

SHARD THEORY FOR g -FANS

YUYA MIZUNO

ABSTRACT. For a finite dimensional algebra A , the notion of g -fan $\Sigma(A)$ is defined from two-term silting complexes of $K^b(\text{proj}A)$ in the real Grothendieck group $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}$. In this paper, we discuss the theory of shards to $\Sigma(A)$, which was originally defined for a hyperplane arrangement. We establish a correspondence between the set of join-irreducible elements of torsion classes of $\text{mod } A$ and the set of shards of $\Sigma(A)$ for g -finite algebra A . Moreover, we show that the semistable region of a brick of $\text{mod } A$ is exactly given by a shard. We also give a poset isomorphism of shard intersections and wide subcategories of $\text{mod } A$.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	3
2.1. Finite lattice	4
2.2. Torsion classes, wide subcategories, semibricks and 2-term silting complexes	4
2.3. g -fans	6
2.4. Reduction technique	8
3. Shards	9
4. Shards and semistable regions	14
5. Shard intersections	17
Acknowledgments	21
References	22

1. INTRODUCTION

Let A be a finite dimensional algebra. One of the fundamental aims of the representation theory of algebras is to study important objects and subcategories of the module category $\text{mod } A$ or its derived category $D^b(\text{mod } A)$. For this aim, many interesting notions and theories have been developed such as τ -tilting modules, semibricks, silting complexes, simple-minded collections and so on (see [AIR, Ri, MS, A1, AI, KV, KY] for example). Recently, it has been found that combinatorial viewpoint plays an important role to investigate these notions. Among others, we can define a fan $\Sigma(A)$, called g -fan (Definition 2.11), which is defined in the real Grothendieck group $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}$ by the notion of g -vectors of two-term silting complexes of $K^b(\text{proj}A)$. Surprisingly, the g -fan reflects not only the property of the partial order and mutation of the two-term silting complexes, but also uncovers several nontrivial results, which are difficult to know in a purely representation-theoretic way as shown in [AHKM, AMN].

The author is supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research 20K03539.

Keywords. torsion classes, shard, shard intersection, semibricks, join-irreducible, g -polytope.

In this paper, we study further property of g -fans and, in particular, we explain that we can understand bricks, wide subcategories and canonical join representations in terms of g -fans. Our results can be summarized as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *Let A be a finite dimensional algebra which is g -finite (Definition 2.8) and $\Sigma(A)$ the g -fan of A . From $\Sigma(A)$, we can determine the following objects.*

- *Join irreducible elements of the set $\text{tors}A$ of torsion classes.*
- *A canonical join representation of elements of the set $\text{tors}A$ of torsion classes.*
- *The set $\text{brick}A$ of bricks.*
- *The set $\text{sbrick}A$ of semibricks.*
- *The set $\text{single-wide}A$ of wide subcategories generated by a single object.*
- *The set $\text{wide}A$ of wide subcategories.*
- *The partial order of $\text{wide}A$.*

Thus the g -fan contains several fundamental data of the representation theory. To establish the theorem, we use the theory of *shards*. Shards are certain codimension 1 cones and they were originally introduced by Reading for a hyperplane arrangement (see [Re1, Re3, Re4]). Shards allow a new construction of noncrossing partition lattices and they were also used to provide a geometric description of lattice congruences [Re4]. We extend the notion of shards to our setting (since g -fan is not necessary a hyperplane arrangement) and show that shards are quite natural and important objects to study bricks and wide subcategories. The key ingredient of our results is the following relationship between bricks and shards through King's stability conditions [Ki].

Theorem 1.2 (Theorem 4.8). *A shard gives precisely the semistable region of a brick. Moreover, we have a bijection between the set $\text{brick}A$ of bricks and the set $\text{shard}A$ of shards of $\Sigma(A)$ by*

$$\Theta(-) : \text{brick}A \longrightarrow \text{shard}A,$$

where $\Theta(X) := \{\theta \in K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}} \mid X : \theta\text{-semistable}\}$.

The main result of [DIRRT] gives a bijection between forcing equivalence classes of arrows of the Hasse quiver of torsion classes of $\text{mod } A$ and isomorphism classes of bricks. From this viewpoint, the above result shows that shards give a geometric counterpart of forcing equivalence classes. Moreover, this result can be regarded as a generalization of [T1]. Indeed, let Π be a preprojective algebra of Dynkin type. Then the g -fan $\Sigma(\Pi)$ is the Coxeter fan [AHKM, Theorem 8.4] and $\Sigma(\Pi)$ is a hyperplane arrangement and shards in our definition coincides with the original definition. In particular, Theorem 1.2 implies [T1, Theorem 6], where it was shown that a shard in the Coxeter arrangement gives precisely the semistable region of a brick of $\text{mod } \Pi$.

Moreover, we can give an explicit relationship between join-irreducible elements, wide subcategory, bricks and shards together with several known results [A1, BCZ, DIRRT, MS, Ri].

Theorem 1.3 (see Theorems 3.11,4.8 for details). *We have the following commutative diagrams, and all maps are bijections.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A)) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Sigma(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{J}(-)} \end{array} & \text{shard}A \\
 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \tau(-) \\ \downarrow B(-) \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \Theta(-) \\ \downarrow W(-) \end{array} \\
 \text{brick}A & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Filt}(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{sim}(-)} \end{array} & \text{single-wide}A
 \end{array}$$

Thus shards are also quite fundamental objects from the viewpoint of the representation theory. Moreover, we study intersections of shards (Definition 5.1). It was shown in [Re3] that the partial order of shard intersections admit several nice properties such as being graded. From the viewpoint of the representation theory, this partial order corresponds to the one of wide subcategories, and they also provide a geometric description of canonical join representations in terms of g -fans.

Theorem 1.4 (see Theorems 3.11, 5.4 for details). (1) *For any $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigvee_{i=1}^k \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_i),$$

where Σ_i runs over all lower shards of \mathcal{R} and it is a canonical join representation.

(2) *There exists a poset anti-isomorphism*

$$\text{wide}A \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Theta(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{W(-)} \end{array} \text{shard-int}A.$$

(3) *We have the following commutative diagrams, and all maps are bijections.*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathfrak{C}(A) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\bigcap \Sigma(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\bigvee \mathcal{J}(-)} \end{array} & \text{shard-int}A \\
 \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \vee \mathcal{T}(-) \\ \downarrow \{B(-)\} \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} \uparrow \Theta(-) \\ \downarrow W(-) \end{array} \\
 \text{sbrick}A & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Filt}(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{sim}(-)} \end{array} & \text{wide}A
 \end{array}$$

Theorem 1.4 provides a direct connection between shard intersections and wide subcategories. In [En], he explained how to obtain the partial order of wide subcategory from the one of torsion classes. Theorem 5.4 can be regarded as a geometric counterpart of this relationship. As an application, we can also show that the partial order of $\text{wide}A$ is graded.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we give some background materials and recall necessary results.

2.1. Finite lattice. We recall basic terminology of a partially ordered set.

Definition 2.1. Let P be a partially ordered set.

- (1) For $x, y, z \in P$, the element z is called the *meet* of x and y if z is the maximum element satisfying $z \leq x$ and $z \leq y$. In this case, z is denoted by $x \wedge y$.
- (2) For $x, y, z \in P$, the element z is called the *join* of x and y if z is the minimum element satisfying $z \geq x$ and $z \geq y$. In this case, z is denoted by $x \vee y$.
- (3) The set P is called a *lattice* if P admits the meet $x \wedge y$ and the join $x \vee y$ for any $x, y \in P$.

In this paper, we basically consider finite lattices.

Definition 2.2. Let P be a finite lattice.

- (1) An element $x \in P$ is called *join-irreducible* if it is not the minimum element of P and if $x = y \vee z$ for some $y, z \in P$, then $y = x$ or $z = x$, or equivalently, the join-irreducible elements are those which cover precisely the one element. We denote by $\text{j-irr}(P)$ the set of join-irreducible elements in P .
- (2) We call $C \subset P$ a *canonical join representation* if
 - (i) $x = \bigvee_{c \in C} c$.
 - (ii) For any proper subset $C' \subsetneq C$, the join $\bigvee_{c \in C'} c$ never coincides with x .
 - (iii) If $U \subset P$ satisfies the properties (i) and (ii), then, for every $c \in C$, there exists $u \in U$ such that $c \leq u$.
 In this case, we also call $x = \bigvee_{c \in C} c$ a canonical join representation. Note that if $x = \bigvee_{c \in C} c$ is a canonical join representation, then it is unique and each element $c \in C$ is join-irreducible.
- (3) P is called *semidistributive* if it satisfies the two following conditions:
 - (i) For $a, b, c \in P$, $a \wedge b = a \wedge c$ implies $a \wedge b = a \wedge (b \vee c)$.
 - (ii) For $a, b, c \in P$, $a \vee b = a \vee c$ implies $a \vee b = a \vee (b \wedge c)$.

Let P be a finite poset. For $x, y \in P$, if x covers y , that is, $x > y$ and there does not exist $z \in P$ satisfying $x > z > y$, then we denote by $x \succ y$. Recall that the *Hasse quiver* $\text{Hasse}(P)$ of a poset P has the set P of vertices, and an arrow $x \rightarrow y$ if $x \succ y$.

2.2. Torsion classes, wide subcategories, semibricks and 2-term silting complexes. Throughout the paper, let A be a finite dimensional algebra over a field k . We denote by $\text{mod } A$ the category of finitely generated right A -modules and by $\text{proj } A$ the category of finitely generated projective A -modules. We denote by $\text{D}^b(\text{mod } A)$ the bounded derived category of $\text{mod } A$ and by $\text{K}^b(\text{proj } A)$ the bounded homotopy category of $\text{proj } A$. For an object X , we denote by $|X|$ the number of non-isomorphic indecomposable direct summands of X . For a full subcategory $\mathbf{C} \subset \text{mod } A$, $\text{Filt } \mathbf{C}$ consists of the objects M such that there exists a sequence $0 = M_0 \subset M_1 \subset \cdots \subset M_n = M$ with $M_i/M_{i-1} \in \text{add } \mathbf{C}$.

We recall the notion of torsion classes.

