

MATRIX FACTORIZATIONS WITH MORE THAN TWO FACTORS

TIM TRIBONE

ABSTRACT. Given an element f in a regular local ring, we study matrix factorizations of f with $d \geq 2$ factors, that is, we study tuples of square matrices $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d)$ such that their product is f times an identity matrix of the appropriate size. Several well known properties of matrix factorizations with 2 factors extend to the case of arbitrarily many factors. For instance, we show that the stable category of matrix factorizations with $d \geq 2$ factors is naturally triangulated and we give explicit formula for the relevant suspension functor. We also extend results of Knörrer and Solberg which identify the category of matrix factorizations with the full subcategory of maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules over a certain non-commutative algebra Γ . As a consequence of our findings, we observe that the ring Γ behaves, homologically, like a “non-commutative hypersurface ring” in the sense that every finitely generated module over Γ has an eventually 2-periodic projective resolution.

INTRODUCTION

Let S be a regular local ring and f a non-zero non-unit in S . A matrix factorization of f is a pair of $n \times n$ matrices (φ, ψ) such that $\varphi\psi = f \cdot I_n$, where I_n is the identity matrix of size n . The correspondence given by Eisenbud [Eis80, Corollary 6.3] between matrix factorizations and maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules has made these objects an important tool for studying hypersurface rings. We consider a natural generalization in which the factorizations have two or more factors. In other words, we consider tuples of $n \times n$ matrices $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d)$, for some $d \geq 2$, such that $\varphi_1\varphi_2 \cdots \varphi_d = f \cdot I_n$.

Several authors, including [Chi78, BHS88, HUB91, BES17] and also [Ber06, BL07], have studied the existence of matrix factorizations with more than 2 factors, though, both sets of authors study special cases of the definition we present. The first set of authors focus their attention mainly on matrices which have only linear entries; factorizations of this type correspond to *Ulrich modules* over the hypersurface defined by f . The second set of authors tackle a different question. Specifically, Bergman asked in [Ber06] whether the adjoint (the matrix of cofactors) of the generic $n \times n$ matrix factors into a product of two non-invertible $n \times n$ matrices.

Our approach is to study the category of matrix factorizations of f with $d \geq 2$ factors. We denote this category by $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. In Section 2 we examine the basic structure of $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. We show that $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is a Frobenius category and therefore its stable category is naturally triangulated. In the case $d = 2$, the stable category we present coincides with the one originally studied by Eisenbud. In particular, it is equivalent to the stable category of maximal Cohen-Macaulay $R = S/(f)$ -modules. In Sections 3 and 4 we extend results of Knörrer and Solberg which give module theoretic descriptions of $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ for all $d \geq 2$. Specifically, Theorem 4.4 extends [Knö87, Proposition 2.1] by identifying the category of matrix factorizations with $d \geq 2$ factors with the category of maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules over the skew group algebra of the d -fold branched cover of R . The equivalence of categories given by Knörrer, which we generalize, is an important initial step in the classification of simple hypersurface singularities. In Section 5, we investigate the suspension functor on the stable category of matrix factorizations with $d \geq 2$ factors. As a consequence of our results, we observe that the skew group algebra mentioned above behaves like a “non-commutative hypersurface ring” in the sense that it is Iwanaga-Gorenstein and that any of its finitely generated modules have an eventually periodic resolution of period at most 2. Throughout, and specifically

in Section 6, we give examples with the goal of illustrating the differences between the categories $\text{MF}_S^2(f)$ and $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ for $d > 2$.

1. DEFINITIONS AND BACKGROUND

In this section we collect the definitions, notation, and conventions that we will use throughout.

Definition 1.1. Let S be a regular local ring, f a non-zero non-unit in S , and $d \geq 2$ an integer. A *matrix factorization of f with d factors* is a d -tuple of homomorphisms between finitely generated free S -modules of the same rank, $(\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \varphi_2 : F_3 \rightarrow F_2, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d)$, such that

$$\varphi_1 \varphi_2 \cdots \varphi_d = f \cdot 1_{F_1}.$$

Depending on the context, we may omit the free S -modules in the notation and simply write $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d)$. If the free S -modules F_1, \dots, F_d are of rank n , we say $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d)$ is of size n .

As we will see, there is an inherent cyclic nature to matrix factorizations with d factors. It will therefore be convenient to adopt the following notation conventions.

Notation 1.2. The letter d will always be an integer indicating the number of factors in a matrix factorization. When d is clear from context, all indices are taken modulo d unless otherwise specified. More specifically, let $i \neq j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and let A_1, A_2, \dots, A_d be symbols indexed over \mathbb{Z}_d . Let \tilde{i} and \tilde{j} be integer representatives of i, j within the range $0 < \tilde{i}, \tilde{j} \leq d$. The notation $A_i A_{i+1} \cdots A_j$ will be taken to mean

$$\begin{cases} A_i A_{i+1} \cdots A_{j-1} A_j & \text{if } \tilde{i} \leq \tilde{j} \\ A_i A_{i+1} \cdots A_d A_1 \cdots A_{j-1} A_j & \text{if } \tilde{i} \geq \tilde{j} \end{cases}.$$

We follow a similar convention for indexing a decreasing list of symbols over \mathbb{Z}_d .

A non-zero finitely generated module M over a local ring A is called *maximal Cohen-Macaulay* (MCM) if $\text{depth}_A(M) = \dim A$ (the Krull dimension of A). Our first observation is that matrix factorizations of f with d factors encode MCM modules over the *hypersurface ring* $R = S/(f)$, and that Definition 1.1 is more symmetric than it seems.

Lemma 1.3. *Let S be a regular local ring and f a non-zero non-unit in S . Let $(\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \varphi_2 : F_3 \rightarrow F_2, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d)$ be a matrix factorization of f with $d \geq 2$ factors. For any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$,*

- (i) $\varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{k-1} = f \cdot 1_{F_k}$, and
- (ii) if $\text{cok } \varphi_k \neq 0$, then $\text{cok } \varphi_k$ is an MCM R -module.

Proof. (i) We proceed by induction on $d \geq 2$. For the case $d = 2$, we simply need to show that $\varphi\psi = f \cdot 1_F$ implies $\psi\varphi = f \cdot 1_G$. This fact is well known but we include the argument here for clarity. Suppose $(\varphi : G \rightarrow F, \psi : F \rightarrow G)$ is a matrix factorization with 2 factors. Since f is a non-zero element in the domain S , it follows that both φ and ψ are injective. Canceling φ on the left of the equation $\varphi\psi\varphi = f \cdot \varphi = \varphi \cdot f$, we find $\psi\varphi = f \cdot 1_G$.

Now, assume $d > 2$ and that the statement holds for matrix factorizations with less than d factors. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and notice that, by viewing the composition $\varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} : F_{k+2} \rightarrow F_k$ as a single homomorphism, the $(d-1)$ -tuple

$$(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{k-1}, \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1}, \varphi_{k+2}, \dots, \varphi_d)$$

is a matrix factorization of f with $d-1$ factors. By induction, it follows that $\varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{k-1} = f \cdot 1_{F_k}$.

- (ii) Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. By (i), we have that $\varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{k-1} = f \cdot 1_{F_k}$. In particular, $f \cdot \text{cok } \varphi_k = 0$, that is, $\text{cok } \varphi_k$ is an R -module. Also, as in (i), the homomorphism φ_k is injective since $f \in S$ is non-zero. Thus, we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\varphi_k} F_k \longrightarrow \text{cok } \varphi_k \longrightarrow 0,$$

which implies that $\text{pd}_S(\text{cok } \varphi_k) \leq 1$. By the Auslander-Buchsbaum formula, we have that $\text{depth}(\text{cok } \varphi_k) = \dim(S) - \text{pd}_S(\text{cok } \varphi_k) \geq \dim(S) - 1 = \dim(R)$.

That is, $\text{cok } \varphi_k$ is an MCM R -module. □

Definition 1.4. Let S be a regular local ring and f a non-zero non-unit in S . Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d)$ and $X' = (\varphi'_1 : F'_2 \rightarrow F'_1, \dots, \varphi'_d : F'_1 \rightarrow F'_d)$ be matrix factorizations of f .

- (i) A *morphism of matrix factorizations* between X and X' is a d -tuple of S -module homomorphisms, $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d)$, making each square of the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} & F_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d-1}} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & F_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & F_1 \\ \downarrow \alpha_1 & & \downarrow \alpha_d & & & & \downarrow \alpha_2 & & \downarrow \alpha_1 \\ F'_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_d} & F'_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_{d-1}} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_2} & F'_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_1} & F'_1 \end{array}$$

Composition of morphisms is defined component-wise, that is, if $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : X \rightarrow X''$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) : X' \rightarrow X$ are morphisms of matrix factorizations, then $\alpha \circ \beta = (\alpha_1 \beta_1, \alpha_2 \beta_2, \dots, \alpha_d \beta_d) : X' \rightarrow X''$. The matrix factorizations X and X' are isomorphic if there exists a morphism $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : X \rightarrow X'$ such that α_k is an isomorphism for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

- (ii) Let $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ denote the category of matrix factorizations of f with d factors. The additive structure on $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is given by the direct sum of X and X'

$$X \oplus X' := (\varphi_1 \oplus \varphi'_1 : F_2 \oplus F'_2 \rightarrow F_1 \oplus F'_1, \dots, \varphi_d \oplus \varphi'_d : F_1 \oplus F'_1 \rightarrow F_d \oplus F'_d).$$

- (iii) Motivated by Lemma 1.3, we define functors $T^j : \text{MF}_S^d(f) \rightarrow \text{MF}_S^d(f)$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, by

$$T^j(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d) = (\varphi_{j+1}, \varphi_{j+2}, \dots, \varphi_{j-1}, \varphi_j)$$

and

$$T^j(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) = (\alpha_{j+1}, \alpha_{j+2}, \dots, \alpha_{j-1}, \alpha_j)$$

for any $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X, X')$. We refer to $T = T^1$ as the *shift functor* on $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$.

Definition 1.5. Let S be a regular local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{n} and let f be a non-zero non-unit in S . Set $R = S/(f)$ and fix $d \geq 2$.

- (i) Let $\text{MCM}(R)$ denote the category of maximal Cohen-Macaulay R -modules.
- (ii) An R -module M is *stable* if it has no direct summands isomorphic to R .
- (iii) For an R -module M , let $\text{syz}_R^1(M)$ denote the *reduced* first syzygy of M .
- (iv) A matrix factorization $X = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d)$ is called *stable* if $\text{cok } \varphi_k$ is a stable R -module for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.
- (v) A homomorphism between free S -modules $\varphi : G \rightarrow F$ is called *minimal* if $\text{Im } \varphi \subseteq \mathfrak{n}F$.
- (vi) A matrix factorization $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is called *reduced* if φ_k is minimal for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.
- (vii) A non-zero matrix factorization $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is *indecomposable* if $X \cong X' \oplus X''$ implies $X' = 0$ or $X'' = 0$.

Eisenbud showed in [Eis80] that there is a one-to-one correspondence between reduced matrix factorizations (with 2 factors) and stable MCM R -modules. This correspondence can be realized in the form of a stable equivalence between the categories $\text{MF}_S^2(f)$ and $\text{MCM}(R)$. We record two consequences that will be needed later.

Proposition 1.6. [Eis80] *Let S be a regular local ring, f a non-zero non-unit in S , and set $R = S/(f)$.*

- (i) For any MCM R -module M , there exists a matrix factorization $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$ such that φ is minimal and $\text{cok } \varphi \cong M$.
- (ii) A matrix factorization $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$ is reduced if and only if it is stable. In this case, $\text{syz}_R^1(\text{cok } \varphi) \cong \text{cok } \psi$ and $\text{syz}_R^1(\text{cok } \psi) \cong \text{cok } \varphi$.

We will see in Section 5 that only one direction of (ii) holds when $d > 2$. Finally, we state another observation, also made by Eisenbud, that will help us identify matrix factorizations.

Lemma 1.7. [Eis80, Corollary 5.4] *Let S be a regular local ring and f a non-zero non-unit in S . Suppose $A : G \rightarrow F$ and $B : F \rightarrow G$ are homomorphisms of finitely generated free S -modules such that $AB = f \cdot 1_F$. Then, $\text{rank } F = \text{rank } G$.*

Proof. Once again, since f is a non-zerodivisor, the maps A and B are injective. Since $f \cdot \text{cok } A = 0$, $\text{cok } A$ is a torsion S -module. From the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow G \xrightarrow{A} F \longrightarrow \text{cok } A \longrightarrow 0$$

it follows that $\text{rank}_S F = \text{rank}_S G$. □

2. $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ IS A FROBENIUS CATEGORY

In this section we show that there is a natural choice of an exact structure on the category $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ which induces the structure of a triangulated category on the stable category $\underline{\text{MF}}_S^d(f)$ defined below. We start by recalling the axioms that define an exact category. The axioms and definitions below follow the presentation given in [Bü10] and we refer the reader to this paper for more information on exact categories.

Let \mathcal{A} be an additive category. A pair of composable morphisms $A' \xrightarrow{i} A \xrightarrow{p} A''$ is called a *kernel-cokernel pair* if i is a kernel of p and p is a cokernel of i . Given a collection of kernel-cokernel pairs, \mathcal{E} , we call a morphism $i : A' \rightarrow A$ an *admissible monomorphism* if there exists a morphism $p : A \rightarrow A''$ such that $A' \xrightarrow{i} A \xrightarrow{p} A''$ is an element of \mathcal{E} . Dually, a morphism $p : A \rightarrow A''$ is an *admissible epimorphism* if there exists a morphism $i : A' \rightarrow A$ such that their composition is in \mathcal{E} . We will indicate admissible monomorphisms and admissible epimorphisms by the arrows \succrightarrow and \twoheadrightarrow respectively.

An *exact structure* on \mathcal{A} is a class \mathcal{E} of kernel-cokernel pairs which is closed under isomorphisms and such that the following axioms hold:

- (E0) The identity morphism 1_X is an admissible monomorphism for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$.
- (E0^{op}) The identity morphism 1_X is an admissible epimorphism for all $X \in \mathcal{A}$.
- (E1) Admissible monomorphisms are closed under composition.
- (E1^{op}) Admissible epimorphisms are closed under composition.
- (E2) The push-out of an admissible monomorphism $X \succrightarrow Y$ and an arbitrary morphism $X \rightarrow X'$ exists and induces an admissible monomorphism as in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \succrightarrow & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X' & \twoheadrightarrow & Y' \end{array}$$

- (E2^{op}) The pull-back of an admissible epimorphism $X'' \twoheadrightarrow Y'$ and an arbitrary morphism $Y \rightarrow Y'$ exists and induces an admissible epimorphism as in the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \twoheadrightarrow & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X' & \twoheadrightarrow & Y' \end{array}$$

Given an additive category \mathcal{A} and a class \mathcal{E} satisfying these axioms, the pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ is called an *exact category*.

Let S be a regular local ring, $f \in S$ a non-zero non-unit, and set $R = S/(f)$. Fix an integer $d \geq 2$ and let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d)$, $X' = (\varphi'_1 : F'_2 \rightarrow F'_1, \dots, \varphi'_d : F'_1 \rightarrow F'_d)$, and $X'' = (\varphi''_1 : F''_2 \rightarrow F''_1, \dots, \varphi''_d : F''_1 \rightarrow F''_d)$ be matrix factorizations in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$.

