

# A COUNTEREXAMPLE TO THE $\phi$ -DIMENSION CONJECTURE

ERIC J. HANSON, KIYOSHI IGUSA

ABSTRACT. In 2005, the second author and Todorov introduced an upper bound on the finitistic dimension of an Artin algebra, now known as the  $\phi$ -dimension. The  $\phi$ -dimension conjecture states that this upper bound is always finite, a fact that would imply the finitistic dimension conjecture. In this paper, we present a counterexample to the  $\phi$ -dimension conjecture and explain where it comes from. We also discuss implications for further research and the finitistic dimension conjecture.

## CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 1. Introduction                                   | 1  |
| 1.1. Our Counterexample                           | 2  |
| 1.2. Organization                                 | 3  |
| 2. A Brief Description of Amalgamation            | 3  |
| 2.1. Global Dimension and Amalgamation            | 4  |
| 3. The $\phi$ and $\psi$ Functions                | 5  |
| 4. The Category of 3-Periodic Chain Complexes     | 6  |
| 5. Syzygies in the Category of Chain Complexes    | 9  |
| 6. Computations for the Counterexample            | 11 |
| 7. Conclusions and Directions for Future Research | 16 |
| Acknowledgements                                  | 16 |
| References  | 16 |

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\Lambda$  be an Artin algebra; that is, an associative algebra which is finitely generated as a module over a commutative Artinian ring. We denote by  $\text{mod}\Lambda$  the category of finitely generated (left)  $\Lambda$ -modules and by  $\text{proj}\Lambda$  the full subcategory of finitely generated projective modules. Let  $\Omega_\Lambda : \text{mod}\Lambda \rightarrow \text{mod}\Lambda$  be the syzygy functor. That is, on objects,  $\Omega_\Lambda M$  is the kernel of the projective cover  $M \xleftarrow{q} P$ .

One of the fundamental homological invariants is the *projective dimension* of a module. This can be defined as

$$\text{pd}_\Lambda M := \min \{ \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid \Omega_\Lambda^k M \in \text{proj}\Lambda\} \cup \{\infty\} \}.$$

This leads to definitions of the *projective dimension* and *finitistic dimension* of an algebra, given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{gl.dim}\Lambda &:= \sup \{ \text{pd}_\Lambda M \mid M \in \text{mod}\Lambda \} = \max \{ \text{pd}_\Lambda S \mid S \in \text{mod}\Lambda \text{ is simple} \}, \\ \text{fin.dim}\Lambda &:= \sup \{ \text{pd}_\Lambda M \mid M \in \text{mod}\Lambda, \text{pd}_\Lambda M < \infty \}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that if  $\text{gl.dim}\Lambda < \infty$  then  $\text{gl.dim}\Lambda = \text{fin.dim}\Lambda$ , but it remains unknown whether the converse is true. The (small) finitistic dimension conjecture, first formally communicated by Bass in 1960 [Bas60], states precisely that this is the case. In other words, it states that  $\text{fin.dim}\Lambda < \infty$  for all Artin algebras.

This conjecture has motivated an enormous quantity of research since it was first stated, both for its intrinsic interest and for its relation to other open questions in representation theory. For example, it is known that the finitistic dimension conjecture implies the generalized Nakayama conjecture (posed by Auslander-Reiten [AR75]), the Wakamatsu tilting conjecture (posed by Beligiannis-Reiten [BR07, Chapter

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16E05; 16E10; 16G10; 16G20; 18G20.

*Key words and phrases.*  $\phi$ -dimension, finitistic dimension, periodic chain complexes.

3]), and the Gorenstein symmetry conjecture (noted by Auslander). A more thorough description of the relationship between these conjectures can be found in [KKS92], [Xi06] and [Wei08].

To study the finitistic dimension conjecture, the second author and Todorov introduced two new homological invariants, which they denoted  $\phi$  and  $\psi$ , in [IT05]. From these invariants, which are now sometimes referred to as the *Igusa-Todorov functions*, one defines the  $\phi$ -dimension and  $\psi$ -dimension of an Artin algebra as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi\dim\Lambda &:= \sup\{\phi(M)|M \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda\}, \\ \psi\dim\Lambda &:= \sup\{\psi(M)|M \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda\}.\end{aligned}$$

These invariants have remained an active area of research since their inception, mainly for their relationship to other homological measures and the finitistic dimension conjecture. For example, in [ES17] and [LM18], Elsener-Schiffler and Lanzilotta-Mata independently prove that for Gorenstein algebras the  $\phi$ -dimension,  $\psi$ -dimension, and Gorenstein dimension all coincide. In addition, in [HL13], Huard-Lanzilotta show that an algebra has  $\phi\dim\Lambda = 0$  if and only if it is self-injective. It remains an open question to characterize algebras with  $\phi\dim\Lambda = 1$ .


The classes of algebras that have been shown to satisfy the finitistic dimension conjecture using the  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  functions include: algebras of representation dimension at most 3 [IT05], algebras of finite injective dimension [LM18], Gorenstein algebras [LM18], truncated path algebras [BMR19], monomial relation algebras [LM18], Igusa-Todorov algebras [Wei09], and, indirectly, special biserial algebras [EHIS04].

As in [LM18], we recall that

$$\mathbf{fin.dim}\Lambda \leq \phi\dim\Lambda \leq \psi\dim\Lambda \leq \mathbf{gl.dim}\Lambda.$$

In particular, finiteness of either the  $\phi$ - or  $\psi$ -dimension implies finiteness of the finitistic dimension. This fact, and the prevalence of the  $\phi$ - and  $\psi$ -dimensions in recent literature on the finitistic dimension conjecture, has led to the so called  $\phi$ -dimension conjecture and  $\psi$ -dimension conjecture, formally stated by Fernandes-Lanzilotta-Mendoza [FLM15] and Lanzilotta-Mendoza [LM17]. These conjectures state, respectively, that  $\phi\dim\Lambda < \infty$  and  $\psi\dim\Lambda < \infty$  for all Artin algebras. We observe that the  $\phi$ -dimension conjecture implies the finitistic dimension conjecture. Said another way, if there is a counterexample to the finitistic dimension conjecture, it must have infinite  $\phi$ -dimension. The purpose of this paper is to show that Artin algebras of infinite  $\phi$ -dimension exist, disproving the  $\phi$ -dimension conjecture (and hence also the  $\psi$ -dimension conjecture), while also showing that this class of algebras is important for future research and the search for a resolution of the finitistic dimension conjecture.

**1.1. Our Counterexample.** We fix for the remainder of this paper an arbitrary field  $K$ . For example, we could take  $K = \mathbb{C}$ . Let  $A = KQ/\text{rad}^2 KQ$  and  $A_3^{CT} = KC_3/\text{rad}^2 KC_3$ , where  $Q$  and  $C_3$  are the quivers shown below.



