

## BALANCED SYSTEMS FOR HOM

VÍCTOR BECERRIL, OCTAVIO MENDOZA, AND MARCO A. PÉREZ

**ABSTRACT.** From the notion of (co)generator in relative homological algebra, we present the concept of finite balanced system  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  as a tool to induce balanced pairs  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  for the Hom functor with domain determined by the finiteness of homological dimensions relative to  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ .

This approach to balance will cover several well known ambients where right derived functors of Hom are obtained relative to certain classes of objects in an abelian category, such as Gorenstein projective and injective modules and chain complexes, Gorenstein modules relative to Auslander and Bass classes, among others.

### INTRODUCTION

It has been proved by Enochs and Jenda [8, Thm. 12.1.4] that if  $R$  is an Iwanaga-Gorenstein ring, then the functor  $\text{Hom}_R(-, -)$  is balanced over  $\text{Mod}(R) \times \text{Mod}(R)$  by the product category  $\mathcal{GP}(R) \times \mathcal{GI}(R)$ , where  $\mathcal{GP}(R)$  and  $\mathcal{GI}(R)$  denote the classes of Gorenstein projective and Gorenstein injective  $R$ -modules. This result was later generalized by Holm in [12, Thm. 3.6] for arbitrary rings, in the sense that the functor  $\text{Hom}_R(-, -)$  is balanced by  $\mathcal{GP}(R) \times \mathcal{GI}(R)$  over  $\mathcal{GP}(R)^\wedge \times \mathcal{GI}(R)^\vee$ , the product of the classes of  $R$ -modules with finite Gorenstein projective and Gorenstein injective dimensions, respectively. Concerning this and other situations of balance for the Hom functor in relative Gorenstein homological algebra, the concept of balanced pair proposed by Chen in [5] has turned out to be unifying, in the sense that it encodes sufficient conditions to obtain balance for  $\text{Hom}(-, -)$  over a domain restricted by such pairs.

The main aim of the present paper is to present in relative homological algebra a general framework within which all of the previously developed theories (and some other new) of balanced for Hom and its derived functors are contained as particular cases. This will be possible via the new concept of finite balanced system: an interplay between four classes  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\omega$  and  $\nu$  of objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  which comprises sufficient conditions so that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a balanced pair, in the sense of [5], with respect to  $(\mathcal{X}^\wedge, \mathcal{Y}^\vee)$ , where  $\mathcal{X}^\wedge$  (resp.  $\mathcal{Y}^\vee$ ) denotes the class of objects with finite left (resp. right) resolution dimension relative to  $\mathcal{X}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{Y}$ ). The classes  $\omega$  and  $\nu$  will act as auxiliary classes for  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , in the sense that every object  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  can be embedded into an object  $W \in \omega$  such that  $W/X \in \mathcal{X}$ , and that for every object  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$  there is an epimorphism  $V \twoheadrightarrow Y$  with kernel in  $\mathcal{Y}$ . In other words,  $\mathcal{Y}$  (resp.  $\mathcal{X}$ ) is equipped with a (co)generating class  $\nu$  (resp.  $\omega$ ). These, along with some other Ext-orthogonality conditions, will allow us to construct relative

---

2020 MSC: Primary: 18G10, 18F20. Secondary: 16E30, 16E65.

Key Words: (finite) balanced systems; balanced pairs; relative Ext-bifunctors.

derived groups  $\text{Ext}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})}^i(M, N)$  for every pair  $(M, N) \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge \times \mathcal{Y}^\vee$ , by either taking a left resolution of  $M$  by objects in  $\mathcal{X}$  which is exact after applying  $\text{Hom}(-, Y)$  for every  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , or taking a right resolution of  $N$  by objects in  $\mathcal{Y}$  which is exact after applying  $\text{Hom}(X, -)$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, the construction of such left and right resolutions comes from Auslander-Buchweitz approximation theory, in which the notions of relative injective cogenerator and relative projective generator are key. Our proposed concept of finite balanced system is motivated by a result of Holm [11] which asserts that the previously mentioned facts hold for the classes  $\mathcal{GP}(R)$  and  $\mathcal{GI}(R)$ . Notice that in that particular case, the class  $\mathcal{I}(R)$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}(R)$ ) of injective (resp. projective)  $R$ -modules acts as a (co)generating class for  $\mathcal{GI}(R)$  (resp. for  $\mathcal{GP}(R)$ ).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 1 we recall some preliminary notions from relative homological algebra which are important in the study of balance, such as relative homological dimensions, left and right approximations, cotorsion pairs and relative (co)generators. Section 2 is devoted to recall the concepts of proper resolutions and relative derived functors of  $\text{Hom}$ , along with some of their properties, within a very general framework. The main results are presented in Section 3. First, we present in Definition 3.1 the concept of balanced pairs  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  relative to a pair  $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}})$  of classes of objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ . This is a relativization of the original concept proposed by Chen [5]. These pairs are sources for relative derived functors of  $\text{Hom}$  with domain in  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  (see Proposition 3.2). Later, in Definition 3.5 we define balanced systems  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  of pairs of classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  with respect to a couple  $[(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}''); (\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}')]$ . These collect sufficient conditions for  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  to be an admissible balanced pair relative to  $(\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}''), \bar{\mathbf{R}}^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}'))$  (see Proposition 3.6), where  $\bar{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  is formed by the objects in  $\mathcal{X}$  or those  $M \in \mathcal{X}''$  admitting a proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution with cycles in  $\mathcal{X}'$  (and  $\bar{\mathbf{R}}^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}')$  is defined dually). Later on we shall focus on a particular type of balanced systems called strongly finite (Definition 3.10). These are balanced systems  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  with respect to  $[(\omega^\wedge, \mathcal{X}^\wedge); (\nu^\vee, \mathcal{Y}^\vee)]$ . We give some basic examples and characterizations for this concept, which will help us to construct more elaborated examples and applications in Section 4. We show how to induce a strongly finite balanced system in the category of chain complexes from such a system in the ground abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ . This method will bring to the category of chain complexes over a ring the examples of balance for  $\text{Hom}$  by the classes of Gorenstein (Ding) projective and injective modules. We also recover a result by Sather-Wagstaff, Sharif and White [18] concerning balanced for  $\text{Hom}$  by the classes of  $C$ -Gorenstein projective and  $\text{Hom}(C, D)$ -Gorenstein injective modules over a commutative Cohen-Macaulay ring with a dualizing module  $D$  and a semidualizing module  $C$ . Other situations of balance regarding Gorenstein flat quasi-coherent sheaves and virtually Gorenstein rings are analyzed as well.

## 1. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout,  $\mathcal{A}$  always denotes an abelian category (not necessarily with enough projective or injective objects). Monomorphisms and epimorphisms in  $\mathcal{A}$  may be denoted by  $\rightarrow$  and  $\twoheadrightarrow$ , respectively. Classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  are always assumed to be closed under isomorphisms.

Given two objects  $M, N \in \mathcal{A}$ , the Yoneda abelian group of  $n$ -fold extensions of  $N$  by  $M$  is denoted by  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(M, N)$ . For  $n = 0$ ,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^0(M, N)$  is the abelian group  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$  of morphisms from  $M$  to  $N$ . Given  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  two classes of objects of  $\mathcal{A}$ , the notation  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(\mathcal{X}, N) = 0$  means that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(X, N) = 0$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . The equality  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(M, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$  has a similar meaning. Finally,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$  means that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^n(X, Y) = 0$  for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . In the case  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(M, N) = 0$  for every  $i > n$ , we write  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\geq n+1}(M, N) = 0$ .

**Relative projective and injective dimensions.** Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and  $M \in \mathcal{A}$ . The *projective dimension of  $M$  with respect to  $\mathcal{X}$*  is defined as

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) := \min\{n \geq 0 : \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\geq n+1}(M, \mathcal{X}) = 0\}.$$

The previous includes the case  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \infty$ . Dually, we have the *injective dimension of  $M$  relative to  $\mathcal{X}$* , denote by  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ . Furthermore, for any  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we set

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y) : Y \in \mathcal{Y}\},$$

and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is defined similarly. Moreover, it can be shown that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{X})$ . If  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}$ , we simply write  $\text{pd}(M)$  and  $\text{pd}(\mathcal{Y})$  for the (absolute) projective dimensions of  $M$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and similarly for  $\text{id}(M)$  and  $\text{id}(\mathcal{Y})$ . We denote by

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}) := \{M \in \mathcal{A} : \text{pd}(M) = 0\} \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A}) := \{M \in \mathcal{A} : \text{id}(M) = 0\}$$

the classes of projective and injective objects of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Orthogonal complements.** For each positive integer  $i > 0$  we consider the right orthogonal classes

$$\mathcal{X}^{\perp i} := \{M \in \mathcal{A} : \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(\mathcal{X}, M) = 0\} \text{ and } \mathcal{X}^{\perp} := \bigcap_{i>0} \mathcal{X}^{\perp i}.$$

Dually, we have the left orthogonal classes  ${}^{\perp i}\mathcal{X}$  and  ${}^{\perp}\mathcal{X}$ .

**Relative resolutions.** Given a class  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and an object  $M \in \mathcal{A}$ , a *left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution of  $M$*  is a (not necessarily exact) complex

$$\cdots \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M \rightarrow 0$$

where  $X_k \in \mathcal{X}$  for every  $k \geq 0$ . The truncated complex  $\cdots \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_0$  will be denoted by  $\mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M)$ . The morphism  $\varepsilon$  is called the *augmentation map*. We may sometimes denote left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolutions as  $\varepsilon: \mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M) \rightarrow M$ .

