

# Finitistic dimension conjecture

Jacob Fjeld Grevstad

2020

## **Abstract**

FDC yo! This is abstract!

## Contents

## Introduction

This is an introduction

### 1 The homological conjectures

- FDC - finitistic dimesnion conjecture

Finitistic dimension is always finite

- WTC - Watamatsu tilting conjecture

A module is called watamatsu tilting if

- $\text{Ext}^n(T, T) = 0$  for all  $n > 0$ .
- There is an exact sequence

$$\eta : 0 \rightarrow \Lambda \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \cdots$$

where  $T_i$  is in  $\text{add } T$ .

- $\text{Hom}(\eta, T)$  is exact. I.e.  $\text{Ext}^1(\text{Ker } f, T) = 0$  for every  $f$  in  $\eta$ .

WTC says that any watamatsu tilting module with finite projective dimension is a tilting module. I.e  $\eta$  can be chosen to be bounded.

- GSC - Gorenstein symmetry conjecture

The injective dimension of  ${}_{\Lambda}\Lambda$  is finite if and only if the projective dimension of  $D(\Lambda_{\Lambda})$  is finite.

- NuC - Nunke condition

If  $X \neq 0$  then there is an  $n \geq 0$  such that  $\text{Ext}^n(D\Lambda, X) \neq 0$ .

- SNC - strong Nakayama conjecture

For every simple module  $S$  there is an  $n \geq 0$  such that  $\text{Ext}^n(D\Lambda, S) \neq 0$ .

- ARC - Auslander Reiten conjecture

If  $\text{Ext}^n(M, M \oplus \Lambda) = 0$  for all  $n > 0$  then  $M$  is projective.

- NC - Nakayama conjecture

If  $\Lambda$  has infinite dominant dimension then  $\Lambda$  is self-injective.

## 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 any  $X \neq 0$  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.

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

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  $\mathcal{D}^b(I, X) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 1.2.**  $WTC \Rightarrow GSC$

*Proof.*  $D(\Lambda_\Lambda)$  is watamatsu tilting. WTC then gives us that if  $D\Lambda$  has finite projective dimension then  $\Lambda$  has a finite injective dimension.

For the other direction assume  ${}_\Lambda\Lambda$  has finite injective dimension. Then  $D({}_\Lambda\Lambda)$  has finite projective dimension, so WTC gives us that  $\Lambda_\Lambda$  has finite injective dimension. Which means  $D(\Lambda_\Lambda)$  has finite projective dimension.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.3.** *ARC is equivalent to  $M$  a generator with  $\text{Ext}^n(M, M) = 0$  for  $n > 0$  implies  $M$  projective.*

*Proof.* Assume ARC and that  $M$  satisfies the hypothesis. Then since  $M$  is a generator  $\Lambda$  is in  $\text{add } M$  and thus  $\text{Ext}^n(M, \Lambda) = 0$ . So  $\text{Ext}^n(M, M \oplus \Lambda) = 0$  and  $M$  is projective.

For the other direction Assume  $M$  satisfies  $\text{Ext}^n(M, M \oplus \Lambda) = 0$ . Then  $\text{Ext}^n(M \oplus \Lambda, M \oplus \Lambda) = 0$ , so  $M \oplus \Lambda$  is projective, which means that  $M$  is projective.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.4.**  $SNC \Rightarrow ARC$

*Proof.*  $\text{Ext}^i(D\Lambda, S) = \text{Ext}^i(DS, \Lambda)$ , so SNC means that for every simple there is an  $i$  such that  $\text{Ext}^i(S, \Lambda) \neq 0$ .

Assume  $M$  is a nonprojective generator such that  $\text{Ext}^n(M, M) = 0$  for all  $n > 0$ . Let  $\Gamma$  be  $\text{End}(M)^{op}$ , and let

$$M \longrightarrow I_0 \longrightarrow I_1 \longrightarrow \cdots$$

be an injective resolution of  $M$ . Since  $\text{Ext}^n(M, M) = 0$  when we apply  $(M, -) := \text{Hom}(M, -)$  we get an exact sequence.

$$\Gamma \longrightarrow (M, I_0) \longrightarrow (M, I_1) \longrightarrow \dots$$

By proposition 1.7 this is an injective resolution of  $\Gamma$ .

Since  $M$  is a non-projective generator it has every indecomposable projective as a summand and a nonprojective summand. So  $M$  has more indecomposable summands than  $\Lambda$  which means that  $\Gamma$  has more indecomposable projectives than  $\Lambda$ . It follows that  $\Gamma$  also has more injectives and thus has an injective not on the form  $(M, I)$ . Let  $Q$  be such an injective and let  $S$  be its socle. Then  $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(S, (M, I_i)) = 0$  for all  $i$ , so  $\text{Ext}^i(S, \Gamma) = 0$  for all  $i$ . Thus  $\Gamma$  does not satisfy SNC.  $\square$

The next proposition requires part of the theory of Wedderburn projectives. The relevant theory is proven in section 1.2 below.

**Proposition 1.5.**  $ARC \Rightarrow NC$

*Proof.* Assume  $\Gamma$  has dominant dimension  $\infty$ , but is not self injective, and let

$$0 \longrightarrow \Gamma \longrightarrow I_0 \longrightarrow I_1$$

be an injective copresentation of  $\Gamma$ . Let  $P$  be the sum of the projective covers of all nonisomorphic simple modules in the socle of  $I_0$ . Then by proposition 1.10 we have that  $P$  is Wedderburn projective.

Let  $\Lambda = \text{End}(P)^{op}$  and let  $M = \text{Hom}(P, \Gamma)$ . Then  $M$  is a nonprojective generator, we want to show that  $\text{Ext}^{>0}(M, M) = 0$ .

We have functors  $(M, -) : \text{mod } \Lambda \rightarrow \text{mod } \Gamma$  and  $(P, -) : \text{mod } \Gamma \rightarrow \text{mod } \Lambda$ . By proposition 1.7  $(M, -)$  is fully faithful and  $(P, -) \circ (M, -) = id_\Lambda$ .

Let  $0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow Q_0 \rightarrow Q_1$  be an injective copresentation of  $M$ . Applying  $(M, -)$  we get an injective copresentation of  $\Gamma$ . We conclude that all the projective-injective modules are in the essential image of  $(M, -)$ .

In other words if  $I^\bullet$  is the minimal injective resolution of  $\Gamma$  then  $Q^\bullet := (P, I^\bullet)$  is the minimal injective resolution of  $M$ , and  $(M, Q^\bullet) = I^\bullet$ . This means that  $(M, Q^\bullet)$  is exact away from 0, so  $\text{Ext}^{>0}(M, M) = 0$ .

But then  $M$  is a nonprojective generator with  $\text{Ext}^{>0}(M, M) = 0$ , so  $\Lambda$  does not satisfy ARC.  $\square$

**Proposition 1.6.**  $[AR75] \text{ SNC} \Rightarrow NC$

*Proof.*  $\text{Ext}(D\Lambda, S) = \text{Ext}(DS, \Lambda)$ .  $\text{Ext}(DS, \Lambda)$  being nonzero means  $I(DS)$  appears in the injective resolution of  $\Lambda$ . If all injectives appear in the resolution and the dominant dimension is infinity then all injectives are projective. Thus  $\Lambda$  is self injective.  $\square$

## 1.2 Wedderburn correspondence

**Proposition 1.7.** *Let  $\Lambda$  be an artin algebra and  $M$  a generator. Let  $\Gamma = \text{End}(M)^{op}$  and  $P = (M, \Lambda)$ . Then we have the following:*

- $\text{End}(P)^{op} = \Lambda$  and  $(P, \Gamma) = M$ .

