

Non-commutative localizations of additive categories and weight structures; applications to birational motives

Mikhail V. Bondarko, Vladimir A. Sosnilo *

November 1, 2018

Abstract

In this paper we demonstrate that *non-commutative localizations* of arbitrary additive categories (generalizing those defined by Cohn in the setting of rings) are closely (and naturally) related to weight structures. Localizing an arbitrary triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ by a set S of morphisms in the heart \underline{Hw} of a weight structure w on it one obtains a triangulated category endowed with a weight structure w' . The heart of w' is a certain version of the idempotent completion of the non-commutative localization $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (of \underline{Hw} by S). The functor $\underline{Hw} \rightarrow \underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is the natural categorical version of Cohn's localization of a ring, i.e., is universal among additive functors that make all elements of S invertible. For any additive category $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$, taking $\underline{\mathcal{C}} = K^b(\underline{\mathcal{A}})$ we obtain a very efficient tool for computing $\underline{\mathcal{A}}[S^{-1}]_{add}$; using it, we generalize the calculations of Gerasimov and Malcolmson (made for rings only). We also prove that $\underline{\mathcal{A}}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ coincides with the "abstract" localization $\underline{\mathcal{A}}[S^{-1}]$ (as constructed by Gabriel and Zisman) if S contains all identity morphisms of $\underline{\mathcal{A}}$ and is closed with respect to direct sums.

We apply our results to certain categories of birational motives $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ (generalizing those defined by Kahn and Sujatha). We define $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ for arbitrary U as a certain localization of $K^b(Cor(U))$

*The first author was supported supported by RFBR (grant no. 14-01-00393). The second author was supported by the Chebyshev Laboratory (Department of Mathematics and Mechanics, St. Petersburg State University) under RF Government grant 11.G34.31.0026 and by JSC "Gazprom Neft".

MSC2010 Primary: 18E35, 16S85, 14C15; Secondary: 18E30, 18E05, 14F42, 19E15, 16U20, 18G35, 16E20.

and obtain a weight structure for it. When U is the spectrum of a perfect field, the weight structure obtained is compatible with the corresponding Chow and Gersten weight structures defined by the first author in previous papers. For a general U the result is completely new. It enables us to calculate the Grothendieck group of $DM_{gm}^o(U)$. The existence of the corresponding adjacent t -structure is also a new result over a general base scheme; its heart is a certain category of birational sheaves with transfers over U .

Contents

1	Some notation and conventions	6
2	Weakly negative classes in triangulated categories, and localizations	8
2.1	Weakly negative classes of objects and Verdier localizations . . .	9
2.2	On the universal additive functor inverting a set of morphisms	12
3	On additive localizations: our computations and their comparison with the arguments of the other authors	15
3.1	Computations for additive localizations	15
3.2	The comparison of our results with the theory of Cohn’s localizations	22
3.2.1	On non-commutative localizations (a la Cohn)	22
3.2.2	The relation of our results with those of Malcolmson	23
4	On weight structures in localizations	26
4.1	A reminder on weight structures	26
4.2	The relation of weight structures with “additive localizations”	29
4.3	The relation with adjacent t -structures	32
4.3.1	On adjacent structures and localizations	33
4.3.2	The relation between our results and some of the results of [Dwy06] and [NeR04]	36
5	On birational motives and weights for them	38
5.1	The definition of birational motives	38
5.2	A weight structure on $DM_{gm}^o(U)$	39

Introduction

For an additive category \underline{A} and some set $S \subset \text{Mor}(\underline{A})$ of morphisms of \underline{A} it is natural to ask the following questions:

(i) does there exist an initial object in the category of those additive functors from \underline{A} to an additive category \underline{A}' such that all the elements of S become invertible in \underline{A}' ?

(ii) provided that the initial object does exist, how can one describe its target $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$?

(iii) is $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ isomorphic to the “abstract” (i.e., “Gabriel-Zisman”) localization of \underline{A} by S ?

In the case when \underline{A} is the category of finitely generated free (left) modules over a associative unital ring R , the answers to questions (i) and (ii) are given by the theory of non-commutative localizations of rings introduced in [Coh85] (see §3.2 and §4.3 below for more references). In the current paper we extend the corresponding results to a more general setting of an arbitrary additive category \underline{A} . We also recall that the answer to (iii) is positive if S contains all identity morphisms of \underline{A} and is closed under direct sums (this certainly implies that the answer to (i) is positive in general).

We give a comprehensive description of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$. Our main “computational” tool is the full embedding of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ into the Verdier localization of $K^b(\underline{A})$ (see §1 below) by S . So we prove the following result.

Theorem 0.1. *Let \underline{A} be a (small) additive category and let S be an arbitrary subset of $\text{Mor}(\underline{A})$.*

Denote by \underline{D} the triangulated subcategory of $K^b(\underline{A})$ generated (see §1) by the cones of elements of S ; denote by l the Verdier localization functor $K^b(\underline{A}) \rightarrow \underline{E} = K^b(\underline{A})/\underline{D}$. Denote by $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add} \subset \underline{E}$ the full subcategory whose objects are those of \underline{A} ; denote by u the functor $\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ induced by l .

Then u is characterized by the following universal property: an additive functor $F : \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}'$ factorizes through u if and only if F converts all elements of S into isomorphisms; if it does, then such a factorization is unique.

Our methods (of proving this theorem) are closely related to weight structures (as was shown in several previous papers of the first author, weight structures are important cousins of t -structures; cf. also Remark 4.1.2(4) below). We prove that a weight structure w on a triangulated category \underline{C} necessarily induces a weight structure on $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ if a triangulated subcategory \underline{D} of \underline{C} is generated by a set of objects of “ w -length 1”, i.e., by cones of some set of morphisms between objects of the heart \underline{Hw} of a weight structure w on \underline{C} (in contrast to the setting of t -structures, w does not have to induce

a weight structure on \underline{D} ; we will say more on this matter at the end of this Introduction). The heart of this weight structure is the Karoubi-closure of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. So, one can describe $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ using any triangulated category \underline{C} with a weight structure whose heart is (contained in) the idempotent completion of \underline{A} . We also prove for a triangulated subcategory $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ that is (“compactly”) generated by $\{\text{Cone}(S)\}$ as a localizing subcategory that $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ possesses a t -structure adjacent to $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ and calculate its heart.

We also apply our results to certain triangulated categories of (geometric) birational motives. Those are obtained from (a version of) Voevodsky’s effective geometric motives over a scheme U by inverting birational equivalences (and by Karoubization). So, there exists a weight structure w_{bir} on the category $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ obtained. It is characterized as follows: \underline{Hw}_{bir} is given by retracts of the birational motives of (smooth) U -schemes; our results also yield a certain description of morphisms in the heart. The existence of w_{bir} previously was only known for U being (the spectrum of) a perfect field (actually, this is the only case in which birational motives were considered previously); even in this case we obtain a new “elementary” proof of this fact (as well as a new method for the calculation of its heart). As shown in previous papers of the first author (see Theorem 2.4.2 of [Bon10a]), the existence of a weight structure yields functorial weight filtrations and weight spectral sequences for any cohomology theory that factors through birational motives, and a conservative exact weight complex functor whose target is $K^b(\underline{Hw}_{bir})$. We also calculate the Grothendieck group of $DM_{gm}^o(U)$.

Now we list the contents of the paper in more detail.

We introduce some basic notation and definitions in §1.

We start §2 with certain calculations in a triangulated category \underline{C} that contains a *weakly negative* class of objects B . We prove that any object in the triangulated subcategory \underline{D} of \underline{C} generated by B (i.e., in the smallest strict triangulated subcategory containing B) is a cone of a morphism of “simpler objects” (i.e., it has a *weak weight decomposition*). It follows that a presentation of a morphism in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ as a “roof” can be “simplified” under certain conditions. This technical result easily yields the first of the statements in Theorem 0.1. We also recall that $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ coincides with the “abstract” localization of \underline{A} by S (as constructed by Gabriel and Zisman) if S contains all identities and is closed under direct sums.

In §3 we “compute” the category $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ very explicitly. In particular, we prove that in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ any morphism can be presented as $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where $i, g \in \text{Mor}(\underline{A})$, s is invertible in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (see Proposition 3.1.2). This result enables us to finish the proof of Theorem 0.1. Other significant computations of this section are Propositions 3.1.4 and (especially) 3.1.7. We also compare our results with (some of) the results of the theory of

non-commutative localizations of rings (especially with the ones of [Mal82]). Unfortunately, the formulas of this section are rather unpleasant; yet the advantage of our methods over those of the predecessors is that we explain the origin of these equalities conceptually.

In §4 we recall some basics on weight structures. For a subcategory \underline{D} generated by cones of a set S of \underline{Hw} -morphisms (where w is a weight structure for \underline{C}) we prove the existence of a weight structure on $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ such that the localization functor is weight-exact. The heart of this weight structure is the Karoubi-closure of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. It coincides with the so-called small envelope of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ in the case when w is a bounded weight structure. We also consider compactly generated triangulated categories; in the case when \underline{Hw} is the Karoubization of the category of coproducts of some additive $\underline{A} \subset \underline{C}$ (consisting of compact objects), $S \subset \text{Mor}(\underline{A})$, and a subcategory $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ generated by $\text{Cone}(S)$ as a localizing subcategory we prove: $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ possesses a t -structure adjacent to $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ whose heart is the category of additive functors from $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]^{op}$ to Ab . This is a generalization of (some of) the results of [Dwy06] and [NeR04].

In §5 we introduce certain categories of birational motives (via the method of [KaS02]; we are the first to consider birational motives over general base schemes). It is easily seen that the results of the previous sections can be applied to them. So, we discuss their “weights” and calculate K_0 -groups of these categories.

Now, for the convenience of readers already acquainted with weight structures (in particular with [Bon10a]) we describe the relation of our current results with those of (§8.1 of) *ibid*; we also recall the behaviour of t -structures in localizations.

Remark 0.1. Several properties of weight structures are quite similar to those of t -structures; in particular, it was proved in §8.1 of [Bon10a]: if a weight structure w on \underline{C} restricts to a weight structure on $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$, then it also yields a weight structure on $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ (i.e., the localization functor $l : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}/\underline{D}$ is weight-exact). Note here: the “simplest” way to construct a subcategory $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ such that w restricts to it is to generate it by an additive subcategory of \underline{Hw} (moreover, one obtains all possible \underline{D} this way if w is bounded). Now, for the setting of t -structures we certainly have: if l is t -exact, then $t_{\underline{C}}$ restricts to a t -structure on \underline{D} . Indeed, since t -decompositions are canonical, we obtain: both components of the $t_{\underline{C}}$ -decomposition of an object killed by l also belong to the categorical kernel of l . Now, a crucial distinction of weight decompositions (see Definition 4.1.1 below) from t -ones is that they are not canonical; so, this argument cannot be carried over to weight structures. Moreover, if \underline{D} is generated by cones of any (!) set of \underline{Hw} -morphisms then

w yields a weight structure on $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$, though w usually does not restrict to a weight structure on \underline{D} (since there are “not enough” objects in $\underline{C}_{w=0} \cap \underline{D}$, we only have “weak weight decompositions” inside \underline{D} ; cf. Remark 2.1.4(1) below)! A certain “explanation” of this distinction between weight and t -structures is given by the notion of adjacent structures; see §4.3 for more detail.

The first author is deeply grateful to prof. L. Barbieri-Viale, the Landau Network-Centro Volta, and the Cariplo Foundation for the wonderful working conditions during his staying in the Milano University, where he started writing this paper. Both authors are very grateful to prof. D.-C. Cisinski, prof. A.I. Generalov, prof. B. Kahn, prof. A. Neeman, prof. L.E. Positselski, and the referee for their interesting comments.

1 Some notation and conventions

Given a category C and objects $X, Y \in \text{Obj } C$, we denote by $C(X, Y)$ the set of morphisms from X to Y in C . We denote by $\text{Mor}(C)$ the class of all morphisms of C ; $\text{Isom}(C) \subset \text{Mor}(C)$ is the subclass of all isomorphisms; $\text{id}(\text{Obj } C) \subset \text{Isom}(C)$ is the subclass of identity morphisms (of all objects of C).

For categories C', C we write $C' \subset C$ if C' is a full subcategory of C .

Given a category C and objects $X, Y \in \text{Obj } C$, we say that X is a *retract* of Y if id_X can be factored as $X \xrightarrow{i} Y \xrightarrow{p} X$ (if C is triangulated or abelian, then X is a retract of Y if and only if X is its direct summand). We will call p a *retraction*; i will be called a *coretraction*.

An additive subcategory \underline{H} of additive category C is called *Karoubi-closed* in C if it contains all retracts of its objects in C .

The full subcategory $\text{Kar}_C(\underline{H})$ of additive category C whose objects are all retracts of objects of a subcategory \underline{H} (in C) will be called the *Karoubi-closure* of \underline{H} in C .

The *Karoubization* $\text{Kar}(\underline{A})$ (no lower index) of an additive category \underline{A} is the category of “formal images” of idempotents in \underline{A} . So, its objects are pairs (A, p) for $A \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$, $p \in \underline{A}(A, A)$, $p^2 = p$, and the morphisms are given by the formula

$$\text{Kar}(\underline{A})((X, p), (X', p')) = \{f \in \underline{A}(X, X') : p' \circ f = f \circ p = f\}. \quad (1)$$

The correspondence $A \mapsto (A, \text{id}_A)$ (for $A \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$) fully embeds \underline{A} into $\text{Kar}(\underline{A})$. Besides, $\text{Kar}(\underline{A})$ is *Karoubian*, i.e., any idempotent morphism yields a direct sum decomposition in \underline{A} . Equivalently, \underline{A} is Karoubian if (and only

if) the canonical embedding $\underline{A} \rightarrow \text{Kar}(\underline{A})$ is an equivalence of categories. Recall also that $\text{Kar}(\underline{A})$ is triangulated if \underline{A} is (see [BaS01]).

\underline{C} below will always denote some triangulated category; usually it will be endowed with a weight structure w .

A class $D \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ will be called *extension-closed* if it contains 0 and for any distinguished triangle $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$ in \underline{C} we have: $X, Z \in D \implies Y \in D$. We will call the smallest extension-closed subclass of objects of \underline{C} that contains a given class $B \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ the *extension-closure* of B .

For a $D \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ we will denote by $\langle D \rangle$ the smallest full Karoubi-closed triangulated subcategory of \underline{C} containing D , whereas the smallest full strict triangulated subcategory \underline{D} of \underline{C} containing D will be called *the triangulated subcategory generated by D* (i.e., $\langle D \rangle$ is the Karoubi-closure of \underline{D} in \underline{C}).

For $X, Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ we will write $X \perp Y$ if $\underline{C}(X, Y) = \{0\}$. For $D, E \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ we will write $D \perp E$ if $X \perp Y$ for all $X \in D, Y \in E$. For $D \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ we will denote by D^\perp the class

$$\{Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{C} : X \perp Y \forall X \in D\}.$$

Dually, ${}^\perp D$ is the class $\{Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{C} : Y \perp X \forall X \in D\}$.

For an additive category \underline{A} we will denote by $K(\underline{A})$ the homotopy category of (cohomological) complexes over \underline{A} . Its full subcategory of bounded complexes will be denoted by $K^b(\underline{A})$.

