arXiv:2206.10872v1 [math.RA] 22 Jun 2022

# Critical and injective modules over skew polynomial rings

Ken Brown, Paula A.A.B. Carvalho and Jerzy Matczuk

June 23, 2022

**Abstract**

Let $R$ be a commutative local $k$-algebra of Krull dimension one, where $k$ is a field. Let $\alpha$ be a $k$-algebra automorphism of $R$, and define $S$ to be the skew polynomial algebra $R[\theta;\alpha]$. We offer, under some additional assumptions on $R$, a criterion for $S$ to have injective hulls of all simple $S$-modules locally Artinian - that is, for $S$ to satisfy property $(\diamond)$. It is easy and well known that if $\alpha$ is of finite order, then $S$ has this property, but in order to get the criterion when $\alpha$ has infinite order we found it necessary to classify all cyclic (Krull) critical $S$-modules in this case, a result which may be of independent interest. With the help of the above we show that $\widehat{S} = k[[X]][\theta,\alpha]$ satisfies $(\diamond)$ for all $k$-algebra automorphisms $\alpha$ of $k[[X]]$.
*Keywords:* Injective module, Noetherian ring, simple module, skew polynomial ring.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16D50, 16P40, 16S35

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Motivating context

A Noetherian ring $S$ is said to satisfy property $(\diamond)$ if the injective hull $E_S(V)$ of every simple right or left $S$-module $V$ is locally Artinian, meaning that every finitely generated submodule of $E_S(V)$ is Artinian. This paper forms part of a project whose ultimate aim is to determine when the skew polynomial ring $S := R[\theta;\alpha]$ satisfies $(\diamond)$ when $R$ is commutative Noetherian and $\alpha$ is an automorphism of $R$ (so that $\theta r = \alpha(r)\theta$ for $r \in R$). In our earlier paper [2] we showed that the key to $(\diamond)$ for such skew polynomial rings is the case where $S$ is primitive. Necessary and sufficient conditions for primitivity are known [11], and recalled in Theorem 2.2 below. In particular it is easy to see that $R[\theta;\alpha]$ is never primitive when $|\alpha| < \infty$. For the primitive case we proved in [2, Theorem 5.4]:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $R$ be a commutative Noetherian ring, $\alpha$ an automorphism of $R$. Set $S := R[\theta;\alpha]$ as above, and assume that $S$ is primitive.*

*(1) If $R$ is Artinian then $S$ satisfies $(\diamond)$.*

*(2) Suppose that $R$ contains an uncountable field. If the Krull dimension of $R$ is at least 2, or if $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is uncountable, then $S$ does not satisfy $(\diamond)$.*

It's clear that a crucial case resting in the gap between (1) and (2) of Theorem 1.1 occurs when $R$ is a local Noetherian domain of Krull dimension 1 and $\alpha$ has infinite order. This is the situation we address in the present paper.

## 1.2 Critical modules

Let $k$ be an arbitrary field. Let $R$ be a discrete valuation ring which is a $k$-algebra with maximal ideal $M = XR$, with residue field $R/M = k$. Let $\alpha$ be a $k$-algebra automorphism of $R$, so $\alpha(X) = qX$ for some unit $q$ of $R$. Set $S = R[\theta; \alpha]$, and assume that $|\alpha| = \infty$. Recall that $S$ has Krull dimension 2 [12, Proposition 6.5.4(i)]. Thus to determine the validity or otherwise of ($\diamond$) for $S$ it is first necessary to study the simple and the 1-critical $S$-modules. This is done in §§3 and §§5, using the fact that the localisation $T := S\langle X^{-1}\rangle$ of $S$ is a principal right and left ideal domain, coupled with work of Bavula and Van Oystaeyen [1]. The following result gives an abbreviated version of what we discover. The definitions of the sets **(A)**, **(B)** and **(C)**, of irreducible elements of $S$, can be found in §4.2. Additionally, set **(F)** := $\{f \in k[\theta] : f$ *monic irreducible*$\}$, which is a subset of **(C)**. Recall that a nonzero module $M$ with Krull dimension $\mathrm{Kdim}(M)$ is *critical* if $\mathrm{Kdim}(N) < \mathrm{Kdim}(M)$ for all proper factors $N$ of $M$; every nonzero module with Krull dimension contains a critical submodule, [12, Lemma 6.2.10]. We say that two critical $S$-modules $M$ and $N$ are *hull similar* if they contain a nonzero isomorphic submodule. The following result summarises parts of Theorems 5.5 and 5.10.

**Theorem 1.2.** *The irreducible elements of $S$ can be divided into 3 disjoint sets* **(A)**, **(B)** *and* **(C)** *with the following properties.*

*(1) There are bijective correspondences between these sets, together with* **(F)**, *and the equivalence classes of finitely generated critical torsion right $S$-modules as follows.*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textbf{(F)} \longleftrightarrow \{V : V \textit{ simple, } \dim_k(V) < \infty\}/\sim .\\
&\textbf{(A)} \longleftrightarrow \{V : V \textit{ unfaithful finitely generated 1-critical}\}/\sim .\\
&\textbf{(B)} \longleftrightarrow \{V : V \textit{ simple, } \dim_k(V) = \infty\}/\sim .\\
&\textbf{(C)} \longleftrightarrow \{V : V \textit{ faithful finitely generated 1-critical}\}/\sim .
\end{aligned}$$

*(2) The equivalence relation $\sim$ is isomorphism for* **(F)**, **(A)** *and* **(B)** *and hull similarity for* **(C)**.

*(3) In cases* **(A)**, **(B)** *and* **(C)** *the map from left to right takes the irreducible element $c$ to the module $S/cS$. In case* **(F)** *the element $f$ of* **(F)** *is sent to the module $S/(XS + fS)$.*

## 1.3 Monoid commutativity

Armed with the classification of Theorem 1.2 we use elementary homological algebra and analysis of non-split extensions of critical $S-$ and $T-$modules to deduce a criterion for $S$ to satisfy ($\diamond$) in terms of what we call the *monoid commutativity* of the sets **(B)** and **(C)** of irreducible elements of $S$. The following result is part of Theorem 6.7.

**Theorem 1.3.** *Let $S$ be as in §1.2. Then the following are equivalent.*

*(1) $S$ satisfies ($\diamond$) for right modules.*

*(2) Given irreducible elements $b$ and $c$ of $S$, respectively of types* **(B)** *and* **(C)**, *there exist irreducible elements $b'$ and $c'$ of $S$, respectively of types* **(B)** *and* **(C)**, *such that*

$$cb \;=\; b'c'. \tag{1}$$

Naturally there is a parallel result for left modules.

### 1.4 $(\diamond)$ for $\widehat{S}$

In §6.3 we specialise from the above setup by taking $R$ to be $k[[X]]$, continuing to assume that $\alpha$ is an arbitrary $k$-algebra automorphism of infinite order. Write $\widehat{S} := k[[X]][\theta;\alpha]$. We prove a type of converse Eisenstein criterion for $\widehat{S}$ (Lemma 6.8), which provides a sufficient condition for an element of $\widehat{S}$ to be reducible and which may be of independent interest. This permits us to confirm that $\widehat{S}$ satisfies the condition stated in Theorem 1.3(2), thus yielding one of the main results of the paper:

**Theorem 1.4.** *$\widehat{S}$ satisfies $(\diamond)$.*

## 2 Background results and notation

### 2.1 Primitivity of skew polynomial algebras

We begin by recalling the following definition from [11]:

**Definition 2.1.** Given a ring $R$ and $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(R)$, $R$ is *$\alpha$-special* if there is an element $a$ of $R$ such that the following conditions are satisfied.

(a) For all $n \geq 1$, $N_n^\alpha(a) := a\alpha(a)\dots\alpha^{n-1}(a) \neq 0$.

(b) For every non-zero $\alpha$-stable ideal $I$ of $R$, there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $N_n^\alpha(a) \in I$.

When this occurs, the element $a$ is called an *$\alpha$-special element*.

Here is the resulting characterisation of primitivity for skew polynomial rings:

**Theorem 2.2.** [11, Theorem 3.10] *Let $R$ be a commutative Noetherian ring and let $\alpha \in \mathrm{Aut}(R)$. Then $R[\theta;\alpha]$ is primitive if and only if $R$ is $\alpha$-special and $\alpha$ has infinite order.*

From the definition it follows easily that an $\alpha$-special ring is $\alpha$-prime. Clearly, an $\alpha$-simple ring is $\alpha$-special, with 1 as $\alpha$-special element in this case. Consider, however, the algebra $R$ defined in §1.2. Clearly $< X >$ is a proper $\alpha$-ideal of $R$, so that $R$ is not $\alpha$-simple; but $X$ is an $\alpha$-special element of $R$, so $R$ is $\alpha$-special. Since $\alpha$ is by hypothesis of infinite order, it therefore follows from Theorem 2.2 that

$$S = R[\theta;\alpha] \text{ is primitive.}$$

In fact one can easily confirm by explicit construction that $S$ is primitive, and - even better - the simple $S$-modules can be completely described using work of Bavula and Van Oystaeyen [1], as we shall explain in §§5.3 and 5.4.

### 2.2 Property $(\diamond)$

Let $R$ be a commutative Noetherian ring and $\alpha$ an automorphism of $R$. In [2] the following question was addressed:

$$\text{For which } R \text{ and } \alpha \text{ does } R[\theta;\alpha] \text{ satisfy } (\diamond)? \tag{2}$$

It is not difficult to show that the key to this question is to answer it when $R[\theta;\alpha]$ is primitive and $R$ is a domain; see [2, Corollary 3.5 and §4.2]. Bringing Theorem 2.2 to bear on this situation, we found the following:

**Proposition 2.3.** [2, Proposition 5.3] *Let $R$ be a commutative Noetherian domain and $\alpha$ an automorphism of $R$. Suppose that $R[\theta;\alpha]$ is primitive, with $\alpha$-special element $a$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the multiplicative subsemigroup of $R\backslash\{0\}$ generated by $\{\alpha^i(a) : i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, so that $\mathcal{A}$ is an $\alpha-$invariant multiplicatively closed subset of $R\backslash\{0\}$ and hence satisfies the Ore condition in $R[\theta;\alpha]$. Suppose that $R\mathcal{A}^{-1}$ is not a field. Then $R[\theta;\alpha]$ does not satisfy $(\diamond)$.*

Notice that Proposition 2.3 fails to determine whether the primitive domains $S = R[\theta; \alpha]$ of §1.2 satisfy ($\diamond$). More precisely, we were able to obtain the following necessary and sufficient conditions in [2]; the result was stated as Theorem 1.1, but is repeated here for the reader's convenience.

**Theorem 2.4.** [2, Theorem 5.4] *Let $R$ be a commutative Noetherian ring, $\alpha$ an automorphism of $R$. Suppose that $R[\theta; \alpha]$ is primitive.*

(a) *If $R$ has Krull dimension 0 then $R[\theta; \alpha]$ satisfies ($\diamond$).*

(b) *Suppose that $R$ contains an uncountable field. Suppose also that either $R$ has Krull dimension at least 2, or $\mathrm{Spec}(R)$ is uncountable. Then $R[\theta; \alpha]$ does not satisfy ($\diamond$).*

Thus the rings $S$ of §1.2 lie in the gap between the two listed families (a) and (b), and so are fundamental to understanding which skew polynomial extensions of commutative Noetherian rings $R$ satisfy ($\diamond$).