*Proof.* By Yoneda lemma we have an equivalence  $(M, -) : \text{add } M \rightarrow \text{add}(M, M) = \text{proj } \Gamma$ . Since  $M$  is a generator  $\Lambda$  is in  $\text{add } M$ . So

$$\text{End}(P) = ((M, \Lambda), (M, \Lambda)) = \text{End}(\Lambda) = \Lambda^{op}$$

and

$$(P, \Gamma) = ((M, \Lambda), (M, M)) = (\Lambda, M) = M.$$

$\square$

- $(P, -) \circ (M, -)$  is the identity on  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ .

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be a  $\Lambda$ -module. Since  $\text{add } M$  has only a finite number of indecomposables it is functorially finite. So we can take an  $M$ -resolution of  $X$ .

$$\cdots \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$$

Since  $\text{add } M$  contains the projectives this is exact. Applying  $(M, -)$  we get a projective resolution of  $(M, X)$ . Since  $(M, X)$  is determined by its projective resolution and  $X$  is determined by its  $M$ -resolution we need only show that  $(P, -) \circ (M, -)$  is the identity on  $\text{add } M$ . Then again by Yoneda lemma  $(P, (M, M')) = (\Lambda, M') = M'$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 1.8.** *Let  $M$  be a module and  $I$  an injective module. If the projective cover of the socle of  $I$  is a direct summand of  $M$ , then  $(M, I)$  is an injective  $\Gamma := \text{End}(M)^{op}$ -module.*

*Proof.* Let  $J \leq \Gamma$  be a left ideal and let  $\psi : J \rightarrow (M, I)$  be any  $\Gamma$ -linear map. By lemma 10.3 it is enough to show that  $\psi$  factors through  $\Gamma$ . Assume  $J$  is generated by  $f_i$ . If we can find  $\gamma : M \rightarrow I$  such that  $\gamma \circ f_i = \psi(f_i)$  then we would get our factorization by mapping  $1 \in \Gamma$  to  $\gamma$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \oplus M & & \\
 \downarrow \Sigma f_i & \searrow \Sigma \psi(f_i) & \\
 M & \xrightarrow{\gamma} & I
 \end{array}$$

Next we want to show that the kernel of  $\sum \psi(f_i)$  contains the kernel of  $\sum f_i$ . To see this let  $K$  be the kernel of  $\sum f_i$  and let  $K'$  be the kernel of  $\sum \psi(f_i)$ . If  $K'$  does not contain  $K$  then  $Q := K/K' \cap K$  is a nonzero module that is mapped injectively into  $I$ . So the socle of  $Q$  is a summand of the socle of  $I$ . Then by assumption the projective cover of the socle of  $Q$  is a direct summand of  $M$ . By the lifting property of projectives we get a map  $M \rightarrow K$  such that the composition with  $\sum \psi(f_i)$  is non-zero.

Let  $a_i$  be the composition  $M \twoheadrightarrow K \hookrightarrow \oplus M \xrightarrow{\pi_i} M$ . Then we get  $\sum f_i \circ a_i = 0$ . Applying  $\psi$  we get  $\sum \psi(f_i) \circ a_i = 0$ , which gives a contradiction. Thus  $K'$  contains  $K$ .

Using this we get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \oplus M & & \\
 \downarrow \Sigma f_i & \searrow \Sigma \psi(f) & \\
 \oplus M/K & \xrightarrow{\quad} & I \\
 \downarrow & \nearrow \exists \gamma & \\
 M & & 
 \end{array}$$

Since  $I$  is injective it lifts monomorphisms so we know that  $\gamma$  exists. Thus  $(M, I)$  is an injective  $\Gamma$ -module.  $\square$

**Definition 1.9** (Wedderburn projective). Let  $\Gamma$  be an artin algebra and  $P$  a finitely generated projective. Let  $\Lambda = \text{End}(P)^{op}$  and  $M = (P, \Gamma)$ .  $P$  is said to be Wedderburn projective if  $\text{End}(M)^{op} = \Gamma$ .

**Proposition 1.10.** *If  $P$  contains the projective cover of all simple modules that appear in the socle of an injective copresentation of  $\Gamma$ , then  $P$  is Wedderburn projective.*

To prove this we first need the next proposition as a lemma.

**Proposition 1.11.** *Let  $P$  be a projective  $\Gamma$ -module, and let  $\Lambda = \text{End}(P)^{op}$ . Then  $(P, -) : \text{mod } \Gamma \rightarrow \text{mod } \Lambda$  is fully faithful on  $\text{add } I(P/J P)$ .*



*Proof.* We want to show that the map  $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(I, I') \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\Lambda((P, I), (P, I'))$  is an isomorphism. Let's first show injectivity. Let  $f : I \rightarrow I'$  be a non-zero map. Then the socle of  $\text{Im } f$  is a semisimple submodule of  $I'$ , so it is in  $\text{add } P/JP$ . Then there exists a nonzero map from  $P$  to  $\text{Im } f$ . Since  $P$  is projective this lifts to a map  $\hat{f} : P \rightarrow I$ . Then  $f \circ \hat{f}$  is non-zero, so  $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(I, I') \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\Lambda((P, I), (P, I'))$  is injective.

The argument for surjectivity is similar to that for proposition 1.8. Let  $\psi : (P, I) \rightarrow (P, I')$  be a  $\Lambda$ -linear map. Let  $f_i : P \rightarrow I$  generate  $(P, I)$  as a  $\Lambda$ -module. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus P & \xrightarrow{\sum f_i} & I \\ & \searrow & \vdots \\ & \sum \psi(f_i) & \downarrow ? \\ & & I' \end{array}$$

We wish to show that there is a map at  $?$  completing the diagram. We wish to show that  $K'$  contains  $K$ . Assume for the sake of contradiction that it does not. Then  $Q := K/K' \cap K$  is mapped injectively into  $I'$  by  $\sum \psi(f_i)$ . So the socle of  $Q$  is in  $\text{add } P/JP$ , and we have a non-zero map  $P \rightarrow Q$ .

Since  $P$  is projective this extends to a map  $P \rightarrow K$ . Let  $a_i$  be the compositions  $P \rightarrow K \rightarrow \bigoplus P \xrightarrow{\pi_i} P$ . Then clearly  $\sum f_i \circ a_i = 0$ , but  $\sum \psi(f_i) \circ a_i$  is non-zero. Since  $\psi$  is  $\Lambda$ -linear this is a contradiction, so  $K'$  contains  $K$ .

Then we get an induced diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus P & & \\ \downarrow & & \\ (\bigoplus P)/K & \xrightarrow{\sum f_i} & I \\ & \searrow & \vdots \\ & \sum \psi(f_i) & \downarrow \exists \\ & & I' \end{array}$$

Now because  $I'$  is injective we know that there is a lift, and so  $\text{Hom}_\Gamma(I, I') \rightarrow \text{Hom}_\Lambda((P, I), (P, I'))$  is surjective, and thus an isomorphism.  $\square$

**Corollary 1.11.1.** *proposition 1.10*

*Proof.* Let  $\Gamma \rightarrow I_0 \rightarrow I_1$  be a minimal injective presentation of  $\Gamma$ . Then by proposition 1.8 we have that  $(P, I_0) \rightarrow (P, I_1)$  is an injective presentation of

$(P, \Gamma)$ . The proposition gives us that  $(P, -)$  is fully faithful on  $I_0$  and  $I_1$ . Since the endomorphisms of  $\Gamma$  are exactly endomorphisms of  $I_0 \rightarrow I_1$  up to homotopy this means that

$$\Gamma^{\text{op}} = \text{End}_{\Gamma}(\Gamma) = \text{End}_{\Lambda}((P, \Gamma))$$

So  $P$  is Wedderburn projective.  $\square$

## 2 Recollement

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

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

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  $\mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda') \begin{array}{c} \xleftarrow{i^*} \\ \xrightarrow{i_*} \end{array} \mathcal{D}^b(\Lambda)$  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.  $\square$

**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  $H^j(i_*X) = 0$  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  $\Lambda'$ -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 abounded 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  $\Lambda'$ -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  $\Lambda$ , we begin by showing it holds for  $\Lambda'$ .

