

THICK SUBCATEGORIES ON WEIGHTED PROJECTIVE CURVES AND NILPOTENT REPRESENTATIONS OF QUIVERS

ALEXEY ELAGIN

ABSTRACT. We continue the study of thick triangulated subcategories, started in [11], and consider thick subcategories in the derived category of a weighted projective curve and corresponding abelian thick subcategories. Our main result is that any thick subcategory on a weighted projective curve either is equivalent to the derived category of nilpotent representations of some quiver (we call such categories quiver-like) or is the orthogonal to an exceptional collection of torsion sheaves (we call such subcategories big). We provide several equivalent descriptions of big subcategories and explain that they can be explicitly classified. We give some results clarifying the structure of thick subcategories: in particular, for weighted projective lines we prove that any admissible subcategory is generated by an exceptional collection and any exceptional collection is a part of a full one. Apart from the above, we study general properties of quiver-like categories. In particular, we extend and simplify results from [11] providing sufficient criteria for a triangulated or abelian category to be quiver-like.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is devoted to the classification problem of thick triangulated subcategories in a given triangulated category, which attracted much attention in the last decades. We continue the work started in our paper [11] with Valery Lunts, where thick subcategories in the derived category $D^b(\text{coh } X)$ of coherent sheaves on a smooth projective curve X were studied. Recall that a full subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } X)$ is called thick if \mathcal{T} is triangulated and closed under taking direct summands in $D^b(\text{coh } X)$.

Definition 1.1. Let Q be a quiver and $\text{Mod-}\mathbb{k}Q$ be the category of right representations of Q over a field \mathbb{k} . Denote by $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ the triangulated subcategory in $D^b(\text{Mod-}\mathbb{k}Q)$, generated by the simple modules concentrated in vertices of Q . We call triangulated categories, equivalent to a category of the form $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$, *quiver-like*.

The main result in [11] is the following

Theorem 1.2. *Let X be a smooth projective curve over a field. Then any finitely generated thick subcategory in $D^b(\text{coh } X)$, different from $D^b(\text{coh } X)$, is quiver-like.*

In the present paper we extend and generalise results of [11] in several directions. First, we obtain a more transparent and general sufficient condition for a triangulated category to be quiver-like. More precisely, we prove

Theorem A (See Theorem 4.12). *Let \mathcal{T} be an algebraic triangulated category, linear over a field \mathbb{k} . Assume that \mathcal{T} is classically generated by a set $\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ of objects, and for all $i, j \in I$*

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}^p(t_i, t_j) &= 0, & \text{if } p \neq 0, 1, \\ \text{Hom}(t_i, t_j) &= 0, & \text{if } i \neq j, \\ \text{Hom}(t_i, t_i) &= \mathbb{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Then \mathcal{T} is quiver-like and t_i -s correspond to simple modules.

Compared with [11], we get rid of the finiteness assumptions on the generating set, of assuming \mathcal{T} has a dg enhancement, and of assuming that the dg endomorphism algebra is formal. Instead, we establish equivalence of \mathcal{T} with the perfect derived category of certain A_∞ -category with the set of objects $\{t_i\}$ and the graded space of morphisms from t_i to t_j being $\bigoplus_p \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}^p(t_i, t_j)$. Due to the grading constraints the A_∞ -structure must be trivial, yielding the equivalence of \mathcal{T} and the quiver-like category whose simple modules have the same Ext-spaces as t_i -s have.

Second, for the derived category of a hereditary abelian category \mathcal{A} , there is a bijection between thick triangulated subcategories in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ and *thick* (i.e., abelian exact extension closed) subcategories in \mathcal{A} . This is [7], see our Proposition 3.7 for a precise statement. Therefore, one can easily transform statements about thick subcategories in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ into statements about thick subcategories in \mathcal{A} and vice versa. We extend our description in terms of quivers from thick subcategories in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ to the corresponding thick subcategories in \mathcal{A} .

Definition 1.3. Let Q be a quiver and $\text{Mod-}kQ$ be the category of right representations of Q over a field \mathbb{k} . Denote by $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \subset \text{Mod-}\mathbb{k}Q$ the full subcategory of finite-dimensional nilpotent representations. We will call abelian categories, equivalent to a category of the form $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$, *quiver-like*.

As a corollary of Theorem A we get

Theorem B (See Corollary 4.14). *Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category linear over a field \mathbb{k} , and $\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a family of objects in \mathcal{A} satisfying conditions (1.1). Let $\mathcal{T} = \langle t_i \rangle_{i \in I} \subset D^b(\mathcal{A})$ be the thick subcategory generated by t_i -s, let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{A}$ be the corresponding thick subcategory in \mathcal{A} . Then \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are quiver-like, and t_i -s correspond to simple modules.*

As another application of Theorem A we deduce a characterisation of abelian quiver-like categories:

Theorem C (See Theorem 4.16). *Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category linear over a field \mathbb{k} . Then \mathcal{A} is quiver-like if and only if \mathcal{A} is essentially small, all objects have finite length, one has $\text{End}(S) = \mathbb{k}$ for any simple object $S \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\text{Ext}^p(S_1, S_2) = 0$ for any $p \geq 2$ and simple objects $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Results similar to Theorem C are likely known to experts but we were unable to find them in literature. We also do not know how to prove such results without passing to derived categories.

Third (and most importantly), we apply the methods developed in [11] and in the first part of this work, to the description of thick subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$, where \mathbb{X} is a weighted projective curve. Geometrically, a weighted projective curve $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$ is given by a smooth projective curve X and a weight function $w: X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $w(x) = 1$ for all but a finite number of points $x \in X$. Points where $w > 1$ are called *orbifold*. For the definition of the category $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ of coherent sheaves see Section 6.2 or [29], see also [12] for the special case of weighted projective *lines*.

In the second part of this paper we give an analog of Theorem 1.2 for a weighted projective curve \mathbb{X} . We demonstrate that **most** of thick subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ are quiver-like. Exceptions are in a sense “close to” the whole category $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$, they can be explicitly constructed and form a finite set (recall that the only exception in the case of a smooth projective curve is $D^b(\text{coh } X)$ itself). The reason for such non-quiver-like subcategories to appear is the presence of exceptional torsion sheaves, which are concentrated in the orbifold points of \mathbb{X} . For any point $x \in \mathbb{X}$ of weight $r = w(x)$ the category $\text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}$ of torsion sheaves on \mathbb{X} supported at x is equivalent to the category of finite-dimensional nilpotent representations of a cyclic quiver of length r . Such category is called a *tube* of rank r and denoted by \mathcal{U}_r . If $r \geq 2$ then $\text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}$ has exceptional objects: for example, simple sheaves supported at orbifold points are exceptional.

Definition 1.4 (See Definition 7.1). We call a subcategory in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ generated by an exceptional collection of torsion sheaves *small* and the orthogonal subcategory to a small subcategory *big*. We use the same terminology for the corresponding subcategories in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$.

The main result of the second part of the paper is the following

Theorem D (See Theorem 8.2). *Let \mathbb{X} be a weighted projective curve over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} . Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ be a thick subcategory, and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$. Then \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are big or \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are quiver-like.*

Note that, in contrast with Theorem 1.2, we do not assume that \mathcal{T} is finitely generated, and give a description for the abelian subcategory \mathcal{S} as well. Note also that two alternatives in Theorem D are not exclusive: big triangulated subcategories can be quiver-like.

Let us explain briefly the idea of proof of Theorem D. We consider two cases: whether a thick subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ contains simultaneously a vector bundle and a sphere-like torsion sheaf (see Definition 2.1) or not. In the first case one can show that \mathcal{T} is big. In the second case, \mathcal{T} has a semi-orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \rangle$, where $\mathcal{T}_1 \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ contains only torsion sheaves and $\mathcal{T}_2 \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ only torsion-free sheaves. We show that the corresponding abelian categories $\mathcal{S}_i = \mathcal{T}_i \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ are finite length categories: the length of a sheaf $F \in \mathcal{S}_i$ as an object in \mathcal{S}_i is bounded by $\dim(H^0(F))$ for \mathcal{S}_1 and by $\text{rank}(F)$ for \mathcal{S}_2 .

The families of simple objects in \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 , taken together, form a generating set for \mathcal{T} satisfying assumptions of Theorem A. By Theorem A we deduce that \mathcal{T} is quiver-like.

To clarify the notion of a big subcategory, we introduce the following

Definition 1.5. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$ be a weighted projective curve. We call a thick subcategory $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ *curve-like* if there exists a weighted projective curve $\mathbb{X}' = (X, w')$ and a fully faithful functor $\Phi: \text{coh } \mathbb{X}' \rightarrow \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ preserving rank and support of coherent sheaves with $\text{im } \Phi = \mathcal{S}$.

It is known that, given a simple exceptional torsion sheaf S on a weighed projective curve \mathbb{X} , its orthogonal subcategory $\{F \in \text{coh } \mathbb{X} \mid \text{Ext}^i(S, F) = 0 \text{ for all } i\}$ is curve-like. As next theorem shows, big subcategories are close to curve-like.

Theorem E (See Proposition 7.7). *For a weighted projective curve over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} , the following conditions on a thick subcategory $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{S} = \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle^\perp \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ for some exceptional collection E_1, \dots, E_n of torsion sheaves (that is, \mathcal{S} is big);
- (2) $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, where $\mathcal{S}_1 \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ is curve-like and $\mathcal{S}_2 \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ is small;
- (3) \mathcal{S} contains a curve-like subcategory of $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$;
- (4) \mathcal{S} contains a non-zero vector bundle and a sphere-like torsion sheaf;
- (5) \mathcal{S} contains a non-zero vector bundle and \mathcal{S} is invariant under functors c_x of “twisting by line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{X}}(x)$ ” for any point $x \in X$ (see Definition 6.10).

Note that exceptional collections in a tube \mathcal{U}_r have been explicitly classified in [10] and [22]. Therefore small (and hence big) subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ can also be explicitly classified.

While preparing this manuscript we discovered a recent paper [9] studying thick subcategories on weighted projective *lines* (i.e., *rational curves*), whose results and methods overlap with ours, in particular, with Theorem E. Its proof, given in [9], is similar to ours. We decided to include our proof of Theorem E for the sake of completeness and because we work in greater generality, allowing curves of higher genus. The main difference of our setting with the case of rational curves is in dealing with condition (5) since for a rational curve all twist functors $c_x, x \in X$ are isomorphic and in general they are not.

We use Theorem D to obtain some information about the structure of thick subcategories on a weighted projective curve \mathbb{X} . Let us mention here some of them. In Proposition 8.6 we show that any admissible subcategory in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ that is not big is generated by an exceptional collection. In particular (Corollary 8.7), if \mathbb{X} is a weighted projective **line** then any admissible subcategory in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is generated by an exceptional collection, and any exceptional collection is part of a full exceptional collection. On the contrary (Corollary 8.8), if $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$ where $X \not\cong \mathbb{P}^1$ then any admissible subcategory in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is either big or small. One can use this to get an alternative proof of a well-known theorem by Okawa about semi-orthogonal indecomposability of the derived category of a smooth projective curve, see Remark 8.9.




FIGURE 1. Variety of thick triangulated subcategories on weighted projective curve. Here QL means quiver-like, CL — curve-like, ADM — admissible, BIG — big, SM — small, TOR — torsion, TOR FREE — torsion-free, WPC — equivalent to the derived category of a weighted projective curve

We call a thick subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ *torsion* (resp. *torsion-free*) if all sheaves in \mathcal{T} are torsion (resp. torsion-free). A torsion subcategory \mathcal{T} decomposes into the orthogonal direct sum

$$\mathcal{T} = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathcal{T}_x,$$

where \mathcal{T}_x is a subcategory supported at point x . For any point x thick subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ supported at x are in bijection with thick subcategories in $D^b(\mathcal{U}_r)$, where \mathcal{U}_r is a tube of rank $r = w(x)$. The latter have been classified in [10] and [22]. On the other hand, we demonstrate (Proposition 8.10) that any thick subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ that is not big has unique semi-orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \rangle$, where \mathcal{T}_1 is torsion and \mathcal{T}_2 is torsion-free. This indicates that description of torsion-free subcategories is the major part of the classification of thick subcategories on weighted projective curves.

Variety of different types of thick subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ for a general weighted projective curve \mathbb{X} is presented (in the form of an Euler diagram) on Figure 1.

1.1. Open question, further directions. We did not investigate here which quivers are realizable on curves, i.e., which quiver-like categories $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ appear as thick subcategories in categories of coherent sheaves on weighted projective curves. This question is apparently more difficult than for ordinary smooth curves and will probably be studied elsewhere. Recall that all module categories over wild algebras are “equally complex” in the sense that for any two such algebras A, B there is a functor $\text{mod-}A \rightarrow \text{mod-}B$ which is injective on isomorphism classes of indecomposables. In general, however, this functor cannot be fully faithful with thick image, and $\text{mod-}A$ is not equivalent to a thick subcategory of $\text{mod-}B$. Likewise, one should not expect that any wild category $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ can be embedded into any wild category $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$.

It seems that quiver-like categories are interesting on their own as natural generalisations of hereditary module categories, and deserve some attention.

For example, we do not know what the Auslander-Reiten quivers of $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ and $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ look like in general. For module categories of finite acyclic quivers it is classically known that $D^b(\text{mod-}\mathbb{k}Q) \cong D^b(\text{mod-}\mathbb{k}Q')$ if and only if Q is obtained from Q' by a finite number of reflections. Also, in [31] the group of autoequivalences of $D^b(\text{mod-}\mathbb{k}Q)$ is described: it is the semi-direct product of the automorphism group of the Auslander-Reiten quiver of $D^b(\text{mod-}\mathbb{k}Q)$ and the product $\prod_{i,j \in Q_0} GL_{d_{ij}}(\mathbb{k})$, where d_{ij} is the number of arrows from i to j in Q . We are not aware of analogues of these results for triangulated quiver-like categories if quivers can have cycles or be infinite.

1.2. Outline. The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we recall necessary background on abelian, triangulated, dg and A_∞ -categories. In Section 3 we gather less standard information about abelian hereditary categories, their derived categories, and thick subcategories in these. In Section 4 we introduce quiver-like categories and generalise results from [11] providing sufficient conditions for categories to be quiver-like. Theorems A, B, and C are proved here. We also describe proper, finitely generated, strongly finitely generated quiver-like categories, and those having a Serre functor, see Proposition 4.6. In Section 5 we recall standard results about tubes and representations of linear A_n -quivers, in particular, we describe their thick subcategories as direct sums of some categories of the same form. In Section 6 we give definitions and basic facts about weighted projective curves and their categories of coherent sheaves. In Section 7 we introduce big, small, and curve-like subcategories in coherent sheaves on weighted projective curves, and give different characterisations of big subcategories from Theorem E. Results of this section are similar to those from [9] but are obtained in greater generality. In Section 8 we prove our main result, Theorem D. Further we discuss the structure and the variety of thick subcategories on weighted projective lines. Finally, in Section 9 we provide some examples of thick quiver-like subcategories on weighted projective lines and compute corresponding quivers.

1.3. Acknowledgements. This paper grows out from the study of thick subcategories on smooth curves carried out in collaboration with Valery Lunts, to whom I am much

indebted. Some part of this work was done in the inspiring environment of IHES, and I am grateful to Maxim Kontsevich, Emmanuel Ullmo, and Mikhail Tsfasman for their hospitality and help during that period. I thank Rudradip Biswas, Nathan Broomhead, Martin Gallauer, Edmund Heng, and Dmitri Kaledin for their interest in this study and for useful discussions. Special thanks go to Timothy Logvinenko for his help with A_∞ -categories. I thank the INI and the LMS for the financial support and all people from School of Mathematics at the University of Edinburgh for their hospitality.

2. BACKGROUND, CONVENTIONS, NOTATION

We work over a fixed field \mathbb{k} . Starting from Section 6 we assume that \mathbb{k} is algebraically closed. For a \mathbb{k} -vector space V , we denote its dual by V^* . An additive category \mathcal{A} is \mathbb{k} -linear if all its Hom groups are \mathbb{k} -vector spaces and composition maps are \mathbb{k} -bilinear. A \mathbb{k} -linear additive category is Hom-*finite* if all Hom spaces are finite-dimensional over \mathbb{k} .

