

MINIMAL AND CELLULAR FREE RESOLUTIONS OVER POLYNOMIAL OI-ALGEBRAS

NATHAN FIELDSTEEL AND UWE NAGEL

ABSTRACT. Minimal free resolutions of graded modules over a noetherian polynomial ring have been attractive objects of interest for more than a hundred years. We introduce and study two natural extensions in the setting of graded modules over a polynomial OI-algebra, namely *minimal* and *width-wise minimal* free resolutions. A minimal free resolution of an OI-module can be characterized by the fact that the free module in every fixed homological degree, say i , has minimal rank among all free resolutions of the module. We show that any finitely generated graded module over a noetherian polynomial OI-algebra admits a graded minimal free resolution and that it is unique. A width-wise minimal free resolution is a free resolution that provides a minimal free resolution of a module in every width. Such a resolution is necessarily minimal. Its existence is not guaranteed. However, we show that certain monomial OI-ideals do admit width-wise minimal free or, more generally, width-wise minimal flat resolutions. These ideals include families of well-known monomial ideals such as Ferrers ideals and squarefree strongly stable ideals. The arguments rely on the theory of cellular resolutions.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	2
3. Minimality for OI Resolutions	6
4. Constructing resolutions	13
References	20

1. INTRODUCTION

FI-modules were introduced in [4]. Since then their theory has been further developed in many directions, see, e.g., [3, 5, 6, 10, 22]. Here FI denotes the category of finite sets and injective functions, and an FI-module is a functor from FI to R -mod where R is a commutative ring. Central to the theory of FI-modules is the notion of noetherianity, which encodes the observed stability. Some of the proofs in the theory of FI-modules are predicated on the introduction of OI-modules, where OI is the category of totally-ordered finite sets with order-preserving injective functions. Every FI-module can be thought of as an OI-module by composition with the forgetful functor $\text{OI} \rightarrow \text{FI}$.

A separate but related area of interest involves the study of a non-noetherian ring R equipped with an action of a group or monoid G , the prime example being a polynomial ring $k[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots]$ in infinitely many variables, equipped with an action of the infinite symmetric group. For suitable G it is shown that every G -invariant ideal is generated by finitely many G -orbits (see [7, 1, 14]).

These two subjects were unified in [19] with the introduction of FI- and OI-algebras and modules over these algebras, together with a theory of Gröbner bases and free resolutions. Hilbert functions of OI-modules were studied in [18, 13, 20].

The second author was partially supported by Simons Foundation grants #317096 and #636513.

In this paper, we add to the theory of ideals and modules over OI-algebras by first introducing notions of *minimal* free resolutions of modules over polynomial OI-algebras. We prove that if \mathbf{A} is a noetherian graded polynomial OI-algebra and \mathbf{M} is a finitely generated \mathbf{A} -module, then a minimal graded free resolution of \mathbf{M} exists and is unique up to isomorphism, and any finitely generated free resolution of \mathbf{M} contains a minimal free resolution as a direct summand (see Theorem 3.10). This is directly analogous to the theory of minimal free resolutions for graded modules over noetherian polynomial rings.

In addition, we provide a related notion of a *width-wise minimal* free resolution, corresponding to the situation where a free resolution of an \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{M} in fact parametrizes a family of minimal free resolutions of modules over different polynomial rings. This is a much stricter condition, and it is not as well behaved as ordinary minimality for free resolutions.

We also consider flat resolutions. If an OI-module \mathbf{M} admits a resolution by OI-modules that gives a minimal free resolution in each width $\mathbf{M}(w)$ of \mathbf{M} with $w \geq 0$, then such a resolution is a resolution by flat OI-modules (see Proposition 3.17). There are modules that do not admit a width-wise minimal free resolution, but do have a width-wise minimal flat resolution. In particular we prove that if \mathbf{I} is an OI-ideal parametrizing a family of Ferrers ideals or of certain squarefree strongly stable ideals, then the complex-of-boxes resolutions introduced in [17] can be assembled into a resolution of \mathbf{I} by flat \mathbf{A} -modules, providing an example of a width-wise minimal flat resolution (see Theorem 4.10). In some cases, this resolution is even a width-wise minimal free resolution (see Corollary 4.11).

The methods in this note allow one also to establish that any finitely generated FI-module over a noetherian polynomial FI-algebra admits a minimal resolution of free FI-modules. However, we are not aware of any non-free FI-module that admits a width-wise minimal resolution by flat FI-modules. Thus, we focus on resolutions of OI-modules.

In Section 2, we introduce and define our objects of study and establish some basic properties. In Section 3, we define minimal free resolutions and width-wise minimal free resolutions as well as width-wise minimal flat resolutions, and we connect their properties to the existing literature. In particular, we characterize graded flat modules over a polynomial OI-algebra (see Proposition 3.13).

Using cellular resolutions, we give explicit constructions of resolutions of modules over polynomial OI-algebras in Section 4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We recall needed concepts, fix notation and present illustrating examples.

Definition 2.1. We use OI to denote the category whose objects are totally-ordered finite sets and whose morphisms are the order-preserving injective functions.

For any natural number $n \geq 0$, there is (up to isomorphism) only one object in OI with n elements, namely the interval $[n] = \{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. By an abuse of notation, we will also use n to refer to this object in OI .

The category OI is equivalent to its skeleton, the category with just one object n for each $n \geq 0$ and morphisms being order-preserving injective maps $\varepsilon: m \rightarrow n$. Such a morphism will be denoted with the string of natural numbers $\varepsilon(1)\varepsilon(2)\cdots\varepsilon(m)$. For example, the morphism $\varepsilon: 3 \rightarrow 8$ defined by its values $1 \mapsto 3$, $2 \mapsto 5$ and $3 \mapsto 7$ will be written as the string 357. While this can lead to distinct morphisms in OI being represented by the same string of digits, we will only use this notation in contexts where no confusion or ambiguity can arise.

Definition 2.2. For a commutative unital ring k , an *OI-module over k* is a covariant functor from OI to the category of k -modules, and a *morphism* between two OI-modules is a natural transformation. If k is a graded ring, then a *graded OI-module over k* is a covariant functor from

OI to the category of graded k -modules with degree-preserving maps. When the ring k or its grading are irrelevant or clear from context, we refer to these objects as *OI-modules*.

In order to define a functor F from OI to a category C , it is enough to define it on the skeleton of OI. We use this convention throughout the paper.

In what follows, we will use plain typeface capital letters such as M and N for ordinary modules over a commutative ring, and boldface capital letters such as \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{N} for OI-modules. For the evaluation of an OI-module \mathbf{M} at an object w in OI, we will use the notation $\mathbf{M}(w)$. In this context, the OI object w is called the *width*, and we refer to $\mathbf{M}(w)$ as the *width w component* of \mathbf{M} . An *element* of an OI-module \mathbf{M} is an element of $\mathbf{M}(w)$ for some width w . It is said to be an *element of width w* . An *OI-submodule* of an OI-module \mathbf{M} is a subfunctor $\mathbf{N} \subseteq \mathbf{M}$. A collection G of elements of an OI-module \mathbf{M} is called a *generating set* for \mathbf{M} if the smallest submodule of \mathbf{M} that contains all elements of G is \mathbf{M} itself.

Example 2.3. Any k -module M defines a constant functor $\text{OI} \rightarrow k\text{-mod}$, which is an OI-module. The constant OI-module defined by k itself will be denoted \mathbf{k} .

The most important OI-modules for our purposes are the *free* OI-modules. See Definition 3.16 in [19], and Definition 2.2 in [5] for a definition of the closely-related free FI-modules.

Example 2.4. Let n be a natural number and consider the functor

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n} : \text{OI} \rightarrow k\text{-mod},$$

which for any width w gives the free k -module with basis indexed by the OI morphisms from n to w ,

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}(w) = \bigoplus_{\pi \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(n,w)} ke_{\pi},$$

and where, for any morphism $\varepsilon \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(w, \ell)$, the map $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}(\varepsilon) : \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}(\ell)$ is defined on basis elements by composing the indexing morphism with ε , i.e. by $e_{\pi} \mapsto e_{\varepsilon \circ \pi}$.

The object $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}$ is called the *free OI-module of rank 1 generated in width n* . This terminology is justified by the observations that $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}$ is generated by the single basis element e_{id} in width n , and that a map of OI-modules $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ is determined by its value on this generating element. In other words, there is a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Nat}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}, \mathbf{M}) \simeq \text{Hom}_k(k, \mathbf{M}(n))$$

The category of OI-modules over k is an abelian category. It has pointwise direct sum and tensor product operations, which for any OI-modules \mathbf{M} and \mathbf{N} are defined in the natural way by

$$(\mathbf{M} \oplus \mathbf{N})(w) := \mathbf{M}(w) \oplus \mathbf{N}(w)$$

and

$$(\mathbf{M} \otimes \mathbf{N})(w) := \mathbf{M}(w) \otimes_k \mathbf{N}(w).$$

Definition 2.5. Generalizing Example 2.4, we say that an OI-module is a *free OI-module of rank r* if it is isomorphic to a direct sum $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n_r}$ for some natural numbers $n_1, \dots, n_r \geq 0$. That this rank is well-defined might not immediately be apparent, but it follows as a special case of Lemma 3.6.

We are interested in a generalization of OI-modules, where instead of one underlying ring k , we have a family of rings parametrized by OI, an object called an OI-algebra. A module over an OI-algebra is a collection of modules over this family of rings, with appropriate structure maps between them. These objects were originally introduced in [19], along with their FI counterparts. We recall these concepts. The reader should be aware that our definitions differ slightly from those which originally appeared in [19], and we will address and justify these differences as they arise.

