

Deformations of Gentle A_∞ -Algebras

Raf Bocklandt and Jasper van de Kreeke

ABSTRACT. In this paper we calculate the Hochschild cohomology of gentle A_∞ -algebras of arc collections on marked surfaces. When the underlying arc collection has no loops or two-cycles, we show that the dgla structure of the Hochschild complex is formal and give an explicit realization of all deformations up to gauge equivalence.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Curved gentle algebras	2
3. Hochschild Cohomology of Gentle A_∞ -algebras	14
References	33

1. Introduction

To a collection of oriented arcs on a closed surface with marked points, one can associate an A_∞ -algebra called the gentle A_∞ -algebra. These were introduced in [5, 9] to study wrapped Fukaya categories of punctured surfaces [1], where the punctured surface is obtained by removing the marked points. These algebras are also variants of well-known algebras that are studied in representation theory [2, 16, 12].

In this paper we study the deformation theory of these A_∞ -algebras in detail. The intuition from mirror symmetry tells us that deforming these algebras as curved A_∞ -algebras should correspond to filling in these punctures with normal points or orbifold points [18, 6].

We will work out this idea as follows. Starting from an arc collection on a closed surface with marked points, we introduce the combinatorial notion of an orbigon and use it to define a family of higher products that count these orbigons. We show

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16E40, 16S80.

Key words and phrases. Deformation theory, Noncommutative algebra, representation theory.

The authors were supported in part by the NWO-grant 'Grant Algebraic methods and structures in the theory of Frobenius manifolds and their applications' (TOP1.17.012).

that these structures satisfy the curved A_∞ -axioms and indeed deform the gentle A_∞ -algebra coming from the arc collection.

To show that these deformations solve the deformation problem we look at the Hochschild cohomology. We show that each element in the Hochschild cohomology is determined by its zeroth and first component; in other words its nullary and unary product. In the case that the arc collection has no loops or two-cycles we obtain an explicit basis for the Hochschild cohomology. This enables us to give a description of the Gerstenhaber algebra structure on the Hochschild cohomology.

These computations match work done by Wong [20] on the Borel-Moore cohomology for matrix factorizations of dimer models (which is the B-side analogon of our setting, from the perspective of mirror symmetry [5]), as well as the theme that Hochschild cohomology of wrapped Fukaya categories agrees with symplectic homology [7, 17].

Finally we show that the bracket from the Gerstenhaber structure is formal and conclude that each solution of the Maurer-Cartan equation for the Hochschild cohomology is gauge equivalent to one of the curved A_∞ -structures we introduced.

2. Curved gentle algebras

In this section we will introduce curved gentle algebras. These are curved deformations of the gentle A_∞ -algebras that were defined in [5] and [9].

2.1. Arc collections and gentle algebras.

DEFINITION 2.1. A **marked surface** (S, M) is a pair consisting of a compact oriented surface without boundary S and a finite subset of marked points $M \subset S$. We will denote the genus of the surface by g . Furthermore we will assume that $|M| \geq 3$ if S is a sphere and $|M| \geq 1$ otherwise.

An **arc collection** \mathcal{A} is a set of oriented curves $a : [0, 1] \rightarrow S$ that meet M only at the end points ($a^{-1}(M) = \{0, 1\}$) and do not (self)-intersect internally. We say that an arc collection **splits the surface** if the complement of the arcs is the disjoint union of discs. These disks are called the **faces** and we denote the set of faces by F . Each face can be seen as a polygon bounded by arcs.

An arc collection that splits the surface satisfies

- the **no monogons or digons condition** [NMD], if no single arc or pair of arcs bounds a face. In this case the surface is split in n -gons with $n \geq 3$.
- the **no loops or two cycles condition** [NL2] if every arc has two different end points and no two arcs share more than one end point.
- the **dimer condition**, if the arcs around each disk form an oriented cycle. In case of a dimer, we will call a face positive or negative depending on whether the cycle around it is anticlockwise or clockwise. We can partition F accordingly: $F = F^+ \cup F^-$.

From now on we will assume that [NMD] holds, but in later sections we will sometimes have to assume the stronger [NL2] condition.

Recall that a **quiver** is a four-tuple $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, h, t)$ representing an oriented graph with vertices Q_0 , arrows Q_1 and maps $h, t : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ that assign to each arrow its head and tail. A quiver is graded by a group G if it comes with a map $|\cdot| : Q_1 \rightarrow G$.

The **path algebra** $\mathbb{C}Q$ of a quiver Q is the complex vector space spanned by the paths with as product concatenation of paths if possible and zero otherwise. We

write the arrows as going from right to left so $\alpha\beta$ is a genuine path if $t(\alpha) = h(\beta)$. Every vertex of the quiver $v \in Q_0$ gives rise to a path of length zero, which is called the vertex idempotent 1_v . These span a semisimple subalgebra which we will denote by $\mathbb{k} \cong \mathbb{C}^{Q_0}$. If Q is G -graded then $\mathbb{C}Q$ is a graded \mathbb{k} -algebra by assigning to each arrow its G -degree and to each vertex idempotent degree 0.

It is tempting to consider the arc collection itself as a quiver, but we will not do this. Instead we will consider a different quiver, which is obtained by putting a vertex in the middle of each arc.

DEFINITION 2.2. Given an arc collection \mathcal{A} that splits (S, M) , we define a \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded quiver $Q_{\mathcal{A}}$ as follows.

- The vertices of the quiver are the arcs: $(Q_{\mathcal{A}})_0 = \mathcal{A}$.
- For each angle of a face we define an arrow that corresponds to the internal anticlockwise angle between consecutive arcs that meet in that corner.
- An arrow has degree zero if both arcs have the same direction at the marked point (both outwards or both inwards), and degree one otherwise. Note that \mathcal{A} is a dimer if and only if all arrows have \mathbb{Z}_2 -degree 1.



We will denote these ‘angle arrows’ by Greek letters and use $h(\alpha)$ and $t(\alpha)$ to denote the arcs (vertices) that correspond to the head and tail of the arrows. Each angle arrow also turns around a unique marked point and is contained in a unique face. We will denote these by $m(\alpha)$ and $f(\alpha)$. In this quiver two consecutive arrows either are angles that turn around a common marked point or they correspond to consecutive angles in a face.

$$t(\alpha) = h(\beta) \implies m(\alpha) = m(\beta) \text{ or } f(\alpha) = f(\beta)$$

DEFINITION 2.3. The **gentle algebra** $\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of an arc collection \mathcal{A} is the path algebra of $Q_{\mathcal{A}}$ modulo the ideal of relations spanned by the products of arrows that are consecutive angles in a face.


$$\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbb{C}Q_{\mathcal{A}} / \langle \alpha\beta \mid \alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are consecutive angles in a face} \rangle$$

The product rule in this algebra can be illustrated pictorially as follows.



REMARK 2.4. The number of arrows is $2|\mathcal{A}|$ because in each vertex precisely two arrows arrive and two arrows leave. More precisely for every angle arrow α there are precisely two angle arrows β_1 and β_2 with $h(\alpha) = t(\beta_i)$. One will satisfy $\beta_1\alpha = 0$ and for the other one we have $\beta_2\alpha \neq 0$. Likewise there are two γ_i with $h(\gamma_i) = t(\alpha)$, one with $\alpha\gamma_1 = 0$ and one with $\alpha\gamma_2 \neq 0$. This notion of a gentle algebra refers to this property and derives from representation theory [2]. The usual definition of a gentle algebra also entails that the algebra is finite-dimensional but this is not the case for our algebras. It is possible to obtain finite dimensional algebras by looking at surfaces with marked points on the boundary [12, 16].

EXAMPLE 2.5. In the picture below on the left you see an arc collection on a torus with two marked points. It has 4 arcs and two square faces. The quiver Q_A has 4 vertices and 8 angle arrows. The angle arrows all have degree 1. The relations are generated by all paths $\alpha_i\beta_j$ and $\beta_i\alpha_j$, whenever the arrows are composable. This implies that every nonzero path in the gentle algebra is either a sequence of only α 's or only β 's. The former turn around the first marked point, while the latter turn around the second marked point.



In general, the nonzero paths of a gentle algebra correspond to positive angles between arcs that share a marked point. Every nonzero angle paths is uniquely determined by it sequence of angle arrows and products of angles paths turning around different marked points are zero.

For each $m \in M$ we define

$$\ell_m = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k + \dots + \alpha_k \dots \alpha_1$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ are the angle arrows around m ordered in anticlockwise direction. These elements represent single loops around the marked points and they generate the center of the algebra.

LEMMA 2.6.

$$Z(\text{Gtl}_A) = \mathbb{C}[\ell_m | m \in M] / (\ell_i \ell_j | i \neq j).$$

PROOF. One can easily check that the $\alpha \ell_m = \ell_m \alpha$ if $m(\alpha) = m$ and $\alpha \ell_m = \ell_m \alpha = 0$ if $m(\alpha) \neq m$. This also implies that $\ell_u \ell_v = 0$ if $u \neq v$.

Suppose $z = c\beta + \dots$ is a nonzero central element containing the angle path β and let α be the angle arrow that follows β in the cycle around m . Then we have that $\alpha\beta \neq 0$, so if $\alpha z = z\alpha$ then $\alpha\beta$ must end in α and hence β must be a cycle that winds a number of full turns around m . Therefore z will contain ℓ_m^r and the ℓ_m^r form a basis for the part of the center with path length > 0 . The length 0 part of the center is \mathbb{C} because the quiver is connected. \square

LEMMA 2.7. As a $Z(\text{Gtl}_A)$ -module the outer $(\mathbb{Z}_2\text{-graded})$ \mathbb{k} -derivations are generated by the Euler derivations

$$E_\alpha := \alpha \partial_\alpha.$$


PROOF. Let α be an angle arrow. If d is a \mathbb{k} -derivation then $h(d\alpha) = h(\alpha)$ and $t(d\alpha) = t(\alpha)$. If $d\alpha$ contains a term γ that does not turn around the same marked point as α , let β be the angle such that $\gamma\beta \neq 0$ is cyclic. We then have that $\alpha\beta = 0$ because they turn around different marked points. Therefore

$$0 = d(\alpha\beta) = \gamma\beta + \dots \pm \alpha d\beta,$$

but this is impossible because these two components turn around different marked points and hence cannot cancel each other.

So suppose $d\alpha$ turns around the same marked point m as α . In that case there are the following possibilities.

- (1) If $a = h(\alpha) = t(\alpha)$ then either a forms a monogon (which is excluded by condition [NMD]) or $\alpha = \ell_m$ is a full turn around a marked point m with one arc a arriving.




In the latter case $d\alpha = g(\alpha)1_a$ for some polynomial g . This polynomial cannot have a constant term: let β be the arrow that follows α in the face $f(\alpha)$. Then α and β turn around different marked points so

$$0 = d(\beta\alpha) = (d\beta)\alpha \pm \beta g(\alpha) = \pm g_0\beta.$$

So $d\alpha = (g(\alpha)\alpha^{-1})\alpha = zE_\alpha(\alpha)$ for $z = g(\ell_m)\ell_m^{-1}$.

- (2) If $a = h(\alpha) \neq t(\alpha)$ and a is a loop then there is an angle path $\kappa : a \rightarrow a$ following α that does not form a full turn around m .



In that case $d\alpha$ can contain a term of the form $\kappa\alpha$. Let β be the angle arrow that directly follows κ . Note that $\beta \neq \alpha$ otherwise the arc a forms a monogon. Because β and α are on different ends of the arc a , we have that

$$d(\beta\alpha) = \beta(c\kappa\alpha + \dots) \pm (d\beta)\alpha = 0.$$

Therefore $d(\beta)$ contains $c\beta\kappa$. The commutator $[c\kappa, -]$ is only nonzero for the angle arrows α and β . By subtracting this from d we can make these terms disappear.

- (3) If $a = t(\alpha) \neq h(\alpha)$ and a is a loop we can do a similar reasoning as above.
 (4) If $a = t(\alpha) \neq h(\alpha) = b$ and a, b are both loops then $d\alpha$ can contain a term of the form $\kappa_1\alpha\kappa_2$. If κ_1 is not a full turn then let β be the angle arrow such that $\beta\kappa_1\alpha\kappa_2 \neq 0$. Because $\beta\alpha \neq 0$ we get

$$d(\beta\alpha) = \beta(c\kappa_1\alpha\kappa_2 + \dots) \pm (d\beta)\alpha = 0.$$

So κ_2 must end in α but then κ_2 is a full turn, so $\kappa_1\alpha\kappa_2 = \ell_m^r\kappa_1\alpha$, and we can make this term disappear with $[\ell_m^r\kappa_1, -]$. If κ_1 is a full turn we can do the same.

- (5) If neither $h(\alpha)$ or $t(\alpha)$ are loops then every path in $d(\alpha)$ is of the form $\ell_m^r\alpha$.

From the discussion above we see that we can remove all terms that are not of the form $\ell_m^r\alpha$ by subtracting commutators. \square

REMARK 2.8. Lemma 2.6 holds more generally for marked surfaces with boundary, but lemma 2.7 does not hold in this generality (think of the cylinder with one marked point on each boundary circle, this has an arc collection whose gentle algebra is the Kronecker quiver $\circ \implies \circ$). However if we impose the [NL2] condition the lemma still holds.

We end this section with a nice interpretation of Koszul duality in this setting. If \mathcal{A} is an arc collection on (S, M) , choose a set of points $F \subset S$ in the centers of the faces. For each arc a draw a perpendicular arc a^\perp that connects the centers of the faces adjacent to a and points inside the left face. The **dual arc collection** $\mathcal{A}^\perp = \{a^\perp \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ forms an arc collection for (S, F) .

