

# Resolution of singularities via Tannaka duality

Jasper van de Kreeke

## Abstract

Resolving finite quotient singularities is a classical problem in algebraic geometry. Traditional methods of Geometric Invariant Theory (GIT) translate the singularity into a quiver representation space and take the GIT quotient with respect to a generic stability parameter. While this approach easily produces smooth resolutions, it fails to produce any stacky resolutions, as quiver representation spaces lack finite stabilizers.

This paper provides an alternative framework which produces both smooth and stacky resolutions. Our framework is based on a trick of Abdelgadir and Segal, which deploys Tannaka duality to describe the points of the classifying stack of a finite group in terms of algebraic data. Abdelgadir and Segal successfully pursue this strategy and obtain smooth and stacky resolutions in the Kleinian  $D_4$  case. We generalize this strategy to all Kleinian singularities and obtain a series of varieties which we refer to as “Clebsch-Gordan varieties”. We provide tools to work with these Clebsch-Gordan varieties, analyze their stable loci with respect to different stability parameters, and study the Kleinian  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  cases in detail.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Preliminaries</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>The Tannakian approach</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Tannakian approach of Abdelgadir and Segal . . . . .	8
3.2	Construction of the variety $Z$ . . . . .	8
3.3	Implementation of the ansatz $X = Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . . . . .	9
<b>4</b>	<b>Resolution of finite quotient singularities</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Clebsch-Gordan data . . . . .	11
4.2	The Clebsch-Gordan variety . . . . .	12
4.3	Resolution of finite quotient singularities . . . . .	13
4.4	Resolution of Kleinian singularities . . . . .	14
4.5	Proof in the Kleinian case . . . . .	14
<b>A</b>	<b>The <math>A_n</math> case</b>	<b>18</b>
A.1	Stage 1: Construction of the Clebsch-Gordan variety . . . . .	19
A.2	Stage 2: Construction of the map $R$ . . . . .	20
A.3	Stage 3: Verification that $R^*$ is an isomorphism of invariants . . . . .	20
A.4	Stage 4: Identification of the stabilizer of $\varphi^{(0)}$ . . . . .	21
A.5	Stage 5: Identification of the $\theta_1$ -semistable locus . . . . .	21
A.6	Stage 6: Identification of the $\theta_2$ -semistable locus . . . . .	21
A.7	The $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . . . . .	26

<b>B</b>	<b>The <math>D_n</math> case</b>	<b>30</b>
B.1	Stage 1: Construction of the Clebsch-Gordan variety . . . . .	30
B.2	Stage 2: Construction of the map $R$ . . . . .	32
B.3	Stage 3: Verification that $R^*$ is an isomorphism of invariants . . . . .	33
B.4	Stage 4: Identification of the stabilizer of $\varphi^{(0)}$ . . . . .	33
B.5	Stage 5: Identification of the $\theta_1$ -semistable locus . . . . .	34
B.6	Stage 6: Identification of the $\theta_2$ -semistable locus . . . . .	35
B.7	Symmetry and coherence relations . . . . .	43
B.8	Comparison with the variety $Z$ of Abdelgadir and Segal . . . . .	47

## 1 Introduction

Resolving singularities is one of the core tasks in algebraic geometry, and multiple strategies exist to accomplish it. Finite quotient singularities  $X = V // \Gamma$  are a particular class of singularities and a popular strategy to resolve them [5, 9, 2] consists of turning  $X$  into a quiver variety:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 U_0, \dots, U_n \in \text{Rep}(\Gamma) & \rightsquigarrow & \varphi_i : U_i \otimes V \rightarrow \bigoplus_k U_k^{\oplus c_{ik}} & \rightsquigarrow & X \cong \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}_\alpha \\
 \text{Simple representations} & & \text{Linear maps} & & \text{Quiver variety}
 \end{array}$$

Adding a stability parameter  $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^\alpha$  produces a map  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) //_\theta \text{GL}_\alpha \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}_\alpha$  which typically is a resolution of singularities. However, all these classical quotients are preprojective varieties and one never obtains the stacky resolution  $[V/\Gamma]$ . In the present paper, we present an alternative strategy to reformulate the finite quotient as a GIT quotient:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 U_0, \dots, U_n \in \text{Rep}(\Gamma) & \rightsquigarrow & \varphi_{ij} : U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_k U_k^{\oplus c_{ijk}} & \rightsquigarrow & X \cong (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times V) // \text{GL} \\
 \text{Simple representations} & & \text{Bilinear maps} & & \text{Clebsch-Gordan variety}
 \end{array}$$

The strategy is to define the points of the variety  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  to consist of bilinear maps  $\varphi_{ij} : U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_k U_k^{\oplus c_{ijk}}$ . Then  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  comes naturally with an action of the general linear group  $\text{GL} = \text{GL}(U_1) \times \dots \times \text{GL}(U_n)$ , but in contrast to the quiver representation space the action is quadratic on the domain of each  $\varphi_{ij}$ . In case of the Kleinian singularity  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$ , we show that the variety  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  indeed produces both the smooth resolution  $\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma}$  and the stacky resolution  $[\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma]$  as GIT quotients. This paper is a cumulation of a long chain of developments:

Year	Key contributions	Approach	Type of resolution	Type of group
1993	Folklore [7]	Toric	Smooth	$A_n$
1994	King [9]	Quiver	Smooth	$A_n, D_n, E_{6,7,8}$
2001	Bridgeland-King-Reid [4]	$\Gamma$ -clusters	Smooth	Finite $\Gamma \subseteq \text{SL}_3(\mathbb{C})$
2004	Van den Bergh [14]	Smash	NCCR	Any finite group
2024	Abdelgadir-Segal [1]	Tannakian	Smooth and stacky	$A_n, D_4$
<b>2025</b>	<b>This paper</b>	<b>Tannakian</b>	<b>Smooth and stacky</b>	<b>Any finite group</b>

In the remainder of this introduction, we elaborate on some of these developments and explain the road to the construction presented in this paper.

## Smooth resolutions via quiver varieties

Kleinian singularities are the affine quotients  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$  where  $\Gamma$  is a finite subgroup of  $\mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . They enjoy an ADE classification, so that we can speak of the Kleinian  $A_n$ ,  $D_n$  and  $E_{6/7/8}$  singularities. Their coordinate rings  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]^\Gamma$  are generated by three variables with a single relation. In fact, the Kleinian singularities are precisely the simple isolated hypersurface singularities in three-dimensional complex space. Kleinian singularities can be resolved and it is well-known that they have a minimal resolution. If  $\Gamma$  is the  $A_n$ ,  $D_n$  or  $E_{n=6,7,8}$  group, it takes precisely  $n$ -many individual blow-ups to reach the minimal resolution.

Every Kleinian singularity can be written as a quiver variety  $\mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \mathrm{GL}_\alpha$ , where  $\bar{Q}$  is the Kleinian double quiver and  $\alpha$  is the minimal imaginary dimension vector. The classical road to this was established by Crawley-Boevey and Holland [6] and proceeds via the skew-group ring  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y] \rtimes \Gamma$  and a calculation that the skew-group ring is Morita equivalent to the preprojective algebra  $\Pi_Q$  of the Kleinian quiver  $Q$ . Describing the singularity as a quiver variety opens up the possibility to introduce stability parameters  $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  in the aim of providing a resolution of singularities. The theory in this direction was heavily influenced by King [9] and in the Kleinian case, when  $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  is a generic stability parameter which pairs to zero with  $\alpha$ , the variety  $\mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) //_\theta \mathrm{GL}_\alpha$  is indeed the minimal resolution of  $\mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \mathrm{GL}_\alpha$ .

## The quest for stacky resolutions via GIT

Noncommutative geometry suggests that we also study resolutions of categories on a categorical level [11]. In case of finite quotient singularities  $V // \Gamma$ , the general theme is that one should study the stack  $[V/\Gamma]$ . This stack is also known as the orbifold resolution or stacky resolution of  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$ . The relevance of this stack is that the derived category  $\mathrm{D}\mathrm{Coh}[V/\Gamma]$  is supposed to be a categorical resolution of  $V // \Gamma$ . This appears to be known in many cases, at least in case of the Kleinian singularities  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$  as  $[\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma]$  is a DM stack resolution of  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$  and hence  $\mathrm{D}\mathrm{Coh}[\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma] \cong \mathrm{D}\mathrm{Coh}\widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma}$ , see e.g. the discussion of [3, Conjecture 1.2]. Categorical and stacky technicalities are however beyond the scope of this paper.

The natural question arises how  $[\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma]$  can be obtained as a GIT quotient of the form  $[X^\theta/\mathrm{GL}]$ . It is impossible to use the quiver approach  $X = \mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  for this purpose. Indeed,  $\theta$ -semistable representations are always stabilized by the diagonal  $\mathbb{C}^* \subseteq \mathrm{GL}$ , and even after the  $\mathbb{C}^*$  factor has been removed from the gauge group the stabilizer never becomes finite. Therefore a representation space of a quiver will never yield the stacky resolution as GIT quotient. We are therefore led to search for alternative varieties  $X$  with  $\mathrm{GL}$ -action.

## The Tannakian strategy of Abdelgadir and Segal

Abdelgadir and Segal [1] paved the way for constructing a variety  $X$  with  $\mathrm{GL}$ -action for a given finite group  $\Gamma$ . Their work consists of two theoretical parts and a precise execution in the Kleinian  $A_n$  and  $D_4$  cases. We shall now list the two theoretical parts and comment on them in more detail.

1. An approach for turning a finite group  $\Gamma$  into an affine variety  $Z$  with a  $\mathrm{GL}$ -action and an open subset  $Z^\circ \subseteq Z$  such that  $\mathrm{GL}$  acts on  $Z^\circ$  with stabilizer  $\Gamma$ .
2. The ansatz  $X = Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . They equip the product with a  $\mathrm{GL}$ -action and propose to find stability parameters  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  such that  $X^{\theta_1} = Z^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2$  and  $X^{\theta_2} \cong \mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2}$ . In consequence we have

$$[X^{\theta_1}/\mathrm{GL}] \cong [\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma] \quad \text{and} \quad [X^{\theta_2}/\mathrm{GL}] \cong \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma}.$$

Let us explain the first part in more detail. The starting point is the observation that Lurie's Tannaka duality for geometric stacks [13] guarantees an equivalence between  $[*/\Gamma]$  and the stack of tensor-product preserving functors from  $\text{Coh}[*/\Gamma] = \text{Rep}(\Gamma)$  to  $\text{Vec}$ . Abdelgadir and Segal focus on those functors which on objects are merely the forgetful functor. They further propose to analyze these functors by studying the category  $\text{Rep}(\Gamma)$  in terms of the simple representations  $U_0, \dots, U_n$  and the tensor and wedge relations among them. Through such presentation, the set of functors can be expressed as an algebraic variety  $Z$ . For instance, if there is a relation of the form  $U_i \wedge U_j \cong U_k$  in  $\text{Rep}(\Gamma)$ , then the datum of a point  $z \in Z$  should include a linear map  $U_i \wedge U_j \rightarrow U_k$ . There is an obvious action by the group  $\text{GL} = \prod_{k=1, \dots, n} \text{GL}(U_k)$  on  $Z$  by gauging all linear maps on their domain and codomain. The problem is that the variety  $Z$  obtained this way has far too many orbits. Unfortunately, in the approach of Abdelgadir and Segal there is no immediate way to reduce the size of  $Z$  in general and their work is therefore limited to the more tractable  $A_n$  and  $D_4$  case.

## The solution for the $A_n$ and $D_4$ type

Abdelgadir and Segal successfully carry out the construction of a suitable variety  $Z$  and stability parameters  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  in the case of the Kleinian  $A_n$  and  $D_4$  groups. Their implementation is however limited to these cases, as their size reduction procedure for  $Z$  does not generalize to other finite groups. To illustrate this limitation, we shall treat here the  $A_n$  case.

For the  $A_n$  case, we have the simple representations  $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_n$  where the generator  $\sigma \in \Gamma = C_{n+1}$  acts by  $e^{2\pi i j/(n+1)}$  on  $U_j$ . Among others, the simple representations satisfy the relations  $U_1 \otimes U_i \cong U_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Therefore the datum of a point in  $B \in Z$  shall be given by  $n$  scalar numbers  $B_i$ , standing for linear maps  $B_i : U_1 \otimes U_i \rightarrow U_{i+1}$ . This choice  $Z = \mathbb{C}^n$  and  $Z^\circ = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  successfully implements the first part of the proposal of Abdelgadir and Segal in the  $A_n$  case.

To visualize the limitation of this approach, note that many relations among the simple representations have been discarded in the construction of  $Z$ . Indeed, we have the general relation  $U_i \otimes U_j \cong U_{i+j}$ . If we were to include these relations into the definition of  $Z$ , we would end up with a  $(n+1)^2$ -dimensional variety  $Z$  which is by far too large to consist of one single orbit. In conclusion, there is good reason in discarding these additional relations, but the choice of relations to be discarded is rather arbitrary.

In the  $D_4$  case, the limitations become even more visible. There is one higher-dimensional irreducible representation and therefore many non-scalar relations arise. We are thus facing the impending question which part of those non-scalar relations should be discarded and which should be preserved. Abdelgadir and Segal succeed in making a valid selection, but the selection is necessarily fragmented and discards many scalar and non-scalar relations. It is even necessary to enforce additional coherence conditions among the non-discarded relations. Nevertheless, the work of Abdelgadir and Segal clearly paves the way for a general construction which we shall now present.

## The general solution for all finite groups

The aim of this paper is to break through the limitation to the  $D_4$  case and construct a variety  $Z$  for any finite group  $\Gamma$ . Our key insight is that it is not necessary to reduce the amount of relations included in the construction of  $Z$ . Rather, we keep all tensor relations  $U_i \otimes U_j \cong \bigoplus_{k=0, \dots, n} U_k^{\oplus c_{ijk}}$ , where  $c_{ijk}$  are the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. Instead of discarding relations, the trick is to define the variety as the closure of one single orbit. This surprisingly simple definition produces a variety with  $\text{GL}$ -action for every finite group  $\Gamma$ .

To mark this level of generality, we will call this variety the **Clebsch-Gordan variety**  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  of  $\Gamma$ , based on a terminology poll held at a conference in Paderborn. The remainder of the paper is devoted to constructing  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  explicitly in case  $\Gamma$  is the Kleinian group of  $A_n$  or  $D_n$  type and checking in detail that  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  produces both the stacky and smooth resolution of  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$  as GIT quotients. As a bonus, we prove the surprising fact that even in the  $D_4$  case our variety  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  is similar but not naturally isomorphic to the variety constructed by Abdelgadir and Segal.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, we recall several preliminaries. In section 3, we recall the approach of Abdelgadir and Segal and their solution in the  $D_4$  case. In section 4, we define the Clebsch-Gordan variety, develop its general mechanism to produce resolutions for Kleinian singularities and state the main results. In Appendix A, we explicitly work out the solution for the Kleinian  $A_n$  case and provide additional material on the classification of semiinvariant functions on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . In Appendix B, we explicitly work out the solution for the Kleinian  $D_n$  case. We include calculations of the symmetry and coherence relations and the comparison with the variety of Abdelgadir and Segal.

## Connection to the physics literature

Abdelgadir and Segal write that “It is perhaps surprising, given the extensive literature on the McKay correspondence, that such a construction has not appeared before.” It was pointed out to the author by Mina Aganagic that theoretical physicists have worked with resolutions of singularities as well. At least two bits of our construction have appeared in work of Lawrence-Nekrasov-Vafa [12] before. The first point concerns the use of bilinear maps  $U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_k U_k^{\oplus c_{ij}}$ . In physics the datum of such a map is known as field content of bifundamental matter type. The second point concerns our comparison map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ , which is mentioned by Lawrence-Nekrasov-Vafa as well. We hope the present paper enriches the mathematical toolbox and provides inspiration to physicists.

## Acknowledgements

The ideas for the paper were born during a visit at the University of Glasgow, where Tarig Abdelgadir was presenting his work. The author would like to thank Gwyn Bellamy for the invitation and the University of Glasgow for hospitality. The author was partially supported by NWO Rubicon grant 019.232EN.029.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this section, we recall several preliminaries and fix pieces of notation. We treat GIT quotients, quivers, Kleinian singularities and their resolutions. For further reading, we recommend [2]. All algebraic varieties in this paper are defined over the field of complex numbers.

**GIT quotients** If  $X$  is an affine variety and  $G$  is a algebraic reductive group acting on  $X$ , then the affine quotient  $X // G$  is the affine variety whose coordinate ring is  $\mathbb{C}[X]^G$ . A stability parameter for  $G$  is a group character  $\theta : G \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ . If  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , then a  $\theta^k$ -semiinvariant on  $X$  is a function  $f \in \mathbb{C}[X]$  such that  $f(gx) = \theta^k(g)f(x)$ . A point  $x \in X$  is  $\theta$ -semistable if there exists a  $\theta^k$ -semiinvariant  $f$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $f(x) \neq 0$ . We write  $X^\theta$  for the subset of  $\theta$ -semistable points of  $X$ . The space of  $\theta^k$ -semiinvariants is denoted  $\mathbb{C}[X]_{\theta^k}$ . The term GIT quotient may refer to either of two concepts. The GIT quotient  $X //_\theta G$  is the quasiprojective variety with graded coordinate ring  $\bigoplus_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathbb{C}[X]_{\theta^k}$ . The GIT quotient  $[X^\theta / G]$  is the stacky quotient of the  $\theta$ -semistable locus by  $G$ .

The Hilbert-Mumford criterion for deciding whether a point  $x \in X$  is  $\theta$ -semistable works as follows. A one-parameter subgroup of  $G$  is an algebraic group homomorphism  $g : \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow G$ , which we commonly denote by  $g(t)$ . The composition  $\theta \circ g$  with a stability parameter  $\theta$  is thus of the form  $(\theta \circ g)(t) = t^\alpha$  for some  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ . The one-parameter subgroup pairs positively with  $\theta$  if  $\alpha > 0$ . The Hilbert-Mumford criterion states that an element  $x \in X$  is not  $\theta$ -semistable if and only if there exists a one-parameter subgroup  $g(t)$  which pairs positively with  $\theta$  and for which  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}x$  exists.

**Quivers** A quiver  $Q$  is a finite directed graph. The vertex and arrow sets are denoted  $Q_0$  and  $Q_1$ , respectively. We denote the head and tail of an arrow  $a \in Q_1$  by  $h(a)$  and  $t(a)$ . The path algebra  $\mathbb{C}Q$  is the associative unital algebra with basis given by the set of paths in  $Q$  and product given by concatenation. The double quiver  $\overline{Q}$  of  $Q$  is the quiver obtained from  $Q$  by adjoining an arrow  $a^* : h(a) \rightarrow t(a)$  for every arrow  $a : t(a) \rightarrow h(a)$ . The preprojective algebra  $\Pi_Q$  of  $Q$  is defined as

$$\Pi_Q = \frac{\mathbb{C}\overline{Q}}{\left(\sum_{t(a)=v} aa^* - a^*a\right)_{v \in Q_0}}.$$

A dimension vector is an element  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ . The representation space  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is the affine variety given by all representations of  $\Pi_Q$  of dimension  $\alpha$ . The gauge group  $\text{GL}_\alpha$  is the product of general linear groups given by

$$\text{GL}_\alpha = \prod_{v \in Q_0} \text{GL}_{\alpha_v}(\mathbb{C}).$$

The group  $\text{GL}_\alpha$  acts on  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  by

$$(g_v) \cdot \rho = (g_{h(a)}(\rho_a)_{a \in Q_1} g_{t(a)}^{-1})_{a \in \overline{Q}_1}.$$

The quiver variety of  $Q$  is the affine quotient  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}_\alpha$ . When  $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ , we define a group character  $\theta : \text{GL}_\alpha \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$  by  $\theta(g) = \prod_{v \in Q_0} \det(g_v)^{\theta_v}$ , using the same letter  $\theta$  by abuse of notation. A representation  $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is  $\theta$ -semistable if we have  $\theta \cdot \alpha = 0$  and for every nontrivial strict subrepresentation  $\eta \subseteq \rho$  we have  $\theta \cdot \dim \eta \geq 0$ .

