

Zeitschrift: Commentarii Mathematici Helvetici
Herausgeber: Schweizerische Mathematische Gesellschaft
Band: 73 (1998)

Artikel: Degenerations for representations of extended Dynkin quivers
Autor: Zwara, Grzegorz
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-55095>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. [Mehr erfahren](#)

Conditions d'utilisation

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. [En savoir plus](#)

Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. [Find out more](#)

Download PDF: 06.02.2026

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, <https://www.e-periodica.ch>

Degenerations for representations of extended Dynkin quivers

Grzegorz Zwara

Abstract. Let A be the path algebra of a quiver of extended Dynkin type $\tilde{\mathbb{A}}_n$, $\tilde{\mathbb{D}}_n$, $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_6$, $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_7$ or $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}_8$. We show that a finite dimensional A -module M degenerates to another A -module N if and only if there are short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow U_i \rightarrow M_i \rightarrow V_i \rightarrow 0$ of A -modules such that $M = M_1$, $M_{i+1} = U_i \oplus V_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq s$ and $N = M_{s+1}$ are true for some natural number s .

Mathematics Subject Classification (1991). 14L30, 16G10, 16G70.

Keywords. Modules, degenerations, extended Dynkin diagrams.

1. Introduction and main results

Let A be a finite dimensional associative K -algebra with an identity over an algebraically closed field K of arbitrary characteristic. If $a_1 = 1, \dots, a_n$ is a basis of A over K , we have the constant structures a_{ijk} defined by $a_i a_j = \sum a_{ijk} a_k$. The affine variety $\text{mod}_A(d)$ of d -dimensional unital left A -modules consists of n -tuples $m = (m_1, \dots, m_n)$ of $d \times d$ -matrices with coefficients in K such that m_1 is the identity matrix and $m_i m_j = \sum a_{ijk} m_k$ holds for all indices i and j . The general linear group $\text{GL}_d(K)$ acts on $\text{mod}_A(d)$ by conjugation, and the orbits correspond to the isomorphism classes of d -dimensional modules (see [11]). We shall agree to identify a d -dimensional A -module M with the point of $\text{mod}_A(d)$ corresponding to it. We denote by $\mathcal{O}(M)$ the $\text{GL}_d(K)$ -orbit of a module M in $\text{mod}_A(d)$. Then one says that a module N in $\text{mod}_A(d)$ is a degeneration of a module M in $\text{mod}_A(d)$ if N belongs to the Zariski closure $\overline{\mathcal{O}(M)}$ of $\mathcal{O}(M)$ in $\text{mod}_A(d)$, and we denote this fact by $M \leq_{\text{deg}} N$. Thus \leq_{deg} is a partial order on the set of isomorphism classes of A -modules of a given dimension. It is not clear how to characterize \leq_{deg} in terms of representation theory.

There has been a work by S. Abeasis and A. del Fra [1], K. Bongartz [7], [10], [9], Ch. Riedmann [13], and A. Skowroński and the author [15], [16], [17] connecting \leq_{deg} with other partial orders \leq_{ext} and \leq on the isomorphism classes in $\text{mod}_A(d)$. They are defined in terms of representation theory as follows:

- $M \leq_{\text{ext}} N: \Leftrightarrow$ there are modules M_i, U_i, V_i and short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow U_i \rightarrow M_i \rightarrow V_i \rightarrow 0$ in $\text{mod } A$ such that $M = M_1, M_{i+1} = U_i \oplus V_i, 1 \leq i \leq s$, and $N = M_{s+1}$ for some natural number s .
- $M \leq N: \Leftrightarrow [X, M] \leq [X, N]$ holds for all modules X .

Here and later on we abbreviate $\dim_K \text{Hom}_A(X, Y)$ by $[X, Y]$, and furthermore $\dim_K \text{Ext}_A^i(X, Y)$ by $[X, Y]^i$. Then for modules M and N in $\text{mod } A$ the following implications hold:

$$M \leq_{\text{ext}} N \implies M \leq_{\text{deg}} N \implies M \leq N$$

(see [10], [13]). Unfortunately the reverse implications are not true in general, and it would be interesting to find out when they are. K. Bongartz proved in [10] (see also [8]) that it is the case for all representations of Dynkin quivers and the double arrow. Recently, the author proved in [17] that \leq and \leq_{ext} are also equivalent for all modules over representation-finite blocks of group algebras. Moreover, in [9] K. Bongartz proved that \leq_{deg} and \leq coincide for all representations of extended Dynkin quivers, and conjectured that possibly \leq_{ext} and \leq_{deg} also coincide. The main aim of this paper is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem. *The partial orders \leq and \leq_{ext} coincide for modules over all tame concealed algebras.*

In particular we get the positive answer to the above question.

Corollary. *The partial orders \leq, \leq_{deg} and \leq_{ext} are equivalent for all representations of extended Dynkin quivers.*

We mention that K. Bongartz described in [8, Theorem 4] the set-theoretic structure of minimal degenerations of modules provided the partial orders \leq_{ext} and \leq coincide. In a forthcoming paper we shall describe the minimal singularities for representations of extended Dynkin quivers.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we fix the notation, recall the relevant definitions and facts, and prove some preliminary results on modules which we apply in our investigations. In Section 3 we recall several known facts on tame concealed algebras. In particular we describe some properties of the additive categories of standard stable tubes. Section 4 is devoted to the proof of the Theorem.

For basic background on the topics considered here we refer to [5], [10], [9], [11] and [14]. The results presented in this paper form a part of the author's doctoral dissertation written under supervision of professor A. Skowroński. The author gratefully acknowledges support from the Polish Scientific Grant KBN No. 2 PO3A 020 08.

2. Preliminary results

2.1. Throughout the paper A denotes a fixed finite dimensional associative K -algebra with an identity over an algebraically closed field K . We denote by $\text{mod } A$ the category of finite dimensional left A -modules, by $\text{ind } A$ the full subcategory of $\text{mod } A$ formed by indecomposable modules, and by $\text{rad}(\text{mod } A)$ the Jacobson radical of $\text{mod } A$. By an A -module is meant an object from $\text{mod } A$. Further, we denote by Γ_A the Auslander-Reiten quiver of A and by $\tau = \tau_A$ and $\tau^- = \tau_A^-$ the Auslander-Reiten translations $D\text{Tr}$ and $\text{Tr } D$, respectively. We shall agree to identify the vertices of Γ_A with the corresponding indecomposable modules. For a module M we denote by $[M]$ the image of M in the Grothendieck group $K_0(A)$ of A . Thus $[M] = [N]$ if and only if M and N have the same simple composition factors including the multiplicities. Finally, for a family \mathcal{F} of A -modules, we denote by $\text{add}(\mathcal{F})$ the additive category given by \mathcal{F} , that is, the full subcategory of $\text{mod } A$ formed by all modules isomorphic to the direct summands of direct sums of modules from \mathcal{F} .

