

Simple restricted modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra as weak modules for vertex operator superalgebras

Haibo Chen

Abstract: In the present paper, a class of new simple modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra are constructed, which are induced from simple modules over some finite dimensional solvable Lie superalgebras. These new simple $N = 1$ Ramond modules are isomorphic to simple restricted modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra. In particular, by simple restricted $N = 1$ Ramond modules and [20], we give a classification of weak modules for vertex operator superalgebras. At last, some example of simple restricted $N = 1$ Ramond modules as various versions of Whittaker modules are presented (classical Whittaker modules were studied in [15]).

Key words: $N = 1$ Ramond algebra, restricted module, simple module, vertex operator superalgebra.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2020): 17B10, 17B65, 17B68, 17B69.

1 Introduction

The $N = 1$ Ramond algebra is an infinite dimensional Lie superalgebra

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}L_m \oplus \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{C}G_m \oplus \mathbb{C}C,$$

which satisfies the following Lie super-brackets

$$\begin{aligned} [L_m, L_n] &= (n - m)L_{m+n} + \frac{n^3 - n}{12}\delta_{m+n,0}C, \\ [G_m, G_n] &= -2L_{m+n} + \frac{4m^2 - 1}{12}\delta_{m+n,0}C, \\ [L_m, G_n] &= (n - \frac{m}{2})G_{m+n}, \quad [\mathcal{R}, C] = 0, \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. By definition, we have the following decomposition:

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_{\bar{0}} \oplus \mathcal{R}_{\bar{1}},$$

where $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{0}} = \text{span}\{L_m, C \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{1}} = \text{span}\{G_m \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Notice that the even part $\mathcal{R}_{\bar{0}}$ is isomorphic to the classical Virasoro algebra. Clearly, $\mathbb{C}C$ is the center of \mathcal{R} . Let $\mathcal{R}_m = \text{span}\{L_{-m}, G_{-m}, \delta_{m,0}C\}$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $[\mathcal{R}_m, \mathcal{R}_n] \subset \mathcal{R}_{m+n}$, and $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})$ are \mathbb{Z} -graded. It is easy to see that \mathcal{R} has the following triangular decomposition:

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_+ \oplus \mathcal{R}_0 \oplus \mathcal{R}_-,$$

H. Chen (hypo1025@163.com).

where $\mathcal{R}_+ = \mathcal{R}_{-m>0}$ and $\mathcal{R}_- = \mathcal{R}_{-m<0}$.

The representation theory of the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra has attracted a lot of attention from mathematicians. The structure of Verma modules, Fock modules and pre-Verma modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra were respectively investigated in [11–13]. All simple Harish-Chandra modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra were classified in [24] (also see [2]). Recently, some non-weight modules as Whittaker modules and $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}L_0 \oplus \mathbb{C}G_0)$ -free modules of rank 1 over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra were studied in [15, 25], respectively. Moreover, a class of non-weight modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra were developed in [4], which include super intermediate series modules, $\mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}L_0)$ -free modules of rank 2 and so on. As everyone knows, the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra can be seen as certain supersymmetric extensions of the Virasoro algebra. However, the representation theory of the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra is far less abundant than the Virasoro algebra.

Highest weight modules and Whittaker modules are two classes of classical representation of Lie (super)algebra, which are both belong to the category of restricted modules. In [23], a generalized construction for simple Virasoro modules was given by Mazorchuk and Zhao, which includes highest weight modules and various version Whittaker modules. These simple Virasoro modules are isomorphic to the simple restricted Virasoro modules (see [3]). From [18], a class of weak modules over the Virasoro vertex operator algebra $V(c, 0)$ were classified by the restricted Virasoro modules. From then on, to classify some weak modules of vertex operator (super)algebras, the restricted modules over some other Lie (super)algebras such as twisted (mirror) Heisenberg-Virasoro algebras, $N = 1$ Neveu-Schwarz algebras, gap- p Virasoro algebras, affine Lie algebras $A_1^{(1)}$ were also investigated (see, e.g., [1, 5–7, 10, 16, 17, 19, 22]). In Proposition 4.1 of [20], they show that any restricted module for the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra of central charge c is a weak ψ -twisted $\bar{W}(c, 0)$ -module. In order to classify the weak modules of vertex operator superalgebras, we need to give a characterization for restricted modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra. These are our motivations for writing this paper.

The rest of the present paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we give some definitions and notations of restricted modules for later use. In Section 3, a class of new simple restricted modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra are constructed. In Section 4, we give a characterization of simple restricted \mathcal{R} -modules, which reduces the problem of classification of simple restricted \mathcal{R} -modules to classification of simple modules over a class of finite-dimensional solvable Lie superalgebras. In Section 5, a classification of weak ψ -twisted modules for vertex operator superalgebras are given by using restricted \mathcal{R} -modules. Finally, some examples of restricted \mathcal{R} -modules are given, such as Whittaker modules and high order Whittaker modules.

Throughout this paper, we denote by \mathbb{C} , \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{Z}_+ the sets of complex numbers, integers, nonnegative integers and positive integers, respectively. All vector superspaces (resp. superalgebras, supermodules) and spaces (resp. algebras, modules) are considered to

be over \mathbb{C} . We use $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{a})$ to denote the universal enveloping algebra for a Lie (super)algebra \mathfrak{a} .

2 Preliminaries

Let $M = M_{\bar{0}} \oplus M_{\bar{1}}$ be a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector space. We say that any element $v \in M_{\bar{0}}$ (resp. $v \in M_{\bar{1}}$) is *even* (resp. *odd*). Set $|v| = 0$ if $v \in M_{\bar{0}}$ and $|v| = 1$ if $v \in M_{\bar{1}}$. We call that all elements in $M_{\bar{0}}$ or $M_{\bar{1}}$ are *homogeneous*. Throughout this paper, all elements in Lie superalgebras and modules are homogenous unless specified. All modules for Lie superalgebras are \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded. All simple modules over Lie (super)algebras are non-trivial.

