Exceptional Sequences and Rooted Labeled Forests
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Abstract. We give a representation-theoretic bijection between rooted labeled forests with \( n \) vertices and complete exceptional sequences for the quiver of type \( A_n \) with straight orientation, i.e., for each labeled rooted forest we construct a unique exceptional sequence. The ascending and descending vertices in the forest correspond to relatively projective and relatively injective objects in the exceptional sequence. We conclude that every object in an exceptional sequence is either relatively projective or relatively injective or both.

We construct a natural action of the extended braid group on rooted labeled forests and show that it agrees with the known action of the braid group on complete exceptional sequences. We also describe the action of \( \Delta \), the Garside element of the braid group, on rooted labeled forest using representation theory.

Introduction

For a quiver \( Q \) of Dynkin type, an exceptional sequence is a sequence of indecomposable representations \((E_1, \ldots, E_k)\) of \( Q \) over any field such that
\[
\text{Hom}(E_j, E_i) = 0 = \text{Ext}(E_j, E_i)
\]
for all \( i < j \). The exceptional sequence is called complete if \( k = n \), the number of vertices of \( Q \). Exceptional sequences first occurred as sequences of line bundles over projective space \([11], [22]\). The number of exceptional sequences for a quiver of any Dynkin type is well-known \([24], [20]\), see also \([18]\).

In this paper we consider the quiver \( A_n \) with straight orientation:
\[
1 \to 2 \to 3 \to \cdots \to n.
\]
The number of exceptional sequences of type \( A_n \) is \((n + 1)^{n-1}\). This is also the number of parking functions and rooted labeled forests. A bijection between parking functions and complete exceptional sequences was given in \([12]\) and can be used to construct a bijection between complete exceptional sequences and rooted labeled forests via Prüfer codes. We give a new proof of this in Section 1 and an example in Section 3.3.

The purpose of this paper is to prove the two variable generating function for exceptional sequences Theorem \([D]\) (Using variables \( a, b \) with \( c = 1 \).) We first tried the known indirect bijection using parking functions and Prüfer codes but that did not work to prove Theorem \([D]\). The bijection which works can be given by combining \([13], [19]\) with other bijections. (See Section 2.4.)

In Section 2 we construct a direct bijection between complete exceptional sequences and rooted labeled forest giving a representation theoretic interpretation of the relation
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between nodes. As we show in Section 3.3, our bijection is different from the one coming from the bijection with parking functions.

An indecomposable representation of a linear quiver of type $A_n$ is given by its support which is a closed interval $[a, b]$ where $1 \leq a \leq b \leq n$. The representation with this support, denoted $M_{ab}$, has top the simple module at $a$ and socle or bottom the simple module at $b$.

**Theorem A.** [12] (Theorem 1.3) For the linear $A_n$ quiver, a bijection between complete exceptional sequences and parking functions is given by assigning to each exceptional sequence $(E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ the sequence of tops $(a_1, \cdots, a_n)$ where $E_i = M_{a_i,b_i}$.

In Section 1 we will repeat the construction of the inverse function (from parking functions to complete exceptional sequences) in order to compare the braid group action given in [12] with the new action given in Section 3

**Theorem B.** (1) (Theorem 2.12) For each complete exceptional sequences $(E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ for $A_n$ consider the partial ordering on $[n]$ given by $i < j$ if the support of $E_i$ is contained in the support of $E_j$. The Hasse diagram is a rooted labeled forest. Conversely, any rooted labeled forest is the Hasse diagram of a unique exceptional sequence.

(2) (Theorem 2.20) Furthermore, $E_i$ is relatively projective if and only if either the corresponding node $v_i$ is a root of a tree in the forest (i.e., the support of $E_i$ is maximal) or $i < j$ for $E_j$ the smallest object containing $E_i$ in its support. Dually, $E_i$ is relatively injective if and only if either $v_i$ is a root of a tree in the forest or $i > j$ for $E_j$ the smallest object containing $E_i$ in its support.

We observe in Section 2.4 that Theorem B(1) follows from [13] and [3].

**Corollary C.** (Corollary 2.21) Every object in a complete exceptional sequence for linear $A_n$ is either relatively projective or relatively injective and at least one object is both.

Using the three variable generating function for rooted labeled forests from [10] (which is a special case of an earlier result in [9]) we obtain the following.

**Theorem D.** (Theorem 2.29) We have a three variable generating function

$$
\sum a^p b^q c^r = c(a + (n-1)b + c)(2a + (n-2)b + c) \cdots ((n-1)a + b + c)
$$

where the sum is over all complete exceptional sequences $E_*$ for a linear quiver of type $A_n$ and the monomial $a^p b^q c^r$ is given by letting

- $p =$ number of relatively projective but not relatively injective objects in $E_*$,
- $q =$ number of relatively injective but not relatively projective objects in $E_*$,
- $r =$ number of objects in $E_*$ which are both relatively projective and relatively injective.

In Section 3 we construct a natural action of the braid group $B_n$ on $n$ strands on the set of rooted labeled forests on $n$ vertices and we show in Theorem 3.1 that this action corresponds to the known action of $B_n$ on complete exceptional sequences.

In Section 4 we extend the braid group action on rooted labeled forests to the “extended braid group” $\tilde{B}_n = B_n \rtimes Z_2$ by adding an outer involution to the braid group which acts by inverting the labels of the forest (Section 4.4). We also describe the action of the Garside element $\Delta$ and show on forests how it transforms cluster tilting sets to signed exceptional sequences (Theorem 4.15).
1. Parking functions

A parking function on \( n \) is a function \( f : [n] \to [n] \), where \([n] = \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\) so that \( f^{-1}[k] \) has at least \( k \) elements for all positive \( k \leq n \). This is equivalent to the condition that there are at most \( p \) elements \( i \in [n] \) with \( f(i) \geq n - p + 1 \).

The name comes from an interpretation using \( n \) cars parking in \( n \) spaces numbered 1 through \( n \). Assume that Car \( i \) has preferred parking space \( a_i \). If that space is not available, Car \( i \) will park in the next available space. If \( f(i) = a_i \) is a parking function, each car \( i \) will find a space \( b_i \geq a_i \) and \( g(i) = b_i \) will give a bijection \( g : [n] \to [n] \).

As an example, suppose \( n = 4 \) and consider the parking function \((1, 1, 2, 2)\). Assume the cars come in reverse order. Then Car 4 will park in its preferred spot \( b_4 = 1 \). Car 3 will go to the next spot \( b_3 = 3 \), Car 2 will park in its favorite spot \( b_2 = 1 \). Finally, Car 1 will park in space \( b_1 = 4 \). The result is an exceptional sequence:

\[(M_{14}, M_{11}, M_{23}, M_{22})\].

Lemma 1.1. Let \((a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n)\) be a nondecreasing parking function on \( n \). Let \( b_1, \ldots, b_n \) be the permutation of \( n \) given by the locations of the cars with preferred positions \( a_i \) assuming they park in reverse order as outlined above. Then \( M_{a_1, b_1}, \ldots, M_{a_n, b_n} \) is an exceptional sequence for linear \( A_n \).

Proof. For \( i < j \) we have \( \text{Ext}(M_{a_j, b_j}, M_{a_i, b_i}) = 0 \) since \( a_i \leq a_j \). It remains to show \( \text{Hom}(M_{a_j, b_j}, M_{a_i, b_i}) = 0 \) for \( i < j \). When \( a_i = a_j \), we have \( b_i \geq b_j \) since Car \( j \) has parked in space \( b_j \) after finding spaces \( a_j \) to \( b_j - 1 \) occupied. Therefore, Car \( i \) will find that spaces \( a_i \) to \( b_j \) are taken and must park in \( b_i > b_j \). Then \( M_{a_j, b_j} \) is a quotient of \( M_{a_i, b_i} \) and \( \text{Hom}(M_{a_j, b_j}, M_{a_i, b_i}) = 0 \).

When \( a_i < a_j \), there is no morphism \( M_{a_j, b_j} \to M_{a_i, b_i} \) since \( b_i \) is not in the closed interval \([a_j, b_j] \) since those spaces are occupied by the time Car \( i \) parks. Thus either

(1) \( b_i < a_j \), making the supports of the two modules disjoint or
(2) \( b_i > b_j \) in which case \( M_{a_j, b_j} \) is a subquotient of \( M_{a_i, b_i} \) and there is no morphism.

Therefore \( M_{a_1, b_1}, \ldots, M_{a_n, b_n} \) is an exceptional sequence. \( \Box \)

Lemma 1.2. Let \((E_1, \ldots, E_n)\) be an exceptional sequence with sequence of tops \((a_1, \ldots, a_n)\). Then, for any \( i \), there is another exceptional sequence with \( a_i, a_{i+1} \) switched in the sequence of tops.

Proof. If \( a_i = a_{i+1} \) there is nothing to do. Otherwise, suppose \( a_i < a_{i+1} \). Then there is a unique object \( E'_{i+1} \) so that \((E_1, \ldots, E'_{i+1}, E_{i+2}, \ldots, E_n)\) is an exceptional sequence. But, the dimension vector of \( E'_{i+1} \) is congruent to \( \dim E_{i+1} \) modulo \( \dim E_i \). So, the top of \( E_{i+1} \) is equal to that of \( E_{i+1} \), i.e., the tops \( a_i, a_{i+1} \) have switched. The case \( a_i > a_{i+1} \) is similar. \( \Box \)

Theorem 1.3. \([12] / \text{Theorem A}\) The construction above gives a unique exceptional sequence having any given parking function as sequence of tops.

Proof. By Lemma [1.1] the construction works for any nondecreasing parking function. By Lemma [1.2] we can permute the parking function. Since the two sets have the same cardinality \( (n + 1)^{n-1} \), this construction gives a bijection. \( \Box \)
We will construct a 1-1 correspondence between complete exceptional sequences for linear $A_n$ and rooted labeled forest. Then we derive some representation theoretic consequences.

2.1. The Hasse diagram of an exceptional sequence. We consider the Hasse diagram of an exceptional sequence and derive some of its properties. For example, we show that it is a rooted forest.

**Definition 2.1.** A rooted labeled forest is a forest with vertices numbered 1 through $n$ and a root chosen for each component. By adding an extra vertex labeled 0 and attaching it to each of the roots, such a structure is equivalent to a tree with $n + 1$ vertices labeled 0 through $n$.