For $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $i \leq j$ we will denote by $K^b(\underline{A})^{\geq i}$ (resp. $K^b(\underline{A})^{\leq i}$) the class of those (bounded) complexes that are isomorphic (i.e., homotopy equivalent) to complexes that have non-zero terms only in degrees $\geq i$ (resp. $\leq i$); $K^b(\underline{A})^{[i, j]}$ is the class of complexes isomorphic to those that have non-zero terms only in degrees from i to j . We will also use similar notation for the whole $K(\underline{A})$. In our arguments below we usually can (and will) assume that the corresponding complexes are concentrated in degrees $\geq i$ (resp. $\leq i$, resp. in degrees between i and j) themselves.

If g is a morphism in $K(\underline{A})$ then for any i we will use the notation g^i for the corresponding morphism (in \underline{A}) between degree i components of complexes and call it the degree i component of g . If we will say that an arrow (or a sequence of arrows) in \underline{A} yields an object of $K^b(\underline{A})$ we will mean by default that the last object of this sequence is in degree 0; yet note that we will ignore this convention when the terms of a complex are indexed by numbers (in $T^0 \rightarrow T^1$ the term T^1 is in degree 1). We will always extend a “finite” \underline{A} -complex by 0’s to $\pm\infty$ (in order to obtain an object of $K^b(\underline{A})$).

For a single morphism $f \in \underline{A}(C^{-1}, C^0)$ we will also call the complex $C^{-1} \xrightarrow{f} C^0$ the cone of f . We will use a similar convention for triangulated

categories (i.e., for any $f \in \underline{C}(X, Y)$ we have a distinguished triangle $X \xrightarrow{f} Y \rightarrow \text{Cone}(f) \rightarrow X[1]$).

Given an object $X \oplus Y$ of \underline{A} we will use the notation in_X for the morphism $\begin{pmatrix} id_X \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : X \rightarrow X \oplus Y$ and pr_X for the morphism $(id_X \ 0) : X \oplus Y \rightarrow X$ if there is no ambiguity.

2 Weakly negative classes in triangulated categories, and localizations

First, we recall certain basic facts on localizations of categories. Everywhere in the paper except §4.3 we will only consider essentially small categories (in order to avoid set-theoretic difficulties).

By Lemma I.1.2 of [GaZ67], for any category C and any set $S \subset \text{Mor } C$ there exists an initial object in the category of those functors from C that converts all elements of S into invertible morphisms. We will denote the target of this functor by $C[S^{-1}]$ and call it the “abstract” or the “Gabriel-Zisman” localization of C by S . We have $\text{Obj } C[S^{-1}] = \text{Obj } C$; any morphism in $C[S^{-1}]$ can be factorized into the composition of a chain of morphisms each of which either comes from C or is inverse to some element of S (in $C[S^{-1}]$). It follows: any morphism in $C[S^{-1}]$ can be presented as the composition $f_1 s_1^{-1} f_2 s_2^{-1} \dots f_n s_n^{-1}$ (a *zig-zag*) for some $n \geq 0$, $f_i \in \text{Mor } C$, $s_i \in S$. We will call a single composition $f_i s_i^{-1}$ of this sort a *roof*.

A caution: in Theorem 0.1 (see also Remark 2.2.1 below) we have already introduced a certain “additive version” of this definition for an additive category \underline{A} ; a priori we only have a comparison functor $Q : \underline{A}[S^{-1}] \rightarrow \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ that does not have to be an isomorphism (though it “usually” is; see Corollary 2.2.3). Note that we still have $\text{Obj } \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add} = \text{Obj } \underline{A}[S^{-1}] = \text{Obj } \underline{A}$.

By the localization of a triangulated category \underline{C} by a triangulated subcategory \underline{D} we will mean the Verdier quotient $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ (see Remark 2.1.9 of [Nee01]). Recall that it is naturally equivalent to $\underline{C}/\underline{D}'$ for \underline{D}' being the Karoubi-closure of \underline{D} in \underline{C} (see Remark 2.1.39 of *ibid.*). Note that $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ is a triangulated category (see Theorem 2.1.8 of *ibid.*); any morphism in it can be presented as a single “roof” $f s^{-1}$, for some $f, s \in \text{Mor}(\underline{C})$, $\text{Cone}(s) \in \text{Obj } \underline{D}$ (see Remark 2.1.13 of *ibid.*).

2.1 Weakly negative classes of objects and Verdier localizations

Definition 2.1.1. 1. We will say that a set D of objects of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ is *weakly negative* if $\{0\} \in D$ and $D \perp (\cup_{i \geq 2} D[i])$.

2. For any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a weakly negative D we will denote by $D_{[i,j]}$ the extension-closure of $\cup_{i \leq l \leq j} D[l]$ if $j \geq i$, and set $D_{[i,j]} = \{0\}$ if $j < i$. We denote $\cup_{k \leq j} D_{[k,j]}$ by $D_{\leq j}$; $D_{\geq i} = \cup_{k \geq i} D_{[i,k]}$.

Remark 2.1.2. 1. The weak negativity condition is a weakening of the negativity one that is fulfilled for the hearts of weight structures; see Remark 4.1.2 below. So, in the case $D = \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w=0}$ for $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ endowed with a weight structure w (see Definition 4.1.1(IV)) $D_{[i,j]}$ equals $\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{[i,j]}$.

2. Certainly, the class of objects of the triangulated subcategory of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ generated by D (in the sense of §1) equals the union of $D_{[-N,N]}$ for all $N > 0$.

3. Our basic example of a weakly negative class is $D \subset K^b(\underline{\mathcal{A}})^{[-1,0]}$; its generalization is $D \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{[0,1]}$ for $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ endowed with a weight structure w . For both of these examples our Proposition 2.1.3(2–4) has consequences that are (more or less) easy to formulate.

Now we prove a technical statement that is crucial for this paper.

Proposition 2.1.3. *Let $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ be a triangulated category and $B \subset \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ a weakly negative set. Denote by $\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ the triangulated subcategory of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ generated by B (see §1; so, $\underline{\mathcal{D}} \subset \langle B \rangle \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}$). Then the following statements are valid.*

1. *For any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$, $M \in B_{[m,n]}$, there exists a distinguished triangle*

$$X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{f} X[1] \quad (2)$$

for some $X \in B_{[m,0]}$, $Y \in B_{[1,n]}$ (it may be called a weak weight decomposition of M ; cf. the formula (11) below).

2. *For an $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $X \in {}^\perp(B_{\geq 1})$, $Y \in (B_{\leq n-2})^\perp$. Then any $e \in (\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}})(X, Y)$ can be presented as $h \circ q^{-1}$ for some $Z \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$, $h \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(Z, Y)$, $q \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(Z, X)$ with $\text{Cone}(q) \in B_{[n,0]}$.*

3. *For n, X, Y, Z, e, h, q as above we have: $e = 0$ if and only if h can be factored in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ through an element of $B_{[n-1,0]}$.*

4. *Assume that $X \in {}^\perp(B_{\geq 1})$, $Y \in (B_{\leq -1})^\perp$. Then $\underline{\mathcal{C}}(X, Y)$ surjects onto $(\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}})(X, Y)$.*

Proof. 1. We apply an argument used in the proof of Proposition 3.5.3(8) of [Bon13a] and of Theorem 4.3.2(II.1) of [Bon10a]; a similar reasoning can also be found in Appendix B of [Pos11].

Obviously, we can assume below that $m \leq 0, n > 0$, since in all the remaining cases the statement is obvious.

We define a certain notion of complexity for elements of $B_{[m,n]}$. For an $M \in B[i]$ (for some i between m and n) we will say that M has complexity ≤ 0 . If there exists a distinguished triangle $E \rightarrow F \rightarrow G$, and $E, G \in B_{[m,n]}$ are of complexity $\leq j$ for some $j \geq 0$ (they also could have smaller complexity) we will say that the complexity of F is $\leq j + 1$. By definition, any element of $B_{[m,n]}$ has finite complexity; hence it suffices to verify: for a distinguished triangle $O[-1] \rightarrow N \rightarrow M \rightarrow O$ if $N, O \in B_{[m,n]}$ and possess weak weight decompositions (i.e., there exist distinguished triangles $X_N \rightarrow N \rightarrow Y_N$ and $X_O \rightarrow O \rightarrow Y_O$ with $X_N, X_O \in B_{[m,0]}$, $Y_N, Y_O \in B_{[1,n]}$), then M possesses a weak weight decomposition also.

Next, we note that the weak negativity of B implies that $B_{[m,0]}\{-1\} \perp B_{[1,n]}$; in particular, $X_O[-1] \perp Y_N$. Hence the morphism $O[-1] \rightarrow N$ can be completed to a commutative square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X_O[-1] & \longrightarrow & O[-1] \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X_N & \longrightarrow & N \end{array}$$

(see the easy Lemma 1.4.1(1) of [Bon10a]). Therefore by Proposition 1.1.11 of [BBD82] we can complete the distinguished triangle $N \rightarrow M \rightarrow O$ to a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X_N & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & Y_N \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & Y \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ X_O & \longrightarrow & O & \longrightarrow & Y_O \end{array} \tag{3}$$

whose rows and columns are distinguished triangles (for some $X, Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$). The light and left columns of this diagram yield that $X \in B_{[m,0]}$, $Y \in B_{[1,n]}$. Hence the middle row yields a weak weight decomposition of M .

2. By the theory of Verdier localizations (see the beginning of this section) e can be presented as $h_1 \circ q_1^{-1}$ for some $q_1 : Z_1 \rightarrow X$ such that $T_1 = \text{Cone}(q_1[-1]) \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{D}}$.

Applying assertion 1 of our proposition to $T_1[1]$ we obtain: for some large enough N there exists a distinguished triangle $T_2 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow V \rightarrow T_2[1]$ such that $T_2 \in B_{[-N-1,-1]}$, $V \in B_{[0,N-1]}$.

Since $X \perp V[1]$, we can factorize the morphism c in the distinguished triangle $T_1 \rightarrow Z_1 \xrightarrow{q_1} X \xrightarrow{c} T_1[1]$ through $T_2[1]$. Hence applying the octahedral axiom of triangulated categories we obtain: there exist $Z_2 \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ and a morphism $d : Z_2 \rightarrow Z_1$ such that $\text{Cone}(d) \cong V \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{D}}$ and $\text{Cone}(q_1 \circ d) \cong T_2[1] \in B_{[-N,0]}$. We set $q_2 = q_1 \circ d$, $h_2 = h_1 \circ d$. We have: $h_2 \circ q_2^{-1} = h_1 \circ d \circ d^{-1} \circ q_1^{-1} = h_1 \circ q_1^{-1}$ in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$.

Next, applying assertion 1 of our proposition to $T_2[2-n]$ we obtain: there exists a distinguished triangle $U \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T \rightarrow U[1]$ such that $U \in B_{[-N-1, n-2]}$ and $T \in B_{[n-1, -1]}$. Hence the octahedral axiom yields: there exist a $Z \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{C}}$, an $m \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(Z_2, Z)$ such that $\text{Cone}(m) = U[1] \in \text{Obj } \underline{\mathcal{D}}$, and a morphism $q \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(Z, X)$ with $\text{Cone}(q) \cong T[1]$. Now, since $U \perp Y$, h_2 can be factorized as $h \circ m$ for some $h \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(Z, Y)$. Thus $h_2 \circ q_2^{-1} = h \circ q^{-1}$ in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$, and we obtain the result.

3. Certainly, $e = 0$ if and only if $h = 0$ in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$. Besides, since any $T \in B_{[n-1,0]}$ becomes 0 in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$, any morphism that factors through an object of $B_{[n-1,0]}$ vanishes in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$. It remains to prove the converse implication.

We note: our assumptions on X and $\text{Cone}(q)$ yield that $Z \in {}^\perp(B_{\geq 1})$. Indeed, for any $b \in B$, $i \geq 1$, we have a long exact sequence $\cdots \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{C}}(X, b[i]) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{C}}(Z, b[i]) \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{C}}(\text{Cone}(q[-1]), b[i]) \rightarrow \cdots$; so, it remains to apply the weak negativity of B .

Next, a well-known (and easily proven) property of Verdier localizations yields: h vanishes in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}}$ if and only if it factors through an object of $\langle B \rangle$. Then it certainly also factors through some $T_1 \in B_{[-N, N]}$ for some large enough N .

Next, we use certain arguments that are quite similar to the proof of the previous assertion.

Applying assertion 1 of our proposition to T_1 we obtain: there exists a distinguished triangle $T_2 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow U \rightarrow T_2[1]$ such that $T_2 \in B_{[-N,0]}$, $U \in B_{[1, N]}$. Since $Z \perp U$, we can factorize h into the composition $Z \rightarrow T_2 \xrightarrow{h'} Y$.

Now we apply assertion 1 to $T_2[2-n]$. We obtain a distinguished triangle $V \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow T \rightarrow V[1]$ for some $T \in B_{[n-1,0]}$, $V \in B_{\leq n-2}$. Since $V \perp Y$, we can factor h' through T ; hence the same is true for h .

4. It suffices to note: by assertion 2 (applied in the case $n = 1$) any $e \in (\underline{\mathcal{C}}/\underline{\mathcal{D}})(X, Y)$ can be presented as $h \circ q^{-1}$, where the cone of q is zero, i.e., q is an isomorphism in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$. □

We will use this proposition several times below. Yet before that we would like to make some extra “computational” remarks.

Remark 2.1.4. 1. Suppose w is a weight structure on a triangulated category \underline{C} (see Definition 4.1.1 below). Then any set $B \subset \underline{C}_{[0,1]}$ is easily seen to be weakly negative; the conditions of Proposition 2.1.3(2,3) are fulfilled for any $X \in \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$, $Y \in \underline{C}_{w \geq n}$ (this is immediate from the orthogonality axiom of weight structures, i.e., from Definition 4.1.1(I.iii)). Besides, in this case we have $B_{[m,n]} \subset \underline{C}_{[m,n+1]}$ for any $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. In particular, for the weak weight decomposition (2) we have $X \in \underline{C}_{[m,1]}$, $Y \in \underline{C}_{[0,n]}$ (see Definition 4.1.1(IV) for the definition of the latter classes), whereas for the “usual” weight decomposition (see (11)) we would certainly have $X \in \underline{C}_{[m,0]}$.

2. It is easily seen that Proposition 2.1.3(4) cannot be applied (or adjusted) to the situation when B is an arbitrary subset of $\underline{C}_{[0,2]}$ (or to $B \subset K^b(\underline{A})^{[-2,0]}$; cf. Remark 2.2.1 below). Indeed, for an abelian \underline{A} , $\underline{C} = K^b(\underline{A})$, B being the class of complexes coming from all short exact sequences in \underline{A} , we have $\underline{C}/\underline{D} = D^b(\underline{A})$, whereas $D^b(\underline{A})(M, N[r]) = \text{Ext}_{\underline{A}}^r(M, N)$ for any $M, N \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}$; hence this group can be non-zero for arbitrarily large $r > 0$ (for general \underline{A}, M, N).

One can also obtain an example of this sort using (effective) Voevodsky’s motives (the corresponding calculations are easy in the well understood case of motives over a perfect field); cf. §5.1 below.

2.2 On the universal additive functor inverting a set of morphisms

Remark 2.2.1. 1. Till the end of §3.1 we will use the following notation: \underline{A} is an additive category, $\underline{C} = K^b(\underline{A})$, S is some set of \underline{A} -morphisms, $B \subset K^b(\underline{A})^{[-1,0]}$ is the set of cones of elements of S , $D = B_{[0,0]}$ (in the notation of Definition 2.1.1) is the extension-closure of B , $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ is the triangulated category generated by B .

