arXiv:1710.03737v1 [math.RT] 10 Oct 2017

ON ANNIHILATORS OF BOUNDED $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-MODULES

ALEXEY PETUKHOV

Abstract. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple Lie algebra and $\mathfrak{k}\subset\mathfrak{g}$ be a reductive subalgebra. We say that a $\mathfrak{g}$-module M is a *bounded* $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$*-module* if M is a direct sum of simple finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{k}$-modules and the multiplicities of all simple $\mathfrak{k}$-modules in that direct sum are universally bounded.

The goal of this article is to show that the "boundedness" property for a simple $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module M is equivalent to a property of the associated variety of the annihilator of M (this is the closure of a nilpotent coadjoint orbit inside $\mathfrak{g}^*$) under the assumption that the main field is algebraically closed and of characteristic 0. In particular this implies that if M_1, M_2 are simple $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-modules such that M_1 is bounded and the associated varieties of the annihilators of M_1 and M_2 coincide then M_2 is also bounded. This statement is a geometric analogue of a purely algebraic fact due to I. Penkov and V. Serganova and it was posed as a conjecture in my Ph.D. thesis.

Key words: $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-modules, spherical varieties, symplectic geometry.

AMS subject classification. 13A50, 14L24, 17B08, 17B63, 22E47.

1. Introduction

A notion of admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module for a generic pair of Lie algebras $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$ is a quite straightforward generalization of both Harish-Chandra modules and $\mathfrak{g}$-modules of category $\mathcal{O}$. Bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-modules [PS2] are a very specific subclass of the admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-modules and it turns out that this class is related to the notion of spherical variety [Ti]. The structure of this subcategory is still very misterious in general and few examples are evaluated explicitly, see [GS], [PSZ2], [Pe4].

The set works on both Harish-Chandra modules and category $\mathcal{O}$ seems to be infinite and one can find some introduction to these subjects in [KV, Hu]. We would like to mention explicitly works [Pe1, Pe2, PZ, GS, PSZ1, Zu, Fe, Ma, Mi].

The goal of this article is to show that this "boundedness" property for a simple $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module M is equivalent to a property of the associated variety of the annihilator of M (this is the closure of a nilpotent coadjoint orbit inside $\mathfrak{g}^*$) under the assumption that the main field is algebraically closed and of characteristic 0. Roughly speaking, a simple $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module M is bounded if and only if the associated variety of the annihilator of M is K-coisotropic with respect to the action of an algebraic group K attached to the pair $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$.

In particular this implies that if M_1, M_2 are simple $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-modules such that M_1 is bounded and the associated varieties of the annihilators of M_1 and M_2 coincide then M_2 is also bounded. This statement is a geometric analogue of [PS1, Theorem 4.3] and it was posed as a conjecture in my Ph.D. thesis [Pe3, Conjecture 2.1].

2. Definitions

2.1. **$(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-modules.** Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a Lie algebra over an algebraically closed field $\mathbb{F}$ of characterstic 0 and $\mathfrak{k}$ be a subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. We say that a $\mathfrak{g}$-module M is a $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$*-module* if

$$\forall m\in M(\dim(\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{k})\cdot m)<\infty)$$

where $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{k})$ is the universal enveloping algebra of $\mathfrak{k}$.

It is clear that any $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module is isomorphic to the direct limit of a directed set of finite-dimensional $\mathfrak{k}$-modules. Thus for any given simple $\mathfrak{k}$-module V we can define the Jordan-Hölder multiplicity $[M:V]$. If such multiplicities $[M:V]$ are finite for all simple $\mathfrak{k}$-modules V then M is called *admissible*. If there exists $C_M\in\mathbb{N}$ such that all multiplicities $[M:V]$ are bounded by C_M then M is called *bounded*.

2.2. **Associated varieties.** Let M be a finitely generated $\mathfrak{g}$-module M (for example M can be a simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module). We consider a finite-dimensional generating subspace M_0 of M and define spaces M_i $(i\geq 0)$ inductively using formula

$$M_{i+1}:=M_i+\mathfrak{g}\cdot M_i.$$

The associated graded object

$$\mathrm{gr}\,M:=\oplus_{i\geq 0}M_{i+1}/M_i$$

is a module of the associated graded algebra $\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ of $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})$. Let J be the annihilator of M in $\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{g})$. We denote by $\mathrm{Var}(M)$ the set of points $\chi\in\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that $f(\chi)=0$ for all $f\in J$.