2.2. Following [13], for M, N from $\text{mod } A$, we set $M \leq N$ if and only if $[X, M] \leq [X, N]$ for all A -modules X . The fact that \leq is a partial order on the isomorphism classes of A -modules follows from a result by M. Auslander [3] (see also [7]). Observe that, if M and N have the same dimension and $M \leq N$, then $[M] = [N]$. Moreover, M. Auslander and I. Reiten have shown in [4] that, if M and N are A -modules with $[M] = [N]$, then for all nonprojective indecomposable A -modules X and all noninjective indecomposable modules Y the following formulas hold (see [12]):

$$\begin{aligned} [X, M] - [M, \tau X] &= [X, N] - [N, \tau X] \\ [M, Y] - [\tau^- Y, M] &= [N, Y] - [\tau^- Y, N] \end{aligned}$$

Hence, if $[M] = [N]$, then $M \leq N$ if and only if $[M, X] \leq [N, X]$ for all A -modules X .

2.3. Let M and N be A -modules with $[M] = [N]$ and

$$\Sigma : 0 \rightarrow D \rightarrow E \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$$

an exact sequence in $\text{mod } A$. Following [13] we define the additive functions $\delta_{M,N}$, $\delta'_{M,N}$ and δ_Σ on A -modules X as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{M,N}(X) &= [N, X] - [M, X] \\ \delta'_{M,N}(X) &= [X, N] - [X, M] \\ \delta_\Sigma(X) &= \delta_{E,D \oplus F}(X) = [D \oplus F, X] - [E, X]. \end{aligned}$$

From the Auslander-Reiten formulas (2.2) we get the following very useful equalities

$$\delta_{M,N}(X) = \delta'_{M,N}(\tau^- X), \quad \delta_{M,N}(\tau X) = \delta'_{M,N}(X)$$

for all A -modules X . Observe also that $\delta_{M,N}(I) = 0$ for any injective A -module I , and $\delta'_{M,N}(P) = 0$ for any projective A -module P . In particular, the following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $M \leq N$,
- (2) $\delta_{M,N}(X) \geq 0$ for all $X \in \Gamma_A$,
- (3) $\delta'_{M,N}(X) \geq 0$ for all $X \in \Gamma_A$.

2.4. For an A -module M and an indecomposable A -module Z , we denote by $\mu(M, Z)$ the multiplicity of Z as a direct summand of M . For a nonprojective indecomposable A -module U , we denote by $\Sigma(U)$ an Auslander-Reiten sequence

$$\Sigma(U) : 0 \rightarrow \tau U \rightarrow E(U) \rightarrow U \rightarrow 0,$$

and, for an injective indecomposable A -module I , we set $E(I) = I/\text{soc}(I)$, $\tau^- I = 0$.

We shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let M, N be A -modules with $[M] = [N]$ and U an indecomposable A -module. Then*

$$\mu(N, U) - \mu(M, U) = \delta_{M,N}(U) - \delta_{M,N}(E(U)) + \delta_{M,N}(\tau U).$$

Proof. If U is nonprojective, then the Auslander-Reiten sequence $\Sigma(U)$ induces an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(M, \tau U) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(M, E(U)) \rightarrow \text{rad}(M, U) \rightarrow 0,$$

and hence we get

$$[M, \tau U \oplus U] - [M, E(U)] = [M, U] - \dim_K \text{rad}(M, U) = \mu(M, U).$$

Similarly, we have

$$[N, \tau U \oplus U] - [N, E(U)] = \mu(N, U).$$

Then we obtain the equalities

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(N, U) - \mu(M, U) &= ([N, \tau U \oplus U] - [M, \tau U \oplus U]) - (N, [E(U)] - [M, E(U)]) \\ &= \delta_{M,N}(\tau U) + \delta_{M,N}(U) - \delta_{M,N}(E(U)). \end{aligned}$$

Assume now that U is projective. Then $\text{Hom}_A(M, \text{rad } U) \simeq \text{rad}(M, U)$, and so

$$[M, U] - [M, \text{rad } U] = \mu(M, U).$$

Similarly, we have

$$[N, U] - [N, \text{rad } U] = \mu(N, U).$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(N, U) - \mu(M, U) &= ([N, U] - [M, U]) - ([N, \text{rad } U] - [M, \text{rad } U]) \\ &= \delta_{M, N}(U) - \delta_{M, N}(\text{rad } U) \\ &= \delta_{M, N}(U) - \delta_{M, N}(E(U)) + \delta_{M, N}(\tau U). \end{aligned}$$

2.6. A component Γ of Γ_A , without oriented cycles and such that any τ -orbit contains a projective module is called *preprojective*. Also any module $X \in \text{add}(\Gamma)$ is called *preprojective*. There is a partial order \preceq on the set of vertices of a preprojective component Γ with $U \preceq V$ if there exists a path in Γ leading from U to V . Preinjective components and preinjective modules are defined dually.

2.7. Let M and N be A -modules with $M < N$. A short nonsplittable exact sequence

$$\Sigma : 0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow 0$$

is said to be *admissible for* (M, N) if $M = M' \oplus V$ for some A -module V and $[L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus V, X] \leq [N, X]$ for any A -module X (equivalently, $\delta_\Sigma \leq \delta_{M, N}$ or $\delta'_\Sigma \leq \delta'_{M, N}$).

We shall need the following fact.

Proposition. *Let M and N be A -modules with $[M] = [N]$, and assume that M is preprojective and $M < N$ holds. Then there exists an admissible sequence $0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow M \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow 0$ for (M, N) .*

Proof. We can repeat the proof of Theorem 4.1 in [10], since Bongartz has used the fact that N is preprojective only to prove that M is preprojective.

3. Some properties of modules over tame concealed algebras

Here and later on A denotes a fixed tame concealed algebra [14].

3.1. We recall those aspects of the representation theory of tame concealed algebras that we will need later (see [14], [10]). We have a decomposition of Γ_A into the preprojective part \mathcal{P} , the preinjective part \mathcal{I} and the regular one \mathcal{R} , where \mathcal{R} is a sum of stable tubes T_μ of ranks $r_\mu \geq 1$, for $\mu \in \mathbb{P}^1(K) = K \cup \{\infty\}$. For any A -module X we can write $X = X_P \oplus X_R \oplus X_I$, where $X_P \in \text{add}(\mathcal{P})$, $X_I \in \text{add}(\mathcal{I})$ and $X_R = \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)} X_\mu$ with $X_\mu \in \text{add}(T_\mu)$. All connected components of Γ_A are standard (see [14] for definition). A tube of rank 1 is called *homogeneous* and T_μ is not homogeneous for at most three $\mu \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. For any $X, Y \in \Gamma_A$, if $[X, Y] > 0$

and X and Y do not belong to the same connected component of Γ_A , then X is preprojective or Y is preinjective. The abelian category $\text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$ is serial and closed under extensions, so we may speak about simple regular modules, composition series in $\text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$, and so on. A tube \mathcal{T}_μ has r_μ simple regular modules, which are conjugate under τ . If a tube \mathcal{T}_μ is homogeneous ($r_\mu = 1$), then we denote a unique simple regular module in \mathcal{T}_μ by E_μ . For any simple regular module E in \mathcal{T}_μ we denote by

$$\cdots \rightarrow \varphi^3 E \rightarrow \varphi^2 E \rightarrow \varphi E \rightarrow \varphi^0 E = E$$

a unique infinite sectional path in \mathcal{T}_μ of epimorphisms and by

$$E = \psi^0 E \rightarrow \psi E \rightarrow \psi^2 E \rightarrow \psi^3 E \rightarrow \cdots$$

a unique infinite sectional path in \mathcal{T}_μ of monomorphisms. Then every indecomposable module in \mathcal{T}_μ is of the form $\varphi^j E$ and $\psi^j E'$ for some $j \geq 0$ and simple regular modules E, E' in \mathcal{T}_μ . In an obvious way we define functions

$$\varphi^k, \psi^k : \mathcal{T}_\mu \rightarrow \mathcal{T}_\mu \cup \{0\}$$

for any integer k , such that for any simple regular module E in \mathcal{T}_μ and $l \geq 0$ we have:

- $\varphi^k(\varphi^l E) = \varphi^{k+l} E$ if $k + l \geq 0$, and $\varphi^k(\varphi^l E) = 0$ otherwise;
- $\psi^k(\psi^l E) = \psi^{k+l} E$ if $k + l \geq 0$, and $\psi^k(\psi^l E) = 0$ otherwise.

