

Finitistic dimension conjecture

Jacob Fjeld Grevstad

2020

Abstract

FDC yo!

Contents

Introduction	1
1 finitistic dimension and conjectures	1
1.1 Implications	1
2 Recollement	2
3 Contravariant finiteness	6
4 repdimension	10
4.1 The Igusa-Todorov function	13
5 Vanishing radical powers	15
6 Unbounded derived category	16
7 Personal appendix	17

Introduction

This is an introduction

1 finitistic dimension and conjectures

- FDC - finitistic dimesnion conjecture Finitistic dimension is always finite
- WTC - Watamatsu tilting conjecture
- GSC - Gorenstein symmetry conjecture
- NuC - Nunke condition
- SNC - strong Nakayama conjecture
- ARC - Auslander Reiten conjecture
- NC - Nakayama conjecture

1.1 Implications

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 FDC & \longrightarrow & WTC & \longrightarrow & GSC & & \\
 \downarrow & & & & & & \\
 NuC & \longrightarrow & SNC & \longrightarrow & ARC & \longrightarrow & NC
 \end{array}$$

Theorem 1.1. *[Hap93, 1.2]*

i) If $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ (FDC) then $K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)^\perp = 0$.

ii) If $K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)^\perp = 0$ then for $X \neq 0$ there exists i such that, $\text{Ext}^i(D(\Lambda), X) \neq 0$ (NuC).

Proof.

i) Let $I^\bullet \in K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)^\perp$ be non-zero. Since $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda) \cong K^{+,b}(\text{inj } \Lambda)$ we may assume I^\bullet is a complex of injectives, and WLOG we may assume it concentrated in degrees $i \geq 0$, and that $d^0 : I^0 \rightarrow I^1$ is not split mono. Since if its concentrated in degrees $i \geq k$ we can just shift it, and if d^0 is split mono then replacing I^0 by 0, and I^1 be I^1/I^0 gives a homotopic complex.

$\text{Hom}(D\Lambda, I^i)$ is in $\text{add Hom}(D\Lambda, D\Lambda) = \text{add } \Lambda$ so $\text{Hom}(D\Lambda, I^\bullet)$ is a complex of projectives.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & D\Lambda & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow & \swarrow \text{dashed} & \downarrow f & & \downarrow \\ I^{i-1} & \xrightarrow{d^{i-1}} & I^i & \xrightarrow{d^i} & I^{i+1} \end{array}$$

Since I^\bullet is in $K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)^\perp$ and $D\Lambda$ is in $K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)$, whenever $d^i f = 0$, f^\bullet is homotopic to 0. Meaning f factors through d^{i-1} . This means that $\text{Hom}(D\Lambda, I^\bullet)$ is an exact complex. Further since $\text{Hom}(D\Lambda, -)$ is an equivalence between $\text{inj } \Lambda$ and $\text{proj } \Lambda$ we have that $\text{Hom}(D\Lambda, d^0)$ is not split mono.

$\text{Cok Hom}(D\Lambda, d^i)$ has a projective resolution of length i . This resolution is the direct sum of the minimal resolution and an acyclic bounded complex of projectives. Since bounded acyclic complexes of projectives are split and $\text{Hom}(D\Lambda, d^0)$ is not, we must have that the minimal resolution has length i , and so $\text{findim}(\Lambda) = \infty$.

ii) Assume there is an $X \neq 0$ with $\text{Ext}^i(D\Lambda, X) = 0$ for all $i \geq 0$. Then X considered as a stalk complex is in $K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)^\perp$. Proceed by induction: If $I[-i] \in K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)$ is a stalk complex then $\mathcal{D}^b(I[-i], X) = \text{Ext}^i(I, X)$. This is 0 because $D\Lambda$ is the sum of the indecomposable injectives.

Let $I \in K^b(\text{inj } \Lambda)$ be a complex of width n . WLOG assume I concentrated in degrees $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. Then

$$I^0 \rightarrow I \rightarrow I^{<0} \rightarrow I^0[1]$$

is a triangle, and $I^{<0}$ has width $n-1$. Taking the long exact sequence in $\mathcal{D}^b(-, X)$ it follows that $\mathcal{D}^b(I, X) = 0$. \square

2 *Recollement*

Definition 2.1 (Recollement). A recollement is a collection of six functors satisfying:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & \overset{i^*}{\curvearrowright} & & \overset{j^!}{\curvearrowright} & \\ & \perp & & \perp & \\ \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda') & \xrightarrow{i_* = i_!} & \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda) & \xrightarrow{j^! = j^*} & \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda'') \\ & \perp & & \perp & \\ & \underset{i^!}{\curvearrowleft} & & \underset{j_*}{\curvearrowleft} & \end{array}$$

1. All functors are exact/triangulated
2. $j^*i_* = 0$
3. $i^*i_* \cong i^!i_! \cong id$ (induced by unit/counit)
4. $j^!j_! \cong j^*j_* \cong id$
5. For every $X \in \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)$ we have the following distinguished triangles:

$$j_!j^!X \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \xrightarrow{\eta} i_*i^*X \longrightarrow j_!j^!X[1]$$

$$i_!i^!X \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} X \xrightarrow{\eta} j_*j^*X \longrightarrow i_!i^!X[1]$$

Note that (3) and (4) are equivalent to i_* , $j_!$, and j^* being fully faithful.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda') \xrightleftharpoons[i_*]{i^*} \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)$ be exact functors with an adjoint pair (i^*, i_*) . Then i^* preserves bounded projective complexes and i_* preserves bounded injective complexes.*

Proof. The bounded projective complexes can be categories as the complexes P such that for any complex Y there is an integer t_Y such that $\text{Hom}(P, Y[t]) = 0$ for $t \geq t_Y$.

