

DERIVED INVARIANTS OF GENTLE ORDERS

WASSILIJ GNEDIN

ABSTRACT. This article is concerned with the derived representation theory of certain infinite-dimensional gentle algebras called gentle orders. For a gentle order, we provide a factorization of the derived Nakayama functor, study its fractionally Calabi-Yau objects and exceptional cycles, and establish that certain combinatorial invariants of its underlying quiver are derived invariants, analogous to results for finite-dimensional gentle algebras.

CONTENTS

1. Preliminaries on derived categories of orders	3
2. Combinatorial notions of quivers underlying gentle orders	9
3. Cartan matrix via graph theory	14
4. A factorization of the Serre functor	18
5. Invariants on derived equivalent gentle orders	24
6. Truncated ribbon graphs of gentle orders	27
References	30

Finite-dimensional gentle algebras have been intensively studied in recent years [40, 1, 39, 13], in particular, due to their appearance in homological mirror symmetry [21, 34]. The derived representation theory of finite-dimensional gentle algebras is well-understood. In [4], Avella-Allaminos and Geiß introduced certain derived invariants for a finite-dimensional gentle algebra which can be computed from its underlying quiver. To study the auto-equivalences of bounded derived categories of certain gentle algebras, Broomhead, Pauksztello and Ploog introduced the notion of exceptional cycles [11]. In [19] Guo and Zhang gave a partial classification of the exceptional cycles in the bounded derived category of a finite-dimensional gentle algebra and related them to AG-invariants. Extending work of [21], Lekili and Polishchuk established derived invariants for homologically smooth graded gentle algebras in terms of geometric invariants of an associated graded surface [34]. Independently, Opper, Plamondon and Schroll provided a geometric model for the bounded derived category of a finite-dimensional gentle algebra [40]. These geometric models were successfully employed to deduce a complete derived equivalence classification of homologically smooth and proper graded gentle algebras [1, 39, 24].

The present article is concerned with a special class of semiperfect infinite-dimensional gentle algebras called *gentle orders*. Their underlying quivers are distinguished by the property that any arrow lies on an oriented cycle without relations. Examples of gentle orders have appeared in connection with Lie theory [17, 29], and are related to a generalized notion of string algebras introduced by Bennett-Tennenhaus [6].

In contrast to finite-dimensional gentle algebras, the derived representation theory of gentle orders is less understood at the present. By work of Burban and Drozd [7] there is a complete classification of indecomposable objects in the right-bounded derived category of a gentle order. Work of Palu, Pilaud and Plamondon [41] associates a natural marked surface to any gentle order. The aim of this work is to provide analogues of some of the above-mentioned results for the derived representation theory of any gentle order Λ .

By work of Iyama and Reiten [23], the derived category of a gentle order admits a *relative Serre functor* \mathbb{S} , an auto-equivalence which restricts to a Serre functor on a certain Hom-finite subcategory of perfect complexes of Λ . Their work implies that the functor \mathbb{S} is given by the composition $\nu \circ [1]$ of the derived Nakayama functor ν with the shift functor. The action of the functor ν on the right-bounded derived category $\mathcal{D}_\Lambda := D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ of Λ can be computed using previous work [16]. The first main result of this article concerns a more conceptual description.

Theorem 0.1 (Theorem 4.13). *For any gentle order Λ the derived Nakayama functor admits a factorization*

$$\nu \cong \xi^* \circ \mathbb{T}_b \circ \dots \circ \mathbb{T}_2 \circ \mathbb{T}_1: \mathcal{D}_\Lambda \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D}_\Lambda$$

of commuting functors, where ξ^ is the auto-equivalence induced by an involution of the ring Λ and $\mathbb{T}_1, \mathbb{T}_2, \dots, \mathbb{T}_b$ denote standard equivalences associated to certain exceptional cycles.*

The gentle order Λ has a maximal idempotent e such that the projective module $B := \Lambda e$ is ν -invariant. This idempotent gives rise to triangulated subcategories

$$\mathcal{U}_\Lambda := K^-(\text{add } \Lambda e) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_\Lambda = D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) \longleftarrow D_A^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) =: \mathcal{V}_\Lambda$$

where A is a certain hereditary quotient of Λ . The pair $(\mathcal{U}_\Lambda, \mathcal{V}_\Lambda)$ forms a stable t -structure of the category \mathcal{D}_Λ , which yields a useful perspective to study homologically distinguished objects.

Theorem 0.2 (Propositions 5.3 and 5.6). *For any gentle order Λ the following statements hold.*

- (1) *Any fractionally Calabi-Yau object in \mathcal{D}_Λ is contained in $\mathcal{U}_\Lambda \cup \mathcal{V}_\Lambda$.
More precisely the following holds.*
 - (a) *The aisle \mathcal{U}_Λ is equal to the full subcategory of ν -periodic objects in \mathcal{D}_Λ .*
 - (b) *Any non- ν -periodic fractionally Calabi-Yau object is contained in \mathcal{V}_Λ .*
- (2) *An object X in \mathcal{D}_Λ gives rise to an exceptional cycle if and only if it is isomorphic to a shift of a simple Λ -module contained in \mathcal{V}_Λ or $X \in \mathcal{U}_\Lambda$ and X is 1-spherical or induces an exceptional 2-cycle.*

The homological interpretation of the aisle \mathcal{U}_Λ as ν -periodic objects allows to derive the first part in the next statement concerning derived invariants of gentle orders.

Theorem 0.3 (Proposition 5.4 (1) and Theorem 5.12). *For any derived equivalent ring-indecomposable gentle orders Λ and Γ the following statements hold.*

- (1) *There are equivalences $\mathcal{U}_\Lambda \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{U}_\Gamma$ and $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{V}_\Gamma$.*
- (2) *The orders Λ and Γ have the same multisets of AG-invariants, the same number of permitted cycles, and the same bicolourability parameter.*

In forthcoming work, we will provide an explicit description of the subcategory \mathcal{V}_Λ and extend the results above to graded skew-gentle orders.

This article is structured as follows. Section 1 collects preliminaries on exceptional cycles in triangulated categories and the derived Morita theory of orders. Section 2 introduces the quiver-theoretic notions relevant for gentle orders. Section 3 provides a graph-theoretic approach to study the Cartan matrix of a gentle order. Section 4 is concerned with the proof of Theorem 0.1. Section 5 contains the main results and the proofs of Theorems 0.2 and 0.3. In Section 6 we consider the notion of truncated ribbon graphs and consider translations between quiver-theoretic, graph-theoretic and derived invariants.

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by the German Research Foundation SFB-TRR 358/1 2023– 491392403. I would like to thank Igor Burban and Kyungmin Rho for helpful discussions of results related to this work.

1. PRELIMINARIES ON DERIVED CATEGORIES OF ORDERS

Conventions on categories and complexes. Any full subcategory of another category is meant to be a full subcategory closed under isomorphisms. Any functor between triangulated categories is assumed to be an exact, additive functor.

For a set of isomorphism classes of objects \mathcal{U} in a triangulated category \mathcal{T} we denote by $\text{tria}(\mathcal{U})$ the smallest triangulated subcategory containing \mathcal{U} , by ${}^\perp\mathcal{U}$ the full subcategory in \mathcal{T} given by objects X such that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(X, U) = 0$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$, and by U^\perp the full subcategory given by objects Y of \mathcal{T} with $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}}(U, Y) = 0$ for all $U \in \mathcal{U}$.

Modules over any ring are assumed to be *left modules*. By a *complex* of modules we mean a chain complex

$$X = (\dots X_{i+1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{i+1}} X_i \xrightarrow{\partial_i} X_{i-1} \dots)$$

The shift of the complex X is denoted by $X[1]$, moves X one step to the left and changes the sign in each differential.

1.1. Serre functor and fractionally Calabi–Yau objects. Throughout this section, let \mathcal{D} denote a \mathbf{k} -linear triangulated category satisfying the following assumptions.

- \mathcal{D} is *Hom-finite* in the sense that for any objects X, Y from \mathcal{D} the \mathbf{k} -linear space of morphisms $X \rightarrow Y$, denoted by $\text{Hom}(X, Y)$ in the following, is finite-dimensional.
- \mathcal{D} has a *Serre functor* \mathbb{S} , that is, an equivalence $\mathbb{S}: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that for any objects X, Y from \mathcal{D} there is a bifunctorial isomorphism

$$(1.1) \quad \text{Hom}(X, Y) \cong \mathbb{D} \text{Hom}(Y, \mathbb{S}(X)), \quad \text{where } \mathbb{D} := \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{k}}(-, \mathbf{k}).$$

Definition 1.2. For $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ a non-zero object X from \mathcal{D} is called (m, n) -Calabi–Yau if $X[m] \cong \mathbb{S}^n(X)$. The Calabi–Yau-dimension $\text{CY-dim}(X)$ is defined as such a pair (m, n) with minimal integer $n \geq 0$. The object X is m -Calabi–Yau if it is $(m, 1)$ -Calabi–Yau.

Remark 1.3. If X is (m, n) -Calabi–Yau, then X is also (qm, qn) -Calabi–Yau for any integer $q \neq 0$. The converse is not true (see e.g. Lemma 2.8).

The next statement is a variation of a known observation [10, Lemma 5.3].

Lemma 1.4. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}$ be (m, n) -Calabi–Yau and $Y \in \mathcal{D}$ be (p, q) -Calabi–Yau such that $\Delta := np - mq \neq 0$ and $\text{Hom}(X, Y[i]) = 0$ for any $i \ll 0$ or $i \gg 0$. Then $X \in {}^\perp Y$.*

Proof. Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. Since $\mathbb{S}^{\pm qn}(X) \cong X[\pm mq]$ and $\mathbb{S}^{\pm nq}(Y) \cong Y[\pm np]$ it holds that

$$\text{Hom}(X, Y[i]) \cong \text{Hom}(\mathbb{S}^{\pm qn}(X), \mathbb{S}^{\pm nq}(Y)[i]) \cong \text{Hom}(X, Y[i \pm \Delta]).$$

It follows that $\text{Hom}(X, Y[i]) \cong \text{Hom}(X, Y[i + \Delta\ell])$ for any $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$, which implies the claim. \square

1.2. Exceptional cycles. The following notion is equivalent to one introduced by Broomhead, Pauksztello and Ploog [11, Definition 4.2].

Definition 1.5. *A sequence of objects $\mathcal{E} = (E_1, E_2, \dots, E_n)$ with $n \geq 1$ from \mathcal{D} is an exceptional n -cycle if it satisfies the following conditions.*

- (E1) *For any index $1 \leq j < n$ there is an integer $m_j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\mathbb{S}(E_j) \cong E_{j+1}[m_j]$, and, similarly, there is an integer $m_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathbb{S}(E_n) \cong E_1[m_n]$ in \mathcal{D} .*
- (E2) *It holds that $\sum_{p=0}^{n-1} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \dim \text{Hom}(E_1, \mathbb{S}^p(E_1)[i]) = 2$.*

We will need the following observations and additional notions for an exceptional cycle \mathcal{E} .

- Each object E_j in an exceptional cycle \mathcal{E} is fractionally (m, n) -Calabi–Yau with $m := \sum_{j=1}^n m_j$. Moreover, all objects in \mathcal{E} have the same Calabi–Yau dimension, which will be denoted by $\text{CY-dim } \mathcal{E}$.
- Vice versa, an (m, n) -Calabi–Yau object E appears in an exceptional cycle if and only if $n > 0$ and E satisfies condition (E2).
- We will call an exceptional cycle *repetition-free* if $E_1 \not\cong E_j[i]$ for any index $2 \leq j \leq n$ and any integer $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Remark 1.6. *We recall a few further remarks on an exceptional n -cycle as above.*

- (1) *The terminology can be explained as follows.*
 - *If $n > 1$, each object E_j is exceptional, that is, $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \dim \text{Hom}(E_j, E_j[i]) = 1$.*
 - *If $n = 1$, the object E_1 is not exceptional but constitutes a spherical object in the sense of Seidel and Thomas [45].*
- (2) *If, in addition to the previous assumptions, the category \mathcal{D} is algebraic and indecomposable, any exceptional n -cycle \mathcal{E} in \mathcal{D} gives rise to an equivalence called a twist functor $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{E}}: \mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D}$, see [45] for $n = 1$ and [11] for general n .*

Following [19, § 2.2] we recall a notion of equivalence of exceptional cycles.

Definition 1.7. *Two exceptional cycles (E_1, \dots, E_n) and $(E'_1, \dots, E'_{n'})$ in \mathcal{D} are equivalent if $n = n'$ and there is an index $1 \leq j \leq n$ and an integer $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $E'_1 \cong E_j[i]$, or, equivalently, there are integers $i_1, \dots, i_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a cyclic permutation $\pi \in S_n$ such that*

$$(E'_1, E'_2, \dots, E'_{n'}) = (E_{\pi(1)}[i_1], E_{\pi(2)}[i_2], \dots, E_{\pi(n)}[i_n])$$

Lemma 1.8. *Let $E \in \mathcal{D}$ be a fractionally (m, n) -Calabi–Yau object satisfying (E2) and q a non-zero integer. Then $\text{Hom}(\tau^q(E), E) \neq 0$ if and only if the following conditions hold.*

- *if $n = 1$, then $m = 1$, that is, E is 1-Calabi–Yau.*

- if $n > 1$, then $m = n$ and n divides q , or $(m, n) \in \{(-q, -q - 1), (q, q + 1)\}$.

Proof. In the notations above, for any $p, i \in \mathbb{Z}$ using $\mathbb{S}^n(E) \cong E[m]$ it holds that

$$(1.9) \quad \text{Hom}(E, \mathbb{S}^p(E)[i]) \cong \text{Hom}(E, \mathbb{S}^r(E)[i + \ell m])$$

where $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq r < n$ are determined by the equality $p = \ell n + r$. On the other hand, since $\tau = \mathbb{S} \circ [-1]$ there is an isomorphism

$$(1.10) \quad \text{Hom}(\tau^q(E), E) \cong \text{Hom}(E, \mathbb{S}^{n-q}(E)[q - m])$$

- Assume that $n = 1$. Since E satisfies (E2) and $(\ell, r) = (p, 0)$, the spaces in (1.9) are not zero if and only if $i \in \{-pm, (1 - p)m\}$. With $(p, i) = (1 - q, q - m)$ it follows that the spaces in (1.10) are not zero if and only if $q \in \{qm, (1 + q)m\}$ if and only if $m = 1$, where the last equivalence is true since $q \neq 0$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- Assume that $n > 1$. Since E satisfies (E2) the spaces in (1.9) are not zero if and only if $i = -\ell m$ and $r \in \{0, 1\}$. Setting $(p, i) = (n - q, q - m)$ it follows that the spaces in (1.10) are not zero if and only if $q = (1 - \ell)m$ and $(1 - \ell)(n - m) \in \{0, 1\}$. As $q \neq 0$, the last condition holds if and only if $m = n \mid q$ or $q = \pm m = \pm n - 1$. This shows the claim in case $n > 1$. \square

1.3. Auslander–Reiten translation. The *Auslander-Reiten translation* on \mathcal{D} is defined by the equivalence

$$\tau := \mathbb{S} \circ [-1]\mathcal{D} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D},$$

For any X from \mathcal{D} , the Serre duality (1.1) yields that

$$\text{End}(X) \cong \mathbb{D} \text{Hom}(X, \tau(X)[1])$$

If X is indecomposable, arguments due to Happel [20] imply that there is an *Auslander-Reiten triangle* beginning in X , that is, a non-split triangle

$$X \xrightarrow{f} Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow X[1]$$

in the category $\text{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$ such that Z is indecomposable and for any non-left-invertible morphism $g: X \rightarrow Y'$ there exists a morphism $g': Y' \rightarrow Y$ with $g = g'f$. In fact, it holds that $Z \cong \tau^{-1}(X)$.