It is well known that $\mathrm{Var}(M)$ is the same for all choices of M_0, see for example [Pe3, p. 19], and therefore $\mathrm{Var}(M)$ is a proper invariant of M. Next, we consider the annihilator $\mathrm{Ann}_{\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})} M$ of M in $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})$ as a left $\mathfrak{g}$-module and put

$$\mathrm{GVar}(M) := \mathrm{Var}(\mathrm{Ann}_{\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})} M).$$

We denote by $\overline{G \cdot \mathrm{Var}(M)}$ the closure of the G-translation of $\mathrm{Var}(M)$. Note that in many interesting cases

$$\mathrm{GVar}(M) = \overline{G \cdot \mathrm{Var}(M)}.$$

Put $\sqrt{J} := \{f \in \mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{g}) \mid \exists n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0} : (f^n \in J)\}$. The ideal J is *involutive*, i.e. $\{\sqrt{J}, \sqrt{J}\} \subset \sqrt{J}$ where $\{\cdot,\ \cdot\}$ is the standard Poisson bracket on $\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{g})$, see [Ga].

Next, if M is a $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$-module then one can choose filtration $\{M_i\}$ to be $\mathfrak{k}$-stable and hence $\mathfrak{k} \subset J$. This condition immediately implies

$$\mathrm{Var}(M) \subset \mathfrak{k}^{\perp}$$

where $\mathfrak{k}^{\perp} := \{\chi \in \mathfrak{g}^* \mid \chi|_{\mathfrak{k}} = 0\}$.

3. Main theorem

We would use notions and terminology on symplectic geometry and algebraic groups actions of [TZh]. Fix a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ together with the adjoint group G of $\mathfrak{g}$, and also fix a subalgebra $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g}$. Assume that $\mathfrak{k}$ is *algebraically reductive* in $\mathfrak{g}$, that is there exists a connected reductive algebraic subgroup K of G such that $\mathfrak{k} \subset \mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra of $K \subset G$. If such a subgroup K exists then it is unique.

Theorem 3.1. Assume that $\mathfrak{g}$ is a semisimple Lie algebra and $\mathfrak{k}$ is an algebraically reductive subalgebra of $\mathfrak{g}$. Then, for a simple $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$-module M, the following conditions are equivalent:

(1) M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g}, \mathfrak{k})$-module,

(2) $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is K-coisotropic.

It turns out that it is possible to reduce the case of any subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}$ of a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ to the case of algebraically reductive subalgebra, see Propositions 4.8, 4.9.

4. Algebraic subalgebras

Let $\mathfrak{k}$ be a subalgebra of a semisimple Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$, G be the adjoint group of $\mathfrak{g}$, and let $\hat{K}$ be the least algebraic subgroup of G such that the Lie algebra of $\hat{K}$ contains $\mathfrak{k}$. Denote by $\hat{\mathfrak{k}}$ the Lie algebra of $\hat{K}$. Then

- $\hat{K}$ is connected and $\hat{K}$ normalizes $\mathfrak{k}$,
- $\hat{\mathfrak{k}}/\mathfrak{k}$ is abelian and $[\hat{\mathfrak{k}}, \hat{\mathfrak{k}}] = [\mathfrak{k}, \mathfrak{k}]$,

see [OV, Subsection 3.3.3].

Definition 4.1. A subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}$ is called *algebraic in* $\mathfrak{g}$ if $\mathfrak{k} = \hat{\mathfrak{k}}$. A subalgebra $\mathfrak{k}$ is called *reductive in* $\mathfrak{g}$ if $\hat{K}$ is reductive.

It is clear that if $\mathfrak{k}$ is algebraically reductive in $\mathfrak{g}$ then $\mathfrak{k}$ is reductive in $\mathfrak{g}$. The inverse statement is false.

Example 4.2. Let $\mathfrak{g} \cong \mathfrak{sl}(3)$ be the Lie algebra of traceless 3×3 matrices and let $\mathfrak{k}$ be the one-dimensional subalgebra spanned by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -(\alpha+\beta) \end{pmatrix},$$

$\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}$. If

$$\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\mathbb{Q} \text{ and } \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \in \mathbb{F}\backslash\mathbb{Q}$$

then $\hat{K}$ is an algebraic torus consisting of the diagonal 3×3 matrices with determinant 1, and therefore $\hat{\mathfrak{k}}$ is the space of traceless diagonal 3×3 matrices. In particular, this implies that $\mathfrak{k}$ is reductive in $\mathfrak{sl}(3)$, but $\mathfrak{k}$ is **not** algebraically reductive in $\mathfrak{sl}(3)$.

