

(QUASI-)ADMISSIBLE MODULES OVER SYMMETRIZABLE KAC-MOODY SUPERALGEBRAS

MARIA GORELIK AND VICTOR G. KAC

ABSTRACT. The theory of admissible modules over symmetrizable anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebras, introduced by Kac and Wakimoto in late 80's, is a well-developed subject with many applications, including representation theory of vertex algebras. Recently this theory was developed in a more general setup by Gorelik and Serganova. In the present paper we develop in this more general setup the theory of admissible modules over arbitrary symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ be a Kac-Moody algebra over \mathbb{C} , with a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix A , and let \mathfrak{h} be its Cartan subalgebra. Let Δ^{re} (resp., Δ_+^{re}) denote the set of all (resp., positive) real roots, and $W = \langle s_\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}} \rangle$ be the Weyl group. Let (\cdot, \cdot) be a non-degenerate symmetric invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}(A)$, defined by the symmetrized A , see [27], Chapter 2. Let $X := \{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid (\lambda, \alpha) \geq 0 \text{ for all, but finite number of } \alpha \in \Delta_+^{\text{re}} \text{ and } (\lambda, \alpha) \neq 0 \text{ for any isotropic root } \alpha\}$. Hereafter, for $a \in \mathbb{C}$ we write $a \geq 0$ if either $\text{Re } a > 0$ or $\text{Re } a = 0$ and $\text{Im } a \geq 0$. See [27], Chapters 1–5 for basic definitions and results on Kac-Moody algebras.

For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ let $R_\lambda = \{\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}} \mid \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, let $R_\lambda^+ = R_\lambda \cap \Delta_+^{\text{re}}$, and $W_\lambda = \langle s_\alpha \mid \alpha \in R_\lambda \rangle \subset W$. Let $D = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_+} (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha}$ be the Weyl denominator. Let $L(\lambda)$ denote the irreducible $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ -module with highest weight λ , see [27], Chapter 9. In [29], Section 2, the following theorem was proved.

1.1. Theorem. *Let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be such that*

$$(1.1) \quad \lambda + \rho \in X,$$

$$(1.2) \quad \langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle > 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in R_\lambda^+.$$

Then

$$(1.3) \quad e^\rho D \text{ch } L(\lambda) = \sum_{w \in W_\lambda} (\det w) e^{w(\lambda + \rho)}.$$

Key words and phrases. Kac-Moody superalgebra, quasi-admissible and admissible weight, vertex algebra, Enright functor.

Note that, by this theorem, if $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfies (1.1), (1.2), then

$$(1.4) \quad e^\rho \text{ch } L(\lambda) \text{ is } W_\lambda\text{-anti-invariant.}$$

We call λ satisfying (1.1), (1.2) a *quasi-admissible weight*, and, as in [29], we call λ an *admissible weight* if, in addition, the \mathbb{Q} -span of R_λ coincides with the \mathbb{Q} -span of Δ^{re} .

1.2. If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A)$ is an affine Lie algebra (see [27], Chapter 6–8), then condition (1.1) means

$$(1.5) \quad k + h^\vee > 0,$$

where $k = \lambda(K)$, the level of λ , and h^\vee is the dual Coxeter number; condition (1.2) means

$$(1.6) \quad \langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Delta_+^{\text{re}},$$

or, equivalently, that $\lambda + \rho$ is the maximal element in its W -orbit. It follows from the character formula (1.3) that $e^{a\delta} \text{ch } L(\lambda)$ is a ratio of Jacobi forms for a suitable constant a , having non-positive weight if λ is quasi-admissible, and zero weight if λ is admissible (see [30]). Thus, the (normalised) character of the \mathfrak{g} -module $L(\lambda)$ with admissible highest weight λ is a modular function.

1.3. A result, similar to Theorem 1.1, was also proved in [29] for anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebras $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$, introduced in [26]. Here A is a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix, satisfying, in addition to the usual requirements, that all entries in the i -th row are even if $i \in \tau$, and τ is the set of indices, for which the Chevalley generators e_i and f_i are odd. For these superalgebras, Theorem 1.1 still holds, with the following change in the definition of R_λ (see [29], Section 6): let Δ_{ev}^{re} and Δ_{odd}^{re} denote the sets of even and odd real roots, and let $R_\lambda = R_{\lambda;ev} \cup R_{\lambda;odd}$, where

$$R_{\lambda;ev} = \{\alpha \in \Delta_{ev}^{\text{re}} \mid \langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}, \alpha/2 \notin \Delta^{\text{re}}\}, R_{\lambda;odd} = \{\alpha \in \Delta_{odd}^{\text{re}} \mid \langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{odd}\}.$$

1.4. Let \mathcal{O}_{adm} denote the full subcategory of the category \mathcal{O} , whose objects are modules over a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra, for which all irreducible subquotients are quasi-admissible. Using [4], it is proved in [30] that the category \mathcal{O}_{adm} is semisimple. The same proof works for all anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebras.

1.5. The theory of admissible modules over a non-twisted affine Lie algebras \mathfrak{g} is related to representation theory of vertex algebras in the following way. Recall that the \mathfrak{g} -module $L(k\Lambda_0)$ carries a structure of a simple vertex algebra $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$. A number $k \in \mathbb{C}$ is called an *admissible level* for \mathfrak{g} and $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ if $k\Lambda_0$ is an admissible weight.

For a simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} an admissible level k of the corresponding non-twisted affine Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} and the simple vertex algebra $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ is of the form $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{q}$, where p and q are coprime positive integers, and k is either *principal*, when q is coprime with the lacity r^\vee of \mathfrak{g} and $p \geq h^\vee$, or *subprincipal*, when q is divisible by $r^\vee > 1$ and $p \geq h$, where h^\vee and h are the dual Coxeter number and the Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g} respectively [34].

An admissible weight λ is called *principal* (resp., *subprincipal*) admissible if its level k is principal (resp., subprincipal) admissible and R_λ is isometric to $R_{k\Lambda_0}$. (Subsets S and S_1 of vector spaces with symmetric bilinear forms are called *isometric* if there exists a linear map ψ , preserving the bilinear forms, of the span of S to the span of S_1 , which restricts to a bijection between S and S_1 .¹.)

Adamović and Milas in [1] proved for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_2^{(1)}$, that for k , such that $k\Lambda_0$ is an admissible weight for \mathfrak{g} , a \mathfrak{g} -module $L(\lambda)$ is actually a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module if and only if λ is an admissible weight of level k , and they stated a conjecture for arbitrary affine Lie algebras. This conjecture was proved by Arakawa in [3], using [1]. This is the following theorem.

Arakawa Theorem. Let k be such that $k\Lambda_0$ is an admissible weight of a non-twisted affine Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . Then an irreducible highest weight \mathfrak{g} -module $L(\lambda)$ is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module if and only if λ is an admissible weight of level k , such that R_λ is isometric to $R_{k\Lambda_0}$.

This theorem was extended to the only anisotropic simple Lie superalgebras $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$, which are not Lie algebras, $\mathfrak{osp}(1|2n)$ in [18].

1.6. In the present paper we study quasi-admissible (called snowflake in [18]) and admissible \mathfrak{g} -modules over arbitrary symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras.

Recall that for any $\ell \times \ell$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ over \mathbb{C} one associates a Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}(A)$ with Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} and Chevalley generators e_i, f_i , $i = 1 \dots, \ell$, described in [27], Chapter 1, and called a *contragredient Lie algebra*. Given a subset $\tau \subset \{1, \dots, \ell\}$, one associates to the pair (A, τ) a contragredient Lie superalgebra by letting the e_i and f_i with $i \in \tau$ be odd elements [25],[26]. The contragredient Lie superalgebra structure is called *integrable* if all its Chevalley generators are ad-locally nilpotent. An integrable contragredient Lie algebra is called a Kac-Moody algebra if $a_{ii} \neq 0$ for all i .

If $a_{ii} = 0$ for some i , then the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ can be given another structure of a contragredient Lie superalgebra by applying the odd reflexion, corresponding to the index i . The superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is called a *Kac-Moody superalgebra* if all contragredient Lie superalgebra structures, obtained from it by a sequence of odd reflexions, are integrable and $a_{ii} \neq 0$ for $i \notin \tau$ for all of them [46].

1.7. If for the matrix A there exists a non-singular diagonal matrix $D = \text{diag}(d_1, \dots, d_\ell)$ such that the matrix DA is symmetric, A is called *symmetrizable*. In this case $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is called symmetrizable, and this Lie superalgebra carries a (essentially unique) non-degenerate supersymmetric invariant bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) , whose restriction to \mathfrak{h} is non-degenerate (cf. [27], Chapter 2).

1.8. The class of symmetrizable indecomposable Kac-Moody superalgebras consists of three classes [46]:

¹Notice that, in our definition, the relation " S is isometric to S_1 " is transitive, but not symmetric, since the map ψ may have a non-zero kernel.

- (a) finite-dimensional, classified in [25];
- (b) anisotropic, i.e. those integrable $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ for which all the diagonal entries of A are non-zero, studied in [26];
- (c) symmetrizable indecomposable infinite-dimensional contragredient Lie superalgebras of finite growth (=Gelfand-Kirillov dimension), classified in [47] in the super case and in [24] in the non-super case; they are called *symmetrizable affine Lie superalgebras* since all of them can be obtained by the same construction as the affine Lie algebras [24],[47].

1.9. Admissible modules over affine Lie algebras, i.e. those $L(\lambda)$, such that λ satisfies (1.5), (1.6) and, in addition, $\mathbb{Q}R_\lambda = \mathbb{Q}\Delta^{\text{re}}$, have been classified in [30]. It was proved there that the span of the (normalised) characters of admissible modules for given level is a finite-dimensional $SL_2(\mathbb{Z})$ -invariant space (this is called modular invariance property). Admissible modules over some affine Lie superalgebras and their characters were studied in a series of papers starting with [32]. It was shown in these papers that, though modular invariance fails, for a modification of the characters of these modules it is restored.

1.10. It follows from (1.3) that for an anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g} and a \mathfrak{g} -module $L(\lambda)$ with a quasi-admissible highest weight λ we have

$$(1.7) \quad De^\rho \text{ch } L(\lambda) \text{ is } W_\lambda\text{-anti-invariant.}$$

In [18] Gorelik and Serganova found another approach to quasi-admissible modules $L(\lambda)$ over anisotropic symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras, defining them by an analogue of the property (1.7), and the property

$$(1.8) \quad \lambda \text{ is non-critical.}$$

(We find this term more natural than "snowflake", used in [18].) The analogue of the property (1.7) is anti-invariance of $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L(\lambda)$ with respect to the group $W_\lambda \cap W[\pi]$ where π stands for the set of simple roots of the "largest" component of $\Delta_{\bar{0}}$.

Condition (1.8) means that $2(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) \neq (\alpha, \alpha)$ for all positive imaginary roots α . For a (symmetrizable) affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, this simply means that k is a non-critical level: $k + h^\vee \neq 0$, which is weaker than (1.5). It is proved in [18] that for an anisotropic symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g} and a non-critical weight λ conditions (1.2) and (1.7) are actually equivalent.

1.11. Our main results are the following:

- Theorem B.6, stating that for any non-critical $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ of a Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g} each indecomposable component of the "integral root system" $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is the set of real roots of a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}' , unless this component is of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$ (which may happen only if $\mathfrak{g} = A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$).

- Theorem 5.5.3, stating that quasi-admissibility of a \mathfrak{g} -module $L(\lambda)$ is equivalent to partial integrability (i.e., integrability with respect to the "largest" component of \mathfrak{g}'_0) of the \mathfrak{g}' -module $L'(\lambda')$, where \mathfrak{g}' is a Kac-Moody superalgebra, if $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ does not have indecomposable components of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$.
- Arakawa-type Theorem 7.3.1 for vertex algebras, attached to non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebras.

We classify in §7.6 and Section 8 the admissible levels of non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebras \mathfrak{g} , which are not Lie algebras and are not of type $D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$:

- For $\mathfrak{g} = A(m|n)^{(1)}$, $D(m|n)^{(1)}$ ($(m, n) \neq (2, 1)$), $G(3)^{(1)}$, $F(4)^{(1)}$ any admissible level is principal admissible and is of the form $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{q}$, where p, q are coprime positive integers, $p \geq h^\vee$, and q is coprime with the lacity of π (i.e. q is odd for $F(4)^{(1)}$, $D(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$, and q is not divisible by 3 for $G(3)^{(1)}$).
- Let $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m \leq n$ (so that $h^\vee = n - m + \frac{1}{2}$). The level k is principal admissible if and only if $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{2q}$, where p, q are coprime odd positive integers and $p \geq 2h^\vee$. If $m \neq 0$ and $(m, n) \neq (1, 1)$, then any admissible level is principal admissible. For $B(0|n)^{(1)}$, k is subprincipal admissible if and only if $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{2q}$, where p, q are coprime positive integers, pq is even and $p \geq n$. For $B(1|1)^{(1)}$, k is subprincipal admissible if and only if $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{2q}$, where p, q are coprime positive integers and p is even.
- Let $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m > n > 0$ (so that $h^\vee = 2(m - n) - 1$). The level k is principal admissible if and only if $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{q}$, where p, q are coprime positive integers, q is odd, and $p \geq h^\vee$. The level k is subprincipal admissible if and only if $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{q}$, where p, q are coprime positive integers, q is even, and $p \geq 2(m - n)$.

1.11.1. Comment. The conditions on p can be unified by the formula: $p \geq u$, where u is the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}' for $k\Lambda_0 + \rho$. If k is principal admissible, then $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0 + \rho} \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}$ so $u = h^\vee$.

It turns out that if k is subprincipal admissible, then $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0 + \rho}$ can be described as follows: we recall that the set of simple roots for \mathfrak{g} takes the form $\Sigma = \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{\delta - \theta\}$ where $\dot{\Sigma}$ is the set of simple roots for $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ and θ is the maximal root for $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$; the set of simple roots for \mathfrak{g}' is of the form $\dot{\Sigma} \cup \{\delta - \theta'\}$ where θ' is a short root. We have the following table (where \mathfrak{g}^L stands for the Langlands dual of \mathfrak{g} - the Dynkin diagram of \mathfrak{g}^L is obtained from the Dynkin diagram of \mathfrak{g} by reversing all arrows):

\mathfrak{g}	$B_m^{(1)}$	$C_m^{(1)}$	$G_2^{(1)}$	$F_4^{(1)}$	$B(0 n)^{(1)}$	$B(m n)^{(1)}, m > 0$
\mathfrak{g}'	$D_{m+1}^{(2)}$	$A_{2m-1}^{(2)}$	$D_4^{(3)}$	$E_6^{(2)}$	$A(0 2n-1)^{(2)}$	$D(m+1 n)^{(2)}$
\mathfrak{g}^L	$A_{2m-1}^{(2)}$	$D_{m+1}^{(2)}$	$D_4^{(3)}$	$E_6^{(2)}$	—	—
u	$2m$	$2m$	6	12	$n - \frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{n-m}{2}$ if $n \geq m$, $m - n$ if $m > n$

For $n > 0$ the Dynkin diagram obtained from the Dynkin diagram of $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ by reversing all arrows is not the Dynkin diagram of a Kac-Moody superalgebra, so \mathfrak{g}^L is not defined in this case. Notice that $A_{2m-1}^{(2)}$, $D_{m+1}^{(2)}$ have the same dual Coxeter number ($=2n$), so $u = h^{\vee, L}$ is the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}^L in all cases except for $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n > 0$.

1.12. Index of definitions and notation. Throughout the paper the ground field is \mathbb{C} . We will frequently use the following notation.

N_ν , $\Omega(N)$, \mathcal{O}^{inf} , base for a triangular decomposition, \mathcal{O}_Σ , $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$, \mathcal{O} , \mathcal{O}^{fin}	2.10
Weyl denominator D	2.11.1
reflexion: $=r_\alpha \Sigma$	2.3.3
spine: $=\text{Sp}$, principal roots: $=\Sigma_{\text{pr}}$, Weyl group: $=W$	2.8
roots real: $=\Delta^{\text{re}}$, $\overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}}$, isotropic: $=\Delta^{\text{iso}}$, non-isotropic: $=\Delta^{\text{an}}$; imaginary: $=\Delta^{\text{im}}$	2.8
the Weyl vector ρ	2.9
$W[E]$, natural action of the Weyl group	2.11
non-critical weight, non-critical module, short root	3.2
\overline{R}_λ , R_λ , Δ_λ	4.1.1
Δ_N	4.2
ψ	4.2.2
L' , \mathfrak{g}'	4.3
$U(\lambda)$	4.6
π -integrable	5.1.1
\mathfrak{g}_π	5.1.8
ρ_π , D_π	5.4.1
cl , $\pi^\#$, $\Delta^\#$	6.1
V^k	6.1.1
(principal) admissible level	6.4
$V^k(\mathfrak{g})$, $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$, $\mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g})^k$, $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$, $\mathfrak{g}^\#$	7.1

Acknowledgment. We are grateful to Vladimir Hinich and Vera Serganova for important suggestions and observations. V.K. was partially supported by Simons collaboration grant and by ISF Grant 1957/21. M. G. was partially supported by ISF Grant 1957/21 and by the Minerva foundation with funding from the Federal German Ministry for Education and Research.

2. CONTRAGREDIENT LIE SUPERALGEBRAS $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$

2.1. Definition of $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$. Let I be an index set, which we assume to be finite, unless otherwise stated, and let $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I}$ be a matrix with entries in \mathbb{C} . A triple $(\mathfrak{h}, \Sigma, \Sigma^\vee)$, such that \mathfrak{h} is a vector space, $\Sigma = \{\alpha_i\}_{i \in I}$ (resp., $\Sigma^\vee = \{h_i\}_{i \in I}$) is a linearly independent subset of \mathfrak{h}^* (resp., \mathfrak{h}), such that

$$\alpha_j(h_i) = a_{ij}, \quad i, j \in I,$$

is called a *realization* of the matrix A .

A realization of A is called *reduced* if \mathfrak{h} cannot be replaced by a strictly smaller subspace; if I is finite, then for the reduced realization of A one has:

$$\dim \mathfrak{h} = |I| + \text{corank } A.$$

Let τ be a subset of I . Define the Lie superalgebra $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, \tau)$ generated by elements e_i, f_i , $i \in I$, and \mathfrak{h} , where \mathfrak{h} consists of even elements and e_i, f_i are even if and only if $i \notin \tau$, subject to the following relations ($i, j \in I$):

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} (a) \quad & [h, h'] = 0 \text{ for } h, h' \in \mathfrak{h}; \quad [h, e_i] = \alpha_i(h)e_i, \quad [h, f_i] = -\alpha_i(h)f_i \text{ for } h \in \mathfrak{h}; \\ (b) \quad & [e_i, f_j] = \delta_{ij}h_i. \end{aligned}$$

Let $J(A, \tau)$ be the sum of all ideals of $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, \tau)$, intersecting \mathfrak{h} trivially, and let

$$\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau) := \tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, \tau) / J(A, \tau).$$

This is called the *contragredient Lie superalgebra* with the Cartan datum (A, τ) . Elements e_i, f_i , $i \in I$ are called the *Chevalley generators*. The Lie algebras $\mathfrak{g}(A, \emptyset)$ were introduced in [24], and the general $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ in [25].

Note that replacing each h_i by $b_i h_i$, where b_i are non-zero numbers, produces an isomorphic contragredient Lie superalgebra, whose Cartan matrix is $A_1 = \text{diag}(b_i)_{i \in I} A$. The Cartan matrices A and A_1 are called equivalent.

We will follow [27], Chapters 1 and 2 on basic properties of $\mathfrak{g}(A)$, they remain valid for $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$, except that Proposition 1.7 (b) is valid if $A \neq (0)$.

2.2. Triangular and root space decompositions. We have the triangular decomposition

$$\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau) = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}^+,$$

where \mathfrak{n}^- (resp., \mathfrak{n}^+) is generated by f_i (resp., e_i), $i \in I$. Furthermore, \mathfrak{n}^+ and \mathfrak{n}^- are normalized by the Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} , so that we have the root space decomposition:

$$\mathfrak{n}^\pm = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \pm \Delta^+(\Sigma)} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \quad \text{where } \mathfrak{g}_\alpha = \{a \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h, a] = \alpha(h)a\}.$$

The set $\Delta^+(\Sigma) = \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid 0 \neq \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \subset \mathfrak{n}^+\}$ is called the set of *positive roots*, corresponding to the base Σ , and the set $\Delta = -\Delta^+(\Sigma) \amalg \Delta^+(\Sigma)$ is the set of *all roots*. Note that $\Delta^+(\Sigma) = \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$, and that $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha < \infty$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta$. The set Σ is called a *base* of Δ .

We define a linear map $p : \mathbb{Z}\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ given by $p(\alpha_i) = 1$ if $i \in \tau$ and $p(\alpha_i) = 0$ if $i \notin \tau$. Then all vectors in \mathfrak{g}_α are even (resp., odd) if $p(\alpha) = 0$ (resp., $p(\alpha) = 1$). Thus $\Delta = \Delta_{\bar{0}} \amalg \Delta_{\bar{1}}$.

2.3. Odd reflexions. We start from the following lemma.

2.3.1. Lemma. *One has in $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$*

- (a) $[e_s, e_s] = 0 = [f_s, f_s]$ if $s \in \tau$ and $a_{ss} = 0$, hence $(\text{ad } e_s)^2 = (\text{ad } f_s)^2 = 0$.
- (b) $[e_s, e_s] \neq 0$ and $[f_s, f_s] \neq 0$ if $s \in \tau$ and $a_{ss} \neq 0$.
- (c) $[e_i, e_j] = 0 = [f_i, f_j]$ if $a_{ij} = 0 = a_{ji}$ and $i \neq j$.
- (d) $[e_i, e_j] \neq 0$ and $[f_i, f_j] \neq 0$ if $a_{ij} \neq 0$ and $i \neq j$.

Proof. For all $s \in \tau$ and $j \in J$ we have $[f_j, [e_s, e_s]] = -2\delta_{sj}a_{ss}e_s$ in $\tilde{\mathfrak{g}}(A, \tau)$, so $[e_s, e_s] \in J(A, \tau)$ if and only if $a_{ss} = 0$. This proves (a) and (b). The proof of (c) and (d) is similar. \square

2.3.2. Proposition. *Suppose that $s \in \tau$ is such that $a_{ss} = 0$ and $a_{sj} = 0$ implies $a_{js} = 0$. Then the Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ carries another structure of a contragredient Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$ with the same \mathfrak{h} , and new Chevalley generators e'_i, f'_i ($i \in I$) given by $e'_i := e_i, f'_i := f_i$ if $a_{sj} = 0$ and $j \neq s, e'_s := f_s, f'_s := e_s$, and $e'_i := [e_s, e_i], f'_i := [f_s, f_i]$ if $a_{sj} \neq 0$. One has*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau' &= \{i \in \tau \mid a_{si} \neq 0\} \cup \{i \in I \setminus \tau \mid a_{si} \neq 0\}, \\ \Sigma' &= \{-\alpha_s\} \cup \{\alpha_i \mid i \in I, i \neq s, a_{si} = 0\} \cup \{\alpha_i + \alpha_s \mid i \in I, a_{si} \neq 0\}, \\ (\Sigma')^\vee &= \{h'_i\}_{i \in I}, \text{ where } h'_i = h_i \text{ if } a_{si} = 0, \quad h'_i = (-1)^{p(\alpha_i)}(a_{is}h_s + a_{si}h_i) \text{ if } a_{si} \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. One readily sees that the sets Σ' and $(\Sigma')^\vee$ are linearly independent.

Let us verify that $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is generated by the new Chevalley generators and \mathfrak{h} . Let \mathfrak{p} be the subalgebra generated by \mathfrak{h} and e'_i, f'_i for $i \in I$. For all $i \neq s \in I$ we have $[e_s, [f_s, f_i]] = -a_{si}f_i$, so $[f'_s, f'_i] = -a_{si}f_i$ if $a_{si} \neq 0$. Therefore $f_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for all $i \in I$. Similarly, $e_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for all $i \in I$, so $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$.

The relations (2.1) (a) for e'_i, f'_i and the relations $[e'_i, f'_i] = h'_i$ are straightforward. For $i \neq j \neq s$ one has $\alpha'_i - \alpha'_j \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$ which gives $[e'_i, f'_j] = 0$. It remains to verify that $[e'_s, f'_i] = [e'_i, f'_s] = 0$ for $i \neq s$.

If $a_{sj} \neq 0$, then $[e'_s, f'_j] = [f_s, [f_s, f_j]] = 0$ by Lemma 2.3.1 (a). If $a_{sj} = 0$, then, by the assumption, $a_{js} = 0$, so $[e'_s, f'_j] = [f_s, f_j] = 0$ by Lemma 2.3.1 (c). Hence $[e'_s, f'_j] = 0$ for all $j \in I$. Similarly, $[e'_j, f'_s] = 0$ for all $j \in I$. \square

2.3.3. Remark. For (A, τ) and $s \in I$ as in the proposition we say that (A', τ') are obtained from (A, τ) by an *odd reflexion*² r_{α_s} . We shall often write $\Sigma' = r_{\alpha_s}\Sigma$. Note that $r_{-\alpha_s}r_{\alpha_s}\Sigma = \Sigma$.

2.3.4. The Cartan matrix A is called *weakly symmetrizable* if $a_{ij} = 0$ implies $a_{ji} = 0$ for all $i, j \in I$. By Proposition 2.3.2, if A is weakly symmetrizable, then the odd reflexion r_{α_s} is well-defined for any $s \in \tau$ with $a_{ss} = 0$.

²In [11] these are called "isotropic reflexions".

2.3.5. For an odd reflexion r_{α_s} we have

$$(2.2) \quad \Delta^+(r_{\alpha_s}\Sigma) = \Delta^+(\Sigma) \setminus \{\alpha_s\} \cup \{-\alpha_s\}.$$

Indeed, if $\gamma \in -\Delta^+(r_{\alpha_s}\Sigma) \cap \Delta^+(\Sigma)$, then $\gamma = \sum_{i \in I} m_i \alpha_i = -\sum_{i \in I} n_i \alpha'_i$ where $m_i, n_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. One has $\alpha'_s = -\alpha_s$. For $i \neq s$ we have $\alpha'_i = \alpha_i + k_i \alpha_s$ for $k_i \in \{0, 1\}$, so $m_i = n_i$. Thus $m_i = 0$ for all $i \neq s$. Hence $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \alpha_s$. By Lemma 2.3.1 (a), $[e_s, s_s] = 0$, so $\Delta \cap \mathbb{Z} \alpha_s = \{\pm \alpha_s\}$. Thus $\gamma = \alpha_s$ as required.

2.4. Integrable $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$. The contragredient Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is called *integrable* if all its Chevalley generators and all Chevalley generators obtained by any sequence of odd reflexions are ad-locally nilpotent.

An integrable contragredient Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is called a *Kac-Moody superalgebra* if for all (A', τ') obtained by any sequence of odd reflexions, the Cartan matrix A' is weakly symmetrizable and $a'_{ii} \neq 0$ for all $i \notin \tau'$.

2.4.1. Example. Suppose that all diagonal entries of the Cartan matrix are non-zero, so that it is equivalent to a Cartan matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ with all diagonal entries equal to 2. In this case the contragredient Lie superalgebra is integrable if and only if A is weakly symmetrizable, and for $i \neq j$, $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ and a_{ij} is even if $i \in \tau$.

These contragredient Lie superalgebras are called *anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebras*.

2.5. Indecomposable $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$. If the set I decomposes in a disjoint union of non-empty subsets I_1 and I_2 , such that $a_{ij} = a_{ji} = 0$ for $i \in I_1, j \in I_2$, then we have direct product decomposition of Lie superalgebras

$$\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau) \cong \mathfrak{g}(A_1, \tau_1) \times \mathfrak{g}(A_2, \tau_2) \times \bar{\mathfrak{h}},$$

where the matrices A_1 and A_2 are the submatrices of A , corresponding to the sets of indices I_1 and I_2 , $\tau_i \subset I_i$, $\mathfrak{g}(A_i, \tau_i)$ correspond to the reduced realizations of the A_i , and $\bar{\mathfrak{h}} \subset \mathfrak{h}$. In this case the Cartan matrix is called *decomposable*.

The contragredient Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is called *indecomposable* if A is *indecomposable* and its realization is reduced.

2.6. Invariant bilinear form on symmetrizable $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$. A Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ (and its Cartan matrix A) is called *symmetrizable* if an equivalent Cartan matrix $A_1 = \text{diag}(b_i)_{i \in I} A$ is symmetric. Note that a symmetrizable Cartan matrix is weakly symmetrizable.

A symmetrizable contragredient Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ admits a non-degenerate supersymmetric invariant bilinear form $(-, -)$, such that $(-, -)_{\mathfrak{h} \times \mathfrak{h}}$ is non-degenerate, $(\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_\beta) = 0$ unless $\alpha = -\beta$, and the root spaces \mathfrak{g}_α and $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ are non-degenerately paired, such that

$$[e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}] = (e_\alpha, e_{-\alpha}) h_\alpha,$$

where h_α is defined by $\alpha(h) = (h, h_\alpha)$ for all $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ (cf. [27], Chapter 2).

2.7. Let $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ be a Kac-Moody superalgebra. Let $\alpha \in \Sigma$. Then $\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha} = 1$ and $[\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}]$ is a one-dimensional subspace of \mathfrak{h} ; we denote by α^\vee a non-zero element in this subspace which satisfies the condition $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \{0, 2\}$ (α^\vee is unique if $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 2$). One has $\mathbb{Z}\alpha \cap \Delta = \{\pm\alpha\}$ except for the case when $p(\alpha) = \bar{1}$ and $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle \neq 0$; in the latter case $\mathbb{Z}\alpha \cap \Delta = \{\pm\alpha; \pm 2\alpha\}$. Moreover the subalgebra generated by $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ coincides with $\mathbb{C}\alpha^\vee + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathfrak{g}_{\pm j\alpha}$ and is isomorphic to one of the following Lie superalgebras (cf. [25]):

- \mathfrak{sl}_2 spanned by $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ and α^\vee ; in this case $p(\alpha) = \bar{0}$ and $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 2$;
- $\mathfrak{sl}(1|1)$ spanned by $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ and α^\vee ; in this case $p(\alpha) = \bar{1}$ and $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 0$;
- $\mathfrak{osp}(1|2)$ spanned by $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}, \mathfrak{g}_{\pm 2\alpha}$ and α^\vee ; in this case $p(\alpha) = \bar{1}$ and $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 2$.

2.8. Spine, principal roots, Weyl group, real and imaginary roots. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra. The *spine* of \mathfrak{g} is the set Sp of all bases of Δ , obtained from Σ by a chain of odd reflexions.

For each non-isotropic vector $\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we define the reflection $s_\alpha \in \text{End}(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ by $s_\alpha(\lambda) := \lambda - \frac{2(\lambda, \alpha)}{(\alpha, \alpha)}\alpha$.

Following notation of [46], [18] we call an even root α *principal* if α or $\alpha/2$ lies in $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$. Since all even roots in Σ_1 are non-isotropic and, by Lemma 2.3.1 (a), $2\beta \notin \Delta$ for any isotropic root in Σ_1 , all principal roots are non-isotropic. We denote the set of principal roots by Σ_{pr} . Note that $(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$ if α is a principal root. The subgroup W of the group $GL(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ generated by the reflections with respect to principal roots, is called the *Weyl group* of \mathfrak{g} . We have: $W(\Delta) = \Delta$ (cf. [27], Section 3) and $W(\Delta_{\bar{i}}) = \Delta_{\bar{i}}$ for $i = 0, 1$.

A root $\gamma \in \Delta$ is called *real* if γ or $\gamma/2$ lies in $w\Sigma_1$ for some $w \in W$ and $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$, and is called *imaginary* otherwise. The sets of real and imaginary roots are denoted by Δ^{re} and Δ^{im} respectively.

Using § 2.7 it is easy to see that $\Delta^{\text{re}} = \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}} \coprod \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \notin \overline{\Delta}_1^{\text{re}}\}$, where

$$(2.3) \quad \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}} := \{\gamma \in \Delta^{\text{re}} \mid \frac{1}{2}\gamma \in \Delta\} = \{w\alpha \mid w \in W, \alpha \in \Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}\}.$$

By § 2.7, $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha = 1$ if $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$, and $[\mathfrak{g}_\alpha, \mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}] = \mathbb{C}\alpha^\vee$, where $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \{0, 2\}$, and $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is non-isotropic (reps., isotropic) if $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 2$ (resp., $= 0$). We denote by Δ^{an} (resp., Δ^{iso}) the set of all non-isotropic (reps., isotropic) real roots. We let $\overline{\Delta}^{\text{an}} = \Delta^{\text{an}} \cap \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}}$. Notice that all even real roots are non-isotropic. The Weyl group contains the reflections s_γ for all $\gamma \in \Delta^{\text{an}}$.

2.8.1. If $\alpha \in \overline{\Delta}^{\text{an}}$, then $w\alpha \in \Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$, so for all $\beta \in \Sigma_1$, the value $\langle \beta, (w\alpha)^\vee \rangle$ is integral and is even if $w\alpha$ is odd. Therefore for any $\beta \in \Delta$ we have

$$(2.4) \quad \langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ if } \alpha \in \overline{\Delta}^{\text{an}}, \quad \langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in 2\mathbb{Z} \text{ if } \alpha \in \overline{\Delta}_1^{\text{an}}.$$

By (2.2) the sets $\Delta^{\text{im}+} = \Delta^{\text{im}} \cap \Delta^+$, $\Delta^{\text{an}+} = \Delta^{\text{an}} \cap \Delta^+$ and Δ_0^+ do not depend on the choice of a base in the spine.

The set of principal roots coincides with the set of indecomposable elements in the set of positive even real roots $(\Delta_0^{\text{re}})^+$, i.e. these are the elements which can not be decomposed as a sum of several other elements in $(\Delta_0^{\text{re}})^+$ (see [16], Proposition 3.5).

Recall that W is generated by reflections s_α with respect to the principal roots. For a principal root α such that α or $\alpha/2$ lies in $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$ and any $\beta \in \Delta^+(\Sigma_1)$ one has $s_\alpha \beta \in \Delta^+(\Sigma_1)$ if $\beta \notin \mathbb{Z}\alpha$. This implies $W(\Delta^{\text{im}+}) = \Delta^{\text{im}+}$.

2.8.2. Remark. Each subset $\Sigma' \subset \Sigma$ defines a Kac-Moody subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{g}$ with the same Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} and the base Σ' . There is a natural embedding of the spine of Σ' to the spine of Σ ; this gives $\Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \subset \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ (cf. [27], Chapter 3).

2.8.3. Since even real roots are non-isotropic we have $\langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle = 2$ for each $\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$. By [46], for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ we have $\langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$, so the matrix $B_{\text{pr}} := (\langle \alpha^\vee, \beta \rangle)_{\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}}$ is the Cartan matrix of a Kac-Moody algebra (from Hoyt-Serganova classification [21],[46], it follows that Σ_{pr} is finite).

Let a triple $(\mathfrak{h}', \pi, \pi^\vee)$ be a realization of B_{pr} in the sense of [27], Chapter I. Consider linear epimorphisms $\phi : \mathbb{Z}\pi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ and $\phi^* : \mathbb{Z}\pi^\vee \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Sigma_{\text{pr}}^\vee$ which map π to Σ_{pr} and π^\vee to Σ_{pr}^\vee respectively. The restriction of ϕ gives a bijection between the set of real roots of $\mathfrak{g}(B_{\text{pr}})$ and Δ_0^{re} . Moreover, ϕ induces a group isomorphism between the Weyl group of $\mathfrak{g}(B_{\text{pr}})$ and the Weyl group W . In particular, W is the Coxeter group generated by s_α with $\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ and $\Delta_0^{\text{re}} = W(\Sigma_{\text{pr}})$.

2.8.4. Lemma. *Any $\gamma \in \Delta_0^{\text{re}+}$ can be written as $\gamma = s_{\alpha_j} \dots s_{\alpha_2} \alpha_1$ (with $\gamma = \alpha_1$ for $j = 1$) where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ are such that*

$$s_{\alpha_{i+1}}(s_{\alpha_i} \dots s_{\alpha_2} \alpha_1) \in (s_{\alpha_i} \dots s_{\alpha_2} \alpha_1 + \mathbb{Z}_{>0} \alpha_{i+1})$$

for each $i = 1, \dots, j-1$.

Proof. Using the induction on the partial order given by $\nu \geq \mu$ if $\nu - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ we reduce the statement to the following: for each $\gamma \in (\Delta_0^{\text{re}+} \setminus \Sigma_{\text{pr}})$ there exists $\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ such that $\langle \gamma, \alpha^\vee \rangle > 0$. For Kac-Moody algebras this assertion is Proposition 5.1 (e) in [27]. Using $\phi : \mathbb{Z}\pi \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ described above, we deduce the required assertion from the corresponding assertion for the Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}(B_{\text{pr}})$. \square

2.9. Weyl vector $\rho = \rho_\Sigma$. Define $\rho \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ satisfying the condition

$$2\langle \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle = \langle \alpha, \alpha^\vee \rangle \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Sigma.$$

For each $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$, the element

$$(2.5) \quad \rho_{\Sigma_1} := \rho - \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta^+(\Sigma) \setminus \Delta^+(\Sigma_1)} (-1)^{p(\gamma)} \gamma$$

is a Weyl vector for Σ_1 . This follows from the observation that $\rho_{r_\alpha \Sigma} = \rho + \alpha$ if $\alpha \in \Sigma \cap \Delta^{\text{iso}}$.

Combining (2.4) and (2.5) we get

$$(2.6) \quad \langle \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for } \alpha \in \overline{\Delta}_0^{\text{an}}, \quad \langle \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1 \text{ for } \alpha \in \Delta_1^{\text{an}}.$$

2.10. Categories $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}} \subset \mathcal{O}_\Sigma \subset \mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}$. Let \mathfrak{g} be an arbitrary Lie superalgebra and let $\mathfrak{h} \subset \mathfrak{g}_0$ be an abelian, self-normalizing subalgebra which acts ad-semisimply on \mathfrak{g} , so that

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{h} \oplus (\oplus_{\alpha \in \Delta} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha), \quad \mathfrak{g}_\alpha := \{x \in \mathfrak{g} \mid [h, x] = \alpha(h)x \text{ for all } h \in \mathfrak{h}\},$$

and $\Delta := \{\alpha \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid \alpha \neq 0, \mathfrak{g}_\alpha \neq 0\}$.

2.10.1. Triangular decomposition. Let $\omega : \mathbb{Z}\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a group homomorphism satisfying $\omega(\alpha) \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta$ (such a homomorphism exists because $\mathfrak{h}^* \cong \mathbb{R}$ as a \mathbb{Q} -vector space [19]). We set $\Delta^\pm := \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid \pm \omega(\alpha) > 0\}$. We introduce the corresponding triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{g}^+$ by setting $\mathfrak{g}^\pm := \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^\pm(\mathfrak{g})} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. Note that a

triangular decomposition of \mathfrak{g} induces a triangular decomposition of any ad \mathfrak{h} -invariant subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} .

2.10.2. Given $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, we define a Verma module $M(\lambda)$ in the usual way, as the \mathfrak{g} -module, induced from the 1-dimensional $\mathfrak{h} + \mathfrak{g}^+$ -module $\mathbb{C}v_\lambda$, such that $\mathfrak{g}^+v_\lambda = 0$ and $hv_\lambda = \lambda(h)v_\lambda$ for $h \in \mathfrak{h}$. This module has a unique simple quotient, denoted by $L(\lambda)$.

We denote by $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ the full subcategory of the category of \mathfrak{g} -modules with the objects which are \mathfrak{h} -semisimple and \mathfrak{g}^+ -locally finite (i.e., every $v \in N$ generates a finite-dimensional \mathfrak{g}^+ -submodule). Note that for any $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ each irreducible subquotient of N is isomorphic to $L(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.

We will use the following standard notation: for each semisimple \mathfrak{h} -module N and $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, N_ν denotes the weight space with weight ν , $\Omega(N) := \{\nu \mid N_\nu \neq 0\}$, and $\text{ch } N = \sum_{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*} (\dim N_\mu) e^\mu$ if $\dim N_\mu < \infty$ for all μ . For an \mathfrak{h} -invariant subalgebra $\mathfrak{l} \subseteq \mathfrak{g}$ we set $\Delta(\mathfrak{l}) := \Omega(\mathfrak{l})$.

2.10.3. Let \mathfrak{g} be a Lie superalgebra with a fixed triangular decomposition. Assume that

- (a) all root spaces \mathfrak{g}_α are finite-dimensional;
- (b) there exists a linearly independent set $\Sigma \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\Delta^\pm(\mathfrak{g}) \subset \pm \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \Sigma$ (note that we do not assume that $\Sigma \subset \Delta(\mathfrak{g})$).

If $\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is any subalgebra containing \mathfrak{h} , then \mathfrak{g}' inherits the triangular decomposition satisfying the above properties (for the same set Σ). The restriction functor $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}'}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ carries $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ to $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g}')$.

We denote by $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ the full subcategory of $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ of modules N satisfying the following condition: \mathfrak{h} has finite-dimensional weight spaces, and $\Omega(N)$ lies in a finite union of the sets of the form $\lambda - \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$ where $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. This notion is a slight variation of the category \mathcal{O} introduced in [28].

By (a), $M(\lambda)$ and $L(\lambda)$ are objects of $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$, and any irreducible module in $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ is isomorphic to $L(\lambda)$ for some $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. Any $N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ has the following properties:

- (i) $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$;
- (ii) all subquotients of N lie in $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$;
- (iii) $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}'}^{\mathfrak{g}} N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g}')$ if $\mathfrak{g}' \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is a subalgebra containing \mathfrak{h} (note that the induced triangular decomposition of \mathfrak{g}' satisfies (a) and (b));
- (iv) the multiplicity $[N : L(\mu)]$ is well defined and $\text{ch } N = \sum_{\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*} [N : L(\nu)] \text{ch } L(\nu)$.

Property (i) is easy to check; (ii), (iii) follow from definition. For (iv), using the arguments of [4] (Proposition 3.2), one shows that for each $\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ any module $N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ admits a *weak composition series at μ* which is a chain of submodules

$$0 = N_0 \subset N_1 \subset \dots \subset N_r = N$$

such that for each $i = 1, \dots, r$ either $N_i/L_{i-1} \cong L(\nu)$ for some $\nu \in (\mu + \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma)$ or $(N_i/N_{i-1})_{\nu} = 0$ for all $\nu \in (\mu + \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma)$.

Assume that the triangular decomposition satisfies (a) and (b). We introduce the algebra $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ over \mathbb{R} as in [14]: the elements of $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ are finite linear combinations of the elements of the form $B := \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma} b_{\mu} e^{\lambda - \mu}$ where $b_{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$. These elements can be multiplied in the obvious way. Any element in $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ can be uniquely written as $x = \sum_{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*} x_{\mu} e^{\mu}$ and we set $\text{supp}(x) := \{\mu \mid x_{\mu} \neq 0\}$. The ring $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ contains $\text{ch } N$ for any $N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$.

2.10.4. We call Σ satisfying (b) a *base* (or a set of simple roots) if $\Sigma \subset \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g})$. If the triangular decomposition admits a base, such base is unique.

2.10.5. We denote by $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ the BGG-category, i.e. the full subcategory of $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ with finitely generated modules N .

It is easy to see ([18], Lemma 3.1.3) that N lies in $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ if and only if N admits a finite filtration $0 = N_0 \subset N_1 \subset \dots \subset N_r = N$ such that for each $i = 1, \dots, r$ the quotient N_i/N_{i-1} is isomorphic to a quotient of a Verma module. As a result, $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ is a subcategory of $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ for any choice of Σ compatible with the triangular decomposition of \mathfrak{g} .

2.10.6. Example. Let \mathfrak{g} be a Kac-Moody superalgebra with a Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} . If \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional or affine, then any triangular decomposition admits a base (and \mathfrak{g} coincides with the Kac-Moody superalgebra constructed for this base), see [16], Theorem 0.4.3. A triangular decomposition of \mathfrak{g} induces a triangular decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$. The latter decomposition admits a base if \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional and does not admit a base for most of affine Kac-Moody superalgebras. For any $N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ we have $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}}^{\mathfrak{g}} N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}})$ so the multiplicity $[N : L_{\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}}(\nu)]$ is well defined.

2.10.7. Remark. The reason why we consider several versions of the category \mathcal{O} is the following.

In this paper we mostly consider the following Lie superalgebras: an affine Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g} with the Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} and a base $\Sigma \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, a Kac-Moody superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ containing \mathfrak{h} , and a Kac-Moody superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}^{\#} \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\pi}$ such that $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi} = \mathfrak{g}^{\#} + \mathfrak{h}$. The Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} is always fixed, but triangular decompositions (and Σ) of \mathfrak{g} vary.

The functor $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\pi}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ carries $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ to $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g}_{\pi})$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ to $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g}_{\pi})$, (notice that Σ , usually, does not lie in Δ_{π}). The above construction allows to define the multiplicity $[N : L_{\mathfrak{g}_{\pi}}(\nu)]$ for any $N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$.

The functor $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^{\#}}^{\mathfrak{g}}$ carries $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ to $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g}^{\#})$ (but the image of $N \in \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ might be not in $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g}^{\#})$ since the weight spaces on N with respect to the Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h} \cap \mathfrak{g}^{\#}$ might be infinite-dimensional).

The category $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ does not behave well under the restriction functor, since the modules $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\pi}}^{\mathfrak{g}} M(\lambda)$ might be not finitely generated. However $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ has the following advantages comparing to $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$: it does not depend on the choice of $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$, see § 2.12, and is stable under the action of the Enright functors, see § 5.7.

2.11. Ring $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ for Kac-Moody $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$. Now let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra. The triangular decomposition satisfies the conditions (a), (b) in § 2.10.3 and we let $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ be the ring introduced there.

For any $E \subset \Delta^{\text{an}}$ we denote by $W[E]$ the subgroup of W generated by s_{α} for $\alpha \in E \cap \Delta^{\text{an}}$.

If $x := \sum x_{\nu} e^{\nu} \in \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ and $w \in W$ are such that $w(\sum x_{\nu} e^{\nu}) := \sum x_{\nu} e^{w\nu} \in \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$, we say that w acts naturally on x . We say that $x \in \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ is naturally w -invariant and, respectively, w -anti-invariant if x is $wx = x$ and, respectively, $wx = \text{sgn}(w)x$ for the natural action of w (the map $\text{sgn} : W \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ is given by $\text{sgn}(s_{\alpha}) = -1$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{an}}$). In other words, $\sum x_{\nu} e^{\nu}$ is naturally w -invariant if $x_{w\nu} = x_{\nu}$ and naturally w -anti-invariant if $x_{w\nu} = \text{sgn}(w) \cdot x_{\nu}$.