2.1. Background on abelian categories. An object in an abelian category is *simple* if it has no non-trivial subobjects. An object F is said to have *finite length* if it has a finite filtration with simple quotients. The number of such quotient does not depend on filtration and is called the *length* of F . An abelian category is a *finite length category* if any its object has finite length.

An abelian category \mathcal{A} is *connected* if it has no non-trivial decompositions into a direct product $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \times \mathcal{A}_2$.

An object A of an abelian category \mathcal{A} is *uniserial* if it has unique filtration $0 = A_0 \subset A_1 \subset \dots \subset A_m = A$ with simple quotients. All subobjects of a uniserial object are terms of this filtration. An abelian category is *uniserial* if all its indecomposable objects are uniserial. Any object in a uniserial category is uniquely determined by its length m and its top simple quotient A_m/A_{m-1} .

The *radical* $\text{rad}(A)$ of an object A in a finite length abelian category is the intersection of all maximal subobjects. Equivalently, radical of A is the kernel of the universal semi-simple quotient of A . The latter is called the *top* of A and denoted $\text{top}(A)$.

For an abelian category \mathcal{A} , we denote by $\Gamma_0(\mathcal{A})$ a set of representatives of isomorphism classes of simple objects in \mathcal{A} .

2.2. Background on triangulated and derived categories. We refer to [4], [5], [14], [17], [32] for the definitions and basic concepts on triangulated and derived categories. We denote shift functor by $[]$ and call distinguished triangles *exact*.

For objects X, Y in a triangulated category \mathcal{D} we denote $\text{Hom}^i(X, Y) := \text{Hom}(X, Y[i])$ and

$$\text{Hom}^\bullet(X, Y) := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}^i(X, Y),$$

this is a graded abelian group. A triangulated \mathbb{k} -linear category \mathcal{D} is *proper* if for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$ the \mathbb{k} -vector space $\text{Hom}^\bullet(X, Y)$ is finite-dimensional.

Let \mathcal{G} be a subcategory (or a collection of objects, or a single object) in a triangulated category \mathcal{D} . We denote by $[\mathcal{G}]$ the smallest strict full triangulated subcategory in \mathcal{D} that

contains \mathcal{G} and call it *the triangulated subcategory generated by \mathcal{G}* . We denote by $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle$ the smallest strict idempotent closed full triangulated subcategory in \mathcal{D} that contains \mathcal{G} and call it *the thick subcategory generated by \mathcal{G}* .

Subcategories $[\mathcal{G}], \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle \subset \mathcal{D}$ can be described constructively as follows. Denote by $[\mathcal{G}]_0$ the full subcategory in \mathcal{D} whose objects are finite direct sums of shifts of objects in \mathcal{G} . For $n \geq 1$, denote by $[\mathcal{G}]_n$ the full subcategory in \mathcal{D} whose objects X fit into an exact triangle $X_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow X_{n-1} \rightarrow X_0[1]$, where $X_i \in [\mathcal{G}]_i$. Let $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle_n$ be the idempotent closure of $[\mathcal{G}]_n$. Then $[\mathcal{G}] = \cup_n [\mathcal{G}]_n$ and $\langle \mathcal{G} \rangle = \cup_n \langle \mathcal{G} \rangle_n$. We say that \mathcal{G} *generates \mathcal{D} as a triangulated category* if $[\mathcal{G}] = \mathcal{D}$.

An object G in \mathcal{D} is called a *generator* of \mathcal{D} if $\langle G \rangle = \mathcal{D}$, and is called a *strong generator* of \mathcal{D} if $\langle G \rangle_n = \mathcal{D}$ for some n .

A *Serre functor* on a triangulated Hom-finite \mathbb{k} -linear category \mathcal{D} is an autoequivalence $S: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that there exist natural isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(Y, S(X))^*$$

for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$. Such functor, if exists, is exact and unique up to an isomorphism.

For a subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{D}$ (or a family of objects, or for a single object) define its *left* and *right orthogonals* as full subcategories in \mathcal{D} , given respectively by

$$\begin{aligned} {}^\perp \mathcal{T} &:= \{X \in \mathcal{D} \mid \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(X, T) = 0 \text{ for any } T \in \mathcal{T}\}, \\ \mathcal{T}^\perp &:= \{X \in \mathcal{D} \mid \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(T, X) = 0 \text{ for any } T \in \mathcal{T}\}. \end{aligned}$$

One says that a triangulated category \mathcal{D} has a *semi-orthogonal decomposition*

$$\mathcal{D} = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n \rangle$$

if $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n$ are full triangulated subcategories and

- (1) $\mathcal{T}_i \subset \mathcal{T}_j^\perp$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq n$, and
- (2) \mathcal{D} is the smallest strict full triangulated subcategory of \mathcal{D} that contains all $\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n$.

In this case the following holds:

- For any $X \in \mathcal{D}$ there is unique diagram

$$0 = X_{n+1} \rightarrow X_n \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_2 \rightarrow X_1 = X,$$

such that $Y_i := \mathrm{Cone}(X_{i+1} \rightarrow X_i) \in \mathcal{T}_i$ for all $i = 1 \dots n$.

- There are well-defined exact functors $\pi_i: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_i$, $\pi_i(X) = Y_i$, called *projection functors*.
- $\pi_1: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_1$ is left adjoint to the inclusion $\mathcal{T}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$, and $\pi_n: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_n$ is right adjoint to the inclusion $\mathcal{T}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$.
- One has

$$\mathcal{T}_i = {}^\perp \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{i-1} \rangle \cap \langle \mathcal{T}_{i+1}, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n \rangle^\perp.$$

- Associativity: for any $1 \leq p \leq q \leq n$ there is a semi-orthogonal decomposition

$$\mathcal{D} = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_{p-1}, \langle \mathcal{T}_p, \dots, \mathcal{T}_q \rangle, \mathcal{T}_{q+1}, \dots, \mathcal{T}_n \rangle.$$

A subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{D}$ is called *left* (resp. *right*) *admissible* if the inclusion functor $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ has a left (resp. right) adjoint functor. A triangulated subcategory \mathcal{T} of a triangulated category \mathcal{D} is left admissible if and only if it appears as a left component in some semi-orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{D} = \langle \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}' \rangle$, and if and only if there is semi-orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{D} = \langle \mathcal{T}, {}^\perp \mathcal{T} \rangle$. Similar statement holds for right admissible subcategories.

A subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{D}$ is called *admissible* if it is both left and right admissible.

Definition 2.1. Let \mathcal{D} be a triangulated \mathbb{k} -linear category. An object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is *exceptional* if

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E, E) = \mathbb{k}, \quad \mathrm{Hom}^i(E, E) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq 0.$$

An object $E \in \mathcal{D}$ is *sphere-like* (more precisely, 1-sphere-like, but we will not encounter any other sphere-like objects) if

$$\mathrm{Hom}(E, E) = \mathbb{k}, \mathrm{Hom}^1(E, E) \cong \mathbb{k}, \quad \mathrm{Hom}^i(E, E) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq 0, 1.$$

A collection of objects $E_1, \dots, E_n \in \mathcal{D}$ is *exceptional* if

- any E_i is exceptional, and
- $\mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(E_q, E_p) = 0$ for all $1 \leq p < q \leq n$.

If \mathcal{D} is proper then the triangulated subcategory in \mathcal{D} generated by an exceptional collection E_1, \dots, E_n is admissible, we denote this subcategory

$$\langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle.$$

In particular, one has semi-orthogonal decompositions

$$\langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle = \langle \langle E_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle E_n \rangle \rangle$$

and

$$\mathcal{D} = \langle \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle^\perp, \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle, {}^\perp \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \rangle.$$

A triangulated category is called *algebraic* if it is the stable category of a Frobenius exact category (see [21] or [24]). Such categories include homotopy and derived categories of abelian categories, and also their triangulated subcategories and Verdier localizations. All triangulated categories that we come across in this paper are algebraic.

For an abelian category \mathcal{A} we denote by $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ its bounded derived category. We will tacitly identify \mathcal{A} with the image of the fully faithful functor $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{A})$. For a subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{A})$ we denote

$$\mathcal{T}_{\mathrm{Ab}} := \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{A},$$

this is a subcategory in \mathcal{A} . In particular, for a subcategory or an object $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}$ we have

$$\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{Ab}}^\perp := \mathcal{S}^\perp \cap \mathcal{A} = \{A \in \mathcal{A} \mid \mathrm{Ext}^i(S, A) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \text{ and } S \in \mathcal{S}\}$$

and similarly for ${}^\perp \mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{Ab}}$.

We will speak about exceptional and sphere-like objects and collections in an abelian category \mathcal{A} , meaning that they are such in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$.

Recall that the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ of an abelian category \mathcal{A} is the abelian group generated by the isomorphism classes $[A]$ of objects $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and relations $-[A] + [B] - [C] = 0$ for all exact triples $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} . Similarly, the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{D})$ of a triangulated category \mathcal{D} is generated by the isomorphism classes $[X]$ of objects $X \in \mathcal{D}$ and relations $[X] + [X[1]] = 0$ and $-[X] + [Y] - [Z] = 0$ for all exact triangles $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow X[1]$ in \mathcal{D} . There is a natural isomorphism $K_0(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow K_0(D^b(\mathcal{A}))$, sending $[A]$ to $[A]$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$. Assume that \mathcal{D} is \mathbb{k} -linear and proper, then there is bilinear Euler form χ on $K_0(\mathcal{D})$, defined by

$$\chi([X], [Y]) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^i \dim \operatorname{Hom}^i(X, Y)$$

for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}$.

2.3. Background on dg and A_∞ -categories. We refer to [6], [19], [20], [24] for main definitions and constructions related to differential graded (=dg) categories and A_∞ -categories. We will be very brief here as we use these machinery only in the proof of Theorem 4.12.

By definition, a differential graded (dg) category is a \mathbb{k} -linear category, whose Hom spaces carry a structure of differential complexes of \mathbb{k} -vector spaces, composition maps are homogeneous and satisfy graded Leibniz rule:

$$d(a \cdot b) = d(a) \cdot b + (-1)^p a \cdot d(b)$$

for any $X, Y, Z \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$, $a \in \operatorname{Hom}^p(Y, Z)$, $b \in \operatorname{Hom}^q(X, Y)$. Given a dg category, one defines its *derived category* $D(\mathcal{A})$ as the localisation of the homotopy category of right dg \mathcal{A} -modules by the class of quasi-isomorphisms, see [19] for details. Then $D(\mathcal{A})$ is a triangulated category, it contains a family of *representable modules* h^X , $X \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$. *Perfect derived category* $\operatorname{Perf}(\mathcal{A})$ of \mathcal{A} is defined as the smallest triangulated subcategory in $D(\mathcal{A})$ containing all modules h^X for $X \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$ and closed under taking direct summands.

By definition, an A_∞ -category \mathcal{A} over \mathbb{k} is given by

- a family of objects $\operatorname{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$,
- a family of \mathbb{Z} -graded vector spaces $\operatorname{Hom}(X, Y)$ for all $X, Y \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$,
- for any $n \geq 1$ a \mathbb{k} -linear homogeneous of degree $2 - n$ homomorphism

$$m_n : \operatorname{Hom}(X_{n-1}, X_n) \otimes \dots \otimes \operatorname{Hom}(X_1, X_2) \otimes \operatorname{Hom}(X_0, X_1) \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}(X_0, X_n),$$

which are subject to relations

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{n=r+s+t, r, t \geq 0, s \geq 1} (-1)^{r+st} m_{r+1+t} \circ (1^{\otimes r} \otimes m_s \otimes 1^{\otimes t}) = 0$$

for any $n \geq 1$.

Parallel to the case of dg categories, for an A_∞ -category one defines its *derived category* $D^\infty(\mathcal{A})$ and *perfect derived category* $\operatorname{Perf}^\infty(\mathcal{A}) \subset D^\infty(\mathcal{A})$ (see [20]), these categories are triangulated. The latter is generated as an idempotent-closed triangulated subcategory in $D^\infty(\mathcal{A})$ by the family of *representable modules* h^X , $X \in \operatorname{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$.

An A_∞ -category is called *strictly unital* if there are elements 1_X for all $X \in \text{Ob}(\mathcal{A})$ such that

$$m_n(a_n \otimes \dots \otimes a_1) = 0$$

as soon as at least one of a_1, \dots, a_n is 1_X for some X , and

$$m_2(a \otimes 1_X) = a = m_2(1_Y \otimes a)$$

for any $a \in \text{Hom}(X, Y)$.

An A_∞ -category is called *minimal* if $m_1 = 0$.

Assume \mathcal{A} is a strictly unital A_∞ -category and all $m_n, n \geq 3$ vanish. Then relations (2.1) take the form

$$m_1^2 = 0, \quad m_1 m_2 = m_2(1 \otimes m_1 + m_1 \otimes 1), \quad m_2(m_2 \otimes 1) = m_2(1 \otimes m_2),$$

so that m_2 is associative. Hence m_2 makes \mathcal{A} a category (a general A_∞ -category is not a category!), m_1 makes any $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$ a differential complex, and composition maps $\text{Hom}(Y, Z) \otimes \text{Hom}(X, Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(X, Z)$ are compatible with the differentials. Therefore, \mathcal{A} is in fact a dg category.

3. ABELIAN HEREDITARY CATEGORIES, THEIR DERIVED CATEGORIES, AND THEIR SUBCATEGORIES

In this paper we deal with hereditary abelian categories and their derived categories, and study thick subcategories in them. Here we give necessary definitions and explain that, given a hereditary abelian category \mathcal{A} , thick subcategories in \mathcal{A} and in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ are in a very natural bijection.

Definition 3.1. An abelian category \mathcal{A} is called *hereditary* if $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(X, Y) = 0$ for all $i \geq 2, X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$.

There are several reasonable properties for a subcategory in an abelian category.

Definition 3.2 (See [21, Sect. 4.4], [10], [16], [9]). Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a full subcategory of an abelian category. Then

- \mathcal{S} is called *wide* if \mathcal{S} is closed under taking kernels, cokernels, and extensions,
- \mathcal{S} is called *thick* if \mathcal{S} is closed under taking direct summands and *2-of-the-3 condition* is satisfied: if in an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ in \mathcal{A} two of X, Y, Z are in \mathcal{S} , then the third one is also in \mathcal{S} ,
- \mathcal{S} is called *Serre* if \mathcal{S} is closed under taking subobjects, quotient objects, and extensions.

Note that a wide subcategory of an abelian category is abelian, and the inclusion functor is exact. Also note that the terminology slightly varies across the literature.

Proposition 3.3. *Any wide subcategory of an abelian category is thick. Moreover, if \mathcal{A} is hereditary then any thick subcategory in \mathcal{A} is wide.*

Proof. The first is obvious, for the second see [10, Th. 3.3.1] or [21, Rem. 4.4.16]. \square

In this paper we will deal with wide (= thick) subcategories of hereditary abelian categories and will call them thick. We will make use of the following important

Proposition 3.4 (See [35, Lemma A.1, Prop. A.2]). (1) *An abelian category \mathcal{A} is hereditary if and only if the functor $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X, -)$ is right exact for any $X \in \mathcal{A}$.*
 (2) *Let \mathcal{A} be hereditary and $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}$ be a thick subcategory. Then \mathcal{S} is also a hereditary abelian category, and the inclusion functor is exact.*

We will also deal with subcategories of derived categories. Recall

Definition 3.5. A full subcategory \mathcal{T} in a triangulated category is *thick* if \mathcal{T} is closed under taking shifts, cones, and direct summands. We will also assume that \mathcal{T} is closed under isomorphisms.