1.4. Main setup. The statements of the present section assume the following conditions on an \mathbb{R} -algebra Λ .

- \mathbb{R} is a complete regular local \mathbf{k} -algebra of Krull dimension d , that is, \mathbb{R} is the ring of formal power series $\mathbf{k}[[x_1, \dots, x_d]]$ if $d > 0$ respectively \mathbb{R} is the field \mathbf{k} otherwise. We will denote by \mathbb{K} the field of fractions of the ring \mathbb{R} .
- Λ is an \mathbb{R} -order, that is, which means that there is a ring homomorphism $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Lambda$ which factors through the center of Λ and Λ is finitely generated and free as an \mathbb{R} -module.
- Λ is *isolated*, that is, for any non-maximal ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathbb{R} the ring $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}} := \Lambda \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{R}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ satisfies $\text{gldim } \Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}} = \dim \mathbb{R}_{\mathfrak{p}}$.
- Moreover, Λ is a *Gorenstein algebra* in the sense of Iyengar and Krause [22], which means that for any prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of \mathbb{R} the ring $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{p}}$ has finite injective dimension as left and right regular module.
- The base field \mathbf{k} is a splitting field for Λ .

Since the ring Λ is a *Noetherian \mathbf{R} -algebra* (that is, Λ is finitely generated as an \mathbf{R} -module), the ring Λ is Noetherian and semiperfect ([33, (23.13)]). For simplicity of the presentation, we assume also the following.

- Λ is basic and ring-indecomposable.

1.5. Derived categories. Associated to Λ we will consider several triangulated categories.

- The unbounded derived category $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{Mod} \Lambda)$ of Λ -modules. For any objects X, Y from $\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{Mod} \Lambda)$ we denote their morphism space by $\mathbf{Hom}(X, Y)$.
- Its full subcategory given by the right-bounded derived category $\mathbf{D}^-(\mathbf{mod} \Lambda)$ of finitely generated Λ -modules, which can be identified with the homotopy category $\mathbf{K}^-(\mathbf{proj} \Lambda)$ of complexes of finitely generated projective Λ -modules.
- The *singularity category* $\mathbf{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$ which is defined as the Verdier quotient of the bounded derived category $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbf{mod} \Lambda)$ by the subcategory $\mathbf{per}(\Lambda)$ of perfect complexes.
- The full subcategory $\mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$ given by perfect complexes X such that the homology $H_i(X)$ is finite-dimensional at each degree $i \in \mathbb{Z}$. This subcategory is *Hom-finite* in the sense that for any two of its objects X, Y the \mathbf{k} -linear space $\mathbf{Hom}(X, Y)$ is finite-dimensional.

Theorem 1.11. *Assume that the Noetherian \mathbf{R} -algebra Λ is derived equivalent to a ring Γ , that is, there is an equivalence of triangulated categories*

$$\Phi: \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{Mod} \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{Mod} \Gamma).$$

Then Γ is a Noetherian \mathbf{R} -algebra and Φ induces equivalences of triangulated categories

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}^-(\mathbf{mod} \Lambda) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{D}^-(\mathbf{mod} \Gamma), & \mathbf{per}(\Lambda) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{per}(\Gamma), & \mathbf{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Gamma) \\ \mathbf{D}^b(\mathbf{mod} \Lambda) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{D}^b(\mathbf{mod} \Gamma), & \mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda) &\xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Gamma) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The ring Γ is a Noetherian \mathbf{R} -algebra by [42, Proposition 9.4]. The equivalence Φ restricts to an equivalence of the subcategories $\mathbf{D}^-(\mathbf{Mod} _)$ by [31, Proof of Theorem 9.2.4], to $\mathbf{D}^-(\mathbf{mod} _)$ and $\mathbf{D}^b(\mathbf{mod} _)$ by [42, Proposition 8.1], and to $\mathbf{per}(_)$ by [42, Section 6] or [31, Theorem 9.2.4]. As observed in [44, Corollary 2.2], there is an equivalence of singularity categories by the universal property of the Verdier quotient.

Note that a perfect complex X of Λ is an object of $\mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$ if and only if for any tilting complex T of Λ it holds that $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \dim \mathbf{Hom}(T, X[i]) < \infty$. This implies that Φ and Φ^{-1} restrict to $\mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(_)$ as well. \square

1.6. The relative Serre functor. The structure morphism $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \Lambda$ gives rise to the Λ -bimodule $\omega := \mathbf{Hom}_{\mathbf{R}}(\Lambda, \mathbf{R})$, which is called the *canonical bimodule* and induces the functors

$$(1.12) \quad \nu := \omega \overset{\mathbf{L}}{\otimes}_{\Lambda} _, \quad \mathcal{S} := \nu \circ [d]: \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{Mod} \Lambda) \longrightarrow \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{Mod} \Lambda).$$

The functor ν is called the *derived Nakayama functor*, whereas the functor \mathcal{S} is a *relative Serre functor* in the following sense.

- (a) Since Λ is a Gorenstein algebra, the functor \mathcal{S} is an equivalence by [22, Theorem 4.5].

- (b) By Theorem 1.11, the functor \mathbb{S} restricts to an auto-equivalence of the Hom-finite subcategory $\mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$. This restriction of \mathbb{S} is the Serre functor on the category $\mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}} \Lambda$ by [23, Theorem 3.7].

We refer to [14, 26, 46] for similar results on properties of the functor \mathbb{S} .

Consequently, the Auslander-Reiten translation on the category $\mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}} \Lambda$ is given by

$$\tau: \mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda), \quad X \longmapsto \tau(X) := \nu(X)[d-1] = \mathbb{S}(X)[-1].$$

1.7. Serre functor for the singularity category. As Λ is a Gorenstein R-algebra, [22, Proposition 6.7] implies that the derived Nakayama functor gives rise to an auto-equivalence of the singularity category

$$\bar{\nu}: \mathbf{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda) \quad X \longmapsto \omega \otimes_{\Lambda}^{\mathbf{L}} X$$

Since the R-order Λ is isolated, the \mathbf{k} -linear category $\mathbf{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$ is Hom-finite and admits a Serre functor which is given by the composition $\bar{\nu} \circ [d-1]$ according to a theorem by Buchweitz [12, Theorem 7.7.5].

1.8. Derived invariants of orders. Since the ring Λ is semiperfect, its unit 1_{Λ} can be written as the sum $e_1 + e_2 + \dots + e_n$ of finitely many primitive orthogonal idempotents. Any indecomposable projective Λ -module is isomorphic to $P_i := \Lambda e_i$ for some index $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Definition 1.13. *The matrix $C_{\Lambda} \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z})$ with $(C_{\Lambda})_{ij} := \text{rk}_{\mathbf{R}} \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(P_i, P_j) = \text{rk}_{\mathbf{R}}(e_i \Lambda e_j)$ for all $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ is called the Cartan matrix of the R-order Λ .*

We collect some basic facts on derived equivalent orders.

Proposition 1.14. *Let Γ be an R-order and*

$$\Phi: \mathbf{D}(\text{Mod } \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbf{D}(\text{Mod } \Gamma)$$

an equivalence of triangulated categories. Then the following statements hold.

- (1) *For any object X in $\mathbf{D}^{-}(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$ there is an isomorphism $\Phi \nu_{\Lambda}(X) \cong \nu_{\Gamma} \Phi(X)$.*
- (2) *The finite-dimensional \mathbf{K} -algebras $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Lambda$ and $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Gamma$ are derived equivalent.*
- (3) *The matrices C_{Λ} and C_{Γ} are congruent over \mathbb{Z} .*

Proof. (1) follows from the proof of the corresponding statement in the setup of finite-dimensional algebras [43, Proposition 5.2]. An application of [43, Theorem 2.1] yields (2) as well as that the finite-dimensional \mathbf{k} -algebras $A := \mathbf{k} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Lambda$ and $B := \mathbf{k} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Gamma$ are derived equivalent. By [48, Proposition 6.8.9] there is a matrix $P \in \text{GL}_n(\mathbb{Z})$ such that $P^T C_A P = C_B$. Since $C_{\Lambda} = C_A$ and $C_{\Gamma} = C_B$, this shows (3). \square

Motivated by statement (1) above, we will call an object in $\mathbf{D}^{-}(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$ *fractionally Calabi–Yau*, if it satisfies the conditions of Definition 1.2 with respect to the relative Serre functor \mathbb{S} .

Corollary 1.15. *In the setup of Proposition 1.14, an object X in $\mathbf{D}^{-}(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$ is fractionally Calabi–Yau if and only if the object $\Phi(X)$ in $\mathbf{D}^{-}(\text{Mod } \Gamma)$ is fractionally Calabi–Yau. In this case, it holds that $\text{CY-dim } X = \text{CY-dim } \Phi(X)$.*

By the next statement, the main setup implies restrictions on possible Calabi–Yau dimensions.

Lemma 1.16. *Let X be a fractionally Calabi-Yau object in $D^-(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$ of dimension (m, n) . Then $m \geq dn$, where $d = \dim R$.*

Proof. For any object $Y \in D^-(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$ set $\mu(Y) := \min\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid H_i(Y) \neq 0\}$. For any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\mu(\omega) \geq i$ and $\mu(X) \geq j$ there is a Λ -linear isomorphism $H_i(\omega) \otimes_{\Lambda} H_j(X) \cong H_{i+j}(\nu(X))$ by the *Künneth trick* (see e.g. [47, Lemma 13.1.36]).

As $\mu(\omega) = 0$, it follows that $\mu(\nu(X)) \geq \mu(X)$. Therefore $\mu(X) + (m - dn) = \mu(X[m - dn]) = \mu(\nu^n(X)) \geq \mu(X)$. \square

1.9. A stable t -structure on the right-bounded derived category. In this subsection, we recall the construction of a stable t -structure on the right-bounded derived category $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ and some of its equivalent formulations. We recall the former notion, coined by Miyachi [36, Section 2], for the convenience of the reader.

Definition 1.17. *A stable t -structure of a triangulated category \mathcal{D} is given by a pair $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ of full triangulated subcategories of \mathcal{D} such that $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ and for any object X from \mathcal{D} there is a triangle*

$$(1.18) \quad U_X \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow V_X \longrightarrow U_X[1]$$

with $U_X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V_X \in \mathcal{V}$.

Any idempotent e of the Noetherian ring Λ gives rise to a subring and a quotient ring

$$\Lambda_e := e\Lambda e \hookrightarrow \Lambda \twoheadrightarrow A := \Lambda/\Lambda e\Lambda$$

as well as a diagram of abelian categories and functors

$$(1.19) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & \mathfrak{f} := \Lambda e \otimes_{e\Lambda e} - & & \mathfrak{q} := A \otimes_{\Lambda} - & \\ & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{mod } \Lambda & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{mod } A \\ \text{mod } \Lambda_e & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \text{mod } \Lambda & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \text{mod } A \\ & \xleftarrow{\quad} & & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \\ & \mathfrak{j} := e(-) & & \mathfrak{r} := \Lambda(-) & \end{array}$$

such that $\mathfrak{q} \dashv \mathfrak{r}$, that is, \mathfrak{q} is left adjoint to \mathfrak{r} , $\mathfrak{r}\mathfrak{q} \cong \text{id}$, $\mathfrak{f} \dashv \mathfrak{j}$ and $\mathfrak{j}\mathfrak{f} \cong \text{id}$.

In the following, let $D_A^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ denote the full subcategory of complexes X in $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ satisfying $eH_d(X) = 0$, that is, $H_d(X) \in {}_{\Lambda}\mathcal{H}$ for any $d \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proposition 1.20. *In the notations above, the following statements hold.*

(1) *There are fully faithful functors of triangulated categories*

$$D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda_e) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}} D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) \xleftarrow{\mathfrak{I}} D_A^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$$

where \mathfrak{I} denotes the inclusion functor, \mathfrak{F} denotes the left-derived functor of \mathfrak{f} , and the pair $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = (\text{im } \mathfrak{I}, \text{im } \mathfrak{F})$ forms a stable t -structure of $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$.

(2) *More precisely, there is a diagram of triangulated categories and functors*

$$(1.21) \quad D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda_e) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{F}} D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) \xleftarrow{\mathfrak{I}} D_A^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$$

forming a left recollement, which means that $\mathfrak{F} \dashv \mathfrak{J}$, $\mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{F} \cong \text{id}$, $\mathfrak{G} \dashv \mathfrak{I}$, $\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{I} \cong \text{id}$, $\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{J}\mathfrak{I} = 0$ and that for each object X from $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ there is a triangle

$$(1.22) \quad \mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{J}(X) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_X} X \xrightarrow{\eta_X} \mathfrak{I}\mathfrak{G}(X) \xrightarrow{\delta_X} \mathfrak{F}\mathfrak{J}(X)[1]$$

where ε_X denotes the counit of the adjunction $\mathfrak{F} \dashv \mathfrak{J}$ and η_X the unit of the adjunction $\mathfrak{G} \dashv \mathfrak{I}$, respectively. The functor \mathfrak{J} is the derived functor of the exact

functor j , while G is defined via the triangle (1.22) on objects, and similarly on morphisms.

(3) In particular, the following statements hold.

(a) For any $X \in D^-(\mathbf{mod} \Lambda)$ and any triangle given by the top row

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} U_X & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & V_X & \longrightarrow & U_X[1] \\ \downarrow \phi & & \parallel & & \downarrow \psi & & \downarrow \phi[1] \\ \mathrm{FJ}(X) & \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_X} & X & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & \mathrm{IG}(X) & \xrightarrow{\delta_X} & \mathrm{FJ}(X)[1] \end{array}$$

with $U_X \in \mathcal{U}$ and $V_X \in \mathcal{V}$, there are unique isomorphisms ϕ, ψ making the diagram above commutative.

(b) Set $B := \Lambda e$, $f := 1 - e$ and $S := \mathbf{top} \Lambda f$. Then $\mathcal{U} = \ker G = {}^\perp \mathcal{V} = {}^\perp S$ and $\mathcal{V} = \ker J = \mathcal{U}^\perp = B^\perp$, where each orthogonal subcategory is defined with respect to the category $D^-(\mathbf{mod} \Lambda)$.

Proof. The statements in (2) were shown in [38, (1.7)]. It is straightforward to check that any left recollement gives rise to a stable t -structure as claimed in (1). A proof of (3a) can be found in [32, Proposition 4.11.2].

It remains to show (3b). The condition $\mathrm{Hom}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}) = 0$ is equivalent to $\mathcal{U} \subseteq {}^\perp \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V} \supseteq \mathcal{U}^\perp$. The condition $\mathrm{JI} = \mathrm{GF} = 0$ translates into $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \ker J$ and $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \ker G$. The converse four inclusions can be shown using (1.18).

For any complex $P \in \mathbf{K}^-(\mathbf{proj} \Lambda)$ and any integer $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ there is an isomorphism $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{proj} \Lambda)}(B[i], P) \cong eH_i(P)$, which yields the equality $B^\perp = \mathcal{V}$.

Since Λ is basic, it holds that $\Lambda e \Lambda f \subseteq \mathbf{rad} \Lambda f$ and thus $S \in \mathcal{V}$, which leads to $\mathcal{U} = {}^\perp \mathcal{V} \subseteq {}^\perp S$. For any minimal complex $C \in \mathbf{K}^-(\mathbf{proj} \Lambda)$, $d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and an indecomposable projective Λ -module P_i the total number of indecomposable summands of the form P_i at degree d in C is equal to $\dim \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbf{K}(\mathbf{proj} \Lambda)}(C, S_i[d])$, where $S_i := \mathbf{top} P_i$. Using that Λ is basic and semiperfect, it follows that $\mathcal{U} = {}^\perp S$, which completes the proof of (3b). \square

We note that any stable t -structure $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ is also called a *weak semiorthogonal decomposition* [37, 1.1] and that the composition FJ of functors in (1.21) is a *localization functor* in the sense of [32, 4.9]. Stable t -structures, left recollements and these two notions yield equivalent setups.