THEOREM 2.9. The Koszul dual of the gentle algebra is a gentle algebra of the dual arc collection:

$$(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})^\dagger \cong \text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}^\perp}.$$


PROOF. From Bardzell [3] and [5] we know that $A = \text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}$ has a bimodule resolution B^\bullet spanned by $A \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} b \otimes_{\mathbb{k}} A$ where $b = \beta_l \beta_{l-1} \cdots \beta_1 \in \mathbb{C}Q_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a path of angle arrows such that all products $\beta_i \beta_{i-1}$ are zero. In other words paths that turn around faces. The maps between the terms have the following form

$$1 \otimes b_k \cdots b_1 \otimes 1 \mapsto b_k \otimes b_{k-1} \cdots b_1 \otimes 1 - (-1)^k 1 \otimes b_k \cdots b_2 \otimes b_1$$

Therefore the Koszul dual $\text{Ext}_A^\bullet(\mathbb{k}, \mathbb{k}) = \text{HHom}(B^\bullet, {}_L \mathbb{k} \otimes \mathbb{k}_R)$ is spanned by the dual basis b^\vee . The element b^\vee corresponds to the (right) module extension

$$0 \leftarrow \mathbb{C}1_{t(\beta_l)} \xleftarrow{\beta_l} \mathbb{C}1_{h(\beta_l)} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \mathbb{C}1_{t(\beta_1)} \xleftarrow{\beta_1} \mathbb{C}1_{h(\beta_1)} \leftarrow 0.$$

Note we use right modules because in that way α and α^\vee run in opposite directions. Stitching together two of these module extensions shows that the ext product matches the (reverse) concatenation of paths if the paths turn around the same face. All other products are zero. In particular the ext algebra is spanned by dual angle arrows and $\alpha^\vee \beta^\vee = 0$ if $m(\alpha) = m(\beta)$. Finally if α is an angle arrow then the dual α^\vee in the Koszul dual has degree $1 - |\alpha|$. All this can be realised geometrically by considering the dual angles as angles between perpendicular arcs.



□

REMARK 2.10. In the theorem above we are referring to the classical Koszul dual [4] where the gentle algebra is considered as a graded algebra graded by path length. A similar statement holds if we work with Koszul duality for A_∞ -algebras but then we need to work with the gentle algebras completed by path length.

2.2. Orbigns. Now let R be a complete local commutative ring over \mathbb{C} with maximal ideal R^+ and residue field $R/R^+ = \mathbb{C}$. For each element $r \in Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \widehat{\otimes} R^+$ we will define a curved R -linear A_∞ -structure over $\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}} \widehat{\otimes} R$. When tensored with R/R^+ the result will be the gentle A_∞ -algebra as defined in [5, 9], so our construction gives a family of deformations of the latter.


To describe these deformations, we need the notion of an orbign. Morally this is a branched cover from a disk to the surface such that the boundary is mapped to arcs and the branch points are mapped to marked points. We can construct such branched covers by joining faces together. We will define this concept combinatorially and inductively in two steps.

DEFINITION 2.11. **Tree-gons** are certain sequences of angles up to cyclic permutation. The basic tree-gon come from faces: $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ is a tree-gon if they form the consecutive angles of a face such that $h(\alpha_i) = t(\alpha_{i+1})$.

If $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ and $(\beta_l, \dots, \beta_1)$ are tree-gons such that $\alpha_1\beta_l \neq 0$ and $\alpha_k\beta_1 \neq 0$ in $\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}$ then we define a new tree-gon

$$(\beta_1\alpha_k, \alpha_{k-1}, \dots, \alpha_2, \alpha_1\beta_l, \dots, \beta_2)$$

Geometrically this operation stitches the two tree-gons together over the common arc $h(\beta_l) = t(\alpha_1)$.



REMARK 2.12. From this definition one can deduce that tree-gons are sequences of internal angles of faces stitched together in a tree-like way. This tree, whose nodes are the faces and whose edges are the stitched arcs, can be reconstructed solely from the angle sequence.

Let $(\gamma_u, \dots, \gamma_1)$ be the sequence of all the indecomposable angle arrows in the tree-gon. Define a permutation σ on $\{1, \dots, u\}$ as follows: for every i there will be a unique shortest nontrivial path $\gamma_j \dots \gamma_{i+1}$ with $i + u \leq j < i$ that lifts to a contractible loop in the universal cover of $S \setminus M$. Set $\sigma(i) = j \bmod u$. One can easily show that for a tree-gon we have that $\sigma^2 = \text{Id}$ and $\sigma(i) = i$ if and only if $h(\gamma_i)$ is an arc on the boundary of the tree-gon. This means that the internal arcs are in 1–1 correspondence with the 2-cycles in σ . The nodes of the tree on the other hand correspond to the orbits of the permutation $\sigma \circ (u \dots 1)$. Indeed this permutation follows the angles and crosses over if the arc is internal, and therefore it cycles around the faces. An edge and a node are incident if their orbits intersect.

Now we will allow to fold together two consecutive arcs on the boundary of a tree-gon that are identical. The result is a disk-like shape with internal marked points, so some of the angles sit in the interior of the disk. We will use square brackets to denote what is interior. In general we get sequences of angles separated by square brackets and commas such as $(\alpha, \beta[\gamma[\delta]\epsilon]\zeta[\eta])$. The **reduced sequence** cuts out anything that is between square brackets: e.g. $(\alpha, \beta\zeta)$. Again we work inductively.

DEFINITION 2.13. An **orbigon** is a bracketed cyclic sequence of angles. The basic orbignons are tree-gons without any brackets and if (\dots, U, \dots) is an orbigon for which the reduced sequence of U is an angle that turns r full turns around a marked point m then $(\dots[U]\dots)$ is also an orbigon. The type of the orbigon is a multiset containing all pairs $p = (m, r)$ that were needed to introduce the brackets. Such a pair is also called an **orbifold point**.


Different tree-gons can be folded together to form the same disk, therefore we also need to impose an equivalence relation on the orbignons. Suppose $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ and $(\beta_l, \dots, \beta_1)$ are tree-gons and

$$(\beta_1\alpha_k | \dots | \alpha_j \underbrace{[\alpha_{j-1} | \dots | \alpha_1 \beta_l]_{U_1}}_{U_1} \underbrace{[\beta_{l+1} | \dots | \beta_i]_{U_2}}_{U_2} | \beta_i | \dots | \beta_2)$$

is an orbigon, where the $|$ -separators can be commas or brackets. Then the shift rule shifts the position of a piece between brackets and reverses the order of the two parts U_1, U_2 that are in thee different tree-gons as follows

$$(\beta_1 | \underbrace{\beta_l | \dots | \beta_{i+1}}_{U_2} | \underbrace{\alpha_{j-1} | \dots | \alpha_1}_{U_1} | \alpha_k | \dots | \alpha_j | \beta_i | \dots | \beta_2)$$

where brackets in U_1 that are paired up with a bracket U_2 and vice versa are flipped, for the formula to make sense.



The **shift rule** generates an equivalence relation on the orbigons that preserves the type and the reduced sequence.

REMARK 2.14. Every tree-gon corresponds to a tree with nodes labeled by faces and edges labeled by arcs. Each folding operation adds another edge to the graph corresponding to the arc $a = h(U)$. In this way we end up with a graph of which this tree is a spanning tree. The graph, which we will sometimes refer to as the **face graph**, is planar. It divides the plane into regions which can be labeled by a pair (m, r) from the type multiset. Clearly the equivalence relation changes the underlying spanning tree while keeping the face graph the same. For the example above the face graph is a grid with 3×3 nodes and the spanning trees are indicated in bold.



The spanning tree of the face graph completely determines the unreduced sequences of the orbigon because it is the sequence of angles that runs around the tree. It also determines the brackets: each time you cross an edge of the face graph that is not in the spanning tree you open or close a bracket depending on whether you crossed it the first or the second time.

LEMMA 2.15. Two orbigons are equivalent if and only if their face graphs are equivalent as labeled planar graphs.

PROOF. By construction the shift rule does not change the underlying face graph. Now suppose that the two orbigons have isomorphic face graphs, then we have to show that we can move from one spanning tree T_1 to another spanning tree T_2 via the shift rules. If a is an edge (or dually an arc) in T_1 not contained

in T_2 then if we remove a , T_1 will split in two parts (or dually tree-gons) denote the angles in the first tree-gon by $\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1$ and those in the second tree-gon by β_l, \dots, β_1 such that $a = t(\beta_1) = h(\alpha_k)$.

Because T_2 is connected it must contain an arc b that connects the two parts of $T_1 \setminus \{a\}$. Now find the indices i, j such that $b = h(\beta_i) = t(\alpha_j)$ and perform the corresponding shift rule. The result will be an orbicon with a spanning tree equal to $T_1 \setminus \{a\} \cup \{b\}$, which is one edge closer to T_2 . Keep repeating this procedure until the spanning tree is T_2 . \square

REMARK 2.16. Note that we can also stitch orbicons together over a common arc in their reduced sequences by stitching the underlying tree-gons and transferring the brackets to the stitched tree-gon. The face graph of the new orbicon consists of the two graphs of the smaller orbicons joined together by one edge labeled by the common arc. Moreover because the common arc must be contained in all spanning trees, this implies that the small orbicons are uniquely determined by the big one.

LEMMA 2.17. If $(\alpha_k, \dots, \xi, \eta, \dots, \alpha_1)$ is the reduced sequence of an orbicon and ξ, η are nontrivial angle paths then there are two possibilities:

- A the orbicon is stitched together of two smaller orbicons with reduced sequences (β_r, \dots, ξ) and (γ_r, \dots, η) such that $\gamma_r \beta_r = \alpha_r$ for some r .
- B the orbicon is folded together from an orbicon with reduced sequence $(\alpha_k, \dots, \xi, \ell_m^r h(\eta), \eta, \dots, \alpha_1)$

in both cases these orbicons are unique.

PROOF. Look at the face graph of the orbicon. The arc $t(\xi) = h(\eta)$ will correspond to an edge in this graph. If the graph remains connected after removing this edge then this new graph will be the graph of an orbicon that can be folded to the old orbicon and we are in situation B. Otherwise the old orbicon is stitched together from two smaller orbicons and we are in situation A. \square

LEMMA 2.18. For a given type and reduced sequence there are at most a finite number of orbicons (up to equivalence).

PROOF. Each bracketing changes two commas in brackets and introduces an extra pair in the multiset of the type. Therefore the length of the unreduced sequence (the number of commas and brackets) is 2 times the size of the multiset longer than the unreduced sequence (the number of commas). \square

LEMMA 2.19. If the arc collection satisfies

- the no monogon or digon condition [NMD] then all tree-gons have length at least 3.
- the no loops or two-cycles condition [NL2] then all orbicons have reduced sequences of length at least 3.

PROOF. If [NMD] holds then all faces are at least 3-gons. Gluing an n -gon to an m -gon results in an $n + m - 2$ -gon, and $n + m - 2 > 2$ if $n, m > 2$. Furthermore, an orbicon with a reduced sequence of length one or two would give rise to a loop or two-cycle of arcs. \square

2.3. A_∞ -structures on the gentle algebra. Fix a commutative ring R . Recall that if A is a \mathbb{Z} or $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ -graded projective R -module then a curved A_∞ -structure is a collection of R -linear maps

$$\mu^k : A^{\otimes_R k} \rightarrow A$$

of degree $2 - k$, satisfying the curved A_∞ -axioms:

$$\sum_{k \geq l \geq m \geq 0} (-1)^{\|x_m\| + \dots + \|x_1\|} \mu(x_k, \dots, \mu(x_l, \dots, x_{m-1}), x_m, \dots, x_1) = 0.$$

Here $\|x\|$ is shorthand for the **shifted degree**: $\|x\| = |x| - 1$. If $l = m$ then we interpret the middle $\mu()$ as the element $\mu^0 := \mu^0(1) \in A$. This is called the curvature and if it is zero the structure is called uncurved.

If A is an algebra, we say that μ is an **extension of the product** if $a \cdot b = (-1)^{\deg b} \mu^2(a, b)$. If $A = \mathbb{C}Q/I \otimes R$ comes from a path algebra of a quiver we will take tensor products over $\mathbb{k} \otimes R$ instead of over R and we ask that the vertex idempotents 1_v are **strict**: all products $\mu^{\neq 2}$ for which one of the entries is such an idempotent are zero.

Now let R be a local nilpotent or complete ring over \mathbb{C} with maximal ideal R^+ . Fix an element $r \in Z(\text{Gtl}_A) \widehat{\otimes} R^+$, where $\widehat{\otimes}$ denotes the R^+ -adic completed tensor product. We will write this element as

$$r_0 + \sum_m r_m(\ell_m)$$

where $r_0 \in R^+$, the $r_m(t) \in R^+[[t]]$ are R^+ -valued power series without constant term such that the reductions $r_m \in (R^+/(R^+)^k)[[t]]$ are actually polynomials for every $k \geq 1$. We will write the j^{th} coefficient of $r_m(t)$ as r_p where $p = (m, j)$ is viewed as an orbifold point. We will also write ℓ_p as shorthand for ℓ_m^j . We are now ready to define a family of extensions of the gentle algebra.

DEFINITION 2.20. For any $r \in Z(\text{Gtl}_A) \widehat{\otimes} R^+$ we define $r_{\mathbb{P}_\bullet}$ on $\text{Gtl}_A \widehat{\otimes} R$ as follows

- For each orbifold point $p = (m, j)$ we define a nullary product

$$r_{\mathbb{P}_p}^0 : \mathbb{k} \rightarrow \text{Gtl}_A \widehat{\otimes} R^+ : 1 \mapsto r_p \ell_m^j$$

- For each orbigon ψ with reduced sequence $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ of length k we define a k -ary product $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$. If β and γ are angles such that $\beta \alpha_{k+i} \neq 0$ and $\alpha_i \gamma \neq 0$ then we set

$$r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}(\beta \alpha_{k+i}, \dots, \alpha_i) = r_\psi \beta \text{ and } r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}(\alpha_{k+i}, \dots, \alpha_i \gamma) = (-1)^{|\gamma|} r_\psi \gamma.$$

where r_ψ is the product of all r_p with p running over the orbifold points in the type of ψ . If the type is empty (i.e. ψ is a tree-gon) then we put $r_\psi = 1$. All other $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n)$ where the β_i are angles are zero.