2.11.1. The Weyl denominator D . It is the following element in $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$

$$D = D_{\bar{0}}/D_{\bar{1}}, \quad \text{where } D_{\bar{0}} = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^{+}(\Sigma)_{\bar{0}}} (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}}, \quad D_{\bar{1}} = \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta^{+}(\Sigma)_{\bar{1}}} (1 + e^{-\alpha})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\alpha}},$$

and by $(1 + e^{-\alpha})^{-1}$ we mean $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-e^{-\alpha})^i \in \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$.

2.12. Category $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ for Kac-Moody superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$. An important advantage of BGG-category $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ is that this category does not depend on the choice of $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$: if $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ for the triangular decomposition with a base Σ , then $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ for the triangular decomposition with any base $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$ (see [18], 1.11.2).

For a base $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$ we denote by $L(\lambda, \Sigma_1)$ the irreducible module of the highest weight λ with respect to the corresponding triangular decomposition. For $L = L(\lambda, \Sigma)$ we set $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L := \lambda + \rho_{\Sigma}$. Then for $\alpha \in (\Sigma \cap \Delta^{\text{iso}})$ we have

$$(2.7) \quad \text{hwt}_{r_{\alpha}\Sigma} L = \begin{cases} \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L & \text{if } \langle \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L, \alpha^{\vee} \rangle \neq 0 \\ \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L + \alpha & \text{if } \langle \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L, \alpha^{\vee} \rangle = 0. \end{cases}$$

(The last formula means that $L(\lambda, r_{\alpha}\Sigma) = L(\lambda, \Sigma)$ if $\langle \lambda, \alpha^{\vee} \rangle = 0$ and α is isotropic.)

The \mathfrak{g} -module $L(\lambda)$ is called *typical* if $\langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^{\vee} \rangle \neq 0$ for all isotropic roots $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{iso}}$. In this case $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L = \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L$ for all $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$.

3. SYMMETRIZABLE KAC-MOODY SUPERALGEBRAS

We will use terminology of [11] and some results of [46] and [11]. If \mathfrak{g} is an indecomposable symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra, we always assume that the invariant bilinear form $(-, -)$ is normalised in such a way that $(\alpha, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}^*$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g})$, unless $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$ (if $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$, then $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}) = \{\pm\alpha\}$ and $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0$).

3.1. Classification. Any symmetrizable indecomposable Kac-Moody superalgebra lies in one of the following classes [21],[46]:

- (An) anisotropic: integrable $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ with $a_{ii} \neq 0$ for all $i \in I$ (these superalgebras are studied in [26]);
- (Fin) finite-dimensional: this class consists of the simple Lie algebras and the following simple Lie superalgebras:

$$(3.1) \quad \mathfrak{sl}(m|n) \text{ with } m \neq n, m, n \geq 1, \mathfrak{osp}(m|2n), \text{ with } m, n > 0, D(2|1, a), F(4), G(3)$$

and the non-simple one $\mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$, $n \geq 1$, see [25]. It is often convenient to use Cartan type notation [25]: $A(m|n) = \mathfrak{sl}(m+1|n+1)$ if $m \neq n$, $A(n|n) = \mathfrak{gl}(n+1|n+1)$, $B(m|n) = \mathfrak{osp}(2m+1|2n)$, $C(n) = \mathfrak{osp}(2|2n)$, $D(m|n) = \mathfrak{osp}(2m|2n)$ (with $m \geq 1$)—these superalgebras are described in [25];

- (Aff) affine: affine Kac-Moody algebras [27], and symmetrizable affine Kac-Moody superalgebras, which are not Lie algebras, described in [47]; their construction is explained in § 3.3.

3.1.1. The classes (Fin) and (Aff) do not intersect (i.e., all affine superalgebras are infinite-dimensional), $(\text{An}) \cap (\text{Fin})$ consists of finite-dimensional simple Lie algebras and $\mathfrak{osp}(1|2\ell) = B(0|\ell)$, and the intersection $(\text{An}) \cap (\text{Aff})$ consists of affine Lie algebras and the series $B(0|n)^{(1)}$, $A(0|2n)^{(4)}$, $A(0|2n+1)^{(2)}$, $C(n+1)^{(2)} = D(1|n)^{(2)}$ with $n \geq 1$ [26].

3.1.2. Remark. The above classification can be also described in terms of Δ^{im} : $\Delta^{\text{im}} = \emptyset$ if \mathfrak{g} is of type (Fin), and $\Delta^{\text{im}} = \mathbb{Z}\delta \setminus \{0\}$ for some $\delta \in \Delta^+$ if \mathfrak{g} is of type (Aff). If \mathfrak{g} is not of types (Fin) and (Aff), then Δ^{im} contains at least two non-proportional imaginary roots, see [11],[16]. If \mathfrak{g} is of type (Aff), then $\mathbb{Z}\delta = \{\nu \in \mathbb{Z}\Delta \mid (\nu, \Delta) = 0\}$.

It can be also described via dimensions: all finite-dimensional algebras lie in (Fin), and all infinite-dimensional of finite growth lie in (Aff). C. Hoyt and V. Serganova classified all indecomposable Kac-Moody superalgebras; from this classification it follows that all indecomposable symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras of infinite growth are anisotropic.

3.2. Definitions. Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra.

3.2.1. Definition. We say that $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is *non-critical* if $2(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) \notin \mathbb{Z}_{>0}(\alpha, \alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{im}+}$ and call a \mathfrak{g} -module N *non-critical* if all irreducible subquotients of N are highest weight modules with non-critical highest weights.

3.2.2. Remark. By [27], Proposition 5.1 (see also [16], (1) for Lie superalgebras), $n\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{im}+}$ if $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{im}+}$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Therefore $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is non-critical if and only if $2(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) \neq (\alpha, \alpha)$.

3.2.3. Remark. Let \mathfrak{g} be a Kac-Moody algebra. By [27], Proposition 3.12, one has

$$\{\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid (\lambda, \alpha) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Delta_+^{\text{re}}\} = \cup_{w \in W} w(C),$$

where $C := \{\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^* \mid (\nu, \alpha) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \Delta^+\}$. Let X be as in Section 1 that is $X = \{\lambda \in \cup_{w \in W} w(C) \mid (\lambda, \alpha) \neq 0 \text{ for any isotropic root } \alpha\}$. Then [4], Proposition 5.2 (i), the set $X - \rho$ coincides with the set of non-critical weights in $-\rho + \cup_{w \in W} w(C)$. This follows the fact that $\alpha \in \Delta$ is imaginary if and only if $(\alpha, \alpha) \leq 0$, see [27], Proposition 5.2. This immediately implies that a non-critical weight in $-\rho + \cup_{w \in W} w(C)$ lies in $X - \rho$. For the inverse inclusion let $\nu \in -\rho + \cup_{w \in W} w(C)$ be a critical weight that is $2(\nu + \rho, \alpha) = j(\alpha, \alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{im}+}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Writing $\nu + \rho$ as $w\mu$ for $w \in W$ and $\mu \in C$ we obtain $2(\mu, w^{-1}\alpha) = j(\alpha, \alpha)$. Since $\mu \in C$ and $w^{-1}\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{im}+}$ this implies $(\alpha, \alpha) \geq 0$. Since α is an imaginary root, $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0$, so $\nu + \rho \notin X$.

3.2.4. Remark. By Remark 3.1.2, all weights are non-critical in type (Fin), and in type (Aff) the weight λ is non-critical if and only if $(\lambda + \rho, \delta) \neq 0$.

3.2.5. Definition. We call $\alpha_s \in \Delta^{\text{an}}$ a *short root* if $(\beta, \beta) \in \mathbb{Z}(\alpha_s, \alpha_s)$ for all $\beta \in \Delta$. For example, for $\mathfrak{sl}(m|n)$, all non-isotropic roots are short.

3.2.6. We will use the following fact: if α_s is a short root of an affine Kac-Moody superalgebra with the minimal imaginary root δ , then $\alpha_s + j\delta \in \Delta$ is equivalent to $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ (this follows from the description of affine root systems in [27], Proposition 6.3; [47], Table V; this can be also proved in a unified way).

3.2.7. Remark. Assume that \mathfrak{g} is of type (Fin) or (Aff) and $\Delta \neq D(2|1, a), D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$. From the classifications in [25], [47] it is easy to see that Δ contains a short root; if, in addition, \mathfrak{g} is not in (An), then Δ contains a short even root.

3.3. Type (Aff). It follows from Hoyt-Serganova classification that any symmetrizable indecomposable infinite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra, which is not anisotropic, is of finite growth. The indecomposable symmetrizable contragredient Lie superalgebras of finite growth were classified by van de Leur in [47]. All these superalgebras are Kac-Moody, and the class (Aff) coincides with the class of the indecomposable symmetrizable contragredient Lie superalgebras of finite growth. Such Lie algebras were classified previously in [24].

These Lie superalgebras can be constructed by the following procedure (cf. [27], Chapter 8). Let σ be an automorphism of order r of one of the Lie superalgebras (3.1), which we denote by \mathfrak{g} . Let $\mathfrak{g} = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{r-1} \mathfrak{g}_{j \bmod r}$ be the eigenspace decomposition for σ , where $\mathfrak{g}_j = \{a \in \mathfrak{g} \mid \sigma(a) = e^{\frac{2\pi\sqrt{-1}}{r}j}a\}$. We shall assume that σ preserves the invariant bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) , so that \mathfrak{g}_j and \mathfrak{g}_{-j} are non-degenerally paired. If $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$ we let

$$\mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}]^{(r, \sigma)} = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} (\mathfrak{g}_{j \bmod r} t^j) \subset \mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}].$$

This Lie superalgebra is called a twisted loop superalgebra. The loop superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}]$ has a well-known 2-cocycle

$$\psi(at^m, bt^n) = m\delta_{m, -n}(a, b), \quad \text{where } m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, a, b \in \mathfrak{g}.$$

We denote by $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}] \oplus \mathbb{C}K$ the central extension of $\mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}]$ with this cocycle, where K is the central element. Then the non-twisted Kac-Moody superalgebra is, provided that $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$:

$$\mathfrak{g}^{(1)} = \hat{\mathfrak{g}} \oplus \mathbb{C}d, \quad \text{where } d = t \frac{d}{dt}$$

and $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ is its subquotient for $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$, obtained by substituting the loop superalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}(n|n)[t, t^{-1}]$ by its subquotient, which is the subalgebra $\mathfrak{gl}(n|n) + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathfrak{sl}(n|n)t^j$ quotient by central elements $I_{2n}t^s$, $s \neq 0$.

The subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}^{(r, \sigma)} = \mathfrak{g}[t, t^{-1}]^{(r, \sigma)} \oplus \mathbb{C}d \subset \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ has a structure of symmetrizable contragredient Lie superalgebra, provided that \mathfrak{g}_0 -module \mathfrak{g}_1 is irreducible, constructed in the same way as in [27], Chapter 8, using that \mathfrak{g}_0 is a contragredient Lie superalgebra and that the \mathfrak{g}_0 -modules \mathfrak{g}_1 and \mathfrak{g}_{-1} are contragredient.

3.3.1. It follows from [27], Proposition 8.5, that the Kac-Moody superalgebras $\mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}$ and $\mathfrak{g}^{(r',\sigma')}$ are isomorphic if σ and σ' lie in the same connected component of the group $\text{Aut } \mathfrak{g}$. Since $\mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}$ can be a contragredient Lie superalgebra only for σ preserving the invariant bilinear form, in order to construct all affine Kac-Moody superalgebras up to isomorphism, we should pick a representative μ in each connected component of the group of automorphisms of \mathfrak{g} , preserving the invariant bilinear form, and verify that the corresponding Lie superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}$ is contragredient. But this follows from Table 4 of van de Leur's paper [47] and the description of $\text{Aut } \mathfrak{g}$ in [44]. We thus obtain that up to isomorphism a complete list of indecomposable symmetrizable affine Kac-Moody superalgebras, which are not Lie algebras, beyond the non-twisted ones, is

$$(3.2) \quad A(m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}, \quad A(2m-2|2n)^{(4)}, \quad D(m|n)^{(2)},$$

where $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ except for $m = 2, n = 1$ in the first case (observe that $G(3)^{(2)}$ in [47] is actually isomorphic to $G(3)^{(1)}$, see [16], Section 8.5).

3.3.2. Remark. Using the description of automorphisms of finite-dimensional Lie superalgebras in [44], a result, similar to that in [27], Chapter 8 holds:

Up to isomorphism, the affine Lie superalgebras $\mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}$ correspond bijectively to connected components of $\text{Aut } \mathfrak{g}$, preserving the bilinear form $(-, -)$, containing σ or σ^{-1} .

3.4. Proposition. *View $\mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}$ as a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ with the non-degenerate bilinear form $(-, -)$ satisfying $(at^i, bt^j) = \delta_{ij}(a, b)$ where $a, b \in \mathfrak{g}$. Then*

$$r(\rho, \delta) = c,$$

where $2c$ is the eigenvalue of the Casimir operator of \mathfrak{g} on the adjoint representation.

We start from the following lemma.

3.4.1. Lemma. *Let \mathfrak{g} be an indecomposable in a direct sum finite-dimensional Lie superalgebra endowed with an even non-degenerate supersymmetric invariant bilinear form $(-, -)$, and let $\{a^j\}_{j=1}^n, \{a_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be dual bases of \mathfrak{g} (i.e., $(a^i, a_j) = \delta_{ij}$). Then for all $x, y \in \mathfrak{g}$ we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n [[x, a^i], [a_i, y]] = c[x, y],$$

where $2c$ is the eigenvalue of the Casimir operator $C := \sum_{i=1}^n a^i a_i$ on the adjoint representation of \mathfrak{g} .

Proof. Let $\Delta : \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g}) \otimes \mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the coproduct of the universal enveloping superalgebra $\mathcal{U}(\mathfrak{g})$. We have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{Ad} \otimes \mathrm{Ad} & \xrightarrow{[-, -]} & \mathrm{Ad} \\ \downarrow \Delta(C) & & \downarrow C \\ \mathrm{Ad} \otimes \mathrm{Ad} & \xrightarrow{[-, -]} & \mathrm{Ad} \end{array}$$

Since $p(a_i) = p(a^i)$ we have $\Delta(C) = C \otimes 1 + 1 \otimes C + \sum_{i=1}^n a^i \otimes a_i + \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{p(a_i)} a_i \otimes a^i$, so

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathrm{ad} C)([x, y]) &= [(\mathrm{ad} C)(x), y] + [x, (\mathrm{ad} C)(y)] \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{p(a_i)p(x)} [[a^i, x], [a_i, y]] + \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{p(a^i)p(x)+p(a_i)} [[a_i, x], [a^i, y]]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\{(-1)^{p(a_i)} a_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{a^j\}_{j=1}^n$ are dual bases. Since the sum $\sum_{i=1}^n a^i \otimes a_j$ does not depend on the choice of dual bases, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n [[a^i, x], [a_i, y]] = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{p(a_i)} [[a_i, x], [a^i, y]].$$

Since $(\mathrm{ad} C)(z) = 2cz$ for any $z \in \mathfrak{g}$ we get

$$2c[x, y] = 4c[x, y] + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{p(a_i)p(x)} [[a^i, x], [a_i, y]] = 4c[x, y] - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n [[x, a^i], [a_i, y]]$$

which implies the required formula. \square

3.4.2. Proof of Proposition 3.4. We set $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} := \mathfrak{g}^{(r, \sigma)}$ and let $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ be a Cartan subalgebra of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$.

We view $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ as a \mathbb{Z} -graded superalgebra with $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_i = \mathfrak{g}_{i \bmod r} t^i$ for $i \neq 0$ and

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_0 = (\mathfrak{g}_0 \times \mathbb{C}K) \rtimes \mathbb{C}d$$

except for the case $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \mathfrak{psl}(n|n)^{(1)}$ (with $n > 1$) where

$$\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_0 = (\mathfrak{gl}(n|n) \times \mathbb{C}K) \rtimes \mathbb{C}d = (\mathfrak{g}_0 \times \mathbb{C}K_1 \times \mathbb{C}K) \rtimes (\mathbb{C}d_1 \times \mathbb{C}d).$$

We fix a triangular decomposition $\hat{\mathfrak{g}} = \hat{\mathfrak{n}}^- \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{h}} \oplus \hat{\mathfrak{n}}^+$ and consider the induced triangular decomposition $\mathfrak{g}_0 = (\mathfrak{n}')^- \oplus \mathfrak{h}' \oplus \mathfrak{n}'$. Let Σ and Σ' be the corresponding bases (then $\Sigma = \Sigma' \cup \{\delta - \theta\}$ where θ is the highest weight of \mathfrak{g}_0 -module \mathfrak{g}_1). We choose a triangular decomposition of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ in such a way that Σ' contains an even root β . Fix $f \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\beta}$, $e \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ such that $h := [e, f] = \nu(\beta)$ where $\nu : \hat{\mathfrak{h}}^* \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ is the isomorphism induced by the bilinear form $(-, -)$.

Let v be a highest weight vector of the Verma $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ -module $M(r\delta + \beta)$. Let h_1, \dots, h_ℓ and h^1, \dots, h^ℓ be dual bases of $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$. The Casimir operator of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is given by the following formula

(see [27], § 2.5)

$$\hat{C} := 2\nu^{-1}(\rho) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} h_i h^i + 2 \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+} \sum_i e_{-\alpha}^{(i)} e_{\alpha}^{(i)}$$

where $\{e_{\alpha}^{(i)}\}$ is a basis of \mathfrak{g}_{α} and $\{e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}\}$ is the dual basis of $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ (i.e., $(e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}, e_{\alpha}^{(j)}) = \delta_{ij}$). The Casimir operator acts on $M(r\delta + \beta)$ by multiplication on

$$(\beta + r\delta + 2\rho, \beta + r\delta) = 2(\beta, \beta) + 2r(\rho, \delta).$$

One has $(et^r)(ft^{-r})v = (\beta, \beta)v$, so

$$(et^r)\hat{C}(ft^{-r})v = 2((\beta, \beta)^2 + r(\rho, \delta)(\beta, \beta))v.$$

The vector $v_0 := (ft^{-r})v$ is of the zero weight, so

$$(\nu^{-1}(\rho) + \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} h_i h^i)v_0 = 0, \quad e_{\alpha}^{(i)}v_0 = 0 \quad \text{if } \alpha \not\leq (r\delta + \beta)$$

where \leq is the standard partial order on \mathfrak{h}^* , i.e. $\alpha \leq \gamma$ if and only if $(\gamma - \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$. Thus

$$(et^r)\hat{C}(ft^{-r})v = (et^r)\hat{C}v_0 = 2 \sum_{0 < \alpha \leq r\delta + \beta} \sum_i (et^r)e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}e_{\alpha}^{(i)}(ft^{-r})v.$$

For $\alpha = r\delta + \beta$ we can choose $e_{\alpha}^{(i)} = et^r$ and $e_{-\alpha}^{(i)} = ft^{-r}$ (by [27], Theorem 2.2), so

$$(et^r) \sum_i e_{-r\delta - \beta}^{(i)} e_{r\delta + \beta}^{(i)} v_0 = (et^r)(ft^{-r})(et^r)(ft^{-r})v = (\beta, \beta)^2 v.$$

If α is such that $0 < \alpha < (r\delta + \beta)$, then $0 < \alpha \leq r\delta$. We conclude that

$$(3.3) \quad r(\rho, \delta)(\beta, \beta)v = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta^+ : \alpha \leq r\delta} \sum_i (et^r)e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}e_{\alpha}^{(i)}(ft^{-r})v.$$

We write $\mathfrak{g} = \oplus_{i=0}^{r-1} \mathfrak{g}_i$ and let $\iota_{\pm} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \hat{\mathfrak{n}}^{\pm}$ be the following embeddings (of vector spaces):

$$\iota_+(a) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \in \mathfrak{n}', \\ at^r & \text{if } a \in ((\mathfrak{n}')^- \oplus \mathfrak{h}'), \\ at^i & \text{if } a \in \mathfrak{g}_i \text{ for } 0 < i < r \end{cases}, \quad \iota_-(a) = \begin{cases} a & \text{if } a \in (\mathfrak{n}')^-, \\ at^{-r} & \text{if } a \in ((\mathfrak{n}')^+ \oplus \mathfrak{h}'), \\ at^{-i} & \text{if } a \in \mathfrak{g}_i \text{ for } 0 < i < r \end{cases}$$

For each $\alpha \in \Delta^+$ such that $0 < \alpha \leq r\delta$ the root space $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\pm\alpha}$ lies in the image of ι_{\pm} , so we have $e_{\alpha}^{(i)} = \iota_+(\dot{e}_{\alpha}^{(i)})$ and $e_{-\alpha}^{(i)} = \iota_-(\dot{e}_{-\alpha}^{(i)})$ for some $\dot{e}_{\pm\alpha}^{(i)} \in \mathfrak{g}$. If α is such that $0 < \alpha \leq r\delta$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (et^r)e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}e_{\alpha}^{(i)}(ft^{-r}) &\equiv (et^r)e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}[e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})]v \\ &\equiv [(et^r), e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}][e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})] \equiv [(et^r), e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}][e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})] \\ &\equiv [[(et^r), e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}], [e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})]] \pmod{\mathcal{U}(\hat{\mathfrak{g}})\hat{\mathfrak{n}}^+} \end{aligned}$$

which gives

$$(et^r)e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}e_{\alpha}^{(i)}(ft^{-r})v = [[(et^r), e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}], [e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})]]v.$$

Observe that

$$[[e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})], [e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})]] = [[e, e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}], [e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, f]] \pmod{\mathbb{C}K}.$$

Since $Kv = 0$ we obtain

$$[[e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})], [e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, (ft^{-r})]]v = [[e, e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}], [e_{\alpha}^{(i)}, f]]v.$$

Since $(at^i, bt^{-j}) = \delta_{ij}(a, b)$, $\{a^i\}_{i=1}^n := \{e_{\alpha}^{(i)}\}_{0 < \alpha \leq r\delta}$ and $\{a_i\}_{i=1}^n := \{e_{-\alpha}^{(i)}\}_{0 < \alpha \leq r\delta}$ are dual bases of \mathfrak{g} . Combining (3.3) and Lemma 3.4.1 we obtain

$$r(\rho, \delta)(\beta, \beta)v = \sum_{j=1}^n [[e, a^j], [a_j, f]]v = c[e, f]v = c(\beta, \beta)v,$$

so $r(\rho, \delta) = c$ as required. \square

3.5. Dual Coxeter number. Let \mathfrak{g} be an indecomposable finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra. We denote by $h_{(\cdot, \cdot)}^{\vee}$ the $\frac{1}{2}$ of the eigenvalue of the corresponding Casimir operator on \mathfrak{g} . The invariant bilinear form (\cdot, \cdot) is usually normalised by the following conditions: $h_{(\cdot, \cdot)}^{\vee} \geq 0$ and $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$ for a root of maximal square length. This gives a normalization in all cases except for $D(n+1|n)$ where $h_{(\cdot, \cdot)}^{\vee} = 0$; in this case we normalise by the condition $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$ for the roots in D_{n+1} . This bilinear form is called the *normalised invariant bilinear form* on \mathfrak{g} . The number $h_{(\cdot, \cdot)}^{\vee}$ for this normalization is called the *dual Coxeter number* of \mathfrak{g} and is denoted by h^{\vee} . It is equal to 0 if and only if the Killing form on \mathfrak{g} is zero. The following table gives the values of h^{\vee} (recall that $C(n+1) = D(1|n)$):

\mathfrak{g}	$A(m n)$	$B(m n), m > n$	$B(m n), m \leq n$	$D(m n), m > n$	$D(m n), m \leq n$
h^{\vee}	$ m - n $	$2(m - n) - 1$	$n - m + \frac{1}{2}$	$2(m - n - 1)$	$n - m + 1$

and $h^{\vee} = 4, 9, 12, 18, 30$ for $\mathfrak{g} = G_2, F_4, E_6, E_7, E_8$ respectively, and $h^{\vee} = 0, 2, 3$ for $\mathfrak{g} = D(2|1, a), G(3), F(4)$ respectively [27], Chapter VI, [31], 4.

3.5.1. We extend the invariant bilinear form $(-, -)$ from \mathfrak{g} to $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ in such a way that $(d, d) = 0$ and $(at^i, bt^j) = \delta_{ij}(a, b)$ for all $a, b \in \mathfrak{g}$. It is easy to see that such extension is unique. Indeed, since K is central we have $(K, u) = 0$ for all $u \in [\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}, \mathfrak{g}^{(1)}]$. Moreover, $i(d, at^i) = (d, [d, at^i]) = 0$ which gives $(d, at^i) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}$ and $i \neq 0$. Finally,

$$([a, b] + i(a, b)K, d) = ([at^i, bt^{-i}], d) = (at^i, ibt^{-i}) = i(a, b)$$

so $(K, d) = 1$ and $(a, d) = 0$ for all $a \in \mathfrak{g}$.

3.5.2. We view $\mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}$ as a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ and define the invariant bilinear form $(-, -)$ on it as the restriction of the bilinear form $r(-, -)$ on $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$. We call this form the *normalised invariant bilinear form on $\mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}$* . Then

$$(at^i, bt^j) = r\delta_{ij}(a, b) \quad \text{for all } a, b \in \mathfrak{g} \text{ such that } at^i, bt^j \in \mathfrak{g}^{(r,\sigma)}.$$

Proposition 3.4 gives

$$(3.4) \quad (\rho, \delta) = h^\vee.$$

3.5.3. Lemma. *Let $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ be the affine Lie algebra of type $X_N^{(r)}$ with the invariant bilinear form normalised as above.*

- (i) *The bilinear form $(-, -)$ coincides with the normalised invariant bilinear form in [27], Section 6.*
- (ii) *The maximal square length of a root is $2r$.*

Proof. Let $\hat{\Delta}$ be the root system of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ and let \hat{m} be the maximal square length of a root: $\hat{m} := \max\{(\alpha, \alpha) \mid \alpha \in \hat{\Delta}\}$. Since all imaginary roots have square length zero and 2α is a root for any odd non-isotropic root, we have $\hat{m} = \max\{(\alpha, \alpha) \mid \alpha \in \hat{\Delta}_0^{\text{re}}\}$. If $r = 1$, then any $\hat{\alpha} \in \hat{\Delta}^{\text{re}}$ is of the form $\alpha + i\delta$ where α is a root of \mathfrak{g} , so $\hat{m} = 2$ by § 3.5.

Let $(-, -)'$ be the normalised bilinear form introduced in [27], Section 6; we use the same notation for the induced form on $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}^*$ (where $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$ is the Cartan subalgebra of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$). Let $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=0}^\ell$ be the set of simple roots for $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ where the roots are enumerated as in Tables Aff 1–Aff 3 in [27], Section 4. The root spaces $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}_{\pm\alpha_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ generate a finite-dimensional simple Lie algebra, so the restrictions of $(-, -)$ and of $(-, -)'$ to this algebra are proportional, i.e. there exists $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = c(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)'$ for all $i, j = 1, \dots, \ell$. Since α_0 lies in the linear combination on δ and α_i for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ and $(\delta, \alpha_i) = 0$ for all $i = 0, \dots, \ell$, we obtain $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = c(\alpha_i, \alpha_j)'$ for all $i, j = 0, \dots, \ell$. Arguing as in § 3.5.1 and taking into account that $(d, d) = (d, d)' = 0$, we conclude that $(h_1, h_2) = c(h_1, h_2)'$ for all $h_1, h_2 \in \hat{\mathfrak{h}}$. From [27], Theorem 2.2 it follows that any invariant form on $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is uniquely defined by its restriction on $\hat{\mathfrak{h}}$. Therefore it remains to verify that $c = 1$.

If $r = 1$, then Corollary 6.4 in [27] implies $\max\{(\alpha, \alpha)' \mid \alpha \in \hat{\Delta}\} = 2$. By above, $\hat{m} = 2$, so $c = 1$ as required. In particular, $(\rho, \delta) = (\rho, \delta)'$.

Now take $r = 2$ or $r = 3$. By [27], 6.1, $(\rho, \delta)'$ computed for $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ are the same. By (3.4), (ρ, δ) computed for $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\mathfrak{g}^{(1)}$ are the same. By above this implies $(\rho, \delta) = (\rho, \delta)'$. Since $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}} = 0$, we have $(\rho, \delta) \neq 0$, so $c = 1$ as required. This completes the proof of (i).

For (ii) note that, since $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ is an affine Lie algebra, any real root is W -conjugated to one of the simple roots, so $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=0}^\ell$ contains the longest and the shortest root in $\hat{\Delta}^{\text{re}}$. Using (i) and [27], Chapter VI, we obtain

$$(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = (\alpha_i, \alpha_i)' = 2a_i^\vee/a_i$$

where $\{a_i\}_{i=0}^\ell$, $\{a_i^\vee\}_{i=0}^\ell$ are labels on the Dynkin diagrams of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ and $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L$ in Tables Aff in Chapter IV [27] (the Dynkin diagram of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L$ is obtained from the Dynkin diagram of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ by reversing arrows; this notion is not defined for Kac-Moody superalgebras). The Dynkin diagram of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ lies in Table Aff r ($r = 1, 2, 3$).

Let $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_\ell$ be the simple roots of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L$. By above,

$$(3.5) \quad (\beta_i, \beta_i)(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 4$$

for $i = 0, \dots, \ell$. If $r = 1$, then the square length of the longest root is 2. Assume that the Dynkin diagram of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}$ lies in Table Aff 2 or Aff 3 and is not $A_{2n}^{(2)}$. Then this Dynkin diagram has a double arrow (if $r = 2$) or a triple arrow (if $r = 3$) and the Dynkin diagram of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L$ lies in Table Aff 1. Therefore the Dynkin diagram of $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L$ has a double arrow (if $r = 2$) or a triple arrow (if $r = 3$). By above, the square length of the longest root among $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_\ell$ is 2 (since $\hat{\mathfrak{g}}^L$ is non-twisted), so the square length of the shortest root among $\beta_0, \dots, \beta_\ell$ is $2/r$. By (3.5), the square length of the longest root among $\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_\ell$ is $2r$. The remaining case is $A_{2n}^{(2)}$. In this case the formula $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 2a_i^\vee/a_i$ gives $(\alpha_0, \alpha_0) = 1$, $(\alpha_\ell, \alpha_\ell) = 4$ and $(\alpha_i, \alpha_i) = 2$ for $1 \leq i < \ell$. \square

4. THE CORRESPONDENCE $L \mapsto L'$

In this section \mathfrak{g} is an indecomposable symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra (i.e., \mathfrak{g} is of type (An), (Fin) or (Aff)).

4.1. Root system Δ_L . For a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g} a set $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is called a *root subsystem* if $s_\alpha \beta \in R$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in R$. For each non-critical weight λ one can assign a root subsystem Δ_λ , called the “integral root system” which is the set of real roots of a Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}(A')$, see [40],[42], [38] and other papers. This definition can be naturally extended to the Kac-Moody superalgebras of type (An). The situation is more complicated if \mathfrak{g} is not of type (An). In this case we define “root subsystems” using the axioms listed in Appendix B. In Corollary 4.1.8 we show that the integral root system is, in fact, an invariant attached to an irreducible highest weight module. Each integral root system, which is not of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$, is isomorphic to the set of real roots of some symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A')$ of at most countable rank. For type (An) this result is proved in [38]. For types (Fin) and (Aff) we prove this result in Theorem B.6. In types (Fin) and (Aff), each indecomposable block of the matrix A' is of type (Fin) or (Aff) (and is of finite size); moreover, the number of blocks is finite if λ is non-critical. We do not know whether this holds for type (An).

4.1.1. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we set

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{R}_\lambda &= \{\alpha \in \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}} \mid 2(\lambda, \alpha) \in j(\alpha, \alpha) \text{ where } j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } j \text{ is odd if } 2\alpha \in \Delta\}, \\ R_\lambda &:= \overline{R}_\lambda \cup \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \in \overline{R}_\lambda, 2\alpha \in \Delta\} = \overline{R}_\lambda \cup \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \in (\overline{R}_\lambda \cap \Delta_1^{\text{an}})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.4) and (2.6) we obtain the following useful formulas

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{R}_{\lambda-\mu} \cap \Delta^{\text{an}} &= \overline{R}_\lambda \cap \Delta^{\text{an}} \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \mathbb{Z}\Delta, \\ \{\alpha \in \Delta_{\overline{0}} \mid \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} &= R_{\lambda+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Delta_\lambda \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ be the minimal subset of Δ^{re} satisfying the following properties

- (a) $\overline{R}_\lambda \subset \Delta_\lambda$;
- (b) if $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_\lambda$ are such that $(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$, then $s_\alpha \beta \in \Delta_\lambda$;
- (c) if $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_\lambda$ are such that $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \neq (\beta, \alpha)$ then $\Delta_\lambda \cap \{\alpha \pm \beta\} = \Delta^{\text{re}} \cap \{\alpha \pm \beta\}$ (note that, by Appendix B, in this case the set $\Delta \cap \{\alpha \pm \beta\} = \Delta^{\text{re}} \cap \{\alpha \pm \beta\}$ has cardinality one);
- (d) if $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$ and $2\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$, then $2\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$.

Note that, by (d), $R_\lambda \subset \Delta_\lambda$. By § 4.1.3 below, such minimal subset is unique.

4.1.2. Remark. Observe that Δ_λ does not depend on the normalization of $(-, -)$ (since R_λ does not depend on this normalization).

4.1.3. Using (2.4) one can easily see that $s_\alpha \beta \in R_\lambda$ if $\alpha, \beta \in R_\lambda$ are anisotropic. In particular, $\Delta_\lambda = R_\lambda$ if $(\lambda, \alpha) \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{iso}}$.

In general, Δ_λ can be constructed by the following procedure:

- we set $X_0 := \overline{R}_\lambda$;
- for odd $i > 0$ we take X_{i+1} to be the union of X_i , the sets $s_\alpha X_i$ where $\alpha \in X_i \cap \Delta^{\text{an}}$;
- for even $i > 0$ we take X_{i+1} to be the union of X_i and the sets $\{\alpha \pm \beta\} \cap \Delta$ for $\alpha, \beta \in X_i$ satisfying $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \neq (\alpha, \beta)$.

Then $X_0 \subset X_1 \subset \dots$ and $X_i = -X_i$. Taking $X := \bigcup_{i=0}^\infty X_i$ we obtain

$$\Delta_\lambda = X \cup \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \in X \text{ and } 2\alpha \in \Delta\}.$$

This implies the uniqueness of Δ_λ and the inclusion $\Delta_\lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}\overline{R}_\lambda$.

4.1.4. Lemma.

- (i) If $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda \cap \Delta_{\overline{0}}$ is such that $\alpha/2 \notin \Delta$ and $(\gamma, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}(\alpha, \alpha)$ for all $\gamma \in \overline{R}_\lambda$, then $\alpha \in \overline{R}_\lambda$.
- (ii) For any $\gamma \in \Delta_\lambda \setminus R_\lambda$ there exists $\alpha \in R_\lambda$ such that $(\gamma, \alpha) \neq 0$.
- (iii) For any non-isotropic $\gamma \in \Delta_\lambda \setminus R_\lambda$ there exists isotropic $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$ such that $(\alpha, \gamma) \neq 0$.

Proof. For (i) normalise $(-, -)$ by the condition $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$. Then $(\lambda, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\gamma \in \overline{R}_\lambda$. Since $\Delta_\lambda \subset \mathbb{Z}\overline{R}_\lambda$ this gives $(\lambda, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\gamma \in \Delta_\lambda$. In particular, $(\lambda, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\alpha/2 \notin \Delta$ we have $\alpha \in \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}}$. Therefore $\alpha \in \overline{\Delta}_{\overline{0}}^{\text{re}}$ and $\frac{2(\lambda, \alpha)}{(\alpha, \alpha)} = (\lambda, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence $\alpha \in \overline{R}_\lambda$ as required.

For (ii) observe that $(\gamma, R_\lambda) = 0$ implies $(\gamma, \Delta_\lambda) = 0$ (since Δ_λ is spanned by R_λ). Hence for (ii), (iii) it is enough to verify the existence of $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$ satisfying $(\gamma, \alpha) \neq 0$ such that α is isotropic if γ is anisotropic. We retain notation of § 4.1.3. Take $\gamma \in \Delta_\lambda \setminus R_\lambda$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\gamma \in X$, so $\gamma \in X_{i+1} \setminus X_i$ for some $i \geq 0$. We proceed by induction on i .

If i is even, then $\gamma \in X_{i+1} \setminus X_i$ implies the existence of $\alpha, \beta \in X_i$ such that $\gamma \in \{\alpha \pm \beta\}$ and $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \neq (\alpha, \beta)$. Then $(\gamma, \alpha) \neq 0$ which implies the required assertions for the case when i is even (in particular, for $i = 0$).

Consider the case when i is odd. Then there exists $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in X_i$ such that $(\beta_1, \beta_1), (\beta_1, \beta_2) \neq 0$ and $\gamma = s_{\beta_1} \beta_2$. Then $(\gamma, \beta_1) \neq 0$ and this completes the proof of (ii). For (iii) we assume that γ is anisotropic. Then β_2 is anisotropic as well. If Δ_λ contains an isotropic root α_2 such that $(\beta_2, \alpha_2) \neq 0$, then $(\gamma, \alpha) \neq 0$ for $\alpha := s_{\beta_1} \alpha_2$ and $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$ is isotropic, since $\beta_2, \alpha_2 \in \Delta_\lambda$ and α_2 is isotropic. Consider the remaining case when Δ_λ does not contain an isotropic root α_2 such that $(\beta_2, \alpha_2) \neq 0$. By induction hypothesis this implies $\beta_2 \in R_\lambda$. Since $\gamma \notin R_\lambda$, this forces $\beta_1 \notin R_\lambda$. By induction hypothesis, there exists isotropic $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$ such that $(\beta_1, \alpha) \neq 0$. By above, $(\beta_2, \alpha) = 0$. Therefore $(\gamma, \alpha) = (s_{\beta_1} \beta_2, \alpha) \neq 0$ (since $\gamma \neq \beta_2$). This completes the proof of (iii). \square

4.1.5. Lemma. *Suppose that $Z \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ satisfies properties (b)–(d) in § 4.1.1 (with Δ_λ replaced by Z) and Z contains two odd real roots α, β such that $(\beta, \beta) = 0$, $(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$, $\langle \beta, \alpha^\vee \rangle < 0$. Then*

$$(\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap Z = \{\pm\alpha, \pm\beta, \pm 2\alpha, \pm(\alpha + \beta), \pm(2\alpha + \beta)\} = (\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Delta^{\text{re}},$$

i.e. $(\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap Z = (\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Delta^{\text{re}}$ forms the root system $B(1|1)$ ³ and $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ is its base.

Proof. Since β is an isotropic real root, Δ^{re} is of type (Fin) or (Aff).

Renormalise the bilinear form by taking $(\alpha, \alpha) = 1$. Then $b := -(\alpha, \beta) > 0$ and, by (2.4), $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Recall that $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ generate a subalgebra isomorphic to $\mathfrak{osp}(1|2)$. Since β and $s_\alpha \beta = \beta + 2b\alpha$ are real roots, one has $\alpha + \beta, 2\alpha + \beta \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$. One has $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta) = 1 - 2b \neq 0$, so $\alpha + \beta$ is a real root and $\frac{2(\alpha+\beta, \beta)}{(\alpha+\beta, \alpha+\beta)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ that is $\frac{b}{2b-1} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since b is a positive integer, this implies $b = 1$, so $s_\alpha \beta = \beta + 2\alpha$. Using properties (b)–(d) we obtain

$$(\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap Z \supset Y \quad \text{for } Y := \{\pm\alpha, \pm\beta, \pm 2\alpha, \pm(\alpha + \beta), \pm(2\alpha + \beta)\}.$$

Let us show that $(\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Delta^{\text{re}} = Y$.

Set $\delta_1 := \alpha$, $\varepsilon_1 := \alpha + \beta$. Note that δ_1 is an odd root and ε_1 is an even root. Using $b = 1$ we get $(\delta_1, \varepsilon_1) = 0$, $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) = -1$.

³The statement does not immediately follow from Serganova's classification of generalized root systems in [45] since we do not assume that $(\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is finite.

Suppose the contrary, that $(\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Delta^{\text{re}} \neq Y$. Take $\gamma := (x\varepsilon_1 + y\delta_1) \in (\Delta^{\text{re}} \setminus Y)$. Then $s_{\varepsilon_1}\gamma, s_{\delta_1}\gamma \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$, so $(\pm x\varepsilon_1 \pm y\delta_1) \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$. Without loss of generality we can (and will) assume that $x, y \geq 0$. If $x = 0$, then $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}\alpha$, so $\gamma \in \{\delta_1, 2\delta_1\} \subset Y$. Similarly, if $y = x$, then $\gamma = \varepsilon_1 + \delta_1 \in Y$. Therefore $x > 0, y \geq 0$ and $x \neq y$. Then $(\gamma, \gamma) \neq 0$ and the conditions

$$\langle \gamma, \varepsilon_1^\vee \rangle, \langle \varepsilon_1, \gamma^\vee \rangle, \langle \delta_1, \gamma^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad \langle \gamma, \delta_1^\vee \rangle \in 2\mathbb{Z}$$

give $2x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\frac{2x}{x^2-y^2}, \frac{2y}{x^2-y^2} \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore $2x \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, y \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, x \neq y$ and $\frac{2}{x+y} \in \mathbb{Z}$. This gives

$$(x, y) \in \{(\frac{1}{2}, 0), (1, 0), (2, 0)\}.$$

In particular, $(\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \delta_1) \notin \Delta$ (in this case $x = \frac{1}{2}, y = 1$). If $(x, y) = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)$, then $\gamma = \frac{\varepsilon_1}{2}$, and $\delta_1, \varepsilon_1 + \delta_1 \in \Delta$ forces $\frac{\varepsilon_1}{2} + \delta_1 \in \Delta$, a contradiction. If $(x, y) = (1, 0)$, then $\gamma = \varepsilon_1 \in Y$. If $(x, y) = (2, 0)$, then $\gamma = 2\varepsilon_1 \notin \Delta^{\text{re}}$ since ε_1 is an even real root. Hence $(\mathbb{R}\alpha + \mathbb{R}\beta) \cap \Delta^{\text{re}} = Y$. This completes the proof. \square

4.1.6. Corollary. *If $\beta \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is such that $2\beta \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$, then $\beta \in \Delta_\lambda$ if and only if $2\beta \in \Delta_\lambda$.*

Proof. If $\beta \in \Delta_\lambda$, then $2\beta \in \Delta_\lambda$ by property (d) of Δ_λ .

Suppose the contrary, that $\beta \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is such that $\beta \notin \Delta_\lambda$ and $2\beta \in \Delta_\lambda$. Since 2β is a real root, β is an odd non-isotropic root. If $2\beta \in R_\lambda$, then, by definition of R_λ , we have $\beta \in \overline{R}_\lambda$, a contradiction. Therefore $2\beta \notin R_\lambda$. By Lemma 4.1.4 (iii), Δ_λ contains an isotropic root α such that $\langle \alpha, (2\beta)^\vee \rangle < 0$. Then, by Lemma 4.1.5, β, α form a base of the root subsystem $\Delta_\lambda \cap (\mathbb{Z}\beta + \mathbb{Z}\alpha)$ which is of type $B(1|1)$, and $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta) = -(\beta, \beta)$.

Since α is isotropic, Δ is of type (Fin) or (Aff). From the Kac and van de Leur classifications [25] and [47] we know that each odd non-isotropic root in Δ is a short root. Renormalise the bilinear form $(-, -)$ in such a way that $(\beta, \beta) = 2$. Since β is a short root, $(\gamma, \gamma) \in 2\mathbb{Z}$ for all $\gamma \in \Delta$, so $(\lambda, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\gamma \in \overline{R}_\lambda$ which implies $(\lambda, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\gamma \in \Delta_\lambda$. By above, $(\alpha + \beta)$ is an even root with $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta) = -2$. Hence $\alpha + \beta, \alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$ with $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \neq (\alpha, \beta)$. Property (c) in § 4.1.1 gives $\beta \in \Delta_\lambda$, a contradiction. \square

4.1.7. Lemma. *If α is a real isotropic root and $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is such that $(\nu, \alpha) = 0$, then $\Delta_\nu = \Delta_{\nu+\alpha}$.*

Proof. Let us verify that $\overline{R}_\nu \subset \Delta_{\nu+\alpha}$. Take $\beta \in \overline{R}_\nu$.

If $(\beta, \alpha) = 0$, then $(\nu, \beta) = (\nu + \alpha, \beta)$, so $\beta \in \overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}$. If β is anisotropic, then, by (2.4), $\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle$ is integral and is even if β is odd; thus $\beta \in \overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}$. This gives

$$(4.3) \quad \{\beta \in \overline{R}_\nu \mid (\beta, \alpha) = 0\} \subset \overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}, \quad (\overline{R}_\nu \cap \Delta^{\text{an}}) \subset \overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}.$$

Now take $\beta \in (\overline{R}_\nu \cap \Delta^{\text{iso}})$ such that $(\beta, \alpha) \neq 0$. By § 4.1.1 (c), the set $\Delta_\nu \cap \{\alpha \pm \beta\}$ is non-empty. We assume that $(\alpha + \beta) \in \Delta_\nu$ (otherwise we substitute β by $-\beta$). Note that

$\alpha + \beta$ is a real even root (since $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta) = 2(\alpha, \beta) \neq 0$). By above, $(\nu, \alpha) = (\nu, \beta) = 0$, so $(\nu, \alpha + \beta) = 0$.

Assume that $(\alpha + \beta)/2 \notin \Delta$. Then $(\alpha + \beta) \in (\overline{R}_\nu \cap \Delta^{\text{an}})$, so $(\alpha + \beta) \in \overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}$ by (4.3). Therefore $\overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}$ contains both α and $\alpha + \beta$. Since $(\alpha, \alpha + \beta) = (\alpha, \beta) \neq 0$, § 4.1.1 (c) gives $\beta \in \Delta_{\nu+\alpha}$ as required.

Now consider the remaining case $\alpha + \beta = 2\gamma$ for $\gamma \in \Delta$. Then γ is an odd non-isotropic root, α is an isotropic root and $(\gamma, \alpha) \neq 0$. By Lemma 4.1.5, $\Delta \cap (\mathbb{R}\gamma + \mathbb{R}\alpha)$ is the root system of type $B(1|1)$. By above, Δ contains $\beta = \alpha - 2\gamma$, so, using the standard notation for $B(1|1)$, we can assume $\gamma = \delta_1$ and $\alpha = \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1$. We have $(\nu, \alpha) = (\nu, \beta) = 0$, so $(\nu, \varepsilon_1) = 0$ and

$$\langle \nu + \alpha, \varepsilon_1^\vee \rangle = \langle \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1^\vee \rangle = 2.$$

Since ε_1 is an even real root and $\varepsilon_1/2 \notin \Delta$, we obtain $\varepsilon_1 \in \overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}$. Using $\alpha = \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1 \in \overline{R}_{\nu+\alpha}$ and § 4.1.1 (b) we get $s_{\varepsilon_1}\alpha \in \Delta_{\nu+\alpha}$. One has $s_{\varepsilon_1}\alpha = \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1 = -\beta$. Hence $\beta \in \Delta_{\nu+\alpha}$ as required.