2. COMBINATORIAL NOTIONS OF QUIVERS UNDERLYING GENTLE ORDERS


From now on, we specialize the ring \mathbf{R} to be the ring of formal power series $\mathbf{k}[[x]]$ over a field \mathbf{k} . In this section, we consider a finite quiver with relations (Q, I) .

Conventions on quivers. As usual, Q is given by data (Q_0, Q_1, s, t) with a finite set of vertices Q_0 , a finite set of arrows Q_1 and two maps $s, t: Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ assigning to each arrow its start and target. We do not assume that each cyclic path in Q is contained in the ideal I , but we do assume that I is generated by \mathbf{k} -linear combinations of paths of length at least two. Paths are composed from right to left. Given a path $p = \alpha_n \dots \alpha_2 \alpha_1$ with $n \geq 1$ arrows we set $t(p) := t(\alpha_n)$ and $s(p) := s(\alpha_1)$, and denote by $\ell(p) := n$ its length.

2.1. Gentle quivers, threads and cycles. A vertex $i \in Q_0$ will be called

- a *transition vertex* if there is precisely one arrow α ending at i , there is precisely one arrow β starting at i , and $\beta\alpha \notin I$; the local situation around such a vertex is shown in the diagram on the left in (2.1);
- a *crossing vertex* if there are precisely two different arrows α_1, α_2 ending at i , there are precisely two different arrows β_1, β_2 starting at i , and for any $i, j \in \{1, 2\}$ it holds that $\beta_j\alpha_i \in I$ if and only if $i = j$; such a vertex is depicted on the right in (2.1) with the zero relations indicated by dotted lines.

The set of transition vertices and that of crossing vertices is denoted by Q_0^t and Q_0^c , respectively.



The quiver (Q, I) is called

- *2-regular gentle* if $Q_0 = Q_0^c$ and the ideal I is generated by the zero relations at crossing vertices,
- *gentle* if it can be obtained from a 2-regular gentle quiver by deleting any choice of arrows and removing all zero relations involving deleted arrows.

In a gentle quiver (Q, I) , a path $p = \alpha_n \dots \alpha_2 \alpha_1 \notin I$ with different arrows is called

- a *permitted cycle* if p is a cyclic path such that $\alpha_1 \alpha_n \notin I$,
- a *permitted thread* if it is not a permitted cycle and there is neither an arrow $\alpha_{n+1} \in Q_1$ with $\alpha_{n+1} \alpha_n \notin I$ nor an arrow $\alpha_0 \in Q_1$ with $\alpha_1 \alpha_0 \notin I$.

A path $f = \beta_n \dots \beta_2 \beta_1$ a path with $n \geq 1$ different arrows such that $\beta_{i+1} \beta_i \in I$ for each index $1 \leq i < n$ is called

- a *forbidden cycle* if f is a cyclic path and $\beta_1 \beta_n \in I$.
- a *forbidden thread* if it is not a forbidden cycle and there is neither an arrow $\beta_{n+1} \in Q_1$ with $s(\beta_{n+1}) = t(\beta_n)$ and $\beta_{n+1} \beta_n \in I$ and nor an arrow $\beta_0 \in Q_1$ with $s(\beta_1) = t(\beta_0)$ and $\beta_1 \beta_0 \in I$.

Remark 2.2. *We give a few remarks concerning the terminology.*

- *Permitted threads and forbidden threads may be cyclic paths.*
- *Somewhat counter-intuitively, any arrow β in Q between transition vertices is also considered as a forbidden thread although $\beta \notin I$. Similarly, a loop β in Q with $\beta^2 \in I$ is considered a forbidden cycle although $\beta \notin I$.*

Let (Q, I) be a gentle quiver. Let Λ denote the J -adic completion of the path algebra $\mathbf{k}Q/I$ with respect to the ideal J generated by all arrows. Then the following statements hold.

- The \mathbf{k} -algebra Λ is finite-dimensional if and only if (Q, I) has no permitted cycles.
- The global dimension of Λ is finite if and only if (Q, I) has no forbidden cycles.

Remark 2.3. *Taking arrow ideal completion ensures that $D^-(\mathbf{mod} \Lambda)$ has the Krull-Remak-Schmidt property in the sense that any object is a countable direct sum of indecomposable objects with local endomorphism rings [7, Corollary A.6].*

2.2. Definition of gentle orders.

Lemma 2.4. *For any gentle quiver (Q, I) , the following conditions are equivalent.*


- (1) *Every vertex in Q is a transition vertex or a crossing vertex.*
- (2) *The quiver (Q, I) has no permitted threads.*
- (3) *Every arrow in Q is contained in a permitted cycle.*
- (4) *The arrow ideal completion Λ of the path algebra $\mathbf{k}Q/I$ has an \mathbf{R} -order structure.*

If (Q, I) is connected, Λ satisfies all assumptions of the setup in Subsection 1.4.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume that (1) holds. Then for any (possibly stationary) path $p \notin I$ in Q there is an arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$ such that $ap \notin I$, which shows (2).

The implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) is true because in a gentle quiver any arrow is either contained in a permitted cycle or in a permitted thread.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) The assumption (3) excludes all possibilities other than (2.1) around a vertex in a gentle quiver, which are given as follows.



The equivalence (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) follows from the proof of [16, Proposition 8.4] with the polynomial ring $\mathbf{k}[x]$ replaced by the power series ring $\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{k}[[x]]$.

The ring Λ is an isolated Gorenstein algebra by [16, Lemma 8.3] and [31, Proposition 6.2.9]. Verifying the remaining properties is straightforward. \square

Definition 2.5. *A basic semiperfect ring Λ will be called a gentle order if Λ satisfies any of the conditions of Lemma 2.4.*

An \mathbf{R} -order structure on a gentle order Λ is given by the unique \mathbf{k} -algebra morphism $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow \Lambda$ which maps the monomial $x \in \mathbf{R}$ to the sum of all permitted cycles in Λ .

2.3. Combinatorial invariants of quivers underlying gentle orders. In the present subsection, we assume that Λ is a gentle order such that its underlying quiver (Q, I) is connected. We will say that a cyclic path c in Q is a *rotation* of a cyclic path c' if c can be obtained from c' by a cyclic permutation of its arrows.

Bicolorability parameter. The gentle quiver (Q, I) is *bicolorable* if there is a map $f: Q_1 \rightarrow \{1, 2\}$ such that for any two arrows $\alpha, \beta \in Q_1$ with $s(\beta) = t(\alpha)$ it holds that $\beta\alpha \in I$ if and only if $f(\beta) \neq f(\alpha)$. For the gentle order Λ we define a binary parameter

$$(2.6) \quad \text{bc}_\Lambda := \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } (Q, I) \text{ is bicolorable,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The number of permitted cycles. For an arbitrary arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$ there are the following notions.

- A unique arrow $\sigma(\alpha) \in Q_1$ with $\sigma(\alpha)\alpha \notin I$.
- A unique permitted cycle, denoted $pc(\alpha)$, starting with α .

As the set Q_1 is finite, the first assignment defines a permutation $\sigma: Q_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_1$. We will denote by Q_1/\sim_σ the set of σ -orbits. The cardinality of this set, denoted

$$p_\Lambda := |Q_1/\sim_\sigma|,$$

is precisely the number of permitted cycles in (Q, I) up to rotation.

Avella-Allaminos Geiss invariants of first type. For any transition vertex $j \in Q_0^t$ there are the following notions.

- A unique forbidden thread f_1 with $s(f_1) = j$. Then $\kappa(j) := t(f_1) \in Q_0^t$.
- A unique cycle $c(j)$, called *the AG-cycle of the vertex j* , which starts in j and is composed from distinct forbidden threads. More precisely, $c(j) = f_{n(j)} \dots f_2 f_1$ with $t(f_p) = \kappa^p(j)$ for each index $1 \leq p \leq n(j) := \min\{q \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid \kappa^q(j) = j\}$.
- The *AG-invariant of the vertex j* , the pair $(m(j), n(j))$ where $m(j) := \ell(c(j))$.

The first assignment defines a permutation $\kappa: Q_0^t \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_0^t$. Any two vertices which lie in the same κ -orbit have the same AG-invariant. The cardinality $n(j)$ of the κ -orbit of j is precisely the number of transition vertices which appear in the cyclic path $c(j)$. In particular, the inequality $m(j) \geq n(j)$ holds.

Let $j_1, j_2 \dots j_b$ denote a complete set of representatives of κ -orbits in Q_0^t . Their invariants give rise to the multiset of *AG-invariants of first type*

$$\mathcal{AG}_1(\Lambda) := \{(m(j_a), n(j_a)) \mid 1 \leq a \leq b\}.$$

Its cardinality b is precisely the number of AG-cycles in (Q, I) up to rotation.

Avella-Allaminos Geiss invariants of second type. Let Q_1^{fc} denote the subset of arrows in Q appearing in a forbidden cycle. For any arrow $\beta \in Q_1^{fc}$ there are the following notions.

- A unique arrow $\varrho(\beta) \in Q_1^{fc}$ with $\varrho(\beta)\beta \in I$ and $s(\varrho(\beta)) = t(\beta)$.
- A unique forbidden cycle $fc(\beta)$ starting with β . We denote by $m(\beta)$ its length.
- The pair $(m(\beta), 0)$, called *the AG-invariant of β* .

The first assignment defines a permutation $\varrho: Q_1^{fc} \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_1^{fc}$. Including 0 in the notation $(m(\beta), 0)$ is consistent with the previous notion of AG-cycles of transition vertices, as there are no transition vertices in the forbidden cycle $fc(\beta)$. Similar to the previous definitions, we denote by Q_1^{fc}/\sim_ϱ the set of ϱ -orbits of arrows in Q_1^{fc} . Any two arrows in Q_1^{fc} which lie in the same ϱ -orbit have the same AG-invariant.

Choosing a complete set $\beta_1, \beta_2 \dots \beta_q$ of representatives of ϱ -orbits in Q_1^{fc} , we denote the multiset of *AG-invariants of second type* by

$$\mathcal{AG}_2(\Lambda) := \{(m(\beta_i), 0) \mid 1 \leq i \leq q\}.$$

In particular, the cardinality of this multiset is given by the number of forbidden cycles in (Q, I) up to rotation.

2.4. Hereditary gentle orders. One of the simplest subclasses of gentle orders is given by that of hereditary ones. These are obtained as follows.

Let Q' be the equioriented quiver of Euclidean type $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}$ with $\ell \geq 1$ vertices. The arrow ideal completion Γ of the path algebra $\mathbf{k}Q'$ is isomorphic to the matrix algebra

$$(2.7) \quad T_\ell(\mathbb{R}) := \{(p_{ij})_{i,j=1 \dots \ell} \in \mathbf{Mat}_{\ell \times \ell}(\mathbb{R}) \mid p_{ij} \in \mathfrak{m} \text{ for any indices } 1 \leq i < j \leq \ell\}$$

In other terms, the quiver Q and the ring Γ can be depicted as follows.

$$Q: \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & 2 \\ 1 & & \bullet \\ \bullet & \xrightarrow{\alpha_2} & 3 \\ & \xrightarrow{\alpha_\ell} & \bullet \\ \bullet & & \end{array} \end{array} \quad \Gamma \cong \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{m} & \dots & \mathbf{m} \\ \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{R} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \mathbf{m} \\ \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{R} & \dots & \mathbf{R} \end{pmatrix}$$

The \mathbf{R} -order structure on Γ proposed after Definition 2.5 can be identified with the diagonal embedding $\mathbf{R} \rightarrow T_\ell(\mathbf{R})$, $r \mapsto r\mathbf{1}_\ell$.

To describe the canonical bimodule of Γ , we introduce an automorphism and a Γ -bimodule.

- Let $\rho: \Gamma \xrightarrow{\sim} \Gamma$ denote the the unique \mathbf{k} -algebra morphism satisfying $e_j \mapsto e_{j+1}$ and $\alpha_j \mapsto \alpha_{j+1}$ for any index $1 \leq j < \ell$ as well as $e_\ell \mapsto e_1$ and $\alpha_\ell \mapsto \alpha_1$. Then ρ is an \mathbf{R} -algebra automorphism of Γ of order ℓ , which can be visualized as a clockwise rotation of the quiver Q .
- Let ${}_\rho\Gamma$ denote the Γ -bimodule with underlying set Γ such that the left Γ -module action is twisted by the automorphism ρ in the sense that $a *_\rho x := \rho(a)x$ for any with $a, x \in \Gamma$, and the right Γ -module action ${}_\rho\Gamma$ is the regular one.

By the next statement, the derived Nakayama functor

$$\nu := \omega \otimes_{\Lambda} - : D(\text{Mod } \Gamma) \xrightarrow{\sim} D(\text{Mod } \Gamma).$$

is induced by the automorphism ρ .

Lemma 2.8. *The canonical bimodule $\omega = \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{R}}(\Gamma, \mathbf{R})$ is isomorphic to the twisted bimodule ${}_\rho\Gamma$. In particular, $D(\text{Mod } \Gamma)$ is fractionally (ℓ, ℓ) -Calabi–Yau.*

Proof. There are isomorphisms of Γ -bimodules

$$\omega = \Gamma^\vee \cong \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}^\vee & \dots & \mathbf{R}^\vee & \mathbf{R}^\vee \\ \mathbf{m}^\vee & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \mathbf{R}^\vee & \mathbf{R}^\vee \\ \mathbf{m}^\vee & \dots & \mathbf{m}^\vee & \mathbf{R}^\vee \end{pmatrix} \cong \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{m} & \dots & \mathbf{m} & \mathbf{m} \\ \mathbf{R} & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \mathbf{m} & \mathbf{m} \\ \mathbf{R} & \dots & \mathbf{R} & \mathbf{m} \end{pmatrix} \cong {}_\rho\Gamma$$

where $(-)^{\vee}$ denotes $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{R}}(-, \mathbf{R})$. Since ρ has order ℓ , the last statement follows. \square

Lemma 2.9. *An object X in $D(\text{Mod } \Gamma)$ appears in an exceptional cycle if and only if X is isomorphic to a simple Γ -module up to shift.*

Proof. Since Γ is hereditary, any indecomposable object in $D(\text{Mod } \Gamma)$ is isomorphic to the projective resolution of an indecomposable Γ -module M up to shift by [31, Proposition 4.4.15].

To show the ‘only if’-implication, assume that X appears in an exceptional cycle. Lemma 2.8 implies that $\text{CY-dim}(X) = (\ell, \ell) \neq (0, 1)$, and thus $\text{End}_{D(\Gamma)}(X) \cong \mathbf{k}$. In particular, X is isomorphic to the projective resolution of an indecomposable Γ -module M up to shift by [31, Proposition 4.4.15].

As Γ is uniserial it follows that $X[i] \cong M_{j,n} := P_j / \text{rad}^n P_j$ for certain $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in Q_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$. It is sufficient to show that $n = 1$.

- Let $\ell > 1$. Assume that $n > 1$ for a proof by contradiction. Then there is a non-zero morphism $M_{j+1,n} \rightarrow M_{j,n}$, $m \mapsto m\alpha_j$. Thus $\text{Hom}(\tau(X), X) \neq 0$. By Lemma 1.8 it follows that $\ell = 1$, a contradiction.

