

CYCLICALLY ORDERED QUIVERS

SERGEY FOMIN AND SCOTT NEVILLE

ABSTRACT. A cyclically ordered quiver is a quiver endowed with an additional structure of a cyclic ordering of its vertices. This structure, which naturally arises in many important applications, gives rise to new powerful mutation invariants.

Quiver mutations form the combinatorial backbone of the theory of cluster algebras. Despite the elementary nature of quiver mutation, many basic questions concerning this notion remain open. There is no known algorithm for detecting mutation equivalence of quivers. The dearth of known invariants of quiver mutation makes it difficult to determine, or even guess, whether two particular cluster structures, perhaps arising in different mathematical contexts, have the same mutation type. Detection of such coincidences is one of the key benefits that the theory of cluster algebras provides.

In this paper, we propose an approach that facilitates the study of quiver mutations by endowing a quiver Q with additional combinatorial structure: a *cyclic ordering* σ on the set of its vertices that yields a *cyclically ordered quiver* (COQ) (Q, σ) .

Some cyclic orderings are better than others, as they allow a wider range of *proper mutations*. (This is a subclass of quiver mutations μ_v that satisfy a simple local condition on the vertex v . Informally, every oriented path of length 2 passing through v must make a right turn at v .) In the framework of cyclically ordered quivers, the concept of proper mutation serves as appropriate enhancement of the standard notion of quiver mutation.

Tearing up a cyclic ordering σ into a linear ordering of the vertices of Q allows us to associate to a COQ (Q, σ) an upper triangular matrix U_Q called the *unipotent companion*. We then show that its *integral congruence class* $\{GU_QG^T \mid G \in \text{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})\}$ (here G^T denotes the transpose of G) does not depend on the choice of a tearing point, nor does it change under *wiggles*, the local transformations of a cyclic ordering that exchanges two consecutive vertices that are not adjacent in the quiver. Even more importantly, this integral congruence class is invariant under proper mutations.

The integral congruence class of the unipotent companion $U = U_Q$ gives rise to an arguably more useful invariant of a COQ (Q, σ) : the $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ *conjugacy class of the cosquare* $U^{-T}U$. Other related—and progressively less powerful—invariants of proper mutations include: the $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ class (the Frobenius normal form) of the cosquare; its $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ class (the Jordan canonical form); and its monic characteristic polynomial, which we call the *Alexander polynomial* of (Q, σ) . (For quivers associated with planar divides [20], this polynomial agrees with the Alexander polynomial of the divide link.)

Date: June 2, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 13F60, Secondary 05E99, 15B36.

Key words and phrases. Quiver, mutation, cyclic ordering, Alexander polynomial.

Partially supported by NSF grants DMS-2054231 and DMS-1840234 (S. N.).

The second coefficient of the Alexander polynomial gives rise to the *Markov invariant*, which generalizes a mutation invariant of 3-vertex quivers introduced in [2]. Other known mutation invariants of quivers [10, 21, 36, 38] can also be derived from the Alexander polynomial. (These invariants do not depend on the cyclic ordering.)

Figure 1 provides an overview of invariants of proper mutations discussed in this paper, of the functional dependencies between them, and of their connections to the aforementioned invariants of quiver mutations.




Figure 1: The hierarchy of equivalence classes, orbits, and invariants. Here $U = U_Q$ (resp., $B = B_Q$) denotes the unipotent companion (resp., the exchange matrix) of Q . Arrows indicate dependencies among different types of objects; thus, the Alexander polynomial determines the Markov invariant, etc.

We call a cyclically ordered quiver *proper* if all its vertices are proper. Proper COQs are especially nice because any mutation leaves all our invariants intact.

We show that the following classes of quivers have a proper cyclic ordering:

- all complete (i.e., at least one arrow between each pair of vertices) quivers that are *vortex-free* (cf. Definition 10.10);
- all quivers on ≤ 3 vertices;
- all quivers of finite type;
- all acyclic quivers.

Moreover, each quiver belonging to one of the last three categories has a *totally proper* ordering: any sequence of (proper) mutations transforms this COQ into a proper one. The totally proper cyclic ordering, if it exists, is necessarily unique (up to wiggles).

We describe many examples that demonstrate that the class of totally proper COQs is fairly wide. Within this class, each of the aforementioned invariants of proper mutations becomes a fully-fledged mutation invariant.

In a forthcoming work, we will show that quiver mutations corresponding to square moves in reduced plabic graphs are proper, for a suitable cyclic order; this statement extends to many non-reduced plabic graphs. More generally, many important classes of quivers arising in applications of Lie-theoretic nature appear to always come equipped with a naturally defined proper cyclic ordering. Each time, proper mutations seem to be sufficient to produce a generating set of the corresponding cluster algebra, so the latter can in fact be defined by only using proper mutations.

To be sure, there are many quivers for which no proper cyclic ordering exists, and consequently the tools developed in this paper do not apply. These quivers however do not seem to arise “in nature,” i.e., in important applications of cluster theory.

To summarize, the framework of proper mutations of cyclically ordered quivers constitutes, in our opinion, a useful “upgrade” of the traditional combinatorics of quiver mutations. It in particular provides new powerful mutation invariants that will hopefully prove effective in future applications of this theory.

Structure of the paper. Section 1 reviews basic background on quivers and their mutations. In Section 2, we introduce cyclically ordered quivers (COQs) and wiggles in them. We define the *winding numbers*, a family of wiggle invariants associated to cycles in a COQ, and characterize wiggle equivalence in terms of these invariants, see Theorem 2.12. The proof of this theorem is given in Section 3. In Section 4, we define a unipotent companion of a linearly ordered quiver and show that its integral congruence class is invariant under wiggles and cyclic reorderings.

The notion of a proper vertex in a COQ is introduced in Section 5. In Section 6, we define proper mutations in COQs, verify that they are well defined up to wiggles, and present several examples of proper mutation equivalence classes of quivers of finite mutation type. In Section 7, we establish that proper mutation preserves the integral congruence class of a unipotent companion, so this congruence class is invariant under proper mutations, see Theorem 7.1. Section 8 is devoted to Alexander polynomials of COQs. In Section 9, we digress to discuss the connection between proper mutations and the well-studied braid group action on upper-triangular matrices [5, 6, 11, 13, 34].

Section 10 focuses on proper COQs, i.e., the ones in which every vertex is proper. We show that vortex quivers have no proper cyclic ordering (Proposition 10.11) and obtain a propagation result for complete vortex-free COQs (Proposition 10.20). In Sections 11–12, we study totally proper COQs. We prove that a totally proper cyclic ordering is unique up to wiggles (Theorem 11.3) and exhibit several families of totally proper COQs. In Section 13, we show that totally proper cyclic orderings give admissible quasi-Cartan companions of quivers, in the sense of A. Seven [37], and discuss quivers that arise from marked surfaces.

Acknowledgments. We thank Roger Casals for stimulating discussions, Danielle Ensign for software assistance/consulting, and Jineon Baek for sharing a construction that inspired Definitions 3.2 and 3.6. We used MAGMA and Sage in our computations.

1. PRELIMINARIES ON QUIVERS AND THEIR MUTATIONS

This section contains basic definitions pertaining to quivers and their mutations. The only (potentially) non-standard notions are those of a complete (resp., abundant) quiver, see Definition 1.4.

Definition 1.1. A *quiver* is a directed graph without loops or oriented 2-cycles. Directed edges in a quiver are called *arrows*. Multiple arrows are allowed.

Remark 1.2. By default, all quivers considered in this paper have no frozen vertices.

Remark 1.3. Unless specified otherwise, we always work with *labeled* quivers. In particular, we distinguish between isomorphic quivers on the same set of vertices.

Definition 1.4. A quiver Q is *complete* (resp., *abundant*) if each pair of vertices in Q is connected by at least one arrow (resp., at least two arrows), in one of the two directions.

Definition 1.5. Let Q be a quiver on n vertices. We say that Q is *acyclic* if Q contains no oriented cycles.



Figure 2: An acyclic and complete (but not abundant) quiver on 4 vertices.

Definition 1.6. A quiver is called a *tree quiver* if its underlying undirected graph is a tree. A quiver is *connected* if its underlying undirected graph is connected.



Figure 3: Left: a tree quiver. Right: a disconnected quiver. Neither quiver is complete.

Definition 1.7. To *mutate* a quiver Q at a vertex j , perform the following steps:

- (1) for each path $i \rightarrow j \rightarrow k$ in Q , add a new arrow $i \rightarrow k$ (thus, if we have a arrows from i to j and b arrows from j to k , we should add ab new arrows from i to k);
- (2) reverse all arrows incident to j ;
- (3) repeatedly remove oriented 2-cycles until there are none left.

The transformed (mutated) quiver is denoted by $\mu_j(Q)$. Mutation is an involution: $\mu_j(\mu_j(Q)) = Q$.

Definition 1.8. Two quivers are called *mutation-equivalent* if they can be related to each other by a sequence of mutations. The *mutation equivalence class* (or just *mutation class*) of Q is denoted by $[Q]$.

Instead of dealing with quivers and their mutations, one can utilize the language of skew-symmetric matrices:

Definition 1.9. For a given n -vertex quiver Q , the *exchange matrix* $B = B_Q = (b_{ij})$ associated to Q is an $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrix defined by

$$b_{ij} = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } Q \text{ contains } x \geq 0 \text{ arrows } i \rightarrow j; \\ -x & \text{if } Q \text{ contains } x \geq 0 \text{ arrows } i \leftarrow j. \end{cases}$$

Example 1.10. Let Q be a quiver on an ordered 3-vertex set $\{a < b < c\}$, with $x \geq 0$ arrows $a \rightarrow b$ and $y \geq 0$ arrows $b \rightarrow c$. (We can always relabel the vertices so that the arrows point in the directions specified above.) The exchange matrix B_Q has the form

$$(1.1) \quad B_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x & z \\ -x & 0 & y \\ -z & -y & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

If $z \geq 0$, then the quiver Q is acyclic, see Figure 4. For the case $z \leq 0$, see Figure 5.




Figure 4: An acyclic 3-vertex quiver.




Figure 5: A 3-vertex quiver with cyclically oriented arrows.

Definition 1.11. For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, define the *positive part* (resp., *negative part*) of x by

$$\begin{aligned} [x]_+ &= \max(x, 0), \\ [x]_- &= \max(-x, 0). \end{aligned}$$

We note that both $[x]_+$ and $[x]_-$ are nonnegative.

Definition 1.12. For a quiver Q , and a vertex j , the *matrix mutation* μ_j transforms B_Q into the skew-symmetric matrix $B_{\mu_j(Q)} = (b'_{ij}) = \mu_j(B)$ defined by

$$(1.2) \quad b'_{ik} = \begin{cases} -b_{ik} & \text{if } i = j \text{ or } j = k; \\ b_{ik} + \frac{1}{2}(b_{ij}|b_{jk}| + |b_{ij}|b_{jk}) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(see [22, (4.3)]). Alternatively, one may set

$$(1.3) \quad b'_{ik} = \begin{cases} -b_{ik} & \text{if } i = j \text{ or } j = k; \\ b_{ik} + [b_{ij}]_+[b_{jk}]_+ - [b_{ij}]_-[b_{jk}]_- & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(see [24, (2.2)]).

2. CYCLIC ORDERINGS AND WIGGLES

Definition 2.1. Let Q be a quiver on an n -element vertex set V . A *cyclic ordering* of Q is a choice of a “clockwise” cyclic ordering of V , i.e., a way of placing the vertices of Q around a circle, viewed up to rotations of the circle. More formally, choose a linear ordering on V and identify two orderings that differ by a cyclic rearrangement. A quiver on an n -element vertex set V has $(n-1)!$ cyclic orderings. For a linear ordering $v_1 < \dots < v_n$ of V , we denote by (v_1, \dots, v_n) the corresponding cyclic ordering. See Figure 6.




Figure 6: The six COQs whose underlying quiver is the 4-cycle $Q = (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \rightarrow a)$. The bottom row shows the corresponding cyclic orders.

Definition 2.2. A *cyclically ordered quiver (COQ)* (Q, σ) is a quiver Q together with a cyclic ordering σ of its vertices. We will sometimes drop σ from the notation and just use Q to denote a COQ.

Definition 2.3. A *wiggle* is a transformation of a COQ that leaves the underlying quiver Q intact while transforming the cyclic ordering via a transposition (ij) that interchanges a pair of consecutive vertices i and j that are not adjacent in the quiver. Note that this notion is insensitive to the orientations of the arrows. See Figure 7.




Figure 7: Four COQs related by a sequence of wiggles. Also, the first COQ is related to the last one by the wiggle (ac) .

Remark 2.4. If each pair of vertices of a quiver Q that are consecutive in a cyclic ordering σ are connected by an arrow (going in either direction), then the COQ (Q, σ) allows no wiggles. (Cf. the first and the last quivers in Figure 6.) In particular, no wiggles are possible if Q is a complete quiver.

Definition 2.5. Two cyclic orderings of a quiver are *wiggle equivalent* if they can be obtained from each other by a sequence of wiggles. We will usually denote a wiggle equivalence class of a COQ Q (i.e., the set of all COQs wiggle equivalent to Q) by \mathcal{Q} . To illustrate, Figure 7 shows a wiggle equivalence class.

In what follows, we will often consider COQs up to wiggle equivalence.

Proposition 2.6. *All cyclic orderings of a tree quiver are pairwise wiggle equivalent.*

Proof. Induction on the number of vertices. The claim for a tree T can be deduced from a similar claim for T with a single leaf removed. Details are left to the reader. \square

Example 2.7. The 6 cyclic orderings of the 4-cycle quiver $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \rightarrow a$ (see Figure 6) fall into 3 wiggle equivalence classes:

- a class consisting of a single cyclic ordering (a, b, c, d) ;
- a class consisting of a single cyclic ordering (a, d, c, b) ;
- a class consisting of the remaining four cyclic orderings of $\{a, b, c, d\}$, see Figure 7.

Our next goal is to describe a solution to the following problems:

- determine whether two cyclic orderings of the same labeled quiver (cf. Remark 1.3) yield wiggle equivalent COQs;
- if two COQs are wiggle equivalent, construct a sequence of wiggles relating them to each other.

To do that, we will need the following notions.

Definition 2.8. Let V be a finite set. Let $\sigma = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ be a (“clockwise”) cyclic ordering on V . (Thus $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$.) Let $a, b \in V$; say, $a = v_i$ and $b = v_j$. The (clockwise) *distance* $\theta(\sigma, a, b)$ between a and b , with respect to the cyclic ordering σ , is defined by

$$\theta(\sigma, a, b) = \begin{cases} j - i & \text{if } i \leq j; \\ n + j - i & \text{if } i > j. \end{cases}$$

In other words, for distinct a and b , the distance $\theta(\sigma, a, b)$ is equal to 1 plus the number of elements of V that we pass while moving clockwise from a to b . Notice that this notion only depends on the cyclic ordering; no quivers are involved.

Example 2.9. For the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (a, b, c)$ on a 3-element set $V = \{a, b, c\}$, we have $\theta(\sigma, a, b) = \theta(\sigma, b, c) = \theta(\sigma, c, a) = 1$ and $\theta(\sigma, a, c) = \theta(\sigma, b, a) = \theta(\sigma, c, b) = 2$.

Definition 2.10. Let (Q, σ) be a COQ. Let

$$C = (u_0 - u_1 - \dots - u_{k-1} - u_k = u_0)$$

be a k -cycle in the underlying undirected graph of Q . (To clarify, the cycle C is endowed with a preferred direction of traversal.) Thus, for each pair of consecutive vertices u_i and u_{i+1} , the quiver Q contains at least one arrow $u_i \rightarrow u_{i+1}$ or $u_i \leftarrow u_{i+1}$. Let ℓ be the number of arrows oriented $u_i \leftarrow u_{i+1}$. The number

$$(2.1) \quad \text{wind}(C) = \text{wind}(C, \sigma) = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{0 \leq i \leq k-1} \theta(\sigma, u_i, u_{i+1}) \right) - \ell$$

is called the *winding number* of C .

Informally, $\text{wind}(C)$ is the signed number of clockwise revolutions that occur when we traverse the cycle C , always progressing clockwise when $u_i \rightarrow u_{i+1}$ and counter-clockwise when $u_i \leftarrow u_{i+1}$ (thus contributing $-\frac{1}{n}\theta(\sigma, u_{i+1}, u_i) = \frac{1}{n}\theta(\sigma, u_i, u_{i+1}) - 1$ to the sum). In particular, the winding number is always an integer.

