

**TENSOR PRODUCTS AND INTERTWINING OPERATORS  
BETWEEN TWO UNISERIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF  
THE GALILEAN LIE ALGEBRA  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$**

LEANDRO CAGLIERO AND IVÁN GÓMEZ RIVERA

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , be the Galilean Lie algebra over a field of characteristic zero, where  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  is the Heisenberg Lie algebra of dimension  $2n + 1$ , and  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  acts on  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  so that  $\mathfrak{h}_n \simeq V(2n - 1) \oplus V(0)$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules (here  $V(k)$  denotes the irreducible  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module of highest weight  $k$ ). The isomorphism classes of uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules are known.

In this paper we study the tensor product of two uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$ . Among other things, we obtain the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module structure of the socle of  $V \otimes W$  and we describe the space of intertwining operators  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n}(V, W)$ , where  $V$  and  $W$  are uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$ . This article extends a previous work in which we obtained analogous results for the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m$  where  $\mathfrak{a}_m$  is the abelian Lie algebra and  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  acts so that  $\mathfrak{a}_m \simeq V(m - 1)$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This article is part of a project whose general goal is to understand to what extent there is a class of finite-dimensional representations of (non-semisimple) Lie algebras that is small enough, so that its members can be described in a reasonably efficient way in terms of uniserial representations, and large enough to include many representations that appear in problems of interest. This naturally leads to consider the tensor products of uniserial representations. A typical example of a representation we would like to describe thoroughly is a cohomology space associated to an algebra (associative algebra or non-semisimple Lie algebra), viewed as a module over its whole Lie algebra of derivations (which is, in general, non-semisimple). Understanding this action becomes specially important if the cohomology space has a Gerstenhaber or a Poisson structure.

Why uniserial representations as building blocks? We recall that, for associative algebras, the class of uniserial modules is very relevant, a foundational result here is due to T. Nakayama [24] (see also [1] or [2]) and it states that every finitely generated module over a serial ring is a direct sum of uniserial modules. For more information in the associative case we refer the reader mainly to [1, 2, 27], and also [3, 21, 25]. In Lie algebra case, even

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 17B10, 18M20, 22E27.

*Key words and phrases.* non-semisimple Lie algebras, uniserial representations, socle, tensor product, intertwining operators.

This research was partially supported by an NSERC grant, CONICET PIP 112-2013-01-00511, PIP 112-2012-01-00501, MinCyT Córdoba, FONCYT Pict2013 1391, SeCyT-UNC 33620180100983CB.

though very little is known about uniserial representations, in the articles [8, 9, 10, 11, 5, 4, 6, 15] we and other authors have classified all finite dimensional uniserial representations for some different families of Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{g}$ . These classifications show that the class of uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is rather small and treatable in the universe of all the indecomposable modules. Also, in [20], it is shown how the infinite dimensional uniserial representations of certain special linear groups obtained in [28] appear naturally in cohomology spaces.

We point out that many other authors work on the idea of describing or classifying a special class of indecomposable representations of (non-semisimple) Lie algebras whose members might be used as building blocks for describing more general representations. For instance, A. Piard [26] analyzed thoroughly the indecomposable modules  $U$ , of the complex Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathbb{C}^2$ , such that  $U/\text{rad}(U)$  is irreducible. More recently, various families of indecomposable modules over various types of non-semisimple Lie algebras have been constructed and/or classified, see for instance [12, 13, 14, 16, 19, 17, 18, 22].

This article and [7] are motivated by the challenge of describing, in a standard way, the tensor product of two uniserial  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules in terms of uniserial  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules. In contrast to the Nakayama case, these tensor products are not at all a direct sum of uniserials, there are many cases where the tensor product of two uniserial  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules is an indecomposable  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module but not uniserial.

**1.1. Main results.** In this paper, all Lie algebras and representations considered are assumed to be finite dimensional over a field  $\mathbb{F}$  of characteristic zero. For  $n \geq 0$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{a}_n$  the abelian Lie algebra of dimension  $n$ , by  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  the Heisenberg Lie algebra of dimension  $2n + 1$ , and by  $V(n)$  the irreducible  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module with highest weight  $n$  ( $\dim V(n) = n + 1$ ). In addition, for  $n \geq 1$ ,  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_n$  denotes the Lie algebra obtained by letting  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  act so that  $\mathfrak{a}_n \simeq V(n - 1)$ , and  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  denotes the Lie algebra where  $\mathfrak{h}_n \simeq V(2n - 1) \oplus V(0)$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules. We notice that  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_{2n-1}$  is isomorphic to the quotient  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  mod its 1-dimensional center  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n) \simeq V(0)$ .

In this work we study the structure of the tensor product of two uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$ . The classification of all the isomorphism classes of uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules was obtained in [4]. This classification is reviewed with details in §3 and a rough description of it is the following:

- *Non-faithful  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules.* Since  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$  acts trivially on them, they are in correspondence with the uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_{2n-1})$ -modules. In turn, these were classified in [8]:
  - A general family  $E(a, b)$ , where  $a, b$  are non-negative integers with certain restrictions (depending on  $n$ ). The composition length of  $E(a, b)$  is 2.
  - A general family  $Z(a, \ell)$  and its duals. Here  $a$  and  $\ell$  are non-negative integers. The composition length of  $Z(a, \ell)$  is  $\ell + 1$ .
  - Some exceptional modules with composition lengths 3 and 4.

The modules  $Z(a, \ell)$  and their duals are referred to as *modules of type Z*.

- *Faithful  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules.* All of them have composition length 3.
  - For  $n = 1$ : Two families denoted by  $FU_a^+$  and  $FU_a^-$ , with  $a$  an integer that satisfies  $a \geq 0$  and  $a \geq 1$ , respectively.
  - For  $n = 2$ : Only four equivalence classes, they are denoted by  $FU_{(0,3,0)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,4,1)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,2,1)}$  and  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$ .
  - For any  $n \geq 3$ : Only three equivalence classes, they are denoted by  $FU_{(0,m,0)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,m+1,1)}$  and  $FU_{(1,m-1,1)}$ , here  $m = 2n - 1$ .

All faithful uniserial modules (except  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$ ,  $n = 2$ ) are, in some sense, of a similar type and are referred to as *standard faithful modules*. The  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_2)$ -module  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$  is quite exceptional.

The modules  $E(a, b)$  constitute the building blocks of all the other uniserial modules: all uniserials can be obtained by combining the modules  $E(a, b)$  in a subtle way governed by the zeros of the  $6j$ -symbols (see [5, 8]). As a consequence, the  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -module structure of the tensor product of two uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  depends strongly on the  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -module structure of  $E(a, b) \otimes E(c, d)$  which is already quite involved.

In [7] we stated a conjecture that provides the description of the socle of  $E(a, b) \otimes E(c, d)$  for any  $a, b, c, d$  (see Conjecture 4.2 below) and we proved the part of it that was necessary to obtain the socle of  $V \otimes W$  and the intertwining operators  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n}(V, W)$  where  $V$  and  $W$  are uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  of type  $Z$  (in fact, we dealt in [7] with uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m$ , instead of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$ , recall that, for modules of type  $Z$ , the action of  $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$  is trivial). In particular we proved that the socle of  $V \otimes W$  is multiplicity free as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules. As an application of these results, we proved in [7] that if  $V$  and  $W$  are  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules of type  $Z$ , then  $V$  and  $W$  are determined from  $V \otimes W$ . Moreover, we provided a procedure to identify the corresponding parameters  $a$  and  $\ell$  of  $V$  and  $W$  from  $V \otimes W$ . This is a rare property, even if the factors are irreducible, it is not frequent that the factors  $V$  and  $W$  are determined from  $V \otimes W$  (see [23] and references within).

In this paper we extend the results of [7] obtaining the socle of  $V \otimes W$  and the intertwining operators  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n}(V, W)$  when both  $V$  and  $W$  are standard faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules, or when one of them is standard faithful and the other one is uniserial of type  $Z$ . In contrast to the non-faithful case, in the standard faithful case it may happen that the socle of  $V \otimes W$  is not multiplicity free as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules (this occurs when  $V = W$ ). As a consequence, if  $V$  and  $W$  are isomorphic standard faithful uniserials, then the space of intertwining operators  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n}(V, W)$  is 2-dimensional. The main step toward these results requires to make a considerable advance in the proof of Conjecture 4.2. See the comments after it to know what is still open about this conjecture.

The paper is organized as follows. In §2 we review some basic facts about uniserial representations of Lie algebras and recall all the necessary definitions and formulas involving the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. In §3 we review the classification of all uniserial representations of the Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_n$  (obtained in [8]) and  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  (obtained in [4]). The main section

of the paper is §4, and we obtain in it the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module structure of the socle of the tensor product of two (non-exceptional) uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules  $V$  and  $W$ : Theorem 4.1 recalls the case when  $V$  and  $W$  are of type  $Z$  (obtained in [7]), Conjecture 4.2 deals with all the possible cases of composition length 2, Theorem 4.3 confirms part of Conjecture 4.2 needed to prove Theorems 4.6 and 4.7, Theorem 4.6 gives the socle when  $V$  is of type  $Z$  and  $W$  is standard faithful, and Theorem 4.7 describes the socle when both  $V$  and  $W$  are standard faithful. Finally, in §5 we obtain the space of intertwining operators from the results in §4. Our proof of Theorem 4.3 is technical and long, it requires to consider some linear systems with entries given by the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, and thus we decided to devote §6 to it.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

**2.1. The Clebsch-Gordan coefficients.** Recall that  $\mathbb{F}$  is a field of characteristic zero and that all Lie algebras and representations are assumed to be finite dimensional over  $\mathbb{F}$ . Let

$$(2.1) \quad e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad h = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

be the standard basis of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ . Let  $V(a)$  be the irreducible  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module with highest weight  $a \geq 0$ . We fix a basis  $\{v_0^a, \dots, v_a^a\}$  of  $V(a)$  relative to which the basis  $\{e, h, f\}$  acts as follows:

$$e v_k^a = \sqrt{\frac{a}{2} \left( \frac{a}{2} + 1 \right) - \left( \frac{a}{2} - k + 1 \right) \left( \frac{a}{2} - k \right)} v_{k-1}^a,$$

$$h v_k^a = (a - 2k) v_k^a,$$

$$f v_k^a = \sqrt{\frac{a}{2} \left( \frac{a}{2} + 1 \right) - \left( \frac{a}{2} - k - 1 \right) \left( \frac{a}{2} - k \right)} v_{k+1}^a,$$

where  $0 \leq k \leq a$  and  $v_{-1}^a = v_{a+1}^a = 0$ . The basis  $\{v_0^a, \dots, v_a^a\}$  has been chosen in a convenient way to introduce below the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. Note that if we denote by  $(x)_a$  the matrix of  $x \in \mathfrak{sl}(2)$  relative to the basis  $\{v_0^a, \dots, v_a^a\}$ , then  $\{(e)_1, (h)_1, (f)_1\}$  are as in (2.1), and

$$(e)_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (h)_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (f)_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This means that we may assume that  $\{v_0^2, v_1^2, v_2^2\} = \{-e, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}h, f\}$ .