The total product is the sum of all these products together with an overall curvature coming from r_0 :

$$\begin{aligned} r_{\mathbb{P}}^0 &= r_0 \mu_1^0 + \sum_p r_{\mathbb{P}_p} \\ r_{\mathbb{P}}^1 &= \sum_{|\psi|=1} r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi} \\ r_{\mathbb{P}}^2 &= r_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{ord}}}^2 + \sum_{|\psi|=2} r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi} \\ r_{\mathbb{P}}^k &= \sum_{|\psi|=k} r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}. \end{aligned}$$

where μ_1^0 is the nullary product with $\mu_1^0(1) = 1$ and $r_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{ord}}}^2$ the R -linear extension of the ordinary product in $\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}$. This is well defined because by lemma 2.18 there are only a finite number of k -orbignons for each type and R is nilpotent or complete.

REMARK 2.21. The condition [NMD] implies that there are no tree-gons with length 1 or 2. This means that $r_{\mathbb{P}}^1 = 0 \pmod{R^+}$ and $r_{\mathbb{P}}^2 = \mu_{\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}}^2 \pmod{R^+}$. The condition [NL2] implies that there are no orbignons with length 1 or 2. This means that $r_{\mathbb{P}}^1 = 0$ and $r_{\mathbb{P}}^2 = r_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{ord}}}^2$.

REMARK 2.22. If $r = 0$, the only $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$ that contribute are those coming from tree-gons and each contributes with a factor $r_\psi = 1$. These are precisely those that correspond to immersed disks that do not cover marked points with their interior. Therefore the definition is equivalent to the definition in [9]. In [5] the definition of the higher product is given inductively, with an induction step that is analogous to the induction step we used to define a tree-gon. Hence the definition is also equivalent to the definition in [5]. From both papers we can conclude that $r_{\mathbb{P}}$ is an uncurved A_∞ -structure if $r = 0$. If $r \neq 0$ then $r_{\mathbb{P}}$ will be a curved deformation of this uncurved A_∞ -structure.

REMARK 2.23. Each higher product removes a sequence of angles that forms an orbignon. If the angle that remains comes from the first entry, we will call that the **front of the product**, if it comes from the last we call it the **back of the product**.

PROPOSITION 2.24. If [NL2] holds then $r_{\mathbb{P}}$ is a well defined curved A_∞ -structure on $\widehat{\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}} \otimes R$, which is strict over $\mathbb{k} = \mathbb{C}^{\mathcal{A}}$.

PROOF. We need to check the curved A_∞ -axioms. The first two axioms

$$r_{\mathbb{P}}^1(r_{\mathbb{P}}^0(1)) = 0, \quad r_{\mathbb{P}}^1(r_{\mathbb{P}}^1(\alpha) + r_{\mathbb{P}}^2(r_{\mathbb{P}}^0(1), \alpha) - r_{\mathbb{P}}^2(\alpha, r_{\mathbb{P}}^0(1))) = 0$$

follow easily from the facts that $r_{\mathbb{P}}^0(1)$ is a central element and $r_{\mathbb{P}}^1 = 0$. The third axiom holds because $r_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{ord}}}$ is associative and there are no $r_{\mathbb{P}_3}(\dots, r_{\mathbb{P}_0}(1), \dots)$ terms as this would imply an orbignon with reduced sequence $(\dots [\ell_m^k] \dots)$ of length 1. This contradicts lemma 2.19.

To show the higher axioms, first note that by construction all the $r_{\mathbb{P}}$ are strict over \mathbb{k} , so we only need to check the axioms when all entries are nontrivial paths. Fix an angle sequence $(\gamma_r, \dots, \gamma_1)$ of length ≥ 4 and assume that there is a nonzero double product

$$r_{\mathbb{P}_u}(\gamma_{s+t-1}, \dots, \gamma_{i+t}, r_{\mathbb{P}_v}(\gamma_{i+t-1}, \dots, \gamma_i), \gamma_{i-1}, \dots, \gamma_1)$$

where $r_{\mathbb{P}_u}$ can be a $r_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{ord}}}$ (if $s = 2$) or a $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$ if $s > 2$, and $r_{\mathbb{P}_v}$ can be a $r_{\mathbb{P}_p}$ (if $t = 0$), a $r_{\mathbb{P}_{\text{ord}}}$ (if $t = 2$) or a $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$ (if $t > 2$). Such a product is uniquely characterized by the triple (u, v, i) .

Each nonzero double product is a path multiplied with a factor $\pm r_u r_v$ (where we use the convention that $r_{\text{ord}} = 1$). We will show there is a unique other triple with a nonzero double product cancel that cancels it.

To do this, we will go through all possible triples (u, v, i) systematically, making a distinction between whether i is 1, s or somewhere in the middle. For each case we draw a diagram of the possible situations and every situation will occur exactly twice (see figure 2.1). Note that most diagrams have two versions depending on whether the (only/outer) higher product has a front or a back. We will only consider the latter cases. The diagrams are named after the operations of type A , B from lemma 2.17 that can be performed on the orbigns to stitch or fold them together.

(1) (ψ, p, i)

- If $i = 1$ then ℓ_p contains the back of $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$ and we are in situation $O1$. We can compensate this term with a term of a similar type but where ℓ_p contains the front:

$$r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}(\gamma_s, \dots, \gamma_1, r_{\mathbb{P}_p}) \text{ cancels with } r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}(r_{\mathbb{P}_p}, \gamma_s, \dots, \gamma_1)$$

- If $1 < i < s$ then ψ has ℓ_p as one of its angles and we are in situation $B1$. We can fold the orbign together to form a new orbign ψ' with $r_{\psi'} = r_\psi r_p$. The other term that cancels it is of the form $(\psi', \text{ord}, i - 1)$.
- If $i = s$ and ℓ_p comes before γ_s then either γ_s is shorter than the back of $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$ or longer. If it is shorter, we are in situation $B2$. If it is longer than the back, the arc $t(\gamma_1)$ will lie inside ψ . In that case we distinguish type BA if $t(\gamma_1)$ cuts ψ in two pieces, or BB if it opens a second fold at a marked point q . The former is compensated by a terms of type (ψ_1, ψ_2, i) , while the latter is compensated by a term (ψ_1, q, i) . In both cases ψ_1 includes the orbifold point p and has a front)

(2) (ψ, ord, i)

- If $1 < i \leq s$ then the inner product $r_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\gamma_{i+1}, \gamma_i)$ is an angle from the orbign ψ then $h(\gamma_i)$ either opens a fold of ψ ($B1$) or it cuts the orbign in two ($A1L, A1R, A1M$). The first is compensated by a term of type $(\psi', p, i + 1)$, while the latter three by a term of type (ψ_1, ψ_2, j) .
- If $i = 1$ and γ_1 is part of the back of $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$ then $h(\gamma_1)$ will cut the back in two. This is situation $O2$ and it is compensated by a term of the form $(\text{ord}, \psi, 2)$.
If the back of $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$ is part of γ_1 then $h(\gamma_1)$ either opens a fold of ψ or it cuts the orbign in two. Just like when $i \neq 1$ above, we are in cases $(B1, A1L, A1R, A1M)$ but now with γ_1 equal to the top of the hexagon instead of the bottom. They are also compensated by terms of type $(\psi', p, i + 1)$ and (ψ_1, ψ_2, j) .

(3) (ord, ψ, i)

- If $i = 1$ and $r_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\gamma_{t+1}, r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}(\dots, \gamma_1))$ puts something in front of the back of $r_{\mathbb{P}_\psi}$, three things can happen. If γ_{t+1} is shorter than the first

angle of ψ then $h(\gamma_{t+1})$ either cuts ψ in two ($A2$) or opens a fold of ψ ($B2$). These cases are compensated by terms of the form (ψ_1, ψ_2, j) and (ψ', p, t) .

If γ_{t+1} is longer than the first angle we are in situation $O3$ and can compensate it with a term of the same type but with a head

$${}^r\mathbb{P}^2({}^r\mathbb{P}_\psi(\gamma_{t+1}, \dots, \gamma_2), \gamma_1).$$

- If $i = 2$ then ${}^r\mathbb{P}^2({}^r\mathbb{P}_\psi(\dots, \gamma_2), \gamma_1)$ adds something to the back of ${}^r\mathbb{P}_\psi$ and we are in situation $O2$.

(4) (ψ_1, ψ_2, i)

- If $i = 1$ and ${}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_2}$ has a back then we are in $A1M$. If ${}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_2}$ has a front we are in situation $O4$. Then we can commute the order of ψ_1 and ψ_2 , this gives two terms that cancel:

$${}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_1}(\gamma_{s+t-1}, \dots, {}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_2}(\dots, \gamma_1)) \text{ and } {}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_2}({}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_1}(\gamma_{s+t-1}, \dots), \dots, \gamma_1).$$

- If $1 < i < s$ and ${}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_2}$ has a back equal to an angle of ψ_1 we are in situation $A1L$, while if it has a front equal to an angle, we are in situation $A1R$.
- If $i = s$ and ${}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_2}$ has a front we are in $A1R$. If it has a back then it depends on the back of ${}^r\mathbb{P}_{\psi_1}$. If it is at least as long as the last angle of ψ_2 we are in situation $A2$. Otherwise $t(\gamma_1)$ will cut ψ_2 in two pieces (situation AA) or it will open a fold (AB). The former is compensated by a term of type (ψ'_1, ψ'_2, j) while the latter is compensated by a term (ψ'_1, p, j) . In both cases the outer product now has a front. Note that type AB and BA only seem to occur once in the list but this is because they are canceled by terms with a front and these are not in the list.

□

REMARK 2.25. The proof is analogous to the one in [9], but because of the internal orbifold points extra cases needed to be considered. These are all the cases with a B in their label. The proof can also be extended to the case where [NL2] does not hold but this will include a lot more extra cases.

REMARK 2.26. It is also possible to weight the faces in the orbifolds using elements in R^+ . Choose an element $s_{(f,i)} \in R^+$ for each face f and $i \in \mathbb{N}$. The weight of a tree-gon is then defined inductively by giving $(\alpha_{ik}, \dots, \alpha_1)$ weight $s_{(f,i)}$ if the angle sequence turns i times around f (note that this definition allows for orbifold faces as well). If you stitch two tree-gons together their weight is defined as the product. The folding operation adds an additional factor $r_{(m,j)}$ in the same way as before.

This gives a family of products ${}^{r,s}\mathbb{P}^\bullet$ on $\text{Gtl}_A \widehat{\otimes} R$ that depends on two parameters sets $r : M \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow R^+$ and $s : M \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow R^+$. Note that the curvature only depends on r not on s .

This same parameter set can be used for the Koszul dual Gtl_{A^\perp} but now the role of r and s are reversed because for the Koszul dual the role of the marked points and the faces are swapped. In this case s will give rise to curvature, while r only contributes to the higher products. Note however that if $s_{(f,j)}$ is nonzero for an infinite number of (f,j) we should go to the completed version $\widehat{\text{Gtl}}_{A^\perp}$ for the curvature to make sense.




FIGURE 2.1. The possible diagrams that can occur in as double products

3. Hochschild Cohomology of Gentle A_∞ -algebras

3.1. Definitions.

DEFINITION 3.1. If (A, μ) is a \mathbb{Z} - or \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded A_∞ -algebra over a semisimple algebra \mathbb{k} , we define the A_∞ -Hochschild complex as

$$CC^\bullet(A) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{k}}\left(\bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A[1]^{\otimes_{\mathbb{k}} i}, A[1]\right)$$

Every element $\nu \in CC^j(A)$ can be seen as a collection of n -ary products ν^n of degree $1 + j - n$, one for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. We will call ν^n the n th component of ν .

REMARK 3.2. Note that the grading on this space is not the classical grading on Hochschild cohomology coming from the number of entries in the products, but the one coming from the degrees of the maps $A[1]^{\otimes_{\mathbb{k}} i} \rightarrow A[1]$. For this grading the product μ can be seen as an element of $CC^1(A)$. To avoid confusion we will call this degree the ∞ -degree $\|\bullet\|$. If we work \mathbb{Z}_2 -graded we will also refer to this grading as the **parity** and denote the homogeneous parts as $CC^{\text{even}}(A)$ and $CC^{\text{odd}}(A)$.

- On $\text{CC}^\bullet(A)$ we have a bracket of degree 0:

$$[\kappa, \nu](a_r, \dots, a_1) := \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq r} (-1)^{(\|a_1\| + \dots + \|a_i\|)\|\nu\|} \kappa(a_r, \dots, a_{j+1}, \nu(a_j, \dots, a_{i+1}), a_i, \dots, a_1) \\ - (-1)^{\|\nu\|\|\kappa\| + (\|a_1\| + \dots + \|a_i\|)\|\kappa\|} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq r} \nu(a_r, \dots, a_{j+1}, \kappa(a_j, \dots, a_{i+1}), a_i, \dots, a_1).$$

The A_∞ -axioms for the product μ , can be rephrased as $[\mu, \mu] = 0$, which also means that $d = [\mu, -]$ is a differential of degree 1 and the triplet

$$(\text{CC}^\bullet(A), d, [,])$$

is a differential graded Lie algebra (DGLA). The solutions to the Maurer-Cartan equation

$$d\nu + \frac{1}{2}[\nu, \nu] = 0$$

describe the deformations of μ as a curved A_∞ -structure.

- There is also a second product on $\text{CC}^\bullet(A)$: the cup product.

$$(\kappa \smile \nu)(a_r, \dots, a_1) := \sum_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq u \leq v \leq r} (-1)^{\mathfrak{X}} \mu(a_r, \dots, \kappa(a_v, \dots, a_{u+1}), \dots, \nu(a_j, \dots, a_{i+1}), \dots, a_1)$$

with $\mathfrak{X} = (\|a_1\| + \dots + \|a_u\|)\|\kappa\| + (\|a_1\| + \dots + \|a_i\|)\|\nu\| + \|\nu\| + 1$. This product has degree 1 and together with d it satisfies the graded Leibniz rule. Therefore

$$(\text{CC}^\bullet(A)[-1], d, \smile)$$

is a differential graded algebra DGA and if we go to homology the triplet

$$(\text{HH}^\bullet(A)[-1], \smile, [,])$$

is a Gerstenhaber algebra.

