

ZERO LEVEL MODULES OVER TWISTED AFFINE LIE SUPERALGEBRAS

Asghar Daneshvar^a, Hajar Kiamehr^a, Malihe Yousofzadeh^{a,b,*}

^a Department of Pure Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran, P.O.Box 81746-73441 and School of Mathematics.

^b Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box: 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran.

Email addresses: a.daneshvar@ipm.ir (Asghar Daneshvar), hkiamehr@sci.ui.ac.ir (Hajar Kiamehr), ma.yousofzadeh@sci.ui.ac.ir & ma.yousofzadeh@ipm.ir (Malihe Yousofzadeh).

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we characterize a class of simple finite weight modules over twisted affine Lie superalgebras. This is an essential step toward completing the classification of simple finite weight modules over these Lie superalgebras.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of Lie (super)algebras is an active research area, uncovering numerous connections and applications in various domains of both mathematics and physics (see for instance [12] and [17]). More specifically, Lie (super)algebras \mathcal{L} having a root space decomposition with respect to an abelian subalgebra \mathcal{H} , such as basic classical simple Lie superalgebras, affine Lie (super)algebras, Virasoro algebra and etc., play a crucial role. For example, affine Lie (super)algebras have an important role in advancing investigations in number theory, group theory, knot theory, and quantum field theory ([4] can be considered as an exemplary reference for knot theory, and [15, 16] can be cited as examples in the context of number theory). They hold considerable importance, especially the classification of their modules is a topic of significance.

After studying finite dimensional \mathcal{L} -modules, the next step is to study finite weight \mathcal{L} -modules, i.e., \mathcal{L} -modules having weight space decomposition with respect to \mathcal{H} with finite weight multiplicities. There have been a vast amount of research in this regard. In the case that real root vectors (root vectors corresponding to the roots which are not self-orthogonal) act locally nilpotently on \mathcal{L} (e.g., in affine and finite theory), the key point in these researchs is the behaviour of real root vectors acting on the module, more precisely, in this case, real root vectors act on a simple module either injectively or locally nilpotently. This behaviour

* Corresponding author.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 17B10, 17B67.

Key Words: Finite weight modules, twisted affine Lie superalgebras.

This work is based upon research funded by Iran National Science Foundation INSF (No. 4001480).

leads the module structure. The simplest case (in some sense), is the case that all real root vectors act locally nilpotently on a module. Such a module is called an integrable module. A simple integrable finite weight module over a finite dimensional reductive Lie algebra is finite dimensional but in infinite dimensional level, the situation is completely different.

By reviewing the literature, all investigations on finite weight modules go back to fabulous works by S.L. Fernando [11] and O. Mathieu [19]; S.L. Fernando started studying finite weight modules over finite dimensional reductive Lie algebras and showed that such a module is parabolically induced from a cuspidal module; in the context of finite theory, it means a module on which all nonzero root vectors act injectively. He also proved that cuspidal modules exist only for those reductive Lie algebras whose simple constituents are just simple Lie algebras of type A and C . Then, Mathieu [19] continued Fernando's work by classifying cuspidal modules. His main idea to classify these modules is the notion of coherent families.

In affine case, the study is more complicated due to the existence of imaginary roots i.e., roots which are orthogonal to all other roots. This study was initiated by works of V. Chari and A. Pressley [3, 2]; the focus of their papers is the study of simple integrable finite weight modules over affine Lie algebras. They show that these modules are either highest-lowest weight modules or so-called loop modules. For the result about non-integrable modules over affine Lie algebras and on some other generalizations of these Lie algebras, see [5], [8], [9], [10], [13] and [14] among the others.

During the time that the research on module theory of affine Lie algebras was going on, the study of simple finite weight modules over finite dimensional Lie superalgebras was started by I. Dimitrov and his colleagues in [6]; according to their results, the characterization of these modules is reduced to the study of cuspidal modules over certain Lie superalgebras. Their study was linked, by S. Eswara Rao and V. Futorny [7], to module theory of affine Lie superalgebras; affine Lie superalgebras had been introduced and classified by J.W. Van de Leur in 1986. According to the classification, affine Lie superalgebras are divided into untwisted and twisted types, see [20] or [23, Appendix A] for the details. An affine Lie superalgebra contains a canonical central element acting on a simple finite weight module as a scalar called the level of the module. In 2001, V.G. Kac and M. Wakimoto [16] studied weakly integrable¹ highest weight modules over untwisted affine Lie superalgebras and their study was followed in [7] for nonzero level weakly integrable modules (not necessarily highest weight ones) again over untwisted affine Lie superalgebras. Also, the third author of the current paper has studied general finite weight modules over twisted affine Lie superalgebras in [23, 21, 22]. It has been shown that the study of the modules under consideration in [7, 23, 21] is reduced to the study of modules investigated in [6].

¹Since there is no simple integrable finite weight module over almost all affine Lie superalgebras, V.G. Kac and M. Wakimoto defined a weaker version of integrability.

Although, there have been significant amount of research on module theory of affine Lie superalgebras, the case that all real root vectors act injectively has been abandoned. In the preprint [24], we study this case; we first notice that in this case, the level of a simple finite weight module over an affine Lie superalgebra \mathcal{L} is zero and then show that the study of these modules is reduced to the study of modules Ω over a subalgebra \mathcal{G} of \mathcal{L} , containing the Cartan subalgebra of \mathcal{L} , whose root system T contains two closed subsets $T(1)$ and $T(2)$ such that all real root vectors of $T(1)$ act locally nilpotently on Ω while all real roots of $T(2)$ are hybrid (see Theorem 3.1 for the definition) and also satisfy some other mild and natural conditions. This means that the classification problem goes back to find the classification of such modules Ω . This is the main purpose of this paper. In our main theorem, we show that such a T contains a parabolic subset P such that $P \cap -P$ is finite and there is a nonzero weight vector v with

$$\mathcal{G}^\alpha v = \{0\} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in (P \setminus (-P \cup \mathbb{Z}\delta)) \cup ((P \setminus \{0\}) \cap T(2) \cap \mathbb{Z}\delta),$$

here \mathcal{G}^α is the root space corresponding to the root α and $\mathbb{Z}\delta$ is the set of imaginary roots. In particular, if the set $T(2)_{im}$ of imaginary roots of $T(2)$ is $\mathbb{Z}\delta$, then there is a nonzero weight vector v such that

$$\mathcal{G}^\alpha v = \{0\} \quad (\text{for all } \alpha \in P \setminus -P).$$

This immediately implies that Ω is parabolically induced from a module over a finite direct sum of basic classical simple Lie superalgebras and we are done. When $T(2)_{im} \neq \mathbb{Z}\delta$, the situation is different and needs a separate investigation which has been done in the preprint [18].

Here is a summary of the content covered in this paper. Section 2 serves as a brief introduction, providing definitions and some facts using in the main section. It is structured into two subsections. The first subsection is dedicated to definitions, revisiting essential concepts, and summarizing previous findings. In the second subsection, a fundamental result concerning zero level integrable modules over split central extensions of affine Lie algebras is presented, a crucial building block for the main portion of the paper (see Theorem 2.1). The concluding section presents our main findings and results (see Theorem 3.6).

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Generic Information. In this short subsection, to unify the notations, we gather some generic definitions and notations. The underlying field, for all vector (super)spaces, is the field of complex numbers \mathbb{C} . Suppose that $\mathfrak{k} = \mathfrak{k}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{k}_1$ ($\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$) is a Lie superalgebra equipped with a nondegenerate supersymmetric invariant even bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) and \mathfrak{h} is a finite dimensional subalgebra of the even part \mathfrak{k}_0 of \mathfrak{k} . A superspace $V = V_0 \oplus V_1$ is called an *\mathfrak{h} -weight \mathfrak{k} -module* (or simply a weight \mathfrak{k} -module if there is no ambiguity) if

- (1) $[x, y]v = x(yv) - (-1)^{|x||y|}y(xv)$ for all $v \in V$ and $x, y \in \mathfrak{k}$,
- (2) $\mathfrak{k}_i V_j \subseteq V_{i+j}$ for all $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$,
- (3) $V = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*} V^\lambda$ with $V^\lambda := \{v \in V \mid hv = \lambda(h)v \ (h \in \mathfrak{h})\}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ (dual space of \mathfrak{h}).

In this setting, an element λ of the *support* of V , defined by

$$\text{supp}(V) := \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid V^\lambda \neq \{0\}\},$$

is called a *weight* of V , and the corresponding V^λ is called a *weight space*. Elements of a weight space are called *weight vectors*. If all weight spaces are finite dimensional, then the module V is called a *finite weight module*.

If \mathfrak{k} is an \mathfrak{h} -weight module via the adjoint representation, we say that \mathfrak{k} has a root space decomposition with respect to \mathfrak{h} ; the set of weights of \mathfrak{k} is said to be the *root system* and weights, weight vectors and weight spaces are termed respectively *roots*, *root vectors* and *root spaces*.