We know that  $V(a) \simeq V(a)^*$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules. More precisely, if  $\{(v_0^a)^*, \dots, (v_a^a)^*\}$  is the dual basis of  $\{v_0^a, \dots, v_a^a\}$  then the map

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} V(a) &\rightarrow V(a)^* \\ v_k^a &\mapsto (-1)^{a-k} (v_{a-k}^a)^* \end{aligned}$$

gives an explicit  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -isomorphism.

It is well known that the decomposition of the tensor product of two irreducible  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules  $V(a)$  and  $V(b)$  is

$$(2.3) \quad V(a) \otimes V(b) \simeq V(a+b) \oplus V(a+b-2) \oplus \dots \oplus V(|a-b|).$$

This is the well known Clebsch-Gordan formula.

The *Clebsch-Gordan coefficients*

$$CG(j_1, m_1; j_2, m_2 | j_3, m_3)$$

are defined below and they provide an explicit  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -embedding  $V(c) \rightarrow V(a) \otimes V(b)$  which is the following

$$\begin{aligned} V(c) &\rightarrow V(a) \otimes V(b) \\ v_k^c &\mapsto v_k^{a,b,c} \end{aligned}$$

where, by definition,

$$(2.4) \quad v_k^{a,b,c} = \sum_{i,j} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - j \mid \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - k\right) v_i^a \otimes v_j^b,$$

where the sum runs over all  $i, j$  such that  $\frac{a}{2} - i + \frac{b}{2} - j = \frac{c}{2} - k$  (in fact, we could let  $i, j$  run freely since the Clebsch-Gordan coefficient involved is zero if  $\frac{a}{2} - i + \frac{b}{2} - j \neq \frac{c}{2} - k$ ). Since

$$(2.5) \quad \text{Hom}(V(b), V(a)) \simeq V(b)^* \otimes V(a) \simeq V(a) \otimes V(b)$$

it follows from (2.2) and (2.4) that the map  $V(c) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(V(b), V(a))$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} v_k^c &\mapsto \sum_{i,j} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - j \mid \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - k\right) v_i^a \otimes v_j^b, \\ &\mapsto \sum_{i,j} (-1)^{b-j} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - j \mid \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - k\right) v_i^a \otimes (v_{b-j}^b)^*, \\ (2.6) \quad &\mapsto \sum_{i,j} (-1)^j CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, -\frac{b}{2} + j \mid \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - k\right) (v_j^b)^* \otimes v_i^a \end{aligned}$$

is an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module homomorphism.

We now recall briefly the basic definitions and facts about the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. We will mainly follow [29].

Given three non-negative integers or half-integers  $j_1, j_2, j_3$ , we say that they *satisfy the triangle condition* if  $j_1 + j_2 + j_3$  is an integer and they can be the side lengths of a (possibly degenerate) triangle (that is  $|j_1 - j_2| \leq j_3 \leq j_1 + j_2$ ). We now define (see [29, §8.2, eq.(1)])

$$\Delta(j_1, j_2, j_3) = \sqrt{\frac{(j_1 + j_2 - j_3)!(j_1 - j_2 + j_3)!(-j_1 + j_2 + j_3)!}{(j_1 + j_2 + j_3 + 1)!}}$$

if  $j_1, j_2, j_3$  satisfies the triangle condition; otherwise, we set  $\Delta(j_1, j_2, j_3) = 0$ .

If in addition  $m_1, m_2$  and  $m_3$  are three integers or half-integers then the corresponding *Clebsch-Gordan coefficient*

$$CG(j_1, m_1; j_2, m_2 | j_3, m_3)$$

is zero unless  $m_1 + m_2 = m_3$  and  $|m_i| \leq j_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . In this case, the following formula is valid for  $m_3 \geq 0$  and  $j_1 \geq j_2$  (see [29, §8.2, eq.(3)])

$$\begin{aligned} CG(j_1, m_1; j_2, m_2 \mid j_3, m_3) &= \Delta(j_1, j_2, j_3) \sqrt{(2j_3 + 1)} \\ &\times \sqrt{(j_1 + m_1)!(j_1 - m_1)!(j_2 + m_2)!(j_2 - m_2)!(j_3 + m_3)!(j_3 - m_3)!} \\ &\times \sum_r \frac{(-1)^r}{r!(j_1 + j_2 - j_3 - r)!(j_1 - m_1 - r)!(j_2 + m_2 - r)!(j_3 - j_2 + m_1 + r)!(j_3 - j_1 - m_2 + r)!}, \end{aligned}$$

where the sum runs through all integers  $r$  for which the argument of every factorial is non-negative. If either  $m_3 < 0$  or  $j_1 < j_2$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} CG(j_1, m_1; j_2, m_2 \mid j_3, m_3) &= (-1)^{j_1 + j_2 - j_3} CG(j_1, -m_1; j_2, -m_2 \mid j_3, -m_3) \\ (2.7) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= (-1)^{j_1 + j_2 - j_3} CG(j_2, m_2; j_1, m_1 \mid j_3, m_3). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, it also holds

$$(2.8) \qquad CG(j_1, m_1; j_2, m_2 \mid j_3, m_3) = (-1)^{j_1 - m_1} \sqrt{\frac{2j_3 + 1}{2j_2 + 1}} CG(j_1, m_1; j_3, -m_3 \mid j_2, -m_2).$$

In the following sections, we will need the following particular values of the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. Here,  $a, b$  are integers and  $i = 0, \dots, a$ ,  $j = 0, \dots, b$ .

$$(2.9) \quad CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - j \mid \frac{a+b}{2}, \frac{a+b}{2} - i - j\right) = \sqrt{\frac{a!b!(a+b-i-j)!(i+j)!}{i!j!(a+b)!(a-i)!(b-j)!}},$$

$$\begin{aligned} (2.10) \quad CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, j - \frac{b}{2} \mid \frac{a-b}{2}, \frac{a-b}{2} - i + j\right) \\ = (-1)^j \sqrt{\frac{(a-i)! i! b! (a-b+1)!}{(a+1)! j! (b-j)! (a-b-i+j)! (i-j)!}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (2.11) \quad CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, i - \frac{a}{2}; \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - j \mid \frac{b-a}{2}, \frac{b-a}{2} + i - j\right) \\ = (-1)^a CG\left(\frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - j; \frac{a}{2}, i - \frac{a}{2} \mid \frac{b-a}{2}, \frac{b-a}{2} + i - j\right) \\ = (-1)^j \sqrt{\frac{(b-j)! j! a! (b-a+1)!}{(b+1)! i! (a-i)! (b-a-j+i)! (j-i)!}}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} (2.12) \quad CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - j \mid \frac{a+b}{2} - i - j, \frac{a+b}{2} - i - j\right) \\ = (-1)^i \sqrt{\frac{(a+b-2i-2j+1)!(i+j)!(a-i)!(b-j)!}{(a+b-i-j+1)!(a-i-j)!(b-i-j)! i! j!}}. \end{aligned}$$

**2.2. Uniserial representations.** Given a Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{g}$ , a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module  $V$  is *uniserial* if it admits a unique composition series. In other words,  $V$  is uniserial if the socle series

$$0 = \text{soc}^0(V) \subset \text{soc}^1(V) \subset \dots \subset \text{soc}^n(V) = V$$

is a composition series of  $V$ , that is, the socle factors  $\text{soc}^i(V)/\text{soc}^{i-1}(V)$  are irreducible for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Recall that  $\text{soc}^1(V) = \text{soc}(V)$  is the sum of all irreducible  $\mathfrak{g}$ -submodules of  $V$  and  $\text{soc}^i(V)/\text{soc}^{i-1}(V) = \text{soc}(V/\text{soc}^{i-1}(V))$ . Note that for uniserial modules, the *composition length* of  $V$  coincides with its *socle length*.

If the Levi decomposition of  $\mathfrak{g}$  is  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{s} \ltimes \mathfrak{r}$ , (with  $\mathfrak{r}$  the solvable radical and  $\mathfrak{s}$  semisimple) we may choose irreducible  $\mathfrak{s}$ -submodules  $V_i \subset V$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , such that

$$(2.13) \quad V = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_n$$

with  $V_i \simeq \text{soc}^i(V)/\text{soc}^{i-1}(V)$  as  $\mathfrak{s}$ -modules and

$$\mathfrak{r}V_i \subset V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_i.$$

In fact, if  $[\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{r}] = \mathfrak{r}$ , then  $\mathfrak{r}V_i \subset V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_{i-1}$ , see Lemma 2.2 below.

**Definition 2.1.** We say that (2.13) is the *socle decomposition* of  $V$ . We point out that, in the socle decomposition of a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module, the order of the summands is relevant.

The proof of the following lemma can be found in [7, Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2].

**Lemma 2.2.** *Assume that  $\mathfrak{r} = [\mathfrak{s}, \mathfrak{r}]$  and let  $V$  be a  $\mathfrak{g}$ -module. Then*

- (1)  $\text{soc}(V) = V^{\mathfrak{r}}$ .
- (2) *If  $V = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_n$  is a vector space decomposition such that  $\text{soc}(V) = V_1$  and  $\mathfrak{r}V_k \subset V_{k-1}$  for all  $k = 2, \dots, n$ , then  $\text{soc}^k(V) = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_k$  for all  $k = 1, \dots, n$ .*

### 3. UNISERIAL REPRESENTATIONS OF $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n$

**3.1. The Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n$ .** Let us fix  $n \geq 1$ . We recall that the Heisenberg Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  is the  $(2n + 1)$ -dimensional vector space with basis

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_n, x'_1, \dots, x'_n, z\}$$

with non-zero brackets  $[x_i, x'_i] = z$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . It is clear that the center of  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  is generated by  $z$ . We know that  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  acts by derivations on  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  in such a way that

$$\mathfrak{h}_n \simeq V(m) \oplus V(0), \quad m = 2n - 1,$$

as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules, where  $V(0)$  corresponds to the center of  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  and we may assume that  $V(m)$  corresponds to the subspace generated by  $\{x_i, x'_i : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ .

**Notation 3.1.** From now on,  $m$  will always be  $2n - 1$  and thus  $\mathfrak{a}_m = \mathfrak{h}_n/\mathbb{F}z$  as Lie algebras. In addition, we will denote by  $\mathfrak{h}_n(m)$  the subspace of  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  isomorphic to  $V(m)$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules. Hence, as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules, we have  $\mathfrak{a}_m \simeq \mathfrak{h}_n(m) \simeq V(m)$ .

We may assume that  $z$  corresponds to the basis element  $v_0^0$  of  $V(0)$ . Similarly, let us denote by  $\{e_0, \dots, e_m\}$  the basis of  $\mathfrak{h}_n(m)$  corresponding to the basis  $\{v_0^m, \dots, v_m^m\}$  of  $V(m)$ . We may assume that  $z$  and  $\{e_0, \dots, e_m\}$  have been chosen such that the bracket in  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  is given by the projection  $V(m) \otimes V(m) \rightarrow V(0)$  (dual to the embedding (2.4)), that is

$$\begin{aligned}
[e_i, e_{m-i}] &= CG\left(\frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - i; \frac{m}{2}, -\frac{m}{2} + i \mid 0, 0\right) z \\
(3.1) \qquad &= (-1)^i \sqrt{\frac{1}{m+1}} z.
\end{aligned}$$

It is clear that  $\mathbb{F}z$  is also the center of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  and

$$(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n) / \mathbb{F}z \simeq \mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m$$

as Lie algebras.

