

SHARD MODULES

WILL DANA, DAVID E SPEYER AND HUGH THOMAS

ABSTRACT. Motivated by the goal of studying cluster algebras in infinite type, we study the stability domains of modules for the preprojective algebra in the corresponding infinite types. Specifically, we study real bricks: those modules whose endomorphism algebra is a division ring and which have no self-extensions. We define “shard modules” to be those real bricks whose stability domain is as large as possible (meaning, of dimension one less than the rank of the preprojective algebra). We show that all real bricks are obtained by applying the Baumann-Kamnitzer reflection functors to simple modules, and we give a recursive formula for the stability domain of a real brick. We show that shard modules are in bijection with Nathan Reading’s “shards”, and that their stability domains are the shards; we also establish many foundational results about shards in infinite type which have not previously appeared in print. With an eye toward applications to cluster algebras, our paper is written to handle skew-symmetrizable as well as skew-symmetric exchange matrices, and we therefore discuss the basics of the theory of species for preprojective algebras. We also give some counterexamples to show ways in which infinite type is more subtle than the well-studied finite type cases.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Background on Coxeter groups and root systems	9
3. Shards	15
4. Background from representation theory	17
5. Proofs of the main theorems	23
6. Shadows of the lattice of torsion classes	26
7. Counterexamples	30
Appendix A. Proof of Theorem 4.2 in the symmetrizable case	33
References	39

1. INTRODUCTION

The aim of this paper is to generalize to infinite root systems various results concerning preprojective algebras in Dynkin type. In this introduction, we summarize the results we want to generalize, state our main results, and explain why we want to establish such a generalization. We begin with a review of the general theory of torsion classes.

1.1. **Bricks, torsion classes, stability.** Let k be a field and let R be a k -algebra. We write $\text{mod}(R)$ for the abelian category of left R -modules which are finite dimensional over k , and call such an R -module a *finite dimensional R -module*.

A **torsion class** T is a collection of isomorphism classes of finite dimensional R -modules which contains 0 and is closed under quotients and extensions. A **torsion free class** F is a collection of isomorphism classes of finite dimensional R -modules which contains 0 and is closed under submodules and extensions. If C is any collection of finite dimensional R -modules, we define

$$\begin{aligned} C^\perp &= \{M \in \text{mod}(R) : \text{Hom}_R(X, M) = 0 \quad \forall X \in C\} \\ {}^\perp C &= \{M \in \text{mod}(R) : \text{Hom}_R(M, X) = 0 \quad \forall X \in C\}. \end{aligned}$$

The collection C^\perp is always a torsion free class; ${}^\perp C$ is always a torsion class, and the maps $T \mapsto T^\perp$ and $F \mapsto {}^\perp F$ are mutually inverse bijections from torsion classes to torsion free classes and vice versa. The pair (T, F) is called a **torsion pair**.

We define a finite-dimensional R -module B to be a **brick** if $\text{Hom}_R(B, B)$ is a division ring. In other words, B is a brick if $B \neq 0$ and every nonzero endomorphism of B is bijective. We write $\text{Brick}(R)$ for the set of bricks of R .

The following results are straightforward:

Proposition 1.1. *Torsion classes form a lattice with respect to containment.*

Proposition 1.2. *Given two torsion classes T_1 and T_2 , we have $T_1 \subseteq T_2$ if and only if $T_1 \cap \text{Brick}(R) \subseteq T_2 \cap \text{Brick}(R)$; in particular, $T_1 = T_2$ if and only if $T_1 \cap \text{Brick}(R) = T_2 \cap \text{Brick}(R)$. The same holds for torsion free classes.*

These results raise the question of finding a concrete description of the lattice of torsion classes of R -modules, and in particular describing such torsion classes as subsets of the set of bricks.

One way to obtain a torsion class or torsion free class is using a stability condition. Let e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n be a complete collection of primitive orthogonal idempotents of R . So every finite dimensional R -module M admits a vector space decomposition as $\bigoplus e_i M$. We abbreviate $e_i M$ to M_i and we define $\dim M$ to be the vector $(\dim_k M_i)$ in \mathbb{R}^n .

Remark 1.3. In all of our motivating examples, the algebra A is basic, meaning that the A -modules Ae_i and Ae_j are not isomorphic for $i \neq j$. If A is not basic, with $Ae_i \cong Ae_j$, then $\dim_k M_i = \dim_k M_j$ for every $M \in \text{mod}_A$. This does not make anything that we write false, and will also not occur for any of the examples we care about, but if we wanted to study non-basic algebras seriously, we would pay more attention to this.

Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Define T^θ to be the set of modules M such that $\langle \theta, Q \rangle \leq 0$ for all quotients Q of M , and define F^θ to be the set of modules M such that $\langle \theta, K \rangle \geq 0$ for all submodules K of M . It is easy to check that T^θ is a torsion class and F^θ is a torsion free class. If, for every brick $B \in \text{mod}(R)$, we have $\langle \theta, \dim B \rangle \neq 0$, then $T^\theta = {}^\perp(F^\theta)$ and $F^\theta = (T^\theta)^\perp$.

By Proposition 1.2, if θ_1 and θ_2 lie on the same side of $(\dim B)^\perp$ for all bricks B , then $T^{\theta_1} = T^{\theta_2}$. Thus, for each region of the hyperplane arrangement complement $\mathbb{R}^n \setminus \bigcup_{B \in \text{Brick}(R)} (\dim B)^\perp$, we obtain a torsion class which occurs as T^θ for every θ in that region.

It is important to understand, as θ passes through a wall $(\dim M)^\perp$, when the module M jumps from F^θ to T^θ . This happens when M is θ -semistable, which is defined as follows: Let $M \in \text{mod}(R)$ and let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then M is θ -**semistable** if and only if $M \in F^\theta \cap T^\theta$, that is to say, if $\langle \theta, \dim K \rangle \geq 0$ for all submodules K

of M and $\langle \theta, \dim Q \rangle \leq 0$ for all quotient modules Q of M . Note that this implies that $\langle \theta, \dim M \rangle = 0$. Also, if we impose that $\langle \theta, \dim M \rangle = 0$, then the conditions on submodules and on quotients become equivalent to each other.

Given a module M , only finitely many dimension vectors can occur as dimensions of submodules of M , so the set of θ for which M is θ -semistable is a closed polyhedral cone in \mathbb{R}^n ; we denote it by $\text{Stab}(M)$ and call it the *stability domain of M* .

1.2. Dynkin type preprojective algebras. To make our introduction simpler, in this subsection we will restrict ourselves to the simply laced types ADE . Many of these results have also been established in types $BCFG$; see Remark 1.7. All of our results apply to any symmetrizable crystallographic Cartan matrix. For standard notation concerning Coxeter groups and root systems, see Section 2.

Let Γ be a Dynkin diagram of type A_n, D_n, E_6, E_7 or E_8 . We write Γ_0 for the vertices of Γ and Γ_1 for the edges. We write W for the corresponding Coxeter group, with simple generators s_i for $i \in \Gamma_0$. We write Φ for the root system, which lives in a vector space V ; we write Φ^+ for the set of positive roots and α_i for the simple roots, which are again indexed by $i \in \Gamma_0$.

We define $\overline{\Gamma}$ to be the directed graph obtained by replacing each edge of Γ by two directed edges, one in each direction. We write $\overline{\Gamma}_1$ for the edges of $\overline{\Gamma}$. For each edge of Γ , choose one orientation of this edge to call a and the other to call a^* . The *preprojective algebra* Λ is the quotient of the quiver path algebra $k\overline{\Gamma}$ (for some finite k) by the relation $\sum_{a \in \overline{\Gamma}_1} a^*a = \sum_{a \in \overline{\Gamma}_1} aa^*$. Thus, a finite dimensional Λ -module U breaks up as $\bigoplus U_i$ for a sequence of vector spaces U_i indexed by $i \in \Gamma_0$, with maps $\rho(a) : U_i \rightarrow U_j$ and $\rho(a^*) : U_j \rightarrow U_i$ for each edge $i \xrightarrow{a} j$. These maps obey $\sum \rho(a^*)\rho(a) = \sum \rho(a)\rho(a^*)$ where the left sum runs over a with source i and the right sum runs over a with target i .

Given a finite dimensional representation U , we define $\dim U$ to be the vector $\sum_{i \in \Gamma_0} (\dim_k U_i)\alpha_i$. We write S_i for the simple Λ -module with dimension α_i . Thus, our stability conditions θ now live in the dual vector space V^* .

Theorem 1.4 ([31, Theorem 1.2]). *Under our hypothesis that Γ is of type ADE , all bricks in $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ have dimension vectors in Φ^+ . The endomorphism rings of these bricks are all isomorphic to k .*

There can be more than one brick with the same dimension vector. For example, let Γ have type A_2 and consider representations with dimension vector $(1, 1)$. So such a representation is of the form $k \begin{matrix} \xrightarrow{a} \\ \xleftarrow{a^*} \end{matrix} k$ where the maps a and a^* obey $aa^* = 0$ and $a^*a = 0$. We get two non-isomorphic bricks by taking $(a, a^*) = (1, 0)$ or $(a, a^*) = (0, 1)$.

Let W be the reflection group corresponding to Γ . Recall that W acts simply transitively on the regions of the hyperplane arrangement complement $V^* \setminus \bigcup_{\beta \in \Phi^+} \beta^\perp$. Let D be the region $\{\theta \in V^* : \langle \alpha_i, \theta \rangle \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in \Gamma_0\}$.

Theorem 1.5 ([37, Corollary 4.1]). *Under our hypothesis that Γ is of type ADE , the torsion classes of $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ are in bijection with the Coxeter group W . Namely, the bijection sends $w \in W$ to T^θ for an arbitrarily chosen θ in the interior of wD . The containment order on torsion classes corresponds to right weak order on W .*

By the observations of the previous section, the torsion class T^θ changes when θ crosses through $\text{Stab}(B)$ for a brick B of Λ . And by Theorem 1.5, this happens

when θ crosses through some hyperplane β^\perp for $\beta \in \Phi^+$. This raises the natural question of how stability domains of bricks sit inside the hyperplanes β^\perp . They turn out to correspond to shards, which are polyhedral objects introduced by Nathan Reading, driven by pure lattice-theoretic questions concerning weak order. We now give the definition of shards:

We define a subset R of Φ^+ to be a **rank two subsystem** if $\#(R) \geq 2$ and if R is the intersection of Φ^+ with a 2-dimensional linear space L . In every rank two subsystem R , there are two vectors, β_1 and β_2 , such that every other vector in R is a nonnegative linear combination of β_1 and β_2 ; these are called the **fundamental roots** of R . We will say that R **cuts** γ^\perp if R is a rank two subsystem containing γ in which γ is *not* fundamental. Even when Φ^+ is infinite, any given hyperplane γ^\perp will only be cut by finitely many root two subsystems (Corollary 2.15). If R cuts γ^\perp then $\gamma \in R$, so the codimension two subspace R^\perp is contained in the codimension one subspace γ^\perp . We call the collection of hyperplanes $\{R^\perp\}_{R \text{ cuts } \gamma^\perp}$ the **shard arrangement** in γ^\perp . We call the closures of the connected components of $\gamma^\perp \setminus \bigcup_{R \text{ cuts } \gamma^\perp} R^\perp$ **shards** or, when we need to specify the vector γ , we call them **shards of γ^\perp** .

Theorem 1.6 ([48, Theorem 6]). *Under our hypothesis that Γ is of type ADE, the bricks in $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ of dimension γ are in bijection with the shards of γ^\perp . More precisely, a brick B corresponds to the shard $\text{Stab}(B)$.*

Remark 1.7. Analogues of the above results follow for the non-simply laced Dynkin preprojective algebras by combining results of [1] and [38].

In more detail, let A be a finite-dimensional algebra, which, for convenience, we assume is basic. Associated to A there is a fan \mathcal{G}_A called the g -fan. If \mathcal{G}_A has only finitely many cones, then the map from chambers of the fan to torsion classes, sending a chamber C to \mathcal{T}^θ for θ in the interior of the chamber, is a bijection, as shown by Brüstle, Smith, and Treffinger [9].

If Λ is a Dynkin type preprojective algebra, then Aoki, Higashitani, Iyama, Kase and Mizuno [1] show that the \mathcal{G}_Λ is the corresponding Coxeter fan. In particular it is finite, so the considerations of the previous paragraph apply. This establishes Theorem 1.5 for all Dynkin-type preprojective algebras.

Again, let A be a basic finite-dimensional algebra as above, and assume the \mathcal{G}_A is finite. Mizuno [38] defines a notion of shards for \mathcal{G}_A ; each shard is the closure of a union of codimension-one cones of \mathcal{G}_A all lying in one hyperplane, and every codimension-one cone lies in exactly one shard. Mizuno shows further that there is a bijection between bricks and shards, such that the stability domain for a brick is given by the corresponding shard.

Since the Coxeter fan originates from a hyperplane arrangement, Mizuno's definition of shards restricts to the usual definition. As Mizuno points out, this establishes Theorem 1.6 for all Dynkin-type preprojective algebras.

1.3. Motivation for studying the infinite case. Now, let Φ be the real roots of an infinite root system and Φ^+ the positive real roots. In this setting, for every element w of the Coxeter group, there is a corresponding region of $V^* \setminus \bigcup_{\beta \in \Phi^+} \beta^\perp$: The union of the closures of these regions in V^* form the so-called ‘‘ Tits cone ’’, and these regions correspond to torsion classes with finitely many bricks (up to isomorphism). The other regions of $V^* \setminus \bigcup_{\beta \in \Phi^+} \beta^\perp$ do not correspond to elements of the Coxeter group. We would like to embed weak order on W into a combinatorially

tractable complete lattice, indexed by something like (though not necessarily the same as) the set of regions of $V^* \setminus \bigcup_{\beta \in \Phi^+} \beta^\perp$. To this end, we want to study the torsion classes of Λ for Λ the preprojective algebra corresponding to Φ . Here are some of the reasons we want to embed weak order into such a lattice:

First, many authors have described the combinatorics of cluster algebras in terms of the combinatorics of Coxeter groups. (See, for example [23, 22, 42, 43, 44, 46, 21, 7].) This work is essentially complete for cluster algebras of Dynkin type, which correspond to finite Coxeter groups. In order to study cluster algebras of non-Dynkin type, it appears we will need to introduce some lattice containing weak order as a lower ideal. The lattice of torsion classes of $\text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ is a reasonable candidate for such a lattice although, as we will discuss below, it is not exactly what we want. Thus, we want to understand $\text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ when Λ is of non-Dynkin type.

We note the following clues that this project is reasonable. First of all, to every cluster algebra and choice of initial cluster there is associated a g -vector fan. Each cone of the g -vector fan is simplicial. The normals to the defining hyperplanes of this cone are called c -vectors. For acyclic cluster algebras, c -vectors are always real roots. Thus, it is natural to hope to define the g -vector fan as a coarsening of the hyperplane arrangement $V^* \setminus \bigcup_{\beta \in \Phi^+} \beta^\perp$, and thus to describe the clusters using some sort of equivalence relation on some lattice which is related to the regions of this hyperplane arrangement. Reading and Speyer have carried this project out for the cluster algebras of affine type.

Garver and McConville [25, 26] studied type A cluster algebras with respect to initial quivers which are mutation equivalent to a type A quiver but which need not themselves be type A Dynkin quivers. They categorified these cluster algebras using modules for a “tiling algebra”. Since tiling algebras are quotients of the path algebras for the quivers associated to these seeds, they are also quotients of the corresponding preprojective algebras. Garcia and Garver [24] make explicit connections between this work and semistable categories. Combining their work with ours, one should be able to describe these g -vector fans as coarsenings of the Coxeter fans for the Coxeter groups of quivers which are mutation equivalent to a type A quiver. Garver and his collaborators also describe the lattice of clusters as a quotient of a lattice called the “lattice of biclosed sets”. Garver, McConville and Mousavand [27] categorify the lattice of biclosed sets using an algebra $\Pi(A)$ which they describe as “analogous to a preprojective algebra” [27, Section 6, first paragraph]; we imagine that they could also work directly with the preprojective algebra, in which case the results of this paper would be useful. We should acknowledge that, for the particular problems that these papers solve, the tiling algebra and the algebra $\Pi(A)$ are more convenient than the preprojective algebra; we hope that the merit of this paper is to show what sort of categorification might be powerful enough to handle a broader range of cluster algebras.

Santos, Stump and Welker [45] discovered the Grassmann-Tamari lattice, whose elements are cones in a certain fan. McConville [36] proved that the Grassmann-Tamari lattice is a quotient of a larger lattice, the lattice of biclosed sets; many but not all of the elements in the lattice of biclosed sets are regions in a hyperplane arrangement. The normal vectors to that hyperplane arrangement are certain real roots in the root system of type $A_k \boxtimes A_{n-k}$ (this is the wild type Coxeter group

whose Coxeter diagram is the product of the A_k and A_{n-k} diagrams); Palu, Pilaud and Plamondon [40], and Brüstle et al. [8], categorify the Grassmann-Tamari lattice using torsion classes for a certain gentle algebra which is, again, a quotient of the preprojective algebra of type $A_k \boxtimes A_{n-k}$; the categorification of biclosed sets of Garver, McConville and Mousavand [27], using an algebra “analogous to a preprojective algebra”, applies to this situation as well. It would be particularly nice to understand these examples better because a large portion of the fan for the Grassmann-Tamari lattice coincides the g -vector fan for the cluster structure on the Grassmannian $G(k, n)$. (Specifically, facets of the Grassmann-Tamari lattice are indexed by maximal non-kissing collections of k -element subsets of $[n]$. The “non-kissing” condition is implied by a stronger condition called “weakly separated”. Maximal weakly-separated collections correspond to those clusters for $G(k, n)$ in which all Plücker variables are cluster variables [39].