### 2.3 Notation

For the reader's convenience we repeat here some notation listed earlier. Let $k$ be an arbitrary field. Henceforth $R$ stands for a discrete valuation ring which is a $k$-algebra with maximal ideal $M = XR$, with residue field $R/M = k$. Let $\alpha$ be a $k$-algebra automorphism of $R$, so $\alpha(X) = qX$ for some unit $q$ of $R$. Set $S = R[\theta; \alpha]$, and assume that $|\alpha| = \infty$; that is, there does not exist $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$N_n^\alpha(q) \ := \ q\alpha(q)\cdots\alpha^{n-1}(q) = 1. \tag{3}$$

We write

$$\mathcal{X} \quad := \quad \{X^n : n \geq 0\},$$

so $\mathcal{X}$ is an Ore subset of $S$, and we denote by $T$ the localisation of $S$ at $\mathcal{X}$; that is,

$$T \ := \ S\mathcal{X}^{-1} \ = S\langle X^{-1}\rangle = Q[\theta; \alpha],$$

where $Q = Q(R) = R\langle X^{-1}\rangle$ is the quotient field of $R$. Taking into account that $X$ is a normal element of $S$, elements of $T$ will either be written as $X^{-n}s$ or $s_0X^{-n}$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $s, s_0 \in S$. Throughout the paper, "module" will mean "right module" unless otherwise indicated.

## 3 Injective hulls of uniform $S$-modules

The class of simple $S-$modules, and - more generally - the class of uniform $S-$modules, splits into two families, as outlined in the following two subsections.

### 3.1 $\mathcal{X}-$torsion $S-$modules

Recall that $\mathcal{X}$ denotes the Ore set $\{X^n : n \geq 0\}$ in $S$.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let $E$ be an indecomposable injective $S-$module, and suppose that the $\mathcal{X}-$torsion submodule of $E$ is non-zero. Then $E$ is $\mathcal{X}-$torsion and one of the following cases pertains:*

*(1) $E = E_S(S/XS)$, and this module is an infinite tower of copies of $k(\theta)$.*

*(2) $E = E_S(S/(XS + p(\theta)S))$ for some irreducible polynomial $p(\theta) \in k[\theta]$, and $E$ is locally finite dimensional.*

*Proof.* By hypothesis there exists a non-zero element $v$ of $E$ with $vX = 0$. Thus $vS$ is a factor of $S/XS \cong k[\theta]$. Suppose first that $vS \cong k[\theta]$. Then

$$E_{S/XS}(vS) \cong E_{k[\theta]}(k[\theta]) \cong k(\theta). \tag{4}$$

Now $X$ is a normal element of $S$ and therefore the ideal $XS$ has the Artin-Rees property [12, Proposition 4.2.6]. This implies that

$$E_S(vS) \;=\; \bigcup_{n\geq 1} \mathrm{Ann}_{E_S(vS)}(X^n S).$$

One can now show by induction that $\mathrm{Ann}_{E_S(vS)}(X^n S)$ is a tower of $n$ copies of $k(\theta)$, the case $n = 1$ being given by (4). The induction step follows using the map from $\mathrm{Ann}_{E_S(vS)}(X^{n+1}S)$ to $\mathrm{Ann}_{E_S(vS)}(X^n S)$ given by multiplication by $X$, which preserves the submodule structure and whose kernel is $\mathrm{Ann}_{E_S(vS)}(XS) = k(\theta)$.

Suppose on the other hand $vS$ is a proper factor of $k[\theta]$. Then $vS$ is finite dimensional and hence contains a simple submodule of the form $S/(XS + p(\theta)S)$ for some irreducible polynomial $p(\theta)$. Thus $E = E_S(S/(XS + p(\theta)S))$, as stated in (2). Now $E_{S/XS}(S/(XS + p(\theta)S))$ is Artinian by Matlis's theorem [13], and the final part of (2) follows from this and the fact that $XS$ has the Artin-Rees property [12, Proposition 4.2.6], arguing in a similar way to the previous paragraph. □

## 3.2 $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free uniform $S-$modules

The following lemma shows that Lemma 3.1(2) encompasses all the unfaithful simple $S-$modules.

**Lemma 3.2.** *Let $V$ be a simple $S-$module. Then:*

*(1) $V$ is faithful if and only if $V$ is $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free.*

*(2) If $V$ is $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free, then $V$ admits a structure as a (necessarily simple) $T-$module.*

*Proof.* (1) Suppose $V$ is faithful. Since $V$ is simple and $X$ is normal, if, for any $n \geq 1$, $X^n$ kills a nonzero element of $V$ then $VX^n = 0$, a contradiction. So $V$ is $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free.

For the reverse implication, suppose that $V$ is a $\mathcal{X}$-torsion free simple $S$-module, and suppose that $P := \mathrm{Ann}_S(V) \neq \{0\}$. Then $P \cap R = \{0\}$, so $PT$ is a proper prime ideal of $T$. But $T\langle\theta^{-1}\rangle$ is a simple ring by [12, Theorem 1.8.5], and so $\theta \in P$. Since $P$ is a primitive ideal of $S$, this forces $P$ to be $\theta S + XS$, contradicting the fact that $V$ is $\mathcal{X}$-torsion free. Therefore $V$ is faithful.

(2) Since $X$ is normal and $VX \neq 0$, the $S-$submodule $VX$ must equal $V$, so $V$ admits a structure as a $T-$module since $T = S\langle X^{-1}\rangle$. □

**Proposition 3.3.** *(1) Let $U$ be an $\mathcal{X}$-torsion free $S-$module. Then*

$$E_S(U) = E_T(U \otimes_S T).$$

*(2) Let $V$ be a faithful simple $S-$module. Then $E_S(V) = E_T(V)$.*

*Proof.* (1) If $0 \neq u \otimes_S t = u \otimes_S sX^{-n} \in U \otimes_S T$, with $u \in U$, $s \in S$, $t \in T$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $0 \neq (u \otimes_S t)X^n \in U$, so that $U \otimes_S T$ is an essential extension of $U$ as $S-$modules. The result will therefore follow if we show that

$$E_S(U \otimes_S T) = E_T(U \otimes_S T). \tag{5}$$

A similar argument to that just given shows that $E_T(U \otimes_S T)$ is an essential extension of $U \otimes_S T$ as $S$-modules, so that it remains only to show that $E_T(U \otimes_S T)$ is an injective $S-$module. For this, let $0 \neq I \lhd_r S$ and $f \in \mathrm{Hom}_S(I, E_T(U \otimes_S T))$. Define $\overline{f} : IT \longrightarrow E_T(U \otimes_S T)$ such that $\overline{f}(it) := f(i)t$ for $i \in I$ and $t \in T$. It is easy to check that $\overline{f}$ is well-defined, with $\overline{f}_{|I} = f$. So $\overline{f}$ extends to a $T$-homomorphism from $T$ to $E_T(U \otimes_S T)$, and the restriction of this map to $S$ gives the required extension of $f$ to $S$. This proves (1).

(2) Let $V$ be a faithful simple $S$-module. By Lemma 3.2 the $S$-module structure of $V$ extends to a $T$-module structure, with $V = VX$. Hence, $V = V \otimes_S T$, and so (2) is a special case of (1). □

Let $V$ be a faithful simple $S$-module. Since $T$ is a prime Noetherian ring of Krull dimension 1, $E_T(V)$ satisfies $(\diamond)$ as a $T$-module (see for instance [14, Proposition 5.5]). Regarding $(\diamond)$ for $S$, in the light of Proposition 3.3(2) and Lemma 3.1(2), the remaining issue therefore is:

**Question 3.4.** *Given a faithful simple $S$-module $V$, a simple $T$-module $W$ which occurs as a subfactor of $E_T(V)$, and a finitely generated $S$-submodule $W_0$ of $W$, does $W_0$ have a finite composition series?*

Theorem 1.4 gives a positive answer to this question in case $R = k[[X]]$.

# 4 Irreducible elements

## 4.1 Elementary lemmas

We have seen in §3 that the injective hulls of simple $S-$ and simple $T-$modules are closely connected. Recall that $T$ is a principal right ideal ring by [12, Theorem 1.2.9(ii)]. Hence, to better understand the representation theory of $S$ and $T$ we need to study the irreducible elements of these algebras, where, by definition, an *irreducible element* $s$ of a ring $S$ is a non-zero non-unit of $S$ such that, whenever $s = ab$ with $a, b \in S$, then either $a$ or $b$ is a unit of $S$.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let $S$ be a noetherian domain. Then every non-zero non-unit of $S$ can be written as a finite product of irreducible elements.*

*Proof.* [4, Proposition 0.9.3]. □

**Lemma 4.2.** *(1) Let $z \in S \setminus XS$. Then $z$ is irreducible in $S$ if and only if $z$ is irreducible in $T$.*

*(2) Let $W$ be a simple $T$-module. Then there is an element $z$ of $S$ such that $z$ is irreducible in both $S$ and $T$, with $W \cong T/zT$.*

*Proof.* (1) $\Longrightarrow$: Let $z \in S \setminus XS$, and suppose that $z$ is irreducible in $S$. Let

$$z \;=\; (aX^{-\ell})(bX^{-m}) \tag{6}$$

be a factorisation of $z$ in $T$, with $a, b \in S \setminus XS$ and $\ell, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Writing $b = \sum_{i=0}^{t} b_i \theta^i$ with $b_i \in R$, this yields

$$z \;=\; a(\sum_i b_i N_i^{\alpha}(q^{\ell})\theta^i)X^{-(\ell+m)},$$

with $a$ and $\sum_i b_i N_i^{\alpha}(q^{\ell})\theta^i$ in $S \setminus XS$. Thus

$$zX^{(\ell+m)} \;=\; a(\sum_i b_i N_i^{\alpha}(q^{\ell})\theta^i),$$

where the factors appearing in the above equation are all in $S$, and all except $X^{(\ell+m)}$ are not in $XS$. Since $XS$ is a completely prime ideal of $S$, this forces $\ell + m = 0$ and hence

$$\ell = m = 0.$$

Thus (6) is a factorisation of $z$ in $S$, so one of $a, b$ is a unit in $S$, as required.

$\Longleftarrow$: Let $z \in S \setminus XS$, and suppose that $z$ is irreducible in $T$. Suppose that $z = ab$ where $a$ and $b$ are non-zero non-units of $S$. Thus $a$ or $b$ must be a unit of $T$, say $a$ is such. So

$$a \in Q \cap S \ = \ R,$$

where $Q = R\langle X^{-1}\rangle$ is the quotient field of $R$. But $a$ is not a unit of $S$, thus $a \in XR$. This forces $z \in XS$, a contradiction. Therefore no such factorisation of $z$ exists, and $z$ is irreducible in $S$. If $b$ is a unit in $T$ the argument is similar.

