

QUANTUM ELLIPTIC CURVES I: ALGEBRAIC CASE

MICHAEL LARSEN AND VALERY LUNTS

ABSTRACT. A complex elliptic curve E can be defined as the quotient of the analytic space \mathbb{C}^* by a discrete action of the cyclic group $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ for $|q| \neq 1$. We study the boundary case when $|q| = 1$, which leads to the notion of a quantum elliptic curve and a conjectural equivalence of categories that one might call a noncommutative GAGA.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Motivation. Fix $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and let $q^{\mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbb{C}^*$ be the cyclic subgroup generated by q . Assume that $|q| \neq 1$. Then the action of $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ on \mathbb{C}^* is discrete and the quotient $\mathbb{C}^*/q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ is an elliptic curve E_q . The quotient map

$$\pi : \mathbb{C}^* \rightarrow E_q$$

induces an equivalence of categories of analytic coherent sheaves

$$(1.1) \quad \pi^* : \mathrm{Coh}_{E_q}^{\mathrm{an}} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{\mathrm{an}, q^{\mathbb{Z}}},$$

where $\mathrm{Coh}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{\mathrm{an}, q^{\mathbb{Z}}}$ is the corresponding category of $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ -equivariant analytic coherent sheaves on \mathbb{C}^* . By GAGA, the analytic category $\mathrm{Coh}_{E_q}^{\mathrm{an}}$ is equivalent to the category Coh_{E_q} of algebraic coherent sheaves on E_q . Thus the equivalence (1.1) combined with the classical GAGA may be considered as the *algebraization* of the analytic category $\mathrm{Coh}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{\mathrm{an}, q^{\mathbb{Z}}}$:

$$(1.2) \quad \mathrm{Coh}_{E_q} \rightarrow \mathrm{Coh}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{\mathrm{an}, q^{\mathbb{Z}}}.$$

Let \mathcal{O} be the algebra of analytic functions on \mathbb{C}^* . The group $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ acts on \mathcal{O} and we let A_q^{an} be the corresponding crossed product algebra. This algebra consists of non-commutative Laurent polynomials in a variable σ over the ring \mathcal{O} where $\sigma f(z) = f(qz)\sigma$.

In [SV], Soibelman and Vologodsky showed that the sheaves in the category $\mathrm{Coh}_{\mathbb{C}^*}^{\mathrm{an}, q^{\mathbb{Z}}}$ are actually globally coherent and hence this category is equivalent to the category of A_q^{an} -modules which are finitely presented as \mathcal{O} -modules.

When $|q| = 1$ and q is not a root of unity, the orbits of $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ on \mathbb{C}^* are no longer discrete, so the geometric quotient E_q no longer makes sense. But the algebra A_q^{an} is defined and one can still consider the category of A_q^{an} -modules which are finitely presented as \mathcal{O} -modules.

Michael Larsen was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-2401098 and the Simons Foundation.

Let us denote this category $\mathcal{M}_q^{\text{an}}$. Soibelman and Vologodsky called it the category of (analytic) coherent sheaves on the quantum elliptic curve.

One may ask for an algebraization of the analytic category $\mathcal{M}_q^{\text{an}}$ in case $|q| = 1$ which would be the analogue of the equivalence (1.2). We propose a conjectural answer. Namely let $A = \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}]$ be the algebra of Laurent polynomials. The group $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ acts on A and we let A_q be the corresponding crossed product algebra, i.e. $A_q = \langle z, z^{-1}, \sigma, \sigma^{-1} \rangle / (\sigma z = qz\sigma)$. Let \mathcal{M}_q be the abelian category of A_q -modules which are finitely generated as A -modules. The natural embedding of algebras $A \hookrightarrow \mathcal{O}$ extends to the embedding $A_q \hookrightarrow A_q^{\text{an}}$ and we obtain the functor of extension of scalars

$$(1.3) \quad F : \mathcal{M}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_q^{\text{an}}, \quad M \mapsto \mathcal{O} \otimes_A M.$$

Conjecture 1.1. (i) Suppose that $|q| = 1$ and q is not a root of 1. Then the functor F is full and faithful.

(ii) Suppose in addition that there exists $L > 0$ such that for every $0 \neq n \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $|q^n - 1| > L^n$. Then F is an equivalence of categories.

One may consider the equivalence (1.2) and the conjectural equivalence (1.3) as two instances of *noncommutative GAGA*. If $|q| \neq 1$, then the algebraic structure on E_q plays the role. But in the limit case $|q| = 1$ the algebraic structure on \mathbb{C}^* appears.

We will address Conjecture 1.1 in the next paper [LaLu].

1.2. The present paper. In this paper, we study the *algebraic* quantum elliptic curve. That is we assume that $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$ is not a root of unity and study the algebra A_q . More precisely, we study the corresponding category \mathcal{M}_q which we consider to be the category of (algebraic) *coherent sheaves* on the quantum elliptic curve.

We establish a number of structural properties of the algebra A_q and of the category \mathcal{M}_q . In particular we study the cohomology of objects in \mathcal{M} . For the *structure sheaf* $\mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{M}_q$ we have $h^0(\mathcal{O}) = h^1(\mathcal{O}) = 1$, as in the case of a usual elliptic curve. Also the Picard group $\text{Pic}(\mathcal{M}_q)$ is isomorphic to the quotient $\mathbb{C}^*/q^{\mathbb{Z}}$, as in the classical case.

We prove a “Riemann-Roch” theorem and a “Serre duality” theorem. Both look rather different from their classical counterparts. For instance, a non-trivial line bundle cannot have a non-zero section in the algebraic quantum setting. This is in agreement with the analytical picture. Indeed, in the classical analytic setting, a non-zero section of such a line bundle has a Laurent series which is unbounded on both sides because it is formally that of a theta function. Whether such a series can actually converge depends on whether the degree of the line bundle is positive or negative and on whether $|q| < 1$ or $|q| > 1$. When $|q| = 1$, there are no non-zero sections.

For non-trivial line bundles $L \in \mathcal{M}_q$, $h^1(L)$ is the absolute value of the degree of L . Thus, “Serre duality” (which is no longer a duality theorem but just a comparison of dimensions) compares $h^i(\cdot, L)$ to $h^j(L^{-1})$ for $i = j$ rather than $i + j = 1$.

We also establish the symmetry property of the Euler form of the category \mathcal{M}_q : for $F, G \in \mathcal{M}_q$ we prove that $\chi(F, G) = \chi(G, F)$, where

$$\chi(F, G) = \text{Ext}^0(F, G) - \text{Ext}^1(F, G)$$

We notice that the same symmetry property holds in the category of holonomic modules over the Weyl algebra [Sa]. This underlines the analogy between the Weyl algebra and its “multiplicative analogue” A_q .

Also in contrast with the classical case, every object in \mathcal{M}_q has finite length and there exist simple objects whose rank is greater than 1.

In the last Section 12 we discuss some applications to the category \mathcal{M}_q of some results of A. Elagin [El]

We gratefully acknowledge useful conversations with A. Elagin, M. Kontsevich, T. Stafford and Yu. Berest.

2. THE ALGEBRA A_q

2.1. The algebra A_q . Fix $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$ such that $q^n \neq 1$ for any $0 \neq n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $R = \mathbb{C}[F_2]$ denote the complex group algebra of the free abelian group on generators σ and z . Consider the noncommutative algebra

$$A_q := R/R(\sigma z - qz\sigma)R.$$

It is clear that every group element $g \in F_2$ is congruent modulo $R(\sigma z - qz\sigma)R$ to a monomial of the form $z^m\sigma^n$, and that these monomials are linearly independent over \mathbb{C} modulo $R(\sigma z - qz\sigma)R$. We therefore think of A_q as the ring of Laurent polynomials in variables σ and z whose commutation rule is $\sigma z = qz\sigma$. It contains the following two commutative subalgebras:

$$A = \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}], \quad S = \mathbb{C}[\sigma, \sigma^{-1}].$$

We denote by $K(A)$ the fraction field of A .

Every element $x \in A_q$ can be expressed uniquely either as

$$x = x_m(z)\sigma^m + x_{m+1}(z)\sigma^{m+1} + \cdots + x_n(z)\sigma^n, \quad \text{where } x_i(z) \in A$$

or as

$$x = x_k(\sigma)z^k + x_{k+1}(\sigma)z^{k+1} + \cdots + x_l(\sigma)z^l, \quad \text{where } x_i(\sigma) \in S.$$

Assuming that $x_m(z), x_n(z), x_k(\sigma), x_l(\sigma) \neq 0$ we call $n - m$ (resp. $l - k$) the σ -degree of x , denoted $\deg_\sigma x$ (resp. the z -degree of x , denoted $\deg_z x$). These degrees satisfy

$$\deg_\sigma(xy) = \deg_\sigma x + \deg_\sigma y \quad \text{and} \quad \deg_z(xy) = \deg_z x + \deg_z y.$$

Note that in the above notation we also have

$$x = \sigma^m x_m(q^{-m}z) + \sigma^{m+1} x_{m+1}(q^{-m-1}z) + \cdots + \sigma^n x_n(q^{-n}z).$$

The algebra A_q has a distinguished automorphism of order 4 (the “Fourier transform”) given by

$$\phi(z) = \sigma, \quad \phi(\sigma) = z^{-1}.$$

It also has a distinguished anti-automorphism $\epsilon : A_q \rightarrow A_q$, defined by $\epsilon(z) = z$ and $\epsilon(\sigma) = \sigma^{-1}$. So if $w = \sum_i w_i(z)\sigma^i$, then

$$\epsilon w = \sum_i \sigma^{-i} w_i(z).$$

The units in the algebra A_q are the monomials $cz^m\sigma^n$, $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$.