Next assume that \mathfrak{k} has a root space decomposition with respect to \mathfrak{h} with root system Φ such that $\mathfrak{k}^0 = \mathfrak{h}$. Since the form on \mathfrak{k} restricted to \mathfrak{h} is a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form, we conclude that

$$(2.1) \quad \text{for each } \alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*, \text{ there is a unique } t_\alpha \in \mathfrak{h} \text{ with } \alpha(h) = (t_\alpha, h) \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h}.$$

Therefore, the form on \mathfrak{h} naturally induces a nondegenerate symmetric bilinear form on the dual space \mathfrak{h}^* of \mathfrak{h} , which we denote again by (\cdot, \cdot) . Now, we assume $S \subseteq \mathfrak{h}^*$ and define

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} S_{re} &= \{\alpha \in S \mid (\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0\}, & S_{im} &= \{\alpha \in S \mid (\alpha, \Phi) = \{0\}\}, \\ S_{ns} &= \{\alpha \in S \setminus S_{im} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) = 0\}, & S^\times &= S \setminus S_{im}. \end{aligned}$$

Elements of S_{im} (resp. S_{re} and S_{ns}) are called imaginary roots (resp. real roots and nonsingular roots). Next assume V is a \mathfrak{k} -module and $S \subseteq \Phi$,

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} &\text{we denote by } S^{ln}(V) \text{ (resp. } S^{in}(V)), \text{ the set of all real roots } \alpha \in S \\ &\text{for which } 0 \neq x \in \mathfrak{k}^\alpha \text{ acts on } V \text{ locally nilpotently (resp. injectively).} \end{aligned}$$

If moreover, $V = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*} V^\lambda$ is an \mathfrak{h} -weight \mathfrak{k} -module and W is an \mathfrak{h} -submodule of V , then, we have $W = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*} (W \cap V^\lambda)$; we next set²

$$(2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathfrak{B}_W &:= \{\alpha \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\Phi \mid \#\{k \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \mid \lambda + k\alpha \in \text{supp}(W)\} < \infty \ (\forall \lambda \in \text{supp}(W))\}, \\ \mathfrak{C}_W &:= \{\alpha \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}}\Phi \mid \alpha + \text{supp}(W) \subseteq \text{supp}(W)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We say that the \mathfrak{h} -weight \mathfrak{k} -module V has *shadow* if

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(s1)} \quad &\Phi_{re} = \{\alpha \in \Phi \mid (\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0\} = \Phi^{in}(V) \cup \Phi^{ln}(V), \\ \text{(s2)} \quad &\Phi^{ln}(V) = \mathfrak{B}_V \cap \Phi_{re} \text{ and } \Phi^{in}(V) = \mathfrak{C}_V \cap \Phi_{re}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that, the behavior of root vectors corresponding to real roots, whether they act locally nilpotently or injectively, depends only on W . Thus, in the case of a fixed W , we can simplify the notation $T^\star(W)$ to T^\star where $\star = in, ln$.

If we have a subset S of Φ and functional $\mathbf{f} : \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then the decomposition

$$(2.5) \quad S = S^+ \cup S^\circ \cup S^-$$

²We use $\#$ to indicate the cardinal number of a set.

where

$$S^\pm = S_f^\pm := \{\alpha \in S \mid \pm \mathbf{f}(\alpha) > 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad S^\circ = S_f^\circ := \{\alpha \in S \mid \mathbf{f}(\alpha) = 0\}$$

is said to be a *triangular decomposition* for S . This situation is referred to as *trivial* when $S = S_f^\circ$. When P is a subset of the root system Φ , it is called a *parabolic subset of Φ* if it meets the following conditions:

$$\Phi = P \cup -P \quad \text{and} \quad (P + P) \cap \Phi \subseteq P.$$

For a parabolic set P , we define the subalgebras as follows:

$$\mathfrak{k}^0 = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in P \cap -P} \mathfrak{k}^\alpha, \quad \mathfrak{k}^+ = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in P \setminus -P} \mathfrak{k}^\alpha, \quad \mathfrak{k}^- = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in -P \setminus P} \mathfrak{k}^\alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{b} = \mathfrak{k}^0 \oplus \mathfrak{k}^+.$$

We can convert each \mathfrak{k}^0 -module N into a \mathfrak{b} -module with the trivial action of \mathfrak{k}^+ . It follows that

$$\bar{N} := U(\mathfrak{k}) \otimes_{U(\mathfrak{b})} N$$

is an \mathfrak{k} -module; here $U(-)$ denotes the universal enveloping algebra of $-$. If the \mathfrak{k} -module N contains a unique maximal submodule Z that intersects N trivially, then the quotient module

$$\text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{k}}(N) := \bar{N}/Z$$

is said to be a *parabolically induced module*. Furthermore, a *cuspidal module* is defined as a simple \mathfrak{k} -module that is not parabolically induced from a simple module over \mathfrak{k}^0 corresponding to a parabolic subset of Φ .

2.2. Level zero integrable modules on split central extensions of affine Lie algebras.

Throughout this subsection, assume \mathfrak{t} is an affine Lie algebra with Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} and Z is an abelian Lie algebra. For

$$\mathfrak{k} := \mathfrak{t} \oplus Z,$$

we assume that

V is a nonzero finite $(\mathfrak{h} \oplus Z =) \mathfrak{H}$ -weight \mathfrak{k} -module on which the canonical central element of \mathfrak{t} acts trivially and for all real roots α of the root system ϕ of \mathfrak{t} (and so of \mathfrak{k}), $x \in \mathfrak{k}^\alpha$ acts locally nilpotently on V .

One knows that there is an irreducible finite root system $\dot{\phi}$ and a free abelian group $\mathbb{Z}\delta$ of rank 1 such that the root system ϕ of \mathfrak{k} is of one of the following forms:

$$\phi = \begin{cases} \dot{\phi} + \mathbb{Z}\delta & X = Y^{(1)}, \\ (\dot{\phi} + 2\mathbb{Z}\delta) \cup ((\dot{\phi}_{sh} \cup \{0\}) + 2\mathbb{Z}\delta + \delta) & X = A_{2\ell-1}^{(2)}, D_\ell^{(2)}, E_6^{(2)}, \\ (\dot{\phi} + 3\mathbb{Z}\delta) \cup ((\dot{\phi}_{sh} \cup \{0\}) + 3\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \delta) & X = D_4^{(3)}, \\ (\dot{\phi}_{ind} + 2\mathbb{Z}\delta) \cup (\dot{\phi} + 2\mathbb{Z}\delta + \delta) & X = A_{2\ell}^{(2)}, \end{cases}$$

in which Y is the type of a finite dimensional simple Lie algebra,

$$\dot{\phi}_{ind} := \dot{\phi} \setminus \dot{\phi}_{ex}$$

and “*sh*”, “*lg*” and “*ex*” stand for “short”, “long” and “extra long” roots respectively (Table 1.24 of [1] potentially holds useful information for the reader.). Set

$$\mathfrak{g} := \bigoplus_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}_{ind}} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}}.$$

Then, \mathfrak{g} is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{k} and V is a finite weight module over the reductive Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Using \mathfrak{sl}_2 -module theory and the fact that all root vectors corresponding to the real roots act locally nilpotently on V , we can deduce that,

$$(2.6) \quad \text{for } \alpha \in \phi_{re} \text{ and } \lambda \in \text{supp}(V), \frac{2(\lambda, \alpha)}{(\alpha, \alpha)} \in \mathbb{Z}; \text{ moreover, if } \lambda \in \text{supp}(V) \text{ and } \frac{2(\lambda, \alpha)}{(\alpha, \alpha)} \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \text{ (resp. } \in \mathbb{Z}^{<0}), \text{ then } \lambda - \alpha \in \text{supp}(V) \text{ (resp. } \lambda + \alpha \in \text{supp}(V)).$$

Fix a base Δ of $\dot{\phi}_{ind}$. The same argument as stated in the proof of [8, Lemma 2.6] together with (2.6), implies that

$$(2.7) \quad \text{there is } \lambda \in \text{supp}(V) \text{ such that } \lambda + \dot{\alpha} \notin \text{supp}(V) \text{ for all } 0 \neq \dot{\alpha} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z} \geq 0} \Delta, \text{ in particular, } 2(\lambda, \dot{\alpha})/(\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \text{ for all } \dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}_{ind}^+(\Delta) := (\dot{\phi}_{ind} \setminus \{0\}) \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z} \geq 0} \Delta.$$

The following theorem is crucial for our main result in the next section.

Theorem 2.1. *Keep the same notations as above and define a functional*

$$\zeta : \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \Delta (= \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{\phi}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

such that $\zeta(\Delta) > 0$. Then, there is a nonzero weight vector v , say e.g., of weight μ such that $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} v = \{0\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}$ with $\zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0$.

Proof. Set

$$r := \begin{cases} 1 & X = Y^{(1)}, \\ 3 & X = D_4^{(3)}, \\ 2 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Using (2.6) and (2.7) as well as the same argument as in [3, Theorem 2.4(ii)], we get $\mu \in \text{supp}(V)$ with

$$(2.8) \quad \mu + \dot{\gamma} + rn\delta \notin \text{supp}(V) \quad \text{and} \quad 2(\mu, \dot{\gamma})/(\dot{\gamma}, \dot{\gamma}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \quad (\dot{\gamma} \in \dot{\phi}_{ind}^+(\Delta), n \in \mathbb{Z}).$$

In particular,

$$(2.9) \quad \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} v = \{0\} \quad (v \in V^\mu, \dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}_{ind}^+(\Delta), n \in r\mathbb{Z}).$$

If there is a nonzero weight vector $v \in V^\mu$ with $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} v = \{0\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}$ with $\zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0$, then we are done. Otherwise, we pick $0 \neq v \in V^\mu$ and note that by (2.9),

$$\mathcal{A} := \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi} \mid \zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0, \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + m\delta} v \neq \{0\} \text{ for some } m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

is not empty. Next pick $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*) = \max\{\zeta(\dot{\alpha}) \mid \dot{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}\}$. Since $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \mathcal{A}$, there is $m_* \in \mathbb{Z}$ with

$$\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_*\delta} v \neq \{0\}.$$

We let $0 \neq w \in \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v$ and show that $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} w = \{0\}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}$ with $\dot{\alpha} + n \delta \in \phi$ and $\zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0$. We break the proof into the following cases.

