FLOW INVARIANTS IN THE CLASSIFICATION OF LEAVITT PATH ALGEBRAS

G. ABRAMS, A. LOULY, E. PARDO, AND C. SMITH

Dedicated to the memory of Stanley H. Abrams

Abstract. We analyze in the context of Leavitt path algebras some graph operations introduced in the context of symbolic dynamics by Williams, Parry and Sullivan, and Franks. We show that these operations induce Morita equivalence of the corresponding Leavitt path algebras. As a consequence we obtain our two main results: the first gives sufficient conditions for which the Leavitt path algebras in a certain class are Morita equivalent, while the second gives sufficient conditions which yield isomorphisms. We discuss a possible approach to establishing whether or not these conditions are also in fact necessary. In the final section we present many additional operations on graphs which preserve Morita equivalence (resp., isomorphism) of the corresponding Leavitt path algebras.

Introduction

Throughout this article $E$ will denote a row-finite directed graph, and $K$ will denote an arbitrary field. The Leavitt path algebra of $E$ with coefficients in $K$, denoted $L_K(E)$, has received significant attention over the past few years, both from algebraists as well as from analysts working in operator theory. (The precise definition of $L_K(E)$ is given below.) When $K$ is the field $\mathbb{C}$ of complex numbers, the algebra $L_K(E)$ has exhibited surprising similarity to $C^*(E)$, the graph $C^*$-algebra of $E$. In this context, it is natural to ask whether an analog of the Kirchberg-Phillips Classification Theorem \cite{13, 18} for $C^*$-algebras holds for various classes of Leavitt path algebras as well. Specifically, the following question was posed in \cite{4}:

The Classification Question for purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras: Let $K$ be a field, and suppose $E$ and $F$ are graphs for which $L_K(E)$ and $L_K(F)$ are purely infinite simple unital. If $K_0(L_K(E)) \cong K_0(L_K(F))$ via an isomorphism $\varphi$ having $\varphi([1_{L_K(E)}]) = [1_{L_K(F)}]$, must $L_K(E)$ and $L_K(F)$ be isomorphic?

The Classification Question is answered in the affirmative in \cite{1} for a few specific classes of graphs. We obtain in the current article an affirmative answer for a significantly wider class of graphs. Our approach is as follows. In Section \S we consider Morita equivalence of
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Leavitt path algebras. By applying a deep theorem of Franks [12] from the field of symbolic dynamics, we obtain in Theorem 1.25 a sufficient set of conditions on $E$ and $F$ which ensure that $L_K(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $L_K(F)$. In Section 2 we exploit these Morita equivalences to obtain sufficient conditions which ensure isomorphism (Theorem 2.7), thereby obtaining the aforementioned partial affirmative answer to the Classification Question.

We complete Section 2 by examining the remaining difficulty in obtaining an affirmative answer to the Classification Question for all germaine graphs. In Section 3 we extend several results about Morita equivalence and isomorphism to certain classes of graphs $E$ for which $L_K(E)$ is not necessarily purely infinite simple unital, thereby giving more general results than have been previously known about isomorphism and Morita equivalence of Leavitt path algebras.

We briefly recall some graph-theoretic definitions and properties; more complete explanations and descriptions can be found in [1]. A graph (synonymously, a directed graph) $E = (E^0, E^1, r_E, s_E)$ consists of two sets $E^0, E^1$ and maps $r_E, s_E : E^1 \to E^0$. The elements of $E^0$ are called vertices and the elements of $E^1$ edges. We write $s$ for $s_E$ (resp., $r$ for $r_E$) if the graph $E$ is clear from context. We emphasize that loops and multiple / parallel edges are allowed. If $s^{-1}(v)$ is a finite set for every $v \in E^0$, then the graph is called row-finite. (All graphs in this paper will be assumed to be row-finite.) A vertex $v$ for which $s^{-1}(v)$ is empty is called a sink; a vertex $w$ for which $r^{-1}(w)$ is empty is called a source. If $F$ is a subgraph of $E$, then $F$ is called complete in case $s_F^{-1}(v) = s_E^{-1}(v)$ for every $v \in F^0$ having $s_F^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset$.

A path $\mu$ in a graph $E$ is a sequence of edges $\mu = e_1 \ldots e_n$ such that $r(e_i) = s(e_{i+1})$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$. In this case, $s(\mu) := s(e_1)$ is the source of $\mu$, $r(\mu) := r(e_n)$ is the range of $\mu$, and $n$ is the length of $\mu$. An edge $f$ is an exit for a path $\mu = e_1 \ldots e_n$ if there exists $i$ such that $s(f) = s(e_i)$ and $f \neq e_i$. If $\mu$ is a path in $E$, and if $v = s(\mu) = r(\mu)$, then $\mu$ is called a closed path based at $v$. If $\mu = e_1 \ldots e_n$ is a closed path based at $v = s(\mu)$ and $s(e_i) \neq s(e_j)$ for every $i \neq j$, then $\mu$ is called a cycle.

The following notation is standard. Let $A$ be a $p \times p$ matrix having non-negative integer entries (i.e., $A = (a_{ij}) \in M_p(\mathbb{Z}^+)$). The graph $E_A$ is defined by setting $(E_A)^0 = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_p\}$, and defining $(E_A)^1$ by inserting exactly $a_{ij}$ edges in $E_A$ having source vertex $v_i$ and range vertex $v_j$. Conversely, if $E$ is a finite graph with vertices $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_p\}$, then we define the incidence matrix $A_E$ of $E$ by setting $(A_E)_{ij}$ as the number of edges in $E$ having source vertex $v_i$ and range vertex $v_j$.

Given a graph $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$, we define the transpose graph $E^t$ to be the graph $(E^0, E^1, s, r)$ with the same vertices as $E$, but with edges in the opposite direction. Notice that $A_{E^t} = (A_E)^t$, and $E_{A^t} = (E_A)^t$, as implied by the notation.

Our focus in this article is on $L_K(E)$, the Leavitt path algebra of $E$. We define $L_K(E)$ here, after which we review some important properties and examples.

**Definition 0.1.** Let $E$ be any row-finite graph, and $K$ any field. The Leavitt path $K$-algebra $L_K(E)$ of $E$ with coefficients in $K$ is the $K$-algebra generated by a set $\{v \mid v \in E^0\}$ of pairwise orthogonal idempotents, together with a set of variables $\{e, e^* \mid e \in E^1\}$, which satisfy the following relations:

1. $s(e)e = ce(e) = e$ for all $e \in E^1$.
2. $r(e)e^* = e^*s(e) = e^*$ for all $e \in E^1$.
3. (The “CK1 relations”) $e^*e' = \delta_{e,e'}r(e)$ for all $e, e' \in E^1$. 
(4) (The “CK2 relations”) \( v = \sum_{e \in E^1 \mid s(e) = v} ee^* \) for every vertex \( v \in E^0 \) for which \( s^{-1}(v) \) is nonempty.

When the role of the coefficient field \( K \) is not central to the discussion, we will often denote \( L_K(E) \) simply by \( L(E) \). The set \( \{ e^* \mid e \in E^1 \} \) will be denoted by \( (E^1)^* \). We let \( r(e^*) \) denote \( s(e) \), and we let \( s(e^*) \) denote \( r(e) \). If \( \mu = e_1 \ldots e_n \) is a path, then we denote by \( \mu^* \) the element \( e_n^* \cdots e_1^* \) of \( L_K(E) \).

An alternate description of \( L_K(E) \) is given in [1], where it is described in terms of a free associative algebra modulo the appropriate relations indicated in Definition 0.1 above. As a consequence, if \( A \) is any \( K \)-algebra which contains a set of elements satisfying these same relations (we call such a set an \( E \)-family), then there is a (unique) \( K \)-algebra homomorphism from \( L_K(E) \) to \( A \) mapping the generators of \( L_K(E) \) to their appropriate counterparts in \( A \). We will refer to this conclusion as the Universal Homomorphism Property of \( L_K(E) \). In particular, if \( F \) is a complete subgraph of \( E \) then the inclusion map \( L_K(F) \to L_K(E) \) is a \( K \)-algebra homomorphism.

Many well-known algebras arise as the Leavitt path algebra of a row-finite graph. For instance (see e.g. [1, Examples 1.4]), the classical Leavitt algebras \( L_n \) for \( n \geq 2 \) arise as the algebras \( L(R_n) \) where \( R_n \) is the “rose with \( n \) petals” graph

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\circ & \circ & \cdots & \circ & \circ & \circ \\
& e_1 & & & e_2 & & \\
& & e_3 & & & & \\
& & & e_n & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

The full \( n \times n \) matrix algebra over \( K \) arises as the Leavitt path algebra of the oriented \( n \)-line graph

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\circ & \circ & \cdots & \circ & \circ & \circ & \\
& e_1 & & & e_2 & & & \circ \\
& & e_3 & & & & & \\
& & & e_n & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

while the Laurent polynomial algebra \( K[x, x^{-1}] \) arises as the Leavitt path algebra of the “one vertex, one loop” graph

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\circ \\
& x \\
\end{array}
\]

Constructions such as direct sums and the formation of matrix rings produce additional examples of Leavitt path algebras.

We recall now some information and establish notation which will be used throughout. We write

\[ R \sim_M S \]

to denote that \( R \) is Morita equivalent to \( S \). For any ring \( R \) we let \( \mathcal{V}(R) \) denote the monoid of isomorphism classes of finitely generated projective left \( R \)-modules, with operation \( \oplus \). Since \( \mathcal{V}(R) \) is conical (i.e., \([P] \oplus [Q] = [0]\) in \( \mathcal{V}(R) \) if and only if \([P] = [Q] = [0]\)), in fact

\[ \mathcal{V}^*(R) = \mathcal{V}(R) \setminus \{[0]\} \]

is a semigroup as well. For any graph \( E \), \( \{[L(E)v] \mid v \in E^0\} \) is a set of generators for \( \mathcal{V}^*(L(E)) \).

If \( \Phi : R - Mod \to S - Mod \) is a Morita equivalence, then the restriction

\[ \Phi_* : \mathcal{V}^*(R) \to \mathcal{V}^*(S) \]

is an isomorphism of semigroups.
A nonzero idempotent \( e \) in a ring \( R \) is called *infinite* in case there exist nonzero idempotents \( f, g \) for which \( e = f + g \), and \( Re \cong Rf \) as left \( R \)-modules. (That is, \( e \) is infinite in case the left ideal \( Re \) contains a proper direct summand isomorphic to itself.) A simple unital ring \( R \) is called *purely infinite* in case every nonzero left ideal of \( R \) contains an infinite idempotent.

By [5, Propositions 2.1 and 2.2], if \( R \) is purely infinite simple, then \( V^*(R) = K_0(R) \) (the Grothendieck group of \( R \)). In particular, any two elements of \( V^*(R) \) which are equal in \( K_0(R) \) are in fact isomorphic as left \( R \)-modules. Thus for \( R, S \) Morita equivalent purely infinite simple rings, a Morita equivalence \( \Phi : R - Mod \to S - Mod \) in fact restricts to an isomorphism

\[
\Phi_V : K_0(R) \to K_0(S).
\]

We note that, in general, such an induced isomorphism of \( K_0 \) groups need not take \([1_R]\) to \([1_S]\).

Although \( L(E) \) can be constructed for any graph \( E \), the Classification Question which is the main subject of this paper pertains to those choices of \( E \) for which \( L(E) \) is purely infinite simple unital. Note that \( L(E) \) is unital if and only if \( E \) is a finite graph, in which case \( \sum_{v \in E^0} v = 1_{L(E)} \). Thus for much of the discussion we will assume that \( E \) is finite. By [1, Theorem 3.11] (and by substituting an equivalent characterization from [8, Lemma 2.8] for one of the conditions therein), we get

**Simplicity Theorem.** For \( E \) finite, \( L(E) \) is simple precisely when every cycle of \( E \) contains an exit, and there exists a path in \( E \) from any vertex to any cycle or sink.

Furthermore, it is shown in [2, Theorem 11] that

**Purely Infinite Simplicity Theorem.** \( L(E) \) is purely infinite simple precisely when \( L(E) \) is simple, and \( E \) contains a cycle.

Note that, as a consequence, whenever \( L(E) \) is purely infinite simple, \( E \) does not contain sinks.

