

MORPHISMS AND EXTENSIONS BETWEEN BRICKS OVER PREPROJECTIVE ALGEBRAS OF TYPE A

ERIC J. HANSON AND XINRUI YOU

ABSTRACT. The bricks over preprojective algebras of type A are known to be in bijection with certain combinatorial objects called “arcs”. In this paper, we show how one can use arcs to compute bases for the Hom-spaces and first extension spaces between bricks. We then use this description to classify the “weak exceptional sequences” over these algebras. Finally, we explain how our result relates to a similar combinatorial model for the exceptional sequences over hereditary algebras of type A.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Bricks and weak exceptional sequences	2
3. Preprojective algebras and their quotients	3
4. Morphisms between bricks	6
5. Extensions between bricks	11
6. Weak exceptional sequences	18
7. Exceptional sequences over hereditary algebras of type A	22
References	23

1. INTRODUCTION

Let Q be a quiver, K a field, and $\Lambda = KQ/I$ the quotient of the path algebra KQ by an admissible ideal I . An *exceptional sequence* over Λ is a sequence (X_k, \dots, X_1) of finitely generated (left) Λ -modules such that $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X_i, X_i)$ is a division algebra (that is, X_i is a *brick*) for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^m(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k$ and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. It is well-known that the length of an exceptional sequence cannot exceed the number of vertices of Q . Furthermore, if Q is acyclic and $I = 0$ (that is, if Λ is hereditary) then every exceptional sequence can be “completed” so as to achieve this length, see [12, 30].

On the other hand, there are many examples of algebras admitting exceptional sequences which cannot be completed. For example, in this paper we focus on *preprojective algebras* of Dynkin type A (see Definition 3.1), denoted $\Pi(A_n)$. Over these algebras, we have that $\text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n)}(X, Y) \neq 0$ for any projective modules X and Y and that $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^2(X, X) \neq 0$ for any non-projective finitely-generated module X , see e.g. [29, Proposition 5.3]. As a consequence, no exceptional sequence over $\Pi(A_n)$ can have length more than one. For additional information on the historical development and significance of preprojective algebras, we refer to the introduction of [19] and the references therein.

Since the exceptional sequences over an arbitrary algebra may not have very nice properties, one natural approach is to weaken the definition. Indeed, to recover the definition in the hereditary

Date: March 22, 2023.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 16G20, 16G10.

case, one needs only assume that a sequence (X_k, \dots, X_1) of indecomposable modules satisfies $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for $1 \leq i < j \leq k$ and $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k$. Over arbitrary algebras, sequences which satisfy only these properties are known as *stratifying systems*. We refer to the introduction of [25] and the references therein for information about the rich history and body of research related to stratifying systems.

The preprojective algebra $\Pi(A_n)$ has wild representation type for $n \geq 6$. Thus classifying all stratifying systems over such algebras is a difficult question. On the other hand, the number of bricks over $\Pi(A_n)$ remains finite for any choice of n . This follows from the “brick- τ -rigid correspondence” of [14] together with Mizuno’s result that the “poset of τ -tilting pairs” of a preprojective algebra of Dynkin type is isomorphic to the weak order on the corresponding Coxeter group [26]. Thus it is natural to consider only those stratifying systems consisting entirely as bricks. Such stratifying systems are also known as *weak exceptional sequences* [31].

The main result of this paper (Theorem 6.8) uses “arcs” on $n + 1$ nodes to formulate a concrete combinatorial description of the weak exceptional sequences over the preprojective algebra $\Pi(A_n)$ (and certain quotient algebras). As an application, we use this model to prove that $2n - 2$ is a tight upper bound on the length of a weak exceptional sequence over $\Pi(A_n)$ for $n \geq 2$ (Corollary 6.10). We also explain how our model relates to that of the exceptional sequences over path algebras of type A_n established in [18] (Section 7).

In concurrent work by the first author [20], we also use arcs to classify which weak exceptional sequences over $\Pi(A_n)$ are the sequences of bricks corresponding (in the sense of [4, Theorem D]) to Buan and Marsh’s τ -*exceptional sequences* [9]. These are another example of stratifying systems which, in full generality, satisfy a weaker version of the “completion property” observed for classical exceptional sequences in the hereditary case. See [9], [1, Theorem 2.10], and [25, Section 5] for further details.

Our results fit into a larger body of work which uses arcs (and associated combinatorial objects) to model various sets of representation-theoretic objects over $\Pi(A_n)$. This includes the sets of τ -tilting modules [22, 26], bricks and semibricks [2, 3, 16], and 2-term simple minded collections [5, 27]. Arcs are also used to construct an explicit basis for the Hom-space between bricks in [3, 27]. In constructing our model, we reprove this result (Proposition 4.9) and also use arcs to give an explicit basis for the first Ext-space between two bricks (Theorem 5.10).

Funding and Acknowledgements. X.Y. was supported by a Mitacs Globalink Summer Research Internship held at l’Université du Québec à Montréal. E.H. was supported by the Canada Research Chairs program (CRC-2021-00120) and NSERC Discovery Grants (RGPIN-2022-03960 and RGPIN/04465-2019). The authors are thankful to Emily Barnard, Karin Baur, Aslak Bakke Buan, Benjamin Dequène, Hernán Ibarra-Mejía, Ray Maresca, Clara Otte, and Hugh Thomas for many insightful discussions related to this project.

2. BRICKS AND WEAK EXCEPTIONAL SEQUENCES

Let Λ be a finite-dimensional basic algebra over a field K . We denote by $\text{mod } \Lambda$ the category of finitely-generated right Λ -modules. We adopt the common convention of identifying $\text{mod } \Lambda$ with a skeleton, meaning we identify every $M \in \text{mod } \Lambda$ with its isomorphism class.

A module $X \in \text{mod } \Lambda$ is called a *brick* if $\text{End}_\Lambda(X)$ is a division algebra. When K is algebraically closed, this condition simplifies to $\text{End}_\Lambda(X) \cong K$. (This will also be the case for the type A preprojective algebras considered in the paper, see Corollary 5.12.) A set of bricks \mathcal{X} is called a *semibrick* if $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X, Y) = 0 = \text{Hom}_\Lambda(Y, X)$ for all $X \neq Y \in \mathcal{X}$. We denote by $\text{brick}(\Lambda)$ and $\text{sbrick}(\Lambda)$ the sets of bricks and semibricks in $\text{mod } \Lambda$, respectively.

The following is the main object of study in this paper.

Definition 2.1. [31] Let $\Delta = (X_k, \dots, X_1)$ be a sequence of indecomposable modules. We say that Δ is a *weak exceptional sequence* if the following hold.

- (1) $\text{End}_\Lambda(X_i) \cong K$ (so in particular X_i is a brick) for all $1 \leq i \leq k$.
- (2) $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$.
- (3) $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k$.

We refer to k as the *length* of Δ . In case $k = 2$, we will sometimes refer to the weak exceptional sequence (X_2, X_1) as a *weak exceptional pair*.

Remark 2.2.

- (1) If one replaces (3) in Definition 2.1 with (3') $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^m(X_i, X_j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq j \leq k$ and for all $m \geq 1$, the result is the definition of an *exceptional sequence*. Similarly, if one removes condition (1) from Definition 2.1, the result is the definition of a *stratifying system*. Moreover, if Λ is hereditary then these three notions all coincide. As mentioned in the introduction, we refer to the introduction of [25] and the references therein for further discussion on these alternatives.
- (2) Weak exceptional pairs are an example of the ‘‘semibrick pairs’’ introduced in [21]. Indeed, if every brick in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ has trivial endomorphism ring, then a pair (X_2, X_1) is a weak exceptional sequence if and only if $X_1 \sqcup X_2[1]$ is a semibrick pair in the sense of [21, Definition 1.8]. Over the type-A preprojective algebras studied in this paper, such pairs were classified in [5, Section 6.2] (see also Lemma 6.1 in the present paper).

Note that a sequence (X_k, \dots, X_1) is a weak exceptional sequence if and only if (X_j, X_i) is a weak exceptional pair for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$. We denote by $\text{weak}(\Lambda, k)$ the set of weak exceptional sequences in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ of length k and by $\text{weak}(\Lambda) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{weak}(\Lambda, k)$. Note also that, outside of the hereditary case, the length of a weak exceptional sequence (and thus also of a stratifying system) may surpass the number of simple objects in $\text{mod } \Lambda$. See e.g. [17, 3.2], [24, Remark 2.7], [31, 33], or Corollary 6.10 for examples.

3. PREPROJECTIVE ALGEBRAS AND THEIR QUOTIENTS

In this section, we give background information on preprojective algebras of type A_n . We begin with the definition. Our convention is to compose arrows from left-to-right.

Definition 3.1. Let A_n be a linear quiver of type A_n , with an arrow $a_i : i \rightarrow i + 1$ for $1 \leq i < n$. We denote by \overline{A}_n the *double quiver* of A_n , obtained by adjoining an arrow $a_i^* : i + 1 \rightarrow i$ for each arrow a_i in Q . We then define a family of algebras as follows. Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}} := \{2, 3, \dots, n-1\}$. We denote

$$c_2(S) := \{a_1 a_1^*, a_{n-1}^* a_{n-1}\} \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in S} \{a_i a_i^*, a_{i-1}^* a_{i-1}\} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{i \in [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}} \setminus S} \{a_i a_i^* - a_{i-1}^* a_{i-1}\} \right),$$

$$\Pi(A_n, S) := \overline{A}_n / (c_2(S)).$$

Then $\Pi(A_n) := \Pi(A_n, \emptyset)$ is the *preprojective algebra* of type A_n .

Example 3.2. Consider the quivers

$$A_4 : \quad 1 \xrightarrow{a_1} 2 \xrightarrow{a_2} 3 \xrightarrow{a_3} 4, \quad \overline{A}_4 : \quad 1 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{a_1} \\ \xleftarrow{a_1^*} \end{array} 2 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{a_2} \\ \xleftarrow{a_2^*} \end{array} 3 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{a_3} \\ \xleftarrow{a_3^*} \end{array} 4.$$

Then the preprojective algebra $\Pi(A_4)$ and the algebra $\Pi(A_n, \{2, 3\})$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi(A_4) = \Pi(A_n, \emptyset) &= K\overline{A}_4 / (a_1 a_1^*, a_2 a_2^* - a_1^* a_1, a_3 a_3^* - a_2^* a_2, -a_3^* a_3), \\ \Pi(A_4, \{2, 3\}) &= K\overline{A}_4 / (a_1 a_1^*, a_2 a_2^*, a_1^* a_1, a_3 a_3^*, a_2^* a_2, -a_3^* a_3). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.3. While we have defined the preprojective algebra only for one particular quiver, the definition is in fact much more general. Indeed, for an arbitrary quiver $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$, the *preprojective algebra of type Q* , denoted $\Pi(Q)$, is defined to be the quotient of $K\overline{Q}$ by the ideal

generated by $\sum_{a \in Q_1} a_i a_i^* - a_i^* a_i$. This algebra will be finite-dimensional if and only if Q is of Dynkin type. Furthermore, it is well-known that (up to isomorphism) the algebra $\Pi(Q)$ depends only on the underlying (undirected) graph of Q , and not on the orientations of the arrows. Thus our choice to work only with the linear orientation of A_n serves only to fix which arrows are denoted a_i and which are denoted a_i^* .

Note that for $S \subseteq T \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, one has $c_2(S) \supseteq c_2(T)$, and so there is a natural quotient map $q_T^S : \Pi(A_n, S) \rightarrow \Pi(A_n, T)$ which induces a fully faithful functor $F_T^S : \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, T) \rightarrow \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$. When viewing modules as representations of quivers with relations, the functor F_T^S acts as the identity on both objects and morphisms. In particular, for $S \subseteq T \subseteq U \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ we have $F_U^S = F_U^T \circ F_T^S$. Moreover, each functor F_T^S is exact and reflects exact sequences; that is, for $M, N \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$, the functor F_T^S induces an injective linear map $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, T)}^1(M, N) \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(M, N)$. This will be useful in Section 5 for proving that the elements of our proposed basis for the Ext-space between bricks in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$ are linearly independent.

