

## DYNAMICAL COMBINATORICS AND TORSION CLASSES

EMILY BARNARD, GORDANA TODOROV, AND SHIJIE ZHU

ABSTRACT. For finite semidistributive lattices the map  $\kappa$  gives a bijection between the sets of completely join-irreducible elements and completely meet-irreducible elements.

Here we study the  $\kappa$ -map in the context of torsion classes. It is well-known that the lattice of torsion classes for an artin algebra is semidistributive, but in general it is far from finite. We show the  $\kappa$ -map is well-defined on the set of completely join-irreducible elements, even when the lattice of torsion classes is infinite. We then extend  $\kappa$  to a map on torsion classes which have canonical join representations given by the special torsion classes associated to the minimal extending modules introduced in [5] by the first and third authors and A. Carroll.

For hereditary algebras, we show that the extended  $\kappa$ -map on torsion classes is essentially the same as Ringel's  $\epsilon$ -map on wide subcategories. Also in the hereditary case, we relate the square of  $\kappa$  to the Auslander-Reiten translation.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Torsion Classes Background	5
2.1. Torsion pairs	5
2.2. Minimal inclusions of torsion classes	5
3. Lattice Background	7
3.1. Complete Semidistributive Lattices	7
3.2. Canonical Join and Meet Representations: CJR and CMR	9
3.3. Completely Join and Meet-Irreducible Elements CJI and CMI	10
4. Kappa Map	11
4.1. Definition of Kappa Map	11
4.2. The Kappa Map and Minimal Extending Modules	12
4.3. Kappa map and Proof of Theorem A	12
4.4. Extension of Kappa Map	13
5. Proof of Theorem D	15
5.1. Wide Subcategories	15
5.2. Simple Objects in Wide Subcategories	17
5.3. Ringel's $\epsilon$ -map	18
5.4. Theorem D: $\bar{\kappa}$ and $\epsilon$	20
6. Iterated Compositions of $\bar{\kappa}$ and Relation with AR translation	21
7. Appendix	23
8. Acknowledgements	24
References	25

## 1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper we study the lattice theoretic map  $\kappa$  and its relations to various representation theoretic notions in the lattices of torsion classes over finite dimensional algebras.

Recall that a lattice (or lattice-poset) is a poset in which each pair of elements has a unique smallest upper bound (called the join) and a unique greatest lower bound (called the meet). We focus on a special class of lattices called semidistributive lattices; they satisfy a semidistributive law which is a weakening of the distributive law (Definition 3.1.1). Semidistributive lattices arise in algebraic combinatorics as the weak order on a finite Coxeter group, in number theory as the divisibility poset (Example 3.3.4), and in representation theory as the lattice of torsion classes.

Fundamental to the study of *finite* semidistributive lattices is a certain function which we denote here as  $\kappa$ , which maps completely join-irreducible elements to completely meet-irreducible elements (for precise definitions see Definition 3.3.1). Actually for finite lattices,  $\kappa$  is a bijection precisely when the lattice is semidistributive [8, Corollary 2.55]. In order to define the  $\kappa$ -map we need the following characterization of completely join-irreducible elements:  $j$  is completely join-irreducible if and only if there is unique element  $j_*$  covered by  $j$ . (See Definition 3.3.2 for the definition of cover relations.) Similarly,  $m$  is completely meet-irreducible if and only if there is unique element  $m_*$  which covers  $m$ . Following [8], we define the  $\kappa$ -map by using the above characterization of completely join-irreducible elements.

**Definition 1.0.1.** *Let  $j$  be a completely join-irreducible element of a lattice  $L$ , and let  $j_*$  be the unique element covered by  $j$ . Define  $\kappa(j)$  to be:*

$$\kappa(j) := \text{unique } \max\{x \in L : j_* \leq x \text{ and } j \not\leq x\}, \text{ when such an element exists.}$$

In this paper we concentrate on  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ , the lattice of torsion classes. Throughout the paper,  $\Lambda$  is a finite dimensional algebra; any additional assumptions on the algebra  $\Lambda$  will be explicitly stated. A torsion class  $\mathcal{T}$  is a subcategory of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$  which is closed under isomorphisms, quotients, and extensions. We write  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  for the poset whose elements are torsion classes ordered by:  $\mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{S}$  precisely when  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ . Observe that for two torsion classes  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  (not necessarily comparable),  $\mathcal{T} \wedge \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T} \vee \mathcal{S} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{S})$ . It is well-known that  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  is a complete semidistributive lattice [7, 9].

In our first main result we explicitly compute  $\kappa$  for the lattice of torsion classes. Hence,  $\kappa$  is well-defined, even though  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  may be infinite. We use the fact the map  $M \mapsto \mathcal{T}_M = \text{Filt}(\text{Gen}(M))$  is a bijection from the set of isoclasses of bricks to the set of completely join-irreducible torsion classes  $\text{CJI}(\text{tors } \Lambda)$  (see [5, Theorem 1.0.3]). Recall that  $M$  is defined to be a *brick* provided that  $\text{End}_\Lambda(M)$  is a division ring.

**Theorem A** (Theorem 4.3.1). *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra, let  $M$  be a  $\Lambda$ -brick. Then  $\kappa : \text{CJI}(\text{tors } \Lambda) \rightarrow \text{CMI}(\text{tors } \Lambda)$  is a bijection with*

$$\kappa(\mathcal{T}_M) = {}^\perp M$$

where  ${}^\perp M$  denotes the set  $\{X \in \text{mod } \Lambda \mid \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X, M) = 0\}$ .

**Remark 1.0.2.** A very recent result of Reading, Speyer, and Thomas implies that  $\kappa$  is a bijection for each *completely* semidistributive lattice. See [15, Theorem 3.2].

Finite semidistributive lattices are analogous to the unique factorization domains of ring theory. Each element  $x \in L$  has a unique “factorization” in terms of the join operation which is irredundant and lowest, called the *canonical join representation* and denoted by  $x = \text{CJR}(x) = \bigvee A$  (see Definition 3.2.1). The dual notion is the *canonical meet representation*, denoted by  $x = \text{CMR}(x) = \bigwedge B$ . For finite semidistributive lattices, the map  $\kappa$  has the pleasant property of respecting factorizations, i.e.  $\kappa$  maps elements of any canonical join representation to the elements of some canonical meet representation, i.e.  $\bigwedge \{\kappa(j) : j \in \text{CJR}(x)\} = \text{CMR}(y)$  for some  $y \in L$ .

With this fact in mind, we make the following definition of the  $\bar{\kappa}$ -map, which is an extension of the  $\kappa$ -map to possibly infinite semidistributive lattices and also to a larger class of elements (not just completely join-irreducible elements).

**Definition 1.0.3.** *Let  $L$  be a (possibly infinite) semidistributive lattice. Let  $x$  be an element which has a canonical join representation such that  $\kappa(j)$  is defined for each  $j \in \text{CJR}(x)$ . Define*

$$\bar{\kappa}(x) = \bigwedge \{\kappa(j) : j \in \text{CJR}(x)\}.$$

It is clear that this generalized  $\bar{\kappa}$  will not exist in general. In particular, if any  $j \in \text{CJR}(x)$  is not completely join-irreducible, then  $\bar{\kappa}(x)$  is not defined. And even if all  $j \in \text{CJR}(x)$  are completely join-irreducible,  $\kappa(j)$  might not exist for some  $j$ . However when  $\bar{\kappa}$  does exist it has quite nice properties, which we show in the next statements for the lattices of torsion classes.

**Proposition B** (Corollary 4.4.3). *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a torsion class which has a canonical join representation of the following form:  $\text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{T}_{M_\alpha}$ , where  $M_\alpha$  are  $\Lambda$ -bricks. Then  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})$  is defined and is of the form:*

$$\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} {}^\perp M_\alpha.$$

In order for  $\bar{\kappa}$  to be defined as in this proposition, it is important that the torsion class  $\mathcal{T}$  has this nice canonical join representation. This will be important in the next theorem as well, so we define the following subset of torsion classes:

$$\text{tors}_0(\Lambda) := \{\mathcal{T} : \text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{T}_{M_\alpha} \text{ where } \{M_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A} \text{ is a set of } \Lambda\text{-bricks}\}.$$

We also want to consider the compositions of  $\bar{\kappa}$ . As one may expect, for general semidistributive lattice  $L$ , even if  $\bar{\kappa}(x)$  exists,  $\bar{\kappa}(\bar{\kappa}(x))$  might not be defined. And it may not be defined even when we consider lattice  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ , since  $\bar{\kappa}(\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}))$  might not be defined if  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})$  is not in  $\text{tors}_0(\Lambda)$ .

A nice situation is when  $\Lambda$  is  $\tau$ -tilting finite. Then the lattice  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  is finite [12] and semidistributive. In this case,  $\bar{\kappa}^n$  is well-defined for all  $n$  because every element in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  (and hence  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})$ ) has canonical join representation consisting of completely join-irreducibles (see Proposition 3.3.7). So by [5]  $\text{CJR}(\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})) = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{T}_{M_\alpha}$  and therefore is in  $\text{tors}_0 \Lambda$ . We consider this special case in Theorem E.

Now, we concentrate on hereditary finite dimensional algebras, where the structure of module categories is very well understood. Let  $H$  be a hereditary finite dimensional algebra. We show that  $\bar{\kappa}$  sends functorially finite torsion classes to functorially finite torsion classes (Corollary 5.4.3). Since the class of functorially

finite torsion classes is contained in  $\text{tors}_0 \Lambda$  by Proposition 4.4.9, it follows that  $\bar{\kappa}^n$  is well defined for functorially finite torsion classes for hereditary algebras.

We let  $\tau$  denote Auslander-Reiten translation. Our next result relates  $\bar{\kappa}$ -map to the Auslander-Reiten translation for hereditary algebras.

**Theorem C** (Corollary 6.0.3). *Let  $H$  be a hereditary finite dimensional algebra and  $M$  a brick such that  $\mathcal{T}_M$  is functorially finite. Then*

$$\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{T}_M) = \mathcal{T}_{\bar{\tau}^{-1}M}.$$

Here  $\bar{\tau}^{-1}M = \tau^{-1}M$  for non-injective modules  $M$  and  $\bar{\tau}^{-1}I(S) = P(S)$  where  $I(S)$  and  $P(S)$  are the injective envelope and projective cover of the same simple  $S$ .

Our final theorem shows that the  $\bar{\kappa}$ -map on torsion categories is essentially Ringel's  $\epsilon$ -map on the wide subcategories. In [18], Ringel defined a map  $\epsilon : \text{wide } H \rightarrow \text{wide } H$  which generalizes a well-studied automorphism of the noncrossing partition lattice to the setting of wide subcategories.

$$\epsilon(\mathcal{W}) := {}^{\perp_{0,1}}\mathcal{W} \text{ where}$$

$${}^{\perp_{0,1}}\mathcal{W} = \{X \in \text{mod } H : \text{Ext}_H^1(X, M) = 0 = \text{Hom}_H(X, M), \forall M \in \mathcal{W}\}.$$

For the relation between wide subcategories and torsion classes, we use  $\alpha : \text{tors } H \rightarrow \text{wide } H$  which is defined as

$$\alpha(\mathcal{T}) := \{X \in \mathcal{T} : \forall (g : Y \rightarrow X) \in \mathcal{T}, \ker(g) \in \mathcal{T}\}.$$

**Theorem D** (Theorem 5.4.1). *Let  $H$  be a finite dimensional hereditary algebra. Let  $\alpha$  and  $\epsilon$  be defined as above. Then the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{tors}_0 H & \xrightarrow{\bar{\kappa}} & \text{tors } H \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \text{wide } H & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & \text{wide } H. \end{array}$$

**Remark 1.0.5.** The dynamics of the  $\bar{\kappa}$ -map have been studied in [20, 21] in the special case when  $L$  is finite, semidistributive and *extremal*. Such lattices are also called *trim*. When  $\Lambda$  has finite-representation type and no cycles, then  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  is extremal. In this setting, it was shown that  $\bar{\kappa}$  can be factored as a composition of local moves called “flips”. See [20, Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.5].

