ON INFINITE-DIMENSIONAL GRADED MODULAR LIE ALGEBRAS OF MAXIMAL CLASS GENERATED BY TWO ELEMENTS OF DIFFERENT WEIGHTS

S. UGOLINI

Abstract. In this paper we study certain infinite-dimensional graded modular Lie algebras of maximal class generated by two elements of weights 1 and \(n\). Such Lie algebras, which we call algebras of type \(n\), can be viewed as a generalization of certain graded Lie algebras of maximal class generated by two elements of weights 1 and 2 investigated in 2000 by Caranti and Vaughan-Lee.

1. Introduction

In 1958 Blackburn [1] introduced the notion of maximal class for \(p\)-groups. Let \(G, \gamma_2(G), \gamma_3(G), \ldots\) be the terms of the lower central series of a group \(G\) with \(p^n\) elements. It is well known that all finite \(p\)-groups are nilpotent, namely there exists a positive integer \(k\) such that \(\gamma_k(G) = 1\). If \(k\) is the smallest of these integers, then \(G\) is said to be of nilpotency class \(k - 1\). The nilpotency class for \(G\) is at most \(n - 1\) and, if this upper bound is reached, we say that \(G\) is of maximal class.

Finite abelian \(p\)-groups are easily classified. When one moves to class two groups, one finds that there are simply too many of them, and a classification is impossible. However, the situation is different if one looks at the coclass instead.

If \(G\) has order \(p^n\) and nilpotency class \(c\), then its coclass is \(cc(G) := n - c\).

The notion of coclass can be extended to pro-\(p\)-groups. Let \(G\) be a pro-\(p\)-group. We denote by \(G , \gamma_2(G), \ldots\) the terms of the lower central series and we define \(G_i := G/\gamma_i(G)\). The coclass of \(G\) is defined as \(cc(G) := \lim_{i \to \infty} cc(G_i)\).

The notions of maximal class and coclass can be defined also for Lie algebras. Let \(L\) be a residually nilpotent Lie algebra and let \(L^i\) be the \(i\)-th term of the lower central series for any positive integer \(i\). Suppose that \(\dim(L^i/L^{i+1})\) is finite for any \(i\) and that \(\dim(L^i/L^{i+1}) \leq 1\) for any sufficiently large value of \(i\). Then we say that \(L\) has finite coclass and we define

\[
cc(L) := \sum_{i \geq 1 \atop L^i \neq 0} (\dim(L^i/L^{i+1}) - 1).
\]
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When \( cc(L) = 1 \) we say that \( L \) is of maximal class. Of special interest from a group-theoretic point of view are \( \mathbb{N} \)-graded Lie algebras of maximal class, \( L = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} L_i \), generated by \( L_1 \) and satisfying \( \dim(L_1) = 2 \) and \( \dim(L_i) = 1 \) for \( i > 1 \). In fact, graded Lie algebras arising from pro-\( p \)-groups of maximal class are of this type.

Shalev and Zelmanov \[8\] developed a coclass theory for Lie algebras of characteristic zero in analogy with the theory established by Leedham-Green and Newman for groups. Shalev and Zelmanov first dealt with the \( \mathbb{N} \)-graded Lie algebras of finite coclass that are generated, as it happens for groups, by their first homogeneous component. They proved that there is only one just infinite algebra, namely

\[
a = \langle x, y : [yx^i y] = 0, \text{ for all } i \geq 1 \rangle.
\]

Indeed such an algebra is of maximal class and metabelian.

In positive characteristic, there is exactly one infinite-dimensional metabelian Lie algebra of maximal class. Shalev \[7\] showed that there are countable many infinite-dimensional graded Lie algebras of maximal class over a field of positive characteristic \( p \) generated by the first homogeneous component. We will refer to these algebras as AFS-algebras.

In 1997, Caranti, Mattarei and Newman \[2\] proved that, for each prime \( p \), there are \( 2^{\aleph_0} \) isomorphism types of \( \mathbb{N} \)-graded Lie algebras of maximal class over \( \mathbb{F}_p \), generated in weight 1. Such algebras were constructed using the algebras in \[7\], by means of a technical process called inflation.

In 1999, Caranti and Newman \[3\] proved that all \( \mathbb{N} \)-graded Lie algebras of maximal class in characteristic \( p > 2 \) generated in weight 1 are obtained via possibly infinitely many inflation steps from some AFS-algebra.

Later the case of \( \mathbb{N} \)-graded Lie algebras of maximal class in characteristic \( p = 2 \) generated in weight 1 has been dealt by Jurman \[6\]. The author proved that, in addition to algebras obtained by inflations of AFS-algebras, there is a further family of infinite-dimensional graded Lie algebras of maximal class.

There are other possibilities for a graded Lie algebra to be of maximal class. One of them is that each homogeneous component of \( L \) has dimension one and that \( [L_1 L_i] = L_{i+1} \), for \( i > 1 \). We will refer to such algebras as algebras of type 2, since they are generated by one element of weight 1 and one of weight 2. Shalev and Zelmanov \[8\] proved that over a field of characteristic zero there are three infinite-dimensional algebras of this type, namely

\[
m := \langle e_1, e_2 : [e_2 e_1 e_2] = 0, \text{ for all } i \geq 1 \rangle,
\]

\[
m_2 := \langle e_i : [e_2 e_1] = e_3, [e_i e_1] = e_{i+1}, [e_i e_2] = e_{i+2}, [e_i, e_j] = 0, \text{ for all } i, j \geq 3 \rangle,
\]

\[
W := \langle e_i : [e_i e_j] = (i - j) e_{i+j}, \text{ for all } i, j \geq 1 \rangle.
\]

In characteristic \( p > 2 \), the algebras \( m \) and \( m_2 \) are still graded Lie algebras of maximal class, but the same does not hold for \( W \). The other algebras of type 2 are the algebras obtainable as subalgebras of an algebra generated in weight one, one
further family of soluble algebras and, for \( p = 3 \), one additional family of soluble algebras \([4]\).

Caranti and Vaughan-Lee \([5]\) studied algebras of type 2 also in characteristic two. This case is more uniform than the odd characteristic case.

In this paper, whose content is partially based on \([9]\), we study graded Lie algebras of the form

\[
L = L_1 \oplus \bigoplus_{i=n}^{\infty} L_i,
\]

defined over a field \( \mathbb{F} \) of odd characteristic, where

- \( \dim(L_1) = 1 \);
- \( \dim(L_i) = 1 \) for any \( i \geq n \);
- \( [L_i, L_1] = L_{i+1} \) for any \( i \geq n \).

Along the way we refer to any such an algebra as an algebra of type \( n \).

For any integer \( i > n \), let \( e_i := [e_n, e_{i-n}] \) be the generator of the homogeneous component \( L_i \).

For any \( i \geq n \), let \( [e_i, e_n] = \lambda_i e_{i+n} \) for some \( \lambda_i \in \mathbb{F} \).

In analogy with \([2]\) and \([4]\), we say that the first constituent of \( L \) has length \( l \) for some positive integer \( l > n \) if

\[
\lambda_i = 0 \quad \text{for any } i < l; \quad \lambda_l \neq 0.
\]

We say that the first constituent of \( L \) is

- long, if \( l \geq p + n \);
- short, if \( l < p + n \).

1.1. Structure of the paper. The paper is organized as follows.

1. In Section 2 we introduce some notations we use in the paper. Moreover we recall some well-known binomial identities and we prove some relations involving binomials we use in the following sections.

2. In Section 3 we focus on the length of the first constituent.

First we prove that \( l \) and \( n \) have different parity.

We define the parameter \( \varepsilon_n \) as follows:

\[
\varepsilon_n := \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } n \text{ is even}, \\
1 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd}.
\end{cases}
\]

We prove that, if \( p > 2n \) and the first constituent is long, then \( l \) belongs to

\[
\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{h=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{L}_h
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{L}_h = \{2p^h - (n - 1)\} \cup \left\{ p^{h+1} + \varepsilon_n - 2k : 0 \leq k \leq \frac{n - 2 + \varepsilon_n}{2} \right\}
\]
for any positive integer \( h \).

Moreover, if \( p > 3n \) and the first constituent is short, there exists no algebra of type \( n \) whose first constituent has length \( l \in \{ p + 2, \ldots, p + (n - 1) \} \).

- In Section 4 we show that there exist algebras of type \( n \) for any \( l \in \mathcal{L} \cup \mathcal{S} \), where

\[
\mathcal{S} = \left\{ p + \varepsilon_n - 2k : 0 \leq k \leq \frac{n - 2 + \varepsilon_n}{2} \right\}.
\]

1.2. Open problems. Experimental results seem to suggest that, in analogy with algebras of type 2, there exists a unique algebra of type \( n \) if \( l = n + 1 \), while no algebra of type \( n \) with short first constituent exists in the remaining cases, namely

- \( l \in \{ p + \varepsilon_n + 1, \ldots, p + n - 1 \} \) and \( p > 2n \);
- \( l \in \{ n + 2, \ldots, p - (n - 1) \} \) and \( p > 2n \).