Observe that for any integer k and $X \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$ we have $\tau X = \psi^- \varphi X$, $\tau^- X = \varphi^- \psi X$ and $\varphi^{kr} X = \psi^{kr} X$, where $r = r_\mu$.

There is a positive, sincere vector \underline{h} in $K_0(A)$, such that

$$[\varphi^{kr_\mu-1} E] = [\psi^{kr_\mu-1} E] = k \cdot \underline{h}$$

for any simple regular module E in \mathcal{T}_μ and $k \geq 1$.

3.2 The global dimension of A is at most 2. All preprojective and regular modules have projective dimension at most 1, and dually all preinjective and regular modules have injective dimension at most 1. The bilinear form on $K_0(A) = \mathbb{Z}^n$ which extends the equality

$$\langle [M], [N] \rangle = [M, N] - [M, N]^1 + [M, N]^2$$

and the associated quadratic form $\chi : K_0(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, $\chi(\underline{y}) = \langle \underline{y}, \underline{y} \rangle$, will play an important role. If M has no non-zero preinjective direct summand or N has no non-zero preprojective direct summand, then

$$\langle [M], [N] \rangle = [M, N] - [M, N]^1.$$

The quadratic form χ is positive semidefinite and controls the category $\text{mod } A$ (see [14]). This means that the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) For any $X \in \Gamma_A$, $\chi([X]) \in \{0, 1\}$.
- (2) For any connected, positive vector \underline{y} with $\chi(\underline{y}) = 1$, there is precisely one $X \in \Gamma_A$ with $[X] = \underline{y}$.
- (3) For any connected, positive vector \underline{y} with $\chi(\underline{y}) = 0$, there is an infinite family of pairwise nonisomorphic modules $X \in \Gamma_A$ with $[X] = \underline{y}$.

Moreover, $\chi(\underline{h}) = 0$ and $\langle \underline{h}, \underline{y} \rangle = -\langle \underline{y}, \underline{h} \rangle$ for any $\underline{y} \in K_0(A)$. Finally, we define a linear function $\partial : K_0(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$, called the *defect*, as follows

$$\partial \underline{y} = \langle \underline{h}, \underline{y} \rangle = -\langle \underline{y}, \underline{h} \rangle.$$

The main property of ∂ is that the value $\partial[X]$ is negative for any $X \in \mathcal{P}$, positive for any $X \in \mathcal{I}$, and zero for any $X \in \mathcal{R}$.

Lemma 3.3. *If $M \leq N$, then $\partial[M_P] - \partial[N_P] = \partial[N_I] - \partial[M_I] \geq 0$.*

Proof. Since $[M] = [N]$, then

$$\partial[M_P] + \partial[M_R] + \partial[M_I] = \partial[N_P] + \partial[N_R] + \partial[N_I].$$

The equalities $\partial[M_R] = \partial[N_R] = 0$ imply $\partial[M_P] - \partial[N_P] = \partial[N_I] - \partial[M_I]$. Take a homogeneous tube \mathcal{T}_μ with $(M \oplus N)_\mu = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq [N, E_\mu] - [M, E_\mu] &= [N_P, E_\mu] - [M_P, E_\mu] \\ &= \langle [N_P], [E_\mu] \rangle - \langle [M_P], [E_\mu] \rangle = \langle [N_P], \underline{h} \rangle - \langle [M_P], \underline{h} \rangle \\ &= \partial[M_P] - \partial[N_P]. \end{aligned}$$

3.4. Fix a tube \mathcal{T}_μ , $\mu \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$, and a module $X \in \text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$. Let $H(X) \geq 0$ be the minimal number such that for any indecomposable direct summand $\varphi^j E$ of X , where E is a simple regular module in \mathcal{T}_μ , we have $j < H(X)$ (so $H(X)$ is the maximal quasi-length of an indecomposable direct summand of X). For any simple regular module E in \mathcal{T}_μ we denote by $\ell_E(X)$ the multiplicity of E as a composition factor of a composition series of X in the category $\text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$. If E_1, \dots, E_r ($r = r_\mu$) denote all simple regular modules in \mathcal{T}_μ , then

$$[X] = \ell_{E_1}(X)[E_1] + \ell_{E_2}(X)[E_2] + \dots + \ell_{E_r}(X)[E_r].$$

Moreover, the following lemma holds (see Lemma 5.1 in [15]).

Lemma 3.5. *Let X be a module in $\text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$ and E be any simple regular module in \mathcal{T}_μ . Then for any $k \geq H(X) - 1$ we have*

$$[X, \psi^k E] = \ell_E(X) = [\varphi^k E, X].$$

As a consequence of the above lemma we obtain

Lemma 3.6. *Let i, j be integers with $j \geq 0$ and E be any simple regular module in T_μ . Then*

- (i) $[\varphi^s \psi^t E, \psi^{r-1} E] = 1$ for all $s \geq 0$, $0 \leq t < r$, and $[X, \psi^{r-1} E] = 0$ for the remaining indecomposable modules $X \in T_\mu$.
- (ii) $[\varphi^s \psi^t E, \psi^{r-1} \varphi^j E] - [\varphi^s \psi^t E, \psi^- \varphi^j E] = 1$ for all $s \geq j$, $0 \leq t < r$, and $[X, \psi^{r-1} \varphi^j E] - [X, \psi^- \varphi^j E] = 0$ for the remaining indecomposable modules $X \in T_\mu$.
- (iii) If $j \geq r$, then $[\psi^j E, \psi^j E] > 1$.
- (iv) $[E, \psi^j E] = 1$ and $[E', \psi^j E] = 0$ for all simple regular modules $E' \neq E$ in T_μ .

Applying Lemmas 4.3 and 4.6 in [15], we obtain the following result (see also Corollary 2.2 in [2]).

Lemma 3.7. *Let $X \in T_\mu$, $s, t \geq 0$ be integers, and M, N be A -modules with $[M] = [N]$. Then*

- (i) *There exists a nonsplittable exact sequence*

$$\Sigma : 0 \rightarrow \varphi^s X \rightarrow \varphi^s \psi^{t+1} X \oplus \varphi^- X \rightarrow \varphi^- \psi^{t+1} X \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, if $s < r$ or $t < r$, then $\delta_\Sigma(\varphi^i \psi^j X) = 1$ for all $0 \leq i \leq s$, $0 \leq j \leq t$, and $\delta_\Sigma(Y) = 0$ for the remaining indecomposable A -modules.