That is,  $A$  and  $A_3^{CT}$  are the quotients of the path algebras (over  $K$ ) of these quivers modulo the relations that the composition of any two arrows is zero. Readers unfamiliar with path algebras and their quotients are referred to [ASS06, Chapter II, III]. For emphasis, we restate the following result of Lanzilotta-Mata.

**Theorem.** [LM18, Corollary 3.9] *Let  $\Lambda$  be a monomial relation algebra. Then  $\phi\dim\Lambda < \infty$ .*

In particular, both  $A$  and  $A_3^{CT}$  are monomial relation algebras, so their  $\phi$ -dimensions are both finite. The counterexample we present in this paper is the algebra  $A \otimes_K A_3^{CT}$ . That is, the aim of this paper is to prove the following.

**Theorem 1.** *The  $\phi$ -dimension of  $A \otimes_K A_3^{CT}$  is infinite.*

As the algebra  $A \otimes_K A_3^{CT}$  is not a monomial relation algebra, this result is not in conflict with that of Lanzilotta-Mata.

**1.2. Organization.** This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we discuss the larger context from which we discovered this counterexample. In Section 3, we recall the definitions of the  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  functions and some useful lemmas. In Section 4, we study the category of *3-periodic chain complexes* of an Artin algebra over a field. This category is isomorphic to the module category of the algebra formed by taking a tensor product with  $A_3^{CT}$ , and our counterexample is a specific instance of this construction. In Section 5, we give a procedure for computing the syzygies of a class of objects in the category of (bounded) chain complexes and the category of 3-periodic chain complexes we call *truncated projective resolutions*. In Section 6, we give an explicit computation which shows that the  $\phi$ -dimension of our proposed counterexample is infinite (i.e., we prove Theorem 1) using the results of Sections 4 and 5.


2. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF AMALGAMATION

The goal of this section is explain the larger context in which we discovered this counterexample. The ideas explained here are a part of a larger forthcoming work by Gordana Todorov and the two authors of this paper. This was originally motivated by the joint work of the second author and Daniel Álvarez-Gavela, who use amalgamation to describe examples and invariants in contact topology in [AGI].


In [FG06], Fock and Goncharov define a combinatorial method for gluing together two cluster  $\mathcal{X}$ -varieties, which they refer to as *amalgamation*. This process is described by how it behaves on seeds. In [AHBC<sup>+</sup>12], amalgamation is used to study on-shell diagrams with the goal of understanding scattering amplitudes and the Jacobian algebra of a plabic diagram. As part of this study, an interpretation of amalgamation in terms of quivers containing “half-arrows” is given.

In our larger work, we avoid the notion of half arrows by instead adding formal inverses to every arrow of the quivers and relations to make them redundant. The reason we do this is that after adding these ‘redundant’ arrows, amalgamating, and deleting the remaining redundant arrows, we recover the Jacobian algebra of the amalgamation defined by Fock-Goncharov. This new interpretation also allows us to naturally expand the process of amalgamation to quivers with relations, and thus to quotients of path algebras. In our larger work, we study what happens when two algebras are amalgamated. We also define a pseudo-inverse process we call “unamalgamation” and study what happens when an algebra is unamalgamated.

The technical definition of amalgamation will not be a part of this paper in favor of an example. Consider the following pair of identical quivers of type  $C_3$




modulo the relations  $\text{rad}^2 C_3 = 0$  on each piece. Observe that this corresponds to two algebras of the form  $A_3^{CT}$ . We can then add formal inverses of each arrow, with relations to make them redundant. The result is the pair of quivers



modulo the relations from before and the new relations that  $y_i = x_{i-1}x_{i-2}$  and likewise for  $y'_i$  (where indices are considered mod 3). We observe that in this case, this means that each  $y_i$  is 0, but if we had started with different relations this may not be the case.


The idea of amalgamation is to now identify an arrow of the first quiver with an arrow of the second. Up to symmetry, there are two ways we can do this.

Our first choice is to identify  $x_3$  with  $y'_3 = x'_2x'_1$  and  $x'_3$  with  $y_3 = x_2x_1$  (hence identifying the vertex 3 with 2' and the vertex 2 with 3'). Upon making this identification and deleting unnecessary arrows, we are left with the quiver



modulo the relations  $x_2x_1 = 0$  and  $x'_2x'_1 = 0$ .

Our other choice is to identify  $x_3$  with  $x'_3$  and  $y_3$  with  $y'_3$  (hence identifying the vertex 3 with 3' and the vertex 2 with 2'). Upon making this identification and deleting unnecessary arrows, we are left with the quiver



modulo the relation  $\text{rad}^2Q_1 = 0$ . We observe that upon taking a tensor product with  $A_3^{CT}$ , this quiver with relations is precisely our counterexample. Thus, in an informal sense, our counterexample is formed by putting together three copies of  $A_3^{CT}$ , a very well-understood algebra.

We now give a brief description of another problem we have studied using amalgamation (see [HI]).

**2.1. Global Dimension and Amalgamation.** Recall that a connected algebra  $\Lambda = KQ/I$  is a *Nakayama algebra* if and only if  $Q$  is one of the quivers

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\gamma_n} \\ \begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \xleftarrow{\gamma_1} & 2 & \xleftarrow{\gamma_2} & \cdots & \xleftarrow{\gamma_{n-1}} & n \\ \Delta_n \end{array} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & \xleftarrow{\gamma_1} & 2 & \xleftarrow{\gamma_2} & \cdots & \xleftarrow{\gamma_{n-1}} & n \\ A_n \end{array} \end{array} \end{array}$$

and  $I$  is an admissible ideal. Nakayama algebras with quiver  $\Delta_n$  are sometimes referred to as *cyclic Nakayama algebras* or *cycle algebras*.

In the example above, we can consider amalgamation as a procedure for combing two Nakayama algebras. Identifying two arrows in the opposite direction (the first case) resulted in another Nakayama algebra and identifying two arrows in the same direction (the second case) did not.


Much work has been done to determine when a Nakayama algebra is of infinite global dimension. We now recall two approaches to this problem and the relationship between them.

In [Rin13], Ringel introduces the *resolution quiver* of a Nakayama algebra as a tool to study its Gorenstein projective modules and determine when it is Gorenstein. Shen then shows in [She17] that a Nakayama algebra has finite global dimension if and only if its resolution quiver is connected and has *weight 1*, an easy condition to check.

