

# ON THE REPRESENTATION THEORY OF NON-SEMISIMPLE (GRADED) DEFORMED FOMIN-KIRILLOV ALGEBRAS.

A. ALIA AND I. HECKENBERGER

ABSTRACT. This work is motivated to study the representation theory of the non-semisimple deformed Fomin-Kirillov algebras  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ . In particular, we consider Gabriel's theorem applications in regard of constructing algebraic presentations.

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Preliminaries	4
1.1. Graded and filtered algebras.	4
1.2. Basic algebras.	5
1.3. The quiver of a finite dimensional algebra	5
2. Part 01: Representation theory of $\mathcal{D}_n(\alpha, -\alpha)$ .	6
3. Part 02: Representation theory of $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, +\alpha)$ .	13
References	22

## INTRODUCTION

Here and throughout this paper we assume  $K$  to be an algebraically closed field of zero characteristic, we denote by  $\mathbb{S}_n$  the symmetric group on  $n$  letters.

In the context of studying Schubert calculus, Fomin and Kirillov introduced a family of quadratic  $K$ -algebras  $\mathcal{E}_n$ , that contains a commutative subalgebra isomorphic to the cohomology ring of the flag manifold. Commonly known as Fomin-Kirillov algebras, we present:

**Definition 0.1** ([1] Definition 2.1). Given a positive integer  $n \geq 3$ .  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is the quadratic  $K$ -algebra generated by  $x_{ij} = -x_{ji}$  for  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$

subject the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
(1a) \quad & x_{ij}^2 = 0 \quad | \ 1 \leq i, j \leq n \text{ distinct}, \\
(1b) \quad & x_{ij}x_{kl} - x_{kl}x_{ij} = 0 \quad | \ 1 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n \text{ distinct}, \\
(1c) \quad & x_{ij}x_{jk} + x_{jk}x_{ki} + x_{ki}x_{ij} = 0 \quad | \ 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n \text{ distinct}.
\end{aligned}$$

While on the surface, it is rather straightforward to present  $\mathcal{E}_n$ , some of the structure's elementary properties remain challenging to approach:

For example, it is well-known that  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is finite-dimensional for  $n \leq 5$  and the opposite is *conjectured* to true otherwise.

Moreover, the nature of  $\mathcal{E}_n$  as a braided Hopf algebra over the symmetric group  $\mathbb{S}_n$  indicates a strong connection to Nichols-algebras over braided vector spaces:

For  $n \leq 4$  in [2], and  $n = 5$  in [3] it was showed that the  $\mathcal{E}_n$  is a Nichols-algebra. A statement that is conjectured to be true for  $n \geq 6$  in [2], [5].

It is also of worth to mention that the algebra  $\mathcal{E}_n$  appears to share some distinctive properties with other types of algebras, most famous of which is that of preprojective type of  $A_{n-1}$ , which shares the same number of indecomposable modules with  $\mathcal{E}_n$  for  $n \leq 5$  and is known to be of infinite representation-type otherwise; This is recognized as Majid's conjecture, which does not have a precise expression, nonetheless highlights that the numerology is not accidental, further details can be explored in [6] and in [7].

With that in mind, we remark that from the point of view of graded algebras,  $\mathcal{E}_n$  remains an approachable candidate of an algebraic structure that is both naturally and symmetrically graded, moreover, the unique action of the symmetric group  $\mathbb{S}_n$  on  $\mathcal{E}_n$  defined as:

$$\sigma(xy) = (\sigma x)(\sigma y) : x, y \in \mathcal{E}_n, \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n \quad \sigma(x_{ij}) = x_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)} \quad | \ i \neq j.$$

validates- above other reasons- the study of  $\mathcal{E}_n$  from the viewpoint of PBW-deformations. We recall that a PBW deformation of a graded algebra  $A$  is a filtered algebra  $D$  such that the associated graded algebra of  $D$  is isomorphic to  $A$ , we formalize a definition:

**Definition 0.2.** Given  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in K$ . The *deformed Fomin-Kirillov* algebra, denoted by  $\mathcal{D}_n(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ , is the quadratic  $K$ -algebra generated by

$x_{ij} = -x_{ji}$  for  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$  subject the following relations:

- (2a)  $x_{ij}^2 = \alpha_1 \quad | \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq n \text{ distinct},$
- (2b)  $x_{ij}x_{kl} - x_{kl}x_{ij} = 0 \quad | \quad 1 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n \text{ distinct},$
- (2c)  $x_{ij}x_{jk} + x_{jk}x_{ki} + x_{ki}x_{ij} = \alpha_2 \quad | \quad 1 \leq i, j, k \leq n \text{ distinct}.$

In 2018, motivated by understanding Nichols and Fomin-Kirillov algebras by means of PBW-deformations. Heckenberger and Vendramin established a framework objected to the classification and the study of representation theory of non-semisimple deformations of Fomin-Kirillov algebras. In particular, the authors theorized:

**Theorem 0.1.** *[4] Theorem 2.11] The algebra  $\mathcal{D}_3(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  is semi-simple if and only if:*

$$(3\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \neq 0$$

*In this case  $\mathcal{D}_3(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \cong (K^{2,2})^3$*

Further, proposed:

**Proposition 0.2.** *[4] Proposition 2.15, 2.16] The following hold:*

- (1) *The algebra  $\mathcal{D}_3(\alpha_1, -\alpha_1)$  is isomorphic to the product of three copies of the preprojective algebra of type  $A_2$ .*
- (2) *The algebra  $\mathcal{D}_3(\alpha_1, 3\alpha_1)$  is isomorphic to the path algebra of the double Kronecker quiver bounded by the relations of the coinvariant ring of  $\mathbb{S}_3$*

Later that year, Wolf in [8] continued the study by examining the case of  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$ , where it was proved that the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  is semisimple if:

$$\alpha_1(3\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \neq 0$$

Further, *conjectured* that:

**Conjecture 0.1.** *[8] Corollary 2.32] The algebra  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  is semisimple if and only if:*

$$(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2)(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) \neq 0$$

Moreover, it has been calculated that the radical of  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, -\alpha)$  is generated by the commutator, that is,  $\sigma[x_{12}, x_{13}]$  for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4$ , while that of  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, \alpha)$  is generated by:

$$\sigma(x_{12}x_{13} + x_{12}x_{14} + x_{12}x_{23} + x_{13}x_{23} + x_{14}x_{12} + \alpha_1) \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4$$

where both ideals are of 552-dimensional, and their corresponding quotient algebras are of 24-dimension.

This paper is motivated by Conjecture 0.1 and mainly aim to address the representation theory of the non-semisimple deformation of  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha_1, \alpha_2)$  as follows:

In Section 1 we present some preliminaries by setting up common terminology, notation and elementary results. Section 2 is dedicated to the study of  $\mathcal{D}_n(\alpha, -\alpha)$  where we start by proving that the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_n(\alpha, -\alpha)$  admits a quiver-presentation that coincidences with the graph of the nil-Coxeter group associated with  $\mathbb{S}_n$ , we then consider the special case of  $n = 4$  where we prove that generic indecomposable projective  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, -\alpha)$ -modules are radically graded and are isomorphic to the nil-Coxeter algebra of  $\mathbb{S}_4$ . Finally we consider the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, \alpha)$  in Section 3, which we show to be non-basic, implying the existence of a basic associated Morita equivalent algebra, we construct an algebraic presentation of its graded generic indecomposable projective modules and then proceed to propose a family of which the none-graded version belongs to.

**Acknowledgments.** The first-named author is sponsored by the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD) to which he is immensely grateful.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

By a  $K$ -algebra, we mean an associative unital algebra over  $K$ . We say that a  $K$ -algebra  $A$  is connected if it is not isomorphic to a direct product of two non-trivial algebras. We also denote  $A$ 's Jacobson's radical, that is, the intersection of all maximal ideals of  $A$  by  $radA$ .

