TRANSLATION QUIVER VARIETIES

SERGEY MOZGOVOY

Abstract. We introduce a framework of translation quiver varieties which includes Nakajima quiver varieties as well as their graded and cyclic versions. An important feature of translation quiver varieties is that the sets of their fixed points under toric actions can be again realized as translation quiver varieties. This allows one to simplify quiver varieties in several steps. We prove that translation quiver varieties are smooth, pure and have Tate motivic classes. We also describe an algorithm to compute those motivic classes.

1. Introduction

Nakajima quiver varieties play a prominent role in geometric interpretation of irreducible integrable representations of Kac-Moody Lie algebras associated to a quiver \([27]\). Considering fixed point sets of quiver varieties under a torus action one obtains graded quiver varieties \([28, 29]\). These varieties as well as cyclic quiver varieties have important applications in the study of quantum affine algebras and cluster algebras \([29, 30, 31, 22]\).

In this paper we propose a framework of translation quiver varieties which includes Nakajima quiver varieties as well as their graded and cyclic versions. It also includes generalized Nakajima quiver varieties introduced in \([37]\). An important property of translation quiver varieties is that the sets of their fixed points under toric actions can be again realized as translation quiver varieties. This implies that we can perform localization and apply Białynicki-Birula decomposition without ever leaving the realm of translation quiver varieties.

A translation quiver is a triple \((\Gamma, \tau, \sigma)\), where \(\Gamma\) is a quiver and
\[
\tau: \Gamma_0 \to \Gamma_0, \quad \sigma: \Gamma_1 \to \Gamma_1
\]
are bijections such that, for any arrow \(a: i \to j\) in \(\Gamma\), the arrow \(\sigma a\) goes from \(\tau j\) to \(i\). One calls \(\tau\) a translation and \(\sigma\) a semitranslation (note that \(\tau = \sigma^2\) defines an automorphism of \(\Gamma\)). The above notion is closely related to translation quivers in Auslander-Reiten theory \(\S 2.3\), where \(\Gamma\) is the Auslander-Reiten quiver of a given category and \(\tau\) is its Auslander-Reiten translation. Most of our translation quivers can be constructed in the following way. Let \((Q, \tau)\) be a quiver with an automorphism. We define its \(\tau\)-twisted double quiver \(\Gamma = Q^r\) by adding to the quiver \(Q\) new arrows \(a^*: \tau j \to i\), for every arrow \(a: i \to j\) in \(Q\). Then we define \(\sigma(a) = a^*\) and \(\sigma(a^*) = \tau(a)\).

For example, if \(\tau = \text{id}\), then we obtain the usual double quiver \(\bar{Q}\). One defines Nakajima quiver varieties as moduli spaces of semistable representations of \(\bar{Q}\) subject to certain relations. As we will see later (see Example 2.10), one can realize graded and cyclic quiver varieties as moduli spaces of semistable representations of some \(\tau\)-twisted double quiver \(\Gamma = Q^r\) subject to the relation

\[
\tau = \sum_{a \in Q_1} (a \cdot \sigma a - \sigma a \cdot \tau a).
\]
Generally, given a translation quiver $\Gamma = Q^r$, we consider its mesh algebra $\Pi = \Pi(\Gamma) = k\Gamma/(r)$ and, for any stability parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0}$ and finite dimension vector $v \in \mathbb{N}^{\Gamma_0}$, define the translation quiver variety $M_\theta(\Pi, v)$ to be the moduli space of $\theta$-semistable $\Pi$-modules having dimension vector $v$.

We also define (framed) translation quiver varieties $M(v, w)$, for $v, w \in \mathbb{N}^{\Gamma_0}$, as a particular case of the above construction. The vector $w$ is used to construct a new (framed) translation quiver $\hat{\Gamma}_f \supset \Gamma$. Then we define $M(v, w) = M_\theta(\Pi(\hat{\Gamma}_f), v_f)$ for certain extension $v_f$ of the vector $v$ and certain stability parameter $\theta$ on $\hat{\Gamma}_f$. We define the nilpotent translation quiver variety $L(v, w) \subset M(v, w)$ to be the subvariety parametrizing nilpotent representations. After developing some homological algebra of translation quivers we will prove that $M(v, w)$ is smooth and admits Bialynicki-Birula decompositions with respect to some toric actions. Then we obtain

**Theorem 1.1.** The translation quiver variety $M(v, w)$ is smooth and has dimension

$$w \cdot (v + v^\tau) - \chi(v, v + v^\tau),$$

where $\chi$ is the Euler-Ringel form of $Q$. Both varieties $M(v, w)$ and $L(v, w)$ are pure and their motivic classes are related by

$$[L(v, w)]^\vee = L^{-\dim M(v, w)}[M(v, w)],$$

where $[L(v, w)]^\vee$ denotes the dual motivic class (see §5.1) and $L = [\mathbb{A}^1]$.

Nakajima quiver varieties as well as their graded and cyclic versions are polynomial-count [29]. The same approach can be used to show that they have Tate motivic classes, meaning polynomials in $\mathbb{L}^{\pm 1}$. In the case of Nakajima quiver varieties one can actually obtain explicit formulas for their counting polynomials [18, 25] as well as for their motivic classes [41]. In this paper we prove that translation quiver varieties also have Tate motivic classes and give at the same time a new way to compute motivic classes of graded and cyclic quiver varieties. Ideally one would like to prove that translation quiver varieties have cellular decompositions.

**Theorem 1.2.** Translation quiver varieties $M(v, w)$ and $L(v, w)$ have Tate motivic classes.

We prove the above statement for general translation quiver varieties $M_\theta(\Pi, v)$, assuming they are smooth. The proof of the theorem is somewhat convoluted, hence I would like to briefly comment on it. First, we apply Bialynicki-Birula decomposition to reduce the question to translation quiver varieties over the so-called repetition quiver (see Theorem 6.8). Then we apply a wall-crossing formula (see Theorem 5.18) to reduce the question to the motivic class of the stack of all representations (not necessarily semistable) of the mesh algebra. Then we show that this motivic class can be related to the motivic class of the stack of representations of the Jacobian algebra (given by a quiver and a potential) associated with a translation quiver §5.4. This motivic class is in turn related to the motivic class of the stack of pairs $(M, \phi)$, where $M$ is a quiver representation and $\phi: M \to M^\tau$ is a homomorphism (see Proposition 5.10). Finally, we compute this motivic class for a class of translation quivers, including repetition quivers (see Theorem 5.12).

In view of the last theorem it is natural to ask if translation quiver varieties $M(v, w)$ always have a cellular decomposition. The localization techniques of this paper allow one
to significantly simplify the quiver under consideration. For example, one can show that this quiver can be reduced to a union of trees. It is interesting to note that in a similar situation of quiver varieties for quivers without relations cellular decompositions always exist [33, 15].

I would like to thank Victor Ginzburg and Hiraku Nakajima for helpful comments.

2. Translation Quivers

2.1. Conventions. A quiver $Q$ is a tuple $(Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$, where $Q_0$ is the set of vertices, $Q_1$ is the set of arrows, and $s, t: Q_1 \to Q_0$ are source and target maps. For any arrow $a \in Q_1$ with $s(a) = i$ and $t(a) = j$, we write $a: i \to j$. For any $i, j \in Q_0$, let $Q(i, j)$ denote the set of arrows from $i$ to $j$. We define a path $u$ in $Q$ to be a sequence of arrows $i_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} i_1 \to \cdots \to i_{n-1} \xrightarrow{a_n} i_n$ for some $n \geq 0$, in which case we write $u = a_n \ldots a_1$. We call it a cycle if $i_0 = i_n$. Denote the trivial path at $i \in Q_0$ as $e_i$.

We define a morphism of quivers $f: \tilde{Q} \to Q$ to be a degree zero map $f: \tilde{Q}_0 \sqcup \tilde{Q}_1 \to Q_0 \sqcup Q_1$ that commutes with $s$ and $t$. We define the opposite quiver $Q^{op}$ to be the quiver with $Q_0^{op} = Q_0$, $Q_1^{op} = Q_1$ and the roles of $s$ and $t$ interchanged.

Given a quiver $Q$ and a set $\Lambda$, consider a quiver $Q \times \Lambda$ that consists of copies of $Q$ for every $n \in \Lambda$. We denote its vertices as $(i, n) = i_n = i[n]$ and its arrows as $(a, n) = a_n = a[n]$ depending on the context, for all $i \in Q_0$, $a \in Q_1$, $n \in \Lambda$.

2.2. Translation quivers. Define a (stable) translation quiver to be a triple $(\Gamma, \tau, \sigma)$, where $\Gamma$ is a quiver and

$$\tau: \Gamma_0 \to \Gamma_0, \quad \sigma: \Gamma_1 \to \Gamma_1$$

are bijections such that for any arrow $a: i \to j$, we have $\sigma a: \tau j \to i$. The map $\tau$ is called a translation and the map $\sigma$ is called a semitranslation. There is a quiver automorphism $\tau: \Gamma \to \Gamma$ defined on vertices as before and defined on arrows as $\tau = \sigma^2: \Gamma_1 \to \Gamma_1$. A quiver morphism $f: \tilde{\Gamma} \to \Gamma$ between two translation quivers is called a translation quiver morphism if it commutes with $\tau$ and $\sigma$. We define the opposite translation quiver to be $(\Gamma^{op}, \tau^{-1}, \sigma^{-1})$.

Define a partial translation quiver to be a triple as above, where $\tau$ and $\sigma$ are only partially defined, meaning that we have a subset $\Gamma'_0 \subset \Gamma_0$ and injective maps

$$\tau: \Gamma'_0 \to \Gamma_0, \quad \sigma: \Gamma'_1 \to \Gamma_1, \quad \Gamma'_1 = \{ a: i \to j \mid j \in \Gamma'_0 \},$$

such that $\sigma$ induces a bijection between the set of arrows $i \to j$ and the set of arrows $\tau j \to i$ for all $i \in \Gamma_0$ and $j \in \Gamma'_0$.

2.3. Relation to Auslander-Reiten theory. Translation quivers appeared originally in Auslander-Reiten theory [35] (see also [36, 17, 2]). Our translation quivers correspond to stable translation quivers and our partial translation quivers correspond to translation quivers inAuslander-Reiten theory. More precisely, one considers a pair $(\Gamma, \tau)$ as above such that, for any $i \in \Gamma_0$ and $j \in \Gamma'_0$, the number of arrows $i \to j$ is equal to the number of arrows $\tau j \to i$. This means that we can construct an injective map $\sigma: \Gamma'_1 \to \Gamma_1$ satisfying the above property. In [35] one also requires $\Gamma$ to have no loops and no multiple arrows. This implies that $\sigma$ is uniquely determined by the map $\tau$.

Example 2.1 (McKay quiver). The following example of a translation quiver structure on a McKay quiver appears in [1] (see also [16, 5.6.4]). Let $G \subset \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C})$ be a finite subgroup
and \( V = \mathbb{C}^2 \) be the corresponding \( G \)-representation. Define the McKay quiver \( \Gamma \) of the representation \( V \) to have vertices corresponding to isomorphism classes of irreducible \( G \)-representations. For any \( L, M \in \Gamma_0 \), define the number of arrows from \( L \) to \( M \) to be the \( \dim \text{Hom}(L, V \otimes M) \). Define the translation map
\[
\tau: \Gamma_0 \to \Gamma_0, \quad L \mapsto \Lambda^2 V \otimes L,
\]
where \( \Lambda^2 V \) is the wedge product of \( V \) and is a 1-dimensional \( G \)-representation. Note that the projection \( V \otimes V \to \Lambda^2 V \) induces an isomorphism \( V \rightarrow V^\vee \otimes \Lambda^2 V \). Therefore, for any \( L, M \in \Gamma_0 \), we have
\[
\text{Hom}_G(\tau M, V \otimes L) \simeq \text{Hom}_G(V^\vee \otimes \Lambda^2 V \otimes M, L) \simeq \text{Hom}_G(V \otimes M, L).
\]
This implies that \( \dim \text{Hom}_G(\tau M, V \otimes L) = \dim \text{Hom}_G(L, V \otimes M) \), hence we have a translation quiver. It is proved in [1] that the McKay quiver \( \Gamma \) with the above translation is isomorphic to the AR quiver (see below) of the category of reflexive modules over \( \mathbb{C}[x, y]^G \) if \( G \subset \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{C}) \) has no pseudo-reflections.

**Remark 2.2** (AR quivers). Given a finite dimensional algebra \( A \) over an algebraically closed field \( k \), let \( \text{mod} \ A \) be the category of finite dimensional left \( A \)-modules. One constructs its AR quiver \( \Gamma_A \) with vertices that are isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects in \( \text{mod} \ A \). The number of arrows between \( [X] \) and \( [Y] \) is defined to be the dimension of the space of non-projective indecomposable modules and having as an image the set of all non-injective indecomposable modules. One has \( \dim \text{Irr}(X,Y) = \dim \text{Irr}(\tau Y, X) \), implying that \( \Gamma_A \) is a translation quiver. If \( A \) is a hereditary algebra, then there are no multiple arrows between vertices of \( \Gamma_A \) [35] (see also [2]). In order to obtain a (stable) translation quiver one needs to consider instead the AR quiver \( \hat{\Gamma}_A \) of the derived category \( D^b(A) = D^b(\text{mod} \ A) \) and assume that \( A \) has a finite global dimension [17]. The translation functor \( \tau: D^b(\text{mod} \ A) \to D^b(\text{mod} \ A) \) is defined to be \( \tau = \nu[-1] \), where \( \nu = DA \otimes_A^L \) is the left derived functor of the Nakayama functor \( X \mapsto D \text{Hom}_A(X, A) \) and \( DV = \text{Hom}_A(V, k) \). Note that \( \nu \) is the Serre functor of the category \( D^b(\text{mod} \ A) \), meaning that \( \text{Hom}(X, Y) \simeq D \text{Hom}(Y, \nu X) \) for all \( X, Y \in D^b(A) \).

**Remark 2.3** (Stabilization of partial translation quivers). If \( A \) is a hereditary algebra, then indecomposable objects in \( D^b(A) \) are shifts of indecomposable objects in \( \text{mod} \ A \). In this case there is a construction that allows one to reconstruct the AR quiver \( \hat{\Gamma}_A \) of \( D^b(A) \) from the AR quiver \( \Gamma_A \) of \( \text{mod} \ A \) and the correspondence between projective and indecomposable modules (given by the Nakayama functor). Let \( \Gamma \) be a partial translation quiver with \( \tau \) defined on \( \Gamma_0' \subset \Gamma_0 \). The vertices in \( \Gamma_0^\nu = \Gamma_0 \setminus \Gamma_0' \) are called projective and the vertices in \( \Gamma_0 = \Gamma_0 \setminus \tau(\Gamma_0') \) are called injective. Let \( \Gamma^p \) and \( \Gamma^i \) be the corresponding full subquivers of \( \Gamma \) and assume that we have a quiver isomorphism \( \nu: \Gamma^p \to \Gamma^i \). Assume also that there are no arrows \( x \to p \) for \( p \in \Gamma_0^p \), \( x \notin \Gamma_0^p \) and no arrows \( i \to x \) for \( i \in \Gamma_0^i \). We construct a translation quiver \( \hat{\Gamma} \) by adding arrows to the quiver \( \Gamma \times \mathbb{Z} \) consisting of copies of \( \Gamma \) for every \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). Denote by \( x[n] \) the vertex \( (x,n) \) and define
\[
\tau(x[n]) = \begin{cases} 
(\tau x)[n] & \text{if } x \in \Gamma_0' \\
(\nu x)[n-1] & \text{if } x \in \Gamma_0^i.
\end{cases}
\]
For any two projective vertices \( p, q \) we add arrows

\[
\Gamma(\tau p[n], q[n]) = \Gamma(q, p).
\]

Then we have bijections

\[
\sigma: \Gamma(q[n], p[n]) = \Gamma(q, p) \Rightarrow \Gamma(\tau p[n], q[n]),
\]

\[
\sigma: \Gamma(\tau p[n], q[n]) = \Gamma(q, p) \Rightarrow \Gamma(\nu q, \nu p) = \Gamma(q[n], \tau p[n])
\]
and obtain a semitranslation \( \sigma \) on \( \hat{\Gamma} \). This makes \( \hat{\Gamma} \) a translation quiver.

In particular, let \( A \) be the path algebra of a quiver, \( \Gamma = \Gamma_A \) be its AR quiver and \( \nu: \Gamma^0 \rightarrow \Gamma^i \) be the isomorphism induced by the Nakayama functor. Then \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is isomorphic to the AR quiver of \( D^b(A) \) (cf. [17]).

**Example 2.4.** Let \( Q \) be a quiver of the form \( 1 \rightarrow 2 \) and let \( A = kQ \) be its path algebra. There are three indecomposable modules \( S_1, S_2, P \) having dimension vectors \((1, 0), (0, 1), (1, 1)\) respectively. The modules \( P, S_2 \) are projective and the modules \( P, S_1 \) are injective. The Auslander-Reiten quiver \( \Gamma_A \) has the form \( S_2 \rightarrow P \xrightarrow{b} S_1 \) with \( \tau S_1 = S_2 \) and \( \sigma(a) = b \).