(2) Let $W$ be a simple $T$-module. Since $T$ is a principal right ideal ring by [12, Theorem 1.2.9(ii)], there is an irreducible element $z$ of $T$ such that $W \cong T/zT$. By multiplying $z$ by a suitable power of $X$ we can assume that $z \in S \setminus XS$, so that $z$ is irreducible in $S$ by (1), as required. □

## 4.2 Taxonomy

Consider the following taxonomy of the irreducible elements of $S$. Since $S/XS \cong k[\theta]$, an irreducible element $z$ of $S$ can be uniquely written in the form

$$z \ = \ f + Xs, \qquad \textit{where } f \in k[\theta],\ s \in S.$$

After normalising by multiplying $z$ by a suitable unit in $S$ - that is, by a suitable element from $R \setminus XR$ - there are the following three mutually exclusive possibilities for $z$:

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **(A)** | $z$ | $=$ | $X$ *or* $z = \theta$, | $f = 0,\ s = 1$ *or* $f = \theta,\ s = 0$; |
| **(B)** | $z$ | $=$ | $1 + Xs$, | $s \in S \setminus R$; |
| **(C)** | $z$ | $=$ | $f + Xs$, | $f \in k[\theta] \setminus k$, $f$ *monic*, $s \in S$, $z \neq \theta$. |

Note that we forbid $s \in R$ in type (**B**) in order to exclude units from the list. We'll make use of these labels below, where we aim to develop our understanding of the simple and the 1-critical $S$-modules. We first need an easy lemma:

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let $z \in S \setminus XS$. Then*

*(1) $S \cap zT = zS$.*

*(2) $S/zS$ is a $\mathcal{X}$-torsion free $S-$module.*

*Proof.* (1) Let $t \in T$ with $zt = s_0 \in zT \cap S$, with $t = sX^{-n}$ for some $s \in S$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Thus

$$zs = s_0 X^n. \tag{7}$$

Suppose that $n \geq 1$. Since $XS$ is a completely prime ideal of the domain $S$ and $z \notin XS$, (7) shows that $s \in X^n S = SX^n$. Write $s = \hat{s}X^n$ for some $\hat{s} \in S$. Then $t = sX^{-n} = \hat{s}X^n X^{-n} = \hat{s} \in S$, as required.
(2) Given $s \in S$, if $sX^n \in zS$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then $s \in S \cap zT = zS$ by (1). □

**Remark 4.4.** Lemma 4.3 applies to a product $z$ of type (**B**) or (**C**) irreducibles in $S$.

# 5 Simple and critical $S-$modules and $T-$modules

## 5.1 Recap on critical modules

Denote the (Gabriel-Rentschler) Krull dimension of a module $M$ by $\mathrm{Kdim}(M)$, and recall that our main rings of interest, $S$ and $T$, have

$$\mathrm{Kdim}(S) = 2 \quad \textit{and} \quad \mathrm{Kdim}(T) = 1,$$

by [12, Theorem 6.5.4(i)]. Given a ring $R$ with Krull dimension and a non-negative integer $n$, an $R$-module $M$ is *$n$-critical* if $\mathrm{Kdim}(M) = n$ and $\mathrm{Kdim}(N) < n$ for every proper factor $N$ of $M$. For background on critical modules, see for example [12, §6.2].

**Definition 5.1.** Let $R$ be a right noetherian ring, and $M$ a finitely generated (right) $R$-module. A *critical composition series* of $M$ is a finite chain

$$0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \cdots \subset M_n = M$$

of submodules of $M$ such that

- ($\bullet$) $M_i/M_{i-1}$ is critical for $i = 1, \ldots, n$;
- ($\bullet$) $\mathrm{Kdim}(M_i/M_{i-1}) \leq \mathrm{Kdim}(M_{i+1}/M_i)$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n-1$.

Finitely generated critical $R$-modules $V$ and $W$ are called *hull-similar* if their injective hulls are isomorphic. Critical modules are uniform, and so critical modules $V$ and $W$ are hull-similar if and only if they share an isomorphic non-zero submodule. It is clear that hull-similarity is an equivalence relation on the class of finitely generated critical $R$-modules. The generalisation of the Jordan-Holder theorem to this setting is as follows:

**Theorem 5.2.** *(*[12, Proposition 6.2.20]*) Let $R$ be a right noetherian ring, and $M$ a finitely generated (right) $R$-module. Then:*

*(1) $M$ has a critical composition series.*

*(2) Any two critical composition series of $M$ have the same length, and after a suitable permutation the composition factors are pairwise hull-similar.*

Since $\mathrm{Kdim}(S) = 2$, every finitely generated $S-$module $M$ has $\mathrm{Kdim}(M) \leq 2$ by [12, Lemma 6.2.5]. It's easy to see that the finitely generated 2-critical $S-$modules are its non-zero right ideals [12, Proposition 6.3.10], and they form a single hull-similarity class since $S$ is a domain satisfying the Ore condition. The classification of 0-critical (that is, simple) and 1-critical $S-$modules runs parallel to the classification of simple $T-$modules, and can therefore exploit the fact that the localisation $T$ of $S$ is a principal left and right ideal domain, [12, Theorem 1.2.9(ii)]. We therefore recall in §5.2 some classical results about the latter.

## 5.2 Principal left and right ideal domains

**Definition 5.3.** (Ore [15]) Let $D$ be a left and right PID and let $a, b \in D$.

(a) $a$ is *(right) similar* to $b$ if there exists $u \in D$ such that 1 is the highest common left factor of $u$ and $b$, (that is, $uD + bD = D$), and $ua$ is the least common right multiple of $u$ and $b$, (that is, $uaD = uD \cap bD$.)

(b) *Left similarity* is defined analogously.

The following results can now be proved by straightforward calculation:

**Theorem 5.4.** *Let $D$ be a left and right PID and let $a, b \in D$.*

*(1) (*Ore, [15, Theorem 18], [9, pages 33-34]*) $a$ and $b$ are right similar if and only if they are left similar (so we may drop the adjectives left and right).*

*(2)* (Jacobson, [9, Chapter 3, Theorem 4]) *The following are equivalent:*

*(i)* *$a$ and $b$ are similar.*

*(ii)* *$D/aD \cong D/bD$.*

*(iii)* *$D/Da \cong D/Db$.*

In particular, of course, elements $a$ and $b$ of $D$ are similar if $a = ub$ or $a = bu$ for a unit $u$ of $D$, and this is equivalent to similarity if $D$ is commutative, but not in general.

## 5.3 Towards a classification of simple $S-$modules

Recall the definition of type (**B**) irreducible elements from §4.2.

**Theorem 5.5.** *Let $S$ and $T$ be as defined in §2.3.*

*(1)* *Let $V$ be a faithful simple $S-$module. Then there exists an element $z$ of $S$ satisfying the following properties (a) and (b).*

*(a)* *$z$ is irreducible in both $S$ and $T$;*

*(b)* *As $S-$modules, $V \cong S/zS \cong T/zT$.*

*Moreover, any element $z$ of $S$ satisfying (b) also satisfies*

*(c)* *$z$ is a type (**B**) irreducible.*

*(2)* *Conversely, if $z \in S$ satisfies (1)(a) and (1)(c), then $S/zS \cong T/zT$ is a faithful simple $S-$module.*

*(3)* *Let $z \in S$ satisfy (1)(a) and (1)(c), and let $y \in S \setminus XS$. Then the following are equivalent:*

*(a)* *$S/zS \cong S/yS$;*

*(b)* *$T/zT \cong T/yT$ as $T-$modules;*

*(c)* *$z$ and $y$ are similar in $T$.*

*Moreover, when these equivalent conditions hold $y$ is a type (**B**) irreducible element of $S$.*

*(4)* *The simple $S-$modules which are not faithful are the $\mathcal{X}-$torsion simple modules*

$$V_f \quad := \quad \frac{S}{XS + fS}, \quad f \in k[\theta],\ f \text{ a monic irreducible polynomial,}$$

*with $V_f \cong V_g$ if and only if $f = g$.*

*Proof.* (1): Let $V$ be a faithful simple $S-$module. Then $V$ is a simple $T$-module by Lemma 3.2. By Lemma 4.2 there is an element $z \in S$, not equal to $X$ or $\theta$ and irreducible in both $S$ and $T$, such that $V \cong T/zT$. Since $S + zT/zT$ is a non-zero $S-$submodule of $V$, it must equal $T/zT$, and so it follows using Lemma 4.3 that, as $S$-modules,

$$T/zT \ = \ S + zT/zT \ \cong \ S/S \cap zT \ = \ S/zS.$$

This proves (1)(*a*) and (1)(*b*).

Suppose now that $z$ is an element of $S$ satisfying (1)(*b*). Then $T/zT$ is a simple $T$-module, so $z$ must be irreducible in $T$. Similarly, since $V$ is by hypothesis a simple $S-$module, $z$ is irreducible in $S$ - equivalently, $X$ is not a factor of $z$ in $S$. To prove (1)(*c*), we now apply [1, Theorem 8.1]. This result, specialised to the present setting, states that for an element $z$ of $S$ which is irreducible in $T$, $T/zT$ is a $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free simple $S-$module if and only if a condition labelled (CO) in [1] is satisfied, namely

$$S \ = \ XS + zS. \tag{8}$$

Clearly, (8) fails when $z$ is type (**A**) or (**C**), as in these cases $z$ is not congruent to a unit $mod\, XS$. This proves the remainder of $(1)(c)$.

(2) Suppose that $z \in S$ satisfies $(1)(a)$ and $(1)(c)$. Then (8) holds, so $T/zT$ is a $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free simple $S-$module by [1, Theorem 8.1]. This proves $(1)(b)$.

(3) Let $z$ and $y$ be as stated. By part (2), $S/zS \cong T/zT$ is a faithful simple $S-$module. $(a) \Longrightarrow (b)$ : Assume $(a)$. By $(a)$ and part (2),

$$S/zS \cong T/zT = S/zS \otimes_S T \cong S/yS \otimes_S T = T/yT,$$

proving $(b)$.
$(b) \Longrightarrow (c)$ : By $(b)$, $y$ is irreducible in $T$, so $(c)$ follows from Theorem 5.4(2).
$(c) \Longrightarrow (a)$ : Suppose that $z$ and $y$ are similar in $T$. Then $T/zT \cong T/yT$ by Theorem 5.4(2), so in particular $y$ is irreducible in $T$. Thus it is also irreducible in $S$ by Lemma 4.2(1). Hence $S/zS \cong S/yS$ by [1, Theorem 8.1].

Suppose that $(a)-(c)$ hold. Then $y$ is irreducible in $S$ by Lemma 4.2(1), and it must be type (**B**) because otherwise $V := S/yS$ is not simple, since in that case $VX \subsetneq V$, contradicting $(1)(a)$.