The algebra $\Pi(A_n)$ is known to have wild representation type for $n \geq 6$. At the same time, it was shown by Mizuno [26] that $\Pi(A_n)$ is “ τ -tilting finite”, and so in particular $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$ contains only finitely many bricks by [14]. On the other hand, the algebra $\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ is a “gentle algebra” with no “bands”. Thus the classical work of Butler and Ringel [10] implies that $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ has finitely many indecomposables, and that each of these is a brick.

In [26], Mizuno showed that the “lattice of torsion classes” of $\Pi(A_n)$ is isomorphic to the “weak order” on the corresponding Coxeter group. In [22], Iyama, Reading, Reiten, and Thomas use this to model the “ τ^{-1} -rigid modules” in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$ using “Young-like diagrams”. This was modified to a model of the bricks over $\Pi(A_n)$ by Asai [2] via the dual of the brick- τ -rigid correspondence of [14]. In the same year, Barnard, Carroll, and Zhu [3, Section 4] and Demonet, Iyama, Reading, Reiten, and Thomas [15, Section 6.3] independently studied the bricks over $\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$. They showed that each brick can be identified with an orientation of a connected subgraph of A_n , and vice versa. Combinatorially, this phenomenon is modeled in [3] using “arcs”, which had appeared in Reading’s previous work on “join-irreducible elements” of the weak order [28]. The use of arcs to model bricks over $\Pi(A_n)$ is also established in [16, 27] without explicit reference to the algebra $\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$. Furthermore, it is shown in both [3] and [15] that the lattice of torsion classes of $\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ is also isomorphic to the weak order on the corresponding Coxeter group (see also [23]), a consequence of which is the following.

Proposition 3.4. *Let $S \subseteq T \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Then F_T^S induces an equality $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, T)) = \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$.*

In the remainder of this section, we recall the “arc model” of $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_n))$, which we identify with $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_n), S)$ for all S by the above proposition. We begin by recalling the definition of an arc on $n+1$ nodes.

Definition 3.5. Let $[n] := \{0, \dots, n\}$ be a set of $n+1$ nodes in \mathbb{R}^2 , arranged in increasing order at the points $(i, 0)$. An *arc* γ on $n+1$ nodes is the data of a pair of nodes $\ell(\gamma) < r(\gamma)$ and a continuous function $[\ell(\gamma), r(\gamma)] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ (which by abuse of notation we also denote by γ) such that

- (1) $\gamma(\ell(\gamma)) = 0 = \gamma(r(\gamma))$, and
- (2) $\gamma(k) \neq 0$ for all $k \in (\ell(\gamma), r(\gamma)) \cap \mathbb{Z}$.

We refer to $\ell(\gamma)$ and $r(\gamma)$ as the left and right *endpoints* of γ , respectively.

Alternatively, one can view an arc as a path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2$ which moves monotonically from left to right and takes values in $[n]$ only at $t = 0$ and $t = 1$.

Definition 3.6. Let γ be an arc on $n+1$ nodes. The *support* of γ is the open interval $(\ell(\gamma), r(\gamma)) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and the *closed support* of γ is the closed interval $[\ell(\gamma), r(\gamma)] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Likewise the *arrow support* of

γ is the set $[\ell(\gamma) + 1, r(\gamma) - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}} \subseteq [n]$. For each k in the arrow support of γ , we say that γ passes *above* k if $\gamma(k) > 0$ and that γ passes *below* k if $\gamma(k) < 0$. Given a second arc ρ , the *common (closed, arrow) support* of γ and ρ is the intersection of their (closed, arrow) supports.

The name arrow support is justified in Remark 3.9

When considering an arc, we are mostly interested in its endpoints and whether it passes above or below each node v in its arrow support. We encode this information as follows.

Definition 3.7. Let $\text{word}(\text{ueo})$ be the set of nonempty words on the letters u, e, and o. We treat $\{u, e, o\}$ as a totally ordered set with $u < e < o$. Define a map $\text{wd} : \text{arc}(n) \rightarrow \{0, \dots, n-1\} \times \text{word}(\text{ueo})$ as follows. Let $\gamma \in \text{arc}(n)$. For $\ell(\gamma) \leq i \leq r(\gamma)$, set

$$s_i := \begin{cases} u & \text{if } \gamma(i) < 0 \\ o & \text{if } \gamma(i) > 0 \\ e & \text{if } \gamma(i) = 0. \end{cases}$$

We then set $\text{wd}(\gamma) = (\ell(\gamma), s_{\ell(\gamma)+1} \cdots s_{r(\gamma)})$.

Definition 3.7 can be used to rigorously say that two arcs γ and ρ are *combinatorially equivalent* if and only if $\text{wd}(\gamma) = \text{wd}(\rho)$. We then denote by $\text{arc}(n)$ the set of equivalence classes of arcs on $n+1$ nodes. We will regularly adopt the standard convention of using $\gamma \in \text{arc}(n)$ to mean both the arc γ and its equivalence class. To aid in visualization and help clarify the relationship between arcs and bricks over $\Pi(A_n)$, we sometimes decorate an arc γ with *small clockwise arrows* as shown in Figure 1.

We now recall the bijection between bricks and arcs.

Proposition 3.8. [3, Proposition 4.6][27, Proposition 3.7] *Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Then:*

- (1) *There is a bijection $\sigma : \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S)) \rightarrow \text{arc}(n)$ given as follows. Let $X \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$. Then X satisfies the following.*
 - (a) *There exists $i \leq j \in [n]$ such that $\dim(X(k)) = 1$ for $i \leq k \leq j$ and $\dim(X(k)) = 0$ for $k < i$ or $k > j$.*
 - (b) *If $\dim(X(i)) = 1 = \dim(X(i+1))$, then one of $X(a_i)$ and $X(a_i^*)$ is 0 and the other is an isomorphism.*

We denote an arc $\sigma(X)$ as follows. Let i, j be as in (a). Then $\text{wd}(\sigma(X)) = (i-1, s_i \cdots s_j)$ with

$$s_k = \begin{cases} u & \text{if } X(a_k^*) \neq 0 \\ o & \text{if } X(a_k) \neq 0 \\ e & \text{if } k = j. \end{cases}$$

That is, the endpoints of $\sigma(X)$ are $\ell(\sigma(X)) = i-1$ and $r(\sigma(X)) = j$. For each $i < k < j$, $\sigma(X)$ passes above the node k if $X(a_k) \neq 0$ and passes below the node k otherwise.

- (2) *Let $\gamma \in \text{arc}(n)$ and denote $\text{wd}(\gamma) = (\ell(\gamma), s_{\ell(\gamma)+1} \cdots s_r)$. Then the brick $\sigma^{-1}(\gamma)$ is given by*

$$\sigma^{-1}(\gamma)(k) = \begin{cases} K & \ell(\gamma) < k \leq r(\gamma) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\sigma^{-1}(\gamma)(a_i) = \begin{cases} 1_K & s_k = o \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \sigma^{-1}(\gamma)(a_i^*) = \begin{cases} 0 & s_k = u \\ 1_K & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.9. Visually, we can understand the bijection σ as follows. See Figure 1 for an example using the brick $X = \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 4 \\ 1 & 3 \end{smallmatrix} \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_4, S))$. The middle $n-1$ nodes represent the (pairs of) arrows of the quiver \overline{A}_n . Given a brick $X \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$, we draw a small clockwise arrow to represent the direction of the nonzero map near its corresponding nodes. Then we draw an arc $\sigma(X)$ from




FIGURE 1. A brick over $\Pi(A_n)$ and the corresponding arc on $n + 1$ nodes.




FIGURE 2. A marked unpunctured surface which allows for the arc model of $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_4, \{2, 3\}))$ to be realized as a special case of Baur and Coelho Simões’s surface model. See Remark 3.10

node i to j , where all the nonzero linear maps lie exactly between i and j . When we have a small clockwise arrow above (resp. below) a node, the arc should go below (resp. above) the node. Note in particular that the arrows of the quiver \overline{A}_n on which X is nonzero coincide with the arrow support of $\sigma(X)$.

Remark 3.10. In [7], Baur and Coelho Simões describe the string modules over an arbitrary gentle algebra using “homotopy classes of permissible arcs” on partially-triangulated marked unpunctured surfaces (with boundary). We observe that the arc model for $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}))$ can be seen as a special case of Baur and Coelho Simões’s model as follows. Start with a disk $D^2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^2$ of radius $n/2$ centered at $(n/2, 0)$. For each node $i \in [n] \setminus \{0, n\}$, we add a boundary component of radius $1/4$ centered at the point $(i, 0)$. Place marked points at the points $(n/2, n/2)$, $(n/2, -n/2)$, $(0, 0)$, $(n, 0)$, and $(i + 1/2, 0)$ for $i \in [n] \setminus \{0, n\}$. We then partially triangulate the resulting marked surface by drawing n distinct edges between the north and south pole, one passing through each point $(i + 1/4, 0)$ for $i \in [n] \setminus \{n\}$. See Figure 2 for an example with $n = 4$. The “tiling algebra” of this triangulated marked surface, as defined in [7, Definition 2.1] is then precisely $\Pi(A_n, [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$. Moreover, each “homotopy class of permissible arcs” can be seen as an arc connecting marked points along the x -axis in an analogous way to combinatorial equivalence classes of arcs.

4. MORPHISMS BETWEEN BRICKS

In this section, we show how the arc model for $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$ can be used to describe the Hom-spaces between bricks. More precisely, recall from Section 2 that $\Pi(A_n, [2, n - 1])$ is a “gentle algebra” with no “bands”. As such, an explicit basis for the Hom-space between two bricks is given in [11, Section 2]. This basis is given an explicit interpretation in terms of arcs in [3, Proposition 4.8]. It is also shown in [27, Section 3.1] that the basis is still valid over the preprojective algebra $\Pi(A_n)$, which can also be seen from the fact that $F_{[2, n - 1]}^{\theta}$ is fully faithful. We recall the definition of this basis in Proposition 4.3(3). We then relate the cardinality of this basis to the set of intersection points between the corresponding arcs in Proposition 4.9.

We begin with the following definitions.

Definition 4.1. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{arc}(n)$. For $t \in \{1, 2\}$, denote $\text{wd}(\gamma_t) = \left(\ell(\gamma_t), s_{\ell(\gamma_t)+1}^t \cdots s_{r(\gamma_t)}^t \right)$.

- (1) We say that γ_2 is a *restriction* of γ_1 if (i) $\ell(\gamma_1) \leq \ell(\gamma_2) < r(\gamma_2) \leq r(\gamma_1)$, and (ii) for every node i in the arrow support of γ_2 , one has $s_i^1 = s_i^2$. That is, the support of γ_2 is contained in that of γ_1 and the arcs pass on the same side of every node in their common arrow support.
- (2) We say that γ_2 is a *quotient arc* of γ_1 if it is a restriction of γ_1 which satisfies both of the following.
 - (a) If γ_1 and γ_2 do not share a left endpoint, then $s_{\ell(\gamma_2)}^1 = o$; that is, γ_1 passes above the left endpoint of γ_2 .
 - (b) If γ_1 and γ_2 do not share a right endpoint, then $s_{r(\gamma_2)}^1 = u$; that is, γ_1 passes below the right endpoint of γ_2 .
- (3) We say that γ_2 is a *submodule arc* of γ_1 if it is a restriction of γ_1 which satisfies the following.
 - (a) If γ_1 and γ_2 do not share a left endpoint, then $s_{\ell(\gamma_2)}^1 = u$; that is, γ_1 passes below the left endpoint of γ_2 .
 - (b) If γ_1 and γ_2 do not share a right endpoint, then $s_{r(\gamma_2)}^1 = o$; that is, γ_1 passes above the right endpoint of γ_2 .

Remark 4.2. Visually, we have that a restriction γ_2 of γ_1 is a quotient arc if and only if the small clockwise arrow of γ_1 at any non-shared endpoint of γ_2 points “outward”. Likewise, we have that a restriction γ_2 of γ_1 is a submodule arc of γ_1 if and only if the small clockwise arrow of γ_1 at any non-shared endpoint of γ_2 points “inward”. See Example 4.4 and Figure 3.

