

REFLEXIVITY AND HOCHSCHILD COHOMOLOGY

ISAMBARD GOODBODY

ABSTRACT. Reflexive DG-categories were defined by Kuznetsov and Shinder as generalisations of smooth and proper DG-categories. Over a perfect field, they include all projective schemes and finite dimensional algebras. Smooth and proper DG-categories are the dualizable objects in the symmetric monoidal category of DG-categories localised at Morita equivalences. We show the reflexive DG-categories are the reflexive objects in this monoidal category. Using this perspective we prove that the Hochschild cohomology of a reflexive DG-category is isomorphic to that of its derived category of cohomologically finite modules.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Homotopy Theory of DG-categories	3
3. Reflexivity in Closed Symmetric Monoidal Categories	6
4. Reflexive DG-categories	9
5. Hochschild Cohomology	10
6. Corepresentability	12
7. Finite Dimensional DGAs and their Koszul duals	23
8. An Example	26
References	29

1. INTRODUCTION

Derived categories encode homological information about geometric and algebraic objects. For example, invariants such as K-theory and Hochschild (co)homology can be computed from the derived category, and various properties like smoothness, properness and being Gorenstein are detected at this level (under reasonable assumptions on the scheme). With this in mind, noncommutative geometry replaces the geometric object with its derived category. The derived category needs to be considered with its higher structure in order to compute most

Date: March 15, 2024.

invariants and detect smoothness in the general case. We encode this higher structure by viewing the derived category as a differential graded category (DG-category) i.e. one enriched in chain complexes.

A DG-category over a field is smooth if it is perfect as a bimodule over itself and proper if its hom-complexes have finite dimensional cohomology. Smooth and proper DG-categories include smooth and proper schemes and finite dimensional algebras of finite global dimension. In [BvdB03], they were shown to satisfy a strong representability property. Reflexive DG-categories were defined in [KS22] as those which satisfy a weaker representability property. Over a perfect field, they are shown to include all projective varieties and all finite dimensional algebras. In general, reflexive DG-categories are neither smooth nor proper.

For a DG-category \mathcal{A} over a commutative ring k there are two categories of modules which are in some sense dual to each other. The first is the category of perfect \mathcal{A} -modules $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})$ and the second is the category of \mathcal{A} -modules $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$ which are perfect when restricted to k . From our perspective $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})$ can be identified with \mathcal{A} . For smooth and proper DG-categories $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$ but with no assumptions on \mathcal{A} one can lose all information when passing to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$. A key feature of reflexive DG-categories is that information about $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})$ can be extracted from $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$. For example, their admissible subcategories are in bijection.

This duality is made precise by considering Hmo the symmetric monoidal category of DG-categories over k localised at Morita equivalences i.e. DG-functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ inducing equivalences $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{B})$. Here the unit is $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(k)$ and the dual of \mathcal{A} is $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$. Smooth and proper DG-categories are the dualizable objects in Hmo (see Theorem 1.43 in [Tab15]). We provide a monoidal characterisation of the reflexive DG-categories as the reflexive objects in Hmo . This is the largest class of objects on which the dual functor restricts to an equivalence. This provides a conceptual justification for why information about a reflexive DG-category can be extracted from its category of perfectly valued modules. It also provides another comparison to the smooth and proper DG-categories which form the largest monoidal subcategory on which the dual restricts to a strong monoidal equivalence.

Using this viewpoint, we show that there is an isomorphism on Hochschild cohomology $HH^*(\mathcal{A}) \cong HH^*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A}))$ for reflexive DG-categories. In fact one only needs a weaker property: semireflexivity. We apply these results to finite dimensional differential graded algebras.

Acknowledgements. I'd like to thank my supervisor Greg Stevenson for his helpful guidance. I am supported by a PhD scholarship from the Carnegie Trust for the Universities of Scotland.

2. HOMOTOPY THEORY OF DG-CATEGORIES

To start off, k will be a commutative ring but it will graduate to a field in Section 6. Throughout $\mathcal{C}(k)$ will denote the category of chain complexes over k . By DG-category we mean a category enriched over $\mathcal{C}(k)$. If \mathcal{A} is a DG-category, $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$ will denote the category of left¹ \mathcal{A} -modules, $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ the derived category of \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})$ the perfect \mathcal{A} -modules. We let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ consist of the perfectly valued modules i.e. \mathcal{A} -modules which factor through $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(k) \subseteq \mathcal{D}(k)$. If k is a field then $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$ consists of those modules with finite dimensional cohomology which we denote $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$. We use the same decorations for the analogous subcategories of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$. The chain complexes of morphisms in a DG-category \mathcal{A} will be denoted $\mathcal{A}(-, -)$. The chain complexes of morphisms in the DG-categories $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ will be denoted $\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, -)$. As an abuse of notation we will occasionally confuse a DG-category with its homotopy category. We let \mathcal{A}^{op} be the opposite differential graded category to \mathcal{A} and $\mathcal{A}^e := \mathcal{A}^{\text{op}} \otimes_k^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{A}$.

Let DGcat denote the category of small DG-categories with respect to some universe. In [Tab05], it is shown that DGcat admits a model category structure whose weak equivalences are quasi-equivalences. We let Hqe denote the associated homotopy category. The tensor product of DG-categories makes DGcat a closed symmetric monoidal category whose internal hom we denote $\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(-, -)$. The symmetric monoidal and model structures are not compatible but the tensor product can be derived to Hqe as

$$- \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} - := Q(-) \otimes -: \text{Hqe} \times \text{Hqe} \rightarrow \text{Hqe}$$

where Q denotes the cofibrant replacement functor.

Theorem 2.1 (Theorem 1.3 [Toë07]). *$(\text{Hqe}, \otimes^{\mathbb{L}}, k)$ is a closed symmetric monoidal category.*

¹This unconventional choice is made to reduce the number of op's appearing in the proofs of section 5.

The internal-hom of Hqe will be denoted $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(-, -)$. Toën's Morita theory in loc. cit. describes $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ as a subcategory of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B} \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{A}^{op})$. The next result is mentioned at the beginning of Section 7 in [Toë07]. It is a derived version of the fact that left modules are covariant functors.

Proposition 2.2. *For a DG-category \mathcal{A} , there are equivalences*

$$\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(k)) \simeq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \quad \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(k)) \simeq \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{pvd}}(\mathcal{A}).$$

Proof. Let $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(-, -)$ denote the set of morphisms in Hqe . Then the functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(- \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(k))$ is represented by $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(k))$. We will show that $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ also represents this functor and deduce the equivalence. We will use Lemma 6.2 in [Toë07] applied to the $C(k)$ -enriched model category $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$ whose homotopy category is $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. As discussed after Definition 3.1 in [Toë07], if M has a $\mathcal{C}(k)$ -enriched model structure then $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{DGcat}}(\mathcal{B}, M)$ inherits one with pointwise structure for any DG-category \mathcal{B} . For example, $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{DGcat}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}(k)) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{B})$ with its projective model structure. Let iso denote the isomorphisms classes of objects in a category and Ho the homotopy category of a model category. There are isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(-, \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})) &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(Q(-), \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{iso} \, \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{DGcat}}(Q(-), \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}))) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{iso} \, \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{DGcat}}(Q(-), \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{DGcat}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}(k)))) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{iso} \, \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{DGcat}}(Q(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}(k))) \end{aligned}$$

Next we wish to apply Lemma 6.2 again but this only applies to cofibrant DG-categories. So we consider its replacement $Q(Q(-) \otimes \mathcal{A})$. Fortunately the map $Q(Q(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}) \rightarrow Q(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}$ is a quasi-equivalence and so restriction along it induces an equivalence on $\mathcal{D}(-)$. Therefore the above is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} &\simeq \mathrm{iso} \, \mathrm{Ho}(\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{DGcat}}(Q(Q(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}), \mathcal{C}(k))) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(Q(Q(-) \otimes \mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}(k)) \\ &\simeq \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(- \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}(k)) \end{aligned}$$

Replacing $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ with $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathcal{D}(k)$ with $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(k)$ proves the second statement. \square

Remark 2.3. $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(-, \mathcal{D}(k))$: $\mathrm{Hqe} \rightarrow \mathrm{Hqe}^{op}$ is a contravariant functor. In Section 6 we detail a way of making $\mathcal{D}(-)$ contravariantly functorial and prove the isomorphisms above are natural. However this construction only works when k is a field.