Example 2.11. In the six COQs shown in Figure 6, the cycle $(a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \rightarrow a)$ has winding numbers 1, 2, 2, 2, 2, 3, respectively.

Theorem 2.12. *Let σ and σ' be two cyclic orderings of the vertices of a quiver Q . The following are equivalent:*

- *the COQs (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') are wiggle equivalent;*
- *for any undirected cycle C in Q , we have $\text{wind}(C, \sigma) = \text{wind}(C, \sigma')$.*

To clarify, the cycles C in Theorem 2.12 do not have to be chordless.

The proof of Theorem 2.12 is given in Section 3.

Remark 2.13. It is easy to see that in Theorem 2.12, it suffices to check the equality $\text{wind}(C, \sigma) = \text{wind}(C, \sigma')$ on any set of (undirected) cycles C that generate the first homology group of the underlying undirected graph of Q . Thus, the collection of winding numbers of such cycles is a complete wiggle invariant.

Proposition 2.14. *Let Q be a quiver whose underlying undirected graph is a chordless n -cycle*

$$(2.2) \quad v_0 - v_1 - \cdots - v_{n-1} - v_n = v_0,$$

i.e., there are no arrows between non-consecutive vertices in C ; multiple arrows are allowed. We fix one of the two directions of traversal of the cycle, namely the direction in which v_{i+1} follows v_i for $i=0, \dots, n-1$. Let $r = \#\{i | v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1}\}$ (resp., $\ell = \#\{i | v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1}\}$) be the number of locations i for which the orientation of the arrows connecting v_i with v_{i+1} agrees (resp., disagrees) with the chosen direction. (Thus $r + \ell = n$.) Then, for any cyclic ordering σ on Q , we have

$$(2.3) \quad 1 - \ell \leq \text{wind}(Q, \sigma) \leq r - 1 = n - \ell - 1,$$

and every winding number between $1 - \ell$ and $r - 1$ is achieved for some σ .

Furthermore, for a cyclic ordering σ on Q , the following are equivalent:

- (a) *the COQ (Q, σ) has no wiggles;*
- (b) *the winding number $\text{wind}(Q, \sigma)$ is equal to $1 - \ell$ or $r - 1$ (cf. (2.3));*
- (c) *either $\sigma = (v_n, v_{n-1}, \dots, v_1)$ or $\sigma = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$.*

Proof. The contribution of each arrow $v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1}$ (resp., $v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1}$) to $\text{wind}(Q, \sigma)$ lies in the interval $[1, n - 1]$ (resp., $[1 - n, -1]$). It follows that

$$\text{wind}(Q, \sigma) \cdot n \in [r + \ell(1 - n), r(n - 1) - \ell] = [n(1 - \ell), n(r - 1)],$$

implying (2.3). To show that every winding number between $1 - \ell$ and $r - 1$ is achieved, take k between 1 and $n - 1$ and consider the cyclic ordering

$$\sigma = (v_k, v_{k-1}, \dots, v_1, v_{k+1}, \dots, v_n).$$

Straightforward calculations show that for this cyclic ordering, $\text{wind}(Q, \sigma) = k - \ell$.

We next show that (a) \Rightarrow (c) \Rightarrow (b). If (Q, σ) has no wiggles, then each pair of vertices $\{v_i, v_{i+1}\}$ must be adjacent in the cyclic ordering. As each vertex has two neighbors in Q and two neighbors in the cyclic ordering, the cyclic ordering must either be $\sigma_{\rightarrow} = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n)$ or $\sigma_{\leftarrow} = (v_n, v_{n-1}, \dots, v_1)$. A quick computation verifies that the corresponding winding numbers are $1 - \ell$ and $r - 1$, respectively.

It remains to prove that (b) \Rightarrow (a). Suppose that $\text{wind}(Q, \sigma) = 1 - \ell$. Since we also have $\text{wind}(Q, \sigma_{\rightarrow}) = 1 - \ell$, Theorem 2.12 implies that the cyclic orderings σ and σ_{\rightarrow} must be wiggle equivalent. But σ_{\rightarrow} allows no wiggles, so $\sigma_{\rightarrow} = \sigma$. The case $\text{wind}(Q, \sigma) = r - 1$ is treated in the same way. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.12

One direction of Theorem 2.12 is intuitively obvious:

Lemma 3.1. *The winding number of any undirected cycle in a COQ is invariant under wiggles.*

A straightforward proof of Lemma 3.1 is omitted.

It remains to show that if two COQs (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') with the same underlying quiver Q have the same winding numbers, then they are wiggle equivalent.

Without loss of generality, we assume that (the underlying unoriented graph of) the quiver Q is connected.

We fix a spanning tree T of the underlying undirected graph of Q . We also fix a root vertex v_\circ . For any vertex v , we denote by

$$T(v) = (v_\circ, v_1, \dots, v_k = v)$$

the unique (undirected) path in T that connects the root v_\circ to v .

Definition 3.2. Let u and v be two adjacent vertices in the tree T . We assume that Q contains an edge $u \rightarrow v$. For any value of the *time parameter* $t \in [0, 1]$, we set

$$\theta(t, u, v) = (1 - t)\theta(\sigma, u, v) + t\theta(\sigma', u, v).$$

Thus, $\theta(t, u, v)$ linearly interpolates between $\theta(\sigma, u, v)$ and $\theta(\sigma', u, v)$.

We then define, for any vertex v and time $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\mathcal{O}(t, v) = \sum_{(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in T(v)} \operatorname{sgn}(b_{v_i v_{i+1}}) \theta(t, v_i, v_{i+1}) \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Alternatively, the real numbers $\mathcal{O}(t, v)$ can be defined as follows. We define the numbers $\mathcal{O}(0, v)$ by the initial condition $\mathcal{O}(0, v_\circ) = 0$ together with the recurrence

$$\mathcal{O}(0, v) - \mathcal{O}(0, u) = \theta(\sigma, u, v),$$

for every arrow $u \rightarrow v$ as above (i.e., u and v are adjacent in the tree T). We define the numbers $\mathcal{O}(1, v)$ in the same way using the cyclic ordering σ' . Finally, we interpolate linearly for $0 < t < 1$:

$$\mathcal{O}(t, v) = (1 - t)\mathcal{O}(0, v) + t\mathcal{O}(1, v).$$

We also set

$$\mathcal{R}(t, v) = \mathcal{O}(t, v) \bmod n \in \mathbb{R}/n\mathbb{Z}.$$

Example 3.3. Let Q be the 3-vertex quiver $(a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c)$ of type A_3 . Consider two wiggle equivalent cyclic orderings $\sigma = (a, b, c)$ and $\sigma' = (a, c, b)$. The underlying undirected graph of Q is a tree. Selecting the root $v_\circ = a$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(t, a) &= 0, & \mathcal{O}(t, b) &= 1 + t, & \mathcal{O}(t, c) &= 2 + 2t, \\ \mathcal{R}(t, a) &= 0, & \mathcal{R}(t, b) &= 1 + t, & \mathcal{R}(t, c) &= \begin{cases} 2 + 2t & \text{if } t < \frac{1}{2}; \\ -1 + 2t & \text{if } t \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Example 3.4. Consider the 4-cycle quiver

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \longrightarrow & b \\ \uparrow & & \downarrow \\ d & \longleftarrow & c \end{array}$$

of type D_4 , with two cyclic orderings $\sigma = (a, b, d, c)$ and $\sigma' = (a, c, d, b)$. Remove the arrow $c \rightarrow d$ from Q to get the tree T . Select the root $v_o = a$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(t, a) &= 0, & \mathcal{O}(t, b) &= 1 + 2t, & \mathcal{O}(t, c) &= 3 + 2t, & \mathcal{O}(t, d) &= -2; \\ \mathcal{R}(t, a) &= 0, & \mathcal{R}(t, b) &= 1 + 2t, & \mathcal{R}(t, c) &= \begin{cases} 3 + 2t & \text{if } t < \frac{1}{2}; \\ -1 + 2t & \text{if } t \geq \frac{1}{2}, \end{cases} & \mathcal{R}(t, d) &= 2. \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.5. The circle $\mathbb{R}/n\mathbb{Z}$ is naturally endowed with the cyclic ordering associated to the linear order $([0, n), <)$. Restricting this cyclic ordering to the locations $\mathcal{R}(t, v) \in \mathbb{R}/n\mathbb{Z}$, we obtain, for a generic time parameter $t \in [0, 1]$, a well-defined cyclic ordering σ_t on the set of vertices of Q . This cyclic ordering “interpolates” between the cyclic orderings σ (at $t = 0$) and σ' (at $t = 1$).

We next focus on the instances of “collisions” where the cyclic orderings σ_t are ill-defined.

Definition 3.6. For $t \in (0, 1)$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}/n\mathbb{Z}$, we say that (t, x) is a *collision point* if there exist distinct vertices $u \neq v$ such that $x = \mathcal{R}(t, u) = \mathcal{R}(t, v)$. It is easy to see that the number of collision points is finite.

For a collision point (t, x) , we refer to the set

$$\mathcal{C}(t, x) = \{v \mid \mathcal{R}(t, v) = x\}$$

as the *set of colliding vertices* (at (t, x)). The vertices in $\mathcal{C}(t, x)$ are permuted at time t according to some permutation $w(t, x)$. More precisely, $w(t, x)$ is the permutation of the vertices of Q that intertwines the orderings of $\mathcal{C}(t, x)$ induced by $\sigma_{t-\varepsilon}$ and $\sigma_{t+\varepsilon}$, respectively, keeping the remaining vertices fixed.

Lemma 3.7. *Each set of colliding vertices $\mathcal{C}(t, x)$ is a contiguous interval in the cyclic ordering $\sigma_{t-\varepsilon}$ (resp., $\sigma_{t+\varepsilon}$), for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small. The permutation $w(t, x)$ reverses the order of the elements of $\mathcal{C}(t, x)$, keeping the remaining vertices fixed.*

Proof. The first statement is clear. To prove the second, recall that the “location” $\mathcal{R}(t, v)$ of each vertex $v \in \mathcal{C}(t, x)$ is moving at constant speed. \square

Example 3.8. In Example 3.3, the only collision point is $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$. Its set of colliding vertices is $\{a, c\}$. The two cyclic orderings are related by the wiggle $(ac) = w(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$.

Example 3.9. In Example 3.4, the collision points are $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$ and $(\frac{1}{2}, 2)$. The sets of colliding vertices are $\mathcal{C}(\frac{1}{2}, 0) = \{a, c\}$ and $\mathcal{C}(\frac{1}{2}, 2) = \{b, d\}$. The two orders are related by the composition of two commuting wiggles $w(\frac{1}{2}, 0) = (ac)$ and $w(\frac{1}{2}, 2) = (bd)$.

Lemma 3.10. *If two COQs (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') have the same winding numbers, then for every arrow $u \rightarrow v$ in the quiver Q and every $t \in [0, 1]$, we have*

$$\mathcal{O}(t, v) - \mathcal{O}(t, u) \equiv (1-t)\theta(\sigma, u, v) + t\theta(\sigma', u, v) \pmod{n}.$$

Proof. If u and v are adjacent in T , then the claim follows from Definition 3.6:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(t, v) - \mathcal{O}(t, u) &= (1-t)\mathcal{O}(0, v) + t\mathcal{O}(1, v) - (1-t)\mathcal{O}(0, u) - t\mathcal{O}(1, u) \\ &= (1-t)\theta(\sigma, u, v) + t\theta(\sigma', u, v). \end{aligned}$$

Now suppose that u and v are not adjacent in T . Then adding the edge $u-v$ to T produces exactly one cycle, say with the edges $v = u_1 - u_2 - \cdots - u_k = u - v$. Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ be the winding number of this cycle with respect to the cyclic orderings σ and σ' . (We know that the two winding numbers agree.) We then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(t, v) - \mathcal{O}(t, u) &= - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} (\mathcal{O}(t, u_{i+1}) - \mathcal{O}(t, u_i)) \\ &= - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \operatorname{sgn}(b_{u_i, u_{i+1}}) ((1-t)\theta(\sigma, u_i, u_{i+1}) + t\theta(\sigma', u_i, u_{i+1})) \\ &= -((1-t)(mn - \theta(\sigma, u, v)) + t(mn - \theta(\sigma', u, v))) \\ &\equiv (1-t)\theta(\sigma, u, v) + t\theta(\sigma', u, v) \pmod{n}. \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Example 3.11. Continuing with Examples 3.4 and 3.9, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(t, d) - \mathcal{O}(t, c) &= -2 - 3 - 2t \\ &= -5 - 2t \\ &\equiv (1-t)\theta(\sigma, c, d) + t\theta(\sigma', c, d) \pmod{4}, \end{aligned}$$

consistent with Lemma 3.10.

Lemma 3.12. *If (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') have the same winding numbers, then each set of colliding vertices $\mathcal{C}(t, x)$ consists of vertices that are pairwise non-adjacent in Q .*

Proof. Let $u, v \in \mathcal{C}(t, x)$. Then $\mathcal{R}(t, v) = \mathcal{R}(t, u)$ by Definition 3.6. Suppose that $u \rightarrow v$ is an arrow in Q . By Lemma 3.10, we have

$$(3.1) \quad 0 = \mathcal{R}(t, v) - \mathcal{R}(t, u) \equiv (1-t)\theta(\sigma, u, v) + t\theta(\sigma', u, v) \pmod{n}.$$

On the other hand, both $\theta(\sigma, u, v)$ and $\theta(\sigma', u, v)$ lie in the interval $(1, n-1)$. Therefore the same is true for $(1-t)\theta(\sigma, u, v) + t\theta(\sigma', u, v)$, in contradiction with (3.1). \square

We are now ready to complete the proof of Theorem 2.12.

Proof of Theorem 2.12. As t changes from $t=0$ to $t=1$, the cyclic ordering σ_t is transformed from σ to σ' via a sequence of vertex permutations $w(t, x)$ corresponding to the various collision points (t, x) . (We apply these permutations in the order dictated by t , breaking ties arbitrarily.) Lemma 3.12 ensures that each permutation $w(t, x)$ permutes pairwise non-adjacent vertices—so this permutation can be implemented as a sequence of wiggles. We conclude that (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') are wiggle equivalent. \square

4. UNIPOTENT COMPANIONS AND THEIR COSQUARES

We will need to recall some basic linear algebra. For a matrix M , we will denote by M^T the transpose of M . We denote by I the $n \times n$ identity matrix.

Definition 4.1. Two $n \times n$ integer matrices L and M are called *congruent* (over \mathbb{Z}) if there exists a matrix $G \in \mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ (i.e., an integer matrix of determinant ± 1) such that $M = GLG^T$. The congruence relation is symmetric. The integral *congruence class* of an $n \times n$ integer matrix M consists of all matrices congruent to M over \mathbb{Z} .

The following definition is fundamental for all subsequent developments.

Definition 4.2. Let Q be a quiver on a linearly ordered vertex set $\{1 < \dots < n\}$. Let $B = B_Q = (b_{ij})$ be the corresponding exchange matrix. The *unipotent companion* of Q (or of B) is the unique unipotent upper-triangular matrix $U = U_Q$ satisfying

$$(4.1) \quad -B = U - U^T.$$

In other words, U is obtained by taking the strictly upper-triangular part of B , changing its sign, and placing 1's on the diagonal:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -b_{12} & -b_{13} & \cdots & -b_{1n} \\ 0 & 1 & -b_{23} & \cdots & -b_{2n} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & -b_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We note that the unipotent companion depends on the choice of a linear ordering of the vertices of a quiver.

Remark 4.3. The notion of a unipotent companion is reminiscent of (but distinct from) the notion of a *quasi-Cartan companion* introduced by M. Barot, C. Geiss, and A. Zelevinsky [1]. Given a linear ordering of the vertices of a quiver Q , the corresponding quasi-Cartan companion is the symmetric matrix $A = A_Q$ defined by

$$(4.2) \quad A = U + U^T.$$

Both the exchange matrix B and the quasi-Cartan matrix A are determined by the unipotent companion U , cf. (4.1) and (4.2). See also Remark 4.6.

