

REPRESENTATIONS OF DRINFELD DOUBLES OF RADFORD HOPF ALGEBRAS

HUA SUN AND HUI-XIANG CHEN

ABSTRACT. In this article, we investigate the representations of the Drinfeld doubles $D(R_{mn}(q))$ of the Radford Hopf algebras $R_{mn}(q)$ over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} , where $m > 1$ and $n > 1$ are integers and $q \in \mathbb{k}$ is a root of unity of order n . Under the assumption $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) \nmid mn$, all the finite dimensional indecomposable modules over $D(R_{mn}(q))$ are displayed and classified up to isomorphism. The Auslander-Reiten sequences in the category of finite dimensional $D(R_{mn}(q))$ -modules are also all displayed. It is shown that $D(R_{mn}(q))$ is of tame representation type.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $m, n \geq 2$ be integers and q a primitive n -th root of unity in a field \mathbb{k} . Radford [24] constructed an mn^2 -dimensional Hopf algebra such that its Jacobson radical is not a Hopf ideal. The Hopf algebra is denoted by $R_{mn}(q)$ and called a Radford Hopf algebra here. Note that the coradical of the dual Hopf algebra $R_{mn}(q)^*$ is not a Hopf subalgebra. When $m = 1$, $R_{mn}(q)$ is still well-defined, which is exactly the Taft Hopf algebra $A_n(q)$ of dimension n^2 given in [20]. Krop and Radford [12] defined the rank as a measure of complexity for Hopf algebras and classified all finite dimensional pointed Hopf algebras of rank one over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero by using group datums. Scherotzke [17] classified such Hopf algebras for the case of $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) = p > 0$. It was proven in [12, 17] that a finite dimensional pointed Hopf algebra of rank one over an algebraically closed field is isomorphic to a quotient of a Hopf-Ore extension of a group algebra (its coradical). For the Hopf-Ore extension, one can see [16]. The Taft algebra $A_n(q)$ and the Radford algebra $R_{mn}(q)$ are both pointed Hopf algebras of rank one. The finite dimensional pointed rank one Hopf algebras are clarified into two types: nilpotent type and non-nilpotent type [12]. The Taft algebra $A_n(q)$ is of nilpotent type, but the Radford algebra $R_{mn}(q)$ is of non-nilpotent type.

The representations of finite dimensional pointed Hopf algebras of rank one was well studied. For instance, Cibils [10] studied the representation theory of (generalized) Taft algebras and described the decomposition rules of tensor product modules over (generalized) Taft algebras. In [9] and [14], the authors studied respectively the Green rings of the Taft algebras and the generalized Taft algebras.

Key words and phrases. Drinfeld double, Radford algebra, representation, indecomposable module, Auslander-Reiten sequence.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16T99, 16E99, 16G70.

Wang, Li and Zhang studied the representations and Green rings of finite dimensional pointed rank one Hopf algebras of nilpotent type and non-nilpotent type over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero in [21, 22], respectively. The representations of Drinfeld doubles of finite dimensional pointed Hopf algebras of rank one also got many achievements. The second author of this paper described the structures of Drinfeld doubles of Taft algebras and classified the finite dimensional indecomposable modules over such Drinfeld doubles in [2, 3, 4, 5]. He with his colleagues studied the Grothendieck rings and Green rings of Drinfeld doubles of Taft algebras, see [6, 7, 8, 18, 23]. When $n = 2$, the Taft algebra $A_2(-1)$ is the same as H_4 , the Sweedler's 4-dimensional Hopf algebra (see [19, 20]). The Green ring of Drinfeld double of H_4 was also studied by Li and Hu in [13]. Krop and Radford studied the representations of Drinfeld double $D(H)$ of any finite dimensional pointed rank one Hopf algebra H over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, and classified the simple modules and projective indecomposable modules over $D(H)$ in [12], when the group $G(H)$ of group-like elements in H is abelian. However, the other finite dimensional indecomposable modules over $D(H)$ are not classified.

In this article, we study the representations of the Drinfeld doubles $D(R_{mn}(q))$ of Radford Hopf algebras $R_{mn}(q)$ over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} with $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) \nmid mn$. The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we recall the definition of a group datum, the structures of Radford Hopf algebras $R_{mn}(q)$ and their Drinfeld doubles $D(R_{mn}(q))$, denoted by $H_{mn}(\xi)$, where $\xi \in \mathbb{k}$ is a primitive mn -th root of unity with $\xi^m = q$. In Section 3, we recall the simple modules and projective indecomposable modules over $H_{mn}(\xi)$, which shows that the Loewy length of $H_{mn}(\xi)$ is 3. In particular, we reconstruct the non-simple projective indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules and give a standard \mathbb{k} -basis for each such module. In Section 4, we study the finite dimensional indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules of Loewy length 2. Using Auslander-Reiten theory, we display all the finite dimensional indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules of Loewy length 2, and classify them up to isomorphism. All the Auslander-Reiten sequences in the category of finite dimensional $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules are also displayed. It is shown that $H_{mn}(\xi)$ is of tame representation type.

Throughout, let \mathbb{k} be an algebraically closed field and $\mathbb{k}^\times = \mathbb{k} \setminus \{0\}$. Unless otherwise stated, all algebras and Hopf algebras are defined over \mathbb{k} ; all modules are finite dimensional and left modules; \dim and \otimes denote $\dim_{\mathbb{k}}$ and $\otimes_{\mathbb{k}}$, respectively. Let \mathbb{Z} denote the set of all integers, $\mathbb{Z}_n := \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ for an integer n , and let \mathbb{N} denote all non-negative integers. The references [11, 15, 19] are basic references for the theory of Hopf algebras and quantum groups. The readers can refer [1] for the representation theory of algebras.

2. DRINFELD DOUBLES OF RADFORD HOPF ALGEBRAS

In this section, we recall the Radford Hopf algebras and their Drinfeld doubles.

A quadruple $\mathcal{D} = (G, \chi, g, \mu)$ is called a *group datum* if G is a finite group, χ is a \mathbb{k} -valued character of G , g is a central element of G and $\mu \in \mathbb{k}$ subject to $\chi^n = 1$ or $\mu(g^n - 1) = 0$, where n is the order of $\chi(g)$. The group datum \mathcal{D} is said to be of *nilpotent type* if $\mu(g^n - 1) = 0$, and it is of *non-nilpotent type* if $\mu(g^n - 1) \neq 0$ and

$\chi^n = 1$. For any group datum $\mathcal{D} = (G, \chi, g, \mu)$, Krop and Radford constructed an associated finite dimensional pointed rank one Hopf algebra $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ and classified such Hopf algebras. They also described the Drinfeld doubles $D(H_{\mathcal{D}})$ of $H_{\mathcal{D}}$, see [12].

Let $n > 1$ and $m > 1$ be integers and let $q \in \mathbb{k}$ be a primitive n -th root of unity. Then the Radford Hopf algebra $R_{mn}(q)$ can be described by a group datum as follows. Let G be a cyclic group of order mn with generator g and let χ be the \mathbb{k} -valued character of G defined by $\chi(g) = q$. Then $\mathcal{D} = (G, \chi, g, 1)$ is a group datum of non-nilpotent type, and the associated Hopf algebra $H_{\mathcal{D}}$ is exactly isomorphic to $R_{mn}(q)$. Regarding $R_{mn}(q) = H_{\mathcal{D}}$ from now on. Then $R_{mn}(q)$ is generated as an algebra by g and x subject to the relations:

$$g^{mn} = 1, \quad x^n = g^n - 1, \quad xg = qgx.$$

The comultiplication Δ , counit ε and antipode S are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(x) &= x \otimes g + 1 \otimes x, & \varepsilon(x) &= 0, & S(x) &= -xg^{-1}, \\ \Delta(g) &= g \otimes g, & \varepsilon(g) &= 1, & S(g) &= g^{-1} = g^{mn-1}. \end{aligned}$$

$R_{mn}(q)$ has a \mathbb{k} -basis $\{g^i x^j \mid i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}, 0 \leq j \leq n-1\}$. For the details, one can refer to [12, 24].

Let $\xi \in \mathbb{k}$ be a primitive mn -th root of unity with $q = \xi^m$. Then by [12, Subsection 2.1], the Drinfeld double $D(R_{mn}(q))$ can be described as follows. $D(R_{mn}(q))$ is generated as an algebra by a, b, c and d subject to the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} a^n &= b^n - 1, \quad b^{mn} = 1, \quad c^{mn} = 1, \quad d^n = 0, \\ ab &= qba, \quad dc = \xi cd, \quad bc = cb, \quad bd = qdb, \quad ad - da = b - c^m, \\ ac &= \xi^{-1}ca + \frac{\xi^{-1} - \xi^{n-1}}{(n-1)!_q} (c^{m+1} - qbc)d^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The comultiplication, the counit and the antipode of $D(R_{mn}(q))$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(a) &= a \otimes b + 1 \otimes a, & \Delta(b) &= b \otimes b, & \Delta(d) &= c^m \otimes d + d \otimes 1, \\ \Delta(c) &= c \otimes c + (\xi^n - 1) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{(k)!_q (n-k)!_q} c^{mk+1} d^{n-k} \otimes cd^k, \\ \varepsilon(a) &= 0, & \varepsilon(b) &= 1, & \varepsilon(c) &= 1, & \varepsilon(d) &= 0, \\ S(a) &= -ab^{-1}, & S(b) &= b^{-1}, & S(c) &= c^{-1}, & S(d) &= -c^{-m}d. \end{aligned}$$

Throughout the following, assume that \mathbb{k} contains a primitive mn -th root ξ of unity with $q = \xi^m$. Then $\text{char}(\mathbb{k}) \nmid mn$. Let $H_{mn}(\xi) := D(R_{mn}(q))$ be the Drinfeld double of $R_{mn}(q)$ as described above. Obviously, $H_{mn}(\xi)$ has a \mathbb{k} -basis $\{a^i b^j c^l d^k \mid j, l \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}, 0 \leq i, k \leq n-1\}$, and $\dim(H_{mn}(\xi)) = m^2 n^4$. For simplicity, we denote the image of an integer i under the canonical epimorphism $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$ still by i .

3. SIMPLE MODULES AND PROJECTIVE MODULES

Throughout this and the next sections, for any $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module V , let $P(V)$ and $I(V)$ denote the projective cover and the injective envelope of V , respectively. Let $l(V)$ and $\text{rl}(V)$ denote the length and the radical length (Loewy length) of V , respectively. Moreover, let sV denote the direct sum of s copies of V for any integer $s \geq 0$, where $sV = 0$ when $s = 0$. For any $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module M and $x_1, \dots, x_s \in M$,

let $\langle x_1, \dots, x_s \rangle$ denote the submodule of M generated by $\{x_1, \dots, x_s\}$, and define $M^d := \{v \in M \mid dv = 0\}$.

3.1. Simple modules. Krop and Radford classified the simple modules over $D(H_{\mathcal{D}})$ for any group datum $\mathcal{D} = (G, \chi, g, \mu)$ with G being abelian in [12, Subsection 2.2]. Therefore, one can get the classification of simple modules over $H_{mn}(\xi)$ from [12, Subsection 2.2]. In this subsection, we recall the simple $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules.

For any $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $\alpha_k(l, i) = (k)_q(q^i - q^{i+l-k})$, $1 \leq k \leq l-1$. It is easy to see that $\alpha_k(l, i) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq l-1$. Let

$$I_0 = \{(i, j) \mid i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn} \text{ with } q^{i+k} \neq \xi^j \text{ for all } 0 \leq k \leq n-2\}.$$

Then $\sharp I_0 = (mn)^2 - mn(n-1)$, where $\sharp I_0$ denotes the number of elements in I_0 .

Let $U(H_{mn}(\xi))$ be the multiplicative group of the invertible elements of $H_{mn}(\xi)$. Then $b, c \in U(H_{mn}(\xi))$ by $b^{mn} = c^{mn} = 1$. Let G be the subgroup of $U(H_{mn}(\xi))$ generated by b and c . Then $G = \{b^i c^j \mid 0 \leq i, j \leq mn-1\}$ and $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_{mn} \times \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$ as groups. Let A be the subalgebra of $H_{mn}(\xi)$ generated by b, c and d . Then the group algebra $\mathbb{k}G$ is a subalgebra of A and the Jacobson radical $J(A)$ of A is equal to the principal ideal (d) generated by d . Moreover, $A = \mathbb{k}G \oplus (d)$ as vector spaces. Hence the quotient algebra $A/J(A)$ is exactly isomorphism to the group algebra $\mathbb{k}G$. Thus, an A -module M is semisimple if and only if $dM = 0$, and there is a 1-1 correspondence between the simple A -modules and the simple $\mathbb{k}G$ -modules. This implies that the simple A -modules are in 1-1 correspondence with the \mathbb{k} -valued characters of G since G is abelian. For each character λ , let \mathbb{k}_λ denote the corresponding one dimensional A -module, and let $Z(\lambda) := H_{mn}(\xi) \otimes_A \mathbb{k}_\lambda$ denote the induced $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module. Since $H_{mn}(\xi)$ is a free right A -module with an A -basis $\{a^i \mid 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$, $Z(\lambda)$ is an n -dimensional $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module with a \mathbb{k} -basis $\{a^i \otimes_A 1_\lambda \mid 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}$, where 1_λ is a nonzero element of \mathbb{k}_λ .

For any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, there is a character λ_{ij} of G given by $\lambda_{ij}(b) = \xi^j$ and $\lambda_{ij}(c) = \xi^i$. Clearly, any character of G has this form. Moreover, for any $i, i', j, j' \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\lambda_{ij} = \lambda_{i'j'} \Leftrightarrow i \equiv i' \pmod{mn} \text{ and } j \equiv j' \pmod{mn}.$$

Let $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then by [12, Proposition 6(a)], $Z(\lambda_{ij})$ is simple if and only if $\lambda_{ij}(bc^{-m}) = \xi^{j-mi} \notin \{1, q, q^2, \dots, q^{n-2}\}$ if and only if $(i, j) \in I_0$. In this case, $\{a^k \otimes_A 1_{\lambda_{ij}} \mid 0 \leq k \leq n-1\}$ is a \mathbb{k} -basis of $Z(\lambda_{ij})$. Moreover, a straightforward computation shows that $Z(\lambda_{ij})^d = \mathbb{k}(1 \otimes_A 1_{\lambda_{ij}})$. Now suppose $(i, j) \notin I_0$. Then there is a unique integer l with $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ such that $\xi^{j-mi} = q^{l-1}$. In this case, $Z(\lambda_{ij})$ contains a unique proper submodule $\text{rad}Z(\lambda_{ij}) = \text{span}\{a^k \otimes_A 1_{\lambda_{ij}} \mid l \leq k \leq n-1\}$ by [12, Proposition 6(b)]. Denote the quotient module $Z(\lambda_{ij})/\text{rad}Z(\lambda_{ij})$ by $M(l, i)$. Then $M(l, i)$ is simple. Define $m_k \in M(l, i)$ for $1 \leq k \leq l$ by $m_1 = 1 \otimes_A 1_{\lambda_{ij}} + \text{rad}Z(\lambda_{ij})$ if $k=1$, and $m_k = \frac{1}{\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_{k-1}} a^{k-1} \otimes_A 1_{\lambda_{ij}} + \text{rad}Z(\lambda_{ij})$ if $2 \leq k \leq l$, where $\alpha_k = \alpha_k(l, i)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq l-1$. Then $\{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_l\}$ is a \mathbb{k} -basis of $M(l, i)$, and hence $\dim M(l, i) = l$. A tedious but standard verification shows that the $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module

action on $M(l, i)$ is determined by

$$\begin{aligned} am_k &= \begin{cases} \alpha_k(l, i)m_{k+1}, & 1 \leq k < l-1, \\ 0, & k = l, \end{cases} & dm_k &= \begin{cases} 0, & k = 1, \\ m_{k-1}, & 1 < k \leq l, \end{cases} \\ bm_k &= q^{i+l-k}m_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq l, & cm_k &= \xi^{i+k-1}m_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq l. \end{aligned}$$

Such a basis is called a standard basis of $M(l, i)$. Clearly, $M(l, i)^d = \mathbb{k}m_1$.