The following is contained in [27, Section 3.1] and [3, Propositions 4.7 and 4.8].

Proposition 4.3. Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.

- (1) Let $X \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$ and let $Y \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$ be indecomposable. Then the following are equivalent.
 - (a) Y is a brick and $\sigma(Y)$ is a quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$.
 - (b) Y is a quotient of X in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$.
 - (c) $Y \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$ and is a quotient of X in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$.

Moreover, if these equivalent conditions hold then

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(X, Y) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(Y, X) = 0.$$

- (2) Let $X \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$ and let $Y \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$ be indecomposable. Then the following are equivalent.
 - (a) Y is a brick and $\sigma(Y)$ is a submodule arc of $\sigma(X)$.
 - (b) Y is a submodule of X in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$.
 - (c) $Y \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$ and is a submodule of X in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$.

Moreover, if these equivalent conditions hold then

$$\dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(X, Y) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(Y, X) = 1.$$

- (3) Let $X, Y \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$. Then the set of arcs γ which are both quotient arcs of $\sigma(X)$ and submodule arcs of $\sigma(Y)$ form a basis of $\text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(X, Y)$. The basis element corresponding to such an arc γ is the composition of the quotient map $X \twoheadrightarrow \sigma^{-1}(\gamma)$ and the inclusion map $\sigma^{-1}(\gamma) \hookrightarrow Y$, each of which is unique up to scalar multiplication.

Example 4.4. Let $X = \overset{2}{1} \overset{3}{3}, Y = 2 = S(2)$, and $Z = 3 = S(3)$. Then $\sigma(Y)$ is a quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Z)$ is a restriction of $\sigma(X)$ which is neither a quotient arc nor a submodule arc, as shown in Figure 3. Moreover, we see that $\dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n)}(X, Y) = 1$ and $\dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n)}(X, Z) = 0$.

We now wish to relate the basis in Proposition 4.3 to certain intersection points between the corresponding arcs. To do so, we need the following definitions.




FIGURE 3. $\sigma(Y)$ (solid orange) is a quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$ (dotted blue). $\sigma(Z)$ (dashed purple) is a restriction of $\sigma(X)$, but is neither a quotient arc nor a submodule arc.

Definition 4.5. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{arc}(n)$, and choose representatives of their equivalence classes which intersect at a minimum number of points. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be in the common closed support of γ_1 and γ_2 , and suppose that $\gamma_1(x) = \gamma_2(x)$.

- (1) We say that x is a *shared (left or right) endpoint* of γ_1 and γ_2 if (left) $\ell(\gamma_1) = x = \ell(\gamma_2)$ or (right) $r(\gamma_1) = x = r(\gamma_2)$.
- (2) We say that x is a *contested endpoint* of γ_1 and γ_2 if $r(\gamma_1) = x = \ell(\gamma_2)$ or $\ell(\gamma_1) = x = r(\gamma_2)$.
- (3) We say that x is a *nontrivial crossing* of γ_1 and γ_2 if it is neither a shared nor a contested endpoint. Note that nontrivial crossings will necessarily be transverse by the minimality assumption.
- (4) We say that x is a *Ext-crossing* of γ_1 and γ_2 if it is either a contested endpoint or a nontrivial crossing.
- (5) We say that x is a *Hom-crossing* of γ_1 and γ_2 if it is either a shared endpoint or a nontrivial crossing. We say that a Hom-crossing x is *directed from γ_1 to γ_2* if one of the following holds.
 - (a) x is not a shared left endpoint and γ_1 is “left locally above” γ_2 near x . More precisely, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ such that $\gamma_1(x - \delta) > \gamma_2(x - \delta)$.
 - (b) x is a shared left endpoint and γ_1 is “right locally below” γ_2 near x . More precisely, for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $0 < \delta < \varepsilon$ such that $\gamma_1(x + \delta) < \gamma_2(x + \delta)$.

Remark 4.6. Note that for $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{arc}(n)$, the number of crossings of each type only depend on the assumption that the chosen representatives intersect a minimal number of times, and not on the specific choice of representatives satisfying this assumption.

Example 4.7. Let γ_1, γ_2 , and γ_3 be the arcs in Figure 4. Then:

- (1) γ_1 and γ_2 have one Ext-crossing and zero Hom-crossings. The unique Ext-crossing is the contested endpoint 5.
- (2) γ_2 and γ_3 have zero Ext-crossings and one Hom-crossing. The unique Hom-crossing is the shared (right) endpoint 6. This crossing is directed from γ_2 to γ_3 .
- (3) γ_1 and γ_3 have three nontrivial crossings, which count as both Hom-crossings and Ext-crossings. The crossings between the nodes 1 and 2 and between the nodes 4 and 5 are directed from γ_3 to γ_1 , while the other crossing is directed from γ_1 to γ_3 . Note also that the arcs can be perturbed so that the crossing directed from γ_1 to γ_3 occurs anywhere within the interval $(2, 4) \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand, the two crossings directed from γ_3 to γ_1 will always occur in the intervals $(2, 3)$ and $(4, 5)$, respectively.

Example 4.7(3) shows that the pair of nodes between which a crossing occurs is not invariant under combinatorial equivalence. We do, however, have the following.

Lemma 4.8. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{arc}(n)$, and choose representatives of γ_1 and γ_2 which intersect a minimum number of times. For $t \in \{1, 2\}$, denote $\text{wd}(\gamma_t) =: \left(\ell(\gamma_t), s_{\ell(\gamma_t)+1}^t \cdots s_{r(\gamma_t)}^t \right)$.




FIGURE 4. The arcs in Example 4.7 γ_1 is drawn in solid blue, γ_2 in dotted purple, and γ_3 in dashed orange.

- (1) Suppose there is a Hom-crossing directed from γ_1 to γ_2 at some point x . Then there exist unique integers $i < j$ in the common closed support of γ_1 and γ_2 which satisfy all of the following.
 - (a) $i \leq x \leq j$.
 - (b) $s_k^1 = s_k^2$ for all $i < k < j$; that is, γ_1 and γ_2 pass on the same side of every node in the interval (i, j) .
 - (c) $s_j^1 \leq e \leq s_j^2$; that is, either j is a shared right endpoint or γ_1 must be below γ_2 at j .
 - (d) If $\ell(\gamma_1) \neq i$ then $s_i^1 = 0$; that is, either i is the left endpoint of γ_1 or γ_1 passes above i .
 - (e) If $\ell(\gamma_2) \neq i$ then $s_i^2 = u$; that is, either i is the left endpoint of γ_2 or γ_2 passes below i .

Moreover, x is a nontrivial crossing if and only if $x \notin \{i, j\}$. Otherwise, x is a shared endpoint.
- (2) Suppose there exist integers $i < j$ in the common closed support of γ_1 and γ_2 which satisfy conditions (b)-(e) from (1). Then either γ_1 and γ_2 are combinatorially equivalent or there is a unique crossing between γ_1 and γ_2 in the interval $[i, j] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, in the second case, this crossing is a Hom-crossing directed from γ_1 to γ_2 .

Proof. (1) Suppose first that x is a nontrivial crossing directed from γ_1 to γ_2 . By perturbing γ_1 and γ_2 if necessary, we can assume that $x \notin \mathbb{Z}$. By definition, there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\gamma_1(x - \delta) > \gamma_2(x - \delta)$ and the interval $(x - \delta, x + \delta)$ does not contain an integer. Moreover, the minimality assumption on γ_1 and γ_2 implies that the intersection at x is transverse. In particular, we can assume that x is the only crossing between γ_1 and γ_2 in the interval $(\lfloor x - \delta \rfloor, \lceil x + \delta \rceil)$, where $\lfloor - \rfloor$ and $\lceil - \rceil$ denote the floor and ceiling functions, respectively.

We now define two new arcs γ'_1 and γ'_2 such that

$$\gamma'_1(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma_1(t) & t \leq x \\ \gamma_2(t) & t \geq x, \end{cases} \quad \gamma'_2(t) = \begin{cases} \gamma_2(t) & t \leq x \\ \gamma_1(t) & t \geq x. \end{cases}$$

The combinatorial data determined by these arcs are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{wd}(\gamma'_1) &= \left(\ell(\gamma_1), s_{\ell(\gamma_1)+1}^1 \cdots s_{\lfloor x \rfloor}^1 s_{\lceil x \rceil}^2 \cdots s_{r(\gamma_2)}^2 \right), \\ \text{wd}(\gamma'_2) &= \left(\ell(\gamma_2), s_{\ell(\gamma_2)+1}^2 \cdots s_{\lfloor x \rfloor}^2 s_{\lceil x \rceil}^1 \cdots s_{r(\gamma_1)}^1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note that the crossing between γ'_1 and γ'_2 at x is not transverse. Thus we can perturb γ'_1 and γ'_2 into arcs γ''_1 and γ''_2 which agree with γ'_1 and γ'_2 outside the interval $(\lfloor x - \delta \rfloor, \lceil x + \delta \rceil)$ and do not intersect within this interval. In particular, γ''_1 is combinatorially equivalent to γ'_1 and likewise for γ''_2 . Moreover, γ''_1 and γ''_2 have fewer nontrivial crossings than γ_1 and γ_2 .

Now suppose for a contradiction that there do not exist $i < j$ satisfying the conditions (a)-(e). We then have two cases to consider.

Suppose first that condition (c) must fail. Then for all nodes j with $x < j \leq \min\{r(\gamma_1), r(\gamma_2)\}$, we must have $s_j^1 \not\leq s_j^2$. If $s_j^1 = s_j^2$ for all nodes $j \in (x, \min\{r(\gamma_1), r(\gamma_2)\}]$, then γ_1 is combinatorially equivalent to γ''_1 , and likewise for γ_2 . This contradicts the fact that the chosen representatives of γ_1 and γ_2 intersect a minimum number of times. Otherwise, let $j \in (x, \min\{r(\gamma_1), r(\gamma_2)\}]$ be minimal such that $s_j^1 \neq s_j^2$. Then $s_j^1 > s_j^2$, and so $\gamma''_2(j) > \gamma''_1(j)$ by the assumption that (c) fails. On the



FIGURE 5. An illustration of the proof of Lemma 4.8. The fact that $\gamma_1(4) < 0$ implies that the two crossings between γ_1 and γ_2 are unnecessary.

other hand, we have $\gamma_2''(x) < \gamma_1''(x)$ by construction. But this means there is an intersection between γ_1'' and γ_2'' , and hence also between γ_1 and γ_2 , somewhere in the interval (x, j) . The minimality of j then implies that γ_1'' and γ_1 pass on the same side of every node in (x, j) , and likewise for γ_2'' and γ_2 . Thus the crossings between γ_1 and γ_2 at x and in (x, j) can be resolved, a contradiction. See Figure 5 for an example.

The other case is that at least one of conditions (d) and (e) must fail. This leads to a similar contradiction as in the previous case.

This concludes the proof in the case that x is a nontrivial crossing. Suppose next that x is a shared left endpoint and take $i = x = \ell(\gamma_1) = \ell(\gamma_2)$. Then γ_1 is right locally below γ_2 near x , and so $s_{i+1}^1 \leq s_{i+1}^2$. It follows that either $s_j^1 = s_j^2$ for all $i < j \leq \min\{r(\gamma_1), r(\gamma_2)\}$ or there exists some minimal $i < j \leq \min\{r(\gamma_1), r(\gamma_2)\}$ such that $s_j^1 < s_j^2$. The proof when x is a shared right endpoint is similar.

(2) Suppose conditions (b)-(e) are satisfied for some $i < j$. If i and j are both shared endpoints between γ_1 and γ_2 , then $\text{wd}(\gamma_1) = \text{wd}(\gamma_2)$ and we are done. Thus assume this is not the case. Then $\gamma_1(i) \geq \gamma_2(i)$ and $\gamma_1(j) \leq \gamma_2(j)$, with at least one of these inequalities being strict. This implies that γ_1 and γ_2 must cross somewhere in the interval $[i, j]$. To show that this crossing is unique, suppose there exist $i \leq x < y \leq j$ such that γ_1 and γ_2 cross at both x and y . We suppose that $y \neq j$, the case where $i \neq x$ being similar. Furthermore, we can assume without loss of generality that γ_1 and γ_2 do not cross in the interval (x, y) . Then, by assumption, γ_1 and γ_2 pass on the same side of every node in (x, y) . Using a similar argument as in the proof of (1), this contradicts that the chosen representatives of γ_1 and γ_2 intersect a minimum number of times. \square

We now combine Proposition 4.3 and Lemma 4.8 to deduce the main result of this section.