The Nakayama functor satisfies \( \nu P = S_1, \nu S_2 = P, \nu b = a \). The quiver \( \hat{\Gamma}_A \) has arrows from \( \Gamma_A \times \mathbb{Z} \) as well as arrows in \( \hat{\Gamma}_A(\tau P[n], S_2[n]) \simeq \Gamma_A(S_2, P) = \{ b \} \), meaning that there are arrows \( S_1[n - 1] \rightarrow S_2[n] \).

2.4. **Translation quivers with a cut.** Define a cut of a translation quiver \( \Gamma \) to be a subset \( \Gamma^+ \subset \Gamma \) such that \( \Gamma = \Gamma^+ \sqcup \sigma \Gamma^+ \). Translation quiver \( \Gamma \) has a cut if and only if every \( \sigma \)-orbit in \( \Gamma \) is either infinite or has an even number of elements. The quiver \( \Gamma^+ \) with the set of vertices \( \Gamma^+_0 = \Gamma_0 \) and the set of arrows \( \Gamma^+_1 \) will be also called a cut of \( \Gamma \).

Note that \( \sigma^2(\Gamma^+) = \Gamma^+ \) and the quiver automorphism \( \tau: \Gamma \rightarrow \Gamma \) (with \( \tau = \sigma^2 \) on arrows) restricts to an automorphism \( \tau: \Gamma^+ \rightarrow \Gamma^+ \).

Conversely, given a pair \((Q, \tau)\), where \( Q \) is a quiver and \( \tau: Q \rightarrow Q \) is a quiver automorphism, we construct a translation quiver \( Q^\tau \), called a twisted double quiver, as follows. Let \( Q_1^\tau \) be the set of new arrows \( a^*: \tau j \rightarrow i \) for all arrows \( a: i \rightarrow j \) in \( Q \). Let \( Q^\tau \) be a quiver with the set of vertices \( Q_0^\tau = Q_0 \) and the set of arrows \( Q_1^\tau = Q_1 \sqcup Q_1^\tau \). Define \( \tau: Q_0^\tau \rightarrow Q_0^\tau \) as before and define \( \sigma : Q_1^\tau \rightarrow Q_1^\tau \) to be

\[
\sigma(a) = a^*: \tau j \rightarrow i, \quad \sigma(a^*) = \tau(a): \tau i \rightarrow \tau j,
\]

for all \( a: i \rightarrow j \) in \( Q_1 \). This translation quiver has a cut \( Q_1 = Q_1^\tau \). In this way we obtain a \( 1-1 \) correspondence between translation quivers with a cut and quivers with an automorphism. In most situations our translation quivers will be equipped with a cut.

**Remark 2.5** (Partial cuts). Let \((\Gamma, \tau, \sigma)\) be a partial translation quiver with \( \tau \) defined on \( \Gamma^+_0 \subset \Gamma_0 \) and assume that \( \tau \Gamma^+_0 \subset \Gamma^+_0 \). Then \( \tau \) and \( \sigma \) induce a translation quiver structure on the full subquiver \( \Gamma' \subset \Gamma \) with the set of vertices \( \Gamma_0' \). Given a cut \( \Gamma_1^+= \Gamma_1 \) be the set consisting of arrows in \( \Gamma_1^+ \) and arrows \( a: i \rightarrow j \) such that \( i \notin \Gamma_0 \) and \( j \notin \Gamma_0 \). Then the set of all arrows incident with vertices in \( \Gamma_0' \) is equal to \( \Gamma_1^+ \sqcup \sigma \Gamma_1^+ \). We call \( \Gamma_1^+ \) a (partial) cut of \( \Gamma \).
Example 2.6 (Double quiver). Let $Q$ be a quiver and $\tau = \text{id}$ be the identity automorphism of $Q$. Then $\tilde{Q} = Q^\tau$ is called the double quiver of $Q$. It has the same vertices as $Q$ and arrows $a: i \to j$, $a^*: j \to i$ for all arrows $a: i \to j$ in $Q$. The semitranslation $\sigma$ of $\tilde{Q}$ is given by $\sigma(a) = a^*$ and $\sigma(a^*) = a$ for all arrows $a$ in $Q$. Conversely, if $\Gamma$ is a translation quiver such that $\tau = \text{id}$ and the number of loops at every vertex is even, then $\Gamma \simeq \tilde{Q}$ for some quiver $Q$.

Example 2.7 (Repetition quiver). Given a quiver $Q$, we construct the repetition quiver $\Gamma = \mathbb{Z}Q$ with the set of vertices $Q_0 \times \mathbb{Z}$ and with arrows
\[ a_n: (i, n) \to (j, n), \quad a_n^*: (j, n-1) \to (i, n) \]
for all arrows $a: i \to j$ in $Q$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We consider $Q$ as a full subquiver of $\mathbb{Z}Q$ by identifying $i \in Q_0$ with $(i, 0)$. Define
\[
\tau(i, n) = (i, n-1), \quad \sigma(a_n) = a_n^*, \quad \sigma(a_n^*) = a_{n-1}.
\]
There is a cut $\Gamma^+_1 \subset \Gamma_1$ consisting of arrows $a_n$, for $a \in Q_1$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that $\tau(a_n) = \sigma^2(a_n) = a_{n-1}$. Alternatively, we can first consider the quiver $\Gamma^+ = Q \times \mathbb{Z}$ with an automorphism
\[
\tau: \Gamma^+ \to \Gamma^+, \quad \tau(i, n) = (i, n-1), \quad \tau(a_n) = a_{n-1},
\]
and then define $\mathbb{Z}Q = (\Gamma^+)^\tau$. If $Q$ is a Dynkin quiver, then the Auslander-Reiten quiver of $D^b(kQ)$ is isomorphic to the repetition quiver $\mathbb{Z}Q$ [17].

There is a simple characterization of translation quivers isomorphic to repetition quivers.

Proposition 2.8. Let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver with a cut $\Gamma^+$. Assume that there exists a subquiver $Q \subset \Gamma^+$ such that $\Gamma^+ = \bigsqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \tau^n Q$. Then we have an isomorphism of translation quivers $\mathbb{Z}Q \simeq \Gamma$.

Proof. By our assumption, there is an isomorphism of quivers $\phi: Q \times \mathbb{Z} \to \Gamma^+$, where
\[
i_n = \tau^{-n} i_0 \mapsto \tau^{-n} i, \quad a_n = \tau^{-n} a_0 \mapsto \tau^{-n} a, \quad i \in Q_0, a \in Q_1, n \in \mathbb{Z}.
\]
By construction it preserves the translation. Therefore it induces an isomorphism of translation quivers $(Q \times \mathbb{Z})^\tau \to (\Gamma^+)^\tau$. But we have seen that $(Q \times \mathbb{Z})^\tau \simeq \mathbb{Z}Q$ and $(\Gamma^+)^\tau \simeq \Gamma$. \hfill \Box

2.5. Localization quiver. Let $Q$ be a quiver, $\Lambda$ be an abelian group and $d: Q_1 \to \Lambda$, $a \mapsto d_a$, be a map. We define a new quiver $\tilde{Q} = \mathfrak{L}_d(Q)$, called a localization quiver, with the set of vertices $Q_0 \times \Lambda$ and with arrows
\[
a_n: (i, n - d_a) \to (j, n), \quad (a: i \to j) \in Q_1, n \in \Lambda.
\]
Let $\tau: Q \to Q$ be an automorphism and assume that $d: Q_1 \to \Lambda$ is $\tau$-invariant. For any $e \in \Lambda$, we define an automorphism $\tau_e: \tilde{Q} \to \tilde{Q}$
\[
\tau_e(i, n) = (\tau i, n - e), \quad \tau_e(a_n) = (\tau a)_{n-e}.
\]
Let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver and $d: \Gamma_1 \to \Lambda$ be a map such that $e = d_a + d_{\sigma a} \in \Lambda$ is independent of $a \in \Gamma_1$. We will call such $d$ a weight map having total weight $e$. Note that
We define a cut \( \tilde{\Gamma} \) for all \( a \in \Gamma_1 \), hence \( d \) is automatically \( \tau \)-invariant. We equip the localization quiver \( \tilde{\Gamma} = L_d(\Gamma) \) with the translation quiver structure

\[
\tau(i,n) = (\tau i, n - e), \quad \sigma(a_n) = (\sigma a)_{n-d_n}: (\tau j, n - e) \to (i, n - d_n).
\]

If \( \Gamma \) has a cut \( \Gamma^+ \), then the weight map is uniquely determined by the \( \tau \)-invariant map \( d^+: \Gamma_1^+ \to \Lambda \) and the total weight \( e \in \Lambda \). We will sometimes denote \( L_d(\Gamma) \) as \( L_d^+(\Gamma) \).

We define a cut \( \Gamma^+ \) of \( \tilde{\Gamma} \) that consists of arrows \( a_n \), for \( a \in \Gamma_1^+ \) and \( n \in \Lambda \). Note that \( \tilde{\Gamma}^+ = L_d^+(\Gamma^+) \) and its translation automorphism is given by \( \tau_e \) defined earlier. Therefore we have an isomorphism of translation quivers

\[
L_d(\Gamma) = L_d^+(\Gamma) \simeq L_d^+(\Gamma^+)^{\tau_e}.
\]

**Remark 2.9.** In particular, for any quiver \( Q \), consider the double quiver \( \tilde{Q} \) with its translation structure described in Example 2.6. Consider the weight map

\[
d: \tilde{Q}_1 \to \mathbb{Z}, \quad a \mapsto \begin{cases} 0 & a \in Q_1, \\ 1 & a \in Q_1^*.
\end{cases}
\]

Then the localization \( L_d(\tilde{Q}) \) coincides with the repetition quiver \( \mathbb{Z}Q \) from Example 2.7 and

\[
\mathbb{Z}Q = L_d(\tilde{Q}) = L_d^0(\tilde{Q}) \simeq L_d^0(Q)^\mathbb{Z}, \quad \tau = \text{id}.
\]

**Example 2.10.** The following example appears in the study of graded (and cyclic) quiver varieties (see e.g. \([29, 30]\)). Given a quiver \( Q \), consider a new quiver \( \Gamma \) with the set of vertices \( Q_0 \times \mathbb{Z} \) (or \( Q_0 \times \mathbb{Z}/r\mathbb{Z} \) in the cyclic case) and with arrows

\[
a_n: (i, n + 1) \to (j, n), \quad a_n^*: (j, n + 1) \to (i, n)
\]

for \( a: i \to j \) in \( Q_1 \) and \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). Define

\[
\tau(i,n) = (i, n+2), \quad \sigma(a_n) = a_{n+1}^*, \quad \sigma(a_n^*) = a_{n+1}.
\]

We define the cut \( \Gamma_1^+ \subset \Gamma_1 \) consisting of arrows \( a_n \), for \( a \in Q_1 \) and \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). This translation quiver can be realized as a localization quiver of \( \tilde{Q} \) with respect to the weight map

\[
d: \tilde{Q}_1 \to \mathbb{Z}, \quad a \mapsto -1.
\]

More precisely, in the case of graded quiver varieties one studies representations of a framed quiver defined as follows. Let \( w \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0 \times \mathbb{Z}} \) be a collection of non-negative numbers. Define the **framed quiver** \( \Gamma^f \) by adding to the quiver \( \Gamma \) one new vertex * as well as \( w_{i,n} \) arrows * \( \to (i, n - 1) \) and \( w_{i,n} \) arrows \( (i, n + 1) \to * \), for all \( i \in Q_0 \) and \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). We can construct a bijection \( \sigma \) between the set of arrows * \( \to (i, n - 1) \) and the set of arrows \( \tau(i,n-1) = (i, n + 1) \to * \). Note that in general the numbers of arrows \( (i, n) \to * \) and \( * \to (i, n) \) are different. Therefore we obtain only a partial translation quiver \( (\Gamma^f, \tau, \sigma) \) with the domain of \( \tau \) equal \( \Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_1^0 \). Note that \( \Gamma^f \) admits a partial cut consisting of arrows \( a_n \) and arrows * \( \to (i, n) \). In the next section we will discuss how one can extend \( \Gamma^f \) to a (stable) translation quiver.
2.6. **Stabilization.** Let $\Gamma$ be a partial translation quiver such that $\tau \Gamma_0' = \Gamma_0'$. Our goal is to construct a (stable) translation quiver $\hat{\Gamma}$ such that $\Gamma$ is its full subquiver with a compatible translation. Our construction will be different from the construction in Remark 2.3 as we will propagate only vertices outside of $\Gamma_0'$. Let $S_0 = \Gamma_0 \setminus \Gamma_0'$ and let $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$, $S \subset \Gamma$ be the full subquivers with the sets of vertices $\Gamma_0'$, $S_0$ respectively. We will construct a translation quiver $\hat{\Gamma}$ by adding arrows to the quiver $\Gamma$ to $\hat{\Gamma}_0'$, where $ZS$ is the repetition quiver of $S$. Note that $\Gamma'$ and $ZS$ are both translation quivers. Denote a vertex $(s, n) \in ZS_0$ by $s[n]$. We consider $S$ as a full subquiver of $ZS$ by identifying $s \in S_0$ with $s[0] \in ZS_0$. By the definition of $ZS$ we have $\tau s[n] = s[n - 1]$ and

$$\hat{\Gamma}(s[n], t[n]) = \hat{\Gamma}(t[n - 1], s[n]) = \Gamma(s, t), \quad s, t \in S_0, \ n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$ 

Define new arrows in $\hat{\Gamma}$ by

$$\hat{\Gamma}(s[n], i) = \hat{\Gamma}(i, s[n + 1]) = \Gamma(s, \tau^n i), \quad s \in S_0, \ i \in \Gamma_0', \ n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$ 

Note that

$$\hat{\Gamma}(s[0], i) = \Gamma(s, i), \quad \hat{\Gamma}(i, s[0]) = \Gamma(s, \tau^{-1} i) \cong \Gamma(i, s),$$

hence we can consider $\Gamma$ as a full subquiver of $\hat{\Gamma}$. We extend $\sigma$ to $\hat{\Gamma}$ using the identifications

$$\hat{\Gamma}(s[n], i) = \Gamma(s, \tau^n \tau i) = \hat{\Gamma}(\tau i, s[n]),$$

$$\hat{\Gamma}(i, s[n]) = \hat{\Gamma}(s[n - 1], i) = \hat{\Gamma}(\tau s[n], i).$$

This makes $\hat{\Gamma}$ a translation quiver.

2.7. **Framed quivers and their stabilization.** Let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver and let $w \in \mathbb{N}^{\Gamma_0}$. We construct the framed quiver $\Gamma^f$ by adding to $\Gamma$ one new vertex $*$ as well as $w_i$ arrows $* \to i$ and $w_i$ arrows $\tau i \to *$ for all $i \in \Gamma_0$. As before, we obtain a partial translation quiver $(\Gamma^f, \tau, \sigma)$ with the domain of $\tau$ equal $\Gamma_0 \subset \Gamma_0^f$. Applying the above stabilization procedure, we obtain a new translation quiver $\hat{\Gamma}^f$ with the set of vertices $\Gamma_0 \cup \mathbb{Z}$. We will denote the vertex $*[n]$ by $[n]$, for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The arrows of $\Gamma^f$ are arrows from $\Gamma$ as well as $w_{\tau^{-1} i}$ arrows $[n] \to i$ and $w_{\tau^{-1} i}$ arrows $\tau i \to [n]$, for all $i \in \Gamma_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The translation extends from $\Gamma$ to $\Gamma^f$ by $\tau[n] = [n - 1]$ for $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We call $\Gamma^f$ the stable framed quiver.

**Remark 2.11.** If $\Gamma$ admits a cut $\Gamma_1^+ \subset \Gamma_1$, then $\Gamma^f$ admits a partial cut consisting of arrows in $\Gamma_1^+$ and arrows $* \to i$ for $i \in \Gamma_0$. Similarly, $\hat{\Gamma}^f$ admits a cut consisting of arrows in $\Gamma_1^+$ and arrows $[n] \to i$ for $i \in \Gamma_0$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

**Example 2.12.** Let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver with vertices $x, y$ and no arrows, and with $\tau(x) = y$, $\tau(y) = x$. Let $w = (0, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^{\Gamma_0}$. Then the framed quiver $\Gamma^f$ has the form $x \xrightarrow{b} * \xrightarrow{a} y$. It is a partial translation quiver with $\sigma(a) = b$. Its stabilization $\hat{\Gamma}^f$ is the quiver

\[ \cdots \xrightarrow{[-2]} \xrightarrow{[0]} \xleftarrow{[1]} \xrightarrow{[2]} \cdots \]
Then it is common to use the mesh relation 
\[
\cdots \to \tau_j \xrightarrow{\sigma_i} i \xrightarrow{a} j \xrightarrow{\sigma^{-1}_i} \tau^{-1} \cdots \to \cdots
\] has the form 
\[
\cdots \to [-1] \to x \to [0] \to y \to [1] \to x \to [2] \to [y] \to \cdots
\]

2.8. Mesh algebra. Let \( \Gamma \) be a translation quiver with a cut \( \Gamma^+_1 \subset \Gamma_1 \). Define 
\[
\varepsilon: \Gamma_1 \to \mathbb{Z}, \quad \varepsilon(a) = \begin{cases} 
1 & a \in \Gamma^+_1, \\
-1 & a \in \sigma \Gamma^+_1.
\end{cases}
\]

Define the mesh relation and the mesh algebra 
\[
\mathfrak{r} = \sum_{a \in \Gamma_1} \varepsilon(a)a \sigma(a), \quad \Pi(\Gamma) = \Pi(\Gamma, \mathfrak{r}) = k\Gamma / (\mathfrak{r}).
\]

Note that translation \( \tau \) induces an algebra automorphism \( \tau: k\Gamma \to k\Gamma \) and we have \( \tau(\mathfrak{r}) = \mathfrak{r} \). Therefore \( \tau \) induces an automorphism \( \tau: \Pi(\Gamma) \to \Pi(\Gamma) \). If \( \Gamma = \tilde{Q} \) is the double quiver of a quiver \( Q \), then \( \Pi(\Gamma) \) is the pre-projective algebra \( \Pi_Q \) of \( Q \) (see e.g. [11]).

