

# SOME ASPECTS OF THE THEORY OF NODAL ORDERS

IGOR BURBAN AND YURIY DROZD

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we elaborate ring theoretic properties of nodal orders. In particular, we prove that they are closed under taking crossed products with finite groups.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Nodal orders are non-commutative generalizations of the ring  $\mathbb{k}\llbracket x, y \rrbracket / (xy)$ , where  $\mathbb{k}$  is a field. This class of rings was introduced by the second-named author in [5].

**Definition 1.1.** Let  $R$  be an excellent reduced equidimensional ring of Krull dimension one and  $K := \text{Quot}(R)$  the corresponding total ring of fractions. An  $R$ -algebra  $A$  is an  $R$ -order if the following conditions are fulfilled:

- $A$  is a finitely generated torsion free  $R$ -module.
- $A_K := K \otimes_R A$  is a semi-simple  $K$ -algebra, having finite length as a  $K$ -module.

A ring  $A$  is an *order* if its center  $R = Z(A)$  is a reduced excellent equidimensional ring of Krull dimension one, and  $A$  is an  $R$ -order. If  $K := \text{Quot}(R)$  then  $A_K := K \otimes_R A$  is called *rational envelope* of the order  $A$ .

**Definition 1.2.** An order  $A$  is called *nodal* if its center is semi-local and there exists a *hereditary* overorder  $H \supseteq A$  such that the following conditions are satisfied.

- $J := \text{rad}(A) = \text{rad}(H)$ .
- For any finitely generated simple left  $A$ -module  $U$  the length of  $H \otimes_A U$  over  $A$  is at most two.

It is clear that an order  $A$  is nodal if and only if its radical completion  $\widehat{A}$  is nodal. Moreover, given a nodal order  $A$ , a hereditary overorder  $H$  from Definition 1.2 is *uniquely determined* and admits the following intrinsic description:

$$(1) \quad H = \{x \in A_K \mid xJ \subseteq J\} \cong \text{End}_A(J),$$

where  $J$  is viewed as a right  $A$ -module and  $A_K$  is the rational envelope of  $A$  (this is essentially a consequence of [8, Theorem 39.11 and Corollary 39.12]). For a nodal order  $A$ , the order  $H$  will be called *hereditary cover* of  $A$ . Hereditary orders form a special subclass of nodal orders.

Let  $R = \mathbb{k}\llbracket t \rrbracket$  be the algebra of formal power series, where  $\mathbb{k}$  is an algebraically closed field. It was shown in [5] that an  $R$ -order  $A$  is representation wild (i.e. the category of

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 16E60, 16G60, 14A22, 16S38.

*Key words and phrases.* nodal orders, nodal pairs, crossed products.

finite length left  $A$ -modules is representation wild) unless  $A$  is nodal. On the other hand, proper nodal orders (i.e. those orders which are not hereditary) are representation tame (hereditary orders are well-known to be representation discrete; see for instance [6]). In our joint work [1], we proved that the derived category of the category of finite length modules over an nodal order  $A$  has tame representation type.

Of great interest is the global version of nodal orders given by (tame) non-commutative projective nodal curves; see for instance [3, 4].

The main result of this work the following.

**Theorem.** Let  $A$  be a nodal order and  $G$  be a finite group acting on  $A$  (this means that we are given a map  $G \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbf{Aut}(A)$  and a normed two-cocycle  $G \times G \xrightarrow{\omega} A^*$  satisfying certain compatibility conditions described below). If  $|G|$  is invertible in  $A$  then the crossed product ring  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is again a nodal order.

*Acknowledgement.* The work of the first-named author was partially supported by the German Research Foundation SFB-TRR 358/1 2023 – 491392403.

## 2. REMINDER ON CROSSED PRODUCT RINGS

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $A$  be a ring,  $A^*$  be its group of units and  $G$  be a finite group. Assume we are given a pair of maps

$$(2) \quad G \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbf{Aut}(A) \quad \text{and} \quad G \times G \xrightarrow{\omega} A^*$$

satisfying the following conditions.