The *left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution dimension of  $M$* , denoted  $\text{l.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ , is defined as the minimum of the set

$$\{n \geq 0 : M \text{ admits an exact left } \mathcal{X}\text{-resolution with } X_k = 0 \text{ for every } k > n\}.$$

This includes the case where  $\text{l.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) = \infty$ . *Right  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolutions* and *right  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution dimensions* of objects, denoted  $\text{r.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M)$ , are defined dually. Given  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we set

$$\text{l.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) := \sup\{\text{l.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(Y) : Y \in \mathcal{Y}\},$$

and  $\text{r.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y})$  is defined dually.

We shall often consider the following classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_n^\wedge &:= \{M \in \mathcal{A} : \text{l.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n\}, & \mathcal{X}^\wedge &:= \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}_n^\wedge, \\ \mathcal{X}_n^\vee &:= \{M \in \mathcal{A} : \text{r.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(M) \leq n\}, & \mathcal{X}^\vee &:= \bigcup_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{X}_n^\vee. \end{aligned}$$

In some references,  $\text{l.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(-)$  and  $\text{r.resdim}_{\mathcal{X}}(-)$  are known as resolution and coresolution dimensions relative to  $\mathcal{X}$ . In our opinion, the terminology of left and right  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution dimensions is more suitable within the context of balanced of functors.

**Approximations.** Given a class  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , a morphism  $f: X \rightarrow M$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  is an  $\mathcal{X}$ -precover of  $M$  if  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X', f): \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X', X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X', M)$  is surjective for every  $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ . Moreover,  $f$  is said to be *special* if  $\text{CoKer}(f) = 0$  and  $\text{Ker}(f) \in \mathcal{X}^{\perp 1}$ . We shall freely make use of the dual notions of  $\mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope and *special  $\mathcal{X}$ -preenvelope*. The class  $\mathcal{X}$  is *precovering* if every object of  $\mathcal{A}$  has a  $\mathcal{X}$ -precover. *Preenveloping*, *special precovering* and *special preenveloping* classes are defined similarly.

**Relative (co)generators.** Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$  be a pair of classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ . We recall that  $\omega$  is a *relative quasi-cogenerator* in  $\mathcal{X}$  if for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  there is a short exact sequence  $X \twoheadrightarrow W \rightarrow X'$  such that  $W \in \omega$  and  $X' \in \mathcal{X}$ . If in addition  $\omega \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ , then  $\omega$  is said to be a *relative cogenerator* in  $\mathcal{X}$ . We also recall [3] that  $\omega$  is a *generator* in  $\mathcal{X}$  if for any  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  there is an epimorphism  $W \twoheadrightarrow X$  with  $W \in \omega$ .<sup>1</sup> Dually, we have the notions of *relative (quasi) generators*. For example, if  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$  denote the classes of projective and injective objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$  (resp.  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A})$ ) is a relative cogenerator (resp. generator) in  $\mathcal{A}$  if, and only if,  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injective (resp. projective) objects.

## 2. RELATIVE EXTENSION FUNCTORS

In this section we recall how to define relative right derived functors from  $\text{Hom}$ . Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a class of objects of  $\mathcal{A}$ . We recall that a chain complex

$$A_\bullet = \cdots \rightarrow A_1 \rightarrow A_0 \rightarrow A_{-1} \rightarrow \cdots$$

in  $\mathcal{A}$  is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic if the induced complex of abelian groups

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, A_\bullet) = \cdots \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, A_1) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, A_0) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X, A_{-1}) \rightarrow \cdots$$

is exact for every  $X \in \mathcal{X}$ . Similarly, we have the concept of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{X})$ -acyclic complexes. This type of acyclicity can be characterized for bounded complexes as shown in Lemma 2.1 below. Given a bounded below complex

$$M_{\bullet \geq -1} \equiv \cdots \rightarrow M_2 \xrightarrow{d_2} M_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} M_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} M_{-1} \rightarrow 0$$

of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ , for each  $i \geq 0$  let  $\mu_i: Z_i(M_\bullet^+) \twoheadrightarrow M_i$  denote the kernel of the differential  $d_i: M_i \rightarrow M_{i-1}$ . Since  $d_{i-1} \circ d_i = 0$ , there exists a unique morphism  $d'_i: M_i \rightarrow Z_{i-1}(M_{\bullet \geq -1})$  such that  $d_i = \mu_{i-1} \circ d'_i$ . By taking  $d'_0 := d_0$  and

<sup>1</sup> Not to be confused with the usual terminology of generator in category theory, where one asks that  $\omega$  is a set and  $X$  is the epimorphic image of a coproduct of objects in  $\omega$ .

$Z_{-1}(M_{\bullet \geq -1}) = M_{-1}$ , we have that the complex  $M_{\bullet \geq -1}$  produces for every  $i \geq 0$  the short complex

$$\eta_i \equiv Z_i(M_{\bullet \geq -1}) \xrightarrow{\mu_i} M_i \xrightarrow{d'_i} Z_{i-1}(M_{\bullet \geq -1}).$$

The statement of the following result comes from the arguments appearing in [5, Proof of Lem. 2.4], and its proof follows by standard arguments.

**Lemma 2.1.** *The complex  $M_{\bullet \geq -1}$  is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic if, and only if, each  $\eta_i$  is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic. Moreover, if any of these conditions holds true and for every  $i \geq -1$  there is an epimorphism  $X_i \rightarrow Z_i(M_{\bullet \geq -1})$  with  $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$ , then  $M_{\bullet \geq -1}$  is exact.*

**Definition 2.2.** *A left (resp. right)  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution is called **proper** if it is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic (resp.,  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{X})$ -acyclic). The classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  admitting a left and a right proper  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution will be denoted by  $\text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\text{RPRes}(\mathcal{X})$ , respectively.*

**Remark 2.3.** *One can use the previous lemma to provide an alternative description of the class  $\text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$  in the case where  $\mathcal{X}$  is a generator in  $\mathcal{A}$ . This description is stated below in terms of relative Gorenstein objects in the sense of [3, Def. 3.1]. Specifically,  $M \in \mathcal{A}$  is **weak  $\mathcal{X}$ -Gorenstein injective** if  $M \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$  and if there exists an exact sequence*

$$\cdots \rightarrow X_1 \rightarrow X_0 \twoheadrightarrow M$$

with  $X_k \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{Ker}(X^{k+1} \rightarrow X^k) \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$  for every  $k \geq 0$ . So if  $\text{WGT}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A})$  denotes the class of weak  $\mathcal{X}$ -Gorenstein injective objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ , then one has that

$$\text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X}) = \text{WGT}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{A}).$$

provided that  $\mathcal{X}$  is a generator in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}) = 0$ . One example of this situation is obtained by setting  $\mathcal{X} = \omega$  satisfying  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\geq 1}(\omega, \omega) = 0$ , where  $\text{WGT}_{\omega}(\mathcal{A})$  coincides with the class of dual Cohen-Macaulay objects relative to  $\omega$  (see [4, pp. 95]).

The following result is basically the one that appears in [8, Lem. 8.2.1], but we have removed the condition that the given class  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  is precovering. Its proof is similar to the mentioned reference and uses Lemma 2.1.

**Lemma 2.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a class of objects closed under finite coproducts, and*

$$\mathbb{M} \equiv 0 \rightarrow M' \xrightarrow{\alpha} M \xrightarrow{\beta} M'' \rightarrow 0$$

be a  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic complex. If  $\varepsilon': \mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M') \rightarrow M'$  and  $\varepsilon'': \mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M'') \rightarrow M''$  are left proper  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolutions, then there is a left proper  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution  $\varepsilon: \mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M) \rightarrow M$  and a degreewise split exact sequence of complexes

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M') \xrightarrow{\bar{\alpha}} \mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M) \xrightarrow{\bar{\beta}} \mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M'') \rightarrow 0$$

such that  $\varepsilon \circ \bar{\alpha}_0 = \alpha \circ \varepsilon'$  and  $\varepsilon'' \circ \bar{\beta}_0 = \beta \circ \varepsilon$ , where  $\bar{\alpha}$  and  $\bar{\beta}$  are the chain maps induced from  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  in the usual way.

In [12, Lem. 1.7] a similar result is stated but with the assumption that the sequence  $\mathbb{M}$  is exact. After a careful revision of this reference, and using Lemma 2.1, one can note that exactness is not needed. Another result from [12] concerning left proper resolutions is the following comparison lemma in the category of left  $R$ -modules, but its proof carries over to any abelian category.

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a class of objects, and  $\varepsilon: \mathcal{X}_\bullet(M) \rightarrow M$  and  $\phi: \mathcal{X}_\bullet(N) \rightarrow N$  be left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolutions of  $M$  and  $N$ , where  $\phi: \mathcal{X}_\bullet(N) \rightarrow N$  is proper. Then, for any morphism  $f: M \rightarrow N$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , there is a chain map  $\overline{f}: \mathcal{X}_\bullet(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_\bullet(N)$  such that  $f \circ \varepsilon = \phi \circ \overline{f}_0$ . Moreover,  $\overline{f}$  is unique up to chain homotopy.*

The previous statement is slightly more general than the one appearing in [12], where the resolutions are assumed to be exact. Actually, for the construction of  $\overline{f}$  and chain homotopies, exactness is not needed but  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclicity.

Having recalled all the previous properties for proper resolutions, one can define left and right derived functors of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, -): \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathbb{Z})$  as follows. Let  $N \in \mathcal{A}$  and  $i \geq 0$ . By [8, Prop. 1.4.13] and Lemma 2.5, it can be shown that there is a well defined (contravariant) functor

$$\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(-, N): \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathbb{Z}),$$

where

$$\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(M, N) := H^i(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M), N)) \text{ for every } M \in \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X}),$$

is the  $i$ -th cohomology group of the complex  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M), N)$ , i.e.  $\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(-, N)$  is the right derived functor of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, N)$ .

The following proposition list several properties of  $\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(-, N)$ . It will be useful to recall a special type of proper resolutions.