Definition 2.1. Suppose we have a pair of morphisms $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : X \rightarrow X''$ and $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) : X' \rightarrow X$ in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then, the composition

$$X' \xrightarrow{\beta} X \xrightarrow{\alpha} X''$$

is called a *short exact sequence of matrix factorizations* if the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F'_k \xrightarrow{\beta_k} F_k \xrightarrow{\alpha_k} F''_k \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence of free S -modules for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

Lemma 2.2. *A short exact sequence of matrix factorizations is a kernel-cokernel pair in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$.*

Proof. Let $X' \xrightarrow{\beta} X \xrightarrow{\alpha} X''$ be a short exact sequence of matrix factorizations. First we show that β is the kernel of α . Certainly, we have that $\alpha\beta = 0$. Suppose $g : Y \rightarrow X$ is another morphism such that $\alpha g = 0$, where $Y = (\psi_1 : G_2 \rightarrow G_1, \dots, \psi_d : G_1 \rightarrow G_d)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. We have the following diagram of free S -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & G_k & & & \\ & & \tilde{g}_k \swarrow & \downarrow g_k & \searrow 0 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F'_k & \xrightarrow{\beta_k} & F_k & \xrightarrow{\alpha_k} & F''_k \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where the bottom row is exact. Since β_k is the kernel of α_k , there exists a unique S -homomorphism $\tilde{g}_k : G_k \rightarrow F'_k$ such that $\beta_k \tilde{g}_k = g_k$. It suffices to show that $\tilde{g} = (\tilde{g}_1, \tilde{g}_2, \dots, \tilde{g}_d) : Y \rightarrow X'$ is a morphism of matrix factorizations since each \tilde{g}_k , $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, is uniquely determined. That is, we need to show that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\psi_k} & G_k \\ \downarrow \tilde{g}_{k+1} & & \downarrow \tilde{g}_k \\ F'_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_k} & F'_k \end{array}$$

commutes for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Note that $g_k \psi_k = \varphi_k g_{k+1}$ and $\varphi_k \beta_{k+1} = \beta_k \varphi'_k$ since g and β are morphisms in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then, $\beta_k \tilde{g}_k \psi_k = g_k \psi_k = \varphi_k g_{k+1} = \varphi_k \beta_{k+1} \tilde{g}_{k+1} = \beta_k \varphi'_k \tilde{g}_{k+1}$ and since β_k is injective, we can cancel it on the left to conclude that $\tilde{g}_k \psi_k = \varphi'_k \tilde{g}_{k+1}$ as desired. Hence, \tilde{g} is the unique morphism such that

$$\begin{aligned} \beta \circ \tilde{g} &= (\beta_1 \tilde{g}_1, \dots, \beta_d \tilde{g}_d) \\ &= (g_1, \dots, g_d) \\ &= g. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof that β is a kernel of α . The proof that α is a cokernel of β is similar. \square

Let \mathcal{E}_d denote the class of short exact sequences of matrix factorizations in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. The first four axioms of an exact category are satisfied by the pair $(\text{MF}_S^d(f), \mathcal{E}_d)$ directly from the definitions. The axioms [E2] and [E2^{op}] also hold, which we will show below. Before we do, we need to know more about the form of the admissible morphisms in $(\text{MF}_S^d(f), \mathcal{E}_d)$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d) : X \rightarrow X''$ be a morphism of matrix factorizations.*

- (1) γ is an admissible epimorphism if and only if the S -homomorphisms $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ are surjections.
- (2) γ is an admissible monomorphism if and only if the S -homomorphisms $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ are split injections.

Proof. We prove only (2) as the proof of (1) is similar. Suppose γ is an admissible monomorphism. Then, there exists an admissible epimorphism $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_d) : X \rightarrow X''$ such that $X' \xrightarrow{\gamma} X \xrightarrow{\pi} X''$ is a short exact sequence of matrix factorizations. In particular,

$$0 \longrightarrow F'_k \xrightarrow{\gamma_k} F_k \xrightarrow{\pi_k} F''_k \longrightarrow 0$$

is a short exact sequence of S -modules for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Since F''_k is free, this sequence is split and therefore γ_k is a split injection.

Conversely, suppose the homomorphisms $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ are each split injections. For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, set $F''_k := \text{cok } \gamma_k$ and $\pi_k : F_k \rightarrow F''_k$ the natural projection map. Notice that F''_k is a free S -module of rank equal to $\text{rank } F_k - \text{rank } F'_k$. Now, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, there exists a map $\varphi''_k : F_{k+1} \rightarrow F_k$ such that the following diagram with split exact rows commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F'_1 & \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} & F_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & F''_1 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \varphi'_d & & \downarrow \varphi_d & & \downarrow \varphi''_d & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F'_d & \xrightarrow{\gamma_d} & F_d & \xrightarrow{\pi_d} & F''_d & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \varphi'_{d-1} & & \downarrow \varphi_{d-1} & & \downarrow \varphi''_{d-1} & & \\ & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \\ & & \downarrow \varphi'_2 & & \downarrow \varphi_2 & & \downarrow \varphi''_2 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F'_2 & \xrightarrow{\gamma_2} & F_2 & \xrightarrow{\pi_2} & F''_2 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \varphi'_1 & & \downarrow \varphi_1 & & \downarrow \varphi''_1 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F'_1 & \xrightarrow{\gamma_1} & F_1 & \xrightarrow{\pi_1} & F''_1 & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

In particular, there exists $t_1 : F''_1 \rightarrow F_1$ such that $\pi_1 t_1 = 1_{F''_1}$. The splitting allows us to compute the composition along the right most column:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi''_1 \varphi''_2 \cdots \varphi''_d &= \pi_1 \varphi_1 \varphi_2 \cdots \varphi_d t_1 \\ &= f \cdot \pi_1 t_1 \\ &= f \cdot 1_{F''_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the free modules $F''_1, F''_2, \dots, F''_d$ are all of the same rank, we have that $X'' = (\varphi''_1 : F''_2 \rightarrow F''_1, \dots, \varphi''_d : F''_1 \rightarrow F''_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and

$$X' \xrightarrow{\gamma} X \xrightarrow{(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_d)} X''$$

is a short exact sequence of matrix factorizations. □

Lemma 2.3 indicates that not every monomorphism of matrix factorizations is an admissible monomorphism. The simplest example of this arises when $d = 2$.

Example 2.4. Suppose $(\varphi : G \rightarrow F, \psi : F \rightarrow G) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$ with $\text{cok } \psi \neq 0$. Then, the tuple $(\psi, 1_G)$ forms a morphism between the matrix factorizations $(\varphi, \psi) \rightarrow (f \cdot 1_G, 1_G)$. This morphism is a monomorphism, in the sense that it can be cancelled on the left, but it is not admissible since the cokernel of ψ is not a free S -module.

The same is true of epimorphisms, that is, there are epimorphisms that are not admissible. For $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$ with $\text{cok } \psi \neq 0$, the tuple $(1_F, \psi)$ forms a morphism between the matrix factorizations $(f \cdot 1_F, 1_F) \rightarrow (\varphi, \psi)$. If $(a, b) \circ (1_F, \psi) = (a', b') \circ (1_F, \psi)$ for some morphisms $(a, b), (a', b')$, then $a = a'$ and $b\psi = b'\psi$. We can pre-compose both sides of the second equation with φ to get $b \cdot f = b' \cdot f$, hence $b = b'$. So, $(1_F, \psi)$ can be cancelled on the right but is not admissible epimorphism since ψ is not surjective.

Actually, further inspection of these examples shows they are both monomorphisms and both epimorphisms but neither is admissible of either type. In particular, neither is an isomorphism. In Abelian category, a monomorphism which is also an epimorphism must be an isomorphism. Similar examples can be constructed for all $d > 2$ and therefore we note that the category $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is not Abelian for any $d \geq 2$.

Proposition 2.5. *The collection \mathcal{E}_d of short exact sequences of matrix factorizations in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ satisfies the axioms [E2] and [E2^{op}].*

Proof. We will show that [E2] holds. The proof that [E2^{op}] is satisfied is similar. Suppose we have a diagram in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{q} & Y \\ & \downarrow \beta & \\ & X' & \end{array}$$

where $Y = (\psi_1 : G_2 \rightarrow G_1, \dots, \psi_d : G_1 \rightarrow G_d)$, $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d)$, and $q = (q_1, \dots, q_d)$. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. We may take the push-out of the injection q_k and the map β_k which yields the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_k & \xrightarrow{q_k} & G_k & \longrightarrow & \text{cok } q_k \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \beta_k & & \downarrow p_k & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F'_k & \xrightarrow{\alpha_k} & P_k & \longrightarrow & \text{cok } q_k \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

We make the following observations from this diagram: Since the morphism q is an admissible monomorphism, the map q_k is a split injection. Hence, $\text{cok } q_k$ is a free S -module. It follows that the bottom sequence also splits and so P_k is free with $\text{rank}_S P_k = \text{rank}_S F'_k + \text{rank}_S G_k - \text{rank}_S F_k$. This also implies that α_k is a split injection. Since k was arbitrary, this yields d free S -modules P_1, P_2, \dots, P_d , each of the same rank, and d -tuples $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ and $p = (p_1, \dots, p_d)$.

Next, let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_k & \xrightarrow{q_k} & G_k \\ \downarrow \beta_k & & \downarrow p_k \\ F'_k & \xrightarrow{\alpha_k} & P_k \end{array} \begin{array}{l} \searrow p_{k-1}\psi_{k-1} \\ \searrow \chi_{k-1} \\ \searrow \alpha_{k-1}\varphi'_{k-1} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \\ \\ P_{k-1} \end{array}$$

There is a unique homomorphism $\chi_{k-1} : P_k \rightarrow P_{k-1}$ depicted above since

$$p_{k-1}\psi_{k-1}q_k = p_{k-1}q_{k-1}\varphi_{k-1} = \alpha_{k-1}\beta_{k-1}\varphi_{k-1} = \alpha_{k-1}\varphi'_{k-1}\beta_k.$$

In particular, the map χ_{k-1} is given by

$$\chi_{k-1}(\overline{(a_k', b_k)}) = \alpha_{k-1}\varphi'_{k-1}(a_k) + p_{k-1}\psi_{k-1}(b_k) = \overline{(\varphi'_{k-1}(a_k), \psi_{k-1}(b_k))} \in P_{k-1},$$

for any $(a_k, b_k) \in F'_k \oplus G_k$. In other words, χ_{k-1} is the map induced by the direct sum $\varphi'_{k-1} \oplus \psi_{k-1}$ on the quotients $P_k \rightarrow P_{k-1}$. These maps link together to form a sequence of compositions

$$P_1 \xrightarrow{\chi_d} P_d \xrightarrow{\chi_{d-1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\chi_2} P_2 \xrightarrow{\chi_1} P_1.$$

From the explicit description of χ_k we have that $\chi_1 \chi_2 \cdots \chi_d = f \cdot 1_{P_1}$. Since the free S -modules P_1, \dots, P_d are all of the same rank, it follows that $Y' = (\chi_1 : P_2 \rightarrow P_1, \dots, \chi_d : P_1 \rightarrow P_d)$ is a matrix factorization of f .

It is not hard to see that $\alpha : X' \rightarrow Y'$ and $p : Y \rightarrow Y'$ form morphisms of matrix factorizations and that these morphisms render (2.1) a commutative square. As we showed above, the map α_k is a split injection for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Hence, α is an admissible monomorphism by Lemma 2.3. To finish the proof, it suffices to check the necessary universal property which we omit as it is a straightforward computation. □

Corollary 2.6. *The pair $(\text{MF}_S^d(f), \mathcal{E}_d)$ is an exact category.* □

With the exact structure on $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ fixed, we will often omit reference to \mathcal{E}_d . We proceed now with the main goal of this section: to show that the exact category $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is a Frobenius category. First, we recall the necessary definitions which can also be found in [Bü10].

An object in an exact category $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ is called *projective*, respectively *injective*, if it satisfies the usual lifting property with respect to admissible epimorphisms, respectively admissible monomorphisms. The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ is said to have *enough projectives* if for every object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, there is an admissible epimorphism $P \twoheadrightarrow X$ with P projective. Dually, $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ has *enough injectives* if for every object $X \in \mathcal{A}$, there is an admissible monomorphism $X \hookrightarrow I$ with I injective. The exact category $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{E})$ is said to be a *Frobenius category* if it has enough projectives, enough injectives, and the classes of projective objects and injective objects coincide.

Definition 2.7. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, let \mathcal{P}_i denote the matrix factorization of size 1 whose i th component is multiplication by f on S while the rest are the identity on S . In other words, \mathcal{P}_i is given by the composition

$$S_1 \xrightarrow{1} S_d \xrightarrow{1} \cdots \xrightarrow{1} S_{i+1} \xrightarrow{f} S_i \xrightarrow{1} \cdots \xrightarrow{1} S_2 \xrightarrow{1} S_1$$

where $S_k = S$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. We also set $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \mathcal{P}_i$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Then, X is projective (respectively injective) if and only if $T^j(X)$ is projective (respectively injective).*

Proof. Suppose X is projective and $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : X' \rightarrow X''$ be an admissible morphism and let $p = (p_1, \dots, p_d) : T^j(X) \rightarrow X''$ be any morphism. Then, we have morphisms $T^{-j}(\alpha) : T^{-j}(X') \rightarrow T^{-j}(X'')$ and $T^{-j}(p) : X \rightarrow T^{-j}(X'')$. The characterization of admissible epimorphisms in Lemma 2.3 implies that $T^{-j}(\alpha)$ is also an admissible epimorphism. Since X is projective, there exists $q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d) : X \rightarrow T^{-j}(X')$ such that $T^{-j}(\alpha)q = T^{-j}(p)$. Applying T^j we find that $\alpha T^j(q) = p$ implying that $T^j(X)$ is projective. The proof of the converse and both directions regarding injectivity are similar. □

Lemma 2.9. *The matrix factorizations $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_d$ are both projective and injective in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$.*

Proof. Directly from the definition we see that $T^j(\mathcal{P}_i) = \mathcal{P}_{i-j}$ for any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Therefore, because of Lemma 2.8, it suffices to show that \mathcal{P}_1 is both projective and injective. We shall start by showing that \mathcal{P}_1 is projective.

Suppose $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : X \rightarrow X''$ is an admissible epimorphism and $p = (p_1, \dots, p_d) : \mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow X''$ is an arbitrary morphism. We would like to complete the diagram

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathcal{P}_1 \\ & \swarrow q & \downarrow p \\ X & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X'' \end{array}$$

One component of this diagram is the following diagram of free S -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & S \\ & \swarrow q_1 & \downarrow p_1 \\ F_1 & \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} & F_1'' \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Since S is free and α_1 is surjective, there exists a map $q_1 : S \rightarrow F_1$ such that $\alpha_1 q_1 = p_1$. We can use this map to construct a morphism of matrix factorizations $\mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow X$ which makes (2.2) commute. Let $q = (q_1, \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_d q_1, \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_d q_1, \dots, \varphi_d q_1)$. The fact that q forms a morphism $\mathcal{P}_1 \rightarrow X$ can be seen in the following diagram of S -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} S & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{f} & S \\ \downarrow q_1 & & \downarrow \varphi_d q_1 & & & & \downarrow \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_d q_1 & & \downarrow \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_d q_1 & & \downarrow q_1 \\ F_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} & F_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d-1}} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\varphi_3} & F_3 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & F_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & F_1. \end{array}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha q &= (\alpha_1 q_1, \alpha_2 \varphi_2 \cdots \varphi_d q_1, \dots, \alpha_d \varphi_d q_1) \\ &= (p_1, \varphi_2'' \cdots \varphi_d'' \alpha_1 q_1, \dots, \varphi_d'' \alpha_1 q_1) \\ &= (p_1, \varphi_2'' \cdots \varphi_d'' p_1, \dots, \varphi_d'' p_1) \\ &= (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d) \\ &= p \end{aligned}$$

which implies that \mathcal{P}_1 is projective.

In order to show that \mathcal{P}_1 is an injective matrix factorization, let $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) : X' \rightarrow X$ be an admissible monomorphism and $a = (a_1, \dots, a_d) : X' \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1$ be an arbitrary morphism. We would like to complete the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X' & \xrightarrow{\beta} & X \\ \downarrow a & \swarrow b & \\ \mathcal{P}_1 & & \end{array}$$

Since β is an admissible monomorphism, each component β_k is split. In particular, there exists a map $t : F_2' \rightarrow F_2$ such that $t\beta_2 = 1_{F_2}$. This splitting allows us to build the morphism

$$b = (a_2 t \varphi_2' \cdots \varphi_d', a_2 t, a_2 t \varphi_2', \dots, a_2 t \varphi_2' \cdots \varphi_{d-1}') : X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1$$

and this morphism satisfies $b\beta = a$. □

In Lemma 5.10, we will see that $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_d$ are the only indecomposable projective (respectively injective) matrix factorizations up to isomorphism.

The next step is to show that $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ has enough projectives and enough injectives. Along the way, we construct the syzygy and cosyzygy of a matrix factorization and give explicit formulas for each.

Remark 2.10. Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. By tensoring with $R = S/(f)$, which we denote here by $\bar{\square} = \square \otimes_S R$, one can associate to X an infinite chain of free R -modules:

$$\dots \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_2} \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_1} \bar{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_d} \bar{F}_d \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_{d-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_2} \bar{F}_2 \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_1} \bar{F}_1 \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}_d} \dots$$

In the case $d = 2$, this chain is acyclic and, by truncating appropriately, it forms a free resolution over R of $\text{cok } \varphi_1$ (or of $\text{cok } \varphi_2$). However, if $d > 2$, this chain is not acyclic. In fact, it is not even a complex. Instead, it is precisely an *acyclic d -complex* (see [IKM17]). With this perspective in mind, it is likely that the formulas given below can be obtained as lifted versions of the ones found in [IKM17, Section 2]. We give explicit constructions without referencing any such lifting.

Construction 2.11. Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ be of size n . We construct short exact sequences

$$K \twoheadrightarrow P \twoheadrightarrow X \quad \text{and} \quad X \twoheadrightarrow I \twoheadrightarrow K'$$

with P projective and I injective and give explicit formula for the resulting syzygy and the cosyzygy of X .

To start, set $\widehat{F}_k = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{d-1} F_{k+i}$. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, define S -homomorphisms $D_k : F_{k+1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+1} \rightarrow F_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k$ and $D'_k : F_{k+1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+1} \rightarrow F_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k$ by

$$D_k(a_{k+1}, a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k) = (fa_k, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_{k-1})$$

and

$$D'_k(a_{k+1}, a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k) = (a_k, fa_{k+1}, a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{k-1})$$

for all $a_i \in F_i, i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Set $P(X) = (D_1, D_2, \dots, D_d)$ and $I(X) = (D'_1, D'_2, \dots, D'_d)$. Then, the d -tuples $P(X)$ and $I(X)$ form matrix factorizations of f both isomorphic to $\bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathcal{P}_i^n$.