Let us show that the mesh algebra is independent of the cut. Assume that we have another cut \( \Gamma_1 \subset \Gamma_1 \) and let \( \varepsilon': \Gamma_1 \to \mathbb{Z} \) be defined by \( \varepsilon'(a) = 1 \) if \( a \in \Gamma_1 \) and \( \varepsilon'(a) = -1 \) otherwise. Define 
\[
\eta: \Gamma_1 \to \mathbb{Z}, \quad a \mapsto \begin{cases} 
-1 & a \in \Gamma^+_1 \setminus Q_1, \\
1 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
\]
and define the algebra automorphism 
\[
\phi: k\Gamma \to k\Gamma, \quad \Gamma \ni a \mapsto \eta(a)a.
\]

If \( a \) is contained in \( \Gamma^+_1 \setminus Q_1 \) or \( \sigma(\Gamma^+_1 \setminus Q_1) \), then \( \eta(a)\eta(a) = 1 = \varepsilon(a)\varepsilon'(a) \). Otherwise \( \eta(a)\eta(a) = -1 = \varepsilon(a)e'(a) \). This implies that 
\[
\phi \left( \sum_{a \in \Gamma_1} \varepsilon(a)a \sigma(a) \right) = \sum_{a \in \Gamma_1} \varepsilon'(a)a \sigma(a)
\]
and \( \phi \) induces an isomorphism of the corresponding mesh algebras.

Remark 2.13. Let \( \Gamma \) be a bipartite translation quiver, meaning that there is a decomposition \( \Gamma_0 = I \cup J \) such that all arrows connect vertices in \( I \) with vertices in \( J \). Consider the cut \( \Gamma^+_1 \subset \Gamma_1 \) consisting of all arrows from \( I \) to \( J \). Then 
\[
e_{ij}^{\mathfrak{r}} = \begin{cases} 
\sum_{a(j) = j} a \sigma(a), & j \in J, \\
-\sum_{a(j) = j} a \sigma(a), & j \in I.
\end{cases}
\]
This implies that \( (\mathfrak{r}) = (\mathfrak{r}') \) and \( \Pi(\Gamma) = k\Gamma / (\mathfrak{r}) = k\Gamma / (\mathfrak{r}') \) for the relation 
\[
\mathfrak{r}' = \sum_{a \in \Gamma_1} a \sigma(a).
\]

Remark 2.14. Let \( \Gamma = \mathbb{Z}Q \) be the repetition quiver of a quiver \( Q \) from Example 2.7. Then it is common to use the mesh relation [35] 
\[
\mathfrak{r}' = \sum_{a \in \Gamma_1} a \sigma(a).
\]

The corresponding quotient algebras are isomorphic. Indeed, consider the isomorphism of algebras \( \phi: k\Gamma \to k\Gamma \) given by 
\[
\phi(a_n) = (-1)^n a_n, \quad \phi(a^*_n) = (-1)^n a^*_n.
\]
We have $\sigma(a_n) = a_n^*$ and $\sigma(a_n^*) = a_{n-1}$, hence
$$\phi(a_n \sigma(a_n)) = a_n \sigma(a_n), \quad \phi(a_n^* \sigma(a_n^*)) = -a_n^* \sigma(a_n^*).$$
This implies that $\phi(\sigma) = \tau'$, hence $\phi$ induces an isomorphism $k\Gamma/(\tau) \simeq k\Gamma/(\tau')$.

**Remark 2.15.** More generally, assume that $\Gamma$ is a translation quiver such that every $\sigma$-orbit is either infinite or has the number of elements divisible by 4. Then there exists a map $\eta: \Gamma_1^+ \to \{\pm 1\}$ such that $\eta(a) + \eta(\tau a) = 0$, for all $a \in \Gamma_1^+$. We extend it to $\eta: \Gamma_1 \to \{\pm 1\}$ by $\eta(\sigma(a)) = \eta(a)$, for all $a \in \Gamma_1^+$. The algebra automorphism
$$\phi: k\Gamma \to k\Gamma, \quad \Gamma_1 \ni a \mapsto \eta(a)a$$
satisfies
$$\phi(a \cdot \sigma a - \sigma a \cdot \sigma^2 a) = a \cdot (\sigma(a) + \sigma a \cdot \sigma^2 a), \quad a \in \Gamma_1^+.$$
This implies that $\phi(\sigma) = \tau'$ and $\phi$ induces an isomorphism $k\Gamma/(\tau) \simeq k\Gamma/(\tau')$.

Let $\Gamma$ be a partial translation quiver with a partial cut $\Gamma_1^+ \subset \Gamma_1$ from Remark 2.5. Then the set $\Gamma_1'' = \{a: i \to j \mid j \in \Gamma_0\}$ is contained in $\Gamma_1^+ \sqcup \sigma \Gamma_1^+$ and we can define $\varepsilon: \Gamma_1'' \to \mathbb{Z}$ in the same way as before. We define the mesh relation and the mesh algebra
$$r = \sum_{a \in \Gamma_1''} \varepsilon(a)a\sigma(a), \quad \Pi(\Gamma) = \Pi(\Gamma, \tau) = k\Gamma/(\tau).$$

2.9. **Coverings.** A quiver morphism $\pi: \tilde{Q} \to Q$ is called a covering if it is surjective on vertices and, for every vertex $i \in \tilde{Q}_0$, the map $\pi$ induces a bijection between the set of all arrows outgoing from $i$ and the set of all arrows outgoing from $\pi(i)$, and the same is true for ingoing arrows. This implies that for any $i \in \tilde{Q}_0$ and a path $u$ in $Q$ that starts at $\pi(i)$, there exists a unique path $\tilde{u}$ that starts at $i$ such that $\pi(\tilde{u}) = u$.

Let $G$ be a group acting on a quiver $\tilde{Q}$. We define a new quiver $Q = \tilde{Q}/G$ with $Q_0 = \tilde{Q}_0/G$ and $Q_1 = \tilde{Q}_1/G$. Let $\pi: \tilde{Q} \to Q = \tilde{Q}/G$ be the corresponding projection. We call the action of $G$ on $\tilde{Q}$ admissible if whenever $\tilde{Q}(i,j) \neq \emptyset$, we have equal stabilizers $G_i = G_j$ and trivial action of $G_i$ on $\tilde{Q}(i,j)$. Note that the usual definition of an admissible action is more restrictive [24].

Given an admissible action of $G$ on a quiver $\tilde{Q}$, let $Q = \tilde{Q}/G$. Then
$$Q([i],[j]) = \bigsqcup_{g \in G/G_i} \tilde{Q}(i,gj)$$
and the projection $\pi: \tilde{Q} \to Q$ is a covering. Note that if $\tilde{Q}$ is locally finite (every vertex is incident with finitely many arrows), then so is $Q$.

Given a covering $\pi: \tilde{Q} \to Q$, we construct a functor
$$\pi_*: \text{Rep}(\tilde{Q}) \to \text{Rep}(Q), \quad \tilde{M} \mapsto M, \quad M_i = \bigoplus_{\pi(k)=i} \tilde{M}_k, \quad M_a = \sum_{\pi(a)=a} \tilde{M}_a,$$
for $i \in Q_0$ and $a \in Q_1$.

Similarly, we say that a translation quiver morphism $\pi: \tilde{\Gamma} \to \Gamma$ is a covering if it is a covering of quivers. If $\Gamma_1^+ \subset \Gamma_1$ is a cut of $\Gamma$, then $\tilde{\Gamma}_1^+ = \pi^{-1}(\Gamma_1^+)$ is a cut of $\tilde{\Gamma}$. In this case the functor $\pi_*: \text{Rep}(\tilde{\Gamma}) \to \text{Rep}(\Gamma)$ induces the functor
$$\pi_*: \text{mod}\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}) \to \text{mod}\Pi(\Gamma).$$
If $G$ is a group acting by translation automorphisms on a translation quiver $\hat{\Gamma}$ and the action of $G$ is admissible, then $\Gamma = \hat{\Gamma}/G$ inherits a translation quiver structure and $\pi: \hat{\Gamma} \to \Gamma$ is a covering of translation quivers.

In particular, let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver, $d: \Gamma_1 \to \Lambda$ be a weight map and $\hat{\Gamma} = \mathbb{L}_d(\Gamma)$ be the corresponding localization quiver. Then the group $\Lambda$ acts on the translation quiver $\hat{\Gamma}$

$$m \circ (i, n) = (i, n + m), \quad m \circ a_n = a_{n+m}, \quad i \in \Gamma_0, \ a \in \Gamma_1, \ m, n \in \Lambda.$$ 

This action is admissible and $\hat{\Gamma}/\Lambda$ is isomorphic to $\Gamma$. This implies that the projection map $\pi: \hat{\Gamma} \to \Gamma$ is a covering. If $\Gamma$ has a cut $\Gamma_1^+ \subset \Gamma_1$, then the cut $\hat{\Gamma}_1^+ = \pi^{-1}(\Gamma_1^+)$ of $\hat{\Gamma}$ is exactly the cut defined in Example 2.5.

Example 2.16 (cf. [37]). Let $\hat{\Gamma}$ be a locally finite translation quiver, meaning that every vertex is incident with finitely many arrows. Let $\nu: \Gamma_0 \to \hat{\Gamma}_0$ be a translation quiver automorphism such that $\nu^n(i) \neq i$ for all $i \in \Gamma_0$ and $n \geq 1$. Then the action of $\mathbb{Z}$ on $\hat{\Gamma}$ given by

$$n \circ i = \nu^n(i), \quad n \circ a = \nu^n(a), \quad i \in \hat{\Gamma}_0, \ a \in \hat{\Gamma}_1, \ n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

is free on vertices, hence is admissible. The quotient quiver $\Gamma = \hat{\Gamma}/\nu = \hat{\Gamma}/\mathbb{Z}$ has the set of vertices consisting of $\nu$-orbits in $\hat{\Gamma}_0$ and the sets of arrows

$$\Gamma([i], [j]) = \sqcup_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{\Gamma}(i, \nu^n j).$$

As before, $\Gamma$ is a translation quiver, with the translation given by $\tau[i] = [\tau i]$.

3. Homological properties

3.1. Quiver representations. Let $Q$ be a quiver. We don’t require $Q_0$ to be finite, but we require that the number of arrows between any two vertices is finite. Given a quiver $Q$, we define its representation $M$ to be a collection of vector spaces $(M_i)_{i \in Q_0}$ together with a collection of linear maps $M_a: M_i \to M_j$ for arrows $a: i \to j$ in $Q$. We will consider only finite-dimensional representations, meaning that $\sum_i \dim M_i < \infty$. Given a path $u = a_i \ldots a_1$ in $Q$, we define $u|M = M_{a_n} \ldots M_{a_1}$ considered as an endomorphism of $M = \bigoplus_i M_i$. We extend this definition to the elements of the path algebra $kQ$ by linearity. Let $A = kQ/I$ be the quotient algebra by some ideal $I$. We can identify $A$-modules with $Q$-representations $M$ that vanish on $I$, meaning that $M_u = 0$ for all $u \in I$. We will call them also $A$-representations.

Given an abelian monoid $\Lambda$ and a set $X$, we define

$$\Lambda^X = \{ f \in \Lambda^X \mid \# \supp f < \infty \}, \quad \supp f = \{ x \in X \mid f_x \neq 0 \}. \quad \sum_i m_i n_i - \sum_{a: i \to j} m_i n_j, \quad m, n \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}.\)$$

Then, for any two representations $M, N$ of $Q$, we have

$$\chi(M, N) = \dim \text{Hom}(M, N) - \dim \text{Ext}^1(M, N) = \chi(\dim M, \dim N).$$

Given a quiver automorphism $\tau: Q \to Q$ and a $Q$-representation $M$, we define a new representation $M^\tau$ with $M^\tau_i = M_{\tau_i}$ and $M^\tau_a = M_{\tau a}: M_{\tau_i} \to M_{\tau j}$ for every arrow $a: i \to j$. 
in $Q$. Similarly, for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$, define $m^\tau = (m_{ri})_{i \in Q_0}$. If $I \subset kQ$ is a $\tau$-invariant ideal, then $A = kQ/I$ inherits the action by $\tau$. For any $A$-representation $M$, we obtain an $A$-representation $M^\tau$.

3.2. Lift properties. Let $(\Gamma, \tau, \sigma)$ be a translation quiver with a cut $\Gamma_1^+$ and let $\Pi = \Pi(\Gamma)$ be the corresponding mesh algebra.

**Proposition 3.1** (cf. [11]). Let $M$ be a $\Gamma^+$-representation. Then there is an exact sequence

$$0 \to D \text{Ext}^1(M, M^\tau) \to \bigoplus_{(a: i \to j) \in \Gamma_1^+} \text{Hom}(M_{\tau j}, M_i) \xrightarrow{\phi} \bigoplus_i \text{Hom}(M_{\tau i}, M_i) \xrightarrow{\tau} D \text{Hom}(M, M^\tau) \to 0$$

where $\phi$ sends $(M_{\tau a})_{a \in \Gamma_1^+}$ to $\sum_{a \in \Gamma_1^+} \varepsilon(a) M_a M_{\sigma a}$. This implies that we can identify the space $D \text{Ext}^1(M, M^\tau)$ with the set of lifts of the $\Gamma^+$-representation $M$ to a $\Pi$-representation.

**Proof.** Given two representations $M, N$ of $\Gamma^+$, there is an exact sequence

$$0 \to \text{Hom}(M, N) \to \bigoplus_i \text{Hom}(M_i, N_i) \xrightarrow{\tau} \bigoplus_{a: i \to j} \text{Hom}(M_{\tau i}, M_j) \to \text{Ext}^1(M, N) \to 0$$

In particular, for the representations $M$ and $M^\tau$, we have

$$0 \to \text{Hom}(M, M^\tau) \to \bigoplus_i \text{Hom}(M_i, M_{\tau i}) \xrightarrow{\tau} \bigoplus_{a: i \to j} \text{Hom}(M_{\tau i}, M_{\tau j}) \to \text{Ext}^1(M, M^\tau) \to 0$$

Dualizing, we obtain the result. \hfill $\square$

3.3. Exact sequence.

**Proposition 3.2** (cf. [10]). Given two $\Pi$-modules $M, N$, there is a complex

$$\cdots \to 0 \to \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}(M_i, N_i) \xrightarrow{(a: i \to j) \in \Gamma_1} \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}(M_i, N_j) \xrightarrow{(a: i \to j) \in \Gamma_1^+} \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}(M_{\tau i}, N_i) \to 0 \to \cdots$$

whose cohomology groups are $\text{Hom}(M, N)$, $\text{Ext}^1(M, N)$ and $D \text{Hom}(N, M^\tau)$.

**Proof.** As $\Pi$ is a quadratic algebra, there exists a projective bimodule resolution of $\Pi$ (see e.g. the proof of [6, Theorem 3.15])

$$\bigoplus_i \Pi e_i \otimes e_i \Pi \to \bigoplus_a \Pi e_a \otimes e_a \Pi \to \bigoplus_i \Pi e_i \otimes e_i \Pi \to \Pi \to 0$$

Applying $- \otimes_\Pi M$ we obtain a projective resolution

$$\bigoplus_i \Pi e_i \otimes M_{\tau i} \xrightarrow{f} \bigoplus_a \Pi e_a \otimes M_a \xrightarrow{g} \bigoplus_i \Pi e_i \otimes M_i \to M \to 0$$

where, using $p_i \in \Pi e_i$ and $m_i \in M_i$, we define

$$f \left( \sum_{a: i \to j} p_i \otimes m_{\tau j} \right) = \sum_{a: i \to j} \varepsilon(a) \left( p_j a \otimes m_{\tau j} - p_i \otimes \tau a \cdot m_{\tau i} \right)_{\sigma a}$$

$$g(p_j \otimes m_i) = (p_j a \otimes m_i)_i - (p_j \otimes a m_i)_j, \quad a: i \to j.$$
Applying $\text{Hom}(-, N)$ and identifying $\text{Hom}(\Pi e_j \otimes M_i, N_j)$ with $\text{Hom}(M_i, N_j)$, we obtain

the complex

$$0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}(M_i, N_i) \xrightarrow{\bar{g}} \bigoplus_{a: i \rightarrow j} \text{Hom}(M_i, N_j) \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \bigoplus_{i \in I} \text{Hom}(M_i, N_i) \rightarrow \ldots$$

$$\bar{g}(\psi) = \sum_{a: i \rightarrow j} (a \psi_i - \psi_j a)_a, \quad \psi = (\psi_i: M_i \rightarrow N_i)_i,$$

$$\bar{f}(\phi) = \sum_{a: i \rightarrow j} \varepsilon(a) (a \phi_a + \phi_a \cdot \sigma a)_j, \quad \phi = (\phi_a: M_i \rightarrow N_j)_a: i \rightarrow j.$$

The first two cohomology groups are $\text{Hom}(M, N)$ and $\text{Ext}^1(M, N)$. Dualizing, we see that the cokernel of $\bar{f}$ is $D \text{Hom}(N, M^\tau)$. □

For any two $\Pi$-modules $M, N$, we define $h^i(M, N) = \dim \text{Ext}^i_{\Pi}(M, N)$.