The following lemmas show that $\hat{K}$-modules, $\hat{\mathfrak{k}}$-modules and $\mathfrak{k}$-modules are close to each other.

Lemma 4.3. Let V_1, V_2 be $\hat{K}$-modules. Then the following conditions are equivalent.

(1) $V_1 \cong V_2$,

(2) $(V_1)|_{\hat{k}} \cong (V_2)|_{\hat{k}}$,

(3) $(V_1)|_{\mathfrak{k}} \cong (V_2)|_{\mathfrak{k}}$.

Proof. Conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent for a connected group in characteristic 0. It is clear that (2) implies (3). We left to show that (3) implies (1).

Assume (3). Consider vector space $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}}(V_1,V_2)$. We have that $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{k}}(V_1,V_2)\neq 0$. Fix

$$0\neq\phi\in\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{k}}(V_1,V_2) \tag{1}$$

such that ϕ defines the isomorphism between V_1 and V_2. Let H be the stabilizer of ϕ in K. Condition (1) implies that $\mathfrak{k}$ is a subalgebra of the Lie algebra of H. The definition of $\hat{K}$ implies that $H=\hat{K}$. Therefore ϕ is an isomorphism of $\hat{K}$-modules. □

Lemma 4.4. Let V be a K-module and let $W\subset V$ be an $\mathbb{F}$-subspace of V. The following conditions are equivalent.

(1) W is $\hat{K}$-stable,
(2) W is $\hat{\mathfrak{k}}$-stable,
(3) W is $\mathfrak{k}$-stable.

Proof. Conditions (1) and (2) are equivalent for a connected group in characteristic 0. It is clear that (2) implies (3). We left to show that (3) implies (1).

Assume (3). Let d be the dimension of W. Consider variety $\mathrm{Gr}(d;V)$ of d-dimensional subspaces of V and denote by $[W]$ the point of $\mathrm{Gr}(d;V)$ defined by W. Let H be the stabilizer of $[W]$ in K. Condition (3) implies that $\mathfrak{k}$ is a subalgebra of the Lie algebra of H. The definition of $\hat{K}$ implies that $H=\hat{K}$. Therefore W is a $\hat{K}$-submodule of V. □

Corollary 4.5. Let V be a finite-dimensional $\hat{K}$-module. Then the lattices of

$$\hat{K}\text{-submodules of } V,\ \hat{\mathfrak{k}}\text{-submodules of } V \text{ and } \mathfrak{k}\text{-submodules of } V$$

coincide.

Corollary 4.6. Let M be a direct limit of finite-dimensional $\hat{K}$-modules. Then

(1) M is a bounded $(\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k})$-module,
(2) M is an admissible $(\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k})$-module.

Proof. This statement is implied by Lemma 4.3 and Corollary 4.5. □

We wish to establish a connection between the admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-modules and the admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-modules. The first step is as follows.

Lemma 4.7. Let M be an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module. Then M is a $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module.

Proof. Let M_0 be a $\mathfrak{k}$-stable subspace of M. Consider the $\hat{\mathfrak{k}}$-submodule $\hat{M}_0$ of M generated by M_0. It is enough to show that $\dim\hat{M}_0<\infty$. Set

$$M_{i+1}:=\hat{\mathfrak{k}}M_i+M_i, i\geq 0.$$

It is clear that each M_i is finite dimensional and $\cup_i M_i=\hat{M}_0$. The definition of M_i implies that there exists a surjective $\mathfrak{k}$-morphism

$$\phi:(\hat{\mathfrak{k}}/\mathfrak{k})\otimes M_i\twoheadrightarrow M_{i+1}/M_i$$

of $\mathfrak{k}$-modules. Theorem 3 of [OV, Subsection 3.3.3] implies that

$$[\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\hat{\mathfrak{k}}]=[\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k}]=[\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\mathfrak{k}]$$

and thus that $(\hat{\mathfrak{k}}/\mathfrak{k})$ is a trivial $\mathfrak{k}$-module. Therefore the list of simple $\mathfrak{k}$-subquotients of M_{i+1} equals the list of simple $\mathfrak{k}$-subquotients of M_i for all $i\geq 0$, and hence these lists equal to the list of simple $\mathfrak{k}$-subquotients of M_0. If $\lim\limits_{i\to\infty}\dim M_i=\infty$ then the multiplicity of at least one such a subquotient would tend to infinity with $i\to\infty$. That is incompatible with the assumption that M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module. □

Lemma 4.7 implies that if M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module then

- $\mathrm{Var}(M)\subset(\hat{\mathfrak{k}})^{\perp}$,
- $\mathrm{Var}(M)$ is stable under the action of $\hat{K}$.

