

SUPPORT τ_2 -TILTING AND 2-TORSION PAIRS

JORDAN MCMAHON

ABSTRACT. The theory of τ -tilting was introduced by Adachi–Iyama–Reiten; one of the main results is a bijection between support τ -tilting modules and torsion classes. We are able to generalise this result in the context of the higher Auslander–Reiten theory of Iyama. For a finite-dimensional algebra A with 2-cluster-tilting subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$, we are able to find a correspondence between support τ_2 -tilting A -modules and torsion pairs in \mathcal{C} satisfying an additional functorial finiteness condition.

1. INTRODUCTION

Support-tilting modules were first studied by Ringel [31] and connected to torsion classes and cluster algebras by Ingalls–Thomas [14]. Since support-tilting modules are able to capture the behaviour of clusters, this led to further study. Significantly, Adachi, Iyama and Reiten [1] introduced support τ -tilting modules, and were able to find a bijection, for an finite-dimensional algebra A , between support τ -tilting A -modules and functorially-finite torsion classes in $\text{mod}A$. See also [18] for a survey of τ -tilting theory, which has seen much activity in recent years [4], [8], [9], [17], [19], [28], [29] as well as its generalisations such as in silting theory [2], [3], [7]. A natural question to ask is whether similar results are true in the context of higher Auslander–Reiten theory, as introduced by Iyama in [15], [16], and an active area of research [10], [20], [22], [23], [24], [30]. As the name suggests, higher Auslander–Reiten theory has connections to higher-dimensional geometry and topology [11], [12], [25], [27], [32] and is hence a natural generalisation. The result we find is the following:

Theorem 1.1. *Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra with 2-cluster-tilting subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$. Then there is a correspondence between support τ_2 -tilting A -modules and 2-functorially finite torsion pairs in \mathcal{C} .*

2. BACKGROUND AND NOTATION

Consider a finite-dimensional algebra A over a field K , and fix a positive integer d . We will assume that A is of the form KQ/I , where KQ is the path algebra over some quiver Q and I is an admissible ideal of KQ . An A -module will mean a finitely-generated left A -module; by $\text{mod}A$ we denote the category of A -modules. The functor $D = \text{Hom}_K(-, K)$ defines a duality. Let $\text{add}M$ be the full subcategory of $\text{mod}A$ composed of all A -modules isomorphic to direct summands of finite direct

sums of copies of M . For an A -module M , the right annihilator of M is the two-sided ideal $\text{ann}M := \{a \in A \mid aM = 0\}$; for a class of modules \mathcal{X} we set $\text{ann}\mathcal{X} := \{a \in A \mid aX = 0 \forall X \in \mathcal{X}\}$. For an A -module M , define $\text{Sub}M := \{N \in \text{mod}A \mid \exists \text{ injection } N \hookrightarrow M\}$; for a class of modules \mathcal{X} we set $\text{Sub}\mathcal{X} := \{N \in \mathcal{X} \mid \exists X \in \mathcal{X}, \text{ injection } N \hookrightarrow X\}$. Define $\text{Fac}M$ and $\text{Fac}\mathcal{X}$ dually.

2.1. Higher cluster-tilting subcategories. Define $\tau_d := \tau\Omega^{d-1}$ to be the *d-Auslander-Reiten translation* and $\tau_d^- := \tau^-\Omega^{-(d-1)}$ to be the *inverse d-Auslander-Reiten translation*. A subcategory \mathcal{C} of $\text{mod}A$ is *precovering* or *contravariantly finite* if for any $M \in \text{mod}A$ there is an object $C_M \in \mathcal{C}$ and a morphism $f : C_M \rightarrow M$ such that $\text{Hom}(C, -)$ is exact on the sequence

$$C_M \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

for all $C \in \mathcal{C}$. The module C_M is said to be a *right \mathcal{C} -approximation*. The dual notion of precovering is *preenveloping* or *covariantly finite*. A subcategory \mathcal{C} that is both precovering and preenveloping is called *functorially finite*.