**Remark 2.2.** The nodes of a rooted tree are partially ordered by paths to the root. Conversely, the Hasse diagram of a finite poset is a rooted forest if it has the property that each node has at most one parent. In that case, the maximal elements are roots of disjoint trees.

Let $E_\ast = (E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ be a complete exceptional sequence for $A_n$. (Unless otherwise noted, we always take the orientation $1 \to 2 \to \cdots \to n$.) We define a partial ordering on the objects $E_i$ by $E_i \leq E_j$ if the support of $E_i$ is contained in the support of $E_j$. In other words, $a_j \leq a_i \leq b_i \leq b_j$. We claim that the Hasse diagram of this partial ordering is a rooted labeled forest. This follow from the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.3.** Given two objects $E_i = M_{a_i,b_i}$ and $E_j = M_{a_j,b_j}$, the intervals $[a_i,b_i], [a_j,b_j]$ are “noncrossing”, i.e. either these closed interval are disjoint or one is contained in the other.

**Proof.** Given two objects whose supports cross, say, $M_{ab}, M_{cd}$ where $a < c \leq b < d$, we have

$$\text{Hom}(M_{cd}, M_{ab}) \neq 0, \text{Ext}(M_{ab}, M_{cd}) \neq 0.$$ 

So, both pairs $(M_{ab}, M_{cd})$ and $(M_{cd}, M_{ab})$ are not exceptional. Therefore, they cannot occur in an exceptional sequence in either order. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 2.4.** The set of elements above $E_i$ form a linearly ordered set.

**Proof.** Suppose $E_i \leq E_j, E_k$. Then the supports of $E_j, E_k$ meet and therefore, by Lemma 2.3, one is contained in the other. So, they are linearly ordered. \hfill \Box

**Proposition 2.5.** The Hasse diagram of the object $E_i$ in an exceptional sequence form a rooted labeled forest. Moreover, the roots are the maximal elements.

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.3, a node cannot have two parents. Therefore, each connected component of the Hasse diagram is a tree with root at the top. \hfill \Box

**Example 2.6.** Consider the exceptional sequence for $A_7$:

$$(S_4, S_5, M_{15}, M_{67}, S_6, M_{12}, S_1)$$
The corresponding Hasse diagram is:

\[
E_1 = S_4 \quad E_2 = S_5 \quad E_6 = M_{12} \quad E_7 = S_1
\]

We note that the leaves are simple modules. More generally, we have the following.

**Proposition 2.7.** The length of the object \( E_i = M_{a_i,b_i} \) (given by \( b_i - a_i + 1 \)) is the number of objects \( E_j \) which are \( \leq E_i \) in the partial ordering. In particular, the leaves (the minimal elements) have length 1, i.e., they are simple modules.

Given a rooted labeled tree, define the weight of any node \( v_i \) to be the number of nodes which are \( \leq v_i \). The statement of the proposition is that the weight of \( v_i \) as a node in the Hasse diagram is equal to the length of the corresponding module \( E_i \).

**Proof.** We use the fact that the dimension vectors \( \dim E_i \) form a vector space basis for \( \mathbb{R}^n \). Suppose that \( E_i = M_{a,b} \) with length \( k = b - a + 1 \). Take the linear map \( \pi : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^k \) given by projection onto coordinates \( a \) through \( b \). Then \( \dim E_i \) maps to the vector \((1, 1, \cdots, 1)\). For any \( E_j \) whose support is not contained in the interval \([a, b]\) we have by Lemma 2.3 that the support of \( E_j \) is either disjoint from the interval \([a, b]\) or it contains that interval. In either case, \( \pi(\dim E_j) \) is a scalar multiple of \( \dim E_i \). Therefore, the image of \( \pi \) is spanned by \( \pi(\dim E_j) \) for those \( E_j \) with support in \([a, b]\). So, there must be at least \( k \) of these. However, there are at most \( k \) linearly independent vectors with support in \([a, b]\). Therefore, the number of \( E_j \) with support in \([a, b]\) is exactly \( k \), the length of \( E_i \). So, the length of \( E_i \) is the weight of \( v_i \) as claimed. \( \square \)

Proposition 2.6 gives a mapping

\[
\{\text{complete exceptional sequence for } A_n\} \xrightarrow{H} \{\text{rooted labeled forests on } n\}
\]

We claim that this map is a bijection. Since the two sets have the same cardinality it will suffice to show that the map is surjective. So, for every rooted labeled forest on \( n \) we will construct the unique exceptional sequence having that forest as Hasse diagram. We will not prove uniqueness directly. Uniqueness follows from the counting argument.

### 2.2. The exceptional sequence of a rooted labeled forests.

We give an explicit construction of the necessarily unique complete exceptional sequence for any rooted labeled forest. The construction will be recursive.

Given \( i \in [n] \), let \( v_i \) be the node labeled \( i \) in the forest \( F \). Let \( T_i \) be the tree having root \( v_i \), i.e., \( T_i \) consists of all nodes \( v_j \leq v_i \) in \( F \). Then \( v_j \leq v_i \) if and only if \( T_j \subset T_i \).

First, consider the connected case, i.e., \( F \) is a tree. Let \( v_r \) be the root of \( F \), i.e., \( F = T_r \). Let \( v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, \cdots, v_{i_k} \) be the children of the root \( v_r \). Without loss of generality, we may choose the labels so that

\[
i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p < r < i_{p+1} < \cdots < i_k
\]
where $0 \leq p \leq k$. Recall that the weight $w(v_i)$ is the size of $T_i$. In particular, the weight of $v_r$ is $n$ and

$$n = 1 + \sum w(v_{i_j})$$

We assign the module $E_r := M_{1n}$ to $v_r$. Since $M_{1n}$ is uniserial, it has a filtration with $k+1$ subquotients, one of length 1 and the others of length $w(v_{i_j})$. Denote the filtration:

$$0 \subset A_p \subset A_{p-1} \subset \cdots \subset A_2 \subset A_1 \subset B_k \subset \cdots \subset B_{p+1} \subset B_p = M_{1n}$$

We may chose these so that $A_x/A_{x-1}$ has length $w(v_{i_x})$ when $x \leq p$ and $B_{y-1}/B_y$ has length $w(v_{i_y})$ for $y \geq p + 1$. (This makes $B_k/A_1$ simple, of length 1.) Then we let

$$E_{i_x} = A_x/A_{x-1}, \quad E_{i_y} = B_{y-1}/B_y.$$ 

**Proposition 2.8.** $(E_{i_1}, \ldots, E_{i_p}, E_r, E_{i_{p+1}}, \ldots, E_{i_k})$ is an exceptional sequence.

**Proof.** It suffices to show that $(X, Y)$ is an exceptional pair for any subsequence $X, Y$ of length 2.

Case 1: $X = E_r$. Then $Y = E_{i_y}$ for $y > p$ which has no morphism to $E_r$ since its support does not contain $n$ by construction. $\text{Ext}(Y, E_r) = 0$ since $E_r$ is injective.

Case 2: $Y = E_r$, Then $X = E_{i_x}$ for $x \leq p$. These cannot be quotients of $Y$. Hence there is no morphism $Y \rightarrow X$ and $\text{Ext}(E_r, X) = 0$ since $E_r$ is projective.

For the remaining pairs, there is no morphism since they have disjoint supports.

Case 3: $X = E_{i_x}$ where $x \leq p$ and $Y = E_{i_y}$ where $y \geq p + 1$. Then the supports of $X, Y$ are disjoint and not consecutive. Therefore there is no morphism and no extension.

In the remaining cases, $X, Y$ are on the same side of $E_r$. So, their supports are disjoint and $\text{Ext}(Y, X) = 0$ since, in any extension, $Y$ would be the submodule. $\square$

We come to the recursion step. Take any subtree of $F$ with root $v_s$. Suppose the corresponding module has been constructed, say $E_s = M_{ab}$ with length $b-a+1 = w(v_s)$. In particular $E_s$ will be simple when $v_s$ is a leaf. When $v_s$ is not a leaf, we repeat the construction above for the children $v_{j_x}$ of $v_s$. This will assign modules $E_{j_x}$ of length equal to the weight $w(v_{j_x})$ having supports which are closed disjoint subintervals of $[a, b]$ with union $[a, b]$ minus one point which we call the “gap”. (In the construction above, the gap is the support of the simple module $B_k/A_1$.) Continuing in this way we construct all modules $E_i$ in the case when $F$ is connected.

Now consider the case when $F$ is a disjoint union of trees $T_1, \ldots, T_k$ with roots $v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_k}$ where $j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k$. Then the weights $w(v_{j_x})$ add up to $n$. Let $E_{j_1}, \ldots, E_{j_k}$ be the modules with disjoint supports of length $w(v_{j_x})$ which are consecutive. For instance $E_{j_1} = M_{1x}$ where $x = w(v_{j_1})$, $E_{j_2} = M_{x+1, y}$ where $y = x + w(v_{j_2})$, etc.

**Proposition 2.9.** $(E_{j_1}, \ldots, E_{j_k})$ is an exceptional sequence.

**Proof.** There are no morphisms between these objects since their supports are disjoint. For any $x < y$, $\text{Ext}(E_{j_x}, E_{j_y}) = 0$ since in any extension, $E_{j_y}$ will be the submodule. $\square$

**Remark 2.10.** We say that a sequence of modules $X_1, \ldots, X_k$ have consecutive supports if $X_i = M_{a_i, b_i}$ where each $a_i = b_{i-1} + 1$. For example, the modules in Proposition 2.9 have consecutive supports. Modules with consecutive support form an exceptional sequence.
We list the basic properties of the modules $E_i$ corresponding to the nodes $v_i$ under the construction above.

**Proposition 2.11.** Given any rooted labeled forest $F$, let $E_i$ be the module corresponding to node $v_i$ by the above recursive construction. Then

1. Each $E_i$ has length equal to $w(v_i)$.
2. The support of $E_i$ is contained in the support of $E_j$ if and only if $v_i \leq v_j$.
3. The supports of $E_i, E_j$ are disjoint if and only if $v_i, v_j$ are not comparable.
4. If $v_{i_1}, \ldots, v_{i_k}$ are the children of $v_r$ and $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p < r < i_{p+1} < \cdots < i_k$ then
   a. $E_{i_x}$ is a submodule of $E_r$ if and only if $x = p$, i.e., if $v_{i_x}$ is the child of $v_r$ with the largest label less than $r$. (None of the $E_{i_x}$ are submodules of $E_r$ when $p = 0$.)
   b. $E_{i_y}$ is a quotient of $E_r$ if and only if $y = p + 1$, i.e., if $v_{i_y}$ is the child of $v_r$ with the smallest label greater than $r$. (None of the $E_{i_y}$ are quotients of $E_r$ when $p = k$.)
   c. $E_{i_1}, \ldots, E_{i_k}$ have consecutive supports.
   d. $E_{i_{p+1}}, \ldots, E_{i_k}$ have consecutive supports.