Proposition 4.4. *The integral congruence class of a unipotent companion is invariant under cyclic rearrangements of the vertices of a quiver.*

Proof. Let Q be an n -vertex quiver on the vertex set $\{1 < \dots < n\}$. Let $c \in \mathrm{GL}_n$ be the permutation matrix

$$(4.3) \quad c = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

associated with the n -cycle (a Coxeter element)

$$(4.4) \quad 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow n \rightarrow 1$$

in the symmetric group \mathcal{S}_n . Let cQ be the quiver with the exchange matrix cB_Qc^T , or equivalently the quiver obtained by changing the vertex ordering in Q according to c . Let B_1 denote the $n \times n$ matrix whose top row is the same as in B and whose other entries are equal to 0:

$$B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & b_{12} & \cdots & b_{1n} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Set $G = c(I + B_1^T)$. We will prove the proposition by showing that $U_{cQ} = GU_QG^T$.

We begin by expressing the matrix U_{cQ} in terms of the original unipotent companion $U = U_Q$, the permutation matrix c , and the matrix B_1 :

$$\begin{aligned} U_{cQ} &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -b_{23} & \cdots & -b_{2n} & -b_{21} \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & -b_{3n} & -b_{31} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -b_{n1} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= c \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -b_{21} & 1 & \cdots & -b_{2,n-1} & -b_{2n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ -b_{n-1,1} & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -b_{n-1,n} \\ -b_{n,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} c^{-1} \\ &= c(U + B_1 + B_1^T)c^T. \end{aligned}$$

Since the matrix $I - U$ is strictly upper-triangular, we have $(I - U)B_1 = 0$, so that

$$B_1 = UB_1.$$

Since the top row of $I - U - B_1$ consists entirely of zeroes, we have $B_1^T(I - U - B_1) = 0$, or equivalently

$$B_1^T = B_1^T U + B_1^T B_1 = B_1^T U + B_1^T U B_1.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} U + B_1 + B_1^T &= U + UB_1 + B_1^T U + B_1^T U B_1 \\ &= (I + B_1^T)U(I + B_1). \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that

$$U_{cQ} = c(U + B_1 + B_1^T)c^T = c(I + B_1^T)U(I + B_1)c^T = GUG^T. \quad \square$$

Proposition 4.4 shows that the unipotent companion of a cyclically ordered quiver (COQ) is well defined up to integral congruence. Thus, we can associate to any COQ the integral congruence class of a unipotent companion.

Proposition 4.5. *The integral congruence class of a unipotent companion is invariant under wiggles.*

Proof. Let (Q, σ) be a COQ on the vertex set $\{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$, with the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$. Assume that the transposition $s_1 = (v_1 v_2)$ is a wiggle in (Q, σ) , i.e., the vertices v_1 and v_2 are not adjacent in Q . We identify s_1 with the corresponding $n \times n$ permutation matrix.

Let $\sigma' = (v_2, v_1, v_3, \dots, v_n)$ be the ordering obtained by swapping the vertices v_1 and v_2 . Let U' denote the corresponding unipotent companion matrix. This matrix can be related to the original unipotent companion U as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 U s_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -b_{13} & \cdots & -b_{1n} \\ 0 & 1 & -b_{23} & \cdots & -b_{2n} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & -b_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -b_{23} & \cdots & -b_{2n} \\ 0 & 1 & -b_{13} & \cdots & -b_{1n} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & -b_{3n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= U'. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that the matrices U and $U' = s_1 U s_1 = s_1 U s_1^T$ are congruent over \mathbb{Z} . \square

Proposition 4.5 shows that the integral congruence class of a unipotent companion is uniquely determined by the wiggle equivalence class of a COQ.

Remark 4.6. Various authors (see, e.g., [1, 10, 21, 38]) considered using the congruence class of either the exchange matrix B_Q or a particular quasi-Cartan companion A_Q to study the properties of a quiver Q . Unfortunately, these congruence classes appear to retain a lot less useful information about Q compared to the congruence class of the unipotent companion U_Q .

We next recall some well-known results relating congruence classes of square matrices to similarity/conjugacy classes. We will use the notation $M^{-T} = (M^T)^{-1} = (M^{-1})^T$. For invertible matrices A and B , we have $(AB)^{-T} = ((AB)^T)^{-1} = (B^T A^T)^{-1} = A^{-T} B^{-T}$.

Definition 4.7. The *cosquare* of an invertible matrix M is the matrix $M^{-T}M$.

Lemma 4.8. *If two matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ are congruent over \mathbb{Z} , then their respective cosquares are similar over \mathbb{Z} (i.e., conjugate in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$).*

Proof. Let L and $M = GLG^T$ be two congruent matrices. Then

$$M^{-T}M = (GLG^T)^{-T}GLG^T = G^{-T}L^{-T}G^{-1}GLG^T = G^{-T}L^{-T}LG^T. \quad \square$$

Remark 4.9. As shown by R. Horn and V. Sergeichuk [29, Lemma 2.1], the converse to Lemma 4.8 holds over \mathbb{C} . However, it fails over the integers, and indeed over the reals. For example, if two matrices $A, B \in \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ (not necessarily with integer

entries) are symmetric, then their cosquares are both equal to the identity matrix. On the other hand, A and B may not be congruent over $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$. Indeed, Sylvester's Law of Inertia asserts that two real symmetric matrices are congruent over $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{R})$ if and only if they have the same number of positive, negative, and zero eigenvalues.

Problem 4.10. It is conceivable (although unlikely) that the integer version of the Horn-Sergeichuk theorem referenced in Remark 4.9 might hold for upper-triangular unipotent matrices. In other words, if U and U' are two upper-triangular unipotent integer matrices whose cosquares are conjugate in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, does it follow that U and U' are congruent over \mathbb{Z} ? (If not, provide a counterexample.)

Corollary 4.11. *Let Q be a quiver on a linearly ordered set of vertices $\{v_1 < \dots < v_n\}$. The $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy class of the cosquare of the unipotent companion U_Q is uniquely determined by the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$, and indeed by the wiggle equivalence class of the COQ (Q, σ) .*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 4.8, together with Propositions 4.4 and 4.5. \square

Remark 4.12. The construction of the cosquare of a unipotent upper-triangular matrix has appeared, under the name of a *Coxeter matrix* or *monodromy matrix*, in a number of contexts ranging from algebraic geometry to singularity theory and mathematical physics. See Section 9 and references therein.

Example 4.13. Let Q be a 2-vertex quiver with

$$B = B_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x \\ -x & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The unipotent companion is

$$U = U_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

and its cosquare is

$$U^{-T}U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ x & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x \\ x & 1 - x^2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Example 4.14. Let Q be a quiver on three linearly ordered vertices, with

$$B = B_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x & z \\ -x & 0 & y \\ -z & -y & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

cf. Example 1.10. The unipotent companion $U = U_Q$ is the matrix

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x & -z \\ 0 & 1 & -y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The cosquare of U is then computed as follows:

$$U^{-T}U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ x & 1 & 0 \\ z + xy & y & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x & -z \\ 0 & 1 & -y \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x & -z \\ x & 1 - x^2 & -y - xz \\ z + xy & y - xz - x^2y & 1 - y^2 - z^2 - xyz \end{bmatrix}.$$

Example 4.15. Let Q be a quiver on four linearly ordered vertices $a < b < c < d$, with

$$B_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x & z & w \\ -x & 0 & y & v \\ -z & -y & 0 & u \\ -w & -v & -u & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The case $x, y, z, u, v, w \geq 0$ (an acyclic 4-vertex quiver) is illustrated in Figure 8. We emphasize that we do not require these inequalities to hold: the computations provided below apply for general 4-vertex quivers.

The unipotent companion of Q is

$$U = U_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x & -z & -w \\ 0 & 1 & -y & -v \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -u \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The cosquare of U is then computed as follows:

$$U^{-T} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ xy + z & y & 1 & 0 \\ xyu + xv + uz + w & yu + v & u & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$U^{-T}U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -x & -z & -w \\ x & 1 - x^2 & -y - xz & -v - xw \\ z + xy & y - xz - x^2y & 1 - y^2 - z^2 - xyz & -u - yv - zw - xyw \\ c_{41} & c_{42} & c_{43} & c_{44} \end{bmatrix},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_{41} &= xyu + xv + uz - w, \\ c_{42} &= v - xw + yu - xuz - x^2v - x^2yu, \\ c_{43} &= u - yv - zw - xzv - uz^2 - uy^2 - xyuz, \\ c_{44} &= 1 - w^2 - v^2 - u^2 - uzw - yuv - xvw - xyuw. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 8: A 4-vertex acyclic quiver.

Remark 4.16. There are known algorithms for testing whether two given matrices in $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ are conjugate to each other (over \mathbb{Z}). We will discuss this topic, and provide references, in Section 7, see Remark 7.6.

5. PROPER VERTICES IN CYCLICALLY ORDERED QUIVERS

Definition 5.1. Let (Q, σ) be a cyclically ordered quiver. We say that an oriented two-arrow path $i \rightarrow j \rightarrow k$ in Q makes a *right turn* at j if the cyclic ordering σ can be represented as

$$\sigma = (\dots, i, \dots, j, \dots, k, \dots).$$

Otherwise, we say that the path $i \rightarrow j \rightarrow k$ makes a left turn at j .

Definition 5.2. A vertex j in a COQ Q is *proper* (alternatively, Q is proper at j) if the following “no-left-turn rule” is satisfied: every oriented path $\dots \rightarrow j \rightarrow \dots$ makes a right turn at j . See Figure 9.




Figure 9: In this COQ, the vertices $g, h, i,$ and j are proper but k and l are not.

Remark 5.3. Properness of an individual vertex in a COQ is not preserved under wiggles: a wiggle may transform a proper vertex into a non-proper one. To see it, suppose that two vertices i and k are adjacent in the cyclic ordering but not connected by an arrow in Q . If an oriented path $i \rightarrow j \rightarrow k$ makes a right turn at j , then the same path would make a left turn at j after the wiggle (ik) has been performed.

Definition 5.4. We say that a vertex j is *proper* in a wiggle equivalence class \mathcal{Q} if j is a proper vertex in some COQ $Q \in \mathcal{Q}$.

Example 5.5. Let Q be a tree quiver. By Proposition 2.6, all cyclic orderings of Q are wiggle equivalent. It follows that every vertex of Q is proper in the corresponding wiggle equivalence class \mathcal{Q} .

Another series of examples involves the quivers that appeared in Proposition 2.14:

Proposition 5.6. Let Q be a COQ of the kind described in Proposition 2.14, with notation n, r, ℓ, v_i as specified there. Recall that $1 - \ell \leq \text{wind}(Q, \sigma) \leq r - 1$, see (2.3). If $\text{wind}(Q) < r - 1$ (resp. $\text{wind}(Q) > 1 - \ell$), then every vertex v_i with $v_{i-1} \leftarrow v_i$ (resp. $v_{i-1} \rightarrow v_i$) is proper in \mathcal{Q} .

Proof. If v_i is a sink or source vertex, then v_i is proper in any cyclic order. Thus we may restrict ourselves to vertices in the middle of directed paths, i.e., $v_{i-1} \rightarrow v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1}$ or $v_{i-1} \leftarrow v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1}$.

Suppose $\text{wind}(Q) = w - l < r - 1$ for a positive integer w (the case of $\text{wind}(Q) > 1 - l$ is similar). Fix a vertex v_i with $v_{i-1} \leftarrow v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1}$. Then v_i is proper in the COQ

$$Q' = (Q, (v_{i+1}, v_i, v_{i-1}, \dots, v_{i+1-w}, v_{i+2}, \dots, v_{i-w})).$$

Since $\text{wind}(Q') = w - l = \text{wind}(Q)$, by Theorem 2.12 Q' and Q are wiggle equivalent. Thus v_i is proper in Q . \square

We will make use of Proposition 5.6 in Section 10, cf. Proposition 10.8.

The material below in this section will be used in Section 6, cf. Proposition 6.4.

Definition 5.7. We denote by $\text{In}(j) = \text{In}_Q(j)$ (resp., $\text{Out}(j) = \text{Out}_Q(j)$) the set of vertices i for which Q contains an arrow $i \rightarrow j$ (resp., an arrow $j \rightarrow i$).

Remark 5.8. If j is a proper vertex in a COQ (Q, σ) , then the cyclic ordering σ can be obtained from a linear ordering in which all elements of $\text{In}(j)$ precede j , while j precedes all elements of $\text{Out}(j)$.

Lemma 5.9. *Let Q and Q' be two wiggle-equivalent COQs on n vertices. Suppose that a vertex j is proper in both Q and Q' . Then there exists a sequence of wiggles w_1, \dots, w_k such that $w_k \cdots w_1(Q) = Q'$ and j is proper in every intermediate COQ $w_\ell w_{\ell-1} \cdots w_1(Q)$ (for $1 \leq \ell \leq k$).*

Proof. We will use the notation and construction from Definitions 3.2 3.5 and 3.6, assuming:

- the root vertex is $v_0 = j$ (the vertex we wish to keep proper);
- and the tree T contains all edges adjacent to j .

We claim that the sequence of wiggles found in Theorem 2.12 are w_1, \dots, w_k .

Wiggles do not change the relative order of any pair of vertices except the two vertices being wiggled. Thus a wiggle can only create a left turn $u \rightarrow j \rightarrow v$ if the wiggle involves both u and v . So it suffices to check that each set of colliding vertices C never includes both u and v .

Assume for contradiction that $u, v \in C(t, x)$. Then

$$\mathcal{R}(t, v) = \theta(t, j, v) = x = -\theta(t, u, j) = \mathcal{R}(t, u) \bmod n,$$

which (since $\theta(t, a, b) \in (0, n)$ for $a \rightarrow b$ in T) implies

$$\theta(t, u, j) + \theta(t, j, v) = n.$$

But, as j is proper in Q and Q' , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta(\sigma, u, j) + \theta(\sigma, j, v) &< n; \\ \theta(\sigma', u, j) + \theta(\sigma', j, v) &< n. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \theta(t, u, j) + \theta(t, j, v) \\ &= (1 - t)(\theta(\sigma, u, j) + \theta(\sigma, j, v)) + t(\theta(\sigma', u, j) + \theta(\sigma', j, v)) < n, \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction. \square

6. PROPER MUTATIONS

The following definition can be viewed as a “proper upgrade” of the notion of quiver mutation to COQs.

Definition 6.1. A *proper mutation* in a COQ Q is a mutation at a proper vertex j , accompanied by the following modification of the cyclic ordering. Let $\text{In}(j) = \text{In}_Q(j)$ and $\text{Out}(j) = \text{Out}_Q(j)$ be the sets from Definition 5.7 for the original COQ Q . (Note that after the mutation, the roles of $\text{In}(j)$ and $\text{Out}(j)$ will get interchanged, since all arrows incident to j are reversed by the mutation.) In the new cyclic ordering, the placement of all vertices besides j remains the same, whereupon j moves clockwise past all the vertices in $\text{Out}(j)$ without passing any vertices in $\text{In}(j)$. In other words, we place j so that the no-left-turn rule is satisfied at j in the mutated COQ $\mu_j(Q)$, keeping j a proper vertex. This placement of j is defined canonically up to wiggle equivalence. In what follows, when dealing with a proper mutation μ_j of a COQ Q , we denote by $\mu_j(Q)$ the COQ described above, i.e., the quiver $\mu_j(Q)$ whose cyclic ordering is determined, up to wiggle equivalence, by the above rule.

Remark 6.2. As mentioned above, if j is a proper vertex in a COQ Q , then j is also proper in the mutated COQ $\mu_j(Q)$. Furthermore, a proper mutation at j in the COQ $\mu_j(Q)$ recovers the original COQ Q , up to wiggle equivalence.

Example 6.3. Let Q be a 3-vertex quiver. We can always assign the labels a, b, c to the vertices of Q so that Q would contain $x \geq 0$ arrows $a \rightarrow b$ and $y \geq 0$ arrows $b \rightarrow c$; cf. Example 1.10. For the cyclic ordering (a, b, c) , all three vertices in Q are proper. A (proper) mutation at each of these vertices produces a new COQ with the reversed cyclic ordering (a, c, b) . Cf. Proposition 10.3.

Our next goal is to show that the notion of proper mutation is well defined at the level of wiggle equivalence classes of cyclically ordered quivers.