In [IZ92], the second author and Zacharia study a larger class of algebras called *monomial relation algebras*; that is, algebras of the form  $KQ/I$  where  $I$  is an admissible ideal generated by monomials and  $Q$  is arbitrary. Their main result is to show that a monomial relation algebra has finite global dimension if and only if the *cyclic homology* of its radical is trivial. They further show that it is sufficient to study the cyclic homology of only the *overlying cycle algebras*. An overlying cycle algebra is a cyclic Nakayama algebra  $K\Delta_n/I'$  where there is a map of quivers  $\Delta_n \rightarrow Q$  and  $I'$  is the pullback of  $I$  by this map. For example,  $KQ_1/\text{rad}^2 KQ_1$  defined above in our example has  $K\Delta_6/\text{rad}^2 K\Delta_6$  as an overlying Nakayama algebra coming from the map of quivers sending the cycle  $(1,2,3,4,5,6)$  to the path  $(3,2,1,3,2,1')$ .

In the case that a monomial relation algebra is Nakayama, the second author and Zacharia test whether the cyclic homology is trivial by relating it to the homology of a simplicial complex defined from the relations of the algebra, which we call the *relation complex*. The main result of our concurrent work [HI] is to show that the Euler characteristic of the relation complex is exactly the number of connected components with weight 1 in the resolution quiver. Our proof of this uses (un)amalgamation.

This result drove us to look for a generalization of resolution quivers to arbitrary monomial relation algebras. Made more precise, our results show that resolution quivers give information about the cyclic homology of Nakayama algebras, but the results of the second author and Zacharia apply to all monomial relation algebras. We wish to recover this result in the more general setting from a construction that restricts to a resolution quiver in the Nakayama case. As a starting point, we examined algebras formed by amalgamation. We discovered that the algebra  $KQ'/\text{rad}^2 KQ'$ , where  $Q'$  is the quiver



contains overlying Nakayama algebras of arbitrarily high  $\phi$ -dimension. In an attempt to leverage this fact, we examined what happens to a (truncated) projective resolution in an overlying Nakayama algebra when we project it back to the original algebra. These resolutions can be considered as modules over a finite dimensional algebra by taking a tensor product with  $A_3^{CT}$  (this idea is detailed in Section 4). We then discovered that after contracting the arrow  $x_4$ , we could use this approach to generate modules of arbitrarily high  $\phi$ -dimension.

### 3. THE $\phi$ AND $\psi$ FUNCTIONS

The aim of this section is to recall the definitions of the  $\phi$  and  $\psi$  functions, first given by the second author and Todorov, and two useful lemmas. In this section, we let  $\Lambda$  an arbitrary Artin algebra; however, in the sections to follow we will restrict to the case where  $\Lambda$  is an algebra over the field  $K$ .

**Definition 3.1.** Fix a representative  $[M]$  for every isomorphism class in  $\text{mod}\Lambda$ . Let  $K_0(\Lambda)$  be the quotient of the free abelian group generated by the symbols  $[M]$  modulo the subgroup generated by

- $[M] - [N] - [N']$  for  $M \cong N \oplus N'$
- $[P]$  for  $P \in \text{proj}\Lambda$ .

$K_0(\Lambda)$  is called the *split Grothendieck group* of  $\Lambda$ . It is well known that  $K_0(\Lambda)$  is the free abelian group generated by the symbols  $[M]$  for all isomorphism classes of indecomposable non-projective modules.

We recall that the syzygy functor  $\Omega_\Lambda$  induces a homomorphism  $L : K_0(\Lambda) \rightarrow K_0(\Lambda)$  by defining  $L[M] := [\Omega_\Lambda M]$ . For  $M \in \text{mod}\Lambda$ , let  $\langle \text{add}M \rangle$  be the subgroup of  $K_0(\Lambda)$  generated by the direct summands of  $M$ . Observe that  $\langle \text{add}M \rangle$ , and more generally  $L^t \langle \text{add}M \rangle$  for  $t \in \mathbb{N}$ , is also free abelian and thus has a well defined rank.

**Definition 3.2.** [IT05] Let  $M \in \text{mod}\Lambda$ . Then define

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(M) &= \min\{t | \text{rank}(L^t \langle \text{add}M \rangle) = \text{rank}(L^{t+j} \langle \text{add}M \rangle) \forall j \in \mathbb{N}\} \\ \psi(M) &= \phi(M) + \sup\{\text{pd}_\Lambda N | N \text{ a direct summand of } \Omega_\Lambda^{\phi(M)} M, \text{pd}_\Lambda N < \infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is immediate that  $\phi(M) < \infty$  for all  $M \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda$  and that if  $\mathrm{pd}_\Lambda M < \infty$  then  $\phi(M) = \psi(M) = \mathrm{pd}_\Lambda M$ . We recall from the introduction that the  $\phi$ - and  $\psi$ -dimensions are then defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi\mathrm{dim}\Lambda &= \sup\{\phi(M) \mid M \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda\} \\ \psi\mathrm{dim}\Lambda &= \sup\{\psi(M) \mid M \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda\}\end{aligned}$$

We conclude this section with the following lemma, which will be used to prove the main theorem of this paper.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $M, N \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda$ .*

- (1) *If  $[M] = [N]$  in  $K_0(\Lambda)$ , then  $\Omega_\Lambda M \cong \Omega_\Lambda N$ .*
- (2) *Suppose there exists  $t \in \mathbb{N}$  so that  $\Omega_\Lambda^t M \cong \Omega_\Lambda^t N$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda^{t-1} M \not\cong \Omega_\Lambda^{t-1} N$ . Then  $\phi\mathrm{dim}(M \oplus N) \geq t - 1$ .*

*Proof.* (1) Suppose  $[M] = [N]$ . Then there exists  $R \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda$  with no projective direct summands and  $P, Q \in \mathbf{proj}\Lambda$  so that  $M \cong R \oplus P$  and  $N \cong R \oplus Q$ . We then have that  $\Omega_\Lambda M \cong \Omega_\Lambda R \oplus \Omega_\Lambda P$  and  $\Omega_\Lambda N \cong \Omega_\Lambda R \oplus \Omega_\Lambda Q$ . Since  $P, Q$  are projective,  $\Omega_\Lambda P \cong \Omega_\Lambda Q \cong 0$ , so  $\Omega_\Lambda M \cong \Omega_\Lambda N$ .


(2) Let  $a = [M] - [N] \in K_0(\Lambda)$ . By assumption, we have  $a \in \langle \mathbf{add}M \oplus N \rangle$ . Now since  $\Omega_\Lambda^{t-1} M \not\cong \Omega_\Lambda^{t-1} N$ , we have by (1) that  $[\Omega_\Lambda^{t-2} M] \neq [\Omega_\Lambda^{t-2} N]$ ; that is,  $L^{t-2}(a) \neq 0$ . Moreover, since  $\Omega_\Lambda^t M \cong \Omega_\Lambda^t N$ , we have  $[\Omega_\Lambda^t M] = [\Omega_\Lambda^t N]$ ; that is,  $L^t(a) = 0$ . This means  $\mathrm{rank}(L^t(\mathbf{add}M \oplus N)) < \mathrm{rank}(L^{t-2}(\mathbf{add}M \oplus N))$ , which implies the result.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** With more work, one could show that in the context of (2), we have  $\phi\mathrm{dim}(M \oplus N) \geq t$ . We chose to omit this since it has no bearing on our main result.