**Kleinian singularities** The finite subgroups  $\Gamma \subseteq \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  are known as the Kleinian groups. They are classified by  $A_n$ ,  $D_n$  and  $E_{n=6,7,8}$  types. The affine quotients  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$  are known as Kleinian singularities. It turns out that every Kleinian singularity can be written as a quiver variety. The classical road to this result is to regard the skew-group ring  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y] \rtimes \Gamma$  whose center is equal to  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]^\Gamma$ . By the Artin-Wedderburn theorem,  $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$  is isomorphic to a product of matrix rings. Similar to the fact that any matrix ring is Morita-equivalent to its coefficient ring, an idempotent reduction yields a Morita-equivalent subring  $e(\mathbb{C}[X, Y] \rtimes \Gamma)e$  of the skew-group ring. It is a classical result of Crawley-Boevey and Holland [6] that this subring is isomorphic to the preprojective algebra  $\Pi_Q$  of a quiver  $Q$ . There is a classical theory of roots for quivers [8] and one denotes by  $\alpha$  the minimal imaginary root of  $Q$ . The set  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  of all  $\alpha$ -dimensional representations of  $\Pi_Q$ , or in other words all representations of the double quiver  $\overline{Q}$  which satisfy the preprojective relations, form an affine variety over the complex numbers. The product  $\text{GL}_\alpha$  of general linear groups acts on  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  and it turns out that the affine quotient  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}_\alpha$  is isomorphic to the Kleinian singularity  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$ . This way, we can write every Kleinian singularity as a quiver variety. The data attached to the Kleinian  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  singularities is depicted in Figure 2.1.

$$\Gamma = \left\langle \left( \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i/(n+1)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i/(n+1)} \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\rangle \quad xy - z^{n+1} = 0$$

(a) The  $A_n$  singularity

$$\Gamma = \left\langle \left( \begin{pmatrix} e^{\pi i/(n-2)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\pi i/(n-2)} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \right\rangle \quad x^2 + y^2z + z^{n-1} = 0$$

(b) The  $D_n$  singularity

Figure 2.1: This figure depicts the  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  singularities. We list the Kleinian group  $\Gamma$ , the equivalent description as hypersurface in  $\mathbb{C}^3$  and the Kleinian quiver setting  $(Q, \alpha)$ . Note that the Kleinian quiver with index  $n$  has  $(n + 1)$ -many vertices.

**Resolutions** Let  $(Q, \alpha)$  be a Kleinian quiver setting and let  $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  be a stability parameter. Then there is a natural map  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) //_{\theta} \text{GL}_{\alpha} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}_{\alpha}$ . If  $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  is generic and  $\theta \cdot \alpha = 0$ , then this map is the minimal resolution of the Kleinian singularity. For this classical fact and material on other quiver varieties and their resolutions we refer to [2].

The points of the variety  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) //_{\theta} \text{GL}_{\alpha}$  are in one-to-one correspondence with orbits of semistable points (or polystable points, in case of general quiver varieties). This way, the variety is equal to the stack  $[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta}/G]$ . The diagonal subgroup  $\mathbb{C}^* \subseteq \text{GL}_{\alpha}$  stabilizes the entire representation space. The reader can easily convince themselves that the stabilizer of  $\theta$ -semistable representations is precisely  $\mathbb{C}^*$ .

The special fiber  $\pi^{-1}(0)$  of the resolution  $\pi : \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) //_{\theta} \text{GL}_{\alpha} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}_{\alpha}$  consists of  $n$ -many transversally intersecting projective lines. In fact, the graph whose vertices are the projective lines and whose edges are the intersections is precisely the Dynkin diagram associated with the Kleinian ADE type. The special fiber  $\pi^{-1}(0)$  consists of the orbits of  $\theta$ -semistable representations which lie in the nullcone. By definition, the nullcone is the set of representations  $\rho$  for which there exists a 1-parameter subgroup  $g(t) \subseteq \text{GL}_{\alpha}$  such that  $g(t)\rho \rightarrow 0$  as  $t \rightarrow 0$ . For specific values of  $\theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ , one can provide explicit representatives for the points in the special fiber. The specific case where  $\theta_v < 0$  for the special vertex and  $\theta_v > 0$  for all other vertices has been investigated by Crawley-Boevey [5]. The statement is that the  $n$ -many 1-parameter families of representations are distinguished by their socle. For every vertex  $v \in Q_0$ , apart from the special vertex, there is a 1-parameter family of representations in  $\pi^{-1}(0)$  whose socle equals the simple representation  $S_v$  at vertex  $v$ . Explicit representatives of these 1-parameter families have been calculated for instance in [10].

### 3 The Tannakian approach

In this section, we recapitulate the Tannakian approach of Abdelgadir and Segal. In section 3.1, we recall the approach to produce a variety  $Z$  together with a  $\mathrm{GL}$ -action via Tannaka duality. In section 3.2, we recall the implementation of this construction in the  $A_n$  and  $D_4$  case. In section 3.3, we recall the ansatz  $X = Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$  to produce both stacky and smooth resolutions. We finish by explaining why the implementation chosen by Abdelgadir and Segal does not easily extend beyond the  $A_n$  and  $D_4$  cases.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{X} = [* / \Gamma] & \rightsquigarrow & \mathcal{X} = \{F : \mathrm{Rep}(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathrm{Vec}\} & \rightsquigarrow & Z = \{(\beta, A, B) \mid \text{Relations}\} \\ \text{Classifying stack} & & \text{Tannakian description} & & \text{Algebraic variety} \end{array}$$

#### 3.1 Tannakian approach of Abdelgadir and Segal

In this section, we describe the approach of Abdelgadir and Segal to produce a variety  $Z$  with a  $\mathrm{GL}$ -action from a finite group  $\Gamma$ . The starting point is the work of Lurie [13] which establishes that a geometric stack  $\mathcal{X}$  is equivalent to the stack of tensor-preserving functors from the category of coherent sheaves  $\mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{X})$  to the category of vector spaces:

$$\mathcal{X} \cong \{F : \mathrm{Coh}(\mathcal{X}) \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathrm{Vec}\}.$$

For  $\mathcal{X} = [* / \Gamma]$  the statement specializes to  $[* / \Gamma] \cong \{F : \mathrm{Rep}(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\otimes} \mathrm{Vec}\}$ . Abdelgadir and Segal propose to convert the data encoded by the functor  $F$  into algebraic data. To simplify the problem, they regard only those functors  $F$  which on objects are the forgetful map. To further understand the functors, they propose to write the category  $\mathrm{Rep}(\Gamma)$  in terms of generators and tensor relations. Implementing this concept precisely is not entirely straight-forward due to the coherence issues between the desirable isomorphisms. Abdelgadir and Segal succeed in implementing this approach in the case where  $\Gamma$  is the Kleinian  $A_n$  or  $D_4$  group. In what follows, we summarize their implementation.

#### 3.2 Construction of the variety $Z$

In this section, we recall the construction of the variety  $Z$  of Abdelgadir and Segal in the  $A_n$  and  $D_4$  cases. This section is for illustrative purposes only, since the materials will not be used in the remainder of the paper and we will provide our alternative construction in the generality of arbitrary finite groups  $\Gamma$  in section 4.

We start with the  $A_n$  case. The Kleinian group  $\Gamma = C_{n+1}$  has the simple representations  $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_n$ . The generator  $\sigma \in \Gamma = C_{n+1}$  acts by  $e^{2\pi i j / (n+1)}$  on  $U_j$ . Among others, the simple representations satisfy the relations  $U_1 \otimes U_i \cong U_{i+1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Therefore the datum of a point in  $B \in Z$  shall be given by  $n$  scalar numbers  $B_i$ , standing for linear maps  $B_i : U_1 \otimes U_i \rightarrow U_{i+1}$ . The gauge action of an element  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in \mathrm{GL} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^n$  is given by

$$(gB)_i = g_{i+1} B_i g_1^{-1} g_i^{-1}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

Note that we use the notation  $U_{n+1} = U_0$  and  $g_0 = g_{n+1} = 1$ . The open locus  $Z^\circ \subseteq Z$  is given by those points  $B$  such that  $B_i \neq 0$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . It is an instructive exercise to verify that  $Z^\circ$  consists of one single  $\mathrm{GL}$ -orbit. Therefore this choice of variety  $Z$  successfully implements the first part of the proposal of Abdelgadir and Segal in the  $A_n$  case.

We now explain the  $D_4$  case. The Kleinian group is the quaternion group  $\Gamma = Q_8 = \{\pm 1, \pm i, \pm j, \pm k\}$ . Abdelgadir and Segal label the irreducible representations by  $\mathbb{C}, L_1, L_2, L_3, V$

which are of dimensions 1, 1, 1, 1, 2. The gauge group is  $G = (\mathbb{C}^*)^3 \times \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . Abdelgadir and Segal choose the following three relations among the simple representations:

$$\begin{aligned} (V \wedge V) \otimes (V \wedge V) &\cong L_1 \otimes L_2 \otimes L_3 \\ L_i \otimes L_i &\cong V \wedge V, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \\ \mathrm{Sym}^2 V &\cong L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus L_3. \end{aligned}$$

All other relations are discarded. The construction therefore revolves around tuples  $(\beta, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, B)$  where

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &\in \mathrm{Hom}((V \wedge V) \otimes (V \wedge V), L_1 \otimes L_2 \otimes L_3), \\ \alpha_i &\in \mathrm{Hom}(L_i^2, V \wedge V), \\ B &\in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathrm{Sym}^2 V, L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus L_3). \end{aligned}$$

The letter  $A$  is a compact way of denoting the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

There are several interrelations among the three relations, so that it is necessary to enforce coherence conditions among  $\beta$ ,  $A$  and  $B$ . In total, the variety  $Z$  is defined as all tuples  $(\beta, A, B)$  which satisfy the following three conditions:

- (E1)  $B^*AB = \alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\beta^2 J$ ,
- (E2)  $BJ^{-1}B^*A = \alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\beta^2 \mathrm{Id}_V$ ,
- (E3)  $\wedge^2 B = \beta ABJ^{-1}$ .

Here  $J$  denotes the canonical isomorphism  $J : \mathrm{Sym}^2 V \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Sym}^2 V^* \otimes (V \wedge V)^{\otimes 2}$ . The left-hand side on the third row must in fact be interpreted through yet another canonical isomorphism. We elaborate on these conditions and on a hands-on version with fixed bases in section B.8.

The action of  $G$  on  $Z$  is given naturally by left-multiplication on the codomain of  $\beta$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  and by inverse-left-multiplication on their codomains. The open subset  $Z^\circ \subseteq Z$  is defined to consist of those points for which  $\det B \neq 0$ . Abdelgadir and Segal prove that  $G$  indeed acts transitively on  $Z^\circ$  with stabilizer isomorphic to  $\Gamma$ .

### 3.3 Implementation of the ansatz $X = Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$

In this section, we show how Abdelgadir and Segal utilize the affine variety  $Z$  to produce both the smooth and the stacky resolution of the Kleinian singularity in the  $D_4$  case. The ansatz is to put  $X = Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . Recall that the gauge group  $G = \mathrm{GL}(L_1) \times \mathrm{GL}(L_2) \times \mathrm{GL}(L_3) \times \mathrm{GL}_2(V)$  acts naturally on  $Z$ . Moreover, the space  $\mathbb{C}^2$  is naturally a representation of the Kleinian group  $\Gamma \subseteq \mathrm{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  and as such it is isomorphic to  $V$ . Through this identification, the product  $X = Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$  obtains a natural  $G$ -action.

The choice of stability parameters is  $\theta_1 = (-1, \dots, -1) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and  $\theta_2 = (+1, \dots, +1) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Abdelgadir and Segal prove that  $(Z \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1} = Z^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . The easy direction of this equality is the inclusion  $Z^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2 \subseteq (Z \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1}$ . To verify the inclusion, it suffices to note that the function  $f((\beta, A, B), x) = \alpha_1^2 \alpha_2^2 \alpha_3^2 \beta^2 \det(B)$  is a  $\theta_1$ -semiinvariant on  $Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$  that does not vanish on  $Z^\circ$ . In consequence, we have  $[X^{\theta_1}/G] \cong [\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma]$ .




Figure 3.1: This figure depicts the quiver representation  $R((\beta, A, B), x)$ . The meaning of all symbols is elaborated in section B.8.

Abdelgadir and Segal prove moreover that  $[(Z \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2}/G] \cong \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma}$ . Their strategy is to construct a comparison map  $R : Z \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ , where  $(Q, \alpha)$  is the Kleinian  $D_4$  quiver. The map  $R$  is constructed explicitly by combining the datum of the maps  $\beta, A, B$  with the vector  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . The representation  $R((\beta, A, B), x)$  is depicted in Figure 3.1.

Generalizing this implementation to all ADE cases is a nontrivial task. The  $A_n$  case is much simpler than the  $D_4$  case due to the scalar nature of the relations and the abelianness of the gauge group, and can be dealt with in a similar manner. The ad-hoc nature in the  $D_4$  case leaves it unclear how to generalize the implementation of Abdelgadir and Segal. The most pressing challenge for the general  $D_n$  and  $E_{6,7,8}$  cases is the choice of tensor, symmetric and wedge relations among the simple representations  $U_0, \dots, U_n \in \text{Rep}(\Gamma)$ .

Abdelgadir and Segal express their wish that the mathematical community replace their “hands-on proof with a more abstract and elegant one, which might then work in greater generality.” In the present article, we respond to this appeal by continuing the Tannakian approach of Abdelgadir and Segal in a different direction that generalizes to all Kleinian singularities.

## 4 Resolution of finite quotient singularities

In this section, we define Clebsch-Gordan varieties and show how to use them to resolve Kleinian singularities.


$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X = \mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma & \rightsquigarrow & \text{GL} \curvearrowright \text{CG}_\Gamma, \theta_1, \theta_2 \\
 \text{Kleinian} & & \text{Clebsch-Gordan} \\
 & & \begin{array}{l} \rightsquigarrow [(\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1}/\text{GL}] \cong [\mathbb{C}^2/\Gamma] \\ \text{Stacky resolution} \\ \rightsquigarrow [(\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2}/\text{GL}] \cong \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma} \\ \text{Smooth resolution} \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

In section 4.1 and 4.2 we define the Clebsch-Gordan variety  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  together with the action of

GL for an arbitrary finite group  $\Gamma$ . In section 4.3 we explain how to use  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  as candidate for resolutions of finite quotient singularities. In section 4.4 we specialize to the case of Kleinian groups  $\Gamma \subseteq \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . In Theorem 4.8, we formulate the main result. In section 4.5, we prove the main result following the six stages formulated in Stage Plan 4.9. Most parts of the stages are proven simultaneously for all ADE types and the others are proven for the  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  types in Appendix A and B.

## 4.1 Clebsch-Gordan data

In this section, we define the notion of a Clebsch-Gordan datum. Simply speaking, a Clebsch-Gordan datum consists of bilinear maps  $U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_k U_k^{\oplus c_{ijk}}$ . The starting point is the Tannakian approach recalled in section 3. While Abdelgadir and Segal convert a Tannakian functor  $F : \text{Rep}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Vec}$  into a limited amount of algebraic data by truncating the information contained in the functor, we instead convert the functor into the full amount of algebraic data and preserve the information contained in the functor.



We start with a finite group  $\Gamma$ . Let  $U_0, \dots, U_n$  be its simple representations, with  $U_0$  denoting the trivial representation. We regard only functors  $F$  which send  $U_i$  to  $U_i$  as a vector space. It is our aim to convert the abstract property that  $F$  preserves tensor products into an algebraic property. We start by the observation that inside the category  $\text{Rep}(\Gamma)$  we have the isomorphisms

$$U_i \otimes U_j \cong \bigoplus_{k=0, \dots, n} U_k^{\oplus c_{ijk}}.$$

Here  $c_{ijk}$  are the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. We convert the property that  $F$  preserves tensor products into the condition that there be an isomorphism  $\varphi_{i,j} : F(U_i) \otimes F(U_j) \xrightarrow{\sim} F(U_i \otimes U_j)$ . Note that the domain and codomain of the maps  $\varphi_{i,j}$  are simply complex vector spaces of known dimension. We have thus turned the functor data of  $F$  into purely algebraic data. Since  $F(U_i)$  is simply the representation  $U_i$  regarded as a vector space, we shall drop the letter  $F$ . We fix this terminology and notation as follows:

**Definition 4.1.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite group. Let  $U_0, \dots, U_n$  be its simple representations, with  $U_0$  denoting the trivial representation. Let  $c_{ijk} \in \mathbb{N}$  be the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients. A **Clebsch-Gordan datum**  $\varphi = (\varphi_{i,j})_{0 \leq i, j \leq n}$  is the datum of bilinear maps

$$\varphi_{i,j} : U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_k U_k^{\oplus c_{ijk}}.$$

The **gauge group** associated with  $\Gamma$  is defined as follows:

$$\text{GL} = \text{GL}(U_1) \times \dots \times \text{GL}(U_n).$$


**Remark 4.2.** The factor  $\mathrm{GL}(U_0) = \mathbb{C}^*$  does not appear in our definition of the gauge group. The group  $\mathrm{GL}$  acts on a Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi$  by “change of basis”. More precisely, a group element acts by left composition on the codomain and inverse composition on the domain:

$$(g\varphi)_{ij} = \left( \bigoplus_{k=0, \dots, n} g_k^{\oplus c_{ijk}} \right) \circ \varphi_{i,j} \circ (g_i^{-1} \otimes g_j^{-1}).$$

The maps  $\varphi_{i,j}$  in a Clebsch-Gordan datum need not be isomorphisms and need not satisfy any coherence relations. Any Clebsch-Gordan datum coming from a functor  $F$  will however satisfy certain coherence relations. We shall exploit this property later on.

## 4.2 The Clebsch-Gordan variety

In this section, we define the Clebsch-Gordan variety  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  for general finite groups  $\Gamma$ . While Abdelgadir and Segal define  $Z$  as the collection of all truncated data  $(\beta, A, B)$  that satisfy coherence relations, we instead define  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  as closure of one single  $\mathrm{GL}$ -orbit:



**Definition 4.3.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a finite group. Let  $U_0, \dots, U_n$  be its simple representations, with  $U_0$  denoting the trivial representation. A Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi = (\varphi_{i,j})$  of  $\Gamma$  is **regular** if each component  $\varphi_{i,j}$  is an isomorphism of  $\Gamma$ -representations and each component  $\varphi_{0,i}$  and  $\varphi_{i,0}$  is the identity. The **Clebsch-Gordan variety**  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  of  $\Gamma$  is defined as  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma = \overline{\mathrm{GL} \varphi^{(0)}}$  where  $\varphi^{(0)}$  is any choice of regular Clebsch-Gordan datum. Its open dense subset  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \subseteq \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  is defined as the orbit  $\mathrm{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$ .

**Remark 4.4.** For every finite group  $\Gamma$  there exists a regular Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi^{(0)}$  and therefore a notion of Clebsch-Gordan variety  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$ . It seems likely but not a priori clear that the Clebsch-Gordan variety is also independent of the choice of  $\varphi^{(0)}$ . In the remainder of the paper, we work out the Clebsch-Gordan variety in the specific case where  $\Gamma$  is the  $A_n$  or  $D_n$  Kleinian group. In these cases, we choose the components  $\varphi_{i,j}^{(0)}$  to be specific isomorphisms that are easy to handle.

The maps  $\varphi_{i,j}$  contained in a Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi$  are not by definition required to satisfy coherence relations. However, we shall explain now that they do in fact satisfy coherence relations. The precise shape of these relations depends on the choice of  $\varphi^{(0)}$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** Let  $U_i, U_j, U_k$  be a choice of simple  $\Gamma$ -representations. Then there exists a unique linear map  $\gamma_{i,j,k}$  which renders the following diagram commutative for all  $\varphi \in \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 U_i \otimes U_j \otimes U_k & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{id} \otimes \varphi_{j,k}} & U_i \otimes \bigoplus_l U_l^{\oplus c_{jkl}} \\
 \downarrow \varphi_{i,j} \otimes \mathrm{id} & & \downarrow \bigoplus_l \varphi_{i,l}^{\oplus c_{jkl}} \\
 \bigoplus_{l'} U_{l'}^{\oplus c_{ijl'}} \otimes U_k & \xrightarrow{\bigoplus_{l'} \varphi_{l',k}^{\oplus c_{ijl'}}} & \bigoplus_{l'} \bigoplus_{m'} U_{m'}^{\oplus c_{ijl'} c_{l'km'}} \\
 & & \nearrow \exists! \gamma_{i,j,k} \sim
 \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We start by picking any element  $\varphi \in \mathrm{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$  and regarding the tensor product of vector spaces  $U_i \otimes U_j \otimes U_k$ . There are two different ways of applying the bilinear maps contained in  $\varphi$  here: either first on the  $U_i \otimes U_j$  component or first on the  $U_j \otimes U_k$  component. After applying on either side, there is only one possible way to apply the bilinear maps to the remaining terms. These two ways are captured in the diagram. The left/bottom path of the diagram is the trilinear map arising from first applying  $\varphi$  on the left tensor component. The top/right path of this diagram is the trilinear map arising from first applying  $\varphi$  on the right tensor component. The core observation is that both paths are isomorphisms of vector spaces since this is true for  $\varphi = \varphi^{(0)}$  and therefore for any  $\varphi \in \mathrm{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$ . Therefore there exists a unique isomorphism  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^\varphi$  which renders the diagram commutative.