For each $i, k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, define a homomorphism $\theta_{ki}^X : F_i \rightarrow F_k$ given by

$$\theta_{ki}^X = \begin{cases} 1_{F_k} & i = k \\ \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{i-2} \varphi_{i-1} & i \neq k. \end{cases}$$

Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, define $\Theta_k^X : \widehat{F}_k \rightarrow F_k$ and $\Xi_k^X : F_k \rightarrow \widehat{F}_k$ by

$$\Theta_k^X(a_{k+1}, a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{k-1}) = \sum_{i \neq k} \theta_{ki}^X(a_i)$$

and

$$\Xi_k^X(a_k) = \left(\theta_{(k+1)k}^X(a_k), \theta_{(k+2)k}^X(a_k), \dots, \theta_{(k-1)k}^X(a_k) \right).$$

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and consider the following diagram:

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{k+1}^X} & F_{k+1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\rho_{k+1}^X} & F_{k+1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \Omega_k & & \downarrow D_k & & \downarrow \varphi_k \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \widehat{F}_k & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_k^X} & F_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k & \xrightarrow{\rho_k^X} & F_k \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

where $\rho_k^X = (1_{F_k} \quad \Theta_k^X)$ and $\epsilon_k^X = \begin{pmatrix} -\Theta_k^X \\ 1_{\widehat{F}_k} \end{pmatrix}$. The rows are split exact sequences of free S -modules and one can check that right most square commutes by recalling that $\varphi_k \theta_{(k+1)i} = \theta_{ki}$ for $i \neq k$ and $\varphi_k \theta_{(k+1)k} = f \cdot 1_{F_k}$. Thus, there is an induced map $\Omega_k : \widehat{F}_{k+1} \rightarrow \widehat{F}_k$ as depicted. Since the rows are

split, Ω_k can be computed by using the splitting, that is, $\Omega_k = \pi_k D_k \epsilon_{k+1}$ where $\pi_k : F_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k \rightarrow \widehat{F}_k$ is projection onto \widehat{F}_k . In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_k(a_{k+2}, a_{k+3}, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k) &= \pi_k D_k \epsilon_{k+1}(a_{k+2}, a_{k+3}, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k) \\ &= \pi_k D_k \left(- \sum_{i \neq k+1} \theta_{(k+1)i}(a_i), a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k \right) \\ &= \pi_k \left(f a_k, - \sum_{i \neq k+1} \theta_{(k+1)i}(a_i), a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{k-1} \right) \\ &= \left(- \sum_{i \neq k+1} \theta_{(k+1)i}(a_i), a_{k+2}, \dots, a_{k-1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and therefore we can represent the components of Ω_k as

$$\Omega_k = \begin{pmatrix} -\theta_{(k+1)(k+2)} & -\theta_{(k+1)(k+3)} & -\theta_{(k+1)(k+4)} & \cdots & -\theta_{(k+1)(k-1)} & -\theta_{(k+1)(k)} \\ 1_{F_{k+2}} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{F_{k+3}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & 1_{F_{k+4}} & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1_{F_{k-1}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since k was arbitrary, we have a d -tuple $(\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_d)$ which has the property that

$$\Omega_1 \Omega_2 \cdots \Omega_d = \pi_1 D_1 D_2 \cdots D_d \epsilon_1 = f \pi_1 \epsilon_1 = f \cdot 1_{\widehat{F}_1}.$$

Since the free S -modules $\widehat{F}_1, \widehat{F}_2, \dots, \widehat{F}_d$ are all of the same rank, it follows that $(\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. We denote this matrix factorization by $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ and refer to it as the *syzygy* of X . Combining the diagrams (2.3) for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ we have a short exact sequence

$$(2.4) \quad \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) \xrightarrow{\epsilon} P(X) \xrightarrow{\rho} X$$

where $\rho = (\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_d)$ and $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_d)$.

Similarly, we have a matrix factorization $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X) = (\Omega_1^-, \Omega_2^-, \dots, \Omega_d^-)$, the *cosyzygy* of X , and a short exact sequence of matrix factorizations induced by the commutative diagrams

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{k+1}^X} & F_{k+1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{k+1}^X} & \widehat{F}_{k+1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \varphi_k & & \downarrow D'_k & & \downarrow \Omega_k^- \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_k & \xrightarrow{\lambda_k^X} & F_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k & \xrightarrow{\eta_k^X} & \widehat{F}_k \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, where $\eta_k^X = \begin{pmatrix} -\Xi_k^X & 1_{\widehat{F}_k} \end{pmatrix}$, $\lambda_k^X = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{F_k} \\ \Xi_k^X \end{pmatrix}$. The induced short exact sequence is

$$(2.6) \quad X \xrightarrow{\lambda} I(X) \xrightarrow{\eta} \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X),$$

where $\eta = (\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_d)$ and $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_d)$. Finally, we can represent the components of Ω_k^- by

$$\Omega_k^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -\theta_{(k+1)k} \\ 1_{F_{k+2}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & -\theta_{(k+2)k} \\ 0 & 1_{F_{k+3}} & \ddots & 0 & 0 & -\theta_{(k+3)k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1_{F_{k-2}} & 0 & -\theta_{(k-2)k} \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1_{F_{k-1}} & -\theta_{(k-1)k} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Example 2.12. Let $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$. Then,

$$\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}(\varphi, \psi) = (-\psi, -\varphi) \cong (\psi, \varphi)$$

and

$$\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}^-(\varphi, \psi) = (-\psi, -\varphi) \cong (\psi, \varphi).$$

In particular, both $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}(-)$ and $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}^-(-)$ are isomorphic to the shift functor when $d = 2$. In this case, (φ, ψ) is reduced if and only if $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}(\varphi, \psi)$ (respectively $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}^-(\varphi, \psi)$) is reduced. However, for $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ with $d > 2$, neither $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ nor $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)$ will be reduced. For instance, if $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \varphi_2 : F_3 \rightarrow F_2, \varphi_3 : F_1 \rightarrow F_3) \in \text{MF}_S^3(f)$ is of size n , then

$$\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^3(f)}(X) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} -\varphi_2 & -\varphi_2\varphi_3 \\ 1_{F_3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -\varphi_3 & -\varphi_3\varphi_1 \\ 1_{F_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -\varphi_1 & -\varphi_1\varphi_2 \\ 1_{F_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

and

$$\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^3(f)}^-(X) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\varphi_2\varphi_3 \\ 1_{F_3} & -\varphi_3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\varphi_3\varphi_1 \\ 1_{F_1} & -\varphi_1 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\varphi_1\varphi_2 \\ 1_{F_2} & -\varphi_2 \end{pmatrix} \right)$$

which are of size $2n$.

Another observation that can be made from these formulas is that, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_3$, we have an isomorphism of R -modules

$$\text{cok} \begin{pmatrix} -\varphi_{k+1} & -\varphi_{k+1}\varphi_{k+2} \\ 1_{F_{k+2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cong \text{cok}(\varphi_{k+1}\varphi_{k+2}) \cong \text{syz}_R^1(\text{cok } \varphi_k) \oplus R^{m_k}$$

for some $m_k \geq 0$. A similar statement is true for $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^3(f)}^-(X)$ and more generally we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.13. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ be of size n . Let $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ and $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)$ be the matrix factorizations constructed in 2.11. Then, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$,*

$$\text{cok}(\Omega_k) \cong \text{syz}_R^1(\text{cok } \varphi_k) \oplus R^{m_k} \cong \text{cok}(\Omega_k^-)$$

where $m_k = n - \mu_R(\text{cok } \varphi_k)$.

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. The diagram (2.3) induces the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_k} & \widehat{F}_k & \longrightarrow & \text{cok } \Omega_k \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F_{k+1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{D_k} & F_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k & \longrightarrow & F_k / f F_k \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_k} & F_k & \longrightarrow & \text{cok } \varphi_k \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & 0 & & 0 & & 0
\end{array}$$

with exact rows and columns. The right most column displays $\text{cok } \Omega_k$ as a (not necessarily reduced) syzygy of $\text{cok } \varphi_k$ over R as desired.

Alternatively, we can see from the explicit formulas for Ω_k and Ω_k^- that

$$\text{cok } \Omega_k \cong \text{cok } \theta_{(k+1)k}^X \cong \text{cok } \Omega_k^-.$$

Now, recall that $\theta_{(k+1)k} = \varphi_{k+1}\varphi_{k+2}\cdots\varphi_{k-1}$. Since $(\varphi_k, \theta_{(k+1)k})$ is a matrix factorization with 2 factors, we have that $\text{cok}(\theta_{(k+1)k}) \cong \text{syzy}_R^1(\text{cok } \varphi_k) \oplus R^{m_k}$ for some $m_k \geq 0$. In particular, $m_k = n - \mu_R(\text{cok } \varphi_k)$ by the uniqueness of minimal free resolutions over R . \square

Returning to our original goal, we note that since the matrix factorizations $P(X) \cong I(X) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathcal{P}_i^n$ are projective and injective by Lemma 2.9, the sequences (2.4) and (2.6) imply that $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ has enough projectives and enough injectives. Additionally, we have the following.

Proposition 2.14. *An object $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is projective if and only if it is injective.*

Proof. The matrix factorizations $P(X)$ and $I(X)$ are both projective and injective by Lemma 2.9. Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. If X is projective, (2.4) implies that X is a summand of the injective matrix factorization $P(X)$ and therefore is injective. Conversely, if X is injective, (2.6) implies it is a summand of the projective $I(X)$. \square

We have therefore established our original goal of this section.

Theorem 2.15. *The category $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is a Frobenius category.* \square

For matrix factorizations $X, X' \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$, let $I(X, X')$ denote the set of morphisms X to X' that factor through an injective matrix factorization. The stable category $\underline{\text{MF}}_S^d(f)$ is formed by taking the same objects as $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and morphisms given by the quotient

$$\text{Hom}_{\underline{\text{MF}}_S^d(f)}(X, X') = \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X, X') / I(X, X').$$

A consequence of Theorem 2.15 is that $\underline{\text{MF}}_S^d(f)$ carries the structure of a triangulated category with suspension functor given by $\Omega_{\underline{\text{MF}}_S^d(f)}^-(-)$ [Hap88]. We call a morphism $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) : X \rightarrow X'$ *null-homotopic* if there exist S -homomorphisms $s_j : F_j \rightarrow F'_{j-1}$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, such that

$$\alpha_i = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \theta_{i(i-k)}^{X'} s_{i-k+1} \theta_{(i-k+1)i}^X$$

for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. We denote by $\text{HMF}_S^d(f)$ the *homotopy category of matrix factorizations* which has the same objects as $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and, for any $X, X' \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$, has morphisms

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{HMF}_S^d(f)}(X, X') = \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X, X') / \sim,$$

where \sim is the equivalence relation $\alpha \sim \alpha'$ if and only if $\alpha - \alpha'$ is null-homotopic.

Proposition 2.16. *The stable category $\underline{\text{MF}}_S^d(f)$ and the homotopy category $\text{HMF}_S^d(f)$ coincide.*

Proof. Let $X, X' \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. It suffices to show that a morphism $\alpha : X \rightarrow X'$ is null-homotopic if and only if it factors through the morphism $\lambda^X : X \rightarrow I(X)$. The proof relies on an explicit description of morphisms $I(X) \rightarrow X'$. Indeed, if $\beta : I(X) \rightarrow X'$ is any morphism, then, for any $k, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ with $j \neq 1$, we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} F_{k+j-1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+j-1} & \xrightarrow{D'_{k+j-2}} & F_{k+j-2} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+j-2} & \xrightarrow{D'_{k+j-3}} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{D'_{k+1}} & F_{k+1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{D'_k} & F_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k \\ \downarrow \beta_{k+j-1} & & \downarrow \beta_{k+j-2} & & & & \downarrow \beta_{k+1} & & \downarrow \beta_k \\ F'_{k+j-1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_{k+j-2}} & F'_{k+j-2} & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_{k+j-3}} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_{k+1}} & F'_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi'_k} & F'_k \end{array}$$

Write the components of β_i as

$$\beta_i = [\beta_{ii} \quad \beta_{i(i+1)} \quad \beta_{i(i+2)} \quad \cdots \quad \beta_{i(i-1)}]$$

for some $\beta_{i(i+s)} : F_{i+s} \rightarrow F'_i$. Notice that the maps $D'_k, D'_{k+1}, \dots, D'_{k+j-2}$ are the identity on F_{k+j} . Hence,

$$\beta_{k(k+j)} = \varphi'_k \varphi'_{k+1} \cdots \varphi'_{k+j-2} \beta_{(k+j-1)(k+j)} = \theta_{k(k+j-1)}^{X'} \beta_{(k+j-1)(k+j)}$$

by the commutativity of the outer most rectangle of the diagram above. Therefore,

$$\beta_k = \left[\theta_{k(k-1)}^{X'} \beta_{(k-1)k} \quad \beta_{k(k+1)} \quad \theta_{k(k+1)}^{X'} \beta_{(k+1)(k+2)} \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{k(k-2)}^{X'} \beta_{(k-2)(k-1)} \right].$$

Now, if $\beta : I(X) \rightarrow X'$ is such that $\beta \lambda^X = \alpha$, then

$$\alpha_k = \beta_k \lambda_k^X = - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \theta_{k(k-i)}^{X'} \beta_{(k-i)(k-i+1)} \theta_{(k-i+1)k}^X$$

for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. This says precisely that α is null-homotopic via the maps $\{-\beta_{(j-1)j}\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$.

Conversely, if α is null-homotopic via maps $s_j : F_j \rightarrow F'_{j-1}$, then it is not hard to see that the maps

$$\gamma_k = \left[\theta_{k(k-1)}^{X'} s_k \quad s_{k+1} \quad \theta_{k(k+1)}^{X'} s_{k+2} \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{k(k-1)}^{X'} s_{k-1} \right],$$

for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, form a morphism $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_d) : I(X) \rightarrow X'$ such that $\alpha = \gamma \lambda^X$. \square

To end this section, we give explicit formula for the mapping cone of a morphism. Suppose $\alpha : X \rightarrow X'$ is a morphism in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. The *mapping cone* of α is the matrix factorization $C(\alpha) = (\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_d)$ where

$$\Delta_k = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi'_k & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \alpha_k \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\theta_{(k+1)k}^X \\ 0 & 1_{F_{k+2}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\theta_{(k+2)k}^X \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{F_{k+3}} & \ddots & 0 & -\theta_{(k+3)k}^X \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \cdots & 1_{F_{k-1}} & -\theta_{(k-1)k}^X \end{pmatrix} : F'_{k+1} \oplus \widehat{F}_{k+1} \rightarrow F'_k \oplus \widehat{F}_k$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. The cone of α fits into a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & I(X) & \xrightarrow{\eta^X} & \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X) \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \beta & & \parallel \\ X' & \xrightarrow{q} & C(\alpha) & \xrightarrow{p} & \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X) \end{array}$$

where $p_k = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1_{\widehat{F}_k} \end{pmatrix}$, $q_k = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{F'_k} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and $\beta_k = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_k & 0 \\ -\Xi_k^X & 1_{\widehat{F}_k} \end{pmatrix}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, and $p = (p_1, \dots, p_d)$, $q = (q_1, \dots, q_d)$, and $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d)$.

3. $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ AS A CATEGORY OF MODULES

Let $(S, \mathfrak{n}, \mathbf{k})$ be a regular local ring, f a non-zero non-unit in S , and $d \geq 2$ an integer. In this section, we will show that $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is equivalent to the category of MCM modules over a certain non-commutative S -algebra which is finitely generated and free as an S -module. This extends a result of Solberg [Sol89, Proposition 1.3] for all $d \geq 2$. As a consequence we will conclude that, if S is complete, the Krull-Remak-Schmidt Theorem (KRS) holds in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$.

Recall from Section 2 the projective (equivalently injective) matrix factorizations $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_d$, and their direct sum $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \mathcal{P}_i$. Our first step is to understand the homomorphisms from \mathcal{P}_j to \mathcal{P}_i for any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

Definition 3.1. For $i \neq j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, let $e_{ij} \in \text{Hom}_S(S, S)^d$ denote the d -tuple of homomorphisms such that the $j+1, j+2, \dots, i-1, i$ components are multiplication by f while the rest are the identity on S . For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, let $e_{ii} = 1_{\mathcal{P}_i}$, the identity on \mathcal{P}_i .

For instance, if $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, the i th map in $e_{i(i-1)}$ is multiplication by f and the rest are the identity on S while $e_{(i-1)i}$ is of the form $(f, f, \dots, f, 1, f, \dots, f, f)$, where only the i th component is the identity on S .

Lemma 3.2. For all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, $\text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{P}_i) = S \cdot e_{ij}$. In particular, the morphisms from \mathcal{P}_j to \mathcal{P}_i form a free S -module of rank 1.

