

SEMI-INVARIANTS FOR CONCEALED-CANONICAL ALGEBRAS

GRZEGORZ BOBIŃSKI

ABSTRACT. In the paper is we generalize known descriptions of rings of semi-invariants for regular modules over Euclidean and canonical algebras to arbitrary concealed-canonical algebras.

Throughout the paper \mathbb{k} is a fixed algebraically closed field. By \mathbb{Z} , \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{N}_+ we denote the sets of the integers, the non-negative integers and the positive integers, respectively. Finally, if $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, then $[i, j] := \{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid i \leq k \leq j\}$ (in particular, $[i, j] = \emptyset$ if $i > j$).

INTRODUCTION

Concealed-canonical algebras have been introduced by Lenzing and Meltzer [22] as a generalization of Ringel's canonical algebras [26]. An algebra is called concealed-canonical if it is isomorphism to the endomorphism ring of a tilting bundle over a weighted projective line. The concealed-canonical algebras can be characterized as the algebras which posses sincere separating exact subcategory [23] (see also [28]). Together with tilted algebras [7, 20], the concealed-canonical algebras form two most prominent classes of quasi-tilted algebras [19]. Moreover, according to a famous result of Happel [18], every quasi-tilted algebra is derived equivalent either to a tilted algebra or to a concealed-canonical algebra.

Despite investigations of a structure of the categories of modules over concealed-canonical algebras, geometric problems have been studied for this class of algebras (see for example [2, 3, 6, 14, 15, 17, 29]). Often these problem were studied for canonical algebras only and sometimes the authors restrict their attention to the concealed-canonical algebras of tame representation type.

In the paper we study a problem, which has been already investigated in the case of canonical algebras. Namely, given a concealed-canonical algebra Λ and a module R , which is a direct sum of modules from of sincere separating exact subcategory of $\text{mod } \Lambda$, we want to describe a structure of the ring of semi-invariants associated to Λ and the dimension vector of R . This problem has been solved provided Λ is a canonical algebra and R comes from a distinguished sincere separating

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 16G20; Secondary: 13A50.

Key words and phrases. concealed-canonical algebra, semi-invariant, sincere separating exact subcategory.

exact subcategory of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ (the answers have been obtained independently by Skowroński and Weyman [29] and Domokos and Lenzing [14, 15]). This problem has also been solved for another class of concealed-canonical algebras, namely the path algebras of Euclidean quivers [30] (see also [12, 27]). The obtained results are very similar, although the methods used in the proof are completely different. The aim my paper is to obtain a unified proof of the above results, which would generalize to an arbitrary concealed-canonical algebra. This aim is achieved if the characteristic of \mathbb{k} equals 0. If $\text{char } \mathbb{k} > 0$, then we show that an analogous result is true if we study the semi-invariants which are the restrictions of the semi-invariants on the ambient affine space. The precise formulation of the obtained results can be found in Section 6. In particular we prove that the studied rings of semi-invariants are always complete intersections, and are polynomial rings if the considered dimension vector is “sufficiently big”.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we introduce a setup of quivers and their representations, which due to a result of Gabriel [16] is an equivalent way of thinking about algebras and modules. Next, in Section 2 we gather facts about concealed-canonical algebras (equivalently, quivers). In Section 3 we introduce semi-invariants and present their basic properties. Next, in Section 4 we study the semi-invariants in the case of concealed-canonical quivers more closely. Section 5 is devoted to presentation of necessary facts about the Kronecker quiver, which is the minimal concealed-canonical quiver. Finally, in Section 6 we present and proof the main result.

The author gratefully acknowledges the support of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. The research was also supported by National Science Center Grant No. DEC-2011/03/B/ST1/00847.

1. QUIVERS AND THEIR REPRESENTATIONS

By a quiver Δ we mean a finite set Δ_0 (called the set of vertices of Δ) together with a finite set Δ_1 (called the set of arrows of Δ) and two maps $s, t : \Delta_1 \rightarrow \Delta_0$, which assign to each arrow α its starting vertex $s\alpha$ and its terminating vertex $t\alpha$, respectively. By a path of length $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ in a quiver Δ we mean a sequence $\sigma = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ of arrows such that $s\alpha_i = t\alpha_{i+1}$ for each $i \in [1, n-1]$. In the above situation we put $\ell\sigma := n$, $s\sigma := s\alpha_n$ and $t\sigma := t\alpha_1$. We treat every arrow in Δ as a path of length 1. Moreover, for each vertex x we have a trivial path $\mathbf{1}_x$ at x such that $\ell\mathbf{1}_x := 0$ and $s\mathbf{1}_x := x =: t\mathbf{1}_x$. For the rest of the paper we assume that the considered quivers do not have oriented cycles, where by an oriented cycle we mean a path σ of positive length such that $s\sigma = t\sigma$.

Let Δ be a quiver. We define its path category $\mathbb{k}\Delta$ to be the category whose objects are the vertices of Δ and, for $x, y \in \Delta_0$, the morphisms from x to y are the formal \mathbb{k} -linear combinations of paths starting at

x and terminating at y . If ω is a morphism from x to y , then we write $s\omega := x$ and $t\omega := y$. By a representation of Δ we mean a functor from $\mathbb{k}\Delta$ to the category $\text{mod } \mathbb{k}$ of finite dimensional vector spaces. We denote the category of representations of Δ by $\text{rep } \Delta$. Observe that every representation of Δ is uniquely determined by its values on the vertices and the arrows. Given a representation M of Δ we denote by $\mathbf{dim} M$ its dimension vector defined by the formula $(\mathbf{dim} M)(x) := \dim_{\mathbb{k}} M(x)$, for $x \in \Delta_0$. Observe that $\mathbf{dim} M \in \mathbb{N}^{\Delta_0}$ for each representation M of Δ . We call the elements of \mathbb{N}^{Δ_0} dimension vectors. A dimension vector \mathbf{d} is called sincere if $\mathbf{d}(x) \neq 0$ for each $x \in \Delta_0$.

By a relation in a quiver Δ we mean a \mathbb{k} -linear combination of paths of lengths at least 2 having a common starting vertex and a common terminating vertex. Note that each relation in a quiver Δ is a morphism in $\mathbb{k}\Delta$. A set \mathfrak{R} of relations in a quiver Δ is called minimal if $\langle \mathfrak{R} \setminus \{\rho\} \rangle \neq \langle \mathfrak{R} \rangle$ for each $\rho \in \mathfrak{R}$, where for a set \mathfrak{X} of morphisms in Δ we denote by $\langle \mathfrak{X} \rangle$ the ideal in $\mathbb{k}\Delta$ generated by \mathfrak{X} . Observe that each minimal set of relations is finite. By a bound quiver $\mathbf{\Delta}$ we mean a quiver Δ together with a minimal set \mathfrak{R} of relations. Given a bound quiver $\mathbf{\Delta}$ we denote by $\mathbb{k}\mathbf{\Delta}$ its path category, i.e. $\mathbb{k}\mathbf{\Delta} := \mathbb{k}\Delta / \langle \mathfrak{R} \rangle$. By a representation of a bound quiver $\mathbf{\Delta}$ we mean a functor from $\mathbb{k}\mathbf{\Delta}$ to $\text{mod } \mathbb{k}$. In other words, a representation of $\mathbf{\Delta}$ is a representation M of Δ such that $M(\rho) = 0$ for each $\rho \in \mathfrak{R}$. We denote the category of representations of a bound quiver $\mathbf{\Delta}$ by $\text{rep } \mathbf{\Delta}$. Moreover, we denote by $\text{ind } \mathbf{\Delta}$ the full subcategory of $\text{rep } \mathbf{\Delta}$ consisting of the indecomposable representations. It is known that $\text{rep } \mathbf{\Delta}$ is an abelian Krull–Schmidt category.

An important role in the study of representations of quivers is played by the Auslander–Reiten translations τ and τ^- [1, Section IV.2], which assign to each representation of a bound quiver $\mathbf{\Delta}$ another representation of $\mathbf{\Delta}$. In particular, we will use the following consequences of the Auslander–Reiten formulas [1, Theorem IV.2.13]. Let M and N be representations of a bound quiver $\mathbf{\Delta}$. If $\text{pdim}_{\mathbf{\Delta}} M \leq 1$, then

$$(1.1) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{\Delta}}^1(M, N) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{\Delta}}(N, \tau M).$$

Dually, if $\text{idim}_{\mathbf{\Delta}} N \leq 1$, then

$$(1.2) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{\Delta}}^1(M, N) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{\Delta}}(\tau^- N, M).$$

Let $\mathbf{\Delta}$ be a bound quiver. We define the corresponding Tits form $\langle -, - \rangle_{\mathbf{\Delta}} : \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0} \times \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by the formula

$$\langle \mathbf{d}', \mathbf{d}'' \rangle_{\mathbf{\Delta}} := \sum_{x \in \Delta_0} \mathbf{d}'(x) \cdot \mathbf{d}''(x) - \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_1} \mathbf{d}'(s\alpha) \cdot \mathbf{d}''(t\alpha) + \sum_{\rho \in \mathfrak{R}} \mathbf{d}'(s\rho) \cdot \mathbf{d}''(t\rho),$$

for $\mathbf{d}', \mathbf{d}'' \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$. Bongartz [8, Proposition 2.2] has proved that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \mathbf{dim} M, \mathbf{dim} N \rangle_{\mathbf{\Delta}} \\ &= \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{\Delta}}(M, N) - \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{\Delta}}^1(M, N) + \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Ext}_{\mathbf{\Delta}}^2(M, N) \end{aligned}$$

for any $M, N \in \text{rep } \Delta$ provided $\text{gldim } \Delta \leq 2$.