Let us now explain that the isomorphism  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^\varphi$  does not depend on  $\varphi$ . Indeed, by assumption the bilinear maps  $\varphi_{i,j}^{(0)}$  are isomorphisms of  $\Gamma$ -representations. Therefore  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^{\varphi^{(0)}}$  is an isomorphism of  $\Gamma$ -representations as well. In particular, it is a direct sum of components which only run between identical simple representations:

$$\gamma_{i,j,k}^{\varphi^{(0)}} = \bigoplus_m \gamma_m, \quad \gamma_m = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{m,11} \mathrm{Id}_{U_m} & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \gamma_{m,d_m d_m} \mathrm{Id}_{U_m} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here  $d_m$  denotes the total number of appearances of  $U_m$  in the domain (equivalently codomain) of  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^{\varphi^{(0)}}$ , and the entries  $\gamma_{m,st}$  are scalars. For an element  $\varphi = g\varphi^{(0)}$  with  $g \in \mathrm{GL}$ , the map  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^\varphi$  is simply the conjugate of  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^{\varphi^{(0)}}$  in every individual matrix entry. Since the matrix entries  $\gamma_{m,st} \mathrm{Id}_{U_m}$  are just scalar multiples of the identity, we conclude that  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^\varphi = \gamma_{i,j,k}^{\varphi^{(0)}}$ . In conclusion, the map  $\gamma_{i,j,k}^\varphi$  is independent of  $\varphi$  as long as  $\varphi \in \mathrm{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$ , and we shall simply denote it by  $\gamma_{i,j,k}$ . We obtain a single coherence relation which holds equally for all  $\varphi \in \mathrm{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$  and by passing to limits, we conclude that the coherence relation in fact holds for every  $\varphi \in \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 4.6.** We shall memorize the coherence relation in the following shortcut notation: For  $u \in U_i$  and  $v \in U_j$  we have

$$\varphi(- \otimes \varphi(u \otimes v)) = \gamma_{\bullet,i,j}(\varphi(\varphi(- \otimes u) \otimes v)).$$

**Remark 4.7.** Similar to the coherence relations, for every pair of simples  $U_i, U_j$  and  $\varphi \in \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  we have symmetry relations

$$\varphi_{i,j} = \gamma_{i,j} \circ \varphi_{j,i} \circ \sigma.$$

Here  $\sigma : U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow U_j \otimes U_i$  denotes the flip, and the linear map  $\gamma_{i,j}$  is independent of  $\varphi$ .

### 4.3 Resolution of finite quotient singularities

In this section, we explain how to use Clebsch-Gordan varieties for resolutions of finite quotient singularities. Let  $V$  be a representation of  $\Gamma$  and regard the quotient singularity  $V // \Gamma$ . Decomposing  $V$  into simple representations as  $V = U_0^{d_0} \oplus \dots \oplus U_n^{d_n}$ , we obtain a natural action of the gauge group  $\mathrm{GL}$  on  $V$ . The gauge group also acts on the Clebsch-Gordan variety  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  and we obtain an action on the product variety:

$$\mathrm{GL} \curvearrowright X = \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times V.$$

Together with different choices of stability parameters  $\theta$  for  $\mathrm{GL}$ , this GIT package serves as candidate to provide both smooth and stacky resolutions of  $V // \Gamma$ . In particular, if  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$  is a Kleinian singularity, we regard  $V = \mathbb{C}^2$  as natural  $\Gamma$ -representation and define  $X = \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ .

## 4.4 Resolution of Kleinian singularities

In this section, we study the case of Kleinian singularities  $\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma$ . The main result reads as follows.

**Theorem 4.8.** Let  $\Gamma$  be any Kleinian group, and let  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  be a certain choice of stability parameters. Then we have

$$[(\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1} / \mathrm{GL}] \cong [\mathbb{C}^2 / \Gamma] \quad \text{and} \quad [(\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2} / \mathrm{GL}] \cong \widetilde{\mathbb{C}^2 // \Gamma}.$$

Even though our variety  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  is different from the variety  $Z$  of Abdelgadir and Segal, we can adapt the six-stage framework of proof. For instance, we succeed in defining a comparison map  $R : \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  for all Kleinian singularities. Another important tool in our construction is the projection map  $\pi : \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]$  along the inclusion  $\{\varphi^{(0)}\} \times \mathbb{C}^2 \subseteq \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ .

**Stage Plan 4.9.** The proof will proceed in the following six stages:

1. Construct the varieties  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma^\circ$ ,  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  and the parameters  $\theta_1, \theta_2$ .
2. Construct the GL-equivariant map  $R : \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ .
3. Verify  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\mathrm{GL}} \xrightarrow{R^*} \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]^{\mathrm{GL}} \xrightarrow{\pi} \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\mathrm{Stab}_{\mathrm{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$ .
4. Verify  $(\mathrm{Stab}_{\mathrm{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)}) \curvearrowright \mathbb{C}^2) \cong (\Gamma \curvearrowright \mathbb{C}^2)$ .
5. Verify  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma^{\theta_1} = \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma^\circ$  and  $(\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1} = \mathrm{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2$ .
6. Verify  $R : (\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2}$ .

The first, second, and part of the third, fourth, fifth and sixth stage can be proved for all ADE types simultaneously. The remaining parts are detailed separately for the  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  case in Appendix A and B. Even though these remaining parts are only checked in the  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  cases, we claim the main result for all Kleinian singularities.

## 4.5 Proof in the Kleinian case

In this section, we prove the six stages of Stage Plan 4.9. Several technical parts are not proven here, but are deferred to appendices where they are checked in the  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  case. The reader finds an enumeration of these technical statements at the beginning of Appendix A. Rather than providing intuitive insight, the aim of this section is to provide general proofs that work for all Kleinian groups. We highly recommend that the interested reader consult Appendix A and B where all materials are illustrated in a more explicit fashion.

**Stage 1: Construction of the Clebsch-Gordan variety** The Clebsch-Gordan variety  $\mathrm{CG}_\Gamma$  is defined for any finite group and therefore also for the Kleinian group  $\Gamma$ . We choose the stability parameters  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  as follows:

$$\theta_1 = (-\dim U_i)_{i=0, \dots, n}, \quad \theta_2 = (+1, \dots, +1).$$

**Stage 2: Construction of the map  $R$**  It is our task to construct the GL-equivariant map  $R : \mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ . Here  $(Q, \alpha)$  is the Kleinian quiver setting and  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  denotes the affine variety whose points are the representations of  $(Q, \alpha)$  which satisfy the preprojective relations. Close inspection of the construction of the map  $R$  defined by Abdelgadir and Segal provides us with the cue that  $R(\varphi, x)$  should be defined by inserting the element  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$  into one slot of the Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi$ . Recall that the number of arrows from  $i$  to  $j$  in the Kleinian double quiver is equal to the dimension  $\dim_\Gamma(U_i \otimes \mathbb{C}^2, U_j)$ . Therefore for every  $i = 0, \dots, n$ , combining the Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi$  and the element  $x$  we obtain a map  $\varphi_{i, \bullet}(- \otimes x) : U_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_k U_k^{|\alpha: i \rightarrow j|}$ . This procedure works for all Kleinian groups. It is implemented in detail in section A.2 and B.2. We shall collect the definition as follows:

**Definition 4.10.** The map  $R : \mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is defined as

$$R(\varphi, x) = \varphi(- \otimes x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha).$$

**Proposition 4.11.** The map  $R$  is well-defined and GL-equivariant.

*Proof.* Well-definedness comes down to checking that the representation  $R(\varphi, x)$  satisfies the preprojective relations. We verify this in Lemma A.2 and B.2. It is however easy to see that the map  $R$  is GL-equivariant: Let  $U_i$  be an irreducible representation and  $u \in U_i$ . Then we have

$$(R(g\varphi, gx))(u) = (g\varphi)(u \otimes gx) = g(\varphi(g^{-1}u \otimes x)) = g(R(\varphi, x)(g^{-1}u)) = (gR(\varphi, x))(u).$$

This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Stage 3: Verification that  $R^*$  is an isomorphism of invariants** It is our task to examine the pullback map  $R^* : \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]$ . We denote by  $\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)}) \subseteq \text{GL}$  the stabilizer group of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  under the GL-action. Recall that the group GL acts on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . Therefore also the stabilizer group acts on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  and we have a notion of invariant ring  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$ . A substantial trick in our investigations is the projection map  $\pi : \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]$  along the inclusion  $\{\varphi^{(0)}\} \times \mathbb{C}^2 \subseteq \mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . The notation  $\pi(f)$  applies regardless of whether  $f$  is an invariant function, a semiinvariant function, or otherwise. We are now ready to prove stage 3.

**Proposition 4.12.** The map  $R^*$  provides an isomorphism between the  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}}$  and  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]^{\text{GL}}$ . The map  $\pi$  provides an isomorphism between  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]^{\text{GL}}$  and  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$ . We thus have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}} & \xrightarrow{\quad R^* \quad} & \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]^{\text{GL}} \\ & \searrow \sim \pi \circ R^* & \swarrow \sim \pi \\ & & \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}. \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We divide the proof into several steps. The first step is to prove that  $R^*$  sends GL-invariants to GL-invariants. The second step is to prove that  $\pi$  sends GL-invariants to  $\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})$ -invariants. The third part is to prove that  $\pi$  is injective on GL-invariants. The fourth step is to prove that  $R^* \circ \pi : \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$  is an isomorphism. Finally, we draw the conclusion that both factors in this composition are isomorphisms.

For the first step, we observe that  $R^*$  sends GL-invariant functions to GL-invariant functions since  $R$  itself is GL-equivariant. For the second step, we check that if  $f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{C}\mathbb{G}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]$  is

GL-invariant, then  $\pi(f)$  is  $\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})$ -invariant. Indeed, pick  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$  and  $\sigma \in \text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})$ . Then we have

$$\pi(f)(\sigma x) = f(\varphi^{(0)}, \sigma x) = f(\sigma \varphi^{(0)}, \sigma x) = f(\varphi^{(0)}, x) = \pi(f)(x).$$

For the third step, we observe that a GL-invariant function is already determined by its value on  $\{\varphi^{(0)}\} \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . Indeed, let  $f, f'$  be two GL-invariant functions on  $\text{CG}_{\Gamma} \times \mathbb{C}^2$  with  $\pi(f) = \pi(f')$ , then

$$f(g\varphi^{(0)}, x) = \pi(f)(g^{-1}x) = \pi(f')(g^{-1}x) = f'(g\varphi^{(0)}, x).$$

For the fourth step, we invoke the checks done in the  $A_n$  and  $D_n$  cases in Lemma A.3 and B.3. Finally, we conclude that  $\pi : \mathbb{C}[\text{CG}_{\Gamma} \times \mathbb{C}^2]^{\text{GL}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$  is both injective and surjective, thus the same holds for  $R^*$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Stage 4: Identification of the stabilizer of  $\varphi^{(0)}$**  It is our task to prove that the stabilizer of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  under the GL-action is isomorphic to  $\Gamma$  and that  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with the action of the stabilizer is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^2$  with the natural action of  $\Gamma \subseteq \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ . Tannaka theory predicts that  $\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)}) \cong \Gamma$  under the assumption that we have correctly turned Tannakian functors into algebraic data. We explain this stage in more detail in section A.4 and B.4.

**Stage 5: Identification of the  $\theta_1$ -semistable locus** It is our task to identify the  $\theta_1$ -semistable locus on  $\text{CG}_{\Gamma} \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . In fact, the reason behind our specific choice of  $\theta_1$  is that there is a very useful  $|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{CG}_{\Gamma}$ , given essentially by multiplying up the determinants of all  $\varphi$  entries:

**Lemma 4.13.** The following function  $f_0 : \text{CG}_{\Gamma} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is a  $|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant. We have  $f_0(\varphi^{(0)}) \neq 0$ . Moreover for  $k \geq 1$ , any  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant is a scalar multiple of  $f_0^k$ .

$$f_0(\varphi) = \prod_{i,j=0}^n \det(\varphi_{i,j})^{\dim U_i \dim U_j}.$$

*Proof.* We shall prove all three parts of the claim after each other. We start with the first part. Its proof comes down to counting the number of appearances of  $\det(g_i)$  for  $i = 0, \dots, n$  in the expanded version of the term  $f_0(g\varphi)$ . We shall present a simple trick to count this number. We start by regarding the regular representation  $\mathbb{C}\Gamma$ . Its character has the property that  $\chi_{\mathbb{C}\Gamma}(1) = |\Gamma|$  and  $\chi_{\mathbb{C}\Gamma}(g) = 0$  for  $g \neq 1$ , and it decomposes as  $\mathbb{C}\Gamma \cong \bigoplus_i U_i^{\dim U_i}$ . The tensor product's character  $\chi_{\mathbb{C}\Gamma \otimes \mathbb{C}\Gamma}$  has the property that  $\chi_{\mathbb{C}\Gamma \otimes \mathbb{C}\Gamma}(1) = |\Gamma|^2$  and  $\chi_{\mathbb{C}\Gamma \otimes \mathbb{C}\Gamma}(g) = 0$  for  $g \neq 1$ , thus decomposes as  $\mathbb{C}\Gamma \otimes \mathbb{C}\Gamma \cong (\mathbb{C}\Gamma)^{\oplus |\Gamma|}$ . The value  $f_0(\varphi)$  is simply the determinant of the map  $\mathbb{C}\Gamma \otimes \mathbb{C}\Gamma \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}\Gamma)^{\oplus |\Gamma|}$  given by applying summing up all components of  $\varphi$  with multiplicities. Recall the rule  $\det(A \otimes B) = \det(A)^b \det(B)^a$  for square matrices  $A, B$  of dimension  $a \times a$  and  $b \times b$  respectively. We thus determine the total weight of  $\det(g_i)$  in expanding  $f_0(g\varphi)$  to be

$$|\Gamma| \dim U_i - 2 \sum_{j \neq i} \dim U_i \dim U_j^2 - 2 \dim U_i^3 = -|\Gamma| \dim U_i = |\Gamma|(\theta_1)_i.$$

This shows that  $f_0$  is a  $|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant as desired.

The second part of the claim easy. All components of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  are linear isomorphisms and therefore  $f_0(\varphi^{(0)}) \neq 0$  and thus  $f_0(g\varphi^{(0)}) = \theta_1(g)^{|\Gamma|} f_0(\varphi^{(0)}) \neq 0$  for any  $g \in \text{GL}$ .

For the third part of the claim, let  $f$  be another nonzero  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant. Then it necessarily takes nonzero value on  $\varphi^{(0)}$  and we conclude that  $f = \lambda f_0$  holds on  $\text{GL}\varphi^{(0)}$ , where

$\lambda := f(\varphi^{(0)})/f_0(\varphi^{(0)})$ . By passing to limits we conclude that  $f = \lambda f_0$  on all of  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$ . This shows that  $f_0$  is the only  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  up to scalar multiplication, finishing the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.14.** Any  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  with  $k \geq 1$  is the product of  $f_0^k$  and an invariant function.

*Proof.* We start by writing  $f_0 : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  for the  $|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant obtained from  $f_0 : \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  by simply extending it independent of the  $\mathbb{C}^2$  factor. Now let  $f : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be any  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant with  $k \geq 1$ . Then for  $\sigma \in \text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})$  and  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$  we deduce

$$\pi(f)(\sigma x) = f(\varphi^{(0)}, \sigma x) = \theta_1(\sigma)^{|\Gamma|} f(\varphi^{(0)}, x) = \pi(f)(x).$$

We have used that  $\theta_1$  is a group character on  $\Gamma$  and hence  $\theta_1(\sigma)^{|\Gamma|} = 1$ . We conclude that  $\pi(f)$  is  $\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})$ -invariant. By Proposition 4.12, there exists a GL-invariant function  $g : \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\pi(R^*g) = \pi(f)$ . Define  $\lambda = 1/f_0(\varphi^{(0)}, x)$ , noting that this number is independent on  $x$ . We claim  $f = \lambda^k f_0^k R^*g$ . Indeed, we have  $f(\varphi^{(0)}, x) = \pi(f)(x) = (R^*g)(\varphi^{(0)}, x)$ , thus  $f = \lambda^k f_0^k R^*g$  holds on  $\varphi^{(0)} \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . Since both sides are  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariants, they agree on all of  $\text{GL} \varphi^{(0)} \times \mathbb{C}^2$  and therefore on all of  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . We conclude that any  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  can be written as the product of  $f_0^k$  and a GL-invariant function.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.15.** We have  $\text{CG}_\Gamma^{\theta_1} = \text{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$  and  $(\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1} = \text{GL} \varphi^{(0)} \times \mathbb{C}^2$ .

*Proof.* For the inclusions  $\text{GL} \varphi^{(0)} \subseteq \text{CG}_\Gamma^{\theta_1}$  and  $\text{GL} \varphi^{(0)} \times \mathbb{C}^2 \subseteq (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1}$ , it suffices to recall that  $f_0(\varphi^{(0)}) \neq 0$ . We treat both reverse inclusions simultaneously. Let  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma^{\theta_1}$  or  $(\varphi, x) \in (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_1}$ , then there is a  $k|\Gamma|\theta_1$ -semiinvariant for some  $k \geq 1$  which does not vanish on  $\varphi$  or  $(\varphi, x)$ . By Lemma 4.13 or 4.14 it follows that  $f_0(\varphi) \neq 0$ . It is checked in Lemma A.4 and B.4 that this implies  $\varphi \in \text{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Stage 6: Identification of the  $\theta_2$ -semistable locus** It is our task to identify the  $\theta_2$ -semistable locus of  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . More precisely, we need to prove that  $R$  is an isomorphism when restricted to the sets of  $\theta_2$ -semistable points. We note that the proof does not depend on the precise value of  $\theta_2$ , only on the positivity of all entries.

**Lemma 4.16.** If  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable, then  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable.

*Proof.* For the  $A_n$  and  $D_4$  cases, this is checked in Lemma A.5 and B.6.  $\square$

We shall now prove that  $R$  actually reaches all  $\theta_2$ -semistable representations. Recall that by definition the preimage of a  $\theta_2$ -semistable is automatically  $\theta_2$ -semistable. It is therefore entirely natural to restrict the domain of  $R$  to  $\theta_2$ -semistables as well.

**Lemma 4.17.** The map  $R : (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2}$  is surjective.

*Proof.* The strategy is to regard two types of representations. We start by regarding the natural projection map  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) //_{\theta_2} \text{GL} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}$ . The quotient  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}$  is simply the Kleinian singularity and it consists of the singular zero point and the nonsingular points. The points in  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) //_{\theta_2} \text{GL}$  which project to the zero point are known as the nullcone. The nullcone is known to consist [5] of  $n$ -many one-parameter families. We prove in Lemma A.6 and B.7 that the representations in these  $n$ -many one-parameter families lie in the image of  $R$ . The remainder of the present proof is dedicated to those  $\theta_2$ -semistable representations which do not lie in the nullcone.

Let  $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2}$  be a representation which does not lie in the nullcone. In other words, one of the three GL-invariants is nonzero on  $\rho$ . Then since  $R$  induces an isomorphism  $(\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2) // \text{GL} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}$ , we can pick an element  $p \in (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2) // \text{GL}$  with the same invariants. Since the map  $(\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2} \rightarrow (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2) // \text{GL}$  is surjective, we can lift  $p$  to a  $\theta_2$ -semistable element  $(\varphi, x) \in (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2}$  with the same invariants. Then  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2}$  has the same invariants as  $\rho$ , and therefore both project to the same element of  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}$ . Since  $\rho$  does not lie in the nullcone, the projected element is nonzero, and since  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2} // \text{GL} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) // \text{GL}$  is bijective away from the zero point, we conclude that  $R(\varphi, x)$  and  $\rho$  are the same point in  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2} // \text{GL}$  and therefore only differ by gauge. This shows that  $\rho$  lies in the image of  $R$  and finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.18.** The map  $R : (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2}$  is injective.