Let P be a bounded complex of projectives in $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)$. Then we want to show that i^*P is as well. Let Y be any complex in $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda')$. Then $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda')(i^*P, Y[t]) = \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)(P, i_*Y[t])$, so since P is a bounded complex of projectives there is t_Y such that this vanishes for $t \geq t_Y$.

The statement for injectives is exactly dual. □

Lemma 2.3. *Let $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda') \xrightleftharpoons[i^!]{i_*} \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)$ be exact functors with adjoint pairs*

(i^, i_*) and $(i_*, i^!)$. Then the homology of i_*X is uniformly bounded for $X \in \text{mod } \Lambda'$. I.e. there is an r such that $H^j(i_*X) = 0$ is 0 outside of $j \in (-r, r)$.*

Proof. We first prove that there is an r' such that $H^j(i_*X) = 0$ for $j \geq r'$. Let P be $i^*\Lambda \in \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda') = K^{-,b}(\text{proj } \Lambda')$. Then by lemma 2.2 P is abounded complex of projectives.

Thus there is an r' such that $P^{-j} = 0$ for $j \geq r'$. Then $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda')(P, X[j]) = \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)(\Lambda, i_*X[j]) = H^j(i_*X) = 0$ for $j \geq r'$ and any Λ' -module X .

Next we prove that there is an r'' such that $H^{-j}(i_*X) = 0$ for $j \geq r''$. The argument is completely dual. Let I be $i^!D\Lambda \in \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda') = K^{+,b}(\text{inj } \Lambda')$. Then again by lemma 2.2 I is bounded complex of injectives.

Thus there is an r'' such that $I^j = 0$ for $j \geq r''$. Then $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda')(X, I[j]) = \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)(i_*X, D\Lambda[j]) = H^{-j}(i_*X) = 0$ for $j \geq r''$ and any Λ' -module X .

Letting r be the maximum of r' and r'' we get that $H^j(X)$ is zero outside of $(-r, r)$. \square

Theorem 2.4. [Hap93, 3.3] *Given a recollement FDC holds for middle if and only if it holds for the two others.*

Proof. Assume FDC holds for Λ , we begin by showing it holds for Λ' .

Let $T = \Lambda'/\text{rad } \Lambda'$. Then the projective dimension of X is the largest t for which $\text{Ext}^t(X, T) \neq 0$. Let X be a module in $\text{mod } \Lambda'$ with finite projective dimension. Then since X is isomorphic to its projective resolution, by lemma 2.2 i_*X is a bounded complex of projectives. Say:

$$i_*X = 0 \rightarrow P^{-s} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P^{s'} \rightarrow 0$$

By lemma 2.3 we know there is an r independent of X such that $H^{-j}(X) = 0$ for $j \geq r$. Truncating i_*X at $-r$ gives a projective resolution of $\ker d_{i_*X}^{-r}$. Since Λ satisfies FDC this means that $s \leq r + \text{findim}(\Lambda)$.

Since i_*T is in $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)$ it is a bounded complex, in particular there is a t_0 such that $i_*T^t = 0$ for $t \geq t_0$. Then by the bounds above $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)(i_*X, i_*T[t]) = 0$ for $t \geq t_0 + r + \text{findim}(\Lambda)$. Since i_* is fully faithful this equals $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda')(X, T[t])$, and so $\text{findim}(\Lambda') \leq t_0 + r + \text{findim}(\Lambda)$. That is, Λ' satisfies FDC.

The proof for Λ'' is the same, just replacing i_* with $j_!$.

For the converse assume Λ' and Λ'' satisfy FDC. Let $T = \Lambda/\text{rad } \Lambda$, and X be a Λ -module with finite projective dimension. By definition 2.1 (5) we have distinguished triangles:

$$j_!j^!X \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow i_*i^*X \longrightarrow j_!j^!X[1]$$

$$i_!i^!T \longrightarrow T \longrightarrow j_*j^*T \longrightarrow i_!i^!T[1]$$

Let $(-, -)_m := \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)(-, -[m])$, and $X_j := j_! j^! X$, $X_i := i_* i^* X$, $T_i := i_! i^! T$, $T_j = j_* j^* T$. Then we have long exact sequences:

$$\cdots \longrightarrow (X, T_i)_m \longrightarrow (X, T)_m \longrightarrow (X, T_j)_m \longrightarrow (X, T_i)_{m+1} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

$$\cdots \longrightarrow (X_i, T_i)_m \longrightarrow (X, T_i)_m \longrightarrow (X_j, T_i)_m \longrightarrow (X_i, T_i)_{m+1} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

$$\cdots \longrightarrow (X_i, T_j)_m \longrightarrow (X, T_j)_m \longrightarrow (X_j, T_j)_m \longrightarrow (X_i, T_j)_{m+1} \longrightarrow \cdots$$

We have

$$(X_i, T_j)_m = (i_* i^* X, j_* j^* T)_m = (j^* i_* i^* X, j^* T)_m = 0$$

and

$$(X_j, T_i)_m = (j_! j^! X, i_! i^! T)_m = (j^! X, j^! i_! i^! T)_m = 0$$

which combined with long exact sequences gives us that $(X_i, T_i)_m = (X, T_i)_m$ and $(X_j, T_j)_m = (X, T_j)_m$. If we can show that $(X_i, T_i)_m$ and $(X_j, T_j)_m$ are bounded, then $(X, T_i)_m$ and $(X, T_j)_m$, and consequently $(X, T)_m$ would be bounded. Which would give a bound on the projective dimension of X .