Given $x, y \in A_q$ we will denote their product either by xy or by $x \cdot y$.

Lemma 2.1. *The algebra A_q has the following properties*

- (1) A_q is a domain (has no zero divisors).
- (2) A_q is simple (has no nontrivial two-sided ideals).
- (3) A_q is left and right Noetherian.
- (4) A_q has global homological dimension 1.

Proof. (1) is obvious;

(2) is [GW, Thm 1.17];

(3) is [GW, Cor 1.15];

(4) is [MR, Ch 7, Thm 5.5]. □

Remark 2.2. *There exist non-principal left (and right) ideals in A_q . An example of such an ideal is given in Example 3.12.*

Definition 2.3. *We denote by \mathcal{O} the left A_q -module A with its A_q -module structure determined by $\sigma \cdot 1 = 1$. So $\mathcal{O} \simeq A_q/A_q \cdot (\sigma - 1)$.*

2.1.1. *Division with remainder in A_q .*

Lemma 2.4. (σ -division) *Let $w = w(z, \sigma)$, $r = r(z, \sigma)$ be nonzero elements in A_q . Assume that $\deg_\sigma w \leq \deg_\sigma r$. Then there exist nonzero $g = g(z) \in A$ and $h = h(z, \sigma) \in A_q$ such that*

$$(2.1) \quad \deg_\sigma(gr - hw) < \deg_\sigma w.$$

In case the coefficient of the highest (or the lowest) power of σ in w is a unit, one may choose $g(z)$ to be a unit as well.

Proof. Write w and r as Laurent polynomials in σ

$$w = w_k(z)\sigma^k + \text{lower}, \quad r = r_l(z)\sigma^l + \text{lower},$$

where $w_k(z), r_l(z) \neq 0$. To find g and h as required we first take

$$s = s(z, \sigma) := w_k(q^{l-k}z)r - r_l(z)\sigma^{l-k}w.$$

Then $\deg_\sigma s < \deg_\sigma r$. If $\deg_\sigma s < \deg_\sigma w$, then we are done. Otherwise, by induction on the difference $\deg_\sigma r - \deg_\sigma w$ we may assume that the assertion holds for the pair (s, w) , hence it also holds for the pair (r, w) .

One could alternatively write

$$w = w_k(z)\sigma^k + \text{higher}, \quad r = r_l(z)\sigma^l + \text{higher},$$

where $w_k(z), r_l(z) \neq 0$. Then the same algorithm applies again.

The last assertion of the lemma is now clear. \square

The proof of the next lemma is completely analogous to the proof of Lemma 2.4.

Lemma 2.5. (*z-division*). *Let $w = w(z, \sigma)$, $r = r(z, \sigma)$ be nonzero elements in A_q . Assume that $\deg_z w \leq \deg_z r$. Then there exist nonzero $g = g(\sigma) \in S$ and $h = h(z, \sigma) \in A_q$ such that*

$$(2.2) \quad \deg_z(gr - hw) < \deg_z w.$$

In case the coefficient of the highest (or the lowest) power of z in w is a unit, one may choose $g(\sigma)$ to be a unit as well.

3. THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}

3.1. The definition and first properties of objects in the category \mathcal{M} . By an A_q -module we will always mean a **left** A_q -module.

Definition 3.1. *Let $A_q\text{-Mod}$ be the abelian category of left A_q -modules, and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_q \subset A_q\text{-Mod}$ its full abelian subcategory consisting of modules which are **finitely generated as A -modules**. We regard \mathcal{M} as the category of “coherent sheaves” on the algebraic quantum elliptic curve with the parameter $q \in \mathbb{C}^*$.*

Question 1. Let $q = e^{2\pi i\alpha}$, $q' = e^{2\pi i\alpha'}$. Suppose that $\alpha' = \alpha^{-1}$. Is then $\mathcal{M}_q \simeq \mathcal{M}_{q'}$?

Lemma 3.2. *Any object in \mathcal{M} is a free (finitely generated) A -module.*

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and denote by $M_{\text{tor}} \subset M$ its A -torsion submodule. Then $\sigma(M_{\text{tor}}) = M_{\text{tor}}$. Hence the support $\text{Supp } M_{\text{tor}} \subset \text{Spec } A = \mathbb{C}^*$ is invariant under multiplication by q . However M_{tor} is a finitely generated torsion module, so its support consists of a finite number of points. As q is not a root of unity, $\text{Supp } M_{\text{tor}} = \emptyset$, and $M_{\text{tor}} = 0$. It remains to note that any finitely generated torsion-free A -module is free. \square

We immediately obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *The abelian category \mathcal{M} is Artinian. In other words, every object in \mathcal{M} has finite length.*

Corollary 3.4. *Every object in \mathcal{M} is a cyclic A_q -module.*

Proof. The algebra A_q is simple, and A_q has infinite length as a left A_q -module. Therefore by a theorem of Stafford, every A_q -module of finite length is cyclic [Bj, Ch 1, Thm 8.18]. \square

Definition 3.5. *We call a nonzero element $p(z, \sigma) = p_m(z)\sigma^m + \cdots + p_n(z)\sigma^n$ σ -good if $p_m(z), p_n(z) \in A$ are units.*

Similarly, we call an element $r(z, \sigma) = r_m(\sigma)z^m + \cdots + r_n(\sigma)z^n$ z -good if $r_m(\sigma), r_n(\sigma) \in S$ are units.

Remark 3.6. *Let $p, r \in A_q$. Then the product $p \cdot r$ is σ -good (resp. z -good) if and only if p and r are so.*

Lemma 3.7. *Let $I \subset A_q$ be a nonzero left ideal and let $M = A_q/I$ be the corresponding cyclic A_q -module. Then the A -rank $\text{rk}_A M$ is the minimum of the σ -degrees of nonzero elements in I . (Similarly, the S -rank $\text{rk}_S M$ is the minimum of the z -degrees of nonzero elements in I .) In particular, $\text{rk}_A M, \text{rk}_S M < \infty$.*

Proof. We prove only the first claim, the second being completely analogous.

Let $e \in M$ be the image of $1 \in A_q$. The collection of elements $\{\sigma^k e\}_{k \in \mathbb{Z}}$ generates the A -module M . Let $0 \neq w(z, \sigma) = w_m(z)\sigma^m + \cdots + w_n(z)\sigma^n \in I$ be an element of minimal σ -degree $n - m$. Any A -linear relation among $\sigma^m e, \sigma^{m+1} e, \dots, \sigma^{n-1} e$ would give an element of I of lower σ -degree than $n - m$, contrary to assumption, so

$$\mathcal{B} := \{1 \otimes \sigma^m e, \dots, 1 \otimes \sigma^{n-1} e\}$$

is an independent set in the $K(A)$ -vector space $K(A) \otimes_A M$. On the other hand, for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$(3.1) \quad w_n(q^k z)\sigma^{n+k} = \sigma^k w_n(z)\sigma^n = - \sum_{i=m}^{n-1} \sigma^k w_i(z)\sigma^i = - \sum_{i=m}^{n-1} w_i(q^k z)q^{i+k},$$

so by induction on $k \geq 0$, all $1 \otimes \sigma^{n+k}e$ lie in the span of \mathcal{B} . Likewise,

$$(3.2) \quad w_m(q^{-k}z)\sigma^{m-k} = \sigma^{-k}w_m(z)\sigma^m = - \sum_{i=m+1}^n \sigma^{-k}w_i(z)\sigma^i = - \sum_{i=m+1}^n w_i(q^{-k}z)q^{i-k},$$

so by induction on $k \geq 1$, all $1 \otimes w_{m-k}(z)$ lie in the span of \mathcal{B} . It follows that \mathcal{B} is a basis for $K(A) \otimes_A M$. □

Lemma 3.8. *Let $0 \neq I \subset A_q$ be a left ideal and let $M := A_q/I$ be the corresponding cyclic A_q -module. Then $M \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if I contains a σ -good element.*

Similarly, M is a finitely generated S -module if and only if I contains a z -good element.

Proof. Again, we prove only the first claim.