Finally, Dyer [16] has conjectured a description of an infinite lattice extending weak order in all cases. Relating Dyer’s conjectures to our approach strikes us as a challenging question; we will remark further on this in Remark 6.10.

In order to study all of these examples systematically, we want to build a larger lattice, and we view torsion classes as a reasonable route toward this goal. Of course, the preprojective algebras are an important class of algebras, and it also seems natural to study their lattices of torsion classes, both for their intrinsic interest, and for a better understanding of the kind of phenomena which can arise in infinite lattices of torsion classes.

1.4. Difficulties of the infinite case. We now explain why thinking about the set of all torsion classes is definitely not what we want, as well as being, in a sense, too hard. Let k be an algebraically closed field and let Γ be the Kronecker quiver, consisting of two vertices joined by two edges.

The corresponding Coxeter group is the infinite dihedral group $\langle s_1, s_2 : s_1^2 = s_2^2 = e \rangle$. The positive real roots are $\{m\alpha_1 + (m+1)\alpha_2, (m+1)\alpha_1 + m\alpha_2 : m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$. The hyperplanes α_1^\perp and α_2^\perp are the stability domains of the simple modules, and the simple modules are the only bricks of dimensions α_1 and α_2 . For $m \geq 1$, there are two bricks each of the dimensions $m\alpha_1 + (m+1)\alpha_2$ and $(m+1)\alpha_1 + m\alpha_2$; we write them as $B(m \leftarrow m+1)$, $B(m \rightarrow m+1)$, $B(m+1 \leftarrow m)$, $B(m+1 \rightarrow m)$, where the nonzero maps go in the direction of the arrow. The two stability domains $\text{Stab}(B(m \leftarrow m\pm 1))$ and $\text{Stab}(B(m \rightarrow m\pm 1))$ are two rays pointing in opposite directions along the line $(m\alpha_1 + (m\pm 1)\alpha_2)^\perp$.

There are two more families of nilpotent bricks, all of dimension vector $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. Namely, for any $[c_1 : c_2] \in \mathbb{P}^1(k)$, let $B(1 \xrightarrow{[c_1:c_2]} 1)$ be the representation where one map $k \rightarrow k$ is multiplication by c_1 and the other by c_2 . For $[c_1 : c_2] \neq [c'_1 : c'_2]$, the corresponding bricks are non-isomorphic. Similarly, we can define a family $B(1 \xleftarrow{[c_1:c_2]} 1)$. (We will gloss over non-nilpotent bricks, since we don’t regard them as the important difficulty here. For more details on nilpotency, see Section 4.2.)

Choose θ with $\langle \theta, \alpha_1 \rangle = -1$ and $\langle \theta, \alpha_2 \rangle = 1$. Then T^θ contains the bricks $B(m+1 \rightarrow m)$ for $m \geq 0$ and $B(1 \xrightarrow{[c_1:c_2]} 1)$ for all $[c_1 : c_2] \in \mathbb{P}^1(k)$. The torsion class ${}^\perp F^\theta$ contains the bricks $B(m+1 \rightarrow m)$ for $m \geq 0$, but not the bricks $B(1 \xrightarrow{[c_1:c_2]} 1)$.

The interval of torsion classes $[\perp F^\theta, T^\theta]$ is then the boolean lattice of all subsets of $\mathbb{P}^1(k)$. For any subset \mathcal{C} whatsoever of $\mathbb{P}^1(k)$, there is a torsion class with bricks

$$\{B(m \rightarrow m+1) : m \geq 0\} \cup \{B(1 \xrightarrow{[c_1:c_2]} 1) : [c_1 : c_2] \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

So the lattice of torsion classes has cardinality (at least) $2^{|k|}$; if $k = \mathbb{C}$, this is $2^{2^{\aleph_0}}$. The authors are combinatorialists at heart, and we do not want to study such large lattices. Moreover, for all of the goals which motivate us, it appears that whether or not a torsion class contains bricks like $B(1 \xrightarrow{[c_1:c_2]} 1)$ is irrelevant.

To ignore the complexity introduced by these seemingly irrelevant bricks, we consider a particular subclass of bricks, which we term **shard modules**, and consider two torsion classes to be equivalent if they contain the same shard modules. This paper contains a proposed definition of shard modules, and studies their properties. We now describe our main results. Attempting to use this definition to study weak order and cluster algebras will be the project of future papers.

1.5. Results. Let A be an $n \times n$ symmetrizable crystallographic Cartan matrix, meaning an $n \times n$ integer matrix with $A_{ii} = 2$, with $A_{ij} \leq 0$ for $i \neq j$ and where there is a set of positive integers d_i such that $d_i A_{ij} = d_j A_{ji}$. In the usual ways (see Section 2), we define a Coxeter group W and a reflection representation of W on V with $\Phi \subset V$ the set of real roots. We write α_i for the simple roots. The reflection group W preserves a symmetric bilinear form $(-, -)$ on V , with respect to which $(\beta, \beta) > 0$ for every real root β . We set $d_\beta = \frac{(\beta, \beta)}{2}$ and $\beta^\vee = d_\beta^{-1} \beta$; each d_β lies in $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n\}$.

We abbreviate $d_{ij} = \text{LCM}(d_i, d_j)$ and $L = \text{LCM}(d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$. Let $\kappa(L)/\kappa$ be a field extension with Galois group cyclic of order L and, for d dividing L , let $\kappa(d)$ be the unique subextension with $[\kappa(d) : \kappa] = d$. We define a preprojective algebra Λ (see Sections 4.1 and 4.2) whose representations are $\bigoplus U_i$ where U_i is a $\kappa(d_i)$ vector space and we have $(-d_i A_{ij})/d_{ij}$ maps $\kappa(d_{ij}) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} U_i \rightarrow U_j$ which are $\kappa(d_j)$ linear. For a finite dimensional Λ -module M , we set $\dim M = \sum (\dim_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i) \alpha_i$. We then define stability domains $\text{Stab}(M)$ in V^* as before.

Definition 1.8. We define a **real brick** to be a brick whose dimension vector is a real root.

There are equivalent ways to formulate the definition of a real brick without mentioning root systems:

Proposition 4.14. *Let B be a brick. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The vector $\dim B$ in V is a real root.*
- (2) *We have $(\dim B, \dim B) > 0$.*
- (3) *The brick B is rigid, meaning that $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(B, B) = 0$.*

We prove Proposition 4.14 at the end of Section 4.5. Rigid bricks are also called **stones** in some sources; see, for example, [32].

Definition 1.9. We define a module B to be a **shard module** if B is a real brick and $\text{Stab}(B)$ is a polyhedral cone of dimension $n - 1$.

Note that $\text{Stab}(M)$ is contained in the hyperplane $(\dim M)^\perp$, so $n - 1$ is the highest possible dimension.

Remark 1.10. It is not easy to give an example of a real brick which is not a shard module. However, such examples do exist! See Section 7.2.

Here is our main theorem:

Theorem 5.7. *The stability domains of shard modules are precisely the shards, and each shard is the stability domain of precisely one isomorphism class of shard modules.*

Our proof works by providing parallel recursive descriptions of shards and of shard modules. We first describe the recursion for shards. For any positive root β , define a **positive expression for β** to be a formula $\beta = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ where, for all $1 \leq k \leq r$, we have

$$s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j - s_{i_{k-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \alpha_{i_k}.$$

We will show (Lemma 2.8) that every positive root has a positive expression. Let K be a convex polyhedral cone in V^* and define

$$\sigma_i^+(K) := s_i(K \cap \{x : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0\}) \text{ and } \sigma_i^-(K) := s_i(K \cap \{x : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0\}).$$

Note that we could also write

$$\sigma_i^+(K) := s_i(K) \cap \{x : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0\} \text{ and } \sigma_i^-(K) := s_i(K) \cap \{x : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0\}.$$

In Section 3, we prove:

Theorem 3.6. *Let β be any positive root and let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β . Then the set of shards of β^\perp is the set of polyhedral cones of the form $\sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^\perp)$ which are of dimension $n - 1$, where the signs $\pm_1, \pm_2, \dots, \pm_r$ may be chosen independently.*

We give an example of a product $\sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^\perp)$ which has dimension less than $n - 1$ in Example 3.5.

We now describe the recursion for shard modules. We define NoSub_i to be the full subcategory of $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ of modules for which the simple module S_i is not a submodule, and define NoQuot_i similarly to be the full subcategory of $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ of modules for which S_i is not a quotient. Baumann and Kamnitzer [3] define, and we will review in Section 4.4, mutually inverse isomorphisms of categories

$$\Sigma_i : \text{NoQuot}_i \rightarrow \text{NoSub}_i \text{ and } \Sigma_i^{-1} : \text{NoSub}_i \rightarrow \text{NoQuot}_i.$$

In Section 5.1, we prove the following recursive description of real brick modules:

Theorem 5.1. *Let β be a positive root and let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β . The bricks of dimension β are precisely the modules of the form $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} S_j$, where the signs must be chosen such that the expression is well-defined.*

To be clear, the condition that $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} S_j$ is well defined means that each partial product $\Sigma_{i_{q-1}}^{\pm(q-1)} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} S_j$ lies in NoQuot_{i_q} or NoSub_{i_q} , according to whether $\pm_{i_q} = +$ or $\pm_{i_q} = -$.

We then describe the stability domains of the real brick modules in terms of this recursion, proved in Section 5.2.

Theorem 5.3. *Let β be a positive root, let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β and let $\pm_1, \pm_2, \dots, \pm_r$ be a choice of signs such that $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} S_j$ is defined. Then the brick $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} S_j$ has stability domain $\sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^\perp)$.*

Combining Theorems 5.1 and 5.3, we immediately obtain

Theorem 1.11. *Let β be a positive root and let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β . The shard modules of dimension β are precisely those modules $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm} S_j$ which are well defined and for which $\sigma_{i_r}^{\pm} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm} (\alpha_j^{\perp})$ has dimension $n - 1$.*

Theorems 3.6 and 1.11 do most of the work to prove Theorem 5.7. We finish the proof of Theorem 5.7 in section 5.3; in particular, we resolve the tension that the recursion of Theorem 5.1 appears to be more restrictive than the recursion of Theorem 3.6, since the former includes the condition that the reflection functors be well-defined, which is absent in the latter.

1.6. Acknowledgments. The first author has been supported by NSF grants DMS-1854225 and DMS-1855135. The second author has been supported by NSF grants DMS-1854225, DMS-1855135 and DMS-1600223. He thanks the Auslander Lectures 2019 for their excellent hospitality and for the helpful feedback of their attendees. The third author was partially supported by the Canada Research Chairs program and an NSERC Discovery Grant. He gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of the Center for Advanced Studies, Oslo, which provided excellent working conditions for the completion of this paper. The authors also thank Nathan Reading for his many helpful comments on this project.

2. BACKGROUND ON COXETER GROUPS AND ROOT SYSTEMS

This section provides our notation and conventions for discussing Coxeter groups and root systems.

2.1. Cartan matrices, Coxeter groups, root systems. All the material in this section is standard. For example, see [29, Chapter 5].

Let d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n be positive integers. Let A be an $n \times n$ integer matrix obeying

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ii} &= 2 \\ d_i A_{ij} &= d_j A_{ji} \\ A_{ij} &\leq 0 \text{ for } i \neq j. \end{aligned}$$

Such a matrix is called a *crystallographic symmetrizable Cartan matrix*.

Remark 2.1. A *symmetrizable Cartan matrix*, without the adjective ‘‘crystallographic’’, would impose that the A_{ij} and d_i were real numbers, rather than integers, with $A_{ij} A_{ji} \in \{4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{m} : m \in \mathbb{Z}, m \geq 2\} \cup [4, \infty)$ and obeying the other conditions above. The non-crystallographic symmetrizable Cartan matrices are not related to preprojective algebras. However, as much of the theory of shards has never been published for infinite Coxeter groups, we will point out how to do some of the foundational work for non-crystallographic symmetrizable Cartan matrices where it is not difficult to do so.

Let V be a vector space with basis $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ and let $\alpha_i^{\vee} = d_i^{-1} \alpha_i$. We define a symmetric bilinear form $(-, -)$ on V by $(\alpha_i, \alpha_j) = d_i A_{ij}$, so $(\alpha_i^{\vee}, \alpha_j) = A_{ij}$. We let s_i be the orthogonal reflection negating α_i , given by the formula:

$$s_i(x) = x - (\alpha_i^{\vee}, x) \alpha_i.$$

So the Coxeter group W acts by transformations which are orthogonal for the form $(-, -)$. We also record explicitly the action of s_i on the α_j :

$$s_i(\alpha_j) = \alpha_j - A_{ij}\alpha_i.$$

Let W be the subgroup of $\text{GL}(V)$ generated by the s_i . Then W is a Coxeter group, generated by the s_i with relations $(s_i s_j)^{m_{ij}} = 1$ where

$$m_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j \\ 2 & A_{ij}A_{ji} = 0 \\ 3 & A_{ij}A_{ji} = 1 \\ 4 & A_{ij}A_{ji} = 2 \\ 6 & A_{ij}A_{ji} = 3 \\ \infty & A_{ij}A_{ji} \geq 4, i \neq j \end{cases}.$$

The set of **real roots** Φ is defined to be $\{w\alpha_i : w \in W, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. In this paper, we will often shorten this to **roots**, as we consider no other kind of root. If β is a root and we write $\beta = \sum c_i \alpha_i$, then either all the c_i are ≥ 0 or all the c_i are ≤ 0 ; we call β a **positive root** or **negative root** accordingly and write $\beta \in \Phi^+$ or $\beta \in \Phi^-$. If β is a root then $-\beta$ is also a root.

We state a lemma on roots for future use:

Lemma 2.2. *Let A be a symmetrizable crystallographic Cartan matrix and $\beta = \sum c_i \alpha_i$ a real root. Then $\text{GCD}(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n) = 1$.*

Proof. Since $s_j \sum c_i \alpha_i = \sum_{i \neq j} c_i \alpha_i + (-c_j + \sum_{i \neq j} A_{ij} c_i) \alpha_j$, we see that the simple reflections preserve the GCD. Thus, it is enough to check the claim for β a simple root, in which case it is obvious. \square

For any real root β , we put $d_\beta = (\beta, \beta)/2$ and put $\beta^\vee = d_\beta^{-1} \beta$.

Proposition 2.3. *If β is in the same orbit as α_i for the W action on Φ , then $d_\beta = d_i$.*

Proof. The group W preserves the inner product $(-, -)$, so, if $\beta = u\alpha_i$, then $d_\beta = (\beta, \beta)/2 = (\alpha_i, \alpha_i)/2 = d_i$. \square

If $\beta = u\alpha_i$ then the **reflection over** β^\perp is the element $t := us_i u^{-1}$ in W . This element is determined by β , and in turn the pair $\pm\beta$ is determined by t . The reflection t acts on V by

$$t(x) = x - (\beta^\vee, x)\beta.$$

The set of all reflections in W is denoted T .

Let V^* be the dual vector space to V . We write $\langle -, - \rangle$ for the pairing between V^* and V . Let ω_i be the dual basis to α_i , so $\langle \omega_i, \alpha_j \rangle = \delta_{ij}$. We let W act on V^* by the dual action, so that $\langle w\eta, w\beta \rangle = \langle \eta, \beta \rangle$. The action on the ω basis is given by

$$s_i(\omega_j) = \begin{cases} -\omega_i + \sum_{k \neq i} (-A_{ik})\omega_k & i = j \\ \omega_j & i \neq j \end{cases}.$$

For $\beta \in \Phi$, we write β^\perp for the hyperplane $\{x \in V^* : \langle x, \beta \rangle = 0\}$. If t is the reflection over β , then β^\perp is the fixed plane for the t -action on V^* .

Let w be in the Coxeter group W . A **word** for w is any sequence $(s_{i_1}, s_{i_2}, \dots, s_{i_m})$ with $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_m} = w$. Such a word is called **reduced** if it is of minimal length among all such words; this minimal length is denoted $\ell(w)$.

A reflection $t \in T$ is called an **inversion** of w if $w^{-1} \beta_t$ is a negative root. The number of inversions of w is $\ell(w)$ and, if $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$ is any reduced word for w , then the inversions of w are $\{s_{i_1}, s_{i_1} s_{i_2} s_{i_1}, s_{i_1} s_{i_2} s_{i_3} s_{i_2} s_{i_1}, \dots, s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_\ell} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}\}$. We write $\text{inv}(w)$ for the set of inversions of w . It is often more convenient to work with $\text{inv}_\Phi(w) := \{\beta_u : u \in \text{inv}(w)\}$.

The **(right) weak order** is the partial order on W where $u \leq v$ if the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) $\ell(v) = \ell(u) + \ell(u^{-1}v)$
- (2) $\text{inv}(u) \subseteq \text{inv}(v)$
- (3) there is a reduced word $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$ for v such that $s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_k}$ is a reduced word for u for some $k \leq \ell$.

Weak order is ranked by the length function ℓ . If $u < v$ then $u = vs_i$ for some i with $\ell(v) = \ell(u) + 1$; in this case, we have $\text{inv}(v) = \text{inv}(u) \sqcup \{us_i u^{-1}\}$. We call $us_i u^{-1}$ the **cover reflection** of the cover $u < v$.

We write D for the simplicial cone $\{x \in V^* : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0\}$ and D° for its interior $\{x \in V^* : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle > 0\}$. The open cones wD° are disjoint, and the closed cones wD are the maximal cones of a fan called the **Coxeter fan**. The support of this fan, $\bigcup_{w \in W} wD$, is called the **Tits cone**. The two cones uD and vD border along a codimension one face if only if $u > v$ or $u < v$. If the cover reflection of this cover is t , then uD and vD border along a portion of the hyperplane β_t^\perp .