**Proposition 3.3.** For any $\Pi$-modules $M, N$ we have

$$h^0(M, N) - h^1(M, N) + h^0(N, M^\tau) = \chi(M, N) + \chi(N, M^\tau),$$

where $\chi$ is the Euler-Ringel form of the quiver $\Gamma^+$. □

**Proof.** If $m = \dim M$ and $n = \dim N$, then the Euler characteristic of the above complex is

$$\sum m_i n_i - \sum_{(a: i \rightarrow j) \in \Gamma^+_1} (m_i n_j + m_{r_j} n_i) + \sum_i m_{r_i} n_i = \chi(M, N) + \chi(N, M^\tau).$$

□

### 4. Translation quiver varieties

#### 4.1. Quiver varieties.**

The material of this section is well-known [23]. We include it to fix notation. Let $Q$ be a quiver (for simplicity we assume it to be finite) and $I \subset kQ$ be an ideal of the path algebra contained in the ideal $J \subset kQ$ generated by all arrows. Let $A = kQ/I$ be the quotient algebra and $v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0}$. We are going to introduce the moduli space of semistable $A$-modules having dimension vector $v$.

Let $V$ be a $Q_0$-graded vector space having dimension vector $v$. Define the representation space

$$\mathcal{R}(Q, v) = \bigoplus_{a: i \rightarrow j} \text{Hom}(V_i, V_j)$$

equipped with an action of the group $\text{GL}_v = \prod_i \text{GL}(V_i)$ given by $(g \cdot M)_a = g_j M_a g_i^{-1}$ for any arrow $a: i \rightarrow j$ in $Q$. For the algebra $A = kQ/I$, let

$$\mathcal{R}(A, v) \subset \mathcal{R}(Q, v)$$

be the closed subvariety consisting of representations that vanish on $I$. It is also equipped with an action of $\text{GL}_v$.

Consider some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_0}$ which we will call a stability parameter. For any $v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0} \setminus \{0\}$, define the slope

$$\mu_\theta(v) = \frac{\sum_i \theta_i v_i}{\sum_i v_i} = \frac{\theta \cdot v}{\rho \cdot v},$$
where \( \rho \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \) is given by \( \rho_i = 1 \) for all \( i \in Q_0 \). For any nonzero \( A \)-module \( M \), define \( \mu_\theta(M) = \mu_\theta(\dim M) \). It is called \( \theta \)-semistable if

\[
\mu_\theta(N) \leq \mu_\theta(M)
\]

for every submodule \( 0 \neq N \subset M \). It is called \( \theta \)-stable if the above inequalities are strict. There exists an open subvariety \( \mathcal{R}_\theta(A,v) \subset \mathcal{R}(A,v) \) consisting of \( \theta \)-semistable submodules. It is proved in [23] that there exists a pre-projective categorical quotient

\[
\mathcal{M}_\theta(A,v) = \mathcal{R}_\theta(A,v)/\mathbb{GL}_v
\]

which parametrizes \( S \)-equivalence classes of \( \theta \)-semistable \( A \)-modules having dimension vector \( v \). Here two \( \theta \)-semistable \( A \)-modules are called \( S \)-equivalent if they have the same composition factors in the category of \( \theta \)-semistable \( A \)-modules (of the same slope).

**Remark 4.1.** To be more precise, the construction in [23] is formulated for \( \theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \) such that \( \theta \cdot v = 0 \). We can reduce semistability with respect to an arbitrary \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_0} \) to this case as follows. First, we consider \( \theta' = \theta - \mu_\theta(v)\rho \) so that \( \theta' \cdot v = 0 \). Semistability conditions with respect to \( \theta \) and \( \theta' \) are equivalent. Next, we approximate \( \theta' \) by some \( \theta'' \in \mathbb{Q}^{Q_0} \) such that \( \text{sgn}(\theta' \cdot u) = \text{sgn}(\theta'' \cdot u) \) for all \( 0 \leq u \leq v \). Then semistability conditions with respect to \( \theta' \) and \( \theta'' \) on representations having dimension \( v \) are equivalent. Finally, we can find an integer \( k \geq 1 \) such that \( k\theta'' \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \).

There also exists an open subvariety \( \mathcal{R}_\theta^s(A,v) \subset \mathcal{R}_\theta(A,v) \) consisting of stable \( A \)-modules and a geometric quotient

\[
\mathcal{M}_\theta^s(A,v) = \mathcal{R}_\theta^s(A,v)/\mathbb{GL}_v
\]

which parametrizes isomorphism classes of \( \theta \)-stable \( A \)-modules having dimension vector \( v \). The moduli space \( \mathcal{M}_\theta^s(A,v) \) is open in \( \mathcal{M}_\theta(A,v) \). We will say that \( \theta \) is \( v \)-generic if \( \mu_\theta(u) \neq \mu_\theta(v) \) for all \( 0 < u < v \). In this case \( \mathcal{M}_\theta^s(A,v) = \mathcal{M}_\theta(A,v) \).

**Remark 4.2.** In the case of the trivial stability parameter \( \theta = 0 \) all modules are semistable and a module is stable if and only if it is simple. This implies that the moduli space \( \mathcal{M}_0(A,v) \) parametrizes isomorphism classes of semisimple \( A \)-modules having dimension vector \( v \). It can be described as

\[
\mathcal{M}_0(A,v) = \mathcal{R}(A,v) / \mathbb{GL}_v = \text{Spec } k[\mathcal{R}(A,v)]^{\mathbb{GL}_v}.
\]

For any \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_0} \), there exists a canonical projective morphism \( \pi: \mathcal{M}_\theta(A,v) \to \mathcal{M}_0(A,v) \) giving rise to a commutative diagram [23]

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{R}_\theta(A,v) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{R}(A,v) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{M}_\theta(A,v) & \xrightarrow{\pi} & \mathcal{M}_0(A,v)
\end{array}
\]

We say that a module \( M \in \text{mod } A \) is nilpotent if \( J^n M = 0 \) for some \( n \geq 1 \), where \( J \) is the ideal generated by all arrows. Let \( \mathcal{L}_\theta(A,v) \subset \mathcal{M}_\theta(A,v) \) be the subvariety of nilpotent modules.

**Lemma 4.3.** We have \( \mathcal{L}_\theta(A,v) = \pi^{-1}(0) \). In particular, \( \mathcal{L}_\theta(A,v) \) is projective.
Proof. A module \( M \in \mathcal{M}_0(A, v) \) satisfies \( \pi(M) = 0 \) if and only if \( M \) is \( S \)-equivalent to the direct sum of 1-dimensional modules \( S(i) \), for \( i \in Q_0 \). This means that \( M \) has a filtration \( 0 = M_0 \subset \ldots \subset M_n = M \) such that \( J(M_k/M_{k-1}) = 0 \), for all \( k \). Then \( J^n M = 0 \). The converse is similar. \( \square \)

4.2. Nakajima quiver varieties. For an introduction to Nakajima quiver varieties see e.g. [16]. Let \( Q \) be a finite quiver, \( \Gamma = \bar{Q} \) be its double quiver and \( \Pi = \Pi(\Gamma) \) be the mesh algebra. Let \( v \in \mathbb{N}^Q \) and \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_0} \). Then one defines Nakajima quiver variety to be \( \mathcal{M}_\theta(\Pi, v) \). There is an alternative approach that uses moment maps. Consider the action of \( GL_v \) on \( R(Q, v) \). It induces a map
\[
\rho : \mathfrak{g}l_v = \prod_i \mathfrak{g}l_{v_i} \rightarrow R(Q, v)^* \otimes R(Q, v).
\]
Dualizing, we obtain a map
\[
\mu : R(\bar{Q}, v) = R(Q, v) \times R(Q, v)^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}l_v^*
\]
called the moment map. One can show that
\[
R(\Pi, v) = \mu^{-1}(0).
\]
This implies that \( R_\theta(\Pi, v) = \mu^{-1}(0)_\theta = \mu^{-1}(0) \cap R_\theta(Q, v) \) and
\[
\mathcal{M}_\theta(\Pi, v) = \mu^{-1}(0)_\theta \parallel GL_v.
\]
Let \( \chi \) be the Euler-Ringel form of \( Q \). The following result is due to Nakajima, although the original proof is different.

**Theorem 4.4.** Assume that \( \theta \) is \( v \)-generic. Then \( \mathcal{M}_\theta(\Pi, v) \) is smooth and has dimension \( 2 - 2\chi(v, v) \).

**Proof.** Given \( \Pi \)-modules \( M, N \), let \( h^i(M, N) = \dim \text{Ext}^i_{\Pi}(M, N) \). The tangent space of the quiver variety \( \mathcal{M}_\theta(\Pi, v) = \mathcal{M}_0^\theta(\Pi, v) \) at the point \( M \in \mathcal{M}_0^\theta(\Pi, v) \) can be identified with \( \text{Ext}^1_{\Pi}(M, M) \) and we need to show that \( h^1(M, M) \) is independent of \( M \). By Corollary 3.3 we have
\[
2h^0(M, M) - h^1(M, M) = 2\chi(M, M).
\]
We have \( h^0(M, M) = 1 \) as \( M \) is stable. Therefore \( h^1(M, M) = 2 - 2\chi(v, v) \). \( \square \)

Given \( w \in \mathbb{N}^Q \) we constructed in §2.7 the framed quiver \( \Gamma^f = \bar{Q}^f \) by adding to \( \Gamma = \bar{Q} \) one new vertex \( * \) as well as \( w_i \) arrows \( * \rightarrow i \) and \( w_i \) arrows \( i \rightarrow * \), for all \( i \in Q_0 \). It is the double quiver of the quiver \( Q^f \) obtained by adding to \( Q \) one new vertex \( * \) as well as \( w_i \) arrows \( * \rightarrow i \), for \( i \in Q_0 \). We extend \( v \in \mathbb{N}^Q \) to \( v^f \in \mathbb{N}^{Q^f} \) by setting \( v_i^f = 1 \). Define \( \theta^f \in \mathbb{R}^{Q^f}_0 \) with \( \theta^f_i = 0 \) for \( i \in Q_0 \) and \( \theta^f_* = 1 \). A representation \( M \in R(\Gamma^f, v^f) \) is \( \theta^f \)-semistable if and only if for any \( N \subset M \) with \( N_* \neq 0 \), we have \( N = M \). One defines Nakajima quiver variety
\[
\mathcal{M}(v, w) = \mathcal{M}_{\theta^f}(\Pi(\Gamma^f), v^f).
\]
The stability parameter \( \theta^f \) is \( v^f \)-generic, hence by the previous theorem \( \mathcal{M}(v, w) \) is smooth and has dimension 2(\( v \cdot w - \chi(v, v) \)).
Remark 4.5. Generally, we extend an arbitrary \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_0} \) with \( \theta \cdot \mathbf{v} = 0 \) to \( \theta^f \in \mathbb{R}^{Q_1} \) by setting \( \theta^f_i = \varepsilon \), for \( 0 < \varepsilon \ll 1 \). This stability parameter is \( \mathbf{v}^f \)-generic and we define

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\theta}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{M}_{\theta^f}(\Pi(\Gamma^f), \mathbf{v}^f).
\]

This quiver variety is smooth and has dimension \( 2(\mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbf{w} - \chi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v})) \).

4.3. Translation quiver varieties. Let \((\Gamma, \tau, \sigma)\) be a translation quiver with a cut \( \Gamma^+ \) and let \( \Pi = \Pi(\Gamma) \) be the mesh algebra. Let \( \chi \) be the Euler-Ringel form of the quiver \( \Gamma^+ \).

Theorem 4.6. Let \( \theta = \mathbf{v} \)-generic, \( \theta^\tau = \theta \) and \( \mathbf{v}^\tau \neq \mathbf{v} \). Then \( \mathcal{M}_{\theta}(\Pi, \mathbf{v}) \) is smooth and has dimension \( 1 - \chi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}^\tau) \).

Proof. Given \( \Pi \)-modules \( M, N \), let \( h^i(M, N) = \dim \text{Ext}^i_{\Pi}(M, N) \). The tangent space of the quiver variety \( \mathcal{M}_{\theta}(\Pi, \mathbf{v}) = \mathcal{M}_{\theta}^0(\Pi, \mathbf{v}) \) at the point \( M \in \mathcal{M}_{\theta}^0(\Pi, \mathbf{v}) \) can be identified with \( \text{Ext}^1_{\Pi}(M, M) \) and we need to show that \( h^1(M, M) \) is independent of \( M \). We have

\[
h^0(M, M) - h^1(M, M) + h^0(M, M^\tau) = \chi(M, M) + \chi(M, M^\tau).
\]

Representation \( M^\tau \) is stable with respect to \( \theta^\tau = \theta \). It is not isomorphic to \( M \) as \( \dim M^\tau = \mathbf{v}^\tau \neq \mathbf{v} \). Therefore \( h^0(M, M^\tau) = 0 \) and we obtain \( h^1(M, M) = 1 - \chi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}^\tau) \). \( \square \)

Let \( \mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{N}^{\Gamma_0} \) and let \( \Gamma^f \) be the corresponding framed quiver (see §2.7) which is a partial translation quiver equipped with a partial cut. We extend \( \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{\Gamma_0} \) to a dimension vector \( \mathbf{v}^f \) over \( \Gamma^f_0 \) by setting \( \mathbf{v}^f_i = 1 \). Define a stability parameter \( \theta^f \) over \( \Gamma^f \) with \( \theta^f_i = 0 \) for \( i \in \Gamma_0 \) and \( \theta^f_\ast = 1 \). Note that \( \theta^f \) is \( \mathbf{v}^f \)-generic. We define the (framed) translation quiver variety to be

\[
\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{M}_{\theta^f}(\Pi(\Gamma^f), \mathbf{v}^f),
\]

where \( \Pi(\Gamma^f) \) is the mesh algebra of the partial translation quiver \( \Gamma^f \). Note that the map \( M \mapsto M^\tau \) induces an isomorphism \( \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \simeq \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{v}^\tau, \mathbf{w}^\tau) \).

In the next theorem we will see that \( \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \) can be interpreted as a moduli space of representations of the mesh algebra \( \Pi(\hat{\Gamma}^f) \), where \( \hat{\Gamma}^f \) is the stabilization of \( \Gamma^f \) (see §2.7). This will allow us to apply the previous theorem which was proved for stable translation quivers.

Theorem 4.7. The translation quiver variety \( \mathcal{M}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \) is smooth and has dimension

\[
\mathbf{w} \cdot (\mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}^\tau) - \chi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}^\tau),
\]

where \( \chi \) is the Euler-Ringel form of the cut \( \Gamma^+ \subset \Gamma \).

Proof. Let \( \hat{\Gamma}^f \) be the stabilization of \( \Gamma^f \) (see §2.7). Let \( \hat{\mathbf{v}}^f \) be an extension of \( \mathbf{v}^f \) to a dimension vector over \( \hat{\Gamma}^f \) by zero. Let \( \hat{\theta}^f \) be an extension of \( \theta^f \) to a stability parameter over \( \hat{\Gamma}^f \) given by \( \hat{\theta}^f_{[n]} = 1 \), for all \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). Then

\[
\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) = \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\theta}^f}(\Pi(\hat{\Gamma}^f), \hat{\mathbf{v}}^f).
\]

The stability parameter \( \hat{\theta}^f \) is \( \hat{\mathbf{v}}^f \)-generic and \( (\hat{\theta}^f)^\tau = \hat{\theta}^f \). On the other hand \( (\hat{\mathbf{v}}^f)^\tau \neq \hat{\mathbf{v}}^f \) as \( (\hat{\mathbf{v}}^f)^\tau_{[0]} = \hat{\mathbf{v}}^f_{[-1]} = 0 \neq \hat{\mathbf{v}}^f_{[0]} = 1 \). Therefore we can apply Theorem 4.6. Let \( Q \) be the cut of the translation quiver \( \hat{\Gamma}^f \) (its arrows are arrows in \( \Gamma^+ \) and arrows \( [n] \to i \) for \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \),
We will again use $\chi$ to denote the corresponding Euler-Ringel form. Let $e_n$ be the dimension vector on $\hat{\Gamma}^f$ that equals 1 at the vertex $[n]$ and zero at all other vertices. Considering $v$ as a dimension vector on $\hat{\Gamma}^f$ we can write $\hat{v}^f = v + e_0$ and $(\hat{v}^f)^r = v^r + e_1$. We have

$$\chi(v + e_0, v + e_0) = \chi(v, v) - w \cdot v + 1.$$ 

On the other hand

$$\chi(v + e_0, v^r + e_1) = \chi(v, v^r) - w \cdot v^r$$

Therefore the dimension of the quiver variety is

$$1 - \chi(\hat{v}^f, \hat{v}^f + (\hat{v}^f)^r) = w \cdot (v + v^r) - \chi(v, v + v^r).$$

\[\square\]

5. Motivic classes

5.1. Motivic theory. Let $\text{Var}$ be the category of algebraic varieties over a field $k$ of characteristic 0, with the monoidal category structure given by the cartesian product. Its identity object is $\text{pt} = \text{Spec} k$. Let $\text{Ab}$ be the category of abelian groups, with the monoidal category structure given by the tensor product. The following structure is an example of a theory with transfer on the category $\text{Var}$ with values in the category $\text{Ab}$ (see e.g. [14]). We will call it a motivic theory (cf. [13]).

