



# Kent Academic Repository

Launois, Stephane and Lenagan, T.H. (2007) *Quantised coordinate rings of semisimple groups are unique factorisation domains*. *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society*, 39 (Part 3). pp. 439-446. ISSN 0024-6093.

## Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/2083/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

## The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/bdm025>

## This document version

UNSPECIFIED

## DOI for this version

## Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

## Additional information

## Versions of research works

### Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

### Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

## Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact [ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

# Quantised coordinate rings of semisimple groups are unique factorisation domains

S Launois and T H Lenagan \*

## Abstract

We show that the quantum coordinate ring of a semisimple group is a unique factorisation domain in the sense of Chatters and Jordan in the case where the deformation parameter  $q$  is a transcendental element.

*2000 Mathematics subject classification:* 16W35, 16P40, 16S38, 17B37, 20G42.

*Key words:* Unique factorisation domain, quantum enveloping algebra, quantum coordinate ring.

## Introduction

Throughout this paper,  $\mathbb{C}$  denotes the field of complex numbers,  $\mathbb{C}^* := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$  is transcendental.

The notion of a noncommutative noetherian unique factorisation domain (UFD for short) has been introduced and studied by Chatters and Jordan in [3, 4]. Recently, the present authors, together with L Rigal, [11], have shown that many quantum algebras are noetherian UFD. In particular, we have shown that the quantum group  $O_q(SL_n)$  is a noetherian UFD.

Let  $G$  be a connected simply connected complex semisimple algebraic group. Since in the classical setting it was shown by Popov, [12], that the ring of regular functions on  $G$  is a unique factorisation domain, one can ask if a similar result holds for the quantisation

---

\*This research was supported by a Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship within the 6<sup>th</sup> European Community Framework Programme and by Leverhulme Research Interchange Grant F/00158/X

$O_q(G)$  of the coordinate ring of  $G$ . The aim of this note is to provide a positive answer to this question. In order to do this, we use a stratification of the prime spectrum of  $O_q(G)$  that was constructed by Joseph, [8].

# 1 Quantised enveloping algebras and quantum coordinate rings

## 1.1 Quantised enveloping algebras

Let  $\mathfrak{g}$  be a complex semisimple Lie algebra of rank  $n$ . We denote by  $\pi = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$  the set of simple roots associated to a triangular decomposition  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+$ . Recall that  $\pi$  is a basis of a euclidean vector space  $E$  over  $\mathbb{R}$ , whose inner product is denoted by  $(\cdot, \cdot)$  ( $E$  is usually denoted by  $\mathfrak{h}_{\mathbb{R}}^*$  in Bourbaki). We denote by  $W$  the Weyl group of  $\mathfrak{g}$ ; that is, the subgroup of the orthogonal group of  $E$  generated by the reflections  $s_i := s_{\alpha_i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , with reflecting hyperplanes  $H_i := \{\beta \in E \mid (\beta, \alpha_i) = 0\}$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . If  $w \in W$ , we denote by  $l(w)$  its length. Further, we denote by  $w_0$  the longest element of  $W$ . Throughout this paper, the Coxeter group  $W$  will be endowed with the Bruhat order that we denote by  $\leq$ . We refer the reader to [8, Appendix A1] for the definition and properties of the Bruhat order.

We denote by  $R^+$  the set of positive roots and by  $R$  the set of roots. We set  $Q^+ := \mathbb{N}\alpha_1 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbb{N}\alpha_n$ . We denote by  $\varpi_1, \dots, \varpi_n$  the fundamental weights, by  $P$  the  $\mathbb{Z}$ -lattice generated by  $\varpi_1, \dots, \varpi_n$ , and by  $P^+$  the set of dominant weights. In the sequel,  $P$  will always be endowed with the following partial order:

$$\lambda \leq \mu \text{ if and only if } \mu - \lambda \in Q^+.$$

Finally, we denote by  $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_n(\mathbb{Z})$  the Cartan matrix associated to these data.

Recall that the scalar product of two roots  $(\alpha, \beta)$  is always an integer. As in [1], we assume that the short roots have length  $\sqrt{2}$ .