Let \mathcal{G} be a Lie superalgebra. A \mathcal{G} -module is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector space M together with a bilinear map $\mathcal{G} \times M \rightarrow M$, denoted $(x, v) \mapsto xv$ satisfying the following conditions

$$x(yv) - (-1)^{|x||y|}y(xv) = [x, y]v, \quad \mathcal{G}_{\bar{i}}M_{\bar{j}} \subseteq M_{\bar{i}+\bar{j}}$$

for all $x, y \in \mathcal{G}, v \in M$. It is clear that there is a parity-change functor Π on the category of \mathcal{G} -modules to itself.

Definition 2.1. Assume that M is a \mathcal{G} -module and $x \in \mathcal{G}$.

- (i) If for any $v \in M$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $x^m v = 0$, we say that the action of x on M is *locally nilpotent*. Similarly, if for any $v \in M$ there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ such that $\mathcal{G}^m v = 0$, we say that the action of \mathcal{G} on M is *locally nilpotent*.
- (ii) For any $v \in M$, the x acts *locally finite* on M if we have $\dim(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathbb{C}x^m v) < +\infty$. Similarly, for any $v \in M$, the \mathcal{G} acts *locally finite* on M if we get $\dim(\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}_+} \mathcal{G}^m v) < +\infty$.

We note that the action of x on M is locally finite can be shown by the action of x on M is locally nilpotent. Generally speaking, it is not true for any Lie (super)algebra \mathcal{G} . But if \mathcal{G} is a finitely generated Lie (super)algebra, the action of \mathcal{G} on M is locally finite can also be obtained by the action of \mathcal{G} on M is locally nilpotent.

Definition 2.2. Suppose that $\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{G}_m$ is a \mathbb{Z} -graded Lie superalgebra. A \mathcal{G} -module M is called the *restricted* module if for any $v \in M$ there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{G}_m v = 0$ for $m > k$.

For simplicity, write $\mathbb{X} = \{0, 1\}$. We denote by \mathcal{S} the set of all infinite vectors of the form $\mathbf{i} := (\dots, i_2, i_1)$ with $i_{2m-1} \in \mathbb{N}, i_{2m} \in \mathbb{X}, m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, satisfying the condition that the number of nonzero entries is finite. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, write $\epsilon_k = (\dots, \delta_{k,3}, \delta_{k,2}, \delta_{k,1})$ and $\mathbf{0} = (\dots, 0, 0)$. Denote

$$\mathfrak{W}(\chi) = m \quad \text{if} \quad 0 \neq \chi \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})_m, \quad \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

For $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}$, set

$$g_{\mathbf{i}} = \cdots (G_{-k+1}^{i_{2k}} L_{-k}^{i_{2k-1}}) \cdots (G_{-2}^{i_6} L_{-3}^{i_5}) (G_{-1}^{i_4} L_{-2}^{i_3}) (G_0^{i_2} L_{-1}^{i_1}) \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}_- \oplus \mathcal{R}_0), \quad (2.1)$$

where $i_{2k-1} \in \mathbb{N}, i_{2k} \in \mathbb{X}, k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then we have

$$\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) := \mathfrak{W}(g_{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} k i_{2k-1} + \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} (k-1) i_{2k}.$$

Denote

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i}) := \mathbf{D}(g_{\mathbf{i}}) = \sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} (i_{2k-1} + i_{2k}).$$

The following total order on \mathcal{S} can be found in [23].

Definition 2.3. We denote by $>$ the *reverse lexicographical total order* on \mathcal{S} , defined as follows:

- (a) $\mathbf{0}$ is the minimum element;
- (b) for different nonzero $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\mathbf{j} > \mathbf{i} \iff \text{there exists } m \in \mathbb{Z}_+ \text{ such that } (j_k = i_k, \forall 0 \leq k < m) \text{ and } j_m > i_m.$$

Definition 2.4. By using the above reverse lexicographical total order, we can define the *principal total order* \succ on \mathcal{S} : for different $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in \mathcal{S}$, set $\mathbf{i} \succ \mathbf{j}$ if and only if one of the following condition is satisfied:

- (a) $\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) > \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{j})$;
- (b) $\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{j})$ and $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i}) > \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j})$;
- (c) $\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{j})$, $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j})$ and $\mathbf{i} > \mathbf{j}$.

For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} \mathbb{C}L_m \oplus \bigoplus_{n > 1} \mathbb{C}G_n \oplus \mathbb{C}C \text{ and } \mathcal{B} = \widehat{\mathcal{B}} \oplus \mathbb{C}G_1.$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{R}_0 \oplus \mathcal{R}_+ = \mathcal{B} \oplus \mathbb{C}G_0$. For any simple module V over \mathcal{R} or one of its subalgebra containing the central element C , we denote that the action of C on V is a scalar c . Assume that $\widehat{M} = \widehat{M}_0 \oplus \widehat{M}_1$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module, where v_0, w_0, \dots are the generators of even space \widehat{M}_0 , and $v_1 = G_1 v_0, w_1 = G_1 w_0, \dots$ are the generators of odd space \widehat{M}_1 . Naturally, one can obtain the induced \mathcal{B} -module

$$V = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M} = \mathbb{C}[G_1] \widehat{M}. \quad (2.2)$$

Clearly, $G_1 v_{\bar{1}} = -L_2 v_{\bar{0}}$. Throughout this paper, we always set the simple \mathcal{B} -module $V = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$. Then we have the following induced \mathcal{R} -module

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V) = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B})} V.$$

By the PBW Theorem (see [8]), and $G_{-m}^2 = -L_{-2m}$ for $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, every element of $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$ can be uniquely written as the following form