#### 4. THE CATEGORY OF 3-PERIODIC CHAIN COMPLEXES


For the remainder of this paper, the term *algebra* will be used to mean an elementary algebra over the field  $K$ . We recall that if  $\Lambda$  is such an algebra, then we can express  $\Lambda = KQ/I$  as the quotient of the ( $K$ -)path algebra of some quiver  $Q$  by some admissible ideal  $I$ .

Recall from the introduction that  $A_3^{CT} = KC_3/\mathrm{rad}^2 KC_3$ , where  $C_3$  is an oriented 3-cycle:



We remark that this algebra is cluster-tilted of type  $A_3$ , which is our reason for denoting it by  $A_3^{CT}$ . Now let  $\Lambda = KQ/I$  be an arbitrary algebra. This section is devoted to the study of algebras of the form  $\Lambda \otimes_K A_3^{CT}$ .

It is well known that the quiver of  $\Lambda \otimes_K A_3^{CT}$  is  $Q \times C_3$  (see for example [Her08]). For simplicity, we write this quiver in the form



where by abuse of notation, each  $d_i$  refers to  $|Q_0|$  distinct arrows. More precisely, for all  $v \in Q_0$  a vertex of  $Q$ ,  $d_1$  refers to the arrow  $(v, 1) \rightarrow (v, 3)$  and likewise for  $d_2$  and  $d_3$ . There are then three types of relations:

- (1) For  $R$  a relation of  $A$ , there is a relation  $(R, 1_{A_3^{CT}})$ , where  $1_{A_3^{CT}}$  is the identity of  $A_3^{CT}$ .
- (2) Abusing notation, there is a relation  $d^2 = 0$ . This is the relation inherited from  $A_3^{CT}$ .
- (3) For all arrows  $\gamma : s \rightarrow t$  in  $Q$ , there is a relation  $\gamma \circ d = d \circ \gamma$  (again abusing notation).

Using this visualization of  $\Lambda$ , we observe that an element  $X \in \mathbf{mod}(\Lambda \otimes_K A_3^{CT})$  is precisely the choice of  $M_1, M_2, M_3 \in \mathbf{mod}A$  and a chain of morphisms  $M_1 \leftarrow M_2 \leftarrow M_3 \leftarrow M_1$  so that the composition of two consecutive morphisms is zero. This observation motivates the following definition.

**Definition 4.1.** Let

$$X = \cdots \xleftarrow{d_0} X_0 \xleftarrow{d_1} X_1 \xleftarrow{d_2} X_2 \xleftarrow{d_3} \cdots$$

be a chain complex over  $\text{mod}\Lambda$ . By definition,  $X$  is piecewise finite; that is, each  $X_i \in \text{mod}\Lambda$ . We say  $X$  is *3-periodic* if we have  $d_m = d_n$  whenever  $m \equiv n \pmod{3}$ . Given  $X, Y$  two 3-periodic chain complexes, we define a morphism of 3-periodic chain complexes to be a chain map  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  such that  $f_m = f_n$  whenever  $m \equiv n \pmod{3}$ . Under these definitions, we denote by  $C^3(\Lambda)$  the category of 3-periodic chain complexes over  $\Lambda$ .

Based on the discussion above, we conclude:

**Proposition 4.2.** *The category  $\text{mod}(\Lambda \otimes_K A_3^{CT})$  is isomorphic to the category  $C^3(\Lambda)$  of 3-periodic chain complexes over  $\text{mod}\Lambda$ .*

Based on this fact, we will identify  $C^3(\Lambda)$  with  $\text{mod}(\Lambda \otimes_K A_3^{CT})$  for the remainder of this paper. We likewise use  $C(\Lambda)$  and  $C^b(\Lambda)$  to refer to the categories of (piecewise finite) chain complexes and bounded chain complexes over  $\text{mod}\Lambda$ . We remark that if we let  $A_\infty$  be the quiver with vertex set  $\mathbb{Z}$  and arrow  $i \rightarrow i-1$  for all  $i$ , we can also identify  $C^b(\Lambda)$  with  $\text{mod}(\Lambda \otimes_K (KA_\infty/\text{rad}^2 KA_\infty))$  if we choose.

Before proceeding, we set some notation for clarity.

**Notation.**

- (1) Let  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We denote by  $[i]$  the equivalence class of  $i \pmod{3}$ .
- (2) Let  $X \in C^3(\Lambda)$ . If we write

$$X = M \leftarrow M' \leftarrow M'' \leftarrow M$$

without specifying the degree of any of the modules, we assume  $M$  is in degree  $[-1]$ . That is,  $M$  is in degree  $i$  for all  $i \equiv -1 \pmod{3}$ . We will usually write this as  $X_{[-1]} = M$ .

- (3) Let  $X \in C^b(\Lambda)$ . If we write

$$X = M \leftarrow M' \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow M''$$

without specifying the degree of any of the modules, we assume  $M$  is in degree  $-1$ .

Our next goal is to relate projective covers and syzygies in  $C^b(\Lambda)$  and  $C^3(\Lambda)$ . We start with a discussion of how to “wrap” a bounded chain complex into a 3-periodic chain complex.

**Definition 4.3.** Let  $X = (M_i, d_i) \in C^b(\Lambda)$ . We define a 3-periodic chain complex

$$WX = \left( \bigoplus_{n \equiv i \pmod{3}} M_n, \bigoplus_{n \equiv i \pmod{3}} d_n \right)$$

which we call the “wrapping” of  $X$ .

By the assumption that  $X$  is bounded, we observe that  $WX$  is piecewise finite, so it is a 3-periodic chain complex as desired. Moreover, it is clear that if there is a map  $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$  in  $C^b(\Lambda)$ , there is an induced map  $WX \xrightarrow{Wf} WY$  given by again taking the direct sum over degrees congruent mod 3. Thus, we have the following.

**Lemma 4.4.** *Wrapping is a functor  $W : C^b(\Lambda) \rightarrow C^3(\Lambda)$ . Moreover, this functor is exact.*

*Proof.* It is clear that  $W$  is a functor. To see that  $W$  is exact, let

$$(M_i, d_i) \hookrightarrow (E_i, e_i) \twoheadrightarrow (N_i, f_i)$$

be an exact sequence of bounded chain complexes. Equivalently, for  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the induced sequence of modules

$$M_i \hookrightarrow E_i \twoheadrightarrow N_i$$

is exact. Thus by the exactness of the bifunctor  $\bigoplus$ , for each equivalence class  $i \in \mathbb{Z}/(3)$ , we have an exact sequence

$$\bigoplus_{n \equiv i \pmod{3}} M_i \hookrightarrow \bigoplus_{n \equiv i \pmod{3}} E_i \twoheadrightarrow \bigoplus_{n \equiv i \pmod{3}} N_i.$$

Therefore the sequence

$$W(M_i, d_i) \hookrightarrow W(E_i, e_i) \twoheadrightarrow W(N_i, f_i)$$

is exact as well. □

We now give several examples and basic properties of wrapping to better illustrate the concept.