By above, $\overline{R}_\nu \subset \Delta_{\nu+\alpha}$. This gives $\Delta_\nu \subset \Delta_{\nu+\alpha}$. Since $(\nu + \alpha, -\alpha) = 0$ we have $\Delta_{\nu+\alpha} \subset \Delta_\nu$. This completes the proof. \square

4.1.8. Corollary. *If $L(\lambda_1, \Sigma_1) = L(\lambda, \Sigma)$ for some $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$ and ρ, ρ_1 are the Weyl vectors of Σ and Σ_1 respectively, then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda_1+\rho_1}$.*

Proof. It is enough to verify the assertion for $\Sigma_1 = r_\alpha \Sigma$ where $\alpha \in (\Sigma \cap \Delta^{\text{iso}})$.

If $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) \neq 0$, then $\lambda_1 + \rho_1 = \lambda + \rho$, so $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda_1+\rho_1}$.

If $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) = 0$, then $\lambda_1 + \rho_1 = \lambda + \rho + \alpha$ and the assertion follows from Lemma 4.1.7. \square

4.2. Definition. For an irreducible module $L \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ we set $\Delta_L := \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ where λ is the highest weight of L . If $N \in \mathcal{O}^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$ is such that Δ_L is the same for all irreducible subquotients of N , we denote this set by Δ_N ; in this case we say that Δ_N is well defined.

4.2.1. By Corollary 4.1.8 the set Δ_L does not depend on the choice of a base in the spine. In § 4.6.6 we will see that Δ_N is defined for any indecomposable non-critical module N .

4.2.2. By Theorem B.6, if $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is of type (Fin) or (Aff), but different from $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau) \neq A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$, and $L \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ is a non-critical irreducible module, then there exists a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$ such that

- (a) the sets $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau'))$ and Δ_L are isometric; denote by $\psi : \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')) \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_L$ the isometry;
- (b) for any $\alpha' \in \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau'))$, the roots α' and $\psi(\alpha') \in \Delta$ have the same parity;
- (c) any indecomposable submatrix A'_1 of A' is of type (Fin) or (Aff); moreover, for such A' the restriction of ψ gives a monomorphism $\mathbb{C}\Delta(\mathfrak{g}(A'_1, \tau'_1)) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\Delta$.

For $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau) = A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ the similar assertion holds if Δ_L does not have an indecomposable component of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$.

For type (An) Proposition B.8 implies the existence of $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$, where A' can be of infinite size, and the isometry $\psi : \mathbb{C}\Delta(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}\Delta$ satisfying (b).

From now on we always exclude the case when $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau) = A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ and Δ_L has an indecomposable component of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$.

Remark. If $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is of type (Aff) and L is critical, then a similar result holds, but \mathfrak{g}' might be a countable product of Kac-Moody superalgebras, with almost all factors isomorphic to $\mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$, see Lemma B.6.5.

4.2.3. Example. Let $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}_4^{(1)}$ and $L = L(\lambda)$ for $\lambda := \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2 + \frac{\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_4}{2}$. Then

$$\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \{\pm(\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2) + \mathbb{Z}\delta\} \cup \{\pm(\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_4) + \mathbb{Z}\delta\}$$

and $\mathfrak{g}(A') = \mathfrak{sl}_2^{(1)} \times \mathfrak{sl}_2^{(1)}$. Let $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_0\}, \{\beta_1, \beta_0\}$ be the sets of simple roots for two copies of $\mathfrak{sl}_2^{(1)}$ in $\mathfrak{g}(A')$. The isometry ψ is given by

$$\psi(\alpha_1) := \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \quad \psi(\alpha_0) = \delta - (\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2), \quad \psi(\beta_1) = \varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_4, \quad \psi(\beta_0) = \delta - (\varepsilon_3 - \varepsilon_4).$$

We see that the restriction of ψ induces a bijection (of sets) between $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}(A'))$ and Δ_L , but the restriction of ψ to $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}(A'))$ is not injective: ψ maps the minimal imaginary roots in both copies of $\mathfrak{sl}_2^{(1)}$ to the minimal imaginary root of $\mathfrak{sl}_4^{(1)}$.

4.2.4. Example. Take $\mathfrak{g} = A(1|3)^{(2)}$ with $\Sigma = \{\delta - 2\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 - \delta_3, 2\delta_3\}$ and $\lambda = \Lambda_0 + \frac{3}{4}\delta_2 + \frac{1}{4}\delta_3$. Then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = A(1|1)^{(2)} \times A_1^{(1)} \times A(1|1)^{(1)}$, where

$$A(1|1)^{(2)} = \{\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, 2\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm 2\delta_1, (2\mathbb{Z} - 1)\delta \pm 2\varepsilon_1\},$$

and two copies of $A_1^{(1)}$ correspond to the subsystems $A_1^{(1)} = \{\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \alpha\}$ for $\alpha = \delta_2 - \delta_3$ and $\alpha = \delta_2 + \delta_3$.

4.2.5. Lemma. Fix a base Σ and set $\Delta_L^+ := \Delta_L \cap \Delta^+$.

(i) The root system $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau'))$ admits a base Σ' such that

$$\psi((\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau'))^+)^+ = \Delta_L^+.$$

(ii) The set $\Sigma_L := \psi(\Sigma')$ coincides with the set of indecomposable elements in Δ_L^+ (i.e., the elements which can not be presented as a sum of several elements from Δ_L^+).

Proof. For type (An) (i) follows from [38], Section 2; in this case

$$\Sigma_L = \{\alpha \in \Delta_L \mid s_\alpha(\Delta_L^+ \setminus \{\alpha, 2\alpha\}) \subset \Delta_L^+\}, \quad \Sigma' := \psi^{-1}(\Sigma_L).$$

Let us prove both statements for types (Fin) and (Aff). It is enough to check the statements for each indecomposable component of $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$. Let Δ' be the root system of such component. Write $\Sigma := \{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^\ell$ and let a_1, \dots, a_ℓ be \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent positive real numbers. Define a homomorphism $\omega : \mathbb{Z}\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by taking $\omega(\alpha_i) := a_i$. Note that $\omega(\mu) \neq 0$ for all non-zero $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}\Delta$. In particular, $\omega(\alpha) \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta$ and $\Delta^+ \coprod \Delta^-$ is the triangular decomposition corresponding to ω in the sense of § 2.10. Since Δ' lies in $\mathbb{Z}(\Delta')^{\text{re}}$ we have $\psi(\Delta') \subset \mathbb{Z}\Delta$ and property (c) in § 4.2.2 implies $(\omega \circ \psi)(\mu') \neq 0$ for all $\mu' \in \Delta'$. Therefore $\omega \circ \psi : \mathbb{Z}\Delta' \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ determines triangular decomposition $\Delta' = -(\Delta')^+ \coprod (\Delta')^+$ in the sense of § 2.10. If $\alpha' \in (\Delta')^+$, then $(\omega \circ \psi)(\alpha') > 0$ that is $\psi(\alpha') \in \Delta_L^+$. Since Δ' is the root system of a Kac-Moody superalgebra of type (Fin) or (Aff), any triangular decomposition of Δ' admits a base (see Theorem 0.4.3 in [16]). This completes the proof of (i). Now (ii) follows from (i) and the fact that Σ' coincides with the set of indecomposable elements in $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau'))^+$. \square

4.2.6. Let $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$ and ψ be as in § 4.2.2 and set $\Delta' := \Delta(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau'))$. Recall that ψ gives a bijection $(\Delta')^{\text{re}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_L$. Using Lemma 4.2.5 (i), we assign to each base Σ_1 of Δ a base of Δ' , which we denote by $\Upsilon(\Sigma_1)$, which satisfies the property

$$\psi((\Delta')^{\text{re}} \cap \Delta^+(\Upsilon(\Sigma_1))) = \Delta_L \cap \Delta^+(\Sigma_1).$$

We claim that for each isotropic $\alpha \in \Sigma$ we have

$$(4.4) \quad \Upsilon(r_\alpha \Sigma) = \begin{cases} \Upsilon(\Sigma) & \text{if } \alpha \notin \psi(\Upsilon(\Sigma)), \\ r_{\psi^{-1}(\alpha)} \Upsilon(\Sigma) & \text{if } \alpha \in \psi(\Upsilon(\Sigma)). \end{cases}$$

Indeed, $\Delta^+ \setminus (\Delta^+(r_\alpha \Sigma)) = \{\alpha\}$ by (2.2). Setting $\Sigma' := \Upsilon(\Sigma)$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^+((r_\alpha \Sigma')) &= \Delta^+(\Sigma') & \text{if } \alpha \notin \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}, \\ \Delta^+ \setminus (\Delta^+(r_\alpha \Sigma')) &= \Delta^+(\Sigma') \cap \mathbb{Z}\psi^{-1}(\alpha) & \text{if } \alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.2.5 (ii), the condition $\alpha \notin \Delta_L$ is equivalent to the condition $\alpha \notin \psi(\Sigma')$. This implies (4.4).

Notice that, since ψ preserves the bilinear form, $\psi^{-1}(\alpha)$ is isotropic. Denote by Sp' the spine of Σ' . Using (4.4) we obtain the correspondence $\Upsilon : \text{Sp} \rightarrow \text{Sp}'$. Viewing Sp, Sp' as graphs where vertices are the bases, and the edges correspond to the isotropic reflexions r_α , we obtain the following description of Υ : $\Upsilon(\Sigma) = \Sigma'$ and for every edge $r_\alpha : \Sigma_1 \rightarrow \Sigma_2$ in Sp we have $\Upsilon(\Sigma_2) := \Sigma'_2$ if Sp' contains the edge $r_{\psi^{-1}(\alpha)} : \Sigma'_1 \rightarrow \Sigma'_2$ and $\Upsilon(\Sigma_2) := \Sigma'_1$ otherwise.

For example, for $\mathfrak{sl}(2|1)$ take $\Sigma = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ where β is isotropic and α is anisotropic. Take $\lambda + \rho = a\beta$ for $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \{\pm\beta\}$, so $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau') \cong \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$ with $\Sigma' = \{\beta'\}$ (β' is

isotropic). Then $\Upsilon : \text{Sp} \rightarrow \text{Sp}'$ takes the following form

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Sp} & & \Sigma & \xrightarrow{r_\beta} & \Sigma_1 & \xrightarrow{r_{\alpha+\beta}} & \Sigma_2 \\ & & \downarrow \Upsilon & & \downarrow \Upsilon & & \downarrow \Upsilon \\ & & \Sigma' & \xrightarrow{r_{\beta'}} & \Sigma'_1 & & \Sigma'_1 \end{array}$$

4.2.7. One can similarly introduce the correspondence between the skeleton Sk and the skeleton Sk' .

Let \mathfrak{g}'' be an indecomposable component of \mathfrak{g}' . Assume that \mathfrak{g}'' is of type (Aff) and let δ'' be the minimal imaginary root of $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}'')$. Then δ'' is a positive root for any triangular decomposition appearing in Sk' , so $\psi(\delta'')$ lies in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Delta^+(\Sigma_1)$ for any $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sk}$. By [11], Proposition 7.6.1 this implies $\psi(\delta'') \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\delta$.

4.3. Module L' . Take $L = L(\lambda)$. The following construction is a slight variation of the construction given in [14]. Retain notation of § 4.2.6. We set

$$\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g}(A', \tau'), \quad \Delta' := \Delta(\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')).$$

Recall that ψ gives a bijection $(\Delta')^{\text{re}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \Delta_L$, see § 4.2.2. We set $(\Delta')^\perp := \{\mu' \in (\mathfrak{h}')^* \mid (\mu', \Delta') = 0\}$ and let $\psi_* : \mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow (\mathfrak{h}')^*/(\Delta')^\perp$ be the linear map satisfying

$$(4.5) \quad (\psi_*(\nu), \mu') = (\nu, \psi(\mu')) \quad \text{for all } \mu' \in \Delta'.$$

4.3.1. Take Σ' as in Lemma 4.2.5 and let $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau') = (\mathfrak{n}')^- \oplus \mathfrak{h}' \oplus (\mathfrak{n}')^+$ be the corresponding triangular decomposition of $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$; let $\rho' \in (\mathfrak{h}')^*$ be the corresponding Weyl vector. Fix $\lambda' \in (\mathfrak{h}')^*$ such that

$$(4.6) \quad (\lambda' + \rho', \alpha') := (\lambda + \rho, \psi(\alpha')) \quad \text{for all } \alpha' \in \Sigma'.$$

and set

$$(4.7) \quad L' := L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda').$$

Note that the choice of λ' is not unique: λ'' satisfies (4.6) if and only if $\psi_*(\lambda') = \psi_*(\lambda'')$, or equivalently, if $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda'')$ and L' are isomorphic as $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ -modules.

4.3.2. Lemma.

(i) For any $\mu' \in \mathbb{Z}\Delta'$ we have

$$\psi(\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}) \subset \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho-\psi(\mu')}, \quad \psi(\Delta_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}) \subset \Delta_{\lambda+\rho-\psi(\mu')}.$$

(ii) We have $\psi(\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'}) = \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$ and $\Delta_{L'} = (\Delta')^{\text{re}}$.

Proof. For any $\mu' \in \mathbb{Z}\Delta'$ and $\beta' \in \Delta'$ we have $(\lambda' + \rho' - \mu', \beta') = (\lambda + \rho - \psi(\mu'), \psi(\beta'))$ by (4.6). Since ψ preserves $(-, -)$ and the parity, this implies $\psi(\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}) \subset \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho-\psi(\mu')}$. If \mathfrak{g} is of type (An), then $\Delta_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'} = R_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}$ and $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho-\mu} = R_{\lambda+\rho-\mu}$. If \mathfrak{g} is of type (Fin) or (Aff), then, by definition, $\Delta_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}$ is the minimal subset of $(\Delta')^{\text{re}}$ which contains $\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}$ and satisfies properties (b)–(d) in § 4.1.1. Therefore $\psi(\Delta_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'})$ is a subset of Δ^{re} which contains $\psi(\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'})$ and satisfying properties (b)–(d). By above, $\psi(\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}) \subset \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho-\psi(\mu')}$, so $\psi(\Delta_{\lambda'+\rho'-\mu'}) \subset \Delta_{\lambda+\rho-\psi(\mu')}$. This establishes (i).

For (ii) take any $\beta \in \Delta_L$. Then $\beta' := \psi^{-1}(\beta) \in (\Delta')^{\text{re}}$ and $(\lambda' + \rho', \beta') = (\lambda + \rho, \beta)$ by (4.6). Since ψ preserves $(-, -)$ and the parity, we obtain $\beta \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$ if and only if $\beta' \in \overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'}$. Therefore $\psi(\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'}) = \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$.

If \mathfrak{g} is of type (An), then $\Delta_L = R_{\lambda+\rho}$ and $\Delta_{L'} = R_{\lambda'+\rho'}$ which gives $\psi(\Delta_{L'}) = \Delta_L$ and implies $\Delta_{L'} = (\Delta')^{\text{re}}$.

If \mathfrak{g} is of type (Fin) or (Aff), then, by definition, $\Delta_{L'}$ is the minimal subset of $(\Delta')^{\text{re}}$ which contains $\overline{R}_{\lambda'+\rho'}$ and satisfies properties (b)–(d) in § 4.1.1. Therefore $\psi(\Delta_{L'}) \subset \Delta$ contains $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$ and satisfies properties (b)–(d). Therefore $\psi(\Delta_{L'})$ contains Δ_L (since Δ_L is the minimal subset of Δ^{re} which contains $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$ and satisfies (b)–(d)). Since the restriction of ψ gives a bijection between $(\Delta')^{\text{re}}$ and Δ_L , we obtain $\Delta_{L'} = (\Delta')^{\text{re}}$ as required. \square

4.3.3. We let Sp' be the spine of Σ' (if \mathfrak{g} is of type (An), then $\text{Sp} = \{\Sigma\}$ and $\text{Sp}' = \{\Sigma'\}$). Let $b_L : \text{Sp} \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}^*$, $b_{L'} : \text{Sp}' \rightarrow (\mathfrak{h}')^*$ be the maps given by

$$b_L(\Sigma_1) := \text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L, \quad b_{L'}(\Sigma'_1) := \text{hwt}_{\Sigma'_1} L',$$

see § 2.12 for the notation (one has $L = L(\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L - \rho_{\Sigma_1}, \Sigma_1)$). Taking $\Upsilon : \text{Sp} \rightarrow \text{Sp}'$ as in § 4.2.6 and $\psi_* : (\mathfrak{h}')^* \rightarrow (\mathfrak{h}')^*/(\Delta')^\perp$ given by (4.5) we obtain the following diagram:

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Sp} & \xrightarrow{b_L} & \mathfrak{h}^* \\ \downarrow \Upsilon & & \searrow \psi_* \\ \text{Sp}' & \xrightarrow{b_{L'}} & (\mathfrak{h}')^* \longrightarrow (\mathfrak{h}')^*/(\Delta')^\perp \end{array}$$

4.4. Lemma. *The diagram (4.8) is commutative.*

Proof. We have to verify that

$$(4.9) \quad (\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'_1} L', \mu) = (\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L, \psi(\mu)) \quad \text{for all } \mu \in \Delta'.$$

For $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma$ the required formula follows from the construction of L' , see (4.6). By the definition of Sp , it is enough to verify that (4.9) holds for $\Sigma_1 = r_\alpha \Sigma$ with $\alpha \in (\Sigma \cap \Delta^{\text{iso}})$.

Consider the case $(\text{hwt}_\Sigma L, \alpha) = 0$. Then $\alpha \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, so $\alpha \in \Delta_L$. Since $\alpha \in \Sigma$ we have $\psi^{-1}(\alpha) \in \Sigma'$ by Lemma 4.2.5 (ii), so (4.4) gives $\Sigma'_1 = r_{\psi^{-1}(\alpha)} \Sigma'$. Formula (4.9) for Σ gives

$$(\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'} L', \psi^{-1}(\alpha)) = (\text{hwt}_\Sigma L, \alpha) = 0.$$

By (2.7) we obtain $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L = \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L + \alpha$ and $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'_1} L' = \text{hwt}_{\Sigma'} L' + \psi^{-1}(\alpha)$. Thus

$$(\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'_1} L', \mu) = (\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'} L' + \psi^{-1}(\alpha), \mu) = (\text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L, \psi(\mu)) + (\alpha, \psi(\mu)) = (\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L, \psi(\mu))$$

as required.

Consider the case $(\text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L, \alpha) \neq 0$. By (2.7) we have $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L = \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L$. By (4.4), one has either $\Sigma'_1 = \Sigma'$ or $\Sigma'_1 = r_{\psi^{-1}(\alpha)} \Sigma'$ and $\alpha \in \psi(\Sigma')$. In the latter case, using (4.9) for Σ , we get $(\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'} L', \psi^{-1}(\alpha)) = (\text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L, \alpha) \neq 0$, so (2.7) gives $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'_1} L' = \text{hwt}_{\Sigma'} L'$. Hence in both cases $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L = \text{hwt}_{\Sigma} L$ and $\text{hwt}_{\Sigma'_1} L' = \text{hwt}_{\Sigma'} L'$, so formula (4.9) for Σ_1 follows from the same formula for Σ . \square

4.4.1. The commutativity of the diagram (4.8) means that the $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ -module L' defined in (4.7) does not depend on the choice of a base: if we apply the same procedure to the pairs (λ, Σ) and (λ_1, Σ_1) such that $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$ and $L = L(\lambda, \Sigma) = L(\lambda_1, \Sigma_1)$, then the modules $L' = L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda', \Sigma')$ and $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda'_1, \Sigma'_1)$ are isomorphic as $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ -modules.

4.5. Definition. Let \sim be the equivalence relation on the set of isomorphism classes of irreducible modules in $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ which is generated by the following relation: $L_1 \sim L_2$ if there exists $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$ and α such that

$$(4.10) \quad \alpha \in (\Sigma_1 \cap \Delta^{\text{an}}), \quad \alpha \notin \Delta_{\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L_1}, \quad \text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L_2 = s_{\alpha}(\text{hwt}_{\Sigma_1} L_1).$$

4.5.1. For $L = L(\lambda)$ we will use the following notation:

$$\mathfrak{g}'_{\lambda+\rho} := \mathfrak{g}', \quad \psi_{\lambda+\rho} := \psi, \quad \Sigma'_{\lambda+\rho} := \Sigma' \subset \Delta(\mathfrak{g}'_{\lambda+\rho}), \quad \Sigma_{\lambda+\rho} := \psi(\Sigma') \subset \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$$

where Σ' is the base introduced in Lemma 4.2.5. We denote by λ' the weight given by (4.6).

4.5.2. Lemma. *If $\lambda + \rho = s_{\alpha}(\nu + \rho)$ for $\alpha \in (\Sigma \cap \Delta^{\text{an}})$ such that $\alpha \notin \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$, then*

- (i) *the algebra $\mathfrak{g}'_{\nu+\rho}$ can be identified with $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g}'_{\lambda+\rho}$ in such a way that $\psi_{\nu+\rho} = s_{\alpha}\psi_{\lambda+\rho}$ and $\Sigma'_{\nu+\rho} = \Sigma'_{\lambda+\rho}$;*
- (ii) *$\Delta_{\nu+\rho}^+ = s_{\alpha}\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}^+$ and $\Sigma_{\nu+\rho} = s_{\alpha}\Sigma_{\lambda+\rho}$;*
- (iii) *for this identification $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\nu')$ and $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ are isomorphic as $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ -modules.*

Proof. One has $\overline{R}_{\nu+\rho} = s_{\alpha}\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, so $\Delta_{\nu+\rho} = s_{\alpha}\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. This allows to identify $\mathfrak{g}_{\nu+\rho}$ with $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda+\rho}$ by taking $\psi_{\nu+\rho} := s_{\alpha} \circ \psi_{\lambda+\rho}$. This gives (i).

By Corollary 4.1.6 we have $2\alpha \notin \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. Since $\alpha \in \Sigma$ and $\alpha, 2\alpha \notin \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$, the formula $\Delta_{\nu+\rho} = s_{\alpha}\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ forces $\Delta_{\nu+\rho}^+ = s_{\alpha}\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}^+$. By Lemma 4.2.5. the sets $\Sigma_{\lambda+\rho}, \Sigma_{\nu+\rho}$ are the sets of indecomposable elements in $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}^+, \Delta_{\nu+\rho}^+$ respectively. This gives $\Sigma_{\nu+\rho} = s_{\alpha}\Sigma_{\lambda+\rho}$ and establishes (ii). By definition (4.6) for any $\mu' \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\nu' + \rho', \mu') &= (\nu + \rho, \psi_{\nu+\rho}(\mu)) = (\nu + \rho, s_{\alpha} \circ \psi_{\lambda+\rho}(\mu)) = (s_{\alpha}(\nu + \rho), \psi_{\lambda+\rho}(\mu)) \\ &= (\lambda + \rho, \psi_{\lambda+\rho}(\mu)) = (\lambda' + \rho', \mu). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $(\lambda' - \nu', \Delta(\mathfrak{g}')) = 0$, so $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ and $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\nu')$ are isomorphic as $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ -modules. \square

Using § 4.4.1 we obtain

4.5.3. Corollary. *If $L(\nu) \sim L(\lambda)$, then $\mathfrak{g}_{\nu+\rho}$ can be identified with $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g}_{\lambda+\rho}$ in such a way that $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\nu')$ and $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ are isomorphic as $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ -modules.*

4.6. Set $U(\lambda)$. For $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we denote by $U(\lambda)$ the subset of \mathfrak{h}^* consisting of weights ν such that there exists a chain $\nu + \rho = \mu_r < \mu_{r-1} < \dots < \mu_0 = \lambda + \rho$, where $\mu_{i+1} = \mu_i - m_i \gamma_i$ for some $\gamma_i \in \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}} \cap \Delta^+$ and $m_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $2(\mu_i, \gamma_i) = m_i(\gamma_i, \gamma_i)$, where $m_i = 1$ is odd if $p(\gamma) = \overline{1}$, $m_i = 1$ if γ is isotropic. Note that $\mu_{i+1} = s_{\gamma_i} \mu_i$ if γ_i is anisotropic.

4.6.1. The following statement follows from [28] for Lie algebras and [12] for Lie superalgebras.

4.6.2. Proposition. *Consider the expansion $De^\rho \text{ch } L(\lambda) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \Sigma} a_\mu e^{\lambda + \rho - \mu}$ (with $a_\mu \in \mathbb{Z}$). Assume that $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \Sigma$ is such that $[M(\lambda) : L(\lambda - \mu)] \neq 0$ or $a_\mu \neq 0$. Then*

- (i) *If λ is non-critical, then $(\lambda - \mu) \in U(\lambda)$.*
- (ii) *If \mathfrak{g} is of type (Aff) and λ is critical, then $(\lambda - \mu) \in (U(\lambda) - \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \delta)$ (where δ is the minimal imaginary root).*

4.6.3. Lemma. *If $\nu \in U(\lambda)$, then $\Delta_{\nu+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ and $(\lambda - \nu)$ lies in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.*

Proof. It is enough to verify the assertion for a chain of length one: $\nu + \rho = \mu_1 < \mu_0 = \lambda + \rho$ (the general case follows by induction on the length of the chain). For such a chain we have $\nu + \rho = \lambda + \rho - m\gamma$ where $\gamma \in \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}} \cap \Delta^+$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is such that $2(\lambda + \rho, \gamma) = m(\gamma, \gamma)$, and m is odd if $p(\gamma) = \overline{1}$, $m = 1$ if γ is isotropic. Notice that $\gamma \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, so $(\lambda - \nu) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. Let us verify that $\Delta_{\nu+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.

If γ is anisotropic, then $\nu + \rho = s_\gamma(\lambda + \rho)$, so $\Delta_{\nu+\rho} = s_\gamma \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ (since $\gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$).

Consider the case when γ is isotropic. Then $(\lambda + \rho, \gamma) = 0$ and $\nu = \lambda - \gamma$, so the formula $\Delta_{\nu+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ follows from Lemma 4.1.7. \square

4.6.4. Arguing as in [4], Section 4 we obtain the following decomposition theorem.

Consider the equivalence relation $\lambda \approx \nu$ on \mathfrak{h}^ which is generated by $\nu \approx \lambda$ if $\nu \in U(\lambda)$ and $(\lambda - \delta) \approx \lambda$ if \mathfrak{g} is of type (Aff) and λ is critical.*

For any $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ there exists a unique set of submodules $\{M_\chi\}_{\chi \in A}$ such that

- $M = \bigoplus_{\chi \in A} M_\chi$;
- for each $\chi_1, \chi_2 \in A$ and λ, ν such that $[M_{\chi_1} : L(\lambda)], [M_{\chi_2} : L(\nu)] \neq 0$ one has $\lambda \approx \nu$ if and only if $\chi_1 = \chi_2$.

If $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ is indecomposable, then $N = M_\chi$.

4.6.5. Corollary. *If $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ is non-critical and indecomposable, then*

$$[N : L(\lambda)], [N : L(\nu)] \neq 0 \implies \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\nu+\rho}, \quad (\lambda - \nu) \in \mathbb{Z}\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}.$$

Proof. By § 4.6.4 we have $\lambda \approx \nu$. By Lemma 4.6.3 this forces $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\nu+\rho}$ and $(\lambda - \nu) \in \mathbb{Z}\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. \square

4.6.6. Let $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ be a non-critical indecomposable module. Using Corollary 4.6.5 we define Δ_N to be $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ where λ is such that $[N : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$.

Take $\nu \in U(\lambda)$ and retain notation of § 4.5.1. By Proposition 4.6.2 we can identify $\mathfrak{g}'_{\nu+\rho}$ with $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g}'_{\lambda+\rho}$; moreover, we can choose ν' in such a way that $\nu' \in U(\lambda')$ and $\psi(\lambda' - \nu') = \lambda - \nu$.

4.7. Remark. The character formulas for arbitrary irreducible non-critical modules $L(\lambda)$ over symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras were established in [39]; these formulas imply the following remarkable formula: $De^\rho \text{ch } L = D'e^{\rho'} \text{ch } L'$, where D, ρ (resp., D', ρ') are the Weyl denominator and the Weyl vector for Δ^+ (resp., for $(\Delta')^+$).

More precisely, we denote by $\mathcal{R}_0(\Sigma)$ the subalgebra of $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ consisting of $x \in \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ satisfying $\text{supp}(x) \subset -\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$. The linear monomorphism $\psi_{\lambda+\rho} : \mathbb{Z}\Sigma' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Sigma$ induces a ring monomorphism $\mathcal{R}_0(\Sigma') \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_0(\Sigma)$ which we also denote by $\psi_{\lambda+\rho}$. The algebra $\mathcal{R}_0(\Sigma')$ contains D' and $e^{-\lambda'} \text{ch } L'$. The formula $De^\rho \text{ch } L = D'e^{\rho'} \text{ch } L'$ means

$$(4.11) \quad De^{-\lambda} \text{ch } L(\lambda) = \psi_{\lambda+\rho}(D'e^{-\lambda'} \text{ch } L'(\lambda')).$$

For example, if a non-critical weight λ is such that $m := \langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}+}$ and $\langle \lambda + \rho, \beta \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\beta \in \Delta^{\text{re}+} \setminus \{\alpha\}$, then $\mathfrak{g}_{\lambda+\rho} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2$, $\Sigma' = \{\alpha'\}$ and $\psi_{\lambda+\rho}(\alpha') = \alpha$. In this case

$$De^{-\lambda} \text{ch } L(\lambda) = \psi_{\lambda+\rho}(D'e^{-\lambda'} \text{ch } L'(\lambda')) = \psi_{\lambda+\rho}(1 - e^{-m\alpha'}) = 1 - e^{m\alpha}.$$

We conjecture that formula (4.11) holds for all symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras, see [14]. In [7], P. Fiebig established equivalence of the corresponding blocks in the categories $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma'}(\mathfrak{g}')$ for an arbitrary symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g} .

5. QUASI-ADMISSIBLE MODULES

In this section \mathfrak{g} is an indecomposable symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra with a base Σ and $\mathfrak{g} \neq \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$. Recall that $(-, -)$ is normalised in such a way that $(\alpha, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ for some $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$. The action of $w \in W$ on $\sum_\nu m_\nu e^\nu$ is always assumed to be the natural, i.e. $w(\sum_\nu m_\nu e^\nu) := \sum_\nu m_\nu e^{w\nu}$.

5.1. Integrable and partially integrable modules. Let Σ_{pr} be the set of principal roots (see § 2.8.3 for definition). In the case when $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ is the non-twisted affinization of $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ we let $\dot{\Delta} \subset \Delta$ be the root subsystem of $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$. By Remark 2.8.2 $\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} := \dot{\Delta} \cap \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ is the set of principal roots of $\dot{\Delta}$.

5.1.1. Definition. For a subset $\pi \subset \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ we call a $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ -module N π -integrable if $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ acts locally nilpotently on N for each $\alpha \in \pi$.

5.1.2. Lemma. Let $W[\pi]$ be the subgroup of W generated by the reflections s_α with $\alpha \in \pi$. If a $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ -module N is π -integrable, then the root space \mathfrak{g}_α acts locally nilpotently on N for each $\alpha \in W\pi$.

Proof. Take $\alpha \in \pi$. We will prove that $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm w\alpha}$ acts locally nilpotently on N by induction on the length of $w \in W[\pi]$. If the length is zero, then, by definition, $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ acts locally nilpotently on N . Otherwise for some $\beta \in \pi$ we have $w = s_\beta w'$, where the length of w' is less than the length of w . By induction, $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm s_\beta \alpha}$ act locally nilpotently on N . By [27], Lemma 3.8, any $u \in \mathfrak{g}_{\pm w\alpha}$ can be written as $u = (\exp \text{ad } f)(\exp \text{ad } (-e))(\exp \text{ad } f)(u')$ for some $u' \in \mathfrak{g}_{\pm w'\alpha}$, $e \in \mathfrak{g}_\beta$ and $f \in \mathfrak{g}_{-\beta}$. Let E, F, U, U' be the images of e, f, u, u' in $\text{End}(N)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} U &= (\exp \text{ad } F)(\exp \text{ad } (-E))(\exp \text{ad } F)(U') \\ &= (\exp F)(\exp -E)(\exp F)U'(\exp -F)(\exp E)(\exp -F), \end{aligned}$$

since $(\exp a)b(\exp -a) = \exp(\text{ad } a)(b)$. For any $v \in N$ we have

$$U^s(v) = (\exp F)(\exp -E)(\exp F)(U')^s(\exp -F)(\exp E)(\exp -F)(v).$$

Since E, F, U' acts locally nilpotently, $U^s v = 0$ for $s \gg 0$, so U acts locally nilpotently. \square

5.1.3. Integrable modules. Since $\Delta_0^{\text{an}} = W(\Sigma_{\text{pr}})$ and $W = W[\Sigma_{\text{pr}}]$, the Σ_{pr} -integrable modules are modules where \mathfrak{g}_α acts locally nilpotently for each $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$. Such modules are called *integrable*.

5.1.4. Remark. If $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is a symmetrizable infinite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra, then the following conditions are equivalent [31]:

- the set Σ_{pr} is linearly independent;
- the Dynkin diagram of Σ_{pr} is connected;
- the subalgebra generated by vector space $\mathfrak{h} + \sum_{\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}} \mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ is a Kac-Moody algebra in the sense of § 2.3.3;
- there exists an irreducible integrable module in $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ which is not one-dimensional;
- \mathfrak{g} is anisotropic, $\mathfrak{sl}(1|n)^{(1)}$, or $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2n)^{(1)}$.

5.1.5. Remark. Consider the case when \mathfrak{g} is affine and the Dynkin diagram of Σ_{pr} is not connected. By above, $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ does not contain irreducible integrable modules which are not one-dimensional. If we take π to be a maximal proper subset of Σ_{pr} (i.e., $\Sigma_{\text{pr}} \setminus \pi$ is of cardinality one), then $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ contains interesting π -integrable modules. For example, if $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ and $\pi = \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} \cup \pi^{\#}$, where $\pi^{\#} := \{\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}$, then, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the irreducible π -integrable modules in $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})^k$ are irreducible modules in the KL_k -category studied in [2]. Important examples of π -integrable modules are irreducible vacuum modules $L(k\Lambda_0)$ for suitable values of k . The irreducible π -integrable modules in $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma}(\mathfrak{g})$ were classified in [32].

5.1.6. The simple affine vertex algebra $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ corresponding to an anisotropic non-twisted affine superalgebra \mathfrak{g} and an integrable \mathfrak{g} -module $L(k\Lambda_0)$ is rational, see [37] (and [6],[5]). This result is based on the fact that in this case the integrability of $L(k\Lambda_0)$ implies that $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules are exactly $V^k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules which are integrable.

The proof of rationality of $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$, given in [37], Section 2.2, uses only the fact that the even part of the finite-dimensional Lie superalgebra $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ to which \mathfrak{g} is associated, is simple. It follows that the adjoint orbit of any non-zero element a in $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}_0$ spans it, hence $U(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})/(a^{k+1})$ and $S(\dot{\mathfrak{g}})/(a^{k+1})$ are finite-dimensional (see [37], Lemma 2.3).

5.1.7. If \mathfrak{g} is a non-twisted affine superalgebra which is not anisotropic, then $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ is not rational for $k \neq 0$, since the category of $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules is not completely reducible. However, for $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$, the $\pi^{\#}$ -integrability of $L(k\Lambda_0)$ implies that $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules are exactly $V^k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules which are $\pi^{\#}$ -integrable, see [17] Theorem 5.3.1.

5.1.8. Let π be a linearly independent subset of Σ_{pr} . This means that π is a proper subset of Σ_{pr} if \mathfrak{g} is affine, not anisotropic and not equal to $\mathfrak{sl}(1|n)^{(1)}$, $\mathfrak{osp}(2|2n)^{(1)}$, $D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$, π lies in $A_1^{(1)} \coprod A_1 \coprod A_1$ for $D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$, and π is an arbitrary subset of Σ_{pr} in the rest of the cases. We denote by \mathfrak{g}_{π} the subalgebra generated by the vector space $\mathfrak{h} + \sum_{\alpha \in \pi} \mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$.

Since $\Sigma_{\text{pr}} \subset \Delta_0^{\text{re}}$, \mathfrak{g}_{π} is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g}_0 . Using the arguments of [46], Theorem 9.1 (see also [16], 3.5) it is easy to show that \mathfrak{g}_{π} is a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra (in the sense of § 2.3.3) with the Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} , the set of simple roots π , and $\pi^{\vee} := \{\alpha^{\vee} \mid \alpha \in \pi\}$. This Kac-Moody algebra is indecomposable if the Dynkin diagram of π is connected. The restriction of $(-, -)$ to \mathfrak{g}_{π} is a non-degenerate invariant bilinear form. We set

$$\Delta_{\pi} := \Delta(\mathfrak{g}_{\pi})^{\text{re}}.$$

5.1.9. Example. Take $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(3|2)^{(1)}$. Then $\Sigma_{\text{pr}} = \{\varepsilon_1, \delta - \varepsilon_1, 2\delta_1, \delta - 2\delta_1\}$. If π is of cardinality three, then $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi} \cong \mathfrak{sl}_2^{(1)} \times \mathfrak{gl}_2$.

5.1.10. If \mathfrak{g} is of type (Aff), then each indecomposable component of \mathfrak{g}_π is of type (Fin) or (Aff). If $\pi^\# = \{\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}$ has a connected Dynkin diagram, then $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$ is an affine Kac-Moody algebra. For $\pi = \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} \cup \pi^\#$, which appeared in Remark 5.1.5, the algebra \mathfrak{g}_π is the direct product of $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$ and a reductive Lie algebra with the set of simple roots $\{\alpha \in \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) < 0\}$.

5.1.11. Remark. For any $N \in \mathcal{O}^\infty(\mathfrak{g})$ one has $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^\mathfrak{g} N \in \mathcal{O}^\infty(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)$. A \mathfrak{g} -module N is π -integrable if and only if $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^\mathfrak{g} N$ is \mathfrak{g}_π -integrable.

Note that for any π -integrable $L(\lambda)$ we have $\Delta_\pi \subset R_{\lambda+\rho}$ and $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for each $\alpha \in \pi$.

We will use the following result (which can be deduced from [18], but we include a proof for the sake of completeness).

5.1.12. Lemma. *For any $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ and $\gamma \in \pi$ the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) $\mathfrak{g}_{-\gamma}$ acts locally nilpotently on N ;
- (b) $s_\gamma((e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}) \text{ch } N) = -(e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}) \text{ch } N$.
- (c) $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N$ is naturally s_γ -anti-invariant (where D_π and ρ_π are respectively the Weyl denominator and the Weyl vector for Δ_π^+).

Proof. Let \mathfrak{t} be the subalgebra which is generated by $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\gamma}$ and \mathfrak{h} . Then \mathfrak{t} is the direct product of a copy of \mathfrak{sl}_2 and a subalgebra of codimension 1 in \mathfrak{h} . Set $M := \text{Res}_\mathfrak{t}^\mathfrak{g} N$. By § 2.10.3 (iv) we have $M \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{t})$ and

$$\text{ch } N = \text{ch } M = \sum_{\mu \in \mathfrak{h}^*} [M : L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu)] \text{ch } L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu).$$

Setting $P^+(\mathfrak{t}) := \{\mu \mid \dim L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu) < \infty\}$ we have

$$(e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}) \text{ch } L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu) = \begin{cases} (e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}} - s_\gamma e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}}) & \text{if } \mu \in P^+(\mathfrak{t}) \\ e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}} & \text{if } \mu \notin P^+(\mathfrak{t}) \end{cases}$$

which gives

$$(e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}) \text{ch } N = \sum_{\mu \in P^+(\mathfrak{t})} [M : L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu)] (e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}} - s_\gamma e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}}) + \sum_{\mu \notin P^+(\mathfrak{t})} [M : L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu)] e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}}.$$

Therefore (b) is equivalent to

$$\sum_{\mu \notin P^+} [M : L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu)] s_\gamma e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}} = - \sum_{\mu \notin P^+} [M : L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu)] e^{\mu+\frac{\gamma}{2}}.$$

Observe that all coefficients in the left-hand side are non-negative and in the right-hand side are non-positive. Thus (b) is equivalent to $[M : L_\mathfrak{t}(\mu)] = 0$ for all $\mu \notin P^+$ which means that M is a direct sum of finite-dimensional \mathfrak{t} -modules. This establishes the equivalence (a) \iff (b).

For the equivalence (b) \iff (c) note that $\rho_\pi - \frac{\gamma}{2}$ and $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)^+ \setminus \{\gamma\}$ are s_γ -invariant, so

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} (e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}})^{-1} &= e^{\rho_\pi - \frac{\gamma}{2}} \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)^+ \setminus \{\gamma\}} (1 - e^{-\alpha}) \text{ is } s_\gamma\text{-invariant} \\ D_\pi^{-1} e^{-\rho_\pi} (e^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}) &= e^{-\rho_\pi + \frac{\gamma}{2}} \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)^+ \setminus \{\gamma\}} (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{-1} \text{ is } s_\gamma\text{-invariant} \end{aligned}$$

(see [14], Section 2 on invariance of infinite products). This implies the equivalence (b) \iff (c) and completes the proof. \square

5.2. Quasi-admissible modules in type (An). Below we recall some definitions and results of [18]. Let \mathfrak{g} be of type (An). In this case

$$\Sigma_{\text{pr}} = \{\alpha \in \Sigma \mid p(\alpha) = \bar{0}\} \cup \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Sigma, p(\alpha) = \bar{1}\}$$

and Σ_{pr} is connected. Recall that for $L = L(\lambda)$ we have

$$\Delta_L = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = R_{\lambda+\rho},$$

(see Definition 4.2). We take $\pi := \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$. The Lie algebra \mathfrak{g}_π is a "maximal Kac-Moody subalgebra" of $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$. For example, for \mathfrak{g} of type $C_2^{(2)}$, $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ is not a Kac-Moody algebra: in this case $\Sigma = \{\alpha, \delta - \alpha\}$ where $p(\alpha) = p(\delta - \alpha) = \bar{1}$ and δ is the minimal imaginary roots; \mathfrak{g}_π is of type $A_1^{(1)}$ with the simple roots $\{2\alpha, 2\delta - 2\alpha\}$, so $\mathfrak{g}_\delta \cap \mathfrak{g}_\pi = 0$.

5.2.1. By [18], Theorem 4.5.1, for $N \in \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g})$ such that Δ_N is well defined (for instance, if N is indecomposable), the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) the expression $De^\rho \text{ch } N$ is (naturally) $W[\Delta_N]$ -anti-invariant, i.e.

$$s_\alpha(De^\rho \text{ch } N) = -De^\rho \text{ch } N \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Delta_N$$

(ii) the expression $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N$ is (naturally) $W[\Delta_N]$ -anti-invariant.

5.2.2. Definition. If $N \in \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g})$ is such that Δ_N is well defined, we say that N is *quasi-admissible*⁴ if $\text{ch } N$ satisfies the equivalent conditions (i) and (ii).

5.2.3. Remark. The equivalence in § 5.2.1 implies that

$$(5.2) \quad N \text{ is quasi-admissible} \iff \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N \text{ is quasi-admissible.}$$

⁴In [18] quasi-admissible modules are called "snowflake".

5.2.4. Theorem. ([29]; [18], Section 4). Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable anisotropic affine Kac-Moody superalgebra.

- (i) A \mathfrak{g} -module N is quasi-admissible if and only if every irreducible subquotient of N is quasi-admissible.
- (ii) The following conditions are equivalent
 - $L := L(\lambda)$ is quasi-admissible;
 - L' is an integrable \mathfrak{g}' -module (see § 4.3 for notation).
- (iii) If $L(\lambda)$ is non-critical quasi-admissible, then $De^\rho \text{ch } L(\lambda) = \sum_{w \in W_L} (\text{sgn } w) e^{w(\lambda+\rho)}$.
- (iv) If $L(\nu)$ is a non-critical quasi-admissible subquotient of $M(\lambda)$, then $\lambda = \nu$.
- (v) All non-critical quasi-admissible modules are completely reducible.

5.3. Remark. Take $L := L(\lambda)$ and $L' = L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ as in § 4.3. By Lemma 4.2.5 (ii), the set $\Sigma_L := \psi(\Sigma')$ is the set of indecomposable elements in Δ_L^+ . Since $\langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle = \langle \lambda' + \rho', \psi^{-1}(\alpha)^\vee \rangle$, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (a) $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ is integrable;
- (b) $\langle \lambda + \rho, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ for all $\alpha \in \Sigma_L$.

5.4. Quasi-admissible modules in general case. We retain notation of § 5.1.8.

5.4.1. Notation. Recall that π is a linearly independent subset of Σ_{pr} , \mathfrak{g}_π is the corresponding Kac-Moody subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{0}}$ and $\Delta_\pi = \Delta(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)^{\text{re}}$. We denote by $W[\pi]$ the subgroup of W generated by $\{s_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in \pi}$. This is the Weyl group of \mathfrak{g}_π and $\Delta_\pi = W\pi$. As before D_π, ρ_π denote the corresponding Weyl denominator and Weyl vector respectively.

Recall that for any subset X of Δ^{re} the notation $W[X]$ stands for the subgroup of W generated by s_α with $\alpha \in X$.

If L is fixed, we retain notation of § 4.3 and denote by Σ'_{pr} the set of principal roots for Δ' ; we set

$$\pi' := \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid \psi(\alpha) \in \Delta_\pi\}.$$

We suggest the following definition.

5.4.2. Definition. If $N \in \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{g})$ is such that Δ_N is well defined we say that N is π -quasi-admissible if $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N$ is naturally $W[\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi]$ -anti-invariant, i.e.

$$s_\alpha(D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N) = -D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi.$$

5.4.3. Remark. Note that Δ_0^+ does not depend on the choice of a base in Sp , so the expression $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N$ does not depend on this choice as well.

5.4.4. In the anisotropic case Definition 5.4.2 is equivalent to Definition 5.2.2.

In Theorem 5.5.1 below we partially extend Theorem 5.2.4 (i) to general \mathfrak{g} ; in Theorem 5.5.3 below we extend Theorem 5.2.4 (ii). The results which are similar of Theorem 5.2.4 (iii)–(v) and the equivalence (a) \iff (b) in § 5.3 do not hold for atypical quasi-admissible modules, since these assertions do not hold for atypical π -integrable modules which are particular cases of π -quasi-admissible modules.

5.4.5. Example. By Lemma 5.1.12, if $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ is such that Δ_N is well defined and $\pi \subset \Delta_N$, then the π -quasi-admissibility of N is equivalent to the π -integrability.

5.5. Main results. In this section we will prove the following theorems.

5.5.1. Theorem. *Let $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be such that Δ_N is well-defined. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) N is π -quasi-admissible;
- (b) all irreducible subquotients of N are π -quasi-admissible;
- (c) all irreducible subquotients of $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ are quasi-admissible \mathfrak{g}_π -modules, Δ_M is well defined and $\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_N = \Delta_M$.