2. SEPARATING EXACT SUBCATEGORIES

In this section we present facts about sincere separating exact subcategories, which we use in our considerations. For the proofs we refer to [23, 26].

Let Δ be a bound quiver and \mathcal{X} a full subcategory of $\text{ind } \Delta$. We denote by $\text{add } \mathcal{X}$ the full subcategory of $\text{rep } \Delta$ formed by the direct sums of representations from \mathcal{X} . We say that \mathcal{X} is an exact subcategory of $\text{ind } \Delta$ if $\text{add } \mathcal{X}$ is an exact subcategory of $\text{rep } \Delta$, where by an exact subcategory of $\text{rep } \Delta$ we mean a full subcategory \mathcal{E} of $\text{rep } \Delta$ such that \mathcal{E} is an abelian category and the inclusion functor $\mathcal{E} \hookrightarrow \text{rep } \Delta$ is exact. We put

$$\mathcal{X}_- := \{X \in \text{ind } \Delta : \text{Hom}_\Delta(\mathcal{X}, X) = 0\}$$

and

$$\mathcal{X}_+ := \{X \in \text{ind } \Delta : \text{Hom}_\Delta(X, \mathcal{X}) = 0\}.$$

Let Δ be a bound quiver. Following [23] we say that \mathcal{R} is a sincere separating exact subcategory of $\text{ind } \Delta$ provided the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) \mathcal{R} is an exact subcategory of $\text{ind } \Delta$ stable under the actions of the Auslander–Reiten translations τ and τ^- .
- (2) $\text{ind } \Delta = \mathcal{R}_- \cup \mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{R}_+$.
- (3) $\text{Hom}_\Delta(X, \mathcal{R}) \neq 0$ for each $X \in \mathcal{R}_-$ and $\text{Hom}_\Delta(\mathcal{R}, X) \neq 0$ for each $X \in \mathcal{R}_+$.
- (4) $P \in \mathcal{R}_-$, for each indecomposable projective representation P of Δ , and $I \in \mathcal{R}_+$, for each indecomposable injective representation I of Δ .

Lenzing and de la Peña [23] have proved that there exists a sincere separating exact subcategory \mathcal{R} of $\text{ind } \Delta$ if and only if Δ is concealed-canonical, i.e. $\text{rep } \Delta$ is equivalent to the category of modules over a concealed-canonical algebra. In particular, if this is the case, then $\text{gldim } \Delta \leq 2$.

For the rest of the section we fix a concealed-canonical bound quiver Δ and a sincere separating exact subcategory \mathcal{R} of $\text{ind } \Delta$. Moreover, we put $\mathcal{P} := \mathcal{R}_-$ and $\mathcal{Q} := \mathcal{R}_+$. Finally, we denote by \mathbf{P} , \mathbf{R} and \mathbf{Q} the dimension vectors of the representations from $\text{add } \mathcal{P}$, $\text{add } \mathcal{R}$ and $\text{add } \mathcal{Q}$, respectively.

It is known that $\text{pdim}_\Delta P \leq 1$ for each $P \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\text{idim}_\Delta Q \leq 1$ for each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Next, $\text{pdim}_\Delta R = 1$ and $\text{idim}_\Delta R = 1$ for each $R \in \mathcal{R}$. The categories \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{Q} are closed under the actions of τ and τ^- , hence using the Auslander–Reiten formulas (1.1) and (1.2) we obtain

that $\text{Ext}_{\Delta}^1(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{R}) = 0 = \text{Ext}_{\Delta}^1(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{Q})$. In particular,

$$(2.1) \quad \langle \mathbf{d}', \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}'' \rangle_{\Delta} \geq 0$$

for all $\mathbf{d}' \in \mathbf{P}$, $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\mathbf{d}'' \in \mathbf{Q}$.

We have $\mathcal{R} = \coprod_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$ for connected uniserial categories \mathcal{R}_{λ} , $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ we denote by r_{λ} the number of the pairwise non-isomorphic simple objects in $\text{add } \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$. Then $r_{\lambda} < \infty$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. Moreover, $\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} (r_{\lambda} - 1) = |\Delta_0| - 2$. In particular, if $\mathbb{X}_0 := \{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1 : r_{\lambda} > 1\}$, then $|\mathbb{X}_0| < \infty$.

Fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. If $R_{\lambda,0}, \dots, R_{\lambda,r_{\lambda}-1}$ are chosen representatives of the isomorphism classes of the simple objects in $\text{add } \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$, then we may assume that $\tau R_{\lambda,i} = R_{\lambda,i-1}$ for each $i \in [0, r_{\lambda}-1]$, where we put $R_{\lambda,i} := R_{\lambda,i \bmod r_{\lambda}}$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. For any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ there exists a unique (up to isomorphism) representation in \mathcal{R}_{λ} whose socle and length in $\text{add } \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$ are $R_{\lambda,i}$ and n , respectively. We fix such representation and denote it by $R_{\lambda,i}^{(n)}$ and its dimension vector by $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i}^n$. Then the composition factors of $R_{\lambda,i}^{(n)}$ are (starting from the socle) $R_{\lambda,i}, \dots, R_{\lambda,i+n-1}$. Consequently, $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i}^n = \sum_{j \in [i, i+n-1]} \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,j}$, where $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda,j} := \mathbf{dim} R_{\lambda,j}$, for $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Moreover, for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n, m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ there exists an exact sequence

$$(2.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow R_{\lambda,i}^{(n)} \rightarrow R_{\lambda,i}^{(n+m)} \rightarrow R_{\lambda,i+n}^{(m)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Obviously, for each $R \in \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$ there exist $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $R \simeq R_{\lambda,i}^{(n)}$. Moreover, it is known that the vectors $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda,0}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,r_{\lambda}-1}$ are linearly independent. Consequently, if $R \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$, then there exist uniquely determined $q_0^R, \dots, q_{r_{\lambda}-1}^R \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathbf{dim} R = \sum_{i \in [0, r_{\lambda}-1]} q_i^R \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i}$. We put $q_i^R := q_{i \bmod r_{\lambda}}^R$, for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Observe that for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ the number $q_{\lambda,i}^R$ counts the multiplicity of $R_{\lambda,i}$ as a composition factor in the Jordan–Hölder filtration of R in the category $\text{add } \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$.

Let $R = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} R_{\lambda}$, for $R_{\lambda} \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. Then we put $q_{\lambda,i}^R := q_i^{R_{\lambda}}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Next, we put $p_{\lambda}^R := \min\{q_{\lambda,i}^R : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, and $p_{\lambda,i}^R := q_{\lambda,i}^R - p_{\lambda}^R$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then

$$\mathbf{dim} R = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} p_{\lambda}^R \cdot \mathbf{h}_{\lambda} + \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} \sum_{i \in [0, r_{\lambda}-1]} p_{\lambda,i}^R \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i},$$

where $\mathbf{h}_{\lambda} := \sum_{i \in [0, r_{\lambda}-1]} \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i}$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. It is known that $\mathbf{h}_{\lambda} = \mathbf{h}_{\mu}$ for any $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. We denote this common value by \mathbf{h} . Then

$$\mathbf{dim} R = p^R \cdot \mathbf{h} + \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} \sum_{i \in [0, r_{\lambda}-1]} p_{\lambda,i}^R \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i},$$

where $p^R := \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} p_{\lambda}^R$. It is known that if $R, R' \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathbf{dim} R = \mathbf{dim} R'$, then $p^R = p^{R'}$ and $p_{\lambda,i}^R = p_{\lambda,i}^{R'}$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in [0, r_{\lambda}-1]$.