1. **Sufficient conditions for Morita equivalence between purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras**

In this section we establish sufficient conditions on the graphs \( E \) and \( F \) which guarantee that \( L(E) \) is Morita equivalent to \( L(F) \). In the first step of this process, we build a cache of operations on graphs that preserve Morita equivalence of the associated Leavitt path algebras. Once this arsenal is large enough, the sufficiency result will follow from a well-known theorem of Franks from symbolic dynamics, specifically, from the theory of subshifts of finite type. Our initial goal is to establish enough such Morita-equivalence-preserving operations to allow us to apply Franks’ theorem. With that in mind, we prove only very restrictive versions of the germane properties here, in order to significantly streamline the proofs and arrive at our main results with maximum haste. For completeness, we provide much more general versions of these properties in Section 3.

Our goal in this section is to establish a Morita equivalence result, i.e., a result which establishes the existence a Morita equivalence between various Leavitt path algebras. However, a specific description of these equivalences, in particular a description of the restriction of these equivalences to the \( V^* \)-semigroups, will be central to our discussion in the subsequent section; we therefore provide such additional information in Propositions 1.8, 1.11 and 1.14.
The key lemma which will be used to establish Morita equivalences throughout this section is:

**Lemma 1.1.** Suppose $R$ and $S$ are simple unital rings. Let $\pi : R \to S$ be a nonzero, not-necessarily-identity-preserving ring homomorphism, and let $g$ denote the idempotent $\pi(1_R)$ of $S$. If $gSg = \pi(R)$, then there exists a Morita equivalence $\Phi : R - \text{Mod} \to S - \text{Mod}$.

Moreover, $\Phi$ restricts to an isomorphism $\Phi_V : V^*(R) \to V^*(S)$ with the property that for any idempotent $e \in R$,

$$\Phi_V([Re]) = [S\pi(e)].$$

**Proof.** That $\pi$ is nonzero, together with the simplicity of $R$, ensures an isomorphism $R \cong \pi(R) = gSg$ as rings. This gives a Morita equivalence

$$\Pi : R - \text{Mod} \to gSg - \text{Mod},$$
given on objects by defining, for each left $R$-module $M$, $\Pi(M) = M^g$ where $M^g = M$ has $gSg$-action given by $gsg \cdot m = \pi^{-1}(gsg)m$.

On the other hand, since $g = \pi(1_R) \neq 0$, the simplicity of $S$ ensures that $SgS = S$, from which we conclude that the finitely generated projective left $S$-module $sSg$ is a generator of the category of left $S$-modules. Thus by the well-known result of Morita we get a Morita equivalence

$$\Psi : gSg - \text{Mod} \to S - \text{Mod}$$
given by defining, for any $gSg$-module $N$, $\Psi(N) = Sg \otimes_{gSg} N$.

The composition of these two Morita equivalences gives a Morita equivalence

$$\Phi : R - \text{Mod} \to S - \text{Mod}.$$

Specifically, for each left $R$-module $M$, $\Phi(M) = Sg \otimes_{gSg} M^g$. In particular, $\Phi$ restricts to an isomorphism

$$\Phi_V : V^*(R) \to V^*(S).$$

It is tedious and straightforward to show, for each $e = e^2 \in R$, that $Sg \otimes_{gSg} (Re)^g \cong S\pi(e)$ as left $S$-modules, so the second statement follows as well. \hfill $\square$

Let $X$ be any set of distinct vertices of $E$, and let $e = \sum_{v \in X} v \in L(E)$. It is immediate that every $y \in eL(E)e$ can be written as a $K$-linear combination of monomials of the form $\mu \nu^*$ for which $s(\mu), s(\nu) \in X$. This observation will be used in the proofs of various results throughout the section without explicit mention.

We now establish the first of the four Morita equivalence results required to achieve Theorem 1.25.

**Definition 1.2.** Let $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a directed graph with at least two vertices, and let $v \in E^0$ be a source. We form the source elimination graph $E_{\setminus v}$ of $E$ as follows:

$$E^0_{\setminus v} = E^0 \setminus \{v\}$$
$$E^1_{\setminus v} = E^1 \setminus s^{-1}(v)$$
$$s_{E_{\setminus v}} = s|_{E^1_{\setminus v}}$$
$$r_{E_{\setminus v}} = r|_{E^1_{\setminus v}}$$
Example 1.3. Let $E$ be the graph:

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\bullet \\
\bullet \\
\bullet
\end{array}
$$

Then the source elimination graph $E_{\setminus v}$ is

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\bullet \\
\bullet
\end{array}
$$

It is easy to see that as long as the graph $E$ contains a cycle, repeated source elimination can be used to convert $E$ into a graph with no sources.

Proposition 1.4. Let $E$ be a row-finite graph containing at least two vertices such that $L(E)$ is simple and unital, and let $v \in E^0$ be a source. Then $L(E_{\setminus v})$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E)$, via a Morita equivalence

$$
\Phi_{\text{elim}} : L(E_{\setminus v}) \to L(E)
$$

for which $\Phi_{\text{elim}}([L(E_{\setminus v})w]) = [L(E)w]$ for all vertices $w$ of $E_{\setminus v}$.

Proof. We begin by noting that, as an easy application of the Simplicity Theorem, $L(E)$ is simple and unital if and only if $L(E_{\setminus v})$ is simple and unital. (The hypothesis that $E$ contains at least two vertices ensures that we are not creating an empty graph by eliminating a single vertex.)

From the definition of $E_{\setminus v}$, it is clear that $E_{\setminus v}$ is a complete subgraph of $E$. Thus, the $K$-algebra map defined by the rule

$$
\begin{array}{c}
\pi : L(E_{\setminus v}) \\
\wedge \\
\ast
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\to L(E) \\
\wedge \\
\ast
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
w \mapsto w \\
e \mapsto e \\
\ast e \mapsto \ast e
\end{array}
$$

for every $w \in E^0_{\setminus v}$ and every $e \in E^1_{\setminus v}$, is a nonzero ring homomorphism.

We claim that $\pi(L(E_{\setminus v})) = \pi(1_{L(L(E_{\setminus v}))} L(E) \pi(1_{L(E_{\setminus v}))})$. Note that by definition we have $\pi(1_{L(L(E_{\setminus v}))} L(E) \pi(1_{L(E_{\setminus v}))})$ is immediate. For the other direction, it suffices to consider an arbitrary $\mu_1 \mu_2^* \in \pi(1_{L(L(E_{\setminus v}))} L(E) \pi(1_{L(E_{\setminus v})}))$. Then $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are paths in $E$ such that neither has $v$ for its source, and their ranges are equal. But if neither has $v$ for a source, then since $v$ is a source itself, neither path can pass through $v$ at all. Therefore, $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are also paths in $E_{\setminus v}$, such that $\pi(\mu_1 \mu_2^*) = \pi(\mu_1 \mu_2^*)$. This completes the argument that $\pi(L(E_{\setminus v})) = \pi(1_{L(E_{\setminus v}))} L(E) \pi(1_{L(E_{\setminus v}))}$.

Applying Lemma 1.1, we conclude that $L(E_{\setminus v})$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E)$, and that the Morita equivalence restricts to an isomorphism between $V^*(L(E_{\setminus v}))$ and $V^*(L(E))$ that maps $[L(E_{\setminus v})w]$ to $[L(E)w]$ for each vertex $w$ of $E_{\setminus v}$. \hfill \square

Corollary 1.5. Let $E$ be a graph for which $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple unital. Then there exists a graph $E'$ which contains no sources, with the property that $L(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E')$ via a Morita equivalence

$$
\Phi_{\text{ELIM}} : L(E') \to L(E)
$$

for which $\Phi_{\text{ELIM}}([L(E')w]) = [L(E)w]$ for all vertices $w$ of $E'$. 
Proof. By the Purely Infinite Simplicity Theorem, each vertex in $E$ connects to a cycle. If $w$ is a vertex in a graph $E$ having this property, then the source elimination process will either eliminate $w$ (in case $w$ is the indicated source), or will produce a graph in which $w$ connects to the same cycle. Since $E$ has only finite many vertices, a finite sequence of the source elimination process starting with $E$, along with the composition of the Morita equivalences ensured by Proposition 1.4, yields the desired result. □

We now build the second of the four indicated Morita equivalence results.

Definition 1.6. Let $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a directed graph, and let $v \in E^0$. Let $v^*$ and $f$ be symbols not in $E^0 \cup E^1$. We form the expansion graph $E_v$ from $E$ at $v$ as follows:

$$
E_v^0 = E^0 \cup \{v^*\} \\
E_v^1 = E^1 \cup \{f\}
$$

$$
s_{E_v}(e) = \begin{cases} 
  v & \text{if } e = f \\
  v^* & \text{if } s_E(e) = v \\
  s_E(e) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

$$
r_{E_v}(e) = \begin{cases} 
  v^* & \text{if } e = f \\
  r_E(e) & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases}
$$

Conversely, if $E$ and $G$ are graphs, and there exists a vertex $v$ of $E$ for which $E_v = G$, then $E$ is called a contraction of $G$.

Example 1.7. Let $E$ be the graph:

```
  v
 /\ 
|  |
|  |
|  f|
```

Then the expansion graph $E_v$ is

```
  f
 /\ 
|  v^*
|  |
|  f|
```

Proposition 1.8. Let $E$ be a row-finite graph such that $L(E)$ is simple and unital, and let $v \in E^0$. Then $L(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E_v)$, via a Morita equivalence

$$
\Phi^{\exp} : L(E) - \text{Mod} \rightarrow L(E_v) - \text{Mod}
$$

for which $\Phi^{\exp}([L(E)w]) = [L(E_v)w]$ for all vertices $w$ of $E$.

Proof. We begin by noting that, as an easy application of the Simplicity Theorem, $L(E)$ is simple and unital if and only if $L(E_v)$ is simple and unital.

For each $w \in E^0$, define $Q_w = w$. For each $e \in s^{-1}(v)$, define $T_e = fe$ and $T_e^* = e^* f^*$. For $e \in E^1$ otherwise, define $T_e = e$ and $T_e^* = e^*$. We claim that $\{Q_w, T_e, T_e^* \mid w \in E^0, e \in E^1\}$ is an $E$-family in $L(E_v)$. The $Q_w$’s are mutually orthogonal idempotents because the $w$’s are. The elements $T_e$ for $e \in E^1$ clearly satisfy $T_e T_f = 0$ whenever $e \neq f$. For $e \in E^1$, it is easy to check that $T_e^* T_e = Q_{r(e)}$. Note that $\sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v)} T_e T_e^* = f \left( \sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v^*)} ee^* \right) f^* = ff^* = v = Q_v$. 

The same property holds immediately for all $w \in E^0$ having $w \neq v$, thereby establishing the claim.

Therefore, by the universal property of $L(E)$, there is a $K$-homomorphism $\pi : L(E) \to L(E_v)$ that maps $w \mapsto Q_w$, $e \mapsto T_e$, and $e^* \mapsto T^*_e$. Note that $\pi$ maps $w$ to $Q_w \neq 0$, so $\pi$ is nonzero. We now claim that $\pi(L(E)) = \pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_v) \pi(1_{L(E)})$, where $\pi(1_{L(E)}) = \sum_{w \in E^0} w$, viewed as an element of $L(E_v)$. The inclusion $\pi(L(E)) \subseteq \pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_v) \pi(1_{L(E)})$ is immediate. For the other direction, it suffices to consider arbitrary nonzero terms in $\pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_v) \pi(1_{L(E)})$ of the form $\mu_1 \mu_2^*$, where $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are paths in $E_v$, $s(\mu_1), s(\mu_2) \neq v^*$, and $r(\mu_1) = r(\mu_2)$.

Let $\alpha$ be the path in $E$ obtained by removing the edge $f$ from $\mu_1$ any place that it occurs, and similarly let $\beta$ be the path obtained by removing $f$ from $\mu_2$. We claim that $\pi(\alpha^* \beta) = \mu_1 \mu_2^*$. There are two cases. If $r(\mu_1) \neq v^* \neq r(\mu_2)$, then $\mu_1 = \pi(\alpha)$ and $\mu_2 = \pi(\beta)$, and the result follows. Otherwise, $r(\mu_1) = v^* = r(\mu_2)$. But because $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ both begin at a vertex other than $v^*$, and the only edge entering $v^*$ is $f$, we must have $\mu_1 = \nu_1 f$ and $\mu_2 = \nu_2 f$, for paths $\nu_1, \nu_2$ in $E_v$ where $r(\nu_1) = v = r(\nu_2)$. But then $\mu_1 \mu_2^* = \nu_1 f f^*\nu_2^* = \nu_1 \nu_2 f$ by the CK2 relation at $v$, and we are back in the first case again, so $\pi(\alpha^* \beta) = \mu_1 \mu_2^*$, completing the argument.

Applying Lemma 1.1, we conclude that $L(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E_v)$, and that the Morita equivalence restricts to the map given above.

