

► Proof of Lemma 5 from last time

- First, we note that  $q \neq \pm 1 \Rightarrow$  the sum of  $M_{\lambda, \mathfrak{s}}$  is indeed a direct sum.
- Second, the equalities  $K_{\mu} E_{\alpha} K_{\mu}^{-1} = q^{(\mu, \alpha)} E_{\alpha}$ ,  $K_{\mu} F_{\alpha} K_{\mu}^{-1} = q^{-(\mu, \alpha)} F_{\alpha}$  imply part (b)
- To prove (c), note that  $M$  becomes an  $U_{q_{\alpha}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -module via the homom.  $\tau_{\alpha}: U_{q_{\alpha}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ . On the other hand, it was proved in [Lecture 5, Lemma 2] that  $E, F$  act nilpotently on any fin. dim.  $U_{q_{\alpha}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -module, hence, (c).
- Likewise, using  $\tau_{\alpha}$  and appealing to [Lecture 5, Lemma 3], the action of each  $K_{\alpha}$  ( $\alpha \in \Pi$ ) is diagonalizable in  $M$ . As  $\{K_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$  pair-wise commute, we can diagonalize all of them simultaneously on  $M$ .

If  $m \in M$  is a common eigenvector for all  $K_{\alpha}$  ( $\alpha \in \Pi$ ), then  $\exists \epsilon_{\alpha} \in \{\pm 1\}$ ,  $a_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}$ , s.t.  $K_{\alpha}(m) = \epsilon_{\alpha} \cdot q^{\alpha a_{\alpha}} \cdot m \ \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ . Set  $\lambda := \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} a_{\alpha} \cdot \omega_{\alpha}$  ( $\omega_{\alpha}$  - fund. weight),  $\mathfrak{s}$  determined via  $\mathfrak{s}(\alpha) = \epsilon_{\alpha}$ . As  $(\lambda, \alpha) = a_{\alpha} \cdot \alpha \Rightarrow q^{(\lambda, \alpha)} = q^{\alpha a_{\alpha}}$ , we see that  $m \in M_{\lambda, \mathfrak{s}}$ .

From now, we assume  $\text{char}(k) \neq 2$

Corollary: Given a fin. dim.  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module  $M$ , it splits into a direct sum  $M = \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{s}} M^{\mathfrak{s}}$  over all homom.  $\mathfrak{s}: \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \{\pm 1\}$ , where  $M^{\mathfrak{s}} := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{P}} M_{\lambda, \mathfrak{s}}$ .

Def:  $M$  is of type  $\mathfrak{s}$  if  $M = M^{\mathfrak{s}}$ .

- Prop: (1) The category of fin. dim.  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules is the direct sum (over all  $\mathfrak{s}$ ) of the categories of fin. dim.  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules of type  $\mathfrak{s}$ .
- (2) Twisting a repr. of type  $\mathbb{1}$  (i.e.  $\mathfrak{s}(\alpha) = 1 \ \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}$ ) by an algebra automorphism  $\mathfrak{S}$  of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  given by  $E_{\alpha} \mapsto \mathfrak{S}(\alpha) E_{\alpha}$ ,  $F_{\alpha} \mapsto F_{\alpha}$ ,  $K_{\alpha} \mapsto \mathfrak{S}(\alpha) K_{\alpha}$  yields an equivalence of categories b/w the category of all fin. dim.  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules of type  $\mathbb{1}$  and those of type  $\mathfrak{s}$ .
- (3) For any  $\lambda, \lambda', \mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{s}'$ , we have  $M_{\lambda, \mathfrak{s}} \otimes N_{\lambda', \mathfrak{s}'} \subset (M \otimes N)_{\lambda+\lambda', \mathfrak{s}\mathfrak{s}'}$ . In particular, if  $M, N$  -  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules of type  $\mathbb{1}$ , then  $M \otimes N$  is also an  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -mod. of type  $\mathbb{1}$ .
- (4) All 1-dim  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules are parametrized by  $\mathfrak{s}$  as above, let  $L(0, \mathfrak{s})$  denote the corr. module. Then  $\mathfrak{S}$ -twist of a type  $\mathbb{1}$  module  $M$  is isomorphic to  $L(0, \mathfrak{s}) \otimes M$ .
- (5) If  $M$  is of type  $\mathfrak{s}$ , then its dual  $M^*$  is also of type  $\mathfrak{s}$ , since  $(M^*)_{\lambda, \mathfrak{s}} = (M_{-\lambda, \mathfrak{s}})^*$ .

