

MORE HAMMOCKS

TOBIAS SCHEUER

*Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Bielefeld
Bielefeld, F.R.G.*

Let A be a representation-directed algebra. If e is a primitive idempotent of A , the subset of the Auslander–Reiten quiver Γ_A given by the indecomposable modules X with $Xe \neq 0$ is a hammock. In this paper we generalize this result. Let e_a and e_b be two primitive idempotents in A and let $w \in e_a A e_b$ be a nonzero element. We show that the subset of Γ_A given by the indecomposable modules X with $Xw \neq 0$ is a hammock. We also give various descriptions of the corresponding hammock function.

1. Introduction and the results

For the general notation we refer to [R]. Let k be a field and let A be the factor algebra of the path algebra of the quiver $\Delta = (\Delta_0, \Delta_1)$ by an admissible ideal I . Assume that A is representation-directed. Denote by Γ_A the Auslander–Reiten quiver of A . By $\text{mod-}A$ we denote the category of finitely generated right A -modules and by $\text{ind-}A$ the full subcategory of indecomposables. By $D = \text{Hom}_k(-, k)$ we denote the usual duality. For any $X \in \text{mod-}A$ we denote by $[X]$ the isomorphism class of X : thus $(\Gamma_A)_0 = \{[X] \mid X \in \text{ind } A\}$. For any $a \in \Delta_0$ let e_a be the corresponding primitive idempotent. We denote by $P_A(a) = P(a) = e_a A$ the indecomposable projective right A -module corresponding to a , and by $I_A(a) = I(a) = D(Ae_a)$ the corresponding indecomposable injective A -module. Let w be a nonzero element in $e_a A e_b$. Since $e_a A e_b \cong \text{Hom}_A(P(b), P(a))$, we also consider w as a map, which is just left multiplication by the element w . Define $C(w) = \text{Coker } w$. Note that $P(b) \rightarrow P(a) \rightarrow C(w) \rightarrow 0$ is a projective presentation of $C(w)$.

This paper is in final form and no version of it will be submitted for publication elsewhere.

THEOREM 1. *The full translation subquiver of Γ_A given by $H_w = \{[X] \mid X \cdot w \neq 0\}$ is a hammock with hammock function h_w given by*

$$h_w[X] = \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X) - \dim \text{Hom}(C(w), X).$$

If we apply the Nakayama functor $v_A = D \text{Hom}_A(-, A)$ to our projective presentation of $C(w)$, we obtain an injective presentation $0 \rightarrow \tau C(w) \rightarrow I(b) \rightarrow I(a)$ for the Auslander–Reiten translate $\tau C(w)$ of $C(w)$. Denote by $S(a)$ the simple A -module corresponding to a . Let $M(w)$ be an A -module satisfying $\text{top } M(w) \cong S(a)$ and $\text{soc } M(w) \cong S(b)$. Clearly, $M(w)$ is indecomposable. It follows that $M(w)$ is uniquely determined up to isomorphism, and isomorphic to the image of any nonzero map in $\text{Hom}(P(a), I(b))$.

We define a quasi-poset structure on $\text{mod-}A$. For any two modules X and Y , we set $X \leq Y$ if and only if there is a chain of submodules $V \subseteq U \subseteq Y$ such that $X \cong U/V$. Clearly, $X \leq Y$ and $Y \leq X$ is equivalent to $X \cong Y$, hence this defines a poset structure on $(\Gamma_A)_0$.

THEOREM 2. *If X is an A -module, then*

$$\begin{aligned} h_w[X] &:= \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X) - \dim \text{Hom}(C(w), X) \\ &= \dim \text{Hom}(X, I(b)) - \dim \text{Hom}(X, \tau C(w)) \\ &= \text{rank } \text{Hom}(w, X) \\ &= \text{rank } \text{Hom}(X, v_A w) \\ &= \min \{ \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X), \dim \text{Hom}(P(b), X) \} \\ &= \max \{ l \mid l \cdot \dim M(w) \leq \dim X \} \\ &= \max \{ l \mid M(w)^l \leq X \}. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\dim X$ denotes the dimension vector of X .

