Cohn path algebras have Invariant Basis Number

Gene Abrams



(joint work with Muge Kanuni)

AMS Sectional Meeting Boulder, CO

April 13, 2013

Gene Abrams

Cohn path algebras have Invariant Basis Number

< □ > < □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇
 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Let K be a field, and let $E = (E^0, E^1, s, r)$ be a directed graph.

The Cohn path K-algebra $C_{K}(E)$ of E with coefficients in K

is the *K*-algebra generated by a set $\{v \mid v \in E^0\}$, together with a set of variables $\{e, e^* \mid e \in E^1\}$, which satisfy the following relations:

$$\begin{array}{ll} (\mathsf{V}) & vw = \delta_{v,w}v \text{ for all } v, w \in E^0, \\ (\mathsf{E1}) & s(e)e = er(e) = e \text{ for all } e \in E^1, \\ (\mathsf{E2}) & r(e)e^* = e^*s(e) = e^* \text{ for all } e \in E^1, \text{ and} \\ (\mathsf{CK1}) & e^*e' = \delta_{e,e'}r(e) \text{ for all } e, e' \in E^1. \end{array}$$

Gene Abrams

-

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

The Leavitt path K-algebra $L_{K}(E)$ of E with coefficients in K

is the K-algebra generated by the same set $\{v \mid v \in E^0\}$,

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

The Leavitt path K-algebra $L_{K}(E)$ of E with coefficients in K

is the K-algebra generated by the same set $\{v \mid v \in E^0\}$, together with the same set of variables $\{e, e^* \mid e \in E^1\}$,

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

(a)

Gene Abrams

The Leavitt path K-algebra $L_{K}(E)$ of E with coefficients in K

is the *K*-algebra generated by the same set $\{v \mid v \in E^0\}$, together with the same set of variables $\{e, e^* \mid e \in E^1\}$, which satisfy the same set of relations (V), (E1), (E2), and (CK1),

Gene Abrams

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

The Leavitt path K-algebra $L_{K}(E)$ of E with coefficients in K

is the *K*-algebra generated by the same set $\{v \mid v \in E^0\}$, together with the same set of variables $\{e, e^* \mid e \in E^1\}$, which satisfy the same set of relations (V), (E1), (E2), and (CK1), and also satisfy the additional relation

(CK2)
$$v = \sum_{\{e \in E^1 | s(e) = v\}} ee^*$$
 for every regular vertex $v \in E^0$.

Gene Abrams

If E^0 is finite then both $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)$ and $L_{\mathcal{K}}(E)$ are unital, each having identity $1 = \sum_{v \in E^0} v$.

These are clearly related:

$$L_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)/N$$

where $N = \langle v - \sum_{\{e \in E^1 | s(e) = v\}} ee^* | v \text{ regular} \rangle \trianglelefteq C_{\mathcal{K}}(E).$

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

But they are ALSO related in a perhaps surprising way.

Gene Abrams

The graph F(E)

Let E be an arbitrary graph.

Let Y denote the set of regular vertices of E.

Let $Y' = \{v' \mid v \in Y\}$ be a disjoint copy of Y.

For $v \in Y$ and for each edge e in E such that $r_E(e) = v$, we consider a new symbol e'.

3

イロン イロン イヨン イヨン

The graph F(E)

Let E be an arbitrary graph.

Let Y denote the set of regular vertices of E.

Let $Y' = \{v' \mid v \in Y\}$ be a disjoint copy of Y.

For $v \in Y$ and for each edge e in E such that $r_E(e) = v$, we consider a new symbol e'.

We define the graph F = F(E), as follows:

$$F^{0} = E^{0} \sqcup Y'; \quad F^{1} = E^{1} \sqcup \{e' \mid r_{E}(e) \in Y\};$$

and for each $e \in E^1$,

$$s_F(e) = s_E(e), \ s_F(e') = s_E(e),$$

$$r_F(e) = r_E(e)$$
, and $r_F(e') = r_E(e)'$.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Less formally (focus on E finite)

F = F(E) is built from E by:

1) adding a new vertex to E corresponding to each non-sink of E, and

2) including new edges going into each of these new vertices as they were connected to the original vertices.