- Let $\ell = 1$. Then $n = \dim M_{j,n} = \dim \text{End}_{D(\Gamma)}(X) = 1$.

To show the ‘if’-implication note that the minimal projective resolution of a simple module S_j is given by a two-term complex $P_{j+1} \rightarrow P_j$. It is then straightforward to verify (E2) of Definition 1.5. \square

In summary, the sequence $(S_1, S_2, \dots, S_\ell)$ of simple Γ -modules is the only exceptional sequence in $D(\text{Mod } \Gamma)$ up to equivalence.

Proposition 2.10. *Let (Q, I) be a connected gentle quiver and Λ the arrow ideal completion of its path algebra. Then the following conditions are equivalent.*

- (1) *There is a vertex $j \in Q_0^t$ such that its AG-invariant satisfies $m(j) = n(j)$.*
- (2) *The gentle order Λ is hereditary.*
- (3) *Any object in $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ is ν -periodic and Λ has finite global dimension.*

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) Assume that (1) holds. Since Q is connected, it follows that $Q_0 = Q_0^t$, thus Q is a quiver of type $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}$ and Λ is hereditary.

The implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) follows from Lemma 2.8.

To show (3) \Rightarrow (1), assume that any object in $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ is ν -periodic and $\text{gldim } \Lambda < \infty$. By the second assumption, Λ is not a ribbon graph order, that is, there exists a vertex $j \in Q_0^t$. Then the simple module S_j is fractionally Calabi–Yau with $\text{CY-dim}(S_j) = (m(j), n(j))$ where $m(j) \geq n(j)$. As S_j is ν -periodic, it follows that $m(j) = n(j)$. \square

2.5. Normalization and rational hull of a gentle order. Let (Q, I) be a connected gentle quiver. The quiver (Q, I) can be viewed as a ‘gluing’ of quivers of equioriented Euclidean type $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}$ as follows.

Let $Q' = (Q'_0, Q'_1, s', t')$ be the quiver defined by $Q'_0 := \{i(\alpha) \mid \alpha \in Q_1\}$, $Q'_1 := Q_1$, $s'(\alpha) := i_\alpha$ and $t'(\alpha) := i_{\sigma(\alpha)}$ for any $\alpha \in Q'_1$. Set $\mathfrak{p} := \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda$ and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\mathfrak{p}}$ denote a complete set of representatives of σ -orbits in Q_1 . Then Q' is the product $\prod_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{p}} \tilde{\mathbb{A}}_{\ell(j)-1}$, where $\ell(j)$ denotes the length of the unique permitted cycle $pc(\alpha_j)$ beginning with α_j . The arrow ideal completion Γ of the path algebra $\mathbf{k}Q'$ is a hereditary order and isomorphic to the product $\prod_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{p}} T_{\ell(j)}(\mathbf{R})$ such that each ring factor is a ‘triangular’ matrix algebra of the form (2.7).

Lemma 2.11. *Let $\iota: \Lambda \hookrightarrow \Gamma$ be the unique \mathbf{k} -algebra homomorphism satisfying $e_i \mapsto \sum_{\alpha \in Q_1: s(\alpha)=i} e_{i(\alpha)}$ for any $i \in Q_0$ and $\alpha \mapsto \alpha$ for any $\alpha \in Q_1$. Then ι is an \mathbf{R} -algebra monomorphism such that $\iota(\text{rad } \Lambda) = \text{rad } (\Gamma)$.*

Proof. The completion of the arrow ideal in $\mathbf{k}Q/I$ is isomorphic to $\text{rad } \Lambda$, and a similar statement holds for Q' . Because of this, the statement follows by taking completion of the \mathbf{k} -algebra monomorphism in [16, Lemma 8.2 (2)]. \square

Corollary 2.12. *The \mathbf{K} -algebra $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Lambda$ is Morita equivalent to the product $\mathbf{K}^{\times \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda}$.*

Proof. Since the cokernel of ι has finite length as an \mathbf{R} -module, there are \mathbf{K} -algebra isomorphisms $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Lambda \cong \mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Gamma \cong \prod_{j=1}^{\mathfrak{p}_\Lambda} \text{Mat}_{\ell(j) \times \ell(j)}(\mathbf{K})$, which imply the claim. \square

3. CARTAN MATRIX VIA GRAPH THEORY

In this section, we introduce a variation of the notion of an undirected graph by allowing so-called *truncated edges*. There is a natural notion of a truncated graph G_Λ associated to a gentle order Λ , which allows to compute the rank and

the determinant of its Cartan matrix. This section is essentially self-contained and requires only a few notions on gentle orders.

3.1. Truncated graphs. Throughout this subsection, let G be a *truncated graph* by which we mean a triple (V, E, μ) comprised from a finite set of vertices V , a finite set of edges E and a map $\mu: E \rightarrow \{m: V \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_0 \mid \sum_{v \in V} m(v) \in \{1, 2\}\}$.

An edge $e \in E$ is called *incident* to a vertex $v \in V$ if $\mu(e)(v) \neq 0$. For any edge $e \in E$ one of the following cases occurs.

- There are distinct vertices $v_1, v_2 \in V$ with $\mu(e)(v_1) = \mu(e)(v_2) = 1$. In this case, the edge e is called *ordinary*.
- There is a vertex $v \in V$ with $\mu(e)(v) = 2$. Then e is called a *loop*.
- Otherwise, $\sum_{v \in V} \mu(e)(v) = 1$. This is when the edge e is called *truncated*.

To simplify the wording, we have called the datum G a truncated graph also if G has no truncated edges. The goal of this subsection is to provide formulas for the rank and the determinant of certain matrices associated to the truncated graph G .

To define the *edge-vertex incidence matrix* B_G of the truncated graph G , we need to choose an enumeration of edges $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and an enumeration of vertices $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_p\}$. For any indices $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$ we set

$$(3.1) \quad b_{ij} := \mu(e_i)(v_j) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } e_i \text{ is a loop incident to } v_j, \\ 1 & \text{if } e_i \text{ is not a loop and } e_i \text{ is incident to } v_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise, that is, } e_i \text{ is not incident to } v_j. \end{cases}$$

This prescription defines the matrix $B_G = (b_{ij}) \in \text{Mat}_{n \times p}(\mathbb{Z})$.

Remark 3.2. For any matrix $A \in \text{Mat}_{n \times p}(\mathbb{Z})$ we define $\text{rk } A$ by the rank of the image of the map $\ell_A: \mathbb{Z}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^n$, $x \mapsto Ax$. Since $\mathbb{Q} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \text{im}(\ell_A) \cong \text{im}(\mathbb{Q}^p \xrightarrow{A} \mathbb{Q}^n)$ it holds that $\text{rk } A = \text{rk}_{\mathbb{Q}} A$, and thus $\text{rk } A = \text{rk } A^T$.

We note that a different enumeration of edges or vertices of G yields another matrix B'_G which is related to B_G by permutations of rows or permutations of columns. In particular, B_G and B'_G have the same rank, but their determinants may differ by a sign.

The following statement is an adaptation of a result from graph theory concerning [18, Theorem 8.2.1].

Proposition 3.3. Let $\text{bc}(G)$ denote the number of connected components of G which are bipartite graphs without truncated edges. Then $\ker B_G \cong \mathbb{Z}^{\text{bc}(G)}$.

Proof. For simplicity, we assume that G is connected. Set $B := B_G$. For any $x \in \mathbb{Z}^p$ it holds that $Bx = 0$ if and only if for any indices $1 \leq i, j \leq p$ it holds that $x_i = 0$ in case there is a loop or a truncated edge incident to v_i and $x_i + x_j = 0$ in case there is an each edge incident to v_i and v_j , or, equivalently, $x_i = (-1)^\ell x_j$ for any walk from v_i to v_j of length ℓ .

- If the graph G is not bipartite, there is a cyclic walk of odd length ℓ starting at a vertex v_i for certain $1 \leq i \leq p$. Then $x_i = (-1)^\ell x_i = 0$. Since the graph G is connected, it follows that $x = 0$.
- If the graph G has a truncated edge, there is also an index $1 \leq i \leq p$ with $x_i = 0$, which implies again that $x = 0$.

- Otherwise the graph G is bipartite without truncated edges. Let $1 \leq i \leq p$. In this case, the lengths of any two walks from vertex v_i to vertex v_1 have the same parity. It follows that $x \in \ker B$ if and only if $x_i = x_1$ in case of even parity and $x_i = -x_1$ in case of odd parity. This shows that $\ker B \cong \mathbb{Z}$. \square

The next proofs require an operation of vertex deletion for truncated graphs. For a vertex v of G let $G \setminus \{v\}$ denote the graph obtained from G by removing vertex v , removing all truncated edges and loops incident to v and transforming any of the remaining edges incident to v into truncated ones.

Proposition 3.4. *Let G be a connected, truncated graph with $n = p$. Then*

$$|\det B_G| = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } G \text{ has a cycle of odd length, no truncated edges,} \\ 1 & \text{if } G \text{ is a tree without truncated edges,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let b denote the number of truncated edges in G . Set $g := n - b$ and $B := B_G$.

- (1) Assume that G is a tree with a unique truncated edge, enumerated as e_1 .
 - If $g = 0$, it holds that $\det B = 1$.
 - In case $g \neq 0$, let v_1 denote the vertex incident to e_1 . Subtracting the first row of the matrix B from each other row with a non-zero entry in the first column yields a block-diagonal matrix, which shows that $\det B = \det B_{G \setminus \{v_1\}}$. Since each connected component of $G \setminus \{v_1\}$ is a tree with a unique truncated edge, we may iterate this procedure until all proper edges have been removed. Therefore, it follows that $\det B = 1$ as well.
- (2) Assume that G has a cycle of odd length ℓ , $b = 0$ and $n = p$. We choose an enumeration of V and E such that

$$v_1 \xrightarrow{e_1} v_2 \xrightarrow{e_2} v_3 \cdots v_\ell \xrightarrow{e_\ell} v_1$$

forms an odd cycle. Since $n = p$, removing any edge e_i with $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ in G yields a tree.

- Assume that $\ell = 1$, that is, there is a loop at v_1 . Viewing B as a matrix over \mathbb{Q} and using that each connected component of $B_{G \setminus \{v_1\}}$ is a tree with a unique truncated edge, we may use elementary row transformations to conclude that $\det B = 2 \det B_{G \setminus \{v_1\}} = 2$.
- If $\ell > 1$, the graph G has no loops and Laplace expansion of the first row yields that $\det B = \det B_{11} - \det B_{12}$. Each of the minors B_{11} and B_{12} is the incidence matrix of a tree with a unique truncated edge, which implies that $|\det B| \in \{0, 2\}$. Since $\text{bc}(G) = 0$, Proposition 3.3 yields that $\text{rk } B = p = n$, and thus $|\det B| = 2$.

In both cases it follows that $|\det B| = 2$.

- (3) Assume that $\det B \neq 0$. Since $n = p$, Proposition 3.3 implies that $\text{bc}(G) = 0$. So $p = \text{rk } B = n = b + g \geq b + p - 1$, which is equivalent to $1 \geq b$. Thus there are only the two possibilities $b \in \{1, 0\}$, which correspond to the previous two cases. This shows that $\det B = 0$ if none of these two cases occurs. \square

For the truncated graph G the *signless edge-based Laplacian matrix* is defined by the symmetric matrix $A_G := BB^T \in \text{Mat}_{n \times n}(\mathbb{Z})$.

Corollary 3.5. *For any connected truncated ribbon graph G with p vertices and n edges the rank and the determinant of the matrix A_G are given by*

$$(3.6) \quad \text{rk } A_G = p - \text{bc}(G),$$

$$(3.7) \quad \det(A_G) = \begin{cases} n+1 & \text{if } G \text{ is a tree without truncated edges} \\ 4 & \text{if } G \text{ has a cycle of odd length, no truncated edges} \\ & \text{and as many vertices as edges,} \\ 1 & \text{if } G \text{ is a tree with a unique truncated edge} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We set $B := B_G$ and $C := A_G$. Since $\text{rk } C = \text{rk } B^T = \text{rk } B$, the first claim follows from Proposition 3.3.

- Assume that G is a tree without truncated edges. In this case, $n = g = p - 1$. For each index $1 \leq j \leq p$ let B_j denote the square matrix obtained from B by deleting column j . Each matrix B_j corresponds to the incidence matrix of the graph $G \setminus \{v_j\}$, which is given by a union of trees, each one of which has a unique truncated edge. Therefore, Proposition 3.4 yields that $\det B_j = 1$. By the Cauchy-Binet formula it follows that $\det C = \det(BB^T) = \sum_{j=1}^p (\det B_j)^2 = n+1$.
- In the second and third case in (3.7), it holds that $n = p$ and $\det C = (\det B)^2 = 4$ respectively 1 by Proposition 3.4.
- Assume that $\det C \neq 0$.
 - If $n = p$, it follows that $\det B \neq 0$, which leads to the second or the third case.
 - Assume that $n \neq p$. Since $n = \text{rk } C = p - \text{bc}(G)$, it follows that $\text{bc}(G) = 1$, which corresponds to the first case.

This shows that $\det C = 0$ if none of these three cases occurs. \square

3.2. Application to the Cartan matrix of a gentle order. Let Λ be a gentle order Λ such that its underlying quiver (Q, I) is connected. The gentle order Λ gives rise to a truncated graph $G = G_\Lambda$ as follows.

Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_p$ denote a complete set of representatives of σ -orbits in Q_1 and $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ an enumeration of the vertices Q_0 . Then $G = (V, E, \mu)$ with $V := \{v_1, \dots, v_p\}$, $E := \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ and $\mu(e_i)(v_j)$ is given by the number of arrows in $\beta \in Q_1$ such that $s(\beta) = i$ and $\beta \sim_\sigma \alpha_j$ for any indices $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq p$.

Since (Q, I) was assumed to be connected, the graph G is connected as well. There is an equality $\text{bc}_\Lambda = \text{bc}(G)$ of the parameters which were introduced in 2.6 and Proposition 3.3.

We may now view relate Cartan matrix C_Λ introduced in Definition 1.13 to the matrix A_G .

Proposition 3.8. *For any gentle order Λ and its truncated graph $G = G_\Lambda$ it holds that $C_\Lambda = A_G$.*

Proof. Let $\iota: \Lambda \rightarrow \Gamma$ denote the monomorphism from Lemma 2.11. Let $1 \leq j \leq p$ and $L_j := \Lambda \alpha_j$. In the notation of Subsection 2.5, the indecomposable projective Γ -module $\Gamma \otimes_\Lambda L_\alpha$ lies in the j -th ring factor of the overring Γ . Accordingly, $V_j := \mathbb{K} \otimes_\mathbb{R} L_j$ denotes the j -th simple module over $\mathbb{K} \otimes_\mathbb{R} \Lambda$. By the considerations above, there are natural bijections

$$E \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{ind proj } \Lambda, \quad e_i \longmapsto P_i \quad V \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{sim } \mathbb{K} \otimes_\mathbb{R} \Lambda, \quad v_j \longmapsto V_j.$$

For any index $1 \leq i \leq n$ we consider the decomposition of $\mathbb{K} \otimes_\mathbb{R} P_i$.

- If e_i is an ordinary edge incident to distinct vertices v_j and v_k , then $\iota(e_i)$ is a sum of two primitive idempotents, which appear in components Γ_j and Γ_k such that $j \neq k$, and thus $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} P_i \cong V_j \oplus V_k$ decomposes in two non-isomorphic simple modules.
- If e_i is a loop incident to a vertex v_j , then $\iota(e_i)$ is a sum of two primitive idempotents, which both appear in the component Γ_j , and thus $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} P_i \cong V_j^2$.
- Otherwise, e_i is a truncated edge incident to a vertex v_j , then the idempotent $\iota(e_i)$ is primitive as well, and appears in component Γ_j , which yields that $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} P_i \cong V_j$ is simple.

