}[X] \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\lambda, K_\mu^*). \tag{2.17}$$

Since $\mathbb{C}[X]$ is projective as $\mathbb{C}[X]$-modules, Theorem 2.11 implies that

$$\operatorname{gdim} \operatorname{ext}^k_{A_{1, n_0 - 1}}(\mathbb{C}[X] \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\lambda, K_\mu^*) \cong \begin{cases} \sum_{1 \le j \le \ell(\mu), \lambda = \mu_{(j)}} q^{n(\mu) - n(\mu_{(j)}) + j} & (k = 0) \\ 0 & (k \neq 0) \end{cases} \tag{2.18}$$

by the short exact sequences associated to (2.1). In other word, we have

$$\operatorname{gdim} \hom_{A_{1, n_0 - 1}}(\mathbb{C}[X] \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\lambda, K_\mu^*) = q^\star [m_j(\mu)]_q.$$

and it is nonzero if and only if $\mu_{(j)} = \lambda$ for some $1 \le j \le \ell(\mu)$. This is equivalent to $\lambda^{(j)} = \mu$ for some $1 \le j \le \ell(\lambda) + 1$. We set $S := \{\lambda^{(j)}\}_{j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)+1} \subset \mathcal{P}_{n_0}$.

Note that $L_\mu = \mathsf{soc}\, K_\mu^*$, and hence every $0 \neq f \in \hom_{A_{n_0}}(\operatorname{ind}(\lambda), K_\mu^*)$ satisfies $[\operatorname{Im} f : L_\mu]_q \neq 0$. In view of Lemma 1.3, we further deduce $[\operatorname{Im} f : L_\mu] = 1$. Therefore, the image of the map

$$f^+ : \operatorname{ind}(\lambda) \longrightarrow \left(K_\mu^*\right)^{\oplus \star}$$

obtained by taking the sum of all the maps of $\hom_{A_{n_0}}(\operatorname{ind}(\lambda), K_\mu^*)$ satisfies

- $\mathsf{soc}\, \operatorname{Im} f^+$ is the direct sum of $L_\mu \langle m \rangle$ ($m \in \mathbb{Z}$);
- $\dim (\mathsf{soc}\, \operatorname{Im} f^+) = (\dim L_\mu) \cdot (\dim \hom_{A_{n_0}}(\operatorname{ind}(\lambda), K_\mu^*))$.

We consider an A_{n_0}-submodule generated by the preimage of $(\mathsf{soc}\, \operatorname{Im} f^+)$ (considered as the direct sum of grading shifts of L_μ), that we denote by N_μ. Although the module N_μ might depend on the choice of a lift, the number of its A_{n_0}-module generators is unambiguously determined.

We have $\lambda^{(j)} \geq \lambda^{(j+1)}$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)$ by inspection. In particular, S is a totally ordered set with respect to $\leq$. Moreover, $\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$ is generated by $\mathrm{Ind}_{1,n_0-1} L_\lambda$ as A_{n_0}-module, and all the irreducible constituent of this induction is of the form $L_{\lambda^{(j)}}$ for $1 \leq j \leq (\ell(\lambda)+1)$ by the Littlewood-Richardson rule. As a consequence, we find that $\sum_{\gamma \in S} N_\gamma = \mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$. For each $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)+1$, we set $N(j) := \sum_{i \geq j} N_{\lambda^{(i)}}$. We have $N(j+1) \subset N(j)$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)$ and $N(1) = \mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$.

By the Littlewood-Richardson rule and Lemma 1.3, we find that

$$[\mathrm{ind}(\lambda) : L_\gamma]_q \neq 0 \quad \text{only if} \quad \gamma \geq \lambda^{(\ell(\lambda)+1)}. \tag{2.19}$$

Claim A. *We have* $[N(j)/N(j+1) : L_\gamma]_q = 0$ *for* $\gamma < \lambda^{(j)}$.

