

Skein relations on punctured surfaces

Michael Tsironis

December 2025

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Preliminaries	7
2.1	Cluster Algebras	7
2.2	Punctured surfaces	9
2.3	Loop graphs	13
2.4	Expansion formula of tagged arcs	18
2.5	Quivers associated to loop graphs	20
2.6	Abstract strings and loopstrings	22
2.7	Construction of the loop graph of an abstract loopstring	24
2.8	Construction of the loopstring of a loop graph	25
2.9	Quiver representations and loop modules	28
2.9.1	String modules	31
2.9.2	Loop modules	33
3	Bijection of loop graphs and loopstrings	37
3.1	Minimal and maximal perfect matchings	37
3.2	Perfect matching lattices and submodule lattices	38
3.3	Bijection between perfect matching lattices and canonical submodule lattices	44
4	Skein relations	45
4.1	Skein relations for crossing arcs	45
4.1.1	Resolution of crossing between two arcs, with non empty overlap	45
4.1.2	Resolution of grafting	52
4.1.3	Monomials associated to loopstrings	56
4.2	Skein relations for crossing arcs and loops	60
4.2.1	Resolution of crossing between an arc and a loop, with non empty overlap	61
4.2.2	Monomials associated to loops	65
4.3	Skein relations for single incompatibility in a puncture	66
4.3.1	Resolution of single incompatibility of two arc at a puncture	67
4.3.2	Resolution of grafting incompatibility of two arcs at a puncture	71

4.3.3	Skein relation for arcs with a single incompatibility at a puncture	75
4.4	Skein relations for double incompatibilities in two punctures	76
4.4.1	Resolution of double incompatibility of two arcs at a puncture	79
4.4.2	Skein relation for arcs with two incompatibilities at two puncture	85
4.5	Skein relations for self crossing tagged arcs	87
4.5.1	Resolution of regular self incompatibility of a doubly notched arc	88
4.5.2	Resolution of grafting self incompatibility of a doubly notched arc	92

Chapter 1

Introduction

The largest part of this thesis concerns introducing *skein relations* for cluster algebras from punctured surfaces. These are identities in terms of cluster variables in a cluster algebra which showcase how certain variables can be expressed in terms of variables which contain some nice properties. Namely, cluster variables corresponding to arcs, which are considered to be *incompatible*, on a surface, can be written as cluster variables corresponding to compatible arcs. Examples of incompatible arcs include intersecting arcs, self-intersecting arcs and closed curves, as well as arcs with opposite tagging at a puncture. In order to prove these important identities, we first construct a bridge between some combinatorial objects (graphs) and some algebraic representations. Our final aim of this thesis, in which skein relations play a crucial role, is to prove the existence of some bases on *surface cluster algebras* that satisfy some nice properties. This expands on the existing bibliography by dealing with a larger collection of surface cluster algebras, by adding punctures (marked points) to the interior of the surface.

Cluster algebras were introduced by Fomin and Zelevinsky [FZ01] [FZ03] [BFZ05] in 2001 with the initial aim of developing a combinatorial framework for the understanding of the Lusztig's dual canonical bases [Lus90] and total positivity in algebraic groups. However, it gained a lot of interest on its own immediately after [CCS06][BMRRT06][BZ11], as well as attention from various other fields such as Teichmüller theory and higher rank geometry [FG06], algebraic geometry, mirror symmetry [GHKK17], mathematical physics, as it can be seen through their appearance in the Kontsevich-Soibelman *wall crossing formula* for Donaldson-Thomas invariants [KS09] and many more [TY14],[Dav18]).

Cluster algebras are commutative rings which are generated through a distinct set of generators called *cluster variables*, which are grouped into a set called *clusters*. Relating back to the original motivation, explicitly stating the elements of these dual canonical bases is a very hard problem, but their initial conjecture was that all the monomials appearing in these cluster variables, belong to the dual canonical basis. This fundamental connection of cluster algebras and dual canoni-

cal bases, poses the natural question of finding and constructing bases which have some desired properties. One of these properties would be to require the basis to have some positivity properties, which is closely related to the initial *Positivity Conjecture* of Fomin and Zelevinsky, which states that every cluster variable can be expressed as a Laurent polynomial in the initial variables with positive coefficients. This conjecture has been proven for specific cases by several authors ([FZ03],[CK08], [Nak09]), while in Lee and Schiffler [LS15] gave a purely combinatorial proof for all skew-symmetrizable cluster algebras. Moreover later Gross, Hacking, Keel and Kontsevich [GHKK17] established positivity, and much more, for cluster algebras of *geometric type* via the construction of *canonical theta basis construction*. This was a very deep result, since they constructed the theta basis for certain cluster varieties using scattering diagrams and the positivity was a simple corollary of their work, which is a prime example of the hidden role that cluster algebras play in various settings.

An important class of *surface cluster algebras* was introduced by Fomin, Shapiro and Thurston ([FST06], [FT12]), where they gave a geometric construction associating a cluster algebra to a marked surface. These algebras are very interesting for a variant of reasons. First of all they have a topological interpretation as they provide coordinate charts for decorated Teichmüller spaces, giving a combinatorial atlas of the moduli space [Pen87]. Additionally, they are closely connected to representation theory and categories, since they represent combinatorially abstract notions.

One of these first connections is by Buan, Marsh, Reineke, Reiten and Todorov from [BMRRT06] where they introduced the notion of the *cluster category*, which served as a nice model for the combinatorics of a class of cluster algebras. However it was Amiot [Ami09] in her fundamental work who contributed vastly in the categorification of cluster algebras by constructing *generalized cluster categories*, extending the original cluster categories to a much broader setting. Relevant to this thesis, Brüstle and Zhang [BZ11] and Labardini-Fragoso [Lab09b],[Lab09a], finalized the formalization of the representation-theoretic model for surface cluster algebras. To give some more details regarding this connection, certain objects called *cluster tilted objects* of a cluster category correspond to *tagged triangulations* of the surface [BZ11],[Sch08]. This result provides another bridge between surface cluster algebras and representation theory, providing tools for structural results in both direction. This in turn, influenced a lot of work in representation theory such as [ABCP10],[AIR14],[QS21].

The initial inspiration of this thesis stems from the work of Musiker, Schiffler and Williams [MSW13], where they constructed two bases for cluster algebras coming from a triangulated surface without *punctures*. This result relied heavily on one of their previous papers [MSW11], in which they gave combinatorial formulas for the cluster variables in the cluster algebra, using the so-called *snake graphs*. To each *arc* (simple curve) on the surface, they associated a planar snake graph and subsequently the formula was given as a weighted sum over perfect matchings of the snake graph. Additionally they expanded this result to *band graphs* that

correspond to closed curves on the surface. One of the key points in their proof of the basis result, was the fact that *skein relations* of intersecting curves on this setup had a nice property.

Skein relations are algebraic identities which express how curves can be transformed through local intersections and smoothing operations. In their specific setup, a product of crossing arcs could be expressed in terms of non intersecting arcs and loops which have a unique term on the right hand side of the equation with no coefficient variables. In the same work they also conjectured that a similar result should be true in the case of *punctured surfaces*, i.e. surfaces where marked points in the interior of the surface are also allowed. One should basically prove the equivalent skein relations in this setup. However the existing machinery was not enough to prove such relations at that point.

This brings us to our second major inspiration for this thesis. In the setting of punctured surfaces, plain arcs are not enough in order to capture all the cluster variables of the associated cluster algebra. In order to do so, a second type of arcs must be introduced, the so-called *tagged arcs* [FST06]. These are arcs that are allowed to have a special *tagging* on their endpoints which are adjacent to *punctures* (marked points in the interior). Expansion formulas were already known for such arcs [MSW11], alas larger graphs and a different more complicated version of perfect matching had been considered, making it complicated to study skein relations in this setup. However, Wilson [Wil20] introduced the notion of *loop graphs*; these are simple graphs that can be associated to a tagged arcs. Using these loop graphs, Wilson gave an alternative expansion formula for the tagged arcs.

One can then ask whether these graphs can be used to show skein relations, and a natural approach is to attempt this question combinatorially in the spirit of the work by Çanakçı and Schiffler. In a series of papers ([CS12]), [CS13], [CS14]), they introduced abstract snake graphs, and gave alternative proofs for the skein relations occurring in the setting of surfaces, by constructing bijections between the sets of perfect matchings of the graphs appearing in both sides of the relations. This technique showcases the importance of these combinatorial objects, and hints on how one could work using loop graphs in order to prove skein relations.

In this thesis we initially explore skein relations on punctured surfaces. As stated earlier, in [MSW13] the authors conjectured that one can extend the given bases of unpunctured surfaces, to the punctured setup. They explicitly stated 15 different cases of skein relations that had to be resolved in order for one to tackle the more general problem of bases on general surfaces. In order for us to prove these relations, we use both directly and indirectly the loop graphs introduced by Wilson. Although helpful in some sense, these loop graphs contain too much information, which complicates things when one explicitly tries to prove things using them.

However one of the more understood and easy to work with objects are quiver representations. In the classical setting of snake graphs Çanakçı and Schroll [CS21] introduced abstract string modules and constructed an explicit bijection between

the submodule lattice of an abstract string module and the perfect matching lattice of the corresponding abstract snake graph. This correspondence comprises the last key component of our approach. We thus expand this framework to a connection between loop graphs and what we call loop modules and loop strings. In Remark 7.11 of [Wil20] the author already indicates how one can do this association, however we make this connection explicit. More explicitly, we first make precise the existence of an isomorphism between the perfect matching lattice of a graph \mathcal{G} and the submodule lattice of the associated module $M_{\mathcal{G}}$ as stated in the following Theorem 3.3.1.

Theorem 1.0.1. *Let $A = kQ^{\bowtie}/I$ and $M(w)$ be a loop module over A with associated loop graph \mathcal{G}^{\bowtie} . Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$, which denotes the perfect matching lattice of \mathcal{G} is in bijection with the canonical submodule lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(w))$.*

The above theorem is the first stepping tool. However we additionally introduce the notion of *loopstrings*, which is a generalization of the notion of strings in classical representation theory. The idea is to substitute loop graphs with what we call *loop modules* and then in turn define these modules using word combinatorics, which entail the most important properties of the module.

Çanakçı and Schiffler in [ÇS13] (and the continuation of this paper introduced snake graph calculus in order to give an alternative proof of skein relations for unpunctured surfaces. They proved this by constructing an explicit bijection between the perfect matchings associated to the initial arcs and the perfect matchings of the arcs generated by the “resolution” of the initial crossing. This provided our first idea of trying to generalize this construction by using the newly introduced loop graphs. However such a construction should not be considered trivial for a multitude of reasons, the first one being that in the case of punctured surfaces the skein relations are not known. The second and most important reason on why such a construction in the new setting would not be ideal, is the fact that the cases that need to be investigated for unpunctured surfaces are more complicated and working out the combinatorics through snake graph, or in our case loop graph calculus would require extreme time and effort, just for setting up each case.

However, a subsequent train of thought would be to take advantage of the bijection of the loop graphs and the newly introduced loopstrings and try to use this new tool as a means of simplifying some procedures. It should be noted here that the exact reason that makes loopstrings easier to work with, is the same reason on why these by themselves do not imply that the skein relations straightforwardly. The problem is, that string modules store much less information than snake graphs, which is extremely important when proving that the elements of the cluster algebra in both parts of the resolution coincide. Thankfully one can get away with this loss of information by realizing that there is a clever way of associating the correct monomial in the cluster algebra to some nice modules. We make this construction clear in Definition 4.1.22 and heavily rely on that and Lemma 4.2.10 to show that we can recover the loss of information that happened when we changed the set up from the loop graphs to the loop modules.

By relying on the key ingredients listed above, we are able to prove skein relations for every punctured surface apart from some extreme cases, which are basically the extreme cases for which loop graphs are not defined. The following theorem sums up Theorem 4.1.1, Theorem 4.2.1, Theorem 4.3.17, Theorem 4.4.15 and Theorem 4.5.1.

Theorem 1.0.2. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface and \mathcal{A} the cluster algebra associated to it. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two arcs, which are incompatible. Then there are multicurves c_1 and c_2 such that:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = Y^- x_{c_1} + Y^+ x_{c_2}$$

where Y^-, Y^+ are monomials in y_i coefficients and satisfy the condition that one of the two is equal to 1.

During the writing of this thesis we became aware that Banaian, Kang and Kelley were working independently on the same problem, using a different approach [BKK24]. We would like to thank them for their transparency and for the helpful communication.

The structure of this thesis, goes as follows:

In Section 2 we recall some well-known results, mainly on cluster algebras and more specifically on cluster algebras associated to triangulated surfaces, which will be extensively used in the rest of the thesis. We also introduce the notion of loop-strings and loop modules.

In Section 3, we construct an explicit bijection between the perfect matching lattice $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$ of a given loop graph \mathcal{G} and the associated canonical submodule lattice $\mathcal{L}(w_{\mathcal{G}})$. This result, although suggested by Wilson, is important to be dealt with care, since the rest of the thesis uses directly and indirectly this construction in virtually every proof and thus making it worthy enough to be given some more attention.

In Section 3, which comprises the main part of the new results of this thesis, we prove skein relations for every possible configuration between two arcs on a given punctured surface building on the previously proven bijection. We do a case by case study, while we also group some of the cases when possible. In total these cases add up to 15 cases that were indicated in [MSW13].

Chapter 2

Preliminaries

2.1 Cluster Algebras

We start by recollecting the definition of a *cluster algebra* which was first introduced by Fomin and Zelevinsky [FZ01]. We will not give the general definition of a cluster algebra, but rather restrict ourselves to the so-called *skew-symmetric cluster algebras with principal coefficients*, which are closely related to bordered surfaces, the main interest of this thesis.

To define a cluster algebra \mathcal{A} we need to start by fixing its ground ring. We will be dealing with cluster algebras of *geometric type*, that is, the *coefficients* of the cluster algebra are elements of a so-called *semifield*.

Let (\mathbb{P}, \cdot) be a free abelian group on the variables $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$. We define an addition on \mathbb{P} as follows:

$$\prod_j y_j^{a_j} \oplus \prod_j y_j^{b_j} = \prod_j y_j^{\min\{a_j, b_j\}}.$$

This makes $(\mathbb{P}, \cdot, \oplus)$ a semifield, i.e., an abelian multiplicative group endowed with a binary operation \oplus which is commutative, associative and distributive with respect to the multiplication \cdot in \mathbb{P} . The group ring $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}$, i.e., the ring of Laurent polynomials in y_1, \dots, y_n will be the *ground ring* of the cluster algebra \mathcal{A} .

Let also $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{P}$ be the field of fractions of $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}$, and $\mathcal{F} = \mathbb{Q}\mathbb{P}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ the field of rational functions in the variables x_1, \dots, x_n and coefficients in $\mathbb{Q}\mathbb{P}$. The field \mathcal{F} will be the *ambient field* of the cluster algebra \mathcal{A} .

So far, we have talked about where the cluster algebra “lives”, but not how it is generated. To define a cluster algebra, we need to determine an *initial seed* $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$, which consists of the following:

- Q is a quiver (i.e., a directed graph) (see chapter 2.9) without loops and 2-cycles and with n vertices,
- $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the n -tuple from \mathcal{F} , which is called the *initial cluster*,

- $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ is the n -tuple of generators of \mathbb{P} , which is called the *initial coefficients*.

The next vital procedure in the construction of a cluster algebra is the so-called *mutation*. The idea is to take a seed $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$ and transform it into a new one $(\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}', Q')$. Since there are n variables in the initial cluster (or equivalently n vertices in the quiver Q) we want to transform it in n different directions (ways).

Definition 2.1.1. Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$ be a seed of a cluster algebra \mathcal{A} and $1 \leq k \leq n$. The *seed mutation* μ_k , in direction k , transforms the seed $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$ into the seed $\mu_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q) = (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}', Q')$ where:

- The quiver Q' is obtained from Q following the next steps:
 1. for every path $i \rightarrow k \rightarrow j$, add one arrow $i \rightarrow j$ to Q' ,
 2. reverse all the arrows adjacent to k ,
 3. delete all the 2-cycles that were created in the previous steps.
- The new *cluster* is $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} \setminus \{x_k\} \cup \{x'_k\}$ where the new *cluster variable* $x'_k \in \mathcal{F}$ is given by the following *exchange relation*:

$$x'_k = \frac{y_k \prod_{i \rightarrow k} x_i + \prod_{i \leftarrow k} x_i}{x_k(y_k \oplus 1)},$$

where the first product runs over all the vertices that are sources to arrows leading to the vertex k , while the second one runs over all the vertices that are targets from arrows coming from the vertex k .


- The new coefficient tuple is $\mathbf{y}' = \{y'_1, \dots, y'_n\}$ where:

$$y'_j = \begin{cases} y_k^{-1} & \text{if } j = k, \\ y_j \prod_{k \rightarrow j} y_k (y_k \oplus 1)^{-1} \prod_{k \leftarrow j} (y_k \oplus 1) & \text{if } j \neq k. \end{cases}$$

These cluster variables are the generators of the cluster algebra. Even though mutations are involutions, meaning that applying a mutation twice in a row in the same direction takes you back to the initial seed, by mutating in different direction each time, we recursively create new cluster variables. Doing this procedure possibly infinite times gives rise to possibly infinitely many cluster variables, which are set to be the generators of the cluster algebra.

Definition 2.1.2. Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$ be an initial seed and \mathcal{X} the set of all cluster variables obtained by all possible mutations starting from the seed $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$. The cluster algebra $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$ is the algebra $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{X}]$, i.e., the $\mathbb{Z}\mathbb{P}$ -subalgebra of \mathcal{F} , generated by \mathcal{X} .

Example 2.1.3. Let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q) = ((x_1, x_2), (1, 1), 1 \rightarrow 2)$ be the initial seed of the cluster algebra \mathcal{A} . Since the initial coefficients are trivial, they coefficients will remain trivial in any seed, so we do not need to keep track of them. In Figure 2.1

Figure 2.1: The exchange graph of the cluster algebra of type A_2 .

we can see the so-called exchange graph, where the edges correspond to the mutations, and the vertices correspond to the cluster variables. Mutating the seed $((\frac{x_1+1}{x_2}, x_1), 1 \rightarrow 2)$ in direction μ_1 produces the seed $((x_2, x_1), 1 \leftarrow 2)$. If we keep on mutating, we will not produce any new cluster variables. Therefore, the cluster algebra \mathcal{A} is said to be of finite type and is generated by the set:

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, x_2, \frac{x_2+1}{x_1}, \frac{x_1+x_2+1}{x_1x_2}, \frac{x_1+1}{x_2}\}.$$

2.2 Punctured surfaces

In this section we recall the notion of *tagged arcs* on a *punctured surface*. Our goal is to describe the lattice structure of a loop graph associated to a tagged arc, which in turn will help us introduce the skein relations when tagged arcs are involved. Therefore, we will restrict our attention to such *loop graphs*. Fomin, Shapiro, and Thurston [FST06] established a cluster structure for triangulated oriented surfaces. Our motivation stems from the interplay between cluster algebras, bordered triangulated surfaces, and cluster categories.

Let S be a compact oriented Riemann surface with boundary ∂S . Fix $M \subset \partial S$ to be a finite set of *marked points* on ∂S , with at least one marked point on each connected component of the boundary. Furthermore, fix $P \subset S$ to be a finite set of marked points in the interior of the surface, which we will call *punctures*. We refer to the triplet (S, M, P) as a *punctured surface* if $P \neq \emptyset$ and *unpunctured surface* otherwise. For technical reasons, we exclude the cases where (S, M, P) is an unpunctured or once-punctured monogon, a digon, a triangle, or a once-, twice- or thrice-punctured sphere.

Definition 2.2.1. An *arc* of (S, M, P) is a simple curve, up to isotopy class, in S connecting two marked points of M , which is not isotopic to a boundary segment or a marked point. A *tagged arc* γ is an arc whose endpoints have been “tagged” in one of two possible ways: *plain* or *notched*. This tagging must also satisfy the following conditions:

- If the beginning and end points of γ are the same point, then the tagging at this point must be the same for both the beginning and the end.
- An endpoint of γ lying on the boundary ∂S of the surface must have a plain tagging.

When an arc γ is notched at least at one of its endpoints, we will denote it by γ^\bowtie , as a reminder of this tagging, and refer to it as a *tagged arc*. An arc with plain tagging will be denoted simply by γ and will be called an *untagged arc*.

Remark 2.2.2. In Definition 2.2.1, when referring to a simple curve up to isotopy classes, we mean that two curves on the surface S are considered the same if you can “stretch” them, without passing “over” a puncture.

Additionally, given a tagged arc γ^\bowtie , we will call the same arc with plain tagging in both of its endpoints, the *untagged version* of it and denote it by γ . The arcs γ^\bowtie and γ then belong to different isotopy classes.

In order to associate a cluster structure to a given surface, one needs the notion of a *tagged triangulation*, which is closely related to the initial seed of the associated cluster algebra. In order to define these triangulations, we first have to define when two arcs on the surface are considered to be *compatible*.

Definition 2.2.3. Let (S, M, P) be a punctured surface and γ_1 and γ_2 be two arcs on the surface. We will say that the arcs γ_1 and γ_2 are *compatible* when the following conditions are met:

- There exist representatives in the isotopy classes of γ_1 and γ_2 that do not intersect on the surface.
- If the arcs γ_1 and γ_2 share an endpoint, and their untagged versions are different, then this endpoint must be tagged in the same way.
- If the untagged versions of γ_1 and γ_2 are the same (or equivalently opposite), then they must have the same tagging in exactly one of their endpoints.

A *tagged triangulation* T is a maximal collection of pairwise compatible arcs and the 4-tuple (S, M, P, T) is called a *triangulated surface*.

Remark 2.2.4. Instead of considering only singular arcs or closed curves on a surface, we can also consider collections of those, which will be called *multicurves*. Additionally, a multicurve c will be called *compatible* if any pair of distinct arcs or closed curves of c are compatible and there are no closed curves which are contractible or contractible to a single puncture of the surface.

Remark 2.2.5. Following definition 2.2.3 one can notice that a tagged triangulation “cuts” the surface S into triangles, with two possible exceptions.

The sides of a triangle may not be distinct, resulting in what is called a *self-folded triangle*. This situation is precisely the reason why the tagged arcs were introduced in the first place. The second exception occurs when both the tagged and the untagged versions of a an arc are part of the triangulation.

The aforementioned exceptions are, in fact, two sides of the same coin, as there




Figure 2.2: Self folded triangle rlr and the associated tagged arc r^{\bowtie} , where $x_l = x_r x_{r^{\bowtie}}$ in the cluster algebra.

is a unique way to transition from one to the other, as illustrated in Figure 2.2. Let $p \in P$ and $q \in M \cup P$. Suppose that l is a plainly tagged *loop*, i.e. a closed curve with both endpoints at q that goes around p and cuts out a *once-punctured monogon* with side r , connecting the points p and q . Then, we can replace the loop l with the arc r^{\bowtie} , which is isotopic to r and is tagged notched at p , setting:

$$x_l = x_r x_{r^{\bowtie}},$$

in the cluster algebra.

Remark 2.2.6. A tagged triangulation that does not contain any tagged arcs is called an *ideal triangulation*. Substituting the loop l with the arc r^{\bowtie} , as described in Remark 2.2.5, is precisely how we assign a tagged triangulation to a given ideal triangulation. Additionally, by replacing all the tagged arcs with plain arcs where possible and reversing the above procedure, we can transitions from a tagged triangulation back to an ideal triangulation.

As mentioned earlier, a cluster algebra can be associated to a given triangulated surface (S, M, P, T) . We are now ready to show how a cluster algebra can be defined by a choice of an initial triangulation T of a punctured surface (S, M, P) . For this, we are going to define a quiver Q_T without loops or 2-cycles, associated to T .

Definition 2.2.7. Let (S, M, P) be a punctured surface and let $T = \{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_n\}$ be a tagged triangulation of the surface. We define the quiver Q_T associated with the triangulation T as follows:

Vertices: For each arc τ_i of the triangulation T , there exists a vertex of the quiver Q_T , which we denote by i .

Arrows: For every triangle in the triangulation T , there exists an arrow $i \rightarrow j$ whenever:

- The side τ_i follows the side τ_j in clockwise order, if the triangle is not self-folded.
- The arc τ_i is the radius of a self-folded triangle enclosed by a loop l , and l follows the side τ_j in clockwise order within a triangle.
- The arc τ_j is the radius of a self-folded triangle enclosed by a loop l , and τ_i follows the side l in clockwise order within a triangle.

If the triangulation T contains tagged arcs that can be substituted through the procedure described in Remark 2.2.5, we first associate a loop to each such arc and then proceed with the construction of the the quiver Q_T .




Figure 2.3: Flipping of the diagonal of a quadrilateral.

To define a cluster algebra, we need to determine an initial seed $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, Q)$. If (S, M, P, T) is a triangulated surface, we associate a cluster variable x_i and an initial coefficient y_i to each arc τ_i of T .

The cluster algebra $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(S, M, P, T)$ determined by the initial seed $(\mathbf{x}_T, \mathbf{y}_T, Q_T)$, where $\mathbf{x}_T = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and $\mathbf{y}_T = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$, is called the *cluster algebra associated with the triangulated surface (S, M, P, T)* .

The following dictionary of notions between a triangulated surface (S, M, P, T) and the corresponding cluster algebra $\mathcal{A}(S, M, P, T)$ contains some of the vital elements of this correspondence.

Theorem 2.2.8. *There exist the following bijections of notions between a surface and the associated cluster algebra:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 (S, M, P) &\quad \mathcal{A}(S, M, P, T) \\
 \{\text{Non-crossing tagged arcs}\} &\longleftrightarrow \{\text{Cluster variables}\} \\
 \{\text{Tagged triangulations}\} &\longleftrightarrow \{\text{Clusters}\} \\
 \{\text{Flips of tagged arcs}\} &\longleftrightarrow \{\text{Mutation of seeds}\}
 \end{aligned}$$

Before proceeding, we would like to elaborate further on how flips of tagged arcs work on a surface. First of all, it is well known that in unpunctured surfaces, each arc d of a triangulation T is the diagonal of a quadrilateral in the surface. We can then flip this arc d by substituting it with the unique other diagonal d' of the corresponding quadrilateral, as shown in Figure 2.3.

In punctured surfaces, if the new diagonal of the quadrilateral shares an endpoint with an arc of T that is tagged “notched” at that endpoint, then the new diagonal must also be tagged “notched” there, in order to satisfy the second condition of Definition 2.2.3.

Additionally, as mentioned in Remark 2.2.5, in punctured surfaces and in the presence of self-folded triangles, some arcs cannot be flipped. For example, in Figure 2.2 the arc r cannot be flipped. This is precisely why tagged arcs were introduced: by associating a tagged arc (see Remark 2.2.6) to the loop that forms one side of the self-folded triangle in question, we are able to flip the arc, as illustrated in Figure 2.4.




Figure 2.4: Flipping of a radius of a self-folded triangle.

2.3 Loop graphs

Having explained the basic dictionary between surfaces and cluster algebras one question that may arise is the following: Given an arc γ on a triangulated surface (S, M, P, T) , which may possibly be self-crossing or even a closed curve, is there an element of the cluster algebra that is associated to it? It turns out that such arcs are actually elements of the cluster algebra, which also raises the next question: What is the element in the cluster algebra associated to that arc? This question is answered by the existence of a combinatorial formula for the Laurent expansion of the cluster element associated to the arc γ . This Laurent expansion is parametrized by the perfect matchings of a suitable graph, depending on the type of the arc γ . There are three types of arcs on a surface, resulting in three types of graphs. If γ is an untagged arc, then we can associate the so-called *snake graph*. If γ^o is a closed curve on the surface, then the associated graph is called a *band graph*. Finally, if $\gamma^<$ is a tagged arc (assuming that at least one of its endpoints is tagged notched), then the associated graph is called a *loop graph*.

We will start by defining what an abstract snake graph is, as well as giving the notion of a zig-zag in a snake graph which will turn out to be useful in some of the proofs that will follow.