Let $e \in M$ be the image of $1 \in A_q$. Let $p(z, \sigma) = p_m(z)\sigma^m + \cdots + p_n(z)\sigma^n \in I$ be a σ -good element, so $p_m(z), p_n(z) \in A$ are units. Then for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ the element

$$\sigma^k p(z, \sigma) = p_m(q^k z)\sigma^{m+k} + \cdots + p_n(q^k z)\sigma^{n+k} \in I$$

is also σ -good. By (3.1) and (3.2), it follows that for any $l \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$\sigma^l e \in \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} A \cdot \sigma^i e.$$

Conversely, assume that $M \in \mathcal{M}$. Then for some $m \leq n \in \mathbb{Z}$, M is generated as an A -module by $\sigma^m e, \sigma^{m+1} e, \dots, \sigma^n e$. It follows that the ideal I contains elements

$$r = r_m(z)\sigma^m + r_{m+1}(z)\sigma^{m+1} + \cdots + r_n(z)\sigma^n + \sigma^{n+1}$$

and also

$$s = \sigma^{m-1} + s_m(z)\sigma^m + s_{m+1}(z)\sigma^{m+1} + \cdots + s_n(z)\sigma^n.$$

Then $r + s \in I$ is a good element. □

Remark 3.9. *Let $0 \neq I \subset A_q$ be a principal ideal generated by $p(z, \sigma)$. Then $M := A_q/I \in \mathcal{M}$ if and only if $p(z, \sigma)$ is σ -good. Similarly, M is finitely generated over S if and only if $p(z, \sigma)$ is z -good.*

Definition 3.10. *An object $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is called **good** if $M \simeq A_q/I$, where I is a principal ideal (generated by a σ -good element).*

3.2. The presentation of an object in \mathcal{M} .

Proposition 3.11. *Let $I \subset A_q$ be an ideal such that $M := A_q/I \in \mathcal{M}$. Then I is either principal generated by a σ -good element (Remark 3.9), or else it has 2 generators. More precisely, let $p(z, \sigma) \in I$ be any σ -good element and $0 \neq w(z, \sigma) \in I$ be any element of the lowest σ -degree. Then I is generated by p and w .*

Proof. Assume that I is not principal. By Lemma 3.8 it contains a σ -good element $p \in I$. Let $0 \neq w \in I$ be an element of the lowest σ -degree. Assume that such a w can be chosen to be σ -good. Then by Lemma 2.4, for any $r \in I$ there exist a unit $g \in A$ and an element $h \in A_q$ such that

$$\deg_\sigma(gr - hw) < \deg_\sigma w,$$

which means that $gr = hw$, hence $r \in A_q \cdot w$, i.e. the ideal I is principal, a contradiction.

So w is not σ -good. (In particular $\deg_\sigma p > \deg_\sigma w$.) This implies that $p \notin A_q \cdot w$, i.e. I is not principal.

Let $J := A_q \cdot p + A_q \cdot w \subset I$ be the ideal generated by p and w . Then $N := A_q/J \in \mathcal{M}$, hence is A -torsion free. Choose $r(z, \sigma) \in I$. Then $\deg_\sigma r \geq \deg_\sigma w$, and we can σ -divide r by w (without remainder). That is there exists $0 \neq g(z) \in A$ and $h \in A_q$ such that $g \cdot r = h \cdot w$. This means that the image of r in the module N is A -torsion. Hence $r \in J$. \square

Example 3.12. *The following example shows that the second possibility in Proposition 3.11 indeed occurs. Consider the left ideal $J = A_q \cdot (\sigma - 1) \subset A_q$ and the corresponding object $M = A_q/J \in \mathcal{M}$. Let $e \in M$ be the image of $1 \in A_q$. Then $M = A \cdot e$, $\sigma e = e$ and $M \simeq \mathcal{O}$. This object is simple and therefore generated by any of its nonzero elements. Choose the generator $f = (1 + z)e \in M$. Let $I := \text{Ann}(f) \subset A_q$. We have $pf = wf = 0$, where*

$$p = p(z, \sigma) = \sigma^2 - (q + 1)\sigma + q, \quad \text{and} \quad w = w(z + 1)\sigma - (qz + 1).$$

Then $w \in I$ is an element of the smallest σ -degree, and $p \in I$ is a σ -good element (of the smallest σ -degree). By Proposition 3.11, $I = A_q \cdot p + A_q \cdot w$. We have the relation $(qz + 1)p = (\sigma - q)w$, i.e. p is σ -divisible by w .

Of course, in the above example, for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the annihilator of the generator $z^n e$ is a principal ideal generated by the σ -good polynomial $\sigma - q^n$. This raises the question if every $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{M}$ is good.

Question 2. Let $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{M}$. Is there a generator m of M , whose annihilator is a principal ideal (generated by a σ -good element)?

3.3. Analyzing the A -rank and S -rank of an object in \mathcal{M} . Let $0 \neq I \subset A_q$ be a left ideal, $M := A_q/I$. Recall (Lemma 3.7) that the A -rank $\text{rk}_A M$ (resp. the S -rank $\text{rk}_S M$) is the smallest σ -degree (resp. z -degree) of a nonzero element $r(z, \sigma) \in I$. The following lemma will be important to us later.

Lemma 3.13. (1) *Suppose that I contains a σ -good element (i.e. $A_q/I \in \mathcal{M}$). Let $0 \neq r(z, \sigma) \in I$ have the smallest z -degree. Then r is σ -good.*

(2) *Similarly, suppose that I contains a z -good element. Let $0 \neq r(z, \sigma) \in I$ be an element of the smallest σ -degree. Then r is z -good.*

Proof. We only prove (1), since the proof of (2) is completely analogous.

Assume not. Choose a σ -good element $p = p(z, \sigma) \in I$. By assumption $\deg_z p \geq \deg_z r$. Then we can z -divide p by r (Lemma 2.5). That is there exists $0 \neq g(\sigma) \in S$ and $h(z, \sigma) \in A_q$ such that $gp = hr$. However, the element gp is σ -good and hr is not (since r is not σ -good). A contradiction. \square

4. TENSOR STRUCTURE AND INNER $\mathcal{H}om$ IN THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}

In this section we denote the A -rank of an A_q -module simply by $\text{rk } M$. When no ring is indicated, tensor products in this section should be understood to be over A .

The category $A_q\text{-Mod}$ has a symmetric tensor structure. Namely, given $M, N \in A_q\text{-Mod}$ the A -module $M \otimes_A N$ (where $am \otimes n = m \otimes an$) is also an A_q -module: $\sigma(m \otimes n) = \sigma(m) \otimes \sigma(n)$. The A_q -modules $M \otimes_A N$ and $N \otimes_A M$ are isomorphic via the map $m \otimes n \mapsto n \otimes m$. The A_q -module \mathcal{O} (Definition 2.3) is the unit for this tensor product. This tensor structure restricts to the subcategory \mathcal{M} and clearly $\text{rk } M \otimes_A N = (\text{rk } M)(\text{rk } N)$.

For $M, N \in A_q\text{-Mod}$ the A -module $\text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ is an A_q -module:

$$\sigma(f)(m) := \sigma(f(\sigma^{-1}m)).$$

We denote this A_q -module by $\mathcal{H}om(M, N)$. Clearly the bifunctor $\mathcal{H}om(-, -)$ preserves the subcategory \mathcal{M} .

Using the A_q -module \mathcal{O} we define the duality (contravariant) functor

$$(-)^\vee : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{opp}, \quad M \mapsto \mathcal{H}om(M, \mathcal{O}).$$

It is an involution, i.e. $M^{\vee\vee} = M$ via the map

$$M \rightarrow M^{\vee\vee}, \quad m \mapsto (f \mapsto f(m)).$$

For $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ we have a natural functorial morphism of A_q -modules

$$\mathcal{H}om(M, N) \otimes_A M \rightarrow N, \quad f \otimes m \mapsto f(m).$$

In particular there is a canonical pairing - the *evaluation map* (a map of A_q -modules)

$$\text{ev} = \langle -, - \rangle : M^\vee \otimes M \rightarrow \mathcal{O}.$$

The standard canonical isomorphism of A -modules

$$M^\vee \otimes M \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(M, M)$$

is a map of A_q -modules. Hence the map of A_q -modules

$$\mathcal{O} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(M, M), \quad 1 \mapsto \text{id}$$

gives the *coevaluation* morphism of A_q -modules

$$\text{coev} : \mathcal{O} \rightarrow M^\vee \otimes M$$

such that the composition

$$M = M \otimes \mathcal{O} \xrightarrow{\text{id} \otimes \text{coev}} M \otimes M^\vee \otimes M \xrightarrow{\text{ev} \otimes \text{id}} M$$

is the identity.

This makes \mathcal{M} into a symmetric rigid monoidal category [EGNO].

The next lemma will be useful for us later.

Lemma 4.1. (1) *For any $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ there is a canonical isomorphism of \mathbb{C} -vector spaces*

$$\text{Hom}_{A_q}(M, N) = \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A, \mathcal{H}om(M, N)).$$

(2) *For $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $N \in A_q\text{-Mod}$ there is a canonical isomorphism of A_q -modules*

$$\mathcal{H}om(M, N) = M^\vee \otimes N.$$

(3) *For $M, N, K \in \mathcal{M}$ there is a canonical isomorphism of A_q -modules*

$$\mathcal{H}om(K \otimes M, N) = \mathcal{H}om(K, \mathcal{H}om(M, N)).$$

In particular (also taking into account (2)) we have

$$(M \otimes N^\vee)^\vee = \mathcal{H}om(M \otimes N^\vee, \mathcal{O}) = \mathcal{H}om(M, N^{\vee\vee}) = \mathcal{H}om(M, N) = M^\vee \otimes N.$$

(4) *For any $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and $N \in A_q\text{-Mod}$ there is a canonical functorial isomorphism of \mathbb{C} -vector spaces*

$$\text{Hom}_{A_q}(A_q \otimes M, N) = \text{Hom}_A(M, N).$$

In particular the A_q -module $A_q \otimes M$ is projective.

Proof. (1): Given a morphism $f \in \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A, \mathcal{H}om(M, N))$ the map $f(1) : M \rightarrow N$ is a morphism of A_q -modules. This gives the bijection.

(2) and (3): One only needs to check that the standard isomorphisms of A -modules are compatible with the action of σ .

(4) Given $f \in \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A_q \otimes M, N)$ define the A -map $g : M \rightarrow N$ as $g(m) := f(1 \otimes m)$.