Finally, we address finiteness conditions. The following conditions are all equivalent:

- (1) The group W is finite.
- (2) The real root system Φ is finite.
- (3) The symmetric matrix $d_i A_{ij}$ is positive definite.

In this case we say that W , Φ and A are **of Dynkin type** or **finite type**. We label the Dynkin type root systems by their standard names A_n , B_n , C_n , D_n , E_6 , E_7 , E_8 , F_4 and G_2 in the usual way.

2.2. The root poset and positive expressions. Let β be a real root and s_i a simple reflection. Then $s_i(\beta) - \beta \in \mathbb{R}\alpha_i$. Define a partial order on Φ^+ by the transitive closure of the relation that $\beta \succ_\Phi s_i \beta$ if $\beta - s_i \beta \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \alpha_i$. (This is clearly an antisymmetric relation, since a positive linear combination of the α_i cannot be zero.) We will refer to this order as the **root poset**. Basic references for the root poset are [6], [19], [20], [5, Chapter 4.6] and [47]; we favor [47].

In the introduction, we introduced the notion of a **positive expression**: Given a positive root β , a **positive expression** for β is a factorization $\beta = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ such that for all $1 \leq k \leq r$, we have $s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j - s_{i_{k-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \alpha_{i_k}$. Thus, $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive expression if and only if $\alpha_j \prec_\Phi s_{i_1} \alpha_j \prec_\Phi s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j \prec_\Phi \cdots \prec_\Phi s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$. Our purpose in discussing the root poset is to prove foundational results about positive expressions.

Remark 2.4. There is another relation which is sometimes called the “root poset” and which we do not consider outside this remark. That relation is defined by $\beta \preceq_{\text{other}} \gamma$ if, writing $\beta = \sum b_i \alpha_i$ and $\gamma = \sum c_i \alpha_i$, we have $b_i \leq c_i$ for all i . Our relation $\beta \preceq_\Phi \gamma$ implies $\beta \preceq_{\text{other}} \gamma$ but not vice versa. For example, in type B_2 , let

α_1 be the short root and α_2 the long root. Then $\alpha_2 \prec_{\text{other}} \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \prec_{\text{other}} 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. In \prec_{Φ} , the relation $\alpha_2 \prec_{\Phi} 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ still holds, but $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$ is incomparable to both of these.

We have described \preceq_{Φ} geometrically in terms of roots, but it can also be described in terms of reflections as described by the following lemma:

Lemma 2.5. *Let t be a reflection and let s_i be a simple reflection not equal to t . Then $\beta_t - s_i\beta_t \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}\alpha_i$ if and only if s_i is an inversion of t ; in this case, $s_i\beta_t = \beta_{s_i t s_i}$.*

Proof. Let $c = (\alpha_i^{\vee}, \beta_t)$. Then $s_i\beta_t = \beta_t - c\alpha_i$, so $\beta_t \prec_{\Phi} s_i\beta_t$ if and only if $c > 0$. But also, $t\alpha_i = \alpha_i - \frac{d_i}{d_{\beta}}c\beta_t$. Since $t \neq s_i$, the root β_t has a nonnegative coefficient on some α_j which is not α_i . Then the coefficient of α_j in $t\alpha_i$ has sign matching that of c , so $t\alpha_i$ is a negative root if and only if $c > 0$. \square

Thus, \prec_{Φ} can also be described as a partial order on T which is the transitive closure of $s_i t s_i \prec_{\Phi} t$ if s_i is an inversion of t (for $t \neq s_i$).

We now summarize the main results on \prec_{Φ} :

Theorem 2.6 ([47, Proposition 2.1]). *The root poset is graded by $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. The grading function is denoted d and called **depth**, and we have $d(\beta_t) = (\ell(t) - 1)/2$. For any root β and any simple reflection s_i , we have $d(\beta) = d(s_i\beta)$ if and only if $\beta = s_i\beta$. If equality does not hold, then $d(\beta) = d(s_i\beta) \pm 1$; in this case, $s_i\beta$ covers β if $d(s_i\beta) = d(\beta) + 1$ and β covers $s_i\beta$ if $d(s_i\beta) = d(\beta) - 1$. The \prec_{Φ} minimal elements of Φ^+ are the simple roots, $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\}$.*

Corollary 2.7. *Let t be a reflection and let β_t be the corresponding positive root. Let $s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \cdots s_{i_1} s_j s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_k} = t$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1) $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive expression for β_t
- (2) $\alpha_j \prec_{\Phi} s_{i_1} \alpha_j \prec_{\Phi} s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j \cdots \prec_{\Phi} s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ in \prec_{Φ} .
- (3) $\alpha_j \prec_{\Phi} s_{i_1} \alpha_j \prec_{\Phi} s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j \cdots \prec_{\Phi} s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ in \prec_{Φ} and every comparison in this chain is a cover.
- (4) We have $k = d(\beta_t)$.
- (5) We have $\ell(t) = 2k + 1$.
- (6) The word $t = s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \cdots s_{i_1} s_j s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{k-1}} s_{i_k}$ is reduced.

Proof. Note that, from the hypothesis $s_{i_k} s_{i_{k-1}} \cdots s_{i_1} s_j s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_k} = t$, we have $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j = \pm \beta_t$. Under each condition, the sign will be $+$; sometimes this will be obvious and sometimes it will take a small argument.

If Condition 2 holds, then in particular $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive root, so $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j = \beta_t$. By definition, Conditions 1 and 2 are then equivalent. From Theorem 2.6, if $\gamma \prec_{\Phi} s_i \gamma$ then this relation is a cover, showing that Conditions 2 and 3 are equivalent.

Assuming Condition 3, we must have $\beta_t = s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$, and the depth of $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ must be the length of the chain, namely k .

We now show that Condition 4 implies 3. It is convenient (as Stembridge does) to extend the definition of the root poset to negative roots. This extended poset is now graded by \mathbb{Z} , with $-\beta_t$ at depth $(-\ell(t) - 1)/2$; see [47, Proposition 2.1]. With this extended definition, we can say that, in the sequence of roots $(\alpha_j, s_{i_1} \alpha_j, s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j, \dots, s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j)$, each root is either equal to its neighbor or adjacent to its neighbor in the Hasse diagram of \prec_{Φ} , so $1 - k \leq$

$d(s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j) \leq k$. So, assuming Condition 4, we must have $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j = \beta_t$ and every step in the sequence must be a cover, showing Condition 3.

We have $d(\beta_t) = (\ell(t) - 1)/2$, so the equivalence of 4 and 5 is immediate. The equivalence of conditions 5 and 6 is also immediate. \square

Since the only \prec_{Φ} minimal elements of Φ^+ are the simple roots, $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, this in particular means

Corollary 2.8. *Any positive root has a positive expression.*

Corollary 2.8 is important to us because we describe bricks of dimension vector β recursively, with the recursion taking place along a positive expression for β .

Given a reflection t and a simple reflection s_j , Stembridge defines x to be an **agent of t for s_j** if $t = x s_j x^{-1}$ and $\ell(t) = 2\ell(x) + 1$. In this vocabulary, we can restate Condition 6 from Corollary 2.7:

Corollary 2.9. *Let t be a reflection and let β_t be the corresponding positive root. Then $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive expression for β_t if and only if $x := s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$ is an agent of t for s_j and $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$ is a reduced word for x . In this case, $s_{i_k} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} s_j s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_k}$ is a reduced word for t . This is a bijection between positive expressions for β_t and palindromic reduced words for t .*

We now discuss the relation between positive expressions for β_t and inversions of t . Let t be a reflection. Recall that $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$ is the set of positive roots γ such that $t\gamma = \gamma - (\beta_t^{\vee}, \gamma)\beta_t$ is a negative root. This implies:

Corollary 2.10. *The map $\gamma \mapsto -t\gamma$ is an involution on the set $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$; the only fixed point of this involution is β_t .*

Proof. By the definition of an inversion, if $\gamma \in \text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$, then $-t\gamma$ is a positive root. We have $t(-t\gamma) = -\gamma$, which is a negative root, so γ is also in $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$ in this situation. This shows that $\gamma \mapsto -t\gamma$ maps $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$ to itself. We clearly have $-t(-t\gamma) = t^2\gamma = \gamma$, so this is an involution. Let γ be fixed by this involution. We know that $t\gamma = \gamma + c\beta_t$ for some scalar c , so we have $-\gamma + c\beta_t = \gamma$ or $\gamma = (c/2)\beta_t$. The only positive root proportional to β_t is β_t , so this only happens for $\gamma = \beta_t$. \square

Proposition 2.11. *Let t be a reflection, let β_t be the corresponding positive root, and let $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β_t . Set $\delta_k = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_{k+1}} \alpha_k$. Let γ be an element of $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$ other than β_t . Then exactly one of γ and $-t\gamma$ occurs in the list $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_r\}$.*

Proof. We abbreviate $x = s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$. Since $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive expression for β_t , we know that $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_1} s_j s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_{r-1}} s_{i_r}$ is a reduced word for t . Thus, the $2r + 1$ inversions of t are associated to the r positive roots of the form $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_{k+1}} \alpha_k = \delta_k$, to the positive root $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j = \beta_t$, and to the r positive roots $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} s_j s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{k-1}} \alpha_k$. In the last case, we have

$$\begin{aligned} s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} s_j s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{k-1}} \alpha_k &= x s_j s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{k-1}} \alpha_k = x s_j x^{-1} s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_k} \alpha_k = \\ &= x s_j x^{-1} s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_{k+1}} \alpha_k = -t\delta_k. \end{aligned}$$

In short, the elements of $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$ are $\{\delta_r, \delta_{r-1}, \dots, \delta_1, \beta_t, -t\delta_1, \dots, -t\delta_{r-1}, -t\delta_r\}$ so exactly one of $\{\gamma, -t\gamma\}$ occurs in the list $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_r\}$ and the other occurs in the list $\{-t\delta_1, -t\delta_2, \dots, -t\delta_r\}$. \square

Remark 2.12. In many cases, given t and s_j , there is a unique agent of t for s_j . See Theorem 2.6 of [47] for conditions under which this holds; in particular, it holds whenever the Coxeter diagram of W is a forest, hence in all Dynkin types and in all affine types except for \tilde{A} . However, this is not always the case: In type \tilde{A}_2 , both $(s_2 s_3 s_1 s_2 s_3)\alpha_1$ and $(s_3 s_2 s_1 s_3 s_2)\alpha_1$ are positive expressions for $2\alpha_1 + 3\alpha_2 + 3\alpha_3$, but $s_2 s_3 s_1 s_2 s_3 \neq s_3 s_2 s_1 s_3 s_2$.

2.3. Rank two subsystems and cutting. We define a subset R of Φ to be a *rank two subsystem* if $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} R$ is two dimensional and $R = \Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}} R$. We write $R^+ = R \cap \Phi^+$ and $R^- = R \cap \Phi^-$. There are always two roots β_1 and β_2 in R^+ such that all roots in R^+ can be written as $c_1\beta_1 + c_2\beta_2$ for $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$; these are called the *fundamental roots* in R . (See [43, Section 2.4] for a presentation very close to this paper's perspective; see [14] and [16] for early references.)

Remark 2.13. We will always discuss rank two sub-root systems using the geometric language above. However, bijecting Φ^+ with T , it is possible to define them as subsets of T instead. Namely, $R \subset T$ corresponds to a rank two subsystem if (1) the subgroup $\langle R \rangle$ generated by R is dihedral (it may be the infinite dihedral group) and (2) there is not a larger subset $R' \supsetneq R$ such that $\langle R' \rangle$ is dihedral (again, including the infinite dihedral group). If $R \subset T$ corresponds to a rank two subsystem and $p \in R$, then p corresponds to a fundamental root if and only if $\text{inv}(p) \cap R = \{p\}$.

Let β be a positive root and let R be a rank two subsystem containing it. We will say that R *cuts* β^\perp if β is not a fundamental root of R .

Proposition 2.14. *Let t be a reflection, let β_t be the corresponding positive root, and let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β_t . Then the following sets of rank two subsystems are equal:*

- (1) *The set of rank two subsystems R such that R cuts β_t^\perp .*
- (2) *The set of rank two subsystems of the form $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, \gamma)$ where γ is an element of $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$ other than β_t .*
- (3) *The set of rank two subsystems of the form $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, \delta_k)$ where $\delta_k = s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_{k+1}} \alpha_k$.*

If x is any agent of t for s_j , this is also the same as the set of rank two subsystems of the form $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, \delta)$ for $\delta \in \text{inv}(x)$.

Proof. The last sentence is a restatement of the third numbered condition, since x is an agent of t for s_j if and only if $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive expression for β_t with $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$ a reduced word for x . So we check equivalence of the numbered conditions.

First, suppose that R cuts β_t^\perp . Let β_1 and β_2 be the fundamental roots of R and let $\beta_t = c_1\beta_1 + c_2\beta_2$. We have $-\beta_t = t(\beta_t) = c_1 t\beta_1 + c_2 t\beta_2$, so at least one of $t\beta_1$ and $t\beta_2$ is a negative root, and thus, either β_1 or β_2 is an inversion of t , without loss of generality say β_1 . Since we assumed that R cuts β_t^\perp , we have $\beta_t \neq \beta_1$. Then $R = \Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_1, \beta_t)$.

Now, suppose that R is of the form $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, \gamma)$ where γ is an element of $\text{inv}_{\Phi}(t)$ other than β_t . Then we also have $R = \Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, -t\gamma)$. By Proposition 2.11, either γ or $-t\gamma$ occurs among the δ_k .

Finally, suppose that R is of the form $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, \delta_k)$. Then δ_k and $-\delta_k$ are both inversions of t and, in particular are both positive roots. The root β_t is a positive linear combination of δ_k and $-\delta_k$, so β_t is not fundamental in R . \square

Corollary 2.15. *Given a positive root β_t , the number of rank two subsystems cutting β_t^\perp is at most $(\ell(t) - 1)/2$. In particular, it is finite.*

Proof. In the notation of the previous proposition, $k = (\ell(t) - 1)/2$. So k is the number of roots $\{\delta_1, \delta_2, \dots, \delta_k\}$, and at most k rank two subsystems cut β_t^\perp . (The number may be less than k because we may have $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, \delta_i) = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta_t, \delta_j)$ for $i \neq j$.) \square

Corollary 2.16. *Let $\beta \prec_{\Phi} s_i \beta$ be a cover in the root poset. Then the set of rank two subsystems cutting $(s_i \beta)^\perp$ is the union of*

- (1) *The set of rank two subsystems of the form $s_i R$, where R cuts β^\perp and*
- (2) *The rank two subsystem $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\alpha_i, \beta) \cap \Phi$.*

Proof. Let $s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β . Then $s_i s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive expression for $s_i \beta$. We use criterion (3) from Proposition 2.14. Let $\delta_k = s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_{k+1}} \alpha_k$. Criterion (3) shows that β^\perp is cut by those subsystems of the form $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta, \delta_k)$, and that $(s_i \beta)^\perp$ is cut by subsystems of the form $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_i \beta, s_i \delta_k)$, and also by $\Phi \cap \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_i \beta, \alpha_i)$. We have $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_i \beta, s_i \delta_k) = s_i \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta, \delta_k)$ and $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(s_i \beta, \alpha_i) = \text{Span}_{\mathbb{R}}(\beta, \alpha_i)$, as desired. \square

Remark 2.17. Let W be a Coxeter group and let t be a reflection in W . Then the set of rank two subsystems R cutting β_t , when considered as subsets of T (using Remark 2.13) depends only on W and t and not on the choice of Cartan matrix. This is because the notion of x being an agent of t for s_j can be defined without the Cartan matrix (it is equivalent to $t = x s_j x^{-1}$ with $\ell(t) = 2\ell(x) + 1$), the notion of being an inversion of x can be defined without the Cartan matrix, and the notion of the rank two subsystem spanned by two reflections can be defined without the Cartan matrix (see Remark 2.13).

3. SHARDS

Let β be a positive root and let R be a rank two subsystem containing β . Let β^\perp and R^\perp be the $n - 1$ dimensional and $n - 2$ dimensional subspaces in V^* orthogonal to β and R respectively, so R^\perp is a hyperplane in β^\perp . For a fixed β , there are only finitely many rank two subsystems that cut β (Corollary 2.15); the corresponding linear spaces R^\perp are thus an arrangement of finitely many hyperplanes in β^\perp . We'll call this hyperplane arrangement the **shard arrangement** in β^\perp , and we call the (closed) regions of the hyperplane arrangement complement **shards of β^\perp** .

Example 3.1. Figure 1 depicts the six shards of the B_2 reflection arrangement.




FIGURE 1. The six shards of the B_2 reflection arrangement

Remark 3.2. In contrast to Lemma 2.5 and Remarks 2.13 and 2.17, the shards really do depend on the choice of Cartan matrix, not solely on the Coxeter group. See Section 7.1 for further discussion.

Remark 3.3. Shards were introduced by Nathan Reading [41]. There are two unimportant differences between our terminology and that of Reading. First, Reading has a standing hypothesis that W is finite, which we do not need. Second, Reading says that β_1 and β_2 cut γ^\perp where β_1 and β_2 are the fundamental roots of R , rather than saying that R cuts γ^\perp . We believe that the focus on R rather than β_1, β_2 is clarifying.