For any index $1 \leq i \leq n$ it follows that $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} P_i \cong V_1^{b_{i1}} \oplus V_2^{b_{i2}} \dots \oplus V_p^{b_{ip}}$ with b_{ij} defined via (3.1). In particular, the incidence matrix B_G coincides with the *decomposition matrix* $D_\Lambda \in \text{Mat}_{n \times m}(\mathbb{Z})$ of the order Λ . Since the algebras $\Lambda / \text{rad } \Lambda$ and $\mathbf{K} \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \Lambda$ are split semisimple, [48, Proposition 2.6.7] implies that $C_\Lambda = D_\Lambda D_\Lambda^T$, and thus the claim holds. \square

Corollary 3.9. *For any gentle order Λ it holds that $\text{rk } C_\Lambda = \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda - \text{bc}_\Lambda$. Moreover, $\det C_\Lambda$ is given by (3.7).*

Proof. These claims follow from Proposition 3.8 and Corollary 3.5. \square

For the subclass of ribbon graph orders, the statements of the last corollary are equivalent to corresponding results of Antipov [2, 3] specialized to multiplicity-free Brauer graph algebras.

4. A FACTORIZATION OF THE SERRE FUNCTOR

From now on, we fix a gentle order Λ . The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 0.1 on the factorization of the relative Serre functor.

4.1. Serre duality for gentle orders. To recall an explicit description of the derived Nakayama functor from [16] we consider a certain automorphism ξ of the gentle order Λ .

Definition 4.1. *We define a \mathbf{k} -algebra involution $\xi: \Lambda \rightarrow \Lambda$ by $\xi(e_i) = e_i$ for any $i \in Q_0$ and the following prescription on arrows.*

- If the base field \mathbf{k} has characteristic two, we set $\xi(\alpha) := \alpha$ for any $\alpha \in Q_1$.
- Assume that \mathbf{k} has characteristic other than two. First, we need to choose a map $\text{sgn}: Q_1 \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ such that $\text{sgn}(\alpha) \neq \text{sgn}(\beta)$ for any two arrows $\alpha \neq \beta$ in Q_1 with $s(\alpha) = s(\beta)$. For each arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$ we set $\xi(\alpha) := \text{sgn}(\sigma(\alpha)) \text{sgn}(\alpha) \alpha$ where $\sigma(\alpha)$ denotes the unique arrow in Q_1 such that $\sigma(\alpha)\alpha \notin I$.

Let ${}_\xi \Lambda$ denote the Λ -bimodule with underlying set Λ , the regular right Λ -module structure and the left Λ -module structure given by $a \cdot x := \xi(a)x$ for any $a \in \Lambda$ and $x \in {}_\xi \Lambda$. Let ${}_\xi \Lambda^\circ$ denote the subbimodule generated by the idempotents e_i with $i \in Q_0^c$ and arrows $\alpha \in Q_1$ such that $s(\alpha) \in Q_0^t$. We recall that the canonical bimodule $\omega := \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{R}}(\Lambda, \mathbf{R})$ gives rise to the derived Nakayama functor ν , which restricts to an auto-equivalence of $\text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$.

Theorem 4.2 ([16, Theorem 9.7, Corollary 9.8]). *There is an isomorphism of Λ -bimodules ${}_{\varepsilon}\Lambda^{\circ} \cong \omega$. In particular, for any arrow $\alpha: i \rightarrow j$ in Q it holds that*

$$(P_j \xrightarrow{\cdot\alpha} P_i) \xrightarrow{\nu} (L_j \xrightarrow{\cdot\xi(\alpha)} L_i) \quad \text{with} \quad L_j := \begin{cases} \text{rad } P_j & \text{if } j \in Q_0^t, \\ P_j & \text{if } j \in Q_0^c. \end{cases}$$

The last statement allows to compute $\nu(P)$ for any complex P from $\mathbf{K}^-(\text{proj } \Lambda)$.

4.2. Exceptional cycles from simples at transition vertices.

Notation 4.3. *A complex of projective Λ -modules of the form*

$$P_{i^{(m)}} \xrightarrow{\cdot p_m} P_{j^{(m-1)}} \cdots P_{j^{(2)}} \xrightarrow{\cdot p_2} P_{j^{(1)}} \xrightarrow{\cdot p_1} P_{i^{(0)}}$$

with the projective P_j located at degree zero, paths $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m, \notin I$, and vertices $i^{(0)}, i^{(m)} \in Q_0^t$ and $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)}, \dots, j^{(m-1)} \in Q_0^c$ will be abbreviated by the diagram

$$\circ \xrightarrow{p_m} \bullet \cdots \bullet \xrightarrow{p_2} \bullet \xrightarrow{p_1} \circ$$

The next statement uses the notions of AG-invariants of first type and the permutation κ on the set Q_0^t of transition vertices introduced in Subsection 2.3.

Lemma 4.4. *For any vertex $j \in Q_0^t$ the simple module S_j is fractionally Calabi-Yau with $\text{CY-dim } S_j = (m(j), n(j))$ and gives rise to a repetition-free exceptional $n(j)$ -cycle $\mathcal{S}(j) := (S_j, S_{\kappa(j)}, \dots, S_{\kappa^{n(j)-1}(j)})$ in the category $\text{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$.*

Proof. Let $f_1 = \beta_{\ell} \dots \beta_2 \beta_1$ denote the forbidden thread starting at j . In terms of Notation 4.3, the minimal projective resolution P of the simple module S_j is given by the diagram

$$\circ \xrightarrow{\beta_{\ell}} \bullet \cdots \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \circ$$

In particular, $\text{pr. dim } S_j = \ell(f_1) < \infty$, and thus $S_j \in \text{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$.

Applying ν to the projective resolution P via Theorem 4.2 yields a complex L with only one non-zero homology, which is given by $H_{\ell-1}(L) \cong \text{top}(\Lambda\beta_{\ell}) \cong S_{\kappa(j)}$ with $\kappa(j) = t(f_1)$. This shows that $\mathbb{S}(S_j) = \nu(S_j)[1] \cong S_{\kappa(j)}[\ell(f_1)]$.

Let $c(j) = f_{n(j)} \dots f_2 f_1$ denote the AG-cycle starting at j . As κ preserves Q_0^t , an iteration of the argument above yields that $\mathbb{S}^p(S_j) \cong S_{\kappa^p(j)}[\ell(f_1) + \dots + \ell(f_p)]$ for any index $1 \leq p \leq n(j)$. Since $m(j) = \ell(c(j))$ and $n(j) = \min\{p \in \mathbb{N} \mid \kappa^p(j) = j\}$, the sequence $\mathcal{S}(j)$ satisfies condition (E1) of Definition 1.5, S_j is fractionally Calabi-Yau of dimension $(m(j), n(j))$ and $S_1 \not\cong S_{\kappa^p(j)}[i]$ for any $1 \leq p < n(j)$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Using that $\dim \text{Hom}(P, S_{j'}[i])$ is given by the number of indecomposable projective summands $\Lambda e_{j'}$ at degree i in the projective resolution P and the diagram above, it follows that the module S_j satisfies condition (E2) of Definition 1.5. \square

In fact, the previous proof shows that there is a bijection between forbidden threads in (Q, I) and simple Λ -modules at transition vertices.

4.3. A monoid of tilting ideals. We call a subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq Q_0^t$ be a κ -stable if $\kappa(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{X}$. For such a subset we consider the two-sided Λ -ideal

$$(4.5) \quad I(\mathcal{X}) := \langle e_i, \alpha \mid i \in Q_0 \setminus \mathcal{X}, \alpha \in Q_1 : s(\alpha) \in \mathcal{X} \rangle$$

where $I(\emptyset) = \Lambda$ in case \mathcal{X} is empty.

Lemma 4.6. *Let \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} be κ -stable subsets of Q_0^t .*

- (1) It holds that $\mathcal{X} \supseteq \mathcal{Y}$ if and only if $I(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq I(\mathcal{Y})$.
(2) If \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are disjoint, then $I(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}) = I(\mathcal{X})I(\mathcal{Y}) = I(\mathcal{Y})I(\mathcal{X})$.

Proof. (1) To verify the ‘only if’-implication let $\mathcal{X} \supseteq \mathcal{Y}$. For any $e_i \in I(\mathcal{X})$ it follows directly that $e_i \in I(\mathcal{Y})$. Let $\alpha \in Q_1 \cap I(\mathcal{X})$. If $s(\alpha) \in \mathcal{Y}$, it holds that $\alpha \in I(\mathcal{Y})$. Otherwise, $\alpha = \alpha e_{s(\alpha)} \in \Lambda I(\mathcal{Y}) = I(\mathcal{Y})$. Thus $I(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq I(\mathcal{Y})$.

Vice versa, let $I(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq I(\mathcal{Y})$. If there was an element $i \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{X}$, it would follow that $e_i \in I(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq I(\mathcal{Y})$, and thus $i \notin \mathcal{Y}$, a contradiction. So $\mathcal{Y} \supseteq \mathcal{X}$.

- (2) First, we claim that any generator of $I(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y})$ is contained in the two-sided ideal $I(\mathcal{X})I(\mathcal{Y})$. For any $i \in Q_0$ with $i \notin \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}$ it holds that $e_i = e_i^2 \in I(\mathcal{X})I(\mathcal{Y})$. Let $\alpha \in Q_1 \cap I(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y})$. If $s(\alpha) \in \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{Y}$, then $\alpha = \alpha e_{s(\alpha)} \in I(\mathcal{X})I(\mathcal{Y})$. Otherwise, $s(\alpha) \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{X}$. In this case, it follows that $t(\alpha) \notin \mathcal{X}$ using that \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} are disjoint and κ -stable, and thus $\alpha = e_{t(\alpha)}\alpha \in I(\mathcal{X})I(\mathcal{Y})$. It follows that $I(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}) \subseteq I(\mathcal{X})I(\mathcal{Y})$. The inclusion \supseteq follows from (1). Interchanging \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} yields the remaining equality in (2). \square

Such two-sided ideals form a monoid under multiplication.

Remark 4.7. Let $\mathcal{I} := \{I(\mathcal{X}) \mid \mathcal{X} \subseteq Q_0^t \text{ } \kappa\text{-stable}\}$ and let \mathcal{P} denote the power set of Q_0^t / \sim_κ . By Lemma 4.6 there is an isomorphism of posets $(\mathcal{P}, \supseteq) \xrightarrow{\sim} (\mathcal{I}, \subseteq)$.

Lemma 4.8. For any κ -stable subset $\mathcal{X} \subseteq Q_0^t$ the ideal $I(\mathcal{X})$ defines a left tilting Λ -module of finite projective dimension.

Proof. In this proof, for any Λ -modules M, N we write $M \geq N$ if $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^n(M, N) = 0$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, or, equivalently, all $n \neq 0$. There is an isomorphism of left Λ -modules

$$(4.9) \quad T := I(\mathcal{X}) \cong L_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus P_{\mathcal{X}^c} \quad \text{with} \quad L_{\mathcal{X}} := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{X}} \text{rad } P_i \quad \text{and} \quad P_{\mathcal{X}^c} := \bigoplus_{j \in Q_0 \setminus \mathcal{X}} P_j.$$

For any $i \in \mathcal{X}$ there is an exact sequence of Λ -modules

$$(4.10) \quad 0 \longrightarrow P_{\kappa(i)} \xrightarrow{\cdot \beta_{\ell(i)}} P_{j^{\ell(i)-1}} \cdots P_{j^{(2)}} \xrightarrow{\cdot \beta_2} P_{j^{(1)}} \xrightarrow{\cdot \beta_1} \text{rad } P_i \longrightarrow 0$$

where $j^{(1)}, j^{(2)} \dots j^{\ell(i)-1} \in Q_0^c$ and the path $\beta_{\ell(i)} \dots \beta_2 \beta_1$ comprises the forbidden thread starting at i . The sequence above implies that $\text{rad } P_i$ has projective dimension $\ell(i) - 1$ and that $P_{\kappa(i)}$ has an **add** T -resolution of the same length. It follows that $I(\mathcal{X})$ has finite projective dimension $\ell = \max\{\ell(i) - 1 \mid i \in \mathcal{X}\}$ and that Λ has an **add** T -resolution of length ℓ .

It remains to show that $T \geq T$. It holds that $P_{\mathcal{X}^c} \geq L_{\mathcal{X}} \oplus P_{\mathcal{X}^c}$ because $P_{\mathcal{X}^c}$ is projective. Viewed as a left Λ -module the canonical bimodule ω is a tilting module. As $L_{\mathcal{X}}$ is a direct summand of ω , it follows that $L_{\mathcal{X}} \geq L_{\mathcal{X}}$. For any $i \in \mathcal{X}$, $j \in Q_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$, a computation in the homotopy category using the minimal projective resolution of $\text{rad } P_i$ shows that $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^n(\text{rad } P_i, P_j) \neq 0$ if and only if $j = \kappa(i)$ and $n = \ell(i)$. This implies that $L_{\mathcal{X}} \geq P_{\mathcal{X}^c}$, which completes the proof that $T \geq T$. \square

Proposition 4.11. Any κ -stable set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq Q_0^t$ induces an auto-equivalence

$$I(\mathcal{X}) \overset{\mathbf{L}}{\otimes}_{\Lambda} -: \text{D}(\text{Mod } \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{D}(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$$

Proof. For any $a \in \Lambda$ let $r_a: I(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow I(\mathcal{X})$ denote the left Λ -linear morphism given by right multiplication with a . We claim that the **R**-algebra morphism

$$r: \Lambda \longrightarrow \Gamma := \text{End}_{\Lambda}(I(\mathcal{X}))^{op} \quad a \longmapsto r_a$$

is bijective. There is a factorization $\omega = I(\mathcal{X}^c)I(\mathcal{X})$. Moreover, the \mathbf{R} -module $I(\mathcal{X})/\omega$ has finite length. This implies that the restriction map

$$(-)|_\omega : \Gamma \longrightarrow \text{End}_\Lambda(\omega)^{op} \quad \phi \longmapsto \phi|_\omega$$

is a well-defined monomorphism of \mathbf{R} -algebras. The composition $r|_\omega := (-)|_\omega \circ r$ maps any element $a \in \Lambda$ to the right multiplication with a on the bimodule ω . By the proof of [22, Theorem 4.5] the map $r|_\omega$ is bijective. It follows that the maps $(-)|_\omega$ and r are bijective as well.

The functor in the claim is isomorphic to the composition

$$\text{D}(\text{Mod } \Lambda) \xrightarrow[\sim]{\Gamma \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} -} \text{D}(\text{Mod } \Gamma) \xrightarrow[\sim]{I(\mathcal{X}) \otimes_\Gamma^{\mathbf{L}} -} \text{D}(\text{Mod } \Lambda)$$

where the first functor is an equivalence, since r is an isomorphism, and the second functor is an equivalence by Lemma 4.8 and [27, 8.1.4]. \square

For any κ -stable subset we denote by

$$\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}} := I(\mathcal{X}) \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} -: \text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$$

the restriction of the auto-equivalence of the previous statement to the right-bounded derived category. For any complex $P \in \text{K}^-(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ the complex $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}}(P)$ is given by taking the radical at each indecomposable projective P_i with $i \in \mathcal{X}$.

In Definition 4.1, an involution ξ of the order Λ was introduced, which gives rise to an auto-equivalence of order two

$$\xi^* := {}_\xi \Lambda \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} -: \text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda).$$

where ${}_\xi \Lambda$ denotes the Λ -bimodule with underlying set Λ , the left multiplication twisted by ξ and regular right Λ -module action.