Proposition 6.4. *Let (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') be wiggle equivalent COQs. Suppose that a vertex j is proper in both (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') (cf. Remark 5.3). Then the COQs $\mu_j(Q, \sigma)$ and $\mu_j(Q, \sigma')$ are wiggle equivalent.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.9, we may assume that (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') are related by a single wiggle. If the wiggle involves the vertex j , then we may choose the placements of j within the cyclic orderings of mutated quivers so that $\mu_j(Q, \sigma) = \mu_j(Q, \sigma')$. Now suppose that (Q, σ) and (Q, σ') are related by a single wiggle (uv) not involving j . Since j remains proper after the wiggle, the vertices u, v are not connected by an oriented path passing through j . Therefore u and v remain non-adjacent in $\mu_j(Q)$, and the wiggle (uv) commutes with μ_j . \square

Definition 6.5. We say that μ_j is a *proper mutation* for a wiggle equivalence class \mathbb{Q} if the vertex j is proper in \mathbb{Q} , i.e., if j is a proper vertex in some COQ $Q \in \mathbb{Q}$. We then define $\mu_j(\mathbb{Q})$ to be the wiggle equivalence class of $\mu_j(Q)$. By Proposition 6.4, the wiggle equivalence class $\mu_j(\mathbb{Q})$ is well defined, i.e., it does not depend on the choice of a COQ $Q \in \mathbb{Q}$ in which j is a proper vertex.

Definition 6.6. A *proper mutation equivalence class* of a COQ Q consists of all COQs that can be obtained from Q by repeated proper mutations and wiggles.

Definition 6.7. Let Q be a COQ. The *opposite* COQ, denoted Q^{opp} , has all its arrows, as well as its cyclic ordering, reversed with respect to Q .

Passing to the opposite COQ is an involution that commutes with COQ mutation and preserves properness of individual vertices. Identifying opposite COQs with each other allows one to simplify the description of proper mutation classes.

In Examples 6.8–6.10 below, we begin with a quiver Q of type A_3 , A_4 , or D_4 . Since Q is a tree quiver, all its cyclic orderings are wiggle equivalent. Furthermore, each vertex is proper in the wiggle equivalence class \mathcal{Q} of Q , cf. Example 5.5.

Example 6.8. Consider the COQ $Q = (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c)$ of type A_3 with the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (a, b, c)$. Its proper mutation class is shown in Figure 10. Cf. also Figure 11, which shows (on the right) the same class with COQs identified up to relabeling.

The COQ $\mu_b(Q, \sigma)$ (see the leftmost quiver in Figure 10) is the oriented 3-cycle $Q' = (c \rightarrow b \rightarrow a \rightarrow c)$ with the cyclic ordering $\sigma' = (a, c, b)$. Taking instead the same quiver Q' with the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (a, b, c)$, we get a COQ (Q', σ) that does not lie in the proper mutation class of (Q, σ) . Indeed, no vertex is proper in (Q', σ) and no wiggles are possible, so it is the only COQ in its proper mutation class.




Figure 10: The proper mutation class of a COQ of type A_3 discussed in Example 6.8. The branches marked “...” lead to isomorphic copies of the middle “diamond”.




Figure 11: Proper mutation classes of COQs of type A_3 , considered up to relabeling. Each box contains a wiggle equivalence class. Double-sided arrows represent proper mutations. The red vertices are not proper.

Example 6.9. Consider the quiver $Q = (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d)$ of type A_4 , with the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (a, b, c, d)$. The COQs in the proper mutation class of (Q, σ) , viewed up to relabeling, taking the opposites, and wiggle equivalence, are depicted in Figure 12.

The quiver $\mu_b(Q)$ has just one other wiggle equivalence class, with a representative cyclic ordering (a, b, c, d) . In this COQ, the only proper vertex is the sink/source d . Mutating at d gives a similar COQ which again has only d as a proper vertex.




Figure 12: Proper mutation classes of COQs of type A_4 , considered up to relabeling, taking the opposites (cf. Definition 6.7), and wiggle equivalence. Red vertices are not proper.

Example 6.10. Consider the oriented 4-cycle quiver Q of type D_4 , with arrows

$$a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \rightarrow a.$$

This quiver has three wiggle equivalence classes of cyclic orderings, cf. Example 2.7, with representatives $\sigma_1 = (a, b, c, d)$, $\sigma_2 = (a, b, d, c)$, $\sigma_3 = (a, d, c, b)$. (These have winding numbers 1, 2, and 3, respectively.) The COQs in the proper mutation class of (Q, σ_1) , viewed up to relabeling and wiggle equivalence, are shown on the left of Figure 13. Every vertex in each of these quivers is proper.

The COQ (Q, σ_3) has no proper vertices and cannot be wiggled. The COQ (Q, σ_2) can be wiggled so that any given vertex is proper. Any single proper mutation applied to (Q, σ_2) gives a COQ isomorphic to $(\mu_a(Q), \sigma_3)$. The only proper vertex in it is a .

There is one additional proper mutation class of COQs of type D_4 (up to wiggles and relabeling), represented by $(\mu_a(Q), \sigma_2)$. Every vertex of this COQ is not proper.




Figure 13: Proper mutation classes of COQs of type D_4 , considered up to relabeling and wiggle equivalence. Red vertices are not proper.

We next discuss a couple of examples of quivers of affine types $\tilde{A}(n_1, n_2)$, cf. [19].

Example 6.11. Let Q be a quiver of type $\tilde{A}(2, 1)$ with arrows $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c$ and $a \rightarrow c$. Up to relabeling and opposites, there are only two quivers mutation-equivalent to Q . Each has two cyclic orderings, which fall into 3 proper mutation classes shown in Figure 14. Fix the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (a, b, c)$. Then every vertex in (Q, σ) is proper. Mutating at b results in the COQ $(\mu_b(Q), (a, c, b))$, where again every vertex is proper.

The other cyclic ordering of Q is (a, c, b) . Only the sink a and the source c are proper in the COQ $(Q, (a, c, b))$.

The other cyclic ordering of $\mu_b(Q)$ is (a, b, c) . No vertex in the COQ $(\mu_b(Q), (a, b, c))$ is proper.




Figure 14: Proper mutation classes of COQs of type $\tilde{A}(2, 1)$, considered up to relabeling, and wiggle equivalence. The red vertices are not proper.

Example 6.12. Consider the quiver Q of type $\tilde{A}(3, 1)$ (cf. [19, Figure 16]) with the vertices and arrows $a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d$, $a \rightarrow d$. This quiver has 3 cyclic orderings up to wiggle equivalence, represented by (a, d, c, b) , (a, b, c, d) and (a, b, d, c) (whose classes appear on the left of each row in Figure 15). In every cyclic ordering, the mutations at the sink d and the source a are proper, and yield relabelings of the same COQs. In the COQ $(Q, (a, d, c, b))$, there are no other proper vertices. Every vertex of every COQ in the proper mutation class of the COQ $(C, (a, b, c, d))$ is proper. In the COQ $(Q, (a, b, d, c))$, every vertex is proper, but mutating at b (resp., c) results in a COQ where c (resp. b) is not proper.

The quiver $Q' = \mu_b(Q)$ has 4 distinct wiggle equivalence classes of cyclic orderings. Both the COQs $(Q', (a, b, c, d))$ and $(Q', (a, d, b, c))$ have no proper vertices besides the sink d . The COQs $(Q', (a, c, b, d))$ and $(Q', (a, d, c, b))$ are in the proper mutation classes of $(Q, (a, b, c, d))$ and $(Q, (a, b, d, c))$ respectively.

The quiver $Q'' = \mu_a(\mu_b(Q))$ has two wiggle equivalence classes of cyclic orderings. The COQ $(Q'', (a, b, d, c))$ is in the proper mutation class of $(Q, (a, b, c, d))$, so every vertex is proper. By contrast, only the sink vertex b is proper in $(Q'', (a, b, c, d))$.




Figure 15: Proper mutation classes of COQs of type $\tilde{A}(3, 1)$, considered up to relabeling, opposites, and wiggle equivalence. The red vertices are not proper.

7. INVARIANTS OF PROPER MUTATIONS

Theorem 7.1. *Proper mutations and wiggles preserve the integral congruence class of a unipotent companion of a cyclically ordered quiver.*

Put slightly differently, proper mutations of wiggle equivalence classes of COQs preserve the integral congruence class of associated unipotent companions.

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Let k be a proper vertex in a COQ (Q, σ) . By Remark 5.8, we can choose a linear ordering (denoted $<$) on the vertices of Q that is compatible with the cyclic ordering σ and satisfies $i < k$ for $i \in \text{In}(k)$ and $k < j$ for $j \in \text{Out}(k)$. For the mutated COQ $Q' = \mu_k(Q)$, we choose a linear ordering $<'$ such that $k <' i$ for all vertices $i \neq k$, and otherwise $<'$ agrees with $<$.

We will use the notation $U = U_Q = (u_{ij})$ and $U' = U_{Q'} = (u'_{ij})$. Here and below, the rows and columns of matrices associated with Q and Q' are ordered using $<$ and $<'$ respectively. Our goal is to show that U and U' are congruent over \mathbb{Z} . We note that for the purposes of establishing congruence, the ordering of the rows and columns of U and U' does not matter, as long as the rows and the columns are permuted in the same way.

We denote $B = B_Q = (b_{ij})$ and let $N = U - I = (n_{ij})$, the strictly upper-triangular part of U (or of $-B$). We also denote

$$\varepsilon_i = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if } i = k; \\ 1 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 7.2. *We have $u'_{ij} = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j u_{ij} - n_{ik} u_{kj} \varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_i u_{ik} n_{jk} + n_{ik} n_{jk}$.*

Proof. In light of Definitions 1.12 and 4.2, we have (recall that vertex k is minimal with respect to $<'$):

$$(7.1) \quad u'_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = j; \\ b_{kj} & \text{if } i = k \neq j; \\ -b_{ij} - [b_{ik}]_+ [b_{kj}]_+ + [b_{ik}]_- [b_{kj}]_- & \text{if } k \neq i <' j; \\ 0 & \text{if } i >' j. \end{cases}$$

Let $u''_{ij} = \varepsilon_i \varepsilon_j u_{ij} - n_{ik} u_{kj} \varepsilon_j - \varepsilon_i u_{ik} n_{jk} + n_{ik} n_{jk}$. To establish the equality $u''_{ij} = u'_{ij}$, we check each case of equation (7.1) separately:

- If $i = j$, then $u''_{ij} = 1 - 0 - u_{ik} n_{ik} + n_{ik}^2 = 1 = u'_{ij}$.
 - If $i = k \neq j$, then $u''_{ij} = -u_{kj} - 0 + n_{jk} + 0 = b_{kj} = u'_{ij}$.
 - If $k \neq i <' j$, then $u''_{ij} = u_{ij} - n_{ik} u_{kj} - u_{ik} n_{jk} + n_{ik} n_{jk} = u_{ij} - n_{ik} u_{kj}$. For these vertices i and j , we have $[b_{ik}]_+ [b_{kj}]_+ = n_{ik} u_{kj}$ and $[b_{ik}]_- [b_{kj}]_- = 0$, both by construction of $<$. So $u''_{ij} = -b_{ij} - n_{ik} u_{kj} + 0 = u_{ij} - n_{ik} u_{kj} = u'_{ij}$.
 - If $i \neq k$ and $j = k$, then $u''_{ij} = -u_{ik} + n_{ik} - 0 + 0 = 0 = u'_{ij}$.
- If $i, j \neq k$ and $j < i$, then $u''_{ij} = 0 - 0 - u_{ik} n_{jk} + n_{ik} n_{jk} = 0 = u'_{ij}$. □

Lemma 7.2 can be restated as follows:

$$\pi^T U' \pi = J U J - N E_{kk} U J - J U E_{kk} N^T + N E_{kk} N^T = (J - N E_{kk}) U (J - E_{kk} N^T)$$

where

- π is a permutation matrix such that $\pi^T U' \pi$ is obtained from U' by reordering of its rows and columns according to the linear ordering $<$ (as opposed to $<'$);
- J is the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$, and
- E_{kk} is the $n \times n$ diagonal matrix whose sole nonzero entry is 1 in row and column k .

(Here we used that $E_{kk} U E_{kk} = E_{kk}$ because $u_{kk} = 1$.) Theorem 7.1 is proved. \square

Remark 7.3. The above proof is similar to the argument in [21, p. 34], which uses the matrix E_j defined (for $\varepsilon = -1$) by setting $(E_k)_{ik} = \max(0, b_{ik})$ for all i and letting all other entries of E_k be equal to 0. This matrix is then used in [21] in the identity $(J + E_k) B_Q (J + E_k^T) = B_{\mu_k(Q)}$. Under our choice of linear ordering, $E_k = N E_{kk}$.

Corollary 7.4. *Proper mutations and wiggles preserve the $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy class of the cosquare of the unipotent companion of a COQ.*

Remark 7.5. We are not aware of algorithms for detecting integral congruence, i.e., deciding whether two given matrices in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ are congruent to each other over \mathbb{Z} . This makes it impractical to use Theorem 7.1 to establish mutation (in)equivalence for specific pairs of quivers.

Remark 7.6. The conjugacy problem in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ has an algorithmic solution whose idea goes back to F. Grunewald [26] (cf. also R. A. Sarkisyan [35] and F. Grunewald–D. Segal [27]). It reduces the problem of deciding whether two matrices in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ are conjugate to each other (over \mathbb{Z}) to the isomorphism problem for (integral) modules over truncated polynomial rings $\mathcal{O}_K[t]/(t^\ell)$, where \mathcal{O}_K is the ring of algebraic integers in a number field K . An algorithm based on this approach was fully developed and implemented in MAGMA by B. Eick, T. Hofmann, and E. A. O’Brien [14]. (For another, open source, software, see [4, Section 9.5].) We used the implementation of [14] to perform computational experiments for various families of quivers.

Remark 7.7. Apparently, there is no standard “canonical form” for conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, see [14, Problem 7.3].

Remark 7.8. The $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy class of an $n \times n$ matrix is contained in (hence determines) its $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ conjugacy class, which in turn determines the $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$ conjugacy class. As we move from \mathbb{Z} to \mathbb{Q} and then to \mathbb{C} , the conjugacy class of a given matrix (in our applications, of the cosquare of a unipotent companion) becomes much easier to compute—but the corresponding (proper) mutation invariants of quivers become substantially less powerful.

Recall that the $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ (resp., $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{C})$) conjugacy class of a matrix is captured by its Frobenius normal form (resp., Jordan canonical form). A $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ conjugacy class is a disjoint union of $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy classes. This union may be infinite, in which case a lot of information is lost when passing from a $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ class to a $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ class. (This happens when the matrices involved are not semisimple, i.e., when their minimal polynomial has repeated irreducible factors; see [14, p. 755].)

We illustrate Remark 7.8 by the following example.

Example 7.9. For an integer $m > 0$, let Q_m be the 3-vertex quiver shown in Figure 16. The unipotent companion of Q_m and its cosquare are given by

$$U_m = U_{Q_m} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -m & 2 \\ 0 & 1 & -m \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad C_m = U_m^{-T} U_m = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -m & 2 \\ m & -m^2 + 1 & m \\ m^2 - 2 & -m^3 + 3m & m^2 - 3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The cosquare $C_m = U_m^{-T} U_m$ has the same characteristic polynomial for all m :

$$\det(tI - C_m) = (t - 1)(t + 1)^2.$$

The Jordan normal form of C_m carries a bit more information: it is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} (m \neq 2), \quad \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} (m = 2).$$

Thus, the complex conjugacy class distinguishes Q_2 from all other Q_m 's. (Indeed, Q_2 is only mutation-equivalent to itself.)

The $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Q})$ conjugacy classes do not provide any additional refinement: the Frobenius normal form of C_m (also known as the rational canonical form) is given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} (m \neq 2), \quad \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} (m = 2).$$

On the other hand, the $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy classes of the matrices C_m are all distinct. To see this, substitute C_m into the polynomial $t^2 - 1 = (t - 1)(t + 1)$:

$$C_m^2 - I = \begin{bmatrix} m^2 - 4 & -m^3 + 4m & m^2 - 4 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -m^2 + 4 & m^3 - 4m & -m^2 + 4 \end{bmatrix} = (m^2 - 4) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -m & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & m & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

This implies that

$$(7.2) \quad C_m^2 - I \equiv 0 \pmod{N}$$

if and only if N divides $m^2 - 4$. In particular, if $m > m' > 0$, then (7.2) holds for $N = m^2 - 4$ whereas $C_{m'}^2 - I \not\equiv 0 \pmod{N}$. Since the validity of (7.2) is invariant under conjugation in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, it follows that C_m and $C_{m'}$ cannot be conjugate in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$. (The latter conclusion also follows from A. Seven's observation about gcd's [36, 21], cf. the discussion at the end of Section 9.)