In [4], it is obtained the classification, up to isomorphism, of all uniserial representations of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$ . It is straightforward to see that a uniserial representation of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  is faithful if and only if  $z$  acts non-trivially. Therefore, the classification is given in two stages: the non-faithful and the faithful ones. The non-faithful ones are the same as those of the Lie algebra  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m \simeq \mathfrak{sl}(2) \times V(m)$  which were classified earlier in [8, Theorem 10.1].

We now recall this classification.

**3.2. The non-faithful  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules  $E(a, b)$ .** If  $a$  and  $b$  are non-negative integers such that  $\frac{m}{2}, \frac{a}{2}, \frac{b}{2}$  satisfy the triangle condition, it follows from (2.3) and (2.5) that, up to scalar, there is a unique  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module homomorphism

$$\mathfrak{r} = V(m) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(V(b), V(a)).$$

This produces an action of  $\mathfrak{r}$  on  $V(a) \oplus V(b)$  such that  $\mathfrak{r}$  maps  $V(a)$  to 0 and  $V(b)$  to  $V(a)$  as follows

$$(3.2) \qquad e_s v_j^b = \sum_{i=0}^a (-1)^j CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, -\frac{b}{2} + j \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a, \quad s = 0, \dots, m.$$

Note that this is, except for a sign, the same as (2.6). Note also that the above sum has, in fact, at most one summand, that is

$$(3.3) \qquad e_s v_j^b = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i \neq j + s + \frac{a-b-m}{2}; \\ (-1)^j CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, -\frac{b}{2} + j \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a, & \text{if } i = j + s + \frac{a-b-m}{2}. \end{cases}$$

This action, combined with the action of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$  defines a uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m)$ -module structure with composition length 2 on

$$E(a, b) = V(a) \oplus V(b).$$

It is straightforward to see that  $E(a, b)^* \simeq E(b, a)$ . The action given in (3.2) is the main building block for all other uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m)$ -modules as follows.

**3.3. Non-faithful  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules of type  $Z$ .** The above construction can be extended to arbitrary composition length

$$V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus \dots \oplus V(a_\ell)$$

only when the sequence  $\{a_i\}$  is monotonic (increasing or decreasing) and  $|a_i - a_{i-1}| = m$ , for all  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ . More precisely, for the ‘‘increasing case’’



let  $\alpha$  and  $\ell$  be non-negative integers and let  $Z(\alpha, \ell)$  be the  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m)$ -module defined by

$$(3.4) \quad Z(\alpha, \ell) = V(\alpha) \oplus V(\alpha + m) \oplus \cdots \oplus V(\alpha + \ell m)$$

as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module with action of  $\mathfrak{t}$  sending

$$0 \longleftarrow V(\alpha) \longleftarrow V(\alpha + 2m) \longleftarrow \cdots \longleftarrow V(\alpha + \ell m)$$

as indicated in (3.2) (with  $a = \alpha + (i - 1)m$ ,  $b = \alpha + im$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ ). We point out that the above sequence serves as an indication of the action of  $\mathfrak{t}$ , there is no chain complex involved.

We notice that  $Z(\alpha, 0) = V(\alpha)$  ( $\mathfrak{t}$  acts trivially) and  $Z(\alpha, 1) = E(\alpha, \alpha + m)$ .

The “decreasing case” corresponds to the dual modules  $Z(\alpha, \ell)^*$ . The modules  $Z(\alpha, \ell)$  and  $Z(\alpha, \ell)^*$  are called *of type Z* and they are the unique isomorphism classes of uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m)$ -modules of composition length  $\ell + 1$  for  $\ell \geq 4$ .

**3.4. Non-faithful  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules of exceptional type (composition lengths 2, 3 and 4).** The modules  $E(a, b)$  with  $|a - b| \neq m$  are not of type  $Z$  and we consider them of exceptional type (of composition lengths 2). For composition lengths 3 and 4 there are very few possible ways to “combine” the modules  $E(a, b)$  so that we do not fall in type  $Z$ .

For composition length equal to 3, given  $0 \leq c < 2m$  and  $c \equiv 2m \pmod{4}$ , let

$$E_3(c) = V(0) \oplus V(m) \oplus V(c)$$

as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules with action of  $\mathfrak{t}$  sending

$$0 \longleftarrow V(0) \longleftarrow V(m) \longleftarrow V(c)$$

with the maps  $V(c) \rightarrow V(m)$  and  $V(m) \rightarrow V(0)$  given by (3.2).

For composition length equal to 4, if  $m \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , there is a family of  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m)$ -modules, parameterized by a non-zero scalar  $t \in \mathbb{F}$ , with a fixed socle decomposition. This is defined by

$$E_4(t) = V(0) \oplus V(m) \oplus V(m) \oplus V(0)$$

as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules with action of  $\mathfrak{t}$ , sending each irreducible component as shown by the arrows

$$0 \longleftarrow V(0) \longleftarrow V(m) \longleftarrow V(m) \longleftarrow V(0)$$

where the horizontal arrows are given by (3.2) and the bent arrow is  $t$  times (3.2).

**3.5. Classification of all non-faithful  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules.** As we said at the beginning of the section, a uniserial representation of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$  is faithful if and only if  $z$  acts non-trivially. Thus, the non-faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules are in correspondence, via the projection  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n \rightarrow \mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m$ , with the uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m$ . These were classified in [8, Theorem 10.1], we summarize that result in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.2.** *The following list describes all the isomorphism classes of non-faithful uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n$ .*

- Length 1.*  $Z(a, 0) = V(a)$ ,  $a \geq 0$  (here  $\mathfrak{r}$  acts trivially).  
*Length 2.*  $E(a, b)$ , with  $a + b \equiv m \pmod{2}$  and  $0 \leq |a - b| \leq m \leq a + b$ .  
*Length 3.*  $Z(a, 2)$ ,  $Z(a, 2)^*$ ,  $a \geq 0$ ; and  
 $E_3(c)$  with  $c \equiv 2m \pmod{4}$  and  $0 \leq c < 2m$ .  
*Length 4.*  $Z(a, 3)$ ,  $Z(a, 3)^*$ ,  $a \geq 0$ ; and  
 $E_4(t)$ , with  $t \in \mathbb{F}$  (this exists only if  $m \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ ).  
*Length  $\ell \geq 5$ .*  $Z(a, \ell - 1)$ ,  $Z(a, \ell - 1)^*$ ,  $a \geq 0$ .

**3.6. Faithful  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules.** The faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules were classified, up to isomorphism, in [4, Theorems 3.5 and 5.2]. It turns out that there are no faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules of composition length different from 3. Moreover, if

$$V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$$

is socle decomposition (see Definition 2.1) of a faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -module, then  $a_0 = a_2$  and an explicit representative of each class can be obtained by conveniently combining the modules  $E(a, b)$  for some specific values of  $a$  and  $b$  as we explain below.

Let us start with the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module  $V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$  with  $a_2 = a_0$  such that  $\frac{m}{2}, \frac{a_0}{2}, \frac{a_1}{2}$  satisfy the triangle condition. We now indicate how to obtain an action of  $\mathfrak{h}_n = \mathfrak{h}_n(m) \oplus \mathbb{F}z$  on  $V$  so that  $V$  becomes a faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -module. Although we know that  $a_2 = a_0$  we keep the notation  $a_2$  because we need to indicate that  $V(a_0)$  is the socle of  $V$  and  $V(a_2)$  corresponds to the third socle factor of  $V$ .

First, let  $\mathfrak{h}_n(m)$  act on  $V$  as follows

$$0 \longleftarrow V(a_0) \longleftarrow V(a_1) \longleftarrow V(a_2)$$

where the actions  $V(a_1) \rightarrow V(a_0)$  and  $V(a_2) \rightarrow V(a_1)$  are given by (3.2) (with  $a = a_0$ ,  $b = a_1$  and  $a = a_1$ ,  $b = a_2$  respectively). This action of  $\mathfrak{h}_n(m)$  on  $V$  can be extended to  $\mathfrak{h}_n$  only in the following cases. In all of them,  $a_0 = a_2$  and  $z$  acts as an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -isomorphism  $V(a_2) \rightarrow V(a_0)$ .

- (i) For  $n = 1$  (that is  $m = 1$ ),  $(a_0, a_1, a_2)$  must be

$$(a_0, a_0 + 1, a_0), \quad a_0 \geq 0; \quad (a_0, a_0 - 1, a_0), \quad a_0 \geq 1.$$

Let us call, respectively,  $FU_{a_0}^+$  and  $FU_{a_0}^-$  the first and second  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules above.

- (ii) For  $n = 2$  (that is  $m = 3$ ),  $(a_0, a_1, a_2)$  must be

$$(0, 3, 0), (1, 4, 1), (1, 2, 1), (4, 3, 4).$$

We call these modules  $FU_{(0,3,0)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,4,1)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,2,1)}$  and  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$  respectively.

(iii) If  $n \geq 3$  (that is  $m \geq 5$ ),  $(a_0, a_1, a_2)$  must be

$$(0, m, 0), (1, m + 1, 1), (1, m - 1, 1).$$

We call these modules  $FU_{(0,m,0)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,m+1,1)}$  and  $FU_{(1,m-1,1)}$  respectively.

In these modules, the action of the center  $\mathbb{F}z$  is given by

$$(3.5) \quad z v_j^{a_2} = \begin{cases} -\frac{2\sqrt{m+1}}{a+1} v_j^{a_0}, & \text{if } V = \begin{cases} FU_a^+ \text{ and } m = 1, \\ FU_{(0,3,0)}, FU_{(1,4,1)} \text{ and } m = 3, \\ FU_{(0,m,0)}, FU_{(1,m+1,1)} \text{ and } m \geq 5. \end{cases} \\ \frac{2\sqrt{m+1}}{a+1} v_j^{a_0}, & \text{if } V = \begin{cases} FU_a^- \text{ and } m = 1, \\ FU_{(1,2,1)} \text{ and } m = 3, \\ FU_{(1,m-1,1)} \text{ and } m \geq 5. \end{cases} \\ -\frac{4}{5} v_j^{a_0}, & \text{if } V = FU_{(4,3,4)} \text{ and } m = 3. \end{cases}$$

The next theorem summarizes this information and was proved in [4].

**Theorem 3.3.** *The following list describes all the isomorphism classes of faithful uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n$ .*

- (i) For  $n = 1$ :  $FU_a^+$ ,  $a \geq 0$ , and  $FU_a^-$ ,  $a \geq 1$ .
- (ii) For  $n = 2$ :  $FU_{(0,3,0)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,4,1)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,2,1)}$  and  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$ .
- (iii) For  $n \geq 3$ :  $FU_{(0,m,0)}$ ,  $FU_{(1,m+1,1)}$  and  $FU_{(1,m-1,1)}$  ( $m = 2n - 1$ ).