Gene Abrams

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Examples.

Let *E* be the graph



Then the graph F = F(E) is:



Gene Abrams

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

Let R_2 be the graph



Then the graph $F = F(R_2)$ is:



Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

<ロ> <四> <四> <日> <日> <日</p>

Note for later: The incidence matrix A_F of F = F(E) is the $(n + t) \times (n + t)$ matrix in which, for $1 \le i \le t$, the *i*th row is

$$(a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, ..., a_{i,n}, a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, ..., a_{i,t}),$$

and the remaining n rows are zeroes.

Gene Abrams

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

Theorem. (P. Ara) Let E be any graph. Then there is an isomorphism of K-algebras

 $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \cong L_{\mathcal{K}}(F(E)).$

Gene Abrams

< □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ < ⊇ < </p>
University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Theorem. (P. Ara) Let E be any graph. Then there is an isomorphism of K-algebras

 $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)\cong L_{\mathcal{K}}(F(E)).$

Idea of Proof. Expressions of the form $v - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v)} ee^*$ are nonzero idempotents in $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)$.

"Replace" each regular v by $\sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v)} ee^*$ and think of v' as $v - \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v)} ee^*$.

Gene Abrams

Suppose $|G^0| = n$. Construct the abelian monoid M_G :

For each regular vertex v_i $(1 \le i \le t)$ define

$$ec{b_i} = (0, 0, ..., 1, 0, ...0) \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^n.$$

Consider the equivalence relation \sim_G in $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^n$, generated by setting

$$\vec{b_i} \sim_G (a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, ..., a_{i,n})$$

for each regular vertex v_i . Define

$$M_G = (\mathbb{Z}^+)^n / \sim_G .$$

The operation in M_G is: $[\vec{a}] + [\vec{a'}] = [\vec{a} + \vec{a'}]$ for $\vec{a}, \vec{a'} \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^n$.

Gene Abrams

 < □ >
 < ⊇ >
 < ⊇ >
 ⊇

 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Viewed another way:

$$\vec{b_i} \sim_G i^{th}$$
 row of A_G

for each nonzero row of A_G .

i.e., for each v_i which is not a sink in G.

Gene Abrams

< □ > < □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇
 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Example.

$$E = \bullet^{u} \xrightarrow{e} \bullet^{v} \xrightarrow{f} \bullet^{w}$$

Then M_E is the monoid $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$, modulo the relation \sim_E generated by setting $(1,0,0) \sim_E (0,1,0)$ and $(0,1,0) \sim_E (0,0,1)$.

Gene Abrams

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

Example.

$$E = \bullet^{u} \xrightarrow{e} \bullet^{v} \xrightarrow{f} \bullet^{w}$$

Then M_E is the monoid $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^3$, modulo the relation \sim_E generated by setting $(1,0,0) \sim_E (0,1,0)$ and $(0,1,0) \sim_E (0,0,1)$.

We get $M_F \cong \mathbb{Z}^+$, via $[(a, b, c)] \mapsto a + b + c$.

Gene Abrams

イロン 不同 とくほう イロン University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

Example.



・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

 M_{R_2} is the monoid $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^1$, modulo the relation generated by setting (1) \sim_{R_2} (2).

We get $M_{R_2} \cong \{0, x\}$, where x + x = x.

(N.b.: M_{R_2} is *not* the group \mathbb{Z}_2 .)

Gene Abrams

Invariant Basis Number

Definition. *R* any unital ring. *R* has *Invariant Basis Number* (IBN) in case for each pair $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$,

 $_{R}R^{m} \cong _{R}R^{m'}$ as left *R*-modules $\Leftrightarrow m = m'$.

Gene Abrams

< □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇
 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Invariant Basis Number

Definition. *R* any unital ring. *R* has *Invariant Basis Number* (IBN) in case for each pair $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$_{R}R^{m} \cong _{R}R^{m'}$$
 as left *R*-modules $\Leftrightarrow m = m'$.