Proposition 4.8. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a semisimple Lie algebra, let M be a simple $\mathfrak{g}$-module, and let $\mathfrak{k}\subset\mathfrak{g}$ be a subalgebra. Then

(a) M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module,
(b) M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module.

Proof. It is straightforward to argue that M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module (respectively bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module) if and only if $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is a bounded $(\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module (respectively bounded $(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k})$-module), see [Pe1, Proof of Proposition 2.6]. In the same way we have that M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module (respectively admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module) if and only if $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is an admissible $(\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module (respectively admissible $(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k})$-module). Therefore it is enough to verify the following facts:

(a′) $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is a bounded $(\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is a bounded $(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k})$-module.

(b′) $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is an admissible $(\hat{\mathfrak{k}},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is an admissible $(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k})$-module.

These statements are implied by Corollary 4.6. □

Let L be a maximal connected reductive subgroup of $\hat{K}$. Such a subgroup is unique up to conjugacy. Denote by $\mathfrak{l}\subset\mathfrak{g}$ the Lie algebra of L. It is clear that $\mathfrak{l}$ is algebraically reductive in $\mathfrak{g}$. We conclude this section with the following.

Proposition 4.9. Let M be a simple $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module. Then

(a) M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{l})$-module,

(b) M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\hat{\mathfrak{k}})$-module if and only if M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{l})$-module.

Proof. This is implied by two facts:

(a) the restriction of a simple finite-dimensional $\hat{K}$-module to L is simple,

(b) the restrictions of two nonisomorphic simple finite-dimensional $\hat{K}$-modules to L are nonisomorphic. □

5. Proof of Theorem 3.1

We use notation of Section 3 and of Theorem 3.1. Fix a simple $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module M. Then $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is irreducible [Jo]. Theorem 3.1 is implied by the following propositions.

Proposition 5.1. If M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module then $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is K-coisotropic.

Proposition 5.2. If $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is K-coisotropic then M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module.

Proposition 5.3. If M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module and $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is K-coisotropic then M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module.

Proof of Proposition 5.1. Proposition 2.6 of [Pe1] implies that if M is a bounded $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module then all irreducible components of $\mathrm{Var}(M)$ are K-spherical varieties.

The Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of $\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})/\operatorname{Ann}_{\mathrm{U}(\mathfrak{g})} M$ equals $\dim \mathrm{GVar}(M)$. Theorem 9.11 of [KL] implies that the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of M is at least $\frac{1}{2}\dim \mathrm{GVar}(M)$. Hence there exists an irreducible component X of $\mathrm{Var}(M)$ such that

$$\dim X \geq \frac{1}{2}\dim \mathrm{GVar}(M).$$

Let $\mathcal{O}$ be the nilpotent coadjoint which is dense in $G\cdot X$. Proposition 2.6(b) of [Pe1] implies that $X\cap\mathcal{O}$ is Lagrangian in $\mathcal{O}$ and hence that

$$\dim X = \frac{1}{2}\dim \mathcal{O} \geq \frac{1}{2}\dim \mathrm{GVar}(M).$$

On the other hand we have that $\mathcal{O}\subset\mathrm{GVar}(M)$. The variety $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is irreducible [Jo] and thus

$$\mathrm{GVar}(M) = \overline{\mathcal{O}}.$$

Recall that $X\cap\mathcal{O}$ is Lagrangian in $\mathcal{O}$, and therefore $X\cap\mathcal{O}\subset\mathcal{O}$ is special in the sense of [TZh, Definition 4]. Next, [TZh, Theorem 7] implies that

$$2\mathrm{c}(X) = \mathrm{cork}M + 2\dim X - \dim\mathcal{O} \tag{2}$$

(notation of [TZh]), and thus $2\mathrm{c}(X) = \mathrm{cork}M$. The variety X is K-spherical and therefore $\mathrm{c}(X) = 0$. Hence $\mathrm{cork}M = 0$ and M is K-coisotropic. □

Proof of Proposition 5.2. It is enough to show that M is an admissible $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$-module, or equivalently that $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is an admissible $(\mathfrak{k},\mathfrak{k})$-module, see [Pe1, Proof of Proposition 2.6]. The last statement is equivalent to the condition

$$\dim(\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]^K) < \infty,$$

see [PV, Theorem 3.24].