- $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}_{ind}, n \in r\mathbb{Z}$. In this case, using (2.9), we have

$$\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} w \subseteq \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v \subseteq [\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta}, \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta}] v + \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} \underbrace{\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} v}_{\{0\}} \subseteq \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n + m_*) \delta} v.$$

If $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n + m_*) \delta$ is not a root, then $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n + m_*) \delta} = \{0\}$ and there is nothing to prove. If $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n + m_*) \delta$ is a root, then since $\zeta(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) > \zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*)$, due to the choice of $\dot{\alpha}_*$, we have $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n + m_*) \delta} v = \{0\}$ which in turn implies that $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} w = \{0\}$ and so we are done.

- $X = A_{2\ell-1}^{(2)}, D_\ell^{(2)}, E_6^{(2)}, D_4^{(3)}$, $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}_{sh}, n \in r\mathbb{Z} \pm 1$. Note that as $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v \neq \{0\}$, by (2.9), we have $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \dot{\phi}_{sh}$ and $m_* \in r\mathbb{Z} \pm 1$. In particular, we have

$$(2.10) \quad \dot{\alpha}_* + (m_* + n) \delta \in \phi \quad \text{and} \quad 2(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*, \dot{\alpha}_*) / (\dot{\alpha}_*, \dot{\alpha}_*) > 0.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} w \subseteq \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v \subseteq V^{\mu + (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) + (m_* + n) \delta}.$$

If $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v \neq \{0\}$, we have $\mu + (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) + (m_* + n) \delta \in \text{supp}(V)$. This together with (2.6), (2.8) and (2.10) implies that

$$\mu + \dot{\alpha} = \mu + (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) + (m_* + n) \delta - (\dot{\alpha}_* + (m_* + n) \delta) \in \text{supp}(V),$$

which contradicts (2.8). Therefore, $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v = \{0\}$ and so, we are done.

- $X = A_{2\ell}^{(2)}$, $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{\phi}, n \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$. In this case, we have $r = 2$. Since $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v \neq \{0\}$, we have $m_* \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$. So

$$(2.11) \quad \dot{\phi}_{ind} + (m_* + n) \delta \subseteq \phi.$$

We shall show $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} w = \{0\}$. To this end, we note that

$$\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} w \subseteq \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v \subseteq V^{\mu + (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) + (m_* + n) \delta}.$$

If $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v = \{0\}$, then, we are done. So we assume $\mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha} + n \delta} \mathfrak{k}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_* \delta} v \neq \{0\}$ and show that it leads a contradiction. We have $\mu + (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) + (m_* + n) \delta \in \text{supp}(V)$. Hence, we can contemplate the following scenarios.

- If $\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha}_* \in \dot{\phi}_{ind}$, then since either $2 \frac{(\dot{\alpha}_* + \dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha})}{(\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha})} \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ or $2 \frac{(\dot{\alpha}_* + \dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha}_*)}{(\dot{\alpha}_*, \dot{\alpha}_*)} \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, we get using (2.6), (2.8) and (2.11) that $\mu + \dot{\alpha} \in \text{supp}(V)$ or $\mu + \dot{\alpha}_* \in \text{supp}(V)$ contradicting (2.8).
- If exactly one of $\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha}_*$ belongs to $\dot{\phi}_{ind}$, then, without loss of generality, we assume $\dot{\alpha} = 2\dot{\beta}$ for some short root $\dot{\beta}$ and $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \dot{\phi}_{ind}$. We have $2 \frac{(\mu + 2\dot{\beta} + \dot{\alpha}_*, \dot{\beta})}{(\dot{\beta}, \dot{\beta})} > 0$. Using (2.6), this implies that $\mu + \dot{\beta} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (m_* + n) \delta \in \text{supp}(V)$. We get a contradiction as in the previous case.

(iii) If $\dot{\alpha}, \dot{\alpha}_* \in \dot{\phi}_{ex}$, then, we have $\dot{\alpha} = 2\dot{\beta}$ and $\dot{\alpha}_* = 2\dot{\beta}'$ for some $\dot{\beta}, \dot{\beta}' \in \dot{\phi}_{sh}$. In particular, we have

$$(2.12) \quad \dot{\beta}' + (m_* + n)\delta \in \phi \quad \text{and} \quad 2(\dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}', \dot{\beta}')/(\dot{\beta}', \dot{\beta}') > 0.$$

This together with (2.6) implies that

$$\mu + 2\dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}' = \mu + 2(\dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}') + (m_* + n)\delta - (\dot{\beta}' + (m_* + n)\delta) \in \text{supp}(V).$$

Similarly, we get

$$\mu + \dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}' = \mu + 2\dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}' - \dot{\beta} \in \text{supp}(V),$$

and finally, as $2(\mu + \dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}', \dot{\beta}')/(\dot{\beta}', \dot{\beta}') > 0$, we have

$$\mu + \dot{\beta} = \mu + \dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}' - \dot{\beta}' \in \text{supp}(V)$$

which is a contradiction due to (2.8).

The proof is now complete. □

3. MAIN RESULTS

Starting from this point until the conclusion of this section, we will adhere to the following notations and conventions. Suppose that \mathcal{L} is a twisted affine Lie superalgebra with $\mathcal{L}_1 \neq \{0\}$, standard Cartan subalgebra \mathcal{H} and corresponding root system $R = R_0 \cup R_1$. One knows that there exists an invariant even nondegenerate supersymmetric \mathbb{C} -valued bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) on \mathcal{L} which is also nondegenerate on \mathcal{H} . The root system R of \mathcal{L} with nonzero odd part can be identified in the following table:

TABLE 1. Root systems of twisted affine Lie superalgebras

Type	R
$A(2m, 2n-1)^{(2)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}, n \neq 0$)	$\mathbb{Z}\delta \cup \mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{\epsilon_i, \delta_p, \epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q, \epsilon_i \pm \delta_p \mid i \neq j, p \neq q\}$ $\cup (2\mathbb{Z} + 1)\delta \pm \{2\epsilon_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ $\cup 2\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{2\delta_p \mid 1 \leq p \leq n\}$
$A(2m-1, 2n-1)^{(2)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{> 0}, (m, n) \neq (1, 1)$)	$\mathbb{Z}\delta \cup \mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q, \delta_p \pm \epsilon_i \mid i \neq j, p \neq q\}$ $\cup (2\mathbb{Z} + 1)\delta \pm \{2\epsilon_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ $\cup 2\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{2\delta_p \mid 1 \leq p \leq n\}$
$A(2m, 2n)^{(4)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}, (m, n) \neq (0, 0)$)	$\mathbb{Z}\delta \cup \mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{\epsilon_i, \delta_p \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq p \leq n\}$ $\cup 2\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{\epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q, \delta_p \pm \epsilon_i \mid i \neq j, p \neq q\}$ $\cup (4\mathbb{Z} + 2)\delta \pm \{2\epsilon_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq m\}$ $\cup 4\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{2\delta_p \mid 1 \leq p \leq n\}$
$D(m+1, n)^{(2)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}, n \neq 0$)	$\mathbb{Z}\delta \cup \mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{\epsilon_i, \delta_p \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq p \leq n\}$ $\cup 2\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \{2\delta_p, \epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q, \delta_p \pm \epsilon_i \mid i \neq j, p \neq q\}$

where

$$(\delta, R) = \{0\}, \quad (\epsilon_i, \epsilon_j) = \delta_{i,j}, \quad (\delta_p, \delta_q) = -\delta_{p,q}.$$

It is apparent from Table 1 that there exists $r \in \{2, 4\}$ satisfying the following:

$$(3.1) \quad R + r\mathbb{Z}\delta \subseteq R.$$

Set

$$\dot{R} := \{\dot{\alpha} \mid \dot{\alpha} + n\delta \in R \text{ (for some } n \in \mathbb{Z})\}.$$

By Table 1, we have

$$\dot{R}^\times = \dot{R} \setminus \{0\} = (\dot{R}_{ns} \setminus \{0\}) \cup \dot{R}_{re}$$

in which

$$\dot{R}_\star := \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R} \mid R \cap (\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \subseteq R_\star\} \quad (\star = ns, re),$$

additionally, Table 2 provides details regarding real and nonsingular roots of \dot{R} :