*Proof.* Let  $(\varphi, x) \in (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2}$  and regard the simple representations  $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_n$  of  $\Gamma$ . It is our goal to show that  $(\varphi, x)$  can be reconstructed from  $R(\varphi, x)$ . We start with the observation that  $x$  is easily reconstructed from  $R(\varphi, x)$ , since  $\varphi(1 \otimes x) = x$  for the unit element  $1 \in U_0$  in the trivial representation. Next, we shall explain how to reconstruct  $\varphi$ .

Let us call a vector  $u \in U_i$  “recognized” if  $\varphi(- \otimes u)$  can be reconstructed from  $R(\varphi, x)$ . By definition, the unit  $1 \in U_0$  is recognized, as the map  $\varphi(- \otimes 1)$  is the identity. Another key observation is that every individual summand of  $x$  in terms of the decomposition into simples  $\mathbb{C}^2 = \oplus U_i^{k_i}$  is recognized. In the  $A_n$  case, the vector  $x \in U_1 \oplus U_{n-1}$  has two components, and both are recognized since we can read off  $\varphi(- \otimes x_1)$  and  $\varphi(- \otimes x_n)$  directly from the representation  $R(\varphi, x)$ . In the  $D_n$  and  $E_n$  cases, the vector  $x$  lies in one simple representation and by definition  $\varphi(- \otimes x)$  can be reconstructed from  $R(\varphi, x)$ , therefore  $x$  is recognized as well.

We claim that if  $u \in U_i$  and  $v \in U_j$  are recognized, then also all individual components of  $\varphi(u \otimes v)$  are recognized. Indeed, we have the equality  $\varphi(- \otimes \varphi(u \otimes v)) = \gamma_{\bullet, i, j}(\varphi(\varphi(- \otimes u) \otimes v))$ . Since  $u$  and  $v$  are recognized, the right-hand side can be reconstructed from  $R(\varphi, x)$ . Both left-hand and right-hand side are, behind the scenes, maps from  $U = U_0 \oplus U_1 \oplus \dots \oplus U_n$  to a direct sum of some  $U_k$ 's. If  $\varphi(u \otimes v)$  consists of one single  $U_k$  component, then we are done. Otherwise, we shall argue that we can still read off  $\varphi(- \otimes w)$  for every component  $w$  of  $\varphi(u \otimes v)$ . In fact, this is trivial since by definition the equality holds in a higher-dimensional space which keeps direct sum inputs separated from each other. This way, we conclude that  $\varphi(- \otimes w)$  is recognized for every component  $w$  of  $\varphi(u \otimes v)$ .

Finally, let us prove that for  $i = 0, \dots, n$  every vector  $u \in U_i$  is recognized. We start by recalling that the representation  $R(\varphi, x)$  is generated by  $1 \in U_0$ . Thus the space  $U_i$  is spanned by the transports of the vector  $1 \in U_0$  along some set  $P$  of paths in  $\overline{Q}$ . By the earlier parts of this proof, we conclude inductively that any vector appearing in such a transport is recognized. Finally we have obtained a generating set for the vector space  $U_i$  that consists of recognized vectors. We conclude that any vector  $u \in U_i$  is recognized as well. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## A The $A_n$ case

In this section, we treat the  $A_n$  case in detail. We construct the variety  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$ , the stability parameters  $\theta_1, \theta_2$  and the map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ , where  $(Q, \alpha)$  is the Kleinian  $A_n$  quiver. We prove the remaining technical parts of Stage Plan 4.9. This concerns precisely the following statements:

- The representation  $R(\varphi, x)$  satisfies the preprojective relations.
- The map  $\pi \circ R^* : \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$  is an isomorphism.

- We have  $(\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)}) \curvearrowright \mathbb{C}^2) \cong (\Gamma \curvearrowright \mathbb{C}^2)$ .
- If  $f_0(\varphi) \neq 0$ , then  $\varphi \in \text{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$ .
- The map  $R$  sends  $\theta_2$ -semistables to  $\theta_2$ -semistables.
- The  $\theta_2$ -semistables in the nullcone lies in the image of  $R$ .

### A.1 Stage 1: Construction of the Clebsch-Gordan variety

The Kleinian group of  $A_n$  is  $\Gamma = C_{n+1}$ , the cyclic group of order  $n+1$ . The group lies embedded into  $\text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  as generated by a specific matrix  $\sigma \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ :

$$\Gamma = C_{n+1} \cong \left\langle \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i/(n+1)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i/(n+1)} \end{pmatrix} \right\rangle \subseteq \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}).$$

We enumerate the irreducible representations of  $\Gamma$  by  $U_0, U_1, \dots, U_n$ , where  $U_0$  is the trivial representation and the generator  $\sigma$  acts on  $U_k$  as  $e^{2\pi i k/(n+1)}$ :

Representation	Action of $\sigma$
$U_k$	$e^{2\pi i k/(n+1)}$

The  $\Gamma$ -representation  $\mathbb{C}^2$  itself is isomorphic to  $U_1 \oplus U_n$ . The gauge group is the product of  $n$  general multiplicative groups:

$$\text{GL} = \mathbb{C}_{U_1}^* \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}_{U_n}^*,$$

A Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi$  for this group consists of scalars  $\varphi_{i,j} \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ , representing maps  $U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow U_{i+j}$ :

$$\varphi = (\varphi_{i,j})_{0 \leq i, j \leq n}, \quad \varphi_{i,j} : U_i \otimes U_j \rightarrow U_{i+j}.$$

Any sums of indices are calculated modulo  $n+1$ . The gauge group  $\text{GL}$  acts on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  by  $(g\varphi)_{ij} = g_{i+j} \varphi_{i,j} g_i^{-1} g_j^{-1}$ . The specific datum  $\varphi^{(0)}$  is given by the following choice:

$$\varphi_{i,j}^{(0)} = 1, \quad \text{for all } i, j.$$

We define  $\text{CG}_\Gamma := \overline{\text{GL} \varphi^{(0)}}$ . It is an affine variety of geometric dimension  $n+1$ . Any  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  satisfies the coherence and symmetry relations

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{i+j,k} \varphi_{i,j} &= \varphi_{i,j+k} \varphi_{j,k}, & 0 \leq i, j, k \leq n, \\ \varphi_{i,j} &= \varphi_{j,i}, & 0 \leq i, j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$


Indeed, the element  $\varphi = \varphi^{(0)}$  satisfies these relations and in consequence any  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  satisfies these relations as well. We make the following choice of stability parameters:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 &= (-1, \dots, -1) \in \mathbb{Z}^n, \\ \theta_2 &= (+1, \dots, +1) \in \mathbb{Z}^n. \end{aligned}$$


**Example A.1.** Let us examine the Clebsch-Gordan variety for the case of  $n = 1, 2$ . Then a point in  $\text{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$  is simply determined by the scalar  $\varphi_{1,1}$ . The orbit of the Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi^{(0)}$  associated with the value  $\varphi_{1,1} \in \mathbb{C}$  is isomorphic to  $\mathbb{C}^* \subseteq \mathbb{C}$  and the orbit closure  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  is simply  $\mathbb{C}$ . In case  $n = 2$ , a Clebsch-Gordan datum is given by scalars  $\varphi_{1,1}, \varphi_{1,2}, \varphi_{2,2} \in \mathbb{C}$  satisfying the condition  $\varphi_{2,2} \varphi_{1,1} = \varphi_{1,2}$ , therefore  $\varphi_{1,1}$  and  $\varphi_{2,2}$  suffice to determine a datum. In this complex plane, the orbit of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  is  $\mathbb{C}^* \times \mathbb{C}^* \subseteq \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$  and the orbit closure is the entire complex plane. The situation is more complicated for  $n \geq 3$ .

## A.2 Stage 2: Construction of the map $R$

We have depicted the Kleinian double quiver  $(\bar{Q}, \alpha)$  with arrows  $A_i, A_i^*$  in Figure 2.1a. For  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  we define the representation  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  following the recipe  $R(\varphi, x) = \varphi(- \otimes x)$ . More precisely, write  $x = (x_1, x_n)$  and then define the representation by sending  $A_i \mapsto \varphi_{i-1,1}x_1$  and  $A_i^* \mapsto \varphi_{i,n}x_n$ :



In particular, the specific representation  $R(\varphi^{(0)}, x)$  takes the following shape:



**Lemma A.2.** For any  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ , the representation  $R(\varphi, x)$  satisfies the preprojective conditions.

*Proof.* We start with the observation that  $R(\varphi, x)$  is in every case a quiver representation and  $R$  defines a GL-equivariant map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\bar{Q}, \alpha)$  to the representations of the Kleinian double quiver. Next, we observe due to the choice  $\varphi_{i,j}^{(0)} = 1$ , the specific representation  $R(\varphi^{(0)}, x)$  satisfies the preprojective relations  $A_i A_i^* - A_{i+1}^* A_{i+1} = 0$ . This implies that  $R(g\varphi^{(0)}, g(g^{-1}x)) = gR(\varphi^{(0)}, g^{-1}x)$  also satisfies the preprojective relations for any  $g \in \text{GL}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . By a standard limit argument, the preprojective conditions then also hold for any  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . We conclude that  $R$  becomes a GL-equivariant map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## A.3 Stage 3: Verification that $R^*$ is an isomorphism of invariants

It is our task to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma A.3.** The map  $\pi \circ R^* : \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]^{\text{GL}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$  is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* The trick is to regard the three generating elements of the domain and codomain. In the codomain we pick the three elements

$$A' = X^{n+1}, \quad B' = Y^{n+1}, \quad C' = XY.$$

In the domain we pick the three elements

$$A = A_{n+1} \dots A_1, \quad B = A_1^* \dots A_{n+1}^*, \quad C = A_1 A_1^*.$$

Evidently, we have  $\pi(R^*(A)) = A'$  and  $\pi(R^*(B)) = B'$  and  $\pi(R^*(C)) = C'$ . In both rings, the only relation satisfied by the three generators is  $A'B' - C'^{n+1} = 0$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

#### A.4 Stage 4: Identification of the stabilizer of $\varphi^{(0)}$

We shall examine the stabilizer of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  under the GL-action. Let  $g = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in \text{GL}$  and assume  $g\varphi^{(0)} = \varphi^{(0)}$ . Then  $g_{i+j} = g_i g_j$  for any  $i, j$ . We immediately see that  $g_1^{n+1} = 1$  and  $g_i = g_1^i$ . We immediately conclude that the stabilizer group of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  under the GL-action is the cyclic group of order  $n+1$  generated by the element  $\sigma \in \text{GL}$  given by  $\sigma_j = e^{2\pi i j / (n+1)}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)}) &= \langle \sigma \rangle \subseteq \text{GL}, \\ \sigma &= (e^{2\pi i j / (n+1)})_j. \end{aligned}$$

The element  $\sigma$  acts on  $\mathbb{C}^2 = U_1 \oplus U_n$  by  $\sigma(x_1, x_n) = (e^{2\pi i / (n+1)} x_1, e^{-2\pi i / (n+1)} x_n)$ . This provides an identification

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)}) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma, \\ \sigma &\mapsto \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i / (n+1)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-2\pi i / (n+1)} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Under this identification, the action of  $\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  agrees with the action of  $\Gamma$  on  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . This finishes stage 4.

#### A.5 Stage 5: Identification of the $\theta_1$ -semistable locus

It is our task to prove Lemma A.4. We start by formulating the  $(n+1)\theta_1$ -semiinvariant  $f_0 : \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  explicitly:


$$f_0(\varphi) = \prod_{i,j=0}^n \varphi_{i,j}.$$

**Lemma A.4.** Let  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$ . If  $f_0(\varphi) \neq 0$ , then  $\varphi \in \text{GL}\varphi^{(0)}$ .


*Proof.* By assumption we have  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  for all  $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ . By gauging  $\varphi$ , we can achieve  $\varphi_{1,i} = 1$  for all  $i$ . Since  $\varphi$  lies in  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$ , it satisfies the coherence and symmetry relations, and in particular  $\varphi_{i+1,j}\varphi_{1,i} = \varphi_{1,i+j}\varphi_{i,j}$  for all  $0 \leq i, j \leq n$ . We inductively deduce that  $\varphi_{i,j} = 1$  for all  $0 \leq i, j \leq n$  and conclude that  $\varphi$  lies in the orbit  $\text{GL}\varphi^{(0)}$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

#### A.6 Stage 6: Identification of the $\theta_2$ -semistable locus

We are now ready to investigate the  $\theta_2$ -semistable locus of  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . Our strategy is to utilize the GL-equivariant map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ . The standard argument of semiinvariants shows that if  $R(\varphi, x)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable, then  $(\varphi, x)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable as well. As we shall prove, the converse statement is also true.



(a) This figure depicts two sample representations and their exponents  $\alpha_i$  in the  $x_n = 0$  case.



(b) This figure depicts two sample representations and their exponents  $\alpha_i$  in the  $x_1, x_n \neq 0$  case.

Figure A.1: This figure visually depicts the rule for determining the exponents  $\alpha_i$  used in the proof of Lemma A.5. Part (a) concerns the case  $x_n = 0$  and part (b) concerns the case  $x_1, x_n \neq 0$ . Each of the four graphics qualitatively depicts a representation of the  $A_n$  quiver with  $n = 15$ . The solid arrows are meant to depict a nonzero arrow value, and all missing arrows are meant to depict the zero arrow value. The special vertex of the quiver is highlighted and positioned in the top of the images. The number at the vertex  $i$  is the exponent  $\alpha_i$  which we associate with that vertex. The representations on the left have more zero arrows than the representations on the right, but both representations in each row have the same exponents  $\alpha_i$ .

**Lemma A.5.** Let  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  be  $\theta_2$ -semistable. Then  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable.

*Proof.* Let us first sketch the structure of the proof. The basic setup is to prove the statement by contraposition. Therefore we shall assume that  $R(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable, and shall deduce that  $(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable. We prove that  $(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable by applying Hilbert-Mumford criterion. This entails that we construct an explicit one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_n}) \subseteq \text{GL}$  which pairs positively with  $\theta_2$  and for which  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists within  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . Since  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  is a closed subset of an affine space, it suffices to simply show that  $g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  converges within the affine space. Our specific construction of the exponents  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  depends on several factors, and we shall proceed by case distinction. We write  $x = (x_1, x_n) \in U_1 \oplus U_n = \mathbb{C}^2$ .

- Consider the case that  $x_n = 0$ . We define integers

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= 0, \\ \alpha_i &= \max\{j \mid 1 \leq j \leq i-1 \text{ and } \varphi_{j,1} = 0\} + 1, \quad i = 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

If the set over which the maximum is taken is empty, then we have  $\varphi_{j,1} \neq 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq i-1$  and we define  $\alpha_i = 1$ . For convenience purposes, we may write  $\alpha_0 = 0$ . To restate the definition in other words, the value  $\alpha_i$  is simply the number smaller than  $i$  such that  $\varphi_{\alpha_i-1,1} = 0$  and  $\varphi_{\alpha_i,1}, \dots, \varphi_{i-1,1} \neq 0$ . Let us list a few important properties of the sequence  $(\alpha_i)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\leq \alpha_i \leq i, \\ \alpha_i &\leq \alpha_{i+1}, \\ \alpha_i \leq i-1 &\implies \alpha_i = \alpha_{i-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We choose the one-parameter subgroup as  $g(t) = (t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_n})$ . Since  $R(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable, at least one of the values  $\varphi_{1,1}, \dots, \varphi_{1,n-1}$  vanishes and therefore we have  $1 \leq \alpha_n$ . Therefore the group  $g(t)$  pairs positively with  $\theta_2$ . The limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}x$  exists, since we assumed  $x_n = 0$  and we have  $\alpha_1 = 1$ . We now claim that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}\varphi$  exists.

In an inductive fashion ranging over the pairs  $(i, j)$  with  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  we shall prove that  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  implies  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ . Recall that in the notation  $\alpha_{i+j}$  the index is taken modulo  $n+1$ , and within this convention  $\alpha_0$  shall be interpreted as zero.

Regard the case  $i+j \geq n+1$ . Then  $i+j-(n+1) \leq i$  and thus  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i$ .

Regard the case  $i+j < n$  and  $\alpha_i = i$  and  $\alpha_j = j$ . Then  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq i+j = \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ , which finishes the case.

Regard the case  $i+j < n$  and  $\alpha_{i+j} = i+j$ . The coherence relations yield  $\varphi_{i,j}\varphi_{1,j-1} = \varphi_{i,j-1}\varphi_{1,i+j-1}$ . Since  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  by assumption and  $\varphi_{1,i+j-1} = 0$  by assumption that  $\alpha_{i+j} = i+j$ , we conclude  $\varphi_{1,j-1} = 0$ . This proves  $\alpha_j = j$ . Similarly we conclude  $\alpha_i = i$ . Finally, we have  $\alpha_{i+j} = \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ , which finishes the case.

Regard the case  $i+j < n$  and  $\alpha_j < j$  and  $\alpha_{i+j} < i+j$ . We conclude  $i \geq 2$ . By induction we can assume that we have already proven the statement for the pair  $(i-1, j)$ . Note that  $\varphi_{1,j-1}\varphi_{i,j} = \varphi_{i,j-1}\varphi_{1,i+j-1}$ . Since  $\varphi_{1,j-1} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{1,i+j-1} \neq 0$ , we deduce  $\varphi_{i,j-1} \neq 0$ . By induction we can assume that we have already proven the statement for the pair  $(i, j-1)$ . Therefore we have  $\alpha_{i+j-1} \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_{j-1}$ . Since  $\alpha_i \leq i-1$  and  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq i+j-1$ , we deduce that  $\alpha_{i+j-1} = \alpha_{i+j}$  and  $\alpha_{j-1} = \alpha_j$ , which finishes the case.

Regard the case  $i + j < n$  and  $\alpha_i < i$  and  $\alpha_{i+j} < i + j$ . This case is dealt with in a manner analogous to the case  $\alpha_j \leq j - 1$ .

We have now exhausted all cases and conclude that  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  implies  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ .

- Consider the case that  $x_1 = 0$ . This case is dealt with in an analogous fashion.
- Consider the case that  $x_1 \neq 0$  and  $x_n \neq 0$ . We shall define the numbers  $\alpha_i$  and pick  $g(t) = (t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_n})$ . For  $i = 1, \dots, n$  define  $\alpha_i$  as

$$\alpha_i = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \varphi_{1,1}, \dots, \varphi_{i-1,1} \neq 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } \varphi_{i+1,n}, \dots, \varphi_{n,n} \neq 0, \\ \max\{j \mid 1 \leq j \leq i-1 \text{ and } \varphi_{j,1} = 0\} + 1, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

We shall say that  $\alpha_i$  is defined by the first, second or third alternative, depending on which of the three rules is used. Let us note that in the third alternative, the set over which the maximum is taken is indeed nonempty since the condition of the first alternative does not hold. We observe that all  $\alpha_i$  are non-negative and at least one of them is nonzero. Indeed, since  $R(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable and  $x_1, x_n \neq 0$ , there exists an index  $1 \leq j \leq n$  such that one of  $\varphi_{1,1}, \dots, \varphi_{j-1,1}$  is zero or one of  $\varphi_{n,n}, \dots, \varphi_{j+1,n}$  is zero. Finally, note that  $0 \leq \alpha_i \leq i$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We shall now prove that for any pair  $(i, j)$  with  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$  we have that  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  implies  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ .

Regard the case that  $i + j \leq n$  and  $\alpha_i$  or  $\alpha_j$  falls under the second alternative. Then we want to show  $\alpha_{i+j} = 0$ . Indeed, we have  $i + j + 1 \geq i + 1$  and  $i + j + 1 \geq j + 1$ , thus  $\varphi_{n,n}, \dots, \varphi_{i+j+1,n} \neq 0$ , thus  $\alpha_{i+j} = 0$ . This finishes the case.

Regard the case that  $i + j \leq n$  and  $\alpha_j < j$ , and both  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_j$  individually fall under the first or third alternatives. We show by induction over  $1 \leq t \leq j - \alpha_j$  that  $\varphi_{i+j-t,1} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{i,j-t} \neq 0$ . The trick is to use the coherence relation  $\varphi_{i+j-t,1} \varphi_{i,j-t} = \varphi_{j-t,1} \varphi_{i,j-(t-1)}$ . In case  $t = 1$ , we have  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  and by definition of  $\alpha_j$  and  $\alpha_j < j$  we have  $\varphi_{j-1,1} \neq 0$ , which proves the base case  $t = 1$ . For any other  $t$ , by definition of  $\alpha_j$  and  $t \leq j - \alpha_j$  we have  $\varphi_{j-t,1} \neq 0$  and by induction hypothesis we have  $\varphi_{i,j-(t-1)} \neq 0$ . Applying the coherence relation finishes the induction step.