**Proof.** Properties (1) and (4) follow from the construction. To prove (2) and (3) we note that, for any $i, j$ there are only two possibilities: either one is $\leq$ the other or they are not comparable. In the first case, suppose $v_i < v_j$. Then there is a sequence $v_i = v_{k_0} < v_{k_1} < v_{k_2} < \cdots < v_j$ where each $v_{k_x}$ is a child of $v_{k_{x+1}}$ in that case, supp $E_{k_x} \subset$ supp $E_{k_{x+1}}$ by construction. So, supp $E_i \subset$ supp $E_j$. In the second case, either $v_i, v_j$ lie in disjoint trees with distinct roots $v_k, v_t$ in which case $E_k$ and $E_t$ have disjoint supports by Proposition 2.9. Otherwise, $v_i, v_j$ lie in the same tree. Let $v_k$ be the smallest node $\geq v_i, v_j$. Then $v_i, v_j$ are two children of $v_k$ where the corresponding modules have disjoint supports. So, $E_i, E_j$ have disjoint supports.

**Theorem 2.12.** (Theorem B(1)) Given any rooted labeled forest $F$, let $E_i$ be the module corresponding to node $v_i$ by the above recursive construction. Then

$$(E_1, E_2, \cdots, E_n)$$

is a complete exceptional sequence.

To prove this theorem we consider the three cases when $E_i$ is a submodule of $E_j$, $E_i$ is a quotient module of $E_j$ and $E_i, E_j$ extend each other.

**Lemma 2.13.** If $E_i$ is a submodule of $E_j$ and $i \neq j$ then $v_i < v_j$ and the nodes $v_{k_1}, \ldots, v_{k_t}$ connecting $v_i$ to $v_j$ in $F$ have increasing labels: $i < k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_t < j$.

**Proof.** Since $v_i < v_{k_1} < v_j$, supp $E_i \subset$ supp $E_{k_1} \subset$ supp $E_j$. Since $E_i$ contains the socle of $E_j$, so does $E_{k_1}$. So, $E_{k_1}$ is a submodule of $E_j$ and $v_{k_1}$ is a child of $v_j$. It follows that the label must be smaller by the construction: $k_t < j$. By the same argument $k_p < k_{p+1}$ for all $p$ and $i < k_1$.

**Lemma 2.14.** If $E_i$ is a quotient module of $E_j$ and $i \neq j$ then $v_i < v_j$ and the nodes $v_{k_1}, \ldots, v_{k_t}$ connecting $v_i$ to $v_j$ in $F$ have decreasing labels: $i > k_1 > k_2 > \cdots > k_t > j$. 
Proof. This statement is dual to Lemma 2.13 and has an analogous proof. □

Lemma 2.15. \( \text{Ext}(E_i, E_j) \neq 0 \) if and only if \( E_i, E_j \) have (disjoint) consecutive supports and, in that case, \( E_i \) is a submodule of some \( E_k \) and \( E_j \) is a quotient module of some \( E_\ell \) where \( v_k, v_\ell \) are sibling and
\[
i \leq k < \ell \leq j.
\]

Proof. Let \( \text{Ext}(E_i, E_j) \neq 0 \). Then either the supports are consecutive or they overlap. But the second case is excluded by Proposition 2.11(2), (3). The converse is clear.

Suppose the supports of \( E_i, E_j \) are consecutive, say \( \text{supp} E_i = [a, b] \), \( \text{supp} E_j = [b + 1, c] \). Let \( v_k \) be maximal in \( F \) so that \( v_i \leq v_k \) and \( v_j \not\leq v_k \). Then \( E_k \) contains the support of \( E_i \) and is disjoint from the support of \( E_j \). So, \( b \in \text{supp} E_k \) and \( b + 1 \not\in \text{supp} E_k \) making \( E_i \) a submodule of \( E_k \). By Lemma 2.13, \( i \leq k \).

Similarly, let \( v_\ell \) be maximal in \( F \) so that \( v_j \leq v_\ell \) and \( v_i \not\leq v_\ell \). Then \( \ell \leq j \) by Lemma 2.14. By maximality of \( v_k, v_\ell \), they must be sibling (or roots of disjoint trees). In either case, \( k < \ell \) since \( E_k, E_\ell \) have consecutive supports. (This follows from either Proposition 2.11(4) or Proposition 2.9.) This proves the lemma. □

Proof of Theorem 2.12. These lemmas imply that \( (E_1, \ldots, E_n) \) is a complete exceptional sequence. Indeed, if \( i < j \) we have \( \text{Hom}(E_j, E_i) = 0 \) since \( E_i \) is not a submodule of \( E_j \) by Lemma 2.13 and \( E_j \) is not a quotient module of \( E_i \) by Lemma 2.14. Also, \( \text{Ext}(E_j, E_i) = 0 \) by Lemma 2.15. □

Example 2.16. It is easy to convert a rooted labeled forest into a complete exceptional sequence. Start with the following.

```
    5
   / \\
  2   4
    |   |
   7   6
    |   |
  3   9
    |   |
  1   8
```

By Remark 2.10, the modules \( E_3, E_5 \) corresponding to the roots \( v_3, v_5 \) have consecutive supports. By Proposition 2.11(1), these supports have lengths 3, 6. So, \( E_3 = M_{13} \) and \( E_5 = M_{49} \). Since \( 1 < 3 \), \( E_1 \) is the length 2 submodule of \( E_3 \). So, \( E_1 = M_{23} \). By Proposition 2.11(4), \( E_6 \) has support at 4 followed by a gap, then \( E_2, E_4 \) have consecutive supports in the interval \([6, 9]\). So, \( E_6 = S_4 \), \( E_2 = S_6 \) and \( E_4 = M_{79} \). The children of \( v_4 \) are leaves with larger labels, so the corresponding modules are simples of injective type: \( E_7 = S_7 \), \( E_9 = S_8 \). The complete exceptional sequence is
\[
E_* = (M_{23}, S_6, M_{13}, M_{79}, M_{49}, S_4, S_7, S_2, S_8)
\]
This same example is done using chord diagrams following [13] in Figure 1.

2.3. Relatively projective and injective objects.

Definition 2.17. An object \( E_i \) in a complete exceptional sequence \( (E_1, \ldots, E_n) \) is called relatively projective if it is a projective object of the full subcategory of mod-\( \Lambda \) of all modules \( Y \) so that
\[
\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(E_j, Y) = 0 = \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}(E_j, Y)
\]
for all $j > i$. This is called the right perpendicular category of $Z = E_{i+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus E_n$ and is denoted $Z^\perp$.

Similarly, an object $E_i$ in a complete exceptional sequence $(E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ is called relatively injective if it is an injective object of the full subcategory of $\text{mod-} \Lambda$ of all modules $X$ so that

$$\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X, E_j) = 0 = \text{Ext}_\Lambda(X, E_j)$$

for all $j < i$. This is called the left perpendicular category of $Z = E_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus E_{i-1}$ and is denoted $^\perp Z$.

**Proposition 2.18.** If any two of the objects in a short exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$ lie in $Z^\perp$ (or $^\perp Z$) then so does the third.

**Proof.** This follows from the 6-term exact sequence:

$$0 \to \text{Hom}(Z, A) \to \text{Hom}(Z, B) \to \text{Hom}(Z, C) \to \text{Ext}(Z, A) \to \text{Ext}(Z, B) \to \text{Ext}(Z, C) \to 0.$$

An analogous argument works for $^\perp Z$. □

Since $X \in Y^\perp$ if and only if $Y \in ^\perp X$, we get the following.

**Corollary 2.19.** For any short exact sequence $0 \to A \to B \to C \to 0$, $(A \oplus B)^\perp = A^\perp \cap B^\perp$ is contained in $C^\perp$ and similarly, $^\perp (A \oplus B) \subseteq ^\perp C$. □

**Theorem 2.20.** (Theorem B(2)) Let $E_* = (E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ be a complete exceptional sequence for a linear quiver of type $A_n$. Let $F$ be the corresponding rooted labeled forest. For each $E_i$ in $E_*$, let $v_i$ be the corresponding node of $F$. Then,

(1) $E_i$ is relatively projective and relatively injective if and only if $v_i$ is a root of $F$.

(2) For $v_i$ not a root of $F$, let $v_j$ be the parent of $v_i$. Then, $E_i$ is relatively projective, resp. injective in $E_*$ if and only if $i < j$, resp $i > j$.

**Corollary 2.21.** (Corollary C) Every object in a complete exceptional sequence of type $A_n$ with straight orientation is either relatively projective or relatively injective and at least one object is both. □

To prove Theorem 2.20 let $v_{i_1}, \ldots, v_{i_k}$ be the children of $v_j$ with $i_1 < i_2 < \cdots < i_p < j < i_{p+1} < \cdots < i_k$.

Then we have by construction that $E_j = M_{ab}$ and $E_{i_1}, \ldots, E_{i_p}$ is a sequence of modules with consecutive support in the interval $[a+1, b] = \text{supp } M_{ab}$ and so that $E_{i_p}$ is a submodule of $M_{ab}$. In more details, we have $E_{i_s} = M_{a_s,b_s}$ where $a < b_1 < b_2 < \cdots < b_p = b$ and $a_s = b_{s-1} + 1$ for $1 < s \leq p$.

**Lemma 2.22.** The objects $E_{i_y}$ for $y > p$ are not relatively projective in $E_*$. $\mathbb{P}$

**Proof.** Let $W$ be the direct sum of the objects $E_t$ which come after $E_{i_y}$, i.e., $t > i_y$. We will show that $E_t$ is not a projective object of $W^\perp$.

Claim: For any $p < x \leq y$, $W^\perp$ contains a module $M_{ab}$ with socle $S_b$ which maps onto $E_{i_x}$.
Since $E_{i_\ast}$ is a proper quotient of $M_{cb}$, $E_{i_\ast}$ cannot be projective in $W_{\perp}$ for $p < x \leq y$. When $x = y$ this proves the lemma. So, it suffices to prove this claim.