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}} g_{\mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i},c} \quad (2.3)$$

where $g_{\mathbf{i}}$ defined as (2.1), $v_{\mathbf{i},c} \in V$ and only finitely many of them are nonzero. For any $w \in \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$ as in (2.3), we write $\text{supp}(w)$ the set of all $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}$ such that $v_{\mathbf{i},c} \neq 0$. For $0 \neq w \in \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$, we denote by $\deg(w)$ the maximal element in $\text{supp}(w)$ (with respect to the principal total order on \mathcal{S}), which is called the *degree* of w . Note that $\deg(w)$ is defined only for $w \neq 0$. Let $\mathfrak{W}(w) = \mathfrak{W}(\deg(w))$ and $\mathfrak{W}(0) = -\infty$. For any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, set

$$\text{supp}_m(w) = \{\mathbf{i} \in \text{supp}(w) \mid \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = m\}.$$

3 Construction of simple \mathcal{R} -modules

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, denote $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq k} = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid m \geq k\}$. Now we give a characterization for simple \mathcal{B} -modules.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}, t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ and \widehat{M} be a simple $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module. Assume that V is a induced \mathcal{B} -module $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$ as (2.2) with $L_k V = 0$ for all $k > t$. Then we get $G_m V = 0$ for all $m > t$.*

Proof. Choose $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m > t$. According to $G_m^2 V = -L_{2m} V = 0$, we see that $\Upsilon = G_m V$ is a proper subspace of V . For any $l \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, one gets

$$G_{m+l} V = \frac{2}{3-m-l} (L_{m+l-1} G_1 - G_1 L_{m+l-1}) V = 0.$$

Then for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we check

$$L_n \Upsilon = L_n G_m V = G_m L_n V + (m - \frac{n}{2}) G_{m+n} V \subset \Upsilon.$$

For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, it is clear that $G_k \Upsilon \subset \Upsilon$. Thus, Υ is a proper submodule of V . It follows from the simplicity of V that we get $\Upsilon = G_m V = 0$ for all $m > t$. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}, k \in \mathbb{Z}, c \in \mathbb{C}, F_k = L_k$ or G_k , and \widehat{M} be a simple $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module. Let V be a induced module $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$ and there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that V satisfying the following two conditions*

- (1) *the action of L_r on V is injective;*
- (2) *$L_m V = G_r V = 0$ for all $m > r$.*

Then for any $0 \neq w \in \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$ with $\mathfrak{W}(w) = q \in \mathbb{Z}, k > r$, we get

- (i) $\text{supp}_{q-k+r}(F_k w) \subset \{\mathbf{i} - \mathbf{j} \mid \mathbf{i} \in \text{supp}_q(w), \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{j}) = k - r\};$
- (ii) $\mathfrak{W}(F_k w) \leq q - k + r.$

Proof. (1) By Lemma 3.1 and (2), we have $G_m V = 0$ for all $m > r - 1$. Now suppose that $w = g_{\mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i},c}$ with $\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = q \in \mathbb{Z}$. For $k > r$ and any fixed F_k , by using Lie super-brackets in (1.1), we may transfer the only negative degree term in $[F_k, g_{\mathbf{i}}]$ to the right side, i. e., $[F_k, g_{\mathbf{i}}] \in \sum_{m \in \{q-k, \dots, q\}} \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}_{>0})_m \mathcal{R}_{q-k-m}$. So

$$F_k w = [F_k, g_{\mathbf{i}}] v_{\mathbf{i},c} = g_{q-k} v_{\mathbf{i},c} + \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in \{\mathbf{k} \mid \mathbf{i} - \mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{S}, \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{k}) = k-1\}} g_{\mathbf{i}-\mathbf{j}} v_{\mathbf{j},c} \quad (3.1)$$

for some $g_{q-k} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R}_{>0})_{q-k}$.

(2) It follows from (1) that we have $\mathfrak{W}(F_k g_{\mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i},c}) \leq \mathfrak{W}(g_{\mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i},c}) - k + r$. The lemma clears. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}, c \in \mathbb{C}$. Let $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}$ with $\widehat{k} = \min\{m \mid i_m \neq 0\} \geq 0$ and \widehat{M} be a simple $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module. Assume that V is a induced module $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$ and there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that V satisfying the conditions*

- (1) *the action of L_r on V is injective;*
- (2) *$L_m V = G_r V = 0$ for all $m > r$.*

Then

- (i) *if $\widehat{k} = 2k - 1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have*
 - (a) $\deg(L_{k+r} g_{\mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i},c}) = \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}};$
 - (b) $\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}} \notin \text{supp}(L_{k+r} g_{\mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i},c})$ for all $\mathbf{i} \succ \widetilde{\mathbf{i}}$.
- (ii) *if $\widehat{k} = 2k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*
 - (a) $\deg(G_{k-1+r} g_{\mathbf{i}} v_{\mathbf{i},c}) = \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}};$

(b) $\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}} \notin \text{supp}(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c})$ for all $\mathbf{i} \succ \widetilde{\mathbf{i}}$.

Proof. (i) (a) To prove this, we write $L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}$ as (3.1). It is clear that the only way to give $g_{\mathbf{i}-\epsilon_{\widehat{k}}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}$ is to commute L_{r+k} with an L_{-k} , which implies $\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}} \in \text{supp}(L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c})$. If there exists a G_{-k} in $g_{\mathbf{i}}$, we obtain $[L_{r+k}, G_{-k}]v_{\mathbf{i},c} = 0$. Then by Lemma 3.2, we conclude $\deg(L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) = \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$.

(b) Now we consider the following three cases.

First consider $\mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) < \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i})$. According to Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\mathfrak{W}(L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) \leq \mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) - k < \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) - k.$$

Obviously, (b) follows in this case.

Assume $\mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) < \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i})$. If the element $\mathbf{j} \in \text{supp}(L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c})$ is such that $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j}) < \mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}})$, then

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j}) < \mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) \leq \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i}) - 1 = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}).$$

This shows $\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$. If the element $\mathbf{j} \in \text{supp}(L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c})$ is such that $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j}) = \mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}})$, then such \mathbf{j} can only be given by commuting L_{k+r} with some L_{-j} , where $j > k + r$. Then we check

$$\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{j}) = \mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) - k - r < \mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) - k = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) - k = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}),$$

which implies that $\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$. So, (b) also follows in this case. Let $\widetilde{k} = \min\{k \mid \widetilde{i}_k \neq 0\}$ be in $\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}$. If $\widetilde{k} = \widehat{k}$, then by (1), $\deg(L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) = \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$, we also have (b) in this case.