Figure 16: A 3-cycle quiver with multiplicities 2, m , m .

Remark 7.10. The above trick is not guaranteed to always work to establish non-conjugacy over the integers. As shown by P. F. Stebe [39], for $n \geq 3$, there exist matrices $M, M' \in \mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ such that (a) M and M' are not conjugate in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ and (b) this fact cannot be detected by passing to $\mathrm{mod} N$ arithmetic for some N (or by applying some other homomorphism from $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ to a finite group).

8. ALEXANDER POLYNOMIALS OF CYCLICALLY ORDERED QUIVERS

Definition 8.1. Let (Q, σ) be a cyclically ordered quiver. By Corollary 4.11, the conjugacy class of the cosquare of the unipotent companion $U = U_Q$ is well defined (and moreover depends only on the wobble equivalence class of (Q, σ)). With this in mind, we define the *Alexander polynomial* $\Delta(t) = \Delta_Q(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ of the COQ (Q, σ) (or of its wobble equivalence class) as the monic characteristic polynomial of the aforementioned cosquare:

$$\Delta_Q(t) = \det(tI - U^{-T}U).$$

Remark 8.2. Alternatively, $\Delta_Q(t)$ can be defined by

$$\Delta_Q(t) = \det(tU - U^T).$$

Indeed, $\det(U) = 1$ implies that

$$\Delta_Q(t) = \det(tI - U^{-T}U) = \det(tU^T - U) = \det(tU - U^T).$$

As in the case of links/knots, the Alexander polynomials of quivers are palindromic, up to a change of signs:

Proposition 8.3. *For any COQ Q , the Alexander polynomial $\Delta(t) = \Delta_Q(t)$ satisfies*

$$\Delta(t) = (-t)^n \Delta(t^{-1}).$$

Proof. Let $C = U^{-T}U$. We first note that C^{-T} is conjugate to C :

$$C^{-T} = UU^{-T} = U^T U^{-T} UU^{-T} = U^T C U^{-T}.$$

It follows that $C^{-1} = (C^{-T})^T$ has the same characteristic polynomial as C . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(t) &= \det(tI - C) = \det(tI - C^{-1}) \\ &= \det(tC - I) = (-t)^n \det(t^{-1}I - C) = (-t)^n \Delta(t^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad \square$$

Definition 8.4. The *Markov invariant* of an n -vertex COQ (Q, σ) is defined by

$$(8.1) \quad M_Q = n - \text{Trace}(U^{-T}U) = n + (\text{coefficient of } t^{n-1} \text{ in } \Delta_Q(t)).$$

Theorem 7.1 directly implies:

Corollary 8.5. *Proper mutations of COQs preserve the Alexander polynomial and, by extension, the Markov invariant.*

It is well known [21, Theorem 2.8.4] that the determinant $\det(B_Q)$ of the exchange matrix is preserved by mutations. This mutation invariant can be recovered from the Alexander polynomial of Q , as follows:

Proposition 8.6. $\det(B_Q) = (-1)^n \Delta_Q(1)$.

Proof. The formula $-B_Q = U_Q - U_Q^T$ implies that

$$(-1)^n \det(B_Q) = \det(-B_Q) = \det(U_Q - U_Q^T) = \Delta_Q(1). \quad \square$$

Remark 8.7. Recently, R. Casals [10] introduced a binary invariant of quiver mutations that can be derived from the specialization $\Delta_Q(-1)$ of the Alexander polynomial. A further generalization of Casals' invariant has been constructed by A. Seven and İ. Ünal [38]. Importantly, the invariants discovered by Casals and Seven–Ünal do not depend on the cyclic ordering data.

Remark 8.8. Another well-known—although not particularly powerful—mutation invariant is the rank of the exchange matrix B_Q , see [21, Theorem 2.8.3] and/or [3, Lemma 3.2]. This invariant is not directly determined by the Alexander polynomial, but it can be easily recovered from the Jordan normal form of the cosquare $U_Q^{-T}U_Q$. Specifically, the corank of B_Q is equal to the number of Jordan blocks of the cosquare that correspond to the eigenvalue 1.

Example 8.9 ($n = 2$). Continuing with Example 4.13, the Alexander polynomial of a 2-vertex (Kronecker) quiver with $\pm x$ arrows is given by

$$\Delta(t) = \det(tI - U^{-T}U) = (t-1)(t-1+x^2) + x^2 = t^2 + t(-2+x^2) + 1.$$

The Markov invariant is given by $M_Q = 2 + (-2 + x^2) = x^2$.

Example 8.10 ($n = 3$). Let Q be a 3-vertex quiver on a linearly ordered set of vertices, with the exchange matrix

$$(8.2) \quad B = B_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x & z \\ -x & 0 & y \\ -z & -y & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

(cf. Examples 1.10 and 4.14). The Alexander polynomial of Q is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(t) &= \det(tI - U^{-T}U) \\ &= t^3 + (-3 + x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + xyz)t^2 + (3 - x^2 - y^2 - z^2 - xyz)t - 1. \end{aligned}$$

The Markov invariant is given by

$$M_Q = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + xyz.$$

Thus

$$\Delta(t) = (t-1)^3 + M_Q \cdot t(t-1).$$

Essentially the same construction of the “Markov constant” associated to a 3-vertex quiver has appeared in [2, Section 3].

Remark 8.11. For quivers on $n \leq 3$ vertices, the Markov invariant contains the same information as the Alexander polynomial.

Remark 8.12. Already in the case of 3-vertex quivers, the Alexander polynomial is not sufficient to determine mutation equivalence. For instance, see Example 7.9.

Example 8.13 ($n = 4$). Let Q be a quiver on four linearly ordered vertices, with

$$B_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x & z & w \\ -x & 0 & y & v \\ -z & -y & 0 & u \\ -w & -v & -u & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

(cf. Example 4.15). The Alexander polynomial of Q is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(t) &= \det(tI - U^{-T}U) \\ &= t^4 + (-4 + x^2 + y^2 + u^2 + z^2 + v^2 + w^2 + xyz + xvw + yuv + uzv + xyuw)t^3 \\ &\quad + (6 + x^2u^2 + z^2v^2 + y^2w^2 - 2yzvw - 2xuzv \\ &\quad - 2x^2 - 2y^2 - 2u^2 - 2z^2 - 2v^2 - 2w^2 - 2xyz - 2xvw - 2yuv - 2uzv)t^2 \\ &\quad + (-4 + x^2 + y^2 + u^2 + z^2 + v^2 + w^2 + xyz + xvw + yuv + uzv + xyuw)t + 1 \\ &= t^4 + (-4 + M_Q)t^3 + (6 + \det(B_Q) - 2M_Q)t^2 + (-4 + M_Q)t + 1, \end{aligned}$$

where M_Q is the Markov invariant, given by

$$M_Q = x^2 + y^2 + u^2 + z^2 + v^2 + w^2 + xyz + xvw + yuv + uzv + xyuw.$$

Thus

$$\Delta(t) = (t - 1)^4 + M_Q \cdot t(t - 1)^2 + \det(B_Q) \cdot t^2.$$

We see that the Alexander polynomial of a four-vertex COQ encodes two quantities: the Markov invariant M_Q and the determinant of the exchange matrix B_Q .

We conclude this section by calculating Alexander polynomials of several families of *tree quivers*, cf. Definition 1.6. We chose to focus on tree quivers since they provide a convenient data set for testing the relative power of mutation invariants. All orientations of the same tree are mutation equivalent to each other. It is also well known, although nontrivial to prove, that orientations of non-isomorphic trees are mutation-inequivalent, see [8] [21, Corollary 2.6.13].

By Proposition 2.6, all cyclic orderings of a tree quiver are wiggle equivalent to each other. Hence the Alexander polynomial does not depend on the choice of a cyclic ordering, cf. Corollary 4.11. It will also transpire that iterated mutations of the quivers examined below are always proper (cf. Theorem 12.3), so the proper mutation class coincides with the ordinary one.

We first treat the Dynkin quivers of finite types *ADE*.

Example 8.14 (Type A_n). Consider the COQ

$$Q = (v_1 \rightarrow v_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_n)$$

of type A_n , with the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$; cf. Examples 6.8– 6.9. Then

$$U_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_Q^{-T}U_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Delta_Q(t) = t^n - t^{n-1} + t^{n-2} + \cdots + (-1)^n = \frac{t^{n+1} - 1}{t - 1},$$

$$M_Q = n - 1, \quad \det(B_Q) = 1 \text{ (} n \text{ even)}, \quad \det(B_Q) = 0 \text{ (} n \text{ odd)}.$$

Example 8.15 (Type D_n). Consider the COQ

$$Q = \begin{array}{ccccccc} & v_1 & \rightarrow & v_3 & \rightarrow & v_4 & \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_n \\ & & & \uparrow & & & \\ & & & v_2 & & & \end{array}$$

of type D_n , with the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$. Then

$$U_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_Q^{-T} U_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Delta_Q(t) = t^n - t^{n-1} + (-1)^{n-1}t + (-1)^n,$$

$$M_Q = n - 1, \quad \det(B_Q) = 0.$$

Example 8.16 (Type E_n). Consider the COQ

$$Q = \begin{array}{ccccccc} & v_1 & \rightarrow & v_2 & \rightarrow & v_4 & \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow v_n \\ & & & & & \uparrow & \\ & & & & & v_3 & \end{array}$$

of type E_n , with the cyclic ordering $\sigma = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$. Then

$$U_Q^{-T} U_Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & -1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Delta_Q(t) = t^n - t^{n-1} + t^{n-3} - t^{n-4} + \cdots + (-1)^n t^3 + (-1)^{n-1}t + (-1)^n,$$

$$M_Q = n - 1, \quad \det(B_Q) = 1 \text{ (} n \text{ even)}, \quad \det(B_Q) = 0 \text{ (} n \text{ odd)}.$$

Remark 8.17. Neither $\det(B)$ nor $\text{rank}(B)$ distinguish between the three finite types A_n , D_n , and E_n when n is odd; or between A_n and E_n when n is even. On the other hand, the Alexander polynomials of these quivers (or of any COQs in the corresponding proper mutation classes) are distinct from each other.

Example 8.18 (Tree quivers on six vertices). There are six pairwise non-isomorphic trees on 6 vertices: the Dynkin diagrams of types A_6 , D_6 , and E_6 , plus three more. We compute Alexander polynomials for the latter three types:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \\ \uparrow \quad \uparrow \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \end{array} & \Delta_Q(t) = t^6 - t^5 - t^4 + 2t^3 - t^2 - t + 1 \\
 & = (t^2 - t + 1)(t - 1)^2(t + 1)^2 \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \downarrow \\ \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \\ \uparrow \\ \bullet \end{array} & \Delta_Q(t) = t^6 - t^5 - 2t^4 + 4t^3 - 2t^2 - t + 1 \\
 & = (t^4 + t^3 - t^2 + t + 1)(t - 1)^2 \\
 \\
 \begin{array}{ccc} \bullet & & \bullet \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet \\ & \downarrow & \\ \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet \end{array} & \Delta_Q(t) = t^6 - t^5 - 5t^4 + 10t^3 - 5t^2 - t + 1 \\
 & = (t^2 + 3t + 1)(t - 1)^4
 \end{array}$$

Remark 8.19. In general, the Alexander polynomial does not necessarily distinguish between tree quivers whose underlying trees are non-isomorphic. The only example with $n \leq 8$ involves the 8-vertex tree quivers

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} \bullet & \bullet \\ \downarrow & \downarrow \\ \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \\ \uparrow & \uparrow \\ \bullet & \bullet \end{array} & \text{and} & \begin{array}{ccccccc} \bullet & \bullet & \bullet & & & & \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \nearrow & & & \\ \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet & \rightarrow & \bullet \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

which have the same Alexander polynomial

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta(t) &= t^8 - t^7 - 5t^6 + 13t^5 - 16t^4 + 13t^3 - 5t^2 - t + 1 \\
 &= (t^4 + 3t^3 + t^2 + 3t + 1)(t - 1)^4.
 \end{aligned}$$

These COQs are however distinguished from each other by the $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy classes of their respective cosquare matrices $U_Q^{-T}U_Q$. This can be shown by evaluating the polynomial $t^4 + 3t^3 + t^2 + 3t + 1$ at each cosquare and verifying that one of these evaluations vanishes mod 3 (i.e., gives a zero matrix) whereas the other one does not.

Remark 8.20. Among 47 pairwise non-isomorphic trees on 9 vertices, 37 trees give rise to tree quivers with unique Alexander polynomials. The remaining 10 trees form 5 “collision pairs” that give rise to quivers with coinciding Alexander polynomials.

For two of these pairs, the corresponding $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy classes of cosquares of unipotent companions are distinct; moreover the latter fact can be certified by a “Hasse principle” argument similar to the one given in Remark 8.19.

For each of the remaining three pairs, the $\text{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy classes for the two quivers coincide, so the algorithms described above do not provide a certificate showing that these two quivers are mutation-inequivalent to each other. We do not know whether these quivers are distinguished from each other by the integral congruence classes of their unipotent companions. These congruence classes might potentially carry more information than the aforementioned conjugacy classes.

9. SIGNED BRAID GROUP ACTION ON UPPER TRIANGULAR MATRICES

In this section, we outline a connection between proper mutations of COQs and the well-known braid group action on upper-triangular matrices that goes back to the work of A. N. Rudakov [34], B. Dubrovin [13, App. F], S. Cecotti–C. Vafa [11, p. 605], and A. I. Bondal–A. E. Polishchuk [6]. We begin by reviewing the basic construction, following [5, Section 2]. For more recent work, see, e.g., [16] and references therein.

Definition 9.1. Let \mathbf{B}_n denote the *braid group* on n strands, with Artin generators $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}$. Let $\mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ denote the set of all $n \times n$ unipotent upper-triangular matrices with integer entries. The braid group \mathbf{B}_n acts on the set $\mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ in the following way. For $U = (u_{ij}) \in \mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ and $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, define the matrix G (which depends on k and, importantly, on U) by

$$G = s_k(I - u_{k,k+1}E_{k+1,k})$$

where

- $E_{k+1,k}$ is the matrix whose only nonzero entry is a 1 in row $(k+1)$ and column k ;
- s_k is the permutation matrix for the adjacent transposition $(k, k+1)$.

We then define the action of the Artin generator σ_k on U by

$$\sigma_k(U) = GUG^T.$$

It is straightforward to check that $\sigma_k(U)$ is again a unipotent upper triangular matrix and that the above construction gives an action of the braid group \mathbf{B}_n on $\mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$.

The action of \mathbf{B}_n described above extends to an action of the semidirect product $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$, with each element $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ acting by simultaneous left and right multiplication by the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n \in \{-1, 1\}$.

Example 9.2. Let $n = 4$. For $k = 2$ and

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & u_{12} & u_{13} & u_{14} \\ 0 & 1 & u_{23} & u_{24} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & u_{34} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

we get

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -u_{23} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \sigma_2(U) = GUG^T = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -u_{12}u_{23} + u_{13} & u_{12} & u_{14} \\ 0 & 1 & -u_{23} & -u_{23}u_{24} + u_{34} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & u_{24} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is immediate from Definition 9.1 that the congruence class of U (hence the conjugacy class of its cosquare, the corresponding Alexander polynomial, etc.) is preserved under this action of $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$. Put differently, the intersection of each congruence class in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ with the set $\mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ of unipotent upper-triangular integer matrices is a disjoint union of $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ orbits.

We next outline the connection between the above construction and the machinery of cyclically ordered quivers and their (proper) mutations.

Proposition 9.3. *Let Q be a quiver on a linearly ordered set of vertices (v_1, \dots, v_n) . Let Q' be another linearly ordered quiver obtained from Q by a sequence of cyclic reorderings, wiggles, and proper mutations. Then the unipotent companions of Q and Q' lie in the same $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ orbit.*

Proof (sketch). Let ρ_k ($1 \leq i \leq n$) denote the generator of the abelian group $\{\pm 1\}^n$ given by $(1, \dots, 1, -1, 1, \dots, 1)$, where the only entry equal to -1 is in position k .