Another model structure on \mathbf{DGcat} is constructed in [Tab05]. Given a DG-functor $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, restriction induces a functor $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. The weak equivalences are DG-functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ which induce equivalences $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B})$. The cofibrant objects are the same as in the previous model structure and the fibrant objects are idempotent complete pretriangulated DG-categories. We denote the associated homotopy category \mathbf{Hmo} . The fibrant replacement of a DG-category \mathcal{A} is $R(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op}) \simeq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op}$. There is a closed symmetric monoidal structure on \mathbf{Hmo} with tensor product given by $R(- \otimes^{\mathbb{L}} -)$ and with internal hom $\mathrm{hom}_{\mathbf{Hmo}}(-, -) = \mathrm{hom}_{\mathbf{Hqe}}(-, R(-))$.

Definition 2.4. The Hochschild cohomology of a DG-category \mathcal{A} is the cohomology of the complex

$$HH(\mathcal{A}) := \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$$

where \mathcal{A} is viewed as the diagonal bimodule.

Note that $HH(\mathcal{A})$ is an endomorphism object in a DG-category and so is a differential graded algebra i.e. a chain complex with a compatible multiplication. There is also an E_2 structure on $HH(\mathcal{A})$ although we won't consider that for the moment.

Remark 2.5. Recall \mathcal{A}^e is the derived enveloping algebra so in the case k is not a field, this is sometimes referred to as Shukla cohomology.

We will heavily use the following description.

Theorem 2.6. (Corollary 8.1 [Toë07]) *If \mathcal{A} is a DG-category then*

$$HH(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathrm{hom}_{\mathbf{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})(1_{\mathcal{A}}, 1_{\mathcal{A}})$$

the endomorphism DGA of $1_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathrm{hom}_{\mathbf{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$.

The proof follows from Toën's Morita theory. Under the description of the internal-hom in \mathbf{Hqe} as a category of bimodules, the identity corresponds to the diagonal bimodule. In Corollary 8.2 in [Toë07], it is shown that $HH(\mathcal{A}) \simeq HH(\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}))$ and so Hochschild cohomology is invariant under Morita equivalence. We will need the small version which can be proved in the same way.

Corollary 2.7. *If \mathcal{A} is a DG-category then*

$$HH(\mathcal{A}) \simeq HH(\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A})).$$

Proof. The Yoneda embedding $\mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op})$ induces a quasi-fully faithful functor by Corollary 6.6 in [Toë07]

$$\mathrm{hom}_{\mathbf{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{hom}_{\mathbf{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op}))$$

By Theorem 7.2.2 in [Toë07], there is an equivalence

$$\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op})) \simeq \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op}), \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op}))$$

also induced by the Yoneda embedding. Therefore it induces a quasi-isomorphism of DGAs $HH(\mathcal{A}) \simeq HH(\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op}))$. Finally we note that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A}^{op}) \simeq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op}$ (e.g. Proposition 5.4 in [Goo23]). So the result follows since Hochschild cohomology is clearly invariant under taking opposites. \square

Remark 2.8. Hochschild cohomology is functorial with respect to quasi-fully faithful functors. This can be seen from Toën's description. If $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ there is a cospan in Hqe

$$\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{F_*} \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \xleftarrow{F^*} \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B})$$

If F is quasi-fully faithful then by Corollary 6.6 in [Toë07], F_* is quasi-fully faithful. Hence, there is a cospan of DGAs

$$\mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})(\mathrm{id}, \mathrm{id}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})(F, F) \leftarrow \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B})(\mathrm{id}, \mathrm{id})$$

Hence, there is a morphism in Hqe from $HH(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow HH(\mathcal{A})$. It is clear that this construction sends $1_{\mathcal{A}} \mapsto 1_{HH(\mathcal{A})}$. Given $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $G: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ then there is a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}) & \xleftarrow{F_*} & \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}) & \xleftarrow{G_*} & \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{C}) \\ G_* \uparrow & & G_* \uparrow & & \\ \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) & \xleftarrow{F_*} & \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}) & & \\ F_* \uparrow & & & & \\ \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) & & & & \end{array}$$

where the square commutes by associativity of the self-enrichment of Hqe . Restricting to the identity morphism and taking cohomology gives that $HH^*(GF) = HH^*(F)HH^*(G)$.

3. REFLEXIVITY IN CLOSED SYMMETRIC MONOIDAL CATEGORIES

Let $(\mathcal{M}, \otimes, \mathbf{1})$ be a closed symmetric monoidal category whose internal hom we denote $\mathrm{hom}(-, -)$. The dual functor

$$D := \mathrm{hom}(-, \mathbf{1}): \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{op}$$

is left adjoint to $D: \mathcal{M}^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$. Indeed, there are natural isomorphisms

$$\mathrm{hom}(x, Dy) \simeq \mathrm{hom}(x \otimes y, \mathbf{1}) \simeq \mathrm{hom}(y \otimes x, \mathbf{1}) \simeq \mathrm{hom}(y, Dx).$$

The unit and the counit coincide as a natural transformation

$$\text{eval}: 1_{\mathcal{M}} \rightarrow DD.$$

The following definition appeared in [DP84].

Definition 3.1. An object $m \in \mathcal{M}$ is reflexive if eval_m is an isomorphism. Let $\text{Refl}(\mathcal{M}) \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ denote the full subcategory of reflexive objects of \mathcal{M} .

Proposition 3.2. *If \mathcal{M} is a closed symmetric monoidal category, then D restricts to a self-inverse equivalence*

$$D: \text{Refl}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Refl}(\mathcal{M})^{op}$$

and $\text{Refl}(\mathcal{M})$ is maximal with this property i.e. if D restricts to an equivalence on any subcategory $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{M}$ then $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{Refl}(\mathcal{M})$.

Proof. The triangle identity of the adjunction implies that D restricts to a contravariant self-adjunction on $\text{Refl}(\mathcal{M})$. Since the unit and counit are isomorphisms for all reflexive objects, it is an equivalence. If D restricts to an equivalence on \mathcal{C} , then the unit and counit must be isomorphisms and so every object of \mathcal{C} is reflexive. \square

Remark 3.3. We consider some canonical morphisms in \mathcal{M} .

- (1) The counit of the adjunction $- \otimes x \dashv \text{hom}(x, -)$ evaluated at the unit produces a map $\varepsilon_1^x: Dx \otimes x \rightarrow 1$.
- (2) For $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$, the adjunct of $\varepsilon_1^x \otimes \varepsilon_1^y$ produces maps

$$\mu_{x,y}: Dx \otimes Dy \rightarrow D(x \otimes y)$$

which make $D: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{op}$ a lax monoidal functor.

- (3) For any $x, y \in \mathcal{M}$ there is a map

$$Dx \otimes y \rightarrow \text{hom}(x, y)$$

defined as the image of ε_1^x under

$$\text{Hom}(Dx \otimes x, 1) \xrightarrow{- \otimes y} \text{Hom}(Dx \otimes x \otimes y, y) \simeq \text{Hom}(Dx \otimes y, \text{hom}(x, y))$$

Reflexivity should be compared to dualizability.

Definition 3.4. An object in \mathcal{M} is dualizable if the canonical map

$$Dx \otimes x \rightarrow \text{hom}(x, x)$$

is an equivalence. Let $\text{Dual}(\mathcal{M})$ denote the full subcategory of dualizable objects in \mathcal{M} .

There are various equivalent versions of dualizability. The following proposition can be extracted from [DP84] and [LMSM86].

Proposition 3.5. *Let \mathcal{M} be a closed symmetric monoidal category and $x \in \mathcal{M}$. The following are equivalent*

- (1) *x is dualizable.*
- (2) *There is a map $c: 1 \rightarrow x \otimes Dx$ such that the composites*

$$\begin{aligned} x &\xrightarrow{c \otimes x} x \otimes Dx \otimes x \xrightarrow{x \otimes \varepsilon_1} x \\ Dx &\xrightarrow{Dx \otimes c} Dx \otimes x \otimes Dx \xrightarrow{\varepsilon_1 \otimes Dx} Dx \end{aligned}$$

are both the identity.

- (3) *The canonical map $Dx \otimes y \rightarrow \text{hom}(x, y)$ is an isomorphism for all $y \in \mathcal{M}$.*
- (4) *x is reflexive and $\mu_{x,y}: Dx \otimes Dy \rightarrow D(x \otimes y)$ is an isomorphism for all $y \in \mathcal{M}$.*
- (5) *x is reflexive and $\mu_{x,Dx}: Dx \otimes DDx \rightarrow D(x \otimes Dx)$ is an isomorphism.*
- (6) *x is reflexive and Dx is dualizable.*

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose \mathcal{M} is a closed symmetric monoidal category. Then $\text{Dual}(\mathcal{M})$ is a symmetric monoidal subcategory of \mathcal{M} and D restricts to a strong monoidal equivalence*

$$D: \text{Dual}(\mathcal{M}) \rightarrow \text{Dual}(\mathcal{M})^{op}$$

and $\text{Dual}(\mathcal{M})$ is maximal with respect to this property.