Lemma 4.12. *Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be disjoint κ -stable subsets of Q_0^t . Then there are isomorphisms of auto-equivalences of $\text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$*

$$\xi^* \circ \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}} \cong \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \xi^* \quad \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}} \cong \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}} \circ \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}} \cong \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}} \circ \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}}$$

Proof. For any automorphism ϕ of the ring Λ and any Λ -bimodule M it holds that

$$\phi \Lambda \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} M \cong \phi \Lambda \otimes M \cong \phi M \cong M_{\phi^{-1}} \cong M \otimes \Lambda_{\phi^{-1}} \cong M \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} \Lambda_{\phi^{-1}}.$$

This implies the first isomorphism using that ξ is an involution.

It remains to show that $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}} \cong \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{Y}} \circ \mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{X}}$ as the other isomorphism then follows by interchanging \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} . Set $S(\mathcal{Y}) := \Lambda/I(\mathcal{Y})$. Using that $\mathcal{X} \cap (\mathcal{Y} \cup Q_0^c) = \emptyset$ and the minimal projective resolution of $\text{rad } P_i$ it follows that

$$S(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} \text{rad } P_i \cong 0 \quad \text{for any } i \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Using the decomposition of $I(\mathcal{X})$ as left Λ -module in (4.9) it holds that

$$\text{Tor}_n^\Lambda(I(\mathcal{Y}), I(\mathcal{X}) \otimes_\Lambda P) \cong \text{Tor}_{n+1}^\Lambda(S(\mathcal{Y}), I(\mathcal{X}) \otimes_\Lambda P) = 0$$

for any $n \in \mathbb{N}^+$ and any module $P \in \text{proj } \Lambda$. This yields the isomorphism of functors

$$I(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} (I(\mathcal{X}) \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} -) \cong (I(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes_\Lambda I(\mathcal{X})) \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} -: \text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda).$$

The previous consideration implies also that $\mathrm{Tor}_1^\Lambda(S(\mathcal{Y}), I(\mathcal{X})) = 0$, which yields an isomorphism of Λ -bimodules

$$I(\mathcal{Y}) \otimes_\Lambda I(\mathcal{X}) \cong I(\mathcal{Y})I(\mathcal{X}) = I(\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}).$$

The last equality holds by Lemma 4.6 (2). \square

Let j_1, \dots, j_b denote a complete set of representatives of κ -orbits of transition vertices. For each index $1 \leq a \leq b$ we consider the auto-equivalence

$$\mathbb{T}_a := I(\mathcal{X}_a) \overset{\mathbf{L}}{\otimes}_\Lambda -: D^-(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^-(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda)$$

where \mathcal{X}_a denotes the κ -orbit of the vertex j_a .

The first main result of this article is the following factorization of the derived Nakayama functor.

Theorem 4.13. *In the notations above, there is an isomorphism of functors*

$$(4.14) \quad \nu \cong \xi^* \circ \mathbb{T}_b \circ \dots \circ \mathbb{T}_2 \circ \mathbb{T}_1: D^-(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda) \xrightarrow{\sim} D^-(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda)$$

where any two functors on the right hand side commute with each other.

Proof. By Theorem 4.2 there are isomorphisms of Λ -bimodules $\xi\omega \cong \Lambda^\circ \cong I(Q_0^t)$. Using that $Q_0^t = \bigcup_{1 \leq a \leq b} \mathcal{X}_a$, Lemma 4.12 implies the claims. \square

Remark 4.15. *The definition of the Λ -bimodule $I(\mathcal{X})$ in (4.5) is motivated by the isomorphism $\mathbb{T}_{\mathcal{S}(j_a)}^{-1}(\Lambda) \cong I(\mathcal{X}_a)$ in $\mathrm{per}_{\mathrm{fd}} \Lambda$ and [23, Theorem 6.14].*

4.4. The square of the derived Nakayama functor. In this subsection, we consider the full subcategory $\mathcal{S} := \mathbf{add}\{S_j[i] \mid j \in Q_0^t, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of the category $\mathrm{per}_{\mathrm{fd}} \Lambda$. In the following, $\mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}$ denotes the full subcategory of all objects in $\mathrm{per}_{\mathrm{fd}} \Lambda$ which are isomorphic to cones of morphisms of the subcategory \mathcal{S} .

Proposition 4.16. *For any $X \in D^-(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda)$ there is a triangle*

$$(4.17) \quad \nu^2(X) \xrightarrow{\Delta_X} X \longrightarrow C_X \longrightarrow \nu^2(X)[1]$$

with $C_X \in \mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}$ which is functorial in X .

Proof. Throughout this proof we abbreviate the derived tensor product $\overset{\mathbf{L}}{\otimes}_\Lambda$ by \otimes . The two-sided ideal $I := I(Q_0^t)$ gives rise to the triangle

$$I \longrightarrow \Lambda \longrightarrow \Lambda/I \longrightarrow I[1]$$

in the derived category of Λ -bimodules. Applying $- \otimes X$ and $- \otimes I \otimes X$ yields the triangles in the first and the third row of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} I \otimes I \otimes X & \xrightarrow{\phi_{I \otimes X}} & I \otimes X & \longrightarrow & \Lambda/I \otimes I \otimes X & \longrightarrow & I \otimes I \otimes X[1] \\ & \parallel & \downarrow \phi_X & & \vdots & & \parallel \\ I \otimes I \otimes X & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & C'_X & \longrightarrow & I \otimes I \otimes X[1] \\ & \downarrow \phi_{I \otimes X} & \parallel & & \vdots & & \downarrow \\ I \otimes X & \xrightarrow{\phi_X} & X & \longrightarrow & \Lambda/I \otimes X & \longrightarrow & I \otimes X[1] \end{array}$$

in $D^-(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda)$. Using the octahedral axiom, the third column can be continued to a triangle. Since $\Lambda/I \otimes Y \in \mathcal{S}$ for any $Y \in D^-(\mathrm{mod} \Lambda)$ this shows that $C'_X \in \mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}$. By Theorem 4.13 and Lemma 4.12, there is an isomorphism $I \otimes I \otimes - \cong \nu^2(-)$

of auto-equivalences of $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$. Therefore, the triangle in the second row is isomorphic to the triangle in (4.17). As ϕ_X and $\phi_{I \otimes X}$ are functorial in X , so is the morphism Δ_X . \square

Lemma 4.18. *The following statements hold.*

(1) For any $j \in Q_0^t$ the middle term Y_j of the Auslander–Reiten triangle

$$\nu(S_j) \longrightarrow Y_j \longrightarrow S_j \xrightarrow{\delta_j} \nu(S_j)[1]$$

in $\text{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$ is indecomposable and satisfies $\text{Hom}(\nu(Y_j), Y_j) \neq 0$.

(2) The indecomposable objects of $\mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}$ are given by $\{S_j[i], Y_j[i] \mid j \in Q_0^t, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Proof. (1) Let $\alpha_\ell \dots \alpha_2 \alpha_1, \beta_m \dots \beta_2 \beta_1$ and $\gamma_n \dots \gamma_2 \gamma_1$ denote the forbidden threads starting at $\kappa^{-1}(j)$, j and $\kappa(j)$ respectively. Because $\nu(S_j)[1] \cong S_j[m]$ and $\mathbb{D} \text{Hom}(S_j, \nu(S_j)[1]) \cong \text{End}(S_j) \cong \mathbf{k}$, we may assume that the morphism δ_j has only one non-zero component which is given by the identity of $P_{\kappa(j)}$ at degree m . Using Notation 4.3, it follows that Y_j is isomorphic to the projective complex depicted by the first row, the projective resolution of S_j is given by the second row and $\nu^{-1}(Y_j)$ corresponds to the last row in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \circ & \xrightarrow{\gamma_n} & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\gamma_1 \beta_m} & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\beta_1} & \circ \\ & & & & & & \downarrow \gamma_1 & \parallel & & & & \parallel & \\ & & & & & & \circ & \xrightarrow{\beta_m} & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\beta_1} & \circ \\ & & & & & & \parallel & \parallel & & & & \parallel & \downarrow \alpha_\ell \\ & & & & & & \circ & \xrightarrow{\beta_m} & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\beta_1 \alpha_\ell} & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{\ell-1}} & \bullet & \cdots & \bullet & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & \circ \end{array}$$

The vertical arrows of this diagram yield a composition of morphisms of complexes $Y_j \rightarrow S_j \rightarrow \nu^{-1}(Y_j)$ which is not homotopic to zero. Therefore, it holds that $\text{Hom}(\nu(Y_j), Y_j) \neq 0$. A computation in the homotopy category shows that $\text{End}(Y_j) \cong \mathbf{k}$, which yields that the complex Y_j is indecomposable.

(2) Any non-zero morphism of indecomposable objects in \mathcal{S} is either given by $\phi := \text{id}: S_j \rightarrow S_j$ or $\psi := \mu \delta_j: S_j \rightarrow \nu(S_j)[1] = \mathbb{S}(S_j)$ with $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbf{k}^*$. Any morphism $S_j \rightarrow S_j \oplus \mathbb{S}(S_j)$ or $S_j \oplus \mathbb{S}(S_j) \rightarrow \mathbb{S}(S_j)$ is decomposable since

$$\begin{bmatrix} \phi^{-1} & 0 \\ -\psi & \phi \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi \\ \psi \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \text{id} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{respectively} \quad \begin{bmatrix} \psi & \phi \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \phi & 0 \\ -\psi & \phi^{-1} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \text{id} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Using that $\text{Hom}(\mathbb{S}(S_j), S_j) = 0$, similarly, any endomorphism of $S_j \oplus \mathbb{S}(S_j)$ decomposes as well. Extending these considerations to more summands it follows that for any morphism $f: X \rightarrow Y$ of objects in $\mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}$ there are automorphisms α of X and β of Y such that $\alpha f \beta$ is the direct sum of shifts of morphisms of the form $S_j \rightarrow 0, 0 \rightarrow S_j$, the identity of S_j or the morphism δ_j with $j \in Q_0^t$. Together with (1), this yields the claim on indecomposables in $\mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}$. \square

Proposition 4.19. *For an object X in $D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ we consider the following conditions.*

- (1) $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}$.
- (2) The natural transformation Δ_X from (4.17) is an isomorphism.
- (3) The object X is ν^2 -invariant.
- (4) The object X is ν -periodic.

Then the implications (1) \Rightarrow (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4) hold. If the gentle order Λ is not hereditary, all four conditions are equivalent.

Proof. Assume that (1) holds. Then $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S} = {}^\perp \text{tria}(\mathcal{S}) \subseteq {}^\perp \mathcal{S} * \mathcal{S}$, and Proposition 4.16 implies (2). The implications (2) \Rightarrow (3) \Rightarrow (4) follow directly.

To show (4) \Rightarrow (1) assume that Λ is not hereditary and that X is ν -periodic. Let $j \in Q_0^t$. Then $S_j \in \text{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$ is $(m(j), n(j))$ -Calabi–Yau by Lemma 4.4 and $m(j) > n(j)$ by Proposition 2.10. In particular, $\text{Hom}(X, S_j[i]) = 0$ for $i \ll 0$. As X is (p, p) -Calabi–Yau for certain $p \in \mathbb{N}^+$, Lemma 1.4 yields that $X \in {}^\perp S_j$. \square

5. INVARIANTS ON DERIVED EQUIVALENT GENTLE ORDERS

As in the previous section, Λ denotes a gentle order such that its underlying quiver (Q, I) is connected.

5.1. A stable t -structure invariant under the Serre functor. For the gentle order Λ we consider the idempotent determined by all crossing vertices, and its corresponding projective Λ -module, idempotent subalgebra and quotient algebra

$$(5.1) \quad e := \sum_{i \in Q_0^s} e_i, \quad B := \Lambda e, \quad \Lambda_e := e \Lambda e \hookrightarrow \Lambda \twoheadrightarrow A := \Lambda / \Lambda e \Lambda.$$

Remark 5.2. *We make a few basic remarks.*

- (1) *The subalgebra Λ_e is a ribbon graph order or zero.*
- (2) *The quotient algebra A is hereditary and uniserial. More precisely, the quiver of A is either a product of quivers of equioriented Dynkin type \mathbb{A} or a quiver of equioriented Euclidean type $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}$.*
- (3) *If $e \neq 0$, it holds that $\text{gldim } \Lambda_e = \infty \geq \text{gldim } \Lambda > \text{gldim } A = 1$.*
- (4) *The module B is a bijective Λ -lattice, that is, a projective-injective object in the category of Λ -lattices, which can be defined as the full subcategory given by submodules of finitely generated projective Λ -modules.*

According to Proposition 1.20 the two subcategories

$$\mathcal{U} := \mathbf{K}^-(\text{add } B) \hookrightarrow \mathbf{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) \longleftarrow \mathbf{D}_A^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) =: \mathcal{V}$$

form a stable t -structure $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ of $\mathbf{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$. Let \mathcal{T} denote the full subcategory of ν -periodic objects, and \mathcal{F} the full subcategory of all non- ν -periodic fractionally Calabi–Yau objects in $\mathbf{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$. A priori, Lemma 1.4 yields that $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F}) = 0$. Next, we compare the stable t -structure $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$ with the pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$.

Proposition 5.3. *In the notations above, the following statements hold.*

- (1) *It holds that $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{T}$. In particular, the relative Serre functor \mathbb{S} restricts to an auto-equivalence of \mathcal{U} and the subcategory \mathcal{T} is triangulated.*
- (2) *It holds that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and the functor \mathbb{S} restricts to an auto-equivalence of \mathcal{V} .*

Proof. Theorem 4.2 implies that ν preserves $\mathbf{K}^-(\text{add } B)$ and acts as an involution on its objects. This shows that $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{U}) = \nu(\mathcal{U})[1] = \mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$. To show $\mathcal{U} \supseteq \mathcal{T}$, let X be ν -periodic.

- If Λ is hereditary, then $e = 0$ and $X \in \mathbf{D}^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) = \mathcal{U}$.
- Assume that Λ is not hereditary. Let $j \in Q_0^t$. Then $S_j \in \text{per}_{\text{fd}}(\Lambda)$ is $(m(j), n(j))$ -Calabi–Yau with $m(j) \geq n(j)$ by Lemma 4.4. In particular, $\text{Hom}(X, S_j[i]) = 0$ for $i \ll 0$. Proposition 2.10 ensures that $m(j) \neq n(j)$. As X is (p, p) -Calabi–Yau for certain $p \in \mathbb{N}^+$, Lemma 1.4 yields that $X \in {}^\perp S_j$. It follows that $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S}$ which is equal to \mathcal{U} by Proposition 1.20 (3b).