Derived category $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ of a hereditary abelian category \mathcal{A} has a simple structure: recall well-known

Proposition 3.6 (See, for example, [21, Prop. 4.4.15]). *Let \mathcal{A} be abelian hereditary category. Then any object $X \in D^b(\mathcal{A})$ is isomorphic to the direct sum of its shifted cohomology:*

$$X \cong \bigoplus_i H^i(X)[-i].$$

In particular, any indecomposable object in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ is a shift of some indecomposable object in \mathcal{A} .

This allows to relate thick subcategories in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ and in \mathcal{A} .

Proposition 3.7. *Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian hereditary category.*

(1) *Then there is a bijection between thick subcategories in \mathcal{A} and in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$, given by assignments*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} \supset \mathcal{S} &\mapsto \{X \mid H^i(X) \in \mathcal{S} \text{ for all } i\} = \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle \subset D^b(\mathcal{A}), \\ \mathcal{A} \supset \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{T} &\leftarrow \mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{A}). \end{aligned}$$

(2) *Moreover, let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{A})$ be corresponding thick subcategories. Then the derived functor $D^b(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{A})$ of the inclusion is fully faithful with the image \mathcal{T} .*

Proof. This is [7, Th. 5.1] or [21, Prop. 4.4.17] for (1) and Prop. 3.4 combined with [21, Prop. 4.4.17] for (2). \square

4. QUIVER-LIKE CATEGORIES

Here we introduce one of the main characters of this paper, quiver-like categories. Most results of this section can be found in [11]. However, now we present a different point of view and work in greater generality. In particular, we do not assume quivers to be finite, in contrast to loc. cit., do not rely on enhancements of triangulated categories, and remove formality assumptions.

A *quiver* $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$ is given by a set Q_0 of vertices, a set Q_1 of arrows, and two maps s (source) and t (target) from Q_1 to Q_0 . Let $\mathbb{k}Q$ denote the path algebra of Q over a field \mathbb{k} . Let $\text{rad}(\mathbb{k}Q) \subset \mathbb{k}Q$ be the two-sided ideal, spanned by all paths of positive length. A (*right*) *representation* of Q over \mathbb{k} is a collection of \mathbb{k} -vector spaces V_i for $i \in Q_0$, and homomorphisms $V_{t(a)} \rightarrow V_{s(a)}$ for $a \in Q_1$. Any representation $(V_i)_{i \in Q_0}$ of Q can be viewed as a (right) module $\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} V_i$ over $\mathbb{k}Q$. A representation $(V_i)_{i \in Q_0}$ is *finite-dimensional* if the vector space $\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} V_i$ is finite-dimensional. A representation $(V_i)_{i \in Q_0}$ is *radical-nilpotent* if $(\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} V_i) \cdot \text{rad}(\mathbb{k}Q)^N = 0$ for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\text{Mod-}\mathbb{k}Q$ denote the category of right representations of Q over \mathbb{k} (we will also call them modules), it is a hereditary abelian category.

Definition 4.1. Let $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \subset \text{Mod-}\mathbb{k}Q$ be the full subcategory of finite-dimensional radical-nilpotent representations, this is a thick and wide (and even Serre) subcategory. Let $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q) \subset D^b(\text{Mod-}\mathbb{k}Q)$ denote the full subcategory of complexes with cohomology in $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$, this is a thick subcategory.

Denote by s_i the simple module concentrated in vertex $i \in Q_0$. It is easy to see that $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ consists precisely of modules having a finite filtration with quotients s_i , and $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ is generated by the modules s_i as triangulated category.

Definition 4.2. An abelian category \mathcal{A} is *quiver-like* if there is an additive equivalence $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ for some quiver Q . A triangulated category \mathcal{T} is called *quiver-like* if there is an exact equivalence $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ for some quiver Q .

Remark 4.3. Quiver Q can be reconstructed from the associated abelian category $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ as the Ext-quiver of the collection of simple objects, see Definition 4.10 below.

On the contrary, there are non-trivial equivalences between triangulated quiver-like categories. For example, $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q) \cong D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q')$ if Q is finite acyclic and Q' is obtained from Q by a sequence of reflections (known since [15], see also [34]). We do not know when, for general quivers Q, Q' , categories $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ and $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q')$ are equivalent.

Proposition 4.4. *The category $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ is hereditary, and the natural functor*

$$D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q) \rightarrow D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$$

is an equivalence.

Proof. It follows from Propositions 3.4 and 3.7, applied to the hereditary category $\text{Mod-}\mathbb{k}Q$. \square

We have trivial but pleasant

Proposition 4.5 ([11, Corollary 3.4]). *Let \mathcal{T} be a quiver-like triangulated category with an equivalence $\Phi: D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$. Put $t_i := \Phi(s_i)$. Then we have the following.*

- (1) *For any indecomposable object $X \in \mathcal{T}$ there exists $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a diagram*

$$0 = X_0 \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow X_m = X[d]$$

such that $\text{Cone}(X_{j-1} \rightarrow X_j) \cong t_{i_j}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, m$ and some $i_j \in Q_0$.

- (2) $K_0(\mathcal{T}) \cong \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} \mathbb{Z} \cdot [t_i]$.
- (3) \mathcal{T} is generated by $t_i, i \in Q_0$, as a triangulated category.

Next we provide some general properties of quiver-like categories. Recall that a quiver is *acyclic* if it has no oriented cycles.

Proposition 4.6. *Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$ be a quiver and $\mathcal{T} = D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ be the corresponding quiver-like category. Assume also that Q is connected. Then*

- (1) \mathcal{T} has a generator $\iff Q_0$ is finite. If this is the case, then $G := \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} s_i$ is also a generator.
- (2) \mathcal{T} is proper \iff any two vertices are connected by finitely many arrows.
- (3) \mathcal{T} has a strong generator $\iff Q_0$ is finite and Q is acyclic.
- (4) \mathcal{T} has a Serre functor \iff one of the following holds:
 - (a) for any vertex i in Q there are only finitely many paths containing i ,
 - (b) Q is a cycle Z_n of length $n \geq 1$,
 - (c) Q is $A_{\infty, \infty}$:

$$\dots \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \dots$$

Proof. (1) and (2) are easy and left to the reader.

For (3), assume Q is acyclic with finitely many vertices. Then $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ is the category of all finite-dimensional modules over path algebra $\mathbb{k}Q$, let $R = \text{rad}(\mathbb{k}Q)$. Let n be the maximal length of a path in Q , then $R^{n+1} = 0$. We claim that $[G]_n = D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$. Indeed, for a bounded complex M of $\mathbb{k}Q$ -modules, consider its filtration by subcomplexes

$$0 = M \cdot R^{n+1} \subset M \cdot R^n \subset \dots \subset M \cdot R \subset M.$$

Any quotient $F_j := M \cdot R^j / M \cdot R^{j+1}$ is a bounded complex, where each term is a finite direct sum of some modules $s_i, i \in I$. The category $\text{add}(G)$ of such direct sums is semi-simple, therefore F_j is quasi-isomorphic to the direct sum of its cohomology modules, which are in $\text{add}(G)$. Hence $F_j \in [G]_0$. It follows that $M \in [G]_n$, and G is a strong generator of $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$.

Contrary, assume $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ has a strong generator. Then any generator is a strong one (see [36, Sect. 3.1]), in particular, by (1) G is: $\langle G \rangle_n = D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ for some n . Note that $G \cdot R = 0$. Using standard technique, one can prove by induction that $M \cdot R^{j+1} = 0$ for any $M \in \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \cap \langle G \rangle_j$. Therefore, $M \cdot R^{n+1} = 0$ for all $M \in \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$. It follows then that the length of paths in Q is bounded by n , in particular, Q cannot have cycles.

(4) is based on the classification of noetherian hereditary abelian categories with a Serre functor, given in [35]. If (a) holds, then all indecomposable projective and injective Q -modules are in $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$, and $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ has enough projectives and injectives. Then the derived Nakayama functor $D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q) \rightarrow D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q)$ is well-defined, is an equivalence, and serves as a Serre functor on $D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q) = D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$. If (b) holds, $D^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ has a Serre functor by [35, Th. B].

The other way, recall that $\mathcal{A} = \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ is a connected noetherian hereditary abelian category of finite length. Assuming that $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ has a Serre functor, \mathcal{A} is Ext-finite and one of the following holds by [35, Th. B]:

- (1) \mathcal{A} has no non-zero projective objects. Then $\mathcal{A} \cong \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Z_n$ or $\mathcal{A} \cong \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}A_{\infty,\infty}$ (this is case (a) in [35, Th. B] or [35, Th. III.1.1]).
- (2) \mathcal{A} has a non-zero projective object. Then by [35, Th. II.4.9] \mathcal{A} is equivalent to category $\widetilde{\text{rep}}(\Gamma)$, defined in [35, Sect. II], where Γ is a quiver obtained in the following way. Start with a quiver Γ' such that any vertex is contained in only finitely many paths. Then, to each vertex γ in Γ' , attach finitely many (possibly zero) infinite rays of the form $A_{\infty,0}$:

$$(4.1) \quad \dots \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 0,$$

by gluing their terminal vertex 0 to γ .

In case (1) it remains to note that equivalence $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \cong \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q'$ implies $Q = Q'$, see Remark 4.3. In case (2) we prove that $\Gamma = \Gamma'$ actually has no infinite rays attached, and $Q = \Gamma$. We will need only two properties of category $\widetilde{\text{rep}}(\Gamma)$ (see [35, Th. II.1.3]):

- (*) $\widetilde{\text{rep}}(\Gamma)$ contains $\text{rep}(\Gamma)$, the category of finitely presented right representations of Γ , as an exact full subcategory, and
- (**) $\widetilde{\text{rep}}(\Gamma) = \text{rep}(\Gamma)$ if $D^b(\text{rep}(\Gamma))$ has a Serre functor.

Assume that Γ contains an infinite ray (4.1). Then projective Γ -modules $P_0 \supset P_1 \supset P_2 \supset \dots$ give an infinite descending chain in $\text{rep}(\Gamma)$ and by (*) in $\widetilde{\text{rep}}(\Gamma) \cong \mathcal{A}$. Since \mathcal{A} is a finite length category, we get a contradiction. Therefore, in $\Gamma = \Gamma'$ every vertex is contained only in finitely many paths, and $\text{rep}(\Gamma) = \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}\Gamma$. By the above arguments, $D^b(\text{rep}(\Gamma))$ has a Serre functor. Using (**), we have

$$\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q = \mathcal{A} \cong \widetilde{\text{rep}}(\Gamma) = \text{rep}(\Gamma) = \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}\Gamma$$

By Remark 4.3 we deduce $Q = \Gamma$. □

Remark 4.7. It is interesting to note that for an acyclic quiver Q with finite Q_0 and Q_1 one always has $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q) \cong D^b(\text{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q)$ and the Rouquier dimension ([36]) of $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ is ≤ 1 . However, it is not clear what the dimension of $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ is for acyclic quivers Q with finite Q_0 but possibly infinite Q_1 .

To recognize a quiver-like category, one needs to find objects, corresponding to simple modules. We leave to the reader the following easy, but very important computation:

Lemma 4.8. *Let $\mathcal{A} = \text{Mod}\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ and let $s_i \in \mathcal{A}$ be simple modules.*

$$(4.2) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(s_i, s_i) = \mathbb{k}, \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(s_i, s_j) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq j,$$

$$(4.3) \quad \dim \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(s_i, s_j) = \text{number of arrows in } Q \text{ from } j \text{ to } i,$$

$$(4.4) \quad \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^p(s_i, s_j) = 0 \quad \text{for } p \geq 2.$$

It is now convenient to make

Definition 4.9. Let \mathcal{T} be a triangulated \mathbb{k} -linear category. A collection of objects $t_i, i \in I$, in \mathcal{T} is called *vertex-like* if

$$\text{Hom}(t_i, t_i) = \mathbb{k}, \text{Hom}(t_i, t_j) = 0 \quad \text{for } i \neq j, \quad \text{Hom}^p(t_i, t_j) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i, j \text{ and } p \neq 0, 1.$$

A model example of a vertex-like collection is given (see Lemma 4.8) by simple modules s_i in $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$, where i runs through Q_0 .

We are going to prove next that any vertex-like collection generates a quiver-like triangulated category. Lemma 4.8 suggests how to define a quiver.

Definition 4.10. Let $\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a vertex-like set in a triangulated category. Its Ext-*quiver* is defined as follows: take $Q_0 = I$ and take $\dim \text{Hom}^1(t_j, t_i)$ arrows from i to j (this can be infinite, then \dim denotes the cardinality of a basis).

The key argument is contained in the following

Proposition 4.11. *Let \mathcal{T} be an algebraic idempotent-complete \mathbb{k} -linear category. Assume \mathcal{T} is generated by a vertex-like set $t_i, i \in I$, of objects. Let \mathcal{E} be the dg category with $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{E}) = I$, and with $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}}^p(i, j) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}^p(t_i, t_j)$ for all $i, j \in I, p \in \mathbb{Z}$, viewed as a complex with zero differential. Then one has an exact equivalence $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{Perf}(\mathcal{E})$, sending t_i to the representable \mathcal{E} -module h^i .*

Proof. By [24, Th. 7.6.0.6], there exists a strictly unital minimal A_∞ -category \mathcal{E} with $\text{Ob}(\mathcal{E}) = I$ and an equivalence $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \text{Perf}^\infty(\mathcal{E})$ of triangulated categories, sending t_i to the representable \mathcal{E} -module h^i . Moreover, by construction one has $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{E}}^p(i, j) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}^p(t_i, t_j)$ for all $i, j \in I, p \in \mathbb{Z}$.

We claim that all operations $m_n, n \geq 3$ vanish. This is because of the grading: by the definition of a vertex-like collection, there are only scalar endomorphisms and Hom-s of degree 1 in \mathcal{E} . More precisely, let a_1, \dots, a_n be homogeneous morphisms in \mathcal{E} , $n \geq 3$. If some a_k has degree 0, then $a_k \in \mathbb{k} \cdot 1_i$ for some object i in \mathcal{E} . Hence $m_n(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) = 0$ by strict unitality of \mathcal{E} . Otherwise all a_i -s have degree 1. Then

$$\deg m_n(a_1 \otimes \dots \otimes a_n) = \deg m_n + \sum_{k=1}^n \deg a_k = 2 - n + n = 2,$$

but there are no nonzero morphisms in degree 2 in \mathcal{E} .

Hence \mathcal{E} is actually a dg category, and its differential m_1 is zero by the minimality assumption. It remains to note that the perfect derived category $\text{Perf}^\infty(\mathcal{E})$ of A_∞ -modules over \mathcal{E} is equivalent to the perfect derived category $\text{Perf}(\mathcal{E})$ of dg modules over \mathcal{E} , see [24, Cor. 4.1.3.11]. \square

Theorem 4.12. *Let \mathcal{T} be an algebraic idempotent-complete \mathbb{k} -linear category. Assume \mathcal{T} is generated by a vertex-like set $t_i, i \in I$, of objects. Let Q be the Ext-*quiver* of this set. Then \mathcal{T} is quiver-like: there exists an exact equivalence $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$, sending t_i to s_i .*

Proof. By Lemma 4.8

$$(4.5) \quad \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}^p(t_i, t_j) \cong \text{Hom}_{D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)}^p(s_i, s_j) \quad \text{for all } i, j \in I \text{ and } p \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Assume first that \mathcal{T} is idempotent-complete. Then we can apply Proposition 4.11 to categories \mathcal{T} and $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ with vertex-like collections $\{t_i\}$ and $\{s_i\}$. By (4.5), both \mathcal{T} and

$D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ are equivalent to the same category $\text{Perf}(\mathcal{E})$, and for any $i \in I$ the objects $t_i \in \mathcal{T}$ and $s_i \in D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ are sent to the same object in $\text{Perf}(\mathcal{E})$. Hence the statement follows.

If \mathcal{T} is not known to be idempotent-complete, the same arguments prove that there is a fully faithful exact functor $\Phi: \mathcal{T} \rightarrow D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$, sending t_i to $s_i, i \in I$. But objects s_i generate $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ as a triangulated category (without adding direct summands). Therefore the essential image of Φ is all $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$, and Φ is an equivalence. \square

Remark 4.13. Theorem 4.12 was first proved in [11, Proposition 3.9] under extra conditions: I was assumed finite and the dg endomorphism algebra of $\oplus t_i$ was assumed formal.