**Remark 1.0.6.** Let  $W$  be a finite Weyl group. When  $H$  is hereditary and of Dynkin type  $W$ , then the lattice of wide subcategories is isomorphic to the *non-crossing partition lattice*  $\text{NW}(W)$  [10, 11, 18]. Under this isomorphism, the inverse of Ringel's map  $\epsilon$  (called  $\delta$  in [18]) is equal to a classical lattice automorphism known as the *Kreweras complement*, which we write here as  $\text{Kr} : \text{NW}(W) \rightarrow \text{NW}(W)$ . Theorem D implies that  $\bar{\kappa}^{-1}$  is essentially equal to  $\text{Kr}$ . The combinatorics of the Kreweras complement are well-studied. For example,  $\text{Kr}^{2h}$  is equal to the identity, where  $h$  is the *Coxeter number* of  $W$ . For any orbit  $\mathcal{O}$  we have

$$(1.1) \quad \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}|} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{O}} |P| = r/2$$

where  $|P|$  is the number parts in  $P$ , and  $r$  is the number of simples in  $\Lambda$ .

When  $\Lambda$  is  $\tau$ -tilting finite, we have an analogue of Formula 1.1 in terms of  $\bar{\kappa}$ .

**Theorem E.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be  $\tau$ -tilting finite, and let  $r$  be the number of simples in  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ . For any  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors } \Lambda$  let  $|\mathcal{T}|$  denote the number of canonical joinands of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then for any  $\bar{\kappa}$ -orbit  $\mathcal{O}$  we have*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}|} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{O}} |\mathcal{T}| = r/2$$

The paper is organized in the following way: In Section 2 we review torsion classes, and a useful labeling of the cover relations in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  by *minimal extending modules*. In Section 3 we review the necessary lattice-theoretic background. In Section 4 we explicitly compute  $\kappa$  and  $\bar{\kappa}$ . In Section 5, we prove our main results relating  $\kappa$  to wide subcategories. Finally, in Section 6 we relate  $\bar{\kappa}$  to Auslander-Reiten translation.

## 2. TORSION CLASSES BACKGROUND

**2.1. Torsion pairs.** In this section we recall the definition of a torsion pair. Throughout the section  $\Lambda$  is a finite dimensional algebra. Denote by  $\text{mod } \Lambda$  the category of finitely generated modules over  $\Lambda$ .

**Definition 2.1.1.** *A pair  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$  of full subcategories of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$  is a torsion pair if each of the following holds:*

- (1)  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N) = 0$  for all  $M \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $N \in \mathcal{F}$ .
- (2)  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, -)|_{\mathcal{F}} = 0$  implies that  $M \in \mathcal{T}$ .
- (3)  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(-, N)|_{\mathcal{T}} = 0$  implies that  $N \in \mathcal{F}$ .

A full subcategory  $\mathcal{T}$  is a torsion class if and only if  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{T}^\perp)$  is a torsion pair [3, Proposition V.I.1.4].

For each torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$  and each module  $M \in \text{mod } \Lambda$  there is a canonical short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow tM \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/tM \rightarrow 0$$

such that  $tM \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $M/tM \in \mathcal{F}$  [3, Definition V.I.1.3]. We will use this fact in Section 5.1 to make an important connection to the wide subcategories of  $\Lambda$ .

Throughout the paper, we study the lattice (poset) of torsion classes also denoted  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  in which  $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{T}$  whenever  $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ . More details are given in Section 3.

**2.2. Minimal inclusions of torsion classes.** In this section we consider minimal inclusions of torsion classes. Each minimal inclusion is a cover relation or an edge in the Hasse diagram for the poset  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ . We also review a certain labeling of these edges by brick modules introduced independently in [2, 5, 7].

**Definition 2.2.1.** [5, Definition 1.0.1] *A module  $M$  is a **minimal extending module for  $\mathcal{T}$**  if it satisfies the following three properties:*

- (P1) *Every proper factor of  $M$  is in  $\mathcal{T}$ ;*
- (P2) *If  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow X \rightarrow T \rightarrow 0$  is a non-split exact sequence with  $T \in \mathcal{T}$ , then  $X \in \mathcal{T}$ ;*
- (P3)  $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{T}, M) = 0$ .

Denote by  $\text{ME}(\mathcal{T})$  the set of isoclasses of minimal extending modules of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Minimal extending modules arise in studying the minimal inclusions of torsion classes. We say that  $\mathcal{S}$  *covers*  $\mathcal{T}$ , denoted by  $\mathcal{S} \succ \mathcal{T}$ , if  $\mathcal{T} \subsetneq \mathcal{S}$  and there is no torsion class  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that  $\mathcal{T} \subsetneq \mathcal{Y} \subsetneq \mathcal{S}$ . Each pair  $\mathcal{S} \succ \mathcal{T}$  is a *cover relation*. (See




FIGURE 1. We label edges of the lattice  $\text{tors } A_2$  (of the hereditary algebra  $kA_2$  where  $A_2 = (1 \rightarrow 2)$ ) with the corresponding minimal extending modules.

Definition 3.3.2.) For any cover relation  $\mathcal{S} \succ \mathcal{T}$ , there is a unique minimal extending module  $M$  such that  $\mathcal{S}$  is the closure of  $\mathcal{T} \cup \{M\}$  taking iterative extensions.

For any set  $\mathcal{M}$  of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ , we write  $\text{Filt } \mathcal{M}$  for the set of modules  $M$  such that there is a sequence of submodules  $0 = M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_l = M$  and the quotients  $M_{i+1}/M_i \in \text{ind } \mathcal{M}$  for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, l-1\}$ .

**Theorem 2.2.2.** [5, Theorem 1.0.2] *Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a torsion class over  $\Lambda$  and let  $[M]$  be the isoclass of the module  $M$ . The map*

$$\eta_{\mathcal{T}} : [M] \mapsto \text{Filt}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{M\})$$

*defines a set bijection  $\eta_{\mathcal{T}} : \{\text{ME}(\mathcal{T})\} \longleftrightarrow \{\mathcal{S} \in \text{tors } \Lambda \mid \mathcal{S} \succ \mathcal{T}\}$ .*

**Remark 2.2.3.** The reason that  $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{M\})$  is a torsion class, when  $M$  is a minimal extending module for  $\mathcal{T}$ , is because each proper factor of  $M$  belongs to  $\mathcal{T}$ . See [5, Lemma 2.3].

A module  $M$  is a minimal extending module for some torsion class if and only if it is a brick [5, Theorem 1.0.3]. We often visualize the minimal extending modules as labeling each of the edges in the poset  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  as in Figure 1.

The notion of minimal extending module for torsion classes can be dualized to minimal co-extending module for torsion-free classes.

**Definition 2.2.4.** [5, Definition 2.3.1] *A module  $M$  is a minimal co-extending module for a torsion-free class  $\mathcal{F}$  if it satisfies the following three properties:*

- (P1') *Every proper submodule of  $M$  is in  $\mathcal{F}$ ;*
- (P2') *If  $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow X \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  is a non-split exact sequence with  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ , then  $X \in \mathcal{F}$ ;*
- (P3')  $\text{Hom}(M, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ .

We omit the dual statement of Theorem 2.2.2 for minimal co-extending modules. It can be obtained easily from the following correspondence between minimal extending and co-extending modules. Note that  $\mathcal{S} \succ \mathcal{T}$  in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  if and only if  $\mathcal{T}^\perp \succ \mathcal{S}^\perp$  in  $\text{torf } \Lambda$ .

**Proposition 2.2.5.** [5, Proposition 2.3.3] *Suppose that  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors } \Lambda$  and  $M$  is an indecomposable  $\Lambda$  module such that  $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{M\})$  is a torsion class. Then  $M$  is a minimal extending module for the torsion class  $\mathcal{T}$  if and only if it is a minimal co-extending module for the torsion-free class  $\text{Filt}(\mathcal{T} \cup \{M\})^\perp$ .*

**Remark 2.2.6.** Property (P3') implies that if  $M$  is a minimal coextending module for the torsion-free class  $\mathcal{T}^\perp$ , then  $M \in \mathcal{T}$ .

### 3. LATTICE BACKGROUND

In this section we fill in the necessary background material on lattices. We recall basic definitions, examples, computations and facts about: complete semidistributive lattices, canonical join and meet representations, completely join-irreducible and meet-irreducible elements.

**3.1. Complete Semidistributive Lattices.** Recall that a lattice (or lattice-poset) is a poset in which each pair of elements has a unique smallest upper bound  $\bigvee$  (called the join) and a unique greatest lower bound  $\bigwedge$  (called the meet). A lattice  $L$  is *complete* if the elements  $\bigvee A$  and  $\bigwedge A$  exist for any (possibly infinite) set  $A \subseteq L$ . In particular,  $\bigvee L$  and  $\bigwedge L$  exist. Therefore a complete lattice  $L$  has a unique greatest element  $\hat{1}$  and a unique smallest element  $\hat{0}$ . An example of a lattice which is not complete is the Divisibility Poset (see Example 3.1.2).

**Definition 3.1.1.** A lattice (lattice-poset)  $L$  is called *join-semidistributive* if it satisfies  $SD_\vee$  for every triple  $x, y, z$  in  $L$ . Dually, a lattice is *meet-semidistributive* if it satisfies  $SD_\wedge$  for every  $x, y, z$  in  $L$ . We say that  $L$  is *semidistributive* if for each  $x, y, z \in L$ , both  $SD_\vee$  and  $SD_\wedge$  are true.

$$(SD_\vee) \quad \text{If } x \vee y = x \vee z, \text{ then } x \vee (y \wedge z) = x \vee y$$

$$(SD_\wedge) \quad \text{If } x \wedge y = x \wedge z, \text{ then } x \wedge (y \vee z) = x \wedge y$$

**Example 3.1.2.** Let  $L$  be the Divisibility Poset, whose elements are the positive integers  $\mathbb{N}$  ordered  $x < y$  whenever  $x|y$ . Observe that  $x \vee y = \text{lcm}(x, y)$  and  $x \wedge y = \text{gcd}(x, y)$ . However,  $L$  is *not* complete. Indeed there is no largest element  $\hat{1}$ . Observe that the join and meet operations distribute:  $x \vee (y \wedge z) = (x \vee y) \wedge (x \vee z)$  and  $x \wedge (y \vee z) = (x \wedge y) \vee (x \wedge z)$  for all  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}$ . Therefore  $L$  is semidistributive but not complete.




FIGURE 2. The lattice of torsion classes (left), and the lattice of wide subcategories (right) for a type  $A_2$  hereditary algebra  $1 \rightarrow 2$ .

