

On the invariants of 4×4 skew-symmetric matrix under cluster mutations.

G. Chelnokov grishabenruven@yandex.ru

National Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

Abstract

We prove that any invariant of a 4-quiver, that is piecewise polynomial, moreover, polynomial for fixed signs of entries, is a function of determinant of a quiver.

Key words: cluster algebras, invariants ???

The main purpose of this paper is to prove Theorem 1, but to formulate it smoothly we need some definitions.

Definition 1. Call a quiver of size n (or n -quiver) an $n \times n$ skew-symmetric matrix with real entries. By U_n denote the set of all n -quivers. Call a carriage S_i a subset of U_n of all quivers with prescribed signs of entries, so U_n is covered by $2^{\binom{n}{2}}$ carriages. Call a quiver X an inner point of its carriage if all entries of X are nonzero.

Definition 2. Given an integer $k \in [1..n]$ by μ_k denote the mapping $U_n \rightarrow U_n$, such that under the mapping $X \rightarrow \mu_k(X)$ $x_{i,j} \rightarrow -x_{i,j}$ if $k = i$ or j . If $k \neq i, j$ then $x_{i,j} \rightarrow x_{i,j} + x_{i,k}x_{k,j}$ if both $x_{i,k}$ and $x_{k,j}$ are positive, $x_{i,j} \rightarrow x_{i,j} - x_{i,k}x_{k,j}$ if both $x_{i,k}$ and $x_{k,j}$ are negative, else $x_{i,j} \rightarrow x_{i,j}$. Call μ_k a cluster mutation with respect to vertex k .

Definition 3. Let \mathcal{P} be an $2^{\binom{n}{2}}$ -plet of polynomials P_i in matrix entries (we will write $P_i(X)$ instead of $P_i(x_{1,2}, \dots, x_{n-1,n})$, keep in mind that it is not a polynomial in matrix sense), moreover, let polynomials P_i bijectively correspond to carriages S_i . By $F_{\mathcal{P}} : U_n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the function $F_{\mathcal{P}} : X \in S_i \rightarrow P_i(X)$. We call such function carriages-wise polynomial.

Certainly we say that $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ is invariant under cluster mutations if $F_{\mathcal{P}}(X) = F_{\mathcal{P}}(\mu_k(X))$ for all k and all $X \in U_n$. Now we have all the notions necessary to formulate the main result of this paper.

Theorem 1. Let $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ be an carriages-wise polynomial function, invariant under cluster mutations, on 4-quivers. Then there exists a polynomial in one variable f such that $F_{\mathcal{P}}(X) = f(\text{Det}(X))$.

Proof. Essentially in this prove we will repeatedly use an obvious fact that if two (multivariable) polynomials coincide as functions on an open set then they coincide as polynomials. First we need one more auxiliary notion.

Definition 4. Let S_i be a carriage in U_n . By $\mu\mu_k^i$ denote a mapping $\mu\mu_k^i : U_n \rightarrow U_n$, which is polynomial in all entries and coincide with $\mu_k(X)$ for $X \in S_i$. For example if $\mu_k(X)$ maps $x_{1,2} \rightarrow x_{1,2} + x_{1,k}x_{k,2}$ for $X \in S_i$ then $\mu\mu_k^i$ maps $x_{1,2} \rightarrow x_{1,2} + x_{1,k}x_{k,2}$ for all X .

Remark 1. If two carriages S_{i_1} and S_{i_2} differ only in the orientation of some arrows not adjusted to vertex k , then the mappings $\mu\mu_k^{i_1}$ and $\mu\mu_k^{i_2}$ coincide.

Lemma 1. Let $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ be an carriages-wise polynomial function, invariant under cluster mutations, on n -quivers. Assume two carriages S_{i_1} and S_{i_2} differ in a sign of just one entry $x_{i,j}$, and there exist a vertex k , such that $x_{i,k}$ and $x_{k,j}$ have same signs. Then P_{i_1} and P_{i_2} coincide.

Proof. Consider inner quivers $X_1 \in S_{i_1}$ and $X_2 \in S_{i_2}$, such that all their entries other than $x_{i,j}$ coincide, entry $x_{i,j}$ differ only in sign and $|x_{i,j}| < x_{i,k}x_{k,j}$. Then μ_k maps X_1 and X_2 into inner quivers of the same carriage, denote this carriage S_j .