**Example 4.5.**

- (1) The object

$$X = 0 \leftarrow M_0 \xleftarrow{d_0} M_1 \xleftarrow{d_1} M_2 \xleftarrow{d_2} M_3 \xleftarrow{d_3} M_4 \leftarrow 0$$

of  $C^b(\Lambda)$  is sent to the object

$$WX = M_0 \oplus M_3 \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d_0 & 0 \\ 0 & d_3 \end{pmatrix}} M_1 \oplus M_4 \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} M_2 \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ d_2 \end{pmatrix}} M_0 \oplus M_3$$

in  $C^3(\Lambda)$  by wrapping.

- (2) Although isomorphic chain complexes become isomorphic 3-periodic chain complexes, the converse is not true. For example, given any nonzero  $M \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda$ , both

$$0 \leftarrow M \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow M \leftarrow 0$$

correspond to the 3-periodic

$$0 \leftarrow M \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0$$

under wrapping.

- (3) Not every 3-periodic chain complex can be obtained by wrapping a bounded chain complex. That is,  $W$  is not essentially surjective. For example, the 3-periodic chain complex

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 1 & & 2 & & 3 & & 1 \\ & \leftarrow & & \leftarrow & & \leftarrow & \\ 2 & & 3 & & 1 & & 2 \end{array}$$

in  $C^3(A_3^{CT})$ , where each boundary map is nontrivial, is not isomorphic to anything in the image of  $W$ .

- (4) It is clear that wrapping is a faithful functor (this again follows from the faithfulness of  $\bigoplus$ ), but it is not full. For example, given any nonzero  $M \in \mathbf{mod}\Lambda$ , the chain complex

$$X = M \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow M$$

has  $\dim \text{End}_{C^b(\Lambda)}(X) = 2 \cdot \dim \text{End}_{\Lambda}(M)$  and the corresponding

$$WX = M \oplus M \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow M \oplus M$$

has  $\dim \text{End}_{C^3(\Lambda)}(X) = 4 \cdot \dim \text{End}_{\Lambda}(M)$

The following is immediate.

**Lemma 4.6.**

- (1) The indecomposable projective objects of  $C^b(\Lambda)$ , up to shifting degrees, are precisely objects of the form

$$0 \leftarrow P \xleftarrow{1} P \leftarrow 0$$

for  $P$  an indecomposable projective in  $\mathbf{mod}A$ .

- (2) The indecomposable projective objects of  $C^3(\Lambda)$ , up to cyclic permutation of the degrees, are precisely objects of the form

$$0 \leftarrow P \xleftarrow{1} P \leftarrow 0$$

for  $P$  an indecomposable projective in  $\mathbf{mod}A$ .



In [Hap88, Chapter 3], Happel obtains a similar result while constructing bounded derived categories. The key difference is that Happel considers projectives with respect to the split exact structure, whereas we are considering projectives with respect to the standard exact structure.

We now observe that the functor  $W$  sends projectives to projectives. Moreover, we observe that if  $0 \neq X \in C^b(\Lambda)$  then  $0 \neq WX \in C^3(\Lambda)$ . In particular, we have the following.

**Lemma 4.7.** *Let  $X \in C^b(\Lambda)$ .*

- (1) *Let  $X \xleftarrow{q} P_X$  be the projective cover of  $X$  in  $C^b(\Lambda)$ . Then  $WX \xleftarrow{Wq} WP_X$  is the projective cover of  $WX$  in  $C^3(\Lambda)$ . That is, taking projective covers commutes with wrapping.*
- (2) *Then  $\Omega_{C^3(\Lambda)}WX \cong W\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)}X$ . That is, taking syzygies commutes with wrapping.*

*Proof.* (1) Let  $X = (M_i, d_i)$  in  $C^b(\Lambda)$  with projective cover  $(P_X, q)$ . As  $W$  is exact and preserves projectives,  $Wq : WP_X \rightarrow WX$  is a surjection from a projective object to  $WX$ . The fact that this is a projective cover is clear, because if  $WP_X$  had a superfluous direct summand,  $P_X$  would as well.

(2) Since  $W$  is exact, we have  $\Omega_{C^3(\Lambda)}WX \cong \ker(Wq) \cong W\ker(q) \cong W\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)}X$ . □

It is, in general, much more difficult to compute syzygies in  $C^3(\Lambda)$  than in  $C^b(\Lambda)$ . Thus, in light of this lemma, our goal will be to find two families of chain complexes,  $\{X_k\}_k$  and  $\{Y_k\}_k$ , in  $C^b(\Lambda)$  so that  $\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)}^t(X_k)$  and  $\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)}^t(Y_k)$  first become isomorphic for arbitrarily large values of  $t$ . We will then pass by wrapping to  $C^3(\Lambda)$  and show this is still the case. This is done in Section 6. Before we do this, we more closely examine the computations of certain syzygies in the category  $C^b(\Lambda)$ .

## 5. SYZYGIES IN THE CATEGORY OF CHAIN COMPLEXES

In this section, we study the syzygies of certain nice chain complexes corresponding to ‘truncated projective resolutions’, which we make precise below. We still assume that  $\Lambda$  is an arbitrary  $K$ -algebra. For clarity, we denote a morphism  $f : \bigoplus_i M_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_j N_j$  by a set of arrows  $\{f_{i,j} : M_i \rightarrow N_j \mid N_j \cap \text{Im}(f|_{M_i}) \neq 0\}$ . We will also omit the quotient maps from the data of projective covers.

**Definition 5.1.** Choose some integer  $m > 0$  and let  $M \in \text{mod}\Lambda$  be of projective dimension at least  $m$ . Let  $P_0$  be the projective cover of  $M$ . Now let  $Q_1 \oplus R_1$  be a direct sum decomposition of  $\ker(P_0 \rightarrow M)$  with  $R_1 \neq 0$  and let  $P_1$  be the projective cover of  $R_1$ . Likewise, for  $1 < i < m$ , define  $P_i$  and  $Q_i$  inductively starting with  $\ker(P_{i-1} \rightarrow R_{i-1})$ . Denote  $Q_m = \ker(P_{m-1} \rightarrow R_{m-1})$ . This data, arranged in the chain complex shown below, gives an object  $X \in C^b(\Lambda)$  which we call a *truncated (minimal) projective resolution* of  $M$  (of length  $m$ ).