We now define a very different, recursive description of shards. Let K be a convex polyhedral cone in V^* . Recall from the introduction that we define

$$\sigma_i^+(K) := s_i(K \cap \{x : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0\}) \text{ and } \sigma_i^-(K) := s_i(K \cap \{x : \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0\}).$$

Proposition 3.4. *Let $\beta \succ_{\Phi} \beta'$ be a cover in the root poset, with $\beta = s_i \beta'$. Then the set of shards of β^\perp is the set of cones $\sigma_i^+(K')$ and $\sigma_i^-(K')$ which are of dimension $n - 1$, where K' ranges over shards of $(\beta')^\perp$.*

Proof. We have $(s_i R)^\perp = s_i(R^\perp)$. Thus, by Corollary 2.16, if H'_1, H'_2, \dots, H'_k are the hyperplanes forming the shard arrangement in $(\beta')^\perp$, then the hyperplanes forming the shard arrangement in β^\perp are $s_i H'_1, s_i H'_2, \dots, s_i H'_k$ and $\alpha_i^\perp \cap \beta^\perp$. The regions of the hyperplane arrangement formed by $s_i H'_1, s_i H'_2, \dots, s_i H'_k$ are simply the images under s_i of the regions of the shard hyperplane arrangement in β' . Adding in $\alpha_i^\perp \cap \beta^\perp$ cuts each of these regions by intersecting it with the half planes where $\langle -, \alpha_i \rangle$ is positive or negative. Since shards are $(n - 1)$ -dimensional cones by definition, the shards of β^\perp are the $(n - 1)$ -dimensional cones of the form $s_i(K') \cap \{x : \pm \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0\}$, where K' runs over shards of β' and we consider both signs. This is the same as $s_i(K' \cap \{x : \mp \langle x, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0\}) = \sigma^\mp(K')$. \square

The statement of Proposition 3.4 requires that the shards $\sigma_i^\pm(K')$ be of dimension $n - 1$, so we pause to give an example where this fails:

Example 3.5. Let us consider type D_4 , with Cartan matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 2 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Put $\beta' = s_2 s_3 s_4 \alpha_1 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4$ and $\beta = s_1 \beta' = 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_4$. The root β' is cut by the three subsystems $\{\alpha_i, \beta', \beta' - \alpha_i\}$ for $i \in \{2, 3, 4\}$. These define three hyperplanes in the three dimensional space $(\beta')^\perp$, cutting $(\beta')^\perp$ into eight shards. Explicitly, $(\beta')^\perp = \{\sum_{i=1}^4 c_i \omega_i \in V^* : \sum_{i=1}^4 c_i = 0\}$, and the shards correspond to the eight choices of signs for (c_2, c_3, c_4) .

The six cones where c_2, c_3 and c_4 do not all have the same sign are cut in half by α_1^\perp , so the reflections of these halves each contribute shards of β . The two cones where c_2, c_3 and c_4 do have the same sign lie entirely to one side of α_1^\perp , so they only contribute one shard of β . To put it another way, for each of these two cones, applying one of σ_1^\pm yields the reflection of the shard, while applying the other yields $\{0\}$. There are, in total, fourteen shards with normal vector β .

Applying Proposition 3.4 repeatedly, we obtain Theorem 3.6 from the Introduction, which we restate here:

Theorem 3.6. *Let β be any positive root and let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β . Then the set of shards of β^\perp is the set of polyhedral cones of the*

form $\sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^\perp)$ which are of dimension $n - 1$, where the signs $\pm_1, \pm_2, \dots, \pm_r$ may be chosen independently.

4. BACKGROUND FROM REPRESENTATION THEORY

4.1. The preprojective algebra, symmetric case. In this section, we explain the standard construction of the preprojective algebra associated to a symmetric Cartan matrix; we will discuss symmetrizable Cartan matrices in the next section. Thus, in this section, let $d_1 = d_2 = \cdots = d_n = 1$, so the Cartan matrix A is symmetric. Let Γ be the quiver with vertices $1, 2, \dots, n$ and $-A_{ij}$ arrows $i \rightarrow j$. We have $-A_{ij} = -A_{ji}$, and we choose a bijection $a \mapsto a^*$ between the arrows $i \rightarrow j$ and those from $j \rightarrow i$, with $(a^*)^* = a$. We write $i \xrightarrow{a} j$ or $j \xleftarrow{a} i$ to indicate that a is the label of an arrow from i to j .

Fix a ground field κ , and we write $\kappa\Gamma$ for the path algebra of γ over κ . Our convention for the order of multiplication in the path algebra is that, if $k \xleftarrow{b} j$ and $j \xleftarrow{a} i$ then ba is the path $k \xleftarrow{b} j \xleftarrow{a} i$.

Let sgn be any map from the set of arrows to $\{\pm 1\}$ such that $\text{sgn}(a^*) = -\text{sgn}(a)$ for all a . Different choices will produce isomorphic algebras.

We define the **preprojective algebra** Λ to be the quotient of $\kappa\Gamma$ by the relations

$$\sum_j \sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \text{sgn}(a) a^* a = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

A module over the preprojective algebra is thus a collection of κ -vector spaces M_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and, for each arrow $i \xrightarrow{a} j$, a map $a : M_i \rightarrow M_j$ obeying the above relations.

An easy way to satisfy the preprojective relation is to ensure that, for each pair $i \neq j$, either all the maps $M_i \rightarrow M_j$ are zero or vice versa. In that case, M can be thought of as a module over a path algebra for some orientation of Γ .

4.2. The preprojective algebra, symmetrizable case. It is not difficult to extend the definition of the preprojective algebra to the case where A is symmetrizable, although it is harder to find references for this case. We explain how it should be done. Our approach follows a much more general approach of Kulshammer [34]. The reader who does not want to think about this may always take all the d_i to be 1 and all the $\kappa(d_i)$ to be κ , at the expense of only considering symmetric Cartan matrices.

Let d_1, \dots, d_n be positive integers and let A_{ij} be a crystallographic symmetrizable Cartan matrix with $d_i A_{ij} = d_j A_{ji}$. Put $d_{ij} = \text{LCM}(d_i, d_j)$ and let $L = \text{LCM}(d_1, \dots, d_n)$. Let $\kappa(L)/\kappa$ be an Galois extension of fields with Galois group cyclic of order L . For d dividing L , let $\kappa(d)$ be the unique degree d extension of κ within $\kappa(L)$. For example, we could take $\kappa = \mathbb{F}_p$ and $\kappa(L) = \mathbb{F}_{p^L}$ or, if $L = 2$, we could take $\kappa = \mathbb{R}$ and $\kappa(2) = \mathbb{C}$.

Let Γ be the quiver with vertices $1, \dots, n$ and $-d_i A_{ij}/d_{ij}$ arrows $i \rightarrow j$. Note that this quantity is symmetrical in i and j , so we can again choose a bijection $a \mapsto a^*$ between arrows $i \rightarrow j$ and $j \rightarrow i$ with $(a^*)^* = a$. Let $E(j \leftarrow i)$ be a $\kappa(d_{ij})$ -vector space with a basis given by arrows $i \rightarrow j$, and define a $\kappa(d_{ij})$ -bilinear pairing $E(j \leftarrow i) \times E(i \leftarrow j) \rightarrow \kappa(d_{ij})$ such that $a \mapsto a^*$ sends each basis to its dual.

$E(j \leftarrow i)$ is also a $\kappa(d_i)$ -vector space and a $\kappa(d_j)$ -vector space, by the inclusions of $\kappa(d_i)$ and $\kappa(d_j)$ into $\kappa(d_{ij})$. So by composing with the field trace maps $\text{tr}_{\kappa(d_i)} : \kappa(d_{ij}) \rightarrow \kappa(d_i)$ and $\text{tr}_{\kappa(d_j)} : \kappa(d_{ij}) \rightarrow \kappa(d_j)$, we get $\kappa(d_i)$ - and $\kappa(d_j)$ -bilinear pairings, respectively. This data determines a **dualizable species of algebras** associated to Q in the sense of [34, Definitions 2.2 and 4.4].

We define the **path algebra** to be

$$\bigoplus E(i_N \leftarrow i_{N-1}) \otimes_{\kappa(d_{i_{N-1}})} E(i_{N-1} \leftarrow i_{N-2}) \otimes_{\kappa(d_{i_{N-2}})} \otimes \cdots \otimes_{\kappa(d_{i_1})} E(i_1 \leftarrow i_0)$$

where the direct sum is over all sequences i_0, i_1, \dots, i_N with adjacent elements distinct. Here a length zero path is still considered to have a given start and end point (which are equal) and the summand corresponding to the length zero path from i to i is $\kappa(d_i)$; we denote the path by e_i . Multiplication is defined in the obvious way by concatenating tensors. Further, a representation of the path algebra is a collection V_i , where V_i is a $\kappa(d_i)$ -vector space, with $\kappa(d_j)$ -linear maps $V_{j \leftarrow i} : E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} V_i \rightarrow V_j$.

Now for any pair $i \neq j$, let b_1^i, \dots, b_p^i be a $\kappa(d_j)$ -basis of $\kappa(d_{ij})$, and let $(b_1^i)^*, \dots, (b_p^i)^*$ be the dual basis under the trace pairing $(b, b') \mapsto \text{tr}_{\kappa(d_j)}(bb')$. (See [35, Section VI.5] for a quick introduction to the trace pairing.)

Finally, define a map sgn from pairs of vertices i, j to $\{\pm 1\}$ such that $\text{sgn}(i, j) = -\text{sgn}(j, i)$.

Then the **preprojective algebra**, Λ , is the quotient of the path algebra by the relations

$$\sum_j \text{sgn}(i, j) \sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \sum_k (b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes a b_k^{ji} = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq n.$$

This relation does not depend on the above choice of basis [34, Corollary 4.2], and different choices of sgn will produce isomorphic algebras [34, Lemma 4.9].

We define a representation to be **finite dimensional** if all the M_i are finite dimensional over κ . If A is of Dynkin type, then Λ is a finite dimensional algebra over κ [15] so all finitely generated Λ -modules are finite dimensional, but this does not hold for A not of Dynkin type. For a finite dimensional Λ -module M , we put

$$\dim M = \sum (\dim_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i) \alpha_i.$$

We define a representation to be **nilpotent** if there is a positive integer N such that, for any path $i_0 \xrightarrow{a_1} i_1 \xrightarrow{a_2} i_2 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow i_{N-1} \xrightarrow{a_N} i_N$ through Γ , the induced map $M_{i_0} \rightarrow M_{i_N}$ is zero. If A is of Dynkin type, then all Λ -modules are nilpotent.

Example 4.1. We consider the B_2 Cartan matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 2 & -2 \\ -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ with $d_1 = 1$ and $d_2 = 2$. We put $\kappa(1) = \mathbb{R}$ and $\kappa(2) = \mathbb{C}$. So a Λ module consists of a real vector space M_1 , a complex vector space M_2 , a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} M_1 \rightarrow M_2$ (which we can identify with an \mathbb{R} -linear map $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_2$) and a \mathbb{R} -linear map $\mathbb{C} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} M_2 \rightarrow M_1$ (which we can identify with an \mathbb{R} -linear map $g : M_2 \rightarrow M_1$). These maps must satisfy the relations $gf = 0$ and $\frac{i}{2}fgi - \frac{1}{2}fg = 0$ (the latter is equivalent to $-ifg = fgi$).

The algebra Λ satisfies a useful property relating it back to the combinatorics of the Cartan matrix.

Theorem 4.2. *Let M and N be left Λ -modules, which are finite dimensional over our ground field κ . Then*

$$\dim_{\kappa}(\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, N)) - \dim_{\kappa}(\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(M, N)) + \dim_{\kappa}(\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(N, M)) = (\dim M, \dim N)$$

This theorem is well-known in the symmetric case [10, Lemma 1] but has not been documented in this model of the symmetrizable case. Appendix A outlines how to adapt a proof in the symmetric case to this setting.

4.3. Stability. Let M be a Λ -module. Let $\theta \in V^*$. Following [33], we say that M is θ -**semistable** if $\langle \theta, \dim M \rangle = 0$ and, for any subrepresentation N of M , we have $\langle \theta, \dim N \rangle \geq 0$. We say that M is θ -**stable** if the latter inequality is strict for $N \neq 0, M$. We remark that θ -semistability of M is equivalent to asking that $\langle \theta, \dim Q \rangle \leq 0$ for all quotient representations Q of M .

We write $\text{Stab}(M)$ for the set of $\theta \in V^*$ for which M is semistable and $\text{Stab}^\circ(M)$ for those θ for which M is stable. Since there are only finitely many possible dimension vectors of subrepresentations of M , we see that $\text{Stab}(M)$ is a closed polyhedral cone in $(\dim M)^\perp$. $\text{Stab}^\circ(M)$ is either empty (if M contains a subrepresentation with dimension vector proportional to $\dim(M)$) or is the interior of $\text{Stab}(M)$ within $(\dim M)^\perp$ (otherwise). In particular, if $\text{Stab}(M)$ has dimension less than $n-1$, then $\text{Stab}^\circ(M)$ is empty.

Remark 4.3. Let M be a Λ -module and suppose the Λ -action on M factors through a quotient algebra R . Then being an R -submodule of M is the same as being a Λ -submodule, so the notions of stability and semi-stability are not affected by passing to such a quotient.

4.4. Reflection functors. Fix a vertex i of Γ , and let S_i be the module assigning the space $\kappa(d_i)$ to vertex i and 0 to all other vertices. Let NoSub_i be the full subcategory of the category of Λ -modules consisting of those modules for which S_i is not a submodule and let NoQuot_i be the full subcategory where S_i is not a quotient.

Baumann and Kamnitzer [3] introduce, in the symmetric case, mutually inverse equivalences of categories

$$\Sigma_i : \text{NoQuot}_i \rightarrow \text{NoSub}_i \quad \Sigma_i^{-1} : \text{NoSub}_i \rightarrow \text{NoQuot}_i$$

and Külshammer [34] generalizes them to a setting including our symmetrizable case. We also have canonical morphisms $\Sigma_i^{-1}(M) \rightarrow M$ and $M \rightarrow \Sigma_i(M)$. We now describe these functors.

Remark 4.4. Baumann–Kamnitzer and Külshammer define Σ_i and Σ_i^{-1} on all of $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$ and then prove their restrictions to NoSub_i and NoQuot_i are inverse. We will adopt the different convention that $\Sigma_i(M)$ is only defined for $M \in \text{NoQuot}_i$ and $\Sigma_i^{-1}(M)$ for $M \in \text{NoSub}_i$.

For $M \in \text{mod}(\Lambda)$, define $M_{\partial i}$ to be the $\kappa(d_i)$ -vector space

$$M_{\partial i} := \bigoplus_{j \neq i} E(i \leftarrow j) \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j.$$

We note that

$$\dim_{\kappa(d_i)} M_{\partial i} = \sum_{j \neq i} (-A_{ij}) \dim_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j.$$

We have a $\kappa(d_i)$ -linear map $M_{i,\text{in}} : M_{\partial i} \rightarrow M_i$ which, in the j th summand, is the map $\text{sgn}(i, j) M_{i \leftarrow j} : E(i \leftarrow j) \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j \rightarrow M_i$.

Additionally, there is a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_{\kappa(d_j)}(E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i, M_j) \cong \text{Hom}_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i, E(i \leftarrow j) \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j).$$

Given $f : E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i \rightarrow M_j$, let $f^\vee : M_i \rightarrow E(i \leftarrow j) \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j$ be the corresponding map under this isomorphism; given $g : M_i \rightarrow E(i \leftarrow j) \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j$, let $g^\wedge : E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i \rightarrow M_j$ be the corresponding map on the other side. The reader who only cares about the symmetric case can think of all tensor products as being over the same ground field.

Then we additionally have a $\kappa(d_i)$ -linear map $M_{i,\text{out}} : M_i \rightarrow M_{\partial i}$ which, in the j th summand, is the map $M_{j \leftarrow i}^\vee : M_i \rightarrow E(i \leftarrow j) \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j$. For M to satisfy the relation defining the preprojective algebra is equivalent to $M_{i,\text{in}} \circ M_{i,\text{out}} = 0$ ([34], Proposition 4.12). The condition that $M \in \text{NoSub}_i$ (respectively NoQuot_i) is equivalent to saying that $M_{i,\text{out}}$ (respectively $M_{i,\text{in}}$) is injective (respectively surjective).

Let $M \in \text{NoQuot}_i$. We define $\Sigma_i(M)$ as follows: $\Sigma_i(M)_i = \text{Ker}(M_{i,\text{in}})$ and $\Sigma(M)_j = M_j$ for $j \neq i$. Since the composition $M_{i,\text{in}} \circ M_{i,\text{out}}$ is 0, we have a factorization indicated by the vertical arrow below, and the maps in and out of $\Sigma_i(M)_i$ are given by the diagonal arrows.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & \Sigma_i(M)_i & \equiv & \text{Ker}(M_{i,\text{in}}) & & \\
 & \nearrow \Sigma_i(M)_{i,\text{in}} & \uparrow & & \nwarrow \Sigma_i(M)_{i,\text{out}} & & \\
 & & \vdots & & & & \\
 M_{\partial i} & \xrightarrow{M_{i,\text{in}}} & M_i & \xrightarrow{M_{i,\text{out}}} & M_{\partial i} & \twoheadrightarrow & M_i
 \end{array}$$

For $j, k \neq i$, the map(s) $\Sigma_i(M)_j \rightarrow \Sigma_i(M)_k$ are the same as the map(s) $M_j \rightarrow M_k$.

The natural map $M \rightarrow \Sigma_i(M)$ is given by the vertical arrow at vertex i and the identity at all other vertices.