Proposition 4.9. *Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let $X, Y \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$. Choose representatives of the corresponding arcs $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ which intersect a minimum number of times. Then $\dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(X, Y)$ is equal to the number of Hom-crossings directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.3, it suffices to show that the number of Hom-crossings directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$ coincides with the number of (combinatorial equivalence classes of) arcs which are both quotient arcs of $\sigma(X)$ and submodule arcs of $\sigma(Y)$.

Suppose first that $X = Y$. Then $\sigma(X) = \sigma(Y)$ is the only arc which is both a quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$ and a submodule arc of $\sigma(Y)$. Moreover, $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have two shared endpoints, one directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$ as a Hom-crossing and one directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$ as a Hom-crossing. This proves the result in this case.

Now suppose $X \neq Y$. First let $\gamma \in \text{arc}(n)$ be a quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$ and a submodule arc of $\sigma(Y)$. Then $i = \ell(\gamma)$ and $j = r(\gamma)$ must satisfy conditions (b)-(e) of Lemma 4.8(1) for $\gamma_1 = \sigma(X)$ and $\gamma_2 = \sigma(Y)$. Thus, by Lemma 4.8(2), there exists a crossing between γ_1 and γ_2 in the interval $[i, j]$, and this crossing is directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$ as a Hom-crossing.

Conversely, let x be a Hom-crossing directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$. Then there exist unique integers $i < j$ which satisfy conditions (a)-(e) in Lemma 4.8(1) for $\gamma_1 = \sigma(X)$ and $\gamma_2 = \sigma(Y)$. Now let $\gamma \in \text{arc}(n)$ be an arc with endpoints $\ell(\gamma) = i$ and $r(\gamma) = j$ which passes on the same side of every node in (i, j) as the arcs $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$. Then γ is both a quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$ and a submodule arc of $\sigma(Y)$.

Now note that the processes in the previous two paragraphs are inverses. This proves the result. \square

In particular, we note that Proposition 4.9 includes the characterization of semibricks over $\Pi(A_n, S)$ in terms of *noncrossing arc diagrams* given in [3, Section 4]. (Only the algebra $\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1])$ is explicitly considered in [3]. See also [27, Theorem 3.13] for an explicit proof of this characterization over $\Pi(A_n)$.) We recall the definition of a noncrossing arc diagram from [28].

Definition 4.10. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \text{arc}(n)$ be a set of arcs. We say that \mathcal{A} is a *noncrossing arc diagram* if no distinct $\gamma \neq \rho \in \mathcal{A}$ have a hom-crossing. More precisely, there exist representatives of the combinatorial equivalence classes of γ and ρ which either do not intersect or intersect only at a contested endpoint. We denote by $\text{arc}_{nc}(n)$ the set of noncrossing arc diagrams (up to combinatorial equivalence) on n nodes.

Remark 4.11. While it does not follow from the definition *a priori*, Reading shows in [28, Proposition 3.2] that \mathcal{A} is a noncrossing arc diagram if and only if there are *fixed* representatives of the arcs in \mathcal{A} which only have intersections at contested endpoints. This justifies the use of the name “noncrossing arc diagram” instead of “pairwise noncrossing arc diagram”.

The semibricks over $\Pi(A_n, S)$ are then characterized as follows.

Corollary 4.12. [3, Section 4][27, Theorem 3.13] *Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Then the map σ induces a bijection $\text{sbrick}(\Pi(A_n, S)) \rightarrow \text{arc}_{nc}(n)$.*

Another consequence of Proposition 4.9 is the following.

Corollary 4.13. *Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let $X, Y \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$. Then*

$$|\dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(X, Y) - \dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(Y, X)| \leq 1.$$

Proof. Choose representatives of the arcs $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ which intersect a minimal number of times. Let $x_1 < \dots < x_k$ be the set of Hom-crossings between these representatives. Then for $1 \leq i < k$, the minimality of the chosen representatives implies that if x_i is directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$, then x_{i+1} is directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$, and vice versa. The result thus follows from Proposition 4.9. \square

5. EXTENSIONS BETWEEN BRICKS

We now turn our attention to using the arc model to compute a basis for the first Ext-space between bricks. Unlike the Hom-spaces, the Ext-spaces will generally depend on the choice of S when working over $\Pi(A_n, S)$. See Example 5.9 for an example. However, we recall from Section 3 that given $S \subseteq T \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $M, N \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, T)$, the functor F_T^S allows us to consider $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, T)}^1(M, N)$ as a subspace of $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(M, N)$.

To start, we recall the following formula of Crawley-Boevey.

Proposition 5.1. [13] *Define a bilinear form $(-, -) : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$(\alpha, \beta) = \sum_{i=1}^n 2\alpha_i\beta_i - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (\alpha_i\beta_{i+1} + \alpha_{i+1}\beta_i)$$

Then for all $M, N \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$, one has

$$(\underline{\dim}M, \underline{\dim}N) = \dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n)}(M, N) + \dim \text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n)}(N, M) - \dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(M, N).$$

We note that Crawley-Boevey proves a version of Proposition 5.1 for the preprojective algebra of any quiver, but we have specified the result to $\Pi(A_n)$ for simplicity. Moreover, when M and N are bricks we can simplify Proposition 5.1 and use it to compute the dimension of Ext^1 as follows.

Corollary 5.2. *Let $X, Y \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n))$. Choose representatives of the arcs $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ which intersect a minimal number of times. Denote by $\text{ce}(X, Y)$ the number of contested endpoints between $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$, by $\text{se}(X, Y)$ the number of shared endpoints between $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$, and by $\text{nc}(X, Y)$ the number of nontrivial crossings between X and Y . Then the following hold.*

- (1) $(\underline{\dim}X, \underline{\dim}Y) = \text{se}(X, Y) - \text{ce}(X, Y)$.
- (2) $\dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y) = \text{ce}(X, Y) + \text{nc}(X, Y)$, which is precisely the number of Ext-crossings between $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$.

Proof. (1) For readability, we append 0 to each end of $\alpha := \underline{\dim}X$ and $\beta := \underline{\dim}Y$; that is, we denote $\alpha_0 = 0 = \alpha_{n+1}$ and $\alpha_i = \dim X(i)$ for all other i and likewise for β . We also denote $\ell_X := \ell(\sigma(X))$, and likewise for r_X, ℓ_Y , and r_Y . Since $(-, -)$ is symmetric, we assume without loss of generality that $\ell_X \leq \ell_Y$.

Suppose first that $r_X \leq \ell_Y$. This means the supports of X and Y have an empty intersection. Then $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have no shared endpoints and there are two possibilities. If $r_X = \ell_Y$ is a contested endpoint, then $\dim X(i-1) = 1 = \dim Y(i)$ and $(\underline{\dim}X, \underline{\dim}Y) = -1$. Otherwise, X and Y have no contested endpoints and $(\underline{\dim}X, \underline{\dim}Y) = 0$. This concludes the proof in this case.

Suppose from now on that $\ell_Y < r_X$, and so in particular $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have no contested endpoints. We next consider the case where Y is a simple module; i.e., where $\ell_Y = r_Y - 1$. In this case, we have $(\underline{\dim}X, \underline{\dim}Y) = 2\alpha_{r_Y} - \alpha_{r_Y+1} - \alpha_{r_Y-1}$, where $\alpha_{r_Y} \neq 0$ by assumption. Now the condition $\alpha_{r_Y+1} = 0$ is equivalent to $r_X = r_Y$ and the condition $\alpha_{r_Y-1} = 0$ is equivalent to $\ell_X = \ell_Y$. Thus the result holds in this case. The case where X is a simple module is similar.

Suppose from now on that neither X nor Y are simple. Again since $(-, -)$ is symmetric, we then have two cases left to consider: (i) $\ell_X \leq \ell_Y < r_Y \leq r_X$ and (ii) $\ell_X < \ell_Y < r_X < r_Y$.

Suppose we are in case (i), and denote $z_i := (2\alpha_i - \alpha_{i+1} - \alpha_{i-1})\beta_i$. Now for $i \in [n] \setminus \{0\}$, the assumption of case (i) implies that if $\alpha_i = 0$ then $\beta_i = 0$. Moreover, since X is not simple, we have that if $\alpha_i \neq 0$ then at least one of α_{i-1} and α_{i+1} is also nonzero. We conclude that $z_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for all i . As $(\underline{\dim}X, \underline{\dim}Y) = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i$, it remains only to show that the number of times z_i takes the value 1 coincides with $\text{se}(X, Y)$. Indeed, suppose $z_i = 1$, so in particular $\beta_i \neq 0$. If $\alpha_{i+1} = 0$, then we have $i = r_X = r_Y$, and this is a shared endpoint. Likewise, if $\alpha_{i-1} = 0$, then we have $i-1 = \ell_X = \ell_Y$ and this is a shared endpoint. This concludes the proof in this case.

Finally, we suppose we are in case (ii). For $i \leq i \leq n$, denote $w_i = 2\alpha_i\beta_i - \alpha_i\beta_{i+1} - \alpha_{i+1}\beta_i$. We then compute directly that $\alpha_i\beta_i = 1$ for $\ell_Y < i \leq r_X$ and is otherwise equal to 0, that $\alpha_{i+1}\beta_i = 1$ for $\ell_Y + 1 < i \leq r_X$ and is otherwise equal to 0, and that $\alpha_i\beta_{i+1} = 1$ for $\ell_Y < i \leq r_X + 1$ and is otherwise equal to 0. Thus we have

$$w_i = \begin{cases} 1 & i = \ell_Y + 1 \\ -1 & i = r_X + 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We conclude that $(\underline{\dim}X, \underline{\dim}Y) = 0$, as desired.

- (2) This follows immediately from combining (1) with Propositions 4.9 and 5.1. □

Our next task is to construct an explicit basis of $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y)$ for $X, Y \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n))$. In doing so, we will also give a description for $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y)$ for $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. In particular, this will build off of the basis for $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y)$ described in [5, Section 6.2] (where it was deduced from [8, Theorem 6.5]).

We first establish some notation via a series of examples. We will identify the following quiver Q and representation M_Q over $\overline{A_5}$:

$$Q = \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 2 & \longrightarrow & 3 & \longleftarrow & 4 \\ & \swarrow & & & & \searrow & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & 2 & \longleftarrow & 3 & \longrightarrow & 4 \end{array} \quad M_Q = K \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{[0]} \\ \xleftarrow{[1 \ 0]} \end{array} K^2 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{[1 \ 0]} \\ \xleftarrow{[0 \ 0]} \end{array} K^2 \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{[0 \ 0]} \\ \xleftarrow{[1 \ 0]} \\ \xleftarrow{[0 \ 0]} \end{array} K^2 \xrightarrow{\quad} 0.$$

Note that, in this case, we have that $M_Q \in \mathbf{mod} \Pi(A_n, \{3, 4\})$ and that $M_Q \notin \Pi(A_n, \{2\})$. If in addition we wish to indicate that there is a (possibly empty) quiver of type A_k “attached” to one end of our diagram, but that the directions of the arrows within this diagram are not relevant, we may write

$$Q = \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 2 & \text{-----} & Q' & & \\ & \swarrow & & & & \searrow & \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & 2 & \longleftarrow & 3 & \text{-----} & Q'' \end{array}.$$

Here, the quiver Q' may be empty, a vertex 3, a pair of vertices 3 and 4 with an arrow either $3 \rightarrow 4$ or $4 \rightarrow 3$, etc., and similarly for Q'' . The dashed arrow oriented from 3 to Q'' indicates that if Q'' is nonempty, then there must be an arrow $3 \rightarrow 4$. The dashed arrow between 2 and Q' indicates that if Q' is nonempty, then there may either be an arrow $2 \rightarrow 3$ or $2 \leftarrow 3$. In such a diagram, we assume that the only arrow connecting a vertex in Q' to one outside of Q' lies along the dotted line connecting 2 and Q' , and similarly for Q'' . In particular, there are no arrows between Q' and Q'' .