We start by bounding $(X, T_i)_m = (X_i, T_i)_m$. First note that

$$(X_i, T_i)_m = (i_* i^* X, i_! i^! T)_m = (i^* i_* i^* X, i^! T)_m = (i^* X, i^! T)_m$$

Since X has finite projective dimension we can think of it as a bounded complex of projectives. Then by lemma 2.2 $i^* X$ is as well. By the second half of lemma 2.3 (using (i^*, i_*) instead of $(i_*, i^!)$) we have that there is an r such that $H^{-j}(i^* X) = 0$ for all $j \geq r$. This means that thinking of $i^* X$ as a complex of projectives it is 0 in degree t for all $t \leq -(r + \text{pd ker } d_{i^* X}^r)$, in particular it is 0 for all $t \leq -(r + \text{findim}(\Lambda'))$. Since $i^! T$ is a bounded complex, it has an upper bound, say t_0 . Thus $(i^* X, i^! T)_m = 0$ for all $m \geq t_0 + r + \text{findim}(\Lambda')$.

The bound on $(X, T_j)_m$ is similar, using the finitistic dimension of Λ'' . Taking the maximum of these two bounds we get a bound on $(X, T)_m$, which gives a bound on the projective dimension independent of X , hence a bound on $\text{findim}(\Lambda)$. \square

3 Contravariant finiteness

Definition 3.1 (Resolving). A full subcategory of an abelian category is called resolving if

- It is closed under extensions
- It contains the projectives
- It contains the kernels of its epimorphisms

Note that the subcategory of modules with finite projective dimension is resolving.

Lemma 3.2. *Let \mathcal{X} be coresolving. Then $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{X}, Y) = 0$ implies that $\text{Ext}^i(\mathcal{X}, Y) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{X} contains the projectives ΩX is the kernel of an epimorphism in \mathcal{X} . Thus \mathcal{X} contains all syzygies. $\text{Ext}^i(X, Y) = \text{Ext}^1(\Omega^{i-1}X, Y) = 0$. \square

Proposition 3.3. *If \mathcal{X} is resolving then $\mathcal{Y} := \ker \text{Ext}^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{X}, -) = \ker \text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{X}, -)$ is closed under extensions.*

Proof. Let $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow E \rightarrow Y' \rightarrow 0$ be an extension of objects in \mathcal{Y} , and let X be an object of \mathcal{X} . Then we get an exact sequence

$$0 = \text{Ext}(X, Y) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}(X, E) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}(X, Y') = 0$$

Thus $\text{Ext}(X, E) = 0$ and E is in \mathcal{Y} . \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let \mathcal{X} be a contravariantly finite, resolving subcategory of $\text{mod } \Lambda$. Then for every object $C \in \text{mod } \Lambda$ there is a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ with $X \rightarrow C$ minimal \mathcal{X} -approximation and $\text{Ext}^i(\mathcal{X}, Y) = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$.*

Proof. Since \mathcal{X} is contravariantly finite C has a minimal approximation $X \rightarrow C$. Since \mathcal{X} contains the projective cover of C this approximation must be an epimorphism. So it is part of a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$. Let X' be an arbitrary object in \mathcal{X} . Taking the long exact sequence in $\text{Ext}(X', -)$ gives us

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \text{Hom}(X', Y) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(X', X) & \longrightarrow & \text{Hom}(X', C) & & \\
 & & & & & \searrow & \\
 & & & & & & \text{Ext}(X', Y) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}(X', X) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}(X', C)
 \end{array}$$

Since $X \rightarrow C$ is an approximation we know that $\text{Hom}(X', X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(X', C)$ is epi. Thus if we can prove that $\text{Ext}(X', X) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X', C)$ is mono we would have that $\text{Ext}(X', Y) = 0$. Assume we have an element of $\text{Ext}(X', X)$ that is mapped to 0, i.e. we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & C \oplus X' & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & 0
 \end{array}$$

Since \mathcal{X} is closed under extensions E is in \mathcal{X} . By composing with projection $C \oplus X' \rightarrow C$ we get a commutative triangle

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X & \longrightarrow & E \\
 \downarrow & \swarrow & \\
 C & &
 \end{array}$$

since $X \rightarrow C$ is an approximation we get that $E \rightarrow C$ factors through X . The endomorphism $X \rightarrow E \rightarrow X$ leaves the approximation unchanged, so by minimality it must be an isomorphism. Hence $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow E \rightarrow X' \rightarrow 0$ is split and $\text{Ext}(X', X) \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X', C)$ is injective. Thus $\text{Ext}(X', Y) = 0$. \square

Theorem 3.5. [AR91, 3.8] *Let \mathcal{X} be a contravariantly finite, resolving subcategory of $\text{mod } \Lambda$. Let X_i be the minimal approximation of S_i . Then any $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is a direct summand of an X_i -filtered module.*

Proof. The first part of the proof is to show by induction on length that any module C is in an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ with X X_i -filtered and $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{X}, Y) = 0$.

For the base case if $C = S_i$ is simple then by lemma 3.4 we have an exact sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X_i \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$.