- Definition 2.3.**
- (1) A full subcategory of $\text{mod } A$ is called a *torsion class* (respectively, *torsion-free class*) if it is closed under extensions and factor modules (respectively, submodules). A torsion class \mathbf{T} (resp. torsion-free class \mathbf{F}) is called *functorially finite* if there exists $M \in \text{mod } A$ satisfying $\mathbf{T} = \text{Fac } M$ (respectively, $\mathbf{F} = \text{Sub } M$).
 - (2) A full subcategory \mathbf{W} of $\text{mod } A$ is called a *wide subcategory* if it is closed under kernels, cokernels, and extensions of $\text{mod } A$.

- (3) A wide subcategory \mathcal{W} is called *single* if \mathcal{W} has only one simple object (i.e., $\mathcal{W} = \text{Filt}(S)$, where S is the simple of \mathcal{W}). Moreover, a wide subcategory \mathcal{W} is called *functorially finite* if the smallest torsion class containing \mathcal{W} is functorially finite.

We denote by $\text{tors}A$ (respectively, $\text{f-tors}A$, $\text{torf}A$, $\text{f-torf}A$, $\text{wide}A$, $\text{single-wide}A$) the set of torsion classes (respectively, functorially finite torsion classes, torsion-free classes, functorially finite torsion-free classes, wide subcategories, single wide subcategories) in $\text{mod } A$. These categories are naturally regarded as posets defined by inclusion.

Next we recall some objects which give the above categories.

- Definition 2.4.** (1) A module S in $\text{mod } A$ is called a *brick* if $\text{End}_A(S)$ is a division K -algebra. We denote by $\text{brick}A$ the set of isoclasses of bricks in $\text{mod } A$.
- (2) A subset $\mathcal{S} \subset \text{brick}A$ is called a *semibrick* if $\text{Hom}_A(S_i, S_j) = 0$ holds for any $S_i \neq S_j \in \mathcal{S}$. We denote by $\text{sbrick}A$ the set of semibricks in $\text{mod } A$.
- (3) We say that a semibrick \mathcal{S} is *left finite* (resp. *right finite*) if the smallest torsion class (resp. torsion-free class) $\mathbb{T}(\mathcal{S}) \subset \text{mod } A$ (resp. $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{S}) \subset \text{mod } A$) containing \mathcal{S} is functorially finite. We denote by $\text{f}_L\text{-sbrick}A$ (resp. $\text{f}_R\text{-sbrick}A$) the set of left finite (resp. right finite) semibricks in $\text{mod } A$.

Definition 2.5. Let $T = (T^i, d^i) \in \mathbb{K}^b(\text{proj}A)$.

- (1) T is called *presilting* if $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{K}^b(\text{proj}A)}(T, T[\ell]) = 0$ for all $\ell > 0$.
- (2) T is called *silting* if it is presilting and $\mathbb{K}^b(\text{proj}A) = \text{thick}T$, where $\text{thick}(T)$ denotes the smallest thick subcategory containing T .
- (3) T is called *2-term* if $T^i = 0$ for all $i \neq 0, -1$.

We denote by $2\text{-silt}A$ (resp. $2\text{-psilt}A$) the set of isomorphism classes of basic 2-term silting (resp. 2-term presilting) complexes of $\mathbb{K}^b(\text{proj}A)$. For an integer i with $1 \leq i \leq n$, we define

$$2\text{-psilt}^i(A) := \{T \in 2\text{-psilt}(A) \mid |T| = i\}.$$

Recall that a 2-term presilting complex T is silting if and only if $|T| = |A|$ holds and hence $2\text{-psilt}^n(A) = 2\text{-silt}(A)$ [AIR, Proposition 3.3]. Moreover, for any $U \in 2\text{-psilt}A$, there exists $T \in 2\text{-silt}A$ such that $U \in \text{add}T$ ([AIR, Theorem 2.10]).

Moreover, for $T, U \in 2\text{-silt}A$, we write $T \geq U$ if $\text{Hom}_{\mathbb{K}^b(\text{proj}A)}(T, U[\ell]) = 0$ holds for all positive integers ℓ . Then $(\text{silt}A, \geq)$ and hence $(2\text{-silt}A, \geq)$ is a partially ordered set [AI].

Then we recall an important connection between torsion classes, 2-term silting complexes and semibricks as follows.

Theorem 2.6. [AIR, A1] *We have a bijection*

$$\mathbb{T}(-) : \text{f}_L\text{-sbrick}A \longrightarrow \text{f-tors}A.$$

Moreover, we have a poset isomorphism

$$\text{Fac}(H^0(-)) : 2\text{-silt}A \longrightarrow \text{f-tors}A.$$

Theorem 2.7. [Ri, A1] *We have bijections*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sbrick}A &\begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Filt}(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{sim}(-)} \end{array} \text{wide}A, \\ \text{f}_L\text{-sbrick}A &\begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Filt}(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{sim}(-)} \end{array} \text{f}_L\text{-wide}A, \\ \text{brick}A &\begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Filt}(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{sim}(-)} \end{array} \text{single-wide}A, \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{sim}(-)$ takes the simple objects.

Definition 2.8. Let A be a finite dimensional algebra. We call A *g-finite* (or *τ -tilting finite*) if $|\text{2-silt}A| < \infty$ (or equivalently, $|\text{f-tors}A| = |\text{f}_L\text{-sbrick}A| < \infty$).

In this paper, we always consider *g-finite* algebras. The following theorem gives a characterization of *g-finiteness*.

Theorem 2.9. [DIJ, A1] *Let A be a finite dimensional algebra. Then A is g-finite if and only if $\text{tors}A = \text{f-tors}A$ if and only if $\text{sbrick}A = \text{f}_L\text{-sbrick}A$.*

Moreover, we recall the following result, which is fundamental in this paper.

Theorem 2.10. [DIRRT] *Let A be a finite dimensional algebra and assume that A is g-finite. Then $\text{tors}A = \text{f-tors}A$ is lattice and semidistributive.*

2.3. g-fans. Recall that, for an exact category (resp. a triangulated category) \mathcal{C} , the Grothendieck group $K_0(\mathcal{C})$ is the quotient group of the free abelian group on the set of isomorphism classes $[X]$ of \mathcal{C} by the relations $[X] - [Y] + [Z] = 0$ for all short exact sequences $0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow 0$ (resp. all triangles $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow X[1]$) in \mathcal{C} .

Let A be a finite dimensional algebra and assume that A is *g-finite*. Let P_1, \dots, P_n (resp. S_1, \dots, S_n) be all the non-isomorphic indecomposable projective A -modules (resp. all the non-isomorphic simple A -modules). Then the $K_0(\text{proj}A)$ (resp. $K_0(\text{mod}A)$) is a free abelian group of rank n having a \mathbb{Z} -basis $[P_1], \dots, [P_n]$ (resp. $[S_1], \dots, [S_n]$) and it is isomorphic to $K_0(\text{K}^b(\text{proj}A))$ (resp. $K_0(\text{D}^b(\text{mod}A))$). Let $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}} := K_0(\text{proj}A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R} \cong \mathbb{R}^{|A|}$.

Definition 2.11. For $T = T_1 \oplus \dots \oplus T_j \in \text{2-psilt}A$ with indecomposable T_i , we define a convex polyhedral cone

$$C(T) := \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^j a_i [T_i] \mid a_1, \dots, a_j \geq 0 \right\} \subset K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}.$$

We call the set

$$\Sigma(A) := \{C(T) \mid T \in \text{2-psilt}A\}$$

of cones the *g-fan* of A . Moreover, we define

$$\mathfrak{C}(A) := \{C(T) \mid T \in \text{2-silt}A\}$$

and the elements of $\mathfrak{C}(A)$ is called *chambers* of $\Sigma(A)$.

Via bijection $2\text{-silt}A \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}(A)$, $T \mapsto C(T)$, we regard $\mathfrak{C}(A)$ as a poset. Thus, we have poset isomorphisms $2\text{-silt}A$, $\text{tors}A$ and $\mathfrak{C}(A)$ and hence $\text{Hasse}(2\text{-silt}A) \cong \text{Hasse}(\text{tors}A) \cong \text{Hasse}(\mathfrak{C}(A))$. To specify this poset structure, without particular reference to which ground set is used to define it, we simply write $\text{Hasse}A := \text{Hasse}(2\text{-silt}A)$ and $\text{j-irr}(A) := \text{j-irr}(2\text{-silt}A)$.

We recall the basic properties of $\Sigma(A)$.

Proposition 2.12. [DIJ] *Let A be a finite dimensional algebra with $n := |A|$.*


- (1) $\Sigma(A)$ is a nonsingular fan in $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}$.
- (2) Any cone in $\Sigma(A)$ is a face of a cone of dimension n .
- (3) Any cone in $\Sigma(A)$ of dimension $n - 1$ is a face of precisely the two cones of dimension n .
- (4) A is g -finite if and only if $\Sigma(A)$ is complete.
- (5) $\Sigma(A)$ is sign-coherent, that is, for each $\sigma \in \Sigma(A)$, there exists $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \in \{1, -1\}$ such that $\sigma \subseteq \{\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i a_i [P_i] \mid a_1, \dots, a_n \geq 0\}$.

For $1 \leq i \leq n$, let H_i be the hyperplane in $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}$ which is orthogonal to $[P_i]$ and we call it the *basic hyperplane*. By Proposition 2.12, if A is g -finite, then any basic hyperplane is contained in the boundaries of the cones of $\Sigma(A)$.

For $L \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-1}A$, we define

$$H(L) := \text{span}(C(L)),$$

that is, $H(L)$ is the hyperplane containing $C(L)$. We remark that a g -fan is not necessary a hyperplane arrangement, so that $H(L)$ ($L \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-1}A$) is not necessary contained in the boundaries of the cones of $\Sigma(A)$. For example, for the quiver $Q := (1 \rightarrow 2)$, let $A := kQ$ be the path algebra of Q . Then the g -fan of A is given as follows:



The aim of this paper is to extend the theory of shards, which was originally introduced by Reading to hyperplane arrangements [Re3, Re4], to g -fans and explain a relationship with several important objects of representation theory.