**Example 3.1.3.** We check  $SD_\vee$  in a small example for the lattice of torsion classes shown left in Figure 2. Take  $x = \text{add}(S_2)$ ,  $y = \text{add}(S_1)$  and  $z = \text{add}(S_1, P_1)$ . Observe that  $x \vee y = \text{add}(S_2) \vee \text{add}(S_1) = \text{add}(S_2) \vee \text{add}(S_1, P_1) = x \vee z$ . Also,  $y \wedge z = \text{add}(S_1) \wedge \text{add}(S_1, P_1) = \text{add}(S_1) \cap \text{add}(S_1, P_1) = \text{add}(S_1)$ . Therefore,

$x \vee [y \wedge z] = \text{add}(S_2) \vee [\text{add}(S_1) \wedge \text{add}(S_1, P_1)] = \text{add}(S_2) \vee \text{add}(S_1) = x \vee y$ . One can check that this lattice is indeed semidistributive.

On the other hand, the lattice of wide subcategories shown to the right is not semidistributive. Note that  $\text{add}(S_2) \vee \text{add}(S_1) = \text{add}(S_2) \vee \text{add}(P_1)$ . However  $\text{add}(P_1) \wedge \text{add}(S_1) = 0$ , so the lattice fails  $SD_\vee$ .

**Example 3.1.4.** We display an example of the lattice of torsion classes for the path algebra of the Kronecker quiver with vertices  $Q_0 = \{1, 2\}$  and arrows  $Q_1 = \{\alpha, \beta\}$ :

$$Q = (2 \cdot \xrightarrow[\beta]{\alpha} \cdot 1)$$




FIGURE 3. The lattice of torsion classes for the path algebra of Kronecker quiver. Here  $\mathcal{I}$  stands for preinjective modules and  $\mathcal{R}$  for regular modules.

The lattice of torsion classes for the Kronecker quiver from Figure 3 is an example of an infinite complete semidistributive lattice. It is well-known that for any finite dimensional algebra  $\Lambda$ ,  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  is a complete semidistributive lattice [7, 9] with meet  $\mathcal{T} \wedge \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{S}$  and join  $\mathcal{T} \vee \mathcal{S} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{T} \cup \mathcal{S})$ .

**Remark 3.1.5.** Suppose that  $\mathcal{T}$  and  $\mathcal{S}$  are torsion classes. Observe that  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{S}$  if and only if  $\mathcal{S}^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{T}^\perp$ . We write  $\text{torf } \Lambda$  for the lattice of torsion-free classes ordered by containment. It follows immediately that the lattices  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  and  $\text{torf } \Lambda$  are anti-isomorphic.



**3.2. Canonical Join and Meet Representations: CJR and CMR.** Here we review the definition of join representations, canonical join representations, and we make the connection to semidistributivity.

A join representation of an element  $x \in L$  is an expression  $\bigvee A = x$ . We say that the join representation is *irredundant* provided that  $\bigvee A' < x$  for each proper subset of  $A$ . We partially order the set of irredundant join representations of  $x$  as follows: Say that  $\bigvee A$  is “lower” than  $\bigvee B$  provided that for each  $a \in A$  there is some element  $b \in B$  such that  $a \leq b$ .

**Definition 3.2.1.** *The canonical join representation of  $x$ , denoted by  $\text{CJR}(x)$  is the unique lowest irredundant join representation among all irredundant join representations of  $x$ , when such a join representation exists.*

*By convention we set  $\text{CJR}(\hat{0}) = \bigvee \emptyset$  to be the empty join. The canonical meet representation is defined dually, and denoted  $\text{CMR}(x)$ .*

**Theorem 3.2.2.** [8, Theorem 2.24] *Suppose that  $L$  is a finite lattice. Then  $L$  satisfies  $SD_{\vee}$  (join semi-distributive law) if and only if each element in  $L$  has a canonical join representation. Dually,  $L$  satisfies  $SD_{\wedge}$  (meet semi-distributive law) if and only if each element in  $L$  has a canonical meet representation.*

**Example 3.2.3.** Let  $L$  be the divisibility poset as in Example 3.1.2. The canonical join representation coincides with primary decomposition:

$$x = \text{CJR}(x) = \bigvee \{p^d : p \text{ is prime and } p^d \text{ is the largest power of } p \text{ dividing } x\}.$$

**Example 3.2.4.** Let us compute the canonical join representation of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$  in the lattice of torsion classes from Example 3.1.3 and shown in Figure 1. Observe that both  $\text{add}(S_1, P_1) \vee \text{add}(S_2) = \text{mod } \Lambda = \text{add}(S_1) \vee \text{add}(S_2)$  are join representations for  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ . However the torsion class  $\text{add}(S_1)$  is “lower” than  $\text{add}(S_1, P_1)$ . Therefore  $\text{add}(S_1) \vee \text{add}(S_2)$  is the canonical join representation for  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ .

In the lattice of wide subcategories, as in Figure 2, the canonical join representation of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$  does not exist because there is not a *unique* lowest join representation.

The next result connects minimal extending modules to canonical join representations in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ .

**Proposition 3.2.5.** [5, Theorem 1.08 and Lemma 3.2.4] *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra and  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors } \Lambda$ . Assume that  $\mathcal{T}$  has canonical join representation*

$$\text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} \text{Filt}(\text{Gen}(M_{\alpha})).$$

*Then for each  $\alpha \in A$ , there is a torsion class  $\mathcal{Y}_{\alpha} < \mathcal{T}$  such that  $M_{\alpha}$  is the minimal extending module for this cover relation.*

**Remark 3.2.6.** When  $L$  is an infinite semidistributive lattice, the canonical join representation or the canonical meet representation may not exist, even when  $L$  is additionally a complete lattice. For example, consider the lattice depicted in Figure 4. Each dashed line in the figure represents an infinite chain of elements, none of which cover  $\hat{0}$  nor are covered by  $\hat{1}$ . Observe that  $L$  is both complete and semidistributive, however the canonical join representation of the top element of  $L$  does not exist and the canonical meet representation for the bottom element does not exist.



FIGURE 4. An infinite complete semidistributive lattice. Each dashed line represents an infinite chain in  $L$ .

### 3.3. Completely Join and Meet-Irreducible Elements CJI and CMI.

**Definition 3.3.1.** An element  $j \in L$  is join-irreducible if whenever  $j = \bigvee A$  and  $A$  is **finite** then  $j \in A$ . We say that  $j \in L$  is *completely join-irreducible* if whenever  $j = \bigvee A$  then  $j \in A$ . Completely meet-irreducible elements are defined dually. By convention, we set the empty join to be  $\hat{0}$ , and hence  $\hat{0}$  is not join-irreducible or completely join-irreducible. Similarly,  $\hat{1}$  is not meet-irreducible or completely meet-irreducible.

**Definition 3.3.2.** An element  $y$  *covers*  $x$  if  $y > x$  and there is no  $z$  such that  $y > z > x$ . In this case we also say that  $x$  is *covered by*  $y$ , and we use the notation  $y \succ x$ . The pair  $(x, y)$  is called a *cover relation*.

**Remark 3.3.3.** Notice that an element  $j$  is completely join-irreducible if it covers precisely one element which we write as  $j_*$ .

We write  $\text{CJI}(L)$  (respectively  $\text{CMI}(L)$ ) for the set of completely join-irreducible elements of  $L$  (completely meet-irreducible elements of  $L$ ).

**Example 3.3.4.** Let  $L$  be the divisibility poset as in Example 3.1.2. An element  $x$  is completely join-irreducible if and only if  $x = p^n$  where  $p$  is prime and  $n$  is a positive integer. Note that if  $p$  is prime then  $px \succ x$ . Therefore, none of the elements of  $L$  are completely meet-irreducible (because each positive integer is covered by infinitely many elements).

**Example 3.3.5.** Consider the lattice of torsion classes for hereditary algebra of type  $A_2$  shown in Figure 1. Observe that  $\text{add}(S_1), \text{add}(S_2)$  and  $\text{add}(S_1, P_1)$  are all join-irreducible and completely join-irreducible.

**Example 3.3.6.** Consider the lattice of torsion classes for the Kronecker quiver shown in Figure 3. In the figure,  $\mathcal{I}$  denotes the subcategory of all preinjective modules. Observe that  $\mathcal{I}$  is join-irreducible but it is not completely join-irreducible.

**Proposition 3.3.7.** (a) Let  $\text{CJR}(x) = \bigvee A$  be the canonical join representation of  $x$ . Then every  $a \in A$  is join-irreducible.  
 (b) Let  $L$  be a finite lattice. Let  $\text{CJR}(x) = \bigvee A$  be the canonical join representation of  $x$ . Then every  $a \in A$  is completely join-irreducible.

*Proof.* Suppose there is some  $a \in A$  that is not join-irreducible. Then  $a = \bigvee A'$ , where  $A' = \{a'_1, a'_2, \dots, a'_n\}$  is finite. Thus  $x = \bigvee (A \setminus \{a\}) \cup A'$  is a lower join representation. We now create an irredundant lower join representation of  $x$ .

First, observe that for any  $b \in A \setminus \{a\}$  we have  $\bigvee (A \setminus \{a, b\}) \cup A' < x$  as shown below:

$$\begin{aligned} \bigvee (A \setminus \{a, b\}) \cup A' &= \bigvee (A \setminus \{a, b\}) \bigvee A' \\ &= \bigvee (A \setminus \{a, b\}) \vee a \\ &= \bigvee A \setminus \{b\} < x \end{aligned}$$

The last equality and inequality follow from the fact that  $\bigvee A$  is irredundant. Therefore, the only way  $\bigvee (A \setminus \{a\}) \cup A'$  is not irredundant is if there is some other element  $a' \in A'$  such that  $\bigvee (A \setminus \{a\}) \cup (A' \setminus \{a'\}) = x$ . Remove each such element from  $A'$  until  $x = \bigvee A \setminus \{a\} \cup (A' \setminus \{a'_{i_1}, a'_{i_2}, \dots, a'_{i_k}\})$  is irredundant. This is possible because  $A'$  is finite. Thus we obtain an irredundant join representation of  $x$  that is lower than the one we started with.  $\square$

**Remark 3.3.8.**

- (1) However in the canonical join representation  $\text{CJR}(x) = \bigvee A$ ,  $a \in A$  may not be completely join-irreducible. For example, let lattice  $L$  be defined by  $\hat{0} = a_0 < a_1 < \dots < \hat{1}$ , where  $\hat{1}$  is greater than  $a_i$  for all  $i$ , but  $\hat{1}$  does not cover any elements. Then  $\text{CJR}(\hat{1}) = \hat{1}$ . However  $\hat{1}$  is not completely join irreducible since  $\hat{1} = \bigvee \{a_i \mid i \geq 0\}$  and  $\hat{1} \neq a_i$  for all  $i$ .
- (2) Notice, in general, if  $j$  is completely join-irreducible then  $\text{CJR}(j) = \{j\}$ .

We use the following theorem throughout the paper.