Definition 2.6. An *OI-algebra over k* is a covariant functor \mathbf{A} from OI to the category of k -algebras. An OI-algebra over k is called *graded*, *commutative* or *graded-commutative* if it takes values in the category of k -algebras with the corresponding property.

Remark 2.7. This is a slight relaxation of the definition given in [19], because here we do not insist that the width 0 algebra $\mathbf{A}(0)$ is k itself. Because of this omission, our definition is equivalent to the category-theoretic definition than an OI-algebra over k is a monoid in the category of OI-modules over k , where \mathbf{k} is the unit object. This change is inconsequential for our purposes, since whenever \mathbf{A} is an OI-algebra over k for which $\mathbf{A}(0)$ is not k but is still commutative, we can simply think of \mathbf{A} as an OI-algebra over $\mathbf{A}(0)$, which adheres to the definition given in [19]. All of the examples we consider will meet this requirement.

Definition 2.8. If \mathbf{A} is an OI-algebra over k , an *\mathbf{A} -module* is an OI-module \mathbf{M} over k with the property that for any object w in OI, the k -module $\mathbf{M}(w)$ has an $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module structure, and for which these module structures and the structure maps $\mathbf{M}(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(w')$ are coherent in the sense that, for any morphism $\varepsilon : w \rightarrow w'$, the following square commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{A}(w) \otimes_k \mathbf{M}(w) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{M}(w) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbf{A}(w') \otimes_k \mathbf{M}(w') & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{M}(w') \end{array}$$

Here the horizontal maps come from the the $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module and $\mathbf{A}(w')$ -module structures on $\mathbf{M}(w)$ and $\mathbf{M}(w')$, respectively, and the vertical maps are determined by the values of the functors \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{M} on ε .

Remark 2.9. If we think of \mathbf{A} as a monoid in the category of OI-algebras, then what we have just defined is equivalent to an \mathbf{A} -module in the category-theoretic sense [15], though since we are focused on commutative or graded-commutative OI-algebras, we don't need to specify whether the \mathbf{A} action is a left or right action.

Example 2.10. The constant OI-module \mathbf{k} discussed above in Example 2.3 is in fact an OI-algebra over k , and an OI-module over k is the same object as a \mathbf{k} -module.

The most natural examples of OI-algebras come from composing an OI-module with a functor from the category of k -modules to the category of k -algebras.

Example 2.11. Let \mathbf{M} be an OI-module over k and let F be a functor from the category of k -modules to the category of k -algebras. Then composition $F \circ \mathbf{M}$ is an OI-algebra over k . We will typically use the more familiar notation $F(\mathbf{M})$ for such constructions. The most important examples for our purposes will come from the symmetric algebra $\text{Sym}_\bullet(-)$ and the exterior algebra $\bigwedge^\bullet(-)$ functors.

The algebra $\text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$ is exactly the OI-algebra $\mathbf{X}^{\text{OI},1}$ described in [19]. More generally, applying the symmetric algebra functor to a finitely generated free OI-module \mathbf{F} yields an OI-algebra \mathbf{A} for which $\mathbf{A}(w)$ is a polynomial ring over k for all w , with predictable variable indices and structure maps. OI-algebras that arise from this construction will be our focus for the rest of this paper, and we encode them via the following definition.

Definition 2.12. An OI-algebra \mathbf{A} is called a *polynomial OI-algebra over k* if it is isomorphic to $\text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F})$, where \mathbf{F} is a finitely generated free OI-module over k . We will call a polynomial OI-algebra *standard-graded* if \mathbf{F} is a graded OI-module over k generated in degree 1. In this case each polynomial ring $\mathbf{A}(w)$ is standard-graded.

Example 2.13. Let $\mathbf{F} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},0}$ be a free OI-module over k generated by n elements of width 0, i.e., \mathbf{F} is the constant functor defined by $\mathbf{F}(w) = k^n$ for all widths w . Then the OI-algebra $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F})$ is the constant OI-algebra defined by $\mathbf{A}(w) = R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for all w , and \mathbf{A} -modules are simply OI-modules over R .

Example 2.14. Let $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1}$ be a free OI-module over k of rank 1 and generated in width 1. Then the OI-algebra $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F})$ is the OI-algebra $\mathbf{X}^{\text{OI},1}$ from [19]. In other words, in any width w we have

$$\mathbf{A}(w) = k[x_1, \dots, x_w],$$

and an OI-morphism $\varepsilon: w \rightarrow w'$ induces an algebra map $\mathbf{A}(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{A}(w')$ defined by $x_i \mapsto x_{\varepsilon(i)}$.

More generally, if $\mathbf{F} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1}$ is a free OI-module generated by n elements of width 1, then the OI-algebra $\mathbf{B} = \text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F})$ is the OI-algebra where for any width w , $\mathbf{B}(w)$ is the coordinate ring of the space of $n \times w$ matrices, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{B}(w) = k[x_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq w].$$

A morphism ε in OI acts on an element of $\mathbf{B}(w)$ by application on the second index, $x_{i,j} \mapsto x_{i,\varepsilon(j)}$. This is exactly the OI-algebra $(\mathbf{X}^{\text{OI},1})^{\otimes c}$ described in [19].

Example 2.15. If $\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1} \oplus \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2}$, then $\mathbf{C} = \text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F})$ is a polynomial OI-algebra with one variable of width 1 and one variable of width 2. Explicitly, the rings $\mathbf{C}[w]$ for the first few values of w are the polynomial rings

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C}[0] &= k \\ \mathbf{C}[1] &= k[x_1] \\ \mathbf{C}[2] &= k[x_1, x_2, y_{12}] \\ \mathbf{C}[3] &= k[x_1, x_2, x_3, y_{12}, y_{13}, y_{23}] \\ \mathbf{C}[4] &= k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4, y_{12}, y_{13}, y_{14}, y_{23}, y_{24}, y_{34}]. \end{aligned}$$

The indices on the variables $y_{ij} \in B_n$ represent the maps in $\text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(2, n)$ as described in Definition 2.1. Again, in the language of [19] this is the algebra $\mathbf{X}^{\text{OI},1} \otimes \mathbf{X}^{\text{OI},2}$

Definition 2.16. Let \mathbf{A} be a commutative OI-algebra over k . An \mathbf{A} -module is called *free* if it is isomorphic to $\mathbf{A} \otimes_k \mathbf{F}$, where \mathbf{F} is a free OI-module over \mathbf{k} . Following [19], we will use the notation $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\text{OI},n}$ for the free \mathbf{A} -module $\mathbf{A} \otimes_k \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},n}$.

Remark 2.17. Any rank r free \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{F} has the form $\mathbf{F} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\text{OI},n_i}$. There is a natural choice of basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$ just as in Definition 2.5, and we note that any \mathbf{A} -module morphism $\mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ is determined by the image of this basis. To be more explicit, the free \mathbf{A} -module $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\text{OI},n}$ is, in width w , a free $\mathbf{A}(w)$ module with basis indexed by $\text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(n, w)$, and an OI-morphism $\varepsilon: w \rightarrow w'$ induces a map $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\text{OI},n}(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\text{OI},n}(w')$ which is defined on basis elements by post-composition with the indexing morphism, and which acts on coefficients via the structure map $\mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)$.

Lemma 2.18. *Any free OI-module over a commutative OI-algebra \mathbf{A} is projective.*

Proof. The proof is nearly identical to the proof of the equivalent statement about ordinary R -modules. Let \mathbf{F} be a free \mathbf{A} -module with basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_r\}$ whose elements have widths w_1, \dots, w_r ,

and consider the usual diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathbf{F} \\ & \tilde{f} \swarrow & \downarrow f \\ \mathbf{M} & \xrightarrow{p} & \mathbf{N} \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

where p is a surjective map of \mathbf{A} -modules. A lift $\tilde{f} : \mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ is constructed by choosing, for each e_i , any preimage $m_i \in p^{-1}(f(e_i)) \subseteq \mathbf{M}(w_i)$ and defining $\tilde{f}(e_i) = m_i$. \square

Definition 2.19. If \mathbf{A} is a commutative OI-algebra over k , an *ideal in \mathbf{A}* is a \mathbf{A} -submodule $\mathbf{I} : \text{OI} \rightarrow k\text{-mod of } \mathbf{A}$. Thus, for each width w , $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is an ideal in $\mathbf{A}(w)$, and for each OI-morphism $\varepsilon : w \rightarrow w'$, the map $\mathbf{I}(\varepsilon)$ is the restriction of the ring map $\mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)$ to $\mathbf{I}(w)$.

Example 2.20. Let \mathbf{A} be the OI-algebra $\text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$, and let \mathbf{I} be the ideal in \mathbf{A} generated by x_2 and x_3 in $\mathbf{A}(3)$, i.e., \mathbf{I} is the smallest \mathbf{A} -submodule of \mathbf{A} that contains these two width 3 elements. Then $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is the zero ideal in $\mathbf{A}(w)$ for $w = 0, 1, 2$, While for any $w \geq 3$ we have that $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is the ideal generated by all of the variables of $\mathbf{A}(w)$ except for x_1 , i.e. $\mathbf{I}(w) = (x_2, \dots, x_w) \subseteq \mathbf{A}(w)$.

We will primarily focus on polynomial OI-algebras with variables of width 0 and 1 only, i.e. algebras of the form $\text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F})$ where \mathbf{F} is a finitely generated free OI-module generated in widths 0 and 1. The reason for this restriction is that such polynomial OI-algebras \mathbf{A} are precisely the *noetherian* algebras (see [19, Proposition 4.8], in the sense that any ideal of \mathbf{A} is finitely generated. If \mathbf{A} has just one variable in width greater than 1, then this is no longer true.