Proof. The morphisms from \mathcal{P}_j to \mathcal{P}_i are tuples of the form $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ for some $\alpha_k \in S$. If $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{P}_i)$, then it is easy to see that $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_d$ and so $\text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}_i, \mathcal{P}_i) = S \cdot e_{ii}$. Suppose $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{P}_i)$ where $i \neq j$. Consider the following diagram, which commutes since $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ is a morphism of matrix factorizations:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} \mathcal{P}_j & & \cdots & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{f} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & \cdots \\ \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \alpha_{i+1} & & \downarrow \alpha_i & & & & \downarrow \alpha_{j+1} & & \downarrow \alpha_j & & \\ \mathcal{P}_i & & \cdots & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{f} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & \cdots \end{array}$$

We conclude that $\alpha_{j+1} = \alpha_{j+2} = \dots = \alpha_i$, $\alpha_j = \alpha_{j-1} = \dots = \alpha_{i+1}$, and $\alpha_i = f\alpha_{i+1}$. Thus, each component of the morphism can be rewritten in terms of the element $\alpha_{i+1} \in S$. It follows that $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) = \alpha_{i+1}e_{ij}$, that is, $\text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{P}_i)$ is generated by e_{ij} as an S -module. Since the components of e_{ij} are given by multiplication by non-zero elements of S , a morphism $s \cdot e_{ij} = 0$ if and only if $s = 0$. Hence, $\text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{P}_i)$ is in fact a free S -module of rank 1 for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. \square

Let $\Gamma = \text{End}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P})^{\text{op}}$ where $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathcal{P}_i$. As S -modules, $\Gamma \cong \bigoplus_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \text{Hom}(\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{P}_i)$ and therefore, Lemma 3.2 implies that Γ is a free S -module of rank d^2 . For each pair $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, use the same symbol e_{ij} to denote the image of the generator of $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{P}_i)$ under the natural inclusion

$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{P}_j, \mathcal{P}_i) \rightarrow \Gamma$. The set $\{e_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$ forms a basis for Γ as an S -module. We record the basic rules for multiplication of the basis elements e_{ij} .

Lemma 3.3. *The basis elements $\{e_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$ satisfy the following properties.*

- (i) $e_{ij}e_{pq} \neq 0$ if and only if $i = q$
- (ii) $e_{ii}^2 = e_{ii}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$
- (iii) $\sum_{i=1}^d e_{ii} = 1_\Gamma$
- (iv) $e_{ij}e_{ii} = e_{ij}$ and $e_{jj}e_{ij} = e_{ij}$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$
- (v) $e_{i(i-1)}e_{ji} = \begin{cases} fe_{(i-1)(i-1)} & \text{if } j = i - 1 \\ e_{j(i-1)} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- (vi) $e_{ij}e_{(i+1)i} = \begin{cases} fe_{(i+1)(i+1)} & j = i + 1 \\ e_{(i+1)j} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
- (vii) $\sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-1)}e_{jj} = e_{j(j-1)} = e_{(j-1)(j-1)} \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-1)}$ for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$

□

The element $\sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-1)} \in \Gamma$ is of particular interest because of the following.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $z = \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-1)}$ and $s \geq 1$ an integer. Write $s = dq + r$ for $q \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r < d$. Then,*

$$z^s = f^q \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-r)}.$$

In particular, $z^d = f \cdot 1_\Gamma$.

Proof. If $s = 1$ there is nothing to prove. Assume the formula holds for $s \geq 1$ and consider z^{s+1} . By induction,

$$z^{s+1} = z \cdot f^q \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-r)}$$

where $s = dq + r$, $q \geq 0$, and $0 \leq r < d$. If $r = d - 1$, then, by Lemma 3.3,

$$z \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-r)} = \sum_{i=1}^d e_{(i+1)i}e_{i(i+1)} = f \cdot 1_\Gamma.$$

Since $s = dq + d - 1$, we have that $s + 1 = d(q + 1)$. Hence,

$$z^{s+1} = f^{q+1} \sum_{i=1}^d e_{ii}$$

as needed. If $0 \leq r < d - 1$, then

$$z \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-r)} = \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-r-1)}$$

also by Lemma 3.3. In this case,

$$z^{s+1} = f^q \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-(r+1))}$$

which completes the induction since $s + 1 = dq + (r + 1)$ with $0 \leq r + 1 < d$.

□

Lemma 3.5. *If $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ with $i \neq j$, then e_{ij} can be written as a product of basis elements of the form $e_{\ell(\ell-1)}$. In particular, $e_{ij} = e_{(j+1)j}e_{(j+2)(j+1)} \cdots e_{(i-1)(i-2)}e_{i(i-1)}$.*

Proof. Let $i \neq j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Lemma 3.3 (vi) implies that, for any $\ell \neq j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, the element $e_{\ell(\ell-1)}$ can be factored out of $e_{\ell j}$ on the right

$$e_{\ell j} = e_{(\ell-1)j}e_{\ell(\ell-1)}.$$

Since $i \neq j$, we may apply this equality for $\ell = i, i-1, \dots, j+2, j+1$ which gives us the factorization

$$\begin{aligned} e_{ij} &= e_{(i-1)j}e_{i(i-1)} \\ &= e_{(i-2)j}e_{(i-1)(i-2)}e_{i(i-1)} \\ &= \cdots \\ &= e_{(j+1)j}e_{(j+2)(j+1)} \cdots e_{(i-1)(i-2)}e_{i(i-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Let $\text{MCM}(\Gamma)$ denote the full subcategory of finitely generated left Γ -modules which are free when viewed as S -modules via the inclusion $S \cdot 1_\Gamma \subset \Gamma$. The rest of this section is dedicated to proving the following.

Theorem 3.6. *The categories $\text{MCM}(\Gamma)$ and $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ are equivalent. In particular, if S is complete, the Krull-Remak-Schmidt Theorem holds in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$.*

If S is complete, it is known that the Krull-Remak-Schmidt Theorem holds in the category $\text{MCM}(\Gamma)$ (for example see [Aus86]). So, establishing the equivalence is the main concern (which does not require S to be complete). We start by defining a functor $\mathcal{H} : \text{MCM}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ using the element $z = \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-1)} \in \Gamma$. Let M be a Γ -module in $\text{MCM}(\Gamma)$. Lemma 3.3 (i)-(iii) show that e_{11}, \dots, e_{dd} are orthogonal idempotents such that $e_{11} + e_{22} + \cdots + e_{dd} = 1_\Gamma$. Thus, M decomposes, as an S -module, into

$$M = e_{11}M \oplus \cdots \oplus e_{dd}M.$$

Since $M \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$, each summand $e_{ii}M$ is a free S -module. Lemma 3.3 (vii) shows that left multiplication by $z \in \Gamma$ defines an S -homomorphism between free S -modules $z : e_{ii}M \rightarrow e_{(i-1)(i-1)}M$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $M \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$. The d -tuple of S -homomorphisms*

$$(z : e_{22}M \rightarrow e_{11}M, z : e_{33}M \rightarrow e_{22}M \dots, z : e_{11}M \rightarrow e_{dd}M)$$

forms a matrix factorization of f in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$, where each map is multiplication by $z = \sum_{i=1}^d e_{i(i-1)} \in \Gamma$.

Proof. In light of Lemma 3.4, the only piece that needs justification is that each of the free S -modules involved are of the same rank. To see this, let $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. The composition

$$e_{ii}M \xrightarrow{z^{d-1}} e_{(i+1)(i+1)}M \xrightarrow{z} e_{ii}M$$

is f times the identity on $e_{ii}M$. Since $e_{ii}M$ and $e_{(i+1)(i+1)}M$ are free over S , Lemma 1.7 implies that $\text{rank}_S(e_{ii}M) = \text{rank}_S(e_{(i+1)(i+1)}M)$. □

Following Proposition 3.7, the functor \mathcal{H} is defined as follows: $\mathcal{H}(M) = (z : e_{22}M \rightarrow e_{11}M, \dots, z : e_{11}M \rightarrow e_{dd}M)$ for any $M \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$ and, for a homomorphism $h : M \rightarrow N$ in $\text{MCM}(\Gamma)$, define $\mathcal{H}(h) = (h|_{e_{11}M}, \dots, h|_{e_{dd}M})$, where $h|_{e_{ii}M}$ denotes the restriction of h to the S -direct summand $e_{ii}M$. Since h is a Γ -homomorphism, $h|_{e_{ii}M}$ maps $e_{ii}M$ into $e_{ii}N$. Since multiplication by an element of Γ commutes with any Γ -homomorphism, this d -tuple forms a morphism between the matrix factorizations $\mathcal{H}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(N)$. At this point we can prove that \mathcal{H} is both full and faithful.

Proposition 3.8. *The functor $\mathcal{H} : \text{MCM}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is full and faithful.*

Proof. Let $M, N \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$. If $\mathcal{H}(h) = 0$ for some Γ -homomorphism $h : M \rightarrow N$, then $h|_{e_{ii}M} = 0$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. But this means that $h = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} h|_{e_{ii}M} = 0$ implying that \mathcal{H} is faithful.

In order to show that \mathcal{H} is full, let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : \mathcal{H}(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(N)$ be a morphism of matrix factorizations. So, $\alpha_i : e_{ii}M \rightarrow e_{ii}N$ and we have a commutative diagram

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} e_{ii}M & \xrightarrow{z} & e_{(i-1)(i-1)}M \\ \downarrow \alpha_i & & \downarrow \alpha_{i-1} \\ e_{ii}N & \xrightarrow{z} & e_{(i-1)(i-1)}N \end{array}$$

for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Let $h = \bigoplus_{j=1}^d \alpha_j : M \rightarrow N$ be the S -homomorphism given by $h(m) = \alpha_1(e_{11}m) + \alpha_2(e_{22}m) + \dots + \alpha_d(e_{dd}m)$ for all $m \in M$. We claim that h is in fact a Γ -homomorphism and furthermore, $\mathcal{H}(h) = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$. The second claim follows from the first and the definition of \mathcal{H} and so our aim is to show that h is a homomorphism of Γ -modules. Since h is an S -homomorphism and Γ is a finitely generated free S -module with basis $\{e_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$, we would be done if we showed that $e_{ij}h(m) = h(e_{ij}m)$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and $m \in M$. By Lemma 3.5, it suffices to show that the elements of the form $e_{k(k-1)}$ pass through h since each e_{ij} is a product of elements of this form.

Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and $m \in M$. By Lemma 3.3(vii), multiplication by z on $e_{ii}M$ (respectively on $e_{ii}N$) coincides with multiplication by the element $e_{i(i-1)} \in \Gamma$. Therefore, the diagram (3.1) implies that

$$\alpha_{i-1}(e_{i(i-1)}e_{ii}m) = e_{i(i-1)}\alpha_i(e_{ii}m).$$

Since $e_{i(i-1)}e_{ii}m \in e_{(i-1)(i-1)}M$, the term on the left hand side is precisely $h(e_{i(i-1)}m)$. On the other hand, since $e_{ii}h(m) = \alpha_i(e_{ii}m)$,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{i(i-1)}h(m) &= e_{i(i-1)}e_{ii}h(m) \\ &= e_{i(i-1)}\alpha_i(e_{ii}m). \end{aligned}$$

Together, we have that $e_{i(i-1)}h(m) = h(e_{i(i-1)}m)$ as desired. Thus, h is a Γ -homomorphism and \mathcal{H} is full. \square

To show that \mathcal{H} is dense, we define a functor $\mathcal{F} : \text{MF}_S^d(f) \rightarrow \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$ which is given by $\mathcal{F}(\square) = \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}, \square)$, where $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathcal{P}_i$. For a matrix factorization $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$, $\mathcal{F}(X)$ is a left Γ -module by pre-composing any morphism $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow X$ with an element of Γ . In order to show that the image of \mathcal{F} does indeed land in $\text{MCM}(\Gamma)$, we must show that $\mathcal{F}(X)$ is a free S -module. This requires an explicit description of the morphisms $\mathcal{P} \rightarrow X$.

Recall that \mathcal{P}_i is the matrix factorization whose i th component is multiplication by f on S while the rest are the identity on S . For $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, let $D_k : S^d \rightarrow S^d$ be given by $D_k(a_1, \dots, a_d) = (a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, f a_k, a_{k+1}, \dots, a_d)$ for any $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \in S^d$. Then, $\mathcal{P} = (D_1 : S^d \rightarrow S^d, D_2 : S^d \rightarrow S^d, \dots, D_d : S^d \rightarrow S^d)$.

Lemma 3.9. *Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and let $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathcal{F}(X) = \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}, X)$. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, we may write $\alpha_k = [\alpha_{k1} \ \alpha_{k2} \ \dots \ \alpha_{kd}]$ for some $\alpha_{ki} \in \text{Hom}_S(S, F_k)$. Then, for any $j \neq 0 \in \mathbb{Z}_d$,*

$$\alpha_{k(k+j)} = \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \dots \varphi_{k+j-1} \alpha_{(k+j)(k+j)}.$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Lemma 2.16, the formula follows from the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} S^d & \xrightarrow{D_{k+j-1}} & S^d & \xrightarrow{D_{k+j-2}} & \dots & \xrightarrow{D_{k+1}} & S^d & \xrightarrow{D_k} & S^d \\ \alpha_{k+j} \downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_{k+j-1} & & & & \downarrow \alpha_{k+1} & & \downarrow \alpha_k \\ F_{k+j} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{k+j-1}} & F_{k+j-1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{k+j-2}} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{k+1}} & F_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_k} & F_k. \end{array}$$

The commutativity of the outermost rectangle gives us that $\alpha_k D_k D_{k+1} \cdots D_{k+j-1} = \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{k+j-1} \alpha_{k+j}$. Since $j \neq 0$, the composition $D_k D_{k+1} \cdots D_{k+j-1}$ is the identity on the $(k+j)$ th component of S^d . Therefore, if we compare the $(k+j)$ th components of the homomorphisms on either side of the above equality, we find that $\alpha_{k(k+j)} = \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{k+j-1} \alpha_{(k+j)(k+j)}$ as desired. \square

Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ be a matrix factorization. Recall from Section 2, the homomorphisms $\theta_{ki}^X : F_i \rightarrow F_k$, $i, k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, which are given by

$$\theta_{ki}^X = \begin{cases} 1_{F_k} & i = k \\ \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{i-2} \varphi_{i-1} & i \neq k. \end{cases}$$

For each $(g_1, \dots, g_d) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^d F_i$, we associate a d -tuple of S -homomorphisms

$$\theta^X(g_1, \dots, g_d) := ([\theta_{k1}^X g_1 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kd}^X g_d])_{k=1}^d.$$

Here $\theta_{ki}^X g_i$ is being identified with its image in $\text{Hom}_S(S, F_k)$ under the natural isomorphism $F_k \cong \text{Hom}_S(S, F_k)$. When X is clear from context, we will omit the superscripts.

Lemma 3.10. *Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then, $\theta(g_1, \dots, g_d) \in \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}, X)$ for any $(g_1, \dots, g_d) \in \bigoplus_{i=1}^d F_i$. Furthermore, the map $\theta : \bigoplus_{i=1}^d F_i \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}, X)$ is an isomorphism of S -modules.*

Proof. First, we show that $\theta(g_1, \dots, g_d)$ as defined is in fact a morphism of matrix factorizations between \mathcal{P} and X . What needs to be shown is the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S^d & \xrightarrow{D_k} & S^d \\ \left[\theta_{(k+1)1} g_1 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{(k+1)d} g_d \right] \downarrow & & \downarrow \left[\theta_{k1} g_1 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kd} g_d \right] \\ F_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_k} & F_k \end{array}$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Notice that $\varphi_k \theta_{(k+1)k} = \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \varphi_{k+2} \cdots \varphi_{k-1} = f \cdot 1_{F_k} = f \theta_{kk}$ and $\varphi_k \theta_{(k+1)i} = \theta_{ki}$ for all $i \neq k$. Therefore, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k [\theta_{(k+1)1} g_1 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{(k+1)d} g_d] &= [\theta_{k1} g_1 \quad \cdots \quad f \theta_{kk} g_k \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kd} g_d] \\ &= [\theta_{k1} g_1 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kk} g_k \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kd} g_d] D_k \end{aligned}$$

which implies the commutativity of the diagram as desired.