**Theorem 3.3.9.** [5, Theorem 3.1.1] *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra. Then:*

- (1) *The map  $\zeta : [M] \mapsto \mathcal{T}_M = \text{FiltGen}(M)$  defines a bijection from the set of isoclasses of bricks over  $\Lambda$  to the set of completely join-irreducible torsion classes  $\text{CJI}(\text{tors } \Lambda)$ .*
- (2) *The map  $\zeta' : [M] \mapsto \text{FiltCogen}(M)$  defines a bijection from the set of isoclasses of bricks over  $\Lambda$  to the set of completely meet-irreducible torsion-free classes  $\text{CMI}(\text{torf } \Lambda)$ .*

**Remark 3.3.10.** Let  $M$  be a brick and let  $(\mathcal{T}_M)_*$  be the unique torsion class covered by  $\mathcal{T}_M$ . It follows from [5, Proposition 2.3.4] that:

- (1)  $M$  is a minimal extending module for the cover relation  $(\mathcal{T}_M)_* < \mathcal{T}_M$ .
- (2) Each proper factor of  $M$  is in  $(\mathcal{T}_M)_*$  by Property (P1), and  $M \in ((\mathcal{T}_M)_*)^\perp$  by Property (P3).

#### 4. KAPPA MAP

**4.1. Definition of Kappa Map.** Before we prove our first main result, we recall the fundamental object of the paper, the  $\kappa$ -map.

**Definition 4.1.1.** *Let  $j$  be a completely join-irreducible element of a lattice  $L$ , and let  $j_*$  be the unique element covered by  $j$ . Define  $\kappa(j)$  to be:*

$$\kappa(j) := \text{unique } \max\{x \in L : j_* \leq x \text{ and } j \not\leq x\}, \text{ when such an element exists.}$$

*Dually, let  $m$  be a completely meet-irreducible element and let  $m_*$  be the unique element covering  $m$ . Define  $\kappa_*(m)$  to be:*

$$\kappa_*(m) := \text{unique } \min\{x \in L : x \leq m_* \text{ and } x \not\leq m\}, \text{ when such an element exists.}$$

**Example 4.1.2.** We evaluate the  $\kappa$  map for the lattice of torsion classes displaced left in Figure 2. First consider  $\kappa(\text{add}(S_2))$ . Note that  $\text{add}(S_2)$  is completely join-irreducible because it covers precisely one element 0. Since  $\text{add}(S_1, P_1)$  is largest torsion class such that  $0 \leq \text{add}(S_1, P_1)$  and  $\text{add}(S_2) \not\leq \text{add}(S_1, P_1)$ , it follows that  $\kappa(\text{add}(S_2)) = \text{add}(S_1, P_1)$ . Similarly  $\kappa(\text{add}(S_1)) = \text{add}(S_2)$  and  $\kappa(\text{add}(S_1, P_1)) = \text{add}(S_1)$ .

On the other hand, the map  $\kappa$  is not well-defined on the lattice of wide subcategories for  $\Lambda$ . If we try to compute  $\kappa(\text{add}(S_1))$  we see that there are two incomparable maximal elements which contain the wide subcategory 0, and do not contain  $\text{add}(S_1)$ . When  $L$  is finite, then it is semidistributive if and only if  $\kappa$  is a bijection from  $\text{CJI}(L)$  to  $\text{CMI}(L)$  with inverse  $\kappa_*$  [8, Corollary 2.55]. Recall, the lattice of wide subcategories of  $\Lambda$  is not semidistributive.

**4.2. The Kappa Map and Minimal Extending Modules.** In this section, we consider arbitrary finite dimensional algebras and prove Theorem A, i.e. the combinatorially defined  $\kappa$ -map (Definition 4.1.1), when restricted to completely join-irreducible torsion classes, has a very nice representation theoretic interpretation as the left Hom-orthogonal operation.

We begin with a useful lemma relating minimal extending modules and naturally associated torsion classes obtained by taking Hom-orthogonal subcategories. Recall that  $\text{ME}(\mathcal{T})$  is the set of isoclasses of minimal extending modules of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

**Lemma 4.2.1.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra and  $M$  be a brick. Then*

- (1)  ${}^\perp M$  is a torsion class.
- (2)  $({}^\perp M)^\perp = \text{Filt Cogen } M$ .
- (3)  $\text{ME}({}^\perp M) = \{M\}$ .

*Proof.* (1) It is clear that  ${}^\perp M$  is closed under quotients and extensions. Therefore it is a torsion class.

(2) Since  $M \in ({}^\perp M)^\perp$  and  $({}^\perp M)^\perp$  is a torsion free class, it follows that  $\text{Filt Cogen } M \subseteq ({}^\perp M)^\perp$ . On the other hand, since  $M \in \text{Filt Cogen } M$ , it follows that  ${}^\perp M \supseteq {}^\perp \text{Filt Cogen } M$  and hence  $({}^\perp M)^\perp \subseteq ({}^\perp \text{Filt Cogen } M)^\perp = \text{Filt Cogen } M$ , where the last equality holds because  $\text{Filt Cogen } M$  is a torsion free class.

(3) By the Theorem 3.3.9(2),  $\text{Filt Cogen}(M)$  is a completely join-irreducible torsion-free class. Hence, by Proposition 2.2.5,  $M$  is the unique minimal extending module for  ${}^\perp M$ .  $\square$

**4.3. Kappa map and Proof of Theorem A.** We are now prepared to prove Theorem A, which we restate below.

**Theorem 4.3.1** (Theorem A). *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra,  $M$  a  $\Lambda$ -brick and  $\mathcal{T}_M = \text{Filt}(\text{Gen}(M))$  the completely join-irreducible torsion class. Then*

$$\kappa(\mathcal{T}_M) = {}^\perp M.$$

*Moreover,  $\kappa : \text{CJI}(\text{tors } \Lambda) \rightarrow \text{CMI}(\text{tors } \Lambda)$  is a bijection between the completely join-irreducible and completely meet irreducible torsion classes.*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a brick. Part 3 of Lemma 4.2.1 implies that  ${}^\perp M$  is completely meet irreducible. Observe that  $M \notin {}^\perp M$  so  $\mathcal{T}_M \not\leq {}^\perp M$ . Let  $(\mathcal{T}_M)_*$  denote the unique element covered by  $\mathcal{T}_M$ . We claim that  $(\mathcal{T}_M)_* \leq {}^\perp M$ . Recall from Remark 3.3.10,  $M \in ((\mathcal{T}_M)_*)^\perp$ . Since  $\text{Filt Cogen } M$  is the smallest torsion-free class

containing  $M$ , we have  $\text{Filt Cogen } M = ({}^\perp M)^\perp \leq ((\mathcal{T}_M)_*)^\perp$ . Applying the lattice anti-isomorphism  ${}^\perp(-) : \text{torf } \Lambda \rightarrow \text{tors } \Lambda$ , we get  $(\mathcal{T}_M)_* \leq {}^\perp M$ . This proves our claim.

Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be any torsion class satisfying

- $(\mathcal{T}_M)_* \leq \mathcal{S}$  and
- $\mathcal{T}_M \not\leq \mathcal{S}$ .

We claim that  $\mathcal{S} \leq {}^\perp M$ . The first item implies that every proper factor of  $M$  is in  $\mathcal{S}$  (because every proper factor of  $M$  is in  $(\mathcal{T}_M)_*$ ; see Remark 3.3.10). The second item implies that  $M \notin \mathcal{S}$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is closed under extensions, we conclude that  $M \in \mathcal{S}^\perp$ . Therefore  $\text{Filt Cogen } M \leq \mathcal{S}^\perp$ . As in the previous paragraph, we conclude that  $\mathcal{S} \leq {}^\perp M$ . Therefore  $\kappa(\mathcal{T}_M) = {}^\perp M$ .

It is clear that  $\kappa$  is one-to-one. Part 2 of Lemma 4.2.1 implies that each completely meet-irreducible torsion class is  ${}^\perp M$  for some brick  $M$ . Therefore  $\kappa$  is also surjective.  $\square$

**4.4. Extension of Kappa Map.** We now recall the definition of  $\bar{\kappa}$  map from 1.0.3

**Definition 4.4.1.** *Let  $L$  be a (possibly infinite) semidistributive lattice. Let  $x$  be an element which has a canonical join representation such that  $\kappa(j)$  is defined for each  $j \in \text{CJR}(x)$  and that  $\bigwedge \{\kappa(j) : j \in \text{CJR}(x)\}$  exists. Define*

$$\bar{\kappa}(x) = \bigwedge \{\kappa(j) : j \in \text{CJR}(x)\}.$$

**Example 4.4.2.** Let  $\Lambda$  be the hereditary algebra of type  $A_2$  from Examples 4.1.2, and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\kappa}(\text{mod } \Lambda) &= \bigwedge \{\kappa(\text{add}(S_1)), \kappa(\text{add}(S_2))\} \\ &= \bigwedge \{\text{add}(S_2), \text{add}(S_1, P_1)\} \\ &= \text{add}(P_1, S_1) \cap \text{add}(S_2) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

**Corollary 4.4.3.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra, and let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a torsion class with canonical join representation  $\bigvee_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{T}_{M_\alpha}$ , where  $\{M_\alpha\}$  is a set of bricks. Then:*

$$\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigcap_{\alpha \in A} {}^\perp M_\alpha.$$

Note that the minimal extending modules of  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})$  are precisely bricks  $M_\alpha$  appearing in the canonical join representation of  $\mathcal{T}$ . We restate this result in terms of Hom-orthogonal bricks using the following theorem.

**Theorem 4.4.4.** [5, Theorem 1.0.8] *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra, and suppose that  $\mathcal{E}$  is a collection of bricks over  $\Lambda$ . Then  $\bigvee \{\mathcal{T}_M : M \in \mathcal{E}\}$  is a canonical join representation of some torsion class if and only if  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, M') = \text{Hom}_\Lambda(M', M) = 0$  for each pair  $M, M' \in \mathcal{E}$ .*

**Proposition 4.4.5.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an artin algebra and  $\{M_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$  be Hom-orthogonal bricks.*

- (1)  $\bigcap_{\alpha \in A} {}^\perp M_\alpha$  is a torsion class.
- (2)  $(\bigcap_{\alpha \in A} {}^\perp M_\alpha)^\perp = \bigvee \text{Filt Cogen } M_i$ .
- (3)  $\text{ME}(\bigcap_{\alpha \in A} {}^\perp M_\alpha) = \{M_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in A}$ .

*Proof.* (1) follows from the fact that intersection of torsion classes is a torsion class. (2) Since  $(-)^{\perp} : \text{tors } \Lambda \rightarrow \text{torf } \Lambda$  is a lattice anti-isomorphism,  $(\bigcap^{\perp} M_{\alpha})^{\perp} = \bigvee (\bigcap^{\perp} M_{\alpha})^{\perp} = \bigvee \text{Filt Cogen } M_{\alpha}$ . (3) follows from (2).  $\square$

**Remark 4.4.6.** Proposition 4.4.5 implies that  $\bar{\kappa}$  can be computed directly from the labeling of the cover relations in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  by minimal extending modules. If  $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in A}$  label the lower cover relations for a torsion class  $\mathcal{T}$ , then  $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in A}$  is precisely the set of minimal extending modules labeling the upper cover relations of  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})$ .

**Remark 4.4.7.** For an infinite semidistributive lattice  $L$ ,  $\bar{\kappa}$  is not necessarily defined for all elements  $x \in L$ . The existence of  $\bar{\kappa}(x)$  depends on: (1) the existence of  $\text{CJR}(x)$ ; (2) every element  $j \in \text{CJR}(x)$  being completely join-irreducible; (3) the existence of  $\kappa(j)$  for each element  $j \in \text{CJR}(x)$ ; (4) the existence of the meet  $\bigwedge \{\kappa(j) : j \in \text{CJR}(x)\}$ .