2. We will use the following notation from Theorem 0.1 throughout this paper: we denote the full subcategory of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ whose objects are those of \underline{A} by $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$ (note that the theorem justifies this notation). We denote by $u : \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$ the restriction of the localization functor $l : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}/\underline{D}$ to \underline{A} .

Now we apply Proposition 2.1.3 to \underline{C} . A more general setting will be considered in §4 below.

Proposition 2.2.2. 1. For $X, Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{A} \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$, any morphism $e \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(X, Y)$ can be presented as $h \circ q^{-1}$ for some $Z \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$, $h \in \underline{C}(Z, Y)$, and $q \in \underline{C}(Z, X)$ such that $\text{Cone}(q) \in D$.

The morphism e is zero if and only if h can be factored through some T such that there exists a distinguished triangle $C_{-1} \rightarrow T \rightarrow C_0$ with $C_i \in D[i]$ (for $i = -1, 0$).

2. More generally, for $X \in K^b(\underline{A})^{\geq 0}$, $Y \in K^b(\underline{A})^{\leq -n}$ we have: any $e \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(X, Y)$ can be presented as $h \circ q^{-1}$ for some $Z \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$, $h \in \underline{C}(Z, Y)$ such that $q \in \underline{C}(Z, X)$, $\text{Cone}(q) \in B_{[n, 0]}$ (in the notation of Proposition 2.1.3).

3. An additive functor $F : \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}'$ factors through u (see the Remark above) if and only if F converts all elements of S into isomorphisms.

Proof. 1-2. It suffices to note that we can apply Proposition 2.1.3 to this setting; note that B is obviously weakly negative.

3. Certainly, u makes all elements of S invertible (since they become isomorphisms in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$). Conversely, assume that an additive functor F maps all elements of S into isomorphisms. We consider the exact functor $K^b(F) : \underline{C} \rightarrow K^b(\underline{A}')$. In order to verify that F factors through u , it suffices to check that $K^b(F)$ factors through l . The universal property of Verdier localizations yields: in order to achieve this, for any distinguished triangle $X \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{f} Z \rightarrow X[1]$, $X \in \text{Obj}(B)$, we should prove that $K^b(F)(f)$ is an isomorphism. Since $K^b(F)$ is exact, it suffices to verify that $K^b(F)(X) = 0$ for such an X . Since $K^b(F)$ is additive, we only have to check that it kills all objects of \underline{D} . Applying the exactness of $K^b(F)$ again, we reduce this to the fact that $K^b(F)$ kills B .

Denote by G the restriction of the corresponding functor from $\underline{C}/\underline{D} \rightarrow K^b(\underline{A}')$ on the full subcategory $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$ of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. Since the image of G is contained in \underline{A}' we can replace the target of G by \underline{A}' . So we obtain a lift of F onto the category $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$. \square

We will finish the proof of Theorem 0.1 (i.e., we will prove that for any F that converts elements of S into invertible morphism its factorization through u is necessarily unique) in the next section. Yet now we recall that $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ is “usually” additive; hence the theorem mentioned implies that it is isomorphic to $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$.

Corollary 2.2.3. *Assume that S contains $\text{id}(\text{Obj } \underline{A})$ and is closed with respect to the direct sum operation. Then the natural functor $Q : \underline{A}[S^{-1}] \rightarrow \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$ is an isomorphism of categories.*

Proof. Theorem 0.1 yields: it suffices to verify whether $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ has a natural structure of an additive category that is compatible with the one of \underline{A} . Though this was done in §A3 of [KaS09] (see also [Cis10]), for the convenience of readers we included this statement into the current text as Proposition 2.2.4. \square

Proposition 2.2.4. *Suppose \underline{A} is an additive category, S is a class of morphisms in \underline{A} containing identities and closed under direct sums. Then the localized category $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ is additive, as well as the localization functor $\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}[S^{-1}]$.*

Proof. To check that the category is additive it suffices to verify that (binary) coproducts and products exist in it, $A \times B \cong A \coprod B$ for any pair of objects, and every object is a group object.

Firstly, note that every adjoint pair of functors $L : \underline{A} \rightleftarrows \underline{H} : R$ induces an adjoint pair $\hat{L} : \underline{A}[S^{-1}] \rightleftarrows \underline{H}[T^{-1}] : \hat{R}$ if $L(S) \subset T$ and $R(T) \subset S$. Indeed, the latter assumptions imply that the functors $Loc_T \circ L$ and $Loc_S \circ R$ send S and T into $\text{Isom } \underline{H}[T^{-1}]$ and $\text{Isom } \underline{A}[S^{-1}]$, respectively; hence they induce some functors \hat{L} and \hat{R} on the localized categories. Now, the unit and the counit for the pair (L, R) yield the unit and the counit of the pair (\hat{L}, \hat{R}) .

Applying the above observation to the diagonal functor $\underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A} \times \underline{A}$ and its right and left adjoints (i.e., the binary product and coproduct functor, respectively) we obtain: in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ all binary coproducts and products exist, and $A \times B \cong A \coprod B$ for any objects A and B .

It remains to verify that every object of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ is a group object. The localization functor Loc_S preserves (binary) products; thus the image of a group object has the structure of a group object. Since Loc_S is surjective on objects, we obtain the result. \square

Remark 2.2.5. 1. For an arbitrary $S \subset \text{Mor } \underline{A}$ denote by \mathcal{S} the closure of $S \cup \text{id}(\text{Obj } \underline{A})$ in $\text{Mor}(\underline{A})$ with respect to the direct sum operation. Certainly, in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ all the elements of \mathcal{S} become invertible. Hence we obtain: $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add} \cong \underline{A}[\mathcal{S}^{-1}]_{add} \cong \underline{A}[\mathcal{S}^{-1}]$.

2. It seems that the additivity of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ (for S as in Corollary 2.2.3) is well-known to experts in the field; yet “classical” literature does not treat the additive structure of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ unless S satisfies (either right or left) Ore condition.

3. Corollary 2.2.3 can also be deduced from Theorem 0.1 via a “very explicit” method. For this purpose one should verify that any morphism in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ can be presented as in Proposition 3.1.2 below; then one should check that two morphisms presented in this form are equal in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$ if they become equal in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (cf. Proposition 3.1.7(III.2b)).

3 On additive localizations: our computations and their comparison with the arguments of the other authors

In this section we “calculate” the category $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ “explicitly”. This allows us to finish the proof of Theorem 0.1. We also describe the relation of our results with the theory of non-commutative localizations of rings.

Some of the formulas of this section are rather unpleasant; most probably this cannot be avoided. Yet we note: in contrast to the preceding papers on the subject, we give a conceptual explanation for the relations established.

3.1 Computations for additive localizations

Let A, A' be some objects of $\text{Obj } \underline{A} = \text{Obj } \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add} \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}/\underline{D}$. Recall from the last section that any morphism between A and A' can be presented as a certain “roof”, i.e., as a composition of the form $h \circ q^{-1}$ for $h, q \in \text{Mor}(\underline{C})$ and $\text{Cone}(q) \in \underline{D}^{[-1,0]}$ (see Proposition 2.2.2(2)). We would like to describe morphisms $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ in terms of the category \underline{A} . We start with describing compositions and sums of morphisms in terms of such roofs; next, we reformulate these results in terms of \underline{A} .

Lemma 3.1.1. *Let $\phi = f \circ s^{-1} \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(A, B)$, $\psi = g \circ t^{-1} \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(B, C)$ be morphisms in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$, where the domains of s and t are $L, T \in \underline{C}^{[0,1]}$, respectively.*

Denote the following complex by LT :

$$L^0 \oplus T^0 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d_L^0 & 0 \\ 0 & d_T^0 \\ f^0 & -t^0 \end{pmatrix}} L^1 \oplus T^1 \oplus B \quad (4)$$

Then for $q \in \underline{C}(LT, A)$, $r \in \underline{C}(LT, C)$ such that $q^0 = \begin{pmatrix} s^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $r^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g^0 \end{pmatrix}$, the composition $\psi \circ \phi$ equals $r \circ q^{-1}$ (in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$).

Proof. Denote by q' an element of $\underline{C}(LT, L)$ such that $q'^0 = \begin{pmatrix} id_{L^0} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $q'^1 = \begin{pmatrix} id_{L^1} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Note that LT (together with q') is a cone of the composition $L \xrightarrow{f} B \rightarrow \text{Cone}(t)$ shifted by $[-1]$. Hence $\text{Cone}(q') = \text{Cone}(t)$ and q' is invertible in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. The composition $s \circ q'$ equals q since it is determined by its degree zero component and $(f \circ q')^0 = \begin{pmatrix} s^0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Denote by r' an element of $\underline{C}(LT, T)$ such that $r'^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & id_{T^0} \end{pmatrix}$, $r'^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & id_{T^1} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. The composition $g \circ r'$ equals r since it is determined by its

degree zero component and $(r \circ q')^0 = (0 \ g^0)$. The composition $t \circ r'$ is determined by its degree zero component and $(t \circ r')^0 = (0 \ t^0)$. Moreover, the morphism $h = (0 \ 0 \ id_B) \in \underline{A}(L^1 \oplus T^1 \oplus B, B)$ defines a homotopy between $t \circ r'$ and $f \circ q'$. So, $t \circ r' = f \circ q'$ in \underline{C} . Hence we have

$$r \circ q^{-1} = g \circ r' \circ q'^{-1} \circ s^{-1} = g \circ t^{-1} \circ f \circ s^{-1} = \psi \circ \phi$$

in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. □

Now we are able to describe morphisms in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ as certain “short zig-zags”.

Proposition 3.1.2. *Let A, A' be objects of \underline{A} . Then any $f \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(A, A')$ can be presented as the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where $A'', T \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$, $g \in \underline{A}(A'', A')$, $s \in \underline{A}(A'', A \oplus T)$, $i \in \underline{A}(A, A \oplus T)$ is the canonical coretraction, whereas $\text{Cone}(s) \in \underline{D}$.*

Proof. Note first: by Proposition 2.2.2(2), f can be presented as the composition $x \circ y^{-1}$, where $x \in \underline{A}(C, A')$, $y \in \underline{A}(C, A)$, $\text{Cone}(y) \in \underline{D}$, for some $C = C^0 \xrightarrow{d} C^1 \in K^b(\underline{A})^{[0,1]}$.

Now, consider the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where $i \in \underline{A}(A, C^1 \oplus A)$ is the canonical coretraction, $s : C^0 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d \\ y^0 \end{pmatrix}} C^1 \oplus A$, $g = x^0 \in \underline{A}(C^0, A')$. We note that s is invertible in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ since its cone is isomorphic to the cone of y .

Denote by p the morphism $C \rightarrow C^0$ coming from the distinguished triangle $C^0[-1] \rightarrow C^1[-1] \rightarrow C \rightarrow C^0$. Note that $x = g \circ p$ and $i \circ y = s \circ p$.

Hence we obtain the result: $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i = g \circ p \circ y^{-1} = x \circ y^{-1} = f$. □

Remark 3.1.3. 1. One can also generalize the proposition above to the setting of an arbitrary triangulated category \underline{C} and its subcategory \underline{D} generated by a weakly negative class of objects (cf. Proposition 4.2.1).

2. In order to finish the proof of Theorem 0.1, we should verify: for any F as in Proposition 2.2.2 its factorization through u is necessarily unique. Consider the smallest (in the sense of inclusions of morphisms sets) additive subcategory \underline{A}_0 of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ such that $\text{Mor}(A_0)$ contains $u(\text{Mor}(\underline{A}))$ and also the inverses to all elements of S (note that $\text{Obj } \underline{A} = \text{Obj } \underline{A}_0 = \text{Obj } \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$). It certainly suffices to prove that $\underline{A}_0 = \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$.

Hence it suffices to prove: if $s \in \underline{A}(A'', A \oplus T)$ and $\text{Cone}(s) \in D$ then s becomes invertible in \underline{A}_0 . Since this is equivalent to $\text{Cone}(s)$ being zero in $K^b(\underline{A}_0)$, it suffices to verify: any $L \in D$ is isomorphic to the cone of some \underline{A} -morphism that becomes invertible in \underline{A}_0 . Since \underline{A}_0 will not change if we

replace S by the closure of $S \cup \text{id}(\text{Obj } \underline{A})$ in $\text{Mor}(\underline{A})$ with respect to the direct sum operation, for this purpose it suffices to apply Proposition 3.1.5 below.

3. All of the results of this paper are self-dual. In particular, Proposition 3.1.2 also yields that every $f \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(A, A')$ can be presented as the composition $p \circ s^{-1} \circ h$, where p is a retraction, $\text{Cone}(s) \in D$.

Now we calculate D .

Proposition 3.1.4. *The elements of D are exactly those complexes that are isomorphic to cones of morphisms which are given by lower triangular matrices with elements of S on the diagonal, i.e., to complexes of the form*

$$\bigoplus_{j=1}^n S_j^{-1} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ f_{12} & s_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ f_{1n} & f_{2n} & \dots & s_n \end{pmatrix}} \bigoplus_{j=1}^n S_j^0 \quad (5)$$

for $n \geq 0$, $s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n \in S$, $f_{kl} \in \underline{A}(S_k^{-1}, S_l^0)$ for all $1 \leq k < l \leq n$.

Proof. Obviously, it suffices to prove: if t_1, t_2 are morphisms of the form (5), $\text{Cone}(t_1) \rightarrow T \rightarrow \text{Cone}(t_2) \rightarrow \text{Cone}(t_1)[1]$ is a distinguished triangle, then T is isomorphic to the cone of another morphism of the form (5). The latter is obvious from the definition of cones (and distinguished triangles) in $K^b(A)$. \square

So, the following statement finishes the proof of Theorem 0.1.

Proposition 3.1.5. *Assume that S contains $\text{id}(\text{Obj } \underline{A})$ and is closed under the direct sum operation. Then any morphism of the form described in (5) becomes invertible in the category $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]$.*

Proof. It suffices to verify that f can be presented as the composition of morphisms each of those is either invertible in $\text{Mor}(\underline{A})$ or belongs to S . We prove the latter statement by induction on n (i.e., on the size of the matrix). For $n = 1$ there is nothing to prove. Suppose that the assertion is valid for $n = k \geq 1$.

Now we make the inductive step. We present an f of the form (5) for

$n = k + 1$ as a matrix $s = \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ g & s_n \end{pmatrix}$, where

$$t = \bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^{-1} \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ f_{12} & s_2 & \dots & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ f_{1k} & f_{2k} & \dots & s_k \end{pmatrix}} \bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^0,$$

$g = (f_{1n}, f_{2n}, \dots, f_{kn})$.

Then $f = \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{\bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^{-1}} & 0 \\ f & \text{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{\bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^{-1}} & 0 \\ 0 & s_n \end{pmatrix}$. Applying the inductive assumption to t we decompose it as $e_1 \circ e_2 \circ \dots \circ e_m$ for some $m \geq 0$, $e_i \in S \cup \text{Isom}(\underline{A})$. Then $\begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & \text{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix} = (e_1 \oplus \text{id}_{S_n^0}) \circ (e_2 \oplus \text{id}_{S_n^0}) \circ \dots \circ (e_m \oplus \text{id}_{S_n^0})$ is a composition of the type desired (note that $S \cup \text{Isom}(\underline{A})$ is closed under the operation $- \oplus \text{id}_{S_n^0}$). Now, the second morphism matrix is invertible in \underline{A} since $\begin{pmatrix} \text{id}_{\bigoplus_{j=1}^k S_j^{-1}} & 0 \\ -g & \text{id}_{S_n^0} \end{pmatrix}$ is its inverse; the third morphism belongs to S itself. □

Remark 3.1.6. This result yields a way to relate the morphism s mentioned in Proposition 3.1.2 with S very explicitly. Indeed, we can assume that the complex C mentioned in the proof of loc. cit. is an extension in $C^b(\underline{A})$ (i.e., we do not identify homotopy equivalent morphisms of complexes!) of $\text{Cone}(y)[-1]$ by A , whereas $\text{Cone}(y)$ is a morphism as in (5). This gives us an explicit description of invertible morphisms that are needed for the decompositions in Proposition 3.1.2.