By [12, Subsection 2.2] and the discussion above, one gets the following lemmas and proposition.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(i, j), (i', j') \in I_0$.*

- (1) $Z(\lambda_{ij})$ is a simple module.
- (2) $Z(\lambda_{ij}) \cong Z(\lambda_{i'j'})$ if and only if $(i, j) = (i', j')$.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $1 \leq l, l' \leq n-1$ and $i, i' \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

- (1) $M(l, i)$ is a simple module.
- (2) $M(l, i) \cong M(l', i')$ if and only if $l = l'$ and $i \equiv i' \pmod{mn}$.
- (3) $M(l, i + kn) \not\cong M(n-l, i+l+k'n)$ for any $k, k' \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proposition 3.3. *The following set*

$$\{M(l, i), Z(\lambda_{i'j'}) \mid 1 \leq l \leq n-1, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}, (i', j') \in I_0\}$$

is a representative set of isomorphism classes of simple $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules.

By Proposition 3.3 and the structures of the simple $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules $M(l, i)$ and $Z(\lambda_{ij})$, one gets the following corollary.

Corollary 3.4. *Let M be a finite dimensional semisimple $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module. Then $l(M) = \dim(M^d)$.*

3.2. Projective modules. Krop and Radford described all projective indecomposable $D(H_{\mathcal{D}})$ -modules for any group datum $\mathcal{D} = (G, \chi, g, \mu)$ with G being abelian in [12, Subsection 2.3]. They described the radical series and simple factors for such modules. Hence from [12, Subsection 2.3], one can get the classification of projective indecomposable modules over $H_{mn}(\xi)$. However, in order to classify all finite dimensional indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules, it is necessary to know the more details of the non-simple projective indecomposable modules over $H_{mn}(\xi)$. For this goal, we investigate non-simple projective indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules in this subsection.

Since $H_{mn}(\xi)$ is a symmetric algebra, $P(V) \cong I(V)$ and $P(V)/\text{rad}(P(V)) \cong \text{soc}(P(V)) \cong V$ for any simple $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module V . Let J denote the Jacobson radical of $H_{mn}(\xi)$. Then by [12, Subsection 2.3], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $(i, j) \in I_0$ and $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 \leq l \leq n-1$.*

- (1) $Z(\lambda_{ij})$ is a projective module.
- (2) $\text{rl}(P(M(l, k))) = 3$ and $l(P(M(l, k))) = 4$.
- (3) $\text{rl}(H_{mn}(\xi)) = 3$ and hence $J^3 = 0$.

For $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, define $\gamma_k(l, i), \alpha_k(l, i) \in \mathbb{k}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k(l, i) &= (k)_q(q^{i+l} - q^{i-k}), \quad \alpha_k(l, i) = (k)_q(q^i - q^{i+l-k}), \quad 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ \gamma_n(l, i) &= \frac{1}{(n-1)!_q}(q^i - q^{i+l}), \quad \alpha_n(l, i) = \frac{1}{(n-1)!_q}(q^{i+l} - q^i). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.6. *Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$.*

- (1) $\gamma_k(l, i) = 0$ if and only if $k = n-l$.
- (2) $\alpha_k(l, i) = 0$ if and only if $k = l$.
- (3) $\gamma_k(l, i) = \alpha_{n-k}(l, i)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $\gamma_n(l, i) = -\alpha_n(l, i)$.
- (4) $\gamma_k(l, i) = \alpha_{l+k}(l, i)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n-l-1$.
- (5) $\gamma_k(l, i) = \alpha_{k-(n-l)}(l, i)$ for all $n-l+1 \leq k \leq n-1$.
- (6) $\gamma_k(l, i) = \alpha_k(n-l, i+l)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$.
- (7) $\gamma_k(l, i) = \gamma_k(l, i+n)$ and $\alpha_k(l, i) = \alpha_k(l, i+n)$ for all $1 \leq k \leq n$.

Proof. It follows from a straightforward verification. \square

For any positive integer s , let $M_s(\mathbb{k})$ denote the algebra of $s \times s$ matrices over \mathbb{k} . Let $I_s \in M_s(\mathbb{k})$ denote the identity matrix, and let $D_s \in M_s(\mathbb{k})$ be defined by

$$D_s = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $X_{l,i}, Z_{l,i} \in M_n(\mathbb{k})$ be given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_{l,i} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \gamma_n(l, i) \\ \gamma_1(l, i) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_2(l, i) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \gamma_{n-1}(l, i) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Z_{l,i} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \alpha_n(l, i) \\ \alpha_1(l, i) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2(l, i) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \alpha_{n-1}(l, i) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

and define $A(l, i)$, $B(l, i)$, $C(l, i)$ and D in $M_{2n}(\mathbb{k})$ by

$$\begin{aligned} A(l, i) &= \begin{pmatrix} X_{l,i} & 0 \\ D_n^{n-l-1} & Z_{l,i} \end{pmatrix}, \quad D = \begin{pmatrix} D_n & 0 \\ 0 & D_n \end{pmatrix}, \\ B(l, i) &= \text{diag}\{q^{i-1}, q^{i-2}, \dots, q^{i-n}, q^{i+l-1}, q^{i+l-2}, \dots, q^{i+l-n}\}, \\ C(l, i) &= \text{diag}\{\xi^{i+l-n}, \xi^{i+l-n+1}, \dots, \xi^{i+l-1}, \xi^i, \xi^{i+1}, \dots, \xi^{i+n-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.7. *Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there is a unique algebra map $\phi_{l,i} : H_{mn}(\xi) \rightarrow M_{2n}(\mathbb{k})$ such that*

$$\phi_{l,i}(a) = A(l, i), \quad \phi_{l,i}(b) = B(l, i), \quad \phi_{l,i}(c) = C(l, i), \quad \phi_{l,i}(d) = D.$$

Let $P(l, i)$ denote the corresponding left $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module.

Proof. For simplicity, let $\gamma_j := \gamma_j(l, i)$ and $\alpha_j := \alpha_j(l, i)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Let

$$A_1(l, i) := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X}_{l,i} & 0 \\ D_n^{n-l-1} & \tilde{Z}_{l,i} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } A_2(l, i) := \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{X}_{l,i} & 0 \\ T & \tilde{Z}_{l,i} \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\tilde{X}_{l,i} = X_{l,i} - \gamma_n D_n^{n-1}$, $\tilde{Z}_{l,i} = Z_{l,i} - \alpha_n D_n^{n-1}$ and T is an $n \times n$ matrix with the $(1, n-l)$ -entry and $(l+1, n)$ -entry to be 1 and the other entries to be zero. For any $1 \leq j \neq k \leq 2n$, let $P_{j,k} \in M_{2n}(\mathbb{k})$ be the elementary matrix obtained from I_{2n} by interchanging the j^{th} row and the k^{th} row, and let $P_{j,k}(\gamma)$ be the elementary matrix obtained from I_{2n} by adding γ times the k^{th} row to the j^{th} row, where $\gamma \in \mathbb{k}$. Define a matrix $P_1 \in M_{2n}(\mathbb{k})$ by

$$P_1 := P_{1,n+l+1}(\gamma_n) P_{2,n+l+2}(\frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_n}{\alpha_{l+1}}) P_{3,n+l+3}(\frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \gamma_n}{\alpha_{l+1} \alpha_{l+2}}) \cdots P_{n-l,2n}(\frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{n-l-1} \gamma_n}{\alpha_{l+1} \alpha_{l+2} \cdots \alpha_{n-1}}).$$

Then P_1 is an invertible matrix. One can check that $P_1^{-1} A(l, i) P_1 = A_1(l, i)$ since $\alpha_n + \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_{n-l-1} \gamma_n}{\alpha_{l+1} \alpha_{l+2} \cdots \alpha_{n-1}} = 0$ by Lemma 3.6(3). Clearly, if $l = 1$ then $A_2(l, i) = A_1(l, i)$. For $l > 1$, let $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{l-1} \in \mathbb{k}$ be defined by

$$\theta_1 = \frac{1}{\alpha_{l-1}}, \theta_2 = \frac{1+\theta_1 \gamma_{n-2}}{\alpha_{l-2}}, \theta_3 = \frac{1+\theta_2 \gamma_{n-3}}{\alpha_{l-3}}, \dots, \theta_{l-1} = \frac{1+\theta_{l-2} \gamma_{n-l+1}}{\alpha_1},$$

and define a matrix $P_2 \in M_{2n}(\mathbb{k})$ by

$$P_2 := P_{n+l-1, n-1}(-\theta_1) P_{n+l-2, n-2}(-\theta_2) \cdots P_{n+1, n-l+1}(-\theta_{l-1}).$$

Then P_2 is an invertible matrix and $P_2^{-1} A_1(l, i) P_2 = A_2(l, i)$. Thus, in any case, $A(l, i)$ is similar to $A_2(l, i)$. Now let $P_3 := P_{n-l+1, n+1} P_{n-l+2, n+2} \cdots P_{n, n+l} \in M_{2n}(\mathbb{k})$. Then P_3 is an invertible matrix and $P_3^{-1} A_2(l, i) P_3 = \begin{pmatrix} T_1 & 0 \\ 0 & T_2 \end{pmatrix}$, where T_1 and T_2 are strictly lower triangular matrices in $M_n(\mathbb{k})$. It follows that $A(l, i)^n = 0$.

Clearly, $B(l, i)^n = I_{2n}$, and hence $A(l, i)^n = B(l, i)^n - I_{2n}$. It is easy to check that $B(l, i)^{mn} = C(l, i)^{mn} = I_{2n}$, $D^n = 0$, $A(l, i)B(l, i) = qB(l, i)A(l, i)$, $DC(l, i) = \xi C(l, i)D$, $B(l, i)C(l, i) = C(l, i)B(l, i)$ and $B(l, i)D = qDB(l, i)$. Moreover, one can check that $A(l, i)D - DA(l, i) = B(l, i) - C(l, i)^m$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & A(l, i)C(l, i) \\ &= \xi^{-1} C(l, i)A(l, i) + \frac{1}{(n-1)!_q} (\xi^{-1} - \xi^{n-1}) (C(l, i)^{m+1} - qB(l, i)C(l, i)) D^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the proposition follows. \square

Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then there is a \mathbb{k} -basis $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ in $P(l, i)$ such that the $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -action is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
av_k &= \begin{cases} \gamma_k(l, i)v_{k+1}, & 1 \leq k \leq n-l-1, \\ \gamma_k(l, i)v_{k+1} + u_{k-n+l+1}, & n-l \leq k \leq n-1, \\ \gamma_n(l, i)v_1 + u_{l+1}, & k = n, \end{cases} \\
au_k &= \begin{cases} \alpha_k(l, i)u_{k+1}, & 1 \leq k \leq n-1, \\ \alpha_n(l, i)u_1, & k = n, \end{cases} \\
bv_k &= q^{i+n-k}v_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \quad cv_k = \xi^{i-(n-l)+k-1}v_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n \\
bu_k &= q^{i+l-k}u_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \quad cu_k = \xi^{i+k-1}u_k, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n, \\
dv_k &= \begin{cases} 0, & k = 1, \\ v_{k-1}, & 2 \leq k \leq n, \end{cases} \quad du_k = \begin{cases} 0, & k = 1, \\ u_{k-1}, & 2 \leq k \leq n. \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

Such a basis is called a standard basis of $P(l, i)$. Clearly, $P(l, i)^d = \mathbb{k}v_1 + \mathbb{k}u_1$.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $P(l, i) \cong P(M(l, i))$.*

Proof. Using the standard basis of $P(l, i)$ given above, and putting

$$M := \langle u_1 \rangle = \text{span}\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_l\}.$$

Then it is easy to see that M is a submodule of $P(l, i)$ and $M \cong M(l, i)$. Let N be a simple submodule of $P(l, i)$. Then $\dim(N^d) = 1$ by Corollary 3.4. Let $0 \neq z \in N^d$. Then $z = \beta_1 v_1 + \beta_2 u_1$ by $N^d \subseteq P(l, i)^d$, where $\beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{k}$. If $\beta_1 \neq 0$, then $bz - q^{i+l-1}z = (q^{i-1} - q^{i+l-1})\beta_1 v_1$. Hence $v_1 \in N$ and so $a^{n-l}v_1 = \gamma_1(l, i)\gamma_2(l, i) \cdots \gamma_{n-l-1}(l, i)u_1 \in N$. Thus, $v_1, u_1 \in N$ and $\dim N^d = 2$, a contradiction. Hence $\beta_1 = 0, \beta_2 \neq 0$ and $u_1 = \beta_2^{-1}z \in N$. This implies $M = \langle u_1 \rangle \subseteq N$, and so $N = M$ since M and N are both simple. Thus, $\text{soc}P(l, i) = M \cong M(l, i)$. Hence $P(l, i)$ is isomorphic to a submodule of $P(M(l, i))$ by $P(M(l, i)) \cong I(M(l, i))$. Hence $\dim((P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i))^d) = 2$, and so $l(\text{soc}(P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i))) \leq 2$ by Corollary 3.4. Let \bar{v} denote the image of $v \in P(l, i)$ under the canonical epimorphism $P(l, i) \rightarrow P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i)$. Then one can see that $M_1 := \text{span}\{\bar{v}_1, \bar{v}_2, \dots, \bar{v}_{n-l}\}$ and $M_2 := \text{span}\{\bar{u}_{l+1}, \bar{u}_{l+2}, \dots, \bar{u}_n\}$ are submodules of $P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i)$. By Lemma 3.6(4,6,7), one can check that $M_1 \cong M(n-l, i+l-n)$ and $M_2 \cong M(n-l, i+l)$. It follows that $\text{soc}(P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i)) = M_1 \oplus M_2$, and consequently, $\text{soc}^2 P(l, i) = \text{span}\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n-l}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$. Then by Lemma 3.6(5), one gets that $P(l, i)/\text{soc}^2 P(l, i) \cong M(l, i)$. Thus, $\text{rl}(P(l, i)) = 3$ and $l(P(l, i)) = 4$. Then by Lemma 3.5(2), $P(l, i) \cong P(M(l, i))$. \square

Corollary 3.9. *A representative set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable projective $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules is given by*

$$\{P(l, i), Z(\lambda_{i'j'}) \mid 1 \leq l \leq n-1, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}, (i', j') \in I_0\}.$$

Proof. It follows from Proposition 3.3, Lemma 3.5(1) and Proposition 3.8. \square

Corollary 3.10. *Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $P(l, i)$ is both a projective cover of $M(l, i)$ and an injective envelope of $M(l, i)$.*

Proof. It follows from the proof of Proposition 3.8. \square

By Proposition 3.8 and its proof, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.11. *If P is a non-simple indecomposable projective $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module, then $\text{rad}P = \text{soc}^2P$ and $\text{rad}^2P = \text{soc}P$.*

Let $\{v_1, \dots, v_n, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ be the standard basis of $P(l, i)$. By the proof of Proposition 3.8, $\{v_1, \dots, v_{n-l}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$ is a basis of $\text{rad}P(l, i) = \text{soc}^2P(l, i)$. Such a basis is called a standard basis of $\text{rad}P(l, i)$ for later use. By Proposition 3.3, Lemma 3.5, Proposition 3.8, and [4, Lemma 3.5], one gets the following lemma.

