SIMPLE TRANSITIVE 2-REPRESENTATIONS OF
2-CATEGORIES ASSOCIATED TO SELF-INJECTIVE CORES

MATEUSZ STROIŃSKI

Abstract. For a finite-dimensional associative algebra $A$, we introduce the
notion of a self-injective core of $A$. Self-injective cores give rise to 2-
subcategories of the 2-category $C_A$ defined in [MM1]. 2-representations of
a particular such 2-subcategory were studied in [Z2]. We classify the simple
transitive 2-representations of a wide class of such 2-subcategories. We also
construct a family of non-cell simple transitive 2-representations of a certain
2-semicategory of projective functors. The existence of such 2-representations
for a closely related 2-category was conjectured in [Z2].
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1. Introduction

The systematic study of 2-representations of finitary 2-categories started with the
series of papers by Mazorchuk and Miemietz ([MM1], [MM2], [MM3], [MM4],
[MM5], [MM6]). The article [MM5] first introduced the notion of a simple transi-
tive 2-representation, which is analogous to that of a simple module in a classical
setting. Classification of simple transitive 2-representations of a given finitary 2-category has since become central to the study of 2-representation theory that followed said series of articles, see [Zi2], [KM], [MMZ2], [MMMTZ], [Jo] for recent examples.

A natural choice of a finitary 2-category to study is that of projective bimodules over a given finite-dimensional associative algebra $A$, which we denote by $\mathcal{C}_A$. In this case, the aforementioned classification problem was solved completely in [MMZ1]: up to equivalence, simple transitive 2-representations of $\mathcal{C}_A$ are exhausted by cell 2-representations. These were defined already in [MM1] for an arbitrary finitary 2-category, by endowing it with a cell structure, in analogy to representation theory of Hecke algebras.

The cell structure of $\mathcal{C}_A$ is relatively simple, so we may construct 2-full 2-subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_A$ simply by removing (equivalently, keeping) some of its right or left cells. This gives us two different kinds of 2-subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_A$, which are the main object of study of this paper. Particular cases of such 2-subcategories associated to a specific family of associative algebras, denoted by $\Lambda_n$, were studied in [Zi2] - we generalize some of the results obtained in that paper, and also give a partial answer to a problem very closely related to a conjecture posed therein.

If $A$ is self-injective, then $\mathcal{C}_A$ is a fiat category, which in the setting of [EGNO] corresponds to having left and right duals. The 2-representation theory of fiat 2-categories is much better understood than the general finitary case. The 2-subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_A$ we study break the symmetry of the cell structure of $\mathcal{C}_A$, and hence are never fiat: however, for one of our main results we assume that said 2-subcategory corresponds to a self-injective core for $A$, that is, a subset $S$ of a system of primitive, mutually orthogonal idempotents for $A$, such that

$$\text{for every } e \in S \text{ there is } f \in S \text{ satisfying } (eA)^* \simeq Af.$$ 

The self-injective core then provides our 2-category of interest with a further 2-subcategory, which is fiat, so that we remain close to the fiat case - a part of the cell structure admits the kind of symmetry found in the case of $\mathcal{C}_A$.

From this perspective, the 2-subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_A$ we consider can be viewed as stepping just outside the realm of fiat categories, in an attempt to gain a better understanding of the non-fiat finitary 2-categories.

Let $S$ be a self-injective core for $A$ and let $\mathcal{D}_R$ be the 2-subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_A$ formed by the right cells of $\mathcal{C}_A$ corresponding either to the identity 1-morphism or elements of $S$. The first of our two main results (Theorem 4.1) can be formulated as

**Theorem 1.** Up to equivalence, the simple transitive 2-representations of $\mathcal{D}_R$ are given by cell 2-representations. Moreover, up to equivalence, there are only two cell 2-representations of $\mathcal{D}_R$.

The second of our main results concerns the following conjecture posed in [Zi2]: given a zig-zag algebra $\Lambda_n$ on a star-shaped graph, consider the 2-subcategory $\mathcal{D}_L$ of $\mathcal{C}_\Lambda_n$ formed by the left cell $L_0$ and the two-sided cell given by the identity 1-morphism.

**Conjecture.** Equivalence classes of simple transitive 2-representations of $\mathcal{D}_L$ are in bijection with set partitions of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. 
Our result is formulated in the setting of 2-representations of 2-semicategories, recently developed in [KMZ]: consider again the algebra $\Lambda_n$ and consider the 2-subsemicategory $\mathcal{Z}_L$ of $\mathcal{C}_{\Lambda_n}$ formed by the left cell $L_0$ (alternatively, formed by removing the identity 1-morphism from $\mathcal{D}_L$). The result (Theorem 7.11) now gives the following:

**Theorem 2.** There is a family of pairwise non-equivalent simple transitive 2-representations of $\mathcal{Z}_L$ indexed by set partitions of $\{1,2,\ldots,n\}$.

A particularly interesting aspect of this result is that $\mathcal{Z}_L$ admits only one cell 2-representation (and $\mathcal{D}_L$ admits only two), so the construction behind Theorem 2 goes beyond cell 2-representations, while in the setting of projective bimodules and 2-categories of the form $\mathcal{C}_A$, no non-cell simple transitive 2-representations were known before (even though the conjecture above predicts their existence).

The document is organized as follows: in Section 2 we collect the preliminaries necessary to state our main results. In Section 3 we introduce the notion of a self-injective core, define the 2-subcategories of $\mathcal{C}_A$ obtained by removing cells and give a complete description of their cell structures, together with examples. In Section 4 we prove Theorem 4.1 stated above as Theorem 1. Section 5 establishes a result analogous to Theorem 4.1 in a particular case of a more difficult setting, where we no longer have a self-injective core to work with. Section 6 moves to a “gentle” problem for the left cell case, where simple transitive 2-representations are determined as cell 2-representations, using methods earlier employed in [MZ1] and [Z1] among others. The final section of the paper proves the second main result (Theorem 7.11, stated above as Theorem 2) crucially using a result of Power ([Po]), which allows us to consider pseudofunctors rather than 2-functors.

**Acknowledgments.** The author would like to thank his supervisor Volodymyr Mazorchuk for numerous stimulating discussions, from which many of the questions addressed in this work emerged.

## 2. Preliminaries

### 2.1. Setup.

Throughout let $k$ denote an algebraically closed field. By a finite-dimensional algebra $A$ we mean an associative, unital, finite-dimensional algebra over $k$, and by a complete system of idempotents of $A$ we mean a set $\{e_i \in A \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, r\}$ of primitive, mutually orthogonal idempotents of $A$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^{r} e_i = 1$.

### 2.2. Finitary 2-categories and their 2-representations.

We say that a category $\mathcal{C}$ is *finitary over* $k$ if it is additive, idempotent split, $k$-linear, and has finitely many isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects. Equivalently, $\mathcal{C}$ is finitary if there is a finite-dimensional algebra $Q$ such that $\mathcal{C}$ is equivalent to $Q$-proj.

A 2-category $\mathcal{C}$ is *finitary over* $k$ if it has finitely many objects such that for every $\bar{i}, \bar{j} \in \mathcal{C}$, the category $\mathcal{C}(\bar{i}, \bar{j})$ is finitary, horizontal composition is biadditive and $k$-bilinear, and for any object $\bar{i} \in \mathcal{C}$, the identity 1-morphism $1_{\bar{i}}$ is an indecomposable object of $\mathcal{C}(\bar{i}, \bar{i})$. 
Given a connected, basic finite-dimensional algebra \( A \), fix a small category \( \mathcal{A} \) equivalent to \( A\text{-mod} \). The 2-category \( \mathcal{C}_A \) consists of

- a single object \( i \);
- endofunctors of \( \mathcal{A} \) isomorphic to tensoring with \( A\)-\( A \)-bimodules in \( \text{add}((A \otimes_k A) \oplus A) \) as 1-morphisms (in other words, so-called projective functors of \( \mathcal{A} \));
- as 2-morphisms, all natural transformations between such functors.

In particular, \( \mathcal{C}_A \) is finitary.

Consider also the following 2-categories:

- \( \mathcal{A}_k \) - the 2-category whose objects are small finitary categories over \( k \), 1-morphisms are additive \( k \)-linear functors between such categories and whose 2-morphisms are all natural transformations between such functors;
- \( \mathcal{R}_k \) - the 2-category whose objects are small abelian \( k \)-linear categories, 1-morphisms are right exact \( k \)-linear functors between such categories and whose 2-morphisms are all natural transformations between such functors.

For the rest of this section, let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a finitary 2-category, unless otherwise stated. A finitary 2-representation of \( \mathcal{C} \) is then a 2-functor \( M : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{A}_k \) such that \( M_{i,j} \) is additive and \( k \)-linear for all \( i, j \in \mathcal{C} \). An abelian 2-representation of \( \mathcal{C} \) is such a 2-functor whose codomain instead is \( \mathcal{R}_k \). Finitary 2-representations together with non-strict 2-transformations and modifications form a 2-category \( \mathcal{C}_2\text{-afmod} \); abelian 2-representations similarly form a 2-category \( \mathcal{C}_2\text{-mod} \); see [MM3, Subsection 2.3] for details. In particular, by [MM3, Proposition 2], a non-strict 2-transformation \( \Phi : M \to N \), such that \( \Phi_i \) is an equivalence of categories for all \( i \), is invertible. We say that two 2-representations \( M, N \) are equivalent if such 2-transformation exists.

Note that the action of 1-morphisms in an abelian representation is necessarily naturally isomorphic to taking the tensor product with a bimodule, and similarly the action of 2-morphisms is represented by bimodule morphisms.

If \( \mathcal{C} \) only has one object \( i \), we define the rank of a finitary 2-representation \( M \) of \( \mathcal{C} \) as the number of isoclasses of indecomposable objects of \( M(i) \). If \( \mathcal{C} \) has more than one object, one can fix an ordering of its objects and define the rank of a finitary 2-representation of \( \mathcal{C} \) as a suitable tuple of positive integers. However, in this document we will only consider 2-categories with a single object.

We say that \( \mathcal{C} \) is weakly fiat if it is finitary and has a weak antiautomorphism \((-)^*\) of finite order and adjunction morphisms, see [MM6, Subsection 2.5]. If \((-)^*\) is involutive, we say that \( \mathcal{C} \) is fiat. The existence of left and right adjoints suffices to conclude weak flatness: taking right (alternatively left) adjoints is functorial and gives the desired weak 2-equivalence; see [EGNO].

A 2-category of the form \( \mathcal{C}_A \) is weakly fiat if and only if \( A \) is self-injective. This is an immediate consequence of [MM1, Lemma 45]:

**Lemma 2.1.** Let \( f, e \) be primitive mutually orthogonal idempotents of \( A \). Then
\[
((Ae \otimes_k fA) \otimes_A -), ((fA)^* \otimes_k eA) \otimes_A -
\]
is an adjoint pair of endofunctors of $A\text{-mod}$.

2.3. Abelianization. Given a finitary 2-representation $M$, we may consider its abelianization $\tilde{M}$, an abelian 2-representation of $C$, defined in [MMMT, Section 3]. The abelianization defined therein is a significant improvement of that given in [MM2, Subsection 4.2], however the main features we will use are shared by both constructions: we may recover $M$ via a canonical embedding and the action of 1-morphisms in $\tilde{M}$ is exact if $C$ is (weakly) fiat. Further, abelianization gives a 2-functor $\tilde{\cdot} : C\text{-afmod} \rightarrow C\text{-mod}$.

2.4. Cells and cell 2-representations. We now introduce certain relations on the set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable 1-morphisms of a finitary 2-category $C$, which are analogous to Green’s relations for semigroups. For indecomposable 1-morphisms $F, G \in C$ we write $F \geq L G$ if there is a 1-morphism $H \in C$ such that $F$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $H \circ G$. This gives the left preorder $L$ on the set of indecomposable 1-morphisms of $C$; the right preorder $R$ and the two-sided preorder $J$ are defined similarly. The equivalence classes of the induced equivalence relations are called the left, right and two-sided cells respectively. (Alternatively, $L$-cells, $R$-cells and $J$-cells.)

Let $L$ be a left cell of $C$ and let $i$ be the object such that $F \in L$ implies $F \in C(i, j)$ for some $j \in C$. Consider the representable 2-functor $P_i := C(i, -)$. This 2-functor gives a finitary 2-representation of $C$, and the additive closure of 1-morphisms $F$ such that $F \geq L \subseteq L$ gives a 2-subrepresentation of $P_i$. This 2-subrepresentation is transitive, that is, for any indecomposable $X \in M(j), Y \in M(k)$ there is a 1-morphism $G$ of $C$ such that $Y$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $M(F)X$.

Every transitive 2-representation admits a unique simple transitive quotient - a 2-representation with no $C$-stable ideals (see [MM5]). The cell 2-representation $C_L$ is the simple transitive subquotient of $P_i$ associated to $L$.

A two-sided cell $J$ of $C$ is said to be idempotent if there are $F, G, H \in J$ such that $H$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $G \circ F$. Given a transitive 2-representation $M$ of $C$, there is a unique maximal two-sided cell not annihilated by $M$ (see [CM, Lemma 1]), called the apex of $M$. The apex of a transitive 2-representation must be idempotent, and it coincides with the apex of its unique simple transitive quotient (See [CM, Lemma 3]).

2.4.1. Simple transitive 2-representations of $C_A$. Let $A$ be a basic, connected, finite-dimensional algebra. Fix a complete system of idempotents $E = \{e_1, \ldots, e_r\}$ of $A$. A complete list of representatives of isoclasses of indecomposable 1-morphisms of $C_A$ is given by the collection $\{A\} \cup \{Ae_i \otimes_k e_j A \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq r\}$. Denote $Ae_i \otimes_k e_j A$ by $F_{ij}$. Similarly to cells coming from Green’s relations for semigroups, the cell structure of a finitary 2-category is often represented by eggbox diagrams. For $C_A$, we have the following:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
F_{11} & F_{12} & \cdots & F_{1r} \\
F_{21} & F_{22} & \cdots & F_{2r} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
F_{r1} & F_{r2} & \cdots & F_{rr} \\
\end{array}
\]

$A$
Where the two eggboxes represent the two J-cells $J_0, J_1$ of $C_A$, satisfying $J_1 > J_0$, columns of the eggboxes represent the left cells, and rows represent the right cells. By construction we then have $r + 1$ cell 2-representations: the apex of a cell 2-representation $C_L$ here is the $J$-cell containing $L$.

2.5. Decategorification and action matrices. Define the decategorification of $C$ as the $\text{Ab}$-enriched category $[\mathcal{C}]$ with the same objects as those of $C$, and for objects $i, j \in [\mathcal{C}]$, the group of morphisms $[\mathcal{C}](i, j)$ is the split Grothendieck group $[\mathcal{C}(i, j)]$. Similarly, we may decategorify a finitary 2-representation $M$ to a functor $[\mathcal{C}] \to \text{Ab}$. We then get the action matrices of 1-morphisms of $C$ with respect to $M$: for $F \in [\mathcal{C}(i, j)]$, choose complete sets of representatives of isoclasses of indecomposables $\{X_1, \ldots, X_n\}, \{Y_1, \ldots, Y_m\}$ for $M(i)$ and $M(j)$ respectively. With respect to the induced basis in split Grothendieck groups, the action matrix $[F]$ is the $m \times n$ matrix such that $[F]_{ij}$ is the multiplicity of $Y_i$ in $MF X_j$.

3. Self-injective cores

Let $A$ be a basic, connected, finite-dimensional algebra, and fix a complete system of idempotents for $A$, $E = \{e_i \in A \mid i = 1, 2, \ldots, r\}$.