Definition 2.3.1. A *snake graph* \mathcal{G} is a connected planar graph consisting of a finite sequence of tiles, which are squares (graphs with four vertices and four edges) in the plane: G_1, \dots, G_n , with $n \geq 1$, which are glued together in the following way: two subsequent tiles G_i and G_{i+1} share exactly one edge, which can either be the North edge of G_i and the South edge of G_{i+1} , or the East side of G_i and the West edge of G_{i+1} .

Definition 2.3.2. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, \dots, G_d\}$ a snake graph.

- A consecutive sequence of tiles $(G_i, G_{i+1}, \dots, G_j)$, $1 \leq i \leq j \leq d$ is called a *subgraph* of \mathcal{G} .
- Let \mathcal{G}' be a subgraph of \mathcal{G} . We will say that \mathcal{G}' is a *zig-zag* if for every tile G_{i+1} of \mathcal{G}' not both of its South and North edges, or West and East edges, are glued to the tiles G_i and G_{i+2} respectively.




Figure 2.5: Sign function on a tile of a snake graph where $\epsilon = \pm$.

- We will also say that \mathcal{G}' is the *maximal zig-zag following* (*maximal zig-zag preceding*) a tile G_i if adding any more tiles of \mathcal{G} at the end (start) of \mathcal{G}' , results in it not being a zig-zag anymore.

We can also define a special function on a given snake graph \mathcal{G} , which is called *sign function*. This is a map $f: \{\text{edges of } \mathcal{G}\} \rightarrow \{+, -\}$, which satisfies the following properties on every tile $G_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$ of \mathcal{G} :

- the North and West sides of G_i have the same sign,
- the South and East side of G_i have the same sign,
- the North and South sides of G_1 have the opposite sign,

as illustrated in Figure 2.5.

The above sign function can help us define the next category of graphs, the so-called “band graphs”.

Definition 2.3.3. A *band graph* is a snake graph, with the additional property that the North or West side of the tile G_n is identified with the South or East side of the tile G_1 , provided they have the same sign. We will denote band graphs as \mathcal{G}^o .

Lastly, we have yet to define what a *loop graph* is. Loop graphs are, roughly speaking, created by gluing the first or last tile of a snake graph \mathcal{G} to an interior tile of \mathcal{G} . The following procedure describing how two edges are “glued” together differs slightly from the original given in [Wil20], since we are concerned with loop graphs associated to tagged arcs on punctured surfaces. Additionally, the definition of loop strings, which will be introduced later (see Definition 2.6.1), would not work on the general setting.

Definition 2.3.4. Let $\mathcal{G} = \{G_1, \dots, G_d\}, d \geq 3$ be a snake graph and c the edge of the tile G_d which is not adjacent to any vertex of the tile G_{d-1} . Let also x be the North-East vertex of G_d and y the remaining vertex adjacent to c . Let $\mathcal{G}' = \{G_{i+1}, \dots, G_d\}, i \geq 1$ be the maximal zig-zag preceding the tile G_d . We let c' denote the North/East edge of the tile G_i that is a boundary edge of \mathcal{G} . If c' is the North edge of G_i we let y' denote the North-East vertex of G_i and x' the




Figure 2.6: Example of isomorphic loop graphs.

remaining vertex adjacent to c' .

A *loop graph* \mathcal{G}^\bowtie is obtained from \mathcal{G} by identifying the vertices x and y to the vertices x' and y' respectively, and subsequently the edge c to c' . We call the subgraph \mathcal{G}' , the *right hook* of the loop graph \mathcal{G}^\bowtie .

Dually, let $\mathcal{G}'' = \{G_1, \dots, G_j\}$, $j \leq d$ be the maximal zig-zag following the tile G_1 . By identifying two vertices of the tile G_1 with two vertices of the tile G_{j+1} we obtain a *loop graph* \mathcal{G}'^\bowtie and call the subgraph \mathcal{G}'' the *left hook* of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie .

Finally, we can do the above procedures at the same time creating a loop graph that has both a left and a right hook.

Example 2.3.5. In Figure 2.6 we give two examples of graphs \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie and \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie with five tiles. For the loop graph \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie we have the right hook $\mathcal{G}'_1 = \{G_3, G_4, G_5\}$, while the right hook of the loop graph \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie is $\mathcal{G}'_2 = \{G_5, G_4, G_3\}$. Additionally, the loop graph \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie has the boundary edge c on the North side of G_5 , while the loop graph \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie has it on the East side of G_5 . However, one can notice that in fact these two graphs are isomorphic.

Having gone through the definitions of abstract snake, band and loop graphs, we are now ready to explain how one can associate the suitable graph to each arc on a triangulated surface. We will first associate a snake graph to a plain arc of the surface and then proceed to associate a loop graph to a given tagged arc.

Definition 2.3.6. Let T be an ideal triangulation of a punctured surface (S, M, P) and γ a plain arc in the surface which is not in T . We choose an orientation of γ and set $s \in M$ to be the starting point and $t \in M$ the ending point of the arc γ . Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_d be the intersection points of γ with T ordered by the sequence that γ intersects T , starting from s and finishing at t . Let τ_{i_j} be the arc containing the point p_j for every $1 \leq j \leq d$.

Assume first that τ_{i_j} is not the self-folded side of a self-folded triangle. Then τ_{i_j} is the diagonal of a quadrilateral Q_{i_j} in (S, M, P, T) and let Δ_j denote the first triangle in one side of Q_{i_j} that γ crosses, and Δ_{j+1} the other triangle. For every such intersection point p_j , we associate a tile G_j which is formed by deleting the diagonal τ_{i_j} and embedding Q_{i_j} in the plane so that the triangle Δ_j forms the lower left half of G_j .

Assume now that τ_{i_j} is the self-folded side of a self-folded triangle. Then we associate a tile G_j to p_j by gluing two copies of the self folded triangle such that




Figure 2.7: Local configuration of a snake graph, for arcs passing through a self-folded triangle.

the labels of the North and West (equivalently South and East) edges of G_j are equal.

The *snake graph* $\mathcal{G}_\gamma = \{G_1, \dots, G_d\}$ associated to γ is formed by gluing the common edges of G_j and G_{j+1} if both tiles were not formed by an intersection in a self-folded triangle, while they are glued as shown in Figure 2.7 otherwise.

The definition of a loop graph associated to a tagged arc requires the notion of a *hook* which was used by Labardini-Fragoso and Cerulli Irelli ([Lab09b], [CL12]) in their work on representations of quivers with potential.

Let γ^\bowtie be a tagged arc on a triangulated surface (S, M, P, T) which is tagged “notched” at its endpoint adjacent to the puncture p . We can then associate a new *hooked arc* γ_h^\bowtie which is obtained from γ by replacing the endpoint of γ^\bowtie that is tagged “notched” with a *hook* which travels around p either clockwise or anti-clockwise intersecting each incident arc of the triangulation T at p once, as illustrated in Figure 2.8

If both of the endpoints of γ^\bowtie are tagged notched, then we do the previous construction in both ends of γ^\bowtie , in order to obtain a doubly hooked arc γ_h^\bowtie .




Figure 2.8: Creating a hooked arc γ_h^\bowtie out of a tagged arc γ^\bowtie .




Figure 2.9: Tagged arc on a surface.

Definition 2.3.7. Let T be an ideal triangulation of a punctured surface (S, M, P) and γ^\bowtie a tagged arc in the surface, such that the underlying plain arc γ is not in T , and the tagging is not adjacent to a puncture enclosed by a self-folded triangle. Consider $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma_h^\bowtie} = \{G_{h_1}, \dots, G_{h_n}, G_1, \dots, G_d\}$ to be the snake graph associated to the hooked arc γ_h^\bowtie , where $\mathcal{G}_\gamma = \{G_1, \dots, G_d\}$ is the snake graph associated to the plain arc γ .

We define $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma^\bowtie}$ to be the *loop graph associated to the tagged arc γ^\bowtie* , which is obtained from $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma^\bowtie}$ by creating a loop at G_{h_1} and G_1 .

If $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma_h^\bowtie} = \{G_1, \dots, G_d, G_{h'_1}, \dots, G_{h'_n}\}$ was the snake graph associated to the hooked arc γ_h^\bowtie , then we define $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma^\bowtie}$ to be the *loop graph associated to the tagged arc γ^\bowtie* , which is obtained from $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma_h^\bowtie}$ by creating a loop at G_d and $G_{h'_d}$:

Lastly if there is a tagging[“] in both endpoints of the arc γ^\bowtie , then we have $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma_h^\bowtie} = \{G_{h_1}, \dots, G_{h_n}, G_1, \dots, G_d, G_{h'_1}, \dots, G_{h'_n}\}$ to be the snake graph associated to the hooked arc γ_h^\bowtie , and we define $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma^\bowtie}$ to be the *loop graph associated to the tagged arc* γ^\bowtie , obtained from $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma_h^\bowtie}$ by creating a loop at G_{h_1} and G_1 and a loop at G_d and G_{h_d} .

Remark 2.3.8. One can notice that, by the definition of the hook around a puncture, we have two choices: either we can go clockwise or anti-clockwise around the puncture. This means that there are two different loop graphs associated to a singly tagged arc. However, this is not a problem, since up to isomorphism, the resulting loop graphs are equal, as can be seen in Figure 2.6.

Example 2.3.9. In Figure 2.9 the tagged arc γ^\bowtie gives rise to two possible loop graphs depending on which direction we follow around the puncture p . If we follow the anti-clockwise orientation then the resulting graph is the graph \mathcal{G}_1 of Figure 2.6, while if we follow the clockwise orientation we take the graph \mathcal{G}_2 of the same figure. It is easy to see that these two graphs are isomorphic, as expected.

Example 2.3.10. In Figure 2.10 the tagged arc γ^\bowtie is passing through a self-folded




Figure 2.10: Tagged arc passing through a self folded triangle.

triangle (the one defined by the arcs 8 and 9). Therefore, in the construction of the loop graph $\mathcal{G}_{\gamma^{\bowtie}}$ we need to follow the local configuration appearing on the left hand side of Figure 2.7.

2.4 Expansion formula of tagged arcs

In the previous section we associated a loop graph to each tagged arc of a surface. The importance of this association becomes evident in this section, as initially Musiker, Schiffler and Williams [MSW13] and later Wilson [Wil20] provided an expansion formula for the associated cluster variable of an arc in the surface using these graphs. We will include only Wilson's result at the end of this section, as it is a generalization that encompasses all possible cases of a given arc in a surface. We will start by explaining what a perfect matching of a graph is and how to associate a monomial to every perfect matching of a snake or loop graph.

A *perfect matching* of a graph \mathcal{G} is a subset P of the edges of \mathcal{G} such that each vertex of \mathcal{G} is incident to exactly one of the edges in P . We define $\text{Match } \mathcal{G}$ to be the collection of all perfect matchings of \mathcal{G} .

Each snake or loop graph has precisely two perfect matchings that contain only boundary edges. We will discuss the matchings for snake graphs and loops graphs separately.

If \mathcal{G} is a snake graph, then we will denote by P_+ , and call it the *maximal perfect matching* of \mathcal{G} , the perfect matching that contains only boundary edges and includes the West side of the first tile of \mathcal{G} . Dually, we will denote by P_- , and call it the *minimal perfect matching* of \mathcal{G} , the perfect matching that contains only boundary edges and includes the South side of the first tile of \mathcal{G} .

If \mathcal{G}^{\bowtie} is a loop graph, the maximal perfect matching P_+ of \mathcal{G}^{\bowtie} is defined to be the




Figure 2.11: Maximal perfect matching of two isomorphic loop graphs.

perfect matching that contains only boundary edges and is a subset of the maximal perfect matching associated to the plain snake graph \mathcal{G} . The minimal perfect matching of a loop graph is defined dually.

Remark 2.4.1. A loop graph \mathcal{G}^\bowtie can be represented in more than one ways as it was pointed out in Example 2.3.5. Therefore, defining the maximal perfect matching of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie , relying on what we call the plain snake graph \mathcal{G} , could potentially create a problem. Namely, if \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie and \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie are isomorphic loop graphs, we must have that $P_{\mathcal{G}_{1,+}^\bowtie} = P_{\mathcal{G}_{2,+}^\bowtie}$.

Let $P_- \ominus P = (P_- \cup P) \setminus (P_- \cap P)$ denote the *symmetric difference* of an arbitrary perfect matching of a graph G with the minimal perfect matching P_- . Notice that $P_- \ominus P$ is a set of boundary edges of a subgraph G_P of G , which consists of a subset of tiles G_i of the graph G .

Definition 2.4.2. Let $P \in \text{Match } G$. The *height monomial* of P is defined by

$$y(P) = \prod_{G_i \in G_P} y_i.$$

The *weight monomial* of P is defined by

$$x(P) = \prod_{\tau_i \in P} x_{\tau_i}$$

Theorem 2.4.3. Let (S, M, P) be a punctured surface and T an ideal triangulation of the surface. Let $\mathcal{C} = \mathcal{C}(S, M, P, T)$ be the associated cluster algebra with principal coefficients, with respect to T . Suppose γ^\bowtie is a (tagged) arc, which is not tagged notched at a puncture enclosed by a self folded triangle in T . Then the cluster variable x_{γ^\bowtie} is equal to

$$x_{\gamma^\bowtie} = \frac{1}{\text{cross}(\gamma, T)} \sum_{P \in \text{Match } G_{\gamma^\bowtie}} x(P)y(P)$$

where $x(P)$ is the weight of the perfect matching P , $y(P)$ is the height of P and $\text{cross}(\gamma^\bowtie) = \prod_{j=1}^d x_{\tau_{i_j}}$ is the crossing monomial of γ^\bowtie .

Remark 2.4.4. As it is the case with unpunctured surfaces, we can also assign a cluster algebra element to each multicurve c by defining $x_c = \prod_{\gamma \in c} x_\gamma$, where γ runs over all arcs, tagged arcs and closed curves of c .

2.5 Quivers associated to loop graphs

In this subsection we first recall from [MSW11] how we can associate a quiver to a given snake graph and later recall from [Wil20], the generalized construction of the quiver associated to a loop graph.

Definition 2.5.1. [MSW11] Let $\mathcal{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$ be a snake graph. The *quiver associated to the graph* \mathcal{G} is defined to be the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}}$ with vertices $1, \dots, n$ and whose arrows are determined by the following rules:

- (i) there is an arrow $i \rightarrow i + 1$ in $Q_{\mathcal{G}}$ if i is odd and G_{i+1} is on the right of G_i , or i is even and G_{i+1} is on the top of G_i ,
- (ii) there is an arrow $i \rightarrow i - 1$ in $Q_{\mathcal{G}}$ if i is odd and G_i is on the right of G_{i-1} , or i is even and G_i is on the top of G_{i-1} .

Following Wilson, we can now define a quiver to a given loop graph.

Definition 2.5.2. [Wil20] Let $\mathcal{G}^\bowtie = (G_1, \dots, G_n)^\bowtie$ be a loop graph, with underlying snake graph $\mathcal{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$. The *quiver associated to the loop graph* \mathcal{G}^\bowtie is defined to be the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}^\bowtie}$ which is the same as the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}}$ with an additional arrow for each loop of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie , where the additional arrow is defined as follows:

- (i) if there is a loop with respect to G_1 and $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ then the arrow $1 \rightarrow k$ (resp. $k \rightarrow 1$) is in $Q_{\mathcal{G}^\bowtie}$ if k is odd (resp. even) and $S(G_k)$ is the cut edge, or k is even (resp. odd) and $W(G_k)$ is the cut edge,
- (ii) if there is a loop with respect to G_n and $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ then the arrow $n \rightarrow k$ (resp. $k \rightarrow n$) is in $Q_{\mathcal{G}^\bowtie}$ if and only if k is odd (resp. even) and $N(G_k)$ is the cut edge, or k is even (resp. odd) and $E(G_k)$ is the cut edge.

One thing that one may notice, is that a loop graph has equivalent representations which could possibly lead to different quivers associated to each representation. However Definition 2.5.2 is consistent in the sense that the quiver that is associated to a loop graph is independent of the choice of the representation of the loop graph as the following propositions indicates.

Proposition 2.5.3. Let \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie and \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie be two different representations of the same loop graph \mathcal{G}^\bowtie . Then, the associated quivers $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie}$ and $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie}$ of the graphs \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie and \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie respectively are the same quiver.

Proof. We will assume that there is only one loop at the start of the loop graph \mathcal{G}^\bowtie , since the arguments for a possibly second loop at the end of the graph would be similar.

Let $\mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie = \{G_1, \dots, G_{d-1}, G_d, \dots, G_n\}$, $2 \leq d \leq n$ where there is a loop with respect to the tiles G_1 and G_d . Therefore since there is only one loop, there are two possible representations of the loop graph and therefore it must be $\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie = \{G_{d-1}, \dots, G_1, G_d, \dots, G_n\}$.

Let w.l.o.g. assume that d is even and that the tile G_2 is on the right of the tile G_1 at the loop graph \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie . We will now construct the quivers $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie}$ and $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie}$ separately.

Starting with $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie}$ we first construct the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1}$ associated to the underlying snake graph \mathcal{G}_1 . The local configuration induced by the tiles $\{G_d, \dots, G_n\}$ at the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1}$ is the same as the local configuration at the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2}$, so we need to focus only on the arrows of the quiver which are induced from the first part of the loops graphs, up to the tile G_d .

Since G_2 is on the right of G_1 following Definition 2.5.1 we have an arrow $1 \rightarrow 2$ in $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1}$. Since $\{G_1, \dots, G_{d-1}\}$ is a zig-zag we must have the following configuration locally in $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1}$: $1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow d-1$. Additionally the zig-zag $\{G_1, \dots, G_{d-1}\}$ is also maximal and therefore we have the arrow: $d-1 \leftarrow d$. Lastly we need to add an arrow that is induced by the loop at the tiles G_1 and G_d . Since d is an even number the tile G_d is over the tile G_{d-1} and therefore $W(G_d)$ is the cut edge in the loop graph \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie . Following Definition 2.5.2(i) we have that the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie}$ is the same as the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1}$ with an additional arrow $1 \rightarrow d$.

We will now construct the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie}$ associated to the loop graph \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie . $\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie = \{G_{d-1}, \dots, G_1, G_d, \dots, G_n\}$ and as stated earlier we need to only investigate the configuration of arrows in $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie}$ induced by the first part $\{G_{d-1}, \dots, G_1, G_d\}$.

To begin with, the tile G_1 is on the left of the tile G_d in the loop graph \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie since the cut edge in \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie is $W(G_d)$. Notice also that G_1 is an odd tile \mathcal{G}_2 and therefore by Definition 2.5.1 (i) there is an arrow $1 \rightarrow d$ in $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2}$. Since $\{G_{d-1}, \dots, G_1\}$ is a maximal zig-zag in \mathcal{G}_2 we must also have the following local configuration in $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2}$: $d-1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow 1$.

Lastly we need to add an extra arrow induced by the loop with respect to the tiles G_{d-1} and G_d in order to complete the quiver $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie}$. The cut edge in \mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie was $W(G_d)$ which implies that the cut edge in \mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie is $S(G_d)$. The cut edge being $S(G_d)$ and d being even implies by Definition 2.5.2 that in $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie}$ we have additionally the arrow $d \rightarrow d-1$.

Noticing that the quivers constructed $Q_{\mathcal{G}_1^\bowtie}$ and $Q_{\mathcal{G}_2^\bowtie}$ are the same completes the proof. ■

A nice visualization of the above proof can be done by looking at the Figure 2.12 where there is a loop at the start of the loop graph, ignoring the second loop at the end of it.

Example 2.5.4. *In Figure 2.12 the loop graph on the left hand side has two loops, one at the start of the graph which “connects” the tiles 1 and 4 and one at the end which “connects” the tiles 6 and 10. Following Definition 2.5.1 and viewing the loop graph as a regular snake graph we take the quiver:*

$$1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \leftarrow 7 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 10.$$




Figure 2.12: Quiver associated to loop graph.

In order to construct the quiver of the loop graph, following the two rules in Definition 2.5.2 we add the arrow $1 \rightarrow 4$ and the arrow $6 \rightarrow 10$ to the quiver resulting in the final quiver that can be viewed in the same figure.

Working on the loop graph on the right hand side of Figure 2.12, the quiver associated on the plain snake graph of that loop graph is the following:

$$3 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 1 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 10 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 7.$$

Looking at the two loops at the start and at the end of the loop graph we also add the arrows $3 \leftarrow 4$ and $6 \leftarrow 7$ respectively.

It is easy to see that the quivers associated to both loop graphs (which are equivalent) are the same.

2.6 Abstract strings and loopstrings

Abstract strings are a well-established tool which has been used as a means of simplifying the information of a snake graph by associating a string to a given graph and by extension to a given arc on a surface. In this chapter we introduce a generalization of such abstract strings, which we call loopstrings. The definition of a loopstring captures the combinatorial structure of a loop graph and is similar to the notion of an abstract string associated with a snake graph.

Let $\{\rightarrow, \leftarrow\}$ be a set of two letters where the first one is called direct arrow and the second one inverse arrow. An *abstract string* is a finite word in this alphabet or is the additional word denoted by \emptyset , which stands for the empty word. We will generalize this construction by adding two new letters in this alphabet and by imposing additional properties for these letters, which will correspond to the loops that appear in loop graphs.

Definition 2.6.1. Let $\{\leftarrow, \rightarrow\}$ be a set of two letters where the first one is called *inverse loop* and the second one *direct loop*. We create a new alphabet from the set

$\{\rightarrow, \leftarrow, \leftrightarrow, \hookrightarrow\}$. An *abstract loopstring* l is either an abstract string, or an abstract string with maximum two additional letters from $\{\leftarrow, \hookrightarrow\}$ subject to the following:

- A direct or inverse loop cannot be the first or last letter of the string l .
- A direct (respectively inverse) loop can be placed in a position only if all the following arrows up to the end of the l or the preceding arrows up to the start of l are inverse (respectively direct) arrows.

To make the above Definition 2.6.1 clear we will present some examples of loopstrings and some examples of non-loopstrings, pointing out the rules that are violated in each case.

Example 2.6.2. *The following sequences are loopstrings:*

(i) $\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow$,

(ii) $\rightarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow$,

(iii) $\leftarrow\rightarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow$,

(iv) $\rightarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow\rightarrow$,

(v) $\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow$.

The following sequences are not loopstrings:

(vi) $\leftarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow$,

(vii) $\leftarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow$,

(viii) $\leftarrow\leftarrow\rightarrow\leftarrow$,

(ix) $\rightarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow\leftarrow$.

The sequences (i) and (v) have exactly two loops. These loops satisfy the conditions of Definition 2.6.1 since the first loops encountered in each case follows arrows of opposite direction, while the second loop in both cases precedes arrows of opposite direction. The sequences (ii) and (iii) satisfy all conditions since the inverse loop in (ii) follows a sequence of three consecutive direct arrows, while the inverse loop in (iii) precedes a sequence of one direct arrow. Regarding the sequence (iv) there is one inverse loop which both precedes and follows a sequence of direct arrows, which is obviously more than enough.

The fact that it can be considered either as the start or the end translates to being associated to two different tagged arcs on a punctured surface.

The sequence (ix) has three loops and therefore cannot be a loopstring. The sequence (vi) is not a loopstring, since the loop is the first letter of the sequence. The sequence (vii) is not a loopstring, since on the left of the direct loop there is a direct arrow, while on the right of the loop there may exist an inverse arrow but this sequence of direct arrows (in this case, a sequence of one arrow) is not continuing up the end of the string. Lastly the sequence (viii) is not a loopstring since the loop follows a sequence of inverse arrows, but it should have been a direct loop for (viii) to be considered a loopstring.

Remark 2.6.3. The reader can notice a repeating pattern on the second condition of Definition 2.6.1. We require the direct or inverse loop to follow or precede a sequence of inverse or direct arrows respectively. This is a parallel to the notion of maximal zig-zag that follows or precedes a tile as it was encountered in Definition 2.3.4. This comes as no surprise since in the classical case of associating a string to a snake graph, zig-zag tiles give rise to a sequence of direct or inverse arrows.

Remark 2.6.4. Our Definition 2.6.1 is not unique in the sense that we could have taken a different root. In the case of loop graphs, one defines at first a snake graph and then identifies some edges on that graph. We could try to define a loopstring, starting with a string and then adding the two new letters of the alphabet in the suitable spots. However we decided to stick to our approach since now loopstrings are defined more abstractly instead of depending on a preexisting string, resembling in some way the way that abstract snake graphs were defined in the first place.

We finish this chapter by remarking that although abstract loopstrings are given as words on an alphabet, in practice when we are dealing with loopstrings associated to loop graphs or tagged arcs, we can view them as a special kind of graphs, by adding numbers in between the arrows and the loops, which correspond to the vertices of a graph. Another interesting observation is the fact if (S, M, P, T) is a triangulated surface, then loopstrings associated to tagged arcs, as it is also the case with regular strings associated to regular arcs, have a close connection to the quiver associated to the triangulation T of the surface (S, M, P) . This connection will be better understood through examples later, after we introduce the connections of loops graphs and loopstrings.

2.7 Construction of the loop graph of an abstract loopstring

In this section we will describe how one can go from an abstract loopstring to a loop graph. In practice, we will be usually working the other way around, building a loopstring out of a loop graph as it is described in the next section, but still it is important to point out that this procedure is bijective.

We start by defining the plain string associated to a loopstring which will simplify the construction.

Definition 2.7.1. Let $w = a_1 \dots a_n$ be an abstract loopstring where $a_{h_1}, a_{h_2} \in \{\rightarrow, \leftarrow, \leftrightarrow, \overleftrightarrow{}\}$, $2 \leq h_1, h_2 \leq n-1$ and $a_i \in \{\rightarrow, \leftarrow\}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ with $i \neq h_1, h_2$. We set a'_{h_1} to be equal to \rightarrow (resp. \leftarrow) if a_{h_1} is equal to \rightarrow or \leftrightarrow (resp. \leftarrow or \leftrightarrow). Similarly we set a'_{h_2} to be equal \rightarrow or \leftarrow based on what a_{h_2} is. We call $w' = a_1 \dots a'_{h_1} \dots a'_{h_2} \dots a_n$ to be the *plain string associated to the loopstring w*.

We will now construct the loop graph of a loop string by combining a classic construction of Çanakçı-Schroll and some of the tools that we have already introduced in previous chapters.

Definition 2.7.2. Let $w = a_1 \dots a_{h_1} \dots a_{h_2} \dots a_n$ be a loopstring where $a_{h_1}, a_{h_2} \in \{\rightarrow, \leftarrow, \leftrightarrow, \hookrightarrow\}$. Let also w' be the plain string associated to w . Let $G_{w'} = \{G_1, \dots, G_{h_1} \dots G_{h_2} \dots G_n\}$ be the snake graph associated to the w' as it is described in [CS21].

We call the loop graph G_w^{\bowtie} the *loop graph associated to the loopstring w*, where G_w^{\bowtie} is the loop graph obtained from the snake graph $G_{w'}$ by identifying the edges of the tiles G_1 and G_{h_1} (resp. G_{h_2} and G_n) if $a_{h_1} \in \{\leftarrow, \hookrightarrow\}$ (resp. $a_{h_2} \in \{\leftarrow, \hookrightarrow\}$) as described in Definition 2.3.4.

2.8 Construction of the loopstring of a loop graph

Given a loop graph \mathcal{G} , we want to associate a loopstring w . We will do this by combining a variety of construction that have already been introduced. Of course this is not the only way that one can define it, but we chose this approach, since it builds on previous results.

Definition 2.8.1. Let $\mathcal{G}^{\bowtie} = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$ be a loop graph and $\mathcal{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$ the underlying snake graph associated to \mathcal{G}^{\bowtie} . Let $Q_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the quiver of the underlying snake graph $G = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$ (which is unique based on Remark 2.5.3). We define $w' = a_1 \dots a_n$ where:

- $a_i = \rightarrow$ if there is an arrow $i \rightarrow i + 1$ in $Q_{\mathcal{G}}$,
- $a_i = \leftarrow$ if there is an arrow $i + 1 \rightarrow i$ in $Q_{\mathcal{G}}$.

