

Constructing Graded Lie Algebras

Meighan I. Dillon*

September 5, 2018

Abstract

The \mathbb{Z} -grading determined by a long simple root of an affine or finite type Lie algebra arises from an adjoint or cominuscule representation of a lower rank semi-simple complex Lie algebra. Analysis of the relationship between the grading and the representation leads to an extension of Kac's construction of nontwisted affine Lie algebras.

Keywords \mathbb{Z} -graded Lie algebra, Kac-Moody algebra, affine Lie algebra

1 Introduction

Kac's construction of nontwisted affine Lie algebras produces a \mathbb{Z} -graded infinite dimensional Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} from the adjoint representation of a simple complex Lie algebra. The grading is determined by a so-called special root of \mathfrak{g} . We describe two related constructions that produce all \mathbb{Z} -graded finite type and affine Lie algebras—twisted as well as nontwisted—where the grading is determined by a long simple root that is not special (an *lsm root*.) Each construction starts with a generalized cominuscule representation of a semisimple Lie algebra.

Definition 1 *If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{l}_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{l}_t$, where \mathfrak{l}_i are simple complex Lie algebras, $V = U_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes U_t$ is a generalized cominuscule representation of \mathfrak{g} provided U_i is irreducible over \mathfrak{l}_i with highest weight $n_i \Lambda_i$, $n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, Λ_i the fundamental weight associated to a cominuscule simple root of \mathfrak{l}_i .*

Fix \mathfrak{g}^k , a semi-simple Lie algebra over \mathbb{C} . Let S be a set of positive integers. For $i \in S$, let V_i designate an irreducible highest weight representation of \mathfrak{g}^k with highest weight λ_i . The adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g}^k is $\text{adj } \mathfrak{g}^k$. Let \mathcal{T}_1 be the submodule of $\Lambda^2 V_1$ with highest weight(s) of the form $2\lambda_1 - \alpha$, α a positive root of \mathfrak{g}^k . \mathcal{T}_1^c is the complement of \mathcal{T}_1 in $\Lambda^2 V_1$. For $i > 1$, \mathcal{T}_i is the submodule of $V_1 \otimes V_i$ associated to highest weights greater than or equal to those of the form $\lambda_1 + \lambda_i - \alpha$, where α is any positive root of \mathfrak{g}^k . \mathcal{T}_i^c is the complement of \mathcal{T}_i in $V_1 \otimes V_i$.

*Partial support was through the Faculty Development Program at Georgia Tech. Joseph Landsberg's considerable help is especially acknowledged.

Theorem 1 The Affine Algorithm Suppose $V = V_1$ is a generalized cominuscle representation of \mathfrak{g} .

Set $j = 1$.

1. If \mathcal{T}_j^c is irreducible, let $V_{j+1} = \mathcal{T}_j^c$. Increase j by 1 and repeat this step.
2. If $\mathcal{T}_j^c = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, let $V_{j+1} = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$. Increase j by 1 and go to step (4).
3. Otherwise V is inadmissible.
4. For $i > j$, let $V_i = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ if $i \equiv 0 \pmod{j}$. Otherwise take $\ell \in \{1, \dots, j-1\}$ so that $\ell \equiv i \pmod{j}$ and let $V_i \cong V_\ell$. For $-i < 0$, take $V_{-i} = V_i^*$.

The algorithm is effective, terminating with $j \leq 6$.

If V is admissible, let $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ and, for $i \neq 0$, let $\mathfrak{g}_i = V_i$. $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_i$ is a \mathbb{Z} -graded affine algebra, the grading determined by an lsn root of \mathfrak{g} . Moreover, any lsn-graded affine Lie algebra can be constructed this way.

The next result generalizes the Minuscle Algorithm as detailed in [7].

Theorem 2 The Finite Algorithm Suppose $V = V_1$ is a generalized cominuscle representation of \mathfrak{g} .

Set $j = 1$.

1. If $\mathcal{T}_j^c = \{0\}$, go to step (4).
2. If \mathcal{T}_j^c is irreducible, take $V_{j+1} = \mathcal{T}_j^c$. Increase j by 1 and go back to step (1).
3. Otherwise V is inadmissible.
4. For $i \in \{-1, \dots, -j\}$, take $V_{-i} = V_i^*$. For $i > j$ and $i < -j$, take $V_i = \{0\}$.

The algorithm is effective, terminating with $j \leq 6$.

If V is admissible, let $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ and, for $i \neq 0$, let $\mathfrak{g}_i = V_i$. $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{g}_i$ is a \mathbb{Z} -graded finite type Lie algebra, the grading determined by an lsn root of \mathfrak{g} . Moreover, any lsn-graded finite type Lie algebra can be constructed this way.

Remark 1 Both algorithms relate to work of B. Kostant. Let \mathfrak{g}_0 be a reductive Lie algebra with module \mathfrak{p} . Theorem 1.50 in [6] gives necessary and sufficient conditions for determining whether a Lie bracket can be imposed on $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 + \mathfrak{p}$, consonant with the action of \mathfrak{g}_0 on \mathfrak{p} . Our work starts with semi-simple \mathfrak{g} and a representation V and constructs a minimal \mathbb{Z} -graded representation space $\mathfrak{p} = \bigoplus \mathfrak{g}_i$ so that $\mathfrak{g}_{-i} = \mathfrak{g}_i^*$, $\mathfrak{g}_1 = V$, \mathfrak{g}_0 contains \mathfrak{g} , and $\mathfrak{g}_0 + \mathfrak{p}$ is an affine or finite type Lie algebra with an lsn-grading.

The rest of the paper is dedicated to background analysis and the proofs of the theorems.

2 Terminology and Notation

A Lie algebra of *finite type* is a simple, finite dimensional Lie algebra over \mathbb{C} . A *semi-simple Lie algebra* is always complex semi-simple. All Lie algebras here are affine or semi-simple. Given a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , we fix a Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} . Δ is the set of roots of \mathfrak{g} , Δ_+ the positive roots, Π the set of simple roots, etc. The Dynkin diagram for \mathfrak{g} is \mathcal{D} . We number the simple roots of a finite type Lie algebra as in [1] and [4]. Otherwise, our notation and conventions typically follow [5]. Unless indicated to the contrary, α_i is a simple root. The extra root on an extended (or affine) Dynkin diagram (cf. [1]) is always α_0 . The *labels* of \mathcal{D} are as in the Tables Aff in Chapter 4 of [5]. It is often convenient to identify elements of Π with the nodes of \mathcal{D} .

The \mathbb{Z} -span of the roots of a Lie algebra form a lattice designated Q . \mathbb{Z}_+ -linear combinations of simple roots comprise Q_+ . If β is in Q_+ , write it as a \mathbb{Z}_+ -linear combination of simple roots. The *support* of β is then the set of simple roots with positive coefficients. The *height* of β is the sum of those coefficients. When applied to roots, the words *highest* and *lowest* refer to height. Let a_i be the label of \mathcal{D} associated to α_i . In the finite case, the highest root of \mathfrak{g} is $\theta = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} a_i \alpha_i$; in the affine case, the minimal positive imaginary root is $\delta = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} a_i \alpha_i$.

A simple root of \mathfrak{g} is *special* if it is conjugate to α_0 under a diagram automorphism. This makes sense for a finite type \mathfrak{g} if we consider the extended Dynkin diagram for \mathfrak{g} . A *cominuscule root* is a special root for a finite type Lie algebra (cf. [8].) The cominuscule roots are: all α_i in A_n ; α_1 in B_n ; α_n in C_n ; α_1, α_{n-1} and α_n in D_n ; α_1 and α_6 in E_6 ; α_7 in E_7 .

Let V be a representation of \mathfrak{g} . A weight vector v^+ is a *highest weight vector* of V provided $e_\alpha.v^+ = 0$ for all positive root vectors e_α in \mathfrak{g} . The weight associated to v^+ is then a *highest weight*. f_α designates a root vector in \mathfrak{g} associated to $-\alpha$, where α is a positive root. A weight vector v^- is a *lowest weight vector* provided $f_\alpha.v^- = 0$ for all positive roots α . To indicate that V is an irreducible \mathfrak{g} -module with highest weight λ , we sometimes write $V(\lambda)$ instead of V .

Suppose \mathfrak{g} is finite type or affine. Distinguishing a long simple root of \mathfrak{g} , α_k , we get a \mathbb{Z} -grading on \mathfrak{g} by $\deg e_j = -\deg f_j = \delta_{jk}$ (Kronecker delta). (See [5], §1.5.) Here e_i, f_i are root vectors of \mathfrak{g} associated to simple α_i and $-\alpha_i$ respectively. The \mathbb{Z} -grading induced by α_k is the α_k -grading of \mathfrak{g} . If α_k is an lsn root, we say the α_k -grading of \mathfrak{g} an *lsn-grading*.

Mark the nodes of \mathcal{D} adjacent to α_k . If a marked node represents a shorter root, label it with the number of edges between it and α_k . Excising α_k and adjacent edges from \mathcal{D} we get $\overset{k}{\mathcal{D}}$, a marked and labeled Dynkin diagram associated to a semi-simple Lie algebra $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$ (cf. [3], Chapter 3, §3.5.) When \mathfrak{g} is affine, $\overset{0}{\mathfrak{g}}$ is the *underlying algebra of finite type*. $\overset{k}{\mathcal{D}}$ represents an irreducible module over $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$. Its highest weight is the sum of the fundamental weights associated to the marked nodes, with multiplicity according to labels. Note that in the nontwisted

affine algebras, $\overset{0}{\mathcal{D}}$ is the diagram for the adjoint representation of $\overset{0}{\mathfrak{g}}$. In general the module associated to $\overset{k}{\mathcal{D}}$ corresponds to \mathfrak{g}_{-1} , the sum of the root spaces of \mathfrak{g} associated to roots with coefficient -1 on α_k . The connection between the α_k -grading and the representation it determines is discussed thoroughly in §4 below.

Fix $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{h}$, a Cartan subalgebra for \mathfrak{g} . The set of roots of \mathfrak{g} is $\overset{k}{\Delta}$, the set of simple roots is $\overset{k}{\Pi}$, etc. Fix $\overset{k}{\Pi}$ so there is a one-to-one correspondence between $\overset{k}{\Pi}$ and $\Pi - \{\alpha_k\}$ and use the same symbols to designate α_j in $\overset{k}{\Pi}$ and in Π , for $j \neq k$. Let (\cdot, \cdot) designate a fixed standard invariant form on \mathfrak{g} . Sometimes we call it the Killing form. Normalize the form so that $\|\alpha\|^2 = 2$ for any long root α of \mathfrak{g} . We use the same notation for the form as it restricts to \mathfrak{h} , also to $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$ and \mathfrak{h} . The canonical isomorphism determined by the form is $\nu : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$ and (\cdot, \cdot) designates the induced form on \mathfrak{h}^* as well. Let $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denote the pairing of \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g}^* , its dual. If $\alpha \in \overset{k}{\Delta}$, $\alpha^\vee \in \mathfrak{h}$ designates its coroot. If α_i is long, $-\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle$ is the number of edges between α_i and α_j in \mathcal{D} . For simple roots α_i, α_j , $\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle = \frac{2(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)}{\|\alpha_j\|^2}$. Also $\nu(\alpha_i^\vee) = \frac{2\alpha_i}{\|\alpha_i\|^2}$.

3 Brackets

Here we consider brackets on the α_k -graded pieces of $\mathfrak{g} = \oplus_i \mathfrak{g}_i$, looking at them in terms of the action of \mathfrak{g}_0 on \mathfrak{g}_i by $x.g = [x g]$. It is enough to consider $[\mathfrak{g}_1 \mathfrak{g}_j]$ and $[\mathfrak{g}_{-1} \mathfrak{g}_j]$ as other brackets are defined iteratively in terms of these.

If \mathfrak{g} is affine type, $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathbb{C}d_k + \mathbb{C}K$, where $\mathbb{C}K$ is the center of \mathfrak{g} and $d_k = \nu^{-1}(\Lambda_k)$, Λ_k the fundamental weight associated to α_k . Λ_k and d_k are isotropic and $(K, d_k) = a_k$, a_k the label on \mathcal{D} associated to α_k . Note that K belongs to the derived algebra of \mathfrak{g} but d_k does not. (See [5].) If \mathfrak{g} is finite type, $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathbb{C}d_k$, where $d_k \in \mathfrak{h}$ is given by $\nu(d_k) = \Lambda_k = \sum_i t_i \alpha_i$, for scalars $t_i \in \mathbb{C}$. If $x \in \mathfrak{g}_t$, $[d_k x] = tx$ and $(\Lambda_k, \Lambda_k) = (d_k, d_k) = t_k$.

3.1 $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_0$

Let $\{X_i\}$ and $\{Y_i\}$ be Killing dual bases of $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$. If \mathfrak{g} is affine, $\{X_i\} \cup \{\frac{1}{a_k}d_k, K\}$ and $\{Y_i\} \cup \{K, \frac{1}{a_k}d_k\}$ are dual bases of \mathfrak{g}_0 . For $u_{-1} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$, $u_1 \in \mathfrak{g}_1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [u_{-1} u_1] &= \sum_i (X_i, [u_{-1} u_1]) Y_i + \frac{1}{a_k} (d_k, [u_{-1} u_1]) K + \frac{1}{a_k} (K, [u_{-1} u_1]) d_k = \\ &= - \sum_i (X_i, [u_1 u_{-1}]) Y_i + \frac{1}{a_k} ([d_k u_{-1}], u_1) K + \frac{1}{a_k} ([K u_{-1}], u_1) d_k = \end{aligned}$$

$$- \sum_i ([X_i u_1], u_{-1}) Y_i - \frac{1}{a_k} (u_{-1}, u_1) K.$$

Then in the affine case we have, $[u_{-1} u] = - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u_1) Y_i - \frac{1}{a_k} (u_{-1}, u_1) K$.

If \mathfrak{g} is finite type, $\{X_i\} \cup \{\frac{1}{t_k} d_k\}$ and $\{Y_i\} \cup \{d_k\}$ are dual bases of \mathfrak{g}_0 . For $u_{-1} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$, $u_1 \in \mathfrak{g}_1$, a calculation similar to the one above yields $[u_{-1} u_1] = - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u_1) Y_i - \frac{1}{t_k} (u_{-1}, u_1) d_k$.

3.2 $[\cdot, \cdot] : \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_2$

Let $u, v \in \mathfrak{g}_1$, $u_{-1} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$. In the affine case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} [u_{-1} [u v]] &= [[u_{-1} u] v] + [u [u_{-1} v]] = [[u_{-1} u] v] - [[u_{-1} v] u] = \\ &= - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u) Y_i \cdot v - \frac{1}{a_k} (u_{-1}, u) K \cdot v + \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot v) Y_i \cdot u \\ &+ \frac{1}{a_k} (u_{-1}, v) K \cdot u = \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot v) Y_i \cdot u - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u) Y_i \cdot v. \end{aligned}$$

Viewing $[u v]$ as an element in $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}_1$, we then have

$$[u v] = \sum_i X_i \cdot v \wedge Y_i \cdot u. \quad (1)$$

A similar calculation in the finite case gives us $[u_{-1} [u v]] =$

$$\begin{aligned} &= - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u) Y_i \cdot v - \frac{1}{t_k} (u_{-1}, u) d_k \cdot v + \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot v) Y_i \cdot u + \frac{1}{t_k} (u_{-1}, v) d_k \cdot u \\ &= \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot v) Y_i \cdot u - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u) Y_i \cdot v + \frac{1}{t_k} ((u_{-1}, v) u - (u_{-1}, u) v). \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Then in the finite case } [u v] = \sum_i X_i \cdot v \wedge Y_i \cdot u + \frac{1}{t_k} v \wedge u. \quad (2)$$

3.3 $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \otimes \mathfrak{g}_t \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{t-1}$ and $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_t \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_{t+1}$

Let \mathfrak{g} be affine type and suppose $t > 1$. Assume $[\mathfrak{g}_{-1} \mathfrak{g}_t]$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} [u_{-1} u_1 \dots u_t] &= - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u_1) Y_i \cdot [u_2 \dots u_t] - (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u_2) [u_1 Y_i \cdot [u_3 \dots u_t]] - \\ &\dots - (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u_{t-1}) [u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i \cdot u_t] + (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u_t) [u_1 \dots Y_i \cdot u_{t-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

At the same time, assume that $[\mathfrak{g}_1 \mathfrak{g}_t]$ is given by

$$[u_1 \dots u_t] = - \sum_i X_i \cdot u_1 \otimes Y_i \cdot [u_2 \dots u_t] - X_i \cdot u_2 \otimes [u_1 Y_i \cdot [u_3 \dots u_t]] -$$

$$\dots - X_i.u_{t-1} \otimes [u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i.u_t] + X_i.u_t \otimes [u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i.u_{t-1}].$$

By induction and the Jacobi identity we have

$$\begin{aligned} [u_{-1} u u_1 \dots u_t] &= [[u_{-1} u] u_1 \dots u_t] + [u u_{-1} u_1 \dots u_t] = \\ &- \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i.u) \otimes Y_i.[u_1 \dots u_t] - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i.u_1) [u Y_i.[u_2 \dots u_t]] - \\ &\dots - (u_{-1}, X_i.u_{t-1}) [u u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i.u_t] + (u_{-1}, X_i.u_t) [u u_1 \dots Y_i.u_{t-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

From there it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} [u u_1 \dots u_t] &= - \sum_i X_i.u \otimes Y_i.[u_1 u_2 \dots u_t] - X_i.u_1 \otimes [u Y_i.[u_2 \dots u_t]] - \\ &\dots - X_i.u_{t-1} \otimes [u u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i.u_t] + X_i.u_t \otimes [u u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i.u_{t-1}]. \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

Let \mathfrak{g} be finite type and suppose $t > 1$. Applying induction and the Jacobi identity as above to both $[u_{-1} u_1 \dots u_t]$ and $[u_1 \dots u_t]$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} [u u_1 \dots u_t] &= - \sum_i X_i.u \otimes Y_i.[u_1 u_2 \dots u_t] - X_i.u_1 \otimes [u Y_i.[u_2 \dots u_t]] - \\ &\dots - X_i.u_{t-1} \otimes [u u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i.u_t] + X_i.u_t \otimes [u u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i.u_{t-1}] \\ &\quad - \frac{t}{t_k} u \otimes [u_1 \dots u_t] - \frac{t-1}{t_k} u_1 \otimes [u u_2 \dots u_t] - \\ &\quad \dots - \frac{1}{t_k} u_{t-1} \otimes [u u_1 \dots u_t] + \frac{1}{t_k} u_t \otimes [u u_1 \dots u_{t-1}]. \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

4 The α_k -Grading

This section is an elaboration on ideas sketched in [3], Chapter 3, §3.5.