- $\phi_{g_1}(\phi_{g_2}(a)) = \omega_{g_1, g_2} \cdot (\phi_{g_1 g_2}(a)) \cdot \omega_{g_1, g_2}^{-1}$  for all  $g_1, g_2 \in G$  and  $a \in A$ .
- $\phi_e = \mathbf{Id}$  and  $\omega_{g, e} = 1 = \omega_{e, g}$  for all  $g \in G$ , where  $e \in G$  is the neutral element.
- $\phi_g(\omega_{g', g''}) \cdot \omega_{g, g' g''} = \omega_{g, g'} \cdot \omega_{g g', g''}$  for all  $g, g', g'' \in G$ .

Then we say that  $G$  acts on  $A$  via  $\phi$  with a system of factors  $\omega$ ; see [9]. The corresponding crossed product  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is a free left  $A$ -module of rank  $|G|$ :

$$(3) \quad A[G, (\phi, \omega)] = \left\{ \sum_{g \in G} a_g [g] \mid a_g \in A \right\}$$

equipped with the product given by the rule

$$a[f] \cdot b[g] := a\phi_f(b)\omega_{f, g}[fg] \text{ for any } a, b \in A \text{ and } f, g \in G.$$

It is not difficult to show that  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is a unital ring, whose multiplicative unit element is  $1[e]$ ; see [9].

**Remark 2.2.** Let  $G \times G \xrightarrow{\omega^\circ} A^*$  be trivial, i.e.  $\omega_{g_1, g_2}^\circ = 1$  for all  $g_1, g_2 \in G$ . Then  $G \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbf{Aut}(A)$  is a group homomorphism and  $A[G, (\phi, \omega^\circ)] = A * G$  is called skew group ring of  $A$ .

If the ring  $A$  is commutative, then  $G \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbf{Aut}(A)$  is automatically a group homomorphism.

**Definition 2.3.** A ring extension  $A \subseteq B$  is called *strictly separable* if it satisfies the following properties.

- (1) The multiplication map  $B \otimes_A B \xrightarrow{\mu} B$  is a split epimorphism of  $B$ -bimodules.
- (2) The inclusion  $A \xrightarrow{i} B$  is a split monomorphism of  $A$ -bimodules.
- (3)  $B$  is projective as a left  $A$ -module and flat as a right  $A$ -module.

**Remark 2.4.** The first condition of Definition 2.3 implies that  $B$  is a direct summand of  $B \otimes_A B$  viewed as an  $B$ -subbimodule. An equivalent characterization of the first condition is the following: there exists an element  $w \in B \otimes_A B$  such that  $\mu(w) = 1$  and  $bw = wb$  for all  $b \in B$ . Similarly, the second condition of Definition 2.3 implies that  $A$  is a direct summand of  $B$  viewed as an  $A$ -subbimodule.

For a ring  $C$  and a left  $C$ -module  $M$  we denote by  $\text{pd}_C(M)$  its projective dimension.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $A \subseteq B$  be a strictly separable ring extension.*

- (1) *For any left  $B$ -module  $M$  we have:  $\text{pd}_B(M) = \text{pd}_A(M)$ .*
- (2) *For any left  $A$ -module  $N$  we have:  $\text{pd}_A(N) = \text{pd}_B(B \otimes_A N)$ .*
- (3) *The left global dimensions of  $A$  and  $B$  are equal.*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $M$  be any left  $B$ -module. Since any projective resolution of  $M$  in  $B\text{-Mod}$  is also a projective resolution in  $A\text{-Mod}$ , we have:  $\text{pd}_B(M) \geq \text{pd}_A(M)$ . Because the functor  $B \otimes_A -$  is exact and maps projective  $A$ -modules to projective  $B$ -modules, we have:  $\text{pd}_A(M) \geq \text{pd}_B(B \otimes_A M)$ . Next, observe that  $B \otimes_A M \cong (B \otimes_A B) \otimes_B M$ . Since  $B$  is a  $B$ -bimodule direct summand of  $B \otimes_A B$ , it follows that the  $B$ -module  $M$  is a direct summand of  $B \otimes_A M$ . Hence,  $\text{pd}_B(B \otimes_A M) \geq \text{pd}_B(M)$  and, as a consequence,  $\text{pd}_A(M) \geq \text{pd}_B(M)$ . Hence,  $\text{pd}_B(M) = \text{pd}_A(M)$ , as asserted.