Hence Proposition 3.1.7 can be translated into certain explicit (though quite clumsy) matrix formulas that only mention \underline{A} and S .

Now we describe the composition of morphisms in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$, their addition, and their equality in terms of \underline{A} and D . Recall here that all morphisms whose cones belong to D become invertible in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (see Remark 3.1.3(2)); one can also describe all s_i in the formulas below using Remark 3.1.6.

By Proposition 3.1.2, any $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ -morphism can be presented as the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$. Now we compute all the basic categorical operations for morphisms presented in this form (so, one may say that we describe $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ “in terms of generators and relations”).

Proposition 3.1.7. *Let $A_1, A'_1, A_2, A'_2 \in \text{Obj } \underline{A} = \text{Obj } \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$. Present the morphisms $f_j \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(A_j, A'_j)$ as $f_j = g_j \circ s_j^{-1} \circ i_j$ (for $j = 1, 2$). Here $C_j, C'_j \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$, $g_j \in \underline{A}(C'_j, A'_j)$, $s_j \in \underline{A}(C'_j, C_j)$, $\text{Cone}(s_j) \in D$, $i_j \in \underline{A}(A_j, C_j)$ (we do not require i_j to be coretractions). Then the following statements are valid.*

1. $f_1 \oplus f_2 = (g_1 \oplus g_2) \circ (s_1 \oplus s_2)^{-1} \circ (i_1 \oplus i_2)$.

2. Assume that $A_1 = A'_2$. Then $f_1 \circ f_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_1 \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} s_2 & 0 \\ -i_1 \circ g_2 & s_1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

3. Let $A_1 = A_2 = A$, $A'_1 = A'_2 = A'$. Then the following statements are valid.

- a. $f_1 + f_2 = \begin{pmatrix} g_1 & g_2 \end{pmatrix} \circ (s_1 \oplus s_2)^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \\ i_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

- b. Denote the morphism $\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix} \in \underline{C}(A \oplus C'_1 \oplus C'_2, C_1 \oplus C_2)$ by r .

Then the following assertions are equivalent:

- $f_1 = f_2$
- For

$$T = A \oplus C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}} C_1 \oplus C_2.$$

there exists a factorization of the morphism $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_1 & -g_2 \end{pmatrix} : T \rightarrow A'$ through an object of $\text{Obj } \underline{D}$ in $C^b(\underline{A})$.

- There exist objects $Z, Z', T_1, T_2 \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$ and morphisms $k_1 \in \underline{A}(Z, T_1)$, $k_2 \in \underline{A}(T_2, Z')$, $p \in \underline{A}(Z, T_2)$, $g \in \underline{A}(T_1, Z')$, $\alpha_1^1 \in \underline{A}(C_1 \oplus C_2, Z')$, $\alpha_1^0 \in \underline{A}(A \oplus C'_1 \oplus C'_2, T_1 \oplus T_2)$, and $\alpha_2 \in \underline{A}(T_1 \oplus T_2, A')$ such that: $\text{Cone}(k_i) \in D$ and the following equality is fulfilled:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2 \\ (g \quad k_2) \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1^0 & \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_1 & -g_2 \\ \alpha_1^1 \circ r & 0 \end{pmatrix} & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. 1. Immediate from the functoriality of the direct sum operation (note that the direct sum of invertible morphisms is invertible).

2. By Lemma 3.1.1 $g_1 \circ s_1^{-1} \circ (i_1 \circ g_2) \circ s_2^{-1} = x \circ y^{-1}$ for $x \in \underline{C}(T, A'_1)$, $y \in \underline{C}(T, C_2)$, $y^0 = \begin{pmatrix} s_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $x^0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_1 \end{pmatrix}$, and $T = C'_2 \oplus C'_1 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} i_1 \circ g_2 & s_1 \end{pmatrix}}$

$C_1 \in K^b(\underline{A})^{[0,1]}$. According to Lemma 3.1.2, we can present $x \circ y^{-1}$ as $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where

$$\begin{aligned} i &= \begin{pmatrix} id_{C_2} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} : C_2 \rightarrow C_2 \oplus C_1, \\ s &= \begin{pmatrix} -s_2 & 0 \\ i_1 \circ g_2 & s_1 \end{pmatrix} : C'_2 \oplus C'_1 \rightarrow C_2 \oplus C_1, \\ g &= (0 \quad g_1) : C'_2 \oplus C'_1 \rightarrow A'_1. \end{aligned}$$

So, $f_1 \circ f_2 = g_1 \circ s_1^{-1} \circ (i_1 \circ g_2) \circ s_2^{-1} \circ i_2 = g \circ s^{-1} \circ i \circ i_2$
 $= g \circ (-id_{C'_2} \oplus id_{C'_1}) \circ (-id_{C'_2} \oplus id_{C'_1})^{-1} \circ s^{-1} \circ i \circ i_2$.

Writing the above explicitly we get:

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 \circ f_2 &= g \circ (-id_{C'_2} \oplus id_{C'_1}) \circ (s \circ (-id_{C'_2} \oplus id_{C'_1}))^{-1} \circ i \circ i_2 \\ &= (0 \quad g_1) \circ \begin{pmatrix} s_2 & 0 \\ -i_1 \circ g_2 & s_1 \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

3. a. $f_1 + f_2 = (id_{A'} \quad id_{A'}) \circ f_1 \oplus f_2 \circ \begin{pmatrix} id_A \\ id_A \end{pmatrix}$. Applying assertion 1 we present the expression in the form: $(id_{A'} \quad id_{A'}) \circ g_1 \oplus g_2 \circ (s_1 \oplus s_2)^{-1} \circ i_1 \oplus i_2 \circ \begin{pmatrix} id_A \\ id_A \end{pmatrix} = (g_1 \quad g_2) \circ (s_1 \oplus s_2)^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \\ i_2 \end{pmatrix}$.
- b. By the previous assertion, $f_1 - f_2 = (g_1 \quad -g_2) \circ (s_1 \oplus s_2)^{-1} \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 \\ i_2 \end{pmatrix}$. Hence by Lemma 3.1.1, $f_1 - f_2$ equals $x \circ y^{-1}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$, where $x = (0 \quad g_1 \quad -g_2) \in \underline{C}(T, A')$, $y = (id_A \quad 0 \quad 0) \in \underline{C}(T, A)$. Applying Proposition 2.2.2(1) we obtain: $x \circ y^{-1} = 0$ if and only if x factors through some $T' \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ that can be presented as a cone of some \underline{C} -morphism between two elements of $D[-1]$.

Firstly, note that the existence of a factorization of x through an object of $\underline{D}_{[-1,1]}$ follows from (and hence is equivalent to) the existence of factorization of any representative of x in $C^b(\underline{A})$ through $\underline{D}_{[-1,1]}$. Indeed, the set H of $C^b(\underline{A})$ -morphisms from T to A' that can be factored through $\underline{D}_{[-1,1]}$ is an additive group (because $\underline{D}_{[-1,1]}$ is an additive subcategory in $C^b(\underline{A})$). An element f of $C^b(\underline{A})(T, A')$ which is null-homotopic via a homotopy h can be factored through $\text{Cone}(id_{A'})[-1] \in \underline{D}_{[-1,1]}$ via morphisms that are written down in columns of the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A \oplus C'_1 \oplus C'_2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}} & C_1 \oplus C_2 \\
\downarrow f & & \downarrow h \\
A' & \xrightarrow{id_{A'}} & A' \\
\downarrow id_{A'} & & \\
A' & &
\end{array} \tag{6}$$

So H also contains all null-homotopic morphisms. Thus if some $C^b(\underline{A})$ -representative of x differs from g by a null-homotopic morphism h (where $g \in H$), then it also belongs to H as the sum $h + g$, i.e., it can be factored through $\underline{D}_{[-1,1]}$.

Let $x' = (0 \ g_1 \ -g_2)$ be a lift of x to $C^b(\underline{A})$. In order to prove the equivalence of the last two of our assumptions, it remains to write down explicitly what does it mean for x' to factor through a cone of a \underline{C} -morphism between two elements of $D[-1]$. A cone of a \underline{C} -morphism

between two elements of $D[-1]$ has the form $Z \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ p \end{pmatrix}} T_1 \oplus T_2 \xrightarrow{(g \ k_2)} Z'$ for some $p, g \in \text{Mor}(\underline{A})$, $k_1, k_2 \in S$.

So $f_1 = f_2$ if and only if there exist a factorization of x' through some

complex $T' = Z \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ p \end{pmatrix}} T_1 \oplus T_2 \xrightarrow{(g \ k_2)} Z'$, i.e., morphisms $\alpha_1 \in C^b(\underline{A})(\text{Cone}(r), T')$ and $\alpha_2 \in C^b(\underline{A})(T', A')$ such that $\alpha_2 \circ \alpha_1 = x'$.

We put these morphisms into a diagram whose rows are T, T', A' , respectively:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & A \oplus C'_1 \oplus C'_2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}} & C_1 \oplus C_2 \\
& & \downarrow \alpha_1^0 & & \downarrow \alpha_1^1 \\
Z & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ p \end{pmatrix}} & T_1 \oplus T_2 & \xrightarrow{(g \ k_2)} & Z' \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \alpha_2 & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & A' & &
\end{array} \tag{7}$$

The diagram yields: $(g \ k_2) \circ \alpha_1^0 = \alpha_1^1 \circ \begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}$ and $\alpha_2 \circ \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ p \end{pmatrix} = 0$.

So, we have $(0 \ g_1 \ -g_2) = \alpha_2 \circ \alpha_1^0$.

Summarizing all the assumptions made and writing the equalities in a matrix form we obtain the result. □

3.2 The comparison of our results with the theory of Cohn’s localizations

We recall the setting of the “classical” theory of non-commutative localizations of rings (see [Coh85]). The authors apologize for not being able to mention all significant contributions to this vast subject.

3.2.1 On non-commutative localizations (a la Cohn)

One considers a set S of matrices over an (associative unital) ring R and looks for an initial object in the category of ring homomorphisms $R \rightarrow R'$ such that all elements of S become invertible over R' (usually only square matrices were considered; yet non-square ones could also become invertible as the morphisms between the corresponding free modules). More generally, instead of matrices one can consider morphisms $P_i \rightarrow Q_i$ of finitely generated projective R -modules and tensor them by R' (see [Sch85]). Here we prefer to consider right R -modules (and tensor them by R' from the right).

Denote by \underline{A} the category of finitely generated free (resp. projective) modules over R . It is easily seen that the problem of finding the ring R' is “equivalent” to the calculation of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$. Indeed, denote R considered as a module over itself by \mathcal{R} (so, R acts on it from the left); then any object of \underline{A} is isomorphic to the direct sum of a finite number of copies of \mathcal{R} (resp. to a retract of such a direct sum). It follows that the image of \mathcal{R} in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ also is a “generator”, i.e., the objects of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ are exactly the direct sums of a finite number of copies of \mathcal{R} (resp. are retracts of such direct sums). Hence the localization R' of R by S (as mentioned above) is naturally isomorphic to $\text{End}_{\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}} \mathcal{R}$.

For any additive category \underline{A} consider the rings $R_I = \text{End}_{\underline{A}}(\bigoplus_{A \in I} A)$, where I runs through all finite subsets of $\text{Obj } \underline{A}$. If \underline{A} is Karoubian, this yields its presentation as the projective limit of the categories of finitely generated projective (right) modules over R_I . So, it is no surprise that our “explicit” description of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is closely related to the (equivalent) descriptions of

the localization of R by S given in [Ger82] and [Mal82] (whereas the results of the two papers cited are easily seen to be equivalent).

Moreover, they can probably be deduced from the results of *ibid.* (via passing to the limit and possibly invoking some methods from [Sch85]; the latter includes considering non-square matrices) in the case of a Karoubian \underline{A} . The extension to the case of a non-Karoubian category could be more difficult.

3.2.2 The relation of our results with those of Malcolmson

First, we show that our condition for equality of morphisms in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (i.e., Proposition 3.1.7(III.2b)) can be rewritten in a form similar to the one in [Mal82] (see the top of page 119). This means: $f_1 = g_1 \circ s_1^{-1} \circ i_1$ equals $f_2 = g_2 \circ s_2^{-1} \circ i_2$ (for g_j, s_j, i_j as in *ibid.*) if and only if there exist $E_1, E_2, R_1, R_2, E \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$ and morphisms $L \in \underline{A}(E_1, R_1), M \in \underline{A}(E_2, R_2), Q \in \underline{A}(C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus E_1 \oplus E_2, E), P \in \underline{A}(E, C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus R_1 \oplus R_2) \in S, u \in \underline{A}(E, A'), v \in \underline{A}(A, E), X \in \underline{A}(E_1, A'), Y \in \underline{A}(A, R_2)$ such that the following equality is fulfilled:

$$\begin{pmatrix} s_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & i_1 \\ 0 & s_2 & 0 & 0 & -i_2 \\ 0 & 0 & L & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & M & Y \\ g_1 & g_2 & X & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} P \\ u \end{pmatrix} \circ (Q \ v) \quad (8)$$

One can mimic the long calculations of [Mal82] and [Sch85] (see also [For02]) to show that the condition above defines an equivalence relation on the sets of triples (g, s, i) , for g, s, i as in Proposition 3.1.7. Moreover, we can define the additive category \underline{A}' with $\text{Obj } \underline{A}' = \text{Obj } \underline{A}$ and morphisms defined by the triples mentioned modulo this equivalence relation, their compositions and addition defined via the relations of parts I-III.1 of *ibid.* Hence there is a functor $M : \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}'$ sending $f \in \text{Mor}(\underline{A})$ to $(f, \text{id}, \text{id})$; it sends elements of S into isomorphisms. So, there is a functor $\underline{A}[S^{-1}] \rightarrow \underline{A}'$.

Now we construct the inverse functor $I : \underline{A}' \rightarrow \underline{A}[S^{-1}]$. We define it on objects in the obvious way. To define it on morphisms consider the map from $\text{Mor } \underline{A}'$ to $\text{Mor } \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ sending (g, s, i) to $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$. Note that it is well-defined. Indeed, let if (g_1, s_1, i_1) and (g_2, s_2, i_2) be equivalent with respect to Malcolmson's relation, i.e., suppose we have L, M, Q, P, u, v, x, y as in Malcolmson's formula. In order to prove that $g_1 \circ s_1^{-1} \circ i_1 = g_2 \circ s_2^{-1} \circ i_2$, we apply Proposition 3.1.7(III.2b). Consider the factorization of $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & g_1 & -g_2 \end{pmatrix}$

through the complex T' :

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
A \oplus C'_1 \oplus C'_2 & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} i_1 & s_1 & 0 \\ i_2 & 0 & s_2 \end{pmatrix}} & C_1 \oplus C_2 \\
\downarrow (v \quad Q \circ (in_{C'_1} \quad -in_{C'_2})) & & \downarrow (in_{C_1} \quad -in_{C_2}) \quad (9) \\
E_2 \xrightarrow{Q \circ in_{E_2}} & E & \xrightarrow{pr_{C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus R_1} \circ P} C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus R_1 \\
\downarrow & \downarrow u & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & A'
\end{array}$$

(see the end of §1 for the notation).