In order to show θ is an S -module isomorphism, let $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}, X)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, and denote the components of $\alpha_k = [\alpha_{k1} \quad \cdots \quad \alpha_{kd}] \in \text{Hom}_S(S^d, F_k)$ as above. By Lemma 3.9, $\alpha_{k(k+j)} = \theta_{k(k+j)} \alpha_{(k+j)(k+j)}$ for each $j \neq 0$. Hence, $\alpha_k = [\theta_{k1} \alpha_{11} \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kd} \alpha_{dd}]$. It follows that the morphism $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ depends only on the diagonal components $\alpha_{11}, \alpha_{22}, \dots, \alpha_{dd}$. In particular, the tuple $(\alpha_{11}, \dots, \alpha_{dd}) \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^d F_j$ is a pre-image for $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d)$ under the map θ . Finally, θ is injective since k th component of $[\theta_{k1} g_1 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kk} g_k \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kd} g_d]$ is $\theta_{kk} g_k = g_k$. \square

Corollary 3.11. *For any $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ of size n , the Γ -module $\mathcal{F}(X) = \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}, X)$ is a free S -module of rank dn . In particular, $\mathcal{F}(X) \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$. \square*

Consider how the elements $e_{ii} \in \Gamma$ act on a morphism $\alpha : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow X$. From the Lemma 3.10, we may write $\alpha_k = [\theta_{k1} g_1 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{kd} g_d]$ for some $(g_1, \dots, g_d) \in \bigoplus_{j=1}^d F_j$. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, we write $e_{ii} = (\epsilon_{ii}^1, \dots, \epsilon_{ii}^d)$ where $\epsilon_{ii}^k(a_1, \dots, a_d) = (0, \dots, 0, a_i, 0, \dots, 0)$ for any $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \in S^d$. It follows that $\alpha_k \circ \epsilon_{ii}^k = [0 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{ki} g_i \quad \cdots \quad 0]$ where the only nonzero entry is in the i th position. Hence, $e_{ii} \cdot \alpha = ([0 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{ki} g_i \quad \cdots \quad 0])_{k=1}^d \in e_{ii} \mathcal{F}(X)$ and in fact this is the form of every element of $e_{ii} \mathcal{F}(X)$:

$$e_{ii} \mathcal{F}(X) = \left\{ ([0 \quad \cdots \quad \theta_{ki} g_i \quad \cdots \quad 0])_{k=1}^d \mid g_i \in F_i \right\}.$$

Proposition 3.12. *Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then, $(\theta|_{F_1}, \dots, \theta|_{F_d}) : X \rightarrow \mathcal{HF}(X)$ is an isomorphism of matrix factorizations.*

Proof. First notice that for any $g_i \in F_i$,

$$\theta|_{F_i}(g_i) = \theta(0, \dots, 0, g_i, 0, \dots, 0) = ([0 \ \cdots \ \theta_{ki}g_i \ \cdots \ 0])_{k=1}^d \in e_{ii}\mathcal{F}(X).$$

The restriction of θ is still injective and the preceding paragraph explains why θ restricted to F_i is surjective. Therefore, it is enough to show the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} & F_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d-1}} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & F_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & F_1 \\ \downarrow \theta|_{F_1} & & \downarrow \theta|_{F_d} & & & & \downarrow \theta|_{F_2} & & \downarrow \theta|_{F_1} \\ e_{11}\mathcal{F}(X) & \xrightarrow{z} & e_{dd}\mathcal{F}(X) & \xrightarrow{z} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{z} & e_{22}\mathcal{F}(X) & \xrightarrow{z} & e_{11}\mathcal{F}(X). \end{array}$$

Let $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and $g_{i+1} \in F_{i+1}$. Then, $\theta|_{F_i}\varphi_i(g_{i+1}) = ([0 \ \cdots \ \theta_{ki}\varphi_i(g_{i+1}) \ \cdots \ 0])_{k=1}^d$ and

$$\theta_{ki}\varphi_i(g_{i+1}) = \begin{cases} fg_{i+1} & k = i + 1 \\ \varphi_k\varphi_{k+1}\cdots\varphi_{i-1}\varphi_i(g_{i+1}) & k \neq i + 1. \end{cases}$$

To compute the other composition, recall that $z \cdot e_{(i+1)(i+1)}\alpha = e_{(i+1)i}\alpha$ for any $\alpha \in \mathcal{F}(X)$. Write $e_{(i+1)i} = (\epsilon_{(i+1)i}^1, \epsilon_{(i+1)i}^2, \dots, \epsilon_{(i+1)i}^d)$ where $\epsilon_{(i+1)i}^k : S^d \rightarrow S^d$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. It suffices to compute the composition of S -homomorphisms $S^d \rightarrow F_k$

$$\left([0 \ \cdots \ \theta_{k(i+1)}(g_i) \ \cdots \ 0] \circ \epsilon_{(i+1)i}^k\right)(a_1, \dots, a_d),$$

for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_d) \in S^d$. We have that

$$\epsilon_{(i+1)i}^k(a_1, \dots, a_d) = \begin{cases} (0, \dots, fa_i, \dots, 0) & k = i + 1 \\ (0, \dots, a_i, \dots, 0) & k \neq i + 1 \end{cases}$$

where the non-zero entries are in the $(i+1)$ st position. Thus, the composition above is equal to $a_i\theta_{k(i+1)}(g_i)$ when $k \neq i+1$ and $fa_i g_i$ when $k = i+1$. Comparing this with the components of $\theta|_{F_i}\varphi_i(g_{i+1})$ we conclude that $z \circ \theta|_{F_{i+1}}(g_{i+1}) = \theta|_{F_i} \circ \varphi_i(g_{i+1})$. Hence, $(\theta|_{F_1}, \dots, \theta|_{F_d}) : X \rightarrow \mathcal{HF}(X)$ is an isomorphism of matrix factorizations. \square

As a consequence of Proposition 3.12, the functor \mathcal{H} is also dense. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.6. It is also worth mentioning that the analogous statement for the composition \mathcal{FH} is true, that is, $\mathcal{FH}(M) \cong M$ for any $M \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$. This follows from observing that the isomorphism of free S -modules, $\theta_{\mathcal{H}(M)} : M \rightarrow \mathcal{FH}(M)$, is also a Γ -homomorphism. As in the proof of Proposition 3.8, one can show that $e_{i(i-1)}\theta_{\mathcal{H}(M)}(m) = \theta_{\mathcal{H}(M)}(e_{i(i-1)}m)$ for all $m \in M$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

4. THE d -FOLD BRANCHED COVER

Let $(S, \mathfrak{n}, \mathbf{k})$ be a complete regular local ring, and let f be a non-zero non-unit in S . Set $R = S/(f)$ and fix an integer $d \geq 2$.

Definition 4.1. The $(d$ -fold) branched cover of R is the hypersurface ring

$$R^\sharp = S[[z]]/(f + z^d).$$

Throughout this section, we will also assume that \mathbf{k} is algebraically closed and that the characteristic of \mathbf{k} does not divide d . In this case, the polynomial $x^d - 1 \in \mathbf{k}[x]$ has d distinct roots in \mathbf{k} and the group formed by its roots is cyclic of order d . Any generator of this group is a *primitive d th root of unity*. Since S is complete, it also contains primitive d th roots of $1 \in S$ [LW12, Corollary A.31].

For the rest of this section, fix an element $\omega \in S$ such that $\omega^d = 1$ and $\omega^t \neq 1$ for all $0 < t < d$. The ring R^\sharp carries an automorphism $\sigma : R^\sharp \rightarrow R^\sharp$ of order d which fixes S and sends z to ωz . Denote by $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ the *skew group algebra* of the cyclic group of order d generated by σ acting on R^\sharp . Specifically, $R^\sharp[\sigma] = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} R^\sharp \cdot \sigma^i$ as R^\sharp -modules with multiplication given by the rule

$$(s \cdot \sigma^i) \cdot (t \cdot \sigma^j) = s\sigma^i(t) \cdot \sigma^{i+j}$$

for $s, t \in R^\sharp$ and $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. The left modules over $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ are precisely the R^\sharp -modules N which carry a compatible action of σ , that is, an action of σ such that $\sigma(rx) = \sigma(r)\sigma(x)$ for all $r \in R^\sharp$ and $x \in N$. It follows that R^\sharp itself is naturally a left $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module with the action of σ given by evaluating $\sigma(r)$ for any $r \in R^\sharp$. We say that a left $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module is *maximal Cohen-Macaulay* (MCM as usual) if it is MCM when it is viewed as an R^\sharp -module. Denote the category of MCM $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -modules by $\text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp)$.

In the case $d = 2$, Knörrer showed that the category of MCM modules over $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ is equivalent to the category of matrix factorizations of f with 2 factors [Knö87, Proposition 2.1]. The main goal of this section is to extend the equivalence given by Knörrer for all $d \geq 2$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let N be an $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module. Then, N decomposes as an S -module into $N = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} N^{\omega^i}$ where*

$$N^{\omega^i} = \{x \in N : \sigma(x) = \omega^i x\}.$$

Furthermore, if N is a MCM $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module, then N and each summand N^{ω^i} are finitely generated free S -modules.

Proof. In order to justify the direct sum decomposition of N , we will make repeated use of the fact $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{ki} = 0$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Let $x \in N$ and observe that

$$\begin{aligned} dx &= dx + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-i} \right) \sigma(x) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-2i} \right) \sigma^2(x) + \cdots + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-(d-1)i} \right) \sigma^{d-1}(x) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \sigma^i(x) + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-i} \sigma^i(x) + \cdots + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-(d-1)i} \sigma^i(x) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-ik} \sigma^i(x). \end{aligned}$$

Also notice that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma \left(\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-ik} \sigma^i(x) \right) &= \sigma(x) + \omega^{-k} \sigma^2(x) + \omega^{-2k} \sigma^3(x) + \cdots + \omega^{-(d-1)k} x \\ &= \omega^k (x + \omega^{-k} \sigma(x) + \omega^{-2k} \sigma^2(x) + \cdots + \omega^{-(d-1)k} \sigma^{d-1}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-ik} \sigma^i(x) \in N^{\omega^k}$. Since σ is S -linear and d is invertible in S , we have that

$$x = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \frac{\omega^{-ik} \sigma^i(x)}{d} \in N^1 + N^\omega + \cdots + N^{\omega^{d-1}}$$

implying that $N = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} N^{\omega^k}$.

Next, suppose we have a sum of elements

$$(4.1) \quad x_0 + x_1 + \cdots + x_{d-1} = 0$$

with $x_i \in N^{\omega^i}$ for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, and let $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Notice that if $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, then $\omega^{-jk}\sigma^k(x_\ell) = \omega^{-jk+k\ell}x_\ell = \omega^{(-j+\ell)k}x_\ell$. In particular, $\omega^{-jk}\sigma^k(x_j) = x_j$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Therefore, applying $\omega^{-jk}\sigma^k$ to (4.1) gives us an equation

$$\omega^{-jk}x_0 + \omega^{(-j+1)k}x_1 + \cdots + x_j + \cdots + \omega^{(-j-1)k}x_{d-1} = 0.$$

Summing over \mathbb{Z}_d , we find that

$$\sum_{i \neq j} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{k(-j+i)}x_i + dx_j = 0.$$

Once again, since $\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \omega^{k(-j+i)} = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, we can conclude that $x_j = 0$. Thus, $N = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{d-1} N^{\omega^i}$ as desired.

The second statement holds since a finitely generated R^\sharp -module N is MCM over R^\sharp if and only if it is free as an S -module. \square

Definition and Proposition 4.3. Let $R, R^\sharp, R^\sharp[\sigma]$, and ω be as above. Let $\mu \in S$ be any root of $x^d + 1 \in S[x]$.

- (i) Let N be an MCM $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module and N^{ω^i} be as in Lemma 4.2 for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Define a matrix factorization $\mathcal{A}(N) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ as follows. Multiplication by μz defines an S -linear homomorphism

$$N^{\omega^i} \rightarrow N^{\omega^{i+1}}$$

for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. The composition

$$N^{\omega^{d-1}} \xrightarrow{\mu z} N^1 \xrightarrow{\mu z} N^\omega \xrightarrow{\mu z} \cdots \xrightarrow{\mu z} N^{\omega^{d-2}} \xrightarrow{\mu z} N^{\omega^{d-1}}$$

is equal to $-z^d = f$ times the identity on $N^{\omega^{d-1}}$. It follows that the above homomorphisms and free S -modules form a matrix factorization of f in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ which we denote as $\mathcal{A}(N)$. For a homomorphism $g : N \rightarrow M$ of MCM $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -modules, define a morphism of matrix factorizations

$$\mathcal{A}(g) = (g|_{N^{\omega^{d-1}}}, g|_{N^{\omega^{d-2}}}, \dots, g|_{N^1})$$

where $g|_{N^{\omega^i}}$ denotes the restriction of g to the S -direct summand N^{ω^i} of N . Thus, we have a functor

$$\mathcal{A} : \text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp) \rightarrow \text{MF}_S^d(f).$$

- (ii) Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Define

$$\mathcal{B}(X) = F_d \oplus F_{d-1} \oplus \cdots \oplus F_1$$

as an S -module which has the structure of a $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module by defining the action of z as

$$z \cdot (x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) = (\mu^{-1}\varphi_d(x_1), \mu^{-1}\varphi_{d-1}(x_d), \dots, \mu^{-1}\varphi_1(x_2))$$

and the action of σ as

$$\sigma \cdot (x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) = (x_d, \omega x_{d-1}, \omega^2 x_{d-2}, \dots, \omega^{d-1} x_1),$$

for any $x_i \in F_i$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. For a morphism of matrix factorizations $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d) : X \rightarrow X'$, where $X' = (\varphi'_1 : F'_2 \rightarrow F'_1, \dots, \varphi'_d : F'_1 \rightarrow F'_d)$, define $\mathcal{B}(\alpha) : \mathcal{B}(X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X')$ by

$$\mathcal{B}(\alpha)(x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) = (\alpha_d(x_d), \alpha_{d-1}(x_{d-1}), \dots, \alpha_1(x_1))$$

for all $(x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. Thus, we have a functor

$$\mathcal{B} : \text{MF}_S^d(f) \rightarrow \text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp).$$

Proof. Several pieces of the definitions need justification. First we note that, since -1 has a d th root in \mathbf{k} , we may apply [LW12, Corollary A.31] to obtain an element $\mu \in S$ such that $\mu^d = -1$.

(i) Multiplication by μz defines an S -linear map $N^{\omega^i} \rightarrow N^{\omega^{i+1}}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ since $\mu \in S$ and

$$\sigma(zx) = \sigma(z)\sigma(x) = \omega^{i+1}zx$$

for all $x \in N^{\omega^i}$. Notice that $(\mu z)^d = \mu^d z^d = f \in R^\sharp$. Therefore, the composition

$$N^{\omega^{i+1}} \xrightarrow{(\mu z)^{d-1}} N^{\omega^i} \xrightarrow{\mu z} N^{\omega^{i+1}}$$

equals $f \cdot 1_{N^{\omega^i}}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. We know that each N^{ω^i} is a free S -module by Lemma 4.2 so, by applying Lemma 1.7, we have that $\text{rank}_S(N^{\omega^i}) = \text{rank}_S(N^{\omega^{i+1}})$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. This implies that $\mathcal{A}(N) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$.

If $g : N \rightarrow M$ is a homomorphism of $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -modules, then $g(rx) = rg(x)$ and $\sigma g(x) = g(\sigma(x))$ for all $x \in N$ and $r \in R^\sharp$. It follows that $g|_{N^{\omega^i}}(N^{\omega^i}) \subseteq M^{\omega^i}$ and the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} N^{\omega^i} & \xrightarrow{\mu z} & N^{\omega^{i+1}} \\ g|_{N^{\omega^i}} \downarrow & & \downarrow g|_{N^{\omega^{i+1}}} \\ M^{\omega^i} & \xrightarrow{\mu z} & M^{\omega^{i+1}} \end{array}$$

commutes for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. In other words, $\mathcal{A}(g)$ is a morphism of matrix factorizations $\mathcal{A}(N) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}(M)$.

(ii) First we justify that the defined action of z and σ make $\mathcal{B}(X)$ a MCM $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module. Recall the homomorphisms $\theta_{ki}^X : F_i \rightarrow F_k$, from Section 2, which are given by

$$\theta_{ki}^X = \begin{cases} 1_{F_k} & i = k \\ \varphi_k \varphi_{k+1} \cdots \varphi_{i-2} \varphi_{i-1} & i \neq k. \end{cases}$$

We will drop the superscript X for the rest of this proof. We claim that for any $s \geq 1$ and $(x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) \in \mathcal{B}(X)$,

$$z^s \cdot (x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) = f^q \mu^{-r} (\theta_{d(d+r)}(x_{d+r}), \dots, \theta_{1(1+r)}(x_{1+r}))$$

where $s = dq + r$, $q \geq 0$, and $0 \leq r < d$. When $s = 1$ the formula is precisely the defined action of z on $\mathcal{B}(X)$. Assume the claim is true for $s = dq + r \geq 1$ with $q \geq 0$ and $0 \leq r < d$ and consider multiplication by z^{s+1} . By induction we have that

$$\begin{aligned} z^{s+1} \cdot (x_d, \dots, x_1) &= z \cdot f^q \mu^{-r} ((\theta_{d(d+r)}(x_{d+r}), \dots, \theta_{1(1+r)}(x_{1+r})) \\ &= f^q \mu^{-(r+1)} (\varphi_d \theta_{1(1+r)}(x_{1+r}), \dots, \varphi_1 \theta_{2(2+r)}(x_{2+r})). \end{aligned}$$

If $r = d - 1$, then $\varphi_{k-1} \theta_{k(k+r)} = f \cdot 1_{F_{k-1}}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and therefore

$$z^{s+1} = f^{q+1} \mu^{-(r+1)} (x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1).$$

If $0 \leq r < d - 1$, then $0 \leq r + 1 < d$ and therefore $\varphi_{k-1} \theta_{k(k+r)} = \theta_{(k-1)(k+r)}$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. In this case,

$$z^{s+1} = f^q \mu^{-(r+1)} (\theta_{d(1+r)}(x_{1+r}), \dots, \theta_{1(2+r)}(x_{2+r}))$$

which completes the induction. It follows that multiplication by z^d is given by

$$z^d \cdot (x_d, \dots, x_1) = f \mu^{-d} (x_d, \dots, x_1).$$

By definition, $\mu^{-d} = -1$. Thus, $(f + z^d)\mathcal{B}(X) = 0$, that is, $\mathcal{B}(X)$ is an R^\sharp -module. In fact, since $\mathcal{B}(X)$ is free as an S -module, it is MCM as an R^\sharp -module.