If $F$ is a contraction of $E$ (i.e., if there exists a vertex $v$ of $F$ for which $E = F_v$), then we denote by

$$\Phi^{\text{cont}} = (\Phi^{\exp})^{-1}$$

the Morita equivalence from $L(F) - \text{Mod} \to L(E) - \text{Mod}$. We note that while the Morita equivalence $\Phi^{\exp} : L(E) - \text{Mod} \to L(E_v) - \text{Mod}$ arises from a ring homomorphism $\pi : L(E) \to L(E_v)$ as described in Lemma 1.1, the inverse equivalence $\Phi^{\text{cont}}$ need not in general arise in this way. For instance, if $E = \bullet^v$ is a graph with a single vertex $v$ and no edges, then $E_v = \bullet^v \to \bullet^v$, $L(E) \cong K$, $L(E_v) \cong M_2(K)$, and $\pi : L(E) \to L(E_v)$ is the inclusion map to the upper left corner. But there is no nonzero homomorphism from $L(E_v)$ to $L(E)$.

Our third and fourth Morita equivalence properties require somewhat more cumbersome machinery to build than did the first two. The following definition is borrowed from [9, Section 5].

**Definition 1.9.** Let $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a directed graph. For each $v \in E^0$ with $r^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset$, partition the set $r^{-1}(v)$ into disjoint nonempty subsets $E^v_1, \ldots, E^v_{m(v)}$ where $m(v) \geq 1$. (If $v$ is a source then we put $m(v) = 0$.) Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the resulting partition of $E^1$. We form the in-split graph $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ from $E$ using the partition $\mathcal{P}$ as follows:

$$E_r(\mathcal{P})^0 = \{v_i \mid v_i \in E^0, 1 \leq i \leq m(v)\} \cup \{v \mid m(v) = 0\},$$

$$E_r(\mathcal{P})^1 = \{e_j \mid e \in E^1, 1 \leq j \leq m(s(e))\} \cup \{e \mid m(s(e)) = 0\},$$

and define $r_{E_r(\mathcal{P})}, s_{E_r(\mathcal{P})} : E_r(\mathcal{P})^1 \to E_r(\mathcal{P})^0$ by

$$s_{E_r(\mathcal{P})}(e_j) = s(e)_j \text{ and } s_{E_r(\mathcal{P})}(e) = s(e),$$

$$r_{E_r(\mathcal{P})}(e) = r(e), \text{ and } r_{E_r(\mathcal{P})}(e) = r(e), \text{ where } e \in E^r_{i(e)}.$$ 

Conversely, if $E$ and $G$ are graphs, and there exists a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $E^1$ for which $E_r(\mathcal{P}) = G$, then $E$ is called an in-amalgamation of $G$. 

Example 1.10. Let $E$ be the graph:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\bullet^v \\
\longrightarrow \\
\bullet^w
\end{array}
\]

Denote by $\mathcal{P}$ the partition of $E^1$ that places each edge in its own singleton partition class. Then $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ is:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\bullet^v \\
\longrightarrow \\
\bullet^w
\end{array}
\]

Proposition 1.11. Let $E$ be a directed graph with no sources or sinks, such that $L(E)$ is simple and unital. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a partition of $E^1$ as in Definition 1.9 and $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ the in-split graph from $E$ using $\mathcal{P}$. Then $L(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$, via a Morita equivalence

\[\Phi_{\text{ins}} : L(E) \rightarrow L(E_r(\mathcal{P})) \rightarrow L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))\]

for which $\Phi_{\text{ins}}([L(E)v]) = [L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))v_1]$ for all vertices $v$ of $E$.

Proof. We begin by noting that, as an easy application of the Simplicity Theorem and a somewhat tedious check, $L(E)$ is simple and unital if and only if $L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$ is simple and unital. Moreover, $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ has no sources if and only if $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ has no sinks.

For each $v \in E^0$, define $Q_v = v_1$, which exists by the assumption that $E$ contains no sources. For $e \in E^*$, define $T_e = \sum_{f \in s^{-1}(v)} e_1 f_i f_i^*$ and $T_e^* = \sum_{f \in s^{-1}(v)} f_i f_i^* e_1$. The claim is that $\{Q_v, T_e, T_e^* \mid v \in E^0, e \in E^1\}$ is an $E$-family inside $L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$. The $Q_v$’s are mutually orthogonal idempotents because the $v_1$’s are. It is immediate from the definition above that whenever $v = s(e)$ in $E$, then $Q_vT_e = T_e$ and $T_e^*Q_v = T_e^*$ in $L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$, and that whenever $w = r(e)$ in $E$, $T_eQ_w = T_e$ and $Q_wT_e^* = T_e^*$ in $L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$. If $e \neq f$, then note that $T_e^*T_f = xe_1^*f_1y$ for some $x, y \in L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$, but since $e_1 \neq f_1$, this is zero. Because $E$ and $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ contain no sinks, there is a CK2 relation at every vertex of both graphs. It is now a straightforward matter of computation to check, by applying the CK1 and CK2 relations, that $T_e^*T_e = Q_{r(e)}$, and that $\sum_{e \in s^{-1}(v)} T_e^*T_e = Q_v$.

By the universal property, then, there exists a homomorphism $\pi : L(E) \rightarrow L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$ which maps $v \mapsto Q_v$, $e \mapsto T_e$, and $e^* \mapsto T_e^*$. It is easy to verify that $\pi(v)$ is nonzero for any $v \in E^0$, so $\pi$ is a nonzero homomorphism. We now claim that $\pi(L(E)) = \pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_r(\mathcal{P})) \pi(1_{L(E)})$, where $\pi(1_{L(E)}) = \sum_{v \in E^0} v_1$.

The inclusion $\pi(L(E)) \subseteq \pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_r(\mathcal{P})) \pi(1_{L(E)})$ is immediate. For the opposite inclusion, it suffices to consider arbitrary nonzero terms in $\pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_r(\mathcal{P})) \pi(1_{L(E)})$ of the form $\mu_1 \mu_2^*$, where $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ are finite length paths in $E_r(\mathcal{P})$, and $s(\mu_1) = v_1$ and $s(\mu_2) = w_1$ for some $v, w \in E^0$, and where $r(\mu_1) = r(\mu_2)$.

Let $\mu$ be any path in $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ such that $s(\mu) = v_1$ for some $v \in E^0$. Define $r(\mu) = w_k$ where $w \in E^0$ and $1 \leq k \leq m(w)$. We now build a path $\nu$ in $E$, by replacing each $v_i$ in $\mu$ with $v$ in $\nu$, and each $e_i$ in $\mu$ with $e$ in $\nu$, so that $\nu$ is essentially the result of removing subscripts from the edges and vertices of $\mu$. An induction on the length of $\mu$ will show that

\[\pi(\nu) = \mu \left( \sum_{f \in s^{-1}(w)} f_k f_k^* \right).\]
If the length of $\mu$ is zero, then $\mu = v_1 = w_k$. Applying the CK2 relation at $v_1$, we get

$$\pi(v) = v_1 \left( \sum_{f \in s^{-1}(v)} f_{11}f^*_1 \right).$$

Since $w = v$ and $k = 1$ in this case, this is the result we need. If the length of $\mu$ is greater than zero, then $\mu = \mu'e_j$, where $r(\mu') = u_j$, $e \in E^1$, $u \in E^0$, and $1 \leq j \leq m(u)$. We define $\nu'$ in the same manner as above, so that from the inductive hypothesis,

$$\pi(\nu) = \pi(\nu')T_e = \mu' \left( \sum_{f \in s^{-1}(u), g \in s^{-1}(w)} f_j f_{11}e_1 g_k g^*_1 \right).$$

When $f \neq e$, we have $f_{11}e_1 = 0$ by the CK1 relation, whereas when $f = e$, $f_{11}e_1 = r(e_1)$, which collapses into the adjacent terms. This expression therefore reduces to

$$\pi(\nu) = \mu'e_j \left( \sum_{g \in s^{-1}(w)} g_k g^*_1 \right) = \mu \left( \sum_{g \in s^{-1}(w)} g_k g^*_1 \right)$$

as desired.

Now, given $\mu_1 \mu^*_2 \in \pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_r(\mathcal{P})) \pi(1_{L(E)})$, we define $\nu_1$ and $\nu_2$ in the manner given above. By a direct computation, it can be verified that $\pi(\nu_1 \nu^*_2) = \mu_1 \mu^*_2$, completing the argument that $\pi(L(E)) = \pi(1_{L(E)}) L(E_r(\mathcal{P})) \pi(1_{L(E)})$.

Applying yet again Lemma 1.1, we conclude that $L(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$, and that the Morita equivalence restricts to the map above.

If $F$ is an in-amalgamation of $E$ (i.e., if there exists a vertex partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $F$ for which $E = F_r(\mathcal{P})$), then we denote by

$$\Phi^{\text{inam}} = (\Phi^{\text{ins}})^{-1}$$

the Morita equivalence from $L(F) - \text{Mod} \rightarrow L(E) - \text{Mod}$.

As a brief remark, we remind the reader that the result established here is not as general as possible. In particular, the hypothesis that $E$ contains no sources or sinks will be weakened in Corollary 3.9 (The difficulties that are avoided by this hypothesis are more notational than substantial. Nevertheless, the result as stated here is strong enough to serve us for our present goal.)

We now establish the fourth and final tool in our cache. The following definition is borrowed from [9] Section 3].

**Definition 1.12.** Let $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a directed graph. For each $v \in E^0$ with $s^{-1}(v) \neq \emptyset$, partition the set $s^{-1}(v)$ into disjoint nonempty subsets $E^1_0, \ldots, E^m(v)$ where $m(v) \geq 1$. (If $v$ is a sink, then we put $m(v) = 0$.) Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the resulting partition of $E^1$. We form the **out-split graph** $E_s(\mathcal{P})$ from $E$ using the partition $\mathcal{P}$ as follows:

$$E_s(\mathcal{P})^0 = \{v^i \mid v \in E^0, 1 \leq i \leq m(v)\} \cup \{v \mid m(v) = 0\},$$

$$E_s(\mathcal{P})^1 = \{e^j \mid e \in E^1, 1 \leq j \leq m(r(e))\} \cup \{e \mid m(r(e)) = 0\},$$
and define $r_{E_s(P)}, s_{E_s(P)} : E_s(P)^1 \to E_s(P)^0$ for each $e \in E_s^i$ by

$$ s_{E_s(P)}(e^j) = s(e)^i \text{ and } s_{E_s(P)}(e) = s(e)^i $$

$$ r_{E_s(P)}(e^j) = r(e)^j \text{ and } r_{E_s(P)}(e) = r(e). $$

Conversely, if $E$ and $G$ are graphs, and there exists a partition $P$ of $E^1$ for which $E_s(P) = G$, then $E$ is called an \textit{out-amalgamation} of $G$.

**Example 1.13.** Let $E$ be the graph:

\[ \bullet \overset{e}{\rightarrow} \overset{e}{\rightarrow} \overset{e}{\rightarrow} \overset{e}{\rightarrow} \bullet \]

Denote by $P$ the partition of $E^1$ that places each edge in its own singleton partition class. Then $E_s(P)$ is:

\[ \bullet \overset{1}{\rightarrow} \overset{1}{\rightarrow} \overset{1}{\rightarrow} \overset{1}{\rightarrow} \bullet \]

Our fourth tool follows as a specific case of a result previously established in [4].

**Proposition 1.14.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph, $P$ a partition of $E^1$ as in Definition 1.12, and $E_s(P)$ the out-split graph from $E$ using $P$. Then $L(E)$ is isomorphic to $L(E_s(P))$. This isomorphism yields a Morita equivalence

$$ \Phi_{outs} : L(E) - Mod \to L(E_s(P)) - Mod $$

for which $\Phi_{outs}([L(E)v]) = [L(E_s(P)) \sum_{i=1}^{m(v)} v^i]$ for every vertex $v$ of $E$.

**Proof.** The indicated isomorphism between $L(E)$ and $L(E_s(P))$ is established in [4, Theorem 2.8]. Furthermore, the isomorphism given there maps $v$ to $\sum_{i=1}^{m(v)} v^i$, so that the associated Morita equivalence restricts to the desired map. $\square$

If $F$ is an out-amalgamation of $E$ (i.e., if there exists a vertex partition $P$ of $F$ for which $E = F_s(P)$), then we denote by

$$ \Phi_{outam} = (\Phi_{outs})^{-1} $$

the Morita equivalence from $L(F) - Mod \to L(E) - Mod$.