We further understand  $Ext_A^1(\rho, \rho')$  the space of extensions between two  $A$ -representations  $\rho, \rho'$  as equivalence classes  $Z^1(\rho, \rho')/B^1(\rho, \rho')$ , where:  $Z^1(\rho, \rho')$  denotes the space of (1)-cocycles, that is:

$$Z^1(\rho, \rho') = \{f : A \rightarrow Hom_K(\rho, \rho') \mid f(xy) = \rho(x)f(y) + f(x)\rho'(y)\}$$

and  $B^1(\rho, \rho')$  denotes the space of coboundaries.

### 1.1. Graded and filtered algebras.

**Definition 1.1.** Given  $A$  a filtered algebra, that is, an algebra with a family of subspaces  $\{F_{i+1} \subseteq F_i, i \geq 0\}$  such that:  $1 \in F_0$ ,  $F_i F_j \subseteq F_{i+j}$  and  $\cup F_n = A$ . We define the associated graded algebra of  $A$ , denoted by  $grA$  by setting  $(grA)_n = F_n/F_{n+1}$  and  $grA = \oplus (grA)_n$ .

**Example 1.1.** Given  $A$  a finite-dimensional  $K$ -algebra. Then  $A$  is *radically* filtered as follows:

$$F_r = (\text{rad}A)^r \subset \cdots \subset F_2 = (\text{rad}A)^2 \subset F = \text{rad}A \subset F_0 = A$$

where  $r$  is the minimal positive integer such that  $F_{r+1} = 0$ <sup>1</sup>

*Note 1.* Unless otherwise mentioned,  $\text{gr}A$  denotes the associated graded algebra of a  $K$ -algebra  $A$  with respect to the radical filtration.

**Definition 1.2.** Given  $\phi : M \rightarrow N$  a filtered homomorphism, that is,  $\phi(M_j) \subseteq \phi(M) \cap N_j$ . If it happens that  $\phi(M_j) = \phi(M) \cap N_j$  for each  $j$  applicable, then  $\phi$  is called *strict*.

**Example 1.2.** If  $\alpha : M \rightarrow N$  is an arbitrary homomorphism and  $M$  is given the induced filtration  $M_j = \alpha^{-1}(\alpha(M) \cap N_j)$  then  $\alpha$  is a strict filtered homomorphism. Similarly, for  $\alpha$  surjective and if  $N$  is given the induced filtration  $N_j = \alpha(M_j)$ , then  $\alpha$  is strict as well.

**Corollary 1** ([9] Corollary 6.14). *For  $\phi : M \rightarrow N$  a filtered homomorphism. Then  $\text{gr}\phi$  is injective (surjective) if and only if  $\phi$  is injective (surjective) and  $\phi$  is strict.*

## 1.2. Basic algebras.

**Definition 1.3.** A finite-dimensional  $K$ -algebra  $A$  is said to be basic if and only if the quotient algebra  $A/\text{rad}(A)$  is isomorphic to a product of copies of  $K$ .

*Remark 1.* Every simple module over a basic  $K$ -algebra is one-dimensional.

**Definition 1.4** ([10] Corollary 6.10). Let  $A$  be a (not necessarily basic)  $K$ -algebra, then there exists a basic  $K$ -algebra  $A^b$  associated with  $A$  such that is *Morita equivalent* to  $A$ , that is, there exists a  $K$ -linear equivalence of the modules categories  $\text{mod}A^b$  and  $\text{mod}A$ .

## 1.3. The quiver of a finite dimensional algebra.

**Definition 1.5.** A *quiver* is a quadruple  $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t)$  with  $Q_0$  and  $Q_1$  finite sets and two maps  $s, t : Q_1 \rightarrow Q_0$ . The elements of  $Q_0$  and  $Q_1$  are called *vertices* and *arrows* of  $Q$  respectively. We say an arrow  $\alpha$  in  $Q_1$  *starts* in  $s(\alpha)$  and *terminates* in  $t(\alpha)$ .

**Example 1.3.** Let  $A$  be a basic and connected finite-dimensional  $K$ -algebra and  $\{S_1, \dots, S_n\}$  a complete set of simple  $A$ -modules. The (*ordinary*) *quiver* of  $A$ , denoted by  $Q_A$ , is defined as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>such  $r$  exists for Jacobson radical are nilpotent

- (1) The vertices of  $Q_A$  are numbers  $1, \dots, n$  which are in bijective correspondence with the simplices  $S_1, \dots, S_n$ .
- (2) Given two points  $i, j \in Q_A$ , the arrows  $\alpha : i \rightarrow j$  are in bijective correspondence with the vectors in a basis of the  $K$ -vector space  $\text{Ext}_A^1(S_i, S_j)$ .

*Remark 2.* A *path* of length  $m \geq 1$  in  $Q$  is a tuple  $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m)$  of arrows of  $Q$  such that  $s(\alpha_i) = t(\alpha_{i+1})$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq m-1$ , we write such path as  $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m$  if no misunderstanding occurs. Additionally, for each vertex  $i$  of  $Q$  there exists a path  $e_i$  of trivial length such that  $s(e_i) = t(e_i) = i$ .

**Definition 1.6.** Let  $Q$  be a quiver. The *path algebra*  $KQ$  of  $Q$  is the  $K$ -algebra whose underlying  $K$ -vector space has as its basis the set of all  $Q$ -paths of length  $l \geq 0$  in  $Q$  such that the product of two basis vectors  $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m$  and  $\beta_1 \cdots \beta_{m'}$  is trivial if  $t(\alpha_m) \neq s(\beta_1)$  and equal to the composed path  $\alpha_1 \cdots \alpha_m \beta_1 \cdots \beta_{m'}$  otherwise.

**Theorem 1.1** (Gabriel [10] Theorem 3.7). *Let  $A$  be a basic and connected finite-dimensional  $K$ -algebra. There exists an admissible ideal  $I$  of  $KQ_A$  such that  $A \cong KQ_A/I$ .*

## 2. PART 01: REPRESENTATION THEORY OF $\mathcal{D}_n(\alpha, -\alpha)$ .

For convenience, we denote  $\Lambda := \mathcal{D}_n(\alpha, -\alpha)$ , we further normalize the  $K$  parameter  $\alpha$  to  $1_K$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Given  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n$ . The algebra homomorphism:  $\rho_\sigma : A \rightarrow K$  defined by mapping a generator  $x_{ij}$  - with  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$ - to:*

$$\rho_\sigma(x_{ij}) = \begin{cases} +1 & | \sigma(i) < \sigma(j), \\ -1 & | \sigma(i) > \sigma(j), \end{cases}$$

*is a well defined one-dimensional representation of  $\Lambda$ .*

*Proof.* The proof follows verifying that subjecting  $\rho_\sigma$  to the defining relations of  $\Lambda$  yields valid equations in  $K$ : Indeed as (2a) and (2b) hold trivially, one only has to check that for  $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$  distinct, then:

$$\rho_\sigma(x_{ij})\rho_\sigma(x_{jk}) + \rho_\sigma(x_{jk})\rho_\sigma(x_{ki}) + \rho_\sigma(x_{ki})\rho_\sigma(x_{ij}) = -1$$

which is easily verified as assuming that  $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$  distinct, yield that the inequality regarding  $\sigma(i), \sigma(j), \sigma(k)$  has exactly one of six possibilities:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \sigma(i) < \sigma(j) < \sigma(k). & \sigma(i) < \sigma(k) < \sigma(j). \\ \sigma(j) < \sigma(i) < \sigma(k). & \sigma(j) < \sigma(k) < \sigma(i). \\ \sigma(k) < \sigma(i) < \sigma(j). & \sigma(k) < \sigma(j) < \sigma(i). \end{array}$$

□

**Lemma 2.2.** *Given  $\rho$  a one-dimensional  $\mathcal{D}_n(\alpha, -\alpha)$ -representation. Then there exists  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n$  such that  $\rho = \rho_\sigma$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\rho$  be a one-dimensional  $\Lambda$ -representation, (2a) implies that  $\rho(x_{ij}) = \pm 1$ , furthermore, for distinct  $1 \leq i, j, k \leq n$ , then (2c) can hold if one of the following possibilities occurs:

$$\begin{array}{ll} +y_{ij} = +y_{jk} = +y_{il} = +1. & +y_{ij} = -y_{jk} = +y_{ik} = +1. \\ -y_{ij} = +y_{jk} = +y_{ik} = +1. & +y_{ij} = +y_{jk} = -y_{ik} = +1. \\ +y_{ij} = -y_{jk} = +y_{ik} = +1. & -y_{ij} = -y_{jk} = -y_{ik} = +1. \end{array}$$