Definition 2.1. [16, Definition 2.2] For a finite-dimensional algebra A , a subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}(A)$ is a *d-cluster-tilting subcategory* if it satisfies the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &= \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Ext}_A^i(M, X) = 0 \forall 0 < i < d\}. \\ \mathcal{C} &= \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Ext}_A^i(X, M) = 0 \forall 0 < i < d\}. \end{aligned}$$

A *right \mathcal{C} -resolution* is a sequence

$$\cdots \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0$$

with $C_i \in \mathcal{C}$ for each i , and which becomes exact under $\text{Hom}_A(C, -)$ for each $C \in \mathcal{C}$. Define a *left \mathcal{C} -resolution* dually.

Theorem 2.2. [16, Theorem 3.6.1] *Let $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$ be a d-cluster-tilting subcategory. Then*

(1) *Any $M \in \text{mod}A$ has a right \mathcal{C} -resolution*

$$0 \longrightarrow C_{d-1} \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow C_0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow 0.$$

(2) *Any $M \in \text{mod}A$ has a left \mathcal{C} -resolution*

$$0 \longrightarrow M \longrightarrow C_0 \longrightarrow C_1 \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow C_{d-1} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Recall the stable module category $\underline{\text{mod}}A$ is full subcategory of $\text{mod}A$ obtained by factoring out all morphisms that factor through a projective module.

Theorem 2.3. [16, Theorem 1.5] *Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra. Then:*

- *If $\text{Ext}_A^i(M, A) = 0$ for all $0 < i < d$, then $\text{Ext}_A^i(M, N) \cong D\text{Ext}_A^{d-i}(N, \tau_d M)$ and $\underline{\text{Hom}}_A(M, N) \cong D\text{Ext}_A^d(N, \tau_d M)$ for all $M \in \text{mod}A$ and all $0 < i < d$.*

- If $\text{Ext}_A^i(DA, N) = 0$ for all $0 < i < d$, then $\text{Ext}_A^i(M, N) \cong \text{DExt}_A^{d-i}(\tau_d^- N, M)$ and $\underline{\text{Hom}}_A(M, N) \cong \text{DExt}_A^d(\tau_d^- N, M)$ for all $N \in \text{mod}A$ for all $0 < i < d$.

We may now generalise a result of Auslander–Smalø, the proof of which is unchanged apart from indices.

Proposition 2.4 (c.f. Proposition 5.8 of [6]). *Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra. Then for $X, Y \in \text{mod}A$ the following are equivalent:*

- (i) $\text{Hom}_A(\tau_2^- Y, X) = 0$.
- (ii) $\underline{\text{Hom}}_A(\tau_2^- Y, \text{Sub}X) = 0$.
- (iii) $\text{Ext}_A^2(\text{Sub}X, Y) = 0$.

Proof. Firstly, statements (ii) and (iii) are equivalent by Theorem 2.3 and statement (i) trivially implies (ii). It remains to show (ii) implies (i); we prove by contradiction. So suppose there is a morphism $f : \tau_2^- Y \rightarrow X$ is a non-zero morphism with image $\text{Im}f \in \text{Sub}X$, and such that the induced morphism $f' : \tau_2^- Y \rightarrow \text{Im}f$ factors through a projective module P . Since f' is surjective, we may assume P is the projective cover of $\text{Im}f$. Let $g : \tau_2^- M \rightarrow P$ be any morphism; since $\tau_2^- Y$ has no non-trivial projective summands, we have $g(\tau_2^- M) \subset \text{rad}P$, hence any composition $\tau_2^- Y \rightarrow P \rightarrow \text{Im}f$ is not an epimorphism. Therefore the image of f' in $\underline{\text{Hom}}_A(\tau_2^- Y, \text{Im}f) = 0$ is not zero. Hence $\text{Hom}_A(\tau_2^- Y, X) = 0$ if and only if $\underline{\text{Hom}}_A(\tau_2^- Y, \text{Sub}X) = 0$. \square

Key homological tools for higher cluster-tilting categories are d -pushouts and d -pullbacks, constructed as follows.

