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Abstract

Let $V$ be a vertex operator algebra and $T$ a $V$-module. We show that if there are $C_2$-cofinite $V$-modules $U$ and $W$ and a surjective (logarithmic) intertwining operator $\mathcal{Y}$ of type $(U \ T \ W)$, then $T$ is also $C_2$-cofinite. So, when $V$ is simple and $V' \cong V$, then if one of $V$-modules is $C_2$-cofinite, then so is $V$.

1 Introduction

A vertex algebra was introduced by axiomatizing the concept of a Chiral algebra in conformal field theory by Borcherds [1]. It is a triple $(V, Y, 1)$ satisfying the several axioms, where $V$ is a graded vector space $V = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} V_i$ over the complex number field $\mathbb{C}$, $Y(v, z) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} v_m z^{-m-1} \in \text{End}(V)$ denotes a vertex operator of $v \in V$ on $V$, $1 \in V_0$ is a specified element called the vacuum. When $V$ has another specified element $\omega \in V_2$ and $V$ has a lower bound of weights and all homogeneous subspaces are of finite dimensional, then we call $V$ a vertex operator algebra. We set $Y(\omega, z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} L(n) z^{-n-1}$.

For a VOA $V$-module $W$, we define $C_2(W) = \{v_{-2}u \mid v, u \in V, \text{wt}(v) \geq 1\}$. When $C_2(W)$ has a finite co-dimension in $W$, $W$ is called to be $C_2$-cofinite. A concept of $C_2$-cofiniteness is originally introduced by Zhu [8] as a technical assumption to prove a modular invariance property of the space of the trace functions on modules. However, we are now recognizing the real meaning and the importance of $C_2$-cofiniteness. For example, $V$ is $C_2$-cofinite if and only if all $V$-modules are $\mathbb{N}$-gradable. (See [2] and [7] for the proof.) We will use this fact frequently in this paper.

Our main result in this paper is the following:

Theorem 1 Let $U$ be a vertex operator algebra of CFT-type. Let $A$, $B$, $C$ be simple $\mathbb{N}$-graded $U$-modules and $\mathcal{I}$ a surjective (formal power series) intertwining operator of type $(A \ C \ B)$. If both of $A$ and $B$ are $C_h$-cofinite as $U$-modules for $h = 1, 2$, then so is $C$.
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2 Preliminary

From the axiom of VOAs, for \( v \in V_r \) and \( u \in V_n \), we have \( v_m u \in V_{r-m-1+n} \). Hence there is an integer \( N \) such that \( v_u u = 0 \) for any \( s > N \). This property is called a truncation property. In this paper, we will say that "\( v \) is truncated at \( u \)" to simplify the terminology.

Set \( V^* = \text{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}) \) and define a pairing \( \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle \) on \( V^* \times V \) by \( \langle \xi, v \rangle = \xi(v) \) for \( \xi \in V^* \) and \( v \in V \). For \( T \subseteq V \), \( \text{Annh}(T) \) denotes an annihilator of \( T \), that is, \( \text{Annh}(T) = \{ \xi \in V^* \mid \langle \xi, t \rangle = 0 \text{ for all } t \in T \} \). For \( v \in V \) and \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \), an action \( v_m^* \) on \( V^* \) is defined by

\[
\langle (\sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} v_m z^{-m-1}) \xi, w \rangle = \langle \xi, Y(e^{L(1)}z^{-2}L(0)v, z^{-1})w \rangle
\]

for \( w \in V \) and \( \xi \in \text{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}) \), where \( Y^*(v, z) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} v_m^* z^{-m-1} \) is called an adjoint operator of \( v \). An important fact is that \( (\oplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}(V_m, \mathbb{C}), Y^*) \) becomes a \( V \)-module as they proved in [3]. This module is called a restricted dual of \( V \) and denoted by \( V' \). In particular, \( Y^*(\cdot, z) \) satisfy the Borcherds identity:

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{m}{i} (u_{i+r}^* v^*)_{m+n-i} \xi = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \binom{r}{i} \{ u_{i+r}^* v^*_{n-i} \xi - (-1)^r v_{r+n-i} \xi \}
\]  (2.1)

for any \( m, n, r \in \mathbb{Z} \), \( v, u \in V \), \( \xi \in V' \). We note \( V' = \oplus_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n \) and \( V^* = \prod_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} V_n \). Therefore we can express \( \xi \in V^* \) by \( \prod_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \xi_n \) with \( \xi_n \in \text{Hom}(V_n, \mathbb{C}) \). We call that \( \xi \in V^* \) is "\( L(0) \)-free" if \( \dim \mathbb{C}[L(0)]\xi = \infty \), that is, \( \xi_n \neq 0 \) for infinitely many \( m \). We note that any \( \mathbb{N} \)-gradable module does not contain any \( L(0) \)-free elements.