Similarly, if $M \in \text{NoSub}_i$, then we define $\Sigma_i^{-1}(M)_i = \text{CoKer}(M_{i,\text{out}})$ and $\Sigma(M)_j = M_j$ for $j \neq i$. For $j, k \neq i$, the map(s) $\Sigma_i(M)_j \rightarrow \Sigma_i(M)_k$ are the same as the map(s) $M_j \rightarrow M_k$; the maps to and from $\Sigma_i^{-1}(M)_i$ are defined by the commutativity of the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 M_i & \xleftarrow{M_{i,\text{out}}} & M_{\partial i} & \xrightarrow{M_{i,\text{in}}} & M_i & \xleftarrow{M_{i,\text{out}}} & M_{\partial i} \\
 & & \searrow \Sigma_i^-(M)_{i,\text{in}} & & \uparrow & & \nearrow \Sigma_i^-(M)_{i,\text{out}} \\
 & & & & \text{CoKer}(M_{i,\text{out}}) & \equiv & \Sigma_i^{-1}(M)_i
 \end{array}$$

The natural map $\Sigma_i^{-1}(M) \rightarrow M$ is given by the vertical arrow at vertex i and the identity at all other vertices.

We refer to the functors $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots, \Sigma_n, \Sigma_1^{-1}, \Sigma_2^{-1}, \dots, \Sigma_n^{-1}$ collectively as **reflection functors**. This name is explained by the following result:

Proposition 4.5. *Let M be a finite dimensional Λ module. Whenever the left hand sides of the following equalities are defined, the equality holds:*

$$\dim \Sigma_i(M) = s_i(\dim M) \quad \dim \Sigma_i^{-1}(M) = s_i(\dim M).$$

Proof. We do the case of $\Sigma_i(M)$, the case of $\Sigma_i^{-1}(M)$ is analogous. Since $M \in \text{NoQuot}_i$, $M_{\partial i} \rightarrow M_i$ is surjective, and we have

$$\dim_{\kappa(d_i)} \Sigma_i(M)_i = \dim_{\kappa(d_i)} M_{\partial i} - \dim_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i = \sum_{j \neq i} -A_{ij} \dim_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j - \dim_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i$$

and, for $j \neq i$,

$$\dim_{\kappa(d_j)} \Sigma_i(M)_j = \dim_{\kappa(d_j)} M_j.$$

Thus

$$\dim \Sigma_i(M) = \dim M - (\alpha_i^\vee, \dim M) \alpha_i = s_i(\dim M). \quad \square$$

4.5. Bricks. Let B be a finite dimensional Λ -module. Then B is defined to be a **brick** if every nonzero endomorphism of B is invertible. So $\text{End}(B)$ is a division algebra.

Example 4.6. Continuing Example 4.1, we list the bricks of Λ and their dimension vectors:

M_1	M_2	$\dim M$
\mathbb{R}	0	α_1
0	\mathbb{C}	α_2
$\mathbb{R} \xrightarrow{1} \mathbb{C}$		$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$
$\mathbb{R} \xleftarrow{\text{Re}} \mathbb{C}$		$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$
$\mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{1} \mathbb{C}$		$2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$
$\mathbb{C} \xleftarrow{1} \mathbb{C}$		$2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2$

The reader can check that the dimension vectors of these representations are precisely the real roots, and the bricks of a given dimension β are in bijection with the shards of β^\perp , as shown in Figure 1.

Remark 4.7. If the Λ action on B factors through a quotient algebra R of Λ , then $\text{End}_\Lambda(B) = \text{End}_R(B)$, so B is a brick when considered as a Λ -module if and only if it is when considered as an R -module.

Remark 4.8. In many cases, when B is a brick, $\text{End}(B)$ is a field. For example, if κ is algebraically closed, then the only division algebra which is finite dimensional over κ is κ , so $\text{End}(B) = \kappa$ for any brick B . If κ has trivial Brauer group (for example, if κ is finite), then all division algebras which are finite dimensional over κ are fields. We will prove in Corollary 5.2 that, for our primary focus, the shard modules, we always have $\text{End}(B) \cong \kappa(d_i)$ for some i .

Remark 4.9. In general, it is possible to obtain non-commutative division algebras. This occurs in affine type \tilde{C}_2 , with the representation $\mathbb{C}^2 \leftarrow \mathbb{R}^4 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$ where the left map is $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \mapsto (x_1 + ix_2, x_3 - ix_4)$ and the right map is $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) \mapsto (x_1 + ix_3, x_2 + ix_4)$. The endomorphism ring of this example is the ring of quaternions \mathbb{H} . (Proof sketch: Think of the middle vector space as \mathbb{H} , with (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) being the quaternion $x_1 + x_2I + x_3J + x_4K$. Then multiplication by i in the left and the right positions corresponds to $q \mapsto qI$ and $q \mapsto qJ$. An endomorphism of this quiver representation is an element of $\text{End}_{\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{H})$ which commutes with both of these; such endomorphisms are of the form $q \mapsto (a + bI + cJ + dK)q$.) We have defined this brick as a representation of the \tilde{C}_2 path algebra. We can lift it to a representation of the corresponding preprojective algebra by letting the reverse arrows act by zero. As discussed in Remark 4.7, the lifted representation is still a brick, but, in agreement with Corollary 5.2, it is not a real brick, as $(\dim B, \dim B) = 0$.

We record some basic observations:

Proposition 4.10. *Let B be a brick, i a vertex of Λ and assume $B \not\cong S_i$. Then B is in at least one of NoSub_i and NoQuot_i .*

Proof. We prove the contrapositive. Suppose there is an inclusion $S_i \hookrightarrow B$ and a surjection $B \twoheadrightarrow S_i$. Then the composition $B \twoheadrightarrow S_i \hookrightarrow B$ is a non-zero endomorphism of B . So either B is not a brick, or this composition is an isomorphism; in the latter case, $B \cong S_i$. \square

Proposition 4.11. *If $(\alpha_i, \dim M) > 0$ then M is in at most one of NoSub_i and NoQuot_i .*

Proof. By Theorem 4.2,

$$2(\alpha_i, \dim M) = \dim_{\kappa} \text{Hom}(S_i, M) - \dim_{\kappa} \text{Ext}^1(S_i, M) + \dim_{\kappa} \text{Hom}(M, S_i).$$

So, if $(\alpha_i, \dim M) > 0$ then at least one of $\text{Hom}(S_i, M)$ and $\text{Hom}(M, S_i)$ is nonzero. Since S_i is simple, any nonzero map from S_i is an injection and any nonzero map to S_i is a surjection. \square

Proposition 4.10 tells us that we can often apply reflection functors to bricks. We now consider interactions between bricks and reflection functors. Since Σ_i^{\pm} is an equivalence of categories, we have

$$\text{End}(B) \cong \text{End}(\Sigma_i(B)) \text{ and } \text{End}(B) \cong \text{End}(\Sigma_i^{-1}(B))$$

whenever these are defined. Thus

Proposition 4.12. *The reflection functors preserve the property of being a brick.*

Combining Propositions 4.5 and 4.12 we deduce:

Proposition 4.13. *The reflection functors preserve the property of being a real brick.*

This is a good time to prove Proposition 4.14, which gives alternative ways to think about the condition that $\dim B$ is a real root. We restate Proposition 4.14 for the reader's convenience.

Proposition 4.14. *Let B be a brick. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The vector $\dim B$ in V is a real root.*
- (2) *We have $(\dim B, \dim B) > 0$.*
- (3) *The brick B is rigid, meaning that $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(B, B) = 0$.*

Proof. The implication (1) \implies (2) is immediate, since we have $(\beta, \beta) > 0$ for any real root β .

The implication (3) \implies (2) is almost as quick: By Theorem 4.2, we have $(\dim B, \dim B) = \dim_{\kappa} \text{End}(B) - \dim_{\kappa} \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(B, B) + \dim_{\kappa} \text{End}(B)$. Under hypothesis (3), the right hand side is $2 \dim_{\kappa} \text{End}(B) > 0$.

We now show that (2) implies (1) and (3). Put $\beta = \dim B = \sum c_j \alpha_j$, so $c_j \geq 0$. We will prove these statements by induction on $\sum c_j$. In the base case, $\sum c_j = 1$, we know that β is a simple root, so B is a simple module and (1) and (3) are clear. Since we are assuming $(\beta, \beta) > 0$, we have $\sum c_j (\alpha_j, \beta) > 0$. So there is some index i for which $(\alpha_i, \beta) > 0$, and we fix i to refer to such an index.

Since B is a brick, we have either $B \in \text{NoSub}_i$ or $B \in \text{NoQuot}_i$, by Proposition 4.10. We treat the case that $B \in \text{NoSub}_i$, and the other case is similar. Put $B' = \Sigma_i^{-1}(B)$ and $\beta' = s_i \beta$. Then B' is a brick of dimension β' . Note that $(\beta', \beta') = (\beta, \beta) > 0$. Also, $\beta' = \beta - (\alpha_i^{\vee}, \beta) \alpha_i$ and $(\alpha_i^{\vee}, \beta) > 0$ so, by induction, β' is a real root and $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(B', B') = 0$.

Then $\beta = s_i \beta'$ is a real root as well. Since Σ_i^\pm is an equivalence of categories, we have $\text{End}(B) \cong \text{End}(B')$. Since $(\beta, \beta) = 2 \dim_\kappa \text{End}(B) - \dim_\kappa \text{Ext}^1(B, B)$ and $(\beta', \beta') = 2 \dim_\kappa \text{End}(B') - \dim_\kappa \text{Ext}^1(B', B')$, the inductive fact that $\text{Ext}^1(B', B') = 0$ implies $\text{Ext}^1(B, B) = 0$. \square

5. PROOFS OF THE MAIN THEOREMS

5.1. Proof of Theorem 5.1. We now prove Theorem 5.1 from the Introduction, which we restate for the reader's convenience:

Theorem 5.1. *Let β be a positive root and let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β . The bricks of dimension β are precisely the modules of the form $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} S_j$, where the signs must be chosen such that the expression is well-defined.*

Proof. By Proposition 4.13, any module of the form $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (S_j)$ is a real brick and, by Proposition 4.5, has dimension $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} (\alpha_j) = \beta$. So all modules of this form are real bricks of the correct dimension, and our task is to prove the converse.

Our proof is by induction on r . In the base case $r = 0$, we have $\beta = \alpha_j$, so the only module of dimension α_j is S_j , which is easily seen to be a brick.

We now consider the inductive case $r > 0$. We abbreviate $\beta' = s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} (\alpha_j)$ and $i = i_r$. So $\beta = s_i \beta'$ and $\beta \succ_\Phi \beta'$.

Let B be a brick of dimension β . By Proposition 4.10, we know that B is in at least one of NoSub_i and NoQuot_i . We'll treat the case that $B \in \text{NoSub}_i$; the other case is similar. Put $B' = \Sigma_i^{-1}(B)$. Then B' is, by Propositions 4.13 and 4.5, a brick of dimension β' . By induction, B' is of the form $\Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \cdots \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (S_j)$, and then $B = \Sigma_i(B) = \Sigma_{i_1} \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \cdots \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (S_j)$. \square

Corollary 5.2. *Let B be a real brick with dimension β and recall that $d_\beta = \beta/\beta^\vee = (\beta, \beta)/2$. Then $\text{End}(B) \cong \kappa(d_\beta)$.*

In particular, non-commutative division rings do not appear as endomorphism rings of real bricks.

Proof. Let

$$B \cong \Sigma_{i_1}^\pm \Sigma_{i_2}^\pm \cdots \Sigma_{i_t}^\pm (S_j)$$

Since the Σ_i^\pm are equivalences of categories (between NoQuot_i and NoSub_i), we have $\text{End}(B) \cong \text{End}(S_j) \cong \kappa(d_j)$. We just need to check that $d_\beta = d_j$. Indeed, we have $\beta = s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_t} \alpha_j$ so the result follows from Proposition 2.3. \square

5.2. Proof of Theorem 5.3. We now prove Theorem 5.3, which we restate for the reader's convenience:

Theorem 5.3. *Let β be a positive root, let $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ be a positive expression for β and let $\pm_1, \pm_2, \dots, \pm_r$ be a choice of signs such that $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm_r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm_2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm_1} S_j$ is defined. Then the brick $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm_r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm_2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm_1} S_j$ has stability domain $\sigma_{i_r}^{\pm_r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm_2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm_1} (\alpha_j^\pm)$.*

This will follow by an immediate recursion once we prove the following:

Proposition 5.4. *Let β and β' be positive roots with $\beta = s_i \beta'$ and $\beta - \beta' \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \alpha_i$. Let B' be a brick of dimension β' and let $B = \Sigma_i^\pm B'$, where we assume that $\Sigma_i^\pm B'$ is well-defined. Then $\text{Stab}(B) = \sigma_i^\pm \text{Stab}(B')$.*

We will cover the case where \pm is $+$; the other sign is similar. This comes down to proving the following two results:

Proposition 5.5. *Let $\beta \succ_{\Phi} s_i \beta'$ be a cover in the root poset. Let B' be a brick of dimension β' in NoQuot_i and let $B = \Sigma_i B'$. Then*

$$\text{Stab}(B) \subset \{\theta : \langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0\}$$

Proof. Because $\beta = s_i \beta'$, we also know $\beta' = s_i \beta = \beta - (\alpha_i^\vee, \beta) \alpha_i$. By assumption, $(\alpha_i^\vee, \beta) > 0$, and so $(\alpha_i, \beta) > 0$. By Proposition 4.11, B is in at most one of NoSub_i and NoQuot_i . Since B is an output of Σ_i , it lies in NoSub_i , so it cannot be in NoQuot_i . Thus B has S_i as a quotient, and so for any θ such that B is θ -semistable, $\langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0$. \square

Lemma 5.6. *Let β and β' be positive roots with $\beta = s_i \beta'$. Let B' be a brick of dimension β' in NoQuot_i , and let $B = \Sigma_i B'$. Then*

$$\sigma_i^+ \text{Stab}(B') := s_i(\text{Stab}(B') \cap \{\theta : \langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle \geq 0\}) = \text{Stab}(B) \cap \{\theta : \langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0\}$$

Given a module M , a submodule K and a weight $\theta \in (\dim M)^\perp$, we say that K is θ -**destabilizing** if $\langle \theta, \dim K \rangle < 0$. So M is θ -semistable if and only if it has no θ -destabilizing submodule. Similarly, we say that a quotient module Q of M is θ -**destabilizing** if $\langle \theta, \dim Q \rangle > 0$, and it is likewise true that M is θ -semistable if and only if it has no θ -destabilizing quotient.

Proof of Lemma 5.6. Let θ be any weight with $\langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0$ and $\langle \theta, \beta \rangle = 0$, and let $\theta' = s_i \theta$. Then the desired conclusion is that the module B is θ -semistable if and only if B' is θ' -semistable.

First, suppose that B has a θ -destabilizing submodule K , so $\langle \theta, \dim K \rangle < 0$. We will show that B' has a θ' -destabilizing submodule. Since $B \in \text{NoSub}_i$, we also have $K \in \text{NoSub}_i$. So we may apply the functor Σ_i^- to the inclusion $K \hookrightarrow B$, producing a new module $K' := \Sigma_i^- K$ and a map $K' \rightarrow B'$. Recall that, for any $X \in \text{NoSub}_i$, we have a natural transformation $\Sigma_i^- (X) \rightarrow X$ with kernel and cokernel of the form $S_i^{\oplus a}$. Define A to be the kernel of $K' \rightarrow B'$ and let I be the image. So we have a commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & A & & & \\
 & & & \downarrow & & & \\
 & & \swarrow & & \searrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & S_i^{\oplus a} & \longrightarrow & K' & \longrightarrow & K \longrightarrow S_i^{\oplus b} \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & I & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & S_i^{\oplus c} & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & B \longrightarrow S_i^{\oplus d} \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

Now, the composite $A \hookrightarrow K' \rightarrow B' \rightarrow B$ is 0, since A is defined as the kernel of $K' \rightarrow B'$, so the composite $A \rightarrow K' \rightarrow K \hookrightarrow B$ is likewise zero. As K injects into B , this means the composite $A \rightarrow K' \rightarrow K$ is 0, so the map $A \rightarrow K'$ factors through the kernel of $K \rightarrow K'$, as shown by the dashed arrow. So A is of the form S_i^k for some $0 \leq k \leq a$. We deduce that $\dim I = \dim K' - k \alpha_i = s_i(\dim K) - k \alpha_i$.

Then

$$\langle \theta', \dim I \rangle = \langle s_i(\theta), s_i(\dim K) - k\alpha_i \rangle = \langle \theta, \dim K \rangle + k\langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle < 0.$$

So I is θ' -destabilizing.

We now dualize the argument to show the converse half. Suppose that Q' is a θ' -destabilizing quotient of B' , so $\langle \theta', \dim Q' \rangle > 0$. Since $B' \in \text{NoQuot}_i$, we also have $Q' \in \text{NoQuot}_i$ and may apply Σ_i to the surjection $B' \rightarrow Q'$, producing a new module $Q := \Sigma_i(Q')$ and a map $B \rightarrow Q$. Let I be the image of this map and let C be the cokernel.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & S_i^{\oplus c} & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & S_i^{\oplus d} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & S_i^{\oplus e} & \longrightarrow & Q' & \longrightarrow & Q & \longrightarrow & S_i^{\oplus f} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & & & \downarrow & & & & \\ & & & & & & \downarrow & & & & \\ & & & & & & C & & & & \end{array}$$

(A dashed arrow points from $S_i^{\oplus f}$ to C .)

The composite $B' \rightarrow B \rightarrow Q \rightarrow C$ is 0, so $B' \rightarrow Q' \rightarrow Q \rightarrow C$ is zero. Since B' surjects on Q' , this means that $Q' \rightarrow Q \rightarrow C$ is zero, so C is a quotient of the cokernel $S_i^{\oplus f}$, as shown by the dashed arrow.