We also recall the following result.

Proposition 2.13. [DIJ] *Let $L \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-1}A$. Then the hyperplane $H(L)$ divides $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}$ into a half-space containing $C(A)$ and a half-space containing $C(A[1])$.*

We call the half-space containing $C(A)$ (resp. $C(A[1])$) the *positive* half-space (resp. *negative* half-space) defined by the hyperplane $H(L)$. Then we have the following important theorem.

Theorem 2.14. [DIJ] *Let $M, N \in 2\text{-silt}A$ such that they are mutation of each other. The following are equivalent, where $L \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-1}A$ such that $\text{add}L = \text{add}M \cap \text{add}N$,*

- (a) $M \succ N$
- (b) $C(M)$ belongs to the positive half-space defined by $H(L)$.
- (c) $C(N)$ belongs to the negative half-space defined by $H(L)$.

2.4. Reduction technique. Let $U \in 2\text{-psilt}A$. Define

$$2\text{-silt}_U A := \{T \in 2\text{-silt}A \mid U \in \text{add}T\}.$$

For $\mathcal{U} := C(U)$, it is naturally identified with

$$\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U}) := \{\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{C}(A) \mid \mathcal{U} \text{ is a face of } \mathcal{T}\} = \{C(T) \mid T \in 2\text{-silt}_U A\}.$$

For a fan Σ in $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sigma \in \Sigma$, we define the reduction of Σ at σ by

$$\Sigma/\sigma := \{\pi(\tau) \mid \tau \in \Sigma, \sigma \subseteq \tau\},$$

where $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{R}\sigma$ is a natural projection. Then Σ/σ is a fan in $\mathbb{R}^n/\mathbb{R}\sigma$.

Theorem 2.15. [J, A2, AHIKM] *Let $U \in 2\text{-psilt}A$ such that $|U| = i$ ($1 \leq i \leq n$).*

- (1) *There exists a finite dimensional algebra B such that $|B| = n - i$ and a poset isomorphism*

$$2\text{-silt}_U A \cong 2\text{-silt}B.$$

- (2) *The isomorphism $K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}/K_0(\text{add}U)_{\mathbb{R}} \cong K_0(\text{proj}B)_{\mathbb{R}}$ gives an isomorphism of fans*


$$\Sigma(A)/C(U) \cong \Sigma(B).$$

As a consequence of Theorem 2.15, we have the following result.


Corollary 2.16. *Let $U \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-2}A$. There exists a finite dimensional algebra B such that $|B| = 2$ and $2\text{-silt}_U A \cong 2\text{-silt}B$. In particular, there exist*

$$T_{\max}, T_{\min}, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_\ell, T'_1, T'_2, \dots, T'_m \in 2\text{-silt}_U A$$

and $\text{Hasse}(2\text{-silt}_U A)$ is given as follows.



Furthermore, $\Sigma(A)/C(U) \cong \Sigma(B)$ has the following picture:



where the top chamber is the maximum element and the bottom chamber is the minimum element, and these chambers are given by the same two hyperplanes.

Let $U \in 2\text{-psilt}A$. Via the identification of $2\text{-silt}A$ with $\text{tors}A$, let $\mathbb{T}(U)_{\max}$ (resp. $\mathbb{T}(U)_{\min}$) be the maximum torsion class (resp. minimum torsion class) of $2\text{-silt}_U A$. Then we have the following result.

Proposition 2.17. [AIR, Proposition 2.9] *Let $U \in 2\text{-psilt}A$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{T}(U)_{\min} = \text{Fac}(H^0(U)) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{T}(U)_{\max} = {}^\perp H^{-1}(\nu U).$$

3. SHARDS

In the rest of this paper, let A be a finite dimensional algebra which is g -finite (hence $\Sigma(A)$ is complete). In this section, we define shards for g -fan $\Sigma(A)$ and study their fundamental properties. In the case of a hyperplane arrangement, the partial order of chambers is defined by the the set of hyperplanes which separates a chamber from the base chamber. However, we can not apply this argument to the g -fan (since it is not necessary a hyperplane arrangement) and hence many previous results in [Re3, Re4] need to be shown in our setting. In particular, we will give a bijection between shards of $\Sigma(A)$ and join-irreducible elements of $\mathfrak{C}(A)$. Moreover, we will provide a canonical join representation in terms of shards.

First we prepare some terminology.


Definition 3.1. We call an $(n-1)$ -dimensional cone \mathcal{U} of $\Sigma(A)$ a *small wall* if there exists $U \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-1}A$ such that $\mathcal{U} = C(U)$. Note that \mathcal{U} is a face of precisely the two cones of dimension n by Proposition 2.12.

Definition 3.2. (1) Take a small wall $\mathcal{U} \in \Sigma(A)$ and let $H := \text{span}(\mathcal{U})$. The *plate* \mathcal{P} containing \mathcal{U} is the maximal collection of small walls of $\Sigma(A)$ containing \mathcal{U} and contained in H such that, for any two small walls $\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{F}'$ contained in \mathcal{P} , there is a sequence of small walls $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_k = \mathcal{F}'$ with \mathcal{F}_i and \mathcal{F}_{i+1} intersecting in a cone of dimension $n-2$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$. We denote by $\mathbb{P}(A)$ the set of all plates of $\Sigma(A)$.


(2) Let $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{P}(A)$ be a plate. Let $\mathcal{U} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$ be a small wall such that $\mathcal{L} := \mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{P}$ is an $(n-2)$ -dimensional cone. We say that \mathcal{U} cuts \mathcal{P} along \mathcal{L} if \mathcal{U} is a facet of maximum or minimum cones of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L})$ and \mathcal{P} contains neither a facet of maximum nor minimum cones of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L})$.

(3) For a plate $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{P}(A)$, we remove all points that cut by small walls of $\Sigma(A)$, that is, consider $\mathcal{P} \setminus \bigcup(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{P})$, where the union is taken over all small walls that cut \mathcal{P} (Thus we could divide a plate into a small pieces of connected components). The closure of a connected component of $\mathcal{P} \setminus \bigcup(\mathcal{U} \cap \mathcal{P})$ is called a *shard*. Thus, a shard consists of a union of small walls of $\Sigma(A)$ belonging to the same hyperplane. We denote by $\text{shard}A$ the set of shards of $\Sigma(A)$.

Example 3.3. (1) Let A be a rank 2 g -finite algebra. Then $\Sigma(A)$ is given as follows:



where $C_1, \dots, C_\ell, C'_1, \dots, C'_m$ are one-dimensional cones generated by an indecomposable presilting complex. Then the shards are illustrated as follows:



Namely, two lines intersecting at the origin bounding $C(A)$ (and $C(A[1])$) are two shards, and $C_1, \dots, C_\ell, C'_1, \dots, C'_m$ are distinct shards. Note that all shards contain the origin, but they do not continue through the origin. This is a natural analog of the original definition of shards [Re3, Re4].

- (2) Let A be a preprojective algebra of Dynkin type. Then $\Sigma(A)$ is the Coxeter fan [AHKM, Theorem 8.4] and hence it is a hyperplane arrangement. Thus, the shards of $\Sigma(A)$ are exactly the same as the original shards of [Re3, Re4].
- (3) Let A be a finite dimensional algebra. Then a basic hyperplane is a shard. Indeed, a basic hyperplane is a plate by Proposition 2.12 (5). Moreover, for a basic hyperplane, consider a small wall \mathcal{U} in it and an $(n-2)$ -dimensional cone $\mathcal{L} = C(L)$ for some $\mathcal{L} \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-2}A$ such that \mathcal{L} is a face of \mathcal{U} . Then Theorem 2.14 implies that \mathcal{U} is a facet of the maximum chamber of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L})$ and hence it is not cut along \mathcal{L} . Thus a basic hyperplane itself is a shard.

Definition 3.4. (1) The unique hyperplane containing a shard Σ is denoted by $H(\Sigma)$.

- (2) We call a chamber $\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$ an *upper chamber* of shard Σ if $\dim(\mathcal{T} \cap \Sigma) = \dim(\Sigma)$ and \mathcal{T} belongs to the positive half-space defined by $H(\Sigma)$. Or equivalently, an upper chamber of a shard Σ has a facet contained in Σ such that the chamber adjacent through that facet is lower in the poset $\mathfrak{C}(A)$. Dually, we can define a *lower chamber* of a shard Σ . We denote by $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ (resp. $\text{Lo}(\Sigma)$) the set of upper chambers (resp. lower chambers) of Σ .
- (3) We say that a shard Σ is a *lower shard* of \mathcal{R} if \mathcal{R} is an upper chamber of Σ .
- (4) For a shard Σ , we denote the set of small walls in Σ by $\text{s.w}(\Sigma)$, that is,

$$\text{s.w}(\Sigma) = \{C(T) \mid T \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-1}A, C(T) \in \Sigma\}.$$

The following lemma is an analog of [Re4, Lemma 9-7.7].