It is straightforward to verify the following statements, which imply all the claims made in the Proposition (here we use the notation $U = U_Q$ and $U' = U_{Q'}$):

- If Q' is obtained from Q by passing to the linear ordering (v_2, \dots, v_n, v_1) , then

$$U' = \sigma_{n-1} \cdots \sigma_1(U).$$
- If Q' is obtained from Q by a wiggle $(v_k v_{k+1})$, then $U' = \sigma_k(U)$.
- If Q' is obtained from Q by a mutation at a sink/source v_k , then $U' = \rho_k(U)$.
- If Q' is obtained from Q by a proper mutation at a vertex v_k that is neither a source nor a sink, with $v_1 \in \text{In}(v_k)$ and $a = |\text{Out}(v_k)| \geq 1$, then

$$(9.1) \quad U' = \rho_{k+a} \sigma_{k+a-1} \cdots \sigma_{k+1} \sigma_k(U). \quad \square$$

Example 9.4. Continuing with Example 9.2, we get

$$\rho_4(\sigma_3(\sigma_2(U))) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -u_{12}u_{23} + u_{13} & -u_{12}u_{24} + u_{14} & -u_{12} \\ 0 & 1 & u_{34} & u_{23} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & u_{24} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

matching the outcome of a proper mutation at vertex v_2 .

Proposition 9.3 shows that the proper mutation class of a COQ is contained in its $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ orbit. While the opposite inclusion is generally false, it turns out that one can obtain an entire $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ orbit of a COQ by allowing additional quiver transformations described below.

Definition 9.5. Let Q be a quiver on a linearly ordered set of vertices (v_1, \dots, v_n) . For a vertex v in Q , the (quiver) *reflection* ρ_v transforms Q by reversing all arrows incident to the vertex v . The ordering of the vertices in $\rho_{v_i}(Q)$ remains the same.

The group $\{\pm 1\}^n$ acts on the set of quivers Q as above by letting each generator ρ_i act by the corresponding quiver reflection ρ_{v_i} . This action is consistent with the action of $\{\pm 1\}^n$ on the associated unipotent companions: $U_{\rho_{v_i}(Q)} = \rho_i(U_Q)$.

For a set $S = \{s_1, s_2, \dots\}$ of vertices in Q , we denote by ρ_S the composition of (commuting) reflections $\rho_S = \rho_{s_1} \rho_{s_2} \cdots$. Thus, an element $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n) \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ acts on quivers by the transformation ρ_S where $S = S(\varepsilon) = \{i \mid \varepsilon_i = -1\}$.

Proposition 9.6. *Let Q be a quiver on a linearly ordered set of vertices (v_1, \dots, v_n) . Let $U = U_Q$ be the associated unipotent companion. Choose an Artin generator σ_k and set $U' = \sigma_k(U)$. Let Q' be the quiver defined by $U' = U_{Q'}$, with the linear ordering in which v_k and v_{k+1} have been switched. Then Q' can be obtained from Q via proper mutations, reflections, and wiggles:*

- If $u_{v_k v_{k+1}} = 0$, then Q' is obtained from Q by the wiggle (v_k, v_{k+1}) .
- If $u_{v_k v_{k+1}} \neq 0$, then $Q' = \rho_S(\mu_{v_k}(\rho_S(Q)))$, for some set of vertices S such that v_k is a proper vertex in $\rho_S(Q)$.

Proof. Let us choose a set of vertices S so that $\text{Out}_{\rho_S(Q)}(v_k) = \{v_{k+1}\}$. Clearly, v_k is proper in $\rho_S(Q)$. Now, let T denote the set of indices of the vertices S in Q' . By (9.1), we have $U_{\mu_{v_k}(\rho_S(Q))} = \sigma_k(U_{\rho_S(Q)})$. We then get

$$U_{Q'} = \sigma_k(U_Q) = \rho_T(\sigma_k(U_{\rho_S(Q)})) = \rho_T(U_{\mu_{v_k}(\rho_S(Q))}) = U_{\rho_S(\mu_{v_k}(\rho_S(Q)))}. \quad \square$$

Corollary 9.7. *The $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ orbit of a COQ Q consists of all COQs that can be obtained from Q by a sequence of proper mutations, reflections, and wiggles.*

We conclude this section by explaining how another well-known invariant of quiver mutations fits into the framework of the $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ action on $\mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$. As observed in [36] and recalled in [21, Section 2.8], the greatest common divisor of the matrix elements in a given row (or column) of the exchange matrix is a mutation invariant of a labeled quiver. Allowing for relabelings, the multiset of these gcd's is an invariant. We next demonstrate that this quantity is in fact constant on each $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ orbit.

Definition 9.8. For a matrix $U = (u_{ij}) \in \mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, let $d_r(U)$ denote the greatest common divisor of all non-diagonal entries in the r th row and column:

$$d_r(U) = \gcd(u_{1r}, u_{2r}, \dots, u_{r-1,r}, u_{r,r+1}, \dots, u_{rn}).$$

We then denote by $\mathbf{d}(U)$ the multiset of numbers $\mathbf{d}(U) = \{d_1(U), \dots, d_n(U)\}$.

Proposition 9.9. *If two matrices $U, U' \in \mathcal{U}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ lie in the same $\mathbf{B}_n \rtimes \{\pm 1\}^n$ orbit, then $\mathbf{d}(U) = \mathbf{d}(U')$.*

Proof. It suffices to check the claim in the cases $U' = \rho_k(U)$ and $U' = \sigma_k(U)$.

Case 1: $U' = \rho_k(U)$. Then $u'_{ij} = \pm u_{ij}$ for all i and j , so $\mathbf{d}(U') = \mathbf{d}(U)$.

Case 2: $U' = \sigma_k(U)$. We are going to rely on the following elementary fact.

Lemma 9.10. *Let $\mathbf{M} = \{m_1, \dots, m_r\}$ and $\mathbf{M}' = \{m'_1, \dots, m'_r\}$ be two collections of integers. Suppose that for some $j \in \{1, \dots, r\}$, we have $m_j = \pm m'_j$ and, for any $i \neq j$, we have $m_j \mid (m'_i - m_i)$. (In other words, m'_i is obtained from m_i by adding a number divisible by m_j .) Then $\gcd(\mathbf{M}) = \gcd(\mathbf{M}')$.*

To complete the proof of Proposition 9.9, one needs to verify, using Lemma 9.10, that

$$d_i(U') = \begin{cases} d_i(U) & \text{if } i \notin \{k, k+1\}; \\ d_{k+1}(U) & \text{if } i = k; \\ d_k(U) & \text{if } i = k+1. \end{cases}$$

We omit the details. □

Example 9.11. In the case of Example 9.2 (i.e., $n = 4$, $k = 2$, $U' = \sigma_2(U)$), we get:

$$d_1(U) = \gcd(u_{12}, u_{13}, u_{14});$$

$$d_2(U) = \gcd(u_{12}, u_{23}, u_{24});$$

$$d_3(U) = \gcd(u_{13}, u_{23}, u_{34});$$

$$d_1(U') = \gcd(-u_{12}u_{23} + u_{13}, u_{12}, u_{14}) = d_1(U);$$

$$d_2(U') = \gcd(-u_{12}u_{23} + u_{13}, u_{23}, -u_{23}u_{24} + u_{34}) = d_3(U);$$

$$d_3(U') = \gcd(u_{12}, -u_{23}, u_{24}) = d_2(U).$$

10. PROPER COQS

Definition 10.1. A COQ (Q, σ) , or its wiggle equivalence class \mathcal{Q} , is called *proper* if every vertex j in Q is proper in \mathcal{Q} , cf. Definition 5.4. To rephrase, a COQ is proper if every vertex in it can be made proper by a sequence of wiggles.

For a quiver Q , a *proper cyclic ordering* is a cyclic ordering σ such that (Q, σ) is a proper COQ.

Remark 10.2. The notion of a proper cyclic ordering is closely related to the notion of a *locally transitive tournament* investigated by several authors [7, 9, 31].

The proper COQs are of interest to us because any mutation in a proper COQ preserves the invariants discussed in Sections 7–8. Unfortunately, the properness property does not propagate under mutations, see Remark 10.13 below.

We next discuss several classes of proper COQs.

Proposition 10.3. *Any quiver on $n \leq 3$ vertices possesses a proper cyclic ordering.*

Proof. Any COQ on $n \leq 2$ vertices is proper. The case $n = 3$ has been treated in Example 6.3. \square

Lemma 10.4. *A mutation of a proper COQ on $n \leq 3$ vertices yields a proper COQ.*

Proof. This claim is verified by a straightforward case-by-case analysis. \square

Example 10.5. An oriented 4-cycle quiver has two proper cyclic orderings (up to wiggle equivalence), see Figures 17 and 6.




Figure 17: Proper cyclic orderings of the 4-cycle quiver $Q = (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \rightarrow a)$. The second and third cyclic orderings are wiggle equivalent. In the first ordering, all vertices are proper. In the second ordering, a and b are proper but c and d are not. In the third ordering, c and d are proper while a and b are not.

Example 10.6. Let Q be a quiver whose vertices are colored in three colors $\{-1, 0, 1\}$, so that every arrow originating at a vertex of color -1 (resp., $0, 1$) points towards a vertex of color 0 (resp., $1, -1$). (These conditions are in particular satisfied for quivers associated with divides, see [20].) Then Q has a proper cyclic ordering obtained from a linear ordering in which the vertices of color -1 precede the vertices of color 0 , which in turn precede the vertices of color 1 . (The ordering among the vertices of the same color does not matter, as all choices are wiggle equivalent.)

Observation 10.7. Any acyclic quiver Q has a proper cyclic ordering, obtained from any linear ordering where v precedes u whenever $v \rightarrow u$.

Proposition 10.8. Let Q be a COQ of type $\tilde{A}(r, \ell)$ whose underlying graph is an undirected n -cycle with r arrows pointing in one direction and ℓ arrows in the other. Recall that $1 - \ell \leq \text{wind}(C, \sigma) \leq r - 1$. If $\text{wind}(Q) \notin \{1 - \ell, r - 1\}$, then Q is proper.

Proof. This is immediate from Proposition 5.6. \square

Remark 10.9. Proposition 10.8 provides many examples of quivers that have multiple wiggly-inequivalent proper cyclic orderings.

We next discuss some examples of quivers that do not possess any proper cyclic orderings.

Definition 10.10. A *vortex* is a complete 4-vertex quiver Q such that one of the vertices of Q is a source or a sink, and the remaining three vertices of Q support an oriented 3-cycle.

Equivalently, a vortex is a complete 4-vertex quiver that contains an oriented 3-cycle but not an oriented 4-cycle. The unique sink/source of a vortex is called its *apex*. See Figure 18.

We say that a quiver Q *contains a vortex* if one of its 4-vertex (induced) subquivers is a vortex. A quiver that does not contain a vortex is called *vortex-free*.

(This terminology goes back to D. E. Knuth [30, Section 4].)




Figure 18: Four vortices with an apex at vertex d .

Proposition 10.11. A 4-vertex quiver has a proper cyclic ordering if and only if it is not a vortex.

Proof. Let Q be a 4-vertex quiver.

Case 1: Q is acyclic (hence not a vortex). Then Q has a proper cyclic ordering, see Observation 10.7.

Case 2: Q has an oriented 4-cycle (hence Q is not a vortex). Then the cyclic ordering induced by this cycle is proper, regardless of the orientations of the remaining arrows.

Case 3: Q has no oriented 4-cycle but has an oriented 3-cycle $C = (a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \rightarrow a)$.

Case 3A: The remaining vertex d is a source or a sink. If d is adjacent to all three vertices a, b, c , then Q is a vortex; furthermore it is not proper since any location of d (with respect to the clockwise 3-cycle C) will create a left turn at some vertex in C . If d is adjacent to at most two of the remaining vertices (so Q is not a vortex), then it's easy to see that we can always complete the cyclic ordering (a, b, c) to a proper ordering of Q .

Case 3B: The vertex d is neither a source nor a sink. This means that d lies in the middle of some oriented 2-arrow path. (Also, Q is not a vortex, as it has no sink/source vertex.) Up to symmetries, there are two cases: (1) a 2-arrow path $a \rightarrow d \rightarrow b$ is ruled out since it would create an oriented 4-cycle; (2) a 2-arrow path $a \rightarrow d \rightarrow c$ would allow a proper ordering (either (a, b, d, c) or (a, d, b, c) , depending on the orientation of the arrows between b and d , if any). \square

Corollary 10.12. *A quiver that contains a vortex has no proper cyclic ordering.*

Remark 10.13. A mutation of a proper COQ does not necessarily produce a proper COQ. More precisely, a quiver that possesses a proper cyclic ordering can sometimes be mutated to a quiver that does not have a proper cyclic ordering. Let Q be the quiver in Figure 19. Then $\mu_a(Q)$ has a proper cyclic ordering (e.g., (a, d, c, b)). But Q is a vortex, so by Proposition 10.11, Q has no proper cyclic ordering.

Furthermore, a proper mutation of a proper COQ may not yield a proper COQ even if the mutated COQ is vortex-free. An example is shown in Figure 20.




Figure 19: Two quivers Q and $\mu_a(Q)$.




Figure 20: On the left, a 4-vertex COQ Q with a proper cyclic ordering (a, b, c, d) . On the right, the mutated COQ $\mu_a(Q)$. Its cyclic ordering (b, a, c, d) is not proper: the path $c \rightarrow b \rightarrow d$ makes a left turn. Note that the quiver $\mu_a(Q)$ is vortex free (and possesses a totally proper cyclic ordering (a, c, b, d)).

The following result appears, in different but equivalent form, in the work of D. E. Knuth [30, Section 4] and A. Brouwer [7, Section 1.B].

Proposition 10.14. *A complete quiver has at most one proper cyclic ordering. Given a complete quiver Q , the following are equivalent:*

- (P) Q has a proper cyclic ordering;
- (VF) Q is vortex-free.

Remark 10.15. By Corollary 10.12, (P) implies (VF) for *any* quiver Q .

Remark 10.16. For incomplete quivers, (VF) does not imply (P), see Figure 21. Cf. also Figure 27.




Figure 21: A vortex-free quiver with no proper cyclic ordering.

We say that a quiver Q has a *vortex-free completion* if one can add arrows (but not vertices) to Q to get a complete vortex-free quiver.

Corollary 10.17. *If Q has a vortex-free completion, then Q has a proper cyclic ordering.*

Remark 10.18. The converse to Corollary 10.17 is false: an incomplete quiver that allows a proper cyclic ordering does not necessarily have a vortex-free completion, see Figure 22.

Remark 10.19. As shown by D. E. Knuth [30, Section 6], it is NP-hard to determine whether a quiver has a vortex-free completion.




Figure 22: A proper COQ that cannot be completed to be vortex-free. Any orientation of the missing edge $a - d$ would create a vortex.

The next result will be our primary tool for propagating the properness property.

Proposition 10.20. *Let Q be a complete proper COQ. If the COQ $Q' = \mu_b(Q)$ is vortex-free, then Q' is proper.*

Proof. The case of quivers with at most 3 vertices follows from Lemma 10.4. We henceforth assume that Q has ≥ 4 vertices.

A COQ is proper if every 3-vertex subCOQ (i.e., a full subquiver equipped with the induced cyclic order) is proper. Every 3-vertex subCOQ appears in a 4-vertex subCOQ along with the vertex b . The proof will not involve any wiggles, so we may assume, without loss of generality, that Q is a complete 4-vertex COQ with a distinguished vertex b . Up to taking the opposite COQ (cf. Definition 6.7), there are only four possible COQs of this kind, shown in Figure 23. (Since Q is proper, it must be vortex-free by Proposition 10.14.)




Figure 23: Non-vortex 4-vertex COQs, $|\text{Out}(b)| \geq 2$ (edge multiplicities not shown).

Case 1: vertex b is a source. In this case, mutation does not change the cyclic ordering and $\mu_b(Q)$ is again proper.

Case 2: we have $\text{Out}(b) = \{c, d\}$, and Q is acyclic. In this case, mutation at b reverses the arrows incident to b and leaves all other orientations unchanged. Thus $\mu_b(Q)$ (which has cyclic ordering (b, a, c, d)) is proper.

Case 3: we have $\text{Out}(b) = \{c, d\}$, $a \rightarrow c$, and Q has a 4-cycle. In this case, we know the orientations of $\mu_b(Q)$ shown in Figure 24. Regardless of the missing orientation, the vertices a, b, c and d are proper in $\mu_b(Q)$.




Figure 24: The known orientations of $\mu_b(Q)$, without considering the multiplicities of the arrows.