Similarly, for $X \in \mathbf{brick}(X)$, recall from Proposition 3.8 that we can visualize X as a quiver of type A_n by drawing a vertex labeled i if $X(i) \neq 0$ and drawing an arrow $X(i) \rightarrow X(i+1)$ (resp. $X(i) \leftarrow X(i+1)$) if $X(a_i) \neq 0$ (resp. if $X(a_i^*) \neq 0$). For example, suppose $\sigma(X) = \gamma_1$ as shown in Figure 4. Then we associate X with the quiver

$$1 \longrightarrow 2 \longleftarrow 3 \longleftarrow 4 \longrightarrow 5.$$

If we are concerned primarily with the behavior of this brick between a certain subset of vertices, say $\{3, 4, 5\}$, we may abbreviate the quiver as

$$\text{left}(X) \text{-----} 3 \longleftarrow 4 \longrightarrow 5 \text{-----} \text{right}(X),$$

where here $\text{right}(X)$ is empty and $\text{left}(X) = 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow$.

We now associate short exact sequences to the various types of ext-crossings between arcs. Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, and let $X, Y \in \mathbf{brick}(\Pi(A_n), S)$.

Suppose first that $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have a contested endpoint x . If $\ell(\sigma(X)) = x = r(\sigma(Y))$, denote

$$Q = \text{left}(Y) \text{---} r(\sigma(Y)) \longleftarrow \ell(\sigma(X)) + 1 \text{---} \text{right}(X).$$

Otherwise, denote

$$Q = \text{left}(X) \text{---} r(\sigma(X)) \longrightarrow \ell(\sigma(Y)) + 1 \text{---} \text{right}(Y).$$

Now let

$$(1) \quad \eta(x) = 0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow M_Q \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0,$$

with the maps at each vertex given by the identity whenever both vector spaces are nonzero.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $\eta(x)$ be as in Equation 1. Then $\eta(x)$ is a nonsplit short exact sequence in $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y)$. Moreover, recalling that we are in the case where $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have a contested endpoint, this short exact sequence spans $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y)$.*




FIGURE 6. The arcs in Example 5.4. γ_L is the solid blue arc with endpoints 0 and 3, and γ_R is the solid blue arc with endpoints 3 and 5.

Proof. The result is shown for $S = [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ in [8, Theorem 8.5]. (One can also see that the sequence is well-defined and does not split for any S since M_Q is a brick.) Thus for an arbitrary $S \subseteq [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we have

$$0 \neq \eta(x) \in \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y).$$

Moreover, if $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have a contested endpoint, then they cannot have a nontrivial crossing, and so $\dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y) = 1$ by Corollary 5.2. This proves the result. \square

Example 5.4. Let γ_L and γ_U be the solid blue arcs in Figure 6 which have endpoints 0 and 3 and 3 and 5, respectively. Set $X = \sigma^{-1}(\gamma_L) = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 2 \end{smallmatrix}$ and $Y = \sigma^{-1}(\gamma_R) = \begin{smallmatrix} 5 \\ 4 \end{smallmatrix}$. Then the term M_Q in Equation 1 is given by $M_Q = \begin{smallmatrix} 5 \\ 1 & 4 \\ 2 & 3 \end{smallmatrix}$. The arc $\sigma(M_Q)$ is precisely the dashed orange arc γ_U in Figure 6, formed by

gluing the arcs γ_L and γ_R at their contested endpoint 3 and perturbing upwards. In particular, the small clockwise arrow of γ_U points away from γ_R towards γ_L . If we instead perturbed the glued arc downwards to the dotted purple arc γ_D , the small clockwise arrow would point in the opposite direction and the corresponding short exact sequence would be an element of $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_5, S)}^1(Y, X)$.

Suppose now that there is a nontrivial crossing x directed from $\sigma(Y)$ and $\sigma(X)$. Let $i < j$ be the unique integers satisfying the properties (a)-(e) in Lemma 4.8 for $\gamma_1 = \sigma(Y)$ and $\gamma_2 = \sigma(X)$. Denote

$$Q = \quad \text{left}(Y) \dashrightarrow i + 1 \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow j \dashrightarrow \text{right}(X)$$

$$Q' = \quad \text{left}(X) \dashleftarrow i + 1 \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow j \dashleftarrow \text{right}(Y),$$

where, for $i < k < j$, both Q and Q' contain an arrow $k \rightarrow k + 1$ (resp. $k \leftarrow k + 1$) if $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ pass below (resp. above) the node k . Now let

$$(2) \quad \eta(x) = \quad 0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow M_Q \oplus M_{Q'} \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0,$$

The component map $Y \rightarrow M_Q$ is the identity on the vertices $\ell(\sigma(Y)) + 1, \dots, j$ and zero elsewhere, and the component map $M_Q \rightarrow X$ is the identity on the vertices $i + 1, \dots, r(\sigma(X))$ and zero elsewhere. The maps through $M_{Q'}$ are similar, but with the necessary signs to make the sequence exact.

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\eta(x)$ be as in Equation 2. Then $\eta(x)$ is a nonsplit short exact sequence in $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y)$.*

Proof. The result is again shown for $S = [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ in [8, Theorem 8.5], and thus follows for S arbitrary as in the proof of Proposition 5.3. \square

Remark 5.6. In the setup of Proposition 5.5, the case where $\text{left}(Y)$ is empty corresponds to the case where $\ell(\sigma(Y)) = i$. If we are not in this case, the condition in Lemma 4.8(d) tells us there must be an arrow $i \rightarrow i + 1$ in our quiver-drawing of Y . The situation at the other endpoint is similar.




FIGURE 7. The arcs in Example 5.7. The arc $\sigma(X)$ has endpoints 0 and 5 and the arc $\sigma(Y)$ has endpoints 1 and 5.

Example 5.7. Let $X = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 5 \\ 2 & 4 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix}$ and $Y = \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 4 \\ 3 & 5 \end{smallmatrix}$ in $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_5, S))$. The corresponding arcs are shown in Figure 7. There is a unique nontrivial crossing, which is directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$. The corresponding nodes i and j are $i = 1 = \ell(\sigma(Y))$ and $j = 4$. The modules M_Q and $M_{Q'}$ in Equation 2 are then given by $M_Q = \begin{smallmatrix} 1 & 5 \\ 2 & 4 \\ 3 \end{smallmatrix}$ and $M_{Q'} = \begin{smallmatrix} 2 & 4 \\ 3 & 5 \end{smallmatrix}$. The corresponding arcs γ_Q and $\gamma_{Q'}$ are shown in Figure 7. Note that these arcs can be formed as follows. Cut $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ at their point of intersection. Glue the left half of $\sigma(Y)$ with the right half of $\sigma(X)$ and perturb upwards to obtain γ_Q . Similarly, glue the left of $\sigma(X)$ with the right half of $\sigma(Y)$ and perturb downward to obtain $\gamma_{Q'}$.

Finally, suppose there is a nontrivial crossing x directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$. Let $i < j$ be the unique integers satisfying the properties (a)-(e) in Lemma 4.8 for $\gamma_1 = \sigma(X)$ and $\gamma_2 = \sigma(Y)$. Denote by Q and Q' the quivers corresponding to X and Y , respectively. For each node $i \in [n]$, if they exist then we denote by i and i' the nodes labeled by i in Q and Q' , respectively. If Q has a vertex i , draw an arrow $i \rightarrow (i+1)'$. Otherwise, Q' has a vertex i' , so draw an arrow $(i+1) \rightarrow i'$. Similarly, if Q has a vertex $j+1$, draw an arrow $(j+1) \rightarrow j'$. Otherwise, Q' has a vertex $(j+1)'$, so draw an arrow $j \rightarrow (j+1)'$. Moreover, for all nodes $i < k < j$, if Q contains an arrow $k \rightarrow k+1$, then draw an arrow $k+1 \rightarrow k'$. Similarly, if Q contains an arrow $k \leftarrow k+1$, draw an arrow $k \rightarrow (k+1)'$. The resulting quiver Q'' resembles:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccccccc} \text{left}(X) & \leftarrow & i+1 & \longrightarrow & i+2 & \longrightarrow & i+3 & \leftarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & j-2 & \longrightarrow & j-1 & \leftarrow & j & \rightarrow & \text{right}(X) \\ & & \swarrow & & \swarrow & & \swarrow & & \swarrow & & \swarrow & & \swarrow & & \swarrow & & \swarrow \\ & & \text{left}(Y) & \rightarrow & (i+1)' & \rightarrow & (i+2)' & \rightarrow & (i+3)' & \leftarrow & \cdots & \rightarrow & (j-2)' & \rightarrow & (j-1)' & \leftarrow & j' & \leftarrow & \text{right}(Y), \end{array}$$

where if $\text{left}(X)$ is empty we replace the arrow from i to $(i+1)'$ with one from $i+1$ to i' , and similarly on the right of the diagram. (See also Example 5.9 for a specific example.) Now let

$$(3) \quad \eta(x) = \quad 0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow M_{Q''} \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0,$$

where the first map is given by the inclusion of Q' as the bottom row of Q'' and the second is given by the projection from the top row of Q'' to Q .

Proposition 5.8. *Let $M_{Q''}$ and $\eta(x)$ be as in Equation 3 above. Then $M_{Q''} \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$ if and only if $S \cap [i+1, j]_{\mathbb{Z}} = \emptyset$. Moreover, if $M_{Q''} \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$, then $\eta(x)$ is a nonsplit short exact sequence in $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y)$.*

Proof. By the assumptions (a)-(e) in Lemma 4.8, we observe the following:

- $\text{left}(X)$ (resp. $\text{left}(Y)$) is empty if and only if $\ell(\sigma(X)) = i$ (resp. $\ell(\sigma(Y)) = i$). In particular, at least one of these is nonempty. The situation is similar for $\text{right}(X)$ and $\text{right}(Y)$.
- If $\text{left}(X)$ (resp. $\text{right}(Y)$) is not empty, then Q contains an arrow $i \leftarrow i+1$ (resp. Q' contains an arrow $i' \rightarrow (i+1)'$). The situation is similar for $\text{right}(X)$ and $\text{right}(Y)$.

- If $k \in (i, j) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, then $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ must pass on the same side of k . In particular, the arrows connecting k with $k + 1$ in Q and k' with $(k + 1)'$ in Q' must point in the same direction.

This shows that $M_{Q''}$ satisfies the relations defining $\Pi(A_n)$, and more precisely that $M_{Q''} \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$ if and only if $S \cap [i + 1, j]_{\mathbb{Z}} = \emptyset$. The fact that $\eta(x)$ is a short exact sequence then follows immediately. Finally, the fact that this sequence is not split follows from the fact that $\eta(x) \notin \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y)$, which contains the trivial extension. \square

Example 5.9. Let $X = \begin{matrix} 2 & 4 \\ 3 & 5 \end{matrix}$ and $Y = \begin{matrix} 1 & 5 \\ 2 & 4 \\ 3 \end{matrix}$ be in $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_5, S))$. (Note that this is the opposite assignment of X and Y from Example 5.7.) As in Example 5.7, there is a unique nontrivial crossing, directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$, with corresponding nodes $i = 1 = \ell(\sigma(X))$ and $j = 4$. The $M_{Q''}$ in Equation 3 then has

$$Q'' = \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 2 & \longrightarrow & 3 & \longleftarrow & 4 & \longrightarrow & 5 \\ & \swarrow & & & \swarrow & & \swarrow & & \swarrow \\ 1 & \longrightarrow & 2 & \longrightarrow & 3 & \longleftarrow & 4 & \longleftarrow & 5. \end{array}$$

(In particular, $\text{left}(X)$ is empty in this case.) We see that $M_{Q''}$ is a module over $\Pi(A_5) = \Pi(A_5, \emptyset)$, but not over $\Pi(A_5, \{2, 3, 4\})$. Moreover, we have that Y is injective over $\Pi(A_5, \{2, 3, 4\})$, but not over $\Pi(A_5)$. Thus the short exact sequence in equation 3 could not possibly exist over $\Pi(A_5, \{2, 3, 4\})$. Finally, we note that the module $M_{Q''}$ is not indecomposable in this case: the bottom basis element “5” projects onto a copy of the simple module $S(5)$, which then includes as the anti-diagonal of $M_{Q''}(5)$. There are, however, examples where the middle term of this extension is indecomposable. Indeed, this is the case if we remove the final composition factor “5” from X .