For the induction step, assume it holds for all modules of length less than n , and let C be a module of length n . Then by Jordan-Hölder C is the extension of two modules of length less than n . Say

$$0 \longrightarrow C' \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow C'' \longrightarrow 0$$

Applying the induction hypothesis we get a diagram on the form

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & 0 & & 0 & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & Y' & & Y'' & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ & & X' & & X'' & & \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & C'' \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & & & 0 \end{array}$$

Taking the pullback of $X'' \rightarrow C''$ we get a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & X'' \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & C'' \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \end{array}$$

Since Y' satisfies $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{X}, Y') = 0$ by lemma 3.2 it also satisfies $\text{Ext}^2(\mathcal{X}, Y') = 0$. In particular from the long exact sequence we get that $X' \rightarrow C'$ induces an isomorphism $\text{Ext}(X'', X') \rightarrow \text{Ext}(X'', C)$. Thus $0 \rightarrow C' \rightarrow E \rightarrow X'' \rightarrow 0$ comes from a sequence $0 \rightarrow X' \rightarrow X \rightarrow X'' \rightarrow 0$. In other words we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & Y' & & Y'' & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & X'' \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & C'' \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array}$$

Applying the snake lemma we can fill out the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & Y' & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & Y'' \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & X' & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & X'' \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & C'' \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array}$$

Since X is an extension of X_i -filtered modules, it is also X_i -filtered. Since Y is the extension of Y'' and Y' it follows from proposition 3.3 that $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{X}, Y) = 0$.

Hence any C fits into a sequence $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ with X being X_i -filtered and $\text{Ext}(\mathcal{X}, Y) = 0$.

Now suppose that C is in \mathcal{X} , and let $0 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be as before. Then we get that

$$\text{Hom}(C, X) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(C, C) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}^1(C, Y) = 0$$

is exact, and thus C is a direct summand of X . So every object in \mathcal{X} is a direct summand of an X_i -filtered module. \square

Corollary 3.5.1. *If the subcategory of modules with finite projective dimension is contravariantly finite, then the finitistic dimension is the supremum of the projective dimension of X_i . In particular it is finite.*

4 repdimension

Many results based on the survey [Opp09].

Definition 4.1 (dominated dimension). Let $\Lambda \longrightarrow I_0 \longrightarrow I_1 \longrightarrow \dots$ be a minimal injective resolution of Λ . Then the dominated dimension of Λ is $\inf\{n \mid I_n \text{ is not projective}\}$.

Definition 4.2 (rep-dimesnion). Let A be defined by

$$A = \{\Gamma \mid \text{domdim} \Gamma \geq 2, \Lambda \text{ morita equivalent to } \text{End}_\Gamma(I_0(\Gamma))\}$$

where $I_0(\Gamma)$ is the injective envelope of Γ . Then the repdimesnion of Λ is the minimal global dimension of $\Gamma \in A$.

Proposition 4.3. *(all modules are right modules) Repdim is the same as minimal global dimension of $\text{End}(M)$ for M being both a generator and cogenerator.*

Proof. Consider $\Gamma \in A$. Since $\text{domdim} \Gamma \geq 1$, $I_0(\Gamma)$ is the sum of all projective-injective modules (some probably several times).

Let \mathcal{S} be the set of all Γ -modules with a copresentation

$$0 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow I_0 \longrightarrow I_1$$

with I_i in $\text{add } I_0(\Gamma)$. In particular Γ is in \mathcal{S} , because $\text{domdim} \Gamma \geq 2$.

The Yoneda embedding gives an equivalence

$$\text{Hom}_\Gamma(-, I_0(\Gamma)) : \text{add } I_0(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{proj } \text{End}_\Gamma(I_0(\Gamma))^{\text{op}}$$

, and thus we get an equivalence

$$D \text{Hom}_\Gamma(-, I_0(\Gamma)) : \text{add } I_0(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{inj } \text{End}_\Gamma(I_0(\Gamma))$$

Since $I_0(\Gamma)$ is injective $D \text{Hom}(-, I_0(\Gamma))$ is exact and preserves kernels, so extends to an equivalence

$$\text{Hom}_\Gamma(-, I_0(\Gamma)) : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \text{mod } \text{End}_\Gamma(I_0(\Gamma))$$

can probably reformulate this in terms of projectives and left modules... is there any significance to the distinction?

I guess this is Auslanders original definition

Since $\text{End}_\Gamma(I_0(\Gamma))$ is morita equivalent to Λ , \mathcal{S} is equivalent to $\text{mod } \Lambda$. $\Gamma \in \mathcal{S}$ is clearly a generator. To see that it is a cogenerator note that Γ contains all the projective-injective indecomposable objects as direct summands, so there is an injection $I_0(\Gamma) \rightarrow \Gamma^n$, and since $I_0(\Gamma)$ is a cogenerator in \mathcal{S} , Γ is aswell.

Thus by the equivalence $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \text{mod } \Lambda$ there is a cogenerator-generator object M such that $\text{End}_\Lambda(M) = \text{End}_\Gamma(\Gamma) = \Gamma$.

The last step of the proof is showing that $\text{End}(M)$ is in A whenever M is a generator-cogenerator.