3. MINIMALITY FOR OI RESOLUTIONS

We begin to develop a theory of minimal free resolutions for \mathbf{A} -modules analogous to the theory of minimal free resolutions for graded modules over a polynomial ring.

Recall that such minimal free resolutions can be characterized by the minimality of the ranks of the free modules or, equivalently, by the minimality of the maps appearing in a resolutions. One of our results shows that both concepts of a minimality can be extended and lead to equivalent descriptions of graded minimal free resolutions over a polynomial OI-algebra. We also consider width-wise minimal and flat resolutions.

Throughout this section we assume that \mathbf{A} is a noetherian commutative OI-algebra over a field k . If the category of \mathbf{A} -modules is noetherian, then any finitely generated \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{M} admits a resolution by finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -modules (see [19, Theorem 7.1]). In fact, since \mathbf{M} is finitely generated, there exists a surjective map from a finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{F}_0 onto \mathbf{M} . By assumption, the kernel of this map is finitely generated. Thus, one can iterate the construction and obtains a free resolution of \mathbf{M} ,

$$\dots \xrightarrow{\varphi_3} \mathbf{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} \mathbf{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \mathbf{F}_0 \xrightarrow{\varphi_0} \mathbf{M} \rightarrow 0$$

where each module \mathbf{F}_d is free and finitely generated. Moreover, if \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{M} are graded, there is a graded free resolution of \mathbf{M} , that is, all maps φ_d are degree-preserving.

In this section, we prove a family of results analogous to classical results on minimal free resolutions for finitely generated graded modules over polynomial rings. Recall that in the classical setting, a homogeneous map $\varphi : F \rightarrow G$ between graded free modules over a polynomial ring R is called *minimal* if it can be represented as a matrix having no unit entries. We adapt this definition of minimality to maps between free \mathbf{A} -modules.

Definition 3.1. Let \mathbf{A} be a graded polynomial OI-algebra, and let \mathbf{F} and \mathbf{G} be finitely generated graded free \mathbf{A} -modules with bases $\{f_1, \dots, f_s\}$ and $\{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$, where each f_i has width u_i and

each g_j has width v_j . A (graded) map $\varphi : \mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$ is determined by its value on the elements of the basis of \mathbf{F} , i.e., it is determined by s expressions of the form

$$\varphi(f_i) = \sum_{j=1}^t \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{i,j} \in \text{Hom}(v_j, u_i)} a_{\varepsilon_{i,j}} \cdot \varepsilon_{i,j}(g_j) \right),$$

where each $a_{\varepsilon_{i,j}}$ is a (homogenous) element of $\mathbf{A}(u_i)$. We say that φ is *minimal* if whenever any map $\varepsilon_{i,j}$ is an identity morphism in OI, the coefficient $a_{\varepsilon_{i,j}}$ is not a unit. A graded complex of finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -modules is called *minimal* if all of the maps in the complex are minimal.

We will prove in Theorem 3.10 that this definition of minimality is equivalent to the definition one might expect, i.e., that a graded free resolution

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\varphi_3} \mathbf{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} \mathbf{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \mathbf{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \rightarrow 0$$

of an \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{M} is minimal if and only if for any other graded free resolution \mathbf{G}_\bullet of \mathbf{M} and for any homological degree d , the rank of \mathbf{F}_d is less than or equal to the rank of \mathbf{G}_d . Furthermore, in analogy with the classical setting, any finitely generated graded \mathbf{A} -module admits a minimal free resolution, and any two minimal free resolutions of \mathbf{M} are isomorphic as chain complexes.

Observe that any graded free resolution \mathbf{F}_\bullet of \mathbf{M} ,

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\varphi_3} \mathbf{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} \mathbf{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \mathbf{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \rightarrow 0$$

gives, for each width w , a graded free resolution $\mathbf{F}_\bullet(w)$ of $\mathbf{M}(w)$ over $\mathbf{A}(w)$,

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_2(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_1(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_0(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(w) \rightarrow 0.$$

If \mathbf{F}_\bullet is minimal one may wish that each resolution $\mathbf{F}_\bullet(w)$ is also minimal, but in general this is not the case. Requiring this property is a stronger, but slightly less well behaved condition on free resolutions, which we define here.

Definition 3.2. With the same setup as in Definition 3.1, a map $\varphi : \mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$ is called *width-wise minimal* if none of the coefficients $a_{\varepsilon_{i,j}}$ is a unit, and a complex \mathbf{F}_\bullet of free \mathbf{A} -modules is called *width-wise minimal* if all of the maps in the complex are width-wise minimal.

It is clear from the definition that every width-wise minimal free resolution is also a minimal free resolution. However, the converse is not true in general. We illustrate this fact and the above concepts with an example that is closely related to the Koszul complex defined in [19].

Example 3.3. Let \mathbf{A} be the polynomial OI-algebra $\text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$, and let $\mathbf{M} \subseteq \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},1}$ be the submodule which is generated by the element e_2 in width 2, i.e., $\mathbf{M}(0) = \mathbf{M}(1) = 0$, and, for $w \geq 2$,

$$\mathbf{M}(w) \subseteq \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1}(w) \text{ is generated by } \{e_2, e_3, \dots, e_w\}.$$

Since \mathbf{M} has a single generator in width 2, any minimal free resolution of \mathbf{M} has to start with a surjective map from $\varphi_0 : \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2} \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ defined by sending the generator e_{12} of $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2}$ to the generator e_2 of \mathbf{M} . In width 2, this map is injective. In width 3, this map is determined by $e_{12} \mapsto e_2$, $e_{13} \mapsto e_3$ and $e_{23} \mapsto e_3$. The kernel of the surjection $(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2}(3) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(3))$ is generated by the element $e_{13} - e_{23}$. In fact, one verifies, that the kernel of φ_0 is the submodule of $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2}$ that is generated by $e_{13} - e_{23}$ in width 3. Hence, using the map $\varphi_1 : \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},3} \rightarrow \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2}$ which sends the generator e_{123} to this kernel generator, we get the beginning of a free resolution

$$\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},3} \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2} \xrightarrow{\varphi_0} \mathbf{M} \rightarrow 0.$$

In the notation of Definition 3.1, the map φ_1 is determined by the expression

$$\varphi_1(e_{123}) = e_{13} - e_{23},$$

where the width 3 elements e_{13} and e_{23} are the images of the generator e_{12} of $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2}$ under two different OI-morphisms from 2 to 3. Both of their coefficients are units, but since none of the indexing morphisms is an identity morphism, φ_1 is a minimal map. However, it is not width-wise minimal.

Since \mathbf{M} is not free and $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},3}$ and $\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2}$ both have rank one, it makes sense to say that the constructed sequence is the beginning of a minimal free resolution of \mathbf{M} . Notice though that this sequence does not give the beginning of a width-wise minimal free resolution because, for $w \geq 3$, the module $\mathbf{M}(w) \neq 0$ is a free $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module.

For our study of minimal resolutions, we first prove a relationship between minimality and trivial complexes which is a direct analog of the corresponding result for graded modules over a polynomial ring, namely that the only way a complex can fail to be minimal is if it has a trivial complex as a direct summand.

Definition 3.4. A complex of free \mathbf{A} -modules is called *trivial* if it is isomorphic to a direct sum of complexes of the form

$$\cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \mathbf{F} \xrightarrow{\text{id}} \mathbf{F} \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots,$$

where \mathbf{F} is a finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -module.

Lemma 3.5. *A graded complex \mathbf{F}_\bullet of finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -modules is minimal if and only if it does not have a trivial complex as a direct summand.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the result for a two-term complex $\varphi: \mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{G}$. With notation as in Definition 3.1, suppose that φ is determined by

$$\varphi(f_i) = \sum_{j=1}^t \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{i,j} \in \text{Hom}(v_j, u_i)} a_{\varepsilon_{i,j}} \cdot \varepsilon_{i,j}(g_j) \right),$$

and assume without loss of generality that $u_1 = v_1$ and that $a = a_{\varepsilon_{1,1}}$ is a unit in $\mathbf{A}(u_1)$. Since the identity map is the only element of $\text{Hom}(v_1, u_1)$ we get $\varepsilon_{1,1} = \text{id}$, and thus

$$\varphi(f_1) = ag_1 + \sum_{j=2}^t \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{i,j} \in \text{Hom}(v_j, u_i)} a_{\varepsilon_{i,j}} \cdot \varepsilon_{i,j}(g_j) \right).$$

Hence the set $\{g'_1, \dots, g'_t\}$ defined by

$$g'_1 = \varphi(f_1) \quad \text{and} \quad g'_j = g_j \quad \text{if } 2 \leq j \leq t$$

is also a basis of \mathbf{G} . Similarly, we get another basis $\{f'_1, \dots, f'_s\}$ of \mathbf{F} by setting

$$f'_1 = f_1 \quad \text{and} \quad f'_i = f_i - a^{-1} \cdot \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_{i,1} \in \text{Hom}(v_1, u_i)} a_{\varepsilon_{i,1}} \cdot \varepsilon_{i,1}(f_1) \right) \quad \text{if } 2 \leq i \leq s.$$

Since φ is a natural transformation, we have that $\varphi(\varepsilon_{i,1}(f_1)) = \varepsilon_{i,1}(\varphi(f_1))$. It follows for $i = 2, \dots, s$ that $\varphi(f'_i)$ has no summands involving $\varepsilon(g_1)$ for any OI-morphism ε . Since $\varphi(f'_1) = g'_1$, this shows that φ is a direct sum of two maps, at least one of which is trivial.