Proof. If x and y are dualizable then by (3) and (4) of Proposition 3.5,

$$\begin{aligned} D(x \otimes y) \otimes x \otimes y &\simeq Dx \otimes Dy \otimes x \otimes y \\ &\simeq \text{hom}(x, Dy \otimes x \otimes y) \\ &\simeq \text{hom}(x, \text{hom}(y, x \otimes y)) \\ &\simeq \text{hom}(x \otimes y, x \otimes y). \end{aligned}$$

One can check this is the canonical map and so $x \otimes y$ is dualizable. By (4), D restricts to a strong monoidal equivalence. Conversely if D restricts to an equivalence on a monoidal subcategory \mathcal{C} , then we must have $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{Refl}(\mathcal{M})$. Furthermore since the equivalence is strong monoidal, we have that $\mu_{x,Dx}$ is an isomorphism for all $x \in \mathcal{C}$. Then by (5) $x \in \text{Dual}(\mathcal{M})$. \square

Example 3.7.

- (1) Dualizability is a notion of smallness and coincides with other notions of smallness in many cases. They correspond to finite dimensional representations over a group; finitely generated projectives in the module category of commutative ring; perfect

complexes in the derived category of a commutative ring; and finite spectra in the stable homotopy category.

- (2) In general there are more reflexive objects than dualizable objects: In $\text{Mod } \mathbb{Z}$, the Specker group $\prod_{\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{Z}$ is reflexive but not dualizable. In $\mathcal{D}(R)$, for a commutative ring R , the object $\bigoplus_{\mathbb{Z}} \Sigma^i R$ is not dualizable but it is reflexive.
- (3) For a ring R , the kernel and the cokernel of the canonical map

$$M \rightarrow \text{Hom}_{R^{op}}(\text{Hom}_R(M, R), R)$$

was studied in [AB69]. Reflexive modules are well studied in commutative algebra (e.g. see [BH98]).

Remark 3.8. The reflexive objects do not form a monoidal subcategory in general. Consider $M := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}} \Sigma^i k \in \mathcal{D}(k)$ where k is a field. This is reflexive but $M \otimes M$ is not for cardinality reasons.

Proposition 3.9. *Reflexive objects and dualizable objects are closed under retracts.*

Proof. Suppose $m \xrightarrow{f} n \xrightarrow{g} m$ are such that $gf = 1_m$ and n is reflexive. Then by naturality of eval , eval_m is a retract of eval_n . Then the result holds since isomorphisms are closed under retracts. The proof is similar for dualizable objects. \square

4. REFLEXIVE DG-CATEGORIES

Our focus is on the closed symmetric monoidal category Hmo .

Definition 4.1. A DG-category \mathcal{A} is reflexive if it represents a reflexive object in Hmo .

Let us spell out what this means for an idempotent complete pretriangulated DG-category \mathcal{A} . Since every object in Hmo is equivalent to such a DG-category this is not a restriction. Using Proposition 2.2, the evaluation map induces a triangulated functor

$$\text{eval}_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{A}$$

which is an equivalence if and only if \mathcal{A} is reflexive.

Remark 4.2. In [KS22], reflexivity is defined over a field using an explicit description of a functor $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}$. In Proposition 6.9 we show these definitions are equivalent.

We will also be interested in the following weaker condition.

Definition 4.3. A DG-category \mathcal{A} is semireflexive if $\text{eval}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is fully faithful.

Remark 4.4. Quasi-fully faithful functors in \mathbf{Hqe} can be encoded as the homotopy monomorphisms of the model category (see [Toë07]). So by considering the higher structure one can also encode semireflexivity in the abstract setting. However for this definition one should work with a model which is compatible with monoidal structure i.e. the infinity categorical enhancement.

Example 4.5. In [KS22], the following examples are given.

- (1) If A is a proper connective DGA (i.e. $H^i(A) = 0$ for $i > 0$) over a perfect field k , then $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(A)$ and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(A)$ are reflexive.
- (2) If X is a projective scheme over a perfect field k , then $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(X)$ and $\mathcal{D}^b(\text{Coh } X)$ are reflexive.
- (3) If \mathcal{A} is a proper DG-category over a field then \mathcal{A} is semireflexive.

Remark 4.6. A subcategory $\mathcal{A}' \subseteq \mathcal{A}$ of a DG-category is right or left admissible if the inclusion has a right or left adjoint. In particular admissible subcategories are retracts in \mathbf{Hmo} and so admissible subcategories of reflexive DG-categories are reflexive.

5. HOCHSCHILD COHOMOLOGY

We prove that $HH^*(\mathcal{A}) \simeq HH^*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A}))$ for a semireflexive DG-category \mathcal{A} .

Lemma 5.1. *If \mathcal{M} is a closed symmetric monoidal category then the dual functor $D: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^{\text{op}}$ lifts to an \mathcal{M} -enriched functor given by*

$$\text{hom}(x, y) \xrightarrow{\text{hom}(x, \text{eval}_y)} \text{hom}(x, DDy) \simeq \text{hom}(Dy, Dx).$$

Proof. The fact that D lifts to an \mathcal{M} -enriched functor follows from the self-enrichment. The maps $\text{hom}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{hom}(Dy, Dx)$ are the adjuncts of the enriched composition map $\text{hom}(x, y) \otimes \text{hom}(y, 1) \rightarrow \text{hom}(x, 1)$. The discussion at the beginning of Section 3 actually shows that there is an enriched adjunction $D \dashv D$. It follows therefore that the action of D is given by the composite as claimed. For example see diagram 1.53 in [Kel82]. \square

The following result generalises Corollary 3.16 in [KS22]. We note that only one of the objects is required to be reflexive.

Proposition 5.2. *If \mathcal{M} is a closed symmetric monoidal category and $y \in \mathcal{M}$ is reflexive then*

$$D: \text{hom}(x, y) \rightarrow \text{hom}(Dy, Dx)$$

is an isomorphism for all $x \in \mathcal{M}$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, if eval_y is an isomorphism then D induces such an isomorphism. \square

We deduce that for DG-categories \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} there is a morphism in Hqe

$$(5.1) \quad \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{B}), \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A}))$$

lifting the action of the functor

$$\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(-, \mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(k)): \text{Hqe} \rightarrow \text{Hqe}^{op}$$

which is an equivalence if \mathcal{B} is a reflexive DG-category. There is a version of Proposition 5.2 for semireflexive DG-categories.

Lemma 5.3. *Suppose \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are DG-categories with \mathcal{B} semireflexive then the DG-functor in Equation (5.1) is quasi-fully faithful.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.1, the DG-functor is the composition of

$$\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{eval}_{\mathcal{B}})} \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{B})$$

with the equivalence $\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{B}) \simeq \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}} \mathcal{A})$. If \mathcal{B} is semireflexive, $\text{eval}_{\mathcal{B}}$ is quasi-fully faithful and by Corollary 6.6 in [Toë07] so is $\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \text{eval}_{\mathcal{B}})$. \square

Proposition 5.4. *If \mathcal{A} is a semireflexive DG-category, then there is a quasi-isomorphism of DGAs*

$$HH(\mathcal{A}) \simeq HH(\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})).$$

Proof. Since the DG-functor in Equation (5.1) is induced by the functor $\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(-, \mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(k))$ it sends the identity to the identity. Since it is quasi-fully faithful it induces an isomorphism on HH^* by Theorem 2.6. \square

Remark 5.5. In Theorem 4.4.1 of [LV05], it is shown using different methods that $HH^*(\mathcal{A})$ is isomorphic to $HH^*(\mathcal{B})$ for any subcategory $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. In the non-proper case this does not apply to our situation since $\mathcal{D}_{\text{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$ does not always meet this condition.

Example 5.6. The analogous result for Hochschild homology of reflexive DG-categories is not true. If k is a field then $k[x]/x^2$ is reflexive and $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(k[x]/x^2) \simeq \mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(A)$ where A is the DGA $k[t]$ with $|t| = 1$. But one can compute that $HH_*(A)$ is non-zero in negative (homological!) degrees. This cannot occur for the Hochschild homology of an algebra.

Remark 5.7. If \mathcal{A} is a Gorenstein (in the sense of [Jin20]) and proper DG-category over a field then it is still possible to compute (the k -dual of) $HH_*(\mathcal{A})$ as an invariant of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$. Indeed if \mathcal{A} is idempotent

complete pretriangulated,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathcal{A}^e} \mathcal{A})^\vee &\simeq \mathrm{RHom}_{\mathcal{A}^e}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^\vee) \\
&\simeq \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})(\mathrm{id}, S) \\
&\simeq \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}))(S^{-1}, \mathrm{id}) \\
&\simeq \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}))(\mathrm{id}, S) \\
&\simeq HH^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}), S).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $S: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ denotes the Serre functor on \mathcal{A} which extends to an equivalence on $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$. Although we note that S is not a Serre functor on $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ and so $HH^*(\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}), S)$ is not intrinsic to $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$.