Lemma 3.12. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module. If $\text{rl}(M) = 1$, then either $M \cong M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l < n$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$, or $M \cong Z(\lambda_{i'j'})$ for some $(i', j') \in I_0$. If $\text{rl}(M) = 3$, then $M \cong P(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l < n$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$.*

By Proposition 3.9, $\mathcal{P} = \{P(l, i), Z(\lambda_{i'j'}) \mid 1 \leq l \leq n-1, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}, (i', j') \in I_0\}$ is a complete set of non-isomorphic indecomposable projective $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules. Let $\mathcal{P}_{l,i} = \{P(l, i+kn), P(n-l, i+l+kn) \mid 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ and $Q_{i',j'} = \{Z(\lambda_{i'j'})\}$, where $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $(i', j') \in I_0$. Then $\mathcal{P}_{l,i} = \mathcal{P}_{l,i+n}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{l,i} = \mathcal{P}_{n-l,i+l}$ for all $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus, by Proposition 3.3, Corollary 3.9 and the proof of Proposition 3.8, one gets the block partition of indecomposable projective $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules below.

Corollary 3.13. (1) *If n is odd then $\mathcal{P} = (\cup_{1 \leq l \leq \frac{n-1}{2}, 0 \leq i \leq n-1} \mathcal{P}_{l,i}) \cup (\cup_{(i,j) \in I_0} Q_{i,j})$ is the block partition of indecomposable projective $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules.*
 (2) *If n is even then $\mathcal{P} = (\cup_{1 \leq l \leq \frac{n-2}{2}, 0 \leq i \leq n-1} \mathcal{P}_{l,i}) \cup (\cup_{0 \leq i \leq \frac{n-2}{2}} \mathcal{P}_{\frac{n}{2},i}) \cup (\cup_{(i,j) \in I_0} Q_{i,j})$ is the block partition of indecomposable projective $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules.*

4. Indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules with Loewy length 2

In this section, we investigate the non-simple non-projective indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules. Such indecomposable modules have Loewy length 2.

Proposition 4.1. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module with $\text{rl}(M) = 2$. Then there are integers $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that $\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k M(l, i+kn)$ and $I(M) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k P(l, i+kn)$ for some $s_k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$.*

Proof. Since M is an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module with $\text{rl}(M) = 2$, it follows from Corollary 3.13 that there are integers $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that M is an indecomposable module over the block $\mathcal{P}_{l,i}$ of $H_{mn}(\xi)$. Since $H_{mn}(\xi)$ is symmetric, $I(M)$ is projective. Hence $I(M) = P_1 \oplus P_2$, where $P_1 \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k P(l, i+kn)$ and $P_2 \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k P(n-l, i+l+kn)$ for some $s_k, t_k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. Regarding $M \subseteq I(M)$, and putting $M_1 = M \cap P_1$ and $M_2 = M \cap P_2$. Since $I(M)$ is an injective envelope of M , $\text{soc}M = \text{soc}I(M) = \text{soc}P_1 \oplus \text{soc}P_2$. Hence $\text{soc}M \subseteq M_1 \oplus M_2$. Since $\text{rl}(M) = 2$, $M/\text{soc}M$ is a semisimple submodule of $I(M)/\text{soc}I(M)$, and so $M/\text{soc}M \subseteq \text{soc}(I(M)/\text{soc}I(M)) = \text{soc}^2I(M)/\text{soc}I(M)$. By Corollary 3.11, $\text{soc}I(M) = \text{rad}^2I(M) = \text{rad}^2P_1 \oplus \text{rad}^2P_2$ and $\text{soc}^2I(M) = \text{rad}I(M) = \text{rad}P_1 \oplus \text{rad}P_2$. Hence $M \subseteq \text{rad}I(M)$. Let $\pi : I(M) \rightarrow I(M)/\text{soc}I(M)$

be the canonical epimorphism. Then $I(M)/\text{soc}I(M) = I(M)/\text{rad}^2I(M) = \pi(P_1) \oplus \pi(P_2)$ and $M/\text{soc}M \subseteq \text{rad}I(M)/\text{rad}^2I(M) = \pi(\text{rad}P_1) \oplus \pi(\text{rad}P_2)$. By the proof of Proposition 3.8, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(\text{rad}P_1) &= (\text{rad}P_1 + \text{rad}^2I(M))/\text{rad}^2(I(M)) \\ &\cong \text{rad}P_1/\text{rad}^2P_1 \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (s_k + s_{k+1})M(n-l, i+l+kn), \\ \pi(\text{rad}P_2) &= (\text{rad}P_2 + \text{rad}^2I(M))/\text{rad}^2(I(M)) \\ &\cong \text{rad}P_2/\text{rad}^2P_2 \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (t_{k-1} + t_k)M(l, i+kn), \end{aligned}$$

where $s_m = s_0$ and $t_{-1} = t_{m-1}$. By Proposition 3.2(3), for any simple submodule X of $M/\text{soc}M$, either $X \subseteq \pi(\text{rad}P_1)$ or $X \subseteq \pi(\text{rad}P_2)$. If $X \subseteq \pi(\text{rad}P_1)$ then $\pi^{-1}(X) \subseteq M \cap (\text{rad}P_1 + \text{rad}^2I(M)) = M \cap (\text{rad}P_1 \oplus \text{rad}^2P_2) = (M \cap \text{rad}P_1) \oplus \text{rad}^2P_2 \subseteq M_1 \oplus M_2$. Similarly, if $X \subseteq \pi(\text{rad}P_2)$ then $\pi^{-1}(X) \subseteq M_1 \oplus M_2$. It follows that $M \subseteq M_1 \oplus M_2$, and so $M = M_1 \oplus M_2$. However, M is indecomposable, we have $M_1 = 0$ or $M_2 = 0$, and consequently $P_1 = 0$ or $P_2 = 0$. Thus either $I(M) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k P(l, i+kn)$ and $\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k M(l, i+kn)$, or $I(M) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k P(n-l, i+l+kn)$ and $\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k M(n-l, i+l+kn)$. This completes the proof. \square

Recall the syzygy functor Ω and the cosyzygy functor Ω^{-1} . Let M be an $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module. Choose a fixed projective cover $f : P(M) \rightarrow M$ and define the syzygy ΩM to be $\text{Ker}f$, called the syzygy of M . Choose an injective envelope $f : M \rightarrow I(M)$ and define the cosyzygy $\Omega^{-1}M$ to be $\text{Coker}f$. If M has no nonzero projective (injective) direct summands, then neither do ΩM and $\Omega^{-1}M$, and $\Omega\Omega^{-1}M \cong M \cong \Omega^{-1}\Omega M$. Moreover, M is indecomposable if and only if ΩM is indecomposable. If N is also an $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module without nonzero projective (injective) direct summands, then $M \cong N$ if and only if $\Omega M \cong \Omega N$, cf. [1, p.126].

Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module with $\text{rl}(M) = 2$. By [4, Lemma 3.7], $\text{soc}M = \text{rad}M$. If $l(\text{soc}M) = t$ and $l(M/\text{soc}M) = s$, then we say that M is of (s, t) -type (cf. [4]).

Lemma 4.2. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module with $\text{rl}(M) = 2$.*

- (1) M is of $(1, 2)$ -type $\Leftrightarrow M \cong \Omega^{-1}M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$.
- (2) M is of $(2, 1)$ -type $\Leftrightarrow M \cong \Omega M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$.

Proof. (1) By Corollary 3.10 and the proof of Proposition 3.8, if $M \cong \Omega^{-1}M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$, then M is of $(1, 2)$ -type. Conversely, let M is of $(1, 2)$ -type. Then $M/\text{rad}M = M/\text{soc}M \cong M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$. It follows from Corollary 3.10 that there is an $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module epimorphism $f : P(l, i) \rightarrow M$. Since $l(M) = 3$ and $l(P(l, i)) = 4$, $l(\text{Ker}f) = 1$. Hence $\text{Ker}f = \text{soc}P(l, i) \cong M(l, i)$, and so $M \cong P(l, i)/\text{Ker}f = P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i) \cong \Omega^{-1}M(l, i)$ by Corollary 3.10.

(2) It is similar to (1) or dual to (1). \square

Lemma 4.3. *Let M be of (s, t) -type.*

- (1) $s \leq 2t$ and $t \leq 2s$.
- (2) If $s \neq 1$, then $t < 2s$ and ΩM is of $(2s-t, s)$ -type.
- (3) If $t \neq 1$, then $s < 2t$ and $\Omega^{-1}M$ is of $(t, 2t-s)$ -type.

(4) If $s = t$, then both ΩM and $\Omega^{-1}M$ are of (t, t) -type.

Proof. By Proposition 4.1, there are integers $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that $\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k M(l, i+kn)$ and $I(M) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k P(l, i+kn)$ for some $t_k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. Moreover, $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k = t$.

(1) By the proof of Proposition 4.1, $M/\text{soc}M \subseteq \text{rad}I(M)/\text{rad}^2I(M)$ and

$$\text{rad}I(M)/\text{rad}^2I(M) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (t_k + t_{k+1})M(n-l, i+l+kn),$$

where $t_m = t_0$. Hence $s = l(M/\text{soc}M) \leq l(\text{rad}I(M)/\text{rad}^2I(M)) = 2t$. Furthermore, we have $M/\text{rad}M = M/\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k M(n-l, i+l+kn)$ for some $s_k \in \mathbb{N}$, $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, with $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k = s$. Hence $P = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k P(n-l, i+l+kn)$ is a projective cover of M . Thus, there is an epimorphism $f : \text{rad}P \rightarrow \text{rad}M$. Since $\text{rad}M = \text{soc}M$ is semisimple, $\text{rad}^2P \subseteq \text{Ker}f$, and hence $l(\text{soc}M) \leq l(\text{rad}P/\text{rad}^2P) = 2s$, and so $t \leq 2s$.

(2) Assume $s \neq 1$. By the proof of (1), $f : P \rightarrow M$ is a projective cover with $\text{soc}P = \text{rad}^2P \subseteq \text{Ker}f$. Hence f induces an epimorphism $\bar{f} : P/\text{rad}^2P \rightarrow M$. If $t = 2s$, then $l(M) = 3s = l(P/\text{soc}P)$, and hence \bar{f} is an isomorphism. However, P/rad^2P is not indecomposable by $s > 1$, a contradiction. Therefore, $t < 2s$. Meanwhile, $\Omega M \cong \text{Ker}f \subseteq \text{rad}P$, $\text{soc}P = \text{rad}^2P \subset \text{Ker}f$ and $\text{rad}^2P \neq \text{Ker}f$. It follows that $\text{rl}(\Omega M) = 2$ and $l(\text{soc}(\Omega M)) = l(\text{soc}P) = s$. But $l(\Omega M) = l(P) - l(M) = 3s - t$ and so $l(\Omega M/\text{soc}(\Omega M)) = 2s - t$. That is, ΩM is of $(2s - t, s)$ -type.

(3) It is dual to (2).

(4) It is clear. □

Corollary 4.4. *Let M be of (s, t) -type with $\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k M(l, i+kn)$ for some integers $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $t_k \geq 0$.*

(1) $M/\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k M(n-l, i+l+kn)$ for some integers $s_k \geq 0$.

(2) $\text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(M, \text{soc}M) = \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(M/\text{soc}M, \text{soc}M) = 0$.

Proof. (1) follows from the proof of Proposition 4.1. Since $\text{rad}M = \text{soc}M$ and $\text{soc}M$ is semisimple, it follows from (1) and Lemma 3.2(3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(M, \text{soc}M) &= \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(M/\text{soc}M, \text{soc}M) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(\bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k M(n-l, i+l+kn), \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k M(l, i+kn)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This shows (2). □

Proposition 4.5. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module of (s, t) -type.*

(1) If $s < t$, then $t = s + 1$ and $M \cong \Omega^{-s}M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$.

(2) If $s > t$, then $s = t + 1$ and $M \cong \Omega^t M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$.

Proof. (1) If $1 = s < t$, then $t = 2$ by Lemma 4.3(1) and $M \cong \Omega^{-1}M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$ by Lemma 4.2. Now assume $1 < s < t$. Then $t < 2s$ by Lemma 4.3. Set $r = t - s$, then $1 \leq r < s$. We know that there is a unique positive

integer l' such that $l'r < s \leq (l'+1)r$. We claim that $\Omega^i M$ is of $(s-ir, s-(i-1)r)$ -type for all $1 \leq i \leq l'$. In fact, ΩM is of $(s-r, s)$ -type by Lemma 4.3(2). Now let $1 \leq i < l'$ and assume $\Omega^i M$ is of $(s-ir, s-(i-1)r)$ -type. Then $s-ir > s-l'r \geq 1$ and $\Omega^{i+1} M$ is of $(s-(i+1)r, s-ir)$ -type again by Lemma 4.3(2). Thus we have proved the claim. In particular, $\Omega^{l'} M$ is of $(s-l'r, s-(l'-1)r)$ -type. If $s-l'r > 1$, then $s-(l'-1)r < 2(s-l'r)$ by Lemma 4.3(2), which forces $(l'+1)r < s$, a contradiction. Hence $s-l'r = 1$ and so $r = 1$. It follows that $t = s+1$, $s = l'+1$, and $\Omega^{l'} M$ is of $(1, 2)$ -type. Thus, by Lemma 4.2, $\Omega^{s-1} M \cong \Omega^{-1} M(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$, and so $M \cong \Omega^{-s} M(l, i)$.

(2) It is similar to (1) or dual to (1). \square

Corollary 4.6. *Let M be the indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module with $rl(M) = 2$. Then either M is of (s, s) -type or M is isomorphic to $\Omega^{\pm s} M(l, i)$ for some integers $s \geq 1$ and $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 4.5. \square

Lemma 4.7. *For any $1 \leq l < n$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}$, we have following Auslander-Reiten sequences in $\text{mod} H_{mn}(\xi)$:*

- (1) $0 \rightarrow \Omega M(l, i) \rightarrow M(n-l, i+l) \oplus M(n-l, i+l-n) \oplus P(l, i) \rightarrow \Omega^{-1} M(l, i) \rightarrow 0$;
- (2) $0 \rightarrow \Omega^{t+2} M(l, i) \rightarrow \Omega^{t+1} M(n-l, i+l) \oplus \Omega^{t+1} M(n-l, i+l-n) \rightarrow \Omega^t M(l, i) \rightarrow 0$;
- (3) $0 \rightarrow \Omega^{-t} M(l, i) \rightarrow \Omega^{-(t+1)} M(n-l, i+l) \oplus \Omega^{-(t+1)} M(n-l, i+l-n) \rightarrow \Omega^{-(t+2)} M(l, i) \rightarrow 0$,

where $t \geq 0$ and $\Omega^0 M(l, i) = M(l, i)$.