**Definition 2.6.** *A proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution  $\varepsilon: \mathcal{X}_\bullet(M) \rightarrow M$  is **admissible** if the sequence*

$$X_1 \rightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{\varepsilon} M \rightarrow 0$$

*is exact. Admissible proper right resolutions are defined dually.*

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $N \in \mathcal{A}$  be an object,  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a class of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ , and*

$$\mathbb{M} \equiv 0 \rightarrow M' \rightarrow M \rightarrow M'' \rightarrow 0$$

*be a complex. The following assertions hold true:*

- (1) *If  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under finite coproducts and  $\mathbb{M}$  is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic with  $M', M'' \in \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$ , then there is a long exact sequence of abelian groups:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(M'', N) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(M, N) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(M', N) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(M'', N) \rightarrow \dots \\ \dots \rightarrow & \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(M'', N) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(M, N) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(M', N) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^{i+1}(M'', N) \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

- (2) *If  $\mathbb{M}$  is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic and  $L \in \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$ , then there is a long exact sequence of abelian groups:*

$$\begin{aligned} & \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(L, M') \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(L, M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(L, M'') \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^1(L, M') \rightarrow \dots \\ \dots \rightarrow & \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(L, M') \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(L, M) \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(L, M'') \rightarrow \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^{i+1}(L, M') \rightarrow \dots \end{aligned}$$

- (3)  $\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{X}, -) = 0$ .

- (4) *If  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$  is a class of objects admitting an admissible proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution, then there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(Z, N) \cong \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z, N)$$

*for every  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ .*

*Proof.* Part (1) follows as in the proof of [8, Thm. 8.2.3], by using Lemma 2.4 (see also [1, Prop. 4.6]). Part (2), on the other hand, follows by [1, Prop. 4.4]. For part (3), it suffices to consider for each  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  the left proper  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution of the form  $\dots \xrightarrow{0} X \xrightarrow{\text{id}} X \xrightarrow{0} X \xrightarrow{\text{id}} X \rightarrow 0$ . Finally, part (4) is straightforward.  $\square$

Dually, for  $M \in \mathcal{A}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  and  $i \geq 0$  it can be shown that there is a well defined (covariant) functor

$$\overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(M, -): \text{RPre}(\mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathbb{Z})$$

where

$$\overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(M, N) := H^i(\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, \mathcal{Y}^\bullet(N))) \text{ for any } N \in \text{RPre}(\mathcal{Y}),$$

where  $0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^\bullet(N)$  is a proper right  $\mathcal{Y}$ -resolution of  $N$ . In other words,  $\overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(M, -)$  is the right derived functor of  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, -)$ , satisfying the dual properties from Proposition 2.7.

### 3. BALANCE SYSTEMS AND INDUCED BALANCED PAIRS

Balanced pairs were firstly introduced by Chen in [5]. This notion comprises the conditions that two classes  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  of objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  need to satisfy in order to obtain balance of Hom by  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Specifically, one needs that:

- $\mathcal{X}$  is precovering and  $\mathcal{Y}$  is preenveloping;
- every object in  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution;
- every object in  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic proper right  $\mathcal{Y}$ -resolution.

Sometimes it is difficult to verify all these conditions for all the objects in the whole domain category  $\mathcal{A}$  (i.e., if we want to balance Hom over  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ ). It is possible to overcome this limitation by restricting balance to classes contained in  $\text{LPre}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\text{RPre}(\mathcal{Y})$ , in the cases where it is not possible to approximate all the objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  by objects in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$ . The following definition is an adaptation of [5, Def. 1.1] to this purpose.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}, \tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \mathcal{Y}$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  be classes of objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ . The pair  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a (admissible) balanced pair with respect to a pair  $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}})$  if the following conditions are satisfied:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \text{LPre}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \subseteq \text{RPre}(\mathcal{Y})$ .
- (2) Every  $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$  admits a (admissible)  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution.
- (3) Every  $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  admits a (admissible)  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{X}, -)$ -acyclic proper right  $\mathcal{Y}$ -resolution.

One of the main advantages of having balance of Hom by  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  over  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$  is to have several ways to define right derived functors. For instance, in [11, Def. 3.7] the Gorenstein extension groups  $\text{GExt}_R^i(M, N)$ , where  $M$  has finite Gorenstein projective dimension and  $N$  has finite Gorenstein injective dimension, are defined as right derived functors of Hom by either taking proper left Gorenstein projective  $\text{Hom}_R(-, \mathcal{GI}(R))$ -acyclic resolutions of  $M$ , or proper right Gorenstein injective  $\text{Hom}_R(\mathcal{GP}(R), -)$ -acyclic resolutions of  $N$ . In a more general sense, the following result is a criterium to get balance for Hom relative to  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ , along with equivalent ways to compute the relative derived functors  $\overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(-, -)$  and  $\overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(-, -)$ . The proof follows from [11, Thm. 2.6].



**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  be a balanced pair in  $\mathcal{A}$  with respect to  $(\tilde{\mathcal{X}}, \tilde{\mathcal{Y}})$ . Then, for every  $i \geq 0$ ,  $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $N \in \tilde{\mathcal{Y}}$ , there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(M, N) \cong \overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(M, N),$$

which yields a bifunctor

$$\text{Ext}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})}^i(-, -): \tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{op}} \times \tilde{\mathcal{Y}} \longrightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathbb{Z}).$$

**Remark 3.3.** *From Lemma 2.1 and Proposition 2.7 (4), we can note that  $\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0$  can be extended to  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{A}$  if  $\mathcal{X}$  is a generator in  $\mathcal{A}$ , where*

$$\text{Ext}_{(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})}^0(M, N) = \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N) \cong \underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{X}}^0(M, N),$$

for every  $M \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $N \in \mathcal{A}$ .

The rest of this section will be devoted to the concept and properties of balanced systems. These will be formed by a pair of classes of objects accompanied with relative (co)generators satisfying certain orthogonality relations under  $\text{Ext}$ . Such relations are in practice easier to check that conditions (2) and (3) in Definition 3.1. Moreover, balanced system will be a good source to obtain balanced pairs. Before being more specific on this, let us introduce some notation and terminology.

Let us borrow the term ‘‘cospan’’ from category theory. In our setting, a *cospan* will be a triple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  of classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  along with containments  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{X}'' \supseteq \mathcal{X}'$ . We shall say that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  is a cospan in a class  $\mathcal{Y}$  if every object of  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}'$  and  $\mathcal{X}''$  belongs to  $\mathcal{Y}$  (or equivalently,  $\mathcal{X}'' \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$ ).

Given a cospan  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  in  $\text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$ , we defined the following classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ :

- $\underline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  is the class of objects  $M \in \mathcal{X}''$  admitting a proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution

$$\cdots \rightarrow X_i \xrightarrow{d_i} X_{i-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} M \rightarrow 0$$

such that  $\text{Ker}(d_i) \in \mathcal{X}'$  for every  $i \geq 0$ .<sup>2</sup>

- $\overline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'') := \underline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'') \cup \mathcal{X}$ .

Dually, for a cospan  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}', \mathcal{Y}'')$  in  $\text{RPRes}(\mathcal{Y})$ , we have dually the classes  $\text{R}^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}')$  and  $\overline{\text{R}}^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}')$ .

**Example 3.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}, \omega \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  is pointed (i.e.,  $0 \in \mathcal{X}$ ) and closed under extensions,  $\omega$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ . Then from [3, Thm. 2.8 (b)] we know that every  $M \in \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$  has a special  $\mathcal{X}$ -precover with kernel in  $\omega^{\wedge}$ . It follows that  $(\mathcal{X}, \omega^{\wedge}, \mathcal{X}^{\wedge})$  is a cospan in  $\text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$  and that  $\underline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}, \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}) = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}$ .*

The classes  $\overline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  and  $\overline{\text{R}}^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}')$  offer a possible domain to obtain balance for  $\text{Hom}$ , provided that certain conditions are fulfilled. Such conditions are comprised in the following definition.

**Definition 3.5.** *A couple  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  of pairs of classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  is a **balanced system** with respect to a couple  $[(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}''); (\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}')] in  $\mathcal{A}$  if the following are satisfied:$*

- (1)  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  is a cospan in  $\text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$ .
- (2)  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}', \mathcal{Y}'')$  is a cospan in  $\text{RPRes}(\mathcal{Y})$ .
- (3)  $\mathcal{X}$  is a generator in  $\mathcal{X}''$ .

<sup>2</sup> In the notation  $\underline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$ ,  $\underline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}$  indicates that one takes left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolutions. The class  $\mathcal{X}''$  placed to the right suggests that these resolutions end at an object in  $\mathcal{X}''$ .



- (4)  $\mathcal{Y}$  is a cogenerator in  $\mathcal{Y}''$ .
- (5)  $\nu$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{Y}$ .
- (6)  $\omega$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- (7)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}'', \nu) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}) = 0$ .
- (8)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \mathcal{Y}'') = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}') = 0$ .<sup>3</sup>

Conditions (1), (3), (5) and (7) are enough to guarantee that any object in  $\text{L}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  has an exact and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution with cycles in  $\mathcal{X}'$ . This is proved in the following result.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'', \nu, \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be classes of objects as in the previous definition. Then, any proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution*

$$\eta \equiv \cdots \rightarrow X_i \xrightarrow{d_i} X_{i-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow X_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} M \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{i})$$

of  $M \in \mathcal{X}''$  with each  $\text{Ker}(d_i) \in \mathcal{X}'$  is exact and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic.

In particular, if  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  is a balanced system with respect to  $[(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}''); (\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}')]$ , then  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is a balanced pair with respect to  $(\overline{\text{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}''), \overline{\text{R}}^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}'', \mathcal{Y}'))$ .