The proof of the claim is by induction on $x$. For $x = p + 1$, $E_{i_{p+1}}$ is a quotient of
\[ E_j = M_{ab} \] which lies in $W_{\perp}$ since it is to the left of $E_{i_\ast}$ in $E_*$. We take $c = a$ in that case. Suppose the claim holds for $x < y$. Then, by induction, there is a module $M_{cb} \in W_{\perp}$ which maps onto $E_{i_\ast}$ which also lies in $W_{\perp}$. Therefore the kernel $M_{ab}$ lies in the abelian category $W_{\perp}$. But $M_{ab}$ maps onto $E_{i_{s+1}}$ since $E_{i_\ast}, E_{i_{s+1}}$ have consecutive supports. So, the claim holds for $x + 1$. This proves the claim and the lemma.

**Lemma 2.23.** $rM_{ab}$ is a projective object in the perpendicular category $M_{ab}^\perp$.

*Proof.* When $b = n$, $rM_{ab}$ is projective and lies in $M_{ab}^\perp$.

For $b < n$, $rM_{ab}$ is a quotient of $\tau M_{ab} = M_{a_{n+1},b+1}$. So, $\text{Hom}(rM_{ab}, \tau M_{ab}) = 0$ and $\text{Hom}(M_{ab}, rM_{ab}) = 0$. So, $rM_{ab} \in M_{ab}^\perp$.

To show that $rM_{ab}$ is projective in $M_{ab}^\perp$, suppose not. Then there is another object $X \in M_{ab}^\perp$ and an epimorphism $X \to rM_{ab}$. But then $X = M_{a_{n+1},c}$ for some $c > b$. Then we have an epimorphism $X \to \tau M_{ab}$ contradicting the assumption that $X \in M_{ab}^\perp$. So, $rM_{ab}$ is projective in $M_{ab}^\perp$.

**Lemma 2.23** is the case $s = p$ of the following lemma:

**Lemma 2.24.** $M_{a_{n+1},b_s}$ is a projective object in the perpendicular category $W_{\perp}$ where $W = M_{ab} \oplus E_{i_{s+1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus E_{i_p}$.

*Proof.* For $b_s = b$, $M_{a_{n+1},b_s} = rM_{ab}$ and the previous lemma applies.

For $b_s < b$, $M_{a_{n+1},b_s}$ is a quotient of $\tau M_{ab} = M_{a_{n+1},b+1}$. So, $M_{a_{n+1},b_s} \in M_{ab}^\perp$. Also, $M_{a_{n+1},b_s} \in E_{i_t}^\perp$ for $s < t \leq p$ since the support of $E_{i_t}$ lies in $(b_s, n]$. So, $M_{a_{n+1},b_s} \in W_{\perp}$.

The module $M_{a_{n+1},b_s}$ is an iterated quotient of components of $W$ since $M_{a_{n+1},b_{s-1}} = M_{ab}/E_{i_p}$ and $M_{a_{n+1},b_s} = M_{a_{n+1},b_{s-1}}/E_{i_{s+1}}$. Therefore, $W_{\perp} \subset M_{a_{n+1},b_s}^\perp$ by Corollary 2.19: $M_{a_{n+1},b_s}$ is projective in $M_{a_{n+1},b_s}^\perp$ by the previous lemma and therefore it is projective in $W_{\perp}$.

**Theorem 2.25.** Let $v_i$ be a child of $v_j$ in the rooted labeled forest $\mathcal{F}$. Then the object $E_j$ in the corresponding complete exceptional sequence $E_* = (E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ is relatively projective if and only if $i < j$.

*Proof.* If $i > j$ then, by Lemma 2.22, $E_i$ is not relatively projective. So, suppose $i < j$. Then, in the notation above, $i = i_s$ for some $s \leq p$.

Let $W$ be the direct sum of all objects $E_k$ in the exceptional sequence with $k > i$. This includes the summands of $W_0 = E_j \oplus E_{i_{s+1}} \oplus \cdots \oplus E_{i_p}$. Thus $W_{\perp} \subset W_0^\perp$. By Lemma 2.24, $W_0^\perp$ contains as a projective object the module $M_{a_{n+1},b_s}$ which has $E_{i_s} = M_{a_{n+1},b_s}$ as a submodule. Since $W_0^\perp$ is a hereditary abelian category, this makes $E_{i_s}$ a projective object of $W_0^\perp$. So, $E_{i_s}$ is a projective object of $W_{\perp} \subset W_0^\perp$.

We have the following dual statement with an analogous argument.

**Theorem 2.26.** Let $v_i$ be a child of $v_j$ in the rooted labeled forest $\mathcal{F}$. Then the object $E_j$ in the corresponding complete exceptional sequence $E_* = (E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ is relatively injective if and only if $i > j$. \qed
By the discussion above, the only $E_j$ which have a chance to be both relatively projective and relatively injective are ones corresponding to the roots of the components of $F$. Let $v_{j_1}, v_{j_2}, \ldots, v_{j_k}$ be the roots of $F$ with $j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_k$. Then the modules $E_{j_1}, \ldots, E_{j_k}$ have consecutive supports with union $[1, n]$.

**Theorem 2.27.** The objects $E_{j_1}, \ldots, E_{j_k}$ corresponding to the roots of the forest $F$ are relatively projective and relatively injective in the complete exceptional sequence $E_\ast$.

*Proof.* First, $E_{j_k}$ is projective since it is a submodule of the projective module $M_{1n}$. Then, as in the proof of Lemma 2.24, the quotient $M_{1n}/E_{j_k}$ is a projective object in the category $E_{j_k}^\perp$. Since $E_{j_{k-1}}$ is a submodule of $M_{1n}/E_{j_k}$, it also becomes projective in $E_{j_k}^\perp$ and therefore projective in $W^\perp$ where $W$ is the direct sum of all $E_t$ for $t > j_{k-1}$. Repeating this process, we see that each $E_{j_t}$ is relatively projective in $E_\ast$.

The dual arguments show that each $E_{j_t}$ is relatively injective in $E_\ast$. \hfill $\square$

**Theorem 2.20** is given by combining Theorems 2.25, 2.26, and 2.27.

### 2.4. Chord diagrams and rooted labeled trees

First, we note that a rooted forest with $n$ labeled vertices is equivalent to a rooted tree with $n + 1$ vertices and $n$ labeled edges. (Just move the edge labels to the endpoint furthest from the root, delete the root of the tree, then declare the adjacent vertices to be roots of the resulting forest.)

A bijection between exceptional sequences on quiver of type $A_n$ (with any orientation) and rooted trees with $n$ labeled edges is given as follows. (Thanks to Hugh Thomas for explaining this to the first author many years ago.)
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**Figure 1.** The exceptional sequence $(M_{23}, S_6, M_{13}, M_{79}, M_{49}, S_4, S_7, S_2, S_8)$ from Example 2.16 is drawn as the sequence of chords $(24, 67, 14, 70, 40, 45, 78, 23, 89)$ in red. The corresponding tree with root is in the region containing the arc 0 to 1 is indicated in blue. Deleting the root gives the rooted labeled forest in Example 2.16.
Goulden and Yon [13] (and earlier [19]) showed that rooted trees with \( n \) labeled edges are in bijection with factorizations of the \( n + 1 \) cycle \((012\cdots n)\) as a product of \( n \) transpositions \( \tau_i = (a_i, b_i) \). The bijection is given by drawing chords (labeled with \( i \)) between points \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) in a circle as indicated in Figure 1. The dual graph of these chords is the tree. The root is the region adjacent to the arc from 0 to 1. Brady and Watt [3] showed that such factorizations of the \( n + 1 \) cycle are in bijection with exceptional sequences where \((\tau_1, \cdots, \tau_n) = ((a_1, b_1), \cdots, (a_n, b_n))\) corresponds to the exceptional sequence \((M_{a_1, b_1-1}, \cdots, M_{a_n, b_n-1})\) where the indices are taken modulo \( n + 1 \).

It is easy to see why the bijection between exceptional sequences and rooted labeled forests (or trees), as illustrated in Figure 1 is the same as the bijection given in Theorem 2.12. Any chords in the construction, say 14, separates the circle in two parts. One part contains the integers in the interval \([1, 2.12]\). Any chords in the construction, say 14, separates the circle in two parts. One part contains the integers in the interval \([1, 2.12]\). The other part contains the arc 01 and therefore the root of the tree. So, any other chord \((a, b)\) will be further away from the root if and only if \([a, b] \subseteq [1, 2.12]\), or, equivalently, \([a, b] \subseteq [1, 4]\). Therefore, the rooted forest is the Hasse diagram of the set of corresponding intervals \([a_i, b_i]\) which are the supports of the objects in the exceptional sequence.

The correspondence between exceptional sequences and factorizations of the Coxeter element of the Weyl group (the \( n + 1 \) cycle in the symmetric group for \( A_n \)) has been generalized to any quiver in [15]. The correspondence with chord diagrams is also known for any orientation of \( A_n \) [8]. See also [17] for the relation to noncrossing partitions.

2.5. Generating function for exceptional sequences. The following theorem and its proof come from [10]. This is a special case of a result from [9].

**Theorem 2.28.** For each \( n \geq 1 \), let \( P_n(a, b, c) \) be the three variable polynomial for rooted labeled forest given by \( P_n(a, b, c) = \sum a^p b^q c^r \) where the sum is over all rooted labeled forests, \( r \) is the number of roots of the forest, \( p \) is the number of nodes \( v_i \) whose parent \( v_j \) has label \( j > i \), \( q \) is the number of nodes \( v_i \) with parent \( v_j \) so that \( j < i \). Then

\[
P_n(a, b, c) = c(a + (n - 1)b + c)(2a + (n - 2)b + c) \cdots ((n - 1)a + b + c).
\]

**Proof.** We associate a weight to each node of a forest. The weight will be \( a, b, c \) depending on which type of node it is. Then the monomial \( a^p b^q c^r \) for a forest is the product of the weights of its nodes.

The proof is by induction on \( n \). For \( n = 1 \), \( P_1(a, b, c) = c \) since there is only one forest with one node which has weight \( c \).