We now associate possibly two more letters from $\{\leftarrow, \hookrightarrow\}$ in the following cases:

- if there is a loop with respect to G_1 and G_{h_1} , $1 < h_1 < n$ then we define $a_{h_1} = \leftrightarrow$ (resp. $a_{h_1} = \hookrightarrow$) if the arrow $1 \rightarrow h_1$ (resp. $h_1 \rightarrow 1$) is in $Q_{\mathcal{G}^{\bowtie}}$,
- if there is a loop with respect to G_{h_2} , $1 < h_2 < n$ G_d then we define $a_{h_2} = \leftarrow$ (resp. $a_{h_2} = \hookrightarrow$) if the arrow $h_2 \rightarrow n$ (resp. $n \rightarrow h_2$) is in $Q_{\mathcal{G}^{\bowtie}}$.

The loopstring w is then defined as $w = a_1 \dots a_{h_1} \dots a_{h_2} \dots a_n$ and is called *the loopstring associated to the loop graph \mathcal{G}^{\bowtie}* .

The next remark is a well known fact about snake graphs, but it can be easily seen that it also holds true for loop graphs. We mention it here for the sake of completion and since it will be widely used later in the proofs of the main results.

Remark 2.8.2. Based on the definition of a loopstring associated to a loop graph we can notice two things:

- if three consecutive tiles of the loop graph form a zig-zag then the two arrows associated to these tiles have the same direction.
- if three consecutive tiles of the loop graph form a straight piece then the two arrows associated to these tile have alternating directions.

Remark 2.8.3. Notice that equivalent planar representations of a loop graph will produce two different loopstrings. We will introduce an equivalence relation for loopstrings which recovers equivalent planar representations of a loop graph.

Definition 2.8.4. Let $w = a_1 \dots a_d \dots a_n$ and $w' = b_1 \dots b_d \dots b_n$ be two different loopstrings, for which $a_d, b_d \in \{\leftarrow, \rightarrow\}$ and $a_i, b_i \in \{\leftarrow, \rightarrow\}$ for every $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $i \neq d$. Then we will say that the two loopstrings are *left equivalent* if $w = w'$ or the following are true:

- (i) $a_d \neq b_d$,
- (ii) if $\{a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}\}$ are direct arrows (resp. inverse arrows), then we must have that $\{b_1, \dots, b_{d-1}\}$ are inverse arrows (resp. direct arrows),
- (iii) $a_i = b_i$ for each $d+1 < i \leq n$.

We can define similarly *right equivalent* loopstrings when there is a direct or inverse loop only at the end part of the loopstrings. Lastly we call two loopstrings w, w' *equivalent* if they are left and right equivalent and we will write $w \sim w'$.

Notice that when two loopstrings w_1 and w_2 are left equivalent, then the arrow a_{d+1} has opposite direction from the arrow b_{d+1} .

Example 2.8.5. Looking at Figure 2.12 we have that the loopstring w associated to the loop graph on the left hand side is the following:

$$w = \rightarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow,$$

while the loopstring w' associated to the graph on the right hand side of the figure is:

$$w' = \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \rightarrow \rightarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow \leftarrow.$$

Following Definition 2.8.4 it is easy to see that $w \sim w'$ which is what we should hope for in order for our constructions to be consistent. This is exactly what we also prove in the next Lemma 2.8.6.

The fact that the above defined relation is indeed an equivalence relation is easy to see, since all properties can be trivially checked. However, what is more important is that equivalent loopstrings, correspond to isomorphic loop graphs. We will prove this for the case that the two loopstrings are left equivalent, but similar arguments can be used for the other cases.

Lemma 2.8.6. Suppose that $w = a_0 \dots a_n$ and $w' = b_0 \dots b_n$ are two loopstrings, which have a direct or inverse loop at the beginning and no direct or inverse loop at the end. Then, the associated loop graphs \mathcal{G}_w^{\bowtie} and $\mathcal{G}_{w'}^{\bowtie}$ are isomorphic if and only w and w' are left equivalent.

Proof. If $w = w'$ there is nothing to prove. So suppose from now on, that $w \neq w'$. We will first prove the direct implication.

Suppose that the loop graphs $\mathcal{G}_w^{\bowtie} = \{G_1, \dots, G_k, \dots, G_n\}^{\bowtie}$ and

$\mathcal{G}_{w'}^{\bowtie} = \{G'_1, \dots, G'_l, \dots, G'_n\}^{\bowtie}$ are isomorphic, where G_k and G'_l are the tiles in which one of their edges is identified with an edge of the first tile of the respective loop graph. Since $w \neq w'$, the underlying snake graphs \mathcal{G}_w and $\mathcal{G}_{w'}$ without the identification of the two respective edges are not equal. Additionally, since the two graphs \mathcal{G}_w^{\bowtie} and $\mathcal{G}_{w'}^{\bowtie}$ are isomorphic we conclude that $k = l$.

W.l.o.g. assume that G_2 is on the right of G_1 . Since the two graphs are isomorphic but not equal when viewed as plain snake graphs, we conclude that G'_2 must be on top of G'_1 , since there are only two possible different planar representations of a loop graph (Remark 2.8.3). Therefore, we can deduce that $a_0 = \leftrightarrow$ and $b_0 = \leftrightarrow$. This, in turn implies that $a_i = \rightarrow$ and $b_i = \leftarrow$ for each $2 \leq i < k - 1$, by definition of loopstrings. Lastly, since the two graphs are isomorphic, the subgraphs $\mathcal{G}_v^{\bowtie} = \{G_k, \dots, G_n\}^{\bowtie}$ and $\mathcal{G}_{v'}^{\bowtie} = \{G'_l, \dots, G'_n\}^{\bowtie}$ are equal, and therefore we have that $a_j = b_j$ for each $k \leq j \leq n$. Therefore, the loopstrings w and w' are left equivalent.

Let us prove now the other direction. Suppose that the loopstrings w and w' are left equivalent. Suppose w.l.o.g that $a_0 = \leftrightarrow$. Since they are not equal, we also have that $b_0 = \leftrightarrow$ from (i) of Definition 2.8.4. Suppose also that a_1, \dots, a_k is the maximum subcollection of consecutive tiles of w which are direct arrows. Therefore, due to (ii) of Definition 2.8.4, b_1, \dots, b_k is the maximum subcollection of consecutive tiles of w' which are inverse arrows. we will treat the case that k is even, since the other case is symmetrical.

Sine k is even, the tile G_{k+1} of the graph \mathcal{G}_w^{\bowtie} is on the right of the tile G_k and the south edge of this tile $S(G_{k+1})$ is identified with $W(G_1)$, by the construction of the loop graph by a given loopstring. Similarly, regarding the graph $\mathcal{G}_{w'}^{\bowtie}$, we can see that G'_{k+1} is on top of G'_k and that the edge $W(G'_{k+1})$ is identified with the edge $S(G'_1)$. By identifying each tile G_i of the graph \mathcal{G}_w^{\bowtie} with the tile G'_{k+1-i} of the graph $\mathcal{G}_{w'}^{\bowtie}$, for every $1 \leq i \leq k$, and each tile G_j with G'_j for every $k+1 \leq j \leq n$. We can construct an isomorphism $\Phi: \mathcal{G}_w^{\bowtie} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_{w'}^{\bowtie}$ which sends each vertex and edge of the graph \mathcal{G}_w^{\bowtie} to the appropriate edge and vertex of $\mathcal{G}_{w'}^{\bowtie}$ respectively, keeping in mind the aforementioned identification of tiles. Therefore, two left equivalent loopstrings, give rise to two different planar representations of the same loopgraph. ■

Remark 2.8.7. Using the above definition we can see that two different planar representations of the same loop graph produce two equivalent loopstrings. So working under equivalence of loop graphs, the construction of loopstrings coming from a loop graph is well defined. From now on when we are talking about loopstrings we will always mean it up to equivalence of loopstrings.

Remark 2.8.8. Lemma 2.8.6 is essential for the arguments that will follow. A lot of the arguments regarding loop graphs can be reduced to the case where the second tile of the graph G is on the right of the first tile, since as we can see by the above Lemma, if the second tile was on top of the first one, we could just consider the isomorphic planar representation of G . Of course symmetric arguments can be applied when the loop is at the end of the graph.

2.9 Quiver representations and loop modules

In this chapter we introduce the notion of *loop modules* which generalize the now classical notion of *string modules*. These are modules over a path algebra that correspond to loopstrings, in the same way that string modules correspond to abstract strings.

We begin by reviewing some basic background on quiver representations and their morphisms. Quivers and their representations are extremely useful tools for studying the structure of a group or algebra through combinatorial objects such as graphs and easily understood linear maps. We then discuss the definition of a path algebra and by extension, that of a string algebra. The importance of string modules is evident from the fact that the finite-dimensional modules over a string algebra are precisely the finite-dimensional string and band modules.

Let us formally define what a quiver is. A *quiver* $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathcal{Q}_0, \mathcal{Q}_1, s, t)$ consists of a set of vertices \mathcal{Q}_0 , a set of arrows \mathcal{Q}_1 , a map $s: \mathcal{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_0$ assigning to its each arrow its source, and a map $t: \mathcal{Q}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_0$ assigning to each arrow its target. Let k be an algebraically closed field.

A *representation* $M = (M_i, \phi_\alpha)_{i \in \mathcal{Q}_0, \alpha \in \mathcal{Q}_1}$ of a quiver \mathcal{Q} is a collection of k -vector spaces M_i together with a collection of k -linear maps $\phi_\alpha: M_{s(\alpha)} \rightarrow M_{t(\alpha)}$.

Quivers are mathematically convenient objects to work with, as they can be regarded simply as directed graphs. A quiver representation then assigns a vector space to each vertex and a linear map to each arrow.

Example 2.9.1. Let \mathcal{Q} be the quiver $1 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$. Then, the following are representations of \mathcal{Q} :

$$\begin{aligned}
 M_1 : k &\xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 \\
 M_2 : k &\xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^2 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 \\
 M_3 : k &\xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^2 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 \\
 M_4 : k &\xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^2 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} k^2 \\
 M_5 : k &\xleftarrow{1} k \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^2
 \end{aligned}$$

If \mathcal{Q} is a quiver and $M = (M_i, \phi_\alpha)$ and $M' = (M'_i, \phi'_\alpha)$ are two representations

of \mathcal{Q} , then a *morphism of representations* $f: M \rightarrow M'$ is a collection of k -linear maps $(f_i)_{i \in \mathcal{Q}}$, such that for each arrow $\alpha: i \rightarrow j$ we have $\phi'_\alpha \circ f_i = f_j \circ \phi_\alpha$, i.e. the linear maps must be compatible with the maps ϕ_α .

Example 2.9.2. If $\mathcal{Q}: 1 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$ and M_1, M_2 and M_3 are the representations appearing in Example 2.9.1 then the following diagrams commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & & \\
 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \xrightarrow{k^3} & \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 & \\
 \begin{matrix} M_1 \\ \uparrow \\ M_2 \end{matrix} & \begin{matrix} \curvearrowleft \\ 1 \\ \curvearrowright \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{matrix} \curvearrowleft \\ 1 \\ \curvearrowright \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \xleftarrow{k^2} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 & \\
 & \begin{matrix} M_1 \\ \uparrow \\ M_3 \end{matrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
 & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \xleftarrow{k^2} & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 &
 \end{array}$$

Notice additionally that $f_i, f'_i, 1 \leq i \leq 3$ are injections, so $f: M_2 \rightarrow M_1$ and $f': M_3 \rightarrow M_1$ are injective morphisms of representations.

Remark 2.9.3. If Q is a quiver, one can consider the category of quiver representations $\text{rep } Q$. The objects of this category are the representations of Q , and the morphisms are morphisms between representations. Composition of morphisms is given by the composition of the corresponding linear maps ϕ_α . Even though we have not explicitly discussed the notions of *indecomposable representations* and *direct sums of representations*, the equivalence of categories stated in Theorem 2.9.9, illustrates the deep connection between modules and representations. In practice we will use these notions interchangeably.

Remark 2.9.4. If N is a *subrepresentation* of M , then we refer to the *canonical embedding* of N into M as the injective map $f: N \hookrightarrow M$ where each component

$f_i: N_i \rightarrow M_i$ is the linear map induced by the identity on the non-zero components of N . The injective maps f and f' from Example 2.9.2 are both canonical embeddings of the representations M_2 and M_3 into the representation M_1 .

Having introduced the category of representations $\text{rep } Q$, this is a good moment to revisit one of the first natural questions: “why do we care about representations of quivers?”. The answer lies in two fundamental results (Theorems 2.9.7 and 2.9.9), which together show that the study of finite-dimensional algebras can, in many cases, be reduced to the study of representations of *bound quivers*.

Let Q be a quiver. One can associate to it the so-called *path algebra* kQ . This is a k -algebra whose basis consists of all finite *paths* in Q -that is, finite sequences of consecutive arrows from one vertex to another. The multiplication of two basis elements $c_1 \cdot c_2$ is defined as the *concatenation* of the paths if the endpoint of c_1 coincides with the starting point of c_2 ; otherwise, the product is defined to be zero. This multiplication is extends linearly to all of kQ , making kQ a (non-commutative) k -algebra. In particular, it can be viewed as a graded k -algebra, with grading given by path length.

Remark 2.9.5. Let $Q = (Q_0, Q_1)$ be a quiver, and let c be a path in Q . We can canonically associate a string w_c , by assigning an arrow in the string w_c for each arrow in the path c , as illustrated in Example 2.9.6. This correspondence provides a convenient alternative representation of strings associated with quivers and will be used extensively throughout the remainder of this thesis.

Example 2.9.6. Let Q be the quiver $1 \xleftarrow{\alpha} 2 \xrightarrow{\beta} 3$, and consider the path

$$c = (1|\alpha, \beta, \beta, \beta, \beta|3).$$

We associate to this path the string w_c which is given by:

$$w_c = 1 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3.$$

This presentation of the string w_c , differs from the one given in Def 2.6.1, but its properties remain the same.

If kQ is the path algebra of a quiver Q , it is not necessarily finite-dimensional algebra. In particular, if Q contains oriented cycles, then kQ is infinite-dimensional. Therefore, to study finite dimensional algebras, we must consider *quotients* of path algebras by suitable ideals. One such suitable ideal is the so-called *admissible ideal*. This is, roughly speaking, an *arrow ideal*-that is, a two-sided ideal generated by paths of length at least two. If I is an admissible ideal of the path algebra kQ , then the pair (Q, I) is called a *bound quiver*, and the quotient algebra kQ/I is called a *bound quiver algebra*.

Having introduced the notion of a bound quiver algebra, we are now in a position to address a very natural question that arises when studying quiver representations: “Why do we study them in the first place?”

Theorem 2.9.7. If \mathcal{A} is a basic finite dimensional k -algebra, then there exists a quiver Q and an admissible ideal I such that $\mathcal{A} \cong kQ/I$.

Remark 2.9.8. The assumption in Theorem 2.9.7 that \mathcal{A} is a basic algebra is not restrictive. Indeed, the module category of any finite dimensional algebra is equivalent to the module category of a basic finite-dimensional algebra. Therefore, the study of basic algebras is sufficient, from a representation theoretic perspective point of view.

The result of Theorem 2.9.7 is fundamental, as it reduces the study of basic finite-dimensional algebras to the study of the bound quiver algebras. The next fundamental results builds upon this by further reducing the study of finitely generated right modules to the study of the representations of a quiver.

Theorem 2.9.9. *Let $\mathcal{A} = kQ/I$ be a bound quiver algebra where Q is a finite connected quiver. Then, the following equivalence of categories is true:*

$$\mathrm{mod}\, kQ \cong \mathrm{rep}(Q, I).$$

2.9.1 String modules

We have already introduced abstract strings and loopstrings in Der 2.6.1. However, another way to view these objects is as modules over an algebra. In the remainder of this chapter, we will describe the classical construction of a *string module* from an abstract string, and subsequently, the construction of what we will call a *loopstring module* from a given abstract loopstring. This correspondence between modules and (loop)strings is important, as it allows us to use these notions interchangeably in the remainder of the thesis.

Let kQ/I be a bound quiver algebra and let c be a path in the quiver. Consider the string

$$w_c = a_0 u_1 a_1 \dots a_{n-1} u_n a_n,$$

where $a_i \in Q_0$ for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, and $u_j \in \{\leftarrow, \rightarrow\}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq n$. Define the index set $\mathcal{I}_a := \{i \mid a_i = a\}$. Then the *string module* $M(w_c)$ corresponding to the string w_c is defined as follows:

- At each vertex $x \in Q_0$ we assign the vector space $M_x = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{I}_x} K_i$ where $K_i = k$ for every $i \in \mathcal{I}_x$.
- For each arrow $a \in Q_1$, where $x \xrightarrow{\alpha} y$, we assign a linear map $M_a: \bigoplus_{j \in \mathcal{I}_x} K_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{I}_y} K_i$ given by the matrix:

$$(M_a)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} Id_k & \text{if } |i - j| = 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Example 2.9.10. Let $Q = 1 \xleftarrow{\alpha} 2 \xrightarrow{\beta} 3$ and $w_c = 1 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$ as in Example 2.9.6. We will now construct the corresponding string module $M(w_c)$. First we compute the index sets:

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \{0\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_2 = \{1, 3, 5\}, \quad \mathcal{I}_3 = \{2, 4, 6\},$$

which indicate the positions in the string w_c where each vertex of the quiver Q appears. Accordingly, the vector spaces assigned to each vertex are:

$$M_1 = k, \quad M_2 = k^3, \quad M_3 = k^3.$$

Finally, we describe the linear maps associated to the arrows α and β . These are given by the matrices:

$$M_\alpha = (Id_k \ 0 \ 0), \quad M_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} Id_k & Id_k & 0 \\ 0 & Id_k & Id_k \\ 0 & 0 & Id_k \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore the string module $M(w_c)$ associated to the string w_c is as follows:

$$M(w_c) : k \xleftarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}} k^3 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}} k^3.$$

We can also depict the string module $M(w_c)$ in the following ways:

$$M(w_c) = \begin{array}{ccccccc} & & k & & k & & k \\ & \swarrow^{1_k} & \alpha & \searrow^{1_k} & \swarrow^{1_k} & \alpha & \searrow^{1_k} \\ k & & k & & k & & k \\ & \swarrow^{1_k} & \beta & \searrow^{1_k} & \swarrow^{1_k} & \beta & \searrow^{1_k} \\ & & k & & k & & k \end{array},$$

$$M(w_c) = \begin{array}{ccccc} & 2 & & 2 & & 2 \\ 1 & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & 3 & & 3 & & 3 \end{array},$$

where the second presentation is called the string presentation of the module $M(w_c)$.

Remark 2.9.11. Notice that the module $M(w_c)$ appearing in Example 2.9.10 is the same as the module M_1 in Example 2.9.1. The string presentation of the modules M_2 and M_3 of Example 2.9.1 is the following:

$$M_2 = \begin{array}{ccccc} & 2 & & 2 & \\ 1 & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow & \searrow \\ & 3 & \oplus & 3 & \oplus & 3 \\ & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & 3 & & 3 & & 3 \end{array},$$

$$M_3 = \begin{array}{ccccc} & 2 & & 2 & \\ 1 & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow & \searrow \\ & 3 & & 3 & & 3 \\ & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & 3 & & 3 & & 3 \end{array} \oplus 3.$$

It is clear that M_2 and M_3 are maximal submodules of M_1 , as in each case we remove a copy of the top vertex 2 from M_1 . However, the resulting submodules are not isomorphic, since the top vertex is removed from “different positions” in the structure of M_1 . This is also reflected in the fact that the inclusion maps from

M_2 and M_3 to M_1 are distinct, as can be seen in Example 2.9.2. In this thesis, the idea of removing a top from a module to produce a submodule will appear frequently. For brevity, whenever we refer to a *canonical submodule* N , we will implicitly mean the pair (N, f) , where $f: N \hookrightarrow M$ is the associated canonical embedding, as described in Remark 2.9.4.

Remark 2.9.12. String modules are of particular interest because they appear in the classification of indecomposable representations of certain algebras. Specifically, these are the so-called *finite-dimensional string algebras* for which the indecomposable modules are completely classified by string and band modules. In this thesis, we will not explicitly construct the band module associated to bands as their construction is analogous to that of string modules described in this chapter and can be found in detail in the relevant literature ([BR87], [Lak16]).

2.9.2 Loop modules

In this chapter we associate a loop module to any given loopstring. This association is particularly important, as it allows us to interchangeably work with loopstrings and their corresponding modules, especially when studying the submodule structure of a loop module. The construction closely parallels that of string modules, but is expanded by adding a non-zero values to the matrix entries corresponding to loops. Since our focus will be on loopstrings associated to tagged arcs on a punctured surface, we will restrict our attention to such cases.

Let (S, M, P, T) be a punctured surface and Q_T the quiver associated to the triangulation T . Let I be an admissible ideal of the quiver Q_T and define the bound quiver algebra kQ_T/I . Let γ^\bowtie be a doubly notched arc on the surface and consider c_{γ^\bowtie} to be the path on the quiver Q_T which follows the intersection points of γ^\bowtie with the triangulation T . Consider the loop string

$$w := w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}} = a_0 u_1 \dots a_{k-1} u_k a_{k+1} \dots a_{l-1} u_l a_{l+1} \dots a_{n-1} u_n a_n,$$

where $a_i \in Q_T$ for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, $u_j \in \{\leftarrow, \rightarrow\}$ for every $1 \leq j \leq n$ with $j \neq k, l$ and $u_k, u_l \in \{\leftarrow, \rightarrow\}$. Define the index set $\mathcal{I}_a := \{i \mid a_i = a\}$. Then the *loop module* $M(w)$ corresponding to the string w is defined as follows:

- At each vertex $x \in Q_0$ we assign the vector space $M_x = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{I}_x} K_i$ where $K_i = k$ for every $i \in \mathcal{I}_x$.
- For each arrow $a \in Q_1$, where $x \xrightarrow{\alpha} y$ we assign a linear map $M_a: \bigoplus_{j \in \mathcal{I}_x} K_j \rightarrow \bigoplus_{i \in \mathcal{I}_y} K_i$ given by the matrix:

$$(M_a)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} Id_k & \text{if } |i - j| = 1, \\ Id_k & \text{if } i = 0 \text{ and } j = k, \text{ or } i = k \text{ and } j = 0, \\ Id_k & \text{if } i = l - 1 \text{ and } j = n, \text{ or } i = n \text{ and } j = l - 1, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We would like now to clarify two points regarding the construction of the loop module. First, since there is a hook at positions k and l of the loopstring w we can deduce that there must exist an edge connecting the vertices a_0 and a_k , as well as an edge connecting a_{l-1} and a_n in the quiver Q_T . This ensures the existence of two matrices, denoted M_α and M_β , which are assigned to these edges. The existence of these matrices implies that exactly one of the two conditions $i = 0$ and $j = k$, or $i = k$ and $j = 0$ (resp. $i = l - 1$ and $j = n$, or $i = n$ and $j = l - 1$) must hold. This gives rise to exactly two non-zero entries in the matrices, as intended.

Additionally, although the construction was given for the case where the loopstring has two loops, it naturally reduced to the case with a single loop.

Example 2.9.13. Let (S, M, P, T) be the triangulated surface, and γ^\bowtie the tagged arc, appearing in Figure 2.9. We can then associate the following equivalent loopstrings to γ^\bowtie :

$$w_{\gamma^\bowtie} = 1 \leftarrow 2 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 5,$$

$$w'_{\gamma^\bowtie} = 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5.$$

The loop modules $M(w_{\gamma^\bowtie})$ and $M(w'_{\gamma^\bowtie})$ associated to the loopstrings w_{γ^\bowtie} and w'_{γ^\bowtie} are isomorphic and equal to the following:

$$M(w_{\gamma^\bowtie}) = M(w'_{\gamma^\bowtie}) = \begin{array}{c} k \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ k & \quad & k \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow & & \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ k & & k & \quad & k \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow & & \swarrow \quad \searrow & & \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ k & & k & & k \end{array}.$$

A different way of depicting the module $M(w_{\gamma^\bowtie})$ which resembles closely the loopstring structure is the following:

$$M(w_{\gamma^\bowtie}) = \begin{array}{c} 5 \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ 2 & \quad & 4 \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow & & \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ 1 & & 3 \end{array},$$

while the equivalent way of representing $M(w'_{\gamma^\bowtie})$ is:

$$M(w'_{\gamma^\bowtie}) = \begin{array}{c} 5 \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ 2 & \quad & 4 \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow & & \searrow \\ 1 & & 3 \end{array}.$$

We will refer to the above presentations as the loopstring presentation of the module. In practice, this will be the primary way we visualize loopstrings or loop modules from now on, as this depiction makes it easier to identify maximal submodules. By locating a top and removing it we can directly read off submodule structures.

In Example 2.9.13, notice that equivalent loopstrings give rise to isomorphic modules. The natural question that arise then is the following: “Is the construction of the loop modules compatible with the different loopstrings that may be associated to the same tagged arc γ^\bowtie ?” We should expect to associate the same loop module $M(w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}})$ to a given tagged arc, as seen in Example 2.9.13, and this is indeed the case, as the next proposition indicates.

Proposition 2.9.14. *Let γ^\bowtie a tagged arc on the triangulated surface (S, M, P, T) and $w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$ and $w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$ two loopstrings associated to γ^\bowtie . Then the modules $M(w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}})$ and $M(w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}})$ are the same.*

Proof. Let us assume that γ^\bowtie has only one tagging. Let

$$w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}} = a_0 u_1 \dots a_{k-1} u_k a_k u_{k+1} \dots u_n a_n,$$

$$w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}} = a_{k-1} u'_1 \dots a_0 u_k a_k u_{k+1} \dots u_n a_n,$$

be the two loopstrings. Notice that the sequence of vertices (a_0, \dots, a_{k-1}) in the loopstring $w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$, appears in the opposite order in the loopstring $w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$.

By the construction of the loop modules we have non-zero entries in the matrices when there are consecutive vertices a_i, a_{i+1} (i.e. when $|i - j| = 1$). Additionally, since there is only one loop starting from the left, we have an additional non-zero entry (when $i = 0$ and $j = k$, or $i = k$ and $j = 0$).

Therefore, the consecutive vertices $a_i, a_{i+1}, 0 \leq i \leq n-1$ in the string $w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$ give rise to a non-zero entry. If $k \leq i \leq n-1$, then the vertices a_i, a_{i+1} appear in that order in the loopstring $w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$, and so they give rise to a non-zero entry in the equivalent matrix. If $0 \leq i \leq k-2$, then the vertices a_i, a_{i+1} appear in the opposite order in the loopstring $w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$, and so they still give rise to a non-zero entry in the equivalent matrix.

Lastly, let us assume that $i = k-1$. Looking at the string $w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}}$ we can notice that the vertex a_{k-1} is the first vertex and the vertex a_k is the first vertex after the hook u_k . We can therefore rewrite:

$$w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}} = b_0 u'_1 \dots b_{k-1} u_k b_k u_{k+1} \dots u_n b_n,$$

where $b_0 = a_{k-1}..$. Notice that then, we must have a non-zero entry in the corresponding matrix, (following the construction of the matrix $(M_\alpha)_{i,j, \cdot}$) since in this case $i = 0$ and $j = k$.

Therefore, the corresponding matrices assigned to the arrows in the quiver representations $M(w_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}})$ and $M(w'_{c_{\gamma^\bowtie}})$ must be the same, and subsequently the modules are isomorphic. ■

Remark 2.9.15. In the case of the strings algebras, we mentioned in the previous chapter that the string and band modules give a complete classification of the indecomposable modules of those algebras.

It is not too difficult to show that loop modules are indecomposable modules, by combining the fact that string modules are indecomposable and exploring what happens with the extra non empty entries to the suitable matrices. Therefore, a natural question, would be to ask if the loop modules, together with some other possible modules (e.g. string and band modules), could fully classify the indecomposable representations of some algebras. However, when working with path algebras, we usually require the representations to satisfy the conditions of the admissible ideal I , which not necessarily happens in our definition of loop modules.