Case 4: we have $\text{Out}(b) = \{c, d\}$, $c \rightarrow a$, and Q has a 4-cycle. In this case, we know the orientations of $\mu_b(Q)$ shown in Figure 25.

Regardless of the missing orientations, the vertices b, c , and d are proper in $\mu_b(Q)$. By assumption, $\mu_b(Q)$ is vortex-free. So we cannot have both $c \rightarrow a$ and $a \rightarrow d$ in $\mu_b(Q)$. Thus a is also proper. \square




Figure 25: The known orientations of $\mu_b(Q)$, without considering the multiplicities of the arrows.

11. TOTALLY PROPER COQS: REQUIREMENTS

Definition 11.1. A COQ is *totally proper* if all COQs in its proper mutation class are proper. A cyclic ordering of a COQ is *totally proper* if that COQ is totally proper.

The following is immediate from Corollary 8.5.

Corollary 11.2. *Proper mutations of a totally proper COQ preserve the integral congruence class of the unipotent companion U —hence the $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy class of the cosquare of U and the associated Alexander polynomial.*

It turns out that if a totally proper cyclic ordering exists, then it is unique:

Theorem 11.3. *A quiver may possess at most one totally proper cyclic ordering (up to wiggles).*

Before presenting a proof of Theorem 11.3, we will make several remarks.

Remark 11.4. Corollary 11.2 highlights the usefulness of the concept of a totally proper COQ: within the class of quivers that allow a totally proper cyclic ordering, the partial invariants discussed in the previous sections become true mutation invariants. (By Theorem 11.3, a totally proper cyclic ordering is unique, so there is no ambiguity involved in defining these invariants.)

Remark 11.5. If a COQ Q is totally proper, then any subCOQ of Q (i.e., a full subquiver of Q with the induced cyclic ordering) is also totally proper. Thus being totally proper is a *hereditary property* of COQs. Similarly, having a totally proper cyclic ordering is a hereditary property of quivers.

In practice, the contrapositive statement is more useful: if a COQ has a subCOQ that is not totally proper, then the whole COQ is not totally proper.

Remark 11.6. As observed in Remark 10.13, properness of COQs does not propagate under (proper) mutations. On the other hand, the existence of a totally proper cyclic ordering is a mutation invariant property.

Remark 11.7. In general, it is hard to determine whether a given quiver has a totally proper cyclic ordering, or whether a given COQ is totally proper. One necessary condition is provided by Corollary 10.12: a totally proper quiver, as well as all quivers in its mutation class, must be vortex-free. This condition is not sufficient: the quiver

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 c & \xrightarrow{3} & a & \xrightarrow{2} & b \\
 & \searrow & \uparrow & \swarrow & \\
 & & d & & \\
 & \swarrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \\
 & & & &
 \end{array}$$

has no totally proper cyclic ordering, even though it is not mutation-equivalent to a vortex.

The proof of Theorem 11.3 will require some preparations.

Lemma 11.8. *Let (Q, σ) be a COQ whose underlying undirected graph is a chordless n -cycle (with multiplicities, cf. (2.2)) containing the arrows $v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow v_2$:*

$$Q = (v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow v_2 - \cdots - v_{n-1} - v_n = v_0).$$

Assume that the vertex v_1 is proper in Q . The COQ $(Q', \sigma') = \mu_{v_1}(Q, \sigma)$ contains an arrow $v_0 \rightarrow v_2$, so its underlying undirected graph contains the chordless $(n-1)$ -cycle

$$C' = (v_0 \rightarrow v_2 - \cdots - v_{n-1} - v_n = v_0).$$

Then $\text{wind}(C', \sigma') = \text{wind}(C', \sigma) = \text{wind}(Q, \sigma)$.

Proof. The restrictions of σ and σ' onto C' coincide, so $\text{wind}(C', \sigma') = \text{wind}(C', \sigma)$.

The summations (2.1), for $\text{wind}(Q)$ and $\text{wind}(C')$ respectively, are very similar. Since proper mutation does not change the cyclic ordering of $\{v_0, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_n\}$, the total number of revolutions remains the same:

$$\frac{1}{n}(\theta(\sigma', v_0, v_2) + \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n-1} \theta(\sigma', v_i, v_{i+1})) = \frac{1}{n}(\theta(\sigma, v_0, v_2) + \sum_{2 \leq i \leq n-1} \theta(\sigma, v_i, v_{i+1})).$$

Since Q is chordless, Q and C' contain the same number of indices i with backward-oriented arrows $v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1}$. So to establish $\text{wind}(C') = \text{wind}(Q)$, it suffices to show that

$$\theta(\sigma, v_0, v_2) = \theta(\sigma, v_0, v_1) + \theta(\sigma, v_1, v_2).$$

Since v_1 is proper, $v_0 \rightarrow v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ is a right turn in σ , and the last equality follows. \square

Proposition 11.9. *Let Q be a COQ whose underlying undirected graph is a chordless n -cycle, possibly with multiplicities, cf. Proposition 2.14. Suppose that Q is totally proper. Then one of the following situations must occur:*

- Q is an oriented cycle (with multiplicities) and $\text{wind}(Q) = \pm 1$;
- Q is acyclic (i.e., is not an oriented cycle) and $\text{wind}(Q) = 0$.

Proof. We argue by induction on n . **Base:** $n=3$. If Q is a proper acyclic 3-cycle, then $\text{wind}(Q) = 0$. If Q is a proper oriented 3-cycle with multiplicities, then $\text{wind}(Q) = 1$ or $\text{wind}(Q) = -1$ depending on the direction of traversal of the cycle.

Induction step. Suppose the claim is true for cycles of length $n-1$. We denote $Q = (v_0 - v_1 - \cdots - v_n = v_0)$. Performing a sink mutation if necessary, we find a vertex v_j with $v_{j-1} \rightarrow v_j \rightarrow v_{j+1}$ (or the same with arrows reversed). Then the quiver $\mu_{v_j}(Q)$ contains an undirected $(n-1)$ -cycle $C' = (v_{j-1} - v_{j+1} - \cdots - v_{j-2} - v_{j-1})$. By Lemma 11.8, $\text{wind}(C') = \text{wind}(Q)$. Furthermore, C' is oriented if and only if Q is. Since C' has the required winding number, so does Q . \square

Since total properness is hereditary, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 11.10. *In a totally proper COQ, every full subquiver C whose underlying graph is a chordless n -cycle (possibly with multiplicities) has winding number ± 1 (if C is a directed cycle; the sign depends on the direction of traversal) or 0 (otherwise).*

Proof of Theorem 11.3. The first homology of any graph is spanned by chordless cycles. The winding numbers of these cycles are uniquely determined by Corollary 11.10. The claim follows by Theorem 2.12. \square

Remark 11.11. The above proof yields an algorithm for identifying the (essentially unique) cyclic ordering σ on a given quiver that has a chance to be totally proper. The algorithm reconstructs σ from its winding numbers, prescribed by Corollary 11.10. (A cyclic ordering with these winding numbers might not exist, but if it does, then it is unique modulo wiggles.) We do not know a good test for deciding whether the cyclic ordering σ obtained in this way is indeed totally proper, cf. Remark 11.7.

12. TOTALLY PROPER COQS: EXAMPLES

The following result is immediate from Lemma 10.4.

Proposition 12.1. *Any proper 3-vertex COQ is totally proper.*

Example 12.2. Continuing with Example 6.10, let Q be an oriented 4-cycle quiver

$$\begin{array}{ccc} a & \longrightarrow & b \\ \uparrow & & \downarrow \\ d & \longleftarrow & c \end{array}$$

of type D_4 . Up to wobble equivalence, Q possesses three cyclic orderings $\sigma_1 = (a, b, c, d)$, $\sigma_2 = (a, b, d, c)$, and $\sigma_3 = (a, d, c, b)$, with respective winding numbers 1, 2, and 3. As explained in Example 6.10, the COQ (Q, σ_1) is totally proper. The COQs (Q, σ_2) and (Q, σ_3) are not. Furthermore, some quivers mutation-equivalent to Q do not appear in the corresponding proper mutation classes, see Figure 13.

Theorem 12.3. *Any quiver of finite type has a unique totally proper cyclic ordering.*

Proof. Uniqueness follows from Theorem 11.3. It remains to establish existence.

For quivers of type E_6, E_7, E_8 , the claim can be verified by a computer check.

Let Q be a quiver of type A_n . Any such quiver can be colored in 3 colors, say 1, 2, 3, so that every arrow is oriented in one of the three ways: $1 \rightarrow 2$, $2 \rightarrow 3$, or $3 \rightarrow 1$. Fix a particular such 3-coloring. Choose a linear ordering of the vertices so that for any vertices a, b, c of colors 1, 2, 3 respectively, we have $a < b < c$. All such choices of linear ordering are wobble equivalent, as vertices of the same color are pairwise non-adjacent. Further, any such choice of coloring is entirely determined by the color of one vertex, so all these choices give linear orders that are cyclic shifts of each other. Let σ be a cyclic ordering compatible with these linear orderings; it is defined uniquely up to wobbles. The resulting COQ (Q, σ) is proper, cf. Example 10.6.

Pick a vertex v to mutate at. The above construction can be applied to the quiver $Q' = \mu_v(Q)$, resulting in a proper COQ (Q', σ') . Alternatively, we can mutate the COQ (Q, σ) at v , yielding a COQ $\mu_v(Q, \sigma) = (Q', \sigma'')$. It remains to show that in fact, the cyclic orderings σ' and σ'' are wobble equivalent to each other. In light of Theorem 2.12 and Remark 2.13, this can be established by proving that σ' and σ'' have the same winding numbers for some basis of the first homology of the underlying graph of Q' . The standard description of quivers of type A_n (see [23]) provides a construction of such basis consisting of (oriented) triangles inscribed in the triangles of the underlying triangulation of an $(n+3)$ -gon. Since the COQ (Q', σ') is proper, all these triangles have winding numbers equal to 1. To complete the proof, we need to show that the same is true for (Q', σ'') .

Every triangle in (Q', σ'') that is entirely disjoint from v has the same induced cyclic ordering in both Q and Q' . Further, v is proper inside any oriented triangle of Q' involving v (viewed as a 3-vertex subCOQ). But if an oriented 3-cycle quiver has one proper vertex, then all three of its vertices are proper. Hence every oriented triangle of Q' has winding number 1.

In type D_n , the argument is similar but more complicated. We omit it. \square

Definition 12.4 ([40, Definition 2.1]). A quiver Q is called a *fork* if

- Q is abundant, i.e., $|b_{ij}| \geq 2$ for all $i \neq j$;
- Q has a distinguished vertex r (the *point of return*) such that whenever $b_{ir}, b_{rj} > 0$, we have $b_{ji} > \max(b_{ir}, b_{rj})$;
- the full subquiver of Q obtained by removing vertex r is acyclic.

Cf. [18, Section 6].

Proposition 12.5. *Any fork quiver has a unique proper cyclic ordering.*

Proof. It follows from [18, Section 6], or by a straightforward case analysis, that any fork quiver is vortex-free (and complete). The claim follows by Proposition 10.14. \square

The following key result is immediate from Proposition 10.20.

Theorem 12.6. *Suppose that every quiver mutation-equivalent to a quiver Q is complete and vortex-free. If Q has a proper cyclic orientation, then it is totally proper.*

There are many examples of quivers to which Theorem 12.6 applies.

Corollary 12.7. *Let Q be an abundant acyclic quiver, with a cyclic ordering σ constructed as described in Observation 10.7. Then (Q, σ) is a totally proper COQ.*

Proof. A. Seven [37, p. 473] shows that a certain vortex quiver is not mutation-equivalent to an acyclic quiver. The same argument establishes that any quiver mutation-equivalent to an acyclic quiver (in particular, to Q) is vortex-free. By [18, Section 6], every quiver in the mutation class of Q is abundant. The claim then follows by Theorem 12.6. \square

Conjecture 12.8. *Any acyclic quiver, endowed with the standard cyclic ordering (cf. Observation 10.7), is totally proper.*

Remark 12.9. This conjecture has been recently proved by the second author [33].

Remark 12.10. G. Muller’s *local acyclicity* property [32] does not guarantee the existence of a totally proper cyclic ordering. A quiver Q of the kind described in [18, Figure 1] is a vortex, so it has no totally proper cyclic ordering. On the other hand, one can use the Banff algorithm [32, Theorem 5.5] to show that Q is locally acyclic.

Corollary 12.11. *Let Q be a complete quiver such that for every vertex k , the quiver $\mu_k(Q)$ is a fork with point of return k , cf. Definition 12.4. (In the language of [18, Section 6], every mutation of Q is an “exit.”) Then Q has a totally proper cyclic ordering.*

Proof. By [40, Lemma 2.5], a mutation μ_j of a fork yields another fork, provided that j is not the point of return. It follows that every quiver in the mutation class of Q is complete and vortex-free. (Q itself cannot contain a vortex, since mutating at its apex would yield a quiver with a vortex, hence not a fork.) By Proposition 10.14, Q has a proper cyclic ordering. By Theorem 12.6 it is totally proper. \square

Example 12.12. Consider the family of 5-vertex COQs shown in Figure 26. We will use Corollary 12.11 to show that every COQ Q in this family is totally proper. It is clear that Q is complete and proper, hence vortex-free. By [18, Proposition 6.13], it suffices to check, for each vertex v_i :

- if $j \rightarrow v_i \rightarrow k$ for some pair of vertices j, k , then $|b_{jk}| < |b'_{jk}|$, where we use the notation $B_Q = (b_{ij})$ and $B_{\mu_{v_i}(Q)} = (b'_{ij})$. Equivalently, v_i is an “ascent” [18, Definition 3.3] in every oriented 3-cycle that contains v_i ;
- v_i is not a sink/source in Q ;
- v_i is not the apex of a vortex in Q .

The second and third conditions are trivial, as Q has no sinks, sources, or vortices. We check the first condition for v_2 ; the arguments for all other vertices are similar. All paths through v_2 contain $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$ and one of $v_2 \rightarrow v_3$, $v_2 \rightarrow v_4$, or $v_2 \rightarrow v_5$. Mutation at v_2 increases the number of arrows $v_1 \rightarrow v_3$ and $v_1 \rightarrow v_4$. Finally, the number of arrows between v_1 and v_5 in $\mu_{v_2}(Q)$ is equal to

$$|2j - (a + f)(aj + f)| = |2j - (a^2j + af + ajf + f^2)| = (a^2 - 2)j + af(j + 1) + f^2,$$

which is larger than $2j$, the number of arrows $v_1 \rightarrow v_5$ in Q .




Figure 26: For any values of $a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, j \geq 4$, this COQ is totally proper.

Remark 12.13. The *forkless part* of a mutation class of quivers, introduced by M. Warkentin [40], is the set of quivers in the mutation class which are not forks. Each of the quivers discussed in Example 12.12 is the unique quiver in the forkless part of its mutation class. In order to show that a given COQ is totally proper, it is sufficient to verify that the forkless part of its mutation class is complete and vortex-free, cf. Proposition 12.5 and Theorem 12.6. Such a verification is particularly straightforward if the forkless part is finite. For example, the fully generic mutation cycles constructed in [18, Examples 10.1–10.2] have finite forkless parts all of whose quivers are complete and vortex-free. Thus all these quivers allow (unique) totally proper cyclic orderings. Also, many of the mutation classes considered in [25] have finite forkless parts consisting of complete vortex-free quivers; whenever this happens, total properness follows. Similar arguments can be applied to quivers with a finite “pre-forkless part” studied by T. Ervin [15].

There are many more families of quivers with finite forkless part to which Theorem 12.6 applies. The examples discussed above in Corollaries 12.7–12.11 and in Remark 12.13 are just a small selection.

Remark 12.14. As discussed in Remark 7.6, the conjugacy problem in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ has an algorithmic solution with a workable implementation. We thus obtain a testable necessary condition for mutation equivalence of two totally proper COQs Q_1 and Q_2 : if the cosquares of their respective unipotent companions U_1 and U_2 are not conjugate in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$, then the quivers Q_1 and Q_2 are not mutation-equivalent.

In our experience, this test rarely produces “false positives:” if the cosquares of U_1 and U_2 turn out to be conjugate, then the given (totally proper) quivers Q_1 and Q_2 are likely mutation equivalent. Counterexamples to this phenomenon are not common, but they do exist. As mentioned in Remark 8.20, there are three pairs of nonisomorphic (hence mutation-inequivalent) 9-vertex trees which give rise to cosquare matrices that are conjugate in $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$.

