

# CATEGORIFICATION AND MIRROR SYMMETRY FOR GRASSMANNIANS

BERNT TORE JENSEN, ALASTAIR KING, AND XIUPING SU

ABSTRACT. The homogeneous coordinate ring  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]$  of the Grassmannian of  $k$ -dimensional quotients of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  is a cluster algebra, with an additive categorification  $\mathrm{CM}C$ , introduced in an earlier paper. Thus every  $M \in \mathrm{CM}C$  has a cluster character  $\Psi_M \in \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]$ .

The aim of this paper is to use the category  $\mathrm{CM}C$  to enrich Rietsch–Williams’ mirror symmetry result that the Newton–Okounkov (NO) body/cone, made from leading exponents of functions in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]$  in an  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster chart, can also be described by tropicalisation of the Marsh–Reitsch superpotential  $W$ .

We start working in a more general Frobenius 2-CY subcategory  $\mathrm{GP}B$  of  $\mathrm{CM}C$  and, for any cluster tilting object  $T$  in  $\mathrm{GP}B$ , with  $A = \mathrm{End}(T)^{\mathrm{op}}$ , we define two new cluster characters, a generalised partition function  $\mathcal{P}_M^T \in \mathbb{C}[K(\mathrm{CM}A)]$  and a generalised flow polynomial  $\mathcal{F}_M^T \in \mathbb{C}[K(\mathrm{fd}A)]$ , related by a ‘dehomogenising’ map  $\mathrm{wt}: K(\mathrm{CM}A) \rightarrow K(\mathrm{fd}A)$ . We also relate  $\mathcal{P}_M^T$  to Fu–Keller’s cluster character  $\Phi_M^T$ , which is a different function, although both leading exponents are the  $g$ -vector of  $M$ .

When  $B = C$ , we show that, in the  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster chart corresponding to  $T$ , the function  $\Psi_M$  becomes  $\mathcal{F}_M^T$  and thus its leading exponent is  $\kappa(T, M)$ , an invariant introduced in another earlier paper (also the image of the  $g$ -vector of  $M$  under  $\mathrm{wt}$ ). In the process, we show that, when  $T$  mutates,  $\mathcal{F}_M^T$  undergoes  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation and  $\kappa(T, M)$  undergoes tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation. We also identify a basis of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]$  given by  $\Psi_M$  for ‘generic’  $M$ .

We then show that the monoid of  $g$ -vectors is saturated, i.e. the integral points of a rational polyhedral cone, and that this cone can be identified with the NO-cone, so the NO-body of Rietsch–Williams can be described in terms of  $\kappa(T, M)$ . Furthermore, we adapt Rietsch–Williams’ mirror symmetry strategy to find module-theoretic inequalities that determine the cone of  $g$ -vectors.

## CONTENTS

1. Introduction and main results	2
2. Frobenius subcategories $\mathrm{GP}B$ in $\mathrm{CM}C$	9
3. Endomorphism algebras of cluster tilting objects in $\mathrm{GP}B$	15
4. Weight modules	21
5. Grothendieck groups $K(\mathrm{fd}A)$ and $K(\mathrm{CM}A)$	24
6. Cluster characters, partition functions and flow polynomials	28
7. Classical partition functions and flow polynomials	35
8. Cluster algebras, monoids and cones	43
9. Cluster characters under isomorphisms of cluster algebras	45
10. Bases and Newton–Okounkov cones for Grassmannians	52
11. $\kappa(T, M)$ and Gelfand–Tsetlin polytopes	57
12. Mutation of $\kappa(T, M)$	59
13. Mutation of simple modules and $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation	63
14. Newton–Okounkov cones and bodies for Grassmannians	68
15. Superpotential and tropicalisation	71
References	77

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULTS

**1.1. Background.** Let  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$  be the Grassmannian of subspaces of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  with  $k$ -dimensional quotient and let  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  be its homogeneous coordinate ring. As representations of  $\text{GL}_n$  (for example, by the Borel–Weil Theorem), we have

$$\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] = \bigoplus_d V_{d\omega_k}$$


where  $\omega_k$  is the  $k$ th fundamental weight and  $V_{d\omega_k}$  is the irreducible representation with highest weight  $d\omega_k$ . Fomin–Zelevinsky showed in [11] that  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(2, n)]$  is a cluster algebra (of finite type  $\mathbf{A}_{n-3}$ ). Scott [31] extended this result, proving that all  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  have cluster structures, in which the Plücker coordinates, i.e. the minors  $\Delta_J$  for each  $k$ -subset  $J$  of  $\{1, \dots, n\}$ , are cluster variables. There is a rich combinatorics of clusters of minors controlled by plabic graphs (see e.g. [25]), but there are usually also higher degree cluster variables (i.e. when  $2 < k < n - 2$ ).

Following e.g. [24, 30], we will write  $[n]$  for  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  and  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  for the collection of all  $k$ -subsets of  $[n]$ . Throughout this paper,

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{C}[[t]] \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{K} = \mathcal{R}[t^{-1}].$$

Note that  $\mathcal{R}$  is a complete local ring and  $\mathcal{K}$  is its field of fractions.

In [18, §3], we introduced an  $\mathcal{R}$ -algebra  $C = C(k, n)$ , which is the path algebra of the circular double quiver with  $n$  vertices, with relations  $xy = t = yx$  and  $x^k = y^{n-k}$ , where  $x$  and  $y$  label clockwise and anti-clockwise arrows respectively, as illustrated here for  $n = 5$ .



More precisely, we label the vertices clockwise by  $1, \dots, n = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ , the arrow from  $i - 1$  to  $i$  by  $x_i$  and the arrow from  $i$  to  $i - 1$  by  $y_i$ . Furthermore, the given relations start at every vertex; for example, when  $(k, n) = (2, 5)$ , the relations starting from 0 are  $x_5 y_5 = t = y_1 x_1$  and  $x_2 x_1 = y_3 y_4 y_5$ .

In [18, §9], building on work of Geiss–Leclerc–Schröer [14], we showed how the cluster structure on  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  can be categorified by the category  $\text{CM } C$  of Cohen–Macaulay  $C$ -modules, that is,  $C$ -modules that are free over  $\mathcal{R}$ . More precisely, we defined a cluster character

$$\Psi: \text{CM } C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]: M \mapsto \Psi_M$$

by homogenising an inhomogeneous cluster character from [14]. Now any  $M \in \text{CM } C$  has a well-defined rank  $\text{rk}_C M$  (see [18, Def. 3.5] and §3.3), which satisfies

$$\text{rk}_C M = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} e_i M$$

for any vertex idempotent  $e_i \in C$ . Rank 1 modules in  $\text{CM } C$  are classified by  $J \in \binom{[n]}{k}$  (see [18, §5] for the construction of  $M_J$ ) and we have

$$\Psi_{M_J} = \Delta_J. \tag{1.2}$$

In [19], we found that  $\text{CM } C$  also categorifies the quantum cluster algebra  $\mathbb{C}_q[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ , in the sense that it knows the quasi-commutation rules. More precisely, we defined an

invariant  $\kappa(M, N)$  for modules  $M, N$  in  $\text{CMC}$ . When  $I, J \in \binom{[n]}{k}$  are non-crossing, so that the quantum minors  $\Delta_I$  and  $\Delta_J$  quasi-compute, then [19, Thm. 6.5]

$$q^{\kappa(M_I, M_J)} \Delta_I \Delta_J = q^{\kappa(M_J, M_I)} \Delta_J \Delta_I.$$

We also observed [19, Lem. 7.1] the (apparently independent) fact that

$$\kappa(M_I, M_J) = \text{MaxDiag}(\lambda_I \setminus \lambda_J),$$

where the right-hand side is a combinatorial invariant that plays a key role in Rietsch–Williams’ work [30] on mirror symmetry for Grassmannians. Here  $\lambda_I, \lambda_J$  are certain Young diagrams labelled by  $I, J$  and the invariant is the maximal length of the diagonals in  $\lambda_I \setminus \lambda_J$ .

In [30], Rietsch–Williams uncovered an instance of mirror symmetry for Grassmannians by studying their Newton–Okounkov (NO) bodies, which are certain convex sets (in this case, rational polytopes) that encode the leading exponents  $\text{val}_G(f)$  of all functions  $f \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ , when expressed in the network (or  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster) chart associated to a plabic graph  $G$ . On the mirror side, there is a superpotential  $W$  and [30, Thm 16.18] shows that, by expressing  $W$  in the dual  $\mathbb{A}$ -cluster chart associated to  $G$  and tropicalising, one obtains the linear inequalities that describe the NO-body. Furthermore, in [30, Thm 15.1], the leading exponents of minors  $\Delta_J$  are shown to be given by

$$\text{val}_G(\Delta_J) = (\text{MaxDiag}(\lambda_I \setminus \lambda_J) : I \in \mathbf{S}), \quad (1.3)$$

where  $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$  is the maximal non-crossing set of face labels of  $G$ .

One key feature of categorification is that clusters are upgraded to cluster tilting objects  $T$  in  $\text{CMC}$ . In particular, a cluster of minors  $\{\Delta_I : I \in \mathbf{S}\}$ , for a maximal non-crossing set  $\mathbf{S}$ , is upgraded to

$$T_{\mathbf{S}} = \bigoplus_{I \in \mathbf{S}} M_I. \quad (1.4)$$

Thus the leading exponent of  $\Delta_J$  can be expressed as a vector invariant  $\kappa(T_{\mathbf{S}}, M_J)$ , which is a dimension vector for the algebra  $A = \text{End}(T_{\mathbf{S}})^{\text{op}}$ , whose Gabriel quiver  $Q$  is dual to the plabic graph  $G$  (see [3]). In other words,  $\kappa(T_{\mathbf{S}}, M_J)$  is an element of the Grothendieck group  $K(\text{fd } A) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  of finite-dimensional  $A$ -modules.

This observation was the starting point for the current paper, since a natural generalisation of (1.3) would be

$$\text{val}_G(\Psi_M) = \kappa(T, M), \quad (1.5)$$

where  $M$  is any module in  $\text{CMC}$ , while  $G$  stands for an arbitrary  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster chart (as in [30, Rem 6.17]) and  $T$  is the corresponding (reachable) cluster tilting object in  $\text{CMC}$ .

One of the main goals of this paper is to prove (1.5) for general  $M$  and  $T$ . Some of the machinery we develop to do this works in a greater generality, which is relevant to the context of positroid subvarieties of  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ .

Let  $G$  be a plabic graph of ‘rank’  $n$  and ‘helicity’  $k$ , and let  $Q$  be its dual quiver with faces (cf. [3], [8]). As described by Muller-Speyer [24], the homogeneous network chart associated to  $G$  can be given by the partition function map

$$\widehat{\text{net}}_G: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{T}_G]: \Delta_J \mapsto P_J = \sum_{\mu: \partial\mu=J} x^\mu, \quad (1.6)$$

which corresponds geometrically to an embedding of a torus  $\mathbb{T}_G$  into the affine cone on the Grassmannian. Note that the  $\mu$  in the sum are perfect matchings on  $G$ , which can (by construction) be viewed as elements of the character lattice  $\mathbb{M}$  of  $\mathbb{T}_G$ . Indeed we will prefer to write the coordinate ring  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{T}_G]$  as the formal Laurent polynomial ring  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{M}]$ , so that  $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$  becomes the formal monomial  $x^\mu \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{M}]$ .

Note also that the image of the torus  $\mathbb{T}_G$  is open in (the affine cone on) the closed positroid subvariety of  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$  on which  $\Delta_J = 0$ , for all  $J$  which are not boundary values of matchings, that is, not in the positroid (a subset of  $\binom{[n]}{k}$ ).

We can turn  $\widehat{\text{net}}_G$  into the more usual network chart  $\text{net}_G$  expressed in terms of flow polynomials (cf. [30]) by a dehomogenising monomial change of variables, given by a lattice map  $\text{wt}: \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_* \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ , where  $\mathbb{N}_*$  is the sublattice of vectors that vanish at a chosen boundary vertex  $*$  (see Section 7 for more details). More precisely,  $\text{net}_G = \mathbb{C}[\text{wt}] \circ \widehat{\text{net}}_G$ , so the flow polynomials are  $F_J = \mathbb{C}[\text{wt}]P_J \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{N}_*]$ . They are polynomials, as all exponents are in  $\mathbb{N}^{Q_0}$ .

We now explain the topics and main results of the paper.

**1.2. Frobenius 2-Calabi–Yau (2-CY) categories.** We start by investigating subcategories of  $\text{CM } C$  that share the properties needed to develop the basic machinery of the paper. Let  $B$  be an  $\mathcal{R}$ -order in  $C[t^{-1}] \cong M_n(\mathcal{K})$ , lying over  $C$ , that is,

$$C \subseteq B \subseteq C[t^{-1}]. \quad (1.7)$$

There are two important subcategories associated to  $B$ ,

$$\text{GP } B \subseteq \text{CM } B \subseteq \text{CM } C.$$

In particular, assuming that  $B$  is rigid as both a left and right  $C$ -module, we can show (Theorem 2.11) that  $B$  is Iwanaga–Gorenstein of injective dimension at most 2, while  $\text{GP } B$  is the category of Gorenstein projective  $B$ -modules and is Frobenius 2-CY. Note that the algebra  $B$  turns out to be a necklace algebra, that is, the (opposite) endomorphism algebra of the module associated to a Grassmann necklace [28].

We will also assume that  $\text{GP } B$  has a cluster structure and, in particular, a collection of cluster tilting objects  $T$  related by mutation. The main idea in the (additive) categorification of cluster algebras is to replace a cluster by a cluster tilting object  $T$  in a Frobenius 2-CY category and to derive everything else from that.

**1.3. Generalised partition functions and flow polynomials.** A first step in the categorification process, in our case, is to replace the map  $\text{wt}: \mathbb{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  by a map between Grothendieck groups associated to  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$

$$\text{wt}: K(\text{CM } A) \rightarrow K(\text{fd } A),$$

induced by an exact functor  $\text{Wt}: \text{CM } A \rightarrow \text{fd } A$ . We observe (Lemma 4.5) that

$$\kappa(T, M) = \text{wt}[T, M],$$

where  $[T, M] := [\text{Hom}_B(T, M)] \in K(\text{CM } A)$  is the  $g$ -vector of  $M \in \text{CM } B$ . Note that the  $g$ -vector is often expressed in components in the basis of indecomposable projective  $A$ -modules, but we will avoid doing this here as far as possible

Furthermore, the boundary value map  $\mu \mapsto \partial\mu$  is replaced by the restriction functor  $\mathbf{e}: \text{CM } A \rightarrow \text{CM } B: X \mapsto eX$ , so the condition  $\partial\mu = J$  is replaced by  $eX = M_J$  and thus generalised to  $eX = M$ , for arbitrary  $M \in \text{CM } B$ . Note that  $\mathbf{e}$  has a right adjoint  $\mathbf{R} = \text{Hom}_B(T, -)$ . To interpret  $eX = M$  correctly, we can use the adjunction to write  $X \leq \mathbf{R}M$ , so that *a priori*  $eX \leq M$ .

Following [8], we generalise the partition function  $P_J \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{M}]$  in (1.6) by a function  $\mathcal{P}_M^T \in \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$ , for any  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , written as a motivic sum as follows.

$$\mathcal{P}_M^T = \sum_{X: eX=M}^{\text{mot}} x^{[X]} = \sum_{Y \leq \underline{\mathbf{R}M}}^{\text{mot}} x^{[\widehat{Y}]} = x^{[T, M]} \mathbf{F}'_{\underline{\mathbf{R}M}}(x^{-\beta}), \quad (1.8)$$

where  $\underline{RM} = \underline{\text{Hom}}_B(T, M)$ , while  $\widehat{Y} \leq \underline{RM}$  is the lift of  $Y \leq \underline{RM}$  and  $F'_N(x)$  is the F-polynomial for quotients of  $N$ . Here, by ‘‘motivic sum’’ we mean that infinite families of modules in the sum are counted by the Euler characteristic of the family (see §6.2 for more details). We also obtain a generalised flow polynomial

$$\mathcal{F}_M^T = \mathbb{C}[\text{wt}] \mathcal{P}_M^T = x^{\kappa(T, M)} F'_{\underline{RM}}(x). \quad (1.9)$$

Note that (1.8) can also be written similarly to the formula for the more familiar cluster character of Fu–Keller [10], that is,

$$\Phi_M^T = x^{[T, M]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(T, M)) x^{-\beta(d)} = x^{[T, M]} F_{\text{Ext}^1(T, M)}(x^{-\beta}), \quad (1.10)$$

where  $\text{Gr}_d E$  is the Grassmannian of  $A$ -submodules of  $E$  of class  $d \in K(\text{fd } A)$  and  $\chi$  is the Euler characteristic. Thus  $F_E(x)$  is the usual F-polynomial for submodules of  $E$ .

One key result that holds in the generality of §1.2 is (Proposition 6.6(2)) that  $\mathcal{P}_M^T$  is a cluster character and hence  $\mathcal{F}_M^T$  is also. We also prove that  $\mathcal{P}_M^T$  is related, by a monomial change of variables, to  $\Phi_M^{\Sigma T}$  where  $\Sigma T$  is obtained from  $T$  by taking the cosyzygies of all mutable summands. More precisely, we show (Theorem 6.8) that

$$\mathcal{P}_M^T = \mathbb{C}[\zeta] \Phi_M^{\Sigma T} \quad (1.11)$$

where, for  $A' = \text{End}(\Sigma T)^{\text{op}}$  and for any  $X \in \text{add } \Sigma T$ ,

$$\zeta: K(\text{CM } A') \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A): [\Sigma T, X] \mapsto [T, X]. \quad (1.12)$$

To go further, we currently need to restrict to the case  $B = C$ , in which case  $\text{GP } B = \text{CM } C$ . Our first major result (Theorem 9.12) is then that, for any cluster tilting object  $T$  in  $\text{CM } C$ , there is a map

$$\Xi^T: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)] \quad (1.13)$$

with the property that, for all  $M \in \text{CM } C$ ,

$$\Xi^T(\Psi_M) = \mathcal{P}_M^T.$$

Thus  $\Xi^T$  generalises the homogeneous network chart and  $\mathbb{C}[\text{wt}] \circ \Xi^T: \Psi_M \mapsto \mathcal{F}_M^T$  generalises the usual (inhomogeneous) network chart. The main stepping stone to this result is (Theorem 9.11) that the  $\mathbb{A}$ -cluster chart associated to  $T$  is a map

$$\Upsilon^T: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)] \quad (1.14)$$

with the property that, for all  $M \in \text{CM } C$ ,

$$\Upsilon^T(\Psi_M) = \Phi_M^T.$$

Note that *a priori* this formula only holds for reachable rigid  $M$ , since  $\Phi^T$  is a cluster character. This result is proved by lifting a similar result of Geiss–Leclerc–Schröer [15]. Then Theorem 9.12 follows by setting  $\Xi^T = \mathbb{C}[\zeta] \circ \Upsilon^{\Sigma T}$  and using Theorem 6.8.

We can also use these results to study the twist map

$$\text{twi}: \text{Gr}^\circ(k, n) \rightarrow \text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)$$

defined by Muller–Speyer [24] more generally for open positroid varieties, that is, where the frozen variables are non-zero. We show (Proposition 9.14) that

$$\text{twi}(\Psi_M) = \frac{\Psi_{\Omega M}}{\Psi_{PM}},$$

for any  $M \in \text{CM } C$ , where  $0 \rightarrow \Omega M \rightarrow PM \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  is a syzygy sequence for  $M$ , that is, a short exact sequence with  $PM$  projective. This generalises a result of [8], when  $M$  has rank 1.

We can summarise the proofs of Theorem 9.12 and Proposition 9.14 by the following commutative diagram (Corollary 9.15) of four cluster characters.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}^\circ(k, n)] & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{twi}} & \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}^\circ(k, n)] \\
 \downarrow \Upsilon^{\Sigma T} & \begin{array}{c} \swarrow \Psi \\ \searrow \Psi^\dagger \end{array} & \downarrow \Upsilon^T \\
 & \mathrm{CM} C & \\
 & \begin{array}{c} \swarrow \Phi^{\Sigma T} \\ \searrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^T \end{array} & \\
 \mathbb{C}[K(\mathrm{CM} A')] & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{C}[-\zeta]} & \mathbb{C}[K(\mathrm{CM} A)]
 \end{array}$$

Here  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M^T = \mathbb{C}[-1] \mathcal{P}_M^T$ , while  $\Psi_M^\dagger = \Psi_{\Omega M} / \Psi_{PM}$  and  $\zeta$  is as in (1.12).

The commuting of the left-hand triangle is Theorem 9.11, the commuting of the bottom triangle is Theorem 6.8, while the commuting of the right-hand triangle also uses Proposition 6.6(1).

**1.4. Generic bases and  $g$ -vectors.** The fact that  $g$ -vectors are the leading exponents of cluster characters, in both cluster charts and homogeneous network charts, leads us to look more closely at the set of all  $g$ -vectors in  $K(\mathrm{CM} A)$ , which is *a priori* a monoid (i.e. closed under addition and with a zero element)

$$\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T) = \{[T, M] : M \in \mathrm{CM} C\}$$

and to investigate its relationship with  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T)$ , the monoid of leading exponents of all functions  $f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]$  in the network chart  $\Xi^T$ .

A key step is to show (Theorem 10.8) that  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]$  has a basis  $\{\Psi_M : M \text{ generic}\}$ . This is similar to a result of Geiss–Leclerc–Schroer [15], but directly uses Lusztig’s characterisation [22] of the irreducible components of representation varieties of pre-projective algebras.

Having this basis enables us to prove (Theorem 10.11) that

$$\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T) = \{[T, M] : M \text{ generic}\} = \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T).$$

Thus the two monoids coincide and, in the process, we see that every  $g$ -vector is the  $g$ -vector of a generic module. Furthermore, we can then prove (Remark 12.9) that  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T)$  is saturated, that is, the integral points of a rational polyhedral cone

$$\mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T) = \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\text{-span}}\{[T, M] : M \in \mathrm{CM} C\}.$$

This is proved inductively, following the same strategy as Rietsch–Williams [30].

First (Theorem 11.4) we explicitly compute in a special cluster, the rectangles cluster  $T^\square$  (Definition 9.4), that  $\widetilde{\mathrm{wt}} \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T^\square) = \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GT}}$ , the well-studied monoid of (cumulative) Gelfand–Tsetlin patterns, which is known to be saturated. Here

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{wt}} : K(\mathrm{CM} A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{N}_* : [Z] \mapsto (\mathrm{rk}[Z], \mathrm{wt}[Z]). \quad (1.15)$$

is a lattice isomorphism.

Second (Theorem 12.5, Corollary 12.8) we show that, when  $T$  is mutated, the invariant  $\kappa(T, M)$  changes by tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation, when  $M$  is suitably generic, and hence generic  $g$ -vectors also change by a piece-wise linear transformation.

**1.5. Valuations, cones and bodies.** Suppose  $G_{\mathbf{S}}$  is a plabic graph whose face labels are a maximal non-crossing collection  $\mathbf{S}$ . Then  $T_{\mathbf{S}} = \bigoplus_{J \in \mathbf{S}} M_J$  is the corresponding cluster tilting object in  $\text{CMC}$ . As in [30], a general  $\mathbb{X}$ -seed will also be denoted  $G$  and is related to a plabic seed  $G_{\mathbf{S}}$  by a sequence of  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutations. Applying the same sequence of mutations to  $T_{\mathbf{S}}$  associates a cluster tilting object  $T$  to  $G$ .

By Theorem 9.12, there is a map

$$\text{wt}\Xi^T = \mathbb{C}[\text{wt}] \circ \Xi^T : \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]/(\Delta_{I_*} - 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{N}_*]: \Psi_M \mapsto \mathcal{F}_M^T. \quad (1.16)$$

We can show directly (Proposition 7.8) that this coincides with the classical network chart  $\text{net}_G$  in the case that  $G = G_{\mathbf{S}}$  is a plabic seed. On the other hand, we can show (Theorem 13.3) that  $\text{wt}\Xi^T$  undergoes  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation when  $T$  mutates and so  $\text{net}_G = \text{wt}\Xi^T$ , in general.

In [30], Rietsch–Williams define the valuation  $\text{val}_G(f)$ , for non-zero  $f \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ , to be minimal exponent (in  $\mathbf{N}_*$ ) of  $\text{net}_G(f)$ . Now we know (Proposition 6.11) that the minimal exponent of  $\mathcal{F}_M^T$  is  $\kappa(T, M)$  and so we conclude (Theorem 14.1) that, for any  $M \in \text{CMC}$ ,

$$\text{val}_G(\Psi_M) = \kappa(T, M).$$

In particular, since  $\Psi_{M_I} = \Delta_I$ ,

$$\text{val}_G(\Delta_I) = \kappa(T, M_I),$$

which recovers (1.3) when  $G$  is a plabic seed. Thus we have proved (1.5) as intended, and as conjectured in [19, Remark 7.3].

Using the valuation  $\text{val}_G$ , Rietsch–Williams [30, (8.2)] also define the *Newton–Okounkov body* in  $\mathbf{N}_* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\Delta_{\text{NO}}(G) = \overline{\text{ConvHull}} \bigcup_r \frac{1}{r} \{ \text{val}_G(f) : f \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]_r \setminus 0 \}$$

which is the degree 1 slice of the ‘NO-cone’ in  $(\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_*) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  given by

$$\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(G) = \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\text{-span}} \{ (\deg(f), \text{val}_G(f)) : f \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]_{\bullet} \},$$

where  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]_{\bullet}$  is the *subset* of all non-zero homogeneous functions.

On the other hand, using the  $\kappa$ -invariant, we can define the body

$$\Delta_{\kappa}(T) = \overline{\text{ConvHull}} \bigcup_r \frac{1}{r} \{ \kappa(T, M) : M \in \text{CMC}, \text{rk}_C M = r \},$$

which is the degree 1 slice of the cone

$$\widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T) = \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\text{-span}} \{ (\text{rk}_C M, \kappa(T, M)) : M \in \text{CMC} \}$$

where  $\widetilde{\text{wt}}$  is as in (1.15).

Clearly (1.5) suggests a relationship between these cones/bodies and indeed we can show (Theorem 14.4) that

$$\Delta_{\text{NO}}(G) = \Delta_{\kappa}(T)$$

or equivalently that

$$\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(G) = \widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T). \quad (1.17)$$

The proof uses Theorem 10.8 and Theorem 10.11, exploiting the fact that we know a basis of  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  consisting of (generic) cluster characters  $\Psi_M$  with distinct leading exponents  $\kappa(T, M)$  in the appropriate chart.

Note that in (1.17), we are using the lattice isomorphism  $\widetilde{\text{wt}}$  to identify the two cones. We are not directly using the so-called  $p^*$  map, which in this case could be given by  $\beta: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A)$ .

**1.6. Mirror symmetry.** Rietsch–Williams [30] give another description of the NO-body (or, equivalently, NO-cone) as an instance of mirror symmetry for Grassmannians. In effect, they show that

$$\mathbf{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(G) = \mathbf{Cone}_W(G),$$

where  $\mathbf{Cone}_W(G)$  is obtained from the Marsh–Rietsch [23] superpotential  $W$ , by writing it in the  $\mathbb{A}$ -cluster chart associated to  $G$  and then tropicalising, that is, using the exponents to give the inequalities defining the cone (see Remark 15.6 for more details).

Given (1.17), we can use the dual of the lattice isomorphism  $\widetilde{\text{wt}}$  to rewrite  $W$  (Proposition 15.7) and thereby find the inequalities defining  $\mathbf{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  (Theorem 15.8). More precisely, these inequalities are obtained by tropicalising the following superpotential, written in  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster coordinates, that is, in  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{fd } A)]$ .

$$W_{\mathbb{X}}(T) = \sum_{i=1}^n x^{[S_i]} \mathbf{F}'_{\text{Ext}^1(T, P_i^\diamond)}(x) \quad (1.18)$$

Here  $P_i^\diamond$  is an extension of  $P_i$  by a simple  $C$ -module  $S_i^\diamond = S_{i+k}$ , that is, we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow P_i \longrightarrow P_i^\diamond \longrightarrow S_i^\diamond \longrightarrow 0$$

and  $\mathbf{F}'_E(x)$  is the quotient  $F$ -polynomial of  $E$  (see §15.2 for more details).

Explicitly, the inequalities defining  $\mathbf{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  are

$$([S_i] + [V])(x) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all quotients } V \text{ of } \text{Ext}^1(T, P_i^\diamond), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (1.19)$$

Alternatively, we can write the inequalities as

$$[U](x) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } U \leq \text{Ext}^1(S_i^\diamond, T), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.20)$$

where  $[U] \in K(\text{fd } A^{\text{op}})$ , which we can also view as dual to  $K(\text{CM } A)$ .

Note that the proof very much follows the strategy of [30] and it would be very interesting to have a more categorical proof of the characterisation of  $g$ -vectors given by (1.19) or (1.20). Note also that the superpotential in (1.18) should coincide with the Gross–Hacking–Keel–Kontsevich [12] superpotential, as described in [32] and [21].

**Notation and conventions.** The following apply throughout the paper.

- (1) A plabic graph  $G$  is presumed to come from a (consistent) Postnikov diagram. The *type* of  $G$  is the (decorated) strand permutation  $\pi$  of  $[n]$ . In the Grassmannian case, the type is the uniform permutation  $\pi_{k,n} : j \mapsto j - k \pmod n$ .
- (2) As in [18], the Plücker label  $I$  on a rank 1  $C$ -module  $M_I$  specifies that the *clockwise* arrows  $x_i$  in (1.1), for  $i \in I$ , act as 1. Elsewhere, e.g. [8], the alternative convention may be used, that is,  $I$  specifies the  $x_i$  acting as  $t$ , or, equivalently, the  $y_i$  acting as 1.
- (3) By a *partial presentation* of a module  $M$ , we mean a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega M \longrightarrow PM \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

where  $PM$  is some projective module. Thus  $\Omega M$  is a (first) syzygy of  $M$ , but not necessarily a minimal one.

**Acknowledgements.** We wish to thank Matthew Pressland, Timothy Magee and Konstanze Rietsch for many enlightening discussions, especially about mirror symmetry. We are also grateful to the Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research for a Focused Research Grant (2021) that enabled these discussions to take place.

2. FROBENIUS SUBCATEGORIES  $\text{GP } B$  IN  $\text{CM } C$ 

We know from [18] that  $\text{CM } C$  is a stably 2-Calabi-Yau (2-CY) Frobenius category. In this section, we find many other such categories  $\text{GP } B$  as full subcategories of  $\text{CM } C$ .

**2.1. Adjoint functors.** We list some basic facts about adjoint functors, for later use.

**Lemma 2.1.** [2, Prop 3.4.1] Let  $F: \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$  be a functor with a left adjoint  $L: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  and a right adjoint  $R: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ .

- (1) The following are equivalent.
  - (a) The functor  $F$  is faithful.
  - (b) The unit  $\eta: \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow RF$  is a pointwise monomorphism, i.e.  $X \rightarrow RFX$  is mono for any  $X \in \mathcal{C}$ .
  - (c) The counit  $\varepsilon: LF \rightarrow \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is a pointwise epimorphism, i.e.  $LFY \rightarrow Y$  is epi for any  $Y \in \mathcal{C}$ .
- (2) The following are equivalent.
  - (a) The functor  $F$  is fully faithful.
  - (b) The unit  $\eta: \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow RF$  is an isomorphism.
  - (c) The counit  $\varepsilon: LF \rightarrow \text{id}_{\mathcal{C}}$  is an isomorphism.

Recall that, in an additive category, a morphism  $f: X \rightarrow Y$  is an epimorphism if  $gf = 0$  implies that  $g = 0$ , for any  $g: Y \rightarrow Z$ . For example, in the category of torsion-free modules for any ring, an epimorphism is a map with torsion cokernel, not necessarily a surjection.

**2.2. The category  $\text{CM } B$ .** Let  $B$  be an  $\mathcal{R}$ -order in the matrix algebra  $M_n(\mathcal{K})$  with

$$C \subseteq B \subseteq C[t^{-1}] \cong M_n(\mathcal{K}). \quad (2.1)$$

In particular,  $e_i B e_i = e_i C e_i = \mathcal{R}$ , for any vertex idempotent  $e_i$  of  $C$ .

Recall that a  $C$ -module is Cohen–Macaulay if and only if  $C$  is a free  $\mathcal{R}$ -module. We also denote by  $\text{CM } B$  the category of  $B$ -modules that are free over  $\mathcal{R}$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** [9, Chap. 23, Exer. 2] The restriction functor  $F: \text{CM } B \rightarrow \text{CM } C$  is fully faithful. In particular, all  $C$ -summands of  $M \in \text{CM } B$  are  $B$ -summands.

*Proof.* If  $M, N \in \text{CM } B$ , then  $M \leq M \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}$ ,  $N \leq N \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}$  and

$$\text{Hom}_B(M, N) = \{f: M \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} \rightarrow N \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} : f(M) \subseteq N\} = \text{Hom}_C(M, N).$$

Thus  $F$  is fully faithful. For the last part, note that, since  $\text{Hom}_C(M, M) = \text{Hom}_B(M, M)$ , any  $C$ -idempotent is a  $B$ -idempotent.  $\square$

Since the restriction functor  $F = {}_C B \otimes_B -$ , it has right adjoint  $R = \text{Hom}_C(B, -)$ .

**Lemma 2.3.** The functor  $R = \text{Hom}_C(B, -): \text{CM } C \rightarrow \text{CM } B$  is faithful.

*Proof.* Note that  $R$  does map  $\text{CM } C$  to  $\text{CM } B$ , because, any  $M \in \text{CM } C$  is free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module and  $\text{Hom}_C(B, M) \leq \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(B, M)$ , which is thus free as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module. Let  $f: M \rightarrow N$  be a homomorphism in  $\text{CM } C$ . Suppose that

$$\text{Hom}_C(B, f) = 0.$$

As  $C \subseteq B$  and  $\text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} C = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} B$ , there is an embedding for any  $X \in \text{CM } C$ ,

$$\text{Hom}_C(B, X) \leq \text{Hom}_C(C, X) \cong X$$

and

$$\text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} \text{Hom}_C(B, X) = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} \text{Hom}_C(C, X) = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} X.$$

Hence  $\text{Hom}_C(B, M)$  is a submodule of  $M$  and has the same rank as  $M$ , and the restriction of  $f = \text{Hom}_C(C, f)$  to  $\text{Hom}_C(B, M)$  is 0. Therefore  $f = 0$ . So the functor  $\mathbf{R}$  is faithful.  $\square$

Note that any  $B$ -module, considered as a  $C$ -module, is a factor of some  $B' \in \text{add}_C B$ , namely its  $B$ -module projective cover, considered as a  $C$ -module. The converse is not true in general, but it is true for modules in  $\text{CM } C$ . The proof is a combination of exercises in [9], but we include it here for completeness.

**Proposition 2.4.** [9, Chap. 37, Exer. 10] If  $M \in \text{CM } C$  is a factor of some  $B' \in \text{add}_C B$ , then  $M \in \text{CM } B$ .

*Proof.* To have  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , it is necessary and sufficient for the counit  $\varepsilon_M: \mathbf{F}RM \rightarrow M$  to be an isomorphism. It is necessary, because

$${}_C B \otimes_B \text{Hom}_C(B, M) = {}_C B \otimes_B \text{Hom}_B(B, M) \cong {}_C B \otimes_B M \cong {}_C M, \quad (2.2)$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 2.2, because  $B, M \in \text{CM } B$ .

So suppose that  $M \in \text{CM } C$  is a factor of some  $C$ -module in  $\text{add}_C B$ . Then  $M$  will have a surjective  $\text{add}_C B$ -approximation

$$0 \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow B' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

Applying the counit  $\varepsilon: \mathbf{F}R \rightarrow \text{id}$  gives the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{F}RN & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{F}RB' & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{F}RM \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \varepsilon_N & & \downarrow \varepsilon_{B'} & & \downarrow \varepsilon_M \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

where the top sequence is exact, because  $B' \rightarrow M$  is an  $\text{add}_C B$ -approximation and  $\mathbf{F}$  is exact. Furthermore  $\varepsilon_{B'}$  is an isomorphism, as in (2.2), because  $B' \in \text{CM } B$ .

By the Snake Lemma,  $\varepsilon_M$  is surjective and  $\text{Ker } \varepsilon_M \cong \text{Cok } \varepsilon_N$ . By Lemma 2.3,  $\text{Hom}_C(B, -)$  is faithful on  $\text{CM } C$  and so by Lemma 2.1(1),  $\varepsilon_N$  is epi in  $\text{CM } C$ . Hence  $\text{Cok } \varepsilon_N$  is torsion. But  $\text{Ker } \varepsilon_M$  is a submodule of the torsion free module  $\mathbf{F}RM$ , so it is also torsion free. Thus

$$\text{Ker } \varepsilon_M \cong \text{Cok } \varepsilon_N = 0$$

and so  $M \cong \mathbf{F}RM$ , that is,  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , as required.  $\square$

As an immediate consequence, if  $M \in \text{CM } B$  and  $0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0$  is a short exact sequence in  $\text{CM } C$ , then  $L, N \in \text{CM } B$ .

Although restriction  $\mathbf{F}: \text{CM } B \rightarrow \text{CM } C$  is necessarily exact, so induces a map  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, N) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_C^1(M, N)$ , for  $M, N \in \text{CM } B$ , this map may not be an isomorphism, i.e.  $\mathbf{F}$  may not be ‘full exact’. However, we do have the following.

**Lemma 2.5.** For any  $M, N \in \text{CM } B$ ,  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, N) \subseteq \text{Ext}_C^1(M, N)$ .

*Proof.* Any extension in  $\text{CM } B$  is an extension in  $\text{CM } C$ . On the other hand, as the restriction is fully faithful, if an extension splits in  $\text{CM } C$ , then it also splits in  $\text{CM } B$ . So the result follows.  $\square$

Note that this lemma shows that  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, N)$  is always finite dimensional, because we already know that  $\text{Ext}_C^1(M, N)$  is finite dimensional, e.g. by [18, Cor. 4.6].