We will use the following two subclasses of  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ , for the purpose of defining  $\bar{\kappa}$  and also for the purpose of relating torsion classes to wide subcategories of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ .

**Definition 4.4.8.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra.

Let  $\text{f-tors}(\Lambda)$  be the set of functorially finite torsion classes over  $\Lambda$ .

Let  $\text{tors}_0(\Lambda)$  denote the set of torsion classes  $\mathcal{T}$  such such that  $\text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{\alpha \in A} \mathcal{T}_{M_{\alpha}}$  where  $\{M_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha \in A}$  is a set of bricks.

Since  $\kappa$  is defined for completely join-irreducible elements—and these are exactly the torsion classes  $\mathcal{T}_M$  where  $M$  is a brick—and since torsion classes are closed under arbitrary intersections, the set  $\text{tors}_0(\Lambda)$  consists of exactly all the torsion classes  $\mathcal{T}$  such that  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})$  exists.

We have the following inclusions of sets:

**Proposition 4.4.9.** Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra. There are inclusions:

$$\text{f-tors}(\Lambda) \subseteq \text{tors}_0(\Lambda) \subseteq \{\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors}(\Lambda) \mid \text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) \text{ exists}\} \subseteq \text{tors}(\Lambda).$$

*Proof.* We only need to prove the first inclusion. Let  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{f-tors}(\Lambda)$ , i.e. let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a functorially finite torsion class. For the entire proof we will use the fact that there is a bijection between functorially finite torsion classes  $\text{f-tors}(\Lambda)$  and support  $\tau$ -tilting modules (see [1, Theorem 2.7]). Next (see [1, Theorem 2.33]) implies that all covering relations  $\mathcal{T} > \mathcal{T}_i$  correspond to mutations of support  $\tau$ -tilting modules. The fact that for each  $\tau$ -tilting module, there are only finitely many mutations, implies that there are only finitely many functorially finite  $\mathcal{T}_i$  such that  $\mathcal{T} > \mathcal{T}_i$ . Now Theorem 2.2.2 says that for each cover relation  $\mathcal{T}_i < \mathcal{T}$ , there is a unique minimal extending module  $M_i$  such that  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Filt}(\mathcal{T}_i \cup M_i)$ . (Alternatively,  $M_i$  is a minimal co-extending module for the torsion-free class  $\mathcal{T}^{\perp}$ .) It follows from [6, Theorem 1.3] that if  $\mathcal{S} < \mathcal{T}$  in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ , there exists some  $i$  such that  $\mathcal{S} \leq \mathcal{T}_i$ . This is exactly the hypothesis of [5, Corollary 3.2.6], which says that  $\bigvee_{i \in I} \mathcal{T}_{M_i}$  is the canonical join representation of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Therefore  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors}_0(\Lambda)$   $\square$

**Remark 4.4.10.** There exist  $\Lambda$  such that the first two inclusions are proper (see Example 4.4.11). It is still an open question if the last containment above can be made proper.

**Example 4.4.11.** Let  $\Lambda = kQ$  where  $Q$  is the Kronecker quiver from Figure 3. Denote by  $\mathcal{R}$  and  $\mathcal{I}$  the subcategory of regular modules and preinjective modules

respectively. Denote by  $\{R_\lambda\}$  the regular module

$$k \xrightarrow{\begin{smallmatrix} [n] \\ [m] \end{smallmatrix}} k$$

where  $(m : n) = \lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1(k)$ . Consider the torsion class  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I}$ . It has a canonical join representation  $\bigvee_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^1(k)} \{\mathcal{T}_{R_\lambda}\}$  and hence  $\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I} \in \text{tors}_0(\Lambda) \setminus \text{f-tors}(\Lambda)$ . On the other

hand, consider the torsion class  $\mathcal{I}$ . It has a canonical join representation which is  $\bigvee \{\mathcal{I}\}$  (join of itself). Note that  $\mathcal{I}$  is join irreducible but not completely join irreducible. Therefore  $\mathcal{I} \in \{\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors}(\Lambda) \mid \text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) \text{ exists}\} \setminus \text{tors}_0(\Lambda)$ . One can check that  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{I} \cup \mathcal{R}) = \mathcal{I}$ . However, since  $\mathcal{I}$  is not completely join-irreducible,  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{I})$  is not defined. Hence  $\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{R} \cup \mathcal{I})$  is not defined.

## 5. PROOF OF THEOREM D

In this section, we first recall some facts about wide subcategories. Then we prove Theorem D as Theorem 5.4.1 in subsection 5.4.

**5.1. Wide Subcategories.** In this section we recall the definition of a wide subcategory, and introduce two important maps between wide  $\Lambda$  and  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ . The main result is Proposition 5.2.1 which relates the simple objects of a wide subcategory and minimal (co)extending modules of an associated torsion class.

Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an abelian category. A subcategory  $\mathcal{D}$  is an *abelian subcategory* of  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $\mathcal{D}$  is abelian and the embedding functor  $i : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  is exact. An abelian subcategory  $\mathcal{W}$  of  $\mathcal{A}$  is called *wide* if  $\mathcal{W}$  is closed under extensions. It is well-known that the following are equivalent:

- (1)  $\mathcal{W}$  is a wide subcategory.
- (2)  $\mathcal{W}$  is closed under extensions, kernels and cokernels.
- (3)  $\mathcal{W}$  satisfies the two-of-three property. i.e. Let  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence in  $\mathcal{A}$ . If two of three objects  $A, B, C$  belong to  $\mathcal{W}$ , then so does the third one.

**Remark 5.1.1.** Wide subcategories are also referred to as *thick subcategories*.

The relation between wide subcategories and torsion classes is studied in [14]. Let  $\Lambda$  be an artin algebra. Denote by  $\text{wide } \Lambda$  the class of wide subcategories of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ . We define maps between  $\text{wide } \Lambda$  and  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  as in [14]:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha : \text{tors } \Lambda &\rightarrow \text{wide } \Lambda \\ \mathcal{T} &\mapsto \{X \in \mathcal{T} : \forall (g : Y \rightarrow X) \in \mathcal{T}, \ker(g) \in \mathcal{T}\} \\ \beta : \text{wide } \Lambda &\rightarrow \text{tors } \Lambda \\ \mathcal{W} &\mapsto \mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{W}} = \text{Filt}(\text{Gen}(\mathcal{W})). \end{aligned}$$

Dually, one can define maps:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha' : \text{torf}(\Lambda) &\rightarrow \text{wide } \Lambda \\ \mathcal{F} &\mapsto \{X \in \mathcal{F} : \forall (g : X \rightarrow Y) \in \mathcal{F}, \text{Coker}(g) \in \mathcal{F}\} \\ \beta' : \text{wide } \Lambda &\rightarrow \text{torf}(\Lambda) \\ \mathcal{W} &\mapsto \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{W}} = \text{Filt}(\text{Cogen}(\mathcal{W})). \end{aligned}$$

**Proposition 5.1.2.** [14, Proposition 3.3] *Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a wide subcategory in  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ . Then  $\alpha\beta(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{W}$  and  $\alpha'\beta'(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{W}$ .*

For a general algebra  $\Lambda$ , the maps  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are *not* mutually inverse bijections. By restricting the domain of  $\alpha$  to functorially finite torsion classes  $\text{f-tors } \Lambda$  and the domain of  $\beta$  to certain special subset of  $\text{f-wide } \Lambda$ , where  $\text{f-wide } \Lambda$  denotes functorially finite wide subcategories, Marks and Šťovíček obtain a bijection.

**Proposition 5.1.3.** [14, Theorem 3.10] *Let  $\Lambda$  be an artin algebra. Then  $\alpha$  yields a bijective correspondence between*

- (1) *functorially finite torsion classes*
- (2) *functorially finite wide subcategories  $\mathcal{W}$  such that  $\beta(\mathcal{W})$  is functorially finite.*

For an arbitrary artin algebra  $\Lambda$ , there are injections (but not inclusions) of the following sets:

$$\text{f-tors } \Lambda \xrightarrow{\alpha} \text{f-wide } \Lambda \hookrightarrow \text{wide } \Lambda \xrightarrow{\beta} \text{tors } \Lambda.$$

There are situations where all these can be proper injections (see [14, 3.4, 4.7]). We further study these injections by restricting to  $\tau$ -tilting finite algebras and to hereditary algebras.

**Corollary 5.1.4.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a  $\tau$ -tilting finite algebra. Then the map  $\alpha : \text{f-tors } \Lambda \rightarrow \text{f-wide } \Lambda$  is a bijection.*

*Proof.* When  $\Lambda$  is a  $\tau$ -tilting finite algebra,  $\text{f-tors } \Lambda = \text{tors } \Lambda$  is a finite set. So the composition of three injections above is an injection of a finite set to itself. Hence  $\alpha$  is bijective.  $\square$

The next Theorem, due to Ingalls-Thomas, will be useful in our proof of Theorem D.

**Theorem 5.1.5.** [11, Corollary 2.17] *Let  $H$  be a hereditary artin algebra. Then  $\alpha : \text{f-tors } H \rightarrow \text{f-wide } H$  is a bijection.*

**Remark 5.1.6.** The result in [11] stated as  $\alpha$  is a bijection between *finitely generated* torsion classes and *finitely generated* wide subcategories. We need to justify the equivalence of terminologies here.

Recall that a torsion class  $\mathcal{T}$  is called *finitely generated* if  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Gen}(M)$  for some finitely generated module  $M$ . A wide subcategory  $\mathcal{W}$  is called *finitely generated* if it is finitely generated as an abelian category. Finitely generated wide subcategories are also called *exceptional subcategories* in [18, §2.2.2].

It is well known that a torsion class is finitely generated if and only if it is functorially finite. We claim that for a hereditary algebra  $H$ , finitely generated wide subcategories are exactly functorially finite wide subcategories. In fact, if  $\mathcal{W} \in \text{wide } H$  is finitely generated, then  $\beta(\mathcal{W}) = \text{Gen } \mathcal{W}$  [11, 2.13] is a finitely generated torsion class. Hence by Proposition 5.1.3,  $\mathcal{W} = \alpha\beta(\mathcal{W})$  is functorially finite. Conversely, if  $\mathcal{W} \in \text{f-wide } H$ , then  $\mathcal{W}$  is generated by the minimal left  $\mathcal{W}$ -approximation of the projective generator  $H$ . Hence it is finitely generated.

The following result is due to Ringel:

**Proposition 5.1.7.** [17, 16] *Let  $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$  be a set of Hom-orthogonal bricks. Then  $\text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I})$  is a wide subcategory of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ , where the  $M_i$ 's are the simple objects of  $\text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I})$ .*

*Conversely, if  $\mathcal{W}$  is a wide subcategory in  $\text{mod } \Lambda$  then the set of simple objects  $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$  in  $\mathcal{W}$  are Hom-orthogonal bricks and  $\mathcal{W} = \text{Filt}(\{M_i\})$ .*



Recall from Theorem 4.4.4 that each canonical join representation  $\text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{i \in I} \{\mathcal{T}_{M_i}\}$  is also determined by a collection  $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$  of hom-orthogonal bricks. We make this connection explicit below.