The proof will be given in § 5.8.

5.5.2. Corollary. *If $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ is π -quasi-admissible and $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ is non-critical, then M is a completely reducible \mathfrak{g}_π -module.*

The proof will be given in § 5.9.

5.5.3. Theorem. *If $L := L(\lambda)$ is non-critical, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a) L is π -quasi-admissible;
- (b) L' is π' -integrable, where $\pi' = \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid \psi(\alpha') \in \Delta_\pi\}$.

The proof will be given in § 5.10.

5.5.4. Remark. By (4.2) we have $\{\alpha \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta_\pi$. Combining Theorem 5.5.1 and § 5.6 we obtain

$$(5.3) \quad L(\lambda) \text{ is } \pi\text{-quasi-admissible} \implies \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta_\pi = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta_\pi.$$

5.6. The set Δ_M for $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$. Recall that $\Delta_\pi \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$ is the set of real roots of the Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g}_π .

The set Δ_M is well defined if and only if the set $\{\alpha \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the same for all ν such that $[M : L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)] \neq 0$; moreover Δ_M coincides with these sets. (Notice that $\{\alpha \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the integral root subsystem of Δ_π corresponding to the weight ν .) Take ν such that $[M : L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)] \neq 0$. Then there exists $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $L(\lambda)$ is a subquotient of N and $L(\lambda)_\nu \neq 0$, so $\lambda - \nu \in \mathbb{Z}\pi$. Therefore

$$\{\beta \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \nu, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \{\beta \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \lambda, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}.$$

We conclude that

- (i) Δ_M is well defined if and only if the set $\{\beta \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \lambda, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the same for all λ such that $[N : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$;
- (ii) if Δ_M is well defined, then $\Delta_M = \{\beta \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \lambda, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ for any λ such that $[N : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$ and $\Delta_M \subset (\Delta_N \cap \Delta_\pi)$;
- (iii) $\{\alpha \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subset (\Delta_N \cap \Delta_\pi)$ for any ν such that $N_\nu \neq 0$.

5.6.1. The important example for the next sections is $L = L(\lambda)$, $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} L$. Then

$$\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi = \Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}.$$

Combining (i) and (4.2) we get

$$\Delta_M = \{\beta \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \lambda, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta_\pi.$$

The condition $\Delta_L = \Delta_M \cap \Delta_\pi$ holds in many cases, for example if

- Δ_π consists of short roots: in this case Lemma 4.1.4 (i) gives $\Delta_\pi \cap R_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.
- if $L(\lambda)$ is typical (in this case $\Delta_L = R_{\lambda+\rho}$).

Introduce $R_{\lambda'+\rho'} \subset \Delta'$ as in § 4.1.1. By Lemma 4.3.2, ψ maps $R_{\lambda'+\rho'}$ to $R_{\lambda+\rho}$, and $\Delta_{L'} = (\Delta')^{\text{re}}$. Therefore $\Delta_{L'} \cap \Delta_{\pi'} = \Delta_{\pi'}$ which gives the following useful equivalence

$$(5.4) \quad \Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_\pi \cap R_{\lambda+\rho} \iff \pi' \subset R_{\lambda'+\rho'}.$$

5.6.2. Example. The following example shows that $\Delta_\pi \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}$ can be a proper subset of $\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ (i.e. Δ_M is a proper subset of $\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_L$).

Take \mathfrak{g} of type $B(1|3)$ with $\Sigma = \{\delta_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 - \delta_3, \delta_3 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1\}$. One has $p(\varepsilon_1) = \bar{0}$ and $p(\delta_i) = \bar{1}$. We have $\Sigma_{\text{pr}} = \{\delta_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 - \delta_3, \delta_3, \varepsilon_1\}$ and we take $\pi := \{\delta_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 - \delta_3, \delta_3\}$.

For $\lambda + \rho := 3\delta_1 + 2\delta_2 + \delta_3 - \varepsilon_1$ we have $R_{\lambda+\rho} = \{\pm\varepsilon_1; \pm\delta_i \pm \delta_j; \pm(\delta_3 - \varepsilon_1)\}$. Therefore $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta$ and $\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_\pi$ is the root system of type B_3 , and $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta_\pi = \{\pm\delta_i \pm \delta_j\}$ is the root system of type D_3 .

5.6.3. Lemma.

- (i) *The set of indecomposable elements in $\Delta_L \cap \Delta_0^+$ coincides with $\psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}})$. One has $\Delta_L \cap \Delta_0 = W[\Delta_L](\psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}}))$ and $W[\Delta_L]$ is the Coxeter group generated by s_α with $\alpha \in \psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}})$.*
- (ii) *The set of indecomposable elements in $\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi^+$ coincides with $\psi(\pi')$. One has $\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi = W[\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi](\psi(\pi'))$ and $W[\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi]$ is the Coxeter group generated by s_α with $\alpha \in \psi(\pi')$.*

Proof. The map $s_{\alpha'} \mapsto s_{\psi(\alpha')}$ for $\alpha' \in \Delta'$ defines a group homomorphism $\psi_W : W(\mathfrak{g}') \rightarrow W[\Delta_L]$ which satisfies $\psi(w\alpha') = \psi_W(w)\psi(\alpha')$ for all $w \in W(\mathfrak{g}')$, $\alpha' \in \Delta'$. Since $\mathbb{C}\Delta'$ is a faithful representation of $W(\mathfrak{g}')$, the map ψ_W is bijective, so

$$\psi_W : W(\mathfrak{g}') \xrightarrow{\sim} W[\Delta_L].$$

By § 2.8.3, $(\Delta_0')^{\text{re}}$ is a real root system with the set of simple roots Σ'_{pr} and $W(\mathfrak{g}')$ is the Coxeter group generated by $s_{\alpha'}$ with $\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}}$. This implies (i).

For (ii) take any $\beta \in (\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi^+)$ and set $\beta' := \psi^{-1}(\beta)$. Then β' is a positive even real root in Δ' . By Lemma 2.8.4, there exist $\alpha'_1, \dots, \alpha'_j \in \pi'$ such that $\beta' = s_{\alpha'_j} \dots s_{\alpha'_2} \alpha'_1$ and $\beta' = \sum_{i=1}^j k_i \alpha'_i$ with $k_i > 0$. Set $\alpha_i := \psi(\alpha'_i)$ and notice that $\alpha_i \in \psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}})$. Therefore

$$\beta = \sum_{i=1}^j k_i \alpha_i \quad \text{with } k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, \quad \alpha_i \in \psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}}).$$

Let us show that $\alpha_i \in \psi(\pi')$ for all $i = 1, \dots, j$. Since Σ_{pr} is the set of indecomposable elements in $\Delta_0^{\text{re}+}$ we have

$$\alpha_i = \sum_{\gamma \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}} m_\gamma^i \gamma \quad \text{for some } m_\gamma^i \geq 0.$$

Therefore

$$\beta = \sum_{\gamma \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}}} n_\gamma \gamma, \quad \text{for } n_\gamma := \sum_{i=1}^j k_i m_\gamma^i.$$

If $\alpha_i \notin \psi(\pi')$, then $m_\gamma^i \neq 0$ for some $\gamma \notin \pi$, so $n_\gamma \neq 0$ and thus $\beta \notin \Delta_\pi$, a contradiction. Hence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_j \in \psi(\pi')$. Therefore $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \psi(\pi')$ and $\beta = s_{\alpha_j} \dots s_{\alpha_2} \alpha_1$. This proves that $\psi(\pi')$ is the set of indecomposable elements in $\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi^+$ and establishes the formula $\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi = W\psi(\pi')$ which implies $W[\Delta_L \cap \Delta_\pi] = W[\psi(\pi')]$. Since $\psi(\pi')$ is a subset of $\psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}})$ and, by (i), s_α with $\alpha \in \psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}})$ are Coxeter generators of $W[\Delta_L] = W[\psi(\Sigma'_{\text{pr}})]$, the set s_α with $\alpha \in \psi(\pi')$ are Coxeter generators of $W[\psi(\pi')]$. This completes the proof of (ii). \square

5.7. Enright functor. The proofs are based on the following construction.

5.7.1. Let α be a positive even real root and let $\mathfrak{t} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be any subalgebra containing $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$. Let $\mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{t})$ be the full subcategory of the category of \mathfrak{t} -modules consisting of the objects where α^\vee acts semisimply with non-integral eigenvalues and \mathfrak{g}_α acts locally nilpotently. By [23]; [18], Section 2, the category $\mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{t})$ admits the Enright functor $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{t}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{t})$ which is an equivalence of categories such that $\mathcal{C}^2(N) \cong N$ for all $N \in \mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{t})$. By construction, the functor \mathcal{C} commutes with the restriction functor, i.e. $\mathcal{C}(\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(N))$ is (canonically) isomorphic to $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{t}}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{C}(N))$ for any $N \in \mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{t})$.

5.7.2. Let $\pi \subset \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ be as in § 5.4.1. Assume that $\alpha \in \pi$ is such that Σ contains α or $\alpha/2$. Let \mathcal{O}_α be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ whose objects are modules lying in $\mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{g})$. By [23]; [18], Theorems 2.3.1 and 3.2 the Enright functor gives the equivalence of categories $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{O}_\alpha \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{O}_\alpha$, such that

$$(5.5) \quad \mathcal{C}(L(\nu)) = L(s_\alpha(\nu + \rho) - \rho), \quad (e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N) = s_\alpha((e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \text{ch } N)$$

for all $L(\nu), N \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha$. Notice that $L(\nu) \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha$ if and only if $\langle \nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$.

Since $\alpha \in \pi$, the product $e^{\rho_\pi - \alpha/2} D_\pi (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{-1}$ is naturally s_α -invariant (see (5.1)). Now the second formula in (5.5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N &= \frac{D_\pi}{1-e^{-\alpha}} \cdot \frac{e^{\rho_\pi}}{e^{\alpha/2}} \cdot (e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \text{ch } N \\ &= \frac{D_\pi}{1-e^{-\alpha}} \cdot \frac{e^{\rho_\pi}}{e^{\alpha/2}} \cdot s_\alpha((e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N)) \\ &= s_\alpha\left(\frac{D_\pi}{1-e^{-\alpha}} \cdot \frac{e^{\rho_\pi}}{e^{\alpha/2}} \cdot (e^{\frac{\alpha}{2}} - e^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}}) \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N)\right) = s_\alpha(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N)) \end{aligned}$$

for the natural action of s_α , which implies

$$(5.6) \quad D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N = s_\alpha(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N)) \quad \text{for all } N \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha.$$

for the natural action of s_α . (Similarly we have $De^\rho \text{ch } N = s_\alpha(De^\rho \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N))$.)

5.7.3. Lemma. *For any $N \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha$ and $\gamma \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$ one has*

$$D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N = -s_\gamma(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N) \iff D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N) = -s_{s_\alpha \gamma}((D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N))).$$

Proof. In the light of (5.6) the formula $D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N = -s_\gamma(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N)$ is equivalent to

$$s_\alpha(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N) = -s_\alpha s_\gamma(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N) = -s_{s_\alpha \gamma} s_\alpha(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N).$$

By above, $s_\alpha(D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } N) = D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N)$ which gives the required equivalence. \square

5.7.4. Let $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be such that Δ_N is well defined. We claim that

$$(5.7) \quad \alpha \notin \Delta_N \implies N \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha.$$

Indeed, if $\alpha \notin \Delta_N$, then by (4.2), $\langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for any λ such that $[N : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$; this implies $\langle \mu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$ for all μ such that $N_\mu \neq 0$, so $N \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha$.

5.7.5. We will use the following formula

$$(5.8) \quad [\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} \mathcal{C}(N) : L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(s_\alpha(\nu + \rho_\pi) - \rho_\pi)] = [\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N : L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)] \quad \text{for any } N \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha.$$

Indeed, take $N \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha$. Then $\mathcal{C}(N) \in \mathcal{O}_\alpha$. Set $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$. (If $M \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)$ the formula follows immediately from § 5.7.2, but M might be not finitely generated.) By § 2.10.3, $M \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)$ and this module admits a weak composition series at ν :

$$0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \dots \subset M_r = M.$$

Observe that $M_1, \dots, M_r \in \mathcal{M}^e(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)$. In the light of § 5.7.1 we obtain a finite filtration

$$0 = \mathcal{C}(M_0) \subset \mathcal{C}(M_1) \subset \dots \subset \mathcal{C}(M_r) = \mathcal{C}(M).$$

Using (5.5) for the algebra \mathfrak{g}_π we get $\mathcal{C}(M_i/M_{i-1}) \cong L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(s_\alpha(\nu + \rho_\pi) - \rho_\pi)$ if and only if $M_i/M_{i-1} \cong L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)$. This gives the inequality \geq in (5.8). The opposite inequality follows from the formula $\mathcal{C}^2(N) \cong N$. This establishes (5.8).

5.8. Proof of Theorem 5.5.1. Let $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be such that Δ_N is well defined. We want to prove the equivalence of the conditions

- (a) N is π -quasi-admissible;
- (b) all irreducible subquotients of N are π -quasi-admissible;
- (c) all irreducible subquotients of $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ are quasi-admissible \mathfrak{g}_π -modules, and $\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_N = \Delta_M$.

5.8.1. Lemma. *Fix any λ and introduce π' for $L(\lambda)$ as in § 5.4.1. If $\gamma \in \psi(\pi')$ is such that $\gamma \notin \pi$, then there exists $\alpha \in \pi$ such that $s_\alpha \gamma = \gamma - j\alpha$ for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $s_\alpha \gamma \in \Delta_\pi^+$. Moreover, $\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.*

Proof. Recall that $\pi \subset \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$ and $\Delta_\pi = W\pi$. Using Lemma 2.8.4 for Δ_π , we conclude that there exists $\alpha \in \pi$ such that $\gamma - s_\alpha \gamma = j\alpha$ for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $s_\alpha \gamma \in \Delta_\pi^+$. If $\alpha \in \Delta_N$, then $s_\alpha \gamma \in \Delta_N$. Therefore $\gamma = s_\alpha \gamma + j\alpha$ with $s_\alpha \gamma, \alpha$ in $\Delta_N \cap \Delta_\pi^+$ which contradicts to Lemma 5.6.3 (since $\gamma \in \psi(\pi')$). Therefore $\alpha \notin \Delta_N$. \square

5.8.2. Lemma. *Fix any λ such that $[N : L(\lambda)] \neq 0$ and introduce π' as in § 5.4.1. Take $\gamma \in \psi(\pi')$ and ν such that $[\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} N : L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)] \neq 0$. If $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N$ is s_γ -anti-invariant, then $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)$ is s_γ -anti-invariant and $\langle \nu, \gamma^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the partial order on Δ_π given by $\alpha \geq \beta$ if $\alpha - \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\pi$.

If $\gamma \in \pi$, then, by Lemma 5.1.12, $\mathfrak{g}_{-\gamma}$ acts locally nilpotently on N and thus acts locally nilpotently on $L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)$. By Lemma 5.1.12, $R_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)$ is s_γ -anti-invariant.

Take $\gamma \notin \pi$ and α as in Lemma 5.8.1. Since $\alpha \in \pi$, either α or $\alpha/2$ lies in a certain base in the spine. Using 5.4.3 we conclude that, without loss of generality, we can (and

will) assume that Σ contains α or $\alpha/2$. Let \mathcal{C} be the Enright functor for α . Since $\alpha \notin \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_N$ we have $\langle \nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$ by § 5.6 (iii). By (5.8) we have

$$[\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}}(\mathcal{C}(N)) : L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\mu)] \neq 0 \quad \text{for } \mu := s_\alpha(\nu + \rho_\pi) - \rho_\pi.$$

Combining Lemma 5.7.3 and (5.7) we conclude that the assumption that $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } N$ is s_γ -anti-invariant implies the $s_{s_\alpha \gamma}$ -anti-invariance of $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N)$.

By Lemma 4.5.2 we have $\psi_{s_\alpha(\lambda+\rho)-\rho}(\gamma') = s_\alpha \gamma$. By § 5.7.2, the module $L(s_\alpha(\lambda+\rho)-\rho)$ is a subquotient of $\mathcal{C}(N)$. Since $s_\alpha \gamma < \gamma$, by induction hypothesis, the $s_{s_\alpha \gamma}$ -anti-invariance of $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } \mathcal{C}(N)$ implies $s_{s_\alpha \gamma}$ -anti-invariance of $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\mu)$ and $\langle \mu, (s_\alpha \gamma)^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$. In particular,

$$\langle \mu, (s_\alpha \gamma)^\vee \rangle = \langle s_\alpha(\nu + \rho_\pi), (s_\alpha \gamma)^\vee \rangle = \langle \nu + \rho_\pi, \gamma^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$$

so $\langle \nu, \gamma^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Since $L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\mu) = \mathcal{C}(L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu))$, the $s_{s_\alpha \gamma}$ -anti-invariance of $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\mu)$ implies the s_γ -anti-invariance of $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)$. This completes the proof. \square

5.8.3. Assume that N is π -quasi-admissible. Combining the above lemma and § 5.6 (iii) we get

$$\psi(\pi') \subset \{\beta \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \nu, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} \subset (\Delta_N \cap \Delta_\pi).$$

Using Lemma 5.6.3 we conclude $(\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_N) = \{\beta \in \Delta_\pi \mid \langle \nu, \beta^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Since this formula holds for all ν such that $[M : L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)] \neq 0$, the set Δ_M is well defined and coincides with $\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_N$, see § 5.6 (ii). Combining the above lemma and Lemma 5.6.3 we conclude that $L_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}(\nu)$ is quasi-admissible. This establishes the implication (a) \implies (c).

Since $\text{ch } N$ is the sum of the characters of irreducible subquotients of N , (b) implies (a). Similarly, $\text{ch } N$ is the sum of the characters of irreducible subquotients of M , so (c) implies (a). Hence (a) \iff (c) and (b) \implies (a).

Now assume that (c) holds. Let L be any subquotient of N . We have $\Delta_N = \Delta_L$. Any irreducible subquotient L_1 of $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}} L$ is a subquotient of M , so, by (c), it is quasi-admissible \mathfrak{g}_π -module. Moreover, $\Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_L = \Delta_\pi \cap \Delta_N = \Delta_{L_1}$. Using the implication (c) \implies (a) for L we conclude that L is π -quasi-admissible. This completes the proof of the implication (c) \implies (b) and the proof of Theorem 5.5.1.

5.9. Proof of Corollary 5.5.2. Let N be a π -quasi-admissible module and $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_\pi}^{\mathfrak{g}}(N)$. Assume that M is non-critical. Fix $v \in M$ and let M_1 be a cyclic module generated by v . Then $M_1 \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{fin}}(\mathfrak{g}_\pi)$. By Theorem 5.5.1, any irreducible subquotient of M_1 is quasi-admissible. Since M_1 is non-critical, M_1 is completely reducible, see Theorem 5.2.4. Hence any cyclic submodule of M is completely reducible. Thus M is a sum of irreducible modules, so M is completely reducible (see [41], Chapter XVII).

5.10. Proof of Theorem 5.5.3. By Lemma 5.6.3, (a) is equivalent to $s_\alpha(D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L) = -D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L$ for all $\alpha \in \psi(\pi')$. On the other hand, (b) is equivalent to the fact that for all $\gamma' \in \pi'$ the root space $\mathfrak{g}'_{-\gamma'}$ acts locally nilpotently on L' . Using Lemma 5.1.12 we conclude that it is enough to verify that for $\gamma' \in \pi'$ the following conditions are equivalent

- (a') $s_\gamma(D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L) = -D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L$ for $\gamma := \psi(\gamma')$;
 (b') $s_{\gamma'}(D_{\pi'} e^{\rho_{\pi'}} \text{ch } L') = -D_{\pi'} e^{\rho_{\pi'}} \text{ch } L'$.

This equivalence is established in the lemma below.

5.10.1. Lemma. *For $\gamma' \in \pi'$ the assertions (a') and (b') are equivalent.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on the partial order on Δ_π given by $\nu \geq \mu$ if $\nu - \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\pi$. For the induction base we assume that $\gamma \in \pi$. Then either γ or $\gamma/2$ lies in a certain base in the spine. Using §§ 4.4.1 and 5.4.3 we conclude that, without loss of generality, we can (and will) assume that Σ contains γ or $\gamma/2$. Then Σ' contains γ' or $\gamma'/2$ respectively. By Lemma 5.1.12 (a') and (b') are equivalent to locally nilpotence of actions of $\mathfrak{g}_{-\gamma}$ and $\mathfrak{g}'_{-\gamma'}$ on L and L' respectively. It is well-known that $\mathfrak{g}_{-\gamma}$ acts locally nilpotently on L if and only if $\frac{2(\lambda+\rho, \gamma)}{(\gamma, \gamma)}$ is a positive integer which is odd if $\gamma/2 \in \Sigma$. Using the formula $\frac{2(\lambda'+\rho', \gamma')}{(\gamma', \gamma')} = \frac{2(\lambda+\rho, \gamma)}{(\gamma, \gamma)}$.

Now assume that $\gamma \notin \pi$. Take $\gamma \notin \pi$ and α as in Lemma 5.8.1. Since $\alpha \in \pi$, either α or $\alpha/2$ lies in a certain base in the spine. Using §§ 4.4.1 and 5.4.3 we conclude that, without loss of generality, we can (and will) assume that Σ contains α or $\alpha/2$ and thus Σ' contains α' or $\alpha'/2$ respectively. Take $\nu := s_\alpha(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$. Combining Lemma 5.7.3 and (5.7) we conclude that (a') is equivalent to

$$D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } L(\nu) = -s_{s_\alpha \gamma}((D_\pi e^\rho \text{ch } L(\nu))).$$

By Lemma 4.5.2 we have $\psi_\nu(\gamma') = s_\alpha \gamma$. Since $s_\alpha \gamma < \gamma$, by induction hypothesis, (b') is equivalent to $s_{s_\alpha \gamma}$ -anti-invariance of $D_\pi e^{\rho_\pi} \text{ch } L(\nu)$. Hence (a') is equivalent to (b') for γ . This completes the proof. \square

6. ADMISSIBLE WEIGHTS

In this section $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$ is an indecomposable symmetrizable affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, which is not anisotropic (i.e., Δ contains a real isotropic root).

6.1. Notation. We normalise the bilinear form $(-, -)$ as in § 3.5 and in Appendix A. For a weight $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we call $k := (\lambda, \delta)$ the *level* of λ .

We let $\dot{\mathfrak{g}} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ be the finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra described in Appendix A. Note that $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ if \mathfrak{g} is non-twisted. We denote by $\dot{\Delta}$ the root system of $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$. We let $\Lambda_0 \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ be such that $(\Lambda_0, \delta) = 1$ and $(\Lambda_0, \dot{\Delta}) = (\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0) = 0$. We let cl be the canonical map $\text{cl} : \mathbb{Q}\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}\Delta/\mathbb{Q}\delta = \mathbb{Q}\dot{\Delta}$. By Remark 2.8.2, $\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} := \Sigma_{\text{pr}} \cap \dot{\Delta}$ is the set of principal roots for $\dot{\Delta}$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^\# &:= \{\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}, \quad \Delta^\# := \Delta_{\pi^\#} = \{\alpha \in \Delta_{\bar{0}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\} \\ \pi &:= \pi^\# \cup \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} = \{\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}} \mid \alpha \in \dot{\Delta} \text{ or } (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

The assumption $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$ ensures that π is linearly independent. If $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ is a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, then $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$ is the direct product of an abelian Lie algebra and a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody algebra, which is the affinization of the "largest component" $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}^\#$ of $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}_0$, since the root system $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#})$ is equal to $\Delta(\dot{\mathfrak{g}}^\#) + \mathbb{Z}\delta$.

Since we use the normalised invariant form, the longest root in $\Delta^\#$ is of square length 2 and $L(k\Lambda_0)$ is $\pi^\#$ -integrable if and only if $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

6.1.1. Vacuum modules. For each $k \in \mathbb{C}$ we introduce the vacuum module V^k of level k in the usual way: we set $\mathfrak{g}_+ := \mathfrak{h} + \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta: (\alpha, \Lambda_0) \geq 0} \mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ and let \mathbb{C}_k the one-dimensional \mathfrak{g}_+ -module where each $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ acts by multiplication by $\langle k\Lambda_0, h \rangle$; we set

$$V^k := \text{Ind}_{\mathfrak{g}_+}^{\mathfrak{g}} \mathbb{C}_k.$$

Notice that $L(k\Lambda_0)$ is the unique irreducible quotient of V^k ; we call this module a *simple vacuum module*; this term will be also used for the corresponding $[\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{g}]$ -module.

6.1.2. Remark. Since V^k is a cyclic module generated by \mathbb{C}_k and $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}\mathbb{C}_k = 0$, V^k is $\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}}$ -integrable. Therefore any subquotient of V^k is $\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}}$ -integrable and any $\pi^\#$ -integrable subquotient is π -integrable. Moreover, any $\pi^\#$ -quasi-admissible subquotient of V^k is π -quasi-admissible.

6.2. The module L' for $L := L(k\Lambda_0)$. Consider the case $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$. Let $L := L(k\Lambda_0)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Q}$. We let $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g}_{k\Lambda_0}$ and let $\psi : \mathbb{Z}\Delta(\mathfrak{g}') \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Delta$ be the linear map as in § 4.3. It is easy to see that $\dot{\Delta} \subset \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ and $\mathfrak{g}' := \mathfrak{g}_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ is of type (Aff). Let $(-, -)'$ be the normalised invariant form on $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$.

6.3. Lemma. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Q}$, \mathfrak{g}' , ψ be as § 6.2.*

- (i) *One has $\mathfrak{g}' \cong \mathfrak{g}$ if $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$.*
- (ii) *If \mathfrak{g} is $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$, then \mathfrak{g}' is also $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$.*
- (iii) *One has $(\psi(v_1), \psi(v_2)) = (v_1, v_2)'$ for $v_1, v_2 \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$ and $\psi^{-1}(\dot{\Delta})$ coincides with $\dot{\Delta}'$ as introduced in Appendix A.1.1.*
- (iv) *For $L := L(k\Lambda_0)$ the module L' is a simple vacuum $[\mathfrak{g}', \mathfrak{g}']$ -module (we denote its level by k').*

Proof. We have $\dot{\Delta} \subset \text{cl}(\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}) \subset \text{cl}(\Delta)$. Since $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$, we have $\text{cl}(\Delta) = \dot{\Delta} \cup \{0\}$, so $\text{cl}(\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}) = \dot{\Delta}$. Using the table in Appendix A.1.1, we conclude that $\mathfrak{g}' \cong \mathfrak{g}$ if \mathfrak{g} is non-twisted and $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$. If $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$, then \mathfrak{g}' is also $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$. This establishes (i), (ii) and the formula $\psi^{-1}(\dot{\Delta}) = \dot{\Delta}'$. The restriction of $(-, -)'$ to $\text{cl}(\Delta') \cong \dot{\Delta}$ is the normalised invariant form, so the restriction of $(-, -)'$ to $\mathbb{Z}\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$ coincides with the restriction of the normalised

invariant form. This establishes (iii). For (iv) set $\lambda := k\Lambda_0$ and introduce λ' as in § 4.3. For $\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}$ we have

$$(\lambda' + \rho', \psi^{-1}(\alpha)) = (\lambda + \rho, \alpha) = (\dot{\rho}, \alpha)$$

where $\dot{\rho}$ is the Weyl vector for $\dot{\Delta}^+$. Since $\psi^{-1}(\dot{\Delta}) = \dot{\Delta}'$, this gives $(\lambda', \alpha') = 0$ for all $\alpha' \in \dot{\Delta}'$. Therefore $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ is a vacuum module. \square

6.4. Admissibility. We retain notation of § 6.1.

6.4.1. Definition. We call $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ *admissible* if N is non-critical, $\pi^\#$ -quasi-admissible, and $\mathbb{Q}(\Delta_N \cap \Delta^\#) = \mathbb{Q}\Delta^\#$. We call a weight λ *admissible* if $L(\lambda)$ is admissible (i.e., if $L(\lambda)$ is $\pi^\#$ -quasi-admissible and $\mathbb{Q}(\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}) = \mathbb{Q}\Delta^\#$). The level k is called *admissible* if the weight $k\Lambda_0$ is admissible. An admissible level k is called *principal admissible* if $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ is isometric to Δ^{re} , and is called *subprincipal admissible* otherwise. An admissible weight λ is called *principal (resp., subprincipal) admissible* if (λ, δ) is a principal (resp., subprincipal) admissible level, and $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$.

6.4.2. We claim that if λ is a principal or a subprincipal admissible weight, then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to the set of real roots of a Kac-Moody superalgebra.

Indeed, by Theorem B.6 (iii), (iv), if $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \not\cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ for a non-critical $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$, then $\mathfrak{g} = A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ and $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ has an indecomposable component of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$. Then $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ has an indecomposable component of type $\{\alpha \in A(1|1)^{(2)} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\} \cong A_1^{(1)}$, so $\text{cl}(\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho})$ has an indecomposable component of type A_1 . However, if λ is a principal or a subprincipal admissible weight, then $\text{cl}(\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho})$ is isometric to $\text{cl}(\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho})$. Without loss of generality we take $m \leq n$. Then $n > 1$. Since $\dot{\Delta} \subset \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ we have

$$D_n = \dot{\Delta}^\# \subset \text{cl}(\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}) \subset \text{cl}(\Delta^\#) = C_n.$$

Therefore $\text{cl}(\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho})$ does not have an indecomposable component of type A_1 .

In the example 4.2.4 λ is an admissible weight and $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is not isometric to the set of real roots of a Kac-Moody superalgebra.

6.4.3. Lemma 6.3 implies the following

6.4.4. Corollary. *If \mathfrak{g} is a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, which is not an affine Kac-Moody algebra, $B(m|n)^{(1)}$, $D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$, then any admissible level is principal admissible.*

6.4.5. Lemma. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra.*

- (i) *If λ is admissible, then $(\lambda + \rho, \delta) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$.*
- (ii) *Any (principal) admissible level for \mathfrak{g} is a (principal) admissible level for the non-twisted affine Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$.*

Proof. We set $(\pi^\#)' := \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid \psi(\alpha') \in \Delta^\#\}$. Then

$$(\pi^\#)' = \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid \psi(\alpha') \in \Delta^\#\} = \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha', \alpha') > 0\}.$$

The condition $\mathbb{Q}\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}^\# = \mathbb{Q}\Delta^\#$ implies the existence of $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $q\delta \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}^\#$. Then $\psi^{-1}(q\delta)$ is a positive imaginary root in $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$. By Theorem 5.5.3, $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ is $(\pi^\#)'$ -integrable, so $(\lambda' + \rho', \psi^{-1}(q\delta)) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which gives $(\lambda + \rho, q\delta) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. By definition, λ is non-critical, thus $(\lambda + \rho, \delta) \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. This proves (i).

For (ii) let k be a (principal) admissible weight. Combining Theorem 5.5.1 (iii) and § 5.6 (ii), we conclude that $L_{\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}}(k\Lambda_0)$ is quasi-admissible (since this module is a subquotient of $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}}^{\mathfrak{g}} L(k\Lambda_0)$) and $\{\alpha \in \Delta^\# \mid \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \Delta^\# \cap R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$, so the \mathbb{Q} -span of this set coincides with $\mathbb{Q}\Delta^\#$. In order to prove that k is a (principal) admissible level for $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$, it remains to verify that k is not the critical level for $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$. Let $\rho^\#$ be the Weyl vector for the Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$. Since \mathfrak{g} is non-twisted, δ is the minimal imaginary root of $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$ and the restriction of $(-, -)$ to $\Delta^\#$ is the normalised invariant form. Thus $(\rho^\#, \delta) = h^{\vee, \#}$ is the dual Coxeter number for $\Delta^\#$. Using the table in § 3.5 we see that $h^\vee \leq h^{\vee, \#}$ (the equality holds if and only if \mathfrak{g} is a Lie algebra, that is $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$). Therefore $(\rho^\# - \rho, \delta) \geq 0$ and thus

$$(k\Lambda_0 + \rho^\#, \delta) = (k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) + (\rho^\# - \rho, \delta) > 0,$$

since, by (i), $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) > 0$. □

6.5. Proposition.

- (i) *Let $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$ be of type (Aff). Assume that $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ is such that $k + h^\vee \neq 0$. Then $L(k\Lambda_0)$ is the unique $\pi^\#$ -integrable subquotient of V^k .*
- (ii) *Let $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$ be a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra. If k is an admissible level, then $L(k\Lambda_0)$ is the unique $\pi^\#$ -quasi-admissible subquotient of V^k .*

Proof. We fix a base Σ as in Appendix A; then the set $\dot{\Sigma} = \Sigma \cap \dot{\Delta}$ is a base of $\dot{\Delta}$.

For (i) let $L(k\Lambda_0 - \mu)$ be a π -integrable subquotient of the Verma module $M(k\Lambda_0)$ and $\mu \neq 0$. Then $\langle k\Lambda_0 - \mu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \pi$ and $2(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \mu) = (\mu, \mu)$. By Proposition A.3 this gives $(k\Lambda_0 - \mu) \in \mathbb{Z}\dot{\Sigma}$, so the $(k\Lambda_0 - \mu)$ -weight space in V^k is zero. Hence $L(k\Lambda_0 - \mu)$ is not a subquotient of V^k .

For (ii) let $L(\nu)$ be a $\pi^\#$ -quasi-admissible subquotient of V^k and $\nu \neq k\Lambda_0$. By Proposition 4.6.2 (i), $\nu \in U(k\Lambda_0)$. Set $\lambda := k\Lambda_0$. By Lemma 6.3 (iv), we have $\lambda' = k'\Lambda'_0$.

Take ν' as in § 4.5.1. By § 4.6.6 we can choose $\nu' \in U(\lambda')$. By Theorem 5.5.3, $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\nu')$ is π' -integrable where $\pi' := \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid \psi(\alpha') \in \Delta_\pi\}$. By Lemma 6.3 (iii), we have

$$\pi' := \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha', \alpha') > 0\} \cup (\Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \cap \dot{\Delta}').$$

Using Proposition A.3 we obtain $\lambda' - \nu' \in \mathbb{Z}\dot{\Delta}'$. Now § 4.6.6 gives $\lambda - \nu \in \mathbb{Z}\dot{\Delta}$, so the ν -weight space in V^k is zero (since $\nu \neq k\Lambda_0$). Hence $L(\nu)$ is not a subquotient of V^k . Now both assertions follow from Remark 6.1.2. \square

7. $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -MODULES

In this section $\mathfrak{g} = \dot{\mathfrak{g}}^{(1)}$ is an indecomposable non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra and $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$.

7.1. Notation. We denote by $V^k(\mathfrak{g})$, $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ the universal and simple affine vertex superalgebras of level k respectively. We always assume that k is non-critical. We denote by $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})^k$, $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$ the full subcategories of $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$, $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})$ consisting of the modules of level k (i.e., the modules annihilated by $(K - k)$). Any module in $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$ has the natural structure of $V^k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module.

We retain notation of §§ 5.1.8 and 5.4. Recall that $\mathfrak{g}_{\pi^\#}$ is a subalgebra of \mathfrak{g} generated by \mathfrak{h} and $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \pi^\#$; this is the direct product of a subalgebra of \mathfrak{h} and a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody algebra, see § 6.1, which we denote $\mathfrak{g}^\#$. The restriction of $(-, -)$ to $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ is the normalised non-degenerate invariant bilinear form. As in Lemma 6.4.5 we denote by $\rho^\#$ and $(h^\#)^\vee$ the Weyl vector and the dual Coxeter number of $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ respectively.

By Lemma 6.4.5 any admissible level for \mathfrak{g} is admissible for $\mathfrak{g}^\#$.

7.2. Anisotropic case. Arakawa's Theorem states that for a non-twisted affine Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g} and an admissible level k , any $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module in the category \mathcal{O} is completely reducible and irreducible modules in this category are admissible \mathfrak{g} -modules $L(\lambda)$ such that $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$.

In [18] this assertion was extended to $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{osp}(1|2n)^{(1)}$ (which is the only anisotropic non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra with $\mathfrak{g}_{\bar{1}} \neq 0$). It was also shown that any $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module in the category $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$ is completely reducible (see [18], Corollary 5.4.1).

7.3. Main results. The main results of this section are the following theorems.

7.3.1. Theorem. *Let \mathfrak{g} be an indecomposable non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, which is not of type $D(2|1; a)^{(1)}$. Let k be an admissible level. Then a $V^k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module N is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module if and only if $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -module (then k is an admissible level for $\mathfrak{g}^\#$).*

For the integral level k the above assertion is Theorem 5.3.1 in [17].

7.3.2. Theorem. *Let \mathfrak{g} and k be as in Theorem 7.3.1, and let $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})^k$ be an indecomposable \mathfrak{g} -module. If N is admissible and $\Delta_N \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$, then N is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module. The converse holds for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(1|1)^{(1)}$ and for $\mathfrak{g} = B(1|1)^{(1)}$ if k is principal admissible.*

7.3.3. Remark. We do not know whether the last statement holds for $B(1|1)^{(1)}$ for sub-principal level k .

7.3.4. Corollary. *Let \mathfrak{g} and k be as in Theorem 7.3.1. A module $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$ is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module if and only if all irreducible subquotients of N are $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules.*

Proof. By Theorem 7.3.1, N is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module if and only if $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -module. If $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$, then $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ lies in $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g}^\#)^k$ (here we have to use \mathcal{O}^{inf} since the weight spaces in M might be infinite-dimensional), so M is completely reducible (by Corollary 5.4.1 in [18]). Thus $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$ is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module if and only if all irreducible subquotients of M are $V_k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -modules. Using Theorem 7.3.1 again we obtain the required statement. \square

7.4. Proof of Theorem 7.3.1. We denote by $V^{\#,k}$ the vacuum module for $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ and view it as a submodule of V^k . We denote by J and by $J^\#$ the maximal proper submodules of V^k and $V^{\#,k}$ respectively (then $L(k\Lambda_0) = V^k/J$ and $L_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}(k\Lambda_0) = V^{\#,k}/J^\#$). A $V^k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module N is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module if and only if $Y(v, z)N = 0$ for all $v \in J$. Similarly, a $V^k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -module N is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -module if and only if $Y(v, z)N = 0$ for all $v \in J^\#$. Thus it is enough to verify that the submodule J is generated by $J^\#$, which is established in the following lemma.

7.4.1. Lemma. *If k is an admissible level, then J is generated by $J^\#$.*

Proof. Since $V^{\#,k}$ is a submodule of $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} V^k$, the module $V^{\#,k}/(V^{\#,k} \cap J)$ is a submodule of $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} L(k\Lambda_0)$. Since k is an admissible level, $L(k\Lambda_0)$ is admissible, so, by Theorem 5.5.1, any irreducible subquotient of $V^{\#,k}/(V^{\#,k} \cap J)$ is quasi-admissible. By Proposition 6.5 (ii) this implies $V^{\#,k}/(V^{\#,k} \cap J) = L_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}(k\Lambda_0)$. Thus $V^{\#,k} \cap J = J^\#$.

Denote by J_1 the \mathfrak{g} -submodule of V^k generated by $J^\#$. By above, $J_1 \subset J$. Let $V_1 := V^k(\mathfrak{g})/J_1$ be the quotient vertex algebra. Then the V_1 -modules are the $V^k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules which are annihilated by $Y(v, z)$ for all $v \in J^\#$. Considering the adjoint representation of V_1 we obtain $Y(v, z)V_1 = 0$ for all $v \in J^\#$. Then $M := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} V_1$ is a $V^k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -module. By above, $Y(v, z)M = 0$ for all $v \in J^\#$, so M is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -module. Since k is a $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ -admissible level and $M \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$, Arakawa's Theorem for $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ implies that M is an admissible $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ -module.

Let $L(\nu)$ be an irreducible subquotient of V^k/J_1 . Let us verify that $L(\nu)$ is $\pi^\#$ -quasi-admissible. By Theorem 5.5.1 it is enough to check that any irreducible subquotient of

$M_1 := \text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} L(\nu)$ is a quasi-admissible $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ -module and that $\Delta_{M_1} = \Delta_{\nu+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$. Since M_1 is a subquotient of M , any irreducible subquotient of M_1 is quasi-admissible. By § 5.6 we have

$$\Delta_{M_1} = R_{\nu+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$$

(the second equality follows from (4.2) and the last equality follows from (5.3) and the fact that $L(\lambda)$ is admissible). By Lemma 4.6.3 we have $\Delta_{\nu+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. Therefore $\Delta_{M_1} = \Delta_{\nu+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$. Hence $L(\nu)$ is quasi-admissible. By Proposition 6.5 (ii), $\nu = k\Lambda_0$. Hence $J_1 = J$ as required. \square

7.5. Proof of Theorem 7.3.2. Let k be an admissible level and $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})^k$ be an indecomposable module. Consider the properties

- (a) N is admissible and $\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}^\#$;
- (b) $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g}^\#)$ -module.

Our goal is to prove that (a) implies (b), and that (b) implies (a) for all cases except for $B(1|1)^{(1)}$ with a subprincipal level k .

7.5.1. By Theorem 5.5.3, (a) is equivalent to

- (a') $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ is admissible, $\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$, and $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$.

Let $L(\lambda)$ be a subquotient of N . Then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$. By § 5.6 we have $\{\alpha \in \Delta^\# \mid \langle \nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\} = \Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}$ for any ν such that $L_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}(\nu)$ is a subquotient of $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$. Since k is a $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ -admissible level, Arakawa's Theorem implies that (b) is equivalent to

- (b') $\text{Res}_{\mathfrak{g}^\#}^{\mathfrak{g}} N$ is admissible and $\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$.

Since (a') implies (b'), (a) implies (b). It remains to show that (b') implies (a') except for the case $\mathfrak{g} = B(1|1)^{(1)}$ when k is subprincipal admissible. It is enough to verify that in these cases one has

$$(7.1) \quad (\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}) \text{ is isometric to } (\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}) \implies \Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$$

if λ is of the level k .

7.5.2. Lemma. *If $\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$ and $\Delta^\#$ contains a short even root of Δ , then (7.1) holds.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.1.4 (i), $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ and $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ contain the same short even roots. Thus $(\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}) \subset (\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho})$ are two affine root systems, which share the same short roots and the smaller one is non-twisted (since $\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$). Using the

description of affine root systems given in [27], Proposition 6.3, we conclude that these root systems coincide. \square

7.5.3. Let k be a principal admissible level. By Lemma 6.4.5, k is principal admissible for $\mathfrak{g}^\#$, so $\Delta^\# \cap R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$. Thus the first assumption of the above lemma is satisfied. From the classification of simple finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebras [25], it follows that $\Delta^\#$ contains a short even root of Δ if $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$.

By Corollary 6.4.4, for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$ any admissible level k is principal. Hence the above lemma establishes (7.1) in all cases except for $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$, or $m > n$ and k being subprincipal. This completes the proof of Theorem 7.3.2 for these cases. The remaining cases will be treated in Section 8 (see § 8.3).

7.6. Classification of admissible levels for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$. We denote by r^\vee the lacety of $\mathfrak{g}^\#$, i.e. the ratio of square lengths of a long root and of a short root of $\Delta^\#$. (This number coincides with the dual tier number used in [30]).

Let k be an admissible level. By Lemma 6.4.5, we have $k + h^\vee \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$; we write $k + h^\vee = \frac{p}{q}$ where p, q are positive coprime integers. By Lemma 6.3 (iv), for $L = L(k\Lambda_0)$ the \mathfrak{g}' -module L' is a simple vacuum module, i.e. $L' = L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda'_0)$.

7.6.1. Admissible levels for affine Kac-Moody algebras. This case is well-known [34]. Indeed, we have $\Sigma = \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{\delta - \theta\}$ where $(\theta, \theta) = 2$. If $\gcd(q, r^\vee) = 1$, then $\Sigma_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} = \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{q\delta - \theta\}$. If $\gcd(q, r^\vee) = r^\vee$, then $\Sigma_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} = \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{q\delta - \theta'\}$ where θ' is the maximal short root; in this case $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0}$ is the root system of a twisted affine Kac-Moody algebra of type $X_\ell^{(r^\vee)}$. As a result, k is principal admissible if and only if $\gcd(q, r^\vee) = 1$ and $p \geq h^\vee$, and k is subprincipal admissible if and only if $\gcd(q, r^\vee) \neq 1$ and p is greater or equal to the dual Coxeter number of $X_\ell^{(r^\vee)}$.

7.6.2. Proposition. *If \mathfrak{g} is an indecomposable affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, which is not of type $B(m|n)^{(1)}$, and is not an affine Kac-Moody algebra, then k is admissible if and only if $\gcd(q, r^\vee) = 1$ and $p - h^\vee \geq 0$ (then $k' = p - h^\vee$).*

Proof. By Corollary 6.4.4, for \mathfrak{g} in question any admissible level k is principal, so, by Lemma 6.4.5, k is principal admissible for $\mathfrak{g}^\#$. By § 7.6.1 this implies $\gcd(q, r^\vee) = 1$. It is easy to see that $\gcd(q, r^\vee) = 1$ implies $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} = \{\mathbb{Z}q\delta + \dot{\Delta}\}$. Therefore $\psi(\delta') = q\delta$ (where ψ is as in § 4.3), so

$$k' := qk - (\rho', \delta') = p - h^\vee,$$

since $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{g}'$. By Theorem 5.5.3, $k\Lambda_0$ is quasi-admissible if and only if $L(k'\Lambda'_0)$ is $\pi^\#$ -integrable, that is $k' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. \square

The remaining case $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ will be considered in the next section.

8. ADMISSIBLE LEVELS FOR $B(m|n)^{(1)}$

In this section we consider $\mathfrak{g} := B(m|n)^{(1)}$. One has $\mathfrak{g}^\# = B_m^{(1)}$ if $m > n$ and $\mathfrak{g}^\# = C_n^{(1)}$ if $n \geq m$.

Recall that $k+h^\vee$ is a positive rational number, if k is an admissible level, see Lemma 6.4.5 (i). Fix a rational number k . For $m > n$ we write $k+h^\vee = \frac{p}{q}$ where p, q are non-zero coprime integers and $q > 0$; for $n \geq m$ we write $k+h^\vee = \frac{p}{2q}$ where p, q are non-zero coprime integers and $q > 0$. For example, for $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $q = 1$ and $p = k + m - n - 1$ for $m > n$, and $p = 2(k + n - m) + 1$ for $n \geq m$.

By Lemma 6.3 (iv), for $L = L(k\Lambda_0)$ we have $L' = L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda_0)$ for some k' .

In this section we will show that for $0 \leq m \leq n$, k is principal admissible if and only if p, q are odd and $\frac{p}{2} \geq h^\vee$; in this case, $\mathfrak{g}' \cong \mathfrak{g}$ and $k' = \frac{p}{2} - h^\vee$. For $m > n > 0$, k is principal admissible if and only if q is odd and $p \geq h^\vee$; in this case, $\mathfrak{g}' \cong \mathfrak{g}$ and $k' = p - h^\vee$.