We can say even more if a vertex-like set in an abelian category is given.

Corollary 4.14. *Let \mathcal{A} be a \mathbb{k} -linear abelian category. Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{A})$ be a thick subcategory and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{A}$. Assume there is a vertex-like set $t_i, i \in I$, in \mathcal{S} that generates \mathcal{T} as a thick triangulated subcategory. Let Q be the associated Ext-quiver. Then*

- (1) *There are equivalences*

$$D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{T} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{S},$$

sending s_i to t_i .

- (2) *Objects t_i represent isomorphism classes of simple objects in \mathcal{S} .*
(3) *\mathcal{S} is the smallest subcategory in \mathcal{A} that contains t_i -s and is closed under extensions.*
(4) *The natural functor $D^b(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{A})$ is fully faithful with the essential image \mathcal{T} .*

Proof. Note that \mathcal{T} is an algebraic triangulated category, so we can apply Theorem 4.12. We get that there is an exact equivalence $\mathcal{T} \rightarrow D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$. Recall equivalence $D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q) \rightarrow D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ from Proposition 4.4. Let

$$\Phi: D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}$$

be the resulting equivalence. Note that Φ sends simple modules s_i to objects t_i . Any module in $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$ is an iterated extension of s_i -s, hence Φ sends the subcategory $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \subset D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q)$ to $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{T}$. Let us check that the restriction

$$\phi = \Phi|_{\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q}: \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$$

is essentially surjective. Recall that any object in $D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q)$ is the direct sum of its cohomology. Let $F \in \mathcal{S}$ and $E = \Phi^{-1}(F)$. Then

$$F \cong \Phi(E) \cong \Phi(\oplus_i H^i(E)[-i]) \cong \oplus_i \phi(H^i(E))[-i].$$

It follows that $\phi(H^i(E)) = 0$ and $H^i(E) = 0$ for $i \neq 0$. Hence $E \cong H^0(E) \in \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q$. Consequently, Φ restricts to an equivalence $\phi: \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$.

- (2) and (3) follow easily from equivalence $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$.

For (4) it suffices to check that the derived functor

$$\Phi' := D(\phi): D^b(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{A})$$

is fully faithful with the image \mathcal{T} . While we are unsure if Φ' is isomorphic to Φ , we note that Φ' and Φ coincide on objects $s_i[d]$, where $i \in I, d \in \mathbb{Z}$. It follows that Φ' is fully

faithful on such objects along with Φ , and by standard dévissage technique Φ' is fully faithful on its domain. Finally, we see that the image of Φ' is generated by objects $t_i[d]$ and therefore is \mathcal{T} . \square

We find it convenient for applications to formulate another consequence of Theorem 4.12. Note that Corollary 4.15 appears in [11, Proposition 3.10] with extra assumptions including finiteness.

Corollary 4.15. *Assume that the field \mathbb{k} is algebraically closed. Let \mathcal{A} be a \mathbb{k} -linear abelian hereditary category. Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{A})$ be a Hom-finite thick essentially small subcategory, and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{A}$. Assume there exists a linear function*

$$r: K_0(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z},$$

such that for any nonzero $F \in \mathcal{S}$ one has $r([F]) > 0$. Then the category \mathcal{S} is of finite length, its simple objects form a vertex-like collection generating \mathcal{T} , and categories \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are quiver-like.

Proof. By Proposition 3.4 \mathcal{S} is an abelian hereditary category. One can prove that any object F in \mathcal{S} has finite length by induction in $r([F])$. Indeed, if $r([F]) = 0$ then $F = 0$ and there is nothing to prove, and if $0 \rightarrow F' \rightarrow F \rightarrow F'' \rightarrow 0$ is a non-trivial exact sequence, then $r([F]) = r([F']) + r([F''])$, $r([F']), r([F'']) < r([F])$, and one can proceed by induction.

Let $t_i, i \in I$, denote the set of (isomorphism classes of) simple objects in \mathcal{S} . Then t_i -s generate \mathcal{S} (because any object in \mathcal{S} is an iterated extension of simples) and \mathcal{T} (because any object in \mathcal{T} is a direct sum of its cohomology objects, which are in \mathcal{S}). Further, t_i -s form a vertex-like family. Indeed, $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}^p(t_i, t_j) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}^p(t_i, t_j) = 0$ for $p \neq 0, 1$ by the heredity of \mathcal{A} , $\text{Hom}(t_i, t_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$ because they are simple objects. Finally, $\text{End}(t_i)$ is a finite-dimensional division \mathbb{k} -algebra (by Schur's lemma and our assumptions) and hence is isomorphic to \mathbb{k} . Now by Corollary 4.14 \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} are quiver-like. \square

Now we provide an analog of Theorem 4.12, giving a characterisation of abelian quiver-like categories.

Theorem 4.16. *An abelian \mathbb{k} -linear category \mathcal{A} is quiver-like if and only if \mathcal{A} is essentially small, has finite length, $\text{End}(S) = \mathbb{k}$ for any simple object $S \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\text{Ext}^j(S_1, S_2) = 0$ for $j \geq 2$ and for any simple objects $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{A}$.*

Proof. “Only if” part is trivial, let's prove “if” part. Consider $D^b(\mathcal{A})$, it is an algebraic triangulated category. Choose a representative set $t_i, i \in I$, for isomorphism classes of simple objects in \mathcal{A} . Then $\{t_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a vertex-like set by our assumptions. Note that this set generates $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ as a triangulated category: any object in \mathcal{A} has a finite filtration with quotients isomorphic to some t_i , hence belongs to the triangulated subcategory in $D^b(\mathcal{A})$ generated by t_i -s. So we can apply Corollary 4.14 with $\mathcal{T} = D^b(\mathcal{A})$ and deduce that \mathcal{A} is quiver-like. \square

Remark 4.17. We do not know how to prove Theorem 4.16 directly, without passing to triangulated categories.

Remark 4.18. Note that we do not require \mathcal{A} to be hereditary in Corollary 4.14 and Theorem 4.16.

5. LINEAR QUIVERS, TUBES, AND THEIR SUBCATEGORIES

Here we collect necessary facts about two families of abelian hereditary categories: modules over linear quivers and tubes, needed for the sequel. We refer to [8, 1.7, 1.8], [9, Section 4], [22], or [10] for details.

5.1. Linear quivers. For $n \geq 1$, let \mathcal{A}_n be the category of right representation of the quiver of type A_n :

$$\bullet_1 \longrightarrow \bullet_2 \longrightarrow \bullet \longrightarrow \dots \longrightarrow \bullet \longrightarrow \bullet_n$$

For $n = 0$ we put $\mathcal{A}_0 = 0$. Categories \mathcal{A}_n are connected, hereditary, and uniserial. They have finitely many indecomposable objects, all off which are exceptional. Despite of their omnipresence, categories \mathcal{A}_n don't seem to have a standard English name. Thick subcategories in \mathcal{A}_n and $D^b(\mathcal{A}_n)$ are very well-understood, we summarize relevant facts in

Proposition 5.1 (See [10], [22]). *Let $n \geq 0$.*

- (1) *Let $E \in \mathcal{A}_n$ be an indecomposable object of length m , $1 \leq m \leq n$. Then E_{Ab}^\perp is equivalent to $\mathcal{A}_{n-m} \times \mathcal{A}_{m-1}$, and $D^b(\mathcal{A}_n) = \langle D^b(E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp), \langle E \rangle \rangle$.*

Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{A}_n)$ be a thick subcategory, and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{A}_n$. Then

- (2) *\mathcal{T} is generated by an exceptional collection in \mathcal{S} , in particular, \mathcal{T} is admissible.*
(3) *One has*

$$\mathcal{S} \cong \mathcal{A}_{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_{n_k},$$

where $k \geq 0$ and $n_i \geq 1$.

Proof. We provide a short proof to illustrate methods from Section 4.

For $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, denote by M_{ij} the indecomposable right representation of A_n , concentrated in vertices $i, i+1, \dots, j-1, j$. We can assume $E = M_{pq}$ with $m = q - p + 1$. One can check that E^\perp is generated by the vertex-like family of modules

$$(5.1) \quad M_{11}, M_{22}, \dots, M_{p-2, p-2}, M_{p-1, q}, M_{q+1, q+1}, \dots, M_{nn}; M_{pp}, M_{p+1, p+1}, M_{q-1, q-1}$$

Note that the Ext-quiver of (5.1) is $A_{n-m} \sqcup A_{m-1}$. By Corollary 4.14, we get an equivalence

$$E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp \cong \text{mod}_0\text{-k}(A_{n-m} \sqcup A_{m-1}) \cong \mathcal{A}_{n-m} \times \mathcal{A}_{m-1}.$$

By Proposition 3.7 $E^\perp \cong D^b(E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp)$, this proves (1).

(2) is clear since any thick subcategory in \mathcal{A}_n contains an indecomposable object, which is necessarily exceptional. (3) follows from (1) by induction, because \mathcal{T} is the orthogonal to an exceptional collection. \square

5.2. Tubes. Let $n \geq 1$, let Z_n be the oriented cyclic quiver with n vertices. Let $\mathcal{U}_n := \text{mod}_0\text{-k}Z_n$. It is a connected abelian uniserial hereditary category. Moreover, \mathcal{U}_n has Serre duality in the form

$$(5.2) \quad \text{Ext}^1(X, Y)^* \cong \text{Hom}(Y, \tau X).$$

where $X, Y \in \mathcal{U}_n$, and $\tau: \mathcal{U}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_n$ is the autoequivalence induced by the rotation of Z_n against the arrows. Note that $\tau^n = \text{id}$. The derived category $D^b(\mathcal{U}_n)$ has a Serre functor, given by $\tau[1]$. Let S be some simple object in \mathcal{U}_n , then all simple objects are $S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{n-1}S$. Further, for a simple object S and $i \geq 1$, denote by $S^{[i]}$ the unique indecomposable object M with $M/\text{rad}(M) \cong S$ and of length i . Such $S^{[i]}$ fits into a non-trivial extension

$$0 \rightarrow \tau S^{[i-1]} \rightarrow S^{[i]} \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0.$$

Then all indecomposable objects of length i in \mathcal{U}_n are $S^{[i]}, \tau S^{[i]}, \dots, \tau^{n-1}S^{[i]}$. In particular, there are infinitely many indecomposable objects in \mathcal{U}_n . We will call \mathcal{U}_n a *tube of rank n* .

Object $S^{[i]}$ is exceptional if and only if $i < n$, and is sphere-like if and only if $i = n$. For $i > n$ the object $S^{[i]}$ is not exceptional nor sphere-like, it has nilpotent endomorphisms.

One can show that any connected abelian category of finite length with Serre duality (5.2) and with finitely many simples is equivalent to \mathcal{U}_n for some $n \geq 1$, see [35].

Thick subcategories in tubes have also been studied, see [22], [9], or [10]. Here we collect the results from these sources that we will use later.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $n \geq 1$.*

- (1) *Let $E \in \mathcal{U}_n$ be an indecomposable object of length $m, 1 \leq m \leq n$. Then E_{Ab}^\perp is equivalent to $\mathcal{U}_{n-m} \times \mathcal{A}_{m-1}$, and we have the semi-orthogonal decomposition $D^b(\mathcal{U}_n) = \langle D^b(E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp), \langle E \rangle \rangle$ (where \mathcal{U}_{n-m} does not appear if $m = n$).*

Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{U}_n)$ be a thick subcategory, and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{U}_n$. Then

- (2) *\mathcal{T} is admissible and exactly one of the following holds:*
- (a) *If \mathcal{T} contains no sphere-like objects then \mathcal{T} is generated by an exceptional collection in \mathcal{S} .*
 - (b) *If \mathcal{T} contains a sphere-like object then \mathcal{T} is generated by a semi-orthogonal collection E_1, \dots, E_m in \mathcal{S} , where E_1, \dots, E_{m-1} are exceptional and E_m is sphere-like.*
- (3) *According to (2), one has:*
- (a)

$$(5.3) \quad \mathcal{S} \cong \mathcal{A}_{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_{n_k},$$

where $k \geq 0, n_i \geq 1$. All indecomposable objects in \mathcal{T} are exceptional.

(b)

$$(5.4) \quad \mathcal{S} \cong \mathcal{U}_s \times \mathcal{A}_{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_{n_k},$$

where $s \geq 1, k \geq 0, n_i \geq 1$. \mathcal{T} is not generated by an exceptional collection. Moreover, \mathcal{T} is of type (a) if and only if \mathcal{T}^\perp (and ${}^\perp\mathcal{T}$) is of type (b).

Proof. As in Proposition 5.1 we sketch a proof, cf. [9, Sect. 4].

We can assume $E = S^{[m]}$ for a simple object S . One can check that E^\perp is generated by the vertex-like family of modules

$$(5.5) \quad \tau^{-1}S, \tau^{-2}S, \dots, \tau^{m+1}S, S^{[m+1]}; \tau S, \tau^2S, \dots, \tau^{m-1}S$$

Note that the Ext-quiver of (5.5) is $Z_{n-m} \sqcup A_{m-1}$. By Corollary 4.14, we get an equivalence

$$E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp \cong \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}(Z_{n-m} \sqcup A_{m-1}) \cong \mathcal{U}_{n-m} \times \mathcal{A}_{m-1}.$$

If $n = m$ then the first group in (5.5) contains $n - m$ modules, so is empty, and Z_{n-m} above does not occur. Note that E together with (5.5) generate $D^b(\mathcal{U}_n)$, and we deduce (1). In particular, $\langle E \rangle$ is right, and similarly left admissible.

Any thick subcategory \mathcal{S} in \mathcal{U}_n contains a simple in \mathcal{S} object E , which must be exceptional or sphere-like. Passing to E^\perp and arguing by induction using (1), we see that any thick subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\mathcal{U}_n)$ is generated by a semi-orthogonal sequence of exceptional and sphere-like objects, hence is admissible. Moreover, assume \mathcal{T} contains a sphere-like object E , then $E^\perp \cong D^b(\mathcal{A}_{n-1})$ by (1). Hence \mathcal{T}^\perp has no sphere-like objects, and one can find a generating semi-orthogonal sequence for \mathcal{T} with only one sphere-like object as required. This explains (2).

For (3), use that \mathcal{T} is admissible and thus $\mathcal{T} = ({}^\perp\mathcal{T})^\perp$. Consider two cases: \mathcal{T} is the right orthogonal to a subcategory as in (2a) or as in (2b). Use induction, (1), and Proposition 5.1 to see that in the first case \mathcal{S} is equivalent to (5.4) and hence of type (b), and in the second case \mathcal{S} is equivalent to (5.3) and hence of type (a). \square

Nice descriptions of thick subcategories in linear quivers and tubes in terms of non-crossing arc arrangements and non-crossing partitions has been found by Ingalls – Thomas [18] for \mathcal{A}_n and Dichev [10] and Krause [22] for \mathcal{U}_n respectively.

6. WEIGHTED PROJECTIVE CURVES

Here we collect necessary facts about weighted projective curves and associated categories of coherent sheaves. In this section and further we assume that the base field \mathbb{k} is algebraically closed.

6.1. Weighted projective curves. Let X be a smooth projective curve over \mathbb{k} and $w: X \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ be a function such that $w = 1$ except for finitely many points x_1, \dots, x_n . Function w is called *weight function*, points $x \in X$ with $w(x) = 1$ are called *regular* or *homogeneous*, points x_1, \dots, x_n are called *orbifold* (or *non-homogeneous*, *stacky*, *weighted*, *singular*, etc), and numbers $r_i := w(x_i) \geq 2$ are called *multiplicities* or *weights*. A pair $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$ will be called a *weighted projective curve*.