Polynomial mappings $\mu\mu_k^{i_1}$ and $\mu\mu_k^{i_2}$ coincide due to Remark 1. Also $\mu\mu_k^j \circ \mu\mu_k^{i_1} = id$ because $\mu_k(\mu\mu_k^{i_1}(X)) = X$ holds for all $X \in S_{i_1} \cap \mu_k(S_j)$ (indeed, here we use the fact that μ_k is an involution, otherwise we would have to write $X \in S_{i_1} \cap \mu_k^{-1}(S_j)$), and $\mu\mu_k^j \circ \mu\mu_k^{i_1}$ is a polynomial mapping.

Since $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ is invariant, $P_{i_1}(X) = P_j(\mu_k(X))$ for all $X \in S_{i_1} \cap \mu_k(S_j)$. Then $P_{i_1}(X) = P_j(\mu\mu_k^{i_1}(X))$ holds as polynomial equality, that is for arbitrary X . Similarly we obtain $P_j(X_1) = P_{i_2}(\mu\mu_k^j(X_1))$.

Substituting into the latter one $X_1 = \mu\mu_k^{i_1}(X)$, combining with the first one and applying $\mu\mu_k^j \circ \mu\mu_k^{i_1} = id$ we get $P_{i_1}(X) = P_{i_2}(X)$ as desired. \square

Lemma 2. The statement of the Lemma 1 implies that in case $n = 4$ all P_i coincide.

Proof. Let us reformulate our statement. Consider four vertices, each pair is connected by an arrow in one of two directions. We are allowed for an oriented path $\overrightarrow{AB}, \overrightarrow{BC}$ to switch the direction of an arrow between A and C . We need to prove that by means of such operations we can transit from any configuration to any one. Here a configuration of arrows represent a carriage, and our right to pass from configuration S_i to S_j represent that Lemma 1 claims $P_i = P_j$.

The proof of the above statement consists of a cases consideration. Call a vertex *regular* in some configuration if this vertex have positive indegree and outdegree. First, if A is regular then we can switch arrows between B, C, D as we want. Indeed, without loss of generality assume arrows are $\overrightarrow{BA}, \overrightarrow{AC}$ and \overrightarrow{AD} ; then we can switch (B, C) and (B, D) as we want; then we can switch (B, C) and (B, D) to \overrightarrow{BC} and \overrightarrow{CD} , then switch (B, D) as we want, then switch (B, C) and (B, D) as we want. Second, we can pass between any to configurations such that A is regular. Third, each configuration have a regular vertex. Assume initial configuration have a regular vertex A and final one have a

regular vertex B . Then using first statement we can make vertex B regular, then using second statement bring adjusted to B arrows into the correct position, then again use the first statement. \square

Remark 2. *Lemma 2 is an essential step that do not works in case of 3×3 matrices. Denote the entries by*

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & x & -y \\ -x & 0 & z \\ y & -z & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then Lemma 1 claims $P_{x \geq 0, y \geq 0, z \geq 0} = P_{x \leq 0, y \geq 0, z \geq 0} = P_{x \geq 0, y \leq 0, z \geq 0} = P_{x \geq 0, y \geq 0, z \leq 0}$ and $P_{x \leq 0, y \leq 0, z \leq 0} = P_{x \geq 0, y \leq 0, z \leq 0} = P_{x \leq 0, y \geq 0, z \leq 0} = P_{x \leq 0, y \leq 0, z \geq 0}$, but nothing else. Thanks to this becomes possible the invariant

$$F_{\mathcal{P}}(X) = \begin{cases} x^2 + y^2 + z^2 - xyz & \text{if 3 or 2 non-negative among } x, y, z \\ x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + xyz & \text{if 3 or 2 non-positive among } x, y, z \end{cases}$$

To formulate the next lemma smoothly we introduce some new notations. We address entries of a skew-symmetric matrix as

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

First, by introducing different letters we avoid index pandemonium, second, this is a more symmetric orientation (if $x, y, z, u, v, w > 0$ arrows are oriented $\overrightarrow{32}$, $\overrightarrow{24}$, $\overrightarrow{43}$ and $\overrightarrow{i1}$). In this notation $\text{Det}(X) = (xw + yv + zu)^2$.

Next, we address vector (x, y, z) as Y and vector (u, v, w) as V . So, short for $F_{\mathcal{P}}(x, y, z, u, v, w)$ is $F_{\mathcal{P}}(Y, V)$. By (\cdot) we denote bilinear form $Y \cdot V = xw + yv + zu$.

Lemma 3. *Let $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ be an carriages-wise polynomial function, invariant under cluster mutations, on 4-quivers. Then $F_{\mathcal{P}}(Y, V) = F_{\mathcal{P}}(Y + Y_1, V)$ holds for any Y_1 such that $Y_1 \cdot V = 0$, and $F_{\mathcal{P}}(Y, V) = F_{\mathcal{P}}(Y, V + V_1)$ holds for any V_1 such that $Y \cdot V_1 = 0$.*

Proof. By virtue of Lemmas 1,2 we consider $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ to be polynomial.