The i th α_k -graded piece of \mathfrak{g} , \mathfrak{g}_i , is a sum of root spaces of \mathfrak{g} associated to roots α with the form $\alpha = i\alpha_k + \sum_{j \neq k} c_j \alpha_j$. Note that $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{g}_i$ if and only if

$\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{-i}$. If \mathfrak{g} is affine, suppose it is of type $X_N^{(r)}$. Recall that α is a real root of $X_N^{(r)}$ if and only if $\alpha + nr\delta$ is a real root for all n in \mathbb{Z} . In the finite case, a_k is maximal so that \mathfrak{g}_{a_k} is nonzero. In the affine case, \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} contains $\mathfrak{g}_{r\delta}$, along with some positive real root spaces. The lowest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} has the form $r\delta - \theta$, where θ is a highest root of \mathfrak{g} . (\mathfrak{g} is semi-simple in general so there may be more than one highest root.) This is an immediate consequence of the definition of the α_k -grading along with Proposition 6.3 (d) in [5]. If \mathfrak{g} is finite type, let $ra_k = a_k$.

Let $\sum_{i=0}^\ell c_i \alpha_i = \alpha \in \Delta_+$. The *root diagram* $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ is the labeled subdiagram of \mathcal{D} comprised of the nodes and connecting edges associated to simple roots in the support of α . If $c_i > 1$, the node associated to α_i is labeled c_i . We can extend the notion of a root diagram to apply to any element of Q_+ . We distinguish α_k in $\mathcal{D}(\alpha)$ by coloring the associated node. Say $\beta \in \Delta_+$ is a *subroot* of $\alpha \in \Delta_+$ provided $\alpha - \beta$ is in Q_+ .

Lemma 1 Let γ_i be a lowest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_i so that $\gamma_1 = \alpha_k$.

$$\gamma_2 - (\gamma_1 + \alpha_k) = \gamma_2 - 2\alpha_k = \sum_{j \neq k} c_j \alpha_j = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3$$

where $\beta_i \in \overset{k}{\Delta}_+$ have the following properties.

1. $\beta_1 = \sum_{j \neq k} c'_j \alpha_j$ is a maximal subroot of $\sum_{j \neq k} c_j \alpha_j$, in the sense that β_1 is a root, $0 \leq c'_j \leq c_j$ for all j , and if c'_j were replaced with $c'_j + 1$, for any j , then β_1 would no longer be a root, or $c'_j + 1$ would exceed c_j . β_2 is a maximal subroot of $\sum_{j \neq k} (c_j - c'_j) \alpha_j \in Q_+$ and $\beta_3 = \sum_{j \neq k} c_j \alpha_j - \beta_1 - \beta_2$.
2. If $i < j$ and β_i and β_j come from the same simple component of $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$, then $\mathcal{D}(\beta_j) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\beta_i)$.
3. $S = \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3\}$ is an inert set of roots, that is, neither the sum nor the difference of elements in S is a root. In particular, $(\beta_i, \beta_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$.
4. For any arrangement of indices, $\gamma_1 + \beta_i$, $\gamma_1 + \beta_i + \beta_j$ and $\gamma_1 + \beta_i + \beta_j + \beta_k$ are all roots of $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$.
5. β_3 is simple.

If $2 < i \leq ra_k$, then $\gamma_i - (\gamma_{i-1} + \alpha_k) = \beta_1 + \beta_2$ where $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \overset{k}{\Delta}_+$. Mutatis mutandis, γ_i , β_1 , and β_2 satisfy the first four properties above.

Proof Any element of Q_+ is a sum of successively maximal subroots as per the first statement of the lemma. We have to show that there are three such subroots for γ_2 and, when $2 < i \leq ra_k$, two for γ_i . We do so by demonstrating how to construct the β_i s in each case. It is a routine matter to check that the other items in the lemma then follow. Constructing the β_i s is straightforward once we identify the possible root diagrams for γ_i .

The tables of roots in [1] give us γ_i in the finite cases. In the affine cases, we appeal to Proposition 6.3 in [5]. If $i < a_k$, γ_i is a finite type root, that is, its support is contained in $\overset{k}{\Delta}$ and it appears on a list in [1]. If $i = ja_k$, $\gamma_i = j\delta - \theta$, where θ is a highest long or short root of $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$. (The root is short if $j < r$.) The one case left to consider is when $i > a_k$ is not a multiple of a_k . That happens only if $\mathfrak{g} = E_6^{(2)}$, $a_k = 2$, and $i = 3$. Then $\gamma_3 = j\delta - \xi$, where ξ is the highest short root of \mathfrak{g} with coefficient 1 on α_k . It turns out this is also a root of finite type. It appears as Case 5 in Figure 2.

We list all possible root diagrams for γ_2 in Figure 1. Along with each root diagram $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_2)$ is the decomposition of $\gamma_2 - 2\alpha_k$ into a sum of three maximal subroots. These disconnected root diagrams are $\mathcal{D}(\beta_1)$, $\mathcal{D}(\beta_2)$, $\mathcal{D}(\beta_3)$ in each case.

Figure 2 shows the possibilities for $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_3)$ when $ra_k \geq 3$. Note that at this stage, all roots are of finite type.




Figure 1: $\gamma_2 - 2\alpha_k = \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3$




Figure 2: $\gamma_3 = \gamma_2 + \alpha_k + \beta_1 + \beta_2$

Along with each root diagram is the decomposition of γ_3 into $\gamma_2 + \alpha_k$ and two maximal subroots. As in Figure 1, these disconnected root diagrams are $\mathcal{D}(\beta_1)$ and $\mathcal{D}(\beta_2)$ in each case. In these and higher order cases, we have to match γ_2 to γ_3 . With the catalog given in Figure 1, this is not difficult.

A complete catalog of root diagrams goes through $a_k = 6$. We leave the remaining three figures to the reader. \square

4.1 The Affine Case

When \mathfrak{g} is affine, $\nu(K) = \delta$. Designating by a_i^\vee the labels on the diagram for the Lie algebra dual to \mathfrak{g} , we have $K = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} a_i^\vee \alpha_i^\vee$: in general $\nu(\alpha_i^\vee) = \frac{a_i}{a_i^\vee} \alpha_i$ (cf. [5], §6.2.) Note finally that $\mathfrak{h}^* = \mathfrak{h}^{*k} \oplus \mathbb{C}\delta + \mathbb{C}\Lambda_k$.

Next is a record of some facts we use throughout our discussion. All are either stated explicitly in [5] or easily deduced.

Lemma 2

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\alpha_k^\vee) &= \alpha_k & \nu(K) &= \delta & \nu(d_k) &= \Lambda_k & (d_k, d_k) &= 0 \\ (\Lambda_k, \Lambda_k) &= 0 & (K, K) &= 0 & (\delta, \delta) &= 0 & (\alpha_i^\vee, d_k) &= \delta_{ik} \\ (\Lambda_k, \alpha_k) &= 1 & (K, d_k) &= a_k & (\Lambda_k, \delta) &= a_k^\vee & \Lambda_k(K) &= a_k^\vee \\ \langle \delta, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle &= 0 & \langle \delta, d_k \rangle &= a_k & \langle \alpha_i, d_k \rangle &= \delta_{ik} & & \square \end{aligned}$$

Let $\pi : \mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{*k}$ be given by $\pi(\alpha_i) = \alpha_i$, for $i \neq k$, $\pi(\delta) = 0$, and $\pi(\Lambda_k) = 0$. Since $\delta = \sum_i a_i \alpha_i$, this gives us $0 = \pi(a_k \alpha_k + \sum_{i \neq k} a_i \alpha_i) = a_k \pi(\alpha_k) + \sum_{i \neq k} a_i \alpha_i$ so that $\pi(\alpha_k) = -\sum_{i \neq k} \frac{a_i}{a_k} \alpha_i = -\frac{1}{a_k} \delta + \alpha_k$.

Note that α_k is special if and only if $ra_k = 1$.

Lemma 3 \mathfrak{g}_1 is an irreducible \mathfrak{g}^k module. When α_k is special, \mathfrak{g}_1 is isomorphic to the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g}^k .

Proof \mathfrak{g}^k acts on \mathfrak{g}_1 via the bracket. That this defines \mathfrak{g}_1 as a \mathfrak{g}^k module follows from the Jacobi identity on \mathfrak{g} and the observation that $[\mathfrak{g}_0, \mathfrak{g}_1] \subset \mathfrak{g}_1$ while $\mathfrak{g}^k \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$. As a \mathfrak{g}^k module, \mathfrak{g}_1 has lowest weight $\pi(\alpha_k) = -\frac{1}{a_k} \delta + \alpha_k$. We show that up to scalar multiples, $e_{\alpha_k} = e_k$ in \mathfrak{g}_{α_k} is the unique lowest weight vector for \mathfrak{g}_1 . From there, it follows that \mathfrak{g}_1 is irreducible. Assume first that $ra_k > 1$.

Suppose $\pi(\beta)$ is another lowest weight associated to \mathfrak{g}_1 so that for $\beta \in \Delta_+$, $e_\beta \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$, $f_j \cdot e_\beta = 0$ for all $\alpha_j \in \Pi^k$. We claim there must be $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}^k$ with $e_i \cdot e_\beta \neq 0$.

By Lemma 2.1 in [2], we can write $\beta = \alpha_k + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i_j}$ where $\alpha_{i_j} \in \Pi$ and for all $t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\alpha_k + \sum_{j=1}^t \alpha_{i_j} \in \Delta_+$. We also know that if β and $\beta - \alpha_j$ are

roots, then $f_j \cdot \mathfrak{g}_\beta \neq 0$ (cf. [5], Prop. 3.6.) If $f_j \cdot e_\beta = 0$, then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\beta > 1$, so β is an imaginary root and $a_k = 1$. Since $ra_k > 1$, it follows that \mathfrak{g} is twisted affine. Now α_k and $-\alpha_k$ are long roots, and in the twisted affine algebras, $\delta + \alpha$ is not a root when α is long (cf. [5], Prop. 6.3.) So if $f_i \cdot e_\beta = 0$ for all $\alpha_i \in \Pi$, then $f_k \cdot e_\beta$ is also zero. By the same argument, if we assume $e_i \cdot e_\beta = 0$ for all $\alpha_i \in \Pi$, then $e_k \cdot e_\beta = 0$ since $\beta + \alpha_k$ is not a root. This gives us a root vector, e_β , that commutes with all root vectors and everything in \mathfrak{h} except d_k . This means e_β is a multiple of K , which is absurd. Conclusion: if we insist that $f_i \cdot e_\beta = 0$ for all $i \in \Pi$, then (1) β is imaginary, and (2) there must be $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}$ with $e_i \cdot e_\beta \neq 0$.

Since $\beta + \alpha_i$ is real, the argument above gives us f_j with $f_j \cdot e_i \cdot e_\beta \neq 0$. If $\alpha_j = \alpha_i$ we have $f_j \cdot e_i \cdot e_\beta = -\alpha_i^\vee \cdot e_\beta + e_i \cdot f_j \cdot e_\beta = e_i \cdot f_j \cdot e_\beta \neq 0$ as $\langle \beta, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = 0$. If $\alpha_j \neq \alpha_i$, f_j and e_i commute and we again get $e_i \cdot f_j \cdot e_\beta \neq 0$, contradicting $f_j \cdot e_\beta = 0$. Final conclusion in case $ra_k > 1$: up to scalar multiples, e_k is a unique lowest weight/root vector associated to \mathfrak{g}_1 so \mathfrak{g}_1 is irreducible.

Next suppose $ra_k = 1$ so that α_k is special and \mathfrak{g} is nontwisted affine. \mathfrak{g} is then simple and $\mathfrak{g}_\delta \subset \mathfrak{g}_1$. The real roots of \mathfrak{g}_1 are precisely those of the form $\alpha + \delta$, where α is any root of \mathfrak{g} : this follows from [5], Prop. 6.3. Thus there is a bijective correspondence between the roots of \mathfrak{g} and the real roots/weights of \mathfrak{g}_1 . In particular, the highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_1 is $\pi(\theta + \delta) = \theta$, the highest root of \mathfrak{g} . It follows that there is a copy of \mathfrak{g} inside \mathfrak{g}_1 . Note that all real root/weight spaces of \mathfrak{g}_1 are one dimensional and that the dimension of \mathfrak{g}_δ is the rank of \mathfrak{g} . By dimension, \mathfrak{g}_1 must be isomorphic to the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} . (Note that \mathfrak{g}_δ is a Cartan subalgebra.) Since \mathfrak{g} is simple, it follows that \mathfrak{g}_1 is irreducible in this case as well. \square

Lemma 4 \mathfrak{g}_i and \mathfrak{g}_{-i} are dual representations of \mathfrak{g} .

Proof The action of \mathfrak{g} on \mathfrak{g}_i is via the bracket and it follows that \mathfrak{g}_i is a \mathfrak{g} module. As \mathfrak{g}_0 is the direct sum of \mathfrak{g} and two copies of the trivial representation of \mathfrak{g} , it is self-dual. Assume $i > 0$. A lowest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_{-i} has the form $-\beta = -i\alpha_k - \sum_{j \neq k} c_j \alpha_j$ where $\sum_{j \neq k} c_j$ is maximal so that β is a positive root of \mathfrak{g} . This is precisely the criterion that determines that β is a highest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_i . Thus as \mathfrak{g} modules, \mathfrak{g}_i has a highest weight $\pi(\beta)$ if and only if \mathfrak{g}_{-i} has lowest weight $\pi(-\beta) = -\pi(\beta)$. This is to say that for $i \neq 0$, \mathfrak{g}_i and \mathfrak{g}_{-i} are dual \mathfrak{g} modules. \square

Lemma 5 As a \mathfrak{g} module, \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} is isomorphic to the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} .

Proof Since $\delta = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell} a_i \alpha_i$, $\mathfrak{g}_{r\delta} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k}$. All other roots $\beta = a_k \alpha_k + \sum_{j \neq k} c_j \alpha_j$ associated to \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} are real in which case $\beta - r\delta$ is a real root of \mathfrak{g} and the associated root space is one dimensional. Since α_k is not in the support of $\beta - r\delta$, $\mathfrak{g}_{\beta - r\delta} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. Conversely, if \mathfrak{g}_{β} is a root space in \mathfrak{g} , then $r\delta - \beta$ is a real root of \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} . Thus root spaces in \mathfrak{g} are in one-to-one correspondence with real root spaces of \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} . In particular, highest weights of \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} correspond precisely to the highest roots of \mathfrak{g} . (In general, \mathfrak{g} is semi-simple so there may be more than one highest root.) Since $\delta|_{\mathfrak{h}} = 0$ and $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{r\delta} = \text{rank } \mathfrak{g}$ (cf. [5] Corollary 8.3), $\mathfrak{g}_{r\delta} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k}$ corresponds to a Cartan subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} . It follows that \mathfrak{g}_{ra_k} is isomorphic to the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} . \square

Lemma 6 For $i, j \neq 0$, $i \equiv j \pmod{ra_k}$ if and only if, as \mathfrak{g} modules, $\mathfrak{g}_i \cong \mathfrak{g}_j$.

Proof Assume i and j are nonzero and that $i \equiv j \pmod{ra_k}$.

Lemma 5 and its proof remain valid if we replace $r\delta$ with $nr\delta$ and ra_k with nra_k for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, $\beta \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ determines a root space in \mathfrak{g}_{nra_k+i} if and only if $\beta - nr\delta$ determines a root space in \mathfrak{g}_i . This shows that \mathfrak{g}_i and \mathfrak{g}_{nra_k+i} have the same weights, thus, are isomorphic.