Lemma 3.5. *Let $\Sigma \in \text{shard}A$.*

- (1) *Let \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{N} be chambers of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$. Then there exists a sequence $\mathcal{F}_0 := \mathcal{M} \cap \Sigma, \mathcal{F}_1, \dots, \mathcal{F}_{\ell-1}, \mathcal{F}_\ell := \mathcal{N} \cap \Sigma$ of small walls in $\text{s.w}(\Sigma)$ such that \mathcal{F}_{i-1} and \mathcal{F}_i are adjacent ($1 \leq i \leq \ell-1$).*
- (2) *For \mathcal{F}_i defined in (1), we denote by \mathcal{R}_i (resp. \mathcal{Q}_i) the corresponding upper chamber in $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ (resp. lower chamber in $\text{Lo}(\Sigma)$), that is, $\mathcal{R}_i \cap \Sigma = \mathcal{F}_i$ (resp. $\mathcal{Q}_i \cap \Sigma = \mathcal{F}_i$) and \mathcal{R}_i (resp. \mathcal{Q}_i) belongs to the positive (resp. the negative) half-space defined by $H(\Sigma)$. Then we have $\mathcal{R}_{i-1} < \mathcal{R}_i$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{i-1} < \mathcal{Q}_i$, or $\mathcal{R}_{i-1} > \mathcal{R}_i$ and $\mathcal{Q}_{i-1} > \mathcal{Q}_i$. In particular, the partial order $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ is connected.*

Proof. (1) follows from the definition. (2) Take an $(n-2)$ -dimensional cone $\mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{F}_{i-1} \cap \mathcal{F}_i \cap \Sigma$. Then we have $\mathcal{Q}_{i-1}, \mathcal{Q}_i, \mathcal{R}_{i-1}, \mathcal{R}_i \in \mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L}_i)$. Moreover, by definition of shards, Σ is not cut along \mathcal{L}_i , and $\mathcal{R}_i > \mathcal{Q}_i$. Since Corollary 2.16 implies that $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L}_i)$ is

isomorphic to $\mathfrak{C}(B)$, where B is an algebra of rank 2, \mathcal{R}_i (resp. \mathcal{Q}_{i-1}) is the maximum element (resp. the minimum element) of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L})$ or \mathcal{R}_{i-1} (resp. \mathcal{Q}_i) is the maximum element (resp. the minimum element) of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L})$. Thus, we get the desired conclusion. \square

Let Σ be a shard and $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3 \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$. For simplicity, we use the same notation as Lemma 3.5, that is, we let $\mathcal{F}_k := \mathcal{R}_k \cap \Sigma$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$. Assume that $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3 \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$ are adjacent, that is, \mathcal{R}_i and \mathcal{R}_{i+1} share an $(n-2)$ -dimensional cone $\mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{F}_i \cap \mathcal{F}_{i+1}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Under the above setting, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *Let Σ be a shard and $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3 \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$ three adjacent upper chambers. If $\mathcal{R}_1 < \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_3$ and $\mathcal{R}_1 \neq \mathcal{R}_3$, then there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$ and increasing chains in $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ such that $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{R}_3$.*

Proof. By our assumption $\mathcal{R}_1 < \mathcal{R}_2 > \mathcal{R}_3$, \mathcal{R}_2 is the maximal element of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L}_1)$ and $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L}_2)$. In particular, \mathcal{R}_2 covers 3 different chambers since it also covers \mathcal{Q}_2 , where \mathcal{Q}_2 the corresponding lower chamber of \mathcal{R}_2 .

(i) Assume that $|A| = 3$. In this case, \mathcal{R}_2 is the unique maximal chamber $C(A)$. Thus Σ is a basic hyperplane, and hence there is a unique chamber \mathcal{M} in $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ which covers the minimal element $C(A[1])$. By Theorem 2.14, \mathcal{M} is a unique minimal element of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$, and hence $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{R}_3$.

(ii) Assume that $|A| = n$. Let \mathcal{N} be $(n-3)$ -dimensional cone given by the intersection \mathcal{L}_1 and \mathcal{L}_2 . By applying Theorem 2.15, we have an isomorphism of fans

$$\pi : \Sigma(A)/\mathcal{N} \cong \Sigma(B),$$

where B is a finite dimensional algebra such that $|B| = 3$ and $\pi(\mathcal{R}_2) \in \text{Up}(\pi(\Sigma))$ is the maximal chamber in $\Sigma(B)$. Thus $\pi(\Sigma)$ is a basic hyperplane and hence there is a unique minimal element \mathcal{M}' in $\text{Up}(\pi(\Sigma))$ as (i).

Since π is a natural projection, for each chamber \mathcal{P}' in $\text{Up}(\pi(\Sigma))$, there exist a chamber \mathcal{P} in $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ such that $\pi(\mathcal{P}) = \mathcal{P}'$. Hence there is an element \mathcal{M} in $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ such that $\pi(\mathcal{M}) = \mathcal{M}'$, which is a unique minimal upper chamber of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ in $\Sigma(A)/\mathcal{N}$ and, in particular, we have $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{R}_1$ and $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{R}_3$. \square


The following proposition gives a connection between shards and join-irreducible elements, which is a natural generalization of [Re3, Proposition 3.3] in our setting.

Proposition 3.7. *For any shard Σ , there exists a unique minimal element of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ and it is join-irreducible. Thus, we can define the map*

$$\text{shard}A \longrightarrow \text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A)), \quad \Sigma \mapsto \mathcal{J}(\Sigma) := \min \text{Up}(\Sigma).$$

Proof. In the case of $|A| \leq 2$, the statement is clear. Thus we only consider the case of $|A| \geq 3$.

(1) First we show that a minimal element is join-irreducible. This is shown by the same argument of [Re2, Proposition 2.2]. Let \mathcal{J} be a minimal element of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$. Assume that \mathcal{J} covers more than one element. We can take $\mathcal{J} > \mathcal{J}_1$ and $\mathcal{J} > \mathcal{J}_2$ such that \mathcal{J}_1 is a lower chamber of Σ , that is, $\mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{J}_1$ belongs to Σ . Then, we can take an $(n-2)$ -dimensional cone $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{J} \cap \mathcal{J}_1 \cap \mathcal{J}_2$ and \mathcal{J} is the maximum of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L})$. By Corollary 2.16, we have the following picture.



Therefore, we can take \mathcal{R} , which belongs to $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ by definition of shard, and $\mathcal{J} > \mathcal{R}$. This contradicts the minimality of \mathcal{J} .

(2) Next we show that a minimal element of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ is unique. Let \mathcal{J} be a minimal element and assume that it is not the unique minimum of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$. Let Ω be the set of chambers of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ such that they are greater than \mathcal{J} and they cover a chamber of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ which does not greater than \mathcal{J} , that is,

$$\Omega := \{\mathcal{X} \in \text{Up}(\Sigma) \mid \mathcal{J} \leq \mathcal{X} \text{ and } \mathcal{Y} \triangleleft \mathcal{X} \text{ for some } \mathcal{Y} \in \text{Up}(\Sigma) \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{J} \not\leq \mathcal{Y}\}.$$

Since \mathcal{J} is not the unique minimal element, Ω is not empty from the connectedness of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$ by Lemma 3.5 (2). Take a minimal element \mathcal{R} of Ω and an increasing chain

$$\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{R}_0 < \mathcal{R}_1 < \cdots < \mathcal{R}_{k-1} < \mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{R}.$$

By the definition of Ω , \mathcal{R} covers some $\mathcal{Y} \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$ which is not above \mathcal{J} . Then, by applying Lemma 3.6 to $\mathcal{R}_{k-1} < \mathcal{R}_k > \mathcal{Y}$, there exists $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{k-1} > \mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{Y}$. Since $\mathcal{M} < \mathcal{Y}$, we have $\mathcal{J} \not\leq \mathcal{M}$. On the other hand, consider the decreasing chain from \mathcal{R}_{k-1} to \mathcal{M} and we have the following sequence of chambers

$$\mathcal{R}_{k-1} = \mathcal{R}_{k-1}^0 > \mathcal{R}_{k-1}^1 > \cdots > \mathcal{R}_{k-1}^{m-1} > \mathcal{R}_{k-1}^m = \mathcal{M}.$$

Then, since $\mathcal{J} \leq \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$ and $\mathcal{J} \not\leq \mathcal{M}$, there exists an integer $1 \leq \ell \leq m-1$ such that $\mathcal{J} \leq \mathcal{R}_{k-1}^\ell$ and $\mathcal{J} \not\leq \mathcal{R}_{k-1}^{\ell+1}$. Namely, we have $\mathcal{R}_{k-1}^\ell \in \Omega$, but this contradicts the minimality of \mathcal{R} since $\mathcal{R}_{k-1}^\ell < \mathcal{R}$. Therefore, \mathcal{J} is the unique minimal element of $\text{Up}(\Sigma)$. \square

Next we recall the following important result.

Theorem 3.8. [T2, RST] *For a Hasse arrow $a \rightarrow b \in \text{Hasse}A$, we have the minimum element in $\{x \mid b \vee x = a\}$ and it is join-irreducible. In particular, we have a map*

$$\gamma : \text{Hasse}A \longrightarrow \text{j-irr}A, \quad (a \rightarrow b) \mapsto \min\{x \mid b \vee x = a\}.$$

We also define the following terminology.

Definition 3.9. Given $\mathcal{M} > \mathcal{N}$ in $\mathfrak{C}(A)$, there is a unique shard containing $\mathcal{M} \cap \mathcal{N}$, which we denote by $\Sigma(\mathcal{M} > \mathcal{N})$. If \mathcal{M} is join-irreducible, then there exists a unique element \mathcal{M}^* such that $\mathcal{M} > \mathcal{M}^*$. In this case, we simply denote by $\Sigma(\mathcal{M})$ instead of $\Sigma(\mathcal{M} > \mathcal{M}^*)$. Thus, via identification $\mathfrak{C}(A)$ with $2\text{-silt}A \cong \text{tors}A$, we can define a map

$$\Sigma : \text{Hasse}A \longrightarrow \text{shard}A, \quad (a \rightarrow b) \mapsto \Sigma(a > b).$$


Theorem 3.8 and Definition 3.9 can be related as follows.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $a \rightarrow b$ be a Hasse arrow of $\text{Hasse}A$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{J}(\Sigma(a \rightarrow b)) = \gamma(a \rightarrow b).$$

Proof. Let $j := \mathcal{J}(\Sigma(a \rightarrow b))$. It is enough to show that $b \vee j = a$ and $b \wedge j = j^*$ since no element smaller than j can be in the set $\{x \mid b \vee x = a\}$ and hence j is the minimum (see [En, Lemma 2.7] for example). Let $\Sigma := \Sigma(a \rightarrow b)$. By Proposition 3.7, we can take $\mathcal{R}_i \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{Q}_i \in \text{Lo}(\Sigma)$ ($1 \leq i \leq k$) such that $j =: \mathcal{R}_0 < \mathcal{R}_1 < \dots < \mathcal{R}_k := a$, $j^* =: \mathcal{Q}_0 < \mathcal{Q}_1 < \dots < \mathcal{Q}_k := b$ and $\mathcal{R}_{i-1}, \mathcal{R}_i, \mathcal{Q}_{i-1}, \mathcal{Q}_i \in \mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L}_i)$, where $\mathcal{L}_i := \mathcal{R}_{i-1} \cap \mathcal{R}_i \cap \Sigma = \mathcal{Q}_{i-1} \cap \mathcal{Q}_i \cap \Sigma$ is an $(n-2)$ -dimensional cone.