TABLE 2. Real and nonsingular roots of \dot{R}

Type	\dot{R}_{re}	$\dot{R}_{ns} \setminus \{0\}$
$A(2m, 2n-1)^{(2)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}, n \neq 0$)	$\{\pm\epsilon_i, \pm\delta_p, \pm 2\epsilon_i, \pm 2\delta_p, \epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q$ $\mid 1 \leq i \neq j \leq m, 1 \leq p \neq q \leq n\}$	$\{\pm\epsilon_i \pm \delta_p \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq p \leq n\}$ $\subseteq \dot{R}_{re} + \dot{R}_{re}$
$A(2m-1, 2n-1)^{(2)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{> 0}, (m, n) \neq (1, 1)$)	$\{\pm 2\epsilon_i, \pm 2\delta_p, \epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q$ $\mid 1 \leq i \neq j \leq m, 1 \leq p \neq q \leq n\}$	$\{\pm\epsilon_i \pm \delta_p \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq p \leq n\}$ $\subseteq \frac{1}{2}(\dot{R}_{re} + \dot{R}_{re})$
$A(2m, 2n)^{(4)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}, (m, n) \neq (0, 0)$)	$\{\pm\epsilon_i, \pm\delta_p, \pm 2\epsilon_i, \pm 2\delta_p, \epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q$ $\mid 1 \leq i \neq j \leq m, 1 \leq p \neq q \leq n\}$	$\{\pm\epsilon_i \pm \delta_p \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq p \leq n\}$ $\subseteq \dot{R}_{re} + \dot{R}_{re}$
$D(m+1, n)^{(2)}$ ($m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}, n \neq 0$)	$\{\pm\epsilon_i, \pm\delta_p, \pm 2\delta_p, \epsilon_i \pm \epsilon_j, \delta_p \pm \delta_q$ $\mid 1 \leq i \neq j \leq m, 1 \leq p \neq q \leq n\}$	$\{\pm\epsilon_i \pm \delta_p \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq p \leq n\}$ $\subseteq \dot{R}_{re} + \dot{R}_{re}$

Moreover, we have

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}c \oplus \mathbb{C}d \oplus \sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R}} \mathbb{C}t_{\dot{\alpha}}$$

with

$$(c, d) = 1, (c, c) = (d, d) = 0, (c, \sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R}} \mathbb{C}t_{\dot{\alpha}}) = (d, \sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R}} \mathbb{C}t_{\dot{\alpha}}) = \{0\}.$$

To arrive at the results, it is essential to recall the following theorem which grants us effective control over the roots.

Theorem 3.1. ([23, Theorem 4.8]) *Suppose that V is an \mathcal{H} -weight \mathcal{L} -module having shadow. Then for each $\beta \in R_{re}$, one of the following will happen:*

- (i) β is full-locally nilpotent, that is $(\beta + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \subseteq R^{ln}(V)$,
- (ii) β is full-injective, that is $(\beta + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \subseteq R^{in}(V)$,

(iii) β is down-nilpotent hybrid, that is, there exist $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in \{0, 1, -1\}$ such that for $\gamma := \beta + m\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma + \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 1}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{in}}(V), & (\gamma + \mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{ln}} \\ (-\gamma + \mathbb{Z}^{\geq t}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{in}}(V), & (-\gamma + \mathbb{Z}^{\leq t-1}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{ln}}, \end{aligned}$$

(iv) β is up-nilpotent hybrid, that is, there exist $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t \in \{0, 1, -1\}$ such that for $\eta := \beta + m\delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} (\eta + \mathbb{Z}^{\leq -1}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{in}}(V), & (\eta + \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{ln}}(V) \\ (-\eta + \mathbb{Z}^{\leq -t}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{in}}(V), & (-\eta + \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 1-t}\delta) \cap R &\subseteq R^{\text{ln}}(V). \end{aligned}$$

Suppose that \mathcal{G} is a subalgebra of \mathcal{L} containing \mathcal{H} with corresponding root system S and V is an \mathcal{H} -weight \mathcal{G} -module having shadow. Suppose that for each $\alpha \in S^\times$, $(\alpha + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \subseteq S$.³ A real root α is said to be *hybrid*, if α is either down-nilpotent hybrid or up-nilpotent hybrid. A subset T of S is called a *full-locally nilpotent* (resp. *full-injective*, *down-nilpotent hybrid*, *up-nilpotent hybrid*, *hybrid*) set if all elements of $T_{r_e} = T \cap R_{r_e}$ are full-locally nilpotent (resp. full-injective, down-nilpotent hybrid, up-nilpotent hybrid, hybrid).

Proposition 3.2. *Suppose that S is a nonempty symmetric closed⁴ subset of R with $S_{r_e} = R_{r_e} \cap S \neq \emptyset$. Set*

$$S_0 := S \cap R_0 \quad \text{as well as} \quad \dot{S} := \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R} \mid (\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap S_0 \neq \emptyset\}$$

and assume that

$$(\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R_0 \subseteq S \quad (\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}^\times = \dot{S} \setminus \{0\}).$$

Then the following statements hold:

- (a) \dot{S} is a finite root system, say e.g. with irreducible components $\dot{S}(1), \dots, \dot{S}(n)$.
- (b) For $1 \leq i \leq n$, set $S(i) := (\dot{S}(i) + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R_0$ and recall (2.2). Then

$$\mathcal{G}(i) := \mathcal{H} + \sum_{\alpha \in S(i)^\times} \mathcal{L}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in S(i)^\times} [\mathcal{L}^\alpha, \mathcal{L}^\beta]$$

is an affine Lie algebra, up to a central space.

Proof. (a) is easily verified; just note that as $2(R_1 \cap R_{r_e}) \subseteq R_0$, we can deduce that $S_0 \cap R_{r_e} \neq \{0\}$ and so $\dot{S} \neq \{0\}$.

³This assumption makes sure that the proof of [23, Theorem 4.8] can be utilized for modules over \mathcal{G} as well.

⁴It means that $S = -S$ and $(S + S) \cap R \subseteq S$.

(b) We first recall that the form (\cdot, \cdot) is nondegenerate on $\mathbb{C}c \oplus \mathbb{C}d$ as well as on \mathcal{H} and on $\sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}(i)^\times} \mathbb{C}t_{\dot{\alpha}}$, and that $(\mathbb{C}c \oplus \mathbb{C}d, \sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}(i)^\times} \mathbb{C}t_{\dot{\alpha}}) = \{0\}$. Setting

$$\mathfrak{h}(i) := (\mathbb{C}c \oplus \mathbb{C}d) + \sum_{\alpha \in S(i)} \mathbb{C}t_\alpha = \mathbb{C}c \oplus \mathbb{C}d \oplus \sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}(i)^\times} \mathbb{C}t_{\dot{\alpha}},$$

we get that the form is nondegenerate on $\mathfrak{h}(i)$ and so, there is an orthogonal complement T_i for $\mathfrak{h}(i)$ in \mathcal{H} ; in particular, for $\alpha \in S(i)$, $x \in \mathcal{L}^\alpha$ and $h \in T_i$, we have

$$[h, x] = \alpha(h)x = (t_\alpha, h)x \in (\mathfrak{h}(i), T_i)x = \{0\},$$

that is, T_i is contained in the center of \mathcal{G}_i . We claim that

$$\mathfrak{k}(i) := \mathfrak{h}(i) + \sum_{\alpha \in S(i)^\times} \mathcal{L}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in S(i)^\times} [\mathcal{L}^\alpha, \mathcal{L}^\beta]$$

is an affine Lie algebra.

To this end, we first note that for each element $\alpha \in S(i)$, we have $\alpha(T_i) = \{0\}$. So, for distinct elements $\alpha, \beta \in S(i)$, the restriction of α to $\mathfrak{h}(i)$ is different from the restriction of β to $\mathfrak{h}(i)$. This, in particular, implies that the decomposition

$$\mathfrak{k}(i) = \mathfrak{h}(i) \oplus \bigoplus_{\alpha \in S(i)^\times} \mathcal{L}^\alpha \oplus \bigoplus_{0 \neq k \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}(i)^\times} \sum_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} [\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+t\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{-\dot{\alpha}+(k-t)\delta}] \right)$$

coincides with the root space decomposition of $\mathfrak{k}(i)$ with respect to $\mathfrak{h}(i)$. It is now easily verified that for

$$(\mathfrak{k}(i))_c := \sum_{\alpha \in S(i)^\times} \mathcal{L}^\alpha \oplus \sum_{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}(i)^\times} \sum_{m, n \in \mathbb{Z}} [\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{-\dot{\alpha}+n\delta}],$$

we have

$$\mathfrak{k}(i) = (\mathfrak{k}(i))_c \oplus \mathbb{C}d$$

and that $\{x \in \mathfrak{k}(i) \mid (x, (\mathfrak{k}(i))_c) = \{0\}\} \subseteq (\mathfrak{k}(i))_c$. This together with [1, Theorem 2.32] implies that $\mathfrak{k}(i)$ is an affine Lie algebra, as we desired. \square

To present the main result, we require the following three lemmas.

Lemma 3.3. *Keep the same notations as in Proposition 3.2 and its proof. Assume V is a nonzero finite weight module over*

$$\mathcal{G}_S := \sum_{\alpha \in S} \mathcal{L}^\alpha$$

such that c acts trivially on V and $S^{ln}(V) = S_{re}$. Fix a base Δ of the finite root system \dot{S} . Assume ζ is a functional on $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{S}$ with $\zeta(\Delta) > 0$. Then, there exist $\mu \in \text{supp}(V)$ and $0 \neq v \in V^\mu$ such that

$$\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}v = \{0\} \quad (m \in \mathbb{Z}, \zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0).$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.2(b), for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, $\mathcal{G}(i)$ is an affine subalgebra of \mathcal{G}_S , up to a central subspace. Set $V(0) := V$ and for $1 \leq i \leq n$, define

$$V(i) := \text{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{v \in V(i-1) \mid \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}v = \{0\} \ (\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}(i), \zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0, m \in \mathbb{Z})\}.$$

It is easy to see that for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, $V(i)$ is a finite weight $\mathcal{G}(i+1)$ -module. In particular, using Theorem 2.1 together with an induction process, we get $V(i+1) \neq \{0\}$. In particular $V(n) \neq \{0\}$. This completes the proof. \square