6.2. Category of coherent sheaves. To a weighted projective curve \mathbb{X} one can associate an abelian category $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$, called *the category of coherent sheaves on \mathbb{X}* . It can be defined in several ways:

- If $n \geq 3$, there exists a smooth projective curve Y , a finite group G and a faithful G -action on Y such that $Y/G \cong X$ and for any $y \in Y$ the stabilizer of y is a cyclic group of order $w(\pi(y))$ (where $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ is the quotient morphism). Then one can define $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ as the category of G -equivariant coherent sheaves on Y . See [27] for details.
- One can obtain $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ from $\text{coh } X$ by *inserting weights* r_1, \dots, r_n at points x_1, \dots, x_n successively. One step of this procedure is known as *root construction* or *stacky blow-up*. Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$ be a weighted curve, $x \in X$ be a point, and $p \geq 1$. Denote $\mathbb{X}' = (X, w')$ with $w'(x) = pw(x)$ and $w'(y) = w(y)$ for $y \neq x$. The idea of obtaining $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}'$ from $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ is to formally take p -th root of the twist functor $\sigma_x: \text{coh } \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ and of the functor morphism $\eta_x: \text{id} \rightarrow \sigma_x$, see Definition 6.5 and Proposition 6.6. We refer to [25, Section 4] for details.
- Following an approach by Artin and Zhang [2], one can consider one-dimensional non-commutative projective schemes. Let $R = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} R_i$ be a finitely generated commutative associative unital graded \mathbb{k} -algebra with $R_0 = \mathbb{k}$. Assume R is an isolated singularity, has Krull dimension 2 and is graded Gorenstein. Then the quotient category

$$\text{qgr}(R) := \frac{\text{grmod-}R}{\text{grmod}_0\text{-}R}$$

of finitely generated graded R -modules by the subcategory of finite-dimensional modules is equivalent to the category of coherent sheaves on weighted projective curve $(\text{Proj}(R), w)$ with certain w . Moreover, any weighted projective curve can be obtained in this way.

Unfortunately, none of the above definitions is direct. Alternatively, one can define coherent sheaves on weighted projective curves axiomatically, as abelian categories satisfying some properties, see [29], [28], [35].

Definition 6.1. Consider a small \mathbb{k} -linear category \mathcal{H} satisfying the following axioms:

- (H1) \mathcal{H} is abelian, connected, and any object in \mathcal{H} is Noetherian,
- (H2) \mathcal{H} is Ext-finite: all Ext spaces are finite-dimensional,
- (H3) \mathcal{H} satisfies Serre duality in the following sense: there exists an autoequivalence $\tau: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ and natural isomorphisms

$$(6.1) \quad \text{Ext}^1(F_1, F_2) \cong \text{Hom}(F_2, \tau F_1)^*$$

of vector spaces for all $F_1, F_2 \in \mathcal{H}$,

- (H4) \mathcal{H} contains an object of infinite length.

Denote by $\mathcal{H}_0 \subset \mathcal{H}$ the full subcategory of objects having finite length. Clearly \mathcal{H}_0 is preserved by τ . We additionally require

- (H5) Any object in $\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}_0$ has finite length, and
- (H6) There are infinitely many τ -orbits of simple objects in \mathcal{H} .

- Remark 6.2.** (1) Condition (H3) is equivalent to the following: \mathcal{H} is hereditary, derived category $D^b(\mathcal{H})$ has a Serre functor and there are no non-zero projective objects in \mathcal{H} .
- (2) It can be shown that (H1)-(H4) actually imply (H5).
- (3) Condition (H6) is needed to exclude some degenerate examples.

Any category, satisfying (H1)-(H6), is equivalent to $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ for some weighted projective curve $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$, see [35]. We will use Definition 6.1 as a definition of a weighted projective curve. Below we explain how to associate a curve with a weight function to a category from Definition 6.1.

6.3. First properties of coherent sheaves on weighted projective curves: points, torsion and torsion-free sheaves. From now on, we assume that \mathcal{H} is a category satisfying conditions (H1)-(H6). We refer to [28], [29], [35] for the properties of \mathcal{H} collected below. Objects in \mathcal{H} (resp. \mathcal{H}_0) will be called *sheaves* (resp. *torsion sheaves*). A sheaf is called *torsion-free*, or a *vector bundle*, if it has no torsion subsheafs. The full subcategory of torsion-free sheaves will be denoted $\mathcal{H}_+ \subset \mathcal{H}$. Any sheaf is a direct sum of a torsion sheaf and a torsion-free sheaf.

Category \mathcal{H}_0 decomposes into a direct sum

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \bigoplus_{x \in X} \mathcal{H}_x$$

of connected thick (and moreover, Serre) subcategories, where index set X is the set of closed points of a smooth projective curve, also denoted by X .

Autoequivalence $\tau: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is called *translation*, it restricts to autoequivalences on \mathcal{H}_0 and \mathcal{H}_+ . Any subcategory \mathcal{H}_x is τ -stable, and is equivalent to the tube $\mathcal{U}_{w(x)}$ for some $w(x) \geq 1$. Moreover, for all points $x \in X$ except for a finite number one has $w(x) = 1$. Thus w is indeed a weight function, and we recover a weighted projective curve (X, w) as defined in Section 6.1. From Section 5.2 we know that \mathcal{H}_x has $w(x)$ simple sheaves, and they belong to the same τ -orbit. In other words, τ -orbits of simple objects of \mathcal{H} correspond to points of X .

Section 5.2 implies

Lemma 6.3. *Let $E \in \mathcal{H}_x$ be an indecomposable torsion sheaf of length i .*

- (1) *E is exceptional if and only if $i < w(x)$. In particular, \mathcal{H}_x contains exceptional sheaves if and only if x is an orbifold point.*
- (2) *E is sphere-like if and only if $i = w(x)$. Moreover, any category \mathcal{H}_x contains $w(x) \geq 1$ sphere-like sheaves.*

For a nonzero sheaf $F \in \mathcal{H}_x$ we say that F is *supported* at x . For a general torsion sheaf F its support $\text{Supp}(F) \subset X$ is defined as the union of supports of the indecomposable summands of F . For a sheaf F with a non-zero torsion-free direct summand we say that $\text{Supp}(F) = X$.

The quotient category $\mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}_0$ is equivalent to the category of finite-dimensional vector spaces over the field $\mathbb{k}(X)$ of rational functions on the curve X . The *Rank* of a vector

bundle $V \in \mathcal{H}$ is defined as the dimension of its image $[V] \in \mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}_0$. Vector bundles of rank one are called *line bundles*. Any vector bundle has a filtration by line bundles. For convenient reference we state

Lemma 6.4. (1) *For any $V \in \mathcal{H}_+$, $F \in \mathcal{H}_0$ one has*

$$\mathrm{Hom}(F, V) = \mathrm{Ext}^1(V, F) = 0.$$

(2) *For any nonzero $V \in \mathcal{H}_+$ and any $x \in X$ there is some simple $S \in \mathcal{H}_x$ such that $\mathrm{Hom}(V, S) \neq 0$. Moreover,*

$$\sum_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} \dim \mathrm{Hom}(V, S) = \mathrm{rank}(V).$$

(3) *For any nonzero $V \in \mathcal{H}_+$, any $x \in X$, and any sphere-like $M \in \mathcal{H}_x$ one has $\mathrm{Hom}(V, M) \neq 0$. Moreover,*

$$\dim \mathrm{Hom}(V, M) = \mathrm{rank}(V).$$

6.4. Twist functors. Here we recall definitions and properties of two families of autoequivalences σ_x and c_x of $\mathrm{coh} \mathbb{X}$, where $x \in X$. Functors σ_x are often called mutations. We consider their iterations $c_x = \sigma_x^{w(x)}$ and call them twists, they should be viewed as tensor twisting with the line bundles $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{X}}(x)$. We will need twists in Proposition 7.7.

Definition 6.5 (See [26, Th. 10.8], also [25], [30]). Let $x \in X$ be a point. One can define an autoequivalence $\sigma_x: D^b(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{H})$ given for an object F by the exact triangle

$$(6.2) \quad \bigoplus_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(S, F) \otimes S \rightarrow F \rightarrow \sigma_x(F) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(S, F) \otimes S[1],$$

where S runs over simple sheaves supported at x . The inverse functor is given by the exact triangle

$$(6.3) \quad \sigma_x^{-1}(F) \rightarrow F \rightarrow \bigoplus_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} \mathrm{Hom}^\bullet(F, S)^* \otimes S \rightarrow \sigma_x^{-1}(F)[1].$$

Conceptual explanation for the fact that these formulas define mutually inverse functors is that σ_x is a spherical twist in the sense of [1]. Indeed, let

$$\mathcal{A} = \mathrm{add} \left(\bigoplus_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} S \right) \subset \mathcal{H}$$

be the additive envelope of simple objects in \mathcal{H}_x , this is a semi-simple abelian category. Then the functor $D^b(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{H})$ induced by inclusion $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ is spherical, and the associated spherical twist is σ_x , see [23, Lemma 2.7].

Proposition 6.6 (See [30], [25]). *Functors σ_x have the following properties*

- (1) σ_x restricts to an autoequivalence between abelian categories $\mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$,
- (2) σ_x preserves subcategories $\mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_y, \mathcal{H}_+ \subset \mathcal{H}$ for all $y \in X$,
- (3) $\sigma_x = \tau^{-1}$ on \mathcal{H}_x , $\sigma_x = \mathrm{id}$ on \mathcal{H}_y for $y \neq x$,

(4) for V a vector bundle, (6.2) is the \mathcal{H}_x -universal extension

$$0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow \sigma_x(V) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} \text{Ext}^1(S, V) \otimes S \rightarrow 0,$$

(5) for V a vector bundle, (6.3) is the \mathcal{H}_x -universal semi-simple quotient

$$0 \rightarrow \sigma_x^{-1}(V) \rightarrow V \rightarrow \bigoplus_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} \text{Hom}(V, S)^* \otimes S \rightarrow 0,$$

(6) (6.2) defines a natural transformation of functors $\eta_x: \text{id} \rightarrow \sigma_x$.

We study the universal semi-simple quotients in more details. For any $x \in X$ and any $F \in \mathcal{H}$ we define $\text{Top}_x(F)$ as the maximal semi-simple quotient of F , supported at x . Explicitly, $\text{Top}_x(F)$ is given by the natural morphism

$$(6.4) \quad F \rightarrow \bigoplus_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} S \otimes \text{Hom}(F, S)^* = \text{Top}_x(F).$$

Recall that for a vector bundle V one has exact triple

$$(6.5) \quad 0 \rightarrow \sigma_x^{-1}(V) \xrightarrow{\eta_x} V \rightarrow \text{Top}_x(V) \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$\text{length}(\text{Top}_x(V)) = \sum_{S \in \Gamma_0(\mathcal{H}_x)} \dim \text{Hom}(V, S) = \text{rank}(V)$$

by Lemma 6.4. We arrive at useful

Lemma 6.7. *Let V be a vector bundle, $x \in X$ and $Q \in \mathcal{H}_x$ be a quotient sheaf of V . Then Q has at most $\text{rank}(V)$ indecomposable summands.*

Proof. Let $Q = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n Q_i$ with nonzero Q_i . Then any $\text{Top}_x(Q_i)$ is non-zero and semi-simple and there is a surjection $V \rightarrow \text{Top}_x(Q) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \text{Top}_x(Q_i)$. By the above discussion, $\text{Top}_x(Q)$ is the quotient of $\text{Top}_x(V)$ and $n \leq \text{length}(\text{Top}_x(Q)) \leq \text{length}(\text{Top}_x(V)) = \text{rank}(V)$. \square

Definition 6.8. For a vector bundle V and $m \geq 1$, consider the composition of injections

$$\eta_x^m: \sigma^{-m}(V) \xrightarrow{\eta_x} \sigma^{-m+1}(V) \xrightarrow{\eta_x} \dots \sigma^{-1}(V) \xrightarrow{\eta_x} V.$$

Denote by $\text{Top}_x^{[m]}(V)$ its cokernel.

Lemma 6.9. *Let V be a vector bundle, $x \in X$ and $Q = \text{Top}_x^{[m]}(V)$. Then $Q \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^r Q_i$ where $r = \text{rank}(V)$, any Q_i is an indecomposable torsion sheaf supported at x and of length m . Moreover, assume*

$$\text{Top}_x(V) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i$$

with S_i simple, then (recall notation from Section 5.2)

$$\text{Top}_x^{[m]}(V) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^r S_i^{[m]}.$$

Proof. Let $Q \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^r Q_i$ with indecomposable Q_i . By Lemma 6.7, $r \leq \text{rank}(V)$. By construction, $Q = \text{Top}_x^{[m]}(V)$ has a filtration F_j of length m with semi-simple factors $\text{Top}_x(\sigma_x^{-j}(V))$, $j = 0, \dots, m-1$. Intersecting F_j with Q_i one gets a filtration of Q_i of length m with semi-simple factors. Since Q_i is uniserial, these factors are simple (if non-zero), and $\text{length}(Q_i) \leq m$. Also we see that the length of Q is $m \cdot \text{rank}(V)$. That is,

$$m \cdot \text{rank}(V) = \text{length}(Q) = \sum_{i=1}^r \text{length}(Q_i) \leq mr \leq m \cdot \text{rank}(V).$$

It follows that we have $\text{length}(Q_i) = m$ for all i and $r = \text{rank}(V)$. We have

$$\bigoplus_i S_i \cong \text{Top}_x(V) \cong \text{Top}_x(Q) \cong \bigoplus_i \text{Top}_x(Q_i),$$

and we may assume, up to renumbering, that $\text{Top}_x(Q_i) \cong S_i$. Since \mathcal{U}_x is a uniserial category, it follows that $Q_i \cong S_i^{[m]}$. \square

Definition 6.10. For $x \in X$, consider the autoequivalence $c_x: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ given by

$$c_x = \sigma_x^{w(x)}.$$

We will call c_x a *twist*.

Note that one has an exact sequence

$$(6.6) \quad 0 \rightarrow c_x^{-1}(V) \rightarrow V \rightarrow \text{Top}^{[w(x)]}(V) \rightarrow 0$$

for any vector bundle V .

Lemma 6.11. *The twist c_x preserves subcategories of torsion sheaves and torsion-free sheaves, and preserves rank and support of sheaves. Moreover, c_x acts by identity on torsion sheaves.*

Proof. Follows from the definition and Proposition 6.6. For the last statement, let $F \in \mathcal{H}_x$, then $c_x(F) = \sigma_x^{w(x)}(F) \cong \tau^{-w(x)}F \cong F$ since τ has order $w(x)$ on \mathcal{H}_x . For $y \neq x$ and $F \in \mathcal{H}_y$, one has $\sigma_x(F) \cong F$ and $c_x(F) = \sigma_x^{w(x)}(F) \cong F$. \square

Remark 6.12. Geometrically, let \mathcal{H} be the category of coherent sheaves on a weighted projective curve $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$, then c_x is the tensor twist with the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_X(x)$. In particular, for $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$, twists c_x do not depend on the point x up to an isomorphism.

6.5. Serre functor. Derived category $D^b(\mathcal{H})$ has a Serre functor, given by $\tau[1]$ (the composition of τ and the cohomological shift by 1).

6.6. Orthogonal subcategories and reduction of weights. Here we describe the orthogonal subcategory to an exceptional torsion sheaf, this is a crucial instrument for our further considerations. This description is well-known to experts, at least in the case of a weighted projective line (=rational curve), or for $m = 1$, since [13]. We find it convenient to sketch a proof for completeness, which is analogous to [9, Prop. 6.5], where \mathbb{X} is supposed to be a weighted projective line.

Proposition 6.13. *Let $\mathcal{H} = \text{coh}(\mathbb{X})$ be a category of coherent sheaves on a weighted projective curve $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$. Let E be an exceptional torsion sheaf supported at point $x \in X$, and m be its length. Let $E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp = E^\perp \cap \mathcal{H} \subset \mathcal{H}$ be the orthogonal full subcategory. Then*

$$E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2, \quad \text{where } \mathcal{S}_1 \cong \text{coh}(X, w'), \mathcal{S}_2 \cong \mathcal{A}_{m-1},$$

and $w'(x) = w(x) - m$, $w'(y) = w(x)$ for $y \neq x$. Moreover, the induced functor $\text{coh}(X, w') \rightarrow \text{coh}(X, w)$ preserves the rank and the support of sheaves, and \mathcal{S}_2 is supported at x .