6. COREPRESENTABILITY

In this section we prove our definition of reflexivity is equivalent to that of [KS22]. This provides an explicit description of the evaluation functor and demonstrates the connection between reflexivity and corepresentability. As in [KS22] we now assume k is a field and use the notation $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{pvd}}(\mathcal{A})$ for the derived category of modules with finite dimensional total cohomology.

We begin by making $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(-)$ a contravariant functor on Hqe and showing the naturality of the equivalence $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \mathrm{hom}_{\mathrm{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^b(k))$. In fact we will define $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(-)$ as a pseudofunctor which descends to a strict functor on Hqe .

Definition 6.1. Let $\mathbb{D}\mathrm{Gcat}$ denote the strict 2-category whose objects are DG-categories, whose 1-cells are DG-functors and whose 2-cells are (closed) DG-natural transformations.

The underlying 1-category of $\mathbb{D}\mathrm{Gcat}$ is DGcat . In this section we will identify $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$ with the subcategory of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$ consisting of the cofibrant objects in the projective model structure. Since k is a field, Corollary 13.2.4 in [Rie14] applies and there is a comonadic DG-cofibrant replacement DG-functor $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})$. Hence, we have DG-functors

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$$

and an enriched adjunction $i^{\mathcal{A}} \dashv Q^{\mathcal{A}}$ whose counit $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{A}}: i^{\mathcal{A}} Q^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{A})}$ is a pointwise quasi-isomorphism. It is clear that this restricts to cohomologically finite modules.

Remark 6.2. This is where we need the assumption that k is a field. Otherwise the replacement functor need not lift to a DG-functor. For example, taking projective resolutions over \mathbb{Z} is not an additive functor.

Proposition 6.3. *There is a pseudofunctor*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-): \mathbb{D}\text{Gcat} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}\text{Gcat}^{\text{op}}$$

which agrees on a DG-category \mathcal{A} with $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. Given a DG-functor $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ let $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)$ denote the DG-functor

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(F)} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$$

where $\text{Res}(F)$ denotes precomposing with F . Given any $\beta: F \rightarrow G$ there is a DG-natural transformation $\text{Res}(\beta): \text{Res}(F) \rightarrow \text{Res}(G)$ and so set

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\beta) = Q^{\mathcal{A}} \text{Res}(\beta)_{i^{\mathcal{B}}}: \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(G)$$

Note that $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\beta\beta') = \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\beta)\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\beta')$. The unitor of this pseudofunctor is the unit of the adjunction $i^{\mathcal{A}} \dashv Q^{\mathcal{A}}$

$$\eta^{\mathcal{A}}: 1_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\text{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) = Q^{\mathcal{A}} i^{\mathcal{A}}.$$

If $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ and $G: \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ the associator is

$$\alpha^{G,F} := Q^{\mathcal{A}} \text{Res}(F) \varepsilon_{\text{Res}(G)i^{\mathcal{C}}}^{\mathcal{B}}: \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(GF).$$

The first is an isomorphism since $i^{\mathcal{A}}$ is DG-fully faithful. For the second, recall that $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{B}}$ is a pointwise quasi-isomorphism. Restrictions preserve pointwise quasi-isomorphisms and $Q^{\mathcal{A}}$ sends quasi-isomorphisms to isomorphisms. We show the 2-unitality and 2-associativity diagrams commute. Given

$$\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{G} \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{H} \mathcal{D}$$

we require the equality $\alpha^{HG,F}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)\alpha^{H,G}) = \alpha^{H,GF}\alpha_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(H)}^{G,F}$ of 2-cells

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(G)\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(H) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(HGF).$$

However this follows since they are both equal to the 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{C}}Q^{\mathcal{C}}} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(G)} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{B}}Q^{\mathcal{B}}} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \\ \text{Res}(H)i^{\mathcal{D}} \nearrow & & \parallel & \xRightarrow{\varepsilon^{\mathcal{C}}} & \parallel & & \parallel & \xRightarrow{\varepsilon^{\mathcal{B}}} & \parallel & \searrow Q^{\mathcal{A}}\text{Res}(F) \\ \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{D}) \rightarrow & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C}) & = & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(G)} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & = & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & \rightarrow & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \end{array}$$

The unitality conditions are that for any $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$

$$\begin{aligned} (Q^{\mathcal{A}} \varepsilon_{\text{Res}(F)i^{\mathcal{B}}}^{\mathcal{A}}) \eta_{Q^{\mathcal{A}}\text{Res}(F)i^{\mathcal{B}}} &= \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)} \\ (Q^{\mathcal{A}} \text{Res}(F) \varepsilon_{i^{\mathcal{B}}}^{\mathcal{B}}) (Q^{\mathcal{A}} \text{Res}(F) i^{\mathcal{B}} \eta^{\mathcal{B}}) &= \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)} \end{aligned}$$

which both follow from the triangle identities for $i \dashv Q$. \square

We now define an evaluation map corresponding to that of [KS22].

Proposition 6.4. *There is a pseudonatural transformation*

$$\mathrm{ev}: 1_{\mathrm{DGcat}} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(-).$$

For a DG-category \mathcal{A} and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, it sends

$$\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{A},a}: \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^b(k); M \mapsto M(a).$$

Proof. For $\mathcal{A} \in \mathrm{DGcat}$ define

$$\overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$$

as follows. For $a \in \mathcal{A}$ set

$$\overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a}: \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^b(k); M \mapsto M(a); \beta \mapsto \beta_a$$

This defines a DG-functor and so $\overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a} \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$. Given some $f \in \mathcal{A}(a, b)^n$, set $\overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},f}: \overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a} \rightarrow \overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},b}$ as the natural transformation whose value at $M \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ is

$$\overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a}(M) = M(a) \xrightarrow{M(f)} M(b) = \overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},b}(M)$$

Then $f \mapsto \overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},f}$ is a chain map and this constructs a DG-functor $\overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Define $\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}$ as the composition

$$\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\overline{\mathrm{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$$

Then $\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{A},a}$ is the cofibrant replacement of and so quasi-isomorphic to a $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ -module which sends

$$\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{A},a}: \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^b(k); M \mapsto M(a)$$

as claimed. Given a DG-functor $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ we define a 2-cell $\phi(F) = \phi$ as follows

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \\ \downarrow \mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{A}} & \searrow \phi & \downarrow \mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{B}} \\ \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(F)} & \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{B} \end{array}$$

First let $\gamma^{\mathcal{A}} = \gamma: \mathrm{Res}(Q^{\mathcal{A}}) i^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \mathrm{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}$ denote the 2-cell defined as

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}(Q^{\mathcal{A}})} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \parallel & & \parallel & \searrow \varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} & \parallel & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{Res}(Q^{\mathcal{A}})} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \parallel & & \parallel & \searrow \mathrm{Res}(\varepsilon^{\mathcal{A}}) & \parallel & & \parallel \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\mathrm{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \end{array}$$

Then let ϕ be the 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \downarrow \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}} & & \downarrow \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}} & & \downarrow \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{B}} \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{B} \\
 \parallel & \nearrow \gamma & \parallel & & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(\text{Res}(F))} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})} \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{B}})} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})
 \end{array}$$

$\searrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{B}}$

where the middle square commutes by naturality of $\overline{\text{ev}}$ and the right triangle commutes by definition. We show ϕ is invertible. For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$, we claim that $\text{Res Res}(F)\gamma_a$ is a quasi-isomorphism of $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$ modules. If $M \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$, then $(\text{Res Res}(F)\gamma_a)_M$ is the composition

$$\begin{aligned}
 & (\text{Res Res}(F) \text{Res}(Q^{\mathcal{A}}) i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a}) (M) \\
 & \parallel \\
 & i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a} i^{\mathcal{A}}) (Q^{\mathcal{A}}(MF)) \\
 & \downarrow \varepsilon_{\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a} i^{\mathcal{A}}}^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (Q^{\mathcal{A}}(MF)) \\
 & (\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a} i^{\mathcal{A}}) (Q^{\mathcal{A}}(MF)) = i^{\mathcal{A}} Q^{\mathcal{A}}(MF)(a) \\
 & \downarrow \varepsilon_{MF}^{\mathcal{A}}(a) \\
 & MF(a)
 \end{aligned}$$

The first morphism is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}^b(k)$ since $\varepsilon_{\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A},a} i^{\mathcal{A}}}^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}$ is a quasi-isomorphism of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ -modules. The second morphism is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}^b(k)$ since $\varepsilon_{MF}^{\mathcal{A}}$ is a quasi-isomorphism of \mathcal{A} modules. Hence, $\text{Res Res}(F)\gamma_a$ is a quasi-isomorphism for all a . Therefore

$$\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{B}}) \text{Res Res}(F)\gamma_a$$

is also a quasi-isomorphism for all a . Therefore

$$\phi_a = Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})} \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{B}}) \text{Res Res}(F)\gamma_a$$

is an isomorphism since $Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})}$ sends quasi-isomorphisms to isomorphisms. Therefore ϕ_a is invertible at each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ as required.