Let $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow I_0(M) \rightarrow I_1(M)$ be a minimal injective copresentation of M . Since M is a cogenerator $I_i(M)$ is in $\text{add } M$, thus we get an exact sequence of projective $\text{End}(M)$ -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \text{End}(M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, I_0(M)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(M, I_1(M)). \quad (1)$$

Now we have the following isomorphisms of Λ - $\text{End}(M)$ -bimodules

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, D\Lambda) &= \\ \text{Hom}_k(M \otimes \Lambda, k) &= \\ \text{Hom}_k(M, k) &= \\ DM &= \\ D \text{Hom}_\Lambda(\Lambda, M) \end{aligned}$$

Since Λ is in $\text{add } M$, $\text{Hom}(\Lambda, M)$ is projective, and thus $D \text{Hom}(\Lambda, M) = \text{Hom}(M, D\Lambda)$ is injective. This means that (1) is an injective copresentation, and thus $\text{domdim } \text{End}(M) \geq 2$.

Since $\text{Hom}(M, I_0(M))$ is the beginning of an injective resolution of $\text{End}(M)$, $I_0(\text{End}(M))$, must be a direct summand. Then $\text{Hom}(M, I_0(M))/I_0(\text{End}(M))$ would map injectively into $\text{Hom}(M, I_1(M))$, but that would mean theres a direct summand of $I_0(M)$ mapping injectively into $I_1(M)$, contradicting minimality. Thus $\text{Hom}(M, I_0(M)) = I_0(\text{End}(M))$.

Let $I = I_0(M)$ and $\Gamma = \text{End}_\Lambda(I)$, then $D \text{Hom}(-, I)$ is an exact equivalence from $\text{add } I$ to $\text{inj } \Gamma$. Since I is an injective cogenerator $\text{add } I = \text{inj } \Lambda$. Then because of exactness $D \text{Hom}(-, I)$ becomes an equivalence between $K^{+,b}(\text{inj } \Lambda)$ and $K^{+,b}(\text{inj } \Gamma)$. Considering only those complexes with homology in degree 0, we see that $\text{mod } \Lambda$ is equivalent to $\text{mod } \Gamma$. So Λ is morita equivalent to $\Gamma = \text{End}(I_0(M)) = \text{End}(I_0(\text{End}(M)))$. \square

Definition 4.4. Let X be an object of $\text{mod } \Lambda$ and M a contravariantly finite subcategory.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \cdots & \longrightarrow & M_2 & \longrightarrow & M_1 & \longrightarrow & M_0 \\
 & \searrow & \uparrow & \searrow & \uparrow & \searrow & \uparrow \\
 & & \Omega_M^3 X & & \Omega_M^2 X & & \Omega_M X \\
 & & & & & & \searrow \\
 & & & & & & X
 \end{array}$$

If \rightarrow are minimal M -approximations (they need not be surjective), and \hookrightarrow are their kernels, then this is an M -resolution of X . The M -res-dimension of X is the length of the sequence of (nonzero) M_i 's, and the M -res-dimension of Λ is the supremum of the dimension on its objects.

Proposition 4.5. *Repdim-2 is the minimum of M -res-dim(mod Λ) for M both generator and cogenerator (assuming repdim is at least 2).*

Proof. The functor $\text{Hom}(M, -)$ is an equivalence from $\text{add } M$ to $\text{proj End}(M)$, which maps minimal M -approximations to projective covers. Let X be any module in $\text{mod End}(M)$ with projective dimension at least 2. Then it has a projective presentation

$$\Omega^2 X \rightarrow (M, M_1) \rightarrow (M, M_0) \rightarrow X.$$

Because of the equivalence this is induced by a map $f : M_1 \rightarrow M_0$. Since Hom is left exact we have that $\Omega^2 X \cong \text{Hom}(M, \ker f)$, and so the projective dimension of X is 2 plus the M -res-dimension of $\ker f$.

Since M is a cogenerator any module Y in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ has a copresentation

$$0 \longrightarrow Y \longrightarrow M_0 \xrightarrow{f} M_1.$$

Applying $\text{Hom}(M, -) =: (M, -)$ we get

$$0 \longrightarrow (M, Y) \longrightarrow (M, M_0) \xrightarrow{(M, f)} (M, M_1) \longrightarrow \text{Cok}(M, f) \longrightarrow 0.$$

If the projective dimension of $\text{Cok}(M, f)$ is less than 2, then (M, Y) is a direct summand of (M, M_0) . This means that $(M, Y) \cong (M, M')$, so the minimal M -approximation of Y is M' , and $(M, \Omega_M Y) = 0$. Since M is a generator this means $\Omega_M Y = 0$ and thus the M -res-dimension of Y is 0.

So provided the projective dimension of $\text{Cok}(M, f)$ is larger than or equal to 2, it equals the M -res-dimension of Y plus 2. In particular the global dimension of $\text{End}(M)$ is 2 plus the M -res-dimension of $\text{mod } \Lambda$, provided it is at least 2. \square

4.1 The Igusa-Todorov function

Let K be the free abelian group generated by isomorphism classes of modules, modulo the relations $[A \oplus B] = [A] + [B]$ and $[P] = 0$ when P is projective. Define the linear map $L : K \rightarrow K$ by $L[A] = [\Omega A]$. For any module X , $[\text{add } X]$ is a finitely generated subgroup of K . Fitting's lemma tells us that there is an integer η_X such that $L : L^m[\text{add } X] \rightarrow L^{m+1}[\text{add } X]$ is an isomorphism for every $m \geq \eta_X$. We define $\psi(X)$ to be $\eta_X + \sup\{\text{pd } Y \mid Y \in \text{add } \Omega^{\eta_X} X, \text{pd } Y < \infty\}$.