Definition. R any ring. $\mathcal{V}(R)$ denotes the abelian monoid of isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective left R-modules, with operation

 $[P] + [Q] = [P \oplus Q].$

Gene Abrams

イロン イロン イヨン イヨン

Invariant Basis Number

Definition. *R* any unital ring. *R* has *Invariant Basis Number* (IBN) in case for each pair $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$_{R}R^{m} \cong _{R}R^{m'}$$
 as left *R*-modules $\Leftrightarrow m = m'$.

Definition. R any ring. $\mathcal{V}(R)$ denotes the abelian monoid of isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective left R-modules, with operation

$$[P] + [Q] = [P \oplus Q].$$

Observation: *R* has IBN if and only if for every pair of distinct positive integers $m \neq m'$ we have $m[R] \neq m'[R]$ in $\mathcal{V}(R)$.

(a)

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Gene Abrams

Theorem. (Ara, Moreno, Pardo, 2007) Let *E* be a finite graph with vertices $\{v_i \mid 1 \le i \le n\}$, and let *K* be any field. Then the assignment $[\vec{b}_i] \mapsto [L_K(E)v_i]$ yields an isomorphism of monoids

 $M_E \cong \mathcal{V}(L_{\mathcal{K}}(E)).$

In particular, under this isomorphism, if $\vec{\rho} = (1, 1, ..., 1) \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^n$, we have $[\vec{\rho}] \mapsto [L_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{E})]$.

Corollary. Let *F* be any finite graph, and *K* any field. Let $\vec{\rho} = (1, 1, ..., 1) \in M_F$. Then $L_K(F)$ has IBN if and only if for any pair of positive integers $m \neq m'$, we have $m\vec{\rho} \approx_F m'\vec{\rho}$.

Gene Abrams

Example.

$$E = \bullet^{u} \xrightarrow{e} \bullet^{v} \xrightarrow{f} \bullet^{w}$$

Then $M_E \cong \mathbb{Z}^+$. In this identification, $[\vec{\rho}] = [(1,1,1)] \mapsto 1 + 1 + 1 = 3.$

 $m \neq m'$ obviously gives $m \cdot 3 \neq m' \cdot 3$ in \mathbb{Z}^+ . So $L_{\mathcal{K}}(E)$ has IBN.

Example.



 $M_{R_2} \cong \{0, x\}$, and $[\vec{\rho}] \mapsto x$. Since 1x = 2x, $L_K(R_2)$ does not have IBN.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Key question: In a monoid of the form M_E , how do you show that two elements $[\vec{a}]$ and $[\vec{a'}]$ are NOT equal?

One possible approach: Find an invariant for the generating relations of $\sim_{\textit{E}}$.

Specifically: Find a function $\varphi : (\mathbb{Z}^+)^n \to \mathbb{Q}$ with the property that if $\vec{c} \sim_E \vec{c'}$ in $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^n$, then $\varphi(\vec{c}) = \varphi(\vec{c'})$. So if for some pair \vec{a} and $\vec{a'}$ we have $\varphi(\vec{a}) \neq \varphi(\vec{a'})$, then $[\vec{a}]$ and $[\vec{a'}]$ are not equal in M_F .

Gene Abrams

Proposition. Given integers a_{ij} $(1 \le i \le t, 1 \le j \le n)$, there exist $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_{n+t}$ in \mathbb{Q} which satisfy the following system of t + 1 linear equations:

1	=	w_1	+	W2	+	 +	Wn	+	w_{n+1}	+	 +	w_{n+t}
w_1	=	$a_{11}w_1$	+	$a_{12}w_{2}$	+	 +	a _{1n} w _n	+	$a_{11}w_{n+1}$	+	 +	$a_{1t} w_{n+t}$
<i>w</i> ₂	=	$a_{21}w_1$	+	a 22 W 2	+	 +	a _{2n} w _n	+	$a_{21}w_{n+1}$	+	 +	$a_{2t}w_{n+t}$
:												
·												
Wt	=	$a_{t1}w_1$	+	$a_{t2}w_2$	+	 +	a _{tn} W _n	+	$a_{t1}w_{n+1}$	+	 +	a _{tt} w _{n+t}