In order to show that $\mathcal{B}(X)$ has the structure of an $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module, we must show that $\sigma(rx) = \sigma(r)\sigma(x)$ for all $r \in R^\sharp$ and $x \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. It suffices to show that $\sigma(zx) = \sigma(z)\sigma(x)$ for all $x \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. This follows since

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma(z)\sigma(x) &= \omega z \cdot (x_d, \omega x_{d-1}, \dots, \omega^{d-1} x_1) \\ &= z \cdot (\omega x_d, \omega^2 x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) \\ &= (\mu^{-1} \varphi_d(x_1), \mu^{-1} \omega \varphi_{d-1}(x_d), \dots, \mu^{-1} \omega^{d-1} \varphi_1(x_2)) \\ &= \sigma(\mu^{-1} \varphi_d(x_1), \mu^{-1} \varphi_{d-1}(x_d), \dots, \mu^{-1} \varphi_1(x_2)) \\ &= \sigma(zx)\end{aligned}$$

for any $x = (x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) \in \mathcal{B}(X)$. Hence, $\mathcal{B}(X) \in \text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp)$.

Finally, we must show that $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ forms a homomorphism of $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -modules. This is straightforward to verify by recalling that $\alpha_k \varphi_k = \varphi'_k \alpha_{k+1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. \square

Theorem 4.4. *The functors $\mathcal{A} : \text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp) \rightarrow \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and $\mathcal{B} : \text{MF}_S^d(f) \rightarrow \text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp)$ are naturally inverse and establish an equivalence of the categories $\text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp) \approx \text{MF}_S^d(f)$.*

Proof. Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then, $\mathcal{B}(X) = F_d \oplus F_{d-1} \oplus \dots \oplus F_1$ with the action of σ on $\mathcal{B}(X)$ given by $\sigma(x_d, \dots, x_1) = (x_d, \omega x_{d-1}, \dots, \omega^{d-1} x_1)$ for each $x_i \in F_i$. For each $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, the S -module F_i is embedded into $\mathcal{B}(X)$ via the natural inclusion map which we will denote as

$$q_i : F_i \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X)$$

Notice that the action of σ on $\mathcal{B}(X)$ implies that

$$\mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-i}} = \{(0, \dots, 0, x_i, 0, \dots, 0) : x_i \in F_i\} = q_i(F_i).$$

Therefore, the matrix factorization $\mathcal{AB}(X)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-1}} \xrightarrow{\mu z} \mathcal{B}(X)^1 \xrightarrow{\mu z} \dots \xrightarrow{\mu z} \mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-2}} \xrightarrow{\mu z} \mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-1}}$$

which is isomorphic to X via the morphism

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_1 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_d} & F_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d-1}} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\varphi_2} & F_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & F_1 \\ \downarrow q_1 & & \downarrow q_d & & & & \downarrow q_2 & & \downarrow q_1 \\ \mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-1}} & \xrightarrow{\mu z} & \mathcal{B}(X)^1 & \xrightarrow{\mu z} & \dots & \xrightarrow{\mu z} & \mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-2}} & \xrightarrow{\mu z} & \mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-1}}. \end{array}$$

Explicitly, the diagram commutes since if $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and $x \in F_{k+1}$, then

$$\mu z q_{k+1}(x) = \mu q_k(\mu^{-1} \varphi_k(x)) = q_k \varphi_k(x).$$

To show \mathcal{AB} is naturally isomorphic to the identity, suppose we have a morphism $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : X \rightarrow X'$ where $X' = (\varphi'_1 : F'_2 \rightarrow F'_1, \dots, \varphi'_d : F'_1 \rightarrow F'_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. The matrix factorizations X' is isomorphic to $\mathcal{AB}(X')$ via the morphism $(q'_1, q'_2, \dots, q'_d)$ where $q'_i : F'_i \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(X')$ is the natural inclusion. Recall that the homomorphism $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{B}(\alpha)(x_d, x_{d-1}, \dots, x_1) = (\alpha_d(x_d), \alpha_{d-1}(x_{d-1}), \dots, \alpha_1(x_1)).$$

Applying the functor \mathcal{A} forms a morphism of matrix factorizations by restricting $\mathcal{B}(\alpha)$ to the submodules $\mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-i}}$. The images of these restrictions land in the submodules $\mathcal{B}(X')^{\omega^{d-i}}$. In other words, the k th component of the morphism $\mathcal{AB}(\alpha)$ is given by the composition

$$\mathcal{B}(X)^{\omega^{d-k}} \xrightarrow{p_k} F_k \xrightarrow{\alpha_k} F'_k \xrightarrow{q'_k} \mathcal{B}(X')^{\omega^{d-k}}$$

where p_k is the natural projection onto F_k . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{AB}(\alpha) \circ (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d) &= (q'_1 \alpha_1 p_1, q'_2 \alpha_2 p_2, \dots, q'_d \alpha_d p_d) \circ (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_d) \\ &= (q'_1 \alpha_1, q'_2 \alpha_2, \dots, q'_d \alpha_d)\end{aligned}$$

and this implies the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & X' \\ (q_1, \dots, q_d) \downarrow & & \downarrow (q'_1, \dots, q'_d) \\ \mathcal{AB}(X) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{AB}(\alpha)} & \mathcal{AB}(X'). \end{array}$$

Next, let N be an MCM $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -module. As an S -module,

$$\mathcal{BA}(N) = N^1 \oplus N^\omega \oplus \dots \oplus N^{\omega^{d-1}}$$

and in fact the natural S -isomorphism $\Psi_N : \mathcal{BA}(N) \rightarrow N$ given by $(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) \mapsto \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} n_i$ is also an $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -homomorphism. To see this, let $(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{d-1}) \in \mathcal{BA}(N)$. Then, Ψ_N is a R^\sharp -homomorphism since

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_N(z \cdot (n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{d-1})) &= \Psi_N(\mu^{-1} \mu z n_{d-1}, \mu^{-1} \mu z n_0, \dots, \mu^{-1} \mu z n_{d-1}) \\ &= \Psi_N(z n_{d-1}, z n_0, \dots, z n_{d-1}) \\ &= z(n_0 + n_1 + \dots + n_{d-1}) \\ &= z \Psi_N(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{d-1})\end{aligned}$$

and a $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ -homomorphism since

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_N(\sigma(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{d-1})) &= \Psi_N(n_0, \omega n_1, \dots, \omega^{d-1} n_{d-1}) \\ &= n_0 + \omega n_1 + \dots + \omega^{d-1} n_{d-1} \\ &= \sigma(n_0) + \sigma(n_1) + \dots + \sigma(n_{d-1}) \\ &= \sigma(n_0 + n_1 + \dots + n_{d-1}) \\ &= \sigma(\Psi_N(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_{d-1})).\end{aligned}$$

□

In Section 3 we showed that the category of MCM modules over the endomorphism ring of the projective object $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}_1 \oplus \mathcal{P}_2 \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{P}_d$ is equivalent to the category of matrix factorizations of f with $d \geq 2$ factors. Together with Proposition 4.4 we have an induced equivalence of the module categories $\text{MCM}_\sigma(R^\sharp)$ and $\text{MCM}(\text{End}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P})^{\text{op}})$. In fact, the two rings are isomorphic which we will see below. Of course, both statements require that the characteristic of \mathbf{k} does not divide d . Recall, also from Section 3, that $\Gamma = \text{End}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P})^{\text{op}}$ is a free S -module with basis given by the elements $\{e_{ij}\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$. The main rules for multiplication in Γ are given in Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5.

Proposition 4.5. *The rings $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ and $\Gamma = \text{End}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P})^{\text{op}}$ are isomorphic.*

Proof. The set $\{z^i \sigma^j\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$ forms a basis for $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ over S . As in 4.3, let $\mu \in S$ be any root of $x^d + 1 \in S[x]$. Define a map $\psi : R^\sharp[\sigma] \rightarrow \Gamma$ by $\psi(z) = \mu \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} e_{i(i-1)}$ and $\psi(\sigma) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{-i} e_{ii}$. Extend ψ multiplicatively, that is, define $\psi(z^i \sigma^j) = \psi(z)^i \psi(\sigma)^j$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Since $\{z^i \sigma^j\}_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}_d}$ is an S -basis, ψ extends uniquely to a well defined S -linear homomorphism. Using the fact that $\sigma z = \sigma(z) \sigma = \omega z \sigma \in R^\sharp[\sigma]$, it is not hard to see that ψ is also a homomorphism of rings.

As S -modules, both $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ and Γ are free of rank d^2 . Therefore, to conclude that ψ is an isomorphism, it suffices to check surjectivity. First, we show that the element e_{kk} is in the image

of ψ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Indeed, if $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, then

$$\psi(\sigma^j) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{-ji} e_{ii}.$$

Thus, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$,

$$\begin{aligned} \psi \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{jk} \sigma^j \right) &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{jk} \psi(\sigma^j) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{j(k-i)} e_{ii} \\ &= \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i \neq k} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \omega^{j(k-i)} e_{ii} + \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_d} e_{kk} \\ &= e_{kk}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the elements $e_{11}, e_{22}, \dots, e_{dd}$, and $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} e_{i(i-1)}$ are in the image of ψ . It follows that $e_{k(k-1)} \in \text{Im } \psi$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ since $e_{kk} \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} e_{i(i-1)} = e_{k(k-1)}$ by Lemma 3.3 (iv). Finally, Lemma 3.5 allows us to conclude that $e_{ij} \in \text{Im } \psi$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, implying that ψ is surjective as desired. \square

5. THE SYZGY OF A MATRIX FACTORIZATION

Let $(S, \mathfrak{n}, \mathbf{k})$ be a complete regular local ring, $f \in S$ a non-zero non-unit, and set $R = S/(f)$. For a matrix factorization $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_2)$, we study its syzygy, $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) = (\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_d)$, defined in Section 2. Note that, by Section 3, the additional assumption of S being complete allows us to utilize the Krull-Remak-Schmidt Theorem in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. As in previous sections, let $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \mathcal{P}_i$ and $\Gamma = \text{End}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P})^{\text{op}}$.

The exact structure on $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ ensures that $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ is *stably equivalent* to any matrix factorization K such that there exists a short exact sequence

$$K \succrightarrow P \twoheadrightarrow X$$

where P is projective. This follows from the appropriate version of Schanuel's Lemma in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$.

Lemma 5.1. (*Schanuel's Lemma*) *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and suppose*

$$K \xrightarrow{q} P \twoheadrightarrow X \quad \text{and} \quad K' \xrightarrow{q'} P' \twoheadrightarrow X$$

are short exact sequences of matrix factorizations with P and P' projective. Then, $P \oplus K' \cong K \oplus P'$. \square

We omit the proof as it follows from [Bü10, Proposition 2.12]. The next Lemma follows directly from Lemma 5.1, KRS, and the sequences (2.4) and (2.6).

Lemma 5.2. *Let $X, X' \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then,*

- (1) $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X \oplus X') \cong \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) \oplus \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X')$
- (2) $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X \oplus X') \cong \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X) \oplus \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X')$
- (3) $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ (respectively $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)$) *is projective if and only if X is projective.*

\square

As a consequence, both $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(-)$ and $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(-)$ define additive functors from the stable category $\underline{\text{MF}}_S^d(f)$ to itself.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ be of size n and $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^d \mathcal{P}_i$. Then, we have isomorphisms*

- (i) $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)) \cong X \oplus \mathcal{P}^{(d-2)n}$,
- (ii) $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)) \cong X \oplus \mathcal{P}^{(d-2)n}$, and
- (iii) $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) \cong \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)$.

Proof. Since $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)$ is of size $(d-1)n$, there is a short exact sequence

$$\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{P}^{(d-1)n} \twoheadrightarrow \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X).$$

By applying Schanuel's lemma to this sequence and the sequence (2.6), we find that

$$\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)) \oplus \mathcal{P}^n \cong X \oplus \mathcal{P}^{(d-1)n}.$$

We may cancel one copy of \mathcal{P}^n from both sides by KRS to obtain the first statement. Dually, the second statement follows from the injective version of Schanuel's Lemma.

In order to prove (iii), we construct an explicit isomorphism. For each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ define an S -homomorphism $\alpha_k : \widehat{F}_k \rightarrow \widehat{F}_k$ by

$$\alpha_k = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{F_{k+1}} & \theta_{(k+1)(k+2)}^X & \theta_{(k+1)(k+3)}^X & \cdots & \theta_{(k+1)(k-1)}^X \\ 0 & 1_{F_{k+2}} & \theta_{(k+2)(k+3)}^X & \cdots & \theta_{(k+2)(k-1)}^X \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{F_{k+3}} & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \theta_{(k-2)(k-1)}^X \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & & 1_{F_{k-1}} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is not hard to see that each α_k is an isomorphism and that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_k} & \widehat{F}_k \\ \downarrow \alpha_{k+1} & & \downarrow \alpha_k \\ \widehat{F}_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\Omega_k^-} & \widehat{F}_k \end{array}$$

commutes for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Hence, we have an isomorphism of matrix factorizations $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) : \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) \rightarrow \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)$. \square

Remark 5.4. In the case $d = 2$, no projective summands occur in the first two isomorphisms. This agrees with what we saw in Example 2.12 which said that the syzygy and cosyzygy operations are isomorphic to the shift functor:

$$\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}(\varphi, \psi) \cong (\psi, \varphi) \cong \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^2(f)}^-(\varphi, \psi)$$

for any $(\varphi, \psi) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$. From this we can see that all three statements of Proposition 5.3 are immediate when $d = 2$. In particular, the isomorphism in Proposition 5.3 (iii) is actually the identity. In contrast, the isomorphism constructed in Proposition 5.3 (iii) when $d = 3$ is

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_2 \oplus F_3 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\varphi_1 & -\varphi_1\varphi_2 \\ 1_{F_2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}} & F_1 \oplus F_2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\varphi_3 & -\varphi_3\varphi_1 \\ 1_{F_1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}} & F_3 \oplus F_1 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -\varphi_2 & -\varphi_2\varphi_3 \\ 1_{F_3} & 0 \end{pmatrix}} & F_2 \oplus F_3 \\ \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1_{F_2} & \varphi_2 \\ 0 & 1_{F_3} \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1_{F_1} & \varphi_1 \\ 0 & 1_{F_2} \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1_{F_3} & \varphi_3 \\ 0 & 1_{F_1} \end{pmatrix} & & \downarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1_{F_2} & \varphi_2 \\ 0 & 1_{F_3} \end{pmatrix} \\ F_2 \oplus F_3 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\varphi_1\varphi_2 \\ 1_{F_2} & -\varphi_2 \end{pmatrix}} & F_1 \oplus F_2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\varphi_3\varphi_1 \\ 1_{F_1} & -\varphi_1 \end{pmatrix}} & F_3 \oplus F_1 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\varphi_2\varphi_3 \\ 1_{F_3} & -\varphi_3 \end{pmatrix}} & F_2 \oplus F_3 \end{array}$$

The next Proposition uses Proposition 5.3 to show that each object in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ has a projective resolution which is periodic of period at most 2. A projective resolution in this context is with respect to the exact structure on $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ (see [Bü10, 12.1]).