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & Q_1 & & Q_2 & \cdots & & Q_{m-1} & & Q_m \\
 & & & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \oplus & & \\
 M & \longleftarrow & P_0 & \longleftarrow & P_1 & \longleftarrow & P_2 & \longleftarrow & \cdots & \longleftarrow & P_{m-1}
 \end{array}$$

Throughout this paper, every truncated projective resolution will be minimal. We will study truncated projective resolutions of a particular algebra in Section 6. The purpose of this section is to explicitly compute the syzygy of a truncated projective resolution. However, we first prove the following, which will be critical in Section 6.

**Lemma 5.2.** *Let  $M \in \text{mod}\Lambda$  be of projective dimension at least  $m$  and let  $X = (X_i, d_i)$  be a truncated projective resolution of  $M$  of length  $m$ . Suppose further that*

- (1)  $X_{-1} \cong M$  is an indecomposable  $\Lambda$ -module.
- (2) For all  $i \equiv j \pmod{3}$  with  $i \neq -1$ , we have  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X_i, \ker(d_j)) = 0$ .

*Then  $WX$  is indecomposable in  $C^3(\Lambda)$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the result for  $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ , although the other cases follow analogously. We first observe that we can write

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & X_{-1} & \xleftarrow{d_0} & X_0 & \xleftarrow{d_1} & X_1 & \xleftarrow{d_5} & X_{-1} \\
WX = & & X_2 & \xleftarrow{d_3} & X_3 & \xleftarrow{d_4} & X_4 & \xleftarrow{d_8} & X_2 \\
& & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
& & X_{m-1} & \xleftarrow{d_m} & X_m & & & & X_{m-1}
\end{array}$$

For  $-1 \leq \ell \leq m$ , we denote by  $\pi_\ell$  the projection  $WX_{[\ell]} \twoheadrightarrow X_\ell$ . Now suppose for a contradiction that there is a direct sum decomposition  $WX \cong B \oplus C$ . Then without loss of generality, (1) implies that  $C_{[-1]}$  does not contain  $X_{[-1]}$  as a direct summand. We claim that this implies  $C = 0$  and hence  $X \cong B$  is indecomposable.

Let  $\iota = (\iota_{[-1]}, \iota_{[0]}, \iota_{[1]}) : C \hookrightarrow X$  be the inclusion map. We will show that  $\iota = 0$  by showing that  $\pi_\ell \circ \iota_{[\ell]} = 0$  for all  $-1 \leq \ell \leq m$ . First observe that by (2),  $\text{Hom}(C_{[-1]}, X_{[-1]}) = 0$ . This implies that  $\pi_{-1} \circ \iota_{[-1]} = 0$ . We now proceed by induction on  $\ell$ .

Assume the result holds for  $\ell$  with  $-1 \leq \ell < m$ . We then have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
C_{[\ell]} & \xleftarrow{e_{[\ell+1]}} & C_{[\ell+1]} \\
\downarrow \iota_{[\ell]} & & \downarrow \iota_{[\ell+1]} \\
X_{[\ell]} & \xleftarrow{d_{[\ell+1]}} & X_{[\ell+1]} \\
\downarrow \pi_\ell & & \downarrow \pi_{\ell+1} \\
X_\ell & \xleftarrow{d_{\ell+1}} & X_{\ell+1}
\end{array}$$

where  $e_{[\ell+1]}$  is the boundary map of  $C$  and  $d_{[\ell+1]} = \bigoplus_{j \equiv \ell+1 \pmod{3}} d_j$ . By assumption, we have  $\pi_\ell \circ \iota_{[\ell]} \circ e_{[\ell+1]} = 0$ .

Since  $\text{Hom}_A(C_{[\ell+1]}, \ker(d_{\ell+1})) = 0$  by (2), this implies that  $\pi_{\ell+1} \circ \iota_{[\ell+1]} = 0$  as desired. We conclude that  $\iota = 0$  and hence  $C = 0$ .  $\square$

We now prove the main result of this section.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $M \in \text{mod } \Lambda$  be of projective dimension at least  $m$  and let  $X$  be a truncated projective resolution of  $M$  of length  $m$ , as shown below. For each  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$ , let  $P_{Q_i}$  be the projective cover of  $Q_i$ . Then  $\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)} X$  and the projective cover of  $X$  are as shown below.*

$$\begin{array}{c}
\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)} X = \left\{ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
& & & \Omega_\Lambda Q_1 & & \Omega_\Lambda Q_2 & & \cdots & \Omega_\Lambda Q_{m-1} & & \Omega_\Lambda Q_m \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \oplus & & \\
& & & \leftarrow^{j_1} & & \leftarrow^{j_2} & & \leftarrow^{j_3} & \cdots & \leftarrow^{j_{m-1}} & & \leftarrow^{j_m} \\
& & & P_{Q_1} & & P_{Q_2} & & P_{Q_3} & \cdots & P_{Q_m} & & \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \\
\Omega_A M & \xleftarrow{f_1} & P_1 & \xleftarrow{f_2} & P_2 & \xleftarrow{f_3} & P_3 & \xleftarrow{f_4} & \cdots & \xleftarrow{f_{m-1}} & P_{m-1} & \xleftarrow{f_m} & P_m
\end{array} \right\} \\
\downarrow h \\
P_X = \left\{ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
& & & P_{Q_1} & & P_{Q_2} & & \cdots & P_{Q_{m-1}} & & P_{Q_m} \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \\
& & & \leftarrow^1 & & \leftarrow^1 & & \leftarrow^1 & \cdots & \leftarrow^1 & & \leftarrow^1 & \\
& & & P_0 & & P_1 & & P_2 & \cdots & P_{m-1} & & P_m \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & \\
P_0 & \xleftarrow{1} & P_1 & \xleftarrow{1} & P_2 & \xleftarrow{1} & P_3 & \xleftarrow{1} & \cdots & \xleftarrow{1} & P_{m-1} & \xleftarrow{1} & P_m \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & \\
& & & P_{Q_1} & & P_{Q_2} & & P_{Q_3} & \cdots & P_{Q_m} & & & \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & \\
& & & \leftarrow^1 & & \leftarrow^1 & & \leftarrow^1 & \cdots & \leftarrow^1 & & \leftarrow^1 & \\
& & & P_0 & & P_1 & & P_2 & \cdots & P_{m-1} & & P_m
\end{array} \right\} \\
\downarrow g \\
X = \left\{ \begin{array}{cccccccc}
& & & Q_1 & & Q_2 & & \cdots & Q_{m-1} & & Q_m \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \\
M & \xleftarrow{f_0} & P_0 & \xleftarrow{f_1} & P_1 & \xleftarrow{f_2} & P_2 & \xleftarrow{f_3} & \cdots & \xleftarrow{f_{m-1}} & P_{m-1} & \xleftarrow{f_m} & P_m \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & \\
& & & \leftarrow^{i_1} & & \leftarrow^{i_2} & & \leftarrow^{i_3} & \cdots & \leftarrow^{i_{m-1}} & & \leftarrow^{i_m} & \\
& & & Q_1 & & Q_2 & & Q_3 & \cdots & Q_{m-1} & & Q_m \\
& & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \oplus & \\
& & & \leftarrow^{i_1} & & \leftarrow^{i_2} & & \leftarrow^{i_3} & \cdots & \leftarrow^{i_{m-1}} & & \leftarrow^{i_m} & \\
& & & P_0 & & P_1 & & P_2 & \cdots & P_{m-1} & & P_m
\end{array} \right\}
\end{array}$$