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

-

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

Proof. Consider this $(t + 1) \times (n + t)$ matrix:

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ a_{11} - 1 & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1t} & \dots & a_{1n} & a_{11} & \dots & a_{1t} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} - 1 & \dots & a_{2t} & \dots & a_{2n} & a_{21} & \dots & a_{2t} \\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ a_{t1} & a_{t2} & \dots & a_{tt} - 1 & \dots & a_{tn} & a_{t1} & \dots & a_{tt} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then the existence of desired rationals $w_1, w_2, ..., w_{n+t}$ is equivalent to the existence of a solution in \mathbb{Q}^{n+t} to the system $B\vec{x} = (1, 0, 0, ..., 0)^t$.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Gene Abrams

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ a_{11} - 1 & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1t} & \dots & a_{1n} & a_{11} & \dots & a_{1t} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} - 1 & \dots & a_{2t} & \dots & a_{2n} & a_{21} & \dots & a_{2t} \\ \vdots & & & & & & \\ a_{t1} & a_{t2} & \dots & a_{tt} - 1 & \dots & a_{tn} & a_{t1} & \dots & a_{tt} \end{pmatrix}$$

Claim: The t + 1 rows of B are linearly independent in \mathbb{Q}^{n+t} .

Idea: Induction on the number of rows. The first two rows are linearly independent (Row 2 has two unequal entries).

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & \dots & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ a_{11} - 1 & a_{12} & \dots & a_{1t} & \dots & a_{1n} & a_{11} & \dots & a_{1t} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} - 1 & \dots & a_{2t} & \dots & a_{2n} & a_{21} & \dots & a_{2t} \\ \vdots \\ a_{t1} & a_{t2} & \dots & a_{tt} - 1 & \dots & a_{tn} & a_{t1} & \dots & a_{tt} \end{pmatrix}$$

Claim: The t + 1 rows of B are linearly independent in \mathbb{Q}^{n+t} .

Idea: Induction on the number of rows. The first two rows are linearly independent (Row 2 has two unequal entries).

In a similar way, Row j + 1 can't be a linear combination of the first j rows, since in Row j + 1, the j^{th} entry $a_{jj} - 1$ is different than the $(j + n)^{th}$ entry a_{jj} ; but in each Row i $(1 \le i \le j)$, the i^{th} and $(i + n)^{th}$ entries are equal.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Theorem. Let *E* be any finite graph, and *K* any field. Then the Cohn path algebra $C_K(E)$ has the Invariant Basis Number property.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト

- **Theorem.** Let E be any finite graph, and K any field. Then the Cohn path algebra $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)$ has the Invariant Basis Number property.
- **Proof.** By Ara's theorem we have $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \cong L_{\mathcal{K}}(F)$, where F = F(E) as above. We show that $L_{K}(F)$ has IBN.

Recall that if $E^0 = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n\}$, and we label the regular vertices of *E* as v_1, \ldots, v_t , then:

- 1) $F^0 = \{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n, v'_1, v'_2, ..., v'_t\}$ (so that $|F^0| = n + t$), and
- 2) the only regular vertices of F are $\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_t\}$.

Gene Abrams

-

The Main Result.

So if $A = A_E = (a_{i,i})$ is the incidence matrix of E, then the monoid M_F is the monoid $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^{n+t}$, modulo the equivalence relation generated by setting

$$ec{b_i} \sim_{{\sf F}} (a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, ..., a_{i,n}, a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, ..., a_{i,t}) ~~{
m for} ~{
m each} ~1 \leq i \leq t.$$

・ロ・ ・四・ ・ヨ・ ・ ヨ・ University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

Gene Abrams

The Main Result.

Let $\vec{\rho}$ denote the element (1, 1, ..., 1) of $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^{n+t}$. We establish, for any pair of positive integers $m \neq m'$, that $m\vec{\rho} \nsim_F m'\vec{\rho}$.