**Corollary 5.1.8.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra and let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a torsion class in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  with canonical join representation  $\text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{i \in I} \{\mathcal{T}_{M_i}\}$ . Then the set of bricks  $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$  is the set of simple objects in  $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ .*

*Proof.* Proposition 5.1.7 says that  $\mathcal{W} = \text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I})$  is a wide subcategory with  $\{M_i\}_{i \in I}$  the set of simple objects. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta(\mathcal{W}) &= \text{Filt}(\text{Gen}(M_i))_{i \in I} \\ &= \bigvee_{i \in I} \text{Filt}(\text{Gen}(M_i)) \\ &= \bigvee_{i \in I} \mathcal{T}_{M_i} \\ &= \mathcal{T} \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.1.2,  $\alpha(\mathcal{T}) = \mathcal{W}$ . The statement follows.  $\square$

**5.2. Simple Objects in Wide Subcategories.** We now describe the simple objects of wide subcategories in terms of minimal extending modules. This proposition is key to our proof of Proposition 5.3.11 and Theorem D.

**Proposition 5.2.1.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an artin algebra and  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors } \Lambda$ . Let  $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$  be the corresponding wide subcategory and  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{T}^\perp$  the torsion-free class. Then  $M$  is a simple object in  $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$  if and only if  $M$  is a minimal co-extending module of  $\mathcal{F}$ .*

*Proof.* “if part”: Let  $M$  be a minimal co-extending module of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Then since  $\text{Hom}(M, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ , we have  $M \in \mathcal{T}$ . Let  $f : T \rightarrow M$  be a homomorphism in  $\mathcal{T}$ . We want to show that  $K = \ker f \in \mathcal{T}$ . In fact, if  $f$  is not an epimorphism then  $\text{image } f$  is a proper submodule of  $M$ . Hence  $\text{image } f \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{T} = 0$  which implies  $\ker f \cong T \in \mathcal{T}$ . Now assume  $f$  is an epimorphism. Take the canonical sequence  $0 \rightarrow tK \rightarrow K \rightarrow K/tK \rightarrow 0$  of  $K$  with respect to the torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ . Then in the push-out diagram we have:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \xrightarrow{i} & T & \xrightarrow{f} & M \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow p & (p.o.) & \downarrow h & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K/tK & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

If the lower exact sequence is not split, then  $E \in \mathcal{F}$  by Property (P2') of minimal co-extending modules. Then  $h = 0$  and hence  $p = 0$ . If the lower exact sequence split, then  $p$  factors through  $i$  and therefore  $p = 0$  again. So in both cases  $K \cong tK \in \mathcal{T}$ . Hence  $M \in \alpha(\mathcal{T})$ . All that remains is to show that  $M$  is simple in  $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ . Let  $M' \in \alpha(\mathcal{T})$  be a proper submodule of  $M$ . Then  $M' \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{T} = 0$ . Therefore  $M$  is simple in  $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ .

“only if part”: Let  $M$  be a simple object in  $\alpha(\mathcal{T})$ . First, since  $M \in \mathcal{T}$ ,  $\text{Hom}(M, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ . This is Property (P3'). Second, let  $M'$  be a proper submodule of  $M$ . Then the torsion part  $tM'$  is also a proper submodule of  $M$ . Therefore, for any  $g : X \rightarrow tM'$  in  $\mathcal{T}$ , we have  $\ker(g) = \ker(i \circ g)$  is in  $\mathcal{T}$ , where  $i : tM' \hookrightarrow M$ . It follows that  $tM' \in \alpha(\mathcal{T})$ . Since  $M$  is simple,  $tM' = 0$ . Therefore  $M' \in \mathcal{F}$ .

This is Property (P1') Last let  $0 \rightarrow F \rightarrow E \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  be a non-split exact sequence with  $F \in \mathcal{F}$ . We need to show  $E \in \mathcal{F}$ . Take the canonical sequence  $0 \rightarrow tE \rightarrow E \rightarrow E/tE \rightarrow 0$  of  $E$  with respect to the torsion pair  $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ . In the pull-back diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & L & \longrightarrow & tE & \longrightarrow & N \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & (p.b.) & \downarrow & & \downarrow \iota \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Notice that  $L \in \mathcal{F}$ . If  $\iota$  is a proper monomorphism, then we have shown that  $N \in \mathcal{F}$ . Hence  $tE \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{T} = 0$  and  $E \cong E/tE \in \mathcal{F}$  which finishes the proof. If  $\iota$  is an isomorphism, then since  $M \in \alpha(\mathcal{T})$  we get  $L \in \mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{F} = 0$ . Hence  $tE \cong N \cong M$ . But then the commutative diagram implies that the lower exact sequence is split, a contradiction. Therefore  $M$  satisfies Property (P2'). We conclude that  $M$  is a minimal coextending module of  $\mathcal{F}$ .  $\square$

**5.3. Ringel's  $\epsilon$ -map.** In [18], Ringel studied the perpendicular categories of wide subcategories over a hereditary algebra and its combinatorial connection with the Kreweras complement from Remark 1.0.6. In this section, we will show that our map  $\bar{\kappa}$  (defined on torsion classes) is the counterpart of taking perpendicular categories of wide subcategories under the Ingalls-Thomas bijection (see Theorem 5.4.1).

Let  $\mathcal{W}$  be a wide subcategory of  $\text{mod } H$  for a hereditary algebra  $H$ . Then it is easy to see that the subcategory  ${}^{\perp_{0,1}}\mathcal{W} = \{X \in \text{mod } H \mid \text{Ext}_H^i(X, M) = 0, \forall M \in \mathcal{W}, i = 0, 1\}$  is also a wide subcategory. Similarly the subcategory  $\mathcal{W}^{\perp_{0,1}}$  is again a wide subcategory.

**Definition 5.3.1.** Let  $H$  be a hereditary artin algebra and  $\mathcal{W}$  be a wide subcategory in  $\text{mod } H$ . Define  $\delta(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{W}^{\perp_{0,1}}$  and  $\epsilon(\mathcal{W}) = {}^{\perp_{0,1}}\mathcal{W}$ .

**Definition 5.3.2.** Let  $H$  be a hereditary artin algebra and  $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V}$  subcategories in  $\text{mod } H$ . Then  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  is called a perpendicular pair provided  $\mathcal{U} = {}^{\perp_{0,1}}\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{U}^{\perp_{0,1}}$ .

**Lemma 5.3.3.** Let  $H$  be a hereditary artin algebra and  $(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V})$  a perpendicular pair.

- [18] Then  $\mathcal{U}$  is a functorially finite wide subcategory if and only if  $\mathcal{V}$  is a functorially finite wide subcategory.
- Therefore  $\epsilon$  is a bijection from f-wide  $H$  to f-wide  $H$ .

In the following, we will heavily use the Auslander-Reiten formulas in the special case when  $H$  is a hereditary algebra [2, Proposition 3.4][3, IV 2.13, 2.14].

**Theorem 5.3.4** (Auslander-Reiten formulas). Let  $H$  be hereditary. Then there exist isomorphisms that are functorial in both variables:

$$\text{Ext}_H^1(M, N) \cong D\text{Hom}_H(\tau^{-1}N, M) \cong D\text{Hom}_H(N, \tau M).$$

As an immediate application we have:

**Lemma 5.3.5.** Suppose that  $H$  is a hereditary algebra and  $M$  is not injective. Then  $M$  is a brick if and only if  $\tau^{-1}M$  is a brick.

*Proof.* Using the AR-formulas, we have:

$$\text{Hom}_\Lambda(\tau^{-1}M, \tau^{-1}M) \cong D\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\tau^{-1}M, M) \cong DD\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, \tau\tau^{-1}M) \cong \text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, M).$$

So  $M$  is a brick if and only if so is  $\tau^{-1}M$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.3.6.** Lemma 5.3.5 does not hold if  $\Lambda$  is not hereditary. For example, let  $\Lambda$  be the preprojective algebra of the quiver

$$4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1.$$

One can check that  $\tau^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix} = 3 \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} 1$ , where  $\begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}$  is a brick and  $3 \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix} 1$  is not.

There is another well-known result by Auslander and Smalø, which is obtained from the AR-formulas.

**Lemma 5.3.7.** [4, Proposition 5.6, 5.8] *Let  $\Lambda$  be an artin algebra and  $M, N$  be  $\Lambda$ -modules. Then*

(a)  $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\tau^{-1}M, N) = 0$  if and only if  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(\text{Cogen}(N), M) = 0$ .

(b)  $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, \tau N) = 0$  if and only if  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(N, \text{Gen}(M)) = 0$ .

As an application, we will use Lemma 5.3.7 to compute  $\alpha(^{\perp}M)$  for a brick module  $M$ . Notice that  $\alpha(^{\perp}M)$  is just the corresponding wide subcategory of the torsion class  $\kappa(\mathcal{T}_M)$  under the Ingalls-Thomas bijection from Theorem 5.1.5. (See Remark 5.3.9 and Corollary 5.3.10 below.)

**Lemma 5.3.8.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be a finite dimensional algebra and let  $M$  be a brick in  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ . Then  $\alpha(^{\perp}M) = \{X \in ^{\perp}M \mid \forall X' \in \text{Cogen } X \cap ^{\perp}M, \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(X', M) = 0\}$ .*

*Proof.* For “ $\subseteq$ ”: Let  $X \in \alpha(^{\perp}M)$  and  $X' \in \text{Cogen } X \cap ^{\perp}M$ . Suppose there is a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \xrightarrow{p} X' \rightarrow 0$ . Since  $M \in \text{ME}(^{\perp}M)$  by Proposition 4.2.1, it follows that  $E \in ^{\perp}M$ . But then the composition  $f : E \xrightarrow{p} X' \hookrightarrow \oplus X$  is a homomorphism in  $^{\perp}M$  with  $\text{Ker } f = M \notin ^{\perp}M$ , which is a contradiction with  $X \in \alpha(^{\perp}M)$ .

For “ $\supseteq$ ”: Let  $X \in \{X \in ^{\perp}M \mid \forall X' \in \text{Cogen } X \cap ^{\perp}M, \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(X', M) = 0\}$  and  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  any homomorphism in  $^{\perp}M$ , we want to show that  $\text{Ker } f$  is also in  $^{\perp}M$ .

Since  $Y \in ^{\perp}M$ , so is  $\text{image } f$ . So  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(\text{image } f, M) = 0$  by the assumption. Then in the exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\text{image } f, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(Y, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\text{Ker } f, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(\text{image } f, M),$$

both the terms  $\text{Hom}(Y, M)$  and  $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(\text{image } f, M)$  vanishes. Hence  $\text{Ker } f \in ^{\perp}M$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.3.9.** Due to Lemma 5.3.7, for any  $\Lambda$ -module  $M$ , the subcategory

$$^{\perp}M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^{\perp} = \{X \in ^{\perp}M \mid \forall X' \in \text{Cogen } X, \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(X', M) = 0\}.$$

Therefore there are inclusions of subcategories:

$$^{\perp}M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^{\perp} \subseteq \alpha(^{\perp}M) \subseteq {}^{\perp_{0,1}}M.$$

**Corollary 5.3.10.** *Let  $H$  be a hereditary artin algebra and  $M$  be a brick in  $\text{mod } H$ . Then  $\alpha(^{\perp}M) = {}^{\perp_{0,1}}M$ .*

*Proof.* When  $H$  is hereditary  $(\tau^{-1}M)^{\perp} = {}^{\perp_1}M$  by Theorem 5.3.4. Therefore

$$^{\perp}M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^{\perp} = {}^{\perp}M \cap {}^{\perp_1}M = {}^{\perp_{0,1}}M.$$

The assertion follows Remark 5.3.9.  $\square$

Questions about whether both inclusions in Remark 5.3.9 can be proper and if  $^{\perp}M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^{\perp}$  is always a wide subcategory for arbitrary finite dimensional algebra are answered later in Appendix. Following our main task, we prove a generalized version of Corollary 5.3.10.