Consequently, for each $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$ there exist uniquely determined $p^{\mathbf{d}} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} \in \mathbb{N}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1]$, such that

$$\mathbf{d} = p^{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \mathbf{h} + \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} \sum_{i \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1]} p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i}$$

and for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ there exists $i \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1]$ with $p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} = 0$. Again we put $p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} := p_{\lambda,i \bmod r_{\lambda}}^{\mathbf{d}}$, for $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

It is known that \mathbf{h} is sincere. Moreover, \mathbf{h} can be used in order to distinguish between representations from \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{Q} and \mathcal{R} . Namely, if X is an indecomposable representation of Δ , then

$$(2.3) \quad X \in \mathcal{P} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \langle \mathbf{dim} X, \mathbf{h} \rangle_{\Delta} > 0.$$

Dually, if X is an indecomposable representation of Δ , then

$$(2.4) \quad X \in \mathcal{Q} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{dim} X \rangle_{\Delta} > 0.$$

Let $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $m, n \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(R_{\lambda,i}^{(n)}, R_{\mu,j}^{(m)}) = \min\{q_{\lambda,i+n-1}^{R_{\mu,j}^{(m)}}, q_{\mu,j}^{R_{\lambda,i}^{(n)}}\}$$

(in particular, $\text{Hom}_{\Delta}(R_{\lambda,i}^{(n)}, R_{\mu,j}^{(m)}) = 0$ if $\lambda \neq \mu$). The above formula, together with the Auslander–Reiten formula (1.1), implies that

$$(2.5) \quad \langle \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i}^n, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} = p_{\lambda,i+n-1}^{\mathbf{d}} - p_{\lambda,i-1}^{\mathbf{d}}$$

for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$. In particular,

$$(2.6) \quad \langle \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} = 0 = \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h} \rangle_{\Delta}$$

for each $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$.

An important role in the proofs will be played by ext-minimal representations. We call a representation V ext-minimal if there is no decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ with $\text{Ext}_{\Delta}^1(V_1, V_2) \neq 0$. We recall facts on ext-minimal representations belonging to $\text{add } \mathcal{R}$.

First assume that $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$ and $p^{\mathbf{d}} = 0$. In this case there is a unique (up to isomorphism) ext-minimal representation $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ with dimension vector \mathbf{d} , which is constructed inductively in the following way. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, let $I_{\lambda} := \{i \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1] : p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} \neq 0 \text{ and } p_{\lambda,i-1}^{\mathbf{d}} = 0\}$. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in I_{\lambda}$, we denote by $m_{\lambda,i}$ the minimal $m \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $p_{\lambda,i+m}^{\mathbf{d}} = 0$. By induction there exists (unique up to isomorphism) ext-minimal representation $W' \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ with dimension vector $\mathbf{d} - \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} \sum_{i \in I_{\lambda}} \mathbf{e}_{\lambda,i}^{m_{\lambda,i}}$. Then $W := W' \oplus \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} \bigoplus_{i \in I_{\lambda}} R_{\lambda,i}^{(m_{\lambda,i})}$ is ext-minimal.

We will use the following property of the above representation.

Lemma 2.1. *Assume $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$ and $p^{\mathbf{d}} = 0$. Let $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ be an ext-minimal representation with dimension vector \mathbf{d} . If $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$, $p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} = p_{\lambda,i+n}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $p_{\lambda,j}^{\mathbf{d}} \geq p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for each $j \in [i, i+n]$, then $\text{Hom}_{\Delta}(R_{\lambda,i+1}^{(n)}, W) = 0$.*

Proof. Observe that $\text{Hom}_{\Delta}(R_{\lambda,i+1}^{(n)}, R_{\lambda,k}^{(m_{\lambda,k})}) = 0$ for each $k \in I_{\lambda}$, since one easily checks that either $q_{\lambda,i+n}^{R_{\lambda,k}^{(m_{\lambda,k})}} = 0$ (if $p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} = 0$) or $q_{\lambda,k}^{R_{\lambda,i+1}^{(n)}} = 0$ (if $p_{\lambda,i}^{\mathbf{d}} > 0$). Now the claim follows by induction. \square

Now let $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$ be arbitrary. The description of the ext-minimal representations with dimension vector \mathbf{d} , which belong to $\text{add } \mathcal{R}$, has been given in [25, Theorem 3.5] (this theorem has been formulated in the case $\Delta = (\Delta, \emptyset)$ for a Euclidean quiver Δ , but its proof translates to an arbitrary concealed-canonical bound quiver). We will not repeat the formulation here, but only mention some consequences. First, if $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathbf{dim} W = \mathbf{d}$, then W is ext-minimal if and only if $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{End}_{\Delta}(W) = p^{\mathbf{d}} + \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta}$. In particular,

$$(2.7) \quad p^{\mathbf{d}} + \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} \\ = \min\{\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{End}_{\Delta}(W) : W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R} \text{ such that } \mathbf{dim} W = \mathbf{d}\}$$

(here we use also [25, Lemma 2.1]). Next, if $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ is an ext-minimal representation with dimension vector \mathbf{d} and $W' \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ is an ext-minimal representation with dimension vector $\mathbf{d} - p^{\mathbf{d}} \cdot \mathbf{h}$, then there exists an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1} R_{\lambda} \rightarrow W \rightarrow W' \rightarrow 0$ with $R_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{R}_{\lambda}$ (in particular, indecomposable) for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ (obviously, $\mathbf{dim} R_{\lambda}$ is a multiplicity of \mathbf{h} for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$).

3. SEMI-INVARIANTS

Let Δ be a bound quiver and \mathbf{d} a dimension vector. By $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ we denote the set of the representations M of Δ such that $M(x) = \mathbb{k}^{\mathbf{d}(x)}$ for each $x \in \Delta_0$. We may identify $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ with a Zariski-closed subset of the affine space $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d}) := \prod_{\alpha \in \Delta_1} \mathbb{M}_{\mathbf{d}(t\alpha) \times \mathbf{d}(s\alpha)}(\mathbb{k})$, hence it has a structure of an affine variety. The group $\text{GL}(\mathbf{d}) := \prod_{x \in \Delta_0} \text{GL}(\mathbf{d}(x))$ acts on $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ by conjugation: $(g * M)(\alpha) := g(t\alpha) \cdot M(\alpha) \cdot g(s\alpha)^{-1}$, for $g \in \text{GL}(\mathbf{d})$, $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ and $\alpha \in \Delta_1$. The set $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ is a $\text{GL}(\mathbf{d})$ -invariant subset of $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ and the $\text{GL}(\mathbf{d})$ -orbits in $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ correspond to the isomorphism classes of the representations of Δ with dimension vector \mathbf{d} . If \mathcal{X} is a full subcategory of $\text{ind } \Delta$, then we denote by $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{d})$ the set of $V \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $V \in \text{add } \mathcal{X}$.

Let Δ be a quiver and $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$. We treat θ as a \mathbb{Z} -linear function $\mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ in a usual way. If \mathbf{d} is a dimension vector, then by a semi-invariant of weight θ we mean every function $f \in \mathbb{k}[\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})]$ such that $f(g^{-1} * M) = \chi^{\theta}(g) \cdot f(M)$ for any $g \in \text{GL}(\mathbf{d})$ and $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$, where $\chi^{\theta}(g) := \prod_{x \in \Delta_0} (\det g(x))^{\theta(x)}$ for $g \in \text{GL}(\mathbf{d})$.

Now let Δ be a bound quiver and \mathbf{d} a dimension vector. If $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$, then a function $f \in \mathbb{k}[\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})]$ is called a semi-invariant of weight θ if f is the restriction of a semi-invariant of weight θ from $\mathbb{k}[\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})]$. This definition differs from the definition used in other papers on the subject

(see for example [5, 11, 13, 15]), however these are the semi-invariants which one needs to understand in order to study King's moduli spaces for representations of bound quivers [21]. Moreover, the two definitions coincide if the characteristic of \mathbb{k} equals 0. We denote the space of the semi-invariants of weight θ by $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_\theta$. If \mathbf{d} is sincere, then we put $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}] := \bigoplus_{\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_\theta$ and call it the algebra of semi-invariants for Δ and \mathbf{d} (we assume sincerity of \mathbf{d} , since under this assumption \mathbb{Z}^{Δ_0} is isomorphic with the character group of $\text{GL}(\mathbf{d})$).

We recall a construction from [13]. Let Δ be a bound quiver. Fix a representation V of Δ and define $\theta^V : \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ by the condition:

$$\theta^V(\mathbf{dim} M) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, M) - \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(M, \tau V)$$

for each representation M of Δ . The formula (1.1) implies that $\theta^V = \langle \mathbf{dim} V, - \rangle_{\Delta}$ if $\text{pdim}_{\Delta} V \leq 1$. Dually, if V has no indecomposable projective direct summands (i.e. $\tau^{-1} \tau V \simeq V$ [1, Theorem IV.2.10]) and $\text{idim}_{\Delta} \tau V \leq 1$, then $\theta^V = -\langle -, \mathbf{dim} \tau V \rangle_{\Delta}$ by the formula (1.2).

Now let \mathbf{d} be a dimension vector. If $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$, then we define a function $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \in \mathbb{k}[\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})]$ in the following way. Let $P_1 \xrightarrow{f} P_0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$ be the minimal projective presentation of V . One shows that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Ker Hom}_{\Delta}(f, M) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, M)$$

and

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Coker Hom}_{\Delta}(f, M) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(M, \tau V),$$

hence

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(P_0, M) - \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(P_1, M) \\ &= \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, M) - \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(M, \tau V) = \theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for each $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$. Thus, we may define $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \in \mathbb{k}[\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})]$ by the formula $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(M) := \det \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, M)$ for $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$. Note that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$ is defined only up to a non-zero scalar. If $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$, then $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(M) = 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, M) \neq 0$. Moreover, if $\text{pdim}_{\Delta} V \leq 1$ and $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$, then $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(M) = 0$ if and only if $\text{Ext}_{\Delta}^1(V, M) \neq 0$. It is known that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \in \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\theta^V}$. This function depends on the choice of f , but the functions obtained for different f 's differ only by non-zero scalars.