Let $w_1, w_2, ..., w_{n+t} \in \mathbb{Q}$ be rationals which satisfy the linear system of the Linear Algebra result.

Gene Abrams

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

The Main Result

Let $\vec{\rho}$ denote the element (1, 1, ..., 1) of $(\mathbb{Z}^+)^{n+t}$. We establish, for any pair of positive integers $m \neq m'$, that $m\vec{\rho} \not\sim_F m'\vec{\rho}$.

Let $w_1, w_2, ..., w_{n+t} \in \mathbb{Q}$ be rationals which satisfy the linear system of the Linear Algebra result. Define $\Gamma : (\mathbb{Z}^+)^{n+t} \to \mathbb{O}$ by

$$\Gamma((z_1, z_2, ..., z_{n+t})) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n+t} z_\ell w_\ell.$$

Then Γ is clearly linear. Also, by the choice of $w_1, w_2, ..., w_{n+t}$, for any of the t generating relations for M_F we get that

$$\Gamma(\vec{b_i}) = \Gamma((a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, ..., a_{i,n}, a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}, ..., a_{i,t})).$$

Gene Abrams

イロン 不同 とくほう イロン University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

The Main Result.

So:

for any $\vec{a}, \vec{a'} \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^{n+t}$ with $\vec{a} \sim_F \vec{a'}$, we have $\Gamma(\vec{a}) = \Gamma(\vec{a'})$. (*)

Gene Abrams

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

The Main Result.

So:

for any $\vec{a}, \vec{a'} \in (\mathbb{Z}^+)^{n+t}$ with $\vec{a} \sim_F \vec{a'}$, we have $\Gamma(\vec{a}) = \Gamma(\vec{a'})$. (*)

But the w_{ℓ} have been chosen so that $\sum_{\ell=1}^{n+t} w_{\ell} = 1$. So in particular for any positive integer m we get

$$\Gamma(m\vec{
ho}) = \Gamma((m,m,...,m)) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{n+t} m w_{\ell} = m \sum_{\ell=1}^{n+t} w_{\ell} = m \cdot 1 = m.$$

So for $m \neq m'$ we have $\Gamma(m\vec{\rho}) = m \neq m' = \Gamma(m'\vec{\rho})$. So by (*) we conclude that if $m \neq m'$, then $m\vec{\rho} \approx_F m'\vec{\rho}$.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

Some concluding remarks.

1) Is the Main Result just an artifact of some more general result about the Leavitt path algebras of graphs with sinks?

Gene Abrams

< □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ >
 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

Some concluding remarks.

1) Is the Main Result just an artifact of some more general result about the Leavitt path algebras of graphs with sinks?

No. There are many graphs with sinks for which the corresponding Leavitt path algebra does not have IBN. For instance:

$$G = \bullet \longleftarrow \bullet \bigstar$$

Then in M_G we have

$$1 \cdot \vec{\rho} = (1,1) = (1,0) + (0,1) \sim_G (2,1) + (0,1) = (2,2) = 2 \cdot \vec{\rho},$$

so that $L_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ does not have IBN.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

2) Is the Main Result just an artifact of some more general result about the elements of $\mathcal{V}(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E))$?

Gene Abrams

- 4 回 2 - 4 三 2 - 4 三 2 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

2) Is the Main Result just an artifact of some more general result about the elements of $\mathcal{V}(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E))$?

No. There can be elements \vec{a} in $\mathcal{V}(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)) \cong \mathcal{V}(L_{\mathcal{K}}(F(E)))$ for which $m\vec{a} = m'\vec{a}$ with $m \neq m'$. For instance:

$$E = R_2 = \bullet_r e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = F(R_2) = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = \bullet_r e f \qquad F = F(R_2) = F(R_2$$

 $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \cong L_{\mathcal{K}}(F)$ has IBN. But consider $\zeta = (1,2) \in M_{F}$. Then $\zeta = (1,0) + (0,2) \sim_F (2,2) + (0,2) = (2,4) = 2\zeta.$

Gene Abrams

イロン 不同 とくほう イロン University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

3

3) Is the Main Result just an artifact of a more general result which says that if you don't put the (CK2) condition at SOME vertex then the resulting algebra must have IBN?