**2.3. The category  $\text{GP } B$ .** We will now assume that  $B$  is rigid as a left  $C$ -module. By a temporary abuse of notation, since we don't yet know that  $B$  is Iwanaga–Gorenstein, we define the full subcategory

$$\text{GP } B = \{M \in \text{CM } B : \text{Ext}_B^i(M, B) = 0, \forall i > 0\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Note that *a priori* a Gorenstein projective  $B$ -module satisfies this Ext-vanishing condition, but is not necessarily in  $\text{CM } B$ . However, we will show (in Theorem 2.11) that actually it is. Observe that  $\text{GP } B$  is non-trivial, since  $\text{add } B \subseteq \text{GP } B$ , and it is an extension-closed subcategory of  $\text{CM } B$ . While  $\text{CM } B$  is not an extension-closed subcategory of  $\text{CM } C$ , we do have the following.

**Proposition 2.6.** If  $N \in \text{CM } B$  and  $M \in \text{GP } B$ , then  $\text{Ext}_B^1(N, M) = \text{Ext}_C^1(N, M)$ . In particular,  $\text{GP } B$  is an extension-closed subcategory of  $\text{CM } C$ .

*Proof.* Consider  $\eta \in \text{Ext}_C^1(N, M)$ . As  $N \in \text{CM } B$ , there exists a surjection  $g: B' \rightarrow N$ , for some  $B' \in \text{add } {}_C B$ . Take the pullback of  $\eta$  along  $g$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow g & & \\ \eta : & 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

and note that  $X$  is a factor module of  $Y$ .

First consider the case  $M \in \text{add } {}_C B$ . Since  $B$  is rigid as a  $C$ -module, the top sequence splits and so  $Y \in \text{add } {}_C B$  and thus  $X$  satisfies the conditions of Proposition 2.4. Hence  $X \in \text{CM } B$ , that is  $\eta \in \text{Ext}_B^1(N, M)$ .

Now consider the general case, for arbitrary  $M \in \text{GP } B$ . We have

$$\text{Ext}_C^1(B', M) = \text{Ext}_C^1(M, B') = \text{Ext}_B^1(M, B') = 0,$$

due (respectively) to the 2-CY property of  $\text{CM } C$ , the special case above (with  $N = M$  and  $M = B'$ ) and the fact that  $M \in \text{GP } B$ . Therefore, the top sequence still splits and so  $Y \in \text{CM } B$ . Thus  $Y$  is a factor of some  $B'' \in \text{add } {}_C B$  and so  $X$  is also and again satisfies the conditions of Proposition 2.4. Hence  $X \in \text{CM } B$ , that is  $\eta \in \text{Ext}_B^1(N, M)$ , as required.

In particular, if both  $M$  and  $N$  are in  $\text{GP } B$ , then the fact that  $X$  is in  $\text{CM } B$  means that it is actually in  $\text{GP } B$ , as claimed.  $\square$

The following result provides a simpler description of  $\text{GP } B$ .

**Proposition 2.7.**  $\text{GP } B = \{M \in \text{CM } B : \text{Ext}_B^1(M, B) = 0\}$ .

Note that, by Proposition 2.6, the condition here could equally be  $\text{Ext}_C^1(M, B) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Clearly any  $M \in \text{GP } B$ , as defined in (2.3), satisfies this weaker condition.

For the converse, if  $M \in \text{CM } B$  satisfies  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, B) = 0$ , then also  $\text{Ext}_C^1(M, B) = 0$ , by Proposition 2.6, since  $B \in \text{GP } B$ . Consider a partial presentation of  $M$  in  $\text{CM } B$ , which is also an  $\text{add } {}_C B$ -approximation in  $\text{CM } C$ , as restriction is fully faithful.

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega M \longrightarrow B' \xrightarrow{f} M \longrightarrow 0.$$

Applying  $\text{Hom}_C(B, -)$  gives

$$\text{Hom}_C(B, B') \xrightarrow{f_*} \text{Hom}_C(B, M) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_C^1(B, \Omega M) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_C^1(B, B'),$$

where  $f_*$  is surjective, because  $f$  is an  $\text{add } {}_C B$ -approximation, and  $\text{Ext}_C^1(B, B') = 0$ , because  $B$  is rigid by assumption. Hence  $\text{Ext}_C^1(B, \Omega M) = 0$ , and so, as  $\text{CM } C$  is 2-CY,  $\text{Ext}_C^1(\Omega M, B) = 0$ . Thus, e.g. by Proposition 2.6,

$$\text{Ext}_B^2(M, B) = \text{Ext}_B^1(\Omega M, B) = 0.$$

In particular,  $\Omega M$  also satisfies the right-hand side condition, so we can proceed inductively to show that  $\text{Ext}_B^i(M, B) = \text{Ext}_B^{i-1}(\Omega M, B) = 0$ , for all  $i > 0$ , and so  $M \in \text{GP } B$ , as required.  $\square$

**Remark 2.8.** Combining Proposition 2.4 and Proposition 2.7 yields a characterisation of  $\text{GP } B$  within  $\text{CM } C$ , using just  ${}_C B$ . More precisely  $M \in \text{CM } C$  is in  $\text{GP } B$  if and only if  $M$  is a factor module of some  $B' \in \text{add } {}_C B$  and  $\text{Ext}_C^1(B, M) = 0$ .

**Lemma 2.9.** For  $M \in \text{CM } C$ , let  $K$  be the kernel of an  $\text{add } {}_C B$ -approximation to  $M$  in  $\text{CM } C$ . Then  $K \in \text{GP } B$ . In particular, if  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , then any syzygy  $\Omega_B M \in \text{GP } B$ .

*Proof.* Let  $M \in \text{CM } C$  have an  $\text{add } {}_C B$  approximation

$$0 \longrightarrow K \longrightarrow B' \xrightarrow{f} M,$$

which is also an  $\text{add } {}_C B$  approximation of  $\text{Im } f \in \text{CM } C$ . Since  $\text{Im } f$  is a factor module of  $B'$ , we have  $\text{Im } f \in \text{CM } B$ , by Proposition 2.4. Hence  $K \in \text{CM } B$ .

As in the proof of Proposition 2.7, we deduce that  $\text{Ext}_C^1(B, K) = 0$ , because  ${}_C B$  is rigid, and so  $\text{Ext}_B^1(K, B) = 0$ , because  $\text{CM } C$  is 2-CY. Hence  $K \in \text{GP } B$ , by Proposition 2.7.

For the last part, note again that a partial presentation of  $M$  in  $\text{CM } B$  is also an  $\text{add } {}_C B$ -approximation in  $\text{CM } C$ , as restriction is fully faithful.  $\square$

**Lemma 2.10.** If  $M$  be a finitely-generated  $B$ -module, then  $\text{Ext}_B^i(M, B) = 0$  for all  $i > 2$ . Thus  $\text{inj. dim } {}_B B \leq 2$ .

*Proof.* Note that the first syzygy  $\Omega M \in \text{CM } B$ , so, by Lemma 2.9, the second syzygy  $\Omega^2 M \in \text{GP } B$ . Hence, for  $i > 2$ , we have  $\text{Ext}_B^i(M, B) = \text{Ext}_B^{i-2}(\Omega^2 M, B) = 0$ , as required.  $\square$

Now we can see that  $\text{GP } B$ , as defined in (2.3), is indeed the category of Gorenstein-projective  $B$ -modules, with an *a priori* stronger rigidity assumption.

**Theorem 2.11.** Let  $B$  be an  $\mathcal{R}$ -order, as in (2.1), which is rigid as both a left and right  $C$ -module. Then the following hold.

- (1)  $B$  is Iwanaga–Gorenstein of injective dimension at most 2.
- (2)  $\text{GP } B$  is the category of Gorenstein projective  $B$ -modules.
- (3)  $\text{GP } B$  is a Frobenius 2-CY category.

*Proof.* (1) By Lemma 2.10, we have  $\text{inj. dim } {}_B B \leq 2$ . Since  $B$  is also rigid as a right  $C$ -module, the arguments in Lemma 2.9 and Lemma 2.10 apply on the right and show that also  $\text{inj. dim } B_B \leq 2$ . Thus  $B$  is Iwanaga–Gorenstein.

(2) Let  $M$  be a Gorenstein projective  $B$ -module, that is,  $\text{Ext}_B^i(M, B) = 0$  for all  $i > 0$ . As  $B$  is Iwanaga–Gorenstein, the category of Gorenstein projective  $B$ -modules is Frobenius [7] (cf. [18, Cor 3.7]). Hence there is an embedding  $M \hookrightarrow B'$  with  $B' \in \text{add } B$ , so  $M \in \text{CM } B$ . Thus  $M$  satisfies (2.3), so  $M \in \text{GP } B$ . Thus  $\text{GP } B$  is after all the category of Gorenstein projective  $B$ -modules and so it is Frobenius.

(3) By Proposition 2.6 and the fact  $\text{CM } C$  is 2-CY, we have for any  $M, N \in \text{GP } B$ ,

$$\text{Ext}_B^1(M, N) \cong \text{Ext}_B^1(N, M).$$

Therefore  $\text{GP } B$  is also 2-CY.  $\square$

**Remark 2.12.** In fact, every such category  $\text{GP } B$  admits a cluster tilting object  $T$  that determines a *cluster structure* on  $\text{GP } B$ . In particular, we can do mutations on cluster tilting objects as usual (see [6, 10] for details).

**2.4. Algebras from Grassmann necklaces.** All examples of the algebras  $B$  in §2.3 are constructed from Grassmann necklaces, as we now explain.

Recall, from [25, Def. 4.1] or [28, Def. 16.1], that a sequence  $I_1, \dots, I_n$  in  $\binom{[n]}{k}$  is a *Grassmann necklace* if  $I_i \setminus \{i\} \subseteq I_{i+1}$ , for all  $i$ , which implies  $I_{i+1} = I_i$  when  $i \notin I_i$ . Here  $[n]$  is cyclically ordered and thus identified with  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  as an additive group.

When  $\mathcal{I} = (I_i)_{i \in [n]}$  is any sequence, we can define a  $C$ -module  $B_{\mathcal{I}} \cong \bigoplus_i M_{I_i}$ , with an explicit embedding  $C \subseteq B_{\mathcal{I}} \subseteq C[t^{-1}]$  taking  $e_i \in C$  to be an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module generator of  $e_i M_{I_i}$ . Then  $B_{\mathcal{I}}$  is a subalgebra of  $C[t^{-1}]$  precisely when

$$I_i \leq_i I_j \quad \text{for all } i, j \in [n], \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\leq_i$  is lex-order with  $[n]$  reordered starting at  $i$ , as in [25, Def. 4.2].

By [25, Lemma 4.4], the algebra condition (2.4) holds when  $\mathcal{I} = (I_i)$  is a necklace, so, in that case, we will call  $B_{\mathcal{I}}$  a *necklace algebra*. However, [25, Lemma 4.4] also shows that, when  $\mathcal{I}$  is a necklace, the collection  $\{I_i\}$  is weakly separated, that is, by [18, Prop. 5.6],  $B_{\mathcal{I}}$  is rigid as a left  $C$ -module.

Note that the necklace condition is definitely stronger than the algebra condition. For example, for  $(k, n) = (2, 5)$ , the sequence  $(I_i) = (13, 24, 34, 45, 51)$  satisfies (2.4), but is not weakly separated.

On the other hand, as we will now demonstrate, for  $B_{\mathcal{I}}$  to be an algebra that is rigid as a left  $C$ -module amounts to precisely the necklace condition on  $\mathcal{I}$ .

**Lemma 2.13.** Suppose  $I, J \in \binom{[n]}{k}$  and  $i \neq j \in [n]$ . If  $I \leq_i J$ ,  $J \leq_j I$  and  $I, J$  are weakly separated, then  $J \setminus I \subseteq [j, i)$  and  $I \setminus J \subseteq [i, j)$ , where the intervals are cyclic.

Note that the converse is straightforward.

*Proof.* If  $I = J$ , then both  $I \setminus J$  and  $J \setminus I$  are empty and so the result follows. Now assume that  $I \neq J$ . As  $I$  and  $J$  are weakly separated, there exist (disjoint) cyclic intervals  $[a, b]$  and  $[c, d]$  such that

- $I \setminus J \subseteq [a, b]$  with  $a, b \in I \setminus J$ ,
- $J \setminus I \subseteq [c, d]$  with  $c, d \in J \setminus I$ .

As  $I <_i J$ , we must have  $d < i \leq a$  in the cyclic order, otherwise

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{either } a \in I \setminus J, \text{ but } y <_i a \text{ for any } y \in J \setminus I, \\ &\text{or } d \in J \setminus I, \text{ but } d <_i x \text{ for any } x \in I \setminus J. \end{aligned}$$

Either case contradicts  $I <_i J$ . Similarly,  $b < j \leq c$  in the cyclic order. Therefore,  $I \setminus J \subseteq [i, j)$  and  $J \setminus I \subseteq [j, i)$ , as claimed.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.14.** The following are equivalent

- (1) The sequence  $(I_i)$  is a necklace.
- (2) For all  $i, j$ , we have  $I_i \setminus I_j \subseteq [i, j)$ .
- (3) For all  $i, j$ , we have  $I_i \leq_i I_j$  and  $I_i$  and  $I_j$  are weakly separated.

*Proof.* (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) is the main content of the proof of [25, Lem 4.4], which is the statement that (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (3), while (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3) is a straightforward conclusion, since the assumption also gives  $I_j \setminus I_i \subseteq [j, i)$

(2)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) is a specialisation, as  $I_i \setminus I_{i+1} \subseteq [i, i+1) = \{i\}$  if and only if  $I_i \setminus \{i\} \subseteq I_{i+1}$ , while (3)  $\Rightarrow$  (2) is a direct application of Lemma 2.13.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.15.** Let  $B$  be a (finitely-generated)  $\mathcal{R}$ -order with  $C \subseteq B \subseteq C[t^{-1}]$ . Then  $B$  is rigid as a left  $C$ -module if and only if  $B$  is a necklace algebra.

**Remark 2.16.** In fact, we can say more, because the combinatorics of necklaces implies that a necklace algebra  $B_{\mathcal{I}}$  is also rigid as a right  $C$ -module, and thus is indeed an algebra of the sort considered in §2.3.

To be more precise, necklaces are in bijection with decorated permutations and so, for every necklace  $\mathcal{I}$ , there is an opposite necklace  $\mathcal{I}^{\text{op}}$  corresponding to the inverse permutation (with decorations swapped). Now, it turns out that the necklace algebra  $B_{\mathcal{I}^{\text{op}}}$  can be identified with the opposite algebra  $(B_{\mathcal{I}})^{\text{op}}$  over  $C^{\text{op}}$  and thus  $B_{\mathcal{I}}$  is rigid as a right  $C$ -module, because, as we already know,  $B_{\mathcal{I}^{\text{op}}}$  is rigid as a left  $C^{\text{op}}$ -module.

**2.5. Syzygies, cosyzygies and stable Hom.** For any  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , we will denote by  $\underline{\text{Hom}}_B(T, M)$  the space of stable homomorphisms, that is, the space of homomorphisms modulo those that factor through  $\text{add } B$ . As earlier, the syzygy  $\Omega M$  is the kernel in a partial presentation of  $M$ , that is, a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega M \longrightarrow PM \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $PM$  is projective. This presentation may not be minimal, so  $\Omega M$  is only defined up to projective summands.

On the other hand, for  $M \in \text{GP } B$ , we denote by  $\Sigma M \in \text{GP } B$ , the cokernel in a ‘partial copresentation’ of  $M$ , that is, a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow P\Sigma M \longrightarrow \Sigma M \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $P\Sigma M$  is projective, and hence also injective, in  $\text{GP } B$ . Thus, when  $M \in \text{GP } B$ , we can take this as a partial presentation of  $\Sigma M$ , so that  $\Omega\Sigma M = M$ .

**Lemma 2.17.** Let  $X \in \text{GP } B$  and let  $M \in \text{CM } B$ .

(1) There is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega M & \longrightarrow & B' & \longrightarrow & \Sigma\Omega M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega M & \longrightarrow & PM & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array} \quad (2.5)$$

of partial presentations such that  $\Sigma\Omega M \in \text{GP } B$ .

(2) There are isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ext}^i(X, f) &: \text{Ext}^i(X, \Sigma\Omega M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^i(X, M), \quad \text{for } i > 0, \\ \underline{\text{Hom}}(X, f) &: \underline{\text{Hom}}(X, \Sigma\Omega M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}(X, M) \end{aligned}$$

(3) Moreover,  $\Sigma$  induces an isomorphism  $\underline{\text{End}} X \cong \underline{\text{End}}(\Sigma X)$ , such that

$$\text{Ext}^1(X, \Omega M) \cong \underline{\text{Hom}}(X, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\Sigma X, M),$$

as  $\underline{\text{End}} X$ -modules. Thus  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(X, M)$  is finite dimensional.

*Proof.* (1) The lower row is the partial presentation of  $M$ , and so  $\Omega M \in \text{GP } B$ , by Lemma 2.9. The extension on top can be constructed in  $\text{GP } B$ , since it is a Frobenius category. Then there is a map  $B' \rightarrow PM$  making the left square commute, because  $B$  is injective in  $\text{GP } B$ . So we obtain the map  $f$ , and the diagram exists.

(2) That  $\text{Ext}^i(X, f)$  are isomorphisms follows using the diagram of long exact sequences, obtained by applying  $\text{Hom}(X, -)$ , and using that  $\text{Ext}^i(X, B)$  for  $i > 0$ , since  $X \in \text{GP } B$ . It remains to prove that  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(X, f)$  is an isomorphism. If a map  $X \rightarrow M$

factors through  $\text{add } B$ , then it factors through the surjection  $g: PM \rightarrow M$ , since  $B$  is projective in  $\text{CM } B$ . So the connecting homomorphism induces a natural isomorphism

$$\underline{\text{Hom}}(X, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(X, \Omega M) \quad (2.6)$$

Consequently,  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(X, f)$  is an isomorphism, as required.

(3) The first isomorphism is (2.6). Applying  $\text{Hom}(\Sigma X, -)$ , we obtain a diagram of long exact sequences, and since  $\text{Ext}^i(\Sigma X, B) = 0$  for all  $i \geq 1$ , we see that

$$\text{Ext}^1(\Sigma X, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\Sigma X, \Sigma \Omega M).$$

Now  $\Sigma$  is an equivalence on the stable category, and so

$$\text{Ext}^1(\Sigma X, \Sigma \Omega M) = \text{Ext}^1(X, \Omega M) = \underline{\text{Hom}}(X, M),$$

by the first isomorphism.  $\square$

**Remark 2.18.** The lemma is standard and straightforward when  $M$  is in the Frobenius category  $\text{GP } B$ , but we emphasise that the lemma is proved for  $M$  in  $\text{CM } B$ .

**Corollary 2.19.** If  $J$  is injective in  $\text{CM } B$ , then  $\Omega J$  is projective.

*Proof.* We know that  $\Omega J \in \text{GP } B$ , by Lemma 2.9, and that  $\text{GP } B$  is Frobenius, by Theorem 2.11(3). Hence it is sufficient to show that  $\Omega J$  is injective in  $\text{GP } B$ . On the other hand, by Lemma 2.17(3), for any  $X \in \text{GP } B$ ,

$$\text{Ext}^1(X, \Omega J) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\Sigma X, J) = 0,$$

as  $J$  is injective in  $\text{CM } B$ , and so  $\Omega J$  is injective in  $\text{GP } B$ , as required.  $\square$

### 3. ENDOMORPHISM ALGEBRAS OF CLUSTER TILTING OBJECTS IN $\text{GP } B$

In this and following sections, until stated otherwise, we work in the generality of §2.3, that is, the  $\mathcal{R}$ -order  $B$  is rigid as a left and right  $C$ -module. Hence the category  $\text{GP } B$  is Frobenius 2-CY and admits cluster tilting objects as part of a cluster structure. We are also interested in the larger category  $\text{CM } B$ .

Recall, from Lemma 2.2, that  $\text{CM } B$  is a full subcategory of  $\text{CM } C$ , so the functors  $\text{Hom}_B(-, -)$  and  $\text{Hom}_C(-, -)$  agree on  $\text{CM } B$ . We will often write them both as just  $\text{Hom}(-, -)$ , although we may sometimes keep the subscripts for emphasis.

When  $T$  is a cluster tilting object in  $\text{GP } B$ , a significant role is played by the endomorphism algebra

$$A = (\text{End } T)^{\text{op}}$$

and the category  $\text{CM } A$  of Cohen–Macaulay  $A$ -modules, that is, as before,  $A$ -modules that are free over  $\mathcal{R}$ .

Note that all indecomposable projective  $B$ -modules must be (isomorphic to) summands of any cluster tilting object. Thus, without loss of generality, we can (and will) assume that  $B$  is a summand of  $T$  and that only the remaining mutable summands are multiplicity-free. This differs from the usual assumption that  $T$  itself is basic, but has no effect on the Morita equivalence class of  $A$ , that is, on the category  $\text{CM } A$ .

By this assumption,  $A$  has a special idempotent

$$e: T \rightarrow T$$

given simply by projection onto  $B$ . Furthermore we have canonical identifications

$$eAe = (\text{End } B)^{\text{op}} = B \quad \text{and} \quad eA = \text{Hom}(B, T) = T. \quad (3.1)$$

**Example 3.1.** A special case of the above is when  $B$  is the boundary algebra of a dimer model on a disc (as in [8, 29] or [3], when  $B = C$ ). In other words,  $B$  is the necklace algebra associated to a *connected* Postnikov diagram or plabic graph. Here the connectedness implies that  $B$  is basic.

In this case, the *dimer algebra*  $A$  is constructed first and  $B$  and  $T$  are defined by (3.1). The fact that  $B$  is the corresponding necklace algebra follows from [8, Prop. 8.2]. The fact that  $T$  is a cluster tilting object in  $\text{GP } B$ , with  $\text{End}(T)^{\text{op}} = A$ , is proved in [29, Thm. 4.5].

**Remark 3.2.** As part of the categorical cluster structure, one associates to  $T$  a quiver  $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$ , whose vertices  $i$  (in  $Q_0$ ) index a complete set of (non-isomorphic) indecomposable summands  $T_i$  of  $T$  and whose arrows  $i \rightarrow j$  (in  $Q_1$ ) correspond to irreducible maps  $T_j \rightarrow T_i$  in  $\text{add } T$ . In this paper, we will indicate this relationship by writing

$$T \simeq \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} T_i \quad (3.2)$$

When  $T$  mutates to  $\mu_k(T) = (T/T_k) \oplus T_k^*$ , the quiver  $Q$  undergoes Fomin–Zelevinsky mutation at  $k \in Q_0$ .

Alternatively,  $Q$  is the Gabriel quiver of  $A$ . Thus  $A$  contains an idempotent  $e_i$ , for each  $i \in Q_0$ , given by projection  $T \rightarrow T$  onto the summand  $T_i$  and  $Ae_i = \text{Hom}(T, T_i)$  is the corresponding indecomposable projective  $A$ -module, whose top is the simple  $A$ -module  $S_i$ .

Note that, if  $T$  (and thus  $A$ ) is not basic, then  $\sum_{i \in Q_0} e_i \neq 1$  and  $A$  is not a quotient of the path algebra of  $Q$ . However, any  $A$ -module  $M$  still determines a representation of  $Q$ , for which the space at  $i \in Q_0$  is  $e_i M = \text{Hom}_A(Ae_i, M)$ . Furthermore, the Grothendieck group  $K(\text{fd } A)$  of finite-dimensional  $A$ -modules is still canonically identified with  $\mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  via the basis  $\{[S_i] : i \in Q_0\}$  or, equivalently, by the map

$$[M] \mapsto \mathbf{dim}[M] := (\dim e_i M)_{i \in Q_0} \quad (3.3)$$

We may still refer to  $\mathbf{dim}[M]$  as the *dimension vector* of  $M$ .

Following the terminology of [3] and [8], but in our more general context, the vertices of  $Q$  indexing summands of  $B$  will be called *boundary* vertices, while those indexing the other summands will be called *interior* vertices. It is precisely the interior vertices that are ‘mutable’ in the sense that  $T_k^*$  and thus  $\mu_k$  are defined, while the boundary vertices are ‘frozen’ and  $\mu_k$  is not defined for them.

Let  $\mathbf{e}$  be the restriction functor induced by  $e$

$$\mathbf{e}: \text{mod } A \rightarrow \text{mod } B: X \mapsto eX.$$

As  $\mathbf{e}$  can be interpreted as  $eA \otimes_A -$ , it has right adjoint

$$\mathbf{R}: \text{mod } B \rightarrow \text{mod } A: M \mapsto \text{Hom}_B(T, M),$$

which restricts to a standard equivalence

$$\mathbf{R} = \text{Hom}_B(T, -): \text{add } T \rightarrow \text{Proj } A. \quad (3.4)$$

As  $\mathbf{e}$  can be also be interpreted as  $\text{Hom}_A(Ae, -)$ , it has a left adjoint

$$\mathbf{L}: \text{mod } B \rightarrow \text{mod } A: M \mapsto Ae \otimes_B M.$$

Note that  $\mathbf{e}$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  restrict to CM-modules, that is, to functors  $\mathbf{e}: \text{CM } A \rightarrow \text{CM } B$  and  $\mathbf{R}: \text{CM } B \rightarrow \text{CM } A$ . However,  $\mathbf{L}$  needs to be modified, by dividing out by torsion, to restrict similarly (cf. [8, §5]).

**3.1. The right adjoint.** We observe first that the counit  $\varepsilon_M: \mathbf{e}RM \rightarrow M$  is always an isomorphism, because  $e \operatorname{Hom}_B(T, M) = \operatorname{Hom}_B(B, M) = M$ . Thus, by Lemma 2.1(2), the functor  $\mathbf{R}$  is fully faithful. In fact, we can identify the essential image of  $\mathbf{R}$ , starting as follows.

**Lemma 3.3.** Every  $M \in \operatorname{CM} B$  has an exact  $\operatorname{add} T$ -presentation, that is, there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T'' \longrightarrow T' \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0 \quad (3.5)$$

with  $T', T'' \in \operatorname{add} T$ .

*Proof.* Let  $g: T' \rightarrow M$  be an  $\operatorname{add} T$ -approximation. Since  $B \in \operatorname{add} T$ ,  $g$  is surjective. Denote  $\operatorname{Ker} g$  by  $T''$  and note that  $T'' \in \operatorname{CM} B$  because  $T'' \leq T' \in \operatorname{CM} B$ . We want to show that  $T'' \in \operatorname{add} T$ .

By Proposition 2.6,  $\operatorname{GP} B$  is a full exact subcategory of  $\operatorname{CM} C$ , so

$$\operatorname{Ext}_C^1(T, T) = \operatorname{Ext}_B^1(T, T) = 0.$$

As  $\operatorname{CM} B$  is a full subcategory of  $\operatorname{CM} C$ , applying  $\operatorname{Hom}_C(T, -)$  to (3.5) and using that  $g_*: \operatorname{Hom}_C(T, T') \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_C(T, M)$  is surjective, we get

$$\operatorname{Ext}_C^1(T, T'') = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

In particular, since  $\operatorname{CM} C$  is 2-CY and  $B \in \operatorname{add} T$ , we get

$$\operatorname{Ext}_C^1(T'', B) = \operatorname{Ext}_C^1(B, T'') = 0,$$

Hence Proposition 2.7 implies that  $T'' \in \operatorname{GP} B$  and so Proposition 2.6 and (3.6) imply that  $\operatorname{Ext}_B^1(T, T'') = 0$ . But  $T$  is cluster tilting in  $\operatorname{GP} B$ , so this implies that  $T'' \in \operatorname{add} T$ , as required.  $\square$

**Remark 3.4.** This result is familiar when  $M$  is in  $\operatorname{GP} B$ . To get the same for  $\operatorname{CM} B$ , we need to use the more delicate relationships with  $\operatorname{CM} C$  and  $\operatorname{GP} B$  from Section 2. Note that, a similar argument without this delicacy shows that every  $M \in \operatorname{CM} B$  also has an exact  $\operatorname{add} T$ -presentation on the other side, that is, a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow T' \longrightarrow T'' \longrightarrow 0, \quad (3.7)$$

with  $T', T'' \in \operatorname{add} T$ .

**Remark 3.5.** Since the restriction functor from  $\operatorname{CM} B \rightarrow \operatorname{CM} C$  is fully faithful, by Lemma 2.2, we also have  $A = \operatorname{End}_C(T)^{\operatorname{op}}$  and so have a well-defined functor  $\operatorname{Hom}_C(T, -): \operatorname{CM} C \rightarrow \operatorname{CM} A$ , which coincides with  $\mathbf{R}$  on  $\operatorname{CM} B$ . However, the functor  $\operatorname{Hom}_C(T, -)$  is typically only faithful, because the counit map is only pointwise epi. Indeed  $e \operatorname{Hom}_C(T, M) = \operatorname{Hom}_C(B, M)$  is necessarily in  $\operatorname{CM} B$  and so only *a priori* a submodule of  $\operatorname{Hom}_C(C, M) = M$ , for  $M \in \operatorname{CM} C$ .

In fact, this is a rather general fact. That is, for any  $M \in \operatorname{CM} C$ , we can show that the counit  $M \otimes \operatorname{Hom}_C(M, -) \rightarrow \operatorname{id}$  is pointwise epi, so that

$$\operatorname{Hom}_C(M, -): \operatorname{CM} C \rightarrow \operatorname{CM}(\operatorname{End}_C M)^{\operatorname{op}}$$

is faithful, by Lemma 2.1(1).

**Proposition 3.6.** The global dimension of  $A$  is  $\leq 3$ .

*Proof.* Let  $X \in \operatorname{mod} A$ . By the equivalence (3.4), we can choose  $g: T'' \rightarrow T'$  in  $\operatorname{add} T$  to get a projective presentation of  $X$

$$\mathbf{R}T'' \xrightarrow{\mathbf{R}g} \mathbf{R}T' \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0. \quad (3.8)$$

Since  $\varepsilon: \mathbf{e}R \rightarrow \text{id}$  is a natural isomorphism, applying  $\mathbf{e}$  to (3.8) gives a exact sequence

$$T'' \xrightarrow{g} T' \longrightarrow \mathbf{e}X \longrightarrow 0. \quad (3.9)$$

If  $K'' = \text{Ker } g$ , then also  $\mathbf{R}K'' = \text{Ker } \mathbf{R}g$ , since  $\mathbf{R}$  is left exact. But  $K'' \in \text{CM } B$ , so, by Lemma 3.3,  $K''$  has an exact add  $T$ -presentation of the form (3.5). Applying  $\mathbf{R}$  to the presentation gives a projective resolution of  $\mathbf{R}K''$ . Hence

$$\text{proj. dim } \mathbf{R}K'' \leq 1$$

and so  $\text{proj. dim } X \leq 3$ . As  $X \in \text{mod } A$  was arbitrary, this means that  $\text{gl. dim } A \leq 3$ , as required.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.7.** For any  $X \in \text{mod } A$ , there is an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(T, \mathbf{e}\Omega^2 X) \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{\eta_X} \mathbf{R}eX \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(T, \mathbf{e}\Omega X) \rightarrow 0 \quad (3.10)$$

*Proof.* Consider the presentations (3.8) and (3.9). As before, let  $K'' = \text{Ker } g$ , so that  $\mathbf{R}K'' = \text{Ker } \mathbf{R}g$ , and also let  $K' = \text{Im } g = \text{Ker}(T' \rightarrow \mathbf{e}X)$ . Notice that, taking syzygies from (3.8), we have  $K' = \mathbf{e}\Omega X$  and  $K'' = \mathbf{e}\Omega^2 X$ , because  $\mathbf{e}$  is exact. Then we can construct the following commutative diagram of exact sequences, in which the middle equality is really  $\eta_{RT'}$ , after we have used  $\varepsilon_{T'}$  to identify  $\mathbf{e}RT'$  with  $T'$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{R}T''/\mathbf{R}K'' & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{R}T' & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow \eta_X & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{R}K' & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{R}T' & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{R}eX & \longrightarrow & \text{Ext}_B^1(T, K') \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

The first vertical map has cokernel  $\text{Ext}_B^1(T, K'')$  and, by the Snake Lemma, this cokernel is isomorphic to  $\text{Ker } \eta_X$ . On the other hand, the image of  $\eta_X$  coincides with the image of the map  $\mathbf{R}T' \rightarrow \mathbf{R}eX$ , so  $\text{Cok } \eta_X \cong \text{Ext}_B^1(T, K')$ .  $\square$

**Remark 3.8.** In particular, Lemma 3.7 says that  $\text{Ker } \eta_X$  and  $\text{Cok } \eta_X$  are finite dimensional (i.e. torsion) modules. Furthermore, they vanish on applying  $\mathbf{e}$ , because  $\mathbf{e}\text{Ext}_B^1(T, -) = \text{Ext}_B^1(B, -) = 0$ . This is consistent with the fact that  $\mathbf{e}\eta_X: \mathbf{e}X \rightarrow \mathbf{e}X$  is the identity map, after using  $\varepsilon_{\mathbf{e}X}$  to identify  $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{R}eX$  with  $\mathbf{e}X$ . Note also that Lemma 3.7 quickly implies that, if  $\mathbf{e}X = 0$ , then  $X$  is torsion.

**Proposition 3.9.** If  $X \in \text{CM } A$ , then  $\text{proj. dim } X \leq 1$  if and only if  $X \cong \text{Hom}_B(T, M)$ , for some  $M \in \text{CM } B$  (and then necessarily  $M \cong eX$ ).

*Proof.* As already used in the proof of Proposition 3.6, any  $M \in \text{CM } B$  has a presentation (3.5), by Lemma 3.3, and applying  $\text{Hom}_B(T, -)$  gives a projective resolution of  $\text{Hom}_B(T, M)$ , since  $\text{Ext}^1(T, T'') = 0$ , so  $\text{proj. dim } \text{Hom}_B(T, M) \leq 1$ .

Conversely, if  $X$  has  $\text{proj. dim } X \leq 1$ , then  $\Omega X$  is projective, so  $\mathbf{e}\Omega X \in \text{add } T$ , and  $\Omega^2 X = 0$ . Hence Lemma 3.7 implies that  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \mathbf{R}eX$  is an isomorphism. If  $X \in \text{CM } A$ , then  $eX \in \text{CM } B$ , which proves the claim.  $\square$

Thus  $\mathbf{R}: \text{CM } B \rightarrow \text{CM } A$  is an equivalence of  $\text{CM } B$  with the full subcategory of  $\text{CM } A$  consisting of modules with  $\text{proj. dim} \leq 1$ . In the other direction, we have

**Proposition 3.10.** For  $X \in \text{CM } A$ , the unit map  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \text{Hom}_B(T, eX)$  is injective. Thus the restriction functor  $\mathbf{e}: \text{CM } A \rightarrow \text{CM } B$  is faithful.

*Proof.* If  $X \in \text{CM } A$ , then, by Lemma 3.7, we know that  $\text{Ker } \eta_X$  is torsion, but  $X$  is torsion-free, so  $\text{Ker } \eta_X = 0$ , as required. The fact that  $\mathbf{e}$  is faithful follows immediately from Lemma 2.1(1).  $\square$

**3.2. The left adjoint.** Define  $AeX \leq X$  to be the image of the  $(L, e)$  counit map

$$\mu_X: Ae \otimes_B eX \rightarrow X,$$

given by multiplication. As the notation suggests, we treat  $eX$  as an  $\mathcal{R}$ -submodule of  $X$ , so that  $AeX$  is the  $A$ -submodule generated by it. In the case  $X = \text{Hom}(T, M)$ , we can identify  $eX = \text{Hom}(B, M) = M$  and we will then write  $AeX$  as

$$A \cdot M \leq \text{Hom}(T, M).$$

**Remark 3.11.** Thus, in general, we have  $AeX \leq X$  and  $A \cdot eX \leq \text{Hom}(T, eX) = \text{Re}X$ , but we can readily see that the unit map  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \text{Re}X$  identifies  $AeX$  with  $A \cdot eX$ , using the following natural diagram and noting that  $e\eta_X$  is an isomorphism (cf. Remark 3.8).

$$\begin{array}{ccc} LeX & \xrightarrow{\mu_X} & X \\ Le\eta_X \downarrow & & \downarrow \eta_X \\ LeReX & \xrightarrow{\mu_{ReX}} & ReX \end{array}$$

In other words, if we use  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \text{Re}X$  to identify  $X$  with a submodule of  $\text{Re}X$ , then we can consider that

$$A \cdot eX \leq X \leq \text{Hom}(T, eX).$$

**Remark 3.12.** Conversely, if  $X \leq \text{Hom}(T, M)$ , then we can consider that  $eX \leq M$ . If  $eX = M$ , then the inclusion map  $j: X \rightarrow \text{RM}$  is identified with the unit map  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \text{Re}X$ . More precisely,  $eX = M$  means that  $e_j: eX \rightarrow e\text{RM}$  is an isomorphism or, equivalently (as  $\varepsilon_M$  is always an isomorphism), that  $\theta_X = \varepsilon_M \circ e_j: eX \rightarrow e\text{RM} \rightarrow M$  is an isomorphism. Then there is a natural diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & \text{Re}X & & \\ j \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Re}j & \searrow R\theta_X & \\ \text{RM} & \xrightarrow{\eta_{\text{RM}}} & \text{ReRM} & \xrightarrow{R\varepsilon_M} & \text{RM} \end{array}$$

in which the bottom composite is the identity map, as for a general adjunction.

**Proposition 3.13.** The following hold.

- (1)  $A \cdot M$  is the kernel of the canonical quotient  $\text{Hom}_B(T, M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_B(T, M)$ .
- (2) For  $X \leq \text{Hom}_B(T, M)$ , we have  $eX = M$  if and only if  $A \cdot M \leq X$ .