Conversely, it is clear by definition that if φ has a trivial summand, then it is not minimal. \square

Next, we prove a version of Nakayama's lemma for modules over polynomial OI-algebras, which states that for a finitely generated \mathbf{A} -module, there is a well-behaved notion of a minimal generating set.

Lemma 3.6. *Let $\mathbf{M} \neq 0$ be a finitely generated graded \mathbf{A} -module. A subset $S \subseteq \mathbf{M}$ of homogeneous elements is called a minimal generating set of \mathbf{M} if S is a generating set for \mathbf{M} and no proper subset of S is a generating set for \mathbf{M} . Let $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_n\}$ and $H = \{h_1, \dots, h_m\}$ be minimal generating sets for \mathbf{M} . Then $n = m$ and (up to a permutation), g_i and h_i have the same width and same degree for each i with $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on n . If $n = 1$, let w be the width of g_1 . Then $\mathbf{M}(w)$ is minimally generated as an $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module by g_1 , and \mathbf{M} is generated by $\mathbf{M}(w)$ as an \mathbf{A} -module. Since w is the smallest width for which $\mathbf{M}(w)$ is non-zero, there must be at least one h_i of width w . Let $H' \subseteq H$ be the generators of width w and let $H'' \subseteq H$ be the complement of H' . Now H' is a minimal generating set for $\mathbf{M}(w)$ as an $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module, and it follows that H' is a singleton set $H' = \{h_1\}$, and that the degree of h_1 is the degree of g_1 . Since $\mathbf{M}(w)$ generates \mathbf{M} as an \mathbf{A} -module and H is a minimal generating set, it follows that H'' is empty.

Next we consider the case where $n > 1$. Let w be the smallest natural number for which $\mathbf{M}(w)$ is nonzero. Then let $G' \subseteq G$ and $H' \subseteq H$ be the (necessarily nonempty) subsets consisting of the width w generators, and let G'' and H'' be their complements. Now G' and H' are both minimal generating sets for $\mathbf{M}(w)$ as an $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module, so $|G'| = |H'|$ and up to a permutation the elements of G' and H' have the same degrees. If we let $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ be the quotient of \mathbf{M} by the \mathbf{A} -submodule generated by $\mathbf{M}(w)$, and let $\overline{G''}$ and $\overline{H''}$ be the images of G'' and H'' in $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$. Then $\overline{G''}$ and $\overline{H''}$ are minimal generating sets for $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$. By induction, $\overline{G''}$ and $\overline{H''}$ have the same number of elements, and up to permutation these elements have the same widths and degrees. This lets us draw the same conclusion about G'' and H'' , which completes the proof. \square

Remark 3.7. In the case that \mathbf{F} is a finitely finitely generated generated free \mathbf{A} -module, the rank of \mathbf{F} (see Definition 2.5) is also the size of a minimal generating set for \mathbf{F} .

Next we prove that a free resolution \mathbf{F}_\bullet of \mathbf{M} is minimal if and only if, when compared to any other graded free resolution of \mathbf{M} , it has the smallest number of generators in each homological degree.

Lemma 3.8. *Let \mathbf{M} be a finitely generated graded \mathbf{A} -module, and let \mathbf{F}_\bullet be a graded resolution of \mathbf{A} by finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -modules. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) \mathbf{F}_\bullet is a graded minimal free resolution of \mathbf{M} .
- (ii) If \mathbf{G}_\bullet is any other graded free resolution of \mathbf{M} , then \mathbf{G}_\bullet contains \mathbf{F}_\bullet as a direct summand.
- (iii) If \mathbf{G}_\bullet is any other graded free resolution of \mathbf{M} , then for any homological degree d , the rank of \mathbf{F}_d is less than or equal to the rank of \mathbf{G}_d .

Proof. To prove (i) \Rightarrow (ii), we construct a split surjective map of complexes $\mathbf{G}_\bullet \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\bullet$ by induction on homological degree. In degree 0, the desired map $\xi_0: \mathbf{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_0$ exists because \mathbf{G}_0 is free and hence projective by Lemma 2.18. So the surjective map $\varphi_0: \mathbf{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{M}$ lifts to a map ξ_0 , giving the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{G}_0 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_0} & \mathbf{M} \\ \downarrow \xi_0 & & \downarrow \text{id}_M \\ \mathbf{F}_0 & \xrightarrow{\psi_0} & \mathbf{M} \end{array}$$

To show that ξ_0 is surjective, let f_1, \dots, f_n be a homogeneous basis for \mathbf{F}_0 , let m_1, \dots, m_n be the images of these basis elements under ψ_0 , and consider the subset of $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ that is contained in the image of the map ξ_0 . This subset generates a submodule $\mathbf{F}' \subseteq \mathbf{F}_0$. If \mathbf{F}' is a proper submodule of \mathbf{F}_0 , this would imply that \mathbf{M} is generated by a proper subset of $\{m_1, \dots, m_n\}$. Without loss of

generality, this means we can express m_1 in terms of $\{m_2, \dots, m_n\}$ as

$$m_1 = \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_i \in \text{Hom}(u_i, u_1)} a_{\varepsilon_i} \varepsilon_i(m_i) \right),$$

where u_i is the width of m_i and each a_{ε_i} is an element of $\mathbf{A}(u_i)$. Hence, the element

$$f_1 - \sum_{i=2}^n \left(\sum_{\varepsilon_i \in \text{Hom}(u_i, u_1)} a_{\varepsilon_i} \varepsilon_i(f_i) \right)$$

is in the kernel of ψ_0 and so, by exactness, it is in the image of $\psi_1: \mathbf{F}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_0$. Since f_1 is in the basis $\{\pi(f_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, \pi \in \text{Hom}(u_i, u_1)\}$ of $\mathbf{F}_0(u_1)$, it follows that ψ_1 is not minimal. This contradiction shows that ξ_0 is surjective. As \mathbf{F}_0 is free and therefore projective, ξ_0 has a splitting $s_0: \mathbf{F}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_0$ which embeds \mathbf{F}_0 as a direct summand of \mathbf{G}_0 .

Now, suppose we have already built a split surjective map of chain complexes up to homological degree $d-1$, i.e., we have surjective maps $\xi_i: \mathbf{G}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_i$ for $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ which form a map of truncated chain complexes, and each ξ_i has a section s_i which embeds \mathbf{F}_i as a direct summand of \mathbf{G}_i , and that these sections s_i also form a map of truncated chain complexes.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} \mathbf{G}_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} & \mathbf{G}_{d-1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d-1}} & \mathbf{G}_{d-2} & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{G}_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & \mathbf{G}_0 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_0} & \mathbf{M} \\ & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ s_{d-1} \end{array} \downarrow \xi_{d-1} & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ s_{d-2} \end{array} \downarrow \xi_{d-2} & & & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ s_1 \end{array} \downarrow \xi_1 & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ s_0 \end{array} \downarrow \xi_0 & & \parallel \\ \mathbf{F}_d & \xrightarrow{\psi_d} & \mathbf{F}_{d-1} & \xrightarrow{\psi_{d-1}} & \mathbf{F}_{d-2} & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{F}_1 & \xrightarrow{\psi_1} & \mathbf{F}_0 & \xrightarrow{\psi_0} & \mathbf{M} \end{array}$$

The image of the composition $\xi_{d-1} \circ \varphi_d$ is contained in the kernel of ψ_{d-1} and hence in the image of ψ_d . So by projectivity of \mathbf{G}_d , we can lift this composition to a map $\xi_d: \mathbf{G}_d \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_d$. Using the minimality of the map ψ_{d+1} , an argument similar to the one given above shows that ξ_d is surjective. Repeating this argument, one gets a surjective map of complexes $\xi_\bullet: \mathbf{G}_\bullet \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\bullet$.

It remains to construct a splitting $s_d: \mathbf{F}_d \rightarrow \mathbf{G}_d$ of ξ_{d+1} with the property that $s_{d-1} \circ \psi_d = \varphi_d \circ s_d$. To this end, consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbf{G}_{d+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d+1}} & \mathbf{G}_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} & \mathbf{G}_{d-1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d-1}} & \cdots \\ \downarrow \xi_{d+1} & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ s_d \end{array} \downarrow \xi_d & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \\ s_{d-1} \end{array} \downarrow \xi_{d-1} & & \\ \mathbf{F}_{d+1} & \xrightarrow{\psi_{d+1}} & \mathbf{F}_d & \xrightarrow{\psi_d} & \mathbf{F}_{d-1} & \xrightarrow{\psi_{d-1}} & \cdots, \end{array}$$

and let $\{f_1, \dots, f_n\}$ be a basis for \mathbf{F}_d . For each f_i , the element $s_{d-1}(\psi_d(f_i))$ is in the kernel of φ_{d-1} . Let $g_i \in \mathbf{G}_d$ be a preimage of $s_{d-1}(\psi_d(f_i))$ under φ_d . Note that $\xi_d(g_i) - f_i$ is in the kernel of ψ_d . Hence, there is an element $h_i \in \mathbf{G}_{d+1}$ with $\psi_{d+1}(\xi_{d+1}(h_i)) = \xi_d(g_i) - f_i$. Define s_d by sending f_i to $g_i - \varphi_{d+1}(h_i)$. One verifies that s_d is a section of ξ_d and that $s_{d-1} \circ \psi_d = \varphi_d \circ s_d$.

The implication (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) follows because the rank of a free direct summand \mathbf{F} of a free module \mathbf{G} is at most the rank of \mathbf{G} .

