

On support varieties over complete intersections

David A. Jorgensen¹ (new stuff at the end is joint with Petter Bergh²)

¹University of Texas at Arlington

²NTNU, Norway

Maurice Auslander Distinguished Lectures
and International Conference, 2013
Woods Hole, MA

The General Idea of Support Varieties

$$M \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{V}(M)$$

- Associate to an R -module M and algebraic set in some affine (or projective) space whose properties reflect homological characteristics of M .

The General Idea of Support Varieties

$$M \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{V}(M)$$

- Associate to an R -module M and algebraic set in some affine (or projective) space whose properties reflect homological characteristics of M .
- Throughout, R ring, $k = \bar{k}$, M, N f.g. R -modules.

The Typical Situation

Let $A = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A^i$ be a commutative graded ring with $A^i = 0$ for i odd. Suppose for every M there is a homomorphism of graded algebras

$$\eta_M : A \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^*(M, M)$$

such that for every N and $\xi \in \text{Ext}_R^*(M, N)$ we have

$$\xi \cdot \eta_M(a) = \eta_N(a) \cdot \xi \quad \text{for every } a \in A$$

The Typical Situation

Let $A = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A^i$ be a commutative graded ring with $A^i = 0$ for i odd. Suppose for every M there is a homomorphism of graded algebras

$$\eta_M : A \rightarrow \text{Ext}_R^*(M, M)$$

such that for every N and $\xi \in \text{Ext}_R^*(M, N)$ we have

$$\xi \cdot \eta_M(a) = \eta_N(a) \cdot \xi \quad \text{for every } a \in A$$

Then A is called a *ring of central cohomology operators*.

Support and Varieties

The *cohomological support* of (M, N) is

$$\text{Supp}_A(M, N) = \{p \in \text{Spec } A \mid \text{Ext}_R^*(M, N)_p \neq 0\}$$

Support and Varieties

The *cohomological support* of (M, N) is

$$\text{Supp}_A(M, N) = \{p \in \text{Spec } A \mid \text{Ext}_R^*(M, N)_p \neq 0\}$$

When A finitely generated over A^0 with $A^0 = k$, then the *support variety* of (M, N) is

$$\mathcal{V}_A(M, N) = (\text{Supp}_A(M, N) \cap \text{MaxSpec } A) \cup \{A^{\geq 1}\}$$

and $\mathcal{V}_A(M) = \mathcal{V}_A(M, k)$.

This construction fits all known classical cases where support varieties are defined:

This construction fits all known classical cases where support varieties are defined:

- Group algebras kG for finite groups; A is then even part of the cohomology ring.

This construction fits all known classical cases where support varieties are defined:

- Group algebras kG for finite groups; A is then even part of the cohomology ring.
- Finite dimensional algebras; A is the even part of the Hochschild cohomology ring.

This construction fits all known classical cases where support varieties are defined:

- Group algebras kG for finite groups; A is then even part of the cohomology ring.
- Finite dimensional algebras; A is the even part of the Hochschild cohomology ring.
- Complete intersections; A is a subring of the cohomology ring, generated by central elements of degree 2.

Special case: complete Intersections

Now assume that Q is a local (meaning also Noetherian) ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{n} and residue field k , $R = Q/(\mathbf{f})$ where $\mathbf{f} = f_1, \dots, f_c$ is a regular sequence in \mathfrak{n}^2 .

Special case: complete Intersections

Now assume that Q is a local (meaning also Noetherian) ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{n} and residue field k , $R = Q/(\mathbf{f})$ where $\mathbf{f} = f_1, \dots, f_c$ is a regular sequence in \mathfrak{n}^2 .

In this case we have

$$A = R[\chi_1, \dots, \chi_c]$$

as the ring of **cohomology operators**, defined from the

Eisenbud operators 1980. ($\deg \chi_i = 2, 1 \leq i \leq c$)

Example

For $Q = k[[x, y]]$, $R = Q/(x^2, y^2)$, and $M = k$, the Eisenbud operators are defined by ...

A theorem of Gulliksen 1974 tells us when $\text{Ext}_R^*(M, N)$ is a **finitely generated** graded module over $R[\chi_1, \dots, \chi_c]$

Theorem

If $\text{Ext}_Q^(M, N)$ is finitely generated over R , then $\text{Ext}_R^*(M, N)$ is a finitely generated graded module over $R[\chi_1, \dots, \chi_c]$.*

Fact: the action of A on $\text{Ext}_R^*(M, k)$ factors through the algebra $\bar{A} = A \otimes_R k = k[\chi_1, \dots, \chi_c]$, so we have the support variety $V_{\bar{A}}(M)$. In other words

$$\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \{(b_1, \dots, b_c) \in k^c \mid \phi(b_1, \dots, b_c) = 0 \text{ for all} \\ \phi \in \text{Ann}_{\bar{A}} \text{Ext}_R^*(M, k)\}$$

a closed set (cone) in k^c when $\text{Ext}_R^*(M, k)$ is f.g. — e.g. Q is a regular local ring.