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  $\Lambda$  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,  $\Lambda'$  satisfies FDC.

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

For the converse assume  $\Lambda'$  and  $\Lambda''$  satisfy FDC. Let  $T = \Lambda/\text{rad}\Lambda$ , and  $X$  be a  $\Lambda$ -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  $\Lambda''$ . 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  $\text{findim}(\Lambda)$ .  $\square$

## 2.1 Triangular matrix algebras and vertex removal

Something somethign triangular.

**Definition 2.5** (Comma category). Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be categories and  $F : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  a functor. Then the comma category  $(F, \mathcal{B})$  has as objects triplets  $(A, B, f)$  with  $A \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $B \in \mathcal{B}$ , and  $f : FA \rightarrow B$  a morphism in  $\mathcal{B}$ . The morphisms are pairs  $(\alpha, \beta) : (A, B, f) \rightarrow (A', B', f')$  with  $\alpha : A \rightarrow A'$  and  $\beta : B \rightarrow B'$  such that the following diagram commutes:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ F\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\ FA' & \xrightarrow{f'} & B'. \end{array}$$

**Proposition 2.6.** *If  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are abelian categories and  $F$  is right exact, then the comma category  $(F, \mathcal{B})$  is abelian.*

*Proof.* We need to show that  $(F, \mathcal{B})$  has kernels, has cokernels, and that image equals coimage. First we show kernels. Let  $(\alpha, \beta) : (A, B, f) \rightarrow (A', B', f')$  be a morphism in the comma category. Then we have a diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 F \ker \alpha & \xrightarrow{F\iota_\alpha} & FA & \xrightarrow{F\alpha} & FA' \\
 \downarrow \theta & & \downarrow f & & \downarrow f' \\
 0 \longrightarrow & \ker \beta & \xrightarrow{\iota_\beta} & B & \xrightarrow{\beta} & B'
 \end{array}$$

Since  $\beta f F \iota_\alpha = f' F \alpha F \iota_\alpha = 0$  there is a unique  $\theta$  making the diagram commute. I claim the kernel of  $(\alpha, \beta)$  is  $(\ker \alpha, \ker \beta, \theta)$ . Indeed if any  $(\alpha', \beta')$  is any map such that  $(\alpha, \beta) \circ (\alpha', \beta') = 0$  then  $\alpha \alpha' = 0$  and  $\beta \beta' = 0$  so both  $\alpha'$  and  $\beta'$  factor uniquely through  $\iota_\alpha$  and  $\iota_\beta$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 FA'' & \xrightarrow{\alpha''} & F \ker \alpha & \xrightarrow{F\iota_\alpha} & FA \\
 \downarrow f'' & & \downarrow \theta & & \downarrow f \\
 B'' & \xrightarrow{\beta''} & \ker \beta & \xrightarrow{\iota_\beta} & B
 \end{array}$$

The only thing left to verify is that the left square commutes. This follows from the outer rectangle commuting, and that  $\iota_\beta$  is a monomorphism.

Showing that cokernels exists is similar, but relies on  $F$  being right exact. The construction is completely dual, but to verify commutativity at the end instead of using that  $\iota_\beta$  is mono we must use that  $F\pi_\alpha : FA' \rightarrow F \text{Cok } \alpha$  is an epimorphism. This follows from  $F$  being right exact. I leave the details to the reader.

or do I?

Now the image equaling the coimage follows from  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  being abelian, and the way we constructed the kernels and cokernels.  $\square$

For the rest of this section we will assume  $F$  is a right exact functor between abelian categories so that the comma category is abelian. We will also assume  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  has enough projectives, whenever we mention projective objects. In particular we will be interested in the case when  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  are module categories over finite dimensional algebras.

Functors  $U : (F, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$ , forgetful.

$$T : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow (F, \mathcal{B}), (A, B) \mapsto (A, B \oplus FA, FA \rightarrow FA \oplus B)$$

$$Z : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow (F, \mathcal{B}) (A, B) \mapsto (A, B, 0 - \text{map})$$

$$C : (F, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}, f : FA \rightarrow B \mapsto (A, \text{Cok } f)$$

$F$  right exact -  $i$   $(F, \mathcal{B})$  abelian

$U$  and  $Z$  are exact

$(T, U)$  and  $(C, Z)$  are adjoint pairs -  $T$  and  $C$  preserves projectives.

**Proposition 2.7.** *[FGR75, Proposition 1.3] The functors  $(T, U)$  and  $(C, Z)$  form adjoint pairs.*

*Proof.* We want to establish an isomorphism between  $\text{Hom}(T(A, B), (A', B', FA' \rightarrow B'))$  and  $\text{Hom}((A, B), (A', B'))$ . A morphism in  $\text{Hom}(T(A, B), (A', B', FA' \rightarrow B'))$  is given by a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}} & B \oplus FA \\ F\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \begin{bmatrix} \beta & \gamma \end{bmatrix} \\ FA' & \xrightarrow{f} & B' \end{array}$$

The isomorphism is then given by sending this to  $(\alpha, \beta)$ . This is clearly surjective. For injectivity assume  $(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ , then  $\gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \beta & \gamma \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = fF\alpha = 0$ , so the map is injective. So  $(T, U)$  is an adjoint pair.

Next we consider  $(C, Z)$ . We want an isomorphism between  $\text{Hom}(C(A, B, f), (A', B')) = \text{Hom}((A, \text{Cok } f), (A', B'))$  and  $\text{Hom}((A, B, f), (A', B', 0))$ . A morphism in  $\text{Hom}((A, B, f), (A', B', 0))$  is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ F\alpha \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\ FA' & \xrightarrow{0} & B' \end{array}$$

Since  $\beta f = 0$ , we have that  $\beta$  factors through the cokernel of  $f$  uniquely. Let the factorization be given by the map  $\beta' : \text{Cok } f \rightarrow B'$ . Then we send this diagram to  $(\alpha, \beta')$ . Since the choice of  $\beta'$  was unique this is an isomorphism, so  $(C, Z)$  is an adjoint pair.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.1.** *The functors  $T$  and  $C$  preserve projective objects.*

*Proof.* What we need to check is that for projective objects  $P$  and  $Q$  in  $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B})$  and  $(F, \mathcal{B})$  respectively we have that  $\text{Hom}(TP, -)$  and  $\text{Hom}(CQ, -)$  are exact. By adjointness these are equal to  $\text{Hom}(P, U-)$  and  $\text{Hom}(Q, Z-)$  respectively. Since  $U$  and  $Z$  this holds, and so  $T$  and  $C$  preserve projective objects.  $\square$

$TC(X) \rightarrow X$  is projective cover -> all projectives are  $T$  of a projective.

**Proposition 2.8.** [FGR75, Corollary 1.6c] For a projective object  $P$  in  $(F, \mathcal{B})$  we have that  $T(C(P)) \cong P$ , in particular all projectives are in the essential image of  $T$ .