Proposition 2.5. [21, Proposition 3.8] *Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$. For any d -exact sequence in \mathcal{C}*

$$0 \rightarrow Y_0 \rightarrow Y_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow Y_{d+1} \rightarrow 0$$

and any morphism $f : X_{d+1} \rightarrow Y_{d+1}$ there exists a commutative diagram in \mathcal{C} :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & Y_0 & \longrightarrow & X_1 & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & X_d & \longrightarrow & X_{d+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow f & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & Y_0 & \longrightarrow & Y_1 & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \longrightarrow & Y_d & \longrightarrow & Y_{d+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

such that there is an induced d -exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_2 \oplus Y_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_{d+1} \oplus Y_d \rightarrow Y_{d+1} \rightarrow 0$$

The construction of this commutative diagram is obtained inductively as follows: X_d is defined to be the right \mathcal{C} -approximation of the pullback of $((X_{d+1} \oplus Y_d) \rightarrow Y_{d+1})$. Subsequently X_{d-1} is defined to be the right \mathcal{C} -approximation of the pullback of $((X_d \oplus Y_{d-1}) \rightarrow Y_d)$. This continues until $X_0 = Y_0$ is reached.

Remark 2.6. In this setting, it is actually immaterial whether Y_{d+1} is in \mathcal{C} or not: Theorem 2.2 ensures that the so-called d -kernel of the morphism $(X_{d+1} \oplus Y_d) \rightarrow Y_{d+1}$ exists. Equally, it is not important whether $Y_0 \in \mathcal{C}$.

A technical result is the following:

Lemma 2.7. *Consider a module $X \in \mathcal{C}$ and two d -exact sequences:*

$$0 \rightarrow L \rightarrow M \rightarrow N \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow L' \rightarrow M' \rightarrow N' \rightarrow X \rightarrow 0.$$

Then there exist $P, Q \in \mathcal{C}$ with no common non-zero summands and a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & & & & 0 & & 0 \\
 & & & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & & & & L & \xlongequal{\quad} & L \\
 & & & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 & & & Q & \longrightarrow & Q \oplus M & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & L' & \longrightarrow & Q \oplus M' & \longrightarrow & P & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & L' & \longrightarrow & M' & \longrightarrow & N' & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & &
 \end{array}$$

Proof. Just as in the above method for d -pullbacks, we may form the following commutative diagram with exact rows and columns by taking the appropriate

right \mathcal{C} -approximations of pullbacks: P, Q, R, S

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & & L & \xlongequal{\quad} & L & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & Q & \longrightarrow & S & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & L' & \longrightarrow & R & \longrightarrow & P & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & L' & \longrightarrow & M' & \longrightarrow & N' & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 & & 0 & &
 \end{array}$$

It suffices to show the surjection $R \twoheadrightarrow M'$ is split (by symmetry, also $S \twoheadrightarrow M$ splits). By the pullback property of P , we find $M' \rightarrow N'$ factors through P . But the pullback property of R then implies both $M' \rightarrow P$ factors through R and that $M' \rightarrow R \rightarrow M' \cong \text{id}$. Hence $R \cong M' \oplus Q$.

Finally, suppose P and Q have a common summand Y . Then any morphism $Y \rightarrow N'$ must factor through M' . But as above, $M' \rightarrow N'$ factors through P . Hence Y must be a summand of M' . This is a contradiction, since M' is already included a summand of $Q \oplus M'$, and hence cannot be a summand of Q . This finishes the proof. \square

A second technical result will prove similarly useful.