*Proof.* Let  $M \in \text{L}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'')$  with a proper left  $\mathcal{X}$ -resolution  $\eta$  as in (i) with each  $\text{Ker}(d_i) \in \mathcal{X}'$ . We show that  $\eta$  is exact and  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic. Indeed, since  $\mathcal{X}$  is a generator in  $\mathcal{X}''$  and  $\mathcal{X}' \subseteq \mathcal{X}''$ , we have by Lemma 2.1 that  $\eta$  is exact. By the same result, it remains to show that each short exact sequence

$$\text{Ker}(d_i) \xrightarrow{\mu_i} X_i \rightarrow \text{Ker}(d_{i-1})$$

is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic. So let  $f: \text{Ker}(d_i) \rightarrow Y$  with  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Since  $\nu$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{Y}$ , there is a short exact sequence

$$Y' \rightarrow V \xrightarrow{g} Y$$

with  $V \in \nu$  and  $Y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Using the relation  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}) = 0$ , there exists a morphism  $f': \text{Ker}(d_i) \rightarrow V$  such that  $g \circ f' = f$ . On the other hand,  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}'', \nu) = 0$  implies that there exists a morphism  $f'': X_i \rightarrow V$  such that  $f'' \circ \mu_i = f'$ . Hence,  $(g \circ f'') \circ \mu_i = f$ , and the result follows.

The assertion concerning balanced couples is straightforward.  $\square$

### Example 3.7.

- (1) Let  $\mathcal{P}(\text{Mod}(R)) = \mathcal{P}(R)$  and  $\mathcal{I}(\text{Mod}(R)) = \mathcal{I}(R)$  denote the classes of projective and injective left  $R$ -modules. Then,  $[(\mathcal{P}(R), \mathcal{P}(R)); (\mathcal{I}(R), \mathcal{I}(R))]$  is a balanced system with respect to  $[(\text{Mod}(R), \text{Mod}(R)); (\text{Mod}(R), \text{Mod}(R))]$ .
- (2) If  $R$  is a Ding-Chen ring, then one has that  $[(\mathcal{DP}(R), \mathcal{P}(R)); (\mathcal{I}(R), \mathcal{DI}(R))]$  is a balanced system with respect to  $[(\mathcal{P}(R)^\wedge, \text{Mod}(R)); (\text{Mod}(R), \mathcal{I}(R)^\vee)]$ . This balance system is not necessarily finite (see Definition 3.8), as there are examples of Ding-Chen rings for which  $\mathcal{DP}(R)^\wedge \subsetneq \text{Mod}(R)$  (see for instance [20, Ex. 3.3]). So as a consequence from Proposition 3.6, we have that  $(\mathcal{DP}(R), \mathcal{DI}(R))$  is a balanced pair with respect to  $(\text{Mod}(R), \text{Mod}(R))$ . The resulting derived functors from Proposition 3.2 are denoted by  $\text{Dext}^i(-, -) := \text{Ext}_{(\mathcal{DP}(R), \mathcal{DI}(R))}^i(-, -)$ , and several of its properties are studied in [22].

<sup>3</sup> Note that the even numbered conditions are the dual of the odd numbered ones. We shall use this convention some of the upcoming definitions.

We also have similar results if we replace  $\mathcal{DP}(R)$  and  $\mathcal{DI}(R)$  by the classes of Gorenstein projective and Gorenstein injective modules over an Iwanaga Gorenstein ring (see [8]), or by the classes of Gorenstein AC-projective and Gorenstein AC-injective modules over an AC-Gorenstein ring (see [10])

The previous classes of relative Gorenstein projective and injective modules also constitute sources of balance over arbitrary ring, as we will mention below in Example 3.12.

Among the balanced systems considered in this work, we shall focus on a special type that we call *finite*, in the sense that the induced balance for Hom is obtained over classes with finite relative left and right resolution dimensions.

**Definition 3.8.** We shall say that two pairs  $(\mathcal{X}, \omega)$  and  $(\nu, \mathcal{Y})$  of classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  form a **finite balanced system**, denoted  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$ , provided that:

- (1)  $\mathcal{X}$  is pointed and closed under extensions.
- (2)  $\mathcal{Y}$  is pointed and closed under extensions.
- (3)  $\omega$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ .
- (4)  $\nu$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{Y}$  with  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu) = 0$ .
- (5)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}, \nu) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega^{\wedge}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$ .
- (6)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \mathcal{Y}^{\vee}) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}, \nu^{\vee}) = 0$ .

**Proposition 3.9.** If  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  is a finite balanced system in  $\mathcal{A}$ , then  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is balanced with respect to the pair  $(\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}, \mathcal{Y}^{\vee})$ .

*Proof.* By Example 3.4 and its dual, we have that  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  is balanced with respect to  $[(\omega^{\wedge}, \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}); (\nu^{\vee}, \mathcal{Y}^{\vee})]$ , and also

$$\bar{\mathcal{L}}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega^{\wedge}, \mathcal{X}^{\wedge}) = \mathcal{X}^{\wedge} \text{ and } \bar{\mathcal{R}}^{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{Y}^{\vee}, \nu^{\vee}) = \mathcal{Y}^{\vee}.$$

Thus, the result follows by Proposition 3.6.  $\square$

For the rest of this section, we focus on a special type of finite balanced system in which we have control over more combinations of relative projective and injective dimensions between the different classes forming the system. Most of our examples in the following sections will be finite balanced systems of this sort.

**Definition 3.10.** We shall say that  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  is a **strongly finite balanced system** if the following are satisfied:

- (1)  $\mathcal{X}$  is pointed and closed under extensions.
- (2)  $\mathcal{Y}$  is pointed and closed under extensions.
- (3)  $\omega$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ .
- (4)  $\nu$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{Y}$  with  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\nu) = 0$ .
- (5)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}, \nu) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega^{\wedge}, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$  and  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega) = 0$ .
- (6)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \mathcal{Y}^{\vee}) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}, \nu^{\vee}) = 0$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu) = 0$ .

**Remark 3.11.** Any strongly finite balanced system is clearly finite. Moreover, if  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  is such a system, then by dimension shifting we have that

$$\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\omega^{\wedge}) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu^{\vee}) = \text{id}_{\omega}(\mathcal{Y}^{\vee}) = \text{pd}_{\nu}(\mathcal{X}^{\wedge}) = 0.$$

**Example 3.12.** Over an arbitrary ring,

$$\begin{aligned} &[(\mathcal{GP}(R), \mathcal{P}(R)); (\mathcal{I}(R), \mathcal{GI}(R))], \\ &[(\mathcal{DP}(R), \mathcal{P}(R)); (\mathcal{I}(R), \mathcal{DI}(R))] \text{ and} \\ &[(\mathcal{GP}_{AC}(R), \mathcal{P}(R)); (\mathcal{I}(R), \mathcal{GI}_{AC}(R))] \end{aligned}$$

are strongly finite balanced systems, where  $\mathcal{GP}_{AC}(R)$  and  $\mathcal{GI}_{AC}(R)$  denote the classes of Gorenstein AC-projective and Gorenstein AC-injective modules. In this situation, we have the corresponding derived functors restricted over the subcategories

$(\mathcal{GP}(R)^\wedge)^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{GI}(R)^\vee$ ,  $(\mathcal{DP}(R)^\wedge)^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{DI}(R)^\vee$  and  $(\mathcal{GP}_{AC}(R)^\wedge)^{\text{op}} \times \mathcal{GI}_{AC}(R)^\vee$ , respectively.

Below we provide a characterization of strongly finite balanced systems.

**Lemma 3.13.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}'$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\nu$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying the following conditions:

- (1)  $\mathcal{X}$  is a relative quasi-generator in  $\mathcal{X}'$ .
- (2)  $\nu$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{Y}$ .
- (3)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}', \nu) = 0$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu) = 0$ .
- (4)  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L) < \infty$  for every  $L \in \mathcal{X}'$ .

Then  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}'}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$ .

*Proof.* We assert that  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}'}(\nu) = 0$ . Indeed, let  $L \in \mathcal{X}'$  and  $V \in \nu$ . Since  $\mathcal{X}$  is a relative quasi-generator in  $\mathcal{X}'$ , there is an exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow X_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} X_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} L \rightarrow 0,$$

with  $X_i \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $K_{i+1} := \text{Ker}(d_i) \in \mathcal{X}'$  for every  $i \geq 0$ . Since  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{X}, \nu) = 0$ , by dimension shifting we have that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{i+1}(L, V) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(K_i, V) = 0$  for every  $i \geq 1$ .

Now let  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . By (4), we know that  $n := \text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(L) < \infty$  is finite. On the other hand, using that  $\nu$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{Y}$ , we can construct an exact sequence

$$\cdots \rightarrow V_1 \xrightarrow{f_1} V_0 \xrightarrow{f_0} Y \rightarrow 0$$

with  $V_i \in \nu$  and  $Y_{j+1} := \text{Ker}(f_j) \in \mathcal{Y}$  for every  $i, j \geq 0$ . Note that the preceding exact sequence splits into exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow Y_{t+1} \rightarrow V_t \rightarrow Y_t \rightarrow 0$$

for any  $t \geq 0$  and  $Y_0 := Y$ . Then, using  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}'}(\nu) = 0$  it follows that

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^i(L, Y_0) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{i+1}(L, Y_1) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{i+2}(L, Y_2) \cong \cdots \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{i+n}(L, Y_n) = 0$$

for every  $i \geq 1$ , that is,  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}'}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$ .  $\square$

**Proposition 3.14.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\omega$  and  $\nu$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4) in Definition 3.10. Then,  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  is a strongly finite balanced system if, and only if, the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega^\wedge, \nu) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\mathcal{X}, \nu) = 0$ .
- (2)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \nu^\vee) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\omega, \mathcal{Y}) = 0$ .
- (3)  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}}(M) < \infty$  for every  $M \in \omega^\wedge$ .
- (4)  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(N) < \infty$  for every  $N \in \nu^\vee$ .
- (5)  $\text{id}_{\omega}(\nu) = 0$ .