Which in and of itself yield the claim. □

*Remark 3.* The previous lemma can be alternatively proven by setting:  $l_i := |\mathbb{L}_i|$ ,  $r_i := |\mathbb{R}_i|$ , where:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{L}_i &:= \{1 \leq j \leq i-1 \mid \rho(x_{ji}) = -1\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, i-1\} \\ \mathbb{R}_i &:= \{i+1 \leq j \leq n \mid \rho(x_{ij}) = -1\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, n-i\} \end{aligned}$$

and defining the mapping  $\sigma$  on  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  where  $\sigma(i) = i + r_i - l_i$ , the claim follows by showing that  $\sigma$  is indeed a permutation such that  $\rho = \rho_\sigma$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** *Given  $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}_n$ , then for all  $x \in A$  we have:*

$$\rho_\sigma(\tau(x)) = \rho_{\sigma\tau}(x).$$

*Proof.* Since  $\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau$  and the group action of  $\mathbb{S}_n$  is multiplicative, it is enough to verify the claim for a generator  $x_{ij}$  with  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq n$  which hold directly since:

$$\rho_\sigma(\tau(x_{ij})) = \rho_\sigma(x_{\tau(i)\tau(j)}) = \rho_{\sigma\tau}(x_{ij}).$$

□

**Question:** Computing the radical of  $\Lambda$  for a positive integer  $n \geq 5$  remains open for the moment. We highlight that our results would imply the basicness of the algebra  $\Lambda$  once we were able to verify that  $\{\rho_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n\}$  gives a complete system of simple  $\Lambda$ -representations.

Our aim in at this point is prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.4.** *Given  $\sigma, \tau \in \mathbb{S}_n$ . If  $\tau = \bar{g}\sigma$  where  $\bar{g}$  denotes a non-simple transposition of  $\mathbb{S}_n$ , then  $\dim_K \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau) = 1$ , and 0 in any other case.*

*Remark 4.* In the purpose of proving Theorem 2.4, we start by utilizing Lemma 2.3, which implies that we may set  $\sigma = e$  with no further restrictions. Furthermore, for  $\tau \in \mathbb{S}_n$ , the space of extensions  $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_e, \rho_\tau)$  has a generating set of the form:

$$\{f_{ij} + B^1(\rho_e, \rho_\tau) \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n \mid f_{ij} \in K\}$$

such that the following hold:

$$(3a) \quad f_{ij}(1 + \rho_\tau(x_{ij})) = 0$$

$$(3b) \quad f_{ij}(1 - \rho_\tau(x_{kl})) - f_{kl}(1 - \rho_\tau(x_{ij})) = 0$$

$$(3c) \quad f_{ij}(\rho_\tau(x_{jk}) - 1) + f_{jk}(1 - \rho_\tau(x_{ik})) - f_{ik}(1 + \rho_\tau(x_{ij})) = 0$$

$$(3d) \quad f_{ij}(1 - \rho_\tau(x_{ik})) + f_{jk}(\rho_\tau(x_{ij}) - 1) - f_{ik}(\rho_\tau(x_{jk}) + 1) = 0$$

where  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$  in 3a,  $1 \leq i, j, k, l \leq n$  distinct in 3b, and  $1 \leq i < j < k \leq n$  in both 3c and 3d.

We now verify 2.4 by showcasing the following set of propositions:

**Proposition 2.5.** *If  $\tau$  is a non-simple transposition. Then:*

$$\dim_K \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_e, \rho_\tau) = 1$$

*Proof.* Assuming that  $\tau = (s, t)$  a non-simple transposition, then  $\rho_\tau(x_{ij}) = -1$  if and only if:

$$(i = s \text{ and } j \leq t) \text{ or } (i \geq s \text{ and } j = t)$$

Therefore, for all  $i < j$ , 3a implies that  $f_{ij} = 0$  except those of the form:

$$f_{s(s+1)} \cdots f_{st} \text{ and } f_{(s+1)t} \cdots f_{(t-1)t}$$

Further, we have:

$$f_{s(s+r)} = f_{(s+r)t} \text{ via } 3c \text{ (} i = s, j = s+r, k = t \text{)} \quad \mid 1 \leq r \leq s-1.$$

$$f_{s(s+1)} = f_{s(s+r)} \text{ via } 3d \text{ (} i = s, j = s+1, k = s+r \text{)} \quad \mid 2 \leq r \leq s-1.$$

Therefore, we are in the situation where:

$$f_{s(s+1)} = \cdots = f_{s(t-1)} = f_{(s+1)t} = \cdots = f_{(t-1)t}.$$

Which with a proper choice of basis assert the claim.  $\square$



*Remark 5.* Given  $\tau \in \mathbb{S}_n$  such that  $\tau \neq \bar{g}$ . Then  $\tau$  has one of the following form:

$$\begin{cases} \tau = e \\ \tau \text{ is a simple transposition} \\ \tau \text{ is a cycle of length } p \geq 3 \\ \tau \text{ has at least two commutative cycles of length } p, q \geq 2 \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 2.6.** *If  $\tau = e$ . Then  $\dim_k \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_e, \rho_\tau) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Assuming that  $\tau = e$ , this would imply that  $\rho_\tau(x_{ij}) = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ . Now we have  $f_{ij} = 0$  directly via 3a which in and of itself assures the claim.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.7.** *If  $\tau$  is a simple transposition. Then  $\dim_k \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_{id}, \rho_\tau) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Assuming that  $\tau = (s, s+1)$  for  $s = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , this would imply that  $\rho_\tau(x_{ij}) = 1$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$  except for  $(i, j) = (s, s+1)$ . Now we have  $f_{ij} = 0$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$  except for  $(i, j) = (s, s+1)$  directly via 3a, which hold the claim with a proper change of basis.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.8.** *If  $\tau$  is a cycle of length  $p \geq 3$ . Then  $\dim_k \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_{id}, \rho_\tau) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Assuming that  $\tau = (a_1, \dots, a_p)$  is a cycle of length  $p \geq 3$  where  $1 \leq a_1, \dots, a_p \leq n$ ,  $a_i \neq a_j$  for all  $i \neq j$  ordered such that  $a_1 < a_j$  for all  $2 \leq j \leq p$ .

$$\text{Since } a_1 < a_p \text{ and } \tau(a_p) = a_1 < a_2 = \tau(a_1) \implies \rho_\tau(x_{a_1 a_p}) = -1.$$

We make a bases change such that  $f_{a_1 a_p} = 0$ .

As for the case of  $i \leq a_1$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(i) = i < a_2 = \tau(a_1) &\implies \rho_\tau(x_{ia_1}) = 1. &\implies f_{ia_1} = 0 \text{ via } 3a \\ \tau(i) = i < a_1 = \tau(a_p) &\implies \rho_\tau(x_{a_p i}) = 1. &\implies f_{a_p i} = 0 \text{ via } 3a \end{aligned}$$

As for the case of  $a_p < i$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(a_p) = a_1 < i = \tau(i) &\implies \rho_\tau(x_{a_p i}) = +1 &\implies f_{a_p i} = 0 \text{ via } 3a \\ \tau(a_p) = a_1 < a_2 = \tau(a_p) &\implies \rho_\tau(x_{a_1 a_p}) = -1 &\implies f_{a_1 i} = 0 \text{ via } 3c \end{aligned}$$

Now if  $a_p = a_1 + 1$  then all possible cases for  $i$  has been considered and the claim follows. If not, then for all  $a_1 < i < a_p$  we have  $\tau(i) > \tau(a_p)$  and hence  $f_{a_1 i} = f_{ia_p}$  via 3c, and we have two cases to consider here as well:

If  $\rho_\tau(x_{a_1 i}) = 1$  then  $f_{a_1 i} = 0$  via 3a. Otherwise, we are in the situation where:

$$a_1 < i < a_p \text{ and } \tau(a_1) > \tau(i) > \tau(a_p)$$

which implies that  $p > 3^2$  and hence  $\tau$  is of the form:

$$\tau = (a_1, \dots, r, \dots, k, \dots, a_p) \mid r > k > a_1$$

which implies that  $f_{a_1 i} = f_{i a_p} = 0$  via 3b for  $(a_1 < k), (r < a_p)$ . Therefore, with all possible cases considered for  $\tau$  a cycle of length  $p \geq 3$  we have  $\dim_k \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_{id}, \rho_\tau) = 0$  as claimed.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.9.** *If  $\tau$  has at least two commutative cycles of length  $p, q \geq 2$ . Then  $\dim_k \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_{id}, \rho_\tau) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $\tau$  has commutative cycles  $(a_1, \dots, a_p), (b_1, \dots, b_q)$  for  $p, q \geq 2$  such that  $a_1 < a_j$  for  $2 \leq j \leq p$ ,  $b_1 < b_j$  for  $2 \leq j \leq q$  and  $a_1 < b_1$ . We start with:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 < a_p \text{ and } \tau(a_p) = a_1 < a_2 = \tau(a_1) &\implies \rho_\tau(x_{a_1 a_p}) = -1 \\ b_1 < b_q \text{ and } \tau(b_q) = b_1 < b_2 = \tau(b_1) &\implies \rho_\tau(x_{b_1 b_q}) = -1 \end{aligned}$$

For convenience of reference, we denote  $a_1 = s, a_p = t, b_1 = s', b_q = t'$ , and consider a change of basis such that  $f_{st} = 0$ , further:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\tau(x_{st}) = -1 &\implies f_{kl} = 0 \quad | \quad 1 \leq k < l \leq n; s \neq t \neq k \neq l \quad \text{via 3b.} \\ \rho_\tau(x_{s't'}) = -1 &\implies f_{kl} = 0 \quad | \quad 1 \leq k < l \leq n; s' \neq t' \neq k \neq l \quad \text{via 3b.} \end{aligned}$$

Note that the first line implies in particular  $f_{s't'} = 0$ . And we are left with the following cases of  $f_{ss'}, f_{st'}, f_{\min(s', t') \max(s', t')}$  and  $f_{\min(t', t) \max(t', t)}$ . On one hand, for  $f_{ss'}$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \rho_\tau(x_{ss'}) = +1 &\implies f_{ss'} = 0 \text{ via 3a} \\ \text{if } \rho_\tau(x_{ss'}) = -1 &\implies f_{ss'} = 0 \text{ via 3c} \quad (i = s, j = s', k = t') \end{aligned}$$

While on the other hand, the remaining cases are processed by differentiating possible orderings of  $t, s', t'$ :

If  $s < s' < t < t'$ , then:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{s't} &= 0 \text{ via 3c } (i = s, j = s', k = t), \\ f_{t't} &= 0 \text{ via 3d } (i = s', j = t', k = t), \\ f_{st'} &= 0 \text{ via 3d } (i = s, j = t', k = t). \end{aligned}$$

If  $s < s' < t < t'$ , then we have:

$$\tau(t) = \tau(a_p) = a_1 < b_1 = \tau(b_q) = \tau(t') \implies \rho_\tau(x_{tt'}) = +1$$

---

<sup>2</sup>otherwise we get  $i < a_p$  and  $i > a_p$  a clear contradiction.

and then:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{tt'} &= 0 \text{ via } 3a \ (i = t, j = t'), \\ f_{s't} &= 0 \text{ via } 3c \ (i = s, j = s', k = t), \\ f_{st'} &= 0 \text{ via } 3d \ (i = s, j = t, k = t'). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for the case of  $s < t < s' < t'$ , then we have  $\text{rho}_\tau(x_{tt'}) = +1$  and:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{tt'} &= 0 \text{ via } 3a \ (i = t, j = t'), \\ f_{ts'} &= 0 \text{ via } 3d \ (i = s, j = t, k = s'), \\ f_{st'} &= 0 \text{ via } 3d \ (i = s, j = t, k = t'). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with all possible cases considered for  $\tau$  an  $\mathbb{S}_n$ -element such that it has at least two commutative cycles of length  $p, q \geq 2$ , we have  $\dim_k \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_{id}, \rho_\tau) = 0$  as claimed.  $\square$

*Note 2.* Given  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_n$ , let  $\tau = \bar{g}\sigma$  for  $\bar{g}$  some non-simple transposition of  $\mathbb{S}_n$ . Then the space of extensions  $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau)$  is one-dimensional by Theorem 2.4, we denote the single generator of such space by  $x(\sigma; \tau)$ .

*Remark 6.* We conclude the connectedness of the algebra  $\Lambda$  by Theorem 2.4 and the fact that the group  $\mathbb{S}_n$  can be generated by non-simple transpositions. In other words, for all positive integers  $n \geq 3$ , the algebra  $\mathcal{D}_n(\alpha, -\alpha)$  cannot be written as direct product of two non-trivial algebras.

**The special case of  $n = 4$ .** We consider the special case of  $\Lambda := \mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, -\alpha)$  where the  $K$  parameter  $\alpha$  remain normalized to  $1_K$ . Furthermore, we set  $t_1 = (1, 3)$ ,  $t_2 = (1, 4)$  and  $t_3 = (2, 4)$  the non-simple transpositions of  $\mathbb{S}_4$ .

2.0.1. *Quiver-presentation of  $\Lambda$ .* As the Jacobson radical of the finite-dimensional algebra  $\Lambda$  is generated by the commutator, we deduce that the algebra  $\Lambda$  is basic with a complete system of simple representations:  $\{\rho_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4\}$ , moreover, Remark 6 implies that the algebra  $\Lambda$  is connected. Therefore, by Theorem 2.4 we conclude that the ordinary quiver of  $\Lambda$  denoted by  $Q_\Lambda$  has a vertices set of the form  $\{\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4\}$ , and there exists an arrow from  $\sigma$  to  $\tau$  labeled by  $\alpha(\sigma; \tau)$  if and only if  $\tau = t_i.\sigma$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ .

Denote by  $\phi$  Gabriel's theorem morphism associated with  $\Lambda$ . By Gabriel's Theorem we deduce that  $\Lambda \cong KQ_\Lambda / \ker(\phi)$ , furthermore, we observe that:

$$KQ_\Lambda = \bigoplus_{\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4} e_\sigma KQ_\Lambda$$

This in particular implies that from the viewpoint of representation theory, the study of  $\Lambda$  can be reduced to that of  $\Gamma$  the indecomposable projective  $\Lambda$ -representation understood to be a quotient of  $e_e KQ_\Lambda$  by the kernel of  $\pi = \phi|_{e_e}$ .

*Remark 7.* When considered in terms of Gabriel's theorem, the action of the symmetric group  $\mathbb{S}_4$  on  $\Lambda$  is understood for any two arrows  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$  as  $\sigma(\alpha_1 \alpha_2) = \sigma \alpha_1 \sigma \alpha_2$  where:

$$\sigma \alpha(\tau_1; \tau_2) = \alpha(\sigma \tau_1; \sigma \tau_2) \quad | \quad \tau_1, \tau_2, \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4$$

2.0.2. *Quiver-representation of  $gr\Gamma$ .*

**Proposition 2.10.**

$$r_i := \alpha(e; t_i) \alpha(t_i; e) \in \ker(gr\pi) \quad | \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