Having built a sufficient arsenal of graph operations, we now proceed toward the first main result of this article. Considerable work has been done in the flow dynamics community regarding the theory of subshifts of finite type; specifically, an explicit description of the flow equivalence relation has been achieved for a large class of such shifts. We refer the interested reader to [16] for a clear, careful introduction to the theory, including the definition of flow equivalence. For our purposes, the following definitions and results will provide all of the connecting information we need.

**Definition 1.15.** Let $E$ be a finite (directed) graph. Then $E$ is:

1. \textit{irreducible} if given any two vertices $v$ and $w$ in $E$, there is a path from $v$ to $w$ ([16, Definition 2.2.13]).
2. \textit{essential} if there are neither sources nor sinks in $E$ ([16, Definition 2.2.13]).
3. \textit{trivial} if $E$ consists of a single cycle with no other vertices or edges ([12]).
Here is an easily verified observation which will be useful later.

**Lemma 1.16.** Let $E$ be a graph, let $v \in E^0$, and let $P$ be a partition of the vertices of $E$. Then $E$ is essential (resp. nontrivial, resp. irreducible) if and only if $E_s(P)$, $E_r(P)$, and $E_v$ are each essential (resp. nontrivial, resp. irreducible).

A set of graphs of great interest in the theory of subshifts of finite type are those that are simultaneously irreducible, essential, and nontrivial. The following connecting result is pivotal here.

**Lemma 1.17.** Let $E$ be a finite graph. The following are equivalent:

1. $E$ is irreducible, nontrivial, and essential.
2. $E$ contains no sources, and $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple.

**Proof.** Suppose first that $E$ is irreducible, essential, and nontrivial. That $E$ contains no sources is immediate. $E$ also contains no sinks and is finite, so it must contain a cycle. Since $E$ is nontrivial, there must exist some edge or vertex not in any cycle, and either that edge or the path from the cycle to that vertex is an exit to the cycle. Finally, since $E$ is irreducible, there is a path between any two vertices, so there must be a path from any vertex to any cycle or sink.

Conversely, suppose $E$ contains no sources, and that $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple. From the Simplicity Theorem [1, Theorem 3.11], every cycle has an exit, so $E$ is nontrivial. From [8, Lemma 2.8], there is a path from any vertex to any cycle. Since by the Purely Infinite Simplicity Theorem [2, Theorem 11] there is at least one cycle in the graph, there are no sinks. Then $E$ is essential. However, with no sources or sinks in a finite graph, every vertex must belong to a cycle, so there is a path between any two vertices, and $E$ is irreducible. □

Much of the heavy lifting required to achieve our first goal is provided by deep, fundamental work in flow dynamics. We collect up all the relevant facts in the following few results, then state as Corollary 1.22 the conclusion we need to achieve our goal. (Following Franks, we state some results in the language of matrices. Statements about non-negative integer matrices may be interchanged with statements about directed graphs by exchanging $E$ for its incidence matrix $A_E$ as described in the Introduction.)

**Definition 1.18.** We call a graph transformation **standard** if it is one of these six types: in-splitting, in-amalgamation, out-splitting, out-amalgamation, expansion, and contraction. Analogously, we call a function which transforms a non-negative integer matrix $A$ to a non-negative integer matrix $B$ **standard** if the corresponding graph operation from $E_A$ to $E_B$ is standard.

**Definition 1.19.** If $E$ and $F$ are graphs, a **flow equivalence from $E$ to $F$** is a sequence $E = E_0 \rightarrow E_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow E_n = F$ of graphs and standard graph transformations which starts at $E$ and ends at $F$. We say that $E$ and $F$ are **flow equivalent** in case there is a flow equivalence from $E$ to $F$. Analogously, a flow equivalence between matrices $A$ and $B$ is defined to be a flow equivalence between the graphs $E_A$ and $E_B$.

We note that the notion of flow equivalence can be described in topological terms (see e.g. [16]). The definition given here is optimal for our purposes. Specifically, it agrees with the topologically-based definition for essential graphs by an application of [17, Theorem], [22].
Corollary 4.4.1], and [16 Corollary 7.15]. Since all graphs under consideration in our main results are essential, this particular definition of flow equivalence will serve us most efficiently.

**Theorem 1.20.** [12 Theorem] (“Franks’ Theorem”) Suppose that $A$ and $B$ are non-negative irreducible square integer matrices neither of which is in the trivial flow equivalence class. Then the matrices $A$ and $B$ are flow equivalent if and only if:

$$\det(I_n - A) = \det(I_m - B) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Z}^n / (I_n - A)\mathbb{Z}^n \cong \mathbb{Z}^m / (I_m - B)\mathbb{Z}^m,$$

where $n \times n$ and $m \times m$ are the sizes of $A$ and $B$ respectively, $I_n$ and $I_m$ are identity matrices, and $\mathbb{Z}^n / (I_n - A)\mathbb{Z}^n$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}^m / (I_m - B)\mathbb{Z}^m$) denotes the image in $\mathbb{Z}^n$ (resp. $\mathbb{Z}^m$) of the linear transformation $I_n - A : \mathbb{Z}^n \to \mathbb{Z}^n$ (resp. $I_m - B : \mathbb{Z}^m \to \mathbb{Z}^m$) induced by matrix multiplication.

**Corollary 1.21.** Suppose $A$ and $B$ are irreducible, nontrivial, essential square non-negative integer matrices for which

$$\det(I_n - A) = \det(I_m - B) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{Z}^n / (I_n - A)\mathbb{Z}^n \cong \mathbb{Z}^m / (I_m - B)\mathbb{Z}^m.$$

Then there exists a sequence of standard transformations which starts with $A$ and ends with $B$.

As is usual, we denote $\mathbb{Z}^n / (I_n - A)\mathbb{Z}^n$ simply by $\text{coker}(I_n - A)$. By examining the Smith normal form of each matrix, it is easy to show that $\text{coker}(I_n - A) \cong \text{coker}(I_n - A^t)$ for any square matrix $A$. Furthermore, by a cofactor expansion, it is clear that $\det(I_n - A) = \det(I_n - A^t) = \det(I_n - A)^t$.

If $E$ is a graph for which $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple unital, then by [4, Section 3] there is an isomorphism

$$\text{coker}(I - A_E^t) \to K_0(L(E)),$$

for which $x_i \mapsto [L(E)v_i]$ for each standard basis vector $x_i$ of $\mathbb{Z}^n$ and each vertex $v_i$ of $E$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. (We note for future use that since $1_{L(E)} = \sum_{v \in E^0} v$ in $L(E)$, this isomorphism takes the element $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ of $\text{coker}(I - A_E^t)$ to $[L(E)] = K_0(L(E))$.)

Thus, using Lemma 1.17 we may restate Corollary 1.21 as follows:

**Corollary 1.22.** Suppose $G$ and $H$ are graphs without sources, for which $L(G)$ and $L(H)$ are purely infinite simple unital. Suppose

$$\det(I_n - A_G^t) = \det(I_m - A_H^t) \quad \text{and} \quad K_0(L(G)) \cong K_0(L(H)),$$

where $n = |G^0|$ and $m = |H^0|$. Then there exists a sequence of standard graph transformations which starts with $G$ and ends with $H$.

Our interest here will be in graphs $E$ and $F$ for which $\det(I_n - A_E^t) = \det(I_m - A_F^t)$ and $K_0(L(E)) \cong K_0(L(F))$. The following notation will prove convenient.

**Definition 1.23.** Let $E$ be a finite graph. The **determinant Franks pair** is the ordered pair

$$\mathcal{F}_{\det}(E) = (K_0(L(E)), \det(I_n - A_E^t)),$$

consisting of the abelian group $K_0(L(E))$ and the integer $\det(I_n - A_E^t)$. For finite graphs $E, G$ we write

$$\mathcal{F}_{\det}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\det}(G)$$

in case there exists an abelian group isomorphism $K_0(L(E)) \cong K_0(L(G))$, and $\det(I_n - A_E^t) = \det(I_m - A_G^t)$. Clearly $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on the set of finite graphs.
We now show that the source elimination process preserves equivalence of the determinant Franks pair.

**Lemma 1.24.** Let \( E \) be a finite graph for which \( L(E) \) is purely infinite simple unital, and let \( v \) be a source in \( E \). Then

\[
\mathcal{F}_{\det}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\det}(E\setminus v).
\]

**Proof.** Let \( n = |E^0| \). Since \( v \) is a source, \( A_E \) contains a column of zeros. Then a straightforward determinant computation by cofactors along this column gives \( \det(I_n - A_E^t) = \det(I_{n-1} - A_{E\setminus v}^t) \).

Since \( E \) satisfies the conditions of the Purely Infinite Simplicity Theorem it is clear by the construction that \( E\setminus v \) must as well. But \( L(E) \) and \( L(E\setminus v) \) are Morita equivalent by Proposition \([1.4]\), so that their \( K_0 \) groups are necessarily isomorphic. \( \square \)

Now we are ready to prove the first of our two main results.

**Theorem 1.25.** Let \( E \) and \( F \) be graphs such that \( L(E) \) and \( L(F) \) are purely infinite simple unital. Suppose that

\[
\mathcal{F}_{\det}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\det}(F);
\]

that is, suppose

\[
\det(I_n - A_E^t) = \det(I_m - A_F^t) \quad \text{and} \quad K_0(L(E)) \cong K_0(L(F))
\]

where \( n \) and \( m \) are the number of vertices in \( E \) and \( F \), respectively. Then \( L(E) \) is Morita equivalent to \( L(F) \).

**Proof.** By Corollary \([1.3]\) there exist graphs \( E' \) and \( F' \) such that \( E' \) and \( F' \) contain no sources, and for which \( L(E) \sim_L L(E') \) and \( L(F) \sim_L L(F') \). By hypothesis, and by applying Lemma \([1.24]\) at each stage of the source elimination process, we have that

\[
\det(I - A_{E'}^t) = \det(I - A_{F'}^t) = \det(I - A_{E}^t) = \det(I - A_{F}^t),
\]

and that

\[
K_0(L(E')) \cong K_0(L(E)) \cong K_0(L(F)) \cong K_0(L(F')).
\]

Furthermore, \( L(E') \) and \( L(F') \) are each purely infinite simple unital (either use the Purely Infinite Simplicity Theorem, or apply the fact that purely infinite simplicity is a Morita invariant). So Corollary \([1.22]\) applies, and we conclude that there exists a finite sequence of elementary graph transformations, which starts at \( E' \) and ends at \( F' \). By Lemmas \([1.16]\) and \([1.17]\), since \( E' \) is purely infinite simple unital with no sources, each time such an operation is applied the resulting graph is again purely infinite simple unital with no sources. Thus, at each step of the sequence, we may apply the appropriate tool from the cache consisting of Propositions \([1.8]\) \([1.11]\) and \([1.14]\), from which we conclude that each step in the sequence preserves Morita equivalence of the corresponding Leavitt path algebras. Combining these Morita equivalences at each step then yields \( L(E') \sim_L L(F') \).

As a result, we have

\[
L(E) \sim_L L(E') \sim_L L(F') \sim_L L(F),
\]

and the theorem follows. \( \square \)
2. Sufficient conditions for isomorphisms between purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras.

In this section we will use the techniques and results of the previous section to investigate the problem of classifying purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras up to isomorphism. Specifically, in Corollary 2.10 we provide an affirmative answer to the Classification Question for a wide class of graphs. To help establish such a connection we introduce some notation.

Definition 2.1. Let $E$ be a finite graph. The unitary Franks pair is the ordered pair 
\[ \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(E) = (K_0(L(E)), \ [1_{L(E)}] ) \]
consisting of the abelian group $K_0(L(E))$ and the element $[1_{L(E)}]$ of $K_0(L(E))$. For finite graphs $E, G$ we write 
\[ \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(G) \]
in case there exists an abelian group isomorphism $\varphi : K_0(L(E)) \to K_0(L(G))$ for which $\varphi([1_{L(E)}]) = [1_{L(G)}]$. Clearly $\equiv$ is an equivalence relation on the set of finite graphs.

We will show that, in the case of Morita equivalent purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras over finite graphs, if the unitary Franks pair of their graphs are equivalent, then the algebras are isomorphic. The argument relies on the adaptation to our context of the deep result of Huang [15, Theorem 1.1].