Next we must check the coherence diagrams commute. Compatibility with composition requires that given DG-functors

$$\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{G} \mathcal{C}$$

the following 2-cells are equal.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \downarrow F \quad \swarrow \phi(F) \quad \downarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F) \\ \mathcal{B} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{B}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \\ \downarrow G \quad \swarrow \phi(G) \quad \downarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(G) \\ \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{C}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C}) \end{array} & = GF & \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \downarrow \quad \swarrow \phi(GF) \quad \downarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(GF) \\ \mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{C}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C}) \end{array} \\
 & & \begin{array}{c} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F) \\ \searrow \alpha \\ \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \\ \swarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(G) \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

where $\alpha: (\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} G)(\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} F) \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(GF)$ is the associator of the composition of pseudofunctors $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}$. In our case this is satisfied since by definition they are both

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{C} \\
 \downarrow \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}} & & \downarrow \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{B}} & & \downarrow \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{C}} \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{F^{**}} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{G^{**}} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C}) \\
 \downarrow & \nearrow \gamma^{\mathcal{A}} & \downarrow & \nearrow \gamma^{\mathcal{B}} & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{C})
 \end{array}$$

Here we have used the shorthand $F^{**} = \text{Res Res}(F)$ and similarly for G . To check ϕ is compatible with the unit we need the following diagram to be the identity 2-cell

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathcal{A} \\
 \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}} & \nearrow \phi(1_{\mathcal{A}}) & \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}} \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(1_{\mathcal{A}})} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A} \\
 \parallel & \nearrow \eta & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A} & \xlongequal{\quad} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}
 \end{array}$$

where η is the unit of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}$. By definition this is

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \mathcal{A} \xlongequal{\quad\quad\quad} \mathcal{A} \\
 \downarrow \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}} \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\
 \uparrow \text{Res}(\varepsilon^{\mathcal{A}}) \quad \uparrow \varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(Q^{\mathcal{A}})} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\
 \uparrow \text{Res}(\eta^{\mathcal{A}}) \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\
 \uparrow \eta^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xlongequal{\quad\quad\quad} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})
 \end{array}$$

$\downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}$

Note that the 2-cell $\varepsilon_{i^{\mathcal{A}}}^{\mathcal{A}} i^{\mathcal{A}} \eta^{\mathcal{A}} = \text{id}_{i^{\mathcal{A}}}$ since the adjunction $i^{\mathcal{A}} \dashv Q^{\mathcal{A}}$ is idempotent. Therefore $\text{Res}(\varepsilon_{i^{\mathcal{A}}}^{\mathcal{A}} i^{\mathcal{A}} \eta^{\mathcal{A}}) = \text{id}_{\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})}$. Hence, the above 2-cell simplifies to

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \mathcal{A} \xlongequal{\quad\quad\quad} \mathcal{A} \\
 \downarrow \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}} \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\
 \uparrow \varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\
 \uparrow \eta^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xlongequal{\quad\quad\quad} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})
 \end{array}$$

$\downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}$

Then we note that $Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} \eta_{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}}^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} = \text{id}_{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}}$ by the triangle identity.

Finally we check naturality of ϕ . Given a 2-cell $\beta: F \Rightarrow G$ between DG-functors $F, G: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, we require the following equality of 2-cells

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}} \downarrow & \nearrow \phi(G) & \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{B}} \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(G)} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{B} \\
 \parallel & \nearrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\beta) & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{B}
 \end{array} =
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \parallel & \nearrow \beta & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}} \downarrow & \nearrow \phi(F) & \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{B}} \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F)} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{B}
 \end{array}$$

Expanding the first gives

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\quad G \quad} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}} & & \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{B}} \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res Res}(G)} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \\
 \downarrow & \nearrow & \parallel & \nearrow \text{Res Res}(\beta) & \parallel & \searrow Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})} \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{B}}) & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res Res}(F)} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})
 \end{array}$$

while the second gives

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \parallel & \nearrow \beta & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}} & & \downarrow \text{ev}_{\mathcal{B}} \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\
 \downarrow & \nearrow & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\quad \gamma \quad} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\text{Res Res}(F)} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})} \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{B}})} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})
 \end{array}$$

Where γ was defined earlier in this proof. Therefore the equality of these squares follows from the following equality.

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res Res}(G)} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{B} \\
 \parallel & \nearrow \text{Res Res}(\beta) & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\text{Res Res}(F)} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{B}
 \end{array} =
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{G} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \parallel & \nearrow \beta & \parallel \\
 \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{F} & \mathcal{B} \\
 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\text{Res Res}(F)} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{B}
 \end{array}$$

which holds since at each $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $M \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$, both are given by $M\beta_a: MF(a) \rightarrow MG(a)$. \square

We now pass to Hqe and in the process strictify from a pseudofunctor to a functor.

Proposition 6.5. *There is a functor $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-): \text{Hqe} \rightarrow \text{Hqe}^{\text{op}}$ and the image of ev defines a natural transformation $1_{\text{Hqe}} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-)$.*

Proof. Let $[\text{DGcat}]$ denote the category whose objects are DG-categories and whose morphisms are isomorphism classes of DG-functors. Then the pseudofunctor $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-)$ on DGcat becomes a strict functor on $[\text{DGcat}]$ and the pseudonatural transformation ev becomes a natural transformation $1_{[\text{DGcat}]} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}$. We claim that $\text{DGcat} \rightarrow [\text{DGcat}]$ is the localisation of DGcat at DG-equivalences.

Suppose $F: \text{DGcat} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ is a functor which sends equivalences to isomorphisms. Define $\hat{F}: [\text{DGcat}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ as F on objects and $\hat{F}[f] = F(f)$ on morphisms. We check this is well defined. Suppose $f, g: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ are naturally isomorphic DG-functors. Let J be the DG-category with 2 objects x, y with all hom-complexes k and all compositions the isomorphisms $k \otimes k \cong k$. Then there are two maps $x, y: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} \otimes J$ which correspond to inclusion at x and at y . Both are equivalences with a common inverse given by projection $p: \mathcal{A} \otimes J \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. It follows that $F(x) = F(y): F(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow F(\mathcal{A} \otimes J)$ are isomorphisms. A natural isomorphism $\alpha: f \rightarrow g$ is the same thing as a functor $\mathcal{A} \otimes J \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ which is equal to f when restricted via x and equal to g when restricted via y . Therefore there is a diagram in \mathcal{C}

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{F(x)} & F(\mathcal{A} \otimes J) & \xleftarrow{F(y)} & F(\mathcal{A}) \\ & \searrow F(f) & \downarrow & \swarrow F(g) & \\ & & F(\mathcal{B}) & & \end{array}$$

Hence it follows that $F(f) = F(g)$. Functoriality of \hat{F} follows from the functoriality of F . If G is any other functor $[\text{DGcat}] \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ whose restriction to DGcat is F then we must have $G([f]) = G(f)$ and $G(\mathcal{A}) = F(\mathcal{A})$ so \hat{F} is unique.

Therefore Hqe is the localisation of $[\text{DGcat}]$ at morphisms $[f]$ such that f is a quasi-equivalence. Since $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-)$ preserves quasi-equivalences, the universal property implies that $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-)$ descends to a functor $\text{Hqe} \rightarrow \text{Hqe}^{\text{op}}$. Furthermore the image of ev descends to a natural transformation between the functors on Hqe . \square

Proposition 6.6. *There is an adjunction*

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-): \text{Hqe} \leftrightarrow \text{Hqe}^{\text{op}}: \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-)$$

whose unit and counit is the image of ev in Hqe .