Lemma 2.8. *In the setting of Lemma 2.7, in case there exists $P' \in \mathcal{C}$ such that $P \cong P' \oplus M'$, then there is a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns*

contradiction. This is illustrated below:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 M & \xrightarrow{f} & X_0 & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } f \\
 \downarrow g & \swarrow & \downarrow & & \parallel \\
 X'_1 & \longrightarrow & X'_0 & \longrightarrow & \text{coker } f
 \end{array}$$

□

Recall that for a finite-dimensional algebra A , then a *torsion pair* in $\text{mod}A$ consists of two subcategories $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ such that

- $\text{Hom}_A(T, F) = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}, F \in \mathcal{F}$.
- $\mathcal{T} = \{X \in \text{mod}A \mid \text{Hom}_A(X, F) = 0 \forall F \in \mathcal{F}\}$.
- $\mathcal{F} = \{Y \in \text{mod}A \mid \text{Hom}_A(T, Y) = 0 \forall T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

We may now define one of our primary objects of study.

Definition 3.3. A *2-functorially-finite torsion pair* in \mathcal{C} consists of two subcategories $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ each 2-functorially finite in \mathcal{C} and such that

- $\text{Hom}_A(T, F) = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}, F \in \mathcal{F}$.
- $\mathcal{T} = \{X \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Hom}_A(X, F) = 0 \forall F \in \mathcal{F}\}$.
- $\mathcal{F} = \{Y \in \mathcal{C} \mid \text{Hom}_A(T, Y) = 0 \forall T \in \mathcal{T}\}$.

For a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in \mathcal{C} , we say \mathcal{T} is a *torsion class* and \mathcal{F} a *torsion-free class*.

Lemma 3.4. For any 2-functorially-finite torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in \mathcal{C} then $(\text{Fac}\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}\mathcal{F})$ is a torsion pair in $\text{mod}A$.

Proof. Suppose $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in \mathcal{C} . Clearly any $X \in \text{mod}A$ satisfies that $\text{Hom}_A(\text{Fac}\mathcal{T}, X) = 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, X) = 0$. Let $f : X \rightarrow C_X$ be a left \mathcal{C} -approximation of X , moreover f must be injective. So $\text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, X) = 0$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, C_X) = 0$ and hence whenever $C_X \in \mathcal{F}$ and $X \in \text{Sub}\mathcal{F}$. The result follows. □

Proposition 3.5. Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$ a 2-cluster-tilting subcategory. Let $\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$ be 2-functorially-finite subcategories in \mathcal{C} . The following are equivalent.

- (i) $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ is a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in \mathcal{C} .
- (ii) For every $M \in \mathcal{C}$ there is an exact sequence

$$T_M \rightarrow M \rightarrow F_M$$

such that $M \rightarrow F_M$ is a left \mathcal{F} -approximation and $T_M \rightarrow M$ is a right \mathcal{T} -approximation.

Proof. (i) \implies (ii): Given $M \in \mathcal{C}$, and a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{F})$ in \mathcal{C} , it follows from Lemma 3.4 that $(\text{Fac}\mathcal{T}, \text{Sub}\mathcal{F})$ is a torsion pair in $\text{mod}A$. A classical property of torsion pairs (see for example [5, Proposition V1.1.5]) there

is an exact sequence in $\text{mod}A$: $0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow M \rightarrow F \rightarrow 0$ for some $T \in \text{Fac}\mathcal{T}$ and $F \in \text{Sub}\mathcal{F}$. By taking appropriate approximations we obtain the result.

(ii) \implies (i) This is trivial. \square

We may characterise torsion classes in \mathcal{C} .

Proposition 3.6. *For a 2-functorially-finite subcategory $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{C}$, the following are equivalent:*

(i) *There is an inclusion $(\text{Fac}\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{C}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}$ and for every d -exact sequence in \mathcal{C} with $T_0, T_3 \in \mathcal{T}$:*

$$0 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow 0$$

there exists a d -pushout diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T'_0 & \longrightarrow & T'_1 & \longrightarrow & T'_2 & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

such that $T'_0, T'_1, T'_2 \in \mathcal{T}$.