In fact, we could start with an arbitrary \mathbf{d} -admissible projective presentation, where, for a representation V of a bound quiver Δ and a dimension vector \mathbf{d} , we call a projective representation $P'_1 \rightarrow P'_0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$ of V \mathbf{d} -admissible if $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(P'_0, M) = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(P'_1, M)$ for any (equivalently, some) $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$.

Lemma 3.1. *Let Δ be a bound quiver, \mathbf{d} a dimension vector and $P'_1 \xrightarrow{f'} P'_0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$ a \mathbf{d} -admissible projective presentation of a representation V of Δ .*

- (1) If $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$, then there exists $\xi \in \mathbb{k}$ such $\xi \neq 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(M) = \xi \cdot \det \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(f', M)$ for each $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$.
- (2) If there exists $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $\det \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(f', M) \neq 0$, then $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$.

Proof. Let $P_1 \xrightarrow{f} P_0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$ be the minimal projective presentation of V . There exists projective representations P and Q of Δ and isomorphisms $g_1 : P_1' \rightarrow P_1 \oplus P \oplus Q$ and $g_0 : P_0' \rightarrow P_0 \oplus P$ such that

$$f' = g_0^{-1} \circ \begin{bmatrix} f & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Id}_P & 0 \end{bmatrix} \circ g_1.$$

Consequently,

$$(3.2) \quad \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(f', M) = \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(g_1, M) \circ \begin{bmatrix} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, M) & 0 \\ 0 & \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(\text{Id}_P, M) \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \circ \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(g_0^{-1}, M)$$

for each $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$. Since the presentation $P_1' \xrightarrow{f'} P_0' \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$ is \mathbf{d} -admissible, (3.1) implies that the condition $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ is equivalent to the condition $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(Q, M) = 0$ for each $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$. Together with (3.2) this implies our claims. \square

As an immediate consequence we obtain the following.

Corollary 3.2. *Let Δ be a bound quiver, \mathbf{d} a dimension vector and $0 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow 0$ an exact sequence such that $\theta^{V_1}(\mathbf{d}) = 0 = \theta^{V_2}(\mathbf{d})$.*

- (1) If $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$, then (up to a non-zero scalar) $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_1} \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_2}$.
- (2) If $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_1} \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_2} \neq 0$, then $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and (up to a non-zero scalar) $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_1} \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_2}$.

Proof. Let $P_1' \xrightarrow{f'} P_0' \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow 0$ and $P_1'' \xrightarrow{f''} P_0' \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow 0$ be the minimal projective presentations of V_1 and V_2 , respectively. Then there exists a projective presentation of V of the form

$$P_1' \oplus P_1'' \xrightarrow{f} P_0' \oplus P_0'' \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0,$$

where $f = \begin{bmatrix} f' & g \\ 0 & f'' \end{bmatrix}$ for some $g \in \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(P_1'', P_0')$. One easily sees that $\det \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, M) = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_1}(M) \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_2}(M)$ for each $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$, hence the claims follows from Lemma 3.1. \square

The following fact is an extension of [10, Lemma 1(a)] to the setup of bound quivers.

Lemma 3.3. *Let Δ be a bound quiver and \mathbf{d} a dimension vector. If $0 \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow V \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow 0$ is an exact sequence, $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$, then $\theta^{V_2}(\mathbf{d}) \leq 0$.*

Proof. If $\theta^{V_2}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$, then

$$\dim_{\mathbf{k}} \operatorname{Hom}_{\Delta}(V_2, M) \geq \theta^{V_2}(\mathbf{d}) > 0$$

for each $M \in \operatorname{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$. This immediately implies that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, M) \neq 0$ for each $M \in \operatorname{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$, hence $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = 0$, contradiction. \square

We have the following multiplicative property.

Lemma 3.4. *Let Δ be a bound quiver and \mathbf{d} a dimension vector. If V_1 and V_2 are representations of Δ , $V := V_1 \oplus V_2$, $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$, then $\theta^{V_1}(\mathbf{d}) = 0 = \theta^{V_2}(\mathbf{d})$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_1} \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_2}$ (up to a non-zero scalar).*

Proof. See [13, Lemma 3.3]. \square

We will also use another multiplicative property.

Lemma 3.5. *Let Δ be a bound quiver and V a representation of Δ . If \mathbf{d}' and \mathbf{d}'' are dimension vectors and $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}') = 0 = \theta^V(\mathbf{d}'')$, then*

$$c_{\mathbf{d}'+\mathbf{d}''}^V(W' \oplus W'') = c_{\mathbf{d}'}^V(W') \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}''}^V(W'')$$

for all $(W', W'') \in \operatorname{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d}') \times \operatorname{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d}'')$.

Proof. Let $P_1 \xrightarrow{f} P_0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$ be the minimal projective presentation of V . If $(W', W'') \in \operatorname{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d}') \times \operatorname{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d}'')$, then

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, W' \oplus W'') = \begin{bmatrix} \operatorname{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, W') & 0 \\ 0 & \operatorname{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, W'') \end{bmatrix}$$

and both $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, W')$ and $\operatorname{Hom}_{\Delta}(f, W'')$ are square matrices, hence the claim follows. \square

The following result follows from the proof of [13, Theorem 3.2] (note that the assumption about the characteristic of \mathbf{k} made in [13, Theorem 3.2] is only necessary to prove surjectivity of the restriction morphism, which we have for free with our definition of semi-invariants).

Proposition 3.6. *Let Δ be a bound quiver, \mathbf{d} a dimension vector and $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$.*

- (1) *If $\theta(\mathbf{d}) \neq 0$, then $\operatorname{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\theta} = 0$.*
- (2) *If $\theta(\mathbf{d}) = 0$, then the space $\operatorname{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\theta}$ is spanned by the functions $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$ for $V \in \operatorname{rep} \Delta$ such that $\theta^V = \theta$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$.* \square

In fact we may take a smaller spanning set.

Corollary 3.7. *Let Δ be a bound quiver and \mathbf{d} a dimension vector. If $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$ and $\theta(\mathbf{d}) = 0$, then the space $\operatorname{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\theta}$ is spanned by the functions $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$ for ext-minimal $V \in \operatorname{rep} \Delta$ such that $\theta^V = \theta$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$.*

Proof. Assume that V is a representation of Δ such that $\theta^V = \theta$, $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$ and there is a decomposition $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ with $\operatorname{Ext}_{\Delta}^1(V_1, V_2) \neq 0$. Lemma 3.4 implies that $\theta^{V_1}(\mathbf{d}) = 0 = \theta^{V_2}(\mathbf{d})$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_1} \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_2} \neq 0$. If $0 \rightarrow V_2 \rightarrow W \rightarrow V_1 \rightarrow 0$ is a non-split exact sequence, then

Corollary 3.2(2) and Lemma 3.4 imply that (up to a non-zero scalar) $c_{\mathbf{d}}^W = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_1} \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{V_2} = c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{End}_{\Delta}(W) < \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{End}_{\Delta}(V)$ (see for example [25, Lemma 2.1]), the claim follows by induction. \square

We may even take a smaller set, if we are only interested in generators of $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$. Namely, we have the following.

Corollary 3.8. *Let Δ be a bound quiver and \mathbf{d} a sincere dimension vector. Then the algebra $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is generated by the semi-invariants $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$ for $V \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$, $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$ and V is indecomposable.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 3.4 (this is also the content of [13, Corollary 3.4]). \square

4. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

Throughout this section we fix a concealed-canonical bound quiver Δ and a sincere separating exact subcategory \mathcal{R} of $\text{ind } \Delta$. We will use notation introduced in Section 2. We also fix $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $p := p^{\mathbf{d}} > 0$. Notice that this implies that \mathbf{d} is sincere.

First we prove that the algebra $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is controlled by the representations from $\text{add } \mathcal{R}$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let V be a representation of Δ such that $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$. If $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$, then $V \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ and $\theta^V = \langle \mathbf{dim } V, - \rangle_{\Delta}$.*

Proof. Assume that $P \in \mathcal{P}$ is a direct summand of V . Since $\text{pdim}_{\Delta} P \leq 1$, (2.1) and (2.3) imply that

$$\theta^P(\mathbf{d}) = \langle \mathbf{dim } P, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} \geq \langle \mathbf{dim } P, \mathbf{h} \rangle_{\Delta} > 0.$$

Consequently, $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = 0$ by Lemma 3.4, contradiction. Dually, V cannot have a direct summand from \mathcal{Q} . Finally, since $\text{pdim}_{\Delta} V = 1$, $\theta^V = \langle \mathbf{dim } V, - \rangle_{\Delta}$. \square

Together with Corollary 3.7 this lemma immediately implies the following.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$ be such that $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\theta} \neq 0$. Then there exists $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\theta = \langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}$ and $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} = 0$.* \square

Taking into account Corollary 3.8 we need to identify $V \in \text{ind } \Delta$ such that $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$. The first step in this direction is the following.