Proof. We consider the case $m = 1$ first. For $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ this is [13, Th. 9.5]. We give a proof in general case, basing on axioms from Definition 6.1.

Assume E is a simple exceptional sheaf, supported at point x of weight $w(x) = r \geq 2$. Denote $\mathcal{H}' := E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp \subset \mathcal{H}$. By Proposition 3.7, $\mathcal{H}' \subset \mathcal{H}$ is thick, and by Proposition 3.4, \mathcal{H}' is abelian hereditary. Also, by Proposition 3.7 $D^b(\mathcal{H}') \cong E^\perp$ is a full subcategory of $D^b(\mathcal{H})$, hence \mathcal{H}' is Ext-finite. Clearly, \mathcal{H}' is Noetherian. Now we prove that \mathcal{H}' has Serre duality in the form (6.1). Consider semi-orthogonal decomposition

$$D^b(\mathcal{H}) = \langle D^b(\mathcal{H}'), \langle E \rangle \rangle,$$

let $\pi: D^b(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow D^b(\mathcal{H}')$ be the left adjoint functor to the inclusion. Explicitly, for $F \in D^b(\mathcal{H})$ it is defined by the exact triangle

$$(6.7) \quad E \otimes \text{Hom}^\bullet(E, F) \rightarrow F \rightarrow \pi(F) \rightarrow E \otimes \text{Hom}^\bullet(E, F)[1].$$

It is known [4, Prop. 3.7] that $D^b(\mathcal{H}')$ has a Serre functor $S_{\mathcal{H}'}$, and one has

$$S_{\mathcal{H}'}^{-1}(F) \cong \pi \circ S_{\mathcal{H}}^{-1}(F)$$

for any $F \in D^b(\mathcal{H}')$. It suffices to verify that $S_{\mathcal{H}'}$ sends \mathcal{H}' to $\mathcal{H}'[1]$, then one can put $\tau' := S_{\mathcal{H}'}[-1]$. Recall that $S_{\mathcal{H}} = \tau[1]$, so we are to check that π sends \mathcal{H} to \mathcal{H}' (i.e., to complexes concentrated in degree 0). Let $F \in \mathcal{H}$, the long exact sequence of cohomology associated with (6.7) shows that $H^i(\pi(F)) = 0$ except for possibly $i = 0, -1$, and that

$$H^{-1}(\pi(F)) = \ker(E \otimes \text{Hom}(E, F) \rightarrow F).$$

The canonical map $E \otimes \text{Hom}(E, F) \rightarrow F$ is injective since E is simple, so $H^{-1}(\pi(F)) = 0$ and $\pi(F)$ is isomorphic to an object of \mathcal{H}' . Therefore, \mathcal{H}' satisfies (H3). Also note that

$$(6.8) \quad \tau'^{-1} \cong \pi \circ \tau^{-1}.$$

For any point $y \neq x$ torsion sheaves in \mathcal{H} supported at y belong to \mathcal{H}' , so (H6) holds. Pick some line bundle L in \mathcal{H} , then (6.7) gives the universal extension

$$0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow \pi(L) \rightarrow E \otimes \text{Ext}^1(E, L) \rightarrow 0,$$

hence $\pi(L)$ is a line bundle in \mathcal{H}' . Let $0 \neq V \in \mathcal{H}'$ be a vector bundle. Pick a point $y \neq x$ and a sphere-like sheaf S_y supported at y . Using Lemma 6.4, one constructs an infinite sequence in \mathcal{H}'

$$V = V_0 \supset V_1 \supset V_2 \supset \dots$$

of decreasing sub-bundles with $\text{coker}(V_{i+1} \rightarrow V_i) \cong S_y \in \mathcal{H}'$. Thus V has infinite length in \mathcal{H}' , and $\mathcal{H}'_0 = \mathcal{H}' \cap \mathcal{H}_0$: object in \mathcal{H}' has finite length in \mathcal{H}' if and only if it has finite length in \mathcal{H} . So, (H4) holds. It is not hard to see that $\mathcal{H}'/\mathcal{H}'_0 \cong \mathcal{H}/\mathcal{H}_0$. Hence, (H5) follows and notions of rank in \mathcal{H} and in \mathcal{H}' agree.

Therefore, \mathcal{H}' satisfies Definition 6.1.

Using (6.7) and (6.8), we see that τ' preserves subcategory $\mathcal{H}_y \cap \mathcal{H}'$ for any point $y \in X$. For $y \neq x$, we have $\mathcal{H}_y \subset \mathcal{H}'$ and $\tau = \tau'$ on \mathcal{H}_y , so there is one τ' -orbit of simples in \mathcal{H}_y . For $y = x$, note that $\mathcal{H}_x \cong \mathcal{U}_r$ and by Proposition 5.2 $\mathcal{H}' \cap \mathcal{H}_x \cong \mathcal{U}_{r-1}$. Therefore τ' on $\mathcal{H}_x \cap \mathcal{H}'$ coincides with $\tau_{\mathcal{U}_{r-1}}$, and there is one τ' -orbit of $r-1$ simple objects in $\mathcal{H}_x \cap \mathcal{H}'$. It follows that points of \mathcal{H}' are the same as points of \mathcal{H} , the weight function of \mathcal{H}' is as stated, and that notions of support for \mathcal{H}' and for \mathcal{H} agree.

Now we treat the general case. We have $E = S^{[m]}$ for some simple sheaf S . One can check as in [9, Prop. 6.5] that

$$(6.9) \quad E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{S}_1 = \langle S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S \rangle_{\text{Ab}}^\perp, \mathcal{S}_2 = \langle \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S \rangle_{\text{Ab}}.$$

Indeed, $\text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_1) = 0$ by definition and $\text{Hom}^\bullet(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2) \cong \text{Hom}^\bullet(\tau^{-1} \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_1)^* = 0$ again by definition. Clearly $\text{Hom}^\bullet(E, \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) = 0$ (note that the simple factors of E are $S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S$). Further, E together with \mathcal{S}_2 generate S . Since $S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S$ is an exceptional collection, one has

$$D^b(\mathcal{H}) = \langle \langle S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S \rangle^\perp, \langle S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle, \langle \mathcal{S}_2 \rangle, \langle E \rangle \rangle = \langle \langle \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{S}_2 \rangle, \langle E \rangle \rangle.$$

Then (6.9) follows since

$$E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp = (\langle \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle \times \langle \mathcal{S}_2 \rangle)_{\text{Ab}} = \langle \mathcal{S}_1 \rangle_{\text{Ab}} \times \langle \mathcal{S}_2 \rangle_{\text{Ab}} = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2.$$

Family $\tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S$ in \mathcal{S}_2 is quiver-like with the Ext-quiver A_{m-1} , by Corollary 4.14 $\mathcal{S}_2 \cong \mathcal{A}_{m-1}$. Remaining statements regarding $\mathcal{S}_1 = \langle S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S \rangle_{\text{Ab}}^\perp$ are obtained by applying inductively $m=1$ case, because $S, \tau S, \dots, \tau^{m-1} S$ is an exceptional collection of simple sheaves. \square

6.7. Weighted projective lines. Here we recall briefly the construction of the category $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ for a weighted projective line $\mathbb{X} = (\mathbb{P}^1, w)$, proposed by Geigle and Lenzing [12]. We will need this description to provide some examples in Section 9.

Let x_1, \dots, x_n be the weighted points of \mathbb{X} and let $r_i = w(x_i)$. Let $V = H^0(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}(1))$, choose non-zero $u_i \in V$ such that $u_i(x_i) = 0$. Denote

$$A_{\mathbb{X}} := S^\bullet(V) \otimes \mathbb{k}[U_1, \dots, U_n] / (U_1^{r_1} - u_1, \dots, U_n^{r_n} - u_n),$$

where $S^\bullet(V)$ denotes the symmetric algebra. Let \mathbb{L} be the abelian group generated by elements $\bar{c}, \bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n$ and relations $\bar{c} = r_i \cdot \bar{x}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then $A_{\mathbb{X}}$ is an \mathbb{L} -graded commutative algebra with the grading given by $\deg(U_i) = \bar{x}_i$, $\deg(v) = \bar{c}$ for $v \in V$. Define $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ as the Serre quotient

$$\text{coh } \mathbb{X} = \frac{\text{mod}^{\mathbb{L}} - A_{\mathbb{X}}}{\text{mod}_0^{\mathbb{L}} - A_{\mathbb{X}}},$$

where $\text{mod}^{\mathbb{L}}-A_{\mathbb{X}}$ is the category of finitely generated \mathbb{L} -graded $A_{\mathbb{X}}$ -modules, and $\text{mod}_0^{\mathbb{L}}-A_{\mathbb{X}} \subset \text{mod}^{\mathbb{L}}-A_{\mathbb{X}}$ is the subcategory of finite-dimensional modules.

For any $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{L}$, denote the object in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ given by the shifted free module $A_{\mathbb{X}}(\bar{x})$ by $\mathcal{O}(\bar{x})$. This is a line bundle, and all line bundles in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ have this form.

One computes Hom and Ext spaces between line bundles as follows. Any element in \mathbb{L} can be written uniquely as

$$a\bar{c} + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \bar{x}_i, \quad \text{where } 0 \leq b_i \leq r_i - 1.$$

This presentation is called *normal form*. One has

$$\dim \text{Hom}(\mathcal{O}(\bar{x}), \mathcal{O}(\bar{y})) = \begin{cases} a + 1, & a \geq 0, \\ 0, & a < 0, \end{cases}$$

where a is the coefficient at \bar{c} in the normal form of $\bar{y} - \bar{x}$.

Denote $\bar{\omega} = -2\bar{c} + \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i - 1)\bar{x}_i$, then Serre duality for $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ is given by the shift of grading by $\bar{\omega}$:

$$\text{Ext}^1(F_1, F_2) \cong \text{Hom}(F_2, F_1(\bar{\omega}))^*.$$

This allows one to find Ext^1 between line bundles easily.

7. THICK SUBCATEGORIES ON WEIGHTED PROJECTIVE CURVES, BIG AND SMALL

Here we introduce two classes of thick subcategories on weighted projective curves that play special role. Similar results have been obtained in [9] for weighted projective **lines**, we follow exposition of loc.cit. with some changes.

Let $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$ be a weighted projective curve. We denote by $\text{coh}_x \mathbb{X} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ the full subcategory of torsion sheaves supported at a point $x \in X$, and by $\text{coh}_0 \mathbb{X} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ the full subcategory of all torsion sheaves. We denote by $D_x^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ the full subcategory of complexes with cohomology supported at x . By Proposition 3.7, $D_x^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) \cong D^b(\text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}) \cong D^b(\mathcal{U}_{w(x)})$.

Definition 7.1. Let us say that

- (1) a thick subcategory \mathcal{T} in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is *small* if \mathcal{T} is generated by an exceptional collection of torsion sheaves;
- (2) a thick subcategory \mathcal{T} in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is *big* if \mathcal{T} is the orthogonal to an exceptional collection of torsion sheaves;
- (3) a thick subcategory \mathcal{S} in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ is *curve-like* if \mathcal{S} is the essential image of a fully faithful exact functor $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}' \rightarrow \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ preserving rank and support of sheaves for some weighted projective curve $\mathbb{X}' = (X, w')$.

Recall bijection between thick subcategories in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ and $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ from Proposition 3.7. We will use the same terminology for the corresponding thick subcategories in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ (for small and big) and in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ (for curve-like).

Remark 7.2. If $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is curve-like and $\Phi: \text{coh } \mathbb{X}' \rightarrow \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ is the functor from Definition 7.1, then the functor $D(\Phi): D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}') \rightarrow D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is fully faithful with the image \mathcal{T} (by Proposition 3.7).

Remark 7.3. By Lemma 6.3, small subcategories are supported at orbifold points. By Proposition 5.2, any small subcategory is equivalent to a direct product of the form $\mathcal{A}_{n_1} \times \dots \times \mathcal{A}_{n_k}$. By Proposition 5.2 any subcategory of a small category is also small, and any subcategory containing a big subcategory is big. Also note that small and big subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ are admissible.

Remark 7.4. By definition, there is a bijection between small and big subcategories of $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$, given by $\mathcal{T} \mapsto \mathcal{T}^\perp$.

Remark 7.5. Note that big subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ are in bijection with collections $(\mathcal{T}_x)_x$, where $\mathcal{T}_x \subset D^b(\text{coh}_x \mathbb{X})$ is a subcategory generated by an exceptional collection, and x runs over orbifold points of \mathbb{X} (a collection of subcategories $(\mathcal{T}_x)_x$ corresponds to its right orthogonal, which is big). For any orbifold point $x \in X$ the number of subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}) \cong D^b(\mathcal{U}_{w(x)})$ generated by an exceptional collection is finite, and by Proposition 5.2 equals $\frac{1}{2}$ of the total number of thick subcategories in $\mathcal{U}_{w(x)}$. The number of thick subcategories in \mathcal{U}_n is $\binom{2n}{n}$ by [10, Prop. 2.4.2]. Hence, the number of big subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is

$$\prod_{x: w(x) \geq 2} \frac{1}{2} \binom{2w(x)}{w(x)}.$$

Remark 7.6. Note that for a thick subcategory in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ condition “to be curve-like” is stronger than “to be equivalent to some category $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}')$ for a weighted projective curve \mathbb{X}' ” as Example 9.2 below shows. On the contrary, any thick abelian subcategory in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ that is equivalent to some category $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}'$ for a weighted projective curve \mathbb{X}' , is curve-like, as we will see in Corollary 8.3.

Now we give several equivalent definitions of big subcategories, highlighting their importance. Some of the equivalences below appear in [9, Prop. 6.2, Th. 6.3] in the case of a weighted projective line.

Proposition 7.7. *Let \mathbb{X} be a weighted projective curve and $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ be a thick subcategory. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\mathcal{S} = \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle_{\text{Ab}}^\perp$ for some exceptional collection E_1, \dots, E_n of torsion sheaves (that is, \mathcal{S} is big);
- (1') $\mathcal{S} = {}^\perp \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle_{\text{Ab}}$ for some exceptional collection E_1, \dots, E_n of torsion sheaves;
- (2) $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, where \mathcal{S}_1 is curve-like and \mathcal{S}_2 is small;
- (3) \mathcal{S} contains a curve-like subcategory in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$;
- (4) \mathcal{S} contains a non-zero vector bundle and a sphere-like torsion sheaf;
- (5) \mathcal{S} contains a non-zero vector bundle and $\mathcal{S} = c_x(\mathcal{S})$ for any point $x \in X$ (cf. Definition 6.10);

(6) \mathcal{S} contains a non-zero vector bundle and $\mathcal{S} = c_x(\mathcal{S})$ for some point $x \in X$.

Proof. (1) \iff (1') by Serre duality.

(1) \implies (2) by iterated application of Proposition 6.13.

(2) \implies (3) is trivial.

(3) \implies (4) is easy: let $\Phi: \text{coh } \mathbb{X}' \rightarrow \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ be a fully faithful functor preserving rank and support of sheaves with $\text{im}(\Phi) = \mathcal{S}$. Take any sphere-like torsion sheaf and vector bundle on \mathbb{X}' and apply Φ to get a sphere-like torsion sheaf and a vector bundle on \mathbb{X} in \mathcal{S} .

(4) \implies (1) is contained in a separate Lemma 7.8 below due to its length, this is the less trivial implication.

(1) \implies (5): if \mathcal{S} consists only of torsion sheaves, then $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) = \langle \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle, \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \rangle$ also does, and we get a contradiction. For the second, note that $c_x(E_i) \cong E_i$ for any i by Lemma 6.11. Consequently, c_x preserves the orthogonal to $\langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle$, which is \mathcal{S} .

(5) \implies (6) is trivial.