Furthermore, the subprincipal admissible levels exist only for the cases $m = 0$ when p or q is even, $m = n = 1$ when p is even, and $m > n$ when q is even. In all these cases k is a subprincipal admissible level if and only if $\frac{p}{2} \geq (h')^\vee$ and $p \neq 0$, where $(h')^\vee$ is the dual Coxeter number for \mathfrak{g}' , which is of type $A(0|2n-1)^{(2)}$ if $m = 0$ and of type $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$ if $m > 0$. In all these cases $k' = \frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee$.

8.1. Case $B(0|\ell)^{(1)}$. In this case $\mathfrak{g}^\# = \mathfrak{g}_0 \cong C_\ell^{(1)}$. We have $h^\vee = \ell + \frac{1}{2}$ and $\Sigma = \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{\delta - \theta\}$ where $\theta = 2\delta_1$. Recall that $(\theta, \theta) = 2$.

For $\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}$ we have

$$(i\delta + \alpha) \in \overline{R}_{k\Lambda_0 + \rho} \iff \begin{cases} \frac{ip}{q} \in \mathbb{Z}, & (\alpha, \alpha) = \frac{1}{2}, 1 \\ \frac{ip}{q} \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1, & (\alpha, \alpha) = 2, \text{ and } i \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

(the condition i is odd in the last line reflects the fact that $i\delta + \alpha \notin \overline{\Delta}$ if i is even). This gives

$$\Sigma_{k\Lambda_0 + \rho} = \begin{cases} \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{q\delta - \theta\} & \text{if } p, q \text{ are odd,} \\ \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{q\delta - \theta_s\} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where θ_s is the maximal among non-long roots: $\theta_s = \delta_1$ for $\ell = 1$ and $\theta_s = \delta_1 + \delta_2$ for $\ell > 1$. Therefore $\psi(\delta') = q\delta$, so

$$k' = (\lambda' + \rho', \delta') - (\rho', \delta') = (\lambda + \rho, q\delta) - (h')^\vee = \frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee,$$

where $(h')^\vee$ is the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}' . This gives

- If pq is odd, then \mathfrak{g}' is of type $B(0|\ell)^{(1)}$ and $k' = \frac{p}{2} - h^\vee$.
- If pq is even, then \mathfrak{g}' is of type $A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}$ and $k' = \frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee$ with $(h')^\vee = \ell - \frac{1}{2}$ (note that $A(0|1)^{(2)} = D(1|1)^{(2)}$ since $\mathfrak{sl}(1|2) = \mathfrak{osp}(2|2)$).

By Theorem 5.5.3, k is admissible if and only if $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda_0)$ is integrable. If pq is odd, then $\mathfrak{g}' \cong \mathfrak{g}$, so $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda_0)$ is integrable if and only if $k' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. If pq is even, then \mathfrak{g}' is of type $A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}$ with the normalised invariant bilinear form (the square length of the long root is 2). The set of simple roots for $A(0|1)^{(2)}$ is $\{\delta - \delta_1, \delta_1\}$ (both roots are odd) and $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda_0)$ is integrable if and only if $2k' = p - 2(h')^\vee \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ i.e. $p \geq 2(h')^\vee = 1$. For $\ell > 1$ the set of simple roots for $A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}$ is $\{\delta - \delta_1 - \delta_2, \delta_1 - \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n\}$ (the last root is odd) and $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda_0)$ is integrable if and only if $k' = \frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ which means that p is odd and $p \geq 2(h')^\vee$. We conclude that

- k is principal admissible if and only if p, q are odd and $p \geq 2h^\vee = 2\ell + 1$;
- k is subprincipal admissible if and only if $p \geq 2\ell - 1$, and, in addition, pq is even for $\ell = 1$, and q is even for $\ell > 1$; if k subprincipal admissible, then $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}$.

8.1.1. Let λ be an admissible weight of $B(0|\ell)^{(1)}$ satisfying $\text{cl}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}) = \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{0}} = C_\ell$. Retain notation of § 4.5.1. By [26], \mathfrak{g}' is one of the following affine Kac-Moody superalgebras: $C_\ell^{(1)}$, $A_{2\ell-1}^{(2)}$, $B(0|\ell)^{(1)}$, $A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}$, or $D(1|\ell)^{(2)} = C(\ell+1)^{(2)}$ (notice that $D(1|1)^{(2)} = C(2)^{(2)} = A(0|1)^{(2)}$).

Recall that $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is even if $(\alpha, \alpha) = 1, 2$, and is odd if $(\alpha, \alpha) = 1/2$. If $(\alpha, \alpha) = 1, 1/2$, then $\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is equivalent to $\alpha \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, so $\alpha, \alpha + j\delta \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is equivalent to $\frac{j\delta}{q} \in \mathbb{Z}$. This gives

$$(8.1) \quad (\alpha + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \alpha + \mathbb{Z}q\delta \quad \text{if } \alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \text{ is s.t. } (\alpha, \alpha) = 1, 1/2.$$

Since $\text{cl}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}) = \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{0}}$, $\text{cl}(\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')_{\bar{0}}) = C_\ell$ and the square length of the longest root in $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$ is 2. Let δ' be the minimal imaginary root of $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$. Recall that $\psi(\delta') = u\delta$ for some $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. By § 3.2.6 if β is a short root of $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$, then $(\beta + j\delta') \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$ is equivalent to $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, so

$$\{\psi(\beta) + \mathbb{Z}\delta\} \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \psi(\beta) + \mathbb{Z}\psi(\delta').$$

If $\mathfrak{g}' \not\cong C_1^{(1)}$, then $(\beta, \beta) \neq 2$, so (8.1) implies $\psi(\delta') = q\delta$. Hence

$$(8.2) \quad \psi(\delta') = q\delta \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{g}' \not\cong C_1^{(1)}.$$

Therefore $(\lambda', \delta') = (\lambda' + \rho', \delta') - (h')^\vee = (\lambda + \rho, \delta) - (h')^\vee$ where $(h')^\vee$ is the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}' . Hence

$$(8.3) \quad (\lambda', \delta') = \frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{g}' \not\cong C_1^{(1)}.$$

If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong C_1^{(1)}$, then $\ell = 1$. For $\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ one has $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$ and $\alpha/2 \notin \Delta$, so $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore $(\alpha + j\delta) \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is equivalent to $s(k + h^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}$ that is $s \in 2\mathbb{Z}q$. Therefore

$$(8.4) \quad \psi(\delta') = 2q\delta, \quad (\lambda', \delta') = p - 2 \quad \text{for } \mathfrak{g}' \cong C_1^{(1)}.$$

Let us show that $\mathfrak{g}' \not\cong D(1|\ell)^{(2)}$ for $\ell > 1$. Suppose the contrary. Then $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')_{\bar{0}}$ contains α such that $(\alpha, \alpha) = 1$ and $\alpha + \delta' \notin \Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$. Then $\psi(\alpha) \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ and $\psi(\alpha + \delta') = \psi(\alpha) + q\delta \notin$

$\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ which contradicts to (8.1). Hence

$$(8.5) \quad \mathfrak{g}' \cong C_\ell^{(1)}, B(0|\ell)^{(1)}, A_{2\ell-1}^{(2)}, \text{ or } A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}.$$

8.1.2. Corollary. *Let $\mathfrak{g} = B(0|\ell)^{(1)}$, k be an admissible level, and $L(\lambda)$ be a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module.*

- (i) *If k is principal admissible, then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cong \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ and $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(0|\ell)^{(1)}$. In this case $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ has level $\frac{p}{2} - h^\vee$.*
- (ii) *Let k be a subprincipal admissible level. Then either $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}$, or $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A_{2\ell-1}^{(2)}$ for $\ell > 1$, or $\mathfrak{g}' \cong C_1^{(1)}$ for $\ell = 1$. If $\mathfrak{g}' \not\cong C_1^{(1)}$, then $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ has level $\frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee$ where $(h')^\vee$ is the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}' . If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong C_1^{(1)}$, then $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ has level $p - 2$.*

Proof. By Arakawa's Theorem (established in [18] for this case), $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta_{\bar{0}}$ is isometric to $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta_{\bar{0}}$.

Consider the case $\ell > 1$ and q is even. Then, by § 8.1, \mathfrak{g}'_0 is of type $A_{2\ell-1}^{(2)}$, and, by [26], \mathfrak{g}' is $A(0|2\ell-1)^{(2)}$ or $A_{2\ell-1}^{(2)}$.

Consider the case when $\ell > 1$ and q is odd. By (8.2), ψ maps the minimal imaginary root of $\Delta'_0 \cong C_\ell^{(1)}$ to $q\delta$. Hence

$$(\gamma + \mathbb{Z}\delta) \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \gamma + \mathbb{Z}q\delta \quad \text{for all } \gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta_{\bar{0}}.$$

Take $\gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ such that $(\gamma, \gamma) = 2$, that is $\gamma = s\delta \pm 2\delta_i$. By above, $(s+q)\delta \pm 2\delta_i$ lies in $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. Since s or $s+q$ is even, $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains an element of the form 2β where β is odd. Thus $\beta \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$, so \mathfrak{g}' contains an odd root. By § 8.1, \mathfrak{g}'_0 is of type $C_\ell^{(1)}$. Hence, by [26], $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(0|\ell)^{(1)}$.

Now consider the case $\ell = 1$. Then $\mathfrak{g}'_0 \cong C_1^{(1)}$. We have the following possibilities

- (a) $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(0|1)^{(1)}$ with $\Sigma_\lambda = \{s_1\delta \pm 2\delta_1, s_2\delta \mp \delta_1\}$, where s_1 is odd;
- (b) $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|1)^{(2)}$ with $\Sigma_\lambda = \{s_1\delta - \delta_1, s_2\delta + \delta_1\}$;
- (c) $\mathfrak{g}' \cong C_1^{(1)}$ with $\Sigma_\lambda = \{s_1\delta - 2\delta_1, s_2\delta + 2\delta_1\}$, where s_1, s_2 are odd.

If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(0|1)^{(1)}$, then $(\lambda + \rho, s_1\delta \pm 2\delta_1) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $4(\lambda + \rho, s_2\delta \mp \delta_1) \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$, so $\frac{(s_1+2s_2)p}{q} \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$. Thus p, q are odd.

If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|1)^{(2)}$, then $(s\delta + \delta_1) \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ for some s and $((2s+2i+1)\delta + 2\delta_1) \notin \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ for all i . Thus $\frac{p(2i+1)}{q} \notin 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$ for all i , so pq is even.

If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong C_1^{(1)}$, then $(s\delta + 2\delta_1) \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ for some odd s and $(i\delta + \delta_1) \notin \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ for all i . This implies $\frac{ip}{q} \notin 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$ for all odd j , so pq is even.

The rest of the assertions follow from (8.4) and (8.3). \square

8.2. Admissible levels for $\mathfrak{g} := B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m, n \geq 1$. Let k be as in the beginning of Section 8. By Lemma 6.3 (ii), \mathfrak{g}' is either $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$. Thus, if k is admissible, then k is principal if \mathfrak{g}' is $B(m|n)^{(1)}$, and is subprincipal if \mathfrak{g}' is $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$.

We denote by δ' the minimal imaginary root of \mathfrak{g}' ; recall that $\psi(\delta') = u\delta$ for some $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. One has $(k'\Lambda'_0 + \rho', \delta') = (k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \psi(\delta))$, so

$$k' = \frac{up}{2q} - (h')^\vee \text{ if } n \geq m, \quad k' = \frac{up}{q} - (h')^\vee \text{ if } n < m,$$

where $(h')^\vee := (\rho', \delta')$ is the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}' .

Note that the lacety r^\vee of $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ is equal to 1 if $m = n = 1$ and is equal to 2 otherwise.

8.2.1. By Lemma 6.3 (iii), the bilinear form on Δ' is the normalised invariant form. If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(m|n)^{(1)}$, then $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda_0)$ is $(\pi')^\#$ -integrable if and only if $k' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$, then $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(k'\Lambda_0)$ is $(\pi')^\#$ -integrable if and only if $2k' \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

8.2.2. Proposition. *Let $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m, n \geq 1$. Recall that $h^\vee = n - m + \frac{1}{2}$, $(h')^\vee = \frac{n-m}{2}$ if $n \geq m$, and $h^\vee = 2m - 2n - 1$, $(h')^\vee = m - n$ if $m > n$.*

- (i) *Let $m = n = 1$. If q is even, then k is not admissible. If p, q are odd, then $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(1|1)^{(1)}$ and $k' = \frac{p}{2} - h^\vee$, so $k + h^\vee = \frac{k' + h^\vee}{q}$. If p is even, then $\mathfrak{g}' \cong D(2|1)^{(2)}$ and $k' = \frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee = \frac{p}{2}$, so $k + h^\vee = \frac{k'}{q}$. In both cases k is admissible if and only if $k' \geq 0$.*
- (ii) *Let $1 \leq n < m$. If q is odd, then $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(m|n)^{(1)}$, and k is admissible (and principal) if and only if $k' = p - h^\vee \geq 0$. If q is even, then $\mathfrak{g}' \cong D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$, and k is admissible (and subprincipal) if and only if $k' = \frac{p}{2} - (h')^\vee \geq 0$ (notice that $k' \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$).*
- (iii) *If $1 \leq m \leq n \neq 1$, then k is not admissible except for the case when p and q are odd. If p, q are odd, then $\mathfrak{g}' \cong B(m|n)^{(1)}$, $k' = \frac{p}{2} - h^\vee$, and k is admissible (and principal) if and only if $k' \geq 0$. In this case $k + h^\vee = \frac{k' + h^\vee}{q}$.*

8.2.3. Corollary.

- (i) *The level k is principal admissible for $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m \geq 0, n \geq 1$ if and only if p, q are odd and $\frac{p}{2} \geq h^\vee$ for $m \leq n$, and q is odd and $p \geq h^\vee$ for $m > n$.*
- (ii) *The level k is subprincipal admissible for $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m \geq 0, n \geq 1$ in the following cases: $\frac{p}{2} \geq (h')^\vee, p \neq 0$ and*
 - $m = 0, n = 1$ when pq is even;
 - $m > n \geq 1$ or $m = 0, n > 1$ when q is even;
 - $m = n = 1$ when p is even for $m = n = 1$.*One has $\mathfrak{g}' = D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$ (so $(h')^\vee = n - \frac{1}{2}$ for $m = 0$, $(h')^\vee = m - n$ for $m > n$ and $m = n = 1$).*

8.2.4. Proof of Proposition 8.2.2. We retain the usual notation for the roots in $B(m|n)$. By abuse of notation, we use the same notation for the set of real roots of affine Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g} and \mathfrak{g} itself (for example, $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cong B(m|n)^{(1)}$ means that $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ is isomorphic to the set of real roots of $B(m|n)^{(1)}$). It is convenient to use the normalization $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) = 1$ (which coincides with the original normalization if $m > n$). Then $(k\Lambda_0+\rho, \delta) = \frac{p_1}{q}$ where $p_1 = p$ for $m > n$ and $p_1 = -p$ if $n \geq m$.

By Theorem 5.5.3, if k is admissible, then it satisfies

$$(8.6) \quad \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# \subset R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}.$$

In the light of Theorem 5.5.3 and § 8.2.1, it is enough to verify that for $u := \frac{q}{\gcd(2,q)}$ (i.e., $u = q$ if q is odd and $u = q/2$ otherwise) we have:

(a) if $n \geq m$ and p, q are odd, or $m > n$ and q is odd, then (8.6) holds and

$$(8.7) \quad \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} = \dot{\Delta} + \mathbb{Z}u\delta \cong B(m|n)^{(1)},$$

(b) if $m = n = 1$ and p is even, or $m > n$ and q is even, then (8.6) holds and

$$(8.8) \quad \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} = \{\dot{\Delta} + 2\mathbb{Z}u\} \cup \{\alpha + \mathbb{Z}u\delta \mid \alpha \in \dot{\Delta}, (\alpha, \alpha) = \pm 1\} \cong D(m+1|n)^{(2)},$$

(c) formula (8.6) does not hold in all other cases, i.e. for $m = n = 1$ if q is even, and for $n \geq m$, $n \neq 1$ if p or q are even.

For $\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}$ we have

$$(\alpha + i\delta) \in \overline{R}_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \implies \begin{cases} i = 0 & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \\ \frac{pi}{q} \in \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha) = \pm 2, -1 \\ \frac{2pi}{q} \in \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha) = 1, \\ i, \frac{pi}{q} \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1 & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha) = -4. \end{cases}$$

If p, q are odd, then $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} = \dot{\Delta} + \mathbb{Z}q\delta \cong B(m|n)^{(1)}$ and $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \overline{\Delta}^{\text{an}} = \overline{R}_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$, so (8.6) holds. This proves (a).

In our normalization the short even roots (i.e., $s\delta \pm \varepsilon_i$) are of square length 1. By Lemma 4.1.4 (i), the root $si\delta \pm \varepsilon_i$ lies in $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ if and only if it lies in $\overline{R}_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$, that is $(s\delta \pm \varepsilon_i) \in \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ if and only if $2s$ is divisible by q . Using Lemma 6.3 (ii), we conclude that $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ satisfies one of the formulas (8.7), (8.8) for $u = \frac{q}{\gcd(2,q)}$.

If q is even, then the set given by formula (8.8) contains $\overline{R}_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$, so $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ is as in (8.8) with $u = \frac{q}{2}$. In this case \mathfrak{g}' is of type $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$. For $m > n$ formula (8.6) holds. If $n \geq m$, then $(q\delta + 2\delta_1) \in \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \setminus R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$, so (8.6) does not hold.

Now consider the remaining case when p is even (and q is odd). For $B(1|1)$ we have

$$\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} = \{2\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, \mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \varepsilon_1, \mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \delta_1, 2\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm 2\delta_1\} \cong D(2|1)^{(2)},$$

so $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = \{2\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm 2\delta_1\} = R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ and (8.6) holds.

For $(m, n) \neq (1, 1)$ the set $\dot{\Delta}$ contains α such that $(\alpha, \alpha) \in \{\pm 2\}$ and $\alpha + q\delta \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$. Thus $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cong B(m|n)^{(1)}$ is given by formula (8.7). If $m > n$,

$$R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = \{\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \dot{\Delta}^\#\} = \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#,$$

so (8.6) holds. If $n \geq m$, then $q\delta + 2\delta_1 \in \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \setminus R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$, so (8.6) does not hold. This completes the proof. \square

8.3. Completion of the proof of Theorem 7.3.2. It remains to verify (7.1) for $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$ and k being principal admissible, and for $m > n$ and k being subprincipal admissible. The first case is treated in the following lemma.

8.3.1. Lemma. *Let $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$ and k such that $k + h^\vee = \frac{p}{2q}$ where p, q are odd. Let λ be a weight of level k such that $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$. Then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$.*

Proof. We will use the normalization $(\delta_1, \delta_1) = 1$. For this normalization $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) = \frac{p}{q}$ and all roots are of integral square length, so $2(\lambda + \rho, \gamma)$ is integral for all $\gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.

We will use the following observation: $(s\delta + 2\delta_i) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ if and only if $(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + 2\delta_i)$ is odd if s is even, and $(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + 2\delta_i)$ is even if s is odd.

The assumption that $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$ implies that for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ there exists s such that $(s\delta + 2\delta_i) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$. If s is odd, then the above observation gives

$$(s\delta + 2\delta_i) \in R_{\lambda+\rho} \iff (\lambda + \rho, s\delta + 2\delta_i) \in 2\mathbb{Z} \iff (\lambda + \rho, (s+q)\delta + 2\delta_i) \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$$

since p is odd. Thus $(s\delta + 2\delta_i) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ for some even s . Therefore for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ there exists p_i such that $(2p_i\delta + 2\delta_i) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$, which means that $\beta_i := p_i\delta + \delta_i$ lies in $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, that is

$$a_i := (\lambda + \rho, \beta_i) \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

Take $\gamma \in (\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#)$ and set $b := (\lambda + \rho, \gamma)$. Since $\gamma \in \Delta^\#$ we have (γ, γ) is 2 or 4, and $\gamma = s\delta \pm \beta_i \pm \beta_j$ for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$, so

$$b = (\pm a_i \pm a_j) + \frac{sp}{q}.$$

Since $\gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$, we have $2b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $(\pm a_i \pm a_j)$ is integral, $\frac{2sp}{q}$ is integral, so s is divisible by q (since q is odd). Therefore $b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence $\gamma \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ if $(\gamma, \gamma) = 2$. If $(\gamma, \gamma) = 4$, then $i = j$ and $b = \pm 2a_i + \frac{sp}{q}$. Thus b is even if s is odd and is odd if s is even (since p is odd). Using the above observation we obtain $\gamma \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ as required. \square

8.3.2. It remains to verify (7.1) for $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m > n$ and k being subprincipal admissible. In the light of Proposition 8.2.2 this corresponds to the case when q is even.

8.3.3. Set $P := \{\nu \in \mathbb{C}\dot{\Delta} \mid (\nu, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for all } \alpha \in \dot{\Delta}\}$. We consider the map $t : P \rightarrow GL(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ given by

$$(8.9) \quad t_\nu(\mu) := \mu + (\mu, \delta)\nu - ((\mu, \nu) + \frac{(\mu, \delta)}{2}(\nu, \nu))\delta.$$

The map t is a group monomorphism; we denote by \tilde{T} the image of this map. Then $\tilde{T} \in O(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ (i.e., t_ν preserves the bilinear form $(-, -)$ on \mathfrak{h}^*). Note that for $\gamma \in \Delta$ we have

$$t_\nu(\gamma) = \gamma - (\gamma, \nu)\delta.$$

In particular, $t_\nu(\delta) = \delta$ and $t_\nu(\Delta) = \Delta$. We denote by \tilde{W} the subgroup of $O(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ generated by \tilde{W} and \tilde{T} (by [27], Proposition 6.5, $\tilde{W} = \tilde{W} \rtimes \tilde{T}$, but we won't use this fact). For each $w \in \tilde{W}$ we have

$$(8.10) \quad w\Delta = \Delta, \quad w\delta = \delta, \quad R_{w(\lambda+\rho)} = wR_{\lambda+\rho}, \quad \Delta_{w(\lambda+\rho)} = w\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \text{ for } \lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*.$$

8.3.4. Recall that $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) = 1$ for $m > n$. For this normalization $P = \mathbb{Z}\Delta$, and all roots are of integral square length, so $2(\lambda + \rho, \gamma)$ is integral for all $\gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.

8.3.5. We want to prove that for $m > n$ we have

$$\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho} \text{ is isometric to } \Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \implies \Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$$

if λ is of level k , where $k + h^\vee = \frac{p}{q}$ and q is even. Using (8.10) we conclude that the above implication for λ is equivalent to the similar implication for the weight $w(\lambda + \rho) - \rho$ for $w \in \tilde{W}$.

8.3.6. We set

$$\begin{aligned} I_\varepsilon &:= \{i \mid \varepsilon_i \in \text{cl}(R_{\lambda+\rho})\} = \{i \mid \exists s \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ s. t. } 2(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + \varepsilon_i) \in \mathbb{Z}\}, \\ I_\delta &:= \{j \mid \delta_j \in \text{cl}(R_{\lambda+\rho})\} = \{j \mid \exists s \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ s. t. } 2(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + \delta_j) \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1\}. \end{aligned}$$

The assumption that $\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$ implies $\dot{\Delta}^\# \subset \text{cl}(R_{\lambda+\rho})$, so $I_\varepsilon = \{1, \dots, m\}$.

Since $2(\lambda, \alpha + \frac{q}{2}\delta) = 2(\lambda, \alpha) + p$ and p is odd we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\varepsilon &= \{i \mid \exists s \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ s. t. } 2(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + \varepsilon_i) \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1\} \\ I_\delta &= \{j \mid \exists s \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ s. t. } 2(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + \delta_j) \in \mathbb{Z}\}. \end{aligned}$$

8.3.7. If $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ does not contain isotropic roots, then $R_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. Thus we may (and will) assume that $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains an isotropic root, that is $(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + \varepsilon_i - \delta_j) = 0$ for some s, i, j . Then $\delta_j \in I_\delta$. Acting by a suitable element of \tilde{W} we can assume that $I_\delta = \{1, \dots, n_1\}$ for some n_1 such that $1 \leq n_1 \leq n$ and that

$$(8.11) \quad \begin{aligned} a_i &:= (\lambda + \rho, \varepsilon_i) \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, m; \\ b_j &:= (\lambda + \rho, \delta_j) \in \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, n_1; \\ a_n &= b_1. \end{aligned}$$

We let $B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ be the corresponding natural copy in $\Delta(\mathfrak{g})$. The intersection of Δ_0^{re} with the span of δ and $\{\delta_j\}_{j>n_1}$ is isomorphic to $C_{n-n_1}^{(1)}$ and we denote this intersection by $C_{n-n_1}^{(1)}$.

For $j > n_1$ we have $j \notin I_\delta$, so $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ does not contain the roots of the form $s\delta \pm \delta_j$, $s\delta \pm \varepsilon_i \pm \delta_j$ and $s\delta \pm \delta_r \pm \delta_j$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $r = 1, \dots, n_1$. This means that $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ lies in $B(m|n_1)^{(1)} \coprod C_{n-n_1}^{(1)}$. Hence

$$\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \subset (B(m|n_1)^{(1)} \coprod C_{n-n_1}^{(1)}).$$

The set $\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ lies $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$. Therefore we have to verify

$$(8.12) \quad (\Delta^\# \cap (\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)})) \subset (R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}).$$

Note that $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ is the minimal subset of $B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ which contains the set $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ and satisfies properties (a)–(c) of § 4.1.1.

Let us compute the set $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$. For a non-isotropic $\alpha \in B(m|n_1)$ we have

$$(8.13) \quad (s\delta + \alpha) \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho} \iff \begin{cases} q|s & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha) = -1, \pm 2 \\ \frac{q}{2}|s & \text{if } (\alpha, \alpha) = 1 \end{cases}$$

(The roots $s\delta \pm 2\delta_1$ do not lie in $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, since $\frac{ps}{q} \pm 2b_j \notin 2\mathbb{Z}$ for odd s). If $s\delta - \varepsilon_i \pm \delta_j$ lies in $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, then $\frac{ps}{q} - a_i \pm b_j = 0$, so $s = \frac{q(a_i \mp b_j)}{p}$ is divisible by q . We conclude that $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ lies in the set

$$\{\alpha + q\delta \mid \alpha \in B(m|n_1)\} \cup \{\alpha + \frac{q}{2}\delta \mid \alpha \in B(m|n_1), (\alpha, \alpha) = \pm 1\} \cong D(m+1|n_1)^{(2)}.$$

Hence $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ lies the copy $D(m+1|n_1)^{(2)}$ given by the formula above (in fact, $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ coincides with this set). Using (8.13) we obtain (8.12) and complete the proof.

8.4. Example: $B(1|1)^{(1)}$ when p is even. Assume that

$$\Delta^\# \cap R_{\lambda+\rho} \text{ is isometric to } \Delta^\# \cap R_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad (\Delta^\# \cap \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}) \not\subset R_{\lambda+\rho}.$$

Then $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains an isotropic root and a root of the form $s\delta + 2\delta_1$.

We will use the normalization $(\delta_1, \delta_1) = -1$. For this normalization $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) = \frac{p}{q}$.

Retain notation of § 8.3.3. If s is even, then, acting by a suitable element of \tilde{W} , we can (and will) assume that $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains $\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ and $2\delta_1$. Since $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains $\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$, one has $(\lambda + \rho, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) = 0$ and $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ does not contain $j\delta + \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ for $j \neq 0$ (since $(\lambda + \rho, \delta) \neq 0$). Set

$$a := (\lambda + \rho, \delta_1).$$

Since $(\lambda + \rho, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) = 0$ we have $a = (\lambda + \rho, \varepsilon_1)$. Since $2\delta_1 \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$, $2a$ is an odd integer. In this case $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^{\text{an}} = \{\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \varepsilon_1; \mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \delta_1\}$. If $j\delta + \varepsilon_1 + \delta$ lies in $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, then $\frac{jp}{q} = 2a$ which is impossible since p is even. Hence $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho} = \{\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \varepsilon_1; \mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \delta_1; \pm(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1)\}$, so

$$\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \{\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \varepsilon_1; \mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm \delta_1\} \cup \{2\mathbb{Z}q \pm \varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, 2\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm 2\delta_1\} \cong D(2|1)^{(2)}$$

and $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = \{2\mathbb{Z}q\delta \pm 2\delta_1\} \subset R_{\lambda+\rho}$.

Now consider the case $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains an isotropic root β and a root of the form $s\delta + 2\delta_1$ for an odd s . Using the normalization $(\delta_1, \delta_1) = 1$ we have

$$(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + 2\delta_1) \in 2\mathbb{Z}, \quad (\lambda + \rho, \beta) = 0$$

for some isotropic root β . Then $2\beta = s\delta + 2\delta_1 + j\delta \pm 2\varepsilon_1$ (for some odd j), so $(\lambda + \rho, \frac{j}{2}\delta \pm \varepsilon_1)$ is integral and thus $(\lambda + \rho, \frac{j+q}{2}\delta \pm \varepsilon_1)$ is integral. Since $j+q$ is even, we get $\varepsilon_1 \in \text{cl}(R_{\lambda+\rho})$. Hence $\text{cl}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho})$ contains $\pm\varepsilon_1, \pm 2\delta_1$ and an isotropic root $\text{cl}(\beta)$. Since $\text{cl}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}) \subset B(1|1)$ and $s_\alpha \text{cl}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho})$ for any non-isotropic $\alpha \in \text{cl}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho})$ we obtain $\text{cl}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}) = B(1|1)$, so $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isomorphic to $B(1|1)^{(1)}$ or to $D(2|1)^{(1)}$. If $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cong D(2|1)^{(1)}$, then for any $\alpha \in (\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#)$ one has $\alpha/2 \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$; since $(s\delta + 2\delta_1)/2 \notin \Delta$ we conclude $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \not\cong D(2|1)^{(1)}$. Hence $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cong B(1|1)^{(1)}$. Let us show that

$$\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# \not\subset R_{\lambda+\rho}.$$

Since $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cong B(1|1)^{(1)}$, the set $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ contains a root of the form 2α where $\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$, that is $\alpha = r\delta \pm \delta_1$. If $2\alpha \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$, then $(\lambda + \rho, 2r\delta \pm 2\delta_1)$ is odd. Since $(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + 2\delta_1)$ is even, $\frac{(2r \pm s)p}{q}$ is an odd integer which is impossible since p is even.

8.5. Subprincipal levels. Summarizing, we obtain: if \mathfrak{g} is an indecomposable non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra which is not a Lie algebra and k is a subprincipal admissible level, then \mathfrak{g} is of type $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m > n$, or $m = n = 1$, or $m = 0$. For $B(0|n)^{(1)}$ the subprincipal admissible levels are of the form $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{2q}$, where p, q are coprime positive integers, pq is even and $p \geq 2n - 1$ (in this case $k' = \frac{p-2n+1}{2}$). For $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m > n$ the subprincipal admissible levels are of the form $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{q}$, where p, q are coprime positive integers q is even and $p > 2(m - n)$ (in this case $k' = \frac{p}{2} - (m - n)$ lies in $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} + \frac{1}{2}$). For $B(1|1)^{(1)}$ the subprincipal admissible levels are of the form $k = -h^\vee + \frac{p}{2q}$, where p, q are positive coprime integers and q is odd (in this case $k' = p$).

9. THE SET Δ_L FOR $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -MODULE L WHEN k IS PRINCIPAL ADMISSIBLE

Let k be a principal admissible level. As before, we write $k + h^\vee = \frac{p}{q}$ for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$ and $k + h^\vee = \frac{p}{2q}$ for $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$, where p, q are positive coprime integers. Let $L(\lambda)$ be a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module.

9.1. Notation. By Theorem 7.3.2 one has $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $\Delta^\#$.

Retain notation of § 4.3. By Theorem B.6 all components of \mathfrak{g}' are finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebras.

Since $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$, this is an indecomposable root system, so $\psi^{-1}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#)$ lies in the root system of an indecomposable component of \mathfrak{g}' . We denote this component by \mathfrak{g}'' and its root system by Δ'' .

Since $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$ is infinite, Δ'' is infinite, so \mathfrak{g}'' is an affine Kac-Moody superalgebra. We denote by δ'' the minimal imaginary root of \mathfrak{g}'' . Recall that $\psi(\delta'') = u\delta$ for some $u \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, see § 4.2.7.

9.2. Example. Let \mathfrak{g} be $A(2|2)^{(1)}$ with

$$\Sigma = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_3 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 - \delta_3, \delta - \varepsilon_1 + \delta_3\}.$$

Let $\lambda = \Lambda_0 + a(\delta_2 + \delta_3)$ where $a \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}'' \times \mathfrak{g}'''$, where $\mathfrak{g}'' = A(2|1)^{(1)}$ with the simple roots $\{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_3 - \delta_1, \delta - \varepsilon_1 + \delta_1\}$ and $\mathfrak{g}''' = A_1^{(1)}$ with the simple roots $\{\delta_2 - \delta_3, \delta - \delta_2 + \delta_3\}$.

9.3. Proposition.

- (i) If $\mathfrak{g}''' \neq \mathfrak{g}''$ is a component of \mathfrak{g}' , then for any real root α of \mathfrak{g}''' we have $(\alpha, \alpha) < 0$ (in particular, \mathfrak{g}''' is anisotropic).
- (ii) The Kac-Moody algebra \mathfrak{g}'' is the non-twisted affinization of $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}''$, where
 - $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}'' = A(m|n_1)$ if $\dot{\mathfrak{g}} = A(m|n)$ with $m \geq n$,
 - $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}'' = G_2$ or $G(3)$ for $\dot{\mathfrak{g}} = G(3)$,
 - $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}'' = B_3$ or $F(4)$ for $\dot{\mathfrak{g}} = F(4)$, and

$\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$	$B(m n), m > n$	$B(m n), n \geq m$	$D(m n), m > n$	$D(m n), n \geq m$
$\dot{\mathfrak{g}}''$	$B(m n_1)$	$B(m_1 n)$	$D(m n_1)$	$D(m_1 n)$

where $0 \leq n_1 \leq n$, $0 \leq m_1 \leq m$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{g}'' \cong \mathfrak{g}^\#$ if λ is typical, and \mathfrak{g}'' is not anisotropic if λ is atypical.

- (iii) One has $\psi(\delta'') = q\delta$.

9.3.1. Corollary. If the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}'' is equal to h^\vee , then $\mathfrak{g}'' \cong \mathfrak{g}$ and $\Delta' = \Delta''$. If $\mathfrak{g}' \not\cong \mathfrak{g}$, then the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}'' is greater than h^\vee .

Proof. From the table for the dual Coxeter numbers in § 3.5 we see that the dual Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g}'' is greater than h^\vee if $\mathfrak{g}'' \not\cong \mathfrak{g}$. If $\mathfrak{g}'' \cong \mathfrak{g}$, then $\text{cl}(\Delta'') \cong \text{cl}(\Delta)$. But $\text{cl}(\psi(\Delta''))$ is a subset of $\dot{\Delta} = \text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ (and $\dot{\Delta}$ is finite), so $\text{cl}(\psi(\Delta'')) = \dot{\Delta}$. This implies $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}''$ (since, if $\mathfrak{g}''' \neq \mathfrak{g}''$ is a component of \mathfrak{g}' , then $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}''')$ is orthogonal to $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}'')$, so $\psi(\Delta(\mathfrak{g}''')) \subset \dot{\Delta}$ is orthogonal to $\psi(\Delta(\mathfrak{g}'')) = \dot{\Delta}$, a contradiction). \square

9.4. Proof of Proposition 9.3. The case $\mathfrak{g} = B(0|n)$ is treated in Corollary 8.1.2. Now we assume that \mathfrak{g} is not anisotropic.

Using ψ we view Δ'' as a subset of Δ .

9.4.1. Proof of (i). By construction, Δ'' contains $\psi^{-1}(\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#)$ which is isometric to $\Delta^\#$, so $\text{cl}((\Delta'')^{\text{re}})$ is a subset of $\text{cl}((\Delta)^{\text{re}}) = \dot{\Delta}$ which contains a subset isometric to $\text{cl}(\Delta^\#) = \dot{\Delta}^\#$. Since $\dot{\Delta}$ is finite, we obtain

$$(9.1) \quad \dot{\Delta}^\# \subset \text{cl}((\Delta'')^{\text{re}}) \subset \dot{\Delta}.$$

Take $\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ such that $(\alpha, \alpha) \geq 0$. We have to verify that $\alpha \in \Delta''$. Suppose the contrary. Then $(\alpha, \Delta'') = 0$. The set $\dot{\Delta}^\#$ contains a root $\dot{\gamma}$ such that $(\text{cl}(\alpha), \dot{\gamma}) \neq 0$ (one has $\mathbb{R}\dot{\Delta} = \mathbb{R}\dot{\Delta}^\# \oplus V'$, where the restriction of $(-, -)$ to V' is negative definite; if $(\text{cl}(\alpha), \dot{\Delta}^\#) = 0$, then $\text{cl}(\alpha) \in V'$, so $(\alpha, \alpha) = (\text{cl}(\alpha), \text{cl}(\alpha)) < 0$). By (9.1), Δ'' contains γ such that $\text{cl}(\gamma) = \dot{\gamma}$ and thus $(\gamma, \alpha) = 0$, a contradiction.

9.4.2. Proof of (ii) for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$, $n \geq m$. The assumption $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$ gives

$$\Delta^\# = \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}.$$

If λ is typical, then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ does not contain isotropic roots and, by (i),

$$(9.2) \quad (\Delta'')^{\text{re}} = \{\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}.$$

The assumption $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$ gives $\Delta^\# = \{\alpha \in \Delta \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}$, so

$$\{\alpha \in (\Delta'')^{\text{re}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\} = (\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#) \text{ is isometric to } (\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}.$$

If λ is atypical, then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains isotropic roots and these roots lie in Δ'' by (i). Using (9.1) and the table in Appendix A.1.1 we obtain the statement for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)$.

For $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)$ the same argument implies that \mathfrak{g}'' is of type $B(m|n_1)^{(1)}$ or $D(m+1|n_1)^{(2)}$ for some $0 < n_1 \leq n$. If $m > n$ and $\mathfrak{g}'' = D(m+1|n_1)^{(2)}$, then

$$\{\alpha \in (\Delta'')^{\text{re}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\} = D_{m=1}^{(2)}$$

is not isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}} = B_m^{(1)}$, a contradiction. This completes the proof of (ii) for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)$, $n \geq m$.

9.4.3. Proof of (iii) for $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(m|n)^{(1)}$, $n \geq m$. Recall that $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$. Since, for \mathfrak{g} in question, $\alpha/2 \notin \Delta$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^\#$ we have

$$\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#.$$

Since this set is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$, it contains α such that $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$. Since $\alpha \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$, so $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$ and

$$(\lambda + \rho, i\delta + \alpha) = i(k + h^\vee) + (\lambda + \rho, \alpha) = \frac{ip}{q} + (\lambda + \rho, \alpha).$$

Therefore $(i\delta + \alpha) \in \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho}$ if and only if i is divisible by q . Since $\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$, this gives

$$(\overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#) + i\delta = \overline{R}_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# \iff q|i$$

so $u = q$ and thus $\psi(\delta'') = q\delta$ as required.

9.4.4. For the remaining case $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$, (ii) and (iii) is proved in Lemma 9.5 below. \square

9.5. Lemma. *Let $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$ and k such that $k + h^\vee = \frac{p}{2q}$ where p, q are odd coprime positive integers. Let λ be a weight of level k such that $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$. Then $\mathfrak{g}'' \cong B(m_1|n)^{(1)}$ for some $0 \leq m_1 \leq m$, where $m = 0$ if and only if λ is typical. Moreover, $\psi(\delta'') = q\delta$.*

Proof. We will use the normalization $(\delta_1, \delta_1) = 1$. For this normalization $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) = \frac{p}{q}$ and all roots are of integral square length, so $2(\lambda + \rho, \gamma)$ is integral for all $\gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.

As in the proof of Lemma 8.3.1 we will use the following observation: $(s\delta + 2\delta_i) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ if and only if $(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + 2\delta_i)$ is odd if s is even, and $(\lambda + \rho, s\delta + 2\delta_i)$ is even if s is odd. The assumption that $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$ implies that $(s\delta + 2\delta_1) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ for some s . Since p is odd, the above observation implies $((s+q)\delta + 2\delta_1) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$. Since q is odd, one of the numbers s and $s+q$ is even and another is odd. Without loss of generality we assume that s is even. Then $(s\delta + 2\delta_1) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ implies $\beta \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ for $\beta := \frac{s}{2}\delta + \delta_1$. Moreover, $R_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains $\gamma = ((s+q)\delta + 2\delta_1)$ such that $\gamma/2 \notin R_{\lambda+\rho}$ (since $s+q$ is odd) and $\text{cl}(\gamma)/2 = \text{cl}(\beta) \in \text{cl}(R_{\lambda+\rho})$.

Set $X := \{\alpha \in R_{\lambda+\rho} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}$. Notice that $\beta, \gamma \in X$.

Since $R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#$ is isometric to $(\Delta^\#)^{\text{re}}$, $\text{cl}(X)$ contains $\dot{\Delta}^\#$. Observe that X is a real root subsystem (this means that $s_\alpha \gamma \in X$ for all $\alpha, \gamma \in X$) in the root system $\{\alpha \in \Delta \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}$ which is of type $B(0|n)^{(1)}$. By Proposition B.8, X is isometric to the set of real roots of an anisotropic affine Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{t} . By above, X contains an odd non-isotropic root β and $\text{cl}(X)$ contains $\dot{\Delta}^\#$ (of type C_n). Using the classification in [26], we conclude that \mathfrak{t} is of type $B(0|n)^{(1)}$ or $D(1|n+1)^{(2)}$. By above, X contains γ such that $\text{cl}(\gamma)/2 \in \text{cl}(X)$ and $\gamma/2 \notin X$. The root system of $D(1|n+1)^{(2)}$ does not contain a root with these properties, so \mathfrak{t} is of type $B(0|n)^{(1)}$.

One has $(\beta + j\delta) \in R_{\lambda+\rho}$ if and only if j is divisible by q . Thus $X + j\delta = X$ if and only if j is divisible by q . This gives $\psi(\delta'') = q\delta$.

If λ is typical, then $\Delta'' = X$ by (9.2), so $\mathfrak{g}'' = \mathfrak{t} = B(0|n)^{(1)}$ as required. If λ is atypical, then Δ'' is a root system which contains isotropic roots and odd non-isotropic root; moreover, $\{\alpha \in \Delta'' \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\} = X$ is of type $B(0|n)^{(1)}$. Using the table in Appendix A.1.1 we obtain that $\mathfrak{g}'' \cong B(m_1|n)^{(1)}$. Since $\text{cl}(\Delta'')$ is a root subsystem of $B(m|n)$ one has $m_1 \leq m$ as required. \square

10. BOUNDARY ADMISSIBLE LEVELS

Let \mathfrak{g} be an indecomposable non-twisted affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$. Retain notation of § 6.1.

Let k be an admissible level. Introduce k' as in Lemma 6.3 (iv). We call k *boundary admissible level* if $k' = 0$, see [36].

10.1. Lemma.

- (i) *The boundary admissible levels are*
 - *principal: $k+h^\vee = \frac{h^\vee}{q}$, where q is a positive integer, $\gcd(q, r^\vee) = \gcd(q, h^\vee) = 1$ (if h^\vee is not integral (i.e., $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $n \geq m$ and $h^\vee = n - m + \frac{1}{2}$), then $\gcd(q, h^\vee) = 1$ stands for $\gcd(2q, 2h^\vee) = 1$);*
 - *subprincipal: this happens only for $\mathfrak{g} = B(0|n)^{(1)}$; in this case $k+h^\vee = \frac{2n-1}{2q}$, where q is an even positive integer which is coprime with $2n-1$ (and $h^\vee = n + \frac{1}{2}$).*
- (ii) *If $h^\vee = 0$, then \mathfrak{g} does not admit boundary admissible levels.*

Proof. Let us verify that boundary subprincipal admissible levels exist only for $\mathfrak{g} = B(0|n)^{(1)}$. Let k be a boundary subprincipal admissible level. By § 8.5, \mathfrak{g} is either a non-twisted affine Lie algebra or $B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m > n$, or $m = n = 1$, or $m = 0$.

Since k is boundary admissible, $k' = 0$. If $\mathfrak{g} = B(m|n)^{(1)}$ with $m > n$ or $m = n = 1$, this is impossible by § 8.5. If \mathfrak{g} is a non-twisted affine Lie algebra, then q is divisible by $r^\vee > 1$ (since k is subprincipal) and $k' = 0$ means that p is equal to the Coxeter number of \mathfrak{g} . By the table in § 1.11.1, p is divisible by $r^\vee > 1$, so p and q are not coprime, a contradiction. Hence $\mathfrak{g} = B(0|n)^{(1)}$. By § 8.5, if k is subprincipal and $k' = 0$, then $k+h^\vee = \frac{2n-1}{2q}$ and $(2n-1)q$ is even, so q is even. This establishes (i).

For (ii) assume that $h^\vee = 0$. Then $\mathfrak{g} \neq B(0|n)^{(1)}$, so by (i), if k is boundary admissible, then $k = 0$, which means that k is a critical level. By definition, critical level is not admissible. \square

10.2. Proposition. *Let k be a boundary admissible level.*

- (i) *If $L(\lambda)$ is a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module, then $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to $\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho}$, $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} + q\delta = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$, and $\dim L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda') = 1$ (see § 4.3 for notation).*

- (ii) *The number of isomorphism classes of irreducible $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules in \mathcal{O} is finite and any $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module $N \in \mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$ is completely reducible.*

Proof. Retain notation of § 4.5.1.

For (i) let $L(\lambda)$ be a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module.

We start from the case when k is boundary principal admissible. Combining Theorems 7.3.2 and 5.5.3 we conclude that $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ is π' -integrable for

$$\pi' := \{\alpha' \in \Sigma'_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha') > 0\}$$

and

$$R_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho} \cap \Delta^\# \text{ is isometric to } (\Delta_{k\Lambda_0+\rho} \cap \Delta^\#).$$

Retain notation of Section 9. Notice that $\pi' \subset \Delta''$. Therefore $L_{\mathfrak{g}''}(\lambda')$ is π' -integrable. By Proposition 9.3 the minimal imaginary root of Δ'' is $\delta'' = \psi^{-1}(q\delta)$. Therefore

$$(\lambda' + \rho', \delta'') = (\lambda + \rho, q\delta) = h^\vee.$$

Then $(\lambda', \delta'') = h^\vee - h^{\vee, ''}$ where $h^{\vee, ''}$ is the dual Coxeter number of Δ'' . Since $L_{\mathfrak{g}''}(\lambda')$ is π' -integrable, $h^\vee - h^{\vee, ''} \geq 0$. In the light of Corollary 9.3.1 we obtain $h^\vee = h^{\vee, ''}$ and $\Delta' = \Delta''$ is isometric to Δ . Therefore $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ is π' -integrable module of level zero. By Lemma 10.3 below, $\dim L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda') = 1$. Finally, the formula $\psi(\delta'') = q\delta$ implies $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} + q\delta = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$.