In this paper we concentrated on algebras of type \( n \) with sufficiently large characteristic, namely \( p > 2n \) or, for some results, \( p > 3n \). Actually, many proofs of the paper rely on the fact that the characteristic is sufficiently large. Indeed, algebras of type 2 in characteristic 2 behave differently with respect to the odd characteristic case and in characteristic 3 there is one more family of Lie algebras with respect to the general odd case. Therefore we suppose that results for algebras of type \( n \) could be quite different if the characteristic \( p \) is close to \( n \).

2. Preliminaries

We introduce some notations and conventions we make use of through the paper.

- All the congruences have to be intended modulo \( p \), where \( p \) is the characteristic of the underlying field \( \mathbb{F} \). Therefore a congruence \( a \equiv b \) reads as \( a \equiv b \pmod{p} \).
- If \( j \) and \( k \) are two integers with \( j < k \), then \( \{ j, \ldots, k \} \) denotes the set of all the integers \( i \) with \( j \leq i \leq k \).
- A relation like \( a \approx b \) stands for \( a = b \) or \( a = -b \).
- All the brackets are left-normed. Moreover we omit commas inside brackets, when such an omission does not compromise the readability. Therefore, the Lie bracket \( [abc] \) reads as

\[
[abc] = [[[a, b], c]],
\]

- If \( i \) is a positive integer, then the notation \( [ab^i c] \) stands for

\[
[a b \ldots b c].
\]

Along the way we make use of the Jacobi identity

\[
[a[bc]] = [abc] - [acb]
\]
and the following generalization:

\[ [a[bc^n]] = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^i \binom{n}{i} [ac^ibc^{n-i}]. \]

Moreover we use some identities for binomial coefficients without further mention. Below we recall some of them.

If \( m, n, r, s \) are integers, then

\[
\sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \binom{r}{m+k} \binom{s}{n+k} = \binom{r+s}{r-m+n},
\]

\[
\binom{r}{m} \binom{m}{k} = \binom{r}{k} \binom{r-k}{m-k}.
\]

In the following results we suppose that \( q = p^h \), where \( p \) is an odd prime and \( h \) a positive integer.

**Theorem 2.1** (Lucas’ theorem). Let \( a \) and \( b \) be two non-negative integers.

- If

  \[
a = a_h p^h + a_{h-1} p^{h-1} + \cdots + a_1 p + a_0,
  \]

  \[
b = b_h p^h + b_{h-1} p^{h-1} + \cdots + b_1 p + b_0,
  \]

  where \( a_i, b_i \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\} \) and \( i \in \{0, \ldots, h\} \), then

  \[
  \binom{a}{b} \equiv \binom{a_h}{b_h} \cdot \binom{a_{h-1}}{b_{h-1}} \cdots \binom{a_0}{b_0} \pmod{p}.
  \]

- If

  \[
a = a_1 q + a_0,
  \]

  \[
b = b_1 q + b_0,
  \]

  where \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) are non-negative integers and \( a_0, b_0 < q \), then

  \[
  \binom{a}{b} \equiv \binom{a_1}{b_1} \cdot \binom{a_0}{b_0} \pmod{p}.
  \]

From Lucas’ theorem we deduce the following result.

**Corollary 2.2.** If \( a \) and \( b \) are two non-negative integers smaller than \( q \), then

\[
\binom{a}{q-1-b} \equiv (-1)^{a+b} \binom{b}{q-1-a} \pmod{p}.
\]

**Proof.** First we suppose that \( h = 1 \). Hence \( a, b \in \{0, \ldots, p-1\} \).
We have that
\[(p - 1)! = \prod_{i=1}^{a}(p - i) \cdot (p - a - 1)! \equiv (-1)^a a!(p - a - 1)! \]
\[(p - 1)! = \prod_{i=1}^{b}(p - i) \cdot (p - b - 1)! \equiv (-1)^b b!(p - b - 1)! \]

Therefore
\[
\left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ p - 1 - b \end{array} \right) = \frac{a!}{(p - 1 - b)!(a - p + 1 + b)!} \equiv \frac{a!(-1)^b b!}{(p - 1)!(a - p + 1 + b)!} \\
\equiv (-1)^{a+b} \frac{b!}{(p - a - 1)!(a - p + 1 + b)!} \\
\equiv (-1)^{a+b} \left( \begin{array}{c} b \\ p - 1 - a \end{array} \right) .
\]

Now we suppose that \( h > 1 \).
Let
\[ a = \sum_{i=0}^{h-1} a_i p^i; \quad b = \sum_{i=0}^{h-1} b_i p^i; \]
\[ q - 1 - a = \sum_{i=0}^{h-1} (p - 1 - a_i)p^i; \quad q - 1 - b = \sum_{i=0}^{h-1} (p - 1 - b_i)p^i. \]

Using Lucas' theorem we get
\[
\left( \begin{array}{c} a \\ q - 1 - b \end{array} \right) \equiv \prod_{i=0}^{h-1} \left( \begin{array}{c} a_i \\ p - 1 - b_i \end{array} \right) \equiv \prod_{i=0}^{h-1} (-1)^{a_i + b_i} \left( \begin{array}{c} b_i \\ p - 1 - a_i \end{array} \right) \\
\equiv \prod_{i=0}^{h-1} (-1)^{p^{\alpha_i + \beta_i}} \left( \begin{array}{c} b_i \\ p - 1 - a_i \end{array} \right) \equiv (-1)^{a+b} \left( \begin{array}{c} b \\ q - 1 - a \end{array} \right) .\]

The following technical lemma holds.

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( p \) be an odd prime.
Let \( a, b, c \) and \( k \) be positive integers such that
- \( k \) is odd and \( k < p \);
- \( c \leq a \) and \( a - c \) is even;
- \( a := \frac{p-k}{2} \);
- \( b := a - c + k \).
Then the following identities hold.

\[ \sum_{i=0}^{a-c} \binom{a}{c+i} \binom{b}{i} \equiv \binom{a}{c} \cdot \frac{c}{a} \pmod{p}; \]  
\[ \sum_{i=0}^{a-c+1} \binom{a}{c-1+i} \binom{b}{i} \equiv -\binom{a}{c-1} \pmod{p}. \]

**Proof.** First we prove the identity (2.1).
We notice that

\[ \sum_{i=0}^{a-c} \binom{a}{c+i} \binom{b}{i} = \binom{a+b}{a-c} = \frac{(a+b)(a+b-1)\cdots(b+c+1)}{(a-c)!}. \]

Since \( b = \frac{p+k}{2} - c \) and \( a+b = p-c \), we have that

\[ \sum_{i=0}^{a-c} \binom{a}{c+i} \binom{b}{i} \equiv \frac{(-c)(-c+1)\cdots(-c+1)}{(a-c)!} \equiv \binom{a}{c} \cdot \frac{c}{a}. \]

Similarly we check that identity (2.2) holds:

\[ \sum_{i=0}^{a-c+1} \binom{a}{c-1+i} \binom{b}{i} = \binom{a+b}{a-c+1} = \frac{(a+b)(a+b-1)\cdots(b+c)}{(a-c+1)!} \]

\[ \equiv -\frac{c \cdot (c+1)\cdots a}{(a-c+1)!} \equiv -\binom{a}{c-1}. \]

\[ \square \]

3. The length of the first constituent

Throughout this section \( L \) denotes an algebra of type \( n \) over a field \( \mathbb{F} \) of characteristic \( p > 2n \).

For any \( i \geq n \), let \( [e_i, e_n] = \lambda_i e_{i+n} \) for some \( \lambda_i \in \mathbb{F} \).

We recall that the length of the first constituent of \( L \) is \( l > n \) if \( \lambda_l \neq 0 \) and \( \lambda_i = 0 \) for all \( i \in \{n, \ldots, l-1\} \).

More in general, we define the length and the type of a constituent in analogy with [3].

**Definition 3.1.** Let \( k, m \) and \( r \) be positive integers with \( k > n \). We say that a sequence \( \{\lambda_i\}_{i=k-1}^{k+m+r} \) with

\[ \lambda_{k-1} = 0, \]
\[ \lambda_k \neq 0, \]
\[ \lambda_i = 0 \text{ if } i \in \{k + m, \ldots, k + m + r - 1\}, \]
\[ \lambda_{k+m+r} \neq 0, \]

is a constituent of length \( m + r \) and type \( \{\lambda_i\}_{i=k-1}^{k+m-1} \).
The following holds.

**Lemma 3.2.** The length \( l \) is even if and only if \( n \) is odd.

**Proof.** If \( l \) and \( n \) have the same parity and \( t := \frac{t + n}{2} \), then \([e_{t+n}, e_ne_1^i] = 0 \) yields
\[
0 = \sum_{i=0}^{t} (-1)^i \binom{t}{i} \lambda_{t+n+i} = (-1)^t \lambda_t
\]
in contradiction with the hypothesis that \( \lambda_t \neq 0 \). \( \square \)

3.1. **First constituent length** \( l \in \{q + n, \ldots, pq - n\} \). In the following results we suppose that \( l, d \) and \( q \) are three integers such that
- \( l \geq n + 3 \);
- \( d := \frac{l - n - 3}{2} \);
- \( q = p^h \) for some integer \( h \geq 1 \).