Using a modification of the proof of [23, Lemma 5.6], one gets the following lemma.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose that \mathcal{G} is a subalgebra of \mathcal{L} containing \mathcal{H} with corresponding root system T . Assume V is a \mathcal{G} -module having shadow. Assume S is a symmetric closed nonempty subset of T with $S_{re} \neq \emptyset$ and $(S + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R_0 \subseteq S$. If S is hybrid, then either all real roots of S are up-nilpotent hybrid or all are down-nilpotent hybrid.*

Lemma 3.5. *Keep the same notations and assumptions as in Lemma 3.4, and define*

$$(3.2) \quad P := \begin{cases} S^{ln}(V) \cup -S^{in}(V) \cup (\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}\delta \cap S) & \text{if } S \text{ is up-nilpotent hybrid,} \\ S^{ln}(V) \cup -S^{in}(V) \cup (\mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}\delta \cap S) & \text{if } S \text{ is down-nilpotent hybrid.} \end{cases}$$

Then, there exists a functional $\zeta : \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(S \setminus R_{ns}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$P = \{0, \alpha \in S \setminus R_{ns} \mid \zeta(\alpha) \geq 0\}.$$

In particular

$$\{\alpha \in S \cap R_{re} \mid \zeta(\alpha) > 0\} \subseteq S^{ln}(V) \quad \text{and} \quad \{\alpha \in S \cap R_{re} \mid \zeta(\alpha) < 0\} \subseteq S^{in}(V).$$

Proof. We know from [23, Theorem 4.7] that if α is a real odd root, then $\alpha \in T^{ln}(V)$ if and only if $2\alpha \in T^{ln}(V)$. So, without loss of generality, we assume $S \subseteq R_0$. We know that $\dot{S} = \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R} \mid (\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap S \neq \emptyset\}$ is a finite root system, say with irreducible components $\dot{S}(1), \dots, \dot{S}(n)$. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let P_i denote the set defined as follows:

$$P_i := \begin{cases} S(i)^{ln}(V) \cup -S(i)^{in}(V) \cup (\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}\delta \cap S(i)) & \text{if } S(i) \text{ is up-nilpotent hybrid,} \\ S(i)^{ln}(V) \cup -S(i)^{in}(V) \cup (\mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}\delta \cap S(i)) & \text{if } S(i) \text{ is down-nilpotent hybrid.} \end{cases}$$

We have $P = P_1 \cup \dots \cup P_n$. Recalling Lemma 3.4, without loss of generality, we assume $S(1), \dots, S(n)$ are up-nilpotent hybrid. Define $\mathcal{G}(i)$'s as in Lemma 2.1 and assume $\mathfrak{s}(i)$'s are their root systems, respectively. We note that for $\mathfrak{s} := \cup_{i=1}^n \mathfrak{s}(i)$,

$$\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}S = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\mathfrak{s}.$$

Using affine theory (see [23, Remark 5.5] for the details), there are bases $\dot{\Pi}_1, \dots, \dot{\Pi}_n$ of finite root systems $\dot{S}(i)$'s respectively such that for specific roots θ_i 's of $\dot{S}(i)$'s respectively and s_i 's defined by

$$\mathfrak{s}(i)_{im} = s_i\mathbb{Z}\delta \quad (1 \leq i \leq n),$$

we have

$$\Pi_i := \dot{\Pi}_i \cup \{s_i\delta - \theta_i\} \subseteq P_i.$$

Now, the statement is proved by applying a modified version of the same argument as presented in the proof of [23, Lemma 5.7]. \square

Now, we are ready to prove our main result.

Theorem 3.6. *Recall that \mathcal{L} is a twisted affine Lie superalgebra, and as noted in Table 2, there is $\kappa \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $\dot{R}_{ns} \subseteq (1/\kappa)(\dot{R}_{re} + \dot{R}_{re})$. Suppose that $T, T(1)$ and $T(2)$ are nonempty symmetric closed subsets of R with $T(1) \cup T(2) \subseteq T$. Assume V is a finite weight module over $\mathcal{G}_T := \sum_{\alpha \in T} \mathcal{L}^\alpha$ which has shadow and that its level is zero, that is, the canonical central element of \mathcal{L} acts trivially on V . Set*

$$\dot{T} := \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R} \mid (\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap T \neq \emptyset\} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{T}(i) := \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{R} \mid (\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap T(i) \neq \emptyset\} \quad (i = 1, 2).$$

Recall (2.2) and assume that

- for each $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T}$, $(\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \subseteq T$,
- for $i = 1, 2$, $T(i)_{re} \neq \emptyset$ and $T_{re} = T(1)_{re} \cup T(2)_{re}$,
- $(T(2), T(1)) = \{0\}$,
- $\dot{T}_{ns} \subseteq (1/\kappa)(\dot{T}_{re} + \dot{T}_{re})$ and for $i = 1, 2$, $\dot{T}(i)_{ns} \subseteq (1/\kappa)(\dot{T}(i)_{re} + \dot{T}(i)_{re})$.

Then, we have the following:

- (a) For $i = 1, 2$, $T(i)_{im} = T(i) \cap R_{im}$ is either $\mathbb{Z}\delta$ or $2\mathbb{Z}\delta$.
- (b) If $T(1)$ is full-locally nilpotent while $T(2)$ is hybrid. Then, there exist a parabolic subset P of T and a nonzero weight vector v such that

$$\mathcal{L}^\alpha v = \{0\} \quad \text{for all} \quad \alpha \in (P \setminus (-P \cup \mathbb{Z}\delta)) \cup ((P \setminus \{0\}) \cap T(2) \cap \mathbb{Z}\delta).$$

- (c) If $T(2)_{im} = \mathbb{Z}\delta$, then there is a nonzero weight vector v such that

$$\mathcal{L}^\alpha v = \{0\} \quad (\text{for all } \alpha \in P \setminus -P).$$

In particular, if V is simple, there is a simple finite weight module Ω over $\mathcal{G}_T^\circ := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in P \cap -P} \mathcal{L}^\alpha$ such that $V = \text{Ind}_P(\Omega)$.

Proof. (a) easily follows from the facts that $T(i)$ is symmetric and closed and that $(T(i) + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \subseteq T(i)$.

(b) We first need to set some notations. We start with recalling that by using Table 1 and [22, Tables 2 and 5], we have the following:

- (1) For each $0 \neq \dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T}$, there are $r_{\dot{\alpha}} \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ and $0 \leq k_{\dot{\alpha}} < r_{\dot{\alpha}}$ such that $(\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R = (\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap T = \dot{\alpha} + k_{\dot{\alpha}}\delta + r_{\dot{\alpha}}\mathbb{Z}\delta$ and if $k_{\dot{\alpha}} \neq 0$, then $k_{\dot{\alpha}} | r_{\dot{\alpha}}$.
- (2) If $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T}_{re}$, then $(\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap T \cap R_1$ is one of the following: \emptyset , $\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta$, $\dot{\alpha} + 2\mathbb{Z}\delta$, $\dot{\alpha} + (2\mathbb{Z} + 1)\delta$.

(3.3)

Using Lemma 3.4, without loss of generality, we can assume that all real roots of $T(2)$ are up-nilpotent hybrid. Following the same argument as in [23, Lemma 5.4], one sees that

$$P_2 := T(2)_{re}^{ln} \cup -T(2)_{re}^{in} \cup (\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}\delta \cap T(2))^5$$

satisfies

$$(P_2 + P_2) \cap (T(2) \setminus R_{ns}) \subseteq P_2 \quad \text{and} \quad P_2 \cup -P_2 = T(2) \setminus R_{ns},$$

that is P_2 is a parabolic subset of $T(2) \setminus R_{ns}$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.5, there is a linear functional ζ_2 on $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}(T(2) \setminus R_{ns}) = \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}T(2)$ such that

$$P_2 = \{0, \alpha \in T(2) \setminus R_{ns} \mid \zeta_2(\alpha) \geq 0\}.$$

Recall (3.3)(1) and for each $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T}(2)$, pick $p_{\dot{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for

$$(3.4) \quad \beta_{\dot{\alpha}} := \dot{\alpha} + k_{\dot{\alpha}}\delta + r_{\dot{\alpha}}p_{\dot{\alpha}}\delta,$$

we have

$$\zeta_2(\beta_{\dot{\alpha}}) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_2(\dot{\alpha} + k_{\dot{\alpha}}\delta + r_{\dot{\alpha}}(p_{\dot{\alpha}} - 1)\delta) < 0.$$

We next set

$$(3.5) \quad S := R_0 \cap T(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{S} := \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T} \mid S \cap (\dot{\alpha} + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \neq \emptyset\}.$$

Then, \dot{S} is a finite root system. Fix a base Δ of \dot{S} and define the linear functional ζ_1 on $\text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(1)_{re}$ such that

$$\max\{\zeta_2(\beta_{\dot{\eta}}) \mid \dot{\eta} \in \dot{T}(2)_{re}\} < \frac{1}{2}\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) \quad (\dot{\gamma} \in \dot{S}^+(\Delta) = \dot{S} \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}}\Delta);$$

in particular, we have

$$-\frac{1}{2}\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) < \zeta_2(\beta_{\dot{\eta}}) < \frac{1}{2}\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) \quad (\dot{\gamma} \in \dot{S}^{\times}, \dot{\eta} \in \dot{T}(2)_{re}).$$

This implies that for $\dot{\eta} \in \dot{T}(2)_{re}$ and $\dot{\gamma} \in \dot{S}^{\times}$,

$$(3.6) \quad \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) + \zeta_2(\beta_{\dot{\eta}}) > \frac{1}{2}\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) + \zeta_2(\beta_{\dot{\eta}}) > 0 \iff \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) > 0.$$

Consider (3.4) and define

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta : \{0\} \cup (\dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2)) &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R} \\ \dot{\alpha} &\mapsto \begin{cases} \zeta_1(\dot{\alpha}) & \dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T}(1) \subseteq \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(1)_{re}, \\ \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) + \zeta_2(\beta_{\dot{\eta}}) & \dot{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\kappa}(\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\eta}), \dot{\gamma} \in \dot{T}(1)_{re}, \dot{\eta} \in \dot{T}(2)_{re}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Now, we are ready to go through the main body of the proof. Before that, we mention that we will frequently use the following fact:

$$(3.7) \quad \text{If } \mu \in \text{supp}(V) \text{ and } \pm\alpha \in T^{ln}(V) \text{ with } 2(\mu, \alpha)/(\alpha, \alpha) > 0, \text{ then } \mu - \alpha \in \text{supp}(V).$$

⁵If $T(2)$ is down-nilpotent hybrid, we must consider $(\mathbb{Z}^{\leq 0}\delta \cap T(2))$ instead of $(\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}\delta \cap T(2))$.