Now observe $\mathcal{R}_0 \not\leq \mathcal{Q}_k$. Indeed, assume that $\mathcal{R}_0 \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$. Since we have $\mathcal{R}_0 \vee \mathcal{Q}_1 = \mathcal{R}_1$ by Proposition 2.17, we get $\mathcal{R}_0 \vee \mathcal{Q}_1 = \mathcal{R}_1 \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$ because $\mathcal{Q}_1 \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$. Similarly, since $\mathcal{R}_1 \vee \mathcal{Q}_2 = \mathcal{R}_2$, we get $\mathcal{R}_2 \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$. By repeating this argument, we finally get $\mathcal{R}_{k-1} \leq \mathcal{Q}_k$, which is contradiction because Corollary 2.16 implies that the poset of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{L}_k)$ is given as follows :



Thus, we conclude $\mathcal{R}_0 \not\leq \mathcal{Q}_k$ and similarly $\mathcal{R}_j \not\leq \mathcal{Q}_k$ for any $0 \leq j \leq k-1$. Hence we have $\mathcal{R}_0 \vee \mathcal{Q}_k = \mathcal{R}_k$ and $\mathcal{R}_0 \wedge \mathcal{Q}_k = \mathcal{Q}_0$. \square

Then we can establish a bijection between $\text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A))$ and $\text{shard}A$. Moreover, shards provide a canonical join representation of $\mathfrak{C}(A)$, which is an analog of [Re3, Theorem 3.6].

Theorem 3.11. (1) *There exists a bijection*

$$\text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A)) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Sigma(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\mathcal{J}(-)} \end{array} \text{shard}A$$

(2) *For any $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_i),$$

where Σ_i runs over all lower shards of \mathcal{R} and it is a canonical join representation.

Proof. (1) By Proposition 3.7, we can show the map $\mathcal{J}(-)$ is well-defined and injective. We will show that the map $\mathcal{J}(-)$ is surjective. Let $\mathcal{M} \in \text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A))$. Then $\mathcal{M} \in \text{Up}(\Sigma)$ and the only chamber covered by \mathcal{M} is in $\text{Lo}(\Sigma(\mathcal{M}))$. Since $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma(\mathcal{M})) \leq \mathcal{M}$, we conclude $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma(\mathcal{M})) = \mathcal{M}$.

(2) By Theorem 2.10, $\mathfrak{C}(A)$ is semidistributive and hence the result [Go, Theorem 1] implies that any element of $\mathfrak{C}(A)$ admits a canonical join representation. Moreover, [B, Lemma 19] implies a canonical join representation of \mathcal{R} is given by

$$\bigvee_{\mathcal{R} > \mathcal{R}'} \{\gamma(\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}')\},$$

where \mathcal{R}' runs over all elements covered by \mathcal{R} . Then Corollary 3.10 implies that $\gamma(\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}') = \mathcal{J}(\Sigma(\mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}'))$ and hence

$$\mathcal{R} = \bigvee_{\mathcal{R} > \mathcal{R}'} \mathcal{J}(\Sigma(\mathcal{R} > \mathcal{R}')) = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_i).$$

Consequently, we get the desired result. \square

4. SHARDS AND SEMISTABLE REGIONS

In this section, we discuss a relationship between shards, bricks, semistable modules and wide subcategories. In particular, we show that a shard gives precisely the semistable region of a brick and it allows us to give one-to-one correspondence between the set of shards and bricks.

Let A be a finite dimensional algebra which is g -finite. We define the Euler form

$$\langle -, - \rangle : K_0(\text{proj} A) \times K_0(\text{mod} A) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$$

by

$$\langle T, X \rangle := \sum_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} (-1)^i \dim_k \text{Hom}_{\text{D}^b(\text{mod} A)}(T, X[i])$$

for any $T \in \text{K}^b(\text{proj} A)$ and $X \in \text{D}^b(\text{mod} A)$, which is a non-degenerate \mathbb{Z} -bilinear form. The Euler form is naturally extended to an \mathbb{R} -bilinear form

$$\langle -, - \rangle : K_0(\text{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}} \times K_0(\text{mod} A)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R},$$

where $K_0(\text{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}} := K_0(\text{proj} A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$ and $K_0(\text{mod} A)_{\mathbb{R}} := K_0(\text{mod} A) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. We regard $\theta \in K_0(\text{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}}$ as an \mathbb{R} -linear form $\langle \theta, - \rangle : K_0(\text{mod} A)_{\mathbb{R}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and we write $\theta(M) := \langle \theta, M \rangle$.

We recall the notion of semistable modules as follows.

Definition 4.1. Let $\theta \in K_0(\text{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}}$.

- (1) We call a module $M \in \text{mod} A$ θ -semistable (resp. θ -stable) if $\theta(M) = 0$ and, for any quotient module M' of M , we have $\theta(M') \geq 0$ (resp. for any nonzero proper quotient module M' of M , we have $\theta(M') > 0$). Moreover, we define the θ -semistable subcategory $\mathcal{W}(\theta)$ as the full subcategory consisting of all the θ -semistable modules in $\text{mod} A$. It is a wide subcategory and the simple objects of $\mathcal{W}(\theta)$ are precisely θ -stable modules (see [BST, Proposition 3.24] for example).
- (2) For $\mathcal{R} \subset K_0(\text{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}}$. We define

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{R}) := \{X \in \text{mod} A \mid X : \theta\text{-semistable for all } \theta \in \mathcal{R}\}.$$

Note that we have

$$\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{R}) = \bigcap_{\theta \in \mathcal{R}} \mathcal{W}(\theta)$$

and in particular $\mathcal{W}(\mathcal{R})$ is a wide subcategory.

- (3) For any $X \in \text{mod} A$, we define

$$\Theta(X) := \{\theta \in K_0(\text{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}} \mid X : \theta\text{-semistable}\}.$$

Moreover, for a subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subset \text{mod} A$, we define

$$\Theta(\mathcal{C}) := \{\theta \in K_0(\text{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}} \mid X : \theta\text{-semistable for all } X \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Note that it is a convex cone and we have

$$\Theta(\mathcal{C}) = \bigcap_{X \in \mathcal{C}} \Theta(X).$$

We remark that, for a simple module S_i , $\Theta(S_i)$ is nothing but a basic hyperplane H_i .

Then we have the following fundamental property. The author would like to thank Haruhisa Enomoto for pointing out this proposition.

Proposition 4.2. (1) *The map*

$$\{\text{subcategories of } \mathbf{mod} A\} \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Theta(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{W(-)} \end{array} \{\text{subset of } K_0(\mathbf{proj} A)_{\mathbb{R}}\}$$

gives an antitone Galois connection, that is, Θ and W are order-reversing, and $(-) \subset \Theta W(-)$ and $(-) \subset W\Theta(-)$. In particular, $\text{Im } \Theta$ and $\text{Im } W$ are anti-isomorphic posets.

(2) *In the above setting, we have*

$$\text{Im } W = \mathbf{wide} A.$$

(3) *Let W be a wide subcategory such that $\{B_i\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$ are simple objects of W , i.e, $W = \text{Filt}(B_1, \dots, B_{\ell})$. Then we have*

$$\Theta(W) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} \Theta(B_i).$$

Proof. (1) This follows from Definition 4.1.

(2) Since A is τ -tilting finite, wide subcategories and semistable categories coincide by [Y]. Thus this follows from (1).

(3) Clearly, we have $\Theta(W) \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} \Theta(B_i)$. On the other hand, let $\theta \in \bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} \Theta(B_i)$. Then, for any i , B_i is θ -semistable and belongs to $W(\theta)$. Since $W(\theta)$ is wide, we have $W = \text{Filt}(B_1, \dots, B_{\ell}) \subset W(\theta)$ and hence $\theta \in \Theta(W)$. \square

Next we recall the notion of brick labeling.

Definition-Theorem 4.3. [DIRRT] There exists an arrow $q : T \rightarrow U$ of $\text{Hasse}(\text{tors} A)$ if and only if the set of bricks in $T \cap U^{\perp}$ contains exactly one element B_q . In this case, we have $T \cap U^{\perp} = \text{Filt}(B_q)$. We denote B_q by $B(T \rightarrow U)$. Thus, we have a map

$$\text{Hasse} A \rightarrow \mathbf{brick} A, \quad (a \rightarrow b) \mapsto B(a \rightarrow b).$$

In this way, for each arrow q of $\text{Hasse} A$, we can associate a brick B_q and we call this label *brick labeling*. If $a \in \mathbf{j}\text{-irr}(A)$, then there exists a unique element a^* such that $a \succ a^*$. In this case, we write $B(a)$ instead of $B(a \rightarrow a^*)$.


From now on, we fix $U \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-2} A$. Recall that there exists a finite dimensional algebra B such that $|B| = 2$ and

$$2\text{-silt}_U A \cong 2\text{-silt} B.$$

Thus, there exist

$$T_{\max}, T_{\min}, T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{\ell}, T'_1, T'_2, \dots, T'_m \in 2\text{-silt}_U A$$

such that $T_{\min} < T_1 < T_2 < \dots < T_{\ell} < T_{\max}$ and $T_{\min} < T'_1 < T'_2 < \dots < T'_m < T_{\max}$. The Hasse quiver is given as follows:



By Theorem 2.6, we have the corresponding torsion classes, which are defined by $\mathsf{T}_{\max} := \text{Fac}(H^0(T_{\max}))$, $\mathsf{T}_{\min} := \text{Fac}(H^0(T_{\min}))$, $\mathsf{T}_i := \text{Fac}(H^0(T_i))$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$) and $\mathsf{T}'_j := \text{Fac}(H^0(T'_j))$ ($1 \leq j \leq m$). We also define bricks $B_i := B(\mathsf{T}_i \rightarrow \mathsf{T}_{i-1})$ ($1 \leq i \leq \ell$) and $B'_j := B(\mathsf{T}'_j \rightarrow \mathsf{T}'_{j-1})$ ($1 \leq j \leq m$) and, moreover, $B_{\ell+1} := B(\mathsf{T}_{\max} \rightarrow \mathsf{T}_{\ell})$ (resp. $B'_{m+1} := B(\mathsf{T}_{\max} \rightarrow \mathsf{T}'_m)$).