(4) The first part of (4) follows from Lemma 3.1. If $f \neq g$ are monic irreducible polynomials in $k[\theta]$ then $V_f$ and $V_g$ have different annihilator ideals, so are not isomorphic. □

**Remark 5.6.** There is an obvious missing component in Theorem 5.5 as a classification of the simple $S-$modules - namely, it gives no answer to:

**Question 5.7.** *Given type* (**B**) *irreducible elements $a$ and $b$ of $S$, is there a method to determine whether $a$ and $b$ are similar in $T$?*

Beyond the rather cumbersome definition of similarity we note only the observation of Jacobson [9, page 36] that, for skew polynomial algebras of automorphism type whose coefficient ring is a division ring, such as $T = R\langle X^{-1}\rangle[\theta;\alpha]$,

*similar polynomials have the same degree in $\theta$,*

since this degree determines the dimension as an $R\langle X^{-1}\rangle-$vector space of the associated cyclic factor module.

The following easy lemma will be needed in the discussion of 1-critical modules in §6.

**Lemma 5.8.** *Let $V$ be a faithful simple $S-$module and $U$ an unfaithful simple $S-$module. Then* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(U,V) = 0$.

*Proof.* Let $V$ and $U$ be as stated, and suppose that $Y$ is an indecomposable extension of $V$ by $U$. By Theorem 5.5(4) there exists a monic irreducible polynomial $f \in k[\theta]$ such that $U = V_f = S/(XS + fS)$. In particular, there exists $y \in Y \setminus V$ such that $yX \in V$. Moreover, $yX \neq 0$, since $V$ is $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free by Lemma 3.2, and $V$ is by hypothesis an essential submodule of $Y$, so $Y$ is also $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free.

But the $S-$action on $V$ extends to a structure as $T-$module, by Lemma 3.2. Therefore

$$y = (yX)X^{-1} \in V,$$

a contradiction. So no such module $Y$ exists. □

## 5.4 Hull similarity classes of 1-critical $S$-modules

In this section we state and prove an anologue of Theorem 5.5 for 1-critical $S$-modules. As preparation for this we need to study certain 1-critical cyclic modules, as follows:

**Lemma 5.9.** *Let $S$ and $T$ be as defined in §2.3 and let $z$ be a type* (**C**) *irreducible element of $S$.*

*(1) Every simple subfactor $V$ of $S/zS$ is finite dimensinal;*

*(2) $S/zS$ is a faithful cyclic 1-critical $S$-module.*

*Proof.* (1) Write $W$ for $S/zS$. Since $z$ is irreducible in $T$ by Lemma 4.2(1), $T/zT = W \otimes_S T$ is a simple $T$-module. Since $z$ has type (**C**), Lemma 4.3 shows that

$$W \text{ is } \mathcal{X}\text{-torsion free.} \tag{9}$$

Let $B$ be a non-zero submodule of $W$, and define $M := W/B$. Since $T$ is a flat left $S-$module, the short exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$ yields the exact sequence of $T$-modules

$$0 \longrightarrow B \otimes_S T \longrightarrow W \otimes_S T \longrightarrow M \otimes_S T \longrightarrow 0. \tag{10}$$

By (9), $B \otimes_S T \neq 0$, so that $B \otimes_S T = W \otimes_S T$ since $W \otimes_S T$ is simple. Therefore, by exactness of (10), $M \otimes_S T = 0$; in other words, $M$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{X}$-torsion $S-$module. Since $M$ is finitely generated and $X$ is a normal element of $S$, there is a positive integer $\ell$ such that

$$MX^{\ell} = 0. \tag{11}$$

In particular, if $M$ is non-zero we can choose $0 \neq m \in M$ with $mX = 0$, say $m = w + B$ for some $w \in W$. Let $I := \mathrm{Ann}_S(w)$, so $I \neq 0$ since $\mathrm{Kdim}(W) \leq 1$ by [12, Lemma 6.3.9]. We claim that

$$I \not\subseteq SX. \tag{12}$$

For, choose $0 \neq \beta \in I$ and write $\beta$ as $\tau X^r$ for some $r \geq 0$, with $\tau \notin SX$. (We can find $\tau$ since $\bigcap_n (SX)^n = 0$.) If $w\tau \neq 0$ then the equation $w\tau X^r = 0$ shows that there exists a non-zero $\mathcal{X}-$torsion element of $W$, contradicting (9). This proves (12). Thus

$$m(I + XS) = 0,$$

and hence, by (12), $mS$ is a non-zero finite dimensional submodule of $M$. Repeating this argument in the factor of $W$ by $B_1 := B + wS$, and so on, the fact that $W$ is noetherian forces

$$\dim_k(W/B) < \infty. \tag{13}$$

We claim next that

$$\mathrm{socle}(W) = 0. \tag{14}$$

To see this, suppose that $U$ is a simple submodule of $W$. By (9) and Theorem 5.5(4), $\dim_k(U) = \infty$. Notice that, by Theorem 5.5(1),(2) and (3) and the fact that $z$ has type (**C**), $W$ itself cannot be simple, so that $U \subsetneq W$. We can therefore apply (13) with $B = U$ to conclude that $W/U$ contains a submodule $A/U$ with $\dim_k(A/U) < \infty$. However Lemma 5.8 now implies that $A$ splits,

$$A \quad \cong \quad U \oplus C,$$

where $C$ is a finite-dimensional simple submodule. Since $CX = 0$, this contradicts (9). This proves (14).

Now let $B \subseteq A$ be submodules of $W$ with $A/B$ a simple module. Then $B$ must be non-zero by (14). Therefore (13) implies that $\dim_k(A/B) < \infty$, proving part (1).

(2) It is immediate from (14) and (13) that $S/zS$ is a cyclic 1-critical $S-$module. If $S/zS$ is not faithful, then it contains a nonzero submodule killed by either $XS$ or by $\theta S$, since these are the only height one primes of $S$. From (9) it is clear that the first of these

possibilities is not possible. Suppose that $S/zS$ has a nonzero submodule killed by $\theta S$. Since $S/zS$ is critical, it is uniform. Therefore, since $\theta S$ has the Artin-Rees property by [12, Proposition 4.2.6], there exists $n \geq 1$ such that

$$(S/zS)\theta^n \ = \ 0. \tag{15}$$

Let $z = f + Xs$, where $s \in S$ and $0 \neq f \in k[\theta]$ is monic, with $f \neq \theta$. Then (15) implies that

$$\theta^n \ = \ (f + Xs)\gamma$$

for some $\gamma \in S$, and a quick calculation shows that this is impossible. Hence $S/zS$ is faithful, as required. □

Here is the promised 1-critical analogue of Theorem 5.5. We repeat Lemma 5.9(2) as part (2) of the theorem, to emphasise it in conjunction with part (1).

**Theorem 5.10.** *Let $S$ and $T$ be as defined in §1.*

*(1) Let $M$ be a finitely generated 1-critical $S$-module.*
  *(a) If $M$ is unfaithful, then $M \cong S/XS$ or $M \cong S/\theta S$.*
  *(b) If $M$ is faithful, then $M$ is hull similar to $S/zS$ for a type* (**C**) *irreducible element $z$ of $S$. More precisely, $S/zS$ is isomorphic to a submodule of $M$.*

*(2) Let $z$ be a type* (**C**) *irreducible element of $S$. Then $S/zS$ is a faithful cyclic 1-critical $S$-module.*

*(3) Let $z$ and $w$ be irreducible elements of $S$ with $z$ of type* (**C**)*. Then the following are equivalent:*
  *(a) $S/zS$ and $S/wS$ are hull-similar.*
  *(b) $T/zT$ and $T/wT$ are isomorphic simple $T$-modules.*
  *(c) $z$ and $w$ are similar in $T$.*

  *When these equivalent statements hold $w$ is of type* (**C**).

*Proof.* (1)(*a*) Suppose that $M$ is unfaithful. The only height one primes of $S$ are $XS$ and $\theta S$, so $M$ has a non-zero submodule $A$ with $A(XS) = 0$ or $A(\theta S) = 0$. Only one of these possibilities can occur for $M$, as otherwise $M$, being uniform, would contain a non-zero submodule killed by $XS + \theta S$, contradicting the fact that $M$ is 1-critical.

So let us suppose that there exists $0 \neq A \subseteq M$ with $A(XS) = 0$; so $\mathrm{Ann}_S(A) = XS$ since $A$ is 1-critical. Since $XS$ satisfies the Artin-Rees property by [12, Proposition 4.2.6], there exists $t \geq 1$ such that $MX^t = 0 \neq MX^{t-1}$. We claim that

$$t \ = \ 1. \tag{16}$$

Suppose that (16) is false. Then we can choose $m \in M$ with

$$mX^2 \ = 0 \ \neq mX;$$

moreover, since $mS$ is a non-zero submodule of $M$, it is 1-critical and hull similar to $S/XS$.

Now $mS/mSX$ is Artinian and annihilated by $XS$. Hence there exists $0 \neq f \in k[\theta]$ such that $mSf \subseteq mSX$. That is, for some non-zero element $\widehat{f}$ of $k[\theta]$,

$$mSfX \ = \ 0 \ = mSX\widehat{f}, \tag{17}$$

where the second equality follows from the relation $\theta X = qX\theta$. But now $mSX$ is a non-zero submodule of $M$ which is killed by the co-Artinian ideal $XS + \widehat{f}S$ of $S$, contradicting the fact that $M$ is 1-critical.

Thus (16) is proved. Hence $M$ is a finitely generated torsion-free 1-critical (and so torsion-free and uniform) $k[\theta]$-module. So it is isomorphic to a non-zero ideal of $k[\theta]$, that is to $k[\theta]$ itself.

If $M$ on the other hand contains a non-zero element annihilated by $\theta$, then the argument is similar.

(1)($b$) Suppose that $M$ is a finitely generated faithful 1-critical $S-$module. We show first that

$$M \text{ is } \mathcal{X} - \text{torsion free.} \tag{18}$$

If (18) is false then there exists $0 \neq m \in M$ with $mX = 0$. But $M$, being critical, is uniform, and is therefore an essential extension of $mS$. Since $(mS)(XS) = 0$ and the invertible ideal $XS$ has the Artin-Rees property [12, Proposition 4.2.6], $MX^{\ell} = 0$ for some positive integer $\ell$. This contradicts the fact that $M$ is faithful, so (18) is proved.

Now choose $0 \neq m \in M$ and $z \in S \setminus XS$ with $mz = 0$ and $z$ irreducible in $S$ and $T$. Note that we can do this thanks to (18) coupled with Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2(1). Moreover $z$ is not type (**A**) since if it were then $mX = 0$ or $m\theta = 0$, and in both cases the Artin-Rees property applied to the essential extension $mS \subseteq M$ implies that $M$ is unfaithful, a contradiction. Nor is $z$ type (**B**), since if it were then $S/zS$ would be simple by Theorem 5.5(2), contradicting the 1-criticality of $M$. Therefore

$$z \text{ has type } (\mathbf{C}). \tag{19}$$

Now $zS \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_S(m)$, so that $mS$ is a factor of $S/zS$. But $S/zS$ is 1-critical by (19) and Lemma 5.9(2), and the socle of $M$ is $\{0\}$ since $M$ is 1-critical by hypothesis. So we must have

$$S/zS \cong mS \subseteq M. \tag{20}$$

Thus $E_S(S/zS) \cong E_S(M)$ since $M$ is uniform, so $M$ is hull-similar to $S/zS$ as claimed.