Now suppose $E$ has $L(E)$ purely infinite simple unital, and has no sources. Then by Lemma 1.17 $E^t$ has these same properties. Let
\[ E^t = H_0 \to m_1 H_1 \to m_2 H_2 \cdots \to m_n H_n = E^t \]
be a finite sequence of standard graph transformations which starts and ends with $E^t$. We write $H_i = G_i^t$ (where $G_i = H_i^t$), and so we have a finite sequence of graph transformations
\[ E^t = G_0^t \to m_1 G_1^t \to m_2 G_2^t \cdots \to m_n G_n^t = E^t. \]

For any graph $G$ let $\tau_G : G \to G^t$ be the graph function which is the identity on vertices, but switches the direction of each of the edges. (This is simply the transpose operation on the corresponding incidence matrices.) In particular, any one of the standard graph transformations
\[ m : G_i^t \to G_{i+1}^t \]
yields a graph transformation
\[ m' = \tau_{G_{i+1}}^{-1} \circ m \circ \tau_{G_i} : G_i \to G_{i+1}. \]

Lemma 2.2. If $m : G_i^t \to G_{i+1}^t$ is a standard graph transformation, then $m' = \tau_{G_{i+1}}^{-1} \circ m \circ \tau_{G_i} : G_i \to G_{i+1}$ is also standard.

Proof. We leave to the reader the straightforward check that
1. If $m$ is an expansion (resp. contraction), then $m'$ is an expansion (resp. contraction).
2. If $m$ is an in-splitting (resp. out-splitting), then $m'$ is an out-splitting (resp. in-splitting).
3. If $m$ is an in-amalgamation (resp. out-amalgamation), then $m'$ is an out-amalgamation (resp. in-amalgamation).
We note that expansions (resp. contractions) remain expansions (resp. contractions) when passing to the transpose graph, but that the other four standard operations indeed become a different type of standard transformation on the transpose. □

As a consequence of the Lemma, if we start with any finite sequence of standard graph transformations

\[ E_t = H_0 \to^{m_1} H_1 \to^{m_2} H_2 \cdots \to^{m_n} H_n = E_t \]

which starts and ends with \( E_t \), then we get a corresponding finite sequence of standard graph transformations

\[ E = G_0 \to^{m'_1} G_1 \to^{m'_2} G_2 \cdots \to^{m'_n} G_n = E \]

which starts and ends with \( E \).

By [15, Lemma 3.7], for any graphs \( E \) and \( F \), any standard graph transformation \( m : E \to F \) yields the so-called induced isomorphism

\[ \varphi_m : \text{coker}(I - A_E) \to \text{coker}(I - A_F). \]

For each of the six types of standard graph transformations, the corresponding induced isomorphism is explicitly described in [15, Lemma 3.7]. As a representative example of these induced isomorphisms, we offer the following description. Suppose \( m : E \to F \) is an in-splitting; that is, \( F = E_\pi(\mathcal{P}) \) for some partition \( \mathcal{P} \) of the edges of \( E \). By generalizing the construction of Franks [12, Theorem 1.7] in the natural way, we define matrices

\[
R = \begin{pmatrix}
a_{11} & a_{12} & \cdots & a_{1n} \\
a_{21} & a_{22} & \cdots & a_{2n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
a_{m1} & a_{m2} & \cdots & a_{mn}
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
S = \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where \( a_{ij} \) is the number of edges in the \( j \)th partition class of \( E_1 \) that leave vertex \( i \). The columns of \( S \) correspond to vertices of \( E \), and the rows to partition classes of \( E_1 \), where a 1 indicates that a partition class contains edges entering the vertex. With \( R \) and \( S \) so defined, it is straightforward to show that \( A_E = RS \) and \( A_F = SR \). By [15, Lemma 3.7], we get \([x] \mapsto [Rx] \) is the induced isomorphism on \( \text{coker}(I_n - A_E) \).

As it turns out, the descriptions of the induced isomorphisms coming from expansions and contractions are somewhat different than the the descriptions of the induced isomorphisms coming from the other four types of standard graph transformations. However, in each case, an explicit description of the induced isomorphism can be given as above. We leave the details in the other five cases to the interested reader. Here now is the connection between the Morita equivalences of Section 1 and the induced isomorphisms given by Huang.
**Proposition 2.3.** Let $G_i$ and $G_{i+1}$ be graphs. Suppose $G_i$ has $L(G_i)$ purely infinite simple unital, and has no sources. Suppose $m_i : G_i \to G_{i+1}$ is a standard graph transformation, and let $\varphi_{m_i} : \text{coker}(I - A_{G_i}) \to \text{coker}(I - A_{G_{i+1}})$ be the induced isomorphism. Let $m^{\prime}_i : G_i \to G_{i+1}$ be the corresponding graph transformation, which, by Lemma 2.2, is also a standard transformation. Let $\Phi_{\psi} : L(G_i) \to L(G_{i+1})$ be the Morita equivalence induced by $m_i$ as described in Section 1. Then, using the previously described identification between $K_0(L(G_i))$ and $\text{coker}(I - A_{G_i})$, we have

$$\Phi_{\psi} m^{\prime}_i = \varphi_{m_i}.$$ 

**Proof.** Each of the six types of isomorphisms $\Phi_{\psi}^{m'_i} : K_0(L(G_i)) \to K_0(L(G_{i+1}))$ have been explicitly described in Section 1. As indicated above, each of the six types of induced isomorphisms $\varphi_{m_i} : \text{coker}(I - A_{G_i}) \to \text{coker}(I - A_{G_{i+1}})$ have been explicitly described in [14, Lemma 3.7]. By definition we have $A_{G_i} = A_{G_{i+1}}$ (resp. $A_{G_i} = A_{G_{i+1}}$). It is now a tedious but completely straightforward check to verify that, in all six cases, these isomorphisms agree. □

We are finally in position to adapt the result of Huang to our context. For a ring $R$, and an automorphism $\alpha$ of $K_0(R)$, we say a Morita equivalence $\Phi : R \to R$ restricts to $\alpha$ in case $\Phi = \alpha$.

**Proposition 2.4.** Suppose $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple unital. Let $\alpha$ be any automorphism of $K_0(L(E))$. Then there exists a Morita equivalence $\Phi : L(E) \to L(E)$ which restricts to $\alpha$.

**Proof.** If $E$ contains sources, then Corollary 1.5 guarantees the existence of a Morita equivalence $\Phi^{\text{ELIM}} : L(E') \to L(E')$, where $E'$ has no sources. If $\Psi : L(E') \to L(E')$ is a Morita equivalence which restricts to the automorphism $(\Phi^{\text{ELIM}})^{-1} \circ \Phi^{\text{ELIM}}$ of $K_0(L(E'))$, then $\Phi^{\text{ELIM}} \circ \Psi \circ (\Phi^{\text{ELIM}})^{-1}$ is a Morita equivalence from $L(E)$ to $L(E)$ which restricts to $\alpha$. Therefore, it suffices to consider graphs $E$ with no sources.

If $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple, and $E$ has no sources, then $E$ is essential, irreducible, and non-trivial, and hence so is $E'$. Since $K_0(L(E))$ is identified with $\text{coker}(I - A_{E'})$, we may view $\alpha$ as an automorphism of $\text{coker}(I - A_{E'})$. Therefore, by [15] Theorem 1.1 (details in [14] Theorem 2.15), there exists a flow equivalence $F$ from $E'$ to itself which induces $\alpha$. Such a flow equivalence can be written as a finite sequence $E' = H_0 \to^{m_1} H_1 \to^{m_2} H_2 \ldots \to^{m_n} H_n = E'$ of standard graph transformations which starts and ends with $E'$. But this then yields a corresponding finite sequence of standard graph transformations $E = G_0 \to^{m'_1} G_1 \to^{m'_2} G_2 \ldots \to^{m'_n} G_n = E$ which starts and ends with $E$, as described in Lemma 2.2. This sequence of standard graph transformations in turn yields a sequence of Morita equivalences (using the results of Section 1) which starts and ends at $L(E) - \text{Mod}$. But by Proposition 2.3, at each stage of the sequence the restriction of the Morita equivalence to the appropriate $K_0$ group agrees with the induced map coming from the standard graph transformation. If we denote by $\Phi : L(E) \to L(E)$ the composition of these Morita equivalences, then $\Phi$ restricts to the same automorphism of $K_0(L(E))$ as does $F$, namely, the prescribed automorphism $\alpha$. □
Here now is the second main result of this article.

**Theorem 2.5.** Let $E, G$ be finite graphs such that $L(E), L(G)$ are purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras, and such that $L(E)$ is Morita equivalent to $L(G)$. If

$$F_{[1]}(L(E)) \cong F_{[1]}(L(G)),$$

(i.e., if $K_0(L(E)) \cong K_0(L(G))$ via an isomorphism which sends $[1_{L(E)}]$ to $[1_{L(G)}]$), then

$$L(E) \cong L(G).$$

**Proof.** Suppose that $\varphi : K_0(L(E)) \to K_0(L(G))$ is an isomorphism with $\varphi([1_{L(E)}]) = [1_{L(G)}]$. Since $L(E)$ and $L(G)$ are Morita equivalent by hypothesis, there exists a Morita equivalence

$$\Gamma : L(E) - \text{Mod} \to L(G) - \text{Mod}.$$

Thus there is an isomorphism $\Gamma_V : K_0(L(E)) \to K_0(L(G))$.

Now consider the group automorphism

$$\varphi \circ \Gamma_V^{-1} : K_0(L(G)) \to K_0(L(G)).$$

By Proposition 2.4, there exists a Morita equivalence $\Psi : L(G) - \text{Mod} \to L(G) - \text{Mod}$ such that

$$\Psi_V = \varphi \circ \Gamma_V^{-1}.$$

Thus, we get a Morita equivalence

$$H := \Psi \circ \Gamma : L(E) - \text{Mod} \to L(G) - \text{Mod}$$

with

$$H_V = (\Psi \circ \Gamma)_V = \Psi_V \circ \Gamma_V = \varphi \circ \Gamma_V^{-1} \circ \Gamma_V = \varphi.$$

In particular, $H_V([1_{L(E)}]) = \varphi([1_{L(E)}]) = [1_{L(G)}]$. As noted in the Introduction, since $L(E)$ and $L(G)$ are purely infinite simple rings, [3, Corollary 2.2] implies that $[1_{L(E)}] \in K_0(L(E))$ consists of the finitely generated projective left $L(E)$-modules isomorphic (as left $L(E)$-modules) to the progenerator $L(E)L(E)$, and analogously $[1_{L(G)}] \in K_0(L(G))$ consists of the finitely generated projective left $L(G)$-modules isomorphic (as left $L(G)$-modules) to the progenerator $L(G)L(G)$. Thus the equation $H_V([1_{L(E)}]) = [1_{L(G)}]$ yields that $H(L(E)L(E)) \cong L(G)L(G)$. Since Morita equivalences preserve endomorphism rings, we get ring isomorphisms

$$L(E) \cong \text{End}_{L(E)}(L(E)) \cong \text{End}_{L(G)}(H(L(E))) \cong \text{End}_{L(G)}(L(G)) \cong L(G),$$

and the theorem is established. \qed

An easy corollary now gives sufficient, readily computable, and remarkably weak conditions under which two unital purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras are known to be isomorphic. We combine $F_{\text{det}}$ and $F_{[1]}$ to obtain these conditions.

**Definition 2.6.** Let $E$ be a finite graph. We define the Franks triple to be the ordered triple

$$F_3(E) = (K_0(L(E)), [1_{L(E)}], \det(I_n - A_E^L)),$$

consisting of the abelian group $K_0(L(E))$, the element $[1_{L(E)}]$ which represents the order unit of $K_0(L(E))$ containing $1_{L(E)}$, and the integer $\det(I_n - A_E^L)$ (where $n = |E^0|$). For finite graphs $E, G$ we write

$$F_3(E) \cong F_3(G)$$
in case there exists an abelian group isomorphism \( \varphi : K_0(L(E)) \to K_0(L(G)) \) for which 
\[ \varphi([1_{L(E)}]) = [1_{L(G)}], \]
and \( \det(I_n - A'_E) = \det(I_m - A'_G) \). Clearly \( \equiv \) is an equivalence relation on the set of finite graphs.

When \( n = |E^0| \) is clear from context we will often denote the \( n \times n \) identity matrix \( I_n \) simply by \( I \). We now have the sufficiency result we pursued.