*Proof.* The “only if” part is clearly a consequence of Remark 3.11. For the “if” part, suppose that conditions (1) to (5) in the previous statement hold. It is only left to show condition (5) in Definition 3.10. By [3, Thm. 2.8], for every  $M \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$  there is a short exact sequence  $M \twoheadrightarrow H \twoheadrightarrow X$  with  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $H \in \omega^\wedge$ . Then for every  $V \in \nu$  we have the exact sequence

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(H, V) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(M, V) \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(X, V),$$

where  $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(H, V) = 0$  and  $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(X, V) = 0$  by condition (1). Then,  $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(M, V) = 0$  for every  $M \in \mathcal{X}^\wedge$  and  $V \in \nu$ . The rest of condition (5) follows by setting  $\mathcal{X}' := \omega^\wedge$  and  $\mathcal{X} := \omega$  in the previous lemma.  $\square$

#### 4. APPLICATIONS AND EXAMPLES

Let us apply the previous results to obtain some relative balanced pairs from balanced systems. Our examples bellow range over settings that include relative Gorenstein modules and chain complexes, and flat and cotorsion quasi-coherent sheaves.

**Balance systems from cotorsion pairs sharing the same kernel.** Recall that two classes  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  of objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  form a *cotorsion pair*  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  in  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $\mathcal{X} = {}^{\perp_1}\mathcal{Y}$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}^{\perp_1}$ . Moreover,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is *complete* if every object of  $\mathcal{A}$  admits a special  $\mathcal{X}$ -precover and a special  $\mathcal{Y}$ -preenvelope. If  $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\mathcal{Y}) = 0$ , we say that  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is *hereditary*.

In this section, we let  $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{Y}_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{Y}_2)$  be hereditary complete cotorsion pairs in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ , satisfying

$$\mathcal{X}_1 \cap \mathcal{Y}_1 = \mathcal{X}_2 \cap \mathcal{Y}_2. \quad (\text{i})$$

Let us refer to the previous intersection as  $\omega$ . We provide necessary and sufficient conditions so that  $[(\mathcal{X}_1, \omega); (\omega, \mathcal{Y}_1)]$  (or equivalently,  $[(\mathcal{X}_2, \omega); (\omega, \mathcal{Y}_2)]$ ) is a strongly finite balanced system in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

It is clear that conditions (1) to (4) in Definition 3.10 hold for  $[(\mathcal{X}_1, \omega); (\omega, \mathcal{Y}_1)]$  and  $[(\mathcal{X}_2, \omega); (\omega, \mathcal{Y}_2)]$ . Moreover, condition (5) in Proposition 3.14 is trivial for  $\omega$ . Regarding (3) and (4) in the same statement, for every  $M \in \omega^\wedge$  it can be shown by induction on  $\mathrm{l.resdim}_\omega(M)$  that

$$\max\{\mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(M), \mathrm{pd}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(M)\} \leq \mathrm{l.resdim}_\omega(M),$$

while

$$\max\{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}_1}(N), \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{X}_2}(N)\} \leq \mathrm{r.resdim}_\omega(N)$$

is dual for every  $N \in \omega^\vee$ . Moreover, we already know that

$$\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\mathcal{X}_1 \cup \mathcal{X}_2, \omega) = 0 = \mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\omega, \mathcal{Y}_1 \cup \mathcal{Y}_2).$$

The remaining conditions in Proposition 3.14 are not necessarily true. Thus, we have the following equivalence.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{Y}_1)$  and  $(\mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{Y}_2)$  be hereditary complete cotorsion pairs in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  which satisfy (i). Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (a)  $[(\mathcal{X}_1, \omega); (\omega, \mathcal{Y}_1)]$  is a strongly finite balanced system.
- (b)  $[(\mathcal{X}_2, \omega); (\omega, \mathcal{Y}_2)]$  is a strongly finite balanced system.
- (c)  $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \omega^\vee) = 0$  and  $\mathrm{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega^\wedge, \omega) = 0$ .

**Example 4.2.** Let  $X$  be a semi-separated noetherian scheme, and  $\Omega\text{coh}(X)$  denote the category of quasi-coherent sheaves over  $X$ . Consider the classes  $\mathfrak{F}(X)$  and  $\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}(X)$  of flat and Gorenstein flat quasi-coherent sheaves, along with their orthogonal complements  $\mathfrak{C}(X) = (\mathfrak{F}(X))^{\perp_1}$  and  $\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{C}(X) = (\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}(X))^{\perp_1}$ , known as cotorsion and Gorenstein cotorsion quasi-coherent sheaves. It is known from Christensen, Estrada and Thompson's work [6, Thm. 2.2., Lem. 2.3 & Rmk. 2.4] that  $(\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}(X), \mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{C}(X))$  and  $(\mathfrak{F}(X), \mathfrak{C}(X))$  are hereditary complete cotorsion pairs in  $\Omega\text{coh}(X)$  with

$$\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}(X) \cap \mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{C}(X) = \mathfrak{F}(X) \cap \mathfrak{C}(X).$$

Then, one has that the pair  $[(\mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{F}(X), \mathfrak{F}(X) \cap \mathfrak{C}(X)); (\mathfrak{F}(X) \cap \mathfrak{C}(X), \mathfrak{G}\mathfrak{C}(X))]$  (or equivalently,  $[(\mathfrak{F}(X), \mathfrak{F}(X) \cap \mathfrak{C}(X)); (\mathfrak{F}(X) \cap \mathfrak{C}(X), \mathfrak{C}(X))]$ ) is a strongly finite balanced system in  $\Omega\text{coh}(X)$  if, and only if, (c) in Proposition 4.1 holds for flat-cotorsion sheaves.

**Induced balance in the category of chain complexes.** So far we have presented examples of balanced systems in the category  $\text{Mod}(R)$ , where the cogenerating class is  $\omega = \mathcal{P}(R)$  and the generating class is  $\nu = \mathcal{I}(R)$ . In that follows, we explore some cases where this situation is different.

Let us commence recalling some concepts and results for the category  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  of chain complexes over  $\mathcal{A}$ . For  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and a complex  $X_{\bullet} \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ , let  $X_{\bullet}[n]$  denote the  $n$ -th suspension complex defined by  $X[n]_m := X_{m-n}$  and with differentials  $\partial_m^{X_{\bullet}[n]} := (-1)^n d_{X_{\bullet}}^{m-n}$ . For each  $M \in \mathcal{A}$ , let  $\overline{M}$  denote the disk complex

$$\overline{M} = \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow M \xrightarrow{\text{id}_M} M \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots,$$

with all the terms 0 except  $M$  in degrees 0 and 1. The sphere complex at  $M$ , on the other hand, is the complex

$$\underline{M} = \cdots \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow M \rightarrow 0 \rightarrow \cdots,$$

with all the terms 0 except  $M$  in degree 0. For a pair of complexes  $X_{\bullet}, Y_{\bullet} \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ , we denote by  $\text{Hom}_{\text{Ch}}(X_{\bullet}, Y_{\bullet})$  the abelian group of morphisms from  $X_{\bullet} \rightarrow Y_{\bullet}$  in  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ , and by  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^i(X_{\bullet}, Y_{\bullet})$  for  $i \geq 1$  the group of  $i$ -fold extensions. It will be useful to recall from [9, Lem. 3.1] that there are natural isomorphisms

$$\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X_0, M) \cong \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(X_{\bullet}, \overline{M}), \quad (\text{ii})$$

for every  $X_{\bullet} \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $M \in \mathcal{A}$ .

Given  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ , we denote by  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}}$  the class of exact complexes  $X_{\bullet} \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $Z_m(X_{\bullet}) \in \mathcal{X}$  for every  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and by  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$  the class of complexes  $X_{\bullet} \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $X_m \in \mathcal{X}$  for every  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . For example, it is known that  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{A})$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(\mathcal{A})$  are the classes of projective and injective complexes over  $\mathcal{A}$ .

We point out some properties involving the previous notations. See [15, Lem. 4.1 & Thm. 4.6] for a proof.

**Proposition 4.3.** Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\omega$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ . Then following assertions hold:

- (1) If  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}) = 0$ , then every complex  $X_{\bullet} \in \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$  is isomorphic to a direct sum<sup>4</sup> of complexes of the form  $\overline{X}[n]$  with  $X \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- (2) Suppose that  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injective objects,  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under extensions and direct summands, and  $\omega$  is closed under finite coproducts. Then,  $\omega$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  with  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$  if, and only if,  $\tilde{\omega}$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$  with  $\text{id}_{\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})}(\tilde{\omega}) = 0$ .

<sup>4</sup> In this case, such a direct sum is also a direct product.

The following two results will be very useful to induce a strongly finite balanced system in  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  from a strongly finite balanced system in  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Lemma 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\omega$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}$  is pointed and closed under extensions, and  $\omega$  is a relative quasi-cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ . If  $\nu$  is a class of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\nu, \nu) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega^\wedge, \nu) = \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^2(\mathcal{X}, \nu) = 0$ , then*

$$\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X}^\wedge), \tilde{\nu}) = 0.$$

*In particular,  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})^\wedge, \tilde{\nu}) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* From [3, Thm. 2.8], we can deduce that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\mathcal{X}^\wedge, \nu) = 0$ . The rest follows by Proposition 4.3-(1) and (ii). For the last assertion, note that the containment  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})^\wedge \subseteq \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X}^\wedge)$  is trivial.  $\square$

**Lemma 4.5.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an abelian category with enough injective objects. Let  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\omega$  and  $\nu$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying the following conditions:*

- (1)  $\mathcal{X}$  is closed under extensions and direct summands.
- (2)  $\omega$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$ .
- (3)  $\nu$  is closed under finite coproducts and satisfies  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\nu, \nu) = 0$ .
- (4)  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \nu^\vee) = 0$ .
- (5)  $\text{pd}_\omega(\mathcal{X}) = \text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\nu) = 0$ .