Proof. Assume to the contrary to deduce contradiction. We have some $1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda)$ and $\gamma < \lambda^{(j)}$ such that $[N(j)/N(j+1) : L_\gamma]_q \neq 0$. Here we have $\lambda^{(\ell(\lambda)+1)} \leq \gamma < \lambda^{(j)}$ by (2.19). By rearranging j, we assume that j is the minimal number with this property. In particular, we have

$$[N(l)/N(l+1) : L_\gamma]_q = 0 \quad \gamma < \lambda^{(l)} \quad \text{for} \quad l < j. \tag{2.20}$$

This in turn implies that $[N(l)/N(j) : L_\gamma]_q = 0$ for $\gamma < \lambda^{(j)}$ for every $l \leq j$. By rearranging γ if necessary, we can assume that the A_{n_0}-submodule $N^-(j) \subset N(j)/N(j+1)$ generated by $\mathfrak{S}_{n_0}$-isotypic components L_κ such that $\kappa < \lambda^{(j)}$ satisfies $L_\gamma \langle m \rangle \subset \mathsf{hd}\, N^-(j)$ and the value m is minimum among all $\gamma < \lambda^{(j)}$. Then, the lift of $L_\gamma \langle m \rangle \subset \mathsf{hd}\, N^-(j)$ to $N^-(j)$ is uniquely determined as graded $\mathfrak{S}_{n_0}$-module. It follows that the maximal quotient L_γ^+ of $N(j)/N(j+1)$ (and hence also a quotient of $N(j)$) such that $\mathsf{soc}\, L_\gamma^+ = L_\gamma \langle m \rangle$ is finite-dimensional (as the grading must be bounded) and $[L_\gamma^+ : L_\kappa]_q = 0$ if $\kappa < \gamma (< \lambda^{(j)})$. By Proposition 2.16 and Theorem 1.6, we find

$$\mathrm{ext}^1_{A_{n_0}}(\mathrm{coker}\,(L_\gamma \to L_\gamma^+), K_\gamma^*) = 0$$

by a repeated applications of the short exact sequences. In particular, the non-zero map $L_\gamma \langle m \rangle \to K_\gamma^* \langle m \rangle$ prolongs to L_γ^+, and hence it gives rise to a map $N(j) \to K_\gamma^* \langle m \rangle$. By (2.20), we additionally have

$$\mathrm{ext}^1_{A_{n_0}}(\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)/N(j), K_\gamma^*) = 0.$$

Therefore, we deduce a non-zero map $\mathrm{ind}(\lambda) \to K_\gamma^* \langle m \rangle$ from our assumption that does not come from the generator set of $N_{\lambda^{(l)}}$ for every l. This is a contradiction, and hence we conclude the result. □

We return to the proof of Theorem 2.3. Note that Claim A guarantees that $N(j)$ $(1 \leq j \leq \ell(\lambda+1))$ is defined unambiguously as the all possible generating $\mathfrak{S}_{n_0}$-isotypical components of $N(j) \subset \mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$ (i.e. $L_{\lambda^{(k)}}$ for $j \leq k \leq \ell(\lambda)+1$)

must belong to $N(j)$. In view of the above and Corollary 2.23, we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi([\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)]) &= \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}} Q^\vee_\gamma \cdot \langle [\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)], [K_\gamma] \rangle_{EP} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}, k \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^k Q^\vee_\gamma \cdot \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{ext}^k_{A_{n_0}}(\mathrm{ind}(\lambda), K^*_\gamma)^* \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in S} Q^\vee_\gamma \cdot \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{hom}_{A_{n_0}}(\mathrm{ind}(\lambda), K^*_\gamma)^* \\ &= \sum_{\gamma \in S} b_\gamma^{-1} \cdot Q_\gamma \cdot \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{hom}_{A_{n_0}}(\mathrm{ind}(\lambda), K^*_\gamma)^* \in \Lambda_q. \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

This expansion exhibits positivity (as a formal power series in $\mathbb{Q}(\!(q)\!)$).

Claim B. *For each $1 \le j \le \ell(\lambda)$, the module $N(j)/N(j+1)$ is the direct sum of grading shifts of $\widetilde{K}'_{\lambda^{(j)}}$, and $\Psi([\widetilde{K}'_{\lambda^{(j)}}]) = Q^\vee_{\lambda^{(j)}}$.*