(ii) *\mathcal{T} is the torsion part of a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. (i) \implies (ii) For an arbitrary $M \in \mathcal{C}$, let $g : T_M \rightarrow M$ be a right \mathcal{T} -approximation. By Proposition 3.5 it suffices to show that $\text{Hom}_A(\mathcal{T}, \text{coker}g) = 0$. So assume there exists a morphism $T_3 \rightarrow \text{coker}g$ for some $T_3 \in \mathcal{T}$. Then there exist $X, Y \in \mathcal{C}$ and a pullback diagram by Remark 2.6

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_M & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & \text{coker}g & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

By assumption there exist some $T'_0, T'_1, T'_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ making the following diagram commute:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & T'_0 & \longrightarrow & T'_1 & \longrightarrow & T'_2 & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_M & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & \text{coker}g & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Since the composition $T'_2 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow \text{coker}g$ is non-zero there exists a non-zero morphism $T'_2 \rightarrow M$, which by assumption factors through T_M . But this implies the above non-zero morphism $T'_2 \rightarrow \text{coker}g$ factors through $T_M \rightarrow M \rightarrow \text{coker}g$, a contradiction.

- (2) $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, T) = 0$ for all $0 < i \leq d$.
(3) there exists an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_d \rightarrow 0$$

where $T_0, \dots, T_d \in \text{add}T$.

We may now define the latter of our primary objects of study.

Definition 3.7. An object $T \in \mathcal{C}$ is τ_2 -tilting if

- $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T) = 0$
- There exists an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$$

such that $T_0, T_1, T_2 \in \text{add}T$.

If T is τ_2 -tilting as an $A/\langle e \rangle$ -module for some idempotent e , then we say that T is *support τ_2 -tilting*.

We now show that support τ_2 -tilting modules are indeed 2-tilting. Recall that an A -module T is *faithful* if its right annihilator $\text{ann}T$ vanishes.

Lemma 3.8 (c.f. Lemma IV.2.7 of [5]; c.f. Lemma VII.5.1 of [5]; c.f. Proposition 2.2(b) of [1]). *Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra with 2-cluster-tilting subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{mod}A$. Then*

- (i) *For any $T \in \mathcal{C}$, $\text{proj.dim}T \leq 2$ if and only if $\text{Hom}_A(DA, \tau_2 T) = 0$.*
- (ii) *Let $T \in \mathcal{C}$ be a faithful A -module. If $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T) = 0$, then $\text{proj.dim}T \leq 2$.*
- (iii) *Any τ_2 -tilting A -module T is a tilting $(A/\text{ann}T)$ -module.*

Proof. (i): Apply the left exact functor $\nu^{-1} = \text{Hom}_A(DA, -)$ to the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \tau_2 M \rightarrow \nu P_2 \rightarrow \nu P_1 \rightarrow \nu P_0 \rightarrow \nu M \rightarrow 0$$

to obtain an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \nu^{-1} \tau_2 M \rightarrow \nu^{-1} \nu P_2 \rightarrow \nu^{-1} \nu P_1 \rightarrow \nu^{-1} \nu P_0 \rightarrow \nu^{-1} \nu M \rightarrow 0$$

It follows that $\text{Hom}_A(DA, \tau_2 M) = \nu^{-1} \tau_2 M$ vanishes if and only if $\text{proj.dim}M \leq 2$.

(ii): It is known (see [5, V1.2.2]) that an A -module T is faithful if and only if DA is generated by T . So let $T^i \rightarrow DA$ be a surjection. Applying the functor $\text{Hom}_A(-, \tau_2 T)$ results in a monomorphism $\text{Hom}_A(DA, \tau_2 T) \hookrightarrow \text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T)$. The result now follows from part (i) above.

(iii) Note that for any idempotent ideal $\langle e \rangle$ of A , and any $M, N \in \text{mod}A$ there is a natural inclusion $\text{Ext}_{A/\langle e \rangle}^2(M, N) \hookrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(M, N)$. In this case let $\langle e \rangle := \text{ann}T$. Since $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T) = 0$, Proposition 2.4 implies $\text{Ext}_A^2(T, \text{Fac}T) = 0$, and it follows that $\text{Ext}_{A/\langle e \rangle}^2(T, \text{Fac}T) = 0$. By Proposition 2.4 once more, we have $\text{Hom}_{A/\langle e \rangle}(T, \tau_2 T) = 0$. Since T is faithful as an $(A/\text{ann}T)$ -module, it follows from part (ii) that $\text{proj.dim}T \leq d$ and that T is 2-tilting as an $(A/\text{ann}T)$ -module. \square