Let $[\mathsf{T}_{\min}, \mathsf{T}_{\max}]$ be the interval of torsion classes in $\text{tors}A$ between T_{\min} and T_{\max} . Recall that $[\mathsf{T}_{\min}, \mathsf{T}_{\max}] \cong 2\text{-silt}_U A$ by Theorem 2.15. We also recall the following result by [J, AP].

Lemma 4.4. [J, AP] *In the above setting,*

- (1) *we have a lattice isomorphism*

$$[\mathsf{T}_{\min}, \mathsf{T}_{\max}] \longrightarrow \text{tors}B.$$

Moreover, the isomorphism preserves the brick labeling.

- (2) *we have $B_1 \cong B'_{m+1}$ and $B'_1 \cong B_{\ell+1}$, which are the simple objects of $\mathsf{T}_{\max} \cap \mathsf{T}_{\min}^\perp$.*

Proof. (1) These statements are [J, AP]. (2) By [AP, Theorem 4.2], the simple objects of $\mathsf{T}_{\max} \cap \mathsf{T}_{\min}^\perp$ are $\{B_1, B'_1\}$, which coincide with $\{B'_{m+1}, B_{\ell+1}\}$. Moreover, since $B_1 \in \mathsf{T}_i$ and $B'_1 \notin \mathsf{T}_i$ (resp. $B'_1 \in \mathsf{T}'_j$ and $B_1 \notin \mathsf{T}'_j$) for $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ (resp. for $1 \leq j \leq m$), we get $B_1 = B'_{m+1}$ and $B'_1 = B_{\ell+1}$. \square

Then we get the following conclusion.

Lemma 4.5. $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_\ell, B'_1, B'_2, \dots, B'_m$ *are all distinct.*

Proof. By our assumption, $\mathsf{T}_1, \mathsf{T}_2, \dots, \mathsf{T}_\ell, \mathsf{T}'_1, \mathsf{T}'_2, \dots, \mathsf{T}'_m$ are all distinct. By Lemma 4.4, we can check that T_i (resp. T'_j) is the minimal torsion class containing B_i (resp. B'_j). Thus we get the conclusion. \square

We also recall the following fundamental result by [BST, Y].

Proposition 4.6. [BST, Y] *Let $\mathcal{T} \succ \mathcal{T}'$ in $\mathfrak{C}(A)$. Then we have*

$$W(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}') = \text{Filt}(B(\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}')).$$

Using the above result, we can give the following corollary.

Corollary 4.7. (1) *We have*

$$W(\mathsf{T}_{\max} \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell) = W(\mathsf{T}_{\min} \cap \mathcal{T}'_1) \text{ and } W(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}'_m) = W(\mathsf{T}_{\min} \cap \mathcal{T}_1).$$

- (2) *For arbitrary $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, $W(\mathcal{T}_i \cap \mathcal{T}_{i+1})$ and $W(\mathcal{T}'_j \cap \mathcal{T}'_{j+1})$ are all distinct.*

Proof. (1) We will only show the first statement. The second one is similar. By Proposition 4.6, we have $W(\mathsf{T}_{\max} \cap \mathcal{T}_\ell) = \text{Filt}(B_{\ell+1})$. Similarly, we have $W(\mathsf{T}_{\min} \cap \mathcal{T}'_1) = \text{Filt}(B'_1)$. Thus, by Lemma 4.4, we get the conclusion.

- (2) This is shown by the same argument of (1) and Lemma 4.5. \square

Finally we establish the following theorem.

Theorem 4.8. (1) *A shard gives precisely the semistable region of a brick. Moreover, we have a bijection between the set $\text{brick}A$ of bricks and the set $\text{shard}A$ of shards by*

$$\Theta(-) : \text{brick}A \longrightarrow \text{shard}A.$$

(2) We have the following commutative diagrams, and all maps are bijections

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A)) & \xrightleftharpoons[\mathcal{J}(-)]{\Sigma(-)} & \text{shard}A \\
 \uparrow \tau(-) \quad \downarrow B(-) & & \uparrow \Theta(-) \quad \downarrow W(-) \\
 \text{brick}A & \xrightleftharpoons[\text{sim}(-)]{\text{Filt}(-)} & \text{single-wide}A.
 \end{array}$$

Proof. (2) Recall that the upper horizontal maps and lower horizontal maps are both bijections by Theorems 3.11 and 2.7, respectively. Moreover, we have a bijection

$$\text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A)) \xrightleftharpoons[\tau(-)]{B(-)} \text{brick}A$$

by [DIRRT, Theorem 3.3],[BCZ, Theorem 1.5]. Thus the left vertical map is also bijection.

Let $\mathcal{T} \in \text{j-irr}(\mathfrak{C}(A))$ and $\mathcal{T} \succ \mathcal{T}^*$. We will show that the diagram is commutative, that is,

$$\Theta(\text{Filt}(B(\mathcal{T}))) = \Sigma(\mathcal{T}).$$

We have $\Theta(\text{Filt}(B(\mathcal{T}))) = \Theta(B(\mathcal{T}))$ by Proposition 4.2 and hence it is enough to show $\Theta(B(\mathcal{T})) = \Sigma(\mathcal{T})$.

Recall that $B(\mathcal{T})$ is semistable on $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*$ by Proposition 4.6. Consider the facet of $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*$, which is codimension 2, and given as $\mathcal{U}_1 := C(U_1)$ for some $U_1 \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-2}A$. If $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*$ is a facet of the maximum or minimum cone on $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U}_1)$, by definition of shards, then a small wall in $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U}_1)$ adjacent to $\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*$, which we denote by \mathcal{L}_1 , is contained in $\Sigma(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*)$. In this case, by Corollary 4.7, $B(\mathcal{T})$ is also semistable on \mathcal{L}_1 .

Next we take a facet of \mathcal{L}_1 which is not \mathcal{U}_1 , and it is given as $\mathcal{U}_2 := C(U_2)$ for some $U_2 \in 2\text{-psilt}^{n-2}A$. If \mathcal{L}_1 is a facet of the maximum or minimum cone on $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U}_2)$, then a small wall in $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U}_2)$ adjacent to \mathcal{L}_1 , which we denote by \mathcal{L}_2 , is contained in $\Sigma(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*)$. Similarly, $B(\mathcal{T})$ is also semistable on \mathcal{L}_2 . We can repeat this argument for small walls $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_k$ of $\Sigma(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*)$, where \mathcal{L}_i and \mathcal{L}_{i+1} are adjacent. Thus we conclude that $B(\mathcal{T})$ is semistable on $\Sigma(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*)$ and $\Theta(B(\mathcal{T})) \supset \Sigma(\mathcal{T})$.

Take a small wall \mathcal{L}_{k+1} on $H(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*)$, which is adjacent to \mathcal{L}_k and $\mathcal{L}_{k+1} \notin \Sigma(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*)$. Let $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{L}_k \cap \mathcal{L}_{k+1}$, which is an $(n-2)$ dimensional cone. Then, by the assumption, \mathcal{L}_k is not a facet of the maximum or minimum cone on $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U})$ and Corollary 4.7 implies that $B(\mathcal{T})$ is not semistable on \mathcal{L}_{k+1} . Thus, $B(\mathcal{T})$ is never semistable on the outside of $\Sigma(\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{T}^*)$ and hence $\Theta(B(\mathcal{T})) = \Sigma(\mathcal{T})$.

Hence the map $\Theta(-) : \text{single-wide}A \rightarrow \text{shard}A$ is well-defined and hence, the map is bijection. Since $\Theta(\text{Filt}(-)) = \Theta(-)$, (1) immediately follows from (2). \square

5. SHARD INTERSECTIONS


In this section we discuss shard intersections and their several properties. One of the main results in this section is a poset isomorphism between shard intersections and wide subcategories. Moreover, we study several properties of shard intersections.

Definition 5.1. Let $\text{shard-int}A$ be the set of arbitrary intersections of shards. We regard the entire space $V := K_0(\text{proj}A)_{\mathbb{R}}$ is the intersection of the empty set of shards. Then $\text{shard-int}A$ is a poset by inclusion and it is lattice. The unique maximal element is V and

the unique minimal element is the intersection of the set of all shards, which is the origin 0. The meet operation is intersection and the join operation Γ_1 and Γ_2 is given by the intersection of all shards containing Γ_1 and Γ_2 .

We remark in [Re3] the partial order of $\text{shard-int}A$ is defined by reverse containment, so that it is opposite of our partial order.

Example 5.2. Let A be a rank 2 g -finite algebra. We use the same terminology of Example 3.3. Then the Hasse quiver of $\text{shard-int}A$ is given by



To discuss our main result, we recall the result of [AHIKM, Proposition 3.13] (which was also discussed in [DIRRT], [BCZ], [A1]).

Theorem 5.3. *We have a bijection*

$$\mathfrak{C}(A) \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\{B(-)\}} \\ \xleftarrow{\vee\{\mathcal{T}(-)\}} \end{array} \text{sbrick}A,$$

where we define $\{B(\mathcal{T})\} := \{B(\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}') \mid \mathcal{T} \succ \mathcal{T}'\}$ and $\vee\{\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{S})\} := \bigvee\{\mathcal{T}(B_i)\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$ for $\mathcal{S} := \{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell}\} \in \text{sbrick}A$.

Then we give the following theorem.

Theorem 5.4. (1) *There exists an anti-isomorphism*

$$\text{wide}A \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\Theta(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{W(-)} \end{array} \text{shard-int}A.$$

(2) *We have the following commutative diagrams, and all maps are bijections*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{C}(A) & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\bigcap \Sigma(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\bigvee \mathcal{J}(-)} \end{array} & \text{shard-int}A \\ \uparrow \vee \mathcal{T}(-) & \begin{array}{c} \{B(-)\} \\ \downarrow \end{array} & \uparrow \Theta(-) \\ \text{sbrick}A & \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{Filt}(-)} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{sim}(-)} \end{array} & \text{wide}A \\ & & \downarrow W(-) \end{array}$$

where we define $\bigcap \Sigma(\mathcal{T}) := \bigcap_{\mathcal{T} \succ \mathcal{T}'} \Sigma(\mathcal{T} \succ \mathcal{T}')$ and $\bigvee \mathcal{J}(\Gamma) := \bigvee_{\Sigma \supset \Gamma} \mathcal{J}(\Sigma)$.