*Proof.* Let  $P$  be given by  $f : FA \rightarrow B$ . Applying  $C$  we get  $(A, \text{Cok } f)$ . We have morphisms  $P \rightarrow ZC(P)$  and  $TC(P) \rightarrow ZC(P)$  given by the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \\ FA & \xrightarrow{0} & \text{Cok } f \\ \parallel & & \uparrow \\ FA & \hookrightarrow & \text{Cok } f \oplus FA \end{array}$$

By the projective property of  $P$  there is some morphism  $\beta$  factorizing the map  $P \rightarrow ZC(P)$  giving us the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} FA & \xrightarrow{f} & B \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \beta \\ FA & \hookrightarrow & \text{Cok } f \oplus FA \\ \parallel & & \downarrow \\ FA & \xrightarrow{0} & \text{Cok } f \end{array}$$

Since  $FA \hookrightarrow \text{Cok } f \oplus FA$  is split mono  $f$  is split mono, and consequently  $\beta$  is an isomorphism. So we have  $P \cong TC(P)$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 2.9.** [FGR75, Lemma 4.16] Let  $X = (A, B, f)$  be an object in the commacategory. Then  $\text{pd } X \geq \text{pd } A$ , and if  $A = 0$  then  $\text{pd } X = \text{pd } B$ .

*Proof.* We first show that  $\text{pd } X \geq \text{pd } A$ . Note that  $\text{pd } C(X) = \max\{\text{pd } A, \text{pd } \text{Cok } f\}$  so we always have  $\text{pd } C(X) \geq \text{pd } A$ . If  $\text{pd } X = \infty$  then the statement holds so let us assume  $\text{pd } X = n < \infty$ . We proceed by induction. If  $n = 0$  then  $C(X)$  is projective so  $\text{pd } X = \text{pd } C(X) = \text{pd } A = 0$ . Next assume the statement holds for whenever the projective dimension is less than  $n$ . Let  $P \rightarrow A$  and  $P' \rightarrow \text{Cok } f$  be epimorphisms from projectives. Then we have an epimorphism  $T(P, P') \rightarrow X$ . If we let  $\Omega A$  be the kernel of  $P \rightarrow A$  and



$X' = (\Omega A, K, \theta)$  be the kernel of  $T(P, P') \rightarrow X$  as shown in the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 F\Omega A & \longrightarrow & FP & \longrightarrow & FA & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 \theta \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & K & \longrightarrow & P' \oplus FP & \longrightarrow & B \longrightarrow 0
 \end{array}$$

Then we have  $\text{pd } A \leq \text{pd } \Omega A + 1$  and  $\text{pd } X = \text{pd } X' + 1$ . By induction we have that  $\text{pd } X' \geq \text{pd } \Omega A$  and so  $\text{pd } X \geq \text{pd } \Omega A + 1 \geq \text{pd } A$ .

If  $A = 0$  then we can associate  $C(X) = (0, B)$  with  $B$ . Any projective resolution  $P_B^\bullet$  of  $B$  gives a resolution of  $X$  by  $T(0, P_B^\bullet)$ , and any resolution  $P_X^\bullet$  of  $X$  gives a resolution of  $(0, B)$  by  $C(P_X^\bullet)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 2.10.** [FGR75, Theorem 4.20] *The finitistic dimension of the comma category  $(F, \mathcal{B})$  is bounded above by  $\text{findim}(\mathcal{A}) + \text{findim}(\mathcal{B}) + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X = (A, B, f)$  be an element of the commacategory with finite projective dimension. Let  $P_A^\bullet$  be a projective resolution of  $A$  shorter than  $\text{findim}(\mathcal{A})$ . Similar to what we did in proposition 2.9 define  $P_X^0$  to be  $T(P_A^0, P(\text{Cok } f))$  where  $P(\text{Cok } f)$  is a projective module with an epimorphism onto  $\text{Cok } f$ . Then we have that the kernel of  $P_X^0 \rightarrow X$  is  $F\Omega A \xrightarrow{\theta^0} K^0$ . We continue inductively defining  $P_X^n$  to be  $T(P_A^n, \text{Cok } \theta^{n-1})$ . Then  $\Omega^{\text{findim}(\mathcal{A})+1} X = (0, K^{\text{findim}(\mathcal{A})}, 0)$ . Then by proposition 2.9 we know that  $\text{pd } \Omega^{\text{findim}(\mathcal{A})+1} X = \text{pd } K^{\text{findim}(\mathcal{A})} \leq \text{findim}(\mathcal{B})$ . So  $\text{pd } X \leq \text{findim}(\mathcal{A}) + \text{findim}(\mathcal{B}) + 1$ .  $\square$

define triangular matrix ring

apply theorem to them

verticies

### 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  $\Omega X$  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

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

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

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

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

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

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.*

**Example 3.6.** [IST90, Proposition 2.3] Let  $\Lambda$  be the pathalgebra of

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 & \alpha & \\
 1 & \xrightarrow{\beta} & 2 \\
 & \gamma &
 \end{array}$$

with relations  $\alpha\gamma$ ,  $\beta\gamma$ , and  $\gamma\alpha$  over an algebraically closed field  $k$ . Then  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) = 1$ , but the subcategory of modules with finite projective dimension is not contravariantly finite.

not sure if this assumption is necessary

*Proof.* Firstly note that both the indecomposable projectives have even dimension, so any projective module will have even dimension. Then if  $X$  is a module with finite projective dimension, since  $\dim X = \sum (-1)^i \dim P_X^i$  the dimension of  $X$  is also even. In particular the two simple modules have infinite projective dimension.

The radical of  $P_1$  is  $P_2$  and the radical of  $P_2$  is  $S_1$ , so the radical of an arbitrary projective looks like  $P_2^n \oplus S_1^m$ . Let  $P \rightarrow X$  be the projective cover of a module with finite projective dimension. Then  $\Omega X$  is a submodule of  $JP = P_2^n \oplus S_1^m$ . Let  $M$  be an indecomposable summand of  $\Omega X$ , and consider the composition  $M \rightarrow JP \rightarrow P_2$  for any possible projection to  $P_2$ . If this is epi then we must have  $M = P_2$ . If none of these are epi then  $M$  is contained in  $JP_2^n \oplus S_1^m = S_1^{m+n}$ . This would mean  $M = S_1$ , but  $S_1$  has infinite projective dimension. Thus we must have  $\Omega X$  projective, and so  $\text{pd } X \leq 1$ .

Nextly we want to show that  $S_1$  has no minimal approximation by modules with finite projective dimension. Assume for the sake of contradiction that  $X \rightarrow S_1$  is such a minimal approximation. Then we claim that  $P_2$  is not a submodule of  $X$ . Since  $\text{Hom}(P_2, S_1) = 0$  if this were the case then  $X' = X/P_2$  would give an approximation of shorter length, because  $X'$  would also have finite projective dimension. Which can be seen in the following diagram


$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & P_X^1 & \longrightarrow & P_X^1 \oplus P_1 & \longrightarrow & P_1 \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow \lrcorner & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & P_X^1 & \longrightarrow & P_X^0 & \longrightarrow & X \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & X' & \xlongequal{\quad} & X' \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0.
 \end{array}$$

This means that  $\gamma X = 0$ , because if there was an element  $x \in X$  with  $\gamma x \neq 0$  then  $X$  would have  $P_2$  as a submodule. . So  $X$  is a  $\Lambda/(\gamma)$  module.

more  
details?