*Proof.* Consider the  $e_e KQ_\Lambda$ -module  $M$  given as the quotient by the (two-sided) ideal generated by:

$$\{e_e rad^3 KQ_\Lambda, rad^2 KQ_\Lambda e_\sigma \mid e \neq \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4\}$$

we remark here that  $M$  exists as a  $e_e KQ_\Lambda / \ker(gr\pi)$ -module if and only if the following (graded) algebra map:

$$\rho : \Lambda \rightarrow \text{End}(K^5)$$

$$x_{st} \mapsto \rho(x_{st}) = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_e(x_{st}) & x_{st}(e; t_1) & x_{st}(e; t_2) & x_{st}(e; t_3) & g_{st(e;e)} \\ 0 & \rho_{t_1}(x_{st}) & 0 & 0 & x_{st}(t_1; e) \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_{t_2}(x_{st}) & 0 & x_{st}(t_2; e) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{t_3}(x_{st}) & x_{st}(t_3; e) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_e(x_{st}) \end{bmatrix}$$

exists<sup>3</sup> **up to the third power of the radical** as a  $\Lambda$ -representation, that is, if and only if:

$$x_{ij}(e; t_1) x_{ij}(t_i; e) + rad^3 \Lambda = 0 \mid i = 1, 2, 3. \text{ per } 2a, 2c$$

that is, if and only if:

$$gr\pi(\alpha(e; t_i) \alpha(t_i; e)) = 0 \mid i = 1, 2, 3.$$

asserting the claim.  $\square$

An identical method of argument as before proposes the following:

**Proposition 2.11.** *The following is of  $\ker(gr\pi)$*

$$r_3 := \alpha(e; t_1) \alpha(t_1; t_1 t_3) - \alpha(e; t_3) \alpha(t_3; t_1 t_3)$$

$$r_4 := \alpha(e; t_1) \alpha(t_1; t_1 t_2) \alpha(t_1 t_2; t_1 t_2 t_1) - \alpha(e; t_2) \alpha(g_2; t_2 t_1) \alpha(t_2 t_1; t_2 t_1 t_2)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>where  $g_{st(e;e)}$  a set of  $K$ -parameters determined by the defining relations of  $\Lambda$

*Remark 8.* Our computations suggest that there exists no further non-trivial relations of length  $n \geq 4$ . In other words, we conclude that:

$$\ker(\text{gr}\pi) = \{\sigma.r_i, \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4, i = 1, \dots, 4.\}$$

For  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , we rename paths  $\alpha(\sigma; t_i\sigma)$  to  $s_i$ . This, along corresponding paths composition to the obvious multiplication implies that we may further identify the algebra  $\text{gr}\Gamma$  with that of the bounded free associative algebra  $K\langle s_1, s_2, s_3 \rangle$ . In other words:

**Corollary 2.** *Up to a higher power of the radical, the algebra  $\text{gr}\Gamma$  is isomorphic to the nil-Coxeter algebra associated with  $\mathbb{S}_4$ , that is:*

$$\text{gr}\Gamma \cong K\langle s_1, s_2, s_3 \rangle / \ker(\text{gr}\pi) \mid \ker(\text{gr}\pi) = \begin{cases} s_i^2 & \mid i = 1, 2, 3 \\ s_1s_3 - s_3s_1 & \\ s_is_2s_i - s_2s_is_2 & \mid i = 1, 3 \end{cases}$$

### 2.0.3. Quiver-representation of $\Gamma$ .

**Proposition 2.12.** *The algebra  $\Gamma$  is isomorphic to the nil-Coxeter algebra associated with  $\mathbb{S}_4$ .*

*Proof.* This is a direct consequence of the deletion property of Coxeter systems combined with the fact that elements of the ideal  $\ker(\text{gr}\pi)$  are minimal and maximal in the precise length sense.  $\square$

## 3. PART 02: REPRESENTATION THEORY OF $\mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, +\alpha)$ .

For convenience, we denote  $\Lambda := \mathcal{D}_4(\alpha, \alpha)$ , the  $K$ -parameter  $\alpha$  remains normalized to  $1_K$ .

**Lemma 3.1.** *The algebra  $\Lambda$  is not basic.*

*Proof.* Assume for a contradiction that the algebra  $\Lambda$  is basic, that is, every simple  $\Lambda$ -module is one-dimensional say of the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho : \Lambda &\rightarrow K \\ x_{ij} &\mapsto \rho(x_{ij}) = y_{ij} \end{aligned}$$

On one hand, 2a implies that  $y_{ij}^2 = 1$ , that is,  $y_{ij} = \pm 1$  for all  $1 \leq i < j \leq 4$ . On the other hand 2c implies that  $y_{ij}y_{jk} - (y_{jk}y_{ik} + y_{ik}y_{ij}) = 1$  for  $1 \leq i < j < k < 4$ . We discuss:

As for the case of  $y_{ij}y_{jk} = +1$  we get that:

$$y_{ij} = y_{jk} \text{ and } y_{jk}y_{ik} + y_{ik}y_{ij} = 0$$

While the case of  $y_{ij}y_{jk} = -1$  implies:

$$y_{ij} = -y_{jk} \text{ and } y_{jk}y_{ik} + y_{ik}y_{ij} = -2$$

A clear contradiction on both cases proving that indeed, the algebra  $\Lambda$  is no basic.  $\square$

*Remark 9.* Lemma 3.1 implies the existence of a basic  $K$ -algebra  $\Lambda^b$  such that Morita equivalent to  $\Lambda$ , that is:

$$\text{mod}\Lambda \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathfrak{F}} \text{mod}\Lambda^b \xrightarrow[\cong]{\mathfrak{G}} \text{mod}\Lambda$$

In particular, such equivalence preserves simplicity and exactness.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Given  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4$ . The algebra homomorphism  $\rho_\sigma : \Lambda \rightarrow K^{2 \times 2}$  defined by mapping a generator  $x_{ij}$  for  $1 \leq i \neq j \leq 4$  to:*

$$\rho_\sigma(x_{ij}) = \begin{cases} \begin{bmatrix} +1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} & | \sigma(i, j) \in \{(1, 3), (4, 2)\} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +1 \\ +1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & | \sigma(i, j) \in \{(4, 1), (s, s+1) \mid s = 1, 2, 3\} \end{cases}$$

*is a well-defined two-dimensional simple  $\Lambda$ -representation.*

*Proof.* For the claim to hold, one must verify that subjecting  $\rho_\sigma$  to the defining relations does not yield any contradictions for all  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4$ . As 2a, and 2b holds directly, one remark that 2c holds by observing that for  $1 \leq \sigma(i) \neq \sigma(j) \neq \sigma(k) \leq 4$ , then one of the following situations occurs:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\sigma(x_{ij} \cdot x_{jl}) &= 1 & \rho_\sigma(x_{jk}x_{ki} + x_{ki}x_{ij}) &= 0 \\ \rho_\sigma(x_{jk} \cdot x_{ki}) &= 1 & \rho_\sigma(x_{ij}x_{jk} + x_{ki}x_{ij}) &= 0 \\ \rho_\sigma(x_{ki} \cdot x_{ij}) &= 1 & \rho_\sigma(x_{ij}x_{jk} + x_{jk}x_{ki}) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

which in and of itself assert the claim.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.3.** *Let  $\tau, \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4$ . Then for all  $x \in \Lambda$  we have:*

$$(\tau \cdot \rho_\sigma)(x) = (\rho_\sigma(\tau^- \cdot x)) = \rho_{\sigma \cdot \tau^-}(x).$$

*Proof.* As  $\rho_\tau, \rho_{\tau\sigma}$  and the group action by  $\mathbb{S}_4$  is multiplicative, the claim is asserted by remarking that:

$$(\tau \cdot \rho_\sigma)(x_{ij}) = (\rho_\sigma(\tau^- \cdot x_{ij})) = \rho_{\sigma \cdot \tau^-}(x_{ij}).$$

for all  $x_{ij}$  generating  $\Lambda$ .  $\square$

**Question:** On the existence of  $\mu$  a 2-dimensional simple  $\mathcal{D}_5(+1, +1)$ -representation such that  $\mu(x_{12}) = \rho_e(x_{12})$ . We deduce that  $\mu(x_{45}) = \pm\mu(x_{12})$ , which in and of itself implies that  $\mu(x_{23}) = \pm\mu(x_{13}) = \pm\mu(x_{12})$  by 2a and 2b contradicting 2c. In other words  $\{\rho_\sigma \mid \sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4\}$  does not extents to a complete system of simple 2-dimensional

$\mathcal{D}_5(+1, +1)$ -representations, and the question of computing simple  $\mathcal{D}_5(+1, +1)$ -representations remains open for the moment.