For any $S \in \text{Var}$, let $\text{Var}/S$ be the category of algebraic varieties over $S$ and let $K(\text{Var}/S)$ be the Grothendieck group of algebraic varieties over $S$ which is the free abelian group generated by isomorphism classes of objects in $\text{Var}/S$ modulo relations

$$[X \to S] = [Y \to S] + [(X \setminus Y) \to S],$$

for any variety $X$ over $S$ and a closed subvariety $Y \subset X$. We define $K(\text{Var}) = K(\text{Var}/\text{pt})$.

We will write generators of $K(\text{Var}/S)$ in the form $[X \to S] = [X]_S$. The abelian groups $M(S) = K(\text{Var}/S)$ have the following properties. For any morphism $u: S \to T$, we have push-forward and pull-back morphisms

$$u_!: M(S) \to M(T), \quad [X \to S] \mapsto [X \to S \xrightarrow{u} T],$$

$$u^*: M(T) \to M(S), \quad [X \to T] \mapsto [X \times_T S \to S],$$

We have a multiplicative structure

$$m: M(S) \otimes M(T) \to M(S \times T), \quad [X \to S] \times [Y \to T] \mapsto [X \times Y \to S \times T]$$
	natural with respect to push-forward and pull-back. It makes $K(\text{Var}) = M(\text{pt})$ a commutative ring with the identity $1 = [\text{pt}]$.

Let us also define $K'(\text{Var}/S)$ to be the localization of $K(\text{Var}/S)$ with respect to $L = [\mathbb{A}^1]$ and define $\hat{K}(\text{Var}/S)$ to be the localization of $K(\text{Var}/S)$ with respect to $L$ and $L^n - 1$ for $n \geq 1$. In particular, let $K'(\text{Var}) = K'(\text{Var}/\text{pt})$ and $\hat{K}(\text{Var}) = \hat{K}(\text{Var}/\text{pt})$. We will call their elements motivic classes. We will say that a motivic class is Tate if it is a polynomial in $L^{\pm 1}$ and we will say that it is quasi-Tate if it is a polynomial in $L^{\pm 1}$ divided by some powers of $L^n - 1$ for $n \geq 1$.

Define a ring homomorphism involution $K'(\text{Var}) \to K'(\text{Var})$ by the rule

$$[X] \mapsto [X]^\vee = L^{-\dim X} \cdot [X],$$
for every smooth, projective and connected variety $X$. Note that $[\mathbb{P}^1] = 1 + L$ and $[\mathbb{P}^1]^\vee = 1 + L^{-1}$, hence $L^\vee = L^{-1}$.

**Remark 5.1.** The above definition of the involution is motivated by taking duals in rigid monoidal categories of motives. To see that the above involution is well-defined it is enough to show that it respects the blow-up relation [4]. Let $Y \subset X$ be a closed subvariety with both $X$, $Y$ smooth and projective. Let $\tilde{X} = \text{Bl}_Y X$ and $E$ be the exceptional divisor. Then we have the blow-up relation $[\tilde{X}] - [E] = [X] - [Y]$. Let $n = \dim X$ and $k = \dim Y$, so that $(1 - L)[E] = (1 - L^{n-k})[Y]$. Then

$$L^n \cdot ([\tilde{X}] - [E])^\vee = [\tilde{X}] - L[E] = [X] - [Y] + (1 - L)[E] = [X] - L^{n-k}[Y] = L^n([X] - [Y])^\vee,$$

meaning that the blow-up relation is preserved.

For $k = \mathbb{C}$, define the virtual Poincaré polynomial

$$P : K'(\text{Var}) \to \mathbb{Z}[t^{\pm \frac{1}{2}}], \quad [X] \mapsto \sum_{p,q,n} (-1)^n h^{p,q}(H^n_c(X, \mathbb{C})) t^{\frac{1}{2}(p+q)},$$

where $h^{p,q}(H^n_c(X, \mathbb{C}))$ is the dimension of the $(p, q)$-type Hodge component of the mixed Hodge structure on $H^n_c(X, \mathbb{C})$. In particular, $P(\mathbb{L}; t) = t$ and if $X$ is smooth, projective and connected, then

$$P(X; t) = P([X]; t) = \sum_n (-1)^n \dim H^n(X, \mathbb{C}) t^{n/2}.$$

Note that in this case, by Poincaré duality, we have

$$P([X]^\vee; t) = P([X]; t^{-1}),$$

hence the same is true for any algebraic variety $X$. Similarly, define the $E$-polynomial

$$E : K'(\text{Var}) \to \mathbb{Z}[u^\pm 1, v^\pm 1], \quad \sum_{p,q,n} (-1)^n h^{p,q}(H^n_c(X, \mathbb{C})) u^p v^q.$$

In particular, $E(\mathbb{L}; u, v) = uv$ and if $X$ is a smooth, projective and connected variety, then

$$E(X; u, v) = E([X]; u, v) = \sum_{p,q} h^{p,q}(H^{p+q}_c(X, \mathbb{C}))(u)^p(-v)^q.$$

Moreover, if $\dim X = d$, then $h^{p,q} = h^{d-p,d-q}$, hence

$$E([X]^\vee; u, v) = E([X]; u^{-1}, v^{-1})$$

and the same is true for any algebraic variety $X$.

More generally, let $S$ be the 2-category of algebraic stacks of finite type over $k$, having affine stabilizers [8]. For any algebraic stack $S$, locally of finite type over $k$, having affine stabilizers, one can define the Grothendieck group $K(S)$ similarly to the above definition [8]. There is an isomorphism $K(S) = K(S/\mathbf{pt}) \simeq K(\text{Var})$ (see e.g. [8, 21, 39]).

Let $X$ be an algebraic variety and $\phi : E \to F$ be a morphism of vector bundles over $X$. Define $Z(\phi) \subset E$ to be the preimage $\phi^{-1}(0_F)$ of the zero section in $F$.

**Proposition 5.2.** Let $\phi : E \to F$ be a morphism of vector bundles and $\phi^\vee : F^\vee \to E^\vee$ be the dual morphism. Then

$$L^{rk E}[Z(\phi)] = L^{rk F}[Z(\phi^\vee)].$$
Proof. Stratifying \( X \), we can assume that \( \phi \) has a constant rank \( r \geq 0 \). Then \( [Z(\phi)] = [X] \cdot \mathbb{L}^{\text{rk} E_r} \) and \( [Z(\phi^\vee)] = [X] \cdot \mathbb{L}^{\text{rk} F_r} \).

**Corollary 5.3.** Given finite dimensional vector spaces \( U, V \) and a morphism of algebraic varieties \( \phi : X \to \text{Hom}(U, V) \), consider the induced maps

\[
\phi_1 : X \times U \to V, \quad \phi_2 : X \times V^\vee \to U^\vee.
\]

Then

\[
\mathbb{L}^{\text{dim} V} [Z(\phi_1)] = \mathbb{L}^{\text{dim} U} [Z(\phi_2)].
\]

5.2. **Exponential motivic theory.** Consider \( \mathbb{A}^1 \) equipped with an abelian group structure \( \mu : \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1 \to \mathbb{A}^1, (x, y) \mapsto x + y \). Define a new motivic theory \( M^e \) given by

\[
M^e(S) = \text{Coker}(M(S) \xrightarrow{\mu} M(S \times \mathbb{A}^1)),
\]

where \( p : S \times \mathbb{A}^1 \to S \) is the projection. We will write generators of \( M^e(S) \) in the form

\[
[X \xrightarrow{(h, f)} S \times \mathbb{A}^1] = [X, f]_S.
\]

The push-forward and pull-back morphisms extend automatically to \( M^e \). We define the multiplicative structure

\[
m : M^e(S) \otimes M^e(T) \to M^e(S \times T),
\]

\[
[X \to S \times \mathbb{A}^1] \times [Y \to T \times \mathbb{A}^1] \mapsto [X \times Y \to S \times T \times \mathbb{A}^1 \times \mathbb{A}^1 \xrightarrow{1 \times 1 \times \mu} S \times T \times \mathbb{A}^1].
\]

The identity element \( 1^e \in M^e(\mathbb{pt}) \) is given by \( [\mathbb{pt} \xrightarrow{0} \mathbb{A}^1] \). We will call \( M^e \) an exponential motivic theory. One can identify \( M^e(S) \) with the Grothendieck group \( K(\text{ExpVar}/S) \) of varieties with exponentials over \( S \) \([9, 41]\). There are injective morphisms

\[
\iota : M(S) \to M^e(S), \quad [X]_S \mapsto [X, 0]_S
\]

which are functorial and preserve multiplicative structures. The map \( \iota \) is a section of the map

\[
\pi = (i_0^* - i_1^*) : M^e(S) \to M(S),
\]

where \( i_t : S \to S \times \mathbb{A}^1, x \mapsto (x, t) \) is defined for every \( t \in \mathbb{A}^1 \). We will usually identify \( M(S) \) with a subgroup of \( M^e(S) \) using the above map \( \iota \).

**Proposition 5.4** (cf. \([9, 41]\)). Let \( s \in \Gamma(X, E) \) be a section of a vector bundle, \( Z(s) \subset X \) be the zero locus and \( \tilde{s} : E^\vee \to \mathbb{A}^1 \) be the induced map. Then we have an equality of exponential motivic classes

\[
[E^\vee, \tilde{s}]_X = \mathbb{L}^{\text{rk} E} [Z(s)]_X.
\]

5.3. **Jacobian algebras.** Given a quiver \( Q \), we define a potential to be an element \( W \in kQ/[kQ, kQ] \). It can be identified with a linear combination of cycles \( W = \sum u c_ua \), where a cycle \( u \) is a path \( u = a_0 \ldots a_1 \) such that \( s(a_1) = t(a_0) \). Here we consider cycles up to a cyclic shift, meaning that a cycle \( a_n \ldots a_1 \) is equivalent to the cycle \( a_i \ldots a_1a_n \ldots a_{i+1} \) for all \( 1 \leq i < n \). Given a cycle \( u = a_n \ldots a_1 \) and an arrow \( a \in Q_1 \), we define the (cyclic) derivative

\[
\frac{\partial u}{\partial a} = \sum_{i : a_i = a} a_{i-1} \ldots a_1 a_n \ldots a_{i+1}
\]
and extend it to $\frac{\partial W}{\partial a}$ by linearity. We define the Jacobian algebra to be
\[ J_W = kQ/(\partial W) = kQ/ (\partial W/\partial a : a \in Q_1). \]
Given a dimension vector $v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0}$, consider the space of representations $\mathcal{R}(Q,v)$. For any representation $M \in \mathcal{R}(Q,v)$ and for any cycle $u = a_n \ldots a_1$, define
\[ \text{tr } u|M = \text{tr}(M_{a_n} \ldots M_{a_1}). \]
Define the map (also called a potential)
\[ \text{tr } W: \mathcal{R}(Q,v) \rightarrow k, \quad M \mapsto \text{tr } W|M = \sum_u c_u \cdot \text{tr } u|M \]

**Proposition 5.5.** (See e.g. [38]) The critical locus of the map $\text{tr } W: \mathcal{R}(Q,v) \rightarrow k$ coincides with with the space of representations $\mathcal{R}(J_W,v) \subset \mathcal{R}(Q,v)$.

Define a cut of a potential $W = \sum_u c_u u$ to be a subset $I_1 \subset Q_1$ such that every cycle $u$ with $c_u \neq 0$ has exactly one arrow from $I_1$ (appearing just once). Let $\bar{I}_1 = Q_1 \setminus I_1$ and let $I, \bar{I} \subset Q$ be the corresponding subquivers with the sets of vertices $I_0 = \bar{I}_0 = \bar{Q}_0$. The map
\[ \text{tr } W: \mathcal{R}(Q,v) = \mathcal{R}(\bar{I}_1,v) \times \mathcal{R}(I,v) \rightarrow k \]
is linear on the second factor and induces the map
\[ s: \mathcal{R}(\bar{I}_1,v) \rightarrow \mathcal{R}(I,v)^{\vee}. \]
According to Proposition 5.4, we have
\[ [\mathcal{R}(Q,v), \text{tr } W] = \mathbb{L}^{d_I(v)} \cdot [Z(s)], \quad d_I(v) = \dim \mathcal{R}(I,v) = \sum_{(a: i \rightarrow j) \in I_1} v_i v_j. \]

**Proposition 5.6.** The zero locus $Z(s) \subset \mathcal{R}(\bar{I}_1,v)$ coincides with the space of representations $\mathcal{R}(J_{W,I},v) \subset \mathcal{R}(\bar{I}_1,v)$, where
\[ J_{W,I} = k\bar{I}_1/(\partial W/\partial a : a \in I). \]

**Proof.** For any cycle $u$ in $W$, we have $u = \sum_{a \in I} a_{\alpha}^a u_{\alpha}$ (up to a cyclic shift) because of the assumption on $I$. This implies that $\text{tr } W|M = \sum_{a \in I} \text{tr } a_{\alpha}^a M$ for any representation $M \in \mathcal{R}(Q,v)$. Given $\bar{M} \in \mathcal{R}(J_{W,I},v) \subset \mathcal{R}(\bar{I}_1,v)$, we have $\frac{\partial W}{\partial a}_{\alpha} \bar{M} = 0$ for all $a \in I$. Therefore, for any $M \in \mathcal{R}(I,v)$, representation $N = (\bar{M}, M) \in \mathcal{R}(Q,v)$ satisfies
\[ \text{tr } W|N = \sum_{a \in I} \text{tr } \left( M_{a} \frac{\partial W}{\partial a}_{\alpha} \bar{M} \right) = 0. \]
This implies $\bar{M} \in Z(s)$. Conversely, if $\bar{M} \in Z(s)$, then for any $M \in \mathcal{R}(I,v)$, representation $N = (\bar{M}, M) \in \mathcal{R}(Q,v)$ satisfies $\text{tr } W|M = 0$. Taking the derivatives with respect to all entries of $M_{a}$, we obtain $\frac{\partial W}{\partial a}_{\alpha} \bar{M} = 0$, for all $a \in I$. This implies $\bar{M} \in \mathcal{R}(J_{W,I},v)$. \[ \square \]

**Corollary 5.7.** For any cut $I$ of the potential $W$, we have
\[ [\mathcal{R}(Q,v), \text{tr } W] = \mathbb{L}^{d_I(v)} \cdot [\mathcal{R}(J_{W,I},v)]. \]

This corollary implies that there is a relationship between the motivic classes $[\mathcal{R}(J_{W,I},v)]$, for different cuts $I$. We will need this relation only for disjoint cuts and in this case we can give a proof that does not rely on exponential motives.
Proposition 5.8. Let $I_1, I'_1$ be two disjoint cuts of $W$. Then
\[ \mathbb{L}^{d_i(v)} \cdot [\mathcal{R}(J_{W,I}, v)] = \mathbb{L}^{d'_i(v)} \cdot [\mathcal{R}(J_{W,I'}, v)]. \]

Proof. Define $I''_1 = Q_1 \setminus (I_1 \cup I'_1)$. Let $X = \mathcal{R}(I'', v)$, $U = \mathcal{R}(I', v)$, $V = \mathcal{R}(I, v)$. We have a map
\[ \text{tr} W : \mathcal{R} = X \times U \times V \to k \]
which is linear on $U$ and $V$. It induces maps
\[ \phi_1 : X \times U \to V^\vee, \quad \phi_2 : X \times V \to U^\vee \]
and we conclude by Corollary 5.3 that
\[ \mathbb{L}^{\dim V}[Z(\phi_1)] = \mathbb{L}^{\dim U}[Z(\phi_2)]. \]
By Proposition 5.6 we have $\mathcal{R}(J_{W,I}, v) = Z(\phi_1), \mathcal{R}(J_{W,I'}, v) = Z(\phi_2)$, hence the statement. □

5.4. Jacobian algebra of a translation quiver. The following construction in the case of a double quiver $\bar{Q}$ can be found in [26]. Let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver with a cut $\Gamma^+_1 \subset \Gamma_1$. Define a new quiver $\bar{\Gamma}$ by adding to $\Gamma$ the arrows $\ell_i : i \to \tau_i, i \in \Gamma_0$.