Consider the last case $\mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = p$, $\mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i})$ and $\widetilde{k} > \widehat{k}$. Then from Lemma 3.2, we have $\mathfrak{W}(L_{k+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) < p - k = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}})$. We complete the proof of (i).

(ii) (a) Write $G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}$ as the form of (3.1). We know that the only way to obtain $g_{\mathbf{i}-\epsilon_{\widehat{k}}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}$ is to commute G_{k-1+r} with a G_{-k+1} , which gives $\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}} \in \text{supp}(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c})$. Combining this with Lemma 3.2, we deduce $\deg(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) = \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$.

(b) Now we have the following three cases.

First consider $\mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) < \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i})$. It follows from Lemma 3.2 that we get

$$\mathfrak{W}(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) \leq \mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) - k + 1 < \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) - k + 1.$$

Thus, (b) holds in this case.

Consider $\mathfrak{W}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = p \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) < \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i})$. If there exists $\mathbf{j} \in \text{supp}(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c})$ such that $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j}) < \mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}})$, then we have

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j}) < \mathbf{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{i}}) \leq \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i}) - 1 = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}).$$

This implies $\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$. If there exists $\mathbf{j} \in \text{supp}(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c})$ such that $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{j}) = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i})$, then such \mathbf{j} can only be given by commuting G_{k-1+r} with some G_{-p} , where $p > k - 1 + r$. So we obtain

$$\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{j}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) - k + 1 - r < \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) - k + 1 = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}),$$

which gives $\mathbf{j} \neq \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$. Obviously, (ii) also holds in this case. We denote by $\widetilde{k} = \min\{k \mid i_k \neq 0\}$ for \mathbf{i} . If $\widetilde{k} = \widehat{k}$, then by (1), $\deg(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) = \mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}}$, we also have (ii) in this case.

At last, we assume $\mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i}) = p \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i}) = \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{i})$ and $\widetilde{k} > \widehat{k}$. Then it follows from Lemma 3.2 that we get $\mathfrak{W}(G_{k-1+r}g_{\mathbf{i}}v_{\mathbf{i},c}) < p - k + 1 = \mathfrak{W}(\mathbf{i} - \epsilon_{\widehat{k}})$. In conclusion, (b) holds. \square

Now we present the main results of this section.

Theorem 3.4. *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}, c \in \mathbb{C}$ and \widehat{M} be a simple $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module as (2.2). Let V be a induced module $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$ and there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that V satisfying the following two conditions*

- (1) *the action of L_r on V is injective;*
- (2) *$L_m V = G_r V = 0$ for all $m > r$.*

Then we obtain that the $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$ is a simple \mathcal{R} -module.

Proof. Let $0 \neq w \in \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$ and $\deg(w) = \mathbf{i}$ for $\mathbf{i} \in \mathcal{S}$. Write $\widehat{k} = \min\{k \mid i_k \neq 0\} \geq 0$. Based on Lemma 3.3, we immediately get the following results. If $\widehat{k} = 2k - 1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then $L_{r+k}w \neq 0$. If $\widehat{k} = 2k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, then $G_{r+k-1}w \neq 0$. Therefore, from any $0 \neq w \in \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$ we can get a nonzero element in $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{R})w \cap V \neq 0$, which shows the simplicity of $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$. This completes the proof. \square

4 Characterization of simple restricted \mathcal{R} -modules

For $m \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, we denote

$$\mathcal{R}^{(r)} = \bigoplus_{m>r} \mathbb{C}L_m \oplus \bigoplus_{m>r-1} \mathbb{C}G_m.$$

Proposition 4.1. *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, c \in \mathbb{C}$ and \mathcal{P} be a simple module for \mathcal{R} . Assume that there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the action of L_k on \mathcal{P} is injective. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *There exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the actions of L_m, G_n for $m > r, n > r - 1$ on \mathcal{P} are locally finite.*
- (ii) *There exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the actions of L_m, G_n for $m > r, n > r - 1$ on \mathcal{P} are locally nilpotent.*
- (iii) *There exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that \mathcal{P} is a locally finite $\mathcal{R}^{(r)}$ -module.*
- (iv) *There exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that \mathcal{P} is a locally nilpotent $\mathcal{R}^{(r)}$ -module.*
- (v) *There exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ and a induced simple \mathcal{B} -module $V = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$ as (2.2) where \widehat{M} is a $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module satisfying the conditions (1) and (2) in Theorem 3.4 such that $\mathcal{P} \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$.*

Proof. It is clear that (v) \Rightarrow (iii) \Rightarrow (i), (v) \Rightarrow (iv) \Rightarrow (ii) and (ii) \Rightarrow (i). So, we only need to give a proof of (i) \Rightarrow (v).

Since there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the actions of L_m and G_n for all $m > r, n > r - 1$ on \mathcal{P} are locally finite, then we can choose a $0 \neq w \in \mathcal{P}$ such that $L_{r+1}w = \mu w$ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$.

Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ with $m > r, n > r - 1$. We denote

$$\mathfrak{M}_L = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}L_{r+1}^i L_m w = \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}L_{r+1}) L_m w \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{M}_G = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}L_{r+1}^i G_n w = \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}L_{r+1}) G_n w.$$

It follows from the definition of \mathcal{R} and $i \in \mathbb{N}$ that we get

$$\begin{aligned} L_{m+i(r+1)}w &\in \mathfrak{M}_L \Rightarrow L_{m+(i+1)(r+1)}w \in \mathfrak{M}_L, \quad \forall m > r, \\ G_{n+i(r+1)}w &\in \mathfrak{M}_G \Rightarrow G_{n+(i+1)(r+1)}w \in \mathfrak{M}_G, \quad \forall n > r - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have $L_{m+i(r+1)}w \in \mathfrak{M}_L$ and $G_{n+i(r+1)}w \in \mathfrak{M}_G$ for all $m > r, n > r - 1$ by induction on $i \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}L_{m+i(r+1)}w$ and $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}G_{n+i(r+1)}w$ are both finite-dimensional for $m > r, n > r - 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}L_{r+1+i}w &= \mathbb{C}L_{r+1}w + \sum_{m=r+2}^{2r+2} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}L_{m+i(r+1)}w \right), \\ \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}G_{r+i}w &= \mathbb{C}G_r w + \sum_{n=r+1}^{2r+1} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}G_{n+i(r+1)}w \right) \end{aligned}$$

are both finite dimensional. Then we can safely choose $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}L_{r+1+i}w = \sum_{i=0}^t \mathbb{C}L_{r+1+i}w \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}G_{r+i}w = \sum_{i=0}^t \mathbb{C}G_{r+i}w.$$

We denote

$$M' = \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_t \in \mathbb{N}, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_t \in \mathbb{X}} \mathbb{C} L_{r+1}^{x_1} \cdots L_{r+t}^{x_t} G_r^{y_0} G_{r+1}^{y_1} \cdots G_{r+t}^{y_t} w,$$

which is a (finite-dimensional) $\mathcal{R}^{(r)}$ -module by (i).

It follows that we can take a minimal $q \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(L_m + \alpha_1 L_{m+1} + \cdots + \alpha_q L_{m+q})M' = 0 \quad (4.1)$$

for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m > r$ and $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}, i = 1, \dots, q$. By applying L_m to (4.1), we immediately get

$$(\alpha_1 [L_m, L_{m+1}] + \cdots + \alpha_q [L_m, L_{m+q}])M' = 0.$$

This shows $k = 0$, i.e., $L_m M' = 0$ for some $m > r$. Thus, for any $k > m > r$, one checks

$$L_{m+k} M' = \frac{1}{k-m} (L_k L_m - L_m L_k) M' = 0.$$

Based on this, we obtain

$$G_{k+m} M' = -\frac{2}{m+k} (L_{m+k} G_0 - G_0 L_{m+k}) M' = 0,$$

that is to say, $G_{k+m} M' = 0$ for all $k > m > r$.

Claim 1. *If $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, then we have $G_1 \mathcal{P} \neq 0$.*

Suppose $G_1 \mathcal{P} = 0$. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, we have $L_k \mathcal{P} = -\frac{1}{2}(G_1 G_{k-1} + G_{k-1} G_1) \mathcal{P} = 0$. Since there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the action of L_k on \mathcal{P} is injective, we get into a contradiction. The claim holds.

Now for any $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, we can consider the following vector space

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{M}_a &= \left\{ w \oplus (G_1 w) \in \mathcal{P} \mid G_n w = L_m w = 0, \right. \\ &\quad \left. G_n (G_1 w) = L_m (G_1 w) = 0 \text{ for all } m > a, n > a-1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\mathfrak{M}_a \neq 0$ for sufficiently large $a \in \mathbb{N}$. On the other hand, $\mathfrak{M}_a = 0$ for all $a < 0$ since there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the action of L_k on \mathcal{P} is injective. Thus we can find a smallest $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ with $\widehat{M} := \mathfrak{M}_b \neq 0$. It follows from $m > b, n > b-1, p \in \mathbb{N}, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ that we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_m (L_p w) &= (p-m) L_{m+p} w = 0, \quad G_n (L_p w) = \left(\frac{p}{2} - n\right) G_{n+p} w = 0, \\ L_m (G_q w) &= \left(q - \frac{m}{2}\right) G_{m+q} w = 0, \quad G_n (G_q w) = -2 L_{n+q} w = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $G_q w \in \widehat{M}$ for all $q \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Similarly, we have $L_p(G_1 w), G_q(G_1 w) \in \widehat{M}$ for all $p \in \mathbb{N}, q \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$. So, \widehat{M} is a $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module with \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded, and defined in Theorem 3.4. Then \widehat{M} can be naturally induced to a \mathcal{B} -module $V = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$.

By the definition of V , one can see that the action of L_b on V is injective. By \mathcal{P} is simple and generated by V , we know that there exists a canonical surjective map

$$\Phi : \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}, \quad \Phi(1 \otimes v) = v, \quad \forall v \in V.$$

Hence, we only need to show that Φ is an injective map. Let $F = \ker(\Phi)$. Clearly, $F \cap V = 0$. If $F \neq 0$, we can choose $0 \neq w \in F \setminus V$ such that $\deg(w) = \mathbf{i}$ is minimal possible. Observe that F is an \mathcal{R} -submodule of $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$. By using an identical process in Lemma 3.3, a new vector $\eta \in F$ with $\deg(\eta) \prec \mathbf{i}$ can be obtained. This shows a contradiction, namely, $F = 0$. Then $\mathcal{P} \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$. To sum up, V is a simple \mathcal{B} -module. We complete the proof. \square

Theorem 4.2. *Let \mathcal{P} be a simple restricted \mathcal{R} -module. Assume that there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the action of L_r on \mathcal{P} is injective. Then $\mathcal{P} \cong \text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$, where V is a induced module $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$ as (2.2), \widehat{M} is a simple $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(r)}$ -module that $\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{(r)} = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}/\mathcal{R}^{(r)}$ is a quotient algebra for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$.*

Proof. It is clear that there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that the actions of L_m, G_n for all $m > r, n > r - 1$ on \mathcal{P} are locally nilpotent. Then based on Proposition 4.1, we immediately get the results. \square

5 Weak modules for vertex operator superalgebras

The Neveu-Schwarz algebra \mathcal{N} is the Lie superalgebra with the \mathbb{C} -basis $\{L_m, G_p, C \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}, p \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}\}$ and the Lie super-bracket defined by

$$\begin{aligned} [L_m, L_n] &= (n - m)L_{m+n} + \frac{n^3 - n}{12}\delta_{m+n,0}C, \\ [G_p, G_q] &= -2L_{p+q} + \frac{4p^2 - 1}{12}\delta_{p+q,0}C, \\ [L_m, G_p] &= (p - \frac{m}{2})G_{m+p}, \quad [\mathcal{R}, C] = 0 \end{aligned}$$

for $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, p, q \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}$. By its definition, we have the following decomposition:

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_0 \oplus \mathcal{N}_1,$$

where $\mathcal{N}_0 = \text{span}\{L_m, C \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, $\mathcal{N}_1 = \text{span}\{G_p \mid p \in \frac{1}{2} + \mathbb{Z}\}$. Note that the \mathcal{N} is isomorphic to the subalgebra of \mathcal{R} spanned by $\{L_m \mid m \in 2\mathbb{Z}\} \cup \{G_p \mid p \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1\} \cup \{C\}$.