To define a map in the other direction notice that any element in $A_q \otimes M$ has a unique presentation as a finite sum $\sum_i \sigma^i \otimes m_i$. Also recall that the A_q -module structure on $A_q \otimes M$ is given by $\sigma(x \otimes m) = \sigma x \otimes \sigma(m)$.

For $g \in \text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ define the corresponding $f \in \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A_q \otimes M, N)$ as

$$f\left(\sum_i \sigma^i \otimes m_i\right) := \sum_i \sigma^i(g(\sigma^{-1}(m_i))).$$

One checks that f is indeed a morphism of A_q -modules and the correspondence $g \mapsto f$ is the inverse to the map $f \mapsto g$ defined above. \square

5. IMPORTANT SUBCATEGORIES OF THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}

Given an object $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we may consider it as an S -module.

Definition 5.1. An object $M \in \mathcal{M}$ is **free** (resp. **torsion**, resp. **torsion free**) if it is so as an S -module. Let $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} \subset \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$ and \mathcal{M}_{tor} be the corresponding full subcategories of \mathcal{M} .

Lemma 5.2. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$ and let $M_{\text{tor}} \subset M$ be its torsion S -submodule. Then M_{tor} is an A_q -submodule, i.e. $M_{\text{tor}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$.

Proof. It suffices to prove that $z^\pm M_{\text{tor}} \subset M_{\text{tor}}$. But this is clear: if $V \subset M$ is an S -submodule which is a finite-dimensional \mathbb{C} -vector space, then so is $z^\pm V$. \square

Corollary 5.3. For any $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have the functorial short exact sequence in \mathcal{M}

$$0 \rightarrow M_{\text{tor}} \rightarrow M \rightarrow M_{\text{tf}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$ and $M_{\text{tf}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$.

Lemma 5.4. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$. Then M is finitely generated as an S -module if and only if $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$.

Proof. If $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$, then M is a finitely generated S -module because $\text{rk}_S M < \infty$ by Lemma 3.7. Conversely, let M be a finitely generated S -module. Then arguing as in Lemma 3.2 (after interchanging the algebras A and S) we find that M is free over S . \square

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}_{tor}

Let S_{fd} be the full subcategory of $S\text{-mod}$ consisting of S -modules finite-dimensional over \mathbb{C} . It is a tensor category with respect to the tensor product over \mathbb{C} . Via Jordan decomposition, S_{fd} is equivalent to the tensor category of finite dimensional \mathbb{C}^* -graded vector spaces with a nilpotent operator. Let $\mathbb{C}_q \in S_{\text{fd}}$ be the 1-dimensional S -module where $\sigma(v) = qv$. The tensor product functor $\mathbb{C}_q \otimes (-)$ is an autoequivalence of the abelian category S_{fd} which generates the action of the group $q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ on S_{fd} . The quotient category $S_{\text{fd}}/q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ (the *orbit category*) is equivalent to the tensor category of finite dimensional $\mathbb{C}^*/q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ -graded vector spaces with a nilpotent operator.

Recall that by definition the objects of the category $S_{\text{fd}}/q^{\mathbb{Z}}$ are the same as objects in S_{fd} and the morphisms between V and W are given by the direct sum

$$\bigoplus_{\gamma \in q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \text{Hom}_{S_{\text{fd}}}(V, \gamma(W)).$$

We have the exact functor

$$(6.1) \quad \theta : S_{\text{fd}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}, \quad V \mapsto A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V,$$

where $\sigma(z^n \otimes v) = \sigma(z^n) \otimes \sigma(v) = q^n z^n \otimes \sigma(v)$.

Lemma 6.1. *The functor θ induces the equivalence of categories*

$$(6.2) \quad \bar{\theta} : S_{\text{fd}}/q^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$$

Proof. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$. Then ${}_S M = \bigoplus M_{\lambda}$, where $M_{\lambda} \subset M$ is the generalized λ -eigenspace of σ , i.e. it consists of elements $m \in M$ that are annihilated by some power of $\sigma - \lambda$.

Choose a set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{C}^*$ of coset representatives for the subgroup $q^{\mathbb{Z}} \subset \mathbb{C}^*$.

Let $m \in M_{\lambda}$. Then $\sigma(zm) = q\lambda zm$, i.e. $z(M_{\lambda}) = M_{q\lambda}$. It follows that the A_q -module M is generated by its subspace

$$\delta(M) := \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Gamma} M_{\lambda}.$$

Moreover M is freely generated by $\delta(M)$ as an A -module. In particular, the space $\delta(M)$ is finite dimensional, i.e. $\delta(M) \in S_{\text{fd}}$, and we have an isomorphism of A_q -modules $\theta(\delta(M)) \simeq M$. Therefore the functor θ is essentially surjective.

To show that θ induces a fully faithful functor $\bar{\theta} : S_{\text{fd}}/q^{\mathbb{Z}} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$, it suffices to notice that for $V, W \in S_{\text{fd}}$ we have an isomorphism of vector spaces

$$\text{Hom}_{A_q}(\theta(V), \theta(W)) \simeq \text{Hom}_S(V, \theta(W)) = \bigoplus_{\gamma \in q^{\mathbb{Z}}} \text{Hom}_{S_{\text{fd}}}(V, \gamma(W)) = \text{Hom}_{S_{\text{fd}}/q^{\mathbb{Z}}}(V, W).$$

□

Lemma 6.1 (and its proof) have the following immediate consequences which we record for future reference.

Corollary 6.2. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$. Then*

(1) *There is an isomorphism of A_q -modules $M = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$ for a finite dimensional S -module V .*

(2) *M is a direct sum of its finite dimensional S -submodules and every σ -eigenvalue in M has finite multiplicity.*

(3) *In particular, the spaces of σ -invariants and σ -coinvariants of M have the same finite dimension.*

6.1. The category \mathcal{M}_{tor} is preserved by the duality $(-)^{\vee} : M \mapsto M^{\vee}$ and the tensor product.

Lemma 6.3. *The category \mathcal{M}_{tor} is preserved by duality. More precisely, if $M = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$ for a finite dimensional S -module V (Corollary 6.2), then $M^{\vee} = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V^*$.*

Proof. Indeed, we have the sequence of natural isomorphisms of A_q -modules

$$M^{\vee} = \text{Hom}_A(A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V, A) = \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, A) = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(V, \mathbb{C}) = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V^*.$$

□

Lemma 6.4. *If $M, N \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$, then $M \otimes N \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$.*

Proof. If $M = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$ and $N = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} W$, then $M \otimes_A N = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} (V \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} W)$. □

Remark 6.5. *The above results show that the functor $\bar{\theta}$ in Lemma 6.1 is an equivalence of rigid tensor categories.*

7. STRUCTURE OF THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}_{tf}

Remark 7.1. *Clearly, $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}) = 0$. Also it follows from Lemma 5.4 that*

$$\text{Hom}(\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}, \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}) = 0.$$

Indeed, for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$, $N \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$ the image of a homomorphism $f : M \rightarrow N$ is an A_q -submodule which is finitely generated over S . By Lemma 5.4 this submodule is free over S , hence is zero.

7.0.1. *Do the abelian categories \mathcal{M}_{tor} and $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ generate \mathcal{M} ?* One might hope that for any $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$ there exists a short exact sequence in \mathcal{M}

$$0 \rightarrow M_{\text{free}} \rightarrow M \rightarrow M_{\text{tor}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $M_{\text{free}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ and $M_{\text{tor}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$.

This is not the case. We construct a counterexample in Lemma 7.2.

Lemma 7.2. *Consider the element $s(z, \sigma) = z - (\sigma + \sigma^{-1}) \in A_q$ and let*

$$M := A_q / A_q \cdot s.$$

Then

- (1) *M is finitely generated over A (i.e. $M \in \mathcal{M}$) and not finitely generated over S .*
- (2) *$\text{rk}_A M = 2$ and $\text{rk}_S M = 1$.*
- (3) *$M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$.*
- (4) *M is a simple A_q -submodule.*

Proof. (1) This follows from Remark 3.9, since the polynomial s is σ -good and not z -good.

(2) We have $\text{rk}_A M = \deg_\sigma s = 2$ and $\text{rk}_S M = \deg_z s = 1$.

(3), (4) Since M_{tor} is an A_q -submodule of M it suffices to prove that M is simple, i.e. that $A_q \cdot s$ is a maximal left ideal.