Consider a carriage given by $v, z \geq 0$ and $w \leq 0$, other three signs unimportant. Denote this carriage S_1 . Then the explicit formula for $\mu\mu_4^1$ is $\mu\mu_4^1(x, y, z, u, v, w) = (x + vz, y + (-w)z, -z, u, -v, -w)$. So $(\mu\mu_4^1)^2(x, y, z, u, v, w) = (x + 2vz, y - 2wz, z, u, v, w)$ or in vector notation $(\mu\mu_4^1)^2(x, y, z, u, v, w) = (x, y, z, u, v, w) + 2z(v, -w, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. Consequently $(\mu\mu_4^1)^{2k}(x, y, z, u, v, w) = (x, y, z, u, v, w) + 2kz(v, -w, 0, 0, 0, 0)$ for all integer k . So the restriction of polynomial $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ to the line $\{(x, y, z, u, v, w) + \lambda(v, -w, 0, 0, 0, 0) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$ takes same value infinitely many times, thus this restriction is a constant. Similarly, by considering carriage $w, y \geq 0$, $u \leq 0$ and vertex 3 get that $F_{\mathcal{P}}$ is constant on the line $\{(x, y, z, u, v, w) + \lambda(-u, 0, w, 0, 0, 0) \mid \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Since any vector Y_1 such that

$Y_1 \cdot V = 0$ belongs to the linear hull $\langle (v, -w, 0, 0, 0, 0), (-u, 0, w, 0, 0, 0) \rangle$ we are done with the statement $F_{\mathcal{P}}(Y, V) = F_{\mathcal{P}}(Y + Y_1, V)$.

The second statement of the Lemma can be achieved similarly. \square

Lemma 4. *Let F be an function $F : \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying conditions*

- $F(Y_1, V) = F(Y_2, V)$ holds for any Y_1, Y_2, V such that $Y_1 \cdot V = Y_2 \cdot V$,
- $F(Y, V_1) = F(Y, V_2)$ holds for any V_1, V_2, Y such that $Y \cdot V_1 = Y \cdot V_2$.

Then there exist a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that $F(Y, V) = f(Y \cdot V)$.

Note that the premise of Lemma 4 is exactly the conclusion of Lemma 3 formulated in more symmetric terms.

Proof. Define $f(x) = F((x, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0))$. Our goal is to transit from $F((y_1, y_2, y_3), (v_1, v_2, v_3))$ via a sequence of equalities, provided by Lemma 4. First, we may assume one of y_1, v_1 be nonzero, otherwise $F((0, y_2, y_3), (0, v_2, v_3)) = F((0, y_2, y_3), (1, v_2, v_3))$. Without loss of generality $v_1 \neq 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} F((y_1, y_2, y_3), (v_1, v_2, v_3)) &= F\left(\frac{y_1 v_1 + y_2 v_2 + y_3 v_3}{v_1}, 0, 0\right), (v_1, v_2, v_3) = \\ F\left(\frac{y_1 v_1 + y_2 v_2 + y_3 v_3}{v_1}, 0, 0\right), (v_1, 1, 0) &= F((0, y_1 v_1 + y_2 v_2 + y_3 v_3, 0), (v_1, 1, 0)) = \\ F((0, y_1 v_1 + y_2 v_2 + y_3 v_3, 0), (1, 1, 0)) &= F((y_1 v_1 + y_2 v_2 + y_3 v_3, 0, 0), (1, 1, 0)) = \\ &= F((y_1 v_1 + y_2 v_2 + y_3 v_3, 0, 0), (1, 0, 0)). \end{aligned}$$

\square Lemma 4 finishes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

Some final remarks

Indeed, analogues of Theorem 1 can be proved for wider classes of functions by the arguments of this paper. We use just two properties of the class of polynomials. First, that equality of two functions on an open set implies global equality. This holds for analytic functions. Second, that a function, taking on a 1-dimensional affine subspace a fixed value infinitely many times is a constant on this line. This holds (for example) for rational functions and real exponents, but not complex exponents. So, the result follows for rational functions, real quasi-polynomials, real quasi-rational similarly.

Also, the question of invariants of integer quivers is more widely known than its real counterpart. In this case the difference is insignificant. Indeed, the intersections of (real)carriages with integer lattice \mathbb{Z}^6 are sufficiently “large” to any carriage-wise polynomial (rational, real quasi-rational...) invariant on integer quivers be an invariant on real quivers.

References

[1] ??