Chapter 3

Bijection of loop graphs and loopstrings

In this section we aim to prove that there is a bijection between the lattice of a loop graph and the submodule lattice of the associated loopstring. At first we will expand on some results on perfect matchings and generalize some results from [CS21] which will be needed for the final proof of Theorem 3.3.1.

3.1 Minimal and maximal perfect matchings

In this section we will define two special perfect matchings of a loop graph $Q_{\mathcal{G}^\bowtie}$ that will be of a great importance later. Our definition is dual to the one given by Wilson [Wil20]. However, we will also prove in Lemma 3.2.4 that if the given graph G has at least two tiles, that definition is equivalent to the one given by Çanakçı-Schroll [CS21].

Remark 3.1.1. Based on the definition of maximal and minimal perfect matchings of a loop graph $\mathcal{G}^\bowtie = (G_1, \dots, G_n)^\bowtie$ we can notice the following:

- if G_2 is on the right of G_1 then $W(G_1)$ (resp. $N(G_1)$ or $S(G_1)$) belong to the minimal (resp. maximal) perfect matching, if they are boundary edges,
- if G_2 is on top of G_1 then $W(G_1)$ or $S(G_1)$ (resp. $S(G_1)$) belong to the minimal (resp. maximal) perfect matching, if they are boundary edges.

We will denote the minimum perfect matching by P_{min} and the maximal perfect matching by P_{max} .

Also if \mathcal{G} is a snake or loop graph we will denote by $E^{bdry}(\mathcal{G})$ the collection of boundary edges of \mathcal{G} . We also note that if \mathcal{G} is a loop graph then the edges that are identified with each other are not boundary.

If P and P' are perfect matchings of a graph \mathcal{G} , then we will denote by $P \ominus P'$ their *symmetric difference*, namely the collection of all edges that belong either only to P or only to P' .

Remark 3.1.2. Suppose that G is a snake graph and that $H = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ is a subgraph of G where the tiles G_1, \dots, G_k form a maximal zig-zag piece. Suppose $P = P_{\max}$ or $P = P_{\min}$. Then the following are true:

- each tile G_2, \dots, G_{k-1} has exactly one of its edges in $P|_H$,
- if the tile G_1 has two of its edges in $P|_H$, then none of the edges of G_k is in $P|_H$,
- if the tile G_1 has none of its edges in $P|_H$, then two of the edges of G_k are in $P|_H$.

Lemma 3.1.3. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}^\bowtie = (G_1, \dots, G_k, \dots, G_n)^\bowtie$ is a loop graph in which edges of the tiles G_1 and G_k are identified, G_2 is on the right of G_1 and P is a perfect matching of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie . Then $E^{\text{bdry}}(G_j) \in P \ominus P_{\min}$, $1 \leq j < k-1$, if and only if $E^{\text{bdry}}(G_i) \in P \ominus P_{\min}$ for all $j < i \leq k-1$.

Proof. Suppose that $E^{\text{bdry}}(G_j) \in P \ominus P_{\min}$ for some $1 \leq j < k-1$. We will first show that $E^{\text{bdry}}(G_{k-1}) \in P \ominus P_{\min}$. By the definition of P_{\min} , no edges of G_1 are in P_{\min} . Therefore G_{k-1} , which is the last tile of the zig-zag, must have two of its edges in P_{\min} and all the other tiles G_2, \dots, G_{k-2} have exactly one of their edges in P_{\min} .

Notice that each perfect matching is connected to the minimal perfect matching by a series of flips that satisfy the twist parity condition. Therefore, since $E^{\text{bdry}}(G_j) \in P \ominus P_{\min}$, it follows that we must first flip the edges of the tile G_{k-1} . Thus, $E^{\text{bdry}}(G_{k-1}) \in P \ominus P_{\min}$.

Notice, that after flipping the edges of G_{k-1} we can only flip the edges of G_{k-2} , since it is the only other tile with two of its edges in P . Continuing inductively, the second part of the Lemma follows. \blacksquare

Corollary 3.1.4. Suppose that $\mathcal{G}^\bowtie = (G_1, \dots, G_k, \dots, G_n)^\bowtie$ is a loop graph in which edges of the tiles G_1 and G_k are identified, G_2 is on the right of G_1 and P is a perfect matching of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie . If $H_i = \{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_n}\}$ is a connected subgraph of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie , then the corresponding loopstring w_i of H_i is equivalent to a "connected" loopstring $w'_i = a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_n}$.

Proof. The proof is a direct consequence of Lemma 2.8.4 and Lemma 3.1.3. \blacksquare

3.2 Perfect matching lattices and submodule lattices

Our aim in this section is to make the bijection in Remark 7.11 [Wil20] explicit.

In this section, when referring to a loop graph $\mathcal{G}^\bowtie = (G_1, \dots, G_k, \dots, G_n)^\bowtie$ we will mean a loop graph with a loop at the beginning of the graph in which edges of the tiles G_1 and G_k are identified. The results in this section can be naturally generalised in the dual case where we have one loop at the end of the graph or in

the case that there are two loops, one at the beginning and one at the end of the graph.

Lemma 3.2.1. *Suppose that $G = \{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$ is a snake graph without loops. Then, the tile G_i of G has two of its boundary edges in P_{min} if and only if it corresponds to a socle.*

Proof. We will use induction on the number of tiles of the graph.

- *base case*

If the graph G has only one tile, then obviously that tile corresponds to a socle and it has two of its edges in P_{min} .

- *induction step*

Suppose now, that our assumption is true for every graph with k tiles. We will prove that this is also true for a graph $G = \{G_1, \dots, G_k, G_{k+1}\}$ with $k+1$ tiles.

There are two cases. Either the tile G_{k+1} is on the right of G_k or it is on top of it. We will deal with the first case, since the other is completely symmetrical.

1. Assume that $E(G_{k+1})$ is in P_{min} . We will prove then, that G_{k+1} does not correspond to a socle. We will consider cases on the configuration of the tile G_{k-1}, G_k and G_{k+1} .

If these three tiles form a straight piece, then we can deduce that $N(G_k)$ and $S(G_k)$ are also in P_{min} . Therefore, when we consider the subgraph $G' = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ and the induced P'_{min} on that graph, using our induction hypothesis, we obtain that G_k correspond to a socle. Subsequently, G_{k+1} cannot correspond to a socle.

If the tiles G_{k-1}, G_k and G_{k+1} form a zig-zag, suppose that G_l is the fist tile of the maximal zig-zag piece. Since $E(G_{k+1})$ is in P_{min} , we deduce that $N(G_k)$ and $S(G_k)$ are also in P_{min} . Therefore, when we consider the subgraph $G' = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ and the induced P'_{min} on that graph, using our induction hypothesis, we obtain that G_l correspond to a socle. Subsequently, there is a local configuration of arrows

$l \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow k \leftarrow k+1$, which means that G_{k+1} does not correspond to a socle.

2. Assume now that $N(G_{k+1})$ and $S(G_{k+1})$ are in P_{min} . We will prove then, that G_{k+1} corresponds to a socle. Again, we will consider cases on the configuration of the tile G_{k-1}, G_k and G_{k+1} .

If these three tiles form a straight piece, then we can deduce that none of the boundary edges of G_k are in P_{min} . Therefore, when we consider the subgraph $G' = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$ and the induced P'_{min} on that graph, which contains only the east boundary edge of G_k , using our induction hypothesis, we obtain that G_k does not correspond to a socle. Subsequently, G_{k+1} must correspond to a socle.

If the tiles G_{k-1}, G_k and G_{k+1} form a zig-zag, then we can deduce that

the induced P'_{min} of the subgraph $G' = \{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$, contains $W(G_k)$ and $E(G_k)$. Therefore, using our induction hypothesis on G' , we obtain that G_k corresponds to a socle of the quiver which is generated by the subgraph G' . Subsequently, there is a local configuration of arrows $k-1 \rightarrow k$. Since, the tiles G_{k-1}, G_k and G_{k+1} form a zig-zag this local configurations of arrows extends to the following configuration: $k-1 \rightarrow k \rightarrow k+1$. This means that G_{k+1} corresponds to a socle, which completes the proof. ■

Remark 3.2.2. The previous Lemma 3.2.1, shows that our definition of minimal and maximal perfect matchings is equivalent to the definition of Çanakçı-Schroll. This also builds a bridge between the definition of Wilson's minimal and maximal perfect matchings, since it shows that a tile G_i of the snake graph has two of its edges in P_{max} if and only if it corresponds to a socle.

The dual of the previous Lemma is also true. The only difference is that we need to exclude the first and the last tile, since when they correspond to a top, one of their boundary edges is part of P_{min} . We state it explicitly in the next Lemma, omitting the proof.

Lemma 3.2.3. *Suppose that $G = \{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$ is a snake graph. Then, the tile G_i , for $1 < i < n$, of the snake graph has none of its boundary edges in P_{min} if and only if it corresponds to a top.*

We would like to have a similar result also for the case of loop graphs, since this is the main interest of this report. It turns out that the same statement is also true for loop graphs, and the next Lemma is going to be one of our main tools for the proofs that will follow.

Lemma 3.2.4. *Suppose that G^\bowtie is a loop graph with at least one loop at the beginning or at the end of the graph. Then, the tile G_i of G^\bowtie has two of its boundary edges in P_{min} if and only if it corresponds to a socle.*

Proof. Consider the plain snake graph G associated to the loop graph G^\bowtie . Then, by definition, the minimal perfect matching P_{min} of G^\bowtie can be extended to the minimal perfect matching P'_{min} of G . Suppose that Q is the quiver associated to G^\bowtie and Q' is the quiver associated to G' . Observe now the following:

- (i) By construction, the vertex of Q associated to the last tile of the loop graph, is a socle if and only if it is a socle in Q' .
- (ii) If G_k , $1 < k < n$, is a tile in which at least one of its boundary edges has been identified with another edge of the graph, then, by construction the vertex k of the quiver Q never corresponds to a socle nor a top.

Continuing now with the proof, suppose that there is a loop at the end of the graph G^\bowtie , and let G_k be the tile in which we have identified one of its boundary edges

with an edge of the tile G_n . First of all, it can be easily seen that if $1 \leq i < n$ and $i \neq k$, the local configuration around the vertex i on the quivers Q and Q' is the same, so the tile corresponds to a socle in Q if and only if it corresponds to a socle in Q' and so the result follows from Lemma 3.2.1.

Regarding the tile G_k , as noted above in (ii), it cannot correspond to a socle in Q . However, we can also notice that it has only one boundary edge, so it can't have two boundary edges in P_{min} .

Lastly, regarding the tile G_n , as noted above in (i), it corresponds to a socle in Q if and only if it corresponds to a socle in Q' , and so the result follows by Lemma 3.2.1. This completes the proof, since the case that there is a loop at the beginning of the graph follows in exactly the same way. \blacksquare

We will now proceed with the first main step on proving that there is a bijection between the perfect matching lattice of a loop graph and the canonical submodule lattice the associated loop word. For this, we will prove that each perfect matching of a loop graph can be canonically associated to a submodule of the corresponding loop word.

Proposition 3.2.5. *Let $A = kQ^\bowtie/I$, where I is an admissible ideal in kQ^\bowtie . Let w be a loopstring, and $M(w)$ be the associated loop module over A . Suppose P is a perfect matching of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie . Then $P \ominus P_{min}$ gives rise to a canonical submodule $M(P)$ of $M(w)$.*

Proof. We have that $P \ominus P_{min} = \bigcup H_i$ where each H_i is a connected subgraph of $\mathcal{G}(w)$ and for each i there is a canonical embedding of graphs $\phi_i: H_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(w)$. We will show that each H_i gives rise to a canonical submodule $M(w_i)$ and these in turn will give rise to the canonical submodule $M(P) = \bigoplus M(w_i)$.

Let T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_n} be the tiles of H_i . Then we can consider the sub-loopstring $w_i = a_{i_1} \dots a_{i_n-1}$ (by Lemma 3.1.4) of the loopstring w which is defined to be the restriction of w to the elements of the set $\{\rightarrow, \leftarrow, \leftrightarrow, \hookrightarrow\}$ which are corresponding to the tiles of H_i . First of all, assume that H_i contains only one tile T_{i_1} . Using Lemma 3.2.4, we see that then T_{i_1} corresponds to a socle and then obviously $M(w_i)$ is a submodule of $M(w)$.

Suppose, from now on that H_i contains at least two tiles.

We know that each subloopstring w_i gives rise to a representation of A . Since each H_i is connected, the representation $M(w_i)$ associated to w_i is irreducible. Therefore $M(w_i)$ would not be a subrepresentation, and subsequently a submodule of $M(w)$, if and only if none of the following is true:

- there exists an arrow $i_1 \rightarrow i_1 - 1$ in the quiver Q^\bowtie ,
- there exists an arrow $i_n \rightarrow i_n + 1$ in the quiver Q^\bowtie

We will show that none of the above is true for $M(w_i)$ focusing only on the first case, since the second is similar.

First, suppose that $T_j = G_j$ for each $1 \leq j \leq k$, namely that H_i contains the whole zig-zag of the loop. Then $i_1 = 1$ so there is not a vertex $i_1 - 1$ and subsequently

no arrow $i_1 \rightarrow i_1 - 1$ in the quiver Q^\bowtie .

Suppose now that H_j contains a strict subset of the tiles $\{G_1, \dots, G_k\}$. Using Lemma 3.1.3, we see that $T_{i_1} = G_j$ for some $1 < j \leq k-1$ and since the tiles G_{j-1} and G_j are part of the zig-zag, we have that there exists an arrow $j-1 \rightarrow j$, and so there is no arrow $i_1 \rightarrow i_1 - 1$ in the quiver Q^\bowtie .

Lastly suppose that T_{i_1} is not part of the loop of the loop graph. Assume that there is an arrow $i_1 \rightarrow i_1 - 1$ in the quiver Q^\bowtie . We consider the following cases:

Suppose that there is an arrow $i_1 \rightarrow i_2$. Then T_{i_1} corresponds to a top and using Lemma 3.2.3 we take that none of the edges of T_{i_1} belong to P_{min} . Therefore, due to the twist parity condition, $T_{i_1} \in P \ominus P_{min}$ if and only if we have flipped the edges of both the tiles T_{i_1-1} and T_{i_2} . But then we would also have that the tile T_{i_1-1} belongs to H_i which is not true.

Suppose now that there is an arrow $i_2 \rightarrow i_1$. Then there must exist a zig-zag of tiles $T_{i_1-1}, T_{i_1}, T_{i_2}, \dots, T_{i_l}$, $2 \leq l \leq n$, where T_l corresponds to a top. The tiles $T_{i_1-1}, T_{i_1}, T_{i_2}, \dots, T_{i_l-1}$ have exactly one of their edges in P_{min} . Additionally, since T_l is a top, it has none of its edges in P_{min} . Therefore, since we have that $T_l \in P \ominus P_{min}$ we see that due to the twist parity condition, we first need to flip the edges of T_{i_l-1} and inductively the edges of T_{i_1-1} . However, in that case we would also have that the tile T_{i_1-1} belongs to H_i which is not true.

Lastly, we need to show now that there is a canonical embedding $M(P) \hookrightarrow M(w)$. Each canonical embedding of graphs $\phi_i: H_i \rightarrow \mathcal{G}(w)$ determines a tile T_{j_i} which is the first tile of H_i , when we consider it as a subgraph of $\mathcal{G}(w)$. This tile corresponds to a vertex of the quiver Q^\bowtie and some vertex of w_i . Identifying these two vertices gives rise to a canonical embedding $M(w_i) \hookrightarrow M(w)$ which in turn gives rise to a canonical embedding $M(P) \hookrightarrow M(w)$. ■

Conversely, given a canonical submodule $N = N(w_1) \oplus \dots \oplus N(w_n)$ of a loop module $M(w)$, with canonical embedding ϕ , we want to associate a perfect matching P_N of the loop graph \mathcal{G}_w . Suppose H_i is the loop subgraph of \mathcal{G}_w which corresponds to the embedding ϕ . We define:

$$P^c(H_i) = E^{bdry}(H_i) \setminus P_{min}|_{H_i},$$

$$P_N = (\bigcup P^c(H_i)) \bigcup P_{min}|_{\mathcal{G}^\bowtie \setminus \bigcup H_i}.$$

Remark 3.2.6. Note that $P^c(H_i) = P_{max}(H_i)$ when the subgraph H_i contains at least two tiles. However, if H_i consists of only one tile then $P^c(H_i)$ is equal to either $P_{max}(H_i)$ or $P_{min}(H_i)$.

Proposition 3.2.7. *The set of edges P_N as defined above is a perfect matching of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie and $N = M(P_N)$.*

Proof. In order to prove that this is indeed a perfect matching, we just have to prove that $P^c(H_i)$ is a perfect matching of the subgraph H_i .

We will prove this by induction on the number of tiles of H_i .

- *base case:*

If H_i contains only one tile then this tile corresponds to a socle and according to Lemma 3.2.4. this tile has two of its edges in P_{min} . But then, this means that $P^c(H_i)$ is also a perfect matching of H_i .

- *induction step:*

Suppose that, for each subgraph H of \mathcal{G}_w which contains less than k tiles, $P^c(H)$ is a perfect matching of H . We will prove that this is also true when H is a subgraph of \mathcal{G}_w with k tiles.

Suppose that $H_i = \{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_k}\}$ with $i_k > 1$. Suppose that the module $N(w'_i)$ is a maximal submodule of $N(w_i)$. Then, $N(w'_i)$ is either a direct sum of two submodules or is an indecomposable module..

Suppose that $N(w'_i)$ is indecomposable. This means that the subgraph H'_i , which is the graph corresponding to $N(w'_i)$, is connected. Therefore, $H'_i = \{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_{k-1}}\}$ or $H'_i = \{T_{i_2}, \dots, T_{i_k}\}$. W.l.o.g suppose that

$H'_i = \{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_{k-1}}\}$ and that T_{i_k} is on the right of $T_{i_{k-1}}$, meaning that $E(T_{i_{k-1}})$ is an interior edge. Using the induction hypothesis, $P^c(H'_i)$ is a perfect matching of H'_i . Since $E(T_{i_{k-1}})$ is an interior edge, it cannot belong to $P^c(H'_i)$. However, in a perfect matching, all edges must be matched, so $N(T_{i_{k-1}})$ and $S(T_{i_{k-1}})$ are in P_{min} . Therefore, in order to prove that $P^c(H_i)$ is a perfect matching of H_i we just need to prove that $E(T_{i_k})$ is in P_{min} , since then we will also have that all the edges of the tile T_{i_k} are matched.

Suppose that $E(T_{i_k})$ is not in P_{min} . However, this can happen only if there is an additional tile on the right or above of T_{i_k} . This means that the tile $T_{i_{k+1}}$ is a tile of \mathcal{G}_w and that the simple corresponding to T_{i_k} is a top of $M(w)$, since none of it's edges belong in P_{min} (this is the dual statement of Lemma 3.2.4). But then, the maximal submodule of $N(w_i)$ which does not contain the simple corresponding to T_{i_k} would be a direct sum of two submodules, which is a contradiction.

Suppose now that $N(w'_i) = N_1 \oplus N_2$, where N_1, N_2 are submodules of N_w . Then we know that $H_1 = \{T_{i_1}, \dots, T_{i_{d-1}}\}$ and $H_2 = \{T_{i_{d+1}}, \dots, T_{i_k}\}$ are subgraphs corresponding to N_1 and N_2 respectively for some $1 < d < k$. Therefore, the simple module corresponding to T_d is a top of both N_1 and N_2 . So the tiles T_{d-1}, T_d and T_{d+1} form a straight piece and w.l.o.g assume that this is a horizontal piece. Therefore, $E(T_{d-1})$ and $E(T_{d+1})$ are interior edges. Also, by the induction hypothesis we have that $P^c(H_1)$ and $P^c(H_2)$ are perfect matchings. Since $E(T_{d-1})$ and $E(T_{d+1})$ are interior edges, they cannot belong to $P_{min}(H)$ and so by the definition of P^c , we have that these two edges are part of the perfect matchings $P^c(H_1)$ and $P^c(H_2)$ respectively. But then this means that also $P^c(H_i)$ is a perfect matching of H_i , since we can flip the tiles of T_d and this will still be a perfect matching.

To prove the last statement, by definition of $P_g(H_i)$ we have that:

$$M(P^c(H_i) \bigcup P_{min}|_{\mathcal{G}^{\bowtie} \setminus H_i} = N(w_i),$$

and so we take that $M(P_N) = N$.

■

3.3 Bijection between perfect matching lattices and canonical submodule lattices

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section. Namely, we prove the existence of a bijection between the perfect matching lattice and the submodule lattice of the associated module.

Theorem 3.3.1. *Let $A = kQ^\bowtie/I$ and $M(w)$ be a loop module over A with associated loop graph \mathcal{G}^\bowtie . Then $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$, which denotes the perfect matching lattice of \mathcal{G} is in bijection with the canonical submodule lattice $\mathcal{L}(M(w))$.*

Proof. By propositions 3.2.5 and 3.2.7 we have that the two lattices are equal as sets. Suppose that $H(\mathcal{G})$ and $H(M)$ are the Hasse diagrams of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$ and $\mathcal{L}(M(w))$. We need to show that there exists an edge between two vertices in $H(\mathcal{G})$ if and only if there exists an edge between the two corresponding vertices of $H(M)$.

Suppose that P and P' are two perfect matchings of $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$ which are connected with an edge in $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{G})$. Let $P \ominus P_{min} = \bigcup H_i$ and $P' \ominus P_{min} = \bigcup H'_i$, and $\phi: \bigcup H_i \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}^\bowtie$ and $\phi': \bigcup H'_i \hookrightarrow \mathcal{G}^\bowtie$ the corresponding canonical embedding of graphs. Since P and P' are connected with an edge, we have that they agree everywhere apart from one tile T_l in which they have opposite matchings. W.l.o.g. suppose that the tile T_l is in $P \ominus P_{min}$.

We can associate to P' a submodule N of $M(w)$. Since P and P' agree in all other tiles apart from T_l by our construction in Prop.3.2.5 this submodule is exactly $M(w_P)$ removing the simple corresponding to T_l . However, this means that these two modules N and $M(w_P)$ are connected with an edge in $H(M)$. Following Prop.3.2.5 we also have two induced canonical embeddings of modules $\Phi': N \hookrightarrow M(w)$ and $\Phi: M(w_P) \hookrightarrow M(w)$. Since these embeddings are induced by the canonical embeddings of graphs ϕ and ϕ' , which agree everywhere apart from the tile T_l , we see that $\Phi|_N = \Phi'$.

Conversely suppose that $(M(w_i), \phi_i)$ and $(M(w_j), \phi_j)$ are two canonical submodules of $M(w)$ connected by an edge in $H(M)$. Then w_i and w_j agree in every vertex apart from one vertex l . W.l.o.g. assume that l belongs to w_i . Following our construction in Prop.3.2.7 there are two perfect matchings $P_{M(w_i)}$ and $P_{M(w_j)}$ corresponding to $M(w_i)$ and $M(w_j)$ respectively. Then we have that :

$$(P_{M(w_i)} \ominus P_{min}) \bigcup (P_{M(w_j)} \ominus P_{min}) = T,$$

where T is a tile of \mathcal{G}^\bowtie . But this means that $P_{M(w_i)}$ and $P_{M(w_j)}$ agree on all tiles apart from T and so by the definition of the perfect matching lattice of a loop graph there must be an edge connecting the two perfect matchings.

■

Chapter 4

Skein relations

4.1 Skein relations for crossing arcs

Our goal in this section is to explore and prove skein relation in the cases that involve:

- (i) a plain arc and a singly notched arc, which cross each other,
- (ii) a plain arc and a doubly notched arc, which cross each other,
- (iii) two singly notched arcs, which cross each other,
- (iv) a singly notched arc and a doubly notched arc, which cross each other,
- (v) two doubly notched arcs which cross each other.

These are the first five cases which are listed in the Appendix of [MSW13]. The following theorem addresses these cases:

Theorem 4.1.1. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface and \mathcal{A} the cluster algebra associated to it. Let γ_1 and γ_2 two arcs, which cross on the surface and let (γ_3, γ_4) and (γ_5, γ_6) be the two pairs of arcs obtained by smoothing the crossing. Then :*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = Y^- x_{\gamma_3} x_{\gamma_4} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_5} x_{\gamma_6},$$

where x_{γ_i} denotes the cluster algebra element associated to the arc γ_i and Y^-, Y^+ are monomials in y_i coefficients and satisfy the condition that one of the two is equal to 1.

4.1.1 Resolution of crossing between two arcs, with non empty overlap

Suppose that (S, M, P) is a punctured surface and T is a triangulation. Then, one can associate a Cluster Algebra $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(x_T, y_T, Q_T)$ and a Jacobian algebra to that


surface and that triangulation. We have also showcased, how one can associate a loopstring, given a loop graph.

Suppose that there is a crossing between two arcs γ_1 and γ_2 , where both arcs can have one or both of their endpoints tagged notched in their endpoints. We can then associate two loopstrings to them, w_2 and w_1 respectively.

In [QS21], the authors interpreted the notion of crossing of snake graphs and their resolutions, as these were defined in [QS13], in terms of string combinatorics. This interpretation will prove very useful to us, since when there is a crossing between two arcs which follows the restrictions of this section (i.e. a plain arc and a singly notched arc crossing), on the surface S , the resolution of the crossing does not depend significantly on the existence of punctures on the surface.

The following definition, is a generalization of the first part of Definition 4.1 in [QS21].

Definition 4.1.2. Suppose that w_1 and w_2 are two abstract loopstrings which possibly contain a hook at their start or their end. Assume that $w_1 = h_1 u_1 a m b v_1 h_2$ and $w_2 = h_3 u_2 c m d v_2 h_4$ where u_i, v_i, m are substrings, a, d are direct arrows, b, c are inverse arrows, and h_i are hooks. We then say that w_1 and w_2 cross in m .



The *resolution of the crossing of w_1 and w_2 with respect to m* are the loopstrings w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 which are defined as follows:

$$(i) \quad w_3 = h_1 u_1 a m b v_2 h_4.$$

$$(ii) \quad w_4 = h_3 u_2 c m b v_1 h_2.$$

(iii)

$$w_5 = \begin{cases} h_1 u_1 e u_2^{-1} h_3 & \text{if } u_1, u_2 \neq \emptyset \text{ and where } e = \leftarrow. \\ h_1 u_2' h_3 & \text{if } u_1 = \emptyset \text{ and } u_2 \neq \emptyset. \\ h_1 u_1' h_3 & \text{if } u_2 = \emptyset \text{ and } u_1 \neq \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

where u_2' is such that $u_2 = u_2' r''$ where r'' is a maximal sequence of direct arrows and u_1' is such that $u_1 = u_1' r'$ where r' is a maximal sequence of inverse arrows.

(iv)

$$w_6 = \begin{cases} h_2 v_1^{-1} f v_2 h_4 & \text{if } v_1, v_2 \neq \emptyset \text{ and where } f = \rightarrow. \\ h_2 v'_2 h_4 & \text{if } v_1 = \emptyset \text{ and } v_2 \neq \emptyset. \\ h_2 v'_1 h_4 & \text{if } v_2 = \emptyset \text{ and } v_1 \neq \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

where v'_2 is such that $v_2 = r'' v'_2$, where r'' is a maximal sequence of inverse arrows and v'_1 is such that $v_1 = r'' v'_1$, where r'' is a maximal sequence of direct arrows

The resolution of a crossing of w_1 and w_2 is illustrated in Figure (4.1)

Remark 4.1.3. Looking at definition 4.1.2, one can notice that it is almost identical to the definition given in [CS21]. The main difference is the inclusion of the hooks h_1, h_2, h_3 and h_4 . This should come as no surprise, since the resolution of the crossing between two arcs, should behave in the same way, even if the arcs are tagged notched on their endpoints. We could give the previous definition in two steps, by first reducing the notched arcs to their plain versions, applying definition 4.1, and then adding the tagging at the appropriate arcs.

Remark 4.1.4. Since we are dealing with all possible five cases listed at the start of the section, we are allowing endpoints of the arcs to be untagged to their endings. In this case the definition remains the same by just setting $h_i = \emptyset$ to the appropriate hooks.