(2) Let  $N$  be any left  $A$ -module. Using again the fact that the functor  $B \otimes_A -$  is exact and maps projective  $A$ -modules to projective  $B$ -modules, we have:

$$\text{pd}_A(N) \geq \text{pd}_B(B \otimes_A N) = \text{pd}_A(B \otimes_A N) \geq \text{pd}_A(N),$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that  $A$  is a direct summand of  $B$  viewed as  $A$ -subbimodule. Hence,  $\text{pd}_A(N) = \text{pd}_B(B \otimes_A N)$ , as asserted.

(3) This statement is a consequence of the previous two. □

**Proposition 2.6.** *Let  $A$  be a ring and  $G$  be a finite group acting on  $A$  via a datum  $(\phi, \omega)$ , as in Definition 2.1. Assume that  $n := |G|$  is a unit element in  $A$ . Then the ring extension  $A \subseteq A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is strictly separable.*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is a finitely generated projective  $A$ -module, viewed as a left or as a right module. Next, the map

$$A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \xrightarrow{\pi} A, \quad \sum_{g \in G} a_g [g] \mapsto a_e,$$

is a morphism of  $A$ -bimodules. It follows that the inclusion  $A \xrightarrow{\iota} A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is split. Finally, consider the following element

$$w := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g \in G} \omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} [g] \otimes [g^{-1}] \in B \otimes_A B.$$

It is clear that  $\mu(w) = 1$ . Next, for any  $g \in G$  and  $a \in A$  we have the following equalities in  $B \otimes_A B$ :

$$[g] \otimes [g^{-1}]a = [g] \otimes \phi_{g^{-1}}(a)[g^{-1}] = [g]\phi_{g^{-1}}(a) \otimes [g^{-1}] = \phi_g(\phi_{g^{-1}}(a))[g] \otimes [g^{-1}].$$

Since  $\omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} \phi_g(\phi_{g^{-1}}(a)) = \phi_e(a) \omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} = a \omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1}$ , we conclude that  $wa = aw$  for any  $a \in A$ .

Next, let  $g, h \in G$ . Then we have the following equalities in  $B \otimes_A B$ :

$$\omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} [g] \otimes [g^{-1}][h] = \omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} [g] \omega_{g^{-1}, h} \otimes [g^{-1}h] = \omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} \phi_g(\omega_{g^{-1}, h}) [g] \otimes [g^{-1}h].$$

Since  $\phi_g(\omega_{g^{-1}, h}) \omega_{g, g^{-1}} = \omega_{g, g^{-1}}$ , we see that  $\omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} \phi_g(\omega_{g^{-1}, h}) = \omega_{g, g^{-1}h}^{-1}$ . As a consequence, we get:

$$w[h] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g \in G} \omega_{g, g^{-1}h}^{-1} [g] \otimes [g^{-1}h].$$

In a similar way, we have:

$$[h] \omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1} [g] \otimes [g^{-1}] = \phi_h(\omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1}) \omega_{h, g} [hg] \otimes [g^{-1}].$$

