

COXETER QUIVER REPRESENTATIONS IN FUSION CATEGORIES AND GABRIEL'S THEOREM

EDMUND HENG

ABSTRACT. We introduce a notion of representation for a class of generalised quivers known as *Coxeter quivers*. These representations are built using fusion categories associated to $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ at roots of unity and we show that many of the classical results on representations of quivers can be generalised to this setting. Namely, we prove a generalised Gabriel's theorem for Coxeter quivers that encompasses all *Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams* – including the non-crystallographic types H and I . Moreover, a similar relation between reflection functors and Coxeter theory is used to show that the indecomposable representations correspond bijectively to the positive roots of Coxeter root systems over fusion rings.

INTRODUCTION

Recall the following well-celebrated result of Gabriel on the classification of finite-type quivers:

Theorem (Gabriel's theorem [Gab72]). *A quiver \tilde{Q} has finitely-many isomorphism classes of indecomposable representations (finite-type) if and only if its underlying graph \overline{Q} is a (finite, disjoint) union of ADE Dynkin diagrams: A_n, D_n, E_6, E_7, E_8 . Moreover, in these cases the isomorphism classes of indecomposable representations correspond bijectively to the positive roots of the root system associated to its underlying graph \overline{Q} by taking the dimension vector.*

By the works of Dlab–Ringel [DR75; DR76], it is known that the result above can be extended to include all Dynkin diagrams (adding in B_n, C_n, F_4, G_2) if one considers representations of a generalised notion of quivers known as valued quivers (or K -species).

The generalisation to valued quivers is quite natural as the *ADE* diagrams are part of the Dynkin diagrams classifying the semisimple Lie algebras, which all have well-defined root systems. However, the *ADE* diagrams are also part of a similar (yet slightly different) classification known as the *Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams*, which serve to classify the finite Coxeter groups [Cox35]. More importantly, root systems for Coxeter groups can be similarly developed; see for example [Deo82; Dye09]. It is therefore natural to search for a generalised Gabriel's theorem that is related to Coxeter theory – such is the aim of this paper. Namely, we shall introduce a notion of representation for a (different) class of generalised quivers known as *Coxeter quivers*, which will extend Gabriel's theorem to include all Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams – including the non-crystallographic types H_3, H_4 and $I_2(n)$.

A *Coxeter quiver* (cf. Definition 2.1) is a quiver Q whose arrows are labelled by natural numbers in $\{3, 4, 5, \dots\} \subset \mathbb{N}$, where a classical quiver is (by definition) a Coxeter quiver with all arrows labelled by '3'. Whilst representations of quivers are built using the category of vector spaces, representations of Coxeter quivers Q are built using different *fusion categories* $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ depending

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 16G20, 18M20, 17B22.

Key words and phrases. Quivers; Fusion categories; Root systems; Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams; Quantum groups.

on Q . These fusion categories $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ are constructed from (tensor products of) fusion categories associated to $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ at roots of unity¹ (see Section 2.2); when Q is just a classical quiver, $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ will be (equivalent to) the category of vector spaces.

A representation V of a Coxeter quiver Q consists of the following datum: to each vertex $i \in Q_0$, we assign an object V_i in the fusion category $\mathcal{C}(Q)$; and to each arrow α from $i \rightarrow j$ with label n , we assign a morphism $V_\alpha : A_n \otimes V_i \rightarrow V_j$ with A_n depending on the label n (see Definition 2.4 for the precise definition). In the particular case where Q is just a classical quiver (all labels are ‘3’), $A_n = A_3$ will be the one-dimensional vector space, so that the definition coincides with the classical quiver representation. These representations, together with their morphisms, form an abelian category in a similar fashion, and we say that a Coxeter quiver is of *finite-type* if its category of representations has finitely many indecomposables (upto isomorphism). The relevance to the first part of Gabriel’s theorem is as follows:

Theorem A (= Theorem 3.4). *A Coxeter quiver Q is of finite-type if and only if its underlying graph (forgetting orientations but keeping the labels) is a finite (disjoint) union of Coxeter–Dynkin diagrams: $A_n, B_n = C_n, D_n, E_6, E_7, E_8, F_4, G_2, H_3, H_4, I_2(n)$.*

While representations of classical quivers are related to root system over \mathbb{Z} defined on lattices $L_{\check{Q}} := \bigoplus_{i \in \check{Q}_0} \mathbb{Z}$, the representations of Coxeter quivers are related to generalised root systems defined over (commutative) *fusion rings* $K_0(\mathcal{C}(Q))$ of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ (see Definition 1.3 for definition of fusion rings). More precisely, given a Coxeter quiver Q , the associated root system is defined on the “lattice” $L_Q := \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} K_0(\mathcal{C}(Q))$ equipped with a bilinear form that is linear in $K_0(\mathcal{C}(Q))$ and takes value in $K_0(\mathcal{C}(Q))$ as well. This type of root systems were studied by Dyer in [Dye09] and many of the properties satisfied by the usual root systems can be generalised to this setting. In particular, the bilinear form induces a (faithful) action of the corresponding Coxeter group and the notion of positive roots (and their extended version) can be defined in a similar fashion (see Section 4.1).

Analogous to the classical case, the dimension vector of a Coxeter quiver representation (cf. Definition 4.3) will take value in L_Q . Using reflection functors for Coxeter quivers (similar to those in [BGP73; DR76]) and their interaction with the generalised root systems described above, we obtain the second part of Gabriel’s theorem for Coxeter quivers.

Theorem B (= Theorem 4.11). *Let Q be a Coxeter quiver whose underlying graph is a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram. The isomorphism classes of indecomposable representations of Q correspond bijectively to the extended positive roots of the free $K_0(\mathcal{C}(Q))$ -module L_Q by taking the dimension vector. Moreover, every indecomposable representation $V \in \text{rep}(Q)$ is of the form*

$$V \cong V' \otimes A$$

for some $V' \in \text{rep}(Q)$ that corresponds to a positive root and some simple object A in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$.

The approach of studying non-simply-laced Dynkin graphs and quivers by folding their simply-laced cousins via automorphisms is well-known; see for example [Ste16; Lus93; Tan80]. However, certain non-crystallographic graphs require foldings that do not arise from automorphisms. One famous example is Lusztig’s folding of the E_8 graph onto the H_4 graph [Lus83], with other similar examples studied in different contexts [Shc88; MP93; Zub94; Cri99; Dye09]. Although the theory of Coxeter quiver representations (a priori) may not seemed related to the classical theory of quiver representations, they turn out to be related through these types of foldings.

¹We will actually use the equivalent diagrammatic category known as the Temperley–Lieb–Jones categories TLJ_n .

Theorem C (= Theorem 3.1). *Let Q be a Coxeter quiver and let \check{Q} be its associated unfolded classical quiver (cf. Section 3.2). The two categories $\text{rep}(Q)$ and $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$ are equivalent as abelian categories.*

It is important to note that the equivalence is only an equivalence of abelian categories; $\text{rep}(Q)$ is also a (right) *module category* (cf. Definition 1.4) over the fusion category $\mathcal{C}(Q)$. In other words, $\text{rep}(Q)$ and the equivalence above provide an explicitly way of realising a $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ -module category structure on $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$, which can be seen as a folding structure on \check{Q} .² Let us also mention here that with the appropriate notion of *path algebra* $\text{Path}(Q)$ for Q (cf. Definition 5.7), we also have an equivalence between the category of modules $\text{Path}(Q)\text{-mod}$ and $\text{rep}(Q)$; see Section 5 for more details.

Now that we have revealed the connection to classical quiver representations, the observant reader may realise that the first part of Gabriel's theorem for Coxeter quiver (Theorem A) is just a simple consequence of this theorem, and that is indeed the case – one just has to show that Q is finite type if and only if \check{Q} is finite type. This will only involve a rather simple combinatorial check (plus some Coxeter theory).

Outline of the paper. Here is a brief outline of the paper. Section 1 contains the background materials, where we define fusion categories and introduce the fusion categories that will be used to construct representations of Coxeter quivers. Section 2 contains the definition of Coxeter quivers and their representations.

Section 3 and Section 4 contain the main results. In Section 3, we define the unfolding of Coxeter quivers Q to obtain their associated classical quiver \check{Q} and moreover, relate their category of representations. This will allow us to prove the first part of Gabriel's theorem for Coxeter quivers (Theorem A = Theorem 3.4). Section 4 is where we define root systems over fusion rings and reflection functors for Coxeter quivers, which we use to prove the second part of Gabriel's theorem for Coxeter quivers (Theorem B = Theorem 4.11).

Section 5 is dedicated to the complementary result that the category modules over the path algebra of a Coxeter quiver is equivalent to the category of Coxeter quiver representations. Finally Section 6 contains some remarks on related works and possible further directions.

Notation and Convention. Throughout this paper, we will use hook arrows \hookrightarrow and two-headed arrows \twoheadrightarrow to represent monomorphisms and epimorphisms respectively.

Given an abelian category \mathcal{C} , the image of a morphism $f : X \rightarrow Y$ is by definition the kernel of the cokernel of f , captured by the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \text{im}(f) := \ker(\text{coker}(f)) & & \\
 & \exists! \bar{f} \twoheadrightarrow & \downarrow \text{i}(f) := \text{t}(\text{c}(f)) & & \\
 X & \xrightarrow{f} & Y & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{coker}(f).
 \end{array}$$

In particular, the unique epi-mono factorisation of a morphism $X \xrightarrow{f} Y$ through its image shall be denoted by $X \xrightarrow{\bar{f}} \text{im}(f) \xrightarrow{\text{i}(f)} Y$.

Given a direct sum $\bigoplus_{i \in I} Y_i$ for some index set I with maps $f_i : X \rightarrow Y_i$ for each $i \in I$, we shall use $[f_i]_{i \in I}$ to denote the map from $X \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} Y_i$ induced by the f_i 's into each summand, thinking of it as a column vector of maps once we fix some ordering on the index set I . Similarly, given

²In the sense of [DT22]; see Section 6.3 for more details.

maps $g_i : Y_i \rightarrow Z$, we shall use $[g_i]_{i \in I}^T$ to denote the map from $\bigoplus_{i \in I} Y_i \rightarrow Z$ induced by the g_i from each summand, thinking of it as a row vector of maps. In particular, the map

$$X \xrightarrow{[f_i]_{i \in I}} \bigoplus_{i \in I} Y_i \xrightarrow{[g_i]_{i \in I}^T} Z$$

is just $\sum_{i \in I} g_i \circ f_i$, which is the same as the matrix multiplication $[g_i]_{i \in I}^T [f_i]_{i \in I}$ once an ordering of I is fixed. On the other hand, if we were given a map $f : \bigoplus_{i \in I} X_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in I} Y_i$, we shall use $(f)_{i,j}$ to denote the map between the summands $(f)_{i,j} : X_i \rightarrow Y_j$. We will also use $A \subseteq^{\oplus} B$ to mean A appears as a direct summand of B (upto isomorphism).

In this paper, two very similar sounding notions will appear: a *module category* over a fusion (tensor) category \mathcal{C} (Definition 1.4) and a *category of modules* over an algebra in a fusion category (Definition 5.2). We warn the reader that these are two different (although related) notions and not to confuse the two of them.

Acknowledgements. I'd like to first thank my PhD supervisor, Tony Licata, for his guidance and questions which led to the making of this work. I'd also like to thank Drew D. Duffield and Greg Kuperberg for the interesting discussions during the preparation of this work.

1. PRELIMINARIES: FUSION CATEGORIES AND TLJ_n

1.1. Fusion tensor categories and their module categories. We shall quickly review the notion of a fusion category and some of its (desired) properties. We refer the reader to [ENO05; EGNO15] for more details on this subject.

Definition 1.1. A (strict) *tensor category* \mathcal{C} is a \mathbb{K} -linear (hom spaces are \mathbb{K} -vector spaces), abelian and (strict) monoidal category with a bi-exact monoidal structure $- \otimes -$, satisfying the following properties:

- the monoidal unit $\mathbb{1}$ is simple; and
- rigidity: every object has left and right duals.

If \mathcal{C} is semi-simple with finitely many isomorphism classes of simple objects, we say that \mathcal{C} is a *fusion category*.

Example 1.2. At this point the reader should check that the simplest possible example of a fusion category is the category of finite dimensional \mathbb{C} -vector spaces.

Other fusion categories of interests will be defined in Section 1.2.

Definition 1.3. Let \mathcal{A} be an abelian category. Its *Grothendieck group* $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ is the abelian group freely generated by isomorphism classes $[A]$ of objects $A \in \mathcal{A}$ modulo the relation

$$[B] = [A] + [C] \iff 0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0 \text{ is exact.}$$

If $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{C}$ is moreover a fusion category, $K_0(\mathcal{C})$ can be equipped with a unital \mathbb{N} -ring structure. Namely, it has basis given by the (finite) isomorphism classes of simples $\{[S_i]\}_{i=1}^k$, multiplication $[A] \cdot [B] := [A \otimes B]$ defined by the tensor product that satisfies

$$[A] \cdot [B] = \sum_{i=1}^k r_i^{AB} [S_i], \quad r_i^{AB} \in \mathbb{N}$$

and with $[S_1] = [\mathbb{1}] = 1$ the unit. Together with this ring structure, we call $K_0(\mathcal{C})$ the *fusion ring* of \mathcal{C} .