Proof. We assume that the assertion holds for all the larger j (or $j = \ell(\lambda)+1$), and $\lambda^{(j)} \neq \lambda^{(j+1)}$ (and hence $\lambda^{(j)} > \lambda^{(j+1)}$). We apply Claim A, and compare Lemma 1.3 and Theorem 2.14 with (2.21) to find

$$\left[\frac{\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)}{N(j+1)} : L_{\lambda^{(j)}}\right]_q = \left[\frac{N(j)}{N(j+1)} : L_{\lambda^{(j)}}\right]_q = b^{-1}_{\lambda^{(j)}} \cdot \mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{hom}_{A_{n_0}}(\mathrm{ind}(\lambda), K^*_{\lambda^{(j)}})^*.$$

Since $\Psi([\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)/N(j)])$ must be the sum of $Q^\vee_\gamma$ for $\gamma = \lambda^{(k)}$ $(k \le j)$ by the induction hypothesis, Theorem 2.14 implies

$$[N(j)/N(j+1) : L_\mu]_q = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad \mu \not\geq \lambda^{(j)}.$$

It follows that $N(j)/N(j+1)$ admits a surjection from direct sum of $\widetilde{K}_{\lambda^{(j)}}$ with its multiplicity $\mathrm{gdim}\, \mathrm{hom}_{A_{n_0}}(\mathrm{ind}(\lambda), K^*_{\lambda^{(j)}})^*$ (as this latter number counts the number of generators of $N(j)/N(j+1)$). Applying Corollary 2.36, we conclude that $N(j)/N(j+1)$ is the direct sum of grading shifts of $\widetilde{K}'_{\lambda^{(j)}}$. By Proposition 2.29 and Proposition 2.35, we have

$$\mathrm{gch}\, \widetilde{K}'_{\lambda^{(j)}} = b^{-1}_{\lambda^{(j)}} \cdot \mathrm{gch}\, K_{\lambda^{(j)}}.$$

This implies $\Psi([\widetilde{K}'_{\lambda^{(j)}}]) = Q^\vee_{\lambda^{(j)}}$. These proceed the induction, and we conclude the result. □

Claim C. *Let us enumerate as $S = \{\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 < \cdots < \gamma_s\}$. We have a finite increasing filtration*

$$\{0\} = G_0 \subset G_1 \subset G_2 \subset \cdots \subset G_s = \mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$$

as A_{n_0}-modules such that each G_i/G_{i-1} is isomorphic to the direct sum of grading shifts of $\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_i}$. In addition, each G_s/G_{i-1} contains a copy of $\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_i}$ as its A_{n_0}-module direct summand.

Proof. The first part is just a rephrasement of the property of the filtration $\{N(j)\}_{j=1}^{\ell(\lambda)+1}$ in Claim B.

We have $L_{\gamma_i} \subset \mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{S}_{n_0-1}}^{\mathfrak{S}_{n_0}} L_\lambda$ as $\mathfrak{S}_{n_0}$-modules by the Littlewood-Richardson rule. If we have $[G_s/G_{i-1} : L_\mu]_q \neq 0$, then Claim B implies $[\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_j} : L_\mu]_q \neq 0$ for some $i \le j \le s$. By Lemma 1.3, we conclude that $\mu \ge \gamma_i$.

Since $\mathrm{Ind}_{\mathfrak{S}_{n_0-1}}^{\mathfrak{S}_{n_0}} L_\lambda = \mathrm{ind}(\lambda)_0$, we find a degree zero copy of L_{γ_i} in $\mathsf{hd}\,\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$. By the above multiplicity count (and Corollary 2.36), it must lift to a direct summand $\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_i} \subset G_i/G_{i-1}$. This implies the second assertion. □

Claim D. *For each $\gamma \in S$, we have*

$$\mathrm{ext}^k_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\gamma, K^*_\mu) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & (k = 0, \gamma = \mu) \\ \{0\} & (\mathit{else}) \end{cases}. \tag{2.22}$$

Proof. We prove (2.22) and

$$\mathrm{ext}^{>0}_{A_n}(G_s/G_j, K^*_\mu) = 0 \tag{2.23}$$

for $0 \le j \le s$ by induction. The $j = 0$ case of (2.23) follows by (2.17). The $j = i-1$ case of (2.23) implies (2.22) for $\gamma = \gamma_i$ and $k > 0$ as G_s/G_{i-1} contains $\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_i}$ as its direct summand by Claim C. We have

$$\hom_{A_{n_0}}(\widetilde{K}'_\gamma, K^*_\mu) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C} & (\gamma = \mu) \\ 0 & (\gamma \neq \mu) \end{cases} \tag{2.24}$$

by Lemma 1.3, $\mathsf{hd}\,\widetilde{K}_\gamma = L_\gamma$, and $\mathsf{soc}\,K^*_\mu = L_\mu$. By counting the multiplicities of L_{γ_i}, we deduce

$$\hom_{A_{n_0}}(G_s/G_{j-1}, K^*_{\gamma_j}) \xrightarrow{\cong} \hom_{A_{n_0}}((\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_j})^{\oplus\star}, K^*_{\gamma_j}) \tag{2.25}$$

for $0 \le j \le s$ from Claim C.