**Corollary 2.7.** Let \( E, G \) be finite graphs such that \( L(E), L(G) \) are purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras. If

\[ \mathcal{F}_3(L(E)) \equiv \mathcal{F}_3(L(G)), \]

(i.e., if \( K_0(L(E)) \cong K_0(L(G)) \) via an isomorphism which sends \( [1_{L(E)}] \) to \( [1_{L(G)}] \), and \( \det(I - A'_E) = \det(I - A'_G) \)), then

\[ L(E) \cong L(G). \]

**Proof.** Since \( \mathcal{F}_3(L(E)) \equiv \mathcal{F}_3(L(G)) \), we have in particular that \( \mathcal{F}_{\text{det}}(L(E)) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\text{det}}(L(G)) \), so that \( L(E) \) and \( L(G) \) are Morita equivalent by Theorem 1.25. At the same time, we have \( \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(L(E)) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(L(G)) \), which together with Theorem 2.5 gives the isomorphism we seek. \( \square \)

**Example 2.8.** Let \( E \) and \( F \) be the graphs

\[ E = R_4 = \quad F = \]

\[ A_E = (4) \quad \text{and} \quad A_F = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \]

so that

\[ I - A'_E = (-3) \quad \text{and} \quad I - A'_F = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -3 \\ -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \]

It is well known (and easy to compute) that \( K_0(L(E)) \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \), with \( [1_{L(E)}] = 1 \) in \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \). Similarly, it is not hard to show that \( K_0(L(F)) \cong \text{coker}(I - A'_F) \cong \mathbb{Z}_3 \) as well, and that \( [1_{L(F)}] = 1 \) in \( \mathbb{Z}_3 \). Clearly \( \det(I - A'_E) = -3 = \det(I - A'_F) \). Since both graphs yield purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras, we conclude by Corollary 2.7 that the Leavitt path algebras \( L(E) \) and \( L(F) \) are isomorphic.

Corollary 2.7 establishes that equivalence of the Franks triple is a sufficient condition to conclude isomorphism of the corresponding purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras over finite graphs. For the remainder of this section we consider whether or not the unitary Franks pair (i.e., the pair \( (K_0(L(E)), [1_{L(E)}]) \)) without the \( \det(I - A'_E) \) information) precisely classifies these algebras. It is known that the converse is true: namely, that an isomorphism \( L(E) \cong L(G) \) implies the equivalence of the unitary Franks pairs \( \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(G) \) (see e.g. [4 Theorem 5.11]).

It turns out that equivalence of the unitary Franks invariant almost guarantees equivalence of the corresponding Franks triples; the only possible difference can be in the sign of the determinant. In particular, we can recast Corollary 2.7 as follows.
Corollary 2.9. If $E$ and $G$ are finite graphs for which the Leavitt path algebras $L(E)$ and $L(G)$ are purely infinite simple, for which $\mathcal{F}_{[1]}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(G)$, and for which the integers $\det(I - A_E^t)$ and $\det(I - A_G^t)$ have the same sign, then $L(E) \cong L(G)$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{F}_{[1]}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(G)$, we have in particular that $\text{coker}(I - A_E^t) \cong \text{coker}(I - A_G^t)$, whence the Smith normal forms of these two matrices are the same. But the Smith normal form of a matrix is achieved by a process which involves multiplication by various matrices, each having determinant 1 or $-1$. In particular, this yields $|\det(I - A_E^t)| = |\det(I - A_G^t)|$. So $\det(I - A_E^t)$ and $\det(I - A_G^t)$ having the same sign implies equality of these two integers, whence the result follows from Corollary 2.7. \qed

We note that there are classes of graphs for which equivalence of the unitary Franks pair automatically implies equivalence of the corresponding Franks triple, which then in turn implies isomorphism of the corresponding Leavitt path algebras by Corollary 2.7. For instance, isomorphisms between various sized matrix rings over the Leavitt algebra $L_n$ (see the Introduction) can be recast as isomorphisms between Leavitt path algebras over appropriate graphs (see [4, Section 5]). In this context, one can show that graphs having equivalent unitary Franks pair indeed have identical (negative) $\det(I - A^t)$, so that [4, Theorem 5.9] in fact follows from Corollary 2.7.

Similarly, isomorphisms between purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras $L(E)$ and $L(G)$, for which neither $E$ nor $G$ have parallel edges, and for which both $|E^0| \leq 3$ and $|G^0| \leq 3$, are established in [4, Section 4]. In this context as well, one can show that graphs having equivalent unitary Franks pair indeed have identical (negative) $\det(I - A^t)$, so that [4, Propositions 4.1 and 4.2] follow from Corollary 2.7 as well.

The previous two paragraphs notwithstanding, the cited isomorphism results from [4] are more than merely special cases of Corollary 2.7 since the isomorphisms of [4] are in fact explicitly constructed.

An immediate, interesting consequence of Corollary 2.7 is the following result along these same lines.

Corollary 2.10. Let $E, G$ be finite graphs such that $L(E), L(G)$ are purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras with infinite Grothendieck groups. If $\mathcal{F}_{[1]}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(G)$, then $L(E) \cong L(G)$. In other words, in this situation, equivalence of the unitary Franks pairs is sufficient to yield isomorphism of the Leavitt path algebras.

Proof. The condition that $L(E)$ and $L(G)$ have infinite Grothendieck groups implies that $\det(I - A_E^t) = 0 = \det(I - A_G^t)$, and Corollary 2.7 then applies. \qed

So, in the case of infinite $K_0$-groups, the unitary Franks pair $(K_0(L(E)), [1_{L(E)}])$ is an invariant for classifying the purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras up to isomorphism.

For the remainder of this section we investigate whether or not the result of Corollary 2.10 can be generalized to all purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras. Rephrased, we seek to show either

1. that there exist non-isomorphic purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebras $L(E), L(F)$ over finite graphs $E, F$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{[1]}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{[1]}(F)$, for which the signs of $\det(I - A_E^t)$ and $\det(I - A_F^t)$ are unequal, or
that the sign of $\det(I - A_E^t)$ plays no role in guaranteeing the existence of an isomorphism between the purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras $L(E)$ and $L(F)$, for which $\mathcal{F}[1](E) \equiv \mathcal{F}[1](F)$.

A key observation related to the analysis of the Classification Question developed by the authors in the present paper and [4] is that the graph operations we have already considered cannot help us in this final step, because all of these graph operations preserve flow equivalence on subshifts of finite type, and thus preserve the sign of $\det(I - A_E^t)$. So it is clear that to attain the final goal of classifying these kinds of Leavitt path algebras using the unitary Franks pair $(K_0(L(E)), [1_{L(E)}])$ as an invariant requires a completely new set of ideas and strategies.

In the context of Cuntz-Krieger $C^*$-algebras, the irrelevance of the sign of the determinant in the analogous Classification Question was shown by Rørdam [20]; and in the case of graph $C^*$-algebras, this irrelevance is a direct consequence of the Kirchberg-Phillips Classification Theorem [13, 18] and the computation of the K-theoretic invariant for such a class of algebras (see e.g. [19]). In this direction, a useful tool is Cuntz’s Theorem (presented by Rørdam [20, Theorem 7.2]), whose adaptation to our context gives the possibility of reducing the above situation to a single pair of algebras. We describe the situation, following Cuntz’s argument.

For any finite graph $E$ having vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, such that $L(E)$ is a purely infinite simple algebra and $v_n$ belongs to a cycle, let $E_-$ be the graph whose incidence matrix and pictorial representation is

\[
A_{E_-} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
A_E & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

Specifically, if $E^0 = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ where $v_n$ belongs to a cycle, then the new graph $E_-$ has $E^0_- = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n, v_{n+1}, v_{n+2}\}$, while $E^1_-$ is the union of $E^1$ with six new edges: one from $v_n$ to $v_{n+1}$; one from $v_{n+1}$ to each of $v_n$, $v_{n+1}$, and $v_{n+2}$; and one from $v_{n+2}$ to each of $v_{n+1}$ and $v_{n+2}$. It is straightforward to show (using the Purely Infinite Simplicity Theorem) that $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple if and only if $L(E_-)$ is purely infinite simple. Furthermore, we have

**Proposition 2.11.** Let $E$ be a finite graph for which $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple, and let $E_-$ be the graph defined above. Then

\[K_0(L(E_-)) \cong K_0(L(E)), \quad \text{and} \quad \det(I - A_{E_-}^t) = -\det(I - A_E^t).\]

**Proof.** For proving $K_0(L(E_-)) \cong K_0(L(E))$, notice that, by [6, Theorem 3.5], the monoid $V(L(E_-))$ is generated by $v_1, \ldots, v_{n+2}$, with relations

\[v_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_e(i, j)v_j \quad (1 \leq i \leq n - 1),\]
together with the three relations
\[ v_n = v_{n+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_e(i, j)v_j, \quad v_{n+1} = v_n + v_{n+1} + v_{n+2}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_{n+2} = v_{n+1} + v_{n+2}. \]

Since \( L(E_-) \) is purely infinite simple we get \( K_0(L(E_-)) \cong V(L(E_-))^* \) by [3, Corollary 2.2]. Thus \( K_0(L(E_-)) \) is the group generated by \([v_1], \ldots, [v_{n+2}]\), with relations
\[ [v_i] = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_e(i, j)[v_j] \quad (1 \leq i \leq n-1), \]

together with the three relations
\[ [v_n] = [v_{n+1}] + \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_e(i, j)[v_j], \quad [v_n] = -[v_{n+2}], \quad \text{and} \quad [v_{n+1}] = [0]. \]

In particular, since \([v_{n+1}] = [0]\) we in fact have that \([v_i] = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_e(i, j)[v_j]\) for all \(1 \leq i \leq n\) (i.e., including \(n\) as well). This yields that the relations between generators of \( K_0(L(E)) \) remain the same when viewed as elements of \( K_0(L(E_-)) \), so that the inclusion map \( K_0(L(E)) \hookrightarrow K_0(L(E_-)) \) is a group homomorphism. The equations \([v_{n+1}] = [0]\) and \([v_{n+2}] = -[v_n]\) show that this inclusion is actually a surjection, so that \( K_0(L(E_-)) \) is isomorphic to \( K_0(L(E)) \).

(We note that the isomorphism from \( K_0(L(E)) \) to \( K_0(L(E_-)) \) given here does not necessarily take \([1_{L(E)}]\) to \([1_{L(E_-)}]\), since in general we need not have \([v_{n+1}] + [v_{n+2}] = [0]\) in \( K_0(L(E_-)) \).

With respect to the determinants, the result is an elementary computation. \(\square\)

As a specific, important example, consider the Leavitt path algebras \(L(2)\) and \(L(2_-)\), where \(2\) and \(2_-\) are the graphs with incidence matrices
\[ A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{2_-} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \]

Pictorially, these graphs are given by
\[ 2 = \begin{tikzpicture} \draw (0,0) -- (1,0) node (v) [below] {\(v_1\)}; \draw (0,0) -- (0,1) node (w) [right] {\(v_2\)}; \end{tikzpicture} \]

and
\[ 2_- = \begin{tikzpicture} \draw (0,0) -- (1,0) node (v) [below] {\(v_1\)}; \draw (0,0) -- (0,1) node (w) [right] {\(v_2\)}; \draw (0,1) -- (0,2) node (y) [right] {\(v_3\)}; \draw (0,2) -- (1,2) node (z) [right] {\(v_4\)}; \end{tikzpicture} \]

Notice that
\[ (K_0(L(2)), [1_{L(2)}], \det(I - A^t_2)) = ([0], 0, -1), \quad \text{while} \]
\[ (K_0(L(2_-)), [1_{L(2_-)}], \det(I - A^t_2)) = ([0], 0, 1). \]

Now consider the standard representations of \(L(2)\) and \(L(2_-)\) in \(R = \text{End}_K(V)\), where \(V\) is a \(K\)-vector space of countable dimension with basis \(\{v_i\}_{i \geq 1}\). (For a description of this process, see [19] page 8.) Let \(u \in R\) be the endomorphism defined by the rule \(u(v_i) = \delta_{i,1}v_1\). Let \(E_2\)
be the subalgebra of $R$ generated by $L(2)$ and $u$, and similarly let $E_2$ be the subalgebra of $R$ generated by $L(2_-)$ and $u$.

**Hypothesis:** There exists a $K$-algebra isomorphism $\tau : L(2) \to L(2_-)$ which extends to an isomorphism $T : E_2 \to E_2$ such that $T(u) = u$.

Using the argument presented in [20, Theorem 7.2], it is long but straightforward to show that

**Theorem 2.12.** If the Hypothesis holds, then for any finite graph $E$ such that $L(E)$ is a purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebra, there is a Morita equivalence $L(E) \sim_M L(E_-)$.

Therefore, as a consequence of Corollary 2.9 and Proposition 2.11 we would then have

**Theorem 2.13.** If the Hypothesis holds, then $K_0$ precisely classifies purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras up to Morita equivalence.