Using these characterizations of h_w , we obtain the following consequence.

COROLLARY. *Let $w = w_1 w_2 w_3$, where $w_1 \in e_a A e_c$, $w_2 \in e_c A e_d$, $w_3 \in e_d A e_b$. Then $H_w = H_{w_1} \cap H_{w_3}$. In particular, $H_w = H_{e_a} \cap H_{e_b}$.*

Proof. Clearly, $H_w \subseteq H_{w_1} \cap H_{w_3} \subseteq H_{e_a} \cap H_{e_b}$. Conversely, if $X \in \text{ind-}A$, with $[X] \in H_{e_a} \cap H_{e_b}$, then $\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X) \geq 1$, $\dim \text{Hom}(P(b), X) \geq 1$, thus $[X] \in H_w$ according to Theorem 2.

For $w = e_a$ we obtain in this way some of the results of [RV].

2. Proof of Theorem 1

We recall the definition of a hammock. A finite directed translation quiver H is a *hammock* provided that there is a function $h: H_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that

- (a) there is a source ω in H and $h(\omega) = 1$,

(b) for every vertex $x \in H_0$ we have $h(x) \geq 1$,

(c) for every vertex $x \neq \omega$

$$h(x) + h(\tau x) = \sum_{y \rightarrow x} h(y),$$

where by abuse of notation we set $h(\tau x) = 0$ if x is a projective vertex,

(d) for every injective vertex q

$$h(q) \geq \sum_{q \rightarrow y} h(y).$$

Such a function is uniquely determined and is called the *hammock function* [Br], [RV].

LEMMA 1. *The following conditions are equivalent for $X \in \text{ind-}A$:*

(a) $[X] \in H_w$.

(b) $X_w := \text{Hom}(w, X) \neq 0$.

(c) $\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X) - \dim \text{Hom}(C(w), X) \geq 1$.

(d) $\text{Hom}(P(a), X) \cdot w \neq 0$.

Proof. (a) \Leftrightarrow (b). By definition of H_w .

(b) \Leftrightarrow (c). The sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), X) \xrightarrow{X_w} \text{Hom}(P(b), X)$$

is exact, hence $X_w \neq 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}(C(w), X)$ is a proper subspace of $\text{Hom}(P(a), X)$.

(b) \Leftrightarrow (d). Trivial.

LEMMA 2. *Neither $[C(w)]$ nor $[\tau C(w)]$ is in H_w .*

Proof. Notice that $X \cdot w \neq 0$ implies that both $X \cdot e_a \neq 0$ and $X \cdot e_b \neq 0$. Since $C(w) \cdot e_b = 0$ and $\tau C(w) \cdot e_a = 0$, they are not in H_w .

Now we prove Theorem 1.

Let $\omega = [P(a)]$. Clearly, $h_w(\omega) = 1$, thus $\omega \in H_w$. This is property (a) with $h = h_w$.

Let $X \in \text{ind-}A$. By Lemma 1, we have $[X] \in H_w$ if and only if $h_w[X] \geq 1$; this shows property (b).

Now we want to show property (c): Assume $[X] \in H_w$. Let $Y \rightarrow X$ be a right almost split map. Since $C(w)$ does not belong to H_w , the induced map $\text{Hom}(C(w), Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), X)$ is surjective. First, let X be projective. Then $Y \rightarrow X$ is a monomorphism, thus $\text{Hom}(C(w), Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), X)$ is bijective. If $X \not\cong P(a)$, then similarly we have a bijection $\text{Hom}(P(a), Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), X)$. It follows in this case that $h_w[X] = h_w[Y]$. Second, let X be nonprojective, and let $0 \rightarrow \tau X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$ be an Auslander-Reiten sequence. Applying

$\text{Hom}(C(w), -)$ and $\text{Hom}(P(a), -)$ we obtain the exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), \tau X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), X) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), \tau X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), X) \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore

$$(*) \quad h_w[X] + h_w[\tau X] = h_w[Y].$$

Now, write $Y = \bigoplus_{i=1}^s Y_i$ with indecomposable modules Y_i , and assume $h_w[Y_i] \neq 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. Then

$$h_w[Y] = \sum_{i=1}^r h_w[Y_i] = \sum_{[Y'] \rightarrow [X]} h_w[Y'].$$

This proves (c).