Since  $\phi_h(\omega_{g, g^{-1}}^{-1}) = \phi_h(\omega_{g, g^{-1}}) \omega_{h, e} = \omega_{h, g} \omega_{hg, g^{-1}}$ , we obtain:  $\phi_h(\omega_{g, g^{-1}})^{-1} \omega_{h, g} = \omega_{hg, g^{-1}}^{-1}$ . It follows that

$$[h]w = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g \in G} \omega_{hg, g^{-1}}^{-1} [hg] \otimes [g^{-1}] = w[h]$$

for any  $h \in G$ . Thus, we have shown that  $bw = wb$  for any  $b \in A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *Assume that the assumptions of Proposition 2.6 are fulfilled. Then Lemma 2.5 implies that  $A$  is semi-simple if and only if  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is semi-simple. Analogously,  $A$  is left (respectively, right) hereditary if and only if  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is left (respectively, right) hereditary.*

**Remark 2.8.** Proposition 2.6 and Corollary 2.7 are essentially due to Reiten and Riedtmann; see [9, Theorem 1.3]. Our exposition slightly deviates from the one of [9].

**Theorem 2.9.** *Let  $A$  be a ring and  $G$  be a finite group acting on  $A$  via a datum  $(\phi, \omega)$  as above. Let  $P$  be  $G$ -invariant left  $A$ -module, i.e. for any  $g \in G$  we have an automorphism of abelian groups  $P \xrightarrow{\alpha_g} P$  such that  $\alpha_g(ap) = \phi_g(a) \alpha_g(p)$  for any  $a \in A$  and  $p \in P$ .*

(i) *There is an action  $(\psi, \xi)$  of  $G$  on the ring  $\text{End}_A(P)$  given by the following rules.*

(a)  $G \xrightarrow{\psi} \text{Aut}(\text{End}_A(P)), g \mapsto (\rho \xrightarrow{\psi_g} \alpha_g \rho \alpha_g^{-1}).$

(b)  $G \times G \xrightarrow{\xi} \text{Aut}_A(P), (f, g) \mapsto \xi_{f, g} := \lambda_{\omega_{f, g}^{-1}} \alpha_f \alpha_g \alpha_{fg}^{-1}$ , where  $P \xrightarrow{\lambda_b} P$  is given by the formula  $\lambda_b(p) = bp$  for any  $b \in A$  and  $p \in P$ .

(ii) Moreover, the map

$$(4) \quad \text{End}_A(P)[G, (\psi, \xi)] \xrightarrow{\Phi} \text{End}_{A[G, (\phi, \omega)]}(A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P)$$

assigning to an element  $\rho\{g\} \in \text{End}_A(P)[G, (\psi, \xi)]$  the endomorphism

$$A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P \longrightarrow A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P, [h] \otimes p \mapsto [h][g]^{-1} \otimes \rho(\alpha_g(p))$$

is a ring isomorphism.

*Proof.* Let  $f, g \in G$ . It is not difficult to check that  $\xi_{f,g} : P \rightarrow P$  is  $A$ -linear. Next, it is obvious that  $\psi_e = \text{Id}$  and  $\xi_{g,e} = 1 = \xi_{e,g}$  for all  $g \in G$ . Another straightforward computation shows that  $\xi_{f,g} \cdot (\psi_{fg}(\rho)) = \psi_f(\psi_g(\rho)) \cdot \xi_{f,g}$  for all  $f, g \in G$  and  $\rho \in \text{End}_A(P)$ . The fact that  $\psi_f(\xi_{g,h}) \cdot \xi_{f,gh} = \xi_{f,g} \cdot \xi_{fg,h}$  for any  $f, g, h \in G$  can also be checked by a lengthy but completely straightforward verification.