Now consider the case when k is a boundary subprincipal admissible level. In this case $\mathfrak{g} = B(0|n)^{(1)}$ and $k + n + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{2n-1}{2q}$ where q is even. Using Corollary 8.1.2 (ii) we obtain the following. If $\mathfrak{g}' \cong C_1^{(1)}$, then $n = 1$ and λ' has the central level -1 , if $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A_{2n-1}^{(2)}$ for $n > 1$, then λ' has the central level $\frac{2n-1}{2} - n = -\frac{1}{2}$, and, if $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|2n-1)^{(2)}$ for $n > 1$, then λ' has the central level 0 . The first two cases are impossible since $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ is integrable, so the central level should be positive. Therefore $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|2n-1)^{(2)}$ and λ' has the zero central level. Since $L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda')$ is integrable, $\dim L_{\mathfrak{g}'}(\lambda') = 1$, by Lemma 10.3 below. Since $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|2n-1)^{(2)}$ is indecomposable, $\mathfrak{g}'' = \mathfrak{g}'$ and $\psi(\delta'') = q\delta$ by (8.2). This implies $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} + q\delta = \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ and completes the proof of (i).

For (ii) let $L(\lambda), L(\nu)$ be $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules. Assume that $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\nu+\rho}$. By (i) we have

$$(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) = (\lambda' + \rho', \psi^{-1}(\alpha)) = (\rho', \psi^{-1}(\alpha'))$$

for all $\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. Similarly, $(\nu + \rho, \alpha) = (\rho', \psi^{-1}(\alpha'))$, so $(\lambda - \nu, \alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$. Since $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ is isometric to Δ^{re} , the span of $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho}$ contains Δ . Hence $(\lambda - \nu) \in \mathbb{C}\delta$, so $L(\lambda)$ and $L(\nu)$ are isomorphic as $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules.

Thus the number of isomorphism classes of irreducible $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules in \mathcal{O} is not greater than the number of the subsets $X \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ satisfying $X + q\delta = X$. Each subset of this form corresponds to a subset of the set $\Delta^{\text{re}}/\mathbb{Z}q\delta$ which is finite. Hence the number of isomorphism classes of irreducible $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -modules in \mathcal{O} is finite.

Now let N be an indecomposable $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module in the category $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})^k$. Set

$$Y := \{\lambda \mid [N : L(\lambda)] \neq 0\}.$$

Take $\lambda, \nu \in Y$. By Corollary 4.6.5 we have $\Delta_{\lambda+\rho} = \Delta_{\nu+\rho}$. By above, this gives $(\lambda - \nu) \in \mathbb{C}\delta$. Using the action of the Casimir operator we obtain $(\lambda + \rho, \lambda + \rho) = (\nu + \rho, \nu + \rho)$ which forces $\lambda = \nu$ (since $(\lambda + \rho, \delta) \neq 0$). Hence $Y = \{\lambda\}$. Since $N \in \mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$, \mathfrak{h} acts diagonally, so $N = L(\lambda)$. Now let N be a $V_k(\mathfrak{g})$ -module in the category $\mathcal{O}^{\text{inf}}(\mathfrak{g})^k$. A non-zero vector $v \in N$ generates a submodule which lie in $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})^k$; by above, this submodule is completely reducible. Hence N is a sum of irreducible modules, so, by [41], Chapter XVII, N is completely reducible. This completes the proof for the case when k is a boundary principal admissible level. \square

10.3. Lemma. *Let \mathfrak{g} be an affine Kac-Moody superalgebra and let $L(\lambda)$ be a $\pi^\#$ -integrable module with $(\lambda, \delta) = 0$. Then $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}\delta$ and $\dim L(\lambda) = 1$.*

Proof. We will check that $(\lambda, \alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Sigma$. If \mathfrak{g} is anisotropic, the assertion immediately follows from the fact that δ is a positive linear combination of simple roots.

For the case when \mathfrak{g} is not anisotropic, take Σ as in Appendix A.2. Since the assertion holds for $\mathfrak{g}^\#$ we have $(\lambda, \alpha) = 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta_{\bar{0}}$ such that $(\alpha, \alpha) > 0$. Take $\alpha \in \Sigma$. If $(\alpha, \alpha) > 0$, then $(\lambda, \alpha) = 0$ by above. Assume that $(\alpha, \alpha) \leq 0$. By § A.1.5 there exists $\beta \in \Sigma$ such that

$$(10.1) \quad (\beta, \beta) = 0 < (\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta).$$

Note that $\alpha + \beta$ lies in $r_\beta \Sigma$. Therefore $(\lambda, \alpha + \beta) = 0$ and $(\lambda_1, \alpha + \beta) = 0$ where λ_1 is the highest weight of $L(\lambda)$ with respect to $r_\beta \Sigma$. Thus $(\lambda - \lambda_1, \alpha + \beta) = 0$. If $(\lambda, \beta) \neq 0$, then $\lambda - \lambda_1 = \beta$, so $(\beta, \alpha + \beta) = 0$ which contradicts to (10.1) (since $(\alpha, \alpha) \leq 0$). Thus $(\lambda, \beta) = 0$, so $(\lambda, \alpha) = 0$ as required. \square

10.4. Character formula. If k is a boundary level, then $\text{ch } L(k\Lambda_0)$ is given by a formula similar to formula (7) in [35], see below.

10.4.1. Let k be a boundary admissible level. We retain notation of § 6.2, 4.7. Using [14], Theorem 11.3.1 for Σ chosen in Appendix A.2 we can write the character formula for $L(k\Lambda_0)$ in the following way:

$$e^{-k\Lambda_0} D \text{ch } L(k\Lambda_0) = \psi(D'),$$

where D is the Weyl denominator for $\Delta^+(\Sigma)$ (see § 2.11.1), D' is the Weyl denominator for $\Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}')$, and $\psi : \mathbb{Z}\Delta(\mathfrak{g}') \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Delta$ is as in § 4.2.2, so that

$$\psi(D') = \frac{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_0^{+'}} (1 - e^{-\psi(\alpha)})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\psi(\alpha)}}}{\prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_1^{+'}} (1 + e^{-\psi(\alpha)})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_{\psi(\alpha)}}}.$$

Set $z := e^{-\delta}$. Then

$$D = \dot{D} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} ((1 - z^i)^s \prod_{\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{0}}} (1 - z^i e^{\alpha}) \prod_{\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{1}}} (1 + z^i e^{\alpha})^{-1}),$$

where \dot{D} is the Weyl denominator for $\dot{\Delta}$ and $s := \dim \mathfrak{g}_{\delta}$ (i.e., $s = \dim \mathfrak{h}$ for $\mathfrak{g} \neq A(n|n)^{(1)}$ and $s = 2n$ for $\mathfrak{g} = A(n|n)^{(1)}$).

10.4.2. If k is a principal boundary admissible level, i.e. $k + h^{\vee} = \frac{h^{\vee}}{q}$ with $\gcd(q, r^{\vee}) = \gcd(q, h^{\vee}) = 1$, then

$$\psi(D') = \dot{D} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} ((1 - z^i)^s \prod_{\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{0}}} (1 - z^{qi} e^{\alpha}) \prod_{\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{1}}} (1 + z^{qi} e^{\alpha})^{-1}),$$

which gives

$$e^{-k\Lambda_0} \text{ch } L(k\Lambda_0) = \prod_{m=1, q \nmid m}^{\infty} ((1 - z^m)^s \prod_{\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{0}}} (1 - z^{qm} e^{\alpha}) \prod_{\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_{\bar{1}}} (1 + z^{qm} e^{\alpha})^{-1}).$$

10.4.3. If k is a subprincipal boundary admissible level, i.e. $\mathfrak{g} = B(0|n)^{(1)}$ and $k + n + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{2n-1}{2q}$, where q is even and $\gcd(q, 2n-1) = 1$, then

$$D = \dot{D} \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} ((1 - z^m)^n \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (1 - z^m e^{\pm \delta_i \pm \delta_j}) (1 - z^m e^{\pm 2\delta_i}) (1 + z^m e^{\pm \delta_i})^{-1}).$$

By § 8.1 we have $\mathfrak{g}' \cong A(0|2n-1)^{(2)}$ with $\psi(\delta') = q\delta$. This gives

$$\psi(D') = \dot{D} \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} ((1 - z^{mq})^n \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (1 - z^{qm} e^{\pm \delta_i \pm \delta_j}) (1 - z^{2qm} e^{\pm 2\delta_i}) (1 + z^{qm} e^{\pm \delta_i})^{-1}).$$

Hence

$$e^{-k\Lambda_0} \text{ch } L(k\Lambda_0) = \prod_{m=1, q \nmid m}^{\infty} ((1 - z^m)^n \prod_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (1 - z^m e^{\pm \delta_i \pm \delta_j}) (1 + z^{qm} e^{\pm \delta_i})^{-1}) \prod_{m=1, 2q \nmid m}^{\infty} (1 - z^m e^{\pm 2\delta_i}).$$

APPENDIX A. ROOT SYSTEMS

In this section $\dot{\Delta}$ or Δ is the set of roots of an indecomposable symmetrizable finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra which is not a Lie algebra and is not $D(2|1, a)$ or $D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$. Our goal is to prove Proposition A.3, which was used in the proof of Proposition 6.5. Proposition A.3 also allows to simplify proofs of some character

formulas in [14]. By abuse of notation, we use the same notation for the set of real roots of finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g} and the superalgebra itself.

A.1. For finite root systems we will use the standard notation of [25], taking into account that $D(1|n) = C(n+1)$, and for the affine root systems we use the notation of [47]. Note that $C(n+1)^{(2)} = D(1|n)^{(2)}$ is anisotropic. Thus $\dot{\Delta}$ and Δ are from the following list of root systems

$$\begin{aligned} & A(m|n) \ (m \geq n \geq 0), \ B(m|n) \ (m \geq 0, n \geq 1), \ D(m|n) \ (m, n \geq 1, (m, n) \neq (2, 1)), \\ & A(m|n)^{(1)}, \ B(m|n)^{(1)}, \ D(m|n)^{(1)}, \\ & G(3), F(4), G(3)^{(1)}, F(4)^{(1)}, \\ & A(2m|2n-1)^{(2)}, \ D(m+1|n)^{(2)} \ (m \geq 0, n \geq 1), \\ & A(2m|2n)^{(4)} \ (m \geq n \geq 1), \ A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)} \ (m \geq n \geq 1, (m, n) \neq (1, 1)). \end{aligned}$$

In the second line the restrictions on m, n are the same as in the first line.

A.1.1. If Δ is affine, then we denote by δ the minimal imaginary root and by $\dot{\Delta}$ the subset of Δ where δ appears with zero coefficient, and let $\text{cl} : \mathbb{Q}\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}\Delta/\mathbb{Q}\delta$ be the canonical map. We have

Δ	$A(2m 2n-1)^{(2)}$	$A(2m-1 2n-1)^{(2)}$	$A(2m 2n)^{(4)}$	$D(m+1 n)^{(2)}$
$\dot{\Delta}$	$B(m n)$	$D(m n)$	$B(m n)$	$B(m n)$
$\text{cl}(\Delta)$	$BC(m n) \cup \{0\}$	$C(m n) \cup \{0\}$	$BC(m n) \cup \{0\}$	$B(m n) \cup \{0\}$

where $BC(m|n) := B(m|n) \cup \{\pm 2\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $C(m|n) := D(m|n) \cup \{\pm 2\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^m$ are the "weak generalized root systems" introduced in [45].

A.1.2. As before, we denote by Λ_0 the weight satisfying $(\Lambda_0, \delta) = 1$, $(\Lambda_0, \dot{\Delta}) = (\Lambda_0, \Lambda_0) = 0$. We will use notation ρ and $\Delta^\#$ introduced in §§ 2.9 and 6.1.

As before, we normalise the bilinear form $(-, -)$ in such a way that $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2$ for a longest root $\alpha \in \Delta^\#$. For the cases $A(n|n)$ and $A(n|n)^{(r)}$ the above conditions determine the bilinear form up to a sign (the root system admits an automorphism which multiplies the bilinear form on -1); we take $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) = 1$ for $A(n|n)^{(1)}$ and $(\delta_1, \delta_1) = 1/2$ for $A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$, $A(2n|2n)^{(4)}$.

A.1.3. *Compatibility of $(-, -)$.* If the bilinear forms on Δ and on $\dot{\Delta}$ are normalised as above, then the restriction of $(-, -)$ from Δ to $\dot{\Delta}$ coincides with the bilinear form on $\dot{\Delta}$ except for the pair $\Delta = A(2n|2n-1)^{(2)}$, $\dot{\Delta} = B(n|n)$, considered in A.2.6 below.

A.1.4. For finite root systems we obtain

$\dot{\Delta}$	$A(m n), m \geq n$	$B(m n), D(m n), m > n$	$B(m n), D(m n), m \leq n$
$\dot{\Delta}^\#$	A_m	B_m, D_m	C_n

and $\Delta^\# = G_2, B_3$ for $G(3), F(4)$ respectively.

For $\Delta = \dot{\Delta}^{(1)}$ we have $\Delta^\# = (\dot{\Delta}^\#)^{(1)}$, for example, $\Delta^\#$ is $B_3^{(1)}$ for $B(3|1)^{(1)}$. In the remaining (i.e., twisted) cases we have

Δ	$A(m n)^{(2)}, A(m n)^{(4)}$	$D(m+1 n)^{(2)}, m > n$	$D(m+1 n)^{(2)}, m \leq n$
$\Delta^\#$	$A_{\max(m,n)}^{(2)}$	$D_{m+1}^{(2)}$	$C_n^{(1)}$

In the cases $A(m|n)^{(4)}$ and $D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$ the minimal imaginary root in $\Delta^\#$ is 2δ (note that $\Delta^\#$ is "less twisted": the order of the automorphism for Δ is twice the order of the automorphism for $\Delta^\#$). In all other cases δ is the minimal imaginary root in $\Delta^\#$.

Notice that the assumption $\Delta \neq D(2|1, a), D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$ ensures that $\Delta^\#$ is indecomposable.

A.1.5. Nice pairs (Σ, S) . Consider the pairs (Σ, S) , where Σ is a base of simple roots and S is a subset of $\Sigma \cap \dot{\Delta}$ satisfying $(S, S) = 0$ and the following properties:

- (a) $\dot{\Sigma} := \Sigma \cap \dot{\Delta}$ is a base for $\dot{\Delta}$;
- (b) for all $\alpha \in \Sigma \setminus S$ one has $(\alpha, \alpha) > 0$ or $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta) > 0$ for some $\beta \in S$;
- (c) $(\alpha, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Sigma$.

They appear in many papers (including [9], where the pair for $B(n+1|n)^{(1)}$ was missed).

Note that (c) implies that for the Weyl vector ρ we have $(\rho, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Sigma$, so

$$(c) \implies (\rho, \mu) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma.$$

If there is no Σ satisfying (c) it is useful to have the property

- (d) ρ can be written as $\rho = h^\vee \Lambda_0 + \sum_{\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_0^+} k_\alpha \alpha$ with $k_\alpha(\alpha, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Q}_{\leq 0}$.


Definition. The pair (Σ, S) satisfying properties (a), (b), and (c) or (d) is called a *nice pair*. The pair $(\dot{\Sigma}, \dot{S})$ is called a *nice pair* if it satisfies properties similar to (b) and (c), where Σ is replaced by $\dot{\Sigma}$.

In § A.2 below we will give examples of nice pairs for all affine root systems except for $D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$ and $A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$:

- we give examples of pairs (Σ, S) satisfying (a), (b), (c) for all cases apart from $D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$, $A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$, $D(n+1|n)^{(2)}$, and $A(2n|2n)^{(4)}$;

- for $D(n+1|n)^{(2)}$ and $A(2n|2n)^{(4)}$ we give examples of pairs (Σ, S) satisfying (a), (b) and (d).

For $\Delta = D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$, $A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ we give examples of (Σ, S) satisfying (a) and (c). In both cases the Dynkin diagram takes the form



where the number of nodes is even for $D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$ and is odd for $A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$. In both cases for any $\alpha \in \Sigma$ there exists $\beta \in \Sigma$ such that $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta) = 2(\alpha, \beta) > 0$.

Note that, if (c) holds, then (b) follows from the following property: for any isotropic $\beta' \in \Sigma \setminus S$ there exists $\beta \in S$ such that $(\beta, \beta') > 0$.

A.2. List of nice pairs (Σ, S) . For affine root systems with $\dot{\Delta} \neq B(n|n)$ we take the pair (Σ, S) of the form $\Sigma = \dot{\Sigma} \cup \{\alpha_0\}$ (we list α_0 for all cases) and $S = \dot{S}$ (where $(\dot{\Sigma}, \dot{S})$ is a nice pair for $\dot{\Delta}$).

In the non-exceptional cases ε_i for $i = 1, \dots, m$, and δ_j for $j = 1, \dots, n$ are pairwise orthogonal and $\varepsilon_i - \delta_j$ are isotropic roots, so $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = -(\delta_j, \delta_j)$.

A.2.1. $\dot{\Delta} = A(m-1|n-1)$ for $m \geq n$. In this case $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = 1$ for all i . We take

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Sigma}_{A(n-1|n-1)} &:= \{\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \delta_{n-1} - \varepsilon_n\}, \\ \dot{\Sigma}_{A(m-1|n-1)} &:= \dot{\Sigma}_{A(n-1|n-1)} \cup \{\delta_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{m-1} - \varepsilon_m\}, \quad \text{for } m > n, \end{aligned}$$

and $S := \{\varepsilon_i - \delta_i\}_{i=1}^n$. For $A(m-1|n-1)^{(1)}$ we have $\alpha_0 = \delta - \varepsilon_1 + \delta_n$ if $m = n$ and $\alpha_0 = \delta - \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_m$ if $m > n$, with the same S . Properties (a), (b) and (c) hold.

A.2.2. $\dot{\Delta} = B(m|n)$ for $m \geq n+2$, $\dot{\Delta} = D(m|n)$, $m \geq n+3$. In this case $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = 1$ for all i . We take

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Sigma}_{B(m|n)} &:= \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3, \dots, \varepsilon_{m-n-1} - \varepsilon_{m-n}, \varepsilon_m\} \cup \\ &\quad \{\beta_1 := \varepsilon_{m-n} - \delta_1, \beta_2 := \delta_1 - \varepsilon_{m-n+1}, \dots, \beta_{2n} := \delta_n - \varepsilon_m\}, \\ \dot{\Sigma}_{D(m|n)} &:= \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3, \dots, \varepsilon_{m-n-2} - \varepsilon_{m-n-1}\} \cup \\ &\quad \{\beta_1 := \varepsilon_{m-n-1} - \delta_1, \beta_2 := \delta_1 - \varepsilon_{m-n}, \dots, \beta_{2n} := \delta_n - \varepsilon_{m-1}, \varepsilon_{m-1} + \varepsilon_m\} \end{aligned}$$

and $S := \{\beta_{2i-1}\}_{i=1}^n$. For the corresponding affine root systems α_0 is given by the following table

Δ	α_0
$B(m n)^{(1)}$ $m > n+1$, $D(m n)^{(1)}$ $m > n+1$	$\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$
$A(2m 2n-1)^{(2)}$ $m > n$, $A(2m-1 2n-1)^{(2)}$ $m > n+1$	$\delta - 2\varepsilon_1$
$A(2m 2n)^{(4)}$ $m > n$, $D(m+1 n)^{(2)}$ $m > n$	$\delta - \varepsilon_1$

Note that δ is odd for $A(2m|2n)^{(4)}$ and even in other cases.

Properties (a) and (c) obviously hold. The simple isotropic roots are $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{2n}$ with $\beta_i \in S$ and $(\beta_i, \beta_{i+1}) > 0$ if i is odd. Thus property (b) holds.

A.2.3. $\dot{\Delta} = B(m|n), D(m|n)$ for $m < n$. In this case $(\delta_j, \delta_j) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all j . We take

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Sigma}_{B(m|m+1)}, \dot{\Sigma}_{D(m|m+1)} &:= \{\beta_1 := \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \beta_2 := \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \dots, \beta_{2m} := \varepsilon_m - \delta_{m+1}; a\delta_{m+1}\} \\ \dot{\Sigma}_{B(m|n)}, \dot{\Sigma}_{D(m|n)} &:= \{\delta_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 - \delta_3, \dots, \delta_{n-m-1} - \delta_{n-m}, a\delta_n\} \cup \\ &\quad \{\beta_1 := \delta_{n-m} - \varepsilon_1, \beta_2 := \varepsilon_1 - \delta_{n-m+1}, \dots, \beta_{2m} := \varepsilon_m - \delta_n\}, \\ S &:= \{\beta_{2i}\}_{i=1}^m. \end{aligned}$$

for $m < n - 1$, where $a = 1$ for $B(m|n)$ and $a = 2$ for $D(m|n)$. For the corresponding affine root systems α_0 is given by the following table

Δ	α_0
$B(m n)^{(1)}, D(m n)^{(1)}$	$\delta - 2\delta_1$
$D(m+1 n)^{(2)}$	$\delta - \delta_1$
$A(2m 2n-1)^{(2)}, m \neq n-1$	$\delta - \delta_1 - \delta_2$
$A(2m 2m+1)^{(2)}$	$\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$

(where $m < n$ in all cases).

Properties (a) and (c) obviously hold. The simple isotropic roots are $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{2m}$, and $\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ for $A(2n-2|2n-1)^{(2)}$. Since $\beta_i \in S$, $(\beta_i, \beta_{i-1}) > 0$ if i is even, and $(\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \beta_2) > 0$, property (b) holds.

For example, for $(m, n) = (1, 2)$ we obtain the following sets of simple roots

$$\begin{aligned} D(1|2)^{(1)} &\quad \{\delta - 2\delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, 2\delta_2\} \\ B(1|2)^{(1)} &\quad \{\delta - 2\delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2\} \\ A(2|3)^{(2)} &\quad \{\delta - \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2\} \\ D(2|2)^{(2)} &\quad \{\delta - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2\} \end{aligned}$$

with $S = \{\varepsilon_1 - \delta_2\}$.

A.2.4. $\dot{\Delta} = B(n+1|n), D(n+2|n)$. In this case $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = 1$ for all i . We set

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 &:= \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \beta_2 := \delta_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \beta_{2n} := \delta_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}, \\ \dot{\Sigma}_{B(n+1|n)} &:= \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^{2n} \cup \{\varepsilon_{n+1}\}, \quad \dot{\Sigma}_{D(n+2|n)} := \{\beta_i\}_{i=1}^{2n} \cup \{\varepsilon_{n+1} \pm \varepsilon_{n+2}\} \\ S &:= \{\beta_{2i}\}_{i=1}^n. \end{aligned}$$

For the corresponding affine root systems α_0 is given by the following table

Δ	α_0
$B(n+1 n)^{(1)}, D(n+2 n)^{(1)}$	$\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$
$A(2n+2 2n-1)^{(2)}, A(2n+3 2n-1)^{(2)}$	$\delta - 2\varepsilon_1$
$A(2n+2 2n)^{(4)}, D(n+2 n)^{(2)}$	$\delta - \varepsilon_1$

Note that δ is odd for $A(2n+2|2n)^{(4)}$ and even in other cases.

Properties (a) and (c) obviously hold. The simple isotropic roots are $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{2m}$, and $\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ for $B(n+1|n)^{(1)}$, $D(n+2|n)^{(2)}$. Since $\beta_i \in S$, $(\beta_i, \beta_{i+1}) > 0$ if i is even, and $(\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \beta_2) > 0$ property (b) holds.

A.2.5. $\dot{\Delta} = D(n+1|n)$. In this case $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = 1$ for all i . We take

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{D(n+1|n)} = \{\beta_1 := \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \beta_2 := \delta_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \beta_{2n} := \delta_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}, \beta_{2n+1} := \delta_n + \varepsilon_{n+1},\}$$

and $S := \{\beta_{2i-1}\}_{i=1}^n$. One has $\alpha_0 = \delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ for $D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$ and $\alpha_0 = \delta - 2\varepsilon_1$ for $A(2n+1|2n-1)^{(2)}$. Properties (a) and (c) hold in both cases, and (b) holds for $A(2n+1|2n-1)^{(2)}$, so the pair (Σ, S) is nice in this case (and is not nice for $D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$).

A.2.6. $\dot{\Delta} = B(n|n)$, $\Delta \neq A(2n|2n-1)^{(2)}$. In this case $(\delta_j, \delta_j) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all j . We take

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{B(n|n)} = \{\beta_1 := \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \beta_2 := \delta_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \beta_{2n-1} := \varepsilon_n - \delta_n, \delta_n\}$$

and $S := \{\beta_{2i-1}\}_{i=1}^n$. Then $\alpha_0 = \delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ for $B(n|n)^{(1)}$ and $\alpha_0 = \delta - \varepsilon_1$ for $A(2n|2n)^{(4)}$, $D(n+1|n)^{(2)}$. Properties (a), (b) hold, since $\beta_i \in S$ and $\beta_i + \beta_{i-1}$ if i is odd, and $(\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \beta_1) > 0$. Property (c) holds for $B(n|n)$ and $B(n|n)^{(1)}$.

Note that in all affine cases we have $\rho = h^\vee \Lambda_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\beta \in S} \beta$ with $h^\vee = \frac{1}{2}$ for $B(n|n)^{(1)}$, and $h^\vee = 0$ for $D(n+1|n)^{(2)}$ and $A(2n|2n)^{(4)}$. If (c) does not hold, then $h^\vee = 0$, so $\rho = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (\varepsilon_i - \delta_i)$. Since $\varepsilon_i, \delta_i \in \dot{\Delta}^+$ and $(\delta_i, \delta_i) = -(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) > 0$, property (d) holds.

A.2.7. $\Delta = A(2n|2n-1)^{(2)}$. In this case $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all j . We take

$$\dot{\Sigma} := \{\delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n - \varepsilon_n, \varepsilon_n\}, \quad \alpha_0 = \delta - \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \quad S = \{\delta_i - \varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n.$$

Properties (a), (b) and (c) hold. Note that $\rho = h^\vee \Lambda_0 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\beta \in S} \beta$ with $h^\vee = 1$.

A.2.8. $\dot{\Delta} = D(n|n)$. In this case $(\delta_j, \delta_j) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all j . We take

$$\dot{\Sigma}_{D(n|n)} = \{\delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \dots, \delta_n - \varepsilon_n, \delta_n + \varepsilon_n\}$$

and $S = \{\delta_i - \varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

For $D(n|n)^{(1)}$ we have $\alpha_0 = \delta - 2\delta_1$ and the properties (a)–(c) are satisfied, so (Σ, S) is a nice pair. For $A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ one has $\alpha_0 = \delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ and (b) does not hold (property (c) holds), so the pair (Σ, S) is not nice. For example, for $m = n = 2$ we have $S = \{\varepsilon_i - \delta_i\}_{i=1}^2$ and

$$\begin{array}{ll} D(2|2)^{(1)} & \{\delta - 2\delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 \pm \varepsilon_2\} \\ A(3|3)^{(2)} & \{\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \delta_2 \pm \varepsilon_2\} \end{array}$$

For $D(2|2)^{(1)}$ the simple roots with non-positive square length are $\beta_i := \delta_i - \varepsilon_i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\beta'_1 = \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2$, $\beta'_2 = \delta_2 + \varepsilon_2$. Since $\beta_i \in S$ and $\beta_i + \beta'_i$ is of positive square length, property (b) holds.

A.2.9. Exceptional cases. We take

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\Sigma}_{G(3)} &:= \{\varepsilon_3, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_3, -\delta_1 + \varepsilon_2\}, \\ \dot{\Sigma}_{F(4)} &:= \{\varepsilon_3, \tfrac{1}{2}(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3 - \delta_1), \tfrac{1}{2}(-\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3 - \delta_1), \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2\},\end{aligned}$$

and $\alpha_0 = \delta + \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$ for $G(3)^{(1)}$, and $\alpha_0 = \delta - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$ for $F(4)^{(1)}$. In these cases Σ contains exactly two isotropic roots β_1, β_2 and $(\beta_1, \beta_2) > 0$; all other roots are of positive square length. Hence the pair (Σ, S) for $S = \{\beta_1\}$ satisfies properties (a)–(c), so it is nice.

A.3. Proposition. *Let Δ be such that $\dot{\Sigma}$ and Σ are as in A.2. Let ρ be the Weyl vector for Σ . Assume that $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$ are such that*

1. $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) \neq 0$;
2. $\langle k\Lambda_0 - \nu, \alpha^\vee \rangle \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_0^+$ and for all $\alpha \in \Delta^+$ such that $(\alpha, \alpha) > 0$;
3. $2(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \nu) = (\nu, \nu)$.

Then $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\dot{\Sigma}$, and, moreover, $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}S$ if $\mathfrak{g} \neq A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}, D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$.

The proof occupies §§ A.3.1–A.3.4 below.

A.3.1. Assume that μ, ξ are such that

$$(A.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu &= \mu + \xi, \quad \mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\Delta^{\#+}, \quad \xi \in \mathbb{Z}\dot{\Sigma}, \quad (\xi, \rho) = 0, \quad (\xi, \xi) \leq 0, \\ \xi &\in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}S \quad \text{if } \mathfrak{g} \neq A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}, D(n+1|n)^{(1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 3. on k gives $2(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \mu) = (\mu + \xi, \mu + \xi)$, so

$$2(k\Lambda_0 + \rho - \nu, \mu) = (\mu + \xi, \mu + \xi) - 2(\mu + \xi, \mu) = (\xi, \xi) - (\mu, \mu).$$

Since $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}\Delta^{\#+}$, the second assumption implies $(k\Lambda_0 - \nu, \mu) \geq 0$, so

$$(A.2) \quad (\mu, \mu) + 2(\rho, \mu) \leq (\xi, \xi) \leq 0.$$

Recall that (Σ, S) satisfies (c) or (d). If (c) holds, then $(\rho, \mu) \geq 0$. The second assumption gives $(\alpha, \alpha)(\nu, \alpha) \leq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \dot{\Delta}_0^+$, so (d) forces $(\nu, \rho) \geq 0$ which again gives $(\mu, \rho) \geq 0$.

Since $(\rho, \mu) \geq 0$, the inequality (A.2) gives $(\mu, \mu) \leq 0$. Since $\Delta^\#$ is the root system of affine algebra, this forces $\mu = s\delta$ for $s \geq 0$. Then $2(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \mu) = (\mu + \xi, \mu + \xi)$ implies $s(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) \leq 0$. Since $k \geq 0$ and $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta) \neq 0$, this forces $s = 0$. Therefore $\mu = 0$ and $\nu = \xi \in \mathbb{Z}\dot{\Sigma}$ as required.

It remains to verify the existence μ, ξ satisfying (A.1). We do this in §§ A.3.2–A.3.4.

A.3.2. Consider the case $\Delta \neq A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}, D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$. Then (Σ, S) satisfies properties (a), (b). We claim that (b) implies the existence of a linear map $p_\# : \mathbb{Z}\Delta \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}\Delta^\#$ with the properties

- $\text{Ker } p_\# = \mathbb{Z}S$;

- $p_{\#}(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Delta^+) \subset \mathbb{Q}_{\geq}\Delta^{\#+}$.

We construct $p_{\#}$ as follows: for $\alpha \in S$ we set $p_{\#}(\alpha) := 0$; for $\alpha \in \Sigma$ such that $(\alpha, \alpha) > 0$ we take $p_{\#}(\alpha) := \alpha$. In the remaining case $\alpha \in \Sigma \setminus S$ such that $(\alpha, \alpha) \leq 0$, there exists $\beta \in S$ such that $(\alpha + \beta, \alpha + \beta) > 0$. In particular, $(\alpha, \beta) \neq 0$, so $\alpha + \beta$ or $\alpha - \beta$ lies in Δ . Since $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma$ we obtain $\alpha + \beta \in \Delta^+$. Set $p_{\#}(\alpha) := \alpha + \beta$. If α is odd, then $p_{\#}(\alpha) \in \Delta^{\#+}$; if α is even, then $2p_{\#}(\alpha) \in \Delta^{\#+}$. Extending this map by linearity we obtain $p_{\#}$ satisfying the above properties.

Now set $\mu := p_{\#}(\nu)$ and $\xi := \nu - \mu$. The properties of $p_{\#}$ give $\mu \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq}\Delta^{\#+}$ and $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}S$. Property (b) gives $\xi \in \mathbb{Z}\Delta$ and $(\xi, \rho) = (\xi, \xi) = 0$. Therefore (μ, ξ) satisfies (A.1) as required.

A.3.3. Consider the case $D(n+1|n)^{(1)}$. We choose

$$\Sigma = \{\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n - \delta_n, \delta_n \pm \varepsilon_{n+1}\}.$$

We draw the diagram for Σ marking the edge between β_i and β_j by (β_i, β_j) .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & \beta_0 & & & & & \beta_{2n+1} \\ & \swarrow \scriptstyle 1 & & & & \swarrow \scriptstyle 1 & \\ -2 \Big| & & & & & & \Big| -2 \\ \beta_1 & \xrightarrow{\scriptstyle 1} & \beta_2 & \xrightarrow{\scriptstyle -1} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\scriptstyle -1} & \beta_{2n-1} & \xrightarrow{\scriptstyle 1} & \beta_{2n} \end{array}$$

Since all β_i are isotropic, we have $\rho = 0$. Moreover, $(\beta_i + \beta_j) \in \Delta^{\#+}$ if $(\beta_i, \beta_j) > 0$, so $\Delta^{\#+}$ contains $\beta_0 + \beta_2$, $\beta_{2n-1} + \beta_{2n+1}$ and $\beta_{2i-1} + \beta_{2i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We have $\nu = \sum_{i=0}^{2n+1} k_i \beta_i$ where $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all i . If $k_{2n} > k_{2n-1}$ we take

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &:= k_0(\beta_0 + \beta_2) + \sum_{i=1}^n k_{2i-1}(\beta_{2i-1} + \beta_{2i}) \\ \xi &:= (k_2 - k_1 - k_0)\beta_2 + \sum_{i=2}^n (k_{2i} - k_{2i-1})\beta_{2i} + k_{2n+1}\beta_{2n+1} \end{aligned}$$

Then $\nu = \mu + \xi$ and $(\xi, \xi) = -4(k_{2n} - k_{2n-1})k_{2n+1} \leq 0$; the pair (μ, ξ) satisfies (A.1).

If $k_{2n} \leq k_{2n-1}$ we take

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &:= k_0(\beta_0 + \beta_2) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} k_{2i-1}(\beta_{2i-1} + \beta_{2i}) + k_{2n}(\beta_{2n-1} + \beta_{2n}) \\ &\quad + (k_{2n-1} - k_{2n})(\beta_{2n-1} + \beta_{2n+1}) \\ \xi &:= (k_2 - k_1 - k_0)\beta_2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} (k_{2i} - k_{2i-1})\beta_{2i} + (k_{2n+1} + k_{2n} - k_{2n-1})\beta_{2n+1} \end{aligned}$$

We have $\nu = \mu + \xi$ and $(\xi, \xi) = 0$; the pair (μ, ξ) satisfies (A.1).

A.3.4. Consider the remaining case $A(2n-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ for $n > 1$. We choose

$$\Sigma = \{\delta - \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_2, \dots, \varepsilon_{n-1} - \delta_n, \delta_n \pm \varepsilon_n\}.$$

We draw the diagram for Σ marking the edge between β_i and β_j by (β_i, β_j) .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & \beta_0 & & & & & \beta_{2n} \\ & \swarrow & & & & & \swarrow \\ -1 \downarrow & & 1/2 & & & & -1/2 \\ & \searrow & & & & & \searrow \\ \beta_1 & \xrightarrow{1/2} & \beta_2 & \xrightarrow{-1/2} & \dots & \xrightarrow{1/2} & \beta_{2n-2} & \xrightarrow{-1/2} & \beta_{2n-1} \end{array}$$

Since all β_i are isotropic, we have $\rho = 0$. Moreover, $(\beta_i + \beta_j) \in \Delta^{\# +}$ if $(\beta_i, \beta_j) > 0$, so $\Delta^{\# +}$ contains $\beta_0 + \beta_2$ and $\beta_{2i-1} + \beta_{2i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

We have $\nu = \sum_{i=0}^{2n} k_i \beta_i$ where $k_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all i . Take

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_+ &:= k_0(\beta_0 + \beta_2) + \sum_{i=1}^n k_{2i-1}(\beta_{2i-1} + \beta_{2i}) \\ \xi_+ &= \nu - \mu_+ = (k_2 - k_1 - k_0)\beta_2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} (k_{2i} - k_{2i-1})\beta_{2i} + (k_{2n} - k_{2n-1})\beta_{2n} \\ \mu_- &:= k_0(\beta_0 + \beta_2) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} k_{2i-1}(\beta_{2i-1} + \beta_{2i}) + k_{2n}(\beta_{2n-1} + \beta_{2n}) \\ \xi_- &= \nu - \mu_- = (k_2 - k_1 - k_0)\beta_2 + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} (k_{2i} - k_{2i-1})\beta_{2i} + (k_{2n-1} - k_{2n})\beta_{2n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The pairs (μ_+, ξ_+) , (μ_-, ξ_-) satisfy (A.1) if $(\xi_+, \xi_+) \leq 0$, $(\xi_-, \xi_-) \leq 0$ respectively. Since $(\xi_+, \xi_+) = -(\xi_-, \xi_-)$ at least one of these pairs satisfies (A.1).

This completes the proof of Proposition A.3. \square

A.4. Simplified proof of character formulas. Proposition A.3 allows to simplify several proofs of character formulas for (Σ, S) listed in § A.2.

A.4.1. Note that

$$(\alpha, \alpha) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \alpha \in \dot{\Sigma}.$$

The sets

$$\Delta^{\#} := \{\alpha \in \Delta_{\bar{0}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}, \quad \dot{\Delta}^{\#} := \Delta^{\#} \cap \dot{\Delta}$$

are the root systems of a Kac-Moody algebra (affine or finite-dimensional). (Notice that for $\dot{\Delta} = B(n|n)$, $\dot{\Delta}^{\#}$ is of type C_n except for the case when $\Delta = A(2n|2n-1)^{(2)}$, where $\dot{\Delta}^{\#}$ is of type B_n). Let $\pi^{\#}$, $\dot{\pi}^{\#}$ be the set of simple roots for $\Delta^{\# +}$, $\dot{\Delta}^{\# +}$, and $W^{\#}$, $\dot{W}^{\#}$ be the Weyl groups of $\Delta^{\#}$, $\dot{\Delta}^{\#}$.

A.4.2. Lemma.

- (i) If \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional, then for $w \in W^\#$ one has $\rho - w\rho \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$.
- (ii) Let \mathfrak{g} be affine and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be such that $k \neq -h^\vee$. For $\lambda := k\Lambda_0 + \rho$ and any $w \in W^\#$ one has $\lambda - w\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\pi^\#$.

Proof. The group $W^\#$ is generated by s_γ for $\gamma \in \pi^\#$. A standard reasoning shows that for $\nu \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $(\nu, \gamma) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all $\gamma \in \pi^\#$ and any $w \in W^\#$, $\nu - w\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\pi^\#$.

If (c) holds (i.e., $(\alpha, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Sigma$), then $(\rho, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^+$, so $\lambda - w\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\pi^\#$ for $\nu = \rho$, and $\nu = k\Lambda_0 + \rho$ if \mathfrak{g} is affine and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.

If (c) does not hold, then $\mathfrak{g} = D(n+1|n)^{(2)}$, $A(2n|2n)^{(4)}$. Since $(\alpha, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \dot{\Sigma}$, we have $(\rho, \gamma) \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \in \dot{\Sigma}$. One has $\pi^\# \setminus \dot{\Sigma} = \{\delta - \delta_1\}$ and $(\rho, \delta - \delta_1) = -\frac{1}{4}$. Since $h^\vee = 0$ the assumptions on k give $k \geq 1$, so $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \delta - \delta_1) > 0$. Therefore $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \pi^\#$. Hence $\lambda - w\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\pi^\#$ for $\lambda = k\Lambda_0 + \rho$. \square

A.4.3. The character formula (A.3) below was established in [14]. In [14] we considered two separate cases: the proof in Section 4 works for $h^\vee \neq 0$ and for $A(n|n)^{(1)}$, and a more complicated arguments in Section 6 work for the rest of the cases. The proof below is a slight simplification of the proof in Section 4 and is very different from the proof in Section 6 loc. cit.. We think that a similar method may simplify other proofs in [14] and might allow to generalize some of the results.

A.4.4. Proposition. *Let $\mathfrak{g} \neq D(2|1, a)^{(1)}$ be a symmetrizable affine Kac-Moody superalgebra and $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ be such that $k + h^\vee \neq 0$. Then*

$$(A.3) \quad De^\rho \text{ch } L(k\Lambda_0) = \sum_{w \in W^\#} \text{sgn}(w) \frac{e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho)}}{\prod_{\beta \in S} (1 + e^{-w\beta})},$$

where $W^\#$ is the Weyl group of $\Delta^\#$, (Σ, S) is as in Appendix A and $(1 + e^{-\alpha})^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i e^{-i\alpha}$, $(1 + e^\alpha)^{-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{i-1} e^{-i\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \Delta^+$.

Proof. By Lemma A.4.2 (ii) we have

$$(A.4) \quad w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho) \in (k\Lambda_0 + \rho) - \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\pi^\#$$

for any $w \in W^\#$. We set

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Sigma) &:= \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_0^+} (1 - e^{-\alpha})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} e^{\rho_\pi}, \quad Q(\Sigma) := \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_1^+} (1 + e^{-\alpha})^{\dim \mathfrak{g}_\alpha} e^{\rho_\pi - \rho}, \\ Z_1 &:= De^\rho \text{ch } L(k\Lambda_0), \quad Z_w := \text{sgn}(w) \frac{e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho)}}{\prod_{\beta \in S} (1 + e^{-w\beta})}, \quad Z_2 := \sum_{w \in W^\#} Z_w \\ Y_i &:= Q(\Sigma) Z_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2. \end{aligned}$$

One easily sees that $P(\Sigma)$, $Q(\Sigma)$ and Z_1 lie in $\mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ (see § 2.10 for notation) and $\text{supp}(Z_1) \subset (k\Lambda_0 + \rho - \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma)$. Moreover, $Z_2 \in \mathcal{R}(\Sigma)$ by [14], Lemma 2.2.8. One has

$$(A.5) \quad \text{supp}(Z_w) \subset w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho) + \sum_{\beta \in S: w\beta \in -\Delta^+} w\beta \subset w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho) - \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma.$$

Using (A.4) we get $\text{supp}(Z_2) \subset (k\Lambda_0 + \rho - \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma)$, so

$$(A.6) \quad \text{supp}(Z_1 - Z_2) \subset (k\Lambda_0 + \rho - \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma).$$

Let

$$\pi := \pi^\# \cup \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} = \{\alpha \in \Sigma_{\text{pr}} \mid \alpha \in \dot{\Delta} \text{ or } (\alpha, \alpha) > 0\}$$

and let $W[\pi]$ be the group generated by s_γ for $\gamma \in \pi$. We claim that $P(\Sigma)$ is naturally $W[\pi]$ -anti-invariant and $Q(\Sigma)$ is naturally $W[\pi]$ -invariant. Since $W[\pi]$ is generated by s_γ for $\gamma \in \pi$, it is enough to verify that for each $\gamma \in \pi$ $P(\Sigma)$, $Q(\Sigma)$ are naturally s_γ -anti-invariant and s_γ -invariant respectively. It is easy to see that this holds if γ or $\gamma/2$ lie in Σ . Since $\pi \subset \Sigma_{\text{pr}}$, for every $\gamma \in \pi$ there exists $\Sigma_1 \in \text{Sp}$ containing γ or $\gamma/2$. One readily sees that $P(\Sigma_2) = P(r_\beta \Sigma_2)$ and $Q(\Sigma_2) = Q(r_\beta \Sigma_2)$ for any $\Sigma_2 \in \text{Sp}$ and an odd reflexion r_β . Therefore $P(\Sigma) = P(\Sigma_1)$ and $Q(\Sigma) = Q(\Sigma_1)$. This implies the claim.

Since the module $L := L(k\Lambda_0)$ is π -integrable, $\text{ch } L$ is naturally $W[\pi]$ -invariant. Moreover, $De^\rho = \frac{P(\Sigma)}{Q(\Sigma)}$, so $Y_1 = Q(\Sigma)Z_1 = P(\Sigma) \text{ch } L$ is naturally $W[\pi]$ -anti-invariant.

Set

$$\dot{Z}_2 := \sum_{w \in W[\dot{\pi}]} Z_w.$$

Since $\rho - \dot{\rho} = h^\vee \Lambda_0$ is $W[\dot{\pi}^\#]$ -invariant we have

$$\dot{Z}_2 = e^{\rho - \dot{\rho}} \sum_{w \in W[\dot{\pi}^\#]} \text{sgn}(w) \frac{e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \dot{\rho})}}{\prod_{\beta \in S} (1 + e^{-w\beta})}.$$

One has $\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} := \dot{\pi}^\# \amalg \dot{\Sigma}_-$, where $\dot{\Sigma}_- := \{\alpha \in \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} \mid (\alpha, \alpha) < 0\}$. This gives

$$\pi = \pi^\# \cup \dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}} = \pi^\# \amalg \dot{\Sigma}_-.$$

The restriction of $(-, -)$ to $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$ coincides with the normalised invariant bilinear form on $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}$, except for the case $\mathfrak{g} = A(2n|2n-1)^{(2)}$ where $\dot{\mathfrak{g}} = B(n|n)$ (in the latter case these forms are proportional with the coefficient -1). By [8], Section 7 in all cases we have

$$\sum_{w \in W[\dot{\pi}^\#]} \text{sgn}(w) \frac{e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \dot{\rho})}}{\prod_{\beta \in S} (1 + e^{-w\beta})} = j_0^{-1} \sum_{w \in W[\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}}]} \text{sgn}(w) \frac{e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \dot{\rho})}}{\prod_{\beta \in S} (1 + e^{-w\beta})} = \dot{D}e^{\dot{\rho}},$$

where j_0 is the cardinality of $W[\dot{\Sigma}_-]$ and $\dot{D} \in \mathcal{R}(\dot{\Sigma})$ is the Weyl denominator for $\dot{\Delta}^+$. Therefore

$$(A.7) \quad \dot{Z}_2 = j_0^{-1} \sum_{w \in W[\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}}]} \text{sgn}(w) \frac{e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho)}}{\prod_{\beta \in S} (1 + e^{-w\beta})} = \dot{D}e^\rho.$$

We have $Z_2 = \sum_{w \in W^\#} Z_w = \sum_{y \in W^\# / W[\dot{\pi}^\#]} y \left(\sum_{w \in W[\dot{\pi}^\#]} Z_w \right)$. Since $W[\pi] / W[\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}}] = W^\# / W[\dot{\pi}^\#]$ this gives

$$Z_2 = j_0^{-1} \sum_{y \in W^\# / W[\dot{\pi}^\#]} y \left(\sum_{w \in W[\dot{\Sigma}_{\text{pr}}]} Z_w \right) = j_0^{-1} \sum_{w \in W[\pi]} Z_w.$$

Since $Q(\Sigma)$ is naturally $W[\pi]$ -invariant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2 &= j_0^{-1} Q(\Sigma) \sum_{w \in W[\pi]} Z_w = j_0^{-1} \sum_{w \in W[\pi]} \text{sgn}(w) \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_1^+} (1 + e^{-w\alpha}) e^{w(\rho_\pi - \rho)} \frac{e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho)}}{\prod_{\beta \in S} (1 + e^{-w\beta})} \\ &= j_0^{-1} \sum_{w \in W[\pi]} \text{sgn}(w) e^{w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho_\pi)} \prod_{\beta \in \Delta_1^+ \setminus S} (1 + e^{-w\beta}) \end{aligned}$$

By [14] § 2.2.5, the last sum is naturally $W[\pi]$ -anti-invariant. Therefore Y_2 is naturally $W[\pi]$ -anti-invariant.