For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , set  $q_i := q^{\frac{(\alpha_i, \alpha_i)}{2}}$  and

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} m \\ k \end{matrix} \right]_i := \frac{(q_i - q_i^{-1}) \dots (q_i^{m-1} - q_i^{1-m})(q_i^m - q_i^{-m})}{(q_i - q_i^{-1}) \dots (q_i^k - q_i^{-k})(q_i - q_i^{-1}) \dots (q_i^{m-k} - q_i^{k-m})}$$

for all integers  $0 \leq k \leq m$ . By convention, we have

$$\left[ \begin{matrix} m \\ 0 \end{matrix} \right]_i := 1.$$

We will use the definition of the quantised enveloping algebra given in [1, I.6.3, I.6.4]. The quantised enveloping algebra  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  of  $\mathfrak{g}$  over  $\mathbb{C}$  associated to the previous data is the  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra generated by indeterminates  $E_1, \dots, E_n, F_1, \dots, F_n, K_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, K_n^{\pm 1}$  subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} K_i K_j &= K_j K_i & K_i K_i^{-1} &= 1 \\ K_i E_j K_i^{-1} &= q_i^{a_{ij}} E_j & K_i F_j K_i^{-1} &= q_i^{-a_{ij}} F_j \\ E_i F_j - F_j E_i &= \delta_{ij} \frac{K_i - K_i^{-1}}{q_i - q_i^{-1}} \end{aligned}$$

and the quantum Serre relations:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i E_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} E_j E_i^k = 0 \quad (i \neq j)$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{1-a_{ij}} (-1)^k \begin{bmatrix} 1 - a_{ij} \\ k \end{bmatrix}_i F_i^{1-a_{ij}-k} F_j F_i^k = 0 \quad (i \neq j).$$

Note that  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is a Hopf algebra; its comultiplication is defined by

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

its counit by

$$\varepsilon(K_i) = 1 \quad \varepsilon(E_i) = \varepsilon(F_i) = 0,$$

and its antipode by

$$S(K_i) = K_i^{-1} \quad S(E_i) = -K_i^{-1} E_i \quad S(F_i) = -F_i K_i.$$

We refer the reader to [1, 7, 8] for more details on this algebra. Further, as usual, we denote by  $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})$  the subalgebra of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  generated by  $E_1, \dots, E_n$  and by  $U_q(\mathfrak{b}^+)$  the subalgebra of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  generated by  $E_1, \dots, E_n, K_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, K_n^{\pm 1}$ . In a similar manner,  $U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})$  is the subalgebra of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  generated by  $F_1, \dots, F_n$  and  $U_q(\mathfrak{b}^-)$  is the subalgebra of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  generated by  $F_1, \dots, F_n, K_1^{\pm 1}, \dots, K_n^{\pm 1}$ .

## 1.2 Representation theory of quantised enveloping algebras

It is well-known that the representation theory of the quantised enveloping algebra  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is analogous to the representation theory of the classical enveloping algebra  $U(\mathfrak{g})$ . In this section, we collect the properties that will be needed in the rest of the paper.

As usual, if  $M$  is a left  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, we denote its dual by  $M^*$ . Observe that  $M^*$  is a right  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module in a natural way. However, by using the antipode of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ , this right action of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  on  $M^*$  can be twisted to a left action, so that  $M^*$  can be viewed as a left  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module.

Let  $M$  be a  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module and  $m \in M$ . The element  $m$  is said to have weight  $\lambda \in P$  if  $K_i.m = q^{(\lambda, \alpha_i)}m$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . For each  $\lambda \in P$ , set

$$M_\lambda := \{m \in M \mid K_i.m = q^{(\lambda, \alpha_i)}m \text{ for all } i \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}.$$

If  $M_\lambda \neq 0$  then  $M_\lambda$  is said to be a weight space of  $M$  and  $\lambda$  is a weight of  $M$ .