Proof. It is similar to [4, Theorem 3.17]. \square

In what follows, we investigate the indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules of (t, t) -type.

Lemma 4.8. *Let M be an indecomposable modules of (t, t) -type with $t \geq 2$. Then M contains no submodules of $(s+1, s)$ -type. Consequently, M contains no submodules N with $l(N/\text{soc}N) > l(\text{soc}N)$.*

Proof. We first show the result for $s = 1$. By Proposition 4.1, we may assume $\text{soc}M \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k M(l, i+kn)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $0 \leq i \leq n-1$ and $t_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k = t$. If M contains a submodule N of $(2, 1)$ -type, then $N \cong \Omega M(l, i+kn) \cong \text{rad}P(l, i+kn)$ for some fixed k with $t_k > 0$ by Lemma 4.2 and $\text{soc}N \subset \text{soc}M$. Hence, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{rad}P(l, i+kn) \rightarrow M \rightarrow K \rightarrow 0$$

with $K \neq 0$ since $l(\text{rad}P(l, i+kn)) = 3 < l(M)$. By Corollary 4.4(2), we have $\text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(K, M(l, i+kn)) = 0$. On the other hand, there is another short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{rad}P(l, i+kn) \rightarrow P(l, i+kn) \rightarrow M(l, i+kn) \rightarrow 0,$$

form which one obtains a long exact sequence

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(K, \text{rad}P(l, i + kn)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(K, P(l, i + kn)) \\ &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(K, M(l, i + kn)) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}^1(K, \text{rad}P(l, i + kn)) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\text{Ext}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}^1(K, \text{rad}P(l, i + kn)) = 0$, which implies $M \cong \text{rad}P(l, i + kn) \oplus K$, a contradiction. This shows that M contains no submodules of $(2, 1)$ -type. Now suppose $1 < s < t$ and any indecomposable module of (t, t) -type contains no submodules of $(j + 1, j)$ -type for all $1 \leq j < s$. If M contains a submodule N of $(s + 1, s)$ -type, then $\text{soc}N \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k M(l, i + kn)$ for some $s_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $s_k \leq t_k$ and $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} s_k = s$. By Corollary 4.4(1), $N/\text{soc}N \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} s'_k M(n - l, i + l + kn)$ for some $s'_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} s'_k = s + 1$. Moreover, there is a short exact sequence.

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{\pi} M/N \rightarrow 0.$$

Let V be a simple submodule of M/N . Then $N \subset \pi^{-1}(V) \subseteq M$ and $\pi^{-1}(V)/N \cong V$. If V is not isomorphic to any submodule of $\text{soc}M$, then V is not isomorphic to any submodule of $\text{soc}(\pi^{-1}(V))$, and hence $\text{soc}(\pi^{-1}(V)) = \text{soc}N$. In this case, $l(\text{soc}(\pi^{-1}(V))) = s$ and $l(\pi^{-1}(V)/\text{soc}(\pi^{-1}(V))) = s + 2$. Thus, $\pi^{-1}(V)$ is decomposable by Lemma 3.12 and Corollary 4.6, and $\pi^{-1}(V)$ has at least one direct summand of $(j + 1, j)$ -type with $j < s$, which contradicts the induction hypothesis. This shows that V is isomorphic to a submodule of $\text{soc}M$. Then by Corollary 4.4, one can check that $V \subseteq \pi(\text{soc}M)$, $\text{soc}(M/N) = \pi(\text{soc}M) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} r_k M(l, i + kn)$ for some $r_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} r_k = t - s$ and $\text{soc}M \cong \text{soc}N \oplus \text{soc}(M/N)$. Hence $I(M) \cong I(N) \oplus I(M/N)$. Thus, any monomorphism $M \rightarrow I(N) \oplus I(M/N)$ is an envelope of M . Now by applying Ω^{-1} to the above exact sequence, one gets an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega^{-1}(N) \rightarrow \Omega^{-1}(M) \rightarrow \Omega^{-1}(M/N) \rightarrow 0.$$

This contradicts the induction hypothesis since $\Omega^{-1}(M)$ is of (t, t) -type and $\Omega^{-1}(N)$ is of $(s, s - 1)$ -type by Lemma 4.3(3). Therefore, M contains no submodule of $(s + 1, s)$ -type. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.9. *Assume that M be an indecomposable modules of (t, t) -type. Let L and N be submodules of M . If $l(L/\text{soc}L) = l(\text{soc}L)$ and $l(N/\text{soc}N) = l(\text{soc}N)$, then $l((L \cap N)/\text{soc}(L \cap N)) = l(\text{soc}(L \cap N))$.*

Proof. Suppose $l(L/\text{soc}L) = l(\text{soc}L)$ and $l(N/\text{soc}N) = l(\text{soc}N)$. For any submodule X of M , we have $[X] = [X/\text{soc}X] + [\text{soc}X]$ in $G_0(H_{mn}(\xi))$. Moreover, $X/\text{soc}X \cong (X + \text{soc}M)/\text{soc}M \subseteq M/\text{soc}M$ and $\text{soc}X \subseteq \text{soc}M$. Since $[L + N] = [L] + [N] - [L \cap N]$ in $G_0(H_{mn}(\xi))$, it follows from Corollary 4.4(2) that

$$\begin{aligned} [(L + N)/\text{soc}(L + N)] &= [L/\text{soc}L] + [N/\text{soc}N] - [(L \cap N)/\text{soc}(L \cap N)], \\ [\text{soc}(L + N)] &= [\text{soc}L] + [\text{soc}N] - [\text{soc}(L \cap N)] \end{aligned}$$

in $G_0(H_{mn}(\xi))$. Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} l((L + N)/\text{soc}(L + N)) &= l(L/\text{soc}L) + l(N/\text{soc}N) - l((L \cap N)/\text{soc}(L \cap N)), \\ l(\text{soc}(L + N)) &= l(\text{soc}L) + l(\text{soc}N) - l(\text{soc}(L \cap N)). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.8, $l((L + N)/\text{soc}(L + N)) \leq l(\text{soc}(L + N))$ and $l((L \cap N)/\text{soc}(L \cap N)) \leq l(\text{soc}(L \cap N))$. This forces $l((L \cap N)/\text{soc}(L \cap N)) = l(\text{soc}(L \cap N))$. \square

For any positive integer i, j . Let $T_{i,j} \in M_{i \times j}(\mathbb{k})$ be given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Clearly, $T_{s,s} = D_s^{s-1}$ for any integer $s \geq 1$. In particular, $T_{n,n} = D_n^{n-1}$. For any $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, define $A_l(i)$ in $M_l(\mathbb{k})$ by

$$A_l(i) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \alpha_1(l, i) & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2(l, i) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \alpha_{l-1}(l, i) & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha_k(l, i)$ is defined in the last section. By Lemma 3.6(2), $\alpha_k(l, i) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq k \leq l-1$.

Lemma 4.10. (1) *For any $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, there is a unique algebra morphism $\phi: H_{mn}(\xi) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{k})$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(a) &= Z_{l,i}, \quad \phi(b) = \text{diag}\{q^{i+l-1}, q^{i+l-2}, \dots, q^{i+l-n}\}, \\ \phi(c) &= \text{diag}\{\xi^i, \xi^{i+1}, \dots, \xi^{i+n-1}\}, \quad \phi(d) = D_n, \end{aligned}$$

where $Z_{l,i}$ and D_n are given in Section 3. Denote by $T_1(l, i)$ the corresponding left $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module. Then $T_1(l, i)$ is of $(1, 1)$ -type, $\text{soc}T_1(l, i) \cong M(l, i)$ and $T_1(l, i)/\text{soc}T_1(l, i) \cong M(n-l, i+l)$.

(2) *For any $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, there is a unique algebra morphism $\phi: H_{mn}(\xi) \rightarrow M_n(\mathbb{k})$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(a) &= \begin{pmatrix} A_{n-l}(i+l-n) & 0 \\ T_{l, n-l} & A_l(i) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi(d) = \begin{pmatrix} D_{n-l} & 0 \\ 0 & D_l \end{pmatrix}, \\ \phi(b) &= \text{diag}\{q^{i-1}, q^{i-2}, \dots, q^{i-n}\}, \quad \phi(c) = \text{diag}\{\xi^{i+l-n}, \xi^{i+l-n+1}, \dots, \xi^{i+l-n+n-1}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote by $\bar{T}_1(l, i)$ the corresponding left $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module. Then $\bar{T}_1(l, i)$ is of $(1, 1)$ -type, and $\text{soc}\bar{T}_1(l, i) \cong M(l, i)$ and $\bar{T}_1(l, i)/\text{soc}\bar{T}_1(l, i) \cong M(n-l, i+l-n)$.

Proof. It follows from a straightforward computation. □

Obviously, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.11. *Let $1 \leq l, l' \leq n-1$ and $i, i' \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

- (1) $T_1(l, i) \not\cong \bar{T}_1(l', i')$.
- (2) $T_1(l, i) \cong \bar{T}_1(l', i')$ if and only if $l = l'$ and $i \equiv i' \pmod{mn}$.
- (3) $\bar{T}_1(l, i) \cong \bar{T}_1(l', i')$ if and only if $l = l'$ and $i \equiv i' \pmod{mn}$.

Proposition 4.12. *Let M be of $(1, 1)$ -type. Then there are $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $M \cong T_1(l, i)$ or $M \cong \bar{T}_1(l, i)$.*

Proof. Since M is of $(1, 1)$ -type, there are $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\text{soc}M \cong M(l, i)$. Hence $P(l, i)$ is an injective envelope of M . We may assume that M is a submodule of $P(l, i)$. Then $\text{soc}M = \text{soc}P(l, i)$, $M/\text{soc}M \subset \text{soc}^2P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i)$ and $M \subset \text{soc}^2P(l, i)$. Let $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n$ be the standard basis of $P(l, i)$. Then by the proof of Proposition 3.8, $\text{soc}P(l, i) = \text{span}\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_l\} \cong M(l, i)$ and $\text{soc}^2P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i) = M_1 \oplus M_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &:= \text{span}\{v_j + \text{soc}P(l, i) \mid 1 \leq j \leq n-l\} \cong M(n-l, i+l-n), \\ M_2 &:= \text{span}\{u_j + \text{soc}P(l, i) \mid l+1 \leq j \leq n\} \cong M(n-l, i+l). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2, M_1 and M_2 are simple submodules of $\text{soc}^2P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i)$ and $M_1 \not\cong M_2$. Since $M/\text{soc}M$ is a simple submodule of $\text{soc}^2P(l, i)/\text{soc}P(l, i)$, $M/\text{soc}M = M_1$ or $M/\text{soc}M = M_2$.

If $M/\text{soc}M = M_1$, then $M = \text{span}\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{n-l}, u_1, u_2, \dots, u_l\}$. In this case, by Lemma 3.6(6,7), one can check that $M \cong \overline{T}_1(l, i)$. If $M/\text{soc}M = M_2$, then $M = \text{span}\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_n\}$. In this case, one can check that $M \cong T_1(l, i)$. \square

Remark 4.13. Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Proposition 4.12 and its proof, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{-1}T_1(l, i) &\cong T_1(n-l, i+l-n), & \Omega T_1(l, i) &\cong T_1(n-l, i+l), \\ \Omega^{-1}\overline{T}_1(l, i) &\cong \overline{T}_1(n-l, i+l), & \Omega \overline{T}_1(l, i) &\cong \overline{T}_1(n-l, i+l-n). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\Omega^2T_1(l, i) \cong T_1(l, i+n)$ and $\Omega^2\overline{T}_1(l, i) \cong \overline{T}_1(l, i-n)$. Moreover, one can check that $\text{End}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(T_1(l, i)) \cong \mathbb{k}$, $\text{End}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(\overline{T}_1(l, i)) \cong \mathbb{k}$ and

$$\text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(T_1(l, i), T_1(l, i+kn)) = 0, \quad \text{Hom}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(\overline{T}_1(l, i), \overline{T}_1(l, i+kn)) = 0,$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $m \nmid k$.

Lemma 4.14. Let M and N be nonzero indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules and assume there is an irreducible morphism $f : M \rightarrow N$. Then M is of (t, t) -type for some t if and only if N is of (s, s) -type for some s .

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3.12, Corollary 4.6, Lemma 4.7 and [1, Theorem V.5.3]. \square

Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $DTrT_1(l, i-n) \cong \Omega^2T_1(l, i-n) \cong T_1(l, i)$, one gets an Auslander-Reiten sequence (AR-sequence for short)

$$0 \rightarrow T_1(l, i) \rightarrow M \rightarrow T_1(l, i-n) \rightarrow 0.$$

If M has a nontrivial indecomposable direct summand N , then there is an irreducible morphism $f : T_1(l, i) \rightarrow N$. By Lemma 4.14 and $l(M) = 4$, N is of $(1, 1)$ -type. Any irreducible morphism is either a monomorphism or an epimorphism, but it is not an isomorphism. However, $l(T_1(l, i)) = l(N)$. It is absurd. Hence M is an indecomposable module of $(2, 2)$ -type. Denote M by $T_2(l, i)$. Thus, we have an AR-sequence

$$0 \rightarrow T_1(l, i) \xrightarrow{f_1} T_2(l, i) \xrightarrow{g_1} T_1(l, i-n) \rightarrow 0. \quad (1)$$

Clearly, $\text{soc}T_2(l, i) \cong M(l, i) \oplus M(l, i-n)$ and $T_2(l, i)/\text{soc}T_2(l, i) \cong M(n-l, i+l) \oplus M(n-l, i+l-n)$.

Lemma 4.15. $\text{Im}f_1$ is the only submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type contained in $T_2(l, i)$.

Proof. Let N be a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type of $T_2(l, i)$. Then by Lemma 4.9,

$$l((N \cap \text{Im}f_1)/\text{soc}(N \cap \text{Im}f_1)) = l(\text{soc}(N \cap \text{Im}f_1)).$$

Hence either $N \cap \text{Im}f_1 = 0$ or $N \cap \text{Im}f_1 = N$. If $N \cap \text{Im}f_1 = 0$, then $T_2(l, i) = N \oplus \text{Im}f_1$, a contradiction. Hence $N \cap \text{Im}f_1 = N$, and so $N = \text{Im}f_1$. \square

By applying Ω^2 to the sequence (1), one gets another AR-sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \Omega^2 T_1(l, i) \rightarrow \Omega^2 T_2(l, i) \rightarrow \Omega^2 T_1(l, i - n) \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence $\Omega^2 T_2(l, i) \cong T_2(l, i + n)$ by $\Omega^2 T_1(l, i) \cong T_1(l, i + n)$ and $\Omega^2 T_1(l, i - n) \cong T_1(l, i)$. By [1, Propositons V.1.12 and 5.3], there is a unique module $T_3(l, i)$ up to isomorphism such that there is an AR-sequence

$$0 \rightarrow T_2(l, i) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}} T_1(l, i - n) \oplus T_3(l, i) \xrightarrow{(f'_1, g_2)} T_2(l, i - n) \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma 4.16. $T_3(l, i)$ is an indecomposable module of $(3, 3)$ -type with $\text{soc}T_3(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^2 M(l, i - kn)$, $T_3(l, i)/\text{soc}T_3(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^2 M(n - l, i + l - kn)$ and $\Omega^2 T_3(l, i) \cong T_3(l, i + n)$. Moreover, $\text{Im}(f_2 f_1)$ and $\text{Im}f_2$ are only submodules of $(1, 1)$ -type and $(2, 2)$ -type, respectively, and $T_3(l, i)/\text{Im}(f_2 f_1) \cong T_2(l, i - n)$ and $T_3(l, i)/\text{Im}f_2 \cong T_1(l, i - 2n)$.