Suppose the contrary, that $Z_1 \neq Z_2$. Let $\nu + \rho$ be a maximal element in $\text{supp}(Z_1 - Z_2)$ with respect to the partial order $\nu_1 \geq \nu_2$ if $\nu_1 - \nu_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$. Then $\nu + \rho_\pi$ is a maximal element in $\text{supp}(Y_1 - Y_2)$ with respect to this partial order. By above, Y_1, Y_2 are naturally $W[\pi]$ -anti-invariant. Thus $Y_1 - Y_2$ is naturally $W[\pi]$ -anti-invariant, so $\langle \nu + \rho_\pi, \alpha^\vee \rangle \notin \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ for all $\alpha \in \pi$. By (A.6), $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\Sigma$. Since $\nu \in \text{supp}(Z_1) \cup \text{supp}(Z_2)$ we have $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, k\Lambda_0 + \rho) = (\nu + \rho, \nu + \rho)$ by § 4.6. By Proposition A.3 this gives $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\dot{\Sigma}$. One readily sees that for $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\dot{\Sigma}$ the coefficient of $e^{k\Lambda_0 + \rho - \mu}$ in Z_1 is equal to the coefficient of $e^{\rho - \mu}$ in $\dot{D}e^\rho = \dot{Z}_2$. Therefore it remains to show $k\Lambda_0 + \rho - \nu \notin \text{supp}(Z_2 - \dot{Z}_2)$.

It remains to verify that for any $w \in W^\#$ such that $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho - \nu) \in \text{supp}(Z_w)$ we have $w \in W[\dot{\pi}^\#]$. Combining (A.5) and (A.4) we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} (k\Lambda_0 + \rho) - w(k\Lambda_0 + \rho) &\in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\dot{\pi}^\#, \\ w\beta &\in -\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}S \text{ for each } \beta \in S \text{ such that } w\beta \in -\Delta^+. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $W^\#$ is the Weyl group generated by s_γ for $\gamma \in \pi^\# = \dot{\pi} \cup \{\alpha_0^\#\}$. We will use the following property of $W^\#$: if $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ is such that $(\lambda, \gamma) \geq 0$ for all $\gamma \in \pi^\#$ and $(\lambda, \alpha_0^\#) > 0$, then $\lambda - y\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}\dot{\pi}$ for $y \in W^\#$ is equivalent $y \in W[\dot{\pi}]$. Using this property we obtain $w \in W[\dot{\pi}^\#]$ if $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha_0^\#) > 0$.

If $\rho = 0$, then $h^\vee = 0$, so $k\Lambda_0 + \rho = k\Lambda_0$ for $k \geq 1$. Therefore $(k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha_0^\#) > 0$.

If $\rho \neq 0$, then property (c) holds, so $(\rho, \alpha) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^+$. Since $\alpha_0^\# \notin \dot{\Delta}$ we have $\alpha_0^\# - \alpha_0 \in \Delta^+$, so

$$0 = (k\Lambda_0 + \rho, \alpha_0^\#) \geq k + (\rho, \alpha^\#) \geq k + (\rho, \alpha_0) = k + \frac{1}{2}(\alpha_0, \alpha_0).$$

This gives $k = (\alpha_0, \alpha_0) = 0$ and $h^\vee \neq 0$ (since $k \neq -h^\vee$).

This completes the proof for all cases except for $k = 0$ and Δ from the following list:

$$B(n|n)^{(1)}, B(n+1|n)^{(1)}, D(n+2|n)^{(1)}, A(2n|2n-1)^{(2)}, A(2m|2m+1)^{(2)}.$$

For the remaining cases the required formula is reduced to the implication

$$(A.8) \quad w \in \text{Stab}_{W^\#} \rho, \quad wS \subset \Delta^+ \implies w \in W[\dot{\pi}^\#]$$

which can be easily verified case-by-case (see an argument for $B(n+1|n)^{(1)}$ below).

For $k = 0$ the required formula is a particular case of Denominator Identity established in [9], [43] and the implication (A.8) was verified in all cases except for the case $B(n+1|n)^{(1)}$ which was not properly treated. Below we give an argument for this case.

For $\Delta = B(n+1|n)^{(1)}$ we have

$$S = \{\delta_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}\}_{i=1}^n, \quad \rho = \Lambda_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \varepsilon_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_i$$

and $\pi^\# = \{\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3, \dots, \varepsilon_n - \varepsilon_{n+1}, \varepsilon_{n+1}; \delta - \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2\}$ has the Dynkin diagram of type $B_{n+1}^{(1)}$. The group $\text{Stab}_{W^\#} \rho$ is generated by s_α for $\alpha \in \pi^\# \setminus \{\varepsilon_{n+1}\}$. The Dynkin diagram corresponding to $\pi^\# \setminus \{\varepsilon_{n+1}\}$ is of type D_{n+1} :

$$\pi^\# \setminus \{\varepsilon_{n+1}\} = \{\epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i+1}\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{\epsilon_n + \epsilon_{n+1}\} \quad \text{for } \epsilon_i := \frac{\delta}{2} - \varepsilon_{n+2-i} \ (i = 1, \dots, n+1).$$

Thus the group $\text{Stab}_{W^\#} \rho$ acts on $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ by signed permutations changing even number of signs. Fix $w \in \text{Stab}_{W^\#} \rho$ is such that $wS \subset \Delta^+$. If w changes some signs, then $w(\epsilon_{n+2-i}) = -\epsilon_{n+2-j}$ for some $i \neq 1$ (since w changes at least two signs), which gives $w\varepsilon_i = \delta - \varepsilon_j$ that is $w(\delta_{i-1} - \varepsilon_i) = \delta_{i-1} + \varepsilon_j - \delta \in \Delta^-$, a contradiction. Therefore w lies the group of permutations of $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$. If $w \neq \text{Id}$, then $w(\epsilon_{n+2-i}) = \epsilon_{n+2-j}$ for some $j < i$ which gives $w(\delta_{i-1} - \varepsilon_i) = \delta_{i-1} - \varepsilon_j \in \Delta^-$, a contradiction. Hence $w = \text{Id}$. This completes the proof. \square

APPENDIX B

The goal of this section is to justify the definition of integral root system Δ_λ given in § 4.1.1. The main result of this section is Theorem B.6.

In this section \mathfrak{g} is a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra and $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ is the set of real roots. As in Appendix A we will use the same notation for Δ^{re} and for \mathfrak{g} (for example, $A(2|2)$ stands for $\Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(3|3))$). As above, if \mathfrak{g} is affine, we denote by δ the minimal

imaginary root and let cl be the canonical map from $\mathbb{C}\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ to $\mathbb{C}\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})/\mathbb{C}\delta$. If \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional, we let cl be the identity map on $\mathbb{C}\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$.

B.1. First consider the case when \mathfrak{g} is a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra. For non-critical $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ the integral root systems $\Delta_\lambda = \{\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}} \mid \langle \lambda, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are well-known, see for example, [40], [42], [38]. In this case $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is called a *root subsystem* if $s_\alpha \beta \in R$ for any $\alpha, \beta \in R$. Clearly, Δ_λ is a root subsystem.

If R is a root subsystem, then setting $R^+ := R \cap \Delta^+$ and

$$(B.1) \quad \Sigma(R) := \{\alpha \in R \mid s_\alpha(R^+ \setminus \{\alpha\}) \subset R^+\},$$

we have

- (a) $\Sigma(R)$ is the set of indecomposable elements in R^+ , see, for example, [38], Lemma 2.2.8.
- (b) The matrix $(\langle \alpha^\vee, \beta \rangle)_{\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma(R)}$ is a symmetrizable generalized Cartan matrix, possibly of countable rank, loc. cit. Lemma 2.2.10.

(The set $\Sigma(R)$ is a base of R^+ if Δ is finite; if Δ is affine, $\Sigma(R)$ could be linearly dependent).

By (b), $(\langle \alpha^\vee, \beta \rangle)_{\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma(R)}$ is the Cartan matrix of a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra (possibly of countable rank), which we denote by \mathfrak{g}_λ . From [28] it follows that if $\lambda - \rho$ is a non-critical weight, then

$$(*) \quad L(\nu - \rho) \text{ lies in the same block as } L(\lambda - \rho) \iff \nu \in W[\Delta_\lambda]\lambda$$

(where $W[\Delta_\lambda]$ is the subgroup of $GL(\mathfrak{h}^*)$ generated by s_α for $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$). P. Fiebig proved that the structure of non-critical block in the category $\mathcal{O}_\Sigma(\mathfrak{g})$ depends only on $W[\Delta_\lambda]$ and its action on the highest weights, see [7], Theorem 4.1.

A similar construction works for symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras in the case when λ is typical, i.e. $(\lambda + \rho, \alpha) \neq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{iso}}$; in particular, this works if \mathfrak{g} is anisotropic (however, to the best of our knowledge, Fiebig's results have not been extended to anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebras).

In this section we consider indecomposable symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras. By [21], [46] all these superalgebras are anisotropic, finite-dimensional or affine. In order to define Δ_λ rigorously we introduce the notion of a real root system, using the axioms given by V. Serganova for generalized finite root systems in [45], and then take Δ_λ to be the minimal real root system containing real roots which are "integral" for λ . By contrast with the anisotropic case, it is not true that, for affine Kac-Moody superalgebras, a real root subsystem R is isomorphic to the set of real roots of a Kac-Moody superalgebra. By Serganova's classification [45] this is "almost true" if R is finite (then R is isomorphic to the set of real roots of a Kac-Moody superalgebra or $\mathfrak{psl}(n|n)$ for $n \geq 3$)—this can be easily deduced from Serganova's classification [45]. However, if a finite real root system R is a subset of the root system of a Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g} , then R is isomorphic to

the set of real roots of a Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}' , see Proposition B.6.7 (i) below (i.e., R is not isomorphic to the root system of $\mathfrak{psl}(n|n)$).

Unfortunately in the affine case the set of real roots of the Kac-Moody superalgebra of type $A(2|1)^{(2)}$ contains a subsystem R of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$ which is not a contragredient Lie superalgebra, see § B.5 below. This example indicates that the real roots of the Kac-Moody superalgebra could not be singled out by a set of "inheritable" axioms (see § B.2.4) since R is the intersection of the set of real roots $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{sl}(2|4)^{(2)})$ with a subspace (spanned by ε_1, δ_1 and δ).

In this section we prove Theorem B.6 asserting that Δ_λ is isomorphic to the set of real roots of a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}_λ (possibly of countable rank) if all indecomposable components of Δ_λ are not isomorphic to $A(1|1)^{(2)}$ (this automatically holds if $\mathfrak{g} \neq A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$, see B.13 below). Using [28], property (*) can be generalized to symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras: by [10], Theorem 4.8, if $\lambda - \rho$ is a non-critical weight, then

$$L(\nu - \rho) \text{ lies in the same block as } L(\lambda - \rho) \iff \nu \in W[\Delta_\lambda](\lambda + \mathbb{Z}S_\lambda),$$

where S_λ is an arbitrary maximal iso-set orthogonal to $\lambda + \rho$, see § B.4 below.

B.1.1. Remark. Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebra and $E \subset \mathbb{C}\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be a vector subspace such that $R := E \cap \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ is non-empty. Then R satisfies axioms (GR0), (GR1) from B.2.3 below. Consider the subalgebra \mathfrak{g}_R generated by \mathfrak{g}_γ for $\gamma \in R$.

Let $\Sigma(R)$ be as in (B.1). Set $A' := (\langle \alpha^\vee, \beta \rangle)_{\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma(R)}$. Consider the Kac-Moody algebra $\mathfrak{g}(A')$ with the set of simple roots Σ' . Let ϕ be the natural bijection of Σ' and $\Sigma(R)$. The algebra $\mathfrak{t} := [\mathfrak{g}(A'), \mathfrak{g}(A')]$ is generated by $\mathfrak{g}(A')_{\pm\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in \Sigma'$ which leads to an algebra homomorphism $\psi : \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_R$ which maps $\mathfrak{g}(A')_{\pm\alpha'}$ for $\alpha' \in \Sigma'$ to $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\phi(\alpha')}$.

By [38], Σ_R coincides with the set of indecomposable elements in $R \cap \Delta^+$ and $R = W[\Sigma_R]\Sigma_R$. The latter gives $\psi(\mathfrak{t}_{\gamma'}) \subset \mathfrak{g}_{\phi(\gamma')}$. Since $\dim \mathfrak{g}_\gamma = 1$ for all $\gamma \in R$, the map $\psi : \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_R$ is surjective.

The above argument can be adapted to anisotropic symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras, see Proposition B.8. For symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebras with isotropic roots we can not define $\Sigma(R)$ by formula (B.1), but we can take $\Sigma(R)$ consisting of the indecomposable elements in $R \cap \Delta^+$. Taking A' as above and τ' corresponding to the set of odd roots in $\Sigma(R)$, we can construct a Kac-Moody superalgebra $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$, and introduce \mathfrak{t}, ψ . From Proposition B.6.7 below it follows that the map $\psi : \mathfrak{t} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}_R$ is surjective except for the case when \mathfrak{g} is of the type $A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ and $R \cong A(1|1)^{(2)}$ (for example, we can take R spanned by δ, ε_1 and δ_1). In the latter case $\mathfrak{g}(A', \tau') \cong \mathfrak{gl}(2|2)$, so $\mathfrak{t} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(2|2)$ is finite-dimensional while \mathfrak{g}_R is infinite-dimensional.

B.2. Real root systems. In this section we will consider various generalizations of the notion of a root system. We consider a complex vector space L endowed by a complex valued symmetric bilinear form $(-, -)$ (our main example is $L = \mathbb{C}\Delta$).

B.2.1. We denote by $L_{m,n}$ the vector space spanned by mutually orthogonal vectors $\varepsilon_i, \delta_j, \delta$ for $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n$ satisfying

$$(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = -(\delta_i, \delta_i) \neq 0, \quad (\delta, \delta) = 0$$

(thus the kernel of the bilinear form $(-, -)$ is spanned by δ).

B.2.2. Definition. We say that $R' \subset L'$ is a *quotient* of $R \subset L$ if there exists a linear map $\psi : \mathbb{C}R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}R'$, which is compatible with the bilinear forms and $\psi(R) = R'$. We say that R' is a *bijective quotient*⁵ of R if the restriction of ψ to R gives a bijection between R and R' , and we say that R and R' are *isomorphic* if $\psi : \mathbb{C}R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}R'$ is bijective.

Note that, under this convention the root systems of $\mathfrak{sl}(n|n)$ and of $\mathfrak{gl}(n|n)$ are isomorphic; moreover, $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ is a bijective quotient of $\Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(n|n))$ for $n \geq 3$ ($\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(2|2))$ is not a bijective quotient of $\Delta(\mathfrak{sl}(2|2))$ since the preimage of each isotropic root contains two roots).

B.2.3. We will consider the following axioms for a subset R of L (for $\alpha, \beta \in R$):

- (GR0) $R \neq \emptyset, 0 \notin R, -R = R$, and $\mathbb{Z}R$ is a free module of finite rank;
- (GR1) if $(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$, then $\frac{2(\alpha, \beta)}{(\alpha, \alpha)} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $(\beta - \frac{2(\alpha, \beta)}{(\alpha, \alpha)}\alpha) \in R$;
- (GR2) if $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \neq (\beta, \alpha)$, then the set $\{\beta + \alpha, \beta - \alpha\} \cap R$ has cardinality one;
- (GR3) for any $\alpha \in R$ there exists $\beta \in R$ such that $(\alpha, \beta) \neq 0$.

If R satisfies some of the above axioms, then any bijective quotient satisfies the same axioms.

We call a set R satisfying (GR0)–(GR2) a *real root system*.

If R satisfies (GR0)–(GR3), then any quotient of R satisfies (GR0), (GR1), (GR3) and the following weaker form of (GR2)

(WGR2) if $\alpha, \beta \in R$ are such that $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \neq (\beta, \alpha)$, then $\{\beta + \alpha, \beta - \alpha\} \cap R \neq \emptyset$.

B.2.4. Inheritable properties. We call a property of $R \subset L$ *inheritable* if for any R satisfying this property and any vector space $L_1 \subset L$ having non-empty intersection with R , the set $R \cap L_1$ satisfies this property. The properties (GR0)–(GR2) and (WGR2) are inheritable.

B.2.5. Group $W[R]$. For $v \in L$ such that $(v, v) \neq 0$ we let $s_v \in \text{End}(L)$ be the reflection $s_v(u) = u - \frac{2(u, v)}{(v, v)}v$. For any $R \subset L$ we denote by $W[R]$ the subgroup of $\text{End}(L)$ which is generated by the reflections s_v for $v \in R$ such that $(v, v) \neq 0$.

If $R \subset L$ satisfies (GR1), then $W[R]R = R$.

⁵In the main text we say that R' is isometric to R .

B.2.6. Notation. For each $R \subset L$ we set

$$R^{\text{an}} := \{v \in R \mid (v, v) \neq 0\}, \quad R^{\text{iso}} := \{v \in R \mid (v, v) = 0\}.$$

B.2.7. Definition. A nonempty subset $R \subset L$ satisfying (GR0) is called *indecomposable* if R can not be presented as a disjoint union of two nonempty mutually orthogonal sets satisfying (GR0).

B.2.8. Remarks. The only indecomposable set satisfying (GR0)–(GR2) which does not satisfy (GR3) is $R = \{\pm\beta\}$ with $(\beta, \beta) = 0$, i.e. $R = \Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(1|1))$.

We will use the following simple lemma.

B.2.9. Lemma. *Let $R \subset L$ be an indecomposable set satisfying (GR0) and (GR1) and let $\beta \in R^{\text{iso}}$. Then*

- (i) *For any $\gamma \in R \setminus \{\pm\beta\}$ there exists a chain of isotropic elements $\beta = \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_s$ such that $(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}) \neq 0$ and $(\gamma_s, \gamma) \neq 0$.*
- (ii) *If R satisfies also (WGR2), then $R^{\text{iso}} = -W[R]\beta \cup W[R]\beta$.*

Proof. Since R is indecomposable, there exists a chain $\beta = \gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_s$ such that $(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}) \neq 0$ and $(\gamma_s, \gamma) \neq 0$. Choosing a chain of the minimal length we obtain $(\gamma_i, \gamma_j) = 0$ for $j - i > 1$. Now, substituting γ_i by $s_{\gamma_i}\gamma_{i-1}$ if γ_i is anisotropic, we obtain a chain of isotropic vectors with the required properties. This establishes (i).

For (ii) take $\gamma \in R^{\text{iso}}$. Consider the case when $(\beta, \gamma) \neq 0$. By (WGR2) R contains $\gamma + \beta$ or $\gamma - \beta$. Without loss of generality we can assume $\alpha = \gamma - \beta \in R$. Since β, γ are isotropic we have $(\alpha, \alpha) = 2(\beta, \gamma) \neq 0$, so $s_\alpha \in W(R)$, and $s_\alpha\beta = \gamma$. Hence $\gamma \in W[R]\beta$ if $(\beta, \gamma) \neq 0$. The general case follows from (i). \square

B.3. Examples. Let $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra of possibly infinite rank with the Cartan subalgebra \mathfrak{h} . The set Δ^{re} satisfies (GR0)–(GR2) and the isotropic roots are isotropic elements in Δ^{re} ; if $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau)$ is indecomposable, then Δ^{re} satisfies (GR3) if and only if $\mathfrak{g}(A, \tau) \neq \mathfrak{gl}(1|1)$.

B.3.1. As in § 4.1.1 for $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ we introduce

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{R}_\lambda &= \{\alpha \in \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}} \mid 2(\lambda, \alpha) \in j(\alpha, \alpha) \text{ where } j \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } j \text{ is odd if } 2\alpha \in \Delta\}, \\ R_\lambda &:= \overline{R}_\lambda \cup \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \in \overline{R}_\lambda, 2\alpha \in \Delta\} = \overline{R}_\lambda \cup \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \in (\overline{R}_\lambda \cap \Delta_1^{\text{an}})\} \end{aligned}$$

and let $\Delta_\lambda \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ be the minimal subset of Δ^{re} satisfying the following properties:

- (a) $\overline{R}_\lambda \subset \Delta_\lambda$;
- (b) if $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_\lambda$ are such that $(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$, then $s_\alpha\beta \in \Delta_\lambda$;
- (c) if $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_\lambda$ are such that $(\alpha, \alpha) = 0 \neq (\beta, \alpha)$ then $\Delta_\lambda \cap \{\alpha \pm \beta\} = \Delta^{\text{re}} \cap \{\alpha \pm \beta\}$;
- (d) if $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$ and $2\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$, then $2\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$.

Since Δ^{re} satisfies (GR0)–(GR3), the set Δ_λ also satisfies properties (GR0)–(GR3).

B.3.2. Serganova's classification. Let $R \subset L$ be a finite indecomposable set satisfying (GR0), (GR1) and (WGR2), and such that the restriction of $(-, -)$ to $\mathbb{C}R$ is non-degenerate. By [45], if R satisfies (GR2), then R is isomorphic to the root system of a finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra or $\mathfrak{psl}(n|n)$ for $n \geq 3$. Moreover, if R does not satisfy (GR2), then R is of type $C(m|n)$ or $BC(m|n)$ (with $m, n \geq 1$), defined by

$$C(m|n) = \{\pm 2\varepsilon_i; \pm 2\delta_j; \pm \varepsilon_i \pm \delta_j\}_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n}, \quad BC(m|n) := C(m|n) \cup \{\pm \varepsilon_i; \pm \delta_j\}_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n},$$

where $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^m \cup \{\delta_j\}_{j=1}^n$ is an orthogonal basis in $\mathbb{C}R$ such that with $(\varepsilon_i, \varepsilon_i) = -(\delta_j, \delta_j) \neq 0$ for all i, j . The root system $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(2|2))$ is of type $C(1|1)$.

B.3.3. For other examples of sets satisfying (GR0)–(GR2) see B.12 below.

B.4. Iso-sets. Let R satisfy (GR0), (GR1) and (WGR2). We call a subset $S \subset R$ *iso-set* if $S = -S$ and $(S, S) = 0$. Iso-sets are ordered by inclusion. For $v \in L$ we denote by A_v^{max} the collection of maximal iso-sets orthogonal to v .

B.4.1. Lemma. *Let R be a finite set satisfying (GR0), (GR1) and (WGR2), and let $S, S' \in A_v^{\text{max}}$. Then there exists $w \in \text{Stab}_{W[R]}(v)$ such that $S' = w(S)$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction in the cardinality of $S' \setminus S$. Let $\alpha \in S' \setminus S$. Then $S \cup \{\alpha\}$ is not an iso-set, so there exists $\beta \in S$ such that $(\alpha|\beta) \neq 0$. This implies that $\alpha + \beta$ or $\alpha - \beta$ lies in R ; without loss of generality we can assume $\gamma = \alpha - \beta \in R$. Obviously, $(\gamma, \gamma) \neq 0$ so $s_\gamma \in W[R]$. The formula $s_\gamma(x) = x - 2(x, \gamma)/(\gamma|\gamma)$ implies that s_γ preserves v and $S \cap S'$, and $s_\gamma(\alpha) = \beta$. This implies the claim. \square

We will use the following corollary.

B.4.2. Corollary. *Let Δ^{re} be the set of real root of an indecomposable symmetrizable finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra. Let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$ be mutually orthogonal isotropic roots such that $(\text{cl}(\beta_i) \pm \text{cl}(\beta_j)) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq s$. Then the set $\{\text{cl}(\beta_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ is linearly independent.*

Proof. If $s = 1$ the claim holds, so we may (and will) assume that $s > 1$.

The set $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is a finite set satisfying (GR0), (GR1) and (WGR2).

The set $B := \{\pm \text{cl}(\beta_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ is an iso-set containing $2s$ elements. Using Lemma B.4.1 for $v = 0$ we conclude that B is $W[R]$ -conjugated to a subset of any maximal iso-set S in $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$. The set $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is not of types $D(2|1, a)$, $G(3)$ and $F(4)$ (for these types any two non-proportional isotropic roots are non-orthogonal, which contradicts to $s > 1$). Using the standard notation for $A(m-1|n-1)$, $B(m|n)$, $D(m|n)$ and the notation of § B.3.2 for $BC(m|n)$, $C(m|n)$, we can choose a maximal iso-set S of the form $\{\pm(\varepsilon_i - \delta_i)\}_{i=1}^d$

for $d := \min(m, n)$. Since the vectors $\{(\varepsilon_i - \delta_i)\}_{i=1}^d$ are linearly independent, the set $\{\text{cl}(\beta_i)\}_{i=1}^s$ is linearly independent. \square

B.4.3. Remark. Corollary B.4.2 implies that $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ does not contain $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$, since $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(2|2))$ does not satisfy (GR3), and, for $n > 2$, the set $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ contains isotropic roots $\beta_i := \varepsilon_i - \delta_i$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i = 0$. By Corollary B.4.2, $\text{cl}(\beta_i) = \pm \text{cl}(\beta_j)$ for some $i \neq j$ which is impossible since $(\beta_i \pm \beta_j, \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(2|2))) \neq 0$.

B.5. Real root system $A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$. Take $L_{m,n}$ as in § B.2.1 and consider the subset

$$R_{m,n} = \{\pm \varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_j, \pm \delta_i \pm \delta_j, 2\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm 2\delta_i, (2\mathbb{Z} - 1)\delta \pm 2\varepsilon_i\}_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} \cup \{\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \varepsilon_i \pm \delta_j\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}.$$

Note that $R_{p,q} = R_{m,n} \cap L_{p,q}$ for $m \geq p, n \geq q$. The set $R_{m,n}$ satisfies (GR0)–(GR4). We will denote this set by $A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$. If $(m, n) \neq (1, 1)$, then $A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ is isomorphic to the set of real roots of the corresponding affine Kac-Moody superalgebra.

B.5.1. Let us show that

$$A(1|1)^{(2)} = \{\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm \varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, 2\mathbb{Z}\delta \pm 2\delta_1, (2\mathbb{Z} - 1)\delta \pm 2\varepsilon_1\}$$

is not isomorphic to the set of real roots of a Kac-Moody superalgebra. Suppose the contrary, i.e. that $A(1|1)^{(2)} = R_{1,1}$ is isomorphic to $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ for some Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}' .

The set $\Sigma_{1,2} := \{\delta - 2\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, \delta_1 - \delta_2, 2\delta_2\}$ is a base of $R_{1,2}$ which is of type $A(3|1)^{(2)}$. Take $\omega : \mathbb{Z}\Sigma_{1,2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\omega(\alpha) = 1$ for all $\alpha \in \Sigma_{1,2}$. Then $\omega(\alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$ for all $\alpha \in R_{2,1}$. Define a triangular decomposition of \mathfrak{g}' via ω (see § 2.10.1). By Hoyt-Serganova classification [21], [46], \mathfrak{g}' is a symmetrizable affine Kac-Moody superalgebra (since $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ is an infinite indecomposable set). By [16], Theorem 0.4.3, the triangular decomposition of \mathfrak{g}' admits a base Σ' and $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}(A', \tau')$, where A' is the Gram matrix of Σ' and τ' is the set of odd roots in this base. The set Σ' coincides with the set of indecomposable elements in $\{\alpha \in R_{1,1} \mid \omega(\alpha) > 0\}$. Since $\{\alpha \in R_{1,1} \mid \omega(\alpha) > 0\}$ is equal to

$$\{\mathbb{Z}_{>0}\delta \pm \varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, 2\mathbb{Z}_{>0}\delta \pm 2\delta_1, (2\mathbb{Z}_{>0} - 1)\delta \pm 2\varepsilon_1\} \cup \{\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, 2\delta_1\},$$

one has $\Sigma' = \{\delta - 2\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1, 2\delta_1\}$. The Gram matrix of Σ' is $A' = \begin{pmatrix} 4 & -2 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & 2 & -4 \end{pmatrix}$.

We have $\tau' = \{2\}$, since $a_{22} = 0$ (so $2 \in \tau'$) and $\frac{2a_{12}}{a_{11}}, \frac{2a_{32}}{a_{33}}$ are odd integers (so $1, 3 \notin \tau'$). Thus (A', τ') is the Cartan datum of $A(1|1)$, so $\mathfrak{g}' = \mathfrak{g}(A', \tau') = \mathfrak{gl}(2|2)$. However, the set $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{gl}(2|2))$ is finite, so $R_{1,1}$ is not isomorphic to a quotient of this set.

B.5.2. Assume that Δ_λ has an indecomposable component R which is isomorphic to $A(1|1)^{(2)}$. Let us show that the bijection $R \cong A(1|1)^{(2)}$ preserves the parity. Indeed, the roots of the form $\mathbb{Z}\delta' \pm \varepsilon'_1 \pm \delta'_1$ are isotropic, so they are odd. All other roots in R are non-isotropic. If R contains a non-isotropic odd root α , then $2\alpha \in R$. However, for any non-isotropic root $\alpha \in R$ we have $2\alpha \notin R$. Therefore all non-isotropic roots in R are even. Hence the bijection between R and $A(1|1)^{(2)}$ preserves the parity.

B.6. Theorem. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra of finite rank and let $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$.*

- (i) *If Δ_λ is a bijective quotient of $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, where \mathfrak{g}' is a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra of at most countable rank, then the bijection $\Delta_\lambda \rightarrow \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ preserves the parity.*
- (ii) *If Δ_λ does not contain isotropic roots, then Δ_λ is a bijective quotient of the system of real roots of an anisotropic symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}' of at most countable rank.*
- (iii) *If \mathfrak{g} is a finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra, then \mathfrak{g}' is as well. If \mathfrak{g} is an affine symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra and each indecomposable component R of Δ_λ is not of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$, then Δ_λ is isomorphic to $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, where $\mathfrak{g}' = \prod_{i \in I} \mathfrak{g}'_i$ and each \mathfrak{g}'_i is either finite-dimensional or affine symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra. Moreover, the set I is finite if $(\lambda, \delta) \neq 0$.*
- (iv) *If Δ_λ has an indecomposable component of type $A(1|1)^{(2)}$, then \mathfrak{g} is of the type $A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$ and $(\lambda, \delta) = \frac{p}{q}$, where p, q are coprime integers and q is odd (see § 3.5 for the normalization).*

B.6.1. Remark. Theorem B.6 was stated in [14] without proof and the case $A(1|1)^{(2)}$ was not excluded.

B.6.2. Proof of (i). Let $\psi : \mathbb{C}\Delta_\lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ be the linear map which gives the bijection $\Delta_\lambda \rightarrow \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$.

Take an odd root $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$. If α is isotropic, then $\psi(\alpha)$ is isotropic, so it is odd. If α is anisotropic, then, by (d) in § B.3, $2\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$. Then $2\psi(\alpha) \in \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, so $\psi(\alpha)$ is odd.

Take an even root $\alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$. By Lemma B.2.9, Δ_λ contains an isotropic β such that $(\beta, \alpha) \neq 0$. By (c) in § B.3, Δ_λ contains $\beta - \alpha$ or $\beta + \alpha$. Without loss of generality we can assume $\beta - \alpha \in \Delta_\lambda$. Since β is odd and α is even, $\beta - \alpha$ is odd. By above, $\psi(\beta)$ and $\psi(\beta - \alpha)$ are odd, so $\psi(\alpha)$ is even. \square

B.6.3. Assume that $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ satisfies (GR0)–(GR2) and each indecomposable component R_i of R is a bijective quotient of the system of real roots of a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}'_i of at most countable rank. Then R is a bijective quotient

of $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, where $\mathfrak{g}' = \prod_i \mathfrak{g}'_i$ is a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}' of at most countable rank.

B.6.4. *Proof of (ii).* This statement follows from § B.6.3 and Proposition B.8 (i) below.

B.6.5. Lemma. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable affine Kac-Moody superalgebra. Then for each $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ the set Δ_λ has finitely many indecomposable components not isomorphic to $\Delta(\mathfrak{sl}(1|1))$. If $(\lambda, \delta) \neq 0$, then the set Δ_λ has finitely many indecomposable components.*

Proof. Set $R_{\lambda,i} := \Delta_{\lambda,i} \cap R_\lambda$. Note that $(\Delta_{\lambda,i}, R_{\lambda,j}) = 0$ for $i \neq j \in I$. If $R_{\lambda,i} = \emptyset$, then for any $\gamma \in \Delta_{\lambda,i}$ one has $\gamma \notin R_\lambda$ and $(\gamma, R_\lambda) = 0$ which contradicts to Lemma 4.1.4 (ii). Hence $R = \coprod_{i \in I} R_{\lambda,i}$ where $R_{\lambda,i}$ are pairwise orthogonal non-empty sets.

Let J be the set of indices j such that $\Delta_{\lambda,j} \not\subset \Delta^{\text{iso}}$.

For $j \in J$ the sets $\Delta_{\lambda,j}$ contains a non-isotropic root γ_j , and for $j_1, j_2 \in J$ one has $\text{cl}(\gamma_{j_1}) \neq \text{cl}(\gamma_{j_2})$. Since $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is finite, the set J is finite.

Take $i \in I \setminus J$. Then $\Delta_{\lambda,i} \subset \Delta^{\text{iso}}$. For each $i \in I \setminus J$ fix $\beta_i \in R_{\lambda,i}$; note that $\beta_i \in \Delta^{\text{iso}}$ (since $\Delta_{\lambda,i} \subset \Delta^{\text{iso}}$), so $(\lambda, \beta_i) = 0$ (by definition of R_λ).

Let us show that $\Delta_{\lambda,i}$ is the root system of $\mathfrak{sl}(1|1)$ for each $i \in I \setminus J$. Indeed, if $\Delta_{\lambda,i} \neq \{\pm\beta_i\}$, then $\Delta_{\lambda,i}$ contains β which is not orthogonal to β_i (since $\Delta_{\lambda,i}$ is indecomposable). Then, by (GR2), $\Delta_{\lambda,i}$ contains $\gamma \in \{\beta_i + \beta, \beta_i - \beta\}$. Since β, β_i are isotropic and non-orthogonal, γ is anisotropic, a contradiction.

Suppose that $I \setminus J$ is infinite. Since $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is finite, one has $\text{cl}(\beta_{i_1}) = \text{cl}(\beta_{i_2})$ for some $i_1, i_2 \in I \setminus J$, so $\beta_{i_1} - \beta_{i_2} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}\delta$. Hence $(\lambda, \delta) = 0$ as required. \square

B.6.6. We will prove (iv) in § B.13 below. Using § B.6.3 and Lemma B.6.5 we reduce Theorem B.6 (iii) to the following statement which will be proved in §§ B.9– B.13 below.

B.6.7. Proposition. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a finite-dimensional or affine symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra.*

- (i) *If $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ satisfying (GR0)–(GR2) is indecomposable, contains an isotropic root, and $\text{cl}(R)$ is not isomorphic to $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(2|2))$, then R is isomorphic to $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, where \mathfrak{g}' is a finite-dimensional or affine symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra.*
- (ii) *If $\lambda \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ and R is an indecomposable component of Δ_λ and $\text{cl}(R)$ is isomorphic to $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(2|2))$, then R is isomorphic to $A(1|1)^{(2)}$ and $(\lambda, \delta) = \frac{p}{q}$, where q is odd.*

B.6.8. Remark. In [45] V. Serganova defined “generalized root systems” (GRS) as finite sets satisfying the condition that $(-, -)$ is non-degenerate on the span of R , and axioms (GR0)–(GR2), and showed that any indecomposable GRS is isomorphic to the root system of a basic classical Lie superalgebra different from $\mathfrak{psl}(2|2)$. Several attempts to generalize

this approach to affine Lie superalgebras were made, but, to the best of our knowledge, root systems of affine Lie superalgebras are not singled out by a set of axioms. In [50] M. Yousofzadeh introduced and classified the extended affine supersystems (with the “string property” instead of the axiom (GR2)), which include root systems of affine Lie superalgebras. Proposition B.6.7 (i) can be deduced from the classification theorem [50], Theorem 2.2 (which is based on the Serganova’s result). Since the latter classification is rather complicated we deduce Proposition B.6.7 (i) directly from Serganova’s result.

B.7. Gram matrices. For a finite subset $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s$ of L we denote by

$$\Gamma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s} = ((\alpha_i, \alpha_j))$$

the corresponding Gram matrix. We will use the following fact.

B.7.1. Lemma. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s \in \Delta^{\text{an}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be such that $(\alpha_i, \alpha_{i+1}) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, s-1$. Then the matrix $(\alpha_1, \alpha_1)^{-1} \Gamma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s}$ is positive semidefinite and $\text{cl}(\alpha_1), \dots, \text{cl}(\alpha_s)$ are linearly dependent if $\det \Gamma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s} = 0$.*

Proof. Set $\gamma_i := \text{cl}(\alpha_i)$ and note that $\Gamma_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_s} = \Gamma_{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s}$. Since $(\gamma_i, \gamma_{i+1}) \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, s-1$, the vectors $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s$ lie in the same indecomposable component of the set $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{an}})$. These components are the sets of real roots of finite-dimensional anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebras. The restriction of the bilinear form $(\gamma_1, \gamma_1)^{-1}(-, -)$ to the span of such component is positive definite. This implies the statement. \square

B.8. Proposition. *Let \mathfrak{g} be a symmetrizable Kac-Moody superalgebra, possibly of countable rank. Let $R \subset \Delta^{\text{an}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be an indecomposable set (in the sense of Definition B.2.7) satisfying $s_\alpha \beta \in R$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in R$ and $2\alpha \in R$ for all odd $\alpha \in R$. Then*

- (i) *There exists an indecomposable symmetrizable anisotropic Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}' , possibly of countable rank, such that R is a bijective quotient of $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')^{\text{re}}$.*
- (ii) *If \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, then \mathfrak{g}' in (i) is finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra, and R is isomorphic to $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')^{\text{re}}$.*

Proof. If $\alpha \in \Delta^{\text{an}}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $\mathfrak{g}_{\pm\alpha}$ act locally nilpotently, so for each $\gamma \in \Delta(\mathfrak{g})$, $\frac{2(\alpha, \gamma)}{(\alpha, \alpha)}$ is integral and is even if α is odd. Set $R^+ := \Delta^+(\mathfrak{g}) \cap R$ and

$$(B.2) \quad \Sigma' := \{\alpha \in R \mid s_\alpha(R^+ \setminus \{\alpha, 2\alpha\}) \subset R^+\}.$$

Arguing as in [38] we obtain $\frac{2(\alpha, \beta)}{(\beta, \beta)} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma'$ with $\alpha \neq \beta$ and

$$(B.3) \quad R = W[\Sigma'](\Sigma' \coprod \{2\alpha \mid \alpha \in \Sigma', p(\alpha) = \bar{1}\}).$$

By above, $\frac{2(\alpha, \beta)}{(\beta, \beta)}$ is even if β is odd. Therefore the matrix $A' := (\langle \alpha, \beta^\vee \rangle)_{\alpha, \beta \in \Sigma'}$ is a Cartan matrix for a anisotropic symmetrizable generalized Kac-Moody superalgebra \mathfrak{g}' with a base Σ'' and the parity function $p' : \Sigma'' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_2$ induced by the parity function $p : \Delta(\mathfrak{g}) \rightarrow$

\mathbb{Z}_2 . Moreover, the map $\Sigma'' \rightarrow \Sigma'$ extends to a linear homomorphism $\psi : \mathbb{Z}\Sigma'' \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}\Sigma'$ which preserves the parity and the bilinear forms, and maps $\overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}') = W\Sigma''$ to $R \cap \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}) = W\Sigma'$. By (2.3), this implies $\psi(\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')) = R$. Using formula (B.3) and the assumption that R is indecomposable, we conclude that the Dynkin diagram of Σ'' is connected. This establishes (i).

For (ii) assume that \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra.

Let us show that \mathfrak{g}' is a Kac-Moody superalgebra, i.e. that Σ' is finite. Indeed, if Δ is finite, then R is finite. If Δ is affine, then the image of Δ in $\mathbb{Z}\Delta/\mathbb{Z}\delta$ is finite, so, if Σ' is infinite, then $\alpha, \alpha + j\delta \in \Sigma'$ for some $j \neq 0$, but $\frac{2(\alpha, \alpha + j\delta)}{(\alpha, \alpha)} = 2$, a contradiction (by above, this number is non-positive). Hence Σ' is finite, so \mathfrak{g}' is a Kac-Moody superalgebra.

Renormalize the bilinear form on $\Delta(\mathfrak{g})$ in such a way that $(\gamma, \gamma) = 2$ for some $\gamma \in \Sigma'$. By (i), the Dynkin diagram of Σ'' is connected. By Lemma B.7.1, the Gram matrix $\Gamma_{\Sigma'} = \Gamma_{\Sigma''}$ is either positive definite or positive semidefinite; the algebra \mathfrak{g}' is finite-dimensional in the first case and affine in the second case (see [27], Theorem 4.3 and [26]).

It remains to verify that the linear map $\psi : \mathbb{C}\Sigma'' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\Sigma'$ is injective. Since ψ preserves the bilinear forms, $\text{Ker } \psi$ lies in the kernel of the bilinear form on $\mathbb{C}\Sigma''$. In particular, $\text{Ker } \psi = 0$ if \mathfrak{g}' is finite-dimensional. In the remaining case \mathfrak{g}' is affine. Suppose the contrary, that $\text{Ker } \psi \neq 0$, so $\text{Ker } \psi = \mathbb{C}\delta'$ where δ' is the minimal imaginary root in $\Delta(\mathfrak{g}')$. Then $R \cap \overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}) = \psi(\overline{\Delta}^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}'))$ is a classical finite root system and Σ' is a set of simple roots of this root system. Thus the Cartan matrix A' is invertible, so \mathfrak{g}' is not affine, a contradiction. This completes the proof of (ii). \square

B.9. Set $F(\alpha)$. Let $R \subset L$ be a set satisfying (GR0), (GR1) and (WGR2). Let K be the kernel of the restriction of $(-, -)$ to $\mathbb{C}R$. Fix any element $\delta_0 \in K$ and let cl_0 be the canonical map $\text{cl}_0 : \mathbb{C}R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}R/\mathbb{C}\delta_0$. For example, if $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$, then for $\delta_0 = \delta$ we have $\text{cl} = \text{cl}_0$. For any $\alpha \in R$ we set

$$F(\alpha) := \{c \in \mathbb{C} \mid \alpha + c\delta_0 \in R\}.$$

Since $\mathbb{Z}R$ is a free module of finite rank, we have $F(\alpha) \subset \mathbb{Z}a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$.

B.9.1. Lemma.

- (i) For all $\alpha \in R$ we have $0 \in F(\alpha)$, $F(-\alpha) = -F(\alpha)$ and $F(w\alpha) = F(\alpha)$ for all $w \in W[R]$.
- (ii) Let $\alpha \in R$ be such that $(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$. Then $F(\alpha) = \mathbb{Z}a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, for $\gamma \in R$ the set $F(\gamma)$ has a structure of \mathbb{Z} -module with respect to the action $j * c := c - j\langle \gamma, \alpha^\vee \rangle a$ (for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c \in F(\gamma)$). In particular,

$$\langle \gamma, \alpha^\vee \rangle F(\alpha) \subset F(\gamma) \quad \text{for all } \alpha, \gamma \in R \text{ with } (\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0.$$

- (iii) If $\beta, \gamma \in R$ are such that

$$(\beta, \beta) = 0, \quad (\gamma, \beta) \neq 0, \quad (\text{cl}_0(\gamma) - \text{cl}_0(\beta)) \notin \text{cl}_0(R),$$

then $\beta + \gamma \in R$ and $F(\beta), F(\gamma) \subset F(\beta + \gamma)$.

Proof. (i) follows from (GR0) and (GR1) and (iii) follows from (GR2). For (ii) take $\alpha \in R$ such that $(\alpha, \alpha) \neq 0$. For $x \in F(\alpha)$ we have $x\delta_0 - \alpha \in R$. Thus for $\gamma \in R$ we have

$$s_{x\delta_0 - \alpha} s_\alpha(\gamma) = \gamma - x\langle \gamma, \alpha^\vee \rangle \delta_0 \in R,$$

so $c \in F(\gamma)$ forces $(c - x\langle \gamma, \alpha^\vee \rangle) \in F(\gamma)$. In particular, for all $x, c \in F(\alpha)$ we have $c - 2x \in F(\alpha)$. Hence $F(\alpha)$ is a subgroup of \mathbb{C} . Since $R \subset \Delta$ we have $F(\alpha) \subset \mathbb{Z}a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$. By above, $c - x\langle \gamma, \alpha^\vee \rangle \in R$. Since $F(\gamma)$ contains 0 this gives $\langle \gamma, \alpha^\vee \rangle F(\alpha) \subset F(\gamma)$. \square

B.9.2. By (ii) we have $F(\alpha) = F(-\alpha)$ for a non-isotropic $\alpha \in R$. In §§ B.9.3–B.9.5 we will see that the same formula holds for isotropic α if $\text{cl}(R) \neq C(1|1)$, using that in all other cases any isotropic root α can be included in $A(1|0)$, $B(1|1)$ or $BC(1|1)$.