Definition 3.1. A self-injective core $S$ for $A$ is a non-empty subset of $E$ such that for every $e \in S$ there is $f \in S$ satisfying $(eA)^{\ast} \simeq Af$.

Note that an algebra does not need to admit a self-injective core, and if it does, a self-injective core is not necessarily unique. Additionally, observe that a union of self-injective cores is a self-injective core.

Alternatively, one could define a self-injective core on the level of the category $A$-proj as a non-zero idempotent-split subcategory $S \subseteq A$-proj such that for the duality $(\cdot)^{\ast} = \text{Hom}_k(\cdot, k)$ one has $\text{Hom}_{A\text{-mod}}(S, A)^{\ast} \subseteq S$. As a consequence one obtains $\text{Hom}_{A\text{-mod}}(S, A)^{\ast} \simeq S$.

Example 3.2. If $A$ is weakly symmetric, then every non-empty subset of $E$ gives a self-injective core for $A$, so that $A$ admits $2^r - 1$ self-injective cores.

More generally, if $A$ is self-injective with Nakayama permutation $\nu \in S_r$, then self-injective cores of $A$ are unions of orbits of the action of $\nu$ on $E$.

For instance, if $A = kQ/\text{Rad}^3 kQ$ for

\[
\begin{array}{c}
1 \quad \xrightarrow{a_1} 2 \\
\downarrow \quad 4 \quad \xrightarrow{a_3} 3 \\
\end{array}
\]

then the self-injective cores for $A$ are $\{e_1, e_3\}, \{e_2, e_4\}$ and $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$. If we further take the quotient $B$ of $A$ by relation $a_2a_1 = 0$, the algebra no longer is self-injective, but $\{e_2, e_4\}$ is a self-injective core for $B$.

Finally, a simple example of an algebra not admitting a single self-injective core is the path algebra of the Kronecker quiver $Q = 1 \rightsquigarrow 2$, which has no projective-injective modules.
Fix some $A$ as above, admitting a self-injective core, and fix a complete system of idempotents $E$ and a self-injective core $S$. We now define the main objects of study in this document.

**Definition 3.3.** In the setting above, using the description of indecomposable 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{C}_A$ given in Section 2.4.1, we define the following 2-full 2-subcategories thereof:

- $\mathcal{D}_J$, given by the additive closure of $\{A\} \cup \{Ae_i \otimes_k e_j A \mid e_i, e_j \in S\}$;
- $\mathcal{D}_L$, given by the additive closure of $\{A\} \cup \{Ae_i \otimes_k e_j A \mid e_j \in S\}$;
- $\mathcal{D}_R$, given by the additive closure of $\{A\} \cup \{Ae_i \otimes_k e_j A \mid e_i \in S\}$.

Note that we define those 2-categories entirely by specifying what part of $\mathcal{J}_1$ we choose to keep: $\mathcal{D}_L$ is obtained by keeping the left cells associated to idempotents in $S$; alternatively, of course, we may say that we remove all the other left cells. Similarly, $\mathcal{D}_R$ is defined by keeping or removing right cells, and $\mathcal{D}_J$ by removing first left and then right cells, or vice versa. Observe also that in this setting, $\mathcal{D}_J$ is a 2-subcategory of $\mathcal{D}_L$ as well as of $\mathcal{D}_R$ - we even have $\mathcal{D}_J = \mathcal{D}_L \cap \mathcal{D}_R$, but we will not use this fact.

Before we continue with an example, we introduce some notation. Soon we will show that all indecomposable non-identity 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{D}_J$ lie in the same $J$-cell: we will denote that $J$-cell by $\mathcal{J}_J^1$. Viewing $\mathcal{D}_J$ as a 2-subcategory of $\mathcal{D}_L, \mathcal{D}_R$ or $\mathcal{C}_A$, we will denote the same collection of 1-morphisms by the same symbol, even if said collection does not necessarily form a $J$-cell in that case. Note that all of $\mathcal{J}_J^1$ still necessarily lies in the same $J$-cell of any of said 2-categories containing it. In the respective cases $\mathcal{D}_L, \mathcal{D}_R$, we will denote this $J$-cell by $\mathcal{J}_J^L, \mathcal{J}_J^R$ respectively. In the case of $\mathcal{C}_A$, this is $\mathcal{J}_1$. In the same spirit we will sometimes denote the $J$-cell consisting of the identity 1-morphism by $\mathcal{J}_0^J, \mathcal{J}_0^L, \mathcal{J}_0^R$ respectively.

**Example 3.4.** Let $\Lambda_2$ be the quotient of the path algebra of

\[ \begin{array}{ccc}
2 & \xleftarrow{a_2} & 0 \\
\downarrow{b_2} & & \downarrow{b_1} \\
1 & \xrightarrow{a_1} & 1
\end{array} \]

by the relations $b_2a_2 = b_1a_1$ and $a_2b_1 = a_1b_2 = 0$. Then the shaded part of the eggbox diagram of $\mathcal{C}_A$,

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
F_{10} & F_{11} & F_{02} \\
F_{10} & F_{11} & F_{12} \\
F_{20} & F_{21} & F_{22}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\Lambda_2
\end{array}
\]

corresponds to the "right-cell" 2-subcategory $\mathcal{D}_R$, associated to the self-injective core $S = \{e_0, e_1\}$, indicated in the quiver above.

The following is the crucial property of self-injective cores:

**Theorem 3.5.** The 2-category $\mathcal{D}_J$ is weakly fiat. Every simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}_J$ is equivalent to a cell 2-representation.
Moreover, a 2-full 2-subcategory of \( \mathcal{C}_A \) is weakly fiat if and only if it is of the form \( \mathcal{D}_J \) for some self-injective core \( S \) of \( A \). In particular, \( \mathcal{C}_A \) is weakly fiat if and only if \( A \) is self-injective.

**Proof.** From the adjunction in Lemma 2.1 we see that \( \mathcal{D}_J \) is by definition constructed so that its 1-morphisms admit and is closed under left and right adjuncts in \( \mathcal{C}_A \). Thus \( \mathcal{D}_J \) is weakly fiat. Moreover, its \( J \)-cells clearly are strongly regular in the sense of \( \text{[MM5, Section 6]} \) so by \( \text{[MM6, Proposition 1]} \), \( \mathcal{D}_J \) satisfies the numerical condition, and by \( \text{[MM5, Theorem 18]} \) its simple transitive 2-representations are cell 2-representations.

A 2-full subcategory \( \mathcal{D} \) of \( \mathcal{C}_A \) is determined by the collection of indecomposable 1-morphisms of \( \mathcal{C}_A \) it contains. For this collection to be closed under composition, it must be obtained by removing some left respectively right cells of \( \mathcal{C}_A \). For \( \mathcal{D} \) to be weakly fiat, each of those indecomposables must admit both left and right adjuncts in \( \mathcal{D} \). Since the weak involution swaps the left and right preorders, \( \mathcal{D} \) must have equally many left and right cells, and both those must be associated to the same collection of idempotents of \( A \). In other words there is \( S \subseteq \{ e_1, \ldots, e_r \} \) such that

\[
\mathcal{D} \cap J_1 = \{ Ae \otimes_k fA \mid e, f \in S \}.
\]

It remains to show that \( S \) is a self-injective core. Again using Lemma 2.1 we see that for \( Ae \otimes_k e_j A \) in \( \mathcal{D} \) to admit a right adjoint, there must be a 1-morphism \( Af \otimes_k e_j A \) in \( \mathcal{D} \) which is (as a bimodule) isomorphic to \( (e_j A)^* \otimes_k e_i A \). In particular, for the left module structure to be isomorphic we need \( (e_j A)^* \simeq Af \), which proves that statement. □

The result above will be very useful, since we will use \( \mathcal{D}_J \) as an auxiliary fiat 2-subcategory in the study of the non-fiat 2-categories of the form \( \mathcal{D}_L \) or \( \mathcal{D}_R \). To that end, we give a detailed study of 2-representations of \( \mathcal{D}_J \) in the following subsection.

### 3.1. 2-representations of \( \mathcal{D}_J \)

**Proposition 3.6.** The cell structure of \( \mathcal{D}_J \) is the restriction of that of \( \mathcal{C}_A \).

**Proof.** For \( \mathcal{C}_A \), one uses \( F_{ij} \circ F_{kl} \simeq F_{ij} \oplus \dim e_j A e_k \), from which one infers the left (or right) incomparability of the various left (right) cells in \( J_1 \), and using \( \dim e_k A e_k > 0 \) and

\[
F_{ik} \circ F_{kj} \simeq F_{ij} \oplus \dim e_k A e_k
\]

one shows \( F_{ij} \sim_L F_{ij} \) (similarly one treats the right cells). For a general 2-full 2-subcategory \( \mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_A \), the cell preorders of \( \mathcal{C}_A \) must be refinements of those of \( \mathcal{D} \). Hence, the incomparability statement is preserved, being caused by the lack of suitable 1-morphisms in \( \mathcal{C}_A \). To show that also left (or right) equivalence is preserved, note that if \( F_{ij}, F_{ik} \in \mathcal{D}_J \), then \( e_i, e_k \in S \) and thus also \( F_{ik} \in \mathcal{D}_J \), so we may again use (1). □

Our next aim is to show that, similarly to \( \mathcal{C}_A \), cell 2-representations of \( \mathcal{D}_J \) with the same apex are equivalent. Towards that, we first formulate and give a proof of a statement often implicitly used in the literature, for instance in \( \text{[MM5, Proposition 9]}, \text{[MZ1]}, \text{[Zi2]} \):
Lemma 3.7. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a finitary 2-category, $\mathcal{L} = \{F_1, \ldots, F_r\}$ be a left cell of $\mathcal{C}$, $\mathcal{J}$ be the J-cell containing $\mathcal{L}$, and let $M$ be a simple transitive 2-representation with apex $\mathcal{J}$.

Consider an ordering $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ of isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects of $M(1)$, yielding in particular $M(1) \simeq \text{Q-proj}$ for $Q = \text{End}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^k X_i)^{\text{op}}$ with a complete system of idempotents induced by $\{\text{id}_{X_i}\}_{i=1}^k =: \{f_i\}_{i=1}^k$.

If there is an ordering as above such that

- The Cartan matrix of $M(1)$ is equal to that of $\text{add}(\mathcal{L})$;
- There is an index $j \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $MF_i \simeq Qf_i \otimes_k f_j Q$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$,

then $M$ is equivalent to $C_{\mathcal{L}}$.

Proof. Let $L_1, \ldots, L_k$ be a complete list of simple objects of $\text{Q-mod} \simeq \overline{M}(1)$ associated to the idempotents $f_1, \ldots, f_k$, and let $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ be the action of $\mathcal{J}$ on $\text{add}(F \mid F \geq_\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L})$ by composition. Similarly to the the Yoneda lemma for $P_1$ given in [MM2] Lemma 9, the functor induced by the map

$$F_i \mapsto \overline{M}F_i(L_j)$$

is a 2-transformation from $K_{\mathcal{L}}$ to $M$. And since $\mathcal{J}$ is the apex of $M$, the identity 2-morphism of any 1-morphism $F$ satisfying $F \geq_\mathcal{L} \mathcal{L}$ is sent to a zero map. Hence there is an induced 2-transformation from the transitive quotient $N_{\mathcal{L}}$ of $K_{\mathcal{L}}$, which acts on $\text{add}(F \mid F \in \mathcal{L})$. We denote that 2-transformation by $\sigma$.

Note that the image of $F_i$ under $\sigma$ is the indecomposable object $Qf_i$ of $\text{Q-proj}$. This shows that all the isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects of $\text{Q-proj}$ are reached by $\sigma$, and so $\sigma$ is essentially surjective.

The kernel of $\sigma$ is an ideal of $N_{\mathcal{L}}$, which doesn’t contain any identity 2-morphisms of $\mathcal{J}$, since $F_i L_j \neq 0$ for all $i$. Thus it is contained in the maximal ideal $I$ of $N_{\mathcal{L}}$. We claim that also $I \subseteq \text{Ker}\,\sigma$. This is because $\sigma$ factors through $N_{\mathcal{L}}/\text{Ker}(\sigma)$, and the induced morphism

$$\tilde{\sigma} : N_{\mathcal{L}}/\text{Ker}(\sigma) \to M$$

is faithful, so that for all $i, j$, the linear map

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{ij} : \text{Hom}_{N_{\mathcal{L}}/\text{Ker}(\sigma)}(F_i, F_j) \to \text{Hom}_{\text{Q-proj}}(Qe_i, Qe_j)$$

is injective, hence

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{N_{\mathcal{L}}/\text{Ker}(\sigma)}(F_i, F_j) \leq \dim \text{Hom}_{\text{Q-proj}}(Qe_i, Qe_j).$$

Since $\text{Ker}(\sigma) \subseteq I$, we have

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{C_{\mathcal{L}}}(F_i, F_j) \leq \dim \text{Hom}_{N_{\mathcal{L}}/\text{Ker}(\sigma)}(F_i, F_j).$$

But the equality of Cartan matrices for $C_{\mathcal{L}}$ and $M$ implies that the lower and the upper bound for $\dim \text{Hom}_{N_{\mathcal{L}}/\text{Ker}(\sigma)}(F_i, F_j)$ coincide, so

$$\dim I(F_i, F_j) = \dim \text{Ker}(\sigma)(F_i, F_j), \text{ and } \text{Ker}(\sigma) = I.$$

So we can take the cell 2-representation as the domain of the induced morphism:

$$\tilde{\sigma} : C_{\mathcal{L}} \to M.$$
Now for all $i, j$, $\tilde{\sigma}_{ij}$ is an injective linear map between equidimensional spaces, and thus is an isomorphism. This shows that $\tilde{\sigma}$ is full and faithful. It is also essentially surjective, since so is $\sigma$. So $\tilde{\sigma}$ is an equivalence of 2-representations. □

Proposition 3.8. Two cell 2-representations of $\mathcal{D}_J$ are equivalent if and only if they have the same apex.

Proof. First, observe that equivalent 2-representations clearly have the same apex, so we only need to prove that cell 2-representations with the same apex are equivalent. This is trivial if the apex is $J_0$. The case where the apex is $J_1$ is similar to [MM5, Proposition 9]: the maximal ideal of transitive subrepresentation used to construct the left cell $L_j = \{ A\epsilon_i \otimes \epsilon_j A \mid \epsilon_i \in S \}$ corresponds to the ideal $Ae_S \otimes_k \text{Rad} e_j A$ of $\text{End}_{A-A\text{-bimod}}(\bigoplus_i A\epsilon_i \otimes_k \epsilon_j A) \simeq Ae_S \otimes_k \epsilon_j A$, where $e_S = \sum \epsilon_i \epsilon_S \epsilon_i$. Thus the cell 2-representation acts on $Ae_S \otimes_k \epsilon_j A \simeq Ae_S$, independently of $j$, and since the action by definition satisfies the latter condition of Lemma 3.7, we have the sought equivalence. □

The next statement concerns discrete extensions of 2-representations, studied in [CM] - we will mainly use the corollary that follows it, so we don’t give details here. The statement itself is a consequence of the results of [CM, Section 6]:

Proposition 3.9. Let $L_0 := J_0^L$ and let $L_1 \subset J_1^L$ be two left cells of $\mathcal{D}_L$. Then

(1) $\text{Dext}(C_{L_0}, C_{L_0}) = \emptyset$
(2) $\text{Dext}(C_{L_1}, C_{L_1}) = \emptyset$
(3) $\text{Dext}(C_{L_1}, C_{L_0}) = \emptyset$.