At this point we need to make some clarifications regarding the notation of a hook and how it "interacts" with other strings.

Remark 4.1.5. Suppose that $(S, M.P, T)$ is a triangulated surface, p is a puncture and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are the arcs of the triangulation T that are adjacent to the puncture p written in a clockwise order. Then, the collection of these arc is called a hook around p and we write $h_p = \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_n$. Note that the labeling of the arcs is arbitrary and there is no clear choice of which adjacent arc to p we could name α_i . However, if β_1, \dots, β_n is a different labeling, which satisfies the rule that the arcs are labeled in the clockwise order, $h'_p = \beta_1 \dots \beta_n$ is equivalent to h_p .


We need to also note that you cannot define a loopstring $w = h$.

In practice, during the proofs and the examples we are allowed to change equivalent representations of h without explicitly mentioning it every time. The necessity of it, is showcased in the next example 4.1.6.

Example 4.1.6. *Example including picture where I am explaining the notation of $w = uh$.*

Now that we have explained what a hook is, we need to make one more convention regarding the notation of the resolution.

Remark 4.1.7. Let w_i , $1 \leq i \leq 6$ as they were defined in 4.1.2. Suppose that $v_1 = a_1 \dots a_n$ and $h = a_{n-k} \dots a_n a_{n+1} \dots a_m$, where $k < n$. Then $v_1 h = a_1 \dots a_n a_{n+1} \dots a_m$, instead of $a_1 \dots a_n a_{n-k} \dots a_n a_{n+1} \dots a_m$ which does not correspond to a module in the Jacobian algebra.

Figure 4.1: Resolution of w_1 and w_2 .

In our next remark, we will illustrate a key ingredient for some of the proofs that will follow. The key idea is that if w is a string module, and a is a vertex corresponding to a top w , then removing a we take a maximal submodule $w' = w \setminus a$ of w . Therefore in principle, we could "reach" each submodule of w by sequentially removing tops a_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, from w .

Remark 4.1.8. Suppose that w is a loopstring (or equivalently a module). If m is a submodule of w then there exists a sequence (a_1, \dots, a_n) such that m can be "reached" from w by removing one simple belonging to the top of each submodule. However, this sequence is not necessarily unique. For example if we consider the quiver $Q : 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4$ and the submodule $0 \rightarrow k \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0$ of $k \rightarrow k \leftarrow k \leftarrow k$, then three possible sequences would be $(1, 4, 3)$, $(4, 1, 3)$ or $(4, 3, 1)$.

An additional thing that one can notice, is that if we are given the end of a sequence $\{b_k, \dots, b_n\}$ leading to a submodule m of w , and another sequence $\{a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, a_k, \dots, a_n\}$, where $\{a_k, \dots, a_n\}$ is a rearrangement of the sequence $\{b_k, \dots, b_n\}$, then we also have that $\{a_1, \dots, a_{k-1}, b_k, \dots, b_n\}$ is a sequence from w to m .

For example, if we were given in the previous quiver Q , and there exists sequences $(\dots, 1, 3)$ and $(4, 3, 1)$ leading from $k \rightarrow k \leftarrow k \leftarrow k$ to $0 \rightarrow k \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0$, we could deduce that there exists also the sequence $(4, 1, 3)$ leading from $k \rightarrow k \leftarrow k \leftarrow k$ to $0 \rightarrow k \leftarrow 0 \leftarrow 0$.

Proposition 4.1.9. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 as they were defined in 4.1.2. Suppose that m_1 (resp. m_2) is a proper submodule of $w_3 \oplus w_4$ (resp $w_5 \oplus w_6$). If m_1 (resp. m_2) is reached from $w_3 \oplus w_4$ (resp. $w_5 \oplus w_6$) by the sequence (a_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$ (resp. $w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m)$) to obtain a submodule m'_1 (resp. m'_2) of it.*

Proof. Suppose that m_1 is a submodule of $w_3 \oplus w_4$ and (a_i) , for $1 \leq i \leq n$ is a

sequence of simples of $w_3 \oplus w_4$, such that $(\dots ((w_3 \oplus w_4/a_1)/a_2)/\dots)/a_n = m_1$. In the context of loopstrings, this corresponds to removing a sequence of vertices (a_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n$, such that in each step, there is no incoming arrow to that vertex. We will prove the statement by induction. For the base case, we want to prove that if a_1 belongs to the top of the module $w_3 \oplus w_4$, then it also belongs to the top of the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$. It follows immediately by the structure of each string, that if a_1 belongs to one of the substrings u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 or is the top of the hook h then it is also a top for the module $w_3 \oplus w_4$. If a_1 is the first letter of the string m , then since this is also assumed to be a top, it means that it was removed from the string w_4 , and therefore $w_4 = u_2 \xleftarrow{c} a_1 \longrightarrow (m \setminus a_1)v_1h$. Therefore a_1 belongs also to the top of w_2 . A similar argument works also for when a_1 is assumed to be the last letter of the string m .

Assume now, that the sequence of simples (a_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ has already been removed from both loopstrings $w_3 \oplus w_4$ and $w_1 \oplus w_2$.

We need to take into account two cases, depending on which substring, each a_i belongs. The following construction will do exactly this, showcasing how depending on these cases, which top must be removed and from which submodule.

Construction:

Suppose that a_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$ is not an element of the string m . Then, there is unique choice up to embedding that we can do, regarding from what substring of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ we can remove it. Indeed, if $a_1 \in u_1$ then we can remove a_1 only from the copy of u_1 viewed as a substring of w_1 .

However, if a_1 is an element of the substring m , then there are two choices. We could either remove it from m viewed as a substring of w_1 or a substring of w_2 . In order to make this construction precise, we impose that if we remove an element of m viewed as a substring of w_3 (resp. w_4), then we remove the same element from m viewed as a substring of w_1 (resp. w_2), if this is possible.

In the above construction there is one exception. Without loss of generality assume that $v_1 \neq \emptyset$, (since otherwise we could argue using the hook h_2). Suppose that $a_n = m^l$ where m^l is the last letter of the string m , viewed as a substring of w_3 , and $v_1^l \neq a_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, where v_1^l is the first letter of v_1 . Attempting to remove this simple from the loopstring w_1 would lead to a contradiction, since locally in w_1 the arrow configuration is as follows:

$$m^l \leftarrow v_1^l.$$

Therefore, we need to apply the sequence a_i in a different way. We retrace the removal of tops and instead of removing local tops from the substring m viewed as a substring of w_1 , we remove these tops from m viewed as a substring of w_2 when possible. This procedure is possible since locally the whole substring m is a top in w_2 and therefore in each step we know that we can actually still remove inductively the sequence a_i for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. This allows us to remove $a_n = m^l$ from w_2 since locally now the arrow configuration is the following:

$$m^l \rightarrow v_2^1,$$

where v_2^1 is the first letter of v_2 .

The above construction also indicates us why the induction step is true, since by the way that it was defined we can always remove the next top from the suitable submodule.

Suppose now that m_2 is a submodule of $w_5 \oplus w_6$ and (a_i) , for $1 \leq i \leq n$ is a sequence of simples of $w_5 \oplus w_6$, such that $(\dots((w_3 \oplus w_4/a_1)/a_2)/\dots)/a_n = m_2$. It follows by a simple induction that we can also remove the same sequence (a_i) from the module $w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m)$ since in this case there is always a unique choice up to embedding of submodules that we can inductively remove tops from $w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m)$. ■

Remark 4.1.10. Before going any further, we need to explain how the construction in the above proposition 4.1.9 works and why the exception mentioned is the only case that would lead to a contradiction.

Our goal is to be able to remove tops and map submodules of $w_3 \oplus w_4$ to submodules of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ in a unique way. Since the substring m appears twice in the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$ it is obvious that every time that we remove a simple from m we have to make a choice. In our construction we choose to remove a simple from w_1 if originally the removed simple was from w_3 , when possible. However, we could have chosen to remove that simple from w_2 when removing it from w_2 . Doing so would not create any problems apart from the fact that the exception that we mention would be different, and we would run on the same contradiction without the necessary changes. Based on this proposition, we will later construct a morphism from the submodules of $w_3 \oplus w_4$ to the submodules of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ and we will argue that this map is an injection by construction.

Notice that by making this choice and since all the other substrings h_1u_1, v_1h_2, h_3u_2 and v_2h_4 appear only once on each side, removing a different sequence of tops from $w_3 \oplus w_4$ leads to a different submodule of $w_1 \oplus w_2$. The only non-obvious part on why this assignment is unique regards the aforementioned exception. By assuming that v_1^1 has not been removed already, we make another indirect choice, namely when v_1^1 is not removed and m^l is removed, we "biject" the substring m of w_3 to the substring m of w_2 . However, if both v_1^1 and m^l have been removed already we "biject" the substring m of w_3 to the substring m of w_1 . In practice we have the following correspondence:

$$(h_1u_1)' \oplus w_4 \longrightarrow ((h_1u_1)' \oplus mv_1h_2) \oplus h_3u_2,$$

where $(h_1u_1)'$ is a submodule of h_1u_1 .

From now on, we will not differentiate between a string w and the associated module $M(w)$, denoting both in the same way. Let also $SM(w)$ denote the set of all the submodules of the module M_w .

The first big step towards proving skein relations is establishing a bijection between the submodules of both hands of the resolution. The existence of a bijection between $SM(w_3 \oplus w_4) \cup SM(w_5 \oplus w_6)$ and $SM(w_1 \oplus w_2)$ should come as no surprise,

since as we will see later, these are just two finite sets with the same cardinality. However, the way that this bijection is constructed is very crucial and will allow us later to pass from the loopstrings to the associated monomials.

Theorem 4.1.11. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 as they were defined in 4.1.2. Then there exists a bijection:*

$$\Psi: SM(w_3 \oplus w_4) \bigcup SM(w_5 \oplus w_6) \rightarrow SM(w_1 \oplus w_2),$$

which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(w_3 \oplus w_4) &= w_1 \oplus w_2, \\ \Psi(w_5 \oplus w_6) &= w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m),\end{aligned}$$

where $w_2 \setminus m := u_2 \oplus v_2$.

If w is a submodule of $w_3 \oplus w_4$ which is reached by the sequence $\{a_i\} 1 \leq i \leq n$, and w' is the submodule of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ which is reached by the same sequence, then we define:

$$\Psi(w) = w'.$$

If w is a submodule of $w_5 \oplus w_6$, then $\Psi(w)$ is defined in a similar way.

We will present the proof of the previous Theorem in steps. At first, we will prove that the map Ψ is an injective map. For this, we will need to make a remark regarding the structure of the submodule lattice of a loopstring module.

We are now ready to prove the injectivity of the map Ψ .

Proposition 4.1.12. *The map Ψ as it was defined in Theorem 4.1.11 is an injection.*

Proof. Let $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_3 \oplus w_4) \bigcup SM(w_5 \oplus w_6)$ such that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$. First of all it is obvious by construction of the map Ψ that if both $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_3 \oplus w_4)$ or $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_5 \oplus w_6)$, then $m_1 = m_2$.

We just have to show now, that if $m_1 \in SM(w_3 \oplus w_4)$ and $m_2 \in SM(w_5 \oplus w_6)$ then $\Psi(m_1) \neq \Psi(m_2)$. Assume that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$. Since $m_1 \in SM(w_3 \oplus w_4)$, we know by construction of the map Ψ , that there exists a (not necessarily unique) sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ of simples, such that when viewed as a loopstring $(w_3 \oplus w_4) \setminus \{a_i\} = m_1$. By proposition 4.1.9 and by construction of Ψ , we have that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(w_3 \oplus w_4) \setminus \{a_i\}$.

Similarly, working on m_2 , there is a sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq k$, such that $m_2 = (w_5 \oplus w_6) \setminus \{b_i\}$ and $\Psi(m_2) = \Psi(w_5 \oplus w_6) \setminus \{b_i\}$.

However, since $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$ we obtain:

$$\Psi(w_3 \oplus w_4) \setminus \{a_i\} = \Psi(w_5 \oplus w_6) \setminus \{b_i\}.$$

Since $\Psi(w_3 \oplus w_4) = w_1 \oplus w_2$, and $\Psi(w_5 \oplus w_6) = w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m)$, we further obtain that:

$$(w_1 \oplus w_2) \setminus \{a_i\} = (w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m)) \setminus \{b_i\}.$$

The previous equality shows us that the sets $\{a_i\}$ and $(\{b_i\} \cup m)$ must be equal. By Remark 4.1.8, we can deduce, that there must exist a sequence $\{m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_l}, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ leading from $w_1 \oplus w_2$ to $\Psi(m_2)$. However, this also implies that using the same sequence $\{m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_l}, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$, we can go from the module $w_3 \oplus w_4$ to the module m_2 . This is a contradiction, since this would mean that we could remove either the first or the last letter of the string m without removing any other simple from the loopstrings $h_1 u_1$ or $v_2 h_4$, which cannot happen, by construction of the loopstrings w_3 and w_4 . \blacksquare

What remains to be shown, is that Ψ is also a surjection. For this, we shall argue on the size of both the domain and the codomain of the map. Let us notice first of all, that there is a finite number of elements both in the domain and the codomain. If we manage to prove that this is the same, then surjectivity will follow by the injectivity of Ψ .

Remark 4.1.13. We have already proven in Section 2, that if w is a loopstring module with associated loop graph \mathcal{G} then the perfect matching lattice of \mathcal{G} is in bijection with the canonical submodule lattice $\mathcal{L}(w)$. We also know from Theorem 5.7 in [Wil20], that each perfect matching of \mathcal{G} , corresponds to a summand of x_w , which denotes the associated element of w in the cluster algebra.

It is also easy for one to prove skein relations in the coefficient free case, as it was noted in section 8.4 of [MSW11], since one can reduce the cases that we are working on, to the classic untagged skein relations, which are already known. Therefore, we have that if we set the y variables to be equal to 1, then the associated elements of the cluster algebra in each side of our map Ψ must agree. Therefore, the number of the terms, which does not depend on the y variables, must agree.

Proof of Theorem 4.1.11. The fact that Ψ is a bijection follows immediately from the fact that Ψ is an injective map, as it was proven in Prop 4.1.12 and the fact that

$$|SM(w_3 \oplus w_4)| + |SM(w_5 \oplus w_6)| = |SM(w_1 \oplus w_2)|$$

as it follows from Remark 4.1.13. \blacksquare

4.1.2 Resolution of grafting

Similarly to the classic case of unpunctured surfaces, there is another type of crossing between two arcs on the surface. This type, following the terminology of [CS13], is called grafting and occurs when there is an empty overlap between the associated graphs of the given arcs. The main difference with the previous resolution of the crossing between two arcs, is that, although the two arcs cross on the surface, when constructing the associated snake/ loop graphs or the modules associated to them, there is not a common overlap m to them, as it was the case in the regular crossing.

We will mainly focus on the case that the grafting appears around a puncture, since, in the other case, that it occurs near a boundary component, it is just a

direct generalization of the classic grafting.

Before giving the definition, let us recall what a grafting is. In the classical setting, grafting is basically an operation that given two snake graphs associates four new graphs. In our setting we will do a similar construction working with loopstrings instead of graphs. The main difference with the regular resolution, is that a priori, one could define a grafting between two abstract loopstrings even when they correspond to two arcs which do not cross in the surface. The results proven still hold true in the general case, although in principle we are mainly interested in the cases that the two arcs cross on the surface.

Let $w_1 = u_1 a v_1$ an abstract string and $w_2 = h u_2$ an abstract loopstring, where u_1, v_1, u_2 are substrings, $a \in \{\leftarrow, \rightarrow\}$ and h is a hook. Let also e denote the arrow which connects $t(u_1)$ and $s(u_2)$ in the loopstring w_2 , where $t(u_1)$ denotes the last letter of u_1 and $s(u_2)$ denotes the first letter of u_2 .

We can then construct the following four loopstrings:

- (i) $w_3 = u_1 e u_2$
- (ii)
 - If $a, v_1 \neq \emptyset$ then $w_4 = h v'_1$ where v'_1 is such that $v_1 = r v'_1$, where r is a maximal sequence of direct arrows (resp. inverse arrows) if a is a direct arrow (resp. inverse arrow).
 - If $a, v_1 = \emptyset$ then $w_4 = h \setminus a_1$, where $a_1 = t(e')$ and e' the denotes the second arrow (apart from e) which connects u_2 with h in w_2 .
- (iii) $w_5 = u'_1 h$ where u_1 is such that $u_1 = u'_1 r'$, where r' is a maximal sequence of direct arrows (resp. inverse arrows) if a is a direct arrow (resp. inverse arrow).
- (iv)
 - If $a, v_1 \neq \emptyset$ then $w_6 = v_1^{-1} a u_2$.
 - If $a, v_1 = \emptyset$ then $w_6 = u'_2$ where u'_2 is such that $u_2 = r'' u'_2$, where r'' is a maximal sequence of direct arrows (resp. inverse arrows) if e' is a direct arrow (resp. inverse arrow).

Definition 4.1.14. The loopstrings w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 , as they were just constructed, are called the *resolution of the grafting* of w_2 on w_1 in a if $a \neq \emptyset$ or in e if $a = \emptyset$.

Remark 4.1.15. One can notice that if $a \neq \emptyset$ then $e = a^{-1}$. Figure 4.2 illustrates the local behavior of a grafting.

Our aim in this subsection will be to construct a map similar to the one defined in Theorem 4.1.11 and prove that this is also a bijection.

Theorem 4.1.16. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 as they were defined in 4.1.14. Then there exists a bijection:*

$$\Psi': SM(w_3 \oplus w_4) \bigcup SM(w_5 \oplus w_6) \rightarrow SM(w_1 \oplus w_2),$$

which is defined as follows:




Figure 4.2: grafting

(i) If $a = \leftarrow$ then:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi'(w_3 \oplus w_4) &= w_1 \oplus w_2, \\ \Psi'(w_5 \oplus w_6) &= w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus r').\end{aligned}$$

(ii) If $a = \rightarrow$ then:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi'(w_3 \oplus w_4) &= w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus r), \\ \Psi'(w_5 \oplus w_6) &= w_1 \oplus w_2.\end{aligned}$$

In both cases, if w is a submodule of $w_3 \oplus w_4$ (or $w_5 \oplus w_6$) then we define $\Psi'(w)$ to be the submodule of $w_3 \oplus w_4$ (or equivalently of $w_5 \oplus w_6$), which is induced by removing the same sequence (a_i) of tops from $w_2 \oplus w_4$ (or $w_5 \oplus w_6$).

Remark 4.1.17. Before proving Theorem 4.1.16, we need to explain why the strings $w_2 \setminus r'$ and $w_2 \setminus r$ appearing in (i) and (ii) are well defined in each case.

First of all, since we are dealing with grafting around a puncture, it is easy to see that $r \cup r' = h$. If $a = \leftarrow$, then a letter from r' is a top on h , while if $a = \rightarrow$, a letter from r is a top on h . Therefore in each setting we can define $w_2 \setminus r$ or $w_2 \setminus r'$, since we are removing tops in both cases.

Example 4.1.18. Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is the triangulated surface depicted on Figure 4.3. We then have that:

$$w_1 = 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 9,$$

$$w_2 = 4 \rightarrow 5.$$

It is easy to see that in this case we have that:

$$h_1 = 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1,$$




Figure 4.3: Resolution of grafting incompatibility for regular crossing.

$$h_2 = 6 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow 8,$$

$$m = 4 \rightarrow 5.$$

while u_1 and u_2 are empty! It is also easy to see that since both of these substrings are empty we have two regular incompatibilities, one at each of the two punctures. Following the resolution as it was defined earlier we take:

$$w_3^o = \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \leftarrow 8 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 6 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow,$$

and $w_4 = h_1$, $w_5 = h_2$ and $w_6 = \emptyset$.

Example 4.1.19. Suppose that $w_1 = 9 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 10$ and $w_2 = 7 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 1 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 2$. Then there is a grafting of w_2 onto w_1 , with $u_1 = 9 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 2$, $a = \rightarrow$, $v_1 = 1 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 10$, $u_2 = 7 \leftarrow 3$ and $h = 1 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 2$. Applying theorem 4.1.16 we have that the grafting is resolved as follows:

$$w_3 = 9 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 7,$$

$$w_4 = 10 \rightarrow 9 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 5,$$

$$w_5 = 10 \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow 1 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 7,$$

$$w_6 = 9 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 5.$$

Notice that we are in case (ii) of theorem 4.1.16 and indeed $r = 1 \rightarrow 8$ is a top of w_2 and therefore:

$$w_2 \setminus r = 7 \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 5$$

is well defined.

Proposition 4.1.20. The map Ψ' , as it was defined in 4.1.16, is an injection.

Proof. The proof follows exactly the same idea as the proof of Proposition 4.1.12. The only difference in this case, is the fact that instead of the overlap m which occurred in the crossing of two arcs, the contradiction here occurs from the existence of r or r' depending on each case.

For example assume that $a = \rightarrow$. Suppose that $m_1 \in SM(w_3 \oplus w_4)$ and $m_2 \in SM(w_5 \oplus w_6)$ with $\Psi'(m_1) = \Psi'(m_2)$. Then we should be able to first remove the substring r from $w_3 \oplus w_4$. However this is a contradiction, since this is a local socle of w_4 . \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 4.1.16. The fact that Ψ' is a bijection follows immediately from the fact that Ψ' is an injective map, as it was proven in Prop 4.1.20 and the fact that

$$|SM(w_3 \oplus w_4)| + |SM(w_5 \oplus w_6)| = |SM(w_1 \oplus w_2)|$$

as it follows from Remark 4.1.13. \blacksquare

4.1.3 Monomials associated to loopstrings

Snake graphs and loop graphs are a very important combinatorial tool which helps us calculate cluster variables, by computing perfect matchings and assigning a weight to each face and edge of these graphs. The loopstrings that we have already defined may be considered easier to work in some occasions since they seem to carry less information than the corresponding graphs. However, in order to prove skein relations, the established bijection Ψ is not enough.

Our goal for the rest of this section will be to first prove that the module $M(P_{max})$ corresponding to the maximal perfect matching P_{max} of a given snake or loop graph G , contains almost all the information needed for the calculation of the corresponding summand of the cluster element associated to the graph G .

After we have proven this fact, we will have all the necessary tools needed to prove our first main theorem 4.1.1, which we will do at the end of this subsection.

Remark 4.1.21. Drawing inspiration from the notion of blossoming quiver, as it was defined in Definition 2.1 in [PPP22], we would like to extend a loopstring to the so called blossoming loopstring. The idea of the blossoming quiver and loopstring is similar, but the difference is that in our case we are only interested in extending the loopstring at the start or at the end, since we want to keep track of the frozen variables which should be appearing in the associated monomial of a loopstring which we will define later.

Assume that (S, M, P) is a punctured surface and T a given triangulation of this surface. Then classically, one can associate a quiver Q_T to the given triangulation, where each vertex of the quiver corresponds to an arc of the triangulation. We can additionally assign a vertex to each boundary component of the surface and extend the quiver Q_T to a new quiver Q'_T . Let us note that by construction, in each vertex of the quiver Q'_T , which corresponds to an arc of T , there are exactly two incoming and two outgoing arrows. Suppose furthermore, that γ is an arc on the surface which does not belong to the triangulation T . Then, one can associate to the arc

γ a graph G_γ as well as a loopstring w_γ and a module $M(w_\gamma)$. In the following definition we will extend the loopstring w_γ , in a way that the new loopstring w'_γ will contain all the information that P_{max} contains.

Definition 4.1.22. Let (S, M, P, T) , be a triangulated punctured surface and Q'_T the extended quiver associated to that surface. Assume that γ is a plain arc, which does not belong to the triangulation T and $w_\gamma = aebucfd$ is the associated string, where a, b, c, d are vertices of the quiver Q'_T , e, f are arrows and u is a substring of w .

- If $e = \rightarrow$, then there exists exactly one vertex a' of the quiver Q'_T such that locally, we have the following configuration: $a \rightarrow a'$ on the quiver Q'_T .
- If $e = \leftarrow$, then there exist two vertices a' and a'' of the quiver Q'_T , such that locally, we have the following configuration $a' \leftarrow a \rightarrow a''$ and the arcs associated to a, a'' and b form a triangle on the surface S .
- If $f = \leftarrow$, then there exists exactly one vertex d' of the quiver Q'_T such that locally, we have the following configuration: $a \rightarrow a'$ on the quiver Q'_T .
- If $f = \rightarrow$, then there exist two vertices d' and d'' of the quiver Q'_T , such that locally, we have the following configuration $d' \leftarrow a \rightarrow d''$ and the arcs associated to d, d'' and c form a triangle on the surface S .

The *extended string* of w is defined to be the string

$$w'_\gamma = a'aebucfd'.$$

Remark 4.1.23. We can define the extended loopstring of a loopstring in a similar way, by just extending it to the side that does not contain the hook.

Definition 4.1.24. Let $w = a_1 \dots a_n$ be a loopstring. The *monomial associated to the loopstring* w is defined in the following way:


$$x(w) = \prod_{i=1}^n x_{a_i}^{e_i},$$

where, if a_i corresponds to a simple in the socle of the module $M(w)$ and simultaneously is part of the hook of the loopstring, then $e_i = 1$, while otherwise e_i denotes the number of incoming arrows to a_i .

Example 4.1.25. Let us take:

$$w = 1 \longrightarrow 2 \leftrightarrow 3 \longleftarrow 4,$$


or equivalently:



Assume that the blossoming loopstring w' is the following:

$$w' = 0 \leftarrow 1 \longrightarrow 2 \leftrightarrow 3 \leftarrow 4.$$

or equivalently:



Then, following definition 4.1.24 we have that:

$$x(w) = x_0 x_2^2 x_3.$$

Lemma 4.1.26. Let (S, M, P, T) , be a triangulated punctured surface and Q'_T the extended quiver associated to that surface. Assume that γ is a plain arc, which does not belong to the triangulation T . Let P_{\max} be the maximal perfect matching of the associated graph G_γ and w_γ the associated loopstring of the arc γ . Then, if $x(P_{\max})$ denotes the x -weight of the maximal perfect matching P_{\max} , as it is classically defined, we have that

$$x(w_\gamma) = x(P_{\max}).$$

Proof. The proof of this Lemma is straightforward by comparing the definitions of the weight monomial in each setting. \blacksquare

Remark 4.1.27. Definition 4.1.24 is very useful, but unfortunately, when one associates a module to a different perfect matching (apart from the maximal), then the associated x monomial of the loopstring is not the same as the associated x monomial of that perfect matching. However, using the structure of the extended quiver Q'_T , and observing how the bijection between the submodule lattice of a loopstring and the perfect matching lattice of the associated loop graphs was constructed one can notice the following useful fact:

Removing a top t from the loopstring w corresponds to switching the two edges on the corresponding quadrilateral in the associated perfect matching P_w . If we denote the new loopstring as w' and compute $x(P_{w'})$, then we can see that:

$$x(P_{w'}) = \frac{x(P_w)x_b x_d}{x_a x_c}$$

where $a, c \in P_w \setminus P_{w'}$ and $b, d \in P_{w'} \setminus P_w$. We can notice now that locally in the quiver Q'_T we have the configuration appearing in figure 4.4. Therefore, by looking at the local configuration around t in the quiver Q'_T we can compute $x(w')$ given $x(w)$. Additionally, we can notice that since the new monomial depends only on the local configuration of the quiver Q'_T , if $x(w_1) = x(w_2)$, removing the same top t from both modules w_1 and w_2 preserves the equality on the x -variables, i.e. $x(w_1 \setminus t) = x(w_2 \setminus t)$.




Figure 4.4: By removing the top t from the string w we obtain $x(P_{w'}) = \frac{x(P_w)x_{v_3}x_{v_4}}{x_{v_1}x_{v_2}}$

Before stating the main Theorem of this section, which proves skein relation for a crossing between two possibly tagged arcs, we need to prove two more Lemmas.

Lemma 4.1.28. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 as they were defined in 4.1.2. Then:*

$$x(w_3 \oplus w_4) = x(w_1 \oplus w_2),$$

and

$$x(w_5 \oplus w_6) = x(w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m))$$

Proof. We will show only the first equality, since the second one is also just a direct computation.