**Proof.** Let $E, G$ be finite graphs for which $L(E)$ and $L(G)$ are purely infinite simple and $K_0(L(E)) \cong K_0(L(G))$. By Corollary 2.9, either $\det(I - A_{E}^{t}) = \det(I - A_{G}^{t})$, or $\det(I - A_{E}^{t}) = -\det(I - A_{G}^{t})$. In the first case, we have $F_{\det}(L(E)) \equiv F_{\det}(L(G))$, so Theorem 1.25 gives Morita equivalence. Otherwise, we have $F_{\det}(L(E_-)) \equiv F_{\det}(L(G))$, so by Theorems 2.12 and 1.25 we get

$$L(E) \sim_M L(E_-) \sim_M L(G),$$

and the theorem follows. \hfill \Box

Following the same strategy as before, we now push this Morita equivalence result to yield isomorphisms by applying Theorem 2.5. In order to do so, we will need another graph construction.

For any finite graph $E$ having vertices $v_1, \ldots, v_n$, such that $L(E)$ is a purely infinite simple algebra and $v_n$ belongs to a cycle, let $E_{1-}$ be the graph whose incidence matrix and pictorial representation is

$$A_{E_{1-}} = \begin{pmatrix}
    0 & 0 & 0 \\
    \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
    0 & 0 & 0 \\
    1 & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
    0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
    0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} \quad E_{1-} = \begin{array}{c}
    \includegraphics{graph.png}
\end{array}.$$

Immediately, we note that $E_- = (E_{1-})_{v_n\to 3}$. It is again straightforward to show (using the Purely Infinite Simplicity Theorem) that $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple if and only if $L(E_{1-})$ is purely infinite simple. Furthermore, we have

**Proposition 2.14.** Let $E$ be a finite graph for which $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple, and let $E_{1-}$ be the graph defined above. Then

$$F_{[1]}(L(E_{1-})) \equiv F_{[1]}(L(E)) \quad \text{and} \quad \det(I - A_{E_{1-}}^{t}) = -\det(I - A_{E}^{t}).$$
Proof. Since $E_-(E_1)_{v_{n+3}}$, we get from Lemma \[2.14\] that $\det(I - A_{E_1}^t) = \det(I - A_{E_1}^t) = -\det(I - A_E^t)$. We follow a strategy similar to the one used in the proof of Proposition \[2.11\] to conclude that the inclusion map is an isomorphism between $K_0(L(E_1))$ and $K_0(L(E_1))$. Specifically, by again using \[6\] Theorem 3.5], the monoid $V(L(E_1))$ is generated by $v_1, \ldots, v_{n+3}$ with relations $v_i = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{e}(i,j)v_j \ (1 \leq i \leq n-1)$, together with the four relations

$$v_n = v_{n+1} + \sum_{j=1}^n A_{e}(i,j)v_j, \ v_{n+1} = v_n + v_{n+1} + v_{n+2}, \ v_{n+2} = v_{n+1} + v_{n+2}, \ v_{n+3} = v_n.$$ 

Again, we apply \[5\] Corollary 2.2] to get the isomorphism $K_0(L(E_1)) \cong V(L(E_1))^*$, and note that $[v_{n+2}] = -[v_n], \ [v_{n+3}] = [v_n]$ and $[v_{n+1}] = [0]$, so that $[v_i] = \sum_{j=1}^n A_{e}(i,j)[v_j] \ (1 \leq i \leq n)$. Hence, the map

$$\begin{align*}
[v_i] &\mapsto [v_i] \ (1 \leq i \leq n) \\
[v_{n+2}] &\mapsto -[v_n] \\
[v_{n+3}] &\mapsto [v_n]
\end{align*}$$

defines an isomorphism $\varphi$ from $K_0(L(E_1))$ to $K_0(L(E))$. In addition,

$$\varphi([1_{L(E_1)}]) = [1_{L(E)}] + [v_{n+1}] + [v_{n+2}] + [v_{n+3}] = [1_{L(E)}] + [v_n] - [v_n] = [1_{L(E)}],$$

which yields the equivalence $F_{[1]}(L(E_1)) \equiv F_{[1]}(L(E))$. \[\square\]

In particular, for any finite graph $E$ with $L(E)$ purely infinite simple, we now have a construction of another graph $E_1$ which shares its unitary Franks pair, but differs in $\text{sgn}(\det(I - A_{E_1}^t))$. We now assume the Hypothesis, and analyze the consequences for isomorphism.

**Proposition 2.15.** If the Hypothesis holds, then for any finite graph $E$ such that $L(E)$ is a purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebra, there is a Morita equivalence $L(E) \sim_M L(E_1)$. 

**Proof.** Applying Theorem \[2.12\] and Proposition \[1.4\], we get

$$L(E) \sim_M L(E_1) = L((E_1)_{v_{n+3}}) \sim_M L(E_1).$$

\[\square\]

Combining the equivalence of the unitary Franks pair from Proposition \[2.14\] with the Morita equivalence from Proposition \[2.15\], we are in position to apply Theorem \[2.5\] and obtain the following key connecting result, one which allows us to cross the “determinant gap”.

**Proposition 2.16.** If the Hypothesis holds, then for any finite graph $E$ such that $L(E)$ is a purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebra, there is an isomorphism $L(E) \cong L(E_1)$. 

As a consequence, we obtain

**Theorem 2.17.** If the Hypothesis holds, then $F_{[1]}$ precisely classifies purely infinite simple unital Leavitt path algebras up to isomorphism.
Proof. Let $E, G$ be finite graphs for which $L(E)$ and $L(G)$ are purely infinite simple and $\mathcal{F}_1(L(E)) \equiv \mathcal{F}_1(L(G))$. By Corollary[2.9] either $\det(I - A_E^t) = \det(I - A_G^t)$, or $\det(I - A_E^t) = -\det(I - A_G^t)$. In the first case, we have $\mathcal{F}_3(L(E)) \equiv \mathcal{F}_3(L(G))$, so Corollary[2.7] gives the desired isomorphism. Otherwise, we have $\mathcal{F}_3(L(E_{1-})) \equiv \mathcal{F}_3(L(G))$, so by Proposition[2.16] and Corollary[2.7] we get

$$L(E) \cong L(E_{1-}) \cong L(G),$$

and the theorem follows. □

3. Some general isomorphism and Morita equivalence results for Leavitt path algebras

In Section[1] we presented four results regarding Morita equivalences between Leavitt path algebras. These four specific results were precisely those which we needed to achieve the first main result of this article, Theorem[1.25]. In the final section of this article, we present a number of similarly-flavored results which we believe are of interest in their own right. Along the way we will give generalizations of Propositions[1.4][1.8] and[1.11] to wider classes of graphs. In addition, we will also show that the hypotheses presented in[4] on one of the isomorphism theorems can be significantly weakened.

Information about various topics presented in this section (e.g. the $\mathbb{Z}$-grading on $L(E)$, the natural action as automorphisms of $K^*$ on $L_K(E)$) can be found in[4].

Here is the indicated generalization of Proposition[1.4].

Proposition 3.1. Let $E$ be a row-finite graph with no sinks, let $v \in E^0$ be a source, and let $E_{v\setminus}$ be the source elimination graph. Then $L(E)$ and $L(E_{v\setminus})$ are Morita equivalent.

Proof. By definition of $F = E_{v\setminus}$, it is clear that $F$ is a (complete) subgraph of $E$. Thus, the $K$-algebra map defined by the rule

$$\phi : L(F) \longrightarrow L(E)
\begin{align*}
w &\mapsto w \\
e &\mapsto e \\
e^* &\mapsto e^*
\end{align*}$$

for every $w \in F^0$ and every $e \in F^1$, is a $\mathbb{Z}$-graded ring homomorphism such that $\phi(w) \neq 0$ for every $w \in F^0$. Hence $\phi$ is injective by[4] Lemma 1.1].

Set $F^0 = \{w_i\}_{i \geq 1}$. For each $n \geq 1$ define $e = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i$. Then $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a set of local units for $L(F)$, and since $v$ is a source, $\phi(L(F)) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} e_n L(E) e_n$. Moreover, as $r(s^{-1}(v)) \subset F^0$, $E^0$ turns out to be the hereditary saturated closure of $F^0$. Hence, we get $L(E) = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} L(E)e_n L(E)$.

Thus, it is not difficult to see that

$$\left(\sum_{n \geq 1} e_n L(E) e_n, \sum_{n \geq 1} L(E) e_n L(E), \sum_{n \geq 1} L(E) e_n, \sum_{n \geq 1} e_n L(E)\right)$$

is a (surjective) Morita context for the rings $L(E)$ and $L(F)$, as desired. □

The following definition is borrowed from[9] Section 4].
**Definition 3.2.** Let $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a row-finite graph. A map $d_s : E^0 \cup E^1 \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ such that

1. if $w \in E^0$ is not a sink then $d_s(w) = \sup\{d_s(e) \mid s(e) = w\}$, and
2. if $d_s(x) = \infty$ for some $x$, then $x$ is a sink

is called a *Drinen source-vector*. Note that only vertices are allowed to have an infinite $d_s$-value. From this data we construct a new graph $d_s(E)$ as follows: Let

$$
d_s(E)^0 = \{v^i \mid v \in E^0, 0 \leq i \leq d_s(v)\},
$$

and for $e \in E^1$ define $r_{d_s(E)}(e) = r(e)^0$ and $s_{d_s(E)}(e) = s(e)^{d_s(e)}$. For $f(v)^i$ define $s_{d_s(E)}(f(v)^i) = v^i$ and $r_{d_s(E)}(f(v)^i) = v^i$. The resulting directed graph $d_s(E)$ is called the *out-delayed graph* of $E$ for the Drinen source-vector $d_s$.

In the out-delayed graph the original vertices correspond to those vertices with superscript $0$. Intuitively, the edge $e \in E^1$ is “delayed” from leaving $s(e)^0$ and arriving at $r(e)^0$ by a path of length $d_s(e)$.

**Theorem 3.3.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph and let $d_s : E^0 \cup E^1 \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a Drinen source-vector. Then $L(d_s(E))$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E)$.

**Proof.** The argument is essentially the same as in the proof of [9, Theorem 4.2], except for the proof of the injectivity of the map $\pi$, and the proof of the Morita equivalence of $L(E)$ and $L(d_s(E))$. We include the whole argument for the sake of completeness.

Given $e \in E^1$ and $v \in E^0$, define $Q_v = v^0$, and define $T_e$ by setting

$$
T_e = f(s(e))^1 \cdots f(s(e))^{d_s(e)}e \text{ if } d_s(e) \neq 0, \quad \text{and} \quad T_e = e \text{ otherwise.}
$$

We claim that \{\(T_e, Q_v \mid e \in E^1, v \in E^0\)\} is an $E$-family in $L(d_s(E))$. The $Q_v$’s are nonzero mutually orthogonal idempotents since the $v^0$’s are. The elements $T_e$ for $e \in E^1$ clearly satisfy $T_e^* T_f = 0$ whenever $e \neq f$, because they consist of sums of elements with the same property.

For $e \in E^1$ it is routine to check that $T_e^* T_e = Q_{r(e)}$.

If $v \in E^0$ is not a sink, then $d_s(v) < \infty$. If $d_s(v) = 0$, then we certainly have

$$
Q_v = \sum_{\{s(e) = v, d_s(e) = j\}} ee^* + f(v)^{j+1}v^{j+1}f(v)^{j+1*},
$$

and since we must have some edges with $s(e) = v$ and $d_s(e) = d_s(v)$ we have

$$
v^{d_s(v)} = \sum_{\{s(e) = v, d_s(e) = d_s(v)\}} ee^*.
$$

Using (1) recursively and (2) when $j = d_s(v) - 1$ we see that

$$
Q_v = v^0 = \sum_{\{s(e) = v, d_s(e) = 0\}} T_e T_e^* + \cdots + \sum_{\{s(e) = v, d_s(e) = d_s(v)\}} T_e T_e^* = \sum_{\{s(e) = v\}} T_e T_e^*,
$$

and this establishes our claim.
So by the universal property of $L_K(E)$ there is a $K$-algebra homomorphism
\[ \pi : L_K(E) \rightarrow L_K(d_s(E)) \]
which takes $e$ to $T_e$ and $v$ to $Q_v$.

Let $\alpha_{d_s(E)}$ denote the $K$-action as automorphisms on $L_K(d_s(E)$ satisfying, for each $t \in K^* = K \setminus \{0\}$,
\[ \alpha_{d_s(E)}^t(e) = te, \quad \alpha_{d_s(E)}^t(f(v)^i) = f(v)^i \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d_s(v), \text{ and } \alpha_{d_s(E)}^t(v^i) = v^i \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq d_s(v). \]

We now establish the injectivity of $\pi$ for all fields $K$. It is straightforward to check that $\pi \circ \tau^E_t = \alpha_{d_s(E)}^t \circ \pi$ for each $t \in K^*$, where $\tau^E$ is the standard action of $K$ on $L_K(E)$ given in [4, Definition 1.5]. If $K$ is infinite, it follows from [4, Theorem 1.8] that $\pi$ is injective.