Corollary 3.10. Let $F^J := \bigoplus_{F_{ij} \in J_1^L} F_{ij}$ and let $C$ be the matrix associated to $F$ under the 2-representation $C_{L_1}$. Given a finitary 2-representation $M$ of $\mathcal{D}_J$ such that not all of its composition factors correspond to $C_{L_0}$, there is an ordering of the indecomposable objects of $M$ such that the matrix $[F^J]$ is of the form

$$[F^J] = \begin{pmatrix} K & * \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $K$ is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} C & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C \end{pmatrix}$$

3.2. Cell structures and cell 2-representations of $\mathcal{D}_L, \mathcal{D}_R$. In this subsection we provide partial variants of results for $\mathcal{D}_J$ from the preceding subsection, in the cases $\mathcal{D}_L, \mathcal{D}_R$. To summarize, cell 2-representations with same apex still are equivalent like in Proposition 3.8, $\mathcal{D}_L$ inherits its right cell structure from $\mathcal{C}_A$ and $\mathcal{D}_R$ similarly inherits its left cell structure from $\mathcal{C}_A$. Obstructions may occur in left cell structure of $\mathcal{D}_L$ and right cell structure of $\mathcal{D}_R$ - we describe exactly what differences one may find in comparison to $\mathcal{C}_A$. We only prove our statements for $\mathcal{D}_L$ - the proofs regarding the cell structure of $\mathcal{D}_R$ are very similar, and $\mathcal{D}_L$ is the more difficult case when considering its cell 2-representations: this is because it is the left cell structure that governs these, which may be pathological for $\mathcal{D}_L$, whereas for $\mathcal{D}_R$ one may just mimic the approach for $\mathcal{D}_J$.

First, an example of aforementioned obstruction:
Example 3.11. Let $A = \Lambda_2$, the algebra introduced in Example 3.4. Choose the self-injective core $S = \{v_2\}$, and consider the associated 2-category $\mathcal{D}_L$. Since $F_{i2} \circ F_{i2} = 0$ for $i = 0, 1, 2$, we don't have $F_{02} \geq_L F_{12}$ nor $F_{22} \geq_L F_{12}$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{D}_L$ has three $J$-cells:

$$\mathcal{J}_0 = \{A_2\}, \mathcal{J}_1 = \{F_{i0}, F_{i2}\}, \mathcal{J}_2 = \{F_{12}\} \text{ with } \mathcal{J}_0 \triangleleft_J \mathcal{J}_1 \triangleleft_J \mathcal{J}_2.$$  

Its left preorder is equal to its two-sided preorder, and its right preorder is inherited from $\mathcal{C}_A$.

Since $\mathcal{D}_L$ is a 2-subcategory of $\mathcal{C}_A$, in view of Proposition 3.10 one sees that the cell structure of $\mathcal{C}_J$ is preserved under inclusion into $\mathcal{D}_L$ - no new relations are introduced. In particular, by $\mathcal{J}_1$ we will denote the two-sided cell of $\mathcal{D}_L$ containing all the non-identity indecomposable 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{D}_J$.

Proposition 3.12. The right preorder of $\mathcal{D}_L$ is the restriction of that of $\mathcal{C}_A$.

A non-identity indecomposable 1-morphism of $\mathcal{D}_L$ lies outside $\mathcal{J}_1^L$ if and only if it is of the form $F_{kl}$ with $k$ such that $e_i A_{ek} = 0$ for all $e_i \in S$. In that case, every 1-morphism of its right cell also lies outside of $\mathcal{J}_1^L$ and constitutes a maximal, non-idempotent $J$-cell. We refer to such $J$-cells as bad cells.

Proof. The first claim follows by noting that the collection $\mathcal{R}_k = \{F_{kl} \mid l \in S\}$, coming from the corresponding right cell of $\mathcal{C}_A$, is a right cell of $\mathcal{D}_L$: given $F_{kl}, F_{kl'}$ in $\mathcal{R}_k$, the 1-morphism $F_{kl}$ is a direct summand of $F_{kl'} \circ F_{l'l}$, where the latter lies in $\mathcal{D}_L$.

If there is $e_i \in S$ such that $e_i A_{ek} \neq 0$, then $F_{kl} \sim_L F_{il}$, being a direct sum of $F_{ik} \circ F_{kl}$, so the left preorder on $\mathcal{J}_1^L \cup \mathcal{R}_k$ is inherited from $\mathcal{C}_A$.

On the other hand, if, given $k$, there is no $i$ as above, then for any $F_{kj} \in \mathcal{D}_L$ we have $G \circ F_{kj} = 0$ for any indecomposable 1-morphism of $\mathcal{D}_L$ not isomorphic to the identity 1-morphism. So every such $F_{kj}$ is $L$-maximal and constitutes its own left cell, and the right cell $\mathcal{R}_k$ becomes a $J$-cell, which is $J$-maximal by $L$-maximality of $F_{kj}$ and $R$-incomparability of non-identity right cells of $\mathcal{C}_A$. It is also non-idempotent, since any composition inside it evaluates to zero. □

Proposition 3.13. Two cell 2-representations of $\mathcal{D}_L$ are equivalent if and only if they have the same apex.

Proof. From the characterization of bad cells in Proposition 3.12 it follows that the cell 2-representation associated to such a cell has apex $\mathcal{J}_0$, consisting of the identity morphism. One may view such 2-representation as a simple transitive 2-representation of the 2-category generated only by the regular bimodule, and any two simple transitive 2-representations of such a 2-category are necessarily equivalent (see [MM5], [MM6]).

For cell 2-representations with apex $\mathcal{J}_1^L$, the proof is very similar to that for $\mathcal{C}_A$ (see [MM2]), with one minor difference. Choose a left cell $\mathcal{L}_j$ in $\mathcal{J}_1^L$. The maximal ideal of the transitive action used to construct $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{L}_j}$ can be represented by an ideal $I$ of the algebra $\text{End}(\bigoplus_j F_{ij}) \simeq A \otimes_k e_j A$. From our earlier calculations and the results for $\mathcal{C}_A$ we see that this ideal must contain $A \otimes \text{Rad} e_j A$. The difference in the case of $\mathcal{D}_L$ is that $I$ is not necessarily equal to that ideal, so $\mathcal{D}_L$ is not $\mathcal{J}_1^L$-simple in the sense of [MM2], Section 6.2. Nonetheless, since the homspaces between
indecomposable 1-morphisms are k-split (in the same sense as the 1-morphisms are represented by k-split bimodules), and $I$ contains $A \otimes \text{Rad} e_j A$, the quotient $A \otimes e_j A / I$ is independent of $j$, and in each case the indecomposable 1-morphisms act as suitable projective bimodules over $A \otimes e_j A / I$ to establish the equivalence using Lemma 5.7.

Example 3.14. Consider again the algebra $\Lambda_2$ defined in Example 3.3 choose the self-injective core $S = \{0\}$ and consider the associated 2-category $\mathcal{D}_L$. Consider the morphism $\varphi_{c_i} \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{D}_L(1,1)}(F_{10})$ given by the bimodule morphism defined by sending $e_1 \otimes e_0$ to $a_1 b_1 \otimes e_0$. The action of $F_{j0}$ on $\varphi_{c_i}$ by tensor product is zero for $j = 0, 1, 2$, so $k[\varphi_{c_i}]$ is a proper ideal in the transitive action used to define the cell 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}_L$ with apex $\mathcal{J}_L^L$, and thus is removed in the quotient defining said cell 2-representation. The same holds for $\varphi_{c_2} \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{D}_L(1,1)}(F_{20})$. As a consequence, the cell 2-representation acts on a category equivalent to $\Delta_2$-proj, where we let $\Delta_2$ be the quotient of $\Lambda_2$ by the ideal generated by relations $a_1 b_1 = 0 = a_2 b_2$.

The following combines [Z2] Theorem 3.1 with [MZ1] Lemma 8:

Proposition 3.15. Let $M$ be a simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}_I$, $\mathcal{D}_R$ or $\mathcal{D}_L$. The 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{D}_I$ act as projective functors.

If $F$ is a 1-morphism acting as a projective functor, and $G \sim_L F$, then $G$ also acts as a projective functor. As a consequence, 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{D}_L$ act as projective functors.

4. Simple Transitive 2-Representations of $\mathcal{D}_R$

The main goal of this section is to prove the following:

Theorem 4.1. Let $A$ be a basic, connected, finite-dimensional algebra with a self-injective core $S$. Consider the right-cell 2-category $\mathcal{D}_R$ associated to $S$. Every simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}_R$ is equivalent to a cell 2-representation.

Given a finitary 2-category $\mathcal{C}$ and a 2-subcategory $\mathcal{D}$ of $\mathcal{C}$, let $M$ be a finitary 2-representation of $\mathcal{C}$, and denote by $M_{|\mathcal{D}}$ the restriction of $M$ to a 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}$. Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ be a complete list of indecomposable objects of $M(\hat{1})$ and let $X_1, \ldots, X_s$ be the objects of that list associated to a transitive subquotient $N$ of $M_{|\mathcal{D}}$. Let $I$ be the ideal of $N$ such that $N/I$ is simple transitive. In that setting, we make the following observation, which is a direct consequence of the definitions of transitive and simple transitive 2-representations:

Observation 4.2. Under the conditions described above, let

$$Q := \text{End}_{M(\hat{1})} \left( \bigoplus_{i=1}^{s} X_i \right),$$

so that $N(\hat{1}) \simeq Q$-proj. The ideal $I$ corresponds to an ideal $I$ of $Q$ such that

$$N/I(\hat{1}) \simeq Q/I\text{-proj}.$$  

In particular, if we denote the Cartan matrix of $M(\hat{1})$ by $C^M$ and similarly by $C^{N/I}$ denote the Cartan matrix of $N/I(\hat{1})$, then for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ we have

$$C^M_{ij} \geq C^{N/I}_{ij}.$$
In this section, the observation above is particularly useful due to the following:

**Proposition 4.3.** Let $M$ be a simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}_R$. The restriction $M_{\mathcal{D}_J}$ of $M$ to $\mathcal{D}_J$ is transitive.

**Proof.** Let $\mathcal{L}_1$ be a left cell of $\mathcal{D}_R$ contained in $\mathcal{J}_1$. Then $\mathcal{L}_1$ also is a left cell of $\mathcal{D}_J$. Hence, using action notation, we may write $\text{add}(\mathcal{D}_R\mathcal{L}_1) = \text{add}(\mathcal{L}_1)$. Similarly, we then also have

$$\text{add}(\mathcal{D}_R(L_1^i M(i))) = \text{add}((\mathcal{D}_R L_1) M(i)) = \text{add}(L_1 M(i)).$$

So $L_1 M(i)$ is $\mathcal{D}_R$-stable, and thus, since $M$ is simple transitive, must equal all of $M(i)$. Thus, if we let $F^J := \bigoplus_{i,j \in \mathcal{J}_1} F_{ij}$, we see that all the rows of the matrix $[F^J]$ are non-zero; we conclude that no factors in the Jordan-Hölder decomposition of $M_{\mathcal{D}_J}$ are equivalent to $C_{\mathcal{D}_J}$. From Corollary 3.10 we see that $[F^J]$ is of the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} C & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_k \end{pmatrix},$$

where the entries of $C$ are positive integers. Now let $F := \bigoplus_{i,j \in \mathcal{J}_1} F_{ij}$. By transitivity of $M$, the entries of $[F]$ also are positive integers. As we have just established, we have

$$\text{add}((F \circ F^J)M(i)) = \text{add}(F^J M(i)).$$

So there are matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_k$ whose entries are positive integers, satisfying

$$[F] \cdot [F^J] = \begin{pmatrix} C_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_k \end{pmatrix},$$

but since all entries of $[F]$ are positive, and all entries of $[F^J]$ are non-negative with the diagonal entries positive, all entries of $[F] \cdot [F^J]$ must be positive. Thus $k = 1$ and so $M_{\mathcal{D}_J}$ is transitive. $\square$

A direct consequence of that statement is that we know the rank of $M$, which is equal to $p := |S|$.

Let $M$ be a simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}_R$, let $Q$ be a finite-dimensional algebra such that $M(i) \simeq Q$-proj, let $f_1, \ldots, f_p$ be a system of idempotents for $Q$, and by $G_{ij}$ denote the indecomposable projective functor $Q f_i \otimes_k f_j Q$.

Let $C^Q$ denote the Cartan matrix of $M(i)$. We will show that $C^Q$ coincides with the Cartan matrix of the target category of $C_{\mathcal{L}}$, for $\mathcal{L}$ a left cell inside $\mathcal{J}_1$, which is easily verified to be that of $eAe$-proj for $e = \sum_{e_i \in S} e_i$. At the same time we will also show that there is an ordering of a complete list of indecomposable objects of $M(i)$ such that for $F_{ij} \in \mathcal{J}_1$, the action of $F_{ij}$ is given by $M F_{ij} \simeq G_{ij}$. From this, as shown in Lemma 3.7, Theorem 4.1 will follow.

Recall from Proposition 3.15 that a 1-morphism $F_{ij} \in \mathcal{J}_1$ acts as a projective functor. To show that this projective functor is naturally isomorphic to $G_{ij}$, we need to introduce the $X$-sets and $Y$-sets of $[MZ2]$:

**Definition 4.4.** Given $e_i, e_j \in S$:
Let $X_{ij}$ be the set of $s \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ such that for some $t \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $G_{st}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $MF_{ij}$.

Let $Y_{ij}$ be the set of $t \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ such that for some $s \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $G_{st}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $MF_{ij}$.

Note that $X_{ij}$ is exactly the set of indices of non-zero rows of $[F_{ij}]$.

From Proposition 4.3 we know the matrix $[F_{ij}]$ - it is the same as the matrix of $F_{ij}$ associated to the simple transitive quotient of $M_{eAe}$, which is equal to the matrix of the action of $eAe_i \otimes e_j e_A e$ on $e_A e$-proj, for $e = \sum_{e_i \in S} e_i$. The only non-zero row of $[F_{ij}]$ is the $i$th one. This means that our choice of enumeration of idempotents in $S$ gives us an ordering on indecomposables of $M(\mathbf{1})$ such that $X_{ij} = \{i\}$ for all $j$.

Since $F_{ij}$ admits a left adjoint in $\mathcal{D}_R$ for all $q$, the proof of [MZ2, Lemma 22] yields:

**Lemma 4.5.** Under the ordering of indecomposables described above, given $e_q \in S$, $Y_{iq} = \{q\}$ for all $e_i \in S$.

We conclude that $MF_{ij} \simeq C_{ij}^{e_{m_{ij}}}$ for some positive integer $m_{ij}$ depending on $i, j$.

We are now ready to prove the main result:

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** Let $C^{eAe}$ denote the Cartan matrix of $eAe$ and similarly let $C^Q$ denote the Cartan matrix of $Q$. Let $e_i, e_j \in S$, so that $F_{ij} \in J_1^i$. Observe that
\[ G_{ij} Q e_i \simeq Q e_i^{\otimes C_{ij}^Q}, \] so $[G_{ij}]_{il} = C_{ij}^Q$.