Let go back to (2.1). If \( \xi \in \text{Hom}(V, \mathbb{C}) \), then all terms in (2.1) have the same weight \( \text{wt}(a) + \text{wt}(b) - r - n - 2 + t \) and so the Borcherds' identity is also well-defined on \( V^* \), as Li has pointed out in [5]. However, \( V^* \) is not a \( V \)-module because of failure of truncation properties. In order to find a \( V \)-module in \( V^* \), we will start our arguments from one point \( \xi \) in \( V^* \).

**Lemma 2** If \( u \) and \( v \) are truncated at \( \xi \), then \( v_m u \) is also truncated at \( \xi \) for any \( m \). In particular, if all elements in \( \Omega \) of \( V \) are truncated at \( \xi \) and \( \langle \Omega \rangle_{VA} = V \), then all elements in \( V \) are truncated at \( \xi \), where \( \langle \Omega \rangle_{VA} \) denotes a vertex subalgebra generated by \( \Omega \).

**Proof** By the assumption, there is an integer \( N \) such that \( u_n \xi = v_n \xi = u_n v = 0 \) for \( n \geq N \). We assert that for \( s \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( n \geq 2N + s \), we have \( (u_{N-s} v)_n \xi = 0 \). Suppose false and let \( s \) be a minimal counterexample. Substituting \( r = N - s \), \( n = N + s + p \), \( m = N + q \) in (2.1) with \( p, q \geq 0 \), we have

\[
[\text{LeftSide}] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{N+s}{i} (u_{N-s+i} v)_{2N+q+s+p-i} \xi = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{N+s}{i} u_{N-(s-i)} v_{2N+s+p-i} \xi = \binom{N+s+q}{i} u_{2N+s+p+q-i} \xi
\]

by the minimality of \( s \). On the other hand, we have:

\[
[\text{RightSide}] = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (-1)^i \binom{N-s}{i} u_{2N-s+q-i} \xi - (-1)^{N-s} v_{2N-s+p-i} u_{N+q+i} \xi = 0,
\]
which contradicts the choice of $s$.

Since $v_{n}u_{m}\xi = u_{m}v_{n}\xi + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \binom{\mu}{i} (v_{i}u)_{n+m-i}\xi$, the above lemma also implies:

**Lemma 3** If $v$ and $u$ are truncated at $\xi$, then $v$ is truncated at $u_{m}\xi$ for any $m$. In particular, if all elements of $V$ are truncated at $\xi$, then $<u_{m}^{1}, \ldots, u_{m}^{k}\xi | u^{i} \in V, m_{i} \in \mathbb{Z} >_{c}$ is a $V$-module.

As Buhl has shown in [2], if $V$ is $C_{2}$-cofinite, then all $V$-modules are $N$-gradable and so there are no $L(0)$-free elements at which all elements in $V$ are truncated. Namely, we have proved the following, which we will frequently use.

**Lemma 4** Let $V$ be a $C_{2}$-cofinite vertex operator algebra and $\xi \in V^{*}$. If $\Omega \subseteq V$ generates $V$ as a vertex subalgebra and all elements of $\Omega$ are truncated on $\xi$, then $\xi$ is not $L(0)$-free.

For $A, B \subseteq V$, we will often use the notation $A_{(m)}B$ to denote a subspace spanned by \{ $a_{m}b | a \in A, b \in B$ \}. We note that if $A$ is a $C[L(-1)]$-module, then $A_{(-2)}B \subseteq A_{(-2)}B$ for $m \in \mathbb{N}$ since $(L(-1)a)_{m}b = ma_{m-1}b$ for $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. Not only $V$, we use this notation for a pair $(U, W)$ of a VOA $U$ and its module $W$. For example, we set $C_{2}(W) = U^{+}_{(-2)}W$, where $U^{+} = \oplus_{k=1}^{\infty}U_{k}$. We also set $C_{1}(W) = U^{+}_{-1}W$. We say that $W$ is $C_{h}$-cofinite as a $U$-module if $\dim W/C_{h}(W) < \infty$ for $h = 1, 2$. We note any VOA $U$ is $C_{1}$-cofinite as a $U$-module and so this definition is not equal to the ordinary $C_{1}$-cofiniteness.

We start the proof of Theorem 1. Namely, we will prove:

**Theorem 1** Let $U$ be a vertex operator algebra of CFT-type. Let $A, B, C$ be simple $\mathbb{N}$-graded $U$-modules and $I$ a surjective (formal power series) intertwining operator of type $(A \overset{C}{\to} B)$. If both of $A$ and $B$ are $C_{h}$-cofinite as $U$-modules for $h = 1, 2$, then so is $C$.

We note that if $U$ is of CFT-type and an $\mathbb{N}$-graded $U$-module $A = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} A_{r+k}$ is $C_{1}$-cofinite, then $\dim A_{r+k} < \infty$ for any $k$ since $A_{r+k} \cap C_{1}(A) = \bigoplus_{s=1}^{k-1} (U_{s})_{-1}A_{r+k-s}$ has a finite codimension in $A_{r+k}$.