To show (iii) \Rightarrow (i), assume that \mathbf{F}_\bullet is not a minimal free resolution. Then by Lemma 3.5 we can decompose \mathbf{F}_\bullet as $\mathbf{T}_\bullet \oplus \mathbf{F}'_\bullet$, where \mathbf{T} is a trivial complex and \mathbf{F}'_\bullet is a free resolution of \mathbf{M} . In any homological degree d for which \mathbf{T}_d is nonzero, the rank of \mathbf{F}'_d is smaller than the rank of \mathbf{F}_d , and so \mathbf{F}_\bullet cannot be a direct summand of \mathbf{F}'_\bullet . This contradiction completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.9. *A free \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{F} is determined up to isomorphism by the set $\{\text{rank } \mathbf{F}(w) \mid w \in \mathbb{N}\}$, where $\mathbf{F}(w)$ is considered as an $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module.*

Proof. Since \mathbf{F} and \mathbf{G} are free, we may assume $\mathbf{F} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\text{OI}, m_i}$ and $\mathbf{G} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^s \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{A}}^{\text{OI}, n_j}$. The assumption gives for every integer $w \geq 0$,

$$\text{rank } \mathbf{F}(w) = \sum_{i=1}^r \binom{w}{m_i} = \sum_{j=1}^s \binom{w}{n_j} = \text{rank } \mathbf{G}(w).$$

Observe, for any integer $t \geq 0$, that $\binom{w}{t}$ is a polynomial in w of degree t . Thus, the claim follows by comparing coefficients of the polynomials $\sum_{i=1}^r \binom{w}{m_i}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^s \binom{w}{n_j}$. \square

We collect the preceding results into the following theorem, which draws an analogy between minimal free resolutions for modules over noetherian polynomial rings and minimal free resolutions for modules over OI-algebras.

Theorem 3.10. *Let \mathbf{A} be a polynomial OI-algebra, and let \mathbf{M} be a finitely generated graded \mathbf{A} -module. Then one has:*

- (i) *Any graded resolution of \mathbf{M} by finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -modules contains a minimal free resolution as a direct summand.*
- (ii) *Any two graded minimal free resolutions of \mathbf{M} are isomorphic.*
- (iii) *If \mathbf{A} is noetherian, then a graded minimal free resolution of \mathbf{M} exists.*

Proof. Statement (i) is a consequence of Lemma 3.8. For statement (ii), Lemma 3.8 implies that for two minimal free resolutions of \mathbf{M} , each contains the other as a direct summand. Together with Lemma 3.9 this means those resolutions are isomorphic. For statement (iii), noetherianity implies the existence of a resolution of \mathbf{M} by finitely generated free \mathbf{A} -modules (see [19, Theorem 6.15]), and applying statement (i) gives that any such resolution has a minimal free resolution as a direct summand. \square

For explicit examples of graded minimal free resolutions we refer to Corollary 4.11 in the next section.

Although any graded module \mathbf{M} over a noetherian polynomial OI-algebra \mathbf{A} admits a graded minimal free resolution, such a resolution is not necessarily width-wise minimal (see Example 3.3). However, as the following example shows, \mathbf{M} may admit a graded complex of not necessarily free modules that in each width w gives a minimal free resolution of $\mathbf{M}(w)$ over $\mathbf{A}(w)$.

Example 3.11. Let \mathbf{A} be the polynomial OI-algebra $\text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI}, 1})$, and let \mathbf{I} be the ideal generated by $x_1 \in \mathbf{A}(2)$.

As in Example 3.3, one can show that \mathbf{I} cannot have a width-wise minimal free resolution. However, as a special case of Theorem 4.10, \mathbf{I} is resolved by graded exact chain complex \mathbf{B}_{\bullet} where in each width w , $\mathbf{B}_{\bullet}(w)$ is a minimal free resolution of $\mathbf{I}(w)$. We sketch its construction here. In each width w , $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is the ideal in $\mathbf{A}(w) = k[x_1, \dots, x_w]$ generated by the variables x_1, \dots, x_{w-1} , and so $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is minimally resolved by a standard Koszul complex on these variables. Consider this Koszul complex as the graded components of the exterior algebra on a free $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module with basis $\{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{w-1}\}$ and with the standard Koszul differentials. So $\mathbf{B}_i(w)$ is the degree i component of this exterior algebra. These width-wise Koszul resolutions form a resolution \mathbf{B}_{\bullet} of \mathbf{I} by \mathbf{A} -modules, where an OI-morphism $\varepsilon : w \rightarrow w'$ induces a map of exterior algebras $\mathbf{B}_i(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_i(w')$ by acting on indices $e_i \mapsto e_{\varepsilon(i)}$.

The \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{B}_1 in this resolution is generated by the element e_1 in width 2. But the rank of this module in any width $w > 1$ is $w - 1$. So it is not a free \mathbf{A} -module.

In order to extend the observation in the above example and to guide the search for complexes that provide width-wise minimal free resolutions we introduce flat OI-modules.

Definition 3.12. An \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{Q} is called \mathbf{A} -flat (or simply *flat* when there is no ambiguity) if the functor $- \otimes_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{Q}$ is an exact functor from the category of \mathbf{A} -modules to itself.

We now explain how this concept relates to width-wise minimal free resolutions.

Proposition 3.13. *Let \mathbf{Q} be a finitely generated graded module over a polynomial OI-algebra \mathbf{A} . Then \mathbf{Q} is \mathbf{A} -flat if and only if, for every width w , $\mathbf{Q}(w)$ is a free $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module.*

Proof. Suppose \mathbf{Q} is \mathbf{A} -flat and consider $\mathbf{Q}(w)$. Any sequence of $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow N'' \rightarrow N \rightarrow N' \rightarrow 0$$

can be lifted to an exact sequence of \mathbf{A} -modules, which is this sequence in width w and is the zero sequence in all other widths. Since $-_{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{Q}$ is exact, it follows that $- \otimes_{\mathbf{A}(w)} \mathbf{Q}(w)$ is exact. Hence, $\mathbf{Q}(w)$ is a finitely generated flat module over a polynomial ring $\mathbf{A}(w)$, and so it is a projective $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module (see [2]). By the Quillen-Suslin Theorem [21, 23], it follows that $\mathbf{Q}(w)$ is a free $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module.

Conversely, if $\mathbf{Q}(w)$ is a free $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module for each width w , then the functor $- \otimes_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{Q}$ is exact in each width, and so it is exact. Hence \mathbf{Q} is \mathbf{A} -flat. \square

While free \mathbf{A} -modules are also \mathbf{A} -flat, the converse is of course not true. Indeed, by the preceding result, the module \mathbf{M} considered in Example 3.3 is flat, but not free.

We now extend the notion of width-wise minimal resolutions to include resolutions by flat modules.

Definition 3.14. For an \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{M} , a *width-wise minimal flat resolution* of \mathbf{M} is an exact sequence

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}: \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_3 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \rightarrow 0,$$

where each \mathbf{Q}_i is a flat \mathbf{A} -module and, in each width w , the complex $\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}(w)$ is a minimal free resolution of $\mathbf{M}(w)$ as an $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module.

Example 3.15. In Example 3.3, we exhibited an \mathbf{A} -module \mathbf{M} , which does not admit a width-wise minimal free resolution. However, we observed above that \mathbf{M} is actually a flat \mathbf{A} -module. Hence, it has a (trivial) width-wise minimal flat resolution of the form

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_0 = \mathbf{M}$ and the map above is an isomorphism. We present non-trivial examples of width-wise minimal flat resolutions in the next section.

As in the classical situation, width-wise minimality admits an alternate characterization.

Lemma 3.16. *Let \mathbf{M} be a finitely generated graded \mathbf{A} -module over a field k , and let \mathbf{k} be the constant OI-algebra determined by k . Consider a resolution of \mathbf{M} by finitely generated flat graded \mathbf{A} -modules*

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet}: \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_2 \xrightarrow{\partial_2} \mathbf{Q}_1 \xrightarrow{\partial_1} \mathbf{Q}_0.$$

The resolution \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet} is width-wise minimal if and only if in the complex $\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet} \otimes_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{k}$, the maps $\partial_i \otimes_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{k}$ are all zero.

Proof. This follows immediately from our definition of width-wise minimal. Indeed, the complex \mathbf{Q}_{\bullet} is width-wise minimal if and only if, for any width w , the maps in the complex

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_2(w) \otimes_{\mathbf{A}(w)} k \xrightarrow{\partial_2(w) \otimes_{\mathbf{A}(w)} k} \mathbf{Q}_1(w) \otimes_{\mathbf{A}(w)} k \xrightarrow{\partial_1 \otimes_{\mathbf{A}(w)} k} \mathbf{Q}_0(w) \otimes_{\mathbf{A}(w)} k$$

are all zero (see, e.g., [11, Lemma 19.4]). These are precisely the width-wise maps in the complex $\mathbf{Q}_{\bullet} \otimes_{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{k}$. \square

The following result summarizes the above discussion and motivates the search for flat resolutions.

Proposition 3.17. *Consider a graded exact sequence of finitely generated modules over a polynomial OI-algebra \mathbf{A} ,*

$$\mathbf{Q}_\bullet: \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_3 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_2 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{M} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then the following conditions are equivalent:

(i) *For every width w , the restricted complex*

$$\mathbf{Q}_\bullet(w): \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_3(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_2(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_1(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{Q}_0(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{M}(w) \rightarrow 0,$$

is a minimal free resolution of the $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module $\mathbf{M}(w)$.

(ii) *\mathbf{Q}_\bullet is a width-wise minimal flat resolution of \mathbf{M} .*

Proof. Proposition 3.13 shows that (i) implies (ii). The converse is clear. \square

In the next section, we present constructions of finitely generated width-wise minimal flat resolutions of certain classes of ideals.

4. CONSTRUCTING RESOLUTIONS

Using cellular resolutions, we explicitly construct classes of graded minimal free resolutions and width-wise minimal flat resolutions.