Proof. (1) By Proposition 4.2, we have an anti-isomorphism $\text{Im } \Theta \cong \text{Im } W = \text{wide}A$. Hence it is enough to show $\text{Im } \Theta = \text{shard-int}A$. Let $C \subset \text{mod } A$ be a subcategory. Then $\Theta(C) = \Theta(W(\Theta(C)))$. Since $W(\Theta(C))$ is wide, there exists a semibrick $\{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell}\}$ such

that $W(\Theta(C)) = \text{Filt}(B_1, \dots, B_\ell)$. Moreover, Theorem 4.8 implies that there exists a shard Σ_i such that $\Sigma_i = \Theta(B_i)$. Thus, Proposition 4.2 implies

$$\Theta(W(\Theta(C))) = \Theta(\text{Filt}(B_1, \dots, B_\ell)) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} \Theta(B_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{\ell} \Sigma_i$$

and hence $\text{Im } \Theta \subset \text{shard-int}A$.

On the other hand, let $\bigcap_{i=1}^m \Sigma_i \in \text{shard-int}A$. Then Theorem 4.8 implies that there exists a brick B_i such that $\Sigma_i = \Theta(B_i)$. Then, for $X := B_1 \oplus \dots \oplus B_m$, we have $\Theta(X) = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \Theta(B_i) = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \Sigma_i$ and hence $\text{Im } \Theta \supset \text{shard-int}A$.

(2) Left vertical maps, lower horizontal maps and right vertical maps are all bijections by Theorem 5.3, Theorem 2.7 and (1), respectively. Thus, the commutativity of Theorem 4.8 implies the commutativity $\bigcap \Sigma(-) = \Theta \circ \text{Filt} \circ \{B(-)\}$ and the map $\bigcap \Sigma(-)$ is bijection. We will show that $\bigvee \mathcal{J} \circ \bigcap \Sigma(-)$ is the identity map.

Let $\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$ and $\mathcal{T} = \bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{J}(\Sigma_i)$ be a canonical join representation, where Σ_i runs over all lower shards of \mathcal{T} . Let $\Gamma := \bigcap \Sigma(\mathcal{T})$ and we will show $\mathcal{T} = \bigvee \mathcal{J}(\Gamma)$. Since $\Gamma \subset \Sigma_i$, it is enough to show that for any shard Σ containing Γ , we have $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \leq \mathcal{T}$.

For each Σ_i , the shard contains a facet of the region \mathcal{T} . Thus Γ contains the face F of \mathcal{T} obtained by intersecting the facets of \mathcal{T} separating \mathcal{T} from regions \mathcal{T}' having $\mathcal{T} \cdot > \mathcal{T}'$. Then any shard Σ containing Γ contains F . Hence there is a region $\mathcal{P} \in U(\Sigma)$ such that \mathcal{P} contains F . By Theorem 2.15, the set $I := \{\mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{C}(A) \mid F \subset \mathcal{T}\}$ is an interval in $\mathfrak{C}(A)$, and \mathcal{T} is the maximal element of I . Therefore we have $\mathcal{P} \in I$ and $\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \leq \mathcal{P} \leq \mathcal{T}$. Consequently $\bigvee \mathcal{J} \circ \bigcap \Sigma(-)$ is the identity map. \square

As a corollary, we get the following result, which can be regarded as a refinement of [T1]. Note that it is also shown in [En, Corollary 4.33] in a different formulation (see also Proposition 5.12 below).

Corollary 5.5. *Let Δ be a Dynkin graph, Π_Δ the preprojective algebra of Δ and $\Sigma(\Delta)$ the Coxeter fan of Δ . Then the shard intersection poset of $\Sigma(\Delta)$ is anti-isomorphic to $\text{wide}\Pi_\Delta$.*

Proof. By [AHIKM, Theorem 8.4], we have $\Sigma(\Pi_\Delta)$ coincides with $\Sigma(\Delta)$. Thus Theorem 5.4 implies the conclusion. \square

We fix a 2-term presilting complex U and the corresponding face $\mathcal{U} := C(U)$ of $\Sigma(A)$.

Proposition 5.6. (1) *Let $W(U) := {}^\perp H^{-1}(\nu U) \cap \text{Fac}(H^0(U))^\perp$. Then*

$$W(U) = W(\mathcal{U})$$

and $\#\text{sim}(W(U)) = |A| - |U|$. Thus it is a semistable wide subcategory. Moreover, there exists a finite dimensional algebra B such that equivalence $W(U) \cong \text{mod } B$.

(2) *There exists surjection $2\text{-psilt}A \rightarrow \text{wide}A$, $U \mapsto W(U)$.*

Proof. The statement is the consequence of [BST] and [Y], where they gave an explicit relationship between semistable regions and the associated wide subcategories. For the convenience of the reader, we provide a brief explanation. [BST, Theorem 3.14] and [Y, Theorem 1.4] show that the semistable subcategories given by two-term presilting complexes can be obtained as wide subcategories associated to the two-term presilting complexes. It implies $W(U) = W(\mathcal{U})$ and (2). Moreover the rank of the wide subcategories also explicitly given by [BST, Theorem 3.14], which completes (1). \square

The following definition provides a canonical description of the shard intersections.

Definition 5.7. Let \mathcal{U} be a face of $\Sigma(A)$. We define

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{U}) := \bigcap \{ \Sigma(\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\max} \succ \mathcal{T}) \mid \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\min} \leq \mathcal{T} \prec \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\max} \},$$

where $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\max}$ (resp. $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\min}$) the maximum chamber (resp. the minimum chamber) of $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U})$. Note that it is clearly a shard intersection.

Theorem 5.8. *In the above setting, we have*

$$\mathbf{W}(U) = \mathbf{W}(\Gamma(\mathcal{U})).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{T}(U)_{\max}$ (resp. $\mathbf{T}(U)_{\min}$) be the corresponding torsion class to $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\max}$ (resp. to $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\min}$). By Proposition 2.17, we have

$$[\mathbf{T}(U)_{\min}, \mathbf{T}(U)_{\max}] = [\mathbf{Fac}(H^0(U)), {}^\perp H^{-1}(\nu U)].$$

Since $\mathbf{W}(U) = {}^\perp H^{-1}(\nu U) \cap \mathbf{Fac}(H^0(U))^\perp$, by applying [AP, Theorem 1.4] to this interval, we have

$$\mathbf{W}(U) = \mathbf{Filt}(\{B(\mathbf{T}_{\max} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}) \mid \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\min} \leq \mathbf{T} \prec \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\max}\}).$$

By Theorem 5.4, the right-hand side coincides with

$$\mathbf{W}(\bigcap \{ \Sigma(\mathbf{T}_{\max} \rightarrow \mathbf{T}) \mid \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\min} \leq \mathbf{T} \prec \mathbf{T}(\mathcal{U})_{\max} \}) = \mathbf{W}(\Gamma(\mathcal{U})).$$

Thus we get the conclusion. \square

The following proposition is the same type of Proposition [Re3, Proposition 4.4], but our proof is different.

Proposition 5.9. *Let $\mathcal{U} \in \Sigma(A)$ be a face and Γ a shard intersection such that $\dim(\mathcal{U}) = \dim(\Gamma)$ and $\mathcal{U} \subset \Gamma$. Then we have $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{U})$. Moreover, Γ is the intersection of all shards containing \mathcal{U} .*

For a proof of Proposition 5.9, we recall the following basic result.

Proposition 5.10. [BM] *Let A be a τ -tilting finite algebra and \mathbf{W}, \mathbf{W}' wide subcategories of $\mathbf{mod} A$. If $\mathbf{W}' \subset \mathbf{W}$ and $\sharp\text{sim} \mathbf{W} = \sharp\text{sim} \mathbf{W}'$, then $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{W}'$.*

Proof of Proposition 5.9. Since $\mathcal{U} \subset \Gamma$, we have $\mathbf{W}(\mathcal{U}) \supset \mathbf{W}(\Gamma)$. Because $\sharp\text{sim}(\mathbf{W}(\mathcal{U})) = \sharp\text{sim}(\mathbf{W}(\Gamma))$ by $\dim(\mathcal{U}) = \dim(\Gamma)$, Proposition 5.10 implies $\mathbf{W}(\mathcal{U}) = \mathbf{W}(\Gamma)$.

On the other hand, Proposition 5.6 and Theorem 5.8 imply that $\mathbf{W}(U) = \mathbf{W}(\mathcal{U}) = \mathbf{W}(\Gamma(\mathcal{U}))$. Therefore, we get $\mathbf{W}(\Gamma) = \mathbf{W}(\Gamma(\mathcal{U}))$. Since Γ and $\Gamma(\mathcal{U})$ are both shard intersections, we have $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{U})$ by Theorem 5.4. Thus we get the first assertion. Let Γ' be the intersection of all shards containing \mathcal{U} . Then we have $\mathcal{U} \subset \Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ and hence \mathcal{U} is a full-dimensional face contained in Γ' . Hence the first assertion implies $\Gamma' = \Gamma(\mathcal{U}) = \Gamma$. \square

Finally we discuss two important properties of shard intersections. The first one is a relationship with the *core label order*.

Definition 5.11. (1) For $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$, we define $\mathcal{R}_\downarrow := \bigwedge \{ \mathcal{R}' \in \mathfrak{C}(A) \mid \mathcal{R} \succ \mathcal{R}' \}$. Moreover, for $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$, we define

$$\text{j-irr}[\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{S}] := \{ \gamma(\mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathcal{T}') : \mathcal{R} \leq \mathcal{T}' \prec \mathcal{T} \leq \mathcal{S} \}.$$

Then, for $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{T} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$, we define the *core label order* $\mathcal{R} \leq_{\text{CLO}} \mathcal{T}$ by $\text{j-irr}[\mathcal{R}_\downarrow, \mathcal{R}] \subset \text{j-irr}[\mathcal{T}_\downarrow, \mathcal{T}]$.