It is well-known, see, for example [1, 7], that, for each dominant weight  $\lambda \in P^+$ , there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) simple finite dimensional  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module of highest weight  $\lambda$  that we denote by  $V(\lambda)$ . In the following proposition, we collect some well-known properties of the  $V(\lambda)$ , for  $\lambda \in P^+$ . We refer the reader to [1, especially I.6.12], [6] and [7] for details and proofs.

**Proposition 1.1** *Denote by  $\Omega(\lambda)$  the set of those weights  $\mu \in P$  such that  $V(\lambda)_\mu \neq 0$ .*

1.  $V(\lambda) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Omega(\lambda)} V(\lambda)_\mu$
2. *The weights of  $V(\lambda)$  are given by Weyl's character formula. In particular, if  $\mu \in \Omega(\lambda)$ , then  $w\mu \in \Omega(\lambda)$  for all  $w \in W$ .*
3. *For all  $w \in W$ , one has  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V(\lambda)_{w\lambda} = 1$ .*
4.  $V(\lambda)^* \simeq V(-w_0\lambda)$ .
5. *The weight  $w_0\lambda$  is the unique lowest weight of  $V(\lambda)$ . In particular, for all  $\mu \in \Omega(\lambda)$ , one has  $w_0\lambda \leq \mu \leq \lambda$ .*
6.  $\Omega(\lambda) = \{\lambda - w\mu \mid w \in W \text{ and } \mu \in P^+ \text{ such that } \mu \leq \lambda\}$ .

For all  $w \in W$  and  $\lambda \in P^+$ , let  $u_{w\lambda}$  denote a nonzero vector of weight  $w\lambda$  in  $V(\lambda)$ . Then we denote by  $V_w^+(\lambda)$  the Demazure module associated to the pair  $\lambda, w$ , that is:

$$V_w^+(\lambda) := U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})u_{w\lambda} = U_q(\mathfrak{b}^+)u_{w\lambda}.$$

We also set

$$V_w^-(\lambda) := U_q^-(\mathfrak{g})u_{w\lambda} = U_q(\mathfrak{b}^-)u_{w\lambda}.$$

(Observe that these definitions are independent of the choice of  $u_{w\lambda}$  because of Proposition 1.1 (3).)

The following result may be well-known; however, we have been unable to locate a precise statement.

**Proposition 1.2** 1.  $V_{w_0}^+(\lambda) = V(\lambda) = V_{id}^-(\lambda)$ .

2. For all  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , one has

$$V_{w_0 s_i}^+(\varpi_j) = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Omega(\varpi_j) \setminus \{w_0 \varpi_j\}} V(\varpi_j)_\mu & \text{if } i = j \\ V(\varpi_j) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and

$$V_{s_i}^-(\varpi_j) = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Omega(\varpi_j) \setminus \{\varpi_j\}} V(\varpi_j)_\mu & \text{if } i = j \\ V(\varpi_j) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* We only prove the assertions corresponding to “positive” Demazure modules, the proof for “negative” Demazure modules is similar.

Since  $w_0\lambda$  is the lowest weight of  $V(\lambda)$ , we have  $U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})u_{w_0\lambda} = V(\lambda)$ ; that is,  $V_{w_0}^+(\lambda) = V(\lambda)$ . This proves the first assertion.

In order to prove the second claim, we distinguish between two cases.

First, let  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $i \neq j$ . Then  $s_i(\varpi_j) = \varpi_j$ . Hence, in this case, one has:  $V_{w_0 s_i}^+(\varpi_j) = U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})u_{w_0 s_i \varpi_j} = U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})u_{w_0 \varpi_j} = V_{w_0}^+(\varpi_j) = V(\varpi_j)$ .