It is clear that the \mathcal{N} has a $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ -grading by the eigenvalues of the adjoint action of L_0 . Then \mathcal{N} has the following triangular decomposition:

$$\mathcal{N} = \mathcal{N}_+ \oplus \mathcal{N}_0 \oplus \mathcal{N}_-,$$

where $\mathcal{N}_+ = \text{span}\{L_m, G_p \mid m, p > 0\}$, $\mathcal{N}_- = \text{span}\{L_m, G_p \mid m, p < 0\}$ and $\mathcal{N}_0 = \mathbb{C}\{L_0, C\}$.

Set

$$L(z) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} L_m z^{-m-2}, \quad G(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} G_{n+\frac{1}{2}} z^{-n-2}. \quad (5.1)$$

By Section 4.2 of [19], we have

$$\begin{aligned} [L(z_1), L(z_2)] &= z_1^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_2}{z_1}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} (L(z_2)) + 2z_1^{-2} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} \left(\delta\left(\frac{z_2}{z_1}\right)\right) L(z_2) + \frac{c}{12} z_1^{-4} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}\right)^3 \delta\left(\frac{z_2}{z_1}\right), \\ [L(z_1), G(z_2)] &= z_1^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_2}{z_1}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} (G(z_2)) + \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} z_1^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_2}{z_1}\right)\right) G(z_2), \\ [G(z_1), G(z_2)] &= 2z_1^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_2}{z_1}\right) L(z_2) + \frac{c}{3} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2}\right)^2 z_1^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_2}{z_1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Definition 5.1. A *vertex superalgebra* denoted by a quadruple $(V, Y, \mathbf{1}, D)$ is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded vector space

$$V = V^{(0)} \oplus V^{(1)},$$

and equipped with a linear map

$$\begin{aligned} V &\longrightarrow (\text{End}(V))[[z, z^{-1}]] \\ v &\longmapsto Y(v, z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} v_n z^{-n-1} \quad (\text{where } v_n \in \text{End}(V)), \end{aligned}$$

and with a specified vector $\mathbf{1} \in V_0$ (the *vacuum vector*) and a endomorphism D of V , such that

- (1) For any $u, v \in V$, $u_n v = 0$ for n sufficiently large;
- (2) $[D, Y(v, z)] = Y(D(v), z) = \frac{d}{dz} Y(v, z)$ for any $v \in V$;
- (3) $Y(\mathbf{1}, z) = \text{Id}_V$ (the *identity operator* of V);
- (4) $Y(v, z)\mathbf{1} \in \text{End}(V)[[z]]$ and $\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} Y(v, z)\mathbf{1} = v$ for any $v \in V$;
- (5) $z_0^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_1 - z_2}{x_0}\right) Y(u, z_1) Y(v, z_2) - (-1)^{|u||v|} z_0^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_2 - z_1}{-z_0}\right) Y(v, z_2) Y(u, z_1) \\ = z_2^{-1} \delta\left(\frac{z_1 - z_0}{z_2}\right) Y(Y(u, z_0)v, z_2)$ (the *Jacobi identity*), where $|v| = j$ if $v \in V^{(j)}$ for $j \in \mathbb{Z}_2$.

This completes the definition of vertex operator superalgebra.

A vertex superalgebra V is called a *vertex operator superalgebra* if there exists another distinguished vector ω of V satisfying the following conditions

- (6) $[L(m), L(n)] = (n - m)L(m + n) + \frac{n^3 - n}{12}\delta_{m+n,0}C$ for $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $Y(\omega, z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} L(n)z^{-n-2}$;
- (7) $L_{-1} = D$, i.e., $\frac{d}{dz}Y(v, z) = Y(L_{-1}v, z)$ for any $v \in V$;
- (8) V is $\frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ -graded such that $V = \bigoplus_{n \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}} V(n)$, $L(0)|_{V(n)} = n\text{Id}_{V(n)}$, $\dim(V(n)) < \infty$ and $V(n) = 0$ for n sufficiently negative.

For any $h, c \in \mathbb{C}$, assume that $W(h, c)$ is the Verma module for \mathcal{N} with highest weight (h, c) . Let $\mathbf{1}$ be a highest weight vector of $W(0, c)$. We denote

$$\bar{W}(0, c) = W(0, c) / \langle G_{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{1} \rangle, \quad (5.2)$$

where $\langle G_{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{1} \rangle$ is the submodule generated by $G_{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{1}$. It is well known that $\bar{W}(0, c)$ has a natural vertex operator superalgebra structure (see [14, 19]).

Assume that \mathcal{V} is a vertex superalgebra. Define the following linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \psi : \mathcal{V} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{V} \\ a + b &\longmapsto a - b \end{aligned}$$

for $a \in \mathcal{V}^{(0)}, b \in \mathcal{V}^{(1)}$. It is clear that ψ is an automorphism of \mathcal{V} (called the *canonical automorphism* (see [9])). Then $\text{Aut}(\bar{W}(0, c)) = \mathbb{Z}_2 = \langle \psi \rangle$.

The following results can be found in [19, 20].