Proposition 5.5. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then, X has a projective resolution which is periodic with period at most 2:*

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{q} I(X) \xrightarrow{p} P(X) \xrightarrow{q} I(X) \xrightarrow{p} P(X) \longrightarrow X.$$

Proof. Set $\Omega(X) = \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ and $\Omega^-(X) = \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(X)$. Let $\alpha : \Omega(X) \rightarrow \Omega^-(X)$ be the isomorphism constructed in Proposition 5.3. Then, we have two diagrams

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} I(X) & \longrightarrow & P(X) & \longrightarrow & I(X) \\ & \searrow \alpha^{-1}\eta^X & \nearrow \epsilon^X & & \nearrow \lambda^X \\ & & \Omega(X) & & X \end{array}$$

and

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} P(X) & \longrightarrow & I(X) & \longrightarrow & P(X) \\ & \searrow \rho^X & \nearrow \lambda^X & & \nearrow \epsilon^X \\ & & X & & \Omega(X) \end{array}$$

The middle sequence in (5.2) is short exact since we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & I(X) & \xrightarrow{\alpha^{-1}\eta^X} & \Omega(X) \\ \parallel & & \parallel & & \downarrow \alpha \\ X & \xrightarrow{\lambda^X} & I(X) & \xrightarrow{\eta^X} & \Omega^-(X) \end{array}$$

with vertical isomorphisms. The desired resolution follows by splicing together (5.1) and (5.2), that is, by setting $p = \epsilon^X \alpha^{-1} \eta^X$ and $q = \lambda^X \rho^X$. \square

Corollary 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{P} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \mathcal{P}_i$ and $\Gamma = \text{End}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P})^{\text{op}}$. Then, every finitely generated left Γ -module has a projective resolution which is eventually periodic of period at most 2.*

Proof. Let N be a finitely generated Γ -module and set $r = \dim S$. Let $M = \text{syz}_\Gamma^r(N)$ be an arbitrary r th syzygy of N over Γ , and let

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow P_{r-1} \rightarrow P_{r-2} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$$

be the first $r-1$ steps of a projective resolution of N for some finitely generated projective Γ -modules P_i , $i = 0, 1, \dots, r-1$. Recall that finitely generated projective Γ -modules are in $\text{MCM}(\Gamma)$, that is, they are finitely generated free S -modules. Thus, the Depth Lemma implies that $\text{depth}_S(M) = r$. Since $\text{MCM } S$ -modules are free, we have that $M \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$ as well. Now, by Section 3, there exists $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ of size n such that $\mathcal{F}(X) = \text{Hom}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P}, X) \cong M$. Since \mathcal{P} is projective in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$, the functor \mathcal{F} is exact. In particular, applying \mathcal{F} to the periodic resolution constructed in Proposition 5.5 yields an exact sequence of $\text{MCM } \Gamma$ -modules

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(p)} \mathcal{F}(P(X)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(q)} \mathcal{F}(I(X)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{F}(p)} \mathcal{F}(P(X)) \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0.$$

Actually, this is a free resolution of M over Γ since $\mathcal{F}(P(X)) \cong \mathcal{F}(\bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \mathcal{P}_i^n) \cong \Gamma^n$ and similarly $\mathcal{F}(I(X)) \cong \Gamma^n$. Thus, splicing together this periodic free resolution of M and the projective resolution of N , we get an eventually periodic resolution of N . \square

Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 5.7 below give a homological description of Γ which resembles that of a (commutative) hypersurface ring. Recall that a Noetherian ring Λ is said to be *Iwanaga-Gorenstein* if $\text{injdim}_\Lambda \Lambda$ and $\text{injdim}_{\Lambda^{\text{op}}} \Lambda$ are both finite.

Lemma 5.7. *Let r be the Krull dimension of S . The ring $\Gamma = \text{End}_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(\mathcal{P})^{\text{op}}$ is Iwanaga-Gorenstein of dimension r .*

Proof. First we show that any short exact sequence

$$(5.3) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \Gamma \xrightarrow{q} M \xrightarrow{p} M' \longrightarrow 0$$

with $M, M' \in \text{MCM}(\Gamma)$ splits. To see this, first note that $\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{HF}(\mathcal{P}) \cong \mathcal{P}$ is injective in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Therefore, the short exact sequence of matrix factorizations

$$\mathcal{H}(\Gamma) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}(q)} \mathcal{H}(M) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{H}(p)} \mathcal{H}(M')$$

is split. Since \mathcal{H} is full and faithful, there exists $t : M \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that $\mathcal{H}(t)\mathcal{H}(q) = 1_{\mathcal{H}(\Gamma)}$ and $tq = 1_M$ which implies that (5.3) is split.

To finish the proof, we apply results from [Aus86] which apply to both Γ and Γ^{op} . By [Aus86, Lemma 1.1] we have that $\Gamma \cong \text{Hom}_S(Q, S)$ for some projective Γ^{op} -module Q . The functor $\text{Hom}_S(\square, S) : \text{MCM}(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{MCM}(\Gamma^{\text{op}})$ defines a duality and therefore

$$Q \cong \text{Hom}_S(\text{Hom}_S(Q, S), S) \cong \text{Hom}_S({}_\Gamma \Gamma, S).$$

Thus, $\text{Hom}_S({}_\Gamma \Gamma, S)$ is Γ^{op} -projective which happens if and only if $\text{Hom}_S(\Gamma^{\text{op}} \Gamma, S)$ is Γ -projective according to [Aus86, Lemma 5.1]. In this case, [Aus86, 5.2] says that $\text{injdim}_\Gamma \Gamma = \text{injdim}_S S$ which is equal to r since S is Gorenstein. Interchanging the roles of Γ and Γ^{op} we find that $\text{injdim}_{\Gamma^{\text{op}}} \Gamma = r$ as well. \square

Remark 5.8. If \mathbf{k} is algebraically closed and its characteristic does not divide d , both Proposition 5.6 and Lemma 5.7 can be restated for the skew group algebra over the d -fold branched cover $R^\sharp[\sigma]$ defined in Section 4.

Over the hypersurface ring $R = S/(f)$, the reduced syzygy of an indecomposable non-free MCM R -module is again indecomposable. Proposition 5.14 gives an analogous result for matrix factorizations. First, we describe the relationship between projective summands in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and free summands in $\text{MCM}(R)$. Recall that a matrix factorization $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is *stable* if $\text{cok } \varphi_k$ is a stable MCM R -module for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $X = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and set $M_i = \text{cok } \varphi_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Then, X has a projective summand isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_i if and only if M_i has a free R -summand.*

Proof. The statement holds when $d = 2$ (for instance see [Yos90, 7.5]). So, assume $d \geq 3$. One direction is immediate: If $X \cong X' \oplus \mathcal{P}_i$ for some $X' = (\varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and $i \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, then $M_i \cong \text{cok } \varphi'_i \oplus R$.

A matrix factorization Y is a summand of X if and only if $T^j(Y)$ is a summand of $T^j(X)$ for any $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Therefore, for the converse, we may assume $i = 1$. That is, assume $M_1 \cong M \oplus R$ for some MCM R -module M . By Proposition 1.6 (i), there exists $(\varphi : G \rightarrow F, \psi : F \rightarrow G) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$, with φ minimal, such that $\text{cok } \varphi \cong M$. Then,

$$0 \longrightarrow G \oplus S \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \varphi & 0 \\ 0 & f \end{pmatrix}} F \oplus S \longrightarrow M_1 \longrightarrow 0$$

is a minimal free resolution of M_1 over S . Thus, there exists isomorphisms α and β and a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_2 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_1} & F_1 & \longrightarrow & M_1 \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \alpha & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & G \oplus S \oplus S^m & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \varphi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{S^m} \end{pmatrix}} & F \oplus S \oplus S^m & \longrightarrow & M_1 \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

for some $m \geq 0$. In other words, we have an isomorphism of matrix factorizations in $\text{MF}_S^2(f)$:

$$(\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_d) \cong \left(\begin{pmatrix} \varphi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{S^m} \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \psi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & f \cdot 1_{S^m} \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

The isomorphisms α and β also give us an isomorphism of matrix factorizations in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$:

$$\begin{aligned} X &\cong (\alpha \varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{d-1}, \varphi_d \alpha^{-1}) \\ &\cong (\alpha \varphi_1 \beta^{-1}, \beta \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{d-1}, \varphi_d \alpha^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Let $p_1 : F \oplus S \oplus S^m \rightarrow S$ and $p_2 : G \oplus S \oplus S^m \rightarrow S$ be projection onto the middle components of $F \oplus S \oplus S^m$ and $G \oplus S \oplus S^m$ respectively. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccc} F \oplus S \oplus S^m & \xrightarrow{\varphi_d \alpha^{-1}} & F_d & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{d-1}} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\varphi_4} & F_4 & \xrightarrow{\varphi_3} & F_3 & \xrightarrow{\beta \varphi_2} & G \oplus S \oplus S^m & \xrightarrow{\alpha \varphi_1 \beta^{-1}} & F \oplus S \oplus S^m \\ \downarrow p_1 & & \downarrow p_2 \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_{d-1} & & & & \downarrow p_2 \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 & & \downarrow p_2 \beta \varphi_2 & & \downarrow p_2 & & \downarrow p_1 \\ S & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{1} & S & \xrightarrow{f} & S \end{array}$$

The two right most squares commute, the first since $\alpha \varphi_1 \beta^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \varphi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & f & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{S^m} \end{pmatrix}$ and the second by construction. Similarly, for $k = 3, 4, \dots, d-1$, the square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_{k+1} & \xrightarrow{\varphi_k} & F_k \\ p_2 \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_{k-1} \varphi_k \downarrow & & \downarrow p_2 \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_{k-1} \\ S & \xrightarrow{1} & S \end{array}$$

also commutes. Since $p_1 \alpha \varphi_1 \beta^{-1} = f p_2$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} f p_1 &= p_1 f = p_1 \alpha \varphi_1 \beta^{-1} \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_{d-1} \varphi_d \alpha^{-1} \\ &= f p_2 \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_{d-1} \varphi_d \alpha^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We may cancel f on the left to conclude that the left most square commutes as well. Thus, we have a morphism

$$X \cong (\alpha \varphi_1 \beta^{-1}, \beta \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{d-1}, \varphi_d \alpha^{-1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1.$$

We claim that this morphism is an admissible epimorphism. By Lemma 2.3, it suffices to show that each of the vertical maps depicted above are surjective. By the commutativity of the diagram,

$$p_1 = (p_2 \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_k)(\varphi_{k+1} \varphi_{k+2} \cdots \varphi_{d-1} \varphi_d \alpha^{-1})$$

for each $k = 2, 3, \dots, d-1$. Since p_1 is surjective, this implies $p_2 \beta \varphi_2 \varphi_3 \cdots \varphi_k$ is surjective for each $k = 2, 3, \dots, d-1$ as claimed. Since \mathcal{P}_1 is projective, the admissible epimorphism $X \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_1$ implies that X has a direct summand isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_1 . \square

We note that KRS was not needed for the proof of Proposition 5.9. The result therefore holds for an arbitrary regular local ring S . The following corollary also holds without the completeness of S .

Corollary 5.10. *Let S be a regular local ring, f a non-zero non-unit in S , and $d \geq 2$.*

- (i) *The objects $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_d \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ are the only indecomposable projectives (equivalently injectives) up to isomorphism.*
- (ii) *A matrix factorization $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is stable if and only if it has no non-zero projective direct summands.*

Proof. Let $Q = (Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ be an indecomposable projective of size n . Then, we have a short exact sequence of the form (2.4), and more specifically, Q is a direct summand of $P(Q) \cong \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_d} \mathcal{P}_i^n$. It follows that, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, $\text{cok } Q_k$ is either 0 or has a direct summand isomorphic to R . Since Q is non-zero matrix factorization, there exists $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ such that $\text{cok } Q_j \neq 0$. Thus, $\text{cok } Q_j$ has a direct summand isomorphic to R . By Proposition 5.9, this implies that Q has a direct summand isomorphic to \mathcal{P}_j . Since Q is indecomposable, we have that $Q \cong \mathcal{P}_j$. The statement about indecomposable injectives follows immediately because of Lemma 2.14.

The second statement follows by combining (i) and Proposition 5.9. \square

Proposition 5.9 and Corollary 5.10 give us a clearer picture of the structure of matrix factorizations and the MCM R -modules they encode.

Proposition 5.11. *Let $X = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then,*

$$(5.4) \quad X \cong \tilde{X} \oplus \mathcal{P}_1^{s_1} \oplus \mathcal{P}_2^{s_2} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{P}_d^{s_d}$$

for some stable matrix factorization $\tilde{X} = (\tilde{\varphi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\varphi}_d)$ and integers $s_k \geq 0$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. The integers s_k are uniquely determined and the direct summand \tilde{X} is unique up to isomorphism. The corresponding MCM R -modules are

$$\text{cok } \varphi_k \cong \text{cok } \tilde{\varphi}_k \oplus R^{s_k}$$

where $\text{cok } \tilde{\varphi}_k$ is a stable MCM R -module for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

Proof. Lemma 5.10 says that the only indecomposable projective matrix factorizations are $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \dots, \mathcal{P}_d$. Since S is complete, KRS implies that we have a decomposition $X \cong \tilde{X} \oplus \mathcal{P}_1^{s_1} \oplus \mathcal{P}_2^{s_2} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{P}_d^{s_d}$ for some unique integers $s_k \geq 0$ and some \tilde{X} which has no projective summands. Finally, using Proposition 5.9, each copy of \mathcal{P}_k contributes a free R -summand to $\text{cok } \varphi_k$. \square

Corollary 5.12. *Let $X = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ of size n . Then,*

$$(5.5) \quad \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) \cong \tilde{\Omega} \oplus \mathcal{P}_1^{m_1} \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{P}_d^{m_d}$$

where $m_k = n - \mu_R(\text{cok } \varphi_k)$ and $\tilde{\Omega} \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is stable. Furthermore, $\tilde{\Omega}$ is of size $\sum_{k=1}^d \mu_R(\text{cok } \varphi_k) - n$.

Proof. The isomorphism (5.5) follows by combining Propositions 5.11 and 2.13. Let $\ell \geq 0$ be the size of $\tilde{\Omega}$. Since $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ is of size $(d-1)n$, we have that

$$(d-1)n = \ell + \sum_{k=1}^d m_k = \ell + dn - \sum_{k=1}^d \mu_R(\text{cok } \varphi_k).$$

Thus, $\ell = \sum_{k=1}^d \mu_R(\text{cok } \varphi_k) - n$. \square

We continue with two more important properties of the stable part of the syzygy of a matrix factorization.

Lemma 5.13. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ and suppose*

$$K \succ \longrightarrow P \longrightarrow \!\!\! \twoheadrightarrow X$$

is a short exact sequence with P projective. Then, $\tilde{\Omega}$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of K where $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) \cong \tilde{\Omega} \oplus Q$ is a decomposition of the form (5.5).

Proof. This follows directly from Lemma 5.1 and Proposition 5.11. \square

Proposition 5.14. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ be a indecomposable non-projective matrix factorization and let $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X) \cong \tilde{\Omega} \oplus P$ be a decomposition of the form (5.5). Then, $\tilde{\Omega}$ is indecomposable.*

Proof. First, note that, $\tilde{\Omega} \neq 0$. Indeed, if $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ was projective, then Proposition 5.2 would imply that X is projective as well, which is not the case. So, assume $\tilde{\Omega} = Y_1 \oplus Y_2$ for some non-zero $Y_1, Y_2 \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Since $\tilde{\Omega}$ is stable, the direct summands Y_1 and Y_2 are also stable. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)) &\cong \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(\tilde{\Omega}) \oplus \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(P) \\ &\cong \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(Y_1) \oplus \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(Y_2) \oplus \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(P). \end{aligned}$$

For $i = 1, 2$, decompose $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(Y_i) \cong U_i \oplus P_i$, for some stable U_i and projective P_i . Now, applying Proposition 5.3, we have that

$$X \oplus \mathcal{P}^{(d-2)n} \cong U_1 \oplus U_2 \oplus P_1 \oplus P_2 \oplus \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(P)$$

where n is the size of X . Since both sides of this isomorphism are decomposed into the form (5.4), we have that $U_1 \oplus U_2 \cong X$. But X is indecomposable, so one of U_1 or U_2 must be zero. Re-indexing if necessary, we may assume $U_1 = 0$. This implies that $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}^-(Y_1)$ is projective and therefore Y_1 is projective. However, this is a contradiction since Y_1 is a non-zero stable matrix factorization. Hence, $\tilde{\Omega}$ is indecomposable. \square

So far, we have refrained from assuming that X is a reduced matrix factorization. On the other hand, if we do assume that $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is reduced, we obtain more concise versions of 2.13, 5.11, 5.12, and 5.14.

Corollary 5.15. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ be reduced. Then, the following hold.*

- (i) $\text{cok } \Omega_k \cong \text{syz}_R^1(\text{cok } \varphi_k)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.
- (ii) Both X and $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ are stable.
- (iii) If X is indecomposable, then $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^d(f)}(X)$ is indecomposable.

Proof. By Proposition 1.6(ii), there is a one-to-one correspondence between reduced matrix factorizations in $\text{MF}_S^2(f)$ and stable MCM R -modules (Lemma 1.6). If $X = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is reduced, then $(\varphi_k, \varphi_{k+1}\varphi_{k+2} \cdots \varphi_{k-1})$ is a reduced matrix factorization in $\text{MF}_S^2(f)$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Hence, $\text{cok } \varphi_k$ is a stable MCM R -module for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$ and $\text{cok}(\varphi_{k+1}\varphi_{k+2} \cdots \varphi_{k-1})$ is its reduced first syzygy. Since, by Proposition 2.13, $\text{cok } \Omega_k \cong \text{cok}(\varphi_{k+1}\varphi_{k+2} \cdots \varphi_{k-1})$, the first statement follows. The second statement follows from Proposition 5.9 and the third follows from the second and Proposition 5.14. \square

6. EXAMPLES

Let S be a regular local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{n} and let f be a non-zero non-unit in S . An important distinction between the categories $\text{MF}_S^2(f)$ and $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$, for $d > 2$, is the existence of stable non-reduced matrix factorizations. We illustrate this with our first example.