Proof. It is similar to [4, Lemma 4.10] by using Lemmas 4.9, 4.14 and 4.15. \square

Now suppose $t \geq 3$ and we have got indecomposable modules

$$T_1(l, i), T_2(l, i), \dots, T_t(l, i)$$

and AR-sequences

$$0 \rightarrow T_1(l, i) \xrightarrow{f_1} T_2(l, i) \xrightarrow{g_1} T_1(l, i - n) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow T_{s-1}(l, i) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_{s-2} \\ f_{s-1} \end{pmatrix}} T_{s-2}(l, i - n) \oplus T_s(l, i) \xrightarrow{(f'_{s-2}, g_{s-1})} T_{s-1}(l, i - n) \rightarrow 0$$

for all $3 \leq s \leq t$, where $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. They satisfy the following:

- (1) $T_s(l, i)$ is of (s, s) -type with $\text{soc}T_s(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{s-1} M(l, i - kn)$ and $T_s(l, i)/\text{soc}T_s(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{s-1} M(n - l, i + l - kn)$;
- (2) $\text{Im}(f_{s-1} \cdots f_j)$ is the only submodule of (j, j) -type of $T_s(l, i)$ and $T_s(l, i)/\text{Im}(f_{s-1} \cdots f_j) \cong T_{s-j}(l, i - jn)$ for all $1 \leq j < s$;
- (3) $\Omega^2 T_s(l, i) \cong T_s(l, i + n)$,

for all $1 \leq s \leq t$. Again by [1, Propositons V.1.12 and 5.3], there is a unique module $T_{t+1}(l, i)$ up to isomorphism such that there is an AR-sequence

$$0 \rightarrow T_t(l, i) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_{t-1} \\ f_t \end{pmatrix}} T_{t-1}(l, i - n) \oplus T_{t+1}(l, i) \xrightarrow{(f'_{t-1}, g_t)} T_t(l, i - n) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then similarly to Lemma 4.16, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 4.17. $T_{t+1}(l, i)$ is an indecomposable module of $(t+1, t+1)$ -type with $\text{soc}T_{t+1}(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^t M(l, i - kn)$, $T_{t+1}(l, i)/\text{soc}T_{t+1}(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^t M(n-l, i+l - kn)$ and $\Omega^2 T_{t+1}(l, i) \cong T_{t+1}(l, i+n)$. Moreover, $\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_j)$ is the unique submodule of (j, j) -type of $T_{t+1}(l, i)$ and $T_{t+1}(l, i)/\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_j) \cong T_{t+1-j}(l, i - jn)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t$.

Proof. It is similar to [4, Lemma 4.11] by using Corollary 4.4, Lemmas 4.8, 4.9 and 4.14. \square

Summarizing the discussion above, one gets the following theorem.

Theorem 4.18. For any $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $t \geq 1$, there is an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module $T_t(l, i)$ of (t, t) -type. We have following properties:

- (1) $\Omega^2 T_t(l, i) \cong T_t(l, i+n)$, $\text{soc}T_t(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{t-1} M(l, i - kn)$ and $T_t(l, i)/\text{soc}T_t(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{t-1} M(n-l, i+l - kn)$.
- (2) For any $1 \leq j < t$, $T_t(l, i)$ contains a unique submodule of (j, j) -type, which is isomorphic to $T_j(l, i)$ and the quotient module of $T_t(l, i)$ modulo the submodule of (j, j) -type is isomorphic to $T_{t-j}(l, i - jn)$.
- (3) For any $1 \leq j < t$, the unique submodule of (j, j) -type of $T_t(l, i)$ is contained in that of $(j+1, j+1)$ -type.
- (4) There are AR-sequences

$$0 \rightarrow T_1(l, i) \xrightarrow{f_1} T_2(l, i) \xrightarrow{g_1} T_1(l, i-n) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow T_t(l, i) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_{t-1} \\ f_t \end{pmatrix}} T_{t-1}(l, i-n) \oplus T_{t+1}(l, i) \xrightarrow{(f'_{t-1}, g_t)} T_t(l, i-n) \rightarrow 0 \quad (t \geq 2).$$

Starting from $\overline{T}_1(l, i)$, a similar discussion as above shows the following theorem.

Theorem 4.19. For any $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $t \geq 1$, there is an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module $\overline{T}_t(l, i)$ of (t, t) -type. We have following properties:

- (1) $\Omega^2 \overline{T}_t(l, i) \cong \overline{T}_t(l, i-n)$, $\text{soc}\overline{T}_t(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{t-1} M(l, i+kn)$ and $\overline{T}_t(l, i)/\text{soc}\overline{T}_t(l, i) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{t-1} M(n-l, i+l + (k-1)n)$.
- (2) For any $1 \leq j < t$, $\overline{T}_t(l, i)$ contains a unique submodule of (j, j) -type, which is isomorphic to $\overline{T}_j(l, i)$ and the quotient module of $\overline{T}_t(l, i)$ modulo the submodule of (j, j) -type is isomorphic to $\overline{T}_{t-j}(l, i+jn)$.
- (3) For any $1 \leq j < t$, the unique submodule of (j, j) -type of $\overline{T}_t(l, i)$ is contained in that of $(j+1, j+1)$ -type.
- (4) There are AR-sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \overline{T}_1(l, i) \xrightarrow{f_1} \overline{T}_2(l, i) \xrightarrow{g_1} \overline{T}_1(l, i+n) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow \overline{T}_t(l, i) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_{t-1} \\ f_t \end{pmatrix}} \overline{T}_{t-1}(l, i+n) \oplus \overline{T}_{t+1}(l, i) \xrightarrow{(f'_{t-1}, g_t)} \overline{T}_t(l, i+n) \rightarrow 0 \quad (t \geq 2).$$

Corollary 4.20. Let $1 \leq l, l' \leq n-1$ and $i, i', t, t' \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $t \geq 1$ and $t' \geq 1$.

- (1) $T_t(l, i) \not\cong \overline{T}_{t'}(l', i')$.

- (2) $T_t(l, i) \cong T_{t'}(l', i')$ if and only if $t = t'$, $l = l'$ and $i \equiv i' \pmod{mn}$.
(3) $\overline{T}_t(l, i) \cong \overline{T}_{t'}(l', i')$ if and only if $t = t'$, $l = l'$ and $i \equiv i' \pmod{mn}$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4.11, Theorems 4.18(2) and 4.19(2), $l(T_t(l, i)) = 2t$ and $l(\overline{T}_{t'}(l', i')) = 2t'$. \square

Proposition 4.21. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module of (t, t) -type. If M contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type, then $M \cong T_t(l, i)$ or $M \cong \overline{T}_t(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. If $t = 1$, it follows from Proposition 4.12. Now let $t > 1$ and assume that M contains a submodule N of $(1, 1)$ -type. Then by Proposition 4.12, $N \cong T_1(l, i)$ or $N \cong \overline{T}_1(l, i)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. If $N \cong T_1(l, i)$, then an argument similar to the proof of [4, Theorem 4.16] shows that $M \cong T_t(l, i)$. Similarly, if $N \cong \overline{T}_1(l, i)$ then $M \cong \overline{T}_t(l, i)$. \square

For any $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module M and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let $M_{(i)} := \{x \in M \mid cx = \xi^i x\}$.

Lemma 4.22. *Let M be an $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module.*

- (1) For any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$, $M_{(i)} = M_{(j)} \Leftrightarrow i \equiv j \pmod{mn}$, and hence $M = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}} M_{(i)}$ as vector spaces.
(2) $dM_{(i)} \subseteq M_{(i-1)}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and hence $M^d = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}} M^d \cap M_{(i)}$.
(3) If K and N are submodules of M such that $M = K \oplus N$, then $M_{(i)} = K_{(i)} \oplus N_{(i)}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.
(4) If $f : M \rightarrow N$ is an $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module map, then $f(M_{(i)}) \subseteq N_{(i)}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Furthermore, if f is surjective, then $f(M_{(i)}) = N_{(i)}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. It follows from a straightforward verification. \square

Let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $P = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} P(l, i+kn)$. For any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, let $\{v_1^k, v_2^k, \dots, v_n^k, u_1^k, u_2^k, \dots, u_n^k\}$ be a standard basis of $P(l, i+kn)$. Then $\{v_j^k, u_j^k \mid 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ is a basis of P . Let $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. For any $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, define $x_j^k \in P$ by $x_j^k = u_j^k$ if $1 \leq j \leq l$; $x_j^k = u_j^k + v_{j-l}^{k+1}$ if $l+1 \leq j \leq n$ and $0 \leq k < m-1$; $x_j^{m-1} = u_j^{m-1} + \eta v_{j-l}^0$ if $l+1 \leq j \leq n$ and $k = m-1$. Note that $q^{j+kn} = q^j$ for any $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$. By Lemma 3.6(4), a straightforward verification shows that

$$ax_j^k = \begin{cases} \alpha_j(l, i)x_{j+1}^k, & 1 \leq j < n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1, \\ \alpha_n(l, i)x_1^k + x_1^{k+1}, & j = n, 0 \leq k < m-1, \\ \alpha_n(l, i)x_1^{m-1} + \eta x_1^0, & j = n, k = m-1, \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

$$bx_j^k = q^{i+l-j}x_j^k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1, \quad (3)$$

$$cx_j^k = \xi^{i+kn+j-1}x_j^k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1, \quad (4)$$

$$dx_j^k = \begin{cases} 0, & j = 1, 0 \leq k \leq m-1, \\ x_{j-1}^k, & 1 < j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

This implies that $\text{span}\{x_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ is a submodule of P , denoted by $M_1(l, i, \eta)$. Clearly, $\{x_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ is a \mathbb{k} -basis of $M_1(l, i, \eta)$. A basis of $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ satisfying Eqs.(2)-(5) is called a standard basis.

Lemma 4.23. *Retain the above notations.*

- (1) $\text{rl}(M_1(l, i, \eta)) = 2$, $\text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M(l, i + kn)$ and $M_1(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M(n-l, i+l+kn)$.
- (2) $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ is an indecomposable module of (m, m) -type.
- (3) $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ does not contain any submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type.
- (4) $M_1(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_m(l', i')$ and $M_1(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_m(l', i')$ for any $1 \leq l' \leq n-1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$

Proof. (1) By the proof of Proposition 3.8, we have $M_1(l, i, \eta) \subseteq \text{rad}P$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta) &= \text{rad}M_1(l, i, \eta) = \text{soc}P \\ &= \text{span}\{x_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq l, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\} \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M(l, i + kn). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $M_1(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta) \subseteq P/\text{soc}P$. Let $\pi : P \rightarrow P/\text{soc}P$ be the canonical epimorphism. By Lemma 3.6(4,6), a straightforward verification shows that $\text{span}\{\pi(x_{l+1}^k), \dots, \pi(x_n^k)\}$ is a submodule of $M_1(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta)$ and isomorphic to $M(n-l, i+l+kn)$ for any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} M_1(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta) &= \text{span}\{\pi(x_j^k) | l+1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\} \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M(n-l, i+l+kn), \end{aligned}$$

and so $\text{rl}(M_1(l, i, \eta)) = 2$.

(2) Suppose $M_1(l, i, \eta) = N \oplus K$ for some submodules N and K of $M_1(l, i, \eta)$. Then by Lemma 4.22(3), $M_1(l, i, \eta)_{(j)} = N_{(j)} \oplus K_{(j)}$ for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is easy to check that for $1 \leq j, j' \leq n$ and $0 \leq k, k' \leq m-1$,

$$i + kn + j - 1 \equiv i + k'n + j' - 1 \pmod{mn} \Leftrightarrow j = j' \text{ and } k = k'.$$

Then by Eq.(4), $x_j^k \in M_1(l, i, \eta)_{(i+kn+j-1)}$ and $\dim(M_1(l, i, \eta)_{(i+kn+j-1)}) = 1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, and so $x_j^k \in N$ or $x_j^k \in K$. In particular, $x_n^0 \in N$ or $x_n^0 \in K$. Without losing generality, we may assume $x_n^0 \in N$. Then $ax_n^0 = \alpha_n(l, i)x_1^0 + x_1^1 \in N$, and $cax_n^0 = \alpha_n(l, i)cx_1^0 + cx_1^1 = \alpha_n(l, i)\xi^i x_1^0 + \xi^{i+n} x_1^1 \in N$. This implies that $x_1^0, x_1^1 \in N$. If $x_n^1 \in K$, then a similar argument shows that $x_1^1, x_1^2 \in K$, and so $x_1^1 \in N \cap K$, a contradiction. Therefore, $x_n^1 \in N$. Similarly, one can check that $x_n^2, \dots, x_n^{m-1} \in N$. However, $M_1(l, i, \eta) = \langle x_n^0, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^{m-1} \rangle$. Hence $N = M_1(l, i, \eta)$, and so $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ is indecomposable. Then by (1), $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ is of (m, m) -type.

(3) Suppose on the contrary that $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ contains a submodule N of $(1, 1)$ -type. Then by (1), $\pi(N)$ is a simple submodule of $M_1(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta)$, and hence $\pi(N) \cong M(n-l, i+l+kn)$ for some $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. This implies that $\pi(N) = \bigoplus_{j=l}^{n-1} \pi(N)_{(i+kn+j)}$ and $\dim(\pi(N)_{(i+kn+j)}) = 1$ for all $l \leq j \leq n-1$. By Lemma 4.22(4), $\pi(N)_{(i+kn+j)} = \pi(N_{(i+kn+j)})$, and hence $N_{(i+kn+n-1)} \neq 0$. By the proof of (2), $N_{(i+kn+n-1)} = M_1(l, i, \eta)_{(i+kn+n-1)}$ and so $x_n^k \in N$. Then similarly to (2), one gets $x_1^k, x_1^{k+1} \in N$, and hence $\langle x_1^k, x_1^{k+1} \rangle \subseteq N$, where $x_1^m = x_1^0$. However,

$\langle x_1^k, x_1^{k+1} \rangle \cong M(l, i + kn) \oplus M(l, i + (k + 1)n)$ and $l(\text{soc}N) = 1$, a contradiction. Therefore, $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ does not contain any submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type.

(4) It follows from (3) and Theorems 4.18(2) and 4.19(2). \square

Lemma 4.24. *Let $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$.*

- (1) $\Omega^{-1}M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(n - l, i + l - n, (-1)^m \eta)$
- (2) $\Omega^{-2}M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i - n, \eta)$ and $\Omega^2M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i + n, \eta)$.