Now a part of the long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\to \hom_{A_{n_0}}(G_s/G_i, K^*_\mu) \to \hom_{A_{n_0}}(G_s/G_{i-1}, K^*_\mu) \xrightarrow{\cong} \hom_{A_{n_0}}((\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_i})^{\oplus\star}, K^*_\mu) \\ &\to \mathrm{ext}^1_{A_{n_0}}(G_s/G_i, K^*_\mu) \to \mathrm{ext}^1_{A_{n_0}}(G_s/G_{i-1}, K^*_\mu) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

associated to the short exact sequence

$$0 \to (\widetilde{K}'_{\gamma_i})^{\oplus\star} \to G_s/G_{i-1} \to G_s/G_i \to 0,$$

as well as (2.24) and (2.25), yields (2.22) for $\gamma = \gamma_i$ and (2.23) for $j = i$ from (2.23) for $j = i-1$ inductively on i. □

We return to the proof of Theorem 2.3. All elements of $\mathcal{P}_{n_0}$ appear as $\lambda^{(j)}$ for suitable $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0-1}$ and $1 \le j \le (\ell(\lambda)+1)$. By rearranging λ if necessary, we conclude (2.22) for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}$. By Theorem 2.12, a repeated use of short exact sequences decomposes $\{K_\mu\}_{\gamma \le \mu}$ into $\{L_\mu\}_{\gamma \le \mu}$ by starting from $K_{(n)} = L_{(n)}$. Substituting these to the second factor of (2.22), we deduce

$$\mathrm{ext}^{>0}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}'_\gamma, L_\mu) \neq 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad \mu < \gamma.$$

This implies $\widetilde{K}'_\gamma = \widetilde{K}_\gamma$ for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0}$. Thus, (2.22) is Theorem 2.3 3) for $n = n_0$. We conclude Theorem 2.3 1) and 2) for $n = n_0$ from Claim B and Proposition 2.35.

In view of the above arguments, we find that each $\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$ ($\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0-1}$) admits a Δ-filtration. Since $\mathrm{ind}_{1,\star}$ preserves projectivity, we deduce that A_{n_0} admits a filtration by $\mathrm{ind}(\lambda)$ ($\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_{n_0-1}$) by the induction hypothesis. Therefore, A_{n_0} admits a Δ-filtration. Since each $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$ is generated by its simple head, applying an idempotent does not separate them out non-trivially. Therefore, we conclude that each projective module of A_{n_0} also admits a Δ-filtration. Given this and Theorem 2.3 2) and 3), the latter assertion of Theorem 2.3 4) is standard (see e.g. [12, Corollary 3.12]). This is Theorem 2.3 4) for $n = n_0$.

These proceeds the induction, and hence we conclude Theorem 2.3.

2.5 Proof of Theorem 2.5

Note that A_n is a Noetherian ring as a finitely generated A_n-module is also finitely generated by $\mathbb{C}[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$. The global dimension of A_n is finite (Theorem 1.7). We have $\mathrm{gdim}\, A_n \in \mathbb{Z}[\![q]\!]$ by inspection.