*Each of these modules is isomorphic to its own dual.*

We close this section pointing out that all the faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules, except  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$ , belong, in some sense, to the same kind of modules (we will say something more about this after Conjecture 4.2). Therefore, we introduce the following definition.

**Definition 3.4.** All faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules that are not isomorphic to  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$  will be referred to as *standard faithful uniserials*.

#### 4. THE TENSOR PRODUCT OF TWO UNISERIAL $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -MODULES

In [7, Theorem 3.5] we obtained the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module structure of the socle of the tensor product of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}(m))$ -modules of type  $Z$ . Therefore (see §3), we already know the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module structure of the socle of the tensor product  $V_1 \otimes V_2$  of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules in the cases where  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are non-faithful of type  $Z$ . We summarize this in Theorem 4.1 below.

In this section we obtain the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module structure of the socle of the tensor product  $V_1 \otimes V_2$  when both  $V_1$  and  $V_2$  are standard faithful uniserial modules, or when one of them is standard faithful and the other one is uniserial of type  $Z$ . From this, we derive a complete description of the space of intertwining operators  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n}(V_1, V_2)$  in all these cases.

**4.1. The non-faithful case and the crucial conjecture.** Let us recall some of the results obtained in [7], mainly Conjecture 3.4 and Theorem 3.5 that describes the  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module structure of the socle of the tensor product of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a})$ -modules of type  $Z$ .

If  $U$  is a  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -module, since  $\mathfrak{h}_n = [\mathfrak{sl}(2), \mathfrak{h}_n]$ , it follows from Lemma 2.2 that

$$(4.1) \quad \text{soc}(U) = U^{\mathfrak{h}_n}.$$

Therefore, if  $V = V(a_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(a_\ell)$  and  $W = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_{\ell'})$  are the socle decomposition of two  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules, then

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{soc}(V \otimes W) &= \bigoplus_{t=0}^{\ell+\ell'} \left( \text{soc}(V \otimes W) \cap \bigoplus_{i+j=t} V(a_i) \otimes V(b_j) \right) \\ &= \bigoplus_{t=0}^{\ell+\ell'} \left( \bigoplus_{i+j=t} V(a_i) \otimes V(b_j) \right)^{\mathfrak{h}_n}. \end{aligned}$$

For  $t = 0, \dots, \ell + \ell'$ , we define

$$S_t = S_t(V, W) = \left( \bigoplus_{i+j=t} V(a_i) \otimes V(b_j) \right)^{\mathfrak{h}_n}.$$

Hence, as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules,

$$\text{soc}(V \otimes W) = \bigoplus_{t=0}^{\ell+\ell'} S_t$$

and

$$S_0 = \text{soc}(V) \otimes \text{soc}(W) = V(a_0) \otimes V(b_0).$$

The following theorem is the same as [7, Theorem 3.5] but stated in terms of non-faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $V_1 = V(a_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(a_\ell)$  and  $V_2 = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_{\ell'})$  be socle decomposition of two non-faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules of type  $Z$ . Then,  $S_t = 0$  for all  $t > \min\{\ell, \ell'\}$ ,*

$$S_0 \simeq \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\min\{a_0, b_0\}} V(a_0 + b_0 - 2k),$$

and, for  $t = 1, \dots, \min\{\ell, \ell'\}$ , we have

(i) *If  $V_1 = Z(a_0, \ell)$  and  $V_2 = Z(b_0, \ell')$ , then*

$$S_t \simeq V(a_0 + b_0 + tm).$$

(ii) *If  $V_1 = Z(a_0, \ell)$  and  $V_2 = Z(b_{\ell'}, \ell')^*$ , then*

$$S_t \simeq \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } tm > b_0 - a_0; \\ V(b_0 - a_0 - tm), & \text{if } tm \leq b_0 - a_0. \end{cases}$$

(iii) *If  $V_1 = Z(a_\ell, \ell)^*$  and  $V_2 = Z(b_{\ell'}, \ell')^*$ , then  $S_t = 0$ .*

One of the main steps towards proving the above theorem was to prove certain instances of the following conjecture (see [7, Conjecture 3.4]).

**Conjecture 4.2.** Let  $V_1 = E(a, b)$  and  $V_2 = E(c, d)$  (two uniserial  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}(m)$ -modules of length 2) and assume that  $a < c$ , or  $a = c$  and  $b \leq d$ . Then  $S_2 = 0$  in all cases and  $S_1 = 0$  except in the following cases.

- Case 1:  $[a, b] = [0, m]$ . Here  $S_1 \simeq V(d)$ .
- Cases 2: Here  $a > 0$ .
  - Case 2.1:  $a + b = c + d = m$  with  $d - a = b - c \geq 0$ . Here  $S_1 \simeq V(d - a)$ .
  - Case 2.2:  $b - a = d - c = m$ . Here  $S_1 \simeq V(d + a)$ .
  - Case 2.3:  $b - a = c - d = m$  with  $d - a = c - b \geq 0$ . Here  $S_1 \simeq V(d - a)$ .
- Case 3:  $[c, d] = [b, a]$ . Here  $S_1 \simeq V(0)$ .

In order to prove Theorem 4.1, we proved in [7, Theorem 3.3] the cases 2.2 and 2.3 (and certain converse statement). Now, in this paper, we need to prove part of case 1 and case 2.1 of the conjecture (together with certain converse statement) in order to prove Theorems 4.6 and 4.7. This is established in Theorem 4.3 below. We point out that this theorem leaves out the uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}(3))$ -modules  $E(3, 4)$  and  $E(4, 3)$ , and a consequence of this is that Theorems 4.6 and 4.7 are restricted to the standard faithful modules, leaving the exceptional faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_2)$ -module  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$  out of our results.

**Theorem 4.3.** Let  $V_1 = E(a, b)$  with  $a + b = m$  and  $a, b \neq 0$ . Let  $V_2 = V(c) \oplus V(d)$  be the socle decomposition of a uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times V(m))$ -module. Then

(i) If  $V_2 \simeq E(c, d)$  with  $c + d = m$  and  $0 < a \leq c < m$ , then, as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules,

$$S_1(V_1, V_2) \simeq \begin{cases} V(d - a), & \text{if } d - a = b - c \geq 0 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) If  $V_2 \simeq Z(c, 1) \simeq E(c, c + m)$ , then, as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules,

$$S_1(V_1, V_2) \simeq \begin{cases} V(b), & \text{if } c = 0 \\ 0, & \text{if } c \neq 0 \end{cases}.$$

(iii) If  $V_2 \simeq Z(d, 1)^* \simeq E(d + m, d)$ , then  $S_1(V_1, V_2) = 0$ .

The proof of this result is very technical and it will be given in §6.

**4.2. The faithful case.** We will now focus on the tensor product of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules where one of the factors is a standard faithful uniserial.

Let  $V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$  be the socle decomposition of a faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -module and set  $W = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_\ell)$ , with  $\ell \geq 1$ , be the socle decomposition of a (not necessarily faithful) uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -module. By Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{h}_n(m) \cdot V(a_i) &\subset V(a_{i-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{h}_n(m) \cdot V(b_j) \subset V(b_{j-1}) \oplus V(b_{j-2}) \\ z \cdot V(a_i) &\subset V(a_{i-2}) \quad \text{and} \quad z \cdot V(b_j) \subset V(b_{j-2}) \end{aligned}$$

for all  $i = 0, 1, 2$  and  $0 \leq j \leq \ell$  (for convenience we assume  $V(a_i) = V(b_j) = 0$  if  $i, j < 0$ ).

Given  $v \in V(a_i) \otimes V(b_j)$ , let

$$(4.3) \quad e_s v = (e_s v)_1 + (e_s v)_2 + (e_s v)_3 \quad \text{and} \quad z v = (z v)_1 + (z v)_2$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (e_s v)_1 &\in V(a_{i-1}) \otimes V(b_j), & (z v)_1 &\in V(a_{i-2}) \otimes V(b_j), \\ (e_s v)_2 &\in V(a_i) \otimes V(b_{j-1}), & (z v)_2 &\in V(a_i) \otimes V(b_{j-2}), \\ (e_s v)_3 &\in V(a_i) \otimes V(b_{j-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $(e_s v)_3 = 0$  if  $W$  is not isomorphic to  $E_4$  and that  $(z v)_2 = 0$  if  $W$  is not a faithful uniserial module.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $V_1 = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$  and  $V_2 = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_\ell)$ , with  $\ell \geq 1$ , be the socle decomposition of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules, where  $V_1$  is faithful (not necessarily standard). If  $v_0 \in V(a_{i_0}) \otimes V(b_{j_0})$  is a highest weight vector then:*

- (i)  $(e_s v_0)_1 = 0$  for all  $s = 0, \dots, m$  if and only if  $i_0 = 0$ .
- (ii)  $(e_s v_0)_2 = 0$  for all  $s = 0, \dots, m$  if and only if  $j_0 = 0$ .
- (iii)  $(z v_0)_1 = 0$  if and only if  $i_0 \neq 2$ .
- (iv) If  $V_2$  is faithful, then  $(z v_0)_2 = 0$  if and only if  $j_0 \neq 2$ .

*Proof.* Since the action of  $\mathfrak{h}_n(m)$  on any uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$  is the same as the action of  $\mathfrak{a}_m$  in the corresponding  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{a}_m)$ -module, cases (i) and (ii) are immediate consequences of [7, Lemma 3.1].

By symmetry, it sufficient to prove (iii) to obtain (iv), so let us prove (iii). If  $c$  is the weight of  $v_0$ , we can assume that  $v_0 = v_0^{a_{i_0}, b_{j_0}, c}$ . It follows from (2.4) and (4.3) that

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{aligned} (z v_0)_1 &= (z v_0^{a_{i_0}, b_{j_0}, c})_1 \\ &= \sum_{i+j=\frac{a_{i_0}+b_{j_0}-c}{2}} CG\left(\frac{a_{i_0}}{2}, \frac{a_{i_0}}{2} - i; \frac{b_{j_0}}{2}, \frac{b_{j_0}}{2} - j \mid \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2}\right) z v_i^{a_{i_0}} \otimes v_j^{b_{j_0}}. \end{aligned}$$

From the definition of the modules  $FU_a^\pm$  for  $n = 1$ ;  $FU_{(0,3,0)}, FU_{(1,4,1)}, FU_{(1,2,1)}$  and  $FU_{(4,3,4)}$  for  $n = 2$ ; and the modules  $FU_{(0,m,0)}, FU_{(1,m+1,1)}$  and  $FU_{1,m-1,1}$  for  $n \geq 3$  (here  $m = 2n - 1$ ), we know that  $z v_i^{a_{i_0}} = 0$  if  $i_0 \neq 2$ . Therefore, if  $i_0 \neq 2$  then

$$(z v_0)_1 = 0.$$

On the other hand, if  $i_0 = 2$ , we know from (3.5) that  $z v_i^{a_2} = \lambda v_i^{a_0}$ , where  $\lambda$  is a non-zero scalar independent of  $i$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq a_2$ . Thus, the equation (4.4) becomes

$$(z v_0)_1 = \lambda \sum_{i+j=\frac{a_2+b_{j_0}-c}{2}} CG\left(\frac{a_2}{2}, \frac{a_2}{2} - i; \frac{b_{j_0}}{2}, \frac{b_{j_0}}{2} - j \mid \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2}\right) v_i^{a_0} \otimes v_j^{b_{j_0}}.$$