Next assume \mathfrak{g}_i and \mathfrak{g}_j are isomorphic as \mathfrak{g} modules. By Lemma 4, we may assume i and j are both positive or both negative so say $i, j > 0$. A highest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_j has the form $\beta = j\alpha_k + \sum_{m \neq k} c_m \alpha_m$ and a highest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_i has the form $\gamma = i\alpha_k + \sum_{m \neq k} c'_m \alpha_m$. Since β and γ belong to Q_+ , and since $\gamma - \beta$ restricted to \mathfrak{h} is identically zero, it follows that $\gamma - \beta = n\delta$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In the nontwisted algebras, this is enough to prove the result.

Now suppose \mathfrak{g} is type $X_N^{(r)}$, $r = 2$ or 3 . In all cases, the lowest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_1 is $\gamma_1 = \alpha_k$. Comparing Tables Aff 2 and 3 in [5] to Figure 1 above, we see that γ_2 is given by Case 1, 6, 7, 8, or 9. In no case is $\gamma_2 = \delta + \gamma_1$. This finishes the proof for the cases where $r = 2$ and $a_k = 1$ as $\mathfrak{g}_1 \not\cong \mathfrak{g}_2$ and for $i > 2$, \mathfrak{g}_i is isomorphic to \mathfrak{g}_1 or \mathfrak{g}_2 . When $\mathfrak{g} = D_4^{(3)}$, γ_2 is as in Case 7 of Figure 1. Using the numbering of roots in [5], we find

$$\gamma_3 = 2\alpha_0 + 5\alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2 = 3\delta - (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1) = 2\delta + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2).$$

(Note that $2\delta + \alpha_k$ is not a root as α_k is long.) Here again, $\gamma_i + \delta$ is not a lowest root for $i = 1, 2$ or 3 so the result holds. Finally, when $\mathfrak{g} = E_6^{(2)}$ and $a_k = 2$, γ_3 is as in Case 5 of Figure 2. $\gamma_3 - \delta$ is not a root (again, γ_3 is long) and $\gamma_3 - 2\delta$ is a negative root so no root of the form $\gamma_3 + n\delta$ is a lowest positive root for \mathfrak{g}_i . A lowest root for \mathfrak{g}_4 has the form $2\delta - \theta$, θ a highest root of \mathfrak{g} . Since $\mathfrak{g} = A_3 \oplus A_1$, this confirms that no two of $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3$, or γ_4 differ by a multiple of δ . The result follows since \mathfrak{g}_i is determined by $\mathfrak{g}_i \cong \mathfrak{g}_{i+4}$. \square

In any affine (or finite type) Lie algebra, $a_k \leq 6$. Lemmas 4, 5, and 6 together thus imply that \mathfrak{g}_1 , \mathfrak{g}_2 , and \mathfrak{g}_3 determine all other graded pieces of \mathfrak{g} , either directly or by duality.

The next theorem gathers some of the results we established in the lemmas.

- Theorem 3**
1. The highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_{-1} is $\lambda_{-1} = \frac{1}{a_k}\delta - \alpha_k$. The highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_1 is $\frac{1}{a_k}\delta - \sigma(\alpha_k)$, where α_k and $\sigma(\alpha_k)$ are dual roots, that is, conjugate under an automorphism of the Dynkin diagram.
 2. The highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_{-1} is also given by $\lambda_{-1} = \sum_{i \neq k} s_i \Lambda_i$ where s_i is the number of edges in \mathcal{D} connecting α_i and α_k . \mathfrak{g}_1 has highest weight $\lambda_1 = \sum_{i \neq k} s'_i \Lambda_i$ where s'_i is the number of edges in \mathcal{D} connecting α_i and $\sigma(\alpha_k)$. In particular, \mathfrak{g}_1 is a generalized cominuscule representation of \mathfrak{g}^k .
 3. The grading on an affine Lie algebra $X_N^{(r)}$ determined by a long simple root α_k has period ra_k .
 4. The grading defined by a long simple root α_k on an affine Lie algebra is completely determined by \mathfrak{g}^k , \mathfrak{g}_1 , \mathfrak{g}_2 and \mathfrak{g}_3 .

Proof It is clear that $\lambda_{-1} = \pi(-\alpha_k) = \frac{1}{a_k}\delta - \alpha_k$ is the highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_1 . The second statement follows from the fact that \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_{-1} are dual representations.

If α_i is a simple root of \mathfrak{g}^k , $\langle \lambda_{-1}, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = \langle -\alpha_k, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle$ is the number of edges between α_k and α_i in \mathcal{D} , since α_k is long. The form of λ_1 follows by duality. Since there is one component of \mathcal{D}^k for each simple root adjacent to α_k in \mathcal{D} , \mathfrak{g}_1 is generalized cominuscule.

The rest of the results have already been established. \square

4.2 The Finite Case

Let \mathfrak{g} be finite type so that $\mathfrak{h} = \mathfrak{h}^k \oplus \mathbb{C}d_k$ and $\mathfrak{h}^* = \mathfrak{h}^{*k} \oplus \mathbb{C}\Lambda_k$ with $d_k = \nu^{-1}(\Lambda_k)$. It is clear that with respect to the α_k -grading on \mathfrak{g} , $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}^k \oplus \mathbb{C}d_k$. The following is an analog to Lemma 2.

Lemma 7

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha_i^\vee, d_k) &= \delta_{ik} & (\Lambda_k, \alpha_k) &= \frac{\alpha_k^\vee}{a_k} = 1 & \nu(\alpha_k^\vee) &= \alpha_k \\ \nu(d_k) &= \Lambda_k & \langle \alpha_i, d_k \rangle &= \delta_{ik} & & \square \end{aligned}$$

Project \mathfrak{h}^* onto \mathfrak{h}^{*k} by $\pi : \mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^{*k}$ where $\pi(\alpha_i) = \alpha_i$, for $i \neq k$, and $\pi(\Lambda_k) = 0$. If $\Lambda_k = \sum_j t_j \alpha_j$ we have $\pi(\alpha_k) = -\sum_{i \neq k} \frac{t_i}{t_k} \alpha_i = -\frac{1}{t_k} \Lambda_k + \alpha_k$.

Lemma 8 \mathfrak{g}_1 is an irreducible \mathfrak{g}^k module.

Proof The first part of the proof of Lemma 3 applies here. We do not need a separate argument for the case $a_k = 1$ because in the current setting, all roots of \mathfrak{g} are real. \square

The proof of Lemma 4 applies nearly unchanged to give us the following.

Lemma 9 \mathfrak{g}_i and \mathfrak{g}_{-i} are dual representations of \mathfrak{g}^k . \square

Let θ be the highest root of \mathfrak{g} so that $\theta = \sum_{i>0} a_i \alpha_i$. Let $\Lambda = \pi(\theta)$ so

$$\Lambda = \sum_{i \neq k} \left(a_i - \frac{t_i}{t_k} \right) \alpha_i.$$

Proposition 1 As \mathfrak{g}^k modules, $\mathfrak{g}_{a_k} \cong V(\Lambda)$.

Proof \mathfrak{g}_{a_k} is a sum of root spaces, among them \mathfrak{g}_θ . Since θ is the highest root associated to \mathfrak{g} , it is the highest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_{a_k} . The highest weight associated to \mathfrak{g}_{a_k} as a \mathfrak{g}^k module is thus $\Lambda = \pi(\theta)$. All roots here are real so $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\theta = 1$. If v^+ is a highest weight vector associated to another root space in \mathfrak{g}_{a_k} , \mathfrak{g}_β , then β has the property that $\beta + \alpha_i$ is not a root for any $i \neq k$. Since a_k is the coefficient of α_k in θ as well as in β , we cannot add α_k to β and get a root of \mathfrak{g} either. Thus, $\beta + \alpha_i$ is not a root for any simple root α_i associated to \mathfrak{g} , which is impossible unless $\beta = \theta$, thus, \mathfrak{g}_{a_k} is irreducible as a \mathfrak{g}^k module. \square

Remark 2 If $a_k > 1$, $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{a_k-1} = \frac{1}{a_k-1} \dim \mathfrak{g}_1$. The reader can verify this curious fact case by case for \mathfrak{g} finite type but we have no insight beyond the observation itself. There appears to be no analog for affine algebras.

Theorem 4 1. The highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_{-1} is $\lambda_{-1} = \frac{1}{t_k} \Lambda_k - \alpha_k$, where $\Lambda_k = \sum_i t_i \alpha_i$. The highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_1 is $\lambda_1 = -\frac{1}{t_k} \Lambda'_k + \sigma(\alpha_k)$ where Λ'_k is fundamental on $\sigma(\alpha_k)$, the root dual to α_k , and $\Lambda'_k = \sum_i t'_i \alpha_i$.

2. The highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_{-1} is also given by $\lambda_{-1} = \sum_{i \neq k} s_i \Lambda_i$ where s_i is the number of edges in \mathcal{D} connecting α_i and α_k . \mathfrak{g}_1 has highest weight $\lambda_1 = \sum_{i \neq k} s'_i \Lambda_i$ where s'_i is the number of edges in \mathcal{D} connecting α_i and $\sigma(\alpha_k)$. In particular, \mathfrak{g}_1 is generalized cominuscul.

Proof It is clear that the highest weight associated to \mathfrak{g}_{-1} is $\pi(-\alpha_k) = \frac{1}{t_k} \Lambda_k - \alpha_k$. For $i \neq k$, $\langle \lambda_{-1}, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = \langle -\alpha_k, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle$, which is the number of edges between α_k and α_i in \mathcal{D} , since α_k is long. The forms of λ_1 follow by duality. As in the affine case, \mathfrak{g}^k has one simple component per simple root adjacent to α_k in \mathcal{D} . This, along with the form of λ_1 given in the second statement, gives us that \mathfrak{g}_1 is generalized cominuscul. \square

4.3 Representations

We revisit Lemma 1 as a statement about weights.

Proposition 2 *Let λ_i be a highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_i as a \mathfrak{g}^k -module. If $a_k > 1$, then*

$$\lambda_2 = 2\lambda_1 - (\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)$$

for positive roots β_i with properties 1-5 in Lemma 1. If $a_k \geq t > 2$,

$$\lambda_t = t\lambda_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{2t-1} \beta_i,$$

for positive roots β_i arising as in Lemma 1. In particular, $\lambda_t = \lambda_{t-1} + \lambda_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2$, where $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \Delta_+^k$ satisfy properties 1-4 in Lemma 1, mutatis mutandis.

Proof If γ_t is a lowest root associated to \mathfrak{g}_t , then $\pi(\gamma_t)$ is a lowest weight of \mathfrak{g}_t . Let w be the longest element in the Weyl group of \mathfrak{g} : then $w(\pi(\gamma_t)) = \lambda_t$, the highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_t .

Lemma 1 gives us $\gamma_2 = 2\gamma_1 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3$. Then

$$w(\pi(\gamma_2)) = \lambda_2 = 2w(\pi(\gamma_1 + \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)) = 2\lambda_1 - (\beta'_1 + \beta'_2 + \beta'_3)$$

where the β'_i 's are positive roots. The longest element in the Weyl group of \mathfrak{g}^k respects properties 1-5 of Lemma 1. Thus, the β'_i 's enjoy those properties as well. The argument for $t > 2$ is similar. \square

We have established that \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_{-1} are irreducible \mathfrak{g}^k modules. Next we show that all \mathfrak{g}_i are irreducible when $i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{ra_k}$, in the affine case, $i \neq 0$ in the finite case. First we need a technical lemma.

If α is a subroot of β , i.e., $\beta - \alpha \in Q_+$, we write $\alpha \subseteq \beta$. When simple α_i is in the support of α , we write $\alpha_i \in \alpha$.

Lemma 10 *If α is a positive root of \mathfrak{g} and $\alpha_r \subseteq \alpha$, we can write $\alpha = \alpha_r + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i_j}$ for $\alpha_{i_j} \in \Pi$ where, for all $t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\alpha_r + \sum_{j=1}^t \alpha_{i_j} \in \Delta_+$.*

Proof The case where α_r is simple is done in [2], Lemma 2.1, so here we assume that the height of α_r is greater than one.

If there is a simple root $\alpha_i \notin \alpha_r$ with $\beta = \alpha - \alpha_i \in \Delta_+$, we get the result by induction on the height of α because $\alpha_r \subseteq \beta$.

If no such simple root exists, we proceed by induction on $\text{ht}(\alpha - \alpha_r)$, the case $\text{ht}(\alpha - \alpha_r) = 1$ being clear. If $\text{ht}(\alpha - \alpha_r) > 1$, the result follows once we produce a simple root $\alpha_j \in \alpha - \alpha_r$ with $\alpha_r + \alpha_j \in \Delta_+$.

If there is a simple root $\alpha_j \in \alpha$, $\alpha_j \notin \alpha_r$, we claim there must be one that satisfies $\alpha_r + \alpha_j \in \Delta_+$. The support of any root must form a connected component of the Dynkin diagram, which implies there must be α_j that shares

an edge of \mathcal{D} with some $\alpha_i \in \alpha_r$. Then $\langle \alpha_r, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle < 0$ implies $\alpha_r + \alpha_j \in \Delta_+$ as claimed. That leaves us with the case where $\text{supp } \alpha = \text{supp } \alpha_r$.

If $(\alpha_r, \alpha) < 0$, there must be a simple $\alpha_i \in \alpha$ with $\alpha_r + \alpha_i \in \Delta_+$. If $(\alpha_r, \alpha) = 0$, invoke the fact that $\text{supp } \alpha_k = \text{supp } \alpha$. This, along with the fact that $\text{ht } \alpha_r > 1$ implies there is $\alpha_i \in \text{supp } \alpha_r$ with $\alpha_r - \alpha_i \in \Delta_+$, means that there must be $\alpha_j \in \text{supp } \alpha_r = \text{supp } \alpha$ with $\alpha_r + \alpha_j \in \Delta_+$. Finally, suppose $(\alpha_r, \alpha) > 0$. This gives us $\alpha - \alpha_r \in \Delta_+$. Now invoke $\alpha_r + (\alpha - \alpha_r) \in \Delta_+$ to get some $\alpha_i \in \text{supp } (\alpha - \alpha_r)$ with $\alpha_r + \alpha_i$ a root. \square

Theorem 5 *If $\mathfrak{g} = X_N^{(r)}$ is affine and $i \not\equiv 0 \pmod{ra_k}$, \mathfrak{g}_i is an irreducible $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$ module. If \mathfrak{g} is finite type and $i \neq 0$, \mathfrak{g}_i is an irreducible $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$ module.*

Proof To show \mathfrak{g}_i is irreducible, we show it has a unique lowest weight.

We show below that the lowest root for \mathfrak{g}_i is well-defined. For now, assume this is so and let γ_i be the lowest root in \mathfrak{g}_i . If there is a second root γ'_i such that $f_j \cdot u = 0$ for some nonzero u in $\mathfrak{g}_{\gamma'_i}$, and all $\alpha_j \in \overset{k}{\Pi}$, note that $\gamma_i \subseteq \gamma'_i$. Lemma 10 allows us to write $\gamma'_i = \gamma_i + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_{i_j}$ where $\alpha_{i_j} \in \overset{k}{\Pi}$ and for all $t \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\gamma_i + \sum_{j=1}^t \alpha_{i_j} \in \Delta_+$. Applying Proposition 3.6 in [5], we get $f_{i_1} \cdot \mathfrak{g}_{\gamma'_i} \neq 0$. Since γ_i and γ'_i have the same coefficient on α_k , α_{i_1} must belong to $\overset{k}{\Pi}$. Our assumption that $f_{i_1} \cdot u = 0$ forces us to conclude that $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\gamma'_i} > 1$, thus, that γ'_i is imaginary. An argument similar to the one we used for Lemma 6 applies to show that there must be some f_{i_j} with $\alpha_{i_j} \in \overset{k}{\Pi}$ and $f_{i_j} \cdot u \neq 0$. The contradiction proves that \mathfrak{g}_i is irreducible.

Now we show that there is a unique lowest root γ_i associated to \mathfrak{g}_i .

There is only one choice of $\gamma_1 = \alpha_k \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ so the result holds when $i = 1$ thus when $i = -1$. By duality and the fact that $a_k \leq 6$, it suffices to show that if $i = 2$ or 3 and $ra_k > 2$ or 3 respectively, then for a fixed \mathfrak{g} and fixed α_k , there is only one choice of γ_i from among the root diagrams in Figures 1 and 2 respectively, at least in the affine case. We deal with those details and leave the rest of the finite type cases to the reader.

A choice of γ_i corresponds to a choice of injective mapping of $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_i)$, up to automorphism of $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_i)$, into \mathcal{D} with its α_k node marked. We do our accounting by considering Tables Aff 1, 2, and 3 in [5] that have nodes associated to long roots with labels such that $ra_k > 2$. We compare those to the diagrams from Figures 1 and 2 that inject into \mathcal{D} and see that in each case, as long as $i < ra_k$, there is a unique injection of $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_i)$ into \mathcal{D} , up to automorphism of $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_i)$.