For the proof of (d), let $Q \in \text{ind-}A$ such that $[Q] \in H_w$ is an injective vertex. First, assume that Q is not an injective module. Thus $Q \cong \tau X$ for some $X \in \text{ind-}A$, and $h_w[X] = 0$. Note that $X \not\cong C(w)$, since $\tau C(w) \notin H_w$ by Lemma 2. The additivity property (*) gives the desired inequality (even equality). So assume now that $Q = I(c)$ for some vertex c of Δ . We apply $\text{Hom}(P(a), -)$ to $0 \rightarrow \text{soc } I(c) \rightarrow I(c) \rightarrow I(c)/\text{soc } I(c) \rightarrow 0$ and obtain a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), \text{soc } I(c)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), I(c)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P(a), I(c)/\text{soc } I(c)) \rightarrow 0;$$

thus $\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), Q) \geq \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), Q/\text{soc } Q)$. Now we apply $\text{Hom}(C(w), -)$ and obtain

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), \text{soc } I(c)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), I(c)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), I(c)/\text{soc } I(c)).$$

Observe that $\text{soc } I(c) \cong S(c)$, so $\text{Hom}(C(w), \text{soc } I(c)) \neq 0$ would imply that $c = a$, but either $[I(a)] \notin H_w$ or $w = e_a$, and in that case $C(w) = C(e_a) = 0$. Thus $\text{Hom}(C(w), \text{soc } I(c)) = 0$. Hence we have

$$\dim \text{Hom}(C(w), I(c)) \leq \dim \text{Hom}(C(w), I(c)/\text{soc } I(c)),$$

whence we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} h_w[Q] &= \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), Q) - \dim \text{Hom}(C(w), Q) \\ &\geq \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), Q/\text{soc } Q) - \dim \text{Hom}(C(w), Q/\text{soc } Q) \\ &= h_w[Q/\text{soc } Q] = \sum_{[Q] \rightarrow [Y]} h_w[Y]. \end{aligned}$$

3. Proof of Theorem 2

There exists an invertible natural transformation $\alpha_P: \text{Hom}(P, -) \rightarrow D \text{Hom}(-, \nu P)$ for any projective A -module P (see e.g. [G]). For $X \in \text{mod-}A$ we therefore obtain the following commutative diagram, where the rows are exact sequences:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), X) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}(P(a), X) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}(P(b), X) & & \\
& & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \cong & & \\
& & D \text{Hom}(X, I(a)) & \rightarrow & D \text{Hom}(X, I(b)) & \rightarrow & D \text{Hom}(X, \tau C(w)) \rightarrow 0
\end{array}$$

In particular, this yields the following exact sequence:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(C(w), X) & \rightarrow & \text{Hom}(P(a), X) & & & & \\
& & \rightarrow & D \text{Hom}(X, I(b)) & \rightarrow & D \text{Hom}(X, \tau C(w)) & \rightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
& \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X) - \dim \text{Hom}(C(w), X) \\
& \quad = \dim \text{Hom}(X, I(b)) - \dim \text{Hom}(X, \tau C(w)) \\
& \quad = \text{rank } \text{Hom}(w, X) = \text{rank } \text{Hom}(X, v_A w).
\end{aligned}$$

Since A is representation-directed, $\text{Hom}(w, X)$ is either injective or surjective. Thus

$$h_w[X] = \min(\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X), \dim \text{Hom}(P(b), X)).$$

This shows the first four equalities of Theorem 2. Since Δ is directed, we have $\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), I(b)) \leq 1$. Hence any two nonzero maps have the same image in $I(b)$, which we define to be $M(w)$. Obviously $\text{top } M(w) \cong S(a)$ and $\text{soc } M(w) \cong S(b)$, and hence $M(w)$ is indecomposable. According to [BS], any indecomposable A -module is uniquely determined by its top and its socle. For $M(w)$, this is immediate, as the following proof shows.