*Proof.* (1)  $A \cdot M$  is the image of the counit map  $Ae \otimes_B e\text{Hom}(T, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T, M)$ , which more explicitly is the composition map

$$\text{Hom}(T, B) \otimes_B \text{Hom}(B, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T, M).$$

Thus  $A \cdot M$  consists of sums of maps that factor through  $B$ . Generally, this is the same as maps that factor through add  $B$ , that is, in this case, that factor through projectives. By definition, this is the kernel of the quotient  $\text{Hom}_B(T, M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}_B(T, M)$ .

(2) First note that  $eA \cdot M = B \otimes_B M = M$ . Hence, if  $A \cdot M \leq X \leq \text{Hom}_B(T, M)$ , then  $M \leq eX \leq M$ , that is,  $eX = M$ .

Conversely, suppose  $X \leq \text{Hom}_B(T, M)$  and  $eX = M$ , that is, we have an inclusion  $j: X \rightarrow \text{RM}$  such that  $e_j: eX \rightarrow e\text{RM}$  is an isomorphism. Then we have a natural

diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{L}eX & \xrightarrow{\mu_X} & X \\ \mathbf{L}e\mathbf{j} \downarrow & & \downarrow \mathbf{j} \\ \mathbf{L}e\mathbf{R}M & \xrightarrow{\mu_{\mathbf{R}M}} & \mathbf{R}M \end{array}$$

showing that  $\mathbf{j}$  identifies  $AeX$  with  $A \cdot M$  and thus  $A \cdot M \leq X$ , as required.  $\square$

**Remark 3.14.** In the dimer model context of Example 3.1, some of the results here are already proved in [8, §5]. For example, Proposition 3.13 is [8, Prop. 5.4, Cor. 5.11], while Proposition 3.10 is [8, Lemma 5.3].

**3.3. Ranks of Cohen–Macaulay modules.** By the definition of  $B$ , we have

$$B \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} = C \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} \cong M_n(\mathcal{K}), \quad (3.11)$$

the  $n \times n$  matrix algebra over  $\mathcal{K}$ . So we can define the rank of a  $B$ -module  $M$  in the same way as that of a  $C$ -module, that is,

$$\mathrm{rk}_B M = \mathrm{len}_{B \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}}(M \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}),$$

the length of  $M \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}$  over  $B \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}$ . Indeed, by (3.11) and [18, Def. 3.5 *et seq*], we have

$$\mathrm{rk}_B M = \mathrm{rk}_C M = \mathrm{rk}_{\mathcal{R}}(e_i M), \quad (3.12)$$

for any vertex idempotent  $e_i$ .

**Lemma 3.15.** The algebra  $A \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}$  is simple, isomorphic to  $M_r(\mathcal{K})$ , where  $r = \mathrm{rk}_B T$ .

*Proof.*  $A \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} = \mathrm{End}_B(T)^{\mathrm{op}} \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} \cong \mathrm{End}_{M_n(\mathcal{K})}(T \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K})^{\mathrm{op}} \cong M_r(\mathcal{K})$ .  $\square$

Thus  $A$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -order and any  $A$ -module is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -module, so we can define the rank of an  $A$ -module  $X$  is the same way as earlier:

$$\mathrm{rk}_A X = \mathrm{len}_{A \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}}(X \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}),$$

The functor  $- \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}$  is exact, so, over any of the algebras  $\mathcal{R}$ ,  $A$ ,  $B$  or  $C$ , we see that  $\mathrm{rk}$  is additive on short exact sequences of modules. Furthermore, over any of these algebras,  $\mathrm{rk} M = 0$  if and only if  $M$  is torsion, i.e. finite dimensional.

**Lemma 3.16.** Suppose  $M \in \mathrm{CM} B$  and  $X \in \mathrm{CM} A$ . Then

- (1)  $\mathrm{rk}_A \mathrm{Hom}(T, M) = \mathrm{rk}_B M$ .
- (2)  $\mathrm{rk}_B eX = \mathrm{rk}_A X$ .

*Proof.* (1) By definition,

$$\mathrm{rk}_A \mathrm{Hom}(T, M) = \mathrm{len}_{M_r(\mathcal{K})}(\mathrm{Hom}(T, M) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}),$$

where  $r = \mathrm{rk}_B T$ . But

$$\mathrm{Hom}_B(T, M) \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{B \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}}(T \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}, M \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}),$$

which has  $\dim_{\mathcal{K}} = (\mathrm{rk}_B T)(\mathrm{rk}_B M)$  and hence  $\mathrm{len}_{M_r(\mathcal{K})} = \mathrm{rk}_B M$ , as required.

(2) By (1),  $\mathrm{rk}_B eX = \mathrm{rk}_A \mathrm{Hom}(T, eX)$ . On the other hand, Lemma 3.7 implies that  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \mathrm{Hom}(T, eX)$  becomes an isomorphism after applying  $- \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K}$ , because  $Y \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{K} = 0$ , when  $Y$  is torsion. Hence  $\mathrm{rk}_A \mathrm{Hom}(T, eX) = \mathrm{rk}_A X$ , giving the result.  $\square$

## 4. WEIGHT MODULES

We continue with the setting in Section 3 and continue to write  $\text{Hom}(-, -)$  for  $\text{Hom}_B(-, -) = \text{Hom}_C(-, -)$  on  $\text{CM } B \subseteq \text{CM } C$ .

We choose a vertex  $*$  (e.g. 0) of the circular double quiver (1.1) and let  $e_* \in C$  be the associated idempotent, which is also an idempotent of  $B$ . Since  $Be_*$  is an indecomposable summand of  $B$ , it is also an indecomposable summand of  $T$ , and so there is a corresponding vertex, also denoted  $*$ , in the Gabriel quiver  $Q$  of  $A$ . We can (and will) assume that  $Be_*$  is the summand  $T_*$  chosen in Remark 3.2. Note that, consequently,  $A$  also has an idempotent denoted by  $e_*$ , but it should be clear which is meant in any situation.

Define functors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{J}: \text{CM } B &\rightarrow \text{CM } B: M \mapsto \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(e_*B, e_*M) \\ \mathbf{P}: \text{CM } B &\rightarrow \text{CM } B: M \mapsto Be_* \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} e_*M. \end{aligned}$$

Then the natural maps  $\mathbf{P}M \rightarrow M$  and  $M \rightarrow \mathbf{J}M$ , become isomorphisms under  $e_*$ , so their kernels have rank 0 and hence are 0 (cf. [19, Lem 5.1]). In other words, we have natural embeddings

$$\mathbf{P}M \leq M \leq \mathbf{J}M \quad \text{with} \quad e_*\mathbf{P}M = e_*M = e_*\mathbf{J}M. \quad (4.1)$$

If we define

$$\mathbf{P}_* = Be_* \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{J}_* = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(e_*B, \mathcal{R}), \quad (4.2)$$

then, using (3.12) and (2.1), we have  $\text{rk}_B \mathbf{P}_* = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} e_*Be_* = 1$ , and similarly  $\text{rk}_B \mathbf{J}_* = 1$ . Furthermore

$$\mathbf{P}M = \mathbf{P}_* \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} e_*M \cong \mathbf{P}_*^{\text{rk}_B M} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{J}M = \mathbf{J}_* \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} e_*M \cong \mathbf{J}_*^{\text{rk}_B M} \quad (4.3)$$

Note that, while  $\mathbf{P}_*$  is a projective  $B$ -module,  $\mathbf{J}_*$  is not an injective  $B$ -module, but it is injective in  $\text{CM } B$ .

**Definition 4.1.** For  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , let  $\epsilon_M: M \rightarrow \mathbf{J}M$  be the natural embedding. Applying  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$  gives a short exact sequence, as in [19, §5],

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, M) \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{M*}} \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}M) \longrightarrow \mathbf{K}(T, M) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.4)$$

which defines the finite dimensional  $A$ -module  $\mathbf{K}(T, M)$ . The class of  $\mathbf{K}(T, M)$  in the Grothendieck group  $K(\text{fd } A)$  is denoted  $\kappa(T, M)$ .

Note that  $\mathbf{K}(T, M)$  is finite dimensional, because it is a submodule of  $\text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}M/M)$  and  $\mathbf{J}M/M$  is a finite dimensional  $B$ -module, since  $\text{rk}_B \mathbf{J}M = \text{rk}_B M$ , by (4.3).

More generally, as in [19, §5], we can replace  $T$  by  $N$  in (4.4) to define  $\mathbf{K}(N, M)$  for any  $N \in \text{CM } B$ . Then  $\mathbf{K}(N, M)$  is just a finite dimensional vector space and we define  $\kappa(N, M) = \dim \mathbf{K}(N, M)$ . Thus, making the identification  $K(\text{fd } A) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ , as in Remark 3.2, we have

$$\kappa(T, M) = \left( \kappa(T_i, M) \right)_{i \in Q_0}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\mathbf{K}(T_*, M) = 0, \quad (4.5)$$

because  $\mathbf{J}M/M$  vanishes at  $*$ . More precisely, as  $T_* = Be_*$ , for  $e_* \in B$ ,

$$\mathbf{K}(T_*, M) \leq \text{Hom}(T_*, \mathbf{J}M/M) = e_*(\mathbf{J}M/M) = e_*\mathbf{J}M/e_*M = 0.$$

In other words, the  $A$ -module  $\mathbf{K}(T, M)$  vanishes at  $*$ , i.e.  $e_*\mathbf{K}(T, M) = 0$ , for  $e_* \in A$ .

**Definition 4.2.** For  $X \in \text{CM } A$ , the unit map  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  is injective, by Proposition 3.10. We define  $\mathbf{G}X$  to be its cokernel, giving a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{\eta_X} \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{e}X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{G}X \longrightarrow 0. \quad (4.6)$$

In fact, by Remark 3.11,  $\mathbf{G}X$  is a quotient of  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$ .

Define the *weight module*  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  to be the cokernel of the composite  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{e}X*} \circ \eta_X$ , so that the Third Isomorphism Theorem yields the following commutative diagram in which the two rows and two columns are short exact sequences.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & 0 & & 0 & \\ & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{\eta_X} & \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{e}X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{G}X \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \epsilon_{\mathbf{e}X*} & & \downarrow & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Wt } X \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & & & & \mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X) & = & \mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X) & \\ & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ & & & & 0 & & 0 & \end{array} \quad (4.7)$$

In Section 7, we will make the connection to dimer models and perfect matchings and show that the dimension vector of  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  is the weight of a corresponding flow, when  $X$  is a matching module. This explains the terminology “weight module”. Both  $\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  and  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  depend on the choice of the boundary vertex  $*$  in the definition of the functor  $\mathbf{J}$ . In practice, this vertex can be any in the circular double quiver (1.1)

**Remark 4.3.** For any  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , we have, by Hom-tensor adjunction, natural isomorphisms

$$\text{Hom}_B(T, \mathbf{J}M) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(e_*T, e_*M) \cong \text{Hom}_C(T, \mathbf{J}_C M)$$

where  $\mathbf{J}_C M = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(e_*C, e_*M)$ . Hence (cf. [19, Lemma 5.4]),  $\mathbf{K}(T, M)$  is also the cokernel of the restriction map  $\text{Hom}_B(T, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{R}}(e_*T, e_*M)$  and of the natural map  $\text{Hom}_C(T, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_C(T, \mathbf{J}_C M)$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{K}(T, M)$  can be computed from just the  $C$ -module structure of  $M$  (and  $T$ ) and  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  can be computed from just the  $C$ -module structure of  $\mathbf{e}X$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** Let  $X, Y \in \text{CM } A$ .

- (1)  $\mathbf{G}X$ ,  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  and  $\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  are (left)  $A$ -modules, which are functorial in  $X$ .
- (2)  $\mathbf{G}X$  is finite dimensional and  $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{G}X = 0$ .
- (3)  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  is finite dimensional and  $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{Wt } X = \mathbf{e}\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X) = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}X/\mathbf{e}X$ . Hence  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  is not supported at vertex  $*$ .
- (4) If  $Y \leq X$  and  $\mathbf{e}Y = \mathbf{e}X$ , then  $\mathbf{G}X$  is a quotient of  $\mathbf{G}Y$  and  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  is a quotient of  $\mathbf{Wt } Y$ . Both kernels are isomorphic to  $X/Y$ .

*Proof.* (1) The right action of  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$  on  $T$  makes  $\text{Hom}(T, M)$  a left  $A$ -module for any  $B$ -module  $M$ . Furthermore, both  $\eta_X$  and  $\epsilon_{\mathbf{e}X*}$  are  $A$ -module maps. Thus  $\mathbf{G}X$ ,  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  and  $\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  are all defined as cokernels of  $A$ -module maps, hence they are all  $A$ -modules. All three are functorial because they are cokernels of natural transformations.

(2) Since  $\mathbf{G}X = \text{Cok } \eta_X$ , both follow from Lemma 3.7 (see Remark 3.8).

(3) First  $\mathbf{Wt } X$  is an extension of  $\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  by  $\mathbf{G}X$ , and these are both finite-dimensional, by Definition 4.1 and (2).

Next, since  $\mathbf{e}$  is exact, applying it to the right-hand vertical sequence in (4.7) gives  $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{Wt} X \cong \mathbf{e}\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  under the induced canonical map, because  $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{G}X = 0$  by (2). Then applying  $\mathbf{e}$  to the middle vertical sequence in (4.7), gives that  $\mathbf{e}\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X) = \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}X/\mathbf{e}X$ .

Finally recall, from (4.1), that  $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}X$  and  $\mathbf{e}X$  agree at vertex  $*$ , so their quotient vanishes there.

(4) This follows from the Third Isomorphism Theorem, using the top and middle rows of (4.7), respectively.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** For any  $M \in \mathbf{CM} B$ , we have  $\mathbf{Wt} \mathbf{Hom}(T, M) = \mathbf{K}(T, M)$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{Wt} \mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}_*) = \mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{J}_*) = 0$ .

*Proof.* If  $X = \mathbf{Hom}(T, M)$ , then  $\mathbf{e}X = M$  and  $\eta_X: X \rightarrow \mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  is an isomorphism. Hence  $\mathbf{G}X = 0$  and so the map  $\mathbf{Wt} X \rightarrow \mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}X)$  in (4.7) is an isomorphism.

When  $M = \mathbf{J}_*$ , the map  $\epsilon_M: M \rightarrow \mathbf{J}M$  in Definition 4.1 is an isomorphism and so  $\mathbf{K}(T, M) = 0$ , by (4.4).  $\square$

It follows immediately from (4.3) that  $\mathbf{Wt} \mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}M) = 0$ , for any  $M \in \mathbf{CM} B$ .

**Proposition 4.6.** The functor  $\mathbf{Wt}: \mathbf{CM} A \rightarrow \mathbf{fd} A$  is exact.

*Proof.* For any short exact sequence in  $\mathbf{CM} A$

$$0 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow 0,$$

applying  $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}$  gives an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}X \longrightarrow \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}Y \longrightarrow \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}Z \longrightarrow 0.$$

which is split, because  $\mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}X$  is injective in  $\mathbf{CM} B$ . Hence the sequence remains exact on applying  $\mathbf{Hom}(T, -)$ . Since the functoriality of  $\mathbf{Wt}$  comes from a natural transformation  $\text{id} \rightarrow \mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}-)$ , we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Wt} X \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Wt} Y \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}\mathbf{e}Z) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{Wt} Z \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & \end{array}$$

The Snake Lemma then implies that

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{Wt} X \longrightarrow \mathbf{Wt} Y \longrightarrow \mathbf{Wt} Z \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, as required.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** Note that the functors  $\mathbf{G}$  and  $\mathbf{K}(T, \mathbf{e}-)$  are not exact and indeed a proof following the strategy of Proposition 4.6 would fail because the functor  $\mathbf{Hom}(T, \mathbf{e}-)$  is not exact. In practical terms, the exactness of  $\mathbf{Wt}$  means that the class  $[\mathbf{Wt} X]$  in the Grothendieck group  $K(\mathbf{fd} A)$  depends only on the class  $[X]$  in the Grothendieck group  $K(\mathbf{CM} A)$  and there is an explicit formula: see (5.11).

**Remark 4.8.** More generally, the (bi)functor  $K(-, -)$  is additive in both slots, but neither  $K(M, -)$  nor  $K(-, M)$  is exact, for most  $M \in \text{CM } A$ . Indeed, applying one of these functors to a short exact sequence leads to a complex, which typically has homology at the middle term. In Section 12, we will prove precise statements on the exactness of these functors, which will help us to understand mutations of  $\kappa(T, M)$ .

## 5. GROTHENDIECK GROUPS $K(\text{fd } A)$ AND $K(\text{CM } A)$

Denote by  $K(\text{fd } A)$  the Grothendieck group of finite dimensional  $A$ -modules and by  $K(\text{CM } A)$  the Grothendieck group of Cohen–Macaulay  $A$ -modules. In this section, we define (non-inverse) maps in both directions between these two Grothendieck groups, and discuss properties of the two maps. We also denote by  $K(\text{Proj } A)$  the Grothendieck group of projective  $A$ -modules.

**Remark 5.1.** Recall from Remark 3.2, that  $K(\text{fd } A) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  via the standard basis  $\{[S_i] : i \in Q_0\}$  given by the classes of simple  $A$ -modules, where  $Q$  is the Gabriel quiver of  $A$ . We will thus (often implicitly) make the identification  $K(\text{fd } A) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ .

Note also that  $K(\text{Proj } A) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  via the standard basis  $\{[Ae_i] : i \in Q_0\}$  given by the classes of indecomposable projective  $A$ -modules, but  $K(\text{Proj } A)$  is more naturally dual to  $K(\text{fd } A)$ , with the basis of projectives being dual to the basis of simples.

Since projective  $A$ -modules are Cohen–Macaulay (i.e. free over  $\mathcal{R}$ ) and  $A$  has finite global dimension, by Proposition 3.6, the inclusion  $\text{Proj } A \subseteq \text{CM } A$  induces an isomorphism  $K(\text{Proj } A) \cong K(\text{CM } A)$ . Hence  $K(\text{CM } A)$  also has a basis  $\{[Ae_i] : i \in Q_0\}$  and so has the same rank as  $K(\text{fd } A)$ , but again is more naturally dual to it. Note, however, that we will avoid, as far as possible, identifying  $K(\text{CM } A)$  with  $K(\text{Proj } A)$ .

**5.1. Maps between the Grothendieck groups.** Recall, from Section 4 (in particular, (4.7)), the functor  $\text{Wt}: \text{CM } A \rightarrow \text{fd } A$  constructed through the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, \text{Je } X) \longrightarrow \text{Wt } X \longrightarrow 0 \quad (5.1)$$

Since  $\text{Wt}$  is exact, by Proposition 4.6, it induces a map

$$\text{wt}: K(\text{CM } A) \rightarrow K(\text{fd } A): [X] \mapsto [\text{Wt } X]. \quad (5.2)$$

In the other direction, there is a natural map

$$\beta: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A): [X] \mapsto [PX] - [\Omega X] \quad (5.3)$$

defined from a minimal partial presentation

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega X \longrightarrow PX \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0$$

We choose a minimal partial presentation just to have an initially well-defined map, but in fact  $\beta$  can be defined equally well by any CM-approximation.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let  $X$  be a finite dimensional  $A$ -module. For any short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow Z \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$ , with  $Z, Y \in \text{CM } A$ , we have  $\beta[X] = [Y] - [Z]$ .

*Proof.* As  $PX$  is projective, the map  $PX \rightarrow X$  in the partial presentation lifts to a map  $PX \rightarrow Y$  which then induces a map of short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega X & \longrightarrow & PX & \longrightarrow & X \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & X \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

Since the right-hand vertical map is an isomorphism, the left-hand square is Cartesian, that is, it induces a short exact sequence in  $\text{CM } A$

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega X \longrightarrow Z \oplus PX \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow 0$$

so that  $[\Omega X] + [Y] = [Z] + [PX]$ , i.e.  $[Y] - [Z] = [PX] - [\Omega X] = \beta[X]$ , as required.  $\square$

Note that, we denote by  $[X]$  the class of a module  $X$  in a Grothendieck group, such as  $K(\text{CM } A)$  and  $K(\text{fd } A)$ , without distinguishing the group. In the special case when  $X = \text{Hom}_B(T, M) \in \text{CM } A$ , for  $m \in \text{CM } B$ , we will write  $[X] = [T, M]$  for brevity.

Define

$$\text{rk}: K(\text{CM } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}: [X] \mapsto \text{rk}_A X \quad (5.4)$$

which is well-defined because, in particular,  $\text{rk}_A$  is additive on short exact sequences in  $\text{CM } A$ . Let  $\mathbf{M}_0 = \text{Ker rk}$ . Since  $\text{rk}_A \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}_*) = \text{rk}_B \mathbf{J}_* = 1$ , we have

$$K(\text{CM } A) = \mathbb{Z}[T, \mathbf{J}_*] \oplus \mathbf{M}_0. \quad (5.5)$$

Also define

$$\delta = (\text{rk}_B T_j)_{j \in Q_0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \cong K(\text{fd } A) \quad (5.6)$$

and

$$\mathbf{N}_* = \{x : x_* = 0\} \leq \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \cong K(\text{fd } A), \quad (5.7)$$

where  $*$   $\in Q_0$  is the chosen boundary vertex, as in Section 4. Note that  $\text{Im wt} \leq \mathbf{N}_*$ , by Lemma 4.4(3). Since  $\delta_* = \text{rk}_B T_* = 1$ , we have

$$K(\text{fd } A) = \mathbb{Z}\delta \oplus \mathbf{N}_*. \quad (5.8)$$

**Remark 5.3.** Using the isomorphism  $K(\text{CM } A) \cong K(\text{Proj } A)$  and the natural duality between  $K(\text{Proj } A)$  and  $K(\text{fd } A)$ , as in Remark 5.1, we can see that the two maps  $\delta: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow K(\text{fd } A): n \mapsto n\delta$  and  $\text{rk}: K(\text{CM } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  are dual, because  $\text{rk}[T, T_j] = \text{rk}_B T_j$ .

We also have an isomorphism  $\mathbf{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_*^\vee$  by restriction of linear functions. In practice this means you write an element of  $\mathbf{M}_0$  in the basis  $\{[Ae_j] : j \in Q_0\}$  of  $K(\text{CM } A)$  and drop the coefficient of  $[Ae_*]$ .

**Proposition 5.4.** The following sequence is exact and, in particular,  $\text{Im } \beta = \mathbf{M}_0$ .

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\delta} K(\text{fd } A) \xrightarrow{\beta} K(\text{CM } A) \xrightarrow{\text{rk}} \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (5.9)$$

Moreover, the restriction  $\beta: \mathbf{N}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_0$  is an isomorphism, with inverse given by the restriction  $-\text{wt}: \mathbf{M}_0 \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_*$ . Hence  $\text{Im wt} = \mathbf{N}_*$ .

*Proof.* First note that, as a map,  $\delta$  is injective, because, as an element,  $\delta \neq 0$ . Further  $\text{rk}$  is surjective, because there are elements of  $K(\text{CM } A)$  with  $\text{rk} = 1$ , such as  $[T, \mathbf{J}_*]$ .

To see that  $\text{rk} \circ \beta = 0$ , consider any CM-approximation of  $X \in \text{fd } A$

$$0 \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0, \quad (5.10)$$

such as a partial presentation. Then  $\beta[X] = [Y] - [Z]$ , by Lemma 5.2, and  $\text{rk}_A X = 0$ , so  $\text{rk}[Y] = \text{rk}[Z]$ , that is,  $\text{rk } \beta[X] = 0$ , as required.

Furthermore, from (5.1) and Lemma 5.2, we see that, for any  $Z \in \text{CM } A$ ,

$$\beta \text{ wt}[Z] = \text{rk}[Z][T, \mathbf{J}_*] - [Z] \quad (5.11)$$

because  $\text{rk}_A Z = \text{rk}_B e Z$ , by Lemma 3.16(2), and so, by (4.3),

$$\text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J} e Z) \cong \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}_*)^{\text{rk}_A Z}$$

When we restrict  $\text{wt}$  to  $\mathbf{M}_0 = \text{Ker rk}$ , we deduce from (5.11) that  $\beta \circ \text{wt} = -\text{id}_{\mathbf{M}_0}$ , and thus that  $\text{Im } \beta = \mathbf{M}_0$ , so the sequence (5.9) is exact at  $K(\text{CM } A)$ .

Since  $K(\text{CM } A)$  and  $K(\text{fd } A)$  have the same rank (Remark 5.1), we deduce that  $\text{Ker } \beta$  has rank 1. To complete the proof, it will suffice to show that  $\beta(\delta) = 0$ . This is because  $\delta$  is primitive, since  $\delta_* = 1$ , so  $\delta$  must then generate  $\text{Ker } \beta$ , that is, the sequence (5.9) is exact at  $K(\text{fd } A)$ .

In particular, this means that the restriction of  $\beta$  to  $\mathbf{N}_*$  is injective, by (5.8), and so, since we already know that  $\beta \circ \text{wt} = -\text{id}_{\mathbf{M}_0}$ , the restrictions of  $\beta$  to  $\mathbf{N}_*$  and  $-\text{wt}$  to  $\mathbf{M}_0$  must be mutual inverses, thereby completing the proof of the second part.

To verify the claim that  $\beta(\delta) = 0$ , observe that multiplication by  $t \in \mathcal{R}$  is injective on any  $Z \in \text{CM } A$ , so  $Z \cong tZ$ . Hence  $\beta[Z/tZ] = [Z] - [tZ] = 0$  in  $K(\text{CM } A)$ . For example, if  $Z = \text{Hom}(T, M)$ , for  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , then

$$\dim \text{Hom}(T_i, M)/t \text{Hom}(T_i, M) = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} \text{Hom}(T_i, M) = (\text{rk}_B M)(\text{rk}_B T_i),$$

that is,  $[Z/tZ] = (\text{rk}_B M)\delta$ . Thus  $\delta \in \text{Ker } \beta$ , as required.  $\square$

**Remark 5.5.** In the proof of Proposition 5.4, we deduced indirectly that, after restriction to  $\mathbf{N}_*$ , we have  $\text{wt} \circ \beta = -\text{id}_{\mathbf{N}_*}$ . It is also possible to prove this directly.

Consider any  $X \in \text{fd } A$  with  $e_* X = 0$ , so that  $[X] \in \mathbf{N}_*$ . Given a CM-approximation

$$0 \longrightarrow Z \xrightarrow{\lambda} Y \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0,$$

the induced map  $e_* Z \rightarrow e_* Y$  is an isomorphism, inducing an isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}e Z) \cong \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}e Y).$$

Thus, following (5.1), we have the following commutative diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}e Z) & \longrightarrow & \text{Wt } Z \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \lambda & & \downarrow \cong & & \downarrow \text{Wt } \lambda \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}e Y) & \longrightarrow & \text{Wt } Y \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

By the Snake Lemma,  $\text{Ker } \text{Wt } \lambda \cong \text{Cok } \lambda = X$  and so

$$\text{wt } \beta[X] = \text{wt}[Y] - \text{wt}[Z] = [\text{Wt } Y] - [\text{Wt } Z] = -[\text{Ker } \text{Wt } \lambda] = -[X].$$

**Remark 5.6.** As well as the natural (i.e. choice independent) exact sequence (5.12), we have an exact sequence in the reverse direction, which does depend on the choice of boundary vertex  $* \in Q_0$ .

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{[T, \mathbf{J}_*]} K(\text{CM } A) \xrightarrow{\text{wt}} K(\text{fd } A) \xrightarrow{[T, \mathbf{P}_*]} \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (5.12)$$

Here, as before, we just write  $[T, \mathbf{J}_*]$  for the map  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A): n \mapsto n[T, \mathbf{J}_*]$ . We also identify the element  $[T, \mathbf{P}_*] = [Ae_*] \in K(\text{Proj } A)$  with the corresponding (dual) map  $K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}: x \mapsto x_*$ , whose kernel is  $\mathbf{N}_*$ . Thus we have already seen that  $\text{Im } \text{wt} = \mathbf{N}_*$ , i.e. the sequence (5.12) is exact at  $K(\text{fd } A)$ . On the other hand, the sequence is exact at  $K(\text{CM } A)$  by Lemma 4.5, since we know that  $\text{Ker } \text{wt}$  has rank 1 and  $[T, \mathbf{J}_*]$  is primitive, because  $\text{rk}[T, \mathbf{J}_*] = 1$ , or equally from the splitting (5.5). Note also that, as a map,  $[T, \mathbf{P}_*]$  is surjective, because  $[T, \mathbf{P}_*]\delta = \delta_* = 1$ , or equally from the splitting (5.8).

A consequence of Proposition 5.4, and in particular (5.11), is that we have an isomorphism

$$\widetilde{\text{wt}}: \text{CM } A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_*: [Z] \mapsto (\text{rk}[Z], \text{wt}[Z]) \quad (5.13)$$

with inverse

$$\widetilde{\beta}: \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_* \rightarrow \text{CM } A: (r, [X]) \mapsto r[T, \mathbf{J}_*] - \beta[X]. \quad (5.14)$$

Recall, from (Remark 5.1, that  $K(\text{fd } A) \cong \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  via the standard basis  $[S_i]$ , that is,  $\sum_i d_i [S_i]$  is identified with  $(d_i)_{i \in Q_0}$ . Hence we can define a partial order on  $K(\text{fd } A)$  by

$$d \leq d' \quad \text{if } d_i \leq d'_i, \text{ for all } i \in Q_0.$$

and also restrict this partial order to  $\mathbf{N}_* \subseteq K(\text{fd } A)$ .

We can then use the isomorphism  $\text{wt}: \text{CM } A \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_*$  from (5.13) to induce (lexicographically) a partial order on  $\text{CM } A$ . Explicitly, this gives the following.

**Definition 5.7.** For  $d, d' \in K(\text{CM } A)$ , we say  $d \leq d'$  if  $\text{rk}(d) < \text{rk}(d')$  or  $\text{rk}(d) = \text{rk}(d')$  and  $\text{wt } d \leq \text{wt } d'$ .

Note that an alternative would be to use the isomorphism  $\beta: \mathbf{N}_* \rightarrow \mathbf{M}_0$  to induce a partial order on  $\mathbf{M}_0$  and then use the splitting  $\text{CM } A = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{M}_0$  to give a lexicographic order on  $\text{CM } A$ . This is not quite the same, because the inverse of  $\text{wt}$  is  $-\beta$ , so the partial order on elements of fixed rank is reversed.

**5.2. Projective resolutions of simples.** For any vertex  $i$  of the Gabriel quiver  $Q$  of  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$ , as defined in Remark 3.2, let

$$E_i = \bigoplus_{j \leftarrow i} T_j \quad \text{and} \quad F_i = \bigoplus_{j \rightarrow i} T_j. \quad (5.15)$$

Note that, when  $i$  is an interior vertex,  $E_i, F_i \in \text{add}(T/T_i)$  and they have no common summands, because  $Q$  has no loops or 2-cycles, by the assumption that  $\text{GP } B$  has a cluster structure, in the sense of [6, §II.1].

In particular, if  $i$  is an interior vertex, then we have the two mutation sequences for  $T_i$  as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\longrightarrow T_i^* \longrightarrow E_i \longrightarrow T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\ 0 &\longrightarrow T_i \longrightarrow F_i \longrightarrow T_i^* \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

**Proposition 5.8.** Write  $\mathbf{R} = \text{Hom}(T, -)$ . From  $E_i, F_i$  as in (5.15), we obtain projective resolutions of the simple  $A$ -module  $S_i$  as follows.

(1) If  $i$  is an interior vertex, then the resolution is

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}T_i \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}F_i \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}E_i \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}T_i \longrightarrow S_i \longrightarrow 0, \quad (5.17)$$

Consequently,  $\text{proj. dim } S_i = 3$  and  $\beta[S_i] = [T, F_i] - [T, E_i]$ . That is, in the bases of simples and projectives,  $\beta$  is given, on interior vertices, by the exchange matrix (up to a sign).

(2) If  $i$  is a boundary vertex, then the resolution is

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}K_i \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}E_i \longrightarrow \mathbf{R}T_i \longrightarrow S_i \longrightarrow 0, \quad (5.18)$$

for some  $K_i \in \text{add } T$ . Consequently,  $\text{proj. dim } S_i \leq 2$  and

$$\beta[S_i] = [T, T_i] - [T, E_i] + [T, K_i].$$

*Proof.* (1) Applying  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$  to the two mutation sequences, and splicing the resulting sequences at  $\mathbf{R}T_i^*$ , gives the projective resolution (5.17), because  $\text{Ext}^1(T, T_i^*) = S_i$ . The resolution is minimal because adjacent terms have no common summands and thus  $\text{proj. dim } S_i = 3$ .

(2) When  $i$  is a boundary vertex,  $T_i$  is a projective  $B$ -module and the minimal  $\text{add } T$ -approximation of  $\text{rad } T_i$  has the following form

$$0 \longrightarrow K_i \longrightarrow E_i \xrightarrow{f} \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0. \quad (5.19)$$

Note that  $f$  is surjective, because  ${}_B B \in \text{add } T$ . Applying  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$  leads to

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, K_i) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, E_i) \xrightarrow{f^*} \text{Hom}(T, \text{rad } T_i) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}^1(T, K_i) \longrightarrow 0.$$

As  $f$  is an add  $T$ -approximation,  $f_*$  is surjective. Hence  $\text{Ext}^1(T, K_i) = 0$  and so  $K_i \in \text{add } T$ . Applying  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$  to the sequence (5.19) and to the embedding  $\text{rad } T_i \rightarrow T_i$ , and splicing the results at  $\text{R}(\text{rad } T_i)$ , gives the projective resolution (5.18), because the cokernel of the (injective) map  $\text{Hom}(T, \text{rad } T_i) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T, T_i)$  is isomorphic to  $S_i$ .  $\square$

## 6. CLUSTER CHARACTERS, PARTITION FUNCTIONS AND FLOW POLYNOMIALS

In this section, we construct various cluster characters on GP  $B$ , with natural extensions to CM  $B$ . As earlier, we assume that GP  $B$  has a cluster structure.

In particular, we define a generalised partition function  $\mathcal{P}$  and a generalised flow polynomial  $\mathcal{F}$ . In Section 7, we will prove that  $\mathcal{P}_M$  and  $\mathcal{F}_M$  coincide with combinatorially defined partition functions and flow polynomials, when  $M$  and all the indecomposable summands of  $T$  have rank 1. This justifies the names of these cluster characters.

**6.1. Fu–Keller’s cluster character.** Following Fu–Keller [10] and Palu [26], what we mean by a ‘cluster character’ is as follows.

**Definition 6.1.** A *cluster character* on GP  $B$  with values in a commutative ring  $H$  is map  $\Phi: \text{GP } B \rightarrow H: M \mapsto \Phi_M$  such that

- (1) if  $M$  and  $N$  are isomorphic, then  $\Phi_M = \Phi_N$ ,
- (2)  $\Phi_{M \oplus N} = \Phi_M \Phi_N$ , for any  $M, N$ ,
- (3) if  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(M, N) = 1$  and the short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow E \rightarrow N \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow F \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0 \quad (6.1)$$

are non-split, then  $\Phi_M \Phi_N = \Phi_E + \Phi_F$ .

**Remark 6.2.** If  $\Phi: \text{GP } B \rightarrow H$  is a cluster character and  $\alpha: H \rightarrow H'$  is any ring homomorphism, then  $\alpha \circ \Phi$  is also a cluster character. We will often consider the case when  $H = \mathbb{C}[L]$ , the ring of formal Laurent polynomials with exponents in a lattice  $L$ . In this case, for a lattice map  $\lambda: L \rightarrow L'$ , we will write  ${}^\lambda \Phi$  for  $\mathbb{C}[\lambda] \circ \Phi$  and for the map  $(-1): L \rightarrow L$ , i.e. multiplication by  $-1$ , we will write  $\tilde{\Phi}$  for  $(-1)\Phi$ .

Note that  $\mathbb{C}[L]$  is the coordinate ring of an algebraic torus  $\mathbb{T}_L$ , whose character lattice is naturally  $L$ . We can thus regard the formal monomial  $x^\ell \in \mathbb{C}[L]$  as the function  $\mathbb{T}_L \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  given by the character  $\ell \in L$ , so that the formal multiplication rule  $x^\ell x^m = x^{\ell+m}$  becomes a true formula. We can regard  $\tilde{\Phi}$  as the pull-back of  $\Phi$  along the involution  $\mathbb{T}_L \rightarrow \mathbb{T}_L: x \mapsto x^{-1}$ .

We adapt Fu–Keller’s cluster character [10] to GP  $B$ , noting that GP  $B$  is not Hom-finite, so is outside their declared context, but it is stably Hom-finite, which is all that is needed to lift Palu’s construction from the stable category.

For any cluster tilting object  $T$  in GP  $B$ , we define

$$\Phi^T: \text{CM } B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]: N \mapsto \Phi_N^T = x^{[T, N]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(T, N)) x^{-\beta(d)}, \quad (6.2)$$

where  $\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(T, N)$  is the Grassmannian of  $A$ -submodules of  $\text{Ext}^1(T, N)$  of dimension vector  $d \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  (or, equivalently, of class  $d \in K(\text{fd } A)$ ) and  $\chi$  is the Euler characteristic. By Lemma 2.5, extension groups in CM  $B$  are finite dimensional, and so  $\Phi$  is well defined and the sum is finite.

Although the map  $\Phi$  is defined on CM  $B$ , it can only meaningfully be a cluster character when restricted to GP  $B$ . Strictly speaking, cluster characters in [10] are constructed using the Grothendieck group  $K(\text{Proj } A)$ , but note, by Remark 5.1, that  $K(\text{Proj } A) \cong K(\text{CM } A)$ . For instance, expressing the class  $[T, N]$  in the basis of projectives gives the ‘index’ of  $N$  used in the definition in [10].

The proof in [10] can be adapted to prove the following.

**Proposition 6.3.**  $\Phi^T$  is a cluster character, when restricted to  $\text{GP}(B)$

The following lemma is straightforward, but we include the proof for completeness.