Next, let  $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then  $s_j(\varpi_j) = \varpi_j - \alpha_j$ . Let  $\mu \in \Omega(\varpi_j)$  with  $\mu \neq w_0 \varpi_j$ , and let  $m \in V(\varpi_j)_\mu$  be any nonzero element. It follows from the first assertion that there exists  $x \in U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})$  such that  $m = x.u_{w_0 \varpi_j}$ . The element  $x$  can be written as a linear combination of products  $E_{i_1} \dots E_{i_k}$ , with  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Naturally, one can assume that  $E_{i_1} \dots E_{i_k}.u_{w_0 \varpi_j} \neq 0$  for each such product. Let  $E_{i_1} \dots E_{i_k}$  be one of these products. Since  $w_0\pi = -\pi$ , there exists  $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $w_0\alpha_{i_k} = -\alpha_l$ . We will prove that  $l = j$ . Indeed, assume that  $l \neq j$ . Since  $E_{i_k}.u_{w_0 \varpi_j}$  is a nonzero vector of  $V(\varpi_j)$  of weight  $w_0 \varpi_j + \alpha_{i_k}$ , we get that

$$w_0 \varpi_j + \alpha_{i_k} \in \Omega(\varpi_j).$$

Then, we deduce from Proposition 1.1 that

$$s_l w_0 (w_0 \varpi_j + \alpha_{i_k}) \in \Omega(\varpi_j),$$

that is,

$$s_l \varpi_j + \alpha_l \in \Omega(\varpi_j).$$

Further, since we have assumed that  $l \neq j$ , we get  $s_l \varpi_j = \varpi_j$ , so that

$$\varpi_j + \alpha_l \in \Omega(\varpi_j).$$

This contradicts the fact that  $\varpi_j$  is the highest weight of  $V(\varpi_j)$ .

Thus, we have just proved that  $w_0\alpha_{i_k} = -\alpha_j$  for all products  $E_{i_1} \dots E_{i_k}$  that appear in  $x$ . Now, observe that  $E_{i_k} \cdot u_{w_0\varpi_j}$  is a nonzero vector of  $V(\varpi_j)$  of weight  $w_0\varpi_j + \alpha_{i_k} = w_0(\varpi_j + w_0\alpha_{i_k}) = w_0(\varpi_j - \alpha_j) = w_0s_j\varpi_j$ . Since  $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} V(\varpi_j)_{w_0s_j\varpi_j} = 1$ , we get that  $E_{i_k} \cdot u_{w_0\varpi_j} = au_{w_0s_j\varpi_j}$  for a certain nonzero complex number  $a$ . Hence we get that

$$m = x \cdot u_{w_0\varpi_j} = \sum \bullet E_{i_1} \dots E_{i_k} \cdot u_{w_0\varpi_j} = y \cdot u_{w_0s_j\varpi_j},$$

where  $\bullet$  denote some nonzero complex numbers and  $y \in U_q^+(\mathfrak{g})$ . Thus  $m \in V_{w_0s_j}^+(\varpi_j)$ . This shows that

$$\bigoplus_{\mu \in \Omega(\varpi_j) \setminus \{w_0\varpi_j\}} V(\varpi_j)_{\mu} \subseteq V_{w_0s_j}^+(\varpi_j).$$

As the reverse inclusion is trivial, this finishes the proof.  $\square$

### 1.3 Quantised coordinate rings of semisimple groups and their prime spectra.

Let  $G$  be a connected, simply connected, semisimple algebraic group over  $\mathbb{C}$  with Lie algebra  $\text{Lie}(G) = \mathfrak{g}$ . Since  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$  is a Hopf algebra, one can define its Hopf dual  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})^*$  (see [8, 1.4]) via

$$U_q(\mathfrak{g})^* := \{f \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(U_q(\mathfrak{g}), \mathbb{C}) \mid f = 0 \text{ on some ideal of finite codimension}\}.$$

The quantised coordinate ring  $O_q(G)$  of  $G$  is the subalgebra of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})^*$  generated by the coordinate functions  $c_{\xi, v}^{\lambda}$  for all  $\lambda \in P^+$ ,  $\xi \in V(\lambda)^*$  and  $v \in V(\lambda)$ , where  $c_{\xi, v}^{\lambda}$  is the element of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})^*$  defined by

$$c_{\xi, v}^{\lambda}(u) := \xi(uv) \text{ for all } u \in U_q(\mathfrak{g}),$$

see, for example, [8, Chapter 9]. As usual, if  $\xi \in V(\lambda)_{\eta}^*$  and  $v \in V(\lambda)_{\mu}$ , we write  $c_{\eta, \mu}^{\lambda}$  instead of  $c_{\xi, v}^{\lambda}$ . Naturally, this leads to some ambiguity. However, when  $\mu \in W\lambda$  and  $\eta \in W(-w_0\lambda)$ , then  $\dim(V(\lambda)_{\mu}) = 1 = \dim(V(\lambda)_{\eta}^*)$ , so that this ambiguity is very minor.