Thus, C is of the form $S_i^{\oplus \ell}$ for some $0 \leq \ell \leq f$. We compute that $\dim I = \dim Q - \ell\alpha_i$. So

$$\langle \theta, \dim I \rangle = \langle \theta, s_i(\dim Q') - \ell\alpha_i \rangle = \langle \theta', \dim Q' \rangle - \ell\langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle > 0$$

and I is θ -destabilizing, as desired. \square

Proof of Proposition 5.4. By Proposition 5.5, under the assumptions of Proposition 5.4, the right side of the equation in Lemma 5.6 is just $\text{Stab}(B)$. \square

5.3. Proof of Theorem 5.7. We now fill in the final steps of the proof of Theorem 5.7, which we restate for the reader's convenience.

Theorem 5.7. *The stability domains of shard modules are precisely the shards, and each shard is the stability domain of precisely one isomorphism class of shard modules.*

We have already done all the work to show that the stability domain of a shard module is always a shard. Let B be a shard module. Then, in particular, B is a real brick so, by Theorem 5.1, B is of the form $\Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \Sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \Sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} S_j$. By Theorem 5.3, we have $\text{Stab}(B) = \sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^{\pm})$ and, by the definition of a shard module, this has dimension $n - 1$. By Theorem 3.6, this is a shard.

We now address the converse: Starting with a shard K , we want to show that there is a shard module B with $\text{Stab}(B) = K$ and that B is unique up to isomorphism. We prove existence first, and then uniqueness.

Write the shard K as $\sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^{\pm})$ where $s_{i_r} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_j$ is a positive expression for β . We will show by induction on r that there is a brick with stability

domain K . For the base case, $r = 0$, note $\text{Stab}(S_j) = \alpha_j^\perp$. For the inductive case, abbreviate $\sigma_{i_{r-1}}^{\pm r-1} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^\perp)$ to K' , and let B' be a brick with this stability domain. We'll analyze the case that $\pm_r = +$ (the other sign is analogous) and we abbreviate i_r to i .

If we can show that $B' \in \text{NoQuot}_i$, then $\Sigma_i(B')$ will be a brick with the required properties. So, suppose for the sake of contradiction that S_i is a quotient of B' . Then $K' = \text{Stab}(B') \subset \{\phi : \langle \phi, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0\}$. But then $\sigma_i^+(K')$ has dimension at most $n - 2$, contradicting that $\sigma_i^+(K')$ is supposed to be a shard. This contradiction concludes the induction.

We now prove uniqueness. Once again, we induct on r . The base case is obvious: S_j is the only module with dimension α_j , so in particular it is the only brick of dimension α_j with stability domain α_j^\perp .

Let $K = \sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^\perp)$ as above. Let $K' = \sigma_{i_{r-1}}^{\pm r-1} \cdots \sigma_{i_2}^{\pm 2} \sigma_{i_1}^{\pm 1} (\alpha_j^\perp)$. By induction, there is a unique brick B' with stability domain K' . Let B be a brick with stability domain K ; we must show that $B \cong \Sigma_{i_r}^{\pm r}(B')$. Once again, we analyze the case that $\pm_r = +$ and abbreviate i_r to i .

Since $K = \sigma_i(K')$, we have $K \subseteq \{\theta : \langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle \leq 0\}$. Because K is $(n - 1)$ -dimensional, it contains points θ with $\langle \theta, \alpha_i \rangle < 0$. Thus $B \in \text{NoSub}_i$, so $\Sigma_i^{-1}(B)$ is well defined. Let B'' be $\Sigma_i^{-1}(B)$. We know that B'' is a real brick, since it is the image of a real brick under Σ_i^{-1} . Let $K'' = \text{Stab}(B'')$. We have $B = \Sigma_i(B'')$ and thus $K = \sigma_i(K'')$. Thus, K'' must have dimension $n - 1$ and must be a shard. There is only one shard G with $\sigma_i(G) = K$, namely, the shard K' . So $K'' = K'$ and, by induction, $B'' \cong B'$. Then $B \cong \Sigma_i(B')$, as desired.

6. SHADOWS OF THE LATTICE OF TORSION CLASSES

As described in the introduction, part of our motivation for writing this paper is to introduce a complete lattice, extending weak order on W , which might be combinatorially more tractable than the lattice of all torsion classes. To begin with, though, we consider several very general approaches to producing smaller lattices from the lattice of torsion classes, before specializing to the case that motivates us.

Let A be an algebra, not necessarily finite-dimensional. We are going to work with the category of finite-dimensional A -modules on which the Jacobson radical of A acts nilpotently, for which we will write mod_A .

Let \mathbb{S} be a set of isomorphism classes of indecomposable modules in $A\text{-mod}$. We define a **type 1T shadow** to be a subset of \mathbb{S} that is of the form $T \cap \mathbb{S}$, for a torsion class T . We define a **type 1F shadow** to be a subset of \mathbb{S} that is of the form $F \cap \mathbb{S}$, for a torsion-free class F . We refer to \mathbb{S} as the **screen set**; in the metaphor which is guiding our nomenclature, we are thinking of \mathbb{S} as providing the screen onto which the shadows of torsion or torsion-free classes are being cast. The type 1T shadow was already considered by [27].

We can combine types 1T and 1F by defining a **type 2 shadow** to be an ordered pair (X, Y) such that there is a torsion pair (T, F) with $X = T \cap \mathbb{S}$, and $Y = F \cap \mathbb{S}$. We order the type 2 shadows by $(X, Y) \leq (X', Y')$ if $X \subseteq X'$ and $Y \supseteq Y'$.

Finally, we define a **type 3 shadow** to be an ordered pair (X, Y) of subsets of \mathbb{S} such that $X = \{M \in \mathbb{S} \mid \text{Hom}(M, N) = 0 \ \forall N \in Y\}$ and $Y = \{N \in \mathbb{S} \mid \text{Hom}(M, N) = 0 \ \forall M \in X\}$. Again, we order type 3 shadows by $(X, Y) \leq (X', Y')$ if $X \subseteq X'$ and $Y \supseteq Y'$.




FIGURE 2. Maps between the posets of shadows

We denote these posets as $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$, $\mathcal{S}_{1F}^{\mathbb{S}}$, $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$. We have maps of posets as shown in Figure 2. We now describe the maps and prove that they are maps of posets:

Definition/Proposition 6.1. *Let X be a type 1T shadow. Let $Y = X^{\perp} \cap \mathbb{S}$ and let $\overline{X} = {}^{\perp}Y \cap \mathbb{S}$. Define $\alpha_T(X) = (\overline{X}, Y)$. Then α_T is a map of posets from $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$ to $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$.*

Proof. We defined \overline{X} to be ${}^{\perp}Y \cap \mathbb{S}$, so to show that $(\overline{X}, Y) \in \mathcal{S}_3$, we must simply show that $Y = \overline{X}^{\perp} \cap \mathbb{S}$. This follows from unwinding definitions. \square

We define α_F dually, and the analogous result is similar. We will show later (Corollary 6.5) that α_T and α_F are surjections.

Proposition 6.2. *Every type 3 shard shadow is also a type 2 shard shadow. Thus, the identity map $(X, Y) \mapsto (X, Y)$ identifies $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$ with an induced poset of $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$.*

Proof. Let (X, Y) be a type 3 shard shadow. Define $F = X^{\perp}$ and $T = {}^{\perp}F$, so (T, F) is a torsion pair. We must show that $X = T \cap \mathbb{S}$ and $Y = F \cap \mathbb{S}$. The definition of a type 3 shard shadow is that $Y = X^{\perp} \cap \mathbb{S}$, so we have $Y = F \cap \mathbb{S}$. It remains to check that $X = T \cap \mathbb{S}$; we put $X' = T \cap \mathbb{S}$. By definition, $X' = ({}^{\perp}F) \cap \mathbb{S} = ({}^{\perp}(X^{\perp})) \cap \mathbb{S}$, which clearly contains X . But, on the other hand, $F \supset Y$ so $({}^{\perp}F) \cap \mathbb{S} \subseteq ({}^{\perp}Y \cap \mathbb{S}) \cap \mathbb{S}$ and the right hand side is X by the definition of a Type 3 shard shadow. So we have shown that $X \subseteq X'$ and $X' \subseteq X$, and we have verified that $X = X'$ as desired.

We have shown that the identity map is an injection from \mathcal{S}_3 to \mathcal{S}_2 , and the partial orders on the two sets are defined in the same way, so the proposition is proven. \square

Definition/Proposition 6.3. *Let β_T and β_F be the projection maps sending $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{S}_2$ to X and to Y respectively. These maps are surjections of posets.*

Proof. This is immediate from the definitions. \square

Proposition 6.4. *For $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$, we have the relations $\alpha_T(\beta_T((X, Y))) = (X, Y)$ and $\alpha_F(\beta_F((X, Y))) = (X, Y)$.*

Proof. We check the first claim; the second is parallel. We have $\beta_T((X, Y)) = X$. Let $\alpha_T(X) = (X', Y')$. The definition of α_T gives $Y' = X^{\perp} \cap \mathbb{S}$ and the definition of a type 3 shard shadow gives $Y = X^{\perp} \cap \mathbb{S}$, so $Y = Y'$. Also, the definition of α_T gives $X' = {}^{\perp}(Y') \cap \mathbb{S}$ and the definition of a type 3 shard shadow gives $X = {}^{\perp}(Y) \cap \mathbb{S}$. So the equality $Y = Y'$ implies $X = X'$. \square




FIGURE 3. The lattice of torsion classes of the A_2 path algebra, together with, first, the identifications that are made in $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$, and second, the identifications that are made in $\mathcal{S}_{1F}^{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$

Corollary 6.5. *The maps α_T and α_F are surjections; the restrictions of β_T and β_F to $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$ (sitting inside $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$) are injections.*

Proof. This is immediate, since we have just shown that α_T is a left inverse of β_T , restricted to $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$, and likewise for α_F and β_F . \square

Corollary 6.6. *For a particular choice of \mathbb{S} , if the containment $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$ is equality, then all the maps in Figure 2 are equalities.*

Proof. The map β_T is surjective by definition, and we have just shown that the restriction of β_T to \mathcal{S}_3 is injective. Thus, if $\mathcal{S}_3 = \mathcal{S}_2$, then β_T is bijective, and its left inverse α_T must also be a bijection. The same applies to α_F and β_F . \square

We pause to consider a simple example.

Example 6.7. Let Λ be the path algebra of an A_2 quiver. In Figure 3, we have drawn, first, its the poset of five torsion pairs. Each torsion pair is represented by a small schematic copy of the Auslander–Reiten quiver of the A_2 module category, with the torsion part drawn in blue, and the torsion-free part drawn in orange.

Let \mathbb{S} consist of the two indecomposable projectives. (In the Auslander–Reiten quiver, these are represented by the circles at the left and top.) To the right of the poset of torsion classes, we have redrawn the same figure, with torsion classes which become identified in $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$ encircled. The next figure shows which pairs of torsion classes become identified with respect to $\mathcal{S}_{1F}^{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$.

Of the equivalence classes of $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$, there is exactly one which is not in the image of the inclusion from $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$; it is the righthand one.

Our goal is to study lattices, not posets, and more specifically complete lattices. We recall that a partially ordered set L is a **complete lattice** if, for any subset \mathcal{X} of L , there is a (necessarily unique) element $\bigvee \mathcal{X}$ which is a lower bound for all upper bounds of \mathcal{X} and a (necessarily unique) element $\bigwedge \mathcal{X}$ which is an upper bound for all lower bounds of \mathcal{X} .

The collection of torsion classes is a lattice, where $\bigwedge \mathcal{X} = \bigcap_{T \in \mathcal{X}} T$ and $\bigvee \mathcal{X} = \bigcap_{T \in \mathcal{X}} T^\perp$. We write $\text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ for the lattice of torsion classes of Λ .

Proposition 6.8. *The partially ordered sets $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$, $\mathcal{S}_{1F}^{\mathbb{S}}$ and $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$ are complete lattices. The map $\pi_T(X) = X \cap \mathbb{S}$ from $\text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ to $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$ obeys $\pi_T(\bigwedge \mathcal{T}) = \bigwedge \pi_T(\mathcal{T})$ and the map $\pi_F(X) = X^\perp \cap \mathbb{S}$ from $\text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ to $\mathcal{S}_{1F}^{\mathbb{S}}$ obeys $\pi_F(\bigvee \mathcal{T}) = \bigvee \pi_F(\mathcal{T})$.*

Proof. The fact that $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$ is a complete lattice is straightforward; if III is any set and \rightarrow any binary relation on \mathbb{S} , we define $\text{Pairs}(\rightarrow)$ to be set of ordered pairs (U, V) where $U = \{u \in \mathbb{S} : u \not\rightarrow v \ \forall v \in V\}$ and $V = \{v \in \mathbb{S} : u \not\rightarrow v \ \forall u \in U\}$. For (U_1, V_1) and $(U_2, V_2) \in \text{Pairs}(\rightarrow)$, we have $U_1 \subseteq U_2$ if and only if $V_1 \supseteq V_2$ and we define a partial order on $\text{Pairs}(\rightarrow)$ by saying that $(U_1, V_1) \leq (U_2, V_2)$ in this situation. This will always be a complete lattice, where $\bigvee \mathcal{X} = (A, A^\perp)$ for $A = \bigcap_{(U,V) \in \mathcal{X}} U$ and $\bigwedge \mathcal{X} = (\perp B, B)$ where $B = \bigcap_{(U,V) \in \mathcal{X}} V$. See, for example, [4, Theorem V.19].

We now show that $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$ is a complete lattice. Let $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{1T}$. Set $A = \bigcap_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X$. We claim that $A \in \mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$; if this is true, then A is clearly the greatest lower bound for \mathcal{X} . To show that $A \in \mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$, for each $X \in \mathcal{X}$, choose a torsion class T_X with $X = \mathbb{S} \cap T_X$. Then $A = \bigcap_{X \in \mathcal{X}} X = \bigcap_{X \in \mathcal{X}} (\mathbb{S} \cap T_X) = \mathbb{S} \cap \bigcap_{X \in \mathcal{X}} T_X$. But $\bigcap_{X \in \mathcal{X}} T_X$ is a torsion class as well, so the equation $A = \mathbb{S} \cap \bigcap_{X \in \mathcal{X}} T_X$ shows that $A \in \mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$. We have now shown that all subsets of $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$ have greatest lower bounds. We then use a standard trick: For $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$, let \mathcal{Y} be the set of all upper bounds of \mathcal{X} . The greatest lower bound of \mathcal{Y} will also be the least upper bound of \mathcal{X} .

The argument of the above paragraph also shows that $\pi_T(\bigwedge \mathcal{T}) = \bigwedge \pi_T(\mathcal{T})$: Let $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ and let $\mathcal{X} = \pi_T(\mathcal{T}) := \{T \cap \mathbb{S} : T \in \mathcal{T}\}$. Then $\bigwedge \pi_T(\mathcal{T}) = \bigcap_{X \in \pi_T(\mathcal{T})} X = \bigcap_{T \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbb{S} \cap T) = \mathbb{S} \cap \bigcap_{T \in \mathcal{T}} T = \mathbb{S} \cap \bigwedge \mathcal{T} = \pi_T(\bigwedge \mathcal{T})$.

This proves the claims regarding $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$; the claims regarding $\mathcal{S}_{1F}^{\mathbb{S}}$ are similar. \square

We cannot prove that $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$ is necessarily a lattice.

A map $\pi : L_1 \rightarrow L_2$ from one complete lattice to another is a **complete lattice quotient** if π is surjective and we have $\pi(\bigwedge X) = \bigwedge \pi(X)$ and $\pi(\bigvee X) = \bigvee \pi(X)$ for all subsets X of L_1 . In the generality which we are considering, the maps from the lattice of torsion classes to \mathcal{S}_{1T} , \mathcal{S}_{1F} or \mathcal{S}_3 need not be complete lattice quotients, as Example 6.7 already shows.

We now explain the connection to the problem that has been motivating us. For Λ a preprojective algebra, we would like to let \mathbb{S} be the shard modules. In Dynkin type, the shard modules coincide with the bricks, and thus all the shadows with respect to \mathbb{S} coincide with the lattice of torsion classes, and thus with (right) weak order on the corresponding Coxeter group W . If our preprojective algebra is not of Dynkin type, our hope is that $\mathcal{S}_{1T}^{\mathbb{S}}$, $\mathcal{S}_{1F}^{\mathbb{S}}$, $\mathcal{S}_2^{\mathbb{S}}$, and $\mathcal{S}_3^{\mathbb{S}}$ still all coincide, and are a complete lattice quotient of the lattice of torsion classes.

Remark 6.9. In the generality considered throughout this section, $\text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ is a completely semidistributive lattice, so any lattice which we can prove to be a complete lattice quotient of $\text{Tor}(\Lambda)$ will be a completely semidistributive lattice [13, Theorem 3.1(a)].

Remark 6.10. Matthew Dyer [17] has made a series of fascinating conjectures about extending the weak order on W to a partial order on the set of “biclosed” sets of roots. These can be thought of as a partition of the positive real roots into two disjoint sets, $\Phi^+ = X \sqcup Y$, where both X and Y satisfy a “closure” condition. If we were to try to associate a biclosed set to a torsion pair (T, F) , the natural thing to do would be to consider $(\dim T, \dim F) := (\{\dim B : B \in T\}, \{\dim B : B \in F\})$, where B ranges over shard modules (or possibly real brick modules). This construction will associate a pair of subsets of Φ^+ to any type 2 or type 3 shard shadow.