- (ii)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \leq i \leq s} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq t} \mu(N, \varphi^{-i} \psi^j X) - \mu(M, \varphi^{-i} \psi^j X) \\ &= \delta_{M,N}(\psi^- \varphi^{s+1} X) - \delta_{M,N}(\psi^- X) - \delta_{M,N}(\varphi^{s+1} \psi^t X) + \delta_{M,N}(\psi^t X). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.8. *Let M, N be A -modules with $M \leq N$ and $\partial[M_P] = \partial[N_P]$. Then*

- (i) $[M_P] \geq [N_P]$.
- (ii) *For any indecomposable simple regular module E in a tube T_μ we have*

$$\ell_E(M_\mu) \leq \ell_E(N_\mu).$$

- (iii) *For any tube T_μ , $[M_\mu] \leq [N_\mu]$ holds.*

Proof. (i) Let I be any indecomposable injective A -module. We shall show that $[M_P, I] \geq [N_P, I]$. For all but finitely many $k > 0$, the vector $k \cdot \underline{h} - [I]$ is positive

and connected. Moreover,

$$\chi(k \cdot \underline{h} - [I]) = \langle k \cdot \underline{h} - [I], k \cdot \underline{h} - [I] \rangle = \langle [I], [I] \rangle = \chi([I]) = 1.$$

Thus for all but finitely many $k > 0$ there is an indecomposable A -module X_k with $[X_k] = k \cdot \underline{h} - [I]$. Of course

$$\partial[X_k] = \langle \underline{h}, k \cdot \underline{h} - [I] \rangle = -\langle \underline{h}, [I] \rangle = -\partial[I] < 0,$$

which implies that X_k is preprojective. Take $k > 0$ such that there exists a preprojective A -module X_k with $[X_k] = k \cdot \underline{h} - [I]$ and $[M_P \oplus N_P, X_k]^1 = 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} [M_P, I] &= \langle [M_P], [I] \rangle = -k\partial[M_P] - \langle [M_P], [X_k] \rangle = -k\partial[M_P] - [M_P, X_k] \\ &\geq -k\partial[N_P] - [N_P, X_k] = -k\partial[N_P] - \langle [N_P], [X_k] \rangle = \langle [N_P], [I] \rangle \\ &= [N_P, I]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $[M_P] \geq [N_P]$.

(ii) Let $r = r_\mu$ and s be a natural number such that $sr \geq H(M_\mu \oplus N_\mu)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq [N, \psi^{sr-1}E] - [M, \psi^{sr-1}E] &= [N_P, \psi^{sr-1}E] - [M_P, \psi^{sr-1}E] + [N_\mu, \psi^{sr-1}E] \\ &\quad - [M_\mu, \psi^{sr-1}E] = \langle [N_P], s \cdot \underline{h} \rangle - \langle [M_P], s \cdot \underline{h} \rangle + \ell_E(N_\mu) - \ell_E(M_\mu) \\ &= -s(\partial[N_P] - \partial[M_P]) + \ell_E(N_\mu) - \ell_E(M_\mu) = \ell_E(N_\mu) - \ell_E(M_\mu), \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 3.5.

(iii) follows from (ii), since for any $X \in \text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$ we have

$$[X] = \ell_{E_1}(X)[E_1] + \dots + \ell_{E_r}(X)[E_r],$$

where $r = r_\mu$ and E_1, \dots, E_r denote all simple regular modules in \mathcal{T}_μ .

Lemma 3.9. *Let Γ' be a disjoint union of some tubes in Γ_A and $\Gamma'' = \Gamma_A \setminus \Gamma'$. Then for any $X \in \text{add}(\Gamma'')$ and $R_1, R_2 \in \text{add}(\Gamma')$ with $[R_1] = [R_2]$ we have*

$$[X, R_1] = [X, R_2] \quad \text{and} \quad [R_1, X] = [R_2, X].$$

Proof. By duality, it is enough to prove the first equality. We may assume that X is indecomposable and preprojective, because $[X, R_1] = [X, R_2] = 0$ for any regular or preinjective A -module $X \in \text{add}(\Gamma'')$. Hence, we get

$$[X, R_1] - [X, R_1]^1 = \langle [X], [R_1] \rangle = \langle [X], [R_2] \rangle = [X, R_2] - [X, R_2]^1.$$

Since $[X, R_1]^1 = [X, R_2]^1 = 0$ for any preprojective A -module X , we obtain the required equality $[X, R_1] = [X, R_2]$.

4. Proof of the Theorem

We shall divide our proof of the Theorem into several steps. We use the notations introduced in Sections 2 and 3.

Proposition 4.1. *Let M and $N = N_0 \oplus N_1$ be A -modules without any common indecomposable direct summands. Assume that $M < N$ and N_0 is a preprojective indecomposable A -module with $[N_0, N] = [N_0, M]$. If there is no admissible sequence of the form $0 \rightarrow N_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ for (M, N) , then there exist a homogeneous tube \mathcal{T}_ν in Γ_A , for which $(M \oplus N)_\nu = 0$, and a nonsplittable exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow E_\nu \rightarrow 0,$$

such that $[L \oplus E_\nu, X] \leq [N, X]$ for any indecomposable A -module $X \notin \mathcal{T}_\nu$.

Proof. By Theorem 2.4 in [10] N_0 embeds into M and the closure $\overline{\mathcal{Q}}$ of the quotients of M by N_0 contains N_1 . Let $t = \dim_K M + 1$ and $\Gamma' \cup \mathcal{T}_{\mu_1} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{T}_{\mu_t}$ be the disjoint union of all homogeneous tubes which do not contain any indecomposable direct summand of $M \oplus N$. We set $\Gamma'' = \Gamma_A \setminus \Gamma'$. Then Γ'' is the disjoint union of finitely many connected components of Γ_A , and for any natural number d , there is only a finite number of isomorphism classes of d -dimensional modules from $\text{add}(\Gamma'')$. We decompose the set \mathcal{Q} into a finite union of pairwise disjoint subsets $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_r$ such that two modules $U_1 \oplus U_2$ and $V_1 \oplus V_2$ from \mathcal{Q} with $U_1, V_1 \in \text{add}(\Gamma'')$, $U_2, V_2 \in \text{add}(\Gamma')$, belong to the same \mathcal{D}_i , $1 \leq i \leq r$, if and only if $U_1 \simeq V_1$. Since $\overline{\mathcal{Q}} = \overline{\mathcal{D}_1} \cup \overline{\mathcal{D}_2} \cup \dots \cup \overline{\mathcal{D}_r}$, the module N_1 belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{D}_i}$ for some $1 \leq i \leq r$. Take any $V \oplus R \in \mathcal{D}_i$ with $V \in \text{add}(\Gamma'')$ and $R \in \text{add}(\Gamma')$. Then any module from \mathcal{D}_i is, up to isomorphism, of the form $V \oplus R'$ for some $R' \in \text{add}(\Gamma')$ with $[R'] = [R]$. Consequently, for any indecomposable module $X \in \text{add}(\Gamma'')$ we have $[R', X] = [R, X]$, by Lemma 3.9. Applying upper semicontinuity of the function $(Z \rightarrow \dim_K \text{Hom}_A(Z, X))$, we conclude that the set

$$\mathcal{S}_X = \{Z \in \overline{\mathcal{D}_i}; [Z, X] \geq [V \oplus R, X] = [V \oplus R', X]\}$$

is closed (see [11],[13]), for any $X \in \text{add}(\Gamma'')$. Since \mathcal{D}_i is a subset of \mathcal{S}_X , we obtain that $[N_1, X] \geq [V \oplus R, X]$ for any $X \in \text{add}(\Gamma'')$. Take a tube $\mathcal{T}_{\mu_c} \subset \Gamma''$, for some $1 \leq c \leq t$, such that any direct summand of $V \oplus N_1$ does not belong to \mathcal{T}_{μ_c} . It is possible, because $\dim_K V < t$.