**Lemma 6.4.** If  $M \in \text{GP } B$ , then  $\Phi_M^T$  is a monomial if and only if  $M \in \text{add } T$ , in which case  $\Phi_M^T = x^{[T, M]}$ . In particular, this holds when  $M$  is projective.

*Proof.* From (6.2), we see that  $\Phi_M^T$  is a monomial if and only if  $\text{Ext}^1(T, M) = 0$ , which is equivalent to  $M \in \text{add } T$ , since  $T$  is a cluster tilting object. The formula is then immediate from (6.2). Finally  $B$  is a summand of  $T$ , so  $\text{add } B \subseteq \text{add } T$ , and so the condition holds for all projectives.  $\square$

**6.2. Generalised partition functions.** For any  $M \in \text{CM } B$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} D_M &= \{[X] \in K(\text{CM } A) : X \leq \text{Hom}(T, M) \text{ and } eX = M\} \\ &= \{[X] \in K(\text{CM } A) : A \cdot M \leq X \leq \text{Hom}(T, M)\} \end{aligned} \quad (6.3)$$

where the equality of the two sets follows from Proposition 3.13(2). For any  $[X] \in D_M$ , by which we implicitly mean  $X$  satisfies the conditions in (6.3), the class, in  $K(\text{fd } A)$ ,

$$d_{[X]} = [X/(A \cdot M)] = \text{wt}[A \cdot M] - \text{wt}[X], \quad (6.4)$$

depends only on the class  $[X]$ . Furthermore,  $d_{[X]} = d_{[Y]}$  if and only if  $[X] = [Y]$ . So there is a bijection  $[X] \mapsto d_{[X]}$  between  $D_M$  and the set of classes of submodules of  $\text{Hom}(T, M)/A \cdot M = \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ , by Proposition 3.13(1).

For any cluster tilting object  $T$  in  $\text{GP } B$ , define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}^T &: \text{CM } B \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]: M \mapsto \mathcal{P}_M^T \\ \mathcal{P}_M^T &= \sum_{[X] \in D_M} \chi(\text{Gr}_{d_{[X]}} \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^{[X]}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

where  $\chi$  and  $\text{Gr}_d$  are as before in (6.2).

**Remark 6.5.** We can rewrite the sum in (6.5) as a ‘motivic sum’

$$\mathcal{P}_M^T = \sum_{\substack{X \leq \text{Hom}(T, M) \\ eX = M}}^{\text{mot}} x^{[X]} = \sum_{Y \leq \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)}^{\text{mot}} x^{[\hat{Y}]}, \quad (6.6)$$

where  $\hat{Y}$  is the inverse image of  $Y$  under the quotient  $\text{Hom}(T, M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ . In (6.6), infinite families in the sum are counted by the Euler characteristic of the family. Indeed, it is precisely  $\text{Gr}_{d_{[X]}} \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$  that parametrises those  $Y$  with  $[Y] = d_{[X]}$ , so that  $[\hat{Y}] = [X]$ .

To make (6.6) look even more like a classical partition function (cf. (7.12)), we could write the sum range as “ $X : eX = M$ ”, with the implicit understanding that we use the unit map  $\eta_X : X \rightarrow \text{Re } X$  to realise  $X \leq \text{Hom}(T, M)$  with  $eX = M$ . Note that we can not just write  $eX \cong M$  here; we must have a prescribed isomorphism  $eX \rightarrow M$ .

**Proposition 6.6.** For  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^T$ , as in (6.5), we have

- (1) For any partial presentation  $0 \rightarrow \Omega M \rightarrow PM \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M = \frac{\Phi_{\Omega M}^T}{\Phi_{PM}^T} \quad (6.7)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} = \mathbb{C}[-1] \circ \mathcal{P}$ , as in Remark 6.2.

- (2)  $\mathcal{P}$  is a cluster character, when restricted to  $\text{GP } B$ .

- (3)  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is homogeneous of degree  $\text{rk}_B M$ .
- (4)  $\mathcal{P}_M$  has minimum term  $x^{[T,M]}$  and maximum term  $x^{[A \cdot M]}$  and both terms have coefficient 1.
- (5)  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is a monomial if and only if  $\Omega M \in \text{add } T$ , in which case  $\mathcal{P}_M = x^{[T,M]}$ . In particular, this holds when  $M$  is projective or injective in  $\text{CM } B$ .
- (6) If  $M \in \text{CM } B$  is not in  $\text{GP } B$ , then there is a projective  $P \in \text{add } B$  so that  $\mathcal{P}_M = x^{-[T,P]} \mathcal{P}_N$ , for some  $N \in \text{GP } B$ .

In (4), the (partial) order on exponents is from Definition 5.7 and so depends on the choice of boundary vertex  $*$ . However, the result clearly doesn't, that is, these are the minimum and maximum terms for all choices of  $*$ .

*Proof.* (1) By Lemma 6.4, we have  $\Phi_{PM}^T = x^{[T,PM]}$  and, by Lemma 2.17(3), we have  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(T, \Omega M)$ . Thus, modifying (6.5) and (6.2), we want to compare

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M = \sum_{[X] \in D_M} \chi(\text{Gr}_{d_{[X]}} \text{Ext}^1(T, \Omega M)) x^{-[X]}, \quad (6.8)$$

$$\frac{\Phi_{\Omega M}^T}{\Phi_{PM}^T} = x^{[T, \Omega M] - [T, PM]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(T, \Omega M)) x^{-\beta(d)} \quad (6.9)$$

The sums in (6.8) and (6.9) are effectively over the same range, by the discussion following (6.4), and give the same coefficients, so it remains to prove that the exponents match up, that is,

$$-[X] = [T, \Omega M] - [T, PM] - \beta(d_{[X]}), \quad (6.10)$$

for any  $[X] \in D_M$ . By (5.11) and (6.4), we have  $\beta(d_{[X]}) = [X] - [A \cdot M]$ . But now, applying  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$  to the partial presentation of  $M$  gives an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, \Omega M) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, PM) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, M).$$

Since  $PM$  is a projective cover, the image of  $\text{Hom}(T, PM)$  here is the kernel of the natural map  $\text{Hom}(T, M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ , which is  $A \cdot M$  by Proposition 3.13(1). Thus

$$[A \cdot M] = [T, PM] - [T, \Omega M],$$

which completes the proof.

(2) We will use (1) to show that  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  is a cluster character, which is equivalent by Remark 6.2. First,  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  satisfies Definition 6.1(1), because  $\Phi$  does.

Second, the direct sum of partial presentations of  $M$  and  $N$  is a partial presentation of  $M \oplus N$ . Since  $\Phi$  satisfies Definition 6.1(2), we have

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{M \oplus N} = \frac{\Phi_{\Omega M \oplus \Omega N}}{\Phi_{PM \oplus PN}} = \frac{\Phi_{\Omega M}}{\Phi_{PM}} \frac{\Phi_{\Omega N}}{\Phi_{PN}} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_N.$$

Thus  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  satisfies Definition 6.1(2).

Now suppose that we have  $M, N \in \text{GP } B$  with  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(M, N) = 1$  and the two non-split short exact sequences with middle terms  $E$  and  $F$ , as in Definition 6.1(3). Choose partial presentations of  $M$  and  $N$  and use the Horseshoe Lemma to get partial presentations of  $E$  and  $F$  with

$$PE = PM \oplus PN = PF, \quad (6.11)$$

giving the following commutative diagram of short exact sequences for  $E$

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega M & \longrightarrow & \Omega E & \longrightarrow & \Omega N \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & PM & \longrightarrow & PE & \longrightarrow & PN \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & N \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array}$$

and similarly for  $F$ , with  $M$  and  $N$  swapped.

As  $\Omega$  is an equivalence on the stable category, we know that  $\text{Ext}^1(\Omega M, \Omega N) = 1$  and the top rows in the diagrams for both  $E$  and  $F$  are non-split. Therefore, since  $\Phi$  satisfies Definition 6.1(3),

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_N = \frac{\Phi_{\Omega M}}{\Phi_{PM}} \frac{\Phi_{\Omega N}}{\Phi_{PN}} = \frac{\Phi_{\Omega E} + \Phi_{\Omega F}}{\Phi_{PM \oplus PN}} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_E + \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_F,$$

where the last equality uses (6.11). Thus  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}$  satisfies Definition 6.1(3) and hence it is a cluster character.

(3) All  $X$  that contribute to the sum (6.5) have  $\mathbf{e} X = M$  and so, by Lemma 3.16(2),

$$\text{rk}[X] = \text{rk}_A X = \text{rk}_B \mathbf{e} X = \text{rk}_B M.$$

Thus  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is a homogeneous polynomial of that degree.

(4) The (partial) order on terms comes from Definition 5.7 applied to their exponents. Since  $\mathcal{P}_M$  is a homogeneous, we just have to compare the weights of the exponents in the sum (6.5). All  $X$  that contribute have  $A \cdot M \leq X \leq \text{Hom}(T, M)$  and applying  $\mathbf{e}$  to both these inclusions gives equality. Hence Lemma 4.4(4) implies that

$$\text{wt}[T, M] \leq \text{wt}[X] \leq \text{wt}[A \cdot M].$$

Thus the minimum exponent is  $[T, M]$ , the maximum exponent is  $[A \cdot M]$  and all other exponents lie between these two in the partial order. Furthermore, both classes only contain a single module, namely,  $X = \text{Hom}(T, M)$  and  $X = A \cdot M$ . Hence the corresponding Euler characteristic is 1.

(5) Follows from (1) and Lemma 6.4, since  $\Omega M \in \text{GP } B$ , by Lemma 2.9. Note that the property  $\Omega M \in \text{add } T$  does not depend on the choice of  $\Omega M$ , because two choices only differ by projectives and  $\text{add } B \subseteq \text{add } T$ . If  $M$  is projective, we can take  $\Omega M = 0$ . If  $M$  is injective, then  $\Omega M$  is projective, by Corollary 2.19, and thus in  $\text{add } T$ .

Alternatively, the formula for  $\mathcal{P}_M$  comes directly from (6.5), using Lemma 2.17(3), since the only contribution in this case is from  $X = \text{Hom}(T, M)$ .

(6) Let  $N = \Sigma \Omega M$ . By Lemma 2.17(2), we know  $\text{Ext}^1(T, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(T, N)$ , as  $\text{End } T$ -modules. So by (1) and (6.9),  $\mathcal{P}_M$  and  $\mathcal{P}_N$  are sums over the same dimension vectors with the same coefficients, and so differ at most by their leading terms. By applying  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$  to the diagram (2.5), we see that the leading terms are equal up to terms coming from  $\text{add } \text{Hom}(T, B)$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 6.7.** Requiring  $\Omega M \in \text{add } T$  in Proposition 6.6(5) is equivalent to requiring  $M \in \text{add } \Sigma T$ , where  $\Sigma T$  is another cluster tilting object in  $\text{GP } B$ , defined as

$$\Sigma T = B \oplus \bigoplus_{\text{interior } j} \Sigma T_j \tag{6.12}$$

and  $\Sigma T_j$  is a minimal cosyzygy of  $T_j$  in  $\text{GP } B$ , as in §2.5. In particular,  $\Sigma T_j$  is indecomposable and has a partial presentation

$$0 \longrightarrow T_j \longrightarrow P\Sigma T_j \longrightarrow \Sigma T_j \longrightarrow 0,$$

so we can suppose that  $\Omega\Sigma T_j = T_j$ .

By Lemma 2.17(3), we can see that  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\Sigma T, M)$ , so comparing (6.5) and (6.2) suggests another relationship between the partition function  $\mathcal{P}$  and the cluster character  $\Phi$ , as follows.

**Theorem 6.8.** Let  $T$  be a cluster tilting object in  $\text{GP } B$ , with  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$ , and  $\Sigma T$  be as in (6.12), with  $A' = \text{End}(\Sigma T)^{\text{op}}$ . Then  $\mathcal{P}^T$  and  $\Phi^{\Sigma T}$  are related by a monomial change of variables, specifically,

$$\mathcal{P}^T = \mathbb{C}[\zeta] \circ \Phi^{\Sigma T}, \quad (6.13)$$

where, for  $X \in \text{add } \Sigma T$ ,

$$\zeta: K(\text{CM } A') \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A): [\Sigma T, X] \mapsto [T, X]. \quad (6.14)$$

Note that the ( $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear) map  $\zeta$  is well-defined by (6.14), because, as  $X$  runs over the indecomposable summands of  $\Sigma T$ , the classes  $[\Sigma T, X]$  form a basis of  $K(\text{CM } A')$ .

*Proof.* We will actually prove that  $\mathbb{C}[-\zeta] \circ \Phi^{\Sigma T} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^T$ , as we can then use the formula from Proposition 6.6(1) for the later. Indeed, by (6.2) and (6.7),

$$\Phi_M^{\Sigma T} = x^{[\Sigma T, M]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(\Sigma T, M)) x^{-\beta_{A'}(d)} \quad (6.15)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M^T = \frac{\Phi_{\Omega M}^T}{\Phi_{PM}^T} = x^{[T, \Omega M] - [T, PM]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(T, \Omega M)) x^{-\beta_A(d)} \quad (6.16)$$

where  $\beta_A: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A)$ , and similarly  $\beta_{A'}$ , are defined as in (5.3) and Lemma 5.2. We need to show that the right-hand sides are identified by  $\mathbb{C}[-\zeta]$ .

By Lemma 2.17(3), the stable equivalence  $\Sigma$  induces an isomorphism

$$\underline{\text{End}}(\Sigma T) \cong \underline{\text{End}}(T) \quad (6.17)$$

so that  $\text{Ext}^1(\Sigma T, M) \cong \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(T, \Omega M)$  as  $\underline{\text{End}}(T)$ -modules. Thus the sums in (6.15) and (6.16) are over the same range and the corresponding terms have the same coefficients. So it remains to show that

$$-\zeta[\Sigma T, M] = [T, \Omega M] - [T, PM] \quad (6.18)$$

and, for all  $d$ ,

$$-\zeta\beta_{A'}(d) = \beta_A(d). \quad (6.19)$$

Note that we need to prove these two separately, because (6.18) is the case  $d = 0$ .

To prove (6.18), we use the Horseshoe Lemma to construct the following commutative diagram of short exact sequences,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \Omega U'' & \longrightarrow & \Omega U' & \longrightarrow & \Omega M \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & PU'' & \longrightarrow & PU' & \longrightarrow & PM \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & U'' & \longrightarrow & U' & \longrightarrow & M \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array} \tag{6.20}$$

where the bottom row is any add  $\Sigma T$  approximation of  $M$ , the outer columns are any syzygy sequences and the middle column is the syzygy sequence with  $PU' = PU'' \oplus PM$ . Then the top row of (6.20) is an add  $T$  approximation of  $\Omega M$  (see Remark 6.7). Since the bottom row of (6.20) remains exact under  $\text{Hom}(\Sigma T, -)$  and  $U', U'' \in \text{add } \Sigma T$ , we can use (6.14) to write

$$\begin{aligned}
 -\zeta[\Sigma T, M] &= -\zeta[\Sigma T, U'] + \zeta[\Sigma T, U''] = -[T, U'] + [T, U''] \\
 &= [T, \Omega U'] - [T, PU'] - [T, \Omega U''] + [T, PU''] \\
 &= [T, \Omega M] - [T, PM],
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last two equalities hold because the left two sequences and the top two sequences in (6.20) remain exact under  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$ . This proves (6.18).

To prove (6.19), since  $\beta$  is additive and the modules  $\text{Ext}^1(\Sigma T, M) \cong \text{Ext}^1(T, \Omega M)$  are supported on the interior vertices, we just need to do the case  $d = [S_i]$  for any interior simple  $S_i$ , where because of the isomorphism (6.17), we can use  $S_i$  to denote both the simple top of  $\text{Hom}(T, T_i)$  and of  $\text{Hom}(\Sigma T, \Sigma T_i)$ .

Consider the following two commutative diagrams of short exact sequences, constructed using the Horseshoe Lemma from the mutation sequences (5.16).

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & T_i & \longrightarrow & F_i & \longrightarrow & T_i^* \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & P\Sigma T_i & \longrightarrow & P\Sigma F_i & \longrightarrow & P\Sigma T_i^* \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \Sigma T_i & \longrightarrow & \Sigma F_i & \longrightarrow & \Sigma T_i^* \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array} \quad
 \begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & T_i^* & \longrightarrow & E_i & \longrightarrow & T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & P\Sigma T_i^* & \longrightarrow & P\Sigma E_i & \longrightarrow & P\Sigma T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \Sigma T_i^* & \longrightarrow & \Sigma E_i & \longrightarrow & \Sigma T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array} \tag{6.21}$$

In particular, the outer columns are minimal cosyzygy sequences, while the middle column is not necessarily minimal and constructed with

$$P\Sigma F_i = P\Sigma T_i \oplus P\Sigma T_i^* = P\Sigma E_i. \tag{6.22}$$

Given that  $T$  is a cluster tilting object, the fact that the top rows are mutation sequences is equivalent to  $F_i, E_i \in \text{add } T/T_i$  and  $\text{Ext}^1(T/T_i, T_i^*) = 0 = \text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, T/T_i)$ , so that the maps to and from  $T_i$  are add  $T/T_i$ -approximations.

But then we know that  $\Sigma F_i, \Sigma E_i \in \text{add } \Sigma T / \Sigma T_i$  (cf. Remark 6.7) and, since  $\Sigma$  is an equivalence on the stable category, it preserves the Ext vanishing condition, so that the bottom rows are mutation sequences for  $\Sigma T_i$ . In particular,  $(\Sigma T_i)^* = \Sigma T_i^*$ .

Hence, by Proposition 5.8,

$$\beta_{A'}[S_i] = [\Sigma T, \Sigma F_i] - [\Sigma T, \Sigma E_i] \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_A[S_i] = [T, F_i] - [T, E_i].$$

Therefore, since  $\Sigma F_i, \Sigma E_i \in \text{add } \Sigma T$  and the middle columns remain exact under  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$ , we can use (6.14) to write

$$\begin{aligned} -\zeta \beta_{A'}[S_i] &= -\zeta[\Sigma T, \Sigma F_i] + \zeta[\Sigma T, \Sigma E_i] = -[T, \Sigma F_i] + [T, \Sigma E_i] \\ &= [T, F_i] - [T, P\Sigma F_i] - [T, E_i] + [T, P\Sigma E_i] \\ &= \beta_A[S_i], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality uses (6.22). This completes the proof of (6.19) and thus of the whole result.  $\square$

**Remark 6.9.** The bottom and right-hand sequences in (6.20) usually do not remain exact under  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$  and the equal quantities in (6.18) are usually not  $-[T, M]$ . Indeed the ‘leading’ term  $x^{[T, M]}$  in  $\mathcal{P}_M^T$  comes from the other end of the sum, not from the ‘leading’ term  $x^{[\Sigma T, M]}$  in  $\Phi_M^{\Sigma T}$ .

**Remark 6.10.** For any  $[X] \in D_M$ , as in (6.3), we know, from (4.7) and Remark 3.12, that  $[GX] = [\text{Hom}(T, M)/X]$ , which we can also write in  $K(\text{CM } A)$  as

$$[X] = [T, M] - \beta[GX]. \quad (6.23)$$

Since  $d_{[X]} = [X/(A \cdot M)]$ , as in (6.4), and  $\text{Hom}(T, M)/A \cdot M = \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ , by Proposition 3.13(1), we also have, in  $K(\text{fd } A)$ ,

$$[GX] = [\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)] - d_{[X]}. \quad (6.24)$$

Hence the generalised partition function can be rewritten as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_M^T &= x^{[T, M]} \sum_{[X] \in D_M} \chi(\text{Gr}_{d_{[X]}} \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^{-\beta[GX]}, \\ &= x^{[T, M]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}^d \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^{-\beta(d)}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.25)$$

where  $\text{Gr}^d V$  is the Grassmannian of  $d$ -dimensional quotients of  $V \in \text{fd } A$ , so that the second sum in (6.25) is the ‘quotient F-polynomial’ of  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ , written in  $\hat{y}$  variables, i.e. the monomials  $x^{-\beta(d)}$ , as in (6.2).

We could also write the partition function from the other end, that is,

$$\mathcal{P}_M^T = x^{[A \cdot M]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^{\beta(d)}, \quad (6.26)$$

so that the sum comes from the more usual (submodule) F-polynomial of  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ .

**6.3. Generalised flow polynomials.** Recall, from (5.2) and (5.7), the lattice homomorphism

$$\text{wt}: K(\text{CM } A) \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_* \leq K(\text{fd } A).$$

For any cluster tilting object  $T \in \text{GP } B$ , we can define  $\mathcal{F}^T = \text{wt} \mathcal{P}^T$ , in the notation of Remark 6.2, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}^T: \text{CM } B &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{N}_*]: M \mapsto \mathcal{F}_M^T \\ \mathcal{F}_M^T &= \sum_{[X] \in D_M} \chi(\text{Gr}_{d_{[X]}} \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^{\text{wt}[X]}. \end{aligned} \quad (6.27)$$

Also recall, from Definition 4.1 and Lemma 4.5, the invariant

$$\kappa(T, M) = [\mathbf{K}(T, M)] = \text{wt}[T, M]. \quad (6.28)$$

More generally, since  $[\mathbf{G}X] \in \mathbf{N}_*$ , by Lemma 4.4(2), we can apply  $\text{wt}$  to (6.23), recalling that  $\text{wt} \circ \beta = -\text{id}$  on  $\mathbf{N}_*$ , by Proposition 5.4, to get

$$\text{wt}[X] = \kappa(T, M) + [\mathbf{G}X]. \quad (6.29)$$

In particular, as  $\mathbf{G}(A \cdot M) = \text{Hom}(T, M)/A \cdot M = \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ , by Proposition 3.13(1),

$$\text{wt}[A \cdot M] = \kappa(T, M) + [\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)]. \quad (6.30)$$

The following come directly from Proposition 6.6.

**Proposition 6.11.** For  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^T$ , as in (6.27), we have

- (1)  $\mathcal{F}$  is a cluster character, when restricted to  $\text{GP } B$ .
- (2)  $\mathcal{F}_M$  has minimum term  $x^{\kappa(T, M)}$  and maximum term  $x^{\kappa(T, M) + [\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)]}$  and both terms have coefficient 1.
- (3)  $\mathcal{F}_M$  is a monomial if and only if  $\Omega M \in \text{add } T$ , in which case  $\mathcal{F}_M = x^{\kappa(T, M)}$ . In particular, this holds when  $M$  is projective or injective in  $\text{CM } B$ .
- (4)  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{J}_*} = 1$ .

*Proof.* (1) As  $\mathcal{F}_M = \text{wt} \mathcal{P}_M$ , Remark 6.2 implies  $\mathcal{F}$  is a cluster character because  $\mathcal{P}$  is, by Proposition 6.6(2).

(2) follows from Proposition 6.6(4), using (6.28) and (6.30).

(3) Note that  $\Omega M \in \text{add } T$  if and only if  $\text{Ext}^1(T, \Omega M) \cong \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M) = 0$ . If this happens, then the sum in (6.27) has just one term, as given in (2). Otherwise, (2) shows that the sum has at least two non-zero terms. The condition holds when  $M$  is projective, because  $\Omega M = 0$ , and when  $M$  is injective, by Corollary 2.19.

(4)  $\mathbf{J}_*$  is injective, so  $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{J}_*} = x^{\kappa(T, \mathbf{J}_*)}$  by (3). But  $\kappa(T, \mathbf{J}_*) = \text{wt Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}_*) = 0$ , by Lemma 4.5.  $\square$

**Remark 6.12.** Similarly to Remark 6.10, but here using (6.29) (or, equivalently, applying  $\text{wt}$  to (6.25)), the generalised flow polynomial can be rewritten as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_M^T &= x^{\kappa(T, M)} \sum_{[X] \in D_M} \chi(\text{Gr}_{d_{[X]}} \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^{[\mathbf{G}X]}, \\ &= x^{\kappa(T, M)} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}^d \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^d, \end{aligned} \quad (6.31)$$

where again  $\text{Gr}^d V$  is the Grassmannian of  $d$ -dimensional quotients of  $V \in \text{fd } A$ , so that the second sum in (6.31) is now precisely the quotient F-polynomial of  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)$ .

## 7. CLASSICAL PARTITION FUNCTIONS AND FLOW POLYNOMIALS

In this section, we explain how the generalised partition functions and flow polynomials, introduced in the previous section, are related to their classical counterparts, as in e.g. [24, 30, 33].

**7.1. Dimer models and perfect matchings.** The context in which we can do this is that of Example 3.1, that is, for a dimer model on a disc, in the sense of [3, 8]. Such a dimer model is formulated in terms of a quiver with faces  $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, Q_2)$  dual to a plabic graph  $G$  that arises from a connected Postnikov alternating strand diagram. The connectedness is required for the topological space associated to  $Q$ , as a 2-dimensional cell complex, to be a disc. The alternating strand properties ensure that the dimer model is ‘consistent’. See Figure 7.1 for an example, associated to the codimension 1 positroid stratum in  $\text{Gr}(2, 5)$  where  $\Delta_{45} = 0$ .




FIGURE 7.1. Plabic graph, with alternating strand diagram, and dual quiver

From such a dimer model  $Q$ , we construct the dimer algebra  $A$ , as in [8, Def 2.11], and then  $T = eA$  is a CM-module over  $B = eAe$ , where  $e$  is the sum of the idempotents at boundary vertices. By [8, Prop 3.6], such a  $B$  is an  $\mathcal{R}$ -order containing  $C = C(k, n)$ , where  $n$  is the number of boundary labels and  $k$  is the ‘helicity’, that is, the average anti-clockwise rotation of the strand permutation or, equivalently, the number of boundary labels on each alternating region in the right source labelling of the Postnikov diagram (cf. Figure 7.2, where  $(k, n) = (2, 5)$ ). We then know [29, Thm 4.5] that  $T$  is a cluster tilting object in the cluster category  $\text{GP } B$  and  $A = \text{End}_B(T)^{\text{op}}$ . Note that this result also requires the Postnikov diagram to be connected.

By [8, Prop. 8.2], we can compute  $B$  and  $T$  as  $C$ -modules using right source labelling of the Postnikov diagram, as illustrated in Figure 7.2. Note that this gives the labelling of rank 1 modules  $M_I$  used in [18], while left source labelling gives the complementary labels for these modules, as used in [8]. Thus, in this example, we have

$${}_C B = M_{12} \oplus M_{23} \oplus M_{34} \oplus M_{14} \oplus M_{15}, \quad {}_C T = {}_C B \oplus M_{24}, \quad (7.1)$$

and thus  $B$  differs from  $C$  just by having  $M_{14}$  as a projective in place of  $M_{45}$ , which is not a  $B$ -module. Indeed, as already indicated, the positroid in this case consists of all  $I \in \binom{[5]}{2}$  except 45.




FIGURE 7.2. Right source labelling and the Gabriel quiver of  $\text{End}_B(T)^{\text{op}}$

**Definition 7.1.** A (perfect) matching  $\mathbf{m}$  on a dimer model  $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, Q_2)$  is a set of arrows  $a \in Q_1$  containing exactly one arrow in the boundary of each face  $f \in Q_2$ .

This definition is combinatorially equivalent to a perfect matching on the dual plabic graph  $G$ , since, through the duality, the arrows of  $Q$  are in bijection with the edges of  $G$  and the faces of  $Q$  are in bijection with the (internal) nodes of  $G$ . Note that the points at which edges of  $G$  meet the boundary are not considered to be nodes of  $G$ , so are not required to be covered in a matching on  $G$ .

The edges of  $G$  that meet the boundary carry the labels  $1, \dots, n$ , which then also label the boundary arrows of  $Q$ , i.e. those that are in only one face. Mirroring the definition in [24, §3.1], the *boundary value*  $\partial \mathbf{m}$  of a matching  $\mathbf{m}$  consists of the labels of the anti-clockwise boundary arrows in  $\mathbf{m}$  together with the labels of the clockwise arrows not in  $\mathbf{m}$ .




FIGURE 7.3. Some matchings and their boundary values

Following [8, §4], a perfect matching  $\mathbf{m}$  determines a rank 1 *matching module*  $N_{\mathbf{m}}$  as follows. As a representation of  $Q$ , we put  $\mathcal{R}$  at each vertex,  $t$  on every arrow in  $\mathbf{m}$  and 1 on the other arrows. From the construction, we see that, as a  $C$ -module

$$eN_{\mathbf{m}} \cong M_{\partial \mathbf{m}} \quad (7.2)$$

because  $M_I$  can also be seen as ‘matching module’, now on the circular double quiver (1.1), where the indices in  $I$  give the anticlockwise arrows which are  $t$ .

As observed in [8, Prop. 8.6],  $M_I$  is a  $B$ -module precisely when  $I = \partial \mathbf{m}$  for some matching  $\mathbf{m}$  on  $Q$ . One direction follows immediately from (7.2).

**7.2. Grothendieck groups and quiver lattices.** In this subsection, when  $A$  a dimer algebra as in §7.1, we prove that the exact sequence in Proposition 5.4

$$\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{\delta} K(\text{fd } A) \xrightarrow{\beta} K(\text{CM } A) \xrightarrow{\text{rk}} \mathbb{Z} \quad (7.3)$$

is isomorphic to a subsequence of the extended cochain complex of the dimer model  $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, Q_2)$ , that is,

$$\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{c} \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{Z}^{Q_1} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{Z}^{Q_2}, \quad (7.4)$$

where  $c(n)$  is the constant map  $Q_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  with value  $n$  and the coboundary maps are

$$\begin{aligned} d\phi(a) &= \phi(ha) - \phi(ta), & \text{for } \phi \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}, \text{ i.e. } \phi: Q_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \text{ and } a \in Q_1, \\ d\theta(f) &= \sum_{a \in \partial f} \theta(a), & \text{for } \theta \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_1}, \text{ i.e. } \theta: Q_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}, \text{ and } f \in Q_2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that (7.4) is exact because the topological space associated to the cell complex  $Q$  is a disc and thus contractible. The faces in  $Q_2$  are implicitly oriented so that their boundary cycles are positive, i.e. not consistently with either orientation of the disc.

In terms of (7.4), we may say that a *perfect matching* on  $Q$  is a cochain  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_1}$  which takes values in  $\{0, 1\}$  and for which  $d\mu$  is constant with value 1. Note that, with the second condition, it is enough to require that  $\mu$  takes non-negative values. One can then further define a *multi-matching* to be a non-negative cochain  $\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_1}$  such that  $d\mu$  is constant, so that these form a cone in the *matching lattice*

$$\mathbb{M} = \{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_1} : d\mu \text{ is constant}\}. \quad (7.5)$$

Thus we have the following subcomplex of (7.4)

$$\mathbb{Z} \xrightarrow{c} \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbb{M} \xrightarrow{\text{deg}} \mathbb{Z}, \quad (7.6)$$

where  $\text{deg}$  is defined so that, if  $\mu \in \mathbb{M}$ , then  $d\mu$  is constant with value  $\text{deg}(\mu)$ . Strictly speaking, to view (7.6) as a subcomplex of (7.4), the final  $\mathbb{Z}$  must be embedded as the constant functions on faces. Our aim is to show that (7.6) is isomorphic to (7.3).

We already know that the dimension vector of a finite dimensional module gives an isomorphism  $\mathbf{dim}: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ . For the next terms, define

$$\nu: K(\text{CM } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{Q_1} \quad \text{by} \quad \nu[X](a) = \dim \text{Cok } X_a. \quad (7.7)$$

Note that  $\text{Cok } X_a$  is finite dimensional, for all  $a \in Q_1$ , because  $\text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} X_{ta} = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} X_{ha}$  and  $X_a$  is injective. This injectivity also implies that  $\nu$  is additive on short exact sequences in  $\text{CM } A$ , by applying the Snake Lemma to the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & X_{ta} & \longrightarrow & Y_{ta} & \longrightarrow & Z_{ta} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow X_a & & \downarrow Y_a & & \downarrow Z_a & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & X_{ha} & \longrightarrow & Y_{ha} & \longrightarrow & Z_{ha} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

and thus  $\nu$  is a well-defined function on  $K(\text{CM } A)$ . Furthermore,  $\nu[X] \in \mathbb{M}$ , because, for any face  $f \in Q_2$  with boundary cycle  $a_1 \cdots a_m$  (to and from  $i \in Q_0$ , say), we have  $X_{a_m} \cdots X_{a_1} = t \text{id}$ , and the cokernel dimensions of a composite of injective maps add up, so that

$$d\nu[X](f) = \dim \text{Cok}(t \text{id}) = \text{rk}_{\mathcal{R}} X_i = \text{rk}[X]$$

independent of  $f$ . Thus  $\nu[X] \in \mathbb{M}$  and  $\text{deg } \nu[X] = \text{rk}[X]$ .

**Proposition 7.2.** If  $A$  is a dimer algebra as in §7.1, then we have the following commutative diagram of (exact) sequences, where the horizontal maps are from (7.3) and (7.6) and all the vertical maps are isomorphisms.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbb{Z} & \xrightarrow{\delta} & K(\text{fd } A) & \xrightarrow{\beta} & K(\text{CM } A) & \xrightarrow{\text{rk}} & \mathbb{Z} \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \mathbf{dim} & & \downarrow \nu & & \parallel \\ \mathbb{Z} & \xrightarrow{c} & \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathbb{M} & \xrightarrow{\text{deg}} & \mathbb{Z} \end{array}$$

*Proof.* The fact that the third square commutes was just proved in the process of showing that  $\nu$  can have codomain  $\mathbb{M}$ . The first square commutes because in this case  $\text{rk}_B T_i = 1$ , for all  $i \in Q_0$ .

For the second square, suppose that  $M \in \text{fd } A$  has a CM-presentation  $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow M$ . Then  $\beta[M] = [Y] - [X]$  and, by a simple application of the Snake Lemma,

$$\nu([Y] - [X])(a) = \dim \text{Cok } M_a - \dim \text{Ker } M_a \quad (7.8)$$

On the other hand,

$$(d \mathbf{dim}[M])(a) = \dim M_{ha} - \dim M_{ta} \quad (7.9)$$

and the right-hand sides of (7.9) and (7.8) agree (e.g. using the Rank-Nullity Theorem). Thus  $\nu\beta[M] = d \mathbf{dim}[M]$ , as required.

Finally, we deduce that  $\nu$  is an isomorphism by the Five Lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 7.3.** For any  $X \in \text{CM } A$ , note that  $\nu[X]$  is non-negative on all  $a \in Q_1$ , so it is a multi-matching. In particular, if  $\text{rk}[X] = 1$  then  $\nu[X]$  is a (perfect) matching.

In [8, Cor. 4.6], it is shown that every rank 1 module  $X \in \text{CM } A$  is isomorphic to some  $N_{\mathbf{m}}$ , and in fact the proof shows that  $X \cong N_{\mathbf{m}}$  for  $\mathbf{m} = \nu[X]$ . In particular,

$$\nu[N_{\mathbf{m}}] = \mathbf{m}. \quad (7.10)$$

The isomorphism of sequences in Proposition 7.2 is essentially the inverse of the one in [8, Prop. 6.17], after making the identification  $K(\text{CM } A) = K(\text{Proj } A)$ . In particular  $\nu$  is the inverse of the map

$$\eta: \mathbb{M} \rightarrow K(\text{Proj } A)$$

from [8], which is defined so that  $[N_{\mathbf{m}}] = \eta(\mathbf{m})$ , for any matching  $\mathbf{m}$ . However  $\nu$  and  $\eta$  are not transparently inverse to each other, because both the identification and  $\eta$  depend (at least, implicitly) on projective resolution, while  $\nu$  does not.

As a special case of Proposition 7.2, we have

**Lemma 7.4.** For a matching module  $N_{\mathbf{m}}$ ,

$$d \dim \text{Wt } N_{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{m}_* - \mathbf{m}, \quad (7.11)$$

where  $\mathbf{m}_*$  is the matching such that  $\text{Hom}(T, \mathbf{J}_*) \cong N_{\mathbf{m}_*}$ .

*Proof.* Since  $\text{rk}_A N_{\mathbf{m}} = 1$ , we know  $\mathbf{J} \in N_{\mathbf{m}} \cong \mathbf{J}_*$ . Hence, by definition of  $\text{Wt } N_{\mathbf{m}}$ , i.e. (4.7), and of  $\mathbf{m}_*$ , there is a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow N_{\mathbf{m}} \longrightarrow N_{\mathbf{m}_*} \longrightarrow \text{Wt } N_{\mathbf{m}} \longrightarrow 0,$$

so that  $\beta[\text{Wt } N_{\mathbf{m}}] = [N_{\mathbf{m}_*}] - [N_{\mathbf{m}}]$ . The result follows by applying  $\nu$ , and using (7.10) and the middle square of Proposition 7.2.  $\square$

By Lemma 4.4(3), we know that  $\text{Wt } N_{\mathbf{m}}$  vanishes at the vertex  $*$ , so (7.11) determines  $\dim \text{Wt } N_{\mathbf{m}}$ , and thus  $\text{wt}[N_{\mathbf{m}}]$ , uniquely.

**7.3. The classical partition function.** The (formal) partition function associated to a  $k$ -set  $I \subseteq [n]$  is

$$P_I = \sum_{\mathbf{m}: \partial \mathbf{m} = I} x^{\mathbf{m}}, \quad (7.12)$$

taking values in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{M}]$ .

We can interpret (7.12) as in [24, §1.5] by choosing edge weights  $\{x_a : a \in Q_1\}$  on the quiver (or the dual plabic graph  $G$ ) and writing  $x^{\mathbf{m}} = \prod_{a \in \mathbf{m}} x_a$ . Then  $x^{\mathbf{m}}$  defines a function  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{Q_1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*$ , which is semi-invariant for the action of a ‘gauge torus’  $(\mathbb{C}^*)^{Q_2}$  with respect to the character

$$p: (\mathbb{C}^*)^{Q_2} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^*: (t_f) \mapsto \prod_{f \in Q_2} t_f.$$

Now  $\mathbb{M}$  is naturally the character lattice of the quotient torus  $\widehat{\mathbb{T}} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^{Q_1} / \text{Ker } p$  and so  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{M}]$  is naturally the ( $\mathbb{Z}$ -graded) coordinate ring  $\mathbb{C}[\widehat{\mathbb{T}}]$ , which we can think of as the homogeneous coordinate ring of  $\mathbb{T} = (\mathbb{C}^*)^{Q_1} / (\mathbb{C}^*)^{Q_2}$ .