Recall (3.5) and consider V as a module over $\mathcal{G}_S := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in S} \mathcal{L}^\alpha$ and use Lemma 3.3 to get that the set

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{aligned} W := & \{v \in V \mid \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}v = \{0\} \quad (\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{S}^+(\Delta), m \in \mathbb{Z}, \dot{\alpha} + m\delta \in S \subseteq R_0)\} \\ & = \{v \in V \mid \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}v = \{0\} \quad (\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T}(1)_{re}, m \in \mathbb{Z}, \dot{\alpha} + m\delta \in S, \zeta_1(\dot{\alpha}) > 0)\} \end{aligned}$$

is a nonzero vector space. For each nonzero weight vector $u \in W$, set

$$\mathcal{A}_u := \{\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2) \mid \zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0, \exists m \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}u \neq \{0\}\}.$$

We note that

$$(3.9) \quad (\mathcal{A}_u + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \subseteq R_1.$$

The proof will be completed through the following claims:

Claim 1. The subset

$$P := \{\dot{\alpha} + m\delta \in ((\dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2)) + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \mid \zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0\} \cup \{\alpha \in T(2) \cup (\mathbb{Z}\delta \cap T) \mid \zeta_2(\alpha) \geq 0\}$$

of T is a parabolic subset of T .

Claim 2. Suppose that u_0 is a nonzero weight vector in W (see (3.8)) such that \mathcal{A}_{u_0} is of minimum cardinality. Suppose $\mathcal{A}_{u_0} \neq \emptyset$, and $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \mathcal{A}_{u_0}$ satisfies

$$\zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*) = \max\{\zeta(\dot{\alpha}) \mid \dot{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}_{u_0}\}.$$

Assume that $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_*+m\delta}u_0 \neq \{0\}$ and $0 \neq v \in \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_*+m\delta}u_0$. Then we have

- (1) $v \in W$,
- (2) $\mathcal{A}_v = \mathcal{A}_{u_0}$.

Claim 3. Suppose that u_0 and $\dot{\alpha}_*$ are as in the statement of the previous claim. Then there are $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and weight vectors u_i ($i \geq 0$) such that

$$\dot{\alpha}_* + m_0\delta, \dot{\alpha}_* + m_i\delta \in R_1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \neq u_i \in \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_*+m_{i-1}\delta}u_{i-1} \quad (i \geq 1).$$

Claim 4. Suppose that u_0 is a nonzero weight vector in W such that \mathcal{A}_{u_0} is of minimum cardinality. Then, $\mathcal{A}_{u_0} = \emptyset$.

Claim 5. The vector space

$$U := \{v \in V \mid \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}v = \{0\} \quad (\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2), m \in \mathbb{Z}, \dot{\alpha} + m\delta \in R, \zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0)\}$$

is a nonzero module over $\mathcal{L}_{T(2)} = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in T(2)} \mathcal{L}^\alpha$.

Claim 6. There is a nonzero weight vector $u \in U$ with $\mathcal{L}^\alpha u = \{0\}$ for $\alpha \in T(2)$ with $\zeta_2(\alpha) > 0$.

Proof of Claim 1. It is enough to show that for $\beta, \beta' \in P \setminus \mathbb{Z}\delta$ with $\beta + \beta' \in T$, we have $\beta + \beta' \in P$. If $\beta, \beta' \in T(2)$, then as $T(2)$ is closed, we get that $\beta + \beta' \in T(2)$ and so, $\zeta_2(\beta + \beta') = \zeta_2(\beta) + \zeta_2(\beta') > 0$, i.e., $\beta + \beta' \in P$.

Next assume $\beta \notin T(2)$. Then, we have $\beta = \dot{\beta} + k_1\delta$ with $k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dot{\beta} = \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\eta}$ in which

- either $0 \neq \dot{\gamma} \in \dot{T}(1)$ and $\dot{\eta} = 0$,
- or $\dot{\gamma} \in \frac{1}{\kappa}\dot{T}(1)_{re} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\dot{\eta} \in \frac{1}{\kappa}\dot{T}(2)_{re} \setminus \{0\}$.

Also, $\beta' = \dot{\beta}' + k_2\delta$ with $k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dot{\beta}' = \dot{\gamma}' + \dot{\eta}'$ for which one of the following happens:

- $0 \neq \dot{\gamma}' \in \dot{T}(1)$ and $\dot{\eta}' = 0$,
- $\dot{\gamma}' = 0$ and $0 \neq \dot{\eta}' \in \dot{T}(2)$,
- $0 \neq \dot{\gamma}' \in \frac{1}{\kappa}\dot{T}(1)_{re}$ and $0 \neq \dot{\eta}' \in \frac{1}{\kappa}\dot{T}(2)_{re}$.

We have

$$\beta + \beta' = \dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}' + (k_1 + k_2)\delta = (\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}') + (\dot{\eta} + \dot{\eta}') + (k_1 + k_2)\delta.$$

Using (3.6), $\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) > 0$ and $\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}') \geq 0$. This implies that $\zeta(\dot{\beta} + \dot{\beta}') > 0$ and so $\beta + \beta' \in \{\dot{\alpha} + m\delta \in ((\dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2)) + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap R \mid \zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0\} \subseteq P$ and we are done.

Proof of Claim 2. Since $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2)$, it is either an element of $\dot{T}(1)$ or an element of $\dot{T}_{ns} \setminus \dot{T}(2)_{ns}$. So, as $\dot{T}_{ns} \subseteq \frac{1}{\kappa}(\dot{T}_{re} + \dot{T}_{re})$, we have

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\alpha}_* &= \dot{\gamma}_* + \dot{\eta}_* \text{ in which either } \dot{\gamma}_* \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(1)_{re} \setminus \{0\} \\ &\text{and } \dot{\eta}_* = 0 \text{ or } \dot{\gamma}_* \in \frac{1}{\kappa}\dot{T}(1)_{re} \setminus \{0\}, \dot{\eta}_* \in \frac{1}{\kappa}\dot{T}(2)_{re} \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

To show (1), let $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T}(1)_{re}$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\dot{\alpha} + m\delta \in S$ and $\zeta_1(\dot{\alpha}) > 0$. Since $u_0 \in W$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}v &\subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_*+m_0\delta}u_0 \subseteq [\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_*+m_0\delta}]u_0 + \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_*+m_0\delta}\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}u_0 \\ &\subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+\dot{\alpha}_*+(m+m_0)\delta}u_0. \end{aligned}$$

We claim that $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+\dot{\alpha}_*+(m+m_0)\delta}u_0 = \{0\}$. If $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (m + m_0)\delta \notin R$, we are done. So, suppose

$$\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (m + m_0)\delta \in R \cap (T + T) \subseteq T = T(1)_{re} \cup T(2)_{re} \cup T_{ns} \cup (T \cap \mathbb{Z}\delta).$$

Recalling (3.6), we have

$$\zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*) > 0 \longrightarrow \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}_*) > 0 \xrightarrow{\zeta_1(\dot{\alpha}) > 0} \zeta_1(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\gamma}_*) \neq 0 \longrightarrow \dot{\alpha} + \dot{\gamma}_* \neq 0.$$

In particular, if $\dot{\eta}_* \neq 0$, $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* = (\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\gamma}_*) + \dot{\eta}_* \in \dot{T}_{ns}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) &= \zeta(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\gamma}_* + \dot{\eta}_*) = \begin{cases} \zeta_1(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\gamma}_*) & \dot{\eta}_* = 0, \\ \zeta_1(\kappa(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\gamma}_*)) + \zeta_2(\beta_{\kappa\dot{\eta}_*}) & \dot{\eta}_* \neq 0, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \zeta_1(\dot{\alpha}) + \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}_*) & \dot{\eta}_* = 0, \\ \zeta_1(\kappa\dot{\alpha}) + \zeta_1(\kappa\dot{\gamma}_*) + \zeta_2(\beta_{\kappa\dot{\eta}_*}) & \dot{\eta}_* \neq 0, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \zeta_1(\dot{\alpha}) + \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}_*) & \dot{\eta}_* = 0, \\ \zeta_1(\kappa\dot{\alpha}) + \zeta(\dot{\gamma}_* + \dot{\eta}_*) & \dot{\eta}_* \neq 0, \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \zeta_1(\dot{\alpha}) + \zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*) & \dot{\eta}_* = 0, \\ \zeta_1(\kappa\dot{\alpha}) + \zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*) & \dot{\eta}_* \neq 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

So, we get $\zeta(\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_*) > \zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*)$, which in turn implies that $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n+m)\delta} u_0 = \{0\}$ due to the choice of $\dot{\alpha}_*$. This completes the proof of (1).