We conclude  $\varphi_{i+j-1,1}, \dots, \varphi_{i+j-(j-\alpha_j),1} = \varphi_{i+\alpha_j,1} \neq 0$ , and also  $\varphi_{i,\alpha_j} \neq 0$ . We want to prove  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ . In case  $\alpha_i = i$ , we obtain  $\varphi_{i+j-1,1}, \dots, \varphi_{\alpha_i+\alpha_j,1} \neq 0$  and thus  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$  as desired. In case  $\alpha_i < i$ , then since  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_j$  fall under the first or third alternative, we apply what we have just proven to  $\varphi_{\alpha_j,i} \neq 0$ . We then obtain  $\varphi_{i+\alpha_j-1,1}, \dots, \varphi_{i+\alpha_j-(i-\alpha_i),1} = \varphi_{\alpha_i+\alpha_j,1} \neq 0$  and conclude  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$  as desired. This finishes the cases.

Regard the case that  $i + j \leq n$  and  $\alpha_i < i$ , and both  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_j$  individually fall under the first or third alternatives. Under the operation of swapping  $i$  and  $j$ , this case is identical to the earlier case.

Regard the case that  $i + j \leq n$  and  $\alpha_i = i$  and  $\alpha_j = j$ . Then  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq i + j = \alpha_i + \alpha_j$  and we are done.

Regard the case that  $i + j > n + 1$ , and that  $\alpha_i$  or  $\alpha_j$  falls under the first or third alternative. Then  $i + j - (n + 1) \leq i$  and  $i + j - (n + 1) \leq j$ . If  $\alpha_i$  falls under the first or third alternative, we conclude  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_i \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ . If  $\alpha_j$  falls under the first or third alternative, we conclude  $\alpha_{i+j} \leq \alpha_j \leq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$ . This proves the case.




Figure A.2: This figure depicts the  $(n + 1)$ -many one-parameter families of  $\theta_2$ -representations that lie in the nullcone. We have expressed the representations  $\rho_{a,b}$  in these families in terms of two parameters  $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$  for notational convenience, even though one parameter would suffice due to gauging.

Regard the case that  $i + j > n + 1$ , and that  $\alpha_i$  and  $\alpha_j$  fall under the second alternative. We have  $\varphi_{n,n}, \dots, \varphi_{i+1,n} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{n,n}, \dots, \varphi_{j+1,n} \neq 0$ . We shall prove  $\alpha_{i+j} = 0$  by showing  $\varphi_{n,n}, \dots, \varphi_{i+j-(n+1)+1,n} \neq 0$ . We shall assume that  $i \geq j$ .

Let us prove by induction that for all  $i \leq s \leq n$  we have  $\varphi_{s,j} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{s+j+1,n} \neq 0$ . The trick is to apply for any  $i \leq s \leq n$  the coherence relation to  $U_n \otimes U_{s+1} \otimes U_j$  and obtain  $\varphi_{n,s+1}\varphi_{s,j} = \varphi_{s+1,j}\varphi_{s+j+1,n}$ . Now in the base case  $s = i$ , we have  $\varphi_{n,i+1} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{i,j} \neq 0$  by assumption, thus  $\varphi_{s,j} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{s+j+1,n} \neq 0$ . As induction step, we are allowed to assume  $\varphi_{s,j} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{s+j+1,n} \neq 0$ . Together with  $\varphi_{s+1,n} \neq 0$  we conclude  $\varphi_{s+1,j} \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{s+j+1,n} \neq 0$ . This finishes the induction.

Finally, we conclude  $\varphi_{i+j+1,n}, \dots, \varphi_{n+j+1,n} \neq 0$ . Note that the index  $n + j + 1$  is just  $j$ . Together with our assumption  $\varphi_{j+1,n}, \dots, \varphi_{n,n} \neq 0$  this proves that  $\alpha_{i+j} = 0$ . This finishes the case.

Finally, in all cases we have constructed a one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) \subseteq \text{GL}$  which pairs positively with  $\theta_2$  and proven that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma A.6.** Let  $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  be a  $\theta_2$ -semistable element in the nullcone. Then  $\rho$  lies in the image of  $R$ .

*Proof.* Regard a representation  $\rho_{a,b}$  in the  $k$ -th one-parameter family. We define  $g(t) = (t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_n})$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_i &= -i(n - k + 1), & 1 \leq i \leq k - 1, \\ \alpha_i &= -(n - i + 1)(k - 1), & k \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

We observe that  $\alpha_i + \alpha_j \leq \alpha_{i+j}$  so that  $\varphi = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)\varphi^{(0)}$  exists. We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{i,1} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-(i+1)(n-k+1)} t^{i(n-k+1)} t^{(n-k+1)} = 1, & 1 \leq i \leq k - 2, \\ \varphi_{i,1} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-(n-i)(k-1)} t^{(n-i+1)(k-1)} t^{(n-k+1)} = 0, & k - 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \varphi_{i,n} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-(n-i+2)(k-1)} t^{(n-i+1)(k-1)} t^{(k-1)} = 1, & k + 1 \leq i \leq n, \\ \varphi_{i,n} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-(i-1)(n-k+1)} t^{i(n-k+1)} t^{(k-1)} = 0, & 1 \leq i \leq k - 1, \\ \varphi_{k,n} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t^{-(k-1)(n-k+1)} t^{(n-k+1)(k-1)} t^{(k-1)} = 0, & i = k. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude that  $\rho_{a,b} = R(\varphi, (a, b))$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

## A.7 The $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$

In this section, we shall determine the  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . This investigation is not strictly necessary for achieving the goal of this paper. However, it allows us to visit an alternative way of proving stage 6. We formulate the goal of this investigation in the following question:

**Question A.7.** Given  $k \geq 1$ , is it true that all  $k\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  are pullbacks from  $k\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  along the map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ ?

In the present section, we answer this question positively for  $k = 1$ . Slightly more effort would most likely establish the statement for any  $k \geq 1$ . Once a positive answer for the question is established, then Lemma A.5 follows automatically. Indeed, if  $(\varphi, x)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable, then there exists a  $k\theta_2$ -semiinvariant  $f$  for some  $k \geq 1$  such that  $f(\varphi, x) \neq 0$ , and by the positive answer it is then of the form  $f = g \circ R$  for some  $k\theta_2$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ , so that  $g(R(\varphi, x)) \neq 0$  and we conclude that  $R(\varphi, x)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable. In other words, a positive answer to the question proves that pullback along  $R$  provides an isomorphism between the semiinvariant rings  $\bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]_{k\theta_2} \xrightarrow{\sim} \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \mathbb{C}[\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]_{k\theta_2}$  and correspondingly also an isomorphism between their Proj varieties. This shows how a positive answer to the question provides a more insightful proof of stage 6.

We are now ready to start our investigation of the  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants. Our first lemma concerns the approximate shape of the semiinvariants:

**Lemma A.8.** Let  $f : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be a  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant. In case  $n$  is odd, the restriction  $\pi(f)$  lies in the linear span of the monomials

$$\begin{aligned} X^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)}Y^l, \quad l, m \geq 0, \\ X^lY^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)}, \quad l, m \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In case  $n$  is even, the restriction  $\pi(f)$  lies in  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]^\Gamma$ , in other words, in the linear span of the monomials

$$\begin{aligned} X^{l+m(n+1)}Y^l, \quad l, m \geq 0, \\ X^lY^{l+m(n+1)}, \quad l, m \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The trick is to exploit the stabilizer  $\Gamma = \text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})$ . For every  $g \in \Gamma$ , we have

$$\pi(f)(gx) = f(\varphi^{(0)}, gx) = \theta_2(g)f(\varphi^{(0)}, x) = \theta_2(g)\pi(f)(x).$$

Recall that  $\Gamma \subseteq \text{GL}$  is the cyclic group generated by the element  $\sigma = (e^{2\pi i/(n+1)}, \dots, e^{2\pi i n/(n+1)}) \in \text{GL}$  and we have  $\theta_2(\sigma) = (-1)^n$ . If  $n$  is even, we conclude that  $\pi(f) \in \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^\Gamma$  which finishes the even case.

Let us now assume  $n$  is odd. We shall find all functions  $h \in \mathbb{C}[X, Y]$  which satisfy the rule  $h(gx) = \theta_2(g)h(x)$ . These are precisely the functions which lie in the image of the Reynolds-style operator  $R : \mathbb{C}[X, Y] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]$  given by

$$R(h) = \frac{1}{|\Gamma|} \sum_{g \in \Gamma} \theta_2(g)g.h.$$

It remains to determine the image of the operator  $R$ . Let us now simply feed the monomials  $X^p Y^q$  into  $R$ :

$$R(X^p Y^q) = \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{j=0}^n e^{-2\pi i j p / (n+1) + 2\pi i j q / (n+1) + \pi i j n} X^p Y^q.$$

If  $(p-q)/(n+1) + n/2$  is not an integer, then the sum is zero since the geometric series summation exponent  $(p-q) + n(n+1)/2$  is an integer. Therefore we only regard the case that  $(p-q)/(n+1) + n/2$  is an integer. Since  $n$  is odd, the image of  $R$  is spanned by the monomials  $X^p Y^q$  with  $p-q \in \mathbb{Z}$  being  $(n+1)/2$  plus an integer multiple of  $n+1$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

We are aiming to enumerate the  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . As we have seen in Lemma A.8, the restriction of a  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants has a very specific shape. The question arises whether any function with this shape is also the restriction of a  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant. The following lemma is the technical step in this direction.

**Lemma A.9.** The pullback  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants are precisely the functions  $f : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  whose restriction  $\pi(f)$  satisfies

$$\pi(f) \in \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^\Gamma \cdot \text{span}\{X^{(n-q)(n-q+1)/2} Y^{q(q+1)/2}\}_{q=0, \dots, n}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

*Proof.* We start by recalling that we have the standard  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants of  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  given for  $q = 0, \dots, n$  by

$$f_q = A_{n-q}^1 \dots A_1^{n-q} \cdot A_{n-q+2}^1 \dots A_{n+1}^q.$$

It is known that every  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant is a  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}}$ -linear combination of these standard semiinvariants. Note that the pullback restriction  $\pi(R^* f_q)$  is precisely the monomial  $X^{(n-q)(n-q+1)/2} Y^{q(q+1)/2}$ . We shall now prove both parts of the claim separately.

For the first part, let  $g \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]_{\theta_2}$  be any  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant. Then we can write  $g = \sum_{q=0}^n g_q f_q$  with  $g_q \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}}$ . Thus,

$$\pi(R^* g) = \sum_{q=0}^n \pi(R^* g_q) \pi(R^* f_q).$$

Recall that  $\pi(R^* g_q) \in \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^\Gamma$  and  $\pi(R^* f_q) = X^{(n-q)(n-q+1)/2} Y^{q(q+1)/2}$ . This finishes the first part of the proof.

For the second part, let  $f : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be any function such that

$$\pi(f) = \sum_{q=0}^n g_q X^{(n-q)(n-q+1)/2} Y^{q(q+1)/2}, \text{ with } g_q \in \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{GL}}.$$

Since  $R^*$  is an isomorphism on invariants, there exist invariants  $h_q \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}}$  such that  $R^* h_q = g_q$ . Then we immediately see that  $\pi(f) = \pi(R^*(\sum_{q=0}^n h_q f_q))$ . Since  $\pi$  is injective among  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants, we conclude that  $f$  is a pullback semiinvariant. This finishes the second part of the claim.  $\square$

Lemma A.9 characterizes the pullback  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants very neatly by describing the shape of their restriction. As we shall see in Lemma A.10, all  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants are in fact of this shape. Therefore all  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants actually arise as pullbacks.

**Lemma A.10.** Regard the  $A_n$  case with odd  $n$ . Then every  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  is the pullback of a  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ .




Figure A.3: This figure qualitatively depicts the exponents  $\alpha_j$  used in the proof of Lemma A.10. The highlighted vertex in the top of the figure is the special vertex of the quiver. There are  $(n-q)$ -many vertices whose exponents are increasing negative multiples of  $q$ , and  $q$ -many vertices whose exponents are increasing negative multiples of  $n-q$ . The proof uses exponents which are slightly different from the ones depicted in this figure in order to ease the distinction of exponents that are responsible for divergence.

*Proof.* Let  $f \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  be any  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant. We already know that  $\pi(f)$  is of the form

$$\pi(f) = \sum_{l,m \geq 0} \alpha_{l,m} X^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)} Y^l + \sum_{l,m \geq 0} \beta_{l,m} X^l Y^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)}.$$

Here  $\alpha_{l,m}$  and  $\beta_{l,m}$  are scalar coefficients.

We divide the remainder of the proof into three parts. The first part is to show that we can assume that  $\alpha_{l,m} = \beta_{l,m} = 0$  whenever  $m \geq (n-1)/2$  or  $l \geq q(q+1)/2$  with  $q := (n-1)/2 - m$ . The second part is to show that for arbitrary but fixed  $l_0, m_0 \geq 0$  assuming  $q := (n-1)/2 - m_0 \geq 0$  and  $l_0 < q(q+1)/2$  we have  $\alpha_{l_0, m_0} = 0$ . The final part draws the right conclusions and finishes the proof.

We now proceed to the first part of the proof. We show that the summands with  $m \geq (n-1)/2$  or  $l \geq q(q+1)/2$  with  $q := (n-1)/2 - m$  are already pullback semiinvariants by themselves. To see this, let us look at the monomial  $X^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)} Y^l$ . In case  $m \geq (n-1)/2$ , we can write

$$X^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)} Y^l = X^{(n+1)(m-(n-1)/2)} \cdot (XY)^l \cdot X^{n(n+1)/2}.$$

In case  $m \leq (n-1)/2$  and  $l \geq q(q+1)/2$  with  $q = (n-1)/2 - m$ , we can write

$$X^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)} Y^l = (X^{n+1})^{s/(n+1)} \cdot (XY)^{l-q(q+1)/2} \cdot X^{(n-q)(n-q+1)/2} Y^{q(q+1)/2}$$

To see that the monomial is indeed a  $\mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{GL}}$ -linear multiple of  $f_q = X^{(n-q)(n-q+1)/2} Y^{q(q+1)/2}$ , note again that

$$s := [(n-q)(n-q+1)/2 + l - q(q+1)/2] - [l + (n+1)/2 + m(n+1)] \geq 0,$$

and that  $s$  is necessarily divisible by  $n+1$ , since the difference of exponents between  $X$  and  $Y$  on the left-hand side and on the remainder of the right-hand side is divisible by  $n+1$ . Analogous considerations hold for  $X^l Y^{l+(n+1)/2+m(n+1)}$ .

We have now shown that the terms of  $\pi(f)$  with  $m \geq (n-1)/2$  or  $l \geq q(q+1)/2$  with  $q := (n-1)/2 - m$  already lie in the right-hand side of (A.1). By Lemma A.9, we can lift these terms to a  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . Subtracting this  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant from  $f$ , the remainder is still a  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant. We can thus assume henceforth that  $\alpha_{l,m} = \beta_{l,m} = 0$  whenever  $m \geq (n-1)/2$  or  $l \geq q(q+1)/2$  with  $q := (n-1)/2 - m$ . This finishes the first part of the proof.

We now proceed to the second part of the proof. We show that for arbitrary but fixed  $l_0, m_0 \geq 0$  assuming  $q := (n-1)/2 - m_0 \geq 0$  and  $l_0 < q(q+1)/2$  we have  $\alpha_{l_0, m_0} = 0$ . We start by defining the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (t^{\alpha_1}, \dots, t^{\alpha_n}) \subseteq \text{GL}$  given by the following exponents:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_j &= -jq, & \text{if } j \leq n-q, \\ \alpha_j &= -(n+1-j)(n-q)(p+1), & \text{if } n-q+1 \leq j \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $p \gg 0$  is a natural number. The exponents are depicted graphically in Figure A.3. It is an elementary check that for  $p$  large enough, we have  $\alpha_{i+j} \geq \alpha_i + \alpha_j$  for any  $i, j$  and therefore the limit  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)\varphi^{(0)}$  exists. Put  $x = (1, 1) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . For brevity let us convene that we write  $k = l + (n+1)/2 + m(n+1)$  in the below sum which runs over  $l, m \geq 0$ . Since  $f$  is assumed to be a  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariant, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(g(t)\varphi^{(0)}, x) &= \theta(g(t))f(\varphi^{(0)}, g(t)^{-1}x) \\ &= \sum_{l, m \geq 0} \alpha_{l, m} t^{\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qp k + (n-q)(p+1)l} + \sum_{l, m \geq 0} \beta_{l, m} t^{\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qpl + (n-q)(p+1)k}. \end{aligned}$$

We now prove two claims about this sum. The first claim entails that the exponent  $\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qp k_0 + (n-q)(p+1)l_0$  is negative, where  $k_0 = l_0 + (n+1)/2 + m_0(n+1)$ . The second claim entails that for any pair  $(l, m) \neq (l_0, m_0)$  this specific exponent is never attained again, that is,

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qp k + (n-q)(p+1)l \neq \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qp k_0 + (n-q)(p+1)l_0, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qpl + (n-q)(p+1)k \neq \sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qp k_0 + (n-q)(p+1)l_0 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

For the first claim, we calculate the sum of exponents as

$$\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j = -\frac{(n-q)(n-q+1)qp}{2} - \frac{q(q+1)(n-q)(p+1)}{2}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Aiming to compare the first summand on the right-hand side of (A.4) with  $qp k_0$ , we observe

$$\begin{aligned} k_0 - (n-q)(n-q+1)/2 &= l_0 + (n+1)/2 + m_0(n+1) - (n-q)(n-q+1)/2 \\ &< q(q+1)/2 + (n+1)/2 + m_0(n+1) - q(q+1)/2 + (2q-1)n/2 - n^2/2 \\ &= m_0 - \frac{n-1}{2} = -q \leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Aiming to compare the second summand on the right-hand side of (A.4) with  $(n-q)(p+1)l_0$ , we observe that by assumption we have

$$(n-q)l_0 - \frac{q(q+1)(n-q)}{2} < 0.$$

Finally, we conclude that the exponent  $\sum_{j=0}^n \alpha_j + qp k_0 + (n - q)(p + 1)l_0$  is negative, proving the first claim.

For the second claim, we shall check the two inequalities (A.2) and (A.3) separately. Towards (A.2), assume that there is any pair  $(l, m)$  such that  $qpk + (n - q)(p + 1)l = qpk_0 + (n - q)(p + 1)l_0$ . Then we conclude that  $p$  divides  $(n - q)(p + 1)(l_0 - l)$  and  $p + 1$  divides  $qp(k_0 - k)$ . Since  $p$  and  $p + 1$  are coprime, we conclude that  $p$  divides  $(n - q)(l_0 - l)$  and  $p + 1$  divides  $q(k_0 - k)$ . Note that the absolute values of the two numbers  $(n - q)(l_0 - l)$  and  $q(k_0 - k)$  are smaller than  $n^3$ . Therefore, if we pick  $p$  to be larger than  $n^3$ , we conclude  $l = l_0$  and  $k = k_0$ , in particular  $m = m_0$ . This proves the first inequality.

Towards the second inequality (A.3), assume that there is any pair  $(l, m)$  such that  $qpl + (n - q)(p + 1)k = qpk_0 + (n - q)(p + 1)l_0$ . We similarly conclude  $l = k_0$  and  $k = l_0$ , which however implies  $k = l_0 \leq k_0 = l$ , a contradiction. This proves the second inequality.

Finally, we have proved both intermediate claims. We conclude that the coefficient  $\alpha_{l_0, m_0}$  vanishes since otherwise  $f(g(t)\varphi^{(0)}, x)$  diverges. This finishes the second part of the proof.