It is again straightforward that the map  $\Phi$  given by (4) is indeed a ring homomorphism. To show that  $\Phi$  is bijective, consider the following commutative diagram of abelian groups:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{End}_A(P)[G, (\psi, \xi)] & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & \text{End}_{A[G, (\phi, \omega)]}(A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P) \\ & \searrow \Psi & \downarrow \text{can} \\ & & \text{Hom}_A(P, A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P) \end{array}$$

where  $\text{can}$  is the adjunction isomorphism and  $\Psi$  is the map given by the formula

$$\Psi\left(\sum_{g \in G} \rho_g\{g\}\right)(p) = \sum_{g \in G} [g]^{-1} \otimes \rho_g(\alpha_g(p))$$

for any  $p \in P$ . For a fixed  $g \in G$  let  $\vartheta_g := \rho_g \alpha_g$ . Then for any  $a \in A$  and  $p \in P$  we have:  $\vartheta_g(ap) = \phi_g(a)\vartheta_g(p)$ . Note that we have an isomorphism of  $A$ -modules

$$A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P \cong \bigoplus_{g \in G} P_g,$$

where  $P_g = P$  as an abelian group, whereas the  $A$ -module structure on  $P_g$  is given by the formula  $a * p := \phi_g(a) \circ p$  (here,  $\circ$  is the action of  $A$  on  $P$ ). It follows that for any  $\vartheta \in \text{Hom}_A(P, A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P)$  one can find a unique family  $\{\rho_g\}_{g \in G}$  of endomorphisms of  $P$  such that  $\Psi(\sum_{g \in G} \rho_g\{g\}) = \vartheta$ . Hence,  $\Psi$  is bijective and, as a consequence,  $\Phi$  is bijective, too.  $\square$

### 3. NODAL PAIRS

Let  $A$  be a ring and  $J = \text{rad}(A)$  be its Jacobson radical. Recall that a ring  $A$  is called *semilocal* if  $\bar{A} := A/J$  is artinian. If, moreover,  $A/J$  is a direct product of skewfields, we call  $A$  *basic*. Also, if  $M$  is an  $A$ -module, we denote  $\bar{M} := M/JM$ . For an  $A$ -module  $M$  we denote by  $\mu_A(M)$  the minimal number of generators of  $M$  and by  $\ell_A(M)$  the length of  $M$ . For a pair of semilocal rings  $A \subseteq H$  we denote

$$\ell^*(A, H) = \sup\{\ell_A(H \otimes_A U) \mid U \text{ is a simple } A\text{-module}\}.$$

**Definition 3.1.** Let  $A \subseteq H$  be a pair of semilocal rings.

- (1) This pair is called *Backström* if  $\text{rad}(A) = \text{rad}(H)$ .
- (2) It is called *nodal* if it is Backström and  $\ell^*(A, H) \leq 2$ .
- (3) If  $H$  is left hereditary and this pair is Backström (nodal),  $A$  is called a (left) *Backström ring* (respectively, a (left) *nodal ring*).

The following fact is obvious.

**Proposition 3.2.** *If a pair  $A \subseteq H$  is nodal, so is the pair  $\bar{A} \subseteq \bar{H}$ . Conversely, if this pair is Backström and the pair  $\bar{A} \subseteq \bar{H}$  is nodal, the pair  $A \subseteq H$  is nodal too.*

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $A \subseteq H$  be a Backström pair,  $P$  be a progenerator in the category of right  $A$ -modules,  $A' = \text{End}_A(P)$ ,  $P' = H \otimes_A P$  and  $H' = \text{End}_H(P')$ . Then*

- (1)  $P'$  is a progenerator in the category of right  $H$ -modules.
- (2)  $A' \subseteq H'$  is a Backström pair.
- (3)  $\ell^*(A', H') = \ell^*(A, H)$ .

*In particular, the properties of a ring “to be Backström” and “to be nodal” are Morita invariant.*

*Proof.* See [7] (proof of Proposition 3.1). □

Under the conditions of this lemma we say that the pair  $A' \subseteq H'$  is *Morita equivalent* to the pair  $A \subseteq H$ .

We shall need the following combinatorial statement.