Note that T' belongs to $\text{Obj } \underline{D}$, since in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ it is isomorphic to the contractible complex $E_2 \xrightarrow{in_{E_2}} C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus E_1 \oplus E_2 \xrightarrow{pr_{C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus E_1}} C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus E_1$ via the obvious isomorphism

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
E_2 \xrightarrow{in_{E_2}} & C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus E_1 \oplus E_2 & \xrightarrow{pr_{C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus E_1}} C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus E_1 \\
\downarrow id_{E_2} & \downarrow Q & \downarrow s_1 \oplus s_2 \oplus L \quad (10) \\
E_2 \xrightarrow{Q \circ in_{E_2}} & E & \xrightarrow{pr_{C'_1 \oplus C'_2 \oplus R_1} \circ P} C_1 \oplus C_2 \oplus R_1
\end{array}$$

Our map on morphisms preserves composition and addition since our composition and addition are obviously compatible with Malcolmsen's ones. So I is an additive functor such that $I \circ M = Q$, where $Q : \underline{A} \rightarrow \underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is the localization functor. It is unique since it is defined on products of morphisms coming from \underline{A} . So, \underline{A}' coincides with $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$; hence Malcolmsen's formula can be used for comparing morphisms in the localized category indeed.

Remark 3.2.1. 1. We can modify the construction of localization given in Proposition 3.1.7 as follows. We may assume that every triple in loc. cit. has the form (f, s, i) , where $f, i \in \text{Mor } \underline{A}$ and $s \in \hat{S}$ (instead of $\text{Cone}(s) \in D$), where \hat{S} is the class of lower triangular matrices with elements of S and identity morphisms on the diagonal.

Indeed, it suffices to verify that every triple (f, s, i) with $\text{Cone}(s) \in D$ is equivalent to a triple (f', s', i') with $s' \in \hat{S}$.

By Proposition 3.1.4, if $\text{Cone}(s) \in D$ then there exists a homotopy equivalence from $\text{Cone}(s')$ to $\text{Cone}(s)$, where $s' \in \hat{S}$. Now, in the proof of Proposition 3.1.2 we may take $T = \text{Cone}(A \rightarrow \text{Cone}(s'))[-1]$, where $s' \in \hat{S}$. So, $s = \begin{pmatrix} d^0 \\ y^0 \end{pmatrix} \in \underline{A}(T^0, T^1 \oplus A)$ belongs to \hat{S} because its cone is a cone of mor-

phism of complexes $\text{Cone}(id_A)[-1] \rightarrow \text{Cone}(s')$, i.e., s is a lower triangular matrix with id_A and s' on the diagonal.

2. Now we show that our results imply the main statements of [Mal82].

As explained in the section 3.2.1, Proposition 3.1.7 can be used to obtain a complete description of non-commutative localizations of rings. Moreover, as we have shown above, we can use the condition (8) instead of the last of equivalent conditions in part III.2b of *ibid.* Now we check that this combination yields exactly the description of non-commutative localizations given in [Mal82].

We have: the non-commutative localization of a ring R with respect to a set of matrices S over R is naturally isomorphic to $R' = \text{End}_{\mathcal{FGF}(R)[S^{-1}]_{add}}(\mathcal{R})$, where $\mathcal{FGF}(R)$ is the category of finitely generated right free modules over R . Denote by \hat{S} the set of lower triangular matrices with elements of S on diagonal. Proposition 3.1.7 and part 1 of this remark yield: R' can be described as the set of triples (g, s, i) modulo the equivalence relation (8), where $s \in \hat{S}$ is of size $n \times m$ for some $n, m > 0$, $i \in \mathcal{FGF}(R)(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}^m)$ and $g \in \mathcal{FGF}(R)(\mathcal{R}^n, \mathcal{R})$, i.e., i is a column and g is a row over R of size n . The operations on this set are defined using Proposition 3.1.7.

Thus one can easily see: we obtain exactly the construction of the non-commutative localization of R described in [Mal82].

Certainly, one can also use the last of equivalent conditions from Proposition 3.1.7(III.2b) instead of (8) here.

A major advantage of our methods is that we define $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ as a full subcategory of $K^b(\underline{A})/\underline{D}$. So, we do not have to verify that our presentation of morphisms and the relations on them (see Proposition 3.1.7) does yield an additive category indeed (in contrast with the arguments of [Ger82] and [Mal82]). Besides, the consideration of $K^b(\underline{A})/\underline{D}$ explains the origin of the relations obtained (their analogues in the papers cited look quite ad hoc). In particular, the *multiplicativity* condition for M in [Mal82] (and also in [Ger82]) corresponds to the extension-closedness of our D (cf. (5)).

Also, *ibid.* contains no information about how (8) was obtained or how it can be understood (in contrast to Proposition 3.1.7(III.2)). Besides, though both our and Malcolmson's conditions for the equality of morphisms in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ are hard to verify (in general), there are some advantages of using our one. Our formula uses only 6 free variables, and Malcolmson's formula uses 7 ones.

Lastly, one can easily note that Theorem 0.1 yields a mighty tool for computations in $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (we thoroughly demonstrated this in the previous section; cf. Proposition 2.2.2).

We will relate our methods and results with the "alternative triangulated

approach to additive localizations” of [NeR04] and [Dwy06] in §4.3 below. Here we only note that non-commutative localizations seem to be really nicely related to weight structures (that we will treat in the next section). Certainly, one of the reasons to say this is Theorem 4.2.2 below. We would also like to say that though Proposition 2.1.3 (that is crucial for this paper) was not formulated in the terms of weight structures, it is certainly closely related to them. In particular, part 1 of the Proposition is a modification of the axiom 4.1.1(I.iv), whereas the formulations of parts 2–4 are motivated by Remark 2.1.4(1).

4 On weight structures in localizations

We start this section by recalling the definition and basic properties of weight structures. They enable us to generalize the results of the previous sections and prove for $S \subset \text{Mor } \underline{Hw}$: the localized category $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ is endowed with a weight structure whose heart is the Karoubi-closure of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. The proofs are minor modifications of the arguments above (that correspond to the case $\underline{C} = K^b(\underline{A})$, w is the ‘stupid weight structure’). Next, we recall the notion of adjacent structures; we prove (in the case of a certain compactly generated $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$) that $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ possesses a t -structure *adjacent* to the corresponding $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$, and calculate its heart.

4.1 A reminder on weight structures

Definition 4.1.1. A pair of subclasses $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}, \underline{C}_{w \geq 0} \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ will be said to define a weight structure w for a triangulated category \underline{C} if they satisfy the following conditions:

(i) $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}, \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ are Karoubi-closed in \underline{C} (i.e., contain all \underline{C} -retracts of their objects).

(ii) **Semi-invariance with respect to translations.**

$$\underline{C}_{w \leq 0} \subset \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}[1], \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}[1] \subset \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}.$$

(iii) **Orthogonality.**

$$\underline{C}_{w \leq 0} \perp \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}[1].$$

(iv) **Weight decompositions.**

For any $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ there exists a distinguished triangle

$$X \rightarrow M \rightarrow Y \rightarrow X[1] \tag{11}$$

such that $X \in \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$, $Y \in \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}[1]$.

II The category $\underline{Hw} \subset \underline{C}$ whose objects are $\underline{C}_{w=0} = \underline{C}_{w \geq 0} \cap \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ and morphisms are $\underline{Hw}(Z, T) = \underline{C}(Z, T)$ for $Z, T \in \underline{C}_{w=0}$, will be called the *heart* of w .

III $\underline{C}_{w \geq i}$ (resp. $\underline{C}_{w \leq i}$, resp. $\underline{C}_{w=i}$) will denote $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}[i]$ (resp. $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}[i]$, resp. $\underline{C}_{w=0}[i]$).

IV We denote $\underline{C}_{w \geq i} \cap \underline{C}_{w \leq j}$ by $\underline{C}_{[i,j]}$ (so it equals $\{0\}$ for $i > j$).

$\underline{C}^b \subset \underline{C}$ will be the category whose object class is $\cup_{i,j \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{C}_{[i,j]}$.

V We will say that (\underline{C}, w) is *bounded* if $\underline{C}_b = \underline{C}$ (i.e., $\cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{C}_{w \leq i} = \text{Obj } \underline{C} = \cup_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{C}_{w \geq i}$)s.

VI Let \underline{C} and \underline{C}' be triangulated categories endowed with weight structures w and w' , respectively; let $F : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}'$ be an exact functor.

F will be called *left weight-exact* (with respect to w, w') if it maps $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ into $\underline{C}'_{w' \leq 0}$; it will be called *right weight-exact* if it maps $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ into $\underline{C}'_{w' \geq 0}$. F is called *weight-exact* if it is both left and right weight-exact.

VII Let \underline{H} be a full subcategory of a triangulated category \underline{C} .

We will say that \underline{H} is *negative* if $\text{Obj } \underline{H} \perp (\cup_{i > 0} \text{Obj}(\underline{H}[i]))$.

VIII The *small envelope* of an additive category \underline{A} is the category $\underline{A}' \subset \text{Kar}(\underline{A})$ whose objects are (X, p) for $X \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$ and $p \in \underline{A}(X, X)$ such that $p^2 = p$ and there exist $Y \in \text{Obj } \underline{A}$ and $q \in \underline{A}(X, Y)$, $s \in \underline{A}(Y, X)$ satisfying $sq = 1 - p$, $qs = \text{id}_Y$. So, the morphism groups in \underline{A}' are given by the formula (1).

Remark 4.1.2. 1. A simple (and yet very useful for us) example of a weight structure comes from the stupid filtration on $K^b(\underline{A})$ (or for $K(\underline{A})$) for an arbitrary additive category \underline{A} . In this case $K^b(\underline{A})_{w \leq 0}$ (resp. $K^b(\underline{A})_{w \geq 0}$) will be the class of complexes that are homotopy equivalent to complexes concentrated in degrees ≥ 0 (resp. ≤ 0). The heart of this weight structure is the Karoubi-closure of \underline{A} in $K^b(\underline{A})$. Note that we have $K^b(\underline{A})^{[-j, -i]} \subset K^b(\underline{A})_{[i,j]}$ for any $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$; we have an equality if \underline{A} is Karoubian, but in general $K^b(\underline{A})_{[0,0]}$ is the small envelope of \underline{A} (so it is not necessarily equivalent to \underline{A} ; cf. Proposition 4.1.3(7)).

3. A weight decomposition (of any $M \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$) is (almost) never canonical.

4. In the current paper we use the ‘‘homological convention’’ for weight structures; it was previously used in [Heb11], [Wil09], and [Bon12], whereas in [Bon10a] and in [Bon10b] the ‘‘cohomological convention’’ was used. In the latter convention the roles of $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ and $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ are interchanged, i.e., one considers $\underline{C}^{w \leq 0} = \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ and $\underline{C}^{w \geq 0} = \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$. So, a complex $X \in \text{Obj } K(\underline{A})$ whose only non-zero term is the fifth one (i.e., $X^5 \neq 0$) has weight -5 in the homological convention, and has weight 5 in the cohomological convention.

Thus the conventions differ by “signs of weights”; $K(\underline{A})_{[i,j]}$ is the class of retracts of complexes concentrated in degrees $[-j, -i]$.

We also recall: in [Pau08] D. Pauksztello introduced weight structures independently (and called them co-t-structures).

5. The orthogonality axiom in Definition 4.1.1(I) immediately yields that $\underline{H}w$ is negative in \underline{C} . We will invoke a certain converse to this statement below.

Now we recall those properties of weight structures that will be needed below (and can be easily formulated).

Proposition 4.1.3. *Let \underline{C} be a triangulated category; we will assume that w is a fixed weight structure on it everywhere except assertion 7.*

1. For $C_1 = C_{w \leq 0}$ and $C_2 = C_{w \geq 0}$, the classes (C_2^{op}, C_1^{op}) define a weight structure on \underline{C}^{op} .
2. $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$, $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$, and $\underline{C}_{w=0}$ are extension-stable.
3. For any weight decomposition of $M \in \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ (see (11)) we have $X \in \underline{C}_{w=0}$.
4. The category \underline{C}^b is a triangulated subcategory of \underline{C} ; w restricts to a bounded weight structure on \underline{C}^b (i.e., we consider the classes $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0} \cap \text{Obj } \underline{C}^b$ and $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0} \cap \text{Obj } \underline{C}^b$) whose heart equals $\underline{H}w$.
5. If w is bounded, then \underline{C} is generated by $\underline{C}_{w=0}$ (see §1).
6. $\underline{C}_{[0,1]}$ consists exactly of cones of morphisms in $\underline{H}w$.
7. Assume that $\underline{H} \subset \underline{C}$ is negative, additive, and generates \underline{C} . Then there exists a unique weight structure w on \underline{C} such that $\underline{H} \subset \underline{H}w$. It is bounded; its heart is equivalent to the small envelope of \underline{H} .

Moreover, $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$ is the smallest Karoubi-closed extension-stable subclass of $\text{Obj } \underline{C}$ containing $\cup_{i \leq 0} \text{Obj } \underline{H}[i]$; $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ is the smallest Karoubi-closed extension-stable subclass of $\text{Obj } \underline{C}$ containing $\cup_{i \geq 0} \text{Obj } \underline{H}[i]$.

8. Assume that \underline{C} is endowed with a bounded weight structure w . Then there exists a unique weight structure w' on the Karoubization \underline{C}' of \underline{C} such that the embedding $\underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}'$ is weight-exact. It is bounded; its heart is the Karoubization of $\underline{H}w$.

9. A certain additive weak weight complex functor $t : \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{Hw})$ is defined, where $K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{Hw})$ is a certain weak homotopy category of complexes. t and $K_{\mathfrak{w}}(-)$ satisfy the following properties.

(i) For any additive category \underline{A} we have: there is a natural conservative additive functor $p = p_{\underline{A}} : K(\underline{A}) \rightarrow K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{A})$ that is bijective on objects and surjective on morphisms. It commutes with $[i]$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$; we have $K(\underline{A})(X, Y) \cong K_{\mathfrak{w}}(\underline{A})(p(X), p(Y))$ for any $X \in K(\underline{A})^{\leq 0}$, $Y \in K(\underline{A})^{\geq 0}$.

(ii) There also exists a certain bounded analogue $K_{\mathfrak{w}}^b(-) \subset K_{\mathfrak{w}}(-)$. If w is bounded then t is conservative and can be factored through $K_{\mathfrak{w}}^b(\underline{Hw})$.

(iii) If $X[-1] \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{f} Z \rightarrow X$ is a distinguished triangle in $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ then there exists a lift of $t(f)$ to a $t'(f) \in K(\underline{A})(t(Y), t(Z))$ such that $t(X) \cong \text{Cone}(t'(f))$.

(iv) Let $S = \{S_i^{-1} \xrightarrow{s_i} S_i^0, i \in I\} \subset \text{Mor } \underline{Hw}$; let $B \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{[0,1]}$ be the set of cones of elements of S (see assertion 6), D is the extension-closure of B . Then $D \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{[0,1]}$; $t(D)$ consists of cones of morphisms given by lower triangular matrices with elements of S on the diagonal; see (5).