It is well-known that  $O_q(G)$  is a noetherian domain and a Hopf-subalgebra of  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})^*$ , see [1, 8]. This latter structure allows us to define the so-called left and right winding automorphisms (see, for instance, [1, 1.9.25] or [8, 1.3.5]), and then to obtain an action of the torus  $\mathcal{H} := (\mathbb{C}^*)^{2n}$  on  $O_q(G)$  (see [2, 5.2]). More precisely, observe that the torus  $H := (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  can be identified with  $\text{Hom}(P, \mathbb{C}^*)$  via:

$$h(\lambda) = h_1^{\lambda_1} \dots h_n^{\lambda_n},$$

where  $h = (h_1, \dots, h_n) \in H$  and  $\lambda = \lambda_1 \varpi_1 + \dots + \lambda_n \varpi_n$  with  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then, it is known (see [5, 3.3] or [1, I.1.18]) that the torus  $\mathcal{H}$  acts rationally by  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra automorphisms on  $O_q(G)$  via:

$$g.c_{\xi,v}^\lambda = g_1(\mu)g_2(\eta)c_{\xi,v}^\lambda,$$

for all  $g = (g_1, g_2) \in \mathcal{H} = H \times H$ ,  $\lambda \in P^+$ ,  $\xi \in V(\lambda)_\mu^*$  and  $v \in V(\lambda)_\eta$ .

(We refer the reader to [1, II.2.6] for the definition of a rational action.)

As usual, we denote by  $\text{Spec}(O_q(G))$  the set of prime ideals in  $O_q(G)$ . Recall that Joseph has proved [9] that every prime in  $O_q(G)$  is completely prime.

Since  $\mathcal{H}$  acts by automorphisms on  $O_q(G)$ , this induces an action of  $\mathcal{H}$  on the prime spectrum of  $O_q(G)$ . As usual, we denote by  $\mathcal{H}\text{-Spec}(O_q(G))$  the set of those primes ideals of  $O_q(G)$  that are  $\mathcal{H}$ -invariant. This is a finite set since Brown and Goodearl [2, Section 5] (see also [1, II.4]) have shown using previous results of Joseph that

$$\mathcal{H}\text{-Spec}(O_q(G)) = \{Q_{w_+,w_-} \mid (w_+, w_-) \in W \times W\},$$

where

$$Q_{w_+}^+ := \langle c_{\xi,v}^\lambda \mid \lambda \in P^+, v \in V(\lambda)_\lambda \text{ and } \xi \in (V_{w_+}^+(\lambda))^\perp \subseteq V(\lambda)^* \rangle,$$

$$Q_{w_-}^- := \langle c_{\xi,v}^\lambda \mid \lambda \in P^+, v \in V(\lambda)_{w_0\lambda} \text{ and } \xi \in (V_{w_-w_0}^-(\lambda))^\perp \subseteq V(\lambda)^* \rangle,$$

and

$$Q_{w_+,w_-} := Q_{w_+}^+ + Q_{w_-}^-.$$

Since  $q$  is transcendental, it follows from [10, Théorème 3] that it is enough to consider the fundamental weights in the definition of  $Q_{w_+}^+$  and  $Q_{w_-}^-$ . More precisely, we deduce from [10, Théorème 3] the following result.