**Lemma 3.3.** We have that \( \lambda_{l+n+i} = 0 \) for \( i \in \{0, \ldots, d\} \).

Moreover, if \( \{\lambda_i\}_{i=k}^{k+m-1} \) is a constituent of length \( s + m \) with \( s \geq d + 1 \), then
\[
\lambda_{k+m+s+n+i} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{0, \ldots, d\}.
\]

**Proof.** Since \( \lambda_k = 0 \) for \( k \in \{n, \ldots, l - 1\} \), we have that
\[
[e_ne_1^i, e_ne_1^{i+1}] = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{0, \ldots, d\}.
\]

Let \( t \in \{l, k + m + s\} \).

We prove the claim by induction on \( i \).

If \( i = 0 \), then \([e_{l-1}, [e_n, e_ne_1]] = 0 \) yields 0 = \( \lambda_l \lambda_{l+n} \). Hence \( \lambda_{l+n} = 0 \).

Suppose that \( \lambda_{l+n+i} = 0 \) for all \( i \in \{0, \ldots, r\} \), where \( r \in \{0, \ldots, d - 1\} \).

Since \([e_{l-r-2}, [e_ne_1^{r+1}, e_ne_1^{r+2}]] = 0 \), we have that
\[
0 \approx \lambda_{l} \left( \sum_{i=0}^{r+1} \binom{r+1}{i} (-1)^i \lambda_{l+n+i} \right) = \lambda_{l} \lambda_{l+n+r+1}.
\]

Hence, \( \lambda_{l+n+r+1} = 0 \). \( \square \)

In the following lemmas we show that some values for \( l \) are not admissible.

**Lemma 3.4.** There is no algebra of type \( n \) such that
\[
l \in \{rq + n, \ldots, (r + 1)q - n\} \quad \text{for some} \quad r \in \{1, \ldots, p - 1\}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( l \in \{rq + n, \ldots, (r + 1)q - n\} \) for some \( r \in \{1, \ldots, p - 1\} \).

According to Lemma 3.3 we have that \( \lambda_{l+n+j} = 0 \) for \( j \in \{0, \ldots, d\} \).

Now we prove by induction on \( i \) that
\[
\lambda_{l+n-i} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{0, \ldots, n\}. \quad (3.1)
\]

The base step is trivially true.
Let \( l = (r + 1)q - n - k \) for some \( k \in \{0, \ldots, q - 2n\} \).

Suppose that (3.1) holds for all \( i \in \{0, \ldots, j - 1\} \) for some \( j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \).

Let \( t := q - n - k - j + 1 \) and \( u := l + n - j \). Then

\[
[e_u, e_n e^l_1] = \sum_{s=0}^{t} (-1)^s \binom{t}{s} \lambda_{u+s} e_{u+n+t} = \lambda_u e_{u+n+t}.
\]

In fact, if \( s \in \{1, \ldots, j - 1\} \) then

\[
u + s = l + n - (j - s) \quad \text{with} \quad j - s \in \{1, \ldots, j - 1\}.
\]

Moreover, if \( s \in \{j, \ldots, t\} \) then

\[
l + n \leq l + n - j + s \leq l + n - 1 + t \leq l + n + (q - n - k - 1)
\]

\[
\leq l + n + \left( q - n - \frac{k + 3 - \varepsilon_{k+3}}{2} \right)
\]

\[
\leq l + n + \left\lceil \frac{(r+1)q - 2n - 3 - k + \varepsilon_{k+3}}{2} \right\rceil
\]

\[
= l + n + \frac{l - n - 3 + \varepsilon_{k+3}}{2} = l + n + \frac{l - n - 3}{2}
\]

since \( l - n \) is odd.

Therefore \( -j + s \in \{0, \ldots, d\} \).

So far we have proved that

\[
\lambda_{u+s} = 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad s \in \{1, \ldots, t\}.
\] (3.2)

Since \([e_u, e_n e^l_1] + [e_{n+t}, e_n e^l_{1-j}] = 0\), we have that

\[
0 = \lambda_u + \sum_{v=0}^{l-j} (-1)^v \binom{l-j}{v} \lambda_{t+n+v}
\]

\[
\equiv \lambda_u + \sum_{w=0}^{r} (-1)^w \binom{r}{w} \sum_{z=0}^{l-1} (-1)^z \binom{t-1}{z} \lambda_{wq+t+n+z}
\]

\[
\equiv \lambda_u.
\]

In fact, if \( w \in \{0, \ldots, r - 1\} \) then

\[
wq + t + n + z \leq (r - 1)q + (q - n - k - j + 1) + n + (q - n - k - j)
\]

\[
= ((r+1)q - n - k) - k - 2j + 1 = l - k - 2j + 1
\]

\[
\leq l - 1.
\]

Hence \( \lambda_{wq+t+n+z} = 0 \).
Moreover, if \( w = r \) then
\[
qw + t + n + z = rq + (q - n - k - j + 1) + n + z = l + n - j + 1 + z = u + s,
\]
where \( s \in \{1, \ldots, t\} \).

From (3.2) we deduce that \( \lambda_{qw+t+n+z} = 0 \).

We conclude that (3.1) holds for all \( i \in \{0, \ldots, n\} \). In particular \( \lambda_i = 0 \), in contradiction with the fact that the length of the first constituent is \( l \). \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.5.** There is no algebra of type \( n \) such that
\[
l \in \{2q - n + 2, \ldots, 2q\} \cup \{rq - n, \ldots, rq\}
\]
for some \( r \in \{3, \ldots, p - 1\} \).

**Proof.** Let \( l \in \{2q - n + 2, \ldots, 2q\} \cup \{rq - n, \ldots, rq\} \) for some \( r \in \{3, \ldots, p - 1\} \).

According to Lemma 3.3 we have that \( \lambda_{l+n+i} = 0 \) for \( i \in \{0, \ldots, d\} \).

We notice that
\[
n + d \geq \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{2q-1}{2} \right\rceil = q & \text{if } r = 2, \\ \frac{rq-3}{2} > q & \text{if } r \in \{3, \ldots, p - 1\}. \end{cases}
\]

Let \( r \in \{2, \ldots, p - 1\} \) and \( t := l + (1 - r)q - n \).

We notice that \( t \geq q - 2n > 0 \).

We have that \( [e_ne_1^t, e_ne_{rq}^1] = \mu e_{l+q+n}, \) where
\[
\mu \equiv \sum_{u=0}^{r} (-1)^u \binom{r}{u} \lambda_{n+l+uq} = (-1)^{r-1}r\lambda_l
\]
because \( \lambda_{l+q} = 0 \).

Since \( 0 = [e_ne_1^t, e_ne_{rq}^1] + [e_{rq+n}, e_ne_1^t] \), we have that
\[
0 = (-1)^{r-1}r\lambda_l + \sum_{i=0}^{t} (-1)^i \binom{t}{i} \lambda_{rq+n+i} = (-1)^{r-1}r\lambda_l. \tag{3.3}
\]

In fact, if \( i \in \{0, \ldots, t\} \) then
\[
l + n \leq rq + n + i \leq l + q \leq l + n + d.
\]

Hence \( \lambda_l = 0 \), which is absurd. \( \square \)

**Lemma 3.6.** There is no algebra of type \( n \) such that
\[
l \in \{rq + 1, \ldots, rq + n - 1\} \quad \text{for some } r \in \{2, \ldots, p - 1\}.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( l \in \{rq + 1, \ldots, rq + n - 1\} \) for some \( r \in \{2, \ldots, p - 1\} \).

According to Lemma 3.3 we have that \( \lambda_{l+n+i} = 0 \) for \( i \in \{0, \ldots, d\} \).

Let \( l = rq + k \), for some \( k \in \{1, \ldots, n - 1\} \).
We have that \([e_ne_1, e_ne_q-n] = \mu e_{l+q+n}\), where
\[
\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{q-n} (-1)^i \binom{q-n}{i} \lambda_{l+n+i} = 0
\]
because for all \(i \in \{0, \ldots, q-n\}\) we have that
\[
l + n \leq l + n + i \leq l + q \leq rq + k + \frac{rq + k + n - 3}{2} = l + n + d.
\]
Moreover, 0 = \([e_ne_1, e_ne_q-n] + [e_q, e_ne_1]\) yields
\[
0 \equiv \sum_{u=0}^{r} (-1)^u \binom{r}{u} \sum_{i=0}^{k} (-1)^i \binom{k}{i} \lambda_{(u+1)q+i} = (-1)^{r-1}r(-1)^k \lambda_{rq+k}.
\]
Hence \(\lambda_l = \lambda_{rq+k} = 0\), which is absurd. □

### 3.2. First constituent length \(l \in \{q + 2, \ldots, q + (n - 1)\}\).

In this section we prove that there is no algebra of type \(n\) satisfying at least one of the following conditions:

1. \(p > 2n\) and \(l \in \{q + 2, \ldots, q + (n - 1)\}\), where \(q = p^h\) for some \(h \geq 2\);
2. \(p > 3n\) and \(l \in \{q + 2, \ldots, q + (n - 1)\}\), where \(q = p^h\) for some \(h \geq 1\).