10. Assume that w be bounded and that w' is a weight structure for a triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'$. Then an exact functor $F : \underline{\mathcal{C}} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{C}}'$ is weight-exact if and only if $F(\underline{\mathcal{C}}_{w=0}) \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}'_{w'=0}$.

Proof. All of these statements except the two last ones can be found in [Bon10a] (pay attention to Remark 4.1.2(4)!); see Remark 1.1.2(1), Proposition 1.3.3(3,6), Proposition 1.3.6(1,2), Corollary 1.5.7, Proposition 1.5.6(2), Theorem 4.3.2(II), and Proposition 5.2.2 of *ibid.*, respectively.

The remaining assertions also easily follow from the results of *ibid.* Part (i) of assertion 9 is immediate from the definition of $K_{\mathfrak{w}}(-)$ (this is Definition 3.1.6 of *ibid.*). Part (ii) follows from Theorem 3.3.1(I,V) of *ibid.* Part (iii) is also an easy consequence of the *weak exactness* of t (see *loc. cit.*); it implies part (iv) immediately (cf. Proposition 3.1.4).

Lastly, assertion 10 is an easy consequence of assertion 7. □

4.2 The relation of weight structures with “additive localizations”

In this subsection we assume that w is a weight structure on a triangulated category $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ and $\underline{D} \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}$ is a full triangulated subcategory generated (see §1) by a set of objects $B \subset \underline{\mathcal{C}}_{[0,1]}$.

We will need a generalization of Proposition 3.1.2 to this setting. Denote by \underline{H} the full subcategory of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ whose objects are $\underline{C}_{w=0}$.

Proposition 4.2.1. *Let A, A' be objects of \underline{H} .*

Then any $f \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})(A, A')$ can be presented as the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where $A'', T \in \text{Obj } \underline{H}$, $g \in \underline{H}(A'', A')$, $s \in \underline{H}(A'', A \oplus T)$, $i : A \rightarrow A \oplus T$ is the canonical coretraction, whereas $\text{Cone}(s) \in \text{Obj } \underline{D}$.

Proof. By Proposition 2.2.2(1), f can be presented as the composition $x \circ y^{-1}$ for some $C \in \underline{C}_{[0,1]}$, $x \in \underline{C}(C, A')$, $y \in \underline{C}(C, A)$, such that $\text{Cone}(y) \in \text{Obj } \underline{D}$. Choose a weight decomposition of C (in \underline{C}); we obtain a distinguished triangle $C^1[-1] \xrightarrow{d'} C \xrightarrow{p} C^0 \xrightarrow{d} C^1$, where $C^0, C^1 \in \text{Obj } \underline{H}$. Since $y \circ d' = 0$, y factors through p . So, there exists a morphism $y' : C^0 \rightarrow A$ such that $y' \circ p = y$. Similarly, there is a morphism $x' : C^0 \rightarrow A'$ such that $x' \circ p = x$.

Now consider the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where $i : A \rightarrow C^1 \oplus A$ is the

canonical coretraction, $s : C^0 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d \\ y' \end{pmatrix}} C^1 \oplus A$, $g = x' : C^0 \rightarrow A'$. Note that s is invertible in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ indeed: the octahedron diagram for the commutative triangle given by the equality $(id_{C^1} \ 0) \circ s = d$ yields a distinguished triangle $C \xrightarrow{y} A \rightarrow \text{Cone}(s)$; thus $\text{Cone}(s)$ is isomorphic to $\text{Cone}(y)$.

Next, there is an equality $i \circ y = s \circ p$:

$$i \circ y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ id_A \end{pmatrix} \circ y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ y \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d \circ p \\ y' \circ p \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} d \\ y' \end{pmatrix} \circ p = s \circ p.$$

Hence $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i = g \circ p \circ y^{-1} = x \circ y^{-1} = f$.

□

Now we prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.2.2. *The following statements are valid.*

1. *The Karoubi-closures of the sets $(\underline{C}_{w \leq 0}, \underline{C}_{w \geq 0})$ in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ yield a weight structure $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ (such that the localization functor is weight-exact).*

2. *$\underline{Hw}_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ is the Karoubi-closure of \underline{H} in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$.*

3. *If w is bounded, then $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ also is; the heart of $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ is isomorphic to the small envelope of \underline{H} .*

4. *Let S denote some set of \underline{Hw} -morphisms such that B consists of cones of elements of S (see Proposition 4.1.3(6)). Then \underline{H} is canonically isomorphic to $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$.*

5. *More generally, for an additive category $\underline{A} \subset \underline{Hw}$ assume that $S \subset \text{Mor}(\underline{A})$, $\underline{Hw} = \text{Kar}_{\underline{C}} \underline{A}$, and $B = \text{Cone}(S)$. Then there exists a unique*

weight structure $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ for $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ such that the localization functor is weight-exact and yields an isomorphism of $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ with the full subcategory $\underline{H}' \subset \underline{H}w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$: $\text{Obj } \underline{H}' = \underline{A}$.

Proof. 1. We should verify that the Karoubi-closures of $(\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}, \underline{C}_{w \leq 0})$ satisfy all the axioms of weight structures.

These Karoubi-closures are obviously semi-invariant with respect to translations. The orthogonality axiom follows from Proposition 2.1.3(4) easily (cf. Remark 2.1.4(1)); it suffices to note that $\underline{C}_{w \leq 0} \perp \underline{C}_{w \geq 1} \supset B_{\geq 1}$, and $B_{\leq -1} \subset \underline{C}_{< 0} \perp \underline{C}_{w \geq 1}$ (in \underline{C} ; by Definition 4.1.1(I.iii)). Lastly, any object of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ possesses a weight decomposition that comes from \underline{C} .

2. $\underline{C}_{w=0} \subset (\underline{C}/\underline{D})_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0}$ by the definition of $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$.

Now we prove that any object of $(\underline{C}/\underline{D})_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0}$ is a retract of an object of $\underline{C}_{w=0}$ (in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$). Actually, this fact is valid for any weight-exact functor that is surjective on objects.

We repeat an argument used in §8.1 of [Bon10a]. Let Z belong to $(\underline{C}/\underline{D})_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0} \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$. Shifting a weight decomposition of $Z[1]$ in \underline{C} by $[-1]$ we obtain a distinguished triangle $T \rightarrow Z \rightarrow U$ with $T \in \underline{C}_{w \leq -1}$, $U \in \underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$. In $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ we have $T \in (\underline{C}/\underline{D})_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}} \leq -1}$; hence $T \perp Z$ and we obtain $U \cong_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}} Z \oplus T[1]$. Therefore, in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ the object Z is a retract of U , whereas $U \in ((\underline{C}/\underline{D})_{w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}=0}) \cap \underline{C}_{w \leq 0}$.

Now, applying the dual argument to U (see Proposition 4.1.3(1)), we obtain: U in $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$ is a retract of some $W \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}_{w=0}$ (here $W \rightarrow U \rightarrow Y$ is a weight decomposition in \underline{C} ; we apply part 3 of loc. cit.).

3. Since the localization functor is weight-exact, $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ is bounded. Next, we have $\underline{H} \subset \underline{H}w$; hence \underline{H} is negative (see Remark 4.1.2(5)). Proposition 4.1.3(2) yields that $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ is the weight structure corresponding to \underline{H} via assertion 7 of loc. cit. Hence the assertion mentioned yields the result.

4. We follow the scheme of the proof of Theorem 0.1. First, we prove that any additive functor $F : \underline{H}w \rightarrow \underline{A}'$ that converts all elements of S into invertible morphisms factors through the functor $u : \underline{H}w \rightarrow \underline{H}$ (actually, it suffices to verify this for F being the localization functor $\underline{H}w \rightarrow \underline{H}w[S^{-1}]_{add}$).

We consider the composition $G = K_w(F) \circ t : \underline{C} \rightarrow K_w(\underline{H}w[S^{-1}]_{add})$. Obviously, it suffices to verify that G factors through the localization functor $\underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{C}/\underline{D}$. By the universal property of “abstract” localizations, it suffices to verify for any distinguished triangle $X \rightarrow Y \xrightarrow{f} Z \rightarrow X[1]$ that $G(f)$ is an isomorphism if $X \in \text{Obj}(B)$. By Proposition 4.1.3(9(iii)) it suffices to verify that $G(X) = 0$ for such an X . Since G is additive, it suffices to verify that it kills all objects of \underline{D} . Applying loc. cit. again (repeatedly) we reduce this to the fact that it kills all elements of B . The latter is obvious since all elements of B die in $K(\underline{H}w[S^{-1}]_{add})$, whereas morphism groups in

$K(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$ surject onto those in $K_{\mathfrak{m}}(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$.

By Theorem 0.1, there exists a unique additive functor $R : \underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add} \rightarrow \underline{H}$ compatible with u that is bijective on objects. Since there also is a functor in the inverse direction (as we have just proved), R is injective on morphisms.

As is the proof of loc. cit., it remains to verify that there are no “redundant” morphisms in \underline{H} . The latter fact is immediate from Proposition 4.2.1: every morphism in \underline{H} can be represented as the composition $g \circ s^{-1} \circ i$, where $s \in S$, s^{-1} comes from $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$. So, the composition comes from $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$.

5. The universal properties of the additive localization construction (see Theorem 0.1) and of the Karoubization one yield a canonical sequence of functors $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add} \rightarrow \underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add} \rightarrow \text{Kar}(\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}) \rightarrow \text{Kar}(\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add})$. Together with the previous assertion it implies that $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is a full subcategory of $\underline{Hw}[S^{-1}]_{add}$. Thus, $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ is a negative subcategory of $\underline{C}/\underline{D}$. Lastly, by Proposition 4.1.3(7) there is only one weight structure whose heart contains $\underline{A}[S^{-1}]_{add}$. □

Remark 4.2.3. 1. Part 4 of the theorem above is not a generalization of Theorem 0.1 (in contrast to part 5), since \underline{A} is not necessarily equivalent to the heart of the “stupid” weight structure (either for $K^b(\underline{A})$ or for $K(\underline{A})$; see Proposition 4.1.3(7).

2. For \underline{C} possessing a differential graded enhancement (“compatible with w ”) one can verify the existence of $w_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ “explicitly”; cf. §8.2 of [Bon09]. Yet it seems hard to compute $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{C}/\underline{D}}$ via calculations of this sort.

3. Our theorem extends the results of §8.1 of [Bon10a], where (essentially) the case $B \subset \underline{C}_{w=0}$ was considered (see Remark 0.1 above).

Note that our setting reduces to this one if all the elements of S are retractions.

4.3 The relation with adjacent t -structures

In this section we discuss the relation of our methods with the “triangulated” approach to localizations used in [Dwy06] and in [NeR04] (that is closely connected with t -structures). First, we demonstrate that weight structures can be used for construction and study of certain t -structures for a wide class of triangulated theories (and their localizations). Next, we explain the relation of the methods used in *ibid.* with our ones.

The idea is to find a weight-exact embedding of a ‘small’ triangulated category \underline{C}' into a certain ‘big’ \underline{C} (with a weight structure w) such that w is dual to a certain t -structure (in a certain sense). Then the weight-exactness

of the localization functor becomes equivalent to the t -exactness of its right adjoint.

For simplicity, till the end of the section we will assume that \underline{C} contains arbitrary small coproducts of its objects (below for a category C fulfilling this condition we will just say that C is closed with respect to coproducts) everywhere except assertions I and II of Proposition 4.3.3. Note yet that for our purposes it is also possible to consider coproducts for sets of objects of limited cardinality only; cf. Theorem 4.3.2(III(i)) of [Bon10a]. In such a situation an $X \in \text{Obj } \underline{C}$ is called compact if the functor $\underline{C}(X, -)$ commutes with all possible coproducts.

4.3.1 On adjacent structures and localizations

We will need some definitions and notation.

Let \underline{C} be a triangulated category closed with respect to coproducts, $B \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$. Then we will call a subcategory $\underline{D} \subset \underline{C}$ the *localizing subcategory generated by B* (or that B generates \underline{D} as a localizing subcategory) if \underline{D} is the smallest full strict triangulated subcategory of \underline{C} containing B and closed with respect to coproducts. Note that in this situation \underline{D} is called compactly generated if all elements of B are compact in it; yet we will not really need the latter definition below.

For a small additive category \underline{A} we denote by $\text{AddFun}(\underline{A}, \text{Ab})$ the category of additive functors from \underline{A} to the category of abelian groups.

Recall that t -structures were defined (in [BBD82]) in terms of certain subclasses $\underline{C}^{t \leq 0}, \underline{C}^{t \geq 0} \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}$. These classes of objects should satisfy certain axioms that are somewhat similar to Definition 4.1.1 (this is certainly not a pure coincidence; *ibid.* inspired the writing both of [Bon10a] and of [Pau08]). The heart \underline{Ht} of t is defined similarly to \underline{Hw} .

We will say that a t -structure t (for \underline{C}) is non-degenerate if $\bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{C}^{t \leq n} = \bigcap_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \underline{C}^{t \geq n} = \{0\}$.

Definition 4.3.1. We say that a weight structure w for \underline{C} is *adjacent* to a t -structure t for \underline{C} if and only if the class $\underline{C}_{w \geq 0}$ coincides with $\underline{C}^{t \leq 0}$.

Remark 4.3.2. This definition (along with Proposition 4.3.3(I,II)) axiomatizes the “duality” between the category \underline{A} of projective R -modules and the category \mathfrak{A} of all R -modules. The “triangulated avatar” of this duality is the fact that any object of $D(R)^{t \leq 0}$ has a projective resolution (t is the canonical t -structure for $\underline{C} = D^-(R)$); so, the “stupid” weight structure w coming from the isomorphism $\underline{C} \cong K^-(\underline{A})$ is adjacent to t . Note however: in this example we have $\underline{Hw} \subset \underline{Ht}$; yet we do not have such an inclusion for a general pair of adjacent w, t .

We will need the following properties of adjacent structures and compactly generated categories; most of them were proved in §§4.4-4.5 of [Bon10a] (yet pay attention to Remark 4.1.2 above!).