Proof. We will show that the triangle identity holds for $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-)$ with candidate unit and counit given by $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}$. To do this we construct an invertible 2-cell in $\mathbb{D}\mathbb{G}\mathbb{c}\mathbb{a}\mathbb{t}$ of the form

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ & & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \end{array}$$

The 2-cell is constructed as

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A}}} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})})} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} \\ & \searrow & \downarrow & \searrow & \downarrow \varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} & \downarrow i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} & \downarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & \xleftarrow{\text{Res}(\varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})})} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & \downarrow \text{Res}(Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}) & \downarrow \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \\ & & & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & \downarrow \text{Res Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})) & \downarrow \text{Res Res}(\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}}) \\ & & & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & \downarrow \text{Res Res}(\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}})) & \downarrow Q^{\mathcal{A}} \\ & & & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & \downarrow Q^{\mathcal{A}} & \downarrow \\ & & & & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}\mathcal{A} & & \end{array}$$

The pentagon commutes by naturality of $\overline{\text{ev}}$ and the unlabelled triangle is the triangle identity for $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(-) \dashv \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(-)$. To see this 2-cell is invertible, denote it $(\eta^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}\beta$. Then, given $M \in \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$, $\beta_M(a)$ is the morphism in $\mathcal{D}^b(k)$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\text{Res}(\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}}) \text{Res} \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \text{Res}(Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}) i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}} Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}} \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}), M})(a) \\
& \quad \parallel \\
& \quad i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}), M}) (Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}, a})) \\
& \quad \downarrow \varepsilon_{\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}, M}}^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}, a})) \\
& \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}, M} (Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}, a})) = (i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}} Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}}) (\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}, a})(M) \\
& \quad \downarrow \varepsilon_{\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}, a}}^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})} (M) \\
& \text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}}) \overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}, a}(M) = i^{\mathcal{A}}(M)(a)
\end{aligned}$$

This is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}^b(k)$ since both ε 's are pointwise quasi-isomorphisms. Therefore β_M is a quasi-isomorphism of \mathcal{A} -modules and $Q^{\mathcal{A}}(\beta_M)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A})$. So the above 2-cell evaluated at M is

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}) \text{ev}_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}(M) \xrightarrow[\sim]{Q^{\mathcal{A}}(\beta_M)} Q^{\mathcal{A}} i^{\mathcal{A}}(M) \xrightarrow[\sim]{(\eta_M^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}} M$$

which is an isomorphism. \square

Lemma 6.7. *There is an isomorphism $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-) \cong \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(-, \mathcal{D}^b(k))$ of functors on Hqe .*

Proof. Recall that for any cofibrant $X \in \text{DGCat}$, there is an isomorphism by Lemma 6.2 in [Toë07]

$$(6.7.1) \quad \text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) \simeq \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGCat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})))$$

using the same notation as the proof of Proposition 2.2. We claim this is natural in \mathcal{A} . Given any DG-functor $F: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, we will show the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGCat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}))) \\
\downarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F) \circ & & \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{DGCat}}(X, \text{Res}(F)) \\
\text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGCat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})))
\end{array}$$

where the right vertical functor is well defined on the homotopy categories since $\text{Res}(F)$ preserves weak equivalences in $\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$ and the weak equivalences in $\text{hom}_{\text{DGCat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}))$ are defined pointwise. Any $f: X \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$ can be modelled as an actual DG-functor since X is cofibrant. This is sent along the top right composition to

$$X \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(F)} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$$

The image of f along the bottom left composition is

$$X \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(F)} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{i^{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$$

Then since $\varepsilon: i^{\mathcal{A}}Q^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow 1_{\mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}$ is a pointwise quasi-isomorphism, these two objects in $\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}))$ are weakly equivalent. Hence, they are equal in $\text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})))$ as required. Next note that following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}))) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X \otimes \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}^b(k))) \\ \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X, \text{Res}(F)) & & \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X \otimes F, \mathcal{C}^b(k)) \\ \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X, \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}))) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}^b(k))) \end{array}$$

since it commutes at the non-derived level by naturality of the Hom-Tensor adjunction. Now Lemma 6.2 of [Toë07] gives us naturality of Equation (6.7.1) in X . Hence, the following diagram commutes

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X \otimes \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}^b(k))) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X \otimes \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}^b(k)) \\ \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X \otimes F, \mathcal{C}^b(k)) & & \downarrow \circ(X \otimes F) \\ \text{iso Ho}(\text{hom}_{\text{DGcat}}(X \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{C}^b(k))) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^b(k)) \end{array}$$

where the left vertical map is well defined since the weak equivalences are defined pointwise. Finally note that the square below commutes by definition of the functoriality of an internal hom

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X \otimes \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}^b(k)) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X, \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}^b(k))) \\ \downarrow \circ(X \otimes F) & & \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(F, \mathcal{D}^b(k)) \circ \\ \text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X \otimes \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^b(k)) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{Hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(X, \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^b(k))) \end{array}$$

Pasting the previous four diagrams together states that the image under Yoneda embedding of the following diagram commutes.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(k)) \\ \downarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(F) & & \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(F, \mathcal{D}^b(k)) \\ \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}^b(k)) \end{array}$$

By the description of Hqe using the calculus of fractions, the naturality holds for any morphism in Hqe . \square

Remark 6.8. There is nothing special about restricting to $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(-)$ here. One can make $\mathcal{D}(-)$ a contravariant functor via restriction and the same argument proves $\mathcal{D}(-) \simeq \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(-, \mathcal{D}(k))$.

We conclude our definition of reflexivity coincides with that of Definition 3.11 in [KS22].

Proposition 6.9. *A DG-category \mathcal{A} is reflexive (semireflexive) if and only if $\text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an equivalence (quasi-fully faithful).*

Proof. By uniqueness of adjunctions, the composition

$$\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \simeq \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}^b(k)), \mathcal{D}^b(k))$$

is $\text{eval}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of Section 4 and so the result follows. \square

Remark 6.10. We note the connection to corepresentability. In Hmo the Yoneda embedding for a DG-category \mathcal{A} is an equivalence and so \mathcal{A} is reflexive if and only if $\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op}$ is. So we're interested in the composition

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op}) \simeq \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}$$

The equivalence is given by restricting along $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op})$ which sends $N \mapsto \text{RHom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-, N)$. Hence the long composite sends

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})^{op} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{A}; \quad M \mapsto \text{RHom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, -)$$

Thus \mathcal{A} is reflexive if and only if every DG-functor $F: \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^b(k)$ is corepresented by some $M \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(\mathcal{A})$ and every morphism in $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}))$ is determined by a morphism between the corepresenting objects. This latter condition is automatic if \mathcal{A} is proper by Example 4.5 (3).

7. FINITE DIMENSIONAL DGAs AND THEIR KOSZUL DUALS

A DGA is finite dimensional if its underlying chain complex is finite dimensional over k . This is a strictly stronger condition than properness although by [RS20], every proper connective DGA admits a finite dimensional model. See [Orl20], [Orl23], [Goo23] for some background on finite dimensional DGAs. In this section we apply the above results to finite dimensional DGAs.

A key construction of [Orl20] is that of the semisimple quotient A/J_+ . Here J_+ is the DG-ideal $J + d(J)$ where J is the radical of the underlying algebra of A and d is the differential of A . This behaves like the radical of a finite dimensional algebra in many ways: $\mathcal{D}(A/J_+)$ is equivalent to a product of finite dimensional division algebras, there is a derived Nakayama Lemma and A/J_+ can detect perfection of A -modules as well as smoothness of A .

Remark 7.1. In contrast to the finite dimensional algebra case, the question of when A/J_+ generates $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(A)$ is more subtle. It is true for connective DGAs by [Orl23]. It is clear that $\text{thick}(A/J_+)$ is the smallest thick subcategory containing all A -modules which admit finite dimensional models. However [Efi20] gives an example of a module over a finite dimensional DGA which has finite dimensional cohomology but does not admit a finite dimensional model. This does not rule out the possibility that A/J_+ generates $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(A)$ since it is not clear that every object in $\text{thick}(A/J_+)$ admits a finite dimensional model.

In light of Remark 7.1, suppose \mathcal{A} is a proper DG-category and there is an intermediary subcategory $\mathcal{A}^{op} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$. The Yoneda embedding of \mathcal{B} restricted to \mathcal{A} factors as

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B}^{op} & \xhookrightarrow{Y} & \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{B}) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \mathcal{A} & \xhookrightarrow{Y|_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \end{array}$$

since $\text{RHom}_{\mathcal{A}}(a, b) \in \mathcal{D}^b(k)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}^{op}$ and $b \in \mathcal{B}$.