Consider the case $i = 2$ where $ra_k > 2$. \mathfrak{g} can be type E , F , or $D_4^{(3)}$. Since $D_4^{(3)}$, $E_6^{(2)}$, and F type algebras are not simply laced, it is clear that there is only one way to inject $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_2)$ in \mathcal{D} in these cases. (These correspond respectively to Cases 7, 6, and 1 in Figure 1.)

Next suppose \mathcal{D} is nontwisted type E with the branch node marked. This is Case 2 in Figure 1. There are three different ways to inject that diagram into

\mathcal{D} with the branch node distinguished but these different injections arise from diagram automorphisms of $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_2)$.

If α_k corresponds to the terminal node at the end of the shortest branch of \mathcal{D} , $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_2)$ is Case 3 in Figure 1. Ignoring diagram automorphisms, there is only one way to inject this into \mathcal{D} . If α_k is the terminal node at the end of a long branch, then $\mathfrak{g} = E_8^{(1)}$ and the diagram from Figure 1 is Case 5. There is a unique injection of $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_2)$ into \mathcal{D} .

If \mathfrak{g} is nontwisted E type with some other distinguished node, the relevant diagram in Figure 1 is Case 2. If $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_2)$ is a D_5 diagram, it fits two different ways into $E_7^{(1)}$ and $E_8^{(1)}$ diagrams. But with a non branch node distinguished on each diagram, there is only one way to inject $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_2)$ into \mathcal{D} .

This is a complete proof that \mathfrak{g}_2 is irreducible in case $ra_k > 2$. Next consider \mathfrak{g}_3 when $ra_k > 3$.

Here \mathcal{D} can be type $E_6^{(2)}$, $E_7^{(1)}$ or $E_8^{(1)}$. Again, since $E_6^{(2)}$ is not simply laced, the uniqueness of the diagram injection is immediate. ($\mathcal{D}(\gamma_3)$ is Case 5 in Figure 2.) In the $E_7^{(1)}$ case the distinguished node is the branch node and $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_3)$ comes from Case 1 in Figure 2. Note that $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_3)$ is a type E_6 diagram. There are two ways to inject such a diagram into one of type $E_7^{(1)}$ but the different ways arise from an automorphism of the E_6 diagram.

When the distinguished node on \mathcal{D} is not the branch node, it is one or two nodes away from the branch node. If one away, it is adjacent to a terminal node or not. If α_k is between a terminal node and a branch node, $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_3)$ comes from Case 2 in Figure 2 so is of type E_7 . There is a unique way to inject an E_7 diagram into an $E_8^{(1)}$. If α_k is adjacent to the branch, not adjacent to a terminal node, $\mathcal{D}(\gamma_3)$ is again from Case 1 Figure 2. This also injects uniquely into \mathcal{D} . \square

4.4 The Invariant Form and The Casimir Operator

How is $(\cdot, \cdot)|_{\mathfrak{g}}^k$ related to the Killing form on \mathfrak{g}^k ?

If $V(\lambda)$ is a generalized cominuscule representation of a semi-simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} with $\lambda = \sum_i n_i \Lambda_i$ as in Definition 1, the *degree* of the representation on \mathfrak{l}_i is n_i .

Let \mathfrak{l}_i be a simple component of \mathfrak{g}^k . Let n_i be the degree of \mathfrak{g}_1 as a generalized cominuscule representation of \mathfrak{l}_i . If $B(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the standard invariant form on \mathfrak{g}^k normalized so that the square length of a long root is 2, then

$$(\cdot, \cdot)|_{\mathfrak{l}_i} = \frac{1}{n_i} B(\cdot, \cdot).$$

This maintains relative root lengths in \mathfrak{g} on restriction to \mathfrak{g}^k . Conversely, if we start with semi-simple \mathfrak{g}^k in a generalized cominuscule representation, and construct \mathfrak{g} using one of the algorithms, $(\cdot, \cdot)|_{\mathfrak{l}_i} := \frac{1}{n_i} B(\cdot, \cdot)$ lifts to the invariant

form on \mathfrak{g} that measures the square length of a long root as 2. Note: (1) long roots of \mathfrak{g} belonging to different simple components may have different lengths; (2) insisting that the square length of long roots of \mathfrak{g} is 2 is not the standard normalization on twisted affine Lie algebras; (3) it remains true that $\langle \alpha_i, \alpha_j^\vee \rangle = \frac{2(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)}{\|\alpha_j\|^2}$ is the number of edges shared by $\alpha_i, \alpha_j \in \overset{k}{\Pi}$ and when α_i is long.

Let λ_j be a highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_j .

Lemma 11 1. In the affine case, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) = 2$. In the finite case, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) = 2 - \frac{1}{t_k}$, where $\Lambda_k = \sum_i t_i \alpha_i$.

2. For $\alpha_i \in \overset{k}{\Pi}$, $(\lambda_1, \alpha_i) = 1$ or 0.

Proof

1. In the affine case, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) = \left\| \frac{1}{a_k} \delta - \alpha_k \right\|^2 = \|\alpha_k\|^2 = 2$. The proof in the finite case is similar.
2. Suppose $\langle \lambda_1, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle = n$ so that $\|\alpha_i\|^2 = 2/n$. Then $(\lambda_1, \alpha_i) = \langle \lambda_1, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \frac{\|\alpha_i\|^2}{2} = 1$. \square

If $V(\lambda)$ is an irreducible highest weight representation of a semi-simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , the Casimir operator C takes the scalar value $c = (\lambda, \lambda) + 2(\rho, \lambda)$, where ρ is the sum of fundamental weights associated to \mathfrak{g} .

In what follows, c_i is the scalar value of the Casimir operator on \mathfrak{g}_i when \mathfrak{g}_i is irreducible and ρ is the sum of the fundamental weights associated to $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$.

Proposition 3 \mathcal{T}_1 is a Casimir eigenspace. In the affine case, $C|_{\mathcal{T}_1} = 2c_1$. In the finite case, $C|_{\mathcal{T}_1} = 2c_1 - \frac{2}{t_k}$.

Proof A highest weight of \mathcal{T}_1 has the form $2\lambda_1 - \alpha_i$ where α_i is a simple root of $\overset{k}{\mathfrak{g}}$ with $\langle \lambda_1, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \neq 0$. On the associated irreducible component of \mathcal{T}_1 , we have

$$C = (2\lambda_1 - \alpha_i, 2\lambda_1 - \alpha_i) + 2(\rho, 2\lambda_1 - \alpha_i) = 2c_1 + 2(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) - 4(\lambda_1, \alpha_i) + \|\alpha_i\|^2 - 2(\rho, \alpha_i).$$

In the affine case, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) = 2$ by Lemma 11. We also have

$$(\rho, \alpha_i) = \langle \rho, \alpha_i^\vee \rangle \frac{\|\alpha_i\|^2}{2} = \frac{\|\alpha_i\|^2}{2}.$$

Since $(\lambda_1, \alpha_i) = 1$, we get

$$C = 2c_1 + 4 - 4 = 2c_1.$$

When we do the calculation for the finite case, the only change is $\|\lambda_1\|^2 = 2 - \frac{1}{t_k}$. \square

Let β_i s be as in Lemma 1 and let n be the degree of the representation \mathfrak{g}_2 on a given component of \mathfrak{g}^k . Perusal of the diagrams in Figure 1 reveals two important data: (1) the β_i s are all long roots in their respective components of \mathcal{D}^k ; and (2) in Cases 7-9, those for which $n > 1$, the β_i s belong to a single component of \mathcal{D}^k . In particular, $\|\beta_i\|^2 = 2/n$, where n is well-defined in each case.

Corollary 1 1. Suppose $ra_k > 2$. In the affine case, the Casimir operator acts on \mathfrak{g}_2 as the scalar $c_2 = 2c_1 - 8 + \frac{6}{r} - \frac{2}{r} \sum_{i=1}^3 \text{ht } \beta_i$.

2. Suppose $ra_k \geq 2$. In the finite case, the Casimir operator acts on \mathfrak{g}_2 as the scalar $c_2 = 2c_1 - 8 - \frac{2}{t_k} + \frac{6}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^3 \text{ht } \beta_i$.

Proof Consider that

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= (2\lambda_1 - (\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3), 2\lambda_1 - (\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)) + 2(\rho, 2\lambda_1 - (\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3)) \\ &= 4(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) + 4(\rho, \lambda_1) - 4(\lambda_1, \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) + \|\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3\|^2 - 2(\rho, \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) \\ &= 2c_1 + 2(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) - 4 \cdot 3 + \|\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3\|^2 - 2(\rho, \beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3). \end{aligned}$$

We note

$$(\rho, \beta_i) = \langle \rho, \beta_i^\vee \rangle = \frac{\|\beta_i\|^2}{2} = \frac{\text{ht } \beta_i}{n}$$

giving us

$$c_2 = 2c_1 + 2(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) - 12 + \frac{6}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^3 \text{ht } \beta_i.$$

Suppose $ra_k > 2$ in the affine case. Perusal of the tables in [5] reveals that $n = r$ in these cases. By Lemma 11 we have

$$c_2 = 2c_1 - 8 + \frac{6}{r} - \frac{2}{r} \sum_{i=1}^3 \text{ht } \beta_i.$$

If $a_k \geq 2$ in the finite case, we apply Lemma 11 to get

$$\begin{aligned} c_2 &= 2c_1 + 4 - \frac{2}{t_k} - 12 + \frac{6}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^3 \text{ht } \beta_i \\ &= 2c_1 - 8 - \frac{2}{t_k} + \frac{6}{n} - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^3 \text{ht } \beta_i. \square \end{aligned}$$

Let $Y_{1,t}$ be the Cartan product of \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_t , that is, $Y_{1,t}$ is irreducible with highest weight $\lambda_1 + \lambda_t$. A corollary of Proposition 2 follows.

Corollary 2 1. If \mathfrak{g} is affine, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_t) = 1$, for $t \in \{2, \dots, a_k\}$. If \mathfrak{g} is finite type, $(\lambda_1, \lambda_t) = 1 - \frac{t}{t_k}$.

2. If \mathfrak{g} is affine, the value of the Casimir operator on $Y_{1,t}$ is $c_1 + c_t + 2$. If \mathfrak{g} is finite type, the value of the Casimir on $Y_{1,t}$ is $c_1 + c_t + 2 - \frac{2t}{t_k}$.
3. If \mathfrak{g} is affine, the value of the Casimir operator on a component of \mathcal{T}_t with highest weight $\lambda_1 + \lambda_t - \alpha$ is $c_1 + c_t + 2 - 2(\rho, \alpha)$. If \mathfrak{g} is finite type, the Casimir on such a component is $c_1 + c_t + 2 - \frac{2t}{t_k} - 2(\rho, \alpha)$.

Proof

1. Proposition 2 along with Lemma 11 gives us

$$(\lambda_1, \lambda_t) = t(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) - (2t - 1) = 2t - 2t + 1 = 1$$

when \mathfrak{g} is affine and when \mathfrak{g} is finite type, we adjust according to $(\lambda_1, \lambda_1) = 2 - \frac{1}{t_k}$.

2. The Casimir operator takes the following value on $Y_{1,t}$:

$$(\lambda_1 + \lambda_t, \lambda_1 + \lambda_t) + 2(\lambda_1 + \lambda_t, \rho) = c_1 + c_t + 2(\lambda_1, \lambda_t).$$

Apply statement (1) now to get statement (2).

3. If \mathfrak{g} is affine type, the Casimir on a given component of \mathcal{T}_t is

$$c_1 + c_t + 2 - 2(\alpha, \lambda_1 + \lambda_t) + (\alpha, \alpha) - 2(\rho, \alpha).$$

We have $(\lambda_1, \alpha) = (\lambda_t, \alpha) = 1$ so the Casimir is $c_1 + c_t - 2 - 2(\rho, \alpha)$. In the finite case, adjust the calculation to reflect the result in part (2). \square

\mathfrak{g}_2 is a distinguished submodule of $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}_1$ and for $i > 2$, \mathfrak{g}_i is a distinguished submodule of $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_{i-1}$. The bracket is then a projection from $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_{i-1}$ onto \mathfrak{g}_i . Proposition 2 tells us what the kernel of the projection is.

Corollary 3 *The bracket as defined on $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}_1$ is identically zero on \mathcal{T}_1 . If $2 \leq i \leq a_k - 1$, the bracket defined on $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_i$ is identically zero on \mathcal{T}_i . \square*

5 Proof of the Algorithm, Part I

It is convenient at this point to treat the Affine Algorithm and the Finite Algorithm as one process. Our goals in this section are: (1) to show that the algorithms are effective, either aborting or terminating successfully with $j \leq 6$; and (2) to establish that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the graded ${}^k \mathfrak{g}$ modules produced by the algorithms and lsn-graded affine/finite type Lie algebras. (Note that $A_n^{(1)}$ and $C_n^{(1)}$ are the only affine or finite type Lie algebras without lsn-gradings.) In the next section, we establish that if \mathfrak{g} is produced by one of the algorithms, then it has the expected Lie algebra structure.

The effect of a successful run of either algorithm is to append a long node to ${}^k \mathcal{D}$. When V is degree n on a component of ${}^k \mathfrak{g}$, the associated node of ${}^k \mathcal{D}$ shares n

edges with the appended node. We use this idea to catalog the graded modules produced by the algorithm.

When considering different input modules, we make no distinction between duals or between different modules that yield dual outputs, for example, the two half-spin representations of D_n .

Lemma 12 *The algorithm aborts with $j = 1$ in cases where \mathfrak{g} has more than four components. The only case in which it tolerates four components is that for which $V = U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_4$, where U_i is the standard (two dimensional) representation of A_1 . This case terminates with $j = 2$ and corresponds to α_3 -graded $D_4^{(1)}$.*

Proof Suppose $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{l}_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathfrak{l}_5$ and $V = U_1 \otimes \dots \otimes U_5$, U_i generalized cominuscle on \mathfrak{l}_i . $\Lambda^2 V$ has sixteen (not necessarily irreducible) components, each a product of one, three, or five $\Lambda^2 U_i$ s, with, respectively, four, two, or zero $S^2 U_j$ s. A weight argument confirms that \mathcal{T}_1 is contained in the sum of the five components that have one $\Lambda^2 U_i$ and four $S^2 U_j$ factors. This leaves at least eleven more irreducible components, too many to comprise either an irreducible \mathcal{T}_1^c or the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} . If \mathfrak{g} has more than five components, the number of components of $\Lambda^2 V$ is even farther beyond the maximum tolerated by the algorithm. So in all cases where \mathfrak{g} has five or more simple components, the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$.

Next suppose \mathfrak{g} has four components. This time, $\Lambda^2 V$ has eight not necessarily irreducible components: four each consisting of the tensor product of one $\Lambda^2 U_i$ with three $S^2 U_j$ s (this sum contains \mathcal{T}_1), and four each consisting of the tensor product of three $\Lambda^2 U_i$ s with one $S^2 U_j$ (these are contained in \mathcal{T}_1^c .) Since the sum of four submodules contained in \mathcal{T}_1^c is not irreducible, the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$ unless \mathcal{T}_1^c coincides with the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} . Note in particular that the algorithm aborts if any of the eight components of $\Lambda^2 V$ is not irreducible. If the algorithm does not abort, the submodule of $\Lambda^2 V$ consisting of products of one symmetric square and three exterior squares must be of the form $\text{adj } \mathfrak{l}_i \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C}$, up to ordering of the factors. This establishes that $\Lambda^2 U_i = \mathbb{C}$, thus, that U_i is the two dimensional representation of $sl_2(\mathbb{C})$. The algorithm terminates successfully then with $j = 2$. \square

5.1 $V = U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes U_3$

Suppose $V = U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes U_3$, where U_i is a generalized cominuscle representation of \mathfrak{l}_i . For the remainder of this section, we use n_i to designate the rank of \mathfrak{l}_i . To make accounting easier, assume $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda^2 V = & \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes S^2 U_2 \otimes S^2 U_3 \oplus S^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2 \otimes S^2 U_3 \oplus S^2 U_1 \otimes S^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3 \\ & \oplus \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3. \end{aligned}$$

\mathcal{T}_1^c always contains $\Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3$. If some $S^2 U_i$ or $\Lambda^2 U_i$ is not irreducible, \mathcal{T}_1^c has other components as well. $S^2 U_i$ is irreducible only if U_i is the standard representation of A_n . In this case, $\Lambda^2 U_i$ is irreducible, as well. Thus, if \mathcal{T}_1^c has components other than $\Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3$, it is because $S^2 U_i$ is not irreducible.

If $S^2 U_i$ is not irreducible and the algorithm advances beyond $j = 1$, then $\Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3 \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{l}_i$, for some i . It follows that $\Lambda^2 U_j = \mathbb{C}$ for $j \neq i$. This forces $\mathfrak{l}_i = A_1$ for $i = 1, 2$.

We use LiE notation [9] for irreducible modules, that is, we identify an irreducible representation with the coordinate vector of its highest weight, using the basis of fundamental weights.

Lemma 13 Suppose $\mathfrak{g} = A_1 \oplus A_1 \oplus \mathfrak{l}_3$ and $V = U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes U_3$.