Lemma 3.9 (Happel [13]). *Let A be a finite-dimensional algebra and T be a d -tilting A -module. Assume that $M \in \text{mod}(A)$ satisfies $\text{Ext}_A^i(T, M) = 0$ for all $i > 0$. Then there exists an exact sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow T_m \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0$$

such that $T_j \in \text{add}(T)$ for all $0 \leq j \leq m$ and $m \leq \text{gl.dim} A$.

We may now prove our main result.

Theorem 1.1. *An object $T \in \mathcal{C}$ is a support τ_2 -tilting module if and only if $\text{Fac}\mathcal{T} \cap \mathcal{C}$ is the torsion part of a 2-functorially-finite torsion pair in \mathcal{C} .*

Proof. Let \mathcal{T} be a torsion class in \mathcal{C} , then by 2-functorial finiteness and closure under factor modules, there exists an exact sequence $A \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow T_1 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$ such that $f : A \rightarrow T_0$ is a left \mathcal{T} -approximation and $T_1, T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$. Clearly $\text{Im} f \cong A/\text{Ann}\mathcal{T}$.

Now we need to prove that T_i are Ext-projective in \mathcal{T} for all $0 \leq i \leq 2$, i.e. that $\text{Ext}_A^2(T_i, T) = 0$ for all $T \in \mathcal{T}$. First suppose $\text{Ext}_A^2(T_0, T) \neq 0$. Then by Proposition 3.6 there exists some $T'_0 \in \mathcal{T}$ and a non-split surjection $T'_0 \twoheadrightarrow T_0$. But then f must factor through T'_0 , a contradiction.

We next claim that there is a surjection $\text{Ext}_A^2(T_2, T) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(T_1, T)$ for any $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Let $X := \text{Im}(T_0 \rightarrow T_1)$. This induces exact sequences

$$\text{Ext}_A^2(T_2, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(T_1, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(X, T)$$

$$\text{Ext}_A^1(A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T}, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(X, T) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(T_0, T) = 0.$$

Suppose $\text{Ext}_A^1(A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T}, T) \neq 0$ and there exists a short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow T \rightarrow E \rightarrow A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T} \rightarrow 0.$$

But then E must be an $A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T}$ -module, since both T and $A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T}$ are, meaning that this sequence splits, a contradiction. So $\text{Ext}_A^1(A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T}, T) = 0 = \text{Ext}_A^2(X, T)$, and there is a surjection $\text{Ext}_A^2(T_2, T) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Ext}_A^2(T_1, T)$ as claimed.

Now suppose $\text{Ext}_A^2(T_2, T') \neq 0$ for some $T' \in \mathcal{T}$. By Proposition 3.6 there exists $T'_0, T'_1, T'_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ and a d -exact sequence $0 \rightarrow T'_0 \rightarrow T'_1 \rightarrow T'_2 \rightarrow T_2 \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma

2.7 there exist $P, Q \in \mathcal{C}$ and a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
 & & & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & & A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T} & \equiv & A/\text{ann}\mathcal{T} & & \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & Q & \longrightarrow & Q \oplus T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \\
 & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & T'_0 & \longrightarrow & Q \oplus T'_1 & \longrightarrow & P & \longrightarrow & T_1 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & T'_0 & \longrightarrow & T'_1 & \longrightarrow & T'_2 & \longrightarrow & T_2 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & & & 0 & & 0 & & & &
 \end{array}$$

Moreover $P, Q \in \mathcal{T}$ by assumption, since they have no common non-zero summands and we may replace T'_0 if necessary. This implies a morphism $A \rightarrow Q$, which by assumption factors through T_0 . But this implies the morphism $T_0 \rightarrow T_1$ also factors through Q , and is hence the zero composition $Q \rightarrow P \rightarrow T_1$, a contradiction.