(6) \implies (4): let $V \neq 0$ be a vector bundle in \mathcal{S} . Consider exact sequence (6.6)

$$0 \rightarrow c_x^{-1}(V) \rightarrow V \rightarrow Q \rightarrow 0.$$

By Lemma 6.9, $Q \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\text{rank}(V)} Q_i$, where Q_i are indecomposable sheaves of length $w(x)$ supported at x . Hence Q_i are sphere-like by Lemma 6.3. Note that $c_x^{-1}(V) \in \mathcal{S}$ and thus $Q_i \in \mathcal{S}$ as needed. \square

Lemma 7.8. *Let \mathbb{X} be a weighted projective curve and $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ be a thick subcategory. Assume \mathcal{S} contains a non-zero vector bundle and a sphere-like torsion sheaf. Then \mathcal{S} is big.*

Proof. We argue by induction in the total weight of orbifold points. The base case is $w = 1$, that is, $\mathbb{X} = X$ is a smooth projective curve. We refer to [11, Lemma 4.1] to see that $\mathcal{S} = \text{coh } X$ as soon as \mathcal{S} contains a torsion sheaf and a vector bundle. Hence, \mathcal{S} is big as the orthogonal to the empty exceptional collection. Now we consider the general case. We divided the argument into several steps.

Step 1. We may assume that \mathcal{S}^\perp (or, equivalently, ${}^\perp \mathcal{S}$) contains no simple exceptional sheaves. Indeed, assume E is a simple exceptional sheaf and $\mathcal{S} \subset E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp$. By Proposition 6.13, $E_{\text{Ab}}^\perp \cong \text{coh } \mathbb{X}'$ for a weighted projective curve \mathbb{X}' with smaller total weight of orbifold points. We observe that \mathcal{S} as a subcategory of $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}'$ also contains a vector bundle and a sphere-like torsion sheaf. Hence by induction hypothesis, \mathcal{S} is the right orthogonal in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}'$ to an exceptional collection E_1, \dots, E_n of torsion sheaves on \mathbb{X}' . We deduce that \mathcal{S} is the right orthogonal in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ to the exceptional collection E_1, \dots, E_n, E of torsion sheaves on \mathbb{X} .

Step 2. We may assume that \mathcal{S} contains no exceptional torsion sheaves. To check this, we find it more convenient to work with derived categories, let $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{S} \rangle \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$. Assume $E \in \mathcal{T}$ is an exceptional torsion sheaf, supported at $x \in X$. By Propositions 6.13 and 3.7, ${}^\perp E \cong D^b(\mathcal{A}_{l-1}) \times D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}')$, where \mathbb{X}' is a weighted projective curve with

smaller total weight of orbifold points, l is the length of E , and $D^b(\mathcal{A}_{l-1})$ is generated by an exceptional collection of torsion sheaves supported at x . Let $\mathcal{T}' := \mathcal{T} \cap^\perp E = \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2$, where $\mathcal{T}_1 \subset D^b(\mathcal{A}_{l-1})$ and $\mathcal{T}_2 \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}')$ are thick subcategories. We have semi-orthogonal decompositions

$$D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) = \langle \langle E \rangle, {}^\perp E \rangle = \langle \langle E \rangle, D^b(\mathcal{A}_{l-1}), D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}') \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{T} = \langle \langle E \rangle, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \rangle.$$

We claim that \mathcal{T}_2 as a subcategory of $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}')$ also contains a vector bundle and a sphere-like torsion sheaf. For the former, assume \mathcal{T}_2 is a torsion subcategory, then all $\mathcal{T} = \langle \langle E \rangle, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \rangle$ is a torsion subcategory, and contains no vector bundles. For the latter, assume \mathcal{T}_2 has no sphere-like torsion sheaves. Then $\mathcal{T}_2 \cap D_x^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is generated by an exceptional collection (see Proposition 5.2), as well as \mathcal{T}_1 (see Proposition 5.1). It follows that

$$\mathcal{T} \cap D_x^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) = \langle \langle E \rangle, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \rangle \cap D_x^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) = \langle \langle E \rangle, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \cap D_x^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) \rangle$$

is also generated by an exceptional collection. Recall that $D_x^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) \cong D^b(\mathcal{U}_{w(x)})$, Proposition 5.2 implies now that $\mathcal{T} \cap \text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}$ contains no sphere-like sheaves. Therefore, \mathcal{T} contains a sphere-like sheaf M supported at some other point $y \in \mathbb{X}$, and clearly $M \in {}^\perp E$ and $M \in \mathcal{T}_2$. Applying induction hypothesis to $\mathcal{T}_2 \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}')$, we see that \mathcal{T}_2 is big:

$$D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}') = \langle \mathcal{T}_2, \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \rangle,$$

where E_1, \dots, E_n is an exceptional collection of torsion sheaves on \mathbb{X}' . By Proposition 5.1,

$$D^b(\mathcal{A}_{l-1}) = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \langle F_1, \dots, F_m \rangle \rangle,$$

where F_1, \dots, F_m is an exceptional collection of torsion sheaves on \mathbb{X} . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) &= \langle \langle E \rangle, D^b(\mathcal{A}_{l-1}), D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}') \rangle = \langle \langle E \rangle, \mathcal{T}_1, \langle F_1, \dots, F_m \rangle, \mathcal{T}_2, \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \rangle = \\ &= \langle \langle E \rangle, \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \langle F_1, \dots, F_m \rangle, \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \rangle = \langle \mathcal{T}, \langle F_1, \dots, F_m, E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and \mathcal{T} is the right orthogonal to the exceptional collection $F_1, \dots, F_m, E_1, \dots, E_n$ of torsion sheaves. Hence $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T}_{\text{Ab}}$ is big.

Step 3. Let $x \in X$, we claim that $\mathcal{S} \cap \text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}$ is zero or generated by one sphere-like sheaf M_x . In the latter case, any sheaf in \mathcal{S} supported at x is an iterated extension of M_x . Also, for any $F \in \mathcal{S}$ any non-zero $f: F \rightarrow M_x$ is surjective.

Indeed, $\mathcal{S} \cap \text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}$ is a thick subcategory in $\text{coh}_x \mathbb{X} \cong \mathcal{U}_{w(x)}$ without exceptional objects, and the claim follows from Proposition 5.2. For the last statement, note that $\text{im}(f)$ belongs to \mathcal{S} since \mathcal{S} is thick. Hence $\text{im}(f)$ is an iterated extension of M_x and must be all M_x .

Step 4. We claim that the intersection $\mathcal{S} \cap \text{coh}_x \mathbb{X}$ is non-zero for any $x \in X$. Let $V \in \mathcal{S}$ be a non-zero vector bundle with the minimal possible rank and $M \in \mathcal{S}$ be a sphere-like torsion sheaf. One can build an infinite sequence

$$V = V_0 \supset V_1 \supset V_2 \supset \dots,$$

of subobjects fitting into exact sequences

$$(7.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow V_{n+1} \rightarrow V_n \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0.$$

Indeed, $\mathrm{Hom}(V_n, M) \neq 0$ by Lemma 6.4, and any non-zero morphism $f: V_n \rightarrow M$ is surjective by Step 3. One can take $V_{n+1} = \ker f$. Note that all $V_i \in \mathcal{S}$ since \mathcal{S} is thick.

Now we claim that $\dim \mathrm{Hom}(V_n, V)$ can be arbitrarily large for $n \gg 0$. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim \mathrm{Hom}(V_n, V) &\geq \chi([V_n], [V]) = \\
&= \chi([V_{n-1}], [V]) - \chi([M], [V]) && \text{by (7.1)} \\
&= \chi([V_{n-1}], [V]) + \chi([V], [\tau M]) && \text{by Serre duality} \\
&= \chi([V_{n-1}], [V]) + \dim \mathrm{Hom}(V, \tau M) = \\
&= \chi([V_{n-1}], [V]) + \mathrm{rank}(V) && \text{by Lemma 6.4} \\
&= \dots \\
&= \chi([V], [V]) + n \cdot \mathrm{rank}(V).
\end{aligned}$$

Let S be a simple sheaf supported at x such that $\mathrm{Hom}(V, S) \neq 0$ (use Lemma 6.4). Choose non-zero $f: V \rightarrow S$. Consider the map induced by f :

$$\mathrm{Hom}(V_n, V) \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(V_n, S).$$

Note that $\dim \mathrm{Hom}(V_n, V)$ can be arbitrarily large for big n , while $\dim \mathrm{Hom}(V_n, S) \leq \mathrm{rank} V_n = \mathrm{rank} V$ by Lemma 6.4. Hence for some n there exist a non-zero morphism $g: V_n \rightarrow V$ such that $fg = 0$. Since \mathcal{S} is thick, $\ker(g) \in \mathcal{S}$ and is a vector bundle, and by the minimality assumption, $\ker(g)$ must be zero. Let $F = \mathrm{coker}(g)$, this is a torsion sheaf since $\mathrm{rank}(V_n) = \mathrm{rank}(V)$, and $F \in \mathcal{S}$. Clearly f factors through F , and so x belongs to the support of F . Some direct summand of F is a sheaf in $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathrm{coh}_x \mathbb{X}$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
V_n & \xrightarrow{g} & V & \longrightarrow & F \\
& & \downarrow f & \swarrow & \\
& & S & &
\end{array}$$

Step 5. Now we are going to show that $\mathbb{X} = X$ is a smooth curve and we can use the induction base. Let $x \in X$ be a point and M be a sphere-like sheaf in \mathcal{S} supported at x from Step 4. Let $S \subset M$ be a simple subsheaf (note that such S is unique). Assume $w(x) > 1$, then S is exceptional. By Step 1, S is not in \mathcal{S}^\perp . It means that $\mathrm{Hom}(F, S) \neq 0$ or $\mathrm{Ext}^1(F, S) \neq 0$ for some $F \in \mathcal{S}$, and one can choose F to be indecomposable. If $\mathrm{Hom}(F, S) \neq 0$, consider the composition $F \rightarrow S \rightarrow M$. Its image is S and belongs to \mathcal{S} since \mathcal{S} is thick. This contradicts to Step 2. Now, if $\mathrm{Ext}^1(F, S) \neq 0$ then F is a torsion sheaf supported at x , and is an iterated extension of M by Step 3. Hence $\mathrm{Ext}^1(M, S) \neq 0$. By Serre duality $\mathrm{Hom}(\tau^{-1}S, M) \neq 0$. But M has unique simple subsheaf, and $S \not\cong \tau^{-1}S$, we get a contradiction. We conclude that $w(x) = 1$. \square

8. MAIN RESULTS

Throughout this section $\mathbb{X} = (X, w)$ is a weighted projective curve. Here we prove our main result saying that any thick subcategory in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ or $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is either big or quiver-like, and obtain some consequences of this.

Before we start, we would like to understand the relation between these two types of subcategories.

Proposition 8.1. *Category $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is quiver-like if and only if $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$ and \mathbb{X} has domestic type. On the contrary, the category $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ is not a finite length category, therefore never is quiver-like.*

Proof. Note that $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ has a strong generator. Indeed, it has a semi-orthogonal decomposition $\langle D^b(\text{coh } X), \mathcal{T} \rangle$ into the derived category of a smooth projective curve (which has a strong generator by [5, Th. 3.1.4]) and a small subcategory \mathcal{T} (which is generated by an exceptional collection hence also has a strong generator). Assume $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) \cong D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$, then $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$ has a strong generator. By Proposition 4.6, Q is finite and acyclic. Hence $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q) \cong D^b(\text{mod-}\mathbb{k}Q)$, where $\mathbb{k}Q$ is a hereditary finite-dimensional algebra. It is known then that \mathbb{X} is a weighted projective line of domestic type (see [26, Sect. 10]). \square

Theorem 8.2. *Let \mathbb{X} be a weighted projective curve, $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ be a thick subcategory, and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$. Then at least one of the following holds:*

- \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are big, or
- \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are quiver-like.

Proof. Note that \mathcal{T} is big \iff \mathcal{S} is big by definition.

Case 1: \mathcal{S} contains a nonzero vector bundle and a sphere-like torsion sheaf. Then \mathcal{S} is big by Lemma 7.8.

Case 2: \mathcal{S} does not contain nonzero vector bundles, that is, \mathcal{S} consists only of torsion sheaves. Then \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are quiver-like by Corollary 4.15 applied to $\mathcal{A} = \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ and the function $r([F]) = \text{length}(F)$, where F is a torsion sheaf.

Case 3: \mathcal{S} does not contain sphere-like torsion sheaves. We prove then that \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are quiver-like. Let E_1, \dots, E_n be the maximal exceptional collection of torsion sheaves in \mathcal{T} , then $\mathcal{T} = \langle \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle, \mathcal{T}' \rangle$ for $\mathcal{T}' := {}^\perp \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle \cap \mathcal{T}$. By our assumptions, \mathcal{T}' does not contain exceptional torsion sheaves and sphere-like torsion sheaves. It follows then that \mathcal{T}' does not contain torsion sheaves at all. Therefore, \mathcal{T}' is quiver-like by Corollary 4.15 applied to $\mathcal{A} = \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ and the function $r([F]) := \text{rank}(F)$ (this argument, originating from [11], is the heart of the paper). Let $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$ be a vertex-like generating family of vector bundles in \mathcal{T}' . Also, $\langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle$ is quiver-like by Case 2, let E'_1, \dots, E'_n be a vertex-like generating family of torsion sheaves in $\langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle$. Then $\{E'_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \cup \{V_i\}_{i \in I}$ is a vertex-like generating family for $\mathcal{T} = \langle \langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle, \mathcal{T}' \rangle$. Indeed, $\text{Hom}(E'_i, V_j) = 0$ since E'_i is torsion and V_j is torsion-free, and $\text{Hom}(V_j, E'_i) = 0$ by semi-orthogonality. Hence, \mathcal{T} and \mathcal{S} are quiver-like by Corollary 4.14. \square

Now we formulate some consequences of Theorem 8.2 and examine the variety of thick subcategories.

Corollary 8.3. *Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ be a thick subcategory and $\mathcal{S} \cong \text{coh } \mathbb{Y}$ for some weighted projective curve $\mathbb{Y} = (Y, w')$. Then \mathcal{S} is curve-like: that is, $Y \cong X$ and the functor $\text{coh } \mathbb{Y} \rightarrow \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ preserves rank and support of sheaves.*

Proof. By Theorem 8.2, \mathcal{S} is either big or quiver-like. Since $\text{coh } \mathbb{Y}$ is not quiver-like, \mathcal{S} is big. By Proposition 7.7, $\mathcal{S} \cong \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, where \mathcal{S}_1 is curve-like and \mathcal{S}_2 is small. Since $\text{coh } \mathbb{Y}$ is indecomposable into a direct product, we have $\mathcal{S}_2 = 0$ and \mathcal{S} is curve-like. \square

Remark 8.4. Note that the analogue of Corollary 8.3 for derived categories does not hold. See Example 9.2 for a thick subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$, which is equivalent to $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{Y})$ for a weighted projective line \mathbb{Y} , but is not curve-like.

Thick subcategories in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ naturally divide into three classes.

Definition 8.5. Let \mathbb{X} be a weighted projective curve and $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ be a thick subcategory. We will say that \mathcal{S} is

- *torsion* if all sheaves in \mathcal{S} are torsion;
- *torsion-free* if all torsion sheaves in \mathcal{S} are zero;
- *mixed* if \mathcal{S} contains both non-zero torsion and torsion-free sheaves.

We will use the same terminology for the corresponding subcategories in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$.

It follows from the proof of Theorem 8.2 that any torsion and any torsion-free subcategory is quiver-like. It follows from definitions that any small subcategory is torsion and any big subcategory is mixed.

Proposition 8.6. (1) *Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ be a quiver-like admissible subcategory. Then \mathcal{T} is generated by an exceptional collection.*
 (2) *Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ be an admissible category. Then \mathcal{T} is big or \mathcal{T} is generated by an exceptional collection.*

Proof. For (1), recall that $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ has a strong generator, hence \mathcal{T} also has a strong generator. Assume $\mathcal{T} \cong D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q)$, then by Proposition 4.6 Q is finite and acyclic. Therefore $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q) \cong D^b(\text{mod-}\mathbb{k}Q)$, and the latter category is generated by an exceptional collection (for example, of indecomposable projective $\mathbb{k}Q$ -modules).