Since $\nu^{\pm 1}(B) \cong B$ and $\mathcal{V} = B^\perp$ it follows that $\mathbb{S}^{\pm 1}(\mathcal{V}) \subseteq \mathcal{V}$, and thus $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{V}) = \mathcal{V}$. As $B \in \text{per}(\Lambda)$, it follows that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq B^\perp = \mathcal{V}$ by Lemma 1.4. \square

Proposition 5.4. *Let Γ be a gentle order derived equivalent to the gentle order Λ . Let f denote the sum of the idempotents of the crossing vertices in Q_0^Γ , set $\Gamma_f := f\Gamma f$ and $B := \Gamma/\Gamma f\Gamma$. Then the following statements hold.*

(1) *There is a diagram of left recollements*

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{U}_\Lambda = D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda_e) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{F_\Lambda} \\ \xleftarrow{J_\Lambda} \end{array} & D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{G_\Lambda} \\ \xleftarrow{I_\Lambda} \end{array} & D_A^-(\text{mod } \Lambda) = \mathcal{V}_\Lambda \\ \downarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{U}} & & \downarrow \Phi & & \downarrow \Phi_{\mathcal{V}} \\ \mathcal{U}_\Gamma = D^-(\text{mod } \Gamma_f) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{F_\Gamma} \\ \xleftarrow{J_\Gamma} \end{array} & D^-(\text{mod } \Gamma) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{G_\Gamma} \\ \xleftarrow{I_\Gamma} \end{array} & D_B^-(\text{mod } \Gamma) = \mathcal{V}_\Gamma \end{array}$$

such that $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}}$, Φ and $\Phi_{\mathcal{V}}$ are equivalences and there are isomorphisms of functors

$$\Phi \circ F_\Lambda \cong F_\Gamma \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{U}}, \quad J_\Gamma \circ \Phi \cong \Phi_{\mathcal{U}} \circ J_\Lambda, \quad I_\Gamma \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{V}} \cong \Phi \circ I_\Lambda, \quad \Phi_{\mathcal{V}} \circ G_\Lambda \cong G_\Gamma \circ \Phi.$$

(2) Λ is hereditary if and only if Γ is hereditary.

(3) Λ is a ribbon graph order if and only if Γ is a ribbon graph order.

Proof. The top and bottom recollement exist by Proposition 1.20, and the functor Φ exists by Theorem 1.11. Proposition 1.14 (1) implies that Φ preserves ν -periodic objects. Using the identification of such objects with aisle subcategories in Proposition 5.3 it follows that $\Phi(\mathcal{U}_\Lambda) = \mathcal{U}_\Gamma$. Since $\text{gldim } \Lambda$ is finite if and only if so is $\text{gldim } \Gamma$, Proposition 2.10 implies that Λ is hereditary if and only if Γ is hereditary.

- If Λ and Γ are hereditary, it holds that $e = f = 0$, the functors G_Λ , I_Λ , G_Γ , and I_Γ are identity functors, and $\Phi = \Phi_{\mathcal{V}}$.
- Assume that neither Λ nor Γ is hereditary. Proposition 5.3 yields that $\mathcal{U}_\Lambda = \text{im } F_\Lambda = \mathcal{T}$ and similarly $\mathcal{U}_\Gamma = \mathcal{T}$. The previous consideration shows that $\Phi(\mathcal{U}_\Lambda) = \mathcal{U}_\Gamma$. Therefore, Φ restricts to an equivalence $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}}$ such that $\Phi \circ F_\Lambda \cong F_\Gamma \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{U}}$. Since $J_\Lambda \vdash F_\Lambda$ and $F_\Gamma \dashv J_\Gamma$, it holds that $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}} J_\Lambda \vdash F_\Lambda \Phi_{\mathcal{U}}^{-1} \cong \Phi^{-1} F_\Gamma \dashv J_\Gamma \Phi$. As left adjoints are unique it follows that $\Phi_{\mathcal{U}} J_\Lambda \cong J_\Gamma \Phi$.

Because Φ is an equivalence it holds that $\Phi(\mathcal{V}_\Lambda) = \Phi(\mathcal{U}_\Lambda^\perp) = \Phi(\mathcal{U}_\Lambda)^\perp = \mathcal{U}_\Gamma^\perp = \mathcal{V}_\Gamma$. Therefore, Φ restricts also to an equivalence $\Phi_{\mathcal{V}}$ with $\Phi \circ I_\Lambda \cong J_\Gamma \circ \Phi_{\mathcal{V}}$. Similar to the previous argument, the adjointness properties $G_\Lambda \dashv I_\Lambda$ and $I_\Gamma \vdash G_\Gamma$ yield that $\Phi_{\mathcal{V}} G_\Lambda \dashv I_\Lambda \Phi_{\mathcal{V}}^{-1} \cong \Phi^{-1} I_\Gamma \vdash G_\Gamma \Phi$, and thus $\Phi_{\mathcal{V}} G_\Lambda \cong G_\Gamma \Phi$.

This shows all isomorphisms of compositions. To show the remaining claim, assume that Λ is a ribbon graph order. Then $e = 1$ and $\mathcal{V}_\Lambda = 0$. Since $\Phi_{\mathcal{V}}$ is an equivalence, it follows that $\mathcal{V}_\Gamma = 0$, $f = 1$ and Γ is a ribbon graph order. \square

Remark 5.5. *Proposition 5.4 (2) recovers an observation by König and Zimmermann [30]. (3) confirms an expectation by Kauer and Roggenkamp [28]. In a forthcoming work [15] it will be shown that (3) is true without assuming that Λ and Γ are R-orders.*

5.2. Homological interpretation of AG-invariants.

Proposition 5.6. *An object $X \in D^-(\text{mod } \Lambda)$ appears in an exceptional cycle if and only if X is isomorphic to a shift of a simple module S_j for certain $j \in Q_0^t$, or $X \in \mathcal{U}$ and X is 1-spherical or induces an exceptional 2-cycle.*

Proof. As above, let $\mathcal{S} := \text{add}\{S_j[i] \mid j \in Q_0^t, i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. The ‘if’-implication follows from Lemma 4.4. To show the converse, assume that X appears in an exceptional cycle. Set $(m, n) := \text{CY-dim}(X)$.

- Assume that $(m, n) \notin \{(1, 1), (2, 2)\}$. By Lemma 1.16 it holds that $m \geq n$. In particular, it holds that $(m, n) \neq (0, 1)$ and X is indecomposable. Lemma 1.8 implies that $\text{Hom}(\nu^q(X), X) = 0$ for each $q \in \{1, 2\}$. Proposition 4.16 and Lemma 4.18 yield that $X \in \text{ind } \mathcal{S}$.
- Assume that $(m, n) \in \{(1, 1), (2, 2)\}$.
 - If Λ is hereditary, then $X \in \text{sim } \Lambda \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ by Proposition 2.9.
 - Otherwise, it follows that $X \in {}^\perp \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{U}$ by Propositions 4.19 and 1.20 (3b). \square

Let us recall that two exceptional cycles are equivalent if they are the same up to shift and rotation, see Definition 1.7.

Corollary 5.7. *The following statements hold.*

- (1) *There is a bijection between the set Q_0^t / \sim_κ of κ -orbits in Q_0^t and the set $\text{exc}(\mathcal{V}) / \sim$ of equivalence classes of repetition-free exceptional cycles in \mathcal{V} given by*

$$(5.8) \quad Q_0^t / \sim_\kappa \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{exc}(\mathcal{V}) / \sim \quad \bar{j} \longmapsto \overline{\mathcal{S}(j)} = \overline{(S_j, S_{\kappa(j)}, \dots, S_{\kappa^{n(j)-1}(j)})}$$

- (2) *There is an equality of multisets*

$$\mathcal{AG}_1(\Lambda) = \{\text{CY-dim } \mathcal{E} \mid \bar{\mathcal{E}} \in \text{exc}(\mathcal{V}) / \sim\}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 4.4 the map $Q_0^t \rightarrow \text{exc}(\mathcal{V})$, $j \mapsto \mathcal{S}(j)$ is well-defined. For any $i, j \in Q_0^t$ it holds that $i \sim_\kappa j$ if and only if $S_i \cong S_{\kappa^p(j)}[q]$ for some $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $\mathcal{S}(i) \sim \mathcal{S}(j)$. Because of this, the induced map in (5.8) is well-defined and injective. It is surjective by Proposition 5.6. which shows 1. The equality of multi-sets in (2) follows then using that $\text{CY-dim } S_j = (m(j), n(j))$ for any $j \in Q_0^t$ from Lemma 4.4. \square

To give a similar interpretation of AG-invariants of second type of the gentle order Λ , we recall the description of its singularity category. By the general considerations in 1.7, the singularity category $\text{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$ is Hom-finite and has a Serre functor $\bar{\nu}$, which is induced by the derived Nakayama functor.

Theorem 5.9 ([16, Theorem 10.13]). *For the gentle order Λ the following statements hold.*

- (1) *There is a bijection between the set Q_1^{fc} of arrows in Q which appear in forbidden cycles and the set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects in the category $\text{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$ given by*

$$Q_1^{fc} \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{ind } \text{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda), \quad \beta \longmapsto L_\beta := \Lambda\beta$$

where L_β is viewed as an object in the category $\text{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$.

- (2) *For any arrow $\alpha \in Q_1^{fc}$ there are isomorphisms*

$$\bar{\nu}(L_\beta) := \omega \otimes_\Lambda^{\mathbf{L}} L_\beta \cong L_\beta \quad \text{and} \quad L_\beta[-1] \cong L_{\varrho(\beta)}.$$

where $\varrho(\beta)$ denotes the unique arrow with $s(\varrho(\beta)) = t(\beta)$ and $\varrho(\beta)\beta \in I$.

- (3) *For any arrows $\alpha, \beta \in Q_1^{fc}$ it holds that $\dim \text{Hom}_{\text{D}_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)}(L_\alpha, L_\beta) = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$.*

We refer to [25] for the counterpart of Theorem 5.9 for finite-dimensional gentle algebras, and to [5] for a statement equivalent to (1).

Remark 5.10. *By arguments due to Buchweitz [12, Section 6], the singularity category $D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$ is equivalent to the homotopy category $K_{\text{ac}}(\text{proj } \Lambda)$ of acyclic projective complexes. Using Notation 4.3, the acyclic complex corresponding to the left ideal L_β of an arrow $\beta \in Q_1^{fc}$ can be represented by the periodic diagram*

$$\cdots \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_m} \bullet \cdots \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_2} \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \bullet \xrightarrow{\beta_m} \bullet \cdots$$

with $\beta_{p+1} := \varrho^p(\beta)$ for each index $0 \leq p < m$, where $m := m(\beta) = \ell(fc(\beta))$.

Corollary 5.11. *The following statements hold.*

(1) *There is a bijection between the set of ϱ -orbits in Q_1^{fc} and the set of shift orbits of indecomposable objects in the category $D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$ given by*

$$Q_1^{fc} / \sim_e \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{ind } D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda) / [1]$$

(2) *There is an equality of multisets*

$$\mathcal{AG}_2(\Lambda) = \{\text{CY-dim } X \mid X \in \text{ind } D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda) / [1]\}.$$

Proof. (1) follows directly from Theorem 5.9 (1) and (2). For any arrow $\beta \in Q_1^{fc}$, Theorem 5.9 2 implies that $m(\beta) = \ell(fc(\beta)) = \min\{p \in \mathbb{N}^+ \mid L_\beta[p] = L_\beta\}$, and thus $(m(\beta), 0) = \text{CY-dim } L_\beta$, which shows (2). \square

5.3. Combinatorial derived invariants.

Theorem 5.12. *Assume that Λ and Γ are derived equivalent ring-indecomposable gentle orders. Then there are equalities*

$$\mathcal{AG}_1(\Lambda) = \mathcal{AG}_1(\Gamma), \quad \mathcal{AG}_2(\Lambda) = \mathcal{AG}_2(\Gamma), \quad \mathfrak{p}_\Lambda = \mathfrak{p}_\Gamma, \quad \text{bc}_\Lambda = \text{bc}_\Gamma,$$

that is, Λ and Γ have the same multi-sets of AG-invariants, the same number of permitted cycles, and the same bicolorability parameter.

Proof. Because Λ and Γ are derived equivalent, their coaisles \mathcal{V}_Λ and \mathcal{V}_Γ are equivalent by Proposition 5.4, their singularity categories are equivalent by Theorem 1.11, and their semisimple rational hulls $K \otimes \Lambda$ and $K \otimes_\mathbb{R} \Gamma$ are derived equivalent and their Cartan matrices have the same rank and by Proposition 1.14. Now the equalities follow from Corollaries 5.7 (2) with 1.15, 5.11 (2), 2.12 and 3.9. \square

6. TRUNCATED RIBBON GRAPHS OF GENTLE ORDERS

In this section we introduce truncated ribbon graphs and review the combinatorial invariants associated to the quiver of a gentle order in graph-theoretic terms.

6.1. Truncated ribbon graphs. Let $\sigma, \theta: H \rightarrow H$ be permutations of a finite set H such that θ is an involution. The pair (σ, θ) gives rise to graph-theoretic data $G_{(\sigma, \theta)} = (\sigma, \theta, \phi, V, E, F, i)$ as follows.

The composition $\phi := \theta\sigma$ defines a third permutation on the set H . Elements of the set H are called *half-edges*. The sets V, E, F of *vertices, edges* and *faces* are defined as the sets of σ -orbits, θ -orbits and ϕ -orbits in H , respectively. The *incidence map* $i: H \rightarrow V$ assigns to each half-edge h its σ -orbit, denoted by v_h .

The data $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ will be called a *truncated ribbon graph*.

Refined notions of edges and faces. It will be convenient to use the following terminology. For any half-edge $h \in H$ its θ -orbit e_h will be called a *truncated edge* if $\theta(h) = h$, and a *glued edge* otherwise. A glued edge e_h is a *loop* if $h \neq \theta(h)$ and $v_h = v_{\theta(h)}$, and otherwise an *ordinary edge*. The set of truncated edges and that of glued edges will be denoted by E_t and E_g .

For $h \in H$ its ϕ -orbit f_h will be called a *boundary face* if f_h contains a fixed point of θ , and a *punctured face* otherwise.

For $h \in H$ the permutation σ yields a cyclic order on the set of half-edges incident to v_h , which is given by $h < \sigma(h) < \dots < \sigma^{p-1}(h) < \sigma^p(h) = h$, where p is the cardinality $|v_h|$ of the σ -orbit of v_h . The face f_h may be viewed as a polygon enclosed by edges $e_h, e_{\phi(h)}, \dots, e_{\phi^{m-1}(h)}$ with $m := |f_h|$. In case f_h is a boundary face, the corresponding polygon has m ordinary edges, otherwise the polygon contains vertices incident to two glued edges and one truncated edge. The set of boundary faces and that of punctured faces will be denoted by F_p and F_b , respectively.

The involution α has no fixed points if and only if $G_{(\sigma, \alpha)}$ has no truncated edges if and only if each face of $G_{(\sigma, \alpha)}$ is punctured. In this case, $G_{(\sigma, \alpha)}$ is called a *ribbon graph*. To simplify the terminology, we call $G_{(\sigma, \alpha)}$ a truncated ribbon graph even if it has no truncated edges.

Remark 6.1. *A vertex in a ribbon graph is called a leaf if it is adjacent to only one glued edge and no loop. Any truncated ribbon graph $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ can be obtained from a ribbon graph $G_{(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\theta})}$ by deleting any choice of the leaves of $G_{(\hat{\sigma}, \hat{\theta})}$ together with their incident half-edges, which results in truncated edges in the sense above.*

The underlying truncated graph. Let $G_{(\sigma, \theta)} = (\sigma, \theta, V, E, F, H, i)$ be a truncated ribbon graph. $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ has an underlying truncated graph $G = (V, E, \mu)$ in the sense of Subsection 3.1, which is defined by setting $\mu(e)(v) := |i^{-1}(v)|$ for any edge $e \in E$ and any vertex v . The terminology of ordinary edges, truncated edges and loops of the truncated ribbon graph $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ of the previous subsection is consistent with the terminology of these types of edges in the truncated graph G .

The surface of a truncated ribbon graph. Any truncated ribbon graph $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ can be embedded in an oriented surface $\mathbf{S} := \mathbf{S}_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ with non-empty boundary and a finite set of marked points $M := M_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ as follows.