! From now on, we will be working only with type 1 fin. dim.  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -mods. (according to the previous Rmk, we do not lose any essential information).

Set  $M_\lambda := M_{\lambda,1}$ , so that  $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in P} M_\lambda$ .

Lemma 1: Let  $M$  be a fin. dim.  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module,  $M \neq 0$ .

(a)  $\exists \lambda \in P, m \in M_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$  s.t.  $E_\alpha(m) = 0 \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ .

(b) Let  $\lambda \in P, m \in M_\lambda \setminus \{0\}$ , s.t.  $E_\alpha(m) = 0 \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ . Then  $\lambda$  is a dominant weight.

Moreover,  $F_\alpha^{a(\alpha)+1}(m) = 0 \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ , where  $a(\alpha) := \frac{2(\lambda, \alpha)}{(\alpha, \alpha)}$ .

► (a) As  $M = \bigoplus_{\lambda} M_\lambda$ ,  $\dim M < \infty \Rightarrow \exists \lambda$  s.t.  $M_\lambda \neq 0, M_{\lambda'} = 0 \forall \lambda' > \lambda$ . Hence  $E_\alpha M_\lambda \subset M_{\lambda+\alpha} = 0$ .

(b) Consider  $M$  as a  $U_{q_\alpha}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -module (via  $\tau_\alpha: U_{q_\alpha}(\mathfrak{sl}_2) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ ).

Know:  $E_\alpha(m) = 0, K_\alpha(m) = q^{(2, \alpha)} \cdot m = q^{d_\alpha \cdot a(\alpha)} \cdot m = q_\alpha^{a(\alpha)} \cdot m$

Hence, the  $U_{q_\alpha}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -submodule of  $M$  generated by  $m$  is an image (under  $U_{q_\alpha}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -morphism) of the  $U_{q_\alpha}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -Verma module  $M(q_\alpha^{a(\alpha)})$ , but also is fin. dim. Therefore, due to [Lecture 7, Lemma 1],  $a(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  and this submodule is isomorphic to  $L(a(\alpha), +)$ . But the structure of the latter also implies  $F_\alpha^{a(\alpha)+1}(m) = 0$ . ■

Similarly to the classical case and the case of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  an important role is played by the Verma modules. Fix  $\lambda \in P$  and consider the 1-dim  $U_q^-$ -module  $k_\lambda$ , where each  $E_\alpha$  acts by 0, while  $K_\alpha$  acts as multiplication by  $q^{(2, \alpha)}$ .

Def: The  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -Verma-module of highest weight  $\lambda \in P$  is defined as

$$M(\lambda) := \text{Ind}_{U_q^-}^{U_q(\mathfrak{g})}(k_\lambda)$$

Explicitly,  $M(\lambda) = U_q(\mathfrak{g})/I_\lambda$ , where  $I_\lambda$  is the left ideal of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  generated by  $\{E_\alpha, K_\alpha - q^{(2, \alpha)}\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$ . Denote the coset of 1 by  $v_\lambda$ . Then  $E_\alpha(v_\lambda) = 0, K_\alpha(v_\lambda) = q^{(2, \alpha)} \cdot v_\lambda \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ .

As always,  $M(\lambda)$  has the following UP (universal property):

Lemma 2: If  $M$  is an  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module and  $m \in M_\lambda$  s.t.  $E_\alpha(m) = 0 \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ , then there is a unique  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -morphism  $M(\lambda) \rightarrow M$  s.t.  $v_\lambda \mapsto m$ .

► Obvious. ■

Rmk: Due to the triangular decomposition of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ , the map  $U_q^- \rightarrow M(\lambda)$  given by  $x \mapsto x(v_\lambda)$  is an isomorphism of vector spaces. In particular,  $(M(\lambda))_{\lambda - n\alpha} = k \cdot F_\alpha^n(v_\lambda) \forall \alpha \in \Pi, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$

As in the classical case,  $M(\lambda)$  admits a unique maximal submodule ( $\neq M(\lambda)$ ) and therefore  $M(\lambda)$  has a unique simple factor module, denoted  $L(\lambda)$ .

The following is a  $q$ -counterpart of the classical result:

Thm 1: For each dominant  $\lambda \in P$  (i.e.  $(\lambda, \alpha) \geq 0 \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ ), the simple  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module  $L(\lambda)$  is finite-dimensional. Vice-versa, each fin. dim. simple  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module is isomorphic to exactly one  $L(\lambda)$  with  $\lambda \in P$ -dominant.