And as $MF_{ij} \simeq C_{ij}^{e_{m_{ij}}}$, we have $[F_{ij}] = m_{ij} [G_{ij}]$, and also
\[ [F_{ij}]_{il} = m_{ij} C_{ij}^Q \]

By the discussion following Definition 4.4 the matrix $[F_{ij}]$ is the same as the matrix of the corresponding 1-morphism of $\mathcal{C}_{eAe}$ in the cell 2-representation thereof. Thus we know that
\[ [F_{ij}]_{il} = C_{ij}^{eAe}. \]

It now follows that
\[ m_{ij} C_{ij}^Q = C_{ij}^{eAe}. \]

But in the proof of Proposition 3.8 we showed that the Cartan matrix of the simple transitive quotient of $M_{eAe}$ is exactly $C^{eAe}$. So by the inequality 2 stated in Observation 4.2, we have
\[ C_{ij}^Q \geq C_{ij}^{eAe}, \]

which, since $m_{ij}$ is to be a positive integer, implies $m_{ij} = 1$ and $C_{ij}^Q = C_{ij}^{eAe}$. This implies both that $MF_{ij} \simeq G_{ij}$ and that $C^Q = C^{eAe}$, from which, by Proposition 3.7, the result follows. \qed
In this section, we focus on the two families of algebras \( \{ \Lambda_n \mid n \geq 1 \} \) and \( \{ \Delta_n \mid n \geq 1 \} \) generalizing the algebras \( \Lambda_2, \Delta_2 \) introduced in Examples 3.4 and 3.14 respectively. The first family was studied in \[Zi2\]: it was established there that for the self-injective core \( S = \{ e_0 \} \), the simple transitive 2-representations of the 2-category \( \mathcal{D}_R \) are equivalent to cell 2-representations. This is generalized by Theorem 4.1. In Example 3.14 we have found that the cell 2-representation connects \( \Lambda_2 \) with a quotient \( \Delta_2 \) thereof. In general, \( \Delta_n \) is a quotient of \( \Lambda_n \) for which only one of its \( n + 1 \) indecomposable projectives is injective, giving a unique self-injective core \( \{ e_0 \} \). In this section we show that removing some cells of \( C_{\Delta_n} \), even without requiring those remaining to correspond to a self-injective core, gives a 2-category whose simple transitive 2-representations are equivalent to its cell 2-representations.

**Definition 5.1.** Given an integer \( n \geq 1 \), the star algebra \( \Lambda_n \) is the quotient of the path algebra of 

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & a_1 & & & a_n & \\
& b_1 & & b_n & & & \\
1 & & & & & & \cdots & n
\end{array}
\]

by the ideal generated by relations

- \( b_i a_i = b_j a_j \) for all \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \);
- \( a_i b_j = 0 \) for \( i \neq j \).

For \( n > 1 \) these relations imply \( \text{Rad}^3 \Lambda_n = 0 \). For \( \Lambda_1 \) we explicitly require that to be the case:

\[ b_1 a_1 b_1 = a_1 b_1 a_1 = 0. \]

The algebra \( \Delta_n \) is defined as the quotient of \( \Lambda_n \) by the relations

\[ a_i b_i = 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n. \]

Fix \( n \geq 1 \) and denote \( \Delta_n \) by \( \Delta \).

**Remark 5.2.** The algebra \( \Lambda_n \) is the so-called zig-zag algebra on the underlying graph of the quiver of \( \Lambda_n \). For more on general zig-zag algebras, see e.g. \[ET\].

**Definition 5.3.** Let \( E = \{ e_0, \ldots, e_n \} \) be the complete system of idempotents for \( \Delta \) induced by the quiver above, and consider a subset \( S \subseteq E \). We let

- \( \mathcal{D}_J^\Delta \) be the 2-full subcategory of \( \mathcal{C}_\Delta \) given by the additive closure of \( \{ \Delta \} \cup \{ \Delta e_i \otimes_k e_j \Delta \mid e_i, e_j \in S \} \);
- \( \mathcal{D}_R^\Delta \) be the 2-full subcategory of \( \mathcal{C}_\Delta \) given by the additive closure of \( \{ \Delta \} \cup \{ \Delta e_i \otimes_k e_j \Delta \mid e_i \in S \} \).

Note that given a permutation \( \sigma \in S_n \), the algebra morphism induced by

\[ e_0 \mapsto e_0, \ e_i \mapsto e_{\sigma(i)} \text{ for } i = 1, \ldots, n \]

is an automorphism of \( \Delta \). So for

\[ S = \{ e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_m \} \text{ and } S' = \{ e_0, e_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, e_{\sigma(m)} \}, \]
the resulting 2-categories are biequivalent. And so if $S$ contains $m$ idempotents among $e_1, \ldots, e_n$ for some $m \leq n$, we will without loss of generality always assume that those idempotents are exactly $e_1, \ldots, e_m$. Moreover, it is easy to verify that if $e_0 \not\in S$, then all the non-identity left cells of $D^*_R$ outside of $J'_1$ are bad cells, in which case $D^*_R$ reduces to $D^*_R$. In this document we will only consider the case $e_0 \in S$. Under this assumption, we will show that simple transitive 2-representations of $D^*_R$, as well as those of $D^*_R$, are equivalent to cell 2-representations.

The proof of Proposition 3.13 also applies to $D^*_J$ and $D^*_R$, so cell 2-representations with the same apex are equivalent in both cases.

**Proposition 5.4.** Let $S = \{e_0, e_1, \ldots, e_m\}$. Then $D^*_J$ is biequivalent to $C_{\Delta_m}$.

**Proof.** Similarly to Example 3.14, one determines that the cell 2-representation with apex $J_1$ of $D_J$ acts on a category equivalent to $\Delta_m$-proj. The 1-morphisms act as respective projective functors, since the projection of $\Delta \otimes k \Delta^\text{op}$ onto $\Delta_m \otimes k \Delta^\text{op}$ sends $\Delta e_i \otimes k e_j \Delta$ to $\Delta_m e_i \otimes k e_j \Delta_m$. Similarly to [MMI] Proposition 46, the above action gives rise to a 2-functor $R : D^*_J \to C_{\Delta_m}$ sending a 1-morphism of $D^*_J$ to the functor it acts by in the cell 2-representation, and similarly for 2-morphisms. This 2-functor is locally essentially surjective, since it reaches all isoclasses of indecomposable 1-morphisms. It is locally faithful, since the cell 2-representation is 2-faithful: explicit calculation proves that there is no 2-morphism $\varphi$ of $D^*_J$ such that $\varphi F_{ij} = 0$ for all $i, j$. To show that it is locally full, we show

\[
\dim \text{Hom}_{D^*_J}(F, G) = \dim \text{Hom}_{C_{\Delta_m}}(RF, RG)
\]

so that the maps between such spaces induced by $R$ are surjective due to being injective between equidimensional spaces.

Using the fact that an indecomposable 1-morphism $F_{ij}$ is represented by a bimodule $\Delta e_i \otimes k e_j \Delta$, which is cyclic on $e_i \otimes e_j$, and similarly the regular bimodule is cyclic on $1 \in \Delta$, we describe the Hom-spaces above using the images of cyclic vectors. On the level of 2-morphisms inside $J'_1$, the equidimensionality above reduces to the observation that

\[
e_i \Delta e_j = e_i (e_0 + \ldots + e_m) \Delta (e_0 + \ldots + e_m) e_j \cong e_i \Delta_m e_j.
\]

The same holds for morphisms from $J'_1$ to the identity 1-morphism $\Delta$, we have:

\[
\text{Hom}_{D^*_J}(F_{ij}, \Delta) = \{ \varphi \mid \varphi(e_i \otimes e_j) \in e_i \Delta e_j \} \cong e_i \Delta e_j.
\]

Finally,

\[
\text{End}_{D^*_J}(\Delta) \cong Z(\Delta)
\]

and

\[
\text{Hom}_{D^*_J}(\Delta, F_{ij}) = \{ \varphi \mid \varphi(1) = x \text{ for } x \in \Delta_m e_i \otimes k e_j \Delta_m \text{ such that } ax = xa \text{ for all } a \in \Delta_m \}.
\]

Elementary calculation shows $Z(\Delta) = k[1, c]$ for $c = b_j a_j$ for any $j$, and, denoting by $\varphi_x$ the morphism sending 1 to $x$, we have

\[
\text{Hom}_{D^*_J}(\Delta, F_{ij}) = \begin{cases} 
    k[\varphi_{b_i \otimes a_j}] & \text{for } i, j \neq 0 \\
    k[\varphi] & \text{for } i = 0, j \neq 0 \\
    k[\varphi_{b_i \otimes c}] & \text{for } i \neq 0, j = 0 \\
    k[\varphi_{c \otimes c}] & \text{for } i = j = 0 \text{ and } z = e_0 \otimes c + c \otimes e_0 + \sum_{k=1}^n a_k \otimes b_k.
    \end{cases}
\]

This shows that the dimension is independent of the number of vertices in the underlying graph, proving the claimed equidimensionality, and concluding the proof. □
The biequivalence above yields a bijection between the equivalence classes of simple transitive 2-representations of $D^\Delta_{m}$. The 2-representations of the latter are equivalent to cell 2-representations, so we conclude that also the simple transitive 2-representations of $D^\Delta$ must be equivalent to cell 2-representations.

Next, we want to establish that the restriction of $M$ to a 2-representation of $D^\Delta_{j}$ is transitive, similarly to Proposition 4.3. To that end, we need a statement concerning discrete extensions, similar to Proposition 4.3.

**Proposition 5.5.** Let $A$ be a finite-dimensional algebra admitting a non-zero projective-injective module. Let $C_{J}$ be the cell 2-representation of $C_{A}$ with apex $J$, and let $C_{\Lambda}$ be the cell 2-representation with apex $\Lambda$. Then we have the following:

1. $\text{Dext}(C_{\Lambda}, C_{\Lambda}) = \emptyset$
2. $\text{Dext}(C_{\Lambda}, C_{\Lambda}) = \emptyset$
3. $\text{Dext}(C_{\Lambda}, C_{\Lambda}) = \emptyset$.

**Proof.** Parts (1) and (2) are shown in [CM, Theorem 22]. For part (3), let $e_1, \ldots, e_r$ be a complete system of idempotents and let $\{F_{i,j}\}_{i,j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}}$ label the indecomposable 1-morphisms of $C_{A}$. Let $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ be such that $Ae_i \cong (e_j A)^{\ast}$. Then our assumption and [MMI, Lemma 45] show that for any $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ we have a pair $(F_{kj}, F_{ik})$ of adjoint 1-morphisms.

Let $M$ be a 2-representation with a transitive 2-subrepresentation $N$ with simple transitive quotient equivalent to $C_{\Lambda}$, and such that the quotient $K$ is transitive, with simple transitive quotient equivalent to $C_{\Lambda}$, so that we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \to N \to M \to K \to 0$$

in the sense of [CM].

Let $X_1, \ldots, X_r, Y$ be a complete list of representatives of isoclasses of indecomposable objects of $M(1)$, with $X_1, \ldots, X_r$ corresponding to $K$ and $Y$ corresponding to $N$. We aim to show that there is no 1-morphism $F$ of $C_{A}$ and $k \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ such that $Y$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $MF(X_k)$. Clearly, we can argue on the level of indecomposable 1-morphisms.

Let $X := \bigoplus_{l=1}^{r} X_l$. Consider a 1-morphism of the form $F_{kj}$. Using $MF_{ik}(Y) = 0$ and the adjunction above, we get

$$\text{Hom}_{M(1)}(MF_{kj}(X), Y) \cong \text{Hom}_{M(1)}(X, MF_{ik}(Y)) = 0$$

showing the sought statement for $F_{kj}$. Similarly, we have

$$0 = \text{Hom}_{M(1)}(MF_{kj}(Y), X) \cong \text{Hom}_{M(1)}(Y, MF_{ik}(X)),$$

which shows it for $F_{ik}$. Denote by $L_k$ the simple $A$-module associated to $e_k$. Observe that

$$\dim \langle e_j A e_i \rangle = [A e_i : L_j] = [(e_j A)^{\ast} : L_j] > 0,$$

where $[M : L_j]$ denotes the composition multiplicity of $L_j$ in $M$, for $M \in A$-mod.

Now let $k, l \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$. We have $F_{kl}^{\dim \langle e_j A e_i \rangle} \cong F_{kj} \circ F_{il}$, so in view of the above we see that $F_{kl}$ is a direct summand of $F_{ki} \circ F_{lj}$. And clearly $Y$ is not isomorphic to a direct summand of $M(F_{ki} \circ F_{lj})(X)$, by what we have shown before. □
Now, just as in Proposition 4.3, the restriction of $M$ to a 2-representation of $D$ is transitive, and so we see that the number of indecomposable objects of $Q$-proj - the rank of $M$ - is equal to $m + 1$. In particular, the Cartan matrix $C^Q$ of $Q$ is an $(m + 1) \times (m + 1)$ matrix. Let $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\}$ be a system of idempotents for $Q$, and by $G_{ij}$ denote an indecomposable projective functor isomorphic to tensoring with $Qf_i \otimes_k f_j Q$ over $Q$. Finally, let $L_i$ denote the simple object of $Q$-mod associated to $f_i$.

As a consequence of Proposition 3.15 and $F_{00}$ being self-adjoint, the following holds:

**Lemma 5.6.** The 1-morphisms of $D^R$ of the form $F_{i0}$ act as projective functors.

Since the restriction of $M$ to $D$ is transitive, we know the matrices of those 1-morphisms, and so, using $X$-sets and $Y$-sets as in Definition 4.4, we see that $X_{i0} = \{i\}$. Moreover, since all of those morphisms are $L$-equivalent, their $Y$-sets coincide; denote that set by $Y_0$. The self-adjointness of $F_{00}$ yields $Y_0 = \{0\}$, as in Lemma 4.5. So $MF_{i0} \simeq G_{i0}^{\oplus m}$. But now the considerations from the proof of theorem 4.1 apply, since we do have transitive restriction and we do know that the simple transitive quotient of that restriction is the cell 2-representation. So $m_i = 1$.

In other words, we have:

**Lemma 5.7.** For $i = 0, \ldots, n$, there is a natural isomorphism $MF_{i0} \simeq G_{i0}$.

In view of Proposition 5.15 we now only need to show that the Cartan matrix of a simple transitive 2-representation is the same as that of a cell 2-representation, i.e. that of $\Delta_m$.

Again mimicking the approach from Section 4, we observe that

$$G_{i0} \circ G_{j0} \simeq G_{i0}^{\oplus c^Q_{ij}}$$

and

$$F_{i0} \circ F_{j0} \simeq \begin{cases} F_{i0} & \text{for } j \neq 0 \\ F_{i0}^{\oplus 2} & \text{for } j = 0 \end{cases}$$

yield $c^Q_{ij} = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$ and $c^Q_{00} = 2$. Furthermore, the self-adjointness of $F_{00}$ yields

$$2c^Q_{i0} = \dim \text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Qf_i, Qf_i^{\oplus 2}) = \dim \text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Qf_i, F_{00}Q_0)$$

$$= \dim \text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(F_{00}Qf_i, Q_0) = \dim \text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Q_0, Q_0) = c^Q_{00} = 2.$$ 

So $c^Q_{i0} = 1$ for $i \neq 0$.

It remains to show that

- $c_{jj} = 1$ for $j = 1, \ldots, m$;
- $c_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$ and $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$.

We will show these statements in that order.

Given a module $M \in Q$-mod and a simple $Q$-module $L$, denote the composition multiplicity of $L$ in $M$ by $[M : L]$.

Lemma 5.8. A 1-morphism of $\mathcal{D}_R^\Delta$ of the form $F_{ij}$ with $j \neq 0$ acts isomorphically to tensoring with a split $Q$-bimodule of the form $Qf_i \otimes_k M$, for some right $Q$-module $M$ satisfying $[M : L_0] = 1 = [M : L_j]$ and $[M : L_k] = 0$ otherwise.

Proof. Since $F_{ij}$ acts as a right exact functor on the abelianization $\overline{M}(1)$, and $M$ embeds into the abelianization as described in Proposition 3.5, $F_{ij}$ acts by tensoring with a $Q$-bimodule $X$ in both $M$ and $\overline{M}$. Using $F_{ij} \sim_R F_{0j}$, in particular $F_{ij} \simeq F_{ij} \circ F_{0j}$, we find that

$$X \simeq Qf_i \otimes_k f_j Q \otimes Q X,$$

which proves the first part of the statement for $M = f_j Q \otimes Q X$. The remaining part is due to the fact that, as we have found earlier, we know the matrix $[F_{ij}]$ - its only two non-zero entries are both equal to 1 and correspond to $MF_{ij}(Q_0)$ and $MF_{ij}(Q_j)$. In other words,

$$Qf_i \simeq Qf_i \otimes_k M \otimes Q Qe_i \text{ for } i = 0, 1$$

and zero otherwise, which concludes the proof. \qed

Lemma 5.9. For $j = 1, \ldots, m$, we have $c^Q_{jj} = 1$.