Ultimately, let us draw the conclusions and finish the proof. In a fashion analogous to the second part of the proof, one shows that if  $q := (n - 1)/2 - m_0 \geq 0$  and  $l_0 < q(q + 1)/2$  then  $\beta_{l_0, m_0} = 0$ . Recalling from the first part of the proof that we have already subtracted certain terms from  $\pi(f)$  and therefore assumed that  $\alpha_{l, m} = \beta_{l, m} = 0$  whenever  $m \geq (n - 1)/2$  or  $l \geq q(q + 1)/2$  with  $q := (n - 1)/2 - m$ , we conclude that  $\pi(f)$  vanishes. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark A.11.** We have shown in Lemma A.10 that for odd  $n$  all  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  are pullbacks of  $\theta_2$ -semiinvariants on  $\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ . The same statement holds for even  $n$  with a similar proof.

## B The $D_n$ case

In this section, we treat the  $D_n$  case in detail. We construct the variety  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$ , the stability parameters  $\theta_1, \theta_2$  and the map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ , where  $(Q, \alpha)$  is the Kleinian  $D_n$  quiver. We prove the remaining technical parts of Stage Plan 4.9.

### B.1 Stage 1: Construction of the Clebsch-Gordan variety

The Kleinian group is the binary dihedral group of order  $4(n - 2)$ :

$$\Gamma = \text{BD}_{n-2} = \langle a, x \mid a^{2(n-2)} = 1, x^2 = a^{n-2}, x^{-1}ax = a^{-1} \rangle.$$

When  $n$  is even, the group  $\Gamma$  has four 1-dimensional representations  $E_1, \dots, E_4$  and two families  $O_1, O_3, \dots, O_{n-3}$  and  $I_2, I_4, \dots, I_{n-4}$  of 2-dimensional representations. When  $n$  is odd, the group  $\Gamma$  has four 1-dimensional representations  $E_1, \dots, E_4$  and two families  $O_1, O_3, \dots, O_{n-4}$  and  $I_2, \dots, I_{n-3}$  of 2-dimensional representations. The  $\Gamma$ -representation  $\mathbb{C}^2$  itself is isomorphic to  $O_1$ . The representations can be written explicitly in the following matrix form:

Representation	Action of $a$	Action of $x$
$E_1$	1	1
$E_2$	1	-1
$E_3$	-1	1
$E_4$	-1	-1
$O_k$	$\begin{pmatrix} e^{\pi ik/(n-2)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\pi ik/(n-2)} \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$I_k$	$\begin{pmatrix} e^{\pi ik/(n-2)} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-\pi ik/(n-2)} \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

**Remark B.1.** For notational reasons, it is occasionally difficult to deal with all  $D_n$  at the same time. We may sometimes make the assumption that  $n$  is an even integer in order to write down the most accurate statements. Moreover, accurate treatment of the Kleinian  $D_4$  case requires attention to the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients which deviate at first sight from the other  $D_n$  cases. For instance, for  $n \geq 5$  the representation  $O_1 \otimes O_1$  decomposes into  $E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus O_2$ , while for  $n = 4$  it decomposes into  $E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4$ . Nevertheless, a shared treatment of all  $D_n$  cases is possible as long as attention to this detail is paid and the reader reinterprets the statements in a specific way for the  $n = 4$  case. In fact, the representation  $O_1$  in the  $n = 4$  case has more similarity with the representation  $I_{(n-4)/2}$  in the case of even  $n \geq 6$ . Therefore, the most accurate statements for the  $n = 4$  case are obtained when  $E_i$  is interpreted as  $E_i$ , but  $O_1$  is interpreted as  $I_{(n-4)/2}$ .

The gauge group consists of three general linear groups of rank one and  $(n-3)$ -many general linear groups of rank two:

$$\mathrm{GL} = \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{C}) \times \dots \times \mathrm{GL}_1(\mathbb{C}),$$

$E_1 \qquad E_2 \qquad E_3 \qquad O_1 \qquad O_{n-3}$

An Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi$  for  $\Gamma$  consists of a long list of bilinear maps. For us, the range of relevant entries of  $\varphi$  is rather limited. In case  $n$  is even, the most important are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{E_i, E_j} &: E_i \otimes E_j \rightarrow E_{\sigma(ij)}, \quad i, j \in \{2, 3, 4\}, \\ \varphi_{E_1, O_1} &: E_1 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow O_1, \\ \varphi_{E_2, O_1} &: E_2 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow O_1, \\ \varphi_{E_3, O_1} &: E_3 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow O_{n/2-1}, \\ \varphi_{E_4, O_1} &: E_4 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow O_{n/2-1}, \\ \varphi_{I_k, O_1} &: I_k \otimes O_1 \rightarrow O_{k-1} \oplus O_{k+1}, \quad k = 2, 4, \dots, n-4, \\ \varphi_{O_k, O_1} &: O_i \otimes O_1 \rightarrow I_{k-1} \oplus I_{k+1}, \quad k = 3, 5, \dots, n-5, \\ \varphi_{O_1, O_1} &: O_1 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus O_1, \\ \varphi_{O_{n-3}, O_1} &: O_{n-3} \otimes O_1 \rightarrow I_{n-4} \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\sigma(ij)$  stands for the missing index. If  $i \neq j$ , then it is defined by  $\{i, j, \sigma(ij)\} = \{2, 3, 4\}$ . If  $i = j$ , then  $\sigma(ij) = 1$ . In case  $n$  is odd, the range of most important entries is analogous. In case

$n \geq 5$ , the specific Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi^{(0)}$  consists of the following choices:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{E_i, E_j}^{(0)} &= 1, \\ \varphi_{E_1, O_1}^{(0)} &= \text{Id}, & \varphi_{E_2, O_1}^{(0)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \varphi_{E_3, O_1}^{(0)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \varphi_{E_4, O_1}^{(0)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \varphi_{I_k, O_1}^{(0)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, & \varphi_{O_k, O_1}^{(0)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \varphi_{O_1, O_1}^{(0)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, & \varphi_{O_{n-3}, O_1}^{(0)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

In case  $n = 4$ , we choose the entries  $\varphi_{E_i, E_j}^{(0)}$  and  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}^{(0)}$  as above and


$$\varphi_{O_1, O_1}^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We define the varieties  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  and the stability parameters  $\theta_1$  and  $\theta_2$  as follows:


$$\text{CG}_\Gamma = \overline{\text{GL}} \varphi^{(0)}, \quad \theta_1 = (-1, -1, -1, -2, \dots, -2), \quad \theta_2 = (+1, \dots, +1).$$

## B.2 Stage 2: Construction of the map $R$

We define the map  $R(\varphi, x)$  following our general recipe  $R(\varphi, x) = \varphi(- \otimes x)$ :



In particular, the specific representation  $R(\varphi^{(0)}, x)$  takes the following shape:



**Lemma B.2.** For any  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ , the representation  $R(\varphi, x)$  satisfies the preprojective conditions.

*Proof.* We start with the observation that  $R(\varphi, x)$  is in every case a quiver representation and  $R$  defines a GL-equivariant map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\overline{Q}, \alpha)$  to the representations of the Kleinian double quiver. Next, we observe that the representation  $R(\varphi^{(0)}, x)$ , which is depicted above, satisfies the preprojective relations. This implies that  $R(g\varphi^{(0)}, g(g^{-1}x)) = gR(\varphi^{(0)}, g^{-1}x)$  also satisfies the preprojective relations for any  $g \in \text{GL}$  and  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . By a standard limit argument, the preprojective conditions then also hold for any  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . We conclude that  $R$  becomes a GL-equivariant map  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### B.3 Stage 3: Verification that $R^*$ is an isomorphism of invariants

It is our task to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma B.3.** The map  $\pi \circ R^* : \mathbb{C}[\text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)]^{\text{GL}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2]^{\text{GL}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[X, Y]^{\text{Stab}_{\text{GL}}(\varphi^{(0)})}$  is an isomorphism.

*Proof.* The trick is to regard the three generating elements of the domain and codomain. In the codomain we pick the three elements

$$A' = X^2Y^2, \quad B' = X^{2(n-2)} + Y^{2(n-2)}, \quad C' = X^{2(n-2)+1}Y - XY^{2(n-2)+1}.$$

In the domain we pick the three elements

$$\begin{aligned} A &= 2^{-2} \text{tr}(A_1^* A_2 A_2^* A_1), \\ B &= \text{tr}(A_1^* A_3^* \dots A_{n-1}^* A_{n-1} \dots A_3 A_1) - 2^{n-3} A^{(n-2)/2}, \\ C &= -2^{3-n} \text{tr}(A_1 A_1^* A_2 A_2^* A_3^* \dots A_{n-1}^* A_{n-1} \dots A_1). \end{aligned}$$

Evidently, we have  $\pi(R^*(A)) = A'$  and  $\pi(R^*(B)) = B'$  and  $\pi(R^*(C)) = C'$ . In both rings, the only relation satisfied by the three generators is the Kleinian  $D_n$  relation. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

### B.4 Stage 4: Identification of the stabilizer of $\varphi^{(0)}$

We shall examine the stabilizer of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  under the GL-action. The stabilizer group of  $\varphi^{(0)}$  under the GL-action is generated by two elements  $\sigma_a$  and  $\sigma_x$ . Mapping these group elements to  $a, x \in$



In this composition, the arrows are given by  $\pi_{O_{i+1}} \circ (g_k \varphi^{(0)})_{O_i, O_1}$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n-4$  and  $\pi_{E_3 \oplus E_4} \circ (g_k \varphi^{(0)})_{O_{n-3}, O_1}$ . The map  $\Phi_k$  is a map from the large space  $O_1^{\otimes(n-2)}$  to the two-dimensional space  $E_3 \oplus E_4$ , in other words a very wide matrix. By assumption, we know that  $(\Phi_k)$  converges.

In what follows, we shall determine four entries of  $(\Phi_k)$  explicitly and draw the conclusion that  $(g_k)_{O_1}$  converges. As a simplification, we calculate these specific entries by pretending that the inverse matrix of  $(g_k)_{O_i}$  agrees with its adjugate, pretending that  $\det(g_k)_{O_i} = 1$ . Since we have already proved that the determinants converge to nonzero values, this simplification is legitimate. We write

$$(g_k)_{O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} A_k & B_k \\ C_k & D_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us now state our calculations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{E_3}(\Phi_k(e_1^{\otimes(n-2)})) &= -C_k^{n-2} + D_k^{n-2}, \\ \pi_{E_3}(\Phi_k(e_2^{\otimes(n-2)})) &= A_k^{n-2} - B_k^{n-2}, \\ \pi_{E_4}(\Phi_k(e_1^{\otimes(n-2)})) &= C_k^{n-2} + D_k^{n-2}, \\ \pi_{E_4}(\Phi_k(e_2^{\otimes(n-2)})) &= -A_k^{n-2} - B_k^{n-2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the left-hand side converges as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , we conclude that  $(g_k)_{O_1}$  converges. We note that the limit is an invertible matrix. Finally, regard the maps

$$\pi_{O_{i+1}} \circ (g_k \varphi^{(0)})_{O_i, O_1} = (g_k)_{O_{i+1}} \circ \pi_{O_{i+1}} \circ \varphi_{O_i, O_1}^{(0)} \circ ((g_k)_{O_i}^{-1} \otimes (g_k)_{O_1}^{-1}).$$

Since the left-hand side converges and  $(g_k)_{O_1}$  converges to an invertible matrix and  $\pi_{O_{i+1}} \circ \varphi_{O_i, O_1}^{(0)}$  is surjective, we conclude inductively that  $(g_k)_{O_i}$  converges to an invertible matrix for all  $2 \leq i \leq n-3$ . This proves that the sequence  $(g_k) \subseteq \text{GL}$  converges. Consequently, we have  $\varphi = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k \varphi^{(0)} = (\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} g_k) \varphi^{(0)} \in \text{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$ . This shows that  $\varphi \in \text{GL} \varphi^{(0)}$ , and finishes the proof.  $\square$

## B.6 Stage 6: Identification of the $\theta_2$ -semistable locus

In this section, we prove the remaining parts of the sixth stage. One part is the claim that if  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable, then  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable. The other part is the claim that the map  $R : (\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)^{\theta_2}$  is surjective.

We start by showing that if  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable, then  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is a  $\theta_2$ -semistable representation. The strategy is to prove the contrapositive. We shall provide a list of non- $\theta_2$ -semistable representations in Figure B.1 and then prove that none of them lie in the image of  $(\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2)^{\theta_2}$  under  $R$ .

In Figure B.1, we list all representations of the Kleinian  $D_4$  quiver which are not  $\theta_2$ -stable. We have depicted all of them only up to gauging, and in fact depicted them in a sloppy way. More precisely, we have ignored all scalar values. With respect to the sign convention that the arrows pointing towards the central vertex are the starred arrows of the double quiver  $\tilde{Q}$ , the preprojective conditions are not exactly satisfied and the values on the arrows should for instance rather be read  $\pm e_1$  instead of  $e_1$ . All these details do not play a role for our investigations of stability. Let us state the fact that we have listed all non-semistable representations as follows:

**Lemma B.5.** Let  $(Q, \alpha)$  be the Kleinian  $D_4$  quiver and  $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  be a non- $\theta_2$ -semistable representation. Then  $\rho$  is one of the representations listed in Figure B.1, up to gauging.




Figure B.1: This figures lists all representations of the Kleinian  $D_4$  quiver which are not  $\theta_2$ -semistable. The star symbol  $*$  stands for arbitrary values. Figure B.1g more generally concerns the case where  $\varphi_{55,1}(- \otimes e_1) = \pi_2$  and for at least one  $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$  we have  $\varphi_{i5}(- \otimes e_1) = 0$ .




Figure B.1: Continued.

We are now ready to prove that if  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable, then  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable. The strategy is to prove the contrapositive and use the list of non- $\theta_2$ -semistable representations from Figure B.1.

**Lemma B.6.** Let  $(Q, \alpha)$  be the Kleinian  $D_4$  quiver and  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  be  $\theta_2$ -semistable. Then  $R(\varphi, x) \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  is  $\theta_2$ -semistable.

*Proof.* We achieve the statement by applying the Hilbert-Mumford criterion. The criterion states that  $(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable if and only if there exists a one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) \subseteq G$  which pairs positively with  $\theta_2$  and for which  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists within  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$ . Since  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  is a closed subset of an affine space, it suffices to simply show that  $g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  converges within the affine space.

We prove the statement by contraposition: Assume that  $R(\varphi, x)$  is a non- $\theta_2$ -semistable representation. It is our goal to deduce that  $(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable. The property of  $\theta_2$ -semistability is invariant under the  $G$ -action, therefore it suffices to check it for all non- $\theta_2$ -semistable representations up to gauging. We achieve this by going through all the cases listed in Figure B.1. Apart from the representation in Figure B.1a, where  $x = 0$ , the listed representations all have  $x = e_1$ .

- Regard the representation in Figure B.1a. We read off that  $x = 0$ . Pick the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (t, t, t, tI_2)$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists and in fact vanishes. The critical ingredient is  $x = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1b. Pick the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) = e_1$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_i}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1c. Pick the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) = e_1$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_i}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1d. Regard the diagram for  $E_4 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1$  with entry vector  $1 \otimes e_2 \otimes e_1$ . Since  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_1}(e_2 \otimes e_1) = 1$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(- \otimes e_1) = 0$ , we have a contradiction and conclude the representation is not in the image of  $R$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1e. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (t, t, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) \in \text{span}(e_1)$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_2}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = \varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_3}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1f. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) = e_1$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_i}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1g. Regard the diagram for  $O_4 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1$  with entry vector  $1 \otimes e_2 \otimes e_1$ . Since  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_1}(e_2 \otimes e_1) = 1$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(- \otimes e_1) = 0$ , we have a contradiction.

- Regard the representation in Figure B.1h. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredient is  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) \in \text{span}(e_1)$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1i. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) = e_1$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1j. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, t, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . We claim that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, regard the diagram for  $E_2 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1$  with entry vector  $1 \otimes e_2 \otimes e_1$ . Since  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_3}(e_2 \otimes e_1) = 1$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(- \otimes e_1) = 0$ , we read off that  $\varphi_{E_2, E_3} = 0$ . Now  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_2, E_3} = 0$ ,  $\varphi_{E_2, O_1}(e_1) = e_1$ ,  $\varphi_{E_3, O_1}(e_1) = e_1$ ,  $\varphi_{E_4, O_1}(e_1) = e_2$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1k. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) \in \text{span}(e_1)$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1l. The first step is to prove that  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4} = 0$ . We start with the observation that  $\varphi_{E_2, O_1}(e_1) = e_2$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(e_2 \otimes e_1) = 0$ . We use the diagram for  $O_1 \otimes E_2 \otimes O_1$  with input vector  $e_1 \otimes 1 \otimes e_1$  to conclude that  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(e_1 \otimes e_2) = 0$ . Next, we use the diagram for  $E_2 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1$  with input vector  $1 \otimes e_1 \otimes e_1$  to conclude that  $\varphi_{E_2, E_2} = 0$ . Finally, we use the diagram for  $E_3 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1$  with input vector  $1 \otimes e_1 \otimes e_1$  to conclude that  $\varphi_{E_2, E_3} = 0$ . We use the diagram for  $E_2 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1$  with input vector  $1 \otimes e_1 \otimes e_2$  to conclude that  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(e_2 \otimes e_2) = 0$ . This shows  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4} = 0$ . Now pick the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, t, I_2)$ . We shall readily check that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. The critical ingredients are that  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4} = 0$  and  $\varphi_{E_i, E_4}$  converges to zero for  $i = 2, 3, 4$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1m. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, 1, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}(e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1n. We can assume that  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_2}(- \otimes e_1) \neq 0$  or  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_3}(- \otimes e_1) \neq 0$ , otherwise we are covered by Figure B.1o. Without loss of generality assume that  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_3}(- \otimes e_1) \neq 0$ . Let  $y$  denote an element of  $O_1$  which does not lie in the kernel. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, 1, t, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Now regard the diagram for  $E_2 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1$  with entry vector  $1 \otimes y \otimes e_1$ . Since  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_3}(y \otimes e_1) \neq 0$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(- \otimes e_1) = 0$ , we get  $\varphi_{E_2, E_3} = 0$ . We now see that  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. The critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_2, E_3} = 0$ ,  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ ,  $\varphi_{E_2, O_1}(e_1) = 0$  and  $\varphi_{E_3, O_1}(e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1o. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (t, t, t, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredient is  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1}(- \otimes$

$$e_1) = 0.$$

- Regard the representation in Figure B.1p. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (1, t, t, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredients are  $\varphi_{E_2, O_1}(e_1) = 0$ ,  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_3}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1; E_4}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ .
- Regard the representation in Figure B.1q. Regard the one-parameter subgroup  $g(t) = (t, t, t, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & t \end{pmatrix})$ . Then  $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)^{-1}(\varphi, x)$  exists. Indeed, the critical ingredient is  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1}(e_1 \otimes e_1) = 0$ .

In every case, we have verified that  $(\varphi, x)$  is not  $\theta_2$ -semistable. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition B.7.** Let  $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  be a  $\theta_2$ -semistable element in the nullcone. Then  $\rho$  lies in the image of  $R$ .

*Proof.* Recall that Crawley-Boevey's analysis [5] shows that there are  $n$ -many 1-parameter families of representations in the nullcone, each distinguished by their socle. These 1-parameter families are depicted in Figure B.2, following [10]. We focus here on the 1-parameter family attached to the  $E_2$  vertex. In other words, this is the 1-parameter family of representations whose socle equals the simple representation  $S_{E_2}$ . The parameter is denoted  $a \in \mathbb{C}^*$  and we shall denote the representation by  $\rho_a$ .

We shall now show that  $\rho_a \in \text{Im}(R)$  by constructing  $(\varphi, x) \in \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  such that  $R(\varphi, x) = \rho_a$ . Let us start by explaining our ansatz. The ansatz entails choosing  $\varphi$  as a limit  $\varphi = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t)R\varphi^{(0)}$  and setting  $x = e_1$ . Here  $g(t) \subseteq \text{GL}$  shall be a 1-parameter subgroup and  $R \in \text{GL}$  is an unknown element. Note that every 1-parameter subgroup of  $\text{GL}$  is a conjugate of a diagonal matrix group, whose diagonal elements consist purely of powers  $t^\alpha$  with  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Since  $g(t)R\varphi^{(0)}$  is supposed to converge, it is a reasonable assumption that the exponents  $\alpha$  are all negative. We note that the entire 1-parameter subgroup  $g(t)$  fixes  $\varphi$ :

$$g(t)\varphi = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} g(t)g(s)R\varphi^{(0)} = \lim_{s \rightarrow 0} g(ts)R\varphi^{(0)} = \varphi.$$

We conclude that in the limit  $g(t)^{-1}$  takes  $\rho_a$  to the zero representation:

$$g(t)^{-1}R(\varphi, x) = R(g(t)^{-1}\varphi, g(t)^{-1}x) \xrightarrow[t \rightarrow 0]{} R(\varphi, 0) = 0.$$

This finishes the description of our ansatz. The remaining task is to identify a 1-parameter subgroup whose inverse in the limit takes  $\rho_a$  to the zero representation. We are allowed a certain flexibility by means of admitting conjugation and finding a suitable element  $R \in \text{GL}$ .