Recall from (6.5) that the generalised partition function for any  $M \in \text{CM } B$  is

$$\mathcal{P}_M = \sum_{[X] \in D_M} \chi(\text{Gr}_{d[X]} \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M)) x^{[X]},$$

taking values in  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$ . In particular, we can consider this formula for a rank 1 module  $M_I$ .

**Proposition 7.5.** Under the isomorphism  $\nu: K(\text{CM } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{M}$  from Proposition 7.2,  $P_I$  is identified with  $\mathcal{P}_{M_I}$ , that is,  $P_I = \nu \mathcal{P}_{M_I}$ , in the notation of Remark 6.2.

*Proof.* By [8, Prop. 5.5 & Rem. 5.6], there is a bijection

$$\theta: \{X \leq \text{Hom}(T, M_I) : eX = M_I\} \rightarrow \{\mathfrak{m} : \partial\mathfrak{m} = I\}: X \mapsto \nu[X]$$

Note that  $\theta$  is well-defined, because every  $X$  in the domain has  $\text{rk}_A X = \text{rk}_B eX = 1$ , by Lemma 3.16(2), and so, by Remark 7.3,  $X$  is a matching module, indeed  $X \cong N_{\mathfrak{m}}$  for  $\mathfrak{m} = \nu[X]$ . Furthermore, since  $eN_{\mathfrak{m}} \cong M_{\partial\mathfrak{m}}$ , by [8, Prop. 4.9],  $\partial\mathfrak{m} = I$ .

Then  $\theta$  is surjective, because, if  $\partial\mathfrak{m} = I$ , then an isomorphism  $eN_{\mathfrak{m}} \rightarrow M_I$  induces an injective map  $N_{\mathfrak{m}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T, M_I)$  by adjunction. Thus the ranges in the sums for  $P_I$  and  $\mathcal{P}_{M_I}$  are identified by  $\nu$ .

The fact that  $\theta$  is injective is the delicate part of the proof in [8], but this then means that there is a single submodule of  $\text{Hom}(T, M_I)$  in each of the relevant classes  $[X] \in D_{M_I}$ , so that  $\text{Gr}_{d_{[X]}} \underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M_I)$  is a single point and thus has  $\chi = 1$ . In other words, every non-zero coefficient in the sum for  $\mathcal{P}_{M_I}$  is 1 and so the sums agree under the identification induced by  $\nu$ .  $\square$

Note that this result and its proof follow closely [8, Theorem 9.3], where an analogous formula is given for a slightly different partition function due to Marsh–Scott.

**7.4. Poincaré duality and flows.** Recall from (6.27) that we also have a generalised flow polynomial  $\mathcal{F}_M = \text{wt}\mathcal{P}_M$ , taking values in  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{fd } A)]$ . From Proposition 7.5 it follows that

$$\mathcal{F}_{M_I} = \sum_{\mathfrak{m}: \partial\mathfrak{m}=I} x^{\text{wt}[N_{\mathfrak{m}}]}. \quad (7.13)$$

Furthermore, the exponent can be calculated using (7.11). Indeed, the quantity  $\mathfrak{m}_* - \mathfrak{m}$  in (7.11) can be regarded as a ‘cohomological flow’, that is, a cocycle in  $\mathbb{Z}^{Q_1}$  which takes values just in  $\{0, \pm 1\}$ . Because the disc has  $H^1 = 0$ , this cocycle is  $dw$  for some ‘weight vector’  $w \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ , which can be fixed uniquely by the extra condition that  $w_* = 0$ , that is,  $w \in \mathbf{N}_* \leq \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ , where  $\mathbf{N}_*$  is defined as in (5.7) and we additionally use the isomorphism  $\mathbf{dim}: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  as the standard identification.

Thus Lemma 7.4 says that  $\text{wt}[N_{\mathfrak{m}}]$  is the unique  $w \in \mathbf{N}_*$  such that  $dw = \mathfrak{m}_* - \mathfrak{m}$ . See Figure 7.4 for some examples, where the cocycle value 0 is omitted and  $\pm$  denote  $\pm 1$ . Note that  $\mathfrak{m}_*$  is the first matching in Figure 7.3 and we chose  $\mathfrak{m}$  to be each of the other three.




FIGURE 7.4. Cohomological flows  $\mathfrak{m}_* - \mathfrak{m}$  and their weight vectors

To view (7.13) as a classical flow polynomial, we need to interpret matchings and weights on the plabic graph  $G$ . We do this using Poincaré duality, which is an isomorphism  $\phi_\bullet$  between the (extended) cochain complex for  $Q$  and the chain complex for  $G$ , extended by a choice of fundamental class  $f \in \mathbb{O}G_2$ , i.e. a map  $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{O}G_2: 1 \mapsto f$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathbb{Z} & \xrightarrow{c} & \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathbb{Z}^{Q_1} & \xrightarrow{d} & \mathbb{Z}^{Q_2} \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \phi_0 & & \downarrow \phi_1 & & \downarrow \phi_2 \\ \mathbb{Z} & \xrightarrow{f} & \mathbb{O}G_2 & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathbb{O}G_1 & \xrightarrow{\partial} & \mathbb{O}G_0 \end{array} \quad (7.14)$$

Note that in (7.14) we write the canonical chain complex of the *open* disc divided up by the unoriented graph  $G$ , where

$$\mathbb{O}G_i = \bigoplus_{g \in G_i} \mathbb{O}_g$$

and  $\mathbb{O}_g$  is the rank one  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module whose two primitive elements are the two orientations of the unoriented  $i$ -cell  $g$ . We don't need to do this for the cochain complex of  $Q$  because all those cells are already oriented. The isomorphism  $\phi_\bullet$  is uniquely determined by the choice of fundamental class  $f$ , or equivalently an orientation of the disc. Notice that the chain complex here must be for the open disc. In particular, some edges in  $G_1$  have only one (internal) node in  $G_0$  as their boundary, to match the fact that some arrows in  $Q_1$  are in the boundary of only one face.

Under the isomorphism  $\phi_1$  a cohomological flow becomes a 'homological flow', that is, a cycle in  $\mathbb{O}G_1$  made up just of oriented edges. Such a flow  $\mathfrak{f}$  must be an edge-disjoint union of oriented paths beginning and ending on the boundary and we write  $\mathfrak{f}: I \rightsquigarrow J$  if the incoming boundary edges are labelled by  $I \setminus J$  and the outgoing boundary edges are labelled by  $J \setminus I$ ; see Figure 7.5 for examples corresponding to the cohomological flows in Figure 7.4.




FIGURE 7.5. Dual homological flows and their weight vectors

The matching  $\mathfrak{m}_*$  determines a 'perfect orientation'  $\mathcal{O}_*$ , as illustrated in Figure 7.6. More precisely,  $\mathcal{O}_*$  is an orientation for each edge in  $G_1$ , from black and/or to white if the edge is dual to an arrow in  $\mathfrak{m}_*$  and the other way otherwise. The outgoing boundary edges of  $\mathcal{O}_*$  are precisely those in  $I_* = \partial\mathfrak{m}_*$ , that is,  $M_{I_*} = \mathbf{J}_*$ .




FIGURE 7.6. The matching  $\mathfrak{m}_*$  and perfect orientation  $\mathcal{O}_*$  ( $\partial\mathfrak{m}_* = 35$ ).

The following result is essentially [30, Lemma 12.3], but with a slight change of language and conventions (see Remark 7.10 for more explanation).

**Lemma 7.6.** The map  $\mathfrak{m} \mapsto \phi_1(\mathfrak{m}_* - \mathfrak{m})$  is a bijection between matchings  $\mathfrak{m}$  with  $\partial\mathfrak{m} = I$  and flows  $\mathfrak{f}: I \rightsquigarrow I_*$  that are contained in the perfect orientation  $\mathcal{O}_*$ .

*Proof.* To see this, treat a matching  $\mathbf{m}$  as set of arrows in  $Q_1$  and a flow  $\mathbf{f}$  as a set of edges in  $G_1$ , implicitly oriented in the direction given by  $\mathcal{O}_*$ . Identifying  $Q_1$  with  $G_1$  by duality, the equation  $\mathbf{f} = \phi_1(\mathbf{m}_* - \mathbf{m})$  can be written

$$\mathbf{f} = (\mathbf{m} \setminus \mathbf{m}_*) \cup (\mathbf{m}_* \setminus \mathbf{m}),$$

which can be inverted as

$$\mathbf{m} = (\mathbf{f} \setminus \mathbf{m}_*) \cup (\mathbf{m}_* \setminus \mathbf{f}).$$

The fact that  $\mathbf{m}$  is a subset with one arrow in each face in  $Q_2$  corresponds to the fact that  $\mathbf{f}$  is a subset with one incoming and one outgoing edge at each node in  $G_0$  it passes through. Since  $\mathbf{f}$  is in  $\mathcal{O}_*$  precisely one of those two edges must be in  $\mathbf{m}_*$ .

Finally, to have  $\mathbf{f}: \partial\mathbf{m} \rightsquigarrow \partial\mathbf{m}_*$ , we choose the fundamental class so that  $\phi_1$  maps anti-clockwise boundary arrows in  $Q_1$  to outgoing boundary edges in  $G_1$ .  $\square$

Flows in  $\mathcal{O}_*$  are vertex-disjoint unions of paths in  $\mathcal{O}_*$ . We can compute the (unique) weight  $w \in \mathbb{N}_* \cap \mathbb{N}^{Q_0}$  with  $dw = \mathbf{m}_* - \mathbf{m}$  in terms of the flow  $\mathbf{f} = \phi_1(\mathbf{m}_* - \mathbf{m})$  as in [30, §6]. That is, we define the weight  $\text{wt } \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{N}^{G_2}$  (identified with  $\mathbb{N}^{Q_0}$ ) by summing, over paths  $\mathbf{p}$  in  $\mathbf{f}$ , the function  $w_{\mathbf{p}}$ , which is 1 on all faces to the left of  $\mathbf{p}$  and 0 on all faces to the right of  $\mathbf{p}$ . (Strictly speaking  $\text{wt } \mathbf{f}$  here is the exponent of the ‘weight’ in [30]).

**Remark 7.7.** Note that, because any path  $\mathbf{p}$  in  $\mathcal{O}_*$  is itself a flow and so corresponds, as in Lemma 7.6, to a matching  $\mathbf{m}$ , we know that  $w_{\mathbf{p}}(*) = 0$ , that is (the face corresponding to)  $*$  is on the right of  $\mathbf{p}$ . Thus  $\text{wt } \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{N}_* \cap \mathbb{N}^{Q_0}$ , as required. This further means that  $I_* = \partial\mathbf{m}_*$  is lexicographically maximal in the positroid (i.e. the set of all boundary values of matchings), since otherwise there would be a flow  $I \rightsquigarrow I_*$  with  $*$  on the left of some path. It also follows from Proposition 6.6(5) and Proposition 7.5 that  $\mathbf{m}_*$  is the unique matching with boundary value  $I_*$ , recovering the more combinatorial way to characterise  $\mathbf{m}_*$  (cf. [30, Remark 6.4]).

The observations above lead to the following conclusion.

**Proposition 7.8.** We can rewrite (7.13) as a classical flow polynomial (cf. [30, (6.3)]).

$$\mathcal{F}_{M_I} = F_I = \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{f}: I \rightsquigarrow I_* \\ \text{in } \mathcal{O}_*}} x^{\text{wt } \mathbf{f}}, \quad (7.15)$$

which is a (regular) polynomial in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{N}_*]$ , that is, the exponents are all in  $\mathbb{N}^{Q_0}$ .

In our running example  $I_* = 35$  and the first two flows in Figure 7.5 are the only two flows  $25 \rightsquigarrow 35$ , so we conclude that

$$F_{25} = y_{34}(1 + y_{24})$$

where  $y_i = x^{[S_i]}$  and the vertices are labelled by the Plücker labels from Figure 7.2.

**Remark 7.9.** The fact that the classical flow polynomials  $F_I$  in (7.15) have a combinatorial form as implied by Remark 6.12 is familiar from [30, Cor. 12.4]. More precisely, the existence of a minimal (and maximal) term amounts to the fact that the matchings in the partition function (7.12) form a distributive lattice (see [30, Thm. 12.1] and references therein). We can see this from the categorical viewpoint of this paper, by interpreting this lattice as (the opposite of) the submodule lattice of  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(T, M_I)$ .

**Remark 7.10.** There are various orientation choices that determine the conventions in the discussion above, which mean that some conventions differ from [30].

First, the choice of the fundamental class  $f \in \mathbb{O}G_2$  determines the direction of the homological flow  $\mathbf{f} = \phi_1(\mathbf{m}_* - \mathbf{m})$  associated to a matching  $\mathbf{m}$  and whether  $w_{\mathbf{p}}$  should be 1 on the left or right of the flow (and so 0 on the other side).

Second, the boundary value of a matching  $\mathfrak{m}$  is most naturally a ‘matching’ on the circular double quiver (1.1), that is, a choice of one of the two arrows between each pair of adjacent vertices. The rank 1 module  $eN_{\mathfrak{m}}$  is canonically determined by this choice as it specifies which arrows that should be  $t$  and which should be 1.

On the other hand, describing such a module as  $M_I$ , for a Plücker label  $I$ , requires a choice of whether  $I$  gives the clockwise or anti-clockwise arrows in the boundary matching. The choice made here and in [18] is anti-clockwise. Changing this choice changes  $I$  to the complementary label  $I^c$ . Note also that a flow  $I \rightsquigarrow I_*$  is also a flow  $I_*^c \rightsquigarrow I^c$  and  $I_*^c$  is lexicographically minimal precisely when  $I_*$  is lexicographically maximal. Thus [30] is effectively using the opposite convention for labelling rank 1  $C$ -modules.

## 8. CLUSTER ALGEBRAS, MONOIDS AND CONES

In this section, we use the cluster character  $\mathcal{P}^T$  to introduce a cluster algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  and two cones (Newton–Okounkov and  $g$ -vector), associated to a cluster tilting object  $T$ . We say that  $M$  is *reachable* from  $T$  if  $M \in \text{add } U$  for a cluster tilting object  $U$  obtained from  $T$  by a sequence of mutations. Recall that we have assumed that  $\text{GP } B$  has a cluster structure. A *cluster isomorphism* between cluster algebras is an algebra isomorphism which preserves clusters and mutation relations.

**Lemma 8.1.** Let  $T \simeq \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} T_i$  be a cluster tilting object in  $\text{GP } B$  (cf. (3.2)) and let

$$\gamma: \text{GP } B \rightarrow H$$

be a cluster character for which the  $\gamma(T_i) \in H$  are algebraically independent.

- (1) There is a cluster algebra  $\mathcal{C}(T, \gamma) \subseteq H$  with cluster variables  $\gamma(M)$  for all rigid indecomposable  $M$  reachable from  $T$ .
- (2) If  $\gamma' : \text{CM } C \rightarrow H'$  is another cluster character with  $\gamma'(T_i)$  algebraically independent, then there is a cluster isomorphism

$$f: \mathcal{C}(T, \gamma) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(T, \gamma'),$$

where  $f(\gamma(M)) = \gamma'(M)$  for all rigid  $M$  reachable from  $T$ .

*Proof.* (1) Let  $\mathcal{F}_\gamma$  be the field of rational functions in the algebraically independent generators  $\gamma(T_i)$ , which is a subfield of the field of fractions of  $H$ . Let

$$\mathcal{C}(T, \gamma) \subseteq \mathcal{F}_\gamma$$

be the cluster algebra constructed using  $\{\gamma(T_i) : i\}$  and the quiver of  $\text{End}_C(T)^{\text{op}}$  for the initial seed.

For any cluster tilting object  $U$ , the Gabriel quiver of  $\text{End}_C(\mu_k U)$  is the Fomin–Zelevinsky mutation of the quiver of  $\text{End}_C U$ . Also, using the mutation sequences

$$0 \rightarrow U_k^* \rightarrow E \rightarrow U_k \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow U_k \rightarrow F \rightarrow U_k^* \rightarrow 0,$$

we have

$$\gamma(U_k)\gamma(U_k^*) = \gamma(E) + \gamma(F),$$

which is precisely the Fomin–Zelevinsky mutation relation between cluster variables. So the cluster variables coincide with the set of  $\gamma(M) \in H$  for all  $M$  that are rigid indecomposable and reachable from  $T$ , by induction.

- (2) There is an isomorphism of fields

$$f: \mathcal{F}_\gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{\gamma'} : \gamma(T_i) \mapsto \gamma'(T_i).$$

We need to show that  $f(\gamma(M)) = \gamma'(M)$  for all  $M$  indecomposable rigid and reachable from  $T$ . We have

$$\gamma(U_k)\gamma(U_k^*) = \gamma(E) + \gamma(F) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma'(U_k)\gamma'(U_k^*) = \gamma'(E) + \gamma'(F),$$

and  $f(\gamma(U_k^*)) = \gamma'(U_k^*)$  provided  $f(\gamma(U)) = \gamma'(U)$ . Therefore  $f(\gamma(M)) = \gamma'(M)$  for all  $M$  which are reachable from  $T$ , by induction.  $\square$

**Remark 8.2.** Lemma 8.1 only requires that  $\gamma$  satisfies

$$\gamma(U_i)\gamma(U_i^*) = \gamma(E) + \gamma(F)$$

on mutation sequences, which is a special case of Definition 6.1(3). Indeed, the result holds more generally for Frobenius 2-CY categories, and even other types of categories, provided there is a suitable cluster character and cluster structure.

**Proposition 8.3.** If  $T \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^m T_i$  is a cluster tilting object in GP  $B$ , then the partition functions  $\mathcal{P}_{T_i}^T$ , as defined in (6.5), are algebraically independent.

*Proof.* Suppose that there is a polynomial  $f(x) = \sum_d c_d x^d$  in  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_m]$  such that

$$f(\mathcal{P}_{T_1}^T, \dots, \mathcal{P}_{T_m}^T) = \sum_d c_d \prod_{i=1}^m (\mathcal{P}_{T_i}^T)^{d_i} = 0$$

Since the partial order  $\leq$  is additive (i.e. if  $a \leq b$  and  $c \leq d$ , then  $a + c \leq b + d$ ), the leading exponent of the  $d$ -summand is  $\sum_i d_i [T, T_i]$ , by Proposition 6.6(4). Since the  $[T, T_i]$  form a basis of  $K(\text{CM } A) \cong K(\text{Proj } A)$ , by Remark 5.1, these leading exponents are all distinct and so we can deduce inductively that  $c_d = 0$  for all  $d$ . Thus  $f = 0$ , as required.  $\square$

Note that by assumption, GP  $B$  admits a cluster structure. So, by Lemma 8.1 and Proposition 8.3, we can define a cluster algebra as follows.

**Definition 8.4.** Let  $\mathcal{A}_T = \mathcal{C}(T, \mathcal{P}^T) \subseteq \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$  be the cluster algebra generated by cluster variables obtained by iterated mutation from the initial variables, that is, generated by all  $\mathcal{P}_M^T$  for reachable rigid  $M$ .

**Remark 8.5.** Recall the partial order  $\leq$  on  $K(\text{CM } A) \cong \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{N}_*$  from Definition 5.7. We can refine this order to a lexicographic total order by choosing an order on the vertices  $i \in Q_0^* := Q_0 \setminus \{*\}$  (cf. [30, Def. 8.1]), as  $\{[S_i] : i \in Q_0^*\}$  is a basis of  $\mathbb{N}_*$ .

We can then, using the total order in Remark 8.5, define

$$\text{Val}_T: \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)] \setminus 0 \longrightarrow K(\text{CM } A), \tag{8.1}$$

where  $\text{Val}_T(f)$  is the minimal exponent of the non-zero terms in  $f$ .

**Definition 8.6.** We define two monoids in  $K(\text{CM } A)$ , and their respective cones in  $K(\text{CM } A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ , associated to any cluster tilting object  $T$  in GP  $B$  as follows.

The *Newton–Okounkov monoid/cone* is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mon}_{\text{NO}}(T) &= \{\text{Val}_T(f) : f \in \mathcal{A}_T \setminus 0\}, \\ \text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(T) &= \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\text{-span}} \text{Mon}_{\text{NO}}(T). \end{aligned}$$

The *g-vector monoid/cone* is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T) &= \{[T, M] : M \in \text{CM } B\}, \\ \text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T) &= \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\text{-span}} \text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T). \end{aligned}$$

Note that we know that these are indeed monoids, because

$$\mathrm{Val}_T(f_1 f_2) = \mathrm{Val}_T(f_1) + \mathrm{Val}_T(f_2) \quad \text{and} \quad [T, M_1 \oplus M_2] = [T, M_1] + [T, M_2].$$

On the other hand, we don't know *a priori* whether these monoids are saturated, that is, equal to the set of all integral points in their cones.

**Remark 8.7.** Since the first term in the lexicographic order on  $K(\mathrm{CM} A)$  is  $\mathrm{rk}$ , the leading exponents of all functions  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  will coincide with the leading exponents of homogeneous functions, that is, whose exponents have fixed  $\mathrm{rk}$ . Thus, if we denote the subset of (non-zero) homogeneous functions by  $\mathcal{A}_\bullet$ , then we can also write

$$\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T) = \{\mathrm{Val}_T(f) : f \in \mathcal{A}_\bullet\}.$$

**Remark 8.8.** Recall, from Proposition 6.6(4), that  $\mathcal{P}_M$  has leading exponent  $[T, M]$  for any refinement to a total order as in Remark 8.5 and for any choice of vertex  $*$ . Hence the two monoids intersect in at least the  $[T, M]$  for reachable rigid  $M$ .

However, on one hand, there may be some  $M$  for which  $\mathcal{P}_M \notin \mathcal{A}$ , so it could be that  $[T, M] \notin \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T)$ . On the other hand, there may be some  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  whose leading exponent is not of the form  $[T, M]$  for any  $M$ .

Note also that  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T)$  may depend on the choice of total order, while  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T)$  plainly doesn't. Despite all this, in the case where  $B = C$ , we will see, in Theorem 10.11, that  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T) = \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T)$ , and so their cones also coincide.

## 9. CLUSTER CHARACTERS UNDER ISOMORPHISMS OF CLUSTER ALGEBRAS

Since mutation in cluster categories is compatible with mutation in cluster algebras, cluster characters of reachable rigid indecomposables are necessarily cluster variables and hence will be identified under any (cluster) isomorphism of cluster algebras. On the other hand, there is no reason *a priori* why such isomorphisms should identify cluster characters of arbitrary modules. However, we will now proceed to show that this does happen for the cluster characters considered in this paper.

To do this, we currently have to restrict attention to the algebra  $C$ , as a special case of the algebras  $B$  studied since Section 3. We will maintain this restriction for the rest of the paper, unless otherwise stated. Since  $\mathrm{GP} C = \mathrm{CM} C$  in this case, the results proved so far for  $\mathrm{GP} B$  all apply to  $\mathrm{CM} C$ .

**Remark 9.1.** Recall from [18, Remark 5.7] that cluster tilting objects in  $\mathrm{CM} C$  with all summands of rank 1 are in bijection with maximal non-crossing collections  $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ . More precisely, as in (1.4), the cluster tilting object corresponding to  $\mathbf{S}$  is

$$T_{\mathbf{S}} = \bigoplus_{I \in \mathbf{S}} M_I. \tag{9.1}$$

By [25, Theorem 1.4], any two such  $T_{\mathbf{S}}$  can be mutated into each other (see e.g. [19, §8] for more explanation). Hence we can define a *reachable* cluster tilting object in  $\mathrm{CM} C$  to be one that is reachable from any (and hence all)  $T_{\mathbf{S}}$ .

**9.1. The rectangles cluster tilting object.** Recall from (4.1) that we have canonical embeddings

$$\mathbf{P}M \leq M \leq JM \quad \text{with} \quad e_* \mathbf{P}M = e_* M = e_* JM.$$

When  $M$  is a rank one module,  $JM/\mathbf{P}M = \mathbf{J}_*/\mathbf{P}_*$  can be depicted as a  $k \times (n - k)$  rectangle with edges in north-west and north-east directions respectively. We further define

$$\pi M = M/\mathbf{P}M \quad \text{and} \quad \omega M = JM/M, \tag{9.2}$$

so that  $\pi M$  can be depicted as a Young diagram contained in the rectangle and based at the bottom corner, while  $\omega M$  can be depicted as the complementary Young diagram,

based at the top corner. See Figure 9.1 for an example; the lower part depicts  $\pi M_{1457}$  and the upper part depicts  $\omega M_{1457}$ . For a general module  $M \in \text{CMC}$ , the sequence  $M/PM \rightarrow JM/PM \rightarrow JM/M$  can be viewed a categorical analogue of dividing of the rectangle into complementary Young diagrams.




FIGURE 9.1. A depiction of  $\pi M_I$  and  $\omega M_I$ , for  $I = 1457$ ,  $(k, n) = (4, 9)$ .

Note that  $M \in \text{CMC}$  is indecomposable projective if and only if  $M$  has a simple top. Let  $P_i = Ce_i$  and  $S_i = \text{top } P_i$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

**Lemma 9.2.** Let  $M$  be a non-projective rank one module.

- (1) The diagrams for  $\pi(P_i)$  and  $\omega(P_i)$  are both rectangular for any  $i$ .
- (2) The diagram for  $\pi M$  is rectangular if and only if  $\text{top } M = S_n \oplus S_i$  for some  $i \neq n$ .
- (3) The diagram for  $\omega M$  is rectangular if and only if  $\text{top } M = S_i \oplus S_j$  for some  $i \neq j$ , both different from  $n$ , and we have embeddings

$$P_i, P_j \leq M \leq P_{n-k},$$

such that

$$(P_i)_0 = (P_j)_0 = M_0 = (P_{n-k})_0.$$

In both cases (2) and (3), the minimal syzygy  $\Omega M$  has rank one.

*Proof.* (1)–(3) all follow from the definitions of  $\pi M$  and  $\omega M$  and the description of the Young diagrams depicting the modules. The final statement follows from the fact that rank is additive.  $\square$

**Remark 9.3.** Lemma 9.2 implies that, for a non-projective rank one module  $M$ , if  $\pi M$  or  $\omega M$  is rectangular, then the minimal syzygy  $\Omega M$  has rank one. The converse is not true: e.g. the cyclic symmetry preserves the later property, but not the former.

**Definition 9.4.** (cf. [30, §4]) Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma(k, n)$  be the  $k \times (n - k)$  grid

$$\Gamma(k, n) = \{(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq n - k\}. \quad (9.3)$$

The rectangles cluster tilting object is

$$T^\square = T_\emptyset \oplus \bigoplus_{ij \in \Gamma} T_{ij}. \quad (9.4)$$

where  $T_\emptyset = \mathbf{P}_*$  and  $T_{ij}$  is the rank 1 module for which  $\pi T_{ij}$  is depicted, as in Figure 9.1, by an  $i \times j$  rectangle. Alternatively,  $T_{ij} = M_{K_{ij}}$  for  $K_{ij} = [1, k - i] \cup [k - i + j + 1, k + j]$  and  $T_\emptyset = M_{[1, k]}$ .

By Remark 9.1, any reachable cluster tilting object in  $\text{CMC}$  can be obtained by mutation from  $T^\square$ .

Given any cluster tilting object  $T = \bigoplus_i T_i$ , define  $\Omega T$  to be the direct sum of the indecomposable projectives and the minimal syzygies  $\Omega T_i$ , when  $T_i$  is not projective. Note that  $\Sigma T$  is defined in a similar way in Remark 6.7.

**Proposition 9.5.** Let  $T$  be a reachable cluster tilting object. Then both  $\Omega T$  and  $\Sigma T$  are reachable cluster tilting objects.

*Proof.* Note that  $\Omega$  is an equivalence on the stable category of  $\text{CM} C$ . So there are exactly  $m$  indecomposable pairwise nonisomorphic summands in  $\Omega T$  and

$$\text{Ext}^1(\Omega T, \Omega T) = \text{Ext}^1(T, T) = 0.$$

Therefore  $\Omega T$  is a maximal rigid module and so it is a cluster tilting object in  $\text{CM} C$ .

Again, as  $\Omega$  is an equivalence on the stable category of  $\text{CM} C$ , the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_i \longrightarrow F_i \longrightarrow T_i^* \longrightarrow 0$$

is a mutation sequence if and only if the following is a mutation sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega T_i \longrightarrow \Omega F_i \longrightarrow \Omega T_i^* \longrightarrow 0,$$

where  $\Omega T_i$  and  $\Omega T_i^*$  are both minimal, although  $\Omega F_i$  is, in general, not minimal. Thus  $\Omega T$  can be mutated to  $\Omega T'$  if and only if  $T$  can be mutated to  $T'$ . A similar fact is proved for  $\Sigma T$  as part of Theorem 6.8 (see in particular (6.21)).

By Remark 9.1, since  $T$  is reachable, it can be mutated into the rectangles cluster tilting object  $T^\square = \bigoplus_i T_i^\square$ , and so  $\Omega T$  can be mutated to  $\Omega T^\square$ . However, the minimal syzygies  $\Omega T_i^\square$  all have rank one, by Lemma 9.2, and so  $\Omega T^\square = T_{\mathbf{S}}$ , for some maximal non-crossing collection  $\mathbf{S} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{k}$ . Hence  $\Omega T^\square$  is reachable, by [25, Thm 1.4], and so  $\Omega T$  is reachable, as required.

For the case of  $\Sigma T$ , we can mutate  $T$  to  $T_{\mathbf{S}}$  and so  $\Sigma T$  to  $\Sigma T_{\mathbf{S}}$ . But  $\Sigma T_{\mathbf{S}} = T^{\square}$ , which is reachable, and thus  $\Sigma T$  is reachable.  $\square$

**Remark 9.6.** Proposition 9.5 implies that the cluster algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  from Definition 8.4 contains a cluster of monomials, namely

$$\{\mathcal{P}_{\Sigma T_i} : T_i \text{ is a mutable summand of } T\} \cup \{\mathcal{P}_P : P \text{ is indecomposable projective}\}$$

because Proposition 6.6(5) implies that these are all monomials.

**9.2. Cluster characters  $\Psi$  and  $\Phi$ .** Recall, from [18, §9], that the cluster character  $\Psi: \text{CM} C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  is obtained by homogenisation of Geiss–Leclerc–Schröer’s character  $\psi: \text{Sub } Q_k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]$ , from [14], where  $\mathcal{N}$  is an open Schubert cell in  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ . More precisely,  $\mathcal{N}$  is the open set where the Plücker coordinate  $\Psi_{\mathbf{P}_*} \neq 0$ , so that the affine coordinate ring  $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}] = \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]/(\Psi_{\mathbf{P}_*} - 1)$ .

Furthermore, by [18, Prop 4.3], there is an exact functor  $\pi: \text{CM} C \rightarrow \text{Sub } Q_k$ , defined as in (9.2), which kills just the subcategory  $\text{add } \mathbf{P}_*$  and induces an equivalence

$$\text{CM} C / \text{add } \mathbf{P}_* \rightarrow \text{Sub } Q_k.$$

The cluster characters are then related by the following commutative square, in which  $\rho$  is the quotient map.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{CM} C & \xrightarrow{\Psi} & \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \\ \downarrow \pi & & \downarrow \rho \\ \text{Sub } Q_k & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}] \end{array} \quad (9.5)$$

Note that  $\rho$  is not injective, but  $\Psi_M$  is the unique lift of  $\psi_{\pi M}$  of degree  $\text{rk}_C M$ .

If  $T = \bigoplus_i T_i$  is a cluster tilting object in  $\text{CM} C$ , then  $\overline{T} = \pi T$  is a cluster tilting object in  $\text{Sub } Q_k$ , with one less summand. Furthermore,  $\overline{A} = \text{End}(\overline{T})^{\text{op}}$  is a quotient of  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$  by the ideal  $(e_*)$ . On the other hand, this quotient induces a stable isomorphism  $\underline{A} = \underline{\text{End}}(T)^{\text{op}} = \underline{\text{End}}(\overline{T})^{\text{op}}$ .

In this case, using the cluster tilting object  $\overline{T}$ , Fu–Keller’s cluster character is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi: \text{Sub } Q_k &\rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{Proj } \overline{A})]: M \mapsto \phi_M \\ \phi_M &= x^{[\overline{T}, M]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(\overline{T}, M)) x^{-\overline{\beta}(d)} \end{aligned} \quad (9.6)$$

where  $\overline{\beta}: K(\text{fd } \underline{A}) \rightarrow K(\text{Proj } \overline{A})$  is given by projective resolution.

Note that the formula (9.6) can be interpreted as an explicit monomial in the variables  $x_i = x^{[\overline{T}, \overline{T}_i]}$ , as  $[\overline{T}, \overline{T}_i]$  form a basis of  $K(\text{Proj } \overline{A})$ . Geiss–Leclerc–Schroer showed that  $\phi_M$  is the expression for  $\psi_M$  in the initial variables corresponding to  $\overline{T}$ .

**Theorem 9.7.** [15, Theorem 4] For any  $M \in \text{Sub } Q_k$ , under the substitution  $x_i = \psi_{\overline{T}_i}$  one has

$$\phi_M = \psi_M.$$

and so, in particular,  $\phi_M \in \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]$ .

In this subsection, we will lift this result to  $\text{CMC}$ . First we prove a useful lemma.

**Lemma 9.8.** Let  $\Gamma: \text{CMC} \rightarrow H$  be a cluster character such that, for some reachable cluster tilting object  $T = \bigoplus_i T_i$ , the characters  $\Gamma_{T_i}$  are algebraically independent. Then  $\Gamma$  induces an injective algebra homomorphism such that

$$\Upsilon_\Gamma: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow H: \Psi_M \mapsto \Gamma_M,$$

for any reachable rigid  $M$  (i.e.  $\Psi_M$  is a cluster variable). In particular,  $\Upsilon_\Gamma$  is determined by  $\Upsilon_\Gamma(\Delta_I) = \Gamma_{M_I}$ .

*Proof.* By [18, §9],  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] = \mathcal{C}(T, \Psi)$ , in the notation of Lemma 8.1, because  $T$  is reachable. The result then follows from Lemma 8.1, and the fact that  $\Psi_{M_I} = \Delta_I$ , by [18, (9.4)]. More precisely,  $\Upsilon_\Gamma$  is the induced isomorphism  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(T, \Gamma)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 9.9.** It is an immediate consequence of Lemma 9.8 that, under the assumptions of the lemma, the characters  $\Gamma_{M_I}$  satisfy all Plücker relations.

**Remark 9.10.** If we apply Lemma 9.8 to the Fu–Keller cluster character  $\Phi^T$  in (6.2), then we obtain the well-known fact (e.g. [10, Thm 5.4], [15, (1.3)]) that one can obtain an expression for any cluster variable  $\Psi_M$ , for  $M$  reachable rigid, in terms of an initial cluster  $\Psi_{T_i}$ , on substituting  $\Psi_{T_i}$  for  $x^{[T, T_i]}$  in the formula for  $\Phi^T$ .

**Theorem 9.11.** Let  $T$  be a reachable cluster tilting object in  $\text{CMC}$ . Let  $\Upsilon^T = \Upsilon_{\Phi^T}$  in the notation of Lemma 9.8. Then  $\Phi^T = \Upsilon^T \circ \Psi$ , that is, for all  $M \in \text{CMC}$ ,

$$\Phi_M^T = \Upsilon^T(\Psi_M).$$

(Note that  $\Upsilon^T$  is defined by this equation just for  $M$  of rank one.)

*Proof.* Define a map  $\pi_*: K(\text{CMA}) \rightarrow K(\text{Proj } \overline{A})$  induced by  $\pi: \text{CMC} \rightarrow \text{Sub } Q_k$ , in the sense that  $\pi_*([T, T_i]) = [\pi T, \pi T_i]$ , which includes  $\pi_*([T, \mathbf{P}_*]) = 0$ .

Using  $\overline{T} = \pi T$  to define  $\phi$  as in (9.6), we have the following diagram, which we want to show is fully commutative.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{CM } C & \xrightarrow{\Phi^T} & \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)] \\
 \downarrow \pi & \searrow \Psi & \downarrow \mathbb{C}[\pi_*] \\
 & \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] & \nearrow \Upsilon^T \\
 \text{Sub } Q_k & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathbb{C}[K(\text{Proj } \overline{A})] \\
 & \downarrow \rho & \\
 & \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{M}] & \nearrow v \\
 & \downarrow \psi & 
 \end{array} \tag{9.7}$$

Here  $v$  is the algebra homomorphism  $\psi_{\pi T_i} \mapsto \phi_{\pi T_i}$ , so Theorem 9.7 says

$$\phi = v \circ \psi,$$

i.e. the bottom triangle in (9.7) commutes. It will then suffice to show that the three vertical squares commute, because we then get  $\mathbb{C}[\pi_*](\Upsilon^T(\Psi_M)) = \mathbb{C}[\pi_*](\Phi_M^T)$ . However, note that both  $\Upsilon^T(\Psi_M)$  and  $\Phi_M^T$  are in the linear subspace of  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$  spanned by monomials of degree  $\text{rk}_C M$ . Furthermore,  $\pi_*$  is an isomorphism when restricted to the affine subspace of  $K(\text{CM } A)$  of classes of any fixed rank. Therefore  $\Upsilon^T(\Psi_M) = \Phi_M^T$ , as required.

To prove the claim that the three vertical rectangles commute, note first that the front left commutation, i.e.  $\psi_{\pi N} = \rho \Psi_N$ , is just (9.5).