We now prove our main result of this section.

Theorem 5.10. *Let $X, Y \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n))$.*

- (1) *Suppose that $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have a contested endpoint x . Then $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y) = \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y)$ is 1-dimensional and spanned by the short exact sequence $\eta(x)$ from Equation 1.*
- (2) *Suppose that $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ do not have a contested endpoint. Choose representatives of $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ which intersect a minimal number of times, let \mathcal{X} be the set of nontrivial crossings between $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$, and let $\mathcal{X}_- \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ be the subset of crossings which are directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$. Then:*
 - (a) *$\{\eta(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_-\}$ is a basis of $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y)$.*
 - (b) *$\{\eta(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ is a basis of $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y)$.*

Proof. (1) This is contained in Proposition 5.3.

(2a) This result is essentially contained in [5, Section 6.2], where it is deduced from [8, Theorem 8.5]. Indeed, in [8], the authors give explicit bases for the Hom- and Ext-spaces between indecomposable “string modules” over gentle algebras. Their basis elements of $\text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}(Y, X)$ are called “graph maps”. The image of a graph map $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is always a brick¹, and f is called “two-sided” if there exists $i < j < k \in [n] \setminus \{0\}$ such that (a) $X(i) \oplus Y(i) \neq 0$ and $\text{im}(f)(i) = 0$, (b) $\text{im}(f)(j) \neq 0$, and (c) $X(k) \oplus Y(k) \neq 0$ and $\text{im}(f)(k) = 0$. As is implicit in [5, Theorem 6.2.5], the two-sided graph maps from Y to X are those corresponding (in the proof of Proposition 4.9) to the nontrivial crossings directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$. It then follows from [8, Theorem 6.5] that the nonsplit sequences $\{\eta(x) \mid x \in \mathcal{X}_-\}$ form a basis of $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y)$.

¹Over an arbitrary gentle algebra, there may be graph maps whose images are not bricks, but over $\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ this will never be the case.

(2b) By Corollary 5.11, we have that $|\mathcal{X}| = \dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y)$. Thus we need only show that the exact sequences $\eta(x)$ are linearly independent.

Let $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{X} \setminus \mathcal{X}_-$. We will show that the vectors in $\mathcal{Y} \cup \mathcal{X}_-$ are linearly independent by induction on $|\mathcal{Y}|$. For the base case, we note that the vectors in \mathcal{X}_- form a basis of $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y)$ by (2a).

Now suppose that $|\mathcal{Y}| = k > 1$, and that the result holds for $k - 1$. Choose some $x \in \mathcal{Y}$, and let $i < j$ be the nodes satisfying conditions (a-e) in Lemma 4.8 for the crossing x (with $\gamma_1 = \sigma(X)$ and $\gamma_2 = \sigma(Y)$). Then Lemma 4.8 implies that x is the only intersection point between $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ in the interval (i, j) . Thus we have $\eta(x) \notin \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [i+1, j]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y)$ and that $\eta(y) \in \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [i+1, j]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y)$ for all $y \in (\mathcal{X}_- \cup \mathcal{Y}) \setminus \{x\}$. The linear independence of $\mathcal{X}_- \cup \mathcal{Y}$ thus follows from the induction hypothesis. \square

As an analog to Corollary 4.13, Theorem 5.10 implies the following.

Corollary 5.11. *Let $X, Y \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}))$. Then*

$$\left| \dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y) - \dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(Y, X) \right| \leq 1.$$

Proof. Choose representatives of the arcs $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ which intersect a minimal number of times. If $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have a contested endpoint, then $\dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y) = 1 = \dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(Y, X)$ by Theorem 5.10. Otherwise, let $x_1 < \dots < x_k$ be the nontrivial crossings between $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$. Then for $1 \leq i < k$, the minimality of the representatives implies that if x_i is directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$, then x_{i+1} is directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$, and vice versa. The result thus follows from Theorem 5.10. \square

We conclude this section with two additional consequences of Theorem 5.10. The first will be critical in the next two sections. See also [22, Theorem 1.2] and [27, Proposition 3.7]

Corollary 5.12. *Let $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and let $X \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n, S))$. Then $\text{End}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(X) \cong K$ and $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, X) = 0$.*

Proof. We can choose two representatives γ and γ' for the arc $\sigma(X)$ so that γ and γ' share both of their endpoints and do not otherwise intersect. As Hom-crossings, one of the endpoints will be directed from γ to γ' and the other from γ' to γ . The result then follows immediately from Proposition 4.9 and Theorem 5.10(2). \square

Now recall that a module $M \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$ is called τ -rigid if $\text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(M, \tau_S M) = 0$, where we use τ_S as shorthand for the Auslander-Reiten translation in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$. Such modules are critical in the study of τ -tilting theory [1], and will be used in our sequel work describing the τ -exceptional sequences over $\Pi(A_n)$. By a well-known result of [32], we have that $\text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}(M, \tau_S N) = 0$ if and only if $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(N, M') = 0$ for every indecomposable quotient M' of M . Thus we can prove the following.

Corollary 5.13. *Let $X \in \text{brick}(\Pi(A_n))$ and write $\text{wd}(\sigma(X)) = (\ell_X, s_{\ell_X+1} \dots s_{r_X})$. Then:*

- (1) X is τ -rigid in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$.
- (2) *The following are equivalent:*
 - (a) X is τ -rigid in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$.
 - (b) X has a simple socle.
 - (c) *There exists $i \in [\ell_X + 1, r_X]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $s_j = \text{u}$ for all $\ell_X < j < i$ and $s_j = \text{o}$ for all $i \leq j < r_X$.*

Proof. (1) Let Y be an indecomposable quotient of X in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$, and suppose that $Y \neq X$. Propositions 4.3 and 4.9 then imply that (i) $Y \in \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$, (ii) $\sigma(Y)$ is a quotient arc

of $\sigma(X)$, and (iii) there is a unique Hom-crossing between $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$, and this Hom-crossing is directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$. Item (1) thus follows immediately from Theorem 5.10(2a) and Corollary 5.12.

(2) By Theorem 5.10(2b), the proof of (1) implies that X is τ -rigid in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$ if and only if every quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$ has a shared endpoint with $\sigma(X)$.

(a \implies b): Suppose that $\text{soc}(X)$ is not simple. Since X has dimension at most 1 at every vertex, this means there exist $i < j \in [n] \setminus \{0\}$ such that both $S(i)$ and $S(j)$ are submodules of X . Now recall that $\text{wd}(\sigma(S(i))) = (i-1, e)$, and likewise for $S(j)$. Thus by Proposition 4.3, we have that $s_i = o$ and $s_{j-1} = u$. In particular, we can choose $k \in [i+1, j-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ minimal such that $s_{k-1} = o$ and $s_k = u$. Then the arc $\sigma(S(k))$ is a quotient arc of $\sigma(X)$ which does not have a shared endpoint with $\sigma(X)$. We conclude that X is not τ -rigid in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$.

(b \implies c): Suppose X has a simple socle. By Proposition 4.3, this means there is a unique $i \in [\ell_X + 1, r_X]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that $\sigma(S(i))$ is a submodule arc of $\sigma(X)$. In particular, $s_i \neq u$ and either $i-1 = \ell_X$ or $s_{i-1} = u$. Since i is unique, it follows that $s_j = u$ for all $\ell_X < j < i$ and that $s_j = o$ for all $i \leq j < r_X$.

(c \implies a): Suppose X is not τ -rigid. Then there exists a quotient arc γ of $\sigma(X)$ which does not have a shared endpoint with $\sigma(X)$. Thus $s_{\ell(\gamma)} = o$ and $s_{r(\gamma)} = u$. We conclude that condition (c) must be false. \square

We note that Corollary 5.13(1) is also a consequence of the ‘‘brick- τ -rigid correspondence’’ of [14]. Indeed, this result implies that, if an algebra has finitely many bricks, then its bricks and its indecomposable τ -rigid modules are in bijection with one another. Since every indecomposable module over $\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ is a brick, (1) then follows immediately.

6. WEAK EXCEPTIONAL SEQUENCES

In this section, we classify the weak exceptional sequences over the algebras $\Pi(A_n, S)$ using arcs. In particular, we show that the set of weak exceptional sequences does not depend on the choice of the subset $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. We then use our characterization to show that if $n \neq 1$ then the maximum length of a weak exceptional sequence over $\Pi(A_n, S)$ is $2n-2$, see Corollary 6.10. We first observe the following, which is also shown in [5, Section 6.2] (see also Remark 2.2(2)).

Lemma 6.1. *Let (Y, X) be a sequence of bricks in $\text{brick}(\Pi(A_n))$. Choose representatives of the arcs $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ which intersect a minimal number of times. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) *There exists $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ such that (Y, X) is a weak exceptional pair in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$.*
- (2) *(Y, X) is a weak exceptional pair in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$ for all $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.*
- (3) *Either (a) $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ do not intersect or (b) $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have one shared endpoint, as a Hom-crossing this endpoint is directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$, and $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ do not otherwise intersect.*

Proof. (1 \implies 3): Suppose (Y, X) is a weak exceptional pair in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$. Then by Proposition 4.9 there are no Hom-crossings directed from $\sigma(X)$ to $\sigma(Y)$. By Corollary 4.13, this means there is at most one Hom-crossing directed from $\sigma(Y)$ to $\sigma(X)$. Moreover, since $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(X, Y) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y)$, this Hom-crossing cannot be a nontrivial crossing by Theorem 5.10. We conclude that (3a) and (3b) are the only possibilities.

(3 \implies 2): Suppose (3) holds. It follows from Proposition 4.9 and Corollary 5.11 that $\text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n)}(X, Y) = 0 = \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X, Y)$. Then for any S , the fact that $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y) \subseteq \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, S)}^1(X, Y)$ implies that (Y, X) is a weak exceptional pair over $\Pi(A_n, S)$.

(2 \implies 1): trivial. \square

An immediate consequence is the following.




FIGURE 8. The arc γ_3 (dashed orange) is clockwise of both γ_1 (dotted purple) and γ_2 (solid blue). At the right endpoint of γ_1 , the small clockwise arrow of γ_3 points “away from” γ_1 , and at the right endpoint of γ_3 , the small clockwise arrow of γ_2 points “towards” γ_3 .

Corollary 6.2. *The weak exceptional sequences in $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, S)$ do not depend on the choice of subset $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$.*

In order to establish a combinatorial model for these weak exceptional sequences, we consider the following definitions.

Definition 6.3. Let $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \text{arc}(n)$. For $t \in \{1, 2\}$, denote $\text{wd}(\gamma_t) =: (\ell(\gamma_t), s_{\ell(\gamma_t)+1}^t \cdots s_{r(\gamma_t)})$.

- (1) Suppose that $\ell(\gamma_1) = \ell(\gamma_2)$ and that γ_1 and γ_2 do not otherwise intersect. We say that γ_2 is *clockwise* of γ_1 if either $r(\gamma_1) < r(\gamma_2)$ and $s_{r(\gamma_1)}^2 = o$ or $r(\gamma_1) > r(\gamma_2)$ and $s_{r(\gamma_2)}^1 = u$. Equivalently, the shared endpoint $\ell(\gamma_1) = \ell(\gamma_2)$ is directed from γ_2 to γ_1 as a Hom-crossing.
- (2) Suppose that $r(\gamma_1) = r(\gamma_2)$ and that γ_1 and γ_2 do not otherwise intersect. We say that γ_2 is *clockwise* of γ_1 if either $\ell(\gamma_1) < \ell(\gamma_2)$ and $s_{\ell(\gamma_2)}^1 = u$ or $\ell(\gamma_1) > \ell(\gamma_2)$ and $s_{\ell(\gamma_1)}^2 = o$. Equivalently, the shared endpoint $r(\gamma_1) = r(\gamma_2)$ is directed from γ_2 to γ_1 as a Hom-crossing.