1. If U_1 and U_2 are copies of the standard representation of A_1 , the algorithm tolerates for U_3 only one of the following types of representations:
 - (a) $\mathfrak{l}_3 = A_n$, $U_3 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$ or, $\mathfrak{l}_3 = A_3$, $U = [0, 1, 0]$, or $\mathfrak{l}_3 = A_1$, $U_3 = [2]$. In these cases, respectively, the algorithm terminates with $j = 2$, \mathfrak{g} corresponding to D_{n+3} with α_{n+1} -grading; $D_5^{(1)}$ with α_2 -grading; $B_3^{(1)}$ with α_2 -grading;
 - (b) $\mathfrak{l}_3 = D_n$, $U_3 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$; the algorithm terminates with $j = 2$, \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_2 -graded $D_{n+2}^{(1)}$;
 - (c) $\mathfrak{l}_3 = B_n$, $U_3 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$; the algorithm terminates with $j = 2$, \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_2 -graded $B_{n+2}^{(1)}$.
2. If $U_1 = [2]$, and $U_2 = [1]$, the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$ unless U_3 is the standard representation of A_1 .
3. If either U_1 or U_2 is $[n]$, $n > 2$, the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$.

Proof

1. Suppose U_1 and U_2 are copies of the standard representation of A_1 . We have

$$\Lambda^2 V = \mathbb{C} \otimes S^2 U_2 \otimes S^2 U_3 \oplus S^2 U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes S^2 U_3 \oplus S^2 U_1 \otimes S^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3 \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3.$$

Note that $S^2 U_i = \text{adj } A_1$, for $i = 1, 2$.

If $\Lambda^2 U_3$ is not irreducible, the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$: it only tolerates a reducible \mathcal{T}_1^c if \mathcal{T}_1^c is the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} , in particular, there can be no more than one irreducible component of \mathcal{T}_1^c per simple summand of \mathfrak{g} . This means $\mathfrak{l}_3 \neq C_n$.

Suppose $\Lambda^2 U_3$ is irreducible. If $S^2 U_3$ has more than one nontrivial component, the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$: in this case, $\mathbb{C} \otimes \text{adj } A_1 \otimes S^2 U_3$ contributes to \mathcal{T}_1^c something other than the adjoint representation of A_1 ,

the net effect being \mathcal{T}_1^c is neither irreducible nor the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} . This guarantees that $\mathfrak{l}_3 \neq E_n$.

We can restrict attention to representations of type A , B , and D algebras with $\Lambda^2 U_3$ irreducible, and $S^2 U_3$ with no more than one nontrivial irreducible component.

- (a) Let $\mathfrak{l}_3 = A_n$. If $U_3 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$, it is easy to verify that the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$. Suppose $U_3 = [0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$. If $n \geq 3$, $S^2 U_3 = [0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] + [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$ so when $n > 3$, the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$. When $n = 3$, the second representation is \mathbb{C} . In this case, $\Lambda^2 U_3 = \text{adj } A_3$. The algorithm tolerates this case, designates $V_2 = A_1 \oplus A_1 \oplus A_3$, and thus terminates successfully at $j = 2$.

If U_3 is a higher exterior power of the standard representation of A_n , $S^2 U_3$ has more than one nontrivial irreducible submodule so the algorithm aborts in these cases with $j = 1$. The same observation applies to higher degree cominuscle representations of A_n , except when $U_3 = \text{adj } A_1$. Here, the algorithm yields $V_2 = A_1 \oplus A_1 \oplus A_1$, terminating successfully with $j = 2$.

- (b) Let $\mathfrak{l}_3 = D_n$. If $U_3 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$, $S^2 U_3 = [2, 0, \dots, 0] + \mathbb{C}$ and $\Lambda^2 U_3 = \text{adj } D_n$. The algorithm designates $V_2 = A_1 \oplus A_1 \oplus D_n$, terminating successfully with $j = 2$.

Suppose $U_3 = \text{adj } D_n$. In this case, $S^2 U_3$ has more than one nontrivial component so the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$.

If $n = 4$, we can take $U_3 = [0, 0, 1, 0]$ because then $S^2 U_3 = [0, 0, 2, 0] + \mathbb{C}$ and $\Lambda^2 U_3 = \text{adj } D_4$. If U_3 is a half-spin representation when $n > 4$, there is a second nontrivial component of $S^2 U_3$ which makes \mathcal{T}_1^c neither irreducible nor adjoint. In these cases, the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$.

If U_3 is a higher degree cominuscle representation of D_n , $S^2 U_3$ has more than one nontrivial component and the algorithm aborts with $j = 1$.

- (c) The cases where U_3 is a representation of B_n are similar to those where U_3 is a fundamental representation of D_n . We leave details to the reader.

2. Now suppose $U_1 = [2]$ and $U_2 = [1]$. In this case $S^2 U_1 = [4] + \mathbb{C}$ so

$$\mathcal{T}_1^c = \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes S^2 U_3 \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes \text{adj } A_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3 \oplus \text{adj } A_1 \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3.$$

The algorithm aborts unless this is the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} . That happens precisely when $\Lambda^2 U_3$ is trivial and $S^2 U_3$ is the adjoint representation of the third simple component of \mathfrak{g} . That is, U_3 must be the standard representation of A_1 .

3. Suppose U_1 and U_2 are copies of $\text{adj } A_1$. In this case, \mathcal{T}_1^c has at least three irreducible components, one of which is $\text{adj } A_1 \otimes \text{adj } A_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3$. This forces the algorithm to abort. Higher symmetric powers of the standard representation of A_1 yield similar results. \square

Next we consider what happens when $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3$. As per remarks preceding the theorem, \mathfrak{l}_i is type A for all i and $U_i = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$. In all these cases, the algorithm advances to $j = 2$ with $V_2 = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_3$. Let $C_{1,i}(U_j)$ be the Cartan product of U_j and $\Lambda^i U_j$. We have

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 = (C_{1,2}(U_1) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1) \otimes (C_{1,2}(U_2) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_2) \otimes (C_{1,2}(U_3) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_3),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_2^c &= C_{1,2}(U_1) \otimes \Lambda^3 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^3 U_3 \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes C_{1,2}(U_2) \otimes \Lambda^3 U_3 \oplus \\ &\quad \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^3 U_2 \otimes C_{1,2}(U_3) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^3 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^3 U_3. \end{aligned}$$

The algorithm directs that one of the following happens.

1. If $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \{0\}$ the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$.
2. If \mathcal{T}_2^c is irreducible, the algorithm advances to $j = 3$ with $V_3 = \mathcal{T}_2^c$.
3. If $\mathcal{T}_2^c \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, $V_3 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$.

Lemma 14 $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \{0\}$ if and only if U_1 and U_2 are standard representations of A_1 . In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_{n_3+1} -graded D_{n_3+3} .

Proof We work under the assumption that $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3$ so $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \{0\}$ precisely when $\Lambda^3 U_i = \{0\}$ for $i = 1, 2$, which happens only if $n_i = 1$, for $i = 1, 2$. \square

Now we work under the assumption that the algorithm has advanced to $j = 2$.

Lemma 15 \mathcal{T}_2^c is irreducible only if $U_1 = [1]$ and $n_2 > 1$.

Proof \mathcal{T}_2^c is irreducible precisely when $\Lambda^3 U_i = \{0\}$ for exactly one i , thus when $i = 1$. This means $\mathfrak{l}_{n_1} = A_1$. \square

Lemma 16 $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ if and only if $U_1 = U_2 = U_3$ is the standard representation of A_2 . In this case the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$, and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_4 -graded $E_6^{(1)}$.

Proof $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ only if $\Lambda^3 U_i = \mathbb{C}$ for all i , which implies the result. \square
We have proved the following.

Proposition 4 *When $V = U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes U_3$, the algorithm advances beyond $j = 3$ only if each U_i is the standard representation of A_{n_i} with $n_1 = 1$, and $n_3 \geq n_2 \geq 2$. In this case we have $V_3 = U_1 \otimes \Lambda^3 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^3 U_3$. \square*

Suppose V_3 is irreducible. We have

$$V_1 \otimes V_3 = (\text{adj } A_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}) \otimes (C_{1,3}(U_2) \oplus \Lambda^4 U_2) \otimes (C_{1,3}(U_3) \oplus \Lambda^4 U_3).$$

This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_3^c = & \text{adj } A_1 \otimes \Lambda^4 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^4 U_3 \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes C_{1,3}(U_2) \otimes \Lambda^4 U_3 \oplus \\ & \mathbb{C} \otimes \Lambda^4 U_2 \otimes C_{1,3}(U_3) \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes \Lambda^4 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^4 U_3. \end{aligned}$$

The algorithm directs that one of the following happens.

1. If $\mathcal{T}_3^c = \{0\}$ the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$.
2. If \mathcal{T}_3^c is irreducible, the algorithm advances to $j = 4$ with $V_4 = \mathcal{T}_3^c$.
3. If $\mathcal{T}_2^c \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$, $V_4 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 4$.

Lemma 17 *Suppose the algorithm has advanced to $j = 3$. V_3 is irreducible if and only if U_1 is the standard representation of A_1 , and each of U_2 and U_3 is the standard representation of A_2 . In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_4 -graded E_6 .*

Proof $V_4 = \{0\}$ precisely when $\Lambda^4 U_2 = \Lambda^4 U_3 = \{0\}$ which happens precisely when $A_{n_i} = A_2$, $i = 2, 3$. \square

Lemma 18 *Suppose the algorithm has advanced to $j = 4$. V_4 is irreducible precisely when U_2 is the standard representation of A_2 and $n_3 > 2$.*

Proof V_4 is irreducible precisely when $\Lambda^4 U_2 = \{0\}$ and $\Lambda^4 U_3 \neq \{0\}$. The result follows from there. \square

Lemma 19 *If the algorithm advances to $j = 4$, $V_4 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ precisely when each of U_2, U_3 is the standard representation of A_3 . In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully to produce \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_4 -graded $E_7^{(1)}$.*

Proof $V_4 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ precisely when $\mathbb{C} \otimes \Lambda^4 U_2 \otimes \Lambda^4 U_3 \cong \mathbb{C}$, that is, when $\Lambda^4 U_2 \cong \Lambda^4 U_3 = \mathbb{C}$, that is, when U_2 and U_3 are copies of the standard representation of A_3 . \square

Suppose the algorithm has advanced to $j = 4$ and that $V_4 = \mathbb{C} \otimes U_2 \otimes \Lambda^4 U_3$ is irreducible, with U_2 the standard representation of A_2 . Since $V_1 \otimes V_4 = U_1 \otimes (S^2 U_2 \oplus U_2^*) \otimes (C_{1,4} \oplus \Lambda^5 U_3)$,

$$\mathcal{T}_4^c = U_1 \otimes U_2^* \otimes \Lambda^5 U_3. \quad (5)$$

This implies the following.

Lemma 20 When $V = U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes U_3$, the algorithm cannot produce $V_5 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}^k$.
 \square

Lemma 21 Suppose the algorithm advances to $j = 4$ with V_4 irreducible. $\mathcal{T}_4^c = \{0\}$ precisely when U_1 is the standard representation of A_1 , U_2 the standard representation of A_2 , and U_3 the standard representation of A_3 . In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_4 -graded E_7 .

Proof $\mathcal{T}_4^c = \{0\}$ precisely when $\Lambda^5 U_3 = \{0\}$, which happens if and only if U_3 is the standard representation of A_3 . \square

Lemma 22 If $V = U_1 \otimes U_2 \otimes U_3$ and for $i = 2, 3, 4, 5$ V_i are defined and irreducible, then U_1 is the standard representation of A_1 , U_2 the standard representation of A_2 , and U_3 the standard representation of A_n for some $n > 3$. In this case, $V_5 = U_1 \otimes U_2^* \otimes \Lambda^5 U_3$.

Proof The proof follows Eq. (5). \square

Suppose the algorithm has advanced to $j = 5$ with V_5 irreducible, in particular, with $n_3 > 3$. We have

$$V_1 \otimes V_5 = (\text{adj } A_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}) \otimes (\text{adj } A_2 \oplus \mathbb{C}) \otimes (C_{1,5}(U_3) \oplus \Lambda^6 U_3).$$

If $n_3 = 4$, $C_{1,5}(U_3) = U_3$ and $\Lambda^6 U_3 = \{0\}$ but in any case, the following is never zero

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_5^c = & \text{adj } A_1 \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes \Lambda^6 U_3 \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes \text{adj } A_2 \otimes \Lambda^6 U_3 \oplus \\ & \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes C_{1,5}(U_3) \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C} \otimes \Lambda^6 U_3. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 23 V_6 is irreducible if and only if U_3 is the standard representation of A_4 . In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 6$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_4 -graded E_8 . \square

Lemma 24 Suppose the algorithm has advanced to $j = 5$ and assume $n_3 > 4$. The algorithm aborts with $j = 5$ unless $n_3 = 5$, in which case it terminates successfully with $j = 6$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_4 -graded $E_8^{(1)}$.

Proof If $n_3 > 4$, \mathcal{T}_5^c has at least two irreducible components so the algorithm aborts with $j = 5$ unless $\mathcal{T}_5^c = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}^k \oplus \mathbb{C}$. This happens, in turn, only if $\Lambda^6 U_3 = \mathbb{C}$, that is, if and only if U_3 is the standard representation of A_5 . \square

The following summarizes what the algorithm produces when \mathfrak{g}^k has three simple components.

Proposition 5 When \mathfrak{g}^k has more than two simple components the algorithm either aborts with $j \leq 5$, or it terminates successfully with $j \leq 6$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to one of the following types: α_2 -graded $B_n^{(1)}$, α_{n-2} -graded D_n , α_2 -graded $D_n^{(1)}$, α_4 -graded E_n , or α_4 -graded $E_n^{(1)}$. \square

5.2 $V = U_1 \otimes U_2$

U_i is a generalized cominuscle representation of finite type \mathfrak{l}_i , $V = U_1 \otimes U_2$, and $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{l}_1 \oplus \mathfrak{l}_2$. We have $\Lambda^2 V = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes S^2 U_2 \oplus S^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2$. The case where $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \{0\}$ is part of the Minuscule Algorithm [7]. To complete our accounting we note that $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \{0\}$ if and only if $S^2 U_i$ is irreducible for $i = 1, 2$, that is, if and only if U_1 and U_2 are standard representations of type A algebras. In such a case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 1$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_k -graded A_n , $1 < k < n$.

\mathcal{T}_1^c is irreducible if and only if $\Lambda^2 U_i$ and $S^2 U_1$ are irreducible and $S^2 U_2$ has two irreducible components. U_1 must be a standard representation of a type A algebra since all other generalized cominuscle representations of finite type algebras have a reducible symmetric square. For the duration of this discussion, let $\mathfrak{l}_1 = A_n$ and $U_1 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$. Choosing U_2 from the following list guarantees that \mathcal{T}_1^c is irreducible. The list is exhaustive.

1. $\mathfrak{l}_2 = A_m$, $U_2 = [2, 0, \dots, 0]$;
2. $\mathfrak{l}_2 = A_m$, $U_2 = [0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$;
3. $\mathfrak{l}_2 = B_m$ or D_m , $U_2 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$;
4. $\mathfrak{l}_2 = D_5$, $U_2 = [0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$;
5. $\mathfrak{l}_2 = E_6$, $U_2 = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$.

The next sequence of lemmas analyzes these cases in order. When we encounter twisted affine Lie algebras, we number the simple roots as in [5].

Lemma 25 *Let $\mathfrak{l}_2 = A_m$ and $U_2 = [2, 0, \dots, 0]$. The algorithm terminates successfully if and only if one of the following holds.*

1. $m = 1$, in which case $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_{n+1} -graded B_{n+2} ;
2. $n = 1$ or 2 and $m = 2$, in which case $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_2 -graded F_4 or $F_4^{(1)}$, respectively; or
3. $n = 1$ and $m = 3$, in which case $j = 4$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_3 -graded $E_6^{(2)}$.

Otherwise, the algorithm aborts with $j \leq 3$.

Proof Under the hypotheses we have $S^2 U_2 = [4, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]$. If $m = 1$, then $[0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] = [0] = \mathbb{C}$. Note that $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes [0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]$. This is always nonzero and irreducible so the algorithm always advances to $j = 2$. Next consider $V_1 \otimes V_2$.

If $m = 1$, $V_2 = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}$ so that $V_1 \otimes V_2 = (C_{1,2}(U_1) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1) \otimes (U_2 \otimes \mathbb{C})$. The algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$ as $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \{0\}$.

For $m \geq 2$, $V_2 \otimes [0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] = [2, 2, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [1, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]$. This gives us $V_1 \otimes V_2 = (C_{1,2}(U_1) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1) \otimes ([2, 2, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [1, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0])$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_2^c &= C_{1,2}(U_1) \otimes [0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes [1, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \\ &\quad \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes [0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Expression (6), always nonzero, is irreducible precisely when $\Lambda^3 U_1 = \{0\}$, that is, when $A_n = A_1$, so that $C_{1,2}(U_1) = U_1$. In this case, the algorithm designates $V_3 = U_1 \otimes [0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]$, which becomes $U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}$ when $m = 2$. For $m > 2$,

$$V_1 \otimes V_3 = (\text{adj } A_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}) \otimes ([2, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [1, 0, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [0, 0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]),$$

and for $m = 2$,

$$V_1 \otimes V_3 = (\text{adj } A_1 \oplus \mathbb{C}) \otimes U_2.$$

This leaves us with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_3^c &= \text{adj } A_1 \otimes [0, 0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes [1, 0, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \\ &\quad \oplus \mathbb{C} \otimes [0, 0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

when $m > 2$, and $\mathcal{T}_3^c = \{0\}$ when $m = 2$. In the latter case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$.