Lemma 5.2. *Let $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\bar{W}(0, c)$ defined as (5.2).*

- (i) *Any restricted module for \mathcal{N} with central charge c is a weak $\bar{W}(0, c)$ -module;*
- (ii) *Any restricted module for \mathcal{R} with central charge c is a weak ψ -twisted $\bar{W}(0, c)$ -module.*

It follows from Theorem 3.1 of [16] and Lemma 5.2 (i) that one has the following results.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and H be a simple module of $\mathfrak{B} = \mathcal{N}_+ \oplus \mathcal{N}_0$. If there exists $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that H satisfying the following two conditions*

- (1) *the action of L_t on H is injective;*
- (2) *$L_m H = 0$ for all $m > t$,*

then the \mathcal{N} -module $\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{B}, c}(H)$ is a weak $\bar{W}(0, c)$ -module.

By Theorem 3.4 and Lemma 5.2 (ii), we have the following proposition.

Proposition 5.4. *Let $c \in \mathbb{C}$ and V be a simple induced module $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{M}$ where \widehat{M} is a $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module. Assume that there exists $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$ such that V satisfying the following two conditions*

- (1) *the action of L_r on V is injective;*
- (2) *$L_m V = G_r V = 0$ for all $m > r$.*

Then we obtain that the \mathcal{R} -module $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V)$ is a weak ψ -twisted $\bar{W}(0, c)$ -module.

6 Examples

In this section, we show some examples of simple restricted \mathcal{R} -modules.

6.1 Simple induced modules

Let $\mathfrak{l} = \mathbb{C}x + \mathbb{C}y$ be the 2-dimensional solvable Lie algebra with basis $\{x, y\}$, which satisfies the non-trivial Lie bracket $[x, y] = y$. As everyone knows, \mathfrak{l} is a subalgebra of classical 3-dimensional solvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$. We shall construct a class of induced restricted \mathcal{R} -module by using a $\mathbb{C}[y]$ -torsion-free simple \mathfrak{l} -module $\mathfrak{k} = (\partial - 1)^{-1}\mathbb{C}[\partial^{\pm 1}]$ defined in [21, Example 13], whose structure is given by

$$x \cdot f(\partial) = \partial \frac{d}{d\partial} f(\partial) + \frac{f(\partial)}{\partial^2(\partial - 1)}, \quad y \cdot f(\partial) = \partial f(\partial), \quad \forall f(\partial) \in \mathfrak{k}.$$

Then we can extended \mathfrak{l} -module to a $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module $\widehat{V}_{\mathfrak{k}} = (\partial - 1)^{-1}\mathbb{C}[\partial^{\pm 1}] \oplus G_1(\partial - 1)^{-1}\mathbb{C}[\partial^{\pm 1}]$ by defining

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 \cdot f(\partial) &= 2x \cdot f(\partial), \quad L_0 \cdot (G_1 f(\partial)) = G_1(2x \cdot f(\partial) + f(\partial)), \\ L_m \cdot f(\partial) &= G_n \cdot f(\partial) = L_m \cdot (G_1 f(\partial)) = G_n \cdot (G_1 f(\partial)) = 0, \\ L_2 \cdot f(\partial) &= y \cdot f(\partial), \quad L_2 \cdot (G_1 f(\partial)) = G_1(y \cdot f(\partial)), \quad C \cdot f(\partial) = cf(\partial), \end{aligned}$$

where $c \in \mathbb{C}, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3} \cup \{1\}, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}, f(\partial) \in \mathfrak{k}$. Note that $G_1^2 f(\partial) = y \cdot f(\partial)$. Clearly, $V_{\mathfrak{k}} = U(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{U(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} \widehat{V}_{\mathfrak{k}}$ is a simple \mathcal{B} -module. By Theorem 3.4, we get the simple induced \mathcal{R} -modules $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V_{\mathfrak{k}})$.

6.2 Whittaker modules

For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we denote

$$\widehat{\mathfrak{b}} = \bigoplus_{m \geq 1} \mathbb{C}L_m \oplus \bigoplus_{n \geq 2} \mathbb{C}G_n.$$

Let $\phi : \widehat{\mathfrak{b}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a non-trivial Lie superalgebra homomorphism and $\phi(G_2) = 0$. Then we have $\phi(L_m) = \phi(G_n) = 0$ for $m > 2, n > 1$. Let $\mathfrak{s}_\phi = \mathbb{C}v_{\bar{0}} \oplus \mathbb{C}v_{\bar{1}}$ be a 2-dimensional vector space with

$$xv_{\bar{0}} = \phi(x)v_{\bar{0}}, \quad v_{\bar{1}} = G_1v_{\bar{0}}, \quad Cv_{\bar{0}} = cv_{\bar{0}}, \quad Cv_{\bar{1}} = cv_{\bar{1}}$$

for all $x \in \widehat{\mathfrak{b}}$. Clearly, if $\phi(L_2) \neq 0$, \mathfrak{s}_ϕ is a simple $\widehat{\mathfrak{b}}$ -module and $\dim(\mathfrak{s}_\phi) = 2$. Now we consider the induced module

$$M_\phi = \mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathfrak{b}})} \mathfrak{s}_\phi = \mathbb{C}[L_0]v_{\bar{0}} \oplus \mathbb{C}[L_0](G_1v_{\bar{0}}).$$

It is easy to check that M_ϕ is a simple $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module if $\phi(L_2) \neq 0$. Let $V_\phi = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} M_\phi$. When $\phi(L_2) \neq 0$, the simple induced \mathcal{R} -modules $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V_\phi)$ in Theorem 3.4 are so-called classical Whittaker modules (see [15]).

6.3 High order Whittaker modules

In the following, we give a generalization version of Whittaker modules of \mathcal{R} called the high order Whittaker modules.