The proof is based on the following few results.

Lemma 3: Let  $\lambda \in P, \alpha \in \Pi$  satisfy  $(\lambda, \alpha) \geq 0$ , set  $n := \frac{2(\lambda, \alpha)}{(\alpha, \alpha)} = \frac{(\lambda, \alpha)}{\alpha}$ .

There is a homom. of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules  $\varphi: M(\lambda - (n+1)\alpha) \rightarrow M(\lambda)$   

$$\downarrow \quad \downarrow$$

$$U_{\lambda - (n+1)\alpha} \longrightarrow F_{\alpha}^{n+1}(U_{\lambda})$$

Clearly  $F_{\alpha}^{n+1}(v_{\lambda}) \in M(\lambda)_{\lambda - (n+1)\alpha}$ . Hence, due to UP of Verma modules, it suffices to show  $E_{\beta}(F_{\alpha}^{n+1}(v_{\lambda})) = 0 \forall \beta \in \Pi$ . If  $\beta \neq \alpha$ , then  $E_{\beta}F_{\alpha} = F_{\alpha}E_{\beta} \Rightarrow E_{\beta}F_{\alpha}^{n+1}v_{\lambda} = F_{\alpha}^{n+1}E_{\beta}v_{\lambda} = 0$ .

On the other hand, for  $\beta = \alpha$  we will apply the equality

$$E_{\alpha}F_{\alpha}^{n+1} = F_{\alpha}^{n+1}E_{\alpha} + [n+1]_{\alpha} \cdot F_{\alpha}^n \cdot [K_{\alpha}; -n]$$

together with  $E_{\alpha}(v_{\lambda}) = [K_{\alpha}; -n](v_{\lambda}) = 0$ .

Alternatively, for  $\beta = \alpha$ , one can appeal to the case of  $U_{q_{\alpha}}(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$  treated before.

Def: An operator  $A: V \rightarrow V$  is locally nilpotent if  $\forall v \in V \exists n \in \mathbb{N}$  s.t.  $A^n(v) = 0$ .

Lemma 4: Let  $V$  be a  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -module s.t.  $V = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n$  with  $V_n = \{v \in V \mid K(v) = q^n \cdot v\}$ .

Suppose  $E, F$  act locally nilpotently on  $V$  and  $\dim V_n < \infty \forall n$ .

Then  $V$  is fin. dim. and  $\dim V_n = \dim V_{-n} \forall n$ .

The proof is by induction on  $\dim V_0 + \dim V_{\pm 1}$ .

Pick  $l \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $w \in V_l \setminus \{0\}$ . As  $E$  acts nilpotently  $\exists r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$  s.t.  $E^{r-1}(w) \neq 0, E^r(w) = 0$ .

Set  $v := E^{r-1}(w)$ , so that  $E(v) = 0$  and  $v \in V_{n = l + 2(r-1)}$ . Hence, the submodule  $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)(v)$

is an image of  $M(q^n)$ . However,  $F^{\gg 0}(v) = 0 \Rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)(v) \cong L(n, +)$ . But  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ :

$\dim L(n, +)_0 + \dim L(n, +)_1 = 1$ . Hence, the induction can be applied to the factor module  $V' := V / U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)(v)$ . The last equality follows from  $\dim L(n, +)_a = \dim L(n, +)_{-a}$ .

Lemma 5: Let  $\lambda \in P$ . Choose  $m(\alpha), n(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ . Let  $I$  be the left ideal

of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  generated by  $\{E_{\alpha}^{m(\alpha)}, F_{\alpha}^{n(\alpha)}, K_{\alpha} - q^{(\lambda, \alpha)}\}$ . Then all

$\{E_{\alpha}, F_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in \Pi}$  act locally nilpotently on the  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})/I$ .

Exercise: Prove Lemma 5.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.

► (Proof of Theorem 1)

• If  $M$  is a fin. dim. simple  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, then by Lemma 1(a)  $\exists \lambda \in \mathcal{P}, m \in M, \forall 0 \neq v \in M$  s.t.  $E_\alpha(v) = 0 \ \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ . By UP of Verma modules, there is a  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -morphism  $M(\lambda) \rightarrow M$  sending  $v_\lambda \mapsto m$ . Since  $M$  is simple, we have  $M \cong L(\lambda)$ . Moreover,  $\lambda$  is unique as it is the maximal weight. But due to Lemma 1(b),  $\lambda$ -dominant

This completes the proof of a simple half of Thm 1.