There is, however, an immediate problem: It is not clear that $\Phi^+ = (\dim T) \sqcup (\dim F)$. Indeed, it is neither clear that $(\dim T) \cup (\dim F) = \Phi^+$, nor that $(\dim T) \cap$

$(\dim F) = \emptyset$. We have $(\dim T) \cap (\dim F) = \emptyset$ for all torsion pairs (T, F) if and only if the following conjecture holds:

Conjecture 6.11. *Let β be a positive real root and let B_1 and B_2 be two shard modules of dimension β . Then $\text{Hom}(B_1, B_2) \neq 0$.*

It is tempting to make some more general conjecture about a condition on $\text{Stab}(B_1)$ and $\text{Stab}(B_2)$ which would imply $\text{Hom}(B_1, B_2) \neq 0$. We warn the tempted reader to consult Remark 7.3 for an example of a brick B' such that $\text{Hom}(S_1, B') = 0$, even though $\langle \alpha_1, - \rangle$ is nonnegative on $\text{Stab}(B')$.

7. COUNTEREXAMPLES

In this section, we collect some counter-examples to natural conjectures.

7.1. Shards can depend on the choice of Cartan matrix. Often, constructions which are described in terms of the reflection arrangement of a Coxeter group can be shown to depend only on the Coxeter group, and not on the choice of Cartan matrix. To be more precise, fix a Coxeter group W with simple generators s_i . Let A and A' be two Cartan matrices for W . This means that, for $m_{ij} < \infty$, we have $A_{ij}A_{ji} = A'_{ij}A'_{ji} = 4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi}{m_{ij}}$ but, for $m_{ij} = \infty$, all we know is that $A_{ij}A_{ji}$ and $A'_{ij}A'_{ji}$ are both ≥ 4 . It is often the case that constructions which are originally defined in terms of the Cartan matrix, and the corresponding reflection representation and root system, in fact depend only on the Coxeter group W . See Lemma 2.5 and Remarks 2.13 and 2.17.

In this section, we will show that is not the case for shards. To be precise, let W be a Coxeter group and let t be a reflection in W . Let $\{R_1, R_2, \dots, R_k\}$ be the list of rank two subsystems cutting β_t^\perp . This list depends on W and t and not on the choice of Cartan matrix (Remark 2.17). However, we will show that the combinatorics of this hyperplane arrangement **does** depend on the choice of Cartan matrix.

Our example relies on the following trick: Let W be a Coxeter group with simple generators s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n and a symmetric Cartan matrix A . Embed W into a larger Coxeter group \widehat{W} with one additional simple generator s_{n+1} , such that $s_i s_{n+1}$ has infinite order for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Embed A into a larger Cartan matrix \widehat{A} with $\widehat{A}_{ij} = A_{ij}$ for $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $\widehat{A}_{i(n+1)} = \widehat{A}_{(n+1)i} \geq 2$. We write V for the reflection representation of W and \widehat{V} for the reflection representation of \widehat{W} , of dimensions n and $n+1$ respectively.

Let u be any element of W and let $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$ be a reduced word for u . Put $\beta = u \alpha_{n+1}$.

Proposition 7.1. *With the above notation, $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_{n+1}$ is a positive expression for β . The shard hyperplane arrangement, in the n -dimensional space β^\perp , is linearly isomorphic to the hyperplane arrangement $\bigcup_{\delta \in \text{inv}_\Phi(u)} \delta^\perp$ in the n -dimensional space V^* .*

Proof. We begin by noting that $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} \alpha_{n+1}$ is a positive expression for β . By Corollary 2.7, it is equivalent to see that $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} s_{n+1} s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{r-1}} s_{i_r}$ is reduced. Since $s_i s_{n+1}$ has infinite order for $1 \leq i \leq n$, no braid moves can be applied to this word that will affect the s_{n+1} in the center, and this will remain true after any braid moves are applied to the left and right of the central s_{n+1} . Since

$s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1}$ is assumed reduced, this means no sequence of braid moves can put us in a position to reduce the length of $s_{i_r} s_{i_{r-1}} \cdots s_{i_2} s_{i_1} s_{n+1} s_{i_1} s_{i_2} \cdots s_{i_{r-1}} s_{i_r}$.

Thus, by Corollary 2.7, the hyperplanes in the shard hyperplane arrangement are $\{\delta^\perp \cap \beta^\perp : \delta \in \text{inv}_\Phi(u)\}$. We now need to relate this hyperplane arrangement, in β^\perp , to the hyperplane arrangement $\{\delta^\perp : \delta \in \text{inv}_\Phi(u)\}$ in V^* . The bridge between these two is the arrangement $\{\delta^\perp : \delta \in \text{inv}_\Phi(u)\}$ in \widehat{V}^* . The canonical inclusion of V into \widehat{V} gives rise to a projection from \widehat{V}^* to V^* . For δ a root of W , δ^\perp in \widehat{V}^* is the pullback of δ^\perp in V^* . The kernel of the projection from \widehat{V}^* to V^* is the line V^\perp . Since $\beta \notin V$, $V^\perp \cap \beta^\perp = \{0\}$, so intersecting with β^\perp removes the one-dimensional lineality factor. \square

The use of Proposition 7.1 is that we can use computations with inversions in a rank n Coxeter group to produce examples of shards in a rank $n+1$ Coxeter group.

We now turn to our example: Consider the rank 4 Coxeter group where $m_{12} = m_{13} = m_{14} = 0$ and $m_{14} = m_{24} = m_{34} = \infty$. Symmetric Cartan matrices for this group are thus of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 0 & 0 & -x \\ 0 & 2 & 0 & -y \\ 0 & 0 & 2 & -z \\ -x & -y & -z & 2 \end{bmatrix}$$

for $x, y, z \geq 2$. Let $w = s_1 s_2 s_4 s_1 s_3 s_4 s_2 s_3$, whose inversions correspond to the following roots in the simple root basis:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_3 = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ y \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_4 = \begin{bmatrix} -1+x^2 \\ xy \\ 0 \\ x \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_5 = \begin{bmatrix} xz \\ yz \\ 1 \\ z \end{bmatrix}, \\ \gamma_6 &= \begin{bmatrix} -2x+x^3+xz^2 \\ -y+x^2y+yz^2 \\ -1+x^2+z^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_7 = \begin{bmatrix} -xy+x^3y+xyz^2 \\ -1+x^2y^2+y^2z^2 \\ yz \\ x^2y+yz^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \gamma_8 = \begin{bmatrix} -3xz+x^3z+xz^3 \\ -2yz+x^2yz+yz^3 \\ -1+z^2 \\ -2z+x^2z+z^3 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

The determinant $\det(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_7, \gamma_8)$ is $y(x+z)(x-z)$. Thus, if $x = z$, the hyperplanes $\gamma_1^\perp, \gamma_2^\perp, \gamma_7^\perp$ and γ_8^\perp intersect in a line, whereas they are transverse if $x \neq z$.

Moreover, even if we restrict to $x \neq z$, the hyperplane arrangements for $x < z$ and $x > z$ will be topologically different. The four lines $\gamma_1^\perp \cap \gamma_2^\perp \cap \gamma_3^\perp, \gamma_1^\perp \cap \gamma_2^\perp \cap \gamma_5^\perp, \gamma_1^\perp \cap \gamma_2^\perp \cap \gamma_7^\perp$ and $\gamma_1^\perp \cap \gamma_2^\perp \cap \gamma_8^\perp$ all lie in the plane $\gamma_1^\perp \cap \gamma_2^\perp$. Their circular order depends on whether the cross ratio


$$\frac{\det(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_5) \det(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_7, \gamma_8)}{\det(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_8) \det(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_5, \gamma_7)}$$

lies in $(-\infty, 0)$, $(0, 1)$ or $(1, \infty)$. We compute that this cross ratio is $\frac{y(x+z)(x-z)}{(z^2-1)x^2y^2}$, whose sign depends on whether x is $< z$ or $> z$.

This example is inspired by a simpler example due to Dyer and Wang [18]. They produce a simpler example of a rank four Coxeter group in which the hyperplane arrangement determined by a finite subset of the roots depends on the entries in the Cartan matrix. We have had to adjust their example to make sure that all of the roots involved were inversions of a single element in the Coxeter group.

7.2. A real brick that is not a shard module. In this section, we will give an example of a rank 6 preprojective algebra (of wild type) and a real brick B for this preprojective algebra whose stability domain has dimension 2. We use a symmetric Cartan matrix, so all our vector spaces are over the same field.

Our preprojective algebra corresponds to the quiver



The purpose of the arrows in this diagram is to convey the sgn function which is used to define the preprojective relation, with $i \xrightarrow{a} j$ meaning that $\text{sgn}(a) = 1$ and $\text{sgn}(a^*) = -1$. Thus, if $i \xrightarrow{a} j \xrightarrow{b} k$, then aa^* and b^*b appear with opposite signs in the preprojective relation. As a convenience to the reader, we have chosen an orientation such that this is the case whenever two nonzero terms appear in a preprojective relation for our module.

Our real brick B has dimension vector $(3, 3, 2, 4, 2, 1)$. We write B_i for the component of B on vertex i .




FIGURE 4. A real brick which is not a shard module

We depict the structure of the module in Figure 4. Here is how to understand the figure: B_i is the free vector space on the vertices labeled i in the figure. For each arrow $i \rightarrow j$ in the doubled quiver, the map $B_i \rightarrow B_j$ is given by the sum over arrows in the figure whose source is labeled i and whose target is labeled j ; each such arrow maps the corresponding basis element of B_i to the corresponding basis element of B_j . We first check that B is a representation of the preprojective algebra. It is sufficient to start at each basis element, follow all the paths of length two from it which lead back to a basis element at the same vertex, and see that they sum to zero. The only length two paths that lead to from a vertex to itself at all are along the sides of the four quadrilateral faces in the figure. For example, between the first and third row, we have a path $4 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 4$ and a path $4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4$. Because this portion of the quiver is oriented $2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3$, these paths cancel. The computation is analogous for the other three quadrilateral faces.

We next check that $\dim B$ is a real root. Indeed, it can be obtained by applying reflections to a simple root:

$$\dim B = s_1 s_2 s_4 s_3 s_5 s_4 s_1 s_2 s_4 s_5(\alpha_6)$$

We now provide a direct verification that B is a brick. Let $\phi : B \rightarrow B$ be an endomorphism. Let $x \in B_4$ be the basis element corresponding to the 4 in the top

row of the diagram, and let y and z be the basis elements of B_2 corresponding to the 2's at the left ends of the second and fourth rows of the diagram. We will represent elements of the path algebra by recording paths through the doubled quiver: For example, $4 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 4$ is the path which goes from 4 to 1 to 4.

Note that $(5 \leftarrow 4)(x) = 0$ and $(4 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 4)(x) = 0$. Therefore, $(5 \leftarrow 4)(\phi(x)) = 0$ and $(4 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 4)(\phi(x)) = 0$. This implies that $\phi(x)$ is a scalar multiple of x , say $\phi(x) = \lambda x$, since the intersection of the kernels of $5 \leftarrow 4$ and $4 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 4$ with B_4 is spanned by x . Similarly, $(5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(y) = 0$, implying that $(5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(\phi(y)) = 0$, so $\phi(y) = \mu y$ for some scalar μ . Also, $(1 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(z) = 0$ implying that $(1 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(\phi(z)) = 0$, so $\phi(z) = \nu z$ for some scalar ν .

Let $w \in B_5$ be the vector corresponding to the bottom 5. We have $w = (5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(z)$, so $\phi(w) = (5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(\phi(z)) = \nu(5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(z) = \nu w$. Similarly, $w = (5 \leftarrow 6 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4)(x)$ and $w = (5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 2)(y)$, so $\phi(w) = \lambda w$ and $\phi(w) = \mu w$. This shows that $\lambda = \mu = \nu$. Since x , y and z generate B , the entire endomorphism ϕ must be multiplication by the scalar λ . We have shown that every $\phi \in \text{End}(B)$ is a scalar, as desired.

We now verify that $\dim \text{Stab}(B) \leq 2$. To this end, we will need to know that B has submodules with the dimension vectors $(1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 1)$, $(1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 0)$, $(3, 1, 2, 4, 2, 1)$ and $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$. These submodules correspond to the boxed elements in Figure 5. So any θ in $\text{Stab}(B)$ must pair nonnegatively with the vectors $(1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 1)$, $(1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 0)$, $(3, 1, 2, 4, 2, 1)$ and $(1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$, and also must pair to 0 with $\dim B = (3, 3, 2, 4, 2, 1)$. But we have

$$2 \cdot (1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 1) + 2 \cdot (1, 2, 1, 2, 1, 0) + (3, 1, 2, 4, 2, 1) + 2 \cdot (1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0) = 3 \cdot (3, 3, 2, 4, 2, 1).$$

So θ must pair to 0 with all of these vectors, which restricts θ to a codimension 4 linear space! We have shown that B is not a shard module. This completes our verification that

Theorem 7.2. *The module B discussed above is a real brick, but is not a shard module.*

By Theorem 5.1, we know that B should be obtainable by a series of reflection functors applied to a simple module. We give the corresponding formula without proof:

$$B = \Sigma_1^- \Sigma_2^+ \Sigma_4^+ \Sigma_3^+ \Sigma_5^- \Sigma_4^- \Sigma_1^- \Sigma_2^+ \Sigma_4^+ \Sigma_5^+ S_6.$$

The module B was found using a SAGE notebook [11] that iteratively searched through formulas like the above one; the authors then worked backwards to find the computations given here, so that readers could trust our result without relying on our code. Using this formula and Theorem 5.3, we can compute the stability domain of B exactly – it is a 2-dimensional cone with rays $(0, 0, -1, 0, 1, 0)$ and $(0, 0, 1, -1, 1, 0)$.

Remark 7.3. It is interesting to consider the module $B' := \Sigma_1^+ B$, which is the result of the above formula right before we apply Σ_1^- . This module is a shard module, and it lies in NoSub_1 (which is why we can apply Σ_1^+ to it). However, its stability domain lies entirely in the closed half space where $\langle \alpha_1, - \rangle$ is nonnegative. This is why $\sigma_1^+(\text{Stab}(B'))$ has lower dimension than $\text{Stab}(B')$ does.

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF THEOREM 4.2 IN THE SYMMETRIZABLE CASE

The goal of this section is to outline a proof of the following identity:




FIGURE 5. Some key submodules of our counterexample

Theorem 4.2. *Let M and N be left Λ -modules, which are finite dimensional over our ground field κ . Then*

$$\dim_{\kappa}(\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, N)) - \dim_{\kappa}(\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(M, N)) + \dim_{\kappa}(\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(N, M)) = (\dim M, \dim N)$$

This identity was originally observed for the case of symmetric Cartan matrices in [10]. It is difficult to find a reference for the symmetrizable case, which is why we have included this appendix. Morally, this theorem should be thought of as saying that $(\dim M, \dim N) = \sum_j (-1)^j \dim_{\kappa} \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^j(M, N)$, combined with a Serre duality property that $\dim_{\kappa} \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^j(M, N) = \dim_{\kappa} \text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^{2-j}(N, M)$. However, this is not literally correct in Dynkin type. In fact, Dynkin type preprojective algebras are self-injective [30, Corollary 3.4], and self-injective algebras are necessarily of infinite global dimension [2, Section IV.3].

A proof of Theorem 4.2 for the symmetric case appears in [28, Section 8]: here, we explain how to generalize that proof to the framework established in Section 4.2 based on [34]. Recall in particular that $\{b_k^{ji}\}$ is a $\kappa(d_j)$ -basis of $\kappa(d_{ij})$ and $\{(b_k^{ji})^*\}$ is its dual basis under the trace pairing $\kappa(d_{ij}) \times \kappa(d_{ij}) \rightarrow \kappa(d_j)$. Because $\kappa(d_{ij})$ is the compositum of $\kappa(d_j)$ and $\kappa(d_i)$, we can choose the b_k^{ji} to lie in $\kappa(d_i)$, which will simplify calculations later on.

The strategy of the proof is to construct, for any Λ -module M , the first three terms of a projective resolution

$$P_2(M) \xrightarrow{d^1} P_1(M) \xrightarrow{d^0} P_0(M) \xrightarrow{\text{mult}} M \rightarrow 0$$

Then, by applying $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(-, N)$, we obtain a complex whose first two homologies compute $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N)$ and $\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(M, N)$:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_0(M), N) \xrightarrow{d_{M,N}^0} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_1(M), N) \xrightarrow{d_{M,N}^1} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_2(M), N) \rightarrow 0$$

The crux of the argument is to show that this complex is isomorphic to the dual (over the ground field κ) of the corresponding complex with M and N switched:

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_2(N), M)^* \xrightarrow{d_{N,M}^{1*}} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_1(N), M)^* \xrightarrow{d_{N,M}^{0*}} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_0(N), M)^* \rightarrow 0$$

This will show that the third homology of our complex computes $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(N, M)^*$. From this we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim_\kappa(\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N)) - \dim_\kappa(\text{Ext}_\Lambda^1(M, N)) + \dim_\kappa(\text{Hom}_\Lambda(N, M)) = \\ & \dim_\kappa(\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_0(M), N)) - \dim_\kappa(\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_1(M), N)) + \dim_\kappa(\text{Hom}_\Lambda(P_2(M), N)) \end{aligned}$$

which we then show is equal to $(\dim M, \dim N)$.

We start with a recipe for building projective resolutions in $\text{mod}(\Lambda)$.