For $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$, we denote

$$\Gamma(s) = \bigoplus_{m \geq s} \mathbb{C}L_m \oplus \bigoplus_{n \geq s} \mathbb{C}G_n.$$

Let ϕ_s be a Lie superalgebra homomorphism $\phi_s : \Gamma(s) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for $s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}$. Then we get $\phi_s(L_m) = \phi_s(G_n) = 0$ for $m > 2s, n > 2s - 1$. Assume that $\mathfrak{s}_{\phi_s} = \mathbb{C}v_{\bar{0}} \oplus \mathbb{C}v_{\bar{1}}$ is a 2-dimensional vector space with

$$xv_{\bar{0}} = \phi_s(x)v_{\bar{0}}, \quad v_{\bar{1}} = G_1v_{\bar{0}}, \quad Cv_{\bar{0}} = cv_{\bar{0}}, \quad Cv_{\bar{1}} = cv_{\bar{1}}$$

for all $x \in \mathcal{R}(s)$. If $\phi_s(L_{2s}) \neq 0$, \mathfrak{s}_{ϕ_s} is a simple $\Gamma(s)$ -module and $\dim(\mathfrak{s}_{\phi_s}) = 2$. Consider the induced module

$$M_{\phi_s} = \mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\Gamma(s))} \mathfrak{s}_{\phi_s}.$$

Clearly, M_{ϕ_s} is a simple $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ -module if $\phi_s(L_{2s}) \neq 0$ and $\dim(M_{\phi_s}) = 2$. Denote $V_{\phi_s} = \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathcal{U}(\widehat{\mathcal{B}})} M_{\phi_s}$. The corresponding simple \mathcal{R} -modules $\text{Ind}_{\mathcal{B},c}(V_{\phi_s})$ in Theorem 3.4 are exactly the high order Whittaker modules.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11801369, 12171129), the Overseas Visiting Scholars Program of Shanghai Lixin University of Accounting and Finance (No. 2021161). The author thanks the Prof. Hongyan Guo for telling him reference [20].

References

- [1] D. Adamović, R. Lü, K. Zhao, Whittaker modules for the affine algebra $A_1^{(1)}$, *Adv. Math.*, **289** (2016), 438-479.
- [2] Y. Cai, D. Liu, R. Lü, Classification of simple Harish-Chandra modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra, *J. Algebra* **567** (2021), 114-127.
- [3] G. Chen, D. Cheng, J. Han, Y. Su, Classification of irreducible weak modules over Virasoro vertex operator algebras, *Internat. J. Math.*, **30** (2019), 1950054.
- [4] H. Chen, X. Dai, D. Liu, From super Weyl modules to the super Virasoro modules, arXiv:2111.10691.
- [5] H. Chen, H. Wu, Y. Xiao, Representations of the twisted $N = 2$ superconformal algebra.
- [6] H. Chen, X. Guo, New simple modules for the Heisenberg-Virasoro algebra, *J. Algebra*, **390** (2013), 77-86.
- [7] G. Chen, J. Han, Y. Su, Some modules over Lie algebras related to the Virasoro algebra, *J. Math. Soc. Japan*, **72** (2020), 61-72.
- [8] S. Cheng, W. Wang, Dualities and representations of Lie superalgebras, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 144. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [9] A. J. Feingold, I. B. Frenkel, J. F. X. Ries, Spinor construction of vertex operator algebras, triality and $E_8^{(1)}$, Contemporary Math. Vol. 121, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1991.
- [10] D. Gao, Simple restricted modules for the Heisenberg-Virasoro algebra, *J. Algebra*, **574** (2021), 233-251.
- [11] K. Iohara, Y. Koga, Representation theory of Neveu-Schwarz and Ramond algebras I: Verma modules, *Adv. Math.*, **178** (2003), 1-65.
- [12] K. Iohara, Y. Koga, Representation theory of Neveu-Schwarz and Ramond algebras II: Fock modules, *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, **53** (2003), 1755-1818.
- [13] K. Iohara, Y. Koga, The structure of pre-Verma modules over the $N = 1$ Ramond algebra, *Lett. Math. Phys.*, **78** (2006), 89-96.
- [14] V. G. Kac, W. Wang, Vertex operator superalgebras and representations, *Contemp. Math.*, **175** (1994), 161-191.
- [15] D. Liu, Y. Pei, L. Xia, Whittaker modules for the super-Virasoro algebras, *J. Algebra, Appl.*, **18** (2019), 1950211.
- [16] D. Liu, Y. Pei, L. Xia, Simple restricted modules for Neveu-Schwarz algebra, *J. Algebra*, **546** (2020), 341-356.
- [17] D. Liu, Y. Pei, L. Xia, K. Zhao, Irreducible modules over the mirror Heisenberg-Virasoro algebra, *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, (2021), 2150026.
- [18] J. Lepowsky and H. Li, Introduction to vertex operator algebras and their representations, Progress in Mathematics, Vol. 227 (Birkhäuser, Boston, 2004).

- [19] H. Li, Local systems of vertex operators, vertex superalgebras and modules, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, **109** (1996), 143-195.
- [20] H. Li, Local systems of twisted vertex operators, vertex operator superalgebras and twisted modules. *Moonshine, the Monster, and related topics (South Hadley, MA, 1994)*, 203-236, Contemp. Math., 193, *Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI*, 1996.
- [21] R. Lü, V. Mazorchuk, K. Zhao, Classification of simple weight modules over the 1-Spatial ageing algebra, *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, **18** (2015), 381-395.
- [22] H. Tan, Y. Yao, K. Zhao, Simple restricted modules over the Heisenberg-Virasoro algebra as VOA modules, arXiv:2110.05714.
- [23] V. Mazorchuk, K. Zhao, Simple Virasoro modules which are locally finite over a positive part, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)*, **20** (2014), 839-854.
- [24] Y. Su, Classification of Harish-Chandra modules over the super-Virasoro algebras, *Comm. Algebra* **23** (1995), 3653-3675.
- [25] H. Yang, Y. Yao, L. Xia, A family of non-weight modules over the super-Virasoro algebras, *J. Algebra* **547** (2020), 538-555.

Haibo Chen

School of Statistics and Mathematics, Shanghai Lixin University of Accounting and Finance,
Shanghai 201209, China and Department of Mathematics, Jimei University, Xiamen, Fujian 361021,
China

Hypo1025@163.com