$\Lambda/(\gamma)$  is the pathalgebra of the 2-Kronecker quiver, whose representation theory is well understood. The indecomposable modules are as follows:

We see that the preprojective and preinjective modules both have odd dimension, so they will have infinite projective dimension as  $\Lambda$ -modules. We




can easily verify that the modules  $k \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\lambda} \\ \xleftarrow{1} \end{array} k$  all have finite projective di-

mension as  $\Lambda$ -modules and that they have a nonzero map onto  $S_1$ . So each of these modules would need to have a nonzero map to  $X$ . But the homset between the regular modules is nonzero only if they have the same value of  $\lambda$ . So for this to be possible  $X$  would need an infinite amount of direct summands. Hence  $S_1$  has no approximation, and the subcategory is not contravariantly finite.  $\square$

In the next example we look at the opposite algebra of  $\Lambda$  to show that there is not necessarily any link between the contravariant finiteness for  $\Lambda$  and for  $\Lambda^{op}$ .

**Example 3.7.** Let  $\Gamma$  be the opposite algebra of the one in example 3.6. That is,  $\Gamma$  is the path algebra of



with relations  $\zeta\delta$ ,  $\zeta\epsilon$ , and  $\delta\zeta$ . Then the subcategory of modules with finite projective dimension is contravariantly finite. In other words the subcategory of  $\Lambda$ -modules with finite injective dimension is covariantly finite.

*Proof.* As before notice that the indecomposable projective modules are 3-dimensional and thus every module with finite projective dimension will have a  $k$ -dimension that is a multiple of 3. So in particular the simple modules have infinite projective dimension.

Let  $X$  be a module with finite projective dimension, and let  $P$  be its projective cover. We have that  $\Omega X$  is a submodule of  $JP$ . Notice that  $\delta J = \zeta J = 0$ , so  $\Omega X$  is a  $\Gamma/(\delta, \zeta)$ -module. But  $\Gamma/(\delta, \zeta)$  is simply equal to  $2 \longrightarrow 1$  over which there are just 3 indecomposable modules. We already know that the simples cannot be summands of  $\Omega X$ , because they have infinite projective dimension. The last module  $k \longrightarrow k$  is 2-dimensional and thus also has infinite projective dimension over  $\Gamma$ . So we conclude that  $\Omega X = 0$ , so  $X$  is projective.

So there are only a finite number of indecomposable modules with finite projective dimension. So the subcategory is contravariantly finite.  $\square$

## 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  $\Lambda$ . Then the dominated dimension of  $\Lambda$  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  $\Gamma$ . Then the repdimesnion of  $\Lambda$  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  $\Gamma$ -modules with a copresentation

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

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

The Yoneda embedding gives an equivalence

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

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

I guess this is Auslander's original definition



, and thus we get an equivalence

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

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

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

Since  $\operatorname{End}_{\Gamma}(I_0(\Gamma))$  is morita equivalent to  $\Lambda$ ,  $\mathcal{S}$  is equivalent to  $\operatorname{mod} \Lambda$ .  $\Gamma \in \mathcal{S}$  is clearly a generator. To see that it is a cogenerator note that  $\Gamma$  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  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\Gamma$  is aswell.

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

The last step of the proof is showing that  $\operatorname{End}(M)$  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  $\operatorname{add} M$ , thus we get an exact sequence of projective  $\operatorname{End}(M)$ -modules

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

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

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

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

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

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  $\Lambda$  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  $\Lambda$  is the supremum of the dimension on its objects.

**Proposition 4.5.** *Repdim-2 is the minimum of  $M$ -res-dim(mod  $\Lambda$ ) 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  $\text{proj } \text{End}(M)$ , which maps minimal  $M$ -approximations to projective covers. Let  $X$  be any module in  $\text{mod } \text{End}(M)$  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  $\text{Hom}$  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.  $\square$

**Proposition 4.6.** *The repdimension of an artin algebra is always finite. [Iya02]*

**Theorem 4.7.** *The repdimension of  $\Lambda$  is less than or equal to 2 if and only if  $\Lambda$  is representation finite.*

*Proof.* Assume  $\Lambda$  is representation finite and let  $M$  be the direct sum of all indecomposable modules (up to iso). Then  $M$  is a generator-cogenerator. Let  $X$  be an  $\text{End}(M)^{op}$ -module with projective presentation

$$(M, M_1) \rightarrow (M, M_0) \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0.$$

Let  $M_2$  be the kernel of  $M_1 \rightarrow M_0$ . Since  $M$  is the sum of all indecomposables  $M_2$  is in  $\text{add } M$ , so

$$0 \rightarrow (M, M_2) \rightarrow (M, M_1) \rightarrow (M, M_0) \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0$$

is a projective resolution of  $X$ . So  $\Lambda$  has repdimension at most 2.

Assume  $\Lambda$  has repdimension at most 2, and let  $M$  be an auslander generator. We want to show that  $\text{add } M = \text{mod } \Lambda$ . Let  $X$  be any  $\Lambda$ -module, and let

$$0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow I_0 \rightarrow I_1$$

be a minimal injective presentation. If  $I_0 \rightarrow I_1$  is split then  $X$  is injective and thus in  $\text{add } M$ . Let  $M_X$  be a minimal  $M$ -approximation of  $X$ , let  $\Omega_M X$  be the kernel of the approximation, and let  $Y$  be the cokernel of  $(M, I_0) \rightarrow (M, I_1)$ . Then

$$(M, \Omega_M X) \rightarrow (M, M_X) \rightarrow (M, I_0) \rightarrow (M, I_1) \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$$

is a minimal exact sequence. Since the global dimension of  $\text{End}(M)^{op}$  is at most 2 this means that  $(M, \Omega_M X) = 0$ . Consequently we have that  $\Omega_M X = 0$  and that  $X = M_X$ , so  $X$  is in  $\text{add } M$ . Thus  $\Lambda$  is representation finite.  $\square$

### 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  $\eta_X$  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 4.8.** *[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  $\psi$  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 4.9.** *[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  $T = \Lambda/J$  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 4.8 we have that  $\text{pd } Z + n \leq \psi(A \oplus B)$ , and thus  $\text{pd } \Omega^n C - 1 + n = \text{pd } C - 1 \leq \psi(A \oplus B)$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 4.9.1.** *Let  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$  be a short exact sequence of modules. If  $\text{pd } A < \infty$  then  $\text{pd } A \leq \psi(\Omega B \oplus \Omega C) + 1$ , and if  $\text{pd } B < \infty$  then  $\text{pd } B \leq \psi(\Omega A \oplus \Omega^2 C) + 2$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $P_B \rightarrow B$  be a projective cover of  $B$ . Then we have a commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & 0 & \longrightarrow & P_B & \longrightarrow & P_B & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & A & \longrightarrow & B & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Applying the snake lemma we get a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow \Omega B \rightarrow \Omega C \oplus P \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$  for some projective  $P$ . Then using the theorem we have that  $\text{pd } A \leq \psi(\Omega B \oplus \Omega C \oplus P) + 1 = \psi(\Omega B \oplus \Omega C) + 1$ .

Applying the same reasoning to  $0 \rightarrow \Omega B \rightarrow \Omega C \oplus P \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$  gives us  $\text{pd } \Omega B \leq \psi(\Omega A \oplus \Omega^2 C) + 1$ . Hence  $\text{pd } B \leq \psi(\Omega A \oplus \Omega^2 C) + 2$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.10.** *[IT05, Corollary 8] If  $\Lambda = \text{End}_\Gamma(P)$  for an algebra  $\Gamma$  with global dimension at most 3, and  $P$  projective then  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X$  be any  $\Lambda$ -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  $\Gamma$ :

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

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 4.9 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  $X$ ,  $\Lambda$  has finite finitistic dimension.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.10.1.** *If  $\text{repdim}(\Lambda) \leq 3$  then  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\Lambda$  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  $\Lambda$  is in  $\text{add } M$  and so  $\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, \Lambda)$  is a projective  $\Gamma$ -module with  $\text{End}_\Gamma(\text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, \Lambda)) = \text{End}_\Lambda(\Lambda) = \Lambda$ .  $\square$

## 4.2 Stably hereditary algebras

In this section we will show that the class of stably hereditary algebras has repdimension at most 3, and thus that they have finite finitistic dimension.