Lemma 7.2. *If \mathcal{A} is a proper DG-category and $\mathcal{A}^{op} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ then $Y|_{\mathcal{A}}: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ is isomorphic in DGCat to*

$$\mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\text{ev}_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(j)} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$$

where $j: \mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\overline{\text{ev}}_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\text{Res}(i^{\mathcal{A}})} & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{Q^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) \\ & \searrow^{Y|_{\mathcal{A}}} & & & \swarrow_{\varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} & & \downarrow_{i^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}} \\ & & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}) & & \downarrow_{\text{Res}(j)} \\ & & & \searrow_{i^{\mathcal{B}}} & & & \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \\ & & & \swarrow_{(\eta^{\mathcal{A}})^{-1}} & & & \downarrow_{Q^{\mathcal{B}}} \\ & & & & & & \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B}) \end{array}$$

Note there is nothing derived about the pentagon in this diagram. Both DG-functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$ can be explicitly described. For example on objects the top route sends $a \in \mathcal{A}$ to the \mathcal{B} -module

$$\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^b(k); b \mapsto b(a); \beta \mapsto \beta_a$$

The bottom sends a to

$$\mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^b(k); b \mapsto \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A}(a, -), b); \beta \mapsto \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{A}(a, -), b);$$

By the non-derived, $\mathcal{C}(k)$ -enriched Yoneda lemma, there is a natural isomorphism between these two DG-functors $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})$ as indicated. Since $\eta^{\mathcal{A}}$ is invertible, it remains to see that $Q^{\mathcal{B}} \text{Res}(j) \varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}$ is too. This holds since $\varepsilon^{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}$ is a pointwise quasi-isomorphism which is preserved by $\text{Res}(j)$ and so is sent to a pointwise isomorphism by $Q^{\mathcal{B}}$. \square

Proposition 7.3. *Suppose \mathcal{A} is a proper DG-category and $\mathcal{A}^{op} \subseteq \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$. Then the map $HH^*(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow HH^*(\mathcal{A})$ induced by the inclusion $\mathcal{A}^{op} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is an isomorphism.*

Proof. Let $j: \mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$. Consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) & \hookrightarrow & \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}} \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}), \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(j)) & & \downarrow \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(j, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) \\ & & \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{B})) & \xrightarrow{\sim} & \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) \\ & & & & \uparrow \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, j) \\ & & & & \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}) \end{array}$$

where the triangle is $\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, -)$ applied to Lemma 7.2. The square commutes by the naturality of the adjunction. From this we see that $\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(j, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}))$ is quasi-fully faithful when restricted to the image of $\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$. Since $1_{\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})}$ is in the image of $\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ it follows that the map

$$\text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(j, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})): HH(\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow \text{hom}_{\text{Hqe}}(\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A}))(j, j)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism. Therefore the map induced by j according to Remark 2.8

$$HH^*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow HH^*(\mathcal{B})$$

is an isomorphism. In particular if we took $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}^{op}$ we have that the inclusion $\mathcal{A}^{op} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})$ induces an isomorphism

$$HH^*(\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(\mathcal{A})) \rightarrow HH^*(\mathcal{A}^{op}) \simeq HH^*(\mathcal{A})$$

So by functoriality and the two out of three property for isomorphisms the map $HH^*(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow HH^*(\mathcal{A}^{op}) \cong HH^*(\mathcal{A})$ induced by $\mathcal{A}^{op} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ is an isomorphism. \square

Remark 7.4. Proposition 7.3 also follows from the results of [LV05].

The Koszul dual of a finite dimensional DGA A is defined as

$$A^! = \mathrm{RHom}_A(A/J_+, A/J_+)$$

then $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}((A^!)^{op}) \simeq \mathrm{thick}_A(A/J_+) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A)$ and so we deduce

Corollary 7.5. *If A is a finite dimensional DGA, then there is an isomorphism $HH^*(A) \cong HH^*(A^!)$.*

Remark 7.6. If $A = k[x]/x^2$ with $|x| = 1$ then $A^! = k[[t]]$ and by Corollary 7.5 we deduce that $HH^*(k[[t]]) \cong HH^*(k[x]/x^2)$ which can be computed as $k[[t]]$ in degrees 0 and 1 and zero otherwise.

We have the following condition for a finite dimensional DGA to be reflexive.

Proposition 7.7. *Suppose A is a finite dimensional DGA such that A/J_+ is k -separable and $\mathrm{thick}(A/J_+) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A)$. Then A is reflexive if and only if $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A^!) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A^!)$.*

Proof. Under the assumption that $\mathrm{thick}(A/J_+) = \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A)$, Theorem 7.2 in [Goo23] states that the restricted Yoneda embedding of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A)$

$$Y|_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A)} : \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A)^{op}$$

is an equivalence if and only if $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A^!) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A^!)$. By Lemma 7.2 this occurs exactly if $\mathrm{ev}_{\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A)}$ is an equivalence. \square

Remark 7.8. The condition that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A^!) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A^!)$ states that $A^!$ is HFD closed in the sense of [KS22]. Proposition 7.7 could also be deduced using a similar argument to the proof of 6.9 of [KS22]. Note that both proofs require separability of A/J_+ .

Remark 7.9. If R is a left Noetherian k -algebra of finite global dimension then every finite dimensional module is finitely generated and so admits a finite resolution by finitely generated projectives. Hence, $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(R)$. There are coherent k -algebras of finite global dimension for which $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(R) \not\subseteq \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(R)$ such as the infinite Kronecker quiver. However this example cannot appear as the Koszul dual of a finite dimensional DGA. If $R = A^!$ for a finite dimensional DGA A then one would have that $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A) \simeq \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A^!) \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A^!)$ by Theorem 6.16 in [Goo23]. But one can show that $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A^!) \cap \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A^!) \simeq D^b(k)$ which clearly cannot occur.

8. AN EXAMPLE

We use Proposition 7.7 to show that the DGA $k[x]/x^2$ with $|x| = 1$ and its Koszul dual $k[[t]]$ are reflexive. To see that k generates the cohomologically finite modules we use the following lemma.

Lemma 8.1. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}, k) be a commutative Noetherian local ring, then any $M \in \text{loc}(k)$ is quasi-isomorphic to a K -injective complex where each term is a sum of copies of the injective hull $E(k)$ of k .*

Proof. Let $M \xrightarrow{\sim} I$ be a K -injective resolution of M with each I^n injective. Since R is Noetherian each injective I^n splits as a direct sum of copies of $E(R/\mathfrak{p})$ for some primes \mathfrak{p} . We claim that we can choose I such that only the terms $E(k)$ can appear. To do this we use that $\text{loc}(k)$ is a smashing tensor ideal (this follows for example by Neeman's classification in [NB92]). Following [DG02], the associated localisation functor can be described as $-\otimes K_\infty(\mathfrak{m}): \mathcal{D}(R) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(R)$ where $K_\infty(\mathfrak{m})$ is the stable Koszul complex. This is defined as $K_\infty(m_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes K_\infty(m_n)$ where m_1, \dots, m_n are generators of \mathfrak{m} and

$$K_\infty(m_i) := (0 \rightarrow R \rightarrow R_{m_i} \rightarrow 0)$$

with R in degree 0. Recall that $E(R/\mathfrak{p})$ is \mathfrak{p} -torsion and that if $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$ then x acts invertibly on $E(R/\mathfrak{p})$. It follows that $E(R/\mathfrak{p})_x = E(R/\mathfrak{p})$ if $x \notin \mathfrak{p}$ and zero otherwise.

For some $x \in R$ consider the subcomplex $I(x) \subseteq I$ whose n -th term contains all summands of the form $E(R/\mathfrak{p})$ where $x \in \mathfrak{p}$. This is indeed a subcomplex since $\text{Hom}(E(R/\mathfrak{p}), E(R/\mathfrak{q})) \neq 0$ if and only if $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathfrak{q}$ and so the differentials must restrict. Now since $K_\infty(x)$ is K -flat there is a triangle

$$I(x) \otimes K_\infty(x) \rightarrow I \otimes K_\infty(x) \rightarrow I/I(x) \otimes K_\infty(x) \rightarrow^+$$

Since $E(R/\mathfrak{p})_x = 0$ if $x \in \mathfrak{p}$ it follows that $I(x) \otimes K_\infty(x) \simeq I(x)$. We claim that $I/I(x) \otimes K_\infty(x) = 0$. Indeed by definition, the n -th differential is

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \bigoplus_{x \notin \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p} \in \Lambda_n} E(R/\mathfrak{p}) & \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} d_{I/I(x)} & 0 \\ (-1)^n & d_{I/I(x)} \end{pmatrix}} & \bigoplus_{x \notin \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p} \in \Lambda_{n+1}} E(R/\mathfrak{p}) \\ \bigoplus_{x \notin \mathfrak{p}, x \notin \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p} \in \Lambda_{n-1}} E(R/\mathfrak{p}) & & \bigoplus_{x \notin \mathfrak{p}, x \notin \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p} \in \Lambda_n} E(R/\mathfrak{p}) \end{array}$$

From which one can see the complex is acyclic. Hence, we have that $I(x) \simeq I \otimes K_\infty(x)$. Repeating this argument we see that

$$I \otimes K_\infty(\mathfrak{m}) \simeq I \otimes K_\infty(m_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes K_\infty(m_n)$$

is quasi-isomorphic to a complex whose only summands are $E(R/\mathfrak{p})$ where $m_1, \dots, m_n \in \mathfrak{p}$ i.e. only $E(k)$ appears. Since $I \in \text{loc}(k)$ it follows that $I \simeq I \otimes K_\infty(\mathfrak{m})$ and so we are done. \square

Lemma 8.2. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}, k) be a commutative Noetherian local ring and suppose $M \in \text{loc}(k)$. If $\text{RHom}_R(k, M) \in \mathcal{D}^b(k)$ then $M \in \text{thick}(E(k))$ where $E(k)$ is the injective hull of k .*

Proof. Let $M \xrightarrow{\sim} I$ be a K -injective resolution of M constructed as in Lemma 8.1. We can replace I with a homotopically minimal complex J as in Appendix B of [Kra05]. So J is a summand of I which is quasi-isomorphic to I and has no non-zero null homotopic summands. Note J is still a K -injective resolution of M and the terms appearing are sums of copies of $E(k)$.