By definition 4.1.24 we can see that if $v_2 \neq \emptyset$ then:

$$x(w_3) = x(h_1 u_1 m v_2 h_4) = \frac{x(h_1 u_1 m v_1 h_2)}{x_{t(m)} x(v_1 h_2)} x(v_2 h_4) x_{s(v_2)},$$

where $t(m)$ denotes the last letter of the string m and $s(v_2)$ denotes the first letter of the string v_2 , while if $v_2 = \emptyset$ then:

$$x(w_3) = x(h_1 u_1 m h_4) = \frac{x(h_1 u_1 m v_1 h_2)}{x(v_1 h_2)} x(h_4),$$

since then there is an extra term $x(t(m))$ due to the fact that h_4 is following m . Working now on the string w_4 we take:

$$x(w_4) = x(h_3 u_2 m v_1 h_2) = x(h_3 u_2 m) x_{t(m)} x(v_1 h_2).$$

Multiplying now $x(w_3)$ and $x(w_4)$, if $v_2 \neq \emptyset$ we take the following:

$$x(w_3)x(w_4) = x(h_1 u_1 m v_1 h_2) x(v_2 h_4) x_{s(v_2)} x(h_3 u_2 m) = x(h_1 u_1 m v_1 h_2) x(h_3 u_2 m v_2 h_4),$$

which is exactly $x(w_1)x(w_2)$, while if $v_2 = \emptyset$ we have:

$$x(w_3)x(w_4) = x(h_1 u_1 m v_1 h_2) x(h_4) x(h_3 u_2 m) x_{t(m)} = x(w_1)x(w_2).$$

■

Theorem 4.1.29. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a singly notched arc on a puncture p and γ_2 a plain arc. Suppose that γ_1 and γ_2 cross on the surface and let (γ_3, γ_4) and (γ_5, γ_6) be the two pairs of arcs obtained by smoothing the crossing.*

(i) *If γ_1 and γ_2 have a non empty overlap, then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = x_{\gamma_3} x_{\gamma_4} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_5} x_{\gamma_6},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m)) \setminus Y(w_5 \oplus w_6)$.

(ii) *If γ_1 and γ_2 have an empty overlap and a is the arrow appearing in definition 4.1.14, then we have the following cases.*

(1) *If $a = \leftarrow$, then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = x_{\gamma_3} x_{\gamma_4} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_5} x_{\gamma_6},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus r')) \setminus Y(w_5 \oplus w_6)$.

(2) *If $a = \rightarrow$, then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = Y^- x_{\gamma_3} x_{\gamma_4} + x_{\gamma_5} x_{\gamma_6},$$

where $Y^- = Y(w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus r)) \setminus Y(w_3 \oplus w_4)$.

Proof. The proof of this theorem for the case (i) (resp. (ii)) is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.1.11 (resp 4.1.16), Lemma 4.1.28 and Remark 4.1.27. \blacksquare

4.2 Skein relations for crossing arcs and loops

Our goal in this section is to prove skein relations in the case that there is a crossing between an arc and a loop on the surface. This covers the following two cases, as they were listed in [MSW11]:

- (i) a singly notched arc and a loop,
- (ii) a doubly notched arc and a loop.

As in the case of a crossing between two arcs, there are two different possibilities when an arc crosses a loop. They can either cross with a non-empty overlap, or cross in an empty overlap, from which case we will define a grafting between the loop and the arc.

The following Theorem, the proof of which will be covered later on this section deals with these two cases.

Theorem 4.2.1. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a notched arc on a puncture p and l^o a loop. Suppose that γ_1 and l^o cross on the surface and let γ_2 and γ_3 be the two arcs obtained by smoothing the crossing.*

If γ_1 and l^o have a non empty overlap, then:

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{l^o} = x_{\gamma_2} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_3},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(m)$.

4.2.1 Resolution of crossing between an arc and a loop, with non empty overlap

As it was the case with the previous chapter, suppose that (S, M, P) is a triangulated punctured surface, and \mathcal{A} is the Cluster algebra associated to it.

Suppose that there is a crossing between an arc γ_1 and a loop β on the surface, where γ_1 is notched tagged in at least one of its endpoints. We can then associate a loopstring w_1 to γ_1 and a band string l^0 to β .

In [CS14] the authors resolved a crossing between a plain arc and a loop, by constructing a bijection of snake and band graphs. In that case the resolution produces two new plain arcs. A similar thing holds, when the arc is not assumed to be plain, as it was to be expected. In the following definition, we resolve the crossing of such two arcs, when viewed as loopstrings or band strings instead.

Definition 4.2.2. Suppose that w_1 and l^0 are two abstract loopstrings and band strings respectively, where w_1 possibly contains a hook at its start or its end. Assume that $w_1 = h_1 u_1 m h_2$ and $l^0 = b m a u_2 b$ where u_i, m are substrings, a, b are arrows (which are opposite) and h_i are hooks. We then say that w_1 and l^0 cross in m .

The *resolution of the crossing of w_1 and l^0 with respect to m* are the loopstring w_2 and w_3 which are defined as follows:

- (i) $w_2 = h_1 u_1 m u_2 m h_2$,
- (ii) If $u_1 \neq \emptyset$ then $w_3 = h_1 u_1 (u_2^{-1})' h_2$,
where $(u_2^{-1})'$ is such that $u_2^{-1} = (u_2^{-1})' s$ where s is a maximal sequence of direct arrows (inverse arrows) if $a = \rightarrow$ (resp. $a = \leftarrow$).
If $u_1 = \emptyset$ then $w_3 = h_1 (u_2^{-1})'' h_2$,
where $(u_2^{-1})''$ is such that $u_2^{-1} = k (u_2^{-1})' s$ where s is a maximal sequence of direct arrows (inverse arrows) if $a = \rightarrow$ (resp. $a = \leftarrow$) and k is a maximal sequence of inverse arrows (direct arrows) if $a = \rightarrow$ (resp. $a = \leftarrow$).

Remark 4.2.3. Let us notice that in the above definition 4.2.2 we did not make an assumption that there might exist a loopstring in between the overlap m and the hook h_2 . We decided to not include this case in the definition since we care about loopstrings and bands associated to tagged arcs and band arcs on a surface respectively, and such behavior cannot occur on such a surface, since loops are also considered up to isotopy.

We also need to elaborate a little bit more, regarding the local configuration of m and h_2 in the loopstring w_1 . Since the substring m is attached to the hook h_2 , locally there are two arrows connecting the last letter of m and the hook h_2 . One incoming and one outgoing arrow. Therefore, since the last letter of m is also connected to the substring u_2 in l^0 through the arrow a , this arrow a as well as a substring of u_2 are part of the hook h_2 . This means that we could possibly define the overlap of the intersection to be a bigger substring that the one appearing in

4.2.2. However, we opted to not define like this, since by the definition of the loop graphs and the tagging on a puncture, the hook which was introduced by Wilson [FST06] is artificial and does not appear on the surface. This important detail will come into the spotlight in the proof of proposition 4.2.5.

The next two examples showcase the two different cases that appear in definition 4.2.2. One may argue that the definition of k and s in the previous definition is superfluous, since in the cases that h_1 and h_2 are non-empty, the arcs in k and s are part of the hooks. However, the above definition should be a generalization of the classic case in which there are no tagged arcs, and in those cases the exemption of the arcs in k and s is needed.

Example 4.2.4. Suppose that $w_1 = 1 \leftarrow 9 \rightarrow 8 \leftrightarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6$ and $l = \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow$.

Then, following definition 4.2.2, we have that $h_1 = \emptyset$, $u_1 = 1$, $m = 9 \rightarrow 8$, $u_2 = 7 \rightarrow 5 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2$, $a = \leftarrow$ and $h_2 = \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow$.

The resolution of the crossing of the loopstring w_1 and the loop l in m is the following:

$$w_2 = 1 \leftarrow 9 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 9 \rightarrow 8 \leftrightarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6.$$

$$w_3 = 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \leftrightarrow 5 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow 6.$$

Proposition 4.2.5. Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and l as they were defined in 4.2.2. Suppose that m_1 (resp. m_2) is a proper submodule of w_2 (resp. w_3). If m_1 (resp. m_2) is reached from w_1 (resp. w_2) by the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 \oplus l^\circ$ (resp. $w_1 \oplus (w_2 \setminus m)$) to obtain a submodule m'_1 (resp. m'_2) of it.

Proof. The proof of this proposition will follow the steps of Prop.4.1.9 and will be done by induction. We will also assume that the arrow a as it was defined in 4.2.2 is an inverse arrow.

Suppose that m_1 is a submodule of w_2 . If only one top was removed from w_2 to generate the submodule m_1 it is clear by the construction of w_2 and the shape of w_1 and l° that the simple which was removed, is also a top in one of the modules associated to w_1 or l° and therefore removing it gives us a submodule of the module $w_1 \oplus l^\circ$.

Assume now that m_1 is reached from w_2 by removing a sequence of simples $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ (which is, as we have stated already non-unique). By the inductive assumption, removing the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n-1$ from $w_1 \oplus l^\circ$ generates a submodule of this module. In order to showcase how the induction works we first need to do the following construction.

Construction:

If a_i for $1 \leq i \leq n$ is simple in h_1 or u_1 viewed as substrings of w_2 then there is a unique simple a_i (up to embedding of submodules) in $w_1 \oplus l^\circ$, and therefore we remove that unique one.

If a_i is in m , there may be two choices depending on which a_i we can remove from $w_1 \oplus l^\circ$ since m appears in both. Additionally, notice that due to the local behavior

of the hook h_2 (as it was discussed in Remark 4.2.3), if a_i is in h_2 or u_2 , it may happen that the simple a_i is also part of the hook h_2 or the substring u_2 making the choice of which simple to be removed from $w_1 \oplus l^o$ non-unique.

In those cases, we decide the following: If a_i is the simple in m , removed from the first copy of m in w_2 , then we remove a_i from w_1 , while if the opposite happens, we remove it from l^o , if possible. If a_i is in h_2 then we remove it from h_2 viewed as the hook of w_1 while if a_i is in u_2 we remove it from u_2 viewed as a substring of l^o , if possible.

Nevertheless, it may happen that we are not able to apply the previous construction. If such a removal is not possible, we apply the following exception to the rule: Suppose that m^l is the last letter of the string m and $a_n = m^l$ removed from the first copy of w_2 . Since a is an inverse arrow (making m_l not a local top in w_2), u_2^1 which denotes the first letter of u_2 must have been one of the simples in the sequence a_i for $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Therefore, following the steps of the previous construction it should have been removed from u_2 viewed as a substring of l^o . This would lead to a contradiction, when trying to remove m^l from w_1 since it is still not a local top. However, we know that $u_2^1 = h_2^1$ or $u_2^1 = h_2^l$ where h_2^1 (resp. h_2^l) denotes the first (resp. last) letter of the hook h_2 . Therefore, by retracing the removal of tops and removing u_2^1 from the hook h_2 now, we take that m^l is a local top in w_1 and can be removed to produce a submodule of $w_1 \oplus l^o$.

The above construction also proves the validity of the induction step, since we can now always remove a_n from $w_1 \oplus l^o$

The proof from m_2 being a submodule of w_3 is omitted since it is an easy induction following the same steps as the earlier proof without the need of defining an exception, since by construction the choice of which simple to remove is always unique. \blacksquare

Remark 4.2.6. The only reason for making the assumption in the previous proof that the arrow a is considered to be an inverse arrow, is the fact that we need to be precise on when the exception mentioned in the proof occurs. If the arrow a was considered to be a direct arrow, we would just have to adjust part of the proof, since now the exception would occur when we attempt to remove the last letter of the second copy of m in w_2 .

Theorem 4.2.7. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and l as they were defined in 4.2.2. Then there exists a bijection:*

$$\Psi: SM(w_2) \bigcup SM(w_3) \rightarrow SM(w_1 \oplus l),$$

which is defined as follows:

1. If $a = \leftarrow$ then:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(w_2) &= w_1 \oplus l, \\ \Psi(w_3) &= \begin{cases} (h_1 u_1) \oplus (h_2 \setminus s) \oplus l & \text{if } u_1 \neq \emptyset \\ (h_1 \setminus k) \oplus (h_2 \setminus s) \oplus l & \text{if } u_1 = \emptyset. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

2. If $a = \longrightarrow$ then:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(w_2) &= w_1 \oplus l, \\ \Psi(w_3) &= w_1 \oplus u_2,\end{aligned}$$

If w is a submodule of w_2 which is reached by the sequence $\{a_i\} 1 \leq i \leq n$, and w' is the submodule of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ which is reached by the same sequence, then we define:

$$\Psi(w) = w'.$$

If w is a submodule of w_3 , then $\Psi(w)$ is defined in a similar way.

We will now prove that the map Ψ that was defined in 4.2.7 is an injection and the surjectivity will follow in a similar way as it was the case with the crossing of two arcs.

Proposition 4.2.8. *The map Ψ as it was defined in 4.2.7 is an injection.*

Proof. Let $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_2) \cup SM(w_3)$ such that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$.

By construction of the map Ψ , if both $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_2)$ or $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_3)$, then $m_1 = m_2$.

Suppose that $m_1 \in SM(w_2)$ and $m_2 \in SM(w_3)$. We will show that $\Psi(m_1) \neq \Psi(m_2)$.

Assume that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$. We need to take cases:

- Suppose that $a = \longrightarrow$. Since $m_1 \in SM(w_2)$, we know by construction of the map Ψ , that there exists a sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ of simples, such that when viewed as a loopstring $w_2 \setminus \{a_i\} = m_1$. By proposition 4.1.9 and by construction of Ψ , we have that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(w_2) \setminus \{a_i\}$. Similarly, working on m_2 , there is a sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq k$, such that $m_1 = (w_3) \setminus \{b_i\}$ and $\Psi(m_2) = \Psi(w_3) \setminus \{b_i\}$. However, since $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$ we obtain:

$$\Psi(w_2) \setminus \{a_i\} = \Psi(w_3) \setminus \{b_i\}.$$

Since $\Psi(w_2) = w_1 \oplus l$, and $\Psi(w_3) = w_1 \oplus u_2$, we further obtain that:

$$(w_1 \oplus l) \setminus \{a_i\} = (w_1 \oplus u_2) \setminus \{b_i\}.$$

The previous equality shows us that the sets $\{a_i\}$ and $(\{b_i\} \cup m)$ must be equal. By Remark 4.1.8, we can deduce, that there must exist a sequence $\{m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_l}, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$ leading from $w_1 \oplus l$ to $\Psi(m_2)$. However, this also implies that using the same sequence $\{m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_l}, b_1, \dots, b_k\}$, we can go from the module w_2 to the module m_2 . We will show that this is a contradiction. Notice first that w_2 contains two copies of the string m . it is easy to see that we cannot remove a whole copy of m from w_2 since neither copy of m is a local top of w_2 . Suppose now that $\{m_{j_1}, \dots, m_{j_k}\}$, where $k < l$, is removed from the first copy of m in w_2 and $\{m_{j_{k+1}}, \dots, m_{j_l}\}$ is removed from the second copy of m in w_2 . By the shape of w_2 obviously $s(m)$ must be removed from the

second copy of m . Furthermore suppose that m' is the connected substring of m which contains $s(m)$ and contains a maximal sequence of direct arrows in m . Then we can also see that $t(m')$ must be removed from the second copy of m in w_2 . Additionally since this is a maximal sequence of direct arrows we also take that locally in m we have that $t(m') \leftarrow s(m \setminus m')$. Therefore, since $t(m')$ is removed from the second copy of m , $s(m \setminus m')$ must also be removed from the second copy of m . Inductively, working on maximal substrings of m that containing only left arrows or right arrows, we take that every m_i , $1 \leq i \leq l$, must be removed from the second copy which is a contradiction.

- Suppose that $a = \leftarrow$. Similar arguments hold in that case too, since the position of the substring m leads to a similar contradiction as before.

■

Proof of Theorem 4.2.7. It follows straightforwardly using 4.2.8 and 4.1.13 that the map Ψ is a bijection.

■

4.2.2 Monomials associated to loops

So far we have proven the existence of a bijection between the submodules of the direct sum of a loopstring and a band string and the disjoint union of the resolved modules. However we still need to show that the monomials associated to these modules are equal.

Remark 4.2.9. Suppose that l is a band. Then we can associate a monomial $x(l)$ to this band, which follows exactly the same rules as they were dictated in definition 4.1.22. Let us note though that in the case of bands, we are not defining an analogue of a blossoming string.

Lemma 4.2.10. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and l as they were defined in 4.2.2. Then:*

$$x(w_2) = x(w_1 \oplus l^o),$$

and

$$x(w_3) \prod_i x_{m(i)} = \begin{cases} x(w_1 \oplus u_2) & \text{if } a = \rightarrow . \\ x((h_1 u_1) \oplus (h_2 \setminus s) \oplus l) & \text{if } a = \leftarrow \text{ and } u_1 \neq \emptyset . \\ x((h_1 \setminus k) \oplus (h_2 \setminus s) \oplus l) & \text{if } a = \leftarrow \text{ and } u_1 = \emptyset . \end{cases}$$

Proof. We will show only one of these equalities since the proof for the others is very similar.

Let us assume that $a = \leftarrow$ and $u_1 \neq \emptyset$. Isolating the factor $x(l^o)$ we obtain:

$$x(l^o) = x(mu_2) = x(m)x(u_2)x_{s(m)}x_{t(m)},$$

where $s(m)$ and $t(m)$ denote the first and last letter of the string m respectively and the equality follows since $a = \leftarrow$ and therefore there are two extra arrows in l^o .

that point at the start and respectively at the end of the string m .

Similarly working on the term corresponding to the band w_1 we obtain:

$$x(w_1) = x(h_1 u_1) x_{t(u_1)} x(m h_2).$$

Simplifying on the left hand side we have:

$$x(w_2) = x(h_1 u_1 u_2^{-1} h_2) = x(h_1 u_1) x_{t(u_1)} x(m) x_{t(m)} x(u_2^{-1}) x_{s(m)} x(m h_2) = x(w_1) x(l^o),$$

which concludes the proof. ■

The following theorem is a direct consequence of the previous Lemma 4.2.10 and the existence of the bijection Ψ from Theorem 4.2.7

Theorem 4.2.11. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a notched arc on a puncture p and l^o a loop. Suppose that γ_1 and γ_l cross on the surface and let γ_2 and γ_3 be the two arcs obtained by smoothing the crossing.*

If γ_1 and γ_l have a non empty overlap, then:

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{l^o} = x_{\gamma_2} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_3},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(m)$.

4.3 Skein relations for single incompatibility in a puncture

So far, we have explored what happens when there is a regular crossing between two arcs. The previous cases could be understood as generalizations of the classical skein relations on unpunctured surfaces, since even if the arcs were not tagged, the arcs are considered incompatible to each other.

However starting with this chapter and onward, the cases that we will explore appear only on punctured surfaces since those cases will deal with incompatibilities that occur between two arcs at a puncture.

In this chapter more specifically we will deal with the following cases:

- a singly notched arc and a plain arc which have an incompatible tagging at a puncture,
- a doubly notched arc and a plain arc which have an incompatible tagging at a puncture,
- two singly notched arcs which have one incompatible tagging at a puncture.
- a doubly notched arc and a singly notched arc which have one incompatible tagging at a puncture.

The reason, for grouping these cases together is the fact that only the incompatibility of the tagging at a single puncture plays a role to the skein relations. The cases that there are two incompatibilities at two punctured are explored later, since then the situation is drastically different.

The following theorem which addresses the above cases will be proven at the end of the chapter.

Theorem 4.3.1. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a notched arc at a puncture p and γ_2 an arc which has an plain endpoint at the puncture p . Let γ_3 and γ_4 be the two arcs obtained by smoothing the crossing. Then we have that:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = x_{\gamma_3} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_4},$$

where Y^+ is a monomial on y -variables.

4.3.1 Resolution of single incompatibility of two arc at a puncture

As we have seen in the previous cases already, given two arcs which have exactly one incompatibility at one puncture, there are two different cases for the resolutions in the skein relations depending on the triangulation of the surface.

We will separate these two cases, calling the first one, which will be dealt with in this chapter as *regular incompatibility* while we will call the second case, which will be dealt in the next section *grafting incompatibility*, since it poses some similarities to the grafting for regular crossing of arcs.

Suppose now that (S, M, P) is a punctured surface and T is a triangulation of the surface. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two arcs which have exactly one incompatible tagging at a puncture p , and w_1, w_2 the associated loopstring to each arc respectively. We will say that γ_1 and γ_2 have a *regular incompatibility* at the puncture p when the arcs do not cross the same arc t of the triangulation T before meeting at the puncture p (Figure 4.5).

looking at the associated loopstrings or modules of the arcs γ_1 and γ_2 one can notice that we would not be able to detect when these arcs meet at a puncture, since it can happen that they do not share any crossings. However since there is an incompatibility at that puncture, we know that at least one of these two arcs it tagged at its endpoint at the puncture p , o its loopstring should contain a hook h which s all the arcs of the triangulation T which are adjacent to the puncture p . Therefore if we assume that γ_1 is tagged at p and γ_2 is untagged at p , by considering the extension w'_2 of the loopstring w_2 , we can notice that w_1 and w'_2 share at least one vertex, which must belong to the hook h of γ_1 .

The following definition explains how we can resolve such an incompatibility and Figure 4.5 showcases the situation that we just explained.

Definition 4.3.2. Suppose that w_1 and w_2 are two abstract loopstrings such that w_1 contains a hook at its end, while w_2 does not contain a hook at its end. Assume that $w_1 = h_1 u_1 h_2$ and $w_2 = h_3 u_2$ where u_i are substrings and h_i are hooks, with




Figure 4.5: Regular incompatibility at a puncture.




Figure 4.6: Resolution of regular incompatibility at a puncture p.

$h_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let also $w'_2 = h_3 u_2 k$ be the extended loopstring of w_2 with $k \in h_2$. We then say that w_1 and w_2 have a *regular incompatibility* at their endpoints.

Since $k \in h_2$ we can write $h_2 = s_1 a k s_2$ where s_i are not necessarily non empty strings and a is an arrow. The *resolution of the regular incompatibility of w_1 and w_2 with respect to k* are the loopstrings w_3 and w_4 which are defined as follows:

- (i) $w_3 = h_1 u_1 s_1 b u_2^{-1} h_2^{-1}$, where b is an opposite arrow to a .
- (ii) $w_4 = h_1 u_1 s_2 c u_2^{-1} h_2^{-1}$, where $b = a$.

Remark 4.3.3. Looking at the above Definition 4.3.2, one can notice that the resolution is defined uniquely for every situation of regular incompatibility, and there is no need for extra cases. This occurs since visually the resolution basically "glues" the two arcs γ_1 and γ_2 to create two new arcs γ_3 and γ_4 which follow γ_3 and γ_4 around the puncture in the two possible ways that one can follow. This can be further illustrated in Figure 4.6, on which also the next example is based on.

Example 4.3.4. Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is the triangulated surface depicted on figure 4.6. Then we have that $w_1 = 2 \leftrightarrow 4 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 5$ and $w_2 = 6$. Considering the extension of w_3 we take $w'_3 = 6 \rightarrow 4$. Therefore, so far we have $h_1 = \emptyset$, $u_1 = 2$,

$h_2 = 5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 3$, $h_3 = \emptyset$, $u_2 = 6$ and $k = 4$.

Notice that indeed $k \in h_2$ and we can write $h_2 = s_1 a k s_2$ where $s_1 = 5$, $s_2 = 4 \leftarrow 3$ and $a = \leftarrow$.

Using Definition 4.3.2 we can resolve the regular incompatibility with respect to $k = 5$, by defining:

$$w_3 = 2 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 6,$$

$$w_4 = 2 \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 6.$$

Remark 4.3.5. One can notice that the hooks h_1 and h_3 can be either assumed to be empty or not without anything substantial changing to the definition of the resolution. This happens, since as one can see by the definition of the resolution, we just follow the arc γ_1 until it "reaches" the puncture p and then we follow the path of γ_2 by either turning left or right at the puncture p . Therefore, the resolution depends on the local neighborhood of the puncture p and the triangulation of the surface around the puncture, so it does not come as a surprise that possible other taggings or equivalently hooks would change anything.

Our next aim, after having given the definition of the resolution is to actually construct a bijection between the submodules of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ and the submodules of w_3 and w_4 .

In order to do so we first have to give a proposition which will help us iteratively define the bijection as we have already done in the previous cases too.

Lemma 4.3.6. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 as they were defined in 4.3.2. Suppose that m_1 (resp. m_2) is a proper submodule of w_3 (resp w_4). If m_1 (resp. m_2) is reached from w_3 (resp. w_4) by the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 \setminus s_2 \oplus w_2$ (resp. $w_1 \oplus w_2$) to obtain a submodule m'_1 (resp. m'_2) of it.*

Proof. Suppose that m_2 is a submodule of w_4 and it is reached by the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$. First of all, since k belongs to w'_2 by definition we have that there exists a right arrow $t(w_2) \rightarrow k$. Therefore, by the construction of w_4 , k is a socle. This shows us that we can split the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ w.l.o.g. to two parts, where the the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq j$ is a sequence of removing tops from u_2^{-1} and $(a_i), j + 1 \leq i \leq n$ is a sequence of removing tops from the rest of w_4 . The only extreme case, is the case that k is an element of this sequence, but in order for this to happen we should have that all the elements of the string s_2 are also part of the sequence $(a_i), j + 1 \leq i \leq n$.

The previous argument is enough to show that we can also apply this same sequence to the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$, since the two subsequences are independent of each other.

Suppose now that m_2 is a submodule of w_3 and it is reached by the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$. Notice that we want to show that we can apply the same sequence not the the whole module $w_1 \oplus w_2$, but to the submodule of it $w_1 \setminus s_2 \oplus w_2$. Additionally, it is easy to see that $w_1 \setminus s_2 = u_1 \rightarrow s_1$. Therefore, we can again split the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ into two smaller ones, $(b_i) = (a_i), 1 \leq i \leq j$ and

$(c_i) = (a_i)$, $j + 1 \leq i \leq n$ for some $0 \leq j \leq n$, where (b_i) consists of vertices only of the string $u_1 \rightarrow s_1$ while (c_i) consists of vertices only of the string $u_1 \rightarrow s_1$. It is important to order them in that way, since any top of the substring $u_1 \rightarrow s_1$ in w_3 is a top, but not necessarily any top of u_2^{-1} is a top in w_3 . \blacksquare

The above lemma, is very important, since it shows us that there is a way to construct a map between the sets that we want to. However, this is not enough, since we want to define that map in a unique way, which will actually preserve the information lost from passing to a loopstring given a loop graph.

Proposition 4.3.7. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 as they were defined in 4.3.2. Suppose that m_1 (resp. m_2) is a proper submodule of w_3 (resp w_4). If m_1 (resp. m_2) is reached from w_3 (resp. w_4) by the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 \setminus s_2 \oplus w_2$ (resp. $w_1 \oplus w_2$) to obtain a unique submodule m'_1 (resp. m'_2) of it.*

Proof. the uniqueness of the modules m'_1 and m'_2 follows straightforwardly by the construction of the modules as it was done in lemma 4.3.6, by noticing that the two subsequences of $(a_i), j + 1 \leq i \leq n$ as they were defined in the proof were independent of each other for both cases. \blacksquare

Having established that there is a unique way of passing from submodules of w_3 and w_4 to submodules of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ we are now ready to construct the desired bijection.

Theorem 4.3.8. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 as they were defined in 4.3.2. Then there exists a bijection:*

$$\Psi: SM(w_3) \bigcup SM(w_4) \rightarrow SM(w_1 \oplus w_2),$$

which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(w_3) &= (w_1 \setminus s_2) \oplus w_2, \\ \Psi(w_4) &= w_1 \oplus w_2, \end{aligned}$$

If w is a submodule of w_3 which is reached by the sequence $\{a_i\} 1 \leq i \leq n$, and w' the unique submodule of $(w_1 \setminus s_2) \oplus w_2$ which is reached by the same sequence, then we define:

$$\Psi(w) = w'.$$

If w is a submodule of w_4 , then $\Psi(w)$ is defined in a similar way.