3) Is the Main Result just an artifact of a more general result which says that if you don't put the (CK2) condition at SOME vertex then the resulting algebra must have IBN?

No. "Relative Cohn path algebras".

Gene Abrams

3) Is the Main Result just an artifact of a more general result which says that if you don't put the (CK2) condition at SOME vertex then the resulting algebra must have IBN?

No. "Relative Cohn path algebras".

For any m, n with $m \ge 1$, we can construct a graph $E_{n,m}$ having n vertices and having a subset of m vertices, so that if we impose the (CK2) condition at those m vertices, the resulting relative Cohn path algebra does not have IBN.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

4) There is a somewhat stronger conclusion:

Every Cohn path algebra has Invariant Matrix Number.

$$\mathrm{M}_d(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)) \cong \mathrm{M}_{d'}(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E)) \Leftrightarrow d = d'.$$

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

5) There is another proof (given by P. Ara) of the Main Result, using an alternate description of $\mathcal{V}(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E))$ (one which does NOT use properties of Leavitt path algebras).

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

6) Where are the tensor products?

Original motivating question:

Is $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ for some graph G?

Gene Abrams

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

-

6) Where are the tensor products?

Original motivating question:

Is $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ for some graph G?

If E and E' are both acyclic, then we know the answer. (Yes.)

Gene Abrams

< □ > < □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇
 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

6) Where are the tensor products?

Original motivating question:

Is $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ for some graph G?

If E and E' are both acyclic, then we know the answer. (Yes.) If E and E' each have a cycle, then we know the answer. (No)

6) Where are the tensor products?

Original motivating question:

Is $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ for some graph G?

If E and E' are both acyclic, then we know the answer. (Yes.) If E and E' each have a cycle, then we know the answer. (No) If just one of E, E' has a cycle, and the other has at least one edge, then we DON'T know the answer.

Can we gin up an example of a nontrivial acyclic graph E, and a graph with a cycle E', for which $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ for some graph G?

If $E = \bullet \longrightarrow \bullet$, then $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \cong \mathcal{K} \oplus M_2(\mathcal{K})$. (easy)

So $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \oplus M_2(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E'))$ for any E'.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 うの()

Can we gin up an example of a nontrivial acyclic graph E, and a graph with a cycle E', for which $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ for some graph G?

If $E = \bullet \longrightarrow \bullet$, then $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \cong \mathcal{K} \oplus M_2(\mathcal{K})$. (easy)

So $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \oplus M_2(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E'))$ for any E'.

So **IF** we could find E' for which $M_2(C_K(E')) \cong C_K(E')$, then $G = E' \sqcup E'$ would work.

Gene Abrams

Can we gin up an example of a nontrivial acyclic graph E, and a graph with a cycle E', for which $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(G)$ for some graph G?

If $E = \bullet \longrightarrow \bullet$, then $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \cong \mathcal{K} \oplus M_2(\mathcal{K})$. (easy)

So $C_{\mathcal{K}}(E) \otimes C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \cong C_{\mathcal{K}}(E') \oplus M_2(C_{\mathcal{K}}(E'))$ for any E'.

So **IF** we could find E' for which $M_2(C_K(E')) \cong C_K(E')$, then $G = E' \sqcup E'$ would work.

So we looked for a graph E' for which $M_2(C_K(E')) \cong C_K(E')$. Where to start the search? Find a graph E' for which $C_K(E') \cong C_K(E') \oplus C_K(E')$ as left $C_K(E')$ -modules.

Gene Abrams

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三 うの()

And, of course, we couldn't find one.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

э

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

And, of course, we couldn't find one.

We're still working on the tensor product question.

Gene Abrams

University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs

<ロ> <同> <同> < 回> < 回>

And, of course, we couldn't find one.

We're still working on the tensor product question.

Questions?

Gene Abrams

< □ > < □ > < □ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇ > < ⊇
 University of Colorado @ Colorado Springs