Define a potential on $\bar{\Gamma}$
\[ W = \sum_{(a: i \to j) \in \Gamma_1} \varepsilon(a)\ell_j \cdot a \cdot \sigma a. \]
Then $\Gamma^+_1$ and $\Gamma^-_1 = \sigma \Gamma^+_1$ are cuts of $W$. There is another cut of $W$
\[ I_1 = \{ \ell_i \mid i \in \Gamma_0 \}. \]

Proposition 5.9. Consider the cuts $\Gamma^-$ and $I$ of the potential $W$ defined above. Then
(1) $J_{W,I} \simeq \Pi(\Gamma)$, the mesh algebra.
(2) The category of modules over $J_{W,\Gamma^-}$ is equivalent to the category of pairs $(M, \phi)$, where $M$ is a representation of $\Gamma^+$ and $\phi : M \to M^\tau$ is a homomorphism of representations.

Proof. (1) For any $j \in \Gamma_0$, we have $\frac{\partial W}{\partial \ell_j} = \sum_{(a: i \to j) \in \Gamma_1} \varepsilon(a) a \sigma(a)$. This is the mesh relation $e_j r e_{\tau_j}$ which follows from the relation $r$. Conversely, we have $r = \sum_j e_j r e_{\tau_j}$.
(2) For any arrow $a : i \to j$ in $\Gamma^+$, the arrow $\sigma a$ appears in the summands
\[ \varepsilon(a)\ell_j \cdot a \cdot \sigma a, \quad \varepsilon(\sigma a)\ell_i \cdot \sigma a \cdot \tau a \]
of $W$. Therefore
\[ \frac{\partial W}{\partial (\sigma a)} = \varepsilon(a) (\ell_j \cdot a - \tau a \cdot \ell_i). \]

Given a module $M'$ over $J_{W,\Gamma^-}$, we can restrict it to a representation $M$ of $\Gamma^+$. There are linear maps $\phi_i = M'_i : M_i \to M_{\tau i} = M'_i$ for all $i \in \Gamma_0$. Because of the above relations, we have a commutative diagram
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M_i & \xrightarrow{M_a} & M_j \\
\phi_i & & \phi_j \\
M_{\tau i} & \xrightarrow{M_{\tau a}} & M_{\tau j}
\end{array}
\]
for all \( a : i \to j \) in \( \Gamma^+ \). Therefore we obtain a homomorphism \( \phi : M \to M^\tau \) of \( \Gamma^+ \)-
representations. The converse construction is straightforward.

Given a quiver \( Q \) with an automorphism \( \tau \), we define \( \mathcal{R}^\tau(Q, \mathbf{v}) \) to be the space of pairs
\( (M, \phi) \), where \( M \in \mathcal{R}(Q, \mathbf{v}) \) and \( \phi \in \text{Hom}(M, M^\tau) \), for any dimension vector \( \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{(Q_0)} \).
By the previous proposition, we can identify \( \mathcal{R}^\tau (\Gamma^+, \mathbf{v}) \) with \( \mathcal{R}(J_{W^\Gamma}, \mathbf{v}) \).

**Proposition 5.10.** We have
\[
\mathbb{L}^{\chi_{(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}^\tau)}} \cdot [\mathcal{R}(\Pi(\Gamma), \mathbf{v})] = [\mathcal{R}^\tau (\Gamma^+, \mathbf{v})],
\]
where \( \chi \) is the Euler-Ringel form of the quiver \( \Gamma^+ \).

**Proof.** By the previous proposition we have
\[
\mathcal{R}(\Pi(\Gamma), \mathbf{v}) \cong \mathcal{R}(J_{W^\Gamma}, \mathbf{v}), \quad \mathcal{R}^\tau (\Gamma^+, \mathbf{v}) \cong \mathcal{R}(J_{W^\Gamma}, \mathbf{v}).
\]
On the other hand by Proposition 5.8 we have
\[
\mathbb{L}^{d_\Gamma(\mathbf{v})} \cdot [\mathcal{R}(J_{W^\Gamma}, \mathbf{v})] = \mathbb{L}^{d_{\Gamma^-}(\mathbf{v})} \cdot [\mathcal{R}(J_{W^\Gamma}, \mathbf{v})].
\]
Note that
\[
d_\Gamma(\mathbf{v}) - d_{\Gamma^-}(\mathbf{v}) = \sum_{i \in I_0} v_i v_{\tau i} - \sum_{(a : i \to j) \in \Gamma_+^+} v_{\tau j} v_i = \chi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}^\tau).
\]

5.5. **Calculation of the motivic classes.** Our goal is to determine the motivic classes of \( \mathcal{R}(\Pi(\Gamma), \mathbf{v}) \) and \( \mathcal{R}^\tau (\Gamma^+, \mathbf{v}) \) using the above relation, for certain translation quivers.

**Conjecture 1.** The motivic class of \( \mathcal{R}^\tau(Q, \mathbf{v}) \) is Tate.

**Remark 5.11.** If \( \tau = \text{id} \), then \( \Gamma = Q^\tau \) is the double quiver and \( \Pi = \Pi(\Gamma) \) is the preprojective algebra. By Proposition 5.10 we have \( \mathbb{L}^{\chi_{(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v}^\tau)}} [\mathcal{R}(\Pi(\mathbf{v}), \mathbf{v})] = [\mathcal{R}^\tau(Q, \mathbf{v})] \). These motivic classes were computed in [26], where they were expressed as rational functions in \( \mathbb{L} \). As \( \mathcal{R}^\tau(Q, \mathbf{v}) \) are algebraic varieties, we conclude that the conjecture is true in this case.

Let \( Q \) be a quiver, \( \Gamma = Q \) be its double quiver and \( d : \Gamma_1 \to \mathbb{Z} \) be a weight map having the total weight \( 0 \neq e \in \mathbb{Z} \). Then we have \( \tilde{\Gamma} = \mathcal{L}_d(Q) = \tilde{Q}^e \), where \( \tilde{Q} = \mathcal{L}_d(Q) \) and
\[
\tau_e : \tilde{Q} \to \tilde{Q}, \quad (i, n) \mapsto (i, n - e), \quad a_n \mapsto a_{n - e}.
\]

**Theorem 5.12.** The motivic class of \( \mathcal{R}^\tau(\tilde{Q}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}}) \) is Tate, for any dimension vector \( \tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbb{N}^{(\tilde{Q}_0)} \).

**Proof.** We will assume that \( e > 0 \). An object in \( \text{Rep}^\tau(\tilde{Q}) \) is a pair \( (M, \phi) \), where \( M \in \text{Rep}(\tilde{Q}) \) and \( \phi : M \to M^\tau \) is a morphism. This means that we have a collection of vector spaces \( (M_{i,n})_{i \in Q_0, n \in \mathbb{Z}} \) and compatible linear maps
\[
M_{a,n} : M_{i,n - da} \to M_{j,n}, \quad \phi_{i,n} : M_{i,n} \to M_{i,n - e}
\]
for \( a : i \to j \) in \( Q \), \( i \in Q_0 \) and \( n \in \mathbb{Z} \). Let \( A_\infty \) be the infinite quiver
\[
\cdots \to m + 1 \to m \to m - 1 \to \cdots
\]
For any representation $N$ of $A_{\infty}$ and for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, we will write $N[n]$ for the shifted representation given by $N[n]_m = N_{m-n}$. The maps $\phi_{i,n}$ induce representations $M^{i,k}$ of $A_{\infty}$

$$\cdots \rightarrow M_{i,(m+1)e+k} \rightarrow M_{i,me+k} \rightarrow M_{i,(m-1)e+k} \rightarrow \cdots$$

for all $i \in Q_0$ and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Note that $M^{i,k}[1]_m = M_{i,(m-1)e+k}^{i,k-e}$, hence $M^{i,k}[1] = M^{i,k-e}$ and we require only representations $M^{i,k}$ for $0 \leq k < e$. The maps $M_{a,n}$ induce homomorphisms of $A_{\infty}$-representations $M^{a,k} : M^{i,k-da} \rightarrow M^{j,k}$ for all $a : i \rightarrow j$ and $0 \leq k < e$.

This implies that an object $M \in \text{Rep}_e(\overline{Q})$ can be identified with a collection of $A_{\infty}$-representations $M^{i,k}$, where $i \in Q_0$ and $0 \leq k < e$, and a collection of homomorphisms of $A_{\infty}$-representations

$$M^{a,k} : M^{i,k-da} \rightarrow M^{j,k}, \quad a : i \rightarrow j, \quad 0 \leq k < e,$$

where we define $M^{i,me+k} = M^{i,k}[m]$, for $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $0 \leq k < e$.

Let $S = \{(p,q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid p \leq q\}$. Indecomposable representations of $A_{\infty}$ are representations $I_{p,q}$, for $(p,q) \in S$, having dimension vector $\mathbf{v}$ given by $v_n = 1$ for $p \leq n \leq q$ and $v_n = 0$ otherwise. This implies that every representation of $A_{\infty}$ is isomorphic to a representation $I(\mathbf{m}) = \bigoplus_{s \in S} I_s^e \mathbf{m}_s$, where $\mathbf{m} : S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ is a map with finite support. In our situation, we parametrize representations $M^{i,k}$ by a map $\mathbf{m} : Q_0 \times \mathbb{Z} \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ with finite support, so that

$$M^{i,k} = I(\mathbf{m}_i) = \bigoplus_{s \in S} I_s^e \mathbf{m}_i,k,s.$$

The corresponding dimension vector $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} = \dim M \in \mathbb{N}(\overline{Q}_0)$ is given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_{i,me+k} = \|\mathbf{m}\|_{i,me+k} = \sum_{p \leq m \leq q} \mathbf{m}_{i,k,p,q}, \quad i \in Q_0, \quad m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad 0 \leq k < e.$$

Consider the motivic class

$$c(\mathbf{m}) = \prod_{a : i \rightarrow j, 0 \leq k < e} [\text{Hom}(M^{i,k-da}, M^{j,k})] / \prod_{i \in Q_0, 0 \leq k < e} [\text{Aut}(M^{i,k})]$$

which is a polynomial in $\mathbb{L}^{\pm 1}$ divided by powers of $(\mathbb{L}^n - 1)$, $n \geq 1$ (see Proposition 5.16). We obtain

$$[\mathcal{R}_e(\overline{Q}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})] / [\text{GL}_{\tilde{\mathbf{v}}}'] = \sum_{\mathbf{m} : Q_0 \times \mathbb{Z} \times S \rightarrow \mathbb{N}} c(\mathbf{m}).$$

This implies that the motivic class of $\mathcal{R}_e(\overline{Q}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})$ is a polynomial in $\mathbb{L}^{\pm 1}$ divided by powers of $(\mathbb{L}^n - 1)$, $n \geq 1$. But as $\mathcal{R}_e(\overline{Q}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})$ is an algebraic variety, we conclude that its motivic class is a polynomial in $\mathbb{L}$ with integer coefficients. \hfill $\square$

**Remark 5.13.** Note that the above proof gives an explicit formula for $[\mathcal{R}_e(\overline{Q}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})]$.

**Theorem 5.14.** Let $\mathbf{d} : \overline{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ be a weight map having total weight $e \neq 0$, $\overline{\Gamma} = \mathcal{L}_d(\overline{Q})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbb{N}(\overline{\Gamma}_0)$. Then the motivic class of $\mathcal{R}(\Pi(\overline{\Gamma}), \tilde{\mathbf{v}})$ is Tate.

**Proof.** We have $\overline{\Gamma} = \widetilde{\overline{Q}}_e$, where $\widetilde{\overline{Q}} = \mathcal{L}_d(\overline{Q})$. By Proposition 5.10 we have

$$L^{\chi(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})} \cdot [\mathcal{R}(\Pi(\overline{\Gamma}), \tilde{\mathbf{v}})] = [\mathcal{R}_e(\widetilde{\overline{Q}}, \tilde{\mathbf{v}})],$$

where $\chi$ is the Euler-Ringel form of $\overline{Q}$. Now we apply the previous theorem. \hfill $\square$
Lemma 5.15. The previous result implies that \( R(\Pi(\mathbb{Z}Q), v) \) has a Tate motivic class, where \( \Gamma = \mathbb{Z}Q \) is the repetition quiver and \( v \in \mathbb{N}^{(\Gamma_0)} \). Indeed, we have seen that \( \Gamma = \mathcal{L}_d(Q) \), where \( d : \bar{Q} \to \mathbb{Z} \) is defined by \( d_a = 0 \) and \( d_{\sigma a} = 1 \), for \( a \in Q_1 \).

Proposition 5.16 (See [26]). Let \( M \) be a finite dimensional module over an algebra and let \( M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} M_i^{\oplus n_i} \) be its decomposition into indecomposable summands, with \( M_i \neq M_j \) for \( i \neq j \). Then

\[
\frac{[\text{Aut} M]}{[\text{End}(M)]} = \prod_{i \in I} (\mathbb{L}^{-1})_{n_i} 
\]

where \( (q)_n = (q; q)_n = \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - q^k) \) is the \( q \)-Pochhammer symbol.

5.6. Wall-crossing formula. Let \( \Gamma \) be a translation quiver with a cut \( \Gamma^+ \) and \( \Pi = \Pi(\Gamma) \) be the mesh algebra. Let \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{(\Gamma_0)} \) be a stability parameter and \( v \in \mathbb{N}^{(\Gamma_0)} \) be a dimension vector. Recall that \( \mathcal{R}_\theta(\Pi, v) \subset \mathcal{R}(\Pi, v) \) is an open subspace of \( \theta \)-semistable representations. Consider the corresponding algebraic stacks

\[
\mathcal{M}_\theta(v) = \mathcal{R}_\theta(\Pi, v) / \text{GL}_v, \quad \mathcal{M}(v) = \mathcal{R}(\Pi, v) / \text{GL}_v.
\]

Our goal is to prove a relation between the motivic classes of the above stacks.

Theorem 5.17. Assume that \( \theta^* = \theta \). Then

\[
[\mathcal{M}(v)] = \sum_{\nu \leq \mu} L^{\nu(v_1, v_j)} \prod_{i} \left[ \mathcal{M}_\theta(v_i) \right],
\]

where \( \nu(u, v) = -\chi(v, u) - \chi(u, v^\tau) \) and \( \chi \) is the Euler-Ringel form \( \Gamma^+ \).

Proof. Let \( \mathcal{M} = \bigsqcup_v \mathcal{M}(v) \) be the stack of all representations of \( \Pi \). Let \( H = K(\text{St}/\mathcal{M}) \) be the motivic Hall algebra of the category \( \text{mod} \Pi(\Gamma) \) (see e.g. [7]) and let \( \hat{H} \) be its completion with respect to the filtration arising from the grading by \( \mathbb{N}^{(\Gamma_0)} \). Then we have the following relation in \( \hat{H} \) (see e.g. [20, 32])

\[
[\mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{M}] = \sum_{\mu \geq \nu} \left[ \mathcal{M}_\theta(v_1) \to \mathcal{M} \right] \cdot \cdots \cdot \left[ \mathcal{M}_\theta(v_n) \to \mathcal{M} \right].
\]

Next we define a non-commutative algebra

\[
A = \bigoplus_{v \in \mathbb{N}^{(\Gamma_0)}} \mathcal{V} \cdot t^v, \quad \mathcal{V} = K(\text{St}) \simeq \hat{K}(\text{Var}),
\]

with the multiplication

\[
t^u \cdot t^v = L^{\nu(u, v)} t^{u+v},
\]

where \( \nu \) is the bilinear form defined above. Let \( \tilde{A} \) be the completion of \( A \). We define the integration map

\[
I : \hat{H} \to \tilde{A}, \quad [\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{M}(v)] \mapsto [\mathcal{X}] \cdot t^v.
\]

This map is not necessary an algebra homomorphism, but it satisfies

\[
I([\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{M}] \ast [\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{M}]) = I([\mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{M}]) \ast I([\mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{M}])
\]

under the assumption that

\[
h^0(N, M) - h^1(N, M) = -\nu(\dim M, \dim N)
\]

for all \( M \in \mathcal{X} \) and \( N \in \mathcal{Y} \) (see e.g. [20, 32]).
In our situation, we consider $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\geq c}$ (the stack of objects with all Harder-Narasimhan factors having slope $\geq c$) and $N \in \mathcal{M}_{< c}$ (the stack of objects with all Harder-Narasimhan factors having slope $< c$). As $\theta^r = \theta$, the module $N^\tau$ has the same slope as $N$ and it is also contained in $\mathcal{M}_{< c}$. Therefore $\text{Hom}(M, N^\tau) = 0$ and we obtain from Proposition 3.3 that

$$h^0(N, M) - h^1(N, M) = \chi(N, M) + \chi(M, N^\tau) = -\nu(\dim M, \dim N).$$

Applying the integration map we obtain

$$\sum_{\nu} [\mathcal{M}(\nu)] t^\nu = \sum_{\mu_0(\nu_1) > \cdots > \mu_0(\nu_n)} L^{\sum i<j \nu(v_i, v_j)} \prod_i [\mathcal{M}(\nu_i)] \cdot t^{\sum v_i}.$$ 

This formula is equivalent to the statement of the theorem. □

The above recursion formula can be solved (see e.g. [32]) and we can express motivic classes of $\mathcal{M}_0(\nu)$ in terms of motivic classes of $\mathcal{M}(\nu)$.