In this sum, the term corresponding to  $i = 0$ , has a non-zero Clebsch-Gordan coefficient, indeed

$$CG\left(\frac{a_2}{2}, \frac{a_2}{2}; \frac{b_{j_0}}{2}, \frac{c-a_2}{2} \mid \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2}\right) = \sqrt{\frac{(c+1)! a_2!}{\left(\frac{a_2+b_{j_0}+c}{2}+1\right)! \left(\frac{a_2+c-b_{j_0}}{2}\right)!}} \neq 0.$$

Since all terms are linearly independent, we obtain  $(zv_0)_1 \neq 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 4.5.** *Let  $V_1 = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$  and  $V_2 = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_\ell)$ , with  $\ell \geq 1$ , be the socle decomposition of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules, where  $V_1$  is standard faithful. Then,  $S_0 = V(a_0) \otimes V(b_0)$  and*

- (i)  $S_t = 0$  for all  $t > \min\{2, \ell\}$ . If  $S_t \neq 0$ ,  $t = 1, 2$ , then it is irreducible as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -module and if  $v$  is a non-zero highest weight vector in  $S_t$  of weight  $\mu$ , then  $v = \sum_{i=0}^t v_i$  with  $v_i$  a non-zero highest weight vector in  $V(a_i) \otimes V(b_{t-i})$ , of weight  $\mu$ , for all  $i = 0, \dots, t$ .
- (ii)  $S_2 = 0$  if  $V_2$  is non-faithful.
- (iii)  $S_1(V_1, V_2) \simeq S_1(E(a_0, a_1), E(b_0, b_1))$ .
- (iv) If  $V_2$  is also standard faithful, then  $S_2 \neq 0$  if and only if  $V_1 \simeq V_2$  (that is  $a_i = b_i$ ,  $i = 0, 1, 2$ ) and in this case  $S_2 \simeq V(0)$ .

*Proof.* The proof of this proposition is very similar to that of Proposition 3.2 in [7]. We fix  $t > 0$  and we assume that there is a non-zero highest weight vector  $u$  of weight  $\mu$ ,

$$u = \sum_{i+j=t} u_{i,j} \in \left( \bigoplus_{i+j=t} V(a_i) \otimes V(b_j) \right)^{\mathfrak{h}_n} \neq 0, \quad u_{i,j} \in V(a_i) \otimes V(b_j).$$

Since  $V(a_i) \otimes V(b_j)$  is an  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -submodule, it follows that  $u_{i,j}$  is either zero or a highest weight vector of weight  $\mu$ . Let

$$I_t^\mu = \{(i, j) : 0 \leq i \leq 2, 0 \leq j \leq \ell, i + j = t \text{ and } u_{i,j} \neq 0\}.$$

Since  $u \neq 0$ , it follows that  $I_t^\mu \neq \emptyset$  and

$$u = \sum_{(i,j) \in I_t^\mu} q_{i,j} v_0^{a_i, b_j, \mu}$$

for certain non-zero scalars  $0 \neq q_{i,j} \in \mathbb{F}$ . Now, it follows from items (i) and (ii) in Lemma 4.4 (see the details in [7][Proposition 3.2]) that

$$(4.5) \quad I_t^\mu = \{(0, t), (1, t-1), \dots, (t, 0)\}.$$

Now, again, items (i) and (ii) in Lemma 4.4 imply that such a non-zero  $u$  cannot exist if  $t > \min\{2, \ell\}$  and thus  $S_t = 0$ . This proves (i). Furthermore, (ii) follows similarly by applying item (iii) in Lemma 4.4.

(iii) is clear from the definition of  $S_1$ .

Let us prove (iv). Assume that  $V_2 = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_1) \oplus V(b_2)$  is standard faithful, and suppose that

$$(4.6) \quad u = q_{0,2} v_0^{a_0, b_2, \mu} + q_{1,1} v_0^{a_1, b_1, \mu} + q_{2,0} v_0^{a_2, b_0, \mu} \neq 0$$

is a highest weight vector of weight  $\mu$  in  $S_2$ . We already know that  $q_{0,2}, q_{1,1}, q_{2,0} \neq 0$  and, moreover, we must have

$$q_{0,2} v_0^{a_0, b_2, \mu} + q_{1,1} v_0^{a_1, b_1, \mu} \in S_1(E(a_0, a_1), E(b_1, b_2)) \neq 0$$

and

$$q_{1,1} v_0^{a_1, b_1, \mu} + q_{2,0} v_0^{a_2, b_0, \mu} \in S_1(E(a_1, a_2), E(b_0, b_1)) \neq 0.$$

Theorems 4.1 and 4.3 imply that it is impossible to have

$$S_1(E(a_0, a_1), E(b_1, b_2)) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_1(E(a_1, a_2), E(b_0, b_1)) \neq 0$$

unless  $(a_0, a_1, a_2) = (b_0, b_1, b_2)$ . This follows by considering all the cases with  $(a_0, a_1, a_2)$  and  $(b_0, b_1, b_2)$  running over (see §3.6)

(i) if  $n = 1$  (that is  $m = 1$ )

$$(k_0, k_0 + 1, k_0), \quad k_0 \geq 0; \quad (k_0, k_0 - 1, k_0), \quad k_0 \geq 1;$$

(ii) if  $n \geq 2$  (that is  $m \geq 3$ ),

$$(0, m, 0), (1, m + 1, 1), (1, m - 1, 1);$$

(it saves time noticing that  $E(a_0, a_1)^* \simeq E(a_1, a_2)$  and  $E(b_0, b_1)^* \simeq E(b_1, b_2)$ ).

Finally, let  $(a_0, a_1, a_2) = (b_0, b_1, b_2)$ . We know, from Theorems 4.1 and 4.3, that

$$S_1(E(a_0, a_1), E(b_1, b_2)) \simeq S_1(E(a_1, a_2), E(b_0, b_1)) \simeq V(0).$$

This implies that there is, up to a scalar, a unique element  $u$  as in (4.6) such that  $\mathfrak{h}_n(m)u = 0$ . This implies that  $zu = 0$  and hence  $u \in S_2$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

We are now in a position to prove the main theorems of the paper.

**Theorem 4.6.** *Let  $V_1 = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$  and  $V_2 = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_\ell)$  be the socle decomposition of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules, where  $V_1$  is standard faithful and  $V_2$  is of type  $Z$ . Then*

$$\text{soc}(V_1 \otimes V_2) = S_0 \oplus S_1$$

where, as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules,

$$S_0 = \text{soc}(V_1) \otimes \text{soc}(V_2) \simeq \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\min\{a_0, b_0\}} V(a_0 + b_0 - 2k)$$

and the following tables describe  $S_1$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules (recall that  $m = 2n - 1$ ):

Case  $n = 1$  ( $m = 1$ ).

$V_1 \setminus V_2$	$Z(b_0, \ell)$	$Z(b_\ell, \ell)^*$
$FU_{a_0}^+$	$V(a_0 + b_0 + m)$ .	$V(b_1 - a_0)$ , if $b_1 \geq a_0$ , $\ell \geq 1$ ; 0, otherwise.
$FU_{a_0}^-$ $a_0 \geq 1$	$V(a_0 - b_1)$ , if $a_0 \geq b_1$ , $\ell \geq 1$ ; 0, otherwise.	0.

Case  $n > 1$  ( $m \geq 3$ ).



$V_1 \setminus V_2$	$Z(b_0, \ell)$	$Z(b_\ell, \ell)^*$
$FU_{(a_0, a_0+m, a_0)}$ $a_0 = 0, 1$	$V(a_0 + b_0 + m)$ .	$V(b_1 - a_0)$ , if $a_0 \leq b_1$ ; 0, if $a_0 > b_1$ .
$FU_{(1, m-1, 1)}$	$V(m-1)$ , if $b_0 = 0$ ; 0, otherwise.	0.

*Proof.* We know from Proposition 4.5 that

$$\text{soc}(V_1 \otimes V_2) \simeq \text{soc}(V_1) \otimes \text{soc}(V_2) \oplus S_1$$

(in particular we know that  $S_t(V_1, V_2) = 0$  for all  $t \geq 2$ ). The decomposition of  $\text{soc}(V_1) \otimes \text{soc}(V_2)$  follows from the Clebsch-Gordan formula. We now describe  $S_1$  in each case.

Let us consider the submodules

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &= V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \subset V_1, \text{ and} \\ U_2 &= V(b_0) \oplus V(b_1) \subset V_2. \end{aligned}$$

We know that  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  are non-faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules. From Proposition 4.5 item (iii) we know that

$$S_1(V_1, V_2) \simeq S_1(U_1, U_2),$$

If  $V_1$  is  $FU_{a_0}^+$  or  $FU_{(0, m, 0)}$  or  $FU_{(1, 1+m, 1)}$  then  $U_1 \simeq Z(a_0, 1)$  and  $S_1$  is obtained from Theorem 4.1. If  $V_1 = FU_{a_0}^-$ , then  $U_1 = Z(a_0 - 1, 1)^*$  and  $S_1$  is also obtained from Theorem 4.1.

Finally, if  $V_1 = FU_{(1, m-1, 1)}$ , then  $U_1 = E(1, m-1)$  and Theorem 4.3 implies the remaining cases.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.7.** *Let  $V_1 = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$  and  $V_2 = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_1) \oplus V(b_2)$  be the socle decomposition of two standard faithful uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules. Then*

$$\text{soc}(V_1 \otimes V_2) = S_0 \oplus S_1 \oplus S_2$$

where

$$S_0 = \text{soc}(V_1) \otimes \text{soc}(V_2) \simeq \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\min\{a_0, b_0\}} V(a_0 + b_0 - 2k)$$

and the following tables describe  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  as  $\mathfrak{sl}(2)$ -modules ( $m = 2n - 1$ ):

Case  $n = 1$  ( $m = 1$ ), structure of  $S_1$ .

$V_1 \setminus V_2$	$FU_{(b_0, b_0+1, b_0)}$	$FU_{(b_0, b_0-1, b_0)}$ $b_0 \geq 1$
$FU_{(a_0, a_0+1, a_0)}$	$V(a_0 + b_0 + 1)$ .	$V(b_0 - a_1)$ , if $a_1 \leq b_0$ ; 0, otherwise.
$FU_{(a_0, a_0-1, a_0)}$ $a_0 \geq 1$	$V(a_0 - b_1)$ , if $b_1 \leq a_0$ ; 0, otherwise.	0.

Case  $n = 1$  ( $m = 1$ ), structure of  $S_2$ .

$V_1 \setminus V_2$	$FU_{(b_0, b_0+1, b_0)}$	$FU_{(b_0, b_0-1, b_0)}$ $b_0 \geq 1$
$FU_{(a_0, a_0+1, a_0)}$	$V(0)$ , if $a_0 = b_0$ ; $0$ , if $a_0 \neq b_0$ .	$0$ .
$FU_{(a_0, a_0-1, a_0)}$ $a_0 \geq 1$	$0$ .	$V(0)$ , if $a_0 = b_0$ ; $0$ , if $a_0 \neq b_0$ .