- (2) By Theorem 5.4, any shard intersection $\Gamma \in \text{shard-int}A$ is given by $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}) = \Gamma$ for some $\mathcal{R} \in \mathfrak{C}(A)$, where $\mathbb{S} := \cap\Sigma(-) : \mathfrak{C}(A) \rightarrow \text{shard-int}A$ is the bijective map. Then we define the *shard intersection order* $\mathcal{R} \leq_{\text{SI}} \mathcal{T}$ if $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}) \subset \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{T})$. Thus the partial order of $\text{shard-int}A$ is identified with $(\mathfrak{C}(A), \leq_{\text{SI}})$.

The following theorem, which corresponds to [Re3, Proposition 5.7], relates the above two partial orders.

Proposition 5.12. *We have*

$$\mathcal{R} \leq_{\text{SI}} \mathcal{T} \iff \mathcal{R} \geq_{\text{CLO}} \mathcal{T}.$$

Thus we have an anti-isomorphism $(\mathfrak{C}(A), \leq_{\text{SI}}) \cong (\mathfrak{C}(A), \leq_{\text{CLO}})$.

A proof of this proposition can be shown by the similar argument of [Re3, Proposition 5.7]. For the convenience of reader, we give a proof.

Proof. The interval $[\mathcal{R}_{\downarrow}, \mathcal{R}]$ coincides with $\mathfrak{C}(A, \mathcal{U})$, where \mathcal{U} is the intersection of \mathcal{R} with all chambers \mathcal{T} such that $\mathcal{T} \prec \mathcal{R}$. Then $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})$ contains \mathcal{U} and $\dim(\mathcal{U}) = \dim(\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}))$. Thus, by Proposition 5.9, a shard Σ contain $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R})$ if and only if it contains \mathcal{U} . On the other hand, a shard Σ contains \mathcal{U} if and only if it separates two adjacent cones \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{V}' of $[\mathcal{R}_{\downarrow}, \mathcal{R}]$. Thus the set $\text{j-irr}[\mathcal{R}_{\downarrow}, \mathcal{R}]$ and $\{\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \mid \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}) \subset \Sigma\}$ coincide.

Moreover $\mathcal{R} \leq_{\text{SI}} \mathcal{T}$, which is equivalent to $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}) \subset \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{T})$, if and only if $\{\Sigma \mid \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}) \subset \Sigma\} \supset \{\Sigma \mid \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{T}) \subset \Sigma\}$. This is also equivalent to $\{\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \mid \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}) \subset \Sigma\} \supset \{\mathcal{J}(\Sigma) \mid \mathbb{S}(\mathcal{T}) \subset \Sigma\}$, that is, $\text{j-irr}[\mathcal{R}_{\downarrow}, \mathcal{R}] \supset \text{j-irr}[\mathcal{T}_{\downarrow}, \mathcal{T}]$. \square

We note that by Theorem 5.4, $\text{shard-int}A$ is anti-isomorphic to $\text{wide}A$. Then, we can also get Proposition 5.12 by [En, Theorem 4.25], which implies that $\text{wide}A \cong (\mathfrak{C}(A), \leq_{\text{CLO}})$.

The second important property is gradedness. Recall that a finite poset \mathcal{P} is *graded* if it is equipped with a rank function $\rho : \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that $\rho(x) = \rho(y) + 1$ if $x \succ y$. Then we have the following result [Re3, Proposition 5.1].

Proposition 5.13. *The partial order $\text{shard-int}A$ and hence $\text{wide}A$ is graded. More precisely, the rank of $\mathbb{S}(\mathcal{R}) \in \text{shard-int}A$ is given by the number of lower hyperplanes of \mathcal{R} and the rank of $\mathbb{W} \in \text{wide}A$ is given by the number of $\text{sim}(\mathbb{W})$.*

Proof. Assume that $\Gamma \supset \Gamma'$ for $\Gamma, \Gamma' \in \text{shard-int}A$. Let \mathcal{U}' be some full-dimensional face in Γ' . As in [Re3, Lemma 2.10], we can take a face \mathcal{U} of $\Sigma(A)$ which is full-dimensional in Γ and \mathcal{U}' is a face of \mathcal{U} . If $\dim(\Gamma) = \dim(\Gamma')$, then $\dim(\mathcal{U}) = \dim(\mathcal{U}')$ and hence $\Gamma = \Gamma(\mathcal{U}') = \Gamma'$ by Proposition 5.9. Moreover, if $\dim(\Gamma) > \dim(\Gamma') + 1$, then $\dim(\mathcal{U}) > \dim(\mathcal{U}') + 1$. Hence we can take a face \mathcal{U}'' such that $\mathcal{U}' \subsetneq \mathcal{U}'' \subsetneq \mathcal{U}$ and $\Gamma' \subsetneq \Gamma(\mathcal{U}'') \subsetneq \Gamma$. Thus we get the conclusion for $\text{shard-int}A$. The statement for $\text{wide}A$ follows from Theorem 5.4 and the first statement. \square

The gradedness of wide subcategories can be directly shown by τ -tilting theory (without using shards). The author would like to thank Haruhisa Enomoto for pointing out this fact.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank Haruhisa Enomoto for variable discussions and helpful comments. He would also like to thank Nathan Reading and Toshiya Yurikusa for answering some questions. He is very grateful to the referee for the careful reading of the paper and for the very kind suggestions that significantly improved the paper.

REFERENCES

- [AI] T. Aihara, O. Iyama, *Silting mutation in triangulated categories*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) 85 (2012), no. 3, 633–668.
- [AIR] T. Adachi, O. Iyama, I. Reiten, τ -tilting theory, Compos. Math. 150 (2014), no. 3, 415–452.
- [AHIKM] T. Aoki, A. Higashitani, O. Iyama, R. Kase, Y. Mizuno, *Fans and polytopes in tilting theory I: Foundations*, arXiv:2203.15213.
- [A1] S. Asai, *Semibricks*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2020, no. 16, 4993–5054.
- [A2] S. Asai, *The wall-chamber structures of the real Grothendieck groups*, Adv. Math. 381 (2021), 107615.
- [AP] S. Asai, C. Pfeifer, *Wide subcategories and lattices of torsion classes*, Algebr. Represent. Theory 25 (2022), no. 6, 1611–1629.
- [AMN] H. Asashiba, Y. Mizuno, K. Nakashima, *Simplicial complexes and tilting theory for Brauer tree algebras*, J. Algebra 551 (2020), 119–153.
- [B] E. Barnard, *The canonical join complex*, Electron. J. Combin. 26 (2019), no. 1, Paper No. 1.24, 25 pp.
- [BCZ] E. Barnard, A. Carroll, S. Zhu, *Minimal inclusions of torsion classes*, Algebr. Comb. 2 (2019), no. 5, 879–901.
- [BST] T. Brustle, D. Smith, H. Treffinger, *Wall and chamber structure for finite-dimensional algebras*, Advances in Mathematics, Volume 354, 1 2019.
- [BM] A. Buan, B. Marsh, *Mutating signed τ -exceptional sequences*, arXiv:2211.10428.
- [DIJ] L. Demonet, O. Iyama, G. Jasso, τ -tilting finite algebras, bricks, and g -vectors, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2019, no. 3, 852–892.
- [DIRRT] L. Demonet, O. Iyama, N. Reading, I. Reiten, H. Thomas, *Lattice theory of torsion classes: beyond τ -tilting theory*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B 10 (2023), 542–612.
- [En] H. Enomoto, *From the lattice of torsion classes to the posets of wide subcategories and ICE-closed subcategories*, Algebr. Represent. Theory 26(2023), no.6, 3223–3253.
- [Go] V. A. Gorbunov, *Canonical decompositions in complete lattices*, Algebra i Logika 17 (1978), no. 5, 495–511, 622.
- [J] G. Jasso, *Reduction of τ -tilting modules and torsion pairs*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN 2015, no. 16, 7190–7237.
- [KV] B. Keller, D. Vossieck, *Aisles in derived categories*, Deuxieme Contact Franco-Belge en Algebre (Faulx-les-Tombes, 1987). Bull. Soc. Math. Belg. Sér. A 40 (1988), no. 2, 239–253.
- [Ki] A. D. King, *Moduli of representations of finite-dimensional algebras*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) 45 (1994), no. 180, 515–530.
- [KY] S. Koenig, D. Yang, *Silting objects, simple-minded collections, t -structures and co- t -structures for finite-dimensional algebras*, Doc. Math. 19 (2014), 403–438.
- [MS] F. Marks, J. Stovicek, *Torsion classes, wide subcategories and localisations*, Bull. London Math. Soc. 49 (2017), Issue 3, 405–416.
- [Re1] N. Reading, *Lattice and order properties of the poset of regions in a hyperplane arrangement*, Algebra Universalis 50(2003), no.2, 179–205.
- [Re2] N. Reading, *The order dimension of the poset of regions in a hyperplane arrangement*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 104 (2003), no. 2, 265–285.
- [Re3] N. Reading, *Noncrossing partitions and the shard intersection order*, J. Algebraic Combin. 33 (2011), no. 4, 483–530.
- [Re4] N. Reading, *Lattice theory of the poset of regions*, Lattice theory: special topics and applications. Vol. 2, 399–487, Birkhauser/Springer, Cham, 2016.
- [Ri] C. M. Ringel, *Representations of K -species and bimodules*, J. Algebra 41 (1976), no. 2, 269–302.
- [RST] N. Reading, D. E. Speyer, H. Thomas, *The fundamental theorem of finite semidistributive lattices*, Selecta Math. (N.S.) 27 (2021), no. 4, Paper No. 59, 53 pp.
- [T1] H. Thomas, *Stability, shards, and preprojective algebras*, Contemp. Math. 705 (2018), 251–262.
- [T2] H. Thomas, *An introduction to the lattice of torsion classes*, Bull. Iranian Math. Soc. 47 (2021), suppl. 1, 35–55.
- [Y] T. Yurikusa, *Wide subcategories are semistable*, Doc. Math. 23 (2018), 35–47.