• Let us now pick a dominant  $\lambda \in \mathcal{P}$  and consider the correspondingly simple  $L(\lambda)$ . Set  $n(\alpha) := \frac{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} = \frac{2\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} \ \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ . According to Lemma 3, we have  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -morphisms

$\varphi_\alpha: M(\lambda - (n(\alpha)+1)\alpha) \rightarrow M_\lambda$ , sending  $v_{\lambda - (n(\alpha)+1)\alpha} \mapsto F_\alpha^{n(\alpha)+1}(v_\lambda)$ . Hence, the result follows from the following claim:

CLAIM: The  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module  $\tilde{L}(\lambda) := M(\lambda) / \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \text{Im}(\varphi_\alpha)$  is finite dimensional.

To prove this claim, we note first that

$$\tilde{L}(\lambda) \cong U_q(\mathfrak{g}) / \left( \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} U_q(\mathfrak{g}) \cdot E_\alpha + \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} U_q(\mathfrak{g}) F_\alpha^{n(\alpha)+1} + \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} U_q(\mathfrak{g}) (K_\alpha - q^{\langle \lambda, \alpha \rangle}) \right)$$

According to Lemma 5, all  $\{E_\alpha, F_\alpha\}$  act loc. nilpotently on  $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$ . The rest of the argument will be parallel to the classical setup, i.e. we will verify that the set of weights of  $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$  is  $W$ -stable ( $W = \text{Weyl gp}$ ). This would imply  $\dim \tilde{L}(\lambda) < \infty$ , since each  $W$ -orbit contains a dominant weight, the number of dominant weights less or equal to  $\lambda$  is finite, and all weight spaces are f.d.

It suffices to show that if  $\tilde{L}(\lambda)_\mu \neq 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{L}(\lambda)_{s_\alpha(\mu)} \neq 0$  (recall that for  $\alpha \in \Pi, \mu \in \mathcal{P}$ :  $s_\alpha(\mu) = \mu - \frac{2\langle \mu, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle} \alpha$ )

Consider  $V := \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \tilde{L}(\lambda)_{\mu+n\alpha}$ . Viewing  $U_{q_\alpha}(sl_2) \curvearrowright \tilde{L}(\lambda)$  via  $\tau_\alpha: U_{q_\alpha}(sl_2) \rightarrow U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ ,  $V$  is a  $U_{q_\alpha}(sl_2)$ -submodule. Moreover, by above  $E, F$  act loc. nilpotently on  $V$ , while  $V = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} V_m$  with  $V_m = \tilde{L}(\lambda)_{\mu+n\alpha}$  for  $m = 2n + \frac{2\langle \mu, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$ . Therefore, we are in the setup of Lemma 4  $\Rightarrow \dim V_\tau = \dim V_{-\tau}$ .

Set  $\tau := \frac{2\langle \mu, \alpha \rangle}{\langle \alpha, \alpha \rangle}$  so that  $V_\tau \neq 0 \Rightarrow V_{-\tau} \neq 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{L}(\lambda)_{s_\alpha(\mu)} \neq 0$ .

This completes the proof of Claim, hence, also Thm 1. ■

Cor: For any f.d.  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module  $M$ ,  $\dim M_\mu = \dim M_{w(\mu)} \ \forall \mu \in \mathcal{P}, w \in W$ .

Remark: Next time we will see that  $\tilde{L}(\lambda) \cong L(\lambda)$ .

The following result is quite useful in applications.

Thm 2: Let  $u \in \mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  be an element acting trivially on all fin. dim.  $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -reps.  
Then  $u=0$ .

• Recall the  $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules  $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$  from the proof of Thm 1 for every dominant  $\lambda \in P$ . That is  $\tilde{L}(\lambda) = M(\lambda) / \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} \text{dm}(\varphi_\alpha)$ . Note that while for every  $\nu \in Q_+$ , the natural map (given by an action on the image of  $v_\lambda$ )  $(\mathcal{U}_q^-)_{-\nu} \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\lambda)_{\lambda-\nu}$  is surjective, it is also injective for "small enough"  $\nu$ . To be precise, let us write  $\lambda = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} n_\alpha \cdot \alpha$  ( $n_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ),  $\nu = \sum_{\alpha \in \Pi} m_\alpha \cdot \alpha$  ( $m_\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ ), in particular,  $n_\alpha$  is consistent with  $n$  from Lemma 3, which was picked to construct embeddings  $\varphi_\alpha: M(\lambda - (n+1)\alpha) \rightarrow M(\lambda)$ . Thus, if  $0 \leq m_\alpha \leq n_\alpha \forall \alpha \in \Pi$  then  $(\sum_{\alpha} \text{dm}(\varphi_\alpha))_{\lambda-\nu} = 0 \Rightarrow$  the map  $(\mathcal{U}_q^-)_{-\nu} \rightarrow \tilde{L}(\lambda)_{\lambda-\nu}$  is isom. of vector spaces.