For the first step, let us find a 1-parameter subgroup  $g(t) \subseteq \text{GL}$  with negative exponents whose inverse in the limit takes  $\rho_a$  to zero. It is easy to find the following candidate:

$$g(t)^{-1} = (t_{E_1}^{2n-2}, t_{E_3}^{n-2}, t_{E_4}^{n-2}, \begin{pmatrix} t^1 & 0 \\ 0 & t^{2n-3} \end{pmatrix}, \dots, \begin{pmatrix} t^{n-3} & 0 \\ 0 & t^{n-1} \end{pmatrix}).$$

$O_1 \qquad \qquad \qquad O_{n-3}$

The remainder of the verification entails finding an element  $Q \in \text{GL}$  and  $R \in \text{GL}$  such that  $\varphi = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} Qg(t)Q^{-1}R\varphi^{(0)}$  exists and  $R(\varphi, e_1) = \rho_a$ . For the case  $n = 4$ , this can be done by hand, departing from the better-suited gauge-equivalent presentation of  $\rho_a$  provided in [10]. For the case  $n \geq 5$ , the author was forced to invoke computer aid. With this aid, we successfully



verified the solvability for  $Q$  and  $R$  for low  $n$ . In what follows, we describe the result of the calculations for  $n = 4, 5, 6$ . We shall write out the elements  $Q, R \in \text{GL}$  as

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & Q_1 & \dots & Q_{n-3} \\ E_2 & E_3 & E_4 & O_1 & & O_{n-3} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} r_2 & r_3 & r_4 & R_1 & \dots & R_{n-3} \\ E_2 & E_3 & E_4 & O_1 & & O_{n-3} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We are now ready to describe the specific matrices  $Q_i \in \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  and  $R_i \in \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{C})$  for  $1 \leq i \leq n - 3$  and elements  $r_2, r_3, r_4 \in \mathbb{C}^*$ . For  $n = 4$  we construct the following matrices:

$$Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2a} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -e^{2\pi i/8} \\ -ie^{2\pi i/8} - \frac{1}{2a} & \frac{2^{-1}e^{2\pi i/8}}{a} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$r_2 = -a$$

$$r_3 = i,$$

$$r_4 = -i.$$

For  $n = 5$  we construct the following matrices:

$$Q_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2a} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$Q_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -i2^{1/3} \\ -2^{2/3}i - \frac{1}{2a} & \frac{2^{-2/3}i}{a} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -2^{-1/3} \\ 2^{1/3} & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$r_2 = -2a,$$

$$r_3 = i,$$

$$r_4 = -i.$$

For  $n = 6$  we construct the following matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2a} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Q_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Q_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
R_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & i e^{2\pi i/16} 2^{1/2} \\ 2^{3/2} i e^{-2\pi i/16} - \frac{1}{2a} & & & -\frac{1}{2a} i e^{2\pi i/16} 2^{1/2} \end{pmatrix}, \\
R_2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & -e^{2\pi i/8} \\ -2i e^{2\pi i/8} & & 0 & \end{pmatrix}, \\
R_3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & & 2^{-1/2} e^{-2\pi i/16} \\ -2^{1/2} e^{2\pi i/16} & & 0 & \end{pmatrix}, \\
r_2 &= -4a, \\
r_3 &= i, \\
r_4 &= -i.
\end{aligned}$$

We have checked with computer aid that  $R(Qg(t)Q^{-1}R\varphi^{(0)}, e_1) \rightarrow \rho_a$ . In the case  $n \geq 5$ , we have omitted the checks that  $Qg(t)Q^{-1}R\varphi^{(0)}$  converges and omitted calculations for the other  $(n-1)$ -many 1-parameter families of representations. In the case  $n = 4$ , we have explicitly performed the checks that  $\varphi := \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} Qg(t)Q^{-1}R\varphi^{(0)}$  exists and  $R(\varphi, e_1) = \rho_a$ , and also treated the other three 1-parameter families of representations, based on the alternative description of  $\rho_a$  from [10]. We finish the proof here.  $\square$

## B.7 Symmetry and coherence relations

In this section, we describe explicitly the symmetry and coherence relations for the Clebsch-Gordan data  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  in the  $D_4$  case. We first deal with the symmetry relations, which are rather easy to state, and after that deal with the coherence relations. This section is intended for illustrative purposes.

We start by explaining the symmetry relations. The data contained in a Clebsch-Gordan datum  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  are

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi_{E_2, E_2}, \varphi_{E_2, E_3}, \varphi_{E_2, E_4}, \varphi_{E_3, E_3}, \varphi_{E_3, E_4}, \varphi_{E_4, E_4}, \\
&\varphi_{E_2, O_1}, \varphi_{E_3, O_1}, \varphi_{E_4, O_1}, \varphi_{O_1, O_1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

By construction, all other data can be expressed in terms of these. For instance, the maps  $\varphi_{E_1, \bullet}$  and  $\varphi_{\bullet, E_1}$  are simply the identity maps for any choice  $\bullet \in \{E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4, O_1\}$ . Moreover, we have the symmetry relations

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi_{E_i, E_j} &= \varphi_{E_j, E_i} \circ \sigma, \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq 4, \\
\varphi_{O_1, E_i} &= \varphi_{E_i, O_1} \circ \sigma, \quad 1 \leq i \leq 4, \\
\varphi_{O_1, O_1} &= \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \circ \varphi_{O_1, O_1} \circ \sigma.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

In all three rows, the letter  $\sigma$  generically denotes the tensor flip. Let us comment on these symmetry relations. The first two rows hold for  $\varphi^{(0)}$  by definition and therefore also for any  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$ . Simply speaking, our construction of the Clebsch-Gordan variety has gone the easy way and defined that only the data in the list (B.1) shall matter and all data not contained in the list is obtained from enforcing trivial symmetry. The symmetry relation for  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1}$  comes down to a self-symmetry statement and is slightly more complicated. Indeed, we observe that  $\pi_{E_1} \varphi^{(0)} : O_1 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow E_1$  is a skew-symmetric bilinear form and thus remains so after gauging with any  $g \in \text{GL}$ . Similarly,  $\pi_{E_i} \varphi^{(0)} : O_1 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow E_i$  is a symmetric bilinear form and thus remains so after gauging. This finishes the explanation of all symmetry relations (B.2).

Next we shall explicitly state the coherence relations. We use the language established in Lemma 4.5. For brevity we may write  $\varphi_{ij}$  for  $\varphi_{E_i, E_j}$  and similarly  $\varphi_{i, O_1}$  for  $\varphi_{E_i, O_1}$ . We also write  $\sigma(ij)$  for the missing index, that is, the index such that  $\{i, j, \sigma(ij)\} = \{2, 3, 4\}$ . We calculate the coherence factors  $\gamma$  by simply using the datum  $\varphi = \varphi^{(0)}$  and forcing the coherence diagram to commute.

The first coherence diagram is the one whose three input representations are one-dimensional. It reads as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
E_i \otimes E_j \otimes E_k & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{jk}} & E_i \otimes E_{\sigma(jk)} \\
\downarrow \varphi_{ij} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \varphi_{i, \sigma(jk)} \\
E_{\sigma(ij)} \otimes E_k & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\sigma(ij), k}} & E_{\sigma(i, \sigma(jk))} \\
& \nearrow \sim & \\
& & E_{\sigma(ij), k}
\end{array}$$

In other words, among the one-dimensional representations the compositions are plainly coherent.

$$\varphi_{\sigma(ij), k} \circ (\varphi_{ij} \otimes \text{id}) = \varphi_{i, \sigma(jk)} \circ (\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{jk}).$$

Let us now regard the coherence diagrams with  $E_i, E_j, O_1$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
E_i \otimes E_j \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{j, O_1}} & E_i \otimes O_1 \\
\downarrow \varphi_{ij} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \varphi_{i, O_1} \\
E_{\sigma(ij)} \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\sigma(ij), O_1}} & O_1 \\
& \nearrow \sim & \\
& & E_{O_1}
\end{array}$$

Evaluating this diagram for all  $i, j \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the following coherence factors:

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{2,2,O_1} &= -\text{Id}, \gamma_{2,3,O_1} = +\text{Id}, \gamma_{2,4,O_1} = +\text{Id}, \\
\gamma_{3,2,O_1} &= -\text{Id}, \gamma_{3,3,O_1} = -\text{Id}, \gamma_{3,4,O_1} = +\text{Id}, \\
\gamma_{4,2,O_1} &= -\text{Id}, \gamma_{4,3,O_1} = -\text{Id}, \gamma_{4,4,O_1} = +\text{Id}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now regard the coherence diagrams with  $E_i, O_1, E_j$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
E_i \otimes O_1 \otimes E_j & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{O_1, j}} & E_i \otimes O_1 \\
\downarrow \varphi_{i, O_1} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \varphi_{i, O_1} \\
O_1 \otimes E_j & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{O_1, j}} & O_1 \\
& \nearrow \gamma_{i, O_1, j} \sim & 
\end{array}$$

Evaluating this diagram for all  $i, j \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the following coherence factors:

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{2,2,O_1} &= +\text{Id}, \gamma_{2,3,O_1} = -\text{Id}, \gamma_{2,4,O_1} = -\text{Id}, \\
\gamma_{3,2,O_1} &= -\text{Id}, \gamma_{3,3,O_1} = +\text{Id}, \gamma_{3,4,O_1} = -\text{Id}, \\
\gamma_{4,2,O_1} &= -\text{Id}, \gamma_{4,3,O_1} = -\text{Id}, \gamma_{4,4,O_1} = +\text{Id}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now regard the coherence diagrams with  $E_i, O_1, E_j$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
O_1 \otimes E_i \otimes E_j & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{ij}} & O_1 \otimes E_{\sigma(ij)} \\
\downarrow \varphi_{O_1, i} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \varphi_{O_1, \sigma(ij)} \\
O_1 \otimes E_j & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{O_1, j}} & O_1 \\
& \nearrow \gamma_{O_1, i, j} \sim & 
\end{array}$$

Evaluating this diagram for all  $i, j \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the following coherence factors:

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma_{O_1, 2, 2} &= +\text{Id}, \gamma_{O_1, 2, 3} = -\text{Id}, \gamma_{O_1, 2, 4} = -\text{Id}, \\
\gamma_{O_1, 3, 2} &= +\text{Id}, \gamma_{O_1, 3, 3} = -\text{Id}, \gamma_{O_1, 3, 4} = -\text{Id}, \\
\gamma_{O_1, 4, 2} &= +\text{Id}, \gamma_{O_1, 4, 3} = +\text{Id}, \gamma_{O_1, 4, 4} = +\text{Id}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let us now regard the coherence diagrams with  $O_1, O_1, E_i$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
O_1 \otimes O_1 \otimes E_i & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{O_1, i}} & O_1 \otimes O_1 \\
\downarrow \varphi_{O_1, O_1} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \varphi_{O_1, O_1} \\
(E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4) \otimes E_i & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \oplus \varphi_{2i} \oplus \varphi_{3i} \oplus \varphi_{4i}} & E_i \oplus E_{\sigma(2i)} \oplus E_{\sigma(3i)} \oplus E_{\sigma(4i)} \\
& \nearrow \gamma_{O_1, O_1, i} \sim & E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4
\end{array}$$

Evaluating this diagram for all  $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the following coherence factors:

$$\gamma_{O_1, O_1, E_2} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \gamma_{O_1, O_1, E_3} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \gamma_{O_1, O_1, E_4} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us now regard the coherence diagrams with  $O_1, E_i, O_1$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
O_1 \otimes E_i \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{i,O_1}} & O_1 \otimes O_1 \\
\downarrow \varphi_{O_1, E_i} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \varphi_{O_1, O_1} \\
O_1 \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{O_1, O_1}} & E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4 \\
& & \nearrow \gamma_{O_1, E_i, O_1} \sim
\end{array}$$

Evaluating this diagram for all  $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the following coherence factors:

$$\gamma_{O_1, E_2, O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \gamma_{O_1, E_3, O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \gamma_{O_1, E_4, O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us now regard the coherence diagrams with  $E_i, O_1, O_1$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
E_i \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{O_1, O_1}} & E_i \otimes (E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4) \\
\downarrow \varphi_{i, O_1} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \text{id} \oplus \varphi_{\sigma(i2)} \oplus \varphi_{\sigma(i3)} \oplus \varphi_{\sigma(i4)} \\
O_1 \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{O_1, O_1}} & E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4 \\
& & \nearrow \gamma_{E_i, O_1, O_1} \sim
\end{array}$$

Evaluating this diagram for all  $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the following coherence factors:

$$\gamma_{E_2, O_1, O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \gamma_{E_3, O_1, O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \gamma_{E_4, O_1, O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let us now regard the coherence diagram with  $O_1, O_1, O_1$ :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
O_1 \otimes O_1 \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \varphi_{O_1, O_1}} & O_1 \otimes (E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4) \\
\downarrow \varphi_{O_1, O_1} \otimes \text{id} & & \downarrow \text{id} \oplus \varphi_{O_1, 2} \oplus \varphi_{O_1, 3} \oplus \varphi_{O_1, 4} \\
O_1 \otimes O_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{O_1, O_1}} & O_1 \oplus O_1 \oplus O_1 \oplus O_1 \\
& & \nearrow \gamma_{O_1, O_1, O_1} \sim
\end{array}$$

Evaluating this diagram for all  $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ , we obtain the following coherence factors:

$$\gamma_{O_1, O_1, O_1} = \begin{pmatrix} -I_2/2 & -I_2/2 & +I_2/2 & +I_2/2 \\ +I_2/2 & +I_2/2 & +I_2/2 & +I_2/2 \\ -I_2/2 & +I_2/2 & +I_2/2 & -I_2/2 \\ -I_2/2 & +I_2/2 & -I_2/2 & +I_2/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

## B.8 Comparison with the variety $Z$ of Abdelgadir and Segal

In this section, we examine the difference between our Clebsch-Gordan variety  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  associated with the Kleinian  $D_4$  case and the variety  $Z$  of Abdelgadir-Segal. In line with our expectations, the open loci  $\text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ$  and  $Z^\circ$  are isomorphic, but against our expectations it turns out that the entire varieties  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  and  $Z$  are not isomorphic in a natural way. When dealing with the variety  $Z$ , we use our notation  $E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4$  and  $O_1$  from section B.1 instead of  $\mathbb{C}, L_1, L_2, L_3$  and  $V$  used by Abdelgadir and Segal.

The section is structured as follows. The first part is to choose bases for the vector spaces  $E_1, E_2, E_3, E_4$  and  $O_1$  and their tensor, wedge and symmetric products in order to facilitate explicit calculations. The second part is to reformulate the definition of the variety  $Z$  and its GL-action with this choice of basis. The third part is to reformulate the definition of the map  $R : Z \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  with this choice of basis. The fourth part is to construct an isomorphism  $\Psi^\circ : \text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \xrightarrow{\sim} Z^\circ$  which makes  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  equal to  $R : Z^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ . Finally, we prove that the isomorphism  $\Psi^\circ$  does not extend to a map  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$ .

As the first part of this section, we choose bases for all the spaces involved in the construction of  $Z$ . The four vector spaces  $E_1, E_2, E_3$  and  $E_4$  are one-dimensional and we simply use an identification with  $\mathbb{C}$ . In other words, they have a single basis vector which we may write as 1 or drop from expressions whenever possible. The space  $O_1$  is two-dimensional and we identify it with  $\mathbb{C}^2$  and basis vectors  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ . There are several important spaces in the construction of  $Z$ , and we shall choose their bases as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} O_1 \wedge O_1 &= \text{span}\{e_1 \wedge e_2\}, \\ \text{Sym}^2 O_1 &= \text{span}\{e_1 \otimes e_1, e_1 \otimes e_2, e_2 \otimes e_2\}, \\ \wedge^2(\text{Sym}^2 O_1) &= \text{span}\{(e_1 \otimes e_1) \wedge (e_1 \otimes e_2), (e_1 \otimes e_1) \wedge (e_2 \otimes e_2), (e_1 \otimes e_2) \wedge (e_2 \otimes e_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

We also make the obvious choices of basis for any tensor products between all these spaces. There is a canonical isomorphism  $F : \wedge^2 \text{Sym}^2 O_1 \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2 O_1 \otimes (O_1 \wedge O_1)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} F((u_1 \otimes v_1) \wedge (u_2 \otimes v_2)) &= (u_1 \otimes u_2) \otimes (v_1 \wedge v_2) + (v_1 \otimes u_2) \otimes (u_1 \wedge v_2) \\ &\quad + (u_1 \otimes v_2) \otimes (v_1 \wedge u_2) + (v_1 \otimes v_2) \otimes (u_1 \wedge u_2). \end{aligned}$$

In terms of our basis,  $F$  takes the following matrix form:

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad F^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1/4 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1/2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

While our basis choices are lexically canonical, there are apparently still slight inconsistencies. We overcome these by means of a few constant conversion matrices. We shall define these matrices as follows:

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

As the second part of this section, we reformulate the variety  $Z$  with our choice of bases. Recall that in the description of Abdelgadir and Segal, a point  $(\beta, A, B) \in Z$  consists of the following data:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &\in \text{Hom}((O_1 \wedge O_1) \otimes (O_1 \wedge O_1)) \rightarrow E_2 \otimes E_3 \otimes E_4, \\ \alpha_i &\in \text{Hom}(E_i^{\otimes 2}, O_1 \wedge O_1), \quad i = 2, 3, 4, \\ B &\in \text{Hom}(\text{Sym}^2 O_1, E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4). \end{aligned}$$

These data are subject to three algebraic compatibility conditions [1, (E1–3)]. The group GL acts naturally on the variety  $Z$  by means of left-multiplication on the codomain and left-inverse-multiplication on the domain of each map  $\beta$ ,  $\alpha_i$  or  $B$ . The letter  $A$  is a compact way of denoting the matrix

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We caution the reader about the index discrepancy given by the fact that  $\alpha_i$  is the  $i$ -th diagonal entry of the matrix  $A$  but describes a map  $E_{i+1}^{\otimes 2} \rightarrow O_1 \wedge O_1$ . For the description of  $Z$  we need to translate the morphism  $\wedge^2 B \in \text{Hom}(\wedge^2(\text{Sym}^2 O_1), (E_3 \otimes E_4) \oplus (E_2 \otimes E_4) \oplus (E_2 \otimes E_3))$  in terms of the bases. Start by writing  $B = (B_{ij})$  as  $3 \times 3$ -matrix in terms of the bases. Then in terms of bases, we have

$$\wedge^2 B = \begin{pmatrix} B_{21}B_{32} - B_{31}B_{22} & B_{21}B_{33} - B_{31}B_{23} & B_{22}B_{33} - B_{32}B_{23} \\ B_{11}B_{32} - B_{31}B_{12} & B_{11}B_{33} - B_{31}B_{13} & B_{12}B_{33} - B_{32}B_{13} \\ B_{11}B_{22} - B_{21}B_{12} & B_{11}B_{23} - B_{21}B_{13} & B_{12}B_{23} - B_{22}B_{13} \end{pmatrix}.$$

**Remark B.8.** We observe by direct computation that

$$\wedge^2 B = S \det(B) B^{-T} \sigma S. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

**Lemma B.9.** The variety  $Z \subseteq \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^3 \times \mathbb{C}^{3,3}$  consists of points  $(\beta, A, B)$  given by a scalar  $\beta \in \mathbb{C}$ , a diagonal  $3 \times 3$ -matrix  $A$ , and a  $3 \times 3$ -matrix  $B$ , satisfying the following three conditions:

$$(E1) \quad B^T A (SB\sigma SF) = -16\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\beta^2 I_3,$$

$$(E2) \quad (SB\sigma SF) B^T A = -16\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\beta^2 I_3,$$

$$(E3) \quad (\wedge^2 B) F^{-1} = \beta AB,$$

The condition (E3) alone implies  $\det(B) = -16\beta^3\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3$ . Moreover, the GL-action on  $Z$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g(\beta, A, B) &= (g\beta, gA, gB), \\ g\beta &= g_{E_2} g_{E_3} g_{E_4} \det(g_{O_1})^{-2} \beta, \\ gA &= \det(g_{O_1}) A \begin{pmatrix} g_{E_2}^{-2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{E_3}^{-2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{E_4}^{-2} \end{pmatrix}, \\ gB &= \begin{pmatrix} g_{E_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & g_{E_3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & g_{E_4} \end{pmatrix} B G^{\otimes 2}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $G = g_{O_1}^{-1}$  and  $G^{\otimes 2}$  is the Gram matrix explicitly given by

$$G^{\otimes 2} = \begin{pmatrix} G_{11}^2 & G_{11}G_{12} & G_{12}^2 \\ 2G_{11}G_{21} & G_{11}G_{22} + G_{21}G_{12} & 2G_{12}G_{22} \\ G_{21}^2 & G_{21}G_{22} & G_{22}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

*Proof.* We divide the proof into three parts. In the first part, we translate the equation [1, (E3)] into our choice of bases. In the second part, we derive the equation for  $\det(B)$ . In the third part,

we explain the translation of the conditions (E1) and (E2). In the fourth part, we comment on the description of the GL-action.