**Lemma 3.4.** *For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  let  $B = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & \dots & b_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{n1} & \dots & b_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{N}_0)$  be such that*

- $b_{ii} > 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .
- For any  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$  we have:  $b_{ij} \neq 0$  if and only if  $b_{ji} \neq 0$ .

For  $\vec{a} = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 \\ \vdots \\ a_n \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{N}^n$  and  $\vec{a}' = B\vec{a}$  consider the following assertions:

- (1)  $a'_i \leq 2a_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .
- (2) For each  $1 \leq i \leq n$  the following condition holds: either  $b_{ii} \leq 2$  and  $b_{ij} = 0$  for all  $j \neq i$  or there is a unique index  $1 \leq i' \neq i \leq n$  such that  $a_i = a_{i'}$ ,  $b_{ii} = b_{i'i} = b_{i'i} = b_{i'i} = 1$  and  $b_{ij} = 0$  for all  $j \notin \{i, i'\}$ .
- (3)  $\sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} \leq 2$  for all  $i$ .

(1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) and, if all  $a_i$  are equal, (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).

*Proof.* Obviously, (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1), (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) and, if all  $a_i$  are equal, (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).

(1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) is proved by induction on  $n$ . The case  $n = 1$  is trivial. Obviously, always  $b_{ii} \leq 2$ . If there is an index  $i$  such that  $a_{ij} = 0$  for all  $j \neq i$ , just apply the induction to

the set of all indices except  $i$ . Suppose there are no such indices,  $a_i$  is the smallest and  $b_{ii'} \neq 0$  for some  $i' \neq i$ . Then  $a_{i'} = a_i$ ,  $b_{ii} = b_{ii'} = 1$  and  $b_{ij} = 0$  if  $j \notin \{i, i'\}$ . As also  $b_{i'i} \neq 0$ , we get  $b_{i'i'} = b_{i'i} = 1$  and  $b_{i'j} = 0$  if  $j \notin \{i, i'\}$ . Now apply induction to the set of all indices except  $i$  and  $i'$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $A \subseteq H$  be a Bäckström pair,  $U_1, U_2, \dots, U_n$  be all non-isomorphic simple  $A$ -modules and  $V_i = H \otimes_A U_i$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Consider the following assertions:*

- (1)  $\mu_A(H) \leq 2$ , i.e. there exists a surjective  $A$ -linear map  $A^2 \twoheadrightarrow H$ .
  - (2) For each  $1 \leq i \leq n$ , either  $V_i \cong U_i^{b_i}$  with  $b_i \leq 2$ , or there is a unique index  $i'$  such that  $V_i \cong V_{i'} \cong U_i \oplus U_{i'}$ .
  - (3)  $A \subseteq H$  is a nodal pair, i.e.  $\ell_A(V_i) \leq 2$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .
- (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) and, if  $A$  is basic, (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (1).

*Proof.* The implication (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) is obvious.

Due to Proposition 3.2, we can without loss of generality assume that  $A$  and  $H$  are semi-simple. There exists a collection of primitive orthogonal idempotents  $e_1, \dots, e_n \in A$  such that  $U_i \cong Ae_i$  and  $V_i \cong He_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Let  $A \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n U_i^{a_i}$  and  $V_i \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^n U_j^{b_{ij}}$ . Then

$$H \cong \bigoplus_{j=1}^n V_j^{a_j} \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^n U_i^{\sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} a_j}.$$

Note that  $b_{ij} \neq 0$  if and only if  $\text{Hom}_A(U_i, V_j) \cong e_i H e_j \neq 0$ . In particular,  $b_{ii} > 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Moreover, if  $e_i H e_j \neq 0$ , then also  $e_j H e_i \neq 0$ , since  $H$  is semi-simple. It follows that  $b_{ij} \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $b_{ij} = 0$  if and only if  $b_{ji} = 0$ . So, the matrix  $B = (b_{ij})$  satisfies the assumption of Lemma 3.4.