For \( n \geq 2 \), we write \( P_n(a, b, c) \) as the sum of two generating function

\[
P_n(a, b, c) = P_n(a, b, c)_{1} + P_n(a, b, c)_{2}
\]

the first is for forest in which \( v_1 \) is a root. We remove the root \( v_1 \), decrease the labels of the other nodes by 1 and keep the weights of the children of \( v_1 \) to be \( b \). This gives a rooted labeled forest with \( n - 1 \) nodes in which the roots have weight either \( b \) or \( c \). Since a node with weight \( c \) was removed we have:

\[
P_n(a, b, c)_{1} = cP_{n-1}(a, b, b + c).
\]

For the remaining forests, we remove the node \( v_1 \) and make the children of \( v_1 \) roots, but keeping the weight \( b \). We obtain a forest with roots of weight either \( b \) or \( c \). To
reassemble the original forest, we need to choose one node to be the parent of \( v_1 \), we need to make the root of the tree in which this node lives to have weight \( c \). The other \( b \) weighted roots become the children of \( v_1 \). So,

\[
P_n(a, b, c)_2 = a(n - 1) \frac{c}{b + c} P_{n-1}(a, b, b + c).
\]

A straightforward calculation proves the result. \( \square \)

Let \( P_{A_n}(a, b, c) = \sum \lambda_{pqr} a^p b^q c^r \) where \( \lambda_{pqr} \) is the number of complete exceptional sequences for linear \( A_n \) having

1. \( p \) objects \( E_i \) which are relatively projective but not relatively injective,
2. \( q \) objects which are relatively injective but not relatively projective
3. \( r \) objects which are both relatively projective and relatively injective.

**Theorem 2.29.** (Theorem [13])

\[
P_{A_n}(a, b, c) = P_n(a, b, c) = c \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (ja + (n - j)b + c).
\]

**Proof.** This follows from Theorem 2.28 and the properties of the bijection between complete exceptional sequences and rooted labeled forests given by Theorem 2.20. \( \square \)

**Remark 2.30.** Theorem 2.29 implies that there is only one exceptional sequence in which all objects are both relatively projective and relatively injective. This is never true for other orientations of \( A_n \) since such an exceptional sequence is given by a sequence of simple modules in which the support of each object is a source in the complement of the supports of the ones on its left and there are many such sequences for nonlinear \( A_n \).

## 3. Braid group action on rooted labeled forests

It is well-known that the braid group acts transitively on the set of complete exceptional sequences for any Dynkin quiver, in particular, for type \( A_n \) [6], [21]. In this section we construct an natural action of the braid group on rooted labeled forests and we show, in Theorem 3.1, that this action corresponds to the action on complete exceptional sequences under the bijection given in the previous section. We also show that this action of the braid group is different from the one given in [12] since we are using a different bijection between the two sets.

The braid group \( B_n \) on \( n \) strands is given by generators and relations as follows. The generators are \( \sigma_i \) for \( 1 \leq i < n \) with two relations:

1. \( \sigma_i, \sigma_j \) commute if \( |j - i| \geq 2 \)
2. \( \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i = \sigma_{i+1} \sigma_i \sigma_{i+1} \).

Given a rooted labeled forest \( F \), two node \( v_i, v_j \) are said to be close if one of the following holds.

1. \( v_i, v_j \) are roots of distinct components of \( F \).
2. \( v_i, v_j \) are sibling, i.e., they have the same parent.
3. One of \( v_i, v_j \) is the parent of the other.
All remaining cases are not close.

To simplify notation, we add a root $v_0$, which we call the master root, at the top of the forest giving a rooted tree $F_+$. Then Case 1 is a special case of Case 2: Roots in $F$ are sibling in $F_+$.

3.1. Braid group action. The braid group $B_n$ acts on the set of rooted labeled forests on $n$ as follows. We give the action of $\sigma_i$ for $1 \leq i < n$. The partial ordering on $[n]$ with Hasse diagram $F$ and the one with Hasse diagram $\sigma_i(F)$ are the same for nodes other than $v_i, v_{i+1}$. We keep the same notation for these nodes in $\sigma_i(F)$. But, we denote by $v'_i, v'_{i+1}$ the nodes of $\sigma_i(F)$ with labels $i, i+1$. These are given as follows.

Case 0: If nodes $v_i, v_j$ are not close then $\sigma_i(F)$ is given by switching the labels $i, i+1$, i.e., $\sigma_i(F) = F$ with nodes relabeled: $v'_i = v_{i+1}, v'_{i+1} = v_i$.

Case 1: Suppose $v_i$ is the parent of $v_{i+1}$, $v_k$ is the parent of $v_i$ in $F_+$, $X$ is the set of other children of $v_i$ and $Y$ is the set of children of $v_{i+1}$. Then $\sigma_i(F)_+$ is given by removing node $v_{i+1}$, relabeling $v_i$ to $v'_{i+1}$, then adding a new node $v'_i$ and making it a child of $v'_{i+1}$ and a parent of all elements of $X$. Thus $Y \cup \{v'_i\}$ is the set of children of the new node $v'_{i+1}$ and $v_k$ is the parent of $v'_{i+1}$ in $\sigma_i(F)_+$.

Case 2: Suppose $v_i$ is a child of $v_{i+1}$, $v_k$ is the parent of $v_{i+1}$ in $F_+$, $Y$ is the set of other children of $v_{i+1}$ and $X$ is the set of children of $v_i$. Then $\sigma_i(F)_+$ is given by removing node $v_{i+1}$, relabeling $v_i$ to $v'_{i+1}$, then adding a new node $v'_i$ which will be the parent of the elements of $Y$. The nodes $v'_i, v'_{i+1}$ will be sibling in $\sigma_i(F)_+$, with parent $v_k$.

Case 3: Suppose $v_i, v_{i+1}$ are sibling with parent $v_k$ in $F_+$ and $Y, X$ are the sets of children of $v_i, v_{i+1}$, resp. Then $\sigma_i(F)_+$ is given by removing node $v_{i+1}$, relabeling $v_i$ to $v'_{i+1}$, then adding a new node $v'_i$ with parent $v_k$ and children $v'_{i+1}$ and the elements of $X$.

Note that $\sigma_i$ takes examples from Cases 1,2,3 to examples from Cases 2,3,1 respectively. Furthermore, $\sigma_i^3$ is the identity map on these three cases. See Figure 2.
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**Figure 2.** Cases 1,2,3 of the braid move $\sigma_i$ are indicated above. $\sigma_i^3$ is the identity in these cases. In all cases, $v_k$ is the smallest node in $F_+$ which is above both $v_i$ and $v_{i+1}$ and $Z$ is the set of other children of $v_k$.

**Theorem 3.1.** The action of $\sigma_i$ on the set of rooted labeled forests described above corresponds to the action of $\sigma_i$ on exceptional sequences under the bijection given in the previous section.
**Corollary 3.2.** The action of $\sigma_i$ on the set of rooted labeled forests satisfies the braid relations and therefore gives an action of the braid group. \( \square \)

The following property of $\sigma_i$, which follows easily from its description, will be needed in the next section.

**Proposition 3.3.** The vertex $v_{i+1}$ is a root of the forest $F$ if and only if $v'_i$ is a root of $\sigma_i F$. \( \square \)

### 3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1

**Lemma 3.4.** Let $F$ be a rooted labeled forest with associated exceptional sequence $E_* = (E_1, \ldots, E_n)$. Then for any $i < n$ we have the following.

1. $E_i$ is a submodule of $E_{i+1}$ if and only if $v_i$ is a child of $v_{i+1}$ in $F$.
2. $E_{i+1}$ is a quotient of $E_i$ if and only if $v_{i+1}$ is a child of $v_i$.
3. $E_i, E_{i+1}$ have disjoint consecutive supports if and only if $v_i, v_{i+1}$ are sibling in $F_+$.\( \square \)
4. $E_i, E_{i+1}$ are Hom and Ext orthogonal if and only if none of the above hold, i.e., if and only if $v_i, v_{i+1}$ are not close.

*Proof of Theorem 3.1.* The braid move $\sigma_i$ acts on $E_*$ by moving $E_i$ to position $i+1$ and inserting a uniquely determined new object $E'_i$ in position $i$ to give a new exceptional sequence

$$\sigma_i(E_*) = (E_1, \ldots, E_{i-1}, E'_i, E_i, E_{i+2}, \ldots, E_n).$$

**Case a:** If $E_i, E_{i+1}$ are Hom and Ext orthogonal then they commute and $E'_i = E_{i+1}$.

**Case b:** Suppose that $E_i$ is a submodule of $E_{i+1}$. Then we know that $E'_i$ is the quotient module $E_{i+1}/E_i$. By Lemma 2.13, $v_i$ must be a child of $v_{i+1}$ since there are no $k$ with $i < k < i + 1$. Let $Y$ denote the other children of $v_{i+1}$. These have disjoint supports whose union is the support of $E_{i+1}/E_i$ minus one point. Therefore, $Y$ is the set of children of $v'_i$ the node in $\sigma_i(F)$ corresponding to $E'_i$. $E_i$ has not changes except for its label which is now $i + 1$. So, it has the same set of children. This is Case 2 in subsection 3.1 and $\sigma_i(F)$ is the Hasse diagram of $\sigma_i(E_*)$.

**Case c:** Suppose that $E_{i+1}$ is a quotient of $E_i$, say $E_{i+1} = M_{ab}$ and $E_i = M_{ac}$. Then $E'_i = M_{b+1,c}$ is the kernel of the epimorphism $E_i \to E_{i+1}$. By Lemma 2.14, $v_{i+1}$ must be a child of $v_i$. If $X$ is the set of the other children of $v_i$ in $F$ then the corresponding modules must have support in $[a, c]$ but disjoint from $[a, b]$. So, their supports are in $\text{supp } E'_i = [b + 1, c]$. So, $X$ is the set of children of the new $v'_i$ in $\sigma_i(F)$. Since $v_{i+1}$ in $F$ has been removed, its children $Y$ become children of the new $v'_{i+1} \in \sigma_i(F)$. \( \square \)

**Case d:** Suppose that $v_i, v_{i+1}$ are sibling in $F_+$ with sets of children $Y, X$, resp. Then $E_i, E_{i+1}$ must have disjoint consecutive supports by construction (Proposition 2.11), say $\text{supp } E_i = [a, b]$, $\text{supp } E_{i+1} = [b + 1, c]$. Since $E_i$ extends $E_{i+1}$, the new exceptional pair $(E'_i, E_i)$ must be $(M_{ac}, M_{ab})$. The children of the new $v'_i$ with module $M_{ac}$ are the new $v'_{i+1}$ with module $M_{ab}$ and $X$. The children of $v'_{i+1}$ with module $M_{ab}$ are $Y$.