**Definition 4.11** ((co)torsionfree). A module is called *torsionfree* if it is a submodule of a projective module. Dually, a module is called *cotorsionfree* if it is a factormodule of an injective.

**Definition 4.12** (Stably hereditary algebra). An algebra is called *stably hereditary* if any indecomposable torsionfree module is projective or simple, and any indecomposable cotorsionfree module is injective or simple.

This generalizes the definition of hereditary algebra by also allowing simple modules to be (co)torsionfree.

**Definition 4.13** (The stable category). For an algebra  $\Lambda$ , *the stable category*  $\underline{\text{mod}} \Lambda$  has the same objects as  $\text{mod } \Lambda$ , but the homsets are given by

$$\text{Hom}_{\underline{\text{mod}} \Lambda}(M, N) = \text{Hom}_\Lambda(M, N) / \mathcal{P}(M, N)$$

where  $\mathcal{P}(M, N)$  is the ideal of all morphisms factoring through a projective.

**Proposition 4.14.** *If for an algebra  $\Lambda$  there is a hereditary algebra  $H$  such that  $\underline{\text{mod}} \Lambda \cong \underline{\text{mod}} H$  then  $\Lambda$  is stably hereditary.*

*Proof.* [AR91, Lemma 4.12] [AR73]

$\square$

+ a bit  
more...

The converse of the above proposition does not hold without more assumptions, but stably hereditary algebras generalize the idea of algebras stably equivalent to hereditary algebras.

**Theorem 4.15.** *[Xi02, Theorem 3.5] Stably hereditary algebras has repdimension at most 3.*

*Proof.* Let  $V$  be the direct sum of all the indecomposable projectives, all the indecomposable injectives, and all the simple modules. Then  $V$  is a generator-cogenerator. So by proposition 4.3 if we can show that the global dimension of  $\Gamma := \text{End}(V)^{op}$  is 3 or less, then we are done.

We will show that for any  $\Lambda$ -module  $M$  there is a short exact sequence  $0 \rightarrow V_3 \rightarrow V_3 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  with  $V_i$  in  $\text{add } V$ , and such that  $0 \rightarrow (V, V_3) \rightarrow (V, V_2) \rightarrow (V, M) \rightarrow 0$  is exact. We will use this to construct short projective resolutions for  $\text{mod } \Gamma$ . To construct  $V_3$  and  $V_2$  let  $M'$  be the sum of the maximal injective summand of  $M$  and all simple submodules of  $M$ . Then let  $P$  be the projective cover of  $M/M'$ . Taking the pullback of  $M \rightarrow M/M' \leftarrow P$  gives us the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & K & \xlongequal{\quad} & K & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \rightarrow & M' & \rightarrow & M' \oplus P & \rightarrow & P \rightarrow 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \rightarrow & M' & \rightarrow & M & \rightarrow & M/M' \rightarrow 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0
 \end{array}$$

I claim that  $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow M' \oplus P \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$  is the desired sequence. Firstly  $M' \oplus P$  is clearly in  $\text{add } V$  since it is the sum of an injective, a semisimple, and a projective module. Further  $K$  is a submodule of  $P$ , hence torsionfree. So since  $\Lambda$  is stably hereditary  $K$  is the sum of a projective and a semisimple module, so  $K$  is also in  $\text{add } V$ .

Next we need to show that  $0 \rightarrow (V, K) \rightarrow (V, M' \oplus P) \rightarrow (V, M) \rightarrow 0$  is exact. The only thing needed to show here is that  $(V, M' \oplus P) \rightarrow (V, M)$  is surjective. We do this by showing that  $(W, M' \oplus P) \rightarrow (W, M)$  is surjective



for any indecomposable summand of  $V$ . If  $W$  is projective this holds by definition. If  $W$  is simple then any map from  $W$  to  $M$  factors through the socle and hence through  $M'$ , so it's surjective. Lastly if  $W$  is injective then the image of  $W$  in  $M$  is a cotorsionfree module, so it is the sum of simple modules and an injective module. Hence the map from  $W$  to  $M$  factors through  $M'$ .

Now we use this to show that the global dimension of  $\Gamma$  is at most 3. Let  $N$  be any  $\Gamma$ -module. Then it has a projective presentation

$$(V, V_1) \xrightarrow{f \circ -} (V, V_0) \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0$$

If we let  $M$  denote the kernel of  $f$  and we choose  $V_3$  and  $V_2$  as above then we get a projective resolution of  $N$  by

$$0 \longrightarrow (V, V_3) \longrightarrow (V, V_2) \longrightarrow (V, V_1) \longrightarrow (V, V_0) \longrightarrow N \longrightarrow 0.$$

This shows that the projective dimension of  $N$  is at most 3, and since  $N$  was arbitrary the global dimension of  $\Gamma$  is at most 3. So the repdimension of  $\Lambda$  is at most 3.  $\square$

### 4.3 Special biserial algebras

[EHIS04]

## 5 Vanishing radical powers

Throughout this section  $\Lambda$  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  $\Lambda$ -modules. Let  $M$  be a module with  $\text{pd } M < \infty$ . Let  $P \rightarrow M$  be a projective cover. Then  $\Omega M$  is contained in  $JP$  and since  $J^2P = 0$ ,  $\Omega M$  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  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) \leq d+1 < \infty$ .  $\square$

**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  $\psi$  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 4.8  $\psi((\Omega^2 M + J^2 P)/J^2 P) = \psi(\Lambda/J)$ , and  $\psi(P/J^2 P) = \psi(\Lambda/J^2)$ .

Applying theorem 4.9 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  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 5.3.** [Wan94] *If  $J^{2l+1} = 0$  and  $\Lambda/J^l$  is representation finite then  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be a module with  $\text{pd } M < \infty$ . We have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow J^l \Omega M \longrightarrow \Omega M \longrightarrow \Omega M/J^l \Omega M \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since  $\Omega M \subseteq JP_M^0$  we have  $J^{2l}\Omega M = 0$ . This means that  $J^l \Omega M$  and  $\Omega M/J^l \Omega M$  are  $\Lambda/J^l$ -modules. We will use this, the fact that  $\Lambda/J^l$  is representation finite, and the Igusa-Todorov function to create a bound for  $\text{pd } M$ .

Applying corollary 4.9.1 we have that:

$$\text{pd } \Omega M \leq \psi(\Omega(J^l \Omega M) \oplus \Omega^2(\Omega M/J^l \Omega M)) + 2.$$

Since  $\Lambda/J^l$  is representation finite there are only finitely many indecomposable  $\Lambda/J^l$ -modules, up to isomorphism. Let  $S$  be the sum of all of them. Then since  $J^l \Omega M$  and  $\Omega M/J^l \Omega M$  are in  $\text{add } S$ , using lemma 4.8 we have that

$$\psi(\Omega(J^l \Omega M) \oplus \Omega^2(\Omega M/J^l \Omega M)) \leq \psi(\Omega S \oplus \Omega^2 S).$$

So  $\text{pd } M \leq \psi(\Omega S \oplus \Omega^2 S) + 3$ , and thus  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ .  $\square$

## 6 Monomial algebras

[GKK91, IZ90]

In this section we will show a particularly nice way to construct a minimal projective resolution of the right module  $\Lambda/J$  for a monomial algebra  $\Lambda$ . We will use this to compute  $\text{Tor}_i(\Lambda/J, M)$  and/or  $\text{Ext}^i(M, D\Lambda/J)$  to get a bound on the projective dimension of all modules  $M$ .