For the back commutation, i.e.  $\phi_{\pi N} = \mathbb{C}[\pi_*]\Phi_N^T$ , we must compare the two Fu-Keller formulae (6.2) and (9.6). First note that  $\text{Ext}^1(T, N) \cong \text{Ext}^1(\pi T, \pi N)$  as  $\underline{A}$ -modules and so the sums match up term-by-term. Thus it remains to show that the exponents match, i.e. that  $\pi_*[T, N] = [\pi T, \pi N]$  and  $\pi_*\beta(d) = \overline{\beta}(d)$ . This follows because  $\pi$  is an exact functor and so transforms one calculation, using add  $T$ -approximation and Proposition 5.8(1) respectively, into the other.

For the front right commutation, it suffices to know that the square commutes when applied to  $\Delta_I = \Psi_{M_I}$  for all rank one modules  $M_I$ . But  $\Upsilon^T$  is defined precisely so that  $\Upsilon^T \Psi_{M_I} = \Phi_{M_I}^T$ , and so the commutation of the other squares and the bottom triangle yields the result.  $\square$

**Theorem 9.12.** Let  $T$  be a reachable cluster tilting object in  $\text{CM } C$ , with associated partition function  $\mathcal{P}^T$ , as in (6.5). Then there is an injective homomorphism, which induces an isomorphism on function fields,

$$\Xi^T: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]: \Psi_M \mapsto \mathcal{P}_M^T,$$

for all  $M \in \text{CM } C$ . Furthermore,  $\Xi^T$  induces a cluster isomorphism  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \cong \mathcal{A}$ , the cluster algebra of Definition 8.4. In particular,  $\mathcal{P}_M^T \in \mathcal{A}$ , for all  $M \in \text{CM } C$ .

*Proof.* By Proposition 8.3, we can define  $\Xi^T = \Upsilon_{\mathcal{P}^T}$ , in the notation of Lemma 9.8, so that  $\Xi^T(\Psi_M) = \mathcal{P}_M^T$  for any reachable rigid object  $M$ .

By Theorem 6.8 and Theorem 9.11, we have

$$\mathcal{P}^T = \mathbb{C}[\zeta] \circ \Phi^{\Sigma T} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^{\Sigma T} = \Upsilon^{\Sigma T} \circ \Psi \tag{9.8}$$

where  $\Upsilon^{\Sigma T} = \Upsilon_{\Phi^{\Sigma T}}$  in the notation of Lemma 9.8. By Remark 9.6, the image of  $\Xi^T$  contains a set of generators for the function field of  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$ , so the induced map on function fields is an isomorphism.

Furthermore,  $\Xi^T = \mathbb{C}[\zeta] \circ \Upsilon^{\Sigma^T}$ , because both maps take  $\Psi_{M_I}$  to  $\mathcal{P}_{M_I}^T$ , for all rank one modules  $M_I$ . Hence  $\mathcal{P}^T = \Xi^T \circ \Psi$ , that is,

$$\Xi^T(\Psi_M) = \mathcal{P}_M^T, \text{ for all } M \in \text{CM } C,$$

as required. The cluster isomorphism is a special case of Lemma 8.1.  $\square$

**Remark 9.13.** Suppose  $T = T_{\mathbf{S}}$ , as in (9.1), for a maximal non-crossing collection  $\mathbf{S}$  of face labels of a plabic graph  $G$  of type  $\pi_{k,n}$ . By Theorem 9.12 and Proposition 7.5,

$$\nu\Xi^T: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{M}]: \Delta_I \mapsto P_I, \quad (9.9)$$

so it coincides with the ‘homogeneous network chart’  $\widehat{\text{net}}_G$  (or boundary measurement map) associated to  $G$ , as in [24, §3.2]. Then the ‘inhomogeneous network chart’  $\text{net}_G$  (cf. [30, Thm. 6.8], [33, Thm. 1.1]) coincides with

$$\text{wt}\Xi^T: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]/(\Delta_{I_*} - 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{N}_*]: \Delta_I \mapsto F_I. \quad (9.10)$$

Note that this map vanishes on the ideal  $(\Delta_{I_*} - 1)$ , because  $F_{I_*} = \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{J}_*} = 1$ , by (7.15) and/or Proposition 6.11(4).

These two charts are familiar coordinate systems, but Theorem 9.12 gives a new proof that (9.9) and (9.10) give well-defined maps, i.e. that the  $P_I$  and  $F_I$  satisfy the appropriate Plücker relations. It also provides the new results that, for any  $M \in \text{CM } C$ ,

$$\widehat{\text{net}}_G(\Psi_M) = \nu\mathcal{P}_M^T \quad \text{and} \quad \text{net}_G(\Psi_M) = \text{wt}\mathcal{P}_M^T = \mathcal{F}_M^T. \quad (9.11)$$

**9.3. Twist of characters of arbitrary modules.** Let  $\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)$  be the complement of the ‘boundary divisors’ in Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$ , and let  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)]$  be its homogeneous coordinate ring, which is obtained from  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  by inverting the frozen cluster variables, i.e. the boundary minors.

For open positroid varieties, Muller–Speyer [24] defined a twist map which we here denote by ‘twi’. In the case of  $\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)$ , Çanakçı–King–Pressland [8, Theorem 12.2] showed that

$$\text{twi}: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)]: \Psi_{M_I} \mapsto \frac{\Psi_{\Omega M_I}}{\Psi_{P M_I}}. \quad (9.12)$$

Note that  $\Psi_M \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ , for any  $M \in \text{CM } C$ , and  $\Psi_{P M}$  is a product of frozen variables. A natural question is whether

$$\text{twi}(\Psi_M) = \frac{\Psi_{\Omega M}}{\Psi_{P M}}$$

for any  $M \in \text{CM } C$ . In this subsection we will prove that this is indeed true.

To this end, we define the map

$$\Psi^\dagger: \text{CM } C \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)]: M \mapsto \frac{\Psi_{\Omega M}}{\Psi_{P M}}. \quad (9.13)$$

Let  $T$  be a cluster tilting object in  $\text{CM } C$  and  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$ . Then, from Theorem 9.11 and Theorem 9.12, we have maps

$$\Upsilon^T: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]: \Psi_M \mapsto \Phi_M^T \quad (9.14)$$

$$\tilde{\Xi}^T: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]: \Psi_M \mapsto \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M^T \quad (9.15)$$

By Lemma 6.4 and Proposition 6.6(5), the frozen variables, i.e.  $\Psi_P$  for  $P$  indecomposable projective, are mapped by  $\Upsilon^T$  and  $\tilde{\Xi}^T$  to monomials in  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$ , which are invertible. Hence  $\Upsilon^T$  and  $\tilde{\Xi}^T$  extend to  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)]$ , without change of codomain, and we will also denote these extensions by  $\Upsilon^T$  and  $\tilde{\Xi}^T$ .

**Proposition 9.14.** For any cluster tilting object  $T$  in  $\text{CM} C$ , with  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$ , we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)] & \xrightarrow{\text{twi}} & \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)] \\
 \Psi \swarrow & & \searrow \Psi^\dagger \\
 & \text{CM} C & \\
 \tilde{\Xi}^T \swarrow & \downarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^T & \searrow \Upsilon^T \\
 & \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM} A)] &
 \end{array} \tag{9.16}$$

In particular, for any  $M \in \text{CM} C$ ,

$$\text{twi}(\Psi_M) = \Psi_M^\dagger = \frac{\Psi_{\Omega M}}{\Psi_{PM}}.$$

*Proof.* Then, from Theorem 9.11 and Theorem 9.12, we have maps

We already know that left-hand triangle commutes, by (9.15), i.e. Theorem 9.12. Furthermore, the right-hand triangle commutes, by (9.14), i.e. Theorem 9.11 and Proposition 6.6(1), giving

$$\Upsilon^T \Psi_M^\dagger = \Upsilon^T \frac{\Psi_{\Omega M}}{\Psi_{PM}} = \frac{\Phi_{\Omega M}^T}{\Phi_{PM}^T} = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M^T$$

On the other hand, we know that the top triangle commutes when applied to any rank 1 module  $M_I$ , by (9.12).

Thus all inner triangles commute when applied to any  $M_I$ , which is sufficient to show that the outer triangle commutes, as the  $\Psi_{M_I}$  (and  $\Psi_P^{-1}$ , for  $P$  indecomposable projective) generate  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)]$ . That is,  $\Upsilon^T \circ \text{twi} = \tilde{\Xi}^T$ , so

$$\Upsilon^T \text{twi}(\Psi_M) = \tilde{\Xi}^T(\Psi_M) = \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_M^T = \Upsilon^T \Psi_M^\dagger,$$

since the left and right triangles commute. But  $\Upsilon^T$  is injective, by Lemma 9.8, and remains so on extension to  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)]$ , so we can conclude that  $\text{twi}(\Psi_M) = \Psi_M^\dagger$ , for all  $M \in \text{CM} C$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

We can combine the proofs of Theorem 9.12 and Proposition 9.14 as follows.

**Corollary 9.15.** The following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)] & \xrightarrow{\text{twi}} & \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}^\circ(k, n)] \\
 \Psi \swarrow & & \searrow \Psi^\dagger \\
 & \text{CM} C & \\
 \Phi^{\Sigma T} \swarrow & \downarrow \tilde{\mathcal{P}}^T & \searrow \\
 \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM} A')] & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{C}[-\zeta]} & \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM} A)]
 \end{array} \tag{9.17}$$

where  $A' = \text{End}(\Sigma T)^{\text{op}}$  and  $\zeta$  is as in (6.14).

*Proof.* The left and bottom triangles commute by (9.8), while the top and left triangles are from (9.16).  $\square$

**Remark 9.16.** The twist automorphism (and the Chamber Ansatz) originates in work of Berenstein–Fomin–Zelevinsky [4] (and more generally in [5]) where, among other things, it is used to invert Lusztig’s parametrisation of the totally non-negative part

of a unipotent group. The Muller–Speyer twist [24] plays a similar role, being used to compute the inverse of the boundary measurement map for positroids. Both these constructions are combinatorial in nature and it is known that the MS twist induces the BFZ twist in the Grassmannian case [24, App. 4]. Geiss–Leclerc–Schroer [15] gave a categorical description of the BFZ twist using cluster characters and partial projective presentations, similar to the definition of  $\Psi^\dagger$  in (9.13).

## 10. BASES AND NEWTON–OKOUNKOV CONES FOR GRASSMANNIANS

**10.1. Bases and their leading exponents.** As before, let  $T$  be a cluster tilting object in  $\text{CM } C$  and  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$ . Fix a refinement of the order  $\leq$  from Definition 5.7 to a total order on  $K(\text{CM } A)$ , as in Remark 8.5.

If  $f \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  is expressed in a chart associated to  $T$ , that is, either the cluster chart  $\Upsilon^T$  or the network chart  $\Xi^T$ , then its leading exponent is an element in  $K(\text{CM } A)$ . Thus, for any basis  $\mathcal{B}$  of  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ , there is a map

$$\mathcal{B} \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A)$$

sending a basis element to its leading exponent in the chart. We are interested in bases where this map is injective, that is, the leading exponents are distinct.

**Lemma 10.1.** Let  $V \leq \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$  be a linear subspace with a basis whose leading exponents are distinct. Then the leading exponents of the basis elements are all the possible leading exponents for elements of  $V$ .

*Proof.* Write any  $f \in V$  as a linear combination in the basis. Among the basis elements with non-zero coefficient, there is (precisely) one whose leading term has minimal exponent. This leading term cannot cancel due to the minimality, so it gives the leading term of  $f$ .  $\square$

In this section, we will construct bases with this leading term property. Such a basis is, in general, far from unique. The lift of Geiss–Leclerc–Schröer’s dual semicanonical basis (or equivalently, the generic basis [15], see also [27]) to  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  is an example of such a basis. The theta basis is another example [30]. Even the standard monomial basis ([16] or [17, Ch. XIV §9]) has this property for some clusters.

Here we construct such a basis, in terms of the cluster character  $\Psi$ , by directly using Lusztig’s result [22] characterising the irreducible components of representation varieties of preprojective algebras.

In our case, the leading exponents all have the explicit form  $[T, M]$ , which enables us to relate the  $g$ -vector cone to the Newton–Okounkov cone (see Definition 8.6). This also helps us to show that the leading exponents are independent of the choices made when defining the order.

**10.2. The minimal class  $[\overline{T}, M]$ .** Let  $\Pi$  be the preprojective algebra of a quiver  $\Lambda$  of type  $\mathbf{A}_{n-1}$  and let  $\mathbf{Q}_k$  be the indecomposable injective  $\Pi$ -module at the vertex  $k$ , which is also the projective at vertex  $n - k$ . Let  $\text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k$  be the subcategory of  $\text{mod } \Pi$  consisting of submodules of modules in  $\text{add } \mathbf{Q}_k$ . Note that the socle of  $\mathbf{Q}_k$  is the simple at vertex  $k$ , while the top is the simple at vertex  $n - k$ .

Let  $\text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$  and  $\text{Rep}(\Lambda, d)$  be the representation varieties of  $\Pi$  and  $\Lambda$  with dimension vector  $d$  and

$$\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d) \subseteq \text{Rep}(\Pi, d),$$

be the subvariety of points corresponding to objects in  $\text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k$ .

Let  $\overline{T} = \bigoplus_i \overline{T}_i$  be a cluster tilting object in  $\text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k$  and

$$\overline{A} = (\text{End } \overline{T})^{\text{op}}.$$

Denote by  $[\overline{T}, M]$  the class of the  $\overline{A}$ -module  $\text{Hom}(\overline{T}, M)$  in the Grothendieck group of projective  $\overline{A}$ -modules  $K(\text{Proj } \overline{A})$ , where  $M \in \text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k$ .

**Lemma 10.2.** The subset  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$  is open in  $\text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$ .

*Proof.* Submodules  $M$  of modules in  $\text{add } \mathbf{Q}_k$  are characterised by

$$\text{Hom}(S, M) = 0,$$

for any simple module  $S$  that is not the socle of  $\text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k$ . As  $\dim \text{Hom}(S, -)$  is upper-semicontinuous,  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$  is an open subset of  $\text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$ .  $\square$

Denote by  $\text{Irr}_\Pi(d)$  the set of irreducible components in  $\text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$  and let

$$\text{Irr}_\Pi = \bigcup_d \text{Irr}_\Pi(d).$$

Similarly, denote by  $\text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}}(d)$  the set of irreducible components in  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$  and let

$$\text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}} = \bigcup_d \text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}}(d).$$

For any component  $\mathbf{c} \in \text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}}$  and for any module  $X$ , the map

$$M \in \mathbf{c} \mapsto \dim \text{Hom}(X, M)$$

is upper-semi continuous, there exists  $M_{\mathbf{c}}$  such that the class  $[\overline{T}, M_{\mathbf{c}}]$  is minimal among  $[\overline{T}, N]$  for all  $N \in \mathbf{c}$ . Moreover, the set

$$\mathbf{c}_{\min} = \{N \in \mathbf{c} : [\overline{T}, N] = [\overline{T}, M_{\mathbf{c}}]\}$$

is an open dense subset of  $\mathbf{c}$ . By Lemma 10.2, the closure of a component  $\mathbf{c}$  in  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$  is a component in  $\text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$ . So we can view  $\text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}}$  as a subset of  $\text{Irr}_\Pi$ .

**Proposition 10.3.** The irreducible components of  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$  are in one-to-one correspondence with the expressions  $d = \sum_{\alpha} d_{\alpha} \alpha$ , where the sum is over positive roots of  $\Lambda$  that are supported at the simple root  $\alpha_k$ .

*Proof.* Lusztig [22, Prop 14.2] proved that the irreducible components of  $\text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$  are closures of conormal bundles of  $\text{GL}(d)$ -orbits in  $\text{Rep}(\Lambda, d)$ . Suppose  $\Lambda$  is the quiver with a unique sink at vertex  $k$ . For any  $M \in \text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k$ , the indecomposable summands of  $M$  restricted to  $\Lambda$  are all supported at  $k$ . Therefore, for any irreducible component  $\mathbf{c}$  of  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$ , the corresponding decomposition  $d = \sum_{\alpha} d_{\alpha} \alpha$  has  $\alpha$  supported at vertex  $k$ , when  $d_{\alpha} \neq 0$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Let  $T', T'' \in \text{add } \overline{T}$  with  $T''$  a submodule of  $T'$ . Define

$$V = \{(f, g, X) : X \in \text{Rep}(\Pi, d) \text{ and } T'' \xrightarrow{f} T' \xrightarrow{g} X \text{ is a short exact sequence}\} \quad (10.1)$$

and

$$\text{Inj}(T'', T') = \{f \in \text{Hom}(T'', T') : f \text{ is injective}\}.$$

The following lemma is known to experts. We include a proof for the convenience of the reader.

**Lemma 10.4.** The projection  $\alpha : V \rightarrow \text{Inj}(T'', T') : (f, g, X) \mapsto f$  is a principal  $\text{GL}(d)$ -bundle. Hence  $V$  is irreducible.

*Proof.* First note that for any  $(f, g, X) \in V$ , the module structure of  $X$  is completely determined by  $g$ . Let  $f \in \text{Inj}(T'', T')$ . For  $(f, g, X) \in \alpha^{-1}(f)$ , the map  $g$  induces an isomorphism  $\bar{g}: T'/\text{Im } f \rightarrow X$ . We have  $\bar{g} \in \text{GL}(d)$ . On the other hand, for any  $g \in \text{GL}(d)$ ,  $g$  induces a module structure on  $\mathbb{C}^d$  such that  $g: T'/\text{Im } f \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$  is an isomorphism. So

$$\alpha^{-1}(f) = \{(f, g, \text{Im } g) : g \in \text{GL}(d)\} \cong \text{GL}(d).$$

Next write  $T' = \text{Im } f \oplus W$  (as vector spaces) and let

$$U_f = \{f' \in \text{Inj}(T'', T') : \text{Im } f' \cap W = 0\},$$

which is an open neighbourhood of  $f$ . Then

$$\alpha^{-1}(U_f) = \{(f', g, \text{Im } g) : g|_W \text{ is an isomorphism}\} \cong U_f \times \text{GL}(d).$$

Therefore  $\alpha$  is a principal  $\text{GL}(d)$ -bundle.  $\square$

**Lemma 10.5.** Given a dimension vector  $d$ , there exists  $T' \in \text{add } \bar{T}$  such that  $T'$  gives a right approximation to any  $X \in \text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $t = \mathbf{dim} \text{top } \bar{T}_i$  be the dimension vector of  $\text{top } \bar{T}_i$ . Note that for any  $X \in \text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$ ,

$$\dim \text{Hom}(\bar{T}_i, X) \leq \sum_j d_j t_j.$$

Let  $c = (c_i)$  be the vector with

$$c_i = \sum_j d_j t_j.$$

Then  $\bigoplus_j \bar{T}_j^{c_j}$  gives a right approximation to any  $X \in \text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 10.6.** The following map is injective,

$$\varphi: \text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}} \rightarrow K(\text{Proj } \bar{A}): \mathbf{c} \mapsto [\bar{T}, M_{\mathbf{c}}].$$

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{c}_1, \mathbf{c}_2$  be two components in  $\text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}}$  such that

$$[\bar{T}, M_{\mathbf{c}_1}] = [\bar{T}, M_{\mathbf{c}_2}]. \quad (10.2)$$

By Lemma 10.5, we can choose  $T' \in \text{add } \bar{T}$  large enough to give right approximations for any modules  $X \in \mathbf{c}_1$  and  $Y \in \mathbf{c}_2$ ,

$$0 \longrightarrow T'' \longrightarrow T' \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \longrightarrow T''' \longrightarrow T' \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow 0.$$

Now let  $X \in (\mathbf{c}_1)_{\min}$  and  $Y \in (\mathbf{c}_2)_{\min}$ . By the assumption (10.2),

$$[\bar{T}, T'] - [\bar{T}, T''] = [\bar{T}, T'] - [\bar{T}, T'''] = [\bar{T}, X] = [\bar{T}, Y] = [\bar{T}, T'] - [\bar{T}, T''']. \quad (10.3)$$

As the classes  $[\bar{T}, \bar{T}_i]$  form a basis of  $K(\text{Proj } \bar{A})$ , we know that  $T'' = T'''$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{dim} M_{\mathbf{c}_1} = \mathbf{dim} M_{\mathbf{c}_2},$$

denoted by  $d$ . So  $M_{\mathbf{c}_1}$  and  $M_{\mathbf{c}_2}$  are both points in  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$ .

Let  $p: V \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$  be the projection sending  $(f, g, X)$  to  $X$ , where  $V$  is as described in (10.1). Let

$$W = \overline{\text{Im } p \cap \text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)}.$$

Since  $V$  is irreducible by Lemma 10.4, and  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$  is open in  $\text{Rep}(\Pi, d)$  by Lemma 10.2,  $W$  is irreducible. Furthermore, by (10.3),

$$(\mathbf{c}_1)_{\min}, (\mathbf{c}_2)_{\min} \subseteq \text{Im } p$$

and so both are contained in  $W$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbf{c}_1 = \overline{(\mathbf{c}_1)_{\min}} = W = \overline{(\mathbf{c}_2)_{\min}} = \mathbf{c}_2.$$

Hence the map  $\varphi$  is injective.  $\square$

10.3. **Bases of  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  and of the cluster algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ .** Recall, from §9.2, that there is an exact functor

$$\pi: \text{CM} C \rightarrow \text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k: M \mapsto M/PM$$

such that

$$\pi \mathbf{P}_* = 0.$$

Any module  $M$  in  $\text{CM} C$  is uniquely determined by the pair  $(\pi M, \text{rk}_C M)$ . Let

$$\text{CM}(r, d) = \{M \in \text{CM} C : \text{rk}_C M = r, \pi M \in \text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)\}.$$

**Lemma 10.7.** The following are true.

- (1) For any  $\pi M \in \text{Sub } \mathbf{Q}_k$ ,  $\dim \text{soc } \pi M \leq \text{rk}_C M$ .
- (2)  $\text{CM}(r, d)$  is non-empty if and only if  $0 \leq d_k \leq kr$ .

*Proof.* (1) For any  $M \in \text{CM} C$ , write  $M = M' \oplus \mathbf{P}_*^s$ , where  $M'$  has no summands isomorphic to  $\mathbf{P}_*$ . Hence  $\text{soc } \pi M = \text{soc } \pi M'$  and thus

$$\dim \text{soc } \pi M = \text{rk}_C M' \leq \text{rk}_C M.$$

- (2) For any module  $M \in \text{CM} C$ , we have, as in Section 4,

$$PM \leq M \leq JM \quad \text{with} \quad e_* PM = e_* M = e_* JM.$$

where  $JM \cong \mathbf{J}_*^{\text{rk}_C M}$ , by (4.3), so

$$0 \leq (\dim \pi M)_k \leq (\dim \pi \mathbf{J}_*)_k \text{rk}_C M = k \text{rk}_C M.$$

Therefore,  $\text{CM}(r, d)$  is not empty if and only if  $0 \leq d_k \leq kr$ .  $\square$

Denote by  $\text{CM}(r)$  the subcategory consisting of objects of rank  $r$ . We have

$$\text{CM}(r) = \bigcup_d \text{CM}(r, d).$$

Let  $\mathbf{c}_{d,1}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{d,s}$  be the irreducible components of  $\text{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$ , and let

$$\mathbf{C}_{r,d,i} = \{M \in \text{CM}(r) : \pi M \in \mathbf{c}_{d,i}\}.$$

and

$$\mathbf{C}_{r,0,1} = \{\mathbf{P}_*^r\}.$$

By abuse of terminology, we call each  $\mathbf{C}_{r,d,i}$  an irreducible component of  $\text{CM} C$ . Denote by  $\text{Irr}_{\text{CM}}(r)$  the set of irreducible components in  $\text{CM}(r)$  and let

$$\text{Irr}_{\text{CM}} = \bigcup_r \text{Irr}_{\text{CM}}(r).$$

Take  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_{r,d,i} \in \text{Irr}_{\text{CM}}$ . When  $d = 0$ , let  $M_{\mathbf{C}} = \mathbf{P}_*^r$ ; otherwise choose  $M_{\mathbf{C}} \in \mathbf{C}$  generically, in the sense that

$$\pi M_{\mathbf{C}} \in (\mathbf{c}_{d,i})_{\min}. \tag{10.4}$$

**Theorem 10.8.** The set  $\{\Psi_{M_{\mathbf{C}}} : \mathbf{C} \in \text{Irr}_{\text{CM}}(r)\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]_r$  and thus  $\{\Psi_{M_{\mathbf{C}}} : \mathbf{C} \in \text{Irr}_{\text{CM}}\}$  is a basis for  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ .

*Proof.* For any  $M \in \text{CM}(r)$ , the cluster character  $\Psi_M$  is the homogenisation of  $\psi_{\pi M}$  to degree  $r = \text{rk}_C M$  and is an element in the homogeneous part  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]_r$ .

Note that  $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]$  has a basis,  $\prod_{\alpha} x_{\alpha}^{d_{\alpha}}$ , where the product is over positive roots of  $\text{GL}_n$  that are supported at the simple root  $\alpha_k$ . The basis elements are in one-to-one correspondence with expressions  $d = \sum_{\alpha} d_{\alpha} \alpha$ , where the sum is over positive roots of  $\text{GL}_n$  that are supported at the simple root  $\alpha_k$ . So the basis elements are in one-to-one correspondence with  $\text{Irr}_{\text{Sub}}$ .

Denote by  $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]_r$  the specialisation of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]_r$  at  $\Delta_{[n-k+1, n]} = 1$ . Then

$$\dim \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]_r = \dim \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]_r$$

and  $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]_r$  is spanned by  $\prod_{\alpha} x_{\alpha}^{d_{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]$  with  $\sum_{\alpha} d_{\alpha} \leq r$ .

By [13, Thm 3] (see also [14, Prop 9.1]),  $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]_r$  is spanned by the characters  $\psi_M$  of submodules  $M$  of  $\mathbf{Q}_k^r$ . By Lemma 10.7, such modules are contained in some  $\mathrm{Sub}(\mathbf{Q}_k, d)$  with  $d_k \leq kr$ .

For any  $M \in \mathrm{Sub} \mathbf{Q}_k$ , by Theorem 9.7, the cluster character  $\phi_{\overline{T}}^M = \psi_M \in \mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]$  and so there is a well-defined leading exponent  $[\overline{T}, M]$ . Now, by Proposition 10.6, the leading exponents  $[\overline{T}, M_{\mathbf{C}}]$  are pairwise distinct and so the cluster characters  $\psi_{M_{\mathbf{C}}}$  for  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{Sub}}$  are linearly independent. Therefore

$$\{\psi_{M_{\mathbf{C}}} : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{Sub}}(d) \text{ for some } d \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1} \text{ with } d_k \leq kr\}$$

is a basis of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathcal{N}]_r$  and so

$$\{\Psi_{M_{\mathbf{C}}} : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}}(r)\}$$

is a basis of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]_r$ .

The final statement is immediate, because  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)] = \bigoplus_{r \geq 0} \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]_r$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 10.9.** The set  $\{\mathcal{P}_{M_{\mathbf{C}}}^T : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}}\}$  is a basis for the cluster algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  of Definition 8.4.

*Proof.* This follows from Theorem 10.8 and the isomorphism  $\Xi^T : \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(n, k)] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  from Theorem 9.12.  $\square$

Note that  $\Psi_{M_{\mathbf{C}}}$ , and hence  $\mathcal{P}_{M_{\mathbf{C}}}^T$ , may not be uniquely determined by the genericity condition (10.4), but there will be a ‘most generic’  $M_{\mathbf{C}}$  giving a well-defined generic  $\Psi_{\mathbf{C}}$  and hence  $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbf{C}}^T$ .

#### 10.4. Newton–Okounkov and $g$ -vector monoids.

**Proposition 10.10.** The map  $\hat{\varphi} : \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}} \rightarrow K(\mathrm{CM} A) : \mathbf{C} \mapsto [T, M_{\mathbf{C}}]$  is injective.

*Proof.* First, suppose that  $\mathrm{rk}_C M_{\mathbf{C}_1} \neq \mathrm{rk}_C M_{\mathbf{C}_2}$ . Then, as

$$\mathrm{rk}[T, M_{\mathbf{C}_i}] = \mathrm{rk}_A \mathrm{Hom}(T, M_{\mathbf{C}_i}) = \mathrm{rk}_C M_{\mathbf{C}_i},$$

by Lemma 3.16(2), we see that  $[T, M_{\mathbf{C}_1}] \neq [T, M_{\mathbf{C}_2}]$ .

Otherwise, suppose  $\mathrm{rk}_C M_{\mathbf{C}_1} = \mathrm{rk}_C M_{\mathbf{C}_2}$  and consider an add  $T$ -presentation

$$0 \longrightarrow T''_{\mathbf{C}} \longrightarrow T'_{\mathbf{C}} \longrightarrow M_{\mathbf{C}} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Applying  $\pi$  gives an add  $\pi T$ -presentation

$$0 \longrightarrow \pi T''_{\mathbf{C}} \longrightarrow \pi T'_{\mathbf{C}} \longrightarrow \pi M_{\mathbf{C}} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Hence,  $[T, M_{\mathbf{C}_1}] = [T, M_{\mathbf{C}_2}]$  if and only if  $[\pi T, \pi M_{\mathbf{C}_1}] = [\pi T, \pi M_{\mathbf{C}_2}]$  in  $K(\mathrm{Proj} \overline{A})$ . So, in this case, the injectivity of  $\hat{\varphi}$  follows from the injectivity of  $\varphi : \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{Sub}} \rightarrow K(\mathrm{Proj} \overline{A})$ , from Proposition 10.6.  $\square$

**Theorem 10.11.** The Newton–Okounkov and  $g$ -vector monoids coincide and, moreover, every  $g$ -vector is the  $g$ -vector of a generic module. Specifically,

$$\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T) = \{[T, M_{\mathbf{C}}] : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}}\} = \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T). \quad (10.5)$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 9.12, we know that  $\mathcal{P}_M^T \in \mathcal{A}$ , for all  $M \in \mathrm{CM} C$ , and, since it has leading exponent  $[T, M]$ , we deduce that  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T) \subseteq \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T)$ .

Conversely, by Corollary 10.9,  $\mathcal{A}$  has a basis  $\{\mathcal{P}_{M_{\mathbf{C}}}^T : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}}\}$ , which has distinct leading exponents  $\{[T, M_{\mathbf{C}}] : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}}\}$ , by Proposition 10.10. By Lemma 10.1, the leading exponent of any  $f \in \mathcal{A}$  is the leading exponent of a basis element, so  $\mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T) = \{[T, M_{\mathbf{C}}] : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}}\} \subseteq \mathrm{Mon}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T)$ , completing the proof.  $\square$

By applying  $\overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ -span, we immediately deduce that  $\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(T) = \text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T)$ .

**Remark 10.12.** As the proof shows, Lemma 10.1 implies that the NO-cone can be understood using any basis with distinct leading exponents. For example, in the next section we can use the standard monomial basis in the case of the rectangles cluster.

## 11. $\kappa(T, M)$ AND GELFAND–TSETLIN POLYTOPES

Let  $\Gamma = \Gamma(k, n)$  be the  $k \times (n - k)$  grid, as in (9.3). A *Gelfand–Tsetlin pattern* (cf. [30, Definition 16.1]) for the  $\text{GL}(n)$  representation  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]_r$  can be defined as (or, strictly, simplified to) an integer vector  $u = (u_{ij}) \in \mathbb{Z}^\Gamma$  satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} u_{11} &\geq 0, & u_{k(n-k)} &\leq r, \\ u_{ij} &\geq u_{(i-1)j} & \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq n - k, \\ u_{ij} &\geq u_{i(j-1)} & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } 2 \leq j \leq n - k. \end{aligned} \tag{11.1}$$

The *GT-polytope* at ‘rank’  $r$  is the collection of all solutions to (11.1) in  $\mathbb{R}^\Gamma$ . Thus GT-patterns are the integer points of a GT-polytope, but it is also known that this polytope is integral, that is, the convex hull of its integer points (see e.g. [1] for a modern account).

Following [30, Rem. 10.12, Lem. 16.2], we can make a unimodular change of variables

$$u_{ij} = v_{ij} - v_{(i-1)(j-1)},$$

with the convention that  $v_{ij} = 0$  if  $i = 0$  or  $j = 0$ . We can also combine the GT-polytopes into a cone.

**Definition 11.1.** A *cumulative GT- $r$ -pattern* is an integer vector  $v \in \mathbb{Z}^\Gamma$  which satisfies the following.

$$\begin{aligned} v_{11} &\geq 0, & v_{k(n-k)} - v_{(k-1)(n-k-1)} &\leq r, \\ v_{ij} - v_{(i-1)(j-1)} &\geq v_{(i-1)j} - v_{(i-2)(j-1)} & \text{for } 2 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq n - k, \\ v_{ij} - v_{(i-1)(j-1)} &\geq v_{i(j-1)} - v_{(i-1)(j-2)} & \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq k \text{ and } 2 \leq j \leq n - k. \end{aligned} \tag{11.2}$$

Note that here  $k$  and  $n - k$  are swapped relative to [30, Rem. 10.12].

The (cumulative) *GT-monoid* and (cumulative) *GT-cone* are defined to be

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mon}_{\text{GT}} &= \{(r, v) \in \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}^\Gamma : v \text{ satisfies (11.2)}\} \\ \text{Cone}_{\text{GT}} &= \{(r, v) \in \mathbb{R} \oplus \mathbb{R}^\Gamma : v \text{ satisfies (11.2)}\} \end{aligned}$$

Thus cumulative GT-patterns are the points of  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GT}}$ , which is saturated. Furthermore

Recall also, from Definition 9.4, the rectangles cluster tilting object

$$T = T^\square = T_\emptyset \oplus \bigoplus_{ij \in \Gamma} T_{ij}.$$

Note that  $T_\emptyset = \mathbf{P}_*$ , so  $\kappa(T_\emptyset, M) = 0$ , for any  $M \in \text{CMC}$ , by (4.5). Hence we can consider that  $\kappa(T, M) \in \mathbb{Z}^\Gamma$ , with

$$\kappa(T, M)_{ij} = \kappa(T_{ij}, M).$$

**Lemma 11.2.** If  $M$  is a rank 1 module, then  $\kappa(T, M)$  is a cumulative GT-1-pattern. Furthermore, every such pattern occurs uniquely in this way.



**Theorem 11.4.**  $\widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T^\square) = \text{Mon}_{\text{GT}}$ .

*Proof.* The result follows from Lemma 11.2, provided we can show that both monoids are generated by their rank 1 slices.

For  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GT}}$ , this is the (known) integer decomposition property of GT-patterns [1], which is preserved by the unimodular change of variables, since that fixes the rank  $r$ . The proof is straightforward: if  $u$  is a GT-pattern and  $u'$  is the GT-1-pattern with the same support (i.e. non-zero entries), then  $u - u'$  is a GT-pattern of smaller rank and so, inductively,  $u$  is a sum of GT-1-patterns.

The canonical sums  $u = u(I_1) + \cdots + u(I_r)$  that arise in this way correspond precisely to semi-standard Young tableau or to standard monomials  $\Delta_{I_1} \cdots \Delta_{I_r}$ . This is one way to see how GT-patterns index a basis of  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ .

For  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T)$ , note that  $[T, M \oplus N] = [T, M] + [T, N]$ , so it suffices to prove that for any module  $M$ , we have  $[T, M] = [T, N]$ , for a *standard module*  $N = \bigoplus_{j=1}^r M_{I_j}$ , whose cluster character  $\Psi_N$  is a standard monomial  $\Delta_{I_1} \cdots \Delta_{I_r}$ .

Thus the cluster characters  $\Psi_N$  of standard modules form a basis of  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$ , whose leading exponents (in the cluster chart  $\Upsilon^T$  or the network chart  $\Xi^T$ ) are  $[T, N]$ . When  $T = T^\square$ , these leading exponents correspond to cumulative GT patterns, by Lemma 11.2, that is,

$$\widetilde{\text{wt}}[T, N] = (\text{rk}_C N, \kappa(T, N)) = (r, v(I_1) + \cdots + v(I_r)).$$

These exponents are distinct, because the sum  $v = v(I_1) + \cdots + v(I_r)$  is canonical, in the sense, explained above, that  $I_1, \dots, I_r$  (and thus  $N$ ) can be recovered from  $v$ .

Hence, by Lemma 10.1, the leading exponent  $[T, M]$  of  $\Psi_M$ , for any  $M$ , must coincide with the leading exponent  $[T, N]$  of  $\Psi_N$ , for some standard module  $N$ , as required.  $\square$

**Remark 11.5.** Theorem 11.4 shows that  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T^\square)$  is saturated, as it consists of the integral points of a rational polyhedral cone, defined by finitely many integral linear inequalities, namely the pull-back of (11.2) under  $\widetilde{\text{wt}}$ .

We will see in the next section (see Remark 12.9) that  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  is always saturated, but this requires more work.

## 12. MUTATION OF $\kappa(T, M)$

For just this section, we return to considering modules in  $\text{CM} B$ , for a general algebra  $B$  as in Section 3, and the algebra  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$ , for a cluster tilting object  $T \simeq \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} T_i$  in  $\text{GP} B$ . Recall, from Definition 4.1 *et seq*, the defining short exact sequence for  $\mathbf{K}(N, M)$ , namely

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(N, M) \xrightarrow{\epsilon_{M^*}} \text{Hom}(N, JM) \longrightarrow \mathbf{K}(N, M) \longrightarrow 0,$$

for any  $M, N \in \text{CM} B$ . Furthermore  $\kappa(N, M) = \dim \mathbf{K}(N, M)$ , so that the  $A$ -module  $\mathbf{K}(T, M)$  has dimension vector

$$\kappa(T, M) = (\kappa(T_i, M))_{i \in Q_0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \cong K(\text{fd } A).$$

**Lemma 12.1.** Let  $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence in  $\text{CM} B$  and  $M \in \text{CM} B$ .