Proof. By definition, $c^Q_{jj} = \dim \text{End}_{Q\text{-proj}} Qf_j$. Hence in particular $c^Q_{jj} \geq 1$ and since $Qf_j$ is indecomposable, $c^Q_{jj} > 1$ if and only if $\text{Rad} \text{End}_{Q\text{-proj}} Qf_j \neq 0$. We will show that this is not the case: let $\alpha \in \text{Rad} \text{End}_{Q\text{-proj}} Qf_j$. The only 1-morphisms that act on $Qf_j$ in a non-zero way are those of the form $F_{00}$ or $F_{ij}$, for $i = 0, \ldots, m$. In the first case, $F_{00} \alpha$ is given by

$$Qf_i \otimes_k f_0 Q \otimes Q Qf_j \xrightarrow{id_{Qf_i} \otimes \alpha} Qf_i \otimes_k f_0 Q \otimes Q Qf_j,$$

and using $f_0 Q \otimes Q Qf_j \simeq f_0 Q f_j$, we see that $\alpha$ corresponds to the $k$-linear endomorphism of $f_0 Q f_j$ induced by the right multiplication by $\alpha$. Recall that $c^Q_{00} = 1$ and so $\dim f_0 Q f_j = 1$. Since $\alpha \in \text{Rad} \text{End}_{Q\text{-proj}} Qf_j$, $\alpha$ must be a nilpotent endomorphism. A nilpotent endomorphism of a one-dimensional space is zero. So $F_{00} \alpha = 0$.

For the other case, let $M$ be such that $F_{ij} \simeq Qe_i \otimes_k M$. The morphism $F_{ij} \alpha$ can be written as

$$Qe_i \otimes_k Me_j \xrightarrow{id \otimes \overline{\alpha}} Qe_i \otimes_k Me_j,$$

where again $Me_j$ is one-dimensional and $\overline{\alpha} \in \text{End}_{Q\text{-mod}}(Me_j)$ is nilpotent, and so $F_{ij} \alpha = 0$. Furthermore, acting on $\text{Rad} \text{End}_{Q\text{-proj}} Qf_j$ by the identity functor or its endomorphism again corresponds to multiplication with central elements of $Q$ and sends $\text{Rad} \text{End}_{Q\text{-proj}} Qf_j$ to itself. We have thus shown that the ideal of $Q\text{-proj}$ generated by $\text{Rad} \text{End}_{Q\text{-proj}} Qf_j$ is $\mathcal{D}_R^\Delta$-invariant, and since $M$ is simple transitive, this ideal must be zero. In particular, $\alpha = 0$. \qed

The final statement we need to show is:

Lemma 5.10. For $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\}$ such that $i \neq j$, we have $c^Q_{ij} = 0$.

Proof. In analogy to previous lemma, we will show that $\text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Qf_i, Qf_j)$ is an ideal of $M$. Assume $\alpha \in \text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Qf_i, Qf_j)$. From Lemma 5.8 and Lemma 5.7, we see that the 1-morphisms of $J^R_{ij}$ that act on $Qf_i$ in a non-zero way are those of the form $F_{li}, F_{0i}$ for $l = 0, \ldots, m$, and so those are the only ones we need to be concerned with (as the identity functor maps $\text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Qf_i, Qf_j)$ to itself). For
F_i, however we have \( F_i Q_j = 0 \), as \( F_i \simeq Q f_i \otimes_k M \) with \([M : L_j] = 0\) by Lemma 5.8.

Recall from Observation 4.2 that if we consider the restriction of \( M \) to \( \mathcal{P}_A \), which, as we have shown earlier, is transitive, and take the simple transitive quotient \( N \) of that 2-representation, then the algebra \( B \) such that \( N(\mathcal{A}) \simeq B\)-proj is a quotient of \( Q \). As observed earlier, we know that \( N \) is the cell 2-representation of \( \Delta_m \) and thus \( B = \Delta_m \). Let \( I \) be the ideal such that \( \Delta_m = Q/I \). Note that since for \( i, j \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \) such that \( i \neq j \) we have \( c_{ij}^m = 0 \), \( \alpha \) must vanish under the quotient - in other words, \( \alpha \in I \).

Let \( i \neq 0 \). By definition of \( \Delta_m \), \( \text{Hom}_{\Delta_m\text{-proj}}(\Delta_m e_i, \Delta_m e_0) = k[\varphi_{b_i}] \), where \( \varphi_{b_i} \) is the unique morphism sending \( e_i \) to \( b_i \). By \( \beta_i \) we will denote the element of \( e_0 Q e_i \) which under the projection \( Q \to Q/I = \Delta_m \) maps to \( b_i \). It is unique due to the fact that for \( i \neq 0 \), \( c_{0i}^Q = 1 = c_{00}^\Delta \). Also due to that equality, if we write \( F_{i0} \alpha \) as

\[
Q f_i \otimes_k f_0 Q f_i \xrightarrow{id_{Q f_i} \otimes \alpha} Q f_i \otimes_k f_0 Q f_j,
\]

where \( \alpha \) is induced by right multiplication with \( \alpha \) (this is analogous to the calculation in the proof of Lemma 5.10), we see that \( \alpha \) is a linear map between one-dimensional spaces and hence must be given by multiplication with a scalar. In other words, \( \beta_i \alpha = \lambda \beta_j \) for some \( \lambda \in k \).

Let \( \pi : Q \to Q/I = \Delta_m \) be the canonical projection. As we have observed earlier, \( \pi(\beta_i) = b_i \) and \( \pi(\alpha) = 0 \). Since \( \pi \) is an algebra morphism, we must have

\[
0 = b_i \cdot 0 = \pi(\beta_i)\pi(\alpha) = \pi(\beta_i \alpha) = \pi(\lambda \beta_j) = \lambda \pi(\beta_j) = \lambda b_j,
\]

which implies that \( \lambda = 0 \).

But this shows that the ideal of \( M \) generated by \( \text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Q e_i, Q e_j) \) does not contain all the morphisms of \( M(\mathcal{A}) \), and hence must be zero. So

\[
\text{Hom}_{Q\text{-proj}}(Q e_i, Q e_j) = 0,
\]

which concludes the proof.

We have thus shown the main theorem of this section:

**Theorem 5.11.** Let \( \{e_0, \ldots, e_n\} \) be the system of idempotents induced by the definition of \( \Delta_n \). Let \( S \subseteq \{e_0, \ldots, e_n\} \) be such that \( e_0 \in S \). The simple transitive 2-representations of the 2-category \( \mathcal{P}_A \) associated to \( S \) are equivalent to cell 2-representations.

6. \( \mathcal{D}_L \) FOR LEAF QUOTIENTS OF TYPE A ZIG-ZAG ALGEBRAS

From the perspective of this document, the main difference between \( \mathcal{D}_L \) and \( \mathcal{D}_R \) is that the left cells of \( \mathcal{D}_L \) do not coincide with those of \( \mathcal{D}_R \), as is the case for \( \mathcal{D}_R \). In particular, the analogous statement to Proposition 5.3 for \( \mathcal{D}_L \) doesn’t necessarily hold, and so we cannot determine the rank of a simple transitive 2-representation of a general 2-category of the form \( \mathcal{D}_L \) using our methods for \( \mathcal{D}_R \). This is a significant difficulty in [Z2, Section 5], where \( \mathcal{D}_L \) is considered for an algebra of the form \( \Lambda_n \), as described in Definition 5.1 and self-injective core \( S = \{e_0\} \).

This indicates that we should not expect our methods for \( \mathcal{D}_R \) to work as well for \( \mathcal{D}_L \) - and this is mirrored in this section, where we only consider a particular
family of algebras together with a particular choice of a self-injective core, and in that setting use weak variants of results of Section 4 to facilitate solving explicit numerical problems, reminiscent of those in [MZ1].

**Definition 6.1.** Given a positive integer $n$, let $B_n$ denote the quotient of the path algebra of

$$
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
  n & a_n & \cdots & a_2 & a_1 & b_1 & 0 \\
  b_n & n-1 & \cdots & b_{n-1} & b_2 & b_1 & 0 \\
\end{array}
$$

by the ideal generated by relations

- $a_{j-1}a_j = 0$ and $b_jb_{j-1} = 0$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$;
- $b_ja_j = a_{j+1}b_{j+1}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n-1$;
- $a_1b_1 = 0$.

All the indecomposable projectives of $B_n$ except for the one associated to $e_0$ are projective-injective with socle and top isomorphic, so the self-injective cores for $B_n$ are exactly the non-empty subsets of $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$.

$B_n$ is the quotient of the zig-zag algebra on the Dynkin diagram $A_{n+1}$ by the ideal generated by $a_1b_1$. This element is the cycle at the leaf we labelled by zero, which motivates the name leaf quotient of type $A$ zig-zag algebras, used in [PW], where these algebras are studied in terms of their (generalized) tilting modules and exceptional sequences.

For the rest of this section we will study the simple transitive 2-representations of $D_L$ associated to the self-injective core $S = \{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ of $B_n$, for some $n \geq 1$.

The main result of this section is of the same flavour as those of preceding two sections:

**Theorem 6.2.** Let $M$ be a simple transitive 2-representation of $D_L$. $M$ is equivalent to a cell 2-representation.

Under the ordering of the system of idempotents indicated by the quiver above, the Cartan matrix of $B_n$ is the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
  1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
  1 & 2 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
  0 & 1 & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\
  0 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\
  0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 2
\end{pmatrix}
$$

To keep consistent with the said ordering of idempotents, we will index the rows and columns of this matrix starting from 0 rather than from 1. We have $\dim B_n = (n+1) + \dim(Rad / Rad^2)B_n + \dim(Rad^2 B_n) = (n+1) + 2n + n = 4n+1$.

As in the earlier sections, we will also be interested in the algebra $eB_ne$ for $e = e_1 + \ldots + e_n$. The dimension of this algebra is

$$\dim eB_ne = \dim B_n - 3 = 4n - 2.$$ 

Its Cartan matrix is the $n \times n$ lower diagonal block of that of $B_n$ given above. For the remainder of this section, choose $n \geq 1$ and let $B := B_n$.  

First, we remark that in this case, $\mathcal{O}_L$ has no bad cells: the only possible such cell would be $R_0 = \{F_{ij} | j = 1, \ldots, n\}$, but $F_{ii} \circ F_{0j} \neq 0$ shows that $R_0$ is not bad.

As we have discussed in the proof of Proposition 3.8, another difficulty with $\mathcal{O}_L$ is that although all cell 2-representations with apex $J^+_1$ are equivalent, the Cartan matrix of a cell 2-representation $C_{\mathcal{L}_j}$ of $\mathcal{O}_L$ for $B$ may be different from the Cartan matrix of $B$-proj (in contrast to $\mathcal{O}_B$). However, here this is not the case:

**Lemma 6.3.** Let $\mathcal{L}_j$ be a left cell of $J^+_1$. The Cartan matrix of the target category of $C_{\mathcal{L}_j}$ coincides with that of $B$-proj.

**Proof.** As explained in the proof of Proposition 3.8, the Cartan matrices in question differ if and only if there are 1-morphisms $F_{ij}, F_{kj}$ of $J^+_1$ and a non-zero 2-morphism $\alpha : F_{ij} \rightarrow F_{kj}$ with $\alpha(e_i \otimes e_j) \in B e_k \otimes_k k[e_j]$ such that $F_{im} \alpha = 0$ for all $F_{im} \in \mathcal{O}_L$. Assume that $\alpha$ is such a 2-morphism.

Also from the discussion in Proposition 3.8 we see that in our particular case, if $\alpha \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_L}(F_{ij}, F_{kj})$ is non-zero and $i \neq 0$, then an identity can be recovered from $F_{ij} \alpha$. So the domain of $\alpha$ is $F_{0j}$.

The only 1-morphisms of the form $F_{ij}$ such that $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_L}(F_{0j}, F_{ij}) \neq 0$ are $F_{0j}, F_{1j}$. However, $\text{End}_{\mathcal{O}_L}(F_{0j}) = k[\text{id}_{F_{0j}}]$, so an identity morphism is immediately found if $\alpha \in \text{End}_{\mathcal{O}_L}(F_{0j})$.

We are left with the case $\alpha \in \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_L}(F_{0j}, F_{1j})$. Since we assume

$$\alpha(e_0 \otimes e_j) \in B e_1 \otimes_k k[e_j]$$

and $e_0 B e_1 = k[a_1]$, up to scalar multiple we must have $\alpha(e_0 \otimes e_j) = a_1 \otimes e_j$. Now $F_{11} \alpha$ is represented by the map

$$\tilde{\alpha} : B e_1 \otimes_k e_1 B e_0 \otimes_k e_j B \rightarrow B e_1 \otimes_k e_1 B e_1 \otimes_k e_j B$$

given by sending $e_i \otimes b_1 \otimes e_j$ to $e_i \otimes b_1 a_1 \otimes e_j \neq 0$, so $\tilde{\alpha} \neq 0$, and hence $F_{11} \alpha \neq 0$, which concludes the proof. \qed

Using the above, a short calculation yields:

**Lemma 6.4.** Let $F := \bigoplus_{F_{ij} \in J^+_1} F_{ij}$. We have

$$F \simeq F^J \oplus F^{R_0}$$

for $F^J := \bigoplus_{F_{ij} \in J^+_1} F_{ij}$ and $F^{R_0} := \bigoplus_{F_{i0}} F_{i0}$. We also have $F \circ F \simeq F^{\oplus(4n-1)}$.

Let $M$ be a simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{O}_L$. Our next objective is to find the matrix $[MF]$, and hence also determine the rank of $M$. The first observation we make is that $F \circ F \simeq F^{\oplus 4n-1}$ implies that $[MF]^2 = (4n - 1)[MF]$ and that $F \simeq F^J \oplus F^{R_0}$ shows $[MF] = [MF^J] + [MF^{R_0}]$.

Consider the restriction $M_{\mathcal{O}_L}$ of $M$ to $\mathcal{O}_L$. Since we assume the apex of $M$ to be $J^+_1$, $[MF^J]$ is non-zero, and so the Jordan-Hölder decomposition of $M_{\mathcal{O}_L}$ must contain a transitive subquotient whose simple transitive quotient is $C_{\mathcal{L}_1}$ - the cell 2-representation with apex $J^+_1$. Direct computation shows that under the ordering of objects induced by the quiver in Definition 6.1, $[C_{\mathcal{L}_1} F^J]$ is equal to the $n \times n$
matrix
\[
\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix}
3 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 \\
3 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 \\
& & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
3 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

However, we permute the basis vectors to get a canonical form of \(\mathbf{C}\) with respect to a classification result we are about to use, and instead assume an ordering of the indecomposable objects of \(\mathbf{M}(i)\) such that \([\mathbf{MF}] = [\mathbf{M}_{J^F}]\) contains \(\mathbf{C}'\) as a diagonal block, rather than \(\mathbf{C}\), for
\[
\mathbf{C}' = \begin{pmatrix}
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 \\
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 \\
& & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Since we have \([\mathbf{MF}]^2 = (4n-1)\mathbf{MF}\), the trace of \([\mathbf{MF}]\) must be \(4n-1\). The trace of \(\mathbf{C}'\) equals \(4n-2\). Since \([\mathbf{MF}]\), \([\mathbf{MF}_{\mathcal{R}_0}]\) have non-negative integer entries, we must have \(\text{tr}[\mathbf{MF}] \leq 4n-1\). Hence \(\mathbf{M}_{J^F}\) admits exactly one subquotient associated to \(\mathbf{C}'_L\), and from Theorem 3.10 we see that there is an ordering of indecomposable objects of \(\mathbf{M}(i)\) so that \([\mathbf{MF}]\) is of the form
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
\mathbf{C}' & \ast \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

However, in our case we will reorder the indecomposables so that it will be of the form
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 \\
\ast & \mathbf{C}'
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

There is at most one zero row on the top of this matrix. This is because the transitivity of \(\mathbf{M}\) implies that all the entries of \([\mathbf{MF}]\) must be positive, and we have established that
\[
\text{tr}[\mathbf{MF}] = 4n-2 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{tr}[\mathbf{MF}] = 4n-1.
\]

Clearly, if there was more than one zero row in \([\mathbf{MF}]\), there would be a diagonal entry of \([\mathbf{MF}]\) equal to zero.