**Definition 6.1** (Monomial algebra). A monomial algebra is a path algebra with admissible relations that are generated by monomials. That is, we do not allow the generators for the relations to consist of nontrivial linear combinations of paths.

**Definition 6.2** ( $m$ -chains). [GKK91] Let  $\Lambda = k\Gamma/(\rho)$  be a monomial algebra, with  $\rho$  a minimal generating set of paths. As usual we define  $\Gamma_0$  to be the vertices of  $\Gamma$ , and  $\Gamma_1$  to be the arrows. Recursively define the set of  $(m-1)$ -chains,  $\Gamma_m$ , as the paths  $\gamma$  with the following criteria:

- $\gamma = \beta\delta\tau$  with  $\beta \in \Gamma_{m-2}$ ,  $\beta\delta \in \Gamma_{m-1}$ , and  $\tau$  a non-zero path of length at least 1.
- $\delta\tau$  is 0 in  $\Lambda$ , i.e. it is in the ideal of relations.
- $\gamma$  is left-minimal in the sense that if  $\gamma = \gamma'\sigma$  such that  $\gamma'$  satisfies the above conditions, then  $\gamma = \gamma'$ .

The  $\Gamma_m$ 's will become the generating sets for the projectives in our projective resolution. But first we will prove some properties of them.

**Lemma 6.3.** Any  $\gamma \in \Gamma_m$  for  $m \geq 1$  can be factored uniquely as  $\gamma_1\gamma_0$  with  $\gamma_1 \in \Gamma_{m-1}$ , and  $\gamma_0$  a non-zero path of length at least 1.

*Proof.* When  $m = 1$  this should be clear, since  $\Gamma_1$  is the set of arrows, and  $\Gamma_0$  is the set of vertices, so if  $\gamma \in \Gamma_1$  is an arrow  $i \rightarrow j$  then  $\gamma = e_j\gamma$ .

When  $m > 1$  we know from the definition of  $\Gamma_m$  that  $\gamma$  can be written as  $\gamma_1\gamma_0$ . Assume there is another decomposition  $\gamma = \gamma'_1\gamma'_0$ . Then without loss of generality we may assume that  $\gamma'_1$  is shorter than  $\gamma_1$ . Then there is a  $\sigma$  such that  $\gamma'_1\sigma = \gamma_1$ . By minimality this means that  $\gamma'_1 = \gamma_1$ , and so the decomposition is unique.  $\square$

From now on we will write  $R$  for  $\Lambda/J$ . Let  $k\Gamma_m$  be the free vectorspace generated by  $\Gamma_m$ . Notice that  $k\Gamma_m$  has a canonical structure as a  $R$ - $R$ -

bimodule. This means we can get projective right  $\Lambda$ -modules  $P^m := k\Gamma_m \otimes_R \Lambda$ .

Define the map  $\delta_m : P^m \rightarrow P^{m-1}$  by  $\delta_m(\gamma \otimes \alpha) = \gamma_1 \otimes \gamma_0 \alpha$  where  $\gamma_1 \gamma_0$  is the unique decomposition of  $\gamma$ , and define  $\delta_0 : k\Gamma_0 \rightarrow \Lambda/J$  by  $\delta_0(e_i \otimes \alpha) = e_i \alpha + J$ . Then I claim we have a minimal projective resolution of the right  $\Lambda$ -module  $\Lambda/J$  by

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \longrightarrow & P^3 & \xrightarrow{\delta_3} & P^2 & \xrightarrow{\delta_2} & P^1 & \xrightarrow{\delta_1} & P^0 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & & & & & & \downarrow \delta_0 & & \\ & & & & & & & & \Lambda/J & & \end{array}$$

*Proof.* For all  $i$   $P^i$  is projective and the image of  $\delta_m$  is clearly contained in  $P^{m-1}J$ , so the only thing left to show is exactness. First we show that  $\delta_m \delta_{m-1} = 0$ . Let  $\gamma \otimes \alpha$  be in  $P^m$  for  $m \geq 2$ . Then we can decompose  $\gamma$  uniquely as  $\gamma_2 \gamma_1 \gamma_0$  and  $\delta_m \delta_{m-1}(\gamma \otimes \alpha) = \gamma_2 \otimes \gamma_1 \gamma_0 \alpha$ . By the way we defined  $\Gamma_m$ ,  $\gamma_1 \gamma_0$  is 0 in  $\Lambda$ , and so  $\gamma_2 \otimes \gamma_1 \gamma_0 \alpha = 0$ .

Next we want to show that  $\text{Ker } \delta_{m-1} \subseteq \text{Im } \delta_m$ . Let  $\sum \gamma^i \otimes \alpha^i$  be in  $\text{Ker } \delta_{m-1}$ .

□

finish

## 7 Unbounded derived category

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

**Theorem 7.1.** *[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  $\Lambda/J$  would give us another homotopy equivalence. Since  $\Lambda/J$  is finitely presented tensoring

preserves both products and coproducts. Because all the resolutions were minimal tensoring with  $\Lambda/J$  gives us 0 differentials. In degree 0 we get

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

Since  $\operatorname{Tor}_i(M_i, \Lambda/J)$  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  $\Lambda$  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 7.2.** [Ric19, Theorem 4.4]  $\operatorname{Findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$  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.  $\square$

## 8 Summary

FDC holds for the following classes of algebras

- Representation finite algebras

*Proof.* The supremum over a finite set is finite so  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$  for a representation finite algebra.  $\square$

- Monomial algebras

*Proof.* This was shown in section 6.  $\square$

- Gorenstein algebras

*Proof.* An algebra is said to be Gorenstein if all injectives have finite projective dimension and all projectives have finite injective dimension. In particular the  $\Lambda$ -module  $\Lambda$  is isomorphic to a finite injective resolution in the derived category. So  $\Lambda$  is in the localizing category generated by injectives. Then theorem 7.1 gives us that  $\text{Findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ , and therefor also  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) < \infty$ .  $\square$

- Local algebras

*Proof.* Local algebras are local artinian rings. So if  $\Lambda$  is local then  $\text{findim}(\Lambda) = 0$ .  $\square$

Not sure where to put this, ill put it here for now

**Theorem 8.1.** *Local artinian rings have finitistic dimension zero.*

*Proof.* Assume there is a non-projective module with finite projective dimension. Then in particular we have one with projective dimension equal to 1. Since all finitely generated projectives are free this means we have a short exact sequence

$$0 \quad R^n \quad R^m \quad M \quad 0$$

with  $R^n$  contained in  $JR^m$ . Let  $k$  be the minimal integer such that  $J^k = 0$ . Let  $a$  be a generator in  $R^n$  and let  $r$  be a non-zero element of  $J^{k-1}$ . Then  $ra$  is non-zero, but is mapped to something in  $J^{k-1}JR^m = 0$ , thus the map is not injective which gives a contradiction.  $\square$

## 9 Dual conjectures

Many of the cases are equivalent to their dual statements. Some are not.

- Given a recollement of the bounded derived category you get one for  $\Lambda^{op}$ .
- Just because the subcategory of modules with finite projective dimension is contravariantly finite does not mean the subcategory of modules with finite injective dimension has to be covariantly finite. See example 3.6.
- $\text{repdim of } \Lambda$  equals the  $\text{repdim of } \Lambda^{op}$ .

Look at examples of recollement to see how it translates.