Let $e \in M$ be the image of $1 \in A_q$. It is clear that $\{e, \sigma e\}$ is an A -basis of M . The action of σ in this basis is given by the formulas

$$(7.1) \quad e \mapsto \sigma e, \quad \sigma e \mapsto qz\sigma e - e.$$

Suppose that M contains a proper A_q -submodule $N \subset M$. Then $\text{rk}_A N = 1$, i.e. N is a line bundle. Therefore there exists $0 \neq n \in N$ such that $(\sigma - cz^k)n = 0$ for some $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ (see (9.1)). Suppose we have such an element $0 \neq n \in M$, $n = p_1 e + p_2 \sigma e$ for $p_1, p_2 \in A$. Then we have

$$(7.2) \quad \sigma n = cz^k(p_1 e + p_2 \sigma e) = p_1^\sigma \sigma e + p_2^\sigma (qz\sigma e - e),$$

where $p^\sigma := \sigma p \sigma^{-1}$. Equating the coefficients of e and σe in (7.2) we find that

$$cz^k p_1 = -p_2^\sigma, \quad cz^k p_2 = p_1^\sigma + qz p_2^\sigma.$$

Substituting $p_2 = -cq^{-k} z^k p_1^{\sigma^{-1}}$ into the second equation we get

$$(7.3) \quad -c^2 q^{-k} z^{2k} p_1^{\sigma^{-1}} + cqz^{k+1} p_1 - p_1^\sigma = 0.$$

If $k > 1$ and l is the highest integer such that the z^l coefficient of p_1 is non-zero, then the z^{l+2k} coefficient in (7.3) is non-zero. If $k = 1$ and l is the lowest integer such that the z^l coefficient of p_1 is non-zero, then the z^l coefficient in (7.3) is non-zero. If $k = 0$ and l is

the highest integer such that the z^l coefficient of p_1 is non-zero, then the z^{l+1} coefficient in (7.3) is non-zero. Finally, if $k \leq -1$ and l is the lowest integer such that the z^l coefficient of p_1 is non-zero, then the z^{l+2k} coefficient in (7.3) is non-zero. In every case, therefore, p_1 is non-zero, and this implies $p_2 = 0$, so $n = 0$, which completes the proof of the lemma. \square

7.1. The structure of $M \in \mathcal{M}$ as an S -module. The algebra $A = \mathbb{C}[z, z^{-1}]$ can be considered as the group algebra of the cyclic group Γ with the generator z . This group acts on the algebra $S = \mathbb{C}[\sigma, \sigma^{-1}]$ via conjugation in A_q :

$$z(\sigma) := z\sigma z^{-1} = q^{-1}\sigma.$$

It induces the Γ -action on $\text{Spec } S = \mathbb{C}^*$: $z(p) = qp$. Let N be an S -module. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ denote by $N_\lambda \subset N$ the submodule consisting of elements annihilated by some power of the operator $\sigma - \lambda$. If N is a torsion S -module, then $N = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*} N_\lambda$. If moreover N is an A_q -module, then $zN_\lambda = N_{q\lambda}$.

If $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$ then the structure of the S -module ${}_S M$ is given by Corollary 6.2. The next proposition determines the S -module structure of $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$.

Proposition 7.3. *Assume that $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$. One can choose a free S -submodule $M_0 \subset M$ of full rank, so that the S -module M/M_0 is torsion and has the following properties: $M/M_0 = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*} (M/M_0)_\lambda$, where each $(M/M_0)_\lambda$ is finite dimensional and the collection of λ 's for which $(M/M_0)_\lambda \neq 0$ is contained in a finite number of Γ -orbits.*

Proof. Let $M = A_q/I$ (Corollary 3.4). Let $w \in I$ be a nonzero polynomial of the smallest z -degree. Then $\text{rk}_S M = \deg_z w$ (Lemma 3.7). Let $\deg_z w = k$. We may assume that

$$w = w_0(\sigma) + w_1(\sigma)z + \cdots + w_l(\sigma)z^k.$$

Let $e \in M$ be the image of $1 \in A_q$ in M . The elements $e, ze, \dots, z^{k-1}e$ are S -independent and we take $M_0 := \bigoplus_{i=0}^{k-1} Sz^i e$.

Denote by $M_{[m,n]} \subset M$ the S -span of the elements $\{z^k e\}_{k=m,\dots,n}$, where m may be $-\infty$ and n may be ∞ (for example $M_0 = M_{[0,k-1]}$). For any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$z^t w = w_0(q^{-t}\sigma)z^t + \cdots + w_k(q^{-t}\sigma)z^{t+k} \in I,$$

which means that $w_0(q^{-t}\sigma)M_{[t,t+k]} \subset M_{[t+1,t+k]}$ and $w_k(q^{-t}\sigma)M_{[t,t+k]} \subset M_{[t,t+k-1]}$. This implies that the S -module M is the sum of submodules $M_{[0,\infty]}$ and $M_{[-\infty,k-1]}$ which have filtrations

$$(7.4) \quad M_0 = M_{[0,k-1]} \subset M_{[0,k]} \subset M_{[0,k+1]} \subset \cdots,$$

$$(7.5) \quad M_0 = M_{[0,k-1]} \subset M_{[-1,k-1]} \subset M_{[-2,k-1]} \subset \cdots,$$

where all subquotients are finite dimensional and the subquotient $M_{[0,n]}/M_{[0,n-1]}$ (resp. $M_{[-m-1,k-1]}/M_{[-m,k-1]}$) is annihilated by the polynomial $w_k(q^{k-n}\sigma)$ (resp. by the polynomial $w_0(q^{m+1}\sigma)$). Therefore any point $\lambda \in \text{Spec } S = \mathbb{C}^*$ is contained in the support of only finitely many subquotients of the two filtrations. It follows that $(M/M_0)_\lambda$ is finite dimensional for each $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and the set of λ 's for which $(M/M_0)_\lambda \neq 0$ is contained in the Γ -orbits of the roots of $w_0(\sigma)$ and $w_k(\sigma)$. \square

Remark 7.4. *We believe that the conclusion of Proposition 7.3 holds for any choice of a free S -submodule $M_0 \subset M$ of maximal rank.*

7.2. The S -rank of a tensor product. We do not know how to compute the S -rank of a tensor product $M \otimes N$ in general. However there is the following fact.

Proposition 7.5. *Let $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ and assume that $\text{rk}_S M = 0$, i.e. $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$. Then*

$$\text{rk}_S(N \otimes M) = \text{rk}_S(N) \cdot \text{rk}_A(M).$$

Proof. By Corollary 6.2, $M = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$ for a finite dimensional S -module V . (In particular $\text{rk}_A(M) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} V$.) Then

$$N \otimes_A M = N \otimes_A A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V = N \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V,$$

i.e. the S -module $N \otimes_A M$ is the tensor product of the S -modules N and V with the σ -action

$$\sigma(n \otimes v) = \sigma(n) \otimes \sigma(v).$$

Let $N_0 \subset N$ be a free S -submodule as in Proposition 7.3, so that N/N_0 is a direct sum of finite dimensional S -modules. Hence $(N/N_0) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$ is also a direct sum of finite dimensional S -modules and therefore $\text{rk}_S N = \text{rk}_S N_0$ and $\text{rk}_S(N \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V) = \text{rk}_S(N_0 \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V)$. So we may and will assume that $N = S$.

Notice that the S -module V has a filtration with 1-dimensional subquotients. Now it suffices to notice that for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^*$ there is an isomorphism of S -modules

$$\phi : S \rightarrow S \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} (S/(\sigma - \alpha)), \quad \phi(1) = 1 \otimes \bar{1}.$$

\square

7.3. The category \mathcal{M}_{tf} is not preserved by the duality.

Example 7.6. *Consider $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$ such that $M = Ae_1 \oplus Ae_2 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$ where $\sigma(e_1) = ze_1$ and $\sigma(e_2) = e_1 + e_2$. Then we have the exact sequence in \mathcal{M}*

$$(7.6) \quad 0 \rightarrow Ae_1 \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/Ae_1 \rightarrow 0,$$

where $Ae_1 \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ and $M/Ae_1 \simeq \mathcal{O} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$. Applying the duality functor to the sequence (7.6) we find that $\mathcal{O}^\vee \simeq \mathcal{O}$ (which is in \mathcal{M}_{tor}) is a submodule of M^\vee .

Notice however that the module M in the above example does not belong to $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$.

8. DUALITY PRESERVES THE S -RANK AND THE CATEGORY $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$

In this section we prove the following two theorems.

Theorem 8.1. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$. We have the equality $\text{rk}_S M = \text{rk}_S M^\vee$.*

Theorem 8.2. *The category $\mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ is preserved by the duality.*

The following key proposition is the main step in the proof of both theorems. Recall the anti-automorphism $\epsilon : A_q \rightarrow A_q$ (Section 2.1).

Proposition 8.3. *Let $t \geq 0$ and let $M = A_q/A_q \cdot p(z, \sigma)$, where $p(z, \sigma)$ is a σ -good polynomial*

$$p(z, \sigma) = p_0(z) + p_1(z)\sigma + \cdots + p_{t-1}(z)\sigma^{t-1} + \sigma^t$$

($p_0(z) \in A_q$ is a unit). Put

$$(8.1) \quad r(z, \sigma) := {}^\epsilon p(z, \sigma) \cdot p_0(z)^{-1}$$

(so that $r(z, \sigma)$ is also a good polynomial). Then there exists an isomorphism of A_q -modules $A_q/A_q \cdot r(z, \sigma) \simeq M^\vee$.

Remark 8.4. *Since $p_0(z) \in A_q$ is a unit, we also have an isomorphism of modules*

$$A_q/A_q \cdot {}^\epsilon p(z, \sigma) \simeq M^\vee.$$

However in the proof of Proposition 8.3 it is more convenient to work with the polynomial $r(z, \sigma)$.

Proof. Let $e \in M$ be the image of $1 \in A_q$. Then the elements

$$e, \sigma e, \dots, \sigma^{t-1} e$$

form an A -basis of M .

Recall that we have the canonical perfect pairing

$$\langle -, - \rangle : M^\vee \otimes_A M \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$$

which is also a morphism of A_q -modules (Section 4). For $m \in M$ and $m^\vee \in M^\vee$ we have $\langle \sigma m^\vee, \sigma m \rangle = \sigma \langle m^\vee, m \rangle$, which implies that

$$(8.2) \quad \langle \sigma^{-k} m^\vee, m \rangle = \sigma^{-k} \langle m^\vee, \sigma^k m \rangle.$$

Let $f \in M^\vee$ be an element such that

$$(8.3) \quad \langle f, e \rangle = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \langle f, \sigma^k e \rangle = 0, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, t-1.$$

This defines a morphism of A_q -modules $\phi : A_q \rightarrow M^\vee$ where $\phi(1) = f$. We claim that ϕ is surjective and the kernel of ϕ is the left ideal $A_q \cdot r(z, \sigma)$.