\([\mathbf{MF}]\) is a quasi-idempotent matrix: it satisfies a relation of the form \(T^2 = aT\) for some \(a \in \mathbb{N}\). Such matrices with positive integer entries were classified in [TZ], and using this classification together with \([\mathbf{MF}] = [\mathbf{MF}] + [\mathbf{MF}_{\mathcal{R}_0}]\) and the form of \([\mathbf{MF}]\) we found above, we conclude that \([\mathbf{MF}]\) for \(n > 2\) must be one of the \(n \times n\) matrices
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
4 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 \\
4 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 \\
& & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
4 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3
\end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{C}' + \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 & 0 \\
& & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
5 & 4 & \ldots & 3 & 3 \\
5 & 4 & \ldots & 3 & 3 \\
& & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
5 & 4 & \ldots & 3 & 3
\end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{C}' + \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
& & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
1 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]
or the $n + 1 \times n + 1$ matrix

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

For $n = 2$, the possible matrices are

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
4 & 3 \\
4 & 3 \\
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
4 & 4 \\
3 & 3 \\
\end{pmatrix},
\begin{pmatrix}
3 & 3 & 1 \\
3 & 3 & 1 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
$$

For $n = 1$ we must have $(3)$, $(\begin{smallmatrix}2 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix})$ or $(\begin{smallmatrix}2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \end{smallmatrix})$. In this case, we use $B_1 = \Delta_1$, where $\Delta_1$ is as defined in the preceding section, and the category $\mathcal{D}_L$ for $S = \{e_1\}$ is studied in [Zi2, Section 4]. In fact, all the homological arguments used there to eliminate the matrices $(3)$, $(\begin{smallmatrix}2 & 2 \\ 1 & 1 \end{smallmatrix})$ apply here, and so in this case

$$[MF] = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We now eliminate the rank $n$ case for $n \geq 2$. In such cases, $[MF]$ equals $C' + P$ where there is a $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $P$ is given by

$$P_{ij} = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } j = k; \\
0 & \text{else}.
\end{cases}$$

Recall that $C'$ corresponds to the action of $F^J$ and $P$ corresponds to the action of $F^{R_0}$. The latter has $n$ indecomposable summands, each acting in a non-zero way. So the matrix of each summand has exactly one non-zero entry. The only idempotent summand of $F^{R_0}$ is $F_{01}$, and so its matrix must satisfy $[MF_{01}]^2 = [MF_{01}]$, hence why its non-zero entry must lie on the diagonal.

Using our knowledge of the matrices of 1-morphisms lying in $\mathcal{D}_J$, we remark that the matrix of $F_{11}$ only has one non-zero row, and two non-zero entries in that row.

On the other hand, since $F_{01} \circ F_{11} \simeq F_{01}^{(2)}$, the equation $[F_{01}][F_{11}] = 2[F_{01}]$ must be satisfied, and from what we have established about $[F_{01}]$, we see that for that to be the case, $[F_{11}]$ would need to have a row with exactly one non-zero entry. This is a contradiction, which allows us to eliminate all matrices where $n = r$.

Hence we have shown the following:

**Lemma 6.5.** Let $M$ be a simple transitive 2-representation of $\mathcal{D}_L$ and consider the 1-morphism $F = \bigoplus_{i,j \in \mathcal{J}_L} F_{ij}$. There is an ordering of the isomorphism classes of indecomposable objects of $\mathcal{M}(i)$ such that for $n > 2$, the matrix $[MF]$ is equal to the $n + 1 \times n + 1$ matrix

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\
4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 & 3 & 1 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
$$
For \( n = 2 \), this matrix is of the form
\[
\begin{pmatrix}
3 & 3 & 1 \\
3 & 3 & 1 \\
3 & 3 & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

In each case, \( \mathcal{C}' \) is the upper \( n \times n \) diagonal block of \( \mathcal{W}' \), all the rows of \( \mathcal{W}' \) are equal and all the entries of the last column of \( \mathcal{W}' \) are equal to 1. This implies that under the ordering of indecomposable objects of \( \mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{i}) \) such that \( [\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}] = \mathcal{W}' \), the first \( n \) indecomposables belong to the transitive subquotient of \( \mathcal{M}_\mathfrak{g}_n \), corresponding to the cell 2-representation \( \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{E}_1 \) of \( \mathcal{D}_2 \), and the last object to the trivial subquotient of \( \mathcal{M}_\mathfrak{g} \). The cell 2-representation \( \mathcal{C}_\mathcal{E}_1 \) induces a different ordering of the first \( n \) indecomposable objects, under which the upper \( n \times n \) block of \( [\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}] \) equals \( \mathcal{C} \) rather than \( \mathcal{C}' \). From now on we will choose the ordering which imposes this ordering on these \( n \) objects, indexing them from 1 to \( n \), and moves the last object to the top of the list, indexing it by 0. As a consequence of that, we have
\[
[\mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}] = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 3 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 \\
1 & 3 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 \\
\vdots & & & & & \vdots \\
1 & 3 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3
\end{pmatrix},
\]
this motivates our earlier introduced convention for this section: we enumerate the rows and columns of this matrix (and generally speaking the matrices of 1-morphisms of \( \mathcal{D}_2 \)) starting from 0, rather than from 1, as is common practice.

Let \( \mathcal{Q} \) be the finite-dimensional algebra \( \mathcal{Q} \) such that \( \mathcal{Q} \)-proj \( \simeq \mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{i}) \) and let \( f_0, f_1, \ldots, f_\mathcal{n} \) be the complete system of idempotents of \( \mathcal{Q} \) induced by our ordering of the isoclasses of indecomposables of \( \mathcal{M}(\mathfrak{i}) \). Similarly to the preceding sections, let \( \mathcal{G}_{ij} \) denote an endofunctor of \( \mathcal{Q} \)-proj naturally isomorphic to tensoring with \( \mathcal{Q} f_i \otimes_k f_j \mathcal{Q} \) over \( \mathcal{Q} \).

We will now work towards establishing equivalence between \( \mathcal{M} \) and a cell 2-representation using the standard argument described in Proposition 3.7, and applied in preceding sections. First, we want to show \( \mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}_{ij} \simeq \mathcal{G}_{ij} \). From Proposition 3.15 we know that \( \mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}_{ij} \) is a projective functor, for all \( \mathcal{F}_{ij} \in \mathcal{J}_1^\mathfrak{d} \). Let \( x_{ij}, y_{ij} \) be defined analogously to Definition 4.3. We prove a slight modification of \( [\mathcal{M} \mathcal{Z}_2] \) Lemma 20:

**Lemma 6.6.** For all \( j, j' \) we have \( x_{ij} = x_{ij'} \). Similarly \( y_{ij} = y_{ij'} \) for all \( i, i' \).

**Proof.** For any \( j, j' \), \( F_{ij'} \) is a direct summand of \( F_{ij} \circ F_{ij'} \), so that also \( \mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}_{ij'} \) is a direct summand of \( \mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}_{ij} \circ \mathcal{M}\mathcal{F}_{ij'} \), and the \( \mathcal{X} \)-set of composition of projective functors is equal to the \( \mathcal{X} \)-set of the left factor whenever the result of composition is non-zero. The composition \( F_{ij} \circ F_{ij'} \) is never zero; in this case we know that \( F_{ij} \circ F_{ij'} \cong F_{ij} \circ F_{ij'} \mathbb{G}_2 \). So \( \mathcal{X}_{ij'} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{ij} \). But we can also change the roles of \( j, j' \) to find \( \mathcal{X}_{ij} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_{ij'} \).

The second statement follows in a similar fashion: the \( \mathcal{Y} \)-set is inherited from the right factor of a composition and so we want to use the fact that \( \mathcal{F}_{ij} \) is a direct summand of \( \mathcal{F}_{ij} \circ \mathcal{F}_{ij} \). However, if \( i = 0 \), then \( \mathcal{F}_{i0} \) is not in \( \mathcal{D}_2 \). The easy fix to that is to note that \( \mathcal{F}_{i1} \circ \mathcal{F}_{0j} \cong \mathcal{F}_{ij} \) is non-zero, and the statement follows. \( \square \)
Let $X_i$ denote the common value of $X_{ij}$ for all $j$, and define $Y_j$ similarly. Note the $X$-sets are indexed by the right cells and the $Y$-sets by the left cells of $D_L$, so there is $n + 1$ $X$-sets and $n$ $Y$-sets.

**Lemma 6.7** ([MZ2, Lemma 22]). For $q = 1, \ldots, n$, we have $X_q = Y_q$.

**Proof.** Observe that in each left cell of $D_L$ there is a morphism of $D_L$ admitting a left adjoint. The $Y$-set of that morphism is then equal to the $X$-set of that of its left adjoint: see the proof of Lemma 4.5. □

Recall that for $F_{ij} \in D_J$, we know everything about $F_{ij}$ except the entries of its leftmost column outside of the top row; the top row of $F_{ij}$ is zero. Recall also that $X_{ij}$ is exactly the set of indices of non-zero rows of $F_{ij}$. From this we immediately find

- $i \in X_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$;
- $0 \notin X_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$;
- $0 \in X_0$.

If, given $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, there is $k \neq i$ such that the $k$th row of $F_{ij}$ is non-zero, then from the form of $F_{ij}$ we know that that row is equal to $(1 \ 0 \ \ldots \ 0 \ 0)$. This row being non-zero means that $M F_{ij}$ has some indecomposable direct summands of the form $G_{kq}$ for some $q \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$. Here it is clearly exactly one summand. We claim that this summand is of the form $G_{i0}$. The claim follows from the fact that $[G_{kq}]_{kq} \neq 0$ as $Q_{f_k} \otimes_{f_k} Q_{f_q} \otimes_{f_k} Q_{f_q} \simeq Q_{f_k} \otimes_{f_k} f_q Q_{f_q}$. The claim follows from the fact that $[F_{ij}]_{kq} = 0$ for all $q \neq 0$. So $0 \in Y_j$. But then also $0 \in X_j$, which implies $j = 0$ and contradicts the assumption that $F_{ij} \in D_L$. We have thus shown the following:

**Lemma 6.8.** For $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have $X_i = \{i\} = Y_i$. Hence, for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $M F_{ij} \simeq G_{i0}^{m_{ij}}$.

for some positive integers $m_{ij}$ depending both on $i$ and $j$.

To complete this statement we also need to consider the case $i = 0$:

**Lemma 6.9.** $X_0 = \{0\}$. Hence we have

$M F_{0j} \simeq G_{00}^{m_{0j}}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$ and positive integers $m_{0j}$ depending on $j$.

**Proof.** The 1-morphism $F_{R_0} = \bigoplus_{j=1}^n F_{0j}$ is idempotent: $F_{R_0} \circ F_{R_0} \simeq F_{R_0}$. Hence $[F_{R_0}]^2 = [F_{R_0}]$. We know that $[F_{R_0}]$ is of the form

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
1 & 3 & 4 & \ldots & 4 & 3 \\
x_1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
x_2 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
x_n & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$
for some non-negative integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. If there is some $k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $x_k \neq 0$, then all the entries of the $k$th row of $[FR_0]^2$ are non-zero, contradicting $[FR_0]$ being idempotent. The result now follows, since the indices of non-zero rows of the matrix of a projective functor form its $X$-set, $[FR_0] = \sum_{j=1}^n [F_{0j}]$, and all the matrices have non-negative integer entries. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 6.10.** $m_{ij} = 1$ for $i = 0, \ldots, n$ and $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

**Proof.** From Observation 4.2 we see that
\[
C_{ij}^Q \geq C_{ij}^{A_{e}}
\]
for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

In particular, $C_{jj}^Q \geq 2$. But now $F_{ij} \simeq G_{ij}^{m_{ij}}$ implies that
\[
F_{ij}Q_j \simeq Q_i^{m_{ij}}c_{ij}^Q
\]
and on the other hand, from the definition of $[F_{ij}]$ and the fact that $[F_{ij}]_{ij} = 2$, we get
\[
F_{ij}Q_j \simeq Q_i^{m_{ij}}2,
\]
so $m_{ij} \cdot C_{jj}^Q = 2$, which together with the bound on $C_{jj}^Q$ implies $m_{ij} = 1$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

We now turn to the case where $i = 0$. For that we use the fact that $F_{jj} \simeq F_{j1} \circ F_{0j}$ for all $j$. This yields
\[
G_{jj} \simeq G_{j1} \circ G_{0j}^{m_{0j}}.
\]
On the other hand, by the law of composition of projective functors, we have
\[
G_{j1} \circ G_{0j}^{m_{0j}} \simeq G_{jj}^{m_{0j}}c_{ij}^Q.
\]
Thus, $m_{0j} \cdot C_{ij}^Q = 1$, and so $m_{0j} = 1$, which concludes the proof. \hfill \Box

We have thus established one of the two sufficient conditions we found in Proposition 3.7, it remains to show that the Cartan matrices of $M(1)$ and that of the target category of a cell 2-representation with apex in $J^L$ coincide. From Lemma 6.3 we see that the latter target category is equivalent to $B$-proj.

In analogy to the preceding sections, let $C^Q$ be the Cartan matrix of $M(1)$.

**Lemma 6.11.** $c_{ij}^Q = c_{ij}^B$ for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ such that $i \neq j$.

**Proof.** We have
\[
F_{ii} \circ F_{jj} \simeq F_{ij}^{m_{ij}}c_{ij}^Q,
\]
so also
\[
MF_{ii} \circ MF_{jj} \simeq MF_{ij}^{m_{ij}}c_{ij}^Q.
\]
Due to $MF_{ij} \simeq G_{ij}$, this yields
\[
G_{ii} \circ G_{jj} \simeq G_{ij}^{m_{ij}}c_{ij}^Q.
\]
On the other hand, the law of composition for projective functors gives us
\[
G_{ii} \circ G_{jj} \simeq G_{ij}^{m_{ij}}c_{ij}^Q,
\]
which goes to show that $c_{ij}^Q = c_{ij}^B$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 6.12.** $c_{0j}^Q = c_{0j}^B$ and $c_{j0}^Q = c_{j0}^B$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. 
Proof. The entries of the form $C^Q_{ij}$ we may find using the exact same method we employed for the preceding statement:

$$F_{jj} \circ F_{0i} \simeq F_{jj}^{\otimes C^Q_{ij}}$$

gives $MF_{jj} \circ MF_{0i} \simeq MF_{jj}^{\otimes C^Q_{ij}}$, and using $MF_{ij} \simeq G_{ij}$ and comparing with the composition of projective functors

$$G_{jj} \circ G_{0i} \simeq G_{jj}^{\otimes C^Q_{ij}},$$

we obtain the sought equality. In particular,

$$C^Q_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{for } j = 1 \\ 0 & \text{for } j = 2, \ldots, n. \end{cases}$$

Since the indecomposable 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{D}_L$ act as functors $G_{ij}$ with $j \neq 0$, this method is not applicable for entries of the form $C^Q_{0j}$.