In the remainder part of this section, we assume the hypotheses of Theorem 1. Since $A$ and $B$ are $C_{h}$-cofinite, there are finite dimensional subspaces $F^{1} \subseteq A$ and $F^{2} \subseteq B$ such that $A = U^{+}_{(-h)}A + F^{1}$ and $B = U^{+}_{(-h)}B + F^{2}$. Let $c_{A}$ and $c_{B}$ be conformal weights of $A$ and $B$, respectively. We may assume that there is an integer $N$ such that $F^{1} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{N} A_{c_{A}+k}$ and $F^{2} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{N} B_{c_{B}+k}$. Fix bases $\{ p^{i} | i \in I \}$ of $F^{1}$ and $\{ q^{j} | j \in J \}$ of $F^{2}$. In order to prove Theorem 1, we prove the following lemma by applying an idea in [4] to $(C/U^{+}_{-h})^{*}$.

**Lemma 5** For $p \in A$, $q \in B$ and $\theta \in \text{Ann}(U^{+}_{-h})C \cap C'$,

$$F(\theta, p, q; z) := \langle \theta, I(p, z)q \rangle$$

is a linear combination of $\{ F(\theta, p^{i}, q^{j}; z) | i \in I, j \in J \}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}]$ and we may choose these coefficients independently of the choice of $\theta$. 

[Proof] We will prove the assertion by the induction on the total weight \( \text{wt}(p) + \text{wt}(q) \). If \( \text{wt}(p) > N + c_B \), then \( p = \sum u^k a^k \) for some \( u^k \in U \) and \( a^k \in A \). We note this expression does not depend on the choice of \( \theta \). So we may assume \( p = u_{-h} a \) with \( u \in U \) and \( a \in A \). Then for \( \theta \in \text{Annh}(U_{(-h)}^+) \), we have:

\[
(\theta, \mathcal{I}(p, z)q) = (\theta, \mathcal{I}(u_{-h} a, z)q) = (\theta, Y^-(L(-1)^{h-1} u, z))\mathcal{I}(a, z)q + (\theta, a)Y^+(L(-1)^{h-1} u, z)q,
\]

where \( Y^-(v, z) = \sum_{m < 0} v_m z^{-m-1} \) and \( Y^+(v, z) = \sum_{m \geq 0} v_m z^{-m-1} \). This is a reduction on the sum of weights because \( Y^+(L(-1)^{h-1} u, z)q \) is a sum of finite terms and all weights of the coefficients are less than \( \text{wt}(u) + \text{wt}(q) \).

Similarly, if \( \text{wt}(q) > N + c_B \), then we may assume \( q = u_{-h} b \) with \( u \in U \) and \( b \in B \) and

\[
(\theta, \mathcal{I}(p, z)q) = (\theta, \mathcal{I}(p, z)u_{-h} b) = (\theta, u_{-h} \mathcal{I}(p, z)b) + \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (\begin{array}{l} -hi \end{array}) z^{-h-i} \mathcal{I}(u_i p, z)b.
\]

Again, these process do not depend on the choice of \( \theta \) and this is also a reduction on the weights because \( \text{wt}(u_p) + \text{wt}(b) < \text{wt}(u_{-h} b) + \text{wt}(p) \) for \( i \geq 0 \). Therefore, \( (\theta, \mathcal{I}(p, z)q) \) is a linear combination of \( \{ (\theta, \mathcal{I}(p^i, z)q^j) \mid i \in I, j \in J \} \) with coefficients in \( \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}] \). We note the coefficients do not depend on the choice of \( \theta \).

Now we are able to prove Theorem 1. By the proof of the above lemma,

\[
\frac{d}{dz} F(\theta, p^s, q^t; z) = F(\theta, L(-1)p^s, q^t; z)
\]

is a linear combination of \( \{ F(\theta, p^i, q^j; z) \mid i \in I, j \in J \} \) with coefficients in \( \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}] \) for any \( s \in I, t \in J \) and all coefficients do not depend on the choice of \( \theta \). Therefore, there is a differential linear equation such that \( F(\theta, p^s, q^t) \) are all its solutions for any \( s \in I, t \in J \) and \( \theta \). Furthermore, since \( \{ \mathcal{I}(p, z)q \mid p \in A, q \in B, z \in \mathbb{Z} \} \) spans \( C \) modulo \( U_{(-h)}^+ \) and \( (\theta, Y(p, z)q) \) are a linear sum of \( \{ (\theta, \mathcal{I}(p^i, z)q^j) \mid \theta \in C' \cap \text{Annh}(U_{(-h)}^+) \} \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I, j \in J} (\theta, \mathcal{I}(p^i, z)q^j) \) is injective. Therefore, we have \( \dim C/U_{(-h)}^+ C < \infty \). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.
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