On the other hand, let T be a support τ_2 -tilting module. We show that $\text{Fac}T \cap \mathcal{C}$ satisfies the conditions of Proposition 3.6. Closure under factor modules is trivial, and 2-functorial finiteness in \mathcal{C} follows from Lemma 3.9. So let

$$0 \rightarrow T_0 \rightarrow X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow 0$$

be a d -exact sequence in \mathcal{C} with $T_0, T_3 \in \text{Fac}T$. By Lemma 2.4, we have that $\text{Hom}_A(T, \tau_2 T) = 0 \iff \text{Ext}_A^2(T, \text{Fac}T) = 0$, so T_3 is not in $\text{add}T$. Lemma 3.9 implies there exists an exact sequence in $\text{Fac}T$: $0 \rightarrow T'_0 \rightarrow T'_1 \rightarrow T'_2 \rightarrow T_3 \rightarrow 0$. By Lemma 2.7 there exist $P, Q \in \mathcal{C}$ to form a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & & & 0 & & 0 \\
& & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & & & T'_0 & \xlongequal{\quad} & T'_0 \\
& & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
& & & Q & \longrightarrow & Q \oplus T'_1 & \longrightarrow & T'_1 \\
& & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & Q \oplus X & \longrightarrow & P & \longrightarrow & T'_2 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & & & & & 0 & & 0 & &
\end{array}$$

Applying Lemma 2.4 once more, we find $\text{Ext}_A^2(T'_2, T_0) = 0$. This implies the diagram splits, $Q \cong T_0$, $P \cong T'_2 \oplus X$ and that we are in the situation of Lemma 2.8, with a commutative diagram with exact rows and columns:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& & & 0 & & 0 & \\
& & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
& & 0 & \longrightarrow & T'_0 & \longrightarrow & T'_1 \\
& & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \searrow \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & T'_2 & \longrightarrow & T'_2 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
& & & & & & 0 & & & &
\end{array}$$

Hence we find the required d -pushout diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 \oplus T'_0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 \oplus T'_1 & \longrightarrow & T'_2 & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & T_0 & \longrightarrow & X & \longrightarrow & Y & \longrightarrow & T_3 & \longrightarrow & 0
\end{array}$$

since we know $0 \rightarrow T'_0 \rightarrow T_0 \oplus T'_1 \rightarrow X \oplus T'_2 \rightarrow Y \rightarrow 0$ is exact. \square