REMARK 3.3. These two classical structures on Hochschild cohomology of ordinary ungraded algebras were analyzed first by Gerstenhaber [8]. Both definitions have been extended to A_∞ -algebras and are well-known in the literature, see e.g. [15].

Mescher [15] uses a different sign convention for A_∞ -categories. This means his definition of the cup product also has different signs. We have adapted the signs in order to suit the signs in our definition of A_∞ -categories. In particular, the cup product as defined is graded symmetric, with respect to a degree shift of 1 on the Hochschild cohomology:

$$(3.1) \quad \nu \smile \eta = (-1)^{(\|\nu\|-1)(\|\eta\|-1)} \eta \smile \nu.$$

The unexpected shift by 1 in this sign rule is desired. In fact, this “shifted graded symmetry” renders the cup product truly graded symmetric with respect to the “traditional” grading of the Hochschild complex, which differs from the A_∞ -grading precisely by one. In other words, if one regards an ordinary ungraded algebra and starts grading the Hochschild cohomology at zero (instead of minus one), the cup product becomes graded symmetric.

We have tried to arrange the signs such that the cup product together with the Gerstenhaber bracket turns $\text{HH}(\text{Gtl}_A)$ into a Gerstenhaber algebra with correct signs. In order to be a Gerstenhaber algebra, sign conventions of cup product and

bracket need to be tuned to each other. The relevant compatibility condition is the signed Leibniz rule which reads

$$[\nu, \eta \smile \omega] = [\nu, \eta] \smile \omega + (-1)^{\|\nu\|(\|\eta\|-1)} \eta \smile [\nu, \omega].$$

We have tried to arrange the signs with the Leibniz rule in mind, but we have not conducted the tedious checks. We have however chosen the signs in analogy with [15]. In particular, the signs are such that the cup product descends to Hochschild cohomology and is graded symmetric, the latter we did check by hand.

REMARK 3.4. If (A, μ) is a strictly unital A_∞ -algebra over \mathbb{k} , i.e. $\mu(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ if $n \neq 2$ and at least one of the $x_i \in \mathbb{k}$, one can construct the **normalized Hochschild cochain complex** $\underline{CC}^\bullet(A)$. This is the subspace of all cochains that evaluate to zero if at least one of the entries is in \mathbb{k} . This subspace is closed under all the operations above the embedding is a quasi-isomorphism [10]. The Maurer-Cartan equation for $\underline{CC}^\bullet(A)$ classifies deformations of μ for which \mathbb{k} remains strict.

We will now specialize to the case where $A = \text{Gtl}_\mathcal{A}$ is the gentle algebra of an arc collection \mathcal{A} equipped with $\mu = r_\mu$ for $r = 0$. We have seen that the $\text{Gtl}_\mathcal{A}$ has a natural \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading, so the ∞ -degree is a \mathbb{Z}_2 -degree, which we refer to as the parity. It is possible to lift this \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading to a \mathbb{Z} -grading. To do this we assign to each angle α a degree $\deg \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ with the same parity as $|\alpha|$. In order to make this degree compatible with μ we have to ensure that μ has ∞ -degree 1. This happens only when the total degree of the angles in a k -gon is $k - 2$. As every angle occurs only in one k -gon this can always be done but not canonically.

The gentle A_∞ -algebra also has an extra grading coming from the relative first homology

$$G = H_1(S \setminus M, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{Z}).$$

This group can be described in terms of the angles and faces

$$G = \frac{\bigoplus_{\alpha \in (Q_\mathcal{A})_1} \mathbb{Z}\alpha}{\langle \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k \mid (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k) \text{ is a face} \rangle}.$$

The group G comes with two natural maps

- $\pi : G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^\mathcal{A} : \alpha \mapsto h(\alpha) - t(\alpha)$
- $\iota : \mathbb{Z}^M \rightarrow G : m \mapsto \sum_{\alpha \in \ell_m} \alpha$

We have $\pi \circ \iota = 0$. The image of the π has corank 1, while the kernel of ι is $(1, \dots, 1)$. Therefore if $\#M \geq 2$ the map ι is nonzero.

If we grade $\text{Gtl}_\mathcal{A}$ by giving each angle its corresponding degree in G , it is clear that all products μ have degree $0 \in G$. We can transfer the G -grading to the Hochschild complex and it is easy to see that it contains only nonzero elements for degrees in $\text{Ker } \pi$. Furthermore the natural operations $[\cdot]$, \smile and d all have G -degree 0.

REMARK 3.5. It is also clear from this construction that if \deg and \deg' are two different \mathbb{Z} -lifts of the \mathbb{Z}_2 -grading then their difference factors through G because \deg and \deg' assign the same degree to a face. More precisely, the possible \mathbb{Z} -gradings form a $\text{Hom}(G, 2\mathbb{Z})$ -torsor.

LEMMA 3.6. If \deg is a \mathbb{Z} -lift of the \mathbb{Z}_2 -degree on $\text{Gtl}_\mathcal{A}$ then

$$\sum_{m \in M} \deg \ell_m = 4 - 4g - 2\#M = 2\chi(S, M) < 0.$$

Here g is the genus of the marked surface (S, M) and $\chi(S, M)$ its Euler characteristic (which is negative by assumption).

PROOF.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m \in M} \deg \ell_m &= \sum_{\alpha \in (Q_{\mathcal{A}})_1} \deg \alpha = \sum_{f \in F} \deg f \\ &= \sum_{f \in F} (2 - \#\{\alpha \in f\}) = 2\#F - 2\#\mathcal{A} = 2(2 - 2g) - 2\#M. \end{aligned}$$

□

3.2. Reduction to the zeroth and first component. In this section we will show that the Hochschild cohomology class of a cocycle can be read off from the 0th and 1st component. In other words, if ν^0 and ν^1 are both zero then ν is a coboundary. Remark 3.4 allows us to restrict to cochains which belong to the normalized Hochschild cohomology. For such classes we will construct an $\epsilon \in \underline{\text{CC}}^\bullet(A)$ such that $\nu - d\epsilon$ evaluates zero on all sequences $(\beta_k, \dots, \beta_1)$ where the β_i are nontrivial angle paths and $t(\beta_i) = h(\beta_{i+1})$. We will often refer to the procedure of adding a coboundary as **gauging**.

DEFINITION 3.7. Let $\beta = (\beta_k, \dots, \beta_1)$ be a sequence of nontrivial angles with $h(\beta_i) = t(\beta_{i+1})$ for $i < k$ (we do not impose that it cycles so $h(\beta_i)$, $t(\beta_1)$ can be different).

- We call β **elementary** if all β_i are indecomposable angles (angle arrows).
- An index i is called a **contractible index** if $\beta_{i+1}\beta_i \neq 0$.
- Denote the set of contractible indices by $\text{Contr}(\beta)$ and if $S \subset \text{Contr}(\beta)$ then the **contracted sequence** β^S will be the sequence where consecutive angles separated by a contractible index are multiplied together.
- Every angle sequence is of the form β^S where β is elementary and S a set of contractible indices. Moreover β and S are uniquely determined. Two sequences are of the **same type** if they are contractions of the same elementary sequence.
- The **total length** of a sequence will be the length of its underlying indecomposable sequence.
- For an elementary sequence we have that $\text{Contr}(\beta) = \{\}$ if and only if it consists of consecutive angles of a polygonal face. Therefore we will call such sequences **polygon sequences**.

LEMMA 3.8. Let $\nu \in \text{Ker}(d) \subset \underline{\text{CC}}^\bullet(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$ with (A) $\nu^0 = \nu^1 = 0$. Then ν can be gauged to satisfy additionally that (B) $\nu^2(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ for all pairs of angle paths with $\alpha\beta \neq 0$. During the gauging procedure, the value of ν does not change on polygon sequences.

PROOF. We will construct an $\epsilon = \epsilon^1$ such that $\nu^2(\alpha, \beta) = (d\epsilon)^2(\alpha, \beta)$ if $\alpha\beta \neq 0$. Set $\epsilon^1(\alpha) = 0$ for every indecomposable angle α . Now define inductively ϵ^1 for decomposable angles (angle paths) by the rule

$$(3.2) \quad \epsilon^1(\alpha\beta) = \epsilon^1(\alpha)\beta + \alpha\epsilon^1(\beta) - (-1)^{|\beta|}\nu^2(\alpha, \beta).$$

Let us check that extending ε^1 according to this rule is well-defined, that is, $\varepsilon^1((\alpha\beta)\gamma) = \varepsilon^1(\alpha(\beta\gamma))$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} & (\varepsilon^1(\alpha\beta)\gamma + \alpha\beta\varepsilon^1(\gamma) - (-1)^{|\gamma|}\nu^2(\alpha\beta, \gamma)) - (\varepsilon^1(\alpha)\beta\gamma + \alpha\varepsilon^1(\beta\gamma) - (-1)^{|\beta\gamma|}\nu^2(\alpha, \beta\gamma)) \\ &= \varepsilon^1(\alpha)\beta\gamma + \alpha\varepsilon^1(\beta)\gamma - (-1)^{|\beta|}\nu^2(\alpha, \beta)\gamma + \alpha\beta\varepsilon^1(\gamma) - (-1)^{|\gamma|}\nu^2(\alpha\beta, \gamma) \\ &\quad - \varepsilon^1(\alpha)\beta\gamma - \alpha\varepsilon^1(\beta)\gamma - \alpha\beta\varepsilon^1(\gamma) + (-1)^{|\gamma|}\alpha\nu^2(\beta, \gamma) + (-1)^{|\beta\gamma|}\nu^2(\alpha, \beta\gamma) \\ &= -(-1)^{|\beta|}\nu^2(\alpha, \beta)\gamma - (-1)^{|\gamma|}\nu^2(\alpha\beta, \gamma) + (-1)^{|\gamma|}\alpha\nu^2(\beta, \gamma) + (-1)^{|\beta\gamma|}\nu^2(\alpha, \beta\gamma) \\ &= (-1)^{|\beta|}(d\nu)(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the final row we have used that $\nu^0 = \nu^1 = 0$. We conclude that for angles α, β with $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ we have

$$(d\varepsilon)(\alpha, \beta) = (-1)^{|\beta|}\varepsilon^1(\alpha)\beta + (-1)^{|\beta|}\alpha\varepsilon^1(\beta) - (-1)^{|\beta|}\varepsilon^1(\alpha\beta) = \nu^2(\alpha, \beta)$$


as desired. Furthermore $(d\varepsilon)^0 = (d\varepsilon)^1 = 0$ and if $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ is a polygon sequence, then

$$(d\varepsilon)(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1) = \varepsilon(\mu(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)) + \mu(\dots, \varepsilon(\alpha_i), \dots) = 0.$$

because all α_i are indecomposable so $\varepsilon(\alpha_i) = 0$. \square

LEMMA 3.9. Let $\nu \in \text{Ker}(d) \subset \underline{\text{CC}}^\bullet(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$ with (A) $\nu^0 = \nu^1 = 0$ and (B) $\nu^2(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ if $\alpha\beta \neq 0$. Then ν can be gauged to (C) evaluate zero on polygonal sequences without affecting the conditions (A), (B).

PROOF. We start off with a little remark that is important to follow the argument. Note that when going around a polygon $(\alpha_N, \dots, \alpha_1)$ the boundary arcs can be oriented clockwise or anticlockwise. If two consecutive arcs $a_i = t(\alpha_i)$ and $a_{i+1} = h(\alpha_i)$ have the same orientation then $|\alpha_i| = 1$ and $\|\alpha_i\| = 0$.



Therefore if we have a polygonal sequence $(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ then the orientation of $h(\alpha_{i+k})$ and $t(\alpha_{i+1})$ will be the same (different) if the total shifted degree $\|\alpha_{i+k}\| + \dots + \|\alpha_{i+1}\|$ is zero (one).

Working with the shifted degree is useful because the shifted degree of $\|\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})\|$ is the total shifted degree $\|\alpha_{i+k}\| + \dots + \|\alpha_{i+1}\|$ plus the parity of ν . With this in mind we will distinguish two cases depending on the parity of ν .

- The parity of ν is odd. We proceed by induction. Regard an elementary polygon $(\alpha_N, \dots, \alpha_1)$ of length N and assume ν already vanishes on its polygon sequences of length $\leq k-1$. We will simultaneously gauge away ν on the polygon sequences of length k of this polygon.

First note that an arc can occur at most twice on the boundary of a face and if it does it must be oriented once clockwise and once anticlockwise around the face because the surface is orientable. This implies that if $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ contains an identity, then k must be a multiple of N . Indeed, if $k < N$ and there is an identity 1_a in the result then $t(\alpha_{i+1}) = h(\alpha_{i+k}) = a$. Because the two orientations of a around the face are different the shifted degree of $(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ is odd. As ν is

odd, $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ will be even and hence it cannot contain 1_a (whose shifted degree is odd).