Proof. With the notations above, $P = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} P(l, i + kn)$ is an injective envelope of $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ and $M_1(l, i, \eta) \subseteq P$. For any $x \in P$, let \bar{x} denote the image of x under the canonical epimorphism $P \rightarrow P/M_1(l, i, \eta)$. Then

$$\bar{u}_j^k = \begin{cases} \overline{-v_{j-l}^{k+1}}, & l + 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k < m - 1, \\ -\eta v_{j-l}^0, & l + 1 \leq j \leq n, k = m - 1. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Let $y_j^k = (-1)^k \overline{v_j^k}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $0 \leq k \leq m - 1$. Then $\{y_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1\}$ is a basis of $P/M_1(l, i, \eta)$. By Lemma 3.6(6,7) and Eq.(6), a straightforward verification shows that

$$ay_j^k = \begin{cases} \alpha_j(n - l, i + l - n)y_{j+1}^k, & 1 \leq j < n, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1, \\ \alpha_n(n - l, i + l - n)y_1^k + y_1^{k+1}, & j = n, 0 \leq k < m - 1, \\ \alpha_n(n - l, i + l - n)y_1^{m-1} + (-1)^m \eta y_1^0, & j = n, k = m - 1, \end{cases}$$

$$by_j^k = q^{i+l-n+(n-l)-j} y_j^k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1,$$

$$cy_j^k = \xi^{i+l-n+kn+j-1} y_j^k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1,$$

$$dy_j^k = \begin{cases} 0, & j = 1, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1, \\ y_{j-1}^k, & 1 < j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1. \end{cases}$$

It follows that $\Omega^{-1}M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong P/M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(n - l, i + l - n, (-1)^m \eta)$. This shows (1). (2) follows from (1). \square

Lemma 4.25. *Let $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. Then*

$$M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i + n, \eta).$$

Proof. Let $\{x_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1\}$ and $\{y_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m - 1\}$ be the standard bases of $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ and $M_1(l, i + n, \eta)$, respectively. Define a linear map $f : M_1(l, i + n, \eta) \rightarrow M_1(l, i, \eta)$ by

$$f(y_j^k) = \begin{cases} x_j^{k+1}, & 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k < m - 1, \\ \eta x_j^0, & 1 \leq j \leq n, k = m - 1. \end{cases}$$

Then f is a linear isomorphism. By a standard computation, one can check that

$$f(ay_j^k) = af(y_j^k), f(by_j^k) = bf(y_j^k), f(cy_j^k) = cf(y_j^k), f(dy_j^k) = df(y_j^k),$$

where $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $0 \leq k \leq m - 1$. Hence f is an $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module isomorphism. This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 4.26. *Let $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. Then*

$$\Omega^2 M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong \Omega^{-2} M_1(l, i, \eta).$$

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 4.24(2) and 4.25. \square

Proposition 4.27. *Let $1 \leq l, l' \leq n-1$, $i, i' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. Then*

$$M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l', i', \eta') \Leftrightarrow l = l', \eta = \eta' \text{ and } i \equiv i' \pmod{n}.$$

Proof. If $l = l'$, $\eta = \eta'$ and $i \equiv i' \pmod{n}$, then $M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l', i', \eta')$ by Lemma 4.25. Conversely, assume $M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l', i', \eta')$. Then $\text{soc}M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong \text{soc}M_1(l', i', \eta')$. By Lemma 4.23(1), $M(l, i) \cong M(l', i' + kn)$ for some $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. It follows from Lemma 3.2(2) that $l = l'$ and $mn|i - i' - kn$. This implies $n|i - i'$. Then by Lemma 4.25, $M_1(l', i', \eta') \cong M_1(l, i, \eta')$, and so $M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta')$. Let $f : M_1(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow M_1(l, i, \eta')$ be a module isomorphism. Let $\{x_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ and $\{y_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ be the standard bases of $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ and $M_1(l, i, \eta')$, respectively. Then by the proof of Lemma 4.23(2), $M_1(l, i, \eta)_{(i+kn+j-1)} = \mathbb{k}x_j^k$ and $M_1(l, i, \eta')_{(i+kn+j-1)} = \mathbb{k}y_j^k$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ and $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. Hence by Lemma 4.22(4), there are scalars $\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{m-1} \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ such that $f(x_n^k) = \beta_k y_n^k$ for all $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. For any $1 \leq j < n$ and $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, $f(d^{n-j}x_n^k) = d^{n-j}f(x_n^k)$, i.e. $f(x_j^k) = \beta_k y_j^k$. Then for $0 \leq k < m-1$, by $f(ax_n^k) = af(x_n^k)$, one gets that $\alpha_n(l, i)\beta_k y_1^k + \beta_{k+1} y_1^{k+1} = \alpha_n(l, i)\beta_k y_1^k + \beta_k y_1^{k+1}$, which implies $\beta_k = \beta_{k+1}$. Thus, $\beta_0 = \beta_1 = \dots = \beta_{m-1}$. Finally, from $f(ax_n^{m-1}) = af(x_n^{m-1})$, one gets $\eta = \eta'$. \square

Corollary 4.28. *Let $1 \leq l < n$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. Then*

$$\text{End}_{H_{mn}(\xi)}(M_1(l, i, \eta)) \cong \mathbb{k}.$$

Proof. It follows from the proof of Proposition 4.27. \square

Lemma 4.29. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module of (t, t) -type. Then either M contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type, or M contains a submodule isomorphic to $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ for some $1 \leq l < n$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$.*

Proof. If $t = 1$, the result is trivial. Now assume $t > 1$. Then by Proposition 4.1, $P = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k P(l, i + kn)$ is an envelope of M for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $t_k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k = t$. Hence we may assume $M \subseteq \text{soc}^2 P = \text{rad}P = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k \text{rad}P(l, i + kn)$. Then $\text{soc}M = \text{soc}P = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k \text{soc}P(l, i + kn)$.

For any $1 \leq s \leq t_k$, let $\{v_1^{k,s}, \dots, v_{n-l}^{k,s}, u_1^{k,s}, \dots, u_n^{k,s}\}$ be a standard basis of the s^{th} summand $\text{rad}P(l, i + kn)$ of $t_k \text{rad}P(l, i + kn)$. Then $\text{rad}P$ has a \mathbb{k} -basis

$$\{v_1^{k,s}, \dots, v_{n-l}^{k,s}, u_1^{k,s}, \dots, u_n^{k,s} | 0 \leq k \leq m-1, 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$$

and $\text{soc}M = \text{soc}P = \text{span}\{u_1^{k,s}, \dots, u_l^{k,s} | 0 \leq k \leq m-1, 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$. Let $V = \text{span}\{v_1^{k,s}, \dots, v_{n-l}^{k,s}, u_{l+1}^{k,s}, \dots, u_n^{k,s} | 0 \leq k \leq m-1, 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$ and $U = M \cap V$. Then as vector spaces, $\text{rad}P = V \oplus \text{soc}P$ and $M = U \oplus \text{soc}M$. For any $0 \leq j \leq l-1$ and $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, $(\text{rad}P)_{(i+j+kn)} = \text{span}\{u_{j+1}^{k,s} | 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$. For any $l \leq j \leq n-1$ and $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, $(\text{rad}P)_{(i+j+kn)} = \text{span}\{v_{j+1-l}^{k+1,s'}, u_{j+1}^{k,s} | 1 \leq s' \leq t_{k+1}, 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$, where we regard $t_m = t_0$ and $v_{j+1-l}^{k+1,s'} = v_{j+1-l}^{0,s'}$. Note that $\text{soc}P = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{l-1} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (\text{rad}P)_{(i+j+kn)}$ and $V = \bigoplus_{j=l}^{n-1} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (\text{rad}P)_{(i+j+kn)}$. Hence $\text{soc}M = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{l-1} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M_{(i+j+kn)}$ and $U = \bigoplus_{j=l}^{n-1} \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M_{(i+j+kn)}$. Moreover, $M_{(i+j+kn)} =$

$(\text{rad}P)_{(i+j+kn)}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq l-1$ and $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. For any $0 \leq j \leq n-1$, let $P_{[j]} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (\text{rad}P)_{(i+j+kn)}$ and $M_{[j]} = M \cap P_{[j]}$. Then $\text{rad}P = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{n-1} P_{[j]}$, $M_{[j]} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M_{(i+j+kn)}$ and $M = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{n-1} M_{[j]}$. Moreover, $M_{[j]} = P_{[j]}$ for all $0 \leq j \leq l-1$, $\text{soc}M = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{l-1} M_{[j]}$ and $U = \bigoplus_{j=l}^{n-1} M_{[j]}$. By the structure of $\text{rad}P$, the maps $M_{[j]} \rightarrow M_{[j-1]}, x \mapsto dx$ and $M_{[j-1]} \rightarrow M_{[j]}, x \mapsto ax$ are both bijective for any $0 < j \leq n-1$ with $j \neq l$. Moreover, $dM_{[0]} = 0$, $dM_{[l]} \subseteq M_{[l-1]}$, $aM_{[l-1]} = 0$ and $aM_{[n-1]} \subseteq M_{[0]}$. It follows that $\dim M_{[j]} = t$ for all $0 \leq j \leq n-1$.

If $M^d \cap M_{[l]} \neq 0$, then it follows from Lemma 4.22(2) and $M_{[l]} = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} M_{(i+l+kn)}$ that $M^d \cap M_{(i+l+kn)} \neq 0$ for some $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. Since $M_{(i+l+kn)} \subseteq (\text{rad}P)_{(i+l+kn)}$, it follows from the action of d on $\text{rad}P$ that $M^d \cap M_{(i+l+kn)} \subseteq \text{span}\{v_1^{k+1,s} | 1 \leq s \leq t_{k+1}\}$. Let $0 \neq x \in M^d \cap M_{(i+l+kn)}$. Then $x = \sum_{s=1}^{t_{k+1}} \beta_s v_1^{k+1,s}$ for some $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{t_{k+1}} \in \mathbb{k}$. Then by the proof of Proposition 4.12, one can see that the submodule $\langle x \rangle$ is isomorphic to $\overline{T}_1(l, i + (k+1)n)$, and hence M contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type.

Now assume $M^d \cap M_{[l]} = 0$. For any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, let $V_k^0 = \text{span}\{v_1^{k+1,s} | 1 \leq s \leq t_{k+1}\}$ and $V_k^1 = \text{span}\{u_{l+1}^{k,s} | 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$. Then $(\text{rad}P)_{(i+l+kn)} = V_k^0 \oplus V_k^1$ and $M_{(i+l+kn)} \cap V_k^0 = 0$. Note that $V_k^0 = 0$ if $t_{k+1} = 0$. Hence $V_k^0 \oplus M_{(i+l+kn)} \subseteq V_k^0 \oplus V_k^1$ and so $\dim M_{(i+l+kn)} \leq \dim V_k^1 = t_k$. However, $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \dim M_{(i+l+kn)} = \dim M_{[l]} = t = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} t_k$. It follows that $\dim M_{(i+l+kn)} = \dim V_k^1 = t_k$ and so $(\text{rad}P)_{(i+l+kn)} = V_k^0 \oplus V_k^1 = V_k^0 \oplus M_{(i+l+kn)}$ for all $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. If t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1} are not all nonzero, then we may assume $t_{k+1} = 0$ but $t_k \neq 0$ for some $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. In this case, $M_{(i+l+kn)} = V_k^1 = \text{span}\{u_{l+1}^{k,s} | 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$, and hence the submodule $\langle u_{l+1}^{k,1} \rangle$ of M is isomorphic to $T_1(l, i + kn)$ by the proof of Proposition 4.12. Thus, M contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type. From now on, assume that t_0, t_1, \dots, t_{m-1} are all nonzero. Then for any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, there exists a basis $\{x_{k,s} | 1 \leq s \leq t_k\}$ of $M_{(i+l+kn)}$ such that $x_{k,s} - u_{l+1}^{k,s} \in V_k^0$ for all $1 \leq s \leq t_k$. Firstly, suppose that $x_{k,1} - u_{l+1}^{k,1}, \dots, x_{k,t_k} - u_{l+1}^{k,t_k}$ are linearly dependent over \mathbb{k} for some $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. If $t_k = 1$ then $x_{k,1} - u_{l+1}^{k,1} = 0$. In this case, $u_{l+1}^{k,1} = x_{k,1} \in M$, and M contains a submodule $\langle u_{l+1}^{k,1} \rangle$ of $(1, 1)$ -type as above. If $t_k > 1$, then without losing generality, we may assume that $x_{k,t_k} - u_{l+1}^{k,t_k} = \sum_{j=1}^{t_k-1} \beta_j (x_{k,j} - u_{l+1}^{k,j})$ for some $\beta_j \in \mathbb{k}$. In this case, $u_{l+1}^{k,t_k} - \sum_{j=1}^{t_k-1} \beta_j u_{l+1}^{k,j} = x_{k,t_k} - \sum_{j=1}^{t_k-1} \beta_j x_{k,j} \in M$ and M contains a submodule $\langle u_{l+1}^{k,t_k} - \sum_{j=1}^{t_k-1} \beta_j u_{l+1}^{k,j} \rangle$ of $(1, 1)$ -type as above. Then suppose that $x_{k,1} - u_{l+1}^{k,1}, \dots, x_{k,t_k} - u_{l+1}^{k,t_k}$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{k} for all $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. Then $t_{k+1} = \dim V_k^0 \geq t_k$ for all $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. Hence $t_0 = t_m \geq t_{m-1} \geq \dots \geq t_1 \geq t_0$, and so $t_0 = t_1 = \dots = t_{m-1}$. Thus, for any $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, there is an invertible matrix $X_k \in M_{t_0}(\mathbb{k})$ such that

$$(x_{k,1} - u_{l+1}^{k,1}, x_{k,2} - u_{l+1}^{k,2}, \dots, x_{k,t_0} - u_{l+1}^{k,t_0}) = (v_1^{k+1,1}, v_1^{k+1,2}, \dots, v_1^{k+1,t_0}) X_k.$$