Proposition 4.3.3. *I Assume that \underline{C} is endowed with a weight structure w and also with an adjacent t -structure t (we do not assume that \underline{C} is closed with respect to coproducts in this assertion).*

1. *Assume that \underline{C} is a small category. Denote by $\underline{C}(\underline{H}w, -)$ the functor $\underline{H}t \rightarrow \text{AddFun}(\underline{H}w^{op}, Ab)$ that sends $N \in \underline{C}^{t=0}$ to the representable functor $M \mapsto \underline{C}(M, N)$ ($M \in \underline{C}_{w=0}$). It is an exact embedding of $\underline{H}t$ into the abelian category $\text{AddFun}(\underline{H}w^{op}, Ab)$.*

2. *Assume that t is non-degenerate. Then $\underline{C}^{t \leq 0} = (\cup_{i < 0} \underline{C}_{w=i})^\perp$, $\underline{C}^{t \geq 0} = (\cup_{i > 0} \underline{C}_{w=i})^\perp$.*

II *Assume that \underline{C} is endowed with a weight structure w and with an adjacent t -structure t (and not necessarily closed with respect to coproducts), whereas a triangulated category \underline{E} is endowed with adjacent $w_{\underline{E}}$ and $t_{\underline{E}}$. Let $\pi : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{E}$ be an exact functor. Then the following statements are valid.*

1. *π is right weight-exact if and only if it is right t -exact (i.e., if $\pi(\underline{C}^{t \leq 0}) \subset \underline{E}^{t_{\underline{E}} \leq 0}$).*

2. *Let $G : \underline{E} \rightarrow \underline{C}$ be the right adjoint to π . Then π is right (resp. left) weight-exact with respect to w and $w_{\underline{E}}$ if and only if G is left (resp. right) t -exact with respect to $t_{\underline{E}}$ and t .*

III *Let \underline{C}' be a full triangulated subcategory of \underline{C} whose objects are compact; let $B \subset \text{Obj } \underline{C}'$ be a set (i.e., it is small); let $\underline{H} \subset \underline{C}'$ be a small additive category such that $\text{Obj } \underline{H}$ generates \underline{C} as (its own) localizing subcategory (whereas \underline{C} is closed with respect to coproducts). Denote by \underline{D} the localizing subcategory of \underline{C} generated by B . Then the following statements are valid.*

1. *The Verdier localization category $\underline{E} = \underline{C}/\underline{D}$ exists; the localization functor $\pi : \underline{C} \rightarrow \underline{E}$ commutes with coproducts, converts compact objects into compact ones, and possesses a right adjoint G that is a full embedding functor. Besides, \underline{E} is generated by $\pi(\text{Obj } \underline{H})$ as a localizing subcategory.*

2. *π induces a full embedding of $\underline{E} = \underline{C}'/\langle B \rangle_{\underline{C}'}$ into \underline{E} .*

3. *Assume moreover that \underline{H} is negative (see Definition 4.1.1(VII)). Then \underline{C} possesses a weight structure w whose heart is equivalent to the Karoubization of the category of all the coproducts of the objects of \underline{H} , and also a non-degenerate t -structure t such that w is adjacent to t . Besides, $\underline{H}w$ is the Karoubization of the category of all “formal” (small) coproducts of objects of \underline{H} (i.e., we have $\underline{C}(\prod_{l \in L} H_l, \prod_{j \in J} H_j) = \prod_{l \in L} (\bigoplus_{j \in J} \underline{C}(H_l, H_j))$; here $H_l, H_j \in \text{Obj } \underline{H}$, L, J are index sets), whereas $\underline{H}t \cong \text{AddFun}(\underline{H}^{op}, Ab)$ (via the functor $N \mapsto (H \in \text{Obj } \underline{H} \mapsto \underline{C}(H, N))$).*

Proof. I Assertion 1 is exactly part 4 of Theorem 4.4.2 of [Bon10a]; it easily implies assertion 2 (which one can reduce to the case of a small $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$).

II.1. Immediate from the definition of adjacent structures.

2. See Remark 4.4.6 of *ibid.*

III 1–2: These statements easily follow from the results of [Nee01].

Next, Theorem 8.3.3 of [Nee01] implies that \underline{D} satisfies the Brown representability condition (see Definition 8.2.1 of *ibid.*). Hence Proposition 9.1.19 of *ibid.* yields the existence of $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ and G ; G is a full embedding since it is adjoint to a localization functor. Corollary 3.2.11 of [Nee01] yields that π respects coproducts; this finishes the proof of assertion III.1. Assertion III.2 is given by Theorem 4.4.9 of *ibid.* (one should take $\alpha = \aleph_0$ in it).

3. Let c be a non-zero object of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$. Then there exist $h \in \text{Obj } \underline{H}$, $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $m \in \underline{\mathcal{C}}(h[i], c)$. Indeed, it suffices to note that the full subcategory of $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ whose objects are ${}^\perp\{c[-i], i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is triangulated, strict, and is closed with respect to coproducts; hence it can contain \underline{H} only if $c = 0$. Hence $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$ is *negatively well-generated* by $\text{Obj } \underline{H}$ in the sense of Definition 4.5.1 of [Bon10a]. Thus we can apply Theorem 4.5.2 of *ibid.* to $\underline{\mathcal{C}}$; this yields the result. □

One may say that part II.2 of this Proposition settles the difficulties caused by the fact that the (left) adjoint to a t -exact functor is usually not t -exact.

Now we formulate the main result of this subsection; we will consider an example for it in detail in §4.3.2.

Theorem 4.3.4. *Let $\underline{\mathcal{C}}, \underline{\mathcal{C}}', B, \underline{H}, \underline{\mathcal{D}}, \underline{\mathcal{E}}, \pi, G, \underline{E}$ be as in Proposition 4.3.3(III) (and satisfy all the conditions mentioned in *loc. cit.*). Assume moreover that B consists of cones of some set $S \subset \text{Mor } \underline{H}$, and that \underline{H} generates $\underline{\mathcal{C}}'$ (see §1). Then the following statements are valid.*

1. $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ possesses a weight structure $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ and also a non-degenerate adjacent t -structure $t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$.

2. $\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$ is a full additive subcategory of $\underline{H}w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ (via π); $\underline{H}w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ is equivalent to the Karoubization of the category of all small coproducts of objects of $\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}$.

3. $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ restricts to a weight structure for $\underline{E} \subset \underline{\mathcal{E}}$.

4. G is t -exact; π is weight-exact.

5. $\underline{H}t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ is equivalent to $\text{AddFun}(\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{\text{add}}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$. It is a full exact abelian subcategory of $\underline{H}t \cong \text{AddFun}(\underline{H}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$ (via G); an $I \in \text{Obj } \text{AddFun}(\underline{H}^{\text{op}}, \text{Ab})$ belongs to $G(\underline{H}t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}})$ if and only if $I(s)$ is bijective for any $s \in S$.

Proof. Note that the full subcategory of \underline{E} whose objects are those of \underline{H} is isomorphic to $\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ (this is the first part of our assertion 2), and is negative in $\underline{E} \subset \underline{\mathcal{E}}$. Hence Proposition 4.3.3(III) yields that $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 4.3.3(III.3) with $\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ instead of \underline{H} . Thus our assertion 1, the rest of assertion 2, and the first part of assertion 5 follow from loc. cit.

Now, Theorem 4.2.2(5) also yields the existence of a weight structure for \underline{E} whose heart is $\text{Kar}_{\underline{E}}(\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{add})$; it is compatible with $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ by Proposition 4.1.3(10). Thus we proved assertion 3.

Next, since π commutes with coproducts, we have $\pi(\underline{C}_{w=0}) \subset \underline{\mathcal{E}}_{w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}=0}$. Hence Proposition 4.3.3(I.2) yields the t -exactness of G . Part II.2 of loc. cit. also implies that π is weight-exact; this finishes the proof of assertion 4.

The second part of assertion 5 is given by the t -exactness of G . In order to verify its last part, it suffices to note that an $I \in \text{AddFun}(\underline{H}^{op}, Ab)$ factors through $\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{add}$ if and only if it converts all $s \in S$ into bijections. □

Remark 4.3.5. 1. It is easy to construct such a setting for any small \underline{H} . To this end, following §4 of [Dwy06] one can take for \underline{C} the derived category of $\text{AddFun}(\underline{H}^{op}, Ab)$. Note that we have $\underline{H}w \subset \underline{H}t$ in this example (yet we don't have an inclusion of $\underline{H}w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ into $\underline{H}t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ for a general S since π is not t -exact).

2. Any object of \underline{H} yields the obvious exact functor from the category $\text{AddFun}(\underline{H}^{op}, Ab) \cong \underline{H}t$ to Ab . Set-theoretic difficulties prevent us from saying that \underline{H}^{op} embeds into the category of exact functors from $\underline{H}t$ to Ab (and the same is true for $\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{add}^{op}$ and $\underline{H}t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$). Yet one can still choose a (large enough) small abelian (exact) subcategory $\mathfrak{A} \subset \underline{H}t$ such that \underline{H}^{op} embeds into the category of exact functors $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow Ab$. So we obtain certain ‘‘Yoneda-like’’ descriptions of \underline{H} and $\underline{H}[S^{-1}]_{add}$. Note also that the restriction of π to \underline{H} can be described via the restriction of the exact functors $\mathfrak{A} \rightarrow Ab$ mentioned to the subcategory $\mathfrak{A} \cap G(\underline{H}t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}})$.

One can also avoid set-theoretic difficulties by finding some ‘‘small substitute’’ for \underline{C} ; cf. Definition 4.7 of [NeR04].

3. One can also prove the existence of $w_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ and the weight-exactness of π more directly via an ‘‘unbounded’’ generalization of Proposition 2.1.3.

4.3.2 The relation between our results and some of the results of [Dwy06] and [NeR04]

We adopt the notation of Theorem 4.3.4.

The papers [Dwy06] and [NeR04] mostly consider \underline{H} being the category of finitely generated projective modules over a ring R (though in §4 of [Dwy06] also arbitrary small additive categories were considered; cf. Remark 4.3.5(1)). Then one can take $\underline{C} = D(R)$. The main “localization” results of the papers cited can be stated as follows: the non-commutative localization ring $R[S^{-1}]$ is naturally isomorphic to the endomorphism ring of \mathcal{R} (i.e., of R considered as a left R -module) in the corresponding localization $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$ of $D(R)$. Certainly, this statement also follows from our results (use the embedding $\underline{E} \rightarrow \underline{\mathcal{E}}$ and apply Theorem 4.2.2(4); cf. also §3.2.1). Besides, note that $\underline{C} = D(R)$ is a very partial case of Theorem 4.3.4.

Remark 4.3.6. 1. A major advantage of our methods is that we can use $\underline{C}' = K^b(\underline{H}) \subset D(R)$ instead of \underline{C} (and $\underline{E} = \underline{C}' / \langle \text{Cone}(S) \rangle$ instead of $\underline{\mathcal{E}}$). Certainly, \underline{C}' is “much smaller” than \underline{C} , whereas Proposition 2.2.2 makes explicit computations in \underline{E} quite easy. Note in contrast that no attempt was made in [Dwy06] and [NeR04] to “calculate $R[S^{-1}]$ explicitly” (i.e., to reprove the results of [Ger82] and [Mal82]). Besides, weight structures (coming from *negative well-generating* subcategories of compact objects; see the proof of Proposition 4.3.3(III.3)) are very useful for constructing t -structures in this setting cf. §§4.5–4.6 of [Bon10a]. Lastly, to the belief of the authors, it is easier to deal with the functor $K^b(F)$ for an additive $F : \underline{H} \rightarrow \underline{A}$ than with functors of the type $-\otimes_R R'$ for a ring homomorphism $R \rightarrow R'$.

2. The t -structure for \underline{C} given by Proposition 4.3.3(III.3) is exactly the canonical t -structure for $D(R)$. Thus for this particular setting the existence of $t_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ (see Theorem 4.3.4(1)) compatible with the embedding $G : \underline{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \underline{C}$ was proved in Proposition 3.4 of [Dwy06] and in Lemma 6.3 of [NeR04] (and was important for these papers).

The usage of t -structures explains why “big” triangulated categories were needed in the papers cited; cf. Remark 4.3.4(4) of [Bon10a]. Note in contrast that the weight-exactness of π holds for its restriction to a “much smaller” \underline{C}' (such a category was very important for the K -theory computations of [NeR04]). Besides, the “duality” between weight and t -structures allows us to study the properties of π (that is not left t -exact in general).

3. Certainly, the t -exactness of G yields the right t -exactness of $G\pi$. In Proposition 3.2 of [Dwy06] it was verified: $\underline{C}(\mathcal{R}, G\pi(\mathcal{R})) \cong \underline{C}(\mathcal{R}, H_0^t(G\pi(\mathcal{R})))$ is isomorphic to $R[S^{-1}]$. Certainly, this statement also follows from our calculation of $\underline{Hw}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}}$ (since $R[S^{-1}] \cong \text{End}_{\underline{\mathcal{E}}} \mathcal{R}$).

4. In [NeR04] the canonical t -structure for $D(R)$ was mentioned explicitly, whereas in [Dwy06] the corresponding cohomology (denoted by π_i) was considered. The existence of cohomology functors is certainly an advantage of derived categories (and of general triangulated categories endowed with

t -structures). Yet the results of the current paper (together with the ones of §2.5–2.6 of [Bon10b]) demonstrate that in certain situations it is quite useful to consider a certain weight structure instead of a t -structure *orthogonal* to it (see Definition 2.5.1 of *ibid.*; this is a certain generalization of Definition 4.3.1 above).

5. For a triangulated category \underline{C} possessing a differential graded enhancement (see Definition 6.1.2(3) of [Bon10a]; this includes all possible triangulated categories whose objects are various complexes) and a weight structure w on it the weak weight complex functor (see Proposition 4.1.3(9)) can be lifted to an exact functor $t^{st} : \underline{C} \rightarrow K(\underline{H}w)$ (see §6.3 of [Bon10a] in the case when w is bounded). So, the localization homomorphism $R \rightarrow R[S^{-1}]$ is *stably* flat (see Theorem 0.7 of [NeR04] and Proposition 3.3 of [Dwy06]) if and only if t_E^{st} is fully faithful.

6. Certainly, in [NeR04] and [Dwy06] (and in several related papers of the same authors) there are several results that we do not mention above (since they are beyond the scope of the current paper). They mostly concern the case when the localization homomorphism $R \rightarrow R[S^{-1}]$ is stably flat; also, several examples of non-commutative localizations were considered.

5 On birational motives and weights for them

We prove that our results yield an “elementary” proof of the existence of certain (birational) weight structures for various triangulated categories of birational motives (defined via the method of [KaS02]). Besides, Theorem 4.3.4 yields the existence of t -structures adjacent to these weight structures; in *ibid.* in the case of motives over a field it was shown that the corresponding t -structure is a restriction of the Voevodsky’s homotopy t -structure to the category of birational motivic complexes.

5.1 The definition of birational motives

Now we define certain categories of birational motives over a base U . We generalize the corresponding definition from [KaS02] to a somewhat more general context.

For a scheme U one considers a certain additive category $Cor(U)$. Two important ‘types’ of $Cor(U)$ were described in detail in [CiD09] starting from §9 (there U was assumed to be noetherian separated). We do not need a precise definition of $Cor(U)$ in this paper (so, we will not specify which version of it we consider); in particular, one can choose arbitrary (associative commutative unital) “coefficient rings” when defining $Cor(U)$. We will only

require $Cor(U)$ to satisfy the following properties: its objects are certain finite type U -schemes (so, the category is essentially small); the disjoint union operation yields the direct sum in $Cor(U)$; for any X/U such that $X \in \text{Obj } Cor(U)$ and any smooth finite type $f : Y \rightarrow X$ we have: $Y \in \text{Obj } Cor(U)$ and $f \in Cor(U)(Y, X)$. We will make no distinction in notation between schemes and their morphisms and the corresponding objects and morphisms in various “motivic” categories that we consider in this section.

Next, (see §11.1.9 of *ibid.*) one considers $K^b(Cor(U))$ and (following [Ivo07]) localizes it by the triangulated subcategory generated by two types of complexes: the complex $\mathbb{A}^1 \times X \rightarrow X$ for any $X \in \text{Obj } Cor(U)$ (we will denote the set of these complexes by B_{HI}) and by complexes of the form

$W \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -k \\ g \end{pmatrix}} Y \oplus V \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} f & j \end{pmatrix}} X$ (we will denote the set of these complexes by B_{MV}) for any elementary (Nisnevich) distinguished square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W & \xrightarrow{k} & Y \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow f \\ V & \xrightarrow{j} & X \end{array}$$

of objects of $Cor(U)$ (this is a certain Cartesian square; j, k are open dense embeddings). One defines $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ as the Karoubization of the triangulated category obtained.