We suppose that \(L\) is an algebra of type \(n\) satisfying one of the conditions above. We define
\[
M := \max\{i \in \{q + 2, \ldots, q + (n - 1)\} : \lambda_i \neq 0\}.
\]
We have that
\[
l = q + d \quad \text{for some} \quad d \in \{2, \ldots, n - 1\};
\]
\[
M = q + f \quad \text{for some} \quad f \in \{2, \ldots, n - 1\}.
\]
We notice in passing that \(d\) and \(n\) have the same parity.

First we prove some necessary conditions for the algebra \(L\).

#### Lemma 3.7. The following hold:

1. \(l > 3n\);
2. \(\lambda_{l+n} = \cdots = \lambda_{l+2n+1} = 0\);
3. \(\lambda_{q+n} = \cdots = \lambda_{l+n} = 0\);
4. \(\lambda_{l+2n} = \cdots = \lambda_{l+q-2} = 0\);
5. either \(\lambda_{l+q-1} \neq 0\) or \(\lambda_{l+q} \neq 0\).

**Proof.** We prove separately the claims.

1. If \(p > 3n\) then \(l > q > 3n\), while if \(p > 2n\) then \(l > p^2 > (2n)^2 = 4n^2\).

2. From Lemma 3.3 it follows that
\[
\lambda_{l+n} = \cdots = \lambda_{l+2n} = 0
\]
because \(l \geq q + 2 \geq 3n + 3\) and \(\frac{l-n-3}{2} \geq n\).
Moreover, $\lambda_{l+2n+1} = 0$.

In fact, let $u := d + n + 1$.

Then the relation $0 = [e_n, e_{l+2n+1}] + [e_{l+2n+1}, e_n]$ yields

$$0 = \sum_{i=0}^{l+2n+1} (-1)^i \binom{q+u}{i} \lambda_{n+i} + \lambda_{l+2n+1}$$

$$\equiv \sum_{i=0}^{d+n+1} (-1)^i \binom{u}{i} \lambda_{n+i} - \sum_{i=0}^{d+n+1} (-1)^i \binom{u}{i} \lambda_{q+n+i} + \lambda_{l+2n+1}$$

$$\equiv 2\lambda_{l+2n+1}$$

Here we used the fact that $\lambda_{n+i} = 0$ for any $i \in \{0, \ldots, d + n + 1\}$ because $n+i \leq d + 2n + 1 \leq 3n < l$.

(3) We prove by induction on $i \in \{0, \ldots, d\}$ that

$$\lambda_{l+n-i} = 0 \quad \text{for any} \quad i \in \{0, \ldots, d\}.$$

The basis step for $i = 0$ has been proved in item (2).

Now we suppose that $i > 0$.

Let $u := d - i + 1$.

The relation $0 = [e_{l+n-i+1}, e_{n}^{d-i}] + [e_{n+d-i}, e_{n}^{l-i+1}]$ yields

$$0 = \sum_{j=0}^{l-i+1} (-1)^j \binom{l-i+1}{j} \lambda_{n+d-i+j} = \sum_{j=0}^{q+u} (-1)^j \binom{q+u}{j} \lambda_{n+d-i+j}$$

$$\equiv \sum_{j=0}^{u} (-1)^j \binom{u}{j} \lambda_{n+d-i+j} - \sum_{j=0}^{u} (-1)^j \binom{u}{j} \lambda_{l+n-i+j}$$

$$\equiv - \binom{u}{0} \lambda_{l+n-i} \equiv -\lambda_{l+n-i}.$$

(4) We prove by induction that

$$\lambda_{l+2n+2j} = \lambda_{l+2n+2j+1} = 0$$

for all $j \in \{0, \ldots, \frac{q-3-2n}{2}\}$.

The base case has been proved in item (2).

Now we suppose that $j > 0$.

We define

$$m := l + 2n + 2j;$$

$$t := m - M - n + 1.$$
Let $u := d + n + 2j + 1$.

Since

$$m - n + 1 = q + u$$

and

$$n + u \leq q + d - 2 < l,$$

the relation $0 = [e_n, e_n e_{m-n+1}] + [e_{m+1}, e_n]$ yields

$$0 = \sum_{i=0}^{q+u} (-1)^i \binom{q+u}{i} \lambda_{n+i} + \lambda_{m+1} \equiv - u \sum_{i=0}^{u} (-1)^i \binom{u}{i} \lambda_{q+n+i} + \lambda_{m+1}$$

$$\equiv - u \lambda_m + 2\lambda_{m+1}.$$

Therefore

$$2\lambda_{m+1} - u \lambda_m = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

If $t$ is even, then the relation $0 = [e_M, e_n e_{t-1} e_n]$ yields

$$0 = \lambda_M \lambda_m - (-1)^{t-1} \lambda_M \lambda_m = 2\lambda_M \lambda_m.$$

Since $\lambda_M \neq 0$, we have that $\lambda_m = 0$.

Moreover, from $(3.4)$ it follows that $\lambda_{m+1} = 0$.

If $t$ is odd, then the relation $0 = [e_M, e_n e_{t-1} e_n]$ yields

$$0 = \lambda_M \lambda_{m+1} - \lambda_M (t \lambda_m - \lambda_{m+1}).$$

Therefore

$$2\lambda_{m+1} - t \lambda_m = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

We notice that

$$t = (q + d + 2n + 2j) - (q + f) - n + 1 = u - f.$$

The equations $(3.4)$ and $(3.5)$ give rise to the linear system

$$\begin{cases}
2\lambda_{m+1} - u \lambda_m = 0 \\
2\lambda_{m+1} - (u - f) \lambda_m = 0
\end{cases}$$

which, after elimination, reduces to

$$\begin{cases}
2\lambda_{m+1} - u \lambda_m = 0 \\
-f \lambda_m = 0
\end{cases}$$

Since $f \in \{2, \ldots, n - 1\}$, we have that $p$ does not divide $f$.

Hence $\lambda_{m+1} = \lambda_m = 0$. 
From the relation \([e_n, e_ne_1^{l-n+q} + [e_{l+q}, e_n] = 0\) we get

\[
0 = \sum_{i=0}^{l-n+q} (-1)^i \binom{l-n+q}{i} \lambda_{n+i} + \lambda_{l+q}
\]

\[
\equiv \binom{l-n}{l-n} \lambda_l - \binom{l-n}{l-n-1} \lambda_{l+q-1} + \binom{l-n}{l-n} \lambda_{l+q} + \lambda_{l+q}
\]

\[
\equiv \lambda_l - (l-n)\lambda_{l+q-1} + 2\lambda_{l+q}.
\]

Since \(\lambda_l \neq 0\), we get the result.

Before proving the other lemmas of the current section, we define the integers

\[
m := \min \{i \in \{l+q-1, l+q\} : \lambda_i \neq 0\},
\]

\[
t := m - M - n + 1,
\]

and the sets of indices

\[
J_1 := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : M - (2j + 1) \geq l - 1\},
\]

\[
J_2 := \{j \in \mathbb{N} : M - (2j + 2) \geq l - 1\},
\]

\[
J := J_1 \cup J_2,
\]

\[
I := \{i \in \mathbb{N} : M - i \geq l - 1\},
\]

\[
I^* := \{i \in \mathbb{N} : M - i \geq l\}.
\]

The following results hold.

**Lemma 3.8.** We have that

1. \(t\) is odd;
2. \(t = q - p + k = (p^{h-1} - 1)p + k\) for some odd integer \(k \in \{1, \ldots, p - 2\}\);
3. if \(j \in J_1\), then \(n + t + 2j \leq q + 1\);
4. if \(j \in J_2\), then \(n + t + 2j + 2 \leq q + 2\).

**Proof.** We prove separately the claims.

1. If \(t\) is even, then the relation \(0 = [e_M, e_ne_1^{l-n+q}]\) yields

\[
0 = \lambda_M \lambda_m + \lambda_M \lambda_m = 2\lambda_M \lambda_m,
\]

in contradiction with the fact that \(\lambda_M \lambda_m \neq 0\).

2. The claim holds because

\[
t \leq l + q - (q + 2) - n + 1 = l - n - 1
\]

\[
\leq q + (n - 1) - (n + 1) = q - 2;
\]

\[
t \geq l + q - 1 - (q + (n - 1)) - n + 1 = l - 2n + 1
\]

\[
\geq q + 2 - 2n + 1 > q - 2n > q - p.
\]
(3) If \( j \in J_1 \) then
\[
n + t + 2j \leq n + (m - M - n + 1) + 2j \leq m - M + M - (l - 1) \\
\leq l + q - (l - 1) = q + 1.
\]

(4) If \( j \in J_2 \) then
\[
n + t + 2j + 2 \leq n + (m - M - n + 1) + 2j + 2 \\
\leq m - M + 1 + M - (l - 1) \\
\leq l + q + 2 - l = q + 2.
\]

Lemma 3.9. We have that \( l \not\in \{q + 3, \ldots, q + (n - 1)\} \).