Let us now assume k is not a multiple of N . Then we can write $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = \alpha_{i+k} \delta^{(i+k)} + \gamma^{(i+1)} \alpha_{i+1}$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (d\nu)(\alpha_{i+k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) \\ &= (-1)^{\|\alpha_{i+k}\| + \dots + \|\alpha_{i+1}\|} \alpha_{i+k+1} (\alpha_{i+k} \delta^{(i+k)} + \gamma^{(i+1)} \alpha_{i+1}) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{\|\alpha_{i+1}\| + |\alpha_{i+1}|} (\alpha_{i+k+1} \delta^{(i+k+1)} - \gamma^{(i+2)} \alpha_{i+2}) \alpha_{i+1} \\ &= \alpha_{i+k+1} ((-1)^{\|\alpha_{i+k}\| + \dots + \|\alpha_{i+1}\|} \gamma^{(i+1)} - \delta^{(i+k+1)}) \alpha_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

In evaluating the first row we have used the induction hypothesis. Independent of arc directions, the angles α_{i+k+1} and $\gamma^{(i+1)}$ are composable and $\delta^{(i+k+1)}$ and α_{i+1} are composable. We deduce $\delta^{(i+k+1)} = (-1)^{\|\alpha_{i+k}\| + \dots + \|\alpha_{i+1}\|} \gamma^{(i+1)}$ for all i . Set $\varepsilon(\alpha_{i+k-1}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = (-1)^{\|\alpha_{i+k-1}\| + \dots + \|\alpha_{i+1}\| + 1} \delta^{(i+k)}$ for all i . Then

$$\begin{aligned} (d\varepsilon)(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) &= \alpha_{i+k} \delta^{(i+k)} + (-1)^{\|\alpha_{i+k}\| + \dots + \|\alpha_{i+2}\| + 1 + |\alpha_{i+1}|} \delta^{(i+k+1)} \alpha_{i+1} \\ &= \alpha_{i+k} \delta^{(i+k)} + \gamma^{(i+1)} \alpha_{i+1} = \nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}). \end{aligned}$$

We have $(d\varepsilon)^0 = (d\varepsilon)^1 = 0$. Let us now check that $d\varepsilon$ does not affect any other elementary polygon sequences or the sequences in the same polygon with length $l \leq k-1$. Regarding shorter sequences in the same polygon, we have

$$(d\varepsilon)(\alpha_{i+l}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = \mu(\dots, \varepsilon, \dots) + \varepsilon(\dots, \mu(\alpha_{i+s+tN}, \dots, \alpha_{i+s+1}), \dots)$$

where N is the length of the polygon. The first summand vanishes, since $l \leq k-1$. In the second summand, the inner μ may only yield an identity and ε vanishes. For sequences in other polygons, similar arguments apply. We have safeguarded that $\nu^{0,1} = 0$ is preserved when gauging by ε . For $k > 2$, also $(d\varepsilon)^2$ vanishes. In case $k = 2$ the $(d\varepsilon)^2(\alpha, \beta)$ may be nonzero in rare cases, but we fix this by applying Lemma 3.8, without changing ν on polygon sequences.

Finally, let us treat the case where k is a multiple of the length N of the polygon. Apart from the identities, we can gauge everything in $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ away as above. It remains to check out the identities. Write $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = c_i 1_{a_i}$. Note we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (d\nu)(\alpha_{i+k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) \\ &= \alpha_{i+k+1} \nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) - \nu(\alpha_{i+k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{i+2}) \alpha_{i+1} \\ &= c_i \alpha_{i+k+1} - c_{i+1} \alpha_{i+1} = (c_i - c_{i+1}) \alpha_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used that ν already vanishes on sequences of the same polygon of length $\leq k-1$. We obtain that all c_i around the polygon are equal. Denote this value by c . Choose an angle α_1 in the polygon and define $\varepsilon(\alpha_{k-N+1}, \dots, \alpha_1) := c\alpha_1$. As desired,

$$\begin{aligned} (d\varepsilon)(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) &= \mu(\dots, \varepsilon(\alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_1), \dots) \\ &= c\mu(\alpha_{i+N}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = c 1_{a_i}. \end{aligned}$$

In the first row we have used that the sequence $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{k-N+1}$ of length $k-N+1$ appears precisely once in the sequence $\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}$ and hence

an inner ε can be applied precisely once. We see that $(d\varepsilon)^0 = (d\varepsilon)^1 = 0$. Let us check that $d\varepsilon$ vanishes on any polygon sequence β_1, \dots, β_l of length $l \leq k-1$ in the same polygon. Indeed,

$$(d\varepsilon)(\beta_l, \dots, \beta_1) = \varepsilon(\dots, \mu(\dots), \dots) + \mu^2(\dots, \varepsilon(\dots), \dots) + \mu^{\geq 3}(\dots, \varepsilon(\dots), \dots).$$

The first summand vanishes, because the inner μ only gives identities. The second summand vanishes, because the result of the inner ε is a multiple of the first, equivalently last input of its input sequence, hence not composable with the input angle of the outer μ^2 . The third summand vanishes, because ε consumes $k-N+1$ inputs and the outer $\mu^{\geq 3}$ needs $N-1$ more inputs, while the sequence β_1, \dots, β_l has length only $l \leq k-1$. Similarly, one checks that $d\varepsilon$ vanishes entirely on polygon sequences in other polygons. For $k > N$, we have $(d\varepsilon)^2 = 0$. For $k = N$, it may happen that $(d\varepsilon)^2 \neq 0$, but we fix this by applying Lemma 3.8.

In total, we have gauged ν infinitely many times during this proof. However, the ε gauges have higher and higher input length. Moreover we only invoke Lemma 3.8 finitely many times, this means that the total sum of the gauges is defined in $\text{Hom}_k(\bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A[1]^{\otimes_k i}, A[1])$ and we conclude it is a Hochschild cochain.

- The parity of ν is even. As in the odd case, we proceed again by induction over the length k of the polygon sequence.

Let us first check for possible identities in $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$. In case k is a multiple of N , the source arc of α_{i+1} is equal to the target arc of α_{i+k} , in particular $||\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})||$ is even and does not contain identities. In case k is not a multiple of N , we observe


$$(d\nu)(\alpha_{i+k+1}, \alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = \alpha_{i+k+1}\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) + \nu(\alpha_{i+k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{i+2})\alpha_{i+1}.$$

Since k is not a multiple of N , we have $\alpha_{i+k+1} \neq \alpha_{i+1}$ and conclude that $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ contains no identities.

We now proceed with gauging $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ to zero. By abuse of wording, let us say “head” and “tail” of a polygon’s arc a to mean the vertex at the clockwise end and at the counterclockwise end of a . For every i we write

$$\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = \kappa_i + \lambda_i,$$

where κ_i contains the angle paths that starts at the “head” of a_{i+1} and λ_i starts at the “tail” of $a_{i+1} = t(\alpha_{i+1})$.



We show that λ_i necessarily vanishes. Regard the source arc a_{i+1} of α_{i+1} and target arc a_{i+k+1} of α_{i+k} . We have

$$0 = (d\nu)(\alpha_{i+k+1}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = \alpha_{i+k+1}(\kappa_i + \lambda_i) + (\kappa_{i+1} + \lambda_{i+1})\alpha_{i+1}.$$

We know κ_i is odd or even, depending on whether a_{i+1} and a_{i+k+1} are equally oriented with respect to the polygon or not. Since κ_i always starts at the “head” of a_{i+1} , we deduce from its degree that it always ends at the “tail” of a_{i+k+1} . In particular $\alpha_{i+k+1}\kappa_i = 0$. Similarly, λ_i starts at the “tail” of a_{i+1} , hence ends at the “head” of a_{i+k+1} , whether a_{i+1} and a_{i+k+1} are oriented equally or not. In particular α_{i+k+1} and λ_i are

composable. But α_{i+1} starts at the “head” of a_{i+1} , while λ_i starts at the “tail” of a_{i+1} , hence the summands $\alpha_{i+k+1}\lambda_i$ and $(\kappa_{i+1} + \lambda_{i+1})\alpha_{i+1}$ consist of disjoint sets of angles. Since the whole sum is supposed to vanish, we conclude $\lambda_i = 0$.

Since κ_i starts at the side of α_{i+1} and $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ contains no identities, we can write $\kappa_i = \gamma_i \alpha_{i+1}$. We aim at gauging $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$ to zero. Let us first gauge away all terms except the possible scalar multiple of α_{i+1} , which comes from a possible identity in γ_i . Put $\varepsilon(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+2}) := \gamma_i$. Then

$$(d\varepsilon)(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = \gamma_i \alpha_{i+1} + \alpha_{i+k} \gamma_{i-1}.$$

Apart from identities in γ_{i-1} , the angles α_{i+k} and γ_{i-1} are not composable. To see this, consider two cases. If a_i and a_{i+k} are oriented opposite, then $\nu(\alpha_{i+k-1}, \dots, \alpha_i) = \kappa_{i-1}$ is even. Hence γ_{i-1} enters a_{i+k} at the opposite side of where α_{i+k} leaves. If a_i and a_{i+k} are oriented equally, then κ_{i-1} is odd and γ_{i-1} enters a_{i+k} still at the opposite side of where α_{i+k} leaves. Either way, we have $\alpha_{i+k} \gamma_{i-1} = 0$ and $\gamma_i \alpha_{i+1} = \kappa_i$ remains as desired.

Let us check that $d\varepsilon$ vanishes on polygon sequences in other polygons and on polygon sequences shorter than k in the same polygon. Indeed,

$$(d\varepsilon)(\beta_l, \dots, \beta_1) = \varepsilon(\dots, \mu(\dots), \dots) + \mu(\dots, \varepsilon(\dots), \dots).$$

In the first summand, the inner μ can only give identities, on which ε vanishes. In the second summand, the input sequence of the inner ε must be from the same polygon as $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N$ and of length precisely $k-1$. Since the outer μ is $\mu^{\geq 2}$, this means that β_1, \dots, β_l has length at least k , which was not to be assumed.

Finally, let us gauge away the remaining scalar multiples of α_{i+1} in $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1})$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$, write $\nu(\alpha_{i+k}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = c_i \alpha_{i+1}$. If $c_i \neq 0$, we deduce that the target arc of α_{i+k} is equal to the target arc of α_{i+1} , that is, $a_{i+k+1} = a_{i+2}$. Moreover, ν is even and hence a_{i+k+1} and a_{i+2} are oriented equally. In other words, a_{i+k+1} and a_{i+2} are equal as arcs and are oriented equally in the polygon. As we remarked in the odd case, this is only possible if $i+k+1 = i+2$ in $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$. We conclude that if some c_i does not vanish, then $k = lN + 1$ for some $l \geq 1$.

Assuming $k = lN + 1$, let us show that the different c_i along the polygon are related. Indeed,

$$0 = (d\nu)(\alpha_{(l+1)N}, \dots, \alpha_1) = \sum_{i=1}^N c_i 1_{a_1} + \mu^2(\alpha_{(l+1)N}, \nu(\dots)) + \mu^2(\nu(\dots), \alpha_1).$$

We have used that an inner ν can be placed in precisely N ways, replicating the corresponding angle α_i and forming a disk together with the remaining angles. Moreover, an inner μ is impossible, since it only yields identities. An outer μ^2 is possible, but gives non-empty angles only which can be distinguished from the identities. We deduce that the sum of all c_i vanishes. Put

$$\varepsilon(\alpha_{i+lN}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) := - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j \right) 1_{a_{i+1}}.$$

Then

$$(d\varepsilon)(\alpha_{i+1N+1}, \dots, \alpha_{i+1}) = - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} c_j \alpha_{i+1N+1} + \sum_{j=1}^i c_j \alpha_{i+1}.$$

This definition makes sense for $i \in \mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$, since the sum over c_i vanishes. The sums cancel each other because $\alpha_{i+1N+1} = \alpha_{i+1}$, and $c_i \alpha_{i+1}$ remains as desired. It is standard to check that $d\varepsilon$ does not have values on shorter polygon sequences or other polygons.

□

LEMMA 3.10. Let $\nu \in \text{Ker}(d) \subset \underline{\text{CC}}^\bullet(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$ with (A) $\nu^0 = \nu^1 = 0$, (B) $\nu(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ if $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ and suppose (C) ν vanishes on polygonal sequences. Then ν can be gauged to zero on all angle sequences.

PROOF. We prove the statement by gauging ν to zero inductively on the total length of the angle sequences. After each step of gauging, we prove that all additional assumptions (A-C) still hold.

We already know $\nu^1 = 0$ and if (α, β) is a sequence of length two then either $\alpha\beta \neq 0$ of (α, β) is a polygon sequence, so by (B) and (C) we are done for total length at most 2.

Now let $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ be any sequence of $k \geq 3$ angles $\alpha_i : a_i \rightarrow a_{i+1}$. By induction, we assume that ν already vanishes on all shorter sequences. Since ν already vanishes on polygon sequences, we can assume $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ is not a polygon sequence.

We will gauge ν on $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ simultaneously with all other sequences of the same type and therefore we will assume $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ is elementary. Now $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$ consists of indecomposable angles of which at least one pair is composable (otherwise it would be a polygon sequence). Orientations of arcs will play no role in this proof, apart from determining the degrees of the angles. For simplicity, let us assume all α_i have odd degree. (This happens in case of a dimer.) Similarly, ν is either of odd or even parity, and the signs we write are for the odd case.

Let $\text{Contr}(\beta)$ be the set of all contractible indices and $s = \max(\text{Contr}(\beta))$. We will now gauge all β^S for $S \subseteq \text{Contr}(\beta)$ simultaneously. Put

$$\varepsilon(\beta^{\{s\} \cup T}) = (-1)^{|T|} \nu(\beta^T), \quad T \subseteq \text{Contr}(\beta) \setminus \{s\}.$$

We show that $(d\varepsilon)(\beta^S) = \nu(\beta^S)$ for all $S \subseteq \text{Contr}(\beta)$.

- In case $s \notin S$, we have

$$(d\varepsilon)(\beta^S) = \varepsilon(\beta^{\{s\} \cup S}) = (-1)^{|S|} \nu(\beta^S).$$

by definition. Note that any $\varepsilon(\dots, \mu^{\geq 3}, \dots)$ and $\mu(\dots, \varepsilon, \dots)$ vanish since their input sequence of ε is shorter than $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$.

- In case $s \in S$, first observe that for $K \subseteq \text{Contr}(\beta)$ we have

$$\sum_{t \notin K} (-1)^{1+|K_{<t}|} \nu(\beta^{K \cup \{t\}}) = (d\nu)(\beta^K) \mp \nu(\dots, \mu^{\geq 3}, \dots) \mp \mu(\dots, \nu, \dots) = 0.$$

Here $|K_{<t}|$ denotes the number of indices in K smaller than t . Indeed, the second and third summands vanish because the input sequence of ν

is shorter than β . Now using this observation for $K = S \setminus \{s\}$ we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(d\varepsilon)(\beta^S) &= - \sum_{t \notin S} (-1)^{1+|S_{<t}|} \varepsilon(\beta^{S \cup \{t\}}) \\
&= \sum_{t \notin S} (-1)^{|S \setminus \{s\} \cup \{t\}| + |S_{<t}|} \nu(\beta^{S \setminus \{s\} \cup \{t\}}) \\
&= \sum_{t \notin S \setminus \{s\}} (-1)^{|S|+1} (-1)^{|(S \setminus \{s\})_{<t}|+1} \nu(\beta^{S \setminus \{s\} \cup \{t\}}) - (-1)^{|S|+1} (-1)^{|S_{<s}|+1} \nu(\beta^{S \setminus \{s\} \cup \{s\}}) \\
&= 0 + \nu(\beta^S)
\end{aligned}$$

as desired. In the first row, we have used that all $\varepsilon(\dots, \mu^{\geq 3}, \dots)$ and $\mu(\dots, \varepsilon, \dots)$ vanish since their input sequence of ε is shorter than $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$.