For all  $k$ , the maps  $i_k$  and  $j_k$  are inclusion maps and the map  $q_k : P_{Q_k} \rightarrow Q_k$  is the quotient map. Moreover, we have

$$g_k = \begin{cases} f_0 & k = -1 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i_1 \circ q_1 & f_1 \end{pmatrix} & k = 0 \\ \begin{pmatrix} q_k & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & i_{k+1} \circ q_{k+1} & f_k \end{pmatrix} & 1 \leq k \leq m-2 \\ \begin{pmatrix} q_{m-1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & i_m \circ q_m \end{pmatrix} & k = m-1 \\ q_m & k = m \end{cases}$$

and

$$h_k = \begin{cases} -j_0 & k = -1 \\ \begin{pmatrix} -i_1 \circ q_1 & -f_1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & k = 0 \\ (-1)^k \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -j_k & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -i_{k+1} \circ q_{k+1} & -f_{k+1} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & 1 \leq k \leq m-2 \\ (-1)^{m-1} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} -j_{m-1} & 0 \\ 0 & -i_m \circ q_m \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & k = m-1 \\ (-1)^{m+1} j_m & k = m \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* It can be verified directly that the diagram commutes and every column corresponds to an exact sequence.  $\square$

**Corollary 5.4.**

- (1)  $\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)} X$  is a truncated projective resolution of  $\Omega_\Lambda M$ . It is of length  $m-1$  if  $Q_m$  is projective and is of length  $m$  otherwise. In particular, higher syzygies of  $X$  can be calculated using the procedure outlined in the proposition.
- (2) Suppose  $Q_1 \neq 0$ . Then  $Q_1 \leftarrow P_{Q_1} \leftarrow \Omega_A Q_1$  is a direct summand of  $\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)} X$ .
- (3) Suppose  $Q_k \neq 0$ . Then there is a truncated projective resolution of the form


$$Q_k \leftarrow P'_0 \leftarrow P'_1 \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow P'_{k-1} \leftarrow \Omega_A^k Q_k$$

which is a direct summand of  $\Omega_{C^b(\Lambda)}^k X$ .

In the next section, we will use these results to study the syzygies of specific truncated projective resolutions related to our counterexample.

## 6. COMPUTATIONS FOR THE COUNTEREXAMPLE

We now fix  $A = KQ/I$  where  $Q$  is the quiver





degrees, we require more applications of  $\Omega_{C^b(A)}$  to obtain an isomorphism. This persists when we apply the functor  $W$ . Thus we can construct 3-periodic chain complexes of arbitrarily high  $\phi$ -dimension.

We start off by generalizing the example.

**Definition 6.2.** Let  $k \geq 0$ .

(1) We define

$$X_k = S_3 \leftarrow P_3 \leftarrow \left\{ P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow P_4 \end{array} \right\}^k \leftarrow P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow S_4 \end{array}$$

and

$$Y_k = S_4 \leftarrow P_4 \leftarrow \left\{ P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_4 \\ \leftarrow P_3 \end{array} \right\}^k \leftarrow P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_4 \\ \leftarrow S_3 \end{array}$$

The notation  $\{-\}^k$  means the portion in the brackets is repeated  $k$  times connected by arrows. For example,

$$X_2 = S_3 \leftarrow P_3 \leftarrow \left\{ P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow P_4 \end{array} \right\} \leftarrow \left\{ P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow P_4 \end{array} \right\} \leftarrow P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow S_4 \end{array}$$

(2) Let  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . We define  $Z_k^i$  to be the chain complex formed by truncating the projective resolution of  $S_i$  at degree  $3 + 3k$ . For example,

$$Z_0^3 = S_3 \leftarrow P_3 \leftarrow P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow S_4 \end{array}$$

and

$$Z_1^4 = S_4 \leftarrow P_4 \leftarrow P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow P_3 \leftarrow P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow S_4 \end{array} \\ \swarrow P_4 \leftarrow P_1 \leftarrow P_2 \begin{array}{c} \swarrow S_3 \\ \leftarrow S_4 \end{array} \end{array}$$

We remark that we could have chosen to define these ‘Z-type’ complexes to be truncated at any degree rather than just at degrees of the form  $3 + 3k$ . The only reason we chose not to is for notational convenience in the statement of Lemma 6.6 below.

We claim the following about these chain complexes:

**Proposition 6.3.** Let  $k \geq 1$ . Then

- (1)  $\Omega_{C^3(A)}^{3k+1} W X_k \cong \Omega_{C^3(A)}^{3k+1} W Y_k$  and  $\Omega_{C^3(A)}^{3k} W X_k \not\cong \Omega_{C^3(A)}^{3k} W Y_k$ .
- (2)  $\phi(W X_k \oplus W Y_k) \geq 3k$ .

Before we prove this, we observe that the main result of this paper is an immediate corollary.

*Proof that Proposition 6.3 implies Theorem 1.* For all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that  $\phi(W X_k \oplus W Y_k) \geq 3k$  by the proposition. Therefore

$$\phi \dim(A \otimes_K A_3^{CT}) = \sup \{ \phi(X) \mid X \in \text{mod}(A \otimes_K A_3^{CT}) \} = \infty.$$

□

The remainder of this section is devoted to proving Proposition 6.3. We begin with proving several lemmas about these particular chain complexes and their syzygies.

**Lemma 6.4.**

- (1) Let  $k \geq 1$ . Then  $W X_k$  and  $W Y_k$  are indecomposable in  $C^3(A)$ .
- (2) Let  $k \geq 0$  and  $i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ . Then  $W Z_k^i$  is indecomposable in  $C^3(A)$ .





and

$$\Omega_{C^3(A)}^{3k} WY_k \cong WZ_k^4 \oplus WZ_{k-1}^3 \oplus \left( \bigoplus_{j=0}^{k-2} (WZ_j^3 \oplus WZ_j^4)^{k-j-1} \right).$$

This means  $\Omega_{C^3(A)}^{3k} WX_k \cong \Omega_{C^3(A)}^{3k} WY_k$  if and only if  $WZ_k^3 \oplus WZ_{k-1}^4 \cong WZ_k^4 \oplus WZ_{k-1}^3$ . We now observe that  $WZ_k^3 \not\cong WZ_k^4$  since  $S_3$  is a direct summand of  $(WZ_k^3)_{[-1]}$  but not  $(WZ_k^4)_{[-1]}$ . Likewise,  $WZ_k^3 \not\cong WZ_{k-1}^3$  since  $(S_3 \oplus S_4)^{2^k}$  is a direct summand of  $(WZ_k^3)_{[-1]}$  but not  $(WZ_{k-1}^3)_{[-1]}$ . Since each of these 3-cyclic chain complexes is indecomposable by Lemma 6.4, we conclude  $WZ_k^3 \oplus WZ_{k-1}^4 \not\cong WZ_k^4 \oplus WZ_{k-1}^3$ .