B.9.3. Consider the case when $\text{cl}_0(R)$ is of type $A(1|0)$. Take $\alpha, \beta \in R$ such that $\text{cl}(\alpha) = \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$, $\text{cl}(\beta) = \varepsilon_2 - \delta_1$. Then $\alpha \in R^{\text{an}}$, $\beta \in R^{\text{iso}}$ and $s_\alpha \beta = \beta + \alpha$. Let E be the span of α, β . By Lemma B.9.1 (i), $R^{\text{an}} = \{\pm\alpha + \mathbb{Z}a\delta_0\}$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Then $W[R]\beta = \{\beta + \mathbb{Z}a\delta_0, \beta + \alpha + \mathbb{Z}a\delta_0\}$. The Gram matrix $\Gamma_{\alpha, \beta}$ is equal to the Gram matrix $\Gamma_{\text{cl}(\alpha), \text{cl}(\beta)}$ which is non-degenerate, so $E \cap \mathbb{C}\delta_0 = 0$ which forces $-\beta \notin W[R]\beta$. Using Lemma B.2.9 (ii) we obtain $R^{\text{iso}} = -W[R]\beta \amalg W[R]\beta$, that is

$$R = \{\pm\alpha + \mathbb{Z}a\delta_0, \pm\beta + \mathbb{Z}a\delta_0, \pm(\beta + \alpha) + \mathbb{Z}a\delta_0\}.$$

Hence $E \cap R$ can be identified with $A(1|0)$ and $R = (E \cap R) + \mathbb{Z}a\delta_0$ is isomorphic to $A(1|0)$ if $a\delta_0 = 0$ and to $A(1|0)^{(1)}$ otherwise.

B.9.4. Consider the case when $\text{cl}_0(R)$ is of type $B(1|1)$, i.e.

$$\text{cl}_0(R) = \{\pm\varepsilon_1, \pm\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, \pm\delta_1, \pm 2\delta_1\}.$$

Take $\alpha, \beta \in R$ such that $\text{cl}_0(\alpha) = \delta_1$ and $\text{cl}_0(\beta) = \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$. By Lemma B.9.1 (iii), R contains $\alpha + \beta$ and $F(\alpha), F(\beta) \subset F(\alpha + \beta)$. Applying Lemma B.9.1 (iii) to the pair $-\beta, \alpha + \beta$ we obtain $F(\alpha + \beta) \subset F(\alpha)$, that is $F(\alpha) = F(\alpha + \beta)$. By (GR1), $s_\alpha \beta = \beta + 2\alpha \in R$ and $F(\beta + 2\alpha) = F(\beta)$ (by Lemma B.9.1 (i)). Applying Lemma B.9.1 (iii) to the pair $-\beta, \beta + 2\alpha$ we obtain $2\alpha \in R$ and $F(\beta) \subset F(2\alpha)$. Using Lemma B.9.1 (ii) we get $F(\beta) = F(2\alpha) = \mathbb{Z}c$ for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$. By above, R contains $\pm\beta, \pm\alpha \pm 2\alpha$ and $\pm(\beta + 2\alpha)$; these elements form $B(1|1)$ and we identify this subset of R with $\text{cl}_0(R)$. By Lemma B.9.1 (ii), $F(\delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Summarizing we have

$$F(\varepsilon_1) = F(\delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}a, \quad F(\pm\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1) = F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) = F(2\delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}c \subset \mathbb{Z}a.$$

By Lemma B.9.1 (ii), for any $b \in F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1)$ we have $(b + 2a) \in F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1)$. Thus either $c = \pm a$ or $c = \pm 2a$ for $a \neq 0$. In the first case $R = B(1|1) + \mathbb{Z}a$, that is $R \cong B(1|1)$ or $R \cong B(1|1)^{(1)}$; in the second case $R \cong D(2|1)^{(1)}$.

B.9.5. Consider the case when R satisfies (GR2) and $\text{cl}_0(R)$ is of type $BC(1|1)$ that is

$$\text{cl}_0(R) = \{\pm\varepsilon_1, \pm\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1, \pm\delta_1, \pm 2\delta_1, \pm 2\varepsilon_1\}$$

where $(\varepsilon_1, \delta_1) = 0$, $(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_1) = -(\delta_1, \delta_1) = 1$.

Take β, α in R such that $\text{cl}_0(\beta) = \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ and $\text{cl}_0(\alpha) = \delta_1$. Notice that R lies in the span of α, β and δ_0 . We identify α, β with δ_1 and $\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$. Then R contains $\pm\delta_1$ and $\pm\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1$. By Lemma B.9.1 (i), $F(\delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Lemma B.9.1 (ii) gives $\varepsilon_1 \in R$ and $F(\delta_1), F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) \subset F(\varepsilon_1)$. Similarly, $F(\varepsilon_1) \subset F(\delta_1)$. Hence $F(\varepsilon_1) = \mathbb{Z}a$ and $F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) \subset \mathbb{Z}a$. By Lemma B.9.1 (i),

$$F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) + 2\mathbb{Z}a = F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1).$$

Therefore

$$(B.4) \quad F(\pm\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1) = F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) \text{ is } \mathbb{Z}a \text{ or } 2\mathbb{Z}a, \quad F(\varepsilon_1) = F(\delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}a.$$

for some $a \in \mathbb{C}$. Since R contains $\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1$ and satisfies (GR2), R contains either $2\delta_1$ or $2\varepsilon_1$. The case $2\varepsilon_1 \in R$ reduces to the case $2\delta_1 \in R$ by permuting the roles of ε_1 and δ_1 . Thus, without loss of generality, we can (and will) assume that $2\delta_1 \in R$. Applying Lemma B.9.1 (i) to the pair $2\delta_1$ and δ_1 we get $4\mathbb{Z}a \subset F(2\delta_1)$. On the other hand, Lemma B.9.1 (ii) gives $F(2\delta_1) \subset F(\varepsilon_1 + \delta_1)$. Thus

$$(B.5) \quad 4\mathbb{Z}a \subset F(2\delta_1) \subset F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1).$$

Set $Y := \{y \in \mathbb{C} \mid 2\varepsilon_1 + y\delta_0 \in R\}$. Since $2\varepsilon_1 \in \text{cl}_0(R)$, Y is not empty. For $y \in Y$ one has

$$s_{2\varepsilon_1+y\delta}(\delta_1 - \varepsilon_1) = \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + y\delta \in R$$

so $y \in F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1)$. For each $x \in F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1)$, R contains $\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ and $\varepsilon_1 + \delta_1 + x\delta_0$, so, by (GR2), the set $\{2\varepsilon_1 + x\delta_0, 2\delta_1 + x\delta_0\} \cap R$ has the cardinality one. Therefore $F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) = F(2\delta_1) \coprod Y$. By Lemma B.9.1 (i) we have $F(2\delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}c$ and $Y = y_0 + \mathbb{Z}d$ for some $c, d, y_0 \in \mathbb{C}$. Applying Lemma B.9.1 (i) to the pair $2\varepsilon_1 + y\delta_0$ and ε_1 we get $4\mathbb{Z}a \subset \mathbb{Z}d$. Using (B.4) and (B.5) we obtain

$$4\mathbb{Z}a \subset \mathbb{Z}c, \quad c, d, y_0 \in \mathbb{Z}a, \quad 2a \in F(\pm\varepsilon_1 \pm \delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}c \coprod (y_0 + \mathbb{Z}d).$$

This gives the following possibilities:

- (1) $F(2\delta_1) = 2\mathbb{Z}a$, $F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) = \mathbb{Z}a$, $2\varepsilon_1 + \delta_0 \in R$, $F(2\varepsilon_1 + \delta_0) = 2\mathbb{Z}a$
- (2) $F(2\delta_1) = 4\mathbb{Z}a$, $F(\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) = 2\mathbb{Z}a$, $2\varepsilon_1 + 2\delta_0 \in R$, $F(2\varepsilon_1 + \delta_0) = 4\mathbb{Z}a$.

We have $R \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, where \mathfrak{g}' is of type $A(2|1)^{(2)}$ for (1), and of type $A(2|2)^{(4)}$ for (2).

We will use the following observation: if $\gamma \in R$ is such that $\text{cl}(\gamma) = \pm 2\delta_1$, then $\gamma/2 \in R$ (this holds, because $s/2 \in F(\delta_1)$ for any $s \in F(2\delta_1)$).

B.9.6. Let $\text{cl}_0(R)$ be of the type $A(m-1|n-1)$ for $m, n \geq 1$ with $mn > 1$, or $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ for $n \geq 3$.

We consider the distinguished base $\{\alpha'_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$ in $\text{cl}_0(R) = A(m-1|n-1)$: $\alpha'_i := \varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$, $\alpha'_{m+j} = \delta_j - \delta_{j+1}$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $\alpha'_m := \varepsilon_m - \delta_1$. Let $\alpha_i \in R$ be such that $\text{cl}_0(\alpha_i) = \alpha'_i$. Let E be the span of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$.

Set $\dot{R} := R \cap E$. Then \dot{R} satisfies (GR0)–(GR2) and contains $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$. The Gram matrix of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$ is the Gram matrix of $\{\alpha'_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$. Therefore s_{α_i} for $i = 1, \dots, m+n-1$, $i \neq m$, generate the group isomorphic to $W[\text{cl}_0(R)]$. Since any element in $\text{cl}_0(R) = A(m-1|n-1)$ is conjugated to one of the elements in $\{\alpha'_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1} \cup \{-\alpha_m\}$, the restriction of cl_0 to \dot{R} gives a surjective map $\dot{R} \rightarrow \text{cl}_0(R)$. If the restriction of cl_0 to $\mathbb{C}\dot{R}$ is injective, then $\dot{R} \cong \text{cl}_0(R)$.

For $m \neq n$, the Gram matrix of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$ is non-degenerate, so $\dot{R} \cong A(m-1|n-1)$. For $m = n$ the Gram matrix of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$ has a one-dimensional kernel, so \dot{R} is isomorphic to $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ or to $A(n-1|n-1) = \Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(n|n))$. Notice that if $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $\dot{R} \cong A(m-1|n-1)$, by Remark B.4.3.

B.10. Set $\text{cl}_K(R)$. From now on \mathfrak{g} is an indecomposable symmetrizable finite-dimensional or affine Kac-Moody superalgebra with the set of real roots Δ^{re} . If \mathfrak{g} is finite-dimensional, we set $\delta := 0$. In all cases $\text{cl} : \mathbb{C}\Delta^{\text{re}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\Delta^{\text{re}}/\mathbb{C}\delta$ is the canonical map.

From now on $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is an indecomposable set satisfying (GR0)–(GR3) and containing an isotropic root. As before, $K = \{v \in \mathbb{C}R \mid (v, R) = 0\}$ and we let $\text{cl}_K : \mathbb{C}R \rightarrow \mathbb{C}R/K$ be the canonical map. The bilinear form $(-, -)$ induces a non-degenerate bilinear form on $\mathbb{C}R/K$.

B.10.1. Lemma. *Let $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}$ be an indecomposable set satisfying (GR0)–(GR3). Then $\text{cl}_K(R) \subset \mathbb{C}R/K$ is a finite indecomposable set satisfying (GR0), (GR1), (WGR2) and (GR3).*

Proof. It is clear that $\text{cl}_K(R) \subset \mathbb{C}R/K$ is an indecomposable set satisfying (GR0), (GR1), (WGR2) and (GR3). It remains to verify that $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is finite. Suppose that R is infinite. Since $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is a finite set, one has $\text{cl}(\alpha) = \text{cl}(\gamma)$ for some $\alpha, \gamma \in R$, so $\delta \in \mathbb{C}R$. Then $\delta \in K$, so cl_K can be decomposed as $\text{cl}_K = \text{cl}'_K \circ \text{cl}$, where $\text{cl}'_K : \mathbb{C}R/\mathbb{C}\delta \rightarrow \mathbb{C}R/K$ is the canonical map. Since $\text{cl}(R) \subset \text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is a finite set, $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is finite. \square

B.10.2. By Lemma B.10.1, $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is one of the sets described in § B.3.2, i.e. $\text{cl}_K(R)$ lies in the list:

$$A(m-1|n-1) \text{ for } m \neq n, \quad B(m|n), D(m|n), C(m|n), BC(m|n), D(2|1, a), G(3), F(4),$$

where $m, n \geq 1$, or $\text{cl}_K(R) \cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ for $n \geq 2$. (Recall that $A(n-1|n-1)$ stands for $\Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(n|n))$). For $D(2|1, a), G(3), F(4)$ we set $n = 1$ and $m = 1, 2, 3$ respectively. If $\text{cl}_K(R) \neq D(2|1, a), F(4)$, we view $\text{cl}_K(R)$ as a subset of $L_{m,n}$ (see § B.2.1 for notation).

B.11. Case $\text{cl}_K(R) \neq C(1|1)$. Our goal is to show that in this case $R \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$. The cases when $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is $A(1|0)$, $B(1|1)$, $BC(1|1)$ were treated in § B.9. Now we consider the remaining cases, i.e. $mn \geq 2$ (and $mn \geq 3$ for $A(m|n)$, since $A(1|0)$ corresponds to $m = 2, n = 1$).

B.11.1. If $\text{cl}_K(R) \neq D(2|1, a), F(4)$ we view $\text{cl}_K(R)$ as a subset of $L_{m,n}$ and set

$$E' := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m x_i \varepsilon_i + \sum_{j=1}^n y_j \delta_j \mid \sum_{i=1}^m x_i + \sum_{j=1}^n y_j = 0, x_i, y_j \in \mathbb{C} \right\}.$$

For $\text{cl}_K(R) = D(2|1, a)$ take E' spanned by two isotropic roots in $\text{cl}_K(R)$, and for $\text{cl}_K(R) = F(4)$ take E' spanned by $(\delta_1 - \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3)/2$, $\varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2$ and $\varepsilon_2 - \varepsilon_3$.

One readily sees that if $\text{cl}_K(R) \not\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$, then $\text{cl}_K(R) \cap E' \cong A(m-1|n-1)$ and this is a maximal root subsystem of type $A(i|j)$ contained in $\text{cl}_K(R)$. For $\text{cl}_K(R) \cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ we have $\text{cl}_K(R) \cap E' = \text{cl}_K(R)$.

Let $\{\alpha'_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n-1}$ be as in § B.9.6. Fix $\alpha_i \in R$ such that $\text{cl}_K(\alpha_i) = \alpha'_i$ and let E be the span of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+n}$. By § B.9.6, $R \cap E$ contains R' such that

$$R' \cong A(m-1|n-1).$$

B.11.2. Lemma. *We have*

- (i) $K \cap \mathbb{C}R' = 0$ if $\text{cl}_K(R) \not\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ for $n \geq 3$;
- (ii) $\{\gamma \in R \mid \text{cl}_K(\gamma) \in E'\} = R' + \mathbb{Z}a\delta$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. For $m \neq n$, R' isomorphic to $A(m-1|n-1)$ and the restriction of $(-, -)$ to R' is non-degenerate, so $K \cap \mathbb{C}R' = 0$. Consider the case $m = n$. Let $\beta_i \in R'$ be such that $\text{cl}_K(\beta_i) = \varepsilon_i - \delta_i$. The kernel of the restriction of $(-, -)$ to $\mathbb{C}R'$ is spanned by $\mu := \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i$.

Therefore $K \cap \mathbb{C}R' = K \cap \mathbb{C}\mu$. Hence the restriction of cl_K to R' is injective (since $n > 1$, so $\alpha - \beta \notin \mathbb{C}\mu$ if $\alpha, \beta \in R'$ and $\alpha \neq \beta$).

If $\text{cl}_K(R) \not\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$, then $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is $D(n|n)$ or $B(n|n)$, so $2\delta_1 \in \text{cl}_K(R)$. Taking $\gamma \in R$ such that $\text{cl}_K(\gamma) = 2\delta_1$ we obtain $(\gamma, \beta_i) = (2\delta_1, \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1) \neq 0$ and $(\gamma, \beta_i) = 0$ for $i > 1$, that is $(\mu, \gamma) \neq 0$, so $\mu \notin K$. Hence $\text{cl}_K(R) \not\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ forces $K \cap \mathbb{C}R' = 0$. This completes the proof of (i).

For (ii) recall that $\text{cl}_K(R) \cap E'$ is isomorphic to $A(m-1|n-1)$ if $\text{cl}_K(R) \not\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$ and $\text{cl}_K(R) \cap E' = \text{cl}_K(R)$ if $\text{cl}_K(R) \cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(n|n))$. Since $R' \cong A(m-1|n-1)$, we have $\text{cl}_K(R') = \text{cl}_K(R)$. Assume that $\{\gamma \in R \mid \text{cl}_K(\gamma) \in \text{cl}_K(R')\} \neq R'$. Take $\gamma \in R$ such that $\text{cl}_K(\gamma) \in E'$ and $\gamma \notin R'$. Since $\text{cl}_K(R') = \text{cl}_K(R)$, $\text{cl}_K(\gamma) = \text{cl}_K(\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in R'$. Set $\delta_0 := \gamma - \alpha$ and define $F(\alpha)$ as in § B.9. Since $\gamma \in R$ we have $1 \in F(\alpha)$, so $\mathbb{Z} \subset F(\alpha)$ by § B.9.3. Therefore $\text{cl}(\alpha + \mathbb{Z}\delta_0) = \text{cl}(\alpha) + \mathbb{Z}\text{cl}(\delta_0)$ lies in $\text{cl}(R) \subset \text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ which is finite. Hence $\text{cl}(\delta_0) = 0$, so $\delta_0 \in \mathbb{C}\delta$. This establishes (ii). \square

B.11.3. Consider the case $\text{cl}_K(R) = A(m-1|n-1)$. Since $R' \cong A(m-1|n-1)$ and $mn \geq 2$, the restriction of cl_K to R' is injective. Since R' and $\text{cl}_K(R)$ contain the same number of elements, we have $\text{cl}_K(R) = \text{cl}_K(R')$. By Lemma B.11.2 (ii), we obtain $R = R' + \mathbb{Z}j\delta$, so R is isomorphic to $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ for \mathfrak{g}' of type $A(m-1|n-1)$.

B.11.4. Now consider the cases when $\text{cl}_K(R) \not\cong A(m-1|n-1)$.

Retain notation of B.11.1. Recall that $R' \cong A(m-1|n-1)$. By Lemma B.11.2 (i), $K \cap \mathbb{C}R' = 0$, so the span of $\text{cl}_K(R')$ is of dimension $m+n-1$. Since $\text{cl}_K(R) \not\cong A(m-1|n-1)$, the span of $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is of dimension $m+n$. In each case we choose $\alpha'_{m+n} \in \text{cl}_K(R)$ which does not lie in $\text{cl}_K(R')$: if $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is $B(m|n)$ or $BC(m|n)$ we take $\alpha'_{m+n} := \delta_n$; in other cases we take α'_{m+n} arbitrary.

Then we choose α_{m+n} such that $\text{cl}_K(\alpha_{m+n}) = \alpha'_{m+n}$. We denote by V the span of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n}$. We set

$$\dot{R} := V \cap R.$$

Since $\{\alpha'_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n}$ is a basis of $\text{cl}_K(R)$ we identify $\mathbb{C}R/K$ with V . Then $\dot{R} \subset \text{cl}_K(R)$.

We have $\dim V = m+n$ and $\dot{R} \subset V$ satisfies (GR0)–(GR2) (since R satisfies these properties). The Gram matrices of $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n}$ and of $\{\alpha'_i\}_{i=1}^{m+n}$ coincide and the latter is the Gram matrix of a distinguished base of a root system which is not of type $A(m-1|n-1)$. Thus this matrix is invertible, so the restriction of $(-, -)$ to V is non-degenerate. By Serganova's classification (§ B.3.2) \dot{R} is the root system of a finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra. Recall that

$$(B.6) \quad \dot{R} \subset R, \quad A(m-1|n-1) \cong R' \subsetneq \dot{R} \subset \text{cl}_K(R), \quad \mathbb{C}\dot{R} = \mathbb{C}\text{cl}_K(R)$$

and that $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is not the types $A(i|j)$ or $\Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(i|i))$ for all i . If $\dot{R} \neq \text{cl}_K(R)$, then $\dot{R} \subset \text{cl}_K(R)$ is one of the following inclusions:

$$D(m|n) \subset B(m|n), \quad D(m|n) \subset C(m|n), \quad D(m|n) \subset BC(m|n), \quad B(m|n) \subset BC(m|n).$$

If $\text{cl}_K(R)$ is $B(m|n)$ or $BC(m|n)$, \dot{R} contains $\alpha_{m+n} = \delta_n$, so \dot{R} is not of the type $D(m|n)$. Hence $\text{cl}_K(R) = \dot{R}$ if $\text{cl}_K(R) \neq C(m|n)$, $\dot{R} = D(m|n)$ if $\text{cl}_K(R) \neq C(m|n)$, and $\dot{R} = B(m|n)$ if $BC(m|n)$.

B.11.5. Take a non-zero $\delta_0 \in K$. By Lemma B.2.9, any isotropic root in $\beta \in \text{cl}_K(R)$ is $W[\dot{R}]$ -conjugate to a root in R' . By Lemma B.9.1, $F(\beta) = 0$ if $\delta_0 \notin \mathbb{C}\delta$ and $F(\beta) = \mathbb{Z}a$ for $\delta_0 = \delta$, where a is as in Lemma B.11.2 (ii).

If $\gamma \in R$ is anisotropic, then, by Lemma B.9.1, $F(\gamma) = \mathbb{Z}c\delta_0$ for some $c \in \mathbb{C}$. Since $\text{cl}(R) \subset \text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is finite, $\text{cl}(c\delta_0) = 0$. We conclude that $F(\alpha) = 0$ for each $\alpha \in R$ if $\delta_0 \in \mathbb{C}\delta$. Since $\text{cl}_K(R) \subset V = \mathbb{C}\dot{R}$ we obtain

$$R \subset (V + \mathbb{C}\delta).$$

B.11.6. Corollary. *Let $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}'$ be the finite-dimensional Kac-Moody superalgebra with the root system \dot{R} . If $\dot{R} = \text{cl}_K(R)$, then $R \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, where \mathfrak{g}' is either $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}'$, or the affinization of $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}'$, or $\mathfrak{g}' \cong D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$.*

Proof. By Lemma B.2.9, \dot{R} contains an isotropic β such that $(\beta, \gamma) \neq 0$. By §§ B.9.3, B.9.4 we have $c = \pm a$ if $\text{cl}_K(R) \cap (\mathbb{C}\beta + \mathbb{C}\gamma)$ is of type $A(1|0)$, and $c \in \{\pm a, \pm a/2\}$ if this is of type $B(1|1)$.

If $c = \pm a$, then $R = \dot{R} + \mathbb{Z}a\delta$, and $R = \dot{R} \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\dot{\mathfrak{g}}')$ if $a = 0$ and $R \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ where \mathfrak{g}' is the affinization of $\dot{\mathfrak{g}}'$ if $a \neq 0$.

If $a \neq 0$ and $c \neq \pm a$, then $\dot{R} = B(m|n)$ or $G(3)$. In this case § B.9.4 gives $F(\alpha_s) = \mathbb{Z}\frac{a}{2}$ if $\alpha_s \in \dot{R}$ is a short root and $F(\alpha) = \mathbb{Z}a$ otherwise. If $\dot{R} = \text{cl}_K(R)$ is of type $B(m|n)$, this gives $R \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ where $\mathfrak{g}' = D(m+1|n)^{(2)}$. If $\dot{R} = G(3)$, then, for a long root α_l in $G(2)$ we have $\langle \alpha_l, \alpha_s^\vee \rangle = \pm 3$, so Lemma B.9.1 (ii) gives $3F(\alpha_s) \subset F(\alpha_l)$ which contradicts to $F(\alpha_s) = \mathbb{Z}\frac{a}{2}$ and $F(\alpha_l) = \mathbb{Z}a$. \square

B.11.7. *Case $C(m|n)$ with $mn \geq 2$.* Without loss of generality we can (and will) assume $n \geq 2$. Recall that $R \subset V \oplus \mathbb{C}\delta$. Set $\delta_0 := \delta$. By Lemma B.9.1, $F(\alpha) = \mathbb{Z}a$ for any $\alpha \in W[\dot{R}]R'$ that is for all $\alpha \in \dot{R}$ with $\alpha \neq \pm 2\delta_j$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$.

Set

$$\beta = \delta_1 - \varepsilon_1.$$

Applying Lemma B.9.1 (ii) to the pair β and $2\delta_1$, we obtain $F(2\delta_1) \subset \mathbb{Z}a$. Since $\langle 2\delta_1, (\delta_1 - \delta_2)^\vee \rangle = 2$ we get $2\mathbb{Z}a \subset F(2\delta_1)$. Hence $F(2\delta_1)$ is $\mathbb{Z}a$ or $2\mathbb{Z}a$.

Set

$$Y := \{y \in \mathbb{C} \mid 2\varepsilon_1 + y\delta \in R\}.$$

Since $\text{cl}_K(R) = C(m|n)$ and $R \subset V + \mathbb{C}\delta$, Y is not empty. For $y \in Y$ one has

$$s_{2\varepsilon_1+y\delta}(\beta_1) = \beta_1 + (2\varepsilon_1 + y\delta) = \delta_1 + \varepsilon_1 + y\delta \in R$$

so $y \in \mathbb{Z}a$ (since $F(\delta_1 + \varepsilon_1) = \mathbb{Z}a$). Thus Y is a non-empty subset of $\mathbb{Z}a$. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, R contains $\varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ and $\varepsilon_1 + \delta_1 + ai\delta$, so the set $\{2\varepsilon_1 + ai\delta, 2\delta_1 + ai\delta\} \cap R$ has the cardinality one. Therefore

$$\mathbb{Z}a = F(2\delta_1) \coprod Y.$$

Since $F(2\delta_1)$ is $\mathbb{Z}a$ or $2\mathbb{Z}a$, and Y is non-empty, we obtain $F(2\delta_1) = 2\mathbb{Z}a$, $Y = a + 2\mathbb{Z}a$ and $a \neq 0$.

Acting by $W[\dot{R}]$ we obtain

$$F(2\delta_j) = 2\mathbb{Z}a, \quad \{y \in \mathbb{C} \mid 2\varepsilon_i + y\delta \in R\}a + 2\mathbb{Z}a$$

for $j = 1, \dots, n$ and $i = 1, \dots, m$. This gives

$$R = \{\alpha + \mathbb{Z}a\delta \mid \alpha \in D(m|n), \alpha \neq \pm 2\delta_j\} \cup \{\pm 2\delta_j + \mathbb{Z}a\delta, \pm 2\varepsilon_i + a\delta + 2\mathbb{Z}a\delta\}$$

(where $i = 1, \dots, m$ and $j = 1, \dots, n$). Hence $R \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ for $\mathfrak{g}' = A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$.

B.11.8. *Case $BC(m|n)$ with $mn \geq 2$.* Without loss of generality we can (and will) assume $n \geq 2$. By §§ B.11.4, B.11.5, R contains $\dot{R} \cong B(m|n)$ and $R \subset (\mathbb{C}\dot{R} \oplus \mathbb{C}\delta)$. Set $\delta_0 := \delta$. Using Lemma B.11.2 (ii) and the fact that $F(w\alpha) = F(\alpha)$ for $w \in W[R]$ and $\alpha \in R$ we get

$$F(\pm\varepsilon_i \pm \delta_j) = F(\pm\varepsilon_i \pm \varepsilon_{i_1}) = F(\pm\delta_j \pm \delta_{j_1}) = \mathbb{Z}a$$

for $1 \leq i \neq i_1 \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \neq j_1 \leq n$. Now § B.9.5 gives the following possibilities

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad & F(2\delta_j) = 2\mathbb{Z}a, \quad F(\varepsilon_i) = F(\delta_i) = \mathbb{Z}a \quad 2\varepsilon_i + \delta \in R, \quad F(2\varepsilon_i + \delta) = 2\mathbb{Z}a \\ (2) \quad & F(2\delta_j) = 2\mathbb{Z}a, \quad F(\varepsilon_i) = F(\delta_j) = \mathbb{Z}a/2 \quad 2\varepsilon_i + 2\delta \in R, \quad F(2\varepsilon_i + \delta) = 2\mathbb{Z}a. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $R \cong \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$, where \mathfrak{g}' is of type $A(2m+1|2n)^{(2)}$ for (1), and of type $A(2m|2n)^{(4)}$ for (2).

B.12. Case $\text{cl}_K(R) = C(1|1)$. Take α_1, α_2 , and β in R such that $\text{cl}_K(\alpha_1) = -2\varepsilon_1$, $\text{cl}_K(\alpha_2) = 2\delta_1$, and $\text{cl}_K(\beta) = \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$. We normalize the form $(-, -)$ by the condition $(\alpha_1, \alpha_1) = 2$. Let V be the span of α_1, α_2 and β . Set

$$\xi := 2\beta + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2.$$

B.12.1. Lemma. *The vectors $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta$ are linearly independent. If ξ is not proportional to δ , then $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta$ and δ are linearly independent.*

Proof. Since R contains β and $s_{\alpha_2}\beta = \beta + \alpha_2$, one has $2\beta + \alpha_2 \notin R$ (by (GR2)), so $\xi \neq 0$.

Notice that the kernel of the Gram matrix of $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta, \delta$ is spanned by ξ and δ . Since $\xi \neq 0$, the vectors $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta$ are linearly independent. If ξ is not proportional to δ , then $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \beta$ and δ are linearly independent. \square

B.12.2. The non-isotropic elements in $\text{cl}_K(R)$ are $\pm \text{cl}_K(\alpha_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. Using Lemma B.9.1 we obtain

$$(B.7) \quad R^{\text{an}} = \{\pm\alpha_1 + \mathbb{Z}a_1\delta\} \coprod \{\pm\alpha_1 + \mathbb{Z}a_1\delta\}$$

for some $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Let W' be the image of $W[R]$ in $GL(\mathbb{C}R)$. By Lemma B.2.9 (ii),

$$R^{\text{iso}} = -W'\beta \cup W'\beta.$$

Since $s_{\alpha_i}s_{\alpha_i+s\delta}\beta = \beta + s\delta$ for any $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$(B.8) \quad W'\beta = \{\beta + \mathbb{Z}a\delta, \beta + \alpha_1 + \mathbb{Z}a\delta, \beta + \alpha_2 + \mathbb{Z}a\delta, \beta + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \mathbb{Z}a\delta\},$$

where $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is such that $\mathbb{Z}a_1 + \mathbb{Z}a_2 = \mathbb{Z}a$ (i.e., $a = 0$ if $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, and a is the greatest common divisor of a_1, a_2 otherwise).

Since R contains $\beta + \alpha_1, \beta + \alpha_2$ and $\beta + aj\delta \in R$ for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, (GR2) gives

$$(B.9) \quad |\{\alpha_1 - aj\delta, \xi - \alpha_2 + aj\delta\} \cap R| = |\{\alpha_2 - aj\delta, \xi - \alpha_1 + aj\delta\} \cap R| = 1$$

where $|X|$ stands for the cardinality of X .

B.12.3. *Case $\xi \notin \mathbb{C}\delta$.* By Lemma B.12.1, $\beta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \delta$ are linearly independent. This implies $W'\beta \cap (-W'\beta) = \emptyset$. Moreover, $\xi - \alpha_i + aj\delta \notin R$ by (B.7) for $i = 1, 2$. Combining (B.7) and (B.9) we conclude $a \in \mathbb{Z}a_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, that is $a = a_1 = a_2$. Hence

$$R = \{\pm\alpha_i + \mathbb{Z}a\delta, \pm\beta + a\delta, \pm(\beta + \alpha_i + \mathbb{Z}a\delta), \pm(\beta + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \mathbb{Z}a\delta\}_{i=1,2}.$$

Since $\beta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \delta$ are linearly independent, the map given by $\alpha_1 \mapsto \varepsilon_1 - \varepsilon_2, \beta \mapsto \varepsilon_2 - \delta_1, \alpha_2 \mapsto \delta_1 - \delta_2, a\delta \mapsto \delta$ induces the isomorphism $R \cong \Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(2|2)) = A(1|1)$ if $a = 0$ and $R \cong A(1|1)^{(1)}$ if $a \neq 0$.

Note that $\text{cl}(R) \cong A(1|1) (\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(2|2)))$.

B.12.4. *Case $a = 0$.* In this case $a_1 = a_2 = 0$. By Lemma B.12.1, $\beta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$ are linearly independent. This implies $W'\beta \cap (-W'\beta) = \emptyset$ and

$$R = \{\pm\alpha_i, \pm\beta, \pm(\beta + \alpha_i), \pm(\beta + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2)\}_{i=1,2} \cong A(1|1),$$

where the isomorphism is the same as in § B.12.3. Note that $\text{cl}(R) \cong A(1|1) (\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(2|2)))$.

B.12.5. *Case $\xi \in \mathbb{C}\delta, a \neq 0$.* Then $\xi = d\delta$ for some $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0}$.

Recall that $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, a_1 + a_2 \neq 0$, and a is the greatest common divisor of a_1, a_2 . Combining (B.7) and (B.9) we conclude that for each $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ either $aj \in \mathbb{Z}a_2$ or $aj + d \in \mathbb{Z}a_1$, and, similarly, either $aj \in \mathbb{Z}a_1$ or $aj + d \in \mathbb{Z}a_2$. Taking $j = 0$ we obtain $d \notin \mathbb{Z}a_i$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then $aa_1 + d \notin \mathbb{Z}a_1$, so $aa_1 \in \mathbb{Z}a_2$. Similarly, $aa_2 \in \mathbb{Z}a_1$. Therefore $a_1, a_2 \neq 0$, so $k_1 := \frac{a_1}{a}, k_2 := \frac{a_2}{a}$ are coprime positive integers. By above, $ak_1|k_2$ and $ak_2|k_1$, which implies $k_1 = k_2 = 1$. Hence $a_1 = a_2 = a$ and $a \nmid d$.

Let us show that $-W'\beta \cap W'\beta = \emptyset$. We will use formula (B.8). Take $\gamma \in -W'\beta \cap W'\beta$. Then $\text{cl}(\gamma) = \text{cl}(w\beta)$ for some $w \in W'$ and $w^{-1}\gamma \in -W'\beta \cap W'\beta$. Thus, without loss of generality, we can assume that $\text{cl}(\gamma) = \text{cl}(\beta)$. In this case

$$\gamma = \beta + j_1a\delta = -\beta + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + j_2a\delta$$

so $2\beta + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = d\delta = (j_2 - j_1)a\delta$ which contradicts to $a \nmid d$.

In the light of § B.12.2 we conclude that $R = R(a, d)$ where

$$(B.10) \quad R(a, d) = \{\pm\alpha_i + \mathbb{Z}a\delta, \pm\beta + a\delta, \pm(\beta + \alpha_i + \mathbb{Z}a\delta), \pm(\beta + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \mathbb{Z}a\delta\}_{i=1,2}$$

where $\beta = \frac{d\delta - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2}{2}$ and $a \nmid d$. One has $R(a, d) \cong R(a, d \pm 2a)$ (the isomorphism is given by $\beta \mapsto \beta + a\delta$), $R(a, d) \cong R(a, -d)$ (the isomorphism is given by $\beta \mapsto -\beta, \alpha_i \mapsto -\alpha_i$), so we can assume that $a \geq 2d$.

One has $R(2d, d) \cong A(1|1)^{(2)}$ (with the isomorphism given by $\alpha_1 \mapsto \delta - 2\varepsilon_1, \beta \mapsto \varepsilon_1 - \delta_1$ and $\alpha_2 \mapsto 2\delta_1$).

For $a \neq 2d$, one has $R(a, d) \not\cong A(1|1)^{(2)}$ (and R is not a bijective quotient of $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$ for any \mathfrak{g}'), since for any isotropic root $\gamma \in R$ and any non-zero $\delta_0 \in K$ we have

$$F(\gamma) = \mathbb{Z}xa \cup (\mathbb{Z}a - d)x,$$

where $\delta_0 = x\delta$, and $F(\gamma)$ forms a subgroup of \mathbb{C} if $a = 2d$ (or if R is a bijective quotient of $\Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g}')$), and does not form a subgroup if $a \neq 2d$.

B.12.6. Corollary. *Let $R \subset \Delta^{\text{re}}(\mathfrak{g})$ be such that $\text{cl}_K(R) \cong C(1|1)$ ($\cong \Delta(\mathfrak{psl}(2|2))$). Then we have the following possibilities:*

$$\begin{aligned} R &\cong A(1|1)(= \Delta(\mathfrak{gl}(2|2))) & \text{cl}(R) &= R, \\ R &\cong A(1|1)^{(1)} & \text{cl}(R) &\cong A(1|1) \\ R &\cong A(1|1)^{(2)} & \text{cl}(R) &= \text{cl}_K(R) \cong C(1|1) \\ R &\cong R(a, d), a, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, a > 2d & \text{cl}(R) &= \text{cl}_K(R) \cong C(1|1). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Proposition B.6.7 (i).

B.13. Proof of Proposition B.6.7 (ii). Now assume that Δ_λ has an indecomposable component R such that $\text{cl}(R) = C(1|1)$.

B.13.1. Since $\text{cl}(R)$ does not satisfy (GR2), $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ does not satisfy (GR2), so $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}})$ is isomorphic either to $BC(m|n)$ for $mn \geq 1$ or to $C(m|n)$ for $mn > 1$, and

$$\text{cl}(R) = \{\pm 2\varepsilon_i, \pm \varepsilon_i \pm \delta_j, \pm 2\delta_j\}$$

for some i, j ($1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n$).

Take $\gamma \in R$ such that $\text{cl}(\gamma) = 2\delta_j$. Note that $\gamma/2 \notin R$ (since $\text{cl}(\gamma/2) = \delta_i \notin \text{cl}(R)$), so $\gamma/2 \notin \Delta_\lambda$. By Corollary 4.1.6, $\gamma/2 \notin \Delta^{\text{re}}$.

If $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}}) \cong BC(m|n)$, then $\text{cl}(\mathbb{C}R \cap \Delta^{\text{re}}) \cong BC(1|1)$, so $\mathbb{C}R \cap \Delta^{\text{re}}$ is one of the real root systems (i.e., $A(2|1)^{(2)}$, $A(2|2)^{(4)}$) described in § B.9.5. For these root system for any root γ satisfying $\text{cl}(\gamma) = 2\delta_j$, $\gamma/2$ is a root (see the observation in the end of § B.9.5), so $\gamma/2 \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$, a contradiction.

Hence $\text{cl}(\Delta^{\text{re}}) = C(m|n)$, so, by § B.11.7, \mathfrak{g} is of the type $A(2m-1|2n-1)^{(2)}$.

B.13.2. Set $k := (\lambda, \delta)$. Since $(\alpha, \alpha) \in \{0, \pm 2\}$ for any $\alpha \in R$, we have $(\lambda, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\alpha \in R_\lambda$, so $(\lambda, \alpha) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all $\alpha \in R$.

Take a non-isotropic $\alpha \in R$. Then $(\alpha, \alpha) = \pm 2$, so $\alpha + s\delta \in \Delta_\lambda$ if and only if $\alpha + s\delta \in \Delta^{\text{re}}$ and $(\lambda, \alpha + s\delta) \in \mathbb{Z}$. The first condition gives $2|s$ and the second condition gives $sk \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Recall that $R = R(a, d)$ for some $a, d \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, $a \geq 2d$. By (B.10), $\alpha + s\delta \in R$ if and only if $a|s$. We conclude that $a|s$ is equivalent to $2|s$ and $sk \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore a is even and $k = \frac{p}{q}$ where p, q are coprime and either q is odd and $a = 2q$ or q is even and $a = q$. Since $d\delta \in \mathbb{Z}R$ we have $(\lambda, d\delta) = dk \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus d is divisible by q . Hence $a = 2q$ and $d = q$. Thus $R(a, d) \cong A(1|1)^{(2)}$ and q is odd. This completes the proof of Proposition B.6.7 (ii).

REFERENCES

- [1] D. Adamović, A. Milas, *Vertex operator algebras associated to module representations for $A_1^{(1)}$* , Math. Res. Lett. **2** (1995), 563–575.
- [2] D. Adamović, V. G. Kac, P. Möseneder Frajria, P. Papi, O. Perše *An application of collapsing levels to the representation theory of affine vertex algebras*, IMRN **13** (2020), 4103–4143.
- [3] T. Arakawa, *Rationality of admissible affine vertex algebras in the category \mathcal{O}* , Duke Math. J. **165** (2016), no. 1, 67–93.
- [4] V. V. Deodhar, O. Gabber and V. Kac, *Structure of some categories of representations of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, **45** (1982), 92–116.
- [5] C. Dong, H. Li and G. Mason, *Regularity of rational vertex algebras*, Adv. Math. **132** (1997), no. 1, 148–166.
- [6] I. Frenkel, Y. Zhu, *Vertex operator algebras associated to representations of affine and Virasoro algebras*, Duke Math. J., **66**, no. 1 (1992), 123–168.
- [7] P. Fiebig, *The combinatorics of category \mathcal{O} over symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras*, Transformation groups **11** (1), (2006), 29–49.
- [8] M. Gorelik, *Weyl denominator identity for finite-dimensional Lie superalgebras*, Highlights in Lie algebraic methods, 167–188, Progr. Math. 295, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012.
- [9] M. Gorelik, *Weyl denominator identity for affine Lie superalgebras with non-zero dual Coxeter number*, J. Algebra **337** (2011), 50–62.
- [10] M. Gorelik, *Depths and cores in the light of DS-functors*, arXiv:2010.05721.
- [11] M. Gorelik, V. Hinich, V. Serganova, *Root groupoid and related Lie superalgebras*, arXiv:2209.06253.
- [12] M. Gorelik, V. G. Kac, *On simplicity of vacuum modules*, Adv. Math. **211:2** (2007), 621–677.
- [13] M. Gorelik, V. G. Kac, *On complete reducibility for infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Adv. in Math., **226:2**, (2011), 1911–1972.
- [14] M. Gorelik, V. G. Kac, *Characters of (relatively) integrable modules over affine Lie superalgebras*, Japan. J. Math. **10**, (2015), no. 2, 135–235.
- [15] M. Gorelik, V. G. Kac, *On simplicity of universal minimal W -algebras*, arXiv:2307.14220.
- [16] M. Gorelik, Sh. C. Kerbis *On the root system of a Kac-Moody superalgebra*, arXiv:2311.17803
- [17] M. Gorelik, V. Serganova, *Integrable modules over affine Lie superalgebras $\mathfrak{sl}(1|n)^{(1)}$* , Comm. in Math. Physics **364**, (2018), 635–654.
- [18] M. Gorelik, V. Serganova, *Snowflake modules and Enright functor for Kac-Moody superalgebras*, Algebra and Number Theory, **16** no. 4 (2022), 839–879.
- [19] M. Gorelik, V. Serganova, A. Sherman, *On the Grothendieck ring of a quasireductive Lie superalgebra*, arXiv:2206.07709
- [20] M. Gorelik, A. Shaviv, *Generalized reflection root systems*, J. of Algebra **491** (2017), 490–516.
- [21] C. Hoyt, *Regular Kac-Moody superalgebras and integrable highest weight modules*, J. Algebra **324** (2010), no. 12, 3308–3354.
- [22] C. Hoyt, Sh. Reif, *Simplicity of vacuum modules over affine Lie superalgebras*, Journal of Algebra, **321**, no.10 (2009).
- [23] K. Iohara, Y. Koga, *Enright functors for Kac-Moody superalgebras*, Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hambg. **82**, (2012), no. 2, 205–226.
- [24] V. G. Kac, *Simple irreducible graded Lie algebras of finite growth*, Math. USSR-Izvestija **2** (1968), 1271–1311.
- [25] V. G. Kac, *Lie superalgebras*, Adv. in Math., **26**, no. 1 (1977), 8–96.
- [26] V. G. Kac, *Infinite-dimensional algebras, Dedekind’s η -function, classical Möbius function and very strange formula*, Adv. in Math., **30**, (1978), 85–136.
- [27] V. G. Kac, *Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Third edition, Cambridge University Press, 1990.

- [28] V. G. Kac, D. Kazhdan, *Structure of representations with highest weight of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras*, Adv. in Math. **34** (1979), 97–108.
- [29] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *Modular invariant representations of infinite-dimensional Lie algebras and superalgebras*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **85** (1988), 4956–4960.
- [30] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *Classification of modular invariant representations of affine algebras*, in Infinite-dimensional Lie algebras and groups (Luminy-Marseille, 1988), Advanced ser. in Math. Phys. vol.7, World Scientific, 1989, 138–177.
- [31] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *Integrable highest weight modules over affine superalgebras and number theory*, Progress in Math. **123** (1994), 415–456.
- [32] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *Integrable highest weight modules over affine superalgebras and Appell's function*, Commun. Math. Phys. **215** (2001), 631–682.
- [33] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *Quantum reduction and representation theory of superconformal algebras*, Adv. in Math. **185** (2004), 400–458.
- [34] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *On rationality of W -algebras*, Transform. Groups **13** (2008), no. 3-4, 671–713.
- [35] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *Representations of superconformal algebras and mock theta functions*, Trans. Moscow Math. Society, **78**, (2017), 9–74.
- [36] V. G. Kac, M. Wakimoto, *A remark on boundary level admissible representations*, Comptes Rendus Mathématique, Ser. I **355** (2017), 128–132.
- [37] V. G. Kac, W. Wang, *Vertex Operator Superalgebras and their representations*, Contemporary Math **175**, (1994), 161–191.
- [38] M. Kashiwara, T. Tanisaki, *Kazhdan-Lusztig conjecture for symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras III. Positive rational case*, in Mikio Sato: a great Japanese mathematician of the twentieth century, Asian J. Math. **2** (1998), no. 4, 779–832.
- [39] M. Kashiwara, T. Tanisaki, *Characters of the irreducible modules with non-critical highest weights over affine Lie algebras*, in Representations and quantizations (Shanghai, 1998), 275–296, China High. Educ. Press, Beijing, 2000.
- [40] Jong-Min Ku, *On the uniqueness of embeddings of Verma modules defined by the Shapovalov elements*, J. Algebra, Vol. **118**, (1988) 85–101.
- [41] S. Lang, *Algebra*, Springer, 2002.
- [42] R. Moody, A. Pianzola, *Lie Algebras with Triangular Decompositions*, Canadian Mathematical Society series of monographs and advanced texts, A Wiley Interscience Publication, John Wiley and Sons, 1995.
- [43] Sh. Reif *Denominator identity for twisted affine Lie superalgebras*, IMRN **15** (2014), 4146–4178.
- [44] V. Serganova, *Automorphisms of simple Lie superalgebras*, Mathematics of the USSR-Izvestiya **24** (1985), 539–551.
- [45] V. Serganova, *On generalization of root systems*, Comm. in Algebra, **24(13)** (1996), 4281–4299.
- [46] V. Serganova, *Kac-Moody superalgebras and integrability*, in Developments and trends in infinite-dimensional Lie theory, 169–218, Progr. Math., 288, Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2011.
- [47] J. van de Leur, *A classification of contragredient Lie superalgebras of finite growth*, Comm. Algebra, **17** (1989), 1815–1841.
- [48] H. Yamane, *Generalized root systems and the affine Lie superalgebra $G(3)^{(1)}$* , Sao Paulo J. Math. Sci. **10** (2016), no. 1, 9–19.
- [49] Y. Yoshii, *Locally extended affine root systems*, Contemporary Math. **506**, (2010), 285–302.
- [50] M. Yousofzadeh, *Extended affine root supersystems*, J. of Algebra, **449** (2016), 539–564.

M.G.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, WEIZMANN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE, REHOVOT 761001,
ISRAEL; MARIA.GORELIK@WEIZMANN.AC.IL

V. K.: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, MIT, 77 MASS. AVE, CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139; KAC@MIT.EDU