(1) If  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, Y) = 0$  or  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, X) = 0$ , then

$$\kappa(M, Y) = \kappa(M, X) + \kappa(M, Z) + \dim \text{Ext}_B^1(M, X).$$

(2) If  $\text{Ext}_B^1(Y, M) = 0$  or  $\text{Ext}_B^1(Z, M) = 0$ , then

$$\kappa(Y, M) = \kappa(X, M) + \kappa(Z, M) + \dim \text{Ext}_B^1(Z, M).$$

*Proof.* (1) Applying  $\text{Hom}(M, -)$  to the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & Z \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \epsilon_X & & \downarrow \epsilon_Y & & \downarrow \epsilon_Z \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & JX & \longrightarrow & JY & \longrightarrow & JZ \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

and noting that  $JX$  is injective in  $\text{CM } B$ , we obtain a commutative diagram in which the first two rows and first three columns are exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(M, X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(M, Y) & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{Hom}(M, Z) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(M, X) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(M, JX) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(M, JY) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(M, JZ) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \mathbf{K}(M, X) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{K}(M, Y) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{K}(M, Z) \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

provided either  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, Y) = 0$  or  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, X) = 0$ . Note that the Hom spaces here are infinite dimensional, but we can still use a spectral sequence argument to deduce that the third row and fourth column have the same cohomology, so, in particular,

$$\kappa(M, Y) - \kappa(M, X) - \kappa(M, Z) = \dim \text{Ext}_B^1(M, X).$$

More explicitly, applying the Snake Lemma to the diagram with  $\text{Hom}(M, Z)$  replaced by  $\text{Im } f$ , we obtain a short exact sequence of finite dimensional spaces

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{K}(M, X) \longrightarrow \mathbf{K}(M, Y) \longrightarrow \frac{\text{Hom}(M, JZ)}{\text{Im } f} \longrightarrow 0$$

and can make another one as follows

$$0 \longrightarrow \frac{\text{Hom}(M, Z)}{\text{Im } f} \longrightarrow \frac{\text{Hom}(M, JZ)}{\text{Im } f} \longrightarrow \mathbf{K}(M, Z) \longrightarrow 0.$$

The result then follows because  $\text{Ext}_B^1(M, X) \cong \text{Hom}(M, Z)/\text{Im } f$ .

(2) We can apply  $\text{Hom}(-, M)$  and  $\text{Hom}(-, JM)$  to the original short exact sequence to obtain a commutative diagram very similar to the one in (1)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(Z, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(Y, M) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(X, M) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}_B^1(Z, M) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(Z, JM) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(Y, JM) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(X, JM) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & \mathbf{K}(Z, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{K}(Y, M) & \longrightarrow & \mathbf{K}(X, M) \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

if either  $\text{Ext}_B^1(Y, M) = 0$  or  $\text{Ext}_B^1(Z, M) = 0$ . The result then follows as in (1).  $\square$

**Proposition 12.2.** Recall the two mutation sequences (5.16) associated to a cluster tilting object  $T = \bigoplus_j T_j$ .

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\longrightarrow T_i^* \longrightarrow E_i \longrightarrow T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\ 0 &\longrightarrow T_i \longrightarrow F_i \longrightarrow T_i^* \longrightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

- (1)  $\kappa(E_i, T_j) = \kappa(T_i^*, T_j) + \kappa(T_i, T_j) = \kappa(F_i, T_j)$ , for  $j \neq i$ .
- (2)  $\kappa(E_i, T_i) = \kappa(T_i^*, T_i) + \kappa(T_i, T_i) = \kappa(F_i, T_i) - 1$ .

*Proof.* (1) follows by applying Lemma 12.1(2) to the two mutation sequences with  $M = T_j$ , for  $j \neq i$ , and using that  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, T_j) = \text{Ext}^1(T_i, T_j) = 0$ .

(2) follow similarly with  $M = T_i$ , using that  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i, T_i) = \text{Ext}^1(F_i, T_i) = 0$  and  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, T_i) = 1$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 12.3.** Let  $T' = \mu_i(T) = (T/T_i) \oplus T_i^*$ . Then we have

- (1)  $\kappa(T, E_i) - [S_i] = \kappa(T, T_i) + \kappa(T, T_i^*) = \kappa(T, F_i)$ .
- (2)  $\kappa(T', E_i) = \kappa(T', T_i) + \kappa(T', T_i^*) = \kappa(T', F_i) - [S_i']$ .

*Proof.* (1) follows by applying Lemma 12.1(1) to the two mutation sequences with  $M = T_k$ , for all  $k$ , and using that, for  $j \neq i$ ,

$$\text{Ext}^1(T_j, T_i^*) = \text{Ext}^1(T_j, T_i) = 0$$

while  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i, T_i) = \text{Ext}^1(T_i, E_i) = 0$  and  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(T_i, T_i^*) = 1$ .

(2) follows similarly, but now using that  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, T_i^*) = \text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, F_i) = 0$  and  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, T_i) = 1$ , for the case  $M = T_i^*$ .  $\square$

Recall, from Lemma 3.3, that every  $M \in \text{CM } B$  has an exact add  $T$ -presentation

$$0 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0, \quad (12.1)$$

that is, with  $X, Y \in \text{add } T$ .

**Definition 12.4.** An add  $T$ -presentation (12.1) is called *generic* if no summand of  $T$  is a summand of both  $X$  and  $Y$ .

**Theorem 12.5.** Suppose that  $T \simeq \bigoplus_j T_j$  is a cluster tilting object in  $\text{GP } B$  and that  $\mu_i(T) = (T/T_i) \oplus T_i^*$ . If  $M \in \text{CM } B$  has a generic add  $T$ -presentation, then

$$\kappa(T_i^*, M) = \min\{\kappa(E_i, M), \kappa(F_i, M)\} - \kappa(T_i, M). \quad (12.2)$$

*Proof.* Consider a generic add  $T$ -presentation of  $M$  as in (12.1). For each summand  $T_i$ , we can suppose that either

- (a)  $T_i$  is not a summand of  $X$ , so  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, X) = 0$ , or
- (b)  $T_i$  is not a summand of  $Y$ , so  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, Y) = 0$ .

In both cases, since  $T_i, E_i, F_i, X \in \text{add } T$ , we have

$$\text{Ext}^1(T_i, X) = \text{Ext}^1(E_i, X) = \text{Ext}^1(F_i, X) = 0.$$

In case (a), Lemma 12.1(1) then implies that

$$\kappa(T_i, M) + \kappa(T_i^*, M) = \kappa(T_i, Y) + \kappa(T_i^*, Y) - \kappa(T_i, X) - \kappa(T_i^*, X), \quad (12.3)$$

$$\kappa(E_i, M) = \kappa(E_i, Y) - \kappa(E_i, X), \quad (12.4)$$

$$\kappa(F_i, M) = \kappa(F_i, Y) - \kappa(F_i, X). \quad (12.5)$$

By Proposition 12.2, we have

$$\kappa(T_i, X) + \kappa(T_i^*, X) = \kappa(E_i, X) = \kappa(F_i, X) \quad (12.6)$$

$$\kappa(T_i, Y) + \kappa(T_i^*, Y) = \kappa(E_i, Y) = \kappa(F_i, Y) - s, \quad (12.7)$$

where  $s$  is the multiplicity of  $T_i$  as a summand of  $Y$ . Substituting (12.6) and (12.7) into (12.3), then using (12.4) and (12.5), we obtain the required result, that is,

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa(T_i, M) + \kappa(T_i^*, M) &= \kappa(E_i, M) = \kappa(F_i, M) - s \\ &= \min\{\kappa(E_i, M), \kappa(F_i, M)\}.\end{aligned}$$

In case (b), Lemma 12.1(1) now implies that

$$\kappa(T_i, M) + \kappa(T_i^*, M) = \kappa(T_i, Y) + \kappa(T_i^*, Y) - \kappa(T_i, X) - \kappa(T_i^*, X) - t$$

where  $t = \dim \text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, X)$ , which is also the multiplicity of  $T_i$  as a summand of  $X$ . The other equations are then the same, except that

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa(T_i, X) + \kappa(T_i^*, X) &= \kappa(F_i, X) - t \\ \kappa(T_i, Y) + \kappa(T_i^*, Y) &= \kappa(F_i, Y).\end{aligned}$$

Thus a similar calculation to (a) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa(T_i, M) + \kappa(T_i^*, M) &= \kappa(E_i, M) - t = \kappa(F_i, M) \\ &= \min\{\kappa(E_i, M), \kappa(F_i, M)\}.\end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

**Remark 12.6.** If  $T_i$  is a summand of both  $X$  and  $Y$  in (12.1), then neither  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, X)$  nor  $\text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, Y)$  vanish and Lemma 12.1(1) can't be used to get a formula for  $\kappa(T_i^*, M)$ . A more careful analysis of the proof shows that, for any presentation (12.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa(T_i, M) + \kappa(T_i^*, M) &= \kappa(E_i, M) - \dim \text{Ker } \theta_* \\ &= \kappa(F_i, M) - \dim \text{Cok } \theta_*,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta_*: \text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, X) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(T_i^*, Y)$  is induced by the presentation map  $\theta: X \rightarrow Y$ . Thus one can determine whether or not (12.2) holds for any particular  $M$ .

We can interpret Theorem 12.5 in the language of tropical mutation, as follows.

**Definition 12.7.** (Tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation, cf. [30, Def. 11.8]) For any quiver  $Q$  and any (mutable) vertex  $i \in Q_0$ , define the (bijective) map

$$\mathbb{L}_{Q,i}: \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}: (v_j) \mapsto (v'_j) \tag{12.8}$$

by  $v'_j = v_j$ , if  $j \neq i$ , while  $v'_i = \min\{\sum_{j \leftarrow i} v_j, \sum_{j \rightarrow i} v_j\} - v_i$ .

**Corollary 12.8.** Let  $T$  and  $M$  be as in Theorem 12.5, so that  $M$  has a generic add  $T$ -presentation. Let  $Q$  be the quiver of  $T$ , that is, the Gabriel quiver of  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$ , and let  $A' = \text{End}(T')^{\text{op}}$ , for  $T' = \mu_i(T)$ . Then

$$\kappa(T', M) = \mathbb{L}_{Q,i} \kappa(T, M),$$

once we make the identifications  $K(\text{fd } A) = \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0} = K(\text{fd } A')$ .

*Proof.* Use Theorem 12.5 and observe from (5.15) that  $\kappa(E_i, M) = \sum_{j \leftarrow i} \kappa(T_j, M)$  and  $\kappa(F_i, M) = \sum_{j \rightarrow i} \kappa(T_j, M)$ .  $\square$

Note that we can make the identifications required in Corollary 12.8, because  $T$  and  $T'$  are related by a single mutation, so there is a preferred bijection between the summands of  $T$  and  $T'$  and thus between the simple modules for  $A$  and  $A'$ .

**Remark 12.9.** We know from Theorem 10.11 that

$$\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T) := \{[T, M] : M \in \text{CMC}\} = \{[T, M_{\mathbf{C}}] : \mathbf{C} \in \text{Irr}_{\text{CM}}\}.$$

But, if  $M_{\mathbf{C}}$  is chosen generically for the purpose of Theorem 10.8, then it can also be chosen to have a generic add  $T$ -presentation, for all reachable  $T$ . Hence Corollary 12.8 implies that  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(\mu_i(T)) = \mathbf{L}_{Q,i} \text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T)$ , for all  $T$  and all  $\mu_i$ .

Since  $\mathbf{L}_{Q,i}$  is a piece-wise linear integral transformation, the property of being saturated, that is, the integer points of a rational polyhedral cone, will be preserved. As we know that  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T^{\square})$  is saturated, by Remark 11.5, we can conclude, by induction, that  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  is saturated, for all reachable  $T$ . In other words,  $\text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  is the set of integer points of  $\text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T)$ .

In Section 15 (see Remark 15.6 and Remark 15.9), we will find explicit inequalities for  $\text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T)$ , using the mirror symmetry viewpoint of [30].

### 13. MUTATION OF SIMPLE MODULES AND $\mathbb{X}$ -MUTATION

We return to the context where  $B = C$ . Let  $T = \bigoplus_{i \in Q_0} T_i$  be a cluster tilting object in  $\text{CMC}$  and  $T' = \mu_j(T) = (T/T_j) \oplus T_j^*$ . Let  $Q$  and  $Q'$  be the Gabriel quivers of  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$  and  $A' = \text{End}(T')^{\text{op}}$ , respectively. Note that  $Q$  and  $Q'$  have no loops or two cycles and  $Q' = \mu_j(Q)$ .

**13.1. More on projective resolutions.** Recall, from (5.19), the minimal add  $T$ -approximation of  $\text{rad } T_i$  when  $T_i$  is projective, that is,  $i \in Q_0$  is a boundary vertex,

$$0 \longrightarrow K_i \longrightarrow E_i \xrightarrow{f} \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0.$$

Define

$$F_{i,\text{int}} = \bigoplus_{\substack{\ell \rightarrow i \\ \text{int}}} T_{\ell}, \quad (13.1)$$

summing over all the *interior* arrows in  $Q$  with head at  $i$  (cf. (5.15)). Since  $j$  is an interior vertex, the multiplicity of  $T_j$  in  $F_{i,\text{int}}$  is the number of arrows  $b_{ji}$  from  $j$  to  $i$ .

**Proposition 13.1.** Suppose that  $\text{rad } T_i$  has the following minimal add  $T$ -approximation,

$$0 \longrightarrow F_{i,\text{int}} \xrightarrow{g} E_i \xrightarrow{f} \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0. \quad (13.2)$$

Then the same holds for its the minimal add  $T'$ -approximation, that is,

$$0 \longrightarrow F'_{i,\text{int}} \xrightarrow{g'} E'_i \xrightarrow{f'} \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0, \quad (13.3)$$

where  $F'_{i,\text{int}}$  is defined with respect to  $Q'$ .

*Proof.* If  $b_{ij} = b_{ji} = 0$ , then (13.2) is also a minimal add  $T'$ -approximation and is equal to (13.3). The proof is now divided into two cases.

First, suppose that  $b_{ji} > 0$ . By assumption,  $K_i = \overline{K}_i \oplus T_j^{b_{ji}}$ , where  $\overline{K}_i$  has no summand isomorphic to  $T_j$ . Let

$$h = \text{id}_{\overline{K}_i} \oplus l_j^{\oplus b_{ji}} : \overline{K}_i \oplus T_j^{b_{ji}} \rightarrow \overline{K}_i \oplus F_j^{b_{ji}},$$

where  $l_j : T_j \rightarrow F_j$  is the left map in the mutation sequence (see (5.16)) starting from  $T_j$ . Constructing the pushout of  $g$  and  $h$  gives the following commutative diagram with

exact rows and columns.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & 0 & & 0 & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{K}_i \oplus T_j^{b_{ji}} & \xrightarrow{g} & E_i & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow h & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \overline{K}_i \oplus F_j^{b_{ji}} & \longrightarrow & X & \xrightarrow{\widehat{f}} & \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & (T_j^*)^{b_{ji}} & = & (T_j^*)^{b_{ji}} & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & 0 & & 0 & & 
\end{array}$$

By assumption,  $T_j$  is not a summand of  $E_i$ , so  $\text{Ext}^1(T_j^*, E_i) = 0$ . Hence

$$X = E_i \oplus (T_j^*)^{b_{ji}} \in \text{add } T'.$$

Observe also that

$$\text{Ext}^1(T', \overline{K}_i \oplus F_j) = 0.$$

Therefore the map  $\widehat{f}: X \rightarrow \text{rad } T_i$  is an  $\text{add } T'$ -approximation, which is usually not minimal. The common summand of  $\overline{K}_i \oplus F_j^{b_{ji}}$  and  $X$  is the common summand of  $F_j^{b_{ji}}$  and  $E_i$ , which is  $M = \bigoplus_p T_p$ , summing over all the paths  $i \rightarrow p \rightarrow j$ . Each such  $T_p$  corresponds to a 2-cycle deleted in the process of mutating  $Q$  at  $j$ . Splitting off  $M$  gives the following minimal  $\text{add } T'$ -approximation of  $\text{rad } T_i$ ,

$$0 \longrightarrow K'_i \longrightarrow E'_i \longrightarrow \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0.$$

In particular,  $K'_i = F'_{i,\text{int}}$ .

As the second case, suppose that  $b_{ij} > 0$ . Then  $T_j^{b_{ij}}$  is a summand of  $E_i$ . Write  $E_i = \overline{E}_i \oplus T_j^{b_{ij}}$  and let

$$h = \text{id}_{\overline{E}_i} \oplus r_j^{\oplus b_{ij}} : \overline{E}_i \oplus E_j^{b_{ij}} \rightarrow \overline{E}_i \oplus T_j^{b_{ij}},$$

where  $r_j$  is the right map in the mutation sequence (see (5.16)) ending at  $T_j$ . Constructing the pullback of  $g$  and  $h$  gives the following commutative diagram with exact rows and columns.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & 0 & & 0 & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & (T_j^*)^{b_{ij}} & = & (T_j^*)^{b_{ij}} & & \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & \overline{E}_i \oplus E_j^{b_{ij}} & \xrightarrow{\widehat{f}} & \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow h & & \parallel \\
0 & \longrightarrow & K_i & \xrightarrow{g} & \overline{E}_i \oplus T_j^{b_{ij}} & \xrightarrow{f} & \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & 0 & & 0 & & 
\end{array}$$

Similar to the first case,  $X = (T_j^*)^{b_{ij}} \oplus K_i$  and  $\widehat{f}$  is an  $\text{add } T'$ -approximation. The common summand of  $X$  and  $\overline{E}_i \oplus E_j^{b_{ij}}$  is  $M = \bigoplus_p T_p$ , summing over all the paths  $j \rightarrow p \rightarrow i$ , and each such  $T_p$  corresponds to a 2-cycle deleted in the process of

mutating  $Q$  at  $j$ . Splitting off  $M$  gives the minimal add  $T'$ -approximation of  $\text{rad } T_i$  as claimed,

$$0 \longrightarrow K'_i \longrightarrow E'_i \longrightarrow \text{rad } T_i \longrightarrow 0.$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Proposition 13.2.** Let  $T$  be a reachable cluster tilting object. Then any boundary simple  $A$ -module  $S_i$  has the following minimal projective resolution.

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, F_{i,\text{int}}) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, E_i) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(T, T_i) \longrightarrow S_i \longrightarrow 0 \quad (13.4)$$

*Proof.* We show that  $\text{rad } T_i$  has a minimal add  $T$ -approximation as in (13.2) and so, by applying  $\text{Hom}(T, -)$ , we obtain the given projective resolution, as in Proposition 5.8(2).

By Proposition 13.1, it suffices to show that this is true for the rectangle cluster tilting object. Indeed, we have

$$T_i = M_{[i+1, i+k]}, \quad \text{rad } T_i = M_{\{i\} \cup [i+2, i+k]},$$

and

$$E_i = \begin{cases} M_{[i, i+k-1]} \oplus M_{\{1\} \cup [i+2, i+k]}, & \text{when } i \leq n - k, \\ M_{[1, i-n+k] \cup [i, n-1]} \oplus M_{[i+2, i+k]}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore,

$$K_i = \begin{cases} M_{\{1\} \cup [i+1, i+k-1]}, & \text{when } i \leq n - k, \\ M_{[1, i-n+k+1] \cup [i+1, n-1]}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

So, in either case, we have  $K_i = F_{i,\text{int}}$ , as required.  $\square$

**13.2.  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation and flow polynomials.** Recall, from Theorem 9.12, that, for any cluster tilting object  $T$  in  $\text{CM } C$ , we have a map

$$\Xi^T : \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)] : \Psi_M \mapsto \mathcal{P}_M^T.$$

We wish to regard  $\Xi^T$  as a generalised ‘homogeneous network chart’ (cf. Remark 9.13), so that the generalised ‘inhomogeneous network chart’ is then  $\text{wt } \Xi^T = \mathbb{C}[\text{wt}] \circ \Xi^T$ , in the notation of Remark 6.2. To justify this, we will show that  $\text{wt } \Xi^T$  transforms under cluster  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation, when  $T$  mutates to  $T' = \mu_j(T)$ .

To this end, we take  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation to be the birational coordinate transformation

$$\xi_j : \mathbb{C}[K(\text{fd } A')] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}(K(\text{fd } A)),$$

where  $\mathbb{C}(K(\text{fd } A))$  is the field of fractions of  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{fd } A)]$ , given by the following formula

$$\xi_j(x^{s'_i}) = \begin{cases} x^{-s_i}, & \text{if } i = j; \\ x^{s_i}(1 + x^{s_j})^{b_{ij}}, & \text{if } b_{ij} > 0; \\ x^{s_i}(1 + x^{-s_j})^{b_{ij}}, & \text{if } b_{ij} < 0; \\ x^{s_i}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where, as in §13.1,  $b_{ji}$  is the number of arrows from  $j$  to  $i$  in  $Q$  (cf. [30, Def 6.14]). Here  $\{s_i = [S_i] : i \in Q_0\}$  is the standard basis of  $K(\text{fd } A)$  and  $\{s'_i = [S'_i] : i \in Q_0\}$  is the standard basis of  $K(\text{fd } A')$ .

**Theorem 13.3.** For a cluster tilting object  $T$  in  $\text{CM } C$  and  $T' = \mu_j(T)$ , we have

$$\xi_j \circ \text{wt } \Xi^{T'} = \text{wt } \Xi^T$$

and hence, for any  $M \in \text{CM } C$ ,

$$\xi_j(\mathcal{F}_M^{T'}) = \mathcal{F}_M^T,$$

that is, (generalised) flow polynomials are related by  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation.

The theorem will follow from the existence of the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & \mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A')] & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{C}[\text{wt}]} & \mathbb{C}[K(\text{fd } A')] \\
& \nearrow \Xi^{T'} & \downarrow \alpha_j & & \downarrow \xi_j \\
\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] & & & \xrightarrow{\mathbb{C}[\text{wt}]} & \mathbb{C}(K(\text{fd } A)), \\
& \searrow \Xi^T & \mathbb{C}(K(\text{CM } A)) & & 
\end{array} \tag{13.5}$$

where  $\mathbb{C}(K(\text{CM } A))$  is the field of fractions of  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A)]$  and  $\alpha_j$  can be defined so that the left-hand triangle in (13.5) commutes and thus

$$\alpha_j(\mathcal{P}_M^{T'}) = \mathcal{P}_M^T.$$

This is possible because  $\mathbb{C}[K(\text{CM } A')]$  has generators in the image of  $\Xi^{T'}$ , namely  $x^{[T', \Sigma T'_i]} = \mathcal{P}_{\Sigma T'_i}^{T'}$ , using the same notation as in Remark 6.7 and (6.21). In particular, on these generators, we have

$$\alpha_j(x^{[T', \Sigma T'_i]}) = \begin{cases} x^{-[T, \Sigma T_i]}(x^{[T, \Sigma E_i]} + x^{[T, \Sigma F_i]}), & \text{if } i = j, \\ x^{[T, \Sigma T_i]}, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \tag{13.6}$$

Note that  $T'_j = T_j^*$ .

Thus, to prove the theorem, we must show that the right-hand square in (13.5) commutes, for which it suffices to show, using the standard basis elements  $[T', T'_i]$  of  $K(\text{CM } A')$ , that, for all  $i \in Q_0$ ,

$$\xi_j(\mathbb{C}[\text{wt}](x^{[T', T'_i]})) = \mathbb{C}[\text{wt}](\alpha_j(x^{[T', T'_i]})). \tag{13.7}$$

For this, we compute the following.

**Lemma 13.4.**

$$\alpha_j(x^{[T', T'_i]}) = \begin{cases} x^{-[T, T_j]}(x^{-[T, E_j]} + x^{-[T, F_j]})^{-1}, & \text{if } i = j, \\ x^{[T, T_i]}, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \tag{13.8}$$

*Proof.* By (6.21), for any  $i$ , we have

$$[T', T'_i] = [T', P\Sigma T'_i] - [T', \Sigma T'_i]. \tag{13.9}$$

So, by (13.6), in the case  $i \neq j$ , we have

$$\alpha_j(x^{[T', T'_i]}) = x^{[T, T_i]}.$$

Now consider the case  $i = j$ . By (13.9) and (6.21)

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_j(x^{[T', T'_j]}) &= \alpha_j(x^{[T', P\Sigma T'_j] - [T', \Sigma T'_j]}) \\
&= x^{[T, P\Sigma T'_j]} x^{[T, \Sigma T'_j]} (x^{[T, \Sigma E_j]} + x^{[T, \Sigma F_j]})^{-1} \\
&= x^{[T, P\Sigma T'_j]} x^{[T, \Sigma T'_j]} (x^{[T, P\Sigma E_j] - [T, E_j]} + x^{[T, P\Sigma F_j] - [T, F_j]})^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall, from (6.22), that  $P\Sigma F_j = P\Sigma T_j \oplus P\Sigma T'_j = P\Sigma E_j$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_j(x^{[T', T'_j]}) &= x^{[T, P\Sigma T'_j]} x^{[T, \Sigma T'_j]} x^{-[T, P\Sigma E_j]} (x^{-[T, E_j]} + x^{-[T, F_j]})^{-1} \\
&= x^{-[T, T_j]} (x^{-[T, E_j]} + x^{-[T, F_j]})^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 13.3.* We need to show that (13.7) holds, in other words, using Lemma 13.4, that

$$\xi_j(x^{\kappa(T', T'_i)}) = \begin{cases} x^{-\kappa(T, T_j)}(x^{-\kappa(T, E_j)} + x^{-\kappa(T, F_j)})^{-1}, & \text{if } i = j, \\ x^{\kappa(T, T_i)}, & \text{if } i \neq j. \end{cases} \quad (13.10)$$

Write

$$\kappa(T', T'_i) = \kappa(T'_j, T'_i)s'_j + \sum_{\substack{b_{tj}=0 \\ t \neq j}} \kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s'_t + \sum_{b_{tj}>0} \kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s'_t + \sum_{b_{tj}<0} \kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s'_t,$$

which is also true without the dashes. From the definition of  $\xi_j$ , we have

$$\xi_j(x^{\kappa(T'_j, T'_i)s'_j}) = x^{-\kappa(T'_j, T'_i)s_j} \quad (13.11)$$

$$\xi_j\left(\prod_{\substack{b_{tj}=0 \\ t \neq j}} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s'_t}\right) = \prod_{\substack{b_{tj}=0 \\ t \neq j}} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s_t} \quad (13.12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j\left(\prod_{b_{tj}>0} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s'_t}\right) &= \left(\prod_{b_{tj}>0} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s_t}\right) (1 + x^{s_j})^{\sum_{b_{tj}>0} b_{tj}\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)} \\ &= \left(\prod_{b_{tj}>0} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s_t}\right) (1 + x^{s_j})^{\kappa(F_j, T'_i)} \end{aligned} \quad (13.13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j\left(\prod_{b_{tj}<0} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s'_t}\right) &= \left(\prod_{b_{tj}<0} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s_t}\right) (1 + x^{-s_j})^{-\kappa(E_j, T'_i)} \\ &= \left(\prod_{b_{tj}<0} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_i)s_t}\right) (1 + x^{s_j})^{-\kappa(E_j, T'_i)} x^{\kappa(E_j, T'_i)s_j} \end{aligned} \quad (13.14)$$

Hence, in the case  $i \neq j$ , noting that  $T'_t = T_t$  when  $t \neq j$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j(x^{\kappa(T', T'_i)}) &= x^{-\kappa(T'_j, T_i)s_j} \left(\prod_{t \neq j} x^{\kappa(T_t, T_i)s_t}\right) (1 + x^{s_j})^{\kappa(F_j, T_i)} (1 + x^{s_j})^{-\kappa(E_j, T_i)} x^{\kappa(E_j, T_i)s_j} \\ &= x^{\kappa(T, T_i)}, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\kappa(F_j, T_i) = \kappa(E_j, T_i)$  and  $\kappa(E_j, T_i) - \kappa(T'_j, T_i) = \kappa(T_j, T_i)$ , by Proposition 12.2(1). So (13.10) holds in this case.

Now consider the case  $i = j$ . By Proposition 12.2(2) for  $T'$  (so  $E'_j = F_j$  and  $F'_j = E_j$ ), we have

$$\kappa(F_j, T'_j) = \kappa(T_j, T'_j) + \kappa(T'_j, T'_j) = \kappa(E_j, T'_j) - 1. \quad (13.15)$$

Using (13.11)–(13.14) again, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_j(x^{\kappa(T', T'_j)}) &= x^{-\kappa(T'_j, T'_j)s_j} \left(\prod_{t \neq j} x^{\kappa(T'_t, T'_j)s'_t}\right) (1 + x^{s_j})^{\kappa(F_j, T'_j) - \kappa(E_j, T'_j)} x^{\kappa(E_j, T'_j)s_j} \\ &= \left(\prod_{t \neq j} x^{\kappa(T_t, T'_j)s_t}\right) (1 + x^{s_j})^{-1} x^{\kappa(T_j, T'_j)s_j} x^{s_j}, \quad \text{by (13.15),} \\ &= x^{\kappa(T, T'_j)} (x^{-s_j} + 1)^{-1} \\ &= x^{-\kappa(T, T_j)} (x^{-\kappa(T, E_j)} + x^{-\kappa(T, F_j)})^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\kappa(T, T'_j) = \kappa(T, F_j) - \kappa(T, T_j)$  and  $\kappa(T, F_j) + s_j = \kappa(T, E_j)$ , by Proposition 12.3(1). This completes the proof.  $\square$

**Remark 13.5.** By applying the projective resolutions in Proposition 5.8 and Proposition 13.2, we can show that the diagram in (13.5) also commutes with the two horizontal maps replaced by  $\mathbb{C}[\beta]$  in the opposite direction, that is,  $\mathbb{C}[\beta] \circ \xi_j = \alpha_j \circ \mathbb{C}[\beta]$ .

## 14. NEWTON–OKOUNKOV CONES AND BODIES FOR GRASSMANNIANS

**14.1. Network charts and valuations.** Let  $G$  be a plabic graph of type  $\pi_{k,n}$  and  $\mathbf{S}$  be the collection of face labels of  $G$ . Let  $T = T_{\mathbf{S}} = \bigoplus_{J \in \mathbf{S}} M_J$  be the corresponding cluster tilting object in  $\text{CMC}$ . By [30, Thm. 6.8], there is a network torus  $\mathbb{T}_G \subseteq \text{Gr}(k, n)$ , whose character lattice can be identified with  $\mathbf{N}_*$ , and a corresponding network chart

$$\text{net}_G: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]/(\Delta_{I_*} - 1) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{N}_*] \quad (14.1)$$

where  $\text{net}_G(\Delta_I) = F_I$ , the flow polynomial as in (7.15).

If  $G$  and  $G'$  are plabic graphs related by a square move, so that their dual quivers  $Q$  and  $Q'$  are related by mutation, then the network charts  $\text{net}_G$  and  $\text{net}_{G'}$  are related by  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation (see [30, Lemma 6.15]). In other words,  $\text{net}_G$  is an  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster chart, or  $\mathbb{T}_G$  is an  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster torus.

Hence, one can, as in [30, Remark 6.17], write an arbitrary  $\mathbb{X}$ -cluster chart, as a map  $\text{net}_G$ , as in (14.1), where now  $G$  is just a symbol standing in for an  $\mathbb{X}$ -seed  $(Q, \{x_i : i \in Q_0\})$ , related to an initial plabic seed by some sequence of mutations. Note that  $N_* \leq \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$  still consists of vectors vanishing at the boundary vertex  $* \in Q_0$ , which, being ‘frozen’, can be followed consistently through any sequence of mutations.

On the other hand, since we can mutate cluster tilting objects arbitrarily, we can still associate some  $T$  to such a ‘generalised’  $G$ , by following the same sequence of mutations from a plabic  $G^0$  and corresponding  $T^0 = T_{\mathbf{S}}$ . The main difference is that summands of  $T$  may now have arbitrary rank.

By Remark 9.13, when  $G$  is a plabic graph and  $T = T_{\mathbf{S}}$ , we have

$$\text{net}_G = \text{wt} \Xi^T, \quad (14.2)$$

where  $\Xi^T$  is as in Theorem 9.12. However, Theorem 13.3 shows that the right-hand side undergoes  $\mathbb{X}$ -mutation, when  $T$  mutates, while the left-hand side does also, by construction. Hence (14.2) is true for all  $\mathbb{X}$ -seeds  $G$  and their associated cluster tilting objects  $T$ .

By ordering the basis  $\{[S_i] : i \in Q_0^*\}$  to define a lexicographic order on  $\mathbf{N}_*$  (as in Remark 8.5), Rietsch–Williams [30, Def. 8.1] define (the restriction of) a valuation

$$\text{val}_G: \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \setminus 0 \rightarrow \mathbf{N}_*, \quad (14.3)$$

by setting  $\text{val}_G(f)$  to be minimal exponent of  $\text{net}_G(f)$ .

**Theorem 14.1.** Let  $G$  be any  $\mathbb{X}$ -seed and  $T$  be the corresponding (reachable) cluster tilting object in  $\text{CMC}$ . Then, for any  $M \in \text{CMC}$ ,

$$\text{val}_G(\Psi_M) = \kappa(T, M). \quad (14.4)$$

In particular,

$$\text{val}_G(\Delta_I) = \kappa(T, M_I). \quad (14.5)$$

*Proof.* By (14.2) and Theorem 9.12, and recalling §6.3, we have

$$\text{net}_G(\Psi_M) = \text{wt} \Xi^T(\Psi_M) = \text{wt} \mathcal{P}_M^T = \mathcal{F}_M^T$$

But we know by Proposition 6.11(2) (see also Remark 6.12), that the leading exponent of  $\mathcal{F}_M^T$  is  $\kappa(T, M)$ , as required. Note that this is, after all, independent of the choice of total ordering. The last part follows immediately, because  $\Psi_{M_I} = \Delta_I$ .  $\square$

This theorem gives a new way of proving the following result [30, Theorem 15.1].

**Corollary 14.2.**  $\text{val}_G(\Delta_I) = (\text{MaxDiag}(\lambda_J \setminus \lambda_I))_{J \in \mathbf{S}}$

*Proof.* Follows immediately from (14.5) and (11.4), since  $T_{\mathbf{S}} = \bigoplus_{J \in \mathbf{S}} M_J$ .  $\square$

In fact, [30, Theorem 15.1] together with the elementary formula (11.4) was how we originally knew (14.5) and thus conjectured (14.4) (see [19, Remark 7.3]).

**14.2. Newton–Okounkov bodies.** Let  $L_r = \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]_r$  be the subspace of homogeneous functions of degree  $r$  and  $\mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]_\bullet$  be the subset of all non-zero homogeneous functions. Define

$$\mathrm{val}_G(L_r) = \{\mathrm{val}_G(f) : f \in L_r \setminus 0\} \subseteq \mathbf{N}_*. \quad (14.6)$$

Rietsch–Williams [30, (8.2)] define the *Newton–Okounkov body* in  $\mathbf{N}_* \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{NO}}(G) = \overline{\mathrm{ConvHull}} \bigcup_r \frac{1}{r} \mathrm{val}_G(L_r).$$

They could equally well have defined the NO-cone in  $(\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_*) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$  by

$$\mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{NO}}(G) = \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\text{-span}} \{(\mathrm{deg}(f), \mathrm{val}_G(f)) : f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)]_\bullet\}$$

which is the cone whose degree 1 slice is  $(1, \Delta_{\mathrm{NO}}(G))$ .

For comparison, we can rewrite  $\mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T)$  from Definition 8.6 using the isomorphism  $\widetilde{\mathrm{wt}}$  from (5.13), or strictly  $\widetilde{\mathrm{wt}} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ , as

$$\widetilde{\mathrm{wt}} \mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T) = \overline{\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\text{-span}} \{(\mathrm{rk}_C M, \kappa(T, M)) : M \in \mathrm{CM} C\}$$

whose degree 1 slice is  $(1, \Delta_\kappa(T))$ , where

$$\Delta_\kappa(T) = \overline{\mathrm{ConvHull}} \bigcup_r \frac{1}{r} \{\kappa(T, M) : M \in \mathrm{CM} C, \mathrm{rk}_C M = r\}$$

**Remark 14.3.** We can also define a canonical degree 1 body in  $K(\mathrm{CM} A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{GV}}(T) = \overline{\mathrm{ConvHull}} \bigcup_r \frac{1}{r} \{[T, M] : M \in \mathrm{CM} C, \mathrm{rk}_C M = r\},$$

which is the degree 1 slice of  $\mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T)$  and is identified with  $\Delta_\kappa(T)$  under  $\mathrm{wt}$ , so that, explicitly,  $\Delta_{\mathrm{GV}}(T) = [T, \mathbf{J}_*] - \beta \Delta_\kappa(T)$ .

**Theorem 14.4.** Let  $G$  be any  $\mathbb{X}$ -seed and  $T$  be the corresponding (reachable) cluster tilting object in  $\mathrm{CM} C$ . Then

$$\Delta_{\mathrm{NO}}(G) = \Delta_\kappa(T). \quad (14.7)$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 10.8, we know that  $L_r$  has a basis  $\{\Psi_{M_C} : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathrm{CM}}(r)\}$ . Furthermore, as in the proof of Theorem 14.1, we have

$$\mathrm{net}_G(\Psi_M) = \mathcal{F}_M^T, \quad (14.8)$$

so the  $\mathrm{net}_G(\Psi_{M_C})$  have leading exponents  $\mathrm{val}_G(\Psi_{M_C}) = \kappa(T, M_C)$ , which are distinct, by Proposition 10.10. Hence, by Lemma 10.1,

$$\mathrm{val}_G(L_r) = \{\kappa(T, M_C) : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr} \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{CM}}(r)\}. \quad (14.9)$$

But we also know from Theorem 10.11 that

$$\{\kappa(T, M_C) : \mathbf{C} \in \mathrm{Irr} \mathbf{C}_{\mathrm{CM}}(r)\} = \{\kappa(T, M) : M \in \mathrm{CM} C, \mathrm{rk}_C M = r\},$$

which completes the proof by applying  $\overline{\mathrm{ConvHull}} \bigcup_r \frac{1}{r} (-)$ .  $\square$

**Remark 14.5.** Theorem 14.4 is equivalent to the fact that

$$\mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{NO}}(G) = \widetilde{\mathrm{wt}} \mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{GV}}(T). \quad (14.10)$$

We can also prove this via Theorem 10.11, by showing that

$$\mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{NO}}(G) = \widetilde{\mathrm{wt}} \mathrm{Cone}_{\mathrm{NO}}(T). \quad (14.11)$$

Indeed, by Theorem 9.12, we know that  $\Xi^T$  gives an isomorphism  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)] \cong \mathcal{A}$ , the cluster algebra that determines  $\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(T)$  as in Definition 8.6. Hence, by Remark 8.7, what we need to show is that, for  $f \in \mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]_{\bullet}$ ,

$$(\deg(f), \text{val}_G(f)) = \widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Val}_T(\Xi^T(f)).$$

But we know that  $\deg(f) = \text{rk} \Xi^T(f)$  and also that  $\text{val}_G(f) = \text{wt} \text{Val}_T(\Xi^T(f))$ , since  $\text{net}_G = \text{wt} \Xi^T$  and we can choose the same order on  $\mathbf{N}_*$  to define the leading exponents. This completes the proof of (14.11).