Now (following Definition 5.1 of [KaS02]) we define $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ as the Karoubization of the localization $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ by the subcategory generated by (images in $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ of) complexes of the form $U \xrightarrow{j} X$ for all open dense embeddings j of objects of $Cor(U)$ (here the upper index “o” stands for “open”). We will denote the set of these complexes by B_{bir} .

5.2 A weight structure on $DM_{gm}^o(U)$

We make the following simple observation: by definition, $B_{MV} \subset \langle B_{bir} \rangle$. Hence $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ is (isomorphic to) the Karoubization of the localization of $K^b(Cor(U))$ by $\langle B_{bir} \cup B_{HI} \rangle$. Hence we can apply all the results of the previous sections to this setting!

Theorem 5.2.1. *1. The Karoubi-closures of the subclasses $(K^b(Cor(U)))^{\leq 0}$, $K^b(Cor(U))^{\geq 0} \subset \text{Obj } DM_{gm}^o(U)$ yield a weight structure w_{bir} on $DM_{gm}^o(U)$. Moreover, this is the unique weight structure such that the localization functor $K^b(Cor(U)) \rightarrow DM_{gm}^o(U)$ is exact.*

2. Denote the heart of w_{bir} by $Chow^o(U)$. Its objects are exactly all the retracts of $\text{Obj } Cor(U)$ in $DM_{gm}^o(U)$, and it is isomorphic to the Karoubization of $Cor(U)[(S_{bir} \cup S_{HI})^{-1}]_{add} \cong Cor(U)[S_{bir}^{-1}]_{add} \cong Cor(U)[S_{bir}^{-1}]$.

Proof. 1. The existence follows from the Theorem 4.2.2 and the uniqueness can be obtained from Theorem 4.2.2(5). 2. The isomorphism of $Chow^o(U)$ with $\text{Kar}(Cor(U)[(S_{bir} \cup S_{HI})^{-1}]_{add})$ follows from 4.2.2(4). Two remaining isomorphisms can be proved via an argument of J.-L. Colliot-Thélène (see Appendix A of [KaS08]) using the fact that S_{bir} is closed under direct sums (see Remark 2.2.5(1)). \square

Now we describe certain ways of making computations in $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ and $Chow^o(U)$.

It could make sense to start from the localization of $K^b(Cor(U))$ by $\langle B_{HI} \rangle$. Note here that all elements of S_{HI} are coretractions (cf. Remark 4.2.3(3)); so, one can apply the calculations from §8.2 of [Bon09]. Moreover, one can probably express $D_{HI} = K^b(Cor(U))/\langle B_{HI} \rangle$ in terms of certain (cubical) Suslin complexes; cf. §5 of *ibid.* In particular, the morphisms between objects of $Cor(U)$ in D_{HI} could be expressed as the morphisms in $Cor(U)$ modulo certain ‘‘homotopy equivalence’’ relation. Next, one should localize D_{HI} by B_{bir} (and consider the Karoubization of the category obtained). Note here: in order to compute $Chow^o(U)$, it suffices to consider the localization of the $K^b(\underline{Hw}_{HI})$ by B_{bir} (here we apply Theorem 4.2.2(5)).

One can also apply Remark 4.3.5(2) to calculations in $Chow^o(U)$ (somehow). Note here: Theorem 4.3.4(1,4,5) yields the natural generalization of Proposition 7.4 of [KaS02] in our setting (the corresponding $\underline{Ht}_{\mathcal{E}}$ was denoted by $HI^0(-)$ in [KaS02]).

Now we briefly recall some consequences of the existence of a bounded weight structure for $DM_{gm}^o(U)$.

Remark 5.2.2. 1. There exists an exact conservative *weight complex* functor $DM_{gm}^o(U) \rightarrow K^b(Chow^o(U))$; cf. §3.1 of [Bon13a].

2. We define $K_0(Chow^o(U))$ as the abelian group with a generator $[X]$ for each $X \in \text{Obj } Chow^o(U)$, and the relation $[Y] = [X] + [Z]$ for any $X, Y, Z \in \text{Obj } Chow^o(U)$ such that $Y \cong X \oplus Z$. For $K_0(DM_{gm}^o(U))$ we take similar generators and set $[Y] = [X] + [Z]$ if $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z \rightarrow X[1]$ is a distinguished triangle. Then the embedding $Chow^o(U) \rightarrow DM_{gm}^o(U)$ yields an isomorphism $K_0(Chow^o(U)) \cong K_0(DM_{gm}^o(U))$; see Theorem 5.3.1 of [Bon10a].

3. For any (co)homological functor $H : DM_{gm}^o(U) \rightarrow \underline{A}$ (\underline{A} is an abelian category) there exists certain *Chow-weight* spectral sequences $T(H, X)$ that relate the cohomology of any $X \in \text{Obj } DM_{gm}^o(U)$ with that of the terms of

its weight complex. $T(H, X)$ is $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ -functorial in X starting from E_2 . $T(H, X)$ induces a certain (Chow)-weight filtration on $H_*(X)$ (or $H^*(X)$); this filtration is also $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ -functorial and can be (easily) described in terms of weight decompositions (only); see §2 of *ibid*.

We also make certain remarks on the relevance of our results.

Remark 5.2.3. 1. So we obtain some new tools for “computing” $Chow^o(U)$ (for a general U). Moreover, the authors hope that Remark 2.1.4(1) will be relevant for computing $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ -morphism groups between $DM_{gm}^o(U)_{w_{bir}=0}$ and $DM_{gm}^o(U)_{w_{bir}=n}$ for (certain) $n < 0$.

Another relevant observation here: for any additive category \underline{A} , $S \subset \text{Mor}(\underline{A})$, $\underline{C} = K^b(\underline{A})$, $B = \text{Cone}(S) \subset K^b(\underline{A})^{[-1,0]}$, one can easily describe $B_{[n,0]}$ (cf. Proposition 2.1.3(2,3)) by a natural generalization of (5).

2. It is certainly “more interesting” to consider weight decompositions of those objects of $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ that do not belong to $DM_{gm}^o(U)_{w=i}$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ (then one can obtain non-trivial weight filtrations and weight spectral sequences for (co)homology). Certainly, we would also like these objects to “come from U -schemes”. So, it seems natural to look for some birational motives of non-smooth finite type U -schemes and for (birational) motives with compact support of (certain) finite type U -schemes. If one can define certain motives of this type for U -schemes in $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$, then one can also obtain the corresponding birational motives by applying the localization functor. Unfortunately, it seems that for a general U the theory of [CiD09] yields “reasonable” motives (with compact support) for arbitrary finite type U -schemes only in the category $DM_c(U)$ (this is the “stabilization” of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$ with respect to Tate twists; it’s better to consider motives with rational coefficients here). Yet this is no problem if U is the spectrum of a perfect field. Besides, in the general case one can still define certain motives (with compact support) of U -schemes in $DM^{eff}(U)$ (this is a “cocompletion” of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(U)$; one also obtains certain “non-constructible” birational motives this way) using the results of *ibid*.

3. Since an $X \in \text{Obj } Cor(U)$ in $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ becomes isomorphic to any open dense $X' \subset X$, the objects of $Chow^o(U)$ are retracts of finite coproducts of “birational motives of the generic points of objects of $Cor(U)$ ”. Moreover, we suspect (following [Kah12]) that $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ splits as the direct sum of the corresponding categories over (generic) Zariski points of U . Yet this could depend on the version of $Cor(U)$ chosen. In any case, even the existence of w_{bir} was not clear previously for U being the spectrum of an imperfect field.

4. In the case when U is the spectrum of a perfect field k (and for the “classical”, i.e., Voevodsky’s $Cor(U)$; see [Voe00]) the existence of w_{bir} was already known previously. One can distinguish three (“old”) methods of the

proof. Their (common) main disadvantage is that they rely on certain (quite hard) results of Voevodsky; they also require certain additional restrictions on U .

(i) By Proposition 4.1.3(7,8) it suffices to verify that the objects of $Cor(U)$ (i.e., smooth k -varieties) form a negative subcategory of $DM_{gm}^o(U)$. This was done in §7 of [KaS02] in the case $\text{char } U = 0$.

(ii) Another possible approach (that yields two distinct proofs of the existence of w_{bir}) is to prove the existence of some weight structure w_{eff} for $DM_{gm}^{eff} = DM_{gm}^{eff}(k)$ or for some its “completion” that yields a weight structure for $DM_{gm}^o(U)$. Note here: in this case the subcategory $\langle B_{bir} \rangle_{DM_{gm}^{eff}}$ is exactly the Tate twist $DM_{gm}^{eff}(1)$ of DM_{gm}^{eff} (resp. of its “completion”); it is isomorphic to DM_{gm}^{eff} by the Voevodsky’s cancellation theorem. Hence by Theorem 4.2.2(1) or by Proposition 8.1.1(1) of [Bon10a] (that is essentially its partial case; see Remark 4.2.3(3) and Remark 0.1) w_{eff} yields a weight structure for $DM_{gm}^o(U)$ if there exists an $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that the functor $-(1)[i]$ (i.e., the composition of the Tate twist with $[i]$) is weight-exact with respect to w_{eff} (see Definition 4.1.1(VI)).

Surprisingly, there are two “geometric” possibilities here and an infinite set of certain “less explicit” ones; they are (“mostly”) parametrized by i .

(iia) In the case $i = 2$ there is the *Chow weight structure*; its heart is the category of effective Chow motives (which is a full subcategory of DM_{gm}^{eff} ; see [Voe00]). This was our reason for denoting $\underline{H}w_{bir}$ by $Chow^o(U)$.

In the case $\text{char } k = 0$ one can take any coefficient ring here (see Proposition 6.5.3 of [Bon10a]); in the case $\text{char } k = p > 0$ one has to invert p (and apply the main result of [Bon11]).

(iib) For $i = 1$ one can construct a certain Gersten weight structure. Its heart is “cogenerated” by certain (co)motives of function fields over U (see Proposition 4.1.1 of [Bon10b] for more detail in the case when k is countable, and §6.4 of [Bon13b] for the general case); so, it is only defined for a certain “completion” $\mathfrak{D}(k)$ of $DM_{gm}^{eff}(k)$.

(iic) One can also construct a “ $-(1)[i]$ -stable” weight structure on a certain version of $\mathfrak{D}(k)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$; see §4.9 of [Bon10b]. Even more generally, one can “glue” certain weight structure from w_{bir} by considering certain “shifts” of it (by arbitrary integers) on the categories $DM_{gm}^{eff}(j)/DM_{gm}^{eff}(j+1) \cong DM_{gm}^o(U)$ for j running through all \mathbb{N} . Yet the author does not know of any constructions of weight structures of this sort that would not rely on the existence of the “explicit” weight structures (that were already mentioned above).

References

- [BaS01] Balmer P., Schlichting M. Idempotent completion of triangulated categories// Journal of Algebra 236, no. 2 (2001), 819-834.
- [BBD82] Beilinson A., Bernstein J., Deligne P., Faisceaux pervers// Asterisque 100, 1982, 5–171.
- [Bon09] Bondarko M.V., Differential graded motives: weight complex, weight filtrations and spectral sequences for realizations; Voevodsky vs. Hanamura// J. of the Inst. of Math. of Jussieu, v.8, 2009, no. 1, 39–97, see also <http://arxiv.org/abs/math.AG/0601713>
- [Bon10a] Bondarko M.V., Weight structures vs. t -structures; weight filtrations, spectral sequences, and complexes (for motives and in general)// J. of K-theory, v. 6, i. 03, p. 387–504, 2010, see also <http://arxiv.org/abs/0704.4003>
- [Bon10b] Bondarko M.V., Motivically functorial coniveau spectral sequences; direct summands of cohomology of function fields// Doc. Math., extra volume: Andrei Suslin’s Sixtieth Birthday (2010), 33–117.
- [Bon11] Bondarko M.V., $\mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$ -motivic resolution of singularities// Compositio Mathematica, vol. 147, is. 5, 2011, 1434–1446.
- [Bon12] Bondarko M.V., Weight structures and ‘weights’ on the hearts of t -structures// Homology, Homotopy and Applications, vol. 14, 2012, No. 1, 239–261.
- [Bon13a] Bondarko M.V., Weights for Voevodsky’s motives over a base; relation with mixed complexes of sheaves, Int. Math. Res. Notes (2013), doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnt088, <http://imrn.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2013/05/17/imrn.rnt088.short>, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1304.6059>
- [Bon13b] Bondarko M.V., Gersten weight structures for motivic homotopy categories; direct summands of cohomology of function fields and coniveau spectral sequences, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.7493>
- [Coh85] Cohn P.M., Free rings and their relations, second edition, Academic Press, London & New York, 1985. xxii + 588 pp.
- [CiD09] Cisinski D.-C., Déglise F., Triangulated categories of mixed motives, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.2110>

- [Cis10] Cisinski D.-C., the answer <http://mathoverflow.net/questions/44047/localizing-a>
- [Dwy06] Dwyer W.G., Noncommutative localization in homotopy theory, in: Non-commutative localization in algebra and topology, 24–39, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., 330, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [For02] Fornasiero M., Projective Version of Malcolmson’s Criterion// Ann. Univ. Ferrara, Sci. Mat., vol. 48 (2002), iss. 1, pp. 119–131.
- [GaZ67] Gabriel P., Zisman M., Calculus of fractions and homotopy theory. Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete, Band 35. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., New York, 1967.
- [Ger82] Gerasimov V.N., Localization in associative rings (Russian)// Siberian Math. Zh. 23–6 (1982), 36–54.
- [Heb11] Hébert D., Structures de poids à la Bondarko sur les motifs de Beilinson// Compositio Mathematica, vol. 147, is. 5, 2011, 1447–1462.
- [Ivo07] Ivorra F. Réalisation l-adique des motifs triangulés géométriques. I// Doc. Math. 12 (2007), 607–671.
- [Kah12] Kahn B., personal communication, 2012–2013.
- [KaS02] Kahn B., Sujatha R., Birational motives, I, preprint, <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/K-theory/0596/>
- [KaS08] Kahn B., Sujatha R. (with appendices by Jean-Louis Colliot-Thélène and Ofer Gabber), Birational geometry and localization of categories, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/pdf/0805.3753.pdf>
- [KaS09] Kahn B., Sujatha R., Birational motives, I: pure birational motives, preprint, <http://arxiv.org/abs/0902.4902>
- [Mal82] Malcolmson P., Construction of universal matrix localizations, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 951 (1982), 117–132.
- [Nee01] Neeman A. Triangulated Categories. Annals of Mathematics Studies 148 (2001), Princeton University Press, viii+449 pp.
- [NeR04] Neeman A., Ranicki A., Noncommutative localisation in algebraic K-theory I// Geometry & Topology, vol. 8, 2004, 1385–1425.

- [Pau08] Pauksztello D., Compact cochain objects in triangulated categories and co-t-structures// Central European Journal of Mathematics, vol. 6, n. 1, 2008, 25–42.
- [Pos11] Positselski L., Mixed Artin-Tate motives with finite coefficients// Mosc. Math. J., vol. 11, is. 2, 2011, 317–402.
- [Sch85] Schofield A. H., Representation of rings over skew fields. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 92. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1985. xii+223 pp.
- [Voe00] Voevodsky V. Triangulated categories of motives over a field, in: Voevodsky V., Suslin A., and Friedlander E., Cycles, transfers and motivic homology theories, Annals of Mathematical studies, vol. 143, Princeton University Press, 2000, 188–238.
- [Wil09] Wildeshaus J., Chow motives without projectivity// Compositio Mathematica, v. 145(5), 2009, 1196–1226.