**Theorem 1.3 (Joseph)**

$$\mathcal{H}\text{-Spec}(O_q(G)) = \{Q_{w_+,w_-} \mid (w_+, w_-) \in W \times W\},$$

where

$$Q_{w_+}^+ := \langle c_{\xi,v}^{\varpi_j} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, v \in V(\varpi_j)_{\varpi_j} \text{ and } \xi \in (V_{w_+}^+(\varpi_j))^\perp \subseteq V(\varpi_j)^* \rangle,$$

$$Q_{w_-}^- := \langle c_{\xi,v}^{\varpi_j} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, v \in V(\varpi_j)_{w_0\varpi_j} \text{ and } \xi \in (V_{w_-w_0}^-(\varpi_j))^\perp \subseteq V(\varpi_j)^* \rangle,$$

and

$$Q_{w_+,w_-} := Q_{w_+}^+ + Q_{w_-}^-.$$

Moreover the prime ideals  $Q_{w_+,w_-}$ , for  $(w_+, w_-) \in W \times W$ , are pairwise distinct.



## 2 $O_q(G)$ is a noetherian UFD.

In this section, we prove that  $O_q(G)$  is a noetherian UFD (We refer the reader to [11, Section 1] for the definition of a noetherian UFD; the key point is that each height one prime ideal should be generated by a normal element.) In order to do this, we proceed in three steps.

1. First, by using results of Joseph, we show that there exist a finite number of nonzero normal  $\mathcal{H}$ -eigenvectors  $r_1, \dots, r_k$  of  $O_q(G)$  such that each  $\langle r_i \rangle$  is (completely) prime, and that each nonzero  $\mathcal{H}$ -invariant prime ideal of  $O_q(G)$  contains one of the  $r_i$ . This property may be thought of as a “weak factoriality” result:  $O_q(G)$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -UFD in the terminology of [11].
2. Secondly, by using the  $H$ -stratification theory of Goodearl and Letzter (see [1, II]), we show that the localisation of  $O_q(G)$  with respect to the multiplicative system generated by the  $r_i$  is a noetherian UFD.
3. Finally, we use a noncommutative analogue of Nagata’s Lemma (see [11, Proposition 1.6]) to prove that  $O_q(G)$  itself is a noetherian UFD.

### 2.1 $O_q(G)$ is an $\mathcal{H}$ -UFD

This aim of this section is two-fold. First, we show that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , the ideal generated by the normal element  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  or  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  is (completely) prime and then we prove that every nonzero  $\mathcal{H}$ -invariant prime ideal of  $O_q(G)$  contains either one of the  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  or one of the  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ .

**Lemma 2.1** *Let  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then  $Q_{w_0, s_i w_0} = \langle c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i} \rangle$  and  $Q_{w_0 s_i, w_0} = \langle c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i} \rangle$ .*

*Proof.* Recall that

$$Q_{w_0, s_i w_0} = Q_{w_0}^+ + Q_{s_i w_0}^-,$$

where

$$Q_{w_0}^+ = \langle c_{\xi, v}^{\varpi_j} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, v \in V(\varpi_j)_{\varpi_j} \text{ and } \xi \in (V_{w_0}^+(\varpi_j))^\perp \subseteq V(\varpi_j)^* \rangle,$$

$$Q_{s_i w_0}^- = \langle c_{\xi, v}^{\varpi_j} \mid j \in \{1, \dots, n\}, v \in V(\varpi_j)_{w_0 \varpi_j} \text{ and } \xi \in (V_{s_i}^-(\varpi_j))^\perp \subseteq V(\varpi_j)^* \rangle.$$

Next, it follows from Proposition 1.2(1) that  $V_{w_0}^+(\varpi_j) = V(\varpi_j)$  for all  $j$ , so that  $Q_{w_0}^+ = (0)$ . Also, we deduce from Proposition 1.2(2) that  $V_{s_i}^-(\varpi_j) = V(\varpi_j)$  if  $j \neq i$ , and  $V_{s_i}^-(\varpi_i) = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \Omega(\varpi_i) \setminus \{\varpi_i\}} V(\varpi_i)_\mu$ . Hence,

$$Q_{s_i w_0}^- = \langle c_{\xi, v}^{\varpi_i} \mid v \in V(\varpi_i)_{w_0 \varpi_i} \text{ and } \xi \in V(\varpi_i)_{-\varpi_i}^* \rangle,$$

that is,  $Q_{s_i w_0}^- = \langle c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i} \rangle$ . Therefore  $Q_{w_0, s_i w_0} = Q_{w_0}^+ + Q_{s_i w_0}^- = \langle c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i} \rangle$ , as desired.