Lemma 4.6. *[IT05, Lemma 3]*

1. $\psi(M) = \text{pd } M$ when $\text{pd } M < \infty$.
2. $\psi(M^k) = \psi(M)$
3. $\psi(M) \leq \psi(M \oplus N)$
4. If Z is a direct summand of $\Omega^n(M)$ where $n \leq \eta_M$ and $\text{pd } Z < \infty$, then $\text{pd } Z + n \leq \psi(M)$.

Proof.

1. If $\text{pd } M < \infty$ then $L^m \neq 0$ for $m < \text{pd } M$, and $L^m = 0$ for $m \geq \text{pd } M$.
2. $\text{add } M^k = \text{add } M$, and ψ is only defined in terms of additive categories.
3. $\text{add } M \subseteq \text{add } M \oplus N$, so if L is injective when restricted to $L^m(\text{add } M \oplus N)$ then L is injective when restricted to $L^m(\text{add } M)$, so $\eta_M \leq \eta_{M \oplus N}$. Further $\Omega^{\eta_{M \oplus N} - \eta_M} \text{add } \Omega^{\eta_M} M \subset \text{add } \Omega^{\eta_{M \oplus N}} M \oplus N$, so $\psi(M) \leq \psi(M \oplus N)$.
4. Let $p = \text{pd } Z$ and $k = \eta_M - n$. Then $\Omega^k Z$ is in $\text{add } \Omega^{\eta_M} M$, so $\text{pd } \Omega^k Z + \eta_M \leq \psi(M)$. Thus

$$\text{pd } Z + n = p + n = (p - k) + \eta_M \leq \text{pd } \Omega^k Z + \eta_M \leq \psi(M).$$

□

Theorem 4.7. *[IT05, Theorem 4] Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be a short exact sequence of modules with $\text{pd } C < \infty$. Then $\text{pd } C \leq \psi(A \oplus B) + 1$.*

Proof. Let P_A^\bullet and P_C^\bullet be the minimal projective resolutions of A and C . Then we get a map of short exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & P_A^0 & \longrightarrow & P_A^0 \oplus P_C^0 & \longrightarrow & P_C^0 \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

Applying the snake lemma we get $0 \rightarrow \Omega A \rightarrow \Omega B \oplus P \rightarrow \Omega C \rightarrow 0$ for some projective P . Thus for some $n \leq \text{pd } C$ we have $L^n[A] = L^n[B]$, and let n be the minimal such number. Clearly $n \leq \eta_{A \oplus B}$. Let $X = \Omega^n A = \Omega^n B$, then our sequence of n -syzygies looks like

$$0 \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow X \oplus P \longrightarrow \Omega^n C \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let f be the composition $X \longrightarrow X \oplus P \xrightarrow{\pi_X} X$. Then by fittings lemma X breaks as a direct sum into two components $X = Z \oplus Y$ such that $f = f_Z \oplus f_Y$ with f_Y an isomorphism and f_Z nilpotent. In other words the sequence above can be written as

$$0 \longrightarrow Z \oplus Y \longrightarrow Z \oplus Y \oplus P \longrightarrow \Omega^n C \longrightarrow 0.$$

with the left map being

$$\begin{bmatrix} f_Z & 0 \\ 0 & f_Y \\ * & * \end{bmatrix} \sim \begin{bmatrix} f_Z & 0 \\ 0 & f_Y \\ * & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

So we get another short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow Z \oplus P \longrightarrow \Omega^n C \longrightarrow 0.$$

Let $T = \Lambda/\text{rad}(\Lambda)$ and apply the long exact sequence in $\text{Ext}(-, T)$. Then we get an exact sequence

$$\text{Ext}^k(Z, T) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}^k(Z \oplus P, T) \longrightarrow \text{Ext}^{k+1}(\Omega^n C, T)$$

where the left map is induced by f_Z since $\text{Ext}^k(Z \oplus P, T) \cong \text{Ext}^k(Z, T)$. Since f_Z is nilpotent this map is surjective if and only if $\text{Ext}^k(Z, T) = 0$, and $\Omega^n C$ has finite projective dimension we have that Z has finite projective dimension. In particular $\text{pd } \Omega^n C - 1 \leq \text{pd } Z \leq \text{pd } \Omega^n C$.

Since Z is a direct summand of $\Omega^n A \oplus B$ by lemma 4.6 we have that $\text{pd } Z + n \leq \psi(A \oplus B)$, and thus $\text{pd } \Omega^n C - 1 + n = \text{pd } C - 1 \leq \psi(A \oplus B)$. \square

Theorem 4.8. [IT05, Corollary 8] *If $\Lambda = \text{End}_\Gamma(P)$ for an algebra Γ with global dimension at most 3, and P projective then $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$.*

Proof. Let X be any Λ -module with finite projective dimension. Then it has a projective presentation $(P, P_1) \rightarrow (P, P_0) \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$ where $(P, P_i) = \text{Hom}_\Gamma(P, P_i)$ with $P_i \in \text{add } P$. Since $(P, -)$ is an equivalence from $\text{add } P$ to $\text{proj } \Lambda$ this corresponds to a map $P_1 \rightarrow P_0$ which we can extend to a projective resolution in Γ :

$$0 \longrightarrow P_3 \longrightarrow P_2 \longrightarrow P_1 \longrightarrow P_0.$$

Applying the exact functor $(P, -)$, we get an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (P, P_3) \longrightarrow (P, P_2) \longrightarrow (P, P_1) \longrightarrow (P, P_0) \longrightarrow X \longrightarrow 0.$$