As long as $m > 2$, the expression in (7) is not irreducible. It is equivalent to $\text{adj } A_1 \oplus \text{adj } A_3 \oplus \mathbb{C}$ if and only if $m = 3$. In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 4$, $V_4 = \text{adj } A_1 \oplus \text{adj } A_3$. If $m > 3$, the algorithm aborts with $j = 3$.

Next we consider when (6) is $\text{adj } \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$. We need $C_{1,2}(U_1) = \text{adj } A_2$, $[0, 0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] = \mathbb{C}$, and $\Lambda^3 U_1 = \mathbb{C}$. This happens precisely when $n = m = 2$, giving us a successful termination of the algorithm with $j = 3$. \square

Lemma 26 *Let $\mathfrak{t}_2 = A_m$, and $U_2 = [0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$. The algorithm terminates successfully if and only if one of the following holds.*

1. $m = 3$, in which case $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_{n+1} -graded D_{n+4} ;
2. $1 \leq n \leq 4$ and $m = 4$; in these cases, $j = 2, 3, 5, 5$ respectively and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_5 -graded E_ℓ , $\ell = 6, 7, 8$, or α_5 -graded $E_8^{(1)}$, respectively;
3. $n = 1$ or 2 , and $m = 5$; in these cases, $j = 3$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_3 -graded E_7 or α_3 -graded $E_7^{(1)}$, respectively;
4. $n = 1$, and $m = 6$ or 7 ; in these cases, $j = 4$, and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_3 -graded E_8 or α_3 -graded $E_8^{(1)}$ respectively.

In all other cases, the algorithm aborts with $j \leq 4$.

Proof We have $\Lambda^2 U_2 = [1, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$ and $S^2 U_2 = [0, 2, 0, \dots, 0] + [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$ so that $V_2 = [0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \otimes [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$ and

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 = ([1, 1, 0, \dots, 0] + [0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]) \otimes ([0, 1, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] + [1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]).$$

This gives us $\mathcal{T}_2^c = [1, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \otimes [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] + [0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \otimes$

$$[1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] + [0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \otimes [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]. \quad (8)$$

When $n = 2$ and $m = 5$, $\mathcal{T}_2^c \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{g} + \mathbb{C}$ so the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$. All other combinations of n and m with $n > 1$ and $m > 4$ yield V inadmissible, the algorithm aborting here with $j = 2$. When $m = 3$, $V_2 = [0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \otimes \mathbb{C}$ for arbitrary n . In these cases, $V_1 \otimes V_2 = \mathcal{T}_2$ and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$.

Restrict now to $n = 1$, $m > 3$. Eq. (8) becomes $[1] \otimes [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$, which is zero when $m = 4$. Thus, $n = 1$ and $m = 4$ yield a successful run of the algorithm terminating with $j = 2$. Taking $m = 5$, we get $V_3 = [1] \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Continuing, $V_1 \otimes V_3 = ([2] + \mathbb{C}) \otimes U_2$ so that \mathcal{T}_3^c is zero and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$. Letting $m = 6$, we get $V_3 = [1] \otimes [0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$ so that $V_1 \otimes V_3 = ([2] + \mathbb{C}) \otimes ([0, 1, 0, 0, 1] + [1, 0, 0, 0, 0])$ and $V_4 = \mathbb{C} \otimes [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. Then $V_1 \otimes V_4 = [1] \otimes ([1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0] + [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0])$ which implies that $\mathcal{T}_4^c = \{0\}$, thus, that the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 4$. If $m = 7$, $V_3 = [1] \otimes [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0]$ and $V_1 \otimes V_3 = ([2] + \mathbb{C}) \otimes ([0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0] + [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1] + \mathbb{C})$, giving us $\mathcal{T}_3^c = [2] \otimes \mathbb{C} + \mathbb{C} \otimes [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1] + \mathbb{C} \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Then $V_4 \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 4$. If $n = 1$ and $m > 7$, the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{l}_2 does not appear in \mathcal{T}_3^c so the algorithm aborts at $j = 3$.

Next take $n = 2$. We need only consider $m = 4$. Here $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \mathbb{C} \otimes [1, 0, 0, 0]$ giving us $V_1 \otimes V_3 = [1, 0] \otimes ([1, 1, 0, 0, 0] + [0, 0, 1, 0])$. Since $\mathcal{T}_3^c = \{0\}$, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$.

Now reconsider Eq. (8) when $n > 2$, $m > 3$. Since V is inadmissible when $m \geq 5$, we only need consider $m = 4$. Then $\mathcal{T}_2^c = [0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \otimes [1, 0, 0, 0]$ so that $\mathcal{T}_3^c = [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \otimes [0, 0, 1, 0]$. The algorithm advances to $j = 4$ and we have

$$V_1 \otimes V_4 = ([1, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] + [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots]) \otimes ([0, 1, 1, 0] + [1, 0, 0, 1] + \mathbb{C}).$$

If $n > 4$, the algorithm aborts with $j = 4$. When $n = 4$, $\mathcal{T}_4^c = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g} + \mathbb{C}$ so the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 5$. When $n = 3$, the algorithm advances with $V_4 = [1, 0, 0] \otimes \mathbb{C}$. Then $V_1 \otimes V_4 = \mathcal{T}_4$ so the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 4$. \square

Lemma 27 *Let $\mathfrak{l}_2 = B_m$ or D_m and $U_2 = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$. The algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$, \mathfrak{g} corresponding respectively to α_{n+1} -graded B_{n+m+1} or D_{n+m+1} .*

Proof If U_2 is the standard representation of B_m , then $\Lambda^2 U_2 = \text{adj } B_m$ and $S^2 U_2 = [2, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus \mathbb{C}$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{T}_1^c = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C},$$

which is always irreducible. The algorithm designates $V_2 = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}$ and we have

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 = (C_{1,2}(U_1) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1) \otimes U_2.$$

Since $\mathcal{T}_2^c = \{0\}$, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$.

The argument applies exactly as stated if U_2 is the standard representation of D_m . \square

Lemma 28 *Let $\mathfrak{l}_2 = D_5$ and $U_2 = [0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$. When $n = 1, 2$ or 3 , the algorithm terminates successfully, with $j = 2$ when $n = 1$, and $j = 4$ when $n = 2$ or 3 . \mathfrak{g} corresponds respectively to α_6 -graded E_7 , α_6 -graded E_8 , or α_6 -graded $E_8^{(1)}$. Otherwise, the algorithm aborts with $j = 3$.*

Proof Under our hypotheses, $S^2 U_2 = [0, 0, 0, 0, 2] \oplus [1, 0, 0, 0, 0]$ so that \mathcal{T}_1^c is always irreducible and the algorithm always advances to $j = 2$. This gets us $V_2 = \mathcal{T}_1^c = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes [1, 0, 0, 0, 0]$ and

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 = (C_{1,2}(U_1) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1) \otimes ([1, 0, 0, 0, 1] \oplus [0, 0, 0, 1, 0]).$$

Note that

$$\mathcal{T}_2^c = \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes [0, 0, 0, 1, 0]$$

is zero if $n = 1$, irreducible otherwise. We see, then, that when $n = 1$, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$. If $n > 1$, the algorithm advances to $j = 3$ with $V_3 = \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes [0, 0, 0, 1, 0]$. This gives us

$$V_1 \otimes V_3 = (C_{1,3}(U_1) \oplus \Lambda^4 U_1) \otimes ([0, 0, 0, 1, 1] \oplus \text{adj } D_5 \oplus \mathbb{C}),$$

so that

$$\mathcal{T}_3^c = C_{1,3}(U_1) \otimes \mathbb{C} \oplus \Lambda^4 U_1 \otimes \text{adj } D_5 \oplus \Lambda^4 U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}. \quad (9)$$

The expression in (9) is irreducible if and only if $\Lambda^4 U_1 = \{0\}$, that is, if and only if $A_n = A_2$, in which case $V_4 = U_1$. Continuing, we have

$$V_1 \otimes V_4 = (S^2 V_1 \oplus \Lambda^2 V_1) \otimes V_2$$

so that $\mathcal{T}_4^c = \{0\}$, and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 4$.

Next consider that the expression in (9) is equivalent to $\text{adj } \mathfrak{g}^k \oplus \mathbb{C}$ if and only if $\Lambda^4 V_1 = \mathbb{C}$, which is true if and only if $A_n = A_3$. In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 4$.

For all values of $n > 3$, the expression in (9) forces the algorithm to abort with $j = 3$. \square

Lemma 29 *Let $\mathfrak{l}_2 = E_6$, $U_2 = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. The algorithm terminates successfully if and only if $n = 1$ or 2 , in which case $j = 3$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds respectively to α_7 -graded E_8 or α_7 -graded $E_8^{(1)}$. Otherwise, the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$.*

Proof Under the hypotheses, say $U_2 = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. We have

$$\mathcal{T}_1^c = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$$

so that the algorithm always advances to $j = 2$. Then

$$U_1 \otimes U_2 = (C_{1,2}(U_1) \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1) \otimes ([1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1] \oplus \text{adj } E_6 \oplus \mathbb{C}),$$

leaving us with

$$\mathcal{T}_2^c = C_{1,2}(U_1) \otimes \mathbb{C} \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes \text{adj } E_6 \oplus \Lambda^3 U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}. \quad (10)$$

This is irreducible if and only if $\Lambda^3 U_1 = \{0\}$, that is, if and only if $A_n = A_1$. In this case, $V_4 = U_1 \otimes \mathbb{C}$ and we continue, to find $V_1 \otimes V_4 = \mathcal{T}_4$. This is a successful termination of the algorithm with $j = 3$.

The expression in (10) is equivalent to $\text{adj } \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$ if and only if $\Lambda^3 U_1 = \mathbb{C}$, that is, if and only if $A_n = A_2$. In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$.

In all other cases, the expression in (10) forces the algorithm to abort with $j = 2$. \square

This exhausts the cases where \mathcal{T}_1^c irreducible. Next, we consider conditions on $V = U_1 \otimes U_2$ that force $\mathcal{T}_1^c \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}^k + \mathbb{C}$. Since

$$\Lambda^2 V = \Lambda^2 U_1 \otimes S^2 U_2 \oplus S^2 U_1 \otimes \Lambda^2 U_2,$$

each summand of $\Lambda^2 V$ would have the form $W + \text{ad } \mathfrak{l}_i \otimes \mathbb{C}$, where W is itself a tensor product, either of something with $\text{ad } \mathfrak{l}_i$ or something with \mathbb{C} . Note in particular that neither $\Lambda^2 U_i$ nor $S^2 U_i$ can have the form $\text{ad } \mathfrak{l}_i \oplus \mathbb{C}$. Note further that $S^2 U_i \neq \mathbb{C}$ and that $\Lambda^2 U_i = \mathbb{C}$ if and only if U_i is the standard representation of A_1 , in which case $S^2 U_i = \text{ad } A_1$. These allow us to limit the criteria determining U_1 and U_2 to the following.

1. $\Lambda^2 U_i = \text{ad } \mathfrak{l}_i$, $S^2 U_i = Z + \mathbb{C}$, where Z is irreducible;
2. U_1 is the standard representation of A_1 , $S^2 U_2 = Z + \text{ad } \mathfrak{l}_2$, and $\Lambda^2 U_2 = W + \mathbb{C}$, where Z and W are irreducible.

What follows is an complete list of generalized cominuscule representations U that satisfy (1). (LiE [9] helps verify that the list is exhaustive.) Taking U_1, U_2 to be any pair from the list, we get $\mathcal{T}_1^c \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}^k + \mathbb{C}$.

1. $\mathfrak{l} = A_1$, $U = [2]$;

2. $\mathfrak{l} = A_3, U = [0, 1, 0]$;
3. $\mathfrak{l} = B_n, U = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$;
4. $\mathfrak{l} = D_n, U = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$.

There are sixteen pairs we can choose. With $V = U_1 \otimes U_2$, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to one of the following types of lsn-graded affine algebras: α_k -graded $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$, $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$; α_k -graded $D_n^{(1)}$, $k \in \{3, \dots, n-3\}$; α_k -graded $B_n^{(1)}$, $k \in \{3, \dots, n-1\}$. Further, any such lsn-graded algebra can be produced by the algorithm for some choice of U_1 and U_2 on this list.

Next, consider the following exhaustive list of generalized cominuscule representations U with $S^2U = Z + \text{ad } \mathfrak{l}$, and $\Lambda^2U = W + \mathbb{C}$, where Z and W are irreducible.

1. $\mathfrak{l} = A_1, U = [3]$;
2. $\mathfrak{l} = A_5, U = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0]$;
3. $\mathfrak{l} = C_3, U = [0, 0, 1]$;
4. $\mathfrak{l} = D_6, U = [0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0]$;
5. $\mathfrak{l} = E_7, U = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$.

Taking $V = U_1 \otimes U_2$, with U_1 the standard representation of A_1 , and U_2 from this list, we get \mathfrak{g} corresponding respectively to: α_2 -graded $G_2^{(1)}$; α_3 -graded $E_6^{(1)}$; α_1 -graded $F_4^{(1)}$; α_1 -graded $E_7^{(1)}$; α_8 -graded $E_8^{(1)}$.

The following summarizes our accounting in case $V = U_1 \otimes U_2$. We omit cases that terminate successfully with $j = 1$.

Proposition 6 *Let U_1 be a generalized cominuscule representation for finite type \mathfrak{l}_1 , U_2 a generalized cominuscule representation for finite type \mathfrak{l}_2 . The algorithm either aborts with $j \leq 4$ or it terminates successfully with $1 < j \leq 4$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to one of the following types of lsn-graded algebras: α_k -graded B_n , $1 < k < n-1$; α_k -graded $B_n^{(1)}$, $2 < k < n-1$; α_k -graded D_n , $1 < k < n-2$; α_k -graded $D_n^{(1)}$, $2 < k < n-2$; α_k -graded $D_{n+1}^{(2)}$, $0 < k < n$; α_k -graded E_n , α_k graded $E_n^{(1)}$, $k = 3$ or $5 \leq k \leq n-1$; α_2 -graded $E_6^{(1)}$; α_1 -graded $E_7^{(1)}$; α_8 -graded $E_8^{(1)}$; α_3 -graded $E_6^{(2)}$; α_2 -graded F_4 ; α_k -graded $F_4^{(1)}$, $k = 1, 2$; α_2 -graded $G_2^{(1)}$. \square*

5.3 \mathfrak{g}^k Simple

Here we detail the cases where \mathcal{T}_1^c is irreducible. Since \mathfrak{g}^k is simple, the irreducible cases subsume the cases where $\mathcal{T}_1^c \cong \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}^k$.

\mathcal{T}_1^c is zero precisely when Λ^2V is irreducible. We list of these cases to have a complete account.

1. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $V = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$, \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_1 -graded A_{n+1} ;
2. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $V = [2, 0, \dots, 0]$, \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_n -graded C_{n+1} ;
3. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $V = [0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$, \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_n -graded D_{n+1} ;
4. $\mathfrak{g} = B_n$ or D_n , $V = [1, 0, \dots, 0]$, \mathfrak{g} corresponds to a type α_1 -graded B_{n+1} or α_1 -graded D_{n+1} algebra respectively.

\mathcal{T}_1^c is irreducible precisely when $\Lambda^2 V$ has exactly two irreducible components.

We list the representations V with this property. In cases where $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$. In cases where $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \mathbb{C}$, $V_1 \otimes V_2$ is irreducible, also resulting in a successful termination of the algorithm at $j = 2$. We note these in the list and analyze the rest of the cases through the lemmas that follow.

1. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $n \geq 5$, $V_1 = [0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$; $V_2 = \mathcal{T}_1^c = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$; when $n = 5$, $V_2 = \mathbb{C}$ and the algorithm terminates with $j = 2$, \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_2 -graded E_6 .
2. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $n \geq 7$, $V_1 = [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$; when $n = 7$, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_2 -graded $E_7^{(1)}$.
3. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $V_1 = [3, 0, \dots, 0]$ or $[4, 0, \dots, 0]$; $\mathcal{T}_1^c = [0, 3, 0, \dots, 0]$ or $[2, 3, 0, \dots, 0]$ respectively.
4. $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $V_1 = [0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]$, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = [1, 0, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$; when $n = 3$, the algorithm terminates with $j = 2$, \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_3 -graded $A_5^{(2)}$.
5. $\mathfrak{g} = B_n$ or D_n , $V_1 = [2, 0, \dots, 0]$, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \text{adj } B_n$, respectively, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \text{adj } D_n$; the algorithm terminates successfully with \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_n -graded $A_{2n}^{(2)}$, respectively α_n -graded $A_{2n-1}^{(2)}$.
6. $\mathfrak{g} = C_3$ or C_4 , $V_1 = [0, \dots, 0, 1]$, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \mathbb{C}$, respectively $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$; the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$, \mathfrak{g} corresponding respectively to α_2 -graded F_4 , or α_4 -graded $E_6^{(2)}$.
7. $\mathfrak{g} = E_6$, $V_1 = [2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1]$.
8. $\mathfrak{g} = E_7$, V_1 the cominuscle representation, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = \mathbb{C}$; the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_8 -graded E_8 .