*Note 3.* Denote by  $\mathbb{V}$  the Klein four-subgroup of the symmetric group  $\mathbb{S}_4$ , that is, the subgroup generated by the permutations  $\nu_1 = (13)(24)$  and  $\nu_2 = (14)(23)$ , further, we set  $\nu_3 = \nu_1\nu_2$ . One may assume with no loss of generality that  $\mathbb{V}$  fixes 1 to realize the associated quotient group as the symmetric group on three letters  $\{2, 3, 4\}$  which we denote by  $\overline{\mathbb{S}_3}$ .

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $\sigma \in \mathbb{S}_4$ , then  $\rho_\sigma \cong \nu_i \cdot \rho_\sigma$  via conjugation with  $m_{\sigma\nu_i\sigma^-}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  where:*

$$m_{\nu_1} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +1 \\ +1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad m_{\nu_2} := \begin{bmatrix} +1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad m_{\nu_3} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

*Proof.* Given any  $x \in \Lambda$ , then:

$$\nu_i \cdot \rho_\sigma(x) = \rho_{\sigma\nu_i^-}(x) = \rho_{\sigma\nu_i\sigma^-}(x) = \sigma^- \cdot \rho_{\sigma\nu_i\sigma^-}(x).$$

Now  $\sigma\nu_i\sigma^- \in \mathbb{V}$  since  $\mathbb{V}$  is a normal subgroup of  $\mathbb{S}_4$ , in other words,  $\sigma\nu_i\sigma^- = \nu_j$  for some  $j = 1, 2, 3$ . The claim is then asserted since  $\rho_{\nu_j} \cong \rho_e$  via  $m_{\nu_j}$ , that is:

$$\rho_{\nu_j}(x) = m_{\nu_j} \cdot \rho_e(x) \cdot m_{\nu_j}^- \quad | \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

□

Our aim in at this point is prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 3.5.** *Let  $\sigma, \tau \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_3}$ , then:*

$$Ext_\Lambda^1(\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau) \cong Ext_\Lambda^1(\mu\rho_\sigma, \mu\rho_\tau) \quad | \quad \mu \in \mathbb{S}_4.$$

*Furthermore, we have:*

$$\dim_K Ext_\Lambda^1(\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau) = \begin{cases} 2 & | \quad \tau = \sigma \cdot s_2^- \\ 1 & | \quad \tau = \sigma \cdot s_3^- \\ 0 & | \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We discuss the first part of the theorem as follows:

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $\sigma, \tau \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_3}$ . Then:*

$$Ext_\Lambda^1(\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau) \cong Ext_\Lambda^1(\mu\rho_\sigma, \mu\rho_\tau) \quad | \quad \mu \in \mathbb{S}_4.$$

*Proof.* The claim is a natural consequence of Lemma 3.3 induced by the group action. In details, given  $f \in Z^1(\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau)$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{S}_4$  then for all  $x_{ij}$  generating  $\Lambda$  we have:

$$\mu(f) \in Z^1(\mu\rho_\sigma, \mu\rho_\tau) \quad | \quad \mu f(x_{ij}) = f(\mu^- x_{ij})$$

a well-defined (1-)cocycles, that is a coboundary if and only  $f$  is.  $\square$

*Remark 10.* The special case of  $\mu \in \mathbb{V}$  in Proposition 3.6 implies that the isomorphism as described is a self-inverse. Furthermore, such isomorphism can be realized by means of Proposition 3.4, which implies that for an arbitrary  $f \in Z^1(\rho_\sigma, \rho_\tau)$ , then for all  $x_{ij}$  generating  $\Lambda$  we have:

$$v(f) \in Z^1(\mu\rho_\sigma, \mu\rho_\tau) \mid v(f)(x_{ij}) = m_{\sigma\mu\sigma}^- f(x_{ij}) m_{\tau\mu\tau}^-$$

a well-defined (1-)cocycles that is a coboundary if and only  $f$  is.

*Note 4.* We understand arbitrary  $\bar{f} \in \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_e, \sigma\rho_e)$ , as a class of the form  $f + B^1(\rho_e, \sigma\rho_e)$  where  $f : \Lambda \rightarrow K^{2,2}$  maps a generator  $x_{ij}$  to:

$$f(x_{ij}) = \begin{bmatrix} a_{ij} & b_{ij} \\ c_{ij} & d_{ij} \end{bmatrix} \mid f(xy) = \rho_e(x)f(y) + f(x)\sigma\rho_e(y).$$

Furthermore, we denote basis changing matrices of  $K^{2,2}$  by:

$$\lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_3 \\ \lambda_2 & \lambda_4 \end{bmatrix} \mid \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4 \in K.$$

**Proposition 3.7.** *Given  $\sigma \in \overline{\mathbb{S}}_3$  a non-Coxeter generator. Then the space of extensions  $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_e, \sigma\rho_e)$  is of null-dimension.*

*Proof.* Given an arbitrary  $\bar{f} \in \text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(\rho_e, \sigma\rho_e)$ :

The case of  $\sigma = e$  is then resolved by a change of basis of which we set:

$$2\lambda_1 = 0 \quad 2\lambda_2 = +c_{13} \quad 2\lambda_3 = +c_{13} - 2a_{12} \quad 2\lambda_4 = +2c_{12}$$

which would imply that:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{12}) = f(x_{34}) = 0 & \quad \mid \text{ via } 2a, 2b, \\ f(x_{13}) = f(x_{24}) = 0 & \quad \mid \text{ via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, k = 3), \\ f(x_{14}) = f(x_{23}) = 0 & \quad \mid \text{ via } 2a, 2b. \end{aligned}$$

The case of  $\sigma = s_2 s_3 s_2$  is resolved by setting:

$$2\lambda_1 = +a_{24} \quad 2\lambda_2 = +c_{13} \quad 2\lambda_3 = -b_{13} \quad 2\lambda_4 = -d_{24}$$

which would then imply that:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{13}) = f(x_{24}) = 0 & \quad \mid \text{ via } 2a, \\ f(x_{12}) = f(x_{23}) = 0 & \quad \mid \text{ via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, k = 3, 4), \\ f(x_{14}) = f(x_{34}) = 0 & \quad \mid \text{ via } 2a, 2b. \end{aligned}$$

The case of  $\sigma = s_3 s_2$  is resolved by setting:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\lambda_1 &= +a_{14} + a_{23} & 2\lambda_2 &= +a_{14} - a_{23} \\ 2\lambda_3 &= (+a_{14} + a_{23}) + 2a_{13} & 2\lambda_4 &= (-a_{14} + a_{23}) + 2c_{13} \end{aligned}$$



which would then imply that:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_{13}) = f(x_{24}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, \\
f(x_{14}) = f(x_{23}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, k = 3, 4), \\
f(x_{34}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, 2, j = 3, k = 4), \\
f(x_{12}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 4, k = 2).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the case of  $\sigma = s_2 s_3$  is resolved by setting:

$$\begin{aligned}
2\lambda_1 &= -a_{13} + a_{24} & 2\lambda_2 &= +c_{13} - c_{24} \\
2\lambda_3 &= -a_{13} - a_{24} & 2\lambda_4 &= -c_{13} - c_{24}
\end{aligned}$$

which would imply:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_{13}) = f(x_{24}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, \\
f(x_{12}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, 4, k = 3, 2), \\
f(x_{34}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2b, \\
f(x_{14}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, 4, k = 4, 3), \\
f(x_{23}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2c : (i = 2, 1, j = 3, k = 4, 2).
\end{aligned}$$

In other words, up to an isomorphism, generic elements of the space  $Ext_{\Lambda}^1(\rho_e, \rho_{\sigma})$  are trivial and therefore, the space in and of itself is of null-dimension as claimed for all  $\sigma$  non-Coxeter generator.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.8.** *The space of extensions  $Ext_{\Lambda}^1(\rho_e, \sigma\rho_e)$  is of one-dimensional for  $\sigma = s_3$ , while is two-dimensional for  $\tau = s_2$ .*

*Proof.* Given an arbitrary  $\bar{f} \in Ext_{\Lambda}^1(\rho_e, \sigma\rho_e)$ :