*Then  $\text{id}_{\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})}(\tilde{\nu}^\vee) = 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $X_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $D_\bullet \in \tilde{\nu}^\vee$  with  $m = \text{r.resdim}_{\tilde{\nu}}(D_\bullet) < \infty$ . We prove that  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^{\geq 1}(X_\bullet, D_\bullet) = 0$  by induction on  $m$ . The case  $m = 0$  can be deduced from Proposition 4.3-(1), (ii) and the fact that  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injectives. Indeed,  $D_\bullet \in \tilde{\nu}$  can be written as a direct product of complexes of the form  $\overline{V}[n]$  with  $V \in \nu$  and  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . It suffices to show that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{\geq 1}(X_\bullet, \overline{V}) = 0$ . The case  $i = 1$  follows by (ii), while for  $i > 1$  we can use the fact that every injective  $i$ -th cosyzygy of  $\overline{V}$  is a disk  $\overline{K}$  with  $K$  an injective  $i$ -th cosyzygy of  $V$ , as follows:

$$\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^{i+1}(X_\bullet, \overline{V}) \cong \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(X_\bullet, \overline{K}) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(X_1, K) \cong \text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^{i+1}(X_0, V) = 0.$$

Now suppose that  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^{\geq 1}(X_\bullet, D'_\bullet) = 0$  for every  $D'_\bullet \in \tilde{\nu}^\vee$  with  $\text{r.resdim}_{\tilde{\nu}}(D'_\bullet) \leq m - 1$ . Note that we can form an exact sequence  $D_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow V_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow D'_\bullet$  with  $V_\bullet \in \tilde{\nu}$  and  $\text{r.resdim}_{\tilde{\nu}}(D'_\bullet) \leq m - 1$ . On the one hand, for every  $i \geq 1$  we have an exact sequence

$$\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^i(X_\bullet, D'_\bullet) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^{i+1}(X_\bullet, D_\bullet) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^{i+1}(X_\bullet, V_\bullet)$$

where  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^{i+1}(X_\bullet, V_\bullet) = 0$  by the case  $m = 0$ , and  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^i(X_\bullet, D'_\bullet) = 0$  by the induction hypothesis. Thus,  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^{\geq 2}(X_\bullet, D_\bullet) = 0$ . On the other hand, by Proposition 4.3-(2) we have an exact sequence  $X_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow W_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow X'_\bullet$  with  $W_\bullet \in \tilde{\omega}$  and  $X'_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$ . Then, there is an exact sequence

$$\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(W_\bullet, D_\bullet) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(X_\bullet, D_\bullet) \rightarrow \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^2(X'_\bullet, D_\bullet)$$

where  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^2(X'_\bullet, D_\bullet) = 0$  and  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(W_\bullet, D_\bullet) = 0$ . For the latter, note that since  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \omega) = 0$ , one can write  $W_\bullet$  as a direct sum of disk complexes centered at objects in  $\omega$ . So it suffices to note that  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(\overline{W}, D_\bullet) \cong \text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(W, D_0) = 0$  for every  $W \in \omega$ , but this follows by the assumption that  $\text{Ext}_{\mathcal{A}}^1(\omega, \nu^\vee) = 0$ . Indeed,  $D_m \in \nu^\vee$  for every  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  is a consequence of condition (3).  $\square$

The following result is a direct consequence of Propositions 3.14 and 4.3-(2), and Lemmas 4.4 and 4.5 (and their duals).

**Proposition 4.6.** *Let  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  be a strongly finite balanced system in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  with enough projective and injective objects, such that  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are closed under direct summands, and  $\omega$  and  $\nu$  under finite coproducts. Then,  $[(\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X}), \tilde{\omega}); (\tilde{\nu}, \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y}))]$  is a strongly finite balanced system in  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ . Furthermore,  $(\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X}), \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y}))$  is a balanced pair with respect to  $(\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})^\wedge, \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee)$ .*

**Example 4.7.** *The balance situations we have mentioned in previous examples concerning Gorenstein homological algebra of modules carry over to chain complexes. From Example 3.12, we know that  $[(\mathcal{GP}(R), \mathcal{P}(R)); (\mathcal{I}(R), \mathcal{GI}(R))]$  is a strongly finite balanced system in  $\text{Mod}(R)$ . Then by the previous proposition, we obtain the strongly finite balanced system in  $\text{Ch}(R)$  given by*

$$[(\text{Ch}(\mathcal{GP}(R)), \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(R)); (\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(R), \text{Ch}(\mathcal{GI}(R)))].$$

On the other hand, it is known from [25, Thm. 2.2 & Prop. 2.8] that over an arbitrary ring  $R$ ,  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{GP}(R))$  and  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{GI}(R))$  are precisely the classes of Gorenstein projective and Gorenstein injective complexes. Also, a very well known fact is that  $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(R)$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}(R)$  coincide with the classes of projective and injective chain complexes.

One also has a similar example of balance in  $\text{Ch}(R)$  by the classes of Ding projective and Ding injective complexes, provided that  $R$  is a left coherent ring (see [23, Thm. 2.8] and [24, Thm. 4.1]). The authors are not aware if there exists a similar description for Gorenstein AC-projective and Gorenstein AC-injective complexes.

**Inner balance over chain complexes.** Given two complexes  $C_\bullet, D_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  over an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ , let  $\text{Hom}(C_\bullet, D_\bullet)$  denote the complex with entries

$$\text{Hom}(C_\bullet, D_\bullet)_m = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(C_i, D_{i+m})$$

for every  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and differentials defined by

$$\partial_m^{\text{Hom}(C_\bullet, D_\bullet)}(f) = (\partial_{m+i}^{D_\bullet} f_i - (-1)^m f_{i-1} \partial_i^{C_\bullet})_{i \in \mathbb{Z}}$$

for every  $f \in \text{Hom}(C_\bullet, D_\bullet)_m$ . Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\omega$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$ , where  $\mathcal{X}$  closed under extensions and direct summands. If  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injective objects,  $\omega$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{X}}(\omega) = 0$ , then by Proposition 4.3-(2) and [2, Thm. 2.8], we have that every  $C_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})^\wedge$  has a special  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$ -precover  $X_\bullet \rightarrow C_\bullet$ . Thus using Lemma 2.5, for each  $D_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  we can define the  $i$ -th relative cohomology group (with  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ ) by

$$\underline{\mathcal{E}xt}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(C_\bullet, D_\bullet) := H^i(\text{Hom}(X_\bullet, D_\bullet)). \quad (\text{iii})$$

With dual properties and arguments, provided that  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough projective objects, for each  $D_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee$  we can define for each  $C_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$  the  $i$ -th relative cohomology group by

$$\overline{\mathcal{E}xt}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(C_\bullet, D_\bullet) := H^i(\text{Hom}(C_\bullet, Y_\bullet)), \quad (\text{iv})$$

where  $D_\bullet \rightarrow Y_\bullet$  is a special  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y})$ -preenvelope of  $D_\bullet$ . The definitions of  $\underline{\mathcal{E}xt}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(-, -)$  and  $\overline{\mathcal{E}xt}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(-, -)$  were originally defined by Di, Lu and Zhao in [7, Def. 3.4].

In this section, we show an analog for Proposition 3.2 which involves the ‘‘inner’’ extensions functors defined in (iii) and (iv), i.e. that both definitions coincide



under certain conditions. More precisely, we shall require that  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are part of a strongly finite balanced system.

The following lemma can be proven as [16, Lem. 11]. Although the arguments there are stated in the category of modules, they carry over to abelian categories.

**Lemma 4.8.** *Let  $X_\bullet$  and  $L_\bullet$  be complexes in  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{A})$ . If  $\text{Ext}_{\text{Ch}}^1(X_\bullet, L_\bullet[-i]) = 0$  for every  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, L_\bullet)$  is an exact complex.*

The previous lemma, along with Lemma 4.5 and the fact that  $\tilde{\nu}^\vee$  is closed under suspensions, implies the following result.

**Corollary 4.9.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an abelian category with enough injective objects, and  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $\omega$  and  $\nu$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying the list of conditions in Lemma 4.5. Then, for every  $X_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $L_\bullet \in \tilde{\nu}^\vee$ , the complex  $\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, L_\bullet)$  is exact.*

**Theorem 4.10.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an abelian category with enough injective and projective objects and consider a strongly finite balanced system  $[(\mathcal{X}, \omega); (\nu, \mathcal{Y})]$  in  $\mathcal{A}$ , with  $\omega$  and  $\nu$  closed under finite coproducts, and  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  closed under direct summands. Then, for every  $C_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})^\wedge$ ,  $D_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee$  and  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , there is a natural isomorphism*

$$\underline{\mathcal{E}xt}_{\mathcal{X}}^i(C_\bullet, D_\bullet) \cong \overline{\mathcal{E}xt}_{\mathcal{Y}}^i(C_\bullet, D_\bullet).$$

The previous result was originally proved in [7, Thm. 3.5] under slightly different assumptions. The authors assume that  $\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\omega}^{\geq 1}(\omega^\wedge, \nu) = 0 = \text{Ext}_{\nu}^{\geq 1}(\omega, \nu^\vee)$ , while we assume conditions (5) and (6) in Definition 3.10 instead.