Lemma 30 Let $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $n > 5$, $V_1 = [0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$. Unless $n = 6, 7$ or 8 , V is inadmissible and the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$. When $n = 6$ or 7 , the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$, and \mathfrak{g} corresponding respectively to α_2 -graded E_7 or α_2 -graded E_8 . When $n = 8$, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to $E_8^{(1)}$.

Proof When $n = 6$, $\mathcal{T}_1^c = [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1]$, $V_1 \otimes V_2 = \mathcal{T}_2$, so the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$. For $n \geq 7$, we have

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0].$$

The algorithm thus aborts when $n > 8$. If $n = 7$, $V_3 = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$. Then

$$V_1 \otimes V_3 = [1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0] \oplus [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0],$$

so that $\mathcal{T}_3^c = \{0\}$. The algorithm thus terminates successfully with $j = 2$. When $n = 8$, $V_3 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ so the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$. \square

Lemma 31 If $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $n > 7$, and $V_1 = [0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$, the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$

Proof We have $V_2 = [1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$ so that when $n > 7$, $V_1 \otimes V_2$ has at least four nontrivial components. \square

Lemma 32 Let $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$ and $V_1 = [3, 0, \dots, 0]$. The algorithm terminates successfully if and only if $n = 1$ or 2 . When $n = 1$, $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_2 -graded G_2 . When $n = 2$, $j = 3$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponds to α_2 -graded $D_4^{(3)}$.

If $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$ and $V_1 = [4, 0, \dots, 0]$, the algorithm aborts unless $n = 1$. In this case, the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$ and \mathfrak{g} corresponding to α_1 -graded $A_2^{(2)}$.

Proof If $V_1 = [3, 0, \dots, 0]$, then $V_2 = [0, 3, 0, \dots, 0]$ so that

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 = [3, 3, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [2, 2, 1, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [1, 1, 2, 0, \dots, 0] \oplus [0, 0, 3, 0, \dots, 0].$$

It is clear that the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$ when $n > 2$. When $n = 2$, $V_3 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$, and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 3$. When $n = 1$, $V_2 = \mathbb{C}$ so $V_1 \otimes V_2 = \mathcal{T}_2$, giving us a successful termination of the algorithm with $j = 2$.

When $k = 4$, $V_2 = [2, 3, 0, \dots, 0]$ so that when $n = 1$, $V_2 = \text{adj } \mathfrak{g}$ and the algorithm terminates successfully with $j = 2$. Otherwise, $V_1 \otimes V_2$ has eleven nontrivial components and the algorithm aborts. \square

Lemma 33 If $\mathfrak{g} = A_n$, $n > 3$, and $V = [0, 2, 0, \dots, 0]$, then V is inadmissible, and the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$.

Proof We have $V_2 = \mathcal{T}_1^c = [1, 0, 1, 1, 0, \dots, 0]$ so that $V_1 \otimes V_2$ has more than five nontrivial irreducible components. \square

Lemma 34 *If $\mathfrak{g} = E_6^k$ with $V_1 = [2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]$, the algorithm aborts with $j = 2$.*

Proof $V_2 = [0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 1]$ so that $V_1 \otimes V_2$ has more than four nontrivial components, forcing the algorithm to abort. \square

This completes the proof that there is an admissible representation associated to any affine or finite Lie algebra with lsn-grading and further, that these are the only admissible representations. In the next section, we verify that the algorithms actually produce Lie algebras with finite or affine type root systems.

6 Proof of the Algorithm, Part II: The Structure of \mathfrak{g}

Here we establish how the structure of an affine or finite type Lie algebra can be extended from \mathfrak{g} to a \mathbb{Z} -graded vector space \mathfrak{g} produced from the Affine or Finite Algorithm.

Suppose \mathfrak{g} is constructed via the Affine Algorithm. Let $\gamma_1 = \sum_{i \neq k} c_i \alpha_i$ be the lowest weight of \mathfrak{g}_1 . Define a_k to be the least common denominator of the c_i 's. Since weights of \mathfrak{g}_1 differ by elements of Q_+ , a_k is the least common denominator when we write any weight of \mathfrak{g}_1 as a linear combination of elements of Π^k . Take $r = j/a_k$, where j is minimal with $\mathfrak{g}_j \cong \mathfrak{g}^k$. We claim that j is a multiple of a_k : since $\mathfrak{g}_j \cong \mathfrak{g}^k$, each $\alpha_i \in \Pi^k$ must be a weight of \mathfrak{g}_j . The highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_j has the form $j\lambda_1$ less $2j - 1$ positive roots of \mathfrak{g}^k . In particular, $j\lambda_1$ is in the root lattice of \mathfrak{g}^k so j/a_k must be a positive integer as claimed.

If the Finite Algorithm produces \mathfrak{g} , let $t_k = 1/(2 - (\lambda_1, \lambda_1))$ where λ_1 is the highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_1 .

Let B be the Killing form on \mathfrak{g}^k . Use (\cdot, \cdot) to denote its rescaling as per §4.4, that is, the long roots associated to a simple component of \mathfrak{g}^k have length $2/n$ where n is the degree of the representation \mathfrak{g}_1 on that component of \mathfrak{g}^k .

The Affine Algorithm defines $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g}^k \oplus \mathbb{C} + \mathbb{C}$. Identify one copy of \mathbb{C} with $\mathbb{C}K$ and the other copy with $\mathbb{C}d_k$, where $K.x = 0$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $d_k.x_t = tx$ if $x \in \mathfrak{g}_t$. In particular, define $[K x] = [d_k x] = 0$ for all $x \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ so \mathfrak{g}_0 is a Lie algebra and \mathfrak{g} is a \mathfrak{g}_0 module. Use Lemma 2 to extend the definition of $(\cdot, \cdot)_k$

to all of $\mathfrak{h} := \mathfrak{h}^0 + \mathfrak{h}^k + \mathbb{C}K + \mathbb{C}d_k$. Decree that K and d_k are orthogonal to $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ if $x \notin \mathfrak{h}$. Let $\nu : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$ be the isomorphism determined by the nondegenerate form on \mathfrak{h} . Define $\delta := \nu(K)$, $\Lambda_k := \nu(d_k)$, and $\alpha_k := \gamma_1 + (1/a_k)\delta = -\lambda_1 + (1/a_k)\delta$.

This puts α_k in \mathfrak{h}^* with $(\alpha_k, \alpha_i) = (\gamma_1, \alpha_i) = -(\lambda_{-1}, \alpha_i)$ for all $\alpha_i \in \Pi$. Note that $\|\alpha_k\|^2 = 2$. It is easy to verify that the net effect of all this on the roots of \mathfrak{g} is to append a node representing α_k to \mathcal{D} as it represents the module \mathfrak{g}_{-1} : α_k is long and shares n edges with any node of \mathcal{D} labeled n . Identify \mathfrak{g}_{α_k} with the γ_1 weight space of \mathfrak{g}_1 and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha_k}$ with the λ_{-1} weight space of \mathfrak{g}_{-1} .

The Finite Algorithm defines $\mathfrak{g}_0 = \mathfrak{g} \oplus \mathbb{C}$. Identify \mathbb{C} with $\mathbb{C}d_k$ where $d_k \cdot x = tx$ for $x \in \mathfrak{g}_t$. Use Lemma 7 to extend the definition of $(\cdot, \cdot)|_{\mathfrak{h}}$ to all of $\mathfrak{h} := \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathbb{C}d_k$. Decree that d_k is orthogonal to $x \in \mathfrak{g}$ if $x \notin \mathfrak{h}$. Let $\nu : \mathfrak{h} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$ be the isomorphism determined by the nondegenerate form on \mathfrak{h} . Define $\Lambda_k := \nu(d_k)$, and $\alpha_k := \gamma_1 + (1/t_k)\Lambda_k = -\lambda_{-1} + (1/t_k)\Lambda_k$. The rest of the previous paragraph now applies without change.

We now have the elements necessary to define all the brackets on the graded pieces of \mathfrak{g} as in §3. The remainder of the discussion goes towards verifying that the α_k -extended \mathcal{D} actually describes \mathfrak{g} as a Lie algebra with those brackets.

6.1 Brackets

Let $[\cdot, \cdot] : \mathfrak{g}_{-1} \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1 \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_0$ be given by

$$[u_{-1} u] = - \sum_i (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot u) Y_i + \kappa(u_{-1}, u) \quad (11)$$

where in the affine case, $\kappa = (-1/a_k)K$ and in the finite case, $\kappa = (-1/t_k)d_k$. Defining the rest of the brackets as in §3, we must show that \mathcal{T}_1 is in the kernel of the bracket defined on $\Lambda^2 V = \Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}_1$ and, for $i > 2$, that \mathcal{T}_i is in the kernel of the bracket defined on $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_i$. We verify that the bracket maps $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_i$ onto \mathfrak{g}_{i+1} by producing a highest weight vector of \mathfrak{g}_{i+1} in terms of the bracket. Operators help advance these arguments.

Let $\{X_i\}$ and $\{Y_i\}$ be Killing dual bases of \mathfrak{g} . Define Φ on $\Lambda^2 \mathfrak{g}_1$ by $\Phi(u \wedge v) = \sum_i X_i \cdot v \wedge Y_i \cdot u$.

Proposition 7 *In the affine case, $\Phi|_{\mathcal{T}_1} \equiv 0$. In the finite case, $\Phi|_{\mathcal{T}_1} \equiv -1/t_k$.*

Proof We have $C \cdot (u \wedge v) = 2c_1(u \wedge v) + 2\Phi(u \wedge v)$. The result follows by Proposition 3. \square

We take $[u v] = \Phi(v \wedge u)$ in the affine case and in the finite case, $[u v] = \Phi(v \wedge u) + \frac{1}{t_k} v \wedge u$ (cf. Eqs. (3) and (4), §3.3.) Invoking Proposition 7 we get the following.

Theorem 6 *The bracket is identically zero on \mathcal{T}_1 . \square*

Lemma 35 *A highest weight vector of \mathfrak{g}_2 has the form $[v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+]$, the β_i s as given in Proposition 2.*

Proof In the affine case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
[v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+] &= - \sum_i X_i \cdot v^+ \wedge Y_i \cdot f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ \\
&= -(\lambda_1, \lambda_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) v^+ \wedge f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ + \sum v_\nu \wedge v_\mu \\
&= v^+ \wedge f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ + \sum v_\nu \wedge v_\mu
\end{aligned}$$

where v_ν and v_μ are weight vectors in \mathfrak{g}_1 with $\nu < \lambda_1$ and $\mu > \lambda_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3$. Note in particular that ν is always of the form $\lambda_1 - \alpha$ for a positive root α and $\mu = \lambda_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3 + \alpha$. Since $v^+ \wedge f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ \neq 0$, $[v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+] \neq 0$. As the component of $[v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+]$ in \mathcal{T}_1 is zero, $[v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+]$ belongs to \mathfrak{g}_2 and by weight considerations, the result follows.

In the finite case,

$$\begin{aligned}
[v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+] &= - \sum_i X_i \cdot v^+ \wedge Y_i \cdot f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ - \frac{1}{t_k} v^+ \wedge f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ = \\
&= - \left((\lambda_1, \lambda_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) + \frac{1}{t_k} \right) v^+ \wedge f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ + \sum v_\nu \wedge v_\mu = \\
&= \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_k} \right) v^+ \wedge f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+ + \sum v_\nu \wedge v_\mu.
\end{aligned}$$

For reasons cited above, this is nonzero and in \mathfrak{g}_2 when $t_k \neq 1$. Even if $t_k = 1$, though, it is clear that $f_{\beta_1} \cdot v^+ \wedge f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+$, a multiple of one of the $v_\nu \wedge v_\mu$ terms, is nonzero. The constant factor itself would be a nonzero multiple of $(\lambda_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3, \beta_1) = 1$. Thus in these cases as well, the result holds. \square

Lemma 36 For $u_{-1} \in \mathfrak{g}_{-1}$ and $v, w \in \mathfrak{g}_1$, we have, in the affine case

$$[u_{-1} [v w]] = \sum_i -(u_{-1}, X_i \cdot v) Y_i \cdot w + (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot w) Y_i \cdot v.$$

In the finite case,

$$[u_{-1} [v w]] = \sum_i -(u_{-1}, X_i \cdot v) Y_i \cdot w + (u_{-1}, X_i \cdot w) Y_i \cdot v - \frac{1}{t_k} (u_{-1}, v) w + \frac{1}{t_k} (u_{-1}, w) v.$$

Proof By the Jacobi identity we have

$$[u_{-1} [v w]] = [[u_{-1} v] w] + [v [u_{-1} w]] = [[u_{-1} v] w] - [[u_{-1} w] v].$$

The result then follows application of Eqs. (3), (4) from §3.3, along with Eq. (11). \square

For $t < j$, define Ψ on $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_t$ by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Psi(u \otimes [u_1 \dots u_t]) &= \sum_i X_i \cdot u \otimes Y_i \cdot [u_1 \dots u_t] + X_i \cdot u_2 \otimes [u_1 Y_i \cdot [u_3 \dots u_t]] + \\
&X_i \cdot u_3 \otimes [u_1 u_2 Y_i \cdot [u_4 \dots u_t]] + \dots + X_i \cdot u_{t-1} \otimes [u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i \cdot u_t] \\
&\quad - X_i \cdot u_t \otimes [u_1 \dots u_{t-2} Y_i \cdot u_{t-1}].
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 8 Ψ is \mathfrak{g} -equivariant.

Proof We can view Ψ as a sum of compositions of two kinds of mappings: (1) permutations on multivectors in $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_t \subset \mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1$; and (2) Casimir polarizations on multivectors, that is, mappings of the form

$$u \otimes u_1 \otimes \dots \otimes u_t \mapsto \sum_i u \otimes \dots \otimes u_{\ell-1} \otimes X_i \cdot u_\ell \otimes u_{\ell+1} \otimes \dots \otimes u_{m-1} \otimes Y_i \cdot u_m \otimes u_{m+1} \otimes \dots \otimes u_t.$$

This is a tedious but straightforward verification that one enacts starting with the observation that

$$\Psi(u_1 \otimes u_2) = \Phi(u_1 \wedge u_2) = \sum_i X_i \cdot u_1 \otimes Y_i \cdot u_2 - X_i \cdot u_2 \otimes Y_i \cdot u_1$$

can be realized as a composition of mappings

$$u_1 \otimes u_2 \mapsto u_1 \otimes u_2 - u_2 \otimes u_1$$

and

$$u_1 \otimes u_2 \mapsto \sum_i X_i \cdot u_1 \otimes Y_i \cdot u_2.$$

Both types of mappings are \mathfrak{g} -equivariant. The first is the difference between the identity and the usual action of the symmetric group on $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_1$. The second is $\frac{C}{2} - c_1$. Since C is \mathfrak{g} -equivariant, its polarization is as well. \square

It is convenient to think of Ψ as a sum of three operators so define

$$\Psi_1(u \otimes [u_1 \dots u_t]) = \sum_i X_i \cdot u \otimes Y_i \cdot [u_1 \dots u_t],$$

$$\Psi_2(u \otimes [u_1 \dots u_t]) = \sum_i X_i \cdot u_1 \otimes [u Y_i \cdot [u_2 \dots u_t]],$$

$$\Psi_3 = \Psi - \Psi_1 - \Psi_2.$$

The argument we advanced to support the claim that Ψ is \mathfrak{g} -equivariant applies to give us Ψ_1 , Ψ_2 and Ψ_3 \mathfrak{g} -equivariant as well.

Recall that $Y_{1,t}$ is the Cartan product of \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_t . Let $U_{1,t}$ be the submodule of $\mathfrak{g}_1 \otimes \mathfrak{g}_t$ with highest weights of the form $\lambda_1 + \lambda_t - \alpha$, $\alpha \in \Delta_+$.

We note the following.

Lemma 37 *In the affine case, $\Psi_1|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv 1$ and $\Psi_1|_{U_{1,t}} \equiv 1 - (\rho, \alpha)$. In the finite case, $\Psi_1|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv 1 - \frac{t}{t_k}$ and $\Psi_1|_{U_{1,t}} \equiv 1 - \frac{t}{t_k} - (\rho, \alpha)$.*

Proof It is clear that $\Psi_1 = \frac{C - (c_1 + c_t)}{2}$. The result then follows Corollary 2. \square

Let $w^+ = \sum v_\nu \otimes v_\mu$ be a highest weight vector of \mathfrak{g}_t , so that $v_\nu \in \mathfrak{g}_1$ and $v_\mu \in \mathfrak{g}_{t-1}$. Take $v_\nu \otimes v_\mu$ so that ν is highest among the weights of \mathfrak{g}_1 associated to w^+ .