This concludes the proof of Theorem 3.1. See Figure 3 for an example. \( \square \)
Figure 3 illustrates the sequence of five rooted labeled forests corresponding to the five complete exceptional sequences for $A_{10}$:

\[
\begin{align*}
\sigma_3 \rightarrow & (M_{99}, M_{1,10}, M_{46}, M_{16}, M_{12}, M_{79}, M_{11}, M_{44}, M_{55}) \\
\sigma_2 \rightarrow & (M_{99}, M_{1,10}, M_{13}, M_{46}, M_{12}, M_{79}, M_{11}, M_{44}, M_{55}) \\
\sigma_1 \rightarrow & (M_{99}, M_{4,10}, M_{1,10}, M_{46}, M_{12}, M_{79}, M_{11}, M_{44}, M_{55}) \\
\sigma_5 \rightarrow & (M_{99}, M_{4,10}, M_{1,10}, M_{49}, M_{46}, M_{12}, M_{77}, M_{11}, M_{44}, M_{55}) \\
\sigma_4 \rightarrow & (M_{99}, M_{4,10}, M_{1,10}, M_{46}, M_{49}, M_{46}, M_{12}, M_{77}, M_{11}, M_{44}, M_{55})
\end{align*}
\]

![Diagram of rooted labeled forests](image)

**Figure 3.** Braid moves $\sigma_5, \sigma_3, \sigma_2, \sigma_4$ illustrated above are examples of Cases a,b,c,d in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

### 3.3. Comparison with the braid group action on parking functions.

There is a well-known bijection between parking functions and rooted labeled forests using Prüfer codes which we will review briefly here. We will use this bijection to compare the braid group action on parking functions given in [12] (using Theorem 1.3) to the one we give in the previous section using rooted labeled forests.

We take as an example, the parking function $(1, 1, 1, 1)$ on $A_4$ and the action of $\sigma_1$ then $\sigma_2$ then $\sigma_3$ using the top function (Theorem 1.3):

\[
(1, 1, 1, 1) \xrightarrow{\sigma_1} (4, 1, 1, 1) \xrightarrow{\sigma_2} (4, 3, 1, 1) \xrightarrow{\sigma_3} (4, 3, 2, 1).
\]

The corresponding Prüfer codes are:

\[
(0, 0, 0) \rightarrow (2, 0, 0) \rightarrow (4, 3, 0) \rightarrow (4, 4, 4)
\]

The Prüfer code corresponding to a parking function $(a_1, a_2, \cdots, a_n)$ is given by

\[
(a_2 - a_1, a_3 - a_2, \cdots, a_n - a_{n-1})
\]
where these numbers are taken modulo \( n + 1 \).

The complete exceptional sequence corresponding to the parking function \((1, 1, 1, 1)\) is the sequence of injective modules \((M_{14}, M_{13}, M_{12}, M_{11})\). The sequence of braid moves from above with corresponding rooted labeled forests is given by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exceptional sequence</th>
<th>Forest</th>
<th>Prüfer code</th>
<th>Parking function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>((M_{14}, M_{13}, M_{12}, M_{11}))</td>
<td>((1, 3, 4))</td>
<td>((3, 2, 1))</td>
<td>((1, 4, 1, 2))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_1 \to (M_{44}, M_{14}, M_{12}, M_{11}))</td>
<td>((2, 4))</td>
<td>((3, 2, 2))</td>
<td>((1, 4, 1, 3))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_2 \to (M_{44}, M_{34}, M_{14}, M_{11}))</td>
<td>((3, 2))</td>
<td>((3, 2, 3))</td>
<td>((3, 1, 3, 1))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma_3 \to (M_{44}, M_{34}, M_{24}, M_{14}))</td>
<td>((2, 3))</td>
<td>((2, 3, 4))</td>
<td>((2, 4, 2, 1))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Prüfer code corresponding to a rooted labeled forest is given by \((p_1, \cdots, p_{n-1})\) where \(p_1\) is the label of the unique node adjacent to the leaf of the forest with the largest label \((p_1 = 0\) if this maximal leaf is a root). When that leaf is removed from the forest, the label of the unique node adjacent to the leaf with the largest label is \(p_2\) and so on. The corresponding parking functions are given in the fourth column of the table above.

We see that, using the standard bijection between rooted labeled forests and parking functions, the braid group actions are different. Using the bijection through exceptional sequences, the braid group actions are the same by definition (since the action comes from the action on exceptional sequences).

3.4. Examples: \(A_2\) and \(A_3\). For \(n = 2\), there are 3 rooted labeled forests and \(\sigma_1\) permutes them in a 3-cycle:
Figure 4. The three rooted binary forests on \( n = 2 \) are cyclically permuted by \( \sigma_1 \).

Figure 5. The action of \( \sigma_1 \) and \( \sigma_2 \) is illustrated in the case \( n = 3 \).

Figure 6. The last three forests in Figure 5 are embedded in the Auslander-Reiten sequence of \( A_3 \).

For \( n = 3 \) there are 16 rooted labeled forests. Figure 5 illustrates 8 of them. Figure 6 illustrates how the rooted labeled forest can be visualized when the exceptional sequence is embedded in the Auslander-Reiten quiver of the path algebra.

4. Action the Garside element

The action of the fundamental braid \( \delta \) on forests has an easy description. However, the action of the Garside element \( \Delta \) is more difficult. This is an important element of the braid group for many reasons [7]. For example, \( \Delta^2 = \delta^n \) generates the center of the braid group [5] and the action of \( \Delta \) on exceptional sequences converts clusters to \( c \)-vectors. (This a comment made without proof in [4].) We also use \( \Delta \) to describe an action of the extended braid group \( \tilde{B}_n \rtimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \) on the set of rooted labeled forests.

To do these detailed computations, we need more notation about exceptional sequences. First, the Euler pairing for \( \Lambda \)-modules \( X, Y \), also called the Euler characteristic of \( \Lambda \) [11] is given by

\[
\langle \dim X, \dim Y \rangle_\Lambda := \dim \text{Hom}_\Lambda(X, Y) - \dim \text{Ext}_\Lambda(X, Y).
\]
We will use the shorthand notation:
\[ \chi_{\Lambda}(X, Y) := \langle \dim X, \dim Y \rangle_{\Lambda}. \]

4.1. **The fundamental braid** $\delta$. This is the braid group element
\[ \delta = \delta_n = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_{n-1}. \]
This pushed the last ($n$th) strand underneath the first $n - 1$ strands to put it on the far left. (See Figure 7) The action of $\delta$ on an exceptional sequence is
\[ \delta(E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_n) = (E_n', E_1, E_2, \ldots, E_{n-1}). \]

**Remark 4.1.** Each object in a complete exceptional sequence is uniquely determined up to isomorphism by its position and the other objects. In this case we must have

1. $E_n' = \tau E_n$, the Auslander-Reiten translation of $E_n$ if $E_n$ is not projective since, in that case,
   \[ \chi_{\Lambda}(E_n, X) = -\chi_{\Lambda}(X, \tau E_n). \]
2. When $E_n = P_i$ is projective with simple top $S_i$ then
   \[ \chi_{\Lambda}(P_i, X) = \dim X_i = \chi_{\Lambda}(X, I_i) \]
   where $I_i$ is the injective envelope of $S_i$. So, $E_n' = I_i$ in this case.

(2) can also be seen combinatorially using Proposition 3.3 which implies that $v_n$ is a root of $F$ if and only if $v_n'$ is a root of $\delta F$. But this is equivalent to $E_n'$, the first object of $\delta E$ being injective. We use the shorthand notation
\[ \tau^*_{\Lambda}(X) := \begin{cases} 
\tau X & \text{if } X \text{ is not projective} \\
I_i & \text{if } X = P_i
\end{cases} \]

**Figure 7.** The braid $\delta$ pulls the last strand to the first position underneath the other strands. On exceptional sequences, it moves the last object $E_n$ to the first position and changes it to a uniquely determined $E_n'$.

Since the formula for $\delta$ depends on whether $E_n$ is projective, we need a combinatorial characterization of vertices corresponding to the projective (and injective) objects.

**Lemma 4.2.** The projective objects $P_1 \subset P_2 \subset \cdots \subset P_p$ of a complete exceptional sequence correspond to vertices $v_{j_1}, v_{j_2}, \ldots, v_{j_p}$ of the forest $F$ given as follows.

1. $v_{j_p}$ is the last root of $F$, i.e., the other roots have smaller labels.
(2) $v_{j_1}$ is the last relatively projective child of $v_{j_{i+1}}$, i.e., $j_1$ is maximal among labels of children of $v_{j_{i+1}}$ so that $j_1 < j_{i+1}$.

**Lemma 4.3.** The injective objects $I_1 \rightarrow I_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow I_q$ of a complete exceptional sequence correspond to vertices $v_{k_1}, v_{k_2}, \ldots, v_{k_q}$ of the forest $F$ given as follows.

1. $v_{k_1}$ is the first root of $F$, i.e., the other roots have larger labels.
2. $v_{k_{i+1}}$ is the first relatively injective child of $v_{k_i}$, i.e., $k_{i+1}$ is minimal among labels of children of $v_{k_i}$ with $k_{i+1} > k_i$.

We call the vertices $v_j$ satisfying Lemma 4.2 projective vertices and those satisfying Lemma 4.3 the injective vertices of the rooted labeled forest $F$. These lemmas imply the following.

**Lemma 4.4.** In a complete exceptional sequence for linear $A_n$, $E_n$ is a projective module if and only if $v_n$ is a root of $F$. Similarly, $E_1$ is injective if and only if $v_1$ is a root.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let $F, \delta F$ be the rooted labeled forests of $E_\ast = (E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ and $\delta E_\ast = (\tau^* E_n, E_1, \cdots, E_{n-1})$ with labeled vertices $v_i$ and $v_i'$ respectively.

1. If $v_i$ is not a root of $F$, then $\delta F$ is equal to $F$ with the labels cyclically permuted so that $v_i' = v_n$ and $v_i'' = v_{i-1}$ for $1 < i \leq n$.
2. If $v_n$ is a root of $F$, then $\delta F$ is obtained by cyclically permuting the labels of $F$, then exchanging $v_i' = v_n$ with the master root $v_0$.