Proof. The relation \( 0 = [e_M, e_n e_1^t e_n] \) yields
\[
0 = \lambda_M \lambda_{m+1} - \lambda_M (k \lambda_m - \lambda_{m+1}) = \lambda_M (2\lambda_{m+1} - k\lambda_m).
\]
Hence
\[
\lambda_m = \frac{2}{k} \lambda_{m+1}.
\]

According to Lemma 3.8 we have that
\[
[e_n e_1^{t+2j} e_n] = 0 \quad \text{for any } j \in J_1, \\
[e_n e_1^{t+2j+2} e_n] = 0 \quad \text{for any } j \in J_2.
\]

For any \( j \in J_1 \) the relation \( 0 = [e_{M - (2j + 1)}, e_n e_1^{t+2j} e_n] \) yields
\[
0 \equiv \left( \sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \binom{k+2j}{i} \lambda_{M-(2j+1)+i} \right) \lambda_m - (-1)^{t+2j} \lambda_{M-(2j+1)} \lambda_m.
\]

Since \( \lambda_m \neq 0 \), we get
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \binom{k+2j}{i} \lambda_{M-(2j+1)+i} = -\lambda_{M-(2j+1)}. \tag{3.6}
\]

For any \( j \in J_2 \) the relation \( 0 = [e_{M-(2j+2)}, e_n e_1^{t+2j+2} e_n] \) yields
\[
0 \equiv \left( \sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \binom{k+2j+2}{i} \lambda_{M-(2j+2)+i} \right) \lambda_{m+1} \\
- \lambda_{M-(2j+2)}(k+2j+2)\lambda_m - \lambda_{m+1}.
\]

We have that \( \lambda_m = \frac{2}{k} \lambda_{m+1} \). Moreover, \( \lambda_{m+1} \neq 0 \) because \( \lambda_m \neq 0 \).

Therefore
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \binom{k+2j+2}{i} \lambda_{M-(2j+2)+i} = \lambda_{M-(2j+2)} \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{2}{k}(2j+2) \right). \tag{3.7}.
\]
Hence, the relations

\[ 0 = [e_{M-(2j+1)}, e_n e_1^{t+2j} e_n^t] \quad \text{for } j \in J_1, \]
\[ 0 = [e_{M-(2j+2)}, e_n e_1^{t+2j+2} e_n^t] \quad \text{for } j \in J_2, \]

give rise to a linear system of maximum rank in the unknowns \( \lambda_{l-1}, \ldots, \lambda_M. \)

Let \( a := \frac{p-k}{2}. \)

Then

\[ \{\lambda_{M-i}\}_{i \in I} = \left\{ (-1)^i \binom{a}{a-i} \lambda_M \right\}_{i \in I} \]

is the general solution of the linear system.

In fact, consider an integer \( j \in J_1. \)

We want to prove that (3.6) holds.

If we define

\[ c := a - 2j, \quad b := a - c + k, \]

then \( b = k + 2j \) and, according to Lemma [2.3] we have that

\[ \sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \binom{k+2j}{i} \lambda_{M-(2j+1)+i} \]
\[ = \sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \binom{b}{i} \cdot (-1)^{2j+1-i} \binom{a}{a-(2j+1)+i} \lambda_M \]
\[ = - \sum_{i=0}^{a-c+1} \binom{a}{c-1+i} \binom{b}{i} \lambda_M \]
\[ \equiv \left( \frac{a}{c-1} \right) \lambda_M \equiv \left( \frac{a}{a-(2j+1)} \right) \lambda_M \equiv -\lambda_{M-(2j+1)} \]

Now we consider an integer \( j \in J_2. \)

We want to prove that (3.7) holds.

If we define

\[ c := a - 2j - 2, \quad b := a - c + k, \]
then \( b = k + 2j + 2 \) and, according to Lemma 2.3, we have that
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \binom{k + 2j + 2}{i} \lambda_M^{-(2j+2)+i} = \sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \binom{b}{i} \cdot (-1)^{2j+2-i} \left( a - \binom{a}{2j+2} + i \right) \lambda_M = \sum_{i=0}^{a+c} \binom{a+c+i}{i} \binom{b}{i} \lambda_M
\]
\[
\equiv \left( \frac{a}{c} \right) \lambda_M \cdot \frac{c}{a} \equiv \left( \frac{a}{a-(2j+2)} \right) \lambda_M a = a \cdot (2j+2)
\]
\[
\equiv \lambda_M^{-(2j+2)} \cdot \left( 1 - \frac{2j+2}{q-k} \right)
\]
\[
\equiv \lambda_M^{-(2j+2)} \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{2}{k}(2j+2) \right).
\]

We get an absurd because \( \lambda_{l-1} = k\lambda_M \) for some non-zero \( k \in \mathbb{F} \) and non-zero \( \lambda_M \in \mathbb{F} \). □

In the following lemma we discard the possibility that \( l = q+2 \) with \( n \) even. The lemma is stated for \( n \geq 4 \). By the way, the claim holds also for \( n = 2 \) according to the results on the first constituent length proved in [4].

**Lemma 3.10.** If \( n \geq 4 \) is even, then \( l \neq q+2 \).

**Proof.** By contradiction, let \( n \) be even and \( l = q+2 \).

In analogy to Lemma 3.9, the relation \( 0 = [e_M, e_n e_1 e_n] \) yields
\[ \lambda_m = \frac{2}{k} \lambda_{m+1} \]

Now we define the sets of indices
\[ J_1^*: = \{ j \in \mathbb{N} : M - (2j+1) \geq l \} \]
\[ J_2^*: = \{ j \in \mathbb{N} : M - (2j+2) \geq l \} \]

Since \( J_1^* \subseteq J_1 \), according to Lemma 3.8 we have that
\[ n + t + 2j \leq q + 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in J_1^* \]

Moreover we have that
\[ n + t + 2j + 2 \leq q + 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad j \in J_2^* \]

In fact, if \( j \in J_2^* \) then
\[
n + t + 2j + 2 = n + (m - M - n + 1) + 2j + 2 \\
\leq m - M + 1 + (M - l) \leq (l + q) + 1 - l \\
\leq q + 1.
\]
In analogy to the proof of Lemma 3.9 the relations

\[ 0 = [e_{M-(2j+1)}, e_ne_1^{t+2j}, e_n] \quad \text{for } j \in J_1^*, \]
\[ 0 = [e_{M-(2j+2)}, e_ne_1^{t+2j+2}, e_n] \quad \text{for } j \in J_2^*, \]

give rise to a linear system of maximum rank in the unknowns \( \lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_M \).

Let \( a := \frac{p-k}{2} \).

We define the set of indices

\[ I^* := \{ i \in \mathbb{N} : M - i \geq l \}. \]

Then

\[ \{ \lambda_{M-i} \}_{i \in I^*} = \left\{ (-1)^i \left( \frac{a}{a-i} \right) \lambda_M \right\}_{i \in I^*} \]

is the general solution of the linear system.

Now we consider for any \( j \in J_1^* \) the relation \( 0 = [e_M, e_ne_1^{t+2j}, e_n] \).

Such a relation yields

\[
0 = \lambda_{m+2j+1} - (-1)^{t-1} \sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \left( \frac{t + 2j}{t - 1 + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i} \\
\equiv \lambda_{m+2j+1} - \sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \left( \frac{k + 2j}{k - 1 + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i} \\
\equiv \lambda_{m+2j+1} - \sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \left( \frac{k + 2j}{k - 1 + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i} 
\]

Hence for all \( j \in J_1^* \) we have that

\[
\sum_{i=0}^{2j+1} (-1)^i \left( \frac{k + 2j}{k - 1 + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i} \equiv \lambda_{m+2j+1} \quad (3.8)
\]

Let \( j \in J_2^* \) and \( u := k + 2j + 2 \).
Then the relation $0 = [e_{M-1}, e_ne_1^{t+2j+2}e_n]$ yields
\[
0 = (\lambda M - (t + 2j + 2)\lambda M)\lambda_{m+2j+2}
\]
\[- \lambda M - 1 \cdot (-1)^t \sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \left( \frac{t + 2j + 2}{t + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i}
\]
\[\equiv (\lambda M - u\lambda M)\lambda_{m+2j+2} + \lambda M - 1 \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \left( \frac{u}{k + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i}
\]
\[\equiv \left(1 + \frac{u}{a}\right) \lambda M - 1 \lambda_{m+2j+2} + \lambda M - 1 \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \left( \frac{u}{k + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i}
\]
\[\equiv \left(-1 - \frac{2}{k}(2j + 2)\right) \lambda M - 1 \lambda_{m+2j+2} + \lambda M - 1 \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \left( \frac{u}{k + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i}
\]
Since $\lambda_{M-1} \neq 0$, for any $j \in J_2^*$ we get that
\[\sum_{i=0}^{2j+2} (-1)^i \left( \frac{k + 2j + 2}{t + i} \right) \lambda_{m+i} \equiv \left(1 + \frac{2}{k}(2j + 2)\right) \lambda_{m+2j+2}
\]
Hence, the relations
\[
0 = [e_M, e_ne_1^{t+2j}e_n] \quad \text{for} \quad j \in J_1^*,
\]
\[0 = [e_{M-1}, e_ne_1^{t+2j+2}e_n] \quad \text{for} \quad j \in J_2^*,
\]
give rise to a linear system of maximum rank in the unknowns $\lambda_m, \ldots, \lambda_{m+(M-l)}$, whose general solution is
\[
\{\lambda_{m+i}\}_{i \in I} = \left\{(-1)^i \left( \frac{a}{i} \right) \lambda_{m+i}\right\}_{i \in I^*}
\]
Now we notice that the relation $0 = [e_n, e_ne_1^{2q+2-n}] + [e_{2q+2}, e_n]$ yields
\[0 \equiv -\lambda_{q+2} - (q + 1 - n)\lambda_{2q+1} + 2\lambda_{2q+2}.
\]
We deal separately with three different cases.