*Proof.* First, let us consider for  $D_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee$  a short exact sequence

$$D_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow Y_\bullet \xrightarrow{\lambda} L_\bullet,$$

with  $Y_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y})$  and  $L_\bullet \in \tilde{\nu}^\vee$ . We show that

$$\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, \lambda): \mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, Y_\bullet) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, L_\bullet)$$

is an epimorphism for every  $X_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$ . We know that

$$\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, \lambda)_m = \prod_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_i, \lambda_{i+m}),$$

for each  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Thus, it is enough to show that for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$  the morphism

$$\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_i, \lambda_{i+m}): \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_i, Y_{i+m}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_i, L_{i+m})$$

is an epimorphism. Since  $\text{id}_{\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})}(\tilde{\omega}) = 0$  and  $\tilde{\omega}$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$  by Proposition 4.3-(2), there is a short exact sequence  $X_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow W_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow X''_\bullet$  with  $X''_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $W_\bullet \in \tilde{\omega}$ . Therefore for each  $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have the following family of exact sequences

$$X_i \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} W_i \twoheadrightarrow X''_i, \quad \text{and} \quad D_{i+m} \twoheadrightarrow Y_{i+m} \xrightarrow{\lambda_{i+m}} L_{i+m}$$

where  $X_i, X''_i \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $Y_{i+m} \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $W_i \in \omega$ ,  $D_{i+m} \in \mathcal{Y}^\vee$  and  $L_{i+m} \in \nu^\vee$ . Now consider the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(W_i, Y_{i+m}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_i, Y_{i+m})} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_i, Y_{i+m}) \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(W_i, \lambda_{i+m}) \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_i, \lambda_{i+m}) \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(W_i, L_{i+m}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(\alpha_i, L_{i+m})} & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_i, L_{i+m}) \end{array}$$

By Remark 3.11, we have that  $\text{id}_\omega(\mathcal{Y}^\vee) = \text{id}_\mathcal{X}(\nu^\vee) = 0$ , and so  $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(W_i, \lambda_{i+m})$  and  $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(\alpha_i, L_{i+m})$  are epimorphisms. Hence, so is  $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(X_i, \lambda_{i+m})$ .

So far we have proved that for every  $D_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{Y})^\vee$  there is a short exact sequence  $D_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow Y_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow L_\bullet$ , such that  $\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, D_\bullet) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, Y_\bullet) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, L_\bullet)$  is a short exact sequence of complexes for every  $X_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$ . Applying Corollary 4.9 to the complex  $\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, L_\bullet)$ , we conclude that

$$H^i(\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, D_\bullet)) \cong H^i(\mathcal{H}om(X_\bullet, Y_\bullet)).$$

Now let  $C_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})^\wedge$ . Using a dual argument, there is a short exact sequence  $K_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow X'_\bullet \twoheadrightarrow C_\bullet$ , with  $X'_\bullet \in \text{Ch}(\mathcal{X})$  and  $K_\bullet \in \tilde{\omega}^\wedge$ , such that the sequence of abelian groups  $\mathcal{H}om(C_\bullet, Y_\bullet) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{H}om(X'_\bullet, Y_\bullet) \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{H}om(K_\bullet, Y_\bullet)$  is exact, where the last term is an exact complex by Corollary 4.9. Then, we obtain

$$H^i(\mathcal{H}om(C_\bullet, Y_\bullet)) \cong H^i(\mathcal{H}om(X'_\bullet, Y_\bullet)).$$

Therefore,  $H^i(\mathcal{H}om(X'_\bullet, D_\bullet)) \cong H^i(\mathcal{H}om(X'_\bullet, Y_\bullet)) \cong H^i(\mathcal{H}om(C_\bullet, Y_\bullet))$ , i.e.,

$$\underline{\mathcal{E}xt}_\mathcal{X}^i(C_\bullet, D_\bullet) = \overline{\mathcal{E}xt}_\mathcal{Y}^i(C_\bullet, D_\bullet).$$

□

**Virtually Gorenstein balanced pairs.** From [26, Def. 3.9], a commutative noetherian ring  $R$  of finite Krull dimension such that  $\mathcal{GP}(R)^{\perp 1} = {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{GI}(R)$  is called *virtually Gorenstein*. In this work, the authors prove that over a commutative noetherian ring  $R$  of finite Krull dimension, the pair  $(\mathcal{GP}(R), \mathcal{GI}(R))$  is balanced with respect to the pair  $(\text{Mod}(R), \text{Mod}(R))$  if and only if  $R$  is virtually Gorenstein (see [26, Thm. 3.10]). In what follows, we show that the conditions of being noetherian and having finite Krull dimension can be replaced by other general conditions in the setting of abelian categories. To that end, let us present some terminology. Given a class  $\mathcal{X}$  of objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$ , the class  $\text{LPRes}^0(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$  is formed by those objects  $M \in \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})$  for which there exists an exact complex  $\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M) \twoheadrightarrow M$  such that  $Z_i(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M)) \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$  for every  $i \geq 0$ . Dually, we have the class  $\text{RPRes}^0(\mathcal{X}) \subseteq \text{RPRes}(\mathcal{X})$ .

**Theorem 4.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an abelian category with enough injective and projective objects, and  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be classes of objects in  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  $\mathcal{X}^{\perp 1} = {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{Y}$ . Then,  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$  is an admissible balanced pair with respect to  $(\text{LPRes}^0(\mathcal{X}), \text{RPRes}^0(\mathcal{Y}))$ .*

*Proof.* Let us take  $M \in \text{LPRes}(\mathcal{X})^0$ , and  $\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M) \twoheadrightarrow M$  be the complex with the properties mentioned above. We show that  $\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M) \twoheadrightarrow M$  is  $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic. For, it suffices to check that the short exact sequence  $Z_0(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M)) \twoheadrightarrow X_0 \twoheadrightarrow M$  is  $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic. Since  $\mathcal{A}$  has enough injective objects, there exists a short exact sequence  $Z_0(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M)) \twoheadrightarrow E \twoheadrightarrow K$  with  $E \in \mathcal{I}(\mathcal{A})$ . Moreover, since  $Z_0(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M)), E \in \mathcal{X}^\perp$ , we have that  $K \in \mathcal{X}^\perp \subseteq {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{Y}$ . Then, the sequence  $Z_0(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M)) \twoheadrightarrow E \twoheadrightarrow K$  is  $\text{Hom}_\mathcal{A}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic. On the other hand, using the fact that  $E$  is injective along with the universal property of cokernels, we can obtain the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} Z_0(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M)) & \twoheadrightarrow & X_0 & \twoheadrightarrow & M \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow \\ & & Z_0(\mathcal{X}_\bullet(M)) & \twoheadrightarrow & E \twoheadrightarrow K \end{array}$$

Applying  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, Y)$  with  $Y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , we obtain the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(K, Y) & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(E, Y) & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z_0(\mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M)), Y) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \parallel \\ \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, Y) & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_0, Y) & \twoheadrightarrow & \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z_0(\mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M)), Y) \end{array}$$

where the upper row is exact by the comments above. It follows that the morphism  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(X_0, Y) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(Z_0(\mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M)), Y)$  is an epimorphism, and hence the sequence  $Z_0(\mathcal{X}_{\bullet}(M)) \twoheadrightarrow X_0 \twoheadrightarrow M$  is  $\text{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, \mathcal{Y})$ -acyclic. Condition (3) in Definition 3.1 follows dually.  $\square$

Under certain conditions, the relative balanced pair in Theorem 4.11 can be obtained from a balanced system. The proof of the following result is straightforward.

**Proposition 4.12.** *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be classes of objects in an abelian category  $\mathcal{A}$  satisfying the equality  $\mathcal{X}^{\perp 1} = {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{Y}$ . If  $\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^{\perp 1}$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{X}$  and  ${}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{Y} \cap \mathcal{Y}$  is a relative generator in  $\mathcal{Y}$ , then  $[(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^{\perp 1}); ({}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{Y} \cap \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y})]$  is a balanced system with respect to the couple  $[(\mathcal{X} \cap \mathcal{X}^{\perp 1}, \text{LPRes}^0(\mathcal{X})); (\text{RPRes}(\mathcal{Y}), {}^{\perp 1}\mathcal{Y} \cap \mathcal{Y})]$ .*

**Balance on Cohen-Macaulay rings.** Throughout, consider a commutative Cohen-Macaulay ring  $R$  with unit. For a fixed  $R$ -module  $C$ , the classes of  $C$ -projective and  $C$ -injective  $R$ -modules were defined by Holm and Jørgensen in [13] as follows:

$$\mathcal{P}_C(R) := \{C \otimes_R P : P \in \mathcal{P}(R)\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_C(R) := \{\text{Hom}_R(C, I) : I \in \mathcal{I}(R)\}.$$

Based on these classes, they also introduced the classes of  $C$ -Gorenstein projective and  $C$ -Gorenstein injective  $R$ -modules, which will be denoted by  $\mathcal{GP}_C(R)$  and  $\mathcal{GI}_C(R)$ , respectively.

Associated to a semidualizing  $R$ -module  $C$ , we have the Auslander and Bass classes [19, §1.8]. The *Bass class respect to  $C$* , denoted  $\mathcal{B}_C(R)$ , consists of all  $R$ -modules  $M$  satisfying

$$\text{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(C, M) = 0 = \text{Tor}_{\geq 1}^R(C, \text{Hom}_R(C, M)),$$

and such that natural evaluation map  $\nu_M : C \otimes_R \text{Hom}_R(C, M) \rightarrow M$  is an isomorphism. Dually, the *Auslander class with respect to  $C$* , denoted  $\mathcal{A}_C(R)$ , consists of all  $R$ -modules  $M$  satisfying

$$\text{Tor}_{\geq 1}^R(C, M) = 0 = \text{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(C, C \otimes_R M),$$

and such that the natural map  $\mu_M : M \rightarrow \text{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes_R M)$  is an isomorphism. With these notions in mind, we give the following example of strongly finite balanced system.