(2) This follows immediately from (1) and Lemma 3.3(2).  $\square$

## 7. CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

First and foremost, we point out the following.

**Remark 7.1.** Let  $X_k$  and  $Y_k$  be defined as above. Then  $\text{pd}_{C^3(A)} WX_k = \infty = \text{pd}_{C^3(A)} WY_k$ . In particular, we have not disproven the finitistic dimension conjecture.

The reason this is the case is that both  $X_k$  and  $Y_k$  defined in Section 6 are truncated projective resolutions of modules of infinite projective dimension. Thus, for any integer  $n$ , the supports of  $\Omega_{C^3(A)}^n WX_k$  and  $\Omega_{C^3(A)}^n WY_k$  will contain non-projective  $A$ -modules in degree  $[-1]$ . In fact, based on this reasoning, we would only be able to use truncated projective resolutions to show a category of 3-periodic chain complexes has infinite finitistic dimension if the original algebra was already of infinite finitistic dimension. It is nevertheless possible that a variant of this construction could give a counterexample to the finitistic dimension conjecture.

Our immediate goal moving forward is to better understand the class of algebras with infinite  $\phi$ -dimension. If there is a counterexample to the finitistic dimension conjecture, it will necessarily come from this class. Thus we wish to determine a more nonspecific method to determine whether an algebra is of infinite  $\phi$ -dimension.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Both authors are thankful to Gordana Todorov, who is working with them on the larger study of amalgamation, for numerous meaningful conversations and support. They would also like to thank Kaveh Mousavand, who asked them whether they could generalize the result of [HI] to arbitrary monomial relation algebras, starting the investigation that led to this paper. The second author is thankful to Daniel Álvarez-Gavela for their collaboration on the use of amalgamation to describe examples and invariants in contact topology (see [AGI]), which motivated the larger study of amalgamation. Lastly, the second author thanks An Huang for sharing the reference [AHBC<sup>+</sup>12] with him, which laid the ground work for the connection between [AGI], [HI], and this paper.

## REFERENCES

- [AGI] Daniel Álvarez-Gavela and Kiyoshi Igusa. Turaev torsion and ribbon Legendrians. In preparation.
- [AHBC<sup>+</sup>12] Nima Arkani-Hamed, Jacob L. Bourjaily, Freddy Cachazo, Alexander B. Goncharov, Alexander Postnikov, and Jaroslav Trnka. Scattering amplitudes and the positive Grassmannian. arXiv:1212.5605, 2012.
- [AR75] Maurice Auslander and Idun Reiten. On a generalized version of the Nakayama conjecture. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 52:69–75, 1975.
- [ASS06] Ibrahim Assem, Daniel Simson, and Andrzej Skowroński. *Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras*. Number 65 in London Math. Soc. Student Texts. Cambridge University Press, New York, 2006.
- [Bas60] Hyman Bass. Finitistic dimension and a homological generalization of semiprimary rings. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 95:466–488, 1960.
- [BMR19] Marcos Barrios, Gustavo Mata, and Gustavo Rama. Igusa-Todorov  $\phi$  function for truncated path algebras. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 2019.
- [BR07] Apostolos Beligiannis and Idun Reiten. Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories. *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 883, 2007.
- [EHIS04] Karin Erdmann, Thorsten Holm, Osamu Iyama, and Jan Schröer. Radical embeddings and representation dimension. *Adv. Math.*, 185(1):159–177, 2004.
- [ES17] Ana Garcia Elsener and Ralf Schiffler. On syzygies over 2-Calabi-Yau tilted algebras. *J. Algebra*, 470:91–121, 2017.



- [FG06] V. V. Fock and A. B. Goncharov. Cluster  $\mathcal{X}$ -varieties, amalgamation, and Poisson-Lie groups. In V. Ginzburg, editor, *Algebraic Geometry and Number Theory*, volume 253 of *Progr. Math.* Birkhäuser, Boston, 2006.
- [FLM15] Sônia Fernandes, Marcelo Lanzilotta, and Octavio Mendoza. The  $\phi$ -dimension: A new homological measure. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 18(2):463–476, 2015.
- [Hap88] Dieter Happel. *Triangulated Categories in the Representation Theory of Finite Dimension Algebras*. Number 119 in London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York-New Orchelle-Melbourne-Sydney, 1988.
- [Her08] Martin Herschend. Tensor products on quiver representations. *J. Algebra*, 212(2):452–469, 2008.
- [HI] Eric J. Hanson and Kiyoshi Igusa. Resolution quiver and cyclic homology criteria for Nakayama algebras. In preparation.
- [HL13] François Huard and Marcelo Lanzilotta. Self-injective right Artinian rings and Igusa-Todorov functions. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 26(3):765–770, 2013.
- [IT05] Kiyoshi Igusa and Gordana Todorov. On the finitistic dimension conjecture for Artin algebras. *Fields Ins. Comm.*, 45, 2005.
- [IZ92] Kiyoshi Igusa and Dan Zacharia. On the cyclic homology of monomial relation algebras. *J. Algebra*, 151:502–521, 1992.
- [KKS92] Ellen Kirkman, James Kuzmanovich, and Lance Small. Finitistic dimensions of Noetherian rings. *J. Algebra*, 147(2):350–364, 1992.
- [LM17] Marcelo Lanzilotta and Octavio Mendoza. Relative Igusa-Todorov functions and relative homological dimensions. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 20(3):765–802, 2017.
- [LM18] Marcelo Lanzilotta and Gustavo Mata. Igusa-Todorov functions for Artin algebras. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 222(1):202–212, 2018.
- [Rin13] Claus Michael Ringel. The Gorenstein projective modules for the Nakayama algebras I. *J. Algebra*, 385:241–261, 2013.
- [She17] Dawei Shen. A note on homological properties of Nakayama algebras. *Arch. Math.*, 108(3):251–261, 2017.
- [Wei08] Jiaqun Wei. Finitistic and representation dimensions. arXiv 0803:3354, 2008.
- [Wei09] Jiaqun Wei. Finitistic dimension and Igusa-Todorov algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 222(6):2215–2226, 2009.
- [Xi06] Chanchang Xi. On the finitistic dimension conjecture II: Related to finite global dimension. *Adv. Math.*, 201:116–142, 2006.