In that case, provided $j \neq 0$, we use the fact that $F_{ij}$ is a self-adjoint 1-morphism of $\mathcal{D}_L$ for $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Hence it must act as a self-adjoint functor, and the adjunction yields

$$2C^Q_{00} = \dim \hom_{Q-proj}(Qf_0, Qf_0^{\otimes 2}) = \dim \hom_{Q-proj}(Qf_0, FiQf_i)$$

$$= \dim \hom_{Q-proj}(FiQf_0, Qf_i) = \dim \hom_{Q-proj}(Qf_i^{\otimes C^Q_{00}}, Qf_i)$$

$$= C^Q_{00} \cdot \dim \hom_{Q-proj}(Qf_i, Qf_i) = 2C^Q_{00} = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i = 1 \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

In other words, for $i = 1, \ldots, n$, we have

$$C^Q_{0i} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } i = 2, \ldots, n. \end{cases}$$

Comparing with the Cartan matrix for $B$, given in the discussion following Theorem 6.2, we infer the equality. \hfill \Box


Proof. Clearly what is left to show is that $C^Q_{00} = 1$, since we know that $C^B_{00} = 1$. The proof of this statement is analogous to that of Lemma 5.9. Since $C^Q_{00} = \dim \end{Qf_0}$, we must have $C^Q_{00} \geq 1$, and since $Qf_0$ is indecomposable, $C^Q_{00} > 1$ if and only if $\rad \end{Qf_0} \neq 0$. Let $\alpha \in \rad \end{Qf_0}$; abusing notation we will also denote the element $\alpha(e_0)$ of $Qf_0$ by $\alpha$. We will show that the ideal of $\mathfrak{M}$ generated by $\alpha$ does not contain all the morphisms of $\mathfrak{M}(1)$, and thus must contain of zero morphisms only; in particular, $\alpha = 0$, and thus $\rad \end{Qf_0} = 0$.

To that end, we show that the morphisms on form $F_{ij}\alpha$ necessarily are zero. If $F_{ij}Qf_0 = 0$, then clearly also $F_{ij}\alpha = 0$. As we have observed when determining entries $C^Q_{0j}$ of $C^Q$, the only indecomposable 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{D}_L$ such that $MF_{ij}(Qf_0)$ is non-zero are those of the form $F_{ii}$. In that case, using the $\mathfrak{k}$-linear isomorphism $f_iQ \otimes Qf_0 \simeq f_iQf_0$, $F_{ii}\alpha$ is represented by

$$Qf_i \otimes_{\mathfrak{k}} f_iQf_0 \xrightarrow{\id_{Qf_i} \otimes \tilde{\alpha}} Qf_i \otimes_{\mathfrak{k}} f_iQf_0,$$

where $\tilde{\alpha}$ is the $\mathfrak{k}$-linear endomorphism of $f_iQf_0$ given by right multiplication with $\alpha$; since $\alpha \in \rad \end{Qf_0}$, the endomorphism $\tilde{\alpha}$ must be nilpotent. But $\dim f_iQf_0$ is one-dimensional; hence $\tilde{\alpha}$ must be zero, and as a consequence also $F_{ii}\alpha = 0$. This
shows that acting on $\alpha$ with non-identity 1-morphisms of $D_L$ gives a zero morphism. Acting by the identity maps $\text{Rad} \ \text{End} \ Qf_0$ to itself, and so the ideal generated by it lies in the radical of $Q$-proj, hence does not contain all the morphisms of that category. As described earlier, this ideal must then be zero, and so $\alpha = 0$ and $\text{Rad} \ \text{End} \ Qf_0 = 0$. The result follows. □

As we have commented earlier, in view of Proposition 5.7, Lemma 6.10 and Lemma 6.13 imply Theorem 6.2.

7. NON-CELL 2-REPRESENTATIONS OF 2-SEMICATEGORIES FOR STAR ALGEBRAS

7.1. Finitary 2-semicategories and weak 2-representations. In a recent article ([KMZ]) by Ko, Mazorchuk and Zhang, instead of finitary 2-categories, so-called finitary 2-semicategories were studied. These can be described as finitary 2-categories without identity 1-morphisms, similarly to how a semigroup can be viewed as a monoid without an identity element.

As is remarked in the introduction to that article, given a finite-dimensional algebra $A$, the identity 1-morphism $A A A$ of $C_A$ can be viewed as artificially added to $C_A$. In this section, for an algebra of the form $\Lambda_n$, as described in Definition 5.1, and the choice of self-injective core $S = \{e_0\}$ for $\Lambda_n$, we will consider a 2-semicategory given by the non-identity 1-morphisms of the corresponding 2-category $D_L$, and construct a family of non-cell 2-representations of that 2-semicategory.

First we give the necessary definitions found in or deduced from [KMZ].

**Definition 7.1.** A 2-semicategory $\mathcal{C}$ consists of

- a class $\text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$ of objects;
- for each $i, j \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$, a category $\mathcal{C}(i, j)$, whose objects are called 1-morphisms, morphisms are called 2-morphisms, and the composition of 2-morphisms is called the vertical composition, denoted by $\circ_v$;
- for each $i, j, k \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$, a functor (called the horizontal composition)

$$h_{i,j,k} : \mathcal{C}(j,k) \times \mathcal{C}(i,j) \to \mathcal{C}(i,k)$$

which is strictly associative, that is,

$$h_{i,k,1} \circ (\text{Id}_{\mathcal{C}(k,1)} \times h_{i,j,k}) = h_{i,j,1} \circ (h_{j,k,1} \times \text{Id}_{\mathcal{C}(1,j)}).$$

Similarly to earlier chapters, we will write $GF := h(G, F)$ for composition of 1-morphisms.

**Definition 7.2.** A 2-semicategory $\mathcal{C}$ is said to be finitary if

1. $\text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$ is a finite set;
2. For $i, j \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$, the category $\mathcal{C}(i, j)$ is finitary;
3. The horizontal composition functor is $k$-bilinear and biadditive.

**Definition 7.3.** Let $\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D}$ be 2-semicategories. A 2-semifunctor $M$ from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{D}$ consists of
• a function $M : \text{Ob} \mathcal{C} \to \text{Ob} \mathcal{D}$;

• a functor $M_{i,j} : \mathcal{C}(i,j) \to \mathcal{D}(i,j)$ for each pair of objects $i, j \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$,

such that $M(GF) = MGMF$ for all 1-morphisms $G, F$ such that $GF$ is well-defined.

We will also be interested in non-strict 2-semifunctors, which, following [Le], we will call homomorphisms.

**Definition 7.4.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be 2-semicategories. A homomorphism of 2-semicategories $M : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{D}$ consists of

• A function $\text{Ob} \mathcal{C} \to \text{Ob} \mathcal{D}$;

• Functors $M_{i,j} : \mathcal{C}(i,j) \to \mathcal{D}(i,j)$ for all objects $i, j \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$;

• For $i, j, k \in \text{Ob} \mathcal{C}$, natural isomorphisms $\alpha_{i,j,k} : (- \circ D -) \circ M_{j,k} \times M_{i,j} \to M_{i,k} \circ (- \circ C -)$, that is, an invertible 2-morphism $\alpha_{G,F} : MF\mathcal{M}G$ such that for any 2-morphisms $\tau_G : G \to G'$ and $\tau_F : F \to F'$ the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
MGMF & \xrightarrow{M(\tau_G \circ \tau_F)} & MG'MF' \\
\downarrow^{\alpha_{G,F}} & & \downarrow^{\alpha_{G',F'}} \\
M(GF) & \xrightarrow{M(\tau_G \circ \tau_F)} & M(G'F')
\end{array}
\]

commutes.

Finally, we require the following diagram to commute:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
M(HG)MF & & MHM(GF) \\
\downarrow^{\alpha_{H,G,F}} & & \downarrow^{\alpha_{H,G,F}} \\
M(HGF) & & MHM(GF)
\end{array}
\]

For the notions of 2-transformations and modifications of semifunctors, similarly to above we follow the non-strict setup presented in [Le], omitting the axioms concerning identity 1-morphisms.

**Definition 7.5.** Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a 2-semicategory. A finitary 2-representation of $\mathcal{C}$ is a 2-semifunctor $M : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{A}_k$. An abelian 2-representation of $\mathcal{C}$ is a 2-semifunctor $M : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{R}_k$. A weak finitary 2-representation is a homomorphism of 2-semicategories $M : \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{A}_k$. A weak abelian 2-representation is such a homomorphism whose codomain instead is $\mathcal{R}_k$. In each case we require that $M_{i,j}$ is additive and $k$-linear for each pair $i, j$ of objects. We say that two 2-representations of a 2-semicategory are equivalent if there exists a 2-natural isomorphism between them, whose components also are additive and $k$-linear. Similarly to finitary 2-categories, the modified 2-setup for 2-semicategories produces a 2-category $\mathcal{C}$-amod of finitary 2-representations of $\mathcal{C}$, and a 2-category $\mathcal{C}$-amod of abelian 2-representations thereof.
We remark that the proof of [MM3, Proposition 2] does not use identity 1-morphisms, and so the result still holds for 2-semicategories: if a 2-natural transformation $\Psi$ between two 2-representations of a 2-semicategory is such that $\Psi_i$ is an equivalence of categories for all $i$, then $\Psi$ is an equivalence of 2-representations.

The reason why we are interested in weak 2-representations is the following result, which can be deduced from [Po, Theorem 3.4]:

**Proposition 7.6.** For any homomorphism of 2-(semi)categories $M : \mathcal{C} \to \text{Cat}$, there is a 2-(semi)functor $\hat{M} : \mathcal{C} \to \text{Cat}$ together with a non-strict 2-natural isomorphism $\Psi_M : M \to \hat{M}$.

In particular this implies that the problem of classifying simple transitive 2-representations of a 2-(semi)category $C$ is equivalent to that of classifying weak simple transitive 2-representations $C$:

**Proposition 7.7.** Let $C$ be a finitary 2-(semi)category and let $M$ be a weak 2-representation of $C$. There is a (strict) 2-representation $\hat{M}$ of $C$ equivalent to $M$.

### 7.2. 2-semicategories of projective functors.

**Definition 7.8.** Let $A$ be a finite-dimensional, basic, connected algebra and let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ be a complete set of idempotents of $A$. Fix a small category $\mathcal{A}$ equivalent to $A$-proj. The 2-semicategory $\mathcal{Z}_A$ is defined as follows:

- $\text{Ob } \mathcal{Z}_A = \{i\}$, where $i$ can be identified with $A$;
- 1-morphisms of $\mathcal{Z}_A$ are endofunctors of $\mathcal{A}$ isomorphic to tensoring with the projective $A$-$A$-bimodules in $\text{add}(A \otimes_k A)$;
- 2-morphisms are given by natural transformations between those functors.

The 2-semicategory $\mathcal{Z}_A$ generally does not admit weak identity 1-morphisms described in [KMZ, Section 2], and hence fails to be a bilax-unital 2-category in the sense of [KMZ].

Now we define the objects of study of the remaining part of this section:

**Definition 7.9.** Consider the star algebra $\Lambda_n$ and its quotient $\Delta_n$, given in Definition 5.1. Choose the self-injective core $S = \{0\}$ for both the algebras. We let $\mathcal{Z}_L$ be the 2-full 2-subsemicategory of $\mathcal{Z}_{\Lambda_n}$ generated by the 1-morphisms $\Lambda_n e_i \otimes_k \Lambda_n e_0$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

and similarly let $\mathcal{G}_L$ be the 2-semicategory generated by the 1-morphisms $\Delta_n e_i \otimes_k \Delta_n e_0$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n$.

### 7.3. The main result.

The main reason for our interest in the 2-semicategories above is that they closely connect to the following conjecture, formulated in [Zi2]:

**Conjecture 7.10.** For the algebra $\Lambda_n$ and the self-injective core $S = \{0\}$, consider the 2-category $\mathcal{Z}_L$. Equivalence classes of simple transitive 2-representations of $\mathcal{Z}_L$ are in bijection with set partitions of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. 
As was remarked in the introduction, the 2-category $\mathcal{D}_L$ above is just $\mathcal{Z}_L$ with an identity 1-morphism added. This shows the close connection between the above conjecture and the main theorem of this section:

**Theorem 7.11.** There is a family of pairwise non-equivalent simple transitive 2-representations of $\mathcal{Z}_L$ indexed by set partitions of $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$.

### 7.4. Existence of non-cell 2-representations.

Similarly to 5.4, we have the following:

**Proposition 7.12.** The cell 2-representation of $\mathcal{Z}_L$ acts on a category equivalent to $\Delta_n$-proj. This induces a 2-semifunctor $\mathcal{Z}_L \to \mathcal{G}_L$ which on the level of isoclasses of indecomposables gives

$$\Lambda_n e_i \otimes_k \Lambda_n e_0 \mapsto \Delta_n e_i \otimes_k \Delta_n e_0.$$ 

Using the 2-semifunctor above, we can construct 2-representations of $\mathcal{Z}_L$ from 2-representations of $\mathcal{G}_L$. This is indeed what we will do; it will then also be important to verify that the non-equivalent 2-representations of $\mathcal{G}_L$ we construct do not give rise to equivalent 2-representations of $\mathcal{Z}_L$.

The main idea for the construction is to define a functor $P_\mu : \Delta_n$-proj $\to$ $\Delta_k$-proj for a set partition $\mu$ partitioning $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ into $k$ subsets. In particular, we say that $P$ "collapses" the isoclasses of indecomposables as prescribed by $\mu$: the vertices corresponding to labels assigned to the same subset by $\mu$ are mapped to the same isomorphism class.

Collapsing functors similar to those we study below exist also for some other algebras and self-injective cores, in particular for more general zigzag algebras. However, no abstract sufficient nor necessary conditions for a pair of an algebra and a self-injective core to admit a suitable collapsing functor are known to the author. Hence only the case of star algebras is presented in what follows.

To verify that our construction yields a weak 2-representation, we perform quite explicit computations; we reduce the complexity thereof by working with skeletal categories whenever possible.

Fix $n \geq 1$ and let $\Delta := \Delta_n$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a skeletal category equivalent to $\Delta$-proj, which we parametrize as follows:

- $Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_n$ is the set of indecomposable objects of $\mathcal{A}$;
- We choose the following bases for Hom-spaces between the indecomposables:

$$\begin{align*}
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Q_0, Q_0) &= k[\text{id}_{Q_0}, c = a_i b_i] \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Q_0, Q_i) &= k[b_i] \text{ for } i \neq 0; \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Q_i, Q_0) &= k[a_i] \text{ for } i \neq 0; \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Q_i, Q_i) &= k[\text{id}_{Q_i}] \text{ for } i \neq 0 \\
\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Q_i, Q_j) &= 0 \text{ for } i, j \neq 0 \text{ and } i \neq j
\end{align*}$$

with composition as indicated by the labels and Definition 5.1: $c = a_i b_i$ and $b_i a_j = 0$ for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$. 
Note that applying any permutation \( \sigma \in S_n \) on the indices \( i, j \) gives an automorphism of \( \mathcal{A} \), which comes from the automorphism of \( \Delta \) given by permuting corresponding vertices of the underlying quiver, as observed in Definition 5.1.

From now on, by \( \mathcal{G}_L \) we will mean the 2-semicategory of projective endofunctors of \( \mathcal{A} \) - we fix the underlying category. Different choices of that category give biequivalent constructions, so weak 2-representations lift between such constructions.