Lemma 4.3. *Let V be an indecomposable representation of Δ . If $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$, then $V = R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n)}$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}} = p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $p_{\lambda, j}^{\mathbf{d}} \geq p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for each $j \in [i+1, i+n-1]$.*

Proof. We know from Lemma 4.1 that $V \in \mathcal{R}$, hence there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $V = R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n)}$. Then $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}} - p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}}$ by (2.5), thus the condition $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ means that $p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}} = p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}}$. Finally,

the condition $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$ and Lemma 3.3 imply that $\theta^{V'}(\mathbf{d}) \leq 0$ for each factor representation V' of V . The sequence (2.2) implies that $R_{\lambda, j+1}^{(n+i-j)}$ is a factor representation of V for each $j \in [i+1, i+n-1]$, hence the claim follows. \square

Now we show that the representations described in the above lemma give rise to non-zero semi-invariants.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}} = p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $p_{\lambda, j}^{\mathbf{d}} \geq p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for each $j \in [i+1, i+n-1]$. If $V := R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n)}$, then $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(R) \neq 0$.*

Proof. We only need to show that there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(R) \neq 0$. Let $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ be an ext-minimal representation for $\mathbf{d} - p \cdot \mathbf{h}$ and fix $\mu \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ different from λ such that $r_{\mu} = 1$. If $R := W \oplus R_{\mu, 0}^{(p)}$, then $R \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ and $\text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, R) = \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, W) = 0$ by Lemma 2.1, hence the claim follows. \square

As a consequence we present a smaller generating set of $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$. First we introduce some notation. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ we denote by \mathcal{I}_{λ} the set of $i \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1]$ such that there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ with $p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}} = p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $p_{\lambda, j}^{\mathbf{d}} > p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for each $j \in [i+1, i+n-1]$ (such n , if exists, is uniquely determined by λ and i , and we denote it by $n_{\lambda, i}$). Observe that $\mathcal{I}_{\lambda} = \{0\}$ and $n_{\lambda, 0} = 1$ if $r_{\lambda} = 1$.

Corollary 4.5. *The algebra $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is generated by the semi-invariants $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$.*

Proof. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ we denote by \mathcal{I}'_{λ} the set of all pairs $(i, n) \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1] \times \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}} = p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and $p_{\lambda, j}^{\mathbf{d}} \geq p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for each $j \in [i+1, i+n-1]$. Observe that if $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $(i, n) \in \mathcal{I}'_{\lambda}$, then $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$. Corollary 3.8 and Lemma 4.3 imply that the algebra $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is generated by the semi-invariants $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n)}}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $(i, n) \in \mathcal{I}'_{\lambda}$. Now, let $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $(i, n) \in \mathcal{I}'_{\lambda}$. Obviously, $n \geq n_{\lambda, i}$. If $n > n_{\lambda, i}$, then (up to a non-zero scalar) $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n)}} = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}} \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+n_{\lambda, i}+1}^{(n-n_{\lambda, i})}}$ by Corollary 3.2(1), as according to (2.2) we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})} \rightarrow R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n)} \rightarrow R_{\lambda, i+n_{\lambda, i}+1}^{(n-n_{\lambda, i})} \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $R_{\lambda, i+n_{\lambda, i}+1}^{(n-n_{\lambda, i})} = R_{\lambda, (i+n_{\lambda, i}+1) \bmod r_{\lambda}}^{(n-n_{\lambda, i})}$ and $((i+n_{\lambda, i}) \bmod r_{\lambda}, n-n_{\lambda, i}) \in \mathcal{I}'_{\lambda}$, the claim follows by induction. \square

At the later stage we will prove that for each non-zero semi-invariant f there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $f(R) \neq 0$. At the moment we formulate the following versions of this fact.

Lemma 4.6. *Let V be a representation of Δ such that $\theta^V(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V \neq 0$. Then there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(R) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Let X be an indecomposable direct summand of V . Lemma 3.4 implies that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^X \neq 0$. Consequently, Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4 imply that there exists $R_X \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^X(R_X) \neq 0$. Since $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ is an irreducible and open subset of $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ [15, Section 4], there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^X(R) \neq 0$ for each indecomposable direct summand X of V . Using once more Lemma 3.4 we obtain that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(R) \neq 0$. \square

Lemma 4.7. *If $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}$ is non-zero, then there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $f(R) \neq 0$.*

Proof. If $q = 0$, then the claim is obvious, since $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_0 = \mathbb{k}$. Thus assume $q > 0$. We know that $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}$ is spanned by the functions $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$ for $V \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ with dimension vector $q \cdot \mathbf{h}$. It is enough to prove that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(M) = 0$ for all $V \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ and $M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $\mathbf{dim } V = q \cdot \mathbf{h}$ and $M \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$. Every such M has an indecomposable direct summand Q from \mathcal{Q} . Indeed, since $M \notin \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$, it has an indecomposable direct summand X which belongs to $\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{Q}$. If $X \in \mathcal{Q}$, then we take $Q := X$. If $X \in \mathcal{P}$, then $\langle \mathbf{dim } M - \mathbf{dim } X, \mathbf{h} \rangle_{\Delta} < 0$ by (2.3) and (2.6). Consequently, M has an indecomposable direct summand Q with $\langle \mathbf{dim } Q, \mathbf{h} \rangle_{\Delta} < 0$. Using again (2.3) and (2.6) we get $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$. Then

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, M) \geq \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(V, Q) = \langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, \mathbf{dim } Q \rangle_{\Delta} > 0$$

by (2.4) and the claim follows. \square

Recall from Corollary 4.2 that the possible weights are of the form $\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}$ for $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} = 0$. Our next aim is to show that it is enough to understand those which are for the form $\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}$ for $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

We start with the following easy lemma.

Lemma 4.8. *Let $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ be such that $\theta^W(\mathbf{d}) = 0$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^W \neq 0$. If $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $f \in \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}$ is non-zero, then there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^W(R) \cdot f(R) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Since $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ is an open irreducible subset of $\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$, the claim follows from Lemmas 4.6 and 4.7. \square

Proposition 4.9. *Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}$, $\langle \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta} = 0$ and $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ be an ext-minimal representation for $\mathbf{r} - p^{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{h}$.*

- (1) *If $c_{\mathbf{d}}^W = 0$, then $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} = 0$.*
- (2) *If $c_{\mathbf{d}}^W \neq 0$, then the map*

$$\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle p^{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} \rightarrow \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}, f \mapsto c_{\mathbf{d}}^W \cdot f,$$

is an isomorphism of vector spaces.

Proof. Let $\Phi : \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle p^r \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta} \rightarrow \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_\Delta}$ be the map given by $\Phi(f) := c_{\mathbf{d}}^W \cdot f$, for $f \in \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle p^r \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta}$.

It follows from Corollary 3.7 and Lemma 4.1 that $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_\Delta}$ is spanned by the functions $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$ for ext-minimal $V \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathbf{dim} V = \mathbf{r}$. If $V \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ is ext-minimal and $\mathbf{dim} V = \mathbf{r}$, then there exists an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow V \rightarrow W \rightarrow 0$, where $R \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ and $\mathbf{dim} R = p^r \cdot \mathbf{h}$. Thus Corollary 3.2(1) implies that (up to a non-zero scalar) $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = c_{\mathbf{d}}^W \cdot c_{\mathbf{d}}^R = \Phi(c_{\mathbf{d}}^R)$. This shows that Φ is an epimorphism. In particular, $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_\Delta} = 0$ if $c_{\mathbf{d}}^W = 0$. On the other hand, if $c_{\mathbf{d}}^W \neq 0$, then Φ is a monomorphism (hence an isomorphism) by Lemma 4.8. \square

In the previous papers on the subject the authors have studied either the semi-invariants on the whole variety $\text{rep}_\Delta(\mathbf{d})$ [14, 15] or on the closure of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ only [29]. However, the answers they have obtained did not differ. We have the following explanation of this phenomena.

Proposition 4.10. *If $f \in \mathbb{k}[\text{rep}_\Delta(\mathbf{d})]$ is a non-zero semi-invariant, then there exists $R \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$ such that $f(R) \neq 0$.*

Proof. Fix $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $f \in \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_\Delta}$. The previous lemma implies that $f = c_{\mathbf{d}}^W \cdot f'$, where $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ is an ext-minimal representation with dimension vector $\mathbf{r} - p^r \cdot \mathbf{h}$ and $f' \in \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle p^r \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta}$. Consequently, the claim follows from Lemma 4.8. \square

Observe that this proposition means in particular, that $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is a domain, hence the product of two non-zero semi-invariants is non-zero again.