First examples of such resolutions can be obtained from a Koszul complex introduced in [19, Lemma 8.3]. Given any OI-algebra \mathbf{A} and any width one element $a \in \mathbf{A}(1)$, there is a complex of free \mathbf{A} -modules

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},d} \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},d-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},1} \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},0} = \mathbf{A} \rightarrow 0,$$

which in each width w is the classical Koszul complex on the set of images of a in $\mathbf{A}(w)$. In fact, if \mathbf{A} is graded and a is homogeneous, the above complex is a graded complex. To state this precisely, we need some notation.

For an integer k and a graded OI-module \mathbf{M} , we denote by $\mathbf{M}[k]$ the module with the same module structure as \mathbf{M} , but with an (internal) grading given by $[(\mathbf{M}[k])(n)]_j = [\mathbf{M}(n)]_{j+k}$ for any integer j .

Example 4.1. Let \mathbf{I} be the ideal of $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{X}^{\text{OI},1}$ generated by x_1 . Then the Koszul complex associated to x_1 gives a graded and exact sequence (see [19, Proposition 8.4]),

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},d}[-d] \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},d-1}[-d+1] \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},1}[-1] \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} \mathbf{I} \rightarrow 0.$$

In each width w , it minimally resolves $\mathbf{I}(w) = (x_1, \dots, x_w)$. Thus, it is a width-wise minimal graded free resolution of the ideal \mathbf{I} .

In [12], we generalize the construction of the mentioned Koszul complex to the case where \mathbf{A} is an arbitrary commutative OI algebra, replacing the choice of $a \in \mathbf{A}(1)$ with a choice of a sequence a_1, \dots, a_r of r elements in \mathbf{A} of arbitrary widths, where this sequence is encoded via an \mathbf{A} -module map $\mathbf{F} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}$ for \mathbf{F} is a free \mathbf{A} -module of rank r generated in the appropriate widths. In particular, if \mathbf{A} is a polynomial OI-algebra over a field k , then the constructed complex gives a width-wise minimal graded free resolution of \mathbf{k} .

Example 4.2. Consider the standard-graded polynomial OI-algebra $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},2})$. Thus, using the notation of Definition 2.1, one has

$$\mathbf{A}(w) = k[x_{ij} \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq w].$$

Let \mathfrak{m} be the ideal generated by $x_{12} \in \mathbf{A}(2)$. Thus, $\mathfrak{m}(w)$ is the graded maximal ideal of $\mathbf{A}(w)$ for any width $w \geq 2$. In this case, the functorially constructed Koszul complex in [12] gives a width-wise minimal graded free resolution of \mathfrak{m} . Note that since \mathbf{A} is not noetherian, finitely generated free resolutions of \mathbf{A} -modules are in general not guaranteed to exist.

We now construct explicit resolutions of classes of ideals in a noetherian polynomial OI-algebra. To this end we use the theory of cellular resolutions for monomial ideals in noetherian polynomial rings. We introduce suitable notation and recall needed concepts.

Definition 4.3. Let P be a partially ordered set. For any a, b in P , the *interval* from a to b , denoted $[a, b]$, is the set

$$[a, b] = \{x \in P \mid a \leq x \leq b\}.$$

An *order ideal* in P is a nonempty subset $I \subseteq P$ such that for any x, y in P , if $x \leq y$ and $y \in I$, then $x \in I$. (Some authors refer to this as a *lower set* in P .)

Often we will identify a monomial with its exponent vector and make use of the following partially ordered sets.

Definition 4.4. Fix positive integers d, n, m_1, \dots, m_d with $d \leq n$, and $m_1 \leq m_2 \leq \dots \leq m_d$, and consider the sets

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) \mid 1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_d \leq n\} \subset [n]^d,$$

$$\mathcal{Q} = \{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) \mid 1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq \dots \leq i_d \leq n\} \subset [n]^d,$$

$$\mathcal{R} = \{(i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) \mid i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_d \text{ and } 1 \leq i_j \leq m_j \text{ for each } j\} \subset [m_1] \times \dots \times [m_d]$$

together with their componentwise (or Gale) partial ordering, defined by

$$(i_1, \dots, i_d) \leq_{\text{Gale}} (j_1, \dots, j_d) \quad \text{if } i_k \leq j_k \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, d.$$

Note that there is a natural bijection between \mathcal{P} and the squarefree monomials of degree d in a polynomial ring $R = k[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$, given by $(i_1, \dots, i_d) \mapsto x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$. Similarly, there is a bijection between \mathcal{Q} and the set of all monomials of degree d in R . Using these correspondences, we define the monomial ideals we are interested in, following [17, Definitions 3.4 and 3.6].

Definition 4.5. Let I be a monomial ideal generated by monomials of degree d .

(i) If I is in R , it is called *squarefree strongly stable* if its monomial generating set corresponds to an order ideal in \mathcal{P} . It is said to be *strongly stable* if its monomial generating set corresponds to an order ideal in \mathcal{Q} .

(ii) If I is generated by monomials in the set $M = \{x_{1,i_1} x_{2,i_2} \cdots x_{d,i_d} \mid (i_1, i_2, \dots, i_d) \in \mathcal{R}\}$, then we say that I is a *Ferrers ideal* if its monomial generating set corresponds to an order ideal in \mathcal{R} .

For simplicity, the following theorem in [17] is stated for a squarefree strongly stable ideal. It is based on earlier work in [8, 9] and applies analogously to strongly stable and to Ferrers ideals as well. For information on cellular resolutions we refer to [16].

Theorem 4.6 ([17, Theorem 3.13]). *Consider a squarefree strongly stable ideal $I \subseteq R = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ that is generated in degree d . Let $\Delta = \Delta^{n-1} \times \Delta^{n-1} \times \dots \times \Delta^{n-1}$ be the polyhedral cell complex obtained by taking the product of d simplices on the set $[n]$. Denote by \mathcal{V}_I the set of vertices of Δ that correspond to the monomial generators of I ,*

$$\mathcal{V}_I = \{\{i_1\} \times \{i_2\} \times \dots \times \{i_d\} \mid x_{i_1} x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_d} \in I \text{ and } i_1 < \dots < i_d\},$$

Let C_I be the vertex-induced subcomplex of Δ determined by the set \mathcal{V}_I . Then C_I supports a linear minimal free resolution B_\bullet of R/I , called the complex-of-boxes resolution,

$$B_\bullet: \quad 0 \rightarrow B_\delta[-d + \delta - 1] \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow B_2[-d - 1] \rightarrow B_1[-d] \rightarrow B_0 = R \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow 0,$$


where δ is the dimension of C_I , B_j is the free R -module with basis $\{e_P \mid P \in C_I, \dim(P) = j - 1\}$ and the differential is defined by

$$\partial(e_P) = \sum_Q \text{sgn}(P, Q) \frac{m_P}{m_Q} e_Q.$$

This sum runs over the codimension one faces Q of P , $\text{sgn}(P, Q)$ is an incidence function determined by an orientation on Δ , and $m_P \in R$ is the least common multiple of the monomials corresponding to the vertices of P .

Before applying this result to the study of OI-ideals, we illustrate it by an example.

Example 4.7. Consider the squarefree strongly stable ideal $I = (x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_1x_4, x_2x_3, x_2x_4) \subseteq k[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$. Theorem 4.6 shows that R/I has a minimal free resolution supported on the polyhedral cell complex shown below:



It has five vertices, six edges and two 2-dimensional faces. Explicitly, the complex-of-boxes resolution determined by this cell complex is

$$0 \rightarrow R(-4)^2 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} R(-3)^6 \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} R(-2)^5 \xrightarrow{\varphi_0} R^1 \rightarrow R/I \rightarrow 0,$$

where the entries of the differentials with the stated bases have the following coordinate matrices:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_0 &= [x_1x_2 \quad x_1x_3 \quad x_2x_3 \quad x_1x_4 \quad x_2x_4], \\ \varphi_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} x_3 & 0 & -x_4 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -x_2 & -x_2 & 0 & -x_4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & 0 & 0 & -x_4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 & -x_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_3 & x_2 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \varphi_2 &= \begin{bmatrix} x_4 & 0 \\ 0 & x_4 \\ x_3 & 0 \\ -x_2 & -x_2 \\ 0 & x_1 \\ 0 & -x_3 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The next step is to consider an OI-ideal that is generated in one width by a strongly stable monomial ideal. As preparation, we establish the following combinatorial results.

Lemma 4.8. Fix an integer $d \geq 1$. For any integer $w \geq d$, let \mathcal{P}_w be the set of strictly-increasing d -tuples of integers from 1 to w , i.e.

$$\mathcal{P}_w = \{\vec{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_d) \mid 1 \leq a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_d \leq w\}.$$

Each set \mathcal{P}_w is a poset under the componentwise partial ordering as discussed in Definition 4.3. Any OI-morphism $\varepsilon : w \rightarrow w + 1$ induces a map $\mathcal{P}_w \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{w+1}$ by componentwise application: $\varepsilon(\vec{a}) = (\varepsilon(a_1), \dots, \varepsilon(a_d))$.

If I_w is an order ideal in \mathcal{P}_w , then the set

$$I_{w+1} = \{\varepsilon(\vec{a}) \mid \vec{a} \in I_w \text{ and } \varepsilon \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(w, w+1)\}$$

is an order ideal in \mathcal{P}_{w+1} .