Example 6.1. Let $d > 2$ and assume $f \in S$ can be written as $f = f_1 f_2 \cdots f_d$ for some $f_i \in \mathfrak{n}$. Then, (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d) is an indecomposable reduced matrix factorization of size 1 in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Since $d > 2$, the syzygy of (f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d) in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is not reduced. However, Corollary 5.15 implies that $\Omega(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_d)$ is indecomposable and stable.

It is tempting to think that the presence of unit entries must make $\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_d)$ redundant in some way. Actually, we can not replace $\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_d)$ with a reduced matrix factorization in the following sense.

Set $\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_d) = (\Omega_1, \Omega_2, \dots, \Omega_d)$ and let $\widehat{f}_k = f_1 \cdots f_{k-1} f_{k+1} \cdots f_d$ for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Then, by Proposition 2.13, we have that $\text{cok } \Omega_k \cong R/(\widehat{f}_k)$. Suppose $X = (\varphi_1, \dots, \varphi_d)$ is a reduced matrix factorization of f such that $\text{cok } \varphi_k \cong R/(\widehat{f}_k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Since φ_k is minimal, the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow F_{k+1} \xrightarrow{\varphi_k} F_k \longrightarrow R/(\widehat{f}_k) \longrightarrow 0$$

is a minimal free resolution of $R/(\widehat{f}_k)$ over S . By tensoring with R , it follows that $\text{rank}_S F_k = \mu_R(R/(\widehat{f}_k)) = 1$. That is, X is a matrix factorization of size 1. Thus, the homomorphism φ_k is given by multiplication by \widehat{f}_k up to a unit, say $\varphi_k = v_k \widehat{f}_k$ for $v_k \in S$ invertible. Since X is a matrix factorization of f , we have that

$$f = \varphi_1 \varphi_2 \cdots \varphi_d = v \widehat{f}_1 \widehat{f}_2 \cdots \widehat{f}_d = v f^{d-1}$$

where $v = v_1 v_2 \cdots v_d$. Since $d > 2$, this is a contradiction. We conclude that no reduced matrix factorization has the same cokernels as $\Omega(f_1, \dots, f_d)$.

With Example 6.1 in mind, we continue to focus on stable matrix factorizations. However, we introduce an additional assumption (which implies stability) in order to avoid particularly trivial factorizations.

Definition 6.2. Let S be a regular local ring, f a non-zero non-unit in S , and $d \geq 2$. A non-zero matrix factorization $X = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is *pseudoprojective* if $\text{cok } \varphi_k = 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$.

We aim to avoid matrix factorizations with pseudoprojective summands. Notice that any indecomposable projective (equivalently injective) in $\text{MF}_S^d(f)$ is pseudoprojective (See 5.10).

An indecomposable matrix factorization in $\text{MF}_S^2(f)$ is pseudoprojective if and only if it is projective; the only possibilities are $(1, f)$ and $(f, 1)$. Consequently, $X \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$ is reduced if and only if it is stable if and only if it has no pseudoprojective summands (compare with 1.6 (ii)). However, for $d > 2$, these properties are not equivalent. The following lemma and examples give the precise relationship.

Lemma 6.3. *Let $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ with $d \geq 2$.*

- (i) *If X is reduced, then X has no pseudoprojective summands.*
- (ii) *If X has no pseudoprojective summands, then X is stable.*

Proof. In order to prove (i), suppose $X \cong X' \oplus X''$ for some $X' = (\varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_d)$ and $X'' = (\varphi''_1, \dots, \varphi''_d)$ with X' pseudoprojective. Then, $\text{cok } \varphi'_k = 0$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Equivalently, φ'_k is an isomorphism and therefore, $\varphi_k \cong \varphi'_k \oplus \varphi''_k$ is not minimal.

Corollary 5.10(ii) showed that X is stable if and only if it has no non-zero projective summands. Since indecomposable projective matrix factorizations are pseudoprojective, (ii) follows. \square

Examples 6.4 and 6.5 below show that the converses of (ii) and (i) respectively fail in general for $d > 2$.

Example 6.4. Let $(\varphi : G \rightarrow F, \psi : F \rightarrow G) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$ be a reduced matrix factorization.

- (i) $(\varphi, \psi, 1_F) \in \text{MF}_S^3(f)$ is stable but is itself pseudoprojective.

(ii) $\left(\begin{pmatrix} \varphi & \\ & 1_F \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \psi & \\ & 1_F \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1_F & \\ & \varphi \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1_F & \\ & \psi \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \text{MF}_S^4(f)$ is stable but it is a direct sum of pseudoprojectives.

Example 6.5. Let $S = \mathbf{k}\llbracket x, y \rrbracket$, with \mathbf{k} an uncountable algebraically closed field of characteristic different from 2. Let $f = x^2y \in S$ and, as usual, set $R = S/(f)$. Consider the following matrix factorization of f with 3 factors:

$$X = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3) = \left(\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & -x \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0 & y \\ x^2 & -x \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ x & y \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Notice that X is not reduced. We claim that X is indecomposable. To see this, first note that the R -module $\text{cok} \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & -x \end{pmatrix}$ is an indecomposable MCM over the D_∞ hypersurface singularity $R = \mathbf{k}\llbracket x, y \rrbracket/(x^2y)$ [BGS87, Proposition 4.2]. If $X \cong Y \oplus Y'$ for some non-zero matrix factorizations $Y = (u, v, w), Y' = (u', v', w') \in \text{MF}_S^3(f)$, both necessarily of size 1, then

$$\text{cok} \begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & -x \end{pmatrix} \cong \text{cok}(u) \oplus \text{cok}(u').$$

This implies that one of $\text{cok}(u)$ or $\text{cok}(u')$ must be zero. Rearranging the summands if necessary, we may assume $\text{cok}(u') = 0$. Equivalently, we have that u' is multiplication by a unit in S . This would imply a matrix equivalence

$$\begin{pmatrix} x & y \\ 0 & -x \end{pmatrix} \sim \begin{pmatrix} u & 0 \\ 0 & u' \end{pmatrix}$$

which is not possible since the matrix on the right has a unit entry. Therefore, no such decomposition is possible. Since X is indecomposable and the matrices φ_1, φ_2 , and φ_3 are non-invertible, it follows that X has no pseudoprojective summands.

Set $\mu_i = \mu_R(\text{cok } \varphi_i)$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}_3$. Then, $\mu_1 = 2, \mu_2 = 2$, and $\mu_3 = 1$. Corollary 5.12 says that we should expect a direct sum decomposition of $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^3(f)}(X)$ into a stable matrix factorization of size 3 and a projective isomorphic to $\mathcal{P}_3 = (1, 1, x^2y)$. Indeed, using invertible row and column operations, one can construct an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{\text{MF}_S^3(f)}(X) &= \left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -y & -xy & -y^2 \\ -x^2 & x & 0 & xy \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & -x & -y \\ -x & -y & -x^2 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -x & -y & -x^2y & 0 \\ 0 & x & x^3 & -x^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &\cong \left(\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x & 0 & xy \\ 0 & -y & -xy & -y^2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -y & 0 & xy \\ 0 & 0 & -x & -y \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x^2y & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x & 0 & -x^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.14 implies that the stable part of $\Omega_{\text{MF}_S^3(f)}(X)$,

$$\tilde{\Omega} = \left(\begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & xy \\ -y & -xy & -y^2 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} -y & 0 & xy \\ 0 & -x & -y \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} x & 0 & -x^2 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

is also an indecomposable matrix factorization of $f = x^2y$. Clearly, none of the matrices that make up $\tilde{\Omega}$ are invertible and therefore $\tilde{\Omega}$ has no pseudoprojective summands.

One benefit of having no pseudoprojective summands is the following.

Lemma 6.6. *Assume $X = (\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ has no pseudoprojective summands. If $\text{cok } \varphi_j$ is an indecomposable MCM R -module for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, then X is an indecomposable matrix factorization.*

Proof. Suppose $X \cong X' \oplus X''$ for non-zero $X' = (\varphi'_1, \dots, \varphi'_d), X'' = (\varphi''_1, \dots, \varphi''_d) \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$. Then, $\text{cok } \varphi_j \cong \text{cok } \varphi'_j \oplus \text{cok } \varphi''_j$. Since $\text{cok } \varphi_j$ is indecomposable, it follows that one of φ'_j or φ''_j is an isomorphism. That is, one of X' or X'' is pseudoprojective, a contradiction. Hence, X is indecomposable. \square

Any partial converse to Lemma 6.6 would be very interesting but would likely need more conditions on X . The only result we have in this direction is a special case of Proposition 5.9 which says that the cokernels of an indecomposable non-projective matrix factorization have no free summands.

In the case that f is an irreducible in S , we have another interesting consequence.

Proposition 6.7. *Assume $f \in S$ is irreducible. Then, any $X \in \text{MF}_S^d(f)$ which is not pseudoprojective must be of size at least d .*

Proof. Let $X = (\varphi_1 : F_2 \rightarrow F_1, \dots, \varphi_d : F_1 \rightarrow F_d)$ and set n to be the size of X . Since $\varphi_1 \varphi_2 \cdots \varphi_d = f \cdot 1_{F_1}$, we have that

$$(\det \varphi_1)(\det \varphi_2) \cdots (\det \varphi_d) = f^n.$$

Since f is irreducible, for each $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$, there exists units $u_k \in S$ and integers $r_k \geq 0$ such that $\det \varphi_k = u_k f^{r_k}$. Moreover, we have that $n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_d} r_k$.

Let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_d$. Since $(\varphi_k, \varphi_{k+1} \varphi_{k+2} \cdots \varphi_{k-1}) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$, [Eis80, Proposition 5.6] implies that $\text{rank}_R(\text{cok } \varphi_k) = r_k$, where $R = S/(f)$ as usual. The non-negative integer $r_k = 0$ if and only if φ_k is an isomorphism. However, since X is not pseudoprojective, we have that $r_k > 0$. Thus, $n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}_d} r_k \geq d$. \square

In the case $d = 2$, this proposition is simply a restatement of the definition of an irreducible element; if $(u, v) \in \text{MF}_S^2(f)$ is of size 1, then one of u or v must be a unit in S .

Example 6.8. Let \mathbf{k} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0 and set $S = \mathbf{k}[[x, y]]$. Let $\omega \in \mathbf{k}$ be a primitive 3rd root of unity. Consider the simple curve singularity $R = S/(x^3 + y^4)$ of type \mathbb{E}_6 . Following the notation of [Yos90, Chapter 9], the indecomposable MCM R -module B is given by the matrix factorization

$$(\beta, \alpha) = \left(\left(\begin{array}{ccc} y & 0 & x \\ x & -y^2 & 0 \\ 0 & x & -y \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} y^3 & x^2 & xy^2 \\ xy & -y^2 & x^2 \\ x^2 & -xy & -y^3 \end{array} \right) \right) \in \text{MF}_S^2(x^3 + y^4)$$

in the sense that $B = \text{cok } \beta$. The matrix α factors further which gives rise to a matrix factorization of $x^3 + y^4$ with 3 factors:

$$(\beta, \beta_2, \beta_3) := \left(\left(\begin{array}{ccc} y & 0 & x \\ x & -y^2 & 0 \\ 0 & x & -y \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} -y^2 & 0 & \omega x \\ \omega x & -y & 0 \\ 0 & \omega x & y \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} -y & 0 & \omega^2 x \\ \omega^2 x & y & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 x & -y^2 \end{array} \right) \right)$$

As we can see, the entries of β, β_2 , and β_3 lie in the maximal ideal of S , that is, $(\beta, \beta_2, \beta_3) \in \text{MF}_S^3(x^3 + y^4)$ is reduced. Combining Lemma 6.3, Lemma 6.6, and the fact that $B = \text{cok } \beta$ is an indecomposable MCM R -module, we conclude that $(\beta, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ is indecomposable. We also note that, since $\det \beta = x^3 + y^4$, the matrix α is the adjoint of β . Hence, $\alpha = \beta_2 \beta_3$ is a factorization of the adjoint.

The matrix factorization $(\beta, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ is essentially the one constructed in [BES17, Proposition 2.1]. Similar examples are also found using this construction. For instance,

(\mathbb{E}_7) Let $f = x^3 + xy^3 \in S$.

$$\left(\left(\begin{array}{ccc} y & 0 & x \\ -x & xy & 0 \\ 0 & -x & y \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} xy & 0 & \omega x \\ -\omega x & y & 0 \\ 0 & -\omega x & y \end{array} \right), \left(\begin{array}{ccc} y & 0 & \omega^2 x \\ -\omega^2 x & y & 0 \\ 0 & -\omega^2 x & xy \end{array} \right) \right) \in \text{MF}_S^3(x^3 + xy^3)$$

(\mathbb{E}_8) Let $f = x^3 + y^5 \in S$.

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} y & -x & 0 \\ 0 & y & -x \\ x & 0 & y^3 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} y^3 & -\omega x & 0 \\ 0 & y & -\omega x \\ \omega x & 0 & y \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} y & -\omega^2 x & 0 \\ 0 & y^3 & -\omega^2 x \\ \omega^2 x & 0 & y \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \text{MF}_S^3(x^3 + y^5)$$

and

$$\left(\begin{pmatrix} y & -x & 0 \\ 0 & y^2 & -x \\ x & 0 & y^2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} y^2 & -\omega x & 0 \\ 0 & y & -\omega x \\ \omega x & 0 & y^2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} y^2 & -\omega^2 x & 0 \\ 0 & y^2 & -\omega^2 x \\ \omega^2 x & 0 & y \end{pmatrix} \right) \in \text{MF}_S^3(x^3 + y^5).$$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to thank his advisor, Graham J. Leuschke, for his dedication to this project and for his guidance and encouragement throughout its preparation.

REFERENCES

- [Aus86] Maurice Auslander, *Isolated singularities and existence of almost split sequences*, Representation theory, II (Ottawa, Ont., 1984), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1178, Springer, Berlin, 1986, pp. 194–242. MR 842486
- [Ber06] George M. Bergman, *Can one factor the classical adjoint of a generic matrix?*, Transform. Groups **11** (2006), no. 1, 7–15. MR 2205070
- [BES17] Markus Bläser, David Eisenbud, and Frank-Olaf Schreyer, *Ulrich complexity*, Differential Geometry and its Applications **55** (2017), 128–145, Publisher: Elsevier.
- [BGS87] Ragnar-Olaf Buchweitz, Gert-Martin Greuel, and Frank-Olaf Schreyer, *Cohen-Macaulay modules on hypersurface singularities. II*, Invent. Math. **88** (1987), no. 1, 165–182. MR 877011
- [BHS88] Jürgen Backelin, Jürgen Herzog, and Herbert Sanders, *Matrix factorizations of homogeneous polynomials*, Algebra some current trends, Springer, 1988, pp. 1–33.
- [BL07] Ragnar-Olaf Buchweitz and Graham J. Leuschke, *Factoring the adjoint and maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules over the generic determinant*, Amer. J. Math. **129** (2007), no. 4, 943–981. MR 2343380
- [Bü10] Theo Bühler, *Exact categories*, Expositiones Mathematicae **28** (2010), no. 1, 1–69, ISBN: 0723-0869 Publisher: Elsevier.
- [Chi78] Lindsay N. Childs, *Linearizing of n -ic forms and generalized Clifford algebras*, null **5** (1978), no. 4, 267–278, Publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [Eis80] David Eisenbud, *Homological algebra on a complete intersection, with an application to group representations*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **260** (1980), no. 1, 35–64. MR 570778
- [Hap88] Dieter Happel, *Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 119, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988. MR 935124
- [HUB91] Jürgen Herzog, Bernd Ulrich, and Jürgen Backelin, *Linear maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules over strict complete intersections*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **71** (1991), no. 2-3, 187–202, ISBN: 0022-4049 Publisher: North-Holland.
- [IKM17] Osamu Iyama, Kiriko Kato, and Jun-ichi Miyachi, *Derived categories of N -complexes*, Journal of the London Mathematical Society **96** (2017), no. 3, 687–716, ISBN: 0024-6107 Publisher: Wiley Online Library.
- [Knö87] Horst Knörrer, *Cohen-Macaulay modules on hypersurface singularities. I*, Invent. Math. **88** (1987), no. 1, 153–164. MR 877010
- [LW12] Graham J. Leuschke and Roger Wiegand, *Cohen-Macaulay representations*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, vol. 181, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. MR 2919145
- [Sol89] Øyvind Solberg, *Hypersurface singularities of finite Cohen-Macaulay type*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **58** (1989), no. 2, 258–280. MR 977477
- [Yos90] Yuji Yoshino, *Cohen-Macaulay modules over Cohen-Macaulay rings*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 146, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. MR 1079937

E-mail address: ttribone@syr.edu

Department of Mathematics, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York 13244, USA