To prove (2), it is enough to show that $\mathcal{A}_v \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{u_0}$. So, assume $\dot{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}_v$. We shall show $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} u_0 \neq \{0\}$ for some integer n . Since $\dot{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}_v$, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} v \neq \{0\}$. As we have

$$\{0\} \neq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} v \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m\delta} u_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m\delta} \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta} u_0 + [\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m\delta}] u_0,$$

it is enough to prove that

$$[\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m\delta}] u_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n+m)\delta} u_0 = \{0\}.$$

If $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n+m)\delta \notin R$, we are done. So, suppose $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n+m)\delta \in R$. Since $\dot{\alpha} \in \mathcal{A}_v \subseteq \dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2)$, we have

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \dot{\alpha} &= \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\eta} \text{ in which either } \dot{\gamma} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(1)_{re} \setminus \{0\} \\ &\text{and } \dot{\eta} = 0 \text{ or } \dot{\gamma} \in \frac{1}{\kappa} \dot{T}(1)_{re} \setminus \{0\}, \dot{\eta} \in \frac{1}{\kappa} \dot{T}(2)_{re} \setminus \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by (3.9), we have $\dot{\alpha} + n\delta, \dot{\alpha}_* + m\delta \in R_1$, so,

$$[\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m\delta}] \subseteq \mathcal{L}_0^{\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (n+m)\delta} = \mathcal{L}_0^{(\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_*) + (\dot{\eta} + \dot{\eta}_*) + (n+m)\delta}.$$

Since $\zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0$ (resp. $\zeta(\dot{\alpha}_*) > 0$), recalling (3.6), we have $\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) > 0$ (resp. $\zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}_*) > 0$). Therefore,

$$(3.12) \quad \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_* \neq 0.$$

Since $(\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_*) + (\dot{\eta} + \dot{\eta}_*) + (n+m)\delta \in T \cap R_0 \subseteq T_{re} = T(1)_{re} \cup T(2)_{re}$, one of the following occurs:

- $(\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_*) + (\dot{\eta} + \dot{\eta}_*) + (n+m)\delta \in T(2)_{re}$,
- $(\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_*) + (\dot{\eta} + \dot{\eta}_*) + (n+m)\delta \in T(1)_{re}$,

If the former case happens, we have $\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_* \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(2)_{re}$. This together with the fact that $(T(1), T(2)) = \{0\}$ gives that $(\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_*, \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(1)_{re}) = \{0\}$ which in turn implies that $\dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_* = 0$ as $\dot{T}(1)_{re}$ is a finite root system. This contradicts (3.12). So, the latter case happens, i.e., we have $\dot{\eta} + \dot{\eta}_* \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(1)_{re}$ which as above gives that $\dot{\eta} + \dot{\eta}_* = 0$. Therefore, $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* = \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\gamma}_* \in \dot{T}(1)$ and so due to the choice of $\dot{\alpha}_*$, we have

$$[\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + n\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m\delta}] u_0 \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\alpha}_* + (m+n)\delta} u_0 = \{0\}$$

as we desired.

Proof of Claim 3. Since $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \mathcal{A}_{u_0}$, there is $m_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_0\delta} u_0 \neq \{0\}$. We pick $0 \neq u_1 \in \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}_* + m_0\delta} u_0$. Using Claim 2 together with an inductive process, we get the result.

Proof of Claim 4. Assume $A_{u_0} \neq \emptyset$ and keep the same notation as above. Set μ_0 to be the weight of u_0 and assume m_i 's ($i \geq 1$) are as in Claim 3. We can deduce from Claim 3 that

$$(3.13) \quad \mu_r := \mu_0 + r\dot{\alpha}_* + (m_0 + \cdots + m_{r-1})\delta \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (r \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}).$$

We have the following two cases:

◇ Case 1. $\dot{\alpha}_*$ is real: Then, we have $\dot{\alpha}_* \in \dot{T}(1)_{re}$. Pick $r_0 \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ with

$$2(\mu_{r_0}, \dot{\alpha}_*) / (\dot{\alpha}_*, \dot{\alpha}_*) = 2(\mu_0 + r_0 \dot{\alpha}_*, \dot{\alpha}_*) / (\dot{\alpha}_*, \dot{\alpha}_*) > 0.$$

We have

$$\mu_{r_0+n} := \mu_{r_0} + n\dot{\alpha}_* + (m_{r_0} + \cdots + m_{r_0+n-1})\delta \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}).$$

Contemplating (3.9), for each $i \geq 0$, $\dot{\alpha}_* + m_i\delta \in R_1$. So by (3.3)(2), for each odd positive integer n , we have $\dot{\alpha}_* + (-(n-2)m_{r_0} + m_{r_0+1} + \cdots + m_{r_0+n-1})\delta \in T(1)$ and so, we get using (3.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mu_{r_0} + (n-1)(\dot{\alpha}_* + m_{r_0}\delta) \\ &= \mu_{r_0} + n\dot{\alpha}_* + (m_{r_0} + \cdots + m_{r_0+n-1})\delta - (\dot{\alpha}_* + (-(n-2)m_{r_0} + m_{r_0+1} + \cdots + m_{r_0+n-1})\delta) \\ &\in \text{supp}(V) \quad (n \in 2\mathbb{Z}^{>0} + 1). \end{aligned}$$

This contradicts the fact that $\dot{\alpha}_* + m_{r_0}\delta \in T(1)_{re} \subseteq R^{ln}(V)$; see (2.4).

◇ Case 2. $\dot{\alpha}_*$ is nonsingular: We have

$$\dot{\alpha}_* \in \dot{T}_{ns} \setminus \dot{T}(2) \subseteq \frac{1}{\kappa}(\dot{T}(1)_{re} + \dot{T}(1)_{re}) \cup \frac{1}{\kappa}(\dot{T}(1)_{re} + \dot{T}(2)_{re}),$$

so $\dot{\alpha}_* = \dot{\xi}_* + \dot{\zeta}_*$ with $\kappa\dot{\xi}_* \in \dot{T}(1)_{re}, \kappa\dot{\zeta}_* \in \dot{T}(1)_{re} \cup \dot{T}(2)_{re}$. Recalling (3.13), we have

$$\mu_{\kappa n} = \mu_0 + \kappa n \dot{\alpha}_* + (m_0 + \cdots + m_{\kappa n-1})\delta \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}).$$

We note that $(\dot{\xi}_*, \dot{\zeta}_*) = 0$ and pick n_0 such that

$$(3.14) \quad \frac{2(\mu_{\kappa n_0}, \kappa\dot{\xi}_*)}{(\kappa\dot{\xi}_*, \kappa\dot{\xi}_*)} = \frac{2(\mu_0 + \kappa n_0 \dot{\alpha}_*, \kappa\dot{\xi}_*)}{(\kappa\dot{\xi}_*, \kappa\dot{\xi}_*)} \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{2(\mu_{\kappa n_0}, \kappa\dot{\zeta}_*)}{(\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*, \kappa\dot{\zeta}_*)} = \frac{2(\mu_0 + \kappa n_0 \dot{\alpha}_*, \kappa\dot{\zeta}_*)}{(\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*, \kappa\dot{\zeta}_*)} \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}.$$

We have

$$v_n := \mu_{\kappa n_0 + \kappa n} = \mu_{\kappa n_0} + \kappa n \dot{\alpha}_* + (m_{\kappa n_0} + \cdots + m_{\kappa n-1})\delta \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}).$$

Since real roots of $T(2)$ are up-nilpotent hybrid and all real roots of $T(1)$ are locally nilpotent, recalling (3.3)(1), for a large enough $m' \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, we have

$$\begin{cases} \kappa\dot{\zeta}_* + k_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}\delta + r_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}m'\delta \in T^{ln}(V), & -(\kappa\dot{\zeta}_* + k_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}\delta + r_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}m'\delta) \in T^{in}(V) & \text{if } \kappa\dot{\zeta}_* \in \dot{T}(2) \\ \kappa\dot{\zeta}_* + k_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}\delta + r_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}m'\delta \in T^{ln}(V), & -(\kappa\dot{\zeta}_* + k_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}\delta + r_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}m'\delta) \in T^{ln}(V) & \text{if } \kappa\dot{\zeta}_* \in \dot{T}(1). \end{cases}$$

This, in particular, together with (3.14) and (3.7) implies that

$$v_n - i(\kappa\dot{\zeta}_* + k_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}\delta + r_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}m'\delta) \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}, 1 \leq i \leq n),$$

in particular, for

$$p_n := (m_{\kappa n_0} + \cdots + m_{\kappa n-1}) - n(k_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*} + r_{\kappa\dot{\zeta}_*}m') \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{\kappa n_0} + n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_*) + p_n \delta &= \mu_{\kappa n_0} + n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_*) + (m_{\kappa n_0} + \cdots + m_{\kappa n-1})\delta - n(k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} + r_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} m')\delta \\ &= v_n - n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta + r_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} m' \delta) \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$(3.15) \quad \mu_{\kappa n_0} + n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta) + (p_n - nk_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*})\delta = \mu_{\kappa n_0} + n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_*) + p_n \delta \in \text{supp}(V)$$

for $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$. We next note that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$, using the quotient algorithm, we get $q_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq s_n < r_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*}$ such that

$$p_n - nk_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} = q_n r_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} + s_n.$$

In particular, (3.15) gives that

$$(3.16) \quad \begin{aligned} &(\mu_{\kappa n_0} + s_n \delta) + n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta) + q_n r_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta \\ &= \mu_{\kappa n_0} + n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta) + (q_n r_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} + s_n)\delta \\ &= \mu_{\kappa n_0} + n(\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta) + (p_n - nk_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*})\delta \in \text{supp}(V).\end{aligned}$$

Since $T(1)_{re} \subseteq R^{ln}(V)$, using this together with (3.7) and (3.14) repeatedly, we get

$$\mu_{\kappa n_0} + s_n \delta \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (n \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}).$$

Since s_n 's are equal for infinitely many n , we get positive integers n_1, n_2, \dots with $s := s_{n_1} = s_{n_2} = \dots$, and so contemplating (3.16), we have

$$(\mu_{\kappa n_0} + s\delta) + n_i(\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta) + (q_{n_0} r_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*})\delta \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (i > 0).$$

Using (3.7), we get that

$$(\mu_{\kappa n_0} + s\delta) + (n_i - 1)(\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta) \in \text{supp}(V) \quad (i > 0)$$

which is a contradiction as $\kappa \dot{\xi}_* + k_{\kappa \dot{\xi}_*} \delta \in T(1)_{re} \subseteq R^{ln}(V)$. This completes the proof of Claim 4.