Proof. The minimum element of \mathcal{P}_w and of \mathcal{P}_{w+1} is $\{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, which we denote by $\widehat{0}$. Let $\vec{m}_1, \dots, \vec{m}_r$ be the maximal elements of I_w . Denote by $\mathbf{1}$ the all ones vector $(1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^d$. Then I_{w+1} is contained in the union of the intervals $[\widehat{0}, \vec{m}_i + \mathbf{1}]$ with $1 \leq i \leq r$. In order to show equality, consider any $\vec{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_d)$ in I_{w+1} . Thus, there is some maximal element $\vec{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_d)$ of I_w with $\vec{b} \leq \vec{m} + \mathbf{1}$. We are done if we can show that there is some $\vec{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \leq \vec{m}$ with $\vec{b} = \varepsilon(\vec{a})$ for some $\varepsilon \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(w, w+1)$.

If $\vec{b} = \widehat{0}$, then $a = \widehat{0}$ and the identity map have the desired property. If $\vec{b} > \widehat{0}$, there is a unique integer $k \geq 1$ such that $b_i = i$ if $i < k$ and $b_k > k$. Set $\vec{a} = (1, 2, \dots, k-1, b_k-1, \dots, b_d-1)$. Note that \vec{a} is in \mathcal{P}_w and that $\vec{a} \leq \vec{m}$ because $\vec{b} \leq \vec{m} + \mathbf{1}$. Moreover, for $\varepsilon \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(w, w+1)$ with

$$\varepsilon(i) = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } 1 \leq i < b_k \\ i+1 & \text{if } b_k \leq i \leq w, \end{cases}$$

we get $\vec{b} = \varepsilon(\vec{a})$, which completes the argument. \square

Corollary 4.9. *Let $I \subseteq k[x_1, \dots, x_{w_0}]$ be a squarefree strongly stable monomial ideal generated in degree d . Consider the ideal \mathbf{I} of $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$ that is generated in width w_0 by I . Then, for each width $w \geq w_0$, the monomial ideal $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is a squarefree strongly stable.*

Proof. We use induction on w . If $w = w_0$, the claim is true by assumption on $\mathbf{I}_{w_0} = I$. Consider any width $w > w_0$. By [19, Lemma 2.3], the ideal \mathbf{I}_w is equal to the width w component of the ideal of \mathbf{A} that is generated in width $w-1$ by \mathbf{I}_{w-1} . By induction, \mathbf{I}_{w-1} is squarefree strongly stable. Thus, Lemma 4.8 shows that \mathbf{I}_w is a squarefree strongly stable monomial ideal as well. \square

Our main result in this section shows that the complex-of-boxes resolutions for each width-wise component of an ideal as above can be given an OI-structure. As a consequence, this produces a width-wise minimal flat resolution of the ideal.

Theorem 4.10. *Let \mathbf{I} be an OI-ideal in $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$ generated in width w_0 by a squarefree strongly stable monomial ideal $I \subseteq \mathbf{A}(w_0) = k[x_1, \dots, x_{w_0}]$ whose generators all have degree d . Then \mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} has a graded width-wise minimal flat resolution \mathbf{B}_{\bullet} ,*

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_i[-d-i+1] \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_{i-1}[-d-i+2] \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_1[-d] \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} \rightarrow 0,$$

which in every width $w \geq w_0$ restricts to the graded minimal free resolution of $\mathbf{A}(w)/\mathbf{I}(w)$ given by the complex-of-boxes.

Proof. By Corollary 4.9, in each width $w \geq w_0$, the ideal $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is a squarefree strongly stable monomial ideal. Thus, the complex-of-boxes in Theorem 4.6 gives a graded minimal free resolution of $\mathbf{A}(w)/\mathbf{I}(w)$. We use these resolutions to define the desired flat \mathbf{A} -modules \mathbf{B}_i .

Let $\mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{A}$. In order to define \mathbf{B}_i for $i > 0$, we first specify it as an $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module in each width w and then describe the structure maps between components of different widths.

Consider any integer $i > 0$. If $0 \leq w < w_0$, the ideal $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is zero, and we set $\mathbf{B}_i(w) = 0$. If $w \geq w_0$, we define $\mathbf{B}_i(w)$ as the the free $\mathbf{A}(w)$ -module appearing in homological degree i of the complex-of-boxes resolution of $\mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I}(w)$ as described in Theorem 4.6. In particular, it has a basis consisting of elements e_P , where P is any $(i-1)$ -dimensional face of the polyhedral cell complex $C_{\mathbf{I}(w)}$. Thus P is of the form $P = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d \subset \Delta^{w-1} \times \cdots \times \Delta^{w-1}$, where Δ^{w-1} is the simplex on the vertex set $[w]$. In the remainder of the proof we use $\sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d$ to denote the basis element e_P .

Given an OI morphism $\varepsilon : w \rightarrow w'$ and an element of the form $a \cdot (\sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d)$ with $a \in \mathbf{A}(w)$, we define a homomorphism of k -modules $\mathbf{B}_i(\varepsilon) : \mathbf{B}_i(w) \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_i(w')$ by

$$\mathbf{B}_i(\varepsilon) (a \cdot (\sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d)) = \mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)(a) \cdot (\varepsilon(\sigma_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \varepsilon(\sigma_d)),$$

i.e., we apply the structure morphism $\mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)$ to the coefficient a , and we apply the OI morphism ε to the elements of the σ_j . One verifies that these maps give \mathbf{B}_i the structure of an \mathbf{A} -module. Moreover, \mathbf{B}_i is \mathbf{A} -flat by Proposition 3.13.

Next, we define the desired differential $\mathbf{B}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_{i-1}$ in any width w as the differential in the complex-of-boxes resolution of $\mathbf{A}(w)/\mathbf{I}(w)$. In order to show that these width-wise assignments give a morphism of \mathbf{A} -modules, it suffices to check (see [19, Lemma 2.3]) that, for any $\varepsilon \in \text{Hom}_{\text{OI}}(w, w+1)$, the following square commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{B}_i(w) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathbf{B}_{i-1}(w) \\ \mathbf{B}_i(\varepsilon) \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{B}_{i-1}(\varepsilon) \\ \mathbf{B}_i(w+1) & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathbf{B}_{i-1}(w+1). \end{array}$$

To this end we claim there are orientations of the polyhedral cell complexes used in Theorem 4.6 such that the resulting differentials are determined by

$$(1) \quad \partial(\sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d) = \sum_{i=1}^d (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \dim(\sigma_j)} \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \partial(\sigma_i) \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d,$$

where ∂ applied to a simplex $\sigma = \{i_0, i_1, \dots, i_j\}$ is defined by

$$(2) \quad \partial(\sigma) = \sum_{k=0}^j (-1)^j x_{i_k} \cdot (\sigma \setminus i_k).$$

This can be verified directly. More conceptually, this follows because (2) corresponds to a choice of an orientation on the simplicial complex generated by a $(w-1)$ -dimensional simplex so that the resulting cellular resolution gives a Koszul complex

$$0 \rightarrow K_w \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow K_0 \rightarrow 0.$$

Thus, (1) is induced from the differential of the cellular resolution supported on the polyhedral cell complex $\Delta^{w-1} \times \cdots \times \Delta^{w-1}$ with d factors. The latter corresponds to the d -fold tensor product of the truncated Koszul complex

$$0 \rightarrow K_w \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow K_1 \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that the mentioned cellular resolution resolves the Ferrers ideal (see [17, Theorem 3.13])

$$(x_{1,1}, \dots, x_{1,w}) \cdots (x_{d,1}, \dots, x_{d,w}) \subset K[x_{i,j} \mid i \in [d], j \in [w]] \cong (\mathbf{A}(w))^{\otimes d}.$$

We now verify the claimed commutativity by checking it for an arbitrary $a \cdot \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d$ with $a \in \mathbf{A}(w)$ and a basis element $\sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d$ of $\mathbf{B}_i(w)$. If $d = 1$ this is straightforward using Formula (2) and is, in fact, part of the statement in Example 4.1. If $d \geq 1$ we compute on the one hand

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{B}_{i-1}(\varepsilon) \circ \partial(a \cdot \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d) \\ &= \mathbf{B}_{i-1}(\varepsilon) \left(\sum_{j=1}^d (-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \dim(\sigma_k)} a \cdot \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \partial(\sigma_j) \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d (-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \deg(\sigma_k)} \mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)(a) \cdot \varepsilon(\sigma_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \varepsilon(\partial(\sigma_j)) \otimes \cdots \otimes \varepsilon(\sigma_d). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \partial \circ \mathbf{B}_i(\varepsilon)(a \cdot \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d) \\ &= \partial(\mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)(a) \cdot \varepsilon(\sigma_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \varepsilon(\sigma_d)) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d (-1)^{\sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \dim(\varepsilon(\sigma_k))} \mathbf{A}(\varepsilon)(a) \cdot \varepsilon(\sigma_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \partial(\varepsilon(\sigma_j)) \otimes \cdots \otimes \varepsilon(\sigma_d). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon(\partial(\sigma_j)) = \partial(\varepsilon(\sigma_j))$ by the argument for the case $d = 1$, we conclude

$$\mathbf{B}_{i-1}(\varepsilon) \circ \partial(a \cdot \sigma_1 \otimes \sigma_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d) = \partial \circ \mathbf{B}_i(\varepsilon)(a \cdot \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d),$$

as desired. Thus, \mathbf{B}_\bullet is a complex \mathbf{A} -modules. It is an exact sequence \mathbf{B}_\bullet of flat \mathbf{A} -modules because because it is width-wise exact by construction. This completes the proof. \square

We single out a special case where the above flat resolution is in fact a free resolution.

Corollary 4.11. *If \mathbf{I} is the ideal of $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$ generated in width d by the monomial $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_d$, then \mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} has a width-wise minimal graded free resolution of the form*

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_i[-d-i+1] \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_{i-1}[-d-i+2] \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_1[-d] \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\mathbf{B}_i = (\mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},d+i-1})^{\binom{d+i-2}{d-1}}$.