**Proposition 5.3.11.** *Let  $H$  be a finite dimensional hereditary algebra and  $\{M_i\}$  a set of Hom-orthogonal bricks. Then  $\alpha(\bigcap^\perp M_i) = \bigcap \alpha(\perp^\perp M_i)$ .*

*Proof.* It suffices to show that  $\alpha(\bigcap^\perp M_i) \subseteq \bigcap \alpha(\perp^\perp M_i)$ . By Corollary 5.3.10,  $\bigcap \alpha(\perp^\perp M_i) = \bigcap^{\perp_{0,1}} M_i$  which is closed under extensions. So it suffices to show that each simple object in  $\alpha(\bigcap^\perp M_i)$  lies in  ${}^{\perp_{0,1}} M_i$  for all  $i$ .

Assume  $X$  is a simple object in  $\alpha(\bigcap^\perp M_i)$ . By Proposition 5.2.1,  $X$  is a minimal co-extending module of  $\mathcal{F} := (\bigcap^\perp M_i)^\perp = \bigvee \text{Filt Cogen } M_i$ . Since  $\text{Hom}_H(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ , it follows that  $X \in {}^{\perp} M_i$  for all  $i$ .

So it remains to show that  $\text{Ext}_H^1(X, M_i) = 0$  for all  $i$ . Assume there is a non-split exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M_i \xrightarrow{l} E \xrightarrow{p} X \rightarrow 0$ . Then by the assumption that  $X$  is a minimal co-extending module, we know  $E \in \mathcal{F}$ . Notice that  $\bigvee \text{Filt Cogen } M_i = \text{Filt}(\bigcup \text{Cogen } M_i)$ . There is a non-zero epimorphism  $\pi : E \rightarrow E_0$ , where  $E_0 \in \text{Cogen } M_j$  for some  $j$ . We claim that  $\pi \circ l \neq 0$ . Otherwise,  $\pi$  can factor through  $X$ . But then  $\pi = 0$  since  $\text{Hom}_H(X, \mathcal{F}) = 0$ , a contradiction. So the composition  $M_i \xrightarrow{l} E \xrightarrow{\pi} E_0 \rightarrow \oplus M_j$  is non-zero. Since  $\{M_i\}$  is Hom-orthogonal, we have  $i = j$ . Since  $M_i$  is a brick, the composition is indeed a split monomorphism. Hence  $l$  is a split monomorphism which is a contradiction.  $\square$

#### 5.4. Theorem D: $\bar{\kappa}$ and $\epsilon$ .

**Theorem 5.4.1** (Theorem D). *Let  $H$  be a hereditary artin algebra.*

*For torsion classes  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors}_0 \Lambda$ ,  $\alpha \bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}) = \epsilon \alpha(\mathcal{T})$ , i.e. the following diagram commutes:*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{tors}_0 H & \xrightarrow{\bar{\kappa}} & \text{tors } H \\ \alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha \\ \text{wide } H & \xrightarrow{\epsilon} & \text{wide } H. \end{array}$$

*Proof.* Assume  $\text{CJR}(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{i \in I} \mathcal{T}_{M_i}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}) & \stackrel{\text{Cor. 4.4.3}}{=} \alpha\left(\bigcap_{i \in I} {}^\perp M_i\right) \\ & \stackrel{\text{Prop. 5.3.11}}{=} \bigcap_{i \in I} \alpha({}^\perp M_i) \\ & \stackrel{\text{Cor. 5.3.10}}{=} \bigcap_{i \in I} {}^{\perp_{0,1}} M_i. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon \alpha(\mathcal{T}) & \stackrel{\text{Prop. 5.1.7}}{=} \epsilon \text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I}) \\ & \stackrel{\text{Def. 5.3.1}}{=} {}^{\perp_{0,1}} \text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I}) \end{aligned}$$

Comparing these results, it is obvious that  ${}^{\perp_{0,1}} \text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I}) \subseteq \bigcap_{i \in I} {}^{\perp_{0,1}} M_i$ . Conversely, pick any  $X \in \bigcap_{i \in I} {}^{\perp_{0,1}} M_i$  and any  $Y \in \text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I})$ , one can check that both  $\text{Hom}(X, Y) = 0$  and  $\text{Ext}^1(X, Y) = 0$ . So  $\bigcap_{i \in I} {}^{\perp_{0,1}} M_i \subseteq {}^{\perp_{0,1}} \text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{i \in I})$ . Therefore,  $\alpha \bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}) = \epsilon \alpha(\mathcal{T})$ .  $\square$

**Remark 5.4.2.** For wide subcategories  $\mathcal{W}$ ,  $\bar{\kappa}\beta(\mathcal{W}) = \beta\epsilon(\mathcal{W})$  is not always true. For example, in Example 4.4.11, let  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{R}$ . One can check that  $\bar{\kappa}\beta(\mathcal{W}) = \mathcal{I}$ , whereas  $\beta\epsilon(\mathcal{W}) = 0$ .

Theorem 5.4.1 shows another surprising fact that  $\bar{\kappa}$  is a bijection of the set of functorially finite torsion classes:

**Corollary 5.4.3.** *Let  $H$  be a hereditary artin algebra and  $\mathcal{T}$  a functorially finite torsion class. Then  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T})$  is functorially finite.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 5.1.5 and Lemma 5.3.3, the restriction of  $\bar{\kappa}$  to  $\mathbf{f}\text{-tors } H$  is a composition of three bijections,  $\alpha\epsilon\alpha^{-1} : \mathbf{f}\text{-tors } H \rightarrow \mathbf{f}\text{-tors } H$ .  $\square$

**Example 5.4.4.** If  $\Lambda$  is not hereditary,  $\bar{\kappa}$  does not necessarily preserve functorial finiteness. We show an example which is the dual of [2, Example 4.5]. Consider the algebra  $\Lambda = kQ/\langle\alpha\gamma\rangle$  with the quiver

$$Q : 1 \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\alpha} \\ \xleftarrow{\beta} \end{array} 2 \xleftarrow{\gamma} 3.$$

Take the brick  $P_3$ . Since  $P_3$  is projective,  $\text{Gen}(P_3)$  is a functorially finite torsion class. Hence  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Filt Gen}(P_3) = \text{Gen}(P_3) = \text{add}\{P_3, I_2, I_3\}$  is functorially finite.

On the other hand,  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}) = {}^\perp P_3$ . Let  $R_\alpha = k \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{\alpha} \\ \xleftarrow{1} \end{array} k \xleftarrow{0} 0$ . It can be directly computed that  ${}^\perp P_3 = \bigvee_{\alpha \neq 0} \text{Filt}(\text{Gen } R_\alpha) \vee \text{Filt}(\text{Gen}(S_3))$ , which is not covariantly finite.

It can also be shown using a result of Smalø from [19] that  ${}^\perp P_3$  is functorially finite if and only if  $({}^\perp P_3)^\perp = \text{Filt Cogen } P_3$  is functorially finite. A result of Asai from [2] shows that  $\text{Filt Cogen } P_3$  is not functorially finite.

## 6. ITERATED COMPOSITIONS OF $\bar{\kappa}$ AND RELATION WITH AR TRANSLATION

Let  $H$  be a hereditary algebra and  $\delta, \epsilon$  be the maps between wide subcategories defined before. Ringel [18] describes the map  $\delta^2$  using the so-called *extended Auslander-Reiten translation*:

**Definition 6.0.1.** *Define  $\bar{\tau}$  to be a permutation of indecomposable  $H$ -modules as follows:*

$$\bar{\tau}X = \begin{cases} \tau X & X \text{ not projective} \\ I(S) & X = P(S) \end{cases}$$

where  $I(S)$  and  $P(S)$  are the injective envelope and projective cover of the same simple  $S$ .

**Theorem 6.0.2.** *Let  $H$  be a hereditary algebra and  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathbf{f}\text{-wide } \Lambda$ . Then  $\delta^2 \mathcal{W} = \bar{\tau} \mathcal{W}$ .*

Here, we give a similar result for torsion classes using our  $\bar{\kappa}$  map.

**Corollary 6.0.3.** *Let  $H$  be a hereditary algebra and  $\mathcal{T} \in \mathbf{f}\text{-tors } \Lambda$  with a canonical join representation  $\bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq k} \text{Filt Gen}(M_i)$ . Then  $\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{T})$  is a functorially finite torsion class. Furthermore, if each  $M_i$  is non-injective, then  $\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{T})$  has a canonical join representation  $\bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq k} \text{Filt Gen}(\tau^{-1} M_i)$ .*

*Proof.* The functorially finiteness of  $\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{T})$  follows from Corollary 5.4.3. Now assume that each  $M_i$  is non-injective. Then according to Theorem 5.4.1  $\alpha\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{T}) = \epsilon^2\alpha(\mathcal{T}) = \epsilon^2\text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}) = \bar{\tau}^{-1}\text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k})$ .

Since each  $M_i$  is non-injective,  $\text{Filt}(\{M_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq k}) (= \text{Filt}(\{M_i\}))$  for short below) contains no injective modules. Therefore  $\bar{\tau}^{-1}(X) = \tau^{-1}(X)$  for each  $X \in \text{Filt}(\{M_i\})$ . Therefore  $\tau^{-1}(\text{Filt}(\{M_i\})) = \bar{\tau}^{-1}(\text{Filt}(\{M_i\}))$ . Now  $\tau^{-1}$  is an equivalence from  $\text{Filt}(\{M_i\})$  to  $\tau^{-1}(\text{Filt}(\{M_i\}))$  (because  $H$  is hereditary and  $\text{Filt}(\{M_i\})$  contains no injective modules). Hence  $\tau^{-1}$  preserves simple objects. So  $\bar{\tau}^{-1}\text{Filt}(\{M_i\})$  is equal to  $\text{Filt}(\{\tau^{-1}M_i\})$ . Using Theorem 5.1.5,  $\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{T}) = \bigvee_{1 \leq i \leq k} \text{Filt Gen}(\tau^{-1}M_i)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 6.0.4.** Let  $H$  be a hereditary algebra and  $I$  be an indecomposable injective module. Then for the functorially finite torsion class  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Filt Gen}(I) = \text{Gen}(I)$ ,  $\bar{\kappa}^2\mathcal{T} = \text{Filt Gen}(\bar{\tau}^{-1}I)$ . However, Corollary 6.0.3 does not always hold if some  $M_i$ 's are injective:

Let  $\Lambda = kQ$  be the path algebra with  $Q = 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1$ . Take  $\mathcal{T} = \text{Filt Gen}(S_2) \vee \text{Filt Gen}(S_3)$ , then  $\bar{\kappa}^2(\mathcal{T}) = \text{Filt Gen}(P_2) \vee \text{Filt Gen}(S_3)$ , where  $P_2 \neq \bar{\tau}^{-1}S_2, \bar{\tau}^{-1}S_3$ .

We conclude this section with a proof of Theorem E, which we restate below.