Remark 6.4. In Definition 6.3(1), we have that γ_1 is clockwise of γ_2 if either $r(\gamma_1) > r(\gamma_2)$ and the small clockwise arrow of γ_1 at $r(\gamma_2)$ points “towards” γ_2 or if $r(\gamma_1) < r(\gamma_2)$ and the the small clockwise arrow of γ_2 at $r(\gamma_1)$ points “away from” γ_1 . See Figure 8 for an example. The possible configurations in Definition 6.3(2) are similar.

Definition 6.5. Let $\omega = (\gamma_k, \dots, \gamma_1)$ be an ordered set of arcs in $\text{arc}(n)$. We say that ω is a *clockwise-ordered arc diagram* (of length k) if the following hold for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$.

- (1) There exist representatives of γ_i and γ_j which have at most one shared endpoint and do not otherwise intersect.
- (2) If γ_i and γ_j have a shared endpoint then γ_j is clockwise of γ_i .

We denote by $\text{arc}_{cw}(n, k)$ the set of combinatorial equivalence classes of clockwise-ordered arc diagrams on $n+1$ of length k and $\text{arc}_{cw}(n) := \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{arc}_{cw}(n, k)$.

We note that it does not follow *a priori* that there exist *fixed* representatives of the arcs in a given clockwise-ordered arc diagram which intersect only at shared endpoints. Indeed, we have only assumed such representatives can be chosen in a pairwise fashion. It is, however, true that such representatives always exists, as the following shows.

Proposition 6.6. *Let $\omega = (\gamma_k, \dots, \gamma_1) \in \text{arc}_{cw}(n)$ be a clockwise-ordered arc diagram. Then the arcs in ω together form a planar bipartite graph on $n+1$ nodes.*

Proof. Let $G(\omega)$ denote the corresponding graph. First note that this graph is simple by the assumption that any pair of arcs have at most one common endpoint. Moreover, since $\omega \in \text{arc}_{cw}(n)$, there cannot exist a node which is both the left endpoint of one arc in ω and the right endpoint of another. This implies that $G(\omega)$ is bipartite. To show that $G(\omega)$ is planar, it therefore suffices to show that $G(\omega)$ does not contain the complete bipartite graph $K_{3,3}$ as a subgraph.



FIGURE 9. An illustration of the proof of Proposition 6.6. In the left (resp. right) diagram, it is impossible to connect the nodes 1 and 3 (resp. 0 and 3) with an arc without introducing a nontrivial crossing.

Assume for a contradiction that $G(\omega)$ contains a copy of $K_{3,3}$. Then by deleting nodes and shifting indices as necessary, we can assume that $n = 5$ and $G(\omega) = K_{3,3}$ with bipartition $\{\{0, 1, 2\}, \{3, 4, 5\}\}$. Up to vertical symmetry, this means that ω in particular contains arcs γ_{t_1} and γ_{t_2} characterized by $\text{wd}(\gamma_{t_1}) = (2, e) =: (\ell^1, s_3^1)$ and $\text{wd}(\gamma_{t_2}) = (2, oe) =: (\ell^2, s_3^2 s_4^2)$. There are then two cases to consider.

Suppose first that ω contains an arc γ_{t_3} with $\text{wd}(\gamma_{t_3}) = (2, uue) =: (\ell^3, s_3^3 s_4^3 s_5^3)$, see the left diagram in Figure 9. Let γ_{t_4} be the arc in ω which satisfies $\ell^4 := \ell(\gamma_{t_4}) = 1$ and $r(\gamma_{t_4}) = 3$, and denote $\text{wd}(\gamma_{t_4}) = (\ell^4, s_2^4, s_3^4)$. If $s_2^4 = o$, then γ_{t_4} and γ_{t_2} satisfy condition (2) in Lemma 4.8 for $i = 2$ and $j = 3$. But then any representatives of γ_{t_2} and γ_{t_4} will have a nontrivial crossing, a contradiction. Similarly, if $s_2^4 = u$, then γ_{t_3} and γ_{t_4} satisfy condition (3) in Lemma 4.8 for $i = 2$ and $j = 3$, again leading to a contradiction.

The other possibility is that ω contains an arc γ_{t_3} with $\text{wd}(\gamma_{t_3}) = (2, ooe)$, see the right diagram of Figure 9. The argument is similar to the previous case, although more arcs must be added to deduce a contradiction. We opt to describe each arc in words, rather than using the data coming from $\text{wd}(-)$. First note that the arc γ_{t_4} with left endpoint 1 and right endpoint 3 must cross under the node 2 to avoid a nontrivial crossing with either γ_{t_1} or γ_{t_2} . Similarly, the arc γ_{t_5} with left endpoint 1 and right endpoint 4 must pass under the nodes 2 and 3 for the same reason. It then follows that the arc γ_{t_6} with left endpoint 0 and right endpoint 4 must pass below the nodes 1, 2, and 3 to avoid having nontrivial crossings with the previous arcs. Similarly, the arc γ_{t_7} with left endpoint 1 and right endpoint 5 will need to pass above the nodes 2, 3, and 4 to avoid the existence of nontrivial crossings. But then using similar reasoning as in the case above, we have that the arc γ_{t_8} with left endpoint 0 and right endpoint 3 must have a nontrivial crossing with one of the previous arcs. See Figure 9. \square

As a consequence of Proposition 6.6, we obtain the following.

Corollary 6.7. *The maximum length of a clockwise-ordered arc diagram on $n+1$ nodes is precisely $\max\{1, 2n-2\}$.*

Proof. If $n = 1$, then $\text{arc}(n)$ contains only a single arc and there is nothing to show. Thus suppose $n > 1$. It is a well-known fact that a planar bipartite graph on $n+1 > 2$ nodes can have at most $2n-2$ edges. Thus the fact that $2n-2$ is an upper bound on the length of a clockwise-ordered arc diagram is an immediate consequence of Proposition 6.6.

To see that this bound is realized, we will show that the complete bipartite graph $K_{n-1,2}$, which has precisely $2n-2$ edges, can be realized as the graph of some clockwise-ordered arc diagram. Indeed, for $1 \leq t \leq n-1$, let o^t be the word consisting of t copies of the letter o , and let γ_t denote an arc with

$$\text{wd}(\gamma_t) = (n-t-1, o^t e).$$

That is, the left endpoint of γ_t is $n-t-1$, the right endpoint is n , and γ_t passes over every node in its arrow support. Likewise for $n \leq t \leq 2n-2$, let u^{t-n} be the (possibly empty) word consisting




FIGURE 10. A realization of the complete bipartite graph $K_{4,2}$ as a clockwise-ordered arc diagram on 6 nodes.

of t copies of the letter u , and let γ_t denote an arc with

$$\text{wd}(\gamma_t) = (t - n, u^{t-n}e).$$

That is, the left endpoint of γ_t is $n - t$, the right endpoint is $n - 1$, and γ_t passes under every node in its arrow support. It is straightforward to show that $(\gamma_t)_{t=2n-2}^1 \in \text{arc}_{cw}(n, 2n - 2)$. See Figure 10 for an example. \square

We now prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 6.8. *Let $S \subseteq [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then σ induces a bijection $\text{weak}(\Pi(A_n, S), k) \rightarrow \text{arc}_{cw}(n, k)$; that is, the association $(X_k, \dots, X_1) \mapsto (\sigma(X_k), \dots, \sigma(X_1))$ is a bijection between $\text{weak}(\Pi(A_n, S), k)$ and $\text{arc}_{cw}(n, k)$.*

Proof. By Corollary 6.2, it suffices to prove the result for $S = \emptyset$. Let $(X_k, \dots, X_1) \in \text{weak}(\Pi(A_n), k)$. Choose representatives of the arcs $\sigma(X_1), \dots, \sigma(X_k)$ so that each pair of arcs intersect a minimum number of times. For $1 \leq i < j \leq k$, Corollary 5.2 and the assumption that $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n)}^1(X_i, X_j) = 0$ imply that $\sigma(X_i)$ and $\sigma(X_j)$ either have a shared endpoint or do not intersect. Moreover, since $\text{Hom}_{\Pi(A_n)}(X_i, X_j) = 0$, Proposition 4.9 and Corollary 4.13 imply that $\sigma(X_i)$ and $\sigma(X_j)$ have at most one shared endpoint, and that such a shared endpoint must be directed from $\sigma(X_j)$ to $\sigma(X_i)$. We conclude that $(\sigma(X_k), \dots, \sigma(X_1)) \in \text{arc}_{cw}(n, k)$.

Conversely, let $(\gamma_k, \dots, \gamma_1) \in \text{arc}_{cw}(n, k)$. The fact that $(\sigma^{-1}(\gamma_k), \dots, \sigma^{-1}(\gamma_1)) \in \text{weak}(\Pi(A_n), k)$ then follows immediately from Proposition 4.9, Corollary 5.2, and Corollary 5.12. \square

Remark 6.9. Since every indecomposable module over $\Pi(A_n, [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ is a brick, we note that Theorem 6.8 gives a classification of all stratifying systems over this algebra.

Combining Theorem 6.8 with Corollary 6.7, we obtain the following.

Corollary 6.10. *Let $S \subseteq [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$. Then the maximum length of a weak exceptional sequence over $\Pi(A_n, S)$ is $\max\{1, 2n - 2\}$.*

We conclude this section with an example. Note in particular that (2) is an example of a weak exceptional sequence which cannot be extended into a weak exceptional sequence of length $2n - 2$.

Example 6.11.

- (1) Consider the clockwise-ordered arc diagram $(\gamma_4, \gamma_3, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$ shown in Figure 11. The corresponding weak exceptional sequence in either $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n, [2, n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ or $\text{mod } \Pi(A_n)$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 \\ & & 1 & \end{pmatrix}.$$

- (2) Consider the clockwise-ordered arc diagram in Figure 10. By deleting the rightmost node (number 5) and all incident arcs, we obtain a clockwise-ordered arc diagram $(\gamma_8, \gamma_7, \gamma_6, \gamma_5)$.




FIGURE 11. A clockwise-ordered arc diagram on 4 nodes. The arc γ_1 is dashed orange, the arcs γ_2 and γ_4 are dotted purple, and the arc γ_3 is solid blue.

The corresponding weak exceptional sequence over either $\Pi(A_4, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ or $\Pi(A_4)$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 4, & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ & 4, & 3, & 2 \\ & & 4 & 4 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that while this clockwise-ordered arc diagram consists of $4 = n < 2n - 2$ arcs, there are no additional arcs that can be added anywhere in the sequence without violating the clockwise-ordered property.

- (3) Consider the clockwise-ordered arc diagram $(\gamma_3, \gamma_2, \gamma_1)$ shown in Figure 8. The corresponding weak exceptional sequence over either $\Pi(A_5, [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ or $\Pi(A_5)$ is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2 & 3 & 5 & 3 \\ 1 & 3, & 2 & 4, & 2 \\ 4 & 1 & & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is shown in the concurrent work [20] that the sequences in (2) and (3) above are examples of “ τ -exceptional sequences”, while the one in (1) is not.

7. EXCEPTIONAL SEQUENCES OVER HEREDITARY ALGEBRAS OF TYPE A

In this section, we briefly explain how the results of this paper relate to the model of exceptional sequences over hereditary algebras of type A constructed in [18].

Let $\varepsilon : \{1, \dots, n-1\} \rightarrow \{u, o\}$. The function ε defines a quiver A_n^ε , which, for any $S \subseteq [2, n-1]_{\mathbb{Z}}$, we can see as a quotient of $\Pi(A_n, S)$ as follows. Let $E(\varepsilon) = \{a_i \mid \varepsilon(i) = u\} \cup \{a_i^* \mid \varepsilon(i) = o\}$, and let $KA_n^\varepsilon = K\overline{A_n}/(E(\varepsilon))$. Alternatively, KA_n^ε is the path algebra of a quiver of type A_n with an arrow $a_i : i \rightarrow i+1$ whenever $\varepsilon(i) = o$ and an arrow $a_i^* : i+1 \rightarrow i$ whenever $\varepsilon(i) = u$.