For (2), suppose \mathcal{T} is not big, then \mathcal{T} is quiver-like by Theorem 8.2, and part (1) applies. \square

Corollary 8.7. *Assume that \mathbb{X} is a weighted projective line: that is, $X \cong \mathbb{P}^1$. Then any admissible subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is generated by an exceptional collection. Moreover, any exceptional collection E_1, \dots, E_n in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ can be completed to a full one.*

Proof. By Theorem 8.2, \mathcal{T} is big or quiver-like. If \mathcal{T} is big then $\mathcal{T} \cong \mathcal{T}_1 \times \mathcal{T}_2$ by Proposition 7.7, where $\mathcal{T}_1 \cong D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{Y})$ for some weighted projective line $\mathbb{Y} = (\mathbb{P}^1, w)$ and \mathcal{T}_2 is

small. Note that \mathcal{T}_1 (see [12]) and \mathcal{T}_2 are generated by exceptional collections, hence \mathcal{T} also does. Alternativley, if \mathcal{T} is quiver-like then Proposition 8.6(1) applies.

The second part follows by considering the orthogonal $\langle E_1, \dots, E_n \rangle^\perp$ and applying the first part. \square

Corollary 8.8. *Assume that \mathbb{X} is not a weighted projective line: that is, $g(X) \geq 1$. Then any admissible subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is either small or big. In particular, there are no exceptional vector bundles on \mathbb{X} and, more generally, no torsion-free admissible subcategories.*

Proof. One has a semi-orthogonal decomposition $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) = \langle \mathcal{T}^\perp, \mathcal{T} \rangle$. If \mathcal{T} is not small neither big then neither of $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}^\perp$ is big, and both are generated by an exceptional collection by Proposition 8.6. Consequently, all $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is generated by an exceptional collection, what is impossible for $g(X) \geq 1$ (for example, because $K_0(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ is not finitely generated).

For the second statement recall that big and small subcategories are not torsion-free. \square

Remark 8.9. Corollary 8.8 provides an alternative way to prove a well-known fact: the derived category of a smooth projective curve X of genus > 0 has no non-trivial semi-orthogonal decompositions. Indeed, $D^b(\text{coh } X)$ has no nontrivial small/big subcategories. Note that the classical argument by Okawa [33] is based on the fact that the canonical line bundle on X has enough non-vanishing sections, and we make no use of that.

Proposition 8.10. *Let $\mathcal{T} \subset D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ be a thick subcategory. Assume \mathcal{T} is not big, then $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \rangle$, where \mathcal{T}_1 is torsion and \mathcal{T}_2 is torsion-free. Semi-orthogonal decomposition of \mathcal{T} with such properties is unique. Moreover, if $\mathcal{T}_2 \neq 0$ then \mathcal{T}_1 is small.*

Proof. By Theorem 8.2, \mathcal{T} and $\mathcal{T} \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ are quiver-like. Let $F_i, i \in I$ be the vertex-like family in $\text{coh } \mathbb{X}$, generating \mathcal{T} . Denote by I_1 (resp. I_2) the set of $i \in I$ such that F_i is torsion (resp. torsion-free). Let $\mathcal{T}_1 = \langle F_i \rangle_{i \in I_1}$, $\mathcal{T}_2 = \langle F_i \rangle_{i \in I_2}$. Clearly, \mathcal{T}_1 and \mathcal{T}_2 together generate \mathcal{T} . Also, for any $i_1 \in I_1, i_2 \in I_2$ one has $\text{Hom}(F_{i_2}, F_{i_1}) = 0$ by the definition of vertex-like and $\text{Ext}^1(F_{i_2}, F_{i_1}) = 0$ since F_{i_2} is torsion-free and F_{i_1} is torsion. Therefore, $\mathcal{T}_1 \subset \mathcal{T}_2^\perp$ and we get a semi-orthogonal decomposition $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2 \rangle$. Note that $\mathcal{T}_1 \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$ coincides with the family of all torsion sheaves in \mathcal{T} , and the uniqueness follows.

For the second part, assume $\mathcal{T}_2 \neq 0$. If \mathcal{T}_1 contains a sphere-like torsion sheaf then \mathcal{T} is big by Lemma 7.8, which contradicts to assumptions. If \mathcal{T}_1 has no sphere-like torsion sheaves then \mathcal{T}_1 is generated by an exceptional collection of sheaves (see Proposition 5.2), hence is small. \square

9. EXAMPLES

In this section we provide some examples of quiver-like subcategories, illustrating general results from previous sections and demonstrating variety of the world of thick subcategories, cf. Figure 1.

where $S_{i,j} := \text{coker}(\mathcal{O}((j-1)\bar{x}_i) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(j\bar{x}_i))$ is a torsion sheaf supported at x_i . Note that $S_{ij} \cong S_{i,j+r_i}$ and $\tau S_{ij} \cong S_{i,j-1}$. Arrows in (9.5) denote Ext^1 spaces, hence the Ext-quiver of (9.5) is Q_l , and $\mathcal{S}_l \cong \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q_l \cong \text{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q_l$. Note that \mathcal{S}_l is in general a mixed subcategory.

Now consider the remaining part of (9.2):

$$(9.6) \quad \{\mathcal{O}(b\bar{x}_i), \mathcal{O}(\bar{c})\}_{i=1\dots n, b=b_i+1\dots r_i-1}.$$

Let \mathcal{T}_r be the subcategory in $D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X})$ generated by (9.6), and $\mathcal{S}_r = \mathcal{T}_r \cap \text{coh } \mathbb{X}$. Endomorphism algebra of (9.6) is the path algebra of the quiver

$$(9.7) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{O}((b_1+1)\bar{x}_1) & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}((r_1-1)\bar{x}_1) & & \\ & & & & & \searrow & \\ & & & & & & \mathcal{O}(\bar{c}) \\ & & & & & \nearrow & \\ & & & & & & \mathcal{O}((r_n-1)\bar{x}_n) \\ \mathcal{O}((b_n+1)\bar{x}_n) & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}((r_n-1)\bar{x}_n) & & \end{array}$$

$Q_r:$ \dots \longrightarrow $\mathcal{O}(\bar{c})$

The vertex-like collection in \mathcal{S}_r generating \mathcal{T}_r is obtained from the right dual exceptional collection to (9.6) by mutating $\mathcal{O}(\bar{c})$ to the right end:

$$(9.8) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} S_{1,r_1} & \longrightarrow & S_{1,r_1-1} & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & S_{1,b_1+2} \\ & & & & & & \searrow \\ & & & & \dots & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{O}(\bar{c} - \sum (r_i - b_i - 1)\bar{x}_i) \\ & & & & & & \nearrow \\ S_{n,r_n} & \longrightarrow & S_{n,r_n-1} & \longrightarrow & \dots & \longrightarrow & S_{n,b_n+2} \end{array}$$

The Ext-quiver of (9.8) is Q_r^{op} (and not Q_r), hence $\mathcal{S}_r \cong \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q_r^{\text{op}} \cong \text{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q_r^{\text{op}}$. Subcategory \mathcal{S}_r is also mixed.

Example 9.2. In Example 9.1 let $n = 4$, $r_1 = \dots = r_4 = 5$, $b_1 = \dots = b_4 = 2$. Then quivers Q_1 and Q_2^{op} are affine Dynkin quivers of type \tilde{D}_4 . Categories \mathcal{T}_l and \mathcal{T}_r are equivalent to $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}\tilde{D}_4) \cong D^b(\text{mod}\text{-}\mathbb{k}\tilde{D}_4) \cong D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}_{2,2,2})$, where $\mathbb{X}_{2,2,2}$ is a domestic weighted projective line of type 2, 2, 2. Hence both components of semi-orthogonal decomposition

$$D^b(\text{coh } \mathbb{X}) = \langle \mathcal{T}_l, \mathcal{T}_r \rangle$$

are equivalent to the derived category of a weighted projective line, and are not curve-like.

Example 9.3. Assume that $n \geq 2$. In collection (9.1), make mutation of $\mathcal{O}(\bar{c})$ to the left end. One gets an exceptional collection

$$(9.9) \quad \{\mathcal{O}(-\bar{c} + \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i - 1)\bar{x}_i), \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}(b\bar{x}_i)\}_{i=1\dots n, b=1\dots r_i-1}.$$

Denote $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{O}(-\bar{c} + \sum_{i=1}^n (r_i - 1)\bar{x}_i)$, then $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O})$ is an exceptional pair. One has

$$\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}((1-n)\bar{c} + \sum_i \bar{x}_i)) = 0$$

and

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O}) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{L}(\bar{\omega}))^* \cong \mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{O}, \mathcal{O}((n-3)\bar{c} + \sum_i (r_i - 2)\bar{x}_i))^* \cong \mathbb{k}^{n-2}.$$

Therefore, pair $(\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O})$ is vertex-like and its Ext-quiver is the m -Kronecker quiver K_m , where $m = n - 2$. Hence $\mathcal{T} = \langle \mathcal{L}, \mathcal{O} \rangle \subset D^b(\mathrm{coh} \mathbb{X})$ is equivalent to $D_0^b(\mathbb{k}K_m)$, this subcategory is generated by an exceptional collection and therefore admissible. Also \mathcal{T} is clearly torsion-free. If $n = 4$ then $m = 2$ and \mathcal{T} is equivalent to $D^b(\mathrm{coh} \mathbb{P}^1)$ but is not curve-like.

Suppose in addition that all $r_i = 2$. Then ${}^\perp \mathcal{T}$ is generated by completely orthogonal collection of line bundles $\mathcal{O}(\bar{x}_1), \dots, \mathcal{O}(\bar{x}_n)$ and hence is torsion-free. In this case one has a semi-orthogonal decomposition of $D^b(\mathrm{coh} \mathbb{X})$ in two torsion-free subcategories.

Example 9.4. Let X be a connected smooth projective curve of genus $g \geq 1$. Let L be the family of all line bundles of degree 0 on X . Clearly, L is a vertex-like family. By Riemann-Roch Theorem, for any $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2 \in L$

$$\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2) = \begin{cases} g - 1 & \mathcal{L}_1 \not\cong \mathcal{L}_2, \\ g & \mathcal{L}_1 \cong \mathcal{L}_2. \end{cases}$$

By Corollary 4.14, one has equivalences

$$\langle L \rangle \cong D_0^b(\mathbb{k}Q), \quad \langle L \rangle_{\mathrm{Ab}} \cong \mathrm{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{k}Q,$$

where Q is the following quiver: its set of vertices has the cardinality of L (and of \mathbb{k}), any vertex has g loops and any two distinct vertices are connected by $g - 1$ arrows in both directions.

REFERENCES

- [1] Rina Anno and Timothy Logvinenko. Spherical dg-functors. *Journal of European Mathematical Society*, 19(9):2577–2656, 2017.
- [2] Michael Artin and James J. Zhang. Noncommutative projective schemes. *Advances in Mathematics*, 109:228–287, 1994.
- [3] Alexey Bondal. Representation of associative algebras and coherent sheaves. *Mathematics of The USSR — Izvestiya*, 34:23–42, 1990.
- [4] Alexey Bondal and Mikhail Kapranov. Representable functors, Serre functors, and mutations. *Mathematics of The USSR — Izvestiya*, 35:519–541, 1990.
- [5] Alexey Bondal and Michel Van den Bergh. Generators and representability of functors in commutative and noncommutative geometry. *Moscow Mathematical Journal*, 3:1–36, 2003.
- [6] Alexey I. Bondal, Michael Larsen, and Valery A. Lunts. Grothendieck ring of pretriangulated categories. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2004(29):1461–1495, 2004.
- [7] Kristian Brüning. Thick subcategories of the derived category of a hereditary algebra. *Homology, Homotopy and Applications*, 9:165–176, 2007.

- [8] Xiao-Wu Chen and Henning Krause. Introduction to coherent sheaves on weighted projective lines. *arXiv: Representation Theory*, 2009.
- [9] Yiyu Cheng. Wide subcategories of a domestic weighted projective line. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 228(9):107669, 2024.
- [10] Nikolay Dimitrov Dichev. *Thick subcategories for quiver representations*. PhD thesis, University of Paderborn, 2009.
- [11] Alexey Elagin and Valery A. Lunts. Thick subcategories on curves. *Advances in Mathematics*, 378:107525, 2021.
- [12] Werner Geigle and Helmut Lenzing. A class of weighted projective curves arising in representation theory of finite dimensional algebras. In *Singularities, Representation of Algebras, and Vector Bundles*, pages 265–297, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1987. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- [13] Werner Geigle and Helmut Lenzing. Perpendicular categories with applications to representations and sheaves. *Journal of Algebra*, 144:273–343, 1991.
- [14] S. I. Gelfand and Yu. I. Manin. *Methods of Homological Algebra*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, 1996.
- [15] Dieter Happel. *Triangulated Categories in the Representation of Finite Dimensional Algebras*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- [16] Mark Hovey. Classifying subcategories of modules. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 353:3181–3191, 1999.
- [17] Daniel Huybrechts. *Fourier-Mukai transforms in algebraic geometry*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
- [18] Colin Ingalls and Hugh Thomas. Noncrossing partitions and representations of quivers. *Compositio Mathematica*, 145:1533–1562, 2009.
- [19] Bernhard Keller. Deriving dg categories. *Annales Scientifiques de L'École Normale Supérieure*, 27:63–102, 1994.
- [20] Bernhard Keller. Introduction to A-infinity algebras and modules. *Homology, Homotopy and Applications*, 3:1–35, 1999.
- [21] Henning Krause. *Homological Theory of Representations*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [22] Henning Krause. The category of finite strings. *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 6(3):661–676, 2023.
- [23] Alexander Kuznetsov and Alexander Perry. Serre functors and dimensions of residual categories. *arXiv: Algebraic Geometry*, 2021.
- [24] Kenji Lefèvre-Hasegawa. *Sur les A_∞ -catégories*. PhD thesis, Université Paris 7, 2003.
- [25] Helmut Lenzing. Representations of finite-dimensional algebras and singularity theory. In *Trends in ring theory (Miskolc, 1996)*, volume 22, pages 71–97. Amer. Math. Soc. Providence, RI, 1998.
- [26] Helmut Lenzing. Hereditary categories. In *Handbook of Tilting Theory*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, page 105–146. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [27] Helmut Lenzing. Weighted projective lines and Riemann surfaces. In *Proceedings of the 49th Symposium on Ring Theory and Representation Theory*, pages 67–79. Symp. Ring Theory Represent. Theory Organ. Comm., 2017.
- [28] Helmut Lenzing. The algebraic theory of fuchsian singularities. In *Advances in Representation Theory of Algebras*, volume 761 of *Contemporary Mathematics*, pages 171–190. AMS Press Inc., 2021.
- [29] Helmut Lenzing and Idun Reiten. Hereditary noetherian categories of positive Euler characteristic. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 254:133–171, 2006.
- [30] Hagen Meltzer. Tubular mutations. *Colloquium Mathematicum*, 74(2):267–274, 1997.
- [31] Jun-Ichi Miyachi and Amnon Yekutieli. Derived Picard groups of finite-dimensional hereditary algebras. *Compositio Mathematica*, 129(3):341–368, 2001.
- [32] Amnon Neeman. *Triangulated Categories*, volume 148 of *Annals of Mathematics Studies*. Princeton University Press, 2001.

- [33] Shinnosuke Okawa. Semi-orthogonal decomposability of the derived category of a curve. *Advances in Mathematics*, 228:2869–2873, 2011.
- [34] Rajagopalan Parthasarathy. t-structures in the derived category of representations of quivers. *Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences — Mathematical Sciences*, 98:187–214, 1988.
- [35] Idun Reiten and Michel van den Bergh. Noetherian hereditary abelian categories satisfying Serre duality. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 15:295–366, 2002.
- [36] Raphaël Rouquier. Dimensions of triangulated categories. *Journal of K-theory*, 1:193–256, 2008.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS
Email address: alexey.elagin@gmail.com