For the first part, we start from the observation that (E3) version  $\wedge^2 B = \beta ABJ^{-1}$  of Abdelgadir and Segal should be correctly read as  $(\wedge^2 B)K^{-1} = \beta ABJ^{-1}$  where  $K$  is the natural isomorphism  $K : \wedge^2(\text{Sym}^2 O_1) \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2 O_1^* \otimes (O_1 \wedge O_1)^{\otimes 3}$ . As it turns out, in bases  $K^{-1} = F^{-1}J^{-1}$ . Therefore the translation of (E3) of Abdelgadir and Segal into a basis version is

$$(\wedge^2 B)F^{-1} = \beta AB.$$

For the second part of the proof, we use Remark B.8 and deduce the following two equations. Using (E3) to compare both right-hand sides gives  $\det(B) = -16\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\beta^3$ , as claimed.

$$\begin{aligned} \det((\wedge^2 B)F^{-1}) &= -\det(B)^3 \det(B)^{-1}/16, \\ \det(\beta AB) &= \beta^3 \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 \det(B). \end{aligned}$$

For the third part of the proof, we derive (E1) and (E2) by rearranging (E3) under the assumption that  $\det(B) \neq 0$ . Indeed, with the help of Remark B.8 we read

$$\beta B^T A = F^{-1}(\wedge^2 B)^T = F^{-1}S\sigma \det(B)B^{-1}S = -F^{-1} \cdot 16\beta^3 \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 \cdot S\sigma B^{-1}S.$$

Canceling  $\beta$  on both sides is possible under the assumption that  $\det(B) \neq 0$ . Bringing  $F^{-1}S\sigma B^{-1}S$  to the other side, either on the left or on the right, yields (E1) and (E2) in analogy with the version of Abdelgadir and Segal.

For the fourth part of the proof, we observe that the GL-action descends in a straightforward manner to our description of  $Z$  by means of bases. Most importantly, the scalar value of  $g_{O_1} \wedge g_{O_1} : O_1 \wedge O_1 \rightarrow O_1 \wedge O_1$  is simply  $\det(g_{O_1})$  and the matrix expression of  $\text{Sym}^2 g_{O_1}^{-1} : \text{Sym}^2 O_1 \rightarrow \text{Sym}^2 O_1$  is the mentioned Gram matrix  $G^{\otimes 2}$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Example B.10.** We claim that the following data  $(\beta, A, B)$  defines a point in  $Z$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= -1/2, \\ A &= I_3, \\ B &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, we calculate that

$$\wedge^2 B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -2 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus we immediately have the (E3) condition  $(\wedge^2 B)F^{-1} = \beta AB$ . The conditions (E1) and (E2) follow automatically since  $\det(B) \neq 0$ . Therefore  $(\beta, A, B)$  defines a point in  $Z$ .

For the third part of this section, we reformulate the definition of the map  $R : Z \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  in terms of the reformulated version of  $Z$  given by Lemma B.9. Simply speaking, the description of the map  $R$  by Abdelgadir and Segal is in abstract terms and we shall therefore translate it into matrix terms. The work of Abdelgadir and Segal also uses a different selection of starred/non-starred arrows in the double quiver  $\bar{Q}$  than in our description of  $\bar{Q}$  in the general  $D_n$  case. We shall therefore reformulate their map  $R$  into our selection. Recall that our selection and assignment of arrow names is depicted in Figure 2.1.

**Lemma B.11.** The map  $R : Z \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  sends a point  $((\beta, A, B), x)$  to the representation  $\rho \in \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(A_1) &= x, \\ \rho(A_1^*) &= 4\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3\beta^2 \begin{pmatrix} x_2 & -x_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \rho(A_2) &= -\alpha_1 H \rho(A_2^*)^T, \\ \rho(A_2^*) &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 B_{11} + x_2 B_{12} & x_1 B_{12} + x_2 B_{13} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \rho(A_3) &= -\alpha_2 H \rho(A_3^*)^T, \\ \rho(A_3^*) &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 B_{21} + x_2 B_{22} & x_1 B_{22} + x_2 B_{23} \end{pmatrix}, \\ \rho(A_4) &= \alpha_3 H \rho(A_4^*)^T, \\ \rho(A_4^*) &= \begin{pmatrix} x_1 B_{31} + x_2 B_{32} & x_1 B_{32} + x_2 B_{33} \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Here  $H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

*Proof.* It is our task to explain why the map  $R$  of Abdelgadir and Segal translates into the given shape upon choice of bases. In fact, the translation is more or less straightforward from the description of Abdelgadir and Segal [1, section 3]. The matrix  $H$  is the basis version of the isomorphism  $H : O_1^* \otimes (O_1 \wedge O_1) \xrightarrow{\sim} O_1$  given by  $H(f \otimes (u \wedge v)) = f(u)v - f(v)u$ . Indeed, in basis elements it reads

$$\begin{aligned}e_1^* \otimes (e_1 \wedge e_2) &\mapsto e_2, \\ e_2^* \otimes (e_1 \wedge e_2) &\mapsto -e_1.\end{aligned}$$

The scalar multiplicative constants involved in our description are somewhat sketchy details, so we shall provide some comments here on why our translation is acceptable. First, it is checked by hand that  $\rho$  satisfies the preprojective relations

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(A_1^*)\rho(A_1) &= \rho(A_2^*)\rho(A_2) = 0, & \rho(A_3)\rho(A_3^*) &= \rho(A_4)\rho(A_4^*) = 0, \\ \rho(A_1)\rho(A_1^*) + \rho(A_2)\rho(A_2^*) - \rho(A_3^*)\rho(A_3) - \rho(A_4^*)\rho(A_4) &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

The first row is checked easily by noticing that  $vHv^T = 0$  for any row vector  $v$ . The second row relies on the fact that  $(\beta, A, B) \in Z$  satisfy conditions (E1–3). Second, it is easy to see that the map  $R$  defined in the statement is GL-equivariant. We finish the proof here.  $\square$

For the fourth part of the present section, we construct an isomorphism  $\Psi^\circ : \text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \xrightarrow{\sim} Z^\circ$  which makes  $R : \text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$  equal to  $R : Z^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha)$ . We start with a brief discussion about the differences and similarities between  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  and  $Z$ . Indeed, an element  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  by construction contains tensor maps such as  $\varphi_{E_2, O_1} : E_2 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow O_1$  and  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1} : O_1 \otimes O_1 \rightarrow E_1 \oplus E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4$ . It looks natural to suggest that from this amount of data we can read off maps  $\beta, A, B$ . For instance, we immediately have a natural candidate  $B : \text{Sym}^2 O_1 \rightarrow E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4$  given by

$$B(v \otimes w) := \pi_{E_2 \oplus E_3 \oplus E_4}(\varphi_{O_1, O_1}(v \otimes w)).$$

This definition of  $B$  is even well-defined since  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1}$  satisfies a strict symmetry relation. However, the choices for  $\beta$  and  $A$  are less obvious. The author has found somewhat natural choices for them, however they are only well-defined on the open locus  $\text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ = \text{GL } \varphi^{(0)} \subseteq \text{CG}_\Gamma$ . We record these choices explicitly as follows:

**Lemma B.12.** The map  $\Psi^\circ : \text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \rightarrow Z^\circ$ , given by sending an element  $\varphi$  to the element  $(\beta, A, B)$  defined below, is well-defined. The map is in fact a GL-equivariant isomorphism of algebraic varieties.

$$\begin{aligned}\beta &= -\frac{1}{2}\varphi_{E_2, E_3}^{-1}\varphi_{E_4, E_4}^{-1}(\varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_1}(e_1 \otimes e_2))^2 \in \mathbb{C}, \\ A &= (\varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_1}(e_1 \otimes e_2))^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{E_2, E_2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varphi_{E_3, E_3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varphi_{E_4, E_4} \end{pmatrix}, \\ B &= \begin{pmatrix} \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_2}(e_1 \otimes e_1) & \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_2}(e_1 \otimes e_2) & \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_2}(e_2 \otimes e_2) \\ \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_3}(e_1 \otimes e_1) & \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_3}(e_1 \otimes e_2) & \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_3}(e_2 \otimes e_2) \\ \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_4}(e_1 \otimes e_1) & \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_4}(e_1 \otimes e_2) & \varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_4}(e_2 \otimes e_2) \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

In this definition we have used the shorthand notation  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_i} := \pi_{E_i}\varphi_{O_1, O_1}$ . Finally, the map  $\Psi^\circ$  renders the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2 & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\Psi^\circ \times \text{Id}_{\mathbb{C}^2}} & Z^\circ \times \mathbb{C}^2 \\ & \searrow R & \downarrow R \\ & & \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) \end{array}$$

*Proof.* We divide the proof into three parts. In the first part, we explain well-definedness of  $\Psi^\circ$ . In the second part, we explain why  $\Psi^\circ$  is a GL-equivariant isomorphism. In the third part, we explain why  $\Psi^\circ$  renders the diagram commutative.

For the first part, let  $g \in \text{GL}$  and regard the orbit element  $\varphi = g\varphi^{(0)}$ . Checking well-definedness of  $\Psi^\circ(\varphi)$  comes down to checking that the relevant entries of  $\varphi$  are nonzero, so that all inverses in the definition of  $\beta$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  exist. For instance, the bilinear form  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_1}$  is skew-symmetric and therefore descends to a map  $O_1 \wedge O_1 \rightarrow E_1$  which scales by  $\det(g_{O_1})^{-1}$  under gauging by  $g \in \text{GL}$ . More precisely, we have

$$\varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_1}(e_1 \otimes e_2) = \det(g_{O_1})^{-1}\varphi_{O_1, O_1 \rightarrow E_1}(e_1 \otimes e_2).$$

In particular, its value is nonzero. Even simpler considerations show that  $\varphi_{E_2, E_3}$  and  $\varphi_{E_4, E_4}$  are both nonzero. This proves well-definedness.

For the second part of the proof, let us mention that after digesting the first part it will be obvious to the reader that  $\Psi^\circ$  is in fact GL-equivariant. Next, recall that by construction  $\text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ = \text{GL}\varphi^{(0)}$  consists of a single orbit. Moreover, the open set  $Z^\circ$  also consists of a single orbit [1, Lemma 3.5]. This proves the second part.

For the third part of the proof, thanks to the second part, it suffices to check  $R(\Psi(\varphi^{(0)}), x) = R(\varphi^{(0)}, x)$ . This can be easily done by hand. Both sides are equal to the representation depicted in section B.1. The author in fact also confirmed the commutativity for any  $\varphi = g\varphi^{(0)}$  with computer aid. This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Example B.13.** Let us determine the element  $\Psi^\circ(\varphi^{(0)})$ . Its  $B$ -value is simply given by extracting the corresponding  $3 \times 3$ -submatrix from  $\varphi_{O_1, O_1}^{(0)}$ :

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Moreover, we immediately calculate that  $\beta = -1/2$  and  $A = \text{Id}$ . We conclude that  $\Psi^\circ(\varphi^{(0)})$  is simply the element  $(\beta, A, B)$  described in Example B.10.

Thanks to Lemma B.12, we have a candidate approach for an isomorphism  $\Psi : \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$ . However, there are many elements  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  with vanishing values  $\varphi_{E_2, E_3}$  or  $\varphi_{E_4, E_4}$ . The description of  $\Psi$  provided in Lemma B.12 is therefore not suited to define an isomorphism  $\Psi : \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$ . It is an intriguing question whether there exist alternative expressions which do not make use of inverses. The reader may wish to draw the analogy to the trivial example that a map on the hyperbola  $\{xy = 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^2$  may be defined by  $f(x, y) = 1/x$  but alternatively as  $f(x, y) = y$ . Despite the high hopes, we shall now prove that the answer to the isomorphism question is negative.

**Proposition B.14.** There does not exist a morphism of algebraic varieties  $\Psi : \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$  which renders the following diagram commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2 & \xrightarrow[\sim]{\Psi \times \text{Id}_{\mathbb{C}^2}} & Z \times \mathbb{C}^2 \\ & \searrow R & \downarrow R \\ & & \text{Rep}(\Pi_Q, \alpha) \end{array}$$

*Proof.* In the first part of the proof, we show that any such morphism  $\Psi$  would necessarily agree with  $\Psi^0$  on the subset  $\text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ \subseteq \text{CG}_\Gamma$ . In the second part of the proof, we show that there is however no extension of  $\Psi^0$  to a morphism of varieties  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$ . Jointly, these arguments close the proof.

For the first part, assume there exists a morphism  $\Psi$  which renders the diagram commutative. We shall prove that on  $\text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ$  it agrees with  $\Psi^0$ . Pick an arbitrary  $\varphi \in \text{CG}_\Gamma^\circ$ . Now by commutativity and Lemma B.12, for every  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$  we have

$$R(\Psi(\varphi), x) = R(\varphi, x) = R(\Psi^0(\varphi), x). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

We shall now prove that  $\Psi(\varphi) = \Psi^0(\varphi)$ , essentially by explaining how to read off the  $\beta$ ,  $A$  and  $B$  values from the quiver representation on the left-hand side and the right-hand side of (B.4). Indeed, by comparing the outward-pointing arrows to  $E_2$ ,  $E_3$  and  $E_4$  for various  $x \in \mathbb{C}^2$  we immediately deduce that the  $B$ -value of  $\Psi(\varphi)$  and  $\Psi^0(\varphi)$  agrees. Since  $\Psi^0(\varphi) \in Z^\circ$ , we conclude  $\det(B) \neq 0$  and therefore also  $\Psi(\varphi) \in Z^\circ$ . By comparing the inward-pointing arrows from  $E_2$ ,  $E_3$  and  $E_4$  and using  $\det(B) \neq 0$ , we deduce that all  $\alpha_i$ -values agree. Since  $\Psi(\varphi) \in Z^\circ$ , they are necessarily nonzero. Finally, by comparing the outward-pointing arrow to  $E_1$  and using that  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \neq 0$ , we deduce that the  $\beta$ -value agrees. This shows  $\Psi(\varphi) = \Psi^0(\varphi)$ .

For the second part, let us assume that  $\Psi$  is an extension of  $\Psi^{(0)}$  to a morphism of algebraic varieties  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$ . Let us define the following algebraic two-parameter family of Clebsch-Gordan elements  $\varphi^{\bullet, \bullet} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{CG}_\Gamma$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{E_i, E_j}^{a, b} &= 0, \quad (i, j) \in \{(2, 2), (2, 3), (2, 4), (3, 3), (4, 4)\}, \\ \varphi_{E_3, E_4}^{a, b} &= a, \\ \varphi_{E_i, O_1}^{a, b} &= 0, \\ \varphi_{O_1, O_1}^{a, b} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & b & b & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us explain that the element  $\varphi^{a,b}$  indeed lies in  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$ . Indeed, for  $a, b \neq 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi^{a,b} &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} g(t) \varphi^{(0)}, \\ g(t) &= (at^{-2}, t^{-1}, t^{-1}, \begin{pmatrix} ab^{-1}t^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} \end{pmatrix}) \in \text{GL}.\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\varphi^{a,b} \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  for  $a, b \neq 0$  and  $\text{CG}_\Gamma$  is closed, we deduce that  $\varphi^{a,b} \in \text{CG}_\Gamma$  for any  $(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2$ . This establishes the algebraic morphism  $\varphi^{\bullet, \bullet} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{CG}_\Gamma$ . Now assuming that  $\Psi : \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$  is an extension of  $\Psi^\circ$ , we regard the composition

$$\pi_\beta \circ \Psi \circ \varphi^{\bullet, \bullet} : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z \rightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

This is a morphism of algebraic varieties as well. We calculate for  $a, b \neq 0$  that

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_\beta(\Psi(\varphi^{a,b})) &= \pi_\beta(\Psi^\circ(\varphi^{a,b})) \\ &= \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \left( -\frac{1}{2}(a^{-1}t^2)^{-1}t^{-2}(a^{-1}bt^2)^2 \right) \\ &= -\frac{b^2}{2a}.\end{aligned}$$

Evidently, this cannot converge as  $a \rightarrow 0$ . We have produced a contradiction, effectively proving that  $\Psi^\circ$  has no extension to an algebraic morphism  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$ . This finishes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark B.15.** From the proof we conclude that the existence of a natural isomorphism  $\Psi : \text{CG}_\Gamma \rightarrow Z$  fails grossly. The failure is not simply due to different signs or conventions, but due to different “scaling” behavior of the varieties as the Clebsch-Gordan data  $\varphi$ , or  $\beta, A, B$ , approach zero. Given this difference, it is surprising that  $\text{CG}_\Gamma \times \mathbb{C}^2$  and  $Z \times \mathbb{C}^2$  have at least two identical GIT quotients.

## References

- [1] Tarig Abdelgadir and Ed Segal. **The McKay correspondence in type  $D_4$  via VGIT**. 2024. eprint: [arXiv:2402.05763](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.05763).
- [2] G. Bellamy and T. Schedler. **Symplectic resolutions of Quiver varieties and character varieties**. [math.AG/1602.00164](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.00164). 2016.
- [3] Michel Van den Bergh. **Non-commutative crepant resolutions, an overview**. 2022. [arXiv: 2207.09703](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.09703) [[math.AG](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.09703)].
- [4] Tom Bridgeland, Alastair King, and Miles Reid. “The McKay correspondence as an equivalence of derived categories”. In: **J. Amer. Math. Soc.** 14.3 (2001), pp. 535–554.
- [5] W. Crawley-Boevey. “On the exceptional fibres of Kleinian singularities”. In: **Amer. J. Math.** 122.5 (2000), pp. 1027–1037.
- [6] William Crawley-Boevey and Martin P. Holland. “Noncommutative deformations of Kleinian singularities”. In: **Duke Math. J.** 92.3 (1998), pp. 605–635. ISSN: 0012-7094,1547-7398. DOI: 10.1215/S0012-7094-98-09218-3. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1215/S0012-7094-98-09218-3>.
- [7] William Fulton. **Introduction to toric varieties**. Vol. 131. Annals of Mathematics Studies. The William H. Roever Lectures in Geometry. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, pp. xii+157.

- [8] V. Kac. “Infinite root systems, representations of graphs and invariant theory”. In: **J. Algebra** 78 (1982), pp. 141–162.
- [9] A. D. King. “Moduli of representations of finite dimensional algebras”. In: **Quart. J. Math. Oxford** 45.2 (1994), pp. 515–530.
- [10] Jasper van de Kreeke. **Calabi-Yau techniques for Namikawa-Weyl groups**. 2025. arXiv: XXXX.YYYYY.
- [11] Alexander Kuznetsov. “Lefschetz decompositions and categorical resolutions of singularities”. In: **Selecta Math. (N.S.)** 13.4 (2008), pp. 661–696.
- [12] Albion Lawrence, Nikita Nekrasov, and Cumrun Vafa. “On conformal field theories in four dimensions”. eng ; jpn. In: **Nuclear Physics B** 533.1 (1998), pp. 199–209. ISSN: 0550-3213.
- [13] Jacob Lurie. **Tannaka Duality for Geometric Stacks**. 2005. arXiv: math/0412266 [math.AG]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0412266>.
- [14] Michel Van den Bergh. “Three-dimensional flops and noncommutative rings”. In: **Duke Math. J.** 122.3 (2004), pp. 423–455.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY, USA  
*jasper.kreeke@berkeley.edu*