**Theorem 5.18.** Assume that $\theta^r = \theta$. Then

$$[\mathcal{M}_0(\nu)] = \sum_{\nu_1 + \cdots + \nu_n = \nu, \mu_0(\nu_1) > \cdots > \mu_0(\nu_n)} L^{\sum i<j \nu(v_i, v_j)} \prod_i [\mathcal{M}(\nu_i)].$$

**Corollary 5.19.** Let $Q$ be a quiver, $\mathbf{d}: \tilde{Q}_1 \to \mathbb{Z}$ be a weight map having total weight $e \neq 0$ and $\tilde{\Gamma} = \Sigma_d(\tilde{Q})$ be the corresponding localization quiver. For any stability parameter $\tilde{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{\Gamma}^0}$ with $\tilde{\theta}^r = \tilde{\theta}$ and for any dimension vector $\tilde{\nu}$, the motivic class $[\mathcal{M}_0(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{\nu})]$ is quasi-Tate.

**Proof.** By Theorem 5.14 the stack $\mathcal{M}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{\nu}) = \mathcal{R}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{\nu})/\text{GL}_\psi$ has a quasi-Tate motivic class. Now we apply the above theorem. □

**Remark 5.20.** Because of Conjecture 1 we expect that if $\theta^r = \theta$, then $\mathcal{M}(\Pi(\Gamma), \nu)$ and $\mathcal{M}_0(\Pi(\Gamma), \nu)$ have quasi-Tate motivic classes for an arbitrary translation quiver $\Gamma$ with a cut. We will see later that $[\mathcal{M}_0(\Pi(\Gamma), \nu)]$ is quasi-Tate at least if $\theta$ is $\nu$-generic, $\theta^r = \theta$ and $\nu^r \neq \nu$.

## 6. Torus Action

### 6.1. Bialynicki-Birula Decomposition

Let $X$ be an algebraic variety equipped with an action of $T = \mathbb{G}_m$. Define the $\pm$-attractors

$$X^+ = \left\{ x \in X \mid \exists \lim_{t \to 0} tx \right\}, \quad X^- = \left\{ x \in X \mid \exists \lim_{t \to \infty} tx \right\}.$$

Assume that $X$ is smooth and can be covered by $T$-invariant quasi-affine open subvarieties. For any point $x \in X^T$, the tangent space $T_x X$ is equipped with a $T$-action and there is a weight space decomposition (for positive, zero and negative weights)

$$T_x X = T_x^+ X \oplus T_x^0 X \oplus T_x^- X.$$

The fixed locus $X^T$ is smooth and $T_x X^T = T_x^0 X$.

**Theorem 6.1** (See [3, 19]). For any connected component $X_i \subset X^T$, the spaces

$$X_i^+ = \left\{ x \in X \mid \exists \lim_{t \to 0} tx \in X_i \right\}, \quad X_i^- = \left\{ x \in X \mid \exists \lim_{t \to \infty} tx \in X_i \right\}.$$
are locally closed and are affine bundles over $X_i$. For all $x \in X_i$, we have
\[ T_x X_i^+ = T^+_x X \oplus T^0_x X, \quad T_x X_i^- = T^-_x X \oplus T^0_x X \]
and $\text{rk} X_i^+ = \dim T^+_x X$, $\text{rk} X_i^- = \dim T^-_x X$. There exists an ordering $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ of the connected components of $X^T$ such that
\[ X^+_{\leq k} = \bigcup_{i \leq k} X_i^+, \quad X^-_{\geq k} = \bigcup_{i \geq k} X_i^- \]
are closed in $X$, for all $1 \leq k \leq n$. We have decompositions $X^+ = \bigcup_i X_i^+$, $X^- = \bigcup_i X_i^-$.  

**Proposition 6.2.** Assume that $X$ is smooth and $X^T$ is projective. Then
\[ [X^-]^\vee = \mathbb{L}^{-\dim X} \cdot [X^+] \]
In particular, $X^+$ has a Tate motivic class if and only if $X^-$ does.

**Proof.** For every connected component $X_i \subset X^T$, let $d_i = \dim X_i$, $d_i^+ = \text{rk} X_i^+$, $d_i^- = \text{rk} X_i^-$, so that $d_i + d_i^+ + d_i^- = \dim X$. Then
\[ [X_i^-]^\vee = \mathbb{L}^{-d_i^-} [X_i] = \mathbb{L}^{-d_i - d_i^+} [X_i] = \mathbb{L}^{-\dim X} [X_i^+] \]
Taking the sum over all connected components, we obtain the required result. □

**Corollary 6.3.** Assume that $X$ is smooth and $X^T$ is projective. Then the virtual Poincaré polynomials of attractors satisfy
\[ P(X^-; t^{-1}) = t^{-\dim X} P(X^+; t). \]

We will say that an algebraic variety $X$ is pure if the mixed Hodge structure on $H^i_c(X, \mathbb{C})$ is pure of weight $i$ for all $i$.

**Proposition 6.4** (cf. [12]). Assume that $X$ is smooth and $X^T$ is projective. Then $X^+$ and $X^-$ are pure.

**Proof.** Connected components $X_i \subset X^T$ are smooth and projective, hence pure. Therefore $X_i^+$ and $X_i^-$, which are affine bundles over $X_i$, are also pure. Let us order connected components $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ as in Theorem 6.1. We will show that $X_{\leq k}^+ = \bigcup_{i \leq k} X_i$ are pure by induction. Then $X^+ = X^+_{\leq n}$ is pure. The proof for $X^-$ is similar. The subvariety $X_{\leq k}^+ \subset X_{\leq k}^+$ is closed and has the complement $X_{> k}^+$. We obtain a long exact sequence
\[ \rightarrow H^{i-1}_c(X_k, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^i_c(X_{< k}, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^i_c(X_{\leq k}, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^i_c(X_k, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^{i+1}_c(X_{< k}, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \]
By purity of $X_k^+$ and $X_{\leq k}^+$, the connection maps are zero, hence we have an exact sequence
\[ 0 \rightarrow H^i_c(X_{< k}, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^i_c(X_{\leq k}, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^i_c(X_k, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow 0 \]
and $H^i_c(X_{< k}, \mathbb{C})$ is pure of weight $i$. □

6.2. Fixed point varieties. Let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver with a cut, $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{(\Gamma)}$ be a dimension vector and $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0}$ be a stability parameter. Our goal is to study torus actions on $M = M_\theta(\Pi(\Gamma), \mathbf{v})$ and to interpret connected components of fixed loci as translation quiver varieties, albeit for different translation quivers.

Let $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z}^r$ be a free abelian group of finite rank and $T = \text{Hom}_\mathbb{Z}(\Lambda, k^*) \simeq \mathbb{G}_m^r$ be the corresponding torus with the character group $X^+(T) = \text{Hom}(T, \mathbb{G}_m) \simeq \Lambda$. For any $t \in T$
and $n \in \Lambda$, define $t^n = t(n) \in k^*$. Let $d : \Gamma_1 \to \Lambda$ be a weight map having the total weight $e \in \Lambda \ $\S\ref{trans}. We define an action of $T$ on $\mathcal{M}$ by the rule

$$t \cdot M = (t^{da} M_a)_{a \in \Gamma_1}, \quad t \in T, \ M \in \mathcal{M}.$$ 

Note that for $M' = t \cdot M$, we have $M'_a M'_a = t^n M_a M_a$, hence representation $M'$ satisfies the mesh relation and $M' \in \mathcal{M}$.

We will show that $T$-fixed points of $\mathcal{M}$ can be interpreted as representations of the localization quiver $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathcal{L}_d(\Gamma)$ defined in \S\ref{trans}. Recall that $\tilde{\Gamma}_0 = \Gamma_0 \times \Lambda$ and arrows of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ are of the form

$$a_n : (i, n - d_a) \to (j, n), \quad (a : i \to j) \in \Gamma_1, \ n \in \Lambda.$$ 

Note that there is an action of $\Lambda$ on $\tilde{\Gamma}$ which induces an isomorphism $\tilde{\Gamma}/\Lambda \simeq \Gamma$. It also induces an action of $\Lambda$ on $\mathbb{N}[\Gamma_0]$. We define a morphism of translation quivers (cf. \S\ref{translation})

$$\pi : \tilde{\Gamma} \to \Gamma, \quad (i, n) \mapsto i, \quad a_n \mapsto a.$$ 

It induces maps

$$\pi_* : \mathbb{N}[\Gamma_0] \to \mathbb{N}[\Gamma_0], \quad \tilde{\nu} \mapsto \nu, \quad v_i = \sum_{k \in \pi^{-1}(i)} \tilde{v}_k.$$ 

$$\pi^* : \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{\tilde{\Gamma}_0}, \quad \theta \mapsto \tilde{\theta}, \quad \tilde{\theta}_k = \theta_{\pi(k)}.$$ 

Note that if $\nu = \pi_*(\tilde{\nu})$ and $\tilde{\theta} = \pi^*(\theta)$, then

$$\theta \cdot \nu = \sum_{i \in \Gamma_0} \theta_i \cdot \sum_{k \in \pi^{-1}(i)} \tilde{v}_k = \sum_{k \in \Gamma_0} \theta_{\pi(k)} \tilde{v}_k = \tilde{\theta} \cdot \tilde{\nu}$$

and $\mu_{\theta}(\nu) = \mu_{\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{\nu})$. The following result in the case of quivers without relations can be found in [34, 40].

**Theorem 6.5.** Let $\nu \in \mathbb{N}[\Gamma_0]$ be a dimension vector, $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0}$ and $\tilde{\theta} = \pi^*(\theta)$. Then

$$\mathcal{M}_\theta^0(\Pi(\Gamma), \nu)^T \simeq \bigcup_{\tilde{\nu} \in \pi^{-1}(\nu)/\Lambda} \mathcal{M}_\theta^0(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{\nu}).$$

**Proof.** Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_\theta^0(\Pi(\Gamma), \nu)^T$ be a fixed point (more precisely, its representative in $\mathcal{R}(\Pi(\Gamma), \nu)$). Note that $M$ is $\theta$-stable, hence $\text{End}(M) \simeq k$. For every $t \in T$, representation $t \cdot M$ is isomorphic to $M$, hence there exists a unique element $\tilde{h}(t) \in G_\nu = \text{GL}_\nu / \mathbb{G}_m$ such that $t \cdot M = \tilde{h}(t) \cdot M$. We obtain a group homomorphism $\tilde{h} : T \to \text{GL}_\nu$. It can be lifted to a group homomorphism $h : T \to \text{GL}_\nu$ (see e.g. [40, Lemma 3.3]). Given another lift $h' : T \to \text{GL}_\nu$, we obtain $h'h^{-1} : T \to \mathbb{G}_m$ which corresponds to an element $n \in \Lambda$.

Using the lift $h : T \to \text{GL}_\nu$, we can consider every vector space $M_i$ as a representation of $T$ and consider the corresponding weight space decomposition

$$M_i = \bigoplus_{n \in \Lambda} M_{i,n}, \quad i \in \Gamma_0,$$

so that $h(t)_i x = t^n x$ for $x \in M_{i,n}$. For every arrow $a : i \to j$ in $\Gamma$, the linear map $M_a : M_i \to M_j$ satisfies

$$(t \cdot M)_a = t^{da} M_a = (h(t) \cdot M)_a = h(t)_j M_{i,j} h(t)^{-1}_i.$$
This implies that its component \( M_{a,m,n} : M_{i,m} \to M_{j,n} \) satisfies \( t^a M_{a,m,n} = t^{n-m} M_{a,m,n} \) and we can have nonzero components only for \( m = n - d_a \). We define
\[
M_{a,n} = M_{a,n-d_a,n} : M_{i,n-d_a} \to M_{j,n}, \quad (a : i \to j) \in \Gamma_1, \; n \in \Lambda.
\]
In this way we obtain a representation \( \tilde{M} \) of the localization quiver \( \hat{\Gamma} \). Its dimension vector
\[
\tilde{v} : \Gamma_0 \times \Lambda \to \mathbb{N}, \quad (i, n) \mapsto \text{dim} M_{i,n}
\]
satisfies \( \pi_* (\tilde{v}) = v \). Translation quiver \( \hat{\Gamma} \) has a cut (see §2.5) and representation \( \tilde{M} \) satisfies the corresponding mesh relation. Moreover, it is stable with respect to the stability parameter \( \tilde{\theta} = \pi^*(\theta) \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0} \) as every subrepresentation of \( \tilde{M} \) induces a subrepresentation of \( M \) (see below). We conclude that \( \tilde{M} \in \mathcal{M}_\theta^\circ (\Pi(\hat{\Gamma}), \tilde{v}) \). Note that the \( \Lambda \)-grading of \( \tilde{M} \) (hence the dimension vector \( \tilde{v} \)) is determined only up to a translation by \( \Lambda \) because of the non-uniqueness of the lift \( h : T \to \text{GL}_\mathbb{Q} \).

We define a functor (cf. §2.9)
\[
\pi_* : \text{Rep} \hat{\Gamma} \to \text{Rep} \Gamma, \quad \tilde{M} \mapsto M, \quad M_i = \bigoplus_{n \in \Lambda} \tilde{M}_{i,n}, \quad M_a = \sum_{n \in \Lambda} \tilde{M}_{a,n}
\]
for \( i \in \Gamma_0, \; a \in \Gamma_1 \). It induces a functor \( \pi_* : \text{mod} \Pi(\hat{\Gamma}) \to \text{mod} \Pi(\Gamma) \). To finish the proof of the theorem, we need to show that if \( M \) is \( \theta \)-stable, then \( M = \pi_* (\tilde{M}) \) is \( \theta \)-stable (cf. [34]). By construction we have an isomorphism \( h(t) : M \to tM \) for all \( t \in T \)
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M_i & \xrightarrow{h(t)} & M_j \\
\downarrow \quad h(t)_i & & \downarrow \quad h(t)_j \\
M_i & \xrightarrow{(tM)_i} & M_j
\end{array}
\]
If \( M \) is not \( \theta \)-stable, let \( N \subseteq M \) be some stable submodule with \( \mu_\theta (N) \geq \mu_\theta (M) \). We have a stable submodule \( tN \subset tM \) (obtained by changing the maps \( N_a \), but leaving the spaces \( N_i \subset M_i \) unchanged) and an isomorphic submodule \( N_t = h(t)^{-1} (tN) \subset M \) (obtained by changing the spaces \( N_i \), and restricting the maps \( M_a \) to them). The submodules \( N_t \), for \( t \in T \), form a direct sum in \( M \), hence there are finitely many of them. But they form a continuous \( T \)-family in the product of Grassmannians of \( M_i \). Therefore we have \( N_t = N \) for all \( t \in T \). This implies that \( h(t) \) restricts to an isomorphism \( h(t) : N \to tN \) and repeating the above construction we obtain that \( N = \pi_* (\tilde{N}) \) for some submodule \( \tilde{N} \subset \tilde{M} \). We have \( \mu_\tilde{\theta} (\tilde{N}) = \mu_\theta (N) \geq \mu_\theta (M) = \mu_\tilde{\theta} (\tilde{M}) \), hence \( \tilde{M} \) is not stable, a contradiction. \( \square \)

### 6.3. Decomposition of translation quiver varieties

In view of §6.1 we will study attractors of torus actions on translation quiver varieties. The fixed locus was already determined in §6.2. Let \( \Gamma \) be a translation quiver with a cut and \( \Pi = \Pi(\Gamma) \) be the corresponding mesh algebra. Let \( v \in \mathbb{N}(\Gamma_0) \) be a dimension vector and \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{\Gamma_0} \) be a stability parameter. The subspace \( \mathcal{L}_\theta (\Pi, v) \subset \mathcal{M}_\theta (\Pi, v) \) of nilpotent representations is equal to \( \pi^{-1}(0) \), where
\[
\pi : \mathcal{M}_\theta (\Pi, v) \to \mathcal{M}_0 (\Pi, v)
\]
is the projective morphism discussed in Remark 4.2. Consider a weight map \( d : \Gamma_1 \to \mathbb{Z} \) with \( d_a > 0 \) for all \( a \in \Gamma_1 \) and the corresponding action of \( T = \mathbb{G}_m \) on the translation quiver variety \( \mathcal{M}_\theta (\Pi, v) \).

**Proposition 6.6.** We have
(1) The space $M_\theta(P, v)^T$ is projective.
(2) For any $M \in M_\theta(P, v)$, there exists $\lim_{t \to 0} tM$.
(3) The attractor $\{ M \in M_\theta(P, v) \mid \exists \lim_{t \to \infty} tM \}$ is equal to $L_\theta(P, v)$.