- The vertices of the truncated ribbon graph are viewed as marked points in the interior of the surface.
- Each punctured face of $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ corresponds as a punctured polygon. More precisely, a punctured face f_h is viewed as a polygon which is enclosed by edges $e_h, e_{\phi(h)}, \dots, e_{\phi^{m-1}(h)}$ with $m := |f_h|$ and has a boundary component without marked points in its interior.
- Each boundary face of $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ corresponds to a a polygon enclosing a boundary component with marked points. More precisely, the glued edges of any boundary face of $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ are viewed as the outer edges of the polygon, while each of its truncated edges is incident to a vertex and an associated marked point on the inner boundary of the polygon.

The genus $g(\mathbf{S})$ of the surface \mathbf{S} is determined by the Euler-Poincaré formula

$$(6.2) \quad 2 - 2g(\mathbf{S}) = |V| - |E| + |F|$$

The graph $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ is a ribbon graph if and only if its associated surface \mathbf{S} has no boundary components with marked points.

TABLE 6.3. Dictionary of invariants

quiver invariant	graph invariant	derived invariant	quiver invariant	graph invariant	derived invariant
$ Q_1 $	$ H $	$ \text{rad } \Lambda $	$ Q_1/\sim_\sigma $	$ V $	$\text{rk } K_0(\Lambda_K)$
$ Q_0 $	$ E $	$\text{rk } K_0(\Lambda)$	bc_Λ	bc_G	$\text{rk } C_\Lambda - \text{rk } K_0(\Lambda_K)$
$ Q_0^t $	$ E_t $	$\text{rk } K_0(A)$	$ Q_0^c $	$ E_g $	$\text{rk } K_0(\Lambda_e)$
$ Q_0^t/\sim_\kappa $	$ F_b $	$ \text{exc}(\mathcal{V})/\sim $	$ Q_1^{fc}/\sim_\rho $	$ F_p $	$ \text{ind } D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)/[1] $
$ Q_1^{ft} $	$\sum_{f \in F_b} f $	$\sum_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{exc}(\mathcal{V})/\sim} m(\mathcal{E})$	$ Q_1^{fc} $	$\sum_{f \in F_p} f $	$ \text{ind } D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda) $

6.2. The truncated ribbon graph of a gentle order. Let Λ be a gentle order and (Q, I) its underlying quiver.

6.2.1. Pair of permutations. The quiver (Q, I) gives rise to a pair $(\sigma, \theta) = (\sigma, \theta)_{(Q, I)}$ as follows. Let $\alpha \in Q_1$. As noted previously, there is a unique arrow $\sigma(\alpha)$ with $\sigma(\alpha)\alpha \notin I$. If $s(\alpha) \in Q_0^c$, there is a unique arrow $\theta(\alpha) \neq \alpha$ with $s(\theta(\alpha)) = s(\alpha)$. If $s(\alpha) \in Q_0^t$, let $\theta(\alpha) := \alpha$. These prescriptions define a permutation σ and involution θ on the set of arrows Q_1 . For formal reasons, it will be convenient to introduce the set $H := \{h_\alpha \mid \alpha \in Q_1\}$ whose elements are permuted via $h_\alpha \mapsto h_{\sigma(\alpha)}$ and $h_\alpha \mapsto h_{\theta(\alpha)}$. We denote these permutations again by $\sigma, \theta: H \rightarrow H$ and consider the associated truncated ribbon graph $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$.

6.2.2. Identifications. Next, we consider the truncated ribbon graph $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ associated to the pair $(\sigma, \theta) = (\sigma, \theta)_{(Q, I)}$. By definition there are bijections

$$Q_1 \xrightarrow{\sim} H, \quad Q_1/\sim_\sigma \xrightarrow{\sim} V \quad Q_0 \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_1/\sim_\theta \xrightarrow{\sim} E$$

where the last composition restricts to bijections $Q_0^t \xrightarrow{\sim} E_t$ and $Q_0^c \xrightarrow{\sim} E_g$. By definition there is a bijection

$$Q_1/\sim_\phi \xrightarrow{\sim} F, \quad [\alpha]_\phi \longmapsto f_\alpha$$

For any arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$ one of the following occurs.

- If $j := s(\alpha) \in Q_0^t$, the arrow α is contained in a forbidden thread starting at j , its ϕ -orbit is given by the arrows in the AG-cycle $c(j)$ and $f_\alpha \in F_b$.
- If $j \in Q_0^c$, the arrow α is contained in a forbidden cycle $fc(\alpha)$ starting at j and $f_\alpha \in F_p$.

In each case, the cardinality $|f_\alpha|$ of the ϕ -orbit matches the length of a cycle naturally associated with α . Let Q_1^{ft} denote the set of arrows appearing in forbidden threads. Since ϕ restricts to the permutation ρ on Q_1^{fc} and preserves Q_1^{ft} , it follows that there are bijections

$$Q_0^t/\sim_\kappa \xrightarrow{\sim} Q_1^{ft}/\sim_\phi \xrightarrow{\sim} F_b \quad Q_1^{fc}/\sim_\rho \xrightarrow{\sim} F_p$$

Summarized, the sets of rotation classes of permitted cycles, AG-cycles and forbidden cycles in (Q, I) have graph-theoretic interpretations as vertices, boundary faces and punctured faces of $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$.

Remarks on notation. In the table above, (Q, I) is the quiver underlying a gentle order Λ and $G_{(\sigma, \theta)}$ its associated truncated ribbon graph. All quiver invariants have been defined in Subsection 2.1. All ribbon graph invariants were introduced in Subsection 6.1. In the column of derived invariants, $|\text{rad } \Lambda|$ denotes the number of isomorphism classes of indecomposable summands of the Λ -module $\text{rad } \Lambda$. The overring Λ_K of the gentle order Λ was defined in Subsection 1.5, the subring Λ_e and the quotient ring A were introduced in (5.1), the Cartan matrix C_Λ in Definition 1.13. If R denotes any of the rings above, $\text{rk } K_0(R)$ denotes the rank of its Grothendieck group, which is equal to $|R|$ as well as $|\text{top } R|$. The notion $\text{exc } \mathcal{V}/\sim$ was defined in Corollary 5.7, notions involving $D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)$ in Corollary 5.11. For an equivalence class $\mathcal{E} \in \text{exc } \mathcal{V}/\sim$, the notion $m(\mathcal{E})$ denotes the first entry in the pair $\text{CY-dim } \mathcal{E}$.

Proposition 6.4. *Let Λ and Γ be derived equivalent gentle orders.*

- (1) *Any three invariants in the same row of Table 6.3 are equal.*
- (2) *The gentle orders Λ and Γ share any invariant listed in Table 6.3. In particular, it holds that $|\text{ind rad } \Lambda| = |\text{rad } \Gamma|$.*
- (3) *The associated surfaces S_Λ and S_Γ are homeomorphic.*

Proof. (1) The equalities of quiver-theoretic invariants and invariants from ribbon graph data follow from the identifications in Subsection 6.2.2. The homological interpretations of Q_0 , Q_0^c and Q_1 are straightforward. It holds that $|Q_0^t| = \text{rk } K_0(A)$ by definition of e . Corollaries 5.7 and 5.11 imply that

$$(|Q_1^{ft}|, |Q_0^t|) = \sum_{(m,n) \in \mathcal{AG}_1(\Lambda)} (m, n) = \sum_{\mathcal{E} \in \text{exc}(\mathcal{V})/\sim} \text{CY-dim } \mathcal{E}, \quad |Q_1^{fc}| = \sum_{(m,0) \in \mathcal{AG}_2(\Lambda)} m = |\text{ind } D_{\text{sg}}(\Lambda)|.$$

Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 2.12 yield the homological expressions for bc_G and $|V|$, respectively.

- (2) The derived invariance of $|Q_0^c|$ and $|Q_0^t|$ in the sense above follows from Proposition 5.4. Using that $|Q_1| = 2|Q_0^c| + |Q_0^t|$ it follows that $|Q_1|$ is derived invariant as well. The remaining derived invariance results follow from Theorem 5.12.
- (3) The genus $g(S)$ of the surface $S := S_\Lambda$ associated to Λ is determined by the formula (6.2). \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Amiot, P.-G. Plamondon, and S. Schroll, A complete derived invariant for gentle algebras via winding numbers and Arf invariants, preprint 2019, arXiv:1904.02555.
- [2] M. A. Antipov, On invariants of the stable equivalence of symmetric special biserial algebras. (Russian) ; *translated from Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* **330** (2006), Vopr. Teor. Predst. Algebr. i Grupp. 13, 5–28, 271 *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)* **140** (2007), no. 5, 611–621.
- [3] M. A. Antipov, The structure of the stable Grothendieck group of a symmetric SB-algebra. (Russian) ; *translated from Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI)* **365** (2009), Voprosy Teorii Predstavlenii Algebr i Grupp. 18, 29–46, 262 *J. Math. Sci. (N.Y.)* **161** (2009), no. 4, 474–482.
- [4] D. Avella-Alaminos and Ch. Geiss, Combinatorial derived invariants for gentle algebras. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **212** (2008), no. 1, 228–243.
- [5] R. J. M. Bennett-Tennenhaus, Functorial Filtrations for Semiperfect generalisations of Gentle Algebras. PhD thesis, University of Leeds, 2017.
- [6] R. J. M. Bennett-Tennenhaus, String algebras over local rings: Admissibility and biseriality. *J. Algebra* **667** (2025), 325–364.
- [7] I. Burban and Yu. A. Drozd, Derived categories of nodal algebras. *J. Algebra* **272** (2004), no. 1, 46–94.

- [8] I. Burban and Yu. A. Drozd, On the derived categories of gentle and skew-gentle algebras: homological algebra and matrix problems, preprint 2017, arXiv:1706.08358
- [9] I. Burban and Yu. A. Drozd, Non-commutative nodal curves and derived tame algebras, preprint 2019, arXiv:1805.05174
- [10] I. Burban and M. Kalck, The relative singularity category of a non-commutative resolution of singularities. *Adv. Math.* **231** (2012), no. 1, 414–435.
- [11] N. Broomhead, D. Pauksztello, and D. Ploog, Discrete derived categories I: homomorphisms, autoequivalences and t-structures. *Math. Z.* **285** (2017), no. 1-2, 39–89.
- [12] R.-O. Buchweitz, Maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules and Tate cohomology. With appendices and an introduction by L. L. Avramov, B. Briggs, S. B. Iyengar and J. C. Letz. *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*, 262. *American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI*, 2021.
- [13] W. Chang, H. Jin, and S. Schroll, Recollements of partially wrapped Fukaya categories and surface cuts, preprint 2023, arxiv:math.RT/2206.11196.
- [14] V. Ginzburg, Calabi-Yau algebras. preprint 2007, [arxiv:math/0612139](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0612139).
- [15] W. Gnedin, Derived equivalences of ribbon graph orders. *to appear*.
- [16] W. Gnedin, S. B. Iyengar and H. Krause, A class of Gorenstein algebras and their dualities. *Representations of algebras and related structures*, 235–278, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., *EMS Press, Berlin*, 2023.
- [17] I. M. Gelfand, ; V. A. Ponomarev, Indecomposable representations of the Lorentz group. (Russian) *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* **23** (1968), no. 2(140), 3–60.
- [18] C. Godsil and G. Royle, Algebraic graph theory. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 207. *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 2001. xx+439 pp.
- [19] P. Guo and P. Zhang, Exceptional cycles for perfect complexes over gentle algebras. *J. Algebra* **565** (2021), 160–195.
- [20] D. Happel, Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 119. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 1988.
- [21] F. Haiden, L. Katzarkov and M. Kontsevich, Flat surfaces and stability structures. *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci.* 126 (2017), 247–318.
- [22] S. B. Iyengar and H. Krause, The Nakayama functor and its completion for Gorenstein algebras. *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **150** (2022), no. 2, 347–391.
- [23] O. Iyama and I. Reiten, Fomin-Zelevinsky mutation and tilting modules over Calabi-Yau algebras. *Amer. J. Math.* **130** (2008), no. 4, 1087–1149.
- [24] J. Haibo, S. Schroll and Z. Wang, A complete derived invariant and silting theory for graded gentle algebras, preprint 2023, arXiv:math.RT/2303.17474
- [25] M. Kalck, Singularity categories of gentle algebras. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **47** (2015), no. 1, 65–74.
- [26] B. Keller, Calabi-Yau triangulated categories. *Trends in representation theory of algebras and related topics*, 467–489, EMS Ser. Congr. Rep., *Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich*, 2008.
- [27] B. Keller, On the construction of triangle equivalences. *Derived equivalences for group rings, 155–176, Lecture Notes in Math., 1685, Springer, Berlin*, 1998.
- [28] M. Kauer and K. W. Roggenkamp, Higher-dimensional orders, graph-orders, and derived equivalences. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **155** (2001), no. 2-3, 181–202.
- [29] S. M. Horoškin, Indecomposable representations of Lorentz groups. (Russian) *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.* **15** (1981), no. 2, 50–60, 96.
- [30] S. König and A. Zimmermann, Tilting hereditary orders. *Comm. Algebra* **24** (1996), no. 6, 1897–1913.
- [31] H. Krause, Homological theory of representations. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 195. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 2022.
- [32] H. Krause, Localization theory for triangulated categories. *Triangulated categories*, 161–235, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 375, *Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge*, 2010.
- [33] T. Y. Lam, A first course in noncommutative rings. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 131. *Springer-Verlag, New York*, 1991.
- [34] Y. Lekili and A. Polishchuk, Derived equivalences of gentle algebras via Fukaya categories. *Math. Ann.* **376** (2020), no. 1-2, 187–225.

- [35] S. Liu and C. Paquette, Standard components of a Krull-Schmidt category. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **143** (2015), no. 1, 45–59.
- [36] J. Miyachi, Localization of triangulated categories and derived categories. *J. Algebra* **141** (1991), no. 2, 463–483.
- [37] D. Orlov, Derived categories of coherent sheaves and triangulated categories of singularities. *Algebra, arithmetic, and geometry: in honor of Yu. I. Manin. Vol. II*, 503–531, Progr. Math., 270, *Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA*, 2009.
- [38] B. J. Parshall, Finite-dimensional algebras and algebraic groups. Classical groups and related topics (Beijing, 1987), 97–114, *Contemp. Math.*, 82, *Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI*, 1989.
- [39] S. Opper, On auto-equivalences and complete derived invariants of gentle algebras, preprint 2019, arXiv:1904.04859
- [40] S. Opper, P.-G. Plamondon and S. Schroll, A geometric model for the derived category of gentle algebras, preprint 2018, arxiv:math.RT/1801.09659.
- [41] Y. Palu, V. Pilaud and P.-G. Plamondon, Non-kissing and non-crossing complexes for locally gentle algebras. *J. Comb. Algebra* 3 (2019), no. 4, 401–438.
- [42] J. Rickard, Morita theory for derived categories. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **39** (1989), no. 3, 436–456.
- [43] J. Rickard, Derived equivalences as derived functors. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)* **43** (1991), no. 1, 37–48.
- [44] J. Rickard, Derived categories and stable equivalence. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **61** (1989), no. 3, 303–317.
- [45] P. Seidel and R. Thomas, Braid group actions on derived categories of coherent sheaves. *Duke Math. J.* **108** (2001), no. 1, 37–108.
- [46] M. van den Bergh, Non-commutative crepant resolutions. *The legacy of Niels Henrik Abel*, 749–770, *Springer, Berlin*, 2004.
- [47] A. Yekutieli, Derived categories. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 183. *Cambridge University Press, Cambridge*, 2020.
- [48] A. Zimmermann, Representation theory. A homological algebra point of view. Algebra and Applications, 19. *Springer, Cham*, 2014.

UNIVERSITÄT PADERBORN, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, WARBURGER STRASSE 100, 33098 PADERBORN, GERMANY

Email address: wassilij.gnedin@math.uni-paderborn.de