Since $\left(\sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i} \sigma^{t-i}\right)e = 0$, for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have

$$(8.4) \quad 0 = \langle f, \sigma^{s-t} \left(\sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i} \sigma^{t-i} \right) e \rangle = \sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i}^{\sigma^{s-t}} \langle f, \sigma^{s-i} e \rangle.$$

Let $X_{t,s}$ denote the set of ordered tuples of integers in $[1, t]$ whose coordinates sum to s (which is the empty set if $s < 0$ and the one element set consisting of the empty tuple if $s = 0$). For $x = (x_1, \dots, x_k) \in X_{t,s}$, let

$$\Pi_x := (-1)^k \prod_{j=1}^k p_{t-x_j}^{\sigma^{x_1+\dots+x_j}}.$$

We claim that for $s > 0$, we have

$$(8.5) \quad \sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i}^{\sigma^s} \sum_{x \in X_{t,s-i}} \Pi_x = 0.$$

To see this, we express $X_{t,s}$ as the disjoint union over $1 \leq i \leq t$ of tuples (x_1, \dots, x_k) with $x_k = i$. Since

$$\Pi_{(x_1, \dots, x_k)} = -p_{t-x_k}^{\sigma^{x_1+\dots+x_{k-1}+x_k}} \Pi_{(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})},$$

we have

$$\sum_{x \in X_{t,s}} \Pi_x = \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}) \in X_{t,s-i}} -p_{t-i}^{\sigma^s} \Pi_{(x_1, \dots, x_{k-1})},$$

which implies the claim.

Likewise, for $s > 0$, we have

$$(8.6) \quad \sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i}^{\sigma^i} \sum_{x \in X_{t,s-i}} \Pi_x^{\sigma^i} = 0.$$

Indeed, expressing $X_{t,s}$ as the disjoint union over $1 \leq i \leq t$ of tuples (x_1, \dots, x_k) with $x_1 = i$, since

$$\Pi_{(x_1, \dots, x_k)} = -p_{t-x_1}^{\sigma^{x_1}} \Pi_{(x_2, \dots, x_k)}^{\sigma^{x_1}},$$

we have

$$\sum_{x \in X_{t,s}} \Pi_x = \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{(x_2, \dots, x_k) \in X_{t,s-i}} -p_{t-i}^{\sigma^i} \Pi_{(x_2, \dots, x_k)}^{\sigma^i},$$

which implies (8.6).

For $s \geq t$,

$$(8.7) \quad \langle f, \sigma^s e \rangle = -p_0 \sum_{x \in X_{t,s-t}} \Pi_x.$$

For $s = t$, this is immediate from (8.4) and the definition of f . For $s > t$, it follows by induction from (8.4) and (8.5).

Claim. For $s > t$, we have

$$\left\langle \left(\sum_{i=0}^t \sigma^{-i}(p_{t-i}/p_0) \right) f, \sigma^s e \right\rangle = 0.$$

Proof. By (8.6),

$$\sum_{j=0}^t p_{t-j}^{\sigma^j} \sum_{x \in X_{t,s-j}} \Pi_x^{\sigma^j} = 0,$$

and applying σ^{-t} to both sides, we obtain

$$\sum_{j=0}^t p_{t-j}^{\sigma^{j-t}} \sum_{x \in X_{t,s-j}} \Pi_x^{\sigma^{j-t}} = 0,$$

Substituting $j = t - i$, this implies

$$\sum_{i=0}^t p_{t-i}^{\sigma^{-i}} \left(\sum_{x \in X_{t,s+i-t}} \Pi_x^{\sigma^{-i}} \right) = 0.$$

By (8.7), this implies

$$\sum_{i=0}^t (p_{t-i}/p_0)^{\sigma^{-i}} \sigma^{-i}(\langle f, \sigma^{s+i} e \rangle) = 0,$$

which means

$$\left\langle \left(\sum_{i=0}^t (p_{t-i}/p_0)^{\sigma^{-i}} \sigma^{-i} \right) f, \sigma^s e \right\rangle = 0.$$

□

Since

$$(p_{t-i}/p_0)^{\sigma^{-i}} \sigma^{-i} = \sigma^{-i} p_{t-i} p_0^{-1} = {}^\epsilon(p_{t-i} \sigma^i) p_0^{-1},$$

we have for any $s > t$

$$(8.8) \quad \langle ({}^\epsilon p) p_0^{-1} f, \sigma^s e \rangle = 0.$$

As any t consecutive terms of $\sigma^i e$ span M , the proposition implies that left multiplication by $r = {}^\epsilon p \cdot p_0^{-1}$ annihilates f . Thus, there is a map of left A_q -modules $A_q/rA_q \rightarrow M^\vee$ sending the residue class of 1 to f . This map is surjective since the matrix

$$\langle \sigma^{i-1} f, \sigma^{j-1} e \rangle_{1 \leq i, j \leq t}$$

is unitriangular. As A_q/rA_q has A -rank n , it is isomorphic to M^\vee .

□

8.0.1. *Proof of Theorem 8.1.* Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$ be a nonzero object, $M \simeq A_q/I$ for a left ideal $I \subset A_q$. We show that $\text{rk}_S M^\vee \leq \text{rk}_S M$.

Let $p \in I$ be a σ -good element such that $\text{rk}_S M = \deg_z p$ (Lemma 3.7 and Lemma 3.13). Put $N := A_q/A_q \cdot p \in \mathcal{M}$ with the canonical surjection $N \twoheadrightarrow M$. We have

$$(8.9) \quad \text{rk}_S M = \deg_z p = \text{rk}_S N.$$

Consider the dual inclusion $M^\vee \hookrightarrow N^\vee$. By Proposition 8.3 $N^\vee \simeq A_q/A_q \cdot r$ where

$$r(z, \sigma) = p_0(q^{-t}z) \cdot \epsilon_p \cdot p_0(z)^{-1}.$$

Then

$$\text{rk}_S N^\vee = \deg_z r = \deg_z p = \text{rk}_S N.$$

Hence

$$\text{rk}_S M^\vee \leq \text{rk}_S N^\vee = \text{rk}_S N = \text{rk}_S M.$$

Applying the same argument to M^\vee instead of M we find that $\text{rk}_S M = \text{rk}_S M^\vee$, which proves Theorem 8.1.

8.0.2. *Proof of Theorem 8.2.* Let M be a good module as in Proposition 8.3. In the notation of that proposition $M = A_q/A_q \cdot p$ and $M^\vee = A_q/A_q \cdot r$. Then

$$M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}} \Leftrightarrow p \text{ is } z\text{-good} \Leftrightarrow r \text{ is } z\text{-good} \Leftrightarrow M^\vee \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}.$$

This proves Theorem 8.2 for good modules.

Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ be any module. By Lemma 3.8 the ideal I contains elements x and y which are σ -good and z -good respectively. For $n > 0$ put

$$p := (\sigma^n + \sigma^{-n})x + (z^n + z^{-n})y.$$

For $n \gg 0$ the polynomial $p \in I$ is both σ -good and z -good.

Let $N := A_q/A_q \cdot p$. Then $N \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ and M is a quotient of N , so $M^\vee \subset N^\vee$. Since N is good, by the above argument we have $N^\vee \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$. Hence also $M^\vee \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 8.2.

9. THE PICARD GROUP OF THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}

Line bundles over A_q are by definition objects $L \in \mathcal{M}$ of $\text{rk}_A L = 1$. The collection of isomorphism classes of line bundles is an abelian group $\text{Pic}(\mathcal{M})$ under the tensor product. Let us describe this group.

Let $L \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M})$ and choose an isomorphism of A -modules $\phi : A \xrightarrow{\cong} L$. Then for the \mathbb{C} -linear automorphism $\sigma : L \rightarrow L$ we have

$$(9.1) \quad \sigma(\phi(1)) = cz^m \cdot \phi(1)$$

for some $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. So $L \simeq A_q/A_q \cdot (\sigma - cz^m)$ and $\text{rk}_S L = |m|$ (Lemma 3.7). If we change the isomorphism ϕ , say consider $\psi := dz^i \cdot \phi$, $d \in \mathbb{C}^*$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, then

$$\sigma(\psi(1)) = q^i cz^m \cdot \psi(1).$$

This defines a bijection $\text{Pic}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^*/q^{\mathbb{Z}}) \times \mathbb{Z}$, which is clearly an isomorphism of groups. We call the integer m in (9.1) the **degree** of L and denote it $\deg(L)$. For $L \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M})$ the dual module L^\vee is the inverse line bundle $L^{-1} \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M})$; in particular, $\deg(L^{-1}) = -\deg(L)$.

10. COHOMOLOGY OF OBJECTS IN \mathcal{M}

Given objects $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ we denote by $\text{Ext}^i(M, N)$ the group computed in the ambient category $A_q\text{-Mod}$. Then by Lemma 2.1, $\text{Ext}^i(M, N) = 0$ if $i \neq 0, 1$. We do not know if these groups coincide with the ones computed in the category \mathcal{M} .