Finally, $(d\varepsilon)^0 = (d\varepsilon)^1 = 0$ and $d\varepsilon$ vanishes on polygon sequences $\gamma_l, \dots, \gamma_1$. Indeed,

$$(3.3) \quad (d\varepsilon)(\gamma_l, \dots, \gamma_1) = \varepsilon(\dots, \mu, \dots) + \mu(\dots, \varepsilon, \dots).$$

The first summand vanishes because the inner μ yields only vertex idempotents. The second summand vanishes, since the input sequence of ε consists only of indecomposable angles, while a sequence $\beta^{\{s\} \cup T}$ on which ε is defined has at least one decomposable angle.

Next, note that $d\varepsilon$ vanishes if an input is a vertex idempotent. Now assume $\gamma_l, \dots, \gamma_1$ is any sequence of non-empty angles of total length less than or equal to that of $\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1$. Consider the sum (3.3) again. The first summand vanishes in case of $\mu^{\geq 3}$ because then the input sequence of ε has less total length than $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$. If the first summand does not vanish for some μ^2 , we conclude that the indecomposable constituents of the sequence are equal to $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$. In other words, it is one of those sequences we have just gauged correctly already. The second summand vanishes, since the input sequence of ε is shorter than $\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1$. \square

THEOREM 3.11. Let $\nu \in \text{Ker}(d)$ with $\nu^{0,1} = 0$ then ν is zero in $\text{HH}^\bullet(\text{Gtl}_A)$.

PROOF. This is an immediate consequence of the previous lemmas. \square

This theorem implies that the cohomology class of the cocycles can be read off from its zeroth and first components.

LEMMA 3.12. If ν is a cocycle then

- ν^0 is a central element,
- if $\nu^0 = 0$ then ν^1 is a derivation.

PROOF. We have that $\nu^0(1)$ is a central element because

$$0 = (d\nu)^1(\alpha) = \mu^2(\alpha, \nu^0(1)) + (-1)^{\|\alpha\|} \mu^2(\nu^0(1), \alpha).$$

If $\nu^0 = 0$ then ν^1 is a derivation because

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= (-1)^{|\beta|} (d\nu)(\alpha, \beta) = \nu^1(\alpha)\beta + \alpha\nu^1(\beta) - \nu(\alpha\beta), \\
0 &= \nu^1(1_a)1_a + 1_a\nu^1(1_a) - \nu(1_a).
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Depending on the parity of the cocycle we can be even more precise: odd cocycles are determined by ν^0 , which is a central element, while even cocycles are determined by ν^1 , viewed as an outer derivation of Gtl_A .

THEOREM 3.13. Let \mathcal{A} be an arc collection.

(1) The map

$$\mathrm{HH}^{\mathrm{even}}(\mathrm{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow \mathrm{OutDer}(\mathrm{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) : \nu \mapsto \nu^1$$

is a well-defined embedding.

(2) The map

$$\mathrm{HH}^{\mathrm{odd}}(\mathrm{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow Z(\mathrm{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) : \nu \mapsto \nu^0(1)$$

is a well-defined embedding.

PROOF. For the first statement note that the center only has cycles of even degree, which represent odd maps $A[1]^{\otimes 0} \rightarrow A[1]$. Therefore $\nu^0 = 0$ if the parity of ν is even and hence by the previous lemma ν^1 is indeed a derivation. The map is also well defined because

$$(d\kappa)^1(\alpha) = \mu^1(\kappa^1(\alpha)) + \mu^2(\kappa^0, \alpha) - \mu^2(\alpha, \kappa^0) = [\kappa^0, \alpha].$$

Furthermore if ν^1 is inner and $\nu^0 = 0$ then we can find a κ such that $(\nu - d\kappa)^1 = 0$ zero. Because $(\nu - d\kappa)^0$ is zero for degree reasons we have by theorem 3.11 that $\nu = 0$ in $\mathrm{HH}^{\mathrm{even}}(\mathrm{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$. Therefore the map is an embedding.

For the second statement, first note that this map is well-defined because $(d\kappa)^0 = \mu^1 \circ \kappa^0 = 0$. Now suppose that $\nu^0(1) = 0$, then we will construct an even ε such that $(d\varepsilon)^1(\alpha) = \nu^1(\alpha)$ for all indecomposable angles. Because $\nu^0(1) = (d\varepsilon)^0 = 0$ both $(d\varepsilon)^1$ and ν^1 are derivations and therefore $(d\varepsilon)^1 = \nu^1$. This means that $(\nu - d\varepsilon)^{\leq 1} = 0$ and hence $\nu = 0$ in $\mathrm{HH}^{\mathrm{odd}}(\mathrm{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$. Therefore the map is an embedding.

To construct ε , let us first make sure that $\nu^1(\alpha)$ does not include the identity. Indeed let $\alpha : a \rightarrow a$ be an indecomposable angle. Since a is not contractible by assumption, α is not the only angle in the polygon. In particular, α does not go from head to tail of a or from tail to head of a . We conclude α is even and $\nu^1(\alpha)$ is odd, hence does not include an identity.

Regard the polygon that α sits in. By abuse of wording, let us say “head” and “tail” of a polygon’s arc a to mean the vertex at the clockwise end and at the counterclockwise end of a . Independent of arrow directions, $\nu^1(\alpha)$ can be decomposed into a part running from the tail of a to the tail of b and a part running from the head of a to the head of b . Write this decomposition as $\nu^1(\alpha) = \alpha\delta^{(\alpha)} + \gamma^{(\alpha)}\alpha$. Whether α is even or odd, $\delta^{(\alpha)}$ and $\gamma^{(\alpha)}$ are always odd since ν^1 is.

Now let a be an arc. Denote by $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$ the angles incident at a as in Figure 3.1a. We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= (d\nu)(\alpha_2, \alpha_4) = (-1)^{\|\alpha_4\|} \mu^2(\nu^1(\alpha_2), \alpha_4) + \mu^2(\alpha_2, \nu^1(\alpha_4)) + \nu^1(\mu^2(\alpha_2, \alpha_4)) \\ &= -\gamma^{(\alpha_2)}\alpha_2\alpha_4 - \alpha_2\delta^{(\alpha_2)}\alpha_4 + (-1)^{\|\alpha_4\|} \alpha_2\gamma^{(\alpha_4)}\alpha_4 + (-1)^{\|\alpha_4\|} \alpha_2\alpha_4\delta^{(\alpha_4)} + 0 \\ &= \alpha_2((-1)^{\|\alpha_4\|} \gamma^{(\alpha_4)} - \delta^{(\alpha_2)})\alpha_4. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude $\delta^{(\alpha_2)} = (-1)^{\|\alpha_4\|} \gamma^{(\alpha_4)}$. Note that we have used that $\alpha_2\alpha_4 = 0$ and that $\gamma^{(\alpha_4)}$ and $\delta^{(\alpha_2)}$ both run from the tail of a to the head of a , and that α_4 ends




FIGURE 3.1

at the tail of a and α_2 starts at the head of a . Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &= (d\nu)(\alpha_3, \alpha_1) = (-1)^{\|\alpha_1\|} \mu^2(\nu^1(\alpha_3), \alpha_1) + \mu^2(\alpha_3, \nu^1(\alpha_1)) + \nu^1(\mu^2(\alpha_3, \alpha_1)) \\
 &= -\alpha_3 \delta^{(\alpha_3)} \alpha_1 - \gamma^{(\alpha_3)} \alpha_3 \alpha_1 + (-1)^{\|\alpha_1\|} \alpha_3 \alpha_1 \delta^{(\alpha_1)} + (-1)^{\|\alpha_1\|} \alpha_3 \gamma^{(\alpha_1)} \alpha_1 + 0 \\
 &= \alpha_3 (-\delta^{(\alpha_3)} + (-1)^{\|\alpha_1\|} \gamma^{(\alpha_1)}) \alpha_1.
 \end{aligned}$$

We conclude $\delta^{(\alpha_3)} = (-1)^{\|\alpha_1\|} \gamma^{(\alpha_1)}$. Let us now put

$$\varepsilon_a^0 := (-1)^{\|\alpha_4\|+1} \gamma^{(\alpha_4)} - \delta^{(\alpha_3)} = (-1)^{\|\alpha_1\|+1} \gamma^{(\alpha_1)} - \delta^{(\alpha_2)}.$$

The expression can be read independent on the arrow direction of a : It stays invariant under rotating the labels $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ and α_4 by 180 degrees. In other words, ε_a^0 can be seen either as the (signed) difference of γ and δ of its incident angles at its head or at its tail. This makes it easy to check $(d\varepsilon)(\alpha) = \nu^1(\alpha)$ for any indecomposable angle $\alpha : a \rightarrow b$. Denote by β_1 and β_2 its predecessor and successor indecomposable angles around the same puncture as in Figure 3.1b. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (d\varepsilon)(\alpha) &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} \varepsilon_b^0 \alpha - \alpha \varepsilon_a^0 \\
 &= (-1)^{|\alpha|} ((-1)^{\|\alpha\|+1} \gamma^{(\alpha)} - \delta^{(\beta_2)}) \alpha - \alpha ((-1)^{\|\beta_1\|+1} \gamma^{(\beta_1)} - \delta^{(\alpha)}) \\
 &= \gamma^{(\alpha)} \alpha + (-1)^{\|\alpha\|} \delta^{(\beta_2)} \alpha + (-1)^{\|\beta_1\|} \alpha \gamma^{(\beta_1)} + \alpha \delta^{(\alpha)} \\
 &= \gamma^{(\alpha)} \alpha + \alpha \delta^{(\alpha)} = \nu^1(\alpha).
 \end{aligned}$$

In the penultimate equality, we have used that $\delta^{(\beta_2)}$ ends where α starts and is odd, therefore not composable with α . Similarly $\alpha \gamma^{(\beta_1)} = 0$. We conclude that $(d\varepsilon)^1 = \nu^1$ on indecomposable angles. \square

REMARK 3.14. If ν is an even cocycle then ν^0 is zero, but if ν has odd parity then ν^1 need not to be zero or not even a derivation. An example of this occurs when m is a marked point surrounded by a loop arc. This loop gives rise to an orbigen of length 1, so the corresponding product A_∞ -deformation has a nontrivial $r_{\mathbb{P}^1}$ if $r_{(m,1)} \neq 0$ and therefore $\nu_{(m,1),o}$, as defined in definition 3.15, will be an odd cocycle with nontrivial ν^1 .

3.3. A set of generators. In this section we will describe a special set of Hochschild classes that span the Hochschild cohomology.

The first class we need is the unit class ν_1 , which corresponds to a single nullary product: $\nu_1^0 : \mathbb{k} \rightarrow A[1] : 1_a \mapsto 1_a$. Clearly this is a Hochschild cycle because the 1_a are strict idempotents. Its parity is odd.

DEFINITION 3.15. For each orbifold point $p = (m, r) \in M \times \mathbb{N}$ we define its orbifold point homology class as

$$\nu_{p,o} = \frac{1}{\hbar}(r\mathbb{P} - \mu) \text{ with } r = \ell_m^r \hbar \in Z(A) \otimes \mathbb{C}[\hbar]/(\hbar^2).$$

LEMMA 3.16. $\nu_{p,o}$ is a cocycle of odd parity.

PROOF. These are clearly cocycles because $r\mathbb{P}$ satisfies the Maurer-Cartan equation, which reduces to $d(r\mathbb{P}) = 0$ in the first order. \square

A second set of cocycles are characterized as follows. Fix a map $\lambda : (Q_{\mathcal{A}})_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Define the first component of ν_λ to be the derivation such that $\nu_\lambda(\alpha) = \lambda_\alpha \alpha$ and set $\nu_\lambda^{\neq 1} = 0$. The derivation condition implies that for a path $\beta = \beta_k \dots \beta_1$ we have $\nu_\lambda(\beta) = \sum_i \lambda_{\beta_i} \beta$, so it makes sense to define $\lambda_\beta := \sum_i \lambda_{\beta_i}$.

LEMMA 3.17. ν_λ is a cocycle if and only if for every polygon $(\alpha_N, \dots, \alpha_1)$ we have $\sum_i \lambda_{\alpha_i} = 0$.

PROOF. The condition that $\sum_i \lambda_{\alpha_i} = 0$ for every polygon implies that $\sum_{\alpha_i} \lambda_{\alpha_i} = 0$ for every tree-gon $(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1)$. Therefore

$$(d\nu_\lambda)(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \beta) = (\sum \lambda_{\alpha_i} + \lambda_\beta) \mu(\alpha_k, \dots, \alpha_1 \beta) - \nu_\lambda(\beta) = 0.$$

On the other hand if $\nu^{\neq 1} = 0$ then we know from lemma 3.12 that ν must be a derivation, while for every polygon $d(\nu_\lambda)(\alpha_N, \dots, \alpha_1) = 0$ implies that $\sum_i \lambda_{\alpha_i} = 0$. \square

The set of all ν_λ with these properties form a vector space S . If two elements in S differ by a commutator with an element in \mathbb{k} they will represent the same homology class.

LEMMA 3.18. $\dim S/[\mathbb{k}, -] = \dim H^1(S, M, \mathbb{C}) = 2g - 1 + |M|$.