Case  $n > 1$  ( $m \geq 3$ ), structure of  $S_1$ .

$V_1 \setminus V_2$	$FU_{(b_0, b_0+m, b_0)}$ $b_0 = 0, 1$	$FU_{(1, m-1, 1)}$
$FU_{(a_0, a_0+m, a_0)}$ $a_0 = 0, 1$	$V(a_0 + b_0 + m)$ .	$V(m-1)$ , if $a_0 = 0$ ; $0$ , otherwise.
$FU_{(1, m-1, 1)}$	$V(m-1)$ , if $b_0 = 0$ ; $0$ , otherwise.	$V(m-2)$ .

Case  $n > 1$  ( $m \geq 3$ ), structure of  $S_2$ .

$V_1 \setminus V_2$	$FU_{(b_0, b_0+m, b_0)}$ $b_0 = 0, 1$	$FU_{(1, m-1, 1)}$
$FU_{(a_0, a_0+m, a_0)}$ $a_0 = 0, 1$	$V(0)$ , if $a_0 = b_0$ ; $0$ , if $a_0 \neq b_0$ .	$0$ .
$FU_{(1, m-1, 1)}$	$0$ .	$V(0)$ .

*Proof.* As in the previous theorem, we know from Proposition 4.5 that

$$\text{soc}(V_1 \otimes V_2) \simeq \text{soc}(V_1) \otimes \text{soc}(V_2) \oplus S_1 \oplus S_2$$

and the decomposition of  $\text{soc}(V_1) \otimes \text{soc}(V_2)$  follows from the Clebsch-Gordan formula. We now describe  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  in each case.

First, we consider  $S_1$ . We know from Proposition 4.5 that

$$S_1(V_1, V_2) \simeq S_1(E(a_0, a_1), E(b_0, b_1)).$$

If  $V_1 = FU_{a_0}^+$  and  $V_2 = FU_{b_0}^+$ , we know from Theorem 4.1 that

$$S_1(V_1, V_2) = S_1(Z(a_0, 1), Z(b_0, 1)) = V(a_0 + b_0 + m).$$

If  $V_1 = FU_{a_0}^+$  and  $V_2 = FU_{b_0}^-$ , we have

$$S_1(V_1, V_2) = \begin{cases} S_1(Z(a_0, 1), Z(b_1, 1)^*), & \text{if } m = 1; \\ S_1(Z(a_0, 1), E(1, 1-m)), & \text{if } m > 1 \text{ and } b_0 = 1; \end{cases}$$

and it follows from Theorems 4.1 and 4.3 that

$$S_1(V_1, V_2) = \begin{cases} V(b_1 - a_0) & \text{if } m = 1; \\ V(m - 1), & \text{if } m > 1, a_0 = 0 \text{ and } b_0 = 1; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This completes the description of  $S_1$ .

The result for  $S_2$  follows from item (iv) in Proposition 4.5.  $\square$

## 5. INTERTWINING OPERATORS

In this section we obtain, from Theorems 4.6 and 4.7, the space of intertwining operators between the uniserial representations of  $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n$  considered in the previous section.

Recall that, for any pairs of  $\mathfrak{g}$ -modules  $U_1$  and  $U_2$ , we know that

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U_1, U_2) \simeq (U_1^* \otimes U_2)^{\mathfrak{g}} = ((U_1^* \otimes U_2)^{\mathfrak{h}_n})^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)}.$$

It follows that  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(U_1, U_2)$  is isomorphic to  $\mathrm{soc}(U_1^* \otimes U_2)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)}$  (see (4.1)). Thus, we must identify the cases in which  $S_t(U_1^*, U_2)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$  for  $t = 0, 1, 2$ .

So let  $V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_2)$  ( $a_0 = a_2$ ) and  $W = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_\ell)$  be the socle decomposition of two uniserial  $(\mathfrak{sl}(2) \ltimes \mathfrak{h}_n)$ -modules, where  $V$  is standard faithful and  $W$  is either of type  $Z$  or standard faithful. Recall that  $V^* \simeq V$  and that the socle decomposition of  $W^*$  is  $V(b_\ell) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_0)$ .

- Case  $S_0^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$ ,  $W$  of type  $Z$ .

It follows from Theorem 4.6 that  $S_0(V^*, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$  if and only if  $a_0 = b_0$  (and equal to  $a_2$ ). Also, Theorem 4.6 implies that, in these cases, we have  $\dim S_0(V^*, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} = 1$  and  $S_t(V^*, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} = 0$ ,  $t = 1, 2$ . Hence  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(V, W)$  is 1-dimensional and it is described by the following arrow

$$\begin{array}{c} V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_0) \\ \downarrow \\ W = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_\ell). \end{array}$$

Similarly, from Theorem 4.6 we know that  $S_0(W^*, V)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$  if and only if  $a_0 = b_\ell$  and in these cases  $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(W, V)$  is 1-dimensional and it is described by the following arrow

$$\begin{array}{c} W = V(b_0) \oplus \dots \oplus V(b_\ell) \\ \downarrow \\ V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_0). \end{array}$$

- Case  $S_0^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$  or  $S_2^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$ ,  $W$  standard faithful.

It follows from Theorem 4.7 that  $S_0(V, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$  if and only if  $a_0 = b_0$ . Hence in what follows,  $a_0 = a_2 = b_0 = b_2$ . In this case,  $S_1(V, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} = 0$  and  $\dim S_0(V, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} = 1$  (note that if  $V \simeq W$ , that is  $a_1 = b_1$ , then Theorem 4.7 says that  $\dim S_2(V, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} = 1$ , see below). The non-zero

$\mathfrak{g}$ -morphism corresponding to the 1-dimensional space  $S_0(V, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)}$  is described by the following arrow

$$\begin{array}{c} V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_1) \oplus V(a_0) \\ \downarrow \\ W = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_1) \oplus V(b_0). \end{array}$$

This is clearly not an isomorphism. In the particular case when  $V \simeq W$ , the isomorphism is the  $\mathfrak{g}$ -morphism corresponding to the 1-dimensional space  $S_2(V, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)}$  (see also Proposition 4.5). Thus

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(V, W) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } V \not\simeq W \text{ (that is } a_1 \neq b_1); \\ 2, & \text{if } V \simeq W \text{ (that is } a_1 = b_1). \end{cases}$$

(Since here  $V$  and  $W$  are of the same type, we do not need to consider  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(W, V)$ .)

- Case  $S_1^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} \neq 0$ .

It follows from Theorems 4.6 and 4.7 that  $\dim S_1^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} = 1$  and in all these cases,  $S_t(V^*, W)^{\mathfrak{sl}(2)} = 0$ ,  $t = 0, 2$ . Hence  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(V, W)$  (or  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(W, V)$ ) is 1-dimensional. We describe all these cases below:

- Cases with  $W$  of type  $Z$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(V, W) \neq 0$ .

- (i)  $n = 1$ ,  $a_0 = b_1$ ,  $V = FU_{a_0}^-$ ,  $W = Z(b_0, \ell)$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{c} V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 - 1) \oplus V(a_0) \\ \downarrow \quad \quad \downarrow \\ W = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus V(b_{\ell}). \end{array}$$

- (ii)  $n = 1$ ,  $a_0 = b_1$ ,  $V = FU_{a_0}^+$ ,  $W = Z(b_{\ell}, \ell)^*$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{c} V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 + 1) \oplus V(a_0) \\ \downarrow \quad \quad \downarrow \\ W = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus V(b_{\ell}). \end{array}$$

- (iii)  $n > 1$ ,  $a_0 = 0, 1$ ,  $V = FU_{(a_0, a_0+m, a_0)}^+$ ,  $W = Z(b_1, 1)^*$ .

$$\begin{array}{c} V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 + m) \oplus V(a_0) \\ \downarrow \quad \quad \downarrow \\ W = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_1). \end{array}$$

- Cases with  $W$  of type  $Z$  and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(W, V) \neq 0$ .

- (i)  $n = 1$ ,  $a_0 = b_{\ell-1}$ ,  $V = FU_{a_0}^+$ ,  $W = Z(b_0, \ell)$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{c} W = V(b_0) \oplus \cdots \oplus V(b_{\ell-1}) \oplus V(b_{\ell}) \\ \downarrow \quad \quad \downarrow \\ V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 + 1) \oplus V(a_0). \end{array}$$

- (ii)  $n = 1$ ,  $a_0 = b_{\ell-1}$ ,  $V = FU_{a_0}^-$ ,  $W = Z(b_{\ell}, \ell)^*$ ,  $\ell \geq 1$ .

$$\begin{array}{c} W = V(b_0) \oplus \cdots \oplus V(b_{\ell-1}) \oplus V(b_{\ell}) \\ \downarrow \quad \quad \downarrow \\ V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 - 1) \oplus V(a_0). \end{array}$$

(iii)  $n > 1$ ,  $V = FU_{(a_0, a_0+m, a_0)}$ ,  $a_0 = 0, 1$ ,  $W = Z(a_0, 1)$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 + m) & & \\ \downarrow & \quad \downarrow & \\ V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 + m) \oplus V(a_0). & & \end{array}$$

◦ Cases with  $W$  standard faithful and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{g}}(V, W) \neq 0$ .

(i)  $n = 1$ ,  $a_0 = b_1$ ,  $V = FU_{a_0}^-$ ,  $W = FU_{b_0}^+$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 - 1) \oplus V(a_0) & & \\ \downarrow & \quad \downarrow & \\ W = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_0 + 1) \oplus V(b_0). & & \end{array}$$

(ii)  $n = 1$ ,  $a_0 = b_1$ ,  $V = FU_{a_0}^+$ ,  $W = FU_{b_0}^-$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} V = V(a_0) \oplus V(a_0 + 1) \oplus V(a_0) & & \\ \downarrow & \quad \downarrow & \\ W = V(b_0) \oplus V(b_0 - 1) \oplus V(b_0). & & \end{array}$$

## 6. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3

Let  $\mu$  be a possible highest weight in  $S_1$ . We start with some general considerations and next we will work out each case.

We know from Proposition 4.5 that  $\mu$  must be highest weight in both  $V(a) \otimes V(d)$  and  $V(b) \otimes V(c)$ , that is

$$(6.1) \quad |a - d|, |b - c| \leq \mu \leq a + d, b + c$$

and  $\mu \equiv a + d \equiv b + c \pmod{2}$ . We also know that  $\mu$  is indeed highest weight in  $S_1$  if and only if there is a linear combination

$$u_0 = q_1 v_0^{a,d,\mu} + q_2 v_0^{b,c,\mu},$$

with  $q_1, q_2 \neq 0$  (see item (i) in Proposition 4.5), that is annihilated by  $e_s$  for all  $s = 0, \dots, m$ . Indeed this implies that  $u_0$  is also annihilated by  $z$  and thus in  $S_1$  (see (4.1)).

We now describe  $e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu}$  and  $e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu}$ .