- **Case 1:** $M = q + (n - 1)$ and $m = 2q + 2$.
  We have that $\lambda_{2q+2} = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{q+2}$ because $\lambda_{2q+1} = 0$.
  We notice that
    \[
m - M = q + 3 - n,
    \]
    \[
    M - n = q - 1.
    \]
  Since $t = m - M - n + 1 = q - p + k$, we have that
    \[
k = 4 + p - 2n.
    \]
Therefore $a = \frac{q - k}{2} = n - 2$ and
\[
\{ \lambda_{q+(n-1)-i} \}_{i=0}^{n-3} = \left\{ (-1)^i \left( \frac{n-2}{n-2-i} \right) \lambda_M \right\}_{i=0}^{n-3}
\]

Let $u := p + 3 - n$.
Then the relation $0 = [e_M, e_M] = [e_M, e_n e_1^{M-n}]$ yields
\[
0 = \lambda_M + \sum_{i=0}^{n-4} (-1)^i \left( \frac{q-1}{q+3-n+i} \right) \lambda_{m+i}
\]
\[
\equiv \lambda_M + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{q+2} \sum_{i=0}^{n-4} \left( \frac{p-1}{u+i} \right) \left( \frac{a}{i} \right)
\]
\[
\equiv \lambda_M - \frac{1}{2} \cdot (n-2) \lambda_M \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{n-4} \left( \frac{p-1}{u+i} \right) \left( \frac{n-2}{i} \right)
\]
\[
\equiv \lambda_M - \frac{n-2}{2} \lambda_M \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{n-4} \left( \frac{p-1}{u+i} \right) \left( \frac{n-2}{i} \right)
\]
\[
\equiv \lambda_M - \frac{n-2}{2} \lambda_M \cdot \left( \frac{n-3}{n-4} \right)
\]
\[
\equiv \frac{2 - (n-2)(n-3)}{2} \lambda_M
\]

We notice that the solutions in $\mathbb{F}$ of the quadratic equation
\[
x(x+1) - 2 = 0
\]
are $x = 1$ and $x = -2$.
Moreover,
\[
n - 3 \equiv 1 \leftrightarrow n \equiv 4,
\]
\[
n - 3 \equiv -2 \leftrightarrow n \equiv 1.
\]

Since $4 \leq n < p$, the only admissible value for $n$ such that
\[
n - 3 \equiv 1 \text{ or } -2
\]
is $n = 4$ (see Case 2).
Hence, for all $n \neq 4$ the congruence
\[
0 \equiv \frac{2 - (n-2)(n-3)}{2} \lambda_M \pmod{p}
\]
is not satisfied.
• Case 2: $n = 4$, $M = q + 3$ and $m = 2q + 2$.
Since $k = 4 + p - 2n$, we have that
\[ k = p - 4, \]
\[ a = 2. \]

Let $\mu = \lambda_{q+3} \neq 0$.
Therefore
\[ \lambda_i = \begin{cases} 
0 & \text{if } i \in \{4, \ldots, q+1\}, \\
-2\mu & \text{if } i = q + 2, \\
\mu & \text{if } i = q + 3, \\
0 & \text{if } i \in \{q + 4, \ldots, 2q + 1\}, \\
-\mu & \text{if } i = 2q + 2, \\
2\mu & \text{if } i = 2q + 3. 
\end{cases} \]

The relation $0 = [e_{q+4}, e_4 e_1^2]$ yields
\[ 0 = \lambda_{q+4} - \lambda_{2q+4}. \]

Since $\lambda_{q+4} = 0$, also $\lambda_{2q+4} = 0$.

The relation $0 = [e_{2q+1}, [e_4 e_1 e_4]]$ yields
\[ 0 = -\lambda_{2q+2} \lambda_{2q+6}. \]

Therefore $\lambda_{2q+6} = 0$.

The relation $0 = [e_4, e_4 e_1^{2q+2}] + [e_{2q+6}, e_4]$ yields
\[ 0 = -(2q + 2) \lambda_{2q+5} + 2 \lambda_{2q+6}. \]

Since $\lambda_{2q+6} = 0$, also $\lambda_{2q+5} = 0$.

Hence, so far we have proved that
\[ \lambda_{2q+4} = \lambda_{2q+5} = \lambda_{2q+6} = 0. \]

Now we prove, by induction on $i \in \{0, \ldots, \frac{q-7}{2}\}$, that
\[ \lambda_{2q+7+2i} = \lambda_{2q+8+2i} = 0. \]

If $i = 0$, then the relation $0 = [e_{2q+2}, e_4 e_1 e_4]$ yields $\lambda_{2q+7} = 0$ because $\mu \neq 0$ and
\[ 0 = (2\lambda_{2q+2} - \lambda_{2q+3}) \lambda_{2q+7} = (-4\mu) \lambda_{2q+7}. \]

Moreover, the relation $0 = [e_{2q+3}, e_4 e_1 e_4]$ yields $\lambda_{2q+8} = 0$ because $\mu \neq 0$ and
\[ 0 = \lambda_{2q+3}(-\lambda_{2q+7} + 2\lambda_{2q+8}) = 4\mu \lambda_{2q+8}. \]

For the inductive step, we consider an index $i > 0$ with $i \leq \frac{q-7}{2}$. 
The relations

\[
0 = [e_{2q+3}, e_4 e_1^{1+2i} e_4],
\]
\[
0 = [e_4, e_4 e_1^{2q+4+2i}] + [e_{2q+8+2i}, e_4],
\]
yield

\[
0 = \lambda_{2q+3}(- (1 + 2i) \lambda_{2q+7+2i} + 2 \lambda_{2q+8+2i}),
\]
\[
0 = -(2q + 4 + 2i) \lambda_{2q+7+2i} + 2 \lambda_{2q+8+2i}.
\]

Since \(\lambda_{2q+3} \neq 0\) and \(p\) divides \(q\), we get the linear system

\[
\begin{align*}
2\lambda_{2q+8+2i} - (1 + 2i) \lambda_{2q+7+2i} &= 0 \\
2\lambda_{2q+8+2i} - (4 + 2i) \lambda_{2q+7+2i} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

which reduces to

\[
\begin{align*}
2\lambda_{2q+8+2i} - (1 + 2i) \lambda_{2q+7+2i} &= 0 \\
-3\lambda_{2q+7+2i} &= 0
\end{align*}
\]

Hence \(\lambda_{2q+7+2i} = \lambda_{2q+8+2i} = 0\).

Therefore, we have that

\[
\lambda_{2q+4} = \lambda_{2q+5} = \cdots = \lambda_{3q+1} = 0.
\]

Moreover, the relation \(0 = [e_{2q+2}, e_4 e_1^{q-4} e_4]\) yields

\[
0 = (2\lambda_{2q+2} - (q - 4) \lambda_{2q+3}) \lambda_{3q+2} \\
\equiv (-2\mu + 8\mu) \lambda_{3q+2} \equiv 6\mu \lambda_{3q+2}.
\]

Since \(6\mu \neq 0\), we get that \(\lambda_{3q+2} = 0\).

From the relation \(0 = [e_{2q+3}, e_4 e_1^{q-3} e_4]\) we get that

\[
0 = \lambda_{2q+3}(2\lambda_{3q+3} - (q - 4) \lambda_{3q+2}) \equiv 2\lambda_{2q+3} \lambda_{3q+3}.
\]

Therefore \(\lambda_{3q+3} = 0\).

We have obtained that

\[
\lambda_{2q+4} = \cdots = \lambda_{3q+3} = 0.
\]

Now we consider the relation \(0 = [e_{3q+7}, e_4 e_1^{3q-1} e_4]\), which yields

\[
0 = \sum_{i=0}^{3q-1} (-1)^i \left( \frac{3q-1}{2} \right) \lambda^{3q+7+i} \approx \left( \frac{3q-1}{2} \right) \lambda_{2q+2} - \left( \frac{3q-1}{2} \right) \lambda_{2q+3} \\
\equiv \left( \frac{q-1}{2} \right) \lambda_{2q+2} - \left( \frac{q-1}{2} \right) \lambda_{2q+3} \equiv \frac{q - 1}{2} \lambda_{2q+2} - \lambda_{2q+3} \\
\equiv -\frac{3}{2} \mu.
\]
Since $\mu \neq 0$, we get an absurd.

Case 3: $m = 2q + 2$ and $M < q + (n - 1)$.

If $2M - n \leq 2q$, then the relation $0 = [e_M, e_n e_1^{M-n}]$ yields

$$0 = \sum_{i=0}^{M-n} (-1)^i \binom{M-n}{i} \lambda_{M+i} = \lambda_M$$

in contradiction with the fact that $\lambda_M \neq 0$.

Now we suppose that $2M - n \geq 2q + 2$.