Proof of Claim 5. Using Claim 4, we get that U is nonzero. Suppose that $v \in U$, $\dot{\beta} \in \dot{T}(2)$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\dot{\beta} + n\delta \in R$. For $\dot{\alpha} \in \dot{T} \setminus \dot{T}(2)$ with $\zeta(\dot{\alpha}) > 0$, $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dot{\alpha} + m\delta \in R$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta} \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\beta}+n\delta} v \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\beta}+n\delta} \underbrace{\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta} v}_{=\{0\}} + [\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+m\delta}, \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\beta}+n\delta}] v \subseteq \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+\dot{\beta}+(n+m)\delta} v.$$

It is enough to show that $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+\dot{\beta}+(n+m)\delta} v = \{0\}$. If $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} + (n+m)\delta$ is not a root, then, we are done. So, assume $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} + (n+m)\delta \in R$ (and so $\in T$). As in (3.11), we have $\dot{\alpha} = \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\eta}$ in which $0 \neq \dot{\gamma} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(1)$ and $\dot{\eta} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(2)$. Now, we have the following cases:

- $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} = \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\eta} + \dot{\beta} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(2)_{re}$. Then, $\dot{\gamma} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(1)_{re} \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}} \dot{T}(2)_{re}$ which implies that $\dot{\gamma} = 0$. This is a contradiction.

- $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} = \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\eta} + \dot{\beta} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(1)_{re}$. Then $\dot{\eta} + \dot{\beta} \in \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(1)_{re} \cap \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(2)_{re}$. This implies that $\dot{\eta} + \dot{\beta} = 0$. Therefore, we have $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} + (m+n)\delta = \dot{\gamma} + (m+n)\delta$ and so $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+\dot{\beta}+(n+m)\delta}_V = \{0\}$ as $\zeta(\dot{\gamma}) = \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) > 0$ by (3.6).
- $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} \notin \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(1)_{re} \cup \text{span}_{\mathbb{R}}\dot{T}(2)_{re}$. Then, $\dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} \in \dot{T}_{ns} \setminus (\dot{T}(1)_{ns} \cup \dot{T}(2)_{ns})$. Therefore, there are $\dot{\zeta}, \dot{\xi}$ with $\kappa\dot{\zeta} \in \dot{T}(1)_{re}$ and $\kappa\dot{\xi} \in \dot{T}(2)_{re}$ such that

$$\dot{\zeta} + \dot{\xi} = \dot{\alpha} + \dot{\beta} = \dot{\gamma} + \dot{\eta} + \dot{\beta}.$$

This implies that

$$\dot{\zeta} = \dot{\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \dot{\xi} = \dot{\eta} + \dot{\beta}.$$

Since $\zeta_1(\dot{\zeta}) = \zeta_1(\dot{\gamma}) > 0$. Therefore by (3.6), we have $\zeta(\dot{\zeta} + \dot{\xi}) > 0$ and so $\mathcal{L}^{\dot{\alpha}+\dot{\beta}+(n+m)\delta}_V = \mathcal{L}^{\dot{\zeta}+\dot{\xi}+(n+m)\delta}_V = \{0\}$, as desired.

Proof of Claim 6. By Proposition 3.2, there is $K \subseteq T(2) \cap R_0$ such that $\sum_{\alpha \in \{0\} \cup K^\times} \mathcal{L}^\alpha + \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in K^\times} [\mathcal{L}^\alpha, \mathcal{L}^\beta]$ is an affine Lie algebra, up to a central space. Now V is a finite weight module over this Lie algebra and $K = K^+ \cup K^\circ \cup K^-$ where

$$K^\circ := \{\alpha \in K \mid \zeta_2(\alpha) = 0\} \quad \text{and} \quad K^\pm := \{\alpha \in K \mid \zeta_2(\alpha) \gtrless 0\}$$

is a triangular decomposition with (see Lemma 3.5)

$$K^+ \cap K_{re} \subseteq K^{ln}(V) \quad \text{and} \quad K^- \cap K_{re} \subseteq K^{in}(V).$$

This implies that there is $\lambda \in \text{supp}(V)$ and positive integer p such that $\lambda + pm\delta \notin \text{supp}(V)$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$; see [23, Lemma 5.1]. Using the same argument as in [23, Theorem 5.8] for the finite weight module V , as a module over $\mathcal{G} := \sum_{\alpha \in T(2)} \mathcal{L}^\alpha$, we are done.

(c) follows from a well-known process in the literature; see e.g., [23, Proposition 3.3 (ii)]. \square

Remark 3.7. The case $T(2)_{im} = 2\mathbb{Z}\delta$ needs more investigation which has been done in [18].

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Allison, S. Berman, Y. Gao and A. Pianzola, *A characterization of affine Kac-Moody Lie algebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **185** (1997), 671–688.
- [2] V. Chari and A. Pressley, *A new family of irreducible, integrable modules for affine Lie algebras*, Math. Ann. **275** (1986), 87–104.
- [3] V. Chari, *Integrable representations of affine Lie algebras*, Invent. Math. **85** (1986), 317–335.
- [4] T. Creutzig, R. McRae and J. Yang, *Tensor structure on the Kazhdan-Lusztig category for affine $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$* , Int. Math. Res. Not. **2022** (2022), 12462–12515.
- [5] I. Dimitrov and D. Grantcharov, *Classification of simple weight modules over affine Lie algebras*, <https://arxiv.org/pdf/0910.0688>.
- [6] I. Dimitrov, O. Mathieu and I. Penkov, *On the structure of weight modules*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **352** (2000), 2857–2869.
- [7] S. Eswara Rao and V. Futorny, *Integrable modules for affine Lie superalgebras*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), 5435–5455.

- [8] S. Eswara Rao, *Classification of irreducible integrable modules for toroidal Lie algebras with finite dimensional weight spaces*, J. Algebra **277** (2004), 318–348.
- [9] S. Eswara Rao, *Complete reducibility of integrable modules for the affine Lie (super)algebras*, J. Algebra **264** (2003), 269–278.
- [10] S. Eswara Rao, *Classification of Loop modules with finite dimensional weight spaces*, Math. Ann. **305** (1996), 51–663.
- [11] S.L. Fernando, *Lie algebra modules with finite dimensional weight spaces I*, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. **322** (1990), 757–781.
- [12] P.G.O. Freund, *Introduction to supersymmetry*, Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics, Cambridge University Press, 1986.
- [13] V. Futorny, *Classification of irreducible nonzero level modules with finite dimensional weight spaces for affine Lie algebras*, J. Algebra **238** (2001), 426–441.
- [14] V. Futorny and A. Tsylye, *Classification of irreducible nonzero level modules with finite dimensional weight spaces for affine lie algebras*, J. Algebra **238** (2001), 426–441.
- [15] V. G. Kac, *Infinite-dimensional algebras, Dedekind’s η -function, classical Möbius function and the very strange formula*, Adv. Math. **30** (1978), 85–136.
- [16] V.G. Kac and M. Wakimoto, *Integrable highest weight modules over affine superalgebras and Appell’s function*, Comm. Math. Phys. **215** (2001), 631–682.
- [17] V. G. Kac, S. Roan and M. Wakimoto, *Quantum reduction for affine superalgebras*, Comm. Math. Phys. **241** (2003), 307–342.
- [18] H. Kiamehr and M. Yousofzadeh, *Integrable modules and affine Lie superalgebras*, preprint.
- [19] O. Mathieu, *Classification of irreducible weight modules*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **50** (2000), 537–592.
- [20] J.W. Van de Leur, *Contragredientlie superalgebras of finite growth*, Ph. D. Thesis, Utrecht University, 1986.
- [21] M. Yousofzadeh, *Quasi-Integrable modules over twisted affine Lie superalgebras*, Transformation Groups (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00031-023-09805-4>
- [22] M. Yousofzadeh, *Tight irreducible finite weight modules over twisted affine Lie superalgebras*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **225** (2021), 1–22.
- [23] M. Yousofzadeh, *Finite weight modules over twisted affine Lie superalgebras*, J. Algebra **564** (2020), 436–479.
- [24] M. Yousofzadeh, *Torsion free modules over twisted affine Lie superalgebras*, preprint.