(2) This is Lemma 5.9(2).

(3) Statements ($b$) and ($c$) are equivalent by Theorem 5.4(2).
($a$) $\Longleftrightarrow$ ($b$): Note first that $S/zS$ is $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free by Lemma 4.3(2). Now we have the following chain of equivalences,

$$\begin{aligned}
S/wS \text{ is hull-similar to } S/zS \Longleftrightarrow \quad & E_S(S/wS) \cong E_S(S/zS) \text{ as } S-\text{modules} \\
\Longleftrightarrow \quad & E_T(S/wS \otimes_S T) \cong E_T(S/zS \otimes_S T) \text{ as } T-\text{modules} \\
\Longleftrightarrow \quad & E_T(T/wT) \cong E_T(T/zT) \text{ as } T\text{-modules} \\
\Longleftrightarrow \quad & T/wT \cong T/zT \text{ as } T\text{-modules,}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equivalence is by definition of hull-similarity, the second by Proposition 3.3(1), and the last equivalence holds because $T/wT$ and $T/zT$ are simple modules due to $T$ being a principal right ideal domain.

Finally, if ($a$) holds, then $S/wS$ is faithful and has Krull dimension 1 by part (2) of the theorem applied to $S/zS$. So $w$ cannot be type (**A**) or type (**B**) by statement (1) and Theorem 5.5(2). Hence $w$ must be type (**C**). □

In view of the above result we introduce the obvious terminology: a finitely generated critical $S$-module is *type* (**C**) *1-critical* if it is hull-similar to $S/zS$ where $z$ is a type (**C**) irreducible in $S$.

# 6 $(\diamond)$ for $S$ via the representation theory of $T$.

## 6.1 Injective hulls of type (B) $T-$modules

In this subsection we make use of the analysis of §§ 5.3 and 5.4 to study injective hulls and extensions of simple $S-$modules.

We begin by examining the injective hull of a faithful simple $S-$module $V$, bearing in mind that $V$ admits a structure as $T-$module by Lemma 3.2, and its $S-$ and $T-$hulls are one and the same by Proposition 3.3(2).

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let $S$ and $T$ be as in §2.3, and let $V$ be a faithful simple $S-$module. Let $\mathcal{C} := \{1 + Xs : s \in S\}$.*

*(1) $\mathcal{C}$ is an $\alpha$-invariant Ore set in $S$.*

*(2) The set $W$ of $\mathcal{C}$-torsion elements of $E_T(V)$ is a non-zero $T$-submodule of $E_T(V)$.*

*(3) Let $c \in \mathcal{C}$, and let $c = c_1 \cdots c_t$ be a factorisation of $c$ as a product of irreducible elements of $S$. Then $c_i$ has type* **(B)** *for all $i$.*

*(4) As an $S-$module, $W$ is locally Artinian, with all composition factors type* **(B)**.

*(5) If $E_T(V)/W$ is nonzero then it has the following properties.*

*(i) $E_T(V)/W$ is a $\mathcal{C}$-torsion-free injective $T$-module.*

*(ii) As $S-$module $E_T(V)/W$ is injective, a direct sum of injective hulls of 1-critical type* **(C)** *$S-$modules.*

*(iii) The decomposition (ii) is also a decomposition of $E_T(V)/W$ as a direct sum of injective hulls of simple $T$-modules.*

*Proof.* (1) Since $X$ is normal in $S$, $XS$ satisfies the Artin-Rees property by [12, Proposition 4.2.6]. Hence, by [12, Proposition 4.2.9(i)], $\mathcal{C}$ is an Ore set in $S$. It's clear from the definitions of $\mathcal{C}$ and $\alpha$ that $\mathcal{C}$ is $\alpha$-invariant.

(2) That $W$ is an $S-$submodule of $E_T(V)$ is a standard consequence of the Ore condition. By Theorem 5.5(1) $V \cong T/zT$ for an irreducible element $z$ of $\mathcal{C}$, so that $0 \neq 1 + zT \in W$.

Let $y \in W$ and $c \in \mathcal{C}$ be such that $yc = 0$. One can easily see that there is $\overline{c} \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $Xc = \overline{c}X$. Then

$$0 = yc = (yX^{-1})(\overline{c}X)$$

and $yX^{-1}\overline{c} = 0$. Hence $WX^{-1} \subseteq W$ and the result follows.

(3) This is a straightforward check.

(4) Clearly it is enough to prove that if $w \in W$ then $wS$ is Artinian with all composition factors type (**B**). But such an element $w$ satisfies $wc = 0$ for some $c \in \mathcal{C}$, so that $wS$ is a factor of $S/cS$. The result follows since $S/cS$ has the desired form by part (3), Lemma 4.1 and Theorem 5.5(2).

(5) That $E_T(V)/W$ is $\mathcal{C}$-torsion-free is an immediate consequence of the fact that $\mathcal{C}$ is multiplicatively closed. It is $T$-injective since it is a factor of an injective $T$-module and $T$ is hereditary (being a principal right ideal ring). Since $E_T(V)/W$ is a $T$-module it is $\mathcal{X}$-torsion free. An easy lemma shows that injective $T$-modules are injective as $S-$modules, so $E_T(V)/W$ is an injective $S-$module. Since $S$ is noetherian, every injective $S-$module is a direct sum of injective hulls of critical $S-$modules. So to confirm the claimed structure of $E_T(V)/W$ as $S-$module we have to confirm that each finitely generated critical $S-$submodule $U$ of $E_T(V)/W$ contains a cyclic critical of type **(C)**. First note that such a $U$ must be 1-critical: for $U$ is $\mathcal{X}$-torsion free since $E_T(V)/W$ is a $T$-module, so $U$ cannot be finite dimensional; and if $U$ is an infinite dimensional simple $S-$module then it is type **(B)**, and hence $\mathcal{C}$-torsion, which contradicts the fact that $E_T(V)/W$ is $\mathcal{C}$-torsion free. But

now Theorem 5.10(1) shows that $U$ is either $\widehat{S}/\theta\widehat{S}$ or it contains a submodule $S/zS$ for a type **(C)** irreducible $z$.

The first of these possibilities is ruled out by an argument similar to that used in part (2). Namely, if $U \cong S/\theta S$ then there is an element $e$ of $E_T(V)\setminus W$ with $e\theta \in W$. But then $e\theta d = 0$ for an element $d$ which is a product of type **(B)** irreducibles. It is easy to check that $\theta d = d'\theta$ where $d' \in \mathcal{C}$. Since $E_T(V)$ is an essential extension of the faithful simple $S$-module $V$, it contains no non-zero elements killed by $\theta$. Hence $ed' = 0$, so $e \in W$, a contradiction.

The final claim in (5) follows immediately from Proposition 3.3(1). □

**Corollary 6.2.** *Continue with the notation of Proposition 6.1. Then the following are equivalent.*

*(1)* $E_S(V)$ *is a locally Artinian* $S-$*module.*

*(2)* $W = E_S(V)$.

*(3)* $W = E_T(V)$.

*Proof.* (2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (3): By Proposition 3.3.

(2) $\Leftrightarrow$ (1): By Proposition 6.1(4),(5). □

## 6.2 Equivalent conditions for $(\diamond)$ for $S$

We summarise the equivalences between the nature of Ext-spaces of critical modules for $S$ and $T$ and the validity of property $(\diamond)$ for $S$ in Theorem 6.6, which is a consequence of the following well-known result.

**Proposition 6.3.** [16, Corollary 3.2] *Let $U$ be a Noetherian domain, $a, b$ nonzero elements of $U$. Then the following are equivalent:*

*(a)* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_U(U/aU, U/bU) = 0$;

*(b)* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_U(U/Ub, U/Ua) = 0$;

*(c)* $Ua + bU = U$.

Before applying Proposition 6.3 to the analysis of $(\diamond)$ for $S$ we record the following corollary, which we will need below and which can be deduced either from the Artin-Rees property of $\theta T$ together with $(a) \Longleftrightarrow (b)$, or by elementary calculations in $T$ using criterion $(c)$ along with our taxonomy in §4.2 of canonical irreducible elements.

**Corollary 6.4.** *Let $c$ be an irreducible element of $T$ which is not an associate of $\theta$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_T(T/Tc, T/T\theta) \;=\; \mathrm{Ext}^1_T(T/T\theta, T/Tc) \;=\; 0,$$

*and similarly for right modules.*

The following lemma is needed for the proof of Theorem 6.6

**Lemma 6.5.** *Let $w$ and $z$ be irreducible elements of $S$, with $w$ of type* **(B)** *and $z$ of type* **(C)**. *Then $\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(S/zS, S/wS) \neq 0$ if and only if there is a short exact sequence of $S$-modules*

$$0 \longrightarrow S/wS \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow S/zS \longrightarrow 0$$

*with $A$ uniform.*

*Proof.* The implication from right to left is clear from basic properties of Ext. For the reverse implication, set $W := S/wS$ and $U := S/zS$, and suppose that $\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(U,W) \neq 0$. Then there exists a module extension

$$0 \longrightarrow W \xrightarrow{\alpha} A \xrightarrow{\pi} U \longrightarrow 0 \tag{21}$$

in which $A$ does not split as the direct sum of $U$ and $W$. We suppose for a contradiction that $A$ is not uniform. Thus $\alpha(W)$ is not essential in $A$, so we can choose a non-zero submodule $B$ of $A$ maximal such that

$$B \cap \alpha(W) \;=\; 0. \tag{22}$$

We now obtain from (21) the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow W \xrightarrow{\overline{\alpha}} A/B \longrightarrow U/\pi(B) \longrightarrow 0, \tag{23}$$

Note that, in (23),

$$U/\pi(B) \;\neq\; 0 \;\neq \pi(B), \tag{24}$$

due to (22) and the assumption that (21) is non-split.

We claim that $\overline{\alpha}(W)$ is essential in $A/B$. Suppose that this is false, and let $C$ be a non-zero submodule of $A/B$ with $\overline{\alpha}(W) \cap C = 0$. Writing $C$ as $D/B$ for a submodule $D$ of $A$ strictly containing $B$, this is equivalent to

$$\alpha(W) \cap D \;\subseteq\; \alpha(W) \cap B \;=\; 0,$$

which contradicts the maximality of $B$. Thus $\overline{\alpha}(W)$ is indeed essential in $A/B$. Equivalently, since $W$ is simple, $A/B$ is uniform, so the exact sequence (23) shows that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(U/\pi(B), W) \neq 0. \tag{25}$$

But the module $U/\pi(B)$ is finite dimensional by Lemma 5.9, using (24) and since $z$ is a type (**C**) irreducible element. This means that (25) contradicts Lemma 5.8. Therefore the module $A$ in (21) is uniform, as required. □

To state Theorem 6.6 precisely it is necessary to consider, here and in Theorem 6.7, one-sided versions of property ($\diamond$) - thus we say that an algebra $A$ satisfies *right* ($\diamond$) if the injective hulls of its simple right modules are locally Artinian; and similarly for left ($\diamond$).