LEMMA 3. *If $M \in \text{mod-}A$ satisfies $\text{top } M \cong S(a)$ and $\text{soc } M \cong S(b)$, then $M \cong M(w)$.*

Proof. Consider the map $M \rightarrow S(a)$; we obtain a surjective map $P(a) \twoheadrightarrow M$ by lifting the map $M \rightarrow S(a)$. Similarly, we obtain an injective map $M \hookrightarrow I(b)$. Thus the composition is a nonzero map in $\text{Hom}(P(a), I(b))$ and the image is M , thus $M \cong M(w)$.

PROPOSITION. *Let $X \in \text{ind-}A$ be indecomposable. The following are equivalent:*

- (a) $l \leq \min(\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X), \dim \text{Hom}(P(b), X))$.
- (b) $l \cdot \underline{\dim} M(w) \leq \underline{\dim} X$.
- (c) $M(w)^l \leq X$.

Proof. (c) \Rightarrow (b). Obviously $M(w)^l \leq X$ implies $\underline{\dim} M(w)^l \leq \underline{\dim} X$ and $\underline{\dim} M(w)^l = l \cdot \underline{\dim} M(w)$.

(b) \Rightarrow (a) follows from the fact that

$$\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), M(w)) = 1 = \dim \text{Hom}(M(w), I(b)).$$

(a) \Rightarrow (c). Since A is representation-directed, $\text{Hom}(w, X) = w^*$ is either

mono or epi. Assume w^* is mono. Let $d = \dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X)$, and let f_1, \dots, f_d be a basis of $\text{Hom}(P(a), X)$. Since w^* is mono, the set w^*f_1, \dots, w^*f_d is linearly independent. Hence there are maps $g_1, \dots, g_d \in \text{Hom}(X, I(b))$ such that $g_i \circ w^*f_j$ is zero if $i \neq j$ and nonzero if $i = j$. Define maps $f: P(a)^d \rightarrow X$ by $f = (f_1, \dots, f_d)$

and $g: X \rightarrow I(b)^d$ by $g = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 \\ \vdots \\ g_d \end{bmatrix}$. Observe that $g_i \circ w^*f_j = g_i f_j w = 0$ implies that $g_i f_j = 0$ by injectivity of w^* . Thus

$$gf = \begin{bmatrix} g_1 f_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ 0 & & g_d f_d \end{bmatrix},$$

where all $g_i f_i$ are nonzero maps in $\text{Hom}(P(a), I(b))$, so $\text{Im}(gf) \cong M(w)^d$. Since g maps $\text{Im} f$ onto $\text{Im}(gf)$, thus $M(w)^d \cong \text{Im}(gf) \cong \text{Im} f / (\text{Im} f \cap \text{Ker} g)$. Since $\text{Im} f \cap \text{Ker} g \subseteq \text{Im} f \subseteq X$ is a chain of submodules, we see by definition of \leq that $M(w)^d \leq X$.

If w^* is epi, we apply a similar argument.

COROLLARY.

$$\begin{aligned} h_w[X] &= \min\{\dim \text{Hom}(P(a), X), \dim \text{Hom}(P(b), X)\} \\ &= \max\{l \mid l \cdot \underline{\dim} M(w) \leq \underline{\dim} X\} \\ &= \max\{l \mid M(w)^l \leq X\}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the remaining equalities of Theorem 2.

References

- [BS] K. Bongartz and S. Smalø, *On modules determined by their top and socle*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear.
- [Br] S. Brenner, *A combinatorial characterization of finite Auslander-Reiten quivers*, in: Representation Theory I. Finite Dimensional Algebras, Proc. Ottawa 1984, Lecture Notes in Math. 1177, Springer, 1986, 13–49.
- [G] P. Gabriel, *Auslander-Reiten sequences*, in: Representation Theory I, Proc. Ottawa 1979, Lecture Notes in Math. 831, Springer, 1980, 1–71.
- [R] C. M. Ringel, *Tame Algebras and Integral Quadratic Forms*, Lecture Notes in Math. 1099, Springer, 1984.
- [RV] C. M. Ringel and D. Vossieck, *Hammocks*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 54 (1987), 216–246.