As the reader may already be familiar by now, we only need to prove that the map defined on Theorem 4.3.8 is an injection, since then the bijectivity will follow from Remark 4.1.13.

Proposition 4.3.9. *The map Ψ as it was defined in Theorem 4.3.8 is an injection.*

Proof. Let $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_3) \cup SM(w_4)$ such that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$.

By construction of the map Ψ , if both $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_3)$ or $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_4)$, then $m_1 = m_2$.

We will now show that if $m_1 \in SM(w_3)$ and $m_2 \in SM(w_4)$ then $\Psi(m_1) \neq \Psi(m_2)$. Assume that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$. Since $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$ and $\Psi(m_1) \subset w_1 \setminus s_2$, by construction of Ψ if $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ is a sequence of the simples removed to reach $\Psi(m_2)$, we must have that all the elements of the string s_2 must be contained in that sequence (b_i) . Since there exists an arrow $k \leftarrow s(u_2^{-1})$ we deduce that $s(u_2^{-1})$ must also be an element of this sequence.

Assume now that $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ is a sequence of the simples removed from m_1 to reach $\Psi(m_1)$. Since $s(u_2^{-1})$ is part of the sequence (b_i) , it must be also part of the sequence (a_i) , since otherwise we could not have $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$. However, this in turn means that $t(u_1)$ as well as the whole string s_1 must belong to the sequence (a_i) , since there is a sequence of direct arrows starting from $t(u_1)$ and going at least until $s(u_2^{-1})$. The above arguments gives us that the module $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$ does not contain any element of the hook h_3 . However this means that a submodule of w_4 is mapped to a module which does not contain any element of the hook h_3 which is impossible by the construction of the map Ψ and the fact that the elements of the string s_1 are not in w_4 . (Basically submodules of w_4 are always mapped to elements which contain the whole string s_1). ■

Proof of Theorem 4.3.8. The fact that Ψ is a bijection follows immediately from the fact that Ψ is an injective map (Proposition 4.3.9) and Remark 4.1.13. ■

4.3.2 Resolution of grafting incompatibility of two arcs at a puncture

So far in this chapter we have covered the resolution of an incompatibility of two arcs at a puncture when they possibly do not have any common intersections to the arcs of the given triangulation. However the situation depicted in Figure 4.7 can happen, which is reminiscent of the grafting of two arcs which was covered in earlier chapters. This is why we will call such an incompatibility a *grafting incompatibility*.

The structure of this section will be similar to the previous one. We will first give a proper definition of what a grafting incompatibility is and how this can be resolved. Later we will construct and prove the desired bijection which in turn will help us prove the announced theorem of this chapter.

Suppose that (S, M, P) is a punctured surface and T is a triangulation of the surface. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two arcs which have exactly one incompatible tagging at a puncture p , and w_1, w_2 the associated loopstring to each arc respectively. We will say that γ_1 and γ_2 have a *grafting incompatibility* at the puncture p when the arcs cross the same arc t of the triangulation T before meeting at the puncture p (Figure 4.7).




Figure 4.7: Grafting incompatibility at a puncture.

One big difference of this incompatibility to the regular incompatibility that was covered earlier, is the fact that one does not need to consider the extended loopstring in order to notice that such a problem occurs on the surface, and the definition is more reminiscent of the classical resolution of a crossing of two arcs with common overlap. However, the idea of the resolution still remains the same. One must follow on arc until the puncture and then create two new arcs by turning left and right respectively around the puncture before continuing following the path of the other arc.

Definition 4.3.10. Suppose that w_1 and w_2 are two abstract loopstrings such that w_1 contains a hook at its end, while w_2 does not contain a hook at its end. Assume that $w_1 = h_1 u_1 a m h_2$ and $w_2 = h_3 u_2 m$ where u_i and m are substrings, h_i are hooks, with $h_2 \neq \emptyset$ and a is an arrow. We then say that w_1 and w_2 have a *grafting incompatibility* at their endpoints.

The resolution of the grafting incompatibility of w_1 and w_2 are the loopstrings w_3 and w_4 which are defined as follows:

$$(i) \quad w_3 = h_1 u_1 m h_2 m^{-1} u_2^{-1},$$

(ii)

$$w_4 = \begin{cases} h_1 u_1 e u_2^{-1} h_3 & \text{if } u_1, u_2 \neq \emptyset \text{ and where } e \text{ is an opposite arrow to } a. \\ h_1 u'_1 & \text{if } u_1 \neq \emptyset \text{ and } u_2 = \emptyset. \\ u'_2 h_3 & \text{if } u_2 \neq \emptyset \text{ and } u_1 = \emptyset. \end{cases}$$

where u'_1 is such that $u_1 = u'_1 r'$ where r' is a maximal sequence of inverse arrows and u'_2 is such that $u_2 = u'_2 r''$ where r'' is a maximal sequence of direct arrows.

The following example is based on Figure 4.8, in which we can see how visually the resolution may look the same, but looking at the intersection of the arcs γ_3 and γ_4 one can notice that there is a fan (in this example it consists of only the arc 4), which fan the arc γ_4 is not actually intersecting, explaining the existence of the cases for w_4 in the above definition.




Figure 4.8: Resolution of grafting incompatibility at a puncture p.

Example 4.3.11. Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is the triangulated surface that appears on Figure 4.8.

Then we have that $w_1 = 2 \leftrightarrow 5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 3$ and $w_2 = 7 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 2$. Using Definition 4.3.10 and since we can write $u_1 = 7 \leftarrow 1$ as $u_1 = u'_1 r'$ where $u'_1 = 7$ and $r' = 1$, we have:

$$w_3 = 7 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \leftarrow 2,$$

$$w_4 = 7.$$

As we have already done in each chapter we will first present an important lemma and a proposition which will be used for the definition of the desired bijection. In the continuation of this section we will focus only on one case, regarding how w_4 is defined in the resolution, since similar arguments and constructions can be given for the rest of the cases.

Lemma 4.3.12. Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 as they were defined in Definition 4.3.10 with $u_1 = \emptyset$. Suppose that m_1 (resp. m_2) is a proper submodule of w_3 (resp w_4). If m_1 (resp. m_2) is reached from w_3 (resp. w_4) by the sequence (a_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$ (resp. $w_1 \oplus u'_2$) to obtain a submodule m'_1 (resp. m'_2) of it.

Proof. Suppose that m_2 is a submodule of w_4 and it is reached by the sequence (a_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n$. One can easily see we can just take out the same sequence from the module $w_1 \oplus u'_2$, by applying the sequence only to $u'_2 \subset w_1 \oplus u_2$.

Suppose now that m_1 is a submodule of w_3 and it is reached by the sequence (a_i) , $1 \leq i \leq n$. The only tricky part of this case is the duplication of the string m in w_3 , since removing elements from m when viewed as a substring of w_3 , does not give us a natural choice of removing this element from either w_1 or w_2 .

W.l.o.g. let $h_2 = x_1, \dots, x_n$ and $w_1 = h_1 u_1 m \hookrightarrow x_k \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow x_1$. We then have that $w_3 = h_1 u_1 m \rightarrow x_k \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow x_1 \rightarrow m^{-1} u_2^{-1}$. It is now easy to see that if the

sequence (a_i) does not contain any of the elements in the set $\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}$ then if a_j is in h_1, u_1, h_3, u_2 or m for some $1 \leq j \leq n$, then there is a unique and obvious choice for the same element to be removed from $w_1 \oplus w_2$. Assume now that there is at least one $a_j \in h_2$ for some $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then this implies also that $x_k \in (a_i)$ since it is locally a top. Therefore we must remove also x_k from h_w viewed as a hook of w_1 , which makes m locally a top in w_1 when viewed next to h_2 . Therefore when we are removing elements twice from both the substrings m of w_3 we can also remove the same elements from w_1 or w_2 which completes the proof. \blacksquare

The next proposition, provides the uniqueness of the construction of the associated submodules as it is needed later for the construction of a suitable mapping.

Proposition 4.3.13. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 as they were defined in 4.3.10 with $u_1 = \emptyset$. Suppose that m_1 (resp. m_2) is a proper submodule of w_3 (resp w_4). If m_1 (resp. m_2) is reached from w_3 (resp. w_4) by the sequence $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply in a unique the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$ (resp. $w_1 \oplus u'_2$) to obtain a submodule m'_1 (resp. m'_2) of it.*

Proof. The uniqueness of the module m'_2 follows straightforwardly by the construction of the module as it was done in lemma 4.3.12, by noticing that we can just “forget” the module w_1 , and remove the same tops from u'_2 when viewed as a submodule of $w_1 \oplus u'_2$. \blacksquare

Having established that there is a unique way of passing from submodules of w_3 and w_4 to submodules of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ we are now ready to construct the following bijection.

Theorem 4.3.14. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 as they were defined in 4.3.10. Then there exists a bijection:*

$$\Psi: SM(w_3) \bigcup SM(w_4) \rightarrow SM(w_1 \oplus w_2),$$

which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(w_3) &= w_1 \oplus w_2, \\ \Psi(w_4) &= w_1 \oplus u'_2,\end{aligned}$$

If w is a submodule of w_3 which is reached by the sequence $\{a_i\} 1 \leq i \leq n$, and w' the unique submodule of $(w_1 \setminus s_2) \oplus w_2$ which is reached by the same sequence, then we define:

$$\Psi(w) = w'.$$

If w is a submodule of w_4 , then $\Psi(w)$ is defined in a similar way.

As per usual we only need to prove that the map defined on Theorem 4.3.14 is an injection, which is done in the following proposition.

Proposition 4.3.15. *The map Ψ as it was defined in Theorem 4.3.14 is an injection.*

Proof. Let $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_3) \cup SM(w_4)$ such that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$.

By construction of the map Ψ , if both $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_3)$ or $m_1, m_2 \in SM(w_4)$, then $m_1 = m_2$.

We will now show that if $m_1 \in SM(w_3)$ and $m_2 \in SM(w_4)$ then $\Psi(m_1) \neq \Psi(m_2)$.

Assume that $\Psi(m_1) = \Psi(m_2)$ and let $(a_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$ be a sequence of the simples removed from m_1 to reach $\Psi(m_1)$.

Since $w_4 = u'_2$ we take that all the elements of r' and m must belong to the sequence (a_i) . However for this to happen, the sequence (a_i) should contain at least one element from the hook, since r' and m are not a top of the module w_3 . However in turn this would give us that there is a submodule of $w_4 = u'_2$ which is not mapped to $w_1 \oplus m''$ for m'' a submodule of w_4 , which gives us a contradiction by the construction of the map Ψ .

■

Proof of Theorem 4.3.14. The fact that Ψ is a bijection follows immediately from the fact that Ψ is an injective map (Proposition 4.3.15) and Remark 4.1.13. ■

4.3.3 Skein relation for arcs with a single incompatibility at a puncture

Having already established the two bijection 4.3.8 and 4.3.14 we would also like to prove that there is no "lost" information from passing to a loopstring from a loop graph. For this, we will use the monomials associated to loopstrings as they were defined in Chapter 4.

We will not give full proofs for each case, since the idea is very similar and it is basically depending on a series of computational tricks in order to rewrite some monomials.

Lemma 4.3.16. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3 and w_4 as they were defined in 4.3.2. Then:*

$$x(w_3) = x((w_1 \setminus s_2) \oplus w_2),$$

and

$$x(w_4) = x(w_1 \oplus w_2)$$

Proof. We will show only the first equality, since the second one is also just a direct computation.

By definition 4.1.24 we have that:

$$x(w_3) = x(h_1 u_1 \rightarrow s_1 \rightarrow k \leftarrow_2^{-1} h_3) = \frac{x(h_1 u_1 \rightarrow s_1) x(u_2^{-1} h_3)}{x_k}$$

However, since k by definition belongs to the extended w_2 we have that:

$$x(w_2) = \frac{x(h_3 u_2)}{x_k},$$

and therefore we take that

$$x(w_3) = x((w_1 \setminus s_2) \oplus w_2),$$

as we wanted to show. ■

Theorem 4.3.17. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a notched arc at a puncture p and γ_2 an arc which has an plain endpoint at the puncture p . Let γ_3 and γ_4 be the two arcs obtained by smoothing the crossing.*

(i) *If γ_1 and γ_2 have a regular incompatibility at the puncture p , then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = x_{\gamma_3} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_4},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(s_1)$.

(ii) *If γ_1 and γ_2 have a grafting incompatibility at the puncture p , then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = x_{\gamma_3} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_4},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(w_1)$.

Proof. The proof of this theorem is a direct consequence of Theorems 4.3.8, 4.3.14, Lemma 4.3.16 and Remark 4.1.27. ■

4.4 Skein relations for double incompatibilities in two punctures

In this section we will work on skein relations for arcs which have two incompatibilities in two punctures. This can happen in two different occasions. We can either have a double notched arc with its endpoints in two punctures p and q and a plain arc with its endpoints in the same punctures p and q . Additionally we could have two singly notched arcs, which have both of their endpoints in the same punctures p and q , but they are tagged in different punctures.

We will see that both of these cases give rise to the same skein relation and therefore instead of proving skein relation for these two cases separately we will just deal with one of these cases and then prove that indeed these cases are equivalent.

These two cases behave a little bit differently than what we have seen so far in the sense that they can give rise to four different arcs of which only one of these arcs does not include any additional y -terms when resolving the incompatibilities. The deeper reason on why such a thing occurs can be understood through looking at the two incompatibilities that occur separately, instead of both at the same time. To understand the above argument let us consider one doubly notched arc γ_1 , which has a tagging at its endpoints p and q , and a plain arc γ_2 which has its endpoints in p and q . One could try and resolve first the tagging at the puncture q . This procedure would look like a natural extension of the previous section, since then, we could think of dealing with a single incompatibility at the puncture q and




Figure 4.9: Resolution of single incompatibility and self incompatible arcs.

therefore apply the results of the previous section to resolve this incompatibility, by creating two new arcs γ'_1 and γ'_2 , as they can be seen in Figure 4.9, which would have a self incompatibility at the puncture p . If we could assume that the results of the previous section can be generalized for self incompatible arcs, we could then deal with these two self incompatibilities separately, giving rise to four new arcs in total. Assuming that the previous results still hold, only one of the newly formed arcs would not have any additional y -terms in front of it in the complete skein relations.

To sum up and under the fore mentioned assumptions the expected skein relations for such arcs would be the following:

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = Y_1 x_{\gamma'_1} + Y_2 x_{\gamma'_2} = Y_1(Y_1^+ \delta_1 + Y_1^- \delta_2) + Y_2(Y_2^+ \delta_3 + Y_2^- \delta_4).$$

Notice also that the initial arbitrary selection of dealing with one specific incompatibility was not restricting. Even if we started by resolving the other incompatibility we would end up to a similar relation, since one can notice that by rearranging the terms we could take the following equality:

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = Y_1 x_{\gamma'_1} + Y_2 x_{\gamma'_2} = Y_1(Y_1^+ \delta_1 + Y_1^- \delta_2) + Y_2(Y_2^+ \delta_3 + Y_2^- \delta_4).$$

However, the above arguments cannot be applied straightforwardly since we do not deal with arcs that have self incompatibilities. In fact, there was an open question from Musiker, Schiffler and Williams, regarding such arcs and if those arcs are elements of the Cluster Algebra. We conjecture that such arcs are indeed part of the cluster algebra when we are dealing with bordered surfaces. The idea, is that such arcs can be decomposed into bands, and then in the presence of border components, one can prove that each band is part of the cluster algebra. We will not get into more details now, since this will be further explored in the last chapter of this thesis.

To get back on the topic of this chapter, we will prove that indeed the skein relations when resolving double incompatibilities at a puncture between two arcs have exactly the form that we described earlier. Nonetheless, our approach in the proof of this statement will be different. We will prove every statement by resolving both




Figure 4.10: Resolution of double incompatibility, which gives rise to a single band arc l .

incompatibilities at the same time, avoiding in this way to deal with self incompatible arcs at a puncture.

We should also mention an important detail before going to the main part of this section. Not every skein relation gives rise to four bands. It can happen that the resolution gives rise to one and only band arc. This however can occur in some very specific cases, as the one appearing in figure 4.10. Such an observation can be very crucial in proving that some band arcs, even in surfaces without boundary components, are part of the cluster algebra. Notably, problems occur in surfaces with genus bigger than one and when dealing with bands that “pass around” the handle of the surface.

To sum up in this chapter we deal with the following cases:

- two singly notched arcs which have two incompatible taggings at two punctures,
- a doubly notched arc and a plain arc which have two incompatible taggings at two punctures.

The following theorem which addresses these cases and will be proven at the end of this chapter.

Theorem 4.4.1. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a double notched arc at two puncture p and q , and γ_2 an arc which has a plain endpoint at the puncture p . Let $\gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$ and γ_6 be the four arcs obtained by smoothing the incompatibilities at the two punctures. Then we have that:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = Y_1 Y_1^- x_{\gamma_3} + Y_1 Y_1^+ x_{\gamma_4} + Y_2 Y_2^- x_{\gamma_5} + Y_2 Y_2^+ x_{\gamma_6},$$

where $Y_1, Y_2, Y_1^+, Y_1^-, Y_2^+$ and Y_2^- are monomials on y -variables and in each pair (Y_1, Y_2) , (Y_1^+, Y_1^-) and (Y_2^+, Y_2^-) at least one term of each pair is equal to 1.




Figure 4.11: Regular incompatibilities at two punctures.

4.4.1 Resolution of double incompatibility of two arcs at a puncture

As in all the previous cases discussed in this thesis, the resolution of the incompatibility at the punctures depends on the local configuration of the given triangulation of a surface. In the case of a double incompatibility, since there are two punctures, the so called grafting incompatibility that was discussed in the previous section can occur in one, both or none of the punctures. Instead of splitting the cases of a regular incompatibility and a grafting incompatibility, we will work on both of them at the same time by assuming that each one of them occurs in exactly one of the punctures. The rest of the cases which consist of all the possible configuration that we can have locally are simple generalisations of the case that we will focus, so we will not discuss them any further.

Suppose that (S, M, P) is a punctured surface and T is a triangulation of the surface. Let γ_1 and γ_2 be two arcs which have two incompatible taggings at the punctures p and q , and w_1, w_2 are the associated loopstring of each arc respectively. We will say that γ_1 and γ_2 have a *regular incompatibility* at the puncture p when the arcs cross the same arc t_3 of the triangulation T before meeting at the puncture p . We will also say that the arcs have a grafting incompatibility at the puncture q when the arcs do not cross the same arcs t_1 and t_2 of the triangulation T before meeting at the puncture q (Figure 4.11).

Definition 4.4.2. Suppose that w_1 and w_2 are two abstract loopstrings such that w_1 contains two hooks at its endpoints, while w_2 does not contain any hook at its endpoints. Assume that $w_1 = h_1 u_1 m h_2$ and $w_2 = u_2 m$ where u_i, m are substrings and h_i are hooks, with $h_1, h_2 \neq \emptyset$. Let also $w'_2 = a_1 u_2 m$ be the extended loopstring of w_2 with $a_1 \in h_2$ and $w''_2 = a_2 u_2 m$ be the extended loopstring of the dual of w_2 with $a_2 \in h_2$. We then say that w_1 and w_2 have a *regular incompatibility* at p and a *grafting incompatibility* at q .

Since $a_1, a_2 \in h_2$ we have that $h_1 = h'_1 a_1 a_2 h''_1$ where h'_1 and h''_1 are not necessarily non empty strings. The resolution of the incompatibilities of w_1 and w_2 are the bandstrings w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 which are defined as follows:

- (i) $w_3^o = a_1 h'_1 u_1 m h_2 m u_2,$

- (ii) $w_4^o = a_1 h'_1 u_1,$
- (iii) $w_5^o = a_2 h''_1 u_1 m h_2 m u_2,$
- (iv) $w_6^o = a_2 h''_1 u_1.$

We will now proceed on constructing two examples that will help us understand how the resolution mentioned in the above definition is applied. In the first example, there will be a regular resolution where all the bandstrings created after the resolution are non empty, while the second one will deal with one of the extreme cases in which there is only one regular bandstring created.

Example 4.4.3. Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is the triangulated surface depicted on Figure 4.12. We then have that:

$$w_1 = 6 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow 10 \rightarrow 11 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 14 \rightarrow 13,$$

$$w_2 = 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 9 \leftarrow 12.$$

Looking at the loopstrings we can notice that there is a regular incompatibility at the end of the end since and we have furthermore the following:

$$\begin{aligned} h_1 &= 6 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1, \\ h_2 &= 14 \rightarrow 13, \\ u_1 &= 10 \rightarrow 11, \\ u_2 &= 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 8, \\ m &= 9 \leftarrow 12. \end{aligned}$$

In order to see if there is an incompatibility at the start of the loopstrings we need to construct the extended and reverse extended strings w'_2 and w''_2 respectively, which are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} w'_2 &= 4 \leftarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 9 \leftarrow 12, \\ w''_2 &= 3 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow 9 \leftarrow 12. \end{aligned}$$

Looking at the above extended strings we see that $a_1 = 4$ and $a_2 = 3$ which are indeed part of h_1 . Therefore, we can rewrite $h_1 = h'_1 a_1 a_2 h''_2$ where:

$$\begin{aligned} h'_1 &= 6 \rightarrow 5, \\ h''_1 &= 2 \rightarrow 1. \end{aligned}$$

We now have all the necessary tools to resolve the incompatibilities. Using Definition 4.4.2 we take the following bandstrings:

$$\begin{aligned} w_3^o &= \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow 10 \rightarrow 11 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 14 \rightarrow 13 \leftarrow 12 \rightarrow 9 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow, \\ w_4^o &= \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow 10 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow, \\ w_5^o &= \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 11 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 14 \rightarrow 13 \leftarrow 12 \rightarrow 9 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 7 \rightarrow, \\ w_6^o &= \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 7 \rightarrow, \end{aligned}$$

which correspond to the bands appearing in Figure 4.13.




Figure 4.12: Double incompatibility at two punctures.




Figure 4.13: Resolution of the double incompatibility in Figure 4.12.




Figure 4.14: Extreme case for double incompatibility.

Remark 4.4.4. Notice that not all the bandstrings defined in the previous definition 4.4.2 are always non empty. In particular it may happen that u_1 and u_2 are empty and a_1, a_2 are located at the start or the end of the hook h_2 . In such a situation at least a bandstring would be empty. To make things more clear, the following example is a case where such a resolution occurs.

Example 4.4.5. Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is the triangulated surface depicted on Figure 4.14. We then have that:

$$w_1 = 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow 8,$$

$$w_2 = 4 \rightarrow 5.$$

It is easy to see that in this case we have that:

$$h_1 = 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1,$$

$$h_2 = 6 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow 8,$$

$$m = 4 \rightarrow 5.$$

while u_1 and u_2 are empty! It is also easy to see that since both of these substrings are empty we have two regular incompatibilities, one at each of the two punctures. Following the resolution as it was defined earlier we take:

$$w_3^o = \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \leftarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 \leftarrow 8 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 6 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow,$$

and $w_4 = h_1$, $w_5 = h_2$ and $w_6 = \emptyset$.

Having showcased how the construction of the four bandstrings works, we should now try to show that indeed under this definition there is a nice bijection between




Figure 4.15: Resolution of extreme case for double incompatibility.

the submodules associated to the initial modules and the modules associated to the newly formed ones.

Remark 4.4.6. Looking at how we obtained a_1 and a_2 in definition 4.4.2, one can notice that a priori there is no way of telling how the local configuration in the hook h_1 looks, meaning we cannot know if there is an arrow from a_1 to a_2 or the other way around. Looking at how we have constructed the bijections in the previous chapters one can see that by taking cases we were trying to differentiate what happens when a simple is locally a socle or a top of the module. A similar obstruction appears here too. However instead of taking both of the aforementioned cases we will only focus on one of them. The reason for such an assumption is the fact that since there are two pairs of bandstrings in the resolution, the situation is very symmetrical and one could prove what happens in the other case, just by relabeling the two pairs. Starting from the next proposition which basically indicates how the bijection will be constructed, we will use the assumption that locally there is an arrow from a_1 to a_2 in the hook h_1 .

Proposition 4.4.7. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 as they were defined in 4.4.2. Suppose that m_i is a proper submodule of w_i for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, and without loss of generality assume that the local configuration of the hook h_1 is $a_1 \leftarrow a_2$. If m_3 is reached from w_3 by the sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$ to obtain a unique submodule m'_1 of it.*

The same statement is true by adjusting the following:

The module m_4 is reached by applying the sequence to the module $(w_1 \setminus m_2) \oplus w_2$.

The module m_5 is reached by applying the sequence to the module $(w_1 \setminus a_1 h'_1) \oplus w_2$.

The module m_6 is reached by applying the sequence to the module $((w_1 \setminus a_1 h'_1) \setminus m_2) \oplus w_2$.

Proof. The uniqueness of the modules follows from the construction of the modules in the next Lemma 4.4.8. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.4.8. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.4.7, For each of the modules m_i and sequences $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, we can apply the same sequence in the associated submodule of $w_1 \oplus w_2$ to obtain a new submodule m'_1*

Proof. We will prove this statement indicatively only for one of the four cases. Let us assume that m_1 is a submodule of w_3 and is reached by the sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$. We need to show that we can apply the same sequence to $w_1 \oplus w_2$ and obtain a submodule m'_1 of it.

First of all, suppose that there are simples in $a_1 h'_1$ that are part of the sequence. By construction since locally in w_1 we have $a_1 \leftarrow a_2$, therefore the h'_1 contains the top of the hook. Therefore, by an iterative process of applying the sequence on $w_1 \oplus w_2$ when we have to remove a simple from the hook, we can always do it. The above argument indicates that simples belonging to the hook cannot cause problems when we try to remove them as local tops from the module $w_1 \oplus w_2$. The cases in which we have to remove a top from u_1 or u_2 are obviously straightforward too, since the local configuration in both modules w_3 and $w_1 \oplus w_2$ is the same.

The last case that we have to investigate is the case that we have to remove simples that belong to the common substring m or in the hook h_2 . However this part follows the same principles of the proofs of Propositions 4.1.9 and 4.2.5 and so we omit the respective arguments. \blacksquare

Let us now construct the bisection which will be used for the proof of the skein relation.

Theorem 4.4.9. *Let w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 as they were defined in 4.4.2. Then there exists a bijection:*

$$\Psi: SM(w_3) \bigcup SM(w_4) \bigcup SM(w_5) \bigcup SM(w_6) \rightarrow SM(w_1 \oplus w_2),$$

which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(w_3) &= w_1 \oplus w_2, \\ \Psi(w_4) &= (w_1 \setminus mh_2) \oplus w_2, \\ \Psi(w_5) &= (w_1 \setminus a_1 h'_1) \oplus w_2, \\ \Psi(w_6) &= ((w_1 \setminus a_1 h'_1) \setminus mh_2) \oplus w_2.\end{aligned}$$

If m is a submodule of w_3 which is reached by the sequence $\{a_i\} 1 \leq i \leq n$, and m' the unique submodule of $(w_1 \setminus s_2) \oplus w_2$ which is reached by the same sequence, then we define:

$$\Psi(m) = m'.$$

If m is a submodule of w_4, w_5 or w_6 , then $\Psi(m)$ is defined in a similar way.

Proof. The fact that Ψ is a bijection follows from Proposition 4.4.10 and Remark 4.1.13. \blacksquare

Proposition 4.4.10. *The map Ψ as it was defined in Theorem 4.4.9 is an injection.*

Proof. The proof of this proposition is omitted, since it follows the same logic as in previous chapters.

The only difference here is that instead of having to compare submodules of two modules, we have to check all possible configurations between the four given modules w_i , $3 \leq i \leq 4$. However this does not create any problem, since the gist of the argument given in previous proposition resolves around the fact that there is always a part of one module that is locally a top, while in the other module it is locally a socle. This principle is not violated in any of the possible cases since each one of the modules apart from w_3 takes out a different part of the hook h_1 or mh_2 or a combination of these two. ■

4.4.2 Skein relation for arcs with two incompatibilities at two puncture

In this chapter we will prove skein relations when there are two arcs which have two different incompatibilities, one at each puncture.