The second claim of the lemma is obtained in the same way.  $\square$

Now observe that, in [8], Joseph uses slightly different conventions for the dual  $M^*$  of a left  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. Indeed, it is mentioned in [8, 9.1] that the dual  $M^*$  is viewed with its natural right  $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ -module structure. As a consequence, Joseph's convention for the weights of the dual  $L(\lambda)^*$  of  $L(\lambda)$ , for  $\lambda \in P^+$ , is not exactly the same as our convention. In particular, the elements  $c_{\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  and  $c_{w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ ,  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , that appear in [8, Corollary 9.1.4], correspond to the elements  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  and  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  in our notation. With this in mind, it follows from [8, Corollary 9.1.4] that the elements  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  and  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , are normal in  $O_q(G)$ . Thus we deduce from Lemma 2.1 the following result which will allow us later to use a noncommutative analogue of Nagata's Lemma in order to prove that  $O_q(G)$  is a noetherian UFD.

**Corollary 2.2** *The  $2n$  elements  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  and  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , are nonzero normal elements of  $O_q(G)$  and they generate pairwise distinct completely prime ideals of  $O_q(G)$ .*

Since the  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  and  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ , are  $\mathcal{H}$ -eigenvectors of  $O_q(G)$ , in order to prove that  $O_q(G)$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -UFD in the sense of [11, Definition 2.7], it only remains to prove that every nonzero  $\mathcal{H}$ -invariant prime ideal of  $O_q(G)$  contains either one of the  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  or one of the  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ . This is what we do next.

**Lemma 2.3** *Let  $\mathbf{w} = (w_+, w_-) \in W \times W$ , with  $\mathbf{w} \neq (w_0, w_0)$ . Then  $Q_{\mathbf{w}}$  contains either one of the  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ , or one of the  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{w} \neq (w_0, w_0)$ , either  $w_+ \neq w_0$ , or  $w_- \neq w_0$ . Assume, for instance, that  $w_+ \neq w_0$ , so that there exists  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $w_+ \leq w_0 s_i$ . One can easily check from the definition of  $Q_{\mathbf{w}}$  that this forces  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i} \in Q_{w_+}^+$ , so that

$$c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i} \in Q_{w_+}^+ \subseteq Q_{\mathbf{w}},$$

as required.  $\square$

As a consequence of Corollary 2.2 and Lemma 2.3, we get the following result.

**Corollary 2.4**  *$O_q(G)$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -UFD.*

*Proof.* Theorem 1.3 establishes that  $\mathcal{H}\text{-Spec}(O_q(G)) = \{Q_{w_+, w_-} \mid (w_+, w_-) \in W \times W\}$ . Note that  $Q_{w_+, w_-} = 0$  precisely when  $w_+ = w_- = w_0$ . Thus, Corollary 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 show that each nonzero  $\mathcal{H}$ -prime ideal of  $O_q(G)$  contains a nonzero  $\mathcal{H}$ -prime of height one that is generated by a normal  $\mathcal{H}$ -eigenvector. Thus,  $O_q(G)$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -UFD.  $\square$

## 2.2 $O_q(G)$ is a noetherian UFD.

Set  $T$  to be the localisation of  $O_q(G)$  with respect to the multiplicatively closed set generated by the normal  $\mathcal{H}$ -eigenvectors  $c_{-\varpi_i, w_0 \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$  and  $c_{-w_0 \varpi_i, \varpi_i}^{\varpi_i}$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then the rational action of  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $O_q(G)$  extends to an action of  $\mathcal{H}$  on the localisation  $T$  by  $\mathbb{C}$ -algebra automorphisms, since we are localising with respect to  $\mathcal{H}$ -eigenvectors, and this action of  $\mathcal{H}$  on  $T$  is also rational, by using [1, II.2.7]. The following result is a consequence of Corollary 2.4 and [11, Proposition 3.5].