Truncating this we get a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (P, P_3) \longrightarrow (P, P_2) \longrightarrow \Omega^2 X \longrightarrow 0.$$

Then by theorem 4.7 the projective dimension of $\Omega^2 X$ is bounded by $\psi((P, P_3) \oplus (P, P_2)) + 1$. Which means

$$\text{pd } X \leq \psi((P, P_3) \oplus (P, P_2)) + 3 \leq \psi((P, \Gamma)) + 3$$

Since this bound doesn't depend on X , Λ has finite finitistic dimension. \square

Corollary 4.8.1. *If $\text{repdim}(\Lambda) \leq 3$ then $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$.*

Proof. If Λ has rep-dimension less than or equal to 3 then by proposition 4.3 there is a generator-cogenerator M in $\text{mod } \Lambda$ such that $\Gamma := \text{End}_\Lambda(M)$ has global dimension 3 or less. Then since M is a generator Λ is in $\text{add } M$ and so $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, \Lambda)$ is a projective Γ -module with $\text{End}_\Gamma(\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, \Lambda)) = \text{End}_\Lambda(\Lambda) = \Lambda$. \square

5 Vanishing radical powers

Throughout this section Λ is a finite dimensional algebra, and J is its radical.

Theorem 5.1. *If $J^2 = 0$ then $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$.*

Proof. Let $d = \max\{\text{pd } S_i \mid \text{pd } S_i < \infty\}$ where S_i ranges over the simple Λ -modules. Let M be a module with $\text{pd } M < \infty$. Let $P \rightarrow M$ be a projective cover. Then ΩM is contained in JP and since $J^2P = 0$, ΩM is annihilated by J and is thus semisimple. This means $\text{pd } \Omega M \leq d$, and thus $\text{pd } M \leq d + 1$. So $\text{findim}(\Lambda) \leq d + 1$. \square

Theorem 5.2. [IT05, Corollary 6] *If $J^3 = 0$ then $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$.*

Proof. Let M be a module with $\text{pd } M < \infty$, and let $P^0 \rightarrow M$ be its projective cover. Since $\Omega M \subseteq JP^0$ we have $J^2\Omega M = 0$. Let $P \rightarrow \Omega M$ be a projective cover. Since $J^2\Omega M = 0$ we can factorize this as $P \rightarrow P/J^2P \rightarrow \Omega M$, and we get a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (\Omega^2 M + J^2 P)/J^2 P \longrightarrow P/J^2 P \longrightarrow \Omega M \longrightarrow 0$$

Let ψ be the Igusa-Todorov function as introduced in section 4.1. Since $\Omega^2 M \subseteq JP$ we have that $(\Omega^2 M + J^2 P)/J^2 P$ is semisimple. Then by lemma 4.6 $\psi((\Omega^2 M + J^2 P)/J^2 P) = \psi(\Lambda/J)$, and $\psi(P/J^2 P) = \psi(\Lambda/J^2)$.

Applying theorem 4.7 to the short exact sequence above we thus get $\text{pd } \Omega M \leq \psi(\Lambda/J \oplus \Lambda/J^2) + 1$, and so $\text{pd } M \leq \psi(\Lambda/J \oplus \Lambda/J^2) + 2$, and $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$. \square

6 Unbounded derived category

If we go to the unbounded derived category we can get a sort of converse to theorem 1.1.

Theorem 6.1. [Ric19, Theorem 4.3] *If the localizing category of $D\Lambda$ is the entire unbounded derived category then $\text{Findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$. (Note the capital F meaning the finitistic dimension of $\text{Mod } \Lambda$, which is bigger than or equal to that of $\text{mod } \Lambda$).*

Proof. Assume $\text{Findim}(\Lambda) = \infty$. Then there are modules M_i with projective dimension i for every $i \geq 0$. Let P_i be the minimal projective resolution of M_i , and consider $\bigoplus P_i[-i]$ and $\prod P_i[-i]$. Both of these have homology M_i in degree i , and are concentrated in non-negative degrees.

The inclusion from the sum to the product is clearly a quasi-isomorphism. We want to show that it is not a homotopy equivalence. Assume for the sake of contradiction that it was. Then tensoring with $\Lambda/\text{rad}(\Lambda)$ would give

us another homotopy equivalence. Since $\Lambda/\text{rad}(\Lambda)$ is finitely presented tensoring preserves both products and coproducts. Because all the resolutions were minimal tensoring with $\Lambda/\text{rad}(\Lambda)$ gives us 0 differentials. In degree 0 we get

$$\bigoplus \text{Tor}_i(M_i, \Lambda/\text{rad}(\Lambda)) \rightarrow \prod \text{Tor}_i(M_i, \Lambda/\text{rad}(\Lambda)).$$

Since $\text{Tor}_i(M_i, \Lambda/\text{rad}(\Lambda))$ is nonzero for every M_i this map is not an isomorphism, and so we don't have a homotopy equivalence.

So the cone of the inclusion $\bigoplus P_i[-i] \rightarrow \prod P_i[-i]$, C , is 0 in the derived category, but non-zero in the homotopy category. Since Λ is artinian the product of projectives is projective [Cha60, Theorem 3.3], so $\prod P_i[-i]$ is a complex of projectives, which means that C is a complex of projectives.