We introduce a total order $\prec$ on $\mathcal{P}_n$ that refines $\le$ and set $\mathbf{e}_\lambda := \sum_{\lambda \succ \mu \in \mathcal{P}_n} e_\mu$ for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$. The two sided ideals $A_n \mathbf{e}_\lambda A_n \subset A_n$ satisfies $A_n \mathbf{e}_\lambda A_n \subset A_n \mathbf{e}_\mu A_n$ if $\mu \succ \lambda$. By Lemma 1.3, we deduce that

$$(A_n \mathbf{e}_\lambda A_n) \otimes_{A_n} P_\lambda \longrightarrow \widetilde{K}_\lambda$$

is a surjection. By Proposition 2.16 and Theorem 2.3 2), we further deduce

$$(A_n \mathbf{e}_\lambda A_n) \otimes_{A_n} P_\lambda \xrightarrow{\cong} \widetilde{K}_\lambda.$$

Theorem 2.3 1) implies that $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ is a graded polynomial ring for each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$. In conjunction with Theorem 2.3 2), we find that

$$\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(P_\mu, \widetilde{K}_\lambda)$$

is a free module over $\mathrm{end}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda)$ for each $\lambda, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_n$.

Therefore, A_n is an affine quasi-hereditary algebra in the sense of [14, Introduction] with $\Delta_\lambda = \widetilde{K}_\lambda$ and $\overline{\nabla}_\lambda = K_\lambda^*$ ($\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n$).

Theorem 2.37 ([14] Theorem 7.21 and Lemma 7.22)**.** *A module $M \in A$-gmod admits a Δ-filtration if and only if*

$$\mathrm{ext}^1_{A_n}(M, K_\lambda^*) = 0 \qquad \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n.$$

A module $M \in A$-fmod admits a $\overline{\Delta}$-filtration if and only if

$$\mathrm{ext}^1_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda, M^*) = 0 \qquad \lambda \in \mathcal{P}_n.$$

Corollary 2.38 ([14] §7, particularly Lemma 7.5)**.** *Let $M \in A$-gmod. If M admits a Δ-filtration, then the multiplicity space of $\widetilde{K}_\lambda$ in M is given by*

$$\mathrm{hom}_{A_n}(M, K_\lambda)^*.$$

If the module M admits a $\overline{\Delta}$-filtration, then the multiplicity space of of K_λ in M is given by

$$\mathrm{hom}_{A_n}(\widetilde{K}_\lambda, M^*)^*.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We prove the first assertion for $\mathrm{res}_{r,n-r}$. By the second part of Theorem 2.37, it suffices to check the ext^1-vanishing with respect to $L_\mu \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\nu$ ($\mu \in \mathcal{P}_r, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_{n-r}$) as a module over $\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_r \boxtimes A_{n-r}$ (equivalently, we can check the ext^1-vanishing with respect to $P_\mu \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\nu$ as a module of $A_{r,n-r}$; see below). In particular, we do not need to mind the first factor as the $\mathfrak{S}_r$-action is granted by construction. Therefore, the first assertion is just a r-times repeated application of Theorem 2.11.

We prove the second assertion for $\mathrm{ind}_{r,n-r}$. For each $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}_r, \mu \in \mathcal{P}_{n-r}$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_n$, we have

$$\mathrm{ext}^\bullet_{A_n}(\mathrm{ind}_{r,n-r}(P_\lambda \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\mu), K_\nu^*) \cong \mathrm{ext}^\bullet_{A_{r,n-r}}(P_\lambda \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\mu, K_\nu^*) \tag{2.26}$$

by Theorem 1.5. Applying Theorem 2.11 to K_ν^* as many as r-times, we find that the restriction of K_ν to A_{n-r} admits a filtration whose associated graded is the direct sum of grading shifts of $\{K_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_{n-r}}$. Since P_λ is free over a polynomial ring of r-variables, we have

$$\mathrm{ext}^\bullet_{A_{r,n-r}}(P_\lambda \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\mu, K_\nu^*) \cong \mathrm{ext}^\bullet_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_r \boxtimes A_{n-r}}(L_\lambda \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\mu, K_\nu^*).$$

Thus, we derive a natural isomorphism

$$\mathrm{ext}^1_{\mathbb{C}\mathfrak{S}_r \boxtimes A_{n-r}}(L_\lambda \boxtimes \widetilde{K}_\mu, K_\nu^*) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{hom}_{\mathfrak{S}_r}(L_r, \mathrm{ext}^1_{A_{n-r}}(\widetilde{K}_\mu, K_\nu^*)). \tag{2.27}$$

By Theorem 2.3 3) and Theorem 2.11, the RHS of (2.27) is zero. By the first part of Theorem 2.37, we conclude the second assertion. □

Acknowledgement: The author presented an intensive lecture course based on the contents of this paper at Nagoya University on Fall 2020. The author thanks the hospitality of Shintarou Yanagida and Nagoya University. He also thanks Kota Murakami for pointing out some typos. This research was supported in part by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP19H01782.