The most interesting part, is the fact that out of the four terms appearing in the resolution, only one term does not contain any y -variables, which was partially explained at the start of this section earlier.

The bijection given in Theorem 4.4.9 as usual indicates to us, which monomials associated to each module on the left hand side of the bijection should be equal to the ones associated to modules on the right hand side of the bijection. We will indicatively prove some of these equalities first before going on the main statement of this subsection.

Remark 4.4.11. Before going any further, we need to deal with an anomaly that may appear depending on the geometry of the surface. As it was showcased in the second example of the previous section the resolution of such incompatibilities may result in the loss of one of the four expected terms. However, what is equally important is the fact that sometimes an expected bandstring may end up being equal to a hook. A natural question would be, what does this even mean, since this cannot be a module. For this reason we will make a small abuse of notation and not indicate each time when this is not a module, but still refer to it like this. The propositions and the theorems in the previous sections still hold valid, under this abuse of notation by noticing one very important thing.

Assuming that w_4 is equal to a hook, we will view this as a simple module. The idea behind it, is going back to the surface and the associated snake graphs, one should expect that the arc linked to w_4 is a band which just goes around a puncture. If one tries to construct the band graph of such an arc, it is easy to see that it would only have two perfect matchings. Since in our language perfect matchings are linked to submodules, it makes sense to view this w_4 as a simple module. Therefore the results of the previous section are still true under this assumption.

One more thing that we need to do before going to the main theorem, is to define




Figure 4.16: Band around puncture

a monomial to such arcs. This is essential, since the definition given earlier cannot be used now. The reason for this, is that given a perfect matching of the graph associated to the such a bandstring, one cannot produce a new one by just flipping two edges in one of the squares of the band graph. Therefore a new but intuitive definition is needed.

Definition 4.4.12. Assume that w is a bandstring produced by a resolution of an incompatibility and is equal to the hook $h \rightarrow a_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow a_n \rightarrow$. Then the monomial associated to the bandstring w is defined to be:

$$x(w) = 1 + y_1 \dots y_n.$$

Example 4.4.13. Assume that $w = h$ where h is the hook around the puncture p on the surface of Figure 4.16. Then we have that:

$$x(w) = 1 + y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4.$$

Proposition 4.4.14. Let w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4, w_5 and w_6 as they were defined in 4.4.2. Then:

$$x(w_3) = x(w_1 \oplus w_2),$$

$$x(w_4) = x((w_1 \setminus m h_2) \oplus w_2),$$

$$x(w_5) = x((w_1 \setminus a_1 h'_1) \oplus w_2),$$

$$x(w_6) = x((w_1 \setminus a_1 h'_1) \setminus m h_2) \oplus w_2.$$

Proof. The proof here goes by induction as in the case of propositions 4.1.9 and 4.2.5. ■




Figure 4.17: Self incompatible arc.

Theorem 4.4.15. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a double notched arc at the puncture p and q and γ_2 a plain arc which has its endpoints also at the punctures p and q . Suppose that $\gamma_3, \gamma_4, \gamma_5$ and γ_6 are the bands obtained by resolving the incompatibilities at the punctures. Then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} x_{\gamma_2} = Y(m)Y(a_2 h_2'')x_{\gamma_3} + Y(a_2 h_2'')x_{\gamma_4} + x_{\gamma_5} + Y(m)x_{\gamma_6}.$$

Proof. The proof of this theorem is a direct consequence of Theorem 4.4.9, Proposition 4.4.14 and Remark 4.1.27. \blacksquare

Remark 4.4.16. By taking a look at the y -variables appearing on the terms of Theorem 4.4.15 one can notice the intricacies of this case and how one could possibly follow a different root on the proof of this statement. For this, we should pay attention on the possible grouping of the terms that was mentioned at the start of this section. One can see that each puncture "generates" its own terms on the y -variables, which is a strong indication that this resolution could be viewed as a two step procedure.

It can also indicate that an arc which has a self incompatibility at a puncture could be viewed under some assumptions as an element of the Cluster algebra, since this is a term appearing after the first step of such a procedure (Figure 4.17).

4.5 Skein relations for self crossing tagged arcs

In this section we will work on the final cases of possible incompatibilities of tagged arcs on punctured surfaces. These two cases are namely the following:

- a single notched generalized arc with a self-crossing,
- a doubly notched generalized arc with a self crossing.

These two cases end up being extremely similar to the standard cases of self crossing untagged generalized arcs, that were studied in [CS14]. The reason for these similarities is the same as that observed in the regular crossing of tagged arcs. Since the crossing takes place away from the puncture, the hook has minimal

impact on the resolution.

As we will see later on this section, one can apply the resolution of arcs as it was described in [CS14] and just add the hook where it is necessary. However, we still need to do some work, since a priori the skein relations are not guaranteed to be the same as in the regular set up of generalized plain self crossing arcs. Nonetheless going through all the cases that were described in their paper adding possible hooks to the arcs would not be mathematically interesting, since one can just recycle all of the arguments combining the ideas of their paper and the suitable generalization on how someone deals with the hooks. This is why we will only focus on some of the more interesting cases that can be encountered on this set up.

The two cases that we will focus on will be about self crossing doubly notched arcs that have both of their endpoints at the same puncture. On these two cases one can encounter either a *self-grafting incompatibility* (Figure 4.19) or a *regular self crossing incompatibility* (Figure 4.18). The purpose of this distinction is the same as in the previous intersections. Depending on the triangulation there may be a common overlap locally at the intersection or not.

The final result of this chapter which will combine both of the previous cases (Theorem 4.5.9, Theorem 4.5.14) that will be explored in detail, as well as the cases that we will not be fully explored due to their similarities will be summed up in the following theorem:

Theorem 4.5.1. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface and γ_1 a self intersecting arc. Let c_1 and c_2 be the two multicurves obtained by smoothing the crossing. Then we have that:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} = x_{c_1} + Y^+ x_{c_2},$$

where Y^+ is a monomial on y -variables.

4.5.1 Resolution of regular self incompatibility of a doubly notched arc

Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is a triangulated punctured surface and let γ be an arc which has both of its endpoints at the same puncture and has a tagging at both of them. Assume that there is a common overlap m locally, where the self-intersection occurs. Then we say that there is a *regular self-incompatibility*.

We will interpret the conditions under which this incompatibility occurs by analyzing the corresponding loop string associated with the arc γ . The main distinction is about the overlap and if it occurs on the same or on the opposite direction.

Definition 4.5.2. Suppose that w is an abstract loopstring with the same hook at both of its ends.

Assume that $w = hu_1ambu_2cm^{-1}du_3h$ where u_i and m are substrings, a and d are inverse arrows, b and c are inverse arrows and h is a hook. We then say that w has a *regular self-crossing in the opposite direction* in m .

The resolution of the self crossing of w with respect to m are the loopstrings w_5, w_{34} and the band w_6^o which are defined as follows:




Figure 4.18: Regular self crossing of a doubly notched arc in the opposite direction.

- $w_{34} = hu_1amc^{-1}u_2^{-1}b^{-1}m^{-1}du_3h$,
- $w_5 = hu_1eu_3h$, where e is a direct arrow,
- $w_6^o = u_2^o$.

Assume now that $w = hu_1ambu_2cmdu_3h$ where u_i, m, a, b, c, d as they were defined earlier. We then say that w has a *regular self-crossing in the same direction* in m . The resolution of the self crossing of w with respect to m is the loopstring w_{34} and the bands w_5^o, w_6^o which are defined as follows:

- $w_3 = hu_1amdu_3h$,
- $w_4^o = cmbu_2c$,
- $w_{56}^o = (u_3 - u_1)' \rightarrow (u_2^{-1})'$, where $(u_3 - u_1)'$ is the string u_3 subtracting the string u_1 and the intersection of u_2 and u_3 , while $(u_2^{-1})'$ is the inverse of the string u_2 subtracting the intersection of u_2 and u_3 .

We will now present one example where there is a self intersection in the opposite direction so that Definition 4.5.2 becomes clearer.

Example 4.5.3. Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is the triangulated surface appearing in Figure 4.18. Let γ_1 be the red arc appearing in the same figure. Then the string w_1 corresponding to γ_1 is the following:

$$w_1 = 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 8 \rightarrow 9 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 10 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 11 \rightarrow 8 \leftarrow \\ \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \rightarrow 7 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 1 \rightarrow 2.$$

Following Definition 4.5.2 we see that there is a self intersection in the opposite direction with overlap $m = 8$. We can additionally break the string w_1 in the

following substrings:

$$\begin{aligned} h &= 1 \leftarrow 2, \\ u_1 &= 3, \\ u_2 &= 9 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 10 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 11, \\ u_3 &= 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \rightarrow 7 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 3. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore get the following resolution of w_1 with respect to m .

$$\begin{aligned} w_{34} &= 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 11 \rightarrow 12 \rightarrow 10 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 9 \\ &\quad \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \rightarrow 7 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 1 \rightarrow 2, \\ w_5 &= 1 \rightarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \rightarrow 7 \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 1 \rightarrow 2, \\ w_6^o &= \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 7 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 10 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 11 \leftarrow . \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the loopstrings/bands w_{34}, w_5, w_6^o in the resolution correspond to the respective arcs/loops $\gamma_{34}, \gamma_5, \gamma_6^o$ appearing in Figure 4.18 as it should be expected.

The following two propositions, each deal with a separate case of opposite and same direction self crossing incompatibility respectively.

Proposition 4.5.4. *Let w_1, w_{34}, w_5 and w_6^o as they were defined in Definition 4.5.2, where w_1 has a self intersection m in the opposite direction. Suppose that m_1 is a proper submodule of w_{34} . If m_1 is reached from w_{34} by the sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module w_1 to obtain a unique submodule m'_1 of it.*

Similarly, assuming that m_2 is a proper submodule of $w_5 \oplus w_6^o$ and is reached from $w_5 \oplus w_6^o$ by the sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $w_1 - m = hu_1 \oplus u_2 cm^{-1} du_3 h$ to obtain a unique submodule m'_1 of it.

Proof. The uniqueness of the modules follows from the construction of the modules in the next Lemma 4.5.6. ■

Proposition 4.5.5. *Let w_1, w_3, w_4^o and w_{56}^o as they were defined in Definition 4.5.2, where w_1 has a self intersection m in the same direction. Suppose that m_1 is a proper submodule of $w_3 \oplus w_4^o$. If m_1 is reached from $w_3 \oplus w_4^o$ by the sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, then we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module w_1 to obtain a unique submodule m'_1 of it.*

Similarly, assuming that m_2 is a proper submodule of w_{56}^o and is reached from w_{56}^o by the sequence $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, we can apply the same sequence (a_i) to the module $u_2 cm du_3 (u_3 - u_1)'$, to obtain a unique submodule m'_1 of it.

Proof. The uniqueness of the modules follows from the construction of the modules in the next Lemma 4.5.6. ■

Lemma 4.5.6. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4.5.4 and Proposition 4.5.5, for each of the modules m_i and sequences $(b_i), 1 \leq i \leq n$, we can apply the same sequence in the associated submodule of w_1 to obtain a new submodule m'_1*

Proof. Let us assume first that the self intersection is in the opposite direction. If m_1 is a submodule of w_{34} it is easy to see that the statement is true since it follows the same arguments from previous chapters and the local position of the substrings u_1h, u_2, u_3h is the same.

If m_2 is a submodule of $w_5 \oplus w_6^o$, having removed the substring m from the module w_1 we can again easily see that each top removed from $w_5 \oplus w_6^o$ has an obvious counterpart from $hu_1 \oplus u_2cm^{-1}du_3h$.

Suppose now that the self intersection is in the same direction. The only interesting case is when we consider m_1 to be a submodule of w_{56}^o when w has a self intersection in the same direction m . However, even this case is straightforward since u_2 and u'_3 are local tops in $u_2cmd(u_3 - u_1)'$, due to the c being a direct arrow and d an inverse arrow. \blacksquare

Theorem 4.5.7. *Let w_1, w_{34}, w_5 and w_6^o as they were defined in Definition 4.5.2, where w_1 has a self intersection m in the opposite direction. Then there exists a bijection:*

$$\Psi: SM(w_{34}) \bigcup SM(w_5 \oplus w_6^o) \rightarrow SM(w_1),$$

which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(w_{34}) &= w_1, \\ \Psi(w_5 \oplus w_6^o) &= hu_1 \oplus u_2cm^{-1}du_3h. \end{aligned}$$

If m is a submodule of w_{34} which is reached by the sequence $\{a_i\} 1 \leq i \leq n$, and m' the unique submodule of w_1 which is reached by the same sequence, then we define:

$$\Psi(m) = m'.$$

If m is a submodule of $w_5 \oplus w_6^o$, then $\Psi(m)$ is defined in a similar way.

Let also w_1, w_3, w_4^o and w_{56}^o as they were defined in Definition 4.5.2, where w_1 has a self intersection m in the same direction. Then there exists a bijection:

$$\Phi: SM(w_3 \oplus w_4^o) \bigcup SM(w_{56}^o) \rightarrow SM(w_1),$$

which is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi(w_3 \oplus w_4^o) &= w_1, \\ \Phi(w_{56}^o) &= u_2m(u_3 - u_1)'. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The fact that Ψ and Φ are bijections follows from Proposition 4.5.8 and Remark 4.1.13. \blacksquare

Proposition 4.5.8. *The maps Ψ and Φ as they were defined in Theorem 4.5.7 are injections.*

Proof. The proof of this proposition is similar to the one given in Proposition 4.1.12 and is omitted. \blacksquare

We will proceed by giving the theorem describing the skein relations for both cases of same and opposite self crossing without explicitly proving it. The only argument missing is the proof that the x -variables of the corresponding whole modules agree in each case, but this has been done multiple times already and the proof technique is exactly the same.

Theorem 4.5.9. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a doubly notched arc at a puncture p which has a self crossing. Then:*

(i) *If the overlap m in γ_1 occurs in the opposite direction, then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} = x_{\gamma_{34}} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_5} x_{\gamma_6^o},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(m)$.

(ii) *If the overlap m in γ_1 occurs in the same direction, then:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} = x_{\gamma_3} x_{\gamma_4^o} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_{56}^o},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(m)Y(u_2 \cap u_3)$.

4.5.2 Resolution of grafting self incompatibility of a doubly notched arc

We will now deal with the case where a tagged arc γ in a triangulated punctured surface (S, M, P, T) has a self intersection but the overlap is empty. In other words we will resolve a grafting self incompatibility of a doubly notched arc. In this section, as it was the case with the previous one, we will limit ourselves to the case where the given arc γ has both of its endpoints at the same puncture.

Contrary to the classical grafting, this case is unique since even though the overlap is empty we can still recognize the grafting case given one abstract loopstring.

Definition 4.5.10. Suppose that w is an abstract loopstring with the same hook $h = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$, $2 \leq n$, at both of its endpoints.

Assume that $w_1 = hu_1 x_k a x_{k+1} u_2 h$ where $1 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $a = \leftarrow$. Then, we say that w has a *grafting incompatibility at x_k, x_{k+1}* .

The *resolution of the grafting incompatibility at $x_k x_{k+1}$* is defined to be the loopstrings γ_{34} , γ_5 and the bandstring γ_6^o which are defined as follows:

- $w_{34} = hu_1^{-1} x_{k+1} u_2 h$,
- $w_5 = h(u_2)'h$, where $(u_2)' = u_2 - (u_2 \cap h)$,
- $w_6^o = (x_k u_1^{-1})^o$.

Remark 4.5.11. In Definition 4.5.10 the string $(u_2)'$ is basically defined to be the string u_2 if we subtract the common elements of u_2 and h .

Additionally as a reminder of the notation used in the above definition, if u is a string then we denote by u^o the bandstring which can be created by adding the appropriate arrow at the start and end of u . Of course this cannot be done on every string, but in our case this is possible.

Example 4.5.12. Suppose that (S, M, P, T) is the triangulated surface appearing in Figure 4.19. Let γ_1 be the red arc appearing in the same figure. Then the string w_1 corresponding to γ_1 is the following:

$$w_1 = 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 11 \rightarrow 12 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \\ \leftarrow 5 \rightarrow 10 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \leftarrow 7.$$

Following Definition 4.5.10 we see that there is a grafting incompatibility at 3, 4. Breaking down the string w_1 we also see the following:

$$h = 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \leftarrow 7, \\ u_1 = 12 \leftarrow 11, \\ u_2 = 5 \rightarrow 10 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 8.$$

Our goal is to resolve this grafting incompatibility using Definition 4.5.10. For that, let us first compute u'_2 . According to our definition, u'_2 should not contain the common elements of u_2 and h , so in our case this is just 5. Therefore:

$$u'_2 = 10 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 8.$$

We are now ready to compute the resolution:

$$w_{34} = 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 11 \rightarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \\ \rightarrow 10 \leftarrow 9 \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \leftarrow 7, \\ w_5 = 5 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 6 \leftarrow 10 \leftarrow 9 \\ \leftarrow 8 \leftarrow 1 \leftarrow 2 \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 4 \leftarrow 5 \leftarrow 6 \leftarrow 7, \\ w_6^o = \leftarrow 3 \leftarrow 12 \leftarrow 11 \leftarrow \dots$$

It is now easy to see that the loopstrings/bandstrings w_{34}, w_5, w_6^o in the resolution correspond to the respective arcs/loops $\gamma_{34}, \gamma_5, \gamma_6^o$ appearing in Figure 4.19.

In this last section we will omit the propositions and lemmas leading to the final theorem which showcases how the bijection between the submodules of w_1 and on the other hand the submodules of w_{34} and $w_5 \oplus w_6^o$ is built, since all the arguments and ideas are following preexisting results.

Theorem 4.5.13. Let w_1, w_{34}, w_5 and w_6^o as they were defined in Definition 4.5.10, where w_1 has a grafting incompatibility at x_k, x_{k+1} . Then there exists a bijection:

$$\Psi: SM(w_{34}) \bigcup SM(w_5 \oplus w_6^o) \rightarrow SM(w_1),$$

which is defined as follows:

$$\Psi(w_{34}) = (h - x_k)bu_1x_kax_{k+1}u_2h, \\ \Psi(w_5 \oplus w_6^o) = w_1,$$

where $(h - x_k)$ is the substring $x_{k-1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow x_{k+1}$ and $b = \leftarrow$. If m is a submodule of w_{34} which is reached by the sequence $\{a_i\} 1 \leq i \leq n$, and m' the unique submodule of w_1 which is reached by the same sequence, then we define:

$$\Psi(m) = m'.$$




Figure 4.19: Grafting self crossing of a doubly notched arc.

If m is a submodule of $w_5 \oplus w_6^o$, then $\Psi(m)$ is defined in a similar way.

As in the previous section we proceed on by finally stating the last theorem dealing with the skein relations without explicitly working the details of the proof.

Theorem 4.5.14. *Let (S, M, P, T) be a triangulated punctured surface, γ_1 a doubly notched arc at a puncture p which has a self crossing at the first triangle of T that γ_1 passes through. Then there is a grafting incompatibility and we the smoothing of the intersection is the following:*

$$x_{\gamma_1} = x_{\gamma_{34}} + Y^+ x_{\gamma_5} x_{\gamma_6^o},$$

where $Y^+ = Y(x_k x_{k+1}) Y(u_2 \cap h)$.

Bibliography

- [BR87] M. C. R. Butler and Claus Michael Ringel. “Auslander-reiten sequences with few middle terms and applications to string algebras”. In: *Communications in Algebra* 15 (1987), pp. 145–179. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:120809950>.
- [Pen87] R C Penner. “The decorated Teichmüller space of punctured surfaces”. en. In: *Commun. Math. Phys.* 113.2 (June 1987), pp. 299–339.
- [Lus90] G. Lusztig. “Canonical Bases Arising from Quantized Enveloping Algebras”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 2 (1990), pp. 447–498. DOI: [10.1090/S0894-0347-1990-1035415-6](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-1990-1035415-6).
- [FZ01] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. “Cluster algebras I: Foundations”. In: *Journal of the American Mathematical Society* 15 (May 2001), pp. 497–529. DOI: [10.1090/S0894-0347-01-00385-X](https://doi.org/10.1090/S0894-0347-01-00385-X).
- [FZ03] Sergey Fomin and Andrei Zelevinsky. “Cluster algebras II: Finite type classification”. In: *Inventiones mathematicae* 154 (Oct. 2003), pp. 63–121. DOI: [10.1007/s00222-003-0302-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00222-003-0302-y).
- [BFZ05] Arkady Berenstein, Sergey Fomin, and Andrei Zelevinsky. “Cluster algebras III: Upper bounds and double Bruhat cells”. In: *Duke Math. J.* 126.1 (Jan. 2005), pp. 1–52.
- [BMRRT06] Aslak Bakke Buan, Bethany Rose Marsh, Markus Reineke, Idun Reiten, and Gordana Todorov. “Tilting theory and cluster combinatorics”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 204.2 (2006), pp. 572–618. ISSN: 0001-8708. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2005.06.003>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870805001763>.
- [CCS06] Philippe Caldero, Frédéric Chapoton, and Ralf Schiffler. “Quivers with relations and cluster tilted algebras”. en. In: *Algebr. Represent. Theory* 9.4 (Aug. 2006), pp. 359–376.
- [FG06] Vladimir Fock and Alexander Goncharov. “Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory”. en. In: *Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Etudes Sci.* 103.1 (June 2006), pp. 1–211.

- [FST06] Sergey Fomin, Michael Shapiro, and Dylan Thurston. “Cluster algebras and triangulated surfaces. Part I: Cluster complexes”. In: (2006). doi: [10.48550/ARXIV.MATH/0608367](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.MATH/0608367). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0608367>.
- [CK08] Philippe Caldero and Bernhard Keller. “From triangulated categories to cluster algebras”. en. In: *Invent. Math.* 172.1 (Apr. 2008), pp. 169–211.
- [Sch08] Ralf Schiffler. “A geometric model for cluster categories of type D_n ”. en. In: *J. Algebr. Comb.* 27.1 (Feb. 2008), pp. 1–21.
- [Ami09] Claire Amiot. “Cluster categories for algebras of global dimension 2 and quivers with potential”. eng. In: *Annales de l'institut Fourier* 59.6 (2009), pp. 2525–2590. URL: <http://eudml.org/doc/10463>.
- [KS09] M. Kontsevich and Y. Soibelman. “Notes on $A\infty$ -Algebras, $A\infty$ -Categories and Non-Commutative Geometry”. In: (2009), pp. 1–67. doi: [10.1007/978-3-540-68030-7_6](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68030-7_6). URL: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-68030-7_6.
- [Lab09a] Daniel Labardini-Fragoso. “Quivers with potentials associated to triangulated surfaces”. en. In: *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)* 98.3 (May 2009), pp. 797–839.
- [Lab09b] Daniel Labardini-Fragoso. *Quivers with potentials associated to triangulated surfaces, Part II: Arc representations*. 2009. arXiv: [0909.4100 \[math.RT\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/0909.4100). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/0909.4100>.
- [Nak09] Hiraku Nakajima. “Quiver varieties and cluster algebras”. In: *Kyoto Journal of Mathematics* 51 (Apr. 2009). doi: [10.1215/0023608X-2010-021](https://doi.org/10.1215/0023608X-2010-021).
- [ABCP10] Ibrahim Assem, Thomas Brüstle, Gabrielle Charbonneau-Jodoin, and Pierre-Guy Plamondon. “Gentle algebras arising from surface triangulations”. en. In: *Algebra Number Theory* 4.2 (Jan. 2010), pp. 201–229.
- [BZ11] Thomas Brüstle and Jie Zhang. “On the cluster category of a marked surface without punctures”. In: *Algebra and Number Theory* 5 (Jan. 2011), pp. 529–566.
- [MSW11] Gregg Musiker, Ralf Schiffler, and Lauren Williams. “Positivity for cluster algebras from surfaces”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 227.6 (2011), pp. 2241–2308. ISSN: 0001-8708. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2011.04.018>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0001870811001423>.
- [ÇS12] Ilke Çanakçı and Ralf Schiffler. “Snake graph calculus and cluster algebras from surfaces III: Band graphs and snake rings”. In: *arXiv: Combinatorics* (2012). URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:118603222>.

- [CL12] Giovanni Cerulli Irelli and Daniel Labardini-Fragoso. “Quivers with potentials associated to triangulated surfaces, Part III: tagged triangulations and cluster monomials”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 148.6 (Nov. 2012), pp. 1833–1866. ISSN: 1570-5846. DOI: [10.1112/S0010437X12000528](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X12000528). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X12000528>.
- [FT12] Sergey Fomin and Dylan Thurston. “Cluster Algebras and Triangulated Surfaces Part II: Lambda Lengths”. In: *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society* 255 (Oct. 2012). DOI: [10.1090/memo/1223](https://doi.org/10.1090/memo/1223).
- [CS13] İlke Çanakçı and Ralf Schiffler. “Snake graph calculus and cluster algebras from surfaces”. In: *Journal of Algebra* 382 (2013), pp. 240–281. ISSN: 0021-8693. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2013.02.018>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0021869313001051>.
- [MSW13] Gregg Musiker, Ralf Schiffler, and Lauren Williams. “Bases for cluster algebras from surfaces”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 149.2 (2013), pp. 217–263. DOI: [10.1112/S0010437X12000450](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X12000450).
- [AIR14] Takahide Adachi, Osamu Iyama, and Idun Reiten. “ τ -tilting theory”. In: *Compositio Mathematica* 150.3 (2014), pp. 415–452. DOI: [10.1112/S0010437X13007422](https://doi.org/10.1112/S0010437X13007422).
- [CS14] İlke Çanakçı and Ralf Schiffler. “Snake graph calculus and cluster algebras from surfaces II: self-crossing snake graphs”. In: *Mathematische Zeitschrift* 281 (2014), pp. 55–102. URL: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119319803>.
- [TY14] Yuji Terashima and Masahito Yamazaki. “N=2 theories from cluster algebras”. In: *Progress of Theoretical and Experimental Physics* 2014.2 (Feb. 2014), 023B01. ISSN: 2050-3911. DOI: [10.1093/ptep/ptt115](https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptt115). eprint: <https://academic.oup.com/ptep/article-pdf/2014/2/023B01/9719238/ptt115.pdf>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptep/ptt115>.
- [LS15] Kyungyong Lee and Ralf Schiffler. “Positivity for cluster algebras”. In: *Annals of Mathematics* 182.1 (2015), pp. 73–125. ISSN: 0003486X. URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24522999>.
- [Lak16] Rosanna Laking. “String Algebras in Representation Theory”. PhD thesis, Department of Mathematics. PhD thesis. The University of Manchester, 2016. URL: <https://personalpages.manchester.ac.uk/staff/mike.prest/LakingThesis.pdf>.
- [GHKK17] Mark Gross, Paul Hacking, Sean Keel, and Maxim Kontsevich. “Canonical bases for cluster algebras”. en. In: *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 31.2 (Nov. 2017), pp. 497–608.
- [Dav18] Ben Davison. “Positivity for quantum cluster algebras”. In: *Ann. Math.* 187.1 (Jan. 2018).

- [Wil20] Jon Wilson. *Surface cluster algebra expansion formulae via loop graphs*. 2020. doi: [10.48550/ARXIV.2006.13218](https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2006.13218). URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.13218>.
- [CS21] İlke Çanakçı and Sibylle Schroll. “Lattice bijections for string modules, snake graphs and the weak Bruhat order”. In: *Advances in Applied Mathematics* 126 (2021). Special Issue: Dedicated to Joseph Kung, p. 102094. ISSN: 0196-8858. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aam.2020.102094>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S019688582030097X>.
- [PPP22] Yann Palu, Vincent Pilaud, and Pierre-Guy Plamondon. *Non-kissing complexes and tau-tilting for gentle algebras*. 2022. arXiv: [1707.07574](https://arxiv.org/abs/1707.07574) [math.CO].
- [BKK24] Esther Banaian, Wonwoo Kang, and Elizabeth Kelley. *Skein relations for punctured surfaces*. 2024. arXiv: [2409.04957](https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.04957) [math.CO]. URL: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.04957>.