REFERENCES

1. Takahide Adachi, Osamu Iyama, and Idun Reiten, τ -tilting theory, *Compos. Math.* **150** (2014), no. 3, 415–452. MR 3187626
2. Lidia Angeleri Hügel, Frederik Marks, and Jorge Vitória, *Silting modules and ring epimorphisms*, *Advances in Mathematics* **303** (2016), 1044–1076.
3. Lidia Angeleri Hügel, *Silting objects*, *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* **51** (2019), no. 4, 658–690.
4. Sota Asai, *Semibricks*, *International Mathematics Research Notices* **2020** (2020), no. 16, 4993–5054.
5. Ibrahim Assem, Daniel Simson, and Andrzej Skowroński, *Elements of the representation theory of associative algebras. Vol. 1*, London Mathematical Society Student Texts, vol. 65, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006, Techniques of representation theory. MR 2197389
6. Ibrahim Assem and Andrzej Skowroński, *Iterated tilted algebras of type \tilde{A}_n* , *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **195** (1987), no. 2, 269–290.
7. Karin Baur and Rosanna Laking, *Classification of cosilting modules in type \tilde{A}* , arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.02495 (2019).
8. Thomas Brüstle, David Smith, and Hipolito Treffinger, *Wall and chamber structure for finite-dimensional algebras*, *Advances in Mathematics* **354** (2019), 106746.
9. Aslak Bakke Buan and Bethany Marsh, *A category of wide subcategories*, *International Mathematics Research Notices* (2019).
10. Erik Darpö and Osamu Iyama, *d-representation-finite self-injective algebras*, *Advances in Mathematics* **362** (2020), 106932.
11. Tobias Dyckerhoff, Gustavo Jasso, and Yanki Lekili, *The symplectic geometry of higher Auslander algebras: Symmetric products of disks*, *Forum of Mathematics, Sigma*, vol. 9, Cambridge University Press, 2021.
12. Tobias Dyckerhoff, Gustavo Jasso, and Tashi Walde, *Simplicial structures in higher Auslander–Reiten theory*, *Advances in Mathematics* **355** (2019), 106762.
13. Dieter Happel, *Triangulated categories in the representation theory of finite-dimensional algebras*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 119, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1988. MR 935124
14. Colin Ingalls and Hugh Thomas, *Noncrossing partitions and representations of quivers*, *Compos. Math.* **145** (2009), no. 6, 1533–1562. MR 2575093
15. Osamu Iyama, *Auslander correspondence*, *Adv. Math.* **210** (2007), no. 1, 51–82. MR 2298820
16. ———, *Higher-dimensional Auslander–Reiten theory on maximal orthogonal subcategories*, *Adv. Math.* **210** (2007), no. 1, 22–50. MR 2298819
17. Osamu Iyama, Nathan Reading, Idun Reiten, and Hugh Thomas, *Lattice structure of Weyl groups via representation theory of preprojective algebras*, *Compos. Math.* **154** (2018), no. 6, 1269–1305. MR 3826458
18. Osamu Iyama and Idun Reiten, *Introduction to τ -tilting theory*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* **111** (2014), no. 27, 9704–9711. MR 3263302
19. Osamu Iyama, Idun Reiten, Hugh Thomas, and Gordana Todorov, *Lattice structure of torsion classes for path algebras*, *Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society* **47** (2015), no. 4, 639–650.
20. Osamu Iyama and Øyvind Solberg, *Auslander–Gorenstein algebras and precluster tilting*, *Adv. Math.* **326** (2018), 200–240. MR 3758429
21. Gustavo Jasso, *n-abelian and n-exact categories*, *Math. Z.* **283** (2016), no. 3-4, 703–759. MR 3519980

22. Gustavo Jasso, Julian Külshammer, Chrysostomos Psaroudakis, and Sondre Kvamme, *Higher Nakayama algebras I: Construction*, Adv. Math. **351** (2019), 1139–1200. MR 3959141
23. Sondre Kvamme, *$d\mathbb{Z}$ -cluster tilting subcategories of singularity categories*, Mathematische Zeitschrift (2020), 1–23.
24. Jordan McMahon, *Fabric idempotents and higher Auslander-Reiten theory*, Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra **224** (2020), no. 8, 106343.
25. Jordan McMahon and Nicholas J. Williams, *The combinatorics of tensor products of higher Auslander algebras of type A*, Glasgow Mathematical Journal (2020), 1–21.
26. Yoichi Miyashita, *Tilting modules of finite projective dimension*, Mathematische Zeitschrift **193** (1986), no. 1, 113–146.
27. Steffen Oppermann and Hugh Thomas, *Higher-dimensional cluster combinatorics and representation theory*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **14** (2012), no. 6, 1679–1737. MR 2984586
28. Arnau Padrol, Yann Palu, Vincent Pilaud, and Pierre-Guy Plamondon, *Associahedra for finite type cluster algebras and minimal relations between g -vectors*, arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.06861 (2019).
29. Pierre-Guy Plamondon, *τ -tilting finite gentle algebras are representation-finite*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **302** (2019), no. 2, 709–716.
30. Matthew Pressland and Julia Sauter, *Special tilting modules for algebras with positive dominant dimension*, Glasgow Mathematical Journal (2020), 1–27.
31. Claus Michael Ringel, *Appendix: Some remarks concerning tilting modules and tilted algebras. Origin. Relevance. Future*, Handbook of tilting theory, London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser., vol. 332, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2007, pp. 413–472. MR 2384619
32. Nicholas J Williams, *New interpretations of the higher Stasheff–Tamari orders*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.12664 (2020).

UNAFFILIATED

Email address: jordanmcmahon37@gmail.com