On the one hand we have (see (2.4))

$$(6.2) \quad v_0^{a,d,\mu} = \sum_{i,j} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - j \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) v_i^a \otimes v_j^d$$

and thus (see (3.2))

$$\begin{aligned}
e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} &= \sum_{i,j} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - j \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) v_i^a \otimes e_s v_j^d \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k} (-1)^j CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - j \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \times CG\left(\frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - k; \frac{d}{2}, -\frac{d}{2} + j \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_k^c \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k} (-1)^k CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - k \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) \\
(6.3) \quad &\quad \times CG\left(\frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - j; \frac{d}{2}, -\frac{d}{2} + k \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_j^c.
\end{aligned}$$

In this sum, if the coefficient of  $v_i^a \otimes v_j^c$  is not zero then we must have

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.4) \quad &\frac{a}{2} - i + \frac{d}{2} - k = \frac{\mu}{2}, \\
&\frac{c}{2} - j - \frac{d}{2} + k = \frac{m}{2} - s.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we have (see (2.4))

$$(6.5) \quad v_0^{b,c,\mu} = \sum_{i,j} CG\left(\frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - i; \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - j \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) v_i^b \otimes v_j^c$$

and thus (see (3.2))

$$\begin{aligned}
e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu} &= \sum_{i,j} CG\left(\frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - i; \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - j \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) e_s v_i^b \otimes v_j^c \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k} (-1)^i CG\left(\frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - i; \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - j \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) \\
&\quad \times CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - k; \frac{b}{2}, -\frac{b}{2} + i \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_k^a \otimes v_j^c \\
&= \sum_{i,j,k} (-1)^k CG\left(\frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2} - k; \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - j \mid \frac{\mu}{2}, \frac{\mu}{2}\right) \\
(6.6) \quad &\quad \times CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{b}{2}, -\frac{b}{2} + k \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_j^c.
\end{aligned}$$

In this sum, if the coefficient of  $v_i^a \otimes v_j^c$  is not zero then we must have

$$\begin{aligned}
(6.7) \quad &\frac{b}{2} - k + \frac{c}{2} - j = \frac{\mu}{2}, \\
&\frac{a}{2} - i - \frac{b}{2} + k = \frac{m}{2} - s.
\end{aligned}$$

Either (6.4) or (6.7) imply

$$(6.8) \quad i + j = \frac{a + c - m - \mu}{2} + s,$$

(recall that  $0 \leq i \leq a$  and  $0 \leq j \leq c$ ). Now we consider all the cases.

(i) *The case  $V_2 = E(c, d)$  with  $c + d = m$  and  $0 < a \leq c$ :* Here

$$\mu = d + a - 2p, \quad 0 \leq p \leq \min\{a, d\}$$

and it follows from (6.8) that

$$(6.9) \quad 0 \leq i + j = p - d + s.$$

The sum (6.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} &= \sum_{i,j,k} (-1)^k CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - k \mid \frac{a+d}{2} - p, \frac{a+d}{2} - p\right) \\ &\quad \times CG\left(\frac{m-d}{2}, \frac{m-d}{2} - j; \frac{d}{2}, -\frac{d}{2} + k \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_j^c. \end{aligned}$$

In this sum, it follows from (6.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} k &= p - i \\ j &= p - d + s - i. \end{aligned}$$

The conditions  $k \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq j \leq m - d$  imply  $p - m + s \leq i \leq \min\{p, p - d + s\}$ . Therefore, we obtain (see (2.9) and (2.12))

$$\begin{aligned} e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} &= \sum_{i=\max\{0, p-m+s\}}^{\min\{p, p-d+s\}} (-1)^{p-i} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - p + i \mid \frac{a+d}{2} - p, \frac{a+d}{2} - p\right) \\ &\quad \times CG\left(\frac{m-d}{2}, \frac{m-d}{2} - p + d - s + i; \frac{d}{2}, -\frac{d}{2} + p - i \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_{p-d+s-i}^c \\ &= \sum_{i=\max\{0, p-m+s\}}^{\min\{p, p-d+s\}} (-1)^p \sqrt{\frac{(a+d-2p+1)! p! (a-i)! (d-p+i)!}{(a-p)! (d-p)! (a+d-p+1)! i! (p-i)!}} \\ &\quad \times \sqrt{\frac{(m-s)! s! (m-d)! d!}{m! (m-p-s+i)! (p-i)! (d-p+i)! (p-d+s-i)!}} v_i^a \otimes v_{p-d+s-i}^c. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} = (-1)^p \sqrt{\frac{(m-d)! (a+d-2p+1)! p! d! (m-s)! s!}{(a-p)! (d-p)! (a+d-p+1)! m!}} w_s^{a,d,\mu}$$

with

$$w_s^{a,d,\mu} = \sum_{i=\max\{0, p-m+s\}}^{\min\{p, p-d+s\}} \sqrt{\frac{(a-i)!}{i! (p-i)!^2 (m-p-s+i)! (p-d+s-i)!}} v_i^a \otimes v_{p-d+s-i}^c.$$

On the other hand, the sum (6.6) is

$$\begin{aligned} e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu} &= \sum_{i,j,k} (-1)^k CG\left(\frac{m-a}{2}, \frac{m-a}{2} - k; \frac{m-d}{2}, \frac{m-d}{2} - j \mid \frac{a+d}{2} - p, \frac{a+d}{2} - p\right) \\ &\quad \times CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{m-a}{2}, -\frac{m-a}{2} + k \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_j^c. \end{aligned}$$

In this sum, it follows from (6.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} j &= p - d + s - i \\ k &= m - a - s + i \end{aligned}$$

and the condition  $k \geq 0$  implies  $i \geq a - m + s$ , and condition  $j \geq 0$  implies  $p - d + s \geq i$ . Therefore, we obtain (see (2.9) and (2.12))

$$\begin{aligned}
e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu} &= \sum_{i=\max\{0, a-m+s\}}^{\min\{a, p-d+s\}} (-1)^{m-a-s+i} \\
&\quad \times CG\left(\frac{m-a}{2}, -\frac{m-a}{2} + s - i; \frac{m-d}{2}, \frac{m-d}{2} - p + d - s + i \mid \frac{a+d}{2} - p, \frac{a+d}{2} - p\right) \\
&\quad \times CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{m-a}{2}, \frac{m-a}{2} - s + i \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_{p-d+s-i}^c \\
&= \sum_{i=\max\{0, a-m+s\}}^{\min\{a, p-d+s\}} \sqrt{\frac{(a+d-2p+1)!(p+m-a-d)!(s-i)!(m-p-s+i)!}{(d-p)!(a-p)!(m-a-s+i)!(p-d+s-i)!(m-p+1)!}} \\
&\quad \times \sqrt{\frac{s!(m-s)!a!(m-a)!}{m!(a-i)!(m-a-s+i)!i!(s-i)!}} v_i^a \otimes v_{a-p+s-i}^c.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu} = \sqrt{\frac{(m-s)!s!(a+d-2p+1)!(p+m-a-d)!a!(m-a)!}{(d-p)!(a-p)!(m-p+1)!m!}} w_s^{b,c,\mu}$$

where

$$w_s^{b,c,\mu} = \sum_{i=\max\{0, a-m+s\}}^{\min\{a, p-d+s\}} \sqrt{\frac{(m-p-s+i)!}{i!(m-a-s+i)!^2(p-d+s-i)!(a-i)!}} v_i^a \otimes v_{p-d+s-i}^c.$$

Now, if  $a \leq d$  and  $p = a$ , we have, for all  $0 \leq s \leq m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
w_s^{a,d,\mu} &= \sum_{i=\max\{0, a-m+s\}}^{\min\{a, a-d+s\}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{i!(a-i)!(m-a-s+i)!(a-d+s-i)!}} v_i^a \otimes v_{p-d+s-i}^c \\
&= w_s^{b,c,\mu}.
\end{aligned}$$

This shows that

$$u_0 = (-1)^a \sqrt{d+1} v_0^{a,d,\mu} - \sqrt{b+1} v_0^{b,c,\mu}$$

is, indeed, a highest weight vector, of weight  $\mu = d - a = b - c$ , in  $S_1$ .

If  $p < a$  then, for  $s = d$ , the sum defining  $w_d^{a,d,\mu}$  has the index  $i$  running up to  $i = a$  while the sum defining  $w_d^{b,c,\mu}$  has the index  $i$  running only up to  $i = p$ . In both cases, all the coefficients are non-zero, and thus  $\{w_1^{a,d,\mu}, w_1^{b,c,\mu}\}$  is linearly independent. This shows that there is no possible  $\mu$  in  $S_1$  and thus  $S_1 = 0$ . This completes the proof in this case.

(ii) *The case  $V_2 = E(c, d)$  with  $d = c + m$ :* Since  $a < m \leq d$  and by equation (6.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu &= b + c - 2p, \quad 0 \leq p \leq \min\{c, b\}, \\
\mu &= a + d - 2p', \quad 0 \leq p' \leq a.
\end{aligned}$$

This implies  $p' - p = a$  and hence  $p' = a$  and  $p = 0$ . This yields

$$\mu = b + c = d - a.$$



First we prove that, if  $c = 0$ , then  $S_1(V_1, V_2) \simeq V(b)$ . In this case, (6.3) becomes

$$e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} = \sum_{i,k} (-1)^k CG\left(\frac{m-b}{2}, \frac{m-b}{2} - i; \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - k \mid \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2}\right) \\ \times CG\left(0, 0; \frac{m}{2}, -\frac{m}{2} + k \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_0^0$$

(the index  $j$  is 0). It follows from (6.4) that

$$k = m - s \\ i = -b + s.$$

Therefore,  $e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} = 0$  if  $s < b$  and, for  $s \geq b$  we have (see (2.9) and (2.11))

$$e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} = (-1)^{m-s} CG\left(\frac{m-b}{2}, -\frac{m-b}{2} + m - s; \frac{m}{2}, -\frac{m}{2} + s \mid \frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2}\right) \\ \times CG\left(0, 0; \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_{s-b}^a \otimes v_0^0 \\ = \sqrt{\frac{(b+1)(m-b)!s!}{(m+1)!(s-b)!}} v_{s-b}^a \otimes v_0^0.$$

On the other hand, since  $c = 0$  and  $\mu = b$ , (6.6) becomes (see also (3.2) or (3.3))

$$e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu} = e_s v_0^b \otimes v_0^0 \\ = \begin{cases} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - (s-b); \frac{b}{2}, -\frac{b}{2} \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_{s-b}^a \otimes v_0^0, & \text{if } s \geq b; \\ 0, & \text{if } s < b. \end{cases} \\ = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\frac{a!s!}{(s-b)!m!}} v_{s-b}^a \otimes v_0^0, & \text{if } s \geq b; \\ 0, & \text{if } s < b. \end{cases}$$

This shows that

$$u_0 = \sqrt{b+1} v_0^{a,d,\mu} - \sqrt{m+1} v_0^{c,d,\mu}$$

is, indeed, a highest weight vector of weight  $\mu = b$ , in  $S_1$ .