**Theorem 6.6.** *(1) Let $w$ and $z$ be irreducible elements of $S$, with $w$ of type* **(B)** *and $z$ of type* **(C)**. *Then the following are equivalent:*

- *(a)* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(S/zS, S/wS) = 0$;
- *(b)* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(S/Sw, S/Sz) = 0$;
- *(c)* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_T(T/zT, T/wT) = 0$;
- *(d)* $\mathrm{Ext}^1_T(T/Tw, T/Tz) = 0$.

*(2) $S$ satisfies right ($\diamond$) if and only if the equivalent statements in (1) hold for all such elements $z$ and $w$.*

*Proof.* (1) That (a) is equivalent to (b) and (c) is equivalent to (d) is immediate from Proposition 6.3.

To see that (a)$\Longleftrightarrow$(c), set $W := S/wS$ and $U := S/zS$, so that $W = T/wT$ and $E_S(W) = E_T(W)$ by Proposition 3.3(2) and Theorem 5.5(2). Suppose first that $\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(U,W) \neq 0$. Then by Lemma 6.5 there exists a cyclic uniform $S-$module $V$ which is an extension of $W$ by $U$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.3(2) and Proposition 3.3(1), $V \otimes_S T$ is a cyclic uniform $T$-module, which is an essential extension of its simple $T$-submodule

$W \otimes_S T = W$, where the equality follows from Lemma 3.2. Exactness of the functor $- \otimes_S T$ and the fact that $U$ is $\mathcal{X}-$torsion free guarantee that

$$(V \otimes_S T)/W \cong T/zT \neq 0.$$

This proves that $\mathrm{Ext}^1_T(T/zT, T/wT) \neq 0$, so that (c)$\Longrightarrow$(a). The converse is proved by a similar but easier argument.

(2) Suppose that right ($\diamond$) holds for $S$. This means that, for all type **(B)** irreducible elements $w$ of $S$, $E_S(S/wS)$ is locally artinian. Transferring this fact to the $T-$modules $E_T(T/wT)$ by means of Theorem 5.5 and Proposition 3.3(2), we see that none of these injective $T-$modules $E_T(T/wT)$ contains a simple $T$-subfactor $T/zT$ with $z$ of type **(C)**, proving (c).

Conversely, if right ($\diamond$) fails for $S$ then by Corollary 6.2 there exists a faithful simple right $S-$module $V$ for which, in the notation of Proposition 6.1, $W \subsetneq E_S(V)$. In view of Theorem 5.10 and Proposition 6.1(5)(ii) there exists a type (**C**) irreducible $d$ of $S$ such that $S/dS \subseteq E_S(V)/W$. Take $e \in E_S(V)$ such that $(eS + W)/W$ is isomorphic to $S/dS$. Then $eS$ is a uniform extension of $V$, and $eS \cap W$ has a finite composition series whose factors are all faithful simple $S$-modules, by Proposition 6.1(4). Since $eS/eS \cap W \cong S/dS$, an application of the long exact sequence of Ext shows that

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1_S(S/dS, Y) \ \neq \ 0$$

for some composition factor $Y$ of $eS \cap W$. Hence (a) fails to hold, as required.

□

The following consequence of the above result reduces the issue of the validity of right ($\diamond$) for $S$ to a "monoidal commutativity" condition on the irreducible elements of $T$, as in ($e$).

**Theorem 6.7.** *The following statements are equivalent.*

*(a) Right ($\diamond$) holds for $S$.*

*(b) There does not exist a uniserial right $T$-module with composition length 2 whose socle is a type* **(B)** *simple and whose simple image is type* **(C)**.

*(c) There does not exist a uniserial left $T$-module with composition length 2 whose socle is a type* **(C)** *simple and whose simple image is type* **(B)**.

*(d) There does not exist a cyclic 1-critical left $S-$module with an infinite dimensional simple image.*

*(e) Let $b, c \in S$ be irreducible, with $b$ type* **(B)** *and $c$ type* **(C)**. *Then there exist $b', c'$ in $S$, respectively irreducibles of types* **(B)** *and* **(C)** *and respectively similar to $b$ and to $c$, with*

$$cb \ = \ b'c'.$$

*Proof.* ($a$) $\Longleftrightarrow$ ($b$): This follows from Theorem 6.6(2) with (c) of Theorem 6.6(1).

($b$) $\Longleftrightarrow$ ($c$): This is the equivalence of Theorem 6.6(c) and (d).

($c$) $\Longrightarrow$ ($d$): Suppose that (c) holds, but that a left $S$-module $M$ of the form described in (d) exists. That is, $M$ is cyclic and uniform, and is the extension of a 1-critical $S$-module $A$ by an infinite dimensional simple $S$-module. Notice that $A$ is faithful: for, if this is not the case $A$ is annihilated by $X^i\theta^j S$ for some $i, j \geq 0$, and since this ideal satisfies the Artin-Rees property by [12, Proposition 4.2.6], $(X^i\theta^j S)^t M = 0$ for some $t \geq 1$. This is impossible since $M$ has a faithful factor by hypothesis. Hence, by (the left-side version of) Theorem 5.10(1)(b), $A$ contains a copy of $S/Sz$ for a type **(C)** irreducible element $z$

of $S$. Now $M$ is $\mathcal{X}$-torsion free, since its essential submodule $A$ is, and so $T \otimes_S M$ is an essential extension of $T/Tz$ and maps onto $T/Tw$ for a type **(B)** simple critical element $w$ of $S$. Therefore, since $T \otimes_S M$ has finite composition length and cannot contain any subfactor isomorphic to $T/T\theta$ thanks to Corollary 6.4, an application of the long exact sequence of Ext shows that it must contain as a subfactor a non-split extension of a type **(C)** simple module by a type **(B)** one, contradicting (c).

$(d) \Longrightarrow (c)$: Conversely, suppose that (d) holds, but that a left $T$-module $N$ exists as in (c), so $N = Ty$ is a non-split $T$-module of composition length two, with unique composition series

$$0 \longrightarrow F \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow 0,$$

with $F$ and $P$ respectively type **(C)** and type **(B)** simple $T$-modules. More precisely, let $p \in P$ be such that the epimorphism $\pi : N \longrightarrow P$ maps $y$ to $p$, and by Theorem 5.5(1),(2),

$$P \;=\; Sp \;\cong\; S/Sb$$

for a type **(B)** irreducible element $b$ of $S$. By restriction, we obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F_0 \longrightarrow Sy \longrightarrow S/Sb \longrightarrow 0, \tag{26}$$

where $F_0 := F \cap Sy$. Since $N$ is a uniform $T$-module, it's easy to show that $Sy$ is a uniform $S$-module, and since $b$ is type **(B)** irreducible, $S/Sb$ is a simple $S$-module. Consider now any non-zero element $u$ of $F_0$. Because $F$ is a simple $T$-module,

$$T \otimes_S Su \;=\; Tu \;=\; F, \tag{27}$$

so $cu = 0$ for a type **(C)** irreducible element $c$ of $S$. Thus $F_0$ is hull-similar to its type **(C)** 1-critical submodule

$$C \;:=\; Su \;\cong\; S/Sc.$$

Now $F/Su$ is $\mathcal{X}$-torsion by (27). Therefore every element of the finitely generated $S$-module $F_0/Su$ is killed by both a power of $X$ and by an irreducible element of type **(C)**. Filtering $F_0/Su$ by the elements killed by $X$, then the elements killed by $X^2$ and so on, we therefore see that $F_0/Su$ is a finite dimensional $S$-module. From the exact sequence (26) we obtain the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F_0/Su \longrightarrow Sy/Su \longrightarrow S/Sb \longrightarrow 0. \tag{28}$$

By Lemma 3.1 the $S$-injective hull of $F_0/Su$ is locally finite dimensional. Since $S/Sb$ is an infinite dimensional simple $S$-module, $Sy/Su$ does not embed in $E_S(F_0/Su)$ and the sequence is split exact. We may thus choose an element $w \in Sy$ whose image *modulo* $Su$ generates a $S$-module isomorphic to $S/Sb$. Set $W := Sw$. We have thus found a non-split exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F_0 \cap W \longrightarrow W \longrightarrow S/Sb \longrightarrow 0, \tag{29}$$

contradicting (d) and so completing the proof.

$(c) \Longrightarrow (e)$: Assume (c), and let $b$ and $c$ be irreducibles in $S$, respectively of types (**B**) and (**C**). Then $T/Tcb$ has composition length 2, so it is either semisimple or has essential socle. By (c), $T/Tcb$ splits; that is,

$$T/Tcb \quad = \quad A \oplus V,$$

where $A = Tb/Tcb \cong T/Tc$ and $V \cong T/Tb$ via the $T-$module projection $\psi : T/Tcb \longrightarrow V$ with $\ker\psi = A$. Set $\psi(1 + Tcb) := v$, so there exists $a \in A$ such that $1 + Tcb = (a, v)$. Let $M = T(a, v)$.

Since $A = Ta$, there exists a type (**C**) irreducible element $c'$, which we can choose to be in $S$ by Lemma 4.2, with

$$\mathrm{Ann}_T(a) = Tc'.$$

Note that $c'$ is similar to $c$ by Theorem 5.10(5), because

$$T/Tc' \cong A \cong T/Tc.$$

Now $c'(a, v) = (0, v')$, and $v' \neq 0$ because $M = T(a, v)$ cannot be a factor of the simple module $T/Tc'$. Thus

$$\mathrm{Ann}_T(v') = Tb''$$

for an irreducible element $b''$, again chosen to be in $S$ thanks to Lemma 4.2, and which is similar to $b$ by Theorem 5.5(3). Therefore

$$Tb''c' \subseteq \mathrm{Ann}_T((a, v)) = \mathrm{Ann}_T(1 + Tcb) = Tcb,$$

so that

$$Tb''c' = Tcb$$

since the factors by both these left ideals have composition length 2. By Lemma 4.3(1) and Remark 4.4,

$$Sb''c' = Tb''c' \cap S = Tcb \cap S = Scb.$$

There is therefore a unit $u$ of $S$ such that

$$ub''c' = cb.$$

Since $u = 1 + Xw$ for some $w \in R$, $b' := ub''$ is a type (**B**) irreducible in $S$, similar to $b''$ which is similar to $b$, and so (e) is proved.