In both cases $\delta F_+ \cong F_+$.

**Proof.** If $v_n$ is not a root of $F$ then, by Lemma 4.4, $E_n$ is not projective. So, $E_n' = \tau E_n$ which has the same length as $E_n$. Since the other objects are the same as before, all objects have the same length as before. So, the support containment relations cannot change. So, $\delta F$ must be the same forest as $F$ with labels cyclically permuted.

If $v_n$ is a root of $F$, then $E_n$ is projective. Every other object in the sequence has support contained either in the support of $E_n$ or the support of the corresponding injective object $E_n' = \tau E_n'$. Therefore, the new root $v_i'$ of $\delta F$ covers exactly those vertices of $F$ which were not descendants of $v_n$. This is equivalent to saying that $v_n$ has been exchanged with the master root and relabeled $v_i'$.

**Figure 8.** Theorem 4.5 in the case $n = 3$ is illustrated (from Figure 5).

**Corollary 4.6.** Let $F, \delta^n F$ be the rooted labeled forests of $E_\ast = (E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ and $\delta^n E_\ast = (\tau^n E_1, \cdots, \tau^n E_n)$. Let $v_{j_1}, \ldots, v_{j_p}$ be the projective vertices of $F$. Then $\delta^n F_+ \cong F_+$ with projective vertices together with the master root $v_0$ cyclically permuted and all other vertices remaining the same. Thus $v_{j_p}' = v_0$, $v_0' = v_{j_1}$, $v_i' = v_{j_{i+1}}$ for $1 \leq i < p$ and $v_{j_p}' = v_0$.
\[ v'_k = v_k \text{ for all other values of } k. \] In particular, \( v'_{j_1}, \ldots, v'_{j_p} \) are the injective vertices of \( \delta^n F \) and the roots of \( \delta^n F \) consist of \( v'_{j_1} \) and the children of \( v_{j_1} \) in \( F \). (See Figure 9.)

**Proof.** The first part follows from Theorem 4.5. The last part follows from Lemma 4.3 since \( j_1 \) must be smaller than the labels of the other roots of \( \delta^n F \). These other roots in \( \delta^n F \) were the children of \( v_{j_1} \) in \( F \) which must have larger index by Lemma 4.2.2. \( \Box \)

![Figure 9](image)

**Figure 9.** Illustrating Corollary 4.6, the projective vertices of \( F \) become the injective vertices of \( \delta^n F \). The children of the smallest projective vertex \( v_{j_1} \) in \( F \) have larger indices and become the other roots of \( \delta^n F \) with the injective vertex \( v'_{j_1} \) being the first root of \( \delta^n F = \Delta^2 F \).

### 4.2. Garside element

The *Garside element* \( \Delta \) of the braid group \( B_n \) is given by

\[
\Delta = \delta_{n-1} \delta_{n-2} \cdots \delta_2 \delta_1
\]

where, for each \( k < n \), \( \delta_k \) is given by

\[
\delta_k = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \cdots \sigma_k.
\]

In particular \( \delta_{n-1} = \delta \) is the fundamental braid. The commutator relation:

\[
\Delta \sigma_i \Delta^{-1} = \sigma_{n-i}
\]

implies that \( \Delta^2 \) lies in the center of the braid group \( B_n \). In fact, \( \Delta^2 \) generates the center of \( B_n \) by [5]. It is also an easy observation that \( \Delta^2 = \delta^n \). So, the action of the central element \( \Delta^2 \) is given by Corollary 4.6 and Figure 9.

The Garside braid is shown in Figure 10. Examples of the action of \( \Delta \) on exceptional sequences for \( A_3 \) were computed in Figure 5 and are summarized in Figure 11 below. The use of the Garside element in cluster theory is explained in the next subsection. Here we discuss the action of \( \Delta \) on forests.

We use the notation

\[
\Delta(E_1, \cdots, E_n) = (E'_1, \cdots, E'_n).
\]
The Garside braid $\Delta$ for $n = 5$. Each strand goes over the ones on its right and under the ones on its left.

The action of $\Delta = \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1 = \sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2$ is shown in the case $n = 3$ using Figure 5. Proposition 4.11 explains the combinatorics of $\Delta$.

The first thing to notice is that $E'_n = E_1$ since the first strand goes over the other strands in each step of the braid $\Delta$. Similarly, every strand goes over the ones on its right and under the ones on its left.

Let $C_k = Z^\perp$, the right perpendicular category of $Z = E_{k+1} \oplus \cdots \oplus E_n$. This is the category of all $\Lambda$-modules $X$ so that $\chi_\Lambda(E_j, X) = 0$ for all $j > k$.

**Lemma 4.7.** The sequence $(E_1, \cdots, E_k)$ is a complete exceptional sequence for the category $C_k$.

**Proof.** The objects $E_1, \cdots, E_k$ lie in $C_k$ by definition of an exceptional sequence. To show it is complete, suppose we could add an object of $C_k$ to this sequence. Then, that object could also be added to the complete exceptional sequence $(E_1, \cdots, E_n)$ to the left of $E_{k+1}$ contradicting its maximality. $\square$

We recall our main theorem (Theorem 2.20) which says that $v_k$ is ascending in $F$ (either a root or the child of some $v_j$ for $j > k$) if and only if $E_k$ is relatively projective which means $E_k$ is a projective object of the category $C_k$.

**Lemma 4.8.** The object $E'_{n-k+1}$ in $\Delta E_n$ is the unique indecomposable object of $C_k$ having the property that $(E'_{n-k+1}, E_1, \cdots, E_{k-1})$ is a complete exceptional sequence for $C_k$. Consequently,

1. If $E_k$ is not relatively projective, then $E'_{n-k+1} = \tau_k E_k$ where $\tau_k$ is Auslander-Reiten translation in $C_k$. In that case, $\chi_\Lambda(E_k, E'_{n-k+1}) = -1$. 

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure10.png}
\caption{The Garside braid $\Delta$ for $n = 5$. Each strand goes over the ones on its right and under the ones on its left.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure11.png}
\caption{The action of $\Delta = \sigma_1\sigma_2\sigma_1 = \sigma_2\sigma_1\sigma_2$ is shown in the case $n = 3$ using Figure 5. Proposition 4.11 explains the combinatorics of $\Delta$.}
\end{figure}
Lemma 4.9. Let $E_k$ be projective. Then $E'_{n-k+1}$ is the injective envelope of $E_k$ in $C_k$. In this case, $\chi(E_k, E'_{n-k+1}) = +1$.

In particular, $E_1 = \tau^* E_n$ (just as in $\delta E_n$).

Proof. The braid move $\delta_{k-1} \cdots \delta_1$ on $E_*$ produces the exceptional sequence

$$(E'_{n-k+2}, \cdots, E_n, E_{k+1}, \cdots, E_n)$$

which implies that $(E'_{n-k+2}, \cdots, E_n)$ is a complete exceptional sequence for $C_{k-1}$. Applying the braid move $\delta_{k-1}$ produces the exceptional sequence

$$(E'_{n-k+1}, E'_{n-k+2}, \cdots, E_n, E_{k+1}, \cdots, E_n)$$

which implies that $E'_{n-k+1}$ is the unique object of $C_k$ in the right perpendicular category of $C_{k-1}$. Equivalently, $(E'_{n-k+1}, E_1, \cdots, E_{k-1})$ is a complete exceptional sequence for $C_k$ as claimed. The rest follows by analogy with Theorem 4.5.

This lemma immediately implies the following.

Lemma 4.9. Let $\Delta E_* = (E'_1, \cdots, E'_n)$. Then $E_k$ is projective in $E_*$ if and only if $E'_{n-k+1}$ is relatively injective in $\Delta E_*$.\[\]

In the proof of Lemma 4.8 we saw that

$$\delta_{k-1}^{-1}(E'_{n-k+1}, E_{n-k+2}, \cdots, E_n) = (E'_{n-k+2}, \cdots, E_n, E_k).$$

If we apply this braid move to the last $k$ objects in $\Delta E_*$ we obtain the following.

Lemma 4.10. With the notation $\Delta(E_1, \cdots, E_n) = (E'_1, \cdots, E'_n)$ we have that

$$(E'_1, \cdots, E'_{n-k}, E'_{n-k+2}, \cdots, E'_n, E_k)$$

is a complete exceptional sequence. In particular,

$$\chi(E_k, E'_j) = 0$$

for $j \neq n - k + 1$.

Proposition 4.11. Let $F' = \Delta F$ for a rooted labeled forest $F$ with $n$ vertices. Then

1. $v_{j_1}, \cdots, v_{j_p}$ are the projective vertices of $F$ if and only if $v'_{n-j_1+1}, \cdots, v'_{n-j_p+1}$ are the roots of $\Delta F$.
2. $v_{k_1}, \cdots, v_{k_q}$ are the projective vertices of $F$ if and only if $v'_{n-k_1+1}, \cdots, v'_{n-k_q+1}$ are the injective vertices of $\Delta F$.
3. If $E_{i_1}$ is the smallest projective in $E_*$ and $E_{i_2}, \cdots, E_{i_s}$ are its children, then $E_{n-i_1+1}, \cdots, E_{n-i_s+1}$ are the projective objects of $\Delta E_*$.
4. If $E_{\ell_1}, \cdots, E_{\ell_q}$ are the injective objects of $E_*$ with $\ell_1 < \ell_2 < \cdots < \ell_q$, then $E'_{n-\ell_1+1}$ is the last (and smallest) injective object of $\Delta E_*$ and $E'_{n-\ell_2+1}, \cdots, E'_{n-\ell_q+1}$ are its children.

Proof. Since $\Delta^2 = \delta^n$, it follows from Corollary 4.6 that (1) and (2) are equivalent. We prove only (1) since (3) and (4) are not needed in this paper.

Statement (1) says that $v_k$ is a projective vertex of $F$ if and only if $v'_{n-k+1}$ is a root of $F' = \Delta F$. We prove this by induction on $n - k$. For $k = n$, $E_n$ is projective if and
only if $v_n$ is a root of $F$ if any only if the first vertex $v'_1$ of $\Delta F$ is a root (See Remark 4.11). So, the statement holds for $k = n$.