• We also have "Cartan twisted" modules  $\tilde{L}(\lambda)^\omega$ , obtained from  $\tilde{L}(\lambda)$  via a twist by the Cartan involution. In particular, the vector  $v_{\lambda'}$  (we put ' to distinguish) of  $\tilde{L}(\lambda)^\omega$  satisfies  $F_\alpha(v_{\lambda'}) = 0 \forall \alpha \in \Pi$ ,  $K_\mu(v_{\lambda'}) = q^{-\langle \mu, \lambda \rangle} \cdot v_{\lambda'} \forall \mu \in Q$ . Due to the above observation, the map  $(\mathcal{U}_q^+)_{\nu} \rightarrow (\tilde{L}(\lambda)^\omega)_{\lambda+\nu}$  is isom. if  $\nu = \sum_{\alpha} m_\alpha \cdot \alpha$  with  $0 \leq m_\alpha \leq n_\alpha$ .

Similarly to the proof of triangular decomp. for  $\bar{\mathcal{U}}_q(\mathfrak{g})$  [Lecture 10, Thm 3], we are gonna consider  $\mathcal{U}_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -action on  $\tilde{L}(\lambda) \otimes \tilde{L}(\lambda')$ , which is fin. dim. We shall see that if  $u(v_\lambda \otimes v_{\lambda'}) = 0 \forall \lambda, \lambda'$ -dominant, then  $u$  must be zero.

• Write  $u$  in the form  $u = \sum_{i,j,\mu} a_{j,\mu,i} \cdot y_j \cdot K_\mu \cdot x_i$ , where  $\{x_i\}$  - basis of  $\mathcal{U}_q^+$   
We will refer to weights of  $x_i, y_j$  by  $\text{wt}(i), -\text{wt}(j)$ .  
 $\{y_j\}$  - basis of  $\mathcal{U}_q^-$

Pick  $\nu \in Q$  such that  $\exists i, j, \mu$  with  $\text{wt}(i) = \nu$ ,  $a_{j,\mu,i} \neq 0$ , and  $\nu$  being maximal with this property.  
Note that  $\Delta(x_i) = K_{\text{wt}(i)} \otimes x_i +$  (some other terms belonging to  $(\mathcal{U}_q^+)_{>0} \otimes \mathcal{U}_q^+$ )

$\Rightarrow x_i(v_\lambda \otimes v_{\lambda'}) = q^{(\text{wt}(i), \lambda)} \cdot v_\lambda \otimes x_i(v_{\lambda'})$  these els act trivially on  $v_\lambda \otimes v_{\lambda'}$ .

Acting further by  $K_\mu$ , we get  $K_\mu x_i(v_\lambda \otimes v_{\lambda'}) = q^{(\text{wt}(i), \lambda) + (\mu, \lambda - \lambda' + \text{wt}(i))} \cdot v_\lambda \otimes x_i(v_{\lambda'})$

Finally, when applying  $y_j$ , we recall that  $\Delta(y_j) = y_j \otimes K_{-\text{wt}(j)} +$  (some terms belonging to  $\mathcal{U}_q^- \otimes (\mathcal{U}_q^+)_{>0}$ )

The maximality of  $\nu$  chosen above implies that the image  $y_j K_\mu x_i(v_\lambda \otimes v_{\lambda'})$  has the second component of weight  $-\lambda' + \nu$  only if  $\text{wt}(j) = \nu$ , and the corresponding term equals  $q^{\frac{(\text{wt}(i), \lambda) + (\mu, \lambda - \lambda' + \text{wt}(i)) - (\text{wt}(j), -\lambda' + \text{wt}(i))}{\nu}} \cdot (y_j v_\lambda) \otimes (x_i v_{\lambda'})$

Now, picking  $\lambda, \lambda'$  "big enough" (see above explanations), one immediately gets  $a_{j,\mu,i} = 0$  for all  $i$  with  $\text{wt}(i) = \nu$  (here we use the first two observations in the proof)