Assume that $R = 0$. Then by Lemma 3.9, for any $\mathcal{T}_\lambda \subset \Gamma'$ and $j \geq 0$, we have

$$[N_1, \varphi^j E_\lambda] = [N_1, \varphi^j E_{\mu_c}] \geq [V, \varphi^j E_{\mu_c}] = [V, \varphi^j E_\lambda].$$

This leads to a contradiction, since the sequence $0 \rightarrow N_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow V \rightarrow 0$ is admissible for (M, N) . So, there is a tube $\mathcal{T}_\nu \subset \Gamma'$ such that $V \oplus R = I \oplus \varphi^j E_\nu$ for

some A -module I and $j \geq 0$. Then, for an epimorphism $p : \varphi^j E_\nu \rightarrow E_\nu$ we obtain the following commutative diagram with exact rows and columns

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & I \oplus \varphi^{j-1} E_\nu & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 \rightarrow & N_0 & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & I \oplus \varphi^j E_\nu & \rightarrow 0 \\
 & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \downarrow (0,p) & \\
 0 \rightarrow & L & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & E_\nu & \rightarrow 0 \\
 & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & \\
 & I \oplus \varphi^{j-1} E_\nu & & & 0 & & \\
 & \downarrow & & & & & \\
 & 0 & & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Hence, for any $T_\lambda \subset (\Gamma' \setminus T_\nu)$ and $k \geq 0$, applying Lemma 3.9, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 [N, \varphi^k E_\lambda] &= [N, \varphi^k E_{\mu_c}] \geq [N_0 \oplus V \oplus R, \varphi^k E_{\mu_c}] \\
 &= [N_0 \oplus I \oplus \varphi^j E_\nu, \varphi^k E_{\mu_c}] \\
 &= [N_0 \oplus I \oplus \varphi^{j-1} E_\nu \oplus E_\nu, \varphi^k E_{\mu_c}] \\
 &\geq [L \oplus E_\nu, \varphi^k E_{\mu_c}] = [L \oplus E_\nu, \varphi^k E_\lambda].
 \end{aligned}$$

This leads to $[L \oplus E_\nu, X] \leq [N, X]$ for any $X \in \Gamma_A \setminus T_\nu$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let M and N be A -modules without any common indecomposable direct summand and such that $M < N$ and $M_P \oplus N_P$ is nonzero. Let $r = r_\mu$ and E be any simple regular module in T_μ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. If there is no admissible sequence for (M, N) , then*

- (i) $\partial[M_P] = \partial[N_P]$.
- (ii) $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^s \psi^t E) = 0$ holds for some $s \geq 0$ and $0 \leq t < r$.
- (iii) For any $j \geq 1$ such that $\psi^- \varphi^j E$ is a direct summand of M , the equality $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^s \psi^t E) = 0$ holds for some $s \geq j$ and $0 \leq t < r$.
- (iv) There are infinitely many modules X in T_μ with $\delta'_{M,N}(X) = 0$.
- (v) There are infinitely many modules X in T_μ with $\delta_{M,N}(X) = 0$.

Proof. (i) If $\delta_{M,N}(X) = 0$ for all indecomposable preprojective A -modules, then, by Lemma 2.5, $\mu(M_P, X) = \mu(N_P, X)$ for any indecomposable preprojective A -module, and consequently $M_P = N_P = 0$, which gives a contradiction. Let N_0 be a minimal, with respect to \preceq , indecomposable preprojective A -module with $\delta_{M,N}(N_0) > 0$. Then by Lemma 2.5 we get

$$\mu(N, N_0) - \mu(M, N_0) = \delta_{M,N}(N_0) > 0,$$

because $X \prec N_0$ for any indecomposable direct summand X of $E(N_0) \oplus \tau N_0$. This implies that $N = N_0 \oplus N_1$ for some A -module N_1 . Of course, $\delta'_{M,N}(N_0) = \delta_{M,N}(\tau N_0) = 0$ and consequently $[N_0, N] = [N_0, M]$. By Proposition 4.1, there is a nonsplittable exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow E_\nu \rightarrow 0$$

such that \mathcal{T}_ν is a homogeneous tube for which $(M \oplus N)_\nu = 0$ and $[L \oplus E_\nu, X] \leq [N, X]$ for any indecomposable A -module $X \notin \mathcal{T}_\nu$. Observe that $L_R \oplus L_I = M_R \oplus M_I$. Then we get a nonsplittable exact sequence

$$\Sigma : 0 \rightarrow L_P \rightarrow M_P \rightarrow E_\nu \rightarrow 0$$

such that $\delta_\Sigma(X) \leq \delta_{M,N}(X)$ for any indecomposable A -module $X \notin \mathcal{T}_\nu$. Thus there is $t \geq 0$ such that $\delta_\Sigma(\varphi^t E_\nu) > \delta_{M,N}(\varphi^t E_\nu)$, because Σ is not admissible for (M, N) . We set $F = E_\nu$. Since $\tau^- \varphi^t F = \varphi^t F$, we get

$$\delta_\Sigma(\varphi^t F) = \delta'_\Sigma(\varphi^t F) = [\varphi^t F, L_P \oplus F] - [\varphi^t F, M_P] = [\varphi^t F, F] = 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{M,N}(\varphi^t F) &= [N, \varphi^t F] - [M, \varphi^t F] = [N_P, \varphi^t F] - [M_P, \varphi^t F] = < [N_P], [\varphi^t F] > \\ &\quad - < [M_P], [\varphi^t F] > = < [N_P], (t+1) \cdot \underline{h} > - < [M_P], (t+1) \cdot \underline{h} > \\ &= (t+1)(\partial[M_P] - \partial[N_P]). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to $\partial[M_P] - \partial[N_P] < 1$ and, by Lemma 3.3, we have $\partial[M_P] = \partial[N_P]$.

(ii) Since $M_P \leq_{\text{ext}} L_P \oplus E_\nu$, then $M_P \leq L_P \oplus E_\nu$. Let X be any indecomposable A -module. If $X \notin \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}_\mu$, then $[X, M_P] = [X, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E] = 0$. If $X \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$, then $0 = [X, M_P] \leq [X, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E]$. Since $[E_\nu] = \underline{h} = [\psi^{r-1} E]$, applying Lemma 3.9 for any preprojective module X , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq [X, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E] - [X, M_P] = [X, L_P \oplus E_\nu] - [X, M_P] \\ &= [X, L \oplus E_\nu] - [X, M] \leq [X, N] - [X, M]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $M_P \leq L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E$ and

$$[X, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E] - [X, M_P] \leq [X, N] - [X, M]$$

for any indecomposable A -module $X \notin \mathcal{T}_\mu$. By Proposition 2.7, there is an admissible sequence

$$\Sigma_0 : 0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow M_P \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow 0$$

for $(M_P, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E)$. Hence, $[X, L_1 \oplus L_2] \leq [X, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E] = 0$ for any indecomposable module $X \notin \mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}_\mu$. This implies that $L_1 \oplus L_2 \in \text{add}(\mathcal{P} \cup \mathcal{T}_\mu)$. Since the sequence Σ_0 is not admissible for (M, N) , we get

$$[X, \psi^{r-1} E] = [X, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E] - [X, M_P] > [X, N] - [X, M]$$

for some indecomposable module $X \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$. By Lemma 3.6(i), $[\varphi^s \psi^t E, \psi^{r-1} E] = 1$ for all $s \geq 0$, $0 \leq t < r$ and $[X, \psi^{r-1} E] = 0$ for the remaining modules $X \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$. Hence, $\delta'_{M,N}(X) = [X, N] - [X, M] = 0$ for some $X = \varphi^s \psi^t E$, $s \geq 0$ and $0 \leq t < r$.