Now suppose the statement holds for $k + 1$. Then, we observe that the braid move $\sigma_k$ moves $E_k$ to the $k + 1$st position in $\sigma_k E^*$:

$$\sigma_k(E_1, \cdots, E_k, \cdots, E_n) = (E_1, \cdots, E_{k-1}, E_{k+1}^*, E_k, E_{k+2}, \cdots, E_n).$$

Therefore, by induction on $n - k$ we have that $E_k$ is a projective module if and only if the $(n - k)$th vertex of $\Delta \sigma_k F = \sigma_{n-k} \Delta F$ is a root. By Proposition 3.3, this is equivalent to the $(n - k + 1)$st vertex of $\Delta F$ being a root. Thus the statement holds for $k$.

This proves (1) in the proposition. □

**Corollary 4.12.** $\Delta E^*$ has a simple injective object if and only if $E^*$ has only one injective objects. Similarly, $E^*$ has a simple projective object if and only if $\Delta E^*$ has only one projective object.

**Figure 12.** Illustrating Proposition 4.11. The projective vertices $v_1, v_2, v_3$ of $F$ become the roots $v_7, v_6, v_5$ resp. of $\Delta F$. The only root $v_3$ of $F$ becomes the only injective vertex $v_5$ of $\Delta F$. The injective vertices $v_3, v_7$ of $F$ correspond to the last injective $v_5$ in $\Delta F$ and its child $v_1$. The first projective in $F$ and its children become the projective vertices of $\Delta F$. For the placement of $v_2$ in $\Delta F$ we go to $\Delta^{-1} F$ then apply $\delta^7 = \Delta^2$.

4.3. **Clusters and signed exceptional sequences.** The Garside element $\Delta$ takes a “cluster tilting set” to the corresponding “signed exceptional sequence” [16]. This is a comment made in [4] using different terminology (before the introduction of signed exceptional sequences).

**Definition 4.13.** We define a *cluster tilting set* for a Dynkin quiver with $n$ vertices to be a set of $n$ nonisomorphic modules and “shifted projective modules” $T_1, \cdots, T_n$ (each $T_i$ is either an indecomposable module $M_i$ or a shifted indecomposable projective module $P_k[1]$) having the property that $\text{Hom}_{D}(T_i, T_j[1]) = 0$ in the bounded derived category $\mathcal{D}^b = \mathcal{D}^b(\text{mod-}\Lambda)$ for all $i, j$. In other words, $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}(M_i, M_j) = 0$ for all $i, j$ and $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(P_k, M_i) = 0$ for all $k, i$.

For example, in $A_3$, $S_1, S_3, P_2[1]$ is a cluster tilting set since $S_1, S_3$ do not extend each other ($\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}(S_1, S_3) = \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}(S_3, S_1) = 0$) and $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(P_2, S_1 \oplus S_3) = 0$. 
Definition 4.14. By a signed exceptional sequence we mean an exceptional sequence $E^* = (E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ together with a sequence $\varepsilon^*$ of signs $\varepsilon_i \in \{+1, -1\}$ so that $\varepsilon_i = -1$ implies $E_i$ is relatively projective. We write the sequence as $(X_1, \ldots, X_n)$ where

$$X_i = \begin{cases} E_i[1] & \text{if } \varepsilon_i = -1 \\ E_i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For example, in $A_3$, $(S_1[1], S_3, P_2)$ is a signed exceptional sequence since $S_1$ is relatively projective. (The first object in an exceptional sequence is always relatively projective.)

Theorem 4.15. Any cluster tilting set can be arranged into a signed exceptional sequence $E^* = (E_1, \ldots, E_n)$ with signs $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_n$. Furthermore, $\Delta E^* = (E'_1, \ldots, E'_n)$ with signs $\varepsilon'_1, \ldots, \varepsilon'_n$ is a signed exceptional sequence with the property that

$$\varepsilon_k \varepsilon'_j \chi_\Lambda(E_k, E'_j) = \delta_{kj}.$$  

Remark 4.16. It is shown in [4] that this holds for any hereditary algebra. Here we prove it in the case of linear $A_n$ using rooted labeled forests. Also, Equation (4.1) implies that $-\varepsilon_j \dim E'_j$ are the “c-vectors” of the “cluster” $\{\dim E_k\}$ if we take the “initial seed” to be the shifted projectives $[14]$.

Proof. It is an observation originally due to Schofield [23] that a support tilting set can be arranged in an exceptional sequence. In the case of finite type, this is very easy to see: take the left-to-right order of the objects as they appear in the Auslander-Reiten quiver. The shifted projective objects can be placed after these in increasing order of size. Since all negative (shifted) objects are projective, the result is a signed exceptional sequence $E^*, \varepsilon^*$.

To see that the exceptional sequence $\Delta E^*$ with signs $\varepsilon^*$ is a signed exceptional sequence we examine which objects have negative signs.

1. If $E_k$ is a projective module then $E_k$ and $E'_{n-k+1}$ have the same sign: $\varepsilon_k = \varepsilon'_{n-k+1}$. Since $\nu_{n-k+1}$ is a root of the forest $\Delta F$, $E'_{n-k+1}$ is relatively projective and either sign is allowed.

2. If $E_k$ is any relative projective object which is not projective then it is positive. So, $\varepsilon'_{n-k+1} = \varepsilon_k = +1$.

3. In all other cases, $E_k$ is relatively injective but not relatively projective. So, $E_k$ is positive and $\varepsilon'_{n-k+1} = -\varepsilon_k = -1$. This is OK since $E'_{n-k+1}$ is relatively projective (but not relatively injective) in $\Delta E^*$.

The conclusion is that all objects in $\Delta E^*$ which are relatively projective but not relatively injective have a negative sign and those which are relatively injective but not relatively projective have positive sign. The roots might have either sign. So, $\Delta E^*$ with signs $\varepsilon'_*$ is a signed exceptional sequence.

By Lemma 4.8 we have $\chi_\Lambda(E_k, E'_{n-k+1}) = \varepsilon_k \varepsilon'_{n-k+1}$. By Lemma 4.10 $\chi_\Lambda(E_k, E'_j) = 0$ when $j \neq n-k+1$. Equation (4.1) follows.

Example 4.17. None of the forests in Figure 12 are examples of cluster tilting sets. In the first and second forest, there is a vertex with two relatively injective children. These
since $\chi E$ is cluster tilting if we shift the projective module $E$. In Figure 11 the second and last forests are not cluster tilting for the same reasons. The second has two relatively injective children of the root and the last has three roots which is not allowed. The first forest is cluster tilting if we shift the projective module $E$. This gives $(S_2, I_2, S_3[1])$. The corresponding signed exceptional sequence is given by the second forest with its root shifted: $(P_1[1], S_1, S_2)$. To illustrate Equation (4.1) note that $\text{Hom}(I_2, S_1) = K$, but $\text{Hom}(I_2, S_2) = 0 = \text{Ext}(I_2, S_2)$ and $\text{Hom}(I_2, P_1) = 0 = \text{Ext}(I_2, P_1)$.

In [16] it is shown that signed exceptional sequences are in 1-1 correspondence with ordered cluster tilting sets. Thus the number of signed exceptional sequences of type $A_n$ is $n!$ times the Catalan number $C_{n+1} = \frac{1}{n+2} \binom{2n+2}{n+1}$. This can also be seen from the generating function. Since the relative projectives can have any sign, the number of signed exceptional sequences is

$$p_n(2,1,2) = 2(n - 1 + 2(2))(n - 2 + 2(4)) \cdots (1 + 2(n)) = \frac{2(n + 1)!}{(n + 2)!} = n!C_{n+1}.$$  

4.4. Action of extended braid group. The extended braid group is

$$\tilde{B}_n := B_n \times_C \mathbb{Z}/2$$

using the outer involution $C$ given by $\sigma_i \mapsto \sigma_i^{-1}$. We refer to $C$ as complex conjugation. Equivalently, we use $D = \Delta C$ in $\tilde{B}_n$ conjugation by which gives

$$D\sigma_i D = \sigma_{n-i}^{-1}.$$  

We call this duality since it corresponds to $D : \text{mod-}\Lambda \rightarrow \text{mod-}\Lambda^\sigma$ given by

$$DM = \text{Hom}_K(M, K).$$

This reverses the order of an exceptional sequence:

$$D(E_1, \cdots, E_n) = (DE_n, \cdots, DE_1)$$

since $\chi_A(X, Y) = \chi_{\Lambda^{op}}(DY, DX)$. The operation $D$ gives an involution on the set of complete exceptional sequences of the linear $A_n$ quiver since this quiver is isomorphic to its opposite quiver. The modules $DE_i$ have the same support inclusion relations as the $E_i$. Therefore, duality $D$ acts on the corresponding rooted labeled forests by reversing the order of vertices: $DF \cong F$ with vertex labels $v'_i = v_{n-i+1}$.

Complex conjugation $C = D\Delta$ has a cleaner description than the Garside element:

**Proposition 4.18.** Let $F' = CF = D\Delta F$. Then $F = D\Delta F'$ and

1. $v_{j_1}, \cdots, v_{j_p}$ are the projective vertices of $F$ if and only if $v'_{j_1}, \cdots, v'_{j_p}$ are the roots of $F'$.
2. $v_{k_1}, \cdots, v_{k_q}$ are the injective vertices of $F$ with $k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_q$ if and only if $v'_{k_1}$ is the first projective vertex of $F'$ and $v'_{k_2}, \cdots, v'_{k_q}$ are its children.
3. Dually, $v_{\ell_q}$ is the last injective vertex of $F$ and $v_{\ell_1}, \cdots, v_{\ell_{q-1}}$ are its children if and only if $v'_{\ell_1}, \cdots, v'_{\ell_q}$ are the projective vertices of $F'' = D\Delta^{-1}F$.  


4.5. **Comments.** We note that the results of this paper partially answer a question in [25] raised by the second author. The question was: “Is it possible to interpret completed exceptional sequences of linear Nakayama algebras via certain rooted labeled forests?” But another question is raised: In [25] a bijection is constructed between rooted labeled trees of height at most 1 and complete exceptional sequences for $A_n$ with radical square zero. How is this related to the bijection constructed in the present paper?

There is also the question of what happens with other orientations of the $A_n$ quiver where our main results do not hold for $A_n$ by Remark 2.30. There is a bijection between exceptional sequences of $A_n$ (or any other Dynkin quiver) with different orientations given by APR-tilting [2] and one can ask how this affects the bijection with parking functions and rooted labeled forest. We note that the bijection using [3], [13] works for any orientation of $A_n$. However, it is not clear how this affects the distribution of relatively injective and projective objects.
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