Since $e_\alpha \cdot w^+ = 0$ for all positive root vectors $e_\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}$, it must be the case that $(e_\alpha \cdot v_\nu) \otimes v_\mu = 0$ for all α or that w^+ has a component of the form $v_{\nu+\alpha} \otimes v_{\mu-\alpha}$. The latter contradicts our choice of ν as maximal so $e_\alpha \cdot v_\nu \otimes v_\mu = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta_+^k$ implies w^+ has a component of the form $v^+ \otimes v_\mu$.

Proposition 9 *If $s \leq j$, a highest weight vector for \mathfrak{g}_s has the form*

$$v_s^+ = \overbrace{[v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+]}^{s \text{ terms}} \quad (12)$$

where $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}, \dots, \{\nu_1, \nu_2\}, \{\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3\}$ are sets of positive roots as in Proposition 2. Moreover, for $v_\nu \in \mathfrak{g}_1$, and $v_\mu \in \mathfrak{g}_{t-1}$, $[v_\nu v_\mu] = 0$ when $\nu + \mu > \lambda_s$. In particular, the bracket projects $v_\nu \otimes v_\mu$ into \mathfrak{g}_s .

We prove the result by induction. The case $s = 2$ was done in Lemma 35. The next sequence of lemmas follow the assumption that the proposition is true for all $s \leq t$. At the end of those lemmas, we will have a proof of the proposition.

Lemma 38 *In the affine case, $\Psi_2|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv -1$. In the finite case, $\Psi_2|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv -1 - \frac{t-1}{t_k}$.*

Proof A highest weight vector of $Y_{1,t}$ has the form

$$v^+ \otimes [v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_3} \cdot v^+]$$

which we write $v^+ \otimes [v^+ u]$. Note that $u \in \mathfrak{g}_{t-1}$.

We have

$$\Psi_2(v^+ \otimes [v^+ u]) = \sum_i X_i \cdot v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i \cdot u]. \quad (13)$$

Terms of (13) associated to X_i from positive root spaces are zero because $X_i \cdot v^+ = 0$. Terms associated to Y_i from positive root spaces are also zero because then $[v^+ Y_i \cdot u]$ has a higher weight than the highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_t . Thus the nonzero terms in (13) are contributed from the part of $\{X_i\}$ and $\{Y_i\}$ that comprise dual bases of \mathfrak{h}^k . Invoking Corollary 2, we get, in the affine case,

$$\Psi_2(v^+ \otimes [v^+ u]) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_t - \lambda_1)v^+ \otimes [v^+ u] = -v^+ \otimes [v^+ u].$$

In the finite case, we have

$$\Psi_2(v^+ \otimes [v^+ u]) = (\lambda_1, \lambda_t - \lambda_1)v^+ \otimes [v^+ u] = \left(-1 - \frac{t-1}{t_k}\right)v^+ \otimes [v^+ u]. \square$$

Lemma 39 *In the affine case, $\Psi|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv 0$.*

Proof We have $(\Psi_1 + \Psi_2)|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv 0$ in the affine case so it remains to show that $\Psi_3|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv 0$.

Let $v_t^+ = [v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2} \cdot v^+]$ be a highest weight vector for \mathfrak{g}_t . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_3(v^+ \otimes v_t^+) &= \sum_i X_i \cdot f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \otimes [v^+ v^+ Y_i \cdot [f_{\xi_1} f_{\xi_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2} \cdot v^+]] + \dots \\ &\quad - X_i \cdot f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2} \cdot v^+ \otimes [v^+ v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots Y_i \cdot f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+]. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

According to Proposition 2, λ_{t-1} has the form $(t-1)\lambda_1$ less $2t-3$ positive roots. Consider that terms of \mathfrak{g}_{t-1} appearing in (14) with the form

$$[v^+ v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots Y_i \cdot [f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2} \cdot v^+]]$$

are brackets of $t-1$ vectors from \mathfrak{g}_1 . The lowest weight that could be associated to such a term has the form $(t-1)\lambda_1$ less $2(t-3) + 1 + 1 = 2t-4$ positive roots. Any such weight is strictly greater than λ_{t-1} . By assumption, these brackets must all be zero, which proves the lemma. \square

Comparing to Eq. (3) in §3.3, we see that the bracket is zero on $Y_{1,t}$.

Lemma 40 *In the finite case, $\Psi|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv -\frac{(2t-1)}{t_k}$.*

Proof The proof that $\Psi_3|_{Y_{1,t}} \equiv 0$ in the affine case applies here without modification. Lemmas 37 and 38 then apply to give us the result. \square

Comparing to Eq. (4) in §3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &[v^+ v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2} \cdot v^+] := \\ &-\Psi(v^+ \otimes [v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2} \cdot v^+]) - \\ &\frac{2t-1}{t_k} [v^+ v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2} \cdot v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2} \cdot v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2} \cdot v^+] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Note that, by assumption, all the other terms of Eq. (4) are zero: they involve brackets associated to weights that are too high, as in the proof of Lemma 39.

Lemma 41 *In the affine case, $\Psi_2|_{U_{1,t}} \equiv (\rho, \alpha) - 1$.*

Proof We start by establishing that highest weight vectors in $U_{1,t}$ can take a certain form. Choose $\alpha \in \overset{k}{\Delta}_+$ with minimal height so that $f_\alpha \cdot v^+$ and $f_\alpha \cdot v_t^+$ are both nonzero, $v_t^+ = [v^+ u]$ a highest weight vector of \mathfrak{g}_t . Let $w_Y \in Y_{1,t}$ and $w_U \in U_{1,t}$ satisfy

$$f_\alpha \cdot v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] = w_Y + w_U.$$

By weight considerations, w_U is a highest weight vector of $U_{1,t}$, thus generates an irreducible submodule of $U_{1,t}$. We assume that $U_{1,t}$ is itself irreducible as doing so does not change our argument materially. We have

$$\Psi_1(f_\alpha \cdot v^+ \otimes v_t^+) = \sum_i X_i \cdot f_\alpha \cdot v^+ \otimes [Y_i \cdot v^+ w] + X_i \cdot f_\alpha \cdot v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i \cdot w].$$

Consider terms of the form

$$X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [Y_i.v^+ w]. \quad (15)$$

Such an expression is nonzero only when X_i is from \mathfrak{h}^k or a positive root space: when X_i is from a negative root space, $Y_i.v^+ = 0$. If $\{H_i\}$ and $\{H'_i\}$ are dual bases of \mathfrak{h}^k we have

$$\sum_i H_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [H'_i.v^+ w] = (\lambda_1, \lambda_1 - \alpha)f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] = f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w].$$

Recall next that there is only one simple root α_i (per simple component of \mathfrak{g}^k) that satisfies $f_{\alpha_i}.v^+ \neq 0$. Moreover, the root α appearing in (15) has minimal height with $f_\alpha.v^+$ and $f_\alpha.[v^+ w]$ both nonzero. In particular, α_i must be in the support of α , but with multiplicity one.

If X_i is from a positive root space, $X_i.f_\alpha.v^+$ is zero when the positive root associated to X_i has α_i in support, unless X_i is associated to α itself. We lose no generality in assuming f_α is among the Y_i basis vectors. The nonzero terms in (15) then reduce to

$$f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] + v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w].$$

This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_1(f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w]) &= f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] + v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] + \\ &\sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w] = (1 - (\rho, \alpha))w_U + w_Y. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$-(\rho, \alpha)w_U = v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] + \sum_i X_i.v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ Y_i.w].$$

If we take

$$v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] = v_U + v_Y,$$

where $v_U \in U_{1,t}$ and $v_Y \in Y_{1,t}$, we can apply Ψ_1 to show that

$$-(\rho, \alpha)v_U = f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] + \sum_i X_i.v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ Y_i.w].$$

Let κ be the scalar value of Ψ_2 on $U_{1,t}$. We have

$$\Psi_2(w_U + w_Y) = \kappa w_U - w_Y = \sum_i X_i.v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ Y_i.w]$$

and

$$\Psi_2(v_U + v_Y) = \kappa v_U - v_Y = \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w].$$

Then $-(\rho, \alpha)v_U = (\kappa + 1)w_U$ and $-(\rho, \alpha)w_U = (\kappa + 1)v_U$ imply that $\kappa + 1 = \pm(\rho, \alpha)$, or, equivalently, that $w_U = \mp v_U$. Suppose $w_U = v_U$. We then have

$$z = w_U + w_Y - (v_U + v_Y) = f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] - v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] \in Y_{1,t}.$$

Note that $e_i.[v^+ w] = [v^+ e_i.w] = 0$ for any positive root vector $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}^k$, by assumption. Suppose α is simple. Then $e_i.z = 0$ for all e_i so z , a weight vector with weight $\lambda_1 + \lambda_t - \alpha$, is a highest weight vector of $Y_{1,t}$. That is impossible since $Y_{1,t}$ is irreducible with highest weight $\lambda_1 + \lambda_t$. If α is not simple, choose a positive root vector $e_i \in \mathfrak{g}^k$ so that $e_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \neq 0$. Let $[e_i f_\alpha] = f_\gamma$ and note that the height of γ is less than the height of α . We have

$$e_i.z = f_\gamma.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] - v^+ \otimes [f_\gamma.v^+ w] \in Y_{1,t}.$$

Repeating the procedure as necessary, we get a highest weight vector in $Y_{1,t}$ associated to a weight strictly less than $\lambda_1 + \lambda_t$, a contradiction. Our conclusion is that $w_U = -v_U$, and $\kappa = (\rho, \alpha) - 1$. \square

Lemma 42 *In the finite case, $\Psi_2|_{U_{1,t}} \equiv (\rho, \alpha) - \frac{t-1}{t_k} - 1$.*

Proof As above, we take $f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] = w_U + w_Y$. On the one hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_1(f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w]) &= \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes Y_i.[v^+ w] = \\ &(\lambda_1 - \alpha, \lambda_1)f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] + v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] + \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w] = \\ &\left(1 - \frac{1}{t_k}\right) f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] + v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] + \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w]. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\Psi_1(f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w]) = \Psi_1(w_U) + \Psi_1(w_Y) = \left(1 - \frac{t}{t_k} - (\rho, \alpha)\right) w_U + \left(1 - \frac{t}{t_k}\right) w_Y.$$

Subtract

$$\left(1 - \frac{t}{t_k}\right) f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] = \left(1 - \frac{t}{t_k}\right) (w_U + w_Y)$$

from both expressions to get

$$-(\rho, \alpha)w_U = \left(\frac{t-1}{t_k}\right) f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] + v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] + \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w]. \quad (16)$$

Applying the same calculations to $w_U + w_Y = v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w]$ we get

$$-(\rho, \alpha)v_U = \left(\frac{t-1}{t_k}\right) v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] + f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] + \sum_i X_i.v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ Y_i.w]. \quad (17)$$

Let τ be the scalar value of Ψ_2 on $U_{1,t}$, assuming $U_{1,t}$ is irreducible. We have

$$\Psi_2(w_U + w_Y) = \tau w_U + \left(-1 - \frac{t-1}{t_k}\right) w_Y = \sum_i X_i \cdot v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha \cdot v^+ Y_i \cdot w],$$

and

$$\Psi_2(v_U + v_Y) = \tau v_U + \left(-1 - \frac{t-1}{t_k}\right) v_Y = \sum_i X_i \cdot f_\alpha \cdot v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i \cdot w].$$

Rewrite (16) to get

$$-(\rho, \alpha) w_U = \frac{t-1}{t_k} (w_U + w_Y) + (v_U + v_Y) + \left(-1 - \frac{t-1}{t_k}\right) v_Y + \tau v_U.$$

This gives us

$$\left(-(\rho, \alpha) + \frac{1-t}{t_k}\right) w_U = (1+\tau) v_U + \frac{t-1}{t_k} (w_Y - v_Y).$$

Since $t > 1$, $w_Y - v_Y = 0$ giving us

$$\left(-(\rho, \alpha) + \frac{1-t}{t_k}\right) w_U = (1+\tau) v_U.$$

The same trick applied to (17) gives us

$$\left(-(\rho, \alpha) + \frac{1-t}{t_k}\right) v_U = (1+\tau) w_U,$$

which implies

$$\left(-(\rho, \alpha) + \frac{1-t}{t_k}\right)^2 = (1+\tau)^2.$$

Then $\left(-(\rho, \alpha) + \frac{1-t}{t_k}\right) = \pm(1+\tau)$, or equivalently, $w_U = \pm v_U$. We established that $w_Y = v_Y$, though, so if $w_U = v_U$, we have $f_\alpha \cdot v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] = v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha \cdot v^+ w]$, which is absurd. We conclude that

$$\left(-(\rho, \alpha) + \frac{1-t}{t_k}\right) = -(1+\tau)$$

giving us $\tau = (\rho, \alpha) + \frac{t-1}{t_k} - 1$, as desired. \square

Lemma 43 *In both the affine and finite cases, $\Psi_3|_{U_{1,t}} \equiv 0$.*

Proof We do the proof for the affine case; there is no significant difference in the finite case.

We have

$$f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] = w_Y + w_U = w_Y - \frac{1}{(\rho, \alpha)} v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] - \frac{1}{(\rho, \alpha)} \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w]. \quad (18)$$

This is for a positive root α so that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_t - \alpha$ is a highest weight of $U_{1,t}$.

We know that Ψ_3 is homothetic on an irreducible component of $U_{1,t}$. As before, we lose no generality assuming that $U_{1,t}$ is irreducible. Say that $\Psi_3|_{U_{1,t}} \equiv \tau$. As per Proposition 9, take

$$[v^+ w] = [v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2}.v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2}.v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2}.v^+].$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi_3(f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w]) = \\ & \sum_i X_i.f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2}.v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ v^+ Y_i.[f_{\xi_1} f_{\xi_2}.v^+ \dots f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2}.v^+ f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2}.v^+]] + \dots \\ & + X_i.f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2}.v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2}.v^+ \dots f_{\zeta_1} f_{\zeta_2}.v^+ Y_i.f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2}.v^+] \\ & - X_i.f_{\beta_1} f_{\beta_2} f_{\beta_2}.v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ v^+ f_{\gamma_1} f_{\gamma_2}.v^+ \dots f_{\zeta_1} f_{\zeta_2}.v^+ Y_i.f_{\nu_1} f_{\nu_2}.v^+] \\ & = -\frac{\tau}{(\rho, \alpha)} v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] - \frac{\tau}{(\rho, \alpha)} \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w]. \quad (19) \end{aligned}$$

If the expression on the right side of the last equal sign in Eq. (19) does not include a nonzero multiple component of $v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w]$, then some $X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w] = -v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w]$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $v^+ \otimes [v^+ f_\alpha.w] = -v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w]$. In this case,

$$f_\alpha.(v^+ \otimes [v^+ w]) = f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ w] \in Y_{1,t}.$$

Comparing to (18), we are forced to conclude that

$$v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w] + \sum_i X_i.f_\alpha.v^+ \otimes [v^+ Y_i.w] = 0,$$

which is impossible unless $U_{1,t}$ is itself zero.

If $U_{1,t}$ is not zero, the expression on the right side of the equal sign in Eq. (19) includes a nonzero multiple of $v^+ \otimes [f_\alpha.v^+ w]$ but the left side does not, as terms on the left side are all of the form $v_\nu \otimes v_\mu$, $v_\nu \in \mathfrak{g}_1$ with ν no greater than λ_1 less one positive root of \mathfrak{g} . We conclude that $\tau = 0$. \square

Lemma 44 *In the finite case, $\Psi|_{U_{1,t}} \equiv \frac{-1}{t_k}$.*

Proof The proof follows the lemmas. \square

If we define the bracket in the affine case to be Ψ and in the finite case to be $\Psi + \frac{1}{t_k}$, then it is identically zero on \mathcal{T}_t . Proposition 9 now follows by a weight argument applied to terms of the form (12). This proves that the algorithms actually produce Lie algebras that enjoy the structure determined by \mathcal{D}^k as extended by α_k , which completes the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2.

References

- [1] Bourbaki, N., “Groupes et algèbres de Lie”, Hermann, Paris, 1968.
- [2] Dillon, M. I., Weight strings in nonstandard representations of Kac-Moody algebras, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **320** (1990), 161 – 169.
- [3] Gorbatsevich, V. V., A. L. Onishchik, and E. B. Vinberg, Lie groups and Lie algebras III: Structure of Lie groups and Lie algebras, *Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences Volume 41*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994.
- [4] Humphreys, J. E., “Introduction to Lie algebras and Representation Theory,” Springer-Verlag, New York, 1972.
- [5] Kac, V. G., “Infinite dimensional Lie algebras, Third Edition,” Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [6] Kostant, B., A cubic Dirac operator and the emergence of Euler number multiplets of representations for equal rank subgroups, *Duke Math. J.* **100** (1999), 447 – 501.
- [7] Landsberg, J. M., and L. Manivel, Construction and classification of complex simple Lie algebras via projective geometry, *Selecta Mathematica* **8** (2002), 137 – 159.
- [8] Magyar, Peter, Littelmann paths for the basic representation of an affine Lie algebra, preprint, 2003.
- [9] van Leeuwen, Marc, *LiE: A Computer algebra package for Lie group computations*, <http://young.sp2mi.univ-poitiers.fr/~marc/LiE/>

Meighan I. Dillon
Mathematics
Southern Polytechnic State University
1100 S. Marietta Pkwy, Marietta, GA 30060
mdillon@spsu.edu