*Proof.* If  $M$  is an auslander generator for  $\Lambda$  then  $DM$  is an auslander generator for  $\Lambda^{op}$ .  $\square$

- If  $J^{2l+1} = 0$  and  $\Lambda/J^l$  is repfinite then the same is true for  $\Lambda^{op}$ .
- If  $\Lambda$  is monomial then so is  $\Lambda^{op}$ .
- Injective generates implies the weaker property that projective cogenerate for the opposite algebra. This is also sufficient to prove the algebra satisfies FDC. [Ric19, Section 5]

Similarly for the weaker conjectures

- GSC says the injective dimension of  $\Lambda$  is finite if and only if the injective dimension of  $\Lambda^{op}$  is finite. This statement is symmetric with respect to  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda^{op}$ . So the dual is equivalent.
- NC: Certainly  $\Lambda$  is self injective if and only  $\Lambda^{op}$  is.
- For all the others it seems just as difficult as solving the conjecture to connect it to it's dual.

Can the dominant dimension of the opposite algebra be different? Arbitrary different?

## 10 Personal appendix

**Theorem 10.1.** *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 10.2.** [hf] Let  $\Lambda = k \left[ a \begin{smallmatrix} \hookrightarrow & 1 & \xrightarrow{b} \\ \xleftarrow{c} & 2 & \end{smallmatrix} \right] / (a^2, ac, ba, cbc)$ . 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  $\Lambda$  are:

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

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  $I_2$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 10.3.** *[CE99, Chapter I, theorem 3.2] Let  $R$  be a noetherian ring. Then an  $R$ -module  $Q$  is injective if and only if it has the injective lifting property for inclusions of ideals into  $R$ .*

*Proof.* If  $Q$  is injective then  $Q$  has the lifting property for all monomorphisms, so one direction is clear. Assume we have a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & Q & \\ f \uparrow & \nearrow & \\ M & \hookrightarrow & N \end{array}$$

We want to show that the dashed arrow exists. Let  $S$  be the partially ordered set  $\{(M', f') : M \leq M', f'|_M = f\}$ . By Zorn's lemma this has a maximal element  $(M', f')$ . Assume  $M' \neq N$ , then there is an element  $x \in N - M'$ . The set of  $r$  such that  $rx \in M'$  forms an ideal  $I$ . Define the map  $g : I \rightarrow Q$  by  $I(r) = f'(rx)$ . By hypothesis  $g$  lifts to a map  $\tilde{g} : R \rightarrow Q$ . Let  $q$  be  $\tilde{g}(1)$ . Then  $\tilde{f} : M' + Rx \rightarrow Q$  defined by  $\tilde{f}(m + rx) = f'(m) + rq$  gives us a bigger element of  $S$ , contradicting maximality. Thus  $M' = N$  and  $Q$  is injective.  $\square$

**Theorem 10.4.** *Let  $R$  be a noetherian ring. Then an arbitrary coproduct of injectives is injective.*

*Proof.* By the lemma above it is enough to show the lifting property on ideals of  $R$ . Let  $I$  be an ideal and  $f : I \rightarrow \bigoplus_i Q_i$  be a map to a coproduct of injectives. Since  $R$  is noetherian  $I$  is finitely generated so  $f$  factors through a finite sum  $I \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i=0}^n Q_i \rightarrow \bigoplus_i Q_i$ . Since finite coproducts of injectives are injective we are done.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \bigoplus Q_i & \\ \uparrow & & \\ \bigoplus_{i=0}^n Q_i & \nearrow & \\ \uparrow & & \\ I & \hookrightarrow & R \end{array}$$

$\square$

**Theorem 10.5.** [CE99, Chapter I, Exercise 8] *Let  $R$  be a noetherian ring. Then direct limits of injectives is injective.*

*Proof.* By the lemma above it is enough to show the lifting property on ideals of  $R$ . Let  $I$  be an ideal and let  $Q = \varinjlim Q_i$  be a direct limit of injectives.

Since  $R$  is noetherian  $I$  is finitely presented, say  $R^n \rightarrow R^m \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$ . Applying  $\text{Hom}(-, Q)$  we get an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(I, Q) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(R^m, Q) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(R^n, Q)$$

Since direct limits are exact we also have an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \varinjlim \text{Hom}(I, Q_i) \longrightarrow \varinjlim \text{Hom}(R^m, Q_i) \longrightarrow \varinjlim \text{Hom}(R^n, Q_i)$$

We also have a natural map  $\varinjlim \text{Hom}(-, Q_i) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(-, Q)$ .  $\text{Hom}(R^n, Q_i)$  just equals  $Q_i^n$ , so this map is an isomorphism at  $R^n$ . Then by the five lemma applied to the two sequences above we get that  $\text{Hom}(I, Q) \cong \varinjlim \text{Hom}(I, Q_i)$  for all ideals  $I$ . So since

$$\varinjlim \text{Hom}(R, Q_i) \longrightarrow \varinjlim \text{Hom}(I, Q_i) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, we get that

$$\text{Hom}(R, Q) \longrightarrow \text{Hom}(I, Q) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. Hence  $Q$  is injective. □

## References

- [AR73] Maurice Auslander and Idun Reiten. Stable equivalence of Artin algebras. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Orders, Group Rings and Related Topics (Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio, 1972)*, pages 8–71. Lecture Notes in Math., Vol. 353, 1973.
- [AR75] Maurice Auslander and Idun Reiten. On a generalized version of the Nakayama conjecture. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 52:69–74, 1975.
- [AR91] Maurice Auslander and Idun Reiten. Applications of contravariantly finite subcategories. *Adv. Math.*, 86(1):111–152, 1991.
- [CE99] Henri Cartan and Samuel Eilenberg. *Homological algebra*. Princeton Landmarks in Mathematics. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1999. With an appendix by David A. Buchsbaum, Reprint of the 1956 original.
- [Cha60] Stephen U. Chase. Direct products of modules. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 97:457–473, 1960.
- [EHIS04] Karin Erdmann, Thorsten Holm, Osamu Iyama, and Jan Schröer. Radical embeddings and representation dimension. *Adv. Math.*, 185(1):159–177, 2004.
- [FGR75] Robert M. Fossum, Phillip A. Griffith, and Idun Reiten. *Trivial extensions of abelian categories*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 456. Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1975. Homological algebra of trivial extensions of abelian categories with applications to ring theory.
- [GKK91] Edward L. Green, Ellen Kirkman, and James Kuzmanovich. Finitistic dimensions of finite-dimensional monomial algebras. *J. Algebra*, 136(1):37–50, 1991.
- [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).
- [IST90] K. Igusa, S. O. Smalø, and G. Todorov. Finite projectivity and contravariant finiteness. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 109(4):937–941, 1990.

- [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.
- [Iya02] Osamu Iyama. Finiteness of representation dimension. In *Proceedings of the 34th Symposium on Ring Theory and Representation Theory (Maebashi, 2001)*, pages 21–25. Symp. Ring Theory Represent. Theory Organ. Comm., Tsukuba, 2002.
- [IZ90] Kiyoshi Igusa and Dan Zacharia. Syzygy pairs in a monomial algebra. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 108(3):601–604, 1990.
- [Opp09] Steffen Oppermann. Representation dimension of artin algebras. [https://folk.ntnu.no/opperman/repdim\\_survey.pdf](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.
- [Wan94] Yong Wang. A note on the finitistic dimension conjecture. *Comm. Algebra*, 22(7):2525–2528, 1994.
- [Xi02] Changchang Xi. Representation dimension and quasi-hereditary algebras. *Adv. Math.*, 168(2):193–212, 2002.