We define

$$u := M + 1 - n,$$
$$d_1 := u - (t - 2 + n),$$
$$d_2 := M - (q + 2).$$

The relation $0 = [e_{M+1}, e_n e_1^u]$ yields

$$0 = \sum_{i=0}^{u} (-1)^i \binom{u}{i} \lambda_{M+1+i} \approx \sum_{i=0}^{d_1} (-1)^i \binom{u}{i} \lambda_{M+i}. $$

We have that $d_1 \leq d_2$ because

$$d_1 = M + 3 - t - 2n = M + 3 - (m - M - n + 1) - 2n$$
$$= M + 2 - (2q + 2) + M - n$$
$$\leq M - (q + 2) - q + 2 + M - n$$
$$\leq d_2 - q + 2 + q + (n - 2) - n = d_2.$$

Therefore

$$0 \approx \sum_{i \in I^*} (-1)^i \binom{u}{t-2+n+i} \lambda_{m+i} \approx \sum_{i \in I^*} \binom{u}{t-2+n+i} \binom{u}{i} \lambda_m$$
$$\approx \sum_{i \in I^*} \binom{u}{t-2+n+i} \left(\binom{u-k}{i} \right) \lambda_m \approx \binom{x}{y} \lambda_m$$

where $x := u + \frac{p-k}{2}$ and $y := M + 3 - 2n - t$.

Since $2M - n \geq 2q + 2$, we have that $x \geq q$ and $y \geq 0$. 
In fact,
\[ x = u + \frac{q - t}{2} = u + \frac{q - m + M + n - 1}{2} \]
\[ = \frac{2M + 1 - n + q - m + M}{2} \geq \frac{2q + 3 + q - m + M}{2} \]
\[ \geq \frac{2q + 3 + q - (2q + 2) + q + 2}{2} \geq q; \]
\[ y = M + 3 - 2n - t = 2M - n + 2 - m \]
\[ \geq 2q + 2 + 2 - m = 2. \]

Moreover
\[ q \leq x = M + 1 - n + \frac{p - k}{2} \leq q + (n - 2) + 1 - n + \frac{p - k}{2} \]
\[ = q - 1 + \frac{p - k}{2} < q + p. \]

Therefore
\[ 0 \approx \begin{pmatrix} x \\ y \end{pmatrix} \lambda_m \]

and \( p \) does not divide \( \binom{n}{y} \). Hence \( \lambda_m = 0 \), which is absurd.

- **Case 4:** \( m = 2q + 1 \).
  In this case we have that \( \lambda_{q+(n-1)} = 0 \).
  Indeed, if \( M = q + u \) for some odd positive integer \( u \), then
  \[ t = (2q + 1) - (q + u) - n + 1 = q + 2 - u - n, \]
in contradiction with the fact that \( t \) is odd.

Therefore \( M \) is odd. As a consequence we have that \( J_2 = J^*_2 \) because there is no \( j \in \mathbb{N} \) such that \( M - (2j + 2) = l - 1 = q + 1 \).

According to Lemma 3.8 we have that \( n + t + 2j \leq q + 1 \) for all \( j \in J_1 \).

Therefore, as in the proof of Lemma 3.9 all the following relations hold:
\[ 0 = [e_{M-(2j+1)}, e_n e_1^{t+2j} e_n] \quad \text{for} \quad j \in J_1, \]
\[ 0 = [e_{M-(2j+2)}, e_n e_1^{t+2j+2} e_n] \quad \text{for} \quad j \in J_2. \]

Hence
\[ \{\lambda_{M-i}\}_{i \in I} = \left\{ (-1)^i \left( \frac{a}{a-i} \right) \lambda_M \right\}_{i \in I} \]

Since there exists an integer \( i \in I \) such that \( M - i = l - 1 = q + 1 \), we deduce that \( \lambda_{q+1} \neq 0 \), in contradiction with the fact that \( l = q + 2 \).

4. **Families of algebras of type \( n \)**

In this section we furnish examples of algebras of type \( n \) with \( p > 2n \). As usual, we denote by \( l \) the length of the first constituent.
4.1. **Algebras of type** $n$ **with** $l \in \{q, q+1\}$. Let $q := p^h$ for some positive $h \geq 1$.

In this section we construct an algebra of type $n$ generated by two elements of weight 1 and $n$ with first constituent of length $q$ (resp. $q + 1$), where $n$ is even (resp. $n$ odd). We notice in passing that the idea of this construction goes back to [4, Section 8].

Let $V$ be a vector space of dimension $q$ over the field $\mathbb{F}_p(t)$ of rational functions over $\mathbb{F}_p$.

We grade $V$ over the cyclic group of order $q$:

$$V = \langle v_0 \rangle \oplus \langle v_1 \rangle \oplus \cdots \oplus \langle v_{q-1} \rangle.$$ 

Accordingly, any index has to be intended modulo $q$.

Let $D$ and $E$ be endomorphisms of $V$ defined as follows:

$$E : v_i \mapsto \begin{cases} v_{i+1} & \text{if } i \neq q - 1, \\ tv_0 & \text{if } i = q - 1, \end{cases}$$

$$D : v_i \mapsto \begin{cases} \lambda_i v_{i+n} & \text{if } i \neq q - 1, \\ t\lambda_i v_{n-1} & \text{if } i = q - 1, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\lambda_i := \begin{cases} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{i+1} & \text{if } i \in \{0, \ldots, n-2\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } i \in \{n-1, \ldots, q-2\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } i = q - 1. \end{cases}$$

Consider the Lie algebra $M$ spanned by $D$ and $E$ in the endomorphism algebra of $V$. In $M$, the endomorphisms $D$ and $E$ have weights respectively $n$ and 1.

Now we prove that, if $j \in \{0, \ldots, q-1\}$, then

$$v_j [DE^m D] = 0 \text{ for } m \in \{0, \ldots, q-n-1\}. \quad (4.1)$$

We deal separately with different cases.

- **Case 1**: $j \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $m+n+j < q-1$.

  We notice that $[DE^m D]$ is a linear combination of monomials in the form $E^\alpha D E^\beta D$ and $DE^\alpha D E^\beta$ with $\alpha + \beta = m$. Since $v_j E^\alpha D E^\beta \in \langle v_{j+m+n} \rangle$ and $v_j D E^\alpha \in \langle v_{j+n+\alpha} \rangle$, we conclude that $v_j [DE^m D] = 0$.

- **Case 2**: $j \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $q-1 \leq m+n+j < 2q$.

  We notice that $j+m \leq q-2$.

  We define

  $$a := m+n-1;$$
  $$b := m+j+1;$$
  $$c := m+n+j.$$
We have that
\[ v_j [DE^m D] = v_j [DE^m, D] - v_j [D, DE^m] = \mu t v_j + m + 2n, \]
where
\[ \mu = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{m} (-1)^k \binom{m}{k} \lambda_{j+k} \right) \lambda_c - \lambda_j \sum_{k=0}^{m} (-1)^k \binom{m}{k} \lambda_{j+n+k} \]
\[ = (-1)^{j+1} \binom{a}{b} \lambda_c - \lambda_j \sum_{k=0}^{m} (-1)^{j+n} \binom{m}{k} \binom{n-1}{j+n+k-(q-1)} \]
\[ = (-1)^{j+c+1} \binom{a}{b} \binom{n-1}{c-(q-1)} + (-1)^n \binom{n-1}{j+1} \binom{a}{c-(q-1)} \]
\[ = (-1)^{j+c+1} \binom{a}{b} \binom{n-1}{q-1-b} + (-1)^n \binom{n-1}{j+1} \binom{a}{q-1-(j+1)} \]
\[ = (-1)^{j+1} \binom{a}{b} \binom{b}{q-n} + (-1)^{m+j} \binom{n-1}{j+1} \binom{a+n-q}{q-1-a} \]
\[ = (-1)^{j+1} \binom{a}{q-n} \binom{a+n-q}{b+n-q} + (-1)^{m+j} \binom{n-1}{q-1-a} \binom{a+n-q}{b+n-q} \]
\[ = (-1)^{j+1} \binom{a}{q-n} \binom{a+n-q}{b+n-q} + (-1)^j \binom{a}{q-n} \binom{a+n-q}{b+n-q} \]
\[ = 0. \]

- **Case 3**: \( j \in \{n, \ldots, q - 2\} \).
  As previously noticed, \([DE^m D]\) is a linear combination of monomials in the form \( E^\alpha DE^\beta D \) and \( DE^\alpha E^\beta \) with \( \alpha + \beta = m \).
  Since \( j \in \{n, \ldots, q - 2\} \), we have that \( v_j D = 0 \) and \( v_j DE^\alpha DE^\beta = 0 \).
  Now we consider the monomials \( E^\alpha DE^\beta D \).
  If \( v_j E^\alpha D = 0 \) we are done.
  If \( v_j E^\alpha D \neq 0 \), then \( v_j E^\alpha DE^\beta \in \langle v_k \rangle \), where \( k = j + n + m - q \).
  We notice that
  \[ n - 1 \leq j + n + m - q \leq (q-2) + n + (q-n-1) - q \leq q - 3. \]
  Hence \( v_j E^\alpha DE^\beta D = 0 \).