The embedding $\mathfrak{k}\hookrightarrow\mathfrak{g}$ defines the sequence of maps

$$\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k})\hookrightarrow\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{g})\twoheadrightarrow\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]\twoheadrightarrow\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)].$$

Further we have

$$\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k})^K \hookrightarrow \mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{g})^K \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]^K \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]^K.$$

Next, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.4. For any maximal ideal $m \in \mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k})^K$ the algebra $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]^K/m\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]^K$ is finite dimensional.

Proof. The proof is based on [Lo, Theorem 1.2.1], see also [Lo, Corollary 5.9.1]. We use the notation of [Lo]. The variety $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is irreducible [Jo] and we have

$$\mathrm{trdeg}\ \mathbb{F}(\mathrm{GVar}(M))^K = \dim \mathrm{GVar}(M) - m_K(\mathrm{GVar}(M))$$

where $\mathrm{trdeg}\ \mathbb{F}(\mathrm{GVar}(M))^K$ is the transcendence degree of $\mathbb{F}(\mathrm{GVar}(M))^K$. This implies that the Gelfand-Kirillov dimension of $\mathbb{F}[X]^K$ is at most $\dim X - m_K(X)$ and therefore

$$\dim X/\!\!/K \leq \dim X - m_K(X).$$

We fix a maximal ideal m of $\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k})^K$ and denote by $[m]$ the respective point in the maximal spectrum $\mathfrak{k}^*/\!\!/K$ of $\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k})^K$. The algebra $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]/m\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]$ is finite dimensional if and only if the fiber of the map

$$X/\!\!/K \to \mathfrak{k}^*/\!\!/K$$

is at most 0-dimensional. Theorem 1.2.1 of [Lo] implies that the dimension of this fiber is at most

$$\dim X/\!\!/K - \underline{\mathrm{def}}_K X \leq \dim X - m_K(X) - \underline{\mathrm{def}}_K X.$$

The variety $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is generically symplectic in the sense of [Lo, Definition 2.2.3] and therefore

$$\dim X = m_K(X) + \underline{\mathrm{def}}_K X,$$

see [Lo, Subsection 5.9]. This implies that the dimension of the fiber under consideration is at most 0. □

Put $m_0 := \mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k})^K \cap (\mathfrak{k}\,\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k}))$. It is clear that m_0 is a maximal ideal of $\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{k})^K$. Next,

$$\mathrm{Var}(M) \subset \mathfrak{k}^\perp$$

implies that $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]$ is annihilated by $\mathfrak{k}\,\mathrm{S}(\mathfrak{g})$. Therefore $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]^K$ is also annihilated by m_0. This implies that $\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]^K$ is a quotient of

$$\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]^K/m_0\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]^K.$$

By Lemma 5.4 we have

$$\dim \mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]^K/m_0\mathbb{F}[\mathrm{GVar}(M)]^K < \infty,$$

and therefore $\dim \mathbb{F}[\mathrm{Var}(M)]^K < \infty$. □

Proof of Proposition 5.3. Let $X_1, ..., X_n$ be the irreducible components of $\mathrm{Var}(M) \subset \mathrm{GVar}(M)$. Proposition 2.6 of [Pe1] implies that it is enough to show that all X_ith are K-spherical varieties.

Fix i. The variety $G \cdot X_i$ contains unique dense orbit $\mathcal{O}_i$. Moreover, $X_i \cap \mathcal{O}_i$ is a coisotropic subvariety of $\mathcal{O}_i$ [Ga]. On the other hand, X_i is K-isotropic [Pe2, Theorem 2]. This implies that X_i is K-special in a sense of [TZh, Definition 4]. Applying formula (2) we have

$$2\mathrm{c}(X_i) = \mathrm{cork}(\mathcal{O}_i).$$

Next, $\mathrm{c}(X_i) = 0$ if and only if X_i is K-spherical and thus we need to check that

$$\mathrm{cork}\ \mathcal{O}_i = 0,$$

i.e. that the action of K on $\mathcal{O}_i$ is coisotropic. This is a consequence of [AP, Proposition 2.7] and the facts that $\mathcal{O}_i \subset \mathrm{GVar}(M)$ and $\mathrm{GVar}(M)$ is K-coisotropic, see also [Lo, Theorem 1.2.4]. □

6. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Roman Avdeev, Dmitry Timashëv and Vladimir Zhgun for useful discussions on spherical varieties. I also thank the math department of the University of Manchester for a very encouraging atmosphere. This work was supported by Leverhulme Trust Grant RPG-2013-293 and by RFBR grant 16-01-00818.