Proof. (1) We define the action of $T = \mathbb{G}_m$ on $R(P, v)$ in the same way as on $M(P, v)$. By assumption, for any $M \in R(P, v)$, we have $\lim_{t \to 0} tM = 0$. Let $p : R(P, v) \to M_\theta(P, v)$ be the projection, which is $T$-equivariant. If $p(M)$ is $T$-fixed, then $p(M) = \lim_{t \to 0} p(tM) = 0$. Therefore $M_\theta(P, v)^T = \{ 0 \}$. The space $M_\theta(P, v)^T$ is mapped to $M_\theta(P, v)^T = \{ 0 \}$ by $\pi$, hence $M_\theta(P, v)^T \subset \pi^{-1}(0)$ is projective.

(2) For any $M \in M_\theta(P, v)$, we have $\lim_{t \to 0} \pi(tM) = 0$, hence the map $\mathbb{G}_m \to M_\theta(P, v)$, $t \to \pi(tM)$ extends to $\mathbb{A}^1 \to M_\theta(P, v)$. As $\pi$ is projective, we conclude by the valuative criterion that $\mathbb{G}_m \to M_\theta(P, v)$, $t \to tM$, extends to $\mathbb{A}^1 \to M_\theta(P, v)$, hence the limit $\lim_{t \to 0} tM$ exists.

(3) If $\lim_{t \to \infty} tM$ exists, then $\lim_{t \to \infty} t\pi(M)$ exists in $M_\theta(P, v)$. We have seen that $\lim_{t \to 0} t\pi(M)$ is zero. Therefore we obtain a morphism $\mathbb{P}^1 \to M_\theta(P, v)$ to an affine variety $M_\theta(P, v)$. This map has to be constantly zero, hence $\pi(M) = 0$ and $M \in \pi^{-1}(0) = L_\theta(P, v)$. Conversely, if $M \in \pi^{-1}(0)$, then $\mathbb{G}_m \to M_\theta(P, v)$, $t \to tM$, extends to $\mathbb{P}^1 \to M_\theta(P, v)$. As $\pi$ is projective, the map $\mathbb{G}_m \to M_\theta(P, v)$, $t \to tM$, extends to $\mathbb{P}^1 \to M_\theta(P, v)$. □

This result implies that we have attractors $M_\theta(P, v)^+ = M_\theta(P, v)$, $M_\theta(P, v)^- = L_\theta(P, v)$.

Corollary 6.7. Assume that $\theta$ is $v$-generic, $\theta^r = \theta$ and $v^r \neq v$. Then $M = M_\theta(P, v)$ and $L = L_\theta(P, v)$ are pure and their motivic classes satisfy

$$[L]^v = \mathbb{L}^{-\dim M} \mathcal{M}$$

where $\dim M = 1 - \chi(v, v + v^r)$ and $\chi$ is the Euler-Ringel form of the cut $\Gamma^+$. Similarly,$$P(L; t^{-1}) = t^{-\dim M} P(M; t).$$

Proof. We proved in Theorem 4.6 that $M_\theta(P, v) = M_\theta(P, v)$ is smooth and has the stated dimension. As $M_\theta(P, v)^T$ is projective by the previous result, we can apply Proposition 6.2 and Proposition 6.4. □

Theorem 6.8. Assume that $\theta$ is $v$-generic, $\theta^r = \theta$ and $v^r \neq v$. Then $M_\theta(P, v)$ and $L_\theta(P, v)$ have Tate motivic classes.

Proof. As before, we consider the action of $T = \mathbb{G}_m$ on $M = M_\theta(P, v)$. By the previous results we obtain the Bialynicki-Birula decomposition of $M^+ = M_\theta(P, v)$ and $M^- = L_\theta(P, v)$. To prove the theorem we need to show that connected components of $M^T$ have Tate motivic classes. By Theorem 6.5 they are translation quiver varieties of the localization quiver $\Gamma = \mathcal{L}_d(\Gamma)$. We will prove that they have Tate motivic classes, for a special choice of the weight map $d$.

Assume that $\Gamma = Q^r$, for a quiver with an automorphism $(Q, \tau)$. Let us choose $r > |v| = \sum_i v_i$ and choose $d : Q_1 \to \mathbb{Z}$ with $d_a = r$ for all $a$. Let $d : \Gamma_1 \to \mathbb{Z}$ also denote the corresponding weight map having total weight $e = r + 1$. Then $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathcal{L}_d(\Gamma) \simeq (\tilde{Q})^r$ (see §2.5), where $\tilde{Q} = \mathcal{L}_d(Q)$ and $\tau_e : \tilde{Q} \to \tilde{Q}$, $(i, n) \mapsto (\tau i, n - e)$, $a_n \mapsto (\tau a)_{n - e}$. 

Recall that $\tilde{Q}$ has arrows $a_n: (i, n - r) \to (j, n)$ for all $a: i \to j$ in $Q$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. For every $k \in \mathbb{Z}_r$, consider

$$Q_0^{(k)} = \{(i, n) \in \tilde{Q}_0 \mid n \equiv k \pmod{r}\}$$

and let $Q^{(k)} \subset \tilde{Q}$ be the corresponding full subquiver. There are no arrows between different $Q^{(k)}$ in $\tilde{Q}$. Translation $\tau_c$ induces isomorphisms $\tau_c: Q^{(k)} \to Q^{(k-1)}$. In the quiver $(\tilde{Q})^{\tau_c}$ we have additional arrows

$$a_n^*: (\tau j, n - e) \to (i, n - r)$$

for $a: i \to j$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. This means that $a_n^*$ is an arrow from $Q^{(k-1)}$ to $Q^{(k)}$ for $n \equiv k \pmod{r}$.

A torus fixed point in $M_{\theta}(\Pi(\Gamma), v)$ corresponds to a point $M \in M_{\theta}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v})$, where $\tilde{v}$ is a dimension vector on $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathfrak{L}_d(\Gamma)$ with $\pi_*(\tilde{v}) = v$, $\tilde{\theta} = \pi^*(\theta)$ and $\pi: \tilde{\Gamma} \to \Gamma$ is the projection. For every $0 < \tilde{u} < \tilde{v}$, we have

$$\mu_{\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{u}) = \mu_{\theta}(u) \neq \mu_{\theta}(v) = \mu_{\tilde{\theta}}(\tilde{v}), \quad u = \pi_*(\tilde{u}) < v.$$

This implies that $\tilde{\theta}$ is $\tilde{v}$-generic and every representation in $M_{\theta}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v})$ is stable.

As $r > |v| = \dim M$, representation $M$ is not supported on some $Q^{(k)}$. Without loss of generality we assume that it is $R = Q^{(0)}$. This implies that we can substitute translations

$$Q^{(r-1)} \tau_{c} \ldots \tau_{c} Q^{(0)} = R$$

by identities (the last translation $Q^{(0)} \to Q^{(r-1)}$ will be possibly non-trivial, but it is irrelevant for the representation $M$). Therefore we can consider $M$ as a (semi-)stable representation of the repetitve quiver $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathbb{Z}R$, where we lift the stability parameter from $R = Q^{(0)}$ to $Z\mathbb{R}$. Recall that $Z\mathbb{R} \simeq (R \times \mathbb{Z})^\tau$, where

$$\tau(i, k) = (i, k - 1), \quad \tau(a, k) = (a, k - 1), \quad i \in R_0, a \in R_1, k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$  

We will write $\tilde{\theta}$ and $\tilde{v}$ for the stability parameter and the dimension vector on $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathbb{Z}R$. An object in $M \in M_{\tilde{\theta}}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v})$ is stable, hence its automorphism group is $G_m$. This implies that we have a $G_m$-torsor $M_{\tilde{\theta}}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v}) \to M_{\theta}(\Pi(\Gamma), v)$, hence

$$[M_{\tilde{\theta}}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v}) \to \mathfrak{L}_d(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v}].$$

Note that $\tilde{\Gamma} = \mathbb{Z}R = \mathfrak{L}_d(\tilde{\Gamma})$ (see Remark 2.9), hence by Corollary 5.19 we conclude that $M_{\theta}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v})$ has a quasi-Tate motivic class. But $M_{\theta}(\Pi(\tilde{\Gamma}), \tilde{v})$ is an algebraic variety, hence it has a Tate motivic class.

Finally, let us consider (framed) translation quiver varieties. Given $w \in \mathbb{N}^{\Gamma_0}$, we constructed the framed quiver $\Gamma^f$ (which is a partial translation quiver) and a stability parameter $\theta^f$ on it in §4.3. A dimension vector $v \in \mathbb{N}(\Gamma_0)$ is extended to $v^f \in \mathbb{N}(\Gamma^f)$ by setting $v^f_i = 1$. Then we define

$$M(v, w) = M_{\theta^f}(\Pi(\Gamma^f), v^f), \quad \mathcal{L}(v, w) = \mathcal{L}_{\theta^f}(\Pi(\Gamma^f), v^f).$$

**Corollary 6.9.** Translation quiver varieties $M(v, w)$ and $\mathcal{L}(v, w)$ are pure and have Tate motivic classes.

**Proof.** We have seen in Theorem 4.7 that $M(v, w)$ can be interpreted as a translation quiver variety for the stable translation quiver $\tilde{\Gamma}^f$. Therefore the result follows from the previous theorem. \qed
6.4. **Alternative approach.** There is an alternative way, based on the algorithm from [29], to show that translation quiver varieties $\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})$ have Tate motivic classes. Let $\Gamma$ be a translation quiver with a cut, $\Pi = \Pi(\Gamma)$ be its mesh algebra and $* \in \Gamma_0$ be a distinguished vertex. Let $\mathbf{v}$ be a dimension vector with $v_* = 1$ and let $\theta$ be a stability parameter with $\theta_* = 1$ and $\theta_i = 0$ for all $i \neq *$. Note that $\theta$ is $\mathbf{v}$-generic and a representation $M$ having dimension vector $\mathbf{v}$ is $\theta$-stable if and only if it is generated by $M_*$. We will denote the moduli space $\mathcal{M}_0(\Pi, \mathbf{v})$ by $\mathcal{M}_*(\mathbf{v})$.

**Proposition 6.10.** Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{N}^{(\Gamma_0)}$ be a dimension vector such that $v_* = 1$ and $v_{*r} = 0$. Then $\mathcal{M}_*(\mathbf{v})$ is smooth.

**Proof.** We apply the same argument as in Theorem 4.6. For any $M \in \mathcal{M}_*(\mathbf{v})$, we have

$$h^0(M, M) - h^1(M, M) + h^0(M, M^*) = \chi(M, M) + \chi(M, M^*),$$

where $\chi$ is the Euler-Ringel form of the cut. We note that $h^0(M, M) = 1$ as $M$ is stable. On the other hand $h^0(M, M^*) = 0$ as $M$ is generated by $M_*$ and $M_*^* = M_{*r} = 0$. This implies $h^1(M, M) = 1 - \chi(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}^*)$.

From now on we will assume that $v_* = 1$ and $v_{*r} = 0$. Performing localization, we can assume that the translation quiver $\Gamma$ is acyclic. This implies that there are no arrows $\tau^k i \rightarrow i$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Otherwise there would exist an arrow $\tau i \rightarrow \tau^k i$, hence an arrow $\tau^{1-k} i \rightarrow i$ and we could assume that $k > 0$. There exists a path $\tau^k i \rightarrow \tau i \rightarrow \tau^k i$ which contradicts to the assumption that $\Gamma$ is acyclic. For any $M \in \mathcal{M}_*(\mathbf{v})$ and a vertex $i \in \Gamma_0$, consider the complex

$$M_{\tau i} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{a : j \rightarrow i} M_j \xrightarrow{g_i} M_i,$$

where $g_i$ is surjective (for $i \neq *$) because of the stability condition. Given a $\tau$-orbit $\mathcal{O} \subset \Gamma_0$ and a vector $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{N}^0$, define

$$\mathcal{M}_{*r}(\mathbf{v}) = \{ M \in \mathcal{M}_*(\mathbf{v}) \mid \dim \ker f_i = r_i \ \forall i \in \mathcal{O} \}.$$

For any $M \in \mathcal{M}_{*r}(\mathbf{v})$, there is a subrepresentation $N \subset M$ defined by $N_i = \ker f_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{O}$ and $N_i = 0$ otherwise. The quotient $M' = M/N$ is stable and is contained in $\mathcal{M}_*(\mathbf{v}_r)$, where $\mathbf{v}_r = \dim M' = \mathbf{v} - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} r_i e_i$. It is actually contained in $\mathcal{M}_{*0}(\mathbf{v}_r)$, where $0 \in \mathbb{N}^0$ is the zero vector, as we have injective maps

$$M'_{\tau i} \rightarrow \bigoplus_{a : j \rightarrow i} M_j.$$

Possible stable representations $M$ that extend $M'$ correspond to surjective maps

$$g_i : \text{Coker } f'_{\tau i} \rightarrow \text{Ker } (f_i), \quad i \in \mathcal{O}.$$

Note that

$$d_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r}) = \dim \text{Coker } f'_{\tau i} = \sum_{a : j \rightarrow i} v_j - v_{\tau i} + r_{\tau i},$$

hence

$$[\mathcal{M}_*(\mathbf{v})] = \sum_{r \leq v|_{\mathcal{O}}} [\mathcal{M}_{*r}(\mathbf{v})] = \sum_{r \leq v|_{\mathcal{O}}} [\mathcal{M}_{*0}(\mathbf{v}_r)] \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{O}} [\text{Gr}(d_i(\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{r}), r_i)],$$
where \( \text{Gr}(n, r) \) is the Grassmannian parametrizing \( r \)-dimensional quotients of an \( n \)-dimensional space. Note that if \( * \in O \) (and \( v \neq e_i \)), then the above sum runs over all \( r \) with \( r_* = 0 \). Using the above formula we can recursively express \([M_{s,0}(v)]\) as a linear combination (with coefficients that are Tate motivic classes) of \([M_s(u)]\) with \( u \leq v \).

For any dimension vector \( v \), there exists a vertex \( i \) such that \( v_i \neq 0 \) and \( v_j = 0 \) for all \( a: i \to j \). Let \( O \) be the \( \tau \)-orbit of this vertex. Then \( M_{s,0}(v) = O \) (as \( f_i = 0 \) by our assumption). Therefore we can express \([M_s(v)]\) in terms of \([M_{s,0}(u)]\) with \( u < v \) and then in terms of \([M_s(u)]\) with \( u < v \). By induction we obtain that \( M_s(v) \) has a Tate motivic class.

6.5. Motivic classes of Nakajima quiver varieties. Let us consider a finite quiver \( Q \), the double quiver \( \Gamma = \bar{Q} \) and vectors \( v, w \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0} \). In this case translation quiver varieties \( M(v, w) \) and \( L(v, w) \) are exactly the Nakajima quiver varieties. The virtual Poincaré polynomials of \( M(v, w) \) were computed in [18, 25] by counting points of \( M(v, w) \) over finite fields. It was proved in [41] that the same formula is satisfied by the motivic classes of \( M(v, w) \). The virtual Poincaré polynomials of \( L(v, w) \) were computed in [5] by applying Białynicki-Birula decomposition to a torus action on \( M(v, w) \) (cf. Corollary 6.3). Because of Theorem 6.11 we can write motivic classes of \( M(v, w) \) and \( L(v, w) \) automatically, if we know their Poincaré polynomials (or if we can count their points over finite fields). Let us write down those formulas for completeness (cf. [25, 5]). Define

\[
\begin{align*}
    r(w, q^{-1}, z) &= \prod_{\tau} q^{-w_{\tau}} \prod_{k \geq 1} q^{\chi(\tau_k, \tau_{k+1})} z^{\tau_k} \frac{(q)_{\tau_k - \tau_{k+1}}}{(q)_{\tau_k}} \\
\end{align*}
\]

where

1. \( \tau = (\tau^i)_{i \in Q_0} \) is a collection of partitions,
2. \( \tau_k = (\tau^i_k)_{i \in Q_0} \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0} \) for \( k \geq 1 \),
3. \( z^v = \prod_{i \in Q_0} z^{e_i} \) for \( v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0} \),
4. \( (q)_v = \prod_{i \in Q_0} (q)_v, \quad (q)_n = (q; q)_n = \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - q^k) \) for \( v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0} \) and \( n \in \mathbb{N} \),
5. \( \chi \) is the Euler-Ringel form of the quiver \( Q \).

**Theorem 6.11.** We have

\[
\sum_{v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0}} L^{-d(v, w)}[M(v, w)] z^v = \frac{r(w, L, z)}{r(0, L, z)},
\]

\[
\sum_{v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0}} L^{-d(v, w)}[L(v, w)] z^v = \frac{r(w, L^{-1}, z)}{r(0, L^{-1}, z)},
\]

where \( d(v, w) = \frac{1}{2} \dim M(v, w) = v \cdot w - \chi(v, v) \).

**Proof.** For the first formula see [18, 25, 41]. For the second formula note that by Corollary 6.7 we have

\[
[M(v, w)]^\vee = L^{-2d(v, w)}[M(v, w)].
\]

Therefore

\[
\sum_{v \in \mathbb{N}^{Q_0}} L^{d(v, w)}[L(v, w)]^\vee z^v = \frac{r(w, L, z)}{r(0, L, z)}.
\]

Taking the duals we obtain the required result (cf. [5]).
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