(iii) Assume that $\psi^- \varphi^j E$ is a direct summand of M for some $j \geq 1$. Take the admissible sequence

$$\Sigma_0 : 0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow M_P \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow 0$$

for $(M_P, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E)$, considered in (ii). We can write $L_2 = L'_2 \oplus Y$ such that $L_1 \oplus L'_2$ is preprojective and $Y \in \text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$. If $Y = 0$, then $[X, L_1 \oplus L_2] - [X, M_P] = 0$ for any $X \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$, and moreover Σ_0 is an admissible sequence for (M, N) . Hence $Y \neq 0$, and consequently

$$[X, Y] = [X, L_1 \oplus L'_2 \oplus Y] - [X, M_P] \leq [X, L_P \oplus \psi^{r-1} E] - [X, M_P] = [X, \psi^{r-1} E]$$

for any X in \mathcal{T}_μ . Applying Lemma 3.6(iv) we get $[E, Y] \leq [E, \psi^{r-1} E] = 1$ and $[E', Y] \leq [E', \psi^{r-1} E] = 0$, for all simple regular modules $E' \neq E$ in \mathcal{T}_μ , and consequently Y is indecomposable and $Y = \psi^k E$ for some $k \geq 0$. Since $[Y, Y] \leq [Y, \psi^{r-1} E] \leq 1$, we obtain $k < r$, by Lemma 3.6. Let

$$e : L'_2 \oplus \varphi^j \psi^k E \rightarrow L'_2 \oplus \psi^k E = L_2$$

be a natural epimorphism. Then the pull back of Σ_0 under e is a sequence of the form

$$\Sigma_j : 0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow M_P \oplus \psi^- \varphi^j E \rightarrow L'_2 \oplus \varphi^j \psi^k E \rightarrow 0,$$

because $\ker e$ is isomorphic to $\psi^- \varphi^j E$ and $\text{Ext}^1(M_P, \psi^- \varphi^j E) = 0$. Observe that $M_P \oplus \psi^- \varphi^j E$ is a direct summand of M and $\delta'_{\Sigma_j} \leq \delta'_{\Sigma_0}$. This implies that $\delta'_{\Sigma_j}(X) \leq \delta'_{M,N}(X)$ for any indecomposable A -module $X \notin \mathcal{T}_\mu$. Since the sequence Σ_j is not admissible for (M, N) , we get $\delta'_{\Sigma_j}(X) > \delta'_{M,N}(X)$ for some $X \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$. Then

$$\delta'_{\Sigma_j}(X) = [X, \varphi^j \psi^k E] - [X, \psi^- \varphi^j E] \leq [X, \varphi^j \psi^{r-1} E] - [X, \psi^- \varphi^j E],$$

because $\varphi^j \psi^k E$ may be treated as a submodule of $\varphi^j \psi^{r-1} E$. Applying Lemma 3.6(ii) we get that $[\varphi^s \psi^t E, \varphi^j \psi^{r-1} E] - [\varphi^s \psi^t E, \psi^- \varphi^j E] = 1$ for all $s \geq j$, $0 \leq t < r$, and $[Y, \varphi^j \psi^{r-1} E] - [Y, \psi^- \varphi^j E] = 0$ for the remaining indecomposable modules $Y \in \mathcal{T}_\mu$. Thus, $X = \varphi^s \psi^t E$ and $\delta'_{M,N}(X) = 0$ for some $s \geq j$ and $0 \leq t < r$.

(iv) Suppose that the required claim is not true. Take a maximal $s \geq 0$ and a simple regular module E' in \mathcal{T}_μ such that $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^s E') = 0$. Applying (ii) for the simple regular module $\tau^- E'$, we infer that there are numbers $s' \geq 0$ and $0 \leq t' < r$ with $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{s'} \psi^{t'} \tau^- E') = \delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{s'-1} \psi^{t'+1} E') = 0$. Take a pair (s', t') with maximal number s' . Since $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{s'} \psi^{t'} \tau^- E') = \varphi^{s'+t'}(\tau^{-t'-1} E')$, then $s' \leq s' + t' \leq s$, by maximality of s . Thus, $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^k \psi^l \tau^- E') > 0$ for all

$k > s'$ and $0 \leq l < r$. Applying Lemma 3.7(ii), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{s' \leq i \leq s} \sum_{0 \leq j \leq t'} \mu(N, \varphi^i \psi^j E') - \mu(M, \varphi^i \psi^j E') &= \delta_{M,N}(\psi^- \varphi^{s+1} E') \\ &\quad - \delta_{M,N}(\psi^- \varphi^{s'} E') - \delta_{M,N}(\varphi^{s+1} \psi^{t'} E') + \delta_{M,N}(\varphi^{s'} \psi^{t'} E') \\ &\leq \delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^s E') - \delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{s+1} \psi^{t'} \tau^- E') + \delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{s'-1} \psi^{t'+1} E') \\ &= -\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{s+1} \psi^{t'} \tau^- E') < 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $s+1 > s'$ and $0 \leq t' < r$. Thus $\varphi^i \psi^j E'$ is a direct summand of M for some $s' \leq i \leq s$ and $0 \leq j < r$. Let $E = \tau^{-j-1} E'$. Then $\psi^- \varphi^{i+j+1} E$ is a direct summand of M , and applying (iii), we get numbers $p \geq i+j+1$ and $0 \leq q < r$ with $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^p \psi^q E) = 0$. Observe that $\varphi^p \psi^q E = \varphi^{p-j} \psi^{q+j} \tau^- E'$ and $0 \leq q+j < 2r$. If $q+j < r$, then $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{p-j} \psi^{q+j} \tau^- E') = 0$, because $p-j \geq i+1 > s'$. This leads to $q+j \geq r$, and $\varphi^{p-j} \psi^{q+j} \tau^- E' = \varphi^{p-j+r} \psi^{q+j-r} \tau^- E'$. But then $\delta'_{M,N}(\varphi^{p-j+r} \psi^{q+j-r} \tau^- E') = 0$, because $p-j+r > s'$ and $0 \leq q+j-r < r$, which is a contradiction.

(v) follows from (iv) and the formula $\delta_{M,N}(X) = \delta'_{M,N}(\tau^- X)$.