Proposition 4.9 implies that the subalgebra $\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta}$ of $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ plays a crucial role. In Section 6 we show that the study of this subalgebra can be reduced to the case of the Kronecker quiver. Thus in the next section we recall facts about semi-invariants for the Kronecker quiver.

5. THE KRONECKER QUIVER

Our aim in this section is to collect necessary facts about representations and semi-invariants for the Kronecker quiver K_2 , i.e. the quiver

$$\bullet_1 \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\alpha} \\ \xrightarrow{\beta} \end{array} \bullet_2$$

with the empty set of relations. In this case a sincere separating exact subcategory is uniquely determined. Let $\mathcal{T} = \coprod_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_k^1} \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ by the sincere separating exact subcategory of $\text{ind } K_2$.

For $\zeta, \xi \in \mathbb{k}$ let $N_{\zeta, \xi}$ be the representation $\mathbb{k} \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\zeta} \\ \xrightarrow{\xi} \end{array} \mathbb{k}$. Then the sim-

ple objects in $\text{add } \mathcal{T}$ are precisely the representations $N_{\zeta, \xi}$ for $(\zeta : \xi) \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$. Moreover, if $(\zeta : \xi), (\zeta' : \xi') \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$, then $N_{\zeta, \xi} \simeq N_{\zeta', \xi'}$ if and only if $(\zeta : \xi) = (\zeta' : \xi')$. Consequently, by abuse of notation, we will denote

$N_{\zeta, \xi}$ by $N_{(\zeta: \xi)}$ for $(\zeta : \xi) \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$. By choosing our parameterization appropriately we may assume that $N_\lambda \in \mathcal{T}_\lambda$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$. In particular, $\tau N_\lambda = N_\lambda$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$.

The Kronecker quiver can be viewed as the minimal concealed-canonical bound quiver. Namely, we can embed the category $\text{rep } K_2$ into the category of representations of an arbitrary concealed-canonical quiver. We describe a construction of such an embedding more precisely.

Let Δ be a concealed-canonical bound quiver with a sincere separating exact subcategory \mathcal{R} of $\text{ind } \Delta$. Let $R := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_k^1} \bigoplus_{i \in I_\lambda} R_{\lambda, i}$ for subsets $I_\lambda \subseteq [0, r_\lambda - 1]$ such that $|I_\lambda| = r_\lambda - 1$ (in particular, $I_\lambda = \emptyset$ if $r_\lambda = 1$), where we use notation introduced in Section 2. Let R^\perp denote the full subcategory of $\text{rep } \Delta$, whose objects are $M \in \text{rep } \Delta$ such that $\text{Hom}_\Delta(R, M) = 0 = \text{Ext}_\Delta^1(R, M)$. Lenzing and de la Peña [23, Proposition 4.2] have proved that there exists a fully faithful exact functor $F : \text{rep } K_2 \rightarrow \text{rep } \Delta$ which induces an equivalence between $\text{rep } K_2$ and R^\perp . Moreover, F induces an equivalence between \mathcal{T} and $R^\perp \cap \mathcal{R}$. The simple objects in $R^\perp \cap (\text{add } \mathcal{R})$, which are the images of the simple objects in $\text{add } \mathcal{T}$, are of the form $R_{\lambda, i_\lambda}^{(r_\lambda)}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$, where for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$ we denote by i_λ the unique element of $[0, r_\lambda - 1] \setminus I_\lambda$. Consequently, (if we choose appropriate parameterization) $F(N_\lambda) \simeq R_{\lambda, i_\lambda}^{(r_\lambda)}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$.

Let $p \in \mathbb{N}$. We define the functions $f_{(p,p)}^{(0)}, \dots, f_{(p,p)}^{(p)} \in \mathbb{k}[\text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p)]$ by the condition: if $V \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p)$, then

$$\det(S \cdot V_\alpha - T \cdot V_\beta) = \sum_{i \in [0, p]} S^i \cdot T^{p-i} \cdot f_{(p,p)}^{(i)}(V).$$

Note that $f_{(p,p)}^{(0)}, \dots, f_{(p,p)}^{(p)}$ are semi-invariants of weight $(-1, 1)$. If $(\zeta : \xi) \in \mathbb{P}_k^1$, then (by choosing a projective presentation of $N_{\zeta, \xi}$ in an appropriate way) we get

$$(5.1) \quad c_{(p,p)}^{N_{\zeta, \xi}}(V) = \det(\xi \cdot V_\alpha - \zeta \cdot V_\beta) = \sum_{i \in [0, p]} \xi^i \cdot \zeta^{p-i} \cdot f_{(p,p)}^{(i)}(V).$$

It is well known (see for example [30]) that $\text{SI}[K_2, (p, p)]$ is the polynomial algebra in $f_{(p,p)}^{(0)}, \dots, f_{(p,p)}^{(p)}$. In particular,

$$(5.2) \quad \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{SI}[K_2, (p, p)]_{(-q, q)} = \binom{q+p}{q}$$

for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$.

We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *If $f_1, f_2 \in \text{SI}[K_2, (p, p)]_{(-1, 1)}$ and*

$$\{V \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p) : f_1(V) = 0\} = \{V \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p) : f_2(V) = 0\},$$

then (up to a non-zero scalar) $f_1 = f_2$.

Proof. From the description of $\text{SI}[K_2, (p, p)]$ it follows that f_1 and f_2 are irreducible, hence the claim follows. \square

6. THE MAIN RESULT

Throughout this section we fix a concealed-canonical bound quiver Δ and a sincere separating exact subcategory \mathcal{R} of $\text{ind } \Delta$. We use freely notation introduced in Section 2. We also fix $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $p := p^{\mathbf{d}} > 0$.

First we investigate the algebra $\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}$. We introduce some notation. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ we denote by \mathcal{I}_{λ}^0 the set of $i \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1]$ such that $p_{\lambda, i}^{\mathbf{d}} = 0$. Observe that $\mathcal{I}_{\lambda}^0 \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ (the sets \mathcal{I}_{λ} for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ were introduced before Corollary 4.5). Recall that, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$, $n_{\lambda, i}$ denotes the minimal $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$ such that $p_{\lambda, i+n}^{\mathbf{d}} = 0$.

We put $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda} := \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}^0} c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}}$. An iterated application of Corollary 3.2(1) to exact sequences of the form (2.2) implies that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda} = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i}^{(r_{\lambda})}}$ for each $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}^0$.

We have the following fact.

Lemma 6.1. *The algebra $\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}$ is generated by the semi-invariants $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}$.*

Proof. This fact has been proved in [4], but for completeness we include its (shorter) proof here.

Fix $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Proposition 3.7 and Lemma 4.1 imply that $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}$ is spanned by the semi-invariants $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V$ for ext-minimal $V \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ with dimension vector $q \cdot \mathbf{h}$. Fix such V . Since V is ext-minimal with dimension vector $q \cdot \mathbf{h}$, $V = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{X}} R_{\lambda, i_{\lambda}}^{(k_{\lambda}, r_{\lambda})}$, where $\mathbb{X} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i_{\lambda} \in [0, r_{\lambda} - 1]$ and $k_{\lambda} \in \mathbb{N}_+$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}$. Moreover, Lemma 4.3 implies that $i_{\lambda} \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}^0$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}$. An iterated application of Corollary 3.2(1) to exact sequences of the form (2.2) implies that $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i_{\lambda}}^{(k_{\lambda}, r_{\lambda})}} = (c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda})^{k_{\lambda}}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}$. Consequently, $c_{\mathbf{d}}^V = \prod_{\lambda \in \mathbb{X}} (c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda})^{k_{\lambda}}$ by Lemma 3.4, hence the claim follows. \square

The following fact is crucial.

Proposition 6.2. *There exists a regular map*

$$\Phi : \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p) \rightarrow \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$$

such that Φ^ induces an isomorphism*

$$\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SI}[K_2, (p, p)]_{(-q, q)}$$

of \mathbb{N} -graded rings and (up to a non-zero scalar) $\Phi^(c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}) = c_{(p, p)}^{N_{\lambda}}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$.*

Proof. For each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ we fix $i_\lambda \in \mathcal{I}_\lambda^0$. From Section 5 we know that there exists a fully faithful exact functor $F : \text{rep } K_2 \rightarrow \text{rep } \Delta$ such that $F(N_\lambda) \simeq R_{\lambda, i_\lambda}^{(r_\lambda)}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. Observe that for each $R \in \text{add}(\coprod_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1 \setminus \mathbb{X}_0} \mathcal{R}_\lambda)$ (recall that \mathbb{X}_0 is the set of all $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ such that $r_\lambda > 1$) there exists $N \in \mathcal{T}$ with $F(N) \simeq R$.