$(e) \Longrightarrow (c)$: Assume (e), and let $M$ be as in (c), namely a uniserial left $T-$module which is an extension of a type (**C**) simple $T-$module $A$ by a type (**B**) simple module. Being uniserial of length 2, $M$ is cyclic, say $M = Tm$. By hypothesis, $\mathrm{Ann}_T(m + A) = Tb$ for some irreducible type (**B**) element, which we can choose to be in $S$ by Lemma 4.2. Since $M$ is not simple, $0 \neq bm \in A$, so $A = Tbm$ and there is a type (**C**) irreducible element $c$ of $S$ such that $c(bm) = 0$. Therefore $M$ is a factor of $T/Tcb$, and, comparing composition lengths, we see that

$$M \cong T/Tcb.$$

Now apply (e) to obtain irreducibles $b'$ and $c'$ in $S$, respectively of types (**B**) and (**C**), with $cb = b'c'$. So

$$b'c'm \quad = \quad cbm \quad = \quad 0,$$

but $c'm \neq 0$ as $M = Tm$ is not a simple $T-$module. Thus

$$T(c'm) \cong T/Tb'$$

is a simple type (**B**) $T-$submodule of $M$, contradicting the fact that $M$ is uniserial with type (**C**) socle. Therefore no such uniserial module $M$ exists, and (c) is proved. □

## 6.3 Proof of $(\diamond)$ for $\widehat{S}$

Our aim is to prove that $\widehat{S} = k[[X]][\theta;\alpha]$ satisfies $(\diamond)$ by showing that it satisfies the monoidal commutativity criterion of Theorem 6.7(e). For this, we need some additional information about the irreducibility of polynomials in the skew polynomial ring $\widehat{S}$, as provided by the next lemma. Note that in it we do not need to assume that $q$ is not a root of unity and the observation it contains seems to be of independent interest even when $q = 1$, that is when $\widehat{S}$ is a commutative ring. We write $q := \sum_{p\geq 0} q_p X^p$, where $q_p \in k$ and $q_0 \neq 0$ as $q$ is a unit of $k[[X]]$. Consider $z = \sum_{i=0}^{m} z_i\theta^i \in \widehat{S}$ with $z_i \in k[[X]]$ for all $i$. If $X$ divides all the $z_i$ except for $z_0$ and $X^2$ does not divide $z_m$ then the generalised Eisenstein criterion, [8, §1, Theorem], tells us that $z$ is irreducible. The following lemma is in the direction of a converse to this. Its formulation is rather technical due to the requirements of its proof, but the underlying idea is quite simple. It shows that if there is an integer $n$ with $0 < n < m$ such that $X$ does not divide $z_n$ and $X$ divides $z_i$ for all $i > n$, then $z$ is necessarily reducible.

**Lemma 6.8.** *Retain the notation and definition of $\widehat{S}$ as above. Let $1 \leq n < m$ and let*

$$z = \sum_{i=0}^{n} f_i\theta^i + \sum_{i=n+1}^{m} g_i\theta^i \in \widehat{S},$$

*where $f_i$, $g_i \in k[[X]]$ and $g_m \neq 0$. Suppose that*

- $(\bullet)$ *$f_n$ is invertible (that is, $X \nmid f_n$), and*
- $(\bullet)$ *$g_i$ is not invertible (that is, $g_i \in Xk[[X]]$), for all $i = n+1, \ldots, m$.*

*Then $z$ is divisible on the right by a monic polynomial in $\theta$ of degree $n$. In particular, $z$ is a reducible polynomial.*

*Proof.* Let $z \in \widehat{S}$ be as above. As $f_n$ is invertible in $\widehat{S}$, we can without loss of generality replace $z$ by $f_n^{-1}z$ and thus assume henceforth that $f_n = 1$. We claim that there exist $h_0, \ldots, h_{n-1} \in k[[X]]$ such that

$$z \in \widehat{S}(h_0 + h_1\theta + \cdots + h_{n-1}\theta^{n-1} - \theta^n). \tag{30}$$

Note that the lemma is immediate from (30).

Let $h_0, h_1, \ldots, h_{n-1}$ be elements of $k[[X]]$ which remain to be determined, and denote the left ideal $\widehat{S}(h_0 + h_1\theta + \ldots + h_{n-1}\theta^{n-1} - \theta^n)$ of $\widehat{S}$ by $I$. Throughout this proof we denote congruence (mod $I$) by $\equiv$. Thus we are aiming to choose elements $h_i$ of $k[[X]]$ such that

$$z \in I. \tag{31}$$

By definition of $I$,

$$\theta^n \equiv h_0 + h_1\theta + \cdots + h_{n-1}\theta^{n-1}. \tag{32}$$

Multiplying (32) on the left by $\theta$, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta^{n+1} &\equiv \theta\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} h_i\theta^i\right) \\
&\equiv \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \alpha(h_i)\theta^{i+1} \;+\; \alpha(h_{n-1})\theta^n \\
&\equiv \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \alpha(h_{j-1})\theta^j \;+\; \alpha(h_{n-1})\left(\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} h_j\theta^j\right) \\
&\equiv \alpha(h_{n-1})h_0 \;+\; \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \left(\alpha(h_{j-1}) + \alpha(h_{n-1})h_j\right)\theta^j.
\end{aligned}$$

This yields by induction: for all $\ell \geq 1$,

$$\theta^{n+\ell} \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} y_{i,\ell}\theta^i, \tag{33}$$

where for each $i$ and $\ell$, $y_{i,\ell} \in k[[X]]$ is a $k$-linear combination of products of elements of the set $\{\alpha^r(h_j) : j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}, r \in \{0,\ldots,\ell\}\}$.

Write $h_i = \sum_{p\geq 0} h_{i,p}X^p$ for $h_{i,p} \in k$ and similarly present the elements $f_i, g_j$ and $y_{i,j-n}$ of $k[[X]]$. Note that $\alpha(h_j) = \sum_p h_{j,p}(qX)^p$, for any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, $\alpha^r(h_j) = \sum_p h_{j,p}(\alpha^r(X))^p$ and that $\alpha^r(X) = N_r^\alpha(q)X$, so $\alpha^r(h_j)_p$ is a sum of products of $h_{j,p*}$ for $p* \leq p$ with some coefficients of $q$, namely $q_p*$ for $p* \leq p$. This means that, for all $r, p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$,

$$\alpha^r(h_j)_p \text{ is an explicit } k\text{-linear combination of } h_{j,p*} \text{ for } p* \leq p. \tag{34}$$

(In case $q \in k$, we actually have $\alpha^r(h_j)_p = q^r h_{j,p}$, a $k$-linear combination of $h_{j,p}$.)

Since $f_n = 1$, from (32) and (33) we have

$$z \equiv \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} f_i\theta^i + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} h_i\theta^i + \sum_{j=n+1}^{m}\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} g_j y_{i,j-n}\theta^i. \tag{35}$$

So $z \in \widehat{S}(h_0 + h_1\theta + \ldots + h_{n-1}\theta^{n-1} - \theta^n)$ if and only if for each $i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$

$$f_i + h_i + \sum_{j=n+1}^{m} g_j y_{i,j-n} = 0 \tag{36}$$

in $k[[X]]$.

We claim that the system of equations (36) in the unknowns $h_0,\ldots,h_{n-1}$ does indeed have a solution in $k[[X]]$.

Recall that $X \mid g_j$ for all $j \in \{n+1,\ldots,m\}$. Therefore, looking at coefficients of terms of degree $p = 0$ and $p = 1$ in $X$ in (36) , we get

$$h_{i,0} = -f_{i,0}, \qquad \forall i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\} \tag{37}$$

$$h_{i,1} = -f_{i,1} - \textstyle\sum_{j=n+1}^{m} g_{j,1}y_{i,j-n,0}, \quad \forall i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\} \tag{38}$$

where, by (33) and (34), $y_{i,j-n,0}$ is a $k$-linear combination of products of elements from the set

$$\{\alpha^r(h_{j,0}) : j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}, r \in \{0,\ldots,m-n\}\}.$$

Assume now that $t$ is a positive integer and that $h_{i,p}$ are known for all $i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$ and $p \leq t$. By (36), we require, for all $i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$,

$$h_{i,t+1} = -f_{i,t+1} - \sum_{j=n+1}^{m}\sum_{s=0}^{t} g_{j,(t+1-s)}y_{i,j-n,s} \tag{39}$$

where, by (33) and (34), for each $i \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}$ and $s \in \{0,\ldots,t\}$, $y_{i,j-n,s}$ is a $k$-linear combination of products of elements from

$$\{\alpha^r(h_{j,\ell}) : j \in \{0,\ldots,n-1\}, r \in \{0,\ldots,i\}, \ell \in \{0,\ldots,s\}\}.$$

So each $h_{i,t+1}$ exists, and hence $h_0,\ldots,h_{n-1}$ exist also. □

The following example shows that the above lemma does not hold when the base ring is replaced by $k[X]_{\langle X\rangle}$.

**Example 6.9.** For $q \in k^*$, let $S = k[X]_{\langle X\rangle}[\theta;\alpha]$ where $\alpha(X) = qX$. The element $r = 1 + X + \theta + X\theta^2 \in S$ is irreducible in $S$. To check this note that if $a, b \in k[X]$ are such that $b \notin < X >$, then

$$r = \alpha(b^{-1})b^{-1}[bX\theta - X\alpha(a) + \alpha(b)](a + b\theta) + 1 + X - b^{-1}a + Xb^{-1}\alpha(b^{-1})\alpha(a)a.$$

So $r \in S(a + b\theta)$ if and only if $\alpha(b)(b - a) = -X(\alpha(b)b + \alpha(a)a)$. Comparing the degrees on the RHS and LHS of the last equation we conclude that $r$ is not divisible on the right by a polynomial of the form $a + b\theta$ for any $a, b \in k[X]$ with $b \notin < X >$.

Making use of the above for $S^{op} = k[X]_{\langle X\rangle}[\theta;\alpha^{-1}]$ we see that also, with the same constraints on $a$ and $b$, $r \notin (a + b\theta)S$, proving that $r$ is irreducible.

A very useful consequence of Lemma 6.8 provides a canonical form for each type (**C**) similarity class of irreducible elements of $\widehat{S}$:

**Corollary 6.10.** *Let $c$ be a type* (**C**) *irreducible element of $\widehat{S}$, of degree $n \geq 1$ as a polynomial in $\theta$. Then there is a unit $u$ of $\widehat{S}$ such that $\hat{c} := uc$ is an irreducible element of $\widehat{S}$, so $\hat{c}$ is similar to $c$, with $\hat{c}$ having form*

$$\hat{c} \quad = \quad h_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} h_i\theta^i + \theta^n,$$

*when $n > 1$, with $h_0 \neq 0$ and $h_i \in k[[X]]$ for all $i$; and $\hat{c}$ having form*

$$\hat{c} \quad = \quad h_0 + \theta$$

*with $0 \neq h_0 \in k[[X]]$ when $n = 1$.*

*Proof.* Let $c = \sum_{i=0}^{n} r_i\theta^i$, where $r_i \in k[[X]]$ for all $i$ and $r_n \neq 0$. Then

$$r_0 \neq 0, \tag{40}$$

since otherwise $c = u\theta$ for some unit $u$ of $\widehat{S}$ as $c$ is irreducible, so that $c$ has type (**A**), which is a contradiction. Moreover

$$n > 0, \tag{41}$$

because if $n = 0$ then $c \in k[[X]]$, which is again a contradiction to $c$ being type (**C**).