Proposition 4.3. *Let M and N be A -modules with $M < N$. Assume that there is a tube T_μ in Γ_A such that $\delta_{M,N}(\psi^j E) = 0$ and $\delta_{M,N}(\psi^{j-1} E) > 0$ for some simple regular module E in T_μ and $j \geq H(M_\mu \oplus N_\mu) + r$, where $r = r_\mu$. Then there exists an admissible sequence for (M, N) .*

Proof. Applying Lemma 3.5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{M,N}(\psi^j E) &= [N, \psi^j E] - [M, \psi^j E] = [N_P \oplus N_\mu, \psi^j E] - [M_P \oplus M_\mu, \psi^j E] \\ &= <[N_P], [\psi^j E]> - <[M_P], [\psi^j E]> + \ell_E(N_\mu) - \ell_E(M_\mu), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{M,N}(\psi^{j-r} E) &= <[N_P], [\psi^{j-r} E]> - <[M_P], [\psi^{j-r} E]> \\ &\quad + \ell_E(N_\mu) - \ell_E(M_\mu). \end{aligned}$$

This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{M,N}(\psi^{j-r} E) &= <[N_P], [\psi^{j-r} E] - [\psi^j E]> - <[M_P], [\psi^{j-r} E] - [\psi^j E]> \\ &= <[N_P], -\underline{h}> - <[M_P], -\underline{h}> = \partial[N_P] - \partial[M_P] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Take a maximal number k such that $j-r \leq k \leq j-2$ and $\delta_{M,N}(\psi^k E) = 0$. Then we have $\delta_{M,N}(\psi^t E) > 0$ for any $k < t < j$. If $\delta_{M,N}(\varphi^c \psi^d E) > 0$ for all $-k-1 \leq c \leq 0$ and $k < d < j$, then we set $Y = 0$, $p = -k-2$ and $q = k+1$. Assume now that this is not the case. Take a maximal number c and a number d

such that $-k - 1 \leq c \leq 0$, $k < d < j$ and $\delta_{M,N}(\varphi^c \psi^d E) = 0$. Of course, $c < 0$. Applying Lemma 3.7(ii), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{c \leq p < 0} \sum_{k < q \leq d} \mu(N, \varphi^c \psi^d E) - \mu(M, \varphi^c \psi^d E) &= \delta_{M,N}(\psi^k E) + \delta_{M,N}(\varphi^c \psi^d E) \\ &\quad - \delta_{M,N}(\psi^d E) - \delta_{M,N}(\varphi^c \psi^k E) \leq -\delta_{M,N}(\psi^d E) < 0, \end{aligned}$$

because $k < d < j$. Hence, $Y = \varphi^p \psi^q E$ is a direct summand of M for some $c \leq p < 0$ and $k < q \leq d$.

We set $V = \psi^q E$ and $W = \varphi^p \psi^j E$. Applying Lemma 3.7(i) for $X = \varphi^{p+1} \psi^q E$, $s = -p - 1$, $t = j - q - 1$, we get a short exact sequence

$$\Omega : 0 \rightarrow V \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} \iota \\ f \end{pmatrix}} \psi^j E \oplus Y \xrightarrow{(f_1, f_2)} W \rightarrow 0,$$

where $\iota : V \rightarrow \psi^j E$ is a monomorphism. Further, $\delta_\Omega(X) = 1$ for any $X \in \mathcal{Y} = \{\varphi^v \psi^w E; p < v \leq 0, q \leq w < j\}$ and $\delta_\Omega(X) = 0$ for the remaining indecomposable A -modules X , because $t < r$. Thus, $\delta_\Omega \leq \delta_{M,N}$, and so $M \oplus V \oplus W \leq N \oplus Y \oplus \psi^j E$. Moreover,

$$0 \leq [N \oplus Y \oplus \psi^j E, \psi^j E] - [M \oplus V \oplus W, \psi^j E] \leq [N, \psi^j E] - [M, \psi^j E] = 0$$

and $M \oplus V \oplus W \leq_{\text{deg}} N \oplus Y \oplus \psi^j E$, by Proposition 3 in [9]. Observe that the set of isomorphism classes of kernels of epimorphisms $M \oplus (V \oplus W) \rightarrow \psi^j E$ is finite. Therefore, there is a nonsplittable short exact sequence

$$\Theta : 0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \oplus V \oplus W \xrightarrow{g} \psi^j E \rightarrow 0$$

such that $L \leq_{\text{deg}} N \oplus Y$, by Theorem 2.4 in [10]. Of course, $M = M' \oplus Y$ for some A -module M' . We may consider the module V as a submodule of $\psi^j E$.

We claim that for any $g' \in \text{Hom}_A(Y \oplus V \oplus W, \psi^j E)$ we have $\text{im } g' \subseteq V$. Indeed, since

$$E \subset \psi E \subset \dots \subset V = \psi^q E \subset \dots \subset \psi^j E$$

is the unique composition series of $\psi^j E$ in $\text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$, we get $\text{im } g' = \psi^{j'} E$ for some $0 \leq j' \leq j$. On the other hand, the equality $\text{im } g' = \psi^{j'} E$ implies that there is an indecomposable direct summand $\varphi^k \psi^{j'} E$ of $(Y \oplus V \oplus W)$, for some $k \geq 0$. This leads to $j' \leq q$, which proves our claim.

Then the epimorphism g is of the form

$$g = (g_1, \iota g_2) : M' \oplus (Y \oplus V \oplus W) \rightarrow \psi^j E,$$

for some $g_1 : M' \rightarrow \psi^j E$ and $g_2 : Y \oplus V \oplus W \rightarrow V$.

Consider the pull back of the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M' \oplus (Y \oplus V \oplus W) \oplus Y \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} g_1 & \iota g_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_Y \end{pmatrix}} \psi^j E \oplus Y \rightarrow 0$$

under the monomorphism $\begin{pmatrix} \iota \\ f \end{pmatrix} : V \rightarrow \psi^j E \oplus Y$. Then we obtain the following commutative diagram with exact rows and columns

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 \rightarrow & L & \longrightarrow & Z & \longrightarrow & V & \rightarrow 0 \\
 & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 \rightarrow & L & \longrightarrow & M' \oplus (Y \oplus V \oplus W) \oplus Y & \longrightarrow & \psi^j E \oplus Y & \rightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow (f_1, f_2) & & \\
 & & W & = & W & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & &
 \end{array}$$

Hence we get an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow Z \rightarrow M' \oplus (Y \oplus V \oplus W) \oplus Y \xrightarrow{(f_1 g_1, f_1 \iota g_2, f_2)} W \rightarrow 0.$$

We may consider the module Z as a submodule of $M' \oplus (Y \oplus V \oplus W) \oplus Y$. Since $f_1 \iota g_2 = -f_2 f g_2$, we obtain a submodule $Z' = \{(0, m, f g_2(m)); m \in Y \oplus V \oplus W\}$ of Z . It is easy to see that $Z' \simeq Y \oplus V \oplus W$, $Z = Z' \oplus Z_1$ for some A -module Z_1 , and there exists an exact sequence of the form

$$\Psi : 0 \rightarrow Z_1 \rightarrow M' \oplus Y = M \rightarrow W \rightarrow 0.$$

Observe that, for any A -module X , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \delta_\Psi(X) &= [Z_1 \oplus W, X] - [M, X] = [Z_1 \oplus W \oplus Y \oplus V, X] - [M \oplus Y \oplus V, X] \\
 &= [Z, X] - [M \oplus Y \oplus V, X] \leq [L \oplus V, X] - [M \oplus Y \oplus V, X] \\
 &= [L, X] - [M \oplus Y, X] \leq [N \oplus Y, X] - [M \oplus Y, X] = \delta_{M, N}(X),
 \end{aligned}$$

because $Z \leq_{\text{ext}} L \oplus V$ and $L \leq_{\text{deg}} N \oplus Y$. Thus the sequence Ψ is admissible for (M, N) , and this finishes the proof.