Fact: the action of A on $\text{Ext}_R^*(M, k)$ factors through the algebra $\bar{A} = A \otimes_R k = k[\chi_1, \dots, \chi_c]$, so we have the support variety $V_{\bar{A}}(M)$. In other words

$$\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \{(b_1, \dots, b_c) \in k^c \mid \phi(b_1, \dots, b_c) = 0 \text{ for all} \\ \phi \in \text{Ann}_{\bar{A}} \text{Ext}_R^*(M, k)\}$$

a closed set (cone) in k^c when $\text{Ext}_R^*(M, k)$ is f.g. — e.g. Q is a regular local ring.

Recall: if \mathcal{M} is finitely generated and graded over $k[\chi_1, \dots, \chi_c]$, then $b_i = \dim_k \mathcal{M}_i$ grows polynomially.

Support varieties give a nice classification of R -modules:

$$M \sim N \text{ iff } \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(N)$$

Support varieties give a nice classification of R -modules:

$$M \sim N \text{ iff } \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(N)$$

A coarser classification is given by the *complexity*, i.e., the dimension of $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$:

$$M \sim N \text{ iff } \dim \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \dim \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(N)$$

Support varieties give a nice classification of R -modules:

$$M \sim N \text{ iff } \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(N)$$

A coarser classification is given by the *complexity*, i.e., the dimension of $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$:

$$M \sim N \text{ iff } \dim \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \dim \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(N)$$

One has

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M, N) = \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(N)$
- For $0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow M_3 \rightarrow 0$ one has

$$\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M_r) \subseteq \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M_s) \cup \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M_t)$$

for $\{r, s, t\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$.

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) = \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(\Omega M)$

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.
- $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i \gg 0 \implies \mathcal{V}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(N) = \{0\}$ — J 1997 (1995).

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.
- $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i \gg 0 \implies \mathcal{V}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(N) = \{0\}$ — J 1997 (1995).
- Fargo 1995 \rightsquigarrow Avramov-Buchweitz 2000 (1998)

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.
- $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i \gg 0 \implies \mathcal{V}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(N) = \{0\}$ — J 1997 (1995).
- Fargo 1995 \rightsquigarrow Avramov-Buchweitz 2000 (1998)
- The realizability question: Which cones in k^c are support varieties?

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.
- $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i \gg 0 \implies \mathcal{V}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(N) = \{0\}$ — J 1997 (1995).
- Fargo 1995 \rightsquigarrow Avramov-Buchweitz 2000 (1998)
- The realizability question: Which cones in k^c are support varieties?
 - Answer: **all**. Solved by Avramov and Jorgensen in 2000.

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.
- $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i \gg 0 \implies \mathcal{V}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(N) = \{0\}$ — J 1997 (1995).
- Fargo 1995 \rightsquigarrow Avramov-Buchweitz 2000 (1998)
- The realizability question: Which cones in k^c are support varieties?
 - Answer: **all**. Solved by Avramov and Jorgensen in 2000.
 - Further realizability ... of modules! Avramov and Jorgensen 201n.

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.
- $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i \gg 0 \implies \mathcal{V}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(N) = \{0\}$ — J 1997 (1995).
- Fargo 1995 \rightsquigarrow Avramov-Buchweitz 2000 (1998)
- The realizability question: Which cones in k^c are support varieties?
 - Answer: **all**. Solved by Avramov and Jorgensen in 2000.
 - Further realizability ... of modules! Avramov and Jorgensen 201n.
 - See also Bergh 2007, and Avramov-Iyengar 2007.

Notes:

- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ was originally defined only for single module by Avramov in 1989.
- $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i \gg 0 \implies \mathcal{V}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}(N) = \{0\}$ — J 1997 (1995).
- Fargo 1995 \rightsquigarrow Avramov-Buchweitz 2000 (1998)
- The realizability question: Which cones in k^c are support varieties?
 - Answer: **all**. Solved by Avramov and Jorgensen in 2000.
 - Further realizability ... of modules! Avramov and Jorgensen 201n.
 - See also Bergh 2007, and Avramov-Iyengar 2007.
- $\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M) \cap \mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(N) = \{0\} \Leftrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^{\gg 0}(M, N) = 0 \Leftrightarrow$
 $\text{Tor}_{\gg 0}^R(M, N) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \text{Ext}_R^{\gg 0}(N, M) = 0$

Yet there are two shortcomings of the standard definition:

Yet there are two shortcomings of the standard definition:

- It is cumbersome.