Lemma A.1 ([34], Lemma 5.1). *The following is the start of a projective Λ - Λ -bimodule resolution of Λ :*

$$\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i \xrightarrow{d^1} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} W_{j \leftarrow i} \xrightarrow{d^0} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i \xrightarrow{\text{mult}} \Lambda \rightarrow 0$$

where

$$V_i = \Lambda e_i \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} e_i \Lambda \text{ and } W_{j \leftarrow i} = \Lambda e_j \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} e_i \Lambda$$

and the maps are given by

$$\text{mult}(e_i \otimes e_i) = e_i$$

$$d^0(e_j \otimes x \otimes e_i) = x \otimes e_i - e_j \otimes x$$

$$d^1(e_i \otimes e_i) = \sum_{j \neq i} \text{sgn}(i, j) \sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \sum_k ((b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes ab_k^{ji} \otimes e_i + e_i \otimes (b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes ab_k^{ji})$$

Recall that the elements e_i appearing here are the idempotents of Λ corresponding to the length-0 paths at each vertex. If M is any left Λ -module, then $M_i := e_i M$ is the vector space attached to vertex i when we view M as a quiver representation. We note the following useful identifications, which are standard properties of idempotents:

Lemma A.2. *There are canonical isomorphisms*

$$f : e_i \Lambda \otimes_\Lambda M \xrightarrow{\sim} M_i$$

$$g : \text{Hom}_\Lambda(\Lambda e_i, M) \xrightarrow{\sim} M_i$$

given by

$$f(x \otimes m) = xm$$

$$g(\phi) = \phi(e_i)$$

Now we obtain a partial projective resolution of M by tensoring it with the above resolution.

Lemma A.3. *The following is the start of a projective left Λ -module resolution of M :*

$$\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i^M \xrightarrow{d^1} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} W_{j \leftarrow i}^M \xrightarrow{d^0} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i^M \xrightarrow{\text{mult}} M \rightarrow 0$$

where

$$V_i^M = \Lambda e_i \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i \text{ and } W_{j \leftarrow i}^M = \Lambda e_j \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i$$

with maps

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mult}(e_i \otimes m) &= e_i m \\ d^0(e_j \otimes x \otimes m) &= x \otimes m - e_j \otimes x m \\ d^1(e_i \otimes m) &= \sum_{j \neq i} \text{sgn}(j, i) \sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \sum_k (b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes ab_k^{ji} \otimes m + e_i \otimes (b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes ab_k^{ji} m \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Because the resolution in Lemma A.1 is a right Λ -module resolution of Λ , and Λ is a flat right Λ -module, the sequence will remain exact when we apply $-\otimes_{\Lambda} M$. The result is the resolution given here. \square

Finally, we apply $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(-, N)$ to this resolution in order to compute Ext_{Λ}^1 . We note that by the tensor-Hom adjunction,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\Lambda e_i \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i, N) &\cong \text{Hom}_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i, \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\Lambda e_i, N)) \cong \text{Hom}_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i, N_i) \\ \text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(\Lambda e_j \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i, N) &\cong \text{Hom}_{\kappa(d_j)}(E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i, N_j) \end{aligned}$$

We thus obtain a complex

$$\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i^{M, N} \xrightarrow{d_{M, N}^0} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} W_{j \leftarrow i}^{M, N} \xrightarrow{d_{M, N}^1} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i^{M, N}$$

where

$$V_i^{M, N} = \text{Hom}_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i, N_i) \text{ and } W_{j \leftarrow i}^{M, N} = \text{Hom}_{\kappa(d_j)}(E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i, N_j).$$

with

$$d_{M, N}^0((f_i)_i)(x \otimes m) = (x f_i(m) - f_j(xm))_{i \neq j}$$

$$\begin{aligned} d_{M, N}^1((g_{j, i})_{i \neq j})(m) &= \\ & \left(\sum_{j \neq i} \text{sgn}(j, i) \sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \sum_k (b_k^{ji})^* a^* g_{j, i} (ab_k^{ji} \otimes m) + g_{i, j} ((b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes ab_k^{ji} m) \right)_i \end{aligned}$$

The first two homologies of this complex will compute $\text{Hom}_{\Lambda}(M, N)$ and $\text{Ext}_{\Lambda}^1(M, N)$. The symmetry in Theorem 4.2 will then come from dualizing it.

Lemma A.4. *The above complex is isomorphic to its κ -dual with M and N swapped:*

$$\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} (V_i^{N, M})^* \xrightarrow{d_{N, M}^{1*}} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} (W_{j \leftarrow i}^{N, M})^* \xrightarrow{d_{N, M}^{0*}} \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} (V_i^{N, M})^*$$

Proof. First, we should identify the terms of the two complexes, which we do by constructing perfect pairings between them. There is a perfect pairing

$$\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i^{M,N} \times \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq n} V_i^{N,M} \rightarrow \kappa$$

defined by

$$((f_i)_i, (\phi_i)_i) \mapsto \sum_i \mathrm{tr}_\kappa(\phi_i \circ f_i)$$

We call this the *vertex pairing*.

Next, we have an isomorphism

$$\theta : \mathrm{Hom}_{\kappa(d_j)}(E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i, N_j) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i, E(i \leftarrow j) \otimes_{\kappa(d_j)} N_j)$$

which we can define using our chosen $\kappa(d_j)$ -basis of $E(j \leftarrow i)$:

$$\theta(g)(m) = \sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \sum_k (b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes g(ab_k^{ji} \otimes m)$$

We can then combine this identification with the trace pairing and twist by the sign factor to get a perfect pairing

$$\bigoplus_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} W_{j \leftarrow i}^{M,N} \times \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} W_{j \leftarrow i}^{N,M} \rightarrow \kappa$$

given by

$$\begin{aligned} ((g_{j,i})_{i \neq j}, (\psi_{j,i})_{i \neq j}) &\mapsto \sum_{i \neq j} \mathrm{sgn}(j, i) \mathrm{tr}_\kappa(\psi_{i,j} \circ \theta(g_{j,i})) \\ &= \sum_{i \neq j} \mathrm{sgn}(j, i) \mathrm{tr}_\kappa \left(\sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \sum_k \psi_{i,j}((b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes g_{j,i}(ab_k^{ji} \otimes -)) \right) \end{aligned}$$

We call this the *edge pairing*.

The presence of the field elements b_k^{ji} is an additional complication compared to the proof in [28], and the discrepancy between $\{b_k^{ji}\}$ being a $\kappa(d_j)$ -basis of $\kappa(d_{ij})$ and $\{b_k^{ij}\}$ being a $\kappa(d_i)$ -basis prevents a direct adaptation. However, we can eliminate the b 's.

Lemma A.5. *The edge pairing is given by*

$$((g_{j,i})_{i \neq j}, (\psi_{j,i})_{i \neq j}) \mapsto \sum_{i \neq j} \mathrm{sgn}(j, i) \mathrm{tr}_\kappa \left(\sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} g_{j,i}(a \otimes \psi_{i,j}(a^* \otimes -)) \right)$$

We show this using the following lemma on the trace pairing.

Lemma A.6. *Let L/K be a separable field extension. Let b_1, \dots, b_n be a K -basis of L , and let b_1^*, \dots, b_n^* be the dual basis with respect to the trace pairing $\mathrm{tr}_K(-, -) : L \times L \rightarrow K$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^* b_i = 1$.*

Proof. First, we note that the value of $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^* b_i$ is independent of our choice of basis. This is because, under the isomorphism $L \otimes_K L \cong L^* \otimes_K L \cong \mathrm{Hom}_K(L, L)$, where the first map is induced by the trace pairing, the element $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i^* \otimes b_i$ corresponds to the identity map regardless of basis.

Let \mathbb{K} be the algebraic closure of K and let A be the \mathbb{K} -algebra $L \otimes_K \mathbb{K}$. The trace pairing $L \times L \rightarrow K$ extends to a bilinear pairing $A \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$, and the ring

structure on L extends to a \mathbb{K} -algebra structure on A , so we can do the computation in A . But, since L/K is separable, $A \cong \mathbb{K}^{\times n}$ as a ring. If e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n is a basis of primitive idempotents for A , then (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) forms a self dual basis of A and $\sum e_i e_i = \sum e_i = 1$, as desired. \square

Proof of Lemma A.5. By cyclically permuting within it, we can rewrite the trace term appearing in the definition of the edge pairing as

$$\mathrm{tr}_\kappa \left(\sum_{i \xrightarrow{a} j} \sum_k a b_k^{ji} \otimes \psi_{i,j}((b_k^{ji})^* a^* \otimes g_{j,i}(-)) \right)$$

Because we assumed $b_k^{ji} \in \kappa(d_i)$, we can use linearity to pass it under $\psi_{i,j}$, next to $(b_k^{ji})^*$, and then apply Lemma A.6 to eliminate the inner sum. \square

With formulas for the vertex and edge pairings in place, it is tedious but straightforward to check that, under the resulting identifications $(V_i^{M,N})^* \cong V_i^{N,M}$ and $(W_{j \leftarrow i}^{M,N})^* \cong W_{i \leftarrow j}^{N,M}$, $d_{N,M}^{1*}$ is identified with $d_{M,N}^0$ and $d_{N,M}^{0*}$ is identified with $-d_{M,N}^1$. One can do the same computations as in [28] while eliminating b 's using the trick of Lemma A.6. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. Lemma A.4 tells us that, in addition to first two homologies of our complex computing $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N)$ and $\mathrm{Ext}_\Lambda^1(M, N)$, the third is isomorphic to $\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(N, M)^*$. Thus we can compute the alternating sum

$$\dim_\kappa(\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N)) - \dim_\kappa(\mathrm{Ext}_\Lambda^1(M, N)) + \dim_\kappa(\mathrm{Hom}_\Lambda(N, M))$$

as the alternating sum of the κ -dimensions of our complex.

We have

$$\dim_\kappa(\mathrm{Hom}_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i, N_i)) = d_i \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i) \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(N_i).$$

Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned} \dim_{\kappa(d_j)}(E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i) &= \frac{d_i}{d_j} \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i) \\ &= -\frac{d_i A_{ij}}{d_j} \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i) \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\dim_\kappa(\mathrm{Hom}_{\kappa(d_j)}(E(j \leftarrow i) \otimes_{\kappa(d_i)} M_i, N_j)) = -d_i A_{ij} \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i) \dim_{\kappa(d_j)}(N_j)$$

Taking the alternating sum, we get

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} 2d_i \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i) \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(N_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i \neq j \leq n} d_i A_{ij} \dim_{\kappa(d_i)}(M_i) \dim_{\kappa(d_j)}(N_j)$$

which is exactly $(\dim M, \dim N)$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Aoki, A. Higashitani, O. Iyama, R. Kase, and Y. Mizuno. Fans and polytopes in tilting theory I: Foundations. arXiv:2203.15213.
- [2] M. Auslander, I. Reiten, and S. Smalø, Representation theory of Artin algebras. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995.
- [3] P. Baumann and J. Kamnitzer, Preprojective algebras and MV polytopes. *Represent. Theory* **16** (2012), 152–188.
- [4] G. Birkhoff, *Lattice theory*, Corrected reprint of the 1967 third edition. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications **25**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I., 1979.
- [5] A. Björner and F. Brenti, Combinatorics of Coxeter groups. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **231**. Springer, New York, 2005. xiv+363 pp. ISBN: 978-3540-442387
- [6] B. Brink and R. Howlett, A finiteness property and an automatic structure for Coxeter groups. *Math. Ann.* **296** (1993), no. 1, 179–190.
- [7] S. Brodsky and C. Stump, Towards a uniform subword complex description of acyclic Dynkin type cluster algebras. *Algebr. Comb.* **1** (2018), no. 4, 545–572.
- [8] T. Brüstle, G. Douville, K. Mousavand, H. Thomas, and E. Yıldırım, On the combinatorics of gentle algebras. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics* **72** (2020), no. 6, 1551–1580.
- [9] T. Brüstle, D. Smith, and H. Treffinger. Wall and chamber structure for finite-dimensional algebras. *Advances in Mathematics* **354** (2019), 106746.
- [10] W. Crawley-Boevey, On the Exceptional Fibres of Kleinian Singularities. *Amer. J. Math.* **122** (2000), no. 5, 1027–1037.
- [11] W. Dana, “Shard Shenanigans: Finding a non-shard real brick”, https://cocalc.com/share/public_paths/56dd5600cf903745f6b9b6e98cab24af06b8f354 . Retrieved on March 25, 2023.
- [12] L. Demonet, O. Iyama, G. Jasso, τ -tilting finite algebras, bricks, and g -vectors. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2019, no. 3, 852–892.
- [13] L. Demonet, O. Iyama, N. Reading, I. Reiten, and H. Thomas, Lattice theory of torsion classes: beyond τ -tilting theory. *Transactions of the AMS*, to appear. arXiv:1711.01785.
- [14] V. Deodhar, A note on subgroups generated by reflections in Coxeter groups. *Arch. Math. (Basel)* **53** (1989), no. 6, 543–546.
- [15] V. Dlab and C. M. Ringel, The preprojective algebra of a modulated graph. *Representation theory, II (Proc. Second Internat. Conf., Carleton Univ., Ottawa, Ont., 1979)*, pp. 216–231, Lecture Notes in Math., **832**, Springer, Berlin-New York, 1980.
- [16] M. Dyer, Reflection subgroups of Coxeter systems. *J. Algebra* **135** (1990), no. 1, 57–73.
- [17] M. Dyer, On the weak order of Coxeter groups, *Canad. J. Math.* **71** (2019), no. 2, 299–336.
- [18] M. Dyer and W. Wang, Oriented matroid structures from realized root systems. *J. Algebraic Combin.* **53** (2021), no. 4, 945–971.
- [19] H. Eriksson, Computational and combinatorial aspects of Coxeter groups, Ph.D. Thesis, KTH, Stockholm, Sweden, 1994.
- [20] K. Eriksson, Strongly convergent games and Coxeter groups, Ph.D. Thesis, KTH, Stockholm, Sweden, 1993.
- [21] A. Felikson and P. Tumarkin, Coxeter groups and their quotients arising from cluster algebras. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* 2016, no. 17, 5135–5186
- [22] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, Cluster algebras. II. Dynkin type classification. *Invent. Math.* **154** (2003), no. 1, 63–121.
- [23] S. Fomin and A. Zelevinsky, Y -systems and generalized associahedra. *Ann. of Math. (2)* **158** (2003), no. 3, 977–1018.
- [24] M. Garcia and A. Garver, Semistable subcategories for tiling algebras. *Beitr. Algebra Geom.* **61** (2020), no. 1, 47–71.
- [25] A. Garver and T. McConville, Lattice properties of oriented exchange graphs and torsion classes. *Algebr. Represent. Theory* **22** (2019), no. 1, 43–78.
- [26] A. Garver and T. McConville, Oriented flip graphs, noncrossing tree partitions, and representation theory of tiling algebras. *Glasg. Math. J.* **62** (2020), no. 1, 147–182.
- [27] A. Garver, T. McConville, and K. Mousavand, A categorification of biclosed sets of strings. *J. Algebra* **546** (2020), 390–431.

- [28] C. Geiß, B. Leclerc, and J. Schröer, Semicanonical bases and preprojective algebras II: A multiplication formula. *Compos. Math.* **143** (2007), no. 5, 1313–1334.
- [29] J. Humphreys, *Reflection groups and Coxeter groups*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **29**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990. xii+204 pp. ISBN: 0-521-37510-X
- [30] O. Iyama and S. Oppermann, Stable categories of higher preprojective algebras. *Adv. Math.* **244** (2014), 23–68.
- [31] 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.
- [32] O. Kerner, F. Lukas, Regular stones of wild hereditary algebras, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* **93** (1994), no. 1, 15–31.
- [33] A. D. King, Moduli of representations of finite-dimensional algebras. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2)* **45** (1994), no. 180, 515–530.
- [34] J. Külshammer, Pro-Species of Algebras I: Basic Properties. *Algebr. Represent. Theory* **20** (2017), no. 5, 1215–1238.
- [35] S. Lang, *Algebra*, revised 3rd edition. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **211**. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2002. xvi+914 pp. ISBN: 0-387-95385-X
- [36] T. McConville, Lattice structure of Grid-Tamari orders. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. A* **148** (2017), pp. 27–56.
- [37] Y. Mizuno, Classifying τ -tilting modules over preprojective algebras of Dynkin type. *Math. Z.* **277** (2014), no. 3–4, 665–690.
- [38] Y. Mizuno, Shard theory for g -fans. arXiv:2212.10745.
- [39] S. Oh, A. Postnikov and D. Speyer, Weak separation and plabic graphs. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* **110** (2015), no. 3, 721–754.
- [40] Y. Palu, V. Pilad and P.-G. Plamondon, Non-kissing complexes for gentle algebras. *Sém. Lothar. Combin.* **80B** (2018), Art. 39, 12 pp.
- [41] N. Reading, Noncrossing partitions and the shard intersection order. *J. Algebraic Combin.* **33** (2011), no. 4, 483–530.
- [42] N. Reading and D. Speyer, Cambrian fans. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)* **11** (2009), no. 2, 407–447.
- [43] N. Reading and D. Speyer, Sortable elements in infinite Coxeter groups. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **363** (2011), no. 2, 699–761.
- [44] N. Reading and D. Speyer, Cambrian frameworks for cluster algebras of affine type. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **370** (2018), no. 2, 1429–1468.
- [45] F. Santos, C. Stump and V. Welker, Noncrossing sets and a Grassmann associahedron. *Forum Math. Sigma* **5** (2017), Paper No. e5, 49 pp.
- [46] D. Speyer and H. Thomas, Acyclic cluster algebras revisited. *Algebras, quivers and representations*, 275–298, *Abel Symp.*, **8**, Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.
- [47] J. Stembridge, Quasi-minuscule quotients and reduced words for reflections. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics* **13** (2001), 275–293.
- [48] H. Thomas, Stability, shards, and preprojective algebras. *Representations of Algebras: Proceedings of ICRA 2016*. AMS, Providence, RI, 2018, pp. 251–262.