Definition 1.4. A right *module category* over a tensor category \mathcal{C} is an additive category \mathcal{A} together with an additive monoidal functor $\Psi : \mathcal{C}^{\otimes \text{op}} \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathcal{A})$. When \mathcal{A} is abelian (or triangulated), we require Ψ to map into the category of exact endofunctors $\text{End}(\mathcal{A})$.

Example 1.5. (i) Any tensor category is always a right module category over itself, sending each object A to the functor $- \otimes A$.

(ii) One can check that every additive category \mathcal{A} is naturally a module category over the category of finite dimensional vector spaces $\text{vec}_{\mathbb{K}}$, sending each (non-zero) vector space V to the endofunctor of \mathcal{A} which takes $A \in \mathcal{A}$ to $V(A) := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{\dim(V)} A$, and every morphism $A \xrightarrow{f} A'$ in \mathcal{A} to $V(A) \xrightarrow{\bigoplus_{i=1}^{\dim V} f} V(A')$.

Note that when a \mathcal{C} -module category \mathcal{A} is abelian (or triangulated), its exact Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{A})$ is naturally a module over the fusion ring $K_0(\mathcal{C})$.

1.2. Temperley-Lieb-Jones category at root of unity. The fusion categories of interest in this paper will be built from (tensor products of) strict fusion categories known as the *Temperley-Lieb-Jones category evaluated at $q = e^{i\pi/n}$* , which we denote as TLJ_n . This is a diagrammatic category, constructed as the additive completion of the category of Jones-Wenzl projectors that is semi-simplified by killing the negligible $(n-1)$ th Jones-Wenzl projector. We will only provide the minimal description of what is needed for the purpose of our paper, where we follow the description in [Che14] closely. For more details, we refer the reader to [Wan10; Tur16].

Remark 1.6. The representation-theoretic-inclined reader could instead use the semi-simplified category $\overline{\text{rep}}(U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2))$ of $U_q(\mathfrak{sl}_2)$ -modules with $q = e^{i\frac{\pi}{n}}$, which is equivalent to TLJ_n as braided fusion categories; see [Tur16, Chapter XI, Section 6] and [ST09, Section 5.5].

The Temperley-Lieb-Jones category TLJ_n at $q = e^{i\pi/n}$ [Che14, Definition 5.4.1] is a strict fusion category that is \mathbb{C} -linear, generated additively and monoidally by the following $n-1$ simple objects:

$$\Pi_0, \Pi_1, \dots, \Pi_{n-2},$$

with Π_0 being the monoidal unit. The simple objects (hence all objects) in TLJ_n are self-dual. In particular, we will use a cap (resp. cup) to denote the counit (resp. unit) of the self-dual structure on each Π_a for $0 \leq a \leq n-2$ (Π_0 is denoted by the “empty diagram”):

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{cap} \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_a \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{cup} \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_a \end{array}, \quad (1)$$

satisfying the usual “isotopy of strings” relation:

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{cap} \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_a \quad \Pi_a \\ \text{cup} \end{array} = \text{id} = \begin{array}{c} \text{cup} \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_a \quad \Pi_a \\ \text{cap} \end{array}.$$

The semi-simple decompositions of the objects in TLJ_n is described by the following *fusion rule*:

$$\Pi_a \otimes \Pi_b \cong \begin{cases} \Pi_{|a-b|} \oplus \Pi_{|a-b|+2} \oplus \dots \oplus \Pi_{a+b}, & a+b \leq n-2; \\ \Pi_{|a-b|} \oplus \Pi_{|a-b|+2} \oplus \dots \oplus \Pi_{2n-(a+b)-4}, & a+b > n-2. \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Notice that no simple appear more than once in the semi-simple decomposition above.

Remark 1.7. Equation (2) is symmetric along a and b , so we have that $\Pi_a \otimes \Pi_b \cong \Pi_b \otimes \Pi_a$. Nonetheless, the category TLJ_n is not symmetric, but instead *braided*; see [Tur16, Chapter XII, Section 6].

The cases where $a = 1, n - 2$ and $n - 3$ will be of utmost importance to us, which we shall explicitly record here for convenience:

- $a = 1$:

$$\Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_b \cong \Pi_b \otimes \Pi_1 \cong \begin{cases} \Pi_1, & b = 0 \\ \Pi_{n-3}, & b = n - 2 \\ \Pi_{b-1} \oplus \Pi_{b+1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

- $a = n - 2$:

$$\Pi_{n-2} \otimes \Pi_b \cong \Pi_{n-2-b}. \quad (4)$$

- $a = n - 3$: Together (3) and (4) implies that

$$\Pi_{n-3} \otimes \Pi_b \cong \Pi_{n-2} \otimes \Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_b \cong \begin{cases} \Pi_{n-3}, & b = 0 \\ \Pi_1, & b = n - 2 \\ \Pi_{n-2-b-1} \oplus \Pi_{n-2-b+1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Using the fusion rules in (2) one can also see that if a and b are both even, then their semi-simple decomposition contains only evenly labelled objects. In other words, the full subcategory of TLJ_n generated the evenly labelled object forms a fusion subcategory of TLJ_n , which we denote by $\text{TLJ}_n^{\text{even}}$. When $n = 3$, the full subcategory $\text{TLJ}_3^{\text{even}}$ is equivalent to the category of finite dimensional vector spaces over \mathbb{C} .

It follows from semi-simplicity and (2) that we have an explicit description of the following morphism spaces:

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_a \otimes \Pi_b, \Pi_c) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}\{\wedge\}, & \text{if } \Pi_c \subseteq^{\oplus} \Pi_a \otimes \Pi_b; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where \wedge denotes our chosen basis element for the one-dimensional morphism space known as the q -admissible map [Che14, Section 3.1]:

$$\begin{array}{c} \Pi_c \\ | \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_b \end{array} \quad (7)$$

When $c = 0$, it follows from (2) that the only case when the morphism space is non-zero is $a = b$ and the q -admissible map \wedge in this case coincides with the cap map \cap in (1). On the other hand when $a = 0$ (resp. $b = 0$), it must be that $c = a$ (resp. $c = b$) and the q -admissible map is the identity map on Π_c . The (non-unique) isomorphism in the fusion rule (2) can also be given by summing up the corresponding q -admissible map into each simple summand.

The q -admissible maps represented by the trivalent graphs are “rotational invariant”, namely under the dualisations

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_a \otimes \Pi_b, \Pi_c) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_a, \Pi_c \otimes \Pi_b) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_c \otimes \Pi_a, \Pi_b),$$

the map obtained agrees with the corresponding q -admissible map:

$$\begin{array}{c} \Pi_b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_c \quad \Pi_a \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \Pi_b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_c \quad \Pi_b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_c \quad \Pi_a \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_c \quad \Pi_a \end{array} ;$$

the same is true for the other rotation.

We shall use the inverted trivalent graphs:

$$\begin{array}{c} \Pi_c \quad \Pi_b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \end{array} := \begin{array}{c} \Pi_c \quad \Pi_b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \end{array}, \quad \begin{array}{c} \Pi_a \quad \Pi_c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_b \end{array} := \begin{array}{c} \Pi_a \quad \Pi_c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_b \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_b \end{array},$$

to denote the two dualisations of the q -admissible map in $\text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_a \otimes \Pi_b, \Pi_c)$ to the (q -admissible) maps in $\text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_a, \Pi_c \otimes \Pi_b)$ and $\text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_b, \Pi_a \otimes \Pi_c)$ respectively. Once again it follows from (2) and the semi-simple property of TLJ_n that

$$\text{Hom}_{\text{TLJ}_n}(\Pi_a, \Pi_c \otimes \Pi_b) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}\{\Upsilon\}, & \text{if } \Pi_a \subseteq^{\oplus} \Pi_c \otimes \Pi_b; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

It also follows from the rotational invariant property that we have the following relation between the q -admissible maps:

$$\begin{array}{c} \Pi_b \quad \Pi_d \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_c \quad \Pi_d \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_e \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \Pi_b \quad \Pi_d \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_b \quad \Pi_c \quad \Pi_e \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \quad \Pi_e \end{array} \quad (9)$$

Finally, given two q -admissible triples (a, b, c) and (d, b, c) , we have that

$$\begin{array}{c} \Pi_d \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_b \quad \Pi_c \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \Pi_a \end{array} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } a \neq d; \\ \frac{\theta(a,b,c)}{[a+1]_q} \text{id}, & \text{if } a = d \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

with $\theta(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{C}$ some non-zero constant (see [Che14, Definition 3.2.1]), whose actual value will not matter to us.

Throughout this paper, we will also use the symbols “ \cap ”, “ \cup ”, “ \wedge ” and “ \vee ” to represent these q -admissible maps during calculations whenever the domain and codomain are clear from context.

1.3. Chebyshev polynomials and fusion ring. Let $\Delta_k(d)$ denote the polynomial (in variable d) defined by the following recurrence relation

$$\Delta_0(d) = 1, \quad \Delta_1(d) = d, \quad \Delta_{k+1}(d) = d\Delta_k(d) - \Delta_{k-1}(d).$$

The fusion rule (2) allows us to identify the fusion ring of TLJ_n with

$$K_0(\text{TLJ}_n) \cong \mathbb{Z}[d]/\langle \Delta_{n-1}(d) \rangle,$$

where each basis element $[\Pi_k]$ is mapped to $\Delta_k(d)$.

1.4. Deligne's tensor product. The following notion of tensor product of monoidal categories will be useful later on.

Definition 1.8. Let \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' be fusion categories. The (*Deligne's*) *tensor product* $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}'$ is the fusion category with objects and morphism spaces given as follows:

- (1) $\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}')$ consists of finite direct sums of the formal objects $A \boxtimes A'$, with A and A' objects in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' respectively;
- (2) $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}'}(\bigoplus A_i \boxtimes A'_i, \bigoplus B_j \boxtimes B'_j) = \bigoplus_{i,j} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(A_i, B_j) \otimes \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}'}(A'_i, B'_j)$.

The monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C} \boxtimes \mathcal{C}'$ is defined component-wise by

$$(A \boxtimes A') \otimes (B \boxtimes B') := (A \otimes B) \boxtimes (A' \otimes B'),$$

with monoidal unit $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}} \boxtimes \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{C}'}$ and direct sums in each \boxtimes -component is distributive over \boxtimes . The simple objects are given by $X \boxtimes X'$ for X and X' simple objects in \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}' respectively.

Given a finite set S and with fusion category \mathcal{C}_s for each $s \in S$, we may define the fusion category $\bigboxtimes_{s \in S} \mathcal{C}_s$ in a similar fashion. It is easy to see that the fusion ring of $\bigboxtimes_{s \in S} \mathcal{C}_s$ is just a tensor product of the individual component

$$K_0\left(\bigboxtimes_{s \in S} \mathcal{C}_s\right) \cong \bigotimes_{s \in S} K_0(\mathcal{C}_s),$$

where the tensor products of the fusion rings are taken over \mathbb{Z} .

Remark 1.9. The Deligne's tensor product for abelian categories is by definition a universal object; when it exists, it is unique up to a unique isomorphism. The above “naive” tensor product of categories is just an explicit realisation of the Deligne's tensor product for fusion categories (which does not work for general tensor categories); see for example [Row19, Chapter 5].

2. COXETER QUIVER REPRESENTATIONS IN FUSION CATEGORIES

2.1. Coxeter quivers. Recall that a *quiver* \check{Q} is a directed graph. Namely, it has a set of vertices \check{Q}_0 and a set of arrows \check{Q}_1 equipped with two maps $s, t : \check{Q}_1 \rightarrow \check{Q}_0$ known as the source and target map respectively, providing the orientation. A *path* of a quiver (of length n) is a sequence of arrows $(\alpha_n, \alpha_{n-1}, \dots, \alpha_1)$ satisfying $t(\alpha_i) = s(\alpha_{i+1})$. Notice that by convention our path goes from “right to left”:

$$\bullet \xleftarrow{\alpha_n} \bullet \xleftarrow{\alpha_{n-1}} \dots \xleftarrow{\alpha_2} \bullet \xleftarrow{\alpha_1} \bullet$$


In this paper, all quivers are assumed to be acyclic and finite (both \check{Q}_0 and \check{Q}_1 are finite sets).

We are interested in the following generalised setting:

Definition 2.1. A *Coxeter quiver* $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t, v)$ consists of a quiver (Q_0, Q_1, s, t) equipped with an arrow label map $v : Q_1 \rightarrow \{n \in \mathbb{N} \mid n \geq 3\}$.

Remark 2.2. The reader who is familiar with Coxeter theory may wonder why the label ∞ is not included. As it will become clear later during the consideration of representations (Definition 2.4), an arrow with label n should be thought of as weighted by $2 \cos(\pi/n)$; the object $\prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)}$ appearing in the definition is an object with quantum dimension (equivalently Perron-Frobenius dimension) equal to $2 \cos(\pi/n)$. As such, the $n \rightarrow \infty$ case (where $2 \cos(\pi/n) \rightarrow 2$) should be represented by double arrows $\bullet \rightrightarrows \bullet$. This coincides with the classical convention where the affine \hat{A}_1 quiver is just the Kronecker quiver.

In practice, we shall present Coxeter quivers as follow:



where we use the ‘‘Coxeter graph convention’’ that an arrow without label is always assumed to have label ‘3’. In particular, every (classical) quiver is by definition a Coxeter quiver with only label ‘3’. We shall use $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ to denote an arrow α in Q labelled by $v(\alpha)$ with $s(\alpha) = i$ and $t(\alpha) = j$.

Remark 2.3. Note that a Coxeter quiver is not the same as a valued quiver – a valued quiver has its arrows labelled by a pair of positive integers. One should think of Coxeter quivers as associated to *possibly non-integral*, but symmetric *Coxeter* matrices; whereas valued quivers are associated to *integral*, but only symmetrisable *Cartan* matrices.

2.2. Representations of Coxeter quivers. Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t, v)$ be a Coxeter quiver and let $\text{im}(v) \subset \{3, 4, 5, \dots\}$ be the image of v . We shall denote

$$\mathcal{C}_n := \begin{cases} \text{TLJ}_n, & \text{when } n \text{ is even;} \\ \text{TLJ}_n^{\text{even}}, & \text{when } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

with TLJ_n and $\text{TLJ}_n^{\text{even}}$ defined in Section 1.2.

We associate a fusion category $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ to Q defined by (see Section 1.4 for definition of \boxtimes)

$$\mathcal{C}(Q) := \boxtimes_{n \in \text{im}(v)} \mathcal{C}_n.$$

We use $\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}$ to denote the monoidal unit of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$, dropping the subscript whenever the category $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ is clear from context. To differentiate between the simple objects in different \mathcal{C}_n , we shall use \prod_i^n to denote the simple objects in \mathcal{C}_n .

Note that for each $n \in \text{im}(v)$, \mathcal{C}_n is naturally identified with a full fusion subcategory of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$. As such, we shall abuse notation and also use \prod_i^n to denote the simple object in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ with \prod_i^n in the \mathcal{C}_n component and \prod_0^j in all other \mathcal{C}_j components.

Definition 2.4. A *representation* V of a Coxeter quiver Q consists of the following datum:

- for each vertex $i \in Q_0$, an object $V_i \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$; and

- for each arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ in Q , a morphism V_α in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$

$$V_\alpha : \prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)} V_i \rightarrow V_j.$$

A *morphism of representations* $f : V \rightarrow W$ is a collection of map $f_i : V_i \rightarrow W_i$ for each vertex i such that $f_j \circ V_\alpha = W_\alpha \circ (\text{id} \otimes f_i)$ for each arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$. Together the objects and morphisms form the *category of representations of Q* , which we denote by $\text{rep}(Q)$.

Note that when Q only has label ‘3’, we have $\mathcal{C}(Q) = \text{TLJ}_3^{\text{even}} \cong \text{vec}_{\mathbb{C}}$ and the definition above coincides with the usual definition of representations (and morphisms) of classical quiver representations. As in the case for classical quivers, $\text{rep}(Q)$ is an abelian category induced by the abelian structure of the underlying $\mathcal{C}(Q)$: the direct sums, kernels and cokernels are taken component wise.

Each object A of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ acts on a representation V by tensoring (on the right) component wise: on each vertex i we now have $V_i \otimes A$ and on each arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ we now have $V_\alpha \otimes \text{id}_A$. Similarly, A acts on morphisms $f : V \rightarrow W$ by sending each f_i to $f_i \otimes \text{id}_A$. In other words, $\text{rep}(Q)$ is a right *module category* over $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ (cf. Definition 1.4).

Remark 2.5. As we shall see in Section 5.2, $\text{rep}(Q)$ is equivalent to the category of modules over a (path) algebra associated to Q (Theorem 5.11), just as in the classical case.

3. UNFOLDING AND GABRIEL'S CLASSIFICATION FOR COXETER QUIVERS

In this section we shall prove our first main theorem, namely a classification of finite-type Coxeter quivers. This will be an easy consequence of a relation between representations of Coxeter quivers and representations of their unfolded (classical) quivers. Throughout, $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t, v)$ denotes a Coxeter quiver.

3.1. Aside on $\mathcal{C}(Q)$. Let us describe some properties of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ that we will require later on.

Suppose B, C are simple objects in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$. Recall that this means each (tensor) component of B and C is a simple object in each corresponding \mathcal{C}_n component. For each $n \in \text{im}(v)$, define $B(n)$ and $C(n)$ to be the simple \mathcal{C}_n objects in the \mathcal{C}_n component of B and C respectively. We then define \bar{B} and \bar{C} to be the ‘‘complement’’ simple objects in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ obtained by replacing the \mathcal{C}_n component of B and C respectively by \prod_0^n , so that

$$B = B(n) \otimes \bar{B}, \quad C = C(n) \otimes \bar{C}.$$

Note that they are both actual equality since \mathcal{C}_n and therefore $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ are strict monoidal categories.

It follows that we have the following variant of (6):

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}(\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B, C) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{C}\{\wedge \otimes \text{id}_{\bar{B}}\}, & \text{if } C \subseteq \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where \wedge denotes the q -admissible morphism in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}(\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B(n), C(n))$. Notice also that the following are all equivalent:


- (i) $C \subseteq \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B$;
- (ii) $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}(\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B, C) = \mathbb{C}\{\wedge \otimes \text{id}_{\bar{B}}\} \neq 0$;
- (iii) $C(n) \subseteq \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B(n)$ and $\bar{B} = \bar{C}$; and
- (iv) $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}(\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B(n), C(n)) = \mathbb{C}\{\wedge\} \neq 0$.

3.2. From Coxeter quivers to classical quivers. To each Coxeter quiver Q , we shall assign an “unfolded” classical quiver $\check{Q} = (\check{Q}_0, \check{Q}_1, s, t)$ as follows:


- its set of vertices \check{Q}_0 is given by the set $\text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q)) \times Q_0$, with $\text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))$ denoting the set of simple objects in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$;
- Given an arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ in Q , we construct an arrow $(B, i) \xrightarrow{\beta} (C, j)$ for each pair of simple objects B and C satisfying the condition that $C \subseteq \prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{\oplus v(\alpha)} B$ (or any of the equivalent conditions in Section 3.1). We call these arrows the *unfolded arrows of α* and denote the set of unfolded arrows of α by $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$. The set of arrows \check{Q}_1 of \check{Q} is then defined to be the disjoint union over all sets of unfolded arrows: $\check{Q}_1 = \coprod_{\alpha \in Q_1} \text{ufld}(\alpha)$; two arrows in \check{Q} between the same vertices obtained from unfoldings of different arrows in Q are thus by convention not the same arrows.

Refer to Figure 1 for some examples of unfoldings. Notice that even if Q is connected, \check{Q} need not be connected.

Given an arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ in Q , its set of unfolded arrows $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$ can be equivalently described as follows, depending on the parity of $n := v(\alpha)$. When n is even, $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$ contains the following $2(n-2)$ arrows for each simple object \bar{A} in $\text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))$ with its \mathcal{C}_n component given by $\bar{\Pi}_0$:



When n is odd, $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$ contains the following $(n-2)$ arrows for each \bar{A} as before:



3.3. Abelian equivalence between $\text{rep}(Q)$ and $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$. Let Q be a Coxeter quiver and \check{Q} its unfolded quiver. We shall also denote the category of representations of \check{Q} (over \mathbb{C}) by the same notation $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$. We claim that the two abelian categories $\text{rep}(Q)$ and $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$ are equivalent. Before we prove this let us set up some notation.

Throughout this subsection, we simplify our notation and use $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{C}(Q)$ and $I := \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C})$. Now suppose X be an object in \mathcal{C} . For each simple object $A \in I$, we use $A(X)$ to denote the summand of *all* A appearing in the semi-simple decomposition of X . In particular, the semi-simple decomposition of X can be written as

$$X \cong \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(X).$$

While the isomorphism realising the semi-simple decomposition of X may not be unique, note that the decomposition itself is unique. As such, we shall use $|A(X)|$ to denote the number of copies of A in $|A(X)|$, so that $A(X) = A^{\oplus |A(X)|}$.




FIGURE 1. Two examples of unfoldings \check{Q} of Coxeter quivers Q , with \check{Q} above Q .

We are now ready to prove our theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *There exists an exact functor $\mathcal{U} : \text{rep}(Q) \rightarrow \text{rep}(\check{Q})$ that is fully faithful and essentially surjective. In other words, $\text{rep}(Q)$ and $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$ are equivalent as abelian categories.*

Proof. Throughout this proof, let us fix the following datum, which we will use to construct the functor \mathcal{U} . Recall that $I := \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C})$.

- (1) For each object X in \mathcal{C} , we fix isomorphisms $\varphi_X : X \cong \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(X) : \varphi_X^{-1}$ identifying X with its semi-simple decomposition.
- (2) A hook arrow \hookrightarrow and ι will always denote the canonical inclusion of a summand into a direct sum containing it; similarly a two-headed arrow \twoheadrightarrow and ρ will always denote the canonical projection of a direct sum onto one of its summand. It will be clear from the context which summand and direct sum we are referring to.

We shall construct a functor \mathcal{U} as follows:

- On objects:

Given a representation V of Q , we will define a representation $U := \mathcal{U}(V)$ of \check{Q} . On each vertex $(A, i) \in \check{Q}_0$, we set $U_{(A, i)} := \mathbb{C}^{|A(V_i)|}$. Let $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ be an arrow of Q and denote $n := v(\alpha)$. Using the semi-simple decomposition of V_i and V_j , the morphism $V_\alpha : \overset{n}{\Pi}_{n-3} \otimes V_i \rightarrow V_j$ induces the morphism

$$\tilde{V}_\alpha := \varphi_{V_j} \circ V_\alpha \circ (\overset{n}{\Pi}_{n-3} \otimes \varphi_{V_i}^{-1}) : \bigoplus_{A \in I} \overset{n}{\Pi}_{n-3} \otimes A(V_i) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(V_j).$$

Note that \tilde{V}_α is completely determined by the component morphisms $(\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B, C}$ for each pair of simples B, C such that $C \subseteq \overset{\oplus}{\Pi}_{n-3} \otimes B$, which by the construction of \check{Q} is equivalent to having an arrow $(B, i) \xrightarrow{\beta} (C, j)$ in \check{Q} that lives in $\text{uflid}(\alpha)$ (the other component morphisms are all zero). Moreover, for each such pair the morphism $(\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B, C}$ is by definition a $|B(V_i)| \times |C(V_j)|$ matrix with each entry an element in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}}(\overset{n}{\Pi}_{n-3} \otimes B, C) = \mathbb{C}\{\wedge \otimes \text{id}_{\overline{B}}\}$ (cf. (11)). We define U_β to be the image of $(\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B, C}$ in $M_{|B(V_i)| \times |C(V_j)|}(\mathbb{C}) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}^{|B(V_i)|}, \mathbb{C}^{|C(V_j)|})$ by sending $\wedge \otimes \text{id}_{\overline{B}} \mapsto 1$.

- On morphisms:

Let $f : V \rightarrow W$ be a morphism of representations of Q . For each $f_i : V_i \rightarrow W_i$, define

$$\tilde{f}_i := \varphi_{W_i} \circ f_i \circ \varphi_{V_i}^{-1} \in \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}\left(\bigoplus_{A \in I} A(V_i), \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(W_i)\right).$$

For each simple object $B \in I$, we use $(\tilde{f}_i)_B := (\tilde{f}_i)_{B,B}$ to denote the component morphism of \tilde{f}_i that maps between the summands $B(V_i) \rightarrow B(W_i)$ (which uniquely determine \tilde{f}_i since all other component morphisms are zero). The morphism $(\tilde{f}_i)_B$ is by definition a $|B(V_i)| \times |B(W_i)|$ matrix with each entry an element of $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(B, B) = \mathbb{C}\{\text{id}_B\}$. We define $(\mathcal{U}(f))_{(B,i)} : \mathbb{C}^{|B(V_i)|} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{|B(W_i)|}$ to be the image of $(\tilde{f}_i)_B$ in $M_{|B(V_i)| \times |B(W_i)|}(\mathbb{C}) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathbb{C}^{|B(V_i)|}, \mathbb{C}^{|B(W_i)|})$ by sending $\text{id}_B \mapsto 1$.

Let us first show that $\mathcal{U}(f)$ does indeed define a morphism of representations. Namely for each arrow $(B, i) \xrightarrow{\beta} (C, j)$ in \tilde{Q} living in $\text{ufd}(\alpha)$ with $n := v(\alpha)$, we have to show that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}^{|B(V_i)|} = \mathcal{U}(V)_{(B,i)} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}(V)_{\beta}} & \mathcal{U}(V)_{(C,j)} = \mathbb{C}^{|C(V_j)|} \\ \mathcal{U}(f)_{(B,i)} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathcal{U}(f)_{(C,j)} \\ \mathbb{C}^{|B(W_i)|} = \mathcal{U}(W)_{(B,i)} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}(W)_{\beta}} & \mathcal{U}(W)_{(C,j)} = \mathbb{C}^{|C(W_j)|}. \end{array}$$

By the construction of \mathcal{U} , the commutativity of this diagram is equivalent to the commutativity of the (outermost) square diagram formed by the four dashed arrows below:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{n-3}^n B(V_i) & \overset{(\tilde{V}_{\alpha})_{B,C}}{\dashrightarrow} & C(V_j) \\ \downarrow \prod_{n-3}^n (\tilde{f}_i)_B & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\prod_{n-3}^n (\varphi_{V_i}^{-1} \circ \iota)} \\ \xrightarrow{V_{\alpha}} \\ \downarrow \prod_{n-3}^n f_i \\ \xrightarrow{W_{\alpha}} \\ \downarrow \rho \circ \varphi_{W_j} \end{array} & \uparrow \rho \circ \varphi_{V_j} \\ \prod_{n-3}^n B(W_i) & \overset{(\tilde{W}_{\alpha})_{B,C}}{\dashrightarrow} & C(W_j) \end{array}$$

It is easy to see that indeed all five inner squares commute: the inner most square commutes since f is a morphism of representation; the inner top and inner bottom diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B(V_i) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B,C}} & C(V_j) \\
 \searrow \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes (\varphi_{V_i}^{-1} \circ \iota) & & \nearrow \rho \circ \varphi_{V_j} \\
 & \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes V_i \xrightarrow{V_\alpha} V_j & \\
 & \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes W_i \xrightarrow{W_\alpha} W_j & \\
 \nearrow \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes (\varphi_{W_i}^{-1} \circ \iota) & & \searrow \rho \circ \varphi_{W_j} \\
 \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B(W_i) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{W}_\alpha)_{B,C}} & C(W_j)
 \end{array} ,$$

commute by definition of the dashed map; and the two squares below

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 B(V_i) & & C(V_j) \\
 \downarrow (\tilde{f}_i)_B & \searrow \varphi_{V_i}^{-1} \circ \iota & \nearrow \rho \circ \varphi_{V_j} \\
 & V_i & V_j \\
 & \downarrow f_i & \downarrow f_j \\
 & W_i & W_j \\
 \nearrow \varphi_{W_i}^{-1} \circ \iota & & \searrow \rho \circ \varphi_{W_j} \\
 B(W_i) & & C(W_j) \\
 \downarrow (\tilde{f}_j)_C & & \downarrow (\tilde{f}_j)_C
 \end{array} ,$$

are both commutative since f_i is and f_j are both uniquely determined by each component morphism $(\tilde{f}_i)_A$ and $(\tilde{f}_j)_A$ for each simple $A \in I$. The right diagram is exactly the inner right square of our main diagram and by applying the tensor product functor $\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes -$ to the left diagram above we obtain the inner left square. This shows that all the inner square commutes and thus the dashed square commutes as desired.

The fact that \mathcal{U} sends identity to identity follows easily from the definition. Moreover, $\mathcal{U}(g_i) \circ \mathcal{U}(f_i) = \mathcal{U}(g_i \circ f_i)$ for all i since $(\tilde{g}_i)_B \circ (\tilde{f}_i)_B = (\tilde{g}_i \circ f_i)_B$ for all simple object B . This completes the proof that \mathcal{U} is a functor from $\text{rep}(Q)$ to $\text{rep}(\tilde{Q})$.

The fact that \mathcal{U} is essentially surjective is clear from construction. Using the vector space structure on hom spaces, it is also easy to see that \mathcal{U} is faithful.

To show fullness of \mathcal{U} , let $g \in \text{Hom}_{\text{rep}(\tilde{Q})}(\mathcal{U}(V), \mathcal{U}(W))$ for V, W representations of Q , so that we have $g_{(A,i)} : \mathbb{C}^{|A(V_i)|} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{|A(W_i)|}$ for each simple object $A \in I$ and vertex $i \in Q_0$. For each vertex $i \in Q_0$ we define $f_i : V_i \rightarrow W_i$ to be the unique morphism determined by

$$(\tilde{f}_i)_A := g_{(A,i)} \cdot \text{id}_A : A(V_i) \rightarrow A(W_i)$$

for each simple object A . It is clear that if $f = \{f_i\}_{i \in Q_0}$ form a morphism of representations of Q , then g would be equal to $\mathcal{U}(f)$ by definition. As such, we are left to show that f is indeed a morphism of representations of Q ; namely we are required to show that the diagram below commutes for each

arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ with $n := v(\alpha)$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes V_i & \xrightarrow{V_\alpha} & V_j \\ \downarrow \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes f_i & & \downarrow f_j \\ \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes W_i & \xrightarrow{W_\alpha} & W_j. \end{array}$$

Using the semi-simple decomposition of V_i, V_j, W_i and W_j , we can instead show that diagram of morphisms between the induced direct sum decomposition is commutative:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{A \in I} \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes A(V_i) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{V}_\alpha} & \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(V_j) \\ \downarrow \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes \tilde{f}_i & & \downarrow \tilde{f}_j \\ \bigoplus_{A \in I} \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes A(W_i) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{W}_\alpha} & \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(W_j). \end{array} \quad (12)$$

Let us start by analysing the composition given by the top right corner:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{A \in I} \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes A(V_i) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{V}_\alpha} & \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(V_j) \\ & & \downarrow \tilde{f}_j \\ & & \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(W_j). \end{array}$$

The morphism \tilde{f}_j is uniquely determined by the component $(\tilde{f}_j)_A$, with all other component morphisms being zero. On the other hand, \tilde{V}_α is determined by the component morphisms $(\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B,C}$ for each pair of simples B, C such that $C \subseteq \bigoplus \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B$, which is equivalent to having an arrow $(B, i) \xrightarrow{\beta} (C, j)$ in $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$. In total, we have that the composition $\tilde{f}_j \circ \tilde{V}_\alpha$ is uniquely determined by $(\tilde{f}_j \circ \tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B,C}$ for each pair of simples B, C with $(B, i) \xrightarrow{\beta} (C, j)$ an arrow in $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$, and

$$(\tilde{f}_j \circ \tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B,C} = (\tilde{f}_j)_C \circ (\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B,C}.$$

By a similar argument, the composition $\tilde{W}_\alpha \circ (\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes \tilde{f}_i)$ given by the bottom right corner

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{A \in I} \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes A(V_i) & & \\ \downarrow \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes \tilde{f}_i & & \\ \bigoplus_{A \in I} \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes A(W_i) & \xrightarrow{\tilde{W}_\alpha} & \bigoplus_{A \in I} A(W_j). \end{array}$$

is uniquely determined by $(\tilde{W}_\alpha \circ (\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes \tilde{f}_i))_{B,C}$ for each pair of simples B, C with $(B, i) \xrightarrow{\beta} (C, j)$ an arrow in $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$, and

$$(\tilde{W}_\alpha \circ (\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes \tilde{f}_i))_{B,C} = (\tilde{W}_\alpha)_{B,C} \circ (\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes (\tilde{f}_i)_B).$$

As such, the square in (12) commutes if and only if $(\tilde{f}_j)_C \circ (\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B,C} = (\tilde{W}_\alpha)_{B,C} \circ (\prod_{n-3}^n \otimes (\tilde{f}_i)_B)$ for each pair of simples B, C with $(B, i) \xrightarrow{\beta} (C, j)$ an arrow in $\text{ufld}(\alpha)$, which amounts to asking for

commutativity of the following square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B(V_i) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{V}_\alpha)_{B,C}} & C(V_j) \\ \downarrow \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes (\tilde{f}_i)_B & & \downarrow (\tilde{f}_j)_C \\ \prod_{n-3}^n \otimes B(W_i) & \xrightarrow{(\tilde{W}_\alpha)_{B,C}} & C(W_j). \end{array}$$

The commutativity of the above square is a direct consequence of the commutativity of the following square:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}^{|B(V_i)|} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}(V)_\beta} & \mathbb{C}^{|C(V_j)|} \\ g_{(B,i)} \downarrow & & \downarrow g_{(C,j)} \\ \mathbb{C}^{|B(W_i)|} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{U}(W)_\beta} & \mathbb{C}^{|C(W_j)|}, \end{array}$$

which is given to us by the fact that g is a morphism of representations of \check{Q} . This completes the proof that f is morphism of representation of Q , which shows that \mathcal{U} is full.

Finally the exactness of \mathcal{U} follows directly from the semi-simplicity of both $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ and $\text{vec}_{\mathbb{C}}$. \square

3.4. Gabriel's classification for Coxeter quivers. Following the classical notion, we make the following definition:

Definition 3.2. A Coxeter quiver Q is of *finite type* if $\text{rep}(Q)$ has only finitely many indecomposable objects up to isomorphism.

The following observation will be useful in the proof of Gabriel's theorem for Coxeter quiver later on. Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t, v)$ be a Coxeter quiver. A *Coxeter subquiver* Q' of Q is just a subquiver (Q'_0, Q'_1) (namely $Q'_0 \subseteq Q_0$ and $Q'_1 \subseteq Q_1$ with $s(\alpha), t(\alpha) \in Q'_0$ for all $\alpha \in Q'_1$) equipped with the restricted label map $v' := v|_{Q'_1}$. In particular, $\text{im}(v') \subseteq \text{im}(v)$ and so the associated fusion category $\mathcal{C}(Q')$ is naturally identified with a fusion subcategory of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$. It follows easily that this identifies $\text{rep}(Q')$ with an abelian subcategory of $\text{rep}(Q)$. As such, if there exists a Coxeter subquiver of Q that is not of finite type, then Q can not be of finite type as well.

We now state the crucial lemma:

Lemma 3.3. *The Coxeter quiver $Q' := \bullet \xrightarrow[i]{m} \bullet \xrightarrow[n]{m} \bullet$ is not of finite type.*

Proof. Using Theorem 3.1 it is sufficient to show that its unfolded classical quiver \check{Q} is not of finite type. We prove this by showing that \check{Q} contains a subquiver that is not of finite type.

Note that if $m = n$ then it follows by the construction of \check{Q} that \check{Q} will contain double arrows $(i, \mathbf{1}) \rightrightarrows (j, \prod_{n-3}^n)$. Thus for the remaining part of the proof we shall assume that $m \neq n$.

Let us start with the case where both $m, n \geq 4$. In this case notice that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\prod_{m-3}^m \otimes \prod_2^n, j) & & (\prod_2^m \otimes \prod_{n-3}^n, j) \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ & (\prod_{m-3}^m \otimes \prod_{n-3}^n, i) & \\ & \swarrow \quad \searrow & \\ (\prod_{m-3}^m \otimes \prod_0^n, j) & & (\prod_0^m \otimes \prod_{n-3}^n, j) \end{array}$$

is a subquiver of \check{Q} , hence Q is not of finite type.

We are now left with the case where at least one of m, n is 3; without loss of generality suppose $n = 3$ and $m \geq 4$. We shall denote the arrow with label m as α and the arrow with label $n = 3$ as β . Our analysis will depend the parity of m .

- (odd case) $m = 2k + 1$ for $k \geq 2$.

Denote

$$\ell := \begin{cases} k, & \text{if } k \text{ is even;} \\ k - 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Using (4) and (3) we get $\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell \otimes \overset{m}{\Pi}_{m-3} \cong \left(\overset{m}{\Pi}_{\ell+1} \oplus \overset{m}{\Pi}_{\ell-1} \right) \otimes \overset{m}{\Pi}_{m-2}$. When $\ell = k$ we have that

$$\overset{m}{\Pi}_{\ell-1} \otimes \overset{m}{\Pi}_{m-2} \cong \overset{m}{\Pi}_k = \overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell, \quad (\text{cf. (4)})$$

otherwise when $\ell = k - 1$ we have that

$$\overset{m}{\Pi}_{\ell+1} \otimes \overset{m}{\Pi}_{m-2} \cong \overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-1} = \overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell. \quad (\text{cf. (4)})$$

In both cases we have $\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell \subseteq \overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell \otimes \overset{m}{\Pi}_{m-3}$ and so $\text{ufd}(\alpha)$ contains an arrow $(\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell, i) \rightarrow (\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell, j)$. On the other hand, since $v(\beta) = 3$, $\text{ufd}(\beta)$ also contains an arrow $(\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell, i) \rightarrow (\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell, j)$, which shows that

$$(\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell, i) \rightrightarrows (\overset{m}{\Pi}_\ell, j)$$

is a subquiver of \check{Q} . This shows that \check{Q} is not of finite type.

- (even case) $m = 2k$ for $k \geq 2$.

As before, one shows that

$$\overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-2} \subseteq \overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-1} \otimes \overset{m}{\Pi}_{m-3}, \quad \text{and} \quad \overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-1} \subseteq \overset{m}{\Pi}_{m-3} \otimes \overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-2}.$$

Together with the arrows from $\text{ufd}(\beta)$, we get that the following is a subquiver of \check{Q} :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-1}, i) & \longrightarrow & (\overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-1}, j) \\ & \searrow & \nearrow \\ (\overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-2}, i) & \longrightarrow & (\overset{m}{\Pi}_{k-2}, j) \end{array}$$

which shows that \check{Q} is not of finite type.

This covers all possible cases and hence completes the proof. \square

We are now ready to prove Gabriel's classification theorem for Coxeter quivers.

Theorem 3.4. *Let Q be a connected Coxeter quiver (underlying graph is connected). Then Q is of finite type if and only if the graph underlying Q is a Coxeter-Dynkin diagram:*

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &= \bullet \cdots \bullet, & B_n = C_n &= \bullet \cdots \bullet \overset{4}{\bullet}, & D_n &= \bullet \cdots \bullet \begin{array}{l} \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \bullet \end{array}, & E_6 &= \bullet \cdots \bullet \begin{array}{l} \bullet \\ | \\ \bullet \end{array}, \\ E_7 &= \bullet \cdots \bullet \begin{array}{l} \bullet \\ | \\ \bullet \end{array}, & E_8 &= \bullet \cdots \bullet \begin{array}{l} \bullet \\ | \\ \bullet \end{array}, & F_4 &= \bullet \overset{4}{\bullet} \bullet \bullet, & G_2 &= \bullet \overset{6}{\bullet}, & H_3 &= \bullet \overset{5}{\bullet} \bullet, \\ H_4 &= \bullet \overset{5}{\bullet} \bullet \bullet, & I_2(n) &= \bullet \overset{n}{\bullet}. \end{aligned}$$

\bar{Q}	$\bar{\bar{Q}}$
$B_n = C_n = \bullet \cdots \bullet \overset{4}{\bullet} \bullet$	$A_{2n-1} \amalg D_{n+1} =$
$F_4 = \bullet \bullet \overset{4}{\bullet} \bullet$	$E_6 \amalg E_6 =$
$G_2 = \bullet \overset{6}{\bullet}$	$A_5 \amalg A_5 =$
$H_3 = \bullet \overset{5}{\bullet} \bullet$	$D_6 =$
$H_4 = \bullet \overset{5}{\bullet} \bullet \bullet$	$E_8 =$
$I_2(2m) = \bullet \xrightarrow{2m} \bullet$	$A_{2m-1} \amalg A_{2m-1} =$
$I_2(2m+1) = \bullet \xrightarrow{2m+1} \bullet$	$A_{2m} =$

FIGURE 2. Unfolding of finite type non-simply-laced Coxeter graphs to finite type simply-laced Coxeter graphs.

Proof. Let \check{Q} denote the unfolded classical quiver of Q and let \bar{Q} and $\bar{\bar{Q}}$ denote the underlying labelled graph of Q and \check{Q} respectively.

If \bar{Q} is a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram, then one can easily check that the connected components of $\bar{\bar{Q}}$ are ADE Dynkin diagrams; refer to Figure 2 for the complete list. By Theorem 3.1 and the classical Gabriel’s theorem, it follows that Q is of finite type.

Suppose instead that Q is of finite type. By Theorem 3.1 its unfolded quiver \check{Q} is also of finite type, hence the classical Gabriel’s theorem says that \check{Q} is a disjoint union of ADE Dynkin diagrams. In particular, the classification of finite Coxeter groups says that the associated Coxeter group $W(\bar{\bar{Q}})$ is a finite group. Since Q is of finite type by assumption, Lemma 3.3 implies that Q can not have more than one labelled arrows between any pair of vertices. In particular, its underlying graph \bar{Q} is actually a Coxeter graph. By construction, the map $f : \bar{Q}_0 \rightarrow \bar{Q}_0$ sending $(A, i) \xrightarrow{f} i$ defines an (admissible) folding map of Coxeter graphs (in the sense of [Lus83, Section

3.1] or [Cri99, Definition 4.1]). As such, it induces an injective Coxeter group homomorphism $W(\overline{Q}) \rightarrow W(\overline{Q})$; see [Lus83, Corollary 3.3] or [Cri99, Proposition 2.3 and 4.3]. Since $W(\overline{Q})$ is finite, it follows that $W(\overline{Q})$ must be finite. By the classification of finite Coxeter groups we get that \overline{Q} must be a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram. \square

4. REFLECTION FUNCTORS AND POSITIVE ROOTS

In this section, we use reflection functors similar to those defined in [BGP73; DR76] to relate indecomposable representations to positive roots of the underlying Coxeter graph. The root system at play will be the ones studied in [Dye09], which are defined over (commutative) fusion rings instead of \mathbb{Z} . We start by briefly recalling this generalised notion of root systems.

4.1. Root system over fusion rings and dimension vectors. Note that if Q and Q' are Coxeter quivers with the same underlying labelled graph $\Gamma := \overline{Q} = \overline{Q}'$, then we must have that $\mathcal{C}(Q) = \mathcal{C}(Q')$. To emphasise this fact, we shall also use the notation

$$\mathcal{C}(\Gamma) := \mathcal{C}(Q) = \mathcal{C}(Q').$$

Let Γ be the underlying labelled graph of a Coxeter quiver. Define L_Γ to be the free $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$ -module

$$L_\Gamma := \bigoplus_{i \in \Gamma_0} K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)).$$

Elements in L_Γ shall be represented as $(v_i)_{i \in \Gamma_0}$, where we think of them as a vector with entries in $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$. The standard basis elements with $1 = [\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}] \in K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$ at position i and 0 elsewhere will be denoted by e_i . The following is a slight generalisation of root systems over commutative rings for labelled graphs.

Definition 4.1. Let $\Gamma := \overline{Q}$ be the underlying labelled graph of a Coxeter quiver Q .

- (i) An element x of the (commutative) fusion ring $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$ is called *positive* if $x = [X]$ for some non-zero object $X \in \mathcal{C}(Q)$. Similarly we say that $v := (v_i)_{i \in \Gamma_0} \in L_\Gamma$ is *positive* if each v_i is positive or zero, but not all zero (namely $v \neq 0$). Both notions of positivity are clearly closed under addition.
- (ii) Define $B : L_\Gamma \times L_\Gamma \rightarrow K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$ to be the (symmetric) $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$ -bilinear form uniquely determined by

$$B(e_i, e_j) := \begin{cases} 2 = 2[\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)}], & \text{when } i = j; \\ -\sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \Gamma_1 \\ \alpha \text{ connects } i \text{ and } j}} \left[\prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)} \right], & \text{when } i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

- (iii) For each $i \in \Gamma_0$, we define the $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$ -linear map $\sigma_i : L_\Gamma \rightarrow L_\Gamma$ by

$$\sigma_i(v) := v - B(e_i, v)e_i.$$

It is easy to see that σ_i is an involution. The group of $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$ -linear maps generated by σ_i for $i \in \Gamma_0$ is denoted by W_Γ .

- (iv) The elements $e_i \in L_\Gamma$ are called the *simple roots* and elements $v \in L_\Gamma$ living in the W_Γ -orbit of the simple roots are called *roots*. An *extended root* is an element in L_Γ given by $[A] \cdot v$ for v a root and A a simple object in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$. A root (similarly extended root) is *positive* if it is positive as an element in L_Γ .

- (v) The set of extended roots is denoted by Φ^{ext} and the set of positive extended roots is denoted by Φ_+^{ext} . On the other hand, the set of roots is denoted by $\Phi \subseteq \Phi^{ext}$ and the set of positive roots is denoted by $\Phi_+ \subseteq \Phi_+^{ext}$. It is easy to check from the definition that

$$\Phi^{ext} = \coprod_{A \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))} [A] \cdot \Phi, \quad \Phi_+^{ext} = \coprod_{A \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))} [A] \cdot \Phi_+.$$

Remark 4.2. When Γ is a Coxeter graph, i.e. no two vertices in Γ are connected by two distinct edges, then the group W_Γ in the above definition is isomorphic to the Coxeter group associated with Γ . Moreover, the datum $(K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)), K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))_{>0}, L_\Gamma, L_\Gamma, B(-, -), \{e_i\}_{i \in \Gamma_0}, \{e_i\}_{i \in \Gamma_0}, \text{id})$ is a root basis datum with positivity structure in the sense of [Dye09, Section 2.3] (see also Section 3.4 and 3.5 in loc. cit.).

Definition 4.3. Let V be a representation of a Coxeter quiver Q . We define the *dimension vector* $\dim(V)$ of V as

$$\dim(V) := ([V_i]_{i \in Q_0}) \in L_{\overline{Q}}.$$

Note that if Q is a classical quiver ($\text{im}(v) = 3$), $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\overline{Q})) \cong \mathbb{Z}$ and $\dim(V)$ for $V \in \text{rep}(Q)$ corresponds exactly to the classical dimension vector of V .

Remark 4.4. Let $S(i)$ be the simple representation of Q such that $S(i)_i = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}$ and is zero everywhere else. It is easy to see that the Grothendieck classes $\{[S(i)] \mid i \in Q_0\} \subset K_0(\text{rep}(Q))$ form a $K_0(\mathcal{C}(\overline{Q}))$ -basis for $K_0(\text{rep}(Q))$, so that $K_0(\text{rep}(Q)) \cong L_{\overline{Q}}$.

4.2. Reflection functors and Gabriel's theorem on indecomposables and positive roots. Throughout Q will be a Coxeter quiver and \check{Q} will be its associated unfolded classical quiver. We shall reserve $S(i)$ to denote the simple representation of Q such that $S(i)_i = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}$ and is zero everywhere else.

Before we begin, let us set up some notation. Recall that every object in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ is self-dual, so we have the following natural isomorphism between morphism spaces in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$:

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}(A \otimes B_1, B_2) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}(B_1, A \otimes B_2).$$

More precisely, the isomorphism can be described as follows. For each $f : A \otimes B_1 \rightarrow B_2$, we denote the image of f in $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{C}(Q)}(B_1, A \otimes B_2)$ induced by the duality of A by \hat{f} , which diagrammatically is given by:

$$\begin{array}{c}
 B_2 \\
 | \\
 \boxed{f} \\
 / \quad \backslash \\
 A \quad B_1
 \end{array}
 \quad \mapsto \quad
 \hat{f} :=
 \begin{array}{c}
 A \quad B_2 \\
 | \quad | \\
 A \quad \boxed{f} \\
 | \quad / \quad \backslash \\
 A \quad B_1 \\
 \cup \\
 A \\
 | \\
 B_1,
 \end{array}
 \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbb{1}$ is represented by an “empty diagram” ($\mathcal{C}(Q)$ is strictly monoidal), the cup $\cup : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A \otimes A$ denotes the unit morphism coming from the self-duality of A (see (1)) and the straight lines denote the corresponding identity morphisms.

Given any vertex $i \in Q_0$, we define $\sigma_i Q$ to be the Coxeter quiver that reverses all the arrows α that start or end at i , whilst preserving the labels $v(\alpha)$. Following the classical notion we say that a vertex is a *sink* (resp. *source*) if it only has incoming (resp. outgoing) arrows.

The following fact (similar to the classical case) can be easily checked using the semi-simple property of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$.

Lemma 4.5. *Let V be an indecomposable representation of Q .*

(i) *Let $i \in Q_0$ be a sink. Then either $V \cong S(i) \otimes A$ for some $A \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))$, or the following morphism ξ in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$*

$$\xi := [V_\alpha]_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}}^T : \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}}^{v(\alpha)} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3} V_{s(\alpha)} \rightarrow V_i$$

is an epimorphism.

(ii) *Let $i \in Q_0$ be a source. Then either $V \cong S(i) \otimes A$ for some $A \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))$, or the following morphism ϑ in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$*

$$\vartheta := [\hat{V}_\alpha]_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ s(\alpha)=i}} : V_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ s(\alpha)=i}}^{v(\alpha)} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3} V_{t(\alpha)}$$

is a monomorphism (refer to (13) for the notation \hat{V}_α).

Definition 4.6 (Reflection functors). Let $i \in Q_0$ be a sink. We define $R_i^+ : \text{rep}(Q) \rightarrow \text{rep}(\sigma_i Q)$ to be the functor constructed as follows. Let the morphism

$$\xi : \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}}^{v(\alpha)} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3} V_{s(\alpha)} \rightarrow V_i$$

be as defined in Lemma 4.5. Given a representation $V \in \text{rep}(Q)$, $R_i^+(V)$ is the representation of $\sigma_i Q$ such that for all vertices $j \neq i \in Q_0$, $R_i^+(V)_j = V_j$. On the vertex i we set $R_i^+(V)_i := \ker(\xi)$ to be the kernel of ξ , fitting into the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker(\xi) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{k}(\xi)} \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}}^{v(\alpha)} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3} V_{s(\alpha)} \rightarrow V_i.$$

For each arrow α not ending at i , we set $R_i^+(V)_\alpha = V_\alpha$. For each arrow β ending at i , we consider the morphism Ψ_β defined as the projection of $\mathfrak{k}(\xi)$ onto the summand $\prod_{v(\beta)-3}^{v(\beta)} V_{s(\beta)}$:

$$\Psi_\beta : \ker(\xi) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{k}(\xi)} \bigoplus_{\alpha \in A_i}^{v(\alpha)} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3} V_{s(\alpha)} \xrightarrow{\rho} \prod_{v(\beta)-3}^{v(\beta)} V_{s(\beta)},$$

and define $R_i^+(V)_\beta := \hat{\Psi}_\beta$ (refer to (13) for the notation $\hat{\Psi}_\beta$).

Given a morphism $f : V \rightarrow W$ of representations of Q , we define $R_i^+(f) : R_i^+(V) \rightarrow R_i^+(W)$ by setting $R_i^+(f)_j = f_j$ for all $j \neq i$ and $R_i^+(f)_i$ is the unique morphism induced by the kernel

property defining $R_i^+(V)$ and $R_i^+(W)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & R_i^+(V)_i & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)} V_{s(\alpha)} & \longrightarrow & V_i \\
 & & \downarrow \exists! R_i^+(f_i) & & \downarrow \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}} \text{id} \otimes f_{s(\alpha)} & & \downarrow f_i \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & R_i^+(W)_i & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)} W_{s(\alpha)} & \longrightarrow & W_i
 \end{array}$$

It is easy to check that $R_i^+(f)$ satisfies the required property to be a morphism of representations. If $i \in Q_0$ is instead a source, one can define $R_i^- : \text{rep}(Q) \rightarrow \text{rep}(\sigma_i Q)$ in a similar fashion, using instead the cokernel of the morphism ϑ defined in Lemma 4.5.

The following property of reflection functors follows from the kernel–cokernel properties:

Lemma 4.7. *Let $V \in \text{rep}(Q)$.*

- (i) *Suppose i is a sink and ξ is as in Lemma 4.5. If ξ is an epimorphism, then $R_i^- R_i^+(V) \cong V$.*
- (ii) *Suppose i is a source and ϑ is as in Lemma 4.5. If ϑ is a monomorphism, then $R_i^+ R_i^-(V) \cong V$.*

Note that $\Gamma := \overline{Q} = \overline{\sigma_i Q}$ for any i , so that the dimension vectors $\dim(V)$ and $\dim(V')$ with $V \in \text{rep}(Q)$ and $V' \in \text{rep}(\sigma_i Q)$ are both elements in $L_\Gamma = \bigoplus_{i \in \Gamma_0} K_0(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$. Similar to the classical case, reflection functors and reflections on L_Γ are related through dimension vectors as follows.

Proposition 4.8. *Let V be an indecomposable representation of Q and let $i \in Q_0$ be a sink (resp. source). If $V \not\cong S(i) \otimes A$ for any $A \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))$, then*

$$\dim(R_i^\pm(V)) = \sigma_i(\dim(V)) \in L_{\overline{Q}}.$$

Proof. We prove the case where i is a sink; the proof for when i is a source follows similarly.

By Lemma 4.5, the assumption on V gives us the follows exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker(\xi) \xrightarrow{\mathfrak{k}(\xi)} \bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)} V_{s(\alpha)} \rightarrow V_i \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\ker(\xi) = R_i^+(V)_i$ by definition. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
 [R_i^+(V)_i] &= \left[\bigoplus_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}} \prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)} V_{s(\alpha)} \right] - [V_i] \\
 &= \left(\sum_{\substack{\alpha \in Q_1 \\ t(\alpha)=i}} \left[\prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)} [V_{s(\alpha)}] \right] \right) - [V_i] \\
 &= [V_i] - B(e_i, \dim(V)).
 \end{aligned}$$

Since $R_i^+(V)_j = V_j$ for all $j \neq i$, it follows that $\dim(R_i^+(V)) = \sigma_i(\dim(V))$ as required. \square

From now on we shall focus on the case where $\Gamma := \overline{Q}$ is a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram (refer to Theorem 3.4 for the classification). Let $n := |Q_0|$ be the number of vertices of Q . In this case, the vertices Q_0 of the Coxeter quiver Q can always be equipped with an *admissible (sink) ordering*: the vertices of Q_0 are labelled by $1, 2, \dots, n$ so that 1 is a sink in Q and for each $i \in \{2, \dots, n\}$, i is a sink in the quiver $\sigma_{i-1} \cdots \sigma_2 \sigma_1 Q$ and moreover $\sigma_n \cdots \sigma_1 Q = Q$.

Definition 4.9. Let $\Gamma := \overline{Q}$ be a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram and suppose Q is equipped with an admissible (sink) ordering. The element $c := \sigma_n \cdots \sigma_2 \sigma_1 \in W_\Gamma$ (cf. Definition 4.1 iii) is called the *Coxeter element* associated to the ordering. Similarly, the composition of reflection functors $C^+ := R_n^+ \cdots R_1^+ : \mathbf{rep}(Q) \rightarrow \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is called the *Coxeter functor* associated to the ordering.

The following slight generalisation of a (well-known) lemma will be useful to us.

Lemma 4.10. *Suppose $\Gamma = \overline{Q}$ is a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram with an admissible (sink) ordering on Q . If $v := (v_i)_{i \in \Gamma_0} \in L_\Gamma$ is a positive element (cf. Definition 4.1 i), then there exists $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c^r(v)$ is no longer a positive element.*

Proof. When Γ is a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram, it is easy to check that $B(-, -)$ is non-degenerate; namely $B(-, v) = 0$ if and only if $v = 0$. It follows that $c(x) = x \iff x = 0$. Moreover, W_Γ is a finite Coxeter group, so $c^m = \text{id}$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. This means that with $x := v + c(v) + \cdots + c^{m-1}(v)$, we get $c(x) = x$, which implies that $x = 0$. Since v is a positive element and the set of positive elements is closed under addition, it must be the case that at least one of $c(v), \dots, c^{m-1}(v)$ is not a positive element. \square

We are now ready to prove the second part of Gabriel’s theorem for Coxeter quivers.

Theorem 4.11. *Suppose Q is a Coxeter quiver whose underlying labelled graph $\Gamma := \overline{Q}$ is a Coxeter–Dynkin diagram. The dimension vector map \dim induces a bijection between the set of indecomposable representations of Q (upto isomorphism) and the set of positive extended roots Φ_+^{ext} of L_Γ . Moreover, every indecomposable representation $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ is of the form*

$$V \cong V' \otimes A$$

for some $V' \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ that corresponds to a positive root (i.e. $\dim(V') \in \Phi_+$) and some simple object A in $\mathcal{C}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. The proof of the first statement is essential identical to the classical case, using analogous lemmas that we have prepared beforehand. Start by fixing some admissible (sink) ordering on Q_0 . The fact that dimension vectors can not be negative together with Proposition 4.8 and Lemma 4.10 imply that for any indecomposable $V \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$,

$$R_k^+ \cdots R_1^+(C^+)^r(V) \cong S(k+1) \otimes A \tag{14}$$

for some $k \in Q_0$, some $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and some $A \in \text{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(\Gamma))$. Moreover, using Proposition 4.8 again, we get

$$\dim(V) = c^{-r} s_1 \cdots s_k([A] \cdot e_{k+1}) = [A] \cdot (c^{-r} s_1 \cdots s_k(e_{k+1})) \in \Phi_+^{ext},$$

which shows surjectivity of \dim . On the other hand, if $V \cong V' \in \mathbf{rep}(Q)$ are indecomposables, then (14) implies that

$$R_k^+ \cdots R_1^+(C^+)^r(V) \cong S(k+1) \otimes A \cong R_k^+ \cdots R_1^+(C^+)^r(V').$$

Using Lemma 4.7 and Proposition 4.8 again, we get $\dim(V) = \dim(V')$, proving the injectivity of \dim .

For the second statement, given V together with (14), define $C^- := R_1^- \cdots R_n^-$. If we let $V' := (C^-)^r R_1^- \cdots R_k^- (S(k+1))$, it follows that $V' \otimes A \cong V$ with $\dim(V') \in \Phi_+$ by construction. \square

5. PATH ALGEBRA AND ITS MODULES

As in the classical case, we show that a suitable notion of path algebra of a Coxeter quiver Q can be defined so that its category of modules is equivalent (as abelian module categories over $\mathcal{C}(Q)$) to the category of representations of Q . We first recall the notions of an algebra and its modules in general tensor categories; see e.g. [Ost03, Section 3.1].

5.1. Algebras and modules in tensor categories. Throughout this subsection, \mathcal{C} denotes a strict tensor category.

Definition 5.1. An *algebra* in \mathcal{C} is an object A in \mathcal{C} equipped with two maps $\mu : A \otimes A \rightarrow A$ (multiplication) and $\eta : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow A$ (unit), satisfying the associativity and the left and right unital constraints:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \otimes A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes \text{id}} & A \otimes A \\ \downarrow \text{id} \otimes \mu & & \downarrow \mu \\ A \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\mu} & A \end{array} \quad (\text{associativity}), \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{1} \otimes A & \xrightarrow{\eta \otimes \text{id}} & A \otimes A \xleftarrow{\text{id} \otimes \eta} & A \otimes \mathbb{1} \\ & \searrow = & \downarrow \mu & \swarrow = \\ & & A & \end{array} \quad (\text{unital}).$$

Definition 5.2. Let A and B be algebras in \mathcal{C} . A left (resp. right) *module* of A is an object M in \mathcal{C} equipped an action map $\lambda : A \otimes M \rightarrow M$ (resp. $\lambda : M \otimes A \rightarrow M$) satisfying the associativity and the left (resp. right) unital constraints:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \otimes A \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\mu \otimes \text{id}} & A \otimes M \\ \downarrow \text{id} \otimes \lambda & & \downarrow \lambda \\ A \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & M \end{array} \quad (\text{associativity}), \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{1} \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\eta \otimes \text{id}} & A \otimes M \\ & \searrow = & \downarrow \lambda \\ & & M \end{array} \quad (\text{left unital}).$$

A *bimodule* over (A, B) is an object M which is both a left module over A and a right module over B , where the two module structures are compatible:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} A \otimes M \otimes B & \xrightarrow{\lambda \otimes \text{id}} & M \otimes B \\ \text{id} \otimes \lambda' \downarrow & & \downarrow \lambda' \\ A \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\lambda} & M \end{array} \quad (\text{compatible actions}).$$

We denote the category of left (resp. right) modules over A as ${}_A \text{mod}$ (resp. mod_A); similarly the category of bimodules over (A, B) is denoted as ${}_A \text{mod}_B$.

Note that ${}_A \text{mod}$ (resp. mod_A) is naturally a right (resp. left) module category over \mathcal{C} ; namely there is a natural tensor functor from $\mathcal{C}^{\otimes \text{op}}$ to $\text{End}({}_A \text{mod})$ defined by $A \mapsto - \otimes A$ (resp. $\mathcal{C}^{\otimes \text{op}}$ to $\text{End}(\text{mod}_A)$ defined by $A \mapsto A \otimes -$).

Definition 5.3. An algebra A in \mathcal{C} is said to be *semi-simple* if its category of left modules is semi-simple.

Example 5.4. (i) Let $\mathbb{1}$ denote the monoidal unit of \mathcal{C} . Then $\mathbb{1}$ is always an algebra object, induced by the monoidal structure of \mathcal{C} . Moreover, ${}_{\mathbb{1}} \text{mod}$ is equivalent to \mathcal{C} and therefore $\mathbb{1}$ is a semi-simple algebra.

(ii) The direct sum $\bigoplus_i \mathbb{1}$ can also be made into a semi-simple algebra, where multiplication between differently-indexed $\mathbb{1}$'s are zero.

Definition 5.5. Let A, B, C be algebra objects in \mathcal{C} . Recall that if (M, θ) and (N, θ') are objects in ${}_A\text{mod}_B$ and ${}_B\text{mod}_C$ respectively, we define $M \otimes_B N$ as the coequaliser of θ and θ' in ${}_A\text{mod}_C$:

$$M \otimes B \otimes N \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\theta \otimes \text{id}} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \theta'} \end{array} M \otimes N \xrightarrow{\Theta} M \otimes_B N.$$

5.2. Coxeter quiver path algebras. Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, s, t, v)$ be a Coxeter quiver and let $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ be its associated fusion category. We shall construct an algebra object associated to Q in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ as follows.

Firstly, note that the monoidal unit $\mathbb{1}$ is an algebra object in the canonical way. For each vertex $i \in Q_0$, let $(e_i := \mathbb{1}, \mu_i := \text{id}, \eta_i := \text{id})$ be the canonical algebra object associated to $\mathbb{1}$, and consider the semi-simple algebra $(S := \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i, \mu_S, \eta_S)$ formed by their direct sum; namely $\eta_S = [\eta_i]_{i \in Q_0} : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow S$ and $\mu_S : S \otimes S \rightarrow S$ is defined on each summand $e_i \otimes e_j$ by μ_i if $i = j$ and otherwise it is zero.

To each arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ in Q , we assign an object $p(\alpha) := \prod_{v(\alpha)-3}^{v(\alpha)}$. Define $D := \bigoplus_{\alpha \in Q_1} p(\alpha)$ and view it as a bimodule over S as if we are doing ‘‘path multiplication’’, namely:

- as a left module over S , the map $\lambda : S \otimes D \rightarrow D$ is defined on each summand $e_i \otimes p(\alpha)$ by zero if $t(\alpha) \neq i$, and otherwise it is the identity map on $p(\alpha)$ (note that $p(\alpha) = \mathbb{1} \otimes p(\alpha)$).
- the right module structure over S is defined similarly, checking if $s(\alpha)$ and i match up.

Lemma 5.6. *We have the following isomorphism of (S, S) -bimodules:*

$$\overbrace{D \otimes_S D \otimes_S \cdots \otimes_S D}^{n \text{ times}} \cong \bigoplus_{\substack{(\alpha_n, \alpha_{n-1}, \dots, \alpha_1) \\ \text{is a path}}} p(\alpha_n) \otimes p(\alpha_{n-1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes p(\alpha_1).$$

Proof. This is a simple calculation of showing the required coequaliser property, which we leave to the reader. \square

We are now ready to define the path algebra of Q .

Definition 5.7. The *path algebra* $\text{Path}(Q)$ of Q is an algebra object in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ defined as the tensor algebra of D over S , namely

$$\text{Path}(Q) := S \oplus D \oplus (D \otimes_S D) \oplus (D \otimes_S D \otimes_S D) \oplus \cdots$$

with multiplication $\mu : \text{Path}(Q) \otimes \text{Path}(Q) \rightarrow \text{Path}(Q)$ defined by taking tensor product over S and unit given by $\eta : \mathbb{1} \rightarrow S \subseteq \text{Path}(Q)$.

Note that since Q is assumed to be acyclic, $D \otimes_S D \otimes_S D \otimes_S \cdots$ eventually becomes 0, hence $\text{Path}(Q)$ is defined by a finite direct sum and in particular is an object in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$.

Let us make a few observations. Firstly, note that every $\text{Path}(Q)$ -action map $\lambda : \text{Path}(Q) \otimes M \rightarrow M$ on its module M is completely determined by its restriction to $e_i \otimes M$ and $p(\alpha) \otimes M$ for each i and each arrow $j \xrightarrow{\alpha} k$ due to the associativity requirement. Moreover, every $\text{Path}(Q)$ -module (M, λ) can be restricted to a S -module $(M, \lambda|_{S \otimes M})$. Note that M as a module over S is semi-simple (since S is semi-simple), decomposing into a direct sum of e_i -modules, which can be explicitly described as follows. We define

$$e_i M := \text{im}(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}) \xleftarrow{i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M})} M \tag{15}$$

as the image of the morphism $\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}$, so that we have a unique factorisation of the morphism $\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}$ into

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & e_i M & \\
 \overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}} \nearrow & & \searrow i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}) \\
 M = e_i \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}} & M.
 \end{array} \tag{16}$$

We have the following decomposition of M (as an S -module and as an object in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$):

Lemma 5.8. *The morphisms*

$$\left[\overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}} \right]_{i \in Q_0} : M \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M, \text{ and } [i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M})]_{i \in Q_0}^T : \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M \rightarrow M$$

are mutual inverses of S -modules, so that $M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M$.

Proof. By the unital property of modules, we have that $\lambda|_{S \otimes M} \circ (\eta_S \otimes \text{id}_M) = \text{id}_M$. By definition we have that $\lambda|_{S \otimes M} = [\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}]_{i \in Q_0}^T : \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} M = \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i \otimes M \rightarrow M$, which together give us

$$\text{id}_M = \lambda|_{S \otimes M} \circ (\eta_S \otimes \text{id}_M) = [\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}]_{i \in Q_0}^T [\text{id}_M]_{i \in Q_0} = \sum_{i \in Q_0} \lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}$$

As such, we have that

$$[i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M})]_{i \in Q_0}^T \circ \left[\overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}} \right]_{i \in Q_0} = \sum_{i \in Q_0} \lambda|_{e_i \otimes M} = \text{id}_M.$$

On the other hand, note that the self-morphisms $\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}$ of M are mutually orthogonal idempotents. Using the epi-mono decomposition (16), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}) \circ \overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}} \circ i(\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}) \circ \overline{\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}} &= \lambda|_{e_i \otimes M} \lambda|_{e_j \otimes M} \\
 &= \begin{cases} i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}) \overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}}, & \text{if } i = j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned}$$

In either cases, the monomorphism property of $i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M})$ and the epimorphism property of $\overline{\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}}$ allow us to conclude that

$$\overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}} \circ i(\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}) = \begin{cases} \text{id}_{e_i M}, & \text{if } i = j; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Hence the composition $\left[\overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}} \right]_{i \in Q_0} \circ [i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M})]_{i \in Q_0}^T$ is indeed the identity on $\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M$ \square

Let us now understand the $\text{Path}(Q)$ -module structure on $\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M$ induced by the S -module isomorphism above. For each arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$, let us define $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)$ to be the following composition of morphisms:

$$\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} (p(\alpha) \otimes e_i M) = p(\alpha) \otimes \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M \xrightarrow{\cong} p(\alpha) \otimes M \xrightarrow{\lambda|_{p(\alpha) \otimes M}} M \xrightarrow{\cong} \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M,$$

which we know completely determines the induced $\text{Path}(Q)$ -action map on $\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M$:

$$\widetilde{\lambda} : \text{Path}(Q) \otimes \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M.$$

By definition, the morphism $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)$ is uniquely determined by each of its component morphisms $p(\alpha) \otimes e_i M \rightarrow e_j M$ between each pair of their summands, which is given by the composition:

$$p(\alpha) \otimes e_i M \xrightarrow{\text{id}_{p(\alpha)} \otimes \text{i}(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M})} p(\alpha) \otimes M \xrightarrow{\lambda|_{p(\alpha) \otimes M}} M = e_j \otimes M \xrightarrow{\overline{\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}}} e_j M.$$

We shall denote each of these component morphisms by $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j}$.

Lemma 5.9. *Let α be an arrow in Q . Then $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j}$ is the zero map whenever $i \neq s(\alpha)$ or $j \neq t(\alpha)$. In other words, the single component morphism $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{s(\alpha),t(\alpha)}$ completely determines $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)$, and hence $\widetilde{\lambda}$.*

Proof. Consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p(\alpha) \otimes e_i M & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j}} & e_j M \\ \downarrow \text{id}_{p(\alpha)} \otimes \text{i}(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}) & & \uparrow \overline{\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}} \\ p(\alpha) \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\lambda|_{p(\alpha) \otimes M}} & M = e_j \otimes M \\ \uparrow \text{id}_{p(\alpha)} \otimes (\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}) & & \uparrow \lambda|_{p(\alpha) \otimes M} \\ p(\alpha) \otimes e_i \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\mu|_{p(\alpha) \otimes e_i} \otimes \text{id}_M} & p(\alpha) \otimes M \end{array}$$

where the bottom square is obtained from the associativity of the module action. If $i \neq s(\alpha)$, then the bottom square is zero and by commutativity of the diagram we obtain

$$\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j} \circ \text{id}_{p(\alpha)} \otimes (\overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}}) = 0.$$

Since $\text{id}_{p(\alpha)} \otimes (\overline{\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}})$ is an epimorphism, we get $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j} = 0$ as required.

Now consider instead the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} p(\alpha) \otimes e_i M & \xrightarrow{\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j}} & e_j M \\ \downarrow \text{id}_{p(\alpha)} \otimes \text{i}(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M}) & & \uparrow \overline{\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}} \\ p(\alpha) \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\lambda|_{p(\alpha) \otimes M}} & M = e_j \otimes M \\ \parallel & \nearrow \text{id}_{e_j} \otimes \lambda|_{p(\alpha) \otimes M} & \downarrow \lambda|_{e_j \otimes M} \\ e_j \otimes p(\alpha) \otimes M & & \\ \downarrow \mu|_{e_j \otimes p(\alpha)} \otimes \text{id}_M & & \downarrow \lambda|_{e_j \otimes M} \\ p(\alpha) \otimes M & \xrightarrow{\lambda|_{p(\alpha) \otimes M}} & M \end{array}$$

where the bottom diagram is again obtained from associativity. If $j \neq t(\alpha)$, the bottom diagram is zero and so we get

$$\text{i}(\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M}) \circ \widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j} = 0.$$

Since $\text{i}(\lambda|_{e_j \otimes M})$ is a monomorphism, we have $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j} = 0$ as required. \square

To conclude, we get the following:

Proposition 5.10. *The $\text{Path}(Q)$ -module structure morphism*

$$\widetilde{\lambda} : \text{Path}(Q) \otimes \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M$$

on $\bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M$ induced by the S -module isomorphism in Lemma 5.8 is completely determined by the component morphisms $\widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{s(\alpha), t(\alpha)} : p(\alpha) \otimes e_{s(\alpha)} M \rightarrow e_{t(\alpha)} M$ for each arrow $\alpha \in Q_1$.

We arrive at the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.11. *The categories $\text{rep}(Q)$ and $\text{Path}(Q)\text{-mod}$ are equivalent as abelian, right module categories over $\mathcal{C}(Q)$.*

Proof. We shall construct two functors

$$\mathcal{F} : \text{rep}(Q) \rightleftarrows \text{Path}(Q)\text{-mod} : \mathcal{G}$$

and use \mathcal{G} to show that \mathcal{F} is essentially surjective and fully faithful.

First suppose we are given V a representation of Q . We define a $\text{Path}(Q)$ -module $M := \mathcal{F}(V)$ as follows. As an object we have $M = \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} V_i$, with the action morphism $\lambda : \text{Path}(Q) \otimes M \rightarrow M$ defined as follows:

- for each $i \in Q_0$, the component morphism $e_i \otimes V_i \rightarrow V_i$ is the identity morphism;
- for each admissible path of arrows $\alpha_n \circ \alpha_{n-1} \circ \cdots \circ \alpha_1$ so that

$$p(\alpha_n) \otimes p(\alpha_{n-1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes p(\alpha_1) \text{ is a summand of } \overbrace{D \otimes_S D \otimes_S \cdots \otimes_S D}^{n \text{ times}},$$

the component morphism $p(\alpha_n) \otimes p(\alpha_{n-1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes p(\alpha_1) \otimes V_{s(\alpha_1)} \rightarrow V_{t(\alpha_n)}$ is defined by the composition of morphisms $V_{\alpha_n} \circ (\text{id} \otimes V_{\alpha_{n-1}}) \circ \cdots \circ (\text{id}^{\otimes n-1} \otimes V_{\alpha_1})$; and

- all other component morphisms are zero.

It is easy to check the required associative and unital properties. Given a morphism of representations $f : V \rightarrow W$, we define $\mathcal{F}(f)$ as the direct sum of the morphisms $f_i : V_i \rightarrow W_i$; namely the component morphisms $\mathcal{F}(f)_{i,j} : V_i \rightarrow W_j$ is the morphism f_i when $i = j$ and 0 otherwise. The fact that this defines a morphism of $\text{Path}(Q)$ -modules follows from the commutativity property $W_\alpha \circ f_i = V_\alpha \circ f_j$ for each arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$.

Now suppose M is a module over $\text{Path}(Q)$. We define $V := \mathcal{G}(M)$ a representation of Q as follows. On each vertex $i \in Q_0$, set $V_i := e_i M$ with $e_i M$ as in (15). For each arrow $i \xrightarrow{v(\alpha)} j$ in Q , we set $V_\alpha = \widetilde{\lambda}(\alpha)_{i,j}$ as in Lemma 5.9. Given a morphism of $\text{Path}(Q)$ -modules $\varphi : (M, \lambda) \rightarrow (N, \lambda')$, we define $f := \mathcal{G}(\varphi)$ as follows: for each vertex $i \in Q_0$, f_i is the following composition of morphisms:

$$e_i M \xrightarrow{i(\lambda|_{e_i \otimes M})} M \xrightarrow{\varphi} N \xrightarrow{\lambda'|_{e_i \otimes N}} e_i N.$$

The fact that this defines a morphism of representation follows from φ being a morphism of $\text{Path}(Q)$ -modules combined with Lemma 5.9.

We now show that \mathcal{F} is essentially surjective and fully faithful. By Proposition 5.10, we have an isomorphism of $\text{Path}(Q)$ -modules

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{G}(M)) = \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} e_i M \cong M$$

for every $\text{Path}(Q)$ -module M , which shows that \mathcal{F} is essentially surjective. It is clear from the definition that $\mathcal{F}(f) = 0$ implies $f = 0$ for any morphism of representations $f : V \rightarrow W$. Since our

hom spaces are vector spaces (over \mathbb{C}), this implies that \mathcal{F} is a faithful functor. Moreover, this gives us an inequality of dimensions:

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{rep}(Q)}(V, W)) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Path}(Q)\text{-mod}}(\mathcal{F}(V), \mathcal{F}(W))). \quad (17)$$

As such, fullness of \mathcal{F} follows from showing that the inequality above is indeed an equality. To this end, note that the functor \mathcal{G} also defines an injective morphism of vector spaces

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Path}(Q)\text{-mod}}(\mathcal{F}(V), \mathcal{F}(W)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{G}} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{rep}(Q)}(\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}(V)), \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}(W)))$$

We leave it to the reader to check that $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}(V)) \cong V$ and $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{F}(W)) \cong W$ in $\mathrm{rep}(Q)$, which implies that (17) is in fact an equality, as required.

The fact that \mathcal{F} (and \mathcal{G}) is exact follows directly from the definition of the abelian structure on $\mathrm{rep}(Q)$ and the definition of \mathcal{F} on morphisms. It is also clear from the definition that both functors respect the right module category structures. \square

Remark 5.12. Note that the path algebra $\mathrm{Path}(Q)$ is almost never commutative (except in the trivial cases). As such, even when $\mathcal{C}(Q) \cong \mathrm{TLJ}_n$ for some fixed n , $\mathrm{Path}(Q)$ does not fall into the classification appearing in [KO02; Ost03]. Moreover, $\mathrm{Path}(Q)$ – as with classical path algebras – are almost never semi-simple (i.e. their category of modules are almost never semi-simple). Nonetheless, it is easy to see that when $\mathcal{C}(Q) \cong \mathrm{TLJ}_n$ for some fixed n , $K_0(\mathrm{Path}(Q)\text{-mod})$ falls into the classification of Etingof–Khovanov [EK95, Theorem 3.4] as the direct sum of type A modules over $K_0(\mathrm{TLJ}_n)$. Namely, $K_0(\mathrm{Path}(Q)\text{-mod}) \cong K_0(\mathrm{rep}(Q))$ is a free $K_0(\mathrm{TLJ}_n)$ -module generated by the simple representations at each vertex.

6. FURTHER REMARKS

We end this paper with a few further remarks on related works and possible extensions.

6.1. The Coxeter groups of Q and \check{Q} . If $i \in Q_0$ is a sink (resp. source) in Q , then so is $(A, i) \in \check{Q}_0$ for each $A \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))$. In particular, it is clear that

$$(\sigma_i \check{Q}) = \prod_{A \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))} \sigma_{(A, i)} \check{Q}, \quad (18)$$

where the order of the product does not matter since the vertices (A, i) are all pairwise disjoint.

Note that $\sigma_i \mapsto \prod_{A \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))} \sigma_{(A, i)}$ is also exactly the defining injective homomorphism induced by the (un)folding of the underlying Coxeter graphs (as given in [Lus83, Corollary 3.3] or equivalently [Cri99, Proposition 2.3]). This relation can be lifted to the functorial level on representations of quivers as follows. With $S_{(A, i)}^{\pm}$ denoting the usual reflection functors on sink (resp. source) of classical quivers and \mathcal{U} denote the equivalence defined in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the following diagram is commutative (upto natural isomorphisms):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathrm{rep}(Q) & \xrightarrow{R_i^{\pm}} & \mathrm{rep}(\sigma_i Q) \\ \mathcal{U} \downarrow & & \mathcal{U} \downarrow \\ \mathrm{rep}(\check{Q}) & \xrightarrow{\prod_{A \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))} S_{(A, i)}^{\pm}} & \mathrm{rep}(\prod_{A \in \mathrm{Irr}(\mathcal{C}(Q))} \sigma_{(A, i)} \check{Q}). \end{array}$$

In other words, as in the classical theory, the representations of finite-type Coxeter quivers can be viewed as a (categorical) realisation of Coxeter root systems over commutative rings in the sense of [Dye09], providing categorical interpretation of some of the results in loc. cit.

Remark 6.1. The commutative diagram above also implies that R_i^- is a left adjoint of R_i^+ .

6.2. Representations in other fusion categories and module categories. It is intriguing to find out what other fusion categories can be considered as “natural candidates” for a nice theory of generalised quiver representations. Even if we focus on Coxeter quivers, certain choices can be changed without affecting the end results. For example, in the odd n cases, one could’ve used $\mathcal{C}_n = \text{TLJ}_n$ instead of just the even part; the reason that we took the even part is so that when $n = 3$ we get the category (equivalent to) $\text{vec}_{\mathbb{C}}$. Moreover, instead of tensoring with $\overset{n}{\Pi}_{n-3}$ for the arrows labelled by n , we could instead tensor by $\overset{n}{\Pi}_1$.

On labels $n = 12$ and $n = 30$, we could also use the type E_6 and type E_8 fusion categories in place of TLJ_{12} (type A_{11}) and TLJ_{30} (type A_{29}) respectively, where $\overset{n}{\Pi}_{n-3}$ is replaced by the generating object of the respective category (see [Ede20, Section 2.3] and references therein for a description of the E_6 and E_8 fusion categories). In these cases, the category of representations of the $I_2(12)$ and $I_2(30)$ Coxeter quivers will be equivalent to the category of representations of the classical quiver whose underlying graph is of type E_6 and type E_8 respectively.

One could also try and work over positive characteristic using the Verlinde category introduced by Ostrik in [Ost20] (note that we never used the braiding structure in the fusion categories that we have considered).

Just as quivers are useful in studying finite-dimensional algebras, Theorem 5.11 also suggests that it could be worth exploring the usage of quivers in understanding algebras in fusion categories, which could also lead to the understanding of (finite) module categories over fusion categories.

6.3. Relation to cluster algebras and their categorifications. In the process of working on this paper, the author came across the paper of Duffield–Tumarkin [DT22], which approaches a related problem directly from the representations of classical quivers. Their motivation is different from ours; the aim was to categorify certain cluster algebra combinatorics and they focus purely on the folding of finite type quivers \check{Q} to obtain induced semi-ring actions on $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$. The semi-ring they consider agrees with the positive part of our fusion ring $K_0(\mathcal{C}(Q))$. Moreover, their semi-ring action on $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$ can indeed be lifted to an action of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$, which coincides with our induced action of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ on $\text{rep}(\check{Q})$ through the equivalence $\text{rep}(Q) \cong \text{rep}(\check{Q})$ in Theorem 3.1. Compare their Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2 with our Theorem 4.11 and Theorem 3.1 respectively.

Due to the incompetence of the author in the theory of cluster algebras, we shall not comment further on the (possible) relevance of our results in this paper with cluster combinatorics, where the interested reader are referred to [DT22] for the finite type cases.

REFERENCES

- [BGP73] I. N. Bernstein, I. M. Gelfand, and V. A. Ponomarev. “Coxeter functors, and Gabriel’s theorem”. In: *Uspehi Mat. Nauk* 28.2(170) (1973), pp. 19–33. ISSN: 0042-1316.
- [Che14] Joshua Chen. *The Temperley-Lieb categories and skein modules*. Preprint online at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1502.06845>. 2014. arXiv: 1502.06845 [math.QA].
- [Cox35] H. S. M. Coxeter. “The Complete Enumeration of Finite Groups of the Form $R_i^2 = (R_i R_j)^{k_{ij}} = 1$ ”. In: *J. London Math. Soc.* 10.1 (1935), pp. 21–25. ISSN: 0024-6107. DOI: [10.1112/jlms/s1-10.37.21](https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s1-10.37.21). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1112/jlms/s1-10.37.21>.
- [Cri99] John Crisp. “Injective maps between Artin groups”. In: *Geometric group theory down under (Canberra, 1996)*. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999, pp. 119–137.

- [Deo82] Vinay V. Deodhar. “On the root system of a Coxeter group”. In: *Comm. Algebra* 10.6 (1982), pp. 611–630. ISSN: 0092-7872. DOI: [10.1080/00927878208822738](https://doi.org/10.1080/00927878208822738). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00927878208822738>.
- [DR75] Vlastimil Dlab and Claus Michael Ringel. “On algebras of finite representation type”. In: *J. Algebra* 33 (1975), pp. 306–394. ISSN: 0021-8693. DOI: [10.1016/0021-8693\(75\)90125-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8693(75)90125-8). URL: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8693\(75\)90125-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-8693(75)90125-8).
- [DR76] Vlastimil Dlab and Claus Michael Ringel. “Indecomposable representations of graphs and algebras”. In: *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* 6.173 (1976), pp. v+57. ISSN: 0065-9266. DOI: [10.1090/memo/0173](https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/0173). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/0173>.
- [DT22] Drew Damien Duffield and Pavel Tumarkin. *Categorifications of Non-Integer Quivers: Types H_4 , H_3 and $I_2(2n+1)$* . 2022. DOI: [10.48550/ARXIV.2204.12752](https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.12752). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.12752>.
- [Dye09] Matthew J. Dyer. “Embeddings of root systems. I. Root systems over commutative rings”. In: *J. Algebra* 321.11 (2009), pp. 3226–3248. ISSN: 0021-8693. DOI: [10.1016/j.jalgebra.2008.10.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2008.10.008). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2008.10.008>.
- [Edi20] Cain Edie-Michell. “Classifying fusion categories \otimes -generated by an object of small Frobenius-Perron dimension”. In: *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 26.2 (2020), Paper No. 24, 47. ISSN: 1022-1824. DOI: [10.1007/s00029-020-0550-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-020-0550-3). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-020-0550-3>.
- [EGNO15] Pavel Etingof, Shlomo Gelaki, Dmitri Nikshych, and Victor Ostrik. “Tensor categories”. In: *Mathematical Surveys and Monographs Tensor Categories* (2015), pp. 65–89. DOI: [10.1090/surv/205/04](https://doi.org/10.1090/surv/205/04).
- [EK95] Pavel Etingof and Michael Khovanov. “Representations of tensor categories and Dynkin diagrams”. In: *Internat. Math. Res. Notices* 5 (1995), pp. 235–247. ISSN: 1073-7928. DOI: [10.1155/S1073792895000183](https://doi.org/10.1155/S1073792895000183). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1155/S1073792895000183>.
- [ENO05] Pavel Etingof, Dmitri Nikshych, and Viktor Ostrik. “On fusion categories”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 162.2 (2005), pp. 581–642. DOI: [10.4007/annals.2005.162.581](https://doi.org/10.4007/annals.2005.162.581).
- [Gab72] Peter Gabriel. “Unzerlegbare Darstellungen. I”. In: *Manuscripta Math.* 6 (1972), 71–103, correction, *ibid.* 6 (1972), 309. ISSN: 0025-2611. DOI: [10.1007/BF01298413](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01298413). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01298413>.
- [KO02] Alexander Kirillov Jr. and Viktor Ostrik. “On a q -analogue of the McKay correspondence and the ADE classification of \mathfrak{sl}_2 conformal field theories”. In: *Adv. Math.* 171.2 (2002), pp. 183–227. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: [10.1006/aima.2002.2072](https://doi.org/10.1006/aima.2002.2072). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1006/aima.2002.2072>.
- [Lus83] George Lusztig. “Some examples of square integrable representations of semisimple p -adic groups”. In: *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* 277.2 (1983), pp. 623–653. ISSN: 0002-9947. DOI: [10.2307/1999228](https://doi.org/10.2307/1999228). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1999228>.
- [Lus93] George Lusztig. *Introduction to quantum groups*. Vol. 110. Progress in Mathematics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1993, pp. xii+341. ISBN: 0-8176-3712-5.
- [MP93] R. V. Moody and J. Patera. “Quasicrystals and icosians”. In: *J. Phys. A* 26.12 (1993), pp. 2829–2853. ISSN: 0305-4470. URL: <http://stacks.iop.org/0305-4470/26/2829>.
- [Ost03] Victor Ostrik. “Module categories, weak Hopf algebras and modular invariants”. In: *Transform. Groups* 8.2 (2003), pp. 177–206. ISSN: 1083-4362. DOI: [10.1007/s00031-003-0515-6](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00031-003-0515-6). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00031-003-0515-6>.

- [Ost20] Victor Ostrik. “On symmetric fusion categories in positive characteristic”. In: *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* 26.3 (2020), Paper No. 36, 19. ISSN: 1022-1824. DOI: [10.1007/s00029-020-00567-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-020-00567-5). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00029-020-00567-5>.
- [Row19] Mitchell Rowett. “Monoidal Ladder Categories”. Honour thesis. Australian National University, 2019.
- [Shc88] O. P. Shcherbak. “Wave fronts and reflection groups”. In: *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk* 43.3(261) (1988), pp. 125–160, 271, 272. ISSN: 0042-1316. DOI: [10.1070/RM1988v043n03ABEH001741](https://doi.org/10.1070/RM1988v043n03ABEH001741). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1070/RM1988v043n03ABEH001741>.
- [ST09] Noah Snyder and Peter Tingley. “The half-twist for $U_q(\mathfrak{g})$ representations”. In: *Algebra Number Theory* 3.7 (2009), pp. 809–834. ISSN: 1937-0652. DOI: [10.2140/ant.2009.3.809](https://doi.org/10.2140/ant.2009.3.809). URL: <https://doi.org/10.2140/ant.2009.3.809>.
- [Ste16] Robert Steinberg. *Lectures on Chevalley groups*. Vol. 66. University Lecture Series. Notes prepared by John Faulkner and Robert Wilson, Revised and corrected edition of the 1968 original [MR0466335], With a foreword by Robert R. Snapp. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016, pp. xi+160. ISBN: 978-1-4704-3105-1. DOI: [10.1090/ulect/066](https://doi.org/10.1090/ulect/066). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/ulect/066>.
- [Tan80] Toshiyuki Tanisaki. “Foldings of root systems and Gabriel’s theorem”. In: *Tsukuba J. Math.* 4.1 (1980), pp. 89–97. ISSN: 0387-4982. DOI: [10.21099/tkbjm/1496158795](https://doi.org/10.21099/tkbjm/1496158795). URL: <https://doi.org/10.21099/tkbjm/1496158795>.
- [Tur16] Vladimir G. Turaev. *Quantum invariants of knots and 3-manifolds*. Vol. 18. De Gruyter Studies in Mathematics. Third edition [of MR1292673]. De Gruyter, Berlin, 2016, pp. xii+596. ISBN: 978-3-11-044266-3; 978-3-11-043522-1; 978-3-11-043456-9. DOI: [10.1515/9783110435221](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110435221). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110435221>.
- [Wan10] Zhenghan Wang. *Topological quantum computation*. Vol. 112. CBMS Regional Conference Series in Mathematics. Published for the Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, DC; by the American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010, pp. xiv+115. ISBN: 978-0-8218-4930-9. DOI: [10.1090/cbms/112](https://doi.org/10.1090/cbms/112). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1090/cbms/112>.
- [Zub94] J.-B. Zuber. “On Dubrovin topological field theories”. In: *Modern Phys. Lett. A* 9.8 (1994), pp. 749–760. ISSN: 0217-7323. DOI: [10.1142/S0217732394000563](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217732394000563). URL: <https://doi.org/10.1142/S0217732394000563>.

INSTITUT DES HAUTES ETUDES SCIENTIFIQUES (IHES). LE BOIS-MARIE, 35, ROUTE DE CHARTRES, 91440 BURES-SUR-YVETTE (FRANCE)

Email address: heng@ihes.fr