**Definition 7.13.** Fix a set partition \( \mu \) of \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \), subdividing \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) into \( k \) disjoint subsets \( M_1, \ldots, M_k \). We define \( P_\mu : \mathcal{A} \to \text{add}(Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) \subseteq \mathcal{A} \) on the level of indecomposables by sending \( Q_0 \) to itself, and for \( i \in M_j \), sending \( Q_i \) to \( Q_j \). On the level of morphisms, we send \( b_i \) to \( b_j \) and \( a_i \) to \( a_j \) accordingly. This determines an additive functor uniquely up to natural isomorphism, by letting \( P_\mu \) act by diagonalizable matrices on Hom-spaces of non-indecomposable objects. For our calculations, we choose \( P_\mu \) exactly as the functor that acts diagonally with respect to our fixed basis.

Note that there is nothing canonical about choosing \( \text{add}(Q_0, Q_0, \ldots, Q_k) \) - we could choose any other set of \( k \) indecomposables \( \{Q_{\sigma(i)}\}_{i=1}^k \) not isomorphic to \( Q_0 \) and define \( P_\mu \) similarly. The two definitions then differ by postcomposing with the isomorphism

\[
\text{add}(Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{add}(Q_0, Q_{\sigma(1)}, \ldots, Q_{\sigma(k)})
\]

constructed analogously to the automorphisms of \( \mathcal{A} \) described earlier.

**Definition 7.14.** Given \( i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \), let \( F_{i0} \) be the endofunctor of \( \mathcal{A} \) sending \( Q_j \) to \( Q_i \) for \( j \neq 0 \) and sending \( Q_0 \) to \( Q_i^{\otimes 2} \), and on the level of morphisms given by

\[
\begin{align*}
F_{i0}a_j &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \text{id}_{Q_i} \end{pmatrix}; \\
F_{i0}b_j &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{Q_i} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}; \\
F_{i0}c &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \text{id}_{Q_i} \end{pmatrix}
\end{align*}
\]

and, similarly to \( P_\mu \), continued diagonally (not only diagonalizably) with respect to our fixed basis to non-indecomposable objects. The functoriality follows from \( F_{i0}a_j F_{i0}b_j = F_{i0}c \) and \( F_{i0}b_j F_{i0}a_k = 0 \).

\( F_{i0} \) is an indecomposable projective endofunctor of \( \mathcal{A} \), by construction corresponding to \( \Delta e_i \otimes k e_0 \Delta \) acting on \( \Delta \text{-proj} \).

Given a collection \( \{F_{i0}\}_{j=1}^k \), by \( \bigoplus_j F_{i0} \) we will denote the functor given the suitable direct sums on the level of functors, and again extending diagonally from the indecomposables \( \{F_{i0}\} \) on the level of matrices giving the action on Hom-spaces.

To clarify what we mean by acting diagonally, we illustrate by a simple example: consider the morphism \( \begin{pmatrix} b_j \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(Q_0, Q_j^{\otimes 2}) \). We explicitly require

\[
F_{i0} \begin{pmatrix} b_j \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{Q_i} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} F_{i0}(b_j) \\ F_{i0}(0) \end{pmatrix}
\]

although we could have a naturally isomorphic functor \( \tilde{F}_{i0} \) satisfying

\[
\tilde{F}_{i0} \begin{pmatrix} b_j \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{Q_i} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]
Fix a set partition \( \mu \) of \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) and let
\[
P := P_\mu : A \to \text{add}(Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_k).
\]
Note that \( F_{i_0a_j} \) is independent of \( j \), and similarly for \( b_j \). On the other hand, all \( P \) does is relabel such indices. Moreover, since the action of \( P \) is diagonal as described above, the following clearly holds:

**Proposition 7.15.** Let \( P \) be as above and let \( G := \bigoplus_i F_{i_0} \) be a projective endofunctor of \( A \) of the form described in Definition 7.14. Denote the inclusion functor of \( \text{add}(Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) \) to \( A \) by \( J \) and denote \( J \circ P \) by \( \Phi \). Then
\[
G = G\Phi.
\]

We are now ready to construct the weak 2-representation \( M_\mu \) of \( G_L \) associated to our chosen set partition \( \mu \).

We let \( M_\mu(\ell) = \text{add}(Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_k) \); given a 1-morphism \( F \) of \( G_L \), we let
\[
M_\mu F = PFJ
\]
and similarly for 2-morphisms. Clearly, every 1-morphism is realized as a \( k \)-linear endofunctor of a finitary category, and every 2-morphism as a natural transformation between such functors. Moreover, vertical composition of 2-morphisms clearly is preserved, the action being given by composing with fixed functors.

What needs to be verified is the coherence and naturality of the assignment on the level of 1-morphisms. To that end we should first specify the structure morphisms \( \alpha_{G,F} \) for any pair \((G,F)\) of 1-morphisms in \( G_L \). However, it turns out that for naturality in \( F \) (the right argument) and coherence we have a great freedom of choice:

**Lemma 7.16.** Choose a natural isomorphism \( \tau_G : G\Phi \xrightarrow{\sim} G \), for every 1-morphism \( G \) of \( G_L \). Let \( \alpha_{G,F} = P\tau_G F \). The collection \( \{\alpha_{G,F}\}_{F,G \in G_L(1,1)} \) satisfies the structural constraint of Definition 7.4.

**Proof.** The condition in Definition 7.4 requires the following diagram to commute:
\[
\begin{array}{c}
P\Phi G\Phi FJ \xrightarrow{P\Phi\tau_G F} P\Phi GFJ \\
\downarrow P\tau_H G\Phi FJ \quad \downarrow P\tau_H GFJ \\
PHG\Phi FJ \xrightarrow{PH\tau_G F} PHGFJ
\end{array}
\]
This is a direct consequence of the commutative square defining the horizontal composition of natural transformations. This is easiest to see by removing \( P, J, F \) from the diagram:
\[
\begin{array}{c}
(H\Phi)(G\Phi) \xrightarrow{H\Phi\tau_G} (H\Phi)G \\
\downarrow \tau_H G\Phi \quad \downarrow \tau_H G \\
H(G\Phi) \xrightarrow{H\tau_G} HG.
\end{array}
\]
This diagram commutes by naturality of \( \tau_H \). From this the commutativity of the first diagram follows. \( \square \)

**Lemma 7.17.** Choose a natural isomorphism \( \tau_G : G\Phi \xrightarrow{\sim} G \), for every 1-morphism \( G \) of \( G_L \). The collection \( \{\alpha_{G,F}\}_{F,G \in G_L(1,1)} \), as defined in Lemma 7.16, is natural.
in $F$, i.e. given a 2-morphism $\beta : F \rightarrow F'$, the following diagram commutes:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
PG\Phi F & \xrightarrow{PG\Phi\beta} & PG\Phi F' \\
\downarrow{P\tau_G F} & & \downarrow{P\tau_G F'} \\
PGF & \xrightarrow{PG\beta} & PGF'
\end{array}
\]

commutes.

**Proof.** Similarly to the proof of Lemma 7.16, the diagram

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
G\Phi F & \xrightarrow{(G\Phi)\beta} & G\Phi F' \\
\downarrow{\tau_G F} & & \downarrow{\tau_G F'} \\
GF & \xrightarrow{G\beta} & GF'
\end{array}
\]

commutes because $\tau_G$ is a natural transformation, and that in turn implies that the diagram in the lemma commutes. \qed

What remains to show to establish that $M_\mu$ is well-defined, is naturality in $G$. This is somewhat more difficult than the case of naturality in $F$ or coherence.

Denote the collection of 1-morphisms of the form given in Definition 7.14 by $S$. By Proposition 7.15, for $G \in S$, letting $\tau_G = \text{id}_G$ and following the definition in Lemma 7.16 yields $\alpha_{G,F} = \text{id}_{M_\mu(GF)}$. Thus obtained collection $\{\alpha_{G,F}\}_{F,G \in S}$ is then clearly natural in $G$. We show that we may lift this property from $S$ to all of $G_L$:

**Lemma 7.18.** For any $F \in G_L(1,1)$ and $G \in S$, set $\alpha_{G,F} = P(\text{id}_{G\Phi F}) = P \text{id}_{G F}$. For a 1-morphism $H \notin S$, let $G$ be the 1-morphism of $S$ isomorphic to $H$ and fix an isomorphism $H \xrightarrow{\gamma} G$. Consider the composition $H\Phi \xrightarrow{\gamma\Phi} G\Phi \xrightarrow{\tau^{-1}} G \xrightarrow{\tau^{-1}} H$.

Let $\alpha_{H,F} = P(\tau^{-1} \circ \tau\Phi)F$. The collection $\{\alpha_{H,F}\}_{H,F \in G_L(1,1)}$ is natural in $H$.

**Proof.** Let $H, H'$ be 1-morphisms of $G_L$ and consider a 2-morphism $\beta : H \rightarrow H'$. Similarly to the proof of Lemma 7.16 to establish sought naturality, it suffices to show the commutativity of the following diagram:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
H\Phi & \xrightarrow{\beta \Phi} & H'\Phi \\
\downarrow{\tau \Phi} & & \downarrow{\tau' \Phi} \\
G\Phi & \xrightarrow{\tau^{-1} \circ \tau\Phi} & G'\Phi \\
\downarrow{G} & & \downarrow{G'} \\
H & \xrightarrow{\beta} & H'
\end{array}
\]

By the naturality we have established on $S$, we have

\[(\tau' \circ \beta \circ \tau^{-1}) \Phi = \tau' \circ \beta \circ \tau^{-1}.
\]

This implies

\[
\begin{align*}
\tau' \Phi \circ \beta \Phi \circ \tau^{-1} \Phi &= \tau' \circ \beta \circ \tau^{-1} \\
\tau' \Phi \circ \beta \Phi &= \tau' \circ \beta \circ \tau^{-1} \circ \tau\Phi \\
\tau^{-1} \circ \tau' \Phi \circ \beta \Phi &= \beta \circ \tau^{-1} \circ \tau\Phi
\end{align*}
\]
which, as we can read from the diagram above, is what we wanted to show. □

This concludes the proof of $M_\mu$ being well-defined.

We remark that different choices we could make in the definition of the functor $P$ give equivalent 2-representations, the equivalence being given in the discussion preceding Definition 7.14.

7.5. Proof of the main result. In the preceding subsection we have constructed weak 2-representations of the 2-semicategory $\mathcal{G}_n$ associated to set partitions of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. To prove Theorem 7.11 we will show that said weak 2-representations are simple transitive and pairwise non-equivalent. From Proposition 7.7 it clearly follows that the same then holds for respective strictifications.

Proposition 7.19. Given a set partition $\mu$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, the 2-representation $M_\mu$ is simple transitive.

Proof. Observe that

$$\text{End} \left( \bigoplus_{i=0}^{k} Q_i \right)^{\text{op}} \simeq \Delta_k \simeq (e_0 + \cdots e_k)\Delta_n(e_0 + \cdots e_k).$$

Denote $\text{add}(\Delta_n e_0, \ldots, \Delta_n e_k)$ by $B$. The isomorphisms above yield $B \simeq \Delta_k$-proj.

Using $e_i\Delta_n e_j = 0$ provided $i, j \neq 0$ and $i \neq j$, we obtain a natural isomorphism

$$(3) \quad (e_0\Delta_n \otimes \Delta_n -) |B \simeq e_0\Delta_k \otimes \Delta_k -$$

induced by the inclusion $(e_0 + \cdots e_k)\Delta_n(e_0 + \cdots e_k) \hookrightarrow \Delta_n$.

In view of the discussion preceding Definition 7.14 concerning the definition of the functor $P_\mu$, we may without loss of generality assume that $P_\mu(Q_1) = Q_1$. Then $M_\mu F_{10} = P_\mu F_{10} J = F_{10}(\text{add}(Q_0, \ldots, Q_k))$. In view of the equation (3), we see that $M_\mu F_{10}$ is the projective endofunctor of $\text{add}(Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_k)$ corresponding to $\Delta_k e_1 \otimes e_0 \Delta_k$.

Since $P_\mu$ on the level of indecomposables gives a surjection

$$\{Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_n\} \twoheadrightarrow \{Q_0, Q_1, \ldots, Q_k\}$$

we may argue similarly to see that $\mathcal{G}_n$ acts by projective functors corresponding to functors of the form $\Delta_k e_1 \otimes e_0 \Delta_k$ acting on $\Delta_k$-proj. Similarly to Examples 3.4 and 3.14, we observe that in the general case of a 2-subsemicategory of a 2-semicategory of the form $\mathcal{A}_n$, a cell 2-representation can be viewed as a quotient of that action. In the case of $A = \Delta_n$, these two coincide. Hence there is no $\mathcal{G}_\mu$-invariant ideal of $\text{add}(Q_0, \ldots, Q_k)$, and so $M_\mu$ is simple transitive. □

Proposition 7.20. Let $\mu, \mu'$ be set partitions of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$, such that $\mu \neq \mu'$. Then $M_\mu \ntriangleq M_{\mu'}$.

Proof. If $M_\mu$ and $M_{\mu'}$ are equivalent, then for $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ we have

$$M_\mu F_{i0} \simeq M_{\mu'} F_{j0} \text{ if and only if } M_{\mu'} F_{i0} \simeq M_\mu F_{j0}.$$ But as established in the proof of the preceding proposition, $M_\mu F_{i0} \simeq M_{\mu'} F_{j0}$ if and only if $i$ and $j$ belong to the same subset in the partition $\mu$ of $\{1, \ldots, n\}$. Hence we may recover $\mu$ from $M_\mu$, which proves the claim. □
Theorem 7.11 now follows from Proposition 7.19 and Proposition 7.20.

**Observation 7.21.** Let \( \mu \) be a set partition of \( \{1, \ldots, n\} \) into \( k \) subsets. Abusing notation, denote by \( \mu \) the surjection
\[
\{0, 1, \ldots, n\} \twoheadrightarrow \{0, 1, \ldots, k\}
\]
corresponding to the surjection \( \{Q_0, \ldots, Q_n\} \twoheadrightarrow \{Q_0, \ldots, Q_k\} \) giving the action of \( P_\mu \) on isoclasses of indecomposables. Under the ordering of indecomposables of \( \text{add}(Q_0, \ldots, Q_k) \) indicated by our notation, we obtain the following action matrices:
\[
[M_\mu F_{00}] = \begin{pmatrix}
2 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix} = [M_\mu F_{00}]
\]
and
\[
[M_\mu F_{00}] = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
2 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
where the \((\mu(i) + 1)\)th row is non-zero.

This shows that there is a fixed ordering of objects of \( \text{add}(Q_0, \ldots, Q_k) \), with respect to which the action matrices of the various 2-representations we have constructed exhaust the set of possible sets of action matrices for a simple transitive 2-representation of the 2-category \( Z_L \) associated to \( \Lambda_n \) and the self-injective core \( \{e_0\} \), as determined in \([Z\text{I}2]\). As we have seen earlier in this section, this 2-category is closely related to the 2-semicategories we study. In particular, the classification given in \([Z\text{I}2]\) applies also to \( G_n \): the only modification we need to impose on the proofs there is a different justification of \( F_{00} \) necessarily being realized as a self-adjoint functor. In \([Z\text{I}2]\), this is just a statement about adjoint 1-morphisms, which in its simplest form requires the presence of an identity 1-morphism. In our case, we use the fact that the 2-subsemicategory of \( G_n \) given by the additive closure of \( F_{00} \) is a fix 2-category, in the sense of \([KMZ]\) (this fact is a special case of Proposition 4.1 therein), which suffices to conclude said self-adjointness.

Shortly put, the additive decategorifications of simple transitive 2-representations of \( G_n \) are classified as those of \( Z_L \) in \([Z\text{I}2]\), and the decategorifications of the 2-representations we have constructed exhaust that list.
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