The first assertion  $\mu_A(H) \leq 2$  is true if and only if  $\sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} a_j \leq 2a_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . The third assertion means that  $\sum_{j=1}^n b_{ij} \leq 2$  for all  $i$ . Finally,  $A$  being basic means that  $a_i = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

By Lemma 3.4, we get an implication (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) and, if  $A$  is basic, all three statements are equivalent. Since assertions (2) and (3) are invariant under Morita equivalences (see [7]), (2)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (3) is true in a full generality.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.6.** *Let  $A \subseteq H$  be a Bäckström pair. Consider the following assertions:*

- (1)  $\mu_A(H) \leq 2$ .
- (2)  $A \subseteq H$  is a nodal pair.

*Then we have: (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) and (1)  $\Leftrightarrow$  (2) provided  $A$  is basic.*

#### 4. CROSSED PRODUCTS OF NODAL ORDERS

Let  $A$  be an order (see Definition 1.1) and  $G$  be a finite group of order  $n$  acting on  $A$  via a datum  $(\phi, \omega)$  as in Definition 2.1. We assume that  $n$  is invertible viewed as an element of  $A$ . We make the following observations.

- (1) Let  $R$  be the center of  $A$ . First note that  $n^{-1}$  belongs to  $R$ . Next, for any  $g \in G$  we have:  $\phi_g(R) = R$ . Moreover,  $\phi_{g_1}(\phi_{g_2}(r)) = \phi_{g_1g_2}(r)$  for any  $g_1, g_2 \in G$  and  $r \in R$ . The ring of invariants  $R^G$  is again an excellent reduced equidimensional ring of Krull dimension one. Moreover, the ring extension  $R^G \subseteq R$  is finite. These statements can be shown in a similar way as for instance [2, Theorem 4.1].
- (2) Let  $K$  be the total rings of quotients of  $R$  and  $A_K$  be the rational hull of  $A$ . Then the action of  $G$  on  $A$  extends to an action on  $A_K$ :

$$A_K \xrightarrow{\tilde{\phi}_g} A_K, \quad \frac{a}{b} \mapsto \frac{\phi_g(a)}{\phi_g(b)}.$$

We see that  $G$  acts on  $A_K$  via the datum  $(\tilde{\phi}, \omega)$ .

- (3) According to Corollary 2.7, the ring  $A_K[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]$  is semi-simple. Next,  $R^G$  is contained in the center of the ring  $A_K[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]$  and the extension  $R^G \subset A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is finite. Next,  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is torsion free viewed as a module over  $R^G$  and its rational hull is  $A_K[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]$ . It follows, that the crossed product  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is again an order.
- (4) Now assume that  $R$  is semi-local. Then  $A$  is semi-local, too. Recall that the Jacobson radical  $J$  of  $A$  has the following characterization:

$$J = \{x \in A \mid 1 + axb \in A^* \text{ for all } a, b \in A\}.$$

It is clear that  $\phi_g(J) = J$  for all  $g \in G$ . Let  $\bar{A} := A/J$ . It follows that for any  $g \in G$  we have an induced ring automorphism

$$\bar{A} \xrightarrow{\bar{\phi}_g} \bar{A}, \quad \bar{a} \mapsto \overline{\phi_g(a)}.$$

Let  $G \times G \xrightarrow{\bar{\omega}} \bar{A}^*$  be given by the composition of  $\omega$  and the natural group homomorphism  $A^* \rightarrow \bar{A}^*$ . It is clear that  $G$  acts on  $\bar{A}$  via the datum  $(\bar{\phi}, \bar{\omega})$ . By Corollary 2.7, the ring  $\bar{A}[G, (\bar{\phi}, \bar{\omega})]$  is semi-simple. It follows that  $J[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is the Jacobson radical of the order  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$ .