Put $E_1 := F(S_1)$ and $E_2 := F(S_2)$, where S_i is the simple representation of K_2 at i , for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, i.e.

$$S_1 := \mathbb{k} \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \circlearrowleft \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_2 := 0 \begin{array}{c} \longleftarrow \\ \circlearrowleft \\ \longrightarrow \end{array} \mathbb{k}.$$

Then [24, Proposition 2.3] (see also [9, Proposition 5.2]) implies that there exists a regular map $\Phi' : \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p) \rightarrow \text{rep}_\Delta(p \cdot \mathbf{h})$ such that $\Phi'(N) \simeq F(N)$ for each $N \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p)$. Moreover, there exists a morphism $\varphi : \text{GL}(p, p) \rightarrow \text{GL}(p \cdot \mathbf{h})$ of algebraic groups such that $\Phi'(g * N) = \varphi(g) * \Phi'(N)$, for all $g \in \text{GL}(p, p)$ and $N \in \text{rep}_\Delta(p \cdot \mathbf{h})$, and

$$(6.1) \quad \chi^\theta(\varphi(g)) = (\det(g(1)))^{\theta(\dim E_1)} \cdot (\det(g(2)))^{\theta(\dim E_2)},$$

for all $g \in \text{GL}(p, p)$ and $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$.

Let $W \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ be an ext-minimal representation for $\mathbf{d}' := \mathbf{d} - p \cdot \mathbf{h}$. We define $\Phi : \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p) \rightarrow \text{rep}_\Delta(\mathbf{d})$ by $\Phi(N) := \Phi'(N) \oplus W$ for $N \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p)$.

Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$. We show that $\Phi^*(f)$ is a semi-invariant of weight $(-q, q)$ for each $f \in \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta}$. Using Proposition 3.6 and Lemma 4.1 it suffices to show that $\Phi^*(c^V)$ is a semi-invariant of weight $(-q, q)$ for each representation V of Δ with dimension vector $q \cdot \mathbf{h}$. Now, if $g \in \text{GL}(p, p)$ and $N \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} (\Phi^*(c_{\mathbf{d}}^V))(g^{-1} * N) &= c_{\mathbf{d}}^V(W \oplus \Phi'(g^{-1} * N)) \\ &= c_{\mathbf{d}'}^V(W) \cdot c_{p \cdot \mathbf{h}}^V(\varphi(g^{-1}) * \Phi'(N)) \\ &= c_{\mathbf{d}'}^V(W) \cdot \chi^{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta}(\varphi(g)) \cdot c_{p \cdot \mathbf{h}}^V(\Phi(N)) \\ &= \chi^{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta}(\varphi(g)) \cdot (\Phi^*(c_{\mathbf{d}}^V))(N), \end{aligned}$$

where the second and the last equalities follow from Lemma 3.5. Using (6.1) we get

$$\chi^{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta}(\varphi(g)) = (\det(g(1)))^{-q} \cdot (\det(g(2)))^q,$$

since

$$\langle \mathbf{h}, \dim E_i \rangle_\Delta = \langle (1, 1), \dim S_i \rangle_{K_2} = (-1)^i$$

for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$ (we use here that F is exact).

The above implies that Φ^* induces a homomorphism

$$(6.2) \quad \bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle q \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_\Delta} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \text{SI}[K_2, (p, p)]_{(-q, q)}$$

of \mathbb{N} -graded rings. We need to show that this is an isomorphism.

First we show $\Phi^*(f) \neq 0$ for each non-zero semi-invariant f (in particular, this will imply that (6.2) is a monomorphism). Let

$$\mathcal{Z} := \{M \in \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d}) : \text{there exists} \\ N \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p) \text{ such that } M \simeq W \oplus \Phi(N)\}.$$

In other words, \mathcal{Z} is in the closure of the image of Φ under the action of $\text{GL}(\mathbf{d})$. Using Proposition 4.10 it suffices to show that \mathcal{Z} contains a non-empty open subset of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$. Let

$$\mathcal{U} := \{M \in \mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d}) : c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}(M) \neq 0 \text{ for each } \lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0 \\ \text{and } \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{End}_{\Delta}(M) = p + \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d} \rangle_{\Delta}\}.$$

Since the function

$$\text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d}) \ni M \mapsto \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{End}_{\Delta}(M) \in \mathbb{Z}$$

is upper semi-continuous, (2.7) implies that \mathcal{U} is a non-empty open subset of $\mathcal{R}(\mathbf{d})$, which consists of ext-minimal representations. In particular, if $M \in \mathcal{U}$, then there exists an exact sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow M \rightarrow W \rightarrow 0$ with $R \in \text{add } \mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathbf{dim} R = p \cdot \mathbf{h}$. If $p_{\lambda}^R \neq 0$ for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$, then $\text{Hom}_{\Delta}(R_{\lambda, i_{\lambda}}^{(r_{\lambda})}, R) \neq 0$. Consequently, $\text{Hom}_{\Delta}(R_{\lambda, i_{\lambda}}^{(r_{\lambda})}, M) \neq 0$, hence $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}(M) = 0$, contradiction. Thus $p_{\lambda}^R = 0$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$, hence $M \simeq W \oplus R$ and $R \in \text{add}(\coprod_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1 \setminus \mathbb{X}_0} \mathcal{R}_{\lambda})$. In particular, there exists $N \in \text{rep } \mathcal{T}$ such that $F(N) \simeq R$, hence $M \in \mathcal{Z}$.

Now we fix $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. We show that (up to a non-zero scalar) $\Phi^*(c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}) = c_{(p,p)}^{N_{\lambda}}$ for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. According to Lemma 6.1 this will imply that (6.2) is an epimorphism, hence finish the proof. Fix $N \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p)$. Then

$$(\Phi^*(c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}))(N) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \text{Hom}_{\Delta}(R_{\lambda, i_{\lambda}}^{(r_{\lambda})}, F(N)) \neq 0.$$

Since $R_{\lambda, i_{\lambda}}^{(r_{\lambda})} \simeq F(N_{\lambda})$ and F is fully faithful,

$$(\Phi^*(c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}))(N) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \text{Hom}_{K_2}(N_{\lambda}, N) \neq 0.$$

Similarly, if $N \in \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p)$, then

$$c_{(p,p)}^{N_{\lambda}}(N) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \text{Hom}_{K_2}(N_{\lambda}, N) \neq 0.$$

Consequently, the claim follows from Lemma 5.1. \square

Corollary 6.3. *If $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} \neq 0$, then*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} = \binom{p^{\mathbf{r}} + p}{p^{\mathbf{r}}}.$$

Proof. Proposition 4.9(2) implies that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle p^{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}}.$$

Next,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{\langle p^{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{h}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{SI}[K_2, (p, p)]_{(-p^{\mathbf{r}}, p^{\mathbf{r}})}$$

by Proposition 6.2, hence the claim follows from (5.2). \square

Let $\Phi : \text{rep}_{K_2}(p, p) \rightarrow \text{rep}_{\Delta}(\mathbf{d})$ be a regular map constructed in Proposition 6.2. For $j \in [0, p]$ we denote by $f_{\mathbf{d}}^{(j)}$ the inverse image of $f_{(p,p)}^{(j)}$ under Φ^* . Then (5.1) implies that (up to a non-zero scalar)

$$(6.3) \quad c_{\mathbf{d}}^{(\zeta:\xi)} = \sum_{j \in [0,p]} \xi^j \cdot \zeta^{p-j} \cdot f_{\mathbf{d}}^{(j)}$$

for each $(\zeta : \xi) \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$. As the first application we get the following (smaller) set of generators of $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$.

Proposition 6.4. *The algebra $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is generated by the semi-invariants $f_{\mathbf{d}}^{(0)}, \dots, f_{\mathbf{d}}^{(p)}$ and $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$.*

Proof. Recall from Corollary 4.5 that the algebra $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is generated by the semi-invariants $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$. Thus we only need to express, for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1 \setminus \mathbb{X}_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$, $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}}$ as the polynomial in the semi-invariants listed in the proposition. However, if $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{k}}^1 \setminus \mathbb{X}_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$, then $c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}} = c_{\mathbf{d}}^{\lambda}$, hence the claim follows from (6.3). \square

We give another formulation of Proposition 6.4. Let \mathcal{A} be the polynomial algebra in the indeterminates S_0, \dots, S_p and $T_{\lambda, i}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$. Proposition 6.4 says that the homomorphism $\Psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ given by the formulas: $\Psi(S_j) := f_{\mathbf{d}}^{(j)}$, for $j \in [0, p]$, and $\Psi(T_{\lambda, i}) := c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_{\lambda, i})}}$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$, is an epimorphism. Our last aim is to describe its kernel.

First, we introduce an \mathbf{R} -grading in \mathcal{A} by specifying the degrees of the indeterminates as follows: $\deg(S_j) := \mathbf{h}$ for $j \in [0, p]$ and $\deg(T_{\lambda, i}) := \mathbf{e}_{\lambda, i}^{n_{\lambda, i}}$, for $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$. Note that Ψ is a homogenous map, i.e. $\Psi(\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{r}}) = \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{(\mathbf{r}, -)_{\Delta}}$ for each $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}$.