So we have $\mathrm{RHom}_R(k, M) = \mathrm{Hom}_R(k, J)$ and we claim the differential on $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, J)$ vanishes. Suppose $f: k \rightarrow J^n = \bigoplus E(k)$. Denote the composition with any of the projections as $g: k \rightarrow J^n \rightarrow E(k)$. Since $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, E(k)) \cong k$, if $g \neq 0$ we must have that g is the inclusion $k \subseteq E(k)$. In this case let $d: E(k) \rightarrow J^{n+1}$ denote the restriction of the differential to this summand of J^n . Since $k \subseteq E(k)$ is essential we either have that $k \cap \ker(d) \neq 0$ or $\ker(d) = 0$. In the former case we must have $k \cap \ker(d) = k$ and so $k \subseteq \ker(d)$ and $dg = 0$. In the latter case we have that $d: E(k) \rightarrow d(E(k))$ is an isomorphism. Hence, $E(k) \rightarrow d(E(k))$ is a null homotopic subcomplex of J . Since $E(k)$ and so $d(E(k))$ is injective, $d(E(k))$ is a summand of J^{n+1} . Also any differential $d': J^{n-1} \rightarrow E(k)$ must vanish since $dd' = 0$ and d is an isomorphism. Therefore $E(k) \rightarrow d(E(k))$ is a null homotopic summand of J . Hence, by minimality it must in fact be zero and so in this case $dg = 0$. We conclude that $df = 0$ and the differential vanishes on $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, J)$.

Then $H^n(\mathrm{RHom}_R(k, M)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_R(k, J^n)$ is finite dimensional for all n and vanishes except at finitely many n . It follows that J is bounded and each term is a finite sum of copies of $E(k)$. Indeed if $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, J^n) = 0$ then $J^n = 0$ since otherwise $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, E(k)) = k$ is a summand of $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, J^n) = 0$. Also if J^n consisted of infinitely many copies of $E(k)$ then $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, J^n)$ would have infinitely many non-zero summands given by $\mathrm{Hom}_R(k, E(k)) = k$. Therefore $M \simeq J \in \mathrm{thick}(E(k))$. \square

Proposition 8.3. *Let $A = k[x]/x^2$ with $|x| = 1$. Then $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A) = \mathrm{thick}_A(k)$ and both A and $A^! = k[[t]]$ are reflexive.*

Proof. Set $R = k[[t]] = A^!$. Since $\mathrm{RHom}_R(k, k) \simeq A$ and k is perfect over R we have the following diagram of equivalences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{perf}}(A) & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{thick}_A(k) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{cf}}(A) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{D}(A) \\
\wr \downarrow k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} - & & \wr \downarrow & & \wr \downarrow & & \wr \downarrow k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} - \\
\mathrm{thick}_R(k) & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{thick}_R(k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} k) & \hookrightarrow & \mathcal{C} & \hookrightarrow & \mathrm{loc}_R(k) \hookrightarrow \mathcal{D}(R)
\end{array}$$

where \mathcal{C} denotes the image of $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(A)$ under the equivalence $k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} - : \mathcal{D}(A) \xrightarrow{\sim} \text{loc}_R(k)$. We claim that $E(k) \simeq k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} k$. To compute this consider the K-projective resolution P of k given by the totalisation of

$$\cdots \rightarrow \Sigma^{-i} A \xrightarrow{x} \Sigma^{-i+1} A \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow A$$

i.e. $P^0 = \bigoplus_{i \leq 0} k$ and $P^1 = \bigoplus_{i \leq 0} (x)$ with differential given by sending the summand indexed at i to the summand indexed by $i - 1$. Then as a complex $k \otimes_A P = \bigoplus_{i \leq 0} k$. For the action note that $t \in k[[t]] \simeq \text{RHom}_A(k, k)$ corresponds to the map $P \rightarrow P$ which sends the first copy of $k[x]/x^2$ to zero and then shifts the index of the other summands up by degree 1. Hence, t acts on $k \otimes_A P$ by shifting the index of each summand up by 1. Therefore as a $k[[t]]$ module $k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} k \cong k[t^{-1}] \cong k((t))/k[[t]]$ which is the injective hull of k . For any $c \in \mathcal{C}$ we have that $\text{RHom}_R(k, c) \in \mathcal{D}^b(k)$. So by Lemma 8.2, $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \text{thick}_R(E(k)) = \text{thick}_R(k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} k)$. Hence $\mathcal{C} = \text{thick}_R(k \otimes_A^{\mathbb{L}} k)$ and so $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(A) = \text{thick}_A(k)$. By Remark 7.9 $\mathcal{D}_{\text{cf}}(R) \subseteq \mathcal{D}^{\text{perf}}(R)$. We can apply Proposition 7.7 since $A/J_+ = k$ is k -separable and conclude that A and $A^!$ are reflexive. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB69] Maurice Auslander and Mark Bridger. Stable module theory. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, (94), 1969.
- [BH98] Winfried Bruns and H. Jürgen Herzog. *Cohen-Macaulay Rings*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 2 edition, 1998.
- [BvdB03] A. Bondal and M. van den Bergh. Generators and representability of functors in commutative and noncommutative geometry. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 3(1):1–36, 258, 2003.
- [DG02] W. G. Dwyer and J. P. C. Greenlees. Complete modules and torsion modules. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 124(1):199–220, 2002.
- [DP84] Albrecht Dold and Dieter Puppe. Duality, trace and transfer. *Proceedings of the Steklov Institute of Mathematics*, (154):85–103, 1984.
- [Efi20] Alexander Efimov. Categorical smooth compactifications and generalized hodge-to-de rham degeneration. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 222, 11 2020.
- [Goo23] Isambard Goodbody. Reflecting perfection for finite dimensional differential graded algebras. *arXiv: 2310.02833*, 2023.
- [Jin20] Haibo Jin. Cohen-macaulay differential graded modules and negative calabi-yau configurations. *Advances in Mathematics*, 374:107338, 2020.
- [Kel82] G. M. Kelly. *Basic concepts of enriched category theory*. Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- [Kra05] Henning Krause. the stable derived category of a noetherian scheme. *Compositio Mathematica*, 141(5):1128–1162, 2005.
- [KS22] Alexander Kuznetsov and Evgeny Shinder. Homologically finite-dimensional objects in triangulated categories. *arXiv: 2211.09418*, 2022.

- [LMSM86] L. G. Lewis, J. P. May, M. Steinberger, and J. E. McClure. *Equivariant stable homotopy theory*. Springer-Verlag, 1986.
- [LV05] Wendy Lowen and Michel Van den Bergh. Hochschild cohomology of abelian categories and ringed spaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 198(1):172–221, 2005. Special volume in honor of Michael Artin: Part I.
- [NB92] Amnon Neeman and Marcel Bökstedt. The chromatic tower for $D(R)$. *Topology*, 31(3):519–532, 1992.
- [Orl20] Dmitri Orlov. Finite-dimensional differential graded algebras and their geometric realizations. *Advances in Mathematics*, 366:107096, jun 2020.
- [Orl23] Dmitri Orlov. Smooth dg algebras and twisted tensor product, 2023.
- [Rie14] Emily Riehl. *Categorical Homotopy Theory*. New Mathematical Monographs. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [RS20] Theo Raedschelders and Greg Stevenson. Proper connective differential graded algebras and their geometric realizations. *arXiv: 1903.02849*, 2020.
- [Tab05] Gonalo Tabuada. Une structure de catgorie de modles de Quillen sur la catgorie des dg-catgories. *Comptes Rendus. Mathmatique*, 340(1):15–19, 2005.
- [Tab15] Gonalo Tabuada. *Noncommutative motives*. American mathematical society, 2015.
- [To07] Bertrand Ton. The homotopy theory of dg -categories and derived Morita theory. *Inventiones Mathematicae*, 167(3):615–667, March 2007.