In other words C is an acyclic lower bounded complex of projectives that is not contractible. Tensoring with $D\Lambda$ is an equivalence from projectives to injectives, so $C \otimes D\Lambda$ is an lower bounded complex of injectives that is not contractible. Such a complex cannot be acyclic so $C \otimes D\Lambda$ has homology.

The homology of C is 0, so $K(\Lambda)(\Lambda, C[i]) = 0$. Applying the equivalence $- \otimes D\Lambda$ we get

$$\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)(D\Lambda, C \otimes D\Lambda[i]) = K(\Lambda)(D\Lambda, C \otimes D\Lambda[i]) = 0.$$

This means that $C \otimes D\Lambda$ is not in the localizing category generated by $D\Lambda$, and so that is not the entire derived category. \square

Theorem 6.2. [Ric19, Theorem 4.4] *Findim(Λ) $< \infty$ if and only if $D\Lambda^\perp \cap \mathcal{D}^+(\Lambda) = 0$.*

Proof. In the theorem above we proved that when the finitistic dimension is infinite then there is a non-zero complex in $\mathcal{D}^+(\Lambda)$ perpendicular to $D\Lambda$.

The proof of the converse is the same as for theorem 1.1. If we have a non-zero object $X \in D\Lambda^\perp \cap \mathcal{D}^+(\Lambda) \neq 0$, then $\mathcal{D}(\Lambda)(D\Lambda, X)$ is a non-split complex of projectives that continue arbitrarily to the right. So the cokernels have arbitrarily big projective dimension. \square

7 Personal appendix

Theorem 7.1. *The global dimension of an artin algebra is the supremum of k with $\text{Ext}^k(T, T) \neq 0$ (T sum of simples). This is also the supremum of projective dimension and supremum of injective dimension.*

Proof. For a minimal projective resolution $\text{Hom}(-, T)$ makes the differentials 0, and similarly with $\text{Hom}(T, -)$ and injective resolutions. So $\text{Ext}^k(M, T)$ is only 0 exactly when $k > \text{pd } M$, similarly $\text{Ext}^k(T, M)$ is only 0 when k is bigger than the injective dimension. Since any module is built by extensions of simples you can prove by induction, and the long exact sequence in $\text{Ext}(-, T)$ you get that any module has projective dimension less than or equal to that of T . Similarly for injective dimension. \square

$\text{findim}(\Lambda)$ need not equal $\text{findim}(\Lambda^{op}) = \sup\{\text{injective dimension of } M \mid M \text{ has finite injective dimension}\}$.

Example 7.2. [hf] Let $\Lambda = k \left[a \underset{c}{\overset{b}{\curvearrowright}} 1 \underset{c}{\overset{b}{\curvearrowright}} 2 \right] / (a^2, ac, ba, cbc)$. Then $\text{findim}(\Lambda) \geq 1$, but $\text{findim}(\Lambda^{op}) = 0$.

Proof. The module $\begin{smallmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{smallmatrix} = P_1/P_2$ (k^2 where a acts by $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and b and c act trivially) has projective dimension 1, so $\text{findim}(\Lambda) \geq 1$. The projective/injective modules of Λ are:

$$P_1 = \begin{smallmatrix} & 1 \\ 1 & \\ & 2 \end{smallmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{smallmatrix} & 2 \\ 1 & \\ & 2 \end{smallmatrix}, \quad I_1 = \begin{smallmatrix} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ 1 & \end{smallmatrix}, \quad I_2 = \begin{smallmatrix} & 1 \\ & 2 \\ 1 & \\ & 2 \end{smallmatrix}$$

If $\text{findim}(\Lambda^{op}) > 0$ there would be a module with finite non-zero injective resolution. In particular it would end with a non-split epimorphism between injectives. I claim this would mean there is a non-split epimorphism $I \rightarrow I_i$ from an injective to an indecomposable injective. Obviously we get epimorphisms by composing with the projections onto summands, so we want to show that they are not split. Assume that they are, that is the map looks like

$$\begin{array}{ccc} I_i \oplus I & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ f & g \end{bmatrix}} & I_i \oplus I' \\ & \searrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ & & I_i \end{array}$$

We see that by changing basis in the domain we get the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & g \end{bmatrix}$. Thus I_i is mapped isomorphically to itself, which doesn't happen in a minimal resolution.

The only thing left to show is that there are no non-split epimorphisms from injective modules to I_1 and I_2 . \square

References

- [AR91] Maurice Auslander and Idun Reiten. Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories. *Adv. Math.*, 86(1):111–152, 1991.
- [Cha60] Stephen U. Chase. Direct products of modules. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 97:457–473, 1960.
- [Hap93] Dieter Happel. Reduction techniques for homological conjectures. *Tsukuba J. Math.*, 17(1):115–130, 1993.
- [hf] Jacob FG (<https://mathoverflow.net/users/157483/jacob fg>). Is there a finite dimensional algebra with left finitistic dimension different from its right finitistic dimension? MathOverflow. URL:<https://mathoverflow.net/q/376211> (version: 2020-11-11).
- [IT05] Kiyoshi Igusa and Gordana Todorov. On the finitistic global dimension conjecture for Artin algebras. In *Representations of algebras and related topics*, volume 45 of *Fields Inst. Commun.*, pages 201–204. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2005.
- [Opp09] Steffen Oppermann. Representation dimension of artin algebras. https://folk.ntnu.no/opperman/repdim_survey.pdf, 2009.
- [Ric19] Jeremy Rickard. Unbounded derived categories and the finitistic dimension conjecture. *Adv. Math.*, 354:106735, 21, 2019.