**Proposition 4.13.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative Cohen-Macaulay ring with dualizing  $R$ -module  $D$  and semidualizing  $R$ -module  $C$ , and let  $C^{\dagger} := \text{Hom}_R(C, D)$ . Then,*

$$[(\mathcal{GP}_C(R), \mathcal{P}_C(R)); (\mathcal{I}_{C^{\dagger}}(R), \mathcal{GI}_{C^{\dagger}}(R))]$$

*is a strongly finite balanced system. In particular,  $(\mathcal{GP}_C(R), \mathcal{GI}_{C^{\dagger}}(R))$  is a balanced pair with respect to  $(\mathcal{GP}_C(R)^{\wedge}, \mathcal{GI}_{C^{\dagger}}(R)^{\vee})$ .*

*Proof.* Let us check first conditions (1), (2), (3) and (4) in Definition 3.10. The closure under extensions for  $\mathcal{GP}_C(R)$  is proven in [21, Thm. 2.8]. By [17, Fact 2.4],  $\mathcal{P}_C(R)$  is a relative cogenerator in  $\mathcal{GP}_C(R)$ . Moreover,  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{GP}_C(R)}(\mathcal{P}_C(R)) = 0$  by [21, Prop. 2.2]. Thus, conditions (1) and (3) hold. Dually, one also has (2) and (4), since  $C^\dagger$  is semidualizing by [18, Not. 3.1].

In order to conclude the proof, let us now check conditions (1) to (5) in Proposition 3.14. We first verify that  $\text{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{P}_C(R)^\wedge, \mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)) = 0$ . So let  $M \in \mathcal{P}_C(R)^\wedge$  and  $\text{Hom}_R(C^\dagger, I) \in \mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)$  (i.e.,  $I \in \mathcal{I}(R)$ ). Note that  $D \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$  since  $\mathcal{B}_C(R)$  is coresolving by [14, Thm. 6.2] (i.e.,  $\mathcal{B}_C(R)$  is closed under extensions and cokernels of epimorphisms in  $\mathcal{B}_C(R)$ , and  $\mathcal{I}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{B}_C(R)$ ), and  $D$  has finite injective dimension. Then we can apply [17, Lem. 6.14] that asserts that  $\mathcal{P}_C(R)^\wedge \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{C^\dagger}(R)$ . On the other hand, by [14, Coroll. 6.1] we have that  $\mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)^\vee \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{C^\dagger}(R)$ . Then,

$$\text{Ext}_R^i(M, \text{Hom}_R(C^\dagger, I)) \cong \overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)}^i(M, \text{Hom}_R(C^\dagger, I)) = 0,$$

for every  $i \geq 1$ , where the isomorphism results from [19, Coroll. 4.2]. Dually, we have  $\text{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{P}_C(R), \mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)^\vee) = 0$ .

Now let us show that  $\text{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{GP}_C(R), \mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)) = 0$ . By [13, Thm. 4.6], we have the containment  $\mathcal{GP}_C(R) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{C^\dagger}(R)$ . We also know that  $\mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{C^\dagger}(R)$ . Then, the result follows again by [19, Coroll. 4.2], while  $\text{Ext}_R^{\geq 1}(\mathcal{P}_C(R), \mathcal{GI}_{C^\dagger}(R)) = 0$  is dual. The latter implies that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{GI}_{C^\dagger}(R)}(M) = 0$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{GP}_C(R)}(N) = 0$  for every  $M \in \mathcal{P}_C(R)$  and  $N \in \mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)$ . Using a dimension shifting argument, we can deduce that  $\text{pd}_{\mathcal{GI}_{C^\dagger}(R)}(M) < \infty$  and  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{GP}_C(R)}(N) < \infty$  for every  $M \in \mathcal{P}_C(R)^\wedge$  and  $N \in \mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)^\vee$ . Moreover, in particular we have  $\text{id}_{\mathcal{P}_C(R)}(\mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}(R)) = 0$ , since  $\mathcal{P}_C(R) \subseteq \mathcal{GP}_C(R)$ .  $\square$

The previous proposition, along with Proposition 3.2 implies that

$$\underline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{GP}_C(R)}^i(M, N) \cong \overline{\text{Ext}}_{\mathcal{GI}_{C^\dagger}(R)}^i(M, N). \quad (\text{v})$$

for every  $M \in \mathcal{GP}_C(R)^\wedge$  and  $N \in \mathcal{GI}_{C^\dagger}(R)^\vee$ , getting thus another proof of [18, Thm. 5.7].

## FUNDING

The first author was partially supported by a postdoctoral fellowship from Programa de Desarrollo de las Ciencias Básicas (PEDECIBA). The second and the third authors thank Project PAPIIT-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México IN100520. The third author was partially supported by the following grants and institutions: Fondo Vaz Ferreira # II/FVF/2019/135 (funds are given by the Dirección Nacional de Innovación, Ciencia y Tecnología - Ministerio de Educación y Cultura, and administered through Fundación Julio Ricaldoni), Agencia Nacional de Investigación e Innovación (ANII), and PEDECIBA.

## REFERENCES

- [1] L. L. Avramov and A. Martsinkovsky. Absolute, relative, and Tate cohomology of modules of finite Gorenstein dimension. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* (3), 85(2):393–440, 2002.
- [2] V. Becerril, O. Mendoza, M. A. Pérez, and V. Santiago. Frobenius pairs in abelian categories. Correspondences with cotorsion pairs, exact model categories, and Auslander-Buchweitz contexts. *J. Homotopy Relat. Struct.*, 14(1):1–50, 2019.

- [3] V. Becerril, O. Mendoza, and V. Santiago. Relative Gorenstein objects in abelian categories. *Commun. Algebra*, 49(1):352–402, 2021.
- [4] A. Beligiannis and I. Reiten. *Homological and homotopical aspects of torsion theories*, volume 883. Providence, RI: American Mathematical Society (AMS), 2007.
- [5] X.-W. Chen. Homotopy equivalences induced by balanced pairs. *J. Algebra*, 324(10):2718–2731, 2010.
- [6] L. W. Christensen, S. Estrada, and P. Thompson. The stable category of Gorenstein flat sheaves on a Noetherian scheme. *Proc. Am. Math. Soc.*, 149(2):525–538, 2021.
- [7] Z. X. Di, B. Lu, and J. X. Zhao. Balance for relative cohomology of complexes. *J. Algebra Appl.*, 19(1):19, 2020. Id/No 2050005.
- [8] E. E. Enochs and O. M. G. Jenda. *Relative Homological Algebra*, volume 30 of *De Gruyter Expositions in Mathematics*. Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 2000.
- [9] J. Gillespie. The flat model structure on  $\text{Ch}(R)$ . *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 356(8):3369–3390, 2004.
- [10] J. Gillespie. AC-Gorenstein rings and their stable module categories. *J. Aust. Math. Soc.*, 107(2):181–198, 2019.
- [11] H. Holm. Gorenstein derived functors. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 132(7):1913–1923, 2004.
- [12] H. Holm. Gorenstein homological dimensions. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 189(1-3):167–193, 2004.
- [13] H. Holm and P. Jørgensen. Semi-dualizing modules and related Gorenstein homological dimensions. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 205(2):423–445, 2006.
- [14] H. Holm and D. White. Foxby equivalence over associative rings. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 47(4):781–808, 2007.
- [15] L. Liang, N. Q. Ding, and G. Yang. Some remarks on projective generators and injective cogenerators. *Acta Math. Sin. (Engl. Ser.)*, 30(12):2063–2078, 2014.
- [16] Z. K. Liu. Relative cohomology of complexes. *J. Algebra*, 502:79–97, 2018.
- [17] S. Sather-Wagstaff, T. Sharif, and D. White. Gorenstein cohomology in abelian categories. *J. Math. Kyoto Univ.*, 48(3):571–596, 2008.
- [18] S. Sather-Wagstaff, T. Sharif, and D. White. Comparison of relative cohomology theories with respect to semidualizing modules. *Math. Z.*, 264(3):571–600, 2010.
- [19] R. Takahashi and D. White. Homological aspects of semidualizing modules. *Math. Scand.*, 106(1):5–22, 2010.
- [20] J. P. Wang. Ding projective dimension of Gorenstein flat modules. *Bull. Korean Math. Soc.*, 54(6):1935–1950, 2017.
- [21] D. White. Gorenstein projective dimension with respect to a semidualizing module. *J. Commut. Algebra*, 2(1):111–137, 2010.
- [22] G. Yang. Homological properties of modules over Ding-Chen rings. *J. Korean Math. Soc.*, 49(1):31–47, 2012.
- [23] G. Yang and X. S. Da. On Ding projective complexes. *Acta Math. Sin., Engl. Ser.*, 34(11):1718–1730, 2018.
- [24] G. Yang and S. Estrada. Characterizations of Ding injective complexes. *Bull. Malays. Math. Sci. Soc.* (2), 43(3):2385–2398, 2020.
- [25] X. Y. Yang and Z. K. Liu. Gorenstein projective, injective, and flat complexes. *Commun. Algebra*, 39(5):1705–1721, 2011.
- [26] F. Zareh-Khoshchereh, M. Asgharzadeh, and K. Divaani-Aazar. Gorenstein homology, relative pure homology and virtually Gorenstein rings. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 218(12):2356–2366, 2014.

(V. Becerril) CENTRO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS. UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MÉXICO. 58089. MORELIA, MICHOACÁN, MÉXICO

*Email address:* victorbecerril@matmor.unam.mx

(O. Mendoza) INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS. UNIVERSIDAD NACIONAL AUTÓNOMA DE MÉXICO. CIRCUITO EXTERIOR, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA. CP04510. MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

*Email address:* omendoza@matem.unam.mx

(M. A. Pérez) INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA Y ESTADÍSTICA “PROF. ING. RAFAEL LAGUARDIA”. FACULTAD DE INGENIERÍA. UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA. CP11300. MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY

*Email address:* mperez@fing.edu.uy