Definition 10.1. For $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we define its cohomology groups $H^i(M)$ as $\text{Ext}^i(\mathcal{O}, M)$.

Lemma 10.2. Given $M \in \mathcal{M}$ consider the complex (of \mathbb{C} -vector spaces)

$$K(M) : 0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{(\sigma-1)} M \rightarrow 0.$$

Then $H^\bullet(K(M)) = H^\bullet(M)$, i.e.

$$H^0(M) = \ker(\sigma - 1), \quad H^1(M) = \text{coker}(\sigma - 1).$$

Proof. We have the projective resolution

$$(10.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow A_q \xrightarrow{\cdot(\sigma-1)} A_q \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then for any M , the cohomology $H^i(M)$ is the cohomology of the complex

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A_q, M) \xrightarrow{(\sigma-1)^*} \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A_q, M) \rightarrow 0,$$

which is exactly the complex $K(M)$. □

Remark 10.3. Lemma 10.2 shows the cohomology $H^\bullet(M)$ for $M \in \mathcal{M}$ depends only on the S -module structure of M .

10.1. The Riemann-Roch and Serre duality theorem for line bundles in \mathcal{M} .

Theorem 10.4. (1) $H^0(\mathcal{O}) \simeq H^1(\mathcal{O}) \simeq \mathbb{C}$. (So the genus of the quantum elliptic curve is indeed 1).

(2) Let $L \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M})$, $\deg(L) = 0$, $L \not\simeq \mathcal{O}$. Then $H^0(L) = H^1(L) = 0$.

(3) (Riemann-Roch) Let $L \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M})$, $\deg(L) \neq 0$. Then $H^0(L) = 0$ and $h^1(L) = |\deg(L)|$.

In particular, for any L we have $h^0(L) \neq 0$ if and only if $L \simeq \mathcal{O}$ and

$$\chi(L) = h^0(L) - h^1(L) = -|\deg(L)| \leq 0$$

(4) (Serre duality) For any $L \in \text{Pic}(\mathcal{M})$ we have $h^i(L) = h^i(L^{-1})$, $i = 0, 1$.

Proof. (1) This is obvious from the complex $K(\mathcal{O})$.

(2) If $H^0(L) \neq 0$, then there exists a nonzero morphism $\mathcal{O} \rightarrow L$, which is necessarily an isomorphism. If $\deg(L) = 0$, $L \not\simeq \mathcal{O}$, then one sees immediately from the complex $K(L)$, that the map $\sigma - 1 : L \rightarrow L$ is surjective, i.e. $H^1(L) = 0$.

(3) Suppose $\deg(L) = d \neq 0$, (say $d > 0$) and choose an isomorphism of A -modules $L \simeq A$. Under this isomorphism $\sigma(1) = cz^d$, $c \in \mathbb{C}^*$. Then the images of $1, z, \dots, z^{d-1} \in L$ in $H^1(L)$ form a \mathbb{C} -basis.

(4) This follows from (1), (2), and (3). \square

10.2. Cohomology of a general object in \mathcal{M} .

Lemma 10.5. *For any $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have $h^0(M) \leq \text{rk}_A(M)$.*

Proof. We claim the natural map of A_q -modules

$$\mathcal{O} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} H^0(M) \rightarrow M$$

is injective. Indeed, if $m_j \in H^0(M) \subset M$ are linearly independent over \mathbb{C} and $\sum c_{i,j} z^i m_j$ is zero, then left-multiplying by σ^k , we obtain $\sum c_{i,j} q^{ik} z^i m_j = 0$ for all k . As q is not a root of unity, this implies all $c_{i,j}$ are 0. \square

Proposition 10.6. *Let $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$. Then $h^0(M) = 0$ and $h^1(M) = \text{rk}_S M$.*

Proof. The first assertion is immediate from Lemma 10.2. Let us prove the second one. By Lemma 3.7 we know that $d := \text{rk}_S M < \infty$.

First assume that $S^d \simeq_S M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$. Consider the map $M \xrightarrow{\sigma-1} M$. Then $H^1(M) = \text{coker}(\sigma - 1) \simeq \mathbb{C}^d$.

For a general $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$ we can find a free S -submodule $N \subset M$ of rank d such that the S -module M/N is torsion. (Note that N and M/N may not be A_q -modules.) Assume that we chose N as in Proposition 7.3, so that the torsion S -module M/N has the form

$$M/N = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} (M/N)_{\lambda},$$

where $\sigma - \lambda$ acts nilpotently on $(M/N)_{\lambda}$ and each $(M/N)_{\lambda}$ is finite dimensional.

This gives the short exact sequence of S -modules

$$(10.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow M/N \rightarrow 0.$$

The cohomology $H^\bullet(M)$ depends only on the S -module structure of M (Remark 10.3). In fact, this cohomology in the category of S -modules coincides with the functor $\text{Ext}_S^\bullet(\mathbb{C}, M)$, where $\mathbb{C} = S/(\sigma - 1)$. Therefore the sequence (10.2) gives rise to the long exact sequence of cohomology

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, N) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, M/N) \\ \rightarrow \text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, N) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, M/N) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly $\text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, N) = \text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, M) = 0$, and we have the exact sequence

$$(10.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, M/N) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, N) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, M) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, M/N) \rightarrow 0$$

As we showed above the space $\text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, N)$ has dimension d . Hence the space $\text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, M/N)$ is also finite dimensional. The proposition now follows from the equality

$$\dim \text{Hom}_S(\mathbb{C}, M/N) = \dim \text{Ext}_S^1(\mathbb{C}, M/N),$$

which is an immediate consequence of part (3) of Corollary 6.2. □

10.3. Riemann-Roch theorem for general objects in \mathcal{M} . We summarize the results on cohomology of objects in \mathcal{M} in the following theorem.

Theorem 10.7. *Fix $0 \neq M \in \mathcal{M}$. Then*

- (1) $h^0(M), h^1(M) < \infty$, and $h^0(M) \leq \text{rk}_A M$.
- (2) If $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$, then $h^0(M) = 0$ and $h^1(M) = \text{rk}_S M > 0$.
- (3) $\chi(M) := h^0(M) - h^1(M) = -\text{rk}_S M$. In particular, $\chi(M) = 0$ if and only if $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$.

Proof. (1) and (2) follow from Lemma 10.5 and Proposition 10.6.

(3) Consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow M_{\text{tor}} \rightarrow M \rightarrow M_{\text{tf}} \rightarrow 0,$$

where $M_{\text{tor}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$ and $M_{\text{tf}} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tf}}$. Then $\chi(M) = \chi(M_{\text{tor}}) + \chi(M_{\text{tf}})$. We have $\chi(M_{\text{tor}}) = 0$ by part (3) of Corollary 6.2. Also $\chi(M_{\text{tf}}) = -\text{rk}_S M_{\text{tf}} \leq 0$ by part (2) above. It remains to notice that $\text{rk}_S M = \text{rk}_S M_{\text{tf}}$. □

10.4. Serre duality for general objects in \mathcal{M} .

Theorem 10.8. (1) *For any $M \in \mathcal{M}$ we have $\chi(M) = \chi(M^\vee)$.*

(2) *If $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$ or $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ then $h^i(M) = h^i(M^\vee)$ for $i = 0, 1$*

Proof. (1) This follows from Theorem 8.1 and part (3) of Theorem 10.7.

(2) If $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$, then $M = A \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} V$ for a finite dimensional S -module V (Corollary 6.2). Let $V = \oplus_{\lambda} V_{\lambda}$, where V_{λ} is the generalized λ -eigenspace for σ . Then both $h^0(M)$ and $h^1(M)$ are equal to the number of Jordan blocks in V_1 . By Lemma 6.3 we have $M^{\vee} = A \otimes V^*$ and $(V^*)_{\lambda} = (V_{\lambda^{-1}})^*$. It follows that $h^i(M) = h^i(M^{\vee})$ for $i = 0, 1$.

Now let $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$. Then $M^{\vee} \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{free}}$ by Theorem 8.2. By Proposition 10.6 we have $h^0(M) = 0 = h^0(M^{\vee})$ and $h^1(M) = \text{rk}_S M$, $h^1(M) = \text{rk}_S M^{\vee}$. It remains to apply Theorem 8.1. \square

11. THE EULER FORM OF THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}

Consider the Euler form on the category \mathcal{M} :

$$(11.1) \quad \chi(M, N) := \dim \text{Hom}(M, N) - \dim \text{Ext}^1(M, N)$$

(where $\text{Ext}^1(-, -)$ is computed in the abelian category $A_q\text{-Mod}$). Theorem 10.8 implies that the Euler form is symmetric.

Corollary 11.1. *The Euler form (11.1) is symmetric, i.e. for any $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ we have*

$$\chi(M, N) = \chi(N, M).$$

We need a lemma.

Lemma 11.2. *For $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ we have an isomorphism*

$$H^{\bullet}(\text{Hom}(M, N)) = \text{Ext}^{\bullet}(M, N).$$

Assume the lemma for now. We know that $\text{Hom}(M, N) = M^{\vee} \otimes N$ and $(M^{\vee} \otimes N)^{\vee} = N^{\vee} \otimes M$ (Lemma 4.1). So Theorem 10.8 and Lemma 11.2 imply that

$$\chi(M, N) = \chi(M^{\vee} \otimes N) = \chi(N^{\vee} \otimes M) = \chi(N, M),$$

which proves the corollary. So it remains to prove the lemma.