References

[AP] R. Avdeev, A. Petukhov, *Spherical actions on flag varieties*, Sb. Math. 205 (2014), **9-10**, 1223–1263 .

[Fe] S. Fernando, *Lie algebra modules with finite-dimensional weight spaces. I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **322** (1990), 757–781.

[Ga] O. Gabber, *The integrability of the characteristic variety*, Amer. J. Math. **103** (1981), 445–468.

[GS] D. Grantcharov, V. Serganova, *Cuspidal representations of* $\mathfrak{sl}(n+1)$, Adv. Math. **224** (2010), 1517–1547.

[Hu] J. Humphreys, *Representations of semisimple Lie algebras in the BGG category O*, Grad. St. in Math., **94**. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.

[Jo] A. Joseph, *On the associated variety of a primitive ideal*, J. Algebra **93** (1985), 509–523.

[KV] A. Knapp, D. Vogan, *Cohomological Induction and Unitary Representations*, Princeton Math. Series 45, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1995.

[KL] G. Krause, T. Lenagan, Growth of algebras and Gelfand-Kirillov dimension, AMS Grad. Studies in Math. **22**, 2000.

[Lo] I. Losev, *Algebraic Hamiltonian actions*, Math. Z. **263** (2009), 685–723.

[Ma] O. Mathieu, Classification of irreducible weight modules. Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **50** (2000), 537–592.

[Mi] T. Milev, *Root Fernando-Kac subalgebras of finite type*, J. Algebra **336** (2011), 257–278.

[OV] A. Onishchik, É. Vinberg, Lie groups and algebraic groups, Springer series in Soviet mathematics, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990.

[PS1] I. Penkov, V. Serganova, *Generalized Harish-Chandra modules*, Mosc. Math. J. **4** (2002), 753–767, 806.

[PS2] I. Penkov, V. Serganova, *On bounded generalized Harish-Chandra modules*, Annales de l'Institut Fourier, **62** (2012), 477–496.

[PSZ1] I. Penkov, V. Serganova, G. Zuckerman, *On the existence of* $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$*-modules of finite type*. Duke Math. J. **125** (2004), 329–349.

[PSZ2] I. Penkov, V. Serganova, G. Zuckerman, *On the categories of admissible* $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{sl}(2))$*-modules*, preprint.

[PZ] I. Penkov, G. Zuckerman, *Construction of generalized Harish-Chandra modules with arbitrary minimal* $\mathfrak{k}$*-type*, Canad. Math. Bull. **50** (2007), 603–609.

[Pe1] A. Petukhov, *Bounded reductive subalgebras of* $\mathfrak{sl}(n)$, Transform. Groups **16** (2011), 1173–1182.

[Pe2] A. Petukhov, *Supports of* $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$*-modules of finite type*, Moscow Univ. Math. Bull. **67** (2012), 125–128.

[Pe3] A. Petukhov, *A geometric approach to* $(\mathfrak{g},\mathfrak{k})$*-modules of finite type*, Ph.D. thesis, see also arXiv:1105.5020.

[Pe4] A. Petukhov, *Categories of bounded* $(\mathfrak{sp}(\mathrm{S}^2V\oplus\mathrm{S}^2V^*),\mathfrak{gl}(V))$*- and* $(\mathfrak{sp}(\Lambda^2V\oplus\Lambda^2V^*),\mathfrak{gl}(V))$*-modules*, J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.) **186** (2011/12), 655–666.

[PV] V. Popov, É. Vinberg, Invariant theory (Russian) Algebraic geometry, **4** (Russian), Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Inform., Moscow, 1989, 137–315.

[Ti] D. Timashev, *Homogeneous spaces and equivariant embeddings*, Enc. of Math. Sc., **138**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.

[TZh] D. Timashëv, V. Zhgun, *Hamiltonian actions on symplectic varieties with invariant Lagrangian subvarieties*, https://arxiv.org/pdf/1109.5239, see also *Symplectic varieties with invariant Lagrangian subvarieties*, Dokl. Math. **85** (2012), 243–246.

[Zu] G. Zuckerman, *Generalized Harish-Chandra modules. Highlights in Lie algebraic methods*, 123–143, Progr. Math., **295**, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012.

Alexey Petukhov: Jacobs University Bremen, Campus Ring 1, Bremen D28759, Germany, on leave from the Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Bolshoy Karetniy 19-1, Moscow 127994, Russia

E-mail address: alex--2@yandex.ru