Then $X = X_{m-1} \cdots X_1 X_0$ is an invertible matrix in $M_{t_0}(\mathbb{k})$. Since \mathbb{k} is an algebraically closed field, there is a nonzero element $B = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{t_0})^T \in \mathbb{k}^{t_0}$ and a nonzero scalar $\eta \in \mathbb{k}$ such that $XB = \eta B$, where $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{t_0})^T$ denotes the

transposition of $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{t_0})$. For $0 \leq k \leq m-1$, define $x_{l+1}^k \in M_{(i+l+kn)}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} x_{l+1}^0 &= (x_{0,1}, \dots, x_{0,t_0})B, \quad x_{l+1}^1 = (x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,t_0})X_0B, \quad \dots, \\ x_{l+1}^{m-1} &= (x_{m-1,1}, \dots, x_{m-1,t_0})X_{m-2} \cdots X_1X_0B. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{l+1}^0 &= (u_{l+1}^{0,1}, \dots, u_{l+1}^{0,t_0})B + (v_1^{1,1}, \dots, v_1^{1,t_0})X_0B, \\ x_{l+1}^1 &= (u_{l+1}^{1,1}, \dots, u_{l+1}^{1,t_0})X_0B + (v_1^{2,1}, \dots, v_1^{2,t_0})X_1X_0B, \\ &\dots \\ x_{l+1}^{m-1} &= (u_{l+1}^{m-1,1}, \dots, u_{l+1}^{m-1,t_0})X_{m-2} \cdots X_0B + (v_1^{m,1}, \dots, v_1^{m,t_0})X_{m-1} \cdots X_0B \\ &= (u_{l+1}^{m-1,1}, \dots, u_{l+1}^{m-1,t_0})X_{m-2} \cdots X_0B + \eta(v_1^{0,1}, \dots, v_1^{0,t_0})B. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the map $P_{[n-1]} \rightarrow P_{[l]}, x \mapsto d^{n-l-1}x$ is a bijection and its restriction gives rise to a bijection from $M_{[n-1]}$ onto $M_{[l]}$. Hence if $x \in P_{[n-1]}$ satisfies $d^{n-l-1}x \in M_{[l]}$, then $x \in M_{[n-1]}$. Define $x_n^0, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^{m-1} \in P_{[n-1]}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} x_n^0 &= (u_n^{0,1}, \dots, u_n^{0,t_0})B + (v_{n-l}^{1,1}, \dots, v_{n-l}^{1,t_0})X_0B, \\ x_n^1 &= (u_n^{1,1}, \dots, u_n^{1,t_0})X_0B + (v_{n-l}^{2,1}, \dots, v_{n-l}^{2,t_0})X_1X_0B, \\ &\dots \\ x_n^{m-1} &= (u_n^{m-1,1}, \dots, u_n^{m-1,t_0})X_{m-2} \cdots X_0B + \eta(v_{n-l}^{0,1}, \dots, v_{n-l}^{0,t_0})B. \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 \leq k \leq m-1$. It is easy to see that $d^{n-l-1}x_n^k = x_{l+1}^k$, and hence $x_n^k \in M_{[n-1]}$. Let $x_j^k = d^{n-j}x_n^k$ for $1 \leq j < n$. Then $x_j^k \in M_{(i+j-1+kn)}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Moreover, $dx_j^k = x_{j-1}^k$ for all $1 < j \leq n$, and $dx_1^k = 0$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_j^0 &= (u_j^{0,1}, \dots, u_j^{0,t_0})B, \quad x_j^1 = (u_j^{1,1}, \dots, u_j^{1,t_0})X_0B, \quad \dots, \\ x_j^{m-1} &= (u_j^{m-1,1}, \dots, u_j^{m-1,t_0})X_{m-2} \cdots X_0B \end{aligned}$$

for all $1 \leq j \leq l$, and

$$\begin{aligned} x_j^0 &= (u_j^{0,1}, \dots, u_j^{0,t_0})B + (v_{j-l}^{1,1}, \dots, v_{j-l}^{1,t_0})X_0B, \\ x_j^1 &= (u_j^{1,1}, \dots, u_j^{1,t_0})X_0B + (v_{j-l}^{2,1}, \dots, v_{j-l}^{2,t_0})X_1X_0B, \\ &\dots \\ x_j^{m-1} &= (u_j^{m-1,1}, \dots, u_j^{m-1,t_0})X_{m-2} \cdots X_0B + \eta(v_{j-l}^{0,1}, \dots, v_{j-l}^{0,t_0})B. \end{aligned}$$

for all $l+1 < j < n$. Clearly, the set $\{x_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ is linearly independent. By Lemma 3.6(4,7), a straightforward verification shows that

$$\begin{aligned} ax_j^k &= \begin{cases} \alpha_j(l, i)x_{j+1}^k, & 1 \leq j < n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1, \\ \alpha_n(l, i)x_1^k + x_1^{k+1}, & j = n, 0 \leq k < m-1, \\ \alpha_n(l, i)x_1^{m-1} + \eta x_1^0, & j = n, k = m-1, \end{cases} \\ bx_j^k &= q^{i+l-j}x_j^k, \quad 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\{x_j^k | 1 \leq j \leq n, 0 \leq k \leq m-1\}$ is a basis of the submodule $\langle x_n^0, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^{m-1} \rangle$ of M and $\langle x_n^0, x_n^1, \dots, x_n^{m-1} \rangle \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$. \square

Corollary 4.30. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module of (t, t) -type. If $m \nmid t$, then M contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type.*

Proof. It follows from the proof of Lemma 4.29. \square

Corollary 4.31. *Let M be a nonzero submodule of $M_1(l, i, \eta)$, where $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. If $l(M/\text{soc}M) = l(\text{soc}M)$, then $M = M_1(l, i, \eta)$.*

Proof. Let $s := l(M/\text{soc}M) = l(\text{soc}M)$. If $s < m$, then it follows from Lemma 4.8 that M contains a direct summand N of (t, t) -type with $1 \leq t \leq s$. By Corollary 4.30, N contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type, and so does $M_1(l, i, \eta)$, which contradicts Lemma 4.23(3). Hence $s = m$, and so $M = M_1(l, i, \eta)$. \square

Throughout the following, unless otherwise stated, let $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$.

By Corollary 4.26, $\Omega^2 M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$. Hence there exists an AR-sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M_1(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{f_1} M_2(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{g_1} M_1(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow 0$$

for a unique module $M_2(l, i, \eta)$ up to isomorphism.

Lemma 4.32. *With the notations above, $M_2(l, i, \eta)$ is an indecomposable module of $(2m, 2m)$ -type, $\Omega^2 M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)$, $\text{soc}M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 2M(l, i + kn)$ and $M_2(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 2M(n-l, i+l+kn)$.*

Proof. Suppose on the contrary that $M_2(l, i, \eta)$ has a nontrivial indecomposable direct summand N . Then $g_1|_N : N \rightarrow M_1(l, i, \eta)$ is an irreducible morphism. By Lemma 4.14, N is of (t, t) -type and $1 \leq t < 2m$. Clearly, $t \neq m$, and hence N contains a submodule K of $(1, 1)$ -type by Corollary 4.30. By Lemma 4.9, $K \subseteq \text{Ker}g_1$ or $K \cap \text{Ker}g_1 = 0$. Since $\text{Ker}g_1 = \text{Im}f_1 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$, $K \not\subseteq \text{Ker}g_1$ by Lemma 4.23(3). Hence $K \cap \text{Ker}g_1 = 0$. This implies that $K \cong g_1(K) \subseteq M_1(l, i, \eta)$, which contradicts Lemma 4.23(3). This shows that $M_2(l, i, \eta)$ is indecomposable. Obviously, $M_2(l, i, \eta)$ is of $(2m, 2m)$ -type. Since $\Omega^2 M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$, one gets $\Omega^2 M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)$. Clearly, $\text{soc}M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 2M(l, i + kn)$ and $M_2(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 2M(n-l, i+l+kn)$. \square

Lemma 4.33. *Let N be a submodule of (t, t) -type of $M_2(l, i, \eta)$. Then either $N = \text{Im}f_1$ or $N = M_2(l, i, \eta)$. Moreover, $M_2(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}f_1 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$.*

Proof. Let $L := N \cap \text{Im}f_1$. Then $l(L/\text{soc}L) = l(\text{soc}L)$ by Lemma 4.9. If $L = 0$, then $N \cong g_1(N) \subseteq M_1(l, i, \eta)$ by $\text{Im}f_1 = \text{Ker}g_1$. In this case, by Corollary 4.31, $g_1(N) = M_1(l, i, \eta)$, and so $M_2(l, i, \eta) = N \oplus \text{Im}f_1$, a contradiction. Hence $L \neq 0$. Note that $L \subseteq \text{Im}f_1 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$. Again by Corollary 4.31, $L = \text{Im}f_1$, and hence $\text{Im}f_1 \subseteq N$. This implies $m \leq t \leq 2m$. If $m < t < 2m$, then N contains a submodule K of $(1, 1)$ -type by Corollary 4.30. By Lemma 4.9, one knows that either $K \subseteq \text{Im}f_1$ or $K \cap \text{Im}f_1 = 0$. Since $\text{Im}f_1 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$, $K \not\subseteq \text{Im}f_1$ by Lemma 4.23(3). Hence $K \cap \text{Im}f_1 = 0$, which implies $K \cong g_1(K) \subseteq M_1(l, i, \eta)$, a contradiction. Hence $t = m$ or $t = 2m$. Thus, either $N = \text{Im}f_1$ or $N = M_2(l, i, \eta)$. Moreover, $M_2(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}f_1 = M_2(l, i, \eta)/\text{Ker}g_1 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$. \square

Corollary 4.34. *For any $1 \leq l' \leq n-1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$, $M_2(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_{2m}(l', i')$ and $M_2(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_{2m}(l', i')$.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.33, $M_2(l, i, \eta)$ does not contain any submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type. However, both $T_{2m}(l', i')$ and $\overline{T}_{2m}(l', i')$ contain a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type by Theorems 4.18(2) and 4.19(2). Thus, the corollary follows. \square

Since $\Omega^2 M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)$, by [1, Propositons V.1.12 and 5.3], there is a unique $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ up to isomorphism which fits an AR-sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M_2(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_1 \\ f_2 \end{pmatrix}} M_1(l, i, \eta) \oplus M_3(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{(f'_1, g_2)} M_2(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma 4.35. *Retain the above notations.*

- (1) $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ is an indecomposable module of $(3m, 3m)$ -type, $\text{soc}M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 3M(l, i + kn)$ and $M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 3M(n - l, i + l + kn)$.
- (2) If N is a submodule of (t, t) -type of $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ with $1 \leq t < 3m$, then $N = \text{Im}(f_2 f_1)$ or $\text{Im}f_2$. Moreover, $M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_2 f_1) \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)$ and $M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}f_2 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$.
- (3) $\Omega^2 M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong M_3(l, i, \eta)$.
- (4) $M_3(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_{3m}(l', i')$ and $M_3(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_{3m}(l', i')$ for any $1 \leq l' \leq n - 1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. (1) Suppose on the contrary that $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ is decomposable. By Lemma 4.14, $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ has a nontrivial indecomposable direct summand N of (s, s) -type with $1 \leq s < 3m$. Then $g_2|_N : N \rightarrow M_2(l, i, \eta)$ is an irreducible morphism. Hence $g_2|_N$ is injective or surjective, but $g_2|_N$ is not bijective. If $g_2|_N$ is surjective, then $2m < s < 3m$, and hence N contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type by Corollary 4.30. Thus, by Proposition 4.21, $N \cong T_s(l', i')$ or $N \cong \overline{T}_s(l', i')$ for some $1 \leq l' \leq n - 1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that there is an irreducible morphism from $T_s(l', i')$ to $M_2(l, i, \eta)$ or from $\overline{T}_s(l', i')$ to $M_2(l, i, \eta)$, which contradicts Theorem 4.18(4) or Theorem 4.19(4) by Corollary 4.34. Hence $g_2|_N$ is injective. So $s < 2m$ and $N \cong g_2(N) \subsetneq M_2(l, i, \eta)$. Then by Lemma 4.33, $s = m$ and $g_2(N) = \text{Im}f_1 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$. Thus, $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ has to be decomposed into a direct sum of three indecomposable submodules of (m, m) -type, and hence $\text{Im}(f'_1, g_2) = \text{Im}f_1$, a contradiction. This shows that $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ is an indecomposable module of $(3m, 3m)$ -type. Clearly, $\text{soc}M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 3M(l, i + kn)$ and $M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} 3M(n - l, i + l + kn)$.

(2) Let N be a submodule of (t, t) -type of $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ with $1 \leq t < 3m$. If $m \nmid t$, then by Corollary 4.30, N contains a submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type, and so does $M_3(l, i, \eta)$. By Proposition 4.21, $M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong T_{3m}(l', i')$ or $M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong \overline{T}_{3m}(l', i')$ for some $1 \leq l' \leq n - 1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$. This contradicts Theorem 4.18(4) or Theorem 4.19(4) as stated above, since g_2 is an irreducible morphism. Hence $m \mid t$.

Case 1: $t = m$. Since $f_2 : M_2(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow M_3(l, i, \eta)$ is an irreducible morphism, f_2 is injective, and so $\text{Im}f_2$ is a submodule of $(2m, 2m)$ -type of $M_3(l, i, \eta)$. If $N \cap \text{Im}f_2 = 0$, then $M_3(l, i, \eta) = N \oplus \text{Im}f_2$, which is impossible. Hence $L := N \cap \text{Im}f_2 \neq 0$. By Lemma 4.9, $l(L/\text{soc}L) = l(\text{soc}L) \leq m$. By Lemma 4.8, L

contains a submodule K of (s, s) -type with $s \leq m$. Then by the previous paragraph, $s = m$. This forces $N = L \subsetneq \text{Im}f_2 \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)$, and so $N = \text{Im}(f_2f_1) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$ by Lemma 4.33. Since g_2 is an irreducible morphism, it is surjective, and hence $l(\text{Kerg}_2/\text{soc}(\text{Kerg}_2)) = l(\text{soc}(\text{Kerg}_2)) = m$. If Kerg_2 is decomposable, then by Lemma 4.8, Kerg_2 has a direct summand of (s, s) -type with $1 \leq s < m$, a contradiction. Hence Kerg_2 is an indecomposable module of (m, m) -type. Thus, $\text{Kerg}_2 = \text{Im}(f_2f_1)$, and so $M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_2f_1) = M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{Kerg}_2 \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)$.

Case 2: $t = 2m$. In this case, $K := N \cap \text{Kerg}_2 \neq 0$ since $M_3(l, i, \eta)$ is indecomposable, and $l(K/\text{soc}K) = l(\text{soc}K)$ by Lemma 4.9. Then by Corollary 4.31 and $K \subseteq \text{Kerg}_2 = \text{Im}(f_2f_1) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$, one gets $K = \text{Kerg}_2$, and so $\text{Kerg}_2 \subseteq N$. In particular, $\text{Kerg}_2 \subseteq \text{Im}f_2$. Hence $\text{Kerg}_2 \subseteq N \cap \text{Im}f_2$. If $\text{Kerg}_2 = N \cap \text{Im}f_2$, then $l(N + \text{Im}f_2) = l(N) + l(\text{Im}f_2) - l(\text{Kerg}_2) = 6m$, and so $N + \text{Im}f_2 = M_3(l, i, \eta)$, which implies $M_2(l, i, \eta) = g_2(N + \text{Im}f_2) = g_2(N) \oplus g_2(\text{Im}f_2)$, a contradiction. Hence $\text{Kerg}_2 \neq N \cap \text{Im}f_2$. Let $L_1 := N \cap \text{Im}f_2$. Then $l(L_1/\text{soc}L_1) = l(\text{soc}L_1)$ by Lemma 4.9. If $L_1 \neq \text{Im}f_2$, $m < l(\text{soc}L_1) < 2m$. In this case, whether L_1 is indecomposable or not, L_1 contains an indecomposable module of (s_1, s_1) with $m \nmid s_1$, a contradiction. Hence $L_1 = \text{Im}f_2$, and so $N = \text{Im}f_2$. Now by Lemma 4.33, $\text{Im}f_2/\text{Im}(f_2f_1) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$ and hence $M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}f_2 \cong (M_3(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_2f_1))/(\text{Im}f_2/\text{Im}(f_2f_1)) \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}f_1 \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$.

(3) Since $\Omega^2 M_1(l, i, \eta) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$ and $\Omega^2 M_2(l, i, \eta) \cong M_2(l, i, \eta)$, an argument similar to $T_2(l, i)$ shows that $\Omega^2 M_3(l, i, \eta) \cong M_3(l, i, \eta)$.