**Proposition 2.5** *The ring  $T$  is  $\mathcal{H}$ -simple; that is, the only  $\mathcal{H}$ -ideals of  $T$  are 0 and  $T$ .*

We are now in position to show that  $O_q(G)$  is a noetherian UFD.

**Theorem 2.6**  *$O_q(G)$  is a noetherian UFD.*

*Proof.* By [11, Proposition 1.6], it is enough to prove that the localisation  $T$  is a noetherian UFD. Now, as proved in Proposition 2.5,  $T$  is an  $\mathcal{H}$ -simple ring. Thus, using [1, II.3.9],  $T$  is a noetherian UFD, as required.  $\square$

As a consequence, we deduce from Theorem 2.6 and [4, Theorem 2.4] the following result.

**Corollary 2.7**  *$O_q(G)$  is a maximal order.*

The fact that  $O_q(G)$  is a maximal order can also be proved directly by using a suitable localisation of  $O_q(G)$ , [8, Corollary 9.3.10], which is itself a maximal order.

**Acknowledgment** We thank Laurent Rigal with whom we first discussed this problem. We also thank Christian Ohn for a very helpful conversation concerning the representation theory of  $U(\mathfrak{g})$  during a meeting of the Groupe de Travail Inter-universitaire en Algèbre in La Rochelle and thank the organisers for the opportunity to attend this meeting.

## References

- [1] K A Brown and K R Goodearl, Lectures on algebraic quantum groups. Advanced Courses in Mathematics-CRM Barcelona. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel, 2002.
- [2] K A Brown and K R Goodearl, *Prime spectra of quantum semisimple groups*, Trans Amer Math Soc 348 (1996), no. 6, 2465-2502.

- [3] A W Chatters, *Non-commutative unique factorisation domains*, Math Proc Camb Phil Soc, 95 (1984), 49-54
- [4] A W Chatters and D A Jordan, *Non-commutative unique factorisation rings*, J London Math Soc 33 (1986), 22-32
- [5] T J Hodges, T Levasseur and M Toro, *Algebraic structure of multiparameter quantum groups*, Adv Math 126 (1997), no. 1, 52-92.
- [6] J E Humphreys, *Introduction to Lie algebras and representation theory*. Second printing, revised. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 9. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1978.
- [7] J C Jantzen, *Lectures on Quantum Groups*, in: Grad. Stud. Math., Vol. 6, Amer. Math. Society, Providence, RI, 1996.
- [8] A Joseph, *Quantum groups and their primitive ideals*. Springer-Verlag, 29, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, 1995.
- [9] A Joseph, *On the prime and primitive spectra of the algebra of functions on a quantum group*, J Algebra 169 (1994), no. 2, 441-511.
- [10] A Joseph, *Sur les idéaux génériques de l'algèbre des fonctions sur un groupe quantique*, C R Acad Sci Paris Sér I Math 321 (1995), no. 2, 135-140.
- [11] S Launois, T H Lenagan and L Rigal, *Quantum unique factorisation domains*, arXiv:math.QA/0501545, to appear in Journal of the London Mathematical Society.
- [12] V L Popov, *Picard groups of homogeneous spaces of linear algebraic groups and one-dimensional homogeneous vector bundles*, Math USSR Izvestija 8 (1974), 301-327

S Launois:

School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh,  
James Clerk Maxwell Building, King's Buildings, Mayfield Road,  
Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, Scotland  
E-mail : [stephane.launois@ed.ac.uk](mailto:stephane.launois@ed.ac.uk)

T H Lenagan:

School of Mathematics, University of Edinburgh,  
James Clerk Maxwell Building, King's Buildings, Mayfield Road,  
Edinburgh EH9 3JZ, Scotland  
E-mail: [tom@maths.ed.ac.uk](mailto:tom@maths.ed.ac.uk)