**Theorem 6.0.5** (Theorem E). *Let  $\Lambda$  be  $\tau$ -tilting finite, and let  $r$  be the number of simples in  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ . For any  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors } \Lambda$  let  $|\mathcal{T}|$  denote the number of canonical joinands of  $\mathcal{T}$ . Then for any  $\bar{\kappa}$ -orbit  $\mathcal{O}$  we have*

$$\frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}|} \sum_{\mathcal{T} \in \mathcal{O}} |\mathcal{T}| = r/2.$$

*Proof.* Since  $\Lambda$  is  $\tau$ -tilting finite, the lattice  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  is finite and *regular* meaning that for any  $\mathcal{T} \in \text{tors } \Lambda$ :

$$|\{\mathcal{S} : \mathcal{T} \succ \mathcal{S}\}| + |\{\mathcal{U} : \mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{U}\}| = r$$

For the remainder of the proof, fix  $\mathcal{T}$  in  $\text{tors } \Lambda$ , and write  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}$  for the  $\bar{\kappa}$ -orbit of  $\mathcal{T}$ .

Suppose that  $|\mathcal{T}| = k$  where  $r - k \neq k$ . Observe that if  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{T}') = \mathcal{T}$  then  $|\mathcal{T}'| = r - k$ , because  $\text{tors } \Lambda$  is regular. Also,  $|\bar{\kappa}^i(\mathcal{T})| = r - k$  if and only if  $i$  is odd. Therefore,  $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}| = (i + 1)$ , and the sum  $\sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}} |\mathcal{S}|$  consists of  $(i + 1)/2$  pairs of torsion classes  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{S})$  with  $|\mathcal{S}| + |\bar{\kappa}(\mathcal{S})| = k + (r - k)$ . We compute:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}|} \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}} |\mathcal{S}| &= \frac{1}{(i + 1)} (k + (r - k) + k + (r - k) + \cdots + k + (r - k)) \\ &= \frac{1}{(i + 1)} (k + (r - k)) \frac{(i + 1)}{2} \\ &= \frac{r}{2} \end{aligned}$$

When  $r$  is even and  $|\mathcal{T}| = r/2$  then we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}|} \sum_{\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}} |\mathcal{S}| &= \frac{1}{|\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}|} \binom{r}{2} |\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{T}}| \\ &= \frac{r}{2} \end{aligned}$$


$\square$

## 7. APPENDIX

We show some minor results which we obtained during our study of the perpendicular categories in previous sections.


**Example 7.0.1.** When  $\Lambda$  is not hereditary, both inclusions in Remark 5.3.9 can be proper:

Let  $Q$  be the  $A_2$  quiver and  $\Lambda = kQ \otimes (k[x]/\langle x^2 \rangle)$ . The algebra  $\Lambda$  is given by the following quiver with relations:



$$\epsilon_1^2 = \epsilon_2^2 = 0, \alpha\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_1\alpha.$$


The AR-quiver of  $\text{mod } \Lambda$  is as the following:



Let  $M = S_1$ , then  ${}^\perp M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp = 0$ ,  $\alpha({}^\perp M) = \text{add}\{\begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}\} = {}^{\perp_{0,1}} M$ .

For the other proper containment, consider the following algebra: Let  $Q$  be the quiver  $4 \xrightarrow{\gamma} 3 \xrightarrow{\beta} 2 \xrightarrow{\alpha} 1$ . Let  $\Lambda$  be the algebra  $kQ / \langle \alpha\beta\gamma \rangle$ .

The AR-quiver looks like:



Consider  $M = \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}$ , then  ${}^\perp M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp = \alpha({}^\perp M) = \text{add}\{\begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix} 4 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix}\}$ , and  ${}^{\perp_{0,1}} M = \text{add}\{\begin{smallmatrix} 3 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix} 4 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix}, \begin{smallmatrix} 4 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix}\}$ .

The following result is a generalization of Jasso's [13, Proposition 3.6], where we do not assume that  $M$  is  $\tau$ -rigid.

**Theorem 7.0.2.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an artin algebra and let  $M$  be any  $\Lambda$ -module. Then  ${}^\perp M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$  is a wide subcategory.*

*Proof.* First, it is clear that  ${}^\perp M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$  is closed under extensions.

Second, given a morphism  $f : Y \rightarrow X$  with  $X, Y \in {}^\perp M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$ , we need to show that both  $\text{Ker } f$  and  $\text{Coker } f \in {}^\perp M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$ .

Observe that given an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ . If  $B \in {}^\perp M$  then so is  $C$ . If  $B \in (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$  then so is  $A$ .

Using this fact, we know that  $\text{Ker } f \in (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$ ,  $\text{Coker } f \in {}^\perp M$  and  $\text{image } f \in {}^\perp M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$ .

To show  $\text{Ker } f \in {}^\perp M$ : Using the exact sequence

$$0 = \text{Hom}(Y, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\text{Ker } f, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(\text{image } f, M).$$

Since we have already shown  $\text{Hom}(\tau^{-1}M, \text{image } f) = 0$ , using AR formula it follows that

$$\text{Ext}^1(\text{image } f, M) \cong D\text{Hom}(\tau^{-1}M, \text{image } f) = 0.$$

Hence  $\text{Hom}(\text{Ker } f, M) = 0$ .

To show  $\text{Coker } f \in (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$ : By Lemma 5.3.7 it suffices to show that for any submodule  $C' \subseteq (\text{Coker } f)^n$ ,  $\text{Ext}^1(C', M) = 0$ . In fact, suppose there is an exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{s} E \xrightarrow{t} C' \rightarrow 0$  and denote by  $i : C' \hookrightarrow (\text{Coker } f)^n$  the inclusion. Then there is a pull-back diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & M & \xlongequal{\quad} & M & & \\ & & \downarrow u & \nearrow u' & \downarrow s & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (\text{image } f)^n & \xrightarrow{a} & F & \xrightarrow{b} & E \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow (p.b.) & & \downarrow i \circ t \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & (\text{image } f)^n & \longrightarrow & X^n & \longrightarrow & (\text{Coker } f)^n \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since  $X \in (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp$ ,  $\text{Ext}^1(\text{Cogen } X, M) = 0$ . Hence  $u$  is a split monomorphism. i.e. there exists  $u' : F \rightarrow M$  such that  $u' \circ u = 1$ . Since  $\text{image } f \in {}^\perp M$ , the composition  $u' \circ a = 0$ . Hence  $u'$  factors through  $b$ . i.e. there exists  $c : E \rightarrow M$  such that  $u' = c \circ b$ .

But since  $cs = cbu = u'u = 1$ ,  $s$  is a split monomorphism. Hence the exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{s} E \xrightarrow{t} C' \rightarrow 0$  splits and therefore  $\text{Ext}^1(C', M) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 7.0.3.** (1) *Dually  $M^\perp \cap {}^\perp \tau M$  is a wide subcategory.*

(2) *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a set of  $\Lambda$ -modules, then the full subcategory  $\{X | X \in M \cap (\tau^{-1}M)^\perp \text{ for all } M \in \mathcal{M}\}$  is a wide subcategory.*

(3) *Let  $\mathcal{M}$  be a set of  $\Lambda$ -modules, then the full subcategory  $\{X | X \in M^\perp \cap {}^\perp \tau M \text{ for all } M \in \mathcal{M}\}$  is a wide subcategory.*

(4) *If  $H$  is a hereditary algebra and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a set of  $H$ -modules, then  ${}^{\perp_{0,1}}\mathcal{M}$  is a wide subcategory.*

(5) *If  $H$  is a hereditary algebra and  $\mathcal{M}$  is a set of  $H$ -modules, then  $\mathcal{M}^{\perp_{0,1}}$  is a wide subcategory.*

## 8. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thank Hugh Thomas for helpful conversations. The mathematics in this project were largely completed while the first author was a Zelevinsky Research Instructor at Northeastern University and the third author was a PhD student at Northeastern University. They wish to thank the department for a supportive research environment throughout their time there.



## REFERENCES

- [1] Takahide Adachi, Osamu Iyama, and Idun Reiten.  $\tau$ -tilting theory. *Compos. Math.*, 150(3):415–452, 2014.
- [2] Sota Asai. Semibricks. *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, 07 2018.
- [3] Ibrahim Assem, Daniel Simson, and Andrzej Skowroński. *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras. Vol. 1*, volume 65 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. Techniques of representation theory.
- [4] M. Auslander and Sverre O. Smalø. Almost split sequences in subcategories. *J. Algebra*, 69(2):426–454, 1981.
- [5] Emily Barnard, Andrew Carrol, and Shijie Zhu. Minimal inclusions of torsion classes. To appear in *Algebraic Combinatorics*, 2019.
- [6] Laurent Demonet, Osamu Iyama, and Gustavo Jasso.  $\tau$ -tilting finite algebras, bricks, and  $g$ -vectors. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2019(3):852–892, 07 2017.
- [7] Laurent Demonet, Osamu Iyama, Nathan Reading, Idun Reiten, and Hugh Thomas. Lattice theory of torsion classes. Preprint available: arXiv:1711.01785, 03 2018.
- [8] Ralph Freese, Jaroslav Ježek, and J. B. Nation. *Free lattices*, volume 42 of *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1995.
- [9] Alexander Garver and Thomas McConville. Lattice Properties of Oriented Exchange Graphs and Torsion Classes. *Algebr. Represent. Theory*, 22(1):43–78, 2019.
- [10] Kiyoshi Igusa and Ralf Schiffler. Exceptional sequences and clusters. *J. Algebra*, 323(8):2183–2202, 2010.
- [11] Colin Ingalls and Hugh Thomas. Noncrossing partitions and representations of quivers. *Compos. Math.*, 145(6):1533–1562, 2009.
- [12] Osamu Iyama, Idun Reiten, Hugh Thomas, and Gordana Todorov. Lattice structure of torsion classes for path algebras. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 47(4):639–650, 2015.
- [13] Gustavo Jasso. Reduction of  $\tau$ -tilting modules and torsion pairs. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (16):7190–7237, 2015.
- [14] Frederik Marks and Jan Šťovíček. Torsion classes, wide subcategories and localisations. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 49(3):405–416, 2017.
- [15] Nathan Reading, Thomas Speyer, and Hugh Thomas. Lattice theory of torsion classes. arXiv:1907.08050, 07 2019.
- [16] Claus Michael Ringel. Representations of  $K$ -species and bimodules. *J. Algebra*, 41(2):269–302, 1976.
- [17] Claus Michael Ringel. Reflection functors for hereditary algebras. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 21(3):465–479, 1980.
- [18] Claus Michael Ringel. The Catalan combinatorics of the hereditary Artin algebras. In *Recent developments in representation theory*, volume 673 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 51–177. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2016.
- [19] Sverre O. Smalø. Torsion theories and tilting modules. *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, 16(5):518–522, 1984.
- [20] Hugh Thomas and Nathan Williams. Rowmotion in slow motion. arXiv:1712.10123, 2018.
- [21] Hugh Thomas and Nathan Williams. Independence posets. arXiv:1805.00815, 2019.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, DEPAUL UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO, IL 60614, USA  
*E-mail address:* e.barnard@depaul.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NORTHEASTERN UNIVERSITY, BOSTON, MA 02115, USA  
*E-mail address:* g.todorov@northeastern.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF IOWA, IOWA CITY, IA 52242, USA  
*E-mail address:* shijie-zhu@uiowa.edu