(4) By (2) and Theorems 4.18(2) and 4.19(2), $M_3(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_{3m}(l', i')$ and $M_3(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_{3m}(l', i')$ for any $1 \leq l' \leq n-1$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Now suppose $t \geq 3$ and we have got indecomposable modules

$$M_1(l, i, \eta), M_2(l, i, \eta), \dots, M_t(l, i, \eta)$$

and AR-sequences

$$0 \rightarrow M_1(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{f_1} M_2(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{g_1} M_1(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow M_{s-1}(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_{s-2} \\ f_{s-1} \end{pmatrix}} M_{s-2}(l, i, \eta) \oplus M_s(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{(f'_{s-2}, g_{s-1})} M_{s-1}(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow 0$$

for all $3 \leq s \leq t$. They satisfy the following:

- (1) $M_s(l, i, \eta)$ is of (sm, sm) -type with $\text{soc}M_s(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} sM(l, i + kn)$ and $M_s(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_s(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} sM(n-l, i+l+kn)$;
- (2) If N is a submodule of (s', s') -type of $M_s(l, i, \eta)$ with $1 \leq s' < sm$, then $s' = jm$ and $N = \text{Im}(f_{s-1} \cdots f_j)$ for some $1 \leq j \leq s-1$. Moreover, $M_s(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_{s-1} \cdots f_j) \cong M_{s-j}(l, i, \eta)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq s-1$;
- (3) $\Omega^2 M_s(l, i, \eta) \cong M_s(l, i, \eta)$;
- (4) $M_s(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_{sm}(l', i')$ and $M_s(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_{sm}(l', i')$ for any $1 \leq l' \leq n-1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$,

for all $1 \leq s \leq t$. Again by [1, Propositons V.1.12 and 5.3], there is a unique module $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ up to isomorphism such that there is an AR-sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M_t(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_{t-1} \\ f_t \end{pmatrix}} M_{t-1}(l, i, \eta) \oplus M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{(f'_{t-1}, g_t)} M_t(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow 0.$$

Lemma 4.36. *Retain the above notations.*

- (1) $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ is an indecomposable module of $((t+1)m, (t+1)m)$ -type with $\text{soc}M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (t+1)M(l, i+kn)$, $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (t+1)M(n-l, i+l+kn)$.
- (2) If N is an indecomposable submodule of (s, s) -type of $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ with $1 \leq s < (t+1)m$, then $s = jm$ and $N = \text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_j)$ for some $1 \leq j \leq t$. Moreover, $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_j) \cong M_{t+1-j}(l, i, \eta)$ for all $1 \leq j \leq t$.
- (3) $\Omega^2 M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \cong M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$.
- (4) $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_{(t+1)m}(l', i')$ and $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_{(t+1)m}(l', i')$ for any $1 \leq l' \leq n-1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. (1) If $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ is decomposable, then by Lemma 4.14, $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ has a nontrivial direct summand N of (s, s) -type with $1 \leq s < (t+1)m$, and $g_t|_N : N \rightarrow M_t(l, i, \eta)$ is an irreducible morphism. Hence $g_t|_N$ is a monomorphism or an epimorphism, but $g_t|_N$ is not an isomorphism. Using the induction hypothesis (4), an argument similar to Lemma 4.35 shows that $g_t|_N$ is not an epimorphism. Hence $g_t|_N$ is a monomorphism. So $s < tm$ and $N \cong g_t(N) \subset M_t(l, i, \eta)$. Then by the induction hypothesis, $g_t(N) = \text{Im}(f_{t-1} \cdots f_j) \cong M_j(l, i, \eta)$ for some $1 \leq j \leq t-1$, and so $g_t(N) \subseteq \text{Im}f_{t-1}$. Thus, if $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ is decomposable, then $g_t(M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)) \subseteq \text{Im}f_{t-1}$, and hence $\text{Im}(f'_{t-1}, g_t) = \text{Im}f_{t-1}$, a contradiction. This shows that $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ is an indecomposable module of $((t+1)m, (t+1)m)$ -type. Clearly, $\text{soc}M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (t+1)M(l, i+kn)$ and $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} (t+1)M(n-l, i+l+kn)$.

(2) Let N be a submodule of (s, s) -type of $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$ with $1 \leq s < (t+1)m$. Then an argument similar to Lemma 4.35 shows that $m|s$.

Let N be a submodule of (m, m) -type of $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$. Then similarly to the proof (Case1) of Lemma 4.35, one can show that $N = \text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_1) \cong M_1(l, i, \eta)$, $\text{Ker}g_t = \text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_1)$ and $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_1) = M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Ker}g_t \cong M_t(l, i, \eta)$.

Now let $1 < j \leq t$, and let N be a submodule of (jm, jm) -type of $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$. If $N \cap \text{Ker}g_t = 0$, then $j < t$, otherwise $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) = N \oplus \text{Ker}g_t$, a contradiction. Hence $(N \oplus \text{Ker}g_t)/\text{Ker}g_t$ is a submodule of (jm, jm) -type of $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Ker}g_t$. Since $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Ker}g_t \cong M_t(l, i, \eta)$, $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Ker}g_t$ contains a unique submodule of (jm, jm) -type. Since all f_j are injective, $\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_{j+1}) \cong M_{j+1}(l, i, \eta)$. Hence $\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_1) = \text{Ker}g_t$ is the unique submodule of (m, m) -type of $\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_{j+1})$ by the induction hypothesis and $j+1 \leq t$, and so $\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_{j+1})/\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_1) \cong M_j(l, i, \eta)$. Thus, $\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_{j+1})/\text{Ker}g_t = (N \oplus \text{Ker}g_t)/\text{Ker}g_t$, and so $\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_{j+1}) = N \oplus \text{Ker}g_t$, a contradiction. This shows that $L := N \cap \text{Ker}g_t \neq 0$. Then $l(L/\text{soc}L) = l(\text{soc}L)$ by Lemma 4.9. By Lemma 4.8 and the result shown above, one can check $L = \text{Ker}g_t$, and hence $\text{Ker}g_t \subseteq N$. Thus, $N/\text{Ker}g_t \subseteq M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Ker}g_t \cong M_t(l, i, \eta)$. Then by Corollary 4.4, $l(\text{soc}(N/\text{Ker}g_t)) = l((N/\text{Ker}g_t)/\text{soc}(N/\text{Ker}g_t)) =$

$(j-1)m$. By Lemma 4.8, any indecomposable direct summand of N/Kerg_t is of (sm, sm) -type. However, it follows by the induction hypothesis that there is a unique submodule of (sm, sm) -type in $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Kerg}_t$ for each $1 \leq s \leq t$, and that the submodule of (sm, sm) -type is contained in that of $((s+1)m, (s+1)m)$ -type for all $1 \leq s < t$. Thus, N/Kerg_t has to be an indecomposable module of $((j-1)m, (j-1)m)$ -type. Then an argument as above shows that $N = \text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_j)$. Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_j) &\cong (M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)/\text{Kerg}_t)/(\text{Im}(f_t \cdots f_j)/\text{Kerg}_t) \\ &\cong M_t(l, i, \eta)/\text{Im}(f_{t-1} \cdots f_{j-1}) \cong M_{t+1-j}(l, i, \eta). \end{aligned}$$

(3) By the induction hypothesis, $\Omega^2 M_{t-1}(l, i, \eta) \cong M_{t-1}(l, i, \eta)$ and $\Omega^2 M_t(l, i, \eta) \cong M_t(l, i, \eta)$. Hence an argument similar to $T_2(l, i)$ shows that $\Omega^2 M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \cong M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta)$.

(4) By (2) and Theorems 4.18(2) and 4.19(2), $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_{(t+1)m}(l', i')$ and $M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_{(t+1)m}(l', i')$ for any $1 \leq l' \leq n-1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$. \square

Summarizing the discussion above, one gets the following theorem.

Theorem 4.37. *For any $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ and $l, i, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ and $t \geq 1$, there is an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module $M_t(l, i, \eta)$ of (tm, tm) -type. Moreover,*

- (1) $\Omega^2 M_t(l, i, \eta) \cong M_t(l, i, \eta)$, $\text{soc}M_t(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} tM(l, i + kn)$ and $M_t(l, i, \eta)/\text{soc}M_t(l, i, \eta) \cong \bigoplus_{k=0}^{m-1} tM(n-l, i+l+kn)$.
- (2) If $M_t(l, i, \eta)$ contains a submodule of (s, s) -type, then $m|s$. Moreover, for any $1 \leq j < t$, $M_t(l, i, \eta)$ contains a unique submodule of (jm, jm) -type, which is isomorphic to $M_j(l, i, \eta)$ and the quotient module of $M_t(l, i, \eta)$ modulo the submodule of (jm, jm) -type is isomorphic to $M_{t-j}(l, i, \eta)$.
- (3) For any $1 \leq j < t$, the unique submodule of (jm, jm) -type of $M_t(l, i, \eta)$ is contained in that of $((j+1)m, (j+1)m)$ -type.
- (4) $M_t(l, i, \eta) \not\cong T_{tm}(l', i')$ and $M_t(l, i, \eta) \not\cong \overline{T}_{tm}(l', i')$ for any $1 \leq l' \leq n-1$ and $i' \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- (5) There are AR-sequences

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow M_1(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{f_1} M_2(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{g_1} M_1(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow 0, \\ 0 \rightarrow M_t(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_{t-1} \\ f_t \end{pmatrix}} M_{t-1}(l, i, \eta) \oplus M_{t+1}(l, i, \eta) \xrightarrow{(f'_{t-1}, g_t)} M_t(l, i, \eta) \rightarrow 0 \quad (t \geq 2). \end{aligned}$$

Corollary 4.38. *Let $\eta, \eta' \in \mathbb{k}^\times$ and $l, l', i, i', t, t' \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 \leq l, l' \leq n-1$ and $t, t' \geq 1$. Then $M_t(l, i, \eta) \cong M_{t'}(l', i', \eta') \Leftrightarrow t = t', l = l', \eta = \eta'$ and $i \equiv i' \pmod{n}$.*

Proof. It follows from Proposition 4.27, Theorem 4.37(2,5), $l(M_t(l, i, \eta)) = 2tm$ and $l(M_{t'}(l', i', \eta')) = 2t'm$. \square

Proposition 4.39. *Let M be an indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -module of (t, t) -type. If M contains a submodule isomorphic to $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$, then $t = sm$ and $M \cong M_s(l, i, \eta)$ for some $s \geq 1$.*

Proof. Assume that M contains a submodule isomorphic to $M_1(l, i, \eta)$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times$. Then $t \geq m$. By Proposition 4.21, Lemma 4.23(4), and Theorems 4.18(2,3) and 4.19(2,3), one can check that M does not contain any submodule of $(1, 1)$ -type. Hence $m|t$ by Corollary 4.30, and so $t = sm$ for some $s \geq 1$. Then an argument similar to [4, Theorem 4.16] shows that $M \cong M_i(l, i, \eta)$. \square

Summarizing the discussions in the last section and this section, one gets the classification of finite dimensional indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules as follows.

Corollary 4.40. *A representative set of isomorphism classes of finite dimensional indecomposable $H_{mn}(\xi)$ -modules is given by*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} M(l, i), Z(\lambda_{i'j'}), P(l, i), \Omega^{\pm s} M(l, i), \\ T_s(l, i), \overline{T}_s(l, i), M_s(l, j, \eta) \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{l} 1 \leq l \leq n-1, i \in \mathbb{Z}_{mn}, s \geq 1, \\ j \in \mathbb{Z}_n, (i', j') \in I_0, \eta \in \mathbb{k}^\times \end{array} \right\}.$$

By Corollary 4.40, we also have the following corollary.

Corollary 4.41. *$H_{mn}(\xi)$ is of tame representation type.*

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by NNSF of China (Nos. 12201545, 12071412).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Auslander, I. Reiten and S. O. Smalø, Representation Theory of Artin Algebras, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [2] H. X. Chen, A class of noncommutative and noncocommutative Hopf algebras-the quantum version, Comm. Algebra 27 (1999), 5011-5032.
- [3] H. X. Chen, Irreducible representations of a class of quantum doubles, J. Algebra 225 (2000), 391-409.
- [4] H. X. Chen, Finite-dimensional representations of a quantum double, J. Algebra 251 (2002), 751-789.
- [5] H. X. Chen, Representations of a class of Drinfeld's doubles, Comm. Algebra 33 (2005), 2809-2825.
- [6] H. X. Chen, The Green ring of Drinfeld double $D(H_4)$, Algebr. Represent. Theor. 17 (2014), 1457-1483.
- [7] H. X. Chen, H. S. E. Mohammed and H. Sun, Indecomposable decomposition of tensor products of modules over Drinfeld doubles of Taft algebras, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 221 (2017), 2752-2790.
- [8] H. X. Chen, H. S. E. Mohammed, W. Lin and H. Sun, The projective class rings of a family of pointed Hopf algebras of rank two, Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin 23 (2016), 693-711.
- [9] H. X. Chen, F. Van Oystaeyen and Y. H. Zhang, The Green rings of Taft algebras, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 142 (2014), 765-775.
- [10] C. Cibils, A quiver quantum group, Comm. Math. Phys. 157 (1993), 459-477.
- [11] C. Kassel, Quantum groups, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [12] L. Krop, D. E. Radford, Finite-dimensional Hopf algebras of rank one in characteristic zero, J. Algebra 302 (2006) 214-230.
- [13] Y. Li and N. Hu, The Green rings of the 2-rank Taft algebra and its two relatives twisted, J. Algebra 410 (2014), 1-35.
- [14] L. B. Li and Y. H. Zhang, The Green rings of the generalized Taft Hopf algebras, Contemp. Math. 585 (2013), 275-288.
- [15] S. Montgomery, Hopf Algebras and their actions on rings, CBMS Series in Math., Vol. 82, Am. Math. Soc., Providence, 1993.

- [16] A. N. Panov, Ore extensions of Hopf algebras, *Math. Notes* 74 (2003), 401-410.
- [17] S. Scherotzke, Classification of pointed rank one Hopf algebras, *J. Algebra* 319 (2008), 2889-2912.
- [18] H. Sun, H. S. E. Mahammed, W. Lin and H. X. Chen, Green rings of Drinfeld doubles of Taft algebras, *Comm. Algebra* 48 (2020), 3933-3947.
- [19] M. E. Sweedler, *Hopf Algebras*, Benjamin, New York, 1969.
- [20] E. J. Taft, The order of the antipode of a finite-dimensional Hopf algebra, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* 68 (1971), 2631-2633.
- [21] Z. Wang, L. Li and Y. Zhang, Green rings of pointed rank one Hopf algebras of nilpotent type, *Algebr. Represent. Theory* 17 (2014), 1901-1924.
- [22] Z. Wang, L. Li and Y. Zhang, Green rings of pointed rank one Hopf algebras of non-nilpotent type, *J. Algebra* 449 (2016), 108-137.
- [23] Y. Zhang, F. Wu, L. Liu and H. X. Chen, Grothendieck groups of a class of quantum doubles, *Algebra Colloq.* 15(2008), 431-448.
- [24] D. E. Radford, On the coradical of a finite-dimensional Hopf algebras, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 53 (1975), 9-15.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, YANGZHOU UNIVERSITY, YANGZHOU 225002, CHINA

Email address: huasun@yzu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCE, YANGZHOU UNIVERSITY, YANGZHOU 225002, CHINA

Email address: hxchen@yzu.edu.cn