Note that Theorem 14.4 and/or Remark 14.5 imply that  $\Delta_{\text{NO}}(G)$  and  $\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(G)$  do not depend on the choice of total order implicit in their definition (cf. [30, Rem. 8.7]), just as Theorem 10.11 implies this for  $\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(T)$ .

**14.3. Alternative proof.** We give here a different proof of Theorem 14.4 or more precisely (14.7), that is,  $\Delta_{\text{NO}}(G) = \Delta_{\kappa}(T)$ . The proof avoids the use of Theorem 13.3 to prove (14.2) for a general  $\mathbb{X}$ -seed, but instead uses Theorem 12.5 or more precisely Corollary 12.8.

*Second proof of Theorem 14.4.* When  $G$  is a plabic graph and  $T = T_{\mathbf{S}}$ , then we get (14.2), that is,  $\text{net}_G = \text{wt} \Xi^T$ , using just Remark 9.13. Then we get (14.8), that is,  $\text{net}_G(\Psi_M) = \mathcal{F}_M^T$ , as in the proof of Theorem 14.1. Hence, as in the proof of Theorem 14.4, we get (14.9), that is,

$$\text{val}_G(L_r) = \{\kappa(T, M_{\mathbf{C}}) : \mathbf{C} \in \mathbf{Irr} \mathbf{C}_{\text{CM}}(r)\}.$$

This is the key to proving (14.7), so we need to prove this for a general  $\mathbb{X}$ -seed  $G$ .

For a general  $G$ , with associated  $T$  and  $Q$ , if  $G' = \mu_i G$ , then, by [30, Lemma 16.17],

$$\text{val}_{G'}(L_r) = \text{L}_{Q,i} \text{val}_G(L_r),$$

where  $\text{L}_{Q,i}$  is tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation, as in Definition 12.7. Similarly, if  $T' = \mu_i T$ , so  $T'$  is associated to  $G'$ , then, by Corollary 12.8 and Remark 12.9, we have

$$\kappa(T', M_{\mathbf{C}}) = \text{L}_{Q,i} \kappa(T, M_{\mathbf{C}}),$$

because  $M_{\mathbf{C}}$  is generic. Hence (14.9) holds for  $(G', T')$  provided it holds for  $(G, T)$ , and thus it holds by induction for all associated  $(G, T)$ , starting from any plabic case.  $\square$

Note that [30, Lemma 16.17] uses a theta basis for  $L_r$ , which is in bijection with  $\text{val}_G(L_r)$  because the basis has distinct leading exponents. The fact that the basis is parameterised by tropical points of a cluster  $\mathbb{A}$ -variety is behind why  $\text{val}_G(L_r)$  undergoes tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation.

**Remark 14.6.** When  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$  is of finite cluster type, there are only finitely many indecomposable modules in  $\text{CM} C$ , all of which are rigid and hence generic. Since any module in  $\text{CM} C$  is a direct sum of indecomposable modules, we can write

$$\Delta_{\kappa}(T) = \text{ConvHull} \left\{ \frac{\kappa(T, M)}{\text{rk}_C M} : M \text{ is indecomposable} \right\},$$

that is, the convex hull of a finite set of (rational) points. Correspondingly, we have

$$\Delta_{\text{NO}}(G) = \text{ConvHull} \left\{ \frac{\text{val}_G(\Psi)}{\deg \Psi} : \Psi \text{ is a cluster variable} \right\},$$

which also follows because cluster monomials are a basis of  $\mathbb{C}[\text{Gr}(k, n)]$  in that case.

15. SUPERPOTENTIAL AND TROPICALISATION

15.1. **Superpotential.** Marsh–Rietsch [23, Def. 6.1] gave the following formula for a superpotential on the Grassmannian  $\text{Gr}(k, n)$

$$W = q \frac{\Delta_{\widehat{J}_{n-k}}}{\Delta_{J_{n-k}}} + \sum_{i \neq n-k} \frac{\Delta_{\widehat{J}_i}}{\Delta_{J_i}} \tag{15.1}$$

where

$$J_i = [i + 1, i + k] \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{J}_i = [i + 1, i + k - 1] \cup \{i + k + 1\}.$$

and indices are taken mod  $n$ .

In terms of representations,  $M_{J_i}$  is the projective module at (boundary) vertex  $i$  and  $M_{\widehat{J}_i}$  is the unique nontrivial extension of  $M_{J_i}$  by the simple  $C$ -module  $S_{i+k}$ . In terms of Young diagrams, this means that, for  $i \neq n - k$ , the diagram for  $\widehat{J}_i$  is obtained by adding a box to the diagram for  $J_i$ . However, for  $\widehat{J}_{n-k}$  one instead removes a hook, because the cyclic structure is hidden from the Young diagram point of view.

Marsh–Rietsch [23, Prop. 6.1] also gave an expression for the superpotential  $W$  in terms of rectangle cluster variables. In this section, we will give a new derivation of this expression using the rectangles cluster tilting object  $T = T^\square$  and the Fu-Keller cluster character  $\Phi^T$  from (6.2).

Recall, from Definition 9.4, that the rectangles cluster tilting object is defined as

$$T = T^\square = T_\emptyset \oplus \bigoplus_{ij \in \Gamma} T_{ij},$$

where  $T_{ij} = M_{K_{ij}}$  for  $K_{ij} = [1, k - i] \cup [k - i + j + 1, k + j]$  and  $T_\emptyset = M_{[1, k]}$ . The Gabriel quiver of  $A = \text{End}(T)^{\text{op}}$  has a quite uniform structure, illustrated in Figure 15.1. This quiver is dual to a particular plabic graph, as in [30, §4, Fig. 5], although some labelling conventions may differ (see Remark 7.10).




FIGURE 15.1. The Gabriel quiver  $Q$  of  $\text{End}(T^\square)^{\text{op}}$ , for  $(k, n) = (3, 7)$ .

Observe that  $M_{J_s} = P_s = Ce_s$  is projective, so always in  $\text{add } T$ . In particular,  $M_{J_s} = T_{ks}$ , if  $0 \leq s \leq n - k$ , and  $M_{J_s} = T_{(n-s)(n-k)}$ , if  $n - k \leq s \leq n$ , where, by convention,  $T_{k0} = T_\emptyset = T_{0(n-k)}$ . On the other hand,  $M_{\widehat{J}_i} \in \text{add } T$  if and only if  $i = 0$  or  $i = n - k$ , in which case

$$M_{\widehat{J}_0} = T_{11} \quad \text{and} \quad M_{\widehat{J}_{n-k}} = T_{(k-1)(n-k-1)}. \tag{15.2}$$

**Lemma 15.1.**  $\text{top } M_{\widehat{J}_s} = S_s \oplus S_{s+k}$ , where  $S_i$  are the simple  $C$ -modules.

Denote the minimal syzygy of  $T_{ij}$  by  $\Omega T_{ij}$ , for all  $ij \in \Gamma$ . If  $i = k$  or  $j = n - k$ , then  $T_{ij}$  is projective and so  $\Omega T_{ij} = 0$ . The following are straightforward, by considering the profiles of the relevant modules.

**Lemma 15.2.** If  $1 \leq i < k$  and  $1 \leq j < n - k$ , then

- (1)  $\Omega T_{ij} = M_{L_{ij}}$  with  $L_{ij} = [k - i + 1, k] \cup [k + j + 1, 2k + j - i]$ .
- (2)  $\text{top } \Omega T_{ij} = S_{k-i} \oplus S_{k+j}$ .
- (3) The irreducible map  $T_{ij} \rightarrow T_{i(j+1)}$  induces a map  $\iota_{ij}: \Omega T_{ij} \rightarrow \Omega T_{i(j+1)}$  which is an isomorphism on the common summands  $S_{k-i}$  of their tops.
- (4) The irreducible map  $T_{ij} \rightarrow T_{(i+1)j}$  induces a map  $\epsilon_{ij}: \Omega T_{ij} \rightarrow \Omega T_{(i+1)j}$  which is an isomorphism on the common summands  $S_{k+j}$  of their tops.

Next we compute  $\text{Ext}^1(T_{ij}, M_{\hat{J}_s})$ , noting that this automatically vanishes when  $i = k$  or  $j = n - k$ , as  $T_{ij}$  is projective, and when  $s = 0$  or  $n - k$ , as  $M_{\hat{J}_s} \in \text{add } T$ .

**Lemma 15.3.** If  $1 \leq i < k$  and  $1 \leq j < n - k$ .

- (1) If  $0 < s < n - k$ , then  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(T_{ij}, M_{\hat{J}_s}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = s, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$
- (2) If  $n - k < s < n$ , then  $\dim \text{Ext}^1(T_{ij}, M_{\hat{J}_s}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i = n - s, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

*Proof.* (1) Note that  $\text{Ext}^1(N, M) \cong \underline{\text{Hom}}(\Omega N, M)$ . Comparing profiles of the modules  $\Omega T_{ij}$  and  $M_{\hat{J}_s}$  we can see that, if  $j < s$ , then any map  $\Omega T_{ij} \rightarrow M_{\hat{J}_s}$  factors through  $P_s$ , while, if  $j > s$ , then any such map factors through  $P_0$ . Thus  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(\Omega T_{ij}, M_{\hat{J}_s}) = 0$ .

If  $j = s$ , then  $\text{top } \Omega T_{ij}$  and  $\text{top } M_{\hat{J}_s}$  share a common summand  $S_{s+k}$ , by Lemma 15.1 and Lemma 15.2 and there is a map  $g_{ij}: \Omega T_{ij} \rightarrow M_{\hat{J}_s}$  which is an isomorphism on these summands. On the other hand, any map with image in  $tM_{\hat{J}_s}$  factors through  $P_0$ . Thus  $\underline{\text{Hom}}(\Omega T_{ij}, M_{\hat{J}_s})$  is 1-dimensional, spanned by (the class of)  $g_{ij}$ .

(2) Similar to (1). If  $i \neq n - s$ , then any map  $\Omega T_{ij} \rightarrow M_{\hat{J}_s}$  factors through  $P_s$  or  $P_0$ . If  $i = n - s$ , then  $\text{top } \Omega T_{ij}$  and  $\text{top } M_{\hat{J}_s}$  share a common summand  $S_{k-i} = S_{s+k}$  and there is a map  $f_{ij}: \Omega T_{ij} \rightarrow M_{\hat{J}_s}$  which is an isomorphism on these summands. Any map with image in  $tM_{\hat{J}_s}$  factors through  $P_0$ .  $\square$

We denote the simple  $A$ -module at vertex  $ij \in \Gamma$  by  $S_{ij}$ .

**Proposition 15.4.** Let  $X = \text{Ext}^1(T, M_{\hat{J}_s})$ .

- (1) If  $0 < s < n - k$ , then  $X$  is a uniserial  $A$ -module, supported at all the vertices in column  $s$  but the top-most one. In particular,

$$\dim X = k - 1, \quad \text{top } X = S_{(k-1)s} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{soc } X = S_{1s}.$$

- (2) If  $n - k < s < n$ , then  $X$  is a uniserial  $A$ -module, supported at all the vertices in row  $s' = n - s$  but the right-most one. In particular,

$$\dim X = n - k - 1, \quad \text{top } X = S_{s'(n-k-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{soc } X = S_{s'1}.$$

*Proof.* The support and dimension are determined by Lemma 15.3. Thus  $X$  is supported on a linear  $\mathbf{A}$ -type sub-quiver of the Gabriel quiver  $Q$  (cf. Figure 15.1).

We know *a priori* the  $X$  must be indecomposable, because  $M_{\hat{J}_s}$  is indecomposable and  $\text{Ext}^1(T, -)$  is an equivalence  $\underline{\text{CMC}}/\text{add } T \rightarrow \text{mod } \underline{\text{End}}(T)^{\text{op}}$ , by [20, Prop. 2.1(c)]. Thus  $X$  is uniserial, with the stated top and socle.

We can also see this directly by observing that all arrows in the sub-quiver act as isomorphisms, because  $f_{(n-s)j} = f_{(n-s)(j+1)}\iota_{(n-s)j}$  and  $g_{is} = g_{(i+1)s}\epsilon_{is}$ , where  $\iota, \epsilon$  are as in Lemma 15.2 and  $f, g$  are as in Lemma 15.3.  $\square$

The cluster variables for  $T^\square$  are  $\Psi_{T_{ij}} = \Delta_{K_{ij}}$ , for  $ij \in \Gamma$ , and  $\Psi_{T_\emptyset} = \Delta_{J_0}$ . We call them *rectangle cluster variables* and the goal is to express the superpotential  $W$  in terms of them, as in [23, Prop. 6.10] and [30, Prop. 10.5].

To simplify notation, as in *loc. cit.*, we write the rectangle cluster variables as

$$p_{ij} = \begin{cases} \Delta_{K_{ij}} & \text{for } ij \in \Gamma, \\ \Delta_{J_0} & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ or } j = 0. \end{cases}$$

Thus the cluster variable  $p_\emptyset = \Delta_{J_0}$  can also appear as  $p_{00}$ ,  $p_{10}$ ,  $p_{01}$ , *etc.*

**Proposition 15.5.** The fractions in (15.1) can be written in terms of rectangle cluster variables as follows.

- (1) If  $0 < s < n - k$ , then  $\frac{\Delta_{\hat{J}_s}}{\Delta_{J_s}} = \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} \frac{p_{(t+1)(s+1)} p_{t(s-1)}}{p_{ts} p_{(t+1)s}}$ .
- (2) If  $n - k < s < n$  and  $s' = n - s$ , then  $\frac{\Delta_{\hat{J}_s}}{\Delta_{J_s}} = \sum_{t=0}^{n-k-1} \frac{p_{(s'+1)(t+1)} p_{(s'-1)t}}{p_{s't} p_{s'(t+1)}}$ .
- (3)  $\frac{\Delta_{\hat{J}_0}}{\Delta_{J_0}} = \frac{p_{11}}{p_\emptyset}$  and  $\frac{\Delta_{\hat{J}_{n-k}}}{\Delta_{J_{n-k}}} = \frac{p_{(k-1)(n-k-1)}}{p_{k(n-k)}}$ .

Thus the Marsh–Rietsch superpotential from (15.1) can be written

$$W = \frac{p_{11}}{p_\emptyset} + \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=2}^{n-k} \frac{p_{ij} p_{(i-1)(j-2)}}{p_{(i-1)(j-1)} p_{i(j-1)}} + q \frac{p_{(k-1)(n-k-1)}}{p_{k(n-k)}} + \sum_{i=2}^k \sum_{j=1}^{n-k} \frac{p_{ij} p_{(i-2)(j-1)}}{p_{(i-1)(j-1)} p_{(i-1)j}} \quad (15.3)$$

recovering [30, Prop. 10.5], i.e. [23, Prop. 6.10].

*Proof.* By Remark 9.10, we can use (6.2), to write

$$\Delta_{\hat{J}_s} = \Psi_{M_{\hat{J}_s}} = x^{[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}]} \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}_d \text{Ext}^1(T, M_{\hat{J}_s})) x^{-\beta(d)}, \quad (15.4)$$

after making the identification  $x^{[T, T_{ij}]} = p_{ij}$ .

(1) By Proposition 15.4(1),  $X_s = \text{Ext}^1(T, M_{\hat{J}_s})$  is a uniserial module with top  $S_{(k-1)s}$  and socle  $S_{1s}$ . For each  $0 \leq t < k$ ,  $X_s$  has a unique submodule  $X_{ts}$  of dimension  $t$ . So the non-zero coefficients  $\chi(\text{Gr}_d X_s)$  in (15.4) are all 1. Thus

$$\Delta_{\hat{J}_s} = x^{[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}]} \sum_{t=0}^{k-1} x^{-\beta[X_{ts}]}.$$

Thus  $\Delta_{\hat{J}_s} / \Delta_{J_s}$  is a sum of terms  $x^{[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}] - \beta[X_{ts}]} / \Delta_{J_s} = x^{[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}] - [T, T_{ks}] - \beta[X_{ts}]}$ .

Observe that the following sequence is exact.

$$0 \rightarrow T_{1s} \rightarrow T_{ks} \oplus T_{1(s+1)} \rightarrow M_{\hat{J}_s} \rightarrow 0.$$

Hence  $[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}] - [T, T_{ks}] = [T, T_{1(s+1)}] - [T, T_{1s}]$  and the  $t = 0$  term of  $\Delta_{\hat{J}_s} / \Delta_{J_s}$  is

$$x^{[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}] - [T, T_{ks}]} = \frac{p_{1(s+1)}}{p_{1s}} = \frac{p_{1(s+1)} p_{0(s-1)}}{p_{0s} p_{1s}}, \quad (15.5)$$

as required, because  $p_{0(s-1)} = p_\emptyset = p_{0s}$ .

Observe that  $X_{ts} / X_{(t-1)s} \cong S_{ts}$ , so  $[X_{ts}] = [X_{(t-1)s}] + [S_{ts}]$ . Hence we can try to prove the formula for the general term by induction on  $t$  starting from (15.5). Assuming the

case  $t - 1$  is proven, we would have

$$\begin{aligned} x^{[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}] - [T, T_{ks}] - \beta[X_{ts}]} &= x^{[T, M_{\hat{J}_s}] - [T, T_{ks}] - \beta[X_{(t-1)s}] - \beta[S_{ts}]} \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{P}_{t(s+1)} \mathcal{P}_{(t-1)(s-1)}}{\mathcal{P}_{(t-1)s} \mathcal{P}_{ts}} x^{-\beta[S_{ts}]} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{(t+1)(s+1)} \mathcal{P}_{t(s-1)}}{\mathcal{P}_{ts} \mathcal{P}_{(t+1)s}}, \end{aligned}$$

provided we can prove that

$$x^{\beta[S_{ts}]} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{t(s+1)} \mathcal{P}_{(t-1)(s-1)} \mathcal{P}_{(t+1)s}}{\mathcal{P}_{(t-1)s} \mathcal{P}_{(t+1)(s+1)} \mathcal{P}_{t(s-1)}} \quad (15.6)$$

Now, by Proposition 5.8,

$$\beta[S_{ts}] = [T, F_{ts}] - [T, E_{ts}],$$

where  $E_{ts}$  and  $F_{ts}$  are the middle terms of the mutation sequences for  $T_{ij}$  from (5.16). At a general vertex  $ts$  in the Gabriel quiver, there are three incoming arrows from  $t(s+1)$ ,  $(t-1)(s-1)$  and  $(t+1)s$  and three outgoing arrows to  $(t-1)s$ ,  $(t+1)(s+1)$  and  $t(s-1)$ , giving

$$F_{ts} = T_{t(s+1)} \oplus T_{(t-1)(s-1)} \oplus T_{(t+1)s} \quad \text{and} \quad E_{ts} = T_{(t-1)s} \oplus T_{(t+1)(s+1)} \oplus T_{t(s-1)}$$

and thus, by the substitution  $p_{ij} = x^{[T, T_{ij}]}$ , we obtain the required expression (15.6) to complete the induction.

In the border cases, where  $s = 1$  or  $t = 1$ , there is a cancellation in (15.6), due to a term in both the numerator and denominator that is  $p_\emptyset$ . In the quiver, there is one incoming and one outgoing arrow missing, which precisely compensates for this cancellation and so (a slight variant of) the above argument is still valid.

(2) is similar to (1), so we omit the details. (3) is immediate because  $\Delta_{\hat{J}_0}$  and  $\Delta_{\hat{J}_{n-k}}$  are rectangle cluster variables (cf. (15.2)). To write the sums as in (15.3) make the change of variables  $(i, j) = (t+1, s+1)$  for (1) and  $(i, j) = (s'+1, t+1)$  for (2).  $\square$

**Remark 15.6.** Setting  $p_\emptyset = 1$  and tropicalising the superpotential  $W$  in (15.3) yields the inequalities (11.2) that define the cone  $\text{Cone}_{\text{GT}}$  of cumulative GT-patterns, as noted in [30, Lem. 16.2]. Specifically,  $p_{ij}$  tropicalises to  $v_{ij}$  and  $q$  to  $r$ . In other words,

$$\text{Cone}_{\text{GT}} = \text{Cone}_W(T^\square) \quad (15.7)$$

where, in general, the *superpotential cone* associated to  $T$  by  $W$  is, in more-or-less the notation of [30, Def. 10.10],

$$\text{Cone}_W(T) = \{(r, v) \in (\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_*) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} : \text{Trop}_T(W)(r, v) \geq 0\}.$$

As it is defined by integral inequalities,  $\text{Cone}_W(T)$  is always a rational polyhedral cone.

From Theorem 11.4, we know that  $\widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T^\square) = \text{Cone}_{\text{GT}}$ , which we can now reformulate as saying that, for  $T = T^\square$ , we have

$$\widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T) = \text{Cone}_W(T) \quad (15.8)$$

Furthermore,  $\widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T^\square)$  is the set of integral points of  $\text{Cone}_W(T^\square)$ , by Remark 11.5.

We can then follow the inductive strategy of [30] to see that (15.8) holds for all  $T$ , by considering what happens when  $T$  is mutated to  $T'$ . On one hand,  $\text{Cone}_W(T)$ , and hence its set of integer points, undergoes tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation, by [30, Cor.11.16]. On the other hand,  $\widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  also undergoes tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation, by Corollary 12.8. Hence  $\widetilde{\text{wt}} \text{Mon}_{\text{GV}}(T')$  is the set of integral points of  $\text{Cone}_W(T')$ , whenever the same holds for  $T$ , as required for the induction.

Note that Rietsch–Williams effectively used this inductive strategy to show that

$$\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(G) = \text{Cone}_W(G), \quad (15.9)$$

for all  $\mathbb{X}$ -seeds  $G$ . In particular, they proved that  $\text{val}_G(L_r)$ , as in (14.6), undergoes tropical  $\mathbb{A}$ -mutation [30, Lemma 16.17] and coincides with the cumulative GT- $r$ -polytope for the rectangles cluster [30, Lemma 16.6].

**15.2. Categorical interpretation of the superpotential.** In order to describe  $\text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  within  $K(\text{CM } A)$  along the lines of (15.8), we need an expression for the superpotential with exponents in the dual lattice  $K(\text{fd } A)$ . We will find such an expression in what follows.

We can write the Marsh-Rietsch superpotential  $W = \sum_{i=1}^n W_i$  in terms of cluster characters by

$$W_i = q^{m_i} \Psi_{P_i^\circ} / \Psi_{P_i} \quad (15.10)$$

where  $m_i = 1$ , if  $i = n - k$ , and  $m_i = 0$ , otherwise, while  $P_i^\circ$  is an extension of  $P_i$  by a simple  $C$ -module  $S_i^\circ = S_{i+k}$ , that is, we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow P_i \xrightarrow{f_i} P_i^\circ \longrightarrow S_i^\circ \longrightarrow 0. \quad (15.11)$$

In the notation of §15.1, we can write  $P_i = M_{J_i}$  and  $P_i^\circ = M_{\widehat{J}_i}$ .

A key step in [30, §18] is to write the superpotential  $W$  in cluster coordinates (and then tropicalise, i.e. look at the exponents). In the notation of Lemma 9.8 and Theorem 9.11, this means computing  $\Upsilon^T W$  by substituting  $\Phi^T$  for  $\Psi$  in (15.10). More precisely, we will use the the co- $g$ -vector variant of the CC formula (6.2), namely

$$\Phi_N^T = x^{\gamma'(N)} \mathbf{F}'_{E(N)}(x^\beta) \quad (15.12)$$

where  $E(N) = \text{Ext}^1(T, N)$ , while the co- $g$ -vector  $\gamma'(N) = [T, N] - \beta[E(N)]$  and

$$\mathbf{F}'_E(x) = \sum_d \chi(\text{Gr}^d E) x^d$$

is the quotient F-polynomial (cf. Remark 6.12), that is,  $\text{Gr}^d E$  is the Grassmannian of  $d$ -dimensional *quotients* of  $E$ . Note also that writing  $\mathbf{F}'_{E(N)}(x^\beta)$  is an alternative notation for making a monomial change of variables, equivalent to writing  $\mathbb{C}[\beta] \mathbf{F}'_{E(N)}(x)$ .

Thus the substitution yields

$$\Upsilon^T W_i = q^{m_i} \Phi_{P_i^\circ}^T / \Phi_{P_i}^T = q^{m_i} x^{\gamma'(P_i^\circ) - [T, P_i]} \mathbf{F}'_{E(P_i^\circ)}(x^\beta). \quad (15.13)$$

In fact, we can simplify this formula as follows

**Proposition 15.7.**

$$\Upsilon^T W_i = \mathbb{C}[\widetilde{\beta}^\vee] \left( x^{[S_i]} \mathbf{F}'_{E(P_i^\circ)}(x) \right) \quad (15.14)$$

where

$$\widetilde{\beta}^\vee: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{M}_0: [X] \mapsto ([T, \mathbf{J}_*][X], -\beta^\vee[X]). \quad (15.15)$$

is dual (in the lattice sense) to the isomorphism  $\widetilde{\beta}: \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_* \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A)$  in (5.14). Here the exponent of  $q$  is taken in the  $\mathbb{Z}$  summand of  $\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{M}_0$  and  $S_i$  is the simple  $A$ -module at the boundary vertex  $i \in Q_0$ .

*Proof.* Note that we can effectively treat  $\beta^\vee: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A)$  just as the dual of  $\beta: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A)$  and then restrict the codomain of  $\beta^\vee$  to  $\mathbf{M}_0$ , into which it maps. Since  $\beta$  appears in  $\widetilde{\beta}$  restricted to  $\mathbf{N}_*$ , we are thus identifying  $\mathbf{N}_*^\vee = \mathbf{M}_0$ , as in Remark 5.3.

If we write  $\beta$  as a matrix using the dual bases of simples and projectives, then  $\beta^\vee$  is given by the transpose matrix. Restricted to the interior vertices  $Q_0^{\text{int}}$ , we know that  $\beta$

is given by the cluster exchange matrix, by Proposition 5.8(1), so  $\beta = -\beta^\vee$  on  $Q_0^{\text{int}}$ . Hence

$$\mathbb{C}[\tilde{\beta}^\vee] \mathbf{F}'_{E(P_i^\diamond)}(x) = \mathbf{F}'_{E(P_i^\diamond)}(x^\beta),$$

which lies in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{M}_0]$  because  $[T, \mathbf{J}_*]: K(\text{fd } A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  vanishes on  $Q_0^{\text{int}}$ . This is because  $\mathbf{J}_* = P_{n-k}$ , so  $[T, \mathbf{J}_*]$  is the projective  $A$ -module at a boundary vertex of  $Q_0$ . This also means that the  $q^{m_i}$  factor is correctly encoded, because  $m_i = [T, \mathbf{J}_*][S_i]$ .

Finally, we need to see that

$$\beta^\vee[S_i] = [T, P_i] - \gamma'(P_i^\diamond).$$

Note that we can compute  $\gamma'(P_i^\diamond) = [T, T'] - [T, T'']$ , where

$$0 \rightarrow P_i^\diamond \rightarrow T' \rightarrow T'' \rightarrow 0, \quad (15.16)$$

is an add  $T$ -approximation, as in (3.7).

Applying  $\text{Hom}(-, T)$  to (15.11) yields an exact sequence of right  $A$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P_i^\diamond, T) \xrightarrow{f_i^*} \text{Hom}(P_i, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(S_i^\diamond, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}^1(P_i^\diamond, T) \rightarrow 0 \quad (15.17)$$

Observe that  $\text{Cok } f_i^* = S_i^{\text{op}}$ , the simple right  $A$ -module at  $i$ , because  $\text{id}: P_i \rightarrow P_i$  is the only map  $P_i \rightarrow T$  that doesn't lift to  $P_i^\diamond$ .

Applying  $\text{Hom}(-, T)$  to (15.16) yields the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T'', T) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T', T) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P_i^\diamond, T) \rightarrow 0$$

which can be spliced into the first part of (15.17) to give a projective resolution of  $S_i^{\text{op}}$

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T'', T) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(T', T) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P_i, T) \rightarrow S_i^{\text{op}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (15.18)$$

By general duality, we can identify  $\beta^\vee$  with  $\beta^{\text{op}}: K(\text{fd } A^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow K(\text{CM } A^{\text{op}})$ . In our case, this also follows quickly from Proposition 13.2. Thus

$$\beta^\vee[S_i] = [T, P_i] - [T, T'] + [T, T''],$$

as required to complete the proof.  $\square$

We can now adapt Rietsch–Williams mirror symmetry result (15.9), describing the NO-cone as a superpotential cone, to our context.

**Theorem 15.8.** The equations defining  $\text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T)$  can be obtained by tropicalisation of the superpotential

$$W_{\mathbb{X}}(T) = \sum_{i=1}^n x^{[S_i]} \mathbf{F}'_{E(P_i^\diamond)}(x) \in \mathbb{C}[K(\text{fd } A)] \quad (15.19)$$

Explicitly, these equations are

$$([S_i] + [V])(x) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all quotients } V \text{ of } \text{Ext}^1(T, P_i^\diamond), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (15.20)$$

Alternatively, we can write these equations as

$$[U](x) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all } U \leq \text{Ext}^1(S_i^\diamond, T), \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (15.21)$$

where  $[U] \in K(\text{fd } A^{\text{op}})$ , which we can also view as dual to  $K(\text{CM } A)$ .

*Proof.* By [30, Thm. 16.18], the tropicalisation of  $\Upsilon^T W$  yields the equations defining the cone

$$\text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(G) \subseteq (\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbf{N}_*) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R},$$

as in §14.2. We also know from Theorem 14.4, specifically (14.10), since  $\tilde{\beta}$  is the inverse of  $\widetilde{\text{wt}}$ , that

$$\tilde{\beta} \text{Cone}_{\text{NO}}(G) = \text{Cone}_{\text{GV}}(T) \subseteq K(\text{CM } A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R},$$

But Proposition 15.7 shows precisely that the superpotential in (15.19) transforms into  $\Upsilon^T W$  under the dual isomorphism, as required.

The equations (15.20) follow immediately, because the exponents in  $F'_{E(P_i^\diamond)}(x)$  are precisely  $[V]$ , for the quotients  $V$  of  $\text{Ext}^1(T, P_i^\diamond)$ .

The equations (15.21) come from the observation that  $\text{Ext}^1(T, P_i^\diamond)$  is the (linear) dual of  $\text{Ext}^1(P_i^\diamond, T)$ , while the last half of (15.17) shows that submodules of  $\text{Ext}^1(P_i^\diamond, T)$  can be extended by  $S_i^{\text{op}}$  to give submodules of  $\text{Ext}^1(S_i^\diamond, T)$ .  $\square$

It would be very interesting to find a categorical proof that  $g$ -vectors satisfy these inequalities. One easy case is that  $[S_i][T, M] \geq 0$  for all  $i$  and  $M$ , because all the projectives in an add  $T$ -presentation of  $M$  appear in the first term.

**Remark 15.9.** The argument deriving (15.21) from (15.20) also shows that adding 1 to the  $i$ -summand of (15.19) gives the usual (sub-module) F-polynomial for  $\text{Ext}^1(S_i^\diamond, T)$ . Note that adding 1 does not affect its use as a superpotential. This also provides an alternative approach to calculating  $\text{Ext}^1(T, P_i^\diamond)$ , compared to the one in §15.1.

**Remark 15.10.** Similar expressions to (15.19) and Remark 15.9 for the potential in terms of F-polynomials are derived in [21, Thm. 6.5]. The description there holds in a much more general context and the relevant modules are expressed intrinsically in terms of the quiver (with potential). It would be interesting to understand why the description here of these modules as  $\text{Ext}^1(T, P_i^\diamond)$  and (the dual of)  $\text{Ext}^1(S_i^\diamond, T)$  gives the same answer.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Alexandersson P., *Gelfand–Tsetlin polytopes and the integer decomposition property*, Eur. J. Combin. **54** (2016) 1–20
- [2] Borceux F., *Handbook of categorical Algebra I*, C.U.P. 1994.
- [3] Baur K., King A., Marsh B.R., *Dimer models and cluster categories of Grassmannians*, Proc. L.M.S. **113** (2016) 213–260
- [4] Berenstein A., Fomin S., Zelevinsky A., *Parametrizations of canonical bases and totally positive matrices*, Adv. Math. **122** (1996) 49–149
- [5] Berenstein A., Zelevinsky A., *Total positivity in Schubert varieties*, Comm. Math. Helv. **72** (1997) 128–166
- [6] Buan A.B., Iyama O., Reiten I., Scott J., *Cluster structures for 2-Calabi–Yau categories and unipotent groups*, Compos. Math. **145** (2009) 1035–1079 ([arXiv:math.RT/0701557](https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0701557))
- [7] Buchweitz R-O., *Maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules and Tate cohomology over Gorenstein rings*, unpublished notes (1985)
- [8] Canacki I., King A., Pressland M., *Perfect matching modules, dimer partition functions and cluster characters*, Adv. Math. **443** (2024) 109570 ([arXiv:2106.15924](https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.15924))
- [9] Curtis C.W., Reiner I., *Methods of Representation Theory: with Applications to Finite Groups and Orders, Vol. 1*, Wiley, New York 1981.
- [10] Fu C-J., Keller B., *On cluster algebras with coefficients and 2-Calabi–Yau categories*, Trans. A.M.S. **362** (2010) 859–895
- [11] Fomin S., Zelevinsky A., *Cluster algebras I: Foundations*, J.A.M.S. **15** (2002) 497–529
- [12] Gross M., Hacking P., Keel S., Kontsevich M., *Canonical bases for cluster algebras*, J.A.M.S. **31** (2018) 497–608
- [13] Geiss C., Leclerc B., Schröer J., *Verma modules and preprojective algebras*, Nagoya Math. J. **182** (2006) 241–258
- [14] Geiss C., Leclerc B., Schröer J., *Partial flag varieties and preprojective algebras*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **58** (2008) 825–876
- [15] Geiss C., Leclerc B., Schröer J., *Generic bases for cluster algebras and the Chamber Ansatz*, J.A.M.S. **25** (2012) 21–76
- [16] Hodge W.V.D., *Some enumerative results in the theory of forms*, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. **39** (1943) 22–30

- [17] Hodge W.V.D., Pedoe D., *Methods of Algebraic Geometry: Vol. 2, Book IV: Quadrics and Grassmannian varieties*, C.U.P. 1952, 1994.
- [18] Jensen B.T., King A., Su X., *A categorification of Grassmannian cluster algebras*, Proc. L.M.S. **113** (2016) 185–212
- [19] Jensen B.T., King A., Su X., *Categorification and the quantum Grassmannian*, Adv. Math. **406** (2022) 108577 ([arXiv:1904.07849](#))
- [20] Keller B., Reiten I., *Cluster tilted algebras are Gorenstein and stably Calabi–Yau*, Adv. Math. **211** (2007) 123–151 ([arXiv:math/0512471](#))
- [21] Labardini-Fragoso D., de Laporte B., *Landau–Ginzburg potentials via projective representations*, [arXiv:2208.00028](#)
- [22] Lusztig G., *Quivers, perverse sheaves, and quantized enveloping algebras*, J.A.M.S. **4** (1991) 365–421
- [23] Marsh B.R., Rietsch K., *The B-model connection and mirror symmetry for Grassmannians*, Adv. Math. **336** (2020) 107027 ([arXiv:arXiv:1307.1085](#))
- [24] Muller G., Speyer D.E., *The twist for positroid varieties*, Proc. L.M.S. **115** (2017) 1014–1071
- [25] Oh S., Postnikov A., Speyer D.E., *Weak separation and plabic graphs*, Proc. L.M.S. **110** (2015) 721–754
- [26] Palu Y., *Cluster characters for 2-Calabi–Yau triangulated categories*, Ann. Inst. Fourier **58** (2008) 2221–2248
- [27] Plamondon P-G., *Generic bases for cluster algebras from the cluster category*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **2013–10** (2013) 2368–2420
- [28] Postnikov A., *Total positivity, Grassmannians and networks*, [arXiv:math/0609764](#)
- [29] Pressland M., *Calabi–Yau properties of Postnikov diagrams*, Forum Math. Sigma **10** (2022) e56 ([arXiv:1912.12475](#))
- [30] Rietsch K., Williams L., *Newton–Okounkov bodies, cluster duality and mirror symmetry for Grassmannians*, Duke Math. J. **168** (2019) 3437–3527
- [31] Scott J., *Grassmannians and cluster algebras*, Proc. L.M.S. **92** (2006) 345–380
- [32] Shen L., Weng D., *Cyclic sieving and cluster duality of Grassmannian*, SIGMA **16** (2020) 067
- [33] Talaska K., *A formula for Plücker coordinates associated with a planar network*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **2008** (2008) rnn081,

BTJ: DEPT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, NORWEGIAN UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, GJØVIK, TEKNOLOGVN. 22,2815 GJØVIK, NORWAY

*Email address:* `bernt.jensen@ntnu.no`

AK: DEPT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF BATH, BATH BA2 7AY, U.K.

*Email address:* `a.d.king@bath.ac.uk`

XS: DEPT OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF BATH, BATH BA2 7AY, U.K.

*Email address:* `xs214@bath.ac.uk`