PROOF. The dimension of S is $2\#\mathcal{A} - \#\{\text{faces}\}$ because there are 2 angles arriving in each arc and every face gives one linear condition. All these conditions are linearly independent because every angle occurs only in one face. The kernel of the map $\mathbb{k} \rightarrow [\mathbb{k}, -]$ is \mathbb{C} , so the image of $[\mathbb{k}, -]$ in S is of dimension $\#\mathcal{A} - 1$ and therefore

$$\dim S/[\mathbb{k}, -] = 2\#\mathcal{A} - \#\{\text{faces}\} - \#\mathcal{A} + 1 = 2g - 2 + |M| + 1.$$

\square

It is easy to find a basis for $S/[\mathbb{k}, -]$. Look again at Figure 3.1a. For each arc a there are 4 angles: two α_2, α_3 leaving a and two α_1, α_4 arriving in a . The angles α_2 and α_4 sit in the face on the right of a and α_1, α_3 in the face on the left.

We define $\nu_{a,L}$ to be the derivation with

$$\lambda(\alpha_1) = 1, \lambda(\alpha_3) = -1$$

while all other entries of λ are zero. Similarly we define $\nu_{a,R}$ with

$$\lambda(\alpha_2) = 1, \lambda(\alpha_4) = -1.$$

Note that because $[1_a, -] = \nu_{a,L} - \nu_{a,R}$ we have that up to homology $\nu_{a,L} = \nu_{a,R}$, so we will drop the subscript R, L and set $\nu_a := \nu_{a,L}$.

LEMMA 3.19. If \mathcal{T} is a set of arcs that forms a spanning tree in the face graph then

$$\{\nu_a \mid a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{T}\}$$

is a basis for $S/[\mathbb{k}, -]$.

PROOF. The sum of the ν_a where a runs over the arcs going around a given face is zero. Because \mathcal{T} is a spanning tree, the $\{\nu_a \mid a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{T}\}$ are independent. Moreover because a spanning tree has $\#\{\text{faces}\} - 1$ arcs, the cardinality of this set is the dimension of $S/[\mathbb{k}, -]$. \square

REMARK 3.20. We will call the ν_a and more general the ν_λ , which are linear combinations of the ν_a , **arc classes**.

Let $p = (m, j)$ be an orbifold point and a be any arc arriving (or leaving) the marked point. We now define

$$\nu_{p,e} := \nu_{p,o} \smile \nu_a \text{ or } -\nu_a \text{ if } a \text{ leaves } m.$$

Note that if a is not a loop we have that $\nu_{p,e}$ is zero for every angle arrow except for α_1 (or α_3 in the case a leaves m).

LEMMA 3.21. If the arc collection \mathcal{A} satisfies [NL2] then the homology class of $\nu_{p,e}$ does not depend on the choice of a .

PROOF. Let a and b be neighboring arcs incident at the same puncture, such that b comes after a in clockwise order. Let $\varepsilon = \varepsilon^0$ be the odd cochain given by $\varepsilon^0 = \ell_m^j 1_a$. For any angle α winding around puncture $m(\alpha)$ we have

$$d(\varepsilon)(\alpha) = \begin{cases} +\ell_m^j \alpha & t(\alpha) = a \text{ and } m(\alpha) = m \\ -\ell_m^j \alpha & h(\alpha) = a \text{ and } m(\alpha) = m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Because a is not a loop, the two nonzero cases each happen for just one α_1 and α_3 angle. We conclude

$$[d(\varepsilon)]^1 = [\nu_{p,e} \smile \nu_a - \nu_{p,e} \smile \nu_b]^1.$$

In other words the difference between $\nu_{p,e} \smile \nu_a$ and $\nu_{p,e} \smile \nu_b$ is homotopic to a cocycle κ with $\kappa^0, \kappa^1 = 0$. In combination with theorem 3.11 this means that two consecutive arcs around m define the same $\nu_{p,e}$ -class, and hence all arcs around m do. \square

THEOREM 3.22. Let \mathcal{A} be an arc collection and \mathcal{T} a spanning tree in the face graph.

- (1) The cocycles $\nu_1, \nu_{p,o}$ where p runs over all orbifold points form a basis for $\text{HH}^{\text{odd}}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$.
- (2) If \mathcal{A} satisfies [NL2] then the cocycles $\nu_{p,e}, \nu_a$ where p runs over all orbifold points and $a \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{T}$ form a basis for $\text{HH}^{\text{even}}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$.

PROOF. The zeroth components of $\nu_1, \nu_{p,o}$ form a basis for $Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$, so the embedding $\text{HH}^{\text{odd}}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$ in lemma 3.13 is a bijection.

To show the second part, note that the fact that there are no loops or two-cycles implies that all nonzero angle paths with the same head and tail as α turn around the same marked point as α and are of the form $\ell_m^r \alpha$.

If ν is G -homogeneous this means that there are two possibilities

- If the degree is 0 then ν must be a linear combination of the ν_a .
- $\nu(\alpha) = \lambda_\alpha \ell_m^j \alpha$ with $j > 0$ then the only other β for which $\nu(\beta) \neq 0$ must turn around m . Up to an inner derivation this ν is determined by the sum $\sum \lambda_\alpha$ where α runs over the indecomposables turning around m .

□

3.4. Gerstenhaber structure product on Hochschild cohomology. In this section, we compute the Gerstenhaber algebra structure on $\mathrm{HH}(\mathrm{Gtl}_A)$. In other words, we determine the bracket and the cup product on Hochschild cohomology. The bracket agrees with the computations by Wong for the Borel-Moore cohomology of matrix factorizations for dimer models [20], which is conjecturally equivalent to $\mathrm{HH}(\mathrm{Gtl}_A)$.

To describe the bracket and cup product, we use the basis for odd and even Hochschild cohomology constructed earlier: the odd classes $\nu_{(m,j),o}$ for a puncture $m \in M$ and $j \geq 0$, the even classes $\nu_{(m,j),e}$, and the arc classes ν_λ with $\lambda : (Q_A)_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$.

We start with the cup-product

PROPOSITION 3.23. Let $m, n \in M$ be two marked points, let $i, j \geq 1$ be two indices, and ν_λ, ν_κ two arc classes. Then the cup product in cohomology reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{(m,i),o} \smile \nu_{(n,j),o} &= \delta_{mn} \nu_{(m,i+j),o}, \\ \nu_{(m,i),o} \smile \nu_{(n,j),e} &= \delta_{mn} \nu_{(m,i+j),e}, \\ \nu_{(m,i),o} \smile \nu_\lambda &= \lambda_{\ell_m} \nu_{(m,i),e}, \\ \nu_\kappa \smile \nu_\lambda &= 0, \\ \nu_{(p,i),e} \smile \nu_\lambda &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. We compute the cup products of the given Hochschild cocycles first on chain level. Then we compute their projection to cohomology. In fact, for the odd products it suffices to compute the curvature component $(\nu \smile \eta)^0$ and for the even products it suffices to compute the first component $(\nu \smile \eta)^1$. Also recall that the parity of \smile itself is odd, so the product of two classes with the same (different) parity is odd (even). We are now ready to start the calculations. For the first identity, regard

$$(\nu_{(m,i),o} \smile \nu_{(n,j),o})^0 = \mu^2(\nu_{(m,i),o}^0(1), \nu_{(n,j),o}^0(1)) = \delta_{mn} \mu^2(\ell_m^i, \ell_n^j) = \ell_m^{i+j}.$$

This is precisely the curvature of the Hochschild cohomology class $\nu_{(m,i+j),o}$ and hence projects to it. For the second identity and third identity one can do a similar calculation but now one has to look at the first component. Alternatively, we can use the definition of $\nu_{(p,i),e}$ in combination with the associativity of \smile on the Hochschild cohomology.

For the last two identities we again have to look at the zeroth component and these are trivially zero because both factors have trivial curvature. □

PROPOSITION 3.24. Let $m, n \in M$ be two marked points, let $i, j \geq 1$ be two indices, and ν_λ, ν_κ two arc classes. Then the Gerstenhaber bracket in cohomology

reads as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
[\nu_{(m,i),o}, \nu_{(n,j),o}] &= 0, \\
[\nu_{(m,i),e}, \nu_{(n,j),o}] &= \delta_{mn} \cdot j \cdot \nu_{(m,i+j),o}, \\
[\nu_{(m,i),e}, \nu_{(n,j),e}] &= \delta_{mn} \cdot (j-i) \cdot \nu_{(m,i+j),e}, \\
[\nu_\lambda, \nu_{(m,i),o}] &= i\lambda_{\ell_m} \cdot \nu_{(m,i),o}, \\
[\nu_\lambda, \nu_{(m,i),e}] &= i\lambda_{\ell_m} \cdot \nu_{(m,i),e}, \\
[\nu_\kappa, \nu_\lambda] &= 0.
\end{aligned}$$

PROOF. The strategy for this calculation is the same as for the cup product. We calculate the zeroth or first component of the bracket.

$$\begin{aligned}
[\nu, \eta]^0 &= \nu^1(\eta^0) - (-1)^{\|\nu\|\|\eta\|} \eta^1(\nu^0), \\
[\nu, \eta]^1(\alpha) &= \nu^1(\eta^1(\alpha)) + (-1)^{\|\eta\|\|\alpha\|} \nu^2(\eta^0, \alpha) + \nu^2(\alpha, \eta^0) \\
&\quad - (-1)^{\|\nu\|\|\eta\|} (\eta^1(\nu^1(\alpha)) + (-1)^{\|\nu\|\|\alpha\|} \eta^2(\nu^0, \alpha) + \eta^2(\alpha, \nu^0)).
\end{aligned}$$

The main difference is now that the bracket has even parity, so we need to check the zeroth component whenever the two entries have different parity. In that case the result is the outer derivation of the even class applied to the central element of the odd class. This takes care of the second and fourth identity.

The first component of the bracket of two even classes is the commutator of their outer derivations because they have no ν^0 . This takes care of the third and the last two identities.

Finally the bracket of two odd classes is zero because they have no ν^1, ν^2 if [NL2] holds. If [NL2] fails and α is an indecomposable angle then $\nu^1(\alpha)$ can only be nonzero if $\alpha = h(\alpha)$ is a loop around a puncture but then the arc collection does not split the surface. Secondly for our deformed products a term of the form $r_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\ell_p, \alpha)$ is always cancelled by $r_{\mathbb{P}^2}(\alpha, \ell_p)$ and therefore the same holds for the odd classes. This implies that $[\nu, \eta]^1(\alpha)$ is zero for all indecomposable α and because $[\nu, \eta]^1$ is a derivation it is identically zero. \square

The Lie-bracket on $\mathrm{HH}^\bullet(\mathrm{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$ is part of an L_∞ -structure. This is a graded vector space L together with brackets $[\dots]^k : L^{\otimes k} \rightarrow L$ of degree $2-k$ which satisfy the L_∞ -axioms [19].

If $(K^\bullet, d, \llbracket \rrbracket)$ is a DGLA then we can construct an L_∞ -structure $[\cdot]^\bullet$ on the homology such that $(HK^\bullet, 0, [\cdot]^\bullet)$ is L_∞ -quasi-isomorphic to $(K^\bullet, d, \llbracket \rrbracket)$.

These products can be constructed using the homotopy transfer lemma (see e.g. [14]). The construction can be summarized as follows:

- Split K^\bullet as a direct sum of graded vector spaces

$$K^\bullet = H \oplus I \oplus R$$

such that $\mathrm{Im} d = I$ and $\mathrm{Ker} d = H \oplus I$. In this way $H \cong HK^\bullet$ and d restricts to an isomorphism $d_{IR} : R \rightarrow I$.

- Let h be the map

$$h : H \oplus I \oplus R \rightarrow H \oplus I \oplus R : (u, v, w) \mapsto (0, 0, d_{R \rightarrow I}^{-1}(v)).$$

In this way the projection onto H becomes $\pi = 1 - dh - hd$.

- for $x_1, \dots, x_k \in H$ we define

$$[x_1, \dots, x_k]^k = \sum_t c_t \pi[\dots, h[x_i, x_j], \dots,]$$

as a linear combination of all possible ways of fully bracketed expressions where each internal bracket is composed with an h . (The precise coefficients c_t will not matter in our discussion.)

In our case we will take $K = \text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$, $H \cong \text{HH}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$ to be the span of the classes we constructed, and we take I and R to be compatible with the G -grading.

THEOREM 3.25. If \mathcal{A} satisfies [NL2] then we can choose a split such that all higher brackets are zero.

PROOF. First note that $[\nu_1, -] = 0$ in $\text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$, so $[\nu_1, -, \dots, -]^k$ will also be zero.

To show that the other brackets are zero, pick any \mathbb{Z} -grading of the gentle algebra. Then we can assume that the bracket $[\cdot]^k$ has degree $2 - k$ for this grading and degree 0 for the $G = H(S \setminus M, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{Z})$ -grading. As we assumed that \mathcal{A} has no loops, there are at least two punctures so the G -degree of ℓ_m is nontrivial for each marked point.

If all the entries of the bracket have G -degree 0 (which means that they are all arc classes, which have \mathbb{Z} -degree 0), then the homotopy transfer lemma tells us that the product must be zero because all pairs $[\nu_\lambda, \nu_\kappa]$ are already zero in $\text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$.

Suppose that there is at least one $\nu_{p,e}$ in one entry. We make the following distinctions:

- All the entries have G -degree a multiple of $\deg_G \ell_m$. In that case the G -degree of the result will be $r \deg_G \ell_m$ for some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and therefore the \mathbb{Z} -degree must be either $r \deg_{\mathbb{Z}} \ell_m$ if the result is even or $r \deg_{\mathbb{Z}} \ell_m - 1$ if the result is odd. The total \mathbb{Z} -degree of the entries is at most $r \deg_{\mathbb{Z}} \ell_m$ and this only happens if all entries are all even. Because the product has degree $2 - k$ it can only be nonzero for degree reasons if $2 - k \geq -1$, or in other words if $k = 2, 3$.
- Some entries have degrees that turn around different punctures. If the result has G -degree $\deg_G \ell_m^j$ then the G -degree of the entries must also be $\deg_G \ell_m^j$ but if there are degrees for more than one marked point all marked points must appear because the only relation between the degrees of the ℓ_m is that $\sum_{m \in M} \deg_G \ell_m = 0$. On the other hand by lemma 3.6 we have that $\sum_m \deg_{\mathbb{Z}} \ell_m \leq -1$, so the \mathbb{Z} -degree of the result must be $\leq \deg_{\mathbb{Z}} \ell_m^j + 2 - k - 1$. This is impossible if $k \geq 3$.