Let \mathbf{R}_0 be the submonoid of \mathbf{R} generated by the elements \mathbf{h} and $\mathbf{e}_{\lambda, i}^{n_{\lambda, i}}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}$. Obviously, if $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}$, then $\mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{r}} \neq 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}_0$. Similarly, Corollary 4.5 implies that $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]_{(\mathbf{r}, -)_{\Delta}} \neq 0$ if and only if $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}_0$ (recall that $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is a domain).

Lemma 6.5. *If $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}_0$, then*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{r}} = \binom{p^{\mathbf{r}} + p + |\mathbb{X}_0|}{p^{\mathbf{r}}}.$$

Proof. One easily observes that there is an isomorphism $\mathcal{A}_{p^{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{h}} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_{\mathbf{r}}$ of vector spaces (induced by multiplying by the unique monomial of degree $\mathbf{r} - p^{\mathbf{r}} \cdot \mathbf{h}$). Moreover, $\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{A}_{q \cdot \mathbf{h}}$ is the polynomial algebra generated by S_0, \dots, S_p and $\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_{\lambda}} T_{\lambda, i}$ for $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$. Now the claim follows. \square

The formula (6.3) implies that for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0$ there exist $\zeta_\lambda, \xi_\lambda \in \mathbb{k}$ such that

$$\prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\lambda^0} c_{\mathbf{d}}^{R_{\lambda, i+1}^{(n_\lambda, i)}} = \sum_{j \in [0, p]} \xi_\lambda^j \cdot \zeta_\lambda^{p-j} \cdot f_{\mathbf{d}}^{(j)}.$$

Obviously, $(\zeta_\lambda, \xi_\lambda) \neq (0, 0)$ and $(\zeta_\lambda : \xi_\lambda) = \lambda$.

Proposition 6.6. *We have*

$$\text{Ker } \Psi = \left(\sum_{j \in [0, p]} \xi_\lambda^j \cdot \zeta_\lambda^{p-j} \cdot S_j - \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\lambda^0} T_{i, \lambda} : \lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0 \right).$$

Proof. Let

$$\mathcal{J} := \left(\sum_{j \in [0, p]} \xi_\lambda^j \cdot \zeta_\lambda^{p-j} \cdot S_j - \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\lambda^0} T_{i, \lambda} : \lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0 \right).$$

Obviously, $\text{Ker } \Psi \subseteq I$. Observe that both $\text{Ker } \Psi$ and \mathcal{J} are graded ideals (with respect to the grading introduced above). Consequently, in order to prove our claim it suffices to show that $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{r}} = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Ker } \Psi_{\mathbf{r}}$ for each $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}_0$.

We already know from Lemma 6.5 and Corollary 6.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{Ker } \Psi_{\mathbf{r}} &= \dim_{\mathbb{k}} A_{\mathbf{r}} - \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{r}]_{\langle \mathbf{r}, - \rangle_{\Delta}} \\ &= \binom{p^{\mathbf{r}} + p + |\mathbb{X}_0|}{p^{\mathbf{r}}} - \binom{p^{\mathbf{r}} + p}{p^{\mathbf{r}}} \end{aligned}$$

for each $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}_0$. On the other hand, similarly as in the proof of Lemma 6.5, we show that $\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{J}_{\mathbf{r}} = \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{J}_{p^{\mathbf{r}}, \mathbf{h}}$ for each $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbf{R}_0$. Moreover, the algebra $\bigoplus_{q \in \mathbb{N}} (\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{J})_{q, \mathbf{h}}$ is obviously the polynomial algebra in $p^{\mathbf{r}} + p$ indeterminates. This, together with Lemma 6.5, immediately implies our claim. \square

We may summarize our considerations in the following theorem (compare [29, Theorem 1.1]).

Theorem 6.7. *We have the isomorphism*

$$\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}] \simeq \mathcal{A} / \left(\sum_{j \in [0, p]} \xi_\lambda^j \cdot \zeta_\lambda^{p-j} \cdot S_j - \prod_{i \in \mathcal{I}_\lambda^0} T_{i, \lambda} : \lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0 \right).$$

If

$$i(\mathbf{d}) := \{ \lambda \in \mathbb{X}_0 : |\mathcal{I}_\lambda| > 1 \},$$

then $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is a complete intersection given by $\max(0, i(\mathbf{d}) - p - 1)$ equations. In particular, $\text{SI}[\Delta, \mathbf{d}]$ is polynomial algebra if and only if $i(\mathbf{d}) \leq p + 1$.

REFERENCES

- [1] I. Assem, D. Simson, and A. Skowroński, *Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras. Vol. 1*, London Math. Soc. Stud. Texts, vol. 65, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [2] M. Barot and Jan Schröer, *Module varieties over canonical algebras*, J. Algebra **246** (2001), no. 1, 175–192.
- [3] G. Bobiński, *Geometry of regular modules over canonical algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **360** (2008), no. 2, 717–742.
- [4] ———, *Normality of maximal orbit closures for Euclidean quivers*, Canad. J. Math. **64** (2012), no. 6, 1222–1247.
- [5] G. Bobiński, Ch. Riedtmann, and A. Skowroński, *Semi-invariants of quivers and their zero sets*, Trends in Representation Theory of Algebras and Related Topics (A. Skowroński, ed.), EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2008, pp. 49–99.
- [6] G. Bobiński and A. Skowroński, *Geometry of periodic modules over tame concealed and tubular algebras*, Algebr. Represent. Theory **5** (2002), no. 2, 187–200.
- [7] K. Bongartz, *Tilted algebras*, Representations of algebras, 1981, pp. 26–38.
- [8] ———, *Algebras and quadratic forms*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **28** (1983), no. 3, 461–469.
- [9] C. Chindris, *Geometric characterizations of the representation type of hereditary algebras and of canonical algebras*, Adv. Math. **228** (2011), no. 3, 1405–1434.
- [10] H. Derksen and J. Weyman, *Semi-invariants of quivers and saturation for Littlewood-Richardson coefficients*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (2000), no. 3, 467–479.
- [11] ———, *Semi-invariants for quivers with relations*, J. Algebra **258** (2002), no. 1, 216–227.
- [12] C. Di Trapano, *The algebras of semi-invariants of Euclidean quivers*, Comm. Algebra **39** (2011), no. 11, 4357–4373.
- [13] M. Domokos, *Relative invariants for representations of finite dimensional algebras*, Manuscripta Math. **108** (2002), no. 1, 123–133.
- [14] M. Domokos and H. Lenzing, *Invariant theory of canonical algebras*, J. Algebra **228** (2000), no. 2, 738–762.
- [15] ———, *Moduli spaces for representations of concealed-canonical algebras*, J. Algebra **251** (2002), no. 1, 371–394.
- [16] P. Gabriel, *Unzerlegbare Darstellungen. I*, Manuscripta Math. **6** (1972), 71–103; correction, *ibid.* **6** (1972), 309.
- [17] Ch. Geiss and J. Schröer, *Varieties of modules over tubular algebras*, Colloq. Math. **95** (2003), no. 2, 163–183.
- [18] D. Happel, *A characterization of hereditary categories with tilting object*, Invent. Math. **144** (2001), no. 2, 381–398.
- [19] D. Happel, I. Reiten, and S. O. Smalø, *Tilting in abelian categories and quasi-tilted algebras*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **120** (1996), no. 575, viii+ 88.
- [20] D. Happel and C. M. Ringel, *Tilted algebras*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **274** (1982), no. 2, 399–443.
- [21] A. D. King, *Moduli of representations of finite-dimensional algebras*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **45** (1994), no. 180, 515–530.
- [22] H. Lenzing and H. Meltzer, *Tilting sheaves and concealed-canonical algebras*, Representation Theory of Algebras, 1996, pp. 455–473.
- [23] H. Lenzing and J. A. de la Peña, *Concealed-canonical algebras and separating tubular families*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **78** (1999), no. 3, 513–540.

- [24] Ch. Riedtmann and A. Schofield, *On open orbits and their complements*, J. Algebra **130** (1990), no. 2, 388–411.
- [25] C. M. Ringel, *The rational invariants of the tame quivers*, Invent. Math. **58** (1980), no. 3, 217–239.
- [26] ———, *Tame Algebras and Integral Quadratic Forms*, Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1099, Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [27] D. A. Shmelkin, *Locally semi-simple representations of quivers*, Transform. Groups **12** (2007), no. 1, 153–173.
- [28] A. Skowroński, *On omnipresent tubular families of modules*, Representation theory of algebras, 1996, pp. 641–657.
- [29] A. Skowroński and J. Weyman, *Semi-invariants of canonical algebras*, Manuscripta Math. **100** (1999), no. 3, 391–403.
- [30] ———, *The algebras of semi-invariants of quivers*, Transform. Groups **5** (2000), no. 4, 361–402.

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, NICOLAUS COPERNICUS UNIVERSITY, UL. CHOPINA 12/18, 87-100 TORUŃ, POLAND

E-mail address: `gregbob@mat.uni.torun.pl`