The case of  $\sigma = s_3$  is resolved by a change of basis of which we configure:

$$\lambda_2 = -\lambda_1 + a_{14} \quad \lambda_3 = -\lambda_1 - a_{13} \quad \lambda_4 = -\lambda_1 + a_{14} - c_{13}$$

where for  $2\beta_2 = -b_{12} - a_{13} + c_{13} + a_{34}$ , we set:

$$2\lambda_1 = +b_{12} + a_{14} - c_{13} + \beta_2 = -a_{13} + a_{14} + a_{34} - \beta_2$$

This would imply that:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_{13}) = f(x_{24}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2b, \\
f(x_{14}) = f(x_{23}) = 0 & \quad | \quad \text{via } 2a, 2b, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, k = 3).
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore. 2a conclude that:

$$f(x_{12}) = \beta_2 \cdot \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad e(x_{34}) = \beta_2 \cdot \begin{bmatrix} +1 & 0 \\ 0 & +1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Where all the other defining relations of  $\Lambda$  are satisfied. In other words, up to an isomorphism, the space  $Ext_{\Lambda}^1(\rho_e, s_3\rho_e)$  has a generating set of

the form:  $\{\overline{f_2} = f_2 + B^1(\rho_e, s_3\rho_e)\}$  where  $f_2$  is defined by mapping the generators of  $\Lambda$  as follows:

$$f_2(x_{12}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, f_2(x_{34}) = \begin{bmatrix} +1 & 0 \\ 0 & +1 \end{bmatrix}, f_2(x_{ij}) = 0 \mid \text{ otherwise.}$$

As for the case of  $\sigma = s_2$ , we set:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\lambda_1 &= +a_{12} - a_{34} & 2\lambda_2 &= -a_{12} - a_{34} \\ 2\lambda_3 &= -b_{12} + b_{34} & 2\lambda_4 &= -b_{12} - b_{34} \end{aligned}$$

which would imply that:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{12}) &= f(x_{34}) = 0 & \mid & \text{ via } 2a, \\ f(x_{13}) &= 0 & \mid & \text{ via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, 3, k = 3, 4), \\ f(x_{24}) &= 0 & \mid & \text{ via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, 2, j = 4, k = 2), \end{aligned}$$

further:

$$\begin{aligned} f(x_{14}) &= \beta_1 \cdot \text{diag}(+1, -1) & \mid & \text{ via } 2a, 2c : (i = 1, j = 2, k = 4), \\ f(x_{23}) &= \beta_3 \cdot \text{diag}(+1, +1) & \mid & \text{ via } 2a, 2c : (i = 2, j = 3, k = 4). \end{aligned}$$

where the  $K$ -parameters  $\beta_1, \beta_3$  are generically given as:

$$2\beta_1 = a_{12} - b_{12} + a_{34} + b_{34} + 2a_{14}, \quad 2\beta_3 = -a_{12} - b_{12} - a_{34} + b_{34} + 2a_{23}$$

and all the other defining relations of  $\Lambda$  are satisfied. In other words, up to an isomorphism, the space  $Ext_{\Lambda}^1(\rho_e, s_2\rho_e)$  has a generating set of the form:  $\{\overline{f_t} = f_t + B^1(\rho_e, s_2\rho_e) \mid t = 1, 3.\}$  where  $f_t$  are defined by mapping the generators of  $\Lambda$  as follows:

$$\begin{cases} f_1(x_{14}) &= \text{diag}(+1, -1) \\ f_3(x_{23}) &= \text{diag}(+1, +1) \\ f_t(x_{ij}) &= 0 \mid \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

□

**Corollary 3.** *Let  $\sigma, \tau \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_3}$ . Then:*

$$\dim_K Ext_{\Lambda}^1(\rho_{\sigma}, \rho_{\tau}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \mid \tau = \sigma.s_2^- \\ 1 & \mid \tau = \sigma.s_3^- \\ 0 & \mid \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

*Remark 11.* We set  $\{\overline{g_t} = g_t + B^1(\nu_1\rho_e, \nu_1\rho_{s_2}) \mid t = 1, 3.\}$  a generating set of the space  $Ext_{\Lambda}^1(\nu_1\rho_e, \nu_1\rho_{s_2})$ , where  $g_t$  are defined by mapping the

generators of  $\Lambda$  as follows:

$$\begin{cases} g_1(x_{14}) &= \text{diag}(+1, +1) \\ g_3(x_{23}) &= \text{diag}(+1, -1) \\ g_t(x_{ij}) &= 0 \mid \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$


and remark that:

$$\overline{f_1} \cong \begin{cases} -\overline{g_3} & \text{via } \nu_1 \\ -\overline{g_1} & \text{via } v \mid \mu = \nu_1 \end{cases} \quad \overline{f_3} \cong \begin{cases} -\overline{g_1} & \text{via } \nu_1 \\ +\overline{g_3} & \text{via } v \mid \mu = \nu_1 \end{cases}$$

This, in particular, indicates that the induced action of the  $\mathbb{V}$  (and that of  $\mathbb{S}_4$  in general) does **not** extend to an action onto  $\Lambda$ -extensions. In other words, the algebra  $\Lambda^b$  is **not** invariant under the action of  $\mathbb{V}$ .

*Note 5.* The space of extensions  $Ext_{\Lambda^b}^1(\mathfrak{F}(\rho_e), \mathfrak{F}(\rho_{s_2}))$  is two-dimensional, we set  $\{\mathfrak{F}(\overline{f_1}), \mathfrak{F}(\overline{f_3})\}$  a generating set. Similarly, we set  $\{\mathfrak{F}(\overline{f_2})\}$  a generating set of the one-dimensional space  $Ext_{\Lambda^b}^1(\mathfrak{F}(\rho_e), \mathfrak{F}(\rho_{s_3}))$ .

3.0.1. *Quiver-presentation of  $\Lambda^b$ .* Now that we have verified that the algebra  $\Lambda^b$  is basic, connected and finite-dimensional, then Theorem 3.5 supported by definition implies that  $Q_\Lambda$  the ordinary quiver of  $\Lambda$  (and that of  $\Lambda^b$  since  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda^b$  are Morita equivalent) has the following shape:



*Note 6.* We simply write  $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$  if no confusions occurs.

Denote by  $\phi$  Gabriel's theorem morphism associated with  $\Lambda^b$ . By Gabriel's Theorem we deduce that  $\Lambda \cong KQ_\Lambda / \ker(\phi)$ , furthermore, we observe that:

$$KQ_{\Lambda^b} = \oplus_{\sigma \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_3}} e_\sigma KQ_\Lambda$$

This in particular implies that from the viewpoint of representation theory, the study of  $\Lambda^b$  can be reduced to that of  $\Gamma$  the indecomposable projective  $\Lambda^b$ -representation understood to be a quotient of  $e_e KQ_\Lambda$  by the kernel of  $\pi = \phi|_{e_e}$ .

### 3.0.2. Quiver-representation of $gr\Gamma$ .

**Proposition 3.9.**  $gr(\pi)(r_t) = 0 \mid t = 1 \cdots, 4$ , where:

$$\begin{aligned} r_t &= \beta_t^2 & \mid t = 1, 2, 3. \\ r_4 &:= \beta_1\beta_3 - \beta_3\beta_1. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Consider the  $e_e KQ_\Lambda$ -module given as the quotient by the (two-sided) ideal generated by:

$$\{e_e rad^3 KQ_\Lambda, e_e rad^2 KQ_\Lambda e_\sigma \mid e \neq \sigma \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_3}\}$$

The claim follows by verify that such module exists as an  $e_e KQ_\Lambda / ker(gr\pi)$ -module if and only if up to the third power of the radical we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{F}(\overline{f_i^2}) &= 0 & \mid i = 1, 2, 3. \\ \mathfrak{F}(\overline{f_1 f_3} - \overline{f_3 f_1}) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

that is, if and only if up to the third power of the radical, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{f_i^2} &= 0 & \mid i = 1, 2, 3. \\ \overline{f_1 f_3} - \overline{f_3 f_1} &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

that is, if and only if:

$$gr\pi(r_i) = 0 \mid i = 1, \cdots, 4.$$

which asserts the claim.  $\square$

An identical method of argument as before proposes the following:

**Proposition 3.10.**  $gr(\phi)r_t = 0 \mid t = 5, 6$ , where:

$$\begin{aligned} r_5 &:= \beta_2\beta_1\beta_2 - \beta_1\beta_2\beta_3 - \beta_3\beta_2\beta_1 \\ r_6 &:= \beta_2\beta_3\beta_2 - \beta_1\beta_2\beta_1 + \beta_3\beta_2\beta_3 \end{aligned}$$

*Remark 12.* Our computations suggest that there exists no further non-trivial relations of length  $n \geq 4$ . In other words, we conclude that:

$$ker(gr\pi) = \{\sigma.r_t \mid \sigma \in \overline{\mathbb{S}_3}, t = 1, \cdots, 6.\}$$

identifying the path algebra  $e_e KQ_\Lambda$  with the free associative algebra  $K\langle s_1, s_2, s_3 \rangle$  by corresponding path composition to the obvious multiplication yield the following:

**Corollary 4.** Up to a higher power of the radical, following hold:

$$gr\Gamma \cong K\langle s_1, s_2, s_3 \rangle / ker(gr(\pi)) = \begin{cases} \iota_i := s_i^2, \mid t = 1, 2, 3. \\ \iota_4 := s_1 s_3 - s_3 s_1, \\ \iota_5 := s_2 s_1 s_2 - s_1 s_2 s_3 - s_3 s_2 s_1, \\ \iota_6 := s_2 s_3 s_2 - s_1 s_2 s_1 + s_3 s_2 s_3. \end{cases}$$

In particular, we find that the algebra  $gr\Gamma$  is 24-dimensional. The following corollary provides a basis:

**Corollary 5.** *The following set of polynomials form a basis of the algebra  $gr\Gamma$ :*

$$\begin{aligned}
l = 1 : & (s_3, s_1, s_2) & l = 2 : & (s_3s_1, s_3s_2, s_1s_2, s_2s_3, s_2s_1) \\
l = 3 : & \begin{pmatrix} s_3s_1s_2, & s_3s_2s_3, & s_3s_2s_1, \\ s_1s_2s_3, & s_1s_2s_1, & s_2s_3s_1, \end{pmatrix} & l = 4 : & \begin{pmatrix} s_3s_1s_2s_3, & s_3s_1s_2s_1, \\ s_3s_2s_3s_1, & s_1s_2s_3s_1, & s_2s_3s_1s_2, \end{pmatrix} \\
l = 5 : & \begin{pmatrix} s_3s_1s_2s_3s_1, \\ s_3s_2s_3s_1s_2, & s_1s_2s_3s_1s_2 \end{pmatrix} & l = 6 : & (s_3s_1s_2s_3s_1s_2)
\end{aligned}$$

*Remark 13.* Remark that the basis elements  $u_1 := s_2s_3s_1s_2, u_2 := (s_3s_1s_2)^2$  corresponds to paths  $p_1, p_2$  (respectively) such that:

$$s(p_1) = s(p_2) = t(p_1) = t(p_2) \quad l(p_1), l(p_2) > 2$$

3.0.3. *Quiver-representation of  $\Gamma$ .* Remark 13 along with the fact that  $\Gamma \cong K\langle s_1, s_2, s_3 \rangle / \ker(\pi)$  implies the existence of some  $K$ -polynomials  $q_i$  such that:

$$\Gamma = K\langle s_1, s_2, s_3 \rangle / \ker(\pi) = \begin{cases} \iota_1 + q_1u_1 + q_2u_2, \\ \iota_2 + q_3u_1 + q_4u_2, \\ \iota_3 + q_5u_1 + q_6u_2, \\ \iota_4 + q_7u_1 + q_8u_2, \\ \iota_5 = s_2s_1s_2 - s_1s_2s_3 - s_3s_2s_1, \\ \iota_6 = s_2s_3s_2 - s_1s_2s_1 + s_3s_2s_3 \end{cases}$$

*Remark 14.* Corollary 5 implies on one hand that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(s_1\iota_4 - \iota_1s_3) &= q_7(s_1s_2s_3s_1s_2) + q_1(s_3s_2s_3s_1s_2) = 0 \\
\pi(s_1\iota_3 - \iota_4s_3) &= q_5(s_1s_2s_3s_1s_2) + q_7(s_3s_2s_3s_1s_2) = 0
\end{aligned}$$

that is,  $q_1 = q_5 = q_7 = 0$ . Further, we remark for  $q$  any non-trivial  $K$ -polynomials that:

$$\begin{aligned}
t_1 := s_1 + qs_3s_2s_3s_1s_2 &\implies t_1^2 = s_1^2 + 2qu_2 \\
t_2 := s_2 + qs_3s_1s_2 &\implies t_2^2 = s_2^2 + qu_1 + q^2u_2
\end{aligned}$$

We remark that there exists no basis elements  $u$  such that setting:

$$t_3 := s_3 + qu \implies t_3^2 = s_3^2 + q'u_2$$

Therefore, we set  $t_3 := s_3$  and propose:

*Proposition 3.11. The following hold:*

$$\Gamma = K\langle t_1, t_2, t_3 \rangle / \ker(\pi) = \begin{cases} t_1^2, t_2^2, t_3^2 + q_1 u_2, \\ t_1 t_3 - t_3 t_1 + q_2 u_2, \\ t_2 t_1 t_2 - t_1 t_2 t_3 - t_3 t_2 t_1, \\ t_2 t_3 t_2 - t_1 t_2 t_1 + t_3 t_2 t_3 \end{cases}$$

for  $q_1, q_2$  two  $K$ -polynomials.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Fomin, S. Kirillov, A.N. Quadratic algebras, Dunkl elements, and Schubert calculus. *Advances in geometry, Progr. Math. 172, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1999, 147–182. MR 1667680.*
- [2] Milinski, A. Schneider, H.J. Pointed Indecomposable Hopf Algebras Over Coxeter Groups *New trends in Hopf algebra theory (La Falda, 1999), 215–236, Contemp. Math., 267, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2000.*
- [3] Grana, M. Finite dimensional Nichols Algebras of Non-Diagonal Group Type. <http://mate.dm.uba.ar/~lvendram/zoo/>.
- [4] Heckenberger, I. Vendramin, L. PBW Deformations of a Fomin-Kirillov Algebra and Other Examples *Algebras and Representation Theory Vol.22, 1513–1532(2019); math.QA/1703.10632.*
- [5] Majid, S. Noncommutative Differentials and Yang-Mills on Permutation groups  $S_n$  *Lect. Notes Pure and Appl. Maths 239 (2004) 189–214, Marcel Dekker; math.QA/0105253.*
- [6] Berenstein, A. Fomin, S. Zelevinsky, A Cluster Algebras. III. Upper Bounds and Double Bruhat Cells. *Duke Math. J., 126(1):1–52, 2005; math.QA/0305434.*
- [7] Geiss, C. Leclerc, B. Schröer J. Preprojective Algebras and Cluster Algebras *Trends in Representation Theory of Algebras and Related Topics 253–283; math.QA/0804.3168.*
- [8] Wolf, K. PBW Deformations of Algebras *Unpublished Degree Dissertation. Philipps-Universität Marburg, Mathematik und Informatik (Fb12).*
- [9] Robson, J C. McConnell. J C. Small l W. Noncommutative Noetherian Rings *American Mathematical Society, 2001..*
- [10] Skowronski, A. Simson, D. Assem, I. Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras: 1: Techniques of Representation Theory. (*London Mathematical Society Student Texts*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/CBO9780511614309.

A. ALIA: PHILIPPS-UNIVERSITÄT MARBURG, FB MATHEMATIK UND INFORMATIK, HANS-MEERWEIN-STRASSE, 35032 MARBURG, GERMANY.  
Email address: alia@mathematik.uni-marburg.de

I. HECKENBERGER: PHILIPPS-UNIVERSITÄT MARBURG, FB MATHEMATIK UND INFORMATIK, HANS-MEERWEIN-STRASSE, 35032 MARBURG, GERMANY.  
Email address: heckenberger@mathematik.uni-marburg.de