References

[1] Sabin Cautis and Anthony M. Licata. Heisenberg categorification and Hilbert schemes. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 161(13):2469–2547, oct 2012.

[2] Vyjayanthi Chari and Bogdan Ion. BGG reciprocity for current algebras. *Compos. Math.*, 151(7):1265–1287, 2015.

[3] Claude Chevalley. Invariants of finite groups generated by reflections. *Amer. J. Math.*, 77:778–782, 1955.

[4] Corrado De Concini and Claudio Procesi. Symmetric functions, conjugacy classes and the flag variety. *Invent. Math.*, 64:203–219, 1981.

[5] Evgeny Feigin, Anton Khoroshkin, and Ievgen Makedonskyi. Peter-Weyl, Howe and Schur-Weyl theorems for current groups. arXiv:1906.03290.

[6] A. M. Garsia and C. Procesi. On certain graded S_n-modules and the q-Kostka polynomials. *Adv. Math.*, 94(1):82–138, 1992.

[7] Alexander Grothendieck. Sur quelques points d'algèbre homologique. *Tohoku Math. J. (2)*, 9:119–221, 1957.

[8] Mark Haiman. Hilbert schemes, polygraphs and the Macdonald positivity conjecture. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 14(941–1006), 2001.

[9] Mark Haiman. Combinatorics, symmetric functions, and Hilbert schemes. In *Current developments in mathematics, 2002*, pages 39–111. Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2003.

[10] Syu Kato. An exotic Deligne-Langlands correspondence for symplectic groups. *Duke Math. J.*, 148(2):305–371, 2009.

[11] Syu Kato. A homological study of Green polynomials. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)*, 48(5):1035–1074, 2015.

[12] Syu Kato. An algebraic study of extension algebras. *Amer. J. Math.*, 139(3):567–615, 2017. arXiv:1207.4640.

[13] David Kazhdan and George Lusztig. Proof of the Deligne-Langlands conjecture for Hecke algebras. *Invent. Math.*, 87(1):153–215, 1987.

[14] Alexander S. Kleshchev. Affine highest weight categories and affine quasihereditary algebras. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 110(4):841–882, 2015.

[15] Steffen König and Changchang Xi. Affine cellular algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 229(1):139–182, 2012.

[16] G. Lusztig. Intersection cohomology complexes on a reductive group. *Invent. Math.*, 75(2):205–272, 1984.

[17] George Lusztig. Cuspidal local systems and graded Hecke algebras. I. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, 67:145–202, 1988.

[18] George Lusztig. Green functions and character sheaves. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 131:355–408, 1990.

[19] I. G. Macdonald. *Symmetric functions and Hall polynomials.* Oxford Mathematical Monographs. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, New York, second edition, 1995. With contributions by A. Zelevinsky, Oxford Science Publications.

[20] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative ring theory*, volume 8 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1986. Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid.

[21] John C. McConnell and James C. Robson. *Noncommutative Noetherian rings.*, volume 30 of *Graduate Studies in Math.* AMS, 2001.

[22] Ryosuke Shimoji and Shintarou Yanagida. A study of symmetric functions via derived Hall algebra. *Communications in Algebras*, to appear, 2020.

[23] Toshiaki Shoji. Green functions associated to complex reflection groups. *J. Algebra*, 245(2):650–694, 2001.

[24] T. A. Springer. Trigonometric sums, Green functions of finite groups and representations of Weyl groups. *Invent. Math.*, 36:173–207, 1976.

[25] T. A. Springer and A. V. Zelevinsky. Characters of $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbf{F}_q)$ and Hopf algebras. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 30(1):27–43, 1984.

[26] Toshiyuki Tanisaki. Defining ideals of the closures of the conjugaty classes and representations of the Weyl groups. *Tohoku Mathematical Journal*, 34:575–585, 1982.

[27] Nanhua Xi. The based ring of two-sided cells of affine Weyl groups of type $\widetilde{A}_{n-1}$. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 157(749):xiv+95, 2002.

[28] Andrey V. Zelevinsky. *Representations of finite classical groups*, volume 869 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1981.