On the other hand, if $K$ is finite, then let $K_1$ be any infinite field extension of $K$ (e.g., let $K_1$ be the algebraic closure of $K$). By extension of scalars, we have isomorphisms $\gamma_E : K_1 \otimes_K L_K(E) \cong L_{K_1}(E)$ and $\gamma_{d_s(E)} : K_1 \otimes_K L_K(d_s(E)) \cong L_{K_1}(d_s(E))$. Consider the homomorphism
\[ 1 \otimes \pi : K_1 \otimes L_K(E) \rightarrow K_1 \otimes L_K(d_s(E)), \]
and define
\[ \psi = \gamma_{d_s(E)} \circ (1 \otimes \pi) \circ \gamma^{-1}_E : L_{K_1}(E) \rightarrow L_{K_1}(d_s(E)). \]

For each $u \in K_1^*$ define $\alpha_{d_s(E)}^u : L_{K_1}(d_s(E)) \rightarrow L_{K_1}(d_s(E))$ in a manner analogous to the description of $\alpha$ given above. Then it is straightforward to check that for every $u \in K_1^*$, $\psi \circ \tau^E_u = \alpha_{d_s(E)}^u \circ \psi$. Hence, because $K_1$ is infinite, [4, Theorem 1.8] applies exactly as in the previous case to yield that $\psi$ is injective. But $\psi = \gamma_{d_s(E)} \circ (1 \otimes \pi) \circ \gamma^{-1}_E$, so that $1 \otimes \pi$ is injective, which yields the injectivity of $\pi$ in case $K$ is finite as well.

Now enumerate the vertices $v^0 \in d_s(E)^0$ by $\{v^0_i \mid i \geq 1\}$, and define $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ by $e_n = \sum_{i=1}^n v^0_i$. Then $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ is an ascending chain of idempotents in $L(d_s(E))$. Let $A = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} e_n L(d_s(E)) e_n$ be the subalgebra of $L(d_s(E))$ with set of local units $\{e_n\}_{n \geq 1}$. The same argument as in [9, Theorem 4.2] shows that $A = \pi(L(E))$, which is isomorphic to $L(E)$ by the previously established injectivity of $\pi$. Also, the same argument as in [8, Lemma 2.4] shows that $A$ is Morita equivalent to the ideal
\[ I = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} L(d_s(E)) e_n L(d_s(E)) = \sum_{v \in E^0} L(d_s(E)) v^0 L(d_s(E)) = I(\{v^0 \mid v \in E^0\}). \]

Since $d_s(E)^0$ is the hereditary saturated closure of $\{v^0 \mid v \in E^0\}$, $I = L(d_s(E))$ by [8, Lemma 2.1], whence the result holds. \qed

Let $E$ be a row-finite graph, and let $v \in E^0$. We define the following Drinen source-vector:

1. For every $w \in E^0 \setminus \{v\}$, $d_s(w) = 0$, while $d_s(v) = 1$.
2. For every $f \in E^1 \setminus s^{-1}(v)$, $d_s(f) = 0$, while $d_s(e) = 1$ for any $e \in s^{-1}(v)$.

Then it is straightforward to see that
\[ E_v = d_s(E). \]
In other words, the out-delay graph $d_r(E)$ related to this particular Drinen source-vector is precisely the expansion graph $E_v$. With this observation, Theorem 3.3 then immediately yields this more general version of Proposition 1.8.

**Corollary 3.4.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph, and $v \in E^0$. Then $L(E_v)$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E)$.

We again borrow a definition from [9, Section 4].

**Definition 3.5.** Let $E = (E^0, E^1, r, s)$ be a row-finite graph. A map $d_r : E^0 \cup E^1 \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfying

1. if $w$ is not a source then $d_r(w) = \sup \{d_r(e) \mid r(e) = w\}$, and
2. if $d_r(x) = \infty$ then $x$ is either a source or receives infinitely many edges

is called a *Drinen range-vector*. We construct a new graph $d_r(E)$, called the *in-delayed graph of $E$* for the Drinen range-vector $d_r$, as follows:

$$d_r(E)^0 = \{v_i \mid v \in E^0, 0 \leq i \leq d_r(v)\},$$

$$d_r(E)^1 = E^1 \cup \{f(v_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq d_r(v)\}.$$

For $e \in d_r(E)^1$ with $e \in E^1$ we define $r_{d_r}(E)(e) = r(e)d_r(e)$ and $s_{d_r}(E)(e) = s(e)0$. For $f \in d_r(E)^1$ of the form $f = f(v_i)$ we define $s_{d_r}(E)(f(v_i)) = v_i$ and $r_{d_r}(E)(f(v_i)) = v_{i-1}$.

**Theorem 3.6.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph and let $d_r : E^0 \cup E^1 \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a Drinen range-vector. Then $L(d_r(E))$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E)$.

**Proof.** The proof is essentially identical to the proof of [9, Theorem 4.5], using arguments analogous to those used in the proof of Theorem 3.3. □

We now give an additional condition on the previously defined notion of an *in-split graph* (see the notation presented in Definition 1.9).

**Definition 3.7.** Let $E$ be a graph, let $\mathcal{P}$ be a partition of $E^1$, and let $m$ be as described in Definition 1.9. $\mathcal{P}$ is called *proper* if for every vertex $v$ which is a sink we have $m(v) = 0$ or $m(v) = 1$. (That is, $\mathcal{P}$ is proper if $\mathcal{P}$ does not in-split at a sink.)

To relate the Leavitt path algebra of a graph to the Leavitt path algebras of its in-splittings we use a variation of the method introduced in [11, Section 4.2]: If $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ is the in-split graph formed from $E$ using the partition $\mathcal{P}$ then we may define a Drinen range-vector $d_{r,\mathcal{P}} : E^0 \cup E^1 \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ by $d_{r,\mathcal{P}}(v) = m(v) - 1$ if $m(v) \geq 1$ and $d_{r,\mathcal{P}}(v) = 0$ otherwise. For $e \in E_r^{r(e)}$ we put $d_{r,\mathcal{P}}(e) = i - 1$. Hence, if $v$ receives $n \geq 2$ edges then we create an in-delayed graph in which $v$ is given delay of size $m(v) - 1$ and all edges with range $v$ are given a delay one less than their label in the partition of $r^{-1}(v)$. If $v$ is a source or receives only one edge then there is no delay attached to $v$.

**Theorem 3.8.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph, $\mathcal{P}$ a partition of $E^1$, $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ the in-split graph formed from $E$ using $\mathcal{P}$ and $d_{r,\mathcal{P}} : E^0 \cup E^1 \to \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\}$ the Drinen range-vector defined as above. Then $L(E_r(\mathcal{P})) \cong L(d_{r,\mathcal{P}}(E))$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}$ is proper.

**Proof.** The proof is analogous to the proof of [9, Theorem 5.3], using the arguments of the proof of Theorem 3.3. □
Applying Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.6, we get the following analog to [9, Corollary 5.4], which in turn gives a generalization of Proposition 1.11. (Note that the hypotheses of Proposition 1.11 include that $E$ contains no sinks, so that every partition of $E^1$ is vacuously proper.)

**Corollary 3.9.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph, $\mathcal{P}$ a partition of $E^1$ and $E_r(\mathcal{P})$ the in-split graph formed from $E$ using $\mathcal{P}$. Then $L(E_r(\mathcal{P}))$ is Morita equivalent to $L(E)$ if and only if $\mathcal{P}$ is proper.

The following graph construction was presented in [4, Definition 2.1]. Examples of this construction can be found in [4, Section 2].

**Definition 3.10.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph, and let $v \neq w \in E^0$ be vertices which are not sinks. If there exists an injective map $\theta : s^{-1}(w) \to s^{-1}(v)$ such that $r(e) = r(\theta(e))$ for every $e \in s^{-1}(w)$, we define the shift graph from $v$ to $w$, denoted $F = E(w \leftrightarrow v)$, as follows:

1. $F^0 = E^0$.
2. $F^1 = (E^1 \setminus \theta(s^{-1}(w))) \cup \{f_{v,w}\}$, where $f_{v,w} \notin E^1$, $s(f_{v,w}) = v$ and $r(f_{v,w}) = w$.

By combining the argument presented in the proof of [4, Theorem 2.3] (which establishes the result for all infinite fields), with the argument given in the penultimate paragraph of the proof of Theorem 3.3 above (which shows how to extend a result of this type from infinite fields to all fields), we achieve the following strengthening of [4, Theorem 2.3] to all fields.

**Theorem 3.11.** Let $E$ be a row-finite graph, and let $v \neq w \in E^0$ be vertices which are not sinks. If there exists an injection $\theta : s^{-1}(w) \to s^{-1}(v)$ such that $r(e) = r(\theta(e))$ for every $e \in s^{-1}(w)$, then there exists a $K$-algebra isomorphism $\varphi : L(E) \to L(E(w \leftrightarrow v))$.

We conclude this article by analyzing the relationship between the Leavitt path algebra $L(E)$ of a graph $E$ and the Leavitt path algebra $L(E^t)$ of its transpose graph $E^t$. An easy example shows that in general these two algebras need not be Morita equivalent. For instance, if $E$ is the graph

$$E = \bullet \leftrightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$$

then

$$E^t = \bullet \rightarrow \bullet \rightarrow \bullet$$

By [3, Proposition 3.5] we get that $L_K(E) \cong M_2(K) \oplus M_2(K)$, while $L_K(E^t) \cong M_3(K)$; these two algebras are not Morita equivalent.

Indeed, we can find a finite graph $E$ having neither sinks nor sources for which $L(E)$ and $L(E^t)$ are not Morita equivalent. Specifically, consider the graph $E$

$$E = \begin{array}{c}
\bullet \\
\downarrow \\
\bullet \\
\end{array}$$

whose transpose graph $E^t$ is
Then $v_1 \in E^0$ generates the unique proper graded two-sided ideal of $L_K(E)$, and the quotient ring $L_K(E)/\langle v_1 \rangle$ is isomorphic to $K[x,x^{-1}]$. Thus, $L(E)$ has no purely infinite simple unital quotients. Since $E$ contains loops, [7, Theorem 2.8] implies that the stable rank $sr(L(E))$ equals 2. On the other hand, $v_2 \in (E^t)^0$ generates a proper graded two-sided ideal in $L(E^t)$, whose quotient ring $L(E^t)/\langle v_2 \rangle$ is isomorphic to the Leavitt algebra $L_K(1,2)$. Thus $sr(L(E^t)) = \infty$ by [7, Theorem 2.8]. But the stable rank is a Morita invariant for unital Leavitt path algebras of row-finite graphs [7, Remark 3.4(1)], so that $L(E)$ and $L(E^t)$ cannot be Morita equivalent.

However, in contrast to the previous two examples, we get the following consequence of Theorem 2.7.

**Proposition 3.12.** If $E$ is a finite graph without sources such that $L(E)$ is a purely infinite simple Leavitt path algebra, then $L(E)$ and $L(E^t)$ are Morita equivalent.

**Proof.** There is an isomorphism $coker(I - A^t_E) \cong coker(I - A_E) = coker(I - A_E)$, since the Smith normal forms of $I - A^t_E$ and $I - A_E$ are equal. Furthermore, cofactor expansions clearly yield $\det(I - A^t_E) = \det(I - A_E)$. Thus we have $\mathcal{F}_{\det}(E) \equiv \mathcal{F}_{\det}(E^t)$. By Lemma 1.17 we have that $E$ is irreducible, essential, and nontrivial. But these three conditions on a graph are easily seen to pass to the transpose graph $E^t$, so that (again by Lemma 1.17) we have that $L(E^t)$ is purely infinite simple. Thus Theorem 1.25 applies to yield the result. \hfill \Box

The result of Proposition 3.12 does not extend to isomorphism, as the following example demonstrates.

**Example 3.13.** Consider the graph $E$ whose incidence matrix is

$$A_E = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$ 

Then $E$ is a graph with no sources, for which $L(E)$ is purely infinite simple. It is not hard to show (see e.g. [21, pp. 67-68]) that $K_0(L(E)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$, and $[1_E] = [1]$ in $\mathbb{Z}_2$. On the other hand, a similarly easy computation yields that $K_0(L(E^t)) = \mathbb{Z}_2$ as well, but $[1_{E^t}] = [0]$ in $\mathbb{Z}_2$. Since, as noted above, an isomorphism between Leavitt path algebras yields an equivalence of the corresponding unitary Franks pairs, we conclude that $L(E) \not\cong L(E^t)$.
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