4.4. Proof of Theorem. Let M and N be two A -modules such that $M < N$. We shall show that $M <_{\text{ext}} N$. By Lemma 1.2 in [10], we may assume that the relation $M < N$ is minimal.

We claim that there is an admissible exact sequence for (M, N) . Suppose that this is not the case. We may assume that M and N have no common indecomposable direct summand. If $M_P = N_P = M_I = N_I = 0$, then by Theorem 1 in [15], or

Section 3 in [9], $M = M_R <_{\text{ext}} N_R = N$. Then by definition of the relation \leq_{ext} , there is an admissible sequence for (M, N) , and we get a contradiction. Hence, up to duality, we may assume that $M_P \oplus N_P$ is nonzero. Then by Proposition 4.2(i), $\partial[M_P] = \partial[N_P]$ and applying Lemma 3.8(i) and its dual we obtain

$$[M_P] \geq [N_P] \quad \text{and} \quad [M_I] \geq [N_I].$$

Assume that $[M_P] = [N_P]$ and let V be any indecomposable A -module. If V is preprojective, then

$$\delta_{M_P, N_P}(V) = [N_P, V] - [M_P, V] = [N, V] - [M, V] \geq 0,$$

otherwise

$$\delta_{M_P, N_P}(V) = \delta'_{M_P, N_P}(\tau^- V) = [\tau^- V, N_P] - [\tau^- V, M_P] = 0 - 0 = 0.$$

This implies that $M_P < N_P$ and by Corollary 4.2 in [10], $M_P <_{\text{ext}} N_P$. Then, by definition of the relation \leq_{ext} , there is an admissible sequence for (M_P, N_P) . Since $\delta_{M_P, N_P} \leq \delta_{M, N}$, this sequence is admissible for (M, N) , again a contradiction.

Hence, $[M_P] > [N_P]$, and consequently $\sum[M_\mu] < \sum[N_\mu]$, where the summation runs through all $\mu \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. Applying Lemma 3.8(iii), we conclude that there is $\mu \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ such that $[M_\mu] < [N_\mu]$. We set $r = r_\mu$ and let E_1, \dots, E_r be all simple regular modules in \mathcal{T}_μ . Then by Lemma 3.8(ii) there is a simple regular module E in \mathcal{T}_μ with $\ell_E(M_\mu) < \ell_E(N_\mu)$, because $[X] = \ell_{E_1}(X)[E_1] + \dots + \ell_{E_r}(X)[E_r]$ for any $X \in \text{add}(\mathcal{T}_\mu)$. Applying Lemma 3.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{M, N}(\psi^{sr-1} E) &= [N, \psi^{sr-1} E] - [M, \psi^{sr-1} E] = [N_P, \psi^{sr-1} E] \\ &\quad - [M_P, \psi^{sr-1} E] + [N_\mu, \psi^{sr-1} E] - [M_\mu, \psi^{sr-1} E] \\ &= < [N_P], [\psi^{sr-1} E] > - < [M_P], [\psi^{sr-1} E] > + \ell_E(N_\mu) - \ell_E(M_\mu) \\ &> < [N_P], s \cdot \underline{h} > - < [M_P], s \cdot \underline{h} > = -s\partial[N_P] + s\partial[M_P] = 0, \end{aligned}$$

for any integer s satisfying $sr \geq H(M_\mu \oplus N_\mu)$. Hence $\delta_{M, N}(X) > 0$ for infinitely many X in \mathcal{T}_μ .

Applying Proposition 4.2(v), we infer that there are a simple regular module F in \mathcal{T}_μ and a number $j > H(M_\mu \oplus N_\mu) + r$ such that $\delta_{M, N}(\psi^j F) = 0$ and either $\delta_{M, N}(\psi^{j-1} F) > 0$ or $\delta_{M, N}(\varphi^- \psi^j F) > 0$. Let $F' = \tau^{-j-1} F$. Then either $\delta_{M, N}(\psi^j F) = 0 < \delta_{M, N}(\psi^{j-1} F)$ or $\delta'_{M, N}(\varphi^j F') = 0 < \delta'_{M, N}(\varphi^{j-1} F')$. Then by Proposition 4.3 or its dual there exists an admissible exact sequence for (M, N) . This proves our claim.

Take an admissible sequence $0 \rightarrow L_1 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow L_2 \rightarrow 0$ for (M, N) . This implies that $M = M' \oplus V$ for some A -module V and we obtain $M <_{\text{ext}} L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus V \leq N$. Since the relation $M < N$ is minimal, then $N = L_1 \oplus L_2 \oplus V$. This leads to $M <_{\text{ext}} N$, and completes the proof.

References

- [1] S. Abeasis and A. del Fra, Degenerations for the representations of a quiver of type \mathbb{A}_m , *J. Algebra* **93** (1985), 376–412.
- [2] I. Assem and A. Skowroński, Minimal representation-infinite coil algebras, *Manuscripta Math.* **67** (1990), 305–331.
- [3] M. Auslander; Representation theory of finite dimensional algebras, *Contemp. Math.* **13** (AMS 1982), 27–39.
- [4] M. Auslander and I. Reiten, Modules determined by their composition factors, *Illinois J. Math.* **29** (1985), 280–301.
- [5] M. Auslander, I. Reiten and S. O. Smalø, *Representation Theory of Artin Algebras*, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [6] K. Bongartz On a result of Bautista and Smalø, *Comm. Algebra* **11** (1983), 2123–2124.
- [7] K. Bongartz, A generalization of a theorem of M. Auslander, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **21** (1989), 255–256.
- [8] K. Bongartz, Minimal singularities for representations of Dynkin quivers, *Commentarii Math. Helvetici* **69** (1994) 575–611.
- [9] K. Bongartz, Degenerations for representations of tame quivers, *Ann. Sci. École Normale Sup.* **28** (1995), 647–668.
- [10] K. Bongartz, On degenerations and extensions of finite dimensional modules, *Advances Math.* **121** (1996), 245–287.
- [11] H. Kraft, Geometric methods in representation theory, in: *Representations of Algebras*, Springer Lecture Notes in Math. **944** (1982), 180–258.
- [12] I. Reiten, A. Skowroński and S. O. SmaløShort chains and short cycles of modules, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **117** (1993), 343–354.
- [13] C. Riedmann, Degenerations for representations of quivers with relations, *Ann. Sci. École Normale Sup.* **4** (1986), 275–301.
- [14] C. M. Ringel *Tame Algebras and Integral Quadratic Forms*, Lecture Notes in Math. **1099**, Springer 1984.
- [15] A. Skowroński and G. Zwara, On degenerations of modules with nondirecting indecomposable summands, *Canad. J. Math.* **48** (1996), 1091–1120.
- [16] G. Zwara, Degenerations in the module varieties of generalized standard Auslander–Reiten components, *Colloq. Math.* **72** (1997), 281–303.
- [17] G. Zwara, Degenerations for modules over representation-finite biserial algebras, *J. Algebra*, **198** (2) (1997), 563–581.

Grzegorz Zwara
 Faculty of Mathematics and Informatics
 Nicholas Copernicus University
 Chopina 12/18, 87-100 Toruń
 Poland
 e-mail: gzwara@mat.uni.torun.pl

(Received: January 31, 1997)