There exists at least one $i$ for which $X \nmid r_i$, because otherwise, as $c$ is irreducible, $c = Xu'$ for a unit $u'$ of $\widehat{S}$, once more contradicting the fact that $c$ is type (**C**). Let $m$ be the greatest value of $i$ such that

$$X \nmid r_m. \tag{42}$$

If $m = 0$ then, by (40), $r_0$ is a unit in $\widehat{S}$ and so

$$\widehat{c} \quad := \quad r_0^{-1}c \quad = \quad 1 + X\tau$$

for some $\tau \in \widehat{S}$, so that $c$ is type (**B**), a contradiction. So

$$m > 0. \tag{43}$$

Suppose that $m < n$. Then

$$c \quad = \sum_{i=0}^{m} r_i\theta^i + \sum_{i=m+1}^{n} r_i\theta^i, \qquad r_m \notin \langle X\rangle,\ r_i \in \langle X\rangle \forall i > m,\ r_n \neq 0. \tag{44}$$

But then, noting (43), Lemma 6.8 applies to the expression (44) for $c$, and tells us that $c$ is reducible, a contradiction. Therefore $m = n$, so that $r_n$ is a unit in $k[[X]]$. That is, we can define

$$\hat{c} := r_n^{-1}c,$$

so that

$$\hat{c} \quad = \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} h_i\theta^i \, + \, \theta^n, \tag{45}$$

with all $h_i \in k[[X]]$, $h_0 \neq 0$ and $n > 0$. Finally, by §5.2, $\hat{c}$ is similar to $c$. □

We now apply Lemma 6.8 and Corollary 6.10 to prove that the monoidal commutativity condition of Theorem 6.7(e) is satisfied, hence deducing that $\widehat{S}$ satisfies ($\diamond$).

**Proposition 6.11.** *Let $b$ and $c$ be irreducible elements of $\widehat{S}$, respectively of type* (**B**) *and* (**C**). *Then there exist irreducible elements $b'$ and $c'$ of $\widehat{S}$, respectively similar to $b$ and $c$, such that*

$$cb \quad = \quad b'c'.$$

*Proof.* Note that if $c$ is replaced by $\hat{c} := uc$ for a unit $u$ of $\widehat{S}$, and we prove that

$$\hat{c}b \quad = \quad \hat{b}c'$$

with $\hat{b}$ and $c'$ irreducibles respectively of types (**B**) and (**C**), then

$$cb = u^{-1}\hat{c}b = (u^{-1}\hat{b})c' = b'c',$$

with $b'$ and $c'$ irreducibles in $\widehat{S}$ respectively of types (**B**) and (**C**).

Thus Corollary 6.10 allows us to assume that $c$ has the form

$$c \quad = \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n} h_i\theta^i \tag{46}$$

with $h_i \in k[[X]]$, $h_0 \neq 0$, $n > 0$ and $h_n = 1$.

Let $b = 1 + Xs$, where $s = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} s_j\theta^j$ with $s_j \in k[[X]]$ for all $j$. Since $b$ is irreducible and so not invertible in $\widehat{S}$,

$$\ell \; > \; 0. \tag{47}$$

Thus, using (46),

$$\begin{aligned} cb \quad &= \quad \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n} h_i\theta^i\right)\left(1 + X(\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} s_j\theta^j)\right) \\ &= \quad \sum_{i=0}^{n} h_i\theta^i + X\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n}\sum_{j=0}^{\ell} q^i h_i\alpha^i(s_j)\theta^{i+j}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In the above expression for $cb$, observe that $n > 0$ and $h_n = 1$ by (41) and (46), while the highest power of $\theta$ occurring is $n + \ell$, with $n + \ell > n$ by (47). Since the coefficient of $\theta^{n+\ell}$ is divisible by $X$, the hypotheses of Lemma 6.8 are satisfied by $cb$. Therefore we can conclude that $cb$ is divisible on the right by a monic polynomial $c'$ of degree $n$; that is,

$$cb \quad = \quad b'c'. \tag{48}$$

Comparing degrees on the right and left of (48),

$$\deg_\theta(b') = \ell > 0$$

by (47), so that neither $c'$ nor $b'$ are units in $\widehat{S}$. Comparing the two factorisations provided by (48) in the PID $T$, both must have length 2 by the Jordan-Holder theorem, since

$T/Tcb = T/Tb'c'$. Thus, both $b'$ and $c'$ are irreducible in $T$ and hence, by Lemma 4.2, in $\widehat{S}$. Moreover, since $c'$ is monic in $\theta$ of degree $n > 0$, it cannot be expressed as $c' = (1+Xd)u$ for any $d \in \widehat{S}$ and unit $u \in k[[X]]$. Therefore $c'$ has type (**C**), and so, again applying the Jordan-Holder theorem to $T/Tcb = T/Tb'c'$, $b'$ has type (**B**). This then forces $b$ to be similar to $b'$ and $c$ to $c'$, as required. □

The version of the following corollary for the right ($\diamond$) property is immediate from the equivalence of ($a$) and ($e$) of Theorem 6.7 coupled with Proposition 6.11. Since the arguments and results of this paper can be repeated with "right" and "left" swapped throughout, left ($\diamond$) follows in a parallel fashion. Note that we only need to discuss here the proof of the "difficult case" where $\alpha$ is not of finite order, since $k[[X]][\theta;\alpha]$ is a finite module over its centre otherwise.

**Corollary 6.12.** *Let $k$ be a field and $\alpha$ an arbitrary $k$-automorphism of $k[[X]]$. Then $\widehat{S} = k[[X]][\theta;\alpha]$ satisfies ($\diamond$).*

The fact that ($\diamond$) holds for $\widehat{S}$ enables one to improve the description of cyclic faithful critical $\widehat{S}-$modules from that given by Theorem 5.10(4)(a) and (5), as follows:

**Corollary 6.13.** *Let $I$ be a left [resp. right] ideal of $\widehat{S}$ with $\widehat{S}/I$ faithful and 1-critical. Then $I = \widehat{S}z$ [resp. $I = z\widehat{S}$] for an irreducible element $z$ of $\widehat{S}$ (which necessarily will have type (**C**)).*

*Proof.* We prove the version for left ideals; the right hand version is obtained by interchanging left and right throughout. Let $M = \widehat{S}/I$ be a cyclic faithful 1-critical left $\widehat{S}-$module. By the left module version of Theorem 5.10(1)(b), $M$ is hull-similar to $\widehat{S}/\widehat{S}c$ for a type (**C**) irreducible element $c$ of $\widehat{S}$. In particular,

$$M \text{ is } \mathcal{X} - \text{torsion free.} \tag{49}$$

The equivalent statements (a) - (e) of Theorem 6.7 all hold, by Corollary 6.12. By Theorem 6.7(d), every proper factor of $M$ is a finite dimensional vector space, and in particular $\mathcal{X}-$torsion. We claim that this implies that

$$T/TI \text{ is a simple } T - \text{module.} \tag{50}$$

For, let $N$ be a non-zero $T$-submodule of $T/TI$. Then $N \cap M \neq 0$ by (49), so that, by Theorem 6.7(d) again,

$$\dim_k(M/N \cap M) < \infty. \tag{51}$$

Let $y \in T \otimes_{\widehat{S}} M$. Thus there exists $n \geq 1$ such that $X^n y \in M$ and then, by (51), there exists $t \geq 1$ such that

$$X^t(X^n y) \in N.$$

But $N$ is a $T-$submodule of $T \otimes_{\widehat{S}} M$, so $y = X^{-(t+n)}X^{t+n}y \in N$. Thus $N = T \otimes_{\widehat{S}} M$ and (50) follows.

In view of (50), $TI = Tz$ for an irreducible element $z$, which we can choose to be in $\widehat{S}$ by Lemma 4.2. That is, $z \in TI \cap \widehat{S} = I$, and $z$ has type (**C**) since otherwise it has type (**B**) and then $\widehat{S}/\widehat{S}z$ is simple by the left module version of Theorem 5.5(2), contradicting the fact that $\widehat{S}/I$ is 1-critical. Therefore $\widehat{S}/\widehat{S}z$ is itself 1-critical by the left module version of Theorem 5.10(2), and hence $\widehat{S}z = I$, as required.

□

## Acknowledgements

Part of this work was done when the second author visited the University of Glasgow in February 2020 supported by a FCT grant SFRH/BSAB/150375/2019. She would like to thank the Univerity and its staff for their hospitality. This work was also partially supported by CMUP, which is financed by national funds through FCT–Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., under the project with reference UIDB/00144/2020. The work of the first author was partially supported by Leverhulme Emeritus Fellowship EM-2017-081/9.

## References

[1] V. Bavula and F. Van Oystaeyen, *The simple modules of certain generalized crossed products*, J. Algebra **194** (1997), no. 2, 521–566, DOI 10.1006/jabr.1997.7038. MR1467166

[2] K.A. Brown, P. A. A. B. Carvalho, and J. Matczuk, *Simple modules and their essential extensions for skew polynomial rings*, Math. Z. **291** (2019), no. 3-4, 877–903, DOI 10.1007/s00209-018-2128-8. MR3936092

[3] P. M. Cohn, *Noncommutative unique factorization domains*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **109** (1963), 313–331, DOI 10.2307/1993910. MR155851

[4] ———, *Free Ideal Rings and Localization in General Rings*, New Mathematical Monographs, vol. 3, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. MR2246388

[5] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra with a View toward Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 150, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. MR1322960

[6] K. R. Goodearl and R. B. Warfield Jr., *An Introduction to Noncommutative Noetherian Rings*, 2nd ed., London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 61, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004. MR2080008

[7] I. Kaplansky, *Commutative Rings*, Revised edition, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Ill.-London, 1974. MR0345945

[8] J. Kovacic, *An Eisenstein criterion for noncommutative polynomials*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **34** (1972), 25–29, DOI 10.2307/2037888. MR292803

[9] N. Jacobson, *The Theory of Rings*, American Mathematical Society Mathematical Surveys, vol. II, American Mathematical Society, New York, 1943. MR0008601

[10] A. V. Jategaonkar, *Jacobson's conjecture and modules over fully bounded Noetherian rings*, J. Algebra **30** (1974), 103–121, DOI 10.1016/0021-8693(74)90195-1. MR352170

[11] A. Leroy and J. Matczuk, *Primitivity of skew polynomial and skew Laurent polynomial rings*, Comm. Algebra **24** (1996), no. 7, 2271–2284, DOI 10.1080/00927879608825699. MR1390373

[12] J. C. McConnell and J. C. Robson, *Noncommutative Noetherian Rings*, Revised edition, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 30, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2001. With the cooperation of L. W. Small. MR1811901

[13] E. Matlis, *Injective modules over noetherian rings*, Pacific J. Math. **8** (1958), 511-528. MR0099360

[14] I. M. Musson, *Injective modules for group rings of polycyclic groups. II*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **31** (1980), no. 124, 449–466, DOI 10.1093/qmath/31.4.429. MR596979

[15] O. Ore, *Theory of noncommutative polynomials*, Annals of Mathematics **34** (1933), no. 3, 480-508.

[16] M. Prest and G. Puninski, *Some model theory over hereditary Noetherian domains*, J. Algebra **211** (1999), no. 1, 268–297, DOI 10.1006/jabr.1998.7607. MR1656581

School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8SQ, Scotland

*E-mail address*: Ken.Brown@glasgow.ac.uk

CMUP, Departamento de Matemática, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade do Porto, rua do Campo Alegre s/n, 4169-007 Porto, Portugal
*E-mail address*: pbcarval@fc.up.pt

Institute of Mathematics, University of Warsaw, Banacha 2, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland
*E-mail address*: jmatczuk@mimuw.edu.pl