Proof. Recall the standard projective resolution of the A_q -module $\mathcal{O} = A$

$$(11.2) \quad 0 \rightarrow A_q \xrightarrow{\cdot(\sigma-1)} A_q \rightarrow \mathcal{O} \rightarrow 0.$$

We apply the exact functor $(-) \otimes_A M$ to the sequence (11.2) to get a resolution of M

$$(11.3) \quad 0 \rightarrow A_q \otimes M \xrightarrow{\cdot((\sigma-1) \otimes \text{id})} A_q \otimes M \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0.$$

It follows from part (4) of Lemma 4.1 that the object $A_q \otimes M \in A_q\text{-Mod}$ is projective, so the complex

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A_q \otimes M, N) \xrightarrow{((\sigma-1) \otimes \text{id})^*} \text{Hom}_{A_q}(A_q \otimes M, N) \rightarrow 0$$

computes $\text{Ext}^\bullet(M, N)$. It also follows from part (4) of Lemma 4.1 (and its proof) that it is isomorphic to the complex

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(M, N) \xrightarrow{(\sigma-1)\cdot} \mathcal{H}om(M, N) \rightarrow 0$$

which computes $H^\bullet(\mathcal{H}om(M, N))$ by Lemma 10.2. This proves the lemma. \square

12. SOME ADDITIONAL RESULTS ABOUT THE CATEGORY \mathcal{M}

The results of this section were suggested to us by Alexey Elagin.

12.1. The derived category $D^b(\mathcal{M})$. For $M, N \in \mathcal{M}$ we defined the groups $\text{Ext}^i(M, N)$ as the corresponding Ext-groups in the category $A_q\text{-Mod}$. However, these groups coincide with the ones computed in the category \mathcal{M} .

Proposition 12.1. (i) *The abelian category \mathcal{M} is hereditary.*

(ii) *The natural functor $D^b(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow D^b_{\mathcal{M}}(A_q\text{-Mod})$ is an equivalence of categories.*

Proof. (i) The category $A_q\text{-Mod}$ is hereditary and \mathcal{M} is its thick abelian subcategory. Hence \mathcal{M} is also hereditary by [RVdB], (Lemma A.1, Prop. A.2).

(ii) This is [Br] (Th. 5.1) or [Kr] (Prop. 4.4.17). \square

12.2. The quiver description of the category \mathcal{M} . Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{M}$ be the collection of all simple objects in \mathcal{M} . Consider the following quiver Q : the set of vertices is the set \mathcal{S} . For $M, N \in \mathcal{S}$ the number of arrows from M to N is the dimension of the space $\text{Ext}^1(N, M)$.

Remark 12.2. *The quiver Q is symmetric, i.e. the number of arrows from M to N is the same as the number of arrows from N to M . Indeed, if $M, N \in \mathcal{S}$ are non-isomorphic, then $\text{Hom}(M, N) = \text{Hom}(N, M) = 0$, hence $\text{Ext}^1(M, N) = \text{Ext}^1(N, M)$ by Corollary 11.1.*

Let $\text{Mod-}\mathbb{C}Q$ be the category of all right modules over the path algebra of the quiver $\mathbb{C}Q$. Let $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q \subset \text{Mod-}\mathbb{C}Q$ be the full abelian subcategory of finite dimensional nilpotent representations. This is the thick abelian subcategory generated by 1-dimensional (right) representations of $\mathbb{C}Q$.

Proposition 12.3. *There is a natural equivalence of abelian categories*

$$\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q$$

which takes a simple object $M \in \mathcal{M}$ to the 1-dimensional module supported at the corresponding vertex of Q .

Proof. This is Theorem 4.12 and Corollary 4.14 in [El]. \square

Proposition 12.3 has several applications.

12.2.1. *The group of auto-equivalences* $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{M})$. Recall that a right $\mathbb{C}Q$ -module P consists of the following data: to each vertex v one assigns a vector space P_v and for any two vertices v, w one specifies a linear map $P_{vw} : \mathbb{C}^{d_{vw}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathbb{C}}(P_w, P_v)$, where d_{vw} is the number of arrows from v to w .

Let $\text{Auteq}(\text{Mod-}\mathbb{C}Q)$ be the group of auto-equivalences of the abelian category $\text{Mod-}\mathbb{C}Q$ (up to an isomorphism of functors).

Fix vertices v, w . Then there is a homomorphism

$$\alpha_{vw} : \text{GL}_{d_{vw}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Auteq}(\text{Mod-}\mathbb{C}Q)$$

defined as follows: for a right $\mathbb{C}Q$ -module P the homomorphism P_{vw} as above is replaced by the composition $P_{vw} \cdot g^{-1}$, for each $g \in \text{GL}_{d_{vw}}$. And for right $\mathbb{C}Q$ -modules P, P' the map

$$\alpha_{vw}(g) : \text{Hom}(P, P') \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\alpha_{vw}(g)(P), \alpha_{vw}(g)(P'))$$

is the identity.

Clearly the auto-equivalences $\alpha_{vw}(g)$ preserve the subcategory $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q$.

The next proposition shows that the group of auto-equivalences of the abelian category $\mathcal{M} \simeq \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q$ is huge. This is in the contrast with the classical case: for an elliptic curve E the group of auto-equivalences of the abelian category Coh_E is generated by the automorphisms of the variety E and by taking the tensor product with a line bundle.

Proposition 12.4. *For any vertices $v \neq w$ of Q the kernel of the group homomorphism $\alpha_{vw} : \text{GL}_{d_{vw}}(\mathbb{C}) \rightarrow \text{Auteq}(\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q)$ is contained in the center of $\text{GL}_{d_{vw}}(\mathbb{C})$.*

Proof. We may assume that $d_{vw} \neq 0$. Consider the collection \mathcal{P} of objects in $\text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q$ consisting of modules P such that $P_w = \mathbb{C} = P_v$ and $P_z = 0$ for any vertex $z \neq v, w$. We require the morphism

$$P_{vw} : \mathbb{C}^{d_{vw}} \rightarrow \text{Hom}(P_w, P_v) = \mathbb{C}$$

to be nonzero and $P_{wv} = 0$.

Thus to define an object in \mathcal{P} is the same as to give a nonzero vector in the dual vector space $(\mathbb{C}^{d_{vw}})^*$. Two such modules are isomorphic if and only if the corresponding vectors are proportional. Let $g \in \text{GL}_{d_{vw}}(\mathbb{C})$ be such that the functor $\alpha_{vw}(g) : \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q \rightarrow \text{mod}_0\text{-}\mathbb{C}Q$ is isomorphic to the identity. Then $\alpha_{vw}(g)$ acts trivially on the set of isomorphism classes of objects in \mathcal{P} , i.e. g lies in the center of $\text{GL}_{d_{vw}}(\mathbb{C})$. \square

Remark 12.5. *The previous proposition applies to any quiver.*

Proposition 12.6. *The graph Q is connected.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 10.4 that the subgraph of Q supported on the line bundles in \mathcal{M} is connected. Let $M \in \mathcal{M}$ be a simple object, i.e. M is a vertex in Q . If $M \notin \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$, then $\text{Ext}^1(\mathcal{O}, M) \neq 0$ by part (3) of Theorem 10.7. Suppose that $M \in \mathcal{M}_{\text{tor}}$. Choose a line bundle L of nonzero degree. Then $\text{rk}_S L \otimes M \neq 0$ (Proposition 7.5). Hence

$$0 \neq h^1(L \otimes M) = \text{Ext}^1(L^{-1}, M)$$

by part (3) of Theorem 10.7, part (2) of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 11.2. \square

REFERENCES

- [Bj] J.-E. Bjork, *Rings of Differential Operators*, North Holland, 1979.
- [Br] K. Bruning, *Thick subcategories of the derived category of a hereditary algebra*, Homology, Homotopy and Applications, 9:165-176, 2007.
- [El] A. Elagin, *Thick subcategories on weighted projective curves and nilpotent representations of quivers*, arxiv:2407.01207.
- [ELLu] A. Elagin, V. A. Lunts, *Thick subcategories on curves*, *Adv. Math.* **378** (2021), Paper No. 107525, 19 pp.
- [EGNO] P. Etingof, S. Gelaki, D. Nikshych, V. Ostrik, *Tensor Categories*, AMS Surveys and Monographs, Vol. 205.
- [GW] K. R. Goodearl, R. B. Warfield Jr., *Introduction to Noncommutative Noetherian Rings*, 2nd edition, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [Kr] H. Krause, *Homological Theory of Representations*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, 2021.
- [LaLu] M. J. Larsen, V. A. Lunts, *Quantum elliptic curve II: Analytic case*, (in preparation).
- [MR] J. C. McConnell, J. C. Robson, *Noncommutative Noetherian Rings*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 30.
- [RVdB] I. Reiten, M. Van den Bergh, *Noetherian hereditary abelian categories satisfying Serre duality*, *Journal of AMS*, 15:295-366, 2002.
- [Sa] C. Sabbah, A letter to M. Kontsevich (2015).
- [SV] Y. Soibelman, V. Vologodsky, *Noncommutative compactifications and elliptic curves*, *Int. Math. Res. Not.* **2003**, no. 28, 1549–1569.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405, USA

Email address: `mjlarsen@iu.edu`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, INDIANA UNIVERSITY, BLOOMINGTON, IN 47405, USA, NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS, MOSCOW, RUSSIA

Email address: `vlunts@iu.edu`