From the discussions above we see that because of degree reasons the only nontrivial higher brackets are of the form

$$[\nu_{(m,i_1),e}, \nu_{(m,i_2),e}, \nu_{(m,i_3),e}] = \lambda \nu_{(m,i_1+i_2+i_3),o}$$

or cases where one or more $\nu_{(m,i_j),e}$ are ν_λ s. To show that these products are all zero, we have to look at the homotopy transfer construction in detail. The triple product can be written down in terms of expressions of the form

$$\pi[h[\nu_{(m,i_1),e}, \nu_{(m,i_2),e}], \nu_{(m,i_3),e}]$$

where π is the projection onto homology. We will now argue why such terms are zero.

From our computation in 3.24 we know that

$$\begin{aligned} [\nu_{(m,i_1),e}, \nu_{(m,i_2),e}]^0 &= 0 \\ [\nu_{(m,i_1),e}, \nu_{(m,i_2),e}]^1 &= ((i_2 - i_1)\nu_{(m,i_1+i_1),e})^1 \end{aligned}$$

So $[\nu_{(m,i_1),e}, \nu_{(m,i_2),e}] = (i_2 - i_1)\nu_{(m,i_1+i_2),e} + d\kappa$ with $(d\kappa)^{\leq 1} = 0$. From the construction in section 3.2, we can choose κ such that $\kappa^0 = 0$. For what follows, choose $R^{\text{odd}} = R_1 \oplus R_2$ (in a G -graded way) such that $R_1^{\neq 0} = R_2^0 = 0$ and $R_1 \cap Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) = 0$. With respect to the direct sum $\text{CC}^{\text{odd}} = H^{\text{odd}} \oplus I^{\text{odd}} \oplus R_1 \oplus R_2$ write $\kappa = h + i + r_1 + r_2$. Then $0 = \kappa^0 = h^0 + r_1^0$, hence $r_1 = r_1^0 = -h^0 \in R_1 \cap Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) = 0$ and we conclude $\kappa = i + r_2$. Simply subtracting i from κ keeps $\kappa^0 = 0$ and brings κ into $R_2 \subseteq R$. Finally

$$[h[\nu_{(m,i_1),e}, \nu_{(m,i_2),e}], \nu_{(m,i_3),e}]^0 = [\kappa, \nu_{(m,i_3),e}]^0 = \nu_{(m,i_3),e}(\kappa^0) \pm \kappa^1(\nu_{(m,i_3),e}^0) = 0$$

Therefore all contributions are zero. \square

COROLLARY 3.26. If \mathcal{A} has no loops or two-cycles then $\text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}), d, [,]$ is formal. In other words there is an L_∞ -quasi-isomorphism between $\text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}), d, [,]$ and $\text{HH}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}), 0, [,]$.

3.5. Classifying curved deformations. As an application of our computations we will show that every curved deformation of $\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is equivalent to one of the $r_{\mathbb{P}}$. Remember that if (A, μ) is an A_∞ -algebra over \mathbb{k} and R is a complete local Noetherian unital commutative \mathbb{C} -algebra with maximal ideal R^+ and residue field $R/R^+ = \mathbb{C}$ then a curved deformation is an odd element $\nu \in \text{Hom}(\bigoplus_i A^{\otimes_i}, A) \widehat{\otimes} R^+$ such that $\mu + \nu$ satisfies the curved A_∞ -axioms. As we indicated before this equation is equivalent to the Maurer-Cartan equation for the Hochschild cochain complex together with the Gerstenhaber bracket [11].

THEOREM 3.27. If [NL2] holds, then every curved A_∞ -deformation of $\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}$ over R is equivalent to one of the $r_{\mathbb{P}}$.

PROOF. We give a proof in terms of deformation functors, in the language of [13]. In short, we interpret our explicit class of deformations $r_{\mathbb{P}}$ as a functor of Artin rings. Gauging by even elements acts on the values of this functor and lands in Maurer-Cartan elements. The first part of the proof deals with the case of R being Artinian. In the second part of the proof, we pass to the non-Artinian case.

Let Art denote the category of Artinian local Noetherian unital commutative rings over \mathbb{C} with residue field \mathbb{C} , with morphisms being local ($\varphi(R^+) \subseteq S^+$) and unital ($\varphi(1_R) = 1_S$). We build three functors $G, F, \text{MC} : \text{Art} \rightarrow \text{Set}$. The functor G is the gauge group functor, F is the functor of our deformation parameters r , and MC is the standard Maurer-Cartan functor. More precisely, define

$$\begin{aligned} G(R) &:= \exp(\text{CC}^{\text{even}}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \widehat{\otimes} R^+), \\ F(R) &:= Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \widehat{\otimes} R^+, \\ \text{MC}(R) &:= \text{MC}(\text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}), R). \end{aligned}$$

All three assignments come with natural restriction maps $G(R) \rightarrow G(S)$, $F(R) \rightarrow F(S)$ and $\text{MC}(R) \rightarrow \text{MC}(S)$ for every morphism $\varphi : R \rightarrow S$ in Art . It is standard to check that all three are deformation functors in the sense of [13, Definition 2.5].

In fact, G and F as well as their product functor $G \times F$ are smooth (unobstructed) in the sense of [13, Definition 2.8]. Regard now the morphism of functors given by

$$\Phi(R) : G(R) \times F(R) \rightarrow \text{MC}(R), (g, r) \mapsto g \cdot {}^r\mu.$$

Let us define obstruction theories $O_{G \times F}$ and O_{MC} for $G \times F$ and MC by defining both $O_{G \times F} := 0$ and $O_{\text{MC}} := 0$ to be trivial. We will now show that Φ is smooth by applying [13, Proposition 2.17]. In the terminology of that paper, we have to check three items: (1) $\Phi(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$ is surjective where $\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon] = \mathbb{C}[X]/(X^2)$ is the ring of dual numbers, (2) the obstruction theory $O_{G \times F} = 0$ is complete, (3) the morphism between obstruction theories $O_{G \times F} \rightarrow O_{\text{MC}}$ is injective and compatible with Φ .

We check the three conditions. (1) Let $\varepsilon c \in \text{MC}(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$. Then c is a Hochschild cocycle and can be gauged by some $g \in G(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$ to be equal to an ${}^r\mu$ for some $r \in \varepsilon Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}})$. In other words, we have $\Phi(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])(g, r) = \varepsilon c$. This proves $\Phi(\mathbb{C}[\varepsilon])$ surjective. Item (2) and item (3) are trivial because $G \times F$ is smooth.

The standard smoothness criterion [13, Proposition 2.17] implies that Φ is smooth. Putting $S = \mathbb{C}$ in the definition of smoothness implies that $\Phi(R) : G(R) \times F(R) \rightarrow \text{MC}(R)$ is surjective for every $R \in \text{Art}$. In other words, every deformation of $\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}$ over $R \in \text{Art}$ is equivalent to an ${}^r\mu$ by gauge equivalence.

In the second part of the proof, we generalize to the non-Artinian case. Let R be a complete local Noetherian unital commutative \mathbb{C} -algebra with residue field \mathbb{C} . Let $\mu \in \text{MC}(\text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}), R)$ be a deformation over R , meaning a Maurer-Cartan element in the completed tensor product $\mu \in \text{CC}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \widehat{\otimes} R^+$. Our aim is to show that μ is gauge equivalent to some ${}^r\mu$ with $r \in Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \widehat{\otimes} R^+$.

Our strategy is to truncate μ to $R/(R^+)^i$ for every i and use the first part of the proof to construct an element r_i and a gauge g_i . We use smoothness of Φ to force both sequences (r_i) and (g_i) to converge.

Put $\mu_i := \pi_i(\mu) \in \text{MC}(R/(R^+)^i)$. We shall construct sequences $r_i \in F(R/(R^+)^i)$ and $g_i \in G(R/(R^+)^i)$ such that (1) $\Phi(R/(R^+)^i)(g_i, r_i) = \mu_i$, (2) $\pi_i(r_{i+1}) = r_i$ and (3) $\pi_i(g_{i+1}) = g_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. For the induction base $i = 1$, let $g_1 := 1 \in G(\mathbb{C})$ and $r_1 := 0 \in F(\mathbb{C})$. Since $\Phi(\mathbb{C})(g_1, r_1) = 0 = \mu_1 \in \text{MC}(\mathbb{C})$, the three conditions are satisfied at $i = 1$.

For induction hypothesis, assume the sequences have already been constructed until index i . Since Φ is smooth, we have a surjection

$$G(R/(R^+)^{i+1}) \times F(R/(R^+)^{i+1}) \twoheadrightarrow (G(R/(R^+)^i) \times F(R/(R^+)^i)) \times_{\text{MC}(R/(R^+)^i)} \text{MC}(R/(R^+)^{i+1}).$$

Pick (g_i, r_i, μ_{i+1}) on the right hand side. Indeed, $\Phi(R/(R^+)^i)(g_i, r_i) = \mu_i = \pi_i(\mu_{i+1})$ by assumption and construction. By surjectivity there is a lift (g_{i+1}, r_{i+1}) such that (1) $\Phi(R/(R^+)^{i+1})(g_{i+1}, r_{i+1}) = \mu_{i+1}$ and (2) $\pi_i(r_{i+1}) = r_i$ and (3) $\pi_i(g_{i+1}) = g_i$. This finishes the induction step.

Finally, we have constructed the desired sequences (r_i) and (g_i) . Since $\pi_i(r_{i+1}) = r_i$, the sequence r_i converges to some $r \in Z(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \widehat{\otimes} R^+$ and g_i converges to some $g \in \exp(\text{CC}^{\text{even}}(\text{Gtl}_{\mathcal{A}}) \widehat{\otimes} R^+)$. Within $\text{MC}(R/(R^+)^i)$ we have

$$\pi_i(g \cdot {}^r\mu) = \Phi(R/(R^+)^i)(g_i, r_i) = \mu_i = \pi_i(\mu), \quad \forall i \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Passing to the limit gives that $g \cdot {}^r\mu = \mu$ within $\text{MC}(R)$. In other words, μ is gauge equivalent to ${}^r\mu$. \square

REMARK 3.28. In remark 2.26 we extended the notion of orbifolds to allow weights on the faces and the marked points. This allows us to construct curved deformations $r, s_{\mathbb{P}}$ of the (completed) gentle algebra without its A_{∞} -structure coming from the Wrapped Fukaya category. It is also possible to show that every deformation of the completed gentle algebra is equivalent to one of these forms. This nicely fits into the framework of Koszul duality because Koszul dual A_{∞} -algebras have the same deformation theory.

References

- [1] Mohammed Abouzaid et al. “Homological mirror symmetry for punctured spheres”. In: **Journal of the American Mathematical Society** 26.4 (2013), pp. 1051–1083.
- [2] Ibrahim Assem et al. “Gentle algebras arising from surface triangulations”. In: **Algebra Number Theory** 4.2 (2010), pp. 201–229.
- [3] Michael J Bardzell. “The alternating syzygy behavior of monomial algebras”. In: **Journal of Algebra** 188.1 (1997), pp. 69–89.
- [4] Alexander Beilinson, Victor Ginzburg, and Wolfgang Soergel. “Koszul duality patterns in representation theory”. In: **J. Amer. Math. Soc.** 9.2 (1996), pp. 473–527. ISSN: 0894-0347.
- [5] Raf Bocklandt. “Noncommutative mirror symmetry for punctured surfaces”. In: **Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.** 368.1 (2016). With an appendix by Mohammed Abouzaid, pp. 429–469.
- [6] Alexander I Efimov. “Homological mirror symmetry for curves of higher genus”. In: **arXiv preprint arXiv:0907.3903** (2009).
- [7] Sheel Ganatra. **Symplectic Cohomology and Duality for the Wrapped Fukaya Category**. Thesis (Ph.D.)—Massachusetts Institute of Technology. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2012, (no paging).
- [8] Murray Gerstenhaber. “The cohomology structure of an associative ring”. In: **Annals of Mathematics** (1963), pp. 267–288.
- [9] F. Haiden, L. Katzarkov, and M. Kontsevich. “Flat surfaces and stability structures”. In: **Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.** 126 (2017), pp. 247–318.
- [10] Bernhard Keller. “A-infinity algebras, modules and functor categories”. In: **Contemporary Mathematics** 406 (2006), pp. 67–94.
- [11] Maxim Kontsevich and Yan Soibelman. “Deformation theory”. In: **Livre en préparation** (2002).
- [12] Yankı Lekili and Alexander Polishchuk. “Derived equivalences of gentle algebras via Fukaya categories”. In: **Mathematische Annalen** 376.1 (2020), pp. 187–225.
- [13] Marco Manetti. “Deformation theory via differential graded Lie algebras”. In: **arXiv preprint math/0507284** (2005).
- [14] Martin Markl. “Transferring A_{∞} (strongly homotopy associative) structures”. In: **arXiv preprint math/0401007** (2004).
- [15] Stephan Mescher. “A primer on A-infinity-algebras and their Hochschild homology”. In: **arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.03963** (2016).
- [16] Sebastian Oppen, Pierre-Guy Plamondon, and Sibylle Schroll. “A geometric model for the derived category of gentle algebras”. In: **arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09659** (2018).

- [17] Alexander F. Ritter and Ivan Smith. “The monotone wrapped Fukaya category and the open-closed string map”. In: (2012). DOI: 10.1007/s00029-016-0255-9. eprint: [arXiv:1201.5880](#).
- [18] Paul Seidel. “Homological mirror symmetry for the genus two curve”. In: **arXiv preprint arXiv:0812.1171** (2008).
- [19] Jim Stasheff. “L-infinity and A-infinity structures: then and now”. In: **Higher Structures** 3.1 (2019).
- [20] Michael Wong. “Dimer models and Hochschild cohomology”. In: **Journal of Algebra** 585 (2021), pp. 207–279.

KdV INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: r.r.j.bocklandt@uva.nl

KdV INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM, AMSTERDAM, THE NETHERLANDS
E-mail address: j.d.c.vandekreeke3@uva.nl