Now, suppose that  $c \neq 0$  and set  $s = m$ . Recall that  $\mu = b + c = d - a$ . When we consider the sum (6.3), it follows from (6.4) that

$$j = k = a - i.$$

The condition  $0 \leq j \leq c$  implies  $a - c \leq i \leq a$  and hence (6.3) becomes (see (2.11))

$$\begin{aligned} e_m v_0^{a,d,\mu} &= \sum_{i=\max\{0,a-c\}}^a (-1)^{a-i} CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} - (a-i) \mid \frac{d-a}{2}, \frac{d-a}{2}\right) \\ &\quad \times CG\left(\frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} - (a-i); \frac{d}{2}, -\frac{d}{2} + a - i \mid \frac{m}{2}, -\frac{m}{2}\right) v_i^a \otimes v_{a-i}^c \\ &= \sum_{i=\max\{0,a-c\}}^a (-1)^{i+d-a} \sqrt{\frac{(c+b+1)(m-b)!(c+b+i)!}{(c+m+1)! i!}} \\ &\quad \times \sqrt{\frac{(m+1)c!(c+b+i)!}{(c+m+1)!(c-m+b+i)!}} v_i^a \otimes v_{a-i}^c. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, when we consider the sum (6.6), it follows from (6.7) that

$$j = a - i = -k$$

and the condition  $k \geq 0$  implies that  $k = j = 0$  and  $i = a = m - b$ . Thus, (6.6) is

$$\begin{aligned} e_m v_0^{b,c,\mu} &= CG\left(\frac{b}{2}, \frac{b}{2}; \frac{c}{2}, \frac{c}{2} \mid \frac{c+b}{2}, \frac{c+b}{2}\right) CG\left(\frac{m-b}{2}, -\frac{m-b}{2}; \frac{b}{2}, -\frac{b}{2} \mid \frac{m}{2}, -\frac{m}{2}\right) v_a^a \otimes v_0^c \\ &= v_a^a \otimes v_0^c. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $c \neq 0$ , the sum in  $e_m v_0^{a,d,\mu}$  has at least two non-zero terms, while the sum in  $e_m v_0^{c,d,\mu}$  has a single non-zero term, and thus  $\{e_m v_0^{a,d,\mu}, e_m v_0^{c,b,\mu}\}$  is linearly independent. This completes the proof in this case.

(iii) *The case  $V_2 = E(c, d)$  with  $c = d + m$ :* Since  $b < m \leq c$ , it follows from (6.1) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= b + c - 2p, \quad 0 \leq p \leq b \\ \mu &= a + d - 2p', \quad 0 \leq p' \leq \min\{a, d\}. \end{aligned}$$

This implies  $p - p' = b$  and hence the only option is  $p = b$ ,  $p' = 0$  and this yields

$$\mu = a + d = c - b.$$

We compute now  $e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu}$ . It follows from (6.8) and (6.4) that

$$\begin{aligned} k &= -i \\ j &= s - i, \end{aligned}$$

and since  $k \geq 0$ , we have  $k = i = 0$  and  $j = s$ . Therefore, (6.3) becomes (see also (2.9) and (2.10))

$$\begin{aligned} e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu} &= CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}; \frac{d}{2}, \frac{d}{2} \mid \frac{a+d}{2}, \frac{a+d}{2}\right) CG\left(\frac{d+m}{2}, \frac{d+m}{2} - s; \frac{d}{2}, -\frac{d}{2} \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_0^a \otimes v_s^c \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{(d+m-s)!(m+1)!}{(d+m+1)!(m-s)!}} v_0^a \otimes v_s^c. \end{aligned}$$

As always, the reader should check that all the numbers under the factorial sign are non-negative.

We compute now  $e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu}$ . It follows from (6.8) and (6.7) that

$$\begin{aligned} j &= s - i \\ k &= m - a - s + i \end{aligned}$$

and conditions  $k \geq 0$  and  $j \geq 0$  imply  $s \geq i \geq s - (m - a)$ . Thus, it follows from (6.6), (2.11) and (2.9) that

$$\begin{aligned} e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu} &= \sum_{i=\max\{0, s-(m-a)\}}^{\min\{a, s\}} CG\left(\frac{m-a}{2}, -\frac{m-a}{2} + s - i; \frac{d+m}{2}, \frac{d+m}{2} - (s - i) \mid \frac{a+d}{2}, \frac{a+d}{2}\right) \\ &\quad \times CG\left(\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2} - i; \frac{m-a}{2}, \frac{m-a}{2} - s + i \mid \frac{m}{2}, \frac{m}{2} - s\right) v_i^a \otimes v_{s-i}^c \\ &= \sum_{i=\max\{0, s-(m-a)\}}^{\min\{a, s\}} (-1)^{s-i} \sqrt{\frac{(d+m-s+i)! (m-a)! (a+d+1)}{(d+m+1)! (m-a-s+i)!}} \\ &\quad \times \sqrt{\frac{a! (m-a)! (m-s)! s!}{i! (s-i)! m! (a-i)! (m-a-s+i)!}} v_i^a \otimes v_{s-i}^c \end{aligned}$$

Again, note that all the numbers under the factorial sign are non-negative.

For  $s = m - a = b$ , the sum giving  $e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu}$  has the index  $i$  running from  $i = 0$  to  $i = \min\{a, b\} \neq 0$ , while the sum giving  $e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu}$  has the index  $i$  running only up to  $i = 0$ . In both cases, all the coefficients are non-zero, and thus  $\{e_s v_0^{b,c,\mu}, e_s v_0^{a,d,\mu}\}$  is linearly independent. This shows that there is no possible  $\mu$  in  $S_1$  and thus  $S_1 = 0$ . This completes this case and the proof of the theorem.

## REFERENCES

- [1] I. Assem, D. Simson, and A. Skowroński. *Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras: 1. Techniques of the Representation Theory*. Cambridge University Press, New York (USA), UK, 2007.
- [2] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, and S. O. Smalø. *Representation Theory of Artin Algebras*. Cambridge University Press, New York (USA), Melbourne (Australia), 1995.
- [3] K. Bongartz and B. Huisgen-Zimmermann. The geometry of uniserial representations of algebras II. Alternate viewpoints and uniqueness. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 157:23–32, 2001.
- [4] L. Cagliero, L. Gutiérrez Frez, and F. Szechtman. Classification of finite dimensional uniserial representations of conformal Galilei algebras. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 57(101706), 2016.
- [5] L. Cagliero, L. Gutiérrez Frez, and F. Szechtman. Free 2-step nilpotent Lie algebras and indecomposable modules. *Comm. Algebra*, 46:2990–3005, 2018.
- [6] L. Cagliero, F. Levstein, and F. Szechtman. Nilpotency degree of the nilradical of a solvable Lie algebra on two generators and uniserial modules associated to free nilpotent Lie algebras. *Journal of Algebra*, 585:447–483, 2021.
- [7] L. Cagliero and I. Gómez Rivera. Tensor products and intertwining operators for uniserial representations of the Lie algebras  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times V(m)$ . *submitted (ArXiv:2201.10605)*.
- [8] L. Cagliero and F. Szechtman. The classification of uniserial  $\mathfrak{sl}(2) \times V(m)$ -modules and a new interpretation of the Racah-Wigner  $6j$ -symbol. *Journal Algebra*, 386:142–175, 2013.
- [9] L. Cagliero and F. Szechtman. On the theorem of the primitive element with applications to the representation theory of associative and Lie algebras. *Canad. Math. Bull.*, 57:735–748, 2014.

- [10] L. Cagliero and F. Szechtman. Classification of linked indecomposable modules of a family of solvable Lie algebras over an arbitrary field of characteristic 0. *J. of Algebra and Its Applications*, 15(1650029), 2016.
- [11] L. Cagliero and F. Szechtman. Indecomposable modules of 2-step solvable Lie algebras in arbitrary characteristic. *Comm. Algebra*, 44:1–10, 2016.
- [12] P. Casati. Irreducible  $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1}$ -representations remain indecomposable restricted to some Abelian subalgebras. *Journal Lie Theory*, 20:393–407, 2010.
- [13] P. Casati. The classification of the perfect cyclic  $\mathfrak{sl}_{n+1} \times \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ -modules. *Journal of Algebra*, 476:311–343, 2017.
- [14] P. Casati, S. Minniti, and V. Salari. Indecomposable representations of the Diamond Lie algebra. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 51(033515):20pp, 2010.
- [15] P. Casati, A. Previtali, and F. Szechtman. Indecomposable modules of a family of solvable lie algebras. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 531:423–446, 2017.
- [16] V. Chari and A. Moura. The restricted Kirillov-Reshetikhin modules for the current and twisted current algebras. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 266:431–454, 2006.
- [17] A. Douglas and H. de Guise. Some nonunitary, indecomposable representations of the Euclidean algebra  $\mathfrak{e}(3)$ . *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, 43(085204):13pp, 2010.
- [18] A. Douglas, D. Kahrobaei, and J. Repka. Classification of embeddings of abelian extensions of  $D_n$  into  $E_{n+1}$ . *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 217:1942–1954, 2013.
- [19] A. Douglas and A. Premat. A class of nonunitary, finite dimensional representations of the euclidean algebra  $\mathfrak{e}(2)$ . *Communications in Algebra*, 35:1433–1448, 2007.
- [20] T. Finis. Appendix to the paper “Some uniserial representations of certain special linear groups” by P. Sin and J. G. Thompson. *J. Algebra*, 398:461–468, 2014.
- [21] B. Huisgen-Zimmermann. The geometry of uniserial representations of finite dimensional algebras. III: Finite uniserial type. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 348:4775–4812, 1996.
- [22] H. P. Jakobsen. *Indecomposable finite-dimensional representations of a class of Lie algebras and Lie superalgebras*, volume 2027. Lecture Notes in Math., Springer, Heidelberg, 2011.
- [23] L. Morotti. Irreducible tensor products of representations of covering groups of symmetric and alternating groups. *Represent. Theory*, 25:543–593, 2021.
- [24] T. Nakayama. On Frobeniusean algebras II. *Ann. of Math.*, 42:1–21, 1941.
- [25] Z. Nazemian, A. Ghorbani, and M. Behboodi. Uniserial dimension of modules. *J. Algebra*, 399:894–903, 2014.
- [26] A. Piard. Sur des représentations indécomposables de dimension finie de  $SL(2).R^2$ . *Journal of Geometry and Physics*, 3:1–53, 1986.
- [27] G. Puninski. *Serial rings*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2001.
- [28] P. Sin and J. G. Thompson. Some uniserial representations of certain special linear groups. *J. Algebra*, 398:448–460, 2014.
- [29] D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moskalev, and V. K. Khersonskii. *Quantum theory of angular momentum*. World Scientific, Singapore, 1989.

FAMAF-CIEM (CONICET), UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE CÓRDOBA, MEDINA ALLENDE S/N, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, 5000 CÓRDOBA, REPÚBLICA ARGENTINA.

*Email address:* `cagliero@famaf.unc.edu.ar`

FAMAF-CIEM (CONICET), UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL DE CÓRDOBA, MEDINA ALLENDE S/N, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, 5000 CÓRDOBA, REPÚBLICA ARGENTINA.

*Email address:* `ivan.gomez.rivera@mi.unc.edu.ar`