- (5) Consider the overorder  $H$  of  $A$  given by the formula (1). It follows that  $\tilde{\phi}_g(H) = H$  for all  $g \in G$ . Hence, the group  $G$  acts on  $H$  via the datum  $(\tilde{\phi}, \omega)$  and the crossed product  $H[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]$  is an overorder of  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$ . Moreover, if  $H$  is hereditary then  $H[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]$  is hereditary, too.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $A$  be a nodal order and  $G$  be a finite group of order  $n$  acting on  $A$  via a datum  $(\phi, \omega)$ . If  $n$  is invertible in  $A$  then the order  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is again nodal.*

*Proof.* A semi-local order is nodal if and only if its radical completion is nodal. Therefore we may without loss of generality assume that  $A$  is complete. Let us first suppose that  $A$  is basic. Let  $H$  be the hereditary cover of  $A$  (see (1) for a description of  $H$ ). By Corollary 3.6 we have:  $\mu_A(H) \leq 2$ . It follows that  $\mu_{A[G, (\phi, \omega)]}(H[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]) \leq 2$ , too. Next,  $J[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is the common radical of  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  and  $H[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]$ , hence  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \subseteq H[G, (\tilde{\phi}, \omega)]$  is a Bäckström pair. By Corollary 3.6, the order  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is nodal.



Let  $A$  be now an arbitrary nodal order. Let  $P$  be a projective generator of the category of finitely generated left  $A$ -modules, whose direct summands are pairwise non-isomorphic. Then  $A' := \text{End}_A(P)$  is a basic nodal order; see [7, Proposition 1.3]. The  $A$ -module  $P$  is invariant in the sense of Theorem 2.9. Hence,  $A'$  admits an action of  $G$  via a datum  $(\psi, \chi)$  such that  $A'[G, (\psi, \xi)] \cong \text{End}_{A[G, (\phi, \omega)]}(A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P)$ . By the previous step we know that  $A'[G, (\psi, \xi)]$  is a nodal order. Hence, the opposite order  $(A'[G, (\psi, \xi)])^\circ$  is nodal as well. On the other hand,  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)] \otimes_A P$  is a projective generator in the category of finitely generated left  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$ -modules. Hence,  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  and  $(A'[G, (\psi, \xi)])^\circ$  are Morita equivalent. Applying again [7, Proposition 1.3], we conclude that  $A[G, (\phi, \omega)]$  is nodal, as asserted.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] I. Burban & Yu. Drozd, *Derived categories of nodal algebras*, J. Algebra **272** (2004), no. 1, 46–94.
- [2] I. Burban & Yu. Drozd, *Maximal Cohen–Macaulay modules over surface singularities*, Trends in representation theory of algebras and related topics, 101–166, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2008.
- [3] I. Burban & Yu. Drozd, *Tilting on non-commutative rational projective curves*, Math. Ann. **351**, no. 3 (2011), 665–709.
- [4] I. Burban & Yu. Drozd, *Non-commutative nodal curves and derived tame algebras*, [arXiv:1805.05174](https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.05174).
- [5] Yu. Drozd, *Finite modules over purely Noetherian algebras*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov. **183** (1990), 86–96.
- [6] Yu. Drozd, *Modules over hereditary orders*, Mat. Zametki **29** (1981), no. 6, 813–816, 955.
- [7] Yu. Drozd & V. Zembyk, *Representations of nodal algebras of type A*, Algebra Discrete Math. **15** (2013), no. 2, 179–200.
- [8] I. Reiner, *Maximal orders*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, New Series **28**. The Clarendon Press, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003.
- [9] I. Reiten & Ch. Riedtmann, *Skew group algebras in the representation theory of Artin algebras*, J. Algebra **92** (1985), no. 1, 224–282.

PADERBORN UNIVERSITY

*Email address:* burban@math.uni-paderborn.de

HARVARD UNIVERSITY AND INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF UKRAINE

*Email address:* y.a.drozd@gmail.com