- **Case 4**: \( j = q - 1 \).
  We have that \( v_j E^\alpha DE^\beta \in \langle v_{m+n-1} \rangle \).
  Then \( v_j E^\alpha DE^\beta D = 0 \) because \( n - 1 \leq m + n - 1 \leq q - 2 \).
  Similarly we have that \( v_j DE^\alpha DE^\beta = 0 \).
  Now we prove that
  \[ [DE^{q-n}] = (-1)^{n-1} t \cdot 1. \]
  We distinguish two cases.
• **Case 1:** \( j \in \{0, \ldots, n - 2\} \).

  Then

\[
    v_j[DE^{q-n}] = \sum_{k=0}^{q-n} (-1)^k \binom{q-n}{k} \lambda_{j+k} tv_j
    = (-1)^j+1 \binom{q-1}{n-j-2} tv_j
    \equiv (-1)^{n-1} tv_j.
\]

• **Case 2:** \( j \in \{n - 1, \ldots, q - 1\} \).

  Then

\[
    v_j[DE^{q-n}] = \sum_{k=0}^{q-n} (-1)^k \binom{q-n}{k} \lambda_{j+k} tv_j
    = (-1)^j \sum_{k=0}^{q-n} \binom{q-n}{k} \binom{n-1}{j+k-(q-1)} tv_j
    \equiv (-1)^{n-1} tv_j.
\]

Hence, all the \([DE^i]\), for \( i \in \{0, \ldots, q - n\} \), are different from zero and linearly independent over \( \mathbb{F}_p \) because they have distinct weights \( n, \ldots, q \).

Moreover, \([DE^m D] = 0\) for any \( m \in \{0, \ldots, q - n - 1\} \).

Therefore

\[
    M := \langle E, [DE^i]: i \in \{0, \ldots, q - n\} \rangle
\]

is a \((q - n + 2)\)-dimensional Lie algebra.

Now consider the semidirect product \( V + \text{End}(V) \) and in it the Lie Algebra \( L \) over \( \mathbb{F}_p \) generated by

\[
    e_1 := E, \quad e_n := \frac{v_{n-1}}{t} + D.
\]

For any integer \( i \geq n + 1 \) we define

\[
    e_i := [e_{i-1}, e_1].
\]

If \( i \in \{n + 1, \ldots, q - 1\} \) then

\[
    e_i = \frac{v_{i-1}}{t} + [DE^{i-n}].
\]

If \( i = q \) then

\[
    e_q = \frac{v_{q-1}}{t} + (-1)^{n-1} t \cdot 1.
\]

If \( i = kq + r + 1 \) for some \( k \geq 1 \) and some \( r \in \{0, \ldots, q - 1\} \) then

\[
    e_{kq+r+1} = t^{k-1} v_r.
\]

Now we compute \([e_i, e_n]\) for different values of the index \( i \).
• If $i \in \{n, \ldots, q-1\}$ then

$$[e_i, e_n] = \left[ \frac{v_i-1}{t} + DE^{i-n}, \frac{v_n-1}{t} + D \right]$$

$$= \frac{v_i-1}{t}D - \frac{v_n-1}{t}DE^{i-n} + DE^{i-n}D = 0$$

because $[DE^mD] = 0$ for $m \in \{0, \ldots, q-n-1\}$.

• If $i = q$ then

$$[e_q, e_n] = \frac{v_q-1}{t}D + (-1)^n t \frac{v_n-1}{t} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd}, \\ 2e_{q+n} & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

• If $k \geq 1$ and $r \in \{0, \ldots, n-2\}$ then

$$[e_{kq+r+1}, e_n] = \left[ t^{k-1}v_r, \frac{v_n-1}{t} + D \right] = (-1)^{r+1} \binom{n-1}{r+1} t^{k-1}v_{r+n}$$

$$=(-1)^{r+1} \binom{n-1}{r+1} e_{kq+r+n+1}.$$ 

• If $k \geq 1$ and $r \in \{n-1, \ldots, q-1\}$ then $[e_{kq+r+1}, e_n] = 0$.

• If $k \geq 1$ then $[e_{(k+1)q}, e_n] = t^k e_{q-n-1} = e_{(k+1)q+n}$.

Summing it all up, we have defined an algebra of type $n$, which we denote by $g(q+\varepsilon_n, n)$, where $q+\varepsilon_n$ is the length of the first constituent.

The coefficients $\lambda_i$ in the multiplication table are defined as follows.

• If $n$ is odd then

$$\lambda_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in \{n, \ldots, q\}, \\ (-1)^r \binom{n-1}{r} & \text{if } i = kq + r \text{ with } k \geq 1 \text{ and } r \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = kq + r \text{ with } k \geq 1 \text{ and } r \in \{n, \ldots, q-1\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } i = kq \text{ with } k \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

• If $n$ is even then

$$\lambda_i = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in \{n, \ldots, q-1\}, \\ 2 & \text{if } i = q, \\ (-1)^r \binom{n-1}{r} & \text{if } i = kq + r \text{ with } k \geq 1 \text{ and } r \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = kq + r \text{ with } k \geq 1 \text{ and } r \in \{n, \ldots, q-1\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } i = kq \text{ with } k \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

We notice in passing that $g(q+\varepsilon_n, n)$ is ultimately periodic and soluble since $[e_r, e_s] = 0$ for $r, s > q+n$. Indeed, if $s-n = aq + b$ for some $a \geq 1$ and some
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If \( b \in \{0, \ldots, q - 1\} \), we have that \([e_r, e_s] = [e_r, e_ne_1^{aq+b}] = \mu e_{r+s} \), where

\[
\mu \equiv \sum_{h=0}^{a} (-1)^h \binom{a}{h} \sum_{j=0}^{b} (-1)^j \binom{b}{j} \lambda_{r+aq+j} = 0,
\]

since \( \lambda_{r+aq+j} = \lambda_{r+j} \) for any \( h \in \{0, \ldots, a\} \) and any \( j \in \{0, \ldots, b\} \).

4.2. **Algebras of type** \( n \) **with** \( l = q + \varepsilon_n - e \) **for** \( e \in \{0, \ldots, n + \varepsilon_n - 2\} \). Let \( g := g(q + \varepsilon_m, m) \), where \( q := p^h \), for some integers \( h, m \geq 1 \) with \( p > 2m \). Then

\[
g = g_1 \oplus \bigoplus_{i=m}^{\infty} g_i.
\]

For any \( d \in \{0, \ldots, m + \varepsilon_m - 2\} \), let \( s := s(q + \varepsilon_m - d, m) \) be the subalgebra of \( g \) generated by \( e_1 \) and \( e_{m+d} \).

We notice that \( s \) is an algebra of type \( m + d \) whose first constituent has length \( q + \varepsilon_m - d \). In fact,

- if \( j \in \{m + d, \ldots, q + \varepsilon_m - d - 1\} \), then \([e_j, e_{m+d}] = [e_j, e_{m+d}] = \mu e_{j+m+d} \), where

\[
\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{d}{i} \lambda_{j+i} = 0
\]

since \( j + i \leq q + \varepsilon_m - 1 \) for all \( i \);

- if \( j = q + \varepsilon_m - d \), then \([e_j, e_{m+d}] = [e_j, e_{m+d}] = \mu e_{j+m+d} \), where

\[
\mu = \sum_{i=0}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{d}{i} \lambda_{j+i} = -\lambda_{q+\varepsilon_m} \neq 0.
\]

Hence, for any \( e \in \{0, \ldots, n + \varepsilon_n - 2\} \) we have that

\( s(q + \varepsilon_{n-e} - e, n - e) \)

is an algebra of type \( n \) with first constituent length \( q + \varepsilon_{n-e} - e \).

Therefore, for any \( k \in \{0, \ldots, \frac{n+\varepsilon_n-2}{2}\} \) there exist algebras of type \( n \) with first constituent length \( q + \varepsilon_n - 2k \).

4.3. **Algebras of type** \( n \) **with** \( l = 2q - (n - 1) \). Let \( q := p^h \) for some \( h \geq 1 \). As proved in [2], there exist infinite dimensional graded Lie algebras

\[
L = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\infty} L_i
\]

such that

- \( L_1 \) is generated by two elements \( x, y \) and \( \dim(L_1) = 2 \);
- \([yx^{i-1}] \) generates \( L_i \) for any \( i \geq 2 \);
- \([yx^{i-1}y] = 0 \) for any \( i \in \{2, \ldots, 2q - 1\} \);
- \([yx^{2q-1}y] \neq 0 \).
We consider in $L$ the subalgebra $M$ generated by
\[ e_1 := x, \quad e_n := [yx^{n-1}]. \]
We notice that $M$ is an algebra of type $n$.

For any $k \geq n$ we define $e_k := [yx^{k-1}]$.

We have that
\[ [e_k e_n] = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (-1)^i \binom{n-1}{i} [yx^{k-1+i} yx^{n-1-i}]. \]

It follows that
\[ [e_k e_n] = 0 \quad \text{for any } k \in \{n, \ldots, 2q - (n - 2)\} \]
\[ [e_{2q-(n-1)} e_n] \neq 0. \]

Hence $M$ is an algebra of type $n$ whose first constituent has length $2q - (n - 1)$.
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