Yet there are two shortcomings of the standard definition:

- It is cumbersome.
- It does not easily explain the relationship between support varieties of intermediate complete intersections
 $Q \rightarrow R' \rightarrow R$.

Yet there are two shortcomings of the standard definition:

- It is cumbersome.
- It does not easily explain the relationship between support varieties of intermediate complete intersections
 $Q \rightarrow R' \rightarrow R$.

The solution is suggested by a theorem of Avramov and Buchweitz (2000).

Definition

Let $R = Q/(\mathbf{f})$ with Q regular, and $V = (\mathbf{f})/\mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$. Then

$$\mathcal{V}_R(M) = \{f + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f}) \in V \mid \text{pd}_{Q/(\mathbf{f})} M = \infty\}$$

is the support variety of M .

Definition

Let $R = Q/(\mathbf{f})$ with Q regular, and $V = (\mathbf{f})/\mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$. Then

$$\mathcal{V}_R(M) = \{f + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f}) \in V \mid \text{pd}_{Q/(\mathbf{f})} M = \infty\}$$

is the support variety of M .

Theorem

- $\mathcal{V}_R(M)$ is well-defined.
- $\mathcal{V}_R(M)$ is an algebraic set (cone) in V .

$\mathcal{V}_{\bar{A}}(M)$ agrees with $\mathcal{V}_R(M)$... a theorem of Avramov and Buchweitz 2000.

Intermediate Complete Intersections

Let W be a subspace of $V = (\mathbf{f})/\mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$. Choose a basis $g_1 + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f}), \dots, g_d + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$ of W . Then $R_W = Q/(g_1, \dots, g_d)$ is an intermediate complete intersection

$$Q \rightarrow R_W \rightarrow R$$

and we have

Intermediate Complete Intersections

Let W be a subspace of $V = (\mathbf{f})/\mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$. Choose a basis $g_1 + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f}), \dots, g_d + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$ of W . Then $R_W = Q/(g_1, \dots, g_d)$ is an intermediate complete intersection

$$Q \rightarrow R_W \rightarrow R$$

and we have

Theorem

$$\mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M) = \mathcal{V}_R(M) \cap W.$$

Intermediate Complete Intersections

Let W be a subspace of $V = (\mathbf{f})/\mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$. Choose a basis $g_1 + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f}), \dots, g_d + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f})$ of W . Then $R_W = Q/(g_1, \dots, g_d)$ is an intermediate complete intersection

$$Q \rightarrow R_W \rightarrow R$$

and we have

Theorem

$$\mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M) = \mathcal{V}_R(M) \cap W.$$

Proof.

$$f + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{g}) \in \mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M) \Leftrightarrow \text{pd}_{Q/(\mathbf{f})} M = \infty \Leftrightarrow f + \mathfrak{n}(\mathbf{f}) \in \mathcal{V}_R(M) \cap W$$



Example

For $c = 3$, assume that $\mathcal{V}_R(M) = Z(\chi_1^2 + \chi_2^2 - \chi_3^2)$.

- $W = \langle f_1, f_3 \rangle$ then $\mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M)$ two transverse lines.
- $W = \langle f_2 \rangle$ then $\mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M) = \{0\}$.
- $W = \langle f_1 + f_3 \rangle$ then $\mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M) = W$.

Theorem

Let $W \subseteq V$. Let M_1 be an R_W -module and M_2 be an R_{W^\perp} -module (both MCM). Then

$$\mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M_1) = \mathcal{V}_R(M_1 \otimes_Q M_2) \cap W$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_{R_{W^\perp}}(M_2) = \mathcal{V}_R(M_1 \otimes_Q M_2) \cap W^\perp$$

Theorem

Let $W \subseteq V$. Let M_1 be an R_W -module and M_2 be an R_{W^\perp} -module (both MCM). Then

$$\mathcal{V}_{R_W}(M_1) = \mathcal{V}_R(M_1 \otimes_Q M_2) \cap W$$

and

$$\mathcal{V}_{R_{W^\perp}}(M_2) = \mathcal{V}_R(M_1 \otimes_Q M_2) \cap W^\perp$$

Proof uses the fact that $\mathcal{V}_R(M \otimes_R N) = \mathcal{V}_R(M)$ whenever $\text{pd}_R N < \infty$ and $\text{Tor}_i^R(M, N) = 0$ for $i > 0$.

Gives an easy proof of

Theorem

Every cone in k^c is realized by an R -module of finite length.

Theorem

Suppose that $\mathcal{V}_R(M)$ is irreducible and $\mathcal{V}_R(M) \cap W$ is reducible. Then the R_W -syzygies of M split.

Uses a theorem of Bergh 2007: if M is MCM, then $\mathcal{V}_R(M)$ is irreducible if M is indecomposable.

THANK YOU!