For 4-vertex quivers, such counterexamples are not easy to find. Here is the simplest one that we found. Consider two quivers Q_1 and Q_2 with the exchange matrices

$$B_{Q_1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -2 & -18 & 21 \\ 2 & 0 & -13 & -9 \\ 18 & 13 & 0 & -6 \\ -21 & 9 & 6 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B_{Q_2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -2 & -9 & 23 \\ 2 & 0 & -15 & -10 \\ 9 & 15 & 0 & -6 \\ -23 & 10 & 6 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

We first verify that Q_1 and Q_2 are mutation-inequivalent. Both mutation classes have finite forkless part (cf. Remark 12.13) where every quiver is abundant and vortex-free. Hence both Q_1 and Q_2 have totally proper cyclic orderings. Neither is a fork, so it is enough to check that Q_1 is not in the forkless part of Q_2 . The only fork-avoiding mutation sequence for Q_2 is v_2, v_4, v_1 (applied left-to-right); it does not produce Q_1 .

On the other hand, the cosquares of Q_1 and Q_2 , given by

$$U_1^{-T}U_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 & -18 & 21 \\ 2 & -3 & -49 & 33 \\ 44 & -75 & -960 & 801 \\ 261 & -435 & -5823 & 4663 \end{bmatrix}, \quad U_2^{-T}U_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -2 & -9 & 23 \\ 2 & -3 & -33 & 36 \\ 39 & -63 & -575 & 741 \\ 231 & -362 & -3573 & 4278 \end{bmatrix},$$

turn out to be conjugate in $\mathrm{GL}(4, \mathbb{Z})$. The MAGMA algorithm [14] certifies this fact by delivering a conjugating matrix whose entries have thousands of decimal digits (!).

Problem 12.15. As explained in Remark 12.14, $\mathrm{GL}(n, \mathbb{Z})$ conjugacy of cosquares does not guarantee mutation equivalence, even for totally proper COQs. Does the potentially stronger assumption of integral congruence of unipotent companions imply mutation equivalence? Put differently, is the integral congruence class of a unipotent companion a complete mutation invariant (say, in the case of totally proper COQs)?

We conclude this section by a brief probabilistic digression.

Recall that a quiver has *finite* (resp., *infinite*) *mutation type* if its mutation equivalence class is finite (resp., infinite).

Remark 12.16. Let Q be a connected quiver of infinite mutation type. As shown by M. Warkentin [40, Proposition 5.2], a simple random walk in the exchange graph of Q will almost surely leave the forkless part and never come back. This implies that, with probability 1, a random sequence of mutations starting at Q will reach a quiver that can be upgraded to a proper COQ in such a way that all subsequent mutations will become proper in the resulting (proper) COQs.

13. ADMISSIBLE QUASI-CARTAN COMPANIONS

Definition 13.1 (M. Barot–C. Geiss–A. Zelevinsky [1]). Let Q be an n -vertex quiver. A *quasi-Cartan companion* for Q (or for the corresponding exchange matrix $B = B_Q$) is an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ with $|a_{ij}| = |b_{ij}|$ for $i \neq j$ and $a_{ii} = 2$ for all i . We note that a typical quiver has many distinct quasi-Cartan companions.

Remark 13.2. Given an $n \times n$ integer matrix $U = (u_{ij})$ such that $U - U^T = -B$ and $u_{ii} = 1$ for all i , we can construct a quasi-Cartan companion A of $B = B_Q$ by setting $A = A_U = U + U^T$. In particular, for any linear ordering of the vertices of Q , the corresponding unipotent companion U (cf. Definition 4.2) gives rise to the quasi-Cartan companion $A_U = U + U^T$.

Definition 13.3 (A. Seven [37]). A quasi-Cartan companion $A = (a_{ij})$ for a quiver Q is *admissible* if every full subquiver whose underlying undirected graph is a chordless cycle

$$(13.1) \quad C = (v_0 - v_1 - \cdots - v_k = v_0)$$

(possibly with multiplicities) satisfies the following conditions:

- if C is oriented (that is, either $v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1}$ for all $i < k$ or $v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1}$ for all $i < k$), then the count $\#\{i \mid 0 \leq i < k \text{ and } a_{v_i v_{i+1}} > 0\}$ is odd;
- if C is not oriented, then this count is even.

Proposition 13.4 ([37], Lemma 3.3). *Let Q be an acyclic quiver. We can choose an admissible quasi-Cartan companion for every quiver in the mutation class of Q , so that all these quasi-Cartan companions are pairwise congruent over \mathbb{Z} .*

Proposition 13.5. *If U is a unipotent companion of a totally proper COQ Q , then A_U is an admissible quasi-Cartan companion of Q .*

Proof. Let C be a chordless oriented (resp., non-oriented) cycle in Q of the form shown in (13.1). The winding number of C is given by

$$(13.2) \quad \text{wind}(C) = \#\{v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1} \mid v_i > v_{i+1}\} - \#\{v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1} \mid v_i < v_{i+1}\}.$$

Let $<$ be the linear order associated to U . For $p \neq q$, the entry u_{pq} of U is positive if and only if $p \leftarrow q$ and $p < q$. (Here $p \leftarrow q$ means that Q contains an arrow $p \leftarrow q$.) This gives a criterion for positivity of an entry a_{pq} of A_U :

$$a_{pq} > 0 \Leftrightarrow (u_{pq} > 0 \text{ or } u_{qp} > 0) \Leftrightarrow ((p \leftarrow q \text{ and } p < q) \text{ or } (p \rightarrow q \text{ and } p > q)).$$

It follows that

$$\#\{i \mid a_{v_i v_{i+1}} > 0\} = \#\{v_i \rightarrow v_{i+1} \mid v_i > v_{i+1}\} + \#\{v_i \leftarrow v_{i+1} \mid v_i < v_{i+1}\},$$

which together with (13.2) implies that

$$\#\{i \mid a_{v_i v_{i+1}} > 0\} \equiv \text{wind}(C) \pmod{2}.$$

Since Q is totally proper, Corollary 11.10 implies that $\text{wind}(C) = \pm 1$ or $\text{wind}(C) = 0$ depending on whether C is oriented or not. It follows that $\#\{i \mid a_{v_i v_{i+1}} > 0\}$ is odd (resp., even) for oriented (resp., non-oriented) chordless cycles. In other words, A_U is admissible. \square

Remark 13.6. The naïve converse of Proposition 13.5 is false: there exist admissible quasi-Cartan companions which do not come from a unipotent companion.

The above discussion of admissible quasi-Cartan companions, taken together with Corollary 11.10, suggests the following notion.

Definition 13.7. For a quiver Q , let Γ_Q be the underlying unoriented graph of Q (ignoring multiplicities). Let $H_1(\Gamma_Q)$ denote the first homology group of Γ_Q . A homomorphism $\varphi: H_1(\Gamma_Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is *admissible* if for every chordless cycle C in Γ_Q , we have

$$\varphi(C) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } C \text{ lifts to an oriented cycle in } Q; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Corollary 11.10 directly implies the following necessary condition that every quiver that has a totally proper cyclic ordering must satisfy.

Corollary 13.8. *Let (Q, σ) be a totally proper COQ. Then the quiver Q —as well as every quiver in its mutation equivalence class—must allow an admissible homomorphism $\varphi: H_1(\Gamma_Q) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$.*

The above corollary, in turn, implies the following necessary condition for the existence of a totally proper cyclic ordering.

Corollary 13.9. *Let Q be a quiver that possesses a totally proper cyclic ordering. Suppose that a collection of chordless cycles in Γ_Q covers every edge of Γ_Q an even number of times. Then this collection must contain an even number of cycles whose lifts are oriented in Q .*

In the rest of this section, we use Corollary 13.9 to provide an example of a quiver of finite mutation type that does not have a totally proper cyclic ordering.

We briefly recall the classification of quivers of finite mutation type that was given by A. Felikson, M. Shapiro, and P. Tumarkin [17], following earlier work in [19, 12]. The combinatorics of quivers of finite mutation types is well understood [17, 19], and algorithms exist that determine which of these quivers are mutation-equivalent [28]. So in this context, mutation invariants have less practical utility. On the other hand, understanding which mutation-finite COQs are totally proper may provide useful insights into the study of total properness for general quivers.

Apart from 11 exceptional mutation classes (all of which turn out to allow totally proper cyclic orderings), all quivers of finite mutation type come from bordered triangulated surfaces with boundary. We refer the reader to [19] for the description of this construction.

Proposition 13.10. *Any quiver arising from a triangulation of a once-punctured annulus does not possess a totally proper cyclic ordering.*

Proof. It suffices to treat the case where each of the two boundary components of the annulus contains a single marked point. The general case will follow by restriction to a full subquiver.

Furthermore, it will be sufficient to establish the claim for a single quiver in the given mutation class. We will use the quiver shown in Figure 27.

We observe that the three oriented chordless cycles $(a \rightarrow b \rightarrow e \rightarrow a)$, $(b \rightarrow e \rightarrow d \rightarrow b)$, $(b \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \rightarrow b)$, together with the unoriented chordless cycle $(a \rightarrow b \rightarrow c \leftarrow a)$, pave the unoriented chordless cycle $(a \rightarrow c \rightarrow d \leftarrow e \rightarrow a)$. The claim now follows from Corollary 13.9. \square




Figure 27: A triangulation of a once-punctured annulus and the corresponding quiver.

Remark 13.11. Proposition 13.10 can be easily extended to a large class of bordered surfaces with sufficiently many “features” (holes, punctures, and/or handles), by making additional cuts and invoking the fact that the existence of a totally proper cyclic ordering is a hereditary property. In this way, we can for example show that a disk with ≥ 3 punctures, a torus with ≥ 2 punctures, or a sphere with ≥ 5 punctures do not possess totally proper cyclic orderings.

Remark 13.12. On the other hand, many surfaces with a small number of “features” give rise to totally proper COQs. A couple of such examples are shown in Figure 28. The corresponding mutation classes contain four (resp., one) non-isomorphic quivers, so verification of total properness is straightforward.




Figure 28: Totally proper COQs whose quivers arise from triangulations of a 4-punctured sphere (on the left) and a one-holed torus (on the right).

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Barot, C. Geiss, and A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras of finite type and positive symmetrizable matrices, *J. London Math. Soc.* **73** (2006), 545–564.
- [2] A. Beineke, T. Brüstle, and L. Hille, Cluster-cyclic quivers with three vertices and the Markov equation. With an appendix by O. Kerner, *Algebr. Represent. Theory* **14** (2011), 97–112.
- [3] A. Berenstein, S. Fomin, and A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras III: Upper bounds and double Bruhat cells, *Duke Math. J.* **126** (2005), 1–52.
- [4] W. Bley, T. Hofmann, and H. Johnston, Computation of lattice isomorphisms and the integral matrix similarity problem, *Forum Math. Sigma* **10** (2022), Paper No. e87, 36 pp.
- [5] A. I. Bondal, A symplectic groupoid of triangular bilinear forms and the braid group, *Izv. Math.* **68** (2004), no. 4, 659–708.
- [6] A. I. Bondal and A. E. Polishchuk, Homological properties of associative algebras: the method of helices, *Russian Acad. Sci. Izv. Math.* **42** (1994), no. 2, 219–260.
- [7] A. E. Brouwer, The enumeration of locally transitive tournaments, Afdeling Zuivere Wiskunde [Department of Pure Mathematics], Report 138/80, Mathematisch Centrum, Amsterdam, 1980.
- [8] P. Caldero and B. Keller, From triangulated categories to cluster algebras. II, *Ann. Sci. Ecole Norm. Sup.* **39** (2006), 983–1009.
- [9] P. J. Cameron, Orbits of permutation groups on unordered sets. II, *J. London Math. Soc.* (2) **23** (1981), 249–264.
- [10] R. Casals, A binary invariant of matrix mutation, [arXiv:2311.03601](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.03601), to appear in *J. Comb. Algebra*.
- [11] S. Cecotti and C. Vafa, On classification of $N = 2$ supersymmetric theories, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **158** (1993), 569–644.
- [12] H. Derksen and T. Owen, New graphs of finite mutation type, *Electron. J. Combin.* **15** (2008), no. 1, Research Paper 139, 15 pp.
- [13] B. Dubrovin, Geometry of 2D topological field theories, *Lecture Notes in Math.* **1620** (1996), Springer-Verlag, 120–348.
- [14] B. Eick, T. Hofmann, and E. A. O’Brien, The conjugacy problem in $GL(n, \mathbb{Z})$, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **100** (2019), 731–756.
- [15] T. Ervin, New hereditary and mutation-invariant properties arising from forks, *Electron. J. Combin.* **31**, Paper No. 1.16, 30 (2024).
- [16] Y.-W. Fan and J. P. Whang, Stokes matrices and exceptional isomorphisms, *Math. Ann.*, to appear, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00208-024-02850-8>.
- [17] A. Felikson, M. Shapiro, and P. Tumarkin, Skew-symmetric cluster algebras of finite mutation type, *J. Eur. Math. Soc.* **14** (2012), 1135–1180.
- [18] S. Fomin and S. Neville, Long mutation cycles, [arXiv:2304.11505](https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.11505).
- [19] S. Fomin, M. Shapiro, and D. Thurston, Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces. Part I: Cluster complexes, *Acta Math.* **201** (2008), 83–146.
- [20] S. Fomin, P. Pylyavskyy, E. Shustin, and D. Thurston, Morsifications and mutations, *J. Lond. Math. Soc.* **105** (2022), 2478–2554.
- [21] S. Fomin, L. Williams, and A. Zelevinsky, Introduction to cluster algebras. Chapters 1–3, [arXiv:1608.05735](https://arxiv.org/abs/1608.05735).
- [22] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras I: Foundations, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **15** (2002), 497–529.
- [23] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras II: Finite type classification, *Invent. Math.* **154** (2003), 63–121.
- [24] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras IV: Coefficients, *Compos. Math.* **143** (2007), 112–164.
- [25] A. P. Fordy and R. J. Marsh, Cluster mutation-periodic quivers and associated Laurent sequences, *J. Algebraic Combin.* **34** (2011), no.1, 19–66.
- [26] F. J. Grunewald, Solution of the conjugacy problem in certain arithmetic groups, *Word problems II*, pp. 101–139 Stud. Logic Found. Math. **95**, North-Holland, 1980.

- [27] F. Grunewald and D. Segal, Some general algorithms. I. Arithmetic groups. *Ann. of Math.* **112** (1980), 531–583.
- [28] W. Gu, A decomposition algorithm for the oriented adjacency graph of the triangulations of a bordered surface with marked points, *Electron. J. Combin.* **18** (2011), no.1, Paper 91, 45 pp.
- [29] R. A. Horn and V. V. Sergeichuk, Canonical forms for complex matrix congruence and *congruence, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **416** (2006), 1010–1032.
- [30] D. E. Knuth, *Axioms and hulls*, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **606**, Springer-Verlag, 1992.
- [31] J. W. Moon, Tournaments whose subtournaments are irreducible or transitive, *Canad. Math. Bull.* **22** (1979), 75–79.
- [32] G. Muller, Locally acyclic cluster algebras, *Adv. Math.* **233** (2013), 207–247.
- [33] S. Neville, Totally proper orderings of acyclic quivers, 2024, in preparation.
- [34] A. N. Rudakov, Integer-valued bilinear forms and vector bundles, *Math. USSR-Sb.* **66** (1990), no. 1, 189–197.
- [35] R. A. Sarkisjan, The conjugacy problem for collections of integral matrices, *Mat. Zametki* **25** (1979), 811–824, 956.
- [36] A. I. Seven, Mutation classes of skew-symmetrizable 3×3 matrices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **141** (2013), 1493–1504.
- [37] A. Seven, Cluster algebras and symmetric matrices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **143**, 469–478 (2015).
- [38] A. Seven and İ. Ünal, Congruence invariants of matrix mutation, [arXiv:2403.10626](https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.10626).
- [39] P. F. Stebe, Congruency separability of groups of integer matrices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **32** (1972), 1–7.
- [40] M. Warkentin, *Exchange graphs via quiver mutation*, Ph.D. thesis, Technische Universität Chemnitz, 2014, <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bsz:ch1-qucosa-153172>.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, ANN ARBOR, MI 48109, USA

Email address: fomin@umich.edu

Email address: nevilles@umich.edu