Proof. We use the flat resolution of \mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} described in Theorem 4.10. For any width w and any homological degree $i \geq 1$, a basis of $\mathbf{B}_i(w)$ is given by an $(i-1)$ -dimensional face $P = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d$ of $C_{\mathbf{I}(w)}$. Thus $Q = \sigma_1 \cup \cdots \cup \sigma_d$ is a subset $\{k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_{d+i-1}\}$ of $[w]$ with $\sigma_j = \{k_l \mid |\sigma_1| + \cdots + |\sigma_{j-1}| < l \leq |\sigma_1| + \cdots + |\sigma_j|\}$. Hence P is determined by first choosing a $(d+i-1)$ -element subset Q of $[w]$. Each such choice can be identified with an OI-morphism $\pi: [d+i-1] \rightarrow [w]$ whose image is Q . The set of all such maps π index a basis of $\mathbf{F}_\mathbf{A}^{\text{OI},d+i-1}(w)$.

Second, given such a choice of Q , a face $P = \sigma_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_d$ with $Q = \sigma_1 \cup \cdots \cup \sigma_d$ is determined by choosing the cardinalities of $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{d-1}$ as $|\sigma_1| + \cdots + |\sigma_d| = d+i-1$. Since every σ_j is non-empty, one must have $1 \leq |\sigma_j| \leq i$. Thus, given Q , there are $\binom{d+i-2}{d-1}$ choices for the cardinalities of $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{d-1}$. In width $(d+i-1)$, these choices index a basis for \mathbf{B}_i as a free \mathbf{A} -module. \square

We illustrate the above results by an explicit example.

Example 4.12. Let $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$ be the polynomial OI-algebra with one variable of width 1. Consider the ideal \mathbf{I} of \mathbf{A} that is generated in width two by $x_1 x_2$ and the ideal \mathbf{J} of \mathbf{A} that generated in width three by $(x_1 x_2, x_1 x_3)$. The complex-of-boxes construction gives a resolution of \mathbf{I} by free \mathbf{A} -modules which is both minimal and width-wise minimal by Corollary 4.11. It gives a width-wise minimal flat resolution of \mathbf{J} that is not a free resolution. The cell complexes supporting these resolutions for widths 2 through 5 are shown in the table below.

The OI-structure on the family of complex-of-boxes resolutions in each width corresponds to an OI-structure on their supporting polyhedral cell complexes supporting the resolution of $\mathbf{I}(w)$ as a subcomplex of the cell complex supporting the resolution of $\mathbf{I}(w+1)$. In the example, we can identify the two-dimensional cell complex supporting the free resolution of $\mathbf{I}(4)$ as a subcomplex of the three-dimensional cell complex for $\mathbf{I}(5)$ in five different ways, corresponding to the five OI morphisms from 4 to 5. See Table 1.

As mentioned above, each squarefree strongly stable monomial ideal has a corresponding Ferrers ideal, which also admits a linear minimal free resolution supported on an identical cell complex. In fact, Theorem 4.10 can be adapted to provide an analogous result for families of Ferrers ideals.

width	I	J
$w = 2$	\bullet x_1x_2	\emptyset
$w = 3$	\bullet — \bullet — \bullet x_1x_2 x_1x_3 x_2x_3	\bullet — \bullet — \bullet x_1x_2 x_1x_3 x_2x_3
$w = 4$		
$w = 5$		

TABLE 1. Simplicial complexes supporting width-wise minimal resolutions.

Theorem 4.13. *Let $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_{\bullet}(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})^{\otimes d}$ be the polynomial OI-algebra with d variables of width 1, that is, for every w ,*

$$\mathbf{A}(w) = k[x_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq d \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq w]$$

and OI morphisms act on the second index of the variables. Let $I \subseteq \mathbf{A}(w_0)$ be any Ferrers ideal generated in degree d , and let \mathbf{I} be the ideal in \mathbf{A} which is generated in width w_0 by I .

Then in each width $w \geq w_0$, the monomial ideal $\mathbf{I}(w)$ is a Ferrers ideal and \mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} has a graded width-wise minimal flat resolution \mathbf{B}_{\bullet} ,

$$\cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_i[-d-i+1] \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_{i-1}[-d-i+2] \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_1[-d] \rightarrow \mathbf{B}_0 = \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} \rightarrow 0,$$

which in every width $w \geq w_0$ restricts to the graded minimal free resolution of $\mathbf{A}(w)/\mathbf{I}(w)$ given by the complex-of-boxes.

Proof. The proof proceeds exactly as in the proof of Theorem 4.10 with only cosmetic changes. We leave the details to the interested reader. \square

Remark 4.14. It is worth noting that in [17], all three classes of monomial ideals mentioned in Definition 4.4 admit complex-of-boxes resolutions: squarefree strongly stable monomial ideals, strongly stable monomial ideals, and Ferrers ideals. Theorem 4.10 and Theorem 4.13 show that, for OI-parametrized families of strongly stable ideals and Ferrers ideals, the complex-of-boxes resolutions can be given an OI-structure. The analogous result is not true for strongly stable monomial ideals because in this case the analog of Corollary 4.9 is not true, i.e., the widthwise components of an OI-ideal generated by a strongly stable ideal in a fixed width are not necessarily strongly stable monomial ideals themselves.

For example, if \mathbf{I} is the ideal of $\mathbf{A} = \text{Sym}_\bullet(\mathbf{F}^{\text{OI},1})$ that is generated in width one by the strongly stable monomial ideal (x_1^3) , then in width 2 we have

$$\mathbf{I}(2) = (x_1^3, x_2^3).$$

This ideal is not strongly stable since it is missing $x_1^2x_2$ and $x_1x_2^2$.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Aschenbrenner and C. J. Hillar, *Finite generation of symmetric ideals*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **359** (2007), 5171–5192. [1](#)
- [2] H. Cartan and S. Eilenberg, *Homological algebra*, Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999. With an appendix by David A. Buchsbaum, Reprint of the 1956 original. [12](#)
- [3] T. Church and J. S. Ellenberg, *Homology of FI-modules*, Geom. Topol. **21** (2017), 2373–2418. [1](#)
- [4] T. Church, J. S. Ellenberg, and B. Farb, *FI-modules and stability for representations of symmetric groups*, Duke Math. J. **164** (2015), 1833–1910. [1](#)
- [5] T. Church, J. S. Ellenberg, B. Farb, and R. Nagpal, *FI-modules over Noetherian rings*, Geom. Topol. **18** (2014), 2951–2984. [1](#), [3](#)
- [6] T. Church and B. Farb. Representation theory and homological stability. Adv. Math., 245:250–314, 2013. [1](#)
- [7] D. E. Cohen, *Closure relations, Buchberger’s algorithm, and polynomials in infinitely many variables*, In *Computation theory and logic*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci. **270** (1987), 78–87. [1](#)
- [8] A. Corso and U. Nagel, *Specializations of Ferrers ideals*, J. Algebraic Combin. **28** (2008), 425–437. [14](#)
- [9] A. Corso and U. Nagel, *Monomial and toric ideals associated to Ferrers graphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), 1371–1395. [14](#)
- [10] J. Draisma, R. Eggermont, R. Krone, and A. Leykin, *Noetherianity for infinite-dimensional toric varieties*, Algebra Number Theory **9** (2015), 1857–1880. [1](#)
- [11] D. Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **150**. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. [12](#)
- [12] N. Fieldsteel and U. Nagel, *Buchsbaum-Eisenbud Complexes of OI-modules*, In preparation. [13](#)
- [13] S. Güntürkün and U. Nagel, *Equivariant Hilbert series of monomial orbits*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **146** (2018), 2381–2393. [1](#)
- [14] C. J. Hillar and S. Sullivant, *Finite Gröbner bases in infinite dimensional polynomial rings and applications*, Adv. Math. **229** (2012), 1–25. [1](#)
- [15] S. MacLane. *Categories for the Working Mathematician*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **5**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1971. [4](#)
- [16] E. Miller and B. Sturmfels, *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **227**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005. [14](#)
- [17] U. Nagel and V. Reiner, *Betti numbers of monomial ideals and shifted skew shapes*, Electron. J. Combin. **16** (2009), Special volume in honor of A. Björner, #R3, 59 pp. [2](#), [14](#), [17](#), [20](#)
- [18] U. Nagel and T. Römer, *Equivariant Hilbert series in non-Noetherian Polynomial Rings*, J. Algebra **486** (2017), 204–245. [1](#)
- [19] U. Nagel and T. Römer, *FI- and OI-modules with varying coefficients*, J. Algebra **535** (2019), 286–322. [1](#), [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#), [7](#), [11](#), [13](#), [16](#), [17](#)
- [20] U. Nagel, *Rationality of Equivariant Hilbert Series and Asymptotic Properties*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. (to appear). [1](#)
- [21] D. Quillen, *Projective modules over polynomial rings*, Invent. Math. **36** (1976), 167–171. [12](#)
- [22] S. V. Sam and A. Snowden, *Gröbner methods for representations of combinatorial categories*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **30** (2017), 159–203. [1](#)
- [23] A. A. Suslin, *Projective modules over polynomial rings are free*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **229** (1976), 1063–1066. [12](#)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, 715 PATTERSON OFFICE TOWER, LEXINGTON,
KY 40506 USA

Email address: `nathan.fieldsteel@uky.edu`

URL: <http://nathanfieldsteel.github.io>

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, 715 PATTERSON OFFICE TOWER, LEXINGTON,
KY 40506 USA

Email address: `uwe.nagel@uky.edu`

URL: <http://www.ms.uky.edu/~uwenagel/>