Let $\gamma \in \text{arc}(n)$ and write $\text{wd}(\gamma) = (\ell(\gamma), s_{\ell(\gamma)+1} \cdots s_{r(\gamma)})$. We say that γ is ε -admissible if $s_i = \varepsilon(i)$ for all $\ell(\gamma) < i < r(\gamma)$. It is well-known that σ induces a bijection from $\text{brick}(KA_n^\varepsilon)$ to the set of (combinatorial equivalence classes of) ε -admissible arcs.

Remark 7.1. One may also see a choice of ε as a choice of “Coxeter element” c in the symmetric group \mathfrak{S}_{n+1} . The ε -admissible arcs can then be seen as those which are “ c -sortable”. See e.g. [27, Section 4] or [6] for further discussion.

In [18], Garver, Igusa, Mathern, and Ostroff classify the exceptional sequences (which in this case correspond precisely to the weak exceptional sequences) over KA_n^ε using “labeled strand diagrams”. Their definition includes the assumption that the arcs underlying any strand diagram form a forest. We remove this assumption and restate the remainder of their definition in our terminology as follows.

Definition 7.2. (c.f. [18, Definiton 14]) Let $\Delta = (\gamma_k, \dots, \gamma_1)$ be a sequence of ε -admissible arcs. We say that Δ is an ε -admissible labeled strand diagram if the following hold for all $1 \leq i < j \leq k$.

- (1) There exist representatives of γ_i and γ_j which do not have a nontrivial crossing.
- (2) If γ_i and γ_j have a shared endpoint then γ_j is clockwise from γ_i .
- (3) Suppose that γ_i and γ_j have a contested endpoint x . If $\varepsilon(x) = o$ then $x = r(\gamma_i)$. Similarly, if $\varepsilon(x) = u$ then $x = r(\gamma_j)$.

We denote by $\text{arc}_\varepsilon(n, k)$ the set of ε -admissible labeled strand diagrams and $\text{arc}_\varepsilon(n) = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \text{arc}_\varepsilon(n, k)$.

We now state and prove the classification given in [18], but again without the assumption that the arcs in question form a forest. Recall once again that $\text{weak}(KA_n^\varepsilon)$ can be considered as the set of exceptional sequences of KA_n^ε .

Theorem 7.3. (c.f. [18, Theorem 16]) *The map σ induces a bijection $\text{weak}(KA_n^\varepsilon, k) \rightarrow \text{arc}_\varepsilon(n, k)$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove the result for $k = 2$. Denote by $F : \text{mod } KA_n^\varepsilon \rightarrow \text{mod } \Pi(A_n, [1, 2n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})$ the inclusion functor induced by the quotient map $\Pi(A_n, [1, 2n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}) \rightarrow KA_n^\varepsilon$. Note that, as with the functors F_T^S , this F is a fully faithful functor which induces injective linear maps on Ext^1 . Moreover, we can see the application of this functor as turning representations of A_n^ε into representations of $\overline{A_n}$ by adding the 0 map on all new arrows.

Suppose first that $\sigma(X)$ and $\sigma(Y)$ have a contested endpoint x . Then $\text{Hom}_{KA_n^\varepsilon}(X, Y) = 0$ and $\dim \text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [1, 2n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(FX, FY) = 1$ by Proposition 4.9 and Theorem 5.10. Now let $\eta(x)$ be the short exact sequence from Equation 1, which spans $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [1, 2n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(FX, FY)$ by Proposition 5.3. The middle term of this short exact sequence is a module over KQ_n^ε if and only if either (a) $\varepsilon(x) = u$ and $x = r(\sigma(X))$ or (b) $\varepsilon(x) = o$ and $x = r(\sigma(Y))$. This shows that $(Y, X) \in \text{weak}(KA_n^\varepsilon, 2)$ if and only if $(\sigma(Y), \sigma(X)) \in \text{arc}_\varepsilon(n, 2)$ in this case.

Now suppose that X and Y do not have a contested endpoint. Then $\text{Ext}_{\Pi(A_n, [1, 2n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}})}^1(FX, FY)$ is spanned by the short exact sequences of the form $\eta(x)$ in Equation 2. Moreover, since FX and FY correspond to ε -admissible arcs, the middle terms of these short exact sequences will, as well. Thus $(FY, FX) \in \text{weak}(\Pi(A_n, [1, 2n - 1]_{\mathbb{Z}}))$ if and only if $(Y, X) \in \text{weak}(KA_n^\varepsilon)$. Lemma 6.1 thus implies the result in this case. \square

Remark 7.4. Our proof of Theorem 7.3 highlights that assuming the underlying arcs form a forest is not necessary in [18, Definition 14]. Indeed, it is shown in the proof of [18, Theorem 12] that the arcs corresponding to any exceptional sequence do form a forest, but the forest condition is not used in showing that the modules corresponding to any strand diagram form an exceptional sequence.

We conclude by highlighting two critical differences between weak exceptional sequences over $\Pi(A_n, S)$ and exceptional sequences over $\Pi(A_n^\varepsilon)$.

Example 7.5.

- (1) Suppose (X_k, \dots, X_1) is an exceptional sequence over KA_n^ε . Then it may not be the case that (FX_k, \dots, FX_1) is an exceptional sequence over $\Pi(A_n, S)$. Indeed, let γ_1 and γ_2 be as in Figure 4, and suppose that $\varepsilon(5) = o$. Then $(\sigma^{-1}(\gamma_2), \sigma^{-1}(\gamma_1))$ is an exceptional sequence over KA_n^ε , but is not a weak exceptional sequence over $\Pi(A_n, S)$ (for any S).
- (2) Example 6.11(1) gives an example of a weak exceptional sequence over $\Pi(A_n, S)$ (for any S) whose corresponding arcs do not form a forest. The argument used to prove the forest result over KA_n^ε in [18] goes wrong in this example as follows. Traversing the arcs in right-to-left order, the cycle $(\gamma_2, \gamma_1, \gamma_4, \gamma_3)$ is oriented counterclockwise around the region it contains. Identifying indices mod 4, the argument in [18, Theorem 12] then deduces that γ_{i+1} is clockwise of γ_i for all i . The reason this fails for $i = 4$ in our example is that γ_2 is allowed to cross under the node 2, even though γ_3 has already passed above this node.

REFERENCES

1. T. Adachi, O. Iyama, and I. Reiten, τ -tilting theory, *Compos. Math.* **150** (2014), no. 3, 415–452.
2. S. Asai, *Bricks over preprojective algebras and join-irreducible elements in Coxeter groups*, *J. Pure App. Alg.* **226** (2022), no. 1.
3. E. Barnard, A. Carroll, and S. Zhu, *Minimal inclusions of torsion classes*, *Algebraic Combin.* **2** (2019), no. 5, 879–901.

4. E. Barnard and E. J. Hanson, *Exceptional sequences in semidistributive lattices and the poset topology of wide subcategories*, arXiv:2209.11734.
5. ———, *Pairwise compatibility for 2-simple minded collections II: preprojective algebras and full rank semibrick pairs*, Ann. Comb. **26** (2022), 803–855.
6. E. Barnard and N. Reading, *Coxeter-biCatalan combinatorics*, J. Algebraic Combin. **47** (2018), 241–300.
7. K. Baur and R. Coelho Simões, *A geometric model for the module category of a gentle algebra*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **2021** (2019), 11357–11392.
8. T. Brüstle, G. Douville, K. Mousavand, H. Thomas, and E. Yildirim, *On the combinatorics of gentle algebras*, Canad. J. Math. **72** (2020), no. 6, 1551–1580.
9. A. B. Buan and B. R. Marsh, *τ -exceptional sequences*, J. Algebra **585** (2021), 36–68.
10. M. C. R. Butler and C. M. Ringel, *Auslander-Reiten sequences with few middle terms and applications to string algebras*, Comm. Algebra **15** (1987), no. 1-2, 145–179.
11. W. Crawley-Boevey, *Maps between representations of zero-relation algebras*, J. Algebra **126** (1989), no. 2, 259–263.
12. ———, *Exceptional sequences of representations of quivers*, Proceedings of the Sixth International Conference on Representations of Algebras (Ottawa, ON, 1992), Carleton-Ottawa Math. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 14, Carleton Univ., Ottawa, ON, 1992.
13. ———, *On the exceptional fibres of Kleinian singularities*, Amer. J. Math. **122** (2000), 1027–1037.
14. L. Demonet, O. Iyama, and G. Jasso, *τ -tilting finite algebras, bricks, and g -vectors*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **2019** (2017), no. 3, 852–892.
15. L. Demonet, O. Iyama, N. Reading, I. Reiten, and H. Thomas, *Lattice theory of torsion classes: beyond τ -tilting theory*, to appear in Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., arXiv:1711.01785.
16. H. Enomoto, *Bruhat inversions in Weyl groups and torsion-free classes over preprojective algebras*, Comm. Algebra **49** (2021), no. 5, 2156–2189.
17. K. Erdmann and C. Sáenz, *On standardly stratified algebras*, Comm. Algebra **31** (2003), no. 7, 3429–3446.
18. A. Garver, K. Igusa, J. P. Matherne, and J. Ostroff, *Combinatorics of exceptional sequences in type A*, Electron. J. Combin. **26** (2019), no. 1.
19. C. Geiß, B. Leclerc, and J. Schröer, *Rigid modules over preprojective algebras*, Invent. Math. **165** (2006), no. 3, 589–632.
20. E. J. Hanson, *τ -exceptional sequences and the shard intersection order in type A*, preprint concurrently submitted to arXiv.org.
21. E. J. Hanson and K. Igusa, *τ -cluster morphism categories and picture groups*, Comm. Alg. **49**, no. 10, 4376–4415.
22. O. Iyama, N. Reading, I. Reiten, and H. Thomas, *Lattice structure of Weyl groups via representation theory of preprojective algebras*, Compos. Math. **154** (2018), no. 6, 1269–1305.
23. R. Kase, *Weak orders on symmetric groups and posets of support τ -tilting modules*, Internat. J. Algebra Comput. **27** (2017), no. 5, 501–546.
24. E. N. Marcos, O. Mendoza, and C. Sáenz, *Stratifying systems via relative simple modules*, J. Algebra **280** (2004), no. 2, 472–487.
25. O. Mendoza and H. Treffinger, *Stratifying systems through τ -tilting theory*, Documenta Math. **25** (2020), 701–720.
26. Y. Mizuno, *Classifying τ -tilting modules over preprojective algebras of Dynkin type*, Math. Z. **277** (2014), no. 3-4, 665–690.
27. ———, *Arc diagrams and 2-term simple-minded collections of preprojective algebras of type A*, J. Algebra **595** (2022), 444–478.
28. N. Reading, *Noncrossing arc diagrams and canonical join representations*, SIAM J. Discrete Math. **29** (2015), no. 2, 736–750.
29. I. Reiten, *Tilting theory and cluster algebras*, Proceedings on Workshop in Representation Theory, Trieste 2006, arXiv:1012.6014.
30. C. M. Ringel, *The braid group action on the set of exceptional sequences of a hereditary Artin algebra*, Abelian group theory and related topics (Oberwolfach, 1993), Contemp. Math., vol. 171, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994, pp. 339–352.
31. E. Şen, *Weak exceptional sequences*, Quaest. Math. **44** (2020), no. 9, 1155–1171.
32. M. Auslander S. O. Smalø, *Almost split sequences in subcategories*, J. Algebra **69** (1981), no. 2, 426–454.
33. H. Treffinger, *The size of a stratifying system can be arbitrarily large*, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **361** (2023), 15–19.

LACIM, UNIVERSITÉ DU QUÉBEC À MONTRÉAL AND UNIVERSITÉ DE SHERBROOKE, QUÉBEC, CANADA
Email address: `hanson.eric@uqam.ca